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PROLEGOMENA.

CHAPTER I.

ON THE THREE FIRST GOSPELS GENERALLY.

SECTION I.

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE THREE FIRST GOSPELS.

1. On examining the four records of our Lord's life on earth which remain to us, the first thing which demands our notice is the distinctness, in character and contents, of the three first Gospels from the fourth. This distinctive character may be thus shortly described.

2. Matthew, Mark, and Luke, in relating His ministry, discourses, and miracles, confine themselves exclusively to the events which took place in Galilee, until the last journey to Jerusalem. No incident whatever of His ministry in Judæa is related by any of them. Had we only their accounts, we could never with any certainty have asserted that He went to Jerusalem during His public life, until His time was come to be delivered up. They do not, it is true, exclude such a supposition, but rather imply it (see Matt. xxiii. 37. xxvii. 57, and parallels); it could not, however, have been gathered from their narrative with any historical precision.

3. If we now turn to the fourth Gospel, we find this deficiency remarkably supplied. The various occasions on which the Lord went up to Jerusalem are specified; not, indeed, with any precision of date or sequence, but mainly for the purpose of relating the discourses and miracles by which they were signalized.

4. But the difference in character between the three first Evangelists and the fourth is even more striking. While their employment (with the sole exception, and that almost exclusively in Matthew, of the application of O. T. prophecies to events in the life of the Lord) is narration without comment, the fourth Evangelist speaks with dogmatic authority, and
delivers his historical testimony as from the chair of an Apostle. In no place do they claim the high authority of eye-witnesses; nay, in the preface to Luke's Gospel, while he vindicates his diligent care in tracing down the course of events from the first, he expressly disclaims such authority. This claim is, however, advanced in direct terms by John (see below, ch. v. § 2. 1). Again, in the character of the Lord's discourses, reported by the three, we have the same distinctness. While His sayings and parables in their Gospels almost exclusively have reference to His dealings with us, and the nature of His kingdom among men, those related by John principally regard the deeper subjects of His own essential attributes and covenant purposes; referring indeed often and directly to His relations with His people and the unbelieving world, but such reference following as a consequence, rather than forming the primary object of the discourse. That there are exceptions to this in both cases (see e.g. Matt. xi. 27. Luke x. 22, on the one hand, and John xv. 6, on the other) is only to be expected from that merciful condescension by which God, in giving us the Gospel records through the different media of individual minds and apprehensions, has yet furnished us with enough common features in them all to satisfy us of the unity and truthfulness of their testimony to His blessed Son.

5. Reserving further remarks on the character of John's Gospel for their proper place (see ch. v. of these Prolegomena), I further notice that the three, in their narration of the Lord's ministry, proceed in the main upon a common outline. This outline is variously filled up, and variously interrupted; but is still easily to be traced, as running through the middle and largest section of each of their Gospels.

6. Besides this large portion, each Gospel contains some prefatory matter regarding the time before the commencement of the Ministry,—a detailed history of the Passion,—fragmentary notices of the resurrection,—and a conclusion. These will be separately treated of and compared in the following sections, and more at large in the Commentary.

SECTION II.

THEIR INDEPENDENCE OF ONE ANOTHER.

1. Having these three accounts of one and the same Life and Ministry of our Lord, it is an important inquiry for us, how far they may be considered as distinct narratives,—how far as borrowed one from another. It is obvious that this inquiry can only, in the absence of any direct historical testimony, be conducted by careful examination of their contents. Such examination however has conducted inquirers to the most various and inconsistent results. Different hypotheses of the mutual interdependence of the three have been made, embracing every possible permutation of
their order. To support these hypotheses, the same phenomena have been curiously and variously interpreted. What, in one writer’s view, has been a deficiency in one Evangelist which another has supplied,—in that of a second writer, has been a condensation on the part of the one Evangelist of the full account of the other;—while a third writer again has seen in the fuller account the more minute depiction of later tradition.

2. Let us, however, observe the evidence furnished by the Gospels themselves. Each of the sacred Historians is, we may presume, anxious to give his readers an accurate and consistent account of the great events of Redemption. On either of the above hypotheses, two of them respectively sit down to their work with one or two of our present narratives before them. We are reduced then to adopt one or other of the following suppositions; Either, (a) they found those other Gospels insufficient, and were anxious to supply what was wanting; or, (β) they believed them to be erroneous, and purposed to correct what was inaccurate; or, (γ) they wished to adapt their contents to a different class of readers, incorporating at the same time whatever additional matter they possessed; or, (δ) receiving them as authentic, they borrowed from them such parts as they purposed to relate in common with them.

3. There is but one other supposition, which is plainly out of the range of probability, and which I should not have stated, were it not the only one, on the hypothesis of mutual dependency, which will give any account of, or be consistent with, the various minute discrepancies of arrangement and narration which we find in the Gospels. It is (ε), ‘That (see last paragraph) they fraudulently plagiarized from them, slightly disguising the common matter so as to make it appear their own.’ One man wishing to publish the matter of another’s work as his own, may be conceived as altering its arrangement and minutiae, to destroy its distinctive character. But how utterly inapplicable is any such view to either of our three Evangelists! And even supposing it for a moment entertained,—how imperfectly and anomalously are the changes made,—and how little would they be likely to answer their purpose!

4. Let us consider the others in order. If (a) was the case, I maintain that no possible arrangement of our Gospels will suit its requirements.

1. That Matt. wrote first—that Mark used his Gospel—and then Luke both these. This is held by Grotius, Mill, Wetstein, Townson, Hug, and Greswell, who advances, and sometimes maintains with considerable ingenuity, the hyp. of a supplemental relation of the three taken in order.


THE THREE GOSPELS.

Let the reader refer to the last note, and follow me through its divisions. (1), (2), (5), (6) are clearly out of the question, because the shorter Gospel of Mark follows upon the fuller ones of Matthew, or Luke, or both. We have then only to examine those in which Mark stands first. Either then Luke supplied Matthew,—or Matthew, Luke. But first, both of these are inconceivable as being expansions of Mark; for his Gospel, although shorter, and narrating fewer events and discourses, is, in those which he does narrate, the fullest and most particular of the three. And again, Luke could not have supplied Matthew; for there are most important portions of Matthew which he has altogether omitted (e.g. ch. xxv. much of ch. xiii. ch. xv.);—nor could Matthew have supplied Luke, for the same reason, having omitted almost all of the important section Luke ix. 51—xviii. 15, besides very much matter in other parts. I may also mention that this supposition leaves all the difficulties of different arrangement and minute discrepancy unaccounted for.

5. We pass to (β), on which much need not be said. If it were so, nothing could have been done less calculated to answer the end, than that which our Evangelists have done. For in no material point do their accounts differ, but only in arrangement and completeness;—and this latter difference is such, that no one of them can be cited as taking any pains to make it appear that his own arrangement is chronologically accurate. No fixed dates are found in those parts where the differences exist; no word to indicate that any other arrangement had ever been published. Does this look like the work of a corrector? Even supposing him to have suppressed the charge of inaccuracy on others,—would he not have been precise and definite in the parts where his own corrections appeared, if it were merely to justify them to his readers?

6. Neither does the supposition represented by (γ) in any way account for the phenomena of our present Gospels. For,—even taking for granted the usual assumption, that Matthew wrote for Hebrew Christians, Mark for Latins, and Luke for Gentiles in general,—we do not find any such consistency in these purposes, as a revision and alteration of another's narrative would necessarily presuppose. We have the visit of the Gentile Magi exclusively related by the Hebraizing Matthew;—the circumcision of the child Jesus, and His frequenting the passovers at Jerusalem, exclusively by the Gentile Evangelist Luke. Had the above purposes been steadily kept in view in the revision of the narratives before them, the Evangelists could not have omitted incidents so entirely subservient to their respective designs.

7. Our supposition (δ) is, that receiving the Gospel or Gospels before them as authentic, the Evangelists borrowed from them such parts as they purposed to narrate in common with them. But this does not represent the matter of fact. In no one case does any Evangelist borrow from another any considerable part of even a single narrative. For such bor-
rowing would imply verbal coincidence, unless in the case of strong Hebraistic idiom, or other assignable peculiarity. It is inconceivable that one writer borrowing from another in good faith and with approval, should alter his diction so singularly and capriciously as, on this hypothesis, we find the text of the parallel sections of our Gospels altered. Let the question be answered by ordinary considerations of probability, and let any passage common to the three Evangelists be put to the test. The phenomena presented will be much as follows:—first, perhaps, we shall have three, five, or more words identical;—then as many wholly distinct: then two clauses or more, expressed in the same words but differing order:—then a clause contained in one or two, and not in the third:—then several words identical:—then a clause not only wholly distinct but apparently inconsistent:—and so forth;—with recurrences of the same arbitrary and anomalous alterations, coincidences, and transpositions. Nor does this description apply to verbal and sentential arrangement only;—but also, with slight modification, to that of the larger portions of the narratives. Equally capricious would be the disposition of the subject-matter. Sometimes, while coincident in the things related, the Gospels place them in the most various order,—each in turn connecting them together with apparent marks of chronological sequence (e. g. the visit to Gadara in Matt. viii. 28 ff. as compared with the same in Mark vi. 1 ff. Luke viii. 26 ff. and numerous other such instances noticed in the commentary). Let any one say, divesting himself of the commonly-received hypotheses respecting the connexion and order of our Gospels, whether it is within the range of probability that a writer should thus singularly and unreasonably alter the subject-matter and diction before him, having (as is now supposed) no design in so doing, but intending fairly and with approval, to incorporate the work of another into his own? Can an instance be any where cited of undoubted borrowing and adaptation from another, presenting similar phenomena?

8. I cannot then find in any of the above hypotheses, a solution of the question before us, how the appearances presented by our three Gospels are to be accounted for. I do not see how any theory of mutual inter-dependence will leave to our three Evangelists their credit as able or trustworthy writers, or even as honest men: nor can I find any such theory borne out by the nature of the variations apparent in the respective texts.

SECTION III.

THE ORIGIN OF OUR THREE GOSPELS.

1. It remains then, that the three Gospels should have arisen independently of one another. But supposing this, we are at once met by the difficulty of accounting for so much common matter, and that narrated, as
we have seen, with such curious verbal agreements and discrepancies. Thus we are driven to some common origin for those parts. But of what kind? Plainly, either documentary, or oral. Let us consider each of these in turn.

2. No documentary source could have led to the present texts of our Gospels. For supposed it to have been in the Aramaic language, and thus accounting for some of the variations in our parallel passages, as being independent translations,—we shall still have no solution whatever of the more important discrepancies of insertion, omission, and arrangement. To meet these, the most complicated hypotheses have been advanced 2,—all perfectly capricious, and utterly inadequate, even when apprehended, to account for the phenomena.—The various opponents of the view of an original Gospel have well shown besides, that such a Gospel could never have existed, because of the omission in one or other of our three, of passages which must necessarily have formed a part of it (e.g. Matt. xxvi. 6—13 (see above) omitted by Luke). I believe then that we may safely abandon the idea of any single original Gospel, whether Aramaic or Greek.

3. Still it might be thought possible that though one document cannot have originated the text of the common parts of our Gospels, several documents, more or less related to one another, may have done so; in the absence of any original Gospel. But this, it will be seen, is but an imperfect analysis of their origin; for we are again met by the question, whence did these documents take their rise? And if they turn out to be only so many modifications of a received oral teaching respecting the actions and sayings of the Lord, then to that oral teaching are we referred back for a more complete account of the matter. That such evangelical documents did exist, I think highly probable; and believe I recognize such in some of the peculiar sections of Luke; but that the common parts of our Gospels, even if taken from such, are to be traced back further, I am firmly convinced.

2 It may be worth while, as an example, to state the nature of Bp. Marah’s hypothesis of the origin of our three Gospels. He supposes, 1) \( \text{\textit{n}} \), the original Hebrew Gospel. 2) \( \text{\textit{N}} \), a Greek version of the same. 3) \( \text{\textit{n}} + \alpha + \Lambda \), a volume containing a copy of the Hebrew original Gospel, accompanied by lesser (\( \alpha \)) and greater (\( \Lambda \)) additions. 4) \( \text{\textit{n}} + \beta + \beta \), another copy of ditto, accompanied by other lesser (\( \beta \)) and greater (\( \beta \)) additions. 5) \( \text{\textit{n}} + \gamma + \Gamma \), a third copy of ditto, accompanied by a third set of lesser (\( \gamma \)) and greater (\( \Gamma \)) additions. 6) \( \text{\textit{\textit{z}}} \), a Hebrew gnomic collection (collection of sayings of the Lord), varying according to different copies.

Hence he holds our Gospels to have arisen: viz. the Hebrew Matthew, from \( \text{\textit{n}} + \text{\textit{\textit{z}}} + \alpha + \Lambda + \gamma + \Gamma \);—Luke, from \( \text{\textit{n}} + \text{\textit{\textit{z}}} + \beta + \beta + \gamma + \Gamma + \text{\textit{N}} \);—Mark, from \( \text{\textit{n}} + \alpha + \Lambda + \beta + \beta + \text{\textit{n}} \);—the Greek Matthew, to be a translation from the Hebrew Matt., with the collation of \( \text{\textit{N}} \), and of Luke and Mark. This is only one of the various arrangements made by the supporters of this hypothesis. For those of Eichborn, Gratz, &c., see Meyer’s Comment., vol. i. Einleitung, pp. 26—27.
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4. We come then to inquire, whether the common sections of our Gospels could have originated from a common oral source. If by this latter is to be understood,—one and the same oral teaching everywhere recognized, our answer must be in the negative: for the difficulties of verbal discrepancy, varying arrangement, insertion, and omission, would, as above, remain unaccounted for. At the same time, it is highly improbable that such a course of oral teaching should ever have been adopted. Let us examine the matter more in detail.

5. The Apostles were witnesses of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus. In this consisted their especial office and work. Others besides them had been companions of the Lord:—but peculiar grace and power was given to them, by which they gave forth their testimony (Acts iv. 33). And what this testimony included, we learn from the conditions of apostleship propounded by Peter himself, Acts i. 21, 22: that in order to its being properly given, an Apostle must have been an eye and ear witness of what had happened from the baptism of John until the ascension: i. e. during the whole official life of the Lord. With the whole of this matter, therefore, was his Apostolic testimony concerned. And we are consequently justified in assuming that the substance of the teaching of the Apostles consisted of their testimony to such facts, given in the Holy Ghost and with power. The ordinary objection to this view, that their extant discourses do not contain Evangelic narrations, but are hortatory and persuasive, is wholly inapplicable. Their extant discourses are contained in the Acts, a second work of the Evangelist Luke, who having in his former treatise given all which he had been able to collect of their narrative teaching, was not likely again to repeat it. Besides which, such narrative teaching would occur, not in general and almost wholly apologetic discourses held before assembled unbelievers, but in the building up of the several Churches and individual converts, and in the catechization of catechumens. It is a strong confirmation of this view, that Luke himself in his preface refers to this original Apostolic narrative as the source of the various διηγήσεις which many had taken in hand to draw up, and states his object in writing, to be, that Theophilus might know the certainty (ἀπάλειπε) of those sayings concerning which he had been catechized.

It is a confirmation of the above view of the testimony of the Apostolic body,—that Paul claims to have received an independent knowledge, by direct revelation, of at least some of the fundamental parts of the Gospel history (see Gal. i. 12. 1 Cor. xi. 23. xv. 3), to qualify him for his calling as an Apostle.

6. I believe then that the Apostles, in virtue not merely of their having been eye and ear witnesses of the Evangelic history, but especially of their office, gave to the various Churches their testimony in a narrative
of facts: such narrative being modified in each case by the individual mind of the Apostle himself, and his sense of what was requisite for the particular community to which he was ministering. While they were principally together, and instructing the converts at Jerusalem, such narrative would naturally be for the most part the same, and expressed in the same, or nearly the same words: coincident however not from design or rule, but because the things themselves were the same, and the teaching naturally fell for the most part into one form. It would be easy and interesting to follow the probable origin and growth of such a cycle of narratives of the words and deeds of our Lord in the Church at Jerusalem,—for both the Jews, and the Hellenists,—the latter under such teachers as Philip and Stephen, commissioned and authenticated by the Apostles. In the course of such a process some portions would naturally be written down by private believers, for their own use or that of friends. And as the Church spread to Samaria, Caesarea, and Antioch, the want would be felt in each of these places of similar cycles of oral teaching, which when supplied would thenceforward belong to and be current in those respective Churches. And these portions of the Evangelic history, oral or partially documentary, would be adopted under the sanction of the Apostles, who were as in all things, so especially in this, the appointed and divinely-guided overseers of the whole Church. This common substratum of Apostolic teaching,—never formally adopted by all, but subject to all the varieties of diction and arrangement, addition and omission, incident to transmission through many individual minds, and into many different localities,—I believe to have been the original source of the common part of our three Gospels.

7. But I cannot think that either of them have incorporated this teaching in its original form. For, first, it was not originally expressed in Greek. That it would very soon be so expressed, follows as a matter of course from the early mention of Hellenistic converts, Acts vi., and the subsequent reception of the Gentiles into the Church; and it seems to have been generally received in that language, before any of its material modifications arose. This I gather from the remarkable verbal coincidences observable in the present Greek texts.—The substance, at least, of one of our present Gospels, appears to have been committed to writing in Hebrew, and lost,—or only preserved to us in a much modified translation.—Then again, the verbal discrepancies of our present Greek texts entirely forbid us to imagine that our Evangelists took up the usual oral teaching at one place or time; but point to a process of alteration and deflection, which will now engage our attention.

8. It will be observed that I am now speaking of those sections which our Gospels possess in common, and without reference to their order. The larger additions, which are due to peculiar sources of information,—
the narratives of the same event which have not sprung from a common source,—the different arrangement of the common sections,—with all these I am not now concerned.

9. The matter then of those sections I believe to have been this generally-received oral narrative of the Apostles of which I have spoken. Delivered, usually in the same or similar terms, to the catechumens in the various Churches, and becoming the text of instruction for their pastors and teachers, it by degrees underwent those modifications which the various Gospels now present to us. And I am not now speaking of any considerable length of time, such as might suffice to deteriorate and corrupt mere traditional teaching,—but of no more than the transmission through men Apostolic or almost Apostolic, yet of independent habits of speech and thought,—of an account which remained in substance the same. Let us imagine the modifications which the individual memory, brooding affectionately and reverently over each word and act of the Lord, would introduce into a narrative in relating it variously and under differing circumstances:—the Holy Spirit, who brought to their remembrance whatever things He had said to them (John xiv. 26), working in and distributing to each severally as He would;—Let us place to the account the various little changes of transposition or omission, of variation in diction or emphasis, which would be sure to arise in the freedom of individual teaching,—and we have I believe the only reasonable solution of the arbitrary and otherwise unaccountable coincidences and discrepancies in these parts of our Gospels.

10. It might perhaps be required that some presumptive corroborations should be given of such a supposition as that here advanced. For the materials of such, we must look into the texts themselves of such sections. And in them I think I see signs of such a process as the latter part of paragraph 9 describes. For,

11. It is a well-known and natural effect of oral transmission, that while the less prominent members of a sentence are transposed, or diminished or increased in number, and common-place expressions replaced by their synonyms, any unusual word, or harsh expression, or remarkable construction, is retained. Nor is this only the case, such words, expressions, or constructions, preserving their relative places in the sentences,—but, from the mind laying hold of them, and retaining them at all events, they are sometimes found preserved near their original places, though perhaps with altered relations and import. Now a careful observation of the text of the Gospels will bring before the reader continually instances of both of these. I have subjoined in a note a few, more to tempt the student to follow the track, than to give any adequate illustration of these remarks.

12. With regard to those parts of our Gospels which do not fall under the above remarks, there are various conceivable sources whence they may have arisen. As each Evangelist may have had more or less access to those who were themselves witnesses of the events, whether before or during the public ministry of the Lord, or as each may have fallen in with a more complete or a shorter account of those events, so have our narratives been filled out with rich detail, or confined to the mere statement of occurrences:—so have they been copious and entire in their history, or have merely taken up and handed down a portion of the Lord’s life. These particulars will come under our notice below, when we treat of each Gospel by itself.

SECTION IV.

THE DISCREPANCIES, APPARENT AND REAL, OF THE THREE GOSPELS.

1. In our three narratives, many events and sayings do not hold the same relative place in one as in another: and hence difficulties have arisen, and the faith of some has been weakened; while the adversaries of our religion have made the most of these differences, to impugn the veracity of the writers themselves. And hence also Christian commentators have been driven to a system of harmonizing which condescends to adopt the weakest compromises, and to do the utmost violence to probability and fairness, in its zeal for the veracity of the Evangelists. It becomes important therefore critically to discriminate between apparent and real discrepancy, and while with all fairness we acknowledge the latter where it exists, to lay down certain common-sense rules whereby the former may be also ascertained.

2. The real discrepancies between our Evangelistic histories are very few, and those all of one kind. They are simply the results of the entire independence of the accounts. They consist in different chronological
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arrangements, expressed or implied. Such for instance is the transposition before noticed of the history of the passage into the country of the Gadarenes, which in Matt. viii. 28 ff. precedes a whole course of events which in Mark v. 1 ff. Luke viii. 26 ff. it follows. Such again is the difference in position between the pair of incidents related Matt. viii. 19—22, and the same pair of incidents found in Luke ix. 57—61. And such are some other varieties of arrangement and position which will be brought before the readers of the following Commentary. Now the way of dealing with such discrepancies has been twofold,—as remarked above. The enemies of the faith have of course recognized them, and pushed them to the utmost: often creating them where they do not exist, and where they do, using them to overthrow the narrative in which they occur. While this has been their course,—equally unworthy of the Evangelists and their subject has been that of those who are usually thought the orthodox Harmonists. They have usually taken upon them to state, that such variously placed narratives do not refer to the same incidents, and so to save (as they imagine) the credit of the Evangelists, at the expense of common fairness and candour. Who, for example, can for a moment doubt that the pairs of incidents above cited from Matthew and Luke are identical with each other? What man can ever suppose that the same offer would have been, not merely twice made to the Lord in the same words and similarly answered by Him (for this is very possible), but actually followed in both cases by a request from another disciple, couched in the very same words? The reiterated sequence of the two is absolutely out of all bounds of probability:—and yet it is supposed and maintained by one of the ablest of our modern Harmonists! And this is only one specimen out of very many of the same kind, notices of which may be seen in the following Commentary.

3. The fair Christian critic will pursue a plan different from both these. With no desire to create discrepancies, but rather every desire truthfully and justly to solve them, if it may be,—he will candidly recognize them where they unquestionably exist. By this he loses nothing, and the Evangelists lose nothing. That one great and glorious portrait of the Lord should be harmoniously depicted by them,—that the procession of events by which our redemption is assured to us should be one and the same in all,—is surely more wonderful, and more plainly the work of God’s Holy Spirit, the more entirely independent of each other they can be shown to have been. Variation in detail and arrangement is to my mind the most valuable proof that they were, not mere mouthpieces or organs of infallible truth, as some would suicidally make them, but holy men, under the inspiration of God the Holy Ghost. I shall treat of this part of our subject more at length below (in § 6):—I mention it now, to show that we need not be afraid to recognize real discrepancies, in the spirit of fairness and truth. Christianity never was, and never can be the gainer,
by any concealment, warping, or avoidance of the plain truth, wherever it is to be found.

4. On the other hand, the Christian critic will fairly discriminate between real and apparent discrepancy. And in order to this, some rules must be laid down by which the limits of each may be determined.

5. Similar incidents must not be too hastily assumed to be the same. If one Evangelist had given us the feeding of the five thousand, and another that of the four, we should have been strongly tempted to pronounce the incidents the same, and to find a discrepancy in the accounts;—but our conclusion would have been false:—for we have now both events narrated by each of two Evangelists (Matthew and Mark), and formally alluded to by the Lord himself in connexion. Matt. xv. 9, 10. Mark viii. 19, 20. And there are several narrations now in our Gospels, the identification of which must be abstained from; e.g. the anointing of the Lord by the woman which was a sinner, Luke vii. 36 ff., and that at Bethany by Mary the sister of Lazarus, in Matt. xxvi. 6 ff. Mark xiv. 3 ff. John xi. 2. xii. 3 ff. In such cases we must judge fairly and according to probability,—not making trifling differences in diction or narrative into important reasons why the incidents should be different,—but rather examining critically the features of the incidents themselves, and discerning and determining upon the evidence furnished by them.

6. The circumstances and nature of the Lord’s discourses must be taken into account. Judging a priori, the probability is, that He repeated most of His important sayings many times over, with more or less variation, to different audiences, but in the hearing of the same Apostolic witnesses. If now these witnesses by their independent narratives have originated our present Gospels, what can be more likely than that these sayings should have found their way into the Gospels in various forms,—sometimes, as especially in Matt., in long and strictly coherent discourses,—sometimes scattered up and down, as is the matter of several of Matthew’s discourses in Luke? Yet such various reports of the Lord’s sayings are most unreasonably by some of the modern German critics (e.g. De Wette) treated as discrepancies, and used to prove Matthew’s discourses to have been mere arrangements of shorter sayings uttered at different times. —A striking instance of the repetition by the Lord of similar discourses varied according to the time and the hearers, may be found in the denunciations on the Scribes and Pharisees as uttered during the journey to Jerusalem, Luke xi. 37 ff., and the subsequent solemn and public reiteration of them in Jerusalem at the final close of the Lord’s ministry in Matt. xxiii. Compare also the parable of the pounds, Luke xix. 11 ff. with that of the talents, Matt. xxv. 14 ff., and in fact the whole of the discourses during the last journey in Luke, with their parallels, where such exist, in Matthew.
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SECTION V.

THE FRAGMENTARY NATURE OF THE THREE GOSPELS.

1. On any hypothesis which attributes to our Evangelists the design of producing a complete history of the life and actions of the Lord, and gives two of them the advantage of consulting other records of the same kind with their own,—the omissions in their histories are perfectly inexplicable. For example,—Matthew, as an Apostle, was himself an eye-witness of the Ascension, an event holding a most important place in the Divine process of the redemption of man. Yet he omits all record or mention of it. And though this is the most striking example, others are continually occurring throughout the three Gospels. Why has there been no mention in them of the most notable miracle wrought by the Lord,—which indeed, humanly speaking, was the final exciting cause of that active enmity of the Jewish rulers which issued in His crucifixion? Can it be believed, that an Apostle, writing in the fulness of his knowledge as such, and with the design of presenting to his readers Jesus of Nazareth as the promised Messiah,—should have omitted all mention of the raising of Lazarus,—and of the subsequent prophecy of Caiaphas, whereby that Messiahship was so strongly recognized?—The ordinary supposition, of silence being maintained for prudential reasons concerning Lazarus and his family, is quite beside the purpose. For the sacred books of the Christians were not published to the world in general, but were reserved and precious possessions of the believing societies: and even had this been otherwise, such concealment was wholly alien from their spirit and character.

2. The absence of completeness from our Gospels is even more strikingly shown in their minor omissions, which cannot on any supposition be accounted for, if their authors had possessed records of the incidents so omitted. Only in the case of Luke does there appear to have been any design of giving a regular account of things throughout: and from his many omissions of important matter contained in Matthew, it is plain that his sources of information were, though copious, yet fragmentary. For, assuming what has been above inferred as to the independence of our three Evangelists, it is inconceivable that Luke, with his avowed design of completeness, ch. i. 3, should have been in possession of matter so important as that contained in those parts of Matthew, and should deliberately have excluded it from his Gospel.

3. The Gospel of Mark,—excluding from that term the venerable and authentic fragment at the end of ch. xvi.,—terminates abruptly, in the midst of the narrative of incidents connected with the resurrection of our Lord. And, with the exception of the short prefatory compendium, ch. i. 1—13, there is no reason for supposing this Evangelist to be an abbreviator, in any sense, of the matter before him. His sources of information
were of the very highest order, and his descriptions and narratives are most life-like and copious; but they were confined within a certain cycle of Apostolic teaching, viz. that which concerned the official life of our Lord: and in that cycle not complete, inasmuch as he breaks off short of the Ascension, which another Evangelistic hand has added from Apostolic sources.

4. I shall have occasion to recur to this subject again, and more especially as regards Matthew, in the Prolegomena to each individual Gospel.

SECTION VI.

THE INSPIRATION OF THE THREE GOSPELS.

1. The results of our inquiries hitherto may be thus stated:—That our three Gospels have arisen independently of one another, from sources of information possessed by the Evangelists;—such sources of information, for a very considerable part of their contents, being, the narrative teaching of the Apostles; and, in cases where their personal testimony was out of the question, oral or documentary narratives preserved in and received by the Christian Church in the Apostolic age;—that the three Gospels are not formal, complete accounts of the whole incidents of the sacred history, but each of them fragmentary, containing such portions of it as fell within the notice of the Evangelist.

2. The important question now comes before us, In what sense are these Gospels to be regarded as inspired by the Holy Spirit of God? That they are so, in some sense, has been the concurrent belief of the Christian body in all ages. In the second, as in the nineteenth century, the ultimate appeal, in matters of fact and doctrine, has been to these venerable writings. It may be well then first to inquire on what grounds their authority has been rated so high by all Christians.

3. And I believe the answer to this question will be found to be, Because they are regarded as presenting to us the substance of the Apostolic testimony. The Apostles being raised up for the special purpose of witnessing to the Gospel history,—and these memoirs having been universally received in the early Church as embodying that their testimony, I see no escape left from the inference, that they come to us with Apostolic authority. The early Church was not likely to be deceived in this matter. The reception of the Gospels was immediate and universal. They never were placed for a moment by the consent of Christians in the same category with the spurious documents which soon sprang up after them. In external history, as in internal character, they differ entirely from the apocryphal Gospels; which though in some cases bearing the name and pretending to contain the teaching of an Apostle, were never recognized as Apostolic.

4. Upon the Apostolicity then of our Gospels, rests their claim to inspira-
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tion. Containing the substance of the Apostles' testimony, they carry with them that special power of the Holy Spirit which rested on the Apostles in virtue of their office. It may be well then to inquire of what kind that power was, and how far extending.

5. We do not find the Apostles transformed, from being men of individual character and thought and feeling, into mere channels for the transmission of infallible truth. We find them, humanly speaking, to have been still distinguished by the same characteristics as before the descent of the Holy Ghost. We see Peter still ardent and impetuous, still shrinking from the danger of human disapproval;—we see John still exhibiting the same union of deep love and burning zeal;—we find them pursuing different paths of teaching, exhibiting different styles of writing, taking hold of the truth from different sides.

6. Again, we do not find the Apostles put in possession at once of the Divine counsel with regard to the Church. Though Peter and John were full of the Holy Ghost immediately after the Ascension, neither at that time, nor for many years afterwards, were they put in possession of the purpose of God regarding the Gentiles, which in due time was specially revealed to Peter, and recognized in the Apostolic council at Jerusalem.

7. These considerations serve to show us in what respects the working of the Holy Spirit on the Apostles was analogous to His influence on every believer in Christ; viz. in the retention of individual character and thought and feeling,—and in the gradual development of the ways and purposes of God to their minds.

8. But their situation and office was peculiar, and unexampled. And for its fulfilment, peculiar and unexampled gifts were bestowed upon them. One of these, which bears very closely upon our present subject, was, the recalling by the Holy Spirit of those things which the Lord had said to them. This was His own formal promise, recorded in John xiv. 26. And if we look at our present Gospels, we see abundant evidence of its fulfilment. What unassisted human memory could treasure up saying and parable, however deep the impression at the time, and report them in full at the distance of several years, as we find them reported in our Gospels? To the Christian reader I need not put the other alternative. I refer to it only to remark, that every consideration, whether of the Apostles' external circumstances, or their internal feelings respecting Him of whom they bore witness, alike combines to confirm the persuasion of all Christians, that they have recorded as said by the Lord what He truly did say, and not any words of their own invention.

9. And let us pursue the matter further by analogy. Can we suppose that the light poured by the Holy Spirit upon the sayings of the Lord would be confined to them, and not extend itself over the other parts of the narrative of His life on earth? Can we believe that those miracles, which though not uttered in words, were yet acted parables, would not be,
under the same gracious assistance, brought back to the minds of the Apostles, so that they should be placed on record for the teaching of the Church?

10. And, going yet further, to those parts of the Gospels which were wholly out of the cycle of the Apostles' own testimony,—can we imagine that the Divine discrimination which enabled them to detect the 'lie to the Holy Ghost,' should have forsaken them in judging of the records of the Lord's birth and infancy,—so that they should have taught or sanctioned an apocryphal, fabulous, or mythical account of such matters? Some account of them must have been current in the Apostolic circle: for Mary the mother of Jesus survived the Ascension, and would be fully capable of giving undoubted testimony to the facts. (See notes on Luke i. ii.) Can we conceive then that, with her among them, the Apostles should have delivered other than a true history of these things? Can we suppose that Luke's account, which he includes among the things delivered by those who were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word from the first, is other than the true one, and stamped with the authority of the witnessing and discriminating Spirit dwelling in the Apostles? Can we suppose that the account in the still more immediately Apostolic Gospel of Matthew is other than the same history seen from a different side and independently narrated?

11. But if it be inquired how far such Divine superintendence has extended in the framing of our Gospels as we at present find them, the answer must be furnished by the contents of the Gospels themselves. That those contents are themselves various, and variously arranged, is token enough that in their selection and disposition we have human agency presented to us, under no more direct Divine guidance than that general leading which in main and essential points should ensure entire accordence. Such leading admits of much variety in points of minor consequence. Two men may be equally led by the Holy Spirit, though one may believe and record, that the visit to the Gadarenes took place before the calling of Matthew, while the other places it after that event; though one in narrating it speaks of two demoniacs, the other, only of one.

12. And it is observable that in the only place in the three Gospels where an Evangelist speaks of himself, he expressly lays claim, not to any supernatural guidance in the arrangement of his subject-matter, but to a diligent tracing down of all things from the first; in other words, to the care and accuracy of a faithful and honest compiler. After such an avowal on the part of the editor himself, to assert an immediate revelation to him of the arrangement to be adopted and the chronological notices to be given, is clearly not justified according to his own showing and assertion. The value of such arrangement and chronological connexion must depend on various circumstances in each case:—on their definiteness
and consistency,—on their agreement or disagreement with the other extant records; the preference being in each case given to that one whose account is the most exact, and whose notes of sequence are the most distinct.

18. In thus speaking, I am doing no more than even the most scrupulous of our Harmonizers have in fact done. In the case alluded to in paragraph 11, there is not one of them who has not altered the arrangement, either of Matthew, or of Mark and Luke, so as to bring the visit to the Gadarenes into the same part of the Evangelic History. But, if the arrangement itself were matter of Divine inspiration, then have we no right to vary it in the slightest degree, but must maintain (as the Harmonists have done in other cases, but never, that I am aware, in this) two distinct visits to have been made at different times, and nearly the same events to have occurred at both. I need hardly add that a similar method of proceeding with all the variations in the Gospels, which would on this supposition be necessary, would render the Scripture narrative a heap of improbabilities; and strengthen, instead of weakening, the cause of the enemies of our faith.

14. And not only of the arrangement of the Evangelic History are these remarks to be understood. There are certain minor points of accuracy or inaccuracy, of which human research suffices to inform men, and on which, from want of that research, it is often the practice to speak vaguely and inexactingly. Such are sometimes the conventionally received distances from place to place; such are the common accounts of phenomena in natural history, &c. Now in matters of this kind, the Evangelists and Apostles were not supernaturally informed, but left, in common with others, to the guidance of their natural faculties.

15. The same may be said of citations and dates from history. In the last apology of Stephen, which he spoke being full of the Holy Ghost, and with Divine influence beaming from His countenance, we have at least two demonstrable historical mistakes. And the occurrence of similar ones in the Gospels does not in any way affect the inspiration or the veracity of the Evangelists.

16. It may be well to conclude this section with a notable illustration of the principles upheld in it. What can be more undoubted and unanimous than the testimony of the Evangelists to the resurrection of the Lord? If there be one fact rather than another of which the Apostles were witnesses, it was this: and in the concurrent narrative of all four Evangelists it stands related beyond all cavil or question. Yet of all the events which they have described, none is so variously put forth in detail, or with so many minor discrepancies. And this was just what might have been expected, on the principles above laid down. The great fact that the Lord was risen,—set forth by the ocular witness of the Apostles, who had seen Him,—became from that day first in importance in the
delivery of their testimony. The *precise order* of His appearances would naturally, from the overwhelming nature of their present emotions, be a matter of minor consequence, and perhaps not even of accurate inquiry till some time had passed. Then, with the utmost desire on the part of the women and Apostles to collect the events in their exact order of time, some confusion would be apparent in the history, and some discrepancies in versions of it which were the results of separate and independent inquiries;—the traces of which pervade our present accounts. But what fair-judging student of the Gospels ever made these variations or discrepancies a ground for doubting the veracity of the Evangelists as to the fact of the Resurrection, or the principal details of the Lord's appearances after it?

**SECTION VII.**

**IMPRACTICABILITY OF CONSTRUCTING A FORMAL HARMONY OF THE THREE GOSPELS.**

1. From very early times, attempts have been made to combine the narratives of our three Gospels into one continuous history. As might have been expected, however, from the characteristics of those Gospels above detailed, such Harmonies could not be constructed without doing considerable violence to the arrangement of some one or more of the three, and an arbitrary adoption of the order of some one, to which then the others have been fitted and conformed. An examination of any of the current Harmonies will satisfy the student that this has been the case.

2. Now on the supposition that the three Gospels had arisen one out of the other, with a design such as any of those which have been previously discussed (with the exception of ε) in § ii. 2, 3, such a Harmony not only ought to be possible, but should arise naturally out of the several narratives without any forcing, or alteration of arrangement. Nay, on the supplementary theory of Greswell and others, the last written Gospel should itself be such a History as the Harmonisers are in search of. Now not only is this not the case, but their Harmonies contain the most violent and considerable transpositions:—they are obliged to have recourse to the most arbitrary hypotheses of repetition of events and discourses,—and after all, their Harmonies, while some difficulties would be evaded by their adoption, entail upon us others even more weighty and inexplicable.

3. Taking, however, the view of the origin of the Gospels above advocated, the question of the practicability of Harmonizing is simply reduced to one of *matter of fact:*—how far the three Evangelists in relating the events of a history which *was itself one and the same,* have
presented us with the same side of the narrative of those events, or with fragments which will admit of being pieced into one another.

4. And there is no doubt that, as far as the main features of the Evangelic history are concerned, a harmonious whole is presented to us by the combined narrative. The great events of the Lord's ministry, His baptism, His temptation, His teaching by discourses and miracles, His selection of the Twelve, His transfiguration, His announcement of His sufferings, death, and resurrection, His last journey to Jerusalem, His Betrayal, His Passion, Crucifixion, Burial, and Resurrection,—these are common to all; and as far as they are concerned, their narratives naturally fall into accordance and harmony. But when we come to range their texts side by side, to supply clause with clause, and endeavour to construct a complete History of details out of them, we at once find ourselves involved in the difficulties above enumerated. And the inference which an unbiased mind will thence draw is, that as the Evangelists wrote with no such design of being pieced together into a complete History, but delivered the Apostolic testimony as they had received it, modified by individual character and oral transmission, and arranged carefully according to the best of their knowledge,—so we should thus simply and reverentially receive their records, without setting them at variance with each other by compelling them in all cases to say the same things of the same events.

5. If the Evangelists have delivered to us truly and faithfully the Apostolic narratives, and if the Apostles spoke as the Holy Spirit enabled them, and brought events and sayings to their recollection, then we may be sure that if we knew the real process of the transactions themselves, that knowledge would enable us to give an account of the diversities of narration and arrangement which the Gospels now present to us. But without such knowledge, all attempts to accomplish this analysis in minute detail must be merely conjectural: and must tend to weaken the Evangelic testimony, rather than to strengthen it.

6. The only genuine Harmony of the Gospels will be furnished by the unity and consistency of the Christian's belief in their record, as true to the great events which it relates, and his enlightened and intelligent appreciation of the careful diligence of the Evangelists in arranging the important matter before them. If in that arrangement he finds variations, and consequently inaccuracies, on one side or the other, he will be content to acknowledge the analogy which pervades all the Divine dealings with mankind, and to observe that God, who works, in the communication of His other gifts, through the medium of secondary agents,—has been pleased to impart to us this, the record of His most precious Gift, also by human agency and teaching. He will acknowledge also in this, the peculiar mercy and condescension of Him who has adapted to universal human reception the record of eternal life by His Son, by means of the
very variety of individual recollections and modified reports. And thus he will arrive at the true Harmonistic view of Scripture; just as in the great and discordant world he does not seek peace by setting one thing against another and finding logical solution for all, but by holy and peaceful trust in that Almighty Father, who doeth all things well. So that the argument so happily applied by Butler to the nature of the Revelation contained in the Scriptures, may with equal justice be applied to the books themselves in which the record of that Revelation is found,—that 'He who believes the Scriptures to have proceeded from Him who is the Author of nature, may well expect to find the same sort of difficulties in them, as are found in the constitution of nature.'

CHAPTER II.

OF THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MATTHEW.

SECTION I.

ITS AUTHORSHIP.

1. The author of this Gospel has been universally believed to be, the Apostle Matthew. And with this belief the contents of the Gospel are not inconsistent, provided it be rightly understood. That the Apostle himself drew up the Gospel in its present form, both external and internal evidence forbid our supposing. For the weight of external evidence (see below, § ii.) is conclusive that the Apostle wrote his Gospel in Hebrew (i. e. Syro-Chaldaic, the vernacular language of Palestine at the time): and from internal features of narration and arrangement, especially in the latter part of the Gospel, it is hardly possible that it can have proceeded directly from an Apostle and eye-witness.

2. We are led then to the inference that we owe our present Gospel to a translator and compiler, similar in character and in the nature of his labours to those who have delivered to us the other two Gospels. Who this was, we are totally unable to say; and conjectures would be labour in vain. That his name does not appear, is a sufficient proof to us that he considered his work as being a faithful representation of the Apostolic record furnished by Matthew, and nothing more; and that, to the best of his belief, he used no other sources than that teaching.

3. That we have not, in this Gospel, the Apostolic record of Matthew entire, is evident, were it only from the omission of the Ascension. But the same may be gathered from other omissions and transpositions, of which instances will be found in the ensuing Commentary.
4. A question then may arise, What was the Gospel which Matthew wrote in Hebrew? And though there may be some difficulty in ascertaining this minutely and exactly,—yet, in the main, there can be little doubt that it consisted of various large sections of the Lord's life and sayings, rather after the manner of memoirs, than of any consecutive history:—that we owe to it the masterly and perfect report of the longer discourses; e. g. the Sermon on the Mount, ch. v.—vii., the discourse concerning John, ch. xi. &c. . . . and the independent narration of a variety of incidents, not contained in the other Gospels.

5. But the arrangement of the matter, and much supplementary and intercalary narrative, I believe to be owing to the researches of our Evangelistic compiler, who was desirous, as far as in him lay, to present to his readers a continuous and unbroken history.

6. I cannot, however, subscribe to the opinion that the translation and compilation was made under the superintendence of the Apostle himself. That our compiler should have omitted all account of the Ascension, in fidelity to his design of reporting nothing which he did not know to have the authority of Matthew, would be only a proof of his trustworthiness and simple adherence to truth: but that an Apostle, deliberately sending forth a professedly complete history, should have sanctioned the omission of so important an event, which he had himself witnessed, is inconceivable.

7. I conclude therefore that our present Gospel, in all its main portions, embraces the genuine contents of the memoirs which the Apostle Matthew committed to writing in Hebrew.—That the compiler of the present Greek Gospel either translated these portions from the original documents, or, which I think more probable, adopted that Greek version of them which was current in the part of the Church where he wrote.—That in doing so, he took pains, where there was a hiatus in the memoirs, to supply it by inquiry into the received record of the Apostle; and that he has inserted several such memoirs, less precise and definite than those other and longer ones.—That where he could not, satisfactorily to himself, ascertain what was the Apostle's testimony, he has not supplied the narrative from other sources, but has omitted the fact.—That we owe to this compiler the chief part of the arrangement of the Gospel as it now stands: which arrangement does not therefore rest on authority more exclusively Apostolic, than that of Mark or Luke.

8. Our attention must now be turned from the Evangelistic compiler, to the Apostle himself. And of him we know very little for certain. His calling, from being a Publican to be one of the twelve, is narrated by all three Evangelists. By Mark and Luke he is called Levi; in this Gospel, Matthew. Such change of name after becoming a follower of the Lord, was by no means uncommon; and the appearance of the Apostolic, not the original name, in the Gospel proceeding from himself, is in
analogy with the practice of Paul, who always in his Epistles speaks of himself by his new and Christian appellation. (On the doubts raised in ancient times respecting the identity of Matthew and Levi, see note on Matt. ix. 9.)

9. The Apostle Matthew is described by Clement of Alexandria (Pædag. II. i. p. 174) as belonging to the ascetic Judaistic school of early Christians. Nothing is known of his Apostolic labours out of Palestine, which Eusebius mentions generally (ἐφ’ ἐρέσον, Hist. Eccl. iii. 24). Later writers fix the scene of them in Ἑθιοπία, but also include in their circle Macedonia, and several parts of Asia (Rufin. Hist. Eccl. x. 9. Socr. Hist. Eccl. i. 19). Heracleon, as cited by Clement of Alexandria, Strom. iv. 9, p. 595, relates that his death was natural. This is implicitly confirmed by Clement himself, and by Origen and Tertullian, who mention only Peter, Paul, and James the Greater as martyrs among the Apostles.

SECTION II.

ITS ORIGINAL LANGUAGE AND AUTHENTICITY.

1. The universal testimony of the early Church declares that the Apostle Matthew wrote the Evangelic history in Hebrew; i.e. Syro-Chaldaic, the vernacular language of the Hebrew Christians in Palestine. The principal authorities on the point are these:—

(a) Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. iii. 39, quotes the testimony of Papias, derived through John the Presbyter, thus:—Ματθαῖος μὲν οὖν ἐβραῖκε διαλέγοντα τὰ λόγια συνετάξας ἤρμηνευς δ’ αὐτὰ ἦς ἐστάρο (οὐ ἰδρυσας) ἔκασσος. This same Papias is described by Eusebius, iii. 36, as ἀνὴρ τὰ πάντα λογισταρχὸς καὶ τῆς γραφῆς εἰδήμων. It is true that he asserts him, with reference to his adoption of chiliastic opinions, to have been σφόδρα σμικρὸς τῶν νοῶν: but this cannot be brought to bear on the validity of his testimony to a matter of fact; being only said controversially, and with regard to the adoption by Papias of apocryphal stories, and his belonging to a particular school of interpretation, from which Eusebius dissented; while at the same time this very author gives him, as above, all weight as an historic witness. The meaning of the expression λόγια in the above passage has been disputed: some saying that it only implies the discourses of the Lord. That the strict import of the word is only this, is true; but it is also true that works were known as collections of λόγια, which contained, besides discourses, historical matter. Such was Papias’s own work, which he entitled λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξηγήσεως: such is the Gospel of Mark, which he also designated as σύνταξις τῶν κυριακῶν λογίων (see Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. iii. 39). It seems therefore that by ῥᾴ λόγια in our passage he means the contents of a Gospel narrative, embracing
both the words and deeds of the Lord. The latter words of the testimony seem to imply, that at the time of its being written, Papias had not heard of any version of the Gospel in Greek: each went to the original Hebrew work of Matthew, and interpreted it as he could, i.e. according to his more or less accurate acquaintance with its language. It would exceed the limits of these Prolegomena to enter at length into the refutation of the attempt to set aside this testimony of Papias (or rather of John the Presbyter), by supposing that the apocryphal Gospel according to the Hebrews, or that of the Ebionites, or Nazarenes, may have been mistaken for the original of Matthew. Ebrard (Evang. Kritik, pp. 930 ff.) has discussed this matter at length, and plainly shown that whatever similarity these documents may have had to the Gospel of Matthew, they were always regarded as distinct from it.

(β) Ireneus, Haer. iii. 1: ὁ μὲν Μαρθαῖος ἐν τοῖς ἔβραιοις τῇ ἑδίᾳ διαλέγεται αὐτῶν καὶ γραφὴν ἠδύνατον εἰς εὐαγγελίου, τοῦ Πέτρου καὶ τοῦ Παύλου ἔμ Πώμη εὐαγγελιζομένων καὶ θεμελιώστων τῷ εἰκονίαν. It is sometimes assumed, because Ireneus in another place (Haer. v. 33) mentions Papias with honour, that this testimony must be derived from Papias. But this assumption is perfectly gratuitous and unwarrantable. Ireneus must be considered here as an independent witness, reporting what was the voice of ecclesiastical tradition at his time.

(γ) Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. v. 10, relates of Pantænus, ὁ Πάντανος καὶ εἰς Ἰνδοὺς ἐθείν λέγεται, ἕνθα λόγος εὑρεῖν αὐτῶν προφθάσαν τὴν αὐτοῦ παροντίαν τό κατὰ Μαρθαῖον εὐαγγελίων παρά τισιν αὐτῷ τῶν χριστῶν ἐπεγνώκοις, οἷς Βαρθολομαίος τῶν ἀποστόλων ἦν κηρύξας, αὐτοῖς τῇ ἔβραιοις γράμμασι τῷ τοῦ Μαρθαίου καταλείψαν γραφὴν, ἣν καὶ σωζοῦσα εἰς τῶν δηλόμενων χρόνον. The value of this testimony, which is altogether independent of that of Papias, is not in any way affected by the fact that Eusebius is speaking of a mere tradition. That tradition recognizes a Hebrew Gospel according to Matthew, and thus agrees with the testimonies before cited. Jerome refers also to the tradition, and says, "Reperit (Pantænus) in India Bartholomeum de duodecim Apostolis adventum Domini nostri Jesu Christi juxta Matthæi Evangelium praedicasse, quod, Hebraicus litteris scriptum, revertens Alexandriam secum detulit." (De Viris Illustr. 86.) A translation of Matthew's Gospel into Hebrew cannot here be meant, as Eusebius himself (see (ε) below) holds the Hebrew to have been the original.

(δ) Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. vi. 25, reports as from Origen, ὅτι πρωτὸν μὲν γέγραπται τὸ κατὰ τὸν πρὸ τοῦ τελών, ὦτερον δὲ ἀπόστολον Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, Μαρθαίον, ἐκδοθείς αὐτῷ τοῖς ἀκολουθεῖν τοὺς πιστεύσαι γράμματα ἔβραιοις συντεταγμένοι. This testimony again cannot without an unwarrantable assumption be supposed to depend on that of Papias; but must rather be regarded as another index of what was the universal tradition of the early Church.
(c) Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. iii. 24: Μαρθαῖος μὲν γὰρ πρότερον Ἐβραῖος κηρύζας, ὡς ἐμμελεῖ καὶ ἕφτερον λέγει, πατρὶω γλώττῃ γραφῇ παραδοῦσι τὸ καὶ αὐτὸν εὐαγγέλιόν, τὸ λείπειν τῇ αὐτοῦ παρουσίᾳ τῶν οὗ τῷ ἐν ἑστέλλετο διὰ τῆς γραφῆς δενιθήμου. With this may be compared another passage of Eusebius (ad Marin. quest. ii., cited by Meyer, Einleitung, p. 9): αἰλέκταν δὲ φίλε τοῦ σαββάτου παρὰ τοῦ ἐρμηνεύσαντος τῆς γραφῆς ὁ μὲν γὰρ εὐαγγελισθής Μαρθαῖος Ἐβραῖδι γλώττῃ παρέδωκε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον. This last passage shows that Eusebius himself believed the Gospel to have been written in Hebrew.

(ζ) Epiphanius, Häer. xxx. 3: ὡς τὰ ἀληθῆ ἵστων εἰσείν, διὶ Μαρθαῖος μόνος Ἐβραῖοι καὶ Ἐβραῖκοις γράμμασιν ἐν τῇ καινῇ διαθήκῃ ἰκοσίῳ τῆς τοῦ εὐαγγέλιου ἐκθέσιν τὸ καὶ κήρυμα.

(η) Jerome, Praef. to Matt.: Matthaeus in Judaeæ Evangelium Hebrœo sermonem edidit ob eorum vel maxime causam qui in Jesum crediderant ex Judæis. Also de Viris Illust., cap. 3, where he states that he had seen the Hebrew Gospel in the library at Caesarea;—which belief he seems however to modify in the 3rd Dialogue contra Pelagianos, near the beginning. See also Ep. ad Damas. iv. p. 48.

(θ) To cite later testimonies would be superfluous. I may only mention that Gregory Nazianzen, Chrysostom, Augustin, Isidorus Hispalensis, Theophylact, Euthymius, and others, assert the same. The ancient Church is unanimous on the subject.

2. When the Gospel was translated into Greek, or by whom, is quite uncertain. 'Quis postea in Græcum transtulerit, non satis certum est.' (Jerome, as above.) On this point see above, § i. 2 ff.

3. From the uncertainty last mentioned, many critics, and those especially Protestants, have maintained that the Gospel was originally written in Greek. Their arguments may be briefly summed up in two heads: 1. They reject the authority of the Fathers, as being likely to be mistaken, and as having been misled by Papias, and by the assertions of the Nazarenes. 2. They argue from internal evidence that our present Greek text of Matthew may very well be an original; but their inference from this is fallacious in two points:—the possibility of our text having been an original text does not prove that it actually was so; and even if this were established, its being an original text does not prove it to have been the original.

4. Our conclusion must therefore be in accordance with the testimony

4 The most remarkable names on both sides are as follow:—


of the early Church, unanimous as it is, and derived from so many independent sources: *that the Gospel was originally written in Hebrew.* What relation I believe our present Gospel to bear to that original one, I have before stated in § i. of the present chapter, 2—7. The considerations there advanced will serve as an answer to the objections which have in recent times been brought against the apostolicity and authenticity of the Gospel. That we have not in all cases such a narrative as would have proceeded from an Apostle and eye-witness, must be ascribed to the fact that our narrative has arisen partly from the written memoirs, partly from the oral teaching of Matthew;—that we have not all the events which an Apostle would undoubtedly have narrated, is to be ascribed to the incomplete and fragmentary nature of the collection;—that chronological inconsistencies are found in it, is to be accounted for by remembering that the arrangement is owing, not to the Apostle, but to the Evangelistic compiler. And these three heads comprise all the objections which have been with any reason made against the authenticity of the Gospel.

SECTION III.

FOR WHAT READERS AND WITH WHAT OBJECT IT WAS WRITTEN.

1. The fact that Matthew wrote in Syro-Chaldaic, and the statements in several of the testimonies above cited, show us that he originally drew up his Gospel for the use of the Jewish converts in Palestine. And internal notices tend to confirm this inference. We have fewer interpretations of Jewish customs, laws, and localities, than in the two other Gospels. The whole narrative proceeds more upon a Jewish view of matters, and is concerned more to establish that point, which to a Jewish convert would be most important,—*that Jesus was the Messiah prophesied in the Old Testament.* Hence the commencement of His genealogy from Abraham and David; hence the frequent notice of the necessity of this or that event happening, *because it was so foretold by the prophets*; hence the constant opposition of the Lord's spiritually ethical teaching to the evil formalistic ethics of the Scribes and Pharisees.

2. But we must not think of the Gospel as a systematic treatise drawn up with this end continually in view. It only exercised a very general and indirect influence over the composition, not excluding narratives, sayings, and remarks which had no such tendency, or even partook of an opposite one.

3. It is also to be remembered that the very fact of a Greek translation having been made indicates that *Grecian readers were in the view of the evangelistic compiler*; and that, in consequence, *he may have added interpretations and explanations: such e. g. as ch. i. 23, xxvii. 8. 33. 46, for their information.*

4. In furtherance of the design above mentioned, we may discern (with
the caution given in 2) a more frequent and consistent reference to the Lord as a King, and to his Messianic kingdom, than in the other Gospels. Designing these Prolegomena, not as a complete Introduction to the Gospels, but merely as subsidiary to the following Commentary, I purposely do not give instances of these characteristics, but leave them to be gathered by the student as he proceeds.

SECTION IV.

AT WHAT TIME IT WAS WRITTEN.

1. The testimony of the early Church is unanimous, that Matthew wrote first among the Evangelists. Clement of Alexandria, who dissented from the present order of our Gospels, yet placed those of Matthew and Luke first: προεγράφα εἶπε τῶν εὐαγγελίων τα περιέχοντα τὰς γενεαλογίας (Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. vi. 14). And Irenaeus (see above, § ii. 1, β) relates that Matthew wrote his Gospel while Peter and Paul were preaching and founding the Church in Rome. To what time this points, I shall hereafter discuss in the Prolegomena to the Acts; I set it now provisionally, as indicating a date not earlier than 61 A.D., nor later than 64 or 65. And to this notice internal marks of date are not repugnant. It seems, from ch. xxvii. 8, and xxviii. 15, that some considerable time had elapsed since the events narrated; while, from the omission of all mention of the destruction of Jerusalem, it would appear that the Gospel was published before that event. All these marks of time are, however, exceedingly vague, especially when other notices are taken into account, which place the Gospel 8 years after the Ascension (Theophyl. and Euthym.); — 15 years after the Ascension (Niceph. Hist. Eccl. ii. 45); — at the time of the stoning of Stephen (Cosmas Indicopleustes. Fabricius, Bibl. Gr. iv. 5, cited by Meyer).

2. At what time the Greek version and compilation was made we are entirely ignorant. From what has been said above (§ i.), I should be disposed to place it not very close to the writing of the Gospel itself, nor necessarily before the destruction of Jerusalem, as Meyer does (Einl. p. 23). It would form no part of the design of the compiler to insert notices of his own of a historical kind; and the intervention of the destruction of Jerusalem, and the consequent dispersion of the Jewish converts, would very much tend to throw the memoirs and testimony of the Apostle into that disjointed and fragmentary state in which we now find them. We must also suppose that the death, or at all events the final departure into distant parts, of Matthew himself, had taken place before our compiler drew up the present Greek Gospel.
SECTION V.
ITS STYLE AND CHARACTER.

1. The present Greek Gospel which we possess is written in the same form of diction which pervades the other Gospels, the Hebraistic or Hellenistic Greek. This dialect resulted from the dispersion of the Greek language by the conquests of Alexander, and more especially from the intercourse of Jews with Greeks in the city of Alexandria. It is that of the LXX version of the Old Testament; of the apocryphal books; and of the writings of Philo and Josephus. In these two latter, however, it is not so marked, as in versions from the Hebrew, or books aiming at a Hebraistic character.

2. Of the three Gospels, that of Matthew presents the most complete example of the Hebraistic diction and construction, with perhaps the exception of the first chapter of Luke. And from what has been above said respecting its design, this would naturally be the case.

3. The internal character of this Gospel also answers to what we know of the history and time of its compilation. Its marks of chronological sequence are very vague, and many of them are hardly perhaps to be insisted on at all. When compared with the more definite notices of Mark and Luke, its order of events is sometimes superseded by theirs. It was to be expected in the first written account of matters so important, that the object should rather be to record the things done, and the sayings of our Lord, than the precise order in which they took place.

4. It is in this principal duty of an Evangelist that Matthew stands pre-eminent; and especially in the report of the longer discourses of our Lord. It was within the limits of his purpose in writing, to include all the descriptions of the state and hopes of the citizens of the kingdom of heaven which Jesus gave during His ministry. This seems to have been the peculiar gift of the Spirit to him,—to recall and deliver down in their strictest verbal connexion, such discourses as the Sermon on the Mount, ch. v.—vii.; the apostolic commission, ch. x.; the discourse concerning John, ch. xi.; that on blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, ch. xii.; the series of parables, ch. xiii.; that to the Apostles on their division, ch. xviii.; and in their fulness, the whole series of polemical discourses and prophetic parables in ch. xxi.—xxv.

5. And I should be much disposed,—where the other two Gospels have manifestly related from a common source with this one,—to believe that common source to have been, the testimony of Matthew, in those cases where that testimony was available as that of an eye or ear witness. This in some instances would be impossible: as for instance in recording the raising of Jairus's daughter; the transfiguration; the agony in Gethsemane, where Peter, James, and John only were present; the parts of
the history preceding (chronologically, which was not the case with the Sermon on the Mount); Matthew's own calling; the prophetic discourse on the Mount of Olives, ch. xxiv.; and the appearance after the resurrection, ch. xxviii. 1—10; besides many other minor incidents.

6. It has been my endeavour in the following Commentary, to point out the close internal connexion of the longer discourses, and to combat the mistake of those critics who suppose them to be no more than collections of shorter sayings associated together from similarity of subject or character.

7. On the connexion in many points between the Epistle of James and this Gospel, see the Prolegomena to that Epistle, vol. ii.

CHAPTER III.

OF THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MARK.

SECTION I.

ITS AUTHORSHIP.

1. As in the case of the two other Gospels, we are dependent entirely on traditional sources for the name of the author. It has been universally believed to be Marcus: and further, that he was the same person who in Acts xii. 25, xv. 37, is spoken of as 'Ἰωάννης ὁ ἐξικάλοιμενος (καλούμενος, ἐπικληθείς) Μάρκος: in iii. 5. 13, as 'Ἰωάννης: in xv. 39, as Μάρκος: also in Col. iv. 10. 2 Tim. iv. 11. Philem. 24. The few particulars gleaned respecting him from Scripture are, that his mother's name was Mary (Acts xii. 12); and that she was sister to the Apostle Barnabas (Col. iv. 10); that she dwelt in Jerusalem (Acts, ibid.); that he was converted to Christianity by the Apostle Peter (1 Pet. v. 13); that he became the minister and companion of Paul and Barnabas, in their first missionary journey (Acts xii. 25); and was the cause of the variance and separation of these Apostles on their second (Acts xv. 37—40),—Barnabas wishing to take him again with them, but Paul refusing, because he had departed from them before the completion of the former journey (Acts xiii. 13). He then became the companion of Barnabas in his journey to Cyprus (Acts xvi. 39). We find him however again with Paul (Col. iv. 10), and an allusion apparently made in the words there to some previous stain on his character, which was then removed; see also Philem. 24. 2 Tim. iv. 11. Lastly, we find him with Peter (1 Pet. v. 13). From Scripture we know no more concerning him. But an unanimous tradition of the ancient Christian writers represents him as the
ITS ORIGIN.

§ i. ii.

'interpres' of Peter; i.e. the secretary or amanuensis, whose office it was to commit to writing the orally-delivered instructions and narrations of the Apostle. See authorities quoted in § ii., below.

2. Tradition (Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. ii. 15) brings him with Peter to Rome (but apparently only on the authority of 1 Pet. v. 13); and thence to Alexandria, where he is said to have become first bishop of the Church in that city, and to have suffered martyrdom there. All this however is exceedingly uncertain.

SECTION II.

ITS ORIGIN.

1. It was universally believed in the ancient Church, that Mark's Gospel was written under the influence, and almost by the dictation, of Peter.

(a) Eusebius quotes from Papias (Hist. Eccl. iii. 39), as the testimony of John the presbyter, Μάρκος μὲν ἐρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου γενόμενος, διὰ ἕμνη- μόνευσεν, ἀριθμὸς ἔγραψεν, κ. τ. λ.

(β) The same author (Hist. Eccl. v. 8) says, Μάρκος ὁ μαθητὴς καὶ ἐρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου, καὶ αὐτὸς τὰ ἐν Πέτρου κηρυσσόμενα ἔγραψεν ἴμιν παραδίδωκε. This he quotes from Irenæus (iii. 1); and further, that this took place μετὰ τὴν τούτων (i.e. τοῦ Πέτρου κ. τοῦ Παύλου) ἔξοδον.

(γ) The same author (Hist. Eccl. ii. 15) relates, on the authority of Clement (Hypotyp. vi.) and Papias, that the hearers of Peter at Rome, unwilling that his teaching should be lost to them, besought Mark, who was a follower of Peter, to commit to writing the substance of that teaching; that the Apostle, being informed supernaturally of the work in which Mark was engaged, ἀσθενεία τῆς τῶν ἀνδρῶν προθυμίας, κηρύσσει τε τὴν γραφήν εἰς ἑκτενίζων τῆς ἔκκλησιας. This account is manifestly inconsistent with the former.

(δ) In Hist. Eccl. vi. 14, Eusebius gives yet another account, citing the very passage of Clement above referred to: that Peter, knowing of Mark's work when it was completed and published, προστετελέως μὴν κυλύσαι μήτε προστέφασθαι.

(ε) The same author, in his Demonstr. Evang. iii. 5, says, Πέτρος δὲ ταύτα περὶ οἰκτρῶν μαρτυρεῖ· πάντα γὰρ τὰ παρὰ Μάρκῳ τοῦ Πέτρου δια- λέξεων ἐγκαὶ λέγεται ἀπομνημονεύματι.

(ζ) Tertullian (cont. Marcion, iv. 5) relates: Marcus quod edidit Evangelium, Petri adfirmatur, cujus interpres Marcus.

(η) Jerome (ad Hedibiam, quæst. ii.) writes: Habebat ergo (Paulus) Titum interpretem, sicut et beatus Petrus Marcum, cujus Evangelium Petro narrante et illo scrivente compositum est.

2. The above testimonies must now be examined as to their authority to rule our opinion on the question. We may observe that the matter to
which they refer is not one of patent fact,—such as Matthew's Gospel having been originally composed and published in Hebrew,—but one which could, from its nature, have been known to very few persons; viz. the private and unavowed influence of an Apostle over the writer. (For I reject at once the account which makes Peter authorise the Gospel, from no such authorization being apparent, which it certainly would have been, had it ever existed.) Again, the accounts cited are most vague and inconsistent as to the extent and nature of this influence,—some stating it to have been no more than that Peter preached, and Mark, after his death, collected the substance of his testimony from memory; others making it extend even to the dictation of the words by the Apostle.

3. It is obvious that all such accounts must be judged according to the phenomena presented by the Gospel itself. Now we find, in the title of the Gospel, a presumption that no such collection of the testimony of Peter is here presented to us, as we have of that of Matthew in the former Gospel. Had such been the case, we should certainly have found it called the Gospel according to Peter, not according to Mark.

4. If again we examine the contents of the Gospel, we are certainly not justified in concluding that Peter's hand has been directly employed in its compilation in its present form. The various mentions, and omissions of mention, of incidents in which that Apostle is directly concerned, are such as to be in no way consistently accounted for on this hypothesis. For let it be allowed that a natural modesty might have occasionally led him to omit matters tending to his honour,—yet how are we to account for his omitting to give an exact detail of other things at which he was present, and of which he might have rendered the most precise and circumstantial account? This has been especially the case in the narrative of the resurrection, not to mention numerous other instances which will be noticed in the Commentary. Besides, the supposition conceded in the last sentence cannot be consistently carried out. A remarkable instance to the contrary may be seen ch. xvi. 7, where εἰπάτε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ Πέτρῳ stands for εἰπάτε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ in Matthew.

5. We are led to the same conclusion by a careful comparison of the contents of this Gospel with those of Matthew and Luke. We find that it follows the same great cycle of Apostolic teaching;—that its narratives are derived in many cases from the same sources;—that it is improbable that any individual Apostle should have moulded and fashioned a record which keeps so generally to the beaten track of the generally-received Evangelic history. His own individual remembrances must unavoidably have introduced additions of so considerable an amount as to have given to the Gospel more original matter than it at present possesses.

6. But while unable to conceive any influence directly exerted by Peter over the compilation of the Gospel, I would by no means deny the possi-
bility of the derivation of some narratives in it from that Apostle. The peculiar minute and graphic precision (presently, § viii., to be further spoken of) which distinguish this Evangelist, seem to claim for him access in many cases to the testimony of some eye-witness where the other two Evangelists have not had that advantage. I have pointed out these cases where they occur, in the Commentary; and have not hesitated in some of them to refer conjecturally to Peter as the source of the narration.

7. The inference to be drawn from what has preceded is, that,—the general tradition of the ancients which ascribed to Mark a connexion with Peter as his secretary or interpreter, being adopted, as likely to be founded on fact,—yet the idea of any considerable or direct influence of Peter over the writing of the Gospel is not borne out by the work itself. We may so far recognize in it one form of the probable truth;—it is likely that Mark, from continual intercourse with and listening to Peter, and possibly from preservation of many of his narrations entire, may have been able, after his death, or at all events when separated from him, to preserve in his Gospel those vivid and original touches of description and filling-out of the incidents, which we now discover in it. Further than this I do not think we are authorized in assuming; and even this is conjectural only.

SECTION III.

FOR WHAT READERS AND WITH WHAT OBJECT IT WAS WRITTEN.

1. Internal evidence is very full as to the class of readers for whom Mark compiled his Gospel: the Gentile Christians are clearly pointed out by the following indications;—

(a) The omission of all genealogical notices of our Lord’s descent.

(β) The general abstinence from Old Testament citations, except in reporting discourses of our Lord (i. 2, 3, is the only exception, xv. 28 being probably spurious).

(γ) The appending of interpretations to the Hebrew or Aramaic terms occurring in the narrative (v. 41, vii. 11. 34).

(δ) The explanations of Jewish customs, as for example ch. vii. 3, 4.

(ε) Remarkable insertions or omissions in particular places: as, e. g. πάντες τοῖς ἐθνείς, ch. xi. 17, which words are omitted in Matthew and Luke:—no mention of the Jewish law:—omission of the limitations of the mission of the Apostles in Matt. x. (common however also to Luke.)

2. It is true that too much stress must not be laid on single particulars of this sort, as indicating design, where the sources of the Gospels were so scattered and fragmentary. But the concurrence of all these affords a very strong presumption that that class of readers was in the view of the
Evangelist, in whose favour all these circumstances unite. See Prolegomena to Matthew, § iii. 2.

SECTION IV.

AT WHAT TIME IT WAS WRITTEN.

1. The most direct testimony on this head is that of Irenæus, iii. 1 (see above, § ii. 1, β), that it was after the deaths of Peter and Paul. This would place its date after the year 64 or 65 (see Prolegg. to Matt. § iv.). But here, as in the case of the other Gospels, very little can be with any certainty inferred. We have conflicting traditions (see above, § ii.), and the Gospel itself affords us no clue whatever.

2. One thing only we may gather from the contents of the three first Gospels,—that none of them could have been originally written after the destruction of Jerusalem. Had they been, the omission of all allusion to so signal a fulfilment of our Lord’s prophecies would be inexplicable. In the case indeed of Luke, we can approximate nearer than this (see below, ch. iv. § iv.); but in those of Matthew and Mark, this is all which can be safely assumed as to the time of their first publication;—that it was after the dispersion or even the death of most of the Apostles, and before the investment of Jerusalem by the Roman armies under Titus, in the year 70. With regard to the time of publication of the Greek edition of Matthew’s Gospel, see remarks in ch. ii. § iv. 2.

SECTION V.

AT WHAT PLACE IT WAS WRITTEN.

Of this we have no trustworthy evidence. Most ancient writers (Clement, Eusebius, Jerome, Epiphanius, &c.) mention Rome; but apparently in connexion with the idea of Mark having written under the superintendence of Peter. Chrysostom mentions Alexandria; but no Alexandrine writer confirms the statement. In modern times, Storr has advanced a hypothesis that Mark wrote at Antioch, which he grounds, but insufficiently, on a comparison of ch. xv. 21, with Acts xi. 20.

SECTION VI.

IN WHAT LANGUAGE IT WAS WRITTEN.

1. There has never been any reasonable doubt, that Mark wrote in Greek. The two Syriac versions contain a marginal note, that Mark preached in Rome in Latin; and four MSS., enumerated by Scholz, Prolegg. p. xxx., append a notice, τὸ κατ. μάρκ. εὐαγ. ἐγράφη ῥωμαίσι ἐν Ἶτι Μητα' εἰ ἤν ἂν ἵπ τής ἀνάληψες τοῦ κυρίου. This statement, however, is destitute of probability from any external or internal evidence, and is
only one more assumption from the hypothetical publication in Rome under the superintendence of Peter, and for Roman converts.

2. Many writers of the Romish Church have defended the hypothesis of a Latin original, being biased by a wish to maintain the authority of the Vulgate: and a pretended part of the original autograph (!!) of the Evangelist is still shown in the Library of St. Mark's church at Venice; which, however, has been detected to be merely part of an ancient Latin MS. of the four Gospels,—another fragment of which exists, or existed, at Prague,—formerly preserved at Aquileia.

3. If Mark wrote in Latin, it is almost inconceivable that the original should have perished so early that no ancient writer should have made mention of the fact. For Latin was the language of a considerable and increasing body of Christians,—unlike Hebrew, which was little known, and belonged to a section of converts few in number:—yet ancient testimony is unanimous to Matthew's having written in Hebrew,—while we have not one witness to Mark having written in Latin.

SECTION VII.

GENUINENESS OF THE GOSPEL.

1. This has never been called in question, till very recently, by some of the German critics (Schleiermacher, Credner;—which last however (see Meyer, Com. ii. 9, note), has since seen reason to abandon his view,—and more recently still, Grimm) on, as it appears to me, wholly insufficient grounds. They allege that the testimony of Papias (see above, § ii. 1) does not apply to the contents of our present Gospel, but that some later hand has worked up and embellished the original simple and unarranged notices of Mark, which have perished.

2. But neither do the words of Papias imply any such inference as that Mark's notices must have been simple and unarranged; nor, if they did, are they of any considerable authority in the matter. It is enough that from the very earliest time the Gospel has been known as that of Mark; confirmed as this evidence is by the circumstance, that this name belongs to no great and distinguished founder of the Church, to whom it might naturally be ascribed, but to one, the ascription to whom can hardly be accounted for, except by its foundation in matter of fact.

3. On the genuineness of the remarkable fragment at the end of the Gospel, see notes there.

SECTION VIII.

ITS STYLE AND CHARACTER.

1. Of the three first Gospels, that of Mark is the most distinct and peculiar in style. By far the greater part of those graphic touches which describe the look and gesture of our Lord, the arrangement or appearance
of those around Him, the feelings with which He contemplated the persons whom He addressed, are contained in this Gospel. While the matters related are fewer than in either Matthew or Luke, Mark, in by far the greater number of common narrations, is the most copious, and rich in lively and interesting detail.

2. In one part only does Mark appear as an abridger of previously well-known facts; viz. in ch. i. 1—13, where,—his object being to detail the official life of the Lord,—he hastens through the previous great events,—the ministry of John, the baptism and temptation of Christ. But even in the abrupt transitions of this section, there is wonderful graphic power, presenting us with a series of life-like pictures, calculated to impress the reader strongly with the reality, and dignity, of the events related.

3. Throughout the Gospel, even where the narratives are the most copious, the same isolated character of each, the same abrupt transition from one to another, are observable. There is no attempt to bind on one section to another, or to give any sequences of events. But occasionally the very precision of the separate narratives of itself furnishes accurate and valuable chronological data:—e. g. the important one in ch. iv. 35, by which it becomes evident that the whole former part of Matthew’s Gospel is out of chronological order.

4. Mark relates but few discourses. His object being to set forth Jesus as the Son of God (see ch. i. 1), he principally dwells on the events of His official life. But the same characteristics mark his report of the Lord’s discourses, where he relates them, as we have observed in the rest of his narrative. While the sequence and connexion of the longer discourses was that which the Holy Spirit peculiarly brought to the mind of Matthew, the Apostle from whom Mark’s record is derived seems to have been deeply penetrated and impressed by the solemn iterations of cadence and expression, and to have borne away the very words themselves and tone of the Lord’s sayings. See especially, as illustrating this, the wonderfully sublime reply, ch. ix. 39—50.

5. According to the view adopted and vindicated in the notes on ch. xvi. 9—20, the Gospel terminates abruptly with the words ἐφοβούντα γὰρ, ver. 8. That this was not intentionally done, but was a defect,—is apparent, by the addition in Apostolic times of the authentic and most important fragment which now concludes the narrative.

6. I regard the existence of the Gospel of Mark as a gracious and valuable proof of the accommodation by the Divine Spirit of the records of the life of our Lord to the future necessities of the Church. While it contains little matter of fact which is not related in Matthew and Luke, and thus, generally speaking, forms only a confirmation of their more complete histories, it is so far from being a barren duplicate of that part of them which is contained in it, that it comes home to every reader with
all the freshness of an individual mind, full of the Holy Ghost, intently
fixed on the great object of the Christian's love and worship, reverently
and affectionately following and recording His positions, and looks, and
gestures, and giving us the very echo of the tones with which He spoke.
And thus the believing student feels, while treating of and studying this
Gospel, as indeed he does of each in its turn, that,—without venturing
to compare with one another in value these rich and abiding gifts of the
Holy Spirit to the Church,—the Gospel of Mark is at least as precious to
him as any of the others; serving an end, and filling a void, which could
not without spiritual detriment be left uncared for.

CHAPTER IV.

ON THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO LUKE.

SECTION I.

ITS AUTHORSHIP.

1. Although the Author of this Gospel plainly enough speaks of himself
in his Introduction, and in that to the Acts of the Apostles, we are left to
gather his name from tradition. Here, however, as in the case of Mark,
there seems to be no reasonable ground of doubt. It has been universally
24, and 2 Tim. iv. 10.

2. Of this person we know no more with any certainty than we find
From Col. iv. 11. 14, it would appear that he was not born a Jew, being
there distinguished from oT δρέες ἐκ περιπομῆς. It is, however, quite
uncertain whether he had become a Jewish proselyte previous to his
conversion to Christianity. His worldly calling was that of a Physician;
he is called ὁ ἰαρηγὸς ὁ ἀγαθηρῆς by Paul, Col. iv. 14. A very late
tradition (Niceph. Hist. Eccl. ii. 43), generally adopted by the Roman
Church, makes him also to have been a painter; but it is in no
respect deserving of credit. His birthplace is said by Eusebius (Hist.
Eccl. iii. 4) and Jerome (Script. Eccles. under Lucas) to have been
Antioch, but traditionally only, and perhaps from a mistaken identification
of him with Lucius, Acts xiii. 1 (Lucas=Lucanus, not Lucius). Tradi-
tion, as delivered by Epiphani. Haer. li. 12, Pseudo-Origen, Theophylact,
Euthymius, &c., makes him to have been one of the seventy, Luke x. 1;
but this is refuted by his own testimony, in his Preface,—where he clearly
distinguishes himself from those who were eye-witnesses and ministers of
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the word. It seems to have arisen from his Gospel alone containing the account of their mission.

3. Luke appears to have attached himself to Paul during the second missionary journey of the Apostle, and at Troas (Acts xvi. 10). This may be inferred from his there first making use of the first person plural in his narrative; after saying (ver. 8) κατέβησαν εἰς Τρωάδα, he proceeds (ver. 10), εἰδώς ἐξηγήσαμεν ἐξελθοῦν εἰς τὴν Μακεδονίαν. He thence accompanied Paul to Macedonia, remaining apparently at Philippi (but see below, § iv. 3) until Paul returned thither again at the end of his second visit to Greece, after the disturbance at Ephesus. Thence (Acts xx. 5) we find him again accompanying Paul to Asia and Jerusalem (xxi. 17); being with him at Cæsarea during his imprisonment (comp. Acts xxiv. 23. Col. iv. 14. Philem. 24); and travelling with him to Rome (xxvii. 1.—xxviii. 16). There we also find him remaining with the Apostle to a late period, very nearly till his martyrdom. (See 2 Tim. iv. 11.)

4. Of the time and manner of his death nothing certain is known, and the traditions are inconsistent with one another: some, as Greg. Naz., alleging him to have suffered martyrdom, while the general report is that he died a natural death.

SECTION II.

ITS ORIGIN.

1. A plain statement of the origin of this Gospel is given us by the Author himself, in his preface, ch. i. 1—4. He there states that many had taken in hand to draw up a statement, according to the testimony of those who were from the beginning eye-witnesses and ministers of the word, of the matters received (or fulfilled) among Christians; and that it therefore seemed good to him also, having carefully traced the progress of events from the first, to write an arranged account of the same to his friend (or patron) Theophilus.

2. From this we gather, (1) that Luke was not himself an eye-witness, nor a minister of the word (ὑπηρέτης τοῦ λόγου) from the beginning: (2) that he compiled his Gospel from the testimony of eye-witnesses and Apostles, which he carefully collected and arranged. For (1) he expressly excludes himself from the number of the ἄνωτα: κ. ὥς τ. λόγου: and (2) by the καθοι, he includes himself among the πολλοί, who made use of autoptic and Apostolic testimony.

3. I have before proved generally that the Gospels of Matthew and Mark cannot have been among the number of these διηγήσεις of which Luke speaks. I may now add to those proofs, that if Luke had seen and received, as of Apostolic authority, either or both of these Gospels, then his variations from them are, on his own showing, unaccountable; if he
had seen them, and did not receive them, his coincidences with them are equally unaccountable. The improbabilities and absurdities involved in his having either or both of them before him and working up their narratives into his own, I have before dealt with, in the general Prolegomena to the three Gospels.

4. Judging entirely from the phenomena presented by the Gospel itself, my conclusion with regard to its sources is the following:—that Luke, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, drew up his Gospel independently of, and without knowledge of, those of Matthew and Mark;—that he fell in with, in the main, the same cycle of Apostolic teaching as the compilers of those Gospels were directed to, viz. that which embraced principally the Galilean life and ministry of the Lord, to the exclusion of that part of it which passed at Jerusalem before the formal call of the twelve Apostles;—but that he possessed other sources of information, not open to the compiler of Matthew's Gospel, nor to Mark.

5. To this latter circumstance may be attributed his access to (I believe, from its peculiar style and character) a documentary record of the events preceding and accompanying the birth of the Lord, derived probably from her who alone was competent to narrate several particulars contained in it;—his preservation of the precious and most important cycle of our Lord's discourses and parables contained in that large section of his Gospel, ix. 51—xviii. 15, which is mostly peculiar to himself:—numerous other details scattered up and down in every part of his narrative, showing autoptic information:—and, lastly, his enlarged account of some events following the Resurrection, and the narration, by him alone, of the circumstances accompanying the Ascension.

6. A tradition was very early current, that Luke's Gospel contained the substance of the teaching of Paul. Irenæus, Hær. iii. 1, states: Ἀνακόλουθος Παύλου τὸ ἐν ἑκείνῳ εὐαγγέλιῳ ἐν βιβλίῳ κατέθεν. See also Tertullian, cont. Marc. iv. 5. This, however, is contradicted by the express assertion of the Evangelist himself in his preface, that the Gospel was compiled and arranged by himself from the testimony of those who ἀποφημίζεσι, 'from the beginning of his history,' were eye-witnesses or ministers of the word. Among these it is not, of course, possible to reckon Paul.

7. It is, however, an interesting inquiry, how far his continued intercourse with the great Apostle of the Gentiles may have influenced his diction,—or even his selection of facts. It is a remarkable coincidence, that the account of the institution of the Lord's Supper should be nearly verbatim the same in Luke xxii. 19 and in 1 Cor. xii. 23,—and that

---

8 Origen, Eusebius, and Jerome go so far as to understand the expression τὸ εὐαγγέλιον μου, Rom. ii. 16, of the Gospel of Luke. But this is contrary to the usage of the word εὐαγγέλιον in the N. T.: see notes there.
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claims to have received this last from the Lord. For we know, that to compensate to Paul in his Apostolic office for the want of autoptic authority, and to constitute him a witness to the truth of the Gospel, a revelation was made to him,—to which he refers, Gal. i. 12. Eph. iii. 3. 1 Cor. xi. 23. xv. 4,—embracing at least the leading facts of the Evangelic history. And this circumstance may have acted imperceptibly on the mind of Luke, and even shaped or filled out some of his narratives, in aid of direct historic sources of testimony.

8. There is very little trace of Paul's peculiar diction, or prominence given to the points which it became his especial work to inculcate in the Gospel of Luke. Doubtless we may trace a similar cast of mind and feeling in some instances; as e.g. Luke's carefulness to record the sayings of our Lord which were assertive of His unrestricted love for Jew and Gentile alike: Luke iv. 25 ff. ix. 52 ff. x. 30 ff. xvii. 16. 18. We may observe too that in Luke those parables and sayings are principally found, which most directly regard the great doctrine of man's free justification by grace through faith: e.g. ch. xv. 11 ff. xvii. 10. xviii. 14, in which latter place the use of δικασώμενος (see note there) is remarkable. These instances, however, are but few,—and it may perhaps be doubted whether commentators in general have not laid too great stress upon them. It would be very easy to trace similar relations and analogies in the other Gospels, if we were bent upon doing so.

SECTION III.

FOR WHAT READERS AND WITH WHAT OBJECT IT WAS WRITTEN.

1. Both these questions are formally answered for us by the Evangelist himself. He states, ch. i. 3, that he wrote primarily for the benefit of one Theophilus, and that he might know the certainty of those accounts which had formed the subject of his catechetical instruction.

2. But we can hardly suppose this object to have been the only moving cause to the great work which Luke was undertaking. The probabilities of the case, and the practice of authors in inscribing their works to particular persons, combine to persuade us that Luke must have regarded his friend as the representative of a class of readers for whom his Gospel was designed. And in inquiring what that class was, we must deal with the data furnished by the Gospel itself.

3. In it we find universality the predominant character. There is no marked regard paid to Jewish readers, as in Matthew, nor to Gentiles, as in Mark; if there be any preference, it seems rather on the side of the latter. In conformity with Jewish practice, we have a genealogy of our Lord, which however does not, as in Matthew, stop with Abraham, but traces up his descent even to the progenitor of the human race. Com
mentators have noticed that Luke principally records those sayings and acts of the Lord by which God's mercy to the Gentiles is set forth: see xv. 11 ff. xviii. 10. xix. 5 (but see notes there). x. 33. xvii. 19. ix. 52—56. iv. 25—27. Such instances, however, are not much to be relied on;—see above, ch. i. § ii. 6;—to which I will add, that it would be easy to construct a similar list to prove the same point with respect to Matthew or John;—and I therefore much prefer assigning the above character of universality to this Gospel, which certainly is visible throughout it. That it was constructed for Gentile readers as well as for Jews, is plain, if it were only from its being published in Greek; and is further confirmed from the fact of its author having been the friend and companion of the great Apostle of the Gentiles.

4. I infer then that the Gospel was designed for the general use of Christians, whether Jews or Gentiles; and subordinately to this general purpose, for those readers whose acquaintance with Jewish customs and places was sufficient to enable them to dispense with those elucidations of them which Mark and John have given, but which are not found in Matthew or Luke.

5. The object of the Gospel has been sufficiently declared in Luke's own words above cited,—that the converts might know the certainty of those things in which they had received oral instruction as catechumens; in other words, that the parts of the Lord's life and discourses thus imparted to them might receive both permanence, by being committed to writing,—and completion, by being incorporated in a detailed narrative of His life and sayings.

SECTION IV.

AT WHAT TIME IT WAS WRITTEN.

1. We are enabled to approximate to the time of the publication of this Gospel with much more certainty than we can to that of any of the others. The inquiry may be thus conducted.—We may safely assume that the 'former treatise' of Acts i. 1, can be no other than this Gospel. And on that follows the inference, that the Gospel was published before the Acts of the Apostles. Now the last event recorded in the Acts is an interview of

---

6 e.g. Matthew relates the visit of the Magi, ch. ii. 1 ff.; refers to Galilee of the Gentiles seeing a great light, ch. iv. 15, 16:—'Many shall come from the East and West,' &c. ch. viii. 11.—'Come unto Me, all ye that labour,' ch. xi. 28: the Syroph Amiasian woman (not related by Luke), ch. xv. 21 ff.: 'The Kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation,' &c. ch. xx. 43 (omitted by Luke): 'The elect from the four winds of heaven' (not in Luke), ch. xxiv. 31: 'The judgment of πᾶν καὶ ἱνα,' ch. xxv. 31—46: 'Make disciples of πᾶν καὶ ἱνα,' ch. xxviii. 19.—Again, John relates the visit to the Samaritans, ch. iv.: 'The other sheep not of this fold,' ch. x. 18: 'not for that nation only, but that he should gather together in one the children of God that were scattered abroad,' ch. xi. 52: 'The request of the Greeks at the feast,' ch. xii. 20, &c. &c.
Paul with the Jews, shortly after his arrival in Rome. We further have the publication of the Acts, by the words of ch. xxviii. 30, postponed \textit{two whole years} after that arrival and interview; but, I believe, \textit{no longer than that}. For, had Paul continued longer than that time in his hired house before the publication, it must have been so stated; and had he left Rome or that house, or had any remarkable event happened to him before the publication, we cannot suppose that so careful a recorder as Luke would have failed to bring his work down to the time then present, by noticing such departure or such event. I assume then the publication of the Acts to have taken place \textit{two years after Paul's arrival at Rome}; i.e. according to Wieseler (Chron. des Apostolischen Zeitalters, pp. 117, 118), in the spring of A.D. 68.

2. We have therefore a fixed date, before which the Gospel \textit{must have been published}. But if I am not mistaken, we have, by internal evidence, the date of its publication removed some time back from this date. It is hardly probable that Luke would speak of, as ὁ πρώτος λόγος, a work in which he was then, or had been very lately, engaged. But not to dwell on this,—even allowing that the prefatory and dedicatory matter, as is usually the case, may have come \textit{last} from the hands of the author,—I find in the account of the Ascension, which immediately follows, a much more cogent proof, that the Gospel had been some considerable time published. For while it recapitulates the Gospel account just so much that we can trace the same hand in it (comp. Acts i. 4 with Luke xxiv. 49), it is manifestly a \textit{different account}, much fuller in particulars, and certainly \textit{unknown to the Evangelist when he wrote his Gospel}. Now, as we may conclude, in accordance with the παρακολουθησάντες πάσιν ἐκριβῶσα of Luke i. 3, that he would have carefully sought out every available source of information at the time of writing his Gospel,—this becoming acquainted with a new account of the Ascension implies that in the mean time fresh sources of information had been opened to him. And this would most naturally be by \textit{change of place}, seeing that various fixed cycles of Apostolic teaching were likely to be current in, and about, the respective mother Churches. Now the changes of place in Luke's recent history had been,—two years before, from Cæsarea to Rome, Acts xxvii. 1 ff.; —two years and a half before that, from Philippi to Jerusalem, Acts xx. 6, xxi. 15 ff.,—and Cæsarea. This last is left to be inferred from his leaving Cæsarea with Paul, ch. xxvii. 1;—at all events he was during this time in Palestine, with, or near Paul. I shall make it probable in the Prolegomena to vol. ii. that during this period he was engaged in collecting materials for and compiling the Acts of the Apostles; and by consequence (see above), that in all probability, the Gospel had been then written and published. This would place its publication before A.D. 58; —consequently, before the traditional date of the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew,—see above, ch. ii. § iv.
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§ V. AT WHAT PLACE WRITTEN.

3. Tracing Luke's history further back than this,—it has been thought that he remained at Philippi during the whole time comprised between Acts xvii. 1 and xx. 6, because he disses the first person at the first of those dates, at Philippi,—and resumes it also at Philippi, at the second. Now this was a period of seven years: far too long for such an inference as the above to be made with any probability. During this time he may have travelled into Palestine, and collected the information which he incorporated in his Gospel. For that it was collected in Palestine, is on all accounts probable. And that it should have been published much before this is, I think, improbable.

4. My reasons are the following:—I have implied in the former part of these Prolegomena, that it is not likely that the present Evangelic collections would be made, until the dispersion of all or most of the Apostles on their missionary journeys. Besides this, the fact of numerous διηγήσεως having been already drawn up after the model of the Apostolic narrative teaching, forbids us to suppose their teaching by oral communication to have been in its fulness still available. Now the Apostles, or the greater part of them, were certainly at Jerusalem at the time of the council in Acts xv. 1—5 ff. i. e. about A. D. 50. How soon after that time their dispersion took place, it is quite impossible to determine;—but we have certainly this date as our terminus a quo, before which, as I believe, no Gospel could have been published.

5. After this dispersion of the Apostles, it will be necessary to allow some time to elapse for the διηγήσεως of which Luke speaks (ch. i. 1) to be drawn up;—not less certainly than one or two years, or more; which would bring us just about to the time when he was left behind by Paul in Philippi. This last arrangement must however be, from its merely hypothetical grounds, very uncertain.

6. At all events, we have thus eight years, A. D. 50—58, as the limits within which it is probable that the Gospel was published. And, without pretending to minute accuracy in these two limits, we may at least set it down as likely that the publication did not take place much before Luke and Paul are found together, nor after the last journey which Paul made to Jerusalem, A. D. 58. And even if the grounds on which this latter is concluded be objected to, we have, as a final resort, the fixed date of the publication of the Acts, two years after Paul's arrival at Rome, after which, by internal evidence, the Gospel cannot have been published.

SECTION V.

AT WHAT PLACE IT WAS WRITTEN.

1. Our answer to this inquiry will of course depend upon the considerations discussed in the last section. Adopting the view there taken, we find Luke in Asia Minor, Syria, or Palestine (probably) previously to his
first journey with Paul A.D. 51; and from that time till his second jour-
ney A.D. 58, perhaps remaining in Greece, but perhaps also travelling for
the sake of collecting information for his Gospel. At all events, at the
latter part of this period he is again found at Philippi. We need not then
dissent from the early tradition reported by Jerome (Prolog. in Matt.),
that Luke published his Gospel 'in Achaia Boeotiseque partibus,' as
being on the whole the most likely inference.

2. The inscription in the Syriac version,—and Simeon Metaphrastes in
the tenth century,—report that the Gospel was written at Alexandria, but
apparently without any authority.

SECTION VI.

IN WHAT LANGUAGE IT WAS WRITTEN.

There never has been any doubt that Luke wrote his Gospel in
Greek. His familiarity with Greek terms and idioms, and above all, the
classical style of his preface, are of themselves convincing internal evi-
dence that it was so.

SECTION VII.

GENUINENESS OF THE GOSPEL.

1. It has been generally and almost unanimously acknowledged that
the Gospel which we now possess is that written and published by Luke.

2. Whatever doubts may have been raised by rationalistic Commen-
tators as to the genuineness of the two first chapters, have been adopted in
aid of their attempts to overthrow their authenticity (on which see the
next section); and have rested on no sufficient ground of themselves.
Their principal appeal is to Marcion, who notoriously mutilated
the Gospel, to make it favour his views of the Person of Christ.

3. On the genuineness of ch. xxii. 43, 44, see various readings and
notes there.

SECTION VIII.

THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE TWO FIRST CHAPTERS.

1. If the view maintained above of the probable time of the publication
of the Gospel be adopted,—and its later terminus, the publication of the
Acts two years after Paul's imprisonment at Rome began, is, I think,
beyond question.—I cannot see how any reasonable doubt can be thrown
upon the authenticity of this portion of the narrative. For there were
those living, who might have contradicted any false or exaggerated
account of the Lord's birth and the events which accompanied it. If not
the mother of the Lord herself, yet His brethren were certainly living;
and the universal reception of the Gospel in the very earliest ages suf-
ficiently demonstrates that no objection to this part of the sacred narrative
had been heard of as raised by them.
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2. The ἐκριβώς παρηκολοουθήτων of Luke forbids us to imagine that he would have inserted any narrative in his Gospel which he had not ascertained to rest upon trustworthy testimony, as far as it was in his power to ensure this; and the means of ensuring it must have been at that time so ample and satisfactory, that I cannot imagine for a moment any other origin for the account, than such testimony.

3. If we inquire what was probably the source of the testimony, I answer, that but one person is conceivable as delivering it, and that person the Mother of our Lord. She was living in the Christian body for some time after the Ascension; and would most certainly have been appealed to for an account of the circumstances attending His birth and infancy.

4. If she gave any account of these things, it is inconceivable that this account should not have found its way into the records of the Lord's life possessed by the Christian Church, but that instead of it a spurious one should have been adopted by two of our Evangelists, and that so shortly after, or even coincident with, her own presence in the Church.

5. Just as inconceivable, even supposing the last difficulty surmounted, is the formation of a mythical, or in any other way unreal, account of these things, and its adoption, in the primitive age of the Church. For the establishment of this I refer to Professor Mill's able tract, On the Mythic Interpretation of Luke i.;—in which he has stated and severally refuted the arguments of Strauss and the rationalists.

6. I infer then that the two first chapters of this Gospel contain the account given by the Mother of our Lord, of His birth, and its prefatory and attendant circumstances; of some of which circumstances that in Matt. i. 18—25 is a more compendious, and wholly independent account.

SECTION IX.
ITS STYLE AND CHARACTER.

1. We might have expected from Luke's name and profession, that he was a man of education, and versed in the elegant use of the Greek, which was then the polite language in the Roman empire. We accordingly find that while we have very numerous Hebraisms in his Gospel, we also have far more classical idioms, and a much freer use of Greek compounds than in the others. By consulting the marginal references in this edition, it will be seen that the number of ἰσαφὶς λαγόμενα in Luke is very great, far exceeding those in any other Gospel; and that very many of them are classically-authorized compound words.

2. The composition of the sentences is more studied and elaborate than in Matthew or Mark:—the Evangelist appears more frequently in the narrative, delivering his own estimate of men and things;—e. g. xvi. 14. vii. 29, 30. xix. 11 al. ;—he seems to love to recount instances of the Lord's
tender compassion and mercy;—and in the report of His parables, e. g. in ch. xv. is particularly simple in diction, and calculated to attract and retain the attention of his readers.

3. In narrative, this Evangelist is very various, according to the copiousness or otherwise of the sources from which he drew. Sometimes he merely gives a hasty compendium; at others he is most minute and circumstantial in detail, and equally graphic in description with Mark: see as instances of this latter, ch. vii. 14. ix. 29. It has been remarked (see Olshausen, Bibl. Comm. i. p. 20) that Luke gives with extreme accuracy not so much the discourses, as the observations and occasional sayings of our Lord, with the replies of those who were present. This is especially the case in his long and important narrative of the journey up to Jerusalem, ch. ix. 51—xviii. 14.

4. On the question how far those doctrines especially enforced by the great Apostle of the Gentiles are to be traced, as inculcated or brought forward in this Gospel, see above in this chapter, § ii. 7.

5. In completeness, this Gospel must rank first among the four. The Evangelist begins with the announcement of the birth of Christ's Forerunner, and concludes with the particulars of the Ascension: thus embracing the whole great procession of events by which our Redemption by Christ was ushered in, accomplished, and sealed in heaven. And by recording the allusion to the promise of the Father (ch. xxiv. 49), he has introduced, so to speak, a note of passage to that other history, in which the fulfilment of that promise, the great result of Redemption, was to be related. It may be remarked, that this completeness,—while it shows the earnest diligence used by the sacred writer in searching out and making use of every information within his reach,—forms an additional proof that he can never have seen the Gospels of Matthew and Mark,—or he would (to say nothing of the other difficulties attending this view, which have before been dealt with in ch. i.) most certainly have availed himself of those parts of their narratives, which are now not contained in his own.

CHAPTER V.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO JOHN.

SECTION I.

ITS AUTHORSHIP.

1. The universal belief of the Christian Church has ascribed this Gospel to the Apostle John. I shall not here anticipate the discussion respecting its genuineness (see below, § vi.), but assume that it has been rightly so ascribed.
§ 1. ITS AUTHORSHIP.

2. John was son of Zebedee and Salome, and younger (?)' brother of James. His father was a Galilean, and by occupation a fisherman on the lake of Galilee. Where he resided, is uncertain: perhaps, at Bethsaida: but the circumstance of Simon Peter, who was of that place, being (Luke v. 10) partner in the fishing trade, or perhaps in that particular expedition only, with the sons of Zebedee, is no proof as to their residence there also.

3. The family of John seems not to have been one of the lowest class: we find hired servants in the ship with Zebedee, Mark i. 20; their mother Salome was one of those women who came with Jesus from Galilee, and ministered to Him of their substance, Luke viii. 3. xxiii. 55, compared with Mark xvi. 1; the same Salome was one of those who bought sweet spices and ointments to anoint Him (Mark, ibid.); and, John xix. 27, we find John himself taking the mother of our Lord ἵνα ἡ δόξα, which though (see note there) it need not imply that John had then a house at Jerusalem, certainly denotes that he had some fixed habitation, into which she was received. If, as is most likely, John be meant by the δὲ λογος μαθητὲς of ch. xviii. 15, he was personally known to the High Priest Caiaphas. From all these facts, the inference is that his family belonged to the middle class of society; the higher grade of those who carried on the by no means despised or ungainful business of fishermen on the sea of Galilee.

4. If (see note on John i. 41) the second of the two disciples who heard the Baptist's testimony to Jesus, and followed Him in consequence, was John himself,—we have his acquaintance with our Lord dating from the very beginning of His Ministry. And to this agree the contents of chapters ii. iii. iv. v., containing particulars of the Ministry at Jerusalem and in Galilee which happened previous to the commencement of the official record of the other Evangelists. It seems that John accompanied our Lord to Jerusalem,—with perhaps those of the Apostles already called,—and witnessed those incidents which he has related in that part of his Gospel.

5. In the intervals of our Lord's first circuits and journeys, the Apostles seem to have returned to their families and occupations. Thus in Luke v. 1—11, we find the sons of Zebedee, as well as Simon Peter, again engaged in fishing, and solemnly and finally summoned by Jesus to follow Him;—an incident which, as Lüke acknowledges (Comm. in Joh., Einleitung, p. 12), would be inexplicable even by the miracle, unless there had been a previous acquaintance on their part with our Lord.

7 This is by no means certain. While Matt. and Mark always write 'Peter, James, and John;' Luke ix. 26, and Acts i. 13 (not in rec.) has 'Peter, John, and James;' although in the other catalogue of the Apostles, Luke vi. 14, he keeps the usual order. It is impossible to say whether the order arose from any account at all being taken of mere seniority.
6. From that time John belonged to that chosen number known as 'the Twelve,' who were nearest to the Person of Jesus during His Ministry. And of that number, he seems to have been the most personally beloved by our Lord. For the assumption that he is the author of our Gospel, also identifies him with 'the disciple whom Jesus loved,' so often mentioned in it. (See ch. xiii. 23. xix. 26. xx. 2. xxi. 7. 29. 24.) He, together with his brother James, and Peter, was witness of the raising of Jairus's daughter, Mark v. 37: also of the transfiguration, Matt. xvii. 1 ff.; and of the agony in Gethsemane: he lay on the bosom of Jesus at the last supper; and was recognized by Peter as being the innermost in His personal confidence, John xiii. 23. To him was committed the charge of the Mother of Jesus, by Himself when dying on the Cross, John xix. 26, 27.

7. And to this especial love of the Redeemer John appears to have corresponded in devoted affection and faithfulness. He fled, it is true, with the rest, at the dark hour of the capture of Jesus: but we find him, together with Peter, soon rallying again,—and from that time, John xviii. 15, 16, even to the end, xix. 25 ff., an eye-witness of the sufferings of His Divine Master. In John xxi. we find the same personal distinction bestowed on the beloved Disciple by our Lord after His Resurrection.

8. In the Acts of the Apostles, John comes before us but very seldom, and always in connexion with and thrown into the back ground by Peter. See Acts iii. 1 ff. viii. 14—25. The history leaves him at Jerusalem: where however he appears not to have been on Paul’s first visit to Jerusalem, Gal. i. 18 ff., cir. a.d. 43 (Wieseler), for he states that he saw none of the Apostles save Peter and James;—but on his second visit, Gal. ii. 1, cir. a.d. 45, John was there (ver. 9). If the journey to determine the question about circumcision, Acts xv. 1, was a different one, and later than this second (see Prolegomena to Acts, vol. ii.), then at that date also John was in Jerusalem. After this time, we lose sight of the Apostles,—nor can we with any approach to certainty point out the period of their final dispersion. It took place probably some time between this council and Paul’s last visit to Jerusalem, Acts xxi. 18 (cir. a.d. 60), when we find only James resident there.

9. For the after-history of John, we are dependent on tradition. And here we have evidence more trustworthy than in the case of any other Apostle.

(a) It is related by Polycrates Bishop of Ephesus at the end of the second century,—in his Epistle to Victor Bishop of Rome on the keeping of Easter,—that John, whom he numbers among the great lights (στοιχεία, see Eusebius, iii. 31, and Heinichen’s note) of Asia, died and was buried (καιομηνεύτω) in Ephesus.

(β) Irenæus also,—the scholar of Polycarp, who himself was a disciple of John,—relates that John remained in Ephesus till the times of Trajan.
ITS AUTHORSHIP.

(Adv. Hær. ii. 39, iii. 1 and 3, cited also by Eusebius, iii. 23.) To the same effect testify Clement of Alexandria (Euseb. ibid.), Origen (Euseb. iii. 1), Eusebius (ibid.), and Jerome (de Viris Eccl., p. 270).

10. But, assuming as a fact the long residence and death of the Apostle at Ephesus, we in vain seek any clue to guide us as to the time when, or the place whence, he came thither. The Asiatic Churches were founded by Paul, who made it a rule not to encroach on the field of labour of any other Apostle, Rom. xv. 20:—who never, in his Epistles to the Asiatic Churches, makes any mention of nor sends any salutation to John:—who, in his parting speech to the Elders of the Ephesian Church at Miletus (Acts xx.) certainly did not anticipate the coming of an Apostle among them. So much then we may set down as certain, that the arrival of John in Asia must have been after the death of Paul.

11. We may perhaps with some appearance of probability conjecture that the dangers which evidently beset the Asiatic Churches in Paul's lifetime,—and to which Peter in his First Epistle, written to them, not indistinctly alludes (see 1 Pet. i. 14. ii. 1, 2. 7, 8. 12. 16 al. fr.),—had taken so serious a form after the removal of Paul their father in the faith, that John, in finding it requisite to fix his residence and exercise Apostolic authority among them. This is supposed by Lücke, Einl. p. 24, and Neander, Leitung u. Pfanzung der Kirche, 4th edition, p. 614.

12. But we are as far as ever, even if this conjecture be adopted, from arriving at any method of accounting for the interval between John's leaving Jerusalem, and his coming to Asia Minor: a period, on any computation, of nearly six years, A.D. 58—64. It is not necessary, however, as Lücke also observes, to reject a tradition so satisfactorily grounded as that of John's residence and death at Ephesus, on this account;—especially when we consider that it is necessary to interpose some influence corresponding to that of John, between the state of the Asiatic Churches as shown in the Pauline Epistles, and that in the time of Polycarp, who immediately followed the Apostolic age. See Neander, Leitung u. Pfanzung, 4th edition, p. 615. I reserve the discussion of the other element of uncertainty in this matter,—the confusion of two persons named John, the Apostle and the Presbyter, for the Prolegomena to the Second Epistle of John, in vol. ii.

13. I mention here,—reserving its discussion for the Prolegomena to the Apocalypse, vol. ii.,—the tradition universally received in the early Church, which records that the Apostle John was exiled under Domitian to the island of Patmos. Assuming the Apocalypse to be his work, the fact of such an exile is established, see Rev. i. 9,—but the time left uncertain. But even those who do not ascribe the Apocalypse to him, relate this exile, e. g. Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. iii. 20.

14. It is also related (Euseb. ibid.) that he returned under Nerva to Ephesus, and that his death (under Trajan, see above) took place (in what
manner is uncertain, but probably not by martyrdom) in extreme old age. It would be out of place here to recount the other traditions, some of them highly interesting, which are extant. See one of them in note on 1 John iii. 18, vol. ii., and the whole recounted and commented on in Stanley's Sermons and Essays on the Apostolic Age, pp. 275—289.

SECTION II.

ITS SOURCES.

1. In several places the Author of this Gospel plainly declares or implies that he relates what he had seen and heard. See ch. i. 14. xiii. 2. xviii. 15. xix. 26. xx. 2, and especially xix. 35. Also xxi. 24.

2. And with this declaration the contents of the Gospel agree. Amidst the entire disregard of minute specifications of sequence or locality as a general rule, in almost every narrative we have undoubted marks of autoptic testimony.

3. The only question which arises on receiving this as the fact, has reference to the diversity of style observed in the discourses of the Lord as related by the three other Evangelists, and as related by John. In their more or less common report, a certain similarity of style is supposed to be observable in the parables and sayings of Jesus, which is wholly absent from them in John's Gospel. Let us examine this matter more closely.

4. In order to form a satisfactory judgment on this point, it would be necessary to be in possession of some common matter reported by both. But such common matter in any sufficient quantity for this purpose, we do not possess. No one discourse is reported by all four. Certain insulated sayings are so reported; e. g. John ii. 19. comp. Matt. xxvi. 61. Mark xiv. 58.—John vi. 20. Matt. xiv. 27. Mark vi. 50.—John xii. 7, 8. Matt. xxvi. 10, 11. Mark xiv. 6, 7.—John xiv. 20. Matt. x. 40. Luke x. 16.—John xiv. 21. Matt. xxvi. 21. Mark xiv. 18.—John xiv. 37, 38. Matt. xxvi. 33 and ||.—John xx. 19. Luke xxiv. 36. Now in these common reports, amidst much variety in verbal and circumstantial detail, such as might have been expected from independent narrators, there is no such difference of style observable.

5. We have then the following remarkable phenomenon presented by the two classes of narrators;—that the sayings of the Lord reported by the one are different from, and exclusive of those contained in the other. And this must very much modify our view of the subject in question.

6. It would be in the highest degree probable that our Lord would discourse mainly and usually on two great branches of divine truth: one of these being, the nature and moral requirements of that kingdom which He came to found among men, which would embrace the greater part of His discourses to the multitude,—His outer or popular sayings,—His parables
and prophecies:—and the other, the deeper spiritual verities relating to His own Divine Person and Mission. Of these latter, there would be two subdivisions: one class of them would be spoken in the gracious condescension of love to His own disciples when conversing privately with them, and the other in the fire of holy zeal when contending against His bitter adversaries, the rulers of the Jews.

7. Now of the two greater classes just mentioned, let us inquire which would most naturally form the matter of the oral Apostolic teaching to the Churches in the first age. Let it be remembered that that teaching was mostly elementary,—matter of catechization;—selected for the edification of those who were to be built up as Christian converts. Would it not unquestionably be the first? Granted, that some few of those deeper sayings (deeper, I mean, in their very form and primary reference) might occasionally find their place in the reports of longer discourses (see e. g. Matt. xi. 27. Luke x. 22), yet I cannot imagine the main stream of oral Apostolic teaching to have been otherwise composed than as we find it: viz. of the popular discourses and parables of our Lord, to the exclusion for the most part of His inner teaching and deeper revelations respecting His own Divine Person. These, in case the Apostles had been suffered by Providence to carry on systematically their testimony to the Church, might have followed after: but certainly they would not be likely to form the first subject of their oral teaching.

8. But that they would dwell powerfully on their minds, and in proportion to their individual receptivity of the Spirit and Person of their Lord, is most evident. And this consideration, united with that of the very nature and purpose of the Apostolic Office, and with the promise specially recorded that the Spirit should bring to their minds all things which He had said to them, will fully account for there arising, late in the Apostolic age, so copious and particular a report of these inner and personal discourses of our Lord.

9. That such a report should be characterized in some measure by the individual mind which has furnished it, was to be expected, on any view of spiritual guidance. But that this individuality has in any considerable degree modified the report, I think extremely improbable. Taking the circumstances into consideration, the relation of John to his Divine Master, the employment and station from which he was called, and the facts also which have been above noticed respecting the sayings reported by all in common, I think it much more probable, that the character and diction of our Lord’s discourses entirely penetrated and assimilated the habits of thought of His beloved Apostle; so that in his first epistle he writes in the very tone and spirit of those discourses; and when reporting the sayings of his own former teacher the Baptist, he gives them, consistently with the deepest inner truth of narration (see note on ch. iii. 31), the forms and cadences so familiar and habitual to himself.
10. It belongs to the present section of our subject to inquire how far it may be supposed that John had seen or used the synoptic Gospels. I confess myself wholly unable to receive the supposition that any of them, in their present form, had ever been seen by him. On such a supposition, the phenomena presented by his Gospel would be wholly inexplicable. To those parts of it which he has in common with them, the reasonings of the former part of these Prolegg. will apply. And though these are not so considerable in extent as in the case of the three Gospels, yet they are quite important enough to decide this question. The account and testimony of the Baptist in ch. i. ;—the miraculous feeding in ch. vi. ;—the whole history from ch. xii. 1, in its subject matter, will come under this description. Let any common passages be selected, and tried by the considerations above advanced, ch. i. § ii.—and our conclusion must be that the report is an independent one, not influenced nor modified by theirs. Of those parts of his Gospel which are original, I will speak in another section.

11. It is, however, an entirely distinct question, how far John had in his view the generally-received oral teaching from which our three Gospels are derived. That he himself, answering so strictly to the description in Acts i. 21,—laying so much weight as he does on testimony, ch. i. 19. xix. 35. xxi. 24,—bore his part, and that no inconsiderable one, in the Apostle's witness to the facts of the Evangelic history,—I take for granted. It will follow that he was aware of the general nature and contents of that cycle of narratives and discourses of our Lord which became current at Jerusalem from his own testimony and that of the other Apostles. Accordingly we find him in his Gospel assuming as known, certain facts contained in that cycle. See ch. vii. 41, and note,—ch. xi. 1,—also ch. i. 40, where Simon Peter is referred to as one known, before the giving of the latter name is related.

12. I can hardly however suppose, that John wrote with any fixed design of filling up by a supplementary Gospel the deficiencies of the generally-received oral account. Sometimes, e.g. ch. vi. 1—14, xviii., xix., he goes over the same ground with it: and in no part can it by the most ingenious application of the supplementary theory be shown, that he in any respect produces or aims at the effect of a work designed to fill up and elucidate those which have gone before. This point will be dwelt on more at length in the next section.

13. I have no hesitation, therefore, in receiving as the true account of the source of this Gospel, that generally given and believed;—viz. that we have it from the autoptic authority of the Apostle himself.
SECTION III.

FOR WHAT READERS AND WITH WHAT OBJECT IT WAS WRITTEN.

1. This Gospel presupposes readers already Christians, and was written to build them up and confirm them in the faith. (See ch. xix. 35. xx. 31.) It is as Lücke remarks (Einl. p. 185), neither complete enough, nor elementary enough, for the first founding of a belief in Christ in the mind. This must have been, even as early as the Apostolic times, the work of no written Gospel (see Luke i. 1—4), but of the oral preaching of the word.

2. Being written then for Christian readers, the main and ultimate purpose as regards them is sufficiently declared in ch. xx. 31,—ταύτα γεγραπταί ὑσπερέσπετε δότε Ἰησοῦς ἐστιν ὁ χριστὸς ὁ νικῶν τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ἵνα πιστεύοντες ζωὴν ἔχητε ἐν τῷ ὄνοματι αὐτοῦ.

3. This purpose however, as it would be common to all the sacred writings of the New Testament more or less, in no way accounts for the peculiar cast of the Gospel, or the portions of the Christian’s faith which are most prominently brought out in it. These will require closer examination.

4. It will at once appear, that some especial occasion must have induced John to write so pointedly as he has done on certain doctrines,—and to adopt, in doing so, a nomenclature unknown to the rest of the New Testament writers. Some state of opinion in the Church must have rendered it necessary for the Apostle to state strongly and clearly the truth about which error was prevalent, or questions had been raised: the method of speaking which even he, under the guidance of the Spirit, adopted to convey that truth, must have become familiar to and valued by the educated and philosophic minds in the Christian community.

5. It may be well to set down the opinions of the ancients on this, before we enter into the matter itself.

Irenæus states that John wrote his Gospel to controvert the errors of Cerinthus, and before him the Nicolaitans. Tertullian (de Præscript. adv. Hær. 33) in the main agrees with this. Epiphanius (Hær. li. 12, Lücke) and Jerome repeat it as a certain fact, that John wrote against

---

1 Hanc fidem annuntians Johannes Domini discipulus, volens per evangeli annunciationem suferre eum qui a Cerintho insenatus erat hominibus errorem, et multo prius ab his qui dicuntur Nicolaitae, qui sunt vulsip ejus, quae false cognominatur scientia,—ut confudenter eos et suaderet quoniam unus Deus qui omnia fecit per verbum suum, . . . . . sic incinavit evangelium, &c. Adv. Hær. iii. 11.

2 Joannes Apostulus novissimus omnium scriptae evangelium, rogatus ab Asie episcopos adversus Cerinthum aliosque haereticos et maxime tune Ebionitarum dogma consurgens, qui asserunt, Christum ante Mariam non fuisse. De Scriptor. Eccl. 9. But he also gives in the same place another reason: see in the text below.
Cerinthus: but instead of the Nicolaitans, they mention the Ebionites. Those who assert him to have written against Valentinus or Marcion are evidently chronologically in error.

6. Several of the ancients give in substance, the supplementary view of the design of John's Gospel. Clement of Alexandria, as cited by Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. vi. 14, related, τον Ἰωάννην ἐσχάτον συνιδόντα ὅτι τὰ σωματικὰ ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις δεδόθηται, προτραπέντα ὑπὸ τῶν γυμνῶν, πνεύματι θεοφορηθέντα, πνευματικὸν τοιῆσαι εὐαγγέλιον. Eusebius in another place (Hist. Eccl. iii. 24) states, that whereas the other Evangelists wrote the history of the official life of our Lord subsequent to the imprisonment of the Baptist, John wishing that there should be a complete account, gave in his Gospel the particulars preceding that event. The same is repeated almost verbatim by Jerome, ut supra. Later authors (see Lücke, Einleitung, p. 189) reproduced the conjectures of their predecessors as being traditions of the Church; and for the most part united the polemical with the supplementary theory.

7. None of the above-cited authors appeal to any historical or traditional fact, as the ground of their own statements. Those statements have therefore for us no authority ab extra, and must be judged by their own intrinsic probability or otherwise, as established by the contents of the Gospel, and the state of the Church at the period of its publication. In modern times, these last considerations have given rise to several opinions, which I shall now briefly state; acknowledging, throughout this part of the section, my obligations to Lücke, whose facts and remarks I have for the most part borrowed.

8. Grotius, and some of the Socinian commentators, supposed,—on account of the contrast strongly drawn in the prologue, ch. i. and elsewhere, between Jesus Christ as the true Light, and the Baptist as only having come to bear witness of that Light,—that the Evangelist wrote against the so-called disciples of John, who held the Baptist to have been the Messiah. Others (as Herder, Overbeck, Ziegler) thought that the Sabæi, who combined gnostic errors with an overweening estimation of John the Baptist, were principally aimed at. Others, not finding in this a sufficient account of the peculiarities of the Gospel, supposed this, or other polemic aims, to have been united with the supplementary one. Of this last number are Storr, Wegscheider, Hug, &c. Others again (as Paulus) finding in the Gospel no sufficient evidence either of a polemical or a supplementary intention, fell back on the didactic aim set forth ch. xx. 31. This view, however, was never found satisfactory to explain the peculiar phænomena of the Gospel.

9. Meantime, however, the critical study of the other Gospels had so far advanced, that it became more and more clearly seen, that the hypothesis of John having been acquainted with, and having wished to complete or correct them, was entirely untenable. Again, not finding traces
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of a polemical design sufficiently prominent in the Gospel, some critics, slightly altering the term, have supposed it to be apologetic in its character (Hemsen, Seiffarth, Schott). Some, lastly, pronounced it unworthy of the Apostle to follow any secondary designs, considering his own avowal in ch. xx. 30, 31 (Credner). But, as Lücke remarks, even granting this, it may still be a lawful inquiry, What peculiar circumstances led to his realizing this his great design in the present peculiar form of composition. The synoptic Evangelists had, he says, beyond question the same great design, and yet have followed it in a very different manner. Something of this may doubtless be explained by the individual character of the writer's mind, but clearly not all: and that character itself was modified by surrounding events. We are driven therefore to the special circumstances under which the Gospel, but especially the prologue, which in this matter rules the Gospel, was composed.

10. Into these Lücke inquires under two heads: (1) the relation of John's Gospel to the other three; (2) the character of the age and section of the Church in which the Evangelist lived. In treating the first of these he disproves, much in the same manner as has been done in these Prolegomena, the probability that John intended to supply, or had ever seen, our present Gospels; and maintains that an acquaintance on his part with the general stream of oral testimony from which they were derived, will sufficiently account for the relations observable between him and them. His inference is, that if his Gospel (as undoubtedly is the case), sometimes supplies and gives precision to theirs, this has been only the result, but could in no way be the aim of his writing; the peculiarities and object of which must be altogether accounted for from considerations belonging to the other head of the inquiry.

11. In pursuing this, he distinguishes three classes of writings likely to arise in the Apostolic age: (a) the simple committal to paper of the cycles of oral narration, with a view to fixing them for the general and continued edification of the readers. To this class he refers the Gospels of Matthew and Mark. (β) Writings compiled with a more set purpose of giving a complete account, in order, of the events of our Lord's life on earth. In this division he classes the Gospel of Luke. (γ) The third class would arise from the growing up of the faith, which at first was a simple historical belief, into the maturer γνωσις of doctrinal system. In the course of this progress, various questions would arise respecting the life and teaching of the Lord Jesus, which the generally-received oral narration was not competent to answer. And these writings would be composed to satisfy such inquirers by presenting such an apologetic view of the Lord's life, and such a doctrinal account of His teaching, as might tend to set their questionings at rest. To this class he supposes may have belonged some of the gnostic apocryphal writings; and to this class certainly does belong the Gospel of John.
12. At the time of its composition, many questionings were already raised between the believing and unbelieving, and among the believing themselves. Traces of such we find even in the Pauline Epistles, 1 Cor. i. 23. xv. 1. Lücke instances some of these questions which this Gospel was well adapted to answer. (a) The rejection of the Lord Jesus by His own people the Jews, was an event likely to prove a stumbling-block, and to be used by unbelievers against our religion. To the elucidation of this,—the tracing its progress, step by step,—the showing its increasing virulence amidst the blameless innocence and holy words and deeds of the Redeemer,—does John especially devote the middle and principal section of his Gospel. He shows that thereby His enemies were fulfilling the Divine purpose, and that they were even forewarned of this by one among themselves, ch. xi. 51, 52. (β) We may evidently see from the diligence with which John accumulates autopic evidence on the subject of the actual death of Christ, and His resurrection, that he has in this part also some in view, who did not receive those great events as undoubted facts, but required the authority of an Apostle to assure them of their truth. (γ) The way also in which he relates the testimonies of the Lord respecting the manner, results, and voluntary nature of His own death,—that it was His true glorification,—that it was undertaken freely, but in complete accordance with the Father’s will,—seems to point to doubts as to the character of that event, which the Evangelist meditated removing. (δ) It was certainly, later (see Origen against Celsus, quoted in note on Matt. ix. 9), a reproach against the Apostles, that they were low born and ignorant men. In the case of Paul we find very early a disposition on the part of some in the Churches, to set aside Apostolic authority. And those who were so disposed might perhaps appeal to the oral narrative which forms the foundation of the synoptic Gospels, to prove that the Apostles often misunderstood the sayings of the Lord,—and might from thence take occasion to vilify their present preaching as resting on similar misunderstanding. John,—from his relating so much at length the discourse of our Lord in which he promised the Comforter to guide them into all the truth, and bring to their minds all that He had said to them, and from noticing (ch. xii. 16. xx. 9) that they understood not certain things at first, which were made clear to them afterwards,—seems to be guarding the Apostolic office and testimony from such imputations.

13. But all these designs, possible as they may have been, do not reach so far as to give any account of the very remarkable cast and diction of the prologue. This opening gives a tone to the whole Gospel, being no less than a compendium or programme of its contents, gathered up and expressed according to a nomenclature already familiar to certain persons within the Church. The fact of John having been led to adopt the gnostic term λόγος as the exponent of his teaching respecting the person of our Lord, would of itself make it probable that he had the combating of
gnostic error in his view; or perhaps, speaking more accurately, that he was led to take advantage of the yearnings of the human desire after an universal and philosophic religion,—by grasping and lifting upward into the certainty of revelation the truth which they had shaped to themselves,—and thereby striking off and proscribing their manifold and erroneous conceits. But neither the language of the prologue itself, nor any prominence given to antagonistic truths in the Gospel, justify us in ascribing to the Evangelist a position directly polemical against the peculiar tenets of Cerinus. The stand made in the Gospel, is against Gnosticism in the very widest sense: in its Ebionitish form, as denying the Divinity and pre-existence of Christ,—and in its Docetic, as denying the reality of His assumption of the Human Nature.

14. While, however, John contends against false γνώσις, he is, in the furtherance and grounding of the true γνώσις, the greatest, as he was the last, of the Spiritual Teachers of the Church. The great Apostle of the Gentiles, amidst fightings without and fears within, built in his argumentative Epistles the outworks of that temple, of which his still greater colleague and successor was chosen noiselessly to complete, in his peaceful old age, the inner and holier places. And this, after all, ranging under it all secondary aims, we must call the great object of the Evangelist:—to advance, purify from error, and strengthen, that maturer Christian life of knowledge, which is the true development of the teaching of the Spirit in men, and which the latter part of the Apostolic period witnessed in its full vitality. That he should have been led to cast his testimony into a form antagonistic to the peculiar errors then prevalent,—that he should have adopted the thoughts and diction of previous seekers after God, so far as they were capable of serving his high purpose and being elevated into vehicles of heavenly truth,—these are arrangements which we may not, because they are natural and probable, the less regard as providential, and admirably designed for that which especially was his portion of the Apostolic work,—the perfecting of the saints.

SECTION IV.

AT WHAT PLACE AND TIME IT WAS WRITTEN.

1. These two questions as relating to John's Gospel, are too intimately connected to form the subject of separate sections.

2. The most ancient testimony, that of Irenæus, relates that it was published at Ephesus. This testimony is repeated by Jerome and
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3 For an account of them, see Neander's Church History, Rose's translation, vol. ii. p. 49.

4 Ἰωάννης ὁ μαθητὴς τοῦ κυρίου, ὁ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος αὐτοῦ ἀναπέσων, καὶ αὐτὸς ἔδωκε τὸ ἐναγγέλιον, ἐν Ἐφέσῳ τῆς Ἀσίας διατίθηκαν. Ἄδων, Hier. iii. 1; cited also by Euseb. H. E. v. 8.

5 Prologue to Matthew.
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others, and is every way consonant with what we have above (§ i.) related of the history of the Apostle its author. Some later writers have reported that it was published from Patmos, during John’s exile; some have combined the two accounts, and made John dictate the Gospel in Patmos, and publish it at Ephesus after his return. But of these the only account which from its date and character deserves attention, is that of Irenæus.

3. The Gospel itself furnishes only negative or uncertain evidence on this point. From the manner in which the sites and habits of Palestine are spoken of, it seems evident that it was composed at a distance from that country. If again we regard the peculiar nomenclature of the prologue, and inquire to what locality this points, two places occur to us where it would be likely to have been adopted; one of these, Alexandria,—the other, Ephesus. The first of these cities was the home and birth-place of the Gnostic philosophy; the other (Acts xviii. 24) was in communication with, and derived its philosophic character from Alexandria. Now as no history gives us any account of the Apostle having laboured or ever been at Alexandria, this consideration also forms a presumptive confirmation of the tradition that the Gospel was written at Ephesus.

4. If so, we have some clue, although but an indirect one, to the time at which it was published. If John cannot be supposed to have come thither till some time after the ultimate disappearance of the Apostle Paul from Asia Minor, then we have obviously a time specified, before which the Gospel cannot have been published.

5. The voice of tradition on this point is very uncertain. Irenæus states that this Gospel was the latest written of the four: which, as he places Mark’s and Luke’s after the deaths of Peter and Paul (but see Prolegg. to Luke, § iv.) would bring us to a similar date with that pointed out in the preceding paragraph. As usual in traditional matter,—on our advance to later writers, we find more and more particular accounts given:—the year of John’s life, the reigning Emperor, &c., under which the Gospel was written. In all such cases the student will do well to remember, that such late traditions are worthless exactly in proportion to their particularity of detail.

6. But we have thus no direct indication, at what date to place the Gospel. On examining its contents, we find no such indication given by them. It is true that the Evangelist speaks in ch. v. 2 of the pool of

---

6 See ch. ii. 6. 13. iii. 23. iv. 4. v. 2. vi. 4. x. 22. xi. 18. 49—51. 54, 55. xviii. 1. 13. 28. xix. 13. 31.
7 See note on John i. 1 (α).
8 See § i. of the present chapter, paragraph 10.
9 Similarly Clement of Alex., Origen, and Eusebius: see Eus. H. E. v. 8. iii. 24.
1 ἐν τῇ γησολίᾳ αὐτοῦ ἔλεις, μετὰ τῆς ζωῆς τῆς λαυτοῦ τοῦ Καίσαρος. Ερίφαν. Hier. ii. 12.
Bethesda in the present tense as being near the sheepgate, and thence it might seem as if he wrote before the destruction of Jerusalem:—but such indications are confounded by the fact that he speaks of places near Jerusalem, which would remain after the destruction, in the past tense (ch. xi. 18), which seems to show that no stress is to be laid on such expressions, which were perhaps used by him according to the cast of the particular narrative which he was then constructing, without any reference to the existing state of things at the time of his writing.

7. It has been inferred from ch. xxi. 18, 19. xviii. 10, that the Gospel must have been written during the lifetime of Peter;—that in the one place, had the Lord's prophecy been fulfilled before the account was written, some notice would have been taken of such fulfilment;—and that Peter's name would not have been mentioned in the other, had he been still living. But it is plain that we might just as well argue for ch. xxi. 18, 19 (waiving for the moment all question as to the chapter itself), being written after Peter's death, on account of the definiteness of the interpretation there given to the prophecy; and I have shown in my note on Matt. xxvi. 51, that no stress can be laid on the other inference.

8. Nor do we find any more certain indication by comparison of the Gospel with the First Epistle, or with the Apocalypse. The dates of both these are very uncertain;—and it has been disputed whether their contents presuppose the Gospel or not. Such expressions as ὁ λόγος τῆς ζωῆς, ἡ ζωὴ αἰώνων, ἡ εἰς τὸν πατήρα καὶ ἐφανερώθη ἡμῖν, 1 John i. 1, 2, and similar ones, make it at least probable, that the Epistle was written after the Gospel (see Lücke, iii. 21 ff.). But how long after, we have no means of even conjecturing. And with regard to the Apocalypse, the whole criticism of that book is still in too imperfect a state for us to be able to deduce any trustworthy chronological inferences from its contents, as to the time of its publication.

9. Our only resource then must be the very wide limits above indicated;—the final departure of Paul from Asia Minor, and indeed his death must be supposed to have happened some time;—this, such as it is, will be our terminus a quo;—and our terminus ad quem, the probable duration of John's life, or more properly speaking, of his powers of writing as we find him writing in this Gospel. And as antiquity testifies that he lived to a great age, this latter terminus will be even less definite than the former.

10. One consideration, however, may tend somewhat to narrow its limits. I have argued in the Commentary, that ch. xxi. is a genuine addition by the hand of the Apostle himself, probably in the decline of life, some years at least, from internal evidence of style, after the Gospel was completed. Add to which, as hinted above, that the style of the

2 See also ch. xviii. 1. xix. 41.
Gospel is, as Lücke has also remarked, that of a matured, but not of an aged writer.

11. If then we set the death of Paul with Wieseler in A.D. 64, we perhaps must not allow our terminus a quo to be placed earlier than 70: nor, supposing John to have been a few years younger than our Lord, can we prolong our later limit much beyond A.D. 85. We should thus have, but with no great fixity either way, somewhere about fifteen years,—A.D. 70—85, during which it is probable that the Gospel was published.

SECTION V.

IN WHAT LANGUAGE IT WAS WRITTEN.

1. The testimony of antiquity is unanimous that John wrote in Greek. (See Lücke, Einleitung, § xi.) Nor is there any reason to doubt the fact. If he lived and taught in Asia Minor, he must have been familiar with the Greek language.

2. Some among the moderns (Salmiasi, according to Lücke, the first) have held an Aramaic or Hebrew original. They seem to ground this principally on the citations from the Old Testament being from the Hebrew, not from the LXX. But this latter is by no means without exception: see i. 23. ii. 17. vi. 45. x. 34. xii. 14, 15. 38. xv. 25. xix. 24. 36. That we find other citations (xii. 40. xiii. 18. xix. 37) after the Hebrew solely or principally, was to be expected from the Apostle’s personal history, as a Jew of Palestine who had been brought up in the knowledge of the Hebrew original: and is a confirmation of the genuineness of the Gospel. See below in the next section, and Bleek, Beitrag zur Evangelien Kritik, p. 87.

SECTION VI.

ITS GENUINENESS.

1. It would enlarge these Prolegomena too much, to give a detailed history of the recognition of this Gospel, and its impugners, in ancient times. It may suffice to refer to such works as Lücke’s Einleitung, where this history will be found. The result of his researches on the subject is, that down to the end of the second century the Gospel was universally recognized and attributed to the Apostle whose name it bears, with the sole exception of the Alogi, an unimportant sect in Asia Minor, who, from excessive opposition to the heresy of Montanus, rejected both the Apocalypse and Gospel of John, as favouring (according to them) some of the views of that Heretic. Such an exception rather strengthens than weakens the general evidence of ancient Christendom in its favour.

2. Equally satisfactory is the testimony of the fathers after the close of the second century. The citations by Irenæus from this Gospel are very
frequent, and express, both as to its canonicity and the name of its author. And his testimony is peculiarly valuable because (1) he was an anti-
agnostic; (2) his acquaintance with the whole Church, Eastern and West-
ern, was greater than that of any other ecclesiastical writer; and (3) in
his youth he had conversed with Polycarp, himself a disciple of the
Apostle John. Theophilus of Antioch, Tertullian, Clement of Alex-
andria, Hippolytus, Origen, Dionysius of Alexandria, Eusebius,—the
ancient Syriac version, the Peschito,—the adversaries of Christianity, Por-
phyry, and Julian,—all these refer to the Gospel as without doubt the
work of the Apostle John.

3. We may then, as far as antiquity is concerned, regard its genuineness
as established. But there is one circumstance which has furnished many
modern writers with a ground for doubting this. Neither Papias, who
carefully sought out all that Apostles and Apostolic men had related
regarding the Life of Christ,—nor Polycarp, who was himself a disciple
of the Apostle John,—nor Barnabas, nor Clement of Rome, in their
Epistles, nor lastly Ignatius (in his genuine writings), make any mention
of, or allusion to, this Gospel. So that in the most ancient circle of
ecclesiastical testimony, it appears to be unknown or not recognized.

4. But this circumstance, when fairly considered in connexion with its
universal recognition by writers following on these, rather serves for a
confirmation of the genuineness of this Gospel. It confessedly was written
late in the Apostolic age. As far then as silence (or apparent silence)
can be valid as an argument, it seems to show that the recognition of this
Gospel, as might have been expected, was later than that of the others.
And it is some confirmation also of this view, that Papias, if Eusebius
(iii. 39) gives his testimony entire, appears not to recognize Luke’s
Gospel, but only those of Matthew and Mark. It is remarkable, however,
on the other hand, that Papias (Eusebius, ibid.) recognizes the First
Epistle of John, which, as remarked in § iv., was probably written after
the Gospel. This would seem to make it probable that we have not in
Eusebius the whole testimony of Papias given; for it would certainly
seem from internal grounds that the First Epistle and the Gospel must
stand or fall together.

5. It is evident that too much stress must not be laid on the silence of
Polycarp, from whom we have one short epistle only. He also (appa-
rently) was acquainted with the First Epistle of John*. But he wrote
with no purpose of giving testimony to the sacred books, and what reason
therefore have we to expect in his Epistle, quotations from or allusions
to any particular book which did not happen to come within his design,
and the subject of which he was treating?

---

* πάς γὰρ ἐκ ἀνὴρ ἰδεῖν Θεοῦν Χριστόν ἐν σαρκὶ ἀναστήναι, ἀντίχριστός

ch. vii.: compare 1 John iv. 3.
6. The same may be said of the silence of Barnabas, Hermas, and Ignatius. Had any intention existed on the part of the primitive Christian writers of informing posterity what books were counted canonical in their days, their silence would be a strong argument against any particular book:—but they had no such intention: their citations are fortuitous, and most of them loose and allusory only. So that we cannot argue from such silence to the recognition or otherwise of any book, unless it be universal and continuous, which is not the case with regard to this Gospel.

7. Again, the kind of testimony furnished by Irenæus is peculiarly valuable. He does not relate from whom he had heard that John wrote a Gospel, but he treats and quotes it as a well-known and long-used book in the Christian Church. What could have induced Irenæus to do this, except the fact of its being thus known and used? So that this character of his testimony virtually carries it back farther than its actual date. Besides, when one who has had the means which Irenæus had of ascertaining the truth in a matter, asserts things respecting that matter,—the ordinary and just method is to suppose that he draws his information from his superior opportunities of gaining it, even though he may not expressly say so: so that when Irenæus, who had conversed with Polycarp himself, the friend of the Apostle John, quotes this Gospel as the work of that Apostle, we may fairly presume that he had assured himself of this by the testimony of one so well capable of informing him.

8. Another historical argument used against its genuineness is,—that in the dispute about the time of keeping Easter between Polycarp and Anicetus bishop of Rome about the year 160, the former defended the practice of the Asiatic Churches,—which was to keep their Christian passover at the time of the Jewish passover, the evening of the 14th of Nisan, by what he had learned from John and the other Apostles (Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. v. 24). But, say the opponents, John himself in his Gospel clearly relates that our Lord instituted the Lord's supper on the evening of the 13th of Nisan, and was crucified on the 14th. Therefore either Polycarp falsely appealed to John's authority, which is not probable, or John did not write the Gospel which bears his name. But, as Lücke has shown, this argument is altogether built on the assumption that the Christian passover must necessarily coincide with the time of the institution of the Lord's supper; whereas such a coincidence does not appear to have entered into the consideration of the litigants in this case, but merely the question, whether the Churches should follow the Jewish calendar, or an arrangement of their own. Even in the later dispute between Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, and Victor (Eusebius, ut supra), on the same point, this question was not raised, but the matter was debated on other grounds.

9. The last historical objection which I shall notice is, that this Gospel was first circulated by the Gnostics, and therefore is to be looked on with
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suspicion. But Lücke has shown (Einl. p. 119) that this was not the case: that unquestionable traces of Catholic reception of it are found before it was received by them: and that, at all events, Irenæus recognized and used it contemporaneously with the Valentinians. The known opposition between the Catholic Fathers and the Gnostics furnishes a sure guarantee, that, had they first promulgated the Gospel, it never would have been received into the Canon of the Catholic Church.

10. The modern opponents of the genuineness and canonicity of this Gospel have raised two arguments against it upon internal evidence. The first of these rests upon the assumed radical diversity between the views of the Person and Teaching of Christ presented to us by John, and by the synoptic Evangelists. On this point I have said nearly all that is necessary in § ii.; and I will only now add, that supposing the diversity to be as unaccountable as it is natural, it would of itself serve as a strong presumption that the Gospel was not the work of a forger, who would have enlarged and decorated the accounts already existing, but a genuine testimony of one who was not an imitator of nor dependent on those others.

11. The second endeavours, by bringing out various supposed inconsistencies in the narration, to show that the Apostle John cannot have been the author. Such are,—imagined want of connexion in certain parts (iv. 44. xiii. 20. xiv. 31, where see notes);—an imputed inconsistency in the character and development of the treachery of Judas (see note on ch. vi. 64);—the not naming once in the Gospel of his own brother James (which, as Lücke remarks, is far easier to account for on supposition of its genuineness than on that of its spuriousness 4);—the supposed want of accurate information with regard to the geography and customs of Judæa. But again, the passages cited to support this involve only geographical and archæological difficulties, such as would never have been raised by an impostor;—and one in particular (vii. 52: see note there) is chargeable, not on the Evangelist, but on the Sanhedrin, who were likely enough to have made the mistake, or purposely overlooked the fact, in their proud spirit of contempt for Galilee. The other objections derived from internal considerations are hardly worth recounting. They are fully stated and answered by Lücke, Einleitung, pp. 136—140.

12. An hypothesis was advanced by Eckermann, Vogel, and Paulus, and brought to completeness by Weisse, founded on a compromise between the evidence for and against the Gospel: that it is partly genuine, and principally in the didactic portions, which are veritable

4 James, the son of Zebedee, though one of the favoured Three, comes forward no where personally in the Gospels, nor in the Acts; and vanishes the first of all the Apostles from the historic field of view. It is very unlikely that John would have introduced mention of him merely because he was his brother. He has not named several others of the Apostles. See ch. xxi. 2, and note.
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notices from the Apostle John: but that a later hand has wrought upon these, and added most of the narrative portions. But first, ecclesiastical tradition gives no countenance to this, always citing the Gospel as a whole, and dropping no hint of any such distinction between its parts; and secondly, it is quite impossible to draw any line in the Gospel itself which shall separate the original matter from the supposed additions. There certainly is a marked distinction in diction and style between the rest of the Gospel and ch. xxi. (of ch. vii. 53—viii. 12, I do not now speak; see notes there):—which I believe to be accounted for by that chapter being a later addition by the author himself:—but farther than this, no such distinction can, even by the most fanciful analogies, be established. The same spirit pervades the form of the narrative and didactic parts: and so strongly, that the impugners of the Gospel have made this very circumstance an argument against the authenticity of the latter;—how unjustly, I have shown above in § ii.:—but the fact of the objection having been made is important, as fatal to Weisse's hypothesis.

13. The principal arguments against the genuineness of the Gospel have been repeated and elaborated by Baur (in Zeller's Theologisches Jahrbuch, 1844, 1. 3. 14), who tries to show that the whole is apocryphal, and has arisen from a pious (?) fraud of an author in the latter part of the second century. I mention this attempt because an admirable answer to it has appeared, by Ebrard, Das Evangelium Johannis und die neueste Hypothese über seine Entstehung, pp. 217. Zurich, 1845. In this work he has gone over carefully all the arguments treated in the preceding sections, and shown their entire untenableness.

14. Our conclusion then from internal as well as external evidence, must be that the Gospel is what it has generally been believed to be,—the genuine work of the Apostle John. And this result has been obtained by rigid criticism, apart from all subjective leanings either way. To dilate on the importance of this conclusion, does not belong to these Prolegomena; but I cannot avoid pointing it out, in an age when on the one hand the historic truth of our scriptural accounts is being again boldly denied;—and on the other, we providentially stand at a point in the progress of criticism, where none but the most rigid trial of them,—none but the fairest and most impartial judgments,—can or ought to satisfy us.

SECTION VII.
ITS STYLE AND CHARACTER.

1. This is the only one of the four Gospels to which a pre-arranged and systematic plan can with any certainty be ascribed. That such does not exist in the other three, any farther than the circumstances under which they were each respectively written have indirectly modified their arrangement, has been already shown. But that such a plan is proposed
and followed out by the writer of this Gospel, will become evident by an examination of its contents.

2. The prologue contains a formal setting forth of the subject-matter of the Gospel:—'that the Eternal Creator Word became Flesh, and was glorified by means of that work which he undertook in the flesh.' This glorification of Christ he follows out under several heads: (1) the testimony borne to Him by the Baptist; (2) His miracles; (3) His conflict with the persecution and malice of the Jews; (4) His own testimony in His discourses, which are very copiously related; (5) His sufferings, death, and resurrection. And this His glorification is the accomplishment of the purpose of the Father, by setting Him forth as the Light and Life of the world,—the One Intercessor and Mediator, by whose accomplished Work the Holy Spirit is procured for men; and through Whom all spiritual help, and comfort, and hope of glory, is derived.

3. Several subdivisions of the Gospel have been proposed, as showing its arrangement, in subordination to this great design. The simplest and most satisfactory is that adopted by Lücke: (1) The prologue, ch. i. 1—18; (2) the first main division of the Gospel, i. 18—xii. 50; (3) the second main division of the Gospel, xiii. 1—xx. 31; (4) the appendix, ch. xxi.

4. Of these divisions, I. the prologue, contains a general statement of the whole subject of the Gospel. II. The first main division treats of the official work of the Lord in Galilee, Judæa, and Samaria, His reception and rejection, and closes with the general reflections of the Evangelist, xii. 37—43, and summary of the commission of Jesus, do. 44—50:—its foundation in the will of the Father, and purposes of grace and love to men. III. The second main division may be subdivided into two parts, (1) the inner glorification of Christ in His last supper and His last discourses, (2) His outer and public glorification by His Sufferings, Death, and Resurrection. Then IV. the appended chapter xxi. relates, for a special purpose, an appearance of the Lord, after His resurrection, in Galilee:—see notes there.

5. In all these, except the last, the great leading object of the Gospel is kept in view and continually worked out more fully. After having stated it in the prologue, he relates the recognition of Christ’s glory by the testimony of the Baptist;—then by the disciples on their being called;—then the manifestation of that glory by His miracle in Cana of Galilee,—by His cleansing of the temple,—by His declaration of Himself to Nicodemus,—and so onwards. But the more this is the case, the more is He misunderstood and withstood; and it becomes evident by degrees, that the great showing forth of His glory is to be brought about by the result of this very opposition of His enemies. This reaches its height in the prophetic testimony of Caiaphas, xi. 47 ff.; and the voice from heaven, xii. 28, ἵδον ē̂s, K. πάλιν doxášw seems to form the point of
transition from the manifestation of His glory by His acts, discourses, and conflict with the Jews, in part I.—to that by His Sufferings, Death, and Resurrection in part II. Thus, as Lücke remarks, these words form the ground tone of the whole Gospel,—‘The public working of Christ, manifested His glory; but at the same time led on to His Death, which Death again manifested His glory.’

6. In the course of the Gospel the Evangelist steadily keeps his great end in view, and does not turn aside from it. For its sake, are the incidents and notices introduced, with which his matter is diversified; but for its sake only. He has no chronological, no purely historical aims. Each incident which is chosen for a manifestation of the Lord’s glory, is introduced sometimes with very slight links, sometimes with altogether no links of connexion to that which has preceded. So that while—in the fulfilment of its inner design the Gospel forms a closely connected and perfect whole, considered in any other view it is disjointed and fragmentary.

7. With regard to the style of this Gospel, it may be remarked, (1) that Dionysius of Alexandria, as cited by Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. vii. 25, remarked the purity of its Greek as compared with that of the Apocalypse. τὰ μὲν γὰρ (the Gospel and First Epistle) οὐ μόνον ἀπαίσως κατὰ τὴν ἑλληνικὴν φωνὴν, ἀλλὰ καὶ λογισταριτάς τὰς λέξεις, τοῖς συλλογισμοῖς, ταῖς συντάξεις τῆς ἐρμηνείας γέγραπται. πολλοὶ γε δεῖ βαρ-bαρόν τινα φθόγγον, ἤ συνοικίαμον, ἤ ὅλως ἰδιωτικὸν ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐφιέθηκα. (2) That without subscribing to the whole of this eulogy, if classical authors are to be the standard of comparison, the same will hold good of this Gospel as compared with the other three. (3) That the greater purity of its Greek is perhaps mainly owing to its far greater simplicity of style. While the deepest truths lie beneath the words, the words themselves are almost colloquial in their simplicity; the historical matter is of small amount as compared with the dialogue. (4) That while the language is for the most part unobjectionable Greek, the cast of expression and thought is Hebraistic. ‘Sermo quidem Graecus sed plane adumbratus ex Syriaco illius saeculi’ (Grotius). There is, both here and in the Epistle, very little unfolding or deducing one proposition from another: different steps of an argument, or sometimes different conclusions from mutually dependent arguments, are indicated by mere juxtaposition:—and the intelligent reader must be carrying on, as it were, an underrun of thought, or the connexion will not be perceived. (5) That in this respect this Gospel forms a remarkable contrast to those parts of the New Testament written by Hellenistic Christians; e.g. the Epistles of Paul, and that to the Hebrews; in which, while external marks of Hebraistic diction abound, there is yet an internal conformation of style, and connexion of thought, more characteristic of the Grecian mind:—they write more in periods, and more according to dialectic form. In
observing all such phænomena in our Sacred Writings, the student will learn to appreciate the evidence which they contribute to the historic truth of our belief with regard to them and their writers:—and will also perceive an admirable adaptation of the workman to his work, by Him whose one Spirit has overruled them all.

CHAPTER VI.

SECTION I.

OF THE ARRANGEMENT OF THE TEXT IN THIS EDITION.

1. In order to set the principles on which the text has been revised clearly before the student, it may be well to premise a short account of what has been hitherto done towards its revision in modern times.

2. The received text of the Greek Testament is that of the second Elzevir edition, published at Leyden in 1633, and founded on a collation of the third edition of Robert Stephens (1550),—which itself was founded on the fifth edition of Erasmus (1535),—with Beza's editions. The term 'received text' appears to have originated in an expression used by the Elzevirs in their preface—‘Textum ergo habes nunc ab omnibus receptum, in quo nihil immutatum aut corruptum damus.' (For particulars respecting the previous editions of the Greek Testament, see Wetstein, prolegomena, p. 116 ff.)

3. The critical authority of the received text is very feeble.—The fifth edition of Erasmus mentioned above was nearly a reprint of his fourth, which was founded on his former editions corrected by the 1 Complutensian, which had just been published at that time. But neither Erasmus nor the Complutensian editors had before them any sufficient critical apparatus whereupon to construct their text;—nor did the latter use faithfully even that which they had. Wetstein has shown that their text is singularly corrupted and inaccurate. Erasmus also, besides committing numerous inaccuracies, tampered with the readings of the very few MSS. which he collated. Stephens has given but a very vague account of the additional MSS. to which he had access, and the work appears to have been done with levity and carelessness. The Elzevirs differ from Stephens's third edition in 145 readings only. (Tischendorf, ed. 2, p. xxxvii.)

1 Published at Alcalá (Complutum) in Spain, under the superintendence of Cardinal Ximenes. This edition was ready in 1514, two years before Erasmus published his first edition; but, from various delays, not published till 1522, after Erasmus had published his third.
ARRANGEMENT OF THE TEXT [CH. VI.

4. The first systematic attempt to revise the received text which I shall notice here, as embracing in itself some previous partial ones, is that of J. J. Griesbach, whose edition (complete) appeared in 1796—1806. He collected and systematized the previous labours of Mill and Wetstein, adding to them very many collations of his own. His theory of various recensions of the Greek text apparent in the different classes of MSS., although arbitrarily carried out by him and those who have adopted it from him, has certainly a foundation in truth, and corresponds in the main to the phenomena:—but it misled him in his recension of the text. Nor has he been sufficiently careful in his collation of the principal MSS., nor consistent in the application of his own critical rules. Besides which, the number and complexity of his symbols indicating his judgment on the quality of the readings, form an objection to his edition as furnishing a text for general use.

5. The next considerable attempt to revise the text is found in the edition of Dr. Scholz, Roman Catholic professor of sacred literature at Bonn. In his extensive travels undertaken in pursuance of his work, he has discovered and collated very many MSS. unknown before:—and in this department of criticism, his services have been considerable. But the theory which he has upheld with regard to the recension of the text is as untenable, as his own departure from it has been manifest. He adopts Griesbach’s classification of MSS. into two great families or recensions, the Alexandrine and the Constantinopolitan. Of these he holds that the latter contain the true original text of the sacred books, the former having been altered and corrupted from them. But notwithstanding this, he continually receives into his text, in almost every page, Alexandrine readings, against the almost unanimous testimony of the Constantinopolitan MSS. In fact, his is a text constructed in spite of, not according to, his theory. Besides which, with all respect for Dr. Scholz’s labours in the cause of Biblical criticism, it must be confessed that the extreme inaccuracy of his edition of the New Testament renders it almost unfit for the use of the scholar.

6. In 1831 a stereotype edition of the New Testament appeared, followed in 1842 by a first part, containing the Gospels, of a larger edition with various readings and the Latin Vulgate annexed, by C. Lachmann. The view with which he has reconstructed his text is explained at length in his prolegomena to the edition of 1842. He professes to give

---

the text as it was received in the East in the fourth century. To this end he cites as his authorities entirely the older MSS., \(^*\) A B C P Q T Z in the Gospels as of primary, and D as of secondary authority; neglecting altogether the other uncial MSS. and all the cursive ms.:—of the versions he lays most stress (and properly) on the ancient Latin ones, a b c d, but to the entire neglect of the important Syrr., Copt., \(\ddot{A}\)Eth., Arm., Sahid.\(^4\) Of the Fathers, in the Gospels he only cites Origen as of primary authority,—Irenæus, Cyprian, Hilary, and Lucifer as of secondary;—and lastly, the Vulgate of Jerome. But this rejection of the greater part (numerically) of the witnesses for the text has reduced him, in a very considerable part of the New Testament, to implicit following of one primary MS. only (e. g. A does not contain Matt. i.—xxv. 6, besides other lacunæ; B does not contain the epistles to Timothy, Titus, and Philemon, nor the Apocalypse; and the lacunæ in C are large and frequent). Besides which, he has not consistently followed his own system, as Tischendorf, ed. Lips. 2, prolegg. p. xlv., as shown by many instances. And he has not taken the pains which he should have done to obtain the best collations of the Vatican MS. (B), by far the most important for his work; having neglected altogether that of Bartolocci, which was known and accessible to him;—nor of the Parisian Codex Ephraemi (C), which was also accessible to him, but which he has taken from the imperfect collation of Wetstein. On the use made of Lachmann’s digest of various readings in this edition, see below, § ii.

7. In 1846 an edition of the New Testament appeared by Muralt, entitled ‘Novum Testamentum Graece ad fidem codicis principis Vaticani edidit Eduardus de Muralt.’ The Editor professes to have had access to the celebrated Vatican MS. during three days, and in that time to have been able to compare the various collations hitherto made, and to decide between them. It need not be remarked, that such an edition, if carefully and faithfully done, would be an invaluable contribution to sacred criticism. But as far as we have the means of judging, this has not been the case; nor does the Editor appear ever to have consulted the Vatican MS. at all! I transcribe the words of Tischendorf, in the prolegomena to his 2nd Leipzig edition, p. xlvii. ‘Opus est incredibili insozia, socordia, perfidia. Quod ut et dicam et paucis probem, ili tam multa debere mihi videor qui, quum rem criticam non profiteantur, tanto promissoris hiato verbisque sesquipedalibus facile in errorem ducuntur et jam ducti sunt.—Videamus primum quod summa res est. Est autem quod “ad fidem codicis Vaticani” N. T. se editurum profitetur. Hunc codicem principem unde tandem habet? Collationes duas, alteram Bar-

\(^*\) See catalogue of MSS. below, ch. vii. § i.
\(^4\) See for all these, catalogue of versions below, ch. vii. § ii.
\(^5\) See below, ch. vii. § i. catalogue of MSS. under B.
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tolocci anni 1669, depositam Parisiis, a Scholzio et me excussam, alteram
Birchii dudum ab omnibus adhibitam cum notis aliquid meis habuit,
pretereaque, si verum quiseris, nihil. Attamen refert "a 1844 per 3
dies
hoc arcano uis" sibi licuissse. Quod si licuit, aliquid lucr eum fecisse
credibile est. Qum vero mense Nov. 1844, Ed. de Muralto, tum ipsum
Roma rediens, ubi paucos dies transegerat, Vindobone mihi se obtulisset,
narrassetque de suis circa cod. Vat. studiis, dubitationem de narratiis mihi
obortam dispulsurus statim Romam scripsi ad eundem legatum, cui com-
mendanti ac tuenti Vaticanam suam messem debere se professus erat.
Ille 11 Dec. 1844 manu fratris sui his verbis mihi rescrpisit: "Sr.
Muralto aus Petersburg hatte sich anfangs ohne Erfolg bemüht den Bibelcode zu
sehen; bieses ist ihm erst durch Bemühung meines Bruders gelungen, benüten hat er ihn
aber nicht können. Wie uns Sr. Dr. De Wette erzählt, hat man Ihnen nur während
weniger Stunden erlaubt dieses wichtige Document zu benutzen, und so waren sie doch
glücklicher als Sr. Muralto gewesen!" This being the case, all dependence
on Muralts work, as representing the Codex Vaticanus, is taken away.
I am sorry to say that I had myself been taken in by it, and from Luke
vi. onwards had cited the readings of B from it. The portion from Luke
vi.—xviii. had passed through the press before I received Tischendorfs
second edition with the above notice. I immediately corrected the various
readings from Luke xviii.—end of John; and of that portion which
was irrevocable I have subjoined a table of errata, which I very much
regret.

8. Dr. Tischendorf has published at Leipzig two editions of the Greek
Testament, the first in 1841, the second in this present summer (1849).
Of these the second is by far the most important, and of that I now
speak. He has bestowed much pains on accurately ascertaining the
readings of several MSS. which had been hitherto carelessly or partially
collated, and his digest of readings is much more copious, and I am
willing to believe, trustworthy, than any which has hitherto appeared. In
his revision of the text, as explained in his prolegomena, he has followed
the most ancient MSS., not however disregarding the testimony of the
later ones, versions and Fathers where the former disagree, or where the
readings of the elder MSS. have apparently sprung from corruption of the
text. And to judge of this last he lays down the following rules:—
1. Readings are to be suspected, which are peculiar to one or other of the
elder MSS., or which savour strongly of the character of some one class
of recensions, and have therefore probably proceeded from some cor-

6 3 dies ex legibus bibl. Vat. faciunt horas novem.
7 "M. Muralto, from Petersburg, had endeavoured at first without success to be allowed
to see the Codex. This was at length granted him through the exertions of my brother,
but he was not permitted to consult it. Dr. De Wette informs us that you were allowed,
for a few hours only, to consult this important document: in that case, however, you
were more fortunate than M. Muralto."
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rer. 2. Readings which although supported by many MSS., have manifestly or probably sprung from the error of a copyist. 3. Readings which have sprung from a desire to assimilate citations from the Old Testament to the text of the cited passage, or parallel places in the Gospels to one another. In such cases (unless there be strong cause to the contrary) the discrepant reading is to be preferred to the accordant one. 4. A reading is to be preferred, which appears to furnish a clue to the others, or to contain the elements of them in itself. 5. The usage of the New Testament writers in general, and of each one in particular, is to be regarded in balancing readings with one another. For the discussion of these rules, I refer the student to the work itself. The theory of them is unobjectionable; it will be by the practical carrying out of them that the New Testament Editor must be judged. And Dr. Tischendorf’s second edition has come into my hands too recently, for me to venture to pronounce on it as a whole. I see some arbitrary readings of his former edition (e.g. Matt. xxvii. 17, Ἰησοῦν Βαραββᾶν μὲ Ἰησοῦ τῶν λαγών. χριστῶν, adopted without the authority of a single uncial codex !!) still retained; and in the portion which I have been able to consult for my own digest of various readings, I find some strange inconsistencies, e.g. the omission of τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, Luke xxiv. 3, on the authority of only D, 1, and some versions;—also of καὶ λάγη αὐτοῖς Εἰρήνη ἤμιν, ib. ver. 36, on the same authority;—of ver 40, on the same authority;—of προκεκυκλωσαίτες αὐτῶν, ib. ver. 52, on the same authority. If one chapter furnishes so many instances of rash innovation on very slight authority (and the same appears to be the case throughout the Gospel of John), I fear we can hardly expect to find Tischendorf’s text any great advance on those previously promulgated. This will not however diminish the value of his digest of various readings, which I only regret I have not had before me during the whole of my labours in that department.

9. It remains now to explain the principles which have regulated the revision of the text in this edition. It seemed to me, that for present use in this country, a middle course should be adopted between two extremes. (a) To reject on the one hand the unanimous testimony of the older MSS. where the sense is affected, in favour of the less supported or altogether unsupported readings of the received text, seemed to be a betrayal of the first duty of a critic; and to depart from the received text where such variation is indifferent, seemed not to be expedient in a country where that text has so long taken hold of the public mind.—(β) It also appeared to me desirable, where the MSS. of primary authority were divided on a reading at present contained in the text (unless some other circumstances, as overwhelming preponderance of secondary testimony, or strong internal evidence, intervened), to give the received text the benefit of that doubt, retaining it, but at the same time marking it as doubtful.—Again (γ), where such division of the primary MSS. occurs, and neither of the
readings upheld by them is found in the received text, but a third, resting on lower authority,—or where the majority of primary authorities concur but perfect unanimity does not exist,—I have (with the caution mentioned in the parenthesis above) still retained the received text, but with a stronger mark, indicating probable spuriousness, and leaving the reader to form his judgment between the conflicting readings.

10. It is obvious that the text thus produced will be a provisional text only; not the best or most correct attainable, but the one best suited to the intended use of this edition under present circumstances. I will not conceal from the reader, that were my work to be done afresh, I should feel much disposed to carry the influence of unanimity in the primary MSS. further,—and to adapt the text to them even in matters of indifference;—and also to leave no reading in the text (even with a mark of probable spuriousness) which had not for its ground some primary authority. But the present volume may be regarded as an experiment how far the public mind in England may be disposed to receive even the first and plainest results of the now advanced state of textual criticism;—by the success or failure of which (unless this latter depend upon deficiencies chargeable upon myself, and not on my system) the practicability of further advance must be determined.

11. I will now enumerate the leading points of my revision, as above implied, adding some illustrative remarks.

(a) Wherever the primary MSS. are unanimous, in any reading affecting the sense, I have adopted that reading, to the rejection of the commonly received text.

(1) That the reader may at once perceive what are the primary MS. authorities containing any given passage, I have throughout marked them in the inner margin, indicating where the lacunæ in the MSS. occur;—and have, for the sake of convenience, repeated the last preceding mark at the top of every left-hand page. So that by referring back to the last preceding notification of the kind in every case, it will be at once perceived on what primary authorities the text of that portion depends.

(2) It sometimes happens, from the frequent lacunæ in the primary MSS., that some portions are contained in only two, or even one, of them. In that case I have not carried out the above principle inflexibly, but have weighed secondary circumstances, such as the concurrence of versions or Fathers, or later MSS.; and where I have not altered the received text, have marked it as probably spurious. See below under (γ).

(3) Every variation from the received text is indicated by an obelus prefixed.

(β) Where the primary MSS. are divided, some containing the received

---

* For a catalogue of these see below, ch. vii. § i. 1.
reading and others a different one, I have (see above under this head) retained the received reading, marking it as doubtful, with an asterisk *, or brackets [  ].

(1) It must be observed that the asterisk will necessarily indicate a variety of shades of difference, verbal, inflexional, or of insertion by some MSS. of a clause or word not found in the text;—it must therefore be regarded in every case as referring to the digest of various readings, where the cause of its being placed there will be explained.

(2) Where an asterisk is found at the beginning of a clause or sentence, and another at the end, connected thus *—*, it is implied that all between the two is included in the doubt thus indicated.

(y) In the cases above specified under this head, I have retained the received reading, marking it with a line drawn over, in addition to the asterisk *, or the brackets [  ].

(1) These marks are also used in the case mentioned under (a), obs. (2). The digest of various readings will in each case indicate the reason of their use.

SECTION II.

OF THE VARIOUS READINGS.

1. The digest of various readings given in this edition has been compiled principally, as regards the primary authorities, from that of Lachmann: combining that of Scholz in the case of the secondary MSS. versions and Fathers. I had not the advantage of consulting Tischendorf's second edition until the work as far as Luke xvi. was printed. From ch. xviii. of that Gospel to the end of the volume has been rewritten and enriched with his more copious notices. From Luke vi.—xviii., as observed above, I have, to my great regret, inserted statements regarding the Codex Vaticanus from the apparently worthless edition of Muralt, which are corrected in the annexed table of errata. I must also take my share of the errors regarding B which have been above charged upon Lachmann, in the former part of the volume. In the latter part, these have been corrected; and cases where the reading of B has been assumed e silentio have been notified by a query (B ?).

2. One great advantage of Lachmann's digest is that he uniformly gives the primary authorities on which the reading adopted in the text rests, and not merely the authorities containing those readings which differ from it. In this I have followed him, thinking it at least as important to know the authority for, as that against our text. But I have not always been able to ascertain the secondary authorities for the existing or adopted text. I know of no digest which contains them,—and to undertake collations for the purpose of ascertaining them has been as yet out of my power. Tischendorf (ed. 2) has given them in many more cases than
had been done before, and I have partially supplied them in the latter part of this volume (Luke xviii.—end) from that source; still, however, in many cases they are unascertained.

3. In the digest of various readings, I have used the following signs and abbreviations:

(a) The abbreviation (om.) before the specification of any MS. or MSS., signifies that the word or clause mentioned is omitted in that MS. or MSS.

(b) The abbreviation (ins.), similarly situated, that it is inserted.

(c) The abbreviation (txt.), similarly situated, that the reading in our text is contained in the MS. or MSS. specified.

(d) The abbreviation (rec.) before any specified reading, signifies that that reading is contained in the received text.

(e) The abbreviation (al.) after a specified number of MSS., signifies that other MSS., not enumerated, also contain the reading; (all.) that many other such contain it.

(f) By MSS., are meant manuscripts in the large or uncial character: by mss., manuscripts in the small, or cursive character.

4. The following varieties of readings, which perpetually occur, and are of no immediate import to the sense or construction of the text, have not been noticed in the following digest, except where special reasons have made their mention advisable:

(1)—plural or singular verbs with neuter plural nouns.

(2)—insertion or omission of δρι loquentis.

(3)—Alexandrine terminations in -αν, &c., as ἡξαν, ἧχαν (Mark vii. 11), ἤθαρσ, &c.

(4)—insertion or omission of Ὁ Ἡσοῦς, or substitution of that Name for αὐτῶς or its cases in the narrative, and vice versa.

(5)—insertion or omission of the article generally before proper names, except where the sense is or may be affected, as Μαρία and Ἡ Μαρία, &c.

(6)—insertion or omission of αὐτῷ or αὐτοῖς, or πρὸς αὐτῶν or -σῶν, after verbs of speaking, where the person or persons addressed are otherwise evident and unmistakeable.

(7)—insertion or omission of αὐτῷ or αὐτῶν, or μον or σον, when ownership is otherwise unmistakeably indicated.

(8)—the endless variations of ἄποκριθείς εἰς, or εἰς εἰν, or σὺν, or δὲ, or καὶ εἰς (in John these especially abound).

(9)—variations of ἔρωτων, ἔρωτου, ἔρωτας, ἔρωτουν, ἔρωτουν, ἐπιρωτεύειν, &c., and generally of the imperfect and aorist; but only in cases where the sense is in no way affected by the change.

(10)—transpositions of the augment in compound words, as προφητεύονται and έπροφητεύονται, &c.

(11)—trifling variations in the way of writing or spelling, as αὐτῷ and 72]
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οὐρως,—ἐδύνατο and ἤδύνατο,—εὐθὺς and εὐθέως,—κάγῳ and καὶ ἐγὼ,—ἐναρμ. and ἐναρμ., &c.

(12)—ὡς and ὡς, when identical in meaning.

(13)—ἐς ὦ, and ἐς ἔτοι. This variety is frequent in the MS. D.

(14)—mere transpositions of words, as πάντα παῦα and παῦα πάντα, &c.

(15)—variations such as ὅξλος πολύς and ὅξλοι πολλοί, &c.

(16)—mere errors in writing, evidently such; which abound in D especially.

(17)—The ordinary instances of itacism, (confounding ασ. and ε) where the sense is not affected, or where the var. reading has obviously been occasioned merely by the itacism, as ἵταφαι, which is found in A, Luke viii. 3, for ἵταφαι,—πεῖδων for πεῖδων in D, Mark vii. 28,—εἰρηνεύοντι for εἰρηνεύοντι in A, D, Mark ix. 50,—ἐταφαι for ἐταφαι in D, Matt. xxvi. 50; &c. &c.

(18)—The indicative future, or subjunctive aorist after οὐ μὴ, in ordinary cases.

(19)—omission or insertion of ἐκ before a genitive, as ἐκ ὑμῶν or ἐκ ἐκ ὑμῶν.

(20)—use of the participial or the direct construction, as ἐλαβέ... καὶ, or ἀλαβ... in ordinary cases.

5. I am aware that some of these may appear to critics of the sacred text varieties too important to be omitted in a digest of various readings. But when it is considered, that many of them appear almost every time that the expressions occur, and thus may be almost taken for granted by the student,—and that if they had been inserted, the following digest would have been more than doubled in bulk without any corresponding addition to its real value,—I hope that I shall be excused for having ventured on their omission. It is of course important that there should be editions of the New Testament, in which every even the least variation is scrupulously noticed;—but such editions will necessarily be as much out of the reach of the ordinary student from their bulk and price, as their purpose is out of the track of his studies:—unless indeed, as has been the case with Lachmann’s edition, reasonableness of size and price has been obtained at a sacrifice of a very considerable part of the evidence.—See also on this point, the remarks made above, § i. 10.

SECTION III.

OF THE MARGINAL REFERENCES.

1. The references in the margin of this Edition of the Greek Testament are not those usually printed in other Editions. Those are references to the subject matter of the text: and are most useful and necessary to every Biblical student. As however they are now to be found in many editions of our English Bible, it seemed unnecessary to reprint them here. Instead of them, I have drawn up a body of references to verbal and idiomatical
usages, which I hope will be found an addition to our apparatus criticus, as tending to exhibit, simultaneously with the text itself, the peculiarities and ἴσα ὁ λέγόμενα of the passage under consideration.

2. The materials for constructing such a body of references have of course been principally found in the various Greek Testament Lexicons, aided by personal study of the text in matters of which Lexicons do not treat. I have also used with profit, but not extensively, Grinfield's Editio Hellenistica Novi Testamenti, and take this opportunity of acknowledging my obligations to that work.

3. The hindrances, as well as the helps, to such a compilation should be mentioned. They have mainly consisted in the almost uniform inaccuracy in the references in the existing Lexicons. In Schleusner and Parkhurst, little more than half of the passages referred to are to be found. The citations are copied without verification. In Wahl, this has not been the case, nor are the inaccuracies so many; but the errors in printing have introduced far more than are compatible with a profitable use of his very laborious and copious work. An honourable exception to the general inaccuracy of our Lexicon references is found, as far as my experience has gone, in Robinson's Greek and English Lexicon to the New Testament edited by Dr. Bloomfield. I have however been constrained principally to use Wahl, from his greater copiousness in detail.

4. In the present edition, no reference has been inserted which has not been verified; and I am bound to acknowledge that the accuracy of the printing has fully corresponded to my earnest desire that the whole may be found correct. In the course of so many thousand citations, I cannot expect but that errors will occasionally have crept in;—I have specified in the errata those which I have observed; and I shall be obliged to any reader who may discover such, to communicate with me (addressed at Messrs. Rivingtons', St. Paul's Churchyard) that the mistake may be corrected.

5. The sources whence the references have been drawn have been, (1) the text of the Greek Testament itself, as affording instances of similarity of usage or construction,—of use of the same of different words in parallel passages of the Gospels,—or of tacit reference to the words and acts of our Lord in the Epistles:—(2) the Septuagint version of the Old Testament; as being, from the place and time of its publication, its use by the New Testament writers, and its similarity of style and diction,—so full of interest in the elucidations of the sacred text:—(3) the Apocrypha, which approaches even more nearly than the LXX to the peculiar Hellenistic style of the New Testament:—and (4) the works of Josephus and Philo-Judæus, who occasionally are found using expressions and constructions similar to those in our text. To these may be added, (5) a few instances from the classic writers, especially Xenophon, justifying or elucidating New Testament words or constructions.
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6. For convenience in arranging this body of reference, it has been found necessary to use some few signs and abbreviations, which will here be explained.

(a) When a reference is preceded by the sign (=), it is indicated that the word which is the subject of reference is used, in the passage referred to, in the same sense as in the text.

(b) When, in the Gospels, the sign (||) occurs in a reference, it is signified that the word occurs in the parallel place in the other Gospels, which will always be found indicated at the head of the note on the paragraph. When the sign (||) is qualified, thus, (|| Mark, or || Matt. Mark, &c.) it is signified that the word occurs in the parallel place in that Gospel or Gospels, but not in the other or others.

(c) When the words 'here only,' or in such and such places 'only,' occur in a reference, they are always to be understood as meaning that the word occurs in that place or those places only of the New Testament; and as having no reference to its occurring in the LXX or elsewhere.

(d) When a reference is followed by the sign †, it is indicated that the word does not occur in the Septuagint version of the Old Testament.

(e) When a reference is followed by the sign ‡, it is indicated that the word does not occur in the LXX in the same sense as in the text.

(z) The abbreviation (constr.) occurring before a reference, indicates that it is the construction of the clause or sentence which is referred to.

(y) Other abbreviations will be understood from the context: e.g. trans. or intrans., that the verb is used transitively or intransitively in the passages referred to: gen., dat., acc., that the verb or preposition governs these cases respectively in those passages: so of 'act. pass.,' &c. &c.

(θ) In one only case, are the references not to verbal or idiomatical usage, but to subject-matter. Where the text contains a citation from or reference to the Old Testament, the place of that citation or reference is indicated in the margin, but in small capitals: thus: Isa. liii. 5.

7. The student is requested not to consider the references in any instance as embracing the whole number of times where a word occurs in the New Testament,—unless it be expressly so stated. In by far the greater number of cases, they consist merely of a selection, at discretion, from an abundance of similar instances.

8. To avoid mistakes, I think it well to advertise the student, that when the references extend below the text, they are to be read in single lines across the page.
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APPARATUS CRITICUS.

SECTION I.

MANUSCRIPTS OF THE GREEK TESTAMENT REFERRED TO IN THIS EDITION.

Manuscripts written in the large capital, or uncial character, of first class authority.

1. A. The MS. known by this symbol is that commonly called the Alexandrine, or Codex Alexandrinus. It once belonged to Cyril Lucaris, patriarch of Alexandria and then of Constantinople, who in the year 1628 presented it to our King Charles I. It is now in the British Museum. It is on parchment and in folio, consisting of four volumes, of which three contain the Old, and one the New Testament, with the Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians. It will be seen by the letters in the inner margin of this Edition, that the first 24 chapters of Matthew are wanting in it, its first leaf commencing ch. xxv. 6:—as also the leaves containing John vi. 50—viii. 52. It is generally agreed that it was written at Alexandria;—it does not however, in the Gospels, represent that commonly known as the Alexandrine text, but approaches much more nearly to the Constantinopolitan, or generally received text. It has often been collated, and published in fac simile,—the New Testament by Woide, Lond. 1786, the Old Testament by Baber, Lond. 1819. The date of this MS. has been variously assigned, but it is now pretty generally agreed to be the fifteenth century. The arguments for the various dates (from the fourth to the tenth century) may be seen in Horne's Introduction, vol. ii. pp. 94—98 (ed. 8):—see also Wetstein's Prolegomena, pp. 8—22 (ed. Amst. 1751).

2. B. The Codex Vaticanus,—No. 1209 in the Vatican Library at Rome. The history of this MS. is unknown. It was apparently, from internal evidence, copied in Egypt. It is on vellum, in quarto, and contains the Old and New Testaments. In the latter, it is defective from Heb. ix. 14—end of the Epistle;—it does not contain the Epistles to Timothy, Titus, and Philemon;—nor the Apocalypse. It has never been published in fac simile (!) nor even thoroughly collated (!1). The partial collations which we possess are,—(1) that of Bartolocci (under the name of Giulio de St. Anastasia), once librarian at the Vatican, made in 1669, and preserved in the Royal Library at Paris; (2) that of Birch, published in various readings to the Acts and Epistles, Copenhagen, 1798—Apocalypse, 1800—Gospels, 1801; (3) that of Thomas Bentley, who was sent to Rome.
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by his uncle, the great Bentley, for that purpose, and was assisted by Mico, an Italian. This collation is published in an Appendix to Woide's edition of the Codex Alexandrinus, 1799. Of these collations, Bartolocci's is very negligently made;—Birch's is in Luke and John dependent on Bentley's, whose sheets he copied;—Bentley's is the most carefully done (Tisch. profl. p. lviii.). Since these collations, the Codex has been occasionally consulted for the verification of certain readings, but never to any extent. Cardinal Angelo Mai has long been employed on an edition of the whole, which has been, from some cause variously assigned (ostensibly the non-completion of his prolegomena), delayed for many years. The printing of the whole was finished before the year 1843 (!). On Muralt's pretended collation of this MS., see above ch. vi. § i. 6. This Codex is sufficiently proved, and now generally allowed, to be the oldest copy of the New Testament extant. It probably was written during the fourth century (Hug, Tischendorf, al.). Its text is that commonly known as the Alexandrine, with, however, considerable additions and variations. The readings of this MS. are given, as far as Luke vi., from Lachmann and Scholz; from Luke vi.—xviii. (see above ch. vi. § i. 6) from the pretended collation of Muralt, an error which I have corrected in the table of errata; from Luke xviii. —end of John, from Tischendorf, ed. 2.

3. C. The Codex Ephraemi, or Codex Regius Parisiensis, preserved in the Royal (National) Library at Paris, No. 9.—It is a Codex rescriptus or palimpsest, consisting of the works of Ephrem the Syrian written over the MS. of fragments of the Old and New Testaments. It seems to have come to France with Catharine de Medicis, and to her from Cardinal Nicolas Ridolfi. Tischendorf thinks it probable that he got it from Andrew John Lascaris, who at the fall of the Eastern Empire was sent to the East by Lorenzo de Medicis to preserve such MSS. as had escaped the ravages of the Turks. This is confirmed by the later corrections in the MS., which were evidently made at Constantinople. But from the form of the letters, and other peculiarities, it is believed to have been written at Alexandria, or at all events, where the Alexandrine dialect and method of writing prevailed. Its text is perhaps the purest example of the Alexandrine text,—holding a place about midway between the Constantinopolitan MSS. and most of those of the Alexandrine recension. It was edited very handsomely in uncial type, but unfortunately not in fac simile, with copious dissertations, &c., by Tischendorf, in 1843. He assigns to it an age at least equal to A, and places it also in the fifth century. The readings of this MS., in the present edition, are throughout taken from Tischendorf's reprint 1.

1 Tischendorf distinguishes three periods of this MS. — C1 (in this ed. C* Tisch.), the original text, written (in Egypt ?) before the middle of the fifth century; C2 (C**)
4. D. The Codex Cantabriensis, or Beza,—so called because it was presented to the University library at Cambridge by Beza in 1581. He procured it in 1562, from the monastery of S. Ireneus at Lyons, where it had lain neglected. It is on parchment, in folio, and contains the Gospels and Acts, with a Latin version. Its lacunæ, which are many, will be perceived by the inner marginal letters in this edition.—It was published in fac simile at the expense of the University of Cambridge, by Dr. Kipling, in 1798. Its text is a very peculiar one, deviating more from the received readings and from the principal MS. authorities, than any other. It appears to have been written in France, and by a Latin transcriber, ignorant of Greek, from many curious mistakes which occur in the text, and version attached. It is closely and singularly allied to the ancient Latin versions, so much so that some critics have supposed it to have been altered from the Latin,—but apparently without reason. Its peculiarities are so great that in many passages, while the sense remains for the most part unaltered, hardly three words together are the same as in the commonly received text. And that these variations often arise from capricious alteration, is evident from the way in which the Gospels, in parallel passages, have been interpolated from one another in this MS.—The concurrence with the ancient Latin versions seems to point to a very early state of the text, not altogether independent of the source whence the Alexandrine recension flowed (for in many places D exactly agrees with it), but having undergone singular alterations. It is impossible to set aside the value of this MS. as an index to the early history of the text, although in critical weight it ranks the lowest of the four leading MSS. Its age has been very variously given: the general opinion now is that it was written in the latter end of the fifth or the sixth century.

5. P. Q. By these symbols are designated the Codices Guepherytani,—two fragmentary palimpsests in the ducal library at Wolfenbuttel; the former containing fragments of the Gospels—the latter only of Luke and John:—both probably of the sixth century.

6. T. A fragment of John,—vi. 28—67. vii. 6.—viii. 31, called the Codex Borgianus, of the fifth century (probably). It is accompanied with a Sahidic version. Both were published by A. A. Georgi, at Rome, in 1789. Its text agrees with the Alexandrine recension.

7. Z. The Codex Rescriptus Dublinensis of the library of Trinity [Tisch.], the first correction, made (in Palestine?) about a century later; C* (C*** Tisch.), the second correction, made at Constantinople about the ninth century. The distinction between C' and C*, which has not been so carefully observed as I could have wished in the first part of my volume, has after Luke viii. 40 been accurately noted.
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College, Dublin;—contains, of the N. T., the Gospel of Matthew. It was discovered by Dr. Barrett, who published it in fac simile at the expense of the College in 1801. It has many lacunæ, which will be seen by the letters in our inner margin. Its text agrees nearly with the Alexandrine recension. The date assigned to it is the sixth century.

8. Such are all the MSS. which in my recension of the text I have regarded as of first class authority, and which alone I have in ordinary cases followed as my guides in departing from the received reading. Those which follow, and which I shall speak of more briefly, I have treated as important in the silence, or equal balance of the primary MSS. That some of them may be of more importance is very possible, as being perhaps copies of MSS. of far earlier date; but from our inability to ascertain this, we must treat them as we find them, and assign them merely that weight which their apparent antiquity justifies.

9. Manuscripts written in the uncial character, but only of second class authority, being subsequent to the sixth century.

E. The Codex Basilensis (B. vi. 21.—K. iv. 35 Tisch.), containing the four Gospels with some considerable lacunæ. Collated by Wetstein, whose various readings are those cited in this edition from Scholz*. Said to be of the middle of the eighth century. (Tisch.)

F. The Codex Boreeli, once possessed by John Boreel, Dutch ambassador in London, under James I. It was lost for many years, till found at Arnhem by Heringa, a professor at Utrecht. It is now in the public library at the latter place. Heringa wrote a dissertation on it, so copious as to serve for an edition of the codex itself. This dissertation was published by Vincke in 1843.—Contains the four Gospels. Was only partly collated (from Matt. vii. 6 to Luke xi.) by an unknown scholar, whose collation was used by Wetstein. Follows the Constantinople text. Neither Wetstein, Griesbach, nor Scholz, mention any date for this MS. :—Tischendorf assigns it to the ninth century.

G. The Codex Harleianus or Wolfii A, in the British Museum, brought by Erasmus (Andrew? Tisch.) Seidel from the East. Contains the Gospels with many lacunæ. Its text generally Constantinopolitan, but not consistently so. Collated by J. C. Wolf, to whom it once belonged,—and recently by Tischendorf. Ascribed to the eleventh century (Scholz).

H. The Codex Wolfii B, now in the public library at Hamburg. Its history is the same as that of the last MS. Its contents, the Gospels,—with many lacunæ: its character Const. with considerable

* As far as Luke xviii.; and more recently by Tischendorf, whose collation has been followed in the subsequent portion of the digest.
mixture of Alexandrian readings: its assigned date the eleventh century. It was collated by Wolf, whose collation has been used by all editors since.

I. The Codex Cottonianus, in the British Museum, a splendid fragment of a MS., written in silver on a faded purple ground, containing only Matt. xxvi. 57—65. xxvii. 26—34. John xiv. 2—10. xv. 15—22. It is a fragment of the same codex as Π and N below. It has been edited and commented on by Tischendorf, in the Monumenta sacra inedita, p. 10 ff. Is assigned by Scholz to the seventh or eighth century: by Tisch. to the end of the sixth or beginning of seventh.

K. The Codex Cyprius, brought from the island of Cyprus to Paris and now in the Royal (National) Library there. Contains the Gospels, memoirs of the saints of the Greek Church, and the canons of Eusebius. Collated by Scholz,—and more recently by Tischendorf. Its text is peculiar and sui generis, sometimes making with one, sometimes with the other family of MSS., sometimes with neither: and is consequently of much value. Scholz assigns it to the ninth century.

L. The Codex Regius Parisiensis 62, contains the Gospels with some lacunæ; was collated almost entirely by Griesbach, and since then the parts deficient in his collation have been supplied by Scholz. Tischendorf has edited it entire in his Monumenta sacra inedita, pp. 57—399. Its text is uniformly Alexandrine, and very nearly related to that of B. From the careless positions of the accents, Scholz and Griesbach think it to have been copied from some more ancient MS. which had no accents. Ascribed to the eighth century.

M. The Codex Regius 48, presented to Louis XIV. by the Abbé des Champs, in 1706. Contains the Gospels, with notices of the saints of the Greek Church, the canons of Eusebius, and much inserted matter betokening late date. Its text is irregular in character, and has some readings common only to itself and K. Assigned to the tenth century by Scholz,—to the ninth by Tischendorf, who collated it, and corrected previous errors.

N. The Codex Caesareus or Vindobonensis, a MS. in the imperial library at Vienna; in silver letters on a purple ground; contains fragments of Genesis, and a fragment of the N. T., Luke xxiv. 13—21. 39—49. It has formed two leaves of the same codex as Π above. Collated for Dr. Holmes's edition of the LXX by Professor Alter, of Vienna;—and since edited in the Mon. sacr. inedit., pp. 21—24, by Tischendorf. Griesbach and Scholz assign it to the seventh century; Tischend. to the end of the sixth or beginning of seventh.

O. A fragment of some MS. of the Gospels, containing only part of Luke xviii. It was given by Bunduri to Montfaucon. No character nor date assigned.
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O (Tischendorf,—who rejects the last-mentioned codex as being merely a fragment of an Evangelistarium). The Codex Mosquensis 120, brought from Mount Athos. Contains fragments of John. Edited by Matthäi, in 1785. Apparently of the ninth century.

R. One leaf only of some MS. containing John i. 38—50; re-published by Reuss: assigned to the seventh century.

R (Tischendorf, who rejects also the last-mentioned codex as merely a fragment of an Evangelistarium)—the Codex Neapolitanus rescriptus, containing, beneath more recent (fourteenth century) ecclesiastical writing of the Greek Church, twelve or fourteen leaves of an ancient MS. of the Gospels, probably of the eighth century.

S. The Codex Vaticanus 354, contains the Gospels entire, with the canons of Eusebius. Written by Michael, a monk, in the year 949. Agrees almost always with the Constantinopolitan recension. Collated by Birch.

U. The Codex Nanianus 1, in S. Mark's library at Venice, contains the Gospels entire, with the canons of Eusebius. It has been collated by Tischendorf. Its text is Constantinopolitan. Assigned to the tenth century by Scholz:—to the ninth or tenth by Tischendorf.

V. A MS. in the library of the Holy Synod at Moscow. Contains the Gospels,—as far as John vii. 39, in uncial letters of the eighth century, Scholz; or ninth, Tischendorf;—after that, in cursive characters of the thirteenth century. Text Constantinopolitan. Collated by Matthäi.


X. The Codex Monacensis, formerly Ingolstadiensis. Contains the four Gospels with numerous lacunæ. Was entirely collated by Scholz. Text Alexandrine. Ascribed to the tenth century. Collated by Scholz, and since by Tischendorf.


Γ. A fragment of the same codex as I and N (see above), once attached to a Latin MS. (3785) in the Vatican: consisting of only five leaves out of the Gospel of Matthew. Edited in the Mon. sacr. inedit., pp. 25—36, by Tischendorf.

Δ. The Codex San Gallensis, in the library at St. Gall. Contains the Gospels with a Latin version. Edited by Rettig, at Zurich, in 1836. The text agrees with the Vat. MS. B. for the most part—sometimes against all other MSS. The readings of this MS. are
not given in the former part of this vol. as not being contained in
any digest to which I had access; after Luke xviii. they are taken
from Tischendorf, ed. 2.

Ω. and Λ, two parts of codices found by Tischendorf in the East, con-
taining fragments of Matthew,—of the seventh and ninth centuries
respectively,—have not been cited in this digest.

10. Of Manuscripts written in the small letter, or cursive character,
469 have been more or less collated, and their readings specified by Scholz.
These, in my digest, I have not enumerated, but have merely given the
number which agree in the readings, after the primary and secondary
authorities.

11. Of MS. Evangelistaria, or collections of lessons from the Gospels,
Scholz enumerates 181;—a few in uncial characters, but most of them
cursive; none older than the eighth century, and the greater number much
later. The readings of these have not been noticed in the following digest.

SECTION II.

VERSIONS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT REFERRED TO IN THIS EDITION.

1. The ancient Latin versions.—The most ancient versions of the
N. T. in Latin appear to have been made in Africa; they are in
barbarous Latin, but rendered from the Greek with such scrupulous
verbal fidelity, that we are able from them to detect the original
Greek with considerable confidence. The younger Buttman, the
coadjutor of Lachmann, in his edition of the Greek Test. has given
a table of renderings by which even the minute variations of sub-
junctive tenses may in most cases be pointed out.—Of these ancient
italic versions (as they are usually called), Lachmann has selected
three as having been edited in an entire form when he drew up his
edition:

a. The MS. at Vercelli, in Piedmont.
b. The MS. at Verona.
c. The Colbertine MS. 4051 of the twelfth century.—The readings of
these versions are for the most part in singular accordance with those
of the Greek Codex D (Bezae).
Besides these he gives, throughout, the readings of
d. The Latin version which accompanies, but is not made from, the
Greek Codex D (Bezae).

2. v. The Vulgate version of Jerome:—undertaken by him at the re-
quest of Damasus, bishop of Rome, in the year 383,—but since its
completion by him variously emended and edited;—finally put forth
by authority under pope Clement VIII., in 1592.

3. Versions in other languages.

a. Syr.—The ancient Syriac version, or Peschito (i.e. simple).—Of
all versions, this has generally been held in the highest esteem. It
is supposed to have been made in the first, or early in the second century: and is remarkable for its close adherence to the original text.—The text of it is in a very corrupt state; and Dr. Scholz, Gr. Test., vol. i. p. cxxviii. despaired of any purer text being found. But a number of very ancient MSS. of this version have lately been discovered. Its readings in the present edition are taken from Scholz, with some corrections after Luke xviii. from Tischendorf.

\( \beta. \) syr. The later or Philoxenian Syriac version, made under the orders of Philoxenus, bishop of Hierapolis, in Syria, in the year 508, by Polycarp, his chorepiscopus. It was edited by Prof. White, in 1778—1804. Its text, says Dr. Scholz, agrees principally with the const. MSS. Readings from Scholz.

When both the Syriac versions concur, I have signified it by the abbreviation Syrr.

\( \gamma. \) Copt. The Coptic or Memphitic version was made from the Greek, in Lower Egypt, in the third century. Edited by Dav. Wilkins, in 1716. Its readings agree mostly with the Alexandrine MSS. I have drawn them from Scholz.

\( \delta. \) Sahid. The Sahidic or Thebaic version, was made from the Greek, in Upper Egypt in the third century. Agrees for the most part with the Alexandrine MSS., but has many singular readings and some in common with the Latin versions. Edited partially by Woide, in an appendix to his edition of the Alexandrine MS (A). Readings from Scholz, corrected after Luke xviii. from Tischendorf.

\( \varepsilon. \) Æth. The Æthiopic version, said to have been made by Frumentius, who introduced Christianity into Æthiopia in the fourth century. It adheres so closely to the Greek, as sometimes to exhibit the various readings of the MSS. from which it was made, in juxta-position in its text. It is Alexandrine in character. Readings from Scholz.

\( \zeta. \) Arm. The Armenian version, originally made in the fifth century from the Syriac versions, and afterwards corrected from the Greek. This version has in later times (since the twelfth century) been re-corrected from the Vulgate, which has much diminished its critical value. The edition from which Scholz's readings are taken was published at Venice by Zohrab, in 1805.

SECTION III.

OF FATHERS AND ANCIENT CHRISTIAN WRITERS REFERRED TO IN THE DIGEST OF VARIOUS READINGS.

1. The critical use of the writings of the Fathers is attended with much uncertainty. They quoted frequently from memory, sometimes very inaccurately; and in many places only hinted at the words of some text of Scripture without any intention of citing it verbatim. We have, however, as will be seen in the following list, from several of them commentaries [83]
on parts of Scripture, from which their readings may be with certainty ascertained;—and in other places of their writings we have occasionally express quotations, which can be depended upon as giving the Scripture faithfully as they read it. I have taken the readings from Lachmann and Scholz, as specified below. The arrangement of writers is alphabetical.

2. Greek Fathers and Writers.

Ath.—Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria, in the fourth century.—In his writings are found very many verbatim citations of the books of the N. T. He generally agrees with the Alexandrine text, but seldom when its variations from the received text are confined to a few MSS. (Scholz.)

Bas.—Basil, bishop of Caesarea, in the fourth century. His citations are very lax and varying, so that little critical use is to be made of them. They will be found seldom referred to in the following digest.

Chrys.—John Chrysostom, presbyter of Antioch, afterwards bishop of Constantinople, in the fourth century. Great caution is required in using the citations so copiously made by him in his noble commentaries. He often confounds various places, of the same or different writers, often quotes loosely, often follows Origen:—but his writings have been diligently collated, and his probable readings given by Mathäi and Scholz. From the above circumstances, he seems occasionally to favour the Alexandrine, sometimes the Constantinopolitan text.

Clem.—Clement of Alexandria, in the second century. He generally cites from memory, but in many places gives the texts as they are found in the earlier Alexandrine MS. His works were collated by Griesbach.

Clem. r.—Clement of Rome, in the second century. In his Epistle to the Corinthians he cites a few passages of the Gospels.

Cyr.—Cyril of Alexandria, in the fifth century. His citations follow the Alexandrine text. (Cyril of Jerusalem is not referred to in this digest.)

Epiph.—Epiphanius, bishop of Constantia in Cyprus, in the fourth century. Ephrem.—Ephrem the Syrian, in the fourth century. His works were very early translated into Greek. Cites the Syriac version.

Eus.—Eusebius of Caesarea, the Ecclesiastical historian, in the fourth century. He often quotes literally, and generally uses the Alexandrine text, but occasionally Constantinopolitan readings are found (Scholz) in his writings.

Euthym. or Euth.—Euthymius Zigabenus, the commentator, a monk of Constantinople in the twelfth century. His text is Constantinopolitan.

Heracl.—Heraclleon the gnostic, in the second century. He wrote commentaries on John, which Origen often quotes. His text (says Scholz) is generally the received one.

84]
Ign.—Ignatius of Antioch, in the second century.
Ir.—Irenaeus, bishop of Lyons, in the second century. Quotes variously and inconsistently; and his Latin translator, from whom alone we have much of his work, has substituted the words of the early Latin versions in his citations:—but apparently (Lachmann, præf. p. x.) from memory, and only where they agreed with Origen’s text.
Just.—Justin Martyr, in the second century. Very seldom quotes exactly.
Or. or Orig.—Origen, of Alexandria, in the third century. He had before him and cites from very many MSS., whose readings he does not appear always to quote accurately;—he has besides, as in Matt. viii. 28, and some other places, altered the text conjecturally. Still from the number and importance of his exegetical works, and the constant reference to his readings in subsequent authors, his authority is considerable in determining, in most cases, the state of the text at his time.
Theod.—Theodoret, bishop of Cyrrhus in Syria, in the fifth century. In his commentaries he generally (Scholz) agrees with the received text; but sometimes follows without consideration Origen or Chrysostom.
Theophyl. or Theoph.—Theophylact, archbishop of Bulgaria, in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. In his commentaries he usually agrees with the received text, but has many Alexandrine readings.

3. Latin Fathers and Writers.
Ambr.—Ambrose, bishop of Milan, in the fourth century. In almost all his citations he follows the Alexandrine text.
Aug.—Augustine, bishop of Hippo in Africa, in the fourth century. He almost always agrees with the ancient Latin versions.
Cypr.—Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, in the third century. Cites variously and much from memory, but most frequently from some ancient Latin version.
Hilar.—Hilary of Poictiers, who lived some time in Phrygia in the fourth century. Used the ancient Latin versions, but also had before him Greek MSS., of whose texts nothing else is known.
Hier. or Jer.—Hieronymus, or Jerome, in the fourth century. Generally uses a Greek text of the Alexandrine family, as agreeing best with the ancient Latin versions.
Lucif.—Lucifer of Cagliari, who lived some time in Upper Egypt, in the fourth century. Agrees with the Alexandrine MSS. and ancient Latin versions.
Tert.—Tertullian, of Carthage, in the third century. Very seldom appealed to in the following digest;—his citations are lax and not to be depended upon. Where they are express,—as from Luke, in his book against Marcion,—they are generally Marcion’s readings;—
PROLEGOMENA.]

APPARATUS CRITICUS.

ROBINSON, DR. EDWARD, Biblical Researches in Palestine, Mount Sinai,
and Arabia Petræa, 3 voll. London 1841; A Harmony of the four
Gospels in Greek, with Explanatory Notes, Boston, U. S. 1845.
SCHLEIERMACHER, DR. F., Essay on the Gospel of Luke, English trans-
lation, London 1825; Predigten, 4 voll. Berlin 1843.
SCHOETTGEN, HORÆ HEB. ET TALMUDICÆ IN N. T. 2 voll. 4to. Dresden
and Leipzig 1733.
SCHROEDER, NOVA JANUA HEBRAICA, 3 voll. Leipzig 1835.
STANLEY, A. P., Sermons and Essays on the Apostolic Age, Oxford
1847.
THEOPHYLACT, Comment. in IV Evangelia, Act. &c. cited throughout
from the works of others.
THOLUCK, DR. A., Philologisch-theologische Auslegung der Bergpredigt
Christi nach Matthäus, 2nd ed. Hamburg 1835; Commentar zum
TISCHENDORF, DR. E. F. C., Novum Testamentum Gr., Leipzig 1841,
2nd ed. Leipzig 1849; Codex Ephraemi Syri Rescriptus (C. see list
of MSS. in § i.), Leipzig 1843.
TRENCH, PROFESSOR, Notes on the Parables, Lond. 1841; Notes on the
Miracles, 2nd ed. Lond. 1847; The Sermon on the Mount illus-
trated from the Writings of S. Augustine, Lond. 1844.
WETSTEIN, NOV. TEST. GRECUM, Amsterdam 1751.
WIESELER, Chronologische Synopse der vier Evangelien, Hamburg 1843;
Chronologie des Apostolischen Zeitalters bis zum Tode der Apostel
Petrus und Paulus, Göttingen 1848.
WILLIAMS, REV. GEORGE, The Holy City; or, Historical and Topogra-
phical Notices of Jerusalem, Lond. 1848. (1st edition.)
WINER, DR. G. B., Biblisches Realwörterbuch, 2 voll. 2nd ed. Leipzig,
1833; Grammatik des Neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms, 3rd ed.
Leipzig, 1830.

The edition of the Septuagint version referred to in the marginal refer-
ences is that of Bagster (London), in small 8vo, recently published, but
without date. The Apocrypha has been cited from the edition of
Carpzovius, Oxf. 1817.

88]
Title] εὐαγγέλιον, in earlier Greek, signifies a present made as a return for good news, (see Hom. Od. c. 15. 166, also 2 Kings iv. 10. LXX.) or a sacrifice offered in thanksgiving for the same (Aristoph. Eq. 668); in later Greek, the good news itself, as in LXX, and N.T. passim, in the appropriated sense of the good news of salvation by Christ Jesus. Hence it came to be applied to the writings themselves which contain this good news, very early: so Justin M. Apol., οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἐν τοῖς γενομένοις ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἀπομνημονεύουσιν, ὃ καλλίται εὐαγγέλια, p. 98.—κατὰ Μ.] as arranged by M.—implies authorship, as far as the present arrangement goes: so ὅμηρος κατὰ Ἀριστοπαρχος. It is not merely = a genitive—of Μ., which would have been used, had it been meant.—Nor does it signify, that the original teaching was Matthew's, and the present Gospel drawn up after that teaching. See proleges, to Matt. Eusebius, H. E. iii. 24, says, Ματθαίοις... γραφή παραδοθείς τῷ καὶ αὐτῶν εὐαγγέλιον.

Chap. I. 1. [βιβλίος γενέσεως] Not always used of a pedigree only: see reff. Here, however, it appears that it refers exclusively to the genealogy, by Ἰησ. χρ. being used in the enunciation, and the close being Ἰησ. ὁ λεγ. Χρ. Then ver. 17 forms a conclusion to it, and ver. 18 passes on to other matter. —χριστοῦ = ἄνευ, anointed. In reff. it is used of kings, priests, prophets, and of the promised Deliverer. Theophylact says, λέγεται ὁ κύριος, χριστός καὶ ὦς βασιλεὺς, ἑβασιλεύει γὰρ κατὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας καὶ ὦς λειψαν. προςήγαγε γὰρ λαυτὸν ἁμαρτία ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἱεροθ σε ἐκ καὶ αὐτής κυρίως τῷ ἁλθοντι ἱερά, τῷ ἅγιον πνευματί. It is here used (see ver. 16) in that sense in which it became affixed to Ἰησοῦς as the name of the Lord. It does not once thus occur in the progress of the Evangelio history; only in the prefatory parts of the Gospels, Matt. i. 1. 16, 17, 18. Mark i. 1. John i. 17, and once in the mouth of the Lord Himself, John xvi. 3; but passim in the Acts and Epistles. This may serve to show that the Evangelic memoirs themselves were of earlier date than their incorporation into our present Gospels. On Ἰησοῦ see below, ver. 21.—οὖν both times refers to our Lord. ἧς μὲν was an especial title of the Messiah: see reff. That He should be the son of Abraham was too solemn a subject of prophecy to be omitted here, even though implied in the other. These words serve to show the character of the Gospel, as written for Jesus: οὖν γὰρ ὡς πρὸς ἄνθρωπος τοὺς ἐν οὐδαίων πνευματίας συνεκόστας, ὡς τῷ μαθητῇ, διὸ καὶ σπηλαίας ἀρισταμα καὶ Δαυίδ ἐν ἔχριστος. Euthymius. Luke, ch. iii. 23, carries his genealogy further back: (but see prolegomena.)—Β. καὶ τ. ἀδελφοὺς. These additions probably indicate that Mat. did not take his
ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ

δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰακώβ. Ἰακώβ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰούδαν καὶ τοὺς ἁδελφοὺς αὐτοῦ. Ἰούδας δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Φαρέα καὶ τὸν Ζαρά. 7 Εσραίας δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰσαίαν. 8 Αραμ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἀμαθαμάν. 9 Οσίας δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰωράμ. 10 Βασσαλής δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰαχών. 11 Ἰεσσαί δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Δαυίδ τὸν βασιλέα ταύτης, 12 διὸ ἐγέννησε τὸν Σολομώνα τοῖς ὀλίβοις τοῦ Ὀνύρου. 13 Σολομών δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ποθσούμα. 14 Ροβούμ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Βασία. 15 Αβία δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἀσαφ. 16 Ασαφ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Θωσαφατ. 17 Θωσαφατ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰωράμ. 18 Ἰωράμ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ὀλίαν. 19 Ὀλίας δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰωαβ. 20 Ἰωαβ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἀχαζ. 21 Ἀχαζ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Εζεκίαν. 22 Εζεκίας δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Μανάσση. 23 Μανάσσης δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰμών. 24 Ἰμὼν δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰωσαίαν. 25 Ἰωσαίας

γενεαλογία from any family or public documents, but constructed it himself. 3. The reason for these women, Thamar, Rahab, Ruth, and Bathsheba, being mentioned, has been variously assigned. It most probably is that given by Maldonatus: 'Prætermissis Evangelista quod ordinarium erat, quod autem singulari et dubium exposuit.' 5. 6. 'Ραχά' It has been imagined, on chronological grounds, that this Rahab must be a different person from Rahab of Jericho. But those very grounds completely tally with their identity. For Naashon (the father of Salmon), the prince of Judah (1 Chron. ii. 10), offered his offering at the setting up of the tabernacle (Num. vii. 12) thirty-nine years before the taking of Jericho. So that Salmon would be of mature age at or soon after that event; at which time Rahab was probably young, as her father and mother were living (Josh. vi. 23). Nor is it any objection that Achan, the fourth in descent from Judah by Zara, is contemporary with Salmon, the sixth of the other branch: since the generations in the line of Zara average sixty-nine years, and those in the line of Pharez forty-nine; both within the limits of probability. The difficulty of the interval of 360 years between Rahab and David does not belong to this passage only, but equally to Ruth iv. 21, 22; and is by no means insuperable, especially when the extreme old age of Jesse, implied in 1 Sam. xvii. 12, is considered. I may add that, considering Rahab's father and mother were alive, the house would hardly be called the house of Rahab, except on account of the character commonly assigned to her. 7. τῆς τοῦ Ωβ. This construction, which is not properly elliptical, but possessive, (Meyer compares Luther's Katharina,) occurs in the Gospels to designate various relations: see ch. x. 3, 4, Luke vi. 16, xxiv. 10. John xxii. 15. — 8. Ἰσαίας, 'Ολίας Three kings, viz., Abázi, Josiah, Amaziah, (1 Chron. iii. 11, 12,) are here omitted. Some (Spanheim, Lightf., Ebrard, &c.) think that they were erased on account of their connexion, by means of Athaliah, with the accursed house of Ahab. Simeon is omitted by Moses in blessing the tribes (Deut. xxxii.): the descendants of Zebulun and Dan are passed over in 1 Chron., and none of the latter tribe are sealed in Rev. vii. But more probably such omission, even if justifiable by that reason, was arbitrarily made, to square the numbers of the genealogies, as here. Compare 1 Chron. viii. 1 with Gen. xlvi. 21.—11. Ἰωσαίας... Ἰασών.] Eliakim, son of Josiah and father
of Jeconias, is omitted; which was objected to the Christians by Porphyry. The reading which inserts Josiam (i.e. Eliakim) rests on hardly any foundation, and would make fifteen generations in the second tesseradecade. The solution of the difficulty by suppressing the name to apply to both Eliakim and his son, and to mean the former in ver. 11 and the latter in ver. 12, is unsupported by example, and contrary to the usage of the genealogy. When we notice that the á̂dilof of Jeconias are his uncles, and find this way of speaking sanctioned by 2 Chron. xxxvi. 10, where Zedekiah, one of these, is called his brother, we are led to seek our solution in some recognized manner of speaking of these kings, by which Eliakim and his son were not accounted two distinct generations. If we compare 1 Chron. iii. 16 with 2 Kings xxiv. 17, we can hardly fail to see that there is some confusion in the records of Josiah’s family. In the latter passage, where we have “his father’s brother,” the LXX render τῶν ἑνὸς αὐτοῦ.—τὰ τῆς μνήμτικον πέρα τῆς μνήμης, after the migration. For the construction, see ref.—19. Ἰωσὴφ. So also the genealogy in 1 Chron. iii. 17. When, therefore, it is denounced (Jer. xxii. 30) that Jeconiah should be “childless,” this word must be understood as explained by the rest of the verse, “for no man of his seed shall prosper, sitting upon the throne of David and ruling any more in Judah.” The LXX render this word γεγένητον: but the Talmudical writers explain it according to our rendering.—Σαλαθ. . . Ζορβάβ. There is no difficulty here which does not also exist in the O. T. Zerubbabel is there usually called the son of Shealtiel (Salathiel). Ezra iii. 2, &c. Neh. xii. 1, &c. Hag. i. 1, &c. In 1 Chron. iii. 19, Zerubbabel is said to have been the son of Pedahzur, brother of Salathiel. Either this may have been a different Zerubbabel, or Salathiel may, according to the law, have raised up seed to his brother.—13. Ζορβάβ. . . Ἄβραμ. Abiud is not mentioned as a son of the Zerubbabel in 1 Chron. iii. The names which follow are taken from public or family records, both of which were kept among the Jews. None of them appear to be elsewhere mentioned.—On the comparison of this genealogy with that given in Luke, see notes on Luke iii. 23—36. —17. γενεαλογεῖται. If we carefully observe Matthew’s arrangement, we shall have no difficulty in completing the three tesseradecades. For the first is from Abraham to David, of course inclusive. The second from David (again inclusive) to the migration, which gives no name, as before, to be included in both the second and third periods, but which is mentioned simultaneously with the begetting of Jeconias, leaving him for the third period. This last, then, takes in from Jeconias to Jesus Christ inclusive. So that the three stand thus, according to the words of this verse: (1) ἀπὸ Ἄβραμ ἕως Δαυδ. (2) ἀπὸ Δαυδ ἕως τ. μεταβολῆς. (3) ἀπὸ τ. μεταβολῆς ἕως τοῦ χριστοῦ.

18—25. γίνεσας] The ordinary reading γίνεσας is taken up from ver. 16, and the γαρ, which follows, accounts for the exception in this last case to the direct sequence of γίνεσας throughout the genealogy. If γίνεσας be read, this remark will still apply; for it must be understood in a wide sense, as identical in meaning with γίνεσας.—μνηστευόμενος] The interval between betrothal and the consummation of marriage was sometimes considerable, during which the betrothed remained in her father's house, till the bridesmaid came and fetched her. See Deut. xx. 7.—συνεδρεῖαν] Here to be regarded as συνεδρεῖαν τὸ γόμφον τῆς γυναϊκὸς, for, by being together in one house as man and wife.—εὐθέλησα not merely for ἦν, as some have said, but in its proper meaning. 'She was discovered to be,' no matter by whom. The words ἐκ πνεύμων ἐκ τούτου are the addition of the Evangelist declaring the matter of fact, and do not belong to the discovery.—ἐκ πνεύμων ἐκ τούτου] by the agency of the Holy Ghost. See ref. ver. 20. The interpretation of πνεῦμων ἐκ τούτου in this place must thus be sought: (1) Unquestionably τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἁγίου is used in the N. T. as signifying the Holy Ghost. Luke iii. 22. Acts i. 16. Eph. iv. 30. (2) But it is a well-known usage to omit the articles from such words under certain circumstances, e. g. when a preposition precedes, as εἰς λίμνην, (Plato, Theet. § i.) πολιορκεῖ εἰς λίμνην, (Xen. Cyrop. vii. 106.) &c. We are therefore justified in interpreting ἐκ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἁγίου according to this usage, and understanding τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἁγίου as the agent referred to.—19. διακονοῦ] Most probably, 'is just man;' in which case καὶ μὴ θεῖος is not the explanation of διακονοῦ, but an additional particular. If we render διακο

kind,' 'merciful,' these latter words will be a mere expansion of it, 'and therefore not wishing,' &c. — λάθος. Not without any writing of divorce, which would have been unlawful; but according to the form prescribed in Deut. xxiv. 1. The husband might either do this, or adopt the stronger course of bringing his wife (or betrothed, who had the same rights, Maimon. in Wetstein, and Philo de legg. spec. p. 788. αἱ ὁμολογίαι γάμων ἰατροῦναν) to justice openly. The punishment in this case would have been death by stoning. Deut. xxii. 23. Maimonides (quoted by Buxtorf de divor.) says, "Femina ex quo desponsata est, licet non nundam a viro cognit, est uxor viri, et si sponsus eam velit repudiare, oporet, ut id faciat libello repudii."—[ἐπομακρύνθη] 'intended, ' was minded.'—20. [ὅ] answers to the Hebrew ויהי, and is frequently used by Matt. and Luke to introduce a new event or change of scene; but not so often by Mark.—[ἀγγέλος κ.] The announcement was made to Mary openly, but to Joseph in a dream; for in Mary's case faith and concurrence of will were necessary,—the communication was of a higher kind,—and referred to a thing future; but here it is simply an advertisement for caution's sake of an event which had already happened, and is altogether a communication of an inferior order;—see Gen. xx. 3.—[οὖς Ἀδελθ] These words would recall Joseph's mind to the promised seed, the expectation of the families of the lineage of David, and at once stamp the message as the announcement of the birth of the Messiah. The nom. for the vocative is frequent in the gospels: generally with an article. See Luke viii. 54. Matt.
"paralabhein Maria'm tìn gnvaikà sou' tò gáron en autò'

BCDZ genvnhen ò ek pnuematos òstwng agiou. 21 tèteza òi vinn,
kai ò kalései to ònoma auton 'Iwsonw autòs gáron ósoe

tòv lavo autov apò tòn amartiov autov. 22 tòuto òi

dòlon gégonen èiva 'plhrophi to òpòthe ò upò ò kai

òiou dia tòu prophi toutou légonon 23 òi Ídow ò parèthenos

èn gaster òezi kai tèteza òi vinn, kai kalései to ònoma

xi. 26 al. and particularly John xx. 28. —
tìn gnon. sou' Not 'as thy wife,' but in

apposition with Máríam. See above, on ver.
19. —tò òi and òi av. y.] ò is here not in

strumental, 'that which is conceived by her,' but local, 'that which is begotten in

her.' The gender here is not to be pressed

as involving any doctrinal consequence, but
to be regarded as the usual way of speak-

ing of the unborn fetus. See also John iii.
6. 1 John v. 4. — 21. 'Iwsonw The same

name as Joshua, the former deliverer of

Israel. It is written γέννησ. in the Law

and Prophets, but γεννησ. in the Hagiographa.

Philo says, 'Iwsonw ἤρηπνησαν, σωφρία

euîon. De mut. nom. § 21. —autèt] He,

emphatically: He alone. —tòv lavo autow]

In the primary sense, the Jews, of whom

alone Joseph could have understood the

words: but in the deeper sense, all who

believe on Him: an explanation which the

subsequent admission of the Gentiles war-

saw. —òi autòs òv òpòthi ò so. It is remark-

able that in this early part of the Evangelic

history, in the midst of pedagogy, and the

disturbances of thrones by the supposed

temporal King of the Jews, we have so

clear an indication of the spiritual nature of

the office of Christ. One circumstance of

this kind outweighs a thousand cavils against

the historical reality of the narration. If I

mistake not, this announcement reaches

further into the deliverance to be wrought

by Jesus, than any thing mentioned by the

Evangelist subsequently. It thus bears the

internal impress of a message from God,
treasured up and related in its original formal

terms.—Meyer understands the words of a

political emancipation and prosperity of the

Jewish people, and refers to Luke i. 68 for

confirmation of this idea (!); adding, how-

ever, that a religious and moral reformation

was considered as intimately connected with

such a change. òaparìa is not for the

punishment of sin, but is the sin itself—the

practice of sin, in its most pregnant sense.

—23. tòuto òi òhòw] It is impossible to

interpret òiva in any other sense than, 'in

order that.' The words tàto òi ð. gýy, and

the uniform usage of the N. T., in which

òiva is never used except in this sense, for-

bid any other. Nor, if rightly viewed, does

the passage require any other. Whatever

may have been the partial fulfilment of the

prophecy in the time of Æhas, its reference to

a different time, and a higher deliverance,

is undeniable: and then, whatever causes

contributed to bring about tàto òhòw, might be all summed up in the fulfilment of

the Divine purpose, of which the prophecy

was the declaration. The accomplishment

of a promise formally made is often

alleged as the cause of an action extending

wider than the promise, and purposed long

before its utterance. And of course these

remarks apply to every passage where òiva

or ð. òivòs òplhrôphi are used. Such a con-

struction can have but one meaning. If

such meaning involve us in difficulty regard-

ing the prophecy itself, far better leave such

difficulty, in so doubtful a matter as the

interpretation of prophecy, unsolved, than

create one in so simple a matter as the ren-

dering of a phrase whose meaning no indif-

ferent person could doubt.—òplhrôphi] The

immediate and literal fulfilment of the pro-

phecy seems to be related in Is. vii. 1—4.

Yet there the child was not called Em-

manuel: but in ver. 8 that name is used as

applying to one of far greater dignity.

Again, Is. ix. 6 seems to be a reference to

this prophecy, as also Micah v. 3. — 33. ò

òplhrôphi] Such is the rendering of the

LXX. The Hebrew word is the more gen-

eral term ð. òivòs, and is translated by ÒQUAL.

Symm. and Theodot. ò ð. òivòs. Do Wette

cites the LXX rendering as a proof that the

prophecy was then understood of the Mes-

siah. But is it not much more probable

that Aquila and the others rendered it ð. òivòs

to avoid this application? Can it be shown

that the birth of the Messiah from ð. òap-

òphiou was matter of expectation? —òkM-

òphiou.] This indefinite plural is surely not

without meaning here. "Men shall call"—
i. e. it shall be a name by which He shall be
called—one of his appellations. The change of person from καλοῖς, which could not well have been cited here, seems to show, both that the prophecy had a literal fulfilment at the time, and that it is here quoted in a form suited to its greater and final fulfilment. The Hebrew has מָכָה, 'thou shalt call' (fem.).—Ἐμμαυνωθή, 'God is with us.' In Isaiah, primarily prophetic of deliverance from the then impending war; but also of final and glorious deliverance by the manifestation of God in the flesh.—καταλ.sin. This addition is by some used to show that Matthew wrote his Gospel in Greek, not in Hebrew, in which it would not be likely to occur. On the other hand, it is said, it might have been inserted by the person who translated the Gospel into Greek. See Prolegomena, and John iv. 25.—25 With regard to the much controverted sense of this verse we may observe, (1) That the primâ facie impression on the reader certainly is, that ὅπε ἀγίνωσκεν was confined to the period of time here mentioned. (2) That there is nothing in Scripture tending to remove this impression, either (a) by narration,—and the very use of the term, ἀγίστω κυρίον, (on which see note at ch. xiii. 55.) without qualification, shows that the idea was not repugnant; or (b) by implication,—for everywhere in the N. T. marriage is spoken of in high and honourable terms; and the words of the angel to Joseph rather imply, than disown, such a supposition. (3) On the other hand, the words of this verse do not require it: both idioms being justified on the hypothesis of the contrary. See reff. On the whole, it seems to me that no one would have thought of interpreting the verse any otherwise than in its primâ facie meaning, except to force it into accordance with a preconceived notion of the perpetual virginity of Mary.—ἐκλέξκεται] i. e. Joseph. See ver. 21.

CHAP. II. 1—19. Βηθ. τῆς Ἰουδαίας. There was another Bethlehem in the tribe of Zebulun, near the sea of Galilee, Josh. xix. 15. The name Bethlehem Judah is used, Judg. xvii. 7, 8, 9. 1 Sam. xvii. 12. Another name for our Bethlehem was Ephraim, Gen. xxxv. 19. xlviii. 7; or Ephrata, Mic. v. 2. It was six Roman miles to the south of Jerusalem, and was known as 'the city of David,' the origin of his family, Ruth i. 1. 19. Ἰωσήφ Herod the Great, son of Antipater, an Idumean, by an Arabian mother, made king of Judea on occasion of his having fled to Rome, being driven from his tetarchy by the pretender Antigonus. (Jos. Ant. iv. 14, 4.) This title was confirmed to him after the battle of Actium by Octavianus. He sought to strengthen his throne by a series of cruelties and slaughters, putting to death even his wife Mariamme, and his sons Alexander and Aristobulus. His cruelties, and his affectation of genteel custom, gained for him a hatred among the Jews which neither his magnificent rebuilding of the temple, nor his liberality in other public works, nor his provident care of the people during a severe famine, could mitigate. He died miserably, five days after he had put to death his son Antipater, in the seventy-first year of his age, and the thirty-seventh of his reign, and the 750th year of Rome. The events here related took place a short time before his death, but necessarily more than forty days; for he spent the last forty days of his life at Jericho and the baths of Calirrhoe, and therefore would not be found by the magi at Jerusalem. The history of Herod's reign is contained in Josephus, Antiq. books xiv. xvii—xiv, 4. —ἀγίστω κυρίον] Magi from the East; (not ἀναρ. παισυ.) It would be useless
to detail all the conjectures to which this history has given rise. From what has been written on the subject, it would appear, (1) That ἀνατολαῖ may mean either Arabis, Persia, Chaldæa, or Parthia, with the provinces adjacent. See Judges vi. 2. Is. xlii. 2. xliii. 11. Num. xxiii. 7. Philo (leg. ad Caïum, p. 384) speaks of Ἱβην γα τῷ και ἡμῖν ἄνων Παρθιαίων. In all these countries there were magi, at least persons who in the wider sense of the word were now known by the name. Their words in ver. 2 seem to point to some land not very near Judea, as also the result of Herod's inquiry as to the date, shown in ἀνδρὸς ἄνω. (2) If we place together (a) the prophecy in Num. xxiv. 17, which could hardly be unknown to the Eastern astrologers, and (b) the assertion of Suetonius, (Vesp. c. 4). 'Percruebuerunt Orientes toto celestis et constans opino, esse in fatis, ut co tempore Judea profecti rerum potiuntur;' and Tacitus, v. 15, 'Fluribus pernasio incrass, antiquis sacerdotum literns contineri, eo ipso tempore fore ut valesceret Oriens, profectique Judea rerum potiuntur,' and (γ) the prophecy, also likely to be known in the East, of the seventy weeks in Daniel ix. 24; we can, I think, be at no loss to understand how any remarkable celestial appearance at this time should have been interpreted as it was. (3) There is no ground for supposing the magi to have been three in number, nor to have been kings. The first tradition appears to have arisen from the number of their gifts: the second, from the prophecy in Is. ix. 3.—2. astrono et astrologo. We may answer West's objection of the magi, 'we have seen his star,' does not seem to point to any miraculous appearance, but to something observed in the course of their watching the heavens. Now we learn from astronomical calculations, that a remarkable conjunction of the planets of our system took place a short time before the birth of our Lord. In the year of Rome 747, on the 20th of May, there was a conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn in the 20th degree of the constellation Piscis, close to the first point of Aries, which was the part of the heavens noted in astrological science as the zodiac. On this and other evidence cited by Münster in his Proph. Mess. (Wettach. Kritik, p. 248) as a tradition, that no conjunction could be of mightier import than that of Jupiter and Saturn, which planets were in conj. a. m. 2365, before the birth of Moses, in the sign of Pisces; and thence remarks that that sign was the most significant one for the Jews. From this consideration he concludes that the conjunction
of these planets in that sign, in his own time, 
\(\text{A.D. 1669}\), betokened the near approach of the birth of the Messiah. And as the Jews did not invent astrology, but learnt it from the Chaldeans, this idea, that a conjunction in Pisces betokened some great event in Judea, must have prevailed among Chaldean astrologers.—in την δεκαν. Not 'at its rising,' in which case we should expect to find αὐρώ, if not here, certainly in ver. 9, but 'in the East,' i.e. either in the Eastern country from which they came, or in the Eastern quarter of the heavens, as above explained. In ver. 9 in την ανατ. is opposed to έκάνας ὑν το θανάτον.—προσκυνήσας 'To do homage to him,' in the Eastern fashion of prostration. Necesse est enim, si in conspectum veneris, venerari te Regem, quod illi προσκυνεῖν vocant.' Corn. Nep. Conc. 3.—3. ἤταμας[42]. Josephus, Ant. xvii. 24, represents these troubles as raised by the Pharisees, who, he says, έπειτα πέτατος αὐτάς ὧν θεοῦ λυσσαμήνης αὐτῷ τε καὶ γένεται τῷ αὐτῷ. Herod, as a foreigner and usurper, feared one who was born King of the Jews: the people, worn away by seditions and slaughters, feared fresh tumults and wars.—πάντα ἵπποςἀλόους. Here apparently, and at iii. 5, used as a feminine singular. Joseph., Bell. Jud. vi. 10, uses ἰδώ τοι προσο. . . . ἰδίως . . ., but none of these instances are decisive; an elliptis of ἐν πόλις being possible. —4. συνετέχων[43]. i.e. says Lightfoot, he assembled the Sanhedrim. For the Sanhedrim consisting of seventy-one members, and comprising Priests, Levites, and Israelites (Maimonides), under the term ἀρχιμαρίτες is contained the two first of these, and under γραμ. τ. λαοῦ the third. ἀρχιμαρίτες are most likely the High Priest and those of his race, and the presidents of the twenty-four courses (1 Chron. xxiv. 6). γρ. composed of the teachers and interpreters of the Divine law, the νομοκοι and νομοδίδασκαλοι of Luke. But the προφήται του λαοῦ are usually mentioned with these two classes as making up the Sanhedrim. See ch. xvi. 21. xxvi. 3. 59. Possibly on this occasion the δρόμων and γρ. only were summoned, the question being one of Scripture learning.—γενναίοι.] The present tense is often used indefinitely of subjects of prophecy, e.g. ἀ πρόξενος, ch. xi. 3. Heb. x. 37; ἔχειστα, in an expression exactly parallel to this, John vii. 42.—6. παλιν[44] This is a free paraphrase of the prophecy in Micah v. 2. It must be remembered that the words are the answer of the Sanhedrim to Herod, and not a citation of the prophet by the Evangelist. Lightfoot renders the Hebrew, 'parvum est ut sis inter chilladas,' and adds, that the Chaldee paraphrase, which possibly may have been present at this very council, renders the words 'infra paullum est ut persicaria.'—γε ὑπάλλελον παρακάτως is not to be supposed to be put for πόλις: the district may be intended, as described in ver. 16.—γενναίοι or χιλιάδαν (LXX). The tribes were divided into chilladas, and the names of the chilladas inscribed in the public records of their respective cities. In Judges vi. 15 Gideon says ἵδε ὅ χιλιας μου ἤδη οἰκεῖσθαι ἐν Μανασσή, on which R. Kimchi (cited by Lightfoot) annotates, 'Some understand Alphai to mean 'my Father,' as if it were Alluph, whose signification is 'Prince or Lord.' And thus it appears did the Sanhedrim understand the word (which is the same) in Micah v. 2. The word, without points, may mean either χιλιάς, ἐν χιλιάδοις, or χιλιάς, ἐν χιλιάδοις—ἐκ σοῦ γάρ ἐστι.] It has been remarked that the singular Latin expression, which occurs both in Tacitus and Suetonius, (see the passages above in note on μάγοι ἰδί. ἀν.) 'Judea
κατα Μαθαίου.

3—11. μάγους ἡ κρίσιμας παρ' αὐτῶν τῶν χρόνων τοῦ φαινομένου ὁ στέρος, καὶ πέμπας αὐτούς εἰς Βηθλείμ εἰπεν Προεδρεύοντας ἐξετάσατε περὶ τοῦ παιδίου ἐπάν ν ἐν γυναι, ἀπαγγέλατε μοι, ὡς κἀγὼ ἔλθων προκυψίναις αὐτῷ. οἱ δὲ ἀκούσαντες τοῦ βασιλέως ἐπερεύθησαν. καὶ ἔδω ὁ ἀστήρ ὧν εἶδον εἰν τῇ ἀνατολῇ πρὸς ἡγον αὐτοὺς, ὡς ἔλθων ἔστάθη ἐπάνω ὑμῖν τὸ παιδίον. ἔδω δὲ τοῦ ἀστήρα ἐχάρησαν χαράν μεγάλην σφόδρα. καὶ ἔλθοντες εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν ἔδω τὸ παιδίον μετὰ Μαρίας τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ πεσόντες προσκυνήσαν αὐτῷ, καὶ ἀνοίξαντες τοὺς θησαυρούς αὐτῶν


Profecti, may have been derived from these words of the LXX. —7. οἱ κρύμων] the participles of the present; 'non initium, sed continuabit, 'Grot. ; the question of Herod would be, 'How long has the star been seen? ' And the direct expression of this question would be, πέσων θοῦ χρόνου φανερωτεὶ ὁ ἀστήρ; De Wette takes the part. for an imperfect; most comm. for φανερωτεὶς, the sorit, Meyer as above. —8. παραστάσεις ἢς ἔλθων] the pleonastic use of these words, common as a Hebraism in the N. T. (see Eph. ii. 17. 1 Pet. iii. 19,) is also idiomatic in English; and it may be remarked, that although not strictly needed in the sentences where they occur, their insertion always give fulness and accuracy to the meaning. —9] On this see note on ver. 2. ίπανοι ou ὑπ τ. w. may mean, over that part of Bethlehem where the young child was, which they might have ascertained by inquiry. Or it may even mean, 'over the whole town of Bethlehem.' If it be to be understood as standing over the house, and thus indicating to the Magi the position of the object of their search, the whole incident must be regarded as miraculous. But this is not necessarily implied, even if the words of the text be literally understood; and in a matter like astronomy, where popular language is so universally inaccurate, and the Scriptures so generally use popular language, it is surely not the letter, but the spirit of the narrative which we are to believe.—11. μετὰ Μαρίαν] No stress must be laid on the omission of Nephar. In the parallel account as regarded the shepherds, in Luke ii. 16, he is mentioned. I would rather regard the omission here as indicating a simple matter of fact, and contributing to show the truthfulness of the narrative: —that Joseph happened not to be present at the time. If the meaning of τὴν οἰκίαν is to be pressed, (as in a matter of detail I think it should,) it will confirm the idea that Joseph and Mary, probably under the idea that the child was to be brought up at Bethlehem, dwelt there some time after the Nativity. Epiphanius supposes that Mary was at this time on a visit to her kindred at Bethlehem (possibly at a passover) as much as two years after our Lord's birth. (Vol. i. p. 48. 154. 430.) But if Mary had kindred at Bethlehem, how could she be so ill-provided with lodgings, and have (as is implied in Luke ii. 7) sought accommodation at an inn? And the supposition of two years having elapsed, derived probably from the διαρκεία of ver. 16, will involve us in considerable difficulty. There seems to be no reason why the Magi may not have come within the forty days before the Purification, which itself may have taken place in the interval between their departure and Herod's discovery that they had mocked him. No objection can be raised to this view from the διά διαρκεία of ver. 16: see note there. The general idea is, that the Purification was previous to the visit of the Magi. Being persuaded of the historic reality of these narratives of Matt. and Luke, we shall find no difficulty in also believing that, were we acquainted with all the events as they happened, their reenactment would be an easy matter; whereas now the two independent accounts, from not being aware of, seem to exclude one another. How often will this be the case in ordinary life? e.g. in the giving of evidence. And nothing can more satisfactorily show the veracity and independence
of the narrators, where their testimony to the main facts, as in the present case, is consistent. — ἀστραφωτοῖς] chests or bales, in which the gifts were carried during their journey. The ancient Fathers were fond of tracing in the gifts symbolical meanings: ἵνα ἑορταί, τὸν χρυσὸν ὡς τὴν παραγωγήν, τὴν ὀρεινὰν. ὡς ὑπὸ τὸν ἱερατέαν. — ἰσχυρὰς] strong ones; of these gifts that the Magi came from Arabia, as they were common to all the East. Strabo says that the most frankincense comes from the borders of Persia. (Book xvi. p. 1129. Wetstein.)

13—33. ἀρρενίας] ariarh. and take thee; not, 'When thou hast arisen (in the morning), take.' The command was immediate; and Joseph made no delay. He must be understood as having arisen the same night, and departed forthwith. (The same words are also used in vv. 20, 21, where no haste is necessarily implied.)

15. ἦν Ἀγγέλων] This citation shows the almost universal application in the N. T. of the prophetic writings to the expected Messiah, as the general antitype of all the events of the typical dispensation. We shall have occasion to remark the same again and again in the course of the Gospels. It seems to have been a received axiom of interpretation, (which has, by its adoption in the N. T., received the sanction of the Holy Spirit Himself, and now stands for our guidance,) that the subject of all allusions, the represented in all parables and dark sayings, was He who was to come, or the circumstances attendant on His advent and reign. — The words are written in Hosea of the children of Israel, and are rendered from the Hebrew. — A similar expression, with regard to Israel, is found in Exod. v. 22, 23. — 16.] Josephus makes no mention of this slaughter; nor is it likely that he would have done. Not more than ten or twelve children most probably perished, in so small a place as Bethlehem and its neighbourhood. The modern objections to this narrative may be answered best by remembering the monstrous character of this tyrant, of whom Josephus asserts, (Ant. xvii. 6, 5,) ἔμελανα χολή αὐτῶν ἦν εἰπτί παίνει ἵζαραίσσουσα. Herod had marked the way to his throne, and his reign itself, with blood; had murdered his wife and three sons (the last just about this time); and was likely enough, in blind fury, to have made no inquiries, but given the savage order at once. Besides, there might have been a reason for not making inquiry, but rather taking the course he did, which was sure, as he thought, to answer the end, without divulging the purpose. The word λαῖδα in ver. 7 seems to favour this view. — Macrobius (Saturnalia, ii. 4) relates an anecdote of Augustus: 'Cum audisset inter
pueiros quos in Syria Herodes rex Judeorum intra bimatum justit interfic, filium quoque ejus occisum, sit, Melius est Herodis porcum esse (τὸν δὲ) quam filium (τὸν οὖν;). But Macrobius wrote in the fifth century, and the words 'intra bimatum' look very like a quotation from our narrative. Besides, the anecdot shows great ignorance of the chronology of Herod's reign. Antipater, the last put to death of his sons, was of full age at his execution. — ἡπεμακτηθηνει Loquitor Matth., ex sensu et opinione Herodis. (Calvin.) — allocation i.e. passio, not χρόνον. This expression must not be taken as any very certain indication of the time when the star did actually appear. The addition καὶ κατωτέρω implies that there was uncertainty in Herod's mind as to the age pointed out; and if so, why might not the jealous tyrant, although he had accurately ascertained the date of the star's appearing, have taken a range of time extending before as well as after it, the more surely to attain his point? — 17. τὸ ἥμιθ. 8. [I. e.] Apparently an accommodation of the prophecy in Jer. xxxi. 16, which was originally written of the Babylonish captivity. We must not draw any fanciful distinction between τὸν εὐλαμβαναν and τὸν πνευματικός, but rather seek our explanation in the acknowledged system of prophetic interpretation among the Jews, still extant in their Rabbinical books, and now sanctioned to us by N. T. usage; at the same time remembering, for our caution, how little even now we understand of the full bearing of prophetic and typical words and acts. None of the expressions of this prophecy must be closely literally pressed. The link of connexion seems to be Rachel's sepulchre, which (Gen. xxxv. 19) was in the way to Bethlehem; and from that circumstance, perhaps, the inhabitants of that place are called her children. We must also take into account the close relation between the tribes of Judah and Benjamin, which had long subsisted. Ramah was six miles to the north of Jerusalem, in the tribe of Benjamin (Jer. xl. 1); so that neither must this part of the prophecy be strictly taken.—20. πεθανεὶσαι γὰρ] The plural here is not merely idiomatic, but a citation from Exod. iv. 19, where the same words are spoken to Moses. ζητηθηντι πνευματικὸν = πνευματικόν. Herod the Great died of a dreadful disease at Jericho, in the seventieth year of his age, and the thirty-eighth of his reign, A. D. C. 750. Jos. B. J. i. 33, 8.—22. ἅπαντες 84] Archelaus was the son of Herod by Malthace, a Samaritan woman: he was brought up at Rome (Jos. B. J. i. 31, 1); succeeded his father, but never had the title of king, only that of Ethnarch, with the government of Idumea, Judea, and Samaria, the rest of his father's dominions being divided between
his brothers Philip and Antipas. (Jos. Ant. xviii. 11, 4.) But, (1) very likely the word βασιλεύω is here used in the wider meaning:—(2) Archelaus did, in the beginning of his reign, give out and regard himself as king: το θεός ... ἐγχωριστε ... τις τῶν αὐτῶν θυσίας ὡς πρὸς βασιλέα (Jos. B. J. ii. 1, 1): (3) in ch. xiv. 9, Herod the Tetrarch is called ὁ βασιλεύς.—In the ninth year of his government Archelaus was deposed, οὗ μᾶλλον Ἰουδαίος, ἀλλὰ καὶ Σαμαρεῖται χρησάμενος ὄνομα, πρεσβυταρίων κατείρων κατ' αὐτοῦ πρὸς Καίσαρα, ... φυγαδεύεται μὲν τῆς Ἰουδαίας πόλις τῆς Γαλάτειας ... (ibid. ii. 7, 3.) i.e. Vienna, in Gaul. — ἄνεμον ὁ πτ. τ. Ἡρ. This account gives rise to some difficulty as compared with Luke's history. It would certainly, on a first view, appear that the writer was not aware that Nazareth had been before this the abode of Joseph and Mary. And it is no real objection to this, that he elsewhere calls Nazareth τὴν παρθένα αὐτοῦ, ch. xiii. 54. 57. It is perhaps just possible that Matthew, writing for Jews, although well aware of the previous circumstances, may not have given them a place in his history, but made the birth at Bethlehem the prominent point, seeing that his account begins at the birth (i. 18), and does not locate what took place before it, which is merely inserted as subservient to that great leading event. If this view be correct, all we could expect is, that his narrative would contain nothing inconsistent with the facts related in Luke; which we find to be the case.—I should prefer, however, believing, as more consistent with the fair interpretation of our text, that Matthew himself was not aware of the events related in Luke i. ii., and wrote under the impression that Bethlehem was the original dwelling-place of Joseph and Mary. Certainly, had we only his Gospel, this inference from it would universally be made.— άνεμος must not be pressed into the service of reconciling the two accounts, by being rendered returned; for the same word is used (ver. 14) of the journey to Egypt.—23. ἔστω πάν ρηθείν] These words refer to the Divine purpose in the event, not to that of Joseph in bringing it about. — το θεός ὁ π. τ. Π] These words are no where verbatim to be found, nor is this asserted by the Evangelist; but that the sense of the prophets is such. In searching for such sense, the following hypotheses have been made—none of them satisfactory:—(1) Euthymius says, σποτον προφητά του τούτως ἤμιν, μη σημαίνω σε εὖρος γάρ εἰσι πολλὰ τῶν προφητειῶν βιβλίων ἀπόλουτο, τά μὲν, εἰς ταῖς αἰγιλλοισίας, τά ἐς καὶ εἰς ἀμυλίας τῶν ἔρωτων, τίνα ἐς καὶ εἰς καπνογρίας. But the expression διὰ τ. π. seems to have a wider bearing than is here implied. (2) The general sense of the prophets is, that Christ should be a despised person, as the inhabitants of Nazareth were (John i. 47). But surely this part of the Messiah's prophetic character is not general or prominent enough, in the absence of any direct verbal connexion with the word in our text, to found such an interpretation on; nor, on the other hand, does it appear that an inhabitant of Nazareth, as such, was despised; only that the obscurity of the town was, both by Nathansel and the Jews, contrasted with our Lord's claims. (3) The Nazarites of old were men holy and consecrated to God; e.g. Samson (Judg. xiii. 5), Samuel (1 Sam. i. 12). But (a) our Lord did not (like John the Baptist) lead a life in accordance with the Nazarite vow, but drank wine, &c., and set himself in marked contrast with John in this very particular (Matt. xi. 18, 19); and (b) the word for Nazarite is Ναζίρ, (Judg. xiii. 5); or Ναζαράῖος, (Judg. xvi. 18) αἰεός.—Lam. iv. 7), whereas this, denoting an inhabitant of Nazareth, is Ναζάραῖος always in the N. T., except in Mark x. 47, where it is Ναζαρηνός. (4) There may be an allusion to ἄγα, a branch, by which name our Lord is called in Isa. xi. 1, and from which word it appears that the name Nazareth is probably derived. But this word is only used in the place cited; and in by far the more precise prophecies of the Branch, Zech. iii. 9. vi. 12. Jer. xxvi. 6. xxxii. 18, and Isa. iv. 2, the word ἄγα is used.—I leave it, therefore, as an unsolved difficulty.
III. 1'ΕΝ [δὲ] ταῖς ἡμεραῖς ἐκείναις "παραγίνεταί
Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτιστής, ἑκάστους ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τῆς Ἰουναίας, 2 [καὶ] λέγων Ἐπιτάξετε· ἡ γῆ γὰρ ἡ ἐστὶν ἡ ἁπάντησις τῶν οὐρανῶν.

Jer. xviii. 6 al. ὥστε—ch. xxi. 34. Lam. iv. 15. Ezek. xii. 23.


CHAP. III. 1—13.] Mark i. 1—8. Luke iii. 1—17. Here the synopsis narrative begins, its extent being the same that was specified by Peter in Acts i. 22, 'from the baptism of John till the day that He was taken up from us.' For a critical comparison of the narratives in the various sections, see notes on Mark. In this Gospel I have generally confined myself to the subject-matter. —I. ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἡμεραῖς ταύταις ἐκείναις, ἐπιτάξετε. —The last matter mentioned was the dwelling at Nazareth: and through we must not take the connexion strictly as implying that Joseph dwelt there all the intermediate thirty years, the ἡμέρας ἐκείναις must be understood to mean that we take up the persons of the narrative where we left them; i.e. dwelling at Nazareth. See Exod. ii. 11, LXX. —παραγίνεται Came forward—made his appearance. The title Ἰ. δὲ βαπτιστής shows that Matthew was writing for those who well knew John the Baptist as an historical personage. Josephus, in mentioning him, (Ant. xviii. 5, 2,) calls him Ἰωάννης ὁ Ἰσραηλινὸς ὁ φασιστής—John was, strictly speaking, a prophet; belonging to the legal dispensation; a rebuke of sin, and preacher of repentance. The expression in Luke, ἡγιασμένος ὁ Θεοῦ ἐκ τῆς Ἰωάννης, is the usual formula for the Divine commission of the Prophet. (Jer. i. 1. Ezek. vi. 1. vii. 1, &c.) And the effect of the Holy Spirit on John was more in accordance with the O.T. than the N.T. inspiration; more of a sudden overpowering influence, than through the individual character, as in the Apostles and Evangelists.—The baptism of John was of a deeper significance than that usual among the Jews in the case of proselytes, and formed an integral part of his divinely appointed office. See below, note on ver. 15. It was emphatically the baptism of repentance (λουστραν ἁμαρτιῶν), says Olhausen, but not λουστραν παλιγγενείας. Luke iii. 3. Titus iii. 5.) We find in Acts xviii. 24. 26. xix. 1. 7, accounts of persons who received the baptism of John, who believed, and (in Apollon's case) taught accurately the things concerning the Lord; but required instruction and (xix. 6) rebaptizing in the name of the Lord Jesus. Whether the baptism practised by the disciples before the Resurrection was of the same kind, and required this renewal, is uncertain. The fact of our Lord Himself having received baptism from John, is decisive against the identity of the two rites, as also against the idea (Olah. i. 154, note) derived from Acts xix. 4, that John used the formula βαπτίζω σε ἐκ τῶν ἱδρυμάτων. His whole mission, as Olah. well observes, was calculated, in accordance with the office of the law which gives the knowledge of sin, (Rom. iii. 20,) to bring men's minds into that state in which the Redeemer invites them, (Matt. xi. 28,) as weary and heavy-laden, to come to Him.—ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ] Where, also, he had been brought up, Luke i. 80. This tract was not strictly a desert, but thinly peopled, and abounding in pastures for flocks. Josephus, B. J. iii. 10, 7, says, that the Jordan διατίμηται τὴν Γεννήσαρ μίσην, ἐκεῖτα πολλὰ ἀναμετρούμεναι ἱδρυμάτων ἐκ τῆς Ἀσαφάλτης ἤτοι λίμνην. See Judg. i. 16. 1 Kings ii. 34. Τότε οὐδεὶς ἔστω μετανοεῖν] By used by the Baptist in the O. T. sense of turning to God as his people, from the spiritual idolatry and typical adultery in which the faithless among the Jews were involved. This, of course, included personal amendment in individuals. See Luke iii. 10—14. Josephus describes John, Ant. xviii. 5, 2, as τοῦ Ἰουναίου κελιστόν ἀρετὴν ἐπισκεύασάν ταύτας καὶ τῇ πρὸς ἄλληλοις ἔκπεμπτιν ὡς καὶ τῷ πάσῃ ἑαυτῷ ἐκδοσεῖ ἠμέρας. ἔστω μετανοεῖν—especially so in the N.T. to Matthew—the more usual one is ἡ βαπτισμὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ—but common in the Rabbinical writers, who do not however, except in one or two places, mean by it the reign of the Messiah, but the Jewish religion—theocracy. But from the use of it by Matthew here, and in iv. 17. x. 7, we may conclude that it was used by the Jews, and understood, to mean the advent of the Christ, probably from the prophecy in Dan. ii. 44. vii. 13, 14. 27.—It has been observed by recent critics, that wherever the term ἰδρυμα τοῦ ὀφρ. (or its equivalent) is.
used in the N.T., it signifies, not the Church, nor the Christian religion, but strictly the kingdom of the Messiah, which is to be revealed hereafter. I should doubt this being exclusively true. The state of Christian men now is undoubtedly a part of the bringing in of the kingdom of Christ, and, as such, is included in this term. See Mark xii. 34.—§ 8. ὥστε γὰρ ἥτινς] Not the words of the Baptist, meaning ἵνα γάρ ἥτινς, as in John i. 23, but of the Evangelist; and ἥτινς is not for ἢν, but represents to us the place which the Baptist fills in the prophetic-historical scheme. The words ἵνα γάρ ἥτινς belong in the Hebrew to ἐπομάσατε, but in the LXX and here to ὧν ἂν θέασθαι. —The primary and literal application of this prophecy to the return from captivity is very doubtful. If it ever had such an application, we may safely say that its predictions were so imperfectly and sparingly fulfilled in that return, or any thing which followed it, that we are necessarily directed onward to its greater fulfilment—the announcement of the kingdom of Christ. Euthymius remarks, ὅδε δὲ κυρίον καὶ τρίσον αὐτοῦ καλεῖ τὰς ψυχὰς, ὅν κατέβατεν ἡμᾶς ὁ λόγος τοῦ ἐκ- αγγέλου, δι καὶ προφητεύει ἤλιομάζειν, ὅσους καθαίρει, τῷ ἐγχείλῳ τῆς μετα- νοιας ἀναστάσεως με τὰς ἁκάνθας τῶν παθῶν, λεκτόντας δὲ τοὺς λίθους τῆς ἀμαρτίας, καὶ ωθεῖς ἐυθείας καὶ ὁμάλως αὐτὴς ἀπεργηθάσθαι πρὸς ἐντόλος ἁν- τοῦ. —§ 4. αὐτῶν δὲ ὁ Σου.] As John was the Elias of prophecy, so we find in his outward attire a striking similarity to Elias, who was αὐτὸς δόξης, καὶ συνῆθις δεματινὴς περιμεσσυρίνος τῆς σφόν αὐτοῦ. 4 Kings i. 8. The garment of camel’s hair was not the camel’s skin with the hair on, which would be too coarse to wear, but raiment woven of camel’s hair, such as Josephus speaks of, (B. J. i. 24, 3), ἐσθῆτες ἐκ τρι- χῶν πετασμέναι, as a contrast to ἵνα βασιλεύῃ. From Zech. xiii. 4, it seems that such a dress was known as the prophetic garb: ‘Neither shall they (the prophets) wear a rough garment (ἐδέρναι τρικίνας, LXX, who, however, make it a garment of penitence for having deceived) to deceive.’ —ἀκρίδες! There is no difficulty here. The ἀπερίκετο, permitted to be eaten, Levit. xii. 22, was used as food by the lower orders in Judea, and mentioned by Strabo and Pliny as eaten by the Ethiopians, and by many other authors as articles of food. Jerome, adv. Jovinian. ii. 6, says, “Apud Orientales et Libyae populos quia per desertam et cali- dam eremi vastitatem lococratum nubes re- periuntur, locustis vesti moris est: hoc verum esse Joannes quoque Baptistae pro- bat.” Shaw found locusts eaten by the Moors in Barbary. (Travels, p. 164.) —μελὶ ἄγρων?] See 1 Sam. xiv. 25. Here, again, there is no need to suppose any thing else meant but honey made by wild bees. Schulz (cited by Winer, Réalw. and De Wette) found such honey in this very wil- derness in our own time. See Psalm lxxxi. 16. Judg. xiv. 6. Deut. xxiii. 13. The passage usually cited from Diodorus Siculus (xiv. 84) to show that μελὶ ἄγρων exuded from trees, does not necessarily imply it. φίληται γὰρ παρ’ αὐτοῖς τὸ πέτρωμα ἀν’ τῶν δινῶν, καὶ μελὶ πολὺ τὸ καλούγεμα ἄγρων, ψ χρώνα καὶ πορτοί μεθ’ θάνατος. Suidas certainly makes it a gum: μ. ἄγ. ὑπαρ κατ’ τῶν δινῶν ἑπισυγαμένοις, μᾶνα τοῖς πολλοῖς προαγωγέσθαι. —§ 8. τότε ἔστω.] The latter κει here has been supposed to mean ‘especially,’ seeing that Judea was part of the περιχώρους; as in the expression ἄλλως τι κει. But the former κει πάσα will hardly allow this. καὶ πάσα ἡ περιχώρους means all the neighbourhood of Jordan not included in Jerusalem and Judea before mentioned. Parts of Perea, Samaria, Galil-
lee, and Gideonites come under this denomination. There need be no surprise at such multitudes going out to John. The nature of his announcement, coupled with the prevalent expectation of the time, was enough to produce this effect. See, as strictly consistent with this account, Matt. xi. 7—15. [§§ 15—17] When men were admitted as proselytes, three rites were performed—circumcision, baptism, and obligation; when women, two—baptism and obligation. The baptism was administered in the day-time, by immersion of the whole person; and while standing in the water the proselyte was instructed in certain portions of the law. The whole families of proselytes, including infants, were baptized. It is most probable that John’s baptism in outward form resembled that of proselytes. See above, on ver. 1. Some (De Wette, Winer, and Meyer) deny that the proselyte baptism was in use before the time of John; but the contrary has been generally supposed, and maintained (by Lightfoot, Schoettgen, Buxtorf, Wetstein, Bengel). Indeed the baptism or lustration of a proselyte on admission would follow as a matter of course, by analogy from the constant legal practice of lustration after all uncleannesses; and it is difficult to imagine a time when it would not be in use. Besides, it is highly improbable that the Jews should have borrowed the rite from the Christians, or the Jewish hierarchy from John. [§§ 15—17] From the form and expression this does not seem to have been merely ‘showing a contrite spirit,’ ‘confessing themselves sinners,’ but a particular and individual confession; not, however, made privately to John, but before the people: see his exhortation to the various classes in Luke iii. 10—15; nor in every case, but in those which required it. Josephus uses the very same expression, Ant. viii. 4, 6—7. Phars. calam. [§§ 15—17] These two sects, according to Josephus, Ant. xiii. 5, 9, originated at the same period, under Jonathan the High Priest (v. c. 159—144). The Pharisees, deriving their name probably from παρθάνομενος, ‘he separated,’ took for their distinctive practice the strict observance of the law and all its requirements, written and oral. They had great power over the people, and are numbered by Josephus as being, about the time of the death of Herod the Great, above 6000. [§§ 15—17] We find in the Gospels the Pharisees the most constant opponents of our Lord, and his discourses frequently directed against them. The character of the sect as a whole was hypocritical; the outside acknowledgment and honouring of God and his law, but inward and practical denial of Him; which rendered them the enemies of the simplicity and genuineness which characterized our Lord’s teaching. Still among them were undoubtedly pious and worthy men, honourably distinguished from the mass of the sect; John iii. 1. Acts v. 34. The various points of their religious and moral belief will be treated of as they occur in the text of the Gospel.
general were not baptized of him. — τις μελλόσφες ὑπόγειος] The reference of John's ministry to the prophecy of Elias, Malachi. iii. 1. iv. 5, (by himself, Mark i. 2,) would naturally suggest to men's minds 'the wrath to come' there also foretold. It was the general expectation of the Jews that troublesome times would accompany the appearance of the Messiah. John is now speaking in the true character of a prophet, foretelling the wrath soon to be poured upon the Jewish nation (Revel. xiv. 7) [καὶ δάξαις]. Not pleonastic: but, 'Do not fancy you may say' &c. In Justin Martyr's dialogue with Trypho the Jew, p. 309, c, we read : οὕτω καὶ ὕπατος πατριμόριοι καὶ ὕπωρ μὴ συνήγοντες, οὕτως φέρουσιν μόνοι διδάσκαλοι υἱῶν αυτῶν ... καὶ πρὸς τούτους ἐνυπότι καὶ ὕπατος βουκολόσφες, ὕπολαβαντες οὕτως πάντως τις ἀπὸ τῆς σπορᾶς τῆς κατὰ ἁρχά τοῦ Ἀβαμάς ὑπόθεν, καὶ ἀμαρτωλοὶ ὤν, καὶ ἀπιστοὶ, καὶ ἀπίστους πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν, ἢ βασιλέα ἢ ἀνώνυμος δοθοῦσαται. —ἐκ τῶν Θ. τ.] The pebbles or gravel on the beach of the Jordan. He possibly referred to Is. li. 1, 2. This also is prophetic, of the admission of the Gentile Church. See Rom. iv. 16. Gal. iii. 29. — 11. ἐν τῇ ἑαυτῇ ἑνὶ is not redundant, but signifies the vehicle of baptism, as in ἐν τῷ ὑπώρ. κ. τ.π. ἐν ὑπώρ after- wards. —ὑπώροις] The present participle, used of a certain and predetermined future event. See on ch. ii. 4.—τῷ ὑπώρ. βασιλέας] Lightfoot (from Maimonides) shows that it was the token of a slave having become his master's property, "to loose his shoe," to tie the same, or to carry the necessary articles for him to the bath. The expressions therefore in all the Gospels amount to the same. —ἐν τῷ ὑπώρ. κ. τ.π. This was literally fulfilled at the day of Pentecost: but Origen and others refer the words to the baptism of the righteous by the Holy Spirit, and the wicked by fire. The members of comparison in this verse are strictly parallel to one another: the baptism by water, the end of which is μετανοεῖ, a mere transition state, a note of preparation; and the baptism by the Holy Ghost (and fire), the end of which is (ver. 12) sanctification, the entire aim and purpose of man's creation and renewal. Thus the official superiority of the Redeemer (which is all that our Evangelist here deals with) is fully brought out. The superiority of nature and pre-existence is reserved for the fuller and more dogmatic account in John i. — 12. ὁ τὸ ἑαυτῶς ὁ ... ἀνώνυμος, a very common redundancy. See ref. o. is ὁ τὸ ἑαυτῶς, which is implied in τῇ. In the Rabbinical work Midrash Tehillim, on Ps. ii., is found: Advenit tritutricato, stramen proicent in ignem, paleam in ventum, sed trisciam conservant in area: sic nationes mundi erunt sicut confisagatio furni: ast Israel conservabitur solus. (Quoted by Lightfoot on John iii. 17.)—ὑπώροις] The contents of the barn-floor. (De Wette, &c.) Thus in Job xxxix.
13. Τότε παραγίνεται ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην πρὸς τὸν Ἰωάννην, τοῦ βαπτισθῆναι ἕναντί αὐτοῦ. 14. ὁ δὲ Ἰωάννης ἐκείκολυν αὐτὸν λέγων Ἔγω χρείαν ἔχω ὑπὸ σοῦ βαπτισθῆναι, καὶ σὺ ἐρχῃ πρὸς με; 15. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐπὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀρετὴν ὤντως γὰρ ὁ πρέπον ἐστὶν ἡμῖν πληρῶσαι enim üce Lucif. — 15. a.Ct ηρ α inserts et quum baptizaretur, lumen ingens circumfult de aqua, ita ut timere nitissent omnes qui advenirent; similarly the Ebionite Gospel quoted

12. ἐξοίσια δὲ σου τὸν ἄλωνα. Or perhaps owing to διακαθ. (shall cleanse from one end to the other) the floor itself, which was an open hard-trodden space in the middle of the field.—Erreur] Not only the chaff, but also the straw: see ref.: 'all that is not wheat.' On the apparent discrepancy between this account and that of John, see note to John i. and the general prolegomena to the Gospel.

19–17.] Mark i. 9–11. Luke iii. 21—23. It does not appear exactly when the baptism of the Lord took place. If the comparative age of the Baptist is taken into account, we should suppose it to have been about six months after this latter began his ministry. But this is no sure guide. The place was Bethany, (the older reading,) beyond Jordan. John i. 28.—13. τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ.] Why should the Lord, who was without sin, have come to a baptism of repentance? Because He was made sin for us: for the same reason as He suffered the curse of the law. It became Him, being in the likeness of sinful flesh, to go through those appointed rites and purifications which belonged to that flesh. There is no more strangeness in His having been baptized by John, than in His keeping the Passovers. The one rite, as the other, belonged to sinners—and among the transgressors He was numbered. The prophetic words in Ps. xlv. 12, spoken in the person of our Lord, indicate, in the midst of sinlessness, the most profound apprehension of the sins of that nature which He took upon Him. I cannot suppose the baptism to have been sought by our Lord merely to honour John (Kuinoel), or as knowing that it would be the occasion of a Divine recognition of his Messiahship (Paulus), and thus preordained by God (Meyer): but bona fide, as bearing the infirmities and carrying the sorrows of mankind, and thus beginning here the triple baptism of water, fire, and blood, two parts of which were now accomplished, and of the third of which He himself speaks, Luke xii. 50, and the beloved Apostle, I John v. 6, where διακαθ. = παραγίνεται. — His baptism, as it was the Lord's closing act of obedience under the Law, in His hitherto concealed life of legal submission, His ἐπληρώσας τὰ σ. δικ., so it was His solemn inauguration and anointing for the higher official life of Mediatorial satisfaction which was now opening upon Him. See Rom. i. 3, 4. We must not forget that the working out of perfect righteousness in our flesh by the actual and spotless keeping of God's law, (Dent. vi. 25.) was, in the main, accomplished during the thirty years previous to the Lord's official ministry.—Erreur] A much stronger word than κυρων, implying the active and earnest preventing, with the gesture or hand, or voice, as here. The imperfect tense conveys, not that he endeavoured merely to hinder Him, (see Hermann's note on Soph. Ajax, 1105,) but begun to hinder Him, was hindering Him. —There is only an apparent inconsistency between the speech of John in this sense, and the assertion made by him in John i. 33, 'I knew Him not.' Let us regard the matter in this light: —John begins his ministry by a commission from God, Who also admonishes him, that He, whose Forerunner he was, would be in time revealed to him by a special sign. Jesus comes to be baptized by him. —From the nature of his relationship to our Lord, he could not but know those events which had accompanied his birth, and his subsequent life of holy and unblemishable purity and sanctity. My impression from the words of this verse certainly is, that he regarded Him as the Messiah. Still, his belief wanted that full and entire assurance which the occurrence of the predicted sign gave him, which the word ἐπήλθε implies, and which would justify him in announcing Him to his disciples as the Lamb of God. —なければ The exact meaning is difficult. It cannot well be that which the E. V. at first sight gives, that something was to be done now, inconsistent with the actual and hereafter to be manifested relation of the two persons. Rather—though what has been said (ver. 14) is true, yet the time is not come for that—as yet, αὐτρί, now, are we in another relation, (viz. our Lord as the fuller of the law, John
as a minister of it, therefore suffer it. So Chrysostom : οὐ διηνέκεις ταῦτα ἔσται, ἀλλ' ἔσται μεν εἰς τοὺς σωματικοὺς καὶ οὐ καὶ καταστάσεις ἐδώρει μένυται ὑπάρχον τοῦτο (Hom. xii. 161 a). This ἕσται is spoken from the Lord's foreknowledge, that this relation of subjection to John was only temporary, and that hereafter their relative situations would be inverted." Meyer. Stier remarks (Reden Jesu, vol. i. p. 18), that now was fulfilled the prophetic announcement of Ps. xl. 7, 8. —καὶ ἐκ ποιμένων ἐκ τοῦ ὄφαντος— not for kai, but for kai kai sa. I cannot help thinking that this word glances at the relationship and previous acknowledged destinations of the speakers. It has however a wider sense, as spoken by Him who is now first coming forth officially as the Son of Man, extending over all those whose baptism plants them in his likeness. Rom. vi. See Stier, ibid.—δικαιοσυνή] requirements of the law. See var. read. on ch. vi. 1, where however the sense is restricted to one such requirement.—16. καὶ βασιλεὺς] On this account I would make the following remarks. (1) The appearance and voice seem to have been only manifested to our Lord and the Baptist. They may have been alone at the time: or, if not, we have an instance, in Acts ix. 7, of such an appearance being confined to one person, while the others present were unconscious of it. We can hardly, however, with some of the Fathers, say, that it was πνευματικὴ θεωρία—ἐπταῖος, οὐ φύσει το φανέρωμεν. Theod. Mopsuest. (Meyer.) 'Apeirionturi exei non reseratione elementorum, sed spiritualibus oculis, quibus et Eschelich in principio voluminis sui apertos eos esse commemoravit.' Jerome in loc. (2) The Holy Spirit descended not only in the manner of a dove, but σωματικῶς εἰς (Luke iii. 22): which I cannot understand in any but the literal sense, as the bodily shape of a dove, seen by the Baptist. There can be no objection to this the straightforward interpretation of the narrative, which does not equally apply to the Holy Spirit being visible at all, which John himself asserts Him to have been, (John i. 33, 34,) even more expressly than is asserted here. Why the Creator Spirit may not have assumed an organized body bearing symbolic meaning, as well as any other material form, does not seem clear. This was the ancient, and is the only honest interpretation. All the modern explanations of the ὦτι περιτρ. as importing the manner of coming down, belong, as Meyer has rightly remarked, to the vain attempt to reduce down that which is miraculous. The express assertion of Luke, and the fact that all four Evangelists have used the same expression, which they would not have done if it were a mere tertium comparationis, are surely a sufficient refutation of this misconstruing interpretation.—ἐνθάδε belongs to ἀναβας, not to βασιλεύς, nor to αἰώνιος. It is the first member of the conjunctive clause of which καὶ ὦτι is the second—as we say, 'the moment that Jesus was gone up out of the water, behold.' (3) Two circumstances may be noticed respecting the manner of the descent of the Spirit: (a) it was, as a dove;—the Spirit as manifested in our Lord was gentle and benign. Lord Bacon (Meditations Sacre, cited in Trench on the Miracles, p. 37) remarks: "Moses edidit miracula, et profigavit Αἰγυπτος pestibus multis: Elias edidit, et occulat cohortem ne plueret super terram: Eliseus edidit, et evocavit uras de desertorum locis. (b) This was not a sudden and temporary descent of the Spirit, but a permanent though special anointing of the Saviour for his holy office. It 'abode upon Him,' John i. 32. And from this moment His ministry and mediatorial work (in the active official sense) begins. εὐθὺς, the Spirit carries Him away to the wilderness: the day of His return thence (possibly; but see notes on John i. 29) John points Him out as the Lamb of God: the next day, Peter, Andrew, and Philip are called, and the third day is the first miracle at the marriage in Cana. But we must not imagine any change in the nature or person of our Lord to have taken
place at his baptism. The anointing and crowning are but signs of the official assumption of the power which the king has by a right independent of, and higher than these. (4) The whole narrative is in remarkable parallelism with that of the Temptation. There we have our Lord supernaturally glorified, in the presence of two great prophetic personages, Moses and Elias, with whom He conversed on the journey to which He forsook of them (ch. xviii. 22, comp. with xix. 1); and accompanied by the same testimony of the voice from heaven, uttering the same words, with an addition accordant with the truth then symbolized. (5) In connexion with the apocryphal additions found in the various readings, the following are not without interest: κατελθόντως τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ ὕδωρ, καὶ πάντες ἄνθρωπον ἐν τῷ ἱερόνῳ καὶ ἀναβοήντως αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ βάθους κ. τ. λ. Justin Martyr, Dial. p. 315 D. The author of the tract 'de Rehbatimate,' among the works of Cyprian, blames the spurious book called 'Petri Predicatio,' for relating, among other things, of Christ, 'cum baptizaretur, ignem super aquam esse visum, quod in evangelio nullo est scriptum.' (ch. ix.)—17 φων. λ.] does not require ἐγκεκριμένον or any word to be supplied, nor the participle to be understood as a past tense. 'Lo, a voice from heaven,' saying. See similar constr. Luke v. 12. xir. 20: al. fr. —εὐδόκησα not the unitative sorit, but declarative of the definite past εὐδοκεία of the Father in Him. Eph. i. 4. see above.

IV. 1, 2. KATA MATHAION.

*) επ᾽ αὐτῶν. 17 καὶ ἰδοὺ ἡ φωνή ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν λέγουσα...* Dayn. iv. 56.

* Gen. xxxii. 5. = monogámenos...* Gen. xlii. 10.

* Gen. xl. 12. 2 Kings xxii. 30.

* Mal. ii. 19. Ps. cxix. 4. v. 5.

* Luke ii. 29 al.


rendering is even grammatical. Hence it is evident that our Lord at this time was not 'led up' of His own will and design, but as a part of the conflict with the Power of Darkness, He was brought to the Temptation. As He had been subject to His earthly parents at Nazareth, so now He is subject, in the outset of His official course, to His Heavenly Parent, and is by His will thus carried up to the inexhaustibly considering the nature and end of this temptation, we may observe, (1) That the whole is undoubtedly an objective historical narrative, recording an actual conflict between our Redeemer and the Power of Evil. (2) That it is undetermined by the letter of the sacred text, whether the Tempter appeared in a bodily shape, or as a spirit, was permitted to exert a certain power, as in ver. 5, and ver. 8, over the person of our Lord, even as the Holy Spirit did in ver. 1. If the latter were the case, the words spoken at the various stages of the temptation, were suggested by this Evil Power to the soul of our Redeemer. But (3) such an interpretation, while it cannot justly be accused of unreason by any who do not reject belief in the spiritual world, hardly meets the expressions of the text, προσελθὼν ver. 3, ἣν πίσων προκεκινήσας ver. 8, and ἅπαντας αὐτόν ver. 11. Nor do the two members of ver. 11 correspond to one another in this case, for the διάγειν must have been visible and corporeal, as in the parallel case at Gethsemane, Luke xii. 43. —διάβολος. The accuser, or adversary: Satan. Not any human tempter or foe: no example can be adduced of a man being called ὁ δίαβολος. In John vi. 70, Judas is by our Lord called δίαβολος, which is the generic substantive without the article. —2. ἐπηρεάσεως. Not in the wider, ecclesiastical sense of the word, but its strict meaning, of abstaining from all food whatever. οὐκ ἔφαγεν οὐδὲν ἐν ταῖς ἡμεραῖς ἑκείναις. Luke iv. 2. Similarly Moses, Exod. xxxiv. 26, ἐν ἑαυτῷ Κυρίου τεσσαράκοντα ἡμ. κ. τ. λ. νῦν ὁ ἄρων οὐκ ἔφαγεν, καὶ θύσῃ οὐκ ἔπεσεν. and Elias ἐπερύθη ἐν ἑαυτῷ τῆς δρόμου ἑκείνης, κ. τ. λ. καὶ τ. ν. 3 Kings xix. 8.—δοτεραν ἴνων.]
Then probably not during the time itself. The period of the fast, as in the case of Moses, was spent in a spiritual ecstasy, during which the wants of the natural body were suspended. — 3. καὶ προσελθὼν. From the words of both Mark and Luke, it appears that He was tempted also during the forty days. Whether the words of Mark, ἦν μετὰ τῶν θηρίων, allude to one kind of temptation, is uncertain. See note on Mark i. 13. The word προσέλθων need not be understood of the first approach, but the first recorded—at a certain time the tempter approaching Him, &c.—υπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ. In the N. T. are found three combinations of these two substantives and the article, and all with one meaning, viz., ΤΗΣ ΣΟΝ ΟΓΝΩ, in the highest and Messianic sense. (1) The expression in the text, of which our Lord says, John x. 36, δὲ δό Πάσης ἡγίασα καὶ ἀποστέλλει εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ἵνα λέγητε ὅτι χριστομαραθοῦντες ὑμῖν, υπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ εἰμί; see also Matt. xxvii. 40.—(2) δὲ ὅλος τοῦ θ. In John ix. 36, we read, σὺ πιστεύεις εἰς τὸν υπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ; . . . . ἐλαλῶ σαμαραθοῦντες ἵναι—(3) μόνος θ. In Luke i. 35, ὡς γυνώμοιον ἄγιον ἐλήθηται υπὸ θεοῦ. See note on Luke xxii. 47.—The εἰ implies no doubt of the Lord’s Messiahship, but as Euthym. observes, φίλος δὲ παρεκκληθῆσαι τῷ λόγῳ, καθαύτου ἀνακεφαλαιοῦντος τῷ μη εἶναι υπὸ θεοῦ.—4.] The words in Deut. are spoken of the children of Israel eating manna in the wilderness. The Lord does not give way to the temptation, so as to meet him with an open declaration, ‘I am the Son of God!’ thus indeed He might have asserted his Lordship over him, but not have been his Conqueror for us. The first word which He uses against him, reaches far deeper: ‘Man shall not live,’ &c. This, like the other text, is taken from the history of Israel’s temptation in the wilderness; for Israel represents, in a foreshadowing type, the Son of Man, the servant of God, for Righteousness, the one ἰδρύμοιος, in whom alone that nature which in all men has degenerated into sin, πληροὶ πάσαν δικαιοσύνην. Adam stood not,—Israel according to the flesh stood not,—when the Lord their God tempted them; but rather, after Satan’s likeness, tempted their God: but now the second Adam is come, the true Israel, by whose obedience the way of life is again made known and opened—that man truly liveth on and in the eternal word of God.’ See Stier’s Raden Josu, vol. i. p. 18. Observe also how the Lord resists Satan in His humanity; at once here numbering Himself with men, by adding ὅ ἀνθρωπος as including His own case; and not only so, but thus speaking out the mystery of His humiliation, in which He had foregone His divine Power, of His own will.—‘By every word (or ‘thing,’ for ὅμια is not expressed in the original) that proceedeth out of the mouth of God,’ we must understand, every arrangement of the Divine will; God who ordinarily sustains by bread, can, if it please Him, sustain by any other means, as in the case alluded to. Compare John iv. 32. 34.—5. τότε παρ.] Power being most probably given to the tempter over the person of our Lord. In Luke this temptation stands third. The real order is evidently that in the text; for otherwise our Lord’s final answer, ver. 10, would not stand in its place. It may be observed, that Luke makes no assertion as to succession, only introducing each temptation with καί: whereas τότε καὶ πάλιν here seem to mark succession. For δὲ, πῶς. see ref. δυσκολία—by the same power by which he brought Him.—παρεκκληθῆσαι. Abundant instances have been produced to show that παρεκκληθῆσαι was applied to a pointed roof or gable. Now the LXX use περιστεράς and πε- 

placed on Herod’s royal portico, described in Jos. Ant. xv. 11, 5, is probably right. That portico overhung the ravine of Kidron from a dizzy height, ως, ει τις αν’ ακρων του ταπης της τιγνου, αμφω συναθης τα βαθη, δυσπετου, συγαθης, ως τεινουμενης τις δυσως τις αμαρτης των θεων. The argument that it was probably on the other side, next the court, is grounded on the perfectly gratuitous assumption, that an exhibition to the people was intended. There is no authority for this in the text; the temptation being one not of ambition, but of presumption. The inference from Eusebius, who, quoting Hegeaeipus, (Hist. ii. 23,) describes James the Just as set on and thrown from το περηγυθον του ναου, among the people, is not decisive; for this term might embrace either side, as ‘the cornice,’ or ‘the parapet’ would.—8. γεγραμαι, cited (verbatim) from the LXX, as all the texts in this narrative, as applying to all servants of God in general, and to fortiori to the Son of God: not as a prophecy of the Messiah.—7. ταλιν] not ‘contra,’ which it never means, not even in Gal. v. 3. 1 John ii. 8: but ‘rurus’ or ‘iterum,’ as the versions rightly render it. The addition of a second Scripture qualifies and interprets the first; but does not refute it.—8. δορο ψ. λ.] The inquiry where and what this mountain was, is entirely nugatory, no data being furnished by the text.—και τι των ειδους, the additional words in Luke, in στιγμα χρόνου, are valuable as pointing out to us clearly the supernatural character of this vision. If it be objected that in that case there was no need for the ascent of the mountain, I answer that such natural accessories are made use of frequently in supernatural revelations: see especially Rev. xxii. 10. The attempts to restrict του εσομον to Palestine, (which was, besides, God’s peculiar portion and vineyard, as distinguished from the Gentile world,) or to the Roman empire, are mere subtleties: as is also the giving to δεινουσα the sense of ‘points out the direction of.’ The very passage of Polyaenus cited to support this view, completely refutes it, when taken entire. Hannibal, from the Alps, is directing the attention of his soldiers to the view of Italy; ιδεινεμενοι ας τα περι του Παλαθα απει (in sight) ... αμα ακται και της της Ρωμης αυτος των άνω των υπολειπουν. where we may observe the distinction between the two compounds εν- and ἐνα- δεινουμαι; and further, that it is not την F. but δοκει F. τον ουν F. that he pointed out to them. Enthusiasts, however, interprets it thus, ... ληγον εν τοι η μη μερικαυ ειναι η βασιλεια των Ρωμαιων, εν τοι δι, η των Πορεων, εν καινει δι ει των Ασπορων, και τα ειδες δωχως και η ειν ημι δεδαη ειτε τοις ειτε, ει δι ειτε ιτε, και αλλαι και ουκ ειναι, και αλλως παντα κατελημεναι. In this last temptation the enemy reveals himself openly, as the αρχων του εσομον τουτου, and as the father of lies; for though power is given him over this world and its sons, his assurance here is most untrue. The Lord once repels him openly; not that He did not know him before, but because he had thus openly tempted Him; but not even this of His own power or will; He adds, for it is written,—again as Man, appealing to the Word of God: see notes on Luke.—From this time, the Lord is known by the
devils, and casts them out by a word. 
Mark i. 24. 34. iii. 11. v. 7.—II. δήμην 
αυτῶν) but only for a season, see || Luke. 
The conflict, however often renewed in 
Galilee (which we cannot determine), was 
certainly again waged in Gethsemane—αβαγγ 
ζων ὑπὸν ἡ ὁρα, ἀπὸ ἡ ἱστοὲα τοῦ σά 
του. (Luke xii. 53. compare John xiv. 
30.) We have probably an imitation of the 
same kind in Luke x. 18, ἰδέως τὸν Ἰω 
σανάν ὡς στρατηγὸν ἐν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ 
παῖσταν.—δημονῖον] vis. with food, as in 
the case of Elias, 1 Kings xix. 6, 7.
Between the last verse and this is a con 
siderable interval of time. On returning 
from the temptation, our Lord was pointed 
out by John the Baptist. (John i. 29—34.,) 
and again on the morrow to two of his dis 
ciples, Andrew and (probably) John, who 
followed Him, and were joined by Simon 
Peter (vv. 36—43); then on the morrow 
Philip and Nathanael were called (vv. 44— 
52); three days after was the marriage in 
Can of Samaria and healing of the ruler’s son in 
Capernaum (vv. 43—54); and the journey to 
Jerusalem related in John v. There 
John breaks off the first part of his nar 
native, and between his v. 47 and vi. 1, comes 
in the synoptic narrative, Matt. iv. 12— 
ix. 16. Then follows καταληκτικὸν τῶν 
Ναζαρέων in lowest in course. This omission 
is in remarkable consistency with Mat 
thew’s account of his own calling in ch. ix. 9.

Being employed in his business in the neigh 
bourhood of Capernaum, he now first 
becomes personally acquainted with the 
words and actions of our Lord. From what 
circumstances the narrative in Matthew 
in Capernaum had not attracted his attention, 
we cannot, of course, definitely say; we 
can, however, easily conceive. Our Lord 
was not then in Capernaum; for the ruler 
sent to Him, and the cure was wrought by 
word at a distance. If Matthew’s attention 
had not been called to Jesus before, he 
might naturally omit such a narrative, which 
John gives probably from personal know 
ledge. The synoptic narrative generally, 
omits this whole section of the Lord’s tra 
vels and ministry. Its sources of informa 
tion seem to have been exclusively Gal 
ilean, and derived from persons who became 
attached to Him at a later period than any 
of the events recorded in that first portion 
of John’s Gospel. The objections to this 
view are, their narrative of the baptism and 
temptation; but the former of these would 
be abundantly testified by John’s disciples, 
many of whom became disciples of Jesus; 
and the latter could only have derived 
from the mouth of the Lord Himself— 
ἀνέγραψεν] not ‘returned,’ but ‘retired,’ 
‘withdrew,’ see ch. ii. 22, and note. No 
otice is given where this withdrawal took 
place. The narrative is evidently taken up 
after an interval, and without any intention 
that it should follow closely on ver. 11. 
in this a proof that Matt. recognised a 
ministry in Judæa during the interval. I 
cannot quite think this, but certainly he does 
not exclude it.—καταληκτικὸν τ. Ν. ] Not 
on account of the behaviour of the Naza 
renes to Him after the preaching in the 
Synagogue, Luke iv. 30, as sometimes sup 
paced. See notes there.—Καταληκτικὸν] 
This town, on the borders of the lake of 
Gennesaret, was central in situation, and in 
the most populous and frequented part of 
Galilee. It, besides, was the residence of
four, at least, of the Apostles, Andrew, and Peter, and James, and John, and probably of Matthew. The town was named from a fountain: πός γὰρ τῶν ἀδέρφων εὐκρασία καὶ πίστις διαφέρει γονιωτάτην. Καθαρασθείτε αὕτη ὑμεῖς ὑπὲρ τοῦ Κυρίου καλοῦν [Joseph. B. J. iii. 10, 87]. Τινὰ πορίᾳ, vices consolationis. It is from this time called His own city, ch. ix. 1, see also xvii. 24. —15.] This prophecy is spoken with direct reference to the days of the Messiah. It is here freely rendered from the Hebrew, without any regard to the LXX, which is wholly different. This, coming so immediately after a string of quotations literally from the LXX, seems to mark the beginning of a new portion of the Gospel, agreeably to what was said above.—δόνω θαλάσσῃ] the country round the coast of the lake. All the members of this sentence are in apposition with one another: thus πάντα τοῦ Ἰορδ. is not a description of the land before spoken of, which was not thus situated, but of a different tract. The later meaning of γάρ γὰρ, as signifying the tract to the west of the Jordan, and which naturally sprung up during the captivity, is not to be thought of in Isaiah, who wrote before that event. See 1 Chron. xxvii. 30 in the Hebrew, where, however, the E. V. renders 'on this side Jordan, westward.' Meyer makes δόνω θαλ. the objective after ἐπιδὲ understood, and construes 'the land of Z. and N. saw the way of the sea on the other side of the Jordan: Galilee of the Gentiles, &c. saw a great light.' I. e. the light which went forth from Capernaum when Jesus dwelt there, is represented as sending its bright beams over the Galilean sea, so that Z. and N. by this light could see the way leading along the other side of the sea (!)—Γαλ. τ. ἄνω. Galilee superior, near to Tyre and Sidon, which was inhabited by a variety of nations. —17. ἄνω τῶν] That is, began His ministry in Galilee. The account of Matthew being that of an eye-witness, begins where his own experience began. It is not correct to suppose, as some of the German commentators have done, (De Wette, Strauss,) that this preaching of repentance was of a different character from the after-teaching of our Lord: we recognize the same formula, though only partly cited, in ch. x. 7. Luke x. 10, and find our Lord still preaching repentance, Luke xiii. 3, after repeated declarations of His Messiaiship.—18.] If we give any consideration to the circumstances here related, we cannot fail to see that the account in John is admirably calculated to complete the narrative. We have there furnished to us the reason why these two brethren were so ready to arise and follow One, whom, if we had this account only, we should infer they had never before seen. Add to this, that there is every probability that one of the other pair of brethren, John the son of Zebedee, is there described as having gone with Andrew to the dwelling of our Lord. It also tends to confirm the chronological view here taken, that Philip, the only one mentioned expressly by John as having been called by Jesus, is not mentioned here as called; and that Andrew, and the other disciple of John the Baptist, clearly were not called by Jesus in John i. 35—40, or the words παρ' αὐτῷ μητρών τῶν μήτρων λείπουν, could not have been used: that these two continued disciples of the Bar-
tist is not probable; but that they were henceforth, but not invariably, attached to the Lord. I believe that the disciple whom Jesus loved was in His company during the whole of the events in John ii. iii. iv. and v., and on His return from Judea with His disciples, John having, for a time, returned to his business, as our Lord was now resident in Capernaum, received, as here related, this more solemn and final call. We must remember, that the disciples would naturally have gone up to Jerusalem at the Passover, John ii. 23, without a call from the Lord, and by what they saw there would become more firmly attached to Him. The circumstance related in John xxii., that even after they were assured of the Resurrection, the Apostles returned to their occupation as fishermen, gives additional probability to the usual explanation of the call in our text, and belegomena to the text.—

20. ἀφέντες κ. τ. Ἀ. i. e. from this time they were constant followers of the Lord. But when He happened to be in the neighborhood of their homes, they resumed their fishing, see Luke v. 1—11, which occurrence was, in my belief, different from, and later than the one related in our text. See notes there.

23—25.] (Mark i. 39. Luke iv. 44, ordinarily: but qu.? There is no necessity for believing this circuit of Galilee to be identical with those. The Lord made many such circuits.) — 23. συναναγωγαῖς These were the places of religious assembly among the Jews after the return from the captivity. Tradition, and the Targums, ascribe a very early origin to synagogues; and Deut. xxxi. 11, and Ps. lxiv. 8, are cited as testimonies of it. But the former passage does not necessarily imply it; and it is doubtful whether that Psalm was not itself written after the captivity. They are generally supposed to have originated in Babylon, and thence to have been brought, at the return, into the mother land. See Neh. viii. 1—8. At the Christian era there were synagogues in every town, and in some larger towns several. See Acts ix. 20. In Jerusalem, according to the Rabbinical writings, there were upwards of 450. (See Acts vi. 9, and note.) The people assembled in them on Sabbath and festival days, and in later times also on the second and fifth ier of each week, for public prayer and the hearing of portions of Scripture. τῶν ἱερῶν ὑπὸ τῶν γερόντων ἠμάνανωσε τοὺς ἱερὸς νόμον αὐτῶς καὶ ἕκαστον ἠμέτοχον πλήρης ἁλίθες ἀλήθες. Philo Fragg. vol. ii. p. 630. See Luke iv. 16. Acts xiii. 15. The officers of the synagogues were (1) the ἀρχισυναγωγοί, Luke vii. 49, xiii. 14. Acts xviii. 8, 17, who had the care of public order, and the arrangement of the service; (2) the Elders, πρεσβυτέρους Luke vii. 3, ἀρχισυναγωγοῖς Mark v. 22, who seem to have formed a sort of council under the presidency of the ἀρχισυναγωγός; (3) the legatus or angelus ecclesiae, who was the reader of prayers, and also secretary and messenger of the synagogues; (4) the νυνήσις (Luke iv. 20), or chapel clerk, whose office was to prepare the books for reading, to sweep, open, and shut the synagogue. Besides these, there appear to have been alms-gatherers. The synagogue was fitted up with seats, of which the first row (πρωτοκαθαρία) was an object of ambition with the scribes. (Matt. xxiii. 6.) A pulpit for the reader, lamps, and a chest for keeping the sacred books, appear to complete the furniture of the ancient synagogue. Punishments, e. g.
scourging, were inflicted in the synagogues. (See Matt. x. 17. xxiii. 3, 4. 11. Acts xxii. 19. xxvi. 11.) The catechizing also of children, seems to have taken place there, (Lightfoot, xi. 281,) as also disputations on religious questions.—Our Lord was allowed to read and teach in the synagogues, although of mean extraction according to the flesh, because of His miracles, and His supposed character as the professed leader and teacher of a religious sect. — κατεχομένων τοῦ εὐαγγελίου. For the exact meaning of these words compare our Saviour's declaration in the synagogue at Nazareth, Luke iv. 16—30. — Δεσμησίας Answering to ἐκ τῶν περιχώρων τῆς Γαλιλαίας, Mark i. 28. On the εὐαγγελίου, see note on ch. viii. 28. The σεληναὶ, probably epileptics: see an instance in ch. xvii. 14 and ||.—25. Δεσμαπόλεως] A district principally east of the Jordan, so called from ten cities, some of the names of which are uncertain. Pliny (Nat. Hist. v. 18) says, "Jungitur ei lateri Syriac Decapolitana regio, a numero oppidorum, in quo non omnes eadem observant. Fluvium tamen Damascum . . . . Philadelphum, Raphanam, omnia in Arabiae regione; Scythopolin . . . . Gadera . . . . Hippon, Dict. Pollan, . . . . Galaasm, Canatham." Josephus appears not to include Damascus in Decapolis, for he calls Scythopolis μαγιστρὸς τῆς Δικαιόλογος (B. J. iii. 9, 7); and Cellarius thinks Cesarea Philippi and Gergesa should be substituted for Damascus and Raphana. See Mark vii. 31.—έραν τ. ἱερός.] Persea. The country east of the Jordan, between the rivers Jab- babok and Arnon. See Jos. B. J. iii. 3, 3.

CHR. V. VI. VII.] The Sermon on the Mount. In this form peculiar to Matthew. —1. Ἰδὼν δὲ] Without attempting a solution of the many difficulties which beset the question of time, place, and arrangement of our Lord's Sermon on the Mount, I shall state the principal views of these subjects, and make some remarks upon them. One of the weightiest questions is, as to the identity or otherwise of the Sermon with that given in Luke vi. 12—19. There is (1) the view that they are identical. This is generally taken by ordinary readers of Scripture, from their similarity in many points. It is also taken most of the modern German commentators, who uniformly reject every attempt at harmonizing by supposing the same or similar words to have been twice uttered (but see prolegg. I. 4. 6). This view is, however, beset by difficulties. For (a) the sermon in Luke is expressly said to have been delivered after the selection of the Apostles; whereas in that in the text is as expressly, by continual consecutive notes of time extending to the call of Matthew, (before which the Apostles cannot have been chosen,) placed before that event. And it is wholly unlikely that Matthew, supposing him the author of our Gospel, would have made a discourse, which he must have heard immediately after his call as an Apostle, to take place before that call. —Then (b) this discourse was spoken on a mountain, that, after descending from a mountain, in the plain; for that is the only admissible sense of the words. And, again (c) the two discourses are, though containing much common material, widely different. Of 107 verses which the latter contains only thirty; his four beatitudes are balanced by as many woes; and in his text, parts of the sermon are introduced by sayings, which do not precede them in Matt. (e.g. Luke vi. 39 ff. 45 ff.) but which naturally connect with them. (11) Luke epitomized this discourse, leaving out whatever was unsuitable for his Gentile readers, e.g. ch. v. 17—42. But this is improbable; for Luke in several verses is fuller than Matthew, and the whole discourse, as related by him, is connected and consecutive. (11) The two discourses are wholly distinct. This view is maintained by Greswell, vol. ii. Dis. xi., and principally from the arguments above noticed. But it also is not without grave difficulties, especially if we suppose, as Gres. does, that Luke had the Gospel of Matthew before him (but on this see prolegg. I. 2). That two discourses wholly distinct should contain so
much in common, seems unlikely and unnatural. It is hardly credible that two great public special occasions should be selected by the Lord near the commencement of his ministry, and two discourses delivered to the same audience, not identical, which might have been very probable, and impressive from that very circumstance,—nor consecutive, nor explanatory one of the other, but only coinciding in fragments, and not even as two different reports at the distance of thirty or forty years might be expected to do. Add to this that those parts of the discourses in which Luke and Matthew agree, occur in both in almost the same order, and that the beginning and conclusion of both are the same. (IV) Matthew gives a general compendium of the sayings of our Lord during this part of his ministry, of which Luke's discourse formed a portion, or perhaps was another shorter compendium. But the last stated objection applies with still greater force to this hypothesis, and renders it indeed quite untenable. Besides, it labours under the chronological difficulty in all its bearings. And to one who has observed throughout the close contextual connexion of the parts in this discourse, it will be quite incredible that such should be the occurrence of sayings, set down at hazard. See notes throughout. (V) The apparent discrepancies are sometimes reconciled by remembering, that there is no fixed time mentioned in any Evangelist for the special ordination of the Apostles, and that it is very doubtful whether they were at any set moment so ordained all together. (See note on Mark iii. 14.) Thus Matthew may have been a usual hearer of our Lord, and present with the whole of the Apostles, as related in Luke, though not yet formally summoned as related in Matt. ix. 9. Moreover, the introduction of the discourse in Luke by the words ἔγινεν δὲ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις (which I maintain to be, on Luke vi. 12, not only possibly, but expressly indefinite, and to indicate that the event so introduced may have happened at any time during the current great period of our Lord's ministry, before, during, or after, those last narrated,) allows us great latitude in assigning Luke's discourse to any precise time. This, however, leaves the difficulties (above stated under I) in supposing the discourses identical, in force, except the chronological one. —With regard to the many sayings of this sermon which occur, dispersed up and down, in Luke, see notes in their respective places, which will explain my view as to their connection and original times of utterance, in each several instance. See also notes on Luke vi. 20—49. —τὸ δέος] Either some hill near Capernaum well known by this name, and called by it in the ref. to Mark and Luke, (tradition, which points out a hill between Capernaum and Tiberias as the Mount of Beatitudes, near the present Saphet, is, in such a matter, utterly worthless,) or, the mountain district, certainly imported by the word in ch. xi. 39, ὁθαυτῶς] in the wider sense: including those of the Apostles already called, and all who had, either for a long or a short time, attached themselves to Him as hearers. See John vi. 66.—2. ἄνοιξεν τ. στ. α الساعة as in ref., a solemn introduction to some discourse or advice of importance. —ἐντὸς] i.e. τούς μαθητὰς. The discourse (see vv. 13, 14, 20, 48. vi. 9, vii. 6) was spoken directly to the disciples, but (see vii. 28, 29) also generally to the multitudes. It is a Divine commentary on the words with which His own and the Baptist's preaching opened: μετανοητικὸν δὲ γενέσα τῇ ἑοιμ. τ. συμβ. It divides itself into various great sections, which see below. 3—16.] The description of the Lord's disciples, their blessedness, and dignity.—οἱ πν. τ. πν.] οὐκ οἶνοι, οἱ πν. τ. χρήσιν, ἀλλὰ οἱ πν. τ. πνευμάτι, τούτιστα, οἱ ταπεινοὶ τῇ προσωπείᾳ καὶ τῷ ψυχὴ. Euthym. τι ἐστιν “οἱ πνευματικοὶ τῇ πνευματί,” οἱ ταπεινοὶ καὶ συνετριμμένοι τῷ καρδίαν. Chrysostom. Homil. xv. in Matt. Ne quis putaret paupertatem, quae nonnuncquam necessitate portaria, a Domino praedicari, adjuxit, spiritum, ut humiliatatam intelleges, non penuriam. Beati pauperes spiritu, qui propter Spiritum Sanctum voluntari sunt pauperes. Jerome in loc. [In the Oxford translation of the Catena Aurea, this last clause is rendered, the poor in spirit are those who embrace a voluntary poverty for the sake of the Holy Spirit (!)] Pau- peres spiritu, humiles et timentes Deum, id est, non habentes infanatem (or, infatuum) spiritum. (Augustine in loc.) Again: Paup- per Dei in animo est, non in sacculo. (Aug. Enarr. in Ps. cxxxi. 26.)—τῇ πν. is in
The spiritual qualification in the former verse must be carried on to this, and the mourning understood to mean not only that on account of sin, but all such as happens to a man in the spiritual life. All such mourners are blessed: for the Father of mercies and God of all consolation being their covenant God, His comfort shall overbear all their mourning, and taste the sweeter for it. In Luke ii. 25 the Messiah's coming is called the consolation of Israel. This consolation is, by many editors (Lachmann, e.g.), placed after ver. 5. But the authority is by no means decisive, and I cannot see how the logical coherence of the sentences is improved by it. In placing these two beatitudes first, the Lord follows the order in Is. lxi. 1, which He proclaimed in the synagogue at Nazareth. Luke iv. 18. — of προσευχὴς A citation from Ps. xxxvii. 11. The usual dividers and allocutors of the earth being mighty and proud conquerors, and the Messiah being expected as such a conqueror, this announcement, that the meek should inherit the earth, struck at the root of the temporal expectations of power and wealth in the Messiah's kingdom. This meekness is not mere outward lowliness of demeanour, but that true προσευχή of Eph. iv. 2, whose active side (Stier) is αὐτοπίστις, and its passive side μακροθυμία. On the promise, compare Is. lvii. 13—15. ix. 1. — coram. That kingdom of God which begins in the hearts of the disciples of Christ, and is not έκ τοῦ εἱρμού τοῦ, shall work onwards till it shall become actually a kingdom over this earth, and its subjects shall inherit the earth. — 8.) See Ps. cvii. 9. lxxv. 22. 26. Is. xli. 17. This hunger and thirst is the true sign of that new life on which those born of the Spirit (John iii. 5) have entered; and it is after δίκαιος, i.e. perfect conformity to the holy will of God. This was His meat, John iv. 34. Ilo cibo satusbuntur de quo ipse Dominus dicit, Meus cibus est ut faciam voluntatem Patris mei, quod est, justitia: et ills aqua, de quae quisquis bibet, ut Idem dicit, fiet in eo fons aquae saliens in vitam aeternam. (See Ps. xvii. 15.) Aug. But he elsewhere says, (in Ev. Joh. Tract. 26. 1.) after quoting this verse, "Justitiam vero nobis esse Christum, Paulus Apostolus dicit. Ac per hoc qui esurit Hunc Panem, esuriat Justitiam: sed justitiam que de cœlo descendit, justitiam quam dat Deus, non quam sibi facit homo." (Chrysostom confines himself to the moral explanation, as also Euthymius.) They shall be satisfied—in the new heaven and new earth, ἐν οἷς δικαιοσύνης κατωτέρα. 2 Pet. iii. 13. This hunger and thirst after r., is admirably set forth in the three first petitions of the Lord's prayer. It is followed be Thy name—Thy kingdom come—Thy will be done on earth, as it is in heaven.—7. δειλινοὶ ὁμιλοῦσιν χρημάτων μόνων ἐκείνῳ ἐλεημόροις καὶ λόγον καὶ
 Orig. Euseb, canon. Hier. Ambr. tzt B C. — 9. αὐτοί om. C D 2 αὐτοί Syr. Hil. ins. B 10. Clem. Alex. Strom. IV. p. 582, after having quoted this verse as in text, says, ἡ ἐς τῶν μεταποίησιν τὰ εἰσαγόμενα, μακάριοι, ψεύδων, οἱ δὲ ὑπὸ τῆς δικ., ὅτι αὐτοὶ ἔστησαν τὴν καθίσματι, καὶ μακάριοι οἱ δεδομένοι ἔστιν εἰμι, ὅτι ἔξω ἔτοι τὸν οὐ διώκτησιν. — 11. ῥήμα om. B 25 have Copt. Χεθ. Hil. Lucat. ins. C. — ψεύδ. om. D 26 Orig. Tert. Hil. Lucat. Ambr. ins. B C. — ένεκεν δικαιοσύνης D 26 Hil. Ambr. — 12. τῷ εὐφ. D ab 1 Tert. Hil. Lucat. — 13. κατά 22 add υπάρξερ εὐφ. D. — 14. τοῦ 22 τοῦ. — οἵ τις ἔχεται, διὰ δικαιῶν. ποικίλος, γράφεται, γὰρ τοῖς ἐκλεισθείσας γίνεται, καὶ πλεῖστοι αὐτὸν οὐκ ἔλησαν ἔλησθον δὲ, ἐνανθάναι μὲν, παρὰ ἀνθρώπων λεγόντως ἐκλήθαν δὲ, παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ. Euthymius, defending Chrysostom. This dispute comprises every degree of sympathy and mutual love and help: from that fulness of it which is shed abroad in those who have been forgiven much, and therefore love much,—down to those first beginnings of the new birth, even among those who know not the Lord, which are brought out in ch. xxv. 37—40, where see notes. — 8. καθ. τ. κ. See Ps. xxiv. 4. 6. — 10. ἐκλεισθείσαι, nor mere moral purity, that is here meant: but that inner purity, which (Acts xxv. 9) is brought about by faith, has its fruit (1 Tim. i. 5) in love; which, as such, expels the world, &c., opposed to all διάφυμα (James i. 8), and all hypocrisy and outward colouring; so that the καθ. τ. κ. are αἱ τὰς καρδίας απὸ πονηρω ἐσυνειδομένων ἱδρυματίσμοι (Heb. x. 22). 'Hoc est mundum cor, quod est simplex cor: et quemadmodum lumen hoc videri non potest nisi oculus mundi, ita nec Deus videtur nisi mundum sit illud quo videri potest.' (Aug. in loc.) But there is also allusion to the nearer vision of God attained by progressive sanctification, of which Paul speaks, 2 Cor. iii. 18, begun indeed in this life, but not perfected till the next, 1 Cor. xiii. 12. Those who have the opportunity should read the magnific conclusion of Augustine De Civit. Del, book xxii. 29, in which he enters more deeply into the meaning of this verse. — 9. ἐκλεισθείσαι] More than 'the peaceful' ('pacifici,' Vulg.). It is doubtful whether the word ever has this meaning. (See note on James iii. 18, and Xen. in ref.) Thus Euthymius, mostly after Chrysostom: οἱ μὴ μόνον αὐτοὶ μὴ σταυρίζοντες, diaδι καὶ εἰρήνους σταυρώσατος συνάγομεν εἰς εἰρήνην: οἱ δὲ θεοῦ κληρονομοῦντες, ὡς μιμοῦμεν τὸν μονογενῆ αὐτοῦ φίλον ἔργων, συναγαγόν τὰ δικαια, καὶ καταλαμβάνον τὰ λεγόμενα. — κληρονομεῖν] Implies the reality, as in ver. 19; 'shall be called,' i. e. recognized, in the highest sense, both generally and by the Highest Himself, as such. Let it ever be remembered, according to the order of these beatitudes, and the assertion of James iii. 17, that the wisdom from above is πρὸς τοῦ ἄγνωτον ἄγνωστον ἄγνωστον, implying no compromise with evil. And it is in the working out of this ἄγνωστος that Luke xii. 51 is especially true. — 10.] Martyres non facit poena, sed causa. Nam si poena martyris faceret, omnis metalla martyris plures essent, omnis catena martyris trabantem: omnes qui gladio ferturunt, coronarentur. Nemo ergo dictat, Quia pater, justus sum. Quia ipse qui primo passus est, pro justitia passus est, idea maxima exceptionem addidit. Beati qui persecutionem patiuntur propter justitiam. (Aug. Enarr. in Ps. xxxiv. 13.) See 1 Pet. iii. 14. iv. 14, which probably refers to this verse. The repetition of the promise in ver. 3 is a close of the string of promises as it began. See var. read. — 11.] With the preceding verse the beatitudes end, in their general reference, and in this our Lord addresses his disciples particularly. The actions described in this verse are the expansion of δεδομένων in the last. διώκεισθαι, however, still means 'persevere;' its legal usage is unknown in the N. T. ῥήμα, if admitted into the text, is, in the Hebraistic sense of 'thing said.' See ref. ψεύδομενοι does not belong to ἐνεκεν εἰμι, as some recent commentators have supposed (Tholuck, Meyer), but to εἰκοσι. — 12. ο μισθός τι.] A reward, not of debt, but of grace, as the parable in ch.

xx. 1 ff. clearly represents it. 'An expression,' as De Wette observes, 'taken from our earthly commerce, and applied to spiritual things,' in which however we must remember, that the principal reference is to God as the giver, and not to us as the deservers: see the parable above cited, where the seed is not what was sown, but what was sown. 'Deus est debtor vosser non ex commissio, sed ex promisso.' Aug. (Tholuck, Bergp. p. 114.)—

διωγμέαν For instance, Jeremiah (Jer. xx. 2) was scourged: Zechariah, son of Jehoiada, was stoned, 2 Chron. xxiv. 21. Isaiah, according to Jewish tradition, was sawn asunder by Mannaasch. — The reasoning implied in γερ may be thus filled up: 'and great will be their reward in heaven.'—15. ] The transition from the preceding verses is easy and natural, from the διωγμοί ἐντεκα δικαιοσύνης, of which vv. 11, 12 were a sort of application, and the allusion to the ancient Prophets, to υμεῖς ἱερό τοῦ Δ. τ. γ. Elieha healed the unwholesome water by means of salt (2 Kings ii. 20), and the ordinary use of salt for culinary purposes is to prevent putrefaction: so (see Gen. xviii. 23—33) are the righteous, the people of God, in this corrupt world. — It hardly seems necessary to find instances of the actual occurrence of salt losing its savour, for this is merely hypothetical. Yet it is perhaps worth noticing, that Maundrell, in his travels, found salt in the Valley of Salt, near Gehul, which had the appearance, but not the taste, having lost it by exposure to the elements (but qu. ?) — and that Schöttgen maintains that a kind of bitumen from the Dead Sea was called 'sal Sdomiticus,' and was used to sprinkle the sacrifices in the temple; which salt was used, when its savour was gone, to stew the temple pavement, that the priests might not slip. This, however, is but poorly made out by him. (Schöttgen, Hor. Hebr. in loc.) — τοῦ γεν. mankind and all creation; but a more inward reference, as to the working of the salt, than in τὸ κόσμον, ver. 14, where there is probably a merely figurative allusion. — μερανθη = ἐναλν γίνεται, Mark ix. 50. — ἐλευθερώσεως] i.e. the salt; not impersonal, as Luther has rendered it, — omnit wirb manälten for τὸ ἀλας is the nom. to all three verbs, μορανθη, ἀλεθη, and ισχυον. The sense is: If you become untrue to your high calling, and spiritually effete and corrupted, there are no ordinary means by which you can be reconverted and brought back to your former state, inasmuch as you have no teachers and guides over you, but ought yourselves to be teachers and guides to others. But we must not from this supposition that our Lord denies all repentance to those who have thus fallen: the scope of His saying must be taken into account, which is not to crush the fallen, but to quicken the sense of duty, and cause His disciples to walk worthy of their calling. (See Heb. vi. 4—6, and note on Mark ix. 49, 50.) — The salt in the sacrifice is the type of God's covenant of sanctification, whereby this earth shall be again hallowed for Him: His people are the instruments, in His hand, of this wholesome salting: all His servants in general, but the teachers and ministers of His covenant in particular. Chrysostom observes, οὐ μὴν γαρ ἄλλοι μυστήρια πιστοτει, δύνανται τυχεῖν συγγράψεις ὁ δὲ διὰ σκαλακός καὶ τόσοῦ πάθῳ, πάσης ἀπίστηται ἀπόλογια, καὶ τὴν ἰσχά την δοσὶ τιμησάν (Hom. x. 194, C. 7.). — ἀπὸ τότε ἤσιν ὃπιστεῖ τοῦ διάσκαλου ἀξίωματος καὶ κατατάσσεται, τουρκον, καταρακτώσων. Euglym. in loc. There does not appear to be any allusion to ecclesiastical excommunication. — 14. τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου] And yet only in a lower and derivative sense; Christ Himself being τὸ φῶς τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ, ὁ φωτιζεῖ πάντα ἀνθρώπων, ἰσχύον τῶν κόσμων. (John i. 9, viii. 12.) His ministers are λόγοι, John v. 35, and φωτηγείς, Phil. ii. 15, receiving their light, and only burning for a time. 'Johannes lumen illuminatum: Christus lumen illuminans.' Aug. Serm. ccclxxii. 7. And here, too, φῶς in this verse = λόγος in ver. 16, where the comparison is resumed. So also Eph. v. 8: ητε σκοτος, νῦν δὲ φῶς ἐν νυμβρίοις, as partaking of His Light, as δύνασθαι. Of course it is possible that our Lord may have had some town before Him thus
situated, but not Bethulia, whose very existence is probably fabulous, being only mentioned in the apocryphal book of Judith; nor Saphet, which did not then exist. (Robs. iii. 325.) But the Church of God, the city on a hill, (Is. ii. 1. Rev. xxi. 10, see also Heb. xii. 22,) in allusion to their present situation on a mountain, is most probably the leading thought.—15. μύσων] A vessel usually found in the house, called generally σευνος, Luke viii. 16,—a Latin word.—καλωσις, i.e. men in general; showing, in the spiritual reference of the parable, that these lights of the world are 'lighted' by Him for whose use they are. See above.—16. οὖν] i.e. like a candle on a candlestick,—like a city on a hill; no οὖν, δεῦρος, so, . . . . that, 'as our English Version seems rather to imply.' By rendering οὖν 'in like manner,' the ambiguity will be avoided. See reff. The sense of this verse is as if it were τους ους τους ζων της ζωος, δεδωκας εις την ζωον της ζωος, the latter verb, and not the former, carrying the purpose of the action. Thus the praise and glory of a well-lighted and brilliant feast would be given, not to the lights, but to the master of the house; and of a stately city on a hill, not to the buildings, but to those who built them.—The whole of this division of our Lord's sermon is addressed to all His followers, not exclusively to the ministers of his word. All servants of Christ are the salt of the earth, the light of the world (Phil. ii. 16). And all that is here said applies to us all. But à fortiori does it apply, in its highest sense, to those who are, among Christians, selected to teach and to be examples; who are, as it were, the towers and pinacities of the city, not only not hid, but seen far and wide above the rest.

17—48. The second part of the sermon, in which the Lord sets forth His relation, as a lawyer, to the law of Moses, especially as currently interpreted according to the letter only. 17. ἤρθαν. Observe how the Lord, through the whole sermon, sets forth Himself, in His proceeding forth from God, as the true ἤρθαν. It is a question whether the Lord includes the prophecies, properly so called, in His meaning here. I think not: for no person professing himself to be the Messiah, would be thought to contradict the prophecies, but to fulfill them. Neither, it appears, does our Lord here allude to the sacrificial and typical parts of the law, but to the moral parts of both the law and the prophets; which indeed He proceeds to cite and particularize. If we however prefer to include both ceremonial and moral in this assertion, we may understand it in its more general sense as applying, beyond the instances here given, to our Lord's typical fulfilment of the law, which could not as yet be unfolded. Thus Augustine: "Hae precepta sunt morum; illa sacra-menta sunt promissorum: haec implantur per adjuvatum gravior, illa per redivivam veritatem, utraseque per Christum, et illam semper gravior donantem, nunc etiam revelantem, et hanc veritatem tunc promitentem, nunc exhibentem." Contr. Faust. xix. 18. —πληρωθεσια implies more than the mere fulfilling; see reff., where the word has the sense of filling out or expanding; i.e. here, giving a deeper and holier sense to,—fulfilling in the spirit, which is nobler than the letter. Theophylact compares the ancient law to a sketch, which the painter of katalo, άλλην ανα-πληρητ. . . του νομου γα τα τηλη των διαμερισμων καλων, των Χριστου και τους αρχες εκκινουσι. Euthym. in loc. ιντι ο νομον ουν εις καταλος, αλλην επιπλησια παραδοσιας της θεου, άλλης επιπλησιας της αρχες περιοδου αμφότερα ταυτα μιλλαντα ανθρωποι ταραττειν προς τους τιμωρους εκκινους εγγραφαι νομους, και ἐξαιλλο τε μιλλον αυτων υπομονης τη διανοια. τι δε η το φως άλλων και αντιερεους; ιντι μιλλον αυτων ταυτα μιλλαντα εναριστη παλαιων νομιμων ποιειν, ταυτη τοις λαγη μιλλαντα εν αναριστη παλαιων νομιμων. Chrysost. Hom. xxv. The gnostic Marcion characteristically enough maintained that the Judaizing Christians had altered this verse, and that it originally stood,—τι
a German writer of this school has expressed it, 'a mythology not so attractive as that of Greece (1)!'. That this is the course which unbelief has run in Germany, should be a pregnant warning to the deciers of the O.T. among ourselves. It should be a maxim for every expositor and every student that Scripture is a whole, and stands or falls together. That this is now beginning to be deeply felt in Germany, we have cheering testimonies in the later editions of their best commentators, and in the valuable work of Stier on the discourses of our Lord.—19.] There is little difficulty in this verse, if we consider it in connexion with the verse preceding, to which it is bound by the σὺν and the τούτων, and with the following, to which the γὰρ unites it. Bearing this in mind, we see (1) that λόγος, on account of what follows in ver. 20 and after, must be taken in the higher sense, as referring to the spirit and not the letter; 'whosoever shall break,' in the sense presently to be laid down. (2) That τῶν ἐν... τούτων. τῶν Ἰ. refers to λόγα ἐν Ἰηροί καὶ καὶ τοίς καθαρίας, and to the following, and these minute commands which seem as insignificant, in comparison with the greater, as the ἱερα καὶ καθαρία in comparison with great portions of writing. (3) That ἀλλαχῶς κλήθ. does not mean 'shall be excluded from,' inasmuch as the question is not of keeping, or not keeping, the commandments of God, in a legal sense, but of appreciating, and causing others to appreciate, the import and weight of even the most insignificant parts of God's revelation of Himself to man; and rather, therefore, applies to teachers than to Christians in general, though to them also through the λόγος and τούτων. (4) That no deduction can be drawn from these words binding the Jewish law, or any part of it, as such, upon Christians. That this is so, is plainly shown by what follows, where our Lord proceeds to pour upon the letter of the law the fuller light of the spirit of the Gospel; thus lifting and expanding (not destroying) every jot and tittle of that precursory dispensation into its full meaning in the life.
and practice of the Christian; who, by the indwelling of the Divine Teacher, God’s Holy Spirit, is led into all truth and purity. (6) That these words of our Lord are decisive against such persons, whether ancient or modern, as would set aside the Old Testament as without significance, or inconsistent with the New. See the last note, and the Book of Common Prayer, Article vii.—On ἐνθάδεται, see note on ver. 9. ἔνθασθαι is in direct allusion to ἐνθασθείωσας; but it can hardly be said (De Wette) that, because there is no article, it means ‘one of the least’ (εἷς γεριγείντες), for the article is often omitted after an appellative verb. μέγας rests on different grounds; being positive, and in its nature generic. See ch. xviii. 1—5. ch. xi. 11. 20. An expansion of the ideas contained in περασαίναι, ver. 17, and of the difference between λογός, which the Scribes and Pharisees did by enforcing the letter to the neglect of the spirit—and ποιήσω καὶ διδάξω, in which particulars Christians were to exceed the Pharisees, the punctilious observers, and the Scribes, the traditional expounders—of the law. ξυκοσιοσύνη, purity of heart and life, as set forth by example in the ποιοῦντες, and by precept in the διδάσκοντες. The whole of the rest of our Lord’s sermon is a comment on, and illustration of, the assertion in this verse.—γραμματείς Persons devoted to the work of reading and expounding the law (Heb. ἡχό), whose office seems first to have become frequent after the return from Babylon. They generally appear in the N. T. in connexion with the Pharisees; but it appears from Acts xxiii. 9, that there were Scribes attached to the other sects also. In Matt. xxi. 15, they appear with the chief priests; but it is in the temple, where (see also Luke xx. 1) they acted as a sort of police. In the description of the assembling of the great Sanhedrim (Matt. xxvi. 3. Mark xiv. 53. xiv. 1) we find it composed of ἀρχιερείς, πρεσβύτεροι, and γραμματίς; and in Luke xxiii. 66, of ἀρχιερεῖς and γραμματίς. The Scribes uniformly opposed themselves to our Lord; watching Him to find matter of accusation, Luke vii. 7. xi. 53, 54; perverting His sayings, Matt. ix. 3, and His actions, Luke v. 30. xv. 2; seeking to entangle Him by questions, Matt. xxvii. 35 (see note there), Luke x. 26. xx. 21; and to embarrass Him, Matt. xii. 38. Their authority as expounders of the law is recognized by our Lord Himself, Matt. xxiii. 1, 2; their adherence to the oral traditionary exposition proved, Matt. xv. 1; the respect in which they were held by the people shown, Luke xx. 46; their existence not only in Jerusalem but also in Galilee, shown, Luke v. 17, and in Rome, Josephus Ant. xviii. 3, 5. They kept schools and auditories for teaching the youth, Luke ii. 46. Acts v. 34, comp. with xxii. 3; are called by Josephus πατρίους Πηγαί, μνόμον, Ἀντ. xvii. 6. 2; σοφισταί, B. J. i. 33. 2.—οὗ μὲν ἐχάλλοντας. A very usual form (see ch. vii. 21. xviii. 3. xix. 17. 23); implying exclusion from the blessings of the Christian state, and the inheritance of eternal life.—ἔχοντες] viz. by the reading of the law in the synagogues, and the expositions of the Scribes. —τοῖς ἀρχαίοις has been rendered, as in E. V., by the ancients; in which case, Moses and his traditional expounders are classed together; or to the ancients,—which last interpretation seems to me to be certainly the right one. Both constructions are found (see ref.); but every instance of the former is either (as ch. vi. 1) resolvable into the latter, or, as Luke xxiii. 15, ambiguous, and none can be produced with ἦχθη, whereas all the latter have this very word, which is never followed in the N. T. or LXX by any other substantive but that denoting the persons to whom the words are spoken. [In ‘Notes on the Gospels and Acts,’ Pickering, 1838 (anonymous), Rom. ix. 12 is cited as decisive for the sense by (1).] The omission of τοῖς ἀρχαίοις, vers. 27. 31. 36. 43, also favours the rendering to, which was the interpretation of the Greek Fathers. Chrysostom expands it thus: τις οὗ τοῖς ἄρχαιοις, ἔχοντες, ὁ καὶ λειτυόντις. ἄντων ἀλλὰ τῶν ἀφροῦντως αὐτὰ τίθηναι, ἠταίρακεν ὁ οὗτος ἄρχαιοις τοὺς φύσεις κατανέμειν τε ὁ και λειτυόντις. ὀφεῖλεν οὖν Ἄρσεν τῷ Θεῷ ὁ ἀρχαίος, ἠταίρακεν ὁ οὗτος ἄρχαιοις.
The judgment-seat of Christ. The most important thing to keep in mind is, that there is no distinction of kind between these punishments, only of degree. In the thing compared, the κρίσεις inflicted death by the sword, the συνέδριον death by stoning, and the disgrace of the γίνεσθαι τοῦ πυρὸς followed as an intensification of the horrors of death; but the punishment is one and the same—death. So also in the subject of the similitude, all the punishments are spiritual; all result in eternal death; but with various degrees, as the degrees of guilt have been. And the words here mentioned must not be superstitiously supposed to have any damming power in themselves (see below), but to represent states of anger and hostility, for which an awful account hereafter must be given.

On ἐκθέμενοι, Euthymius remarks: τοὺς ἀρχικούς, τοὺς ἀρχικούς, καὶ πᾶσαν ἀν ἐρείσῃ τοῖς ἀκούοντες, ὧν ἐν πάλιν μετά, ὅτι ἦσαν τοῖς ἀρχικοῖς παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς μου, ἐκτόκοι, καὶ ἐκτακτοὶ, καὶ πᾶσαν τοῖς ἀρχικοῖς συναντάμεθα. Meyer (ed. 2) has well observed that ἰδρυθήκεις τοῖς ἀρχικοῖς corresponds to λέγω δὲ ὅτι, and the λέγω to the understood subject of ἰδρυθήκεις. He has not, however, apprehended the deeper truth which underlies the omission of the subject of ἰδρυθήκεις, that it was the same Person who said both. It will be noticed that our Lord does not here speak against the abuse of the law by tradition, but that every instance here given is either from the law itself, or such traditional teaching as was in accordance with it (e.g. the latter part of this verse is only a formal expansion of the former). The contrasts here are not between the law misunderstood and the law rightly understood, but between the imperfection of the law and its ancient exposition, which in their letter, and as given, were κατὰ τοὺς ἀρχικούς, and the same as spiritualized, παραλαμβάνων, by Christ: not between two lawgivers, Moses and Christ, but between δραμάτες, and Christ (the idea is Chrysostom’s) the children by the same bondwoman of the bondwoman and of the free woman. —κρίσεις [viz. the courts in every city, ordered Deut. xvi, 18, and explained by Josephus Antt. iv, 8, 14 to consist of seven men, and to have the power of life and death. But τῇ κρίσει in the next verse (see note) is the court of judgment in the Messiah’s kingdom. —22.] The sense is: ‘There were among the Jews three well-known degrees of guilt, coming respectively under the cognizance of the local and the supreme courts, and after these is set the γίνεσθαι τοῦ πυρὸς, the end of the malefactor, whose corpse, thrown out into the valley of Hinnom, was devoured by the worm or the flame. Similarly, in the spiritual kingdom of Christ, He judges the sins even of thought and word be brought into judgment and punished, each according to its degree of guilt, but even the least of them before no less a tribunal than the
πυρός. 23 είναι οὖν ὑποσφέρεις τὸ δῶρόν σου ἐπὶ τὸ ὑστεριστήριον καὶ μνημοσύνης ὁτι ὁ ἀδέλφος σου ἐκεῖ τῇ κατα σου, 24 ἀφες ικεῖ τὸ δῶρὸν σου ἐμπροσθεν τοῦ ὑστεριστήριου, καὶ ὑπαγε πρῶτον ἀπὸ τὸ ἀδελφόν σου, καὶ τότε ἐλευθερία προσφέρει τὸ δῶρόν σου. 25 ἀφεῖς ὑπῶνων τῷ ἀντικείμενῳ σου ταχύ, ὡς ἔστων ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὕδατι μετὰ αὐτοῦ, ὑποτείνετε σε ἐπαρχία οὗ ἀντικείμενοι τῷ κρύπτῃ καὶ ὁ κρυπτός ἑκείνῃ τῷ ὑποτέθηκεν, καὶ εἰς φυλακήν ἐλεηθήσοντα. 26 ἀμήν λέγω σοι, ὅτι μή ἐξέλθῃ ἐκείνῃ ἐν ἀποδόσῃ τοῦ ἐσχατοῦ καθορισμοῦ. 27 ἢ ἐκείνη ἡ ἐτέρα ὑμῖν ὃ ὅπερ τὸ ἄνευν γνωκά πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμεῖσαι ἀμήν ζῆν ἐν τῷ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ.

Cypr. txt B. — 24. ἐκατολάγητοι D. txt B.—ὑποφέρεις D. ab. — 25. σε παραδώσει D.—σε παραδώσω ομ. B 2 Arm. Chrys. Hil. ins. (παραδώσω D) D (see prolegem.). — ἀντίκειμενος D. — οὐκέπειν D. — 27. ὑπὸ ἐκείνην οὐκ εἰσέλθη τῇ ἐσχάτῳ καθορισμῷ καθορίσας οὐκ ὑπερβάλλεις σε ὑπάρχουσας ἲδονικαῖς ἡμᾶς. Chrysostom remarks: καθαίρει σφόδρα τοὺς μόνους τὰ προσφυγματικὰ τῶν νοομάτων τίθηναι, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ διορθωτικὰ, σωτὴρ καὶ αὐτὸς σωτῆρ. τὸ μὲν γὰρ κειμένων καλεῖται μόρφων, προφυγματικὸν ἢτο τῆς ἤγερσάς τοῦ, ἵνα κειμένωσι τῶν κατάλαγην, τῶν μετὰ τῆς ἤγερσας γενομένων νουματικῶν ἀναφηκτίων. Hom. xvi. p. 218. B. The whole of his comment on this verse is excellent.—No conclusion whatever can be drawn from this verse as to the admissibility of the term altar as applied to the Lord's Table under the Christian system. The whole language is Jewish, and can only be understood of Jewish rites. The command, of course, applies in full form as to reconciliation before the Christian offering of prayer and thanksgiving in the Holy Communion; but further nothing can be inferred. — 25.] The whole of this verse is the earthly example of a spiritual duty which is understood, and runs parallel with it. The sense may be given: As in worldly affairs, it is prudent to make up a matter with an adversary before judgment is passed which may deliver a man to a hard and rigorous imprisonment, so reconciliation with an offended brother in this life is absolutely necessary before his wrong cry against us to the Great Judge, and we be cast into eternal condemnation. — The ἀντικείμενος, in its abstract personification, is the offended law of God, which will cry against us in that day for all wrongs done to others; but in its concrete representation it is the offended brother, who is to us that law, as long as he has its claim upon us. — These words, as in the earthly example they imply future liberation, because an earthly debt can be paid in most cases, so in the spiritual counterpart they amount to a negation of it, because the debt can never be discharged. ὑπερβάλλεις = πράσεκωρ in Luke xii. 68, and is the officer of the court who saw the sentences executed. καθορισμόν, quadrans, a Latin word (= λεπτόν in § Luke), the fourth part of an as. See note on Luke, l. c. — 28. τῶν σε βλέψων] The precise meaning should be in this verse be kept in mind, as the neglect of it may lead into error. Our Lord is speaking of the sin of adultery; and therefore, however the saying may undoubtedly apply by implication to cases where this sin is out of the question — e.g. the impure beholding of an unmarried woman with a view to fornication — yet the direct assertion in this verse must be understood as applying to the cases where this sin is in question. And, again, the βλέπων πρὸς τῷ ἐπαθ. must not be interpreted of the casual evil thought which is checked by holy watchfulness, but the gazing with a view to feed that desire (for so πρὸς τοῖς with an inf. must mean). And

again, δέ τι μετ. τ. τ. εἰς, whatever it may undoubtedly imply respecting the guilt incurred in God's sight, does not directly state any thing; but plainly understood, affirms that the man who can do this—viz. 'gaze with a view to feed unlawful desire'—has already in his heart passed the barrier of criminal intention; made up his mind, stiffened his conscience; in thought, committed the deed. — But perhaps there is justice in Siger's remark, Reden Jesu I. 145, that the Lord speaks here after the O. T. usage, in which both in the seventh commandment and elsewhere adultery also includes fornication: for marriage is the becoming one flesh, and therefore every such union, except that after the manner and in the state appointed by God, is a violation and contempt of that holy ordinance. — 29.] An admonition, arising out of the truth announced in the last verse, to withstand the first springs and occasions of evil desire, even by the sacrifice of what is most useful and dear to us. 'ταῦτα προσεῖται, οὔ περι μελῶν διαλεγόμενον ἀπαγε' συνδυασμὸν γαί τῆς σαρκὸς τοῦ γῆς. — ἄλλα πανταχοῦ τῆς γνώμης τῆς συναγωγῆς ἡ κατηγορία. οὐ γάρ ὁ φθανταὶ ιστιν οἱ ὀργῆς ἄλλ' οἱ κοίται καὶ οἱ λογισμοῖς. Chrysostom: and to the same effect Euthymius, who adds, 'ἄλλα φθάνοντας μὲν δεινών κατειλ. τόν δικών φθαρμον στεργομένον διείσοντο φιλον χειρα δι δεινών, τόν δικών χειρὸς χρεσμονεύοντα διεισοντα ὑπεράντων, καὶ εἴπει αἵρεσε εἰναι, εἴτε γνωσιαίς λέγει τοῖν πρεπεῖ δι καὶ τοιούτου σκανδαλιζομενίας καὶ πρὸς ἑκάστων, μὴ τοῖν δικίνας ἄλλ' ἑκακουν αὐτῆς τῆς πρὸς ἑκάστην, καὶ δὲ λέγει τοῖς ζώοις ταύτῃ. — Chrysostom reports that he had heard αἰτί δις ἀρθείς αἰτίς, an interpretation of the.
Otherwise this one strictly guarded exception would give indefinite and universal latitude. — τομεί ἀφτ. μουχ.] 'Per alias nuptias, quorum potestatem dat divorium.' Bengel.—καλ δὲ λανδος] How far the marriage of the innocent party after separation on account of πορνεία, is forbidden by this or the parallel passage ch. xix. 9, is a weighty and difficult question. By the Roman Church such marriage is strictly forbidden, and the authority of Augustine much cited, who strongly upholds this view, but not without misgivings later in life. 'Scripta duos libros de conjugis adulterinis, ... cupiens solvere difficiillimam questionem. Quod utrum enodassime fecerim nescio; immo vero non me perseverare ad hujusvis rei perfectionem sentio.' Retract. i. 57. On the other hand, the Protestant and Greek Churches allow such marriage. Certainly it would appear, from the literal meaning of our Lord's words, that it should not be allowed; for if by such divorce the marriage be altogether dissolved, how can the woman be said μουχουθήναι as second marriage? or how will St. Paul's precept (1 Cor. vi. 11) find place, in which he says, δεν δί και χαροθήναν, μεντόν ἄγαμος, ἢ τῷ ἄνδρι καταλαγητώ; for stating this as St. Paul does, prefixed by the words οὐκ ἐγώ, αλλ' ὅ φροιμο, it must be understood, as referring to the very marriage, and consequently can only suppose πορνεία as the cause. Besides which, the tenor of our Lord's teaching in other places (see above) seems to set before us the state of marriage as absolutely indissoluble as such, however He may sanction the expulsion a menad et thoro of an unfaithful wife.—Those who defend the other view suppose the ἄπολυμφηνα to mean the woman unlawfully divorced, not for πορνεία: and certainly this is not improbable. We may well leave a matter in doubt, of which Augustine could write thus: 'In ipsis divinis sententiis its obscuring us utrum et iste, cui quidem sine dube adulterum licet dimittere, adulter tamen habeatur si alteram duxerit, ut, quantum existimo, venialiter ibi quisque fallatur.' De Fide atq. Op. c.19.—33, 34.] The exact meaning of these verses is to be ascertained by two considerations. (1) That the Jews held all those oaths not to be binding in which the sacred name of God did not directly occur; as Phileastes (De Special. legg. p. 770 Potter), προελαβῇται τις το βοῦλοι, μη μιν το ἀνωτάτω και προελαβήταις εὐθὺς αἰτημ., ἀλλά γὰρ, ἔλιον, αἰτήμα, ἐννοοῦν, τὴν οἴκους τομον. And Lightfoot (Hor. Hebr. ad locum) cites from the rabbinical books, 'Si quis jurat per culum, per terram, per solem, etc. non est juramentum.' It therefore appears that a stress is to be laid on this technical distinction in the quotation made by our Lord; and we must understand as belonging to the quotation, 'but whatever thou shalt swear not to the Lord may be transgressed.' (2) Then our Lord passes so far beyond this rule, that He lays down (including in it the understanding that all oaths must be kept 'if made, for that they are all ultimately referable to swearing by God) the rule of the Christian community, which is, not to swear at all; for that every such means of strengthening a man's simple affirmation arises out of the evil in human nature, is rendered requisite by the distrust that sin has induced, and is, therefore, out of the question among the just and true and pure of heart. See James v. 12. In the words, 'Swear not at all,' our Lord does not so much make a positive enactment by which all swearing is to individuals forbidden, e.g. on solemn occasions, and for the asseveration of others, (for that would be a mere technical Pharisaism wholly at variance with the spirit of the Gospel, and inconsistent with the example of God Himself, Heb. vi. 13—17. vii. 21; of the Lord when on earth, whose ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν was a solemn asseveration, and Who at once respected the solemn adjuration of Caiphas, ch. xxvi. 63, 64; of His Apostles writing under the guidance of His Spirit, see Gal. i. 20. 2 Cor. i. 23. Rom. i. 9. Phil. i. 8, and especially 1 Cor. xv. 31,) as declare to us, that the proper state of Christians is, to reject all oaths; that when τὸ πορνεία is expelled from among them, every νοι and as will be as decisive as an oath, every promise as binding as a vow. We observe (α) that these verses imply the unfitness of νοι of every kind as rules of Christian action; (β) that the greatest regard ought to be had to the scruples of those, not only sects, but individuals, who object to taking an oath, and every facility given in a Christian state for their ultimate entire abolition. There
θρόνος εστι του θεου 35 μητε εν τη γη, οτι υποτοδιον x ch. xxii. 44. 
εστι των ποδων αυτου, μητε εις Ιεροσολυμα, οτι πωλις γ — here only. 
εστι του μεγαλου βασιλεως, 36 μητε εν τη κεφαλη σου 
ωμετρι, οτι ου δυνατα μιαν της θεου καθη ανλαιαν. 37 * εστω δε ο λογος υμων 
vai vai ου γιοντος των μετα πονηρου εστιν. 38 Ηκουσαι 
οτι ερρηθη οφθαλμον αντι οφθαλμου, και οδοντα αντι 
οδοντου. 39 εγω δε λεγω υμιν μη αντιστηναι την πονηρον 
αλλα οσις σε ειπε την δεξιαν σου σιαγονα.

for δε δαν απ. γαμ. θ απολ. γαμησας Β β; but see ch. xix. 9. — 37. for έσω, ησων Β. 
txt D abc Iren. Cypr. — 38. και om. D abc Hil. — 39. παντινι Β. ttx D. — for ινι, 
is an elaborate account in Tholuck, Berg- 
predigt, p. 282 ff., of the history of opinions 
on this question.—[34, 35.] Compare ch. 
xxiii. 16—22. Trench observes, (Serm. on 
Mosaic, p. 65.) that men have learned to think 
that, if only God's name were avoided, there 
was no irreverence in the frequent oaths by 
heaven, by the earth, by Jerusalem, by their 
own heads, and these brought in on the 
slightest need, or on no need at all; just as 
now-a-days the same lingering half-respect 
for the Holy Name will often cause men, 
who would not be wholly profane, to sub-
stitute for that name sounds that nearly 
resemble, but are not exactly it, or the 
name, it may be, of some heathen deity. —
34.] See Is. Ivvi. 1, to which reference is 
here made; and for πολις τ. μηγ. Βασ., 
Psalm xlviii. 2. Ανευ υν ειναι is a Hebraism: the 
classical usage is with κατα and a gen., 
or simply with an acc.—36. ου δυνασαι μιαν 
πρ ι μ. ττ. Thou hast no control over 
the appearance of grey hairs on thy head 
—thy head is not thine own—so thou swear-
est by a creature of God, whose 
destinies and changes are in God's hand; so that 
every oath is an appeal to God. And, 
indeed, men generally regard it as such now, 
even unconsciously.—37. οκ του πονηρου] 
See reff. The gender is ambiguous, as in 
the Lord's Prayer, ch. vi. 13. It is quite 
immaterial to the sense in which we understand 
it; for the evil of man's corrupt nature is 
in Scripture spoken of as the work of πονηρας, 
and is itself τη πονηραν. See 
John viii. 44. 1 John iii. 8. — 38.] That is, 
such was the public enactment of the 
Mosaic law, and, as such, implied a private 
spirit of retaliation which should seek such 
redress; for the evidence evidently refers to 
private as well as public retribution. Here 
again our Lord appears to speak of the 
true status and perfection of a Christian 
community,—not to forbid, in those mixed 
and but Christian states, which have 
ever divided so-called Christendom among 
them, the infliction of judicial penalties for 
crime. In fact Scripture speaks, Rom. 
xxiii. 4, of the minister of such infliction as 
the minister of God. But as before, our 
Lord shows us the condition to which a 
Christian community should tend, and to 
further which every private Christian's own 
endeavours should be directed. It is quite 
beside the purpose for the world to say, 
that these precepts of our Lord are too 
highly pitched for humanity, and so to find 
an excuse for violating them. If we were 
disciples of His in the true sense, these 
precepts would, in their spirit, as indicative of 
frames of mind, be strictly observed; and, 
as far as we are His disciples, shall we at-
tain to such their observance.—Here again, 
our Lord does not contradict the Mosaic 
law, but expands and fulfils it, declaring to 
us that the necessity for it would be alto-
ger removed in the complete state of 
that kingdom which He came to establish. 
—Against the notion that φηθ. διρι φηθ. 
κ.τ.λ. sanctioned all kinds of private re-
venge, Augustine remarks, ‘Quandoquidem 
et illud antiquum ad reprimendas flammas 
odiorem, sevientiumque immoderatos ani-
mos refrenandos, iis preceptum est. Quis 
enim tantundem facile contentus est repo-
nere vindicet quantum accepti injuriae? 
Nonum videamus homines leviter lasos mo-
liri sedem, sitre sanguinem, viroque inver-
K " Malis inimici unde satietur? ... 
Huic igitur immoderate et per hoc injustae 
ultiones, lex justum modum agens, poenam 
taliones institut: hoc est ut qualcum quique 
intuit injuriam, talip supremum pendat. 
Proinde, "Oculos pro oculo, dentem pro 
dente," non fomes sed limes furoris est; 
non ut id quod sopitum erat inde accedere-
tur, sed ne id quod ardebit ultra extendere-
tur ippositus." Cont. Faust. xix. 25. See 
1 Cor. vi. 1—6. — 39. Εικς ων άντι 
πουνηρον] Here again, we have our Divine lawgiver legi-
lating, not in the bondage of the letter, so as to stultify His disciples, and in many circumstances to turn the salt of the earth into a means of corrupting it,—but in the freedom of the spirit, laying down those great principles which ought to regulate the inner purposes and consequent actions of His followers. Taken spiritually and literally, neither did our Lord Himself conform to this precept (John xviii. 22, 23), nor his Apostles (Acts xxiii. 3). But truly, and in the spirit, did our blessed Redeemer obey it: 'He gave his back to the smiters, and his cheeks to them that plucked off the hair, and hid not his face from shame and spitting' (Is. l. 6): and his Apostles also, see 1 Cor. iv. 9—13.—τῷ πονηρῷ] The evil man; him who injures thee. Or, perhaps, in the indefinite sense, as before, 'evil,' generally, 'when thus directed against thee.' Only, the other possible meaning there, the 'evil one,' is excluded here. δεντιάσθης τῷ διαβόλῳ: but not this particular form of his working (viz. malice directed against thyself) so as to revenge it on another.—40, 41.] See note on ver. 39. κρατιάν imports legal contention only, and is thus distinguished from the violence in ver. 39 (Meyer, against Tholuck and De Wette). λαβείν, i.e. in pledge for a debt: see Exod. xxii. 26. χύσανα, the inner and less costly garment; λέπαν, the outer and more valuable, used also by the poor as a coverlet by night (Exod. xxii. 26). In Luke vi. 29 the order is inverted, and appears to be that in which the two garments would be taken from the body.—ἀγγαρευόντας] Herod. vii. 98, after describing the Persian post-couriers, adds, τούτου τὸ δράμημα τῶν ἵππων καλοὶ Πώραι ἀγγαρεύοντας. Ἀσσυρίων, Agam. 285 (Dindorf), says of the beacons which brought the intelligence of the capture of Troy to Mycene, φωτιῶν δὲ φωτοῦν δεύτερ' αὐτ' ἀγγαροῦ πυρὸς ἔπειτα. 'The Jews particularly objected to the duty of furnishing posts for the Roman government; and Demetrius, wishing to conciliate the Jews, promised, among other things, κατέθεσεν δὲ μηδὲ ἄγγαρευεσθαι τὸ θεωρεῖαν ἡμῶν ἐποίησε τοῖς ἀνθρώποις Ἰουδαίοις (Jos. Ant. xiii. 2, 3). Hence our Saviour represents this as a burden;—and in the same manner Epictetus says, ἄν δὲ ἄγγαρευα γίνῃ, καὶ σπαραγήσῃς ἑπιλαβήσηται, ἄφες μὴ άντιγινώσκω, μηδὲ γαίρω. Dr. Barton, The Epistles, or Bullettin of the Roman soldiers and their horses on the Jews, was one kind of this ἀγγεια. —42.] The proper understanding of the command in this verse may be arrived at from considering the way in which the Lord Himself, who declares, 'If ye shall ask anything in my name, I will do it' (John xiv. 14), performs this promise to us. It would obviously be, not a promise of love, but a sentence of condemnation to us, understood in its bare literal sense; but our gracious Saviour, knowing what is good for us, so answers our prayers, that we never are sent empty away; not always, indeed, receiving what we ask,—but that which in the very disappointment we are constrained thankfully to confess is better than our wish. So, in his humble sphere, should the Christian giver act. To give every thing to every one—the sword to the madman, the alms to the impostor, the criminal request to the temptress—would be to act as the enemy of others and ourselves. Ours should be a higher and deeper charity, flowing from those inner springs of love, which are the sources of outward actions sometimes widely divergent; whence may arise both the timely concession, and the timely refusal. As Chrysostom observes on a former verse, μὴ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τὰ πράγματα ἐξάσκεσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ καιρὸν, καὶ αἰτίαν, καὶ γνώμην, καὶ προσωπῶν διάφορον, καὶ δόσαν ἀνάρχον ἤτερα συμβάλλον, πάντα μετὰ αἱρετικὰς ζητώμενοι οὐδὲ γάρ ἔστιν ἑαυτὸς ἑισεῖσθαι τῆς ἀθέσεις. Hom. vii. —Δανιήλων.] Here, to borrow, without χρησι, which was forbidden by the law, Exod. xxii. 24. Levit. xxv. 37. Deut. xxiii. 20.—43.] The Jews called all Gentiles indiscriminately, 'enemies.' In the Pharisian interpretation
εὐθροῦς ὑμῶν, [ἡ εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρμένους ὑμᾶς,]
καλῶς ποιεῖτε ἡ τοῖς ἡ μισοῦσιν ὑμᾶς, καὶ ἡ προεύθετε

BDZ ἥ τοῖς τῶν ['ἐπιρεάζοντων ἡ καὶ'] διακόνους ὑμᾶς.


therefore of the maxim (the latter part of which, although a gloss of the Rabbis, is a true representation of the spirit of the law, which was enacted for the Jews as a theocratic people,) it would include the "odium humani generis" with which the Jews were so often charged. But our Lord's 'fulfilment' of neighbourly love extends it to all mankind—not only foreign nations, but even those who are actively employed in cursing, reviling, and persecuting us; and the hating of enemies is, in His fulfilment of it, no longer an individual or national aversion, but a coming out and being separate from all that rebel against God. — 48. ποιεῖν τοῖς Χριστοῦ τοῦ Ιησοῦ. The more we lift ourselves above the world's view of the duty and expediency of revenge and exclusive dealing, into the mind with which the 'righteous Judge, strong and patient, who is proved every day,' yet does good to the unthankful and evil,—the more firmly shall we assure, and the more nobly illustrate, our place as sons in His family, as εὐλογοῦσιν ὑμῶν, ἡ τοῖς καταρμένους ὑμᾶς, καὶ ἡ προεύθετε

Christosom beautifully observes, καὶ οὕτως ὑμῶν ἡ τοῖς καταρμένους ὑμᾶς, τοῖς μισοῦσιν ὑμᾶς, καὶ ἡ προεύθετε

— 47. ἀπαντήσοντες[1] Here, most probably, in its literal sense. Jews did not salute Gentiles: Moham medians do not salute Christians even now in the East. — 48. ἐθνοὶ[2] Not altogether imperative in meaning, but including the imperative sense: such shall be the
state, the aim, of Christians. — ταξίων Complete, in your love of others; not one-sided, or exclusive, as these just mentioned, but all-embracing and God-like, = οἰκουμένη, Luke vi. 36. No countenance is given by this verse to the ancient Pelagian or the modern heresy of perfectibility in this life. Such a sense of the words would be utterly at variance with the whole of the discourse. See especially vv. 22. 29. 32, in which the imperfections and conflicts of the Christian are fully recognized. Nor, if we consider this verse as a solemn conclusion of the second part of the Sermon, does it any the more admit of this view, asserting as it does that likeness to God in inward purity, love, and holiness, must be the continual aim and end of the Christian in all the departments of his moral life. But how far from having attained this likeness we are, St. Paul shows us (Phil. iii. 12); and every Christian feels just in the proportion in which he has striven after it. Augustine argues for the true sense of this and similar passages of Scripture against the Pelagians at length, De peccatorum emis et remissione, lib. ii. ch. 12—17, and De perfectione justitiae hominis, ch. 8. 9. — οἱ μὲν ἀγαπῶντας τοὺς ἁγίους σάλις ἀμείβουσι ἀλλιώς εἶναι εἰς ἀγάπην, οἱ δὲ τοὺς ἱχθόναις, τέλειοι. Euthym.

Chap. VI. 1—18.] The third division of the Sermon, in which the disciples of Christ are warned against hypocrisy, by the examples of abuses of the duties of almsgiving (ver. 2), praying (ver. 5), and fasting (ver. 16). — 1.] The discourse of our Lord now passes from actions to motives: not that he then was only by inference, now directly. In ver. 1, δικαιοσύνη is the more probable reading, but does not rest on sufficient authority to claim insertion in the text. If it be read, we have in ver. 1 a general caution, and in ver. 2 it is particularized in the case of giving of alms; or δικαιοσύνη, as the Hebrew corresponding word, תִּירָשׁ, may mean 'benignity,' 'benevolence.' — The words προσέγχετε τῷ θεῷ clearly define the course of action objected to—not the open benevolence of the Christian who lets his light shine that men may glorify God, but the ostentation of him whose object is the praise and glory coming from men. οὐ γὰρ καὶ ἐμπροσθέν τῶν ἁνρῶτων παράγοιτα, μὴ πρὸς τὸ διαθηνεῖ παίτιν καὶ μὴ παίτιν ἐμπροσθέν πάλιν, πρὸς τὸ διαθηνεῖ παίτιν. Chrysostom, Hom. xix. 245 A. — el 53 μῆνας does not apply to προσεγχεῖτε, so as to mean, 'if ye do not take heed;' but τοῦ μὴ παίτιν, and means 'if ye do.' That this is so, is clear from the ref. — 2. μὴ σαλπιρίζει A proverbial expression, not implying any such custom of the hypocrites of that day, but the habit of self-laudation, and display of good works in general. οὗτοι δὲ σαλπιρίζουσιν εἶχον ἐκεῖνοι, ἀλλὰ τὴν πάλιν αὐτῶν ἐξελέξαι βουλόμενοι μάν, τῷ λίῃ τὴς μεταφορὰς ταύτης, κωμῳδοῖς ταύτη καὶ ἱκεροπτοῖς αὐτῶν. Chrysostom. Meyer remarks that the word σαλπιρίζει is tuba canas, not tuba cani eures, and must therefore refer to what the person himself does. — ἀνέχονται] Have in full, exhaust. Plutarch in Solon (cited by Wetstein) says, that he who marries for pleasure, and not for children, τὸν μισθὸν ἀνέχεται. — 3. μὴ γνώστα] Another popular saying, not to be pressed so as to require a literal interpretation of it in the act of almsgiving, as De Wette and others have done, but implying simplicity, both of intention
and act. Equally out of place are all attempts to explain the right and left hand symbolically, as was once the practice. The sound sense of Chrysostom preserves the right interpretation, where even Augustine strays into symbolism: "καί οι νοεθήσας ου κείσας αδινίτεται, ἀλλ' υπερβολικος αὐτὸ τιθείειν. εἰ γὰρ οἷον τι ἑστὶ, ψεύτι, σεαυτόν ἀγνοησί, περιποιηθῶν ἑστι ςε τοῦτο, εὰν αὐτὰς ὑποθνύμ ὑδα τις ἀποκοιμηθήναι, χεῖρας λαδετί.-Hom. xii. 246. A.-
4. ἐν τα δῶρα] Not to be rendered as if it were τα ἐν τῷ, κρ., or εἰς τὸ εκποτον, but as the Eng. Vers., 'seeth in secret;' as we say, 'in the dark.'—If the words ἐν τῷ φανερῷ, inserted by the rec., are to stand, they must mean, before men and angels at the resurrection of the just.—
5. ἐστώτως] No stress must be laid on this word as implying ostentation; for it was the ordinary posture of prayer. The command in Mark runs, ὄποιον στῆτε προσευχόμενον... ch. xx. 25. See also Luke xviii. 11. 13. Indeed, of the two positions of prayer, considering the place, kneeling would have been the more singular and savouring of ostentation.—6. εὐσέβεια κ.t.l.] Both Chrysostom and Augustine caution us against taking this merely literally. τ从严治党, ἐφανεί, οὐ εἰς προσευχήσεα; καὶ σφόδρα μὲν, ἀλλὰ μᾶτα γνώμης τοιαύτης. πανταχοῦ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς τῶν σκοτών ζητεῖ τῶν γνωμῶν. ἐπὶ κἂν εἰς τὸ ταμίον εἰλίθης, καὶ ἀποκλί-
σας, πρὸς ἐπίδειξαι αὐτὸ ἐργάσθη, οὐδὲν σου τῶν θυρῶν ἄνθισσε. δρα γεων καὶ ἰνασθάλη τῶς ἀρχηγῆς τῶν διακονῶν τίθενται, εἰτῶν, "ὅπως φανεῖ ταῖς ἀνθρώπων."—ἐπέτε κἂ τάς ψυχὰς ἀποκλίσεις, τοῦτο πρὸ τῆς τῶν θυρῶν ἀποκλίσεως καταρθοῦσα σε βοηθησάται καὶ τάς τῆς διανοίας ἀποκλίσεις ψυχάς. Hom. xii. 247. 'Parum est intrare in cubicula, si ostium pateat impor-
tanum, per quod ostium ea quae foris sunt improbre se immersunt, et interiores nostra appetunt.'—De Serm. Dom. i. ii. c. 3.—
7. ἐβαθωλογηθη] a word probably without any further derivation than an imitation of the sounds uttered by stammers, who repeat their words often without meaning; (εκαδ μίμησις τῆς φωνῆς, Hesych.)—Suid.

Suseath, and others, suppose it derived from a certain stammering Battus, Herod. iv. 155. But the name of this Battus seems to have been given from the circumstance; παῖς λαγνήρως καὶ τραυλὸς, τῷ ὀνόμα τῦθεν Βάττος: and we have βατταρίων and its derivatives with the same signification; and Echines called Demostrhenes βάταλος (περὶ στ. p. 258. 17 Bekker)—(ευσεβεία) prece qua fatigent virgines sancte minus antientem carmina Vestam?—Hor. Od. i. 2, 26. nisi illos (Deos) tue ex ingenio judicata, Ut nil credas intelligere nisi idem dictum est centes. Ter. Haest.

v. 1. What is forbidden in this verse is not much praying, for our Lord Himself passed whole nights in prayer; nor praying in the same words, for this He did in the very intensity of His agony at Gethsemane;
but the making number and length a point of observance, and imagining that prayer will be heard, not because it is the genuine expression of the desire of faith, but because it has been such or such a number of times repeated. The repetitions of Paternosters and Ave-Marias in the Romish Church, as practised by them, are in direct violation of this precept; the number of repetitions being prescribed, and the efficacy of the performance made to depend on it. But the repetition of the Lord's Prayer in the Liturgy of the Church of England is not a violation of it, nor that of the Kyrie Eleison, because it is not the number of these which is the object, but each has its appropriate place and reason in that which is pre-eminent a reasonable service.—Our Lord was also denouncing a Jewish error. Lightfoot quotes from the Rabbinical writings, 'Omnis qui multiplicat orationem, auditor.' Hor. Hebr. in loc. Augustine puts admirably the distinction between much praying and much speaking: 'Absit ab oratione multa locutione; sed non desit multa precatio, si fervens persuerat intentio. Nam multum loqui, est in orando rem necessariam superfusis agere verbis; multum autem precari, est ad eum quem precamur diuturna et pia cordis excitatione pulsera. Nam plerumque hoc negotium plus gemitibus quam sermonibus agitur; plus fletu, quam affatio.' Ep. cxxv. 10. And Chrysostom, in one of his finest strains of eloquence, comments on this verse: μὴ τοιῶν τῷ σχήματι τοῦ σώματος, μηδὲ τῇ κραυγῇ τῆς φωνῆς, ἀλλὰ τῇ προσώπῳ τῆς γυνής τὰς εὐχὰς ποιομεθά μηδὲ μετὰ ψόφου καὶ ἡχίς, καὶ πρὸς άκιδομὶ ἄς καὶ τοῖς πλήθοις ἱεροῦ, ἀλλὰ μετὰ ἤτεικεν πάσης, καὶ τῇ κατὰ διάνοιαν συνεργῆς, καὶ διὰ χρόνων τῶν ἱδοθείν. Hom. x. 248 A. Those who have the opportunity should by all means read the whole passage, which is too long for insertion in a note.—8. oǐδα γὰρ i oǐδα, φησιν, ὃν χρείαν ἔχεις, τίνος ἓκεν εὑρεσία δε; οἴκων ἑδιάδικος, ἀλλ' ἑνα ἐπικάρδιῳ, ἑνα κατειχόμενος ἕνα οἰκεῖον τῷ συνεχείᾳ τῆς ἐντεύξεως, ἑνα τακτικόν, ἑνα συνομοσύνης τῶν ἀμαρτημάτων τῶν ὁμί. Chrys. Hom. x. 240 C. Ipsi orationes intempestive nostrum serenam et purgam, sanctificasse efficit ad accipienda divina manu, quae spiritualiter nobis infunduntur. August. de Serm. Dom. ii. 3. —9.] There is very slender proof of what is often asserted, that our Lord took nearly the whole of this prayer from existing Jewish formulæ. Not that such a view of the matter would contain in it any thing irreverent or objectionable; for if pious Jews had framed such petitions, our Lord, who came ἔλεηος every thing that was good under the Old Covenant, might in a higher sense and spiritual meaning, have recommended the same forms to His disciples. But such does not appear to have been the fact. Lightfoot produces only the most general commonplace parallels for the petitions, from the Rabbinical books.—With regard to the prayer itself, we may remark, 1. The whole passage, vers. 7—16, is digressive from the subject of the first part of this chapter, which is the discouragement of the performance of religious duties to be seen of men, and is resumed at ver. 16. Neander (Leben Jesu, p. 349, note) therefore supposes that this passage has found its way in here as a sort of accompaniment to the preceding verses, but is in reality the answer of our Lord to the request in Luke x. 1, more fully detailed than by that Evangelist. But to this I cannot assent (see Prolegg. II. 1. 4). 2. It is very improbable that the prayer was regarded in the very earliest times as a set form delivered for liturgical use by our Lord. The variations of τὰς ἀμαρτιὰς ἡμῶν καὶ γὰρ αὕτω ἀφιέμεν παντὶ ἐφελούμεν ἡμῖν, and τὸ καθ' ἡμῖν, in Luke, for the corresponding clauses in our text, however unimportant in themselves, are fatal to the supposition of its being used liturgically at the time when these Gospels were written. See notes on Luke xi. 1. This, however, forms no argument whatever against its successive use, which we know shortly to have prevailed in all Christian churches. 3. The view of some that our Lord gave this, selecting it out of forms known and in use, as a prayer ad interim, till the effusion of the Spirit of prayer, is inadmissible, as we have no traces of any such purpose in our Saviour's discourses, and to suppose any such would amount to nothing less than to set them entirely aside. On the contrary, one work of the Holy Spirit was to bring to their mind all things whatsoever He had said unto them. John xiv. 26.—οὗτως ἐπαράδειλον τοὺς νῦν ἐν χής, οὐκ ἔνα ταύτῃ μόνην τὴν εὐχήν εὐχῶμεθα, ἀλλ' ίνα, ταύτῃ ἤσσοντες πηγῆν εὐχής, ἡμεῖς χαίρε.
D Z abc. — 8. ο Θεός ο π. ὑμ. B. Sahid. D. — 10. ἀληθής εἰς τοὺς ὑπάρχοντας  ἀληθείας οὐκ, ἀληθείας τοῦ ἐστίν τοῖς ἐπισκόποις δοκεῖ ὑμῖς σήμερον. D Orig. (six times). ins. B D ** Z Cyrpr. Hil. — τῆς ὑμᾶς ὑμῶν. B Z 3 Clem. Orig. (six times). ins. D Orig. (once). — 12. θρόνος τοῦ Θεοῦ χρύσων εἰς τοὺς ἐπισκόπους σανίδών. Chrys. Hom. xix. 250 D. — 10. ἀληθῆς ἢ βασιλεία σου] 'Ut in nobis veniat, optamus; ut in illo inventum, optamus.' Aug. Germ. iv. c. 4. 'Thy kingdom,' here is the fullness of the accomplishment of the kingdom of God, so often spoken of in prophetic Scripture; and by implication all that process of events which lead to that accomplishment. Meyer, as usual, in objecting to all ecclesiastical and spiritual meanings of 'Thy kingdom,' forgets that the one for which he contends exclusively, the Messianic kingdom, does in fact include or imply them all. — γεννήσαι τ. Θ. σου] i.e. not, 'may our will be absorbed into thy will;' but may it be conformed to and subordinated to thine. The literal rendering is, 'Let thy will be also done upon earth, as in heaven.' — Π. τοῦ ἐπ. κ. τ. λ.] This word ἐπισκόπους has been very variously explained. Jerome renders it 'supersubstantialem,' and interprets it of the Bread of Life; Origen, τὸν τις τῆς ὑποίας συμβαλλόμενον: Theophylact, τὸν ἐμὸν ἀλήθεια καὶ αὐτός ἡμῶν αὐτάρκη: Euthymius, τὸν ἐμὸν τῆς ὑποίας καὶ αὐτός καὶ συμβαλλόμενον τῆς ἡμῶν ἑπισκοπῆς; and similarly Suidas and the Etymologicum Magnum. The greatest objection to this rendering is, that ὑποία is not subsistence (σώσιάς), but existence; which would give no sense. On the difficulties attending the formation of the adjective from ὑποία, I should lay no stress, as these matters are in later Greek very laxly attended to. See Tholuck. p. 402. Some suppose it to mean 'the bread of tomorrow,' τὸν ἄρτον τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἡμῖν ἔπεμψε; and Jerome found for it in the Gospel according to the Hebrews, ἔπεμψε 'to-morrow'
bread; and this would not make the request inconsistent with the command in ver. 34; for the command there not μαρτύριον about the affairs of to-morrow (as Meyer well remarks) not only does not preclude, but rather presupposes making them the subject of prayer. Chrysostom says, τί λέγεις, τόν ἄριστον τόν ἑσυχότατον; τὸν ἐφίμησον. And so the ancient Latin versions, abce, 'quodcumque,' and E. V. 'daily.'—But most probably ἑσυχότατος is contradistinguished from περιοδικός, and means 'sufficient,' as that does 'superabundant.' It seems to me that the higher and mystical meaning of ἄριστον is precluded by the insertion of ἡμῶν; besides that such meaning would be at variance with the simplicity of the whole prayer, and out of place in a discourse where no allusion of the kind occurs. This does not, however, exclude the application of the petition to all that we need for soul and body (as Augustine says, Serm. Iviii. c. 4: 'Quicquid animae nostrae et carnis nostrae in hac vita necessarium est, quotidiano pane conclusitum,') i.e. 'sins,' short-comings, and therefore 'debts' = παραπτώματα. ver. 14. Augustine remarks (contra Epist. Parmeniam. l. ii. c. 3) 'Quidquid unique non de illis peccatis dicturus quod in baptismi regenerationes dimissae sunt, sed de illa quod quotidianum esse seculi amari assimissim fructibus humanae vitae infirmitas contrahit.'—δις καί] Not 'for we also,' &c. (as in Luke, καί γὰρ εὐρείᾳ ἄφισεν) nor 'in the same measure as we also,' &c., but 'like as we also,' &c.; implying similarity in the two actions, of kind, but no comparison of degree. Augustine uses the testimony of this prayer against all proud Pelagian notions of an absolutely sinless state in this life (Trench); and answers the various excuses and evasions by which that sect escaped from the conclusion. In the uncertainty of the reading here, we may comment on the sense of ἀφήμενον, as implying that (see vers. 23, 24) the act of forgiveness is completed before we approach the throne of grace. —13.] The 'leading into temptation' must be understood in its plain literal sense: see ποιήσας σὺν τῷ πειρασμῷ καὶ τὴν ἠθικήν, 1 Cor. x. 13. There is no discrepancy with James i. 13, which speaks not of the providential bringing about of, but the actual solicitation of, the temptation. Ἀλλὰ must not be taken as equivalent to et etsi, qu. d. 'but thou dost, deliver,' &c.: but is rather the opposition to the former clause, and forms but one petition with it,—'bring us not into conflict with evil, but rather deliver (rid) us from it altogether.' And τοῦ παν., though, as in ch. v. 37, ambiguous in gender, is here most probably neuter, see reff.—On the omission of the doxology, see var. read. Euthymius calls it: τὸ παρὰ τῶν θείων φωτιῶν καὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας καθηγητῶν προερχόμενον ἐκκρατείωσιν ἐκπνεύσῃ. Fragm. Tholuck, p. 436. Stier defends its insertion eloquently, but to me not convincingly, Redon Jesu, l. 221 ff. Compare 2 Tim. iv. 17, 18, which also seems to testify to some such way of ending the prayer at that time. —14, 15.] Our Lord returns (γὰρ) to explain the only part of the prayer which peculiarly belonged to the new law of love, and enforces it by a solemn assurance. See Chrysostom's most eloquent appeal on this verse, Hom. xix. 255, end. —16.] Another department of the spiritual life, in which reality in the sight of God,
not appearance in the sight of man, must be our object. While these verses determine nothing as to the manner and extent of Christian fasting, they clearly recognize it as a solemn duty, ranking it with almsgiving and prayer; but, like them, (see ch. ix. 14—18,) to spring out of reality, not mere formal prescription. —17.] i.e. appear as usual: seem to men the same as if thou wert not fasting. It has been observed that this precept applies only to voluntary and private fasts, (such as are mentioned Luke xviii. 12,) not to public and enjoined ones. But this distinction does not seem to be necessary; the one might afford just as much occasion for ostentation as the other.

19—34.] From cautions against the hypocrisy of formalists, the discourse naturally passes to the entire dedication of the heart to God, from which all duties of the Christian should be performed. In this section this is enjoined, 1. (vers. 19—28,) with regard to earthly treasures, from the impossibility of serving God and Mammon: 2. (vers. 29—34,) with regard to earthly cares, from the assurance that our Father careth for us.—19, 20. [βρασον] more general in meaning than μυρων: the wear and tear of time, which eats into and consumes the fairest possessions. The θυμ. ἐν ὑπωρ. = the βα-

tur, ipsa putas caligo quantis tenebris obvolvetur! and by Chrysostom: διὰ τὸ γὰρ τὸ εὐφυέστατον ὑποβρύχιόν γίνεται καὶ τὸ λυχνία σκότος, καὶ τὸ ἡγεμών αἰχμαλώτου γίγαντα, ποια λουθν ἦσαν τοῖς υπάρχουσι ἄλλης; Hom. xx. 264 C., and Euthymius: εἰ οὖν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἐν σοὶ, δ ὁ θεός ὁ νοῦς, ὁ δωρικὴς εἰς τὸ φωτεινὸς καὶ ἐνθάγα τὴν τύχην, σκότος λατρείας, τούτοις, ἵστασθαι, λογικόν τὸ σκότος, τὸ ἀπὸ τῶν παθῶν, πάνω εἶσαι, ἵνα τὸ σκοτεινό τῆς κυρίων, συστροφήν τοῦ ἀνατίθηκον αὐτῇ φωτοῦ. Augustine (De Serm. Dom. § 46) renders it similarly, but understands σκότος to refer to a different thing: Si ipsa cordis intentio, qua facis quod facis, quia tibi est, sodidater appetitus rerum temporum ... aequus castitatis; quanto magis ipsum factum, cujus incertus est exitus, sodiidentum et tenebrosum est? Stier expands this well, Reden Josu, I. 238. As the body, of itself a dark mass, has its light from the eye, so we have here compared to it the sensuous, bestial life (ψυχεῶν) of men, their appetites, desires, and aversions, which belong to the lower creature. This dark region—human nature under the gross dominion of the flesh—shall become spiritualized, enlightened, sanctified, by the spiritual light; but if this light be darkness, how great must then the darkness of the sensuous life be!—The usual modern interpretation makes το σκότος πάνω a mere expression of the greatness of the darkness thereby occasioned, and thus loses the force of the sentence. — 24. Σουλθέων not merely 'serere,' but in that closer sense in which he who serves is the δοῦλος of, i.e. belongs to, and obeys entirely. ὃ ἑαυτῷ πλούσιος ἦν, ἀλλ' ὁυ ὕπονοις τῷ μαμων, ἀλλ' ἔχειν ἀφός και ἰστάντει, και δι-
καὶ περὶ εὐνομάσιον τῆς μεριμνῆς τῆς ἀνθρώπου, τὸ ἔνα ἡκάκιαν αὐτοῦ πήχων ἐνα; 28 καὶ περὶ εὐνομάσιον τι τῆς μεριμνῆς; ἐκ τοῦ κρίνα τοῦ ἄγρου, πῶς ἐν οὐ προσφέρῃς αὐξάνεις οὐ καὶ κοπιάς, οὐδὲ νήπεις ἐνεγὼ ἐν καὶ τὸν ἁρών οὗτος σῖμερον οὖν καὶ ἁπρών σις, κλάβαμεν, θεὸς οὗτος, ἡμᾶς ὑμᾶς ἐξελεύσασθαι; 32 ἐν αὐτεῖς τοῖς περὶ βασιλείας [τοὺς] καὶ τὴν δικαιοσύνην αὐτοῦ, καὶ ταῦτα πάντα 1 προορίζεται ἡμῖν μὴ ὑπερμιμνησθῆναι τὰ τῆς ἀνθρώπου μὴ ἕνεκα τῆς θεοῦ καὶ τὴν δικαιοσύνην αὐτοῦ, καὶ ταῦτα πάντα 1 προορίζεται τῶν, τῆς ἁθανασίας τῆς ἀνθρώπου. 19 Λεγόμενον πρὸ τοῦ μεταγείναν, οὐ πολλῶν ἡμῶν ὑμῶν ἡ οἰκίασθαι; 31 μὴ ὑμῖν μεριμνήσατε λέγοντες τί φάγοντας· οὐ πίετε, τί πιεῖτε; 32 πάντα γὰρ ταῦτα τὰ ἐδώμενες· οὐδὲ γὰρ ὁ παθήματος ὁ ὑπάρχων ὁ συνέδρον; 33 ἐν τούτῳ ἀπαντῶν, θετικὴ δὲ πρῶτον τῆς τῇ θεοῦ ἡμῖν ἡμίσεις. 34 αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡμῶν μεριμνῆσθαι τήμα· ἡμῖν μὴ ὑπερμιμνησθῆναι, εἰς τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τὴν ἡμῖν ἡμῖν ἡμῖν.
VII. 1 ΜΗ κρίνετε, ἵνα μὴ κρίθητε. 2 ἕν ψ' γὰρ B

κρίματι κρίνετε, κρίθησετε καί ἐν ψ' μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε μὲν μετρηθῆσαι ὑμῖν. 3 Τί δὲ βλέπεις τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν ὅφθαλμῳ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου, τὴν δὲ ἐν τῷ σοὶ ὅφθαλμῳ

p 1 & Gen. xlix. 29 D δοκοῦ σοῦ ἃ κατανοεῖς; 3 ἡ τῶς ἑρείς τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου

q Ραχ. xlii. 9 ἄφες ἐκβάλω τὸ κάρφος ἀπὸ τοῦ ὅφθαλμου σου, καὶ

r ἰδοὺ ἡ δοκοῦ ἐν τῷ ὅφθαλμῳ σου; 5 ὑποκρίτα, ἐκβάλε BC πρῶτον τὴν δοκοῦ ἐκ τοῦ ὅφθαλμος σου, καὶ τότε

s ἄφησεν τὸν κάρφος ἐκ τοῦ ὅφθαλμος τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου. 6 Μὴ δώτε τὸ ἄγιον τοῖς κνεί, μπήθη


prayer days of avarice and worldly anxiety, but ‘make your great object,’ as we say, ‘your first care.’ — δικαίωσινγ] Not here the forensic righteousness of justification, but the spiritual purity inculcated in this discourse. τὴν δικ. αὐτῶν answers to ἡ ἐκκλησίας αὐτῶν, spoken of in ch. v. 48. The same remark applies to ref. to the former member of the clause, is solemn and emphatic. See note on Luke vi. 38, xvi. 19, and xii. 20. The sense then is, that you have not to answer before God for your rash judgment and its consequences. The same remarks apply to ver. 2. — 3 5.] Lightfoot produces instances of this proverbial saying among the Jews. With them, however, it seems only to be used of a person retaliating rebuke. 6 Díxít Rabbi Tarphon, Miror ego, an sit in hoc sæculo, qui recipere vult correctionem; quin si dicat quis alteri, Ejecite stramen ex oculo tuo, responsurus ille est, Ejicite tram ex oculo tuo?—whereas our Lord gives us a further application of it, viz. to the incapability of one involved in personal iniquity to form a right judgment on others, and the clearness given to the spiritual vision by contrast with and victory over evil. There is also no doubt here a lesson given us of the true relative magnitude which our own faults, and those of our brother, ought to hold in our estimation. What is a κάρφος to one looking on another, is to that other himself a δοξῆς: just the reverse of the ordinary estimate.—τὸ κάρφ. and η δοξ., not as referring to a known proverb, but because the mote and beam are in situ, ἐν τῷ ὅφθαλμῳ.—5 ὑποκρίτα ὑποκρίτην τοῦ τοιωτοῦ ἄνωμαν, ὡς Ἰατρόν μὲν τὰ ἄρα, καὶ τὸν ἄρα ἔπεμα, ἦ δὲ προσερέμεν οἱ διαθήκης τὸ τάλαντον σφάλμα πολυπραγμονίας, σετὶ δὲ εἰς ἐκατεροτείς τοῦ τοιωτοῦ. Euthym. — 6 τὸ ἄγιον Some have thought this a mistranslation of the Chaldee, πρὸ τοῦ ear-ring, or amulet; but the connexion is not at all improved by it. Pearls bear a resemblance to pearls or
acorns, the food of swine, but ear-rings none whatever to the food of dogs. The similitude is derived from τὸ ἄγιον, or τὰ ἄγια, the meat offered in sacrifice, of which no unclean person was to eat. (Lev. xxii. 6, 7, 10, 14 [where τὸ ἄγιον is used], 15, 16.) Similarly in the ancient Christian Liturgies and Fathers, τὰ ἄγια are the consecrated elements in the Holy Communion. The fourteenth canon of the Council of Laodicea orders μὴ τὰ ἄγια...εἰς ἑτέρας παροικίας διανομής. Again, Cyril of Jerusalem: μὴ γὰρ τὰ ἁγια λατρεύεις ἐν αὐτῶ, τὰ ἁγία τὸις ἁγίωσθεν, τὰ προεκτεθεῖσαν ἐκ δόμου ἁγίου πνεύματος. (See Suicer on the word.) Thus interpreted, the saying would be one full of meaning to the Jews. As Trench observes, (Serm. Mount, p. 136.) ‘It is not that the dogs would not eat it, for it was welcome to be welcomed; but that it would be a profanation to give it to them; thus to make it a σκύδαλον, Exod. xxii.31.’ The other part of the similitude is of a different character, and belongs entirely to the swine, who having cast to them pearls, something like their value, which value is inappreciable by them, in fury trample them with their feet, and turning against the donor, rend him with their tusks. It is the wild boar which must be understood. The connexion with the foregoing and following verses is this: ‘Judge not,’ &c.; ‘attempt not the correction of others, when you need it far more yourselves;’ still, ‘be not such mere children, as not to distinguish the characters of those with whom you have to do. Give not that which is holy to dogs,’ &c. Then, as a humble hearer might be disposed to reply, ‘if this last be a measure of the least dealings, what hath it then I expect of God’s hand?’ (ver. 7) — ‘ask of God, and He will give to each of you; for this is His own will that you shall obtain by asking (ver. 8),—good things, good for each in his place and degree (ver. 10, 11), not unworthy or unfitting things. Therefore (ver. 12) do ye the same to others, as ye wish to be done, and as God does, to you; viz, give that which is good for each, to each, not judging uncharitably on the one hand, nor casting pearls before swine on the other.—7. The three similitudes are all to be understood of prayer. —8. The only limitation in this promise, which, under various forms, is several times repeated by the Lord, is furnished in vv. 9—11, and in James iv. 3, αὐτίς καὶ οἱ λαμβάνεις διότι κακῶς αἰτεῖθεν. —9. There are two questions here, the first of which is broken off. The similitude of ἀργος and λίθος also appears in ch. iv. 3. Luke (xi. 12) adds the egg and the scorpion. —II. The same argument &c. is used by our Lord in the parable of the unjust judge, Luke xvii. 6, 7. —12. Trench (Serm. Mount, p. 143) has noticed Augustine’s refutation of the sneer of infidels, (such as Gibbon’s against this precept,) that none of our Lord’s sayings have been before written by heathen.
authors. 'Dixit hoc Pythagoras, dixit hoc Plato . . . Propterter si inventus fuerit aliquis sorum hoc dixisse quod dixit et Christus, gratulamur illi, non sequimur illum. Sed prior fulit ille quam Christus. Si quis verum loquitur, prior est quam ipsa Veritas! O homo, attende Christum, non quando ad te venerit, sed quando te fecerit.' Enarr. in Ps. cxli. 6. — ἄνω is the inference from the preceding eleven verses, but immediately from the ἀγαθὰ τοῖς αἰτοῦσιν αὐτῶν just said,—and thus closing this section of the Sermon with a lesson similar to the last verse of ch. v., which is, indeed, the ground-tone of the whole Sermon—'Be ye like unto God.'

12—27.] The conclusion of the discourse—setting forth more strongly and personally the dangers of hypocrisy, both in being led aside by hypocritical teachers, and in our own inner life. —The τῆλη stands at the end of the δὸς, as in the remarkable parallel in the Table of Cebes, c. 12 (cited by Olahausen): ὁδεῖς ὑδρὸς θέραι τινα μεκρὰν, καὶ ὁδοὶ τινα πρὸ τῆς θάρσου, ὡς ὁ θυγατέρεια, ἀλλὰ πάνω δίλαιος ποιοῦνται: αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ δόσις ἡ ἀγούσα πρὸς τὴν ἀθηνὴν παῖδειν. —14.] ἄνω gives a second reason, on which that in ver. 13 depends: strive, &c., for broad is, &c., narrow is, &c. 'The reason why the way to destruction is so broad, is because so few find and their way into the narrow path of life. This is not merely an arbitrary assignment of the ὅτι, but there is a deep meaning in it. The reason why so many perish is not that it is so ordained by God, who will have all to come to the knowledge of the truth,—but because so few will come to Christ, that they might have life; and the rest perish in their sins. See notes on ch. xxvi. 41. The reading ὅτι, generally now adopted, will not bear the significance commonly assigned to it, 'How narrow is the gate!' And the interrogative meaning (Meyer) is inconsistent with ὅτι, which follows.—15.] These παντερϊα directly, refer to the false prophets who were soon to arise, to deceive, if possible, even the very elect, ch. xxiv. 24; and, indirectly, to all such false teachers in all ages. —In ἐξώδημα προβ., there may be allusion to the prophetic dress, ch. iii. 4; but most probably it only means that, in order to deceive, they put on the garb and manners of the sheep themselves. —16.] The καρποί are both their corrupt doctrines and their vicious practices, as contrasted with the outward shows of almsgiving, prayer, and fasting, their sheep's clothing to deceive. 'Querimus fructus caritatis, invenimus spinas dissensionis.' Aug. Enarr. in Ps. cxli. 2. —17. συνάντητε See also ch. xiii. 48. From these two verses, 17, 18, the Manicheans defended their heresy of the two natures, good and bad; but Augustine answers them,

that such cannot possibly be their meaning, as it is entirely contrary to the whole scope of the passage, (see for example ver. 13,) and adds, 'Mala ergo arbore fructus bonus facere non potest; sed ex malo fieri bona potest, ut bonus fructus feret.' Cont. Adiamb. c. 26. On the other hand, these verses were his weapon against the shallow Pelagian scheme, which would look at men's deeds apart from the Living Root in man out of which they grew, and suppose that man's unaided will is capable of good. Trench on the Sermon, p. 160.—21. The doom of the hypocritical false prophets introduces the doom of all hypocrites, and brings on the solemn close of the whole, in which the hypocrite and the true disciple are parabolically compared.—Observe that here the Lord sets Himself forth as the Judge in the great day, and at the same time speaks not of τὸ θελ. μου, but τὸ θελ. τοῦ πατρός μου: an important and invaluable doctrinal landmark in this very opening of His ministry in the first Gospel. —οὐ μὴν is not here 'no one,' as some have interpreted it. That meaning would require τὸ ἐξελθέσαι.—The context must rule the meaning of such wide words as λγεῖ. Here it is evidently used of mere lip hommage, and in οὐ δύνηται εἰπέναι Κύριον ἵθελεν οὐ μὴν εἰπεῖν μοι ἀγίω, 1 Cor. xii. 3, it has the deeper meaning of a genuine heartfelt confession. To seek for discrepancies in passages of this kind implies a predisposition to find them; and is to treat Holy Scripture with less than that measure of candour which we give to the writings of one another. — 22. τῇ σε ἐν. As hearing and using thy name, and by its power performing these things.—νησίτωτα, 'preached,' not necessarily foretold future events. 1 Cor. xii. 10, and note. On δοιμ., η. see note on ch. viii. 32. ἄκαιρῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ refers to ver. 19. — 23. As the words now stand, οὐκ is merely recitative, and cannot be (Meyer) 'because,' belonging to ἀναχωρ. Such an arrangement would be unprecedented. Orig. Chrys., οὐκ &c. placed ὅτι ὧδε ἐγὼ, ὑμ. after ἄκακω, &c., in which case the meaning 'for, because' would be right. —οὐδέποτε ἐγὼ, ὑμ., i.e. in the sense in which it is said, John x. 14, γινώσκω τὰ ἱματία, καὶ γινώσκωμεν ὑπὸ τῶν ζητῶν. Neither the preaching Christ, nor doing miracles in His name, are infallible signs of being His genuine servants, but only the devotion of life to God's will which this knowledge brings about. — 24. τούτως λέγων τούτων seems to bind together the Sermon, and preclude, as indeed does the whole structure of the Sermon, the supposition that these last chapters are merely a collection of sayings uttered at different times.—ὁμοιώματι Meyer and Tholuck take this word to signify, not 'I will compare him,' but 'I will make him like,' viz. εἰς ἐκάκω τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, as in ch. vii. 29. Rom. ix. 29. But it is, perhaps, more in analogy with the usage of the Lord's discourse to understand it, 'I will compare him:' so ὁμοιώματι, ch. xi. 16. Luke xiii. 16, and ref. — 25. This similitude must not be pressed to an
οἱ ἄνεμοι καὶ προσέπεσον τῇ οἰκίᾳ ἐκείνῃ, καὶ οὐκ ἔσσετε· ΒΖ

X ch. Ir. 16. Is. xi. 3. y Luke ii. 84. Bong. xxvii. 15. 

καὶ πάς ὁ ἀκώνομος τοὺς λόγους τούτους καὶ μὴ ποιῶν αὐτῶν Ὀμοιωθῆσεται ἄνδρι μωρῷ· ὡς οἶκος ἐφυλάσσετε τῇ οἰκίᾳ αυτοῦ ἐπὶ τῇ ἱματίᾳ. 27 καὶ κατέβη ἡ βροχή καὶ ἦθαν οἱ ποταμοί καὶ ἐνεύσαν οἱ ἄνεμοι καὶ προσέκοψαν τῇ οἰκίᾳ ἐκείνῃ, καὶ ἔσσετε· καὶ ἦταν ἡ πτώσις αὐτῆς μεγάλη. 28 Καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἔτελεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοὺς λόγους τούτους, εἶπεν συνεπάγαντοι οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ. 29 καὶ ἦν γὰρ διδασάκην αὐτῶς ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων, καὶ οὐχ ὡς οἱ γραμματεῖς·


CHAP. VIII. 1. rec. καμαντός δὲ αὐτῷ with qu. txt B C Z (καὶ εἰς Z) 8 acebo. — 2. προσεβόλησαν. B E M 9 Syr. Sahid. Chrys. Cyr. Theophyl. txt C aceb Hil. (?) — 4. rec. allegorical or symbolical meaning in its details, e.g. so that the rain, floods, and winds should mean three distinct kinds of temptation; but the Rock, as signifying Him who spoke this, is of too frequent use in Scripture for us to overlook it here. He founds his house on a rock, who, hearing the words of Christ, brings His heart and life into accordance with His expressed will, and is thus by faith in union with Him, founded on Him. Whereas he who merely hears His words, but does them not, has never dug down to the rock, nor become united with it, nor has any stability in the matter of trial. — τὴν πόρπερα τῆς ἱματίας, —the articles importing that these two were usually found in the country where the discourse was delivered; — ἡ βροχή, οἱ ποταμοί, οἱ ἄνεμοι, —that such trials of the stability of a house were common. In the whole of the similitude reference is probably made to the prophetic passage Is. xxi. 15—18. —ταβεάμαλε. The N. T. writers usually omit the augment in the plurperfect, so πεποιήσαν, Mark xv. 7; ἐκήθησαν, xvi. 9; περεπηγαγαν, Acts xiv. 8; μεμφησαν, 1 John ii. 19 al. fr. This is also done occasionally by Herodotus and by Attic prose writers, where euphony is served by it. See Herod. i. 122. iii. 42. ix. 22. — 27. μεγάλη. All the greater, because such an one as here supposed is a professed disciple—ἀκώνομος τοῖς λόγοις— and therefore would have the further to fall in case of apostasy.

29.] ὁ γὰρ εἰς ἑτέρον ἀναστρίφοι, ὡς ὁ προφήτης καὶ ὁ Μωυσῆς, ἔλεγεν ἀπόλεγον, ἀλλὰ πανταχοῦ ἐλευθεροφυνομένοις ἔνωσε τὸν τοῦ ἐξωτικοῦ ἑρέτα. καὶ γὰρ νοῳ πολλων συνεκαθήθω προφήτης ἐν δὲ λέγω ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἑνώσῃς ἑυμερίᾳ ἀναμφισβήτηται, διεκρίνεται τὴν ξένων ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐξωτικοῦ, καὶ βεβαιάθω τοῖς λόγοις ἀπὸ τῶν πράξεων. Euthym. — 2.] This same miracle is related by Luke without any mark of definiteness, either as to time or place,—καὶ ἐγένετο, ἐν τῇ ἑβδόμῃ ἄνω τῶν τόπων. . . . In this instance there is, and can be, no doubt that the transactions are identical; and this may serve us as a key-note, by which the less obvious and more intricate harmonies of these two narrations may be arranged. The plain assertion of the account in the text requires that the leper should have met our Lord on His descent from the mountain, while great multitudes were following Him. The accounts in Luke and Mark require no such fixed date. This narrative therefore fixes the occurrence. I conceive it highly probable.
that Matthew was himself a hearer of the Sermon, and one of those who followed our Lord at this time. From Luke's account, the mistake was performed in, or rather, perhaps, in the neighbourhood of, some city:—what city, does not appear. As the leper is in all three accounts related to have come to Jesus,  ξαίρειν implying it in Luke, he may have been outside the city, and have run into it to our Lord. — άσπωρος] The limits of a note only allow of an abridgment of the most important particular relating to this disease. Read Le· vitic s xiii. xiv. for the Mosaic enactments respecting it, and its nature and symptoms. See also Exod. iv. 6 Num. xii. 10. 2 Kings v. 27. xxv. 5. 2 Chron. xxvi. 19. 21. The writers here mean a purely symbolic and typical. The disease was not contagious: so that the view which makes then mere sanitary regulations is out of the question. The fact of its non-contagious nature has been abundantly proved by learned men, and is evident from the Scripture itself; for the priests had continually to be in close contact with lepers, even to handling and examining them. We find Nasan, a leper, commanding the armies of Syria (2 Kings v.); Gehazi, though a leper, is conversed with by the king of Israel (2 Kings vii. 4, 5); and in the examination of a leper by the priest, if a man was entirely covered with leprosy, he was to be pronounced clean (Levit. xiii. 12, 13). The leper was not shut out from the synagogue, (Lightfoot, vol. i. p. 513,) nor from the Christian churches. (Suidas, Thesaurus Patrum, under λέπιρος.) Besides, the analogy of the other uncleannesses under the Mosaic law, e. g. having touched the dead, having an issue, which are joined with leprosy, (Num. v. 2,) shows that sanitary caution was not the motive of these ceremonial enactments, but a far deeper reason. This disease was specially selected, as being the most loathsome and incurable of all, to represent the effect of the defilement of sin upon the once pure and holy body of man. "Leprosy was, indeed, nothing short of a living death, a poisoning of the springs, a corrupting of all the humours, of life; a dissolution, little by little, of the whole body, so that one limb after another actually decayed and fell away." (Trench on the Miracles, p. 213.) See Num b. xii. 12. The leper was the type of one dead in sin: the same emblems are used as his misery as those of mourning for the dead: the same means of cleansing as for uncleanness through connexion with death, and which were never used except on these two occasions. Comp. Num. xix. 16. 13. 18, with Levit. xiv. 4—7. And all this exclusion and mournful separation imported the perpetual exclusion of the abominable and polluted from the true city of God, as declared Rev. xxvi. 27, ὁ μὴ θάνατος θανάτων ἡ καθαρισθητεί καὶ ἑνδείκτες ἀκρα. And David, when after his deadly sin he utters his prayer of penitence, 'Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean,' Ps. ii. 7, doubtless saw in his own utter spiritual uncleanness, that of which the ceremonial uncleanness that was purged with hyssop was the type. Thus in the above-cited instances we find leprosy ascribed to the punishment of rebellion, lying, and presumption. 'I put the plague of leprosy in an house,' (Levit. xiv. 34,) 'Remember what the Lord thy God did to Miriam,' (Deut. xxix. 9,) and other passages, point out this plague as a peculiar infliction from God. "The Jews termed it 'the finger of God,' and emphatically 'The stroke.' They said that it attacked first a man's house; and if he did not turn, his clothing; and then, if he persisted in sin, himself. So too they said, that a man's true repentance was the one condition of his leprosy leaving him." Trench, p. 216. The Jews too from the prophecy Is. liii. 4, had a tradition that the Messiah should be a leper. —προσώπων ἐν πρόσωπων, Luke v. 12; γνωστοῖς Mark i. 40. These differences of expression are important. See beginning of note on ver. 2. —Κύριε] Not here merely a title of respect, but an expression of faith in Jesus as the Messiah. — 3. ἐπιτρεπτοῦντος] He who just now expansively fulfilled the law by word and commands, now does the same by act and deed: the law had forbid the touching of the leper. Levit. v. 3. It was an act which stood on the same ground as the healing on the Sabbath, of which we have so many instances. —Here is also a noble example illustrating His own precept so lately delivered, 'Give to him that asketh thee.' Again, we can hardly forbear to recognize in His touching the leper, a deed symbolic of His taking on Him, touching, laying hold of, our nature. Compare Luke xiv. 4, and ἅπλωμάκος λάσπομον ἀμών, with Heb. li. 16, στήνομαι ἃς σκίνην ἁπλώσας λάσπην τελετῶν. — Οὐκ] 'Echo prompter ad fidem leprosi mortem em.' Bengel, ad loc. — αἰχμή αὐτῷ, ἡ λέγμ. Luke's words, (ver. 13,) ἡ λείψα ἀνεπήλθην ἀκρα ἀντάμονα, are more
strictly correct in construction. See also Mark i. 42.—4. "Ora μηθεῖ κακοὶ Either (1) these words were a moral admonition, having respect to the state of the man, (διὰ διάσεων τὸ αἰχμαστὸν καὶ ἁφλότητον, Chrysost.) for the injunction to silence was not our Lord's uniform practice, (see Mark v. 19, and Luke viii. 39,) and in this case they were of lasting obligation, that the cleansed leper was not to make His healing a matter of boast hereafter; or (2) they were a cautionary admonition, only binding till he should have shown himself to the priest, in order to avoid delay in this necessary duty, or any hindrance which might, if the matter should first be blazon abroad, arise to his being pronounced clean, through the malice of the priests (see note on Mark i. 40); or (3), which I believe to be the true view, our Lord almost uniformly repressed the fame of His miracles, for the reason given in ch. xii. 18—21, that, in accordance with prophetic truth, He might be known as the Messiah not by wondrous power, but by the Great Result of His work upon earth: οὐκ ἐρατεία, ότι λατρεύς, ότι λατρεύς θεοῖς. Thus the Apostles always refer primarily to the Resurrection, and only incidentally, if at all, to the wonders and signs. (Acts ii. 22—24. iii. 13—16.) These latter were tokens of power common to our Lord and His followers; but in His great conflict, ending in His victory, He trod the wince-press alone. —σαρκόντων δὲ ζωὴν χ. β. κ.] Read Levit. xiv. 1—32. This command has been used in support of the theory of satisfaction by priestly confession and penance. But even then (Trench on the Miracles, p. 221) the advocates of it are constrained to acknowledge that Christ alone is the cleanser. "Ut Dominus estenderet, quod non sacerdotali judicio, sed largitate divine gratie peccato emundatur, leprosum tangendo mundavit, et postea sacerdotii sacrificium ex lege offere prescipient." 

(Gratian de Poenitentia, Dist. 1.) 'Domi- nus leprosum sanitate prius per se restituit, deinde ad sacerdotes misit quorum judicio ostendetur mundatus ... quae esti aliquis apud Deum sit solutus, non tamen in facie Ecclesiae solutus habetar, nisi per judicium sacerdotis. In solvendis ergo culpis vel retinendis its operatur sacerdos evangelicus et judicat, sicut olim legalis in illis qui contaminati erant lepra que pecatum signavit.' (Peter Lombard. Sent. i. 4. dist. 18, cited by Trench.) It is satisfactory to observe this drawing of parallels between the Levitical and (popularly so called) Christian priesthood, thus completely showing the fallacy and untenableness of the whole system; all those priests being types, not of future human priests, but of Him, who abideth a Priest for ever in an unchangeable priesthood, and in Whom, not a class of Christians, but all Christians, are priests unto God. —μαρτυρῶν αὐτοῖς] A testimony against them. Compare refs.—The man disobeyed the injunction, so that our Lord could no more enter the city openly. See Mark i. 45—13.] Luke vii. 1—10, where we have a more detailed account of this miracle. On the chronological arrangement, see prolegomena. The centurion did not himself come to the Lord, but sent elders of the Jews to Him, who recommended to Him his notice as loving their nation, and having built them a synagogue. Such variations, the concise account making a man facere per se what the fuller one relates him facisse per alterum, are common in all written and oral narrations. In such cases the fuller account is, of course, the stricter one. Augustine, answering Faustus, the Mani- chean, who wished, on account of the words of our Lord in ver. 11, to set aside the whole, and used this variation for that purpose, says 'Quid enim, nonne talibus locutionibus humana plena est consuetudo ... quid ergo, cum legimus, obliviscimur quemadmodum loqui soleamus? An Scrip-
4—12. **Kata Mathaimi.**

Δεινός ἡμανίκόμενος. 1] καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς Ἡ ἐλθὼν θεραπεύω αὐτόν. 2 καὶ ἀποκρίθη τοῦ ἐκατόντερχος ἐφή Κύριε, οὐκ εἰμί ἢ καίκος ἢ μαν. 3 ὥστε τῇ = 1 L. ch. ili. 4 στέγην εὐσέβης ἀλλὰ μόνον εἰπε ἐγώ, καὶ ἀναίθεται ὁ παῖς μου. 5 καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ ἀνθρωπός εἰμι ὑπὸ ἐξουσίαν, ὁ = 1 L. only. ἔχων ὑπὸ ἐμαυτὸν στρατιῶτας, καὶ λέγω τούτῳ Πορεύθητι, καὶ πορεύεται, καὶ ἔρχεται καὶ τῷ δοῦλῳ μου Ποίησον τούτο, καὶ ποιεῖ. 6 ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εὑρίσκασι καὶ εἶπε τοῖς ἄκολουθοις ἢ Ἁμών ἔχων ὑμῖν, οὐδὲ ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ τουσαύτην πίστιν ἔχων. 7 λέγω δὲ υἱν ὧν ἀναλλοί αὐτῷ ἄνωτέρων καὶ ἤξει αὐτοῖς καὶ ἀνακληθοῦσαι μετὰ Διόρασος καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ ιακώβ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν. 8 ναὶ τὸς ῥαπτικάς ἐκβληθησαν εἰς τὸ σκότος τοῦ ἐξωτερον.


Whom does serve as their Master! That this is the right interpretation is shown by our Lord's special commendation of his faith, ver. 10, volens ostendere Dominum quoque non per adventum tantum corporis, sed per angulum ministeria possit implores quod vellet, Jerome in loc. 'Potuisset Ratio excipere; servus et miles imperium liber adiutur; morbus non item.' Sed hanc exceptionem concorruit sapientis fideis, ex ruditate militari pulcher lucens. Bengel ad loc. On the distinctness of this miracle from that recorded John iv. 46—54, see notes there. — 10, 11.] 'Amen, inquit, dico voabis, non invenit tantam fidem in Israele; propter ce dico voabis quia multi ab Or. et Occ. . . . . &c. Quam laboris occupavistat olivam! Amen, si multus hic fuit; sed propter hubilitatem, propter non sum dignus ut sub tectum memum intresi, multi ab Or. et Occ. venient. Et puta quia venient; quid de illis fiet? Si enim venient, jam precaria sunt de silva: ubi inserendi sunt, ne arescant? Et recumbam, inquit, cum Abraham et Isaac et Jacob . . . . Ubi? In regno, inquit, cœlorum. Et quid erit de illis qui venerunt de stipe Abraham? quid fiet de ruinis quibus arbor plena erat? quid nisi quis præcedentur, ut isti inserantur? Doce quia præcedentur: Filii autem regni ibunt in tenebris exteriores Auf. in Johan. tract. vii. 6. — 12. of vela] the natural heirs, but disinterred by rebellion. τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξωτερικός, the darkness outside, i.e. outside the lighted chamber of the feast, see ch. xxii. 13, and Eph. v. 7, 8. These verses are wanting in Luke, and occur when the
LORD repeated them on a wholly different occasion, ch. xiii. 28, 29.—δ κλ. κ. δ βρ.] The articles here on are not possessive, as Middleton supposes, for that would give a sense having no definite meaning, and would be a rendering inadmissible after ἢσται, which generalizes the assertion; they rather import the notoriety and eminence of the κλ. κ. βρ. 'Articulus insignis: in hac vita dolor numund est dolor.' Bengel.—13. ἰδαν] Of what precise disease does not appear. In Luke ἴδαντες τελευτάτη—here he has ἴδαντες τελευτάτην ἦσσως διαβαίνομεν. But though these descriptions do not agree with the character of palsy among us, we read of a similar case in 1 Mac. ix. 55, 56, ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἵστατο ἵππηγγέ "Ἀλεξίος καὶ ἰαμασθήσεται τὰ ἐργὰ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἰατρικὴ τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ, καὶ σωματίζω, καὶ οὐκ ἰδυνάω ἵτι λαλήσαι λόγον καὶ ἵντειλαται περὶ τοῦ οἷον αὐτοῦ. καὶ ἰδανὲν "Ἀλεξίος ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἵστατο μετὰ βασιλέαν μεγάλης. The disease in the text may have been an attack of Tetanus, which the ancient physicians included under paralysis, and which is more common in hot countries than with us. It could hardly have been apoplexy, which usually becaues of sensaation.

14—17.] Mark i. 29—34. Luke iv. 38—41. From the other Evangelists it appears, that our Lord had just healed a demoniac in the synagogue at Capernaum: for they both state, 'when they were come out of the synagogue, they entered into the house of Simon and Andrew,' &c. Both Mark and Luke are fuller in their accounts than the text. The expression (of the fever) δήλησαι αὐτοῦ, is common to the three, as is also the circumstance of her ministering immediately after; showing that the fever did not leave her, by natural means, weak and exhausted, but completely restored.—16.] at sunset, Mark ver. 32. Luke ver. 40. From Mark we learn that the whole city was collected at the door; from Luke, that the demons cried out and said, Thou art Christ the Son of God. And from both, that our Lord permitted them not to speak, for they knew Him. They brought the sick in the evening, either because it was cool—or because the day's work was over, and men could be found to carry them—or perhaps because it was the sabbath, see Mark i. 21, 29, 32, which ended at sunset.—17.] This is a version of the prophecy differing from the LXX, which has ὠνὸς τάς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν φίλας, καὶ περὶ ἡμῶν δένναια. The exact sense in which these words are quoted is matter of difficulty. Some understand ἔλαβεν ἃς ἔλαβεν ἃς as merely 'took away,' and 'healed.' But besides this being a very harsh interpretation of both words, it entirely destroys the force of αὐτοῦ, and makes it expetive. Others suppose it to refer to the personal fatigue, (or even the spiritual exhaustion, [Olahusen,] which however is inconsistent with sound doctrine,) which our Lord felt by these cures being long protracted into the evening. But I believe the true relevancy of the prophecy is to be sought by...
regarding the miracles generally to have been, as we know so many of them were, lesser and typical outshowings of the great work of bearing the sin of the world which He came to accomplish; just as diseases themselves, on which those miracles operated, are all so many testimonies to the existence, and types of the effect of sin. Moreover in these His deeds of mercy, He was touched with the feeling of our infirmities: witness His tears at the grave of Lazarus, and His sighing over the deaf and dumb man, Mark vii. 34. The very act of compassion is a suffering with (as the name imports) its object; and if this be true between man and man, how much more strictly so in His case who had taken upon Him the whole burden of the sin of the world, with all its sad train of sorrow and suffering.

19. — [IX. 1.] Mark iv. 35—v. 20. Luke ix. 57—60. viii. 22—39, on which passages compare the notes. — [18.] It is obviously the intention of Matthew to bind on the following incidents to the occurrence which he had just related.—[19.] Both the following incidents are placed by Luke long after, during our Lord’s last journey to Jerusalem. For it is quite impossible (with Greswell, Diss. iii. p. 156, sq.) in any common fairness of interpretation, to imagine that two such incidents should have twice happened and both times have been related together. It is one of those cases where the attempts of the Harmonists do violence to every principle of sound historical criticism. Every such difficulty, instead of being a thing to be wiped out and buried up at all hazards, is a valuable index and guide to the humble searcher after truth, and is used by him as such (see Prolegomena.). — [20. Í ó[vos tòú ánthrston] "It is thought that this phrase was taken from Daniel vii. 13, to which passage our Saviour seems to allude in ch. xxvi. 64, and probably Ste-

25 Καὶ ἐλθόντος αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ πέραν εἰς τὴν χώραν

om. B C. — 26. ἐποπλήθη B (omitting οἱ μ. αὐ.). txt (most probably, according to Tischendorf C). rec. σῶσ. ὑμᾶς with abcd. txt B C. — 27. καὶ om. C abcd Hil. ins. B d. — 28. rec. ἰδοὺ αὐτῷ with qu. txt B C abcd. — (It is very difficult to assign the true reading; for Γαθαζῆς is probably a correction from Mark and Luke.) rec. (also C in marg. and L and Copt. Æth. Arm.) Γιργισηνων, which I retain, marking

ἐν τῇ τελευταίᾳ. Euthym. — 23.] This journey across the lake, with its incidents, is placed by Mark and Luke after the series of parables commencing with that of the sower, and recorded in ch. xii. By Mark with a precise note of sequence: λέγει ἀντίς ἐν ἑκάστη τῇ ἡμέρᾳ δύος γενόμενης, Mark iv. 38.—24.] σωτηρός, usually, of an earthquake, = λαῖλαψ, Mark and Luke, a great commotion in the sea. καλύπτεσθαι. τὰ δὲ κύμα ἐπιβάλλον εἰς τὸ πλ. ἔστε αὐτῷ ὡς γειτονεῖ, Mark iv. 37. καινοπληρωμένα, Luke viii. 23. By keeping to the strict imperfect sense we obviate all necessity for qualifying these words: [Hartt Kustruč: bei Mögen (diffusen int Schiff, de Wette) was becoming covered, &c. All lakes bordered by mountains, and indeed all such coasts, are liable to these sudden gusts of wind.—26.] Κύριε σώσον ἀπόλλ. = διδάσκεις, οὗ μέλει σοι ὑπὸ ἀπόλλ.; Mark iv. 38. = κειστάσα, κειστάσα, ἄπολλ. Luke viii. 24. On these and such like variations, notice the following excellent and important remarks of Augustine (De Consensu Evv. ii. 24) : "Una eademque sententia est excitantium Dominum, velentiumque salvari: nec opus est quærere quid horum potius Christo dictum sit. Sive enim aliquod horum trium dilecti, sive alia verba quæ nullus Evangelistarum memoravit, tantundem tamen valentia ad eandem sententiam veritatem, quid ad rem interest?" We may well exclaim, O si sic omina! Much useless labour might have been spared, and men's minds led to the diligent inquiry into the real difficulties of the Gospels, instead of so many spending time in knitting cobwebs. But Augustine himself in the very next sentence, descends to the unsatisfactory ground of the Harmonists, when he adds, 'Quamquam et hoc fieri potuit, ut plurum eum simul excitabint, omnia hec, aliud ab alio, dicentur.' His mind however was not one to rest contented with such sophisms; and all his deeper and more earnest sayings are in the truer and freer spirit of the above extract.—26.] The time of this rebuke in the text precedes, but in Mark and Luke follows, the stilling of the storm. See the last note.—They were of little faith, in that they were afraid of perishing while they had on board the slumbering Saviour: they were not faithless, for they had recourse to that Saviour to help them. Therefore He acknowledges the faith which they had; answers the prayer of faith, by working a perfect calm: but rebukes them for not having the stronger, firmer faith, to trust Him even when He seemed insensible to their danger.—The symbolic application of this occurrence is too striking to have escaped general notice. The Saviour with the company of His disciples in the ship tossed on the waves, seemed a typical reproduction of the Ark bearing mankind on the flood, and a foreshadowing of the Church tossed by the tempests of this world, but having Him with her always. And the personal application is one of comfort and strengthening of faith in danger and doubt.—27. τοῦ ἀρηθ. The men who were in the ship, besides the Lord and His disciples. — 28.] Among the difficulties attendant on this narrative, the situation and name of the place where the event happened are not the least. Origen's remarks
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tων * Γεργησσών, υπήνθησαν αυτῷ δύο δαμονίζομενοι εκ των μυθείων εξερχομένου. "χαλεποί λίαν, ωστε μη ισχύειν τινά παρελθόν διὰ τῆς οδύο εκείνης" και ἰδοὺ ἐκραζαν λέγοντες "Τι ἡμῖν καὶ σοι, ἦν τε τοῦ Θεοῦ; ἡλθες ὅτε πρὸ καιροῦ βασανίσαι ἡμᾶς; ἢν δὲ μακράν

it as doubtful: Γαδαρηνὸν B C M 6 and a few copies mentioned by Orig. Γεργησσών desc Sahid. Ath. Orig. (expressly, who prefers it) Hil. (see notes). — 29. rec. ἢςον οὗ, are: ἦν περὶ τοὺς ὑπὸ τῶν δαμονίων κατακραμιζόμενοι καὶ ἐν τῇ βαλάσῃ συμπιγμονόμονοι χοίρους οἰκονομία ἀναγίγνασαν γεγονός ἐν τῷ χῶρῳ τῶν Γεργησσών. Προαῆ δὲ τῆς Αποκλίσεως ἤτοι πόλεως, οὕτω βαλάσαν οὕτω λίμνην πληθυνόκως ἑξοσαν. καὶ οὐ ἀν οὕτως προφανεὶς ψέδοι καὶ εὐπλεγοντοι οἳ ἐστισθεσαν ἤσχεςαν, ἀνδρεὶς ἰσαμοῦσι γίνοσκοντες τὰ περὶ τὴν Ἰουδαίαν. ἵπποι δὲ ἐν ἄλλοις ὑφομένοις "εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν Γαδαρηνῶν" καὶ πρὸς τοῦτο λεγοντι. Γάδαρα γὰρ πόλεις μίν ὑπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας, περὶ ἤν τὰ διοικήτα θεμάτια τυγχάνει, λιμνὴ δὲ κρυμμοῦς παρακυμή νος ὁδοίως ἤτοι ἐν αὐτῇ ἦν βαλασσα. Ἀλλὰ Γεργεσία, ἁπά τοίς ἡ Γεγονός, πόλεις ἀρχαῖα περὶ τὴν τῶν καλομένης Τιβερίαδα λίμνην, περὶ ἄν κρυμμοῦς παρακυμή νος τῇ λίμνῃ, ἀπὸ δὲ διείνεται τοὺς χοίρους ὑπὸ τῶν δαμανῶν καταβιβάζονται. Vol. i. p. 239, Lommatzsch. Notwithstanding this, it appears very doubtful whether there ever was a town named Gergesa near the lake. There were the Gergashites (Joseph. i. 6, 2) in former days, but their towns had been destroyed by the Israelites at their first irrigation, and never, that we hear of, afterwards rebuilt (see Deut. vii. 1. Josh. xxiv. 11). Gerasa (now Deraschah) lies much too far to the southeast. The site of Gadar is probably that alluded to in the text, which was destroyed by the Romans. It was entirely burned at the end of the Jewish War (Joseph. B. J. iv. 7, 3) μητρόπολις τῆς Πισγᾶς κατάρα, and (Euseb. Onomasticon) ἀντικριτοῦσα καὶ Τιβερίας διὸς πρὸς αναστάλην, ἐν τῷ δρόμῳ, ὡς πρὸς ταῖς ὑπορείας (Dr. Bloomfield in loc. conjectures ὑπορείας) ταὶ τῶν θερμῶν ὑδάτων λαυρά παράσειται. It was on the river Hierocam (Gadda Hierocam praefluente, Plin. v. 18), and sixty stadia from Tiberias (Joseph. Vit. § 60), πόλεις Ἐλλήνης (Jos. Ant. xvii. 11, 4). It was destroyed in the civil wars of the Jews, and rebuilt by Pompeius (Jos. B. J. i. 7, 7), presented by Augustus to King Herod (Jos. Ant. xv. 7, 3), and after his death united to the province of Syria (Jos. B. J. ii. 6, 3). It was one of the ten cities of Decapolis. (Pliny, ibid.) Burckhardt and others believe that they have found its ruins at Omneis, near the ridge of the chain which divides the valley of Jordan from that of the Sea of Tiberias. The territory of this city might well extend to the shore of the lake. It may be observed, that there is nothing in any of the three accounts to imply that the city was close to the scene of the miracle, or the scene of the miracle close to the herd of swine, or the herd of swine, at the time of their possession, close to the lake. Indeed the expression μακρὰν ἐν αὐτῶν, ver. 30, implies the contrary with regard to the swine. It appears, from Burckhardt, that there are many tombs in the neighbourhood of the ruins of Gadar to this day, hewn in the rock, and thus capable of affording shelter. Finally, we may observe, that Γεργησσων in the text can hardly have arisen entirely from Ori- gen's conjecture, as it pervades so many MSS and ancient versions. We cannot say that a part of the territory of Gadar may not have been known to those who, like Matthew, were locally intimate with the shores of the lake, by this ancient and generally disused name. I have therefore in the deficiency of decisive evidence against it, retained the reading, marking it as doubtful.—δύο δαμανοὺς] In Mark v. 2, and Luke vii. 27, but one is mentioned. All three Evangelists have some particulars peculiar to themselves; but Mark the most, and the most striking, having evidently proceeded from an eye-witness. The δύο πολλοί ισμόν of Mark is worth noticing, in connexion with the discrepance of number in the two accounts, as perhaps the origin of more than one being mentioned in the text, which omits the circumstance connected with that speech. Compare ver. 31, ὅλο Αἰαμοὺς = πάντες ὅλο δ Ολ. in Mark. —χαλεποί λίαν] See the terribly graphic account of Mark (v. 3—6). The demoniac was without clothes, which, though related only by Luke (viii. 27), yet, with remarkable consistency, appears from Mark's narrative, where he is described as sitting, clothed, and in his right mind, at Jesus's feet, after his cure. — ἐπὶ μέτα μοι] Pe- culiar to this Gospel. — 29. τι ημ. κ. ὑπό] τῆς ψυ τῆς. See 2 Sam. xvi. 10. xix. 22. πρὸς καιροῦ is peculiar to this Gospel; ὅτι τοῦ Θεού, common to all. — 30. μακρὰν] The
the demons enter into the swine, their ferocity, having no self-conserving balance as in the case of man, impels them headlong to their own destruction. — 34.] This request, which is related by all three Evangelists, was probably not from humility, but for fear the miraculous powers of our Lord should work them still more worldly loss. For the additional particulars of this miracle, see Mark v. 14. Luke viii. 36, and notes. — IX. 1.] Certainly this verse should be the sequel of the history in the last chapter. It is not connected with the miracle following; — which is placed by Luke at a different time, but with the indefinite introduction of ἵνα ἵ

the spiritual and bodily pain seem to have been connected and interchanged within him, and the former to have received accession of strength from the presence of the latter. Schleiermacher (on St. Luke, p. 90) supposes the haste of these bearers to have originated in the prospect of our Lord’s speedy departure thence; but, as Neander observes, we do not know enough of the paralytic’s own state to be able to say whether there may not have been some cause for it in the man himself. — δεινοί. Winer remarks, (§ 14.3.) —'The old grammarians themselves were divided about this word; some, as Eustathius, (Π. π. 590,) treat it as identical with ἄφωνα, as in Homer ἀφινη αἵρεται, o. e. Herodian, the Etymologicum, and Suidas, with this difference, however, that Suidas believes it to be a Doric, the author of the Etym. an Attic form; the former is certainly right, and this perfect-passive form is cognate with the perf.-act., ἄφωνη.‘ — 4. Θέα] By the spiritual power indwelling in Him. See John ii. 24, 25. No other interpretation of such passages is admissible. Mark’s expression, ἑπιστρεφοντα τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ, is more precise and conclusive. So we have ἑπιστρεφόντας τῷ πνεύματι, John xi. 33, synonymous with ἑπιστρεφόμενος ἐν ἑαυτῷ below, ver. 38. From τί γέρα . . . . οἶκον σου is common to the three Evangelists. — 5. τί γέρα ἔστιν σου. “In our Lord’s argu-
IX. 1—9. KATA MATHEION.

ment it must be carefully noted, that He does not ask, which is easiest, to forgive sins, or to raise a sick man—for it could not be affirmed that of forgiving was easier than this of healing—but, which is easiest, to claim this power or that; to say, Thy sins be forgiven thee, or to say, Arise and walk? That (i. e. the former) is easiest, and I will now prove my right to say it, by saying, with effect and with an outward consequence setting its seal to my truth, the harder word, Arise and walk. By doing that, which is capable of being put to the proof, I will vindicate my right and power to do that which in its very nature is incapable of being proved. By these visible tides of God’s grace I will give you to know in what direction the great under-currents of His love are setting, and that both are obedient to My word. From this, which I will now do openly and before you all, you may conclude that it is ‘no robbery’ (Phil. ii. 6) upon my part to claim also the power of forgiving men their sins.” Trench, p. 206. — 6. ἐν τῷ γῆς] Distinguished from ἐν τῷ σόφῳ, as in ch. xvi. 18, xviii. 13. — τότε λέγει] See a similar interchange of the persons in construction, Gen. iii. 22, 23. τότε λ. τ. π. is not parenthetic, nor is τότε δὲ εἴπητε λ. κ. ο. an elliptic sentence; but the speech and narrative are intermixed. A simple construction would require either τότε δὲ εἴπητε . . . ὑπὲρ λέγω τῷ παρ. . . . or τότε δὲ εἶπωσιν . . . τότε λέγει . . . We have, in the text, the first member of the former construction joined with the second of the latter. — 8. τοῖς ἀνθρώποις] Not plur. for sing. ‘to a man,’ nor ‘for the benefit of men’ but ‘to mankind.’ They regarded this wonder-working as something by God granted to men—to mankind; and without supposing that they had before them the full meaning of their words, those words were true in the very highest sense. See John xvii. 8. In Mark they say, δέτι οὐδὲν τοῦτο ἐδόμεν: in Luke, δέτι οὐδὲν παράδοξα σήμερον. 9—13.] Mark ii. 13—17. Luke v. 27—32. The Lord was going out to the sea to teach, Mark v. 13. All three Evangelists connect this calling with the preceding miracle, and the subsequent entertainment. The real difficulty of the narrative is the question as to the identity of Matthew in the text, and Levi in Mark and Luke. I shall state the arguments on both sides. (1) There can be no question that the three narratives relate to the same event. They are identical almost verbatim; inserted between narratives indisputably relating the same occurrences. (2) The almost general consent of all ages has supposed the two persons the same.—On the other hand, (3) our Gospel makes not the slightest allusion to the name of Levi, either here, or in x. 3, where we find Ματθαῖους τοὺς ἀποστόλους among the Apostles, clearly identified.
with the subject of this narrative: whereas the other two Evangelists having in this narrative spoken of Levi, in their enumerations of the Apostles (Mark ii. 18. Luke vi. 15.) mention Matthew without any note of identification with the Levi called on this occasion. This is almost inexplicable, on the supposition of his having borne both names. (4) Early tradition separates the two persons. Clement of Alexandria, (Stromata iv. ix. 73,) quoting from Heracleon, the Gnostic, (ὁ τῶν Οὐαλεντίνων σχολής δεικνυόντας κατὰ λέξιν,) mentions Ματθαῖος, Φιλίππας, Θωμᾶς, Λευκάς καὶ ἄλλοι πολλοί, as eminent men who had not suffered martyrdom from a public confession of the faith. (5) Again, Origen, (against Celsus, book i.) when Celsus has called the apostles τελωναὶ καὶ ναύτας, after acknowledging Ματθαῖος ὁ τελωνής, adds, ἢτω δὲ καὶ ὁ Ἁβίθης τελωνής ἀκολουθήσας τῷ Ἰησοῦ. Ἀλλὰ οὕτω γε τοῦ δρᾶμα τῶν ἀποστόλων αὐτῶν ἢ, ἢ μὴ κατὰ τὰς τῶν ἀντιγράφων τοῦ κατὰ Μάρκου εἰσαγγελίας. It is not quite clear from this, whether the copies of Mark substituted Levi’s name for Matthew’s, or for some other: but most probably the latter. But Λευκάς and Λευκάς are hardly more nearly allied than Λεβίς and Λεβίζσις, with whom Levi has sometimes been supposed identical. Λεβίς τῶν τελωνῶν may then have been the reading for Θαδαίον, Mark iii. 19, where we now find the reading Λεβίζσις in D abd. (6) It certainly would hence appear as if the preponderance of testimony were in favour of the distinctness of the two persons. Those who hold this suppose both publicans to have been called together. But it would be inexplicable on this supposition, how Matthew should in his account have omitted all mention of Levi,—evidently the man of most account, seeing that he was the giver of the greatest feast in his own house. Either this supposition cannot hold, or this account cannot have been written by Ματθαῖος ὁ τελωνής, a question which I have discussed elsewhere. See Prolegg. to Matt. With regard to the narrative itself in the text, we may observe, that this solemn and peculiar rite occurs (see ch. iv. 19, 22) hardly to belong to any but an Apostle: and that, as in the case of Peter, it here also implies a previous acquaintance and discipleship. —λεγόμενος must not be pressed to any closer signification than that his name was Matthew. See ch. ii. 23.—10.] We are told in Luke v. 29, that Levi made him a great feast in his house; and, similarly, Mark has ἐστίν ὁκε. αὐτῶς. The narrative in our text is so closely identical with that in Mark, that it is impossible to suppose, with Gresswell, that a different feast is intended. The arguments by which he supports his view are by no means weighty. From the words τῷ οἰκῳ, he infers that the house was not that of Matthew, but that in which our Lord usually dwelt, which he supposes to be intended in several other places. But surely the article might be used without any such significance, or designating any particular house,—as would be very likely if Matthew himself is here the narrator. (A similar mistake has been made in supposing τὸ πλοῖον, as in ver. 1, and elsewhere, to mean some one particular ship, whereas it is generic.) (Meyer’s assertion that Matthew’s house cannot be meant either here or in Mark ii. 15, but nothing else than the house where Jesus resided, only furnishes an instance (and they are frequent in his commentary) where, because two accounts are in remarkable coincidence, he wrests both reason and grammar to try to make them differ.) Again, Gresswell presses to verbal accuracy the terms used in the accounts, (e. g. συναφές και ἄλλος τοις συναφέσι,) and attempts to show them to be inconsistent with one another. But surely the time is past for such dealing with the historic text of the Gospels; and, besides, he has overlooked a great inconsistency in his own explanation, viz., that of making in the second instance, according to him, Scribes and Pharisees present at the feast given by a Publican, and claiming against that which they themselves were doing. It was not αὐτῷ, but αὐτήν the feast that the discourse in ver. 11—17 took place, when our Lord had left the house. And his whole inference, that δοκή μεγάλη must be the great meal in the day, and consequently in the evening, hangs on too slender a thread to need refutation. The real difficulty, insuperable to a Harmonist, is the connexion here of the raising of Jairus’s daughter with this feast: on which see below, ver. 18.—Καὶ ἐγὼ... καὶ [18.] a Hebraism, see reff.; it occurs, but with the omission of ἔσοδον, in Mark’s account. The not very usual word,
... is also common to the two. Mark, with his usual precision, adds ἵσαν γὰρ πολλοί, καὶ ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ: a clause answering to ἴδοντες in our text. See last note. — 11. [Ἰδόντες] having observed this, see ver. 4. These Pharisees appear to have been the Pharisees of the place: Luke adds αὐτῶν: οἱ γραμ. αὐτῶν καὶ οἱ Φ.—The very circumstances related show that this remonstrance cannot have taken place at the feast. The Pharisees say the words to the disciples: our Lord hears it. This denotes an occasion when our Lord and the disciples were present, but not surely intermixed with the ἄχος τῆς πολικής. — 12. ἱερουσαλήμ... καὶ Φ.—Both words in the saying, must be understood subjectively (‘ironica concessio,’ Calvin. Meyer): as referring to their respective opinions of themselves; as also δικαίως and ἀμαρτωλοῦς, ver. 13:—not as though the Pharisees were objectively either ἱερούσαλημ or δικαίοι, however much objective truth κακῶς ἔχουσιν and ἀμαρτωλοί may have had as applied to the publicans and sinners. The whole of this discourse, with the exception of the citation, is verbatim in Mark, and (with ἤγαναίσθης = ἠγούσθης and Ἰησοῦς = Ἰησοῦν) Luke also.

14—17.] Mark ii. 18—22. Luke v. 33—39. According to the detailed narrative of Mark (ii. 19) it was the disciples of John and of the Pharisees who asked this question. Luke continues the discourse as that of the former Pharisees. This is one of those instances where the three accounts imply and confirm one another, and the hints incidentally dropped by one Evangelist form the prominent assertions of the other.—The fasting often of the disciples of John must not be understood as done in mourning for their master's imprisonment, but as belonging to the asceticism which John, as a preacher of repentance, inculcated. — 15. πενθείς = νηστείους Mark and Luke. The difference of these two words is one of Greswell’s arguments for the non-identity of the narratives (!). Even if there were any force in such an argument, we might fairly set against it that ἀπαρθή is common to all three Evangelists, and occurs nowhere else in the N. T.—ὁ νυμφίος. This appellation of Himself had from our Lord peculiar appropriateness as addressed to the disciples of John. Their master had himself said (John iii. 29) ὁ ἵνα τὴν νυμφίαν, νυμφίος λατινων ὁ δὲ φίλος τοῦ νυμφίου, ὁ ἱεροῦ καὶ ἀκούων ἀπορεῖ, ἀν Χριστός δὲ σω ἰππήρωσαμ. —Our Lord in calling Himself the Bridegroom, announces the fulfilment in Him of a whole cycle of O. T. prophecies and figures: very probably with immediate reference to Hosea ii. 12, that prophet having been just cited before: but also to many other passages, in which the Bride is the Church of God, the Bridegroom the God of Israel. See especially Isai. liv. 5—10. As Stier (Reden des Herrn Jesu, I. 365) observes, the article here must not be
considered as merely introduced on account of the parable, as usual elsewhere, but the parable itself to have sprung out of the emphatic name, ὁ νυμφίος. The νομισματίκης is more than the mere guests at the wedding: they are the bridegroom's friends who go and fetch the bride.—ἐλεύθερον ο人居环境 the dwelling place of the bride, when the bridegroom shall have been taken from them: when His departure shall have taken place.—καλά τότε ν.] These words are not a declaration of a duty, or of an ordinance, as binding on the Church in the days of her Lord's absence: the whole spirit of what follows is against such a supposition:—but they declare, in accordance with the parallel word παρεθάνη, that in those days they shall have real occasion for fasting; sorrow enough, it is said, without the presence of Him who fulfils the solemn purpose of His will respecting them, not one of their own arbitrary laying on. This view is strikingly brought out in Luke, where the question is, Can ye ποιήσαι νυστατίνες the children, &c., i. e. by your rites and ordinances? but, &c. and τοῦτο προφθασσόμενοι: there is no constraint in this latter case: they shall (or better, they will) fast. And this furnishes us with an analogous rule for the fasting of the Christian life: that it should be the genuine offspring of inward and spiritual sorrow, of the sense of the absence of the Bridegroom in the soul,—not the forced and stated fasts of the old covenant, now passed away.—16.] Our Lord in these two parables contrasts the old and the new, the Legal and Evangelic dispensations, with regard to the point on which He was questioned. The ideas of the wedding seem to run through them; the preparation of the robe, the pouring of the new wine, are connected by this as their leading idea to one another and the preceding verses.—The old system of prescribed fasts for fasting's sake must not be patched with the new and sound piece; the complete and beautiful whole of Gospel light and liberty must not be engraved as a mere addition on the worn out system of ceremonies. For the προφθασμα αὐτῶν, the completeness of it, the new patch, by its weight and its strength pulls away the neighbouring weak and loose threads by which it holds to the old garment, and the rent is made worse. Stier notices the prophetic import of this parable: in how sad a degree the χήρον σχῆμα γίνεται has been fulfilled in the History of the Church, by the attempts to patch the new, the Evangelic state, upon the old worn out ceremonial system. 'Would,' he adds, 'that we could say in the interpretation, as in the parable, No man doeth this! The robe must be all new, all consistent: old things, old ceremonies, old burdens, all are passed away: behold all things are become new.—χήρον σχ. γίνεται not a worse rent takes place; but as in E. V. 'the rent becomes worse.' The usage is, when the whole subject, or the subject and predicate, as here, precede a verb substantive, to omit the article: so in the interpretation of the parable of the tares in ch. xiii. 37 ff., ὁ ἄγρ. ἵστεν ὁ κάδος.—οὐδείς εἶσον οἱ νυστάται—πάντοτε οἱ διαβάλλονται τοῦ αἰώνος ἵστεν, οἱ διαβάλλονται ἵστεν.—IX. This parable is not a repetition of the previous one, but a stronger and more exact setting forth of the truth in hand. As is frequently our Lord's practice in his parables, He advances from the immediate subject to something more spiritual and higher,
and takes occasion from answering a cavil, to press the sublimest truths. The garment was something outward; this wine is powdered in, is something inward, the spirit of the system. The former parable respected the outward freedom and simple truthfulness of the New Covenant; this regards its inner spirit, its pervading principle. And admirably does the parable describe the vanity of the attempt to keep the new wine in the σακχαρος παλαιος, the old ceremonial man, Renewed in the spirit of his mind: ἁγνυνται οἱ ἄσσοι: the new wine is something too living and strong for so weak a moral frame; it shatters the fair outside of ceremonies, and by the κατασκευασμον, the spirit is lost; the man is neither a blameless Jew nor a faithful Christian; both are spoilt. And then the result: not merely the damaging, but the utter destruction of the vessel,—οἱ ἄσσοι ἀπολούνται.—According to some expositors, the new patch and new wine denote the fasting; the old garment and old bottles, the disciples. ἢ δέ λέγει, τοιούτων ἱστιν σῦνε γεγονσιν ἵσχυροι οἱ μαθηταὶ, ἀλλ' ἐν πολλῇ δοσονται συγκατασκευασμος, ὅτι ἐν τοι τοπομαστα ἀνεκανασθαν. οὕτω ἐδικαιόμενοι σὴν κρίσιν, ἐκπλήθος ἕτοιμαι συγκαταγομ. Chrysostom, Hom. in Matt. xxx. 355, A. This view is stated and defended at some length by Neander, Leben Jesu, p. 346; but I own seems to me, as to De Wette, far fetched. For how can fasting be called ἑπιθυμησια ῥέας ἀγνίφον, or how compared to new wine? And Neander himself when he comes to explain the important addition in Luke (on which see Luke v. 39, and note) is obliged to change the meaning, and understand the new wine of the Spirit of the Gospel.—It was and is the custom in the East to carry their wine on a journey in leather bottles, generally of goats' skin, sometimes of asses' or camels' skin. (Winer, Reallwörterbuch. Schlauch.)

18—26.] Mark v. 21—43. Luke viii. 41—56. In Luke and Mark this miracle follows immediately after the casting out of the devils at Gadara, and our Lord's rescr热搜ing the lake to capernaum; but without any precise note of time as here. He may well have been by the sea, as seems implied by Mark and Luke,) when the foregoing conversation with the disciples of John and the Pharisees took place. The account in the text is the most concise of the three; both Mark and Luke, but especially the latter, giving many additional particulars. The miracle forms a very instructive point of comparison between the three Gospels. — ἀρχων ἐκ] A ruler of the synagogue, named Jairus. In all except the connecting words, ταύτη αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος αὐτῶν, the account in the text is summary, and deficient in particularity. I have therefore reserved full annotation for the account in Luke, which see throughout. — ἐκπλήθος ἕτοιμαι She was no dead, but dying; at the last extremity. Matthew, omitting the misspelling from the ruler's house, (Mark v. 35. Luke viii. 49,) gives the matter summarily in these words. — 29.] The cure was effected on her touch,
ing our Lord's garment. Mark v. 29. Luke viii. 44. And our Lord inquired who touched Him, (Mark, Luke,) for He perceived that virtue had gone out of Him (Luke). She, knowing what had been done to her, came fearing and trembling and told Him all.— 24.] No inference can be drawn from these words as to the fact of the maiden's actual death; for our Lord uses the same words of Lazarus. (John xi. 11.) And if it be answered that there He explains the sleep to mean death, we answer, that this explanation is only in consequence of the disciples misunderstanding His words. In both cases the words are most probably used with reference to the speedy awakening which was to follow, as Fritzche (cited by Trench, Miracles, p. 183): 'Puellam ne pro mortua habetote, sed dormire extinctamote, quippe in vitam mox redditur.' Luke appends, after kar. abr., εἰδότες δὲ ἀνέπιπτεν, in which words at least there is no recognition by the Evangelist of a mere apparent death. — 26.] ἐκρ. τῆς χ. ἡμ. is common to the three Evangelists. From Luke we learn that our Lord said ἵνα πάντες, ἵνα πάντες: from Mark we have the words He actually uttered, ἀλλάδο κομώμεν: both these are in the name of the maiden, that she was twelve years old, and that our Lord commanded that something should be given her to eat. She was an only daughter. Luke viii. 42.

27—31.] Peculiar to Matthew. ἔστω τοις ἡμέρασιν is too vague to be taken as a fixed note of sequence; for ἔστω τοις may mean the house of Jairus, or the town itself, or even that part of the country,—as ver. 26 has generalized the locality, and implied some pause of time.—ὡς Ἅλωνς εἰς τοὺς τοῦτο κράξον μεν ἵναι σωματικόν γαρ ναὶ τοιούτου προσαγωγα. Euthym. — 28. τῆς εἰκόνας εἰς, ἵνα τῆς ἐν αὐτῆς, εἰς ἡν εἰρήσασα. Euthym. Or, the house which our Lord inhabited at Capernaum (De Wette and others); but I conceive that τῆς εἰκόνα need not mean any particular house, merely, as we sometimes use the expression, the house, as opposed to the open air.—τοῦτο ποιήσας i.e. the healing implied in κατέστην ἡμᾶς.—ὡς Δ. . . . . κατέστη] See Ps. cx. 1, and ch. xxii. 45. It is remarkable that, in all the three narratives of giving sight to the blind in this Gospel, the title 'Son of David' appears. See ch. xii. 23. xx. 31.—Touching, or anointing the eyes, was the ordinary method which our Lord took of impressing on the blind the action of the Divine power which healed them. Ch. xx. 31 and 11. Mark viii. 26. John ix. 6. — 29.] In this miracle however we have this peculiar feature, that no direct word of power passes from the Lord, but a relative concession, making that which was done a measure of the faith of the blind men: and from the result the degree of their faith appears. Stier remarks, (Reden Jesu, I. 383,) 'We may already notice, in the history of this first period of our Lord's ministry, that, from having at first yielded immediately to the request for healing, He begins, by degrees, to prove and exercise the faith of the applicants.'— 30. ἐνεβρώμωσεν] Suidas explains this word, μετὰ ἀνελίς ἐνεβρώ-
"Orate μηδεὶς γινωσκέτω. 31 οἱ δὲ ἔξελθόντες διεφήμισαν αὐτὸν ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ γῇ ἐκείνῃ. 32 Αὐτῶν δὲ ἔξερχομένων, ἵδιον προσήνεγκαν αὐτῷ ἀνθρωπὸν κωδόν δαιμονιζόμενον. 33 καὶ ἐκβλήθην τὸν δαιμόνιον ἐλάλησεν εὐφωβε ἐκεῖ καὶ ἐθάμισαν οἱ ὄχλοι λέγοντες Ὁ Ὁδέποτε ἔφανεν οὕτως ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ. 34 οἱ δὲ Φαρισαῖοι ἔλεγον, Ἐν τῷ ἀρχοντὶ τῶν δαιμονίων ἐκβάλλει τα δαιμονία.

Καὶ β περιήγην ὁ Ἰσραήλ ἐπὶ τῶν πολέων πόλεως καὶ τάς κώμας, διάδακτος ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν, καὶ κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας καὶ θεραπεύων πάσαν νόσον καὶ πάσαν μαλακίαν. 36 ἰδὼν δὲ τοὺς ὀχλοὺς, ἐπιλαγχυσθῆναι περὶ αὐτῶν, ὅτι ἦσαν ἐσκυλμένοι καὶ λυθῆσαι μετ’ ἀναστρόφησιν εὐπληγίᾳ.

The purpose of our Lord's earnestness appears to have been two-fold: (1) that He might not be so occupied and overpressed with applications as to have neither time nor strength for the preaching of the Gospel: (2) to prevent the already-excited people from taking some public measure of recognition, and thus arousing the malice of the Pharisees before His hour was come.—No doubt the two men were guilty of an act of disobedience in thus breaking the Lord's solemn injunction: for obedience is better than sacrifice; the humble observance of the word of the Lord, than the most laborious and wide-spread will-worship after man's own mind and invention. Tocher (Miracles, p. 197) well remarks, that the fact of almost all the Romish interpreters having applauded this act, "is very characteristic, and rests on very deep differences."

32—34.] Peculiar to Matthew. The word ἔξερχομένων, being a present participle, places this miracle in direct connexion with the foregoing. This narration has a singular affinity with that in ch. xii. 22, or still more with its parallel in Luke xi. 14. In both, the same expression of wonder follows; the same calumny of the Pharisees; only that in ch. xii. the demoniac is said (not in Luke xi.) to have been likewise blind. These circumstances, coupled with the immediate connexion of this miracle with the cure of the blind men, and the mention of 'the Son of David' in both, have led some to suppose that the account in ch. xii. is a repetition, or slightly differing version of the account in our text, intermingled also with the preceding healing of the blind. But the supposition seems unnecessary,—as, the habit of the Pharisees once being to ascribe our Lord's expulsion of devils to Beelzebub, the repetition of the remark would be natural—and the other coincidences, though remarkable, are not exact enough to warrant it.—This was a dumbness caused by demoniacal possession: for the difference between this and the natural infirmity of a deaf and dumb man, see Mark vii. 31—37. [κ.δ.κ.] viz. the casting out of devils—never was seen to be followed by such results as those now manifested.' See above. ὀφθαλμὸς is not for τοῦτο or τούτο τι (De Wette, &c.); the passages cited as bearing out this meaning in the LXX do not apply, for in all of them ὀφθαλμὸς is so. 1 Kings xxviii. 17. Ps. xlvii. 8. Judg. xix. 30 alex. Neh. viii. 17.

35—38.] Peculiar to Matthew. In the same way as ch. iv. 23—25 introduces the Sermon on the Mount, so do these verses the calling and commissioning of the Twelve. These general descriptions of our Lord's going about and teaching at once remove all exactness of date from the occurrence which follows—as taking place at some time during the circuit and teaching just described. Both the Sermon on the Mount and this discourse are introduced and closed with these marks of indefiniteness as to time. This being the case, we must have recourse to the other Evangelists, by whose account it appears, (as indeed may be implied in ch. x. 1,) that the Apostles had been called to their distinct office some time before this. (See Mark iii. 16. Luke vi. 13.) After their calling, and selection,
they probably remained with the Lord for some time, before they were sent out upon their mission.——36. τοὺς δὲ λόγους] Wherever He went, in all the cities.——37. ἄσκωλος] Vexatī — harassed, plagued — viz. literally, with weariness in following Him; or spiritually, with the tyranny of the Scribes and Pharisees, their pharisaic dicta, ecclesia, ch. xxiii. 4. — ἀναμυνομένως] Temere projecti, abjecti, neglectī, as sheep would be who had wandered from their pasture. The context shows that our Lord's compassion was excited by their being without competent spiritual leaders and teachers.——37.] The harvest was primarily that of the Jewish people, the multitudes of whom before Him excited the Lord's compassion. ἄρα πάντως τὸ ἀνεύρωδον, ἢ χρώμα σερνατάς, ἱστέψαι τοὺς μαθητάς. οὗ διὰ δὲ τούτο μόνον, ἀλλὰ τῶν αὐτῶν καὶ πᾶππου, καθάρι ζυς τῶν παλαιότερων, ἢ δύνασθαι τοὺς ἀκατάλληλους, εἰς τῆς ἀκμῆς ἀναπόσπασθαι. Chrysost. Hom. xxxii. 367 B. 38.] τίνος ἡμῶν Πέτρος, Λουκαί, x. 1—13. Luke ix. 1—6,—for the sending out of the Apostles; Mark iii. 12—19. Luke vi. 13—16,—for their names. On the characteristic differences between this discourse and what delivered to the Seventy (Luke x. 1 ff.) see notes there.——Notice, that this is not the choosing, but merely the mission of the twelve. The choosing had taken place some time before, but is not anywhere distinctly related by the Evangelists.——2.] We have in the N. T. four catalogues of the Apostles: the present one,—at Mark iii. 16, Luke vi. 14, Acts i. 13. All seem to follow one common outline, but fill it up very differently. The following table will show the agreements and differences:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Σίμων Πέτρος</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ἀνδρέας</td>
<td>Τάκκωμος</td>
<td>'Ανδρέας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ἰάκωβος</td>
<td>'Ιακώβος</td>
<td>'Ιακώβος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ἰωάννης</td>
<td>'Ιωάννης</td>
<td>'Ιωάννης</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Φίλιππος</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Θωμᾶς</td>
<td>Μαθαθίας</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Μαθαθίας</td>
<td>Θωμᾶς</td>
<td>Μαθαθίας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Τάκκωμος</td>
<td>Θαδδαίος</td>
<td>Τάκκωμος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>'Ιακώβος</td>
<td>Σίμων ο ἐκα.</td>
<td>'Ιακώβος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Θαδδαίος</td>
<td>Σίμων ο θηλ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Κανανησίς</td>
<td>Τιμόθεος</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Τιμόθεος</td>
<td>Τιμόθεος</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From this it appears (1), that in all four, three classes are enumerated, and that each class contains (assuming at present the identity of Θαδδαῖος with Ιωάννας Ιακώβου the same names in all four, but in different order, with the following exceptions—that (2) Peter, Philip, James the (son) of Alpheus, and Judas Iscariot hold the same places in all four. (3) That in the first class the two arrangements are (a), that of Matt. and Luke (Gospel).—Peter and Andrew, brothers; James and John, brothers;—i.e. according to their order of calling and connexion, and with reference to their being sent out in couples, Mark vi. (8): (3) Mark and Luke (Acts).—Peter, James, John, (the three principal), and Andrew;—i.e. according to their personal pre-eminence. In the second class (γ), that of Matt., Mark, and Luke (Gospel).—Philip and Bartholomew, Matthew and Thomas,—i.e. in couples: (2) Luke (Acts).—Philip, Thomas, Barth., Matthew (reason uncertain). In the third class (τ), Matt. and Mark.—James the (son) of Alpheus and Thaddeus, Simon the Canaanite and Judas Iscariot; i.e. in couples: (2) Luke (Gosp. and Acts).—James the (son) of Alpheus, Simon Zelotes, Judas Ιακώβου, and Judas Iscariot (uncertain). (4) Thus in all four, the leaders of the three classes are the same, viz. Peter, Philip, and James the (son) of Alpheus; and the traitor is always last. (4) It would appear then that the only difficulties are these two: the identity of Θαδδαῖος with Ιωάννας Ιακώβου, and of Σίμων Κανανείας with Simon ο Καλ. Ζωλνίτης. These will be discussed under the names.—πρώτος] Not only as regards arrangement, or mere priority of calling, but as primus inter pares. This is clearly shown from James and John and Andrew being set next, and Judas Iscariot the last, in all the catalogues. We find Simon Peter, not only in the lists of the Apostles, but also in their history, prominent on various occasions before the rest. Sometimes he speaks in their name (Matt. xix. 27. Luke xii. 41); sometimes answers when all are addressed (Matt. xvi. 16. Mark viii. 29); sometimes our Lord addresses him as principal, even among the three favoured ones (Matt. xxvi. 40 Luke xxii. 31); sometimes he is addressed by others as representing the whole (Matt. xvii. 24. Acts ii. 37). He appears as the organ of the Apostles after our Lord’s ascension (Acts i. 16. ii. 14. iv. 8. v. 29); the first speech, and apparently that which decided the Council, is spoken by him, Acts xv. 7. All this accords well with the bold and energetic character of Peter, and originated in the unerring discernment and appointment of the Lord Himself, who saw in him a person adapted to take precedence of the rest in the founding of His Church, and shuffling (Acts v. 26. 9) and opening (Acts ii. 14. 41. x. 5. 46) the doors of the kingdom of Heaven. That however no such idea was current among the Apostles as that he was destined to be the Prince of the future Church, is as clear as the facts above mentioned. For (1) no trace is found in all the Epistles of the other Apostles of such a pre-eminence; but when he is mentioned, it is either, as 1 Cor. ix. 5, as one of the Apostles, one example among many, but in no wise the chief;—or as in Gal. ii. 7, 8, with a distinct account of a peculiar province of duty and preaching being allotted to him, viz. the apostleship of the circumcision, (see 1 Pet. i. 1,) as distinguished from Paul, to whom was given the apostleship of the uncircumcision;—or as in Gal. ii. 9, as one of the principal αρχιερείας, together with James and John;—or as in Gal. ii. 11, as subject to rebuke from Paul as from an equal. (2) Wherever by our Lord Himself the future constitution of His Church is alluded to, or by the Apostles its actual constitution, no hint of any such primacy is given, (see note on Matt. xvi. 18,) but the whole college of Apostles are spoken of as absolutely equal. Matt. xix. 27, 28. xx. 26. 28. Eph. ii. 20, and many other places. Again (3) in the two Epistles which we have from his own hand, there is nothing for, but every thing against, such a supposition. He exhorts the πρεσβύτεροι as being their συμμετοχήτεροι (1 Pet. v. 1): describes himself as τῆς μετάφρασις ἀποκάλυπτειν δόξας κοινωνίας; addresses his second Epistle τῆς ἴσωτης ἡμῶν λαθείας πίστις (2 Pet. i. 1): and makes not the slightest allusion to any pre-eminence over the other Apostles.—So that πρώτος here must be understood as signifying the prominence of Peter among the Apostles, as well as his early calling. (See John i. 42.)—ὁ λεγόμενος Πέτρος] Ο Κηφᾶς, νηστείος, so named by our Lord Himself (John as above) at His first meeting with him, and again more solemnly, and with a direct reference to the meaning of the name, Matt. xvi. 16. —Ανδρέας] He in conjunction with John (see note on John i. 37—40) was a disciple of the Baptist, and followed our Lord on their master
καὶ Ἰωάννης ὁ ἀλεφός αὐτοῦ. Φιλίππος καὶ Βαρθολομαῖος, Θωμᾶς, καὶ Ματθαῖος ὁ τελώνης, Ἰάκωβος, ὁ τοῦ καὶ Άλφαῖος, καὶ Λεβανίας ὁ ἐπικληθείς Θαδαίας,

Σίμων ὁ Ἰακωβαῖος καὶ Ἰούδας ὁ Ἰσκαρίωτης ὁ καὶ τοῦ

ΧAP. X. 3 καὶ Θαδαίας Β 2 ce Copt. Sahid. κ. Λεβανίας(ai)ς D d. ttx C. (what C had is uncertain, as it has been erased; but certainly more than καὶ Θ. or καὶ Λ.)—rec. Κανανίτης, but ttx (xav. D ac) B C D L abcv Copt.—5. καὶ λύγ. D ab.—6. for απο,

pointing Him out as the Lamb of God. They did not however from that time constantly accompany Him, but received a more solemn calling, (see Matt. iv. 17—22. Luke v. 1—11,) in the narrative of which Peter is prominent, and so πρῶτος called as an apostle, at least of those four.—Ὑακίνθου, ὁ τύχων Καθολικοῦ.] Partners in the fishing trade with Peter and Andrew, Luke v. 10.—3. Φιλίππ. Βαρθολομαίος, γεύς ζη, son of Talmai or Tolomeus, has been generally supposed to be the same with Nathanael of Cana in Galilee; and with reason: for (1) the name Bartholomew is not his own name, but a patronymic:—(2) He follows next in order, as Nathanael, in John i. 46, to the Apostles just mentioned, with the same formula οὐδὲ σεις Φιλίππος τῶν Ναθ.:—(3) He is there, as here, and in Mark and Luke (Gospel), in connexion with Philip.—(4) In John xxi. 2, at the appearance of our Lord on the shore of the sea of Tiberias, Nathanael is mentioned as present, where five if not seven apostles are recounted:—Θωμᾶς, κ. Μαθ. ὁ τῆς Ταλής.] Thomas was called Ἀλέφας, John xi. 16. xx. 24. xxi. 2. On the question whether Μαθ. ὁ τῆς was the author of this Gospel, see Prolegomena. He is clearly by this appellation identified with the Matthew of ch. ix. 9. We hear nothing of him except in these two passages. —Ὑακίνθου, ὁ τύχων Καθολικοῦ] From John xix. 25 we learn that Mary the (wife) of Κλωνᾶς was sister of Mary the mother of our Lord. From Mark xv. 40, that Mary was the mother of James the less, which may be this James. Hence it would appear, if these two passages point to the same person, that Ἀλέφας = Κλωνᾶς. And indeed the two Greek names are but different ways of expressing the Hebrew name Υακίνθου.

If this be so, then this James the Less is the δ ἀλεφός τοῦ Κυρίου mentioned Gal. i. 19 apparently as an apostle, and one of the ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ mentioned Matt. xiii. 55 (where see note). On the difficulties attending this view, see note on John vii. 5. Κλωνᾶς must not be confused with Κλωνᾶς, Luke xxii. 18, with whom there is no reason to suppose him identical.—Λεβανίας δὲ της Θαδαί.] Much difficulty rests on this name, both from the various readings, and the questions arising from the other lists. The present reading appears to be a conjunction of the two ancient ones, Λεβανίας and Θαδαίας: and perhaps the latter of these may have been introduced from Mark. (But it is remarkable that in Mark D has Λεβανίας.) Whichever of these is the true reading, the Apostle himself has generally been supposed to be identical with Πολυσίλους in both Luke's catalogues, i.e. (see note there) Judas the brother of James, and so son of Alphaeus, and likewise one of the ἀδελφοί κυρίου named Matt. xiii. 55. In John xiv. 22 we have a 'Judas, not Iscariot,' among the Apostles; and the catholic epistle is written by 'Judas brother of James.' What in this case the names Λεβανίας and Θαδαίας are, is impossible to say. The common idea that they are cognate names, Λεβανίας being from λέβανος, and Θαδαίας from ςάδης, breast, is disproved by De Wette, who observes that the latter signifies mensa, and not ψέκτης. So that the whole rests on conjecture, which however does not contradict any known fact, and may be allowed as the only escape from the difficulty. —Σίμων ὁ Καναβ.] This is not a local name, but is derived from Σίμων (Hebr. שׁוֹם) = ζηλωτής (Luke, Gosp. and Acts). We may therefore suppose that before his conversion he belonged to the sect of the Zealots, who after the example of Phineas (Num. xxv. 7, 8) took the law into their own hands and punished offenders against the law. This sect eventually brought upon Jerusalem its destruction. —Ἰωάννης δὲ Ἰωάν.] Son of Simon (John vii. 11. xii. 3. 26). Probably a native of Keriōth in Judæa, Josh. xv. 26, Ἱερώνῦμος, a man of Keriōth, as Ιστορέας, i.e. Ἰστόριον, a man of Tob, Joseph. Ant. vii. 6. 1. That the name Ἰωάν cannot be a surname, as Bp. Middleton supposes, the expression Ἰωάννης Σύμωνος Ἱσκαριώτης, used in all the above places of John, clearly proves.—

5. λέγων] If we compare this verse with ch. xi. 1, there can be little doubt that this discourse of our Lord was delivered at one time, and that, the first sending of the Twelve. How often its solemn injunctions may have been repeated on similar occasions we cannot say: many of them reappear at the sending of the Seventy in Luke x. 2 f. —Its primary reference is to the then mission of the Apostles to prepare His way; but it includes, in the germ, instructions prophetically delivered for the ministers and missionaries of the Gospel to the end of time. It may be divided into three great portions, in each of which different departments of the subject are treated, but which follow in natural sequence one another. In the first of these (ver. 5—15), our Lord taking up the position of the messengers whom He sends from the declaration with which the Baptist and He Himself began their ministry, ὅτι ἡ γέγενσιν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν ὑπαρχόντων, gives them commands, mostly literal and of present import, for their mission to the cities of Israel. This portion concludes with a denunciation of judgment against that unbelief which should reject their preaching. —The second (vv. 16—23) refers to the general mission of the Apostles as developing itself, after the Lord should be taken from them, in preaching to Jews and Gentiles (vv. 17, 18), and subjecting them to persecutions (vv. 21, 22). This portion ends with the end of the apostolic period properly so called, ver. 23 referring primarily to the destruction of Jerusalem. In this portion there is a foreshadowing of what shall be the lot and duty of the teachers of the Gospel to the end, inasmuch as the 'coming of the Son of Man' is ever typical of His final coming to judge the world. The direct reference is to the Apostles and their mission, and the other only by inference. —The third (vv. 24—42), the longest and weightiest portion, is spoken directly (with occasional reference only to the Apostles and their mission (ver. 40) of all disciples of the Lord, —their position, —their encouragements, —their duties, —and finally concludes with the last great reward (ver. 42). In these first verses, 5, 6, we have the location; in 7, 8, the purpose; in 9—11, the fitting out; and in 11—14, the manner of proceeding,—of their mission: ver. 15 concluding with a prophetic denunciation tending to impress them with a deep sense of the importance of the office intrusted to them. —Σαμαρεύων] The Samaritans were the Gentile inhabitants of the country between Judæa and Galilee, consisting of heathens whom Shalmaneser king of Assyria brought from Babylon and other places. Their religion was a mixture of the worship of the true God with idolatry (2 Kings xvii. 24—41). The Jews had no dealings with them, John iv. 9. They appear to have been but not so unready as the Jews to receive our Lord and His mission (John iv. 39—42. Luke ix. 51 and note); —but this prohibition rested on judicial reasons. See Acts xii. 48. In Acts i. 8 the prohibition is expressly taken off: ' Ye shall be witnesses in Jerusalem, and in all Judæa, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth.' And in Acts viii. 1. 5. 8, we find the result. See Matt. xv. 21—28. —6. τὰ προβ. τὰ ἀπόλ.] See ch. ix. 36. John x. 16. —7.] This announcement shows the preparatory nature of this first apostolic mission. Compare, as showing the difference of their ultimate message to the world, Col. i. 26—28. —8. Σαμαρεύω Ι., Σαμαρεῖν 8.] See Acts xii. 18—20. —9. ημεῖς ἑξακείσθε] All the words following depend on this verb, and it is explained by the parallel expression in Mark and Luke, μηδὲν αἴρετε εἰς τὴν ὅδον. They were to
μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἑθνεῖσι. 18 ὅταν δὲ * παραδέδω ὅπως ἦν καὶ πνεύμα τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν τὸ λαλοῦσα εἰς τῆς ὑμῖν ἐν εἰκονική τῇ ὁρᾷ λαλήσετε. 20 οὖ γὰρ ὑμεῖς ἐστε οἱ λαλοῦντες, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἔποιημα τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν τὸ λαλοῦν ἐν ὑμῖν. 21 ὅταν δὲ ἀδελφοὶ ἀδελφόν εἰς θάνατον, καὶ πατὴρ τέκνον, καὶ ἐπαναστήσονται τέκνα ἐπὶ γονεῖς καὶ "θανατώσωσιν αὐτοὺς. 22 καὶ ἐστάθη μισοῦμεν ὑπὸ πάντων διὰ τὸ ὅνομα μου. ὁ δὲ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος, οὖν ὁ σωθήσεται. 23 ὅταν δὲ διώκωσιν ὑμᾶς εἰς τῷ πόλει ταύτην, φεύγετε εἰς τὴν ἄλλην. ἀμήν [γὰρ] λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ τελέσητε τὰς πόλεις [τοῦ] Ἰσραήλ ἑως


tion; this of Gentile: the concluding words show that the scope of the both, in the Divine purposes, as regarded the Apostles, was the same, viz. εἰς μαρτ. αὐτ. κ. τ. ἔθνων. The μαρτ. is in both senses—a testimony to, and against them, and refers to both sets of persecutors: αὐτοῖς, to them, i.e. the Jews (not the ἵγιος καὶ βασιλ., for they are Gentiles themselves), καὶ τοῖς ἔθνων. It was a testimony in the best sense to Sergius Paulus, Acts xii. 7, but against Felix, Acts xxiv. 25; and this double power ever belongs to the word of God as preached—it is αὐτοκρατορία (Rev. i. 16. ii. 12).—19. χεῖ μεριμνήσατε—take not anxious or distracting thought. A spiritual prohibition answering to the literal one in vv. 9, 10. See Exodus iv. 12.—20. οὐ γὰρ ἦν σκέψις κ.τ.λ.] This shows the reference of the command to a future mission of the Apostles, see John xv. 26, 27. (1) It is to be observed that our Lord never in speaking to His disciples says our Father, but either πατήρ, or ὁ πατήρ, or both conjoined; never leaving it to be inferred that God is in the same sense His Father and our Father. (2) It is also to be observed that in the great work of God in the world, human individuality sinks down and vanishes, and God alone, His Christ, His Spirit, is the great worker, as here οὐκ ἐστιν ὑμῖς ... ἀλλὰ τῷ πν. τοῦ π. νῷ.——21. Spoken most likely of official information given against Christians, as there are no female relations mentioned.—22. πάνων] i.e. all else but yourselves; not, as De Wette so often interprets, 'a strong expression, intended to signify many, or the majority of mankind.'—δὲ διὰ αὐτούς In order to understand these words it is necessary to enter into the character of our Lord's prophecies respecting His coming, as having an immediate literal, and a distant foreshadowed fulfilment. Throughout this discourse and the great prophecy in ch. xxiv., we find the first Apostolic period used as a type of the whole ages of the Church, and the vengeance on Jerusalem— which historically is applied to the old dispensation, and was in its place with reference to that order of things, the coming of the Son of Man,—as a type of the final coming of the Lord. These two subjects accompany and interpenetrate one another in a manner wholly inexplicable to those who are unaccustomed to the wide import of Scripture prophecy, which speaks very generally not so much of events themselves, points of time,—as of processes of events, all ranging under one great description. Thus in the present case there is certainly direct reference to the destruction of Jerusalem; the τίλος directly spoken of is that event, and the σωθήσεται the preservation provided by the warning afterwards given in ch. xxv. 15—18. And the next verse directly refers to the journeys of the Apostles over the actual cities of Israel, territorial, or where Jews were located. But as certainly do all these expressions look onwards to the great final coming of the Lord, the τίλος of all prophecy; as certainly the σωθήσεται here bears its full Scriptural meaning, of everlasting salvation;
and the endurance to the end is the finished course of the Christian; and the precept in the next verse is to apply to the conduct of Christians of all ages with reference to persecution, and the announcement that hardly will the Gospel have been fully preached to all nations (or, to all the Jewish nation, i.e. effectively) when the Son of Man shall come. It is most important to keep in mind the great prophetic parallels which run through our Lord's discourses, and are sometimes separately, sometimes simultaneously, presented to us by Him. That the tracing out and applying such parallels should be called by such expositors as Meyer, 'lauter wortwürdige und nichtgesprängte Ausführende' (Com. i. 211), is just as if a man should maintain that a language unknown to him had therefore no meaning. — 24.] The third part of the discourse begins here. See note on ver. 6. It treats of (1.) the conflicts (vv. 24—26), duties (vv. 26—28), and encouragements (vv. 28—32) of all Christ's disciples. (II.) The certain issue of this fight in victory; the confession by Christ of those who confess Him, set in strong light by the contrast of those who deny Him (vv. 32—34); the necessity of the conflict to victory, by the nature of Christ's mission (vv. 34—37), the kind of self-devotion which He requires (vv. 37—39); concluding with the solemn assurance that no reception of His messengers for His sake, nor even the smallest labour of love for Him, shall pass without its final reward. Thus we are carried on to the end of time and of the course of the Church.—This proverb is used in different senses, in Luke vi. 40 and John xiii. 16. The view here is, that disciples must not expect a better lot than their Master, but be well satisfied if they have no worse. The threefold relation of our Lord and His followers here brought out may be thus exemplified from Scripture: μαθητής and διδάσκαλος, Matt. v. 1. xxii. 7, 8. Luke vi. 20; δοῦλος and κύριος, John xiii. 13. Luke xii. 35—48. Rom. i. 1. 2 Pet. i. 1. Jude i.; ἵσοδοσωτῆς and οἰκίασων, Matt. xxvi. 26—29 and || places, Luke xxiv. 30. Matt. xxiv. 39 and ||. — 25. Βελβε-βοῦλ. Either γῆς, lord of dung, or as in 2 Kings i. 2, γῆς, lord of flies, a god worshipped at Ekron by the Philistines. There is however another derivation more probable than either of these, upheld by Meyer, from γῆς and γῆ, a house, by which it would exactly correspond to οἰκοδοσωτῆς.—A name by which the prince of the devils was called by the Jews, ch. xii. 24, to which accusation, probably an usual one (see ch. ix. 34), and that in John viii. 48, our Lord probably refers. In those places they had not literally called Him Beelzebub, but He speaks of their mind and intention in those charges. They may however have literally done so on other unrecorded occasions. — 26. μη σοώ The force of this is: Notwithstanding their treatment of Me your Master, Mine will be victory and triumph; therefore ye, My disciples, in your turn need not fear. Comp. Rom. viii. 37. — οὐδάν γὰρ ἄντι This solemn truth is again and again enounced by our Lord on different occasions, and with different references. See Luke viii. 17. xii. 2 and notes. The former part of the verse drew comfort and encouragement from the past: this from the future. All that is hidden must be revealed — (1) it is God's purpose in His Kingdom that the everlasting Gospel shall be freely preached, and this purpose ye serve. (2) Beware then of hypocrisy (see Luke xii. 2) through fear of men, for all such will be detected and exposed hereafter; and (3) fear them not, for under whatever aspersions ye may labour from them, the day is coming which shall clear you and condemn them, if ye are fearlessly doing the work of Him that sent you (ch. xiii. 43). τίνος γὰρ ἄνεκων ἀλγεῖτι; ὅτα γότως ὑμᾶς καλύσῃ καὶ πλάνοις; ἀγνοομέναι μιμῶρον καὶ σωτῆ- ρας ὑμᾶς καὶ ενεργητὰς τῆς οἰκουμένης.
κρυπτὸν ὁ ὦ γνωσθήσεται. 27 ὁ λέγω ὑμῖν ἐν τῷ ὕμνῳ σκοτά BCD ἐπιτε ἐν τῷ φωτὶ, καὶ ὡς ἡ ὁ ὄνοι ἀκουέτε. 28 πηγαδε ἐπὶ τῶν δωμάτων. 29 καὶ μὴ ὅ φωβήθητε ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποκτενώντων τὸ σῶμα, τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν μὴ δυνάμενον ἀποκτείναι. φωβήθητε δὲ μάλλον τὸν δυνάμενον καὶ ψυχὴν καὶ σῶμα ἀπολέσει ἐν γεννήσει. 30 οὐχὶ δὲ στροφῆς ἁσαφῶς πωλεῖται; καὶ ἐν ἐξ ἀυτῶν ὦ ἐπεσεται ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἀνευ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν. 31 ὑμῶν δὲ καὶ ἀτρίχης τῆς κεφαλῆς πάσα ἁμημείναι εἰς αὐτὸς.
27—39. KATA MATHAION.

31 μη ουν * φοβηθητε* πολλων στροφιων * διαφερετε υμεις. 32 πας ουν οτι π ομολογησει εν εμοι εμπροσθεν των ανθρωπων, ομολογησο κατω εν αυτω εμπροσθεν του πατρος μου του εν ουρανοις. 33 οτις ου [αν] αρνησηται με εμπροσθεν των ανθρωπων, αρνησομαι αυτον κατω εμπροσθεν του πατρος μου του εν ουρανοις. 34 Μη νομισητε ότι ήλθον βαλειν ειρηνην επι την γην ουκ ήλθον βαλειν ειρηνην αλλα μαχαιραν. 35 ήλθον γαρ διαγας ανθρωπων κατα του πατρος αυτου, και θυγατερα κατα της μητρος αυτης, και νυμφην κατα της πενθιμας αυτης. 36 και εχοροι του ανθρωπου οι οικιαι αυτου. 37 ο φιλων πατερα η μητερα επε αμε αου εστι μου αζιος και ο φιλων νυν η θυγατερα υπερ εμε αου εστι μου αζιος, και ος ου λαμβανει τον σταυρον αυτου και ακολουθει αποσω μου αου εστι μου αζιος. 38 ευρον την ψυχην αυτου απολεσαι αυτην και απολεσαι την ψυχην αυτου.

5 Orig. Cyr. txt C.—32. καγω σωθην D L abc 2 Hil. Cypr. txt B C Orig. Cypr.—33. αν ομι B C L I. txt D Orig. (C has D απαραν.)—35. for αθρη, ειναυ D bc Hil.—37. και ανεος om. B D Cypr. ins. C B abcc.—42. for μιρωρω, ελευξιστω D bc.

40. The ομων is emphatic, corresponding to the υμις at the end of ver. 31. But the emphatic υμις, spoken directly to the Apostles, is generalized immediately by the πας ουν in ver. 32.—33. Α δαλ. εν ιοικ. A Hebraistic or rather perhaps Syriac mode of expression (De Wette) for, shall make me the object of His acknowledgment among and before men.' The context shows plainly that it is a practical consistent confession which is meant, and also a practical and enduring denial. The Lord will not confess the confessing Judas, nor deny the denying Peter; the traitor who denied Him in fact is denied: the Apostle who confessed Him even to death will be confessed. We may observe that both in the Sermon on the Mount (vii. 21—23) and here, after mention of the Father, our Lord describes Himself as the Judge and Arbitrator of eternal life and death.—34. In Luke xii. 51—53 this announcement, as here, is closely connected with the mention of our Lord's own sufferings (ver. 38). As He won His way to victory through the contradiction of sinners and strife, so must those who come after Him. The immediate reference is to the divisions in families owing to conversions to Christianity. Ver. 35 is quoted nearly literally from Micah vii. 6. When we read in Commentaries, e. g. De Wette, that these divisions were not the purpose, but the inevitable results only, of the Lord's coming, we must remember that with God, results are all purposes.—36. του ανθρ. The article is generic, and is rightly rendered in the E. V. 'a man's foes,' &c.—37.] Compare Deut. xxxiii. 9, and Exod. xxix. 26—29, to which passages this verse is a reference. Stier well remarks, that under the words διδω ου there lies an exceeding great reward which counterbalances all the seeming asperity of this saying.—38.] How strange must this prophetic announcement have seemed to the Apostles! It was no Jewish proverb, (for crucifixion was not a Jewish punishment,) no common saying which our Lord heard and so often utters. See ch. xvi. 24. Mark x. 21. Luke ix. 23. He does not here plainly mention His Cross, but leaves it to be understood, see ver. 26. This is one of those sayings of which John xii. 16 was eminently true.—39. ψυχην d ανεος] refer to the same thing, but in somewhat different senses. The first ψυχη is the life of this world, which we here all count so dear to us; the second, implied in ανεος, the real life of man in a blessed eternity,—ευρον = φιλων, John xii. 25, = εσωσι διην, Mark viii. 34. But ευρον and απολεσαι are again somewhat different in position: the first implying earnest desire to save, but not so the second any will or voluntary act to destroy. This is brought out by the εις ην ιοικ., which gives the ruling providential arrangement whereby the απολεσαι is brought about. But besides the primary meaning of this saying as regards the laying down of life literally for
Christ's sake, we cannot fail to recognize in it a far deeper sense in which he who loses his life shall find it. In Luke ix. 23, the taking up of the Cross is to be καθ' ἑμᾶς; in Mark viii. 34, and Matt. xvi. 24, ἀραρραπασάθω or ἀραρράσαθα λαυτόν is joined with it. Thus we have the crucifying of the life of this world,—the death to sin spoken of Rom. vi. 4—11, and life unto God. And this life unto God is the real, true ψυχή αὐτῶν, which the self-denier shall find, and preserve unto life eternal. See John xii. 25 and note.—40.] Here in the conclusion of the discourse, the Lord recurs again to His Apostles whom He was sending out. From ver. 32 has been connected with πᾶς δεις, and therefore generally, ἐφέξεται, see ver. 14; but it has here the wider sense of not only receiving to house and board,—but receiving in heart and life the message of which the Apostles were the bearers. On the sense of the verse see John xx. 21, and on τὸν ἀποστολικάνα με, ἵνα ἀποστῆλε ὦμί, ver. 16, and Heb. iii. 1. There is a difference between the first representation, of Christ by His messengers, which at least is only official, and even then broken by personal imperfection and infirmity (see Gal. ii. 11. iv. 13, 14),—and the perfect unbroken representation of the Eternal Father by His Blessed Son, John xiv. 9. Heb. i. 3.—41. μεθ' προφητης] olov τειθ' τὸν προφητήν ἢ δικαιον δεξιάμων λαβεῖν ὡς ἄλλοι ἀκινοι μιλλεῖ λαμβάνειν. Chrysost. Hom. xxxv. 401, B.—ἐλε γυνα, a Hebraism (ὡ): 'because he is;' i.e. for the love of Christ whose prophet he is. The sense is, He who by receiving (see above) a prophet because he is a prophet, or a holy man because he is a holy man, recognizes, enters into, these states as appointed by Me, shall receive the blessedness of these states, shall derive all the spiritual benefits which these states bring with them, and share their everlasting reward.—42. τῶν μικρῶν] To whom this applies is not very clear. Hardly (De Wette) to the despised and meanly-esteemed for Christ's sake. I should rather imagine some children may have been present; for of such does our Lord generally use this term, see ch. xviii. 2—6. Though perhaps the expression may be meant of lower and less advanced converts, thus keeping up the gradation from προφήτης. This however hardly seems likely: for how could a disciple be in a downward gradation from δικαιον;—τῶν μισθών. adv.] His (i.e. the doer's) reward: not, the reward of one of these little ones, as before μισθόν προφ., μισθόν ἐκκαιον: the article here makes the difference: and the expression is reflexive.—XI. 1. ἀλλα} No fixed locality is assigned to the foregoing discourse. It was not delivered at Capernaum, but on a journey, see ix. 35. adv. τῶν is also indeterminate, as in iv. 23. ix. 35. 2—30.] Luke vii. 18—35. There have been several different opinions as to the reason why this inquiry was made. I will state them, and append to them my own view. (1) It has been a very generally received idea that the question was asked for the sake of the disciples themselves, with the sanction of their master, and for the purpose of confronting them, who were doubtful and jealous of our Lord, with the testimony of His own mouth. This view
XI. 1—4. KATA MATHEIA.

is ably maintained by Chrysostom; 
 τίνος ὑμῖν ἐπήμνησε Ἰωάννην; ἀπεπεισόντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ οἱ Ἰωάννου μαθηταί, καὶ τοῦτο παρά τῷ Καίσαρι καὶ Ἰησοῦς διὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἤγγισαν, καὶ δῆλον δὲ ὁ πρὸς τὸν διδάσκαλον Ἰησοῦν (John iii. 26), καὶ πάλιν (John iii. 25), καὶ αὐτῷ πάλιν προσέλθεντες Ἱησοῦν (Matt. ix. 14),—οὕτως γὰρ ἦσαν εἰδότες, τις ἦν ὁ χριστός, ἀλλὰ τῶν μὴ Ἰωάννου ἀνθρωπῶν ὄσον ὑποτιθέν τις τῷ τῇ Ἰωάννῃ μείζων ἡ κατὰ ἁνθρωπον, ἠδύνατο εὐθυμοῦντα τοῦτον ὀρθῶς, εἰκὼν δὲ, καθὼς εἶτε, λοιπὸν λέγοντα. Hom. xxxvi. p. 406, A. And similarly Euthymius and Theophylact. This view is also adopted and eloquently defended by Stier, Reden Jesu, i. p. 445 seq. The case of John when he saw the Saviour text evidently treats the question as coming from John himself; the answer is directed to John; and the following discourse is on the character and position of John. These are answered by Stier with a supposition that John allowed the inquiry to be made in his name; but surely our Saviour would not in this case have made the answer as we have it, which clearly implies that the object of the miracles done was John's satisfaction. (3) The other great section of opinions on the question is that which supposes doubt to have existed, for some reason or other, in the Baptist's own mind. This is upheld by Tertullian (cont. Marc. iv. 18) and others, and advocated by De Wette, who thinks that the doubt was not perhaps respecting our Lord's mission, but His way of manifesting Himself, which did not agree with the theocratic views of the Baptist. This he considers to be confirmed by ver. 6. Olshausen (in loc.) and Neander (Leben Jesu, p. 92) suppose the ground of the doubt to have lain partly in the Messianic idea of the Baptist, partly in the weakening and bedimming effect of imprisonment on John's mind. Lightfoot carries this latter still further, and imagines that the doubt arose from dissatisfaction at not being liberated from prison by some miracle of our Lord. (Hor. Hebr. in loc.) This however is refuted by Schöttgen. (H. Hebr. in loc.)—The author of the Questiones et Resp. ad Orthodoxos among the works of Justin Martyr suggests, and Benson (Hulsean Lectures for 1829, p. 58 seq.) takes up the following solution: ἦτοι δὲ διάφορα φημα περὶ δὲ μνηματω τοῦ Ἰησοῦ διηγήσω, τῶν μὲν λεγόντων, Ἡλίας ἤτοι τοῦτο ποντίων VOL. I.
inexcusable who should be offended in Him. And the return message is so far from being a satisfaction designed for the disciples, that they are sent back like the messenger from Gabit to Sextus Tarquinius, with indeed a significant narrative to relate, but no direct answer; they were but the intermediate transmitters of the symbolic message, known to Him who sent it, and him who received it. It is a fact not to be neglected in connexion with this solution of the difficulty, that John is said to have heard of the works, not τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, but τοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ πρωτού: the only place where that name, standing alone, is given to our Lord in this Gospel. It would seem as if the Evangelist had purposely avoided saying τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, to show that the works were reported to John not as those of the Person whom he had known as Jesus, but of the Deliverer—the Christ; and that he was thus led to desire a distinct avowal of the identity of the two. I have before said that the opening part of the ensuing discourse seems to have been designed to prevent, in the minds of the multitude, any such unworthy estimations of John as those above cited. The message and the answer might well begot such suppositions, and could not, from the nature of the case be explained to them in that deeper meaning which they really bore; but the character of John here given would effectually prevent them, after hearing it, from entertaining any such idea. 

3. ἀκούσας] From His own disciples, Luke vii. 18. The place of his imprisonment was Machæerus. ὁ μὲν ἐπισκύρα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, βεβηγμένος εἰς τὸν Μαχαιροτάτος πειρατάς, ... (μεθορίον δὲ ἢ μὲν τῇ τοῦ Ἀρίττον τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἀρχής). ... τοῦτον εἰσήγησαν. Jos. Ant. xviii. v. 1. 2. — 4.) In αὐτῷ τῇ ἐφίδροτῃ πόλει, πολλοί αὐτὸν καὶ μακραγωνικοὶ λαμπρών, καὶ τυφλοί πολλοὶ ἀναγλύφω. Luke vii. 21. From καὶ ἀκούσας ... ἐν Ιωακ., is verbatim in the two previous verses (except that ἀκούσας κ. βλέπετε, M. = εἰ- δεῖς κ. ἀκούσας, L.). — 5.) The words νεκροὶ ἐγανέκτησαν some difficulty; but surely without reason. In Luke, the raising of the widow’s son at Nain immediately precedes this message; and here we have had the ruler’s daughter raised. These miracles might be referred to by our Lord under the words νεκρὸν ἐγανέκτησαν, (and in vers. 9, 10), but τοῦτοι δὲ πορευομένων ἤρξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγειν τοῖς ὀχλοῖς περὶ Ἰωάννου Τί ἐξήλθατε εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν θεάσασθαι; κάλαμον ὑπὸ ἀνίμου σαλευόμενον;
more than a prophet."—John was more than a prophet, because he did not write of, but saw and pointed out, the object of his prophecy;—and because of his proximity to the kingdom of God. He was moreover more than a prophet, because he himself was the subject as well as the vehicle of prophecy. But with deep humility he applies to himself only that one, of two such prophetic passages, which describes him as ὁ δὲ ἄγγελος μου, here cited by our Lord.—10. σωμ Οur Lord here changes the person of the original prophecy, which is μου. And that He does so, making that which is said by Jehovah of Himself, to be addressed to the Messiah, is, if such were needed (compare also Luke i. 16, 17, and 76), no mean indication of His own eternal and co-equal Godhead. It is worthy of remark that all three Evangelists agree verbatim in their citations of this prophecy thus changed. See Mark i. 2. Luke vii. 27. Also, that the high dignity and honour which our Lord here predicates of the Baptist has a further reference: He was thus great above all others, because he was the forerunner of Christ. How great then above all others and him, must HE be!—11. ἐγγυται] Not merely a word of course, but especially used of prophets, and once of our Saviour Himself, Acts v. 30. see ref.—γεννυτος is most likely masculine. See ref.—δὲ μικρότερος This has been variously rendered and understood. Chrysostom's interpretation is as follows:—"δὲ μικρότερος, ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν αἰθρων μείζων αὐτοῦ λατε." μικρότερος, κατὰ τὴν ἡλικίαν, κατὰ τὴν τῶν πολλῶν δόξαν καὶ γὰρ ἠλικὸν αὐτὸν φάγων καὶ αὐτοῦ τὴν ἡλικίαν καὶ ὀφθ. oφθ. ἡλικίαν δὲ τῶν πρῶτων υἱῶν; καὶ πανταχοῦ αὐτὸν ἤπειροιοι. Hom. xxxvii. 416, D. And a little afterwards:—περὶ ταυτόν ἠλικίαν,
in substance the above interpretation, believes that aitou, i.e. Ιανόν τοῦ β., is to be supplied after μετατηθοῦν. This would be unobjectionable in sense, but is it, in usage? See ref., and remember that ἤτε τοῦ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, καὶ οὕτως ἤτε τοῦ ίδιου τῆς τύχης, καὶ οὕτως ἐπεσε ἐν τῷ ιδίῳ. [12] The sense of this verse has been much disputed. (1) βασιλεία has been taken in a middle sense: 'forcibly introduces itself,' 'breaks in with violence,' as in the similar passage Luke vi. 16, τάς τις αὐτήν βασιλεία. Certainly such a sense agrees better with ἀναγεννησία, which we find in Luke, than the passive expression of βασιλεία, but it seems inconsistent with the latter half of the verse, to say that it breaks in by force, and then that others break by force into it. (2) βασιλεία is taken passively: so τὰς τάς βασιλείας, Xen. Hell. v. 2, 15 (Meyer;—which is however, like many of his citations, incorrect): 'suffereth violence,' Eng. Vers. And thus the construction of the verse is consistent: 'and the violent take it by force.' Believing this latter interpretation to be right, we now come to the question, in what sense are these words spoken? Is βασιλεία in a good or a bad sense? Does it mean, 'is taken by force,' and the following, 'and men violently press in for their share of it, as for plunder;' or does it mean, 'is violently resisted, and violent men tear it to pieces?' (viz. its opponents, the Scribes and Pharisees?) This latter meaning bears no sense as connected with the discourse before us. The subject is not the resistance made to the kingdom of heaven, but the difference between a prophesied and a present kingdom of heaven. The fifteenth verse closes this subject, and the complaints of the arbitrary prejudices of 'this generation' begin with ver. 16. We conclude then that these words imply 'From the days of John the Baptist until now (i.e. inclusively, from the beginning of his preaching), the kingdom of heaven is pressed into, and violent persons—eager, ardent multitudes—seize on it.' Of the truth of this, notwithstanding our Lord's subsequent approaches for unbelief, we have abundant proof from the multitudes who followed, and outwent Him, and thronged the doors where He was, and would (John vi. 16) take Him by force to make Him a king. But our Lord does not mention this so much to commend the μαθηταί, as to show the undoubted fact that Ὅ τι προέφθερεν was
KATA MATHEION.

12—17.  

βιαζόταί, καὶ Βιαστάι ἀρνάζομαι αυτήν. 13 πάντες γὰρ οἱ προφίται καὶ ὁ νόμος ἔως Ἰωάννου προφητεύονταν 14 καὶ η γλες, ἡ δεξιάσθαι, αὐτὸς ἔστιν Ἡλίας ὁ μέλλων ἐρχόμα. 15 ὁ ἔχων ὑπὸ ἀκονία ἀκοῦται. 16 τίνι δὲ ὁ ὑμων ἡ γενεὰς ταύτης; ὁμοία ἐστὶ παῖδοις. 17 εἰν ἀγοράς καθήμενοις, θέσσαρις τοις εὐαγγελισθησαν καὶ ὡς ἥρησασθε ἡ ὑψώσασθαι [ὑμῖν], καὶ οὐκ ἐκό-

p Gen. xxii. 2, 10. Rev. i. 7. 18.


come — that the kingdom of heaven, which before had been the distant subject of prophecy, a closed fortress, a treasure hid, was now undoubtedly upon earth (Luke xvi. 21 and note), laid open to the entrance of men, spread out that all might see. Thus this verse connects with ver. 28, διὰ τῶν πρῶτων καὶ τῶν πάντων, and with Luke xvi. 16, πάσα βιασταζαί αὐτήν. Compare also with this throwing open of the kingdom of heaven for all to press into, the stern prohibition in Exod. xix. 12, 13, and the comment on it in Heb. xii. 18—24. — 18, 14.] The whole body of testimony as yet has been prophetic — the Law and Prophets, from the first till Zecharias the priest and Simeon and Anna prophesied; and preceding to the declaration of prophecy itself, John, in the spirit and power of Elias, was the forerunner of the great subject of all prophecy. Neither this — nor the testimony of our Lord, ch. xvii. 12 — is inconsistent with John's own denial that he was Elias, John i. 21. For (1) that question was evidently asked as implying a reappearance of the actual Elias upon earth; and (2) our Lord cannot be understood in either of these passages as meaning that the prophecy of Malachi iv. 5 received its full completion in John. For as in other prophecies, so in this, we have a partial fulfilment both of the coming of the Lord and of His forerunner, while the great and complete fulfilment is yet future — at the great day of the Lord. Mal. iv. 1—5 μᾶλλον ἐρχεθαί here is not = ἐς ἐμαλλον ἐρχεθαί (as Bengel, 'sermo est tanquam e prospectu testamenti veteris in novum'), but strictly future, 'who shall come.' Compare ch. xvii. 11, where the future is used. The εἰ ἄνετε δεξιάσθαι must be taken as referring to the partial sense of the fulfilment implied; for it was said to this day the belief of the Jews that Elias in person should come before the end. — 15.] These words are generally used by our Lord when there is a further and deeper meaning in His words than is expressed: as here — if John the Baptist is Elias, and Elias is the forerunner of the coming of the Lord, then know surely that the Lord is come. — 18. 54] Implying, the men of this generation have ears to hear, and hear not; will not receive this saying; are arbitrary, childish, and prejudiced, not knowing their own mind. τιν ἀνατόλων; See similar questions in Mark iv. 30, Luke xiii. 18, 29; and note on ch. xvii. 24. ἱδροῦς τινὶς καθήμενοι — in children in their games imitate the business and realities of life, so these in the great realities now before them show all the waywardness of children. The similitude is to two bodies of children, the one inviting the other to play, first at the imitation of a wedding, secondly at that of a funeral — to neither of which will the others respond. Stier remarks that the great condescension of the preaching of the Gospel is shown forth in this parable, where the man sent from God, and the Eternal Word Himself, are represented as children among children, speaking the language of their sports. Compare Heb. ii. 14. It must not be supposed that the two bodies of children are two divisions of the Jews, as some have done: the children who call are the Jews — those called to, the two Preachers; both belonging, according to the flesh, to ἡ γενεὰ αὐτῆς, but neither of them corresponding to the kind of mourning (in John's case) with which the Jews would have them mourn, or the kind of joy (in the Lord's case) with
ψαθε. 18 ἡλθε γὰρ Ἰωάννης μήτε ἑσθὼν μήτε πίνων, Β Ζ Δ καὶ λέγουσι Δαμόνιον ἐξει. 19 ἦλθεν ὁ νικὸς τοῦ ἀνθρωποῦ ἑσθὼν καὶ πίνων, καὶ λέγουσιν Ἰδοὺ ἄνθρωπος φάγος καὶ οἰνοπότης, τελωνίων φίλος καὶ ἀμαρτωλός. καὶ εὐδοκιάθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ τῶν τεκνῶν αὐτῆς. 20 Τότε ἦσαν ὁνειδίζον τὰς πόλεις ἐν αἷς ἐγένοντο αἱ πλείσται ὑπὸ τῶν τεκνῶν αὐτῶν, ὅτι οὐκ εὐνοοῦσαν. 21 Οὐαί σοι Χοραζίν, οὐαί σοι Βηθsaidaν, ὅτι εἰ ἐν Τύρῳ καὶ Σιδώνι ἐγένοντο αἱ δυνάμεις αἱ γενόμεναι εἰς μιν, πάλαι αἱ ἐν σάκκῳ καὶ προδῷ ὑπονόομαι. 22 πλὴν λέγω μιν, Τύρῳ καὶ Σιδώνι ἀνέκτότερον ἔσται εἰς ἡμέρα κρίσεως μιν.

which the Jews would have him rejoice. The converse application, which is commonly made, is against the ὅποια ἤστιν παιδία, by which the σαίτια must be the children of this generation. — 18, πρὸς ὅπαν, μητρὶ, ἔνθεν.] Luke vii. 33 fills up this expression by inserting ἄριστον and ἐνὼν. See ch. iii. 4. The neglect of John's preaching, and rejection of his message, is implied in several places of the Gospels (see ch. xxi. 23, 27. John v. 35, πρὸς ὅπαν;) but hence only do we learn that they brought against him the same charge which they afterwards tried against our Lord. See John vii. 20. x. 20. — 19. ἐσθών καὶ πί- νων] Alluding to our Lord's practice of frequenting entertainments and feasts, e.g. the marriage at Cana, the feast in Levi's house. See also on ix. 14. — 18. ἔνθα καὶ χωρὶς, and yet, notwithstanding. — η σοφία, the Divine wisdom which hath ordered these things. — ἐξ ὅτι, in the sorīs, because of ἡλθε, which rules the construction of the sentence; but, like the second ἥδεν, bearing a present sense. — The meaning seems to be, that the waywardness above described was not universal; but that the τεκνα σο- φίας (in allusion probably to the Book of Proverbs, which constantly uses the same expression; see ch. i. 1. iii. 1. 11. 31. iv. 1, &c.) were led to receive and justify (= clear of imputation) the Wisdom of God, who did these things! The τεκνα σοφίας are opposed to the wayward παιδία above, the childlike to the childish; and thus this verse serves as an introduction to the saying in ver. 25. Chrysostom understands the verse differently: τουτοις, τι καὶ ψυκῆς ὅποι ἱπποθετητε, ἀλλ' ἤρσι λοιπὸν ιγ- καλίν ὅπε ἐγατε. Thus ψυκῆς = τὰ τεκνα τῆς σοφ., as being the people of the Lord; and η σοφία is our Lord Himself. This seems far-fetched, and not so consistent with the context as the other interpretation.— ἵστα, not exactly equivalent to ἔνθεν, but implying 'at the hands of' the quarter whence the justification comes. — 20. τὸν ἡραστόν] This expression betokens a change of heart, but not of locality or time. The whole chapter stands in such close connection, one part arising out of another (e.g. this out of ver. 16—30), and all pervaded by the same great undertone, which sounds forth in vv. 28—30, that it is quite impossible that this should be a collection of our Lord's sayings uttered at different times. I would rather regard the τὸν ἡραστόν as a token of the report of an ear- witness, and as pointing to a pause or change of manner on the part of our Lord. See note on Luke x. 13. — ἐν οἷς εἰς εἰς.] Connect this with the first subject of our Lord's preaching, ch. iv. 17. The reference is to some unrecorded miracles, of which we know (John xxi. 25) that there were many. — Φι. Χοραζ] According to Jerome (cited by Winer, Realwörterbuch) a town of Galilee, two (according to Eusebius twelve, but most likely an error in the transcript) miles from Capernaum. It is nowhere mentioned except here and in the place of Lake. The etymology is uncertain. Some would read χωρία ζ.ιν.—Βηθsaidaν] Called τόπος John i. 45. — καὶ τὸν Μαρκ. vii. 25. — in Galilee, John xii. 21. — on the western bank of the lake of Gennesaret, near the middle; not far from Capernaum; the birth-place of Simon Peter, Andrew, and Philip. Both this and Chorazin appear to be put as examples of the esser towns in which our Lord had wrought His miracles (the εκμισ- τόλες Mark i. 38), as distinguished from
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23 Kai aiv Kateraou'm, mpi eis [tov] onoanov unothera, 
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* Acts xxii. 50.


t. o. unotha'th, ky. L. ky kataunbaathenov L (?).—rec. Igonoito. tiv B C D. —24. for soi, 


Copernum, the chief town (ver. 23) of the neighbourhood. — Τώρα κ. Σιδώνιοι: These wealthy cities, so often the subject of history, had been chastised by God's judgments under Nebuchadnezzar and Alexander, but still existed (Acts xii. 20. xxi. 3. 7. xxi. 5).—In ed. κ. σταδίων. It is probably an error to general Eastern custom. —23.] Lachmann puts a question after unotha'th, which is perhaps the right punctuation: Shalt thou be exalted to heaven? Thou shalt be cast down to Hades! But then the second clause without any connecting particle is harsh. The sense has been variously interpreted. Some suppose it to allude to the distinguished honour conferred on Copernum by our Lord's residence there. So Euthymius: χατεραυμ ενδος γίγνεται διὰ τὰ ματαιών ἐν αὐτῷ τῶν χριστῶν, καὶ τὰ πολλὰ τῶν θανάτων ἐν αὐτῷ τελέσοαι. Others (as Costia) to the rich sojourners of the town. —24.] In Copernum, by means of which the town was proud and prosperous. Jerome says, 'Ideo ad inferna descendens, quia contra predicacionem meam superbiae' restitui.' He also mentions the first interpretation.—Others, as Stier (Reden Jesu, I. 491), refer the expression to the lothy situation of Copernum, which however is very uncertain. The first interpretation appears to me the most probable, seeing that our Lord chose that place to be the principal scene of His ministry and residence, τί διά πολεο, ch. ix. 1. —4ν Σο 

θέμον. The comparison between sinful Israel and Sodom is common in the O.T. See Deut. xxxii. 32. Is. 1. 10. Lam. iv. 6. Ezek. xvi. 46—57. —([μαν] ἄν) This declaration of the Lord of all events, opens to us an important truth, that the destruction of Sodom was brought about, not by a necessity in the Divine purposes—still less by a connexion of natural causes—but by the iniquity of its inhabitants, who, had they turned and repented, might have averted their doom. The same is strikingly set before us in the history of Jonah's preaching at Nineveh.—24. and 25.] These verses are connected with those respectively preceding them thus:—If these mighty works had been done in Tyre and Sidon—in Sodom—then would they have &c.; but, since no such opportunity was afforded them, and ye, Betha, Chera, and Copernum had and rejected such, it shall be more tolerable &c. —And as to the saying of our Lord, 'If more warnings had been given they would have repented,' it is not for the infidel to say, 'Why then were not more given?' Because every act of God for the rescue of a sinner from his doom is purely and entirely of free and undeserved grace, and the proportion of such means of escape dealt out to men is ruled by the counsel of His Will who is holy, just, and true, and willeth not the death of the sinner; but Whose ways are past our finding out. We know enough when we know that it was inexcusable, having (see Rom. i. i.) the witness of God in their consciences; and our only feeling should be overflowing thankfulness, when we find ourselves in possession of the light of the glorious Gospel, of which so many are deprived.—That the reference here is to the last great day of Judgment is evident, by the whole being spoken of in the future. Had our Lord been speaking of the outward judgment on the rebellious cities, the future might have been used of them, but could not of Sodom, which was already destroyed.—This αποκρό 

δολος αναφορά is one of those mysterious hints at the future dealings of God, into which we can penetrate no further than the actual words of our Lord reveal, nor say to what difference exactly they point in the relative states of those who are compared. See also Luke xii. 47, 48. —25.] This is certainly a continuation of the foregoing discourse; and the αποκρο 

δολος, which seems to have nothing to refer to, does in reality refer to the words which have immediately preceded. The ἐν οἷς τ. ο. is not ἐν οἷς.
nological, but gives additional solemnity to what follows. There may have been a slight break in the discourse; but I do not see any necessity for supposing it. The whole ascription of praise is an answer: an answer to the mysterious dispensations of God's Providence above recounted. With regard to the arrangement in Luke, see note on Luke x. 21.—ἐξεισαλήθησα. Not merely, 'I praise Thee,' but 'I confess to Thee,' 'I recognize the justice of Thy doings;' viz. in the words vae δι' αὐτός, ἡμῖν ὑμᾶς. Stier remarks that this is the first public mention by our Lord of His Father; the words in ch. x. 32, 'having been addressed to the twelve. We have two more instances of such a public address to His Father, John xi. 41. xii. 28; and again Luke xxiii. 34. It is to be observed that He does not address the Father as His Lord, but as Lord of heaven and earth; as τὰ πάντα ἐνεργοῦν κατά τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ θεόλογος αὐτῶν, Eph. i. 11.—ἀπεκαλύφθης ... ἀπεκαλύφθης] 'Revealed' and 'hidden,' in the deeper and spiritual sense of the words. See 1 Cor. ii. 9—12.—ταῦτα, these mysterious arrangements by which the sinner is condemned in his pride and unbelief, the child of earth and childlike savagery, and God justified when He saves and condemns. These are 'revealed' to those who can in a simple and teachable spirit, as νόμισον, obey the invitation in vv. 28—30, but hidden from the wise and clever of this world, who attempt their solution by the inadequate instrumentality of the mere human understanding. See 1 Cor. i. 26—30.—27.] In one other place only in the three first Gospels (besides the || Luke x. 22) does the expression αὐτὸς occur, viz. Mark xili. 32. The spirit of this verse, and its form of expression, are quite those of the Gospel of John; and it serves to form a link of union between the three synoptic Gospels and the fourth, and to point to the vast and weighty mass of discourses of the Lord which are not related except by John. We may also observe another point of union:—this very truth (John iii. 35) had been part of the testimony borne to Jesus by the Baptist—and its repetition here, in a discourse of which the character and office of the Baptist is the suggestive groundwork, is a coincidence not surely without meaning. The verse itself is in the closest connexion with the preceding and following, and is best to be understood in that connexion:—τάτα μοι παρέδωκεν ἀπεκαλύφθης αὐτὰ in ver. 25, only ἀπεκαλύφθης could not be used of the Eternal Son, but παρέδωκεν, for He is Himself the Revealer;—οὖν δὲ ἔφεξεν τ. νῦν ... none but the Almighty Father has full entire possession of the mystery of the Person and Office of the Son: it is a depth hidden from all but His Whose Purposes are evolved in and by it:—οὐδὲ τ. πατέρα ... nor does any fully apprehend in the depths of his being the love and grace of the Father, except the Son, and he to whom the Son, by the Eternal Spirit, proceeding from the Father and the Son, will reveal Him. (Certainly αὐτὸν must be understood after ἀπεκαλύφθης, as in E. V.; some, e. g. Stier, take αὐτὸκ. absolutely, 'make His revelations.' Luther supplies 'it.') See Col. ii. 2. Some (from ver. 25) understand the Father as the Revealer here also; and undoubtedly He is so, but mediately through the Son. See John vi. 45, 46. Then in close connexion with the ὁ λόγος ἀποκαλύφθη, which by itself might seem to bring in an arbitrariness into the Divine counsel, follows, by the Eternal Son Himself, the δῴης πρὸς μνεῖν τὰ πάντας, the wonderful and merciful generalization of the call to wisdom unto salvation! In Luke this verse is introduced by καὶ σαφῶς τοῦ μνηστήρα εἰπὲ.—28.] This is the great and final answer to the question στὸ εἰ ἢ ἰρημούνος, ἢ ἰρενὸν προδικοῦμεν; ... δύοτα πρὸς μὲ πάντες. As before, we may observe the closest connexion between this and the preceding. As the Son is the great Revealer, and as the ὁ λόγος ἀποκαλύφθη is by His grace extended to all the weary—all who feel their need—so He here invites them to receive this revelation, ἀναθέτω δὲ ἐπ' ῥημ. But the way
to this heavenly wisdom is by quietness and confidence, rest unto the soul, the reception of the Divine grace for the pardon of sin, and the breaking of the yoke of the corruption of our nature. No mere man could have spoken these words. They are || with the command in 1s. xiv. 22, which is spoken by Jehovah Himself.—καὶ ἐπὶ λόγους καὶ προφητήματα, the active and passive sides of human misery, the labouring and the burdened, are invited. Doubtless, outward and bodily misery is not shut out; but the promise, ἀνάπαυσις τῶν ψυχῶν, is only a spiritual promise. Our Lord does not promise to those who come to Him freedom from toil or burden, but rest in the soul, which shall make all yokes easy, and all burdens light. The main invitation however is to those burdened with the yoke of sin, and of the law, which was added because of sin. All who are under the burden are invited. —29.] μάθετε ἐκ τῆς ἔριδος τῶν ἰδιώτων, from My example, which however is the lower sense of the words, and from ‘My teaching,’ from which alone the ἀνάπαυσις can flow: the ἀνάπαυσις of ν. 25 and 27.—ἐπιστρέφετε ἀνάντως ἑαυτῶν, quoted from Jer. vi. 16, Heb. Thus we have it revealed here, that the rest and joy of the Christian soul is, to become like Christ; to attain by His teaching this ἐκπατήριος and ταπινώμος of His.—Ohlhausen makes an excellent distinction between ταπινώμος of His. —Ohlhausen makes an excellent distinction between ταπινώμος of His and καρδία, an attribute of Divine Love in the Saviour, and ταπινώμος of πνευμάτως τῆς πνευματ. Prov. xxix. 23. Matt. v. 3, which can only be said of sinful man, knowing his unworthiness and need of help. καρδία is only here used of Christ. (Stier on John xiv. 1.) —30.] χρηστεύει, easy, not exacting; answering to ‘kind,’ spoken of persons, Luke vi. 35. See 1 John v. 3. Owing to the conflict with evil ever incident to our corrupt nature even under grace, the ἀνάπαυσις which Christ gives is yet to be viewed as a yoke and a burden, seen on this its painful side, of conflict and sorrow: but it is a light yoke; the inner rest in the soul giving a peace which paseth understanding, and bearing it up against all. See 2 Cor. iv. 16. XII. 1—3. KATA MATHEION. 89 ἐν ἑκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ ἐπορεύθη ὁ Ἰσσοῦς τοῦ σαββάτου διὰ τῶν σπορίσσων οἱ δὲ μαθητάς αὐτοῦ ἐπένεα- σαν καὶ ἤρέαντο τιλλείν στάχνας καὶ ἑσθείες. οἱ δὲ Φαρισσαίοι ἰδιότες εἰπον αὐτῷ ἢδον ὅτι μαθητάς σου πουνήν ὅν ἐξετο ποιοὶ ἐν σαββάτῳ. οὐκ ὅτι ἐπένεαν αὐτοῖς ὅν τὸ ἐποίησε Δαίδαλ, ὅτε ἐπένεασεν τῷ ἔτρωκεν ὁ Ἰσσοῦς τοῦ σαββάτου.
of David's arrival; which therefore, Levit. xxiv. 8, was a sabbath. The example was thus doubly appropriate. Bengel maintains, on the commonly-received interpretation of σαβ. διατροφησιν Luke vi. 1, that I Sam. xxi. was the lesson for the day. But the Jewish calendar of lessons cannot be shown to have existed in the form which we now have, in the time of the Gospel history.—4. ἐν τῷ, in the construction, is not for ἄλλα, but belongs to ἵνα ἢν, and retains its proper meaning of 'except.'—5. See note. The priests were ordered to offer their appointed following of Luke who is greater than the temple, the true Temple of God on earth, the Son of Man!—7.] The law of this new Temple service is the law of charity and love:—mercy and not sacrifice, see ch. ix. 13; and if their hearts had been ready to receive our Lord, and to take on them this service, they would not have condemned the guiltless. —8.] On the important verse preceding this in Mark ii. 27, see note there. The sense of it must have been supplied to complete the inference. Since the Sabbath was an ordinance instituted for the use and benefit of man,—the Son of Man, who has taken upon Him full and complete Manhood, the great representative and Head of humanity, has this institution under His own power. See this teaching of the Lord illustrated and expanded in Apostolic practice and injunctions, Rom. viii. 4, 5, 17. Col. ii. 16, 17. 9—14. μεταβας ξειδην] Mark iii. 1—6. Luke vi. 11—16. This change of place is believed by Greweill to have been a journey back to Galilee after the appearance of Jesus. (John viii. vol. ii.) It is true that no such change is implied in Mark and Luke; but the words here point to a journey undertaken, as in xi. 1. xv. 29, the only places in this Gospel where the expression occurs. In John vii. 3, the cognate expression μεταβαιν εις την ιερουσαλημ, is used of a journey from Galilee to Judea.—εν αυθεν, not, of the Pharisees; but of the Jews generally, of the people of the place. Meyer's note is worth observing; —"μεταβας ξειδην." Therefore, on the same Sabbath. Inconsistent with Luke vi. 6, ἐν εἰρισθα μαθητας (!)."

The only real 'difference' here seems to me to be that between one who has taken pains to understand the expression μεταβας ξειδην, and one who has not.—10.] This narrative is found Mark iii. 1—6 and Luke vi. 6—11, but with considerable variation in details from our text, agreeing however with one another. In both these accounts, they (the Scribes and Pharisees, Luke) were watching our Lord to see whether He would heal on the Sabbath:—and He (knowing their thoughts, Luke) ordered the man
to stand forth in the midst, and asked them the question here given. The question about the animal does not occur in either of them but in Luke xiv. 3, on a similar occasion. On these variations see Prolegomena. The additional particulars given are very interesting. By Luke—it was the right hand; by Mark,—our Lord looked round on them with ‘derzh, συλλα-

ποίμνος ἐν τῷ πορώσει τῆς καρδίας αὐ-

τῶν;—and the Herodians were joined with the Pharisees in their counsel against Him. See notes on Luke.—ἐρωτάω = ἐοιμαίνων Mark, ‘of which the use had been last and the vital powers withered.’—[11.] The construction of this verse is involved: there is a double question, as in ch. vii. 9.—Our Lord evidently asks this as being a thing allowed and done at the time when He spoke: but subsequently, (perhaps, suggests Stier, on account of these words of Christ) it was forbidden in the Gemara; and only permitted to lay planks for the beast to come out.—[13.] Our Lord does

no outward act: the healing is performed without even a word of command. The stretching forth the hand was to prove its soundness, which the Divine power wrought in the act of stretching it forth. Thus His enemies were disappointed, having no legal ground against Him.—[14.] This is the first mention of counsel being taken by the Pharisees to put our Lord to death. Mark ii. 6 joins the Herodians with them: which circumstance, compared with Matt. xxii. 16. Mark xii. 13, seems to make it probable that this happened not in Galilee but in Jerusalem.—[15-16.] Peculiar to Matthew. ἀνέβευ ἡντας: see similar expressions, ch. xix. 2. Luke v. 17;—i. e. all who wanted healing.—[16.] συνετάων: see ch. viii. 4, and note; on ἐν πλησίωδι, see note on ch. i. 22. The prophecy is partly from the LXX, partly an original translation. The LXX have Ἰακώβ ὁ παῖς μου . . . Ἰσαάκ ὁ ἐλλεκτος μου . . . but the Rabbis generally understood it of the Messiah.—[20.] καλεσμ. συν. κτλ.]
καὶ λίνον ὑπὸ τυφόμενων οὐ αἰσθάει, ἐὼς ἄν ἐκβάλη εἰς BCD νικὸς τὴν κρίσιν. 21 καὶ [ἐν] τῷ ὅνοματι αὐτοῦ ἔδη εἴποισαν.


A proverbial expression for, 'He will not crush the contrite heart, nor extinguish the slight spark of repentant feeling in the sinner.' — ἐς καὶ καὶ ὑπὸ τυφόμενων οὐ αἰσθάει, ἐὼς ἄν ἐκβάλη εἰς BCD νικὸς τὴν κρίσιν. — ἐφερµούται, εἰντα jussurit, see ref. 23—45.] Mark iii. 20—31. Luke xi. 14—36, where also see notes. This account is given by Luke later in our Lord's ministry, but without any fixed situation or time, and with less copiousness of detail. See also ch. ix. 31—37. Mark gives part of the discourse which follows, (iii. 29—39,) but without any determinate sequence, and omitting the miracle which led to it. — 23. ὡς Α. L. see ch. ix. 27, and note. — 24. cf. St Φ. ἀκόφων.] Mark states (iii. 22) that this accusation was brought by the γραμματεῖος καὶ Ἰρωσολύμων καταβαίνεις. Luke, by τινὲς ἡ αὐτῶν, i. e. τῶν ἀγγ. xi. 18. On the charge itself, Trench remarks, 'A rigid monotheistic religion like the Jewish, left but one way of escape from the authority of miracles, which once were acknowledged to be indeed such, and not mere consolidations and sleights of hand. There remained nothing to say but that which we find in the N. T. the adversaries of our Lord continually did say, namely, that these works were works of hell.' — 25. The Pharisees said this covertly to some among the multitude.

'There is at first sight a difficulty in the argument which our Saviour draws from the oneness of the kingdom of Satan; viz. that it seems the very idea of this kingdom, that it should be this anarchy; blind rage and hate not only against God, but each part of it warring against every other part. And this is most deeply true, that hell is as much in arms against itself as against Heaven: neither does our Lord deny that in respect of itself that kingdom is infinite contradiction and division: only He asserts that in relation to the kingdom of goodness it is at one: there is one life in it and one soul in relation to that. Just as a nation or kingdom may embrace within itself infinite parties, divisions, discord, jealousies, and heart-burnings: yet, if it is to subsist as a nation at all, it must not, as regards other nations, have lost its sense of unity; when it does so, of necessity it falls to pieces and perishes.' Trench, Miracles, p. 58. We may observe (1) that our Lord here in the most solemn manner re-asserts and confirms the truths respecting the kingdom of evil which the Jews also held. The βασιλείαι are so set parallel with one another, that the denial of the reality of the one with its ἀρχέων, or the supposing it founded merely in assent on the part of our Lord to Jewish notions, inevitably brings with it the same conclusions with regard to the other. They are both real, and so is the conflict between them. (2) That our Lord here appeals not to an insulated case of casting out of devils, in which answer might have been made, that the craft of Satan might sometimes put on the garb and arms of an adversary to himself, for his own purposes,—but to the general and uniform
autōv; 27 kai ei ē gōw 8 en Beulēbouł ekβalllw tā dai- 8 Mark xvi. 17
mōnia, oi uioi ūmōn en tin βekβallousai; dein tou tōu autōi ūmōn esontai kritai. 28 ei de 7 en pnevumati thēou ēgōw 7 Ecol. viii. 14
ekβalllw tā daimōnia, ērē 8 ephesai epi umōs h basileia tōu thēou. 29 h pōs dēnatai tis eikelethei eis tēn oikian
του ιαγωνου kai tā 8 skheu autōu koi diaristais, en μη πρωτον dēn th του ιαγωνου; kai tōc την oikian autōi
diaristaseι. 30 o u μη đōn meti ēmōv kai emōv 9 esti' kai o μη
doros B. ttxt (as dp D) C D abed iren. — 31. before toic dēn, ins. um B. ttxt C D.

The tenor of all such acts on His part, in which He was found as the continual Adversary of the kingdom of Satan. (3) That our
Lord proceeds to show that the axiom is true of all human societies, even to a family, the smallest of such. (4) That He does not
state the same of an individual man, 'Every man divided against himself, fallth,' rests upon deeper grounds, which
will be entered on in the note on ver. 31.—
27. The interpretation of this verse has been much disputed; viz. as to whether the casting out by the vōi Φαρισαίων,
(scholars, disciples; see 2 Kings ii. 3 and passim) were a real or a pretended exorcism. The occurrence mentioned Luke ix.
49 does not seem to apply; for there John says, ἵνα εἰσδοθή, τίδομεν τινα ἐκ τῷ ὁδό
ματι σου ἐκβάλλοντα τὰ δ., which hardly could have been the case with those here referred to. Nor again can the πατριρχ
μνου τούτου ἔργον των Acts xix. 13
be the same as these, inasmuch as they also named over the possessed the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. It can be no
such invocation which is here referred to. In Josephus (Ant. viii. 2, 5) we read that
Solomon ἦσαν ἔργους κατελειτυτων, ete inōmōn tā daimōnā ως μηὶς ἵπ
αντλῆται ἐκςωκουν. αἱ τήρηγς μηὶς νῆν παρ’ ἡμῖν ἣ θηρασία πλησίον ἥρεμων. It certainly seems unlikely that our Lord
should have solemnly compared with His own miracles, and have drawn inferences from, a system of imposture, which on that
supposition, these Pharisees must have known to be such. I infer then that the vōi Φαρ. did really cast out devils; and I
think this view is confirmed by what the multitudes said in ch. ix. 33, where upon the
dumb speaking after the devil was cast out they exclaimed oδηγήσεις ἐφανεν σωμα ἐν τῷ Ἱεροσόλυμα: meaning that this was a
more complete healing than they had ever seen before. The difficulty has arisen
mainly from forgetting that miracles, as
such, are no test of truth, but have been permitted to, and prophesied of, false religions and teachers. See Exodus vii. 22.
There is an important passage in Justin Martyr, Dial. with Trypho, p. 311, B. as
follows:—κατὰ γὰρ τοῦ ὁνόματος αὐτοῦ τοῦ ὑιοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
πάν ὁ διαμόνων ἔργα τούτων καθιεῖται καὶ ὑπο-
τάσσεται. ἕν τε κατὰ κάθος ὁνόματος τῶν ἑορτῶν ἔργων τῆς ἁρματής τῶν ἡμι
διακοςίων, ἡ προφητεία, ἡ πατρία τῆς ἔργησις τῶν ὁ ὁ διαμόνων. ἕν τε κατὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀβαμαμ καὶ θεοῦ ἰσακε, καὶ θεοῦ ἰακωβ, ἰωσὴ κατά τοῦ ἑραστὴς ἐν
Irenæus (cited by Grotius) says that
Luke xi. 21, which is the fuller report of this parabolic saying. — 30.] These words
have been variously understood. Chrysostom and Euthynius understand them to refer to the devil: Bengel, Schleiermacher, and Neander, to the Jewish exorcists named above. Grotius and others understand it as merely a general proverb, and the ἕρως
that it is not, I then must be his adversary.
But this is on all accounts improbable: see
below on ἔννοϊαν and σχολή. I believe Stier is right in regarding it as a saying setting forth to us generally the entire and complete disjunction of the two kingdoms, of Satan and God. There is and can be in the world no middle party: they who are not with Christ, do not gather with Him,—are against Him and His work, and as far as in them lives are undoing it. See Rom. viii. 7. And thus the saying connects itself with the following verse:—this being the case, ἐὰν τοῦτο λέγω ὑμῖν,—the sin of an open belying of the present power of the Holy Spirit of God working in and for His Kingdom assumes a character surpassingly awful. This saying is no way inconsistent with that in Mark ix. 40. Luke ix. 50. That is not a conversion of this, for the terms of the respective propositions are not the same. See note on Mark ix. 40. As usual, this saying of our Lord reached farther than the mere occasion to which it referred, and spoke forcibly to those many half-persuaded hesitating persons who flattered themselves that they could strike out a line avoiding equally the persecution of men and the rejection of Christ. He informed them (as we also) of the impossibility of such an endeavour.—In the ἔννοιαν there is an allusion to the idea of gathering the harvest: see ch. xiii. 30. John xi. 52, and for σχολή, John x. 12, in which all places the words exactly bear out their sense here. —31, 32. ἔννοια is because this is the case, see last note. The distinction in these much-controverted verses seems to be, between (1) that sin which arises from culpable ignorance and sensual blindness, as that of the fool who saith in his heart, 'There is no God,'—of those who, e.g., Saul of Tarsus, opposed Jesus, as not being the Christ; which persons, to whatever degree their sin may unhappily advance, are capable of enlightenment, repentance, and pardon:—and (2) those who, acknowledging God, and seeing His present power working by His Holy Spirit, openly oppose themselves to it, as did, or as were very near doing, (for our Lord does not actually imply that they had incurred this dreadful charge,) these Pharisees. They may as yet have been under the veil of ignorance; but this their last proceeding, in the sight of Him who knows the hearts, approximated very near to, or perhaps reached, this awful degree of guilt. The principal misunderstanding of this passage has arisen from the prejudice which possesses men's minds owing to the use of the words, 'the sin against the Holy Ghost.' It is not one particular act of sin which is here condemned, but a state of sin, and that state a wilful determined opposition to the present power of the Holy Spirit. The declaration, in substance, often occurs in the N. T. See 1 John v. 16, and note on ἀμαρτία there. 2 Tim. iii. 8. Jude 4. 12. 13. Heb. x. 26—31. vi. 4—8. Euthymius expands the sense well and clearly: ἄς μὲν ἀμαρτῇ κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητάς μου, φησί, τούτων, διὸς ἐν εἰς βλασφήμιον λόγον κατ' αὐτής, . . . . . . . . . . . . ὁ τοιοῦτος συγγνωσθεῖσας πάντως, ὡς εἰς ἱδελοκατάσκεψας, ἀλλ' ἐν ἄγνοια τῆς ἀληθείας βλασφημίας ὃ δὲ βλασφήμως τὰς θεωρήσεις μω ἐνεργεῖς, ἃς μόνον ἐγείρατε πολίτες τὴν δὲ θεόν, καὶ τῷ Βιβλίῳ ταῦτα ἐνεργοφόροντο, ὡς καὶ μάλιστα, ὅτι ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ κατὰ τὸν πνεύματος τοῦ ἀγίου, ἦταν κατὰ τὴν θυσίας (ταύτης γὰρ τῶν κατὰ πνεῦμα ἄγων (?)) οὖστος, ὡς ἱδελοκατάσκεψας προδόλως, καὶ ἐν γνώσει καθυστέρειας τῶν θεῶν, καὶ ἀναπτομένη πλημμέλητος, οὐ συγγνωσθεῖσας.—No inference can be drawn from the words οὐδὲ ἐν τῷ μὴλλοντι—with regard to forgiveness of sins in a future state. Sin forgiven is forgiven ἐν τῷ στόχῳ τοῦ ἀλών καὶ ἐν τῷ μὴλλοντι both in its guilt and power, and in its consequences after judgment: sin am forgiven, is forgiven ἐν τῷ στόχῳ τοῦ ἀλών οὐδὲ ἐν τῷ μὴλλοντι neither in its guilt and power here, nor in its consequences after judgment.—Olshausen remarks that a parallel on the other side is found in Matt. x. 41, 42, where the recognition of Divine power in those sent from God is accompanied with promise of eternal reward. He himself however understands the passage (as many others have done) to

imply forgiveness on repentance in the imperfect state of the Dead before the judgment, and considers it to be cognate with 1 Pet. iii. 18. In the entire silence of Scripture on any such a doctrine, every principle of sound interpretation requires that we should resist the introduction of it on the strength of two difficult passages, in neither of which does the plain construction of the words require it.—The expressions αἴσθησις τοῦ τόπου, Mark x. 30; αἰών τῶν κόσμων τοῦτον, Eph. ii. 2; αἰών ἀντικειμένων, Gal. i. 4; and αἰὼν μὴ ἄνθρωπος, Mark x. 30; αἰών ἑαυτοῦ, Luke xx. 35; αἰῶν ἐκπληθοῦσα, Eph. ii. 7) were common among the Jews, and generally signified respectively the time before and after the coming of the Messiah. In the N.T. these significations are replaced by the present life, and that to come: the present mixed state of state and tares, and the future completion of Messiah's Kingdom after the great harvest. The expression κόσμος μὴ ἄνθρωπος is not found.—αἰῶν μὴ ἄνθρωπος, &c., seem to differ from βασιλ. τοῦ ἀνεμώνοι τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ, in never being spoken of, or as in, individuals, but as an age or time belonging to the universal Church. —33, 34.] ποιήσας, 'ponitae,' 'represent... as.' See ref. The same sense occurs Xenoph. Anat. v. 7, 9: καὶ δὲ ὑμᾶς ἐκαταρπάστησα τοὺς ἑαυτοῦ.
follows. It seems that the first part of the discourse gave rise, as here related, to the request for a sign (from Heaven); but, as we learn from Luke, on the part of different persons from those who made the accusation. In consequence of our Lord declaring that His miracles were wrought by the Holy Ghost, they wish to see some decisive proof of this by a sign, not from Himself, but from Heaven.—The account in ch. xvi. 1—4 manifests itself to a different occurrence: see notes there. See John vii. 30, 31. xii. 28. —29.] μορφάλα (see ref.), because they had been the peculiar people of the Lord, and so in departing from Him had broken the covenant of marriage, according to the similitude so common in the prophets.—The expression συνμύχον ευοδον αντιγ does not, as De Wette maintains, exclude our Lord's miracles from being σημεία: but is the direct answer to their request in the sense in which we know they used σημεία, 'a sign, not wrought by Him, and so to be suspected of magic art, but one from Heaven.' Besides, even if this were not so, how can the refusing to work a miracle to satisfy them, affect the nature or signification of those wrought on different occasions, and with a totally different view? And yet on ground like this it is (De Wette, vol. i. p. 147) that rationalistic systems are built.—τι οὖν; οὐκ ἔστοιχος ἔστοιχος σημείων; ἐστοιχος, ἀλλ' οὐ δει αὕτοις πεπομένων γαρ ἡσαν ἀλλά διὰ τὴν γνώμην ἄλλων φιλοσ. Euthym. in loc.—The sign of Jonas is the most remarkable foreshadowing in the O. T. of the resurrection of our Lord. It was of course impossible that His resurrection should be represented by an actual resurrection, as His birth was by births (Isaac, Samson, Samuel, Mahershalalhashbaz), and His death by deaths (Abel; the substitute for Isaac; Zachariah the prophet; the daily and occasional sacrifices); so that we find the events symbolic of His resurrection (Jo-
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γενέας ταυτίς καὶ κατακρινεὶ αυτήν, διότι ἦλθεν ἐκ τῶν
περάτων τῆς γῆς ἀκούσαι τὴν σοφίαν Σολομώντος, καὶ
ἰδοὺ πλεῖον Σολομώντος ἔδε. 43. Οὖν δὲ τῷ ἀκόμαρτῳ
πνεῦμα ἐξέλθη ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, διέρχεται δὲ ἀνώ-

BCDZ δροῦν τῶν ἦτοιων ἀνάπαυσιν, καὶ οὐχ ἐυρίσκει

τὸτε λέγει Ἔποστρέψω εἰς τὸν οἰκὸν μου ὅθεν ἐξῆλθον

καὶ ἐλθὼν ἐυρίσκετο ἵχολάζοντα, ἐσπαρμένοιν καὶ

κεκοσμημένον. 45 τὸτε πορεύεται καὶ παραλαμβάνει μεθ' 

ἐαυτοῦ ἐπὶ ἑτερα πνεύματα πονηρότερα ἑαυτοῦ, καὶ εἰς ἐλ-

θόντα κατοικεῖ ἐκεῖ, καὶ γίνεται τὰ ἑσχατα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου

ἐκείνου χείρονα τῶν πρωτῶν. οὕτως ἔσται καὶ τῇ γενεᾷ

tαυτῇ τῇ πονηρᾷ.

44. ὑποστρέψω Z. tkt (att. δὲ μ. B D) B C D.—ἐλθὼν D E. tkt B C.—γων. καὶ C. 


sephus, Ant. viii. 6, 5, calls her τὴν τῆς 

Διόγκου καὶ τῆς Ἀλθοσίας τὸς βασι-

λευθεραν γυναῖκα, i. e. of Meroe (whose 

queens were usually called Candace. Plin. 

Hist. vi. 29). Abyssinian tradition agrees 

with this account, calls her Maqudsae, and 

supposes her to have embraced the Jewish 

religion in Jerusalem. The Arabian on 

the other hand also claims her, calling her 

Balkis (Koran, c. xxvii, cited by Winier), 

which latter view is probably nearer the 

truth, Sheba being a tract in Arabia Felix, 

near the shores of the Red Sea, near the 

present Aden (see Plin. vi. 23), abounding 

in spices and gold and precious stones. 

—43.] This important parable, in the simili-

tude itself, sets forth to us an evil spirit 

driven out from a man, wandering in his 

misery and restlessness through desert 

places, the abodes and haunts of evil spir-

its (see Is. xiii. 21, 22; xxxiiv. 14), and at 

last determining on a return to his former 

victim, whom he finds so prepared for his 

purposes, that he associates with himself 

seven other spirits, by whom the wretched 

man being possessed, ends miserably. In 

its interpretation we may trace three dis-

tinct references, each full of weighty in-

struction. (1) The direct application of 

the parable is to the Jewish people, and 

the parallel runs thus:—The old demon of 

idolatry brought down on the Jews the Baby-

lonish captivity, and was cast out by it. 

They did not after their return fall into it 

again, but rather endured persecution, as 

under Antiochus Epiphanes. The empty-

ing, sweeping, and garnishing may be traced 

in the growth of Pharisaic hypocrisy and 

the Rabbinical schools between the return 

and the coming of our Lord. The re-pos-

session by the one, and accession of seven 

other spirits more malicious (πονηρότερα) 

Vol. I.
48 Ἐν τῷ ἀντὶ τοῦ λαλοῦντος τοῖς ὄχλοις, ἵδον ἡ Β.] C D Z μήτηρ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ εἰσήκειαν ἐξω τοῖς ἡγούμενοι τοῦ λαλοῦσαι. 49 εἶπε δὲ τοῖς ἵδον ἡ μήτηρ σου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ σου ἐξελεφάσαι τοῖς ἡγούμενοι τοῦ λαλοῦσαι.

50 ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπε τῷ * εἰσώντα τῷ Τις ἤστιν ἡ μήτηρ μου, καὶ τίνες εἶςν οἱ ἀδελφοὶ μου; 49 καὶ εἰκέναι τῷ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ εἰπεν Ἰδοὺ ἡ μήτηρ μου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ μου. 50 δότες γὰρ ἂν σωθήσω τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρὸς μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς, αὐτός μου ἀδελφὸς καὶ ἀδελφὴ καὶ μήτηρ εἰσίν.
in the N. T. are various, and may be found in the lexicons. My present concern with it is to explain its meaning as applied to the "parables" of our Lord. (1) The Parable is not a Fable, inasmuch as the Fable is concerned only with the maxims of worldly prudence, whereas the parable conveys spiritual truth. The Fable in its form rejects probability, and teaches through the fancy, introducing speaking animals, or even inanimate things; whereas the Parable adheres to probability, and teaches through the imagination, introducing only things which may possibly happen. ἵκτον παραβολήν ἐφοσον ὡς πτητι γοιμόσων, ρή γοιμόσων ἡγομένη καρα τὸ ημῖσον, διάσωμαν δὲ γίνεσθαι. Origen, cited by Trench on the Parables, p. 4. (2) Nor is the Parable a Myth; inasmuch as in Mythology the course of the story is set before us as the truth, and simple minds receive it as the truth, only the reflective mind penetrating to the distinction between the vehicle and thing conveyed; whereas in the Parable these two stand distinct from one another to all minds, so that the simplest would never believe in the Parable as fact. (3) Nor is the Parable a Proverb; though παραβολή is used for both in the N. T. (Luke iv. 23. v. 36. Matt. xv. 14, 15), and παροιμία in John for a parable (John x. 6. xvi. 25. 29). It is indeed more like a Proverb than either of the former; being an expanded Proverb, and a Proverb a concentrated parable, or fable, or result of human experience expressed without a figure. Hence it will be seen that the Proverb ranges far wider than the parable, which is an expansion of only one particular case of a proverb. Thus θες Physician, heal thyself; would, if expanded, make a parable; θες θες Μινείαμ, a fable; 'honesty is the best policy,' neither of these. (4) Nor is the Parable an Allegory: inasmuch as in the Allegory the imaginary persons and actions are placed in the very places and footsteps of the real ones, and stand there instead of them, declaring all the time by their names or actions who and what they are. Thus the Allegory is self-interpreting, and the persons in it are invested with the attributes of those represented; whereas in the Parable the courses of action related and understood run indeed parallel, but the persons are strictly confined to their own natural places and actions, which are, in their relation and succession, typical of higher things. (5) It may well hence be surmised what a Parable is. It is a serious narration, within the limits of probability, of a course of action pointing to some moral or spiritual Truth (Collatio per narratimculam fictam, sed veri similem, serio illustratil saccem sublimiorem. Unger, de Parabolis Jesu (Meyer)); and derives its force from real analogies impressed by the Creator of all things on His creatures. The great Teacher by Parables therefore is He who needed not that any should testify of man; for He knew what was in man, John ii. 25. The Parable is especially adapted to different classes of hearers at once; it is understood by each according to his measure of understanding. (See note on ver. 13).—The seven Parables related in this chapter cannot be regarded as a collection made by the Evangelist as relating to one subject, the Kingdom of Heaven and its development: they are clearly indicated by ver. 53 to have been all spoken on one and the same occasion, and form indeed a complete and glorious whole in their inner and deeper sense. The first four of these parables appear to have been spoken to the multitude from the ship (the interpretation of the parable of the sower being interposed); the last three to the disciples in the house.—From the expression ἐξεστάσατο here compared with the question of the disciples in ver. 10,—and with ver. 34,—it appears that this was the first beginning of our Lord's teaching by parables, expressly so delivered, and properly so called. And the natural sequence of things here agrees with, and confirms Matthew's arrangement against those who would place (as Ebrard) all this chapter before the Sermon on the Mount. He there spoke without parables, or mainly so; and continued to do so till the rejection and misunderstanding of His teaching led to His judicially adopting the course here indicated, χωρίς παρ. ἐνε διάλεισ ἀντιν. The other order would be inconceivable: that after such parabolic teaching, and such a reason assigned for it, the Lord should, that reason remaining in full force, have deserted His parabolic teaching, and opened out his meaning as plainly as in the Sermon on the Mount. —3.] For the explanation of the parable see on vv. 19—23.—4 αὐτ. generic, singular of οἱ παραβολίσται εστιν, he that soweth.—4.] παρὰ v. 38. by the
path through the field. Luke inserts κατασκαφῆθη. Mark after τὰ πετρωθῆ,— τοῦ ὄρους,— τὰ πετρωθῆ (= τὴν πίταν τὸ Λυκέ), strong places where the native rock is but slightly covered with earth (which abound in Palestine), and where therefore the radiation from the face of the rock would cause it to spring up quickly, the shallow earth being heated by the sun of the day before.—[5.] διέβαζεν = ἔμεθα τὸ Λυκέ. If the one could have struck down it would have found the other.—[7.] ἔμεθα τ. ἀλ. = ἐγὼ τ. ἀλ. Mark; ἐν μέσῳ τῶν ἀλ. Luke. In places where were the roots of thorns, beds of thistles, or such like.—ἀναβεβαίωσεν... καὶ = συμφώνουσα τοιὸς κυριός = συνιστάνει. Mark, who adds καὶ καρδίαν οὐκ ἔχωμεν.—[9.] ἐγὼν = φῶς ἐποίησε τὸ Λυκέ. After κατ᾿ ἔσχατον ἀναβαίνω οὐκ ἔχων. Luke gives only ἐκομματισμὸν. —[9.] is common to all three Evangelists.

10—12.] Peculiar to Matthew. —10.] οἱ μαθηταὶ εἰς περὶ αὐτὸν σὺν τοῖς ὑδάινοις Mark. This question took place during a pause in our Lord’s teaching, not when He had entered the house, ver. 36. The question shows the newness of the method of teaching to the disciples. It is not mentioned in Mark; only the inquiry into the meaning of the parable just spoken: nor in Luke; but the answer implies it.—11.] The Kingdom of Heaven, like other kingdoms, has its secrets and inner councils, which strangers must not know. These are only revealed to the humble diligent listeners, διὰ τὸ: to those who were immediately around the Lord with the twelve; not ἐκεῖνος = τοῖς λαοῖς, Luke, = οἱ συνηθείς τοῖς ἠκούσαν Mark. (1 Cor. v. 12, 13.)—οἱ συνηθείς = ἐν παραβολαῖς (Luke), πάντα γίνεται Mark. —12.] In this saying of the Lord is summed up the double force—the revealing and concealing properties of the parable. By it, he who hath,—he who not only hears with the ear, but understands with the heart, has more given to him; and it is for this main purpose undoubtedly that the Lord spoke parables: to be to His Church revelations of the truth and mysteries of His Kingdom. But His present purpose in speaking them, as further explained below, was the quality possessed by them, and declared in the latter part of this verse, of hiding their meaning from the heart and making it impossible to the human heart and soulful. By them, he who hath not, in whom there is no spark of spiritual desire nor meekness to receive the engrafted word, has taken from him even that which he hath (‘seemeth to have’ Luke), even the poor confused notions of heavenly doctrine which a sensual and careless life allow him, are further bewildered and darkened by this simple teaching, into the depths of which he cannot penetrate so far as even to ascertain that they exist. No practical comment on the latter part of this saying can be more striking, than that which is furnished to our day by the study of the German rationalistic commentators; while at the same time I rejoice to see the fulfillment of the former in the commentaries of Olshausen, Neander, Stier, and Trench. In ch. xxv. 29 the fuller meaning of this saying as applied not only to hearing, but to the whole spiritual life, is brought out by the
Lord.—18.] ἕτε βλ. οὐ βλέπωσι κ.τ.λ. =
(νε Mark, Luke, and below) ἵνα μὴ βλέπωσι κ.τ.λ. In the deeper view of the purpose of the parable, both of these run into one. Taking the saying of ver. 12 for our guide, we have δύτις οὐκ ἰσούν = δύτι βλέπουσι, and σῶσι ἰσούν. In this passage, the difficulty raised on these variations, and on the prophecy quoted in vv. 14, 15, have arisen entirely from not keeping this in view. —14, 15.] This prophecy is quoted with a similar reference John xii. 40, Acts xxviii. 26, 27, and Rom. xi. 8. —ἀνακήρυξαν, has its complete fulfilment, 'its partial one having taken place in the contemporaries of the prophet. It is cited verbatim from the LXX, which changes the imperative of the Hebrew (*Make the heart of this people fat,* &c., E. V.) into the indicative, as bearing the same meaning. —ἐκραύγη, 'has grown fat;' from prosperity: —torments, omni sensu cares (Simonsis Lex. under γρόγω). —βαδίσως ἤκουσαν, 'have heard heavily, sluggishly, and imperfectly.' —ἐκάλυψαν, 'have closed (Heb. smeared over) their eyes.' —All this have they done: all this is increased in them by their continuing to do it, and all lest they should (so that they cannot) hear, see, understand, and be saved! —ἵσομαι ἀντ. = ἀποθέ αὐτῶς τὰ ἄμαρτήματα Mark. This citation gives no countenance to the fatalist view of the passage, but rests the whole blame on the hard-heartedness and un readiness of the hearers, which is of itself the cause why the very preaching of the word is a means of further darkening and condemning them. (See 2 Cor. iv. 3, 4.) —16, 17.] See Prov. xx. 12. These verses occur again in a different connexion, and with the form of expression slightly varied, Luke x. 23, 24. It was a saying likely to be repeated. There it is μακάρ. ἵνα βλέπωσι κ.τ.λ. and for ἵσοι we have ἰσούσαν. On the fact that prophets, &c. desired to see those things, see 2 Sam. xxiii. 8. Job xii. 23, 27; also Exod. iv. 17, and Luke ii. 29—32. —18, 19.] Mark iv. 10—22. Luke viii. 9—18, who incorporate with the answer of the Lord to the request of the disciples, much of our last section. —18.] ἀκούσαν, in the sense of the verse before—the true meaning of, hear in your hearts. With regard to the Parable itself, we may remark that its great leading idea is that μνημείων τῆς βασιλείας, according to which the grace of God, and the receptivity of it by man, work ever together in bringing forth fruit. The seed is one and the same everywhere and to all; but seed does not spring up without earth, nor does earth bring forth without seed; and the success or failure of the seed is the consequence of the adapta-
tion to its reception, or, otherwise, on the spot on which it fails. But, of course, on the other hand, as the inquiry, ‘Why is this ground rich, and that barren?’ led us up into the creative arrangements of God,—so a similar inquiry in the spiritual interpretation would lead us into the inscrutable and sovereign arrangements of Him who preventeth us that we may have a good will, and worketh with us when we have that will’ (Art. X. of the Church of England).

—19.) In Luke we have an important prelimentary declaration, implied indeed here also: δος σοφός διῶν τοῦ λόγου τοῦ θεοῦ. This word is in this parable especially meant of the word preached, though the word written is not excluded: nor the word unswritten—the providences and judgments, and even the creation, of God. (See Rom. x. 17, 18.) The similitude in this parable is alluded to in 1 Pet. i. 23. Jam. i. 21.—The sower is first the Son of Man (ver. 37), then His ministers and servants (1 Cor. iii. 6) to the end. He sows over all the field, unlikely as well as likely places; and commands His sowers to do the same, Mark xvi. 15. Some, Stier says, (Reden Jesu, ii. 58,) have objected to the Parable a want of truthful correspondence to reality, because sowers do not thus waste their seed by scattering it where it is not likely to grow; but as he rightly answers—the simple idea of the parable must be borne in mind, and its limits not transgressed—‘a sower went out to sow’—his sowing—sowing over all places, is the idea of the parable. We see him only as a sower, not as an economist. The parable is not about Him, but about the seed and what happens to it. He is the fit representative of διδόντως θεοῦ πάνω ἄπλως, και ὁνιμακόρεως, James i. 5.—καὶ μὴ συνάντης is peculiar to Matthew, and very important; as in Mark and Luke this first class of hearers are without any certain index to denote them. The reason of the parable is clearly set forth by the parable: the heart is hardened, trodden down; the seed cannot penetrate.

ο-Job xix. 28.
P-Heb. xi. 25.
q-2 Cor. iv. 16.
q-Sir. xxii. 8.

λόγον (1st time) ins. μου X.—22. for σπ., γνωρίμονος D acd.—σαλίνος om. τεσσαρων

—δος σοφός = δ Σατανάς (Mark, who also inserts οὐθεν), = δ διαβόλος (Luke). The parable itself is here most satisfactory as to the manner in which the work proceeds. By fowls of the air—passing thoughts and desires, which seem insignificant and even innocent—does Satan do his work, and rob the heart of the precious seed. Luke adds the purpose of Satan in taking away the word: ἵνα μὴ πιστόταταις σωθώσιν.—δ. . . . σωθήσεται: not ‘he that received seed by the way side,’ but ‘he that was sown by the way side.’ This is not a confusion of similitudes, but a deep truth. The seed sown, springing up in the earth, becomes the plant, and bears the fruit, or fails of bearing it; it is therefore the representative, when sown, of the individuals of whom the discourse is. And though in this first case it does not spring up yet the same form of speech is kept up: throughout they are οἱ σκορπίστες, as, when the question of bearing fruit comes, they must be. We are said to be ἀναγεγραμμένοι διὰ λόγου ζωντος θεοῦ 1 Pet. i. 23. It takes us up into itself, as the seed the earth, and we become a new plant, a κατηκτικός. —20, 21.] In this case the surface of the mind and disposition is easily stirred, soon excited: but beneath lies a heart even harder than the trodden way. So the plant, springing up under the false heat of excitement, having no root struck down into the depths of the being, is, when the real heat from without arises which is intended to strengthen and forward the healthy-rooted plant, withered and destroyed.—πρόσκαιρος έστι, not only ‘endureth for a while,’ but also ‘is the creature of circumstances,’ changing as they change. Both ideas are included.—γιγνεῖται = in καρποφόρους Luke, thus accommodating themselves to that καρπος.—23.] In this third sort, all as regards the soil is well: the seed goes deep, the plant springs up; all is as is clearly set forth by the parable: the heart is hardened, trodden down; the seed cannot penetrate.
And this because the seeds or roots of thorns are in, and are suffered to spring up in, the heart, and to overwhelm the plant. There is a divided will, a half service, which ever ends in the prevalence of evil over good (μέριμνα απ' μερίζων). This class is not confined to the rich; πλοῦτος in Scripture is not riches absolutely, as possessed, but riches desired. Mark adds καὶ αἱ πείραὶ ἡ λοίπη ἐνθυμεῖται, viz. the ἡ λοίπη which shall be added to us if we seek first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness. The identity of the seeds σωμάτων with the individuals of these classes, as maintained above, is strikingly shown in Luke here: τὸ δὲ εἰς τὰς ἀκανθὰς πεσόν, οὕτως οἶον οἱ αἰσχροι στεφανοῦντες τὸν καθιστάναι, χ. τ. τινί ἁγ. D. — 25. for ἀπειθεῖς, ἀπειθεῖτε B D abcd. — 24. for στεροῦντες, στεροῦντες B M X ms. Syr. Ekh. abcd. — 23. for ισιοῖς, ἰσιοῖς B abcd Arm. Clem. Orig. Ir. Amb.


generically.—The reading <i>lixos</i> is not to be overlooked, as the word occurs no where else in the N. T.—<i>ξίλανα</i>, apparently the darnel, or bastard wheat (lofium album), so often seen in our fields and by our hedge-rows; if so, what follows will be explained, that the <i>tares</i> appeared when the wheat came into ear, having been previously not noticeable.—It appears to be an Eastern word, expressed in the Talmud by <i>תֶּלֶּלֶב</i>.

—Our Lord was speaking of an act of malice yet practised in the East, where persons of revoligious disposition watch the ground of a neighbour being ploughed, and in the night following sow destructive weeds. (Robert's Oriental Illustrations, p. 541, cited by Trench on the Parables, p. 68.)—26.] Jerome in loc. says: 'Inter triticum et <i>ξίλανα</i> quod nos appellamus loliu, quam diu herbæ est, et nondum culmus venit ad spicam, grandis similitudine est, et in discernendo nulla aut perdidictis distantia.' Jerome, it must be remembered, resided in Palestine.

18, 19. On the connexion of this parable with the two last, Chrysostom observes (Hom. in Matt. xvi. p. 483, A) τωδε γε ἐπέστησαν οἱ χρυσοὶ καὶ καρπῶν ἐποίησε, τότε ἐφανε καὶ τα <i>ξίλανα</i>. He would have us understand that the 'tares' were not sown by God, but by Satan; and that the word of Christ, as in the other parables, was 'sown in the field of the Kingdom of God.' This would be in harmony with the design of the whole discourse, which is, to shew the necessity of the presence of the Son of Man at the last day. Ellicott.

duitque tres cabos sinapis. Rabbi Simeon ben Chalapha dixit, Canlis sinapis erat mihi in agro meo, in quum ego scandere solitus sum, ut ut scandere solent in ficum.— This parable, like most others respecting the kingdom of God, has a double reference—general and individual. (1) In the general sense, the insignificant beginnings of the kingdom are set forth: the little babe cast in the manger at Bethlehem; the Man of sorrows with no place to lay His Head; the crucified One; or again the hundred and twenty names who were the seed of the Church after the Lord had ascended; then we have the Kingdom of God waxing onward and spreading its branches here and there, and different nations coming into it. "He must increase," said the great Forerunner. We must beware however of imagining that the outward Church-form is this Kingdom. It has rather reversed the parable, and is the worldly power waxed to a great tree and the Churches taking refuge under the shadow of it. It may be, where not corrupted by error and superstition, subservient to the growth of the heavenly plant; but is not itself that plant. It is at best no more than (to change the figure) the scaffolding to aid the building, not the building itself. (2) The individual application of the parable points to the small beginnings of Divine grace; a word, a thought, a passing sentence, may prove to be the little seed which eventually fills and shadows the whole heart and being, and calls all things together, all delights' to come and shelter under it. Jerome has a comment on this parable (in loc.) too important to be passed over: Prædicitio Evangelii minima est omnibus disciplinis. Ad primam quippe doctrinam, fidem non habet veritas, hominem Deum, Deum mortuum, et scandalum crucis predicans. Confer hujusmodi doctrinam dogmatibus Philosophorum, et libris eorum, splendori eloquentiae, et compositioni sermonum, et videbils quanto minor sit cæteris seminibus somantis Evangelii. Sed ills cum creverit, nihil mordax, nihil veadum, nihil vitæ demonstrat, sed totum moralem, marctudum quaerit, malum sublii in olivæ et in herbas que cito aescant et corrunt. Hæc enim predicatione que parva videbaturn in principio, cum vel in anima credentis, vel in toto mundo satis fuerit, non exsurgit in olivæ, sed crescit in arborum.
universally manifested. But this effect again is not to be traced in the establishment or history of so-called Churches, but in the hidden advancement, without observation, of that deep learning power which works irrespective of human forms and systems. (2) In the transforming power of the 'new leaven' on the whole being of individuals. "In fact the Parable does nothing less than set forth to us the mystery of regeneration, both in its first act, which can be but once, as the leaven is but once hidden; and also in the consequent (subsequent?) renewal by the Holy Spirit, which, as the ulterior working of the leaven, is continual and progressive." (Trench, p. 97.) Some have contended for this as the sole application of the parable; but I, I think, rightly. As I have said, the γνάων has any especial meaning. (though I am more and more convinced that such considerations are not always to be passed by as nugatory) it will hardly be of much consequence here to inquire, seeing that γνάων εἰς στοιχεῖα would be every where a matter of course.—ἀγριότερον has given rise to a technical word ἀγριότερον signifying a leavened cake (which however Passow, Lex. explains to be a cake baked under hot ashes, thus applying the ἀγριότερον differently). See reff.—οὖν, γὰς = the third part of an Ephah, = μῆλον καὶ ἱμημὶ Ισραήλ, Joseph. Antt. ix. 4, 5. Three of these, an Ephah, appears to have been the usual quantity prepared for a baking; see Gen. xviii. 6. Judg. vi. 19. 1 Sam. i. 24. This being the case, we must not I think seek for any symbolical interpretation.

34-35.] Mark iv. 33, 34. — 34. καὶ χωρ.
of sin into the world by the malice of the devil, the mixed state of mankind, notwithstanding the development of God's purposes by the dispensations of grace, and the final separation of the good and evil at the end. The very declaration 'the harvest is the end of the world' suggests the original sowing as the beginning of it. But this sowing is not in the fact, as in the parable, one only, but repeated again and again. In the parable the Lord gathers as it were the whole human race into one lifetime, as they will be gathered in one harvest, and sets that forth as simultaneous, which has been scattered over the ages of time. But (2) as applying principally to the \( \beta \sigma \tau \rho \varepsilon \) which lay in the future and began with the Lord's incarnation, the parable sets forth to us the universal sowing of good seed by the Gospel: it sow no bad seed: all this is done by the enemy, and further we may not inquire. Soon, even as soon as Acts v. in the History of the Church, did the tares begin to appear; and remarkably coincident with the wheat bringing forth fruit (see Acts iv. 32—37). Again, see Acts xiii. 10, where Paul calls Elias by the very name \( \nu \varepsilon \delta \sigma \delta \varepsilon \) And ever since, the same has been the case; throughout the whole world, where the Son of Man sows good seed, the Enemy sows tares. And it is not the office, however much it may be the desire, of the servants of the householder, the labourers in His field, to collect or root up these tares, to put them out of the world literally, or of the Church spiritually (save in some few exceptional cases, such as that in Acts v.); this is reserved for another time and for other hands—for the harvest, the end; for the reapers, the angels. (3) It is also most important to notice that as the Lord here gathers up ages into one season of seedtime and harvest, so He also gathers up the various changes of human character and shiftings of human will into two distinct classes. We are not to suppose that the wheat can never become tares, or the tares wheat: this would be to contradict the purpose of Him who will not allow the death of a sinner, but rather that he should be converted and live; and this gracious purpose shines through the command \( \delta \rho \varepsilon \sigma \tau \varphi \varepsilon \mu \varepsilon \rho \sigma \varepsilon \alpha \mu \varepsilon \rho \varphi \varepsilon \) —let time be given (as above) for the leaven to work. As in the parable the sower the various classes were the concentrations of various dispositions, all of which are frequently found in one and the same individual, so here the line of demarcation between wheat and tares, so fixed and impassable at last, is during the probation-time, the time of \( \sigma \nu \alpha \tilde{\nu} \varepsilon \varepsilon \alpha \tau \sigma \varepsilon \) not yet determined by Him who will have all to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth. In the very first example, that of our first parents, the good seed degenerated, but their restoration and renewal was implied in the promises made to them, and indeed in their very punishment itself; and we their progeny are by nature the children of wrath, till renewed by the same grace. The Parable is delivered by the Lord as knowing all things, and describing by the final result; and gives no countenance whatever to predestinarian error. (4) The parable has an historical importance, having been much in the mouths and writings of the Donatists, who, maintaining that the Church is a perfectly holy congregation, denied the applicability of this Scripture to convict them of error, seeing that it is spoken not of the Church but of the world: missing the deeper truth which would have led them to see that the world is the Church, only overrun by those very tares. —41. \( \tau \varepsilon \sigma \varphi \varepsilon \delta \varepsilon \) generally understood of those who give cause of offence, tempters and hinderers of others: Stier would rather understand it of things, as well as men, who are
afterwards designated. On ver. 42, see note at ch. viii. 12. — 42. έλαφρωσένι να. Shall shine out, (their light here being enfeebled and obscured,) as the sun from a cloud. — τον πατέρα, answering to ο λειαν, ver. 38.

44—46.] Peculiar to Matthew. This and the following parable are closely connected, and refer to two distinct classes of persons who become possessed of the treasure of the Gospel. Notice that these, as also the seventh and last, are spoken not to the multitude, but to the disciples.—In this parable, a man, labouring perchance for another, or by accident in passing, finds a treasure which has been hidden in a field; from joy at having found it he goes, and selling all he has, buys the field, thus by the Jewish law becoming the possessor also of the treasure. Such hiding of treasures is common even now, and was much more common in the East (see Jer. xii. 8. Job iii. 21. Prov. ii. 4.)—This sets before us the case of a man who unexpectedly, without earnest seeking, finds, in some part of the outward Church, the treasure of true faith and hope and communion with God; and having found this, for joy of it he becomes possessor, not of the treasure without the field (for that the case suppose impossible) but of the field at all hazards, to secure the treasure which is in it; i. e. he possesses himself of the means of grace provided in that branch of the Church, where, to use a common expression, he has "gotten his good;" he makes that field his own. — 45.] In this parable the Lord sets before us that although in ordinary cases of finding 'the truth,' as it is in Jesus,' the buying of the field is the necessary prelude to becoming duly and properly possessed of it; yet there are cases, and those of a nobler kind, where such condition is not necessary. We have here a merchantman, one whose business it is, on the search for goodly pearls; i. e. a man who intellectually and spiritually is a seeker of truth of the highest kind. — 46. He whom this pursuiv occupies, is a merchantman; i. e. one trained, as well as devoted, to business. The search is therefore determinate, discriminative, unremitting. This case, then, corresponds to such Christians only as from youth have been trained up in the way which they should go. In these alone can be the settled habits, the effectual self-direction, the convergence to one point of all the powers and tendencies of the soul, which are indicated by the illustration." (Knox's Remains, i. 460.) But as the same writer goes on to observe, even here there is a discovery, at a particular time. The person has been seeking, and finding, goodly pearls; what is true, honest, just, pure, lovely, and of good report: but at last he finds one pearl of great price—the efficacious principle of inward and spiritual life. We hear of no emotion, no great joy of heart, as before; but the same decision of conduct: he sells all and buys it. He chooses vital Christianity at whatever cost for his portion. But here is no field. The pearl is bought pure—by itself. It is found, not unexpectedly in the course of outward ordinances, with which therefore it becomes to the finder inseparably bound up: but by diligent search, spiritual and immediate, in its highest and purest form. Trench instances (Parables, p. 100) Nathanael and the Samaritan woman as examples of the finders without seeking.—Augustine, as related in his Confessions, of the search seeker and finder. Compare with this parable Prov. ii. 3—9, and to see what kind of buying is not meant, Isa. lv. 1. Matt. xxv. 9, 10. Also see Rev. iii. 18.
καὶ ἡγόρασεν αὐτόν. Ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ἐστὶν ἡ σαλίνη ἡ βεθεία σιὰ τὴν βάλασσα σαν καὶ ἐκ παντὸς γένους ἡ συναγαγούσα, ἡ ἐπιληφθῇ ἀναβίβασάντες ἐκ τοῦ αἰγιαλοῦ καὶ καθίσαντες συνέλευσαν τὰ καλὰ εἰς ἀγγεία, τὰ δὲ σαπρὰ ἐξώ ἐβαλον. Ὁ στόρως ἑστιν ἐν τῷ συντελεῖ σὺ τοῦ αἰωνος. ἐξελεύσονται οἱ ἀγγείοι καὶ ἀφορισθοῦ τοὺς BCD ποιήσωμεν ἐκ μέσου τῶν δικαιῶν, καὶ βαλοῦσιν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν κάμπην τοῦ πυρός· ἐκεῖ ἑστιν ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυντὸς τῶν ὁδότων. ἤτοι αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰσοσύνη
d ἡ συνήκατε ταῦτα πάντα; ἔλεγον αὐτῷ Ναὶ [κύριε].

47—53.] Peculiar to Matthew. — 47.] σαλίνη is a drag, or draw-net, drawn over the bottom of the water, and permitting nothing to escape it. The leading idea of this parable is the ultimate separation of the holy and unholy in the Church, with a view to the selection of the former for the master’s use. We may notice that the fishermen are kept out of view and never mentioned: the comparison not extending to them. A net is cast into the sea and gathers of every kind (of flesh: not of things, as mud, weeds, &c., as Stier supposes); when this is full, it is drawn to shore, and the good collected into vessels, while the bad (the legally unclean, those out of season, those putrid or maimed) are cast away. This net is the Church gathering from the sea (a common Scripture similitude for nations: see Rev. xii. 16. Is. viii. 7. Ps. lxi. 7) of the world, all kinds (see Rev. vii. 9); and when it is full, it is drawn to the bank (the limit of the ocean, as the aurrilia is the limit of the aëron), and the angeles (not the same as the fishers, as Olshausen maintains; for in the parable of the tares the servants and reapers are clearly distinguished) shall gather out the wicked from among the just, and cast them into everlasting punishment. It is plain that the comparison must not be strained beyond its limits, as our Lord shows us that the earthly here gives but a faint outline of the heavenly. Compare the mere ἰδέα ἐβαλον of the one with the fearful antitype of vv. 49, 50. On ver. 50 see note on ch. viii. 12. — 52.] When the Lord asks, ‘Have ye understood all these things?’ and they answer ‘Yes, Lord,’ the reply must be taken as spoken from their then standing point, from which little could be seen of that inner and deeper meaning which the Holy Spirit has since unfolded. And this circumstance explains the following parabolic remark of our Lord: that every γραμματικὸς (they in their study of the Lord’s sayings answering to the then γραμματικὸς in their study of the Law) who is μαθητευθεὶς, enrolled as a disciple and taught as such, is like a householder (the Great Householder being the Lord Himself, comp. ch. xxiv. 45) who puts forth from his store new things and old; i.e. ye yourselves, scribes of the Kingdom of Heaven, instructed as ye shall fully be in the meaning of these sayings, are (shall be) like householders, from your own stores of knowledge respecting them hereafter bringing out, not only your present understanding of them, but ever new and deeper meanings.—And this is true of πᾶς γρ. κ.τ.λ. Every real spiritually-learned scribe of the Kingdom of Heaven is able, from the increasing stores of his genuine experimental knowledge of the word (not merely from
books, or learning, or the Bible itself, but εκ τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτοῦ], things new and old.—The ἄνω τοῦ is an expression of consequence, but not a strong one; answering nearly to our 'Well, then.'

53—66.] Mark vi. 1—6. Luke iv. 16—29 and notes.—53, 64.] τὴν περι ἀν., Nazareth. The connexion of this event with the preceding is direct and consecutive, and I cannot therefore with Greswell imagine that the proceedings of ch. viii. 18—ix. 34 are to be inserted between these two verses. In Mark vi. 1 the connexion is not, as De Wette maintains (Ex. Handbuch Matt. p. 160), equally consecutive, but only definite as to place, and not to time, ἐκείνους ἔκεινον: which, since the events just related there, as well as here, happened in Capernaum, agrees with our text so far (see note there). The teaching was on the Sabbath (Mark).—55. οἱ ἄνθρωποι] It is an inquiry of much interest and some difficulty, who these were. After long examination of the evidence on the subject, I believe that the truth will best be attained by disencumbering the mind in the first place of all a priori considerations, and traditions (which last are very inconsistent and uncertain), and fixing the attention on the simple testimony of Scripture itself. I will trace the ἄνθρωποι ἄνθρωποι or ἄνθρωποι through the various mentions of them in the N. T., and then state the result: placing at the end of the note the principal traditions on the subject, and the difficulties attending them. (1) The expression οἱ ἄνθρωποι occurs nine times in the Gospels, and once in the Acts. Of these the three first are in the narratives of the coming of His mother and brethren to speak with Him, ch. xii. 46. Mark iii. 31. Luke viii. 19; the two next are the present passage and its || in Mark vi. 3, where they are mentioned in connexion with His mother and sisters; the other four are in John ii. 12. vii. 3, 5, 10, in the first of which He and his mother and brethren and disciples are related to have gone down to Capernaum: and in the three last His brethren are introduced as urging Him to show Himself to the world, and it is stated that they did not believe on Him. The last is in Acts i. 14, where we read that the Apostles continued in prayer and supplication with the women, and with Mary the mother of Jesus, and with His brethren. In another place, 1 Cor. ix. 5, Paul mentions οἱ λαοί τῆς Αἰγύπτου, οἱ ἄνθρωποι τῶν νυμφών, ταῖς Καρθ. Such are all the places where the meaning is undisputed that persons called, and being in some usual sense, brethren of the Lord, are mentioned. (Besides these the Lord Himself uses the words οἱ ἄνθρωποι of Matt. xxviii. 10. John xx. 17, but apparently (see note there) with a wider meaning, including at least the eleven Apostles in the term, as He does in Matt. xii. 46 and ||.) Now I would observe, (a) that in all the mentions of them in the Gospels, except those in John vii., they are in connexion with His mother; the same being the case in Acts i. 14. (5) That it is nowhere asserted or implied that any of them were of the number of the twelve: but from John vii. 5, following upon vi. 50 (by μετὰ ταῦτα vii. 1), they are excluded from that number. John would certainly not have used the words οἱ ἄνθρωποι, had any of them believed on Him at that time:—and again in Acts i. 14, by being mentioned after the Apostles have been enumerated by name, and after the mother of Jesus, they are indicated at that time also to have been separate from the twelve, although then certainly believing on Him. (γ) Their names, as stated here and in Mark vi. 3, were Jacob, Joses (or Joseph), Simon, and Judas, all of them among the very commonest of Jewish names. Of Joses (or Joseph, certainly not the Joseph Barnabas Justus of Acts i. 23: see ver. 21) and Simon (not Simon Cananites or Zeelotes: see above) we know from Scripture nothing. Of the other two we have the following traces—(δ) Jacob (James) appears in the Apostolic narrative as οἱ ἄνθρωποι τῶν νυμφών, Gal. i. 19: he is there called an apostle. This however determines
nothing as to his having been among the twelve; for Paul and Barnabas are called apostles Acts xiv. 14, and Paul always calls himself such. Whether he is identical with the James of Gal. ii. 9, whom Paul mentions with Cephas and John as having given him and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship, fourteen years after the visit in ch. i. 19, does not appear. (See this whole subject discussed in the note on James i. 1, vol. ii.)

(1) The Jude who has left an epistle, and was brother of James, not only does not call himself an apostle, ver. 1 (as neither does James, nor indeed John himself, so that his two brothers are both neglected), but in ver. 17 seems to draw a distinction between himself and the Apostle. Whether this indicate that the James and Jude, the authors of the Epistles, were two of these δώδεκα ἐκ τῶν εὐαγγελίων is uncertain; but it may at least be mentioned in the course of our inquiry.

—I shall now state the result of that inquiry, which has been based on Scripture testimony only. (1) That there were four persons known as Ἄλφας, αὐτοῦ or τοῦ Ἐβραίου, not of the number of the twelve. (2) That these persons are found in all places (but one) where their names occur in the Gospels, in immediate connexion with Mary, the mother of the Lord. (3) That not a word is anywhere dropped to prevent us from inferring that the δώδεκα and ἄρακτοι were His relations in the same literal sense as we know ἡ μητέρα αὐτοῦ to have been; but that His own saying, where He distinguishes His relations according to the flesh from His disciples (ch. xii. 60 and 1), seems to sanction that inference. (4) That nothing is said from which it can be inferred whether Joseph had been married before he appears in the Gospel history; or again, whether those ἄδεις were, according to the flesh, older or younger than the Lord. (5) That the silence of the Scripture narrative leaves it free for Christians to believe these to have been real (younger) brethren and sisters of the Lord, without incurring any imputation of unsoundness of belief as to His miraculous conception. That such an imputation has been cast, is no credit to the logical correctness of those who have made it, who set down that, because this view has been taken by impugners of the great Truth just mentioned, therefore it eventually leads, or may fairly be used, towards the denial of it (see Dr. Mill on the Brethren of our Lord, p. 224); for no attempt is made to show its connexion with such a conclusion. The fact is that the two matters, the miraculous conception of the Lord Jesus by the Holy Ghost, and the subsequent virginity of His Mother, are essentially and entirely distinct: see note on Matt. i. 25; see also, respecting a supposed difficulty attending this view, note on John xix. 26. (II) I will now state the principal traditional views respecting the brethren of the Lord. That they were all sons of Alpheus (or Clopas) and Mary the sister of the Mother of our Lord; and so cousins of Jesus, and called agreeably to Jewish usage — this is the view taken in the remarkable fragment of Papias, quoted in Dr. Mill, p. 238, adopted by Jerome (cont. Helvidium), and very generally received in ancient and modern times. But it seems to me that a comparison of the Scripture testimonies cited above will prove it untenable. One at least of the sons of this Alpheus was an apostle, of the number of the twelve, viz. Ἀκάμβας of τοῦ Ἀλφαίου (see all the lists, on ch. x. 3); which (see above) would exclude him from the number of the brethren of the Lord. But even if one of the four could be thus detached (which, from John vii. 5, I cannot believe), it is almost certain that Ἱακώβου (see Luke's two lists as above) is Jude the brother of James; and if so, this would be another son of Alpheus, and another subtraction from the number who did not believe on Him. Again Matthew (see note on Matt. ix. 9), if identical with Levi (Mark ii. 14), was another son of Alpheus; which would make a fifth brother, and leave therefore out of five, three believing on Him at the time when it was said ὁ δὲ γὰρ ὁ δή...κρ.λ. This view besides labours under the difficulty arising from these brethren always accompanying and being found in connexion with Mary the Mother of our Lord, whereas throughout that time their own mother was living. The way in which the assertors of this view explain John vii. 5, is either by supposing that all the brethren are not there implied, or that all are not here mentioned; both suppositions, it seems to me, very unlikely (compare e.g. John's minute accuracy whereon exception was to be made, ch. vi. 23, 24). (III) That they were children of Joseph by a former marriage (or even by a later one with Mary wife of Clopas, to raise up seed to his dead brother
as Clopas is said to have been: but this needs no refutation). This view was taken by several early Fathers, e.g. Hilary, Epiphanius, and mentioned by Origen, who (Winer Realwörterbuch, i. p. 683) says respecting it, oi ταύτα λίγοντες τό άξιόμα τῆς Μαρίας εν παρθένῳ τηρεῖν μέχρι τί- λους βούλονται. This however, while by no means impossible, and in some respects agreeing with the apparent position of these brothers as older (according to the flesh) than the Lord (John vii. 3), has no countenance whatever in Scripture, either in their being called sons of any other woman, or in any distinct mention of Joseph as their father. (IV) On the a priori considerations which have influenced opinions on this matter, see note on Matt. i. 25:

and on the traditional literature, see the tract of Professor Mill on the Brethren of our Lord. See also Winer Realwörterbuch, Art. Jesus, § 3. Gresswell, Dissertations, vol. ii. Dis. iii. Blom, Disputatio Theologica de τ. δό. τ. Χ. Lug. Bat. 1839. Wieseler, Stud. und Kritiken, 1842, i. 96 ff. (These two last I have not seen.)—Neander, Leben J. p. 48, brings out the importance of the view which I have above (under 1) endeavoured to justify, as showing that the account of the miraculous conception is not mythical, in which case all would have been arranged to suit the views of virginity from which it had arisen,—but strictly historical, found as it is with no such arrangements or limitations.—58.] ούς ἡσύνεσθαι = οὔς ἰδο- ναύο ποιήσαι Mark vi., where see note. On the identity of this preaching at Nazareth with that related much earlier by Luke iv. 14 sq., see note there.

CHAP. XIV. 1—12.] Mark vi. 14—29. Luke ix. 7—9, who does not relate the death of John.—1.] This Herod was Herod Antipas, son of Herod the Great, in Malαθης τῆς Σαμαρίνδος, and own brother of Archelaus (Jos. B. J. i. 28, 4). The portion of the kingdom allotted to him by the second will of his father (in the first he was left as king) was the tetrarchy of Galilee and Perea (Jos. Ant. xvii. 8, 1). He married the daughter of the Arabian king Aretas; but having during a visit to his half-brother Herod Philip (not the tetrarch of that name, but another son of Herod the Great, disinherited by his father), became enamoured of his wife Herodias, he prevailed on her to leave her husband, and live with him. This step, accompanied as it was with a stipulation of putting away the daughter of Aretas, involved him in a war with his father-in-law, which however did not break out till a year before the death of Tiberius (A. D. 37, u. C. 790), Jos. Antt. xvi. 5, 1—3, and in which he was totally defeated and his army destroyed by Aretas; a Divine vengeance, according to the Jews, for the death of John the Baptist (Josephus, ibid.). He and Herodias afterwards went to Rome at the beginning of Caligula's reign, to complain of the assumption of the title of king by Agrippa his nephew, son of Aristobulus; but Caligula having heard the claims of both, banished Antipas and Herodias to Lyons in Gaul, whence he was afterwards removed to Spain, and there died: Jos. Antt. viii. 7, 1, 2. The following events took place at Machærus, a frontier fortress between Perea and Arabia:—μῆνι μεταφέρεις τ' ἡρώδους] It was the fame of the preaching and miracles of the twelve, on their mission, of which Herod heard,—probably in conjunction with the works of Christ.—9. οἷος = δούλος. In Luke ix. 7 it is said that Herod διηκόρισεν, διὰ τοῦ λεγένηται εντό τι- νων, δι' ἱεραρχ. ἐγγ. ε.τ.λ. There is no inconsistency in these accounts: the report originated with others: but if Herod διηκόρισεν concerning it, he in the terrors of
a guilty conscience, doubtless gave utterance to these words himself. There is no evidence that Herod was a Sadducee, or a disbeliever in the resurrection as then held by the Pharisees. See note on Mark viii. 14. — There is no allusion here to metempsychosis, but to the veritable bodily resurrection, and supposed greater power acquired by having passed through death; for John wrought no miracle while living (see John x. 41). — 4.] It was unlawful by Levit. xviii. 16. — 5.] This verse is further expanded in Mark: ὁ γὰρ Ὅσα ἡμᾶς τὸν Ἰωάννην ἐλπίζω ἔμειναι ἐν τῷ ζωέντα. This verse is further expanded in Mark: ὁ γὰρ Ὅσα ἡμᾶς τὸν Ἐφεσίους ἐλπίζω ἔμειναι ἐν τῷ ζωέντα. This verse is further expanded in Mark: ὁ γὰρ Ὅσα ἡμᾶς τὸν Ἐφεσίους ἐλπίζω ἔμειναι ἐν τῷ ζωέντα. This verse is further expanded in Mark: ὁ γὰρ Ὅσα ἡμᾶς τὸν Ἐφεσίους ἐλπίζω ἔμειναι ἐν τῷ ζωέντα.

The great feast was given to the nobility of Galilee, Mark vi. 21. The damsel's name was Salome (Jos. Antt. xviii. 5, 4), daughter of Herodias by her former husband Philip. The dance was probably a pantomimic dance. — 9.] Herod was grieved, because he heard John gladly, and from policy did not wish to put him to death on so slight a cause. This is not at all inconsistent (as De Wette maintains) with his wishing to put him to death, for to that is distinctly added καὶ ὅτι ἔδωκεν: not for want of power, certainly, but for want of cause sufficient to satisfy the people. — 10.] It appears from the damsel's expression διός μοι δότις and this verse, that the feast was held either at Macherus or at no great distance from it. Antipas had a palace near, τὰ πλησίον Ἴριδον ἀλήλια καὶ Βαθρεμαθῶν, B. J. ii. 4, 2; but he was not there on account of the war with Aretas, see above.

13—21.] Mark vi. 30—44. Luke ix. 10—17. John vi. 1—13, where all are noted. — 13.] There is some difficulty here in conceiving how the narration is to proceed continuously. The death of the Baptist is evidently retrospectively and parenthetically
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ο ο λοι ήκολουθσαι αυτω πεζη απο των παλαν. 16 kai BCDZ εξελθων το Ισιους ιδε πολυν ολον, και ειπεν εσπλαγγισθη εστι αυτων και εθερατος τους αρωματους αυτων. 13 ὁ δή Γενομενης προσηλθον αυτω οι μαθηται αυτω λεγοντες Βοσμιος εστιν το τοπος και η ωρα ήπη παρηλθεν επιτυμουν τους ουκους, ειναι απελθοντες εις τας κωμας Βος αγορασων ειατοι το βρωματα. 16 ο δε Ισιους ειπεν αυτως Ου χρειαν έχουσαι απελθενι δοτε αυτοις υμεις φαγεν. 17 οι δε λεγονται αυτω Ουκ εχομεν ωδε ει μη πεντε αρτους και δυο ιχθυας. 18 ο δε ειπεν Φιλειχο μοι αυτους ωδε. 19 Και κελευσας τους ολους ἀνακληθηναι Βος ιν τους χορτους, και λαβων τους πεντε αρτους και τους δυο ιχθυας και κλασας οδοι τους μαθητας τους αρτους οι δε μαθηται τους ολους. 20 και ειπον Παντες εχορ η τύπος και η προσε οντων και κλασαν των δωδεκα και κοψας πληρες. 21 οι δε εσπουντες ήσαν ανδρες που και παιανων εσπα αυτους και χωρις γυναικων και παιανων.inserted; and yet the retirement of the Lord in this verse seems to be the immediate consequence of His hearing of that occurrence. But this may well have been so: for (1) the disciples of John would be some days in bringing the news from Machera to Capernaum, and the report mentioned in ver. 1 might reach Herod meantime; and (2) the expression with which that report is introduced, ἐν ψευδων τω ενορίω, extends it over a considerable space of time; and (3) the message which the disciples of John brought to our Lord might have included both particulars, the death of their Master, and the saying of Herod respecting Himself.—He went across the lake (John vi. 2) into a desert place belonging to the city called Bethsaida (Luke ix. 10). His retirement (Luke, ibid., and Mark vi. 30) was connected also with the return of the twelve from their mission: compare the full and affecting account of the miracle transaction in Mark vi. 30—35. —15.] This ἡ ψηφια was the first evening, the decline of the day, about 3 p.m.; the ἡ ψηφια in ver. 23, after the miracle, was late in the night.—ἡ δε ἀναπαυμα της ψηφιας του νυκτος ηλιου, Xen. Hell. vi. 2. 22—16, 17.] Ποτα αυτοις ψηφεις φι, which is common to the three first Evangelists, is considerably expanded in the more detailed account of John, ver. 3—7;—it was Andrew who spoke in ver. 17, and the five loaves and two fishes were brought by a lad: John v. 8, 9. They were barley loaves and salt fish: ibid. And we have the vast concourse accounted for in John by the fact that the Passover was at hand, and so they were collected on their journey to Jerusalem.—See a very similar miracle in 2 Kings iv. 42—44; only then there were twenty barley loaves and an hundred men. See also Numbers xi. 21, 22. —19.] ἔλληνων, viz. the loaves and fishes, see Luke ix. 16. This miracle was one of symbolic meaning for the loaves and fishes, see Luke xi. 16. This miracle was one of symbolic meaning for the first Evangelists, is considerably expanded in the more detailed account of John, ver. 3—7;—it was Andrew who spoke in ver. 17, and the five loaves and two fishes were brought by a lad: John v. 8, 9. They were barley loaves and salt fish: ibid. And we have the vast concourse accounted for in John by the fact that the Passover was at hand, and so they were collected on their journey to Jerusalem.—See a very similar miracle in 2 Kings iv. 42—44; only then there were twenty barley loaves and an hundred men. See also Numbers xi. 21, 22. —19.] ἔλληνων, viz. the loaves and fishes, see Luke ix. 16. This miracle was one of symbolic meaning for the loaves and fishes, see Luke xi. 16. This miracle was one of symbolic meaning for the first Evangelists, is considerably expanded in the more detailed account of John, ver.
22 And the people were saying to each other, "This is the voice of a god." But He, being_ue #2 \text{nagkase} 
1 
1 Pro. v. 7. 
1 J 1 Mac. x. 
1 k = ch. xxii. 81. 
1 xxvi. 52. 
1 ver. 16. 
1 m ver. 18. 
1 2 Mac. iv. 6. 
1 u = John i. 20. 
1 q = Gen. xxiv. 36. 
1 Rev. x. y. 
1 Job ix. 8. 
1 Gen. xii. 6. 
1 Mark only. 1. 
1 Mark ix. 6. 
1 Paul. xv. 16. 
1 Gen. xxiv. 41. 
1 ch. xii. 88. 
1 al. 
1 v = ch. xii. 88. 
1 al. 
1 txt C. — 22. rec. ηναγκασε 1 τους μαθητας αυτου εμβηναι εις το πλοιον και προαγεν αυτον εις το περαν εως ου απολυσα τους υχλους. 
1 και απολυσας τους υχλους ην ανεβη εις το όροι και ιδιαν προσυκαθαλασσης ην ανεβη εις το πλοιον ην μεσο της θαλασσης ην θασανικομεν υπο των κυμων ην γαι εναντιος ο ανεμος. 
1 και ειδοντες αυτον οι μαθηται ετε την θαλασσην περιπλαναντα ετεραγθησαν λεγοντες ον φαινησα αιστη 
1 Ψαλ. xxviii. 29. 
1 και απο του φοβου εκραζαν. 
1 ευθεως δε ελαλησεν αυτοις ο Ιησους λεγων Θαραιστε εγω ειμι μη φοβηστεθε 
1 αποκριθεις δε αυτω ετη Πετρος ειπε Κυριε ει σου ει κελευνομεν με προς σε ελθειν ετε τα υδατα 
1 δε ειπεν ΄Ελθη και καταβας απο του πλοιου ο Πετρος περη 
1 επανησαν ειτε τα υδατα ελθειν προς των Ιησουν. 
1 μεν η ανεμον εις χρονον εφοβηθη και αραξεμος κατα 
1 ποντιζεθαι εκραζε λεγων Κυριε σωσον με. 
1 ευθεως δε 
1 Ιησους εκτεινας την χειρα επελαβετο αυτου και την 
1 Luke ix. 47. 

this might have been inferred from διψας being used in the other three Evangelists. See note on John v. 10. 
23—38.] Mark vi. 45—52. (Luke omits this incident.) John vi. 14—21. The conviction of the people after this miracle was, that Jesus was the Messiah; and their disposition, to take Him by force and make Him a king. See John v. 14, 15. For this reason He constrained His disciples to leave Him, because they were but too anxious to second this wish of the multitude; and their dismissal was therefore an important step towards the other. — εις το περαν] Mark adds προς Βεθανιαν, John ε ε Κα 

\text{αιρασονου}: for the Bethsaida the city of Philip and Andrew and Peter, was distinct from Bethsaida Julias, in whose neighbourhood the miracle took place, and in the direction of Capernaum. — 25.] The fourth watch, according to the Roman calculation, which was by this time common among the Jews (who themselves divided the night into three parts or watches). This would be between three and six in the morning. — δεπιλευν προς αυτ. A mixed construction for δεπιλευν απο του δρος και ήλθε προς αυτ. The words περιστατ. ειτς τη 

θαλασσης are common to the three Evangelists, and can have no other meaning here, than that the Lord walked bodily on the surface of the water. The passages commonly cited to show that ειτς with a gen. can mean 'on the bank of,' are not applicable here, being all after verbs of rest, not of motion. 4 Kings ii. 7. Dan. vii. 2. 

John xxii. 1. In Job ix. 8 we read of the Almighty, η τημρας τον νυφαν μονος, and περιπλανους μεν ειτς ιδιους ειτς 

θαλασσης. Mark adds και ήλθε παρελθεν αυ 

τους ομος, John ε ε Κα 

ποντιζεθαι εκραζε λεγων Κυριε σωσον με. 

This narrative respecting Peter is peculiar to Matthew. It is in very strict accordance with his warm and confident character, and has been called almost a 'rehearsal' of his denial afterwards. It is one of the most pointed and striking revelations which we have of the nature and analogy of faith; and a notable example of the power of the higher spiritual state of man over the inferior laws of matter, so often
λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ὀλυμπίστεις εἰς τί ἐδιστασάς; καὶ ΒΧΔΡ
*ἐμβάντων αὐτῶν εἰς τὸ πλοῖον ἐκόπασεν ὁ ἄνεμος.
οὐκέτας. 53 οἱ δὲ ἐν τῷ πλοῖῳ ἠλθόντες προσεύχοντας αὐτῷ
λέγοντες Ἀληθῶς δὲ θεοῦ γὰρ εἰ.

54 Καὶ διαπεράσαντες ἤλθον *εἰς τὴν γῆν *Γεννα
σαρίτ. 55 καὶ ἐπιγνόντες αὐτῶν οἱ ἄνδρες τοῦ τοποῦ
ἐκείνου ἀπεστάλησαν εἰς δὴν τὴν περίχωρον ἑκείνην, καὶ
προσῆγακαν αὐτῷ πάντας τοὺς ἰκακῶς ἔχοντας, καὶ
παρεκάλουν αὐτὸν ἵνα μύων ἀψωνται τοῦ κρασίου
τοῦ ἐμαυτοῦ αὐτοῦ, καὶ οὐκ ἦν πιστοὶ δεισώθην.

ΧV. 1 Τότε προσέσχονται τῷ Ἰησοῦ [οἱ] ἀπὸ Ἰεροσο-
λιών γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαίοι λέγοντες Διατοὶ οἱ
μαθηταὶ σου παραβάλαντες τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν προ-
βυτέρων; οὐ γὰρ νιπτοῦσι ταῖς χείρας αὐτῶν ὅταν
ἐστὶν ἐθισαίν. 5 ὦ δὲ ἀποκριθεῖν ἐπὶ αὐτοῖς Διατοὶ ΒΧΔ
καὶ οἱ μὲς παραβαίνεις τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ τὴν
παράδοσιν ὕμων; οὐ γὰρ θεὸς ἐνεπέλαξεν λέγον 
Τίμα
τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα, καὶ ὁ κακολογῶν πατέρα

C.P. — 33. ἠλθόντες om. B C Copt. Æth. Or. txt D P abcdv. — 34. ἤλθον ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν εἰς B D. and C, but omg. eic. txt P abcdv Orig.—Γεννασαρίτ D* abc (Genesar abcd ο. Θεος σιριώει D*). Γενασαρίτ ΚΛ. Γενασαρίτ E F F Syr. Copt. txt B C. — 35. Απάντησεν αὐτοῖς διὰ τὸν ἐν 
παραβαίνεις τὴν ἐντολήν τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ τὴν 
παράδοσιν ὑμῶν; οὐ γὰρ θεὸς ἐνεπέλαξεν λέγον 
Τίμα 
τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα, καὶ ὁ κακολογῶν πατέρα

brought forward by the Lord. See ch. xvii.
20. xxi. 21. — 39.] John adds καὶ εὑρίσκε 
τὸ πλοῖον λέγετο ἐπὶ τὰς γῆς ἐκ ὧν ὑπῆγον, vi. 21:—see note there. — 35.] These persons were probably the crew of the ship, and distinct from the disci-
plines. On τοῦτο ὁλοθ see note at ch. iv. 3.
21. It was the first time that the Lord had been called so by men. See ch. iii. 17. iv. 3.
viii. 20. This feeling of amazement and reverence pervaded the disciples also: see the strong expressions of Mark vi. 22.
34.—36.] Mark vi. 53—56. Gennesaret or Gennesaret, a district from which the lake 
was also occasionally so called, extended along its western shore. At its northern 
end was Capernaum, near which the Lord landed, as would appear from John vi. 24-
26.—On κρασίων. See note on ch. ix. 20.
36. as E V, 'we were made perfectly whole.'
Chap. XV. 1—20.] Mark vii. 1—53.
From Mark it appears that these Scribes and Pharisees had come expressly from Jера-
usalem to watch our Lord: most probably after that Passover which was nigh at the 
time of feeding the five thousand.
vi. 4. If the αἱ be omitted in the text, the same will be here implied also. — 8.] The 
Jews attached more importance to the tradi-
tionary exposition than to the Scripture 
text itself. They compared the written 
word to water; the traditionary exposition 
to the wine which must be mingled with 
it. —The duty of washing before meat is 
not inculcated in the law, but only in the 
traditions of the Scribes. So rigidly did 
the Jews observe it, that Rabbi Akiba, 
being imprisoned, and having water scarce-
ly sufficient to sustain life given him, pre-
ferrably dying of thirst to eating without 
washing his hands!—παραβαίνεις are not 
the elders, but the ancients. See ref. 
3. καὶ θυ. [the καὶ implies that there was a 
παραβαίνεις also on their part—acknow-
ledging that on the part of the disciples. —θι 
ἀντ. τ. 6.] A remarkable testimony from 
our Lord to the Divine origin of the Mosaic 
law: not merely of the Decalogue, as 
such, for our second command quoted is not 
in the Decalogue; and it is to be observed 
that where the text has ὁ θεὸς ἐν διεργασίᾳ, 
Mark (vii. 10) has Μωσῆς ἔτη. — 4.] Θα-
KATA MATHEION.

η μητέρα θανάτω τελευτάτων· 5 υμείς δὲ λέγετε "Οσ εὖν εἰτῷ τῷ πατρὶ η τῇ μητρὶ Δόρων ὁ εὖν εἰς ἐμον 6 ὕφελθής, οὗ μη τέμεθε τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ [η τῇ μητέρᾳ αὐτοῦ], καὶ ἴκερωσατε τὴν ἐντολήν τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ τινὰ ταῦτα παράδοσιν υμῶν. 7 ὑποκρίταις, κἀκεῖς προφέτευσεν περὶ ύμῶν Ἡσαίας λέγων 8 ["Εσχηξει μοί ὁ λαός οὗτος τῷ στόματι αὐτῶν καὶ τοῖς χείλεσι με τιμᾶ, ἐς καὶ καρδία αὐτῶν πόρος ἀπέχει απ' ἐμοῦ. 9 μάτην δὲ σέβονται με διδάσκοντες διδασκαλίας ἐνταλμάτων αὐδῆρω

10 καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τὸν οἶχον εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Ἀκούετε καὶ συνιετε. 11 οὐ τὸ ἐισερχόμενον εἰς τὸ στόμα κοινὸν τοῦ ἀνθρωπον, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἐκπορευόμενον εἰς τὸ στόματος τοῦ κοινοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρωπον. 12 τότε προελθὼν ὁ μαθητα οὐτοῦ εἶπον αὐτῷ Οἶδας ὅτι οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ἀκούσαντες τὸν λόγον ἐσκανδαλίσθησαν; ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν Πάσα 13 φυτεία ἔν τιν οὐκ ἐφύτευσεν ὁ παῖς


νάτῳ τ. 6. a Hes. νατ. in a Hes. — 5.] Lightfoot on this verse shows that the expression cited by our Lord did not always bind the utterer to consecrate his property to religious uses, but was, by its mere utterance, sufficient to absolve him from the duty of caring for his parents: see further on the word Corban in Mark vii. 11. — 6.] The constr. (with the rec. καὶ) admits of two explanations: (1) it may be an unfinished sentence, and καὶ οὐ μὴ τιμήσῃ in apposition with δεν αἰτέῃ in the verse before, in which case some such addition as the E. V. makes ('he shall be free') is required; or, (2) which seems the better way (see Winer, p. 479 note, and De Wette in loc.), it is to be taken as the consequence of δεν αἰτέῃ, —οὐ μὴ with a subjunctive giving, as usual, a future tense. In this case it is not redundant: 'he shall also (or, even) be free from honouring his father and mother;' or even ' he shall also not honour,' &c., as we read in Mark vii. 12, οὐκ οἴσαι αἰτεῖν αὐτῶν οὐκ οἶσαι ταυτίζει κ.τ.λ. Bengel, Ohlhausen, and others suppose καὶ to be the Hebrew sign of the consequence, so that καὶ οὐ μὴ = οὐχ. — 5.] The portion of Isaiah from which this citation is made (ch. xxiv—xxv.) sets forth in alternate threatenings and promises, the punishment of the mere nominal Israel; and the salvation of the true Israel of God. And, as so often in the prophetic word, its threats and promises are for all times of the Church,—the particular event then foretold being but one fulfillment of those deeper and more general declarations of God, which shall be ever having their successive illustrations in His dealings with men.—The prophecy is nearly according to the LXX, which compare. The citation in Mark is (if the spurious words be cancelled) verbatim the same with that in the text. Stier however maintains (vol. ii. p. 161) that the words in question ought to be supplied in Mark, because ἤγγίζει is wanted to oppose to πάρθω ἀπέχει, and στάται to connect with στόμα in ver. 11.—9.] LXX. ἐνταλμάτων ἀνθ. καὶ διδασκαλίας. The two are here in apposition, as in E. V.—10.] ἔκνιψας μὲν ἑκστορίσας καὶ ἐκατοστρέφεις ὡς ἀνάγοντος τρικτι ἐκ τῶν λόγων πρὸς τὸν οἶχον, ὡς διεξολογώτερον. Ethym.—13.] This took place after our Lord had entered the house and was apart from the multitude: see Mark v. 17.—17. λόγων the saying addressed to the Pharisees in ver. 11.—13.] The plant is the teaching of the Pharisees, altogether of
human, and not of Divine planting. That this is so, is clear by ἄφυε αὐτοῖς following, and by the analogy of our Lord’s parabolic symbolism, in which seed, plant, &c., are compared to doctrine, which however in its growth becomes identified with, and impersonated by, its recipients and disseminators. See this illustrated in notes on the parable of the sower, ch. xiii. ‘φῶν, natural: φωτιά, curt.’ Bengel. On this verse see John xv. 1, 2. —15.] The saying in ver. 11, which is clearly the subject of the question, was not strictly a παραβολή, but a plain declaration; so that either Peter took it for a parable,—or παραβ. must be taken in its wider sense of ‘an hard saying.’ Stier thinks that their questioning as to the meaning of parables in ch. xiii. had habituated them to asking for explanations in this form. —16.] The saying in ver. 11 was spoken for the multitude, who were exorted δεόντες κ. σωτήρα: much more ought the disciples to have understood it. —ἀλήθης = adubic is a later Greek word. —17.] στοματίζειν, δι’ οὗ γίνεται θυγατέρων μν., ὡς Ἰησ. Πλάτων, εἰς ὄντος, ἐξοδοὶ δὲ ἀφάρασων. ιναεριστὰς μὲν γὰρ αὐτῷ στίγμα καὶ πόρ. θαυμάτος φθαρῶν ῥοποι. λόγῳ δὲ ἔξαισιν, ἀθανάτου ψυχῆς ἀθάνατοι νόμοι, δὲν ἰδοὺ λογικὸς βίος εὐδοκίας. Philo Judæus de Opif. Mundi, i. 29. —21—28.] Mark vii. 24—30: omitted by Luke. It is not quite clear whether our Lord actually passed the frontier into the land of the heathen, or merely was on the frontier. The usage of τῇ ἀκοῇ in Matthew favours the former supposition: see ch. ii. 22. xvi. 13; also, for δήμοι, ch. ii. 16. v. 13. vii. 34. Exod. xvi. 30, εἰς μήκος τῆς φωνίας, ‘to the borders of Canaan,’ has been quoted as supporting the other view; but the usage of our Evangelist itself seems to carry greater weight. And the question is not one of importance; for our Lord did not go to teach or to heal, but, as it would appear, to avoid the present indignation of the Pharisees. Mark’s account certainly implies that the woman was in the same place where our Lord was wishing to be hid, and could not.—23. ὡς ὅτι δὲ ἡ ἁτομακομία: does not belong to ἤλθε, but means ‘of, or from those parts.’ —[ὁ δὲ] ‘coming out’ (they were going by the way, see ver. 23): i.e. from her house, or town, or village. —The inhabitants of these parts are called Canaanites, Num. xiii. 29. Judg. i. 30. 32, 33; and Phoenicians, Exod. vi. 16 (LXX). Josh. v. 1 (LXX). Mark calls her Ἑλληνίς, i.e. a heathen by re-
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κακῶς δαμουζεται. 23 ὁ δὲ οὖκ ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῇ λόγον, σειρ. ch. xvi. 41. 

BCD καὶ προσελθόντες οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἤρωτον αὐτοῦ λέγοντες Ἀπολύσων αὐτήν, ὅτι κράζει ὅποιος ἡμῶν. 24 ὁ δὲ ἀποκρίθης εἶπεν Οὐκ ἀπεστάλην εἰ μὴ εἰς τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἀπολωλότα οἴκου Ἰσραήλ. 25 ἡ δὲ ἐλθοῦσα προσεκύνηκεν αὐτῷ λέγουσα Κυριε βοήθει μοι. 26 ὁ δὲ ἀποκρίθης εἶπεν Οὐκ ἐστι καλὸν λαβεῖν τὸν ἀρτὸν τῶν τέκνων καὶ βαλεῖν τοὺς κυνάριας. 27 εἶπε Ναὶ κύριε, καὶ γὰρ τὰ κυνάρια ἐσθεῖ αὐτῷ τῷ ψιχίῳ τῶν πιπτόντων ἀπὸ τῆς τραπέζης τῶν κυρίων αὐτῶν. 28 τότε ἀποκρίθης ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῇ Ὡ Γάρ, μεγάλη σου ἡ πίστις· γεννηθήσον σοι ὡς θέλεις. καὶ ἔδει δὲ ψυχάντο αὐτῆς ἀπὸ τῆς ὀρας ἐκείνης.

Arm. Orig. ins. ὅσων αὐτοῦ D d.—23. λόγον om. Z.—rec. ἤφων. txx B C D X.—24. aft. prohib. ins. ταύτα D d.—25. προσεκύνησις C F K L S S V mm. xx Chrys. txx B D and many mss. be.—26. for οὖκ ἐστι καλὸν, οὖκ ἔστιν D abc Orig. (twice, once as in txx) Bas. Hil. Ambr. Jer. txx B C.—27. γὰρ om. B.—28. ὃ om. D.—30. κωφ. om. D. religion, and Σωφρονίσσα τῇ γυνῇ: and describes her only as having come to our Lord in the house. But by the account in our text, she had been crying after the Lord and the disciples by the way previously; and Mark's account must be understood to begin at ἡ δὲ ἐλθοῦσα, ver. 25. From Mark iii. 8. Luke vi. 17, we learn that the fame of our Lord had been spread in these parts, and multitudes from thence had come to Him for healing. It was not this woman's dwelling-place, but her descent, which placed the bar between her and our Lord's ministrations. The expression τινὰ Δαυὶδ shows her acquaintance with Jewish expressions and expectations; but the whole narrative is against De Wette's supposition, that she may have been a proselyte of the Gate. —23.] The reason alleged by the disciples must be coupled with our Lord's unwillingness to be known, stated by Mark (vii. 24), and means, 'she will draw the attention of all upon us.' The word ἀπεκρίθη does not necessarily imply granting her request, nor the contrary; but simply 'dissmiss her,' leaving the method to the Lord Himself. —24.] See ch. x. 5. Such was the purpose of our Lord's personal ministry; yet even this was occasionally broken by such incidents as this. The 'fountain sealed' sometimes broke its banks, in token of the rich flood of grace which should follow. See Rom. xv. 8.—25.] ἐλθοῦσα, i.e. into the house where our Lord was. See Mark vii. 24.—26.] ἔστιν ἀκριβῶς] No further contempt is indicated by the diminutive, still less any allusion to the daughter of the woman: the word is com-

monly used of tame dogs, as diminutives frequently express familiarity. So in Xen. Cynt. viii. 4: εἰ δὲ μεγάλην γαμίζει, δέν ποτε βούλη αὐτῆς ὅρθην φιλίαν, προσέλθει σα σῆς ὡς τὰ κυνάρια. —27.] The sense of καὶ γὰρ is not given by 'yet' in the E. V. The woman, in her humility, accepts the appellation which our Lord gives to her, and-ground her pleas upon an inference from it. Her words also have a reference to ἀφίσι προφέτων χορηγεῖν τὰ τιεναν, expressed by Mark v. 27. The Vulgate has rightly, 'Etiam Domine: nemo et castelli edunt.' The Lord, in the use of the familiar diminutive, has expressed not the uncleanness of the dog so much, as his attachment to and dependence on the human family: she lays hold on this favourable point and makes it her own, 'if we are dogs, then may we fare as such;' be fed with the crumbs of Thy mercy.' She was, as it were, under the edge of the table—close on the confines of Israel's feast. Some say that the ψιχία are the pieces of bread on which the hands were wiped, εἰς δὲ τὰς χεῖρας ἀπομαστύμων, εἰναι κυνίς ἵδαλλος (Eustathius, cited by Trench on Mir. p. 342); but the πνεύμων looks more like accidental falling, and the ψιχία like minute crumbs. —28.] In Mark, διὰ τούτου τὸν λόγον, ὑπάγε. The greatness of the woman's faith is thus emphasized in this, that in spite of all discouragements she continued her pleas; and not only so, but accepting and laying to her account all adverse circumstances, she out of them made reasons for urging her request. Thus the Lord gives the additional circumstance, that on
Καὶ μεταβὰς ἐκεῖθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἦλθεν παρὰ τὴν ΒΚΔΡ
θάλασσαν τῆς Γαλιλαίας καὶ ἀναβὰς εἰς τὸ ὄρος ἐκάθητο ἐκεῖ. 30 καὶ προσῆλθον αὐτῷ ὁ χλοῦς πολλοὶ, ἔχοντες μὲθ᾽ ἑαυτῶν χωλοὺς, τυφλοὺς, κωπφοὺς, κυλλοὺς καὶ ἑτέρους πολλοὺς· καὶ ἔρριψαν αὐτοὺς παρὰ τοὺς πόδας τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ ἐθεράπευσαν αὐτοὺς, ὥστε τοὺς χωλοὺς θαυμᾶσα βλέποντας κωπφοὺς λαλοῦντας, κυλλοὺς ύγιείς, καὶ χωλοὺς περιστατοῦντας, καὶ τυφλοὺς βλέποντας, καὶ ἔδοξαν τῶν θεῶν Ἰσραήλ.
32 ὅ δέ Ἰησοῦς προσκαλεσάμενος τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ εἶπεν Σπαλαγχνίζομαι ἐπὶ τὸν χόλον, ὅτι ἡδυς ἡμέρας προμινῦναι μοι καὶ οὐκ ἔχον τί φάγων· καὶ ἀπολύσας αὐτούς ἡμίσεις οὐ θέλω, μὴ ποτε ἐκλυθοῦσιν ἐν τῷ ὄνῳ.
33 καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ Πόθεν ἦμιν ἐν ὕμνῳ ἀρτοί τοσοῦτοι ὥστε ἀρτοὺς ἔχεσθε; ἢ δὲ εἰπόν Ἐσπᾶ, καὶ ὀλίγα ἐγάθεια.
35 καὶ ἐκλεύσει τοὺς χωλοὺς ἀναπεσον ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν· καὶ λαβὼν τούτων ἐπάτω ἄρτους καὶ τούς ἐκθένει ἐνεχασμάτωσεν ἐκλαθεὶ καὶ ἔσωκεν τοὺς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, ὅ δέ


Mark gives an instance of κωπφοὺς λαλοῦντας τοῦ 33. τὸ δρος is the high land on the coast of the lake, not any particular mountain. From this account it is uncertain to which side of the lake our Lord came; from Mark vii. we learn that it was to the eastern side, ἄν πλους τῶν ὀρίων Δεσποτών. He also gives us an account of a miracle wrought on this occasion. — 30. κυλλαὶ are persons maintained in the hands. Quomodo claudus dicitur, qui uno coagulat pede, sic κυλλαὶ appellatur, qui unam manum debilem habet. Jer. viii. 8. (But it is also used of the feet, τὸ δεύτερον πόδα τὸ κυλλὸν καὶ κυλλὸν κυλλοῦν τοῖς εὐκλείς; Aristoph. Av. 1379.) The meaning need not be, that a wanting member was supplied to these persons; but that a debility, such as that arising from paralysis or wound, was healed.
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muathetai tou 'ochlws. 37 kai efangon pantes kai exor-
tadosan, kai hran to 6 periosseuon twn 6 klasmatwn enta 8 ch. xiv. 20.

b syneridas plhres. 38 oi de esthontes hsan tetrakiskhioi k ch. xvi. 10.

BCD anbdes cheoikov kai paiidwn. 39 kai apolousas

touch 'ochlous *i enibh eis to plion, kai hlbv eis ta 11 Micos. xvi. 27.

161 *Meadala.

XVI. 1 kai proselthontes ois Fovisaioi kai Soudoukatoi k ch. iv. 8.

k peirapolantes eporn ethan auton 1 syemion ek tou oufanou 1 ch. xiv. 30.


Chrys.—6b1aiD D. ttx B.—Magdala C M Copt. Maydala B D. Maydala abcv (?).

tudes, who had continued with him three days; here also the provision is greater, the numbers are less than on the former occasion. But there is one small token of authenticity which marks these two accounts as referring to two distinct events, even had we not such direct testimony as that of ch. xvi. 9, 10. It is, that whereas the baskets in which the fragments were collected on the other occasion are called by all four Evangelists ekphano, those used for that purpose after this miracle are in both Matt. and Mark synerides. And when our Lord refers to the two miracles, the same distinction is observed; a particularity which could not have arisen except as pointing to a matter of fact, that, whatever the distinction be, which is uncertain, different kinds of baskets were used on the two occasions. Perhaps the strangest reason for supposing the two identical (given by De Wette, Schleiermacher, and others) is an imagined difficulty in the question of the disciples, peithn hmn ev.k.l., so soon after the former miracle: as if the same slowness to believe and trust in Divine power were not repeatedly found among men, and instance in Scripture itself—compare Exod. xi. 18 with Num. xx. 21, 22; and read in Exod. xiv. 1—7 the murmurations of the Israelites immediately after their deliverance at the Red Sea. And even could we recognize this as a difficulty, it is not necessarily implied in the text. Our Lord puts the matter to them as a question, without the slightest intimation of his intention to supply the want supernaturally. They make answer in the same spirit, without venturing (as indeed it would have been most unbecoming in them to do, see John ii. 3, 4) to suggest the working of a miracle. De Wette's assumption that the usage of ekphano and synerides shows two different traditional sources used by the author, would make it necessary to suppose that the forger of ch. xvi. 9, 10 has been skilful enough to preserve this distinction; an accuracy seldom found in interpolations of early Christian times.—On ephryai tregas see reff. and Winer, § 84, i. 1.—77.] The ephrya (commonly derived from synerida, as being of woven work; or by some from peitho, wheat, as being to twn puroys agyos. Hesych.) was large enough to contain a man's body, as Paul was let down in one from the wall of Damascus, Acts ix. 25. Greswell (Disc. viii. pt. 4) suggests that they may have been used to sleep in, during the stay in the desert.—38.] Lightfoot (Centuria Chorograph. Marco premisses, p. 413) shows Magdala to have been only a Sabbath-day's journey from Caphnath Gadara on the Jordan, and on the east side of the lake; but probably he is mistaken, for most travellers (see Winer, Realwéterbuch, iv.) place it about three miles from Tiberias, on the west side of the lake, where is now a village named Madschel. Dalmanutha, mentioned by Mark (viii. 10), seems to have been a village in the neighbourhood.

CHAP. XVI. 1—4.] Mark viii. 10—12, but much abridged. See also Luke xii. 34 and notes.—1. syemion ek tou oufanou] see notes at ch. xii. 38. There is no ground for supposing that this narrative refers to the same event as that. What is more natural than that the adversaries of our Lord should have met His miracles again and again with this demand of a sign from heaven? For in the Jewish superstition it was held that demons and false gods could give signs on earth, but only the true God signs from heaven. In the apocryphal Epistle of Jeremiah, ver. 67, we read of the gods of the heathen, syemian te ev theou, ev oufanov o ev dixioun . . . And for such a notion they alleged the bread from heaven given by Moses (see John vi. 32), the staying of the sun by Joshua (Josh. x. 12), the thunder and rain by Samuel (1 Sam. xii. 17, compare Jer. xiv. 29), and Elijah (James v. 17, 18). And thus we find that immediately after the first miraculous feeding the same demand was made, (John vi.

30,) and answered by the declaration of our Lord that He was the true bread from heaven. And what more natural likewise than that our Lord should have uniformly have met the demand by the same answer,—the sign of Jonas, one so calculated to baffle His enemies and hereafter to fix the attention of His disciples? Here however that answer is accompanied by other rebukes sufficiently distinctive.—It was now probably the evening, (see Mark viii. 10, ἐνεβίωσεν,) and our Lord was looking on the glow in the West which suggested the remark in ver. 2. On the practice of the Jews to demand a sign, see 1 Cor. i. 22.—2.] Mark viii. 12 adds καὶ ἀναστενάξας τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ ... , omitting however the sentences following. The Jews were much given to prognosticating the rains, &c. of the coming season in each year. —3.] Polybius iv. 21, 1, speaks of the ἡθων αὐτηριᾶν (of the Arcadians) ἡτις αὐτοῖς παρέχεται διὰ τοῦ περίχωντος (ἀρος) πυγμέστα καὶ συγναβεργω.—Si circas occidentem rubescunt tubae, serenitatem future diei spondent; concavus oriens pluvias predict; idem ventos cum ante exorientem eum nubes rubescunt: quod si et nigre rubentibus interventerint (πυράδζαι συγναβεργω) et pluvias, Plin. Hist. Nat. xviii. 36.

—πρὸς τοῖς, because συγγνος and συγναβεργω are properly used of sadness and obscurity in the visage of man.—τῶν καταρ, of times, generally. The Jews had been, and were, most blind to the signs of the times, at all the great crises of their history;—and also particularly to the times in which they were then living. The sceptre had departed from Judah, the law-giver no longer came forth from between his feet, the prophetic weeks of Daniel were just at their end; yet they discerned none of these things.—4.] see note on xii. 39.

5—12.] Mark viii. 13—21.—5. This crossing of the lake was not the voyage to Magdala mentioned in ch. xv. 39, for after the dialogue with the Pharisees, Mark adds (viii. 13), ἢμιδας πάλπ γε τὸ κλαδον, ἢπλὴν εἰς τὸ πτέραν.—ἐπεκλήθη not for a pluperfect: ’After they had come to the other side, they forgot to take bread;’ viz. on their land journey further. Mark gives us as a reason why they should have provided themselves with bread, that they had but one loaf in the ship when they crossed. Mark viii. 14.—8. τῆς ἑβης see beginning of note on xiii. 33. It is from the penetrating and diffusive power of heaven that the comparison, whether for good or bad, is derived. In Luke xii. 1, where the warning is given on a wholly different occasion, the leaven is explained to mean, hypocrisia: which is of all evil things the most penetrating and diffusive.—This is the charge which the Lord most frequently brings against the Jewish sects. In Mark we read, καὶ τῆς ἑβης Ἡρωδου. The Herodians were more a political than a religious sect, the dependents and supporters of the dynasty of Herod, for the most part Sadducees in religious sentiment. These, though directly opposed to the Pharisees, were yet united with them in their persecution of our Lord, see ch. xxii. 16. Mark iii. 6. And their
leaven was the same,—hypocrisy,—however it might be disguised by external difference of sentiment. They were all unbelievers at heart.—7.] αὐτοίς = πρὸς ἄλλον χ. viii. 16. This is an important parallelism to which I may have occasion to refer again.—8—12.] not only had they forgotten these miracles, but the weighty lesson given them in ch. xv. 16—20. The reproof is much fuller in Mark, where see note. This voyage brought them to Bethsaida: i.e. Bethsaida Julias, on the North-Eastern side of the lake, see Mark viii. 22, and the miracle there related.

13—20.] Mark viii. 27—30. Luke ix. 18—21. Here Luke rejoins the synoptic narrative, having left it at ch. xiv. 22. We here begin the second great division of our Saviour’s ministry on earth, introductory to His sufferings and death. Up to this time we had no distinct intimation, like that in ver. 21, of these events. And this intimation is brought in by the solemn question and confession now before us. And as the former period of His ministry was begun by a declaration from the Father of His Sonship, so this also, on the Mount of Transfiguration.—Καισαρείαν τῆς Φ.] A town at the foot of Mount Libanus, not far from the source of the Jordan, a day’s journey from Sidon, once called Leish (Judg. xviii. 7. 29) and afterwards Dan, (ibid.) but in later times Paneas, or Panias, from the mountain Panium, under which it lay (Joseph. Antt. x. 10, 3. Φίλιππου Καισαρείας, ἣν Πανιάδα Φοίνικας προσ-
nature, and which even then was taken by the Jews as the Son of God, (see Luke xxii. 69, 70,) which would serve as a test of the faith of the disciples, according to their understanding of it.—ος ἐσήφων, (= οι ἐγκλαίῳ in Luke) i.e. the σαρξ κ. αίμα of ver. 17, the human opinion. —14.] It is no contradiction to this verdict that some called him the Son of David (ch. ix. 27, xii. 23, xv. 22); for either these were or were about to become His disciples, or are quoted as examples of rare faith, or as in xii. 23, it was the passing doubt on the minds of the multitude, not their settled opinion. The same may be said of John vii. 26, 31. iv. 42. On our Lord's being taken for John the Baptist, see ch. xiv. 2, from which this would appear to be the opinion of the Herodians.—ἐν τῶν προφ. = δι' προφ. τις τῶν ἄρχαίων of Acts iv. 25, Luke ix. 19. It was not a mere empancship, but a bodily resurrection which was believed. On Ἡλίαν, see note at ch. xii. 14. Jeremiah was accounted by the Jews the first in the prophetic canon (Lightfoot on Matt. xxvii. 9).—16.] τι οὖν τὸ σώμα τῶν ἀποστόλων ὁ Πέτρος, ὁ πανταχοῦ θερός, ὁ τοῦ χεροῦ τῶν ἀποστόλων κοιβασίας; πάντων ἱρωτηθέντων, αὐτὸς ἀποκρίνεται, Chrysost. Hom. iv. The confession is not made in the terms of the other answer: it is not 'we say,' or 'I say,' but 'Thou art.' It is the expression of an inward conviction wrought by God's Spirit. The excellence of this confession is, that it brings out both the human and the Divine nature of the Lord: ὁ χριστός is the Messiah, the Son of David, the anointed King: ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζωντος is the Eternal Son, begotten of the Eternal Father, as the last word most emphatically implies, not 'Son of God,' in any inferior figurative sense, not one of the sons of God, of angelic nature, but the Son of the Living God, having in Him the Sonship and the Divine nature in a sense in which they could be in none else. This was a view of the Person of Christ quite distinct from the Jewish Messianic idea, which appears to have been made (Justin Mart. Dial. p. 267) that He should be a man born from men, but selected by God for the office on account of his eminent virtues. This distinction accounts for the solemn blessing pronounced in the next verse.—ζωντος must not for a moment be taken here as it sometimes is used, (e.g. Acts xiv. 15,) as merely distinguishing the true God from dead idols: it is here emphatic, and imparts force and precision to νίκη.—That Peter when he uttered the words, understood by them in detail all that we now understand, is not of course here asserted: but that they were his testimony to the true humanity and true Divinity of the Lord, in that sense of deep truth and reliance, out of which springs the Christian life of the Church. —17. ἀμαρτάνει, as in ch. iv. 4, &c., is a solemn expression of blessing, an inclusion of him to whom it is addressed in the kingdom of heaven, not a mere word of praise. And the reason of it is, the fact that the Father had revealed the Son to him (see ch. xi. 25—27); also Gal. i. 15, 16, in which passage the occurrence of σαρκι καὶ αἷμα seems to indicate a reference to this very saying of the Lord. The whole declaration of Paul in that chapter forms a remarkable parallel to the character and promise given to Peter in our text, as establishing Paul's claim to be another such πέτρα or σέλας as Peter and the other great Apostles, because the Son had been revealed in him not of man nor by men, but by God Himself. The name, Simon Bar Jonas, is doubtless used as indicating his fleshly state and extraction, and forming the greater contrast to his spiritual state, name, and blessing, which follow. —18.] The name Πέτρος (not now first given, but prophetically bestowed by our Lord on His first interview with Simon, John i. 43) or
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κατασχύσασιν αὐτῆς. 19 καὶ δῶσω σοι τὰς * * κλειστὶς τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ οὖν ὅπερ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐσται δεδεμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, καὶ ὁ ἐκεῖ ἄλωσις ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐσται λευμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. 20 τοῖς * * διεργασίαις.

κατασχύσασιν αὐτῆς. 19 καὶ δῶσω σοι τὰς * * κλειστὶς τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ οὖν ὅπερ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐσται δεδεμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, καὶ ὁ ἐκεῖ ἄλωσις ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐσται λευμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. 20 τοῖς * * διεργασίαις.

κατασχύσασιν αὐτῆς. 19 καὶ δῶσω σοι τὰς * * κλειστὶς τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ οὖν ὅπερ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐσται δεδεμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, καὶ ὁ ἐκεῖ ἄλωσις ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐσται λευμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. 20 τοῖς * * διεργασίαις.

(κατασχύσασιν αὐτῆς. 19 καὶ δῶσω σοι τὰς * * κλειστὶς τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ οὖν ὅπερ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐσται δεδεμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, καὶ ὁ ἐκεῖ ἄλωσις ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐσται λευμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. 20 τοῖς * * διεργασίαις.)

κατασχύσασιν αὐτῆς. 19 καὶ δῶσω σοι τὰς * * κλειστὶς τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ οὖν ὅπερ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐσται δεδεμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, καὶ ὁ ἐκεῖ ἄλωσις ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐσται λευμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. 20 τοῖς * * διεργασίαις.

κατασχύσασιν αὐτῆς. 19 καὶ δῶσω σοι τὰς * * κλειστὶς τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ οὖν ὅπερ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐσται δεδεμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, καὶ ὁ ἐκεῖ ἄλωσις ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐσται λευμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. 20 τοῖς * * διεργασίαις.

κατασχύσασιν αὐτῆς. 19 καὶ δῶσω σοι τὰς * * κλειστὶς τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ οὖν ὅπερ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐσται δεδεμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, καὶ ὁ ἐκεῖ ἄλωσις ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐσται λευμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. 20 τοῖς * * διεργασίαις.

κατασχύσασιν αὐτῆς. 19 καὶ δῶσω σοι τὰς * * κλειστὶς τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ οὖν ὅπερ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐσται δεδεμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, καὶ ὁ ἐκεῖ ἄλωσις ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐσται λευμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. 20 τοῖς * * διεργασίαις.

κατασχύσασιν αὐτῆς. 19 καὶ δῶσω σοι τὰς * * κλειστὶς τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ οὖν ὅπερ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐσται δεδεμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, καὶ ὁ ἐκεῖ ἄλωσις ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐσται λευμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. 20 τοῖς * * διεργασίαις.

κατασχύσασιν αὐτῆς. 19 καὶ δῶσω σοι τὰς * * κλειστὶς τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ οὖν ὅπερ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐσται δεδεμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, καὶ ὁ ἐκεῖ ἄλωσις ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐσται λευμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. 20 τοῖς * * διεργασίαις.

κατασχύσασιν αὐτῆς. 19 καὶ δῶσω σοι τὰς * * κλειστὶς τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ οὖν ὅπερ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐσται δεδεμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, καὶ ὁ ἐκεῖ ἄλωσις ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐσται λευμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. 20 τοῖς * * διεργασίαις.

κατασχύσασιν αὐτῆς. 19 καὶ δῶσω σοι τὰς * * κλειστὶς τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ οὖν ὅπερ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐσται δεδεμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, καὶ ὁ ἐκεῖ ἄλωσις ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐσται λευμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. 20 τοῖς * * διεργασίαις.

κατασχύσασιν αὐτῆς. 19 καὶ δῶσω σοι τὰς * * κλειστὶς τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ οὖν ὅπερ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐσται δεδεμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, καὶ ὁ ἐκεῖ ἄλωσις ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐσται λευμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. 20 τοῖς * * διεργασίαις.

κατασχύσασιν αὐτῆς. 19 καὶ δῶσω σοι τὰς * * κλειστὶς τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ οὖν ὅπερ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐσται δεδεμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, καὶ ὁ ἐκεῖ ἄλωσις ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐσται λευμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. 20 τοῖς * * διεργασίαις.
is not to be confounded with this. — 20. see note on ch. viii. 4. Ἰησοῦς would certainly seem to be better omitted with many MSS. But it is difficult to assign a reason for its insertion here: and on that account I have not marked it as doubtful. There may possibly be an allusion to the meaning of the name Ἰησοῦς.

21—28.] Mark viii. 31—38. Luke ix. 22—27. See note on ver. 13. Obscure intimations had before been given of our Lord's future sufferings, see ch. x. 38. John iii. 14, and of His resurrection, John ii. 19. x. 17, 18. xii. 40, but never yet plainly, as now. With Mark's usual precise note of circumstances, he adds, καὶ παρῴξησι τὸν λόγον ἵλλητι. On ἵλλητι, which is common to the three Evangelists, see Luke xxiv. 26, and ch. xxvi. 54. — πολλὰ παθέν = ἀποκολοκυθήσῃν in Mark and Luke. These πολλὰ were afterwards explicitly mentioned ch. xx. 18. Luke xviii. 31, 32. — On the prophecy of the resurrection, some have objected that the disciples and friends of our Lord appear not to have expected it (see John xx. 2. Luke xxiv. 12). But we have it directly asserted (Mark ix. 10 and 32) that they did not understand the saying, and therefore were not likely to make it a ground of expectation. Certainly enough was known of such a prophecy to make the Jews set a watch over the grave (Matt. xxviii. 63), which of itself answers the objection. Meyer in loc. reasons about the state of the disciples after the crucifixion just as if they had not suffered any remarkable overthrow of their hopes and reliances, and maintains that they must have remembered this precise prophecy if it had been given by the Lord. But on the other hand we must remember how slow despondency is to take up hope, and how many of the Lord's sayings must have been completely veiled from their eyes, owing to their non-apprehension of His sufferings and triumph as a whole. He Himself reproaches them with this very slowness of belief after His resurrection. It is in the highest degree improbable that the precision should have been given to this prophecy after the event as Meyer supposes: both from the character of the Gospel History in general, (see Prolegomena,) and because the careful and precise Mark adds παρῴξησι τὸν λόγον ἵλλητι. — 28.] The same Peter who but just now had made so noble and spiritual a confession, and received so highly a blessing, now shows the weak and carnal side of his character, becomes a stumbling-block in the way of his Lord, and earns the very rebuff with which the Tempter before him had been dismissed. Nor is there any thing improbable in this, as Schleiermacher would have us believe (Translation of the Essay on St. Luke, p. 153); the expression of spiritual faith may, and frequently does, precede the betraying of carnal weakness; and never is this more probable than when the mind has just been uplifted, as Peter's was, by commendation and lofty promise. — ἀποκαλεῖν, aor.] by the dress or hand, or perhaps ἀπὶ τῶν, παραδότων καὶ ἴδιων. Ethym. — ὁ λόγος σω] supply τίς ὁ θεός, according to the Hebrew expression, ὁ τύχη, for which the LXX sometimes give ἵλλης (see reff.), sometimes μια χαρά. — σοὶ μι μισεῖς] I cannot think with Winer (§ 60) that this means 'abait, ne accidat; it is an authoritative declaration as it were on Peter's part, 'This shall not happen to Thee,' implying that he knew better, and could ensure his Divine Master against such an event. It is this spirit of confident rejection of God's revealed purpose which the Lord so sharply rebukes. — 33. As it was Peter's spiritual discernment, given from above, which made him a foundation
stone of the Church, so is it his carnality, proceeding from want of unity with the Divine will, which makes him an adversary now. Compare ch. iv. 10, also Eph. vi. 12. —σκάνδαλον ὑπὸ μου] Thou art my stumbling-block (not merely a stumbling-block to me; the definite article is omitted, but to be supplied: see note on ch. ix. 16), my πέτρα σκάνδαλον (in Peter's own remarkable words (1 Pet. ii. 7, 8), joined too with the very expression, ὅν ἀναδικίασα δὲ λάθος, ὅπως, as above noticed, occurs in this passage in Mark and Luke).—Before this rebuke Mark inserts καὶ ἐδώκω τοῖς: μαθαῖοι αὐτοῦ, that the reproof might be before them all. —24.] προσελισθάμενος τὸν ἄγιον σὺν τοῖς μαθ. αὐτοῦ, Mark viii. 34; ἔγει ἐπὶ πρὸς πάντας, Luke ix. 23. This discourse is a solemn sequel to the Lord's announcement respecting Himself and the rebuke of Peter: teaching that not only He, but also His followers, must suffer and self-denial; that they all have a life to save, more precious than all else to them; and that the great day of account of that life's welfare should be ever before them. On this and the following verse see ch. x. 36, 39. After τὸν στ. αὐτοῦ, Luke inserts καθ' ἡμέραν. —26.] There is apparently a reference to Psalm xlix. in this verse. Compare especially the latter part with ver. 7 of that Psalm.—τὴν ψ. ἡμᾶς = ἣν τοῦ δὶ ἀπολλογήσας Luke. Compare also 1 Pet. i. 18. In the latter part of the verse, ἀνθρώποι and αὐτῶ refer to the same person: 'What shall a man give to purchase the happiness of his life?'' ψυχῇ, not soul, but life, in the higher sense. —27.] A further revelation of this important chapter respecting the Son of Man. He is to be Judge of all—and as in ch. xxii. 41, is to appear with His angels, and in the glory of His Father—the δῶρα, Ἡ τὸ δῶρον ἕνας John xvii. 22. Mark and Luke place here, not this declaration, but that of our ch. x. 23. The Lord doubtless joined the two. Compare ch. xxii. 21. —they] his work, considered as a whole. —28.] This declaration refers, not to the transfiguration which follows, for the very expression, τῶν σ. . . . . . . σοὶ μὴ γ. θ., indicates a distant event,—but to the destruction of Jerusalem, and the full manifestation of the Kingdom of Christ by the annihilation of the Jewish polity; which event, in this aspect as well as in all its terrible attendant details, was a type and earnest of the final coming of Christ. See John xxii. 22, and compare Deut. xxxii. 36 with Heb. x. 30. This dreadful destruction was indeed judgment beginning at the house of God. The interpretation of Meyer, &c., that the Lord referred to His ultimate glorious παροικία, the time of which was hidden from Himself (see Mark xiii. 32. Acts i. 7), is self-contradictory on his own view of the Person of Christ. That the Lord in His humanity in the flesh did not know the day and the hour, we have from His own lips: but that not knowing it He
should have uttered a determinate and solemn prophecy of it, is utterly impossible. His ἀφίημι λέγει ἄραν always introduces His solemn and authoritative revelations of Divine Truth. The fact is, there is a reference back in this discourse to that in ch. x., and the coming here spoken of is the same as that in ver. 23 there. Stier well remarks that this cannot be the great and ultimate coming, on account of οὐ μὴ γενέτο, θανάτου ἦσαν ἄν ἑως, which implies that they should taste of death after they had seen it, and would therefore be inapplicable to the final coming (Reden Jean, ii. 224).

CHAP. XVII. 1—13.] Mark ix. 2—13. Luke ix. 28—36. This weighty event forms the solemn installation of the Lord to His sufferings and their result. Those Three Apostles were chosen to witness it, who had before witnessed His power over death (Mark v. 37), and who afterwards were chosen to accompany Him in His agony (ch. xxvi. 37), and were (John xx. 2. Mark xvi. 1 Cor. xv. 7) in an especial sense witnesses of His resurrection. The two who appeared to them were the representatives of the law and the prophets: both had been removed from this world in a mysterious manner;—the one without death,—the other by death indeed, but so that his body perished not the lot of the bodies of all; both, like the Greater One with whom they spoke, had endured that supernatural Fast of forty days and nights: both had been on the holy mount in the visions of God. And now they came, endowed with glorified bodies, before the rest of the dead, to hold converse with the Lord on that sublime event, which had been the great central subject of all their teaching, and solemnly to consign into His hands, once and for all, in a symbolical and glorious representation, their delegated and expiring power. And then follows the Divine voice, as at the Baptism, commanding however here in addition the sole hearing and obedience of Him whose power and glory were thus testified. —There can be no doubt of the absolute historical reality of this narration. It is united by definite marks of date with what goes before; and by intimate connexion with what follows. It cannot by any unfairness be severed from its context. Nor again is there any thing mentioned which casts a doubt on the reality of the appearances (see below on Ἰραμα, ver. 9). The persons mentioned were seen by all—spoke—and were recognized. The concurrence between the three Evangelists is exact in all the circumstances, and the fourth alludes, not obscurely, to the event which it was not part of his purpose to relate; John i. 14. Another of the Three distinctly makes mention of the facts here related, 2 Pet. i. 16—18. —μεθ' ἡμῶν ἦσαν ήσαν. Luke ix. 28. The one computation is inclusive, the other not; or perhaps, from the ἐκείνη being inserted, the one is accurate, the other roughly stated. The time of the transfiguration was probably night, for the following reasons. (1) Luke informs us that the Lord had gone up to the Mount to pray: which He usually did at night (Luke vi. 12. xxii. 37. xxii. 39. Matt. xiv. 23, 24 al.). (2) All the circumstances connected with the glorification and accompanying appearances would thus be more prominently seen. (3) The Apostles were asleep, and are described, Luke ix. 32, as having kept awake through it (διαγραφθήσαντες) (4) They did not descend till the next day (1er ix. 37), which would be almost inexplicable had the event happened by day, but a matter of course if by night. —ὁρεῖς ὅψ. The situation of this mountain is uncertain. It was not, probably, Tabor, according to the legend; for on the top of Tabor then most likely stood a fortified town (De Wette, from Robinson). Nor is there any likelihood that it was Panaes, near Cesarea Philippi, for the six days would probably be spent in journeying; and they appear immediately after to have come to Capernaum. It was most likely one of the mountains bordering the lake. Luke speaks of it merely as τὸ ὅρας. —2.] μεταμορ. = ἵγενετο τὸ εἶδος του προσώπου αὐτοῦ ἔγερνον Luke. In what way, is not stated; but we may conclude from what follows, by being lighted with radiance, both from without and from with-
It is fortunate that we disciples are here; let us make 'sacre. Surely the words kalon istorin hamas ede elia will not bear this.

It is one of those remarkable coincidences of words which lead men on, in writing, to remembrances connected with those words, that in 2 Peter i. 14, 15 epinomia and lexous have just been mentioned before the allusion to the event: see note there, vol. ii. — kipes = rabbi Mark, = kerastra Luke. — 5.] andrives, viz. the Lord, Moses, and Elias. Luke adds, phosbhsan de ou ton atous ton elicos tin ton aposkatein. The atous icious, and disappearance of the two heavenly attendants, are symbolically connected,—as signifying that God, who had spoken in times past to the Fathers by the Prophets, henceforth would speak by His Son.—vv. 6, 7 are peculiar to Matthew. — 9.] No unreality is implied in the word atoma, for it = eido in Mark, and ... on lopatasin in Luke: see Num. xxiv. 3, 4. Luke, without mentioning the condition of time imposed on them, remarkably confirms it by saying, otiavi akpugelai in leitouragias rati oukous odiv i. —10.] The occasion of this inquiry
was, that they had just seen Elías withdrawn from their eyes, and were enjoined not to tell the vision. How should this be? If these were not the coming of Elías, was he yet to come? If it were, how was it so secret and so short?—On ver. 18 see note on ch. xi. 14. Our Lord speaks here plainly in the future, and uses the very word of the prophecy Mal. iv. 6. The double allusion is only the assertion that the Elías (in spirit and power) who forerun our Lord's first coming, was a partial fulfilment of the great prophecy which announces the real Elías (the words of Malachi will bear no other than a personal meaning), who is to fore-run His greater and second coming.

14-21.] Mark ix. 14-29. Luke ix. 37—43. By much the fullest account of this miracle is contained in Mark, where see notes. It was the next day: see Luke ix. 37, and note on ver. 1. Our Lord found the Scribes and the disciples disputing (Mark).—15.] He was an only son, Luke ix. 38. The demon had deprived him of speech, Mark ix. 17—17.] μὴ ὡς = πρός υἱὸς Luke.—19.] It was in the house, Mark ix. 28.—20.] ἀποστασίας = διαλογισμός, which reading was probably
an interpretation of it. — 23, 23.] Mark ix. 30—32. Luke ix. 43—45. This followed immediately after the miracle (Mark ix. 30);—our Lord went privately through Galilee; διάδασσα γὰρ εἰς τὰς τάφους.—the imparting of this knowledge more accurately to His disciples, which He had begun to do in the last chapter, was the reason for His privacy. For more particulars, see Luke ix. 45. Mark ix. 32.

24—27.] Peculiar to Matthew. The narrative connects well with the whole chapter, the aim of the events narrated in which is, to set forth Jesus as the undoubted Son of God.—οἱ τὰ δύο διδάσκαλοι. This ‘tribute,’ hardly properly so called, was a sum paid annually by the Jews of twenty years old and upwards, towards the temple in Jerusalem, Exod. xxx. 13. 2 Kings xii. 4. 2 Chron. xxiv. 6. 9. The LXX reckoned according to the Alexandrian double drachma, and have therefore, as in the first of the above places, ἱμῖν τοῦ διδαχμοῦ: but Josephus and Philo reckon as here, and Aquila, Exod. xxxviii. 26 (cited by Stier, ii. 260), translates τῷ διδαχμῷ. Josephus (B. J. vii. 6, 6) says of Vespasian, φώμος δὲ ἥκεν ἶδρυσον ἰδιωτὴν Ἰουδαίων ἱππαλκόν, δύο δραχμὰς ἱκανὸν κελεύσαι ἀνά ταῖς ἐκ τοῦ κατταίκων φόρων, ὀπίσθεν πρῶτον εἰς τόν ἐν Ιουδαίοις νέων συντάξιν.—It does not quite appear whether this payment was compulsory or not; the question here asked would look as if it were voluntary, and therefore by some declined.—Many commentators hold both ancient and modern, and among them no less names than Augustine, Clement Alex., Origen, and Jerome, have entirely missed the meaning of this miracle, by interpreting the payment as a civil one, which it certainly was not.—οι λαμβ. τ. 8, not the publicans, but they who received the drachma, i.e. one for each person. Peter answered in the affirmative, probably because he had known it paid before. — 25, 26.] The whole force of this argument depends on the fact of the payment being a Divine one. It rests on this: if the sons are free, then on Me, being the Son of God, has this tax no claim.—This money taken after the reckoning of the census; a capitation tax: a Latin word.—αὐτοτρέπον, all who are not their children; those out of their family. — 27.] In this, which has been pronounced (even by Olahusen) the most difficult miracle in the Gospels, the deeper student of our Lord’s life and ac-
�αφων δει αυτοις ́αντι εμου και σου. ΧVIII. 'Εν BDZ
εκεινη τη ωρα προςληθον οι μαθηται την Ιση ιλεγοντες
Τις αρα μειζων εστιν εν τη βασιλεια των ουρανων;
και μεροκαλεσαμενος ο Ισης παιδιον, εστησαν αυτο
νε μεσω αυτων και ειτεν Αμην λεγω υμιν, εαν μη
στραφη κα κενηση ως τα παιδια, ου μη εισελθησεν
eιπ τη βασιλεια των ουρανων. δι των σου τοπων;
αυτων ως τα παιδια τουτο, αυτος εστιν ο μειζων εν τη
βασιλεια των ουρανων. και ος εαν δεξηται παιδιον
τοιουτον [του] επι την ουνοματι μου, εμε δεχηται;
δι αν σκανδαλιση ενα των μικρων τουτων των
πιτευσωντων εις ειμι, συμφερει αυτω την κρεμασθη
μυλος ονικος επι του τραχηλου αυτου, και καταποντισθη
ΒD


In the natural interpretation, the Lord of God will find no difficulty. That, notwithstanding this immunity, we (graciously including the Apostle in the earthly payment, and omitting the distinction between them, which was not now to be told to any), that we may not offend them, will pay what is required—and shall find it furnished by God's special providence for us. In the foreknowledge and power which this miracle implies, the Lord recalls Peter to that great confession which his hasty answer to the collectors shows him to have again in part forgotten.—Of course the miracle is to be understood in its literal historic sense. The natural interpretation, that the fish was to be sold for the money (and a wonderful price it would be for a fish caught with a hook), and the mythical one, are stated and refuted by Meyer, who honestly concludes, 'κατηρι βαθι Bueder bleibt νιτ ετ Ματθ, βρεχιτη τατη.'—The stater = four drachmes—the exact payment required. —ἀντι, because the payment was a redemption paid for the person, Exod. xxx. 12—to this also refers the λαθερον above. —με ιν κ. σωθ—not ἀθων—as in John xx. 17:—because the footing on which it was given was different.

CHAP. XVIII. 1—35.] Mark ix. 33—50. Luke ix. 46—50. — 1.] In Mark we learn that this discourse arose out of a dispute among the disciples who should be the greatest. It took place soon after the last incident. Peter had returned from his fishing; see ver. 21. The dispute had taken place before, on the way to Capernaum. It had probably been caused by the mention of the kingdom of God as at hand in ch. xvi. 19. 28, and the preference given by the Lord to the Three. In Mark it is the Lord who asks them what they were disputing about, and they are silent. — 2.] From Mark ix. 36 it appears that the Lord first placed the child in the midst, and then took him in His arms: possibly writing a lesson for His disciples from its ready submission and trustfulness. — 3.] στραφη = μετανασθη: it also conveys the idea of turning back from the course previously begun, viz. that of ambitious rivalry. Without this they should not only not be prominent in, but not even admitted into, the Christian state—the Kingdom of Heaven. — 4.] Not ως το παιδ. της πανοικοι λαθοτι: 'iste parvulus non se humiliat, sed humiliat est.' Valla (in Meyer). 'Quales puere natura sunt, ab ambitu scilicet alieni, tales nos esse jubemur την παρειατι.' Grotius. — 5.] Having shown the child as the pattern of humiliation, the Lord proceeds to show the honour in which children are held in His heavenly kingdom; and not only actual, but spiritual children—for both are understood in the expression παιδιων τουτων εν τυ φαινεται Mark ix. 36) with Christian love, and as belonging to Christ (see also ch. xx. 40). — 6.] Here Mark and Luke insert the saying of John respecting one casting out devils in Jesus' name, who followed not with the Apostles; which it appears gave rise to the
κατὰ Μαθαίων.

ἐν τῷ ἑκάστῳ τῆς θαλάσσης. ἴδ οὐαὶ τῷ κόσμῳ ἡ ἀνάγκη γαρ ἐστὶν ἐλθεῖν ὑμῖν. ἐκείνῳ δὲ οὗ τὸ σκάνδαλον ἐρχεται ἔτι εἰς ὑμᾶς οὐ καὶ βάλε ἀπὸ γού. Καὶ τῷ ἐστὶν εἰς τὴν ζωὴν χωλὸν ἢ σκάνδαλισί σε, ἐκκοπῶν, ἐπιτυχὸν ταύτων καὶ δεῖ ὑμᾶς ἐφεξῆς εἰς τὸ πύρ καὶ ἀιώνιον. ἐκαί εἰ ὁ όφθαλμός σου σκάνδαλισί οὗ ἐξελε βαίλε ἄπε τούτου αὐτῶν καὶ βάλε ἀπὸ τούτου καὶ ταῦτα οὗ, τῷ ἐστὶ μονοφθάλμενος εἰς τὴν ζωὴν εἰς ἀιώνιον, ἦ τῷ όφθαλμῳ τούτῳ ἐχόμενα βληθήσεται ἀπὸ τοῦ γενέσθαι τοῦ πυρὸς. Ὁ ὑπὲρ ἔκατε ἄγγελοι αὐτῶν εἰς οὐρανοὺς διὰ παντὸς διέφθερον τοὺς πάτερας μου εἰς οὐρανοὺς.

here conveyed by the term; and those who would in after-life enter into the kingdom must turn back, and become as these little children—as they were when they had just received the new life in Baptism. The whole discourse is in deep and constant reference to the covenant with infants, which was to be made and ratified by an ordinance, in the Kingdom of Heaven, just as then. — On the reason assigned in the latter part of this verse, there have been many opinions; some of which have been broached merely to evade the plain sense of the words, which is—that to individuals (whether invariably, or under what circumstances of minor detail, we are not informed) certain angels are allotted as their especial attendants and guardians (this Meyer, Comm. in loc., as usual in such cases, honestly confesses). We know elsewhere from the Scriptures, both of the Old and New Testament (Ps. xxxvii. 7. xci. 11. Heb. i. 14 al.), that the angels do minister about the children of God; and what should forbid that in this service, a prescribed order and appointed duty should regulate their ministrations? Nay, is it not logically certain that such would be the case? But this saying of our Lord assures us that such is the case; and that those angels whose honour is high before God are entrusted with the charge of the humble and meek,—the children in age and the children in grace. The phrase λίγω γάρ ύπνιν, or λίγω ύπνιν, as in Luke xv. 7, 10, is an introduction to a revelation of some previously unknown fact in the spiritual world. Stier has some very beautiful remarks on the guardian angels, and on the present general neglect of the doctrine of angelic tutelage, which has been doubtless a reaction from the idolatrous angel-worship of the Church of Rome (see Acts xii. 15. Daniel xii. 1: in the former case we have an individual, in the latter a national, guardianship). — ἐκλεκτοὶ τοῦ πρόσωπων κτλ., i.e. are in high honour before God; not perhaps especially so, but the meaning may be, 'for they have angelic guardians, who always' &c. — II.] The angels are the servants and messengers of the Son of Man; and they therefore (ἐλθ. γὰρ κτλ.) are appointed to wait on these little ones whom He came to save. 'Hero,' remarks Stier (ii. 275), 'is Jacob's ladder planted before our eyes: beneath are the little ones;—then their angels;—then the Son of Man in heaven, in whom alone man is exalted above the angels, Who, as the Great Angel of the Covenant, cometh from the Presence and Bosom of the Father;— and above Him again (ver. 14) the Father Himself, and His good pleasure.' — 13. 13.] See notes on Luke xv. 3—9, where the same parable is more expanded. Compare also Ezek. xxxiv. 6. 11. 12.— ὡς τὰ δραὶ belongs to ἀσέις, not to ποριν. See var. read. — 14.] This verse sets forth to us the work of the Son as accomplishing the will of the Father;—for it is unquestionably the Son who is the Good Shepherd, searching for the lost, ver. 11. For similar declarations see Ezek. xviii. 23. xxxiii. 11. 2 Pet. iii. 9.—The inference from this verse is—then whoever despises or scandalizes one of these little ones, acts in opposition to the will of your Father in Heaven. Observe, when the dignity of the little ones was asserted, it was πατρός μου: now that a motive directly acting on the conscience of the Christian is urged, it is πατρός ὑμῶν. — 16.] The connexion of this with the pre-
ceding is: The Lord has been speaking of σκάνδαλον, which subject is the ground tone of the whole discourse. One kind is, when thou sinnest against another, vv. 7—14. A second kind, when thy brother sins against thee. The remedy for the former must be, in each individual being cautious in his own person,—that of the latter, in the exercise of brotherly love, and if that fail, the authority of the congregation, vv. 15—17. Then follows an exposition of what that authority is, vv. 18—20.—On this verse see Levit. xix. 17, 18. This direction is only in case of personal offence against ourselves, and then the injured person is to seek private explanation, and that by going to his injurer, not waiting till he comes to apologize. The stop must be after μόνον, as ordinarily read, and not after αὐτῶν, as proposed by Frizache and Olshausen, which construction would be contrary to the usage of the N. T.—ἐκφράσας, in the higher sense, 'reclaimed,' gained for God, see ref.: and for thyself too: πρῶτον γὰρ ἔχεις τούτον, ἵνα του σκάνδαλον μην ἵνα ἀπό τῆς ἀδικίας σου συναφής. Euthym. — 16.] παρ. . . . . άρα, Go again, and take . . . The first attempt of brotherly love is to heal the wound, to remove the offence, in secrecy; to cover the sin: but if this cannot be done, the next step is, to take two or three, still, in case of an adjustment, preventing publicity; but in the other event, providing sufficient legal witness. See ref. and John viii. 17.—ήμα, not thing, but word, as always.—17. παρακαταπτάω: a stronger word than μη δέ., implying something of obtundancy.—γά κεκληθείσα, by what follows, certainly not 'the Jewish synagogue,' (for how could vv. 18—20 be said in any sense of it?) but the congregation of Christians; i. e. in early times, such as in Acts iv. 32, the one congregation,—in after times, that congregation of which thou and he are members. That it cannot mean the Church as represented by her rulers, appears by vv. 19, 20, where any collection of believers is gifted with the power of deciding in such cases. Nothing can be further from the spirit of our Lord's command than proceedings in what are oddly enough called 'ecclesiastical' courts.—ἐστω σοι κυλ. let him no longer be accounted as a brother, but as one of those without, as the Jews accounted Gentiles and Publicans. Yet even then not with hatred, see 1 Cor. v. 11, and compare 2 Cor. ii. 6, 7, and 2 Thess. iii. 14, 15.—18.] This verse reasserts in a wider and more general sense the grant made to Peter in ch. xvi. 19. It is here not only to him as the first stone, but to the whole building. See note there, and on John xx. 23, between which and our ch. xvi. 19 this is a middle point.—19. παραιτέω πρ.] 'any thing.' The construction is an instance of attraction: πάν πράγμα, the subject of the sentence, is thrown into government after the verb: the plain construction would be δι' αυτῶν, ἵνα δι' αὐτῶν. See ref. and John viii. 17.—βίων, not thing, but word, as always.—17. παρακαταπτάω, a stronger word than μην δέ., implying something of obtundancy.—γά κεκληθείσα, by what follows, certainly not
...
God without having yet any idea that God Himself will help the sinner. Trench remarks, 'It seems simpler to see in the words nothing more than exclamations characteristic of the extreme fear and anguish of the moment, which made him ready to promise impossible things, even mountains of gold.' p. 127. — 32.] Perhaps we must not lay stress on ἔξελθων, as indicating any wrong frame of mind already begun, as Theophylact does:—the sequel shows how completely he had 'gone out' from the presence of his Lord. At all events the word corresponds to the time when the trial of our principle takes place; when we 'go out' from the presence of God in prayer and spiritual exercises into the world. We may observe, that forgiveness of sin does not imply a change of heart or principle in the sinner. —The fellow-servant is probably not in the same station as himself, but none the less a fellow a servant. The insignificance of the sum is to show us how trifling any offence against one another is in comparison to the vastness of our sin against God. Chrysostom finely remarks: ο ούσι τι θύματα φθανόντω, δι σε ὡς έκκλησίας (καὶ γὰρ αὐτοῦ ταύτα εἰσέχων ἀπελθάθη τῶν μνεῖων τακτῶν) καὶ οὔτε τῶν λειμάτων ἤπειρον ὃτι τό κατάγαζον διέφων οὐκ ὁ σχέσεως τῆς ἱεραρχίας ἄκακως συντόκων θλιβομένως ἀλλὰ πάντα ἐκεῖνα ἐπὶ τῆς πλούσιος καὶ τῆς μοναδικὴς ἐκβολῆς, θερίῳ παντὸς χαλατωτοῦ ἦν, ἄγων τῶν συντόκων. Τι ποιεῖτε, ἄνθρωπε; σιωπῶν ἀπαίτων οὐει αἰσθάνεται, καθά σιωποῦ τοις ἔσχασι καὶ τῆς ἀνθρώπων ἀνακολουθούν. — Hom. lxi. 616, A. The ἔτι τι φρειάς is, which is beyond doubt the true reading, must be understood as a haughty expression of one ashamed to meet the mention of the paltry sum really owing, and by this very expression generalizing his unforgiving treatment to all who owed him aught. — 31.] The fellow-servants ἔληφθησαν, the lord ἄφησεν. Anger is not man's proper mood towards sin, but sorrow, (see Ps. cxix. 136) because all men are sinners. These fellow-servants are the praying people of God, who plead with Him against the oppression and tyranny in the world. — 32.] οτι μὲν μαχαιρία ταύτην ἀξίων ἐκέλευσαν, οὔτε ἱεράς πονηρόν, οὔτε ὄψον, ἀλλὰ ἐγώς. Chrysostom. Hom. lxi. 616, D. — 34. τοίς βασιλικοῖς not merely the prison-keepers, but the torturers. Remember he was to have
Oútw kai ó patér mou ó *  ἐπουράνιος ποιήσαi ύμιν, εάν βεδ
μὴ ἀφήσε, ἑκατός τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ, ἀπὸ τῶν ἑκατὸν ἵμων
[t] "παραπτώματα αὐτῶν].

Χ. X. 1. Καὶ ἔγενε τε ἐγέλεσεν ὁ Ἰσσοῦς τοὺς
λόγους τούτους, μετάφεν ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς ταύτα ἡ Ἰουδαία ἐπί τοῦ Ἰορώνου. 2 καὶ
κοιλούθησαν αὐτῶν ὁ χολι πολλοὶ, καὶ ἵπποι οὐκ ἠκέχθη. 3 καὶ προσήλθουν αὐτῷ [ο] Φαρισαῖοι πειράζοντες
αὐτῶν καὶ λέγοντες αὐτῷ "Εἶ ἔχεστιν ἀνθρώπῳ ἀπολύσας
τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ κατὰ τὰ πᾶνα δίαιταν; 4 ὁ δὲ ἀπὸ ΒΕΔΖ
κρῆθης εἰπὲν αὐτοῖς ὡς ἀνέγνως ὅτι ὁ ποιήσας ἀπ
ἀρχῆς ἀρσεν καὶ θηλῇ ἐποίησαν αὐτοὺς, 5 καὶ εἶπεν
Εἶπεν τοῦτον καταλείψει ἀνθρώπους τῶν πατέρων καὶ
τῆς μητέρας καὶ δοποθέν τις γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ,
καὶ ἐσονται οἱ δύο ἕς σάρκα μίαν; 6 ὅτε ὦκείς εἰς
dύο, ἀλλὰ σάρκες, μίαν ὃν ὅ τις καὶ συνέζεων, ἀνθρώπος.


been sold into slavery before, and now his
punishment is to be greater. The condition
following would amount in the case of
the sum in the parable to perpetual
imprisonment. So Chrysostom, τοιοῦτοι,
διηνεκέων οὐδὲ γαρ ἀπόδοσις ποτε. Hom.
Lxi. 617. A. See note on ch. v. 26.—There
is a difficulty made, from the punishment of
this debtor for the very debt which had
been forgiven, and the question has been
asked, utrum peccata semel dimissa redempt.
But it is the spiritual meaning which has
here ruled the form of the parable. He
who falls from a state of grace falls into a
state of condemnation, and is overwhelmed
with 'all that debt,' not of this or that
actual sin formerly remitted, but of a whole
state of enmity to God.—Meyer well
remarks, that the motive held up in this
parable could only have full light cast on it by
the great act of Atonement which the Lord
was about to accomplish. (Comm. in loc.)
We may see from that consideration, how
properly it belongs to this last period of
His ministry.—§8. σ. π. μον] not ύμιν
as in the ‹declaration in ch. vi. 14, 16.
This is more solemn and denunciatory.
—στρεφόμενον, not elsewhere used by our
Evangelist.

CHAP. XIX. 1—12.] Mark x. 1—12.

This appears to be the journey of our Lord
into the region beyond Jordan, mentioned
John x. 40. If so, a considerable interval
has elapsed since the discourse in ch. xviii.—
ta εἴρη τῆς ἱερ. προ. τοῦ ἱερ. form one
continuous description. Bethany, where
He went, was beyond Jordan, but on the
confines of Judea. On Mark's expression
(x. 1) διὰ τῶν π. τ. 'Ιερ. see note there,
and also note on Luke ix. 81. — 3. This
agrees with what is said John x. 41, 42. For
ἡσαρία, Mark has ἰδίας. — 5. This
was a question of dispute between the rival
Rabbinitic schools of Hillel and Shammai;
the former asserting the right of arbitrary
divorce, from Deut. xxiv. 1, the other deny-
ing it except in case of adultery. It was
also, says De Wette, a delicate question
where our Lord now was, in the dominions
of Herod Antipas.—κ. φάγαν abr. not as
B. V. 'for every cause,' but 'for any
cause?' — 4. — 6. On these verses we may
remark (1) that our Lord refers to the
Mosaic account of the Creation as the his-
torical fact of the first creation of man;
and grounds His argument on the literal
expressions of that narrative. (2) That He
cites both from the first and second chapers
of Genesis, and in immediate con-
nection; thus showing them to be con-
XIX. 1—12. KATA MATΘAIΩΝ.

μὴ 1 χωρίζω. 7 λέγουσιν αυτῷ  "Τί οὖν Μωσῆς ἐνε-
tελέσατο δύοναβίσβλιον ἀποστασίου καὶ ἀπολύσαι [αὐτήν];
8 λέγει αὐτοῖς "Οτι Μωσῆς πρὸς τὴν "σκληροκαρδιὰν
καθὼς ἐπέτρεψεν υἱόν ἀπολύσαι τὰς γυναῖκας υἱῶν αὐτῶν ἀρχῆς δὲ οὐ λέγοντες ὦτως. 9 λέγω δὲ υἱόν οὐδὲν ἀνἀπολύσα τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ [κ] μη ἐπι τοπρείᾳ, καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην, μοιχάται καὶ ὁ ἀπολελυμένην γαμήσας μοιχάται. 10 λέγουσιν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἔτσι ἐστιν ἡ αἰτία τοῦ ἀνθρώπου μετὰ τῆς γυναῖκός, οὐ " συμφέρει γαμήσας. 11 ο δὲ εἰπεν αὐτοῖς Οὐ πάντες καθὼς χωροῦσι τῶν λόγων τούτων ἀλλ' οῖς δεδοται. ἔστι γὰρ εὐνοῦχοι οἴτινες ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς ἐγεννηθήσαν BCD ὁ οὗτος, καὶ εἰπεν εὐνοῦχοι οἴτινες εὐνοῦχησαν ὑπὸ τῶν


Executive parts of a continuous narrative, which, from their different diction, and apparent repetition, they have sometimes been supposed not to be. (2) That He quotes as spoken by the Creator the words in Gen. ii. 24, which were actually said by Adam; they must therefore be understood as said in prophecy, divino afflato, which indeed the terms made use of in them would require, since the relations alluded to by those terms did not yet exist. Augustin. de Nupt. ii. 4, ‘Deus utique per hominem dixit quod homo prophetando predictix.’ (4) That the force of the argument consists in the previous unity of male and female, not indeed organically, but in Adam. Thus it is said in Gen. i. 27, not ἄνδρα καὶ γυναῖκα ἐποιήσαν αὐτοὺς, but ἄρσεν καὶ ἥπα τί. αὐ. ‘He made them (man, as a race) male and female;’ but then the male and female were implicitly shut up in one; and therefore after the creation of woman from man, when one man and one woman were united in marriage they should be one flesh, ἰδίων τούτων, because woman was taken out of man. The answer then is, that abstractedly, from the nature of marriage, it is indissoluble.—The words of Ἐκκ. are in the LXX and the Samaritan Pentateuch, but not in the Hebrew.—εἰς σάμως μὲν ἵνα σας ἑστι εἰς is not Greek, but a Hebraism, 7 της (Meyer). — 7—8.] In this second question, the Pharisees imagine that they have over-thrown our Lord’s decision by a permission of the law, which they call a command (compare ἰερεύνα, ver. 7, with ἰπτερεύναν, ver. 8). But He answers them that this was done by Moses on account of their hardness and sinfulness, as a lesser of evils, and belonged to that dispensation which παρεμίπληθος, Rom. v. 20; τῶν παραβα- σεων χάριν προφητεία, Gal. iii. 19. This He expresses by the ὑμῖν, ὑμῖν, ὑμῶν, as opposed to ἀνθρώπως, and to άπ’ ἀρχῆς. Only that πορνία which itself breaks marriage, can be a ground for dissolving it.—Mark gives this last verse (9) as spoken to the disciples in the house; and his accuracy in such matters of detail is not to be questioned. The enactment by our Lord is a formal repetition of what He had said before in the Sermon on the Mount, ch. v. 32. — 10.] αἰτία, not the cause of divorce just mentioned; nor, the condition of the man with his wife: but, the account to be given, the original ground and principle, of the relationship of man and wife:—λαν τοῦτον ἰσιν ή αἰτία τῆς συζυγίας, Euthym. who however mentions other renderings. The disciples apprehend that the trials and temptations of marriage would prove sources of sin and misery. This question and its answer are peculiar to Matthew's. He refers αἰτία back to the αἰτία in ver. 3. and understands it to mean, the only reason justifying divorce; but the above interpretation seems to me preferable. — 11, 12.]
νὰ ἀνθρώπων, καὶ εἰσὶν εὐνοῦχοι οὕτινες· εὐνοῦχισαν ἑαυτοὺς ΒΣΔ 
διὰ τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν. ὁ δυνάμενος χωρεῖν 
χωρείτω.

13 Τότε ἐπηρεάσθησαν αὐτῷ παῖδια, ἵνα τὰς χειρὰς
ἐπιθῇ αὐτοῖς καὶ προσεύχηται. οἱ δὲ μάθησαν ἐπετίθη
μεν αὐτοῖς. 14 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν ἢ ἄφησε τὰ παῖδια,
καὶ μὴ κωλύσετε αὐτὰ ἐλθεῖν πρὸς με· τῶν γὰρ τοιοῦτων
ἐστίν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν. 15 ἐπεί τινες αὐτοῖς τὰς
χειρὰς, ἐπορεύθη ἐκείθεν.

16 Καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐκ προσελθὼν εἶπεν αὐτῷ Ἑλλάσ καὶ 
ἀγαθὲ, τί ἀγαθὸν ποιήσω ἵνα ἐξω ὑστηρί γιανοῦν;
17 οἱ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Τί με ἄλλης ἢ ἀγαθὸν; ὁ δὲ εἶπε
ἀγαθὸς ἐμὶ εἰς τὸν Θεὸν. οἱ δὲ διὰ τῆς ἐκείθεν εἰς τὴν

for ἐξω, στὴ Β Ορ. ττ. — ἐληρονομήσῃ Λ Ὀρι. — 17. for τί μ. λ. ἀγ., τί με ἠρωτὶς 
περὶ τοῦ ἁγαθοῦ ΒΒῚ Λ (ὁμ. ὁμ.) ἀνεβ. Κρύπ. Ἀἴθ. Ὀρι. (expressly, 
four times) Ἔσσ. Σρ. Διον. ἁρ. Η. Ἐρ. Αὐγ. The rec. text is in C and all other MSS., 
and in Στρ. Σρ. Χρύσ. Ἡλ. Origen says ὅ μυν ὁμ Ματ. ὃς 
ἐρωτήσει τοῦ Σωτῆρα ἵνα τί ἀγαθὸν ποιήσῃ ἄνεγραφεν ὁ 
ἥλ Μάρσος καὶ 
διὰ τοῦ ἄγαθος 
σακτοῦν ἰσχυρὸν ἵνα 
τί με 
λέγης 
ἄγαθον; 
οὓς 
ἀγαθὸς 
ἐμὶ 
ἐς 
θεὸν. 
τοῖς, 
αἰς 
αὐτὸν ὁ 
ἀγαθὸς 
ΒΒῚ Λ 
ὁμ. 
καὶ 
Ἀρι. 
Ὀρι. 
τῶν λόγων τ. τρ’ this saying of yours,’ viz. οὐ 
συμφέρει γομῆσαι. The γάρ in ver. 12 
shows that the sense of ροῦσον is carried 
on; see ch. 1. 18. — The Lord mentions 
the three exceptions, the αἱς ἄδειαν οἱ γαμῆ- 
σαί. 1. Those who from natural incapacity, 
or if not that, inaptitude, have no tenden- 
cies towards marriage: 2. Those who 
by actual physical deprivation, or compul- 
sion from men, are prevented from marry- 
ing: 3. Those who in order to do the work 
of God more effectually, (as e. g. Paul,) 
abstain from marriage, see 1 Cor. vii. 26. 
The εὐνοῦχοι and εὐνοῦχιζω in the two 
first cases are to be taken both literally and 
figuratively: in the latter, figuratively only. 
It is to be observed that our Lord does not 
here utter a word from which any su- 
periority can be attributed to the state 
of celibacy: the imperative in the last clause 
being not a command but a permission, as 
in Rev. xxii. 17. — χωρεῖν, as in E. V. ‘to 
receive it.’ 

16—17. After the long divergence of ch. ix. 
the synoptic narrative. This incident is 
more fully related in Mark, where see notes. 
—Our Evangelist gives τὰς χ. καθ. αὐτ. κ. 
προσεύχ. see Gen. xlviii. 14. Acts vi. 6, 
where the other two have only ‘that He 
should touch them.’ The connexion in 
which it stands here and in Mark seems to 
be natural, immediately after the discourse 
on marriage. Some further remarks of the 
Lord, possibly on the fruit of marriage, 
may have given rise to the circumstance. 
18—30. — 18.] From Luke ver. 18 we 
learn that he was a ruler: from Mark x. 17, 
that he ran to our Lord. The spirit in 
in which he came seems to have been that of 
excessive admiration for our Lord as a 
man of eminent virtue, and of desire to 
know from Him by what work of exceed- 
ing merit he might win eternal life. This 
spirit our Lord reproves, by replying that 
He was no such ἀγαθὸς as supposed by 
the young man, no Teacher of this sort, 
that the grace of God only is the source of 
good, and that the walking by His grace in 
the way of holiness is the path to life. 
I have retained the common reading as being 
persuaded of its genuineness: and agree 
with Stier in thinking that Origen’s (see 
var. read.) was an early correction, made on 
doctrinal grounds. The reply, so far from 
furnishing any support for Socinian error, 
is itself a rebuke of the very view of Christ 
which they who deny His Divinity enter- 
tain. It sets forth to us, besides, the 
truthfulness of the Lord’s humiliation, in 
that He who was now being made perfect by 
sufferings disclaims the ἀγαθὸς which in
its perfection dwells in God alone.—18.] De Wette observes well, that our Lord gives this enumeration of the commandments to bring out the self-righteous spirit of the young man, which He before saw. He only mentions those of the second table, having in ver. 17, in His explanation of ἀγαθός, included those of the first. Mark has the addition of μὴ ἀπεστραφῆς, representing probably the tenth commandment.—καλ ἀγαθ. κ. τ.λ. is peculiar to Matthew.—20.] We may remark that this young man, though self-righteous, was no hypocrite, no Pharisee: he spoke earnestly, and really strove to keep, as he really believed he had kept, all God’s commandments. Accordingly Mark adds, that Jesus looking upon him loved him: in spite of his error there was a nobleness and openness about him, contrasted with the hypocritical bearing of the Pharisees and Scribes.—21.22.] Our Lord takes him on his own showing. As Mark and Luke add, “One thing is wanting to thee.” Supposing thy statement true, this topstone has yet to be laid on the fabric. But then it is to be noticed, that part of that one thing is διότι δειλοῖθεν μοι (ἀράς τὸν σταυρὸν Mark).—23.] This was a test of His observance of the first commandment of the first table: of breaking which he is by the result convicted.—ὑπὲρ γὰρ ἄρα ἐκκρ. τ. ἐστ. common to Mark, verbatim.—24.] No alteration to κάμιλον is necessary or admissible. Lightfoot brings instances from the Talmud of similar proverbial expressions regarding an elephant: we have a case in ch. xxiii. 24, of a camel being put for anything very large: and we must remember that the object here was to set forth the greatest human impossibility, and to magnify Divine grace, which could accomplish even that.—25.] τίς, not τίς πλούσιος, which would have been wholly beside the purpose, but a general question—what man? Besides the usual reason given for this question “since all are striving to be rich,” we must remember that the disciples yet looked for a temporal Kingdom, and therefore would naturally be dismayed at hearing that it was so
difficult for any rich man to enter. — 26. Θρόνος] Probably to give force to and impress what was about to be said, especially as it was a saying reaching into the spiritual doctrines of the Gospel, which they could not yet apprehend. — οὕτως, salvation in general, and even of those least likely to be saved. — παρὰ in both cases, as in 13. v. 15. "in reference to, by power of." — 27.] The discourse, or Peter rather speaking for them, recur to the εἰς ἑαυτοὺς ἐν ὑπὸ said to the young man, and inquire what their reward shall be, who have done all that was required of them. He does not ask respecting salvation, but some pre-eminent reward, as is manifest by the answer. — The ‘all’ which the Apostles had left, was not in all cases contemptible. The sons of Zebedee had hired servants (Mark i. 20). and Levi (Matthew?) could make a great feast in his house. But whatever it was, it was their all. — 28—30.] We may admire the simple truthfulness of this answer of the Lord. He does not hide from them their reward: but tells them prophetically, that in the new world, the accomplishment of that regeneration which He came to bring in, (see Acts iii. 21. Rev. xxii. 5. Matt. xxvi 29.) when He should sit (καθίσας in the active) on His throne of glory (ἐπὶ τὸν δόξαν, v. d. ab.) then they also should sit (καθίσατε in middle) on twelve thrones ἐν δόξαν, ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων) judging (see 1 Cor. vi. 2, 3) the twelve tribes of Israel (see Rev. xx. 4. xxi. 12, 14: — one throne, Judas’s, another took, Acts i. 20). — At the same time he informs them, ver. 29, that this reward should not in its most blessed particulars be theirs alone, but that every one who should deny himself for Him (see 2 Tim. iv. 8) and (ver. 30) comments them, referring perhaps especially to Judas, but with a view to all, as appears by the following parable, that many first should be last, and last first. — On ver. 29, Stier remarks that the family relations are by Matthew mentioned in the order in which they would be left: and that the Lord having mentioned γυναῖκα in the singular (the reading however is doubtful) clearly decrees monogamy. On the other points requiring notice, see note on Mark x. 29, 30. — Meyer’s rendering of ver. 30, joining πρῶτοι with ἐπονυματεί, and thus making ἐπονυματεί the subject and πρῶτοι the predicate of the first clause and vice versā in the second, is contrary to usage. — CHAP. XX.1—19.] Peculiar to Matthew. — In interpreting this difficult Parable, we must first carefully observe its occasion and connexion. It is bound by the γὰρ to the conclusion of chap. ix., and arose out of
the question of Peter in ver. 27, ri ἀπα στα ἦσαν ἡμῖν; (1) Its ‘punctum saliens’ is, that the Kingdom of God is of grace, not of debt; that they who were called first, and have laboured longest, have not more claim upon God than those who were called last; but that to all, His covenant promise shall be fulfilled in its integrity. (2) Its primary application is to the Apostles, who had asked the question. They were not to be of such a spirit, as to imagine, with the murmurers in ver. 11, that they should have something supereminent (because they were called first, and had laboured longest) above those who in their own time were to be afterward called (see 1 Cor. xv. 8—11). (3) Its secondary applications are to all those to whom such a comparison, of first and last called, will apply—nationally, to the Jews, who were first called, and with a definite covenant, and the Heathens who came in afterwards, and on a covenant, though really made (see Jer. xxxi. 33. Zech. viii. 8. Heb. viii. 10), yet not so open and prominent;—individually, to those whose call has been in early life, and who have spent their days in God’s active service, and those who have been summoned later; and to various other classes and persons between whom comparison, not only of time, but of advantages, talents, or any other distinguishing characteristic, can be made; that none of the first of these can boast themselves over the others, nor look for higher place and greater reward, inasmuch as there is but one “gift” of God according to the covenant of grace. And the “first” of these are to see that they do not by pride and self-righteousness become the “last,” or worse—be rejected, as nationally were the Jews; for among the many that are called, there are few chosen—many who will fail of the reward in the end. (4) In subordination to this leading idea and warning of the Parable must the circumstances brought before us be interpreted. The day and its hours are not any fixed time, such as the duration of the world, or our Lord’s life on earth, or the life of man, exclusively: but the natural period of earthly work as applied to the various meanings of which the parable is capable. The various times of hiring are not to be pressed as each having an exclusive meaning in each interpretation: they serve to spread the calling over the various periods, and to show that it is again and again made. They are the quarters of the natural day, when the all-
His Church in all ages is His true vineyard, see John xv. 1. — Our language admits of the idiom εἰς τὸν ὀμ. ab. being exactly rendered—‘into His vineyard,’ E. V.—2.]

In συμφωνία is understood μεταχώσεσθαι, after which, as a verb of buying, έστι is found: see ref.—The denarius a day was the pay of a Roman soldier in Tiberius' time, a few years before this parable was uttered (see Tacitus Annal. i. 17). Polybian ii. 16 (cited by Greswell) mentions that the charge for a day's entertainment in the inns in Cisalpine Gaul was half an as, = 1/10th of the denarius. This was therefore liberal pay for the day's work.—3, 4.] The third hour, = at the equinox, our 9 a.m., and in summer 10-30, was the πλῆθος άγωρα, or αγώρα πληθώρα—when the market was fullest.—No positive stipulation is made with these second, but they are to depend on the justice of the householder. They might expect έπειτα of a denarius.—From the same dialogue being implied at the sixth and ninth hour (ἱπποίσιν ὑπάτως) the δέλεα δικαιον is probably in each case the corresponding part of the denarius, at least in their expectation; so that it cannot be said that no covenant was made. —7.] For the reason mentioned in the last note, the words in brackets, wanting in so many mss., probably ought to be cancelled.—8.] By the Mosaic law (Deut. xxiv. 15) the wages of an hired servant were to be paid him before night. This was at the twelfth hour, or sunset: see ver. 12. I do not think the έπιτροπος must be pressed as having a spiritual meaning. If it have, it represents Christ (see Heb. iii. 6, and ch. xi. 27).—Αρξάμενος is not merely explicative, but definitive, as in Luke xxii. 5.—9.] Ουκέτα. Διαν supply ἀκαταλημμένος εἰς τὸν ἄμεσα. —10.] The precedent cited by Greswell for this method of payment, from Josephus Antt. xx. 9, 7, does not apply. It is there said that in the rebuilding of the temple, οἱ μὲν τῷ ἄραν τῆς ἡμέρας εὐρύσαστου, τὸν μισθὸν ὑπὲρ ταύτης ἡμέρας λαμβάνοντες: the ταύτης referring to the μισθὸν ἄραν, not to τῆς ἡμέρας, and the fact related being that if any one worked only one hour in the day, he was immediately paid for that hour. Indeed the manifest effect of such a rule as Greswell supposes, would have been to stop the build-
...καὶ αὐτοὶ οἱ ἐσχατοὶ μίαν ἄραν εἴσηκον, καὶ ἵσωσι ἑνῶς αὐτοὺς ἐποίησα τοὺς ἑστασάσαι τοῦ βάρους τῆς ἁμαρτίας καὶ τοῦ καθαρίσματος. 13 οἱ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς ἐπενέν ἐναὶ αὐτῶν Ἑστάρη σικ ἀδικῶν σὲ υἱοὶ ἰδινῶν συνεφωνήσασι μοι; 14 ἀρον τὸ σῶν καὶ ὑπαγεί. θηλὼ δὲ τοῦτῳ τῷ ἑσχατῷ δοῦναι ὡς καὶ σοι. 15 [ἤ] οὖκ ἐξετῆ ἦν οὐδὲν ἐν τοῖς ἑσχατοῖς; ἦ γὰρ ὁ ὑφαλῶν σον πονηρὸς ἔστιν, ὃτι ἐγὼ ἀγάθος ἡμῖν; 16 οὕτως ἐσχάτου ἐσχατοὶ πρῶτοι, καὶ οἱ πρῶτοι ἐσχατοί. [ὑπολογ. γάρ εἰσι δὲ κλητοὶ, ὅλοι γὰρ εἰς ἐκλεκτοὺ.]

17 Καὶ ἀναβαίνων ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα, παρέδαπ ροῦς δώδεκα [μαθητὰς] 19 καὶ ἤδειαν ἐν τῷ ὄνῳ καὶ ἐπεν ἐναὶ αὐτῶς 18 Ἡμῶν ἀναβαίνων εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα, καὶ ὁ νῦς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδοθήσεται τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦσι καὶ γραμματεύσῃ, καὶ 1 κατακρινοῦσιν αὐτὸν θανάτῳ, 19 καὶ παραδοσίαν αὐτῶν ἔθεσιν εἰς τὸ ἐμπάρακτα καὶ 2 μαστίγωσι καὶ σταυρώσι καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀναστήσεται. 20 Τότε προσεύχονται αὐτῷ ἡ μὴ τῶν νῦν ζεβεδαίοι μετὰ τῶν νῦν αὐτῶς 2 προκυνούσα καὶ 9 αὐτοῦ τι παροικοῦσα καὶ 19 οὗτοι ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Τί βίλεις; 21

was the part preserved in the Apostolic memoirs to which Mark had access, and he constructs his narrative accordingly (see Ptolemaic to the Gospels). The mother's name was Salome — she had followed the Lord from Galilee, and witnessed the crucifixion, see Mark xv. 40. Probably the two brethren, fearing the rebuke which had followed their former contention about precedence, had directed this request through their mother. — 21.] The places close to the throne were those of honour, as in Josephus, speaking of Saul (Antt. vi, 11, 9), τοὺς μὲν παύσας Ἰωάννης ἐκ δεξιῶν, Ἀβέβηρον δὲ τοῦ ἀρχιστρατήγου ἐκ τῶν ἐπιστρόφων . . . . In the Rabbinical work Midrasch Tehillim, cited by Weissmann, — God, it is said, will seat the King Messiah at His right hand, and Abraham at his left. — Of these brethren, John, the beloved disciple, had his usual place close to the Lord, John xiii. 23: the other was among the chosen Three (this request hardly can imply in their minds any idea of the rejection of Peter from his peculiar post of honour by the rebuke in ch. xvi. 23, for since then had happened the occurrences in ch. xvii. 1—8, and especially vv. 22—27). Both were called Boanerges, or the Sons of Thunder, Mark iii. 17. — They thought the Kingdom of God was immediately to appear, Luke xix. 11.— 23.] One at least of these brethren saw the Lord on His Cross — on His right and left hand the crucified thieves. Bitter indeed must the remembrance of this ambitious prayer have been at that moment! Luther remarks, 'The flesh ever seeks to be glorified, before it is crucified: exalted, before it is abased.' — The 'cup' is a frequent Scripture image for joy or sorrow: see Ps. xiii. 5. cxvi. 15. Is. lii. 22. Matt. xxvi. 42. It here seems to signify more the inner and spiritual bitterness, resembling the agony of the Lord Himself, — and the baptism more the outer succession of persecution and trial, through which we must pass to the Kingdom of God. On the latter image see Ps. xlii. 7. lxix. 2. cxxiv. 4. — Stier rightly observes that this answer of the Lord contains in it the kernel of the doctrine of the Sacraments in the Christian Church: see Rom. vi. 1 Cor. xii. 13, and note on Luke xii. 50. — Some explain their answer as if they understood the Lord to speak of drinking out of the royal cup, and washing in the royal ewer: but the words δύνασθε πιάν, and δύναμιν, indicating a difficulty, preclude this. The clauses in brackets have most probably been inserted from Mark, being (besides the MSS. evidence against them) not in keeping with the corresponding clauses, which would require διὰ ἐγώ μήλλον βαπτισθῆσαί. — 33.] The one of these brethren was the first of the Apostles to drink the cup of suffering, and be baptized with the baptism of blood, Acts xii. 1; the other had the longest experience among them of a life of trouble and persecution. — The last clause of the verse must not be understood as in the E. V., 'is not mine to give, but it shall be given to them for whom it is prepared of My Father'; but, 'is not mine to give, except to those for whom &c. &c. = εἰ μὴ: see Mark iv. 22. ix. 8, comp. with Matt. xvii. 8. If however we understand the former, 'it shall be given by Me,' we may say with Bengal, 'res codem reedit, sive oppositio, sive exceptione.' — 25.]
The two clauses, . . . κατάκαυροι, αὐτῶν and . . . κατέχει, αὐτῶν, are parallel, and αὐτῶν in both cases refers to τῶν ἱμάτων. Grocius and others would take the second αὐτῶν to refer to οἱ αὐτῶν, but wrongly.

28—33.] μέγας . . . πρῶτος, i. e. in the next life, let him be διάς. and δούλος here. Thus also the ἠλάβων, ver. 28, applies to the coming of the Son of man in the flesh only.—λατρεύω ἀντὶ πολλῶν is a plain declaration of the sacrificial and vicarious nature of the death of our Lord. The principal usages of λατρεύω are the following: (1) a payment as equivalent for a life destroyed, Ex. xxi. 30; (2) the price of redemption of a slave, Lev. xxv. 51 al.; (3) 'propitiation for,' as in Prov. xiii. 8. where Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion have ἵλισσαμα.—λατρεύω ἀντὶ πολλῶν here = ἀντίλατρευον ὑπὲρ πάντων 1 Tim. ii. 6. No stress is to be laid on this word πολλῶν as not being πάντων here; it is placed in opposition to the one life which is given—the one, for many—and not with any distinction from πάντων. (I may observe once for all, that in the usage of these two words, as applied to our redemption by Christ, πάντων is the objective, πολλῶν the subjective designation of those for whom Christ died.—He died for all, objectively; subjectively, the great multitude whom no man can number, πολλῶν will be the saved by Him in the end.)—‘As the Son of man came to give His life for many and to serve many, so ye, being many, should be to each one the object of service and self-denial.’

29—34.] Mark x. 46—52. Luke xviii. 36—43. xix. 1, with however some remarkable differences. In the much more detailed account of Mark, we have but one blind man, mentioned by name as Bartimaeus; Luke also relates it of only one, and besides says that it was ἐν τῷ ἐγγίζοντι αὐτῶν εἰς ἵλισσαμα. The only fair account of such differences is, that they existed in the sources from which each Evangelist took his narrative. This latter one is easily explained, from the circumstance having happened close to Jericho—in two accounts, just on leaving it—in the third, on approaching to it: but he may be indeed a slave to the letter, who would stumble at such discrepancies, and not rather see in them the corroborating coincidence of testimonies to the fact itself (see Olshausen, Comment. i. 782). Yet Mr. Greswell (as also Ebrard, Evangelien Kritik, p. 572) supposes our Lord to have healed one blind man (as in Luke) on entering Jericho, and another (Bartimæus, as in Mark) on leaving it,—and Matthew to have, 'with his characteristic brevity in relating miracles,' combined both these in one!! But then, what becomes of Matthew's assertion, ἀκοπεσφαίρον αὐτῶν ἀντὶ τοῦ ? Can we not reasonably imagine, that the Evangelist, having both facts before him, could combine them and preface them with what he must know to be false? It is just thus that the Harmonists utterly destroy the credibility of the Scripture narrative. Accumulate upon this the absurd improbabilities involved in two men, under the same circumstances, addressing our Lord in the same words, at so very
short an interval,—and we may be thankful that biblical criticism is at length being emancipated from 'forcing narratives into accordance.' See notes on Mark.—30, 31. The multitude appear to have silenced them, lest they should be wearisome and annoying to our Lord: not because they called Him the Son of David,—for the multitudes could have no reason for repressing this cry, seeing that they themselves (being probably for the most part the same persons who entered Jerusalem with Jesus) raised it very soon after: see ch. xxi. 9. I have before noticed (on ix. 27) the singular occurrence of these words, 'Son of David,' in the three narratives of healing the blind in this Gospel. —32.] ἑβατομέατος = εἶναι φωνήθημαɪ Mark, = ἔκλεισεν αὐξῆθαιν Luke. —34.] ἡ βίον τῶν ὕδων, not mentioned in the other Gospels. In both we have the addition of the Lord's saying, ἱπτείται σου σίωπαι στ. The question preceding was to elicit their faith.

Mark xxi. 1—17.] Mark x. 1—11. Luke xix. 29—44. John xii. 12—36. This occurrence is related by all four Evangelists, with however some differences, doubtless easily accounted for, if we knew accurately the real detail of the circumstances in chronological order. In John (xii. 1),—our Lord came six days before the Passover to Bethany, where the anointing (of Matt. xxvi. 6-13) took place; and on the morrow, the triumphal entry into Jerusalem was made. According to Mark xi. 11,—on the day of the triumphal entry the Lord only entered the city, went to the temple, and looked about on all things—and then when now it was late in the evening returned to Bethany, and on the morrow the cleansing of the temple took place. The account in Luke, which is the fullest and most graphic of the four, agrees chronologically with that in the text.—I would venture to suggest, that the suppression of the triumphal entry in Mark being related a day too soon, will bring all into unison. If this be so, our Lord's first entry into Jerusalem was private; probably the journey was interrupted by a short stay at Bethany, so that He did not enter the city with the multitudes. That this was the fact seems implied in Mark xi. 11. Then it was that περιβλησίαμονα πάντα, He noticed the abuse in the temple, which next day He corrected. Then in the evening He went back with the twelve to Bethany, and the supper there, and anointing took place. Meantime the Jews (John xii. 9) knew that He was at Bethany; and many went there that evening to see Him and Lazarus. (Query, had not Lazarus followed Him to Ephraim?) Then on the morrow multitudes came out to meet Him, and the triumphal entry took place, the weeping over the city (Luke xx. 41), and the cleansing of the temple. The cursing of the fig-tree occurred early that morning, as He was leaving Bethany with the twelve, and before the multitude met Him or the asses were sent for. (On Matthew's narrative of this event see below on ver. 18.) According to this view, our narrative omits the supper at Bethany, and the anointing
μαθητας ἵνα λέγων αὐτοῖς Πορεύσθε εἰς τὴν κόμην τῆν
κατέναντι ὑμῶν, καὶ εὐθεῖας εὑρήσετε ὄνον δεδεμένον, καὶ Πῶλου μετ᾿ αὐτοῦς ἠσαντες αὐτοὺς.  Εἴη ἐστιν καὶ ἐάν τις ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τῇ ὑπεροπτῆ, ἐρείτε ὅτι ὁ κύριος αὐτῶν ἀφεῖναι ἑκείνης ἐν τῷ ἑαυτόν καὶ τῷ εὐθείας ἐν τῷ ὑπεροπτῆ. Τότε δὲ ἐλογον γέγονεν ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ μὴ δὲν διὰ τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος. Εἴπατε τῇ θυγατρὶ Σίων Ἰδοὺ ὁ βασιλεὺς σου ἐρέσεται σοι, πρῶς καὶ ἐπιβασιλεύσει ἐπὶ ὄνον καὶ Πῶλου ὑπὸ ὑπολογίον. Πορευθήσετε δὲ οἱ μαθηταὶ καὶ ἴος ἐν τῷ ὑπεροπτῆ καὶ Πῶλου καὶ ἐπέθεσαν εὐλογημένος ἐν οἴνοις.
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(See the right place), and passes to the events of the next day. On the day of the week when this event happened, see note on John xii. 1. — Βηθαφήνη = ἡ γυνὴ, the house of figs: a considerable suburban, nearer to Jerusalem than Bethany, and sometimes reckoned part of the city. No trace of it now remains. — 2, 3. τῆν κ. τ. κάν., i.e. Bethphage. Mark and Luke mention the πώλον only, adding, "whereon never yet man sat" (see note on Mark): John ὁδόρρων. Justin Martyr (Apolog. ii. 73) connects this verse with the prophecy in Gen. xlix. 11, ἄφιεν τόν πώλον τῷ ἰατρῷ, καὶ τῷ βασιλείῳ τού πώλον ἡς ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ.— ὁ κύριος, here, 'the LORD,' 'Jehovah;' most probably a general intimation to the owners that they were wanted for the service of God.—ἐκ. ἰερό. ἀν. ἀν., 'he will immediately send them:' see Mark xi. 3.—The two disciples were perhaps Peter and John: compare Mark xiv. 13 and Luke xxii. 8.—4. A formula of our Evangelist's, (see ch. i. 22) spoken with reference to the Divine counsels, but not to the intention of the doers of the act; for this application of prophecy is in John xii. 16 distinctly said not to have occurred to the disciples at the time, but after Jesus was glorified.—6, 7.] In Mark, υἱὸν τόν πώλον δεινήσων προς τὴν θεράν ἢν ἤτοι τοῦ ἀμφότου. The Lord sat on the foal (Mark, Luke), and the mother accompanied, apparently after the manner of a sumptar, as prophets so riding would be usually accompanied (but not of course doing the work of a sumptar).—In the last αὐτῶν, the animals, not the garments, are to be understood. Thus we say 'the position rode on the horses.' That this riding and entry were intentional on the part of our Lord, is clear: and also that He did not thereby mean to give any countenance to the temporal ideas of His Messiahship, but solemnly to fulfil the Scriptures respecting Him, and to prepare the way for His sufferings, by a public avowal of His mission. The typical meaning also is not to be overlooked. In all probability the evening visit to the temple was at the very time when the Paschal Lamb was to be taken up—i.e. set apart for the sacrifice. —8, 9.] Which was a royal honour:
κυρίου, ὡσανάνα ἐν τοῖς ὑψιστοῖς. 16 Καὶ εἰσελθόντος BCD αὐτοῦ εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα ἢ ἐσιάθη πᾶσα ἡ πόλις λέγουσα "Τις ἔστιν οὗτος;" οἱ δὲ ὕχοι ἔλεγον Οὐτός ἐστιν Ἰσσοῦς ὁ προφήτης ὁ ἀπὸ Ναζαρὲτ τῆς Γαλαλαίας. 17 Καὶ εἰσῆλθον ὁ Ἰσσοῦς εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν [τοῦ θεοῦ], καὶ εξῆβαλε πάντας τοὺς πωλούσας καὶ ἀγοράζοντας ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, καὶ τὰς τραπέζας τῶν κολυβιστῶν κατέστρεψε καὶ τὰς καθεδρὰς τῶν πωλούσων τὰς περισσοτέρας. 18 καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς Γέγραπται ὁ οἶκος μου οἶκος προφητῶν κληθήσατε ὑμεῖς δὲ αὐτῶν ἐποίησεν σπάλαιον λῃστῶν. 19 καὶ προσέλθον αὐτῷ τοῦ θυσίας καὶ χωλοὶ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, καὶ ἐθέραπευσεν αὐτούς. 20 ἢδονες δὲ οἱ ἀρχηγεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς τὰ θεαμασία ἐπέστησε, καὶ τοὺς παιδιᾶς κράζοντας ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ καὶ λέγοντας Ωσανά τῷ νησί δαυίδ, ἢ γανάκτησαν καὶ εἶπαν αὐτῷ Ἀκούσεις τί οὕτω λέγουσιν; ὁ δὲ Ἰσσοῦς λέγει αὐτοῖς Ναὶ ὑπέκυψεν ἀνέγγυτον.
10—24. KATA MATHEION.

... 10:11 καὶ καταλιπτὼν αὐτού εἰπὸν ἡ τῆς πόλεως τῆς Βηθανίας καὶ ἡ θυλαζόντων κατηρτίσω παραχρῆμα ἡ συκή. 11 καὶ ἰδοὺ συκὴ μιαν ἐπὶ τῆς ὠδοῦ ἠλθεν ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν την πόλιν επενεάσα, 12 καὶ ἰδοὺ συκὴν μιαν ἐπὶ τῆς ὠδοῦ ἠλθεν ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν την πόλιν επενεάσα, 13 καὶ ἰδοὺ συκὴν μιαν ἐπὶ τῆς ὠδοῦ ἠλθεν ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν την πόλιν επενεάσα, 14 καὶ ἰδοὺ συκὴν μιαν ἐπὶ τῆς ὠδοῦ ἠλθεν ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν την πόλιν επενεάσα, 15 καὶ ἰδοὺ συκὴν μιαν ἐπὶ τῆς ὠδοῦ ἠλθεν ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν την πόλιν επενεάσα, 16 καὶ ἰδοὺ συκὴν μιαν ἐπὶ τῆς ὠδοῦ ἠλθεν ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν την πόλιν επενεάσα, 17 καὶ ἰδοὺ συκὴν μιαν ἐπὶ τῆς ὠδοῦ ἠλθεν ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν την πόλιν επενεάσα, 18 καὶ ἰδοὺ συκὴν μιαν ἐπὶ τῆς ὠδοῦ ἠλθεν ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν την πόλιν επενεάσα, 19 καὶ ἰδοὺ συκὴν μιαν ἐπὶ τῆς ὠδοῦ ἠλθεν ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν την πόλιν επενεάσα, 20 καὶ ἰδοὺ συκὴν μιαν ἐπὶ τῆς ὠδοῦ ἠλθεν ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν την πόλιν επενεάσα, 21 καὶ ἰδοὺ συκὴν μιαν ἐπὶ τῆς ὠδοῦ ἠλθεν ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν την πόλιν επενεάσα, 22 καὶ ἰδοὺ συκὴν μιαν ἐπὶ τῆς ὠδοῦ ἠλθεν ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν την πόλιν επενεάσα, 23 καὶ ἰδοὺ συκὴν μιαν ἐπὶ τῆς ὠδοῦ ἠλθεν ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν την πόλιν επενεάσα, 24 καὶ ἰδοὺ συκὴν μιαν ἐπὶ τῆς ὠδοῦ ἠλθεν ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν την πόλιν επενεάσα, 25 καὶ ἰδοὺ συκὴν μιαν ἐπὶ τῆς ὠδοῦ ἠλθεν ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν την πόλιν επενεάσα, 26 καὶ ἰδοὺ συκὴν μιαν ἐπὶ τῆς ὠδοῦ ἠλθεν ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν την πόλιν επενεάσα.

B C D L. ομ. C. — 18. πρὸς D.—παράγων D abcd H επανάγων B οτι B C. — 19. bef. μηκετι B ins. ὁτι C D. — 23. rec. ἐλθόντων αὐτῷ. οτι B C D L dealings of God.—Those who can, should by all means consult Stier's admirable remarks on this truth, vol. ii. p. 387-8. — 17.] If this is to be literally understood of the village (and not of a district round it, including part of the Mount of Olives; see Luke xxii. 37), this will be the second night spent at Bethany. I would rather of the two understand it literally, and that the spending the nights on the Mount of Olives did not begin till the next night (Tuesday).

18—23.] Mark xi. 12—14, 20—26, where see notes. Luke omits the incident.—The cursing of the fig-tree had in fact taken place on the day before, and the withering of it was now noticed. Mark separates the two accounts, which here are given together. We must remember that this miracle was wholly typical and parabolical. The fig-tree was the Jewish people—full of the leaves of an useless profession, but without fruit—and further, all hypocrites of every kind, in every age. It is true, as De Wette observes, that no trace of a parabolic meaning appears in the narrative (and yet he himself, a few lines after, denying the truth of the miracle, accounts for the narrative by supposing it to have arisen out of a parable spoken by our Lord!); but neither does there in that of the driving out the buyers and sellers from the temple, and of many other actions which we know to have been symbolic. — 21, 22.] This assurance has occurred before in ch. xvii. 20. That truest and highest faith, which implies a mind and will perfectly in unison with that of God, can even in its least degree, only have been in Him who spoke these words. And by it, and its elevating power over the function and laws of inferior natures, were His most notable miracles wrought. It is observable, that such a state of mind entirely precludes the idea of an arbitrary exercise of power—none such can therefore be intended in our Lord's assertion—but we must understand, — "if expedient." Though we cannot reach this faith in its fulness, yet every approach to it (ver. 21) shall be endowed with some of its wonderful power,—in obtaining requests from God. See the remarkable and important addition in Mark xxi. 25, 26, and notes.

23—32.] Mark xi. 27—33. Luke xx. 1—8. Now commences that series of parables, and discourses of the Lord with His enemies, in which He develops, more completely than ever before, His hostility to their hypocrisy and iniquity,—and so they are stirred up to compass His death. — of ἀρχ. κ. οἱ προσ. τ. λ. Mark and Luke add
ἔαν εἰπήγε ἦν, κἀγὼ ὑμῖν ἔρω ἐν ποια ἐξουσία ταῦτα BCDZ
ποι. 25 τὸ βάπτισμα * Ἰωάννου πόθεν ἦν; ἐξ σοφα-
νοῦ ἦ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων; οἱ δὲ "διελογίζοντο * 'παρ'
εἰσόεις λέγοντες Ἐαὶ εἰπωμεν ἐξ σοφανου, ἢμι ἦμιν
Διὰ ὑμῶν οὐκ ἐπιστεύσατε αὐτῷ; 26 εάν δὲ εἰπωμεν
ἐξ ἀνθρώπων, φοβοῦμεθα τὸν ὄχλον πάντες γὰρ ἐξοι-
τον Ἰωάννην ὡς προφήτην. 27 καὶ ἀποκρίθητες τῷ
Ἥνου εἶπον Οὐκ οἴδαμεν. ἐφ᾿ αὐτοῖς καὶ αὐτὸς Ὁμᾶς
ἐγὼ λέγω ὑμῖν ἐν ποια ἐξουσία ταῦτα ποι. 28 τί δὲ ὑμῖν
δοκεῖ; ἀνθρώπος * εἰχε τέκνα δύο. καὶ προσελήφθος τῷ
πρώτῳ εἶπε Τέκνων ὑπαγε σήμερον ἐγὼ ᾿Αχίλλου ἐν τῷ ἀμπε-
λώνι μου. 29 οὐ δὲ ἀποκρίθησα εἴπεν Ὡν θέλω ὑστερον
μεταμεληθεὶς ἀπήθη. 30 καὶ προσελήθω τῷ δεύτερῳ
εἶπεν ὤσιμος. 31 οὐ δὲ ἀποκρίθησα εἴπεν Ἡ ἐγὼ κύριε" καὶ

Orig.— đỏτι C. — 24. ἐπιστάτησο D. — 25. bef. ἰω. ins. τὸ B Ζ Orig. txt D abc. —
μοί om. D Κ Λ M al. ΣΥΡ. Arm. Orig. Cyp. Hil. — 29. There is much confusion in the Mss. between the order and answers of these two sons.— aft. εἶπεν, or Θ se. δι ὑμ. στ., B has ἐγὼ, κἀπει, καὶ οὐκ ἀπηλθεῖν, as also Copt. Arm. and οὐκ θιλ., &c. at the other place. — οὕτως τὸ C D Ζ, and almost all MSS. Orig. and Latin Fathers.— aft. ἀπηλθεῖν ins. εἰς τὴν ἀμφιλοθείαν B abe Arm. Orig. (once). — 30. for δεύτερον, ἐπέρημα ΤΕ Ζ H K 34 al. αὑτον ΣΥΡ. Arm. Ἑθ. Orig. (once) Cyp. txt Β Ζ. — aft. κύριε ins. ὑπάγω D. — 31. for

γραμματίς, and so make up the members of the Sanhedrim. It was an official message
sent with a view to make our Saviour declare Himself to be a Prophet sent from
God—in which case the Sanhedrin had power to take cognizance of His proceed-
ings, as of a professed Teacher. Thus the Sanhedrin sent a deputation to John on
his appearing as a Teacher, John ii. 19. The question was the result of a combina-
tion to destroy Jesus, Luke xix. 47, 48. They do not now ask, as in John ii. 18, τι
σημεῖον δεινός ὑμῖν ὑπὲρ ταῦτα ποιεῖ; for they had had many signs, which are
now included in their ταῦτα. The second question, καὶ τις εὐλ. is an expansion of
προηγ. — 25. τὸ βάπτισμα, meaning thereby the
whole office and teaching, of which the baptism was the central point and seal. If
they had recognized the heavenly mission of John, they must have also acknowledged the
authority by which Jesus did these things, for John expressly declared that he
was sent to testify of Him, and bore witness to having seen the Holy Spirit
descend and rest upon Him. John i. 33, 34. — 26.] These 'blind leaders of the blind'
had so far made an insincere concession to the people's persuasion as to allow John
to pass for a prophet—but they shrunk from the reproof which was sure to follow
their acknowledging it now. This consultation among themselves is related almost
verbatim by the three Evangelists. The intelligence of it may have been derived
from Nicodemus or Joseph of Arimathea originally. — 28.] τις θελες; Θ. 8; a formula of
connexion—but doubtless here intended to help the questioners to the true answer
of their difficulty about John's baptism. The following parable (peculiar to Mat-
thew) refers, under the image of the two
sons, to two classes of persons, both sum-
mommed by the great Father, to "work in
His vineyard" (see ch. xx. 1); both Jesus,
and of His Family. The first answer the
summons by a direct and open refusal—
these are the open sinners, the publicans
and harlots, who disobey God to His face.
But afterwards, when better thoughts are
suggested, they repent, and go. The second
class (no stress is to be laid on the order
of calling—the parable merely mentions
that the call was made ἔχαθεν—it is this
mistake which has given rise to such con-
fusion in the readings) receive the summons
with a respectful assent (not unaccompanied
with a self-exaltation and contrast to the
other, implied in the emphatic ἔγω)—having
however no intention of obeying (there is
no mention of a change of mind in this
case): but go not. These are the Scribes
and Pharisaees, with their show of legal obedience, who "said, and did not" (ch. xxiii. 3). It will of course admit of wider applications—to Jews and Heathens, or any such similar pair of classes who may be compared.—31.] προέγγοντες—not entirely without hope for you, that you may follow, but not necessarily implying your following. The door of mercy was not yet shut for them: see John xii. 35. Luke xxiii. 34. προέκυψε, answers to ἔπηξεν κ. ἵπηγεν in the parable. The idea of 'showing the way' by being their example, is also included. There were publicans among the disciples, and probably repentant harlots among the women who followed the Lord.—32.] ἐξ θεοῦ, not only in the 'way of God's commandments,' so often spoken of, but in the very path of ascetic purity which you so much approve; yet perhaps it were better to let the simpler sense here be the predominant one, and take διακοινούσες for 'repentance,' as Noah is called δικ. εἰρήνα (2 Pet. ii. 5) in similar circumstances.—μεταμελεῖται are words repeated from the parable (ver. 29), and serving to fasten the application on the hearers.—τοῦ πιστ., so as to believe on Him.'

33—46.] Mark xii. 1—12. Luke xx. 9—19. The original source of this parable is probably Isa. v. 1 ff. Both Mark and Luke open it with an ἐξῆγεν λίγον... as a fresh beginning, by the Lord, of a series of parables. Luke adds, that it was spoken πρὸς τὸν λαόν. Its subject is, of course, the continued rejection of God's prophets by the people of Israel, till at last they rejected and killed His only Son. The οἰκοδομεῖ, ἑφύτευσαν ἀμπέλι, 'selected it out of all His world, and fenced it in, and dug a receptacle for the juice in the rock or ground, to keep it cool, into which it flowed from the press above, through a grated opening, and built a tower (of recreation—or observation to watch the crops). This exactly coincides with the state of the Jewish nation, under covenant with God as His people. All these expressions are in Isaiah v. The letting out to husbandmen was probably that kind of letting where the tenant pays his rent in kind, although the καρποὶ may be understood of money. God began about 430 years after the Exodus to send His prophets to the people of Israel, and continued even till John the Baptist; but all was in vain; they 'persecuted the prophets,' casting them out, and putting them to death. (See Neh. ix. 26. Matt. xxiii. 31—37. Heb. xi. 36—38.)—The different sendings must not be pressed; they pro-
bably the fulness and sufficiency of warnings given, and set forth the long-suffering of the householder; and the increasing rebellion of the householders is shown by their increasing ill-treatment of the messengers. Meyer understands αὑτοὺς as καταρχοὺς, ver. 34, to mean His fruits; i. e. in money.—37.] See Luke v. 13. Mark v. 6. The Lord sets forth His heavenly Father in human wise delimitating, τι ποιήσα (Luke,) and ἰσόν ἰσόν, to signify His gracious adoption, for man's sake, of every means which may turn sinners to repentance.—The difference here is fully made between the Son and all the other messengers; see Mark: ἦν οὖν Ἰακὼβ αὐτοῦ ἄναρπα πάντων... and, as Stier remarks, this is the real and direct answer to the question in ver. 23. The Son appears here, not in His character of Redeemer, but in that of a preacher—a messenger demanding the fruits of the vineyard. (See Matt. iv. 17.)—38. οὐδέ οὐτων] So Nicodemus, John iii. 2: ὠφανεν ὁ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ἡλικιωτας διδασκαλος, even at the beginning of His ministry; how much more then after three years spent in His Divine working!—4 στρων.] This the Son is in virtue of His human nature; see Heb. i. 1, 2. See above. abv.] The very words of the LXX, Gen. xxxvii. 20, where Joseph's brethren express a similar resolution: and no doubt used by the Lord in reference to that history, so deeply typical of His rejection and exaltation. This resolution had actually been taken, see John xi. 53: and that immediately after the manifestation of His power as the Son of God, (πάτερ, εὐχαριστῶ σοι κ.λ. John xi. 41,) in the raising of Lazarus.—καὶ κατάρχης.] See John xi. 48. As far as this, the parable is History; from this point, Prophecy.—39.] This is partly to be understood of our Lord being given up to the heathen to be judged; but also literally, as related by all three Evangelists. See also John xix. 17, and Heb. xiii. 11, 12. In Mark the order is different, αὐτῶν ἐξεβάλαν ἐξ τοῦ ἀμπελώνος καὶ ἀπέκτειναν. 40. οὖν ἄλλος ἐθέτο τοῦ κύριου τοῦ ἀμπελώνος, τι ποιήση τοῖς γεωργοῖς ζεύκοις; 41. ἔγουσιν αὐτῷ ὁ Κακοῦς κακῶς ἀπολέεις αὐτούς, καὶ τὸν ἀμπελώνα ἐκδικήσεται ἄλλοις γεωργοῖς, αὐτῶν ἐπεδώσουσιν αὐτῷ τοὺς καρποὺς ἐν τοῖς καρποῖς αὐτῶν.

XXII. 1. KATA MATHAION. 155

42 λέγει αυτοίς ὁ Ἡσυχὸς Οὐδέποτε ἀνέγνωτε ἐν ταῖς
gραφαῖς ὁ Διόνυς ὁ ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες, ἀντι

43 τοῦτο λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ἀρξησαί τὰς παραβολὰς αὐτοῦ ἐγνώσαν

καὶ ξητοῦντες αὐτὸν κρατὴσαί ἐκ πιστοῦ τοὺς καρποὺς αὐτοῦ.

44 καὶ ὁ πεσὼν ἐπὶ τὸν δίθον τοῦτον συνδιασθήσεται ἐφ

δὲ ἄν πίση, ξηκμήσαί αὐτὸν. ἄκοισαντες οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι τὰς παραβολὰς αὐτοῦ ἐγνώσαν

οἱ περὶ αὐτῶν λέγει· καὶ ἤζουσαντες αὐτὸν κρατήσαν

ἐφοβήθησαν τοὺς ὅχλους, * ἐκείνη ἡ προφήτη αὐτὸν ἔχον.

XXII. 1 Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἡσυχὸς πάλιν εἶπεν καὶ τῇ οὐράνῳ: 16 1

ὁμῶν D e d 7 al. — 44. om. D ad Orig. — 46. for ἐκείνη ὡς, ἐκεῖ εἰς B L Orig. Chrys.

πτωτοὶ ὡς D in. C.

phetic arrangement. — 43.] A citation from the same Psalm of triumph from which the multitudes had taken their Hosannas. This verse is quoted with the same signification in Acts iv. 11. Eph. ii. 20. 1 Pet. ii. 6, 7, where also the cognate passage Isa. xxviii. 16 is quoted, as in Rom. ix. 33. The words here are those of the LXX.—αὕτη...θαυμασθη...are feminine by a Hebraism, in which idiom the fem. is used as the neuter, there being no neuter. Meyer takes it as agreeing with αὐτῶν...γωνίας, but surely with the examples in the ref. before us, it is simpler and better to understand the construction as above.—The so-called answer to the husbandsmen, and the addition is made in this changed similitude to show them that though they might reject and kill the Son, yet He would be victorious in the end. —εἰς κεφ. γων. The corner stone binds together both walls of the building; so Christ unites Jews and Gentiles in Himself.—On θαυμάσθη ἐν δόθη. ἡμ. see Acts iv. 13, 14. — 43.] The Lord here returns to the parable, and more plainly than ever before announces to them their rejection by God. The ἁρματλῶν is now ὁ βασιλεὺς. The Ἡσυχὸς here spoken of is not the Gentiles in general, but the Church of the truly faithful. — 44.] A reference to Isa. viii. 14, 15, and Dan. ii. 44, and a plain identification of the stone there mentioned with that in Ps. cxviii. The stone is the whole kingdom and power of the Messiah, summed up in Himself.—ὁ ψωνὼ...he that takes offence, that makes it a stone of stumbling, shall be broken: see Luke ii. 34: but on whomsoever, as its enemy, it shall come in vengeance, as prophesied in Daniel, λικενήσει αὐτῶν, it shall dash him in pieces. Meyer maintains that the meaning of λικενήσει, is not this, but literally ’shall winnow him,’ throw him off as chaff. But the confusion in the parable thus occasioned is quite unnecessary. The result of winnowing is complete separation and dashes away of the worthless part: and it is surely far better to understand this result as the work of the falling of the stone, than to apply the words to a part of the operation for which the falling of a stone is so singularly un-suited. This verse can hardly be an interpolation from Luke, as Lachmann supposes; the words are not exactly the same, the sense and the sense and position are strictly appropriate: verses 43 and 44 answering to the two parables as their applications. — 45, 46.] All three Evangelists have this addition. Mark besides says καὶ ἀρνητές αὐτῶν ἀπεκλήθων, answering to our ch. xxii. 22. Supposing Mark’s insertion of these words to be in the right place, we have the following parable spoken to the people and disciples; see below.

CHAP. XXII. 1—14.] Peculiar to Matthew. A parable resembling this in several particulars occurs in Luke xiv. 15—24, yet we must not hastily set it down as the same. Many circumstances are entirely different: the locality and occasion of delivery different, and in both cases stated with precision. And the difference in the style of the parables is correspondent to the two periods of their utterance. That in Luke is delivered earlier in our Lord’s ministry, when the enmity of the Pharisees had yet not fully manifested itself: the refusal of the guests is more courteous,
their only penalty exclusion;—here they maltreat the servants, and are utterly destroyed. This binds the parable in close connexion with that of the wicked husbandmen in the last chapter, and with this period of our Lord's course. —2.] The householder of the former parable is the King here, who sends to the people. The εἰς τοὺς ἐγγόμοις is not always necessarily a 'marriage,' but any great celebration, as accession to the throne, or coming of age, &c. See Esth. i. 5, LXX. Meyer (in loc.) denies this, but does not refer to the passage of Esther just cited, which to my mind is decisive. Esth. ix. 22 is not satisfactorily explained on his interpretation, viz. that the LXX translate freely and exegetically,—but is another instance in point. Here however the notion of a marriage is certainly included; and the interpretation is, the great marriage supper (Rev. xix. 9) of the Son of God; i.e. His people are summoned to the Church in glory. See Eph. v. 25—27. The difficulty of the totality of the guests in this case constituting the Bride, may be lessened by regarding the ceremony as an enthronization, in which the people are regarded as being espoused to their prince, see Ps. xlv. —3.] These δοῦλοι are not the prophets, not the same as the servants in ch. xxi. 34, as generally interpreted:—the parable takes up its ground nearly from the conclusion of that former, and is altogether a New Testament parable. The office of these δοῦλοι was καλεῖν τοὺς συνάδελφους, to summon those who had been invited, as was customary (see Esth. v. 8 and vi. 14); these being the Jewish people, who had been before, by their prophets and covenant, invited. These first δοῦλοι are then the first messengers of the Gospel,—John the Baptist, the Twelve, and the Seventy,—who preached saying, 'The Kingdom of heaven is at hand.' And even our Lord Himself must in some sort be here included, inasmuch as He spoke of δοῦλοι λαβεῖ, and preached this same truth, with however the weighty addition of δεύτερος πρεσβ. μα. —4.] We now come to a different period of the Evangelic announcement. Now, all is ready: the sacrifice, or the meat for the feast, is slain. We can hardly help connecting this with the declarations of our Lord in John vi. 51—59, and supposing that this second invitation is the preaching of the Apostles and Evangelists after the great Sacrifice was offered. That thus the slaying of the Lord is not the doing of the invited, but is mentioned as done for the Feast, is no real difficulty. Both sides of the truth may be included in the parable, as they are in Acts ii. 23, and indeed wherever it is set forth. The discourse of Peter in that chapter is the best commentary on His Bride's being admitted to the Church in glory. Meyer well remarks that ἀφετέρων is not διὰ τούτων, but is the meal at noon with which the course of marriage festivities begun.' This will give even greater precision to the meaning of the parable as applying to these preparatory foretastes of the great feast which the Church of God now enjoys. —5, 6.] Two classes are here represented: the irreligious and careless people, and the rulers, who persecuted and slew God's messengers. Stephen,—James the brother of John, James the Just, and doubtless other of the Apostles of whose end we have no certain account, perished by the hands or instigation of the Jews: they persecuted Paul all through his life, and most probably brought him to his death at last; and the guilt of the death of the Lord abode upon them (ch. xxvii. 25). They repeatedly insulted and scourged the Apostles (see Acts iv. 3. v. 18. 40).
The occurrence of this verse before the opening of the Feast to the Gentiles has perplexed some interpreters: but it is strictly exact: for although the Gospel was preached to the Gentiles forty years before the destruction of Jerusalem, yet the final rejection of the Jews and the substitution of the Gentiles did not take place till that event. — τὰ στράτευμα. [The Roman armies; a similar expression for the unconscious instruments of God’s anger is used Isa. x. 5. xiii. 5. Jer. xxv. 9. Joel ii. 26. — τὴν πόλιν αὐτοῦ] no longer His, but their city. Compare ὃ οἱκεῖ ἐνών at end of ch. xxiii. This is a startling introduction of the interpretation into the parable; we knew not before that they had a city. — 8—10.] On ὥστε δέοι see Acts xiii. 46. — διεξετέοι are the places of resort at the meetings of streets, the squares or consequences of ways. De Wette and Meyer are wrong in saying that they are not in the city, ‘for that was destroyed’: it is not the city of the murderers, but that in which the feast is supposed to be held, which is spoken of. — τον οὖς της άγαθος:] (See ch. xiii. 47, where the net collects ἐκ παντὸς γένους both the morally good and the open sinners. Stier remarks that we might expect, from ch. xxxi. 31, to find the guest who by and by is expelled, among the ἄγαθοι.— ἡ γάμος is here the feast, not, the place where it was held.—Here, so to say, the first act of the parable closes; and here is the situation of the Church at this day;—collected out of all the earth, and containing both bad and good. — 11, 12.] This second part of the parable is in direct reference to the word of prophecy, Zeph. i. 7, 8. The coming of the King to see his guests is the final and separating Judgment—when that distinction shall be made, which God’s ministers have no power nor right to make in admissions into the visible Church. Yet as Trench remarks, (Parrs. p. 207,) this coming of the King is not exclusively the final one, but every trying and sifting judgment adumbrates it in some measure. — With regard to the γάμος γάμου, we must not, I think, make too much of the usually cited Oriental custom of presenting the guests with such garments at feasts. For (1) it is not distinctly proved that such a custom existed; the passages usually quoted (Gen. xlv. 22. Judges xiv. 12. 2 Kings v. 22) are nothing to the purpose; 2 Kings x. 22 shows that the worshippers of Baal were provided with vestments, and at a feast; and at the present day those who are admitted to the presence of Royalty in the East are clothed with a caftan: but all this does not make good the assumption: and (2) even granting it, it is not to be pressed, as being manifestly not the punctum saliens of this part of the parable. The guest was bound to provide himself with this proper habit, out of respect to the feast and its Author: how this was to be provided, does not here appear, but does elsewhere. The garment is the imputed and inherent righteousness of the Lord Jesus, put on symbolically in Baptism, and really by a true and living faith,—without which none can appear before God in His Kingdom of Glory;—Heb. xii. 14. Phil. iii. 7, 8. Eph. iv. 24. Col. iii. 10. Rom. xiii. 14;—which truth could not be put forward here, but at its subsequent manifestation threw its great light over this and other such similitudes and expressions. —This guest imagines his own garment will be as acceptable, and therefore neglects to
provide himself. See 1 John v. 10. Isa. lxiv. 6. lxi. 10. Rev. xix. 8.—Ἐναέρως, see note on ch. xx. 13. —13, 14.] The διάκονοι are not the same as the δοῦλοι above, but the ἀγγέλων, see ch. xiii. 41. 49. The 'binding of his feet and hands' has been interpreted of his being now in the night, in which so man can work; but I doubt whether this be not fanciful. On τὸ σκοτ. τῶν ἄγγελων, see ref.—In ver. 14 the Lord shows us that this guest, thus single in the parable, is, alas! to be the representative of a numerous class in the visible Church, who, although sitting down as guests before His coming, have not on the ἐννομια γάμου. 15—22.] Mark xii. 13—17. Luke xx. 20—26. On the Herodians see above ch. xvi. 6. By the union of these two hostile parties they perhaps thought that the ἐγείρεσθαι, (Luke,) who were to feign themselves honest men, Luke xx. 20, would be more likely to deceive our Lord! For this also is their flattery here designed. 16. The devil never lies so foully, as when he speaks the truth. The application may have been as if to settle a dispute which may have sprung up between the Pharisees, the strong theocratic repudiators of Roman rule, and the Herodians, the hangers-on of a dynasty created by Caesar.—In case the answer were negative, these last would be witnesses against Him to the governor, (Luke xx. 20,) (as indeed they became, with false testimony, when they could not get true, Luke xxii. 2;) in case it were affirmative, He would be compromised with the Roman conquerors, and could not be the people's deliverer, their expected Messiah; which would furnish them with a pretext for stirring up the multitudes against Him (see Deut. xvii. 16).—17. κύριος = φόρος, Luke xx. 22 = ἐπικεφάλαιον : a poll-tax, which had been levied since Judea became a province of Rome. —18—23.] The Lord not only detects their plot, but answers their question; and in answering it, teaches them each a deep lesson.—The νόμισμα κύριος was a denarius. It was a saying of the Rabbis, quoted by Lightfoot and Wetstein, that 'wherever any king's money is current, there that king is lord.' The Lord's answer convictsthem, by the matter of fact that this money was current among them, of subjection to Caesar.
and recognition of that subjection: 'Pay therefore.' He says, 'that which is Caesar's to Caesar, and (not perhaps without reference to the Herodians, but with much deeper reference) that which is God's, to God.' These weighty words, so much misunderstood, bind together, instead of separating, the political and religious duties of the followers of Christ. See Jer. xxvii. 4—18. Rom. xiii. 1. 1 Pet. ii. 13, 14. John xix. 11. The second clause comprehend: the first, and gives its true foundation: q. d. this obedience to Caesar is but an application of the general principle of obedience to God, of Whom is all power. The latter clause thus reaches infinitely deeper than the former: just as the Lord in Luke x. 41, 42 declares a truth reaching far beyond the occasion of the meal. Man is the coinage, and bears the image, of God (Gen. i. 27): and this image is not lost by the fall (Gen. ix. 6. Acts xvii. 29. James iii. 9. See also notes on Luke xv. 8, 9). We owe then ourselves to God; and this solemn duty is implied, of giving ourselves to Him, with all that we have and are.—The answer also gives them the real reason why they were now under subjection to Caesar: viz., because they had fallen from their allegiance to God. 'The question was as if an adulterer were to ask, whether it were lawful for him to pay the penalty of his adultery.' (Claudius, cited by Stier ii. 445.) They had again and again rejected their theocratic inheritance;—they refused it in the wilderness;—they would not have God to reign over them, but a king;—therefore were they subjected to foreigners (see 2 Chron. xii. 8). 23—33. Mark xii. 18—27. Luke xx. 27—40. From Acts xxiii. 3, the Sadducees denied resurrection, angel, and spirit; consequently the immortality of the soul, as well as the resurrection of the body. This should be borne in mind, as our Lord's answer is directed against both errors. It is a mistake into which many commentators have fallen, to suppose that the Sadducees recognized only the Pentateuch: they acknowledged the prophets also, and only rejected tradition (see Winer Realwörterbuch, Sadducei.). -23. ολ'λγη. So also in Luke (οι νεκροι ὑμῶν) Mark. —24. ἀναστ. σώφρ.] The first-born son of a levitical marriage was reckoned and registered as the son of the deceased brother. Michaelis, Mom. R. ii. 96 (Meyer. —28.) γενος is the predicate. —29, 30.] τὰς γυ. μ. τ. ᾽θ. τ. ᾽θ., not = τὴν δ. τ. θ. ἐν ταῖς γυ.—but literally, 'ye
do not understand the Scriptures, which imply the resurrection (ver. 31), nor the power of God, before whom all these obstacles vanish (ver. 30). See Rom. iv. 17. Acts xxvi. 8. Rom. viii. 11. 1 Cor. vi. 14. γενέσεως, of males; γένες, of females. The Lord also asserts here against them the existence of angels, and reveals to us the similarity of our glorified state to their present one. Not in σο, εἰσιν, ὡς ἡγ. τ. θ., but εἰσιν, ὡς ἡγ. τ. ἐκλ. αὐτ., ἐκλ. (see note on Luke xx. 35, and 1 Cor. xv. 44)—the risen are not in heaven, but on earth.—

Weststein quotes the Rabbinical decision of a similar question—¹ Mulier illa qua duxibus non potest in hoc mundo, priori restituitur in mundo futuro.'—31—33.] The Lord does not cite the strong testimonies of the Prophets, as Is. xxvi. 19. Ezek. xxixvii. Dan. xii. 2, but says, as in Luke (xx. 37), 'even Moses has shown,' &c., leaving those other witnesses to be supplied. The books of Moses were the great and ultimate appeal for all doctrine: and thus the assertion of the Resurrection comes from the very source whence their difficulty had been constructed. On the passage itself, and our Lord's interpretation of it, much has been written. Certain it is that our Lord brings out in this answer a depth of meaning in the words, which without it we could not discover. The ground-work of His argument seems to me to be this:—the words 'I am God' imply a covenant; there is another side to them: "thou art Mine" follows upon "I am thine." When God therefore declares that He is the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, He declares their continuance in this covenant, It is an assertion which could not be made of an annihilated part of the past. And notice also that Abraham's (κ.κ.) body, having had upon it the seal of the covenant, is included in this.—Stier remarks that this is a weighty testimony against the so-called 'sleep of the soul' in the intermediate state. Compare πάντες γὰρ αὐτῷ ζώον Luke xx. 38. Thus the 'burden' of the Law, 'I am the Lord thy God,' contains in it the seed of immortality and the hope of the resurrection.

34—40.] Mark xii. 28—34. In the more detailed account of Mark, (Luke has a similar incident in another place, x. 25,) this question does not appear as that of one maliciously tempting our Lord: and his seems to me to the view to be taken,—as there could not be any evil consequences to our Lord whichever way He had answered the question. See the notes there.—34.] ἐγὼ τῷ αὐτῷ is local; not of their purpose. —35.] νομίσεως is only used here by Matt.: often by Luke. They were Mosiac Jurists, whose special province was the interpretation of the Law. γραμματεία is a wider term, including them. —παράδειγμα See above. —36.] τοια ἄντ. μεγ. Not, 'which is the great commandment;'—but, which (what kind of a) commandment is great in the law?' In Mark, otherwise.—37. κυρ. τ. θ. σοῦ] Not, 'the LORD
ταῖς δυσὶν ἐντολάις ὅλος ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφηταὶ κρῆμανται.

41 Συνηγμένων δὲ τῶν Φαρισαίων ἐπιρώθησαν αὐτοὺς ὁ Ἰσαώγος λέγων Τί υμῖν δοκεί περὶ τοῦ χριστοῦ; τίνος νῦς ἐστί; λέγουσιν αὐτῷ Τοῦ Δαυὶδ. 42 λέγει αὐτοῖς Πῶς ὁν Δαυὶδ ἐν πνεύματι κύριον αὐτὸν καλεῖ, λέγων

43 Ἐπειπὲν ὁ Κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου Κάθου εἰκ δεξίων μου, ἐνθάν θω τοὺς εἰχθοὺς σου ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν σου. 44 εἰ σὺν Δαυὶδ καλεῖ αὐτὸν κύριον, πῶς νῦς αὐτὸν ἐστί; 45 καὶ οὕτως ἐδυνάτο αὐτῷ ἀποκριθῆναι λόγον, οὐδὲ ἔτολμησε τίς ἡμέρας ἐπερωτήσας αὐτὸν οὐκέτι.

XXIII. 1 Τότε ὁ Ἰσαώγος ἐλάλησε τοῖς ὁχλοῖς καὶ τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ λέγων Ἐπὶ τῆς Μασσωίς καθέδρας


as thy God,—but, 'the LORD thy God.'
41—46.] Mark xii. 35—37. Luke xx. 41—44. The Lord now questions His adversaries (according to Matt., in Mark and Luke He asks the question not to, but concerning the Scribes or interpreters of the law), and again convicts them of ignorance of the Scriptures. From the universally recognized title of the Messiah as the Son of David, which by His question He elicits from the Scribes, He takes away to show them, who understood this title in a mere worldly political sense, the difficulty arising from David's own reverence for this His Son: the solution lying in the incarnate Godhead of the Christ, of which they were ignorant.—It is lamentable to see the subtleties to which rationalism is driven in its disingenuous work of robbing us of God's revelation of Himself to men. De Wette holds (Exeg. Handbuch, p. 238) that our Lord's view was to show that the Messiah was not the Son of David! that the Psalm has no reference to the Messiah (!), and was not written by David at all!! Surely such a man might have spared himself the trouble of commenting on a book or a character which he values so lightly. Can we imagine that our Lord could have answered without remark the call of the blind men at Jericho, ch. xx. 30, 31, if such had been the case? But the whole comment is too shallow and stupid to require more notice than to be pointed out for warning.—Mark adds to this "the common people heard Him gladly:"
—see ver. 37. Here then end the endeavours of His adversaries to entrap Him by questions: they now betake themselves to other means.

' Nova dehinc quasi scena se pandit.'
Bengel.

CHAP. XXIII. 1—39.] Peculiar to Matthew.
—1.] Much of the matter of this discourse is to be found in Luke xi. and xiii. On its appearance there, see the notes on those passages. There can, I think, be no doubt that it was delivered, as our Evangelist here relates it, all at one time, and in these the last days of our Lord's ministry. On the notion entertained by so many recent critics, of Matthew having rearranged the scattered sayings of the Lord into longer discourses, see Prolegomena to Matthew. A trace of this discourse is found in Mark xii. 38—40, Luke xx. 45—47. In the latter place it is spoken to the disciples, in hearing of the crowd: which (see ver. 8 ff.) is the exact account of the matter. It bears many resemblances to the Sermon on the Mount, and may be regarded as the solemn close, as that was the opening, of the Lord's public teaching.

—Moses' seat, is the office of judge and lawgiver of the people: see Exod. ii. 13—26. Deut. xviii. 9—13. The Lord says, 'In so far as the Pharisees and Scribes enforce the law and precepts of Moses, obey them: but imitate not their conduct.'—θέσις καθέων must not be pressed too

Vol. I.
strongly, as conveying blame: 'have seated themselves'—it is merely stated here as a matter of fact. Vv. 8, 10 however apply to their leadership, as well as their faults: and declare that among Christians there are to be none sitting on the seat of Christ.

3. ἑανάκα τὸν δεί καὶ τιν [εἰρήνην] with ecc. but τοῖς αὐτῶν [οἰκεῖοι Β. Ἡλίας].

The stress here is on the ὅν—because they sit on Moses' seat: and this clears the meaning, and shows it to be, 'all things which they, as successors of Moses, out of his law, command you to observe, do there being a distinction between their lawful teaching as exponents of the law, and their frivolous traditions superadded thereto, and blamed below. —τηρεῖν—to observe, e. g. a thing already commanded: it is not ποιεῖν. —4.] The warning was, imitate them not—for they do not themselves what they enjoin on others. And this verse must be strictly connected with ver. 3. The ἀφορίσεις then are not, as so often misinterpreted (even by Olshausen, i. 334), human traditions and observances, but the severity of the law, which they enforce from others, but do not observe (see Rom. ii. 21—23). The ἀφορίσεις here are the Ἐξειδίκευσε τοις νόμοις of ver. 23. The irksomeness and unbearableness of these rites did not belong to the Law itself, as rightly explained, but were created by the rigour and ritualism of these men, who followed the letter and lost the spirit: 'ομονοματική inaudita (says Grotius) iritibus urgens et amplitudinis. —τῆς δὲ ἀρίθμου, not τοῦτος: there is no emphasis here. —5—7.] But whatever they do perform, has but one motive. —φασιζόμενος—Heb. Tephillin, were strips of parchment with certain passages of Scripture, viz. Exod. xiii. 11—17 and 1—11, Deut. xi. 13—22. vi. 4—10, written on them, and worn on the forehead between the eyes, on the left next the heart, and on the left arm. The name in the text was given because they were considered as charms. They appear not to have been worn till after the captivity; and are still in use among the rabbinical Jews.—Their use appears to have arisen from a superstitious interpretation of Deut. vi. 8, 9. The fringes were commanded to be worn for a memorial, Num. xv. 38. On τῷ ἑανάκα τὸν δεί καὶ τιν. see Luke xiv. 7.—τοῦ is probably corrupt. It nowhere occurs in the conjunction sense in the Evangelists. —9—10.] The prohibition is against loving, and in any religious matter, using, such titles, signifying dominion over the faith of others. It must be understood in the spirit and not in the letter. Paul calls Timotheus his 'eun', in the faith, 1 Tim. i. 2, and exhorts the Corinthians (1 Cor. xi. 1) to be fol-
KATA MATΩAION.
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καὶ 1 πατέρα μὴ καλέσητε * ὃμοι ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς* εἰς γὰρ ἐστιν ὁ πατὴρ ὦμῶν ὁ ἐν [τοῖς] οὐρανοῖς. 10 μὴ δὲ κλησθῆτε καθηγταί, *εἰς γὰρ ὦμῶν ἐστῖν ὁ καθηγητὴς*. 11 ὁ δὲ *μείζων ὦμῶν ἐσται ὦμῶν* διακονος. 12 ὃς ὄντι δὲ ὁ ὑψωσει ἑαυτῶν ὁ ταπεινωθήσεται, καὶ ὃς ὃς τεταπεινωσει ἑαυτῶν ὑψώσεται. 13 οὐαὶ μὴ γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοι ὑποκρίται, ὅτι *κατεσθίετε τὰς οἰκίας τῶν* χρημάτων, καὶ ὁ προφάσεις μακρὰ προσευχόμενοι ἀδιά τούτο ἐλπίζεσθε ο προσευχότερον κρίμα. 14 οὐαὶ δὲ ὦμοι γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοι ὑποκρίται, ὅτι *κλείετε τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν* ἐμπροσθέν τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὑπὲρ οὐκ ἐτρωγότας τῶν γάρ οὐκ


text could not be rendered due to the presence of images and symbols.
admitting to, Knowledge, but the Knowledge itself, the plain simple interpretation of Scripture which would have admitted them, and caused them to admit others, into the Kingdom of Heaven, by the recognition of Him of whom the Scriptures testify; whereas now by their perverse interpretations they had shut out both themselves and others from it. See a notable instance of this perversion of the Pharisees in John xii. 24. They shut the door as it were in men's faces who were entering. —15.—And with all this betrayal of your trust as of διδάσκαλος τοῦ Ἰσραήλ (John iii. 10), as if all your work at home were done, ye πετράγ. τ. Θ. κ. Λ. This was their work of supererogation—not commanded them, nor in the spirit of their law. The Lord speaks not here of those pious Godfearing men, who were found dwelling among the Jews, favouring and often attending their worship—but of the proselytes of righteousness, so called, who by persuasion of the Pharisees took on them the whole Jewish law and its observances. These were rare—and it was to the credit of our nature that they were. For what could such a proselyte, made by such teachers, become? A disciple of hypocrisy merely—neither a sincere heathen nor a sincere Jew—doubly the child of Hell—condemned by the religion which he had left—condemned again by that which he had taken. —16—23.—The Lord forbade all swearing to His own disciples, ch. v. 34; and, for the very same reason,—because every oath is really and eventually an oath by God—shows these Pharisees the validity and solemnity of every oath. "This subterfuge became notorious at Rome. Ecco negas, juroque mihi per templum Tontanis = non credo: juro, verpe, per Anchialum = am chai aloh (as God liveth). Martial, xi. 94" (F. M.). The gold here is probably not the ornamental gold but the Canaanite temple, which hallowed it, and the gift than the altar—not as if this were of any real consequence, except to show their folly—for, vv. 20—22, every oath is really an oath by God. But these men were servants only of the Temple (ὁ οἶκος ἢμῶν, ver. 39) and the altar, and had forgotten God.—The reading κατασκονσάτω, ver. 21, is remarkable, as God did not then dwell in the Temple, nor had He done so since Captivity.—ὅπερ, is bound (see Exod.
kathmenw epánw autou. 23 ouai umin grammatiakai kai 

arissaiou upokritai, oti an apostekatouste to 'housmon 
kai to athena kai to kumion, kai afikate ta 

baryteria tou vnomou, t' krisin kai * ton * elon kai ton 
pistin' tauna * edei poiasai, kakeina mi arfitai.

24 * Oi nogoioi tufloi, oi diwloipoi tov kwnou, tov 
kamphon katanovites. 25 ouai umin grammatiakai kai 
arissaiou upokritai, oti katharizete to exedon tou 
pnoirion kai tis parousidou, eswthen de geumoun [e] 
aragyn kai * akariaxia. 26 Farrisaios tufhe, katharison 
pwonton to entos tou pnoirion kai tis parousidou, ina 
gennetai kai to ektos * auton katharon. 27 ouai umin 
grammatiakai kai arissaiou upokritai, oti * paromoloi 
tafoui kekonimenei, ouiteres eswthien men 

eukratia, eswthen de geumoun oswmen nekron kai paige 
d' akariaxia. 28 ou to kai umi eswthen men 

eukratei tois antrupoi * dikaiou, eswthen de 

mestoi esti * upokriseis


Eth. txt C. — 27. dromizete B. — for ouiteres . . . . . . . . . . . . 

gramoun, eswthen o tafos phainai

xxix. 37). — 23, 24.] It was doubtful whether 

Levit. xxvii. 30 applied to every smallest 

est garden herb: but the Pharisees, in their 

over-rightin in externalities, stretched it to this 

and then, if for the sake of these they be 

observed, the others should not be neglected. 

Stier gives an instance of this, in (Scripture) 

Philology, which if it be applied in 

subjected to a worthy appreciation of the 

sense and spirit of the Writer, may profitably 

descend to the minutest details: but if the 

Philologist begin and end with his 

micrology, he incurs the mori kai tufli 

of the Pharisees (ii. 815). — The straining 

the gnats, is not a mere proverbial say- 

ing. The Jews (as do now the Buddhists 

in Ceylon and Hindostan) strained their 

wine, &c., carefully, that they might not 

violate Levit. xi. 20. 23. 41, 42 (and, it 

might be added, Lev. xvii. 10—14). The 

camel is not only opposed as of immense 

size, but is also unclean. — 25—28.] This 

woe is founded not on a literally, but a 

typically denoted practice of the Pharisees. 

Our Lord, in the everdeepening denuncia- 

tion of His discourse, has now arrived at 

the delineation of their whole character and 

practices by a parabolic similitude. — Ye- 

monen le, not, 'are filled by' (Dr. Burton), 

but, 'are full of.' ye wph in Hebrew. The 

straining out of the gnats is a cleansing par- 

taining to the esoph, as compared with 

the inner composition of the wine itself, of 

which the cup is full: see Rev. xviii. 3.— 

iya gey. The exterior is not in reality 

pure when the interior is foul: it is not a 

clean cup,' unless both exterior and interior 

be clean: 'alias enim illa munditiae externa 

non est munditiae.' Bengel. — tapo. 

koxon. The Jews used once a year (on the 

fifteenth of the month Adar) to whitewash the 

spotes where graves were, that persons might 

not be liable to uncleanness by passing over 

them (see Numb. xix. 18). — This goes to 

the root of the mischief at once: your heart
is not a temple of the living God, but a grave of pestilential corruption: not a heaven, but a hell! And your religion is but the whitewash—hardly skin deep!—39—33.]
The guilt resting on these present Pharisees from being the last in a progressive series of generations of such hypocrites and persecutors, forms the matter of the last Woe. The burden of this hypocrisy is, that they, being made godparents to their fathers, were treading in their steps, but vainly disavowing their deeds, were, by the very act of building the sepulchres of the prophets, joined with their prophet-persecuting acts, convicting themselves of continuity with their fathers' wickedness. See, as clearly setting forth this view, Luke xi. 47, 48.—(Sit lixivivus, dummodo non virus). Instead of the penitent confession, "We have sinned, we and our fathers," this last and worst generation in vain protests against their participation in their fathers' guilt, which they are meanwhile devoting to the utmost, and filling up its measure (Acts vii. 52). Stier (ii. 518)—ver. 38 repeats almost verbatim the first denunciation of the Baptist—in this, the last discourse of the Lord: thus denoting the unchanged state of these men, on whom the whole preaching of repentance had now been expended. One weighty difference however there is: there was, τὰ ὑπάθειαν ὑμᾶς φησίν; the wonder was, how they betought themselves of escaping—νῦν, τώσον Φιλάυγης: how shall ye escape? On ἰγὼ see Rev. xii. 9. —34.]
From the parallel place in the former discourse (see notes there), Luke xi. 49, it would appear that the did τοῦρε refers to the whole last denunciation; 'quae cum suas sint'—since ye are bent upon filling up the iniquities of your fathers, in God immutable purposes ye shall go on rejecting His messengers. Notice the difference between νὰ σοφία τοῦ θ. in Luke xi. 49, and ἰγὼ here.—These words are nowhere written in Scripture, nor is it necessary to suppose that to be our Lord's meaning. He speaks this as Head of His Church, of those whom He was about to send: see Acts xii. 1. 1 Cor. xii. 8. Eph. iii. 5. He cannot, as some (Olah.) think, include Himself among those whom He sends—the Jews may have crucified many Christian teachers before the destruction of Jerusalem. See Euseb. H. E. iii. 32, where he relates from Hegesippus the crucifixion of Symeon son of Clopas, in the reign of Trajan.—The προφῆται were the Apostles, who, in relation to the Jews, were such—the σοφοί, Stephen and such like, men full of the Holy Ghost—the γραμματεύς, Apollos, Paul (who indeed was all of these together), and such. On πατὴρ ἐν τ. ἡμῖν κ.τ.λ. see Acts v. 40. xxv. 19. xxvi. 11. —35.] ἀλαρδοκοροήθησαι is a
common expression in the O.T. See 2 Kings xxii. 16. xxiv. 4. Jer. xxvi. 18; and more especially Lam. iv. 13, which perhaps our Lord referred to in speaking this. — ὧν ἤθελεν. Thus in Babylon, Rev. xviii. 24, is found the blood of all that were slain upon the earth. Every such signal judgment is the judgment for a series of long-crying crimes—and these judgments do not exhaust God's anger, Is. ix. 12. 17. 21.—The murder of Abel was the first in the strife between unrighteousness and holiness, and as these Jews now represent the murderers of the first, they must bear the vengeance of the whole in God's day of wrath.—Who Zacharias son of Barachias is, has been much disputed. At least we may conclude that it cannot be (as Aug. and Greswell suppose) a future Zacharias, mentioned by Josephus, B. J. xxvii. 21, and of 4, as sibi Baruch, and slain in the temple just before the destruction of Jerusalem—for the Lord evidently speaks of an event past, and never prophesies in this manner elsewhere. Origen has preserved a tradition (iv. 228), that Zacharias father of John the Baptist was slain by them in the temple; but in the absence of all other authority, this must be suspected as having arisen from the difficulty of the allusion here. Most likely (see note on Luke xi. 51) it is Zacharias the son of Jehoiada, who was killed there, 2 Chron. xxiv. 21, and of whose blood the Jews had a saying, that it never was washed away till the temple was burnt at the captivity.—ὁ λαός Βαραχίου does not occur in Luke xi. 51, and perhaps was not uttered by the Lord Himself, but may have been inserted by mistake, as Zacharias the prophet was son of Barachiah. — ἀντι τ. τ. κ. τ. ἐ.] He was killed in the priests' court, where the altar of burnt-offerings was. Abel also was killed by his offering. On ver. 36 see note on ch. xxiv. 34.—It is no objection to this interpretation, that the whole period of the Jewish course of crime is not filled by it: the death of Abel can by no explanation be brought within its limits or responsibility; and the Lord's saying reaches far deeper than a mere announcement of their responsibility for what they themselves had done. The Jews stood in the central point of God's dealings with men; and so were they the chosen for the election of grace, so, rejecting God and His messengers, they became, in an especial and awful manner, vessels of wrath. —The Lord mentions this murder, not as being the last even before His own day, but because it was connected specially with the cry of the dying man, 'The Lord look upon it and require it.' Compare Genesis iv. 10.—This death of Zacharias was the last in the arrangement of the Hebrew Canon of the O.T., though chronologically that of Uriah, Jer. xxvi. 23, was later.—37.] These words were before spoken by the Lord, Luke xiii. 34: see notes there. On the constr. ἀντι, see reff. —φῶς δὲ κ. τ. λ. must be understood of all the messages of repentance and mercy sent by the prophets, for the Lord's words embrace the whole time comprised in the historic survey of ver. 35, as well as His own ministry. On the similitude, see Deut. xxxii. 11. Ps. xvii. 3. xxxvi. 7. lxxii. 1. lxxi. 4. Is. xxxii. 5. Mal. iv. 2, and compare ch. xxiv. 28. —σω μ. See 1 Sam. xxvii. 12. xxx. 15. The tears of the Lord over the perverseness of Jerusalem are witnesses of the freedom of man's will to resist the grace of God. —38, 39.] This is the Lord's last and solemn departure from the temple —the true μεταβάσεις μου ἐντέθησα (mots excedentium Deorum. Tacitus). —οὐκ ἔσται —no more God's, but your house—i.e. primarily, the temple,—then Jerusalem,—and then the whole land in which ye dwell.—Οὐ μή με ἀλλ' —He did not show
CHAP. XXIV. 1. ἁκι ἐξελθὼν ὁ Ἰσραήλ ἐπορεύετο ἀπὸ τοῦ ΒΣΔ ἱεροῦ καὶ προσήλθον οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἐπιδείκται αὐτῷ τὰς οἰκοδομάς τοῦ ἱεροῦ. 2 ὁ δὲ Ἰσραήλ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ [Οὐ] βλέπετε πάντα ταῦτα; ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ ἀφεθῇ ὡδὲ 1 λίθος ἐπὶ λίθον, ὃς οὐ ἐν καταλύθηται.

καθημένον δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τοῦ ὄρους τῶν ἐλαιῶν, προσήλθον αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ κατ' ιδίαν λέγοντες Εἰπέ ὑμῖν πότε ταῦτα ἔσται, καὶ τί τὸ ἀσημέον τῆς σῆς παροουσίας καὶ ὅ 4 Kings xx. 8, 9. Ἐκδ. iii. 12. ch. xii. 55. p 1 Cor. xv. 25. Sc. James v. 7. ver. 25, 27, 28.

Himself to all the people after His resurrection, but only to chosen witnesses, Acts x. 41. — ἦν ἄν κἀκεῖνος] until that day, the subject of all prophecy, when your repentant people shall turn with true and loyal Hosannas and blessings to greet ‘Him whom they have pierced!’ see Deut. iv. 30, 31. Ἱσραήλ iii. 4, 5. Zech. xii. 10. xiv. 8—11. Stier well remarks, ‘He who reads not this in the prophets, reads not yet the Prophets aright.’—Προφητεύοντος, which is Luke’s usual form, does not occur elsewhere in Matt. This is to be accounted for by these verses being a solemn utterance of the Lord, and the sound yet dwelling on the mind of the narrator; and not by supposing the verses to be spurious and inserted out of Luke, as Wieseler has done, Chronolog. Synops. p. 322. His assertion that ver. 39 has no sense here, is implicitly refuted above.

CHAP. XXIV. 1—51.] Mark xili. 1—37. Luke xxii. 5—36. Matt. omits the incident of the widow’s mite, Mark xili. 41—44. Luke xxii. 1—4. — 1, 2.] Mk. expresses their remarks on the buildings—see note there—they were probably occasioned by ver. 36 of the last chapter. — Josephus writes, B. J. vii. 1, καθέναν Καίσαρ ἤθη τὴν τε κόλπων ἅπασαν καὶ τὸν νόμον κατασκεύασαν . . . τὸν δὲ ἄλλον ἅπασαν τῆς πόλεως περίβολον ὅπως ἠζώρησαν οἱ κατασκεύασαντες, ὡς μὴλ πωσεν οἰκισθήναι πιστῶν ἐν ἐπι παρασχεν τοῖς προσελθοῦσιν. There is no difficulty in οὐ here used interrogatively. See a similar case John vi. 70. — 3.] From Mark we learn that it was Peter and James and John and Andrew who asked this question. With regard to the question itself, we must, I think, be careful not to press the clauses of it too much, nor to make them bear separate meanings corresponding to the arrangements of the Lord’s discourse. As expressed in the other Evangelists, the question was concerning the time, and the sign, of these things happening, viz. the overthrow of the temple and desolation of Judaea, with which, in the then idea of the Apostles, our Lord’s coming and the end of the world were connected. Against this mistake He warns them, ver. 6. 14.—Luke v. 24.—and also in the two first parables in our ch. xiv. — For the understanding of this necessarily difficult prophetic discourse, it must be borne in mind, that the whole is spoken in the pregnant language of prophecy, in which various fulfilments are involved. (1) The view of the Jewish Church and its fortunes as representing the Christian Church and its history, is one key to the interpretation of this chapter. Two parallel interpretations run through the former part as far as ver. 28; the destruction of Jerusalem and the final judgment being both enwrapped in the words, but the former, in this part of the chapter, predominating. Even in this part, however, we cannot tell how applicable the warnings given may be to the events of the last times, in which apparently Jerusalem is again to play so distinguished a part. From ver. 28, the lesser subject begins to be swallowed up by the greater, and the Lord’s second coming to be the predominant theme, with however certain hints thrown back as it were at the event which was immediately in question: till, in the latter part of the chapter and the whole of the next, the second advent, and, at last, the final judgment ensuing on it, are the subjects. (2) Another weighty matter for the understanding of this prophecy is, that (see Mark xili. 32) any obscurity or concealment concerning the time of the Lord’s second coming, must be attributed to the right
cause, which we know from His own mouth to be, that the Divine Speaker Himself, in His humiliation, did not know the day nor the hour. All that He had heard of the Father, He made known unto His disciples (John xv. 15): but that which the Father kept in His own power (Acts i. 7), He could not in His abased humanity know. He told them the attendant circumstances of His coming; He gave them enough to guard them from error in supposing the day to be close at hand, and from carelessness in not expecting it as near. (Regarding Scripture prophecy as I do as a whole, and the same great process of events to be denoted by it, all will be but waste labour to be continually at issue, in the notes of this and the succeeding chapter, with Meyer and others, who hold that the Gospel prophecies are inconsistent in their eschatology with those after the Ascension, and those again with the chiliasm of the Apocalypse. How untenable this view is, I hope the following notes will show: but to be continually meeting it, is the office of polemic, not of exegetical theology.)—4, 5.]

The Lord does not answer the πόροι but by admonitions not to be deceived. See a question similarly answered, Luke xiii. 23, 24.—καὶ ἄρα. [This was the first danger awaiting them; not of being drawn away from Christ, but of imagining that these persons were Himself. Of such persons, before the destruction of Jerusalem, we have no distinct record; doubtless there were such; but (see above) I believe the prophecy and warning to have a further reference to the latter times in which its complete fulfilment must be looked for. The persons usually cited as fulfilling this (Theudas, Simon Magnus, Barchocab, &c.) are all too early or too late, and not correspondent to the condition, ἐν τῷ ὄντι μοι. See Greswell on the Parables, v. 380 note. Luke adds (ver. 9) to the speech of the false Christs, and ὁ καιρὸς ἠγέρθη. —6—8.] πόλεμοι and ἀκόλουθοι πολέμων there certainly were during this period; but the prophecy must be interpreted rather of those of which the Hebrew Christians would be most likely to hear as a cause of terror. Such undoubtedly were the three threats of war against the Jews by Caligula, Claudius, and Nero; of the first of which Josephus says, Antt. xix. 1, 2. Ἰωνίου τοῦ ἠμιτεροῦ οὕτω δὲ ὁ λίγον ἐξεγάγωμεν μὴ σκέτοις ἀλλ' ἀπολλεῖνα, μὴ ταχίας τούτων (Γαίως τε- λευτής παραγενομένης). Luke couples with πολ., ἀκαταστασισι, and to this ἵδειν ἐπὶ ἰδοὺς seems also to point. There were serious disturbances,—(1) at Alexandria, which gave rise to the complaint against and deposition of Flaccus, and Philo's work against him (A.D. 38), in which the Jews as a nation were the especial objects of persecution; (2) at Sardis about the same time (Josephus Antt. xviii. 9, 8, 9), in which more than 50,000 Jews were killed; (3) at Jannin, a city on the coast of Judea near Joppa (Philo Judeus, ii. 575). Many other such national tumults are recorded by Josephus. See especially B. J. ii. 17, 10, 18, 1—8, in the former of which places he calls the sedition προ- σομίμων ἀλάσσως, and says that ἑστας τῶν μετρίων ἵππαρκότα: and adds, δεινή δὲ δῆλη τὴν Σωφίαν ἐνίκησιν ταραξῆ, καὶ πάντα πόλεις εἰς δύο διήγητα στρατεύει. —Ἀμέρα and λοιμᾶς are usual companions—a proverb says, μαρτυρίς λυμάν λοιμάς. Greswell (vol. v. p. 260 note) shows that the famine prophesied of in the Acts (xi. 28) happened in the ninth of Claudius, A.D. 49. It was great at Rome,—and therefore probably Egypt and Africa, on which the Romans depended so much for supplies, were themselves much affected by it. Suetonius (Claud. 18) speaks of a sitidum stirilitatis; and Tacitus (Ann. xii. 45) of 'frugum egestas, et orts ex eo famine,' about
the same time. There was a famine in Judea in the reign of Claudius (the true date of which however Mr. Gresswell proves (Diiss. vol. ii. p. 5) to be the third of Nero, mentioned by Josephus (Antt. iii. 15, 3). And as to lógoi, though their occurrence might, as above, be inferred from the other, we have distinct accounts of a pestilence at Rome (A.D. 65) in Suetonius, Nero 30, and Tacitus Ann. xvi. 13, which in a single autumn carried off 30,000 persons at Rome. But such matters as these are not often related by historians, unless of more than usual severity. —σεμών] The principal earthquakes occurring between this prophecy and the destruction of Jerusalem were, (1) a great earthquake in Crete A.D. 46 or 47; (2) one at Rome on the day when Nero assumed the toga virilis, A.D. 51; (3) one at Pammêa in Phrygia, mentioned by Tacitus (Ann. xii. 58) A.D. 53; (4) one at Laodicea in Phrygia (Tacitus Ann. xiv. 27) A.D. 60; (5) one in Campania, Tacitus Ann. xv. 22. Seneca, Ep. 91, § 9 (cited by Mr. Gresswell, Parab. v. 356 note) in the year A.D. 58, writes: 'Quoties Asie, quoties Achaise urbem uno tremore consummatur! quod oppidum in via qua insurgeret Macedonia devorata sunt! Cyprium quoties vastavit hsec clades! quoe in se Phaphus corruptit! frequenter nobis nuntiati sunt totarum urbium interitus.' The prophecy, mentioning κατὰ τόπους, does not seem to imply that the earthquakes should be in Judea or Jerusalem. We have an account of one in Jerusalem, in Josephus, B. J. iv. 4, 5, which Mr. Gresswell (as above) places about Nov. A. D. 67. On the additions in Luke xxii. 11 see notes there; and on this whole passage see the prophesies in 2 Chron. xv. 5—7, and Jer. ii. 45, 46. —ἀγαθής η διάκονος] in reference to the παλαγγελία (ch. xix. 28), which is to precede the συντίμια τοῦ αἰωνοῦ. So Paul in Rom. viii. 12, πάσης ἡ ψυχής... συνέδεσα ἄρχε τοῦ νῦν. The deaththroes of the Jewish state precede the 'regeneration' of the universal Christian Church, as the deaththroes of this world the new heavens and new earth.—9—13.] τότε, before these things (the ἄρχε, ἄρχε, see note on Luke v. 12) have taken place; not 'after they have happened.' De Wette press this latter meaning, that he may find a contradiction to Luke v. 12, πρὶν ἐν τούτω ἀπάντησεν. These words serve only definitely to fix the time of the indefinite τότε, here and in ver. 10. The τότε in ver. 14 is altogether different.—For ἀντων. ἔρις, Luke has σακαλαθήσονται τολοί καὶ τοῖς ἀλλήλους καὶ μισήσουσιν ἀλλήλους. 11] καὶ τοῖς ἄνθρωποις ἐγερθήσονται καὶ πλανήσουσιν.
heathen licentiousness with the profession of Christianity. But perhaps we ought to have regard to the past tense of πληθυν-θηναι, and interpret, *because the iniquity is filled up,* on account of the horrible state of morality (parallel to that described by Thucydides (III. 82—4) as prevailing in Greece, which had destroyed all mutual confidence), the love and mutual trust of the generality of Christians shall grow cold. τῶν πολλῶν,—thus we have ch. xxv. 5, ἐνυπάκουεις πάσαν καὶ ἐκινήθην. Even the Church itself is leften by the distrust of the evil days. See 2 Thess. ii. 3. —13.] The primary meaning of this seems to be, that whoever remained faithful till the destruction of Jerusalem, should be preserved from it. No Christian, that we know of, perished in the siege or after it: see below. But it has ulterior meanings, according to which τίλος will signify, to an individual, the day of his death, (see Rev. ii. 10,—his martyrdom, as in the case of some of those here addressed,—to the Church, endurance in the faith to the end of all things. See Luke ver. 19, and note. —14.] We here again have the pregnant meaning of prophecy. The Gospel had been preached through the whole φυτευμα ταραττων, and every nation had received its testimony, before the destruction of Jerusalem: see Col. i. 6. 23. 2 Tim. iv. 17. This was necessary not only as regarded the Gentiles, but to give to God's people the Jews, who were scattered among all these nations, the opportunity of receiving or rejecting the preaching of Christ. But in the wider sense, the words imply that the Gospel shall be preached in all the world, literally taken, before the great and final end come. The apostasy of the latter days, and the universal dispersion of missions, are the two great signs of the end drawing near.—15.] Βεβαιωαι τις προφ. The LXX rendering (Alex. MS) of ἡ ἡμερήσιαν, the similar expression in ch. xi. 31, is rendered βεβ. ἡμερήσιαν, and in ch. ix. 27, το βεβαιωμεν τοις ἐρημωταις in the Vat. MS, and altogether differently in the Alex.—To what exactly in Daniel the words apply, is not clear. Like other prophecies, it is probable that they are pregnant with several interpretations, and are not yet entirely fulfilled. They are interpreted of Antiochus Epiphanes by the Alexandrine Jews; thus 1 Macc. i. 64 we read φασινισχωμεν βεβαιωμεν ἐρημωται κα το θυσιαστηριου. Josephus refers the prophecy to the desolation by the Romans: Antt. x. 11, 7. Δανιηλος κα πηρι της των Ἱουδαων ἡμοιοις ἀνώγας, και δη η αυτων ἐρημωθησαι. The principal commentators have supposed, that the eagles of the Roman legions are meant, which were βεβαιωται, inasmuch as they were idols worshipped by the soldiers. These, they say, stood, in the holy place, or a holy place, when they encamped round Jerusalem under Cestius Gallus first, a.d. 66, then under Vespasian a.d. 68, lastly under Titus a.d. 70. Of these the first is generally taken as the sign meant. Josephus relates, B. J. ii. 20, 1, that after Cestius was defeated, πολλοι των Ιππαρων Ιουδαιων, ὦτες βαπτιστηρια νυμος, ἀνεφίλητο της τοπως. But, without denying that this time was that of the sign being given, I believe that all such interpretations of its meaning are wholly inapplicable. The error has mainly arisen from supposing that the parallel warning of Luke (ver. 20), οδηγηθη περι πολυμονην υπο στρατοφεων την Ἱερ. τιτα γνωρισθαι ετη ἐρημωθης ατοθης is identical in meaning with our text and that of Mark. The two first Evangelists, writing for Jews, or as Jews, give the inner or domestic sign of the approaching calamity: which was to be seen in the temple, and was to be the abomination (always used of something caused by God), and here itself, see 2 Kings xxii. 2—7. Ezek. v. 11. vii. 8, 9, viii. 8—16) which should cause the desolation,—the last drop in the cup of iniquity. Luke, writing
for Gentiles, gives the outward state of things corresponding to this inward sign. That the Roman eagles cannot be meant is apparent: for the sign would thus be no sign, the Roman eagles having been seen on holy ground for many years past, and at the very moment when these words were uttered. Also τότες ἁγίας must mean the temple: see reft.—Now in searching for some event which may have given such alarm to the Christians, Josephus's unconscious admission (B. J. iv. 6, 3) is important: ἵνα γὰρ δὴ τίς παλαιός λόγος ἀνέβω, ἐνδά τινι τῆν πόλιν ἀλώσεθαι, καὶ καταθηκησόμεθα τὰ ἅγια νόμων κολλήσωμεν, στίχος ἐκεῖ καταστάσεως, καὶ χῆρας ἐλευθερία προμάληκτος ἢτονικός οὐκ ἀπίστησαν οἱ Ἰησοῦς διακή
νους λαύσους ἐπίστευσαν. The party of the Zelots, as we learn from ib. ch. iii. 6—8, had taken possession of the temple,—οὐ τῶν νεὼν τοῦ θ. φρονέων αὐτοὺς ποιοῦντες, καὶ καταφυγή καὶ τυφωνία αὐτοῖς ἢ τὸ ἅγιον. In the next section (8) he tells us that they chose one Phannias as their high-priest, an ignorant and profane fellow, brought out of the field,—ἐκτὸς ἐκείνης ἀλλοτρίως κατεδαφίσαν προφητείας, καὶ ταῦτα ἐπεθέταντο ἢται, καὶ τῆς προφητείας ἐπιδίωκειας. I own that the above cited passages strongly in-
duce me to think that if not this very impiety, some similar one, about or a little before this time, was the sign spoken of by the Lord. In its place in Josephus, this very event seems to stand a little too late for our purpose (A. D. 67, a year after the investment by Cestius): but the narrative occurs in a description of the atrocities of the Zelots, and without any fixed date, and they had been in possession of the temple from the very first. So that this or some similar abomination may have about this time filled up the cup of iniquity and given the sign to the Christians to depart. on one day, (μιᾷ ἐν σαββάτῳ,) and universal from all parts of Judea. Putting then Luke's expression and the text together, I think that some internal description of the holy place by the Zelots coincided with the approach of Cestius, and thus, both from without and within, the Christians were warned to escape. See note on Luke xxii. 20. — δ' ἁγίας, νοεῖν] This I believe to have been an ecclesiastical note, which like the doxology in ch. vi. 13, has found its way into the text. If the two first Gospels were published before the destruction of Jerusalem, such an admonition would be very intelligible. The words may be part of our Lord's discourse directing attention to the prophecy of Daniel (see 2 Tim. ii. 7, Dan. xii. 10); but this is not likely. They cannot be the words of the Evangelist, inserted to bespeak attention, as this in the three first Gospels is wholly without example.—16—18.] The Christian Jews are said (Euseb. H. E. iii. 5) to have fled to Pella, a town described by Josephus (B. J. iii. 3, 3) as the northernmost boundary of Perea. Eusebius says they were directed thither by a certain prophetic intimation (τῷ χρυσομένῳ), which however cannot be this; as Pella is said, on p. 317, to be beyond them:—Epiphanius (Her. i. 123, Nazar. vii. cited by Greswell, Par. p. 332,) that they προερχόμενοι εἰς τὸ ἄγ
γιον. —17.] A person might run on the flat-roofed houses in Jerusalem from one part of the city to another, and to the city gates. Perhaps however this is not meant, but that he should descend by the outer stairs, instead of the inner, which would lose time. —19, 20.] It will be most important that so sudden a flight should not be encumbered, by personal hindrances (τ. ἐν γ. ἤγ.), by hindrances of accom-
pansion (τ. ἐν γ. ἤγ.), see 1 Cor. viii. 28; and that those things which are out of our power to arrange, should be propitious,—weather, and freedom from legal prohibition. The words μὴ δὲ ἐν σαββάτῳ are peculiar to Matthew, and show the strong Jew-
ish tinct which pervades his record of our Lord's sayings. That they were not said as any sanction of observance of the Jew-
ish Sabbath, is most certain: but merely as
referring to the positive impediments which might meet them on that day, the shutting of gates of cities, &c., and their own scruples about travelling further than the ordinary Sabbath-day’s journey (about a mile English); for the Jewish Christians adhered to the law and customary observances till the destruction of Jerusalem. — 21, 22.] In ver. 19 there is probably also an allusion to the horrors of the siege, which is here taken up by the yap, see Deut. xxxviii. 49—57, which was literally fulfilled in the case of Mary of Peres, related by Josephus, B. J. vi. 3, 4.—The Lord still has in view the prophecy of Daniel (ch. xii. 1), and this citation clearly shows the intermediate fulfilment, by the destruction of Jerusalem, of that which is yet future in its final fulfilment: for Daniel is speaking of the end of all things. Then only will these words be accomplished in their full sense: although Josephus (but he only in a figure of rhetoric) has expressed himself in nearly the same language (B. J. proem. § 4): τα γονιων παιων ἀς αἰώνων ἀνυχήματα προς τα Ἰουδαίων ἄγαθαὶ μοι δοκεὶ κατὰ σύγκρας. — 23.] If God had not in His mercy shortened those days (ἡμίαρις ἐξελήφθως, Luke ver. 22) the whole nation (in the ultimate fulfilment, all flesh) would have perished: but for the sake of the chosen ones,—the believing,—or those who should believe,—or perhaps the preservation of the chosen race whom God hath not cast off, Rom. xi. 1,—they shall be beheaded. It appears that besides the cutting short in the Divine counsels, which must be hidden from us, various causes combined to shorten the siege. (1) Herod Agrippa had begun strengthening the walls of Jerusalem in a way which if finished would have rendered them πάσης ἀνθρωπίνης κριτικοῦ ἔνας, but was stopped by orders from Claudius, A.D. 42 or 43, Jos. Antt. xix. 7, 2. (2) The Jews being divided into factions among themselves had totally neglected any preparations to stand a siege. (3) The magazines of corn and provision were burnt just before the arrival of Titus; the words of Josephus are remarkable on this, κατεκαύντας το πλῆθος τῶν σιτῶν, ἓς ἀν αὐτοῦ ὡς ἐν ἄγαθα ἄνθρωπον ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἀνασκίμαται, ἵππων τάρατος ἔχει τότε πάντα τοῦ ἐν τῷ ἐν τοῖς παμην ἔστι; 1 Ιωσ. 7, 5. (5) The suddenness of the arrival of Titus, and the voluntary abandonment of parts of the fortifications by the Jews (B. J. vi. 8, 4). (6) Titus himself confessed, (B. J. vi. 9, 1, σω τοι γ’ ἰναλοιμ<stdionov, καὶ θὰς ἐν τοῖς ἰματίων Ἰουδαίων ἀνασκίμαται, ἵππων τάρατος τῶν ἐν τῷ ἐν τ


diairouv τὸ πλῆθος ἀνέφεδον . . . . . . . ··: their principal reference is to the latter days. In their first meaning, they would tend to correct the idea of the Christians that the Lord's coming was to be simultaneous with the destruction of Jerusalem: and to guard them against the impostors who led people out into the wilderness (see Acts xxi. 36) or invited them to consult they privately, with the promise of deliverance. In their main view, they will preserve the Church firm in her waiting for Christ, through even the awful troubles of the latter days, unmoved by enthusiasm or superstition, but seeing and looking for Him who is invisible. On the signs and wonders, see 2 Thess. ii. 9—12. Deut. xiii. 1—3.—

27, 28.) The coming of the Lord in the end, even as that in the type was, shall be a plain unmistakable fact, understood of all;—and like that also, sudden and all-prevading. But here again the full meaning of the words is only to be found in the final fulfilment of them. The lightning, lightning both ends of heaven at once, seen of all beneath it, can only find its full similitude in His Personal coming, Whom every eye shall see, Rev. i. 7. — 28.] In the similar discourse, Luke xvii. 36, before this saying, the disciples ask, 'Where, Lord?' The answer is,—first at Jerusalem; where the corrupting body lies, thither shall the vultures (literally) gather themselves together, coming as they do from far on the scent of prey. Secondly, in its final fulfilment,—over the whole world;—for that is the πτωμα now, and the ἀρετος the angels of vengeance. See Deut. xxviii. 49, which is probably here referred to; also Hosea viii. 1. Hab. i. 8. The interpretation (Theophylact. Euthym. Calvin, &c.) which makes the πτωμα our Lord, and the ἀρετος the Elect, is quite beside the purpose. Neither is any allusion (Lightfoot, Ham., Wetstein, Wolf, &c.) to the Roman eagles to be for a moment thought of. The ἀρετος are the vultures (vultur percornpectus, Linn.), usually reckoned by the ancients as belonging to the eagle kind. Plin. Nat. Hist. ix. 3. — 29] εἰδέναι— all the difficulty which this word has been supposed to involve has arisen from confounding the partial fulfilment of the prophecy with its ultimate one. The important insertion of vv. 23, 24 in Luke, shows us that the θλιψις includes ἄργη ἐν τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ, which is yet being inflicted: and the treading down of Jerusalem by the Gentiles, and still going on (see note there): and immediately after that tribulation, which shall happen when the cup of Gentile iniquity is full, and when the Gospel shall have been preached in all the world for a witness, and rejected by the Gentiles, (παροιμοιαζόμενος εἰς τὸν θλιβόμενον,) shall the coming of the Lord Himself happen. On the indefiniteness of this assigned period in the prophecy, see note on ver. 3. (The expression in Mark is equally indicative of a considerable interval: ἐν λειτουργίᾳ ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις μετὰ τὴν θλίψιν ἱερατείαν.) The fact of His coming and its attendant circumstances being known to Him, but the exact time unknown, He speaks without regard to the interval, which would be employed in His waiting till all things are put under His feet: see Rev. i. 1. xxiii. 6. 20. — In what follows, from this verse, the Lord speaks mainly and directly of His great second coming. Traces there are (as e.g. in the literal meaning of ver. 34) of slight and indirect allusions to the destruction of Jerusalem;—as there were in the former part to the great events of which that is a overshadowing: — but no direct mention. The contents of the rest of the chapter may be set forth as follows: (ver. 29) signs which shall immediately precede (ver. 30) the coming of the Lord to judgment, (ver. 31) to bring salvation to His Elect. The certainty of the event and its intimate connexion with its premonitory signs, ver. 32, 33; the endurance (ver. 34) of the Jew-
30. For in **τῷ οὐρανῷ**, τοῦ **ιν οὐρανῶν D d.**

iah people till the end—even till Heaven and Earth (ver. 35) pass away. But (ver. 36) of the day and hour none knoweth. Its suddenness (vv. 37—39) and decisiveness (ver. 40, 41) and exhortation (vv. 42—44) to be ready for it. A parable setting forth the blessedness of the watching, and misery of the neglectful servant (vv. 44—end), and forming a point of transition to the parables in the next chapter. — δὲ θανάτος σωροῦ. The darkening of the material lights of this world is used in prophecy as a type of the occurrence of trouble and danger in the fabric of human societies, Is. v. 30. xiii. 10. xxxiv. 4. Jer. iv. 26. Ezek. xxxii. 7, 8. Amos viii. 9, 10. Micah iii. 6. But the type is not only in the words of the prophecy, but also in the events themselves. Such prophecies are to be understood literally, and indeed without such understanding would lose their truth and significance. The physical signs shall happen (see Joel iii. 4. Hagg. ii. 6, 21, compared with Heb. xii. 26, 27) as accompaniments and intensifications of the awful state of things which the description typifies. The Son of this world and the Church (Mal. iv. 2. Luke i. 78. John i. 9. Eph. v. 14. 2 Pet. i. 19) is the Lord Jesus—the Light, the Knowledge of Him. The moon—human knowledge and science, of which it is said (Ps. xxxvi. 9), 'In Thy light shall we see light;' reflected from, and drinking the beams of, the Light of Christ. The stars—see Dan. viii. 10. Rev. i. 20. xii. 1—are the leaders and teachers of the Church. The Knowledge of God shall be obscured—the Truth nigh put out—worldly wisdom darkened—the Church system demolished, and her teachers cast down. And all this in the midst of the fearful signs here (and in Luke, vv. 25, 26, more at large, where see notes) recounted: not setting aside, but accompanying, their literal fulfilment. — *καὶ τότε φανερωθήσεται* w. ch. xii. 7, Luke vi. 48. Acts iv. 21. xvi. 30. Ps. xix. 7. "καὶ τότε Κύριος εὐφαντάζεται πάσης αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς, καὶ θυσιάζεται τόν οὐρανών τόν ἄνθρωπον ἑξειμένην ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ μετὰ δυνάμεως καὶ δόξης πολλῆς." kai aπo- τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ θάνατος σωροῦ. **—πολλῆς καὶ δόξης D ἀποκρ. Cypr.**
angel and the trump of God are distinguished from one another, which seems to favour the reading which inserts καθε. This is not the great Trumpet of the general Resurrection (1 Cor. xv. 52), except in so far as that may include also the first resurrection: see on this verse the remarkable opening of Ps. 1., which is itself a prophecy of these same times (see note on Luke v. 25). — 32, 33, 34.] This coming of the Lord shall be as sure a sign that the Kingdom of Heaven is nigh, as the putting forth of the tender leaves of the fig-tree is a sign that summer is nigh. Observe ἀρχάριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ —this coming of the Son of Man included, which will introduce the millennial Kingdom.—As regards the parable,—there is a reference to the withered fig-tree which the Lord cursed; and as that, in its judicial unfruitfulness, emblematised the Jewish people, so here the putting forth of the fig-tree from its state of winter dryness, symbolizes the future reinvincence of that race, which the Lord (ver. 34) declares shall not pass away till all be fulfilled. That this is the true meaning of this verse, must appear when we recollect that it forms the conclusion of this parable, and is itself joined by ἀρχάριον to the verse following. We cannot go back to the taking of Jerusalem and make the words apply to it.—As this is one of the points on which the rationalising interpreters (De Wette, &c.) lay most stress to show that the prophecy has failed, it may be well to show that γενεά has in Hellenistic Greek the meaning of a race or family of people. See Jer. viii. 3 in LXX; compare ch. xxiii. 36 with ver. 35, ἐφονευσαται...but this generation did not slay Zacharias—so that the whole people are addressed: see also ch. xii. 45, in which the meaning absolutely requires this sense (see note there): see also Luke xvii. 25. Matt. xvii. 16. Luke xvi. 8, where γενεά is predicated both of the οὐλος τοῦ ἡλίου οὖν and the οὐλος τοῦ φωτός. Acts ii. 40. Phil. ii. 15. In all these places γενεά is ὑνος, or nearly so; having it is true a more pregnant meaning, implying that the character of one generation stamps itself upon the race, as here in this verse also. The continued use of παρέρχεσθαι in these two verses should have saved the commentators from the blunder of imagining that the then living generation were meant, seeing that the prophecy is by the next verse carried on to the end of all things. But, as Stier well remarks, "there are men foolish enough now to say, Heaven and Earth will never pass away, but the words of Christ pass away in course of time; of this however we wait the proof." vol. ii. p. 371. On ver. 35 see Ps. cxix. 39. Is. xi. 8. li. 6. Ps. cii. 26. ἀνότατα —all the signs hitherto recounted—so that both these words and υἱοί have their partial, and full meanings. ἀνότατα τοῦ Χριστοῦ. —viz. τοῦ λόγου. —36.] τοῦ ἔρωτος. —36.] τοῦ Χριστοῦ.
course of humiliation undertaken by the Son, in which He increased in wisdom (Luke ii. 52), learned obedience (Heb. v. 6), uttered desires in prayer (Luke vi. 12, &c.),

This matter was hidden from Him: and as I have already remarked, this is carefully to be borne in mind in explaining the prophecy before us. — 37—39] This comparison also occurs in Luke xvii. 26, 27, with the addition of 'the days of Lot' to it: see also 2 Pet. ii. 4—10. iii. 5, 6. It is important to notice the confirmation, by His mouth who is Truth itself, of the historic reality of the flood of Noah.—The expression πιστότητα may serve to show that it is a mistake to imagine that we have in Gen. ix. 20 the account of the first wine and its effects.—The security here spoken of is in no wise inconsistent with the anguish and fear prophesied Luke v. 25, 26. They say, there is peace, and occupy themselves as if there were: but fear is at their hearts:—surgit amari aliquid, quod inians floribus angit. — On the addition in Luke, vv. 34—36, see notes there. — 40, 41.] From this point (or perhaps even from ver. 37, as historic resemblance is itself parabolic) the discourse begins to assume a parabolic form, and gradually forms a series of formal parables in the next chapter.—These verses set forth that, as in the times of Noah, men and women shall be employed in their ordinary work. They also show us that the elect of God will to the last be mingled in companionship and partnership with the children of this world (see Mark i. 19, 20).—We may notice, that these verses do not refer to the same as vv. 16 — 18. Then it is a question of voluntary flight: now of being taken (by the angels, ver. 31), or left. Nor again do they refer to the great judgment of ch. xix. 31, for then (ver. 32) all shall be summoned: but they refer to the millenary dispensation, and the gathering of the elect to the Lord then. — 42—44.] The Lord here resumes the tone of direct exhortation with which He commenced. To the secure and care-
ανθρώπου ἐρχεται. 45 τίς ἄρα ἔστιν ὁ πιστός δύοιος καὶ ΒΔ
φρόνιμος, ὅπως ἑκάστην ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τής
* * * θεραπείας αὐτοῦ, τοῦ † διὸνει αὐτοίς τήν τροφήν ἐν ΒΔ
καιρῷ; 46 μακάριος ὁ δύολος ἐκεῖνος ὃν ἐλθὼν ὁ κύριος
αὐτοῦ ἐρήμησε ποιοῦντα ὦτος. 47 ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι
ἐπὶ ταῖς ὑπάρχουσιν αὐτοῦ καταστήσει αὐτῶν.
ἐὰν δὲ ἐπὶ τὸ κακὸν δύολος ἐκεῖνος ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ
αὐτοῦ Χρονίζει τὸ κύριος μοι [ἐλθέν] 48 καὶ ἀρέσται
τύπτειν τοὺς συνδύοντας † αὐτοῦ, † ἐσθη δὲ καὶ † πίνῃ
μετὰ τῶν μεθυόντων, 50 ἢ ἔστιν ὁ κύριος τοῦ δύολον ἐκείνου
ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὑπὸ προσδοκαὶ καὶ ἐν ὧρᾳ τῇ ὧν ὁ γινώσκει,
καὶ διὸνομοῦσει αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὸ † μέρος αὐτοῦ μετὰ τῶν
ὑποκρίτων † θέσει ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμός καὶ ὁ βρυγμός
Luke i. 31 al. 1 Gen. xliii. 27. m ch. xliii. 20 al. x Lam. ii. 15. 3 ver. 59.
† p 1 add Exod. xlix. 19. see Rev. xlii. 8. 7 ch. viii. 19 al.

Ἀθ. Arm.—rec. ἑσθην δ. ε. πίνειν with (Schol.) many const. MSS., but txt
K M al.—for δι, ἐν C Syr. Copt. Ἑθ. Bas.

less, He will come as a thief in the night:
to His own, as their Lord. See Obad. 5.
Rev. iii. 3. xvi. 1. Thess. v. 1—10,
where the idea is expanded at length. Compare
ver. 7 there with our ver. 49, and on the
distinction between those who are of
the day, and those who are of the night,
see notes there. —45—47.] The Lord had
given this parabolic exhortation before,
Luke xii. 42—47. Many of these His last
sayings in public are solemn repetitions of,
and references to, things already said by
Him. That this was the case in the present
instance, is almost demonstrable, from
the implicit allusion in Luke xii. 36, to
the return from the wedding, which is here
expanded into the parable of ch. xcv. 1 ff.
How much more natural that our Lord
should have preserved in his parabolic dis-
courses the same leading ideas, and again
and again gathered His precepts round them,—than that the Evangelists should
have thrown into utter and inconsistent
confusion, words which would have been
treasured up so carefully by them that
heard them,—to say nothing of the pro-
posed help of the Spirit to bring to mind
all that He had said to them.—τίς ὡς
ἐστιν.] A question asked that each one may
put it to himself,—and to signify the high
honour of such an one.—πιστ. κ. ἐφ.]
Prudence in a servant can only be the
consequence of faithfulness to his master.—This
verse is especially addressed to the Apostles
and ministers of Christ. The διδόναι τὴν
tροφήν (= τὸ στοιχεῖον Luke xii. 42)
answers to ἑργάζεσθαι ἀνεπαίχνιστον, ὄρθο-
τομονωτα τῶν λόγων τῆς ἀλήθ. in 2 Tim.
ii. 16. On ver. 47 compare chap. xcv. 21.
1 Tim. iii. 12. Rev. ii. 26. iii. 21, which
last two passages answer to the promise here,
that each faithful servant shall be
over all his master's goods. That
promotion shall not be like earthly promotion,
wherein the eminence of one excludes that
of another—but rather like the diffusion of
love, in which, the more each has, the
more there is for all. —48—51.] The question
is not here asked again, τίς ἔστιν κ. τ.λ.,
but the transition made from the good to the
bad servant, or even the good to the
bad mind of the same servant, by the epithet
cατός.—χρονίζειν then manifestly a
long delay is in the mind of the Lord: see
above on ver. 28. Notice that this servant
also is one set over the household—one who
says τῶν κύριος μου—and begun well—but
now ἐντυφνυται, &c.—falls away from
his truth and faithfulness; the sign of
which is that he begins to καταπεμπεῖν
τῶν ἐλάφων 1 Pet. v. 3, and to revel with
the children of the world. In consequence,
though he have not lost his belief (ὁ κύρ.
μου), he shall be placed with those who
believed not, the hypocrites.—51. ἐφ. refers
to the punishment of cutting, or sawing
asunder: see Dan. ii. 5. iii. 29. Sus. ver.
59: see also Heb. iv. 12. The expression
XXV. 1.—4. KATA MATHEAION.

tων ὁδόντων. XXV. 1. Τότε * ὑμιῶθησαι ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν δέκα παρθίνοις, αἴτινες λαβώσαι τὰς λαμπάδας αὐτῶν ἐξήλθον ἵνα ἀπάντησιν τοῦ νυμφοῦ. BCDZ 2 πέντε δὲ ἦσαν ἐξ αὐτῶν φρόνιμοι, καὶ [αἱ] πέντε μωραὶ. 3 ἀἴτινες μωραὶ λαβώσαι τὰς λαμπάδας *εὐανθὸν οὐκ ὑπάρχει τῷ νυμφών. Acts xvi. 14. 4. Τότε εἶπεν ἦλασον μὲν εὐανθὸν ἑλασών 1 αἱ δὲ φρόνιμοι ἑλασών 2 ἑλασον ἐν τοῖς ἁγγείας αὐτῶν μετὰ τῶν λαμπάδων. v. ch. xiii. 48


here is perhaps not without a symbolical reference to that dreadful muddling of the conscience and practice which shall be the reflective torment of the condemned:—and by mingling and confounding of which only is the anomalous life of the willful sinner made in this world tolerable.

CHAP. XXV. 1.—18. | Peculiar to Matthew. — 1.] Τότε—at the period spoken of at the end of the last chapter, viz. the coming of the Lord to His personal reign—not His final coming to judgment.— ἔδειξα ὑμῖν. The subject of this parable is not, as of the last, the distinction between the faithful and unfaithful servants; no outward distinction here exists—all are virgins—all companions of the bride—all furnished with brightly-burning lamps—all, up to a certain time, fully ready to meet the Bridegroom—the difference consists in some having made a provision for feeding the lamps in case of delay, and the others none—and the moral of the parable is the blessedness of endurance unto the end. ' In so vertitur summa parabole, quod non satis est ad officium semel accinctos suisse et parastos, nisi ad finem usque duremus.' Calvin, cited by Stier, l. 686. There is no question here of apostasy or unfaithfulness—but of the want of provision to keep the light bright against the coming of the bridegroom however delayed.—Ten was a favourite number with the Jews—ten men formed a congregation in a synagogue. In a passage from Rabbi Salomo, cited by Wetzstein, he mentions ten lamps or torches as the usual number in marriage processions: see Luke xix. 13. — εἰς ἀνώ τ. ν.] It would appear that these virgins had left their own homes, and were waiting somewhere for the bridegroom to come, probably the house of the bride; for the object of the marriage procession was to fetch the bride—not the bridegroom's house. Meyer however supposes that in this case the wedding was to be held in the bride's house, on account of the thing signified—the coming of the Lord to His Church—but it is better to take the ordinary custom, and interpret accordingly, where we can. In both the wedding parables (see ch. xxii.) the bride does not appear—for she, being the Church, is in fact the aggregate of the guests in the one case, and of the companions in the other. We may perhaps say that she is here, in the strict interpretation, the Jewish Church, and these ten virgins Gentile congregations accompanying her. The reading καὶ τῆς νύφης is probably an interpolation, such as is of frequent occurrence in D. and its cognates.—This ἔδειξεν is not their final going out in ver. 6, for only half of them did so—but their leaving their own homes: see λαβοῦσα—ἔλασον, &c., v. 3. 4. The interpretation is—these are souls come out from the world into the Church, and there waiting for the coming of the Lord—not hypocrites, but faithful souls, bearing their lamps—the inner spiritual life fed with the oil of God's Spirit (see Zech. iv. 2—12. Acts x. 38. Heb. i. 9). All views of this parable which represent the foolish virgins as having only a dead faith, only the lamp without the light, the body without the spirit, &c., are quite beside the purpose—the lamps (see ver. 8) were all burning at first, and for a certain time.—Whether the equal partition of wise and foolish have any deep meaning we cannot say; it may be so.—3. 4.] These were not torches or wicks fastened on staves, as some have supposed, but properly lamps: and the oil vessels (which is most important to the parable) were separate from the lamps. The lamps being the hearts lit with the flame of heavenly love and patience, supplied with the oil of the Spirit,—now comes in the difference between the wise and foolish—the one made no provision for the supply of this oil—the other did. How so? The wise ones gave all diligence to make their calling and election sure (2 Pet. i. 10 and 5—8), making their bodies, souls, and
spirits (their vessels, 2 Cor. iv. 7. 1 Thess. iv. 4) a supply of spiritual food for the light within, by seeking, in the appointed means of grace, more and more of God's Holy Spirit. The others did not this—but trusting that the light once burning would ever burn, made no provision for the strengthening of the inner man by watchfulness and prayer. — 5—7.] χρονιστ. : comp. ch. xxiv. 48. But the thought of the foolish virgins is very different from that of the wicked servant: his—there will be plenty of time, my Lord tarrieth;—thine, surely He will soon be here, there is no need of a store of oil. This may serve to show how altogether diverse is the ground of the two parables. — 6. παροικ. κ. 4κ. I believe no more is meant here than that all, being weak by nature, gave way to drowsiness, as indeed the wakefulness of the holiest Christian, compared with what it should be, is a sort of slumber:—but, while the way, how much difference was there between them! — ἐνυστ.] We have, Aristoph. Vesp. 12, ἐνυστειτείς;—6. κρανγῇ γ᾽.] see Is. ixii. 5—7; and the porter's duty, Mark xiii. 34. This warning cry was before the coming: see ver. 10. —7. πάντων] All now seem alike—all wanted their lamps trimmed—but for the neglectful, there is not wherewith! It is not enough to have burned, but to be burning, when He comes. Raise the wick as they will, what avail it if the oil is spent? — 8, 9.] σφ. 'are going out,' —not as E. V.—Μητρ. ὡς ἰρ. ] see Ps. xlix. 7. Rom. xiv. 12. No man can have more of this provision than will supply his own wants. — τοικαιο. 5.] This is not said in mockery, as some (Luther, Calv.) suppose: but in earnest.—οἱ παρεφώτες are the ordinary dispensers of the means of grace—ultimately of course God Himself, who alone can give His Spirit. The counsel was good, and well followed—but the time was past. (Observe that those who sell are a particular class of persons—no mean argument for a set and appointed ministry—and moreover for a paid ministry. If they sell, they receive for the thing sold. This selling bears no analogy with the crime of Simon Magus in Acts viii.) — 10—12.] We are not told that they could not buy—that the shops were shut—but simply that it was too late—for that time. For it is not the final coming of the Lord to judgment, when the day of grace will be past, that is spoken of,—except in so far as it is hinted at in the back-ground, and in the individual application of the parable (virtually, not actually) coincides, to each man, with the day of his death. This feast is the marriage supper of Rev. xix. 7—9—xx. 4—6: after which, these improvident ones gone to buy their oil shall be judged in common with the rest of the dead, ibid. v. 12, 13. — so serve here, as below, ἰρ. The ἰρ. is very different, as the whole circumstances are different, from ὄλοις αὐτοῖς οὐκ ἰρ. in ch. vii. 23, where the ἐνυστειτε ἰρ. ἰρ. binds it to the παρέσχει ἰρ. ἰρ. in our
13 Ἐντολήσετε δόν, δι' αὐτῶν ἵµέραν ὡραν τὴν ἁµέραν. 14 ὅπως γὰρ ἀνθρωπος ἀποδηµητὰς ἐκάςε ἀπὸ τοὺς ἰδίους δοῦλους καὶ παρέδωκεν αὐτοῖς τὰ υπάρχοντα αὐτοῦ, 15 καὶ ᾧ µὲν ἐδώκε οὔτε τάλαντα, ᾧ δέ δύο, ᾧ ἐν τῇ ἡµέρᾳ καὶ ἐν τῇ ἡµέρᾳ δύον. 16 ὅπως λαβών ἡµέραν καὶ ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐν τῇ ἡµέρᾳ, 17 ἀνείνατο καὶ οὗ τὰ δύο ἐκδόθη [καὶ αὐτοῖς] ἀλλὰ δύο. 18 οὐκ οὗ τοῦ ἱεροτεληθέντος καὶ τῷ γῇ καὶ ἐκρυψε τοῦ ἐν αὐτῶν τῷ κυρίῳ αὐτοῦ. 19 ἐν τῷ γῇ καὶ ἐν τῷ γῇ, ὅπως λόγον πολλάν χρόνον ἐκείνων καὶ τῶν συναίρει μετ' αὐτῶν λόγον. 20 καὶ προσελθὼν ἀνεινάτο τὸ τὸν λαβὼν προφήτηκεν ἀλλὰ πεντε τάλαντα λέγων Κύριε πέντε τάλαντα µοι παρέδωκας, ἵδε ἀλλα


ver. 41, and to the time of the final judgment, spoken of in that parable.

14—30.] Peculiar to Matthew. The similar parable contained in Luke xix. 11 — 27 is altogether distinct, and uttered on a different occasion: see notes there. 14.] καὶ ἐν — the elipsis is rightly supplied in Luke xix. 11. "For the Kingdom of Heaven is as a man..." See this parable and the preceding one alluding to in very few words by Mark xii. 34 — 36. In it we have the active side of the Christian life, and its danger, set before us, as in the last contemplative side. There, the foolish virgins failed from thinking their part too easy — here the wicked servant from thinking his too hard. The parable is still concerned with Christians (τοῖς ἰδίους δοῦλους), and not the world at large. — We must remember the relation of master and slave, in order to understand his delivering to them his property, and punishing them for not fructifying with it.

—15.] In Luke each receives the same, but the profit made by each is different: see notes there. Here in fact they did each receive the same, for they received according to their ability — their character and powers. There is no Pelagianism in this, for each man's powers are themselves the gift of God. — 16—18.] Each of the two faithful servants' increase was the full amount of their talents — of each will be required as much as has been given. — ἔφησεν is not a Latinism (conferere pecuniam), but answers to ποιεῖν καρπὸν ch. iii. 10. — The third is not to be confounded with the wicked servant in ch. xxiv. 48. This one is not actively an ill-doer, but a Hider of the money intrusted to him, one who brings no profit: see on ver. 24. — 19—23.] μετὰ χρόνων πολλῶν. — Here again, as well as in the χρονιζ. of ver. 5 and xxiv. 48, we have an intimation that the interval would be no short one. — This proceeding is not, strictly speaking, the last judgment, but still the same as that in the former parable; the beginning of judgment at the house of God — the judgment of the millennial advent. This, to the servants of Christ (τοῖς ἰδίους δοῦλους ver. 14), is their final judgment — but not that of the rest of the world. We may observe that this great account differs from the coming of the bridgemen, inasmuch as this is altogether concerned with a course of action past — that with a present state of preparation. This holds of the account after the resurrection: that, at the utmost (and not in the direct sense of the parable even so much), of being ready for His summons at death. — 30.] The faithful servant does not take the praise to himself — µετὰ παρέδωκας is his confession — and ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ the enabling cause of his
πέντε τάλαντα ἐκέρδησα [ἐπ’ αὐτοῖς]. 21 ἡφι [ἐδε] αὐτῷ ABCD ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ Ἐν δούλε ἀγαθε καὶ πιστε, ἐπὶ ὀλίγα ἡς πιστοῖς, ἐπὶ "πολλῶν σε καταστήσω" εἰσέλθει εἰς τὴν ἀρχὰν τοῦ κυρίου σου. 22 προσελθὼν δὲ καὶ ο τὰ δύο τάλαντα [λαβὼν] ἐπεί Κύριε δύο τάλαντα μοι παρέδωκας, ἵδε ἄλλα δύο τάλαντα ἐκέρδησα [ἐπ’ αὐτοῖς]. 23 ἡφι αὐτῷ ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ Ἐν δούλε ἀγαθε καὶ πιστε, ἐπὶ ὀλίγα ἡς πιστοῖς, ἐπὶ πολλῶν σε καταστήσω" εἰσέλθει εἰς τὴν ἀρχὰν τοῦ κυρίου σου. 24 προσελθὼν δὲ καὶ ο τὸ ἐν τάλαντοι εὐληφῶς ἐπεί Κύριε, ἐγνώς σε ὅτι σκληρός εἰ ἀνθρωπος, ἃθρηζον ὅπου οὐκ ἐσπειρας, καὶ ἴσων ἐνο "διεσκόρπισα" καὶ φοβηθείς, απέλυσεν ἐκρυψα τὸ τάλαντον σου ἐν τῇ γῇ, ἵδε ἐχει τὸ σῶν. 25 ἀποκρηθείς δὲ ο κύριος αὐτοῦ εἰπὲν αὐτῷ Ποινή δούλε καὶ ἀκνηρ, ὑδεις ὅτι θερίζω ὅπου οὐκ ἐσπειρας, καὶ συνάγω φθον πάλιν ὑμῖν διεσκόρπισα; 27 ἐδέχοντες αὐτὸν σε ἀβαίνει τὸ ἀργυρίον μου ὅτι τραπεζίας, καὶ ἐλθὼν ἐγὼ ἐκομισμην αὐτὸ τό


gain—'without Me, ye can do nothing,' John xv. 6. This is plainer in Luke (xix. 10), ἢ μνα σου προσφερχασα δικα μνας. See 1 Cor. xv. 10—and on the joy and alacrity of these faithful servants in the day of reckoning, 1 Thess. ii. 19. 2 Cor. i. 14. Phil. iv. 1. — 21.] In Luke = διη ἐν ἐλαιαίῳ διπλάς ἰγκον, ἵθα ἐξεύρισεν ἰγκῶν ἐπὶ δικα πολλῶν—where see note. (I cannot imagine with Meyer that ὅ is to be taken with ἵπτα διλήγα ἡς παρ., or that it will not bear the sense of 'Well done!' Although ἵπτας is the more usual word, we have (see Passow) in later Greek such expressions as μακ ῥα, which is as near as possible to that meaning.)—The ἁρχὰ here is not a feat, as sometimes interpreted, but that joy spoken of Heb. xii. 2, and Is. liv. 11—that joy of the Lord arising from the completion of His work and labour of love, of which the first Sabbatical rest of the Creator was typical—Gen. i. 31. ii. 2—and of which His faithful ones shall stand in the end partake: see Heb. iv. 3—11. Rev. iii. 21. Notice the identity of the praise and portion of him who had been faithful in less, with those of the first. — 24. 26.] This sets forth the excuse which men are perpetually making of human infirmity and inability to keep God's commands, when they never apply to that grace which may enable them to do so—an excuse, as here, self-convicting and false at heart. — ἐπίθετον ὅπως ὃς ἐκείνης D abe A C K. The connexion of thought in this the Lord's last parable, with His first (ch. xiii. 3—9), is remarkable. He looks for fruit where he has sown—this is truth; but not beyond the power of the soil by Him enabled—this is man's lie, to encourage himself in idleness. — φθ. see Gen. iii. 10. But that pretended fear and this insolent speech are inconsistent, and betray the falsehood of his answer. — ἔχως τὸ σῶν This is also false—it was not τό σῶν—for there was his lord's time,—and his own labour, which was his lord's,—to be accounted for.— 26, 27.] Luke prefixes οτι τοῦ στάμάτος σου καταισ ας,—viz., because, knowing the relation between us, that of absolute power on my part over thee,—if thou hast really thought me such an hard master, ὅς ει κ.τ.λ., in order to avoid utter ruin.—But this was not thy real thought—thou wert σουρὸς κ. ὀξηρός. The ὑπθ. ὅς is not concessive, but hypothetical;—God is not really such a Master— τοις τραπ. in Luke (xix. 23) ἵπτα τὶν τράπεζαν—τραπεζίτας is interpreted κολοβομητής (see ch. xxi. 12) by Hesychius. There was a saying very current among the
early Fathers, τίνος δέκαυον τραπετισμάτων, which some of them seem to attribute to the Lord, some to one of the Apostles. It is supposed by some to be taken from this place, and it is just possible it may have been: but it more likely was traditional, or from some apocryphal gospel. Suicer Thea, under the word, discusses the question, and inclines to think it a way of expressing the general moral of the two parables in Matt. and Luke.—But, in the interpretation, who are these τραπετισματι; The explanation (Olah, and adopted by Trench, Par. 247) of their being those stronger characters who may lead the more timid to the useful employment of gifts which they have not energy to use, is objectionable, (1) as not answering to the character addressed—he was not timid, but false and slothful;—and (2) nor to the facts of the case: for it is impossible to employ the grace given to one through another’s means, without working one’s-self. I rather take it to mean, ‘If thou hast really been afraid, &c., slothful as thou art, thou mightest at least, without trouble to thyself, have provided that I should have not been defrauded of the interest of my money—but now thou art both slothful and wicked, in having done me this injustice.’ Observe there would have been no praise due to the servant—but ῥόμον would not have lost its τάκτος. The machinery of religious and charitable societies in our day is very much in the place of the τραπετισματι.—Let the subscribers to them take heed that they be not in the degraded case of this servant, even if his excuse had been genuine. —

26—31.] This command is answered in Luke xix. 25, by a remonstrance from those addressed, which the Master overrules by stating the great law of His Kingdom. In ch. xiii. 12 we have explained this as applied to the system of teaching by parables. Here it is predicative of the whole Christian life. It is the case even in nature: a limb used is strengthened; disused, becomes weak. The transference of the talent is not a matter of justice between man and man, but is done in illustration of this law, and in virtue of that sovereign power by which God does what He will with His own: see Rom. xi. 29, and note there.—In τῷ σκ. τῷ ζ. there is again an allusion to the marriage supper of the Lamb, from which the useless servant being excluded, gnashes his teeth with remorse without: see ch. xxii. 13.

31—46.] Peculiar to Matthew. —31—46.] In the two former parables we have seen the difference between, and judgment of, Christians—in their inward readiness for their Lord, and their outward diligence in profiting by His gifts. And both these had reference to that first resurrection and millennial Kingdom, the reality of which is proved by the passages of Scripture cited in the notes above, and during which all Christians shall be judged. We now come to the great and universal judgment at the end of this period, also prophesied of distinctly in order in Rev. xx., in which all the dead, small and great, shall stand before God. This last great judgment answers to the judgment on Jerusalem, after the Christians had escaped from it: to the gathering of the eagles (ministers of vengeance) to the carcasse. Notice the precision of the words in ver. 31, Σκατά Σε ἀπολύειν—εἰς τοὺς ἐκατοντάκις ἠμίσθη οἱ συναντηθέντες. Compare for the better understanding of the distinction, and connection of these two ‘comings’ of the Lord, I Thess. iv. 16,17, and 2 Thess. i. 7—10.—This description is not a parable, though there are in it parabolic passages, e.g. ὥσπερ ὁ θεός τοιμάζεται, and for that very
reason, that which is illustrated by those likenesses is not itself parabolic. It will heighten our estimation of the wonderful sublimity of this description, when we re-
collect that it was spoken by the Lord only three days before His sufferings! — \( \text{ἐν τῷ δὲ σάββατῳ} \) This expression, repeated again at the end of the verse, is quite distinct from \( \text{ἡμέραν τῶν ἄνδρων} \) and \( \text{ἡμέραν τῶν άνδρῶν} \) in Rev. xix. 11. This His glory is that also of all His saints, with whom He shall be accompanied: — see Jude, ver. 14. In this His coming they are with the angels, and as the angels: — see Rev. xix. 14 (comp. v. 8). Zech. xiv. 5. — 38. The expression \( \text{πάντα τὰ θύην} \) implies all the nations of the world, as distinguished from the εἰλαστεροῖ already gathered to Him, just as the Gentiles were by that name distinguished from His chosen people the Jews. Among these are “the other sheep which He has, not of this fold.” John x. 16. — \( \text{ἀφορισμένοι κ.τ.λ.} \) — see Ezek. xxxiv. 17. The sheep are those referred to in Rom. ii. 7, 10—the goats, in v. 8, 9, where this same judgment according to works is spoken of. — 34. The King — here for the first and only time does the Lord give Himself this name: — see Rev. xix. 16. Rom. xiv. 9. — \( \text{Δέξατε κ.τ.λ.} \) Whatever of good these persons had done, was all from Him from whom cometh every good gift — and the fruit of His Spirit. And this Spirit is only purchased for man by the work of the Son, in whom the Father is well pleased: and to whom all judgment is committed. And thus they are the blessed of the Father, and those for whom this kingdom is prepared. It is not to the purpose to say that these εὐλογημένοι . . . must be the work of God in the stricter sense (οἱ ἐκεῖστεροι) — and that, because the Kingdom has been prepared for them from the foundation of the world. For evidently this would in the Divine omniscience be true of every single man who shall come to salvation, whether belonging to those who shall be found worthy to share the first resurrection or not. The Scripture assures us of two resurrections: the first, of the dead in Christ, to meet Him and reign with Him, and hold (1 Cor. vi. 2) judgment over His servants; the second, of all the dead, to be judged according to their works. And to what purpose would be a judgment, if all were to be condemned? And if any escape condemnation, to them might the words of this verse be used: so that this objection to the interpretation does not apply. — Election to life is the universal doctrine of Scripture; but not the reprobation of the wicked: — see below, on ver. 41. On ἐκάκησθησάται κόσμων see John xvii. 24. 1 Pet. i. 20. — 35. ἔσχατην ἡμέραν — received me with hospitality — took me in; the idea is, numbered me among your own circle. — 37—40.] The answer of these δικαίου appears to me to show plainly (as Olshausen and Stier interpret it) that they are not to be understood as being the covenanted servants of Christ. Such an answer it would be impossible for them to make; who had done all distinctly with reference to Christ, and for His sake, and with His
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ἐποίησαμεν; 38 τότε δέ σε εἴδομεν ξένου καὶ συνηγά
gομέν, ἡ γυμνόν καὶ περιεβάλομεν; 39 τότε δέ σε εἴδομεν ἀσθενῆς ἡ ἐν φυλακῇ καὶ ἡλθόμεν πρὸς σε; 40 καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ βασιλὲς ἦτοί αὐτοῦ Ἀμὴν λέγω υἱῆς, ἐφ’ ἐστι ὑμᾶς ἐν τοῖς διδακτών μου τῶν x ch. xx. 82. ἐλαχίστων, ἦμοι ἐποίησατε. 41 τότε ἦτοι καὶ τοῖς ἐνωμένοις. 42 ἐπείνασα γὰρ καὶ οὐκ ἐδώκατε μοι φαγεῖν, ἐδύσατε καὶ οὐκ ἐποίησατε με. 43 ἔσον ἡμῖν καὶ οὐ συνηγάγατε με, γυμνὸς καὶ οὐ περιεβάλατε με, ἀσθενῆς καὶ ἐν φυλακῇ καὶ οὐ ἐπεκτάτησε με. 44 τότε ἀποκριθῆ
σονται Τ καὶ αὐτοὶ λέγοντες Κύριε πότε σε εἴδομεν πεινώντας ἡ διψώντα ἡ ξένον ἡ γυμνόν ἡ ἀσθενῆς ἡ ἐν φυλακῇ καὶ οὐ διδακτόπισαν σοι; 45 τότε ἀποκριθῆσαται αὐτοῖς λέγων Ἀμὴν λέγω υἱῆς, ἐφ’ ὑμῶν οὐκ ἐποίησατε ἐν τοῖς διδακτών ἐλαχίστων, οὔτε ἦμοι ἐποίησατε. 46 Καὶ


declaration of ch. x. 40—42 before them. Such a supposition would remove all reality, as indeed it has generally done, from the Lord’s description. See the remarkable difference in the answer of the faithful servants, vv. 20. 22. The saints are already in His glory—judging the world with Him (1 Cor. vi. 2)—accounted as parts of, representatives of, Himself (ver. 40)—in this judgment they are not the judged (John v. 24. 1 Cor. xi. 31). But these who are the judged, know not that all their deeds of love have been done to and for Christ—they are overwhelmed with the sight of the grace which has been working in and for them, and the glory which is now their blessed portion. And notice, that it is not the works, as such, but the love which prompted them—that love which was their faith,—which felt its way, though in darkness, to Him who is Love,—which is commended. — τῶν διδακτῶν. Not necessarily the saints with Him in glory—though primarily those—but also any of the great family of man. Many of those here judged may never have had opportunity of doing these things to the saints of Christ properly so called.—In this is fulfilled the covenant of God to Abraham, ἐνσώματοι εἰς τῷ σωμάτω σου πάνω τὰ ὀφθή τῆς γῆς. Gen. xxii. 18.—42—43.] It is very important to observe the distinction between the blessing, ver. 34, and the curse here. 'Blessed —of my Father:'—but not 'cursed of my Father,' because all man’s salvation is of God—all his condemnation from himself. The Kingdom, prepared for you; but fire, prepared for the devil and his angels—not, for you! because there is election to life—but no reprobation to death:—a book of Life—but no book of Death; no hell for man—because the blood of Jesus hath purchased life for all: but they who will serve the devil must share with him in the end.—The repetition of all these particulars shows how exact even for every individual the judgment will be. Stier excellently remarks, that the curse shows the termination of the High Priesthood of Christ, in which office He only intercedes and blesses. Henceforth He is King and Lord—His enemies being now for ever put under His feet.—44, 45.] see note on ver. 37. —The sublimity of this description surpasses all imagination—Christ, as the Son of Man, the Shepherd, the King, the Judge—as the centre and end of all human love—bringing out and rewarding His latent grace in those who have lived in love—overlastingly punishing those who have quenched it in an unloving and selfish life—and in the accomplishment of His mediatorial office, causing, even from
out of the iniquities of a rebellious world, His sovereign mercy to rejoice against judgment. — [46.] see John v. 28, 29; and as taking up the prophetic history at this point, Rev. xxii. 1—8. Observe, the same epithet is used for κόλασις and ζωή—which are here contraries—for the ζωή here spoken of is not bare existence, which would have annihilation for its opposite; but blessedness and reward, to which punishment and misery are antagonist terms.

Chap. xxvi. 1, 2.] (Mark xiv. 1. Luke xxii. 1.) The public office of the Lord as a Teacher having been now fulfilled, His priestly office begins to be entered upon. He had not completed all His discourses, for He delivered after this, those contained in John xiv—xvii. but not in public; only to the inner circle of His disciples. Henceforward commences the narrative of His passion. — [47.] This gives no certainty as to the time when the words were said: we do not know whether the current day was included or otherwise. But thus much of importance we learn from them: that the delivery of the Lord to be crucified, and the taking place of the Passover, strictly coincided. The solemn mention of them in this connexion is equivalent to a declaration from Himself, if it were needed, of the identity, both of time and meaning, of the two sacrifices; and serves as the fixed point in the difficult chronological arrangement of the history of the Passion. The latter clause, καὶ ἅδε κ. ἡλ. depends on οὗτοι as well as the former. The Lord had doubtless before joined these two events together in His announcements to His disciples. To separate this clause from the former, ' and then' &c. seems to me to do violence to the construction. It would require καὶ τότε. 3—5.] This assembling has no connexion with what has just been related, but follows rather on the end of ch. xxiii. — ἐκ δὲ λεγόμενος K. is in Jos. Antt. xviii. 2, 2, ἑως τότε ὁ καὶ Καίσαρ. Valerius Gratus, Procurator of Judæa, had appointed him instead of Simon ben Kamith. He continued through the procuratorship of Pontius Pilate, and was displaced by the procural Vitalias, A.D. 36. See note on Luke iii. 2. — τοῦ λεγ. does not mean 'surnamed,' but (see ver. 14) implies that some name is to follow, which is more than, or different from, the real one of the person. — [48.] This expression must be taken as meaning the whole period of the feast—the seven days. On the feast-day, i. e. the day on which the Passover was sacrificed (E. V.), they could not lay hold of and slay any one, as it was a day of sabbatical obligation (Exod. xii. 10). See note on ver. 17.

6—13.] (Mark xiv. 3—9. John xii. 1—8. On Luke vii. 36—50, see note there.) This history of the anointing of the Lord is here inserted out of its place. It occurred six days before the Passover, John xii. 1. It perhaps can hardly be said that in its position here, it accounts in any degree for the subsequent application of Judas to the Sanhedrim (vers. 14—16) since his name is not even mentioned in it: but I can hardly doubt that it originally was placed where it here stands by those who were aware of its connexion with that application. The paragraphs in the beginning of this chapter come in regular sequence, thus: The Lord announces His approaching Pas-
TOU LEPPOU, 'PROSEBHNEV AVTOGY GYNY 'ALABASTROV MIROU
"XOUSA * M E BAPRITMNOV, KAI 'KATHEEVN EPI * TIN KAFALIN
AVTOU ANAKOIMENOU. "IDOUTES DE OI MAHTAI AVTOU 'HYGA-
VAKTSAH LEOYNTE EIS T' HATPOLEIA AVH; 'H HNOITAO
GAAT TOUTO ' 'PRATHNIAI PALLLOV KAI DOHTHIAI * PTOXHOS.
' GNOV DE OI IROUS EIPEN AVTOIS T' KOPONOS 'PARXETE
'Y GYNAKIE; 'ERGOV YAO KALON ' 'ERGASATO EIS EME.
' PANTOTE YAO TOWS PTOXHOS EKTE MEV 'EIVATON, EME DE
OY PANTOTE EKTE. 12 'BALOUSA YAO AVH T' MIROU TOUTO
'EP I TOU SWMATOS OU, PROV TO 'ENTHAIASAI ME EPOISEN.
' AMH YEGO XMNON, ONPO EAN YEN KHRVCHTO TO OYAGELVON
x Gen. 1. 2. John xix. 40. y ch. iii. 1, etc.

sion: the chief priests, &c. meet and plot His capture, but not during the feast: but when Jesus was in Bethany, &c. occasion was given for an offer to be made to them, which led to its being effected, after all, during the feast. On the rebuke given to Judas at this time having led to his putting into effect his intention of betraying the Lord, see notes on John xii. The trace of what I believe to have been the original reason of the anointing being inserted in this place, is still further lost in Mark, who instead of του χαιη[μον ... has και των απροε... just as if the narrative, at the end instead of our τοτα περετθηκα ... has και των απροε... as if there were no connexion between the two. It certainly cannot be said of Matthew (De Wette, Neander, Stier) that he relates the anointing as taking place two days before the Passover: of Mark it may be said.—It may be observed that Luke relates nothing of the Lord’s visits to Bethany.—6. ΧΩΜΕΝΑΣ υπο λ. Not at this time a leper, or he could not be at his house receiving guests. It is at least possible, that he may have been healed by the Lord. Who he was, is wholly uncertain. From Martha serving (John xii. 2) it would appear as if she were at home in the house (Luke x. 38 sqq.); and that Lazarus was one των ανακειμενων need not necessarily imply that he was a guest properly so called. He had been probably (see John xii. 9) absent with the Lord at Ephraim, and on this account and naturally for other reasons would be an object of interest, and one of the ανακειμενων. —7. ΑΛΑΒΑΣΤΡΟΝ] ΔΥΟΓΟΝ ΜΥΡΟΝ ΜΗ ΧΟΝ ΛΩΦΗ; ΛΙΘΟΣ, Η ΛΙΘΟΥ ΜΥΡΟθηΠ, Suidas. See Herodot.
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(xiv, 8.) and the εἰς τὴν Ἰ. τοῦ ἱστ. μον τέτηρες αὐτὸ του John (xii. 7) point even more strongly to her intention.—

18.] The only case in which the Lord has made such a promise. We cannot but be struck with the majesty of this prophetic announcement: introduced with the peculiar and weighty ἀμὴν λέγω ἦν, conveying, by implication, the whole mystery of the ἀγγελίας which should go forth from His death as its source,—looking forward to the end of time when it shall have been preached in the whole world,—and specifying the fact that this deed should be recorded wherever it is preached. We may notice (1) that this announcement is a distinct prophetic recognition by the Lord of the existence of written records, in which the deed should be related; for in no other conceivable way could the universality of mention be brought about: (2) that we have here (if indeed we needed it) a convincing argument against that view of our three first Gospels which supposes them to have been compiled from an original document: for if there had been such a document, it must have contained this narrative, and no one using such a Gospel could have failed to insert this narrative, accompanied by such a promise, in his own work; which Luke has failed to do: (3) that the same consideration is equally decisive against Luke having used, or even seen, our present Gospels of Matthew and Mark. (See the English Translation of Schleiermacher’s Essay on Luke, p. 121.) (4) As regards the practical use of the announcement, we see that though the honourable mention of a noble deed is thereby recognised by the Lord as a legitimate source of joy to us, yet by the very nature of the case all regard to such mention as a motive is excluded. The motive was Love alone.

14—16.] (Mark xiv. 10. Luke xxii. 3. See also ἤδη, John xiii. 2.) When this took place, does not appear. In all probability, immediately after the conclusion of the Lord’s discourses, and therefore coincidently with the meeting of the Sanhedrin in ver. 3. As these verses bring before us the first overt act of Judas’s treason, I will give here what appears to me the true estimate of his character and motives. In the main, my view agrees with that given by Neander, in his Leben Jesu, p. 688. I believe that Judas at first became attached to the Lord with much the same view as the other Apostles. He appears to have been a man with a practical talent for this world’s business, which gave occasion to his being appointed the Treasurer, or Bursar, of the company (John—xii. 6. xiii. 29). But the self-seeking, sensuous element, which his character had in common with that of the other Apostles, was deeper rooted in him; and the Spirit and love of Christ gained no such influence over him as over the others, who were more disposed to the reception of Divine things. In proportion as he found our Lord’s progress disappoint his greedy anticipations, did his attachment to Him give place to coldness and aversion. The exhibition of miracles alone could not keep him faithful, when once the deeper appreciation of the Lord’s Divine Person failed. We find by implication a remarkable example of this in John vi. 60—66, 70, 71, where the denunciation of the one unfaithful among the twelve seems to point to the (them) state of his mind, as already beginning to be scandalized at Christ. Add to this, that latterly the increasing clearness of the Lord’s announcements of His approaching passion and death, while they gradually opened the eyes of the other Apostles to some terrible event to come, without shaking their attachment to Him, were calculated to involve in more bitter disappointment and disgust one so disposed to Him as Judas was.—The actually exciting causes of the deed of treachery at this particular time may have been many. The reproof administered at Bethany (on the Saturday evening probably), disappointment at seeing the triumphal entry followed not by the adhesion but by the more bitter enmity of the Jewish authorities,—the denunciations of the Lord in ch. xxii. xxiii. rendering the breach irreparable,—and perhaps His last announcement in ver. 2, making it certain that His death would soon take place, and sharpen-
ing the eagerness of the traitor to profit by it:—all these may have influenced him to apply to the chief priests as he did. With regard to his motive in general, I cannot think that he had any design but that of the darkest treachery. See further on this the note on ch. xxvii. 3. —15.] δοτήρας may be either 'weighed out,' or 'appointed.' That the money was paid to Judas (ch. xxvii. 3) is not decisive argument for the former meaning: for it may have been paid on the delivery of Jesus to the Sanhedrim. The συνάθρωσις of Luke and ἐνσυνάξεως of Mark would lead us to prefer the other. —τρίκομανα ἀργύρων] Thirty shekels, = the price of the life of a servant, Exod. xxi. 32. Between three and four pounds of our money. Matthew is the only Evangelist who mentions the sum. De Wette and others have supposed that the mention of thirty pieces of silver with the verb ἵστησαν, has arisen from the prophecy of Zecharias, (xi. 12), which Matthew clearly has in view. The others have simply ἀργύρων. It is just possible that the thirty pieces may have been merely earnest money: but a difficulty attends the supposition: if so, Judas would have been entitled to the whole on the Lord being delivered up to the Sanhedrim (for this was all he undertook to do); whereas just as the text (ch. xxviii. 3) that after the Lord's condemnation, Judas bought only the thirty pieces back, and nothing more. See note there.

17—19.] Mark xiv. 12. Luke xxi. 7. The whole narrative which follows is extremely difficult to arrange and account for chronologically. Matthew is the least circumstantial, and as will I think appear, the least exact in detail of the three. Mark partially fills up the outline:—but the account of Luke is the most detailed, and I believe the most exact. It is to be noticed that the narrative which Paul gives, I Cor. xi. 23, 24, of the institution of the Lord's Supper, and which he states he 'received from the Lord,' coincides almost verbatim with that given by Luke. But while we say this, it must not be forgotten that over all three narratives extends the great difficulty of explaining ἡ πρῶτη τῶν ἄχ. (Matt., Mark), or ἡ ἑκ. τ. ἄχ. (Luke), and of reconciling the impression undeniably conveyed by them, that the Lord and His disciples are the usual Passover, with the narrative of John, which not only does not sanction, but I believe absolutely excludes, such a supposition. I shall give in as short a compass as I can, the various solutions which have been attempted, and the objections to them; fairly confessing that none of them satisfy me, and that at present I have none of my own. I will (1) state the grounds of the difficulty itself. The day alluded to in all four histories as that of the supper, which is unquestionably one and identical, is Thursday the 13th of Nisan. Now the day of the Passover being slain and eaten was the 14th of Nisan (Exod. xii. 6, 18. Lev. xxiii. 5. Numb. ix. 3. xxvii. 16. Ezek. xlv. 21), between the evenings (ἐν εὐρυχρόνιῳ), which was interpreted by the generality of the Jews to mean the interval between the first westerling of the sun (3 p.m.) and the setting, —but by the Karaites and Samaritans that between sunset and darkness:—in either case, however, the day was the same. The feast of unleavened bread began at the very time of eating the Passover (Exod. xii. 8), so that the first day of the feast of unleavened bread was the 15th (Numb. xxvii. 17). All this agrees with the narrative of John, where (xiii. 1) the last supper takes place, ἐν τῷ δεκατῃ τοῦ πάσχα, where the disciples think (ver. 29) that Judas had been directed to buy the things ἄν χρίσαι καθώς ἐκ τῆς ἐξουσίας, where the Jews (xiii. 28) would not enter into the sanctuary, lest they should be defiled, ἀλλ' ἵνα φάγωσι τὸ πάσχα (see note on John xviii. 28)—where at the exhibition of the Lord by Pilate (on the Friday at noon) it was (xix. 14) παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα, and where it could be said (xix. 31), ἵν' γαρ μητά ἡ ἤμετα ἐκείνου τοῦ αἰσθάνοντα,—being as it was a double Sabbath,—the coincidence of the first day of unleavened bread, which was sabbatically hallowed (Exod. xii. 10), with an actual sabbath. But as plainly it does not agree with the view of the three other Evangelists, who not only relate the meal on the evening of the 13th of Nisan to have been a Passover, but manifestly regard it as the ordinary legal time of eating it. τῇ πρῶτῃ τῇ. τ. ἄχ., οὖν τὸ πάσχα Ἰουνίου (Mark xiv. 12), ἵν' ἵνα ἄκουσιν τὸ πάσχα (Luke xxi. 7), and in
our Gospel by implication, in the use of ὅ τοῦ πάσχα, &c., without any qualifying remark.

The solutions which have been proposed are the following: (1) That the Passover which the Lord and His disciples ate, was not the ordinary, but an anticipatory one, seeing that He Himself was about to be sacrificed as the true Passover at the legal time. To this it may be objected that such an anticipation would have been wholly unprecedented and irregular, in a matter most strictly laid down by the law: and that in the three Gospels there is no allusion to it, but rather everything (see above) to render it improbable. (2) That the Lord and His disciples ate the Passover, but at the time observed by a certain portion of the Jews, while He Himself was sacrificed at the hour generally observed. This solution is objectionable, as wanting any historical testimony whereon to ground it, being in fact a pure assumption. Besides, it is clearly inconsistent with Mark xiv. 12. Luke xxii. 7, cited above. A similar objection lies against (3) the notion that the Lord ate the Passover at the strictly legal, the Jews at an inaccurate and illegal time. (4) The Lord ate only a πάσχα μνημονευτικόν, such as the Jews now celebrate, and not a πάσχα θείον (Grotius).—But this is refuted by the absence of any mention of a π. μνημ. before the destruction of Jerusalem; besides its inconsistency with the above-mentioned disciples. (5) The Lord did not eat the Passover at all. But this is manifestly not a solution of the difficulty, but a setting aside of one of the differing accounts: for the three Gospels manifestly give the impression that He did eat it.

I will conclude this note by offering a few hints which, though not pointing to any particular solution, ought I think to enter into the consideration of the question. (a) That, on the evening of the 13th (i.e. the beginning of the 14th) of Nisan, the Lord ate a meal with His disciples, at which the announcement that one of them should betray Him was made;—after which He went into the garden of Gethsemane, and was betrayed (Matt., Mark, Luke, John):—(b) That, in some sense or other, this meal was regarded as the eating of the Passover (Matt., Mark, Luke). (The same may be inferred even from John; for some of the disciples must have gone into the preteritorium, and have heard the conversation between the Lord and Pilate (xviii. 33—38); and as they were equally bound with the other Jews to eat the passover, would equally with them have been incapacitated from so doing by having incurred defilement, had they not eaten theirs previously. It would appear too, from Joseph of Arimathea going to Pilate during the παρασκευή (Mark xv. 43), that he also had eaten his passover.) (γ) That it was not the ordinary passover of the Jews: for (Exod. xii. 22) when that was eaten, none might go out of the house until morning; whereas not only did Judas go out during the meal (John xiii. 29), but the Lord and the disciples went out when the meal was finished. Also when Judas went out it was understood that he was gone to buy, which could not have been the case had it been the night of eating the passover, which in all years was sabbatically hallowed. (d) John, who omits all mention of the Paschal nature of this meal, also omits all mention of the distribution of the symbolic bread and wine. The latter act was anticipatory: the body was not yet broken, nor the blood shed. Is it possible that the words in Luke xxii. 15, 16 may have been meant by the Lord as an express declaration of the anticipatory nature of that passover meal likewise? May they mean, I have been most anxious to eat this Paschal meal with you to-night (before), yet I will not eat it to-morrow.—I shall not eat it any more with you? May a hint to the same effect be intended in ὅ καὶ τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἱεροτόνων (ver. 18), as accounting for the time of making ready—may the present tense πασώ itself have the same reference?

I may remark that the whole of the narrative of John, as compared with the others, satisfies me that he can never have seen their accounts. It is inconceivable, that one writing for the purpose avowed ch. xx. 31 could have found the three accounts as we have them, and have made no more allusion to the discrepancy than the faint (and to all appearance undesigned) ones in ch. xii. 1. xiii. 1. 29. xviii. 28. —τῷ τρώ. τ. ἡλικίας.] If this note had been the ordinary time of sacrificing the Passover, the day preceding would not indeed have been strictly the first day of unleavened bread; but there is reason to suppose that it was
accounted so. The putting away leave
from the houses was part of the work of
the day, and the eating of the unleavened
bread actually commenced in the evening.

Thus Josephus, Antt. ii. 15, 1, ἑορτὴν
ἀγομεν ἕως ἡμίρας οἰκή, τὴν τῶν ἀλῷων
λημοῦριν,—including this day in the feast.

—τῶν ἡμερῶν] The ‘making ready’ would
include the following particulars: the prep-
aration of the guest-chamber itself (which
however in this case was already done, see
Mark xiv. 15 and note)—the lamb already
kept up from the 10th (Exod. xii. 3) had
to be slain in the fore court of the temple
(2 Chron. xxxv. 5: see also Joseph. B. J.
vii. 9, 3)—the unleavened bread, bitter herbs,
&c., prepared; and theroom arranged. This
report does not represent the whole that
passed: it was the Lord who sent the two
disciples; and in reply this inquiry was
made (Mark, Luke).—18.] The person
spoken of was unknown even by name, as
appears from Mark and Luke, where he is
to be found by the turning is of a man
seek a pitcher of water. This Lord spoke
not from any previous arrangement, as some
have thought, but in virtue of His know-
ledge, and command of circumstances. Com-
pare the command ch. xxi. 2 sq., and that
in ch. xvii. 27.—In the words πρὸς τὸν
δίκτυα here must be involved the addi-
tional circumstance mentioned by Mark and
Luke, but probably unknown to our narrator:
see note on Luke xxi. 10, where the fullest
account is found.—The words δὲ διδάσωκα,
common to the three accounts, do not imply
that the man was a disciple of the Lord.
It was the common practice during the
feast for persons to receive strangers into
their houses gratuitously, for the purpose
of eating the Passover: and in this descrip-
tion of Himself in addressing a stranger,
the Lord has a deep meaning, as in δὲ κύριος
in ch. xxi. 3. ‘Our Master and thine says.’
It is His form of ‘pressing’ for the service
of the King of this Earth, the things that
are therein.—δὲ καὶ διδάσωκα is not ‘the
time of the feast,’ but ‘my time,’ i.e. for
suffering: see John vii. 8 al. freq.—There
is no reason for supposing from this ex-
pression that δὲ διδάσωκα was aware of its
meaning. The bearers of the message were;
and the words, to the receiver of it, bore
with them a weighty subjective reason,
which, with such a title as ὁ διδάσκαλος
prefixed, he was bound to respect. For
these words we are indebted to Matthew’s
report.

20—25.] The Lord and the twelve were
a full Paschal company; ten persons
was the ordinary and minimum number.
Here come in (1) the expression of the Lord’s
desire to eat this Passover before His suf-
ferring, Luke xxi. 16, 16; (2) the division
of the first cup, v. 17, 18; (3) the wash-
ing of the disciples’ feet, John xiii. 1—20
(see note, John xiii. 22). I mention
these, not that I have any desire to reduce
the four accounts to a harmonized narrative,
for that I believe to be impossible, and the
attempt wholly unpardonable; but because
they are additional circumstances inserted
by their narrators at this period of the feast.
I shall similarly notice all such addi-
tional matter, but without any idea of
harmonizing the discrepancies of the four
(as appears to me) entirely distinct and
independent reports.—21.] This announce-
ment is common to Matt., Mark, and John.
In the part of the events of the supper
which relates to Judas, Luke is deficient,
giving no further report of it than vv. 21—
23. The whole minute detail is given by
John, who bore a considerable part in it.—
23.] In the (I believe) more circumstantial
accounts of Luke and John, this inquiry is
made πρὸς λαυτοὺς or εἰς ἄλλους. The
real inquiry from the Lord was made by
John himself, owing to a sign from Peter.
This part of John’s narrative stands in the
highest position for accuracy of detail, and
the facts related in it are evidently the
**EYAGGELEION XXVI.**

ground of the other accounts.—23.] These first words represent the answer of the Lord to John's question (John xiii. 26). The latter (ver. 24) were not said now, but (Luke, ver. 21, 22) formed part of the previous announcement in our ver. 22. —25.] I cannot understand these words (which are peculiar to our Gospel) otherwise than as an imperfect report of what really happened, viz. that the Lord dipped the sop, and gave it to Judas, thereby answering the general doubt, in which the traitor had incommodiously presumed to feign a share. If the question μή εἴης είνας; before, represented ἐδείχνεις δι' ἀλήθειας ἀπαραγόμενον, and was our author's impression of what was in reality not a spoken but a signified question,—why now also should not this question and answer represent that Judas took part in that ἄσπολια, and was, not by word of mouth, but by a decisive sign, of which our author was not aware, declared to be the traitor? Both cannot have happened;—for (John xiii. 28) no one knew (not even John, see note there) why Judas went out; whereas if he had been openly (and it is out of the question to suppose a private communication had been previously declared to be the traitor, reason enough would have been furnished for his immediately leaving the chamber. (Still, consult the note on Luke (vr. 24—30 where I have left room for modifying this view.) I am aware that this explanation will give offence to those who believe that every part of each account may be tessellated into one consistent and complete whole. Stier (Reden Jesu, vi. 47—79) handles the above supposition very roughly, and speaks of its upholders in no measured terms. Valuable as are the researches of this commentator into the inner sense of the Lord's words, and ready as I am to acknowledge continual obligation to him, I cannot but think that in his whole interpretation of this part of the Gospel-history, he has fallen into the error of a too minute and letter-serving exposition. Even in his anxiety to retain every portion of every account in its strict literal sense, he is obliged to commit many inconsistencies; e. g. vol. vi. p. 19, "Εὐχαριστίας hat afterfully and not as the second and third, where his narrative is consistent, vitiated by the supposition of an imagined explanation. The comparison with a sentence in p. 63, "εἰσὶν αὐτοί, ὅταν ἐπάθη, ὅτι οὐκ ἔνα πλῆθος ἐν Μάρτυρις· τοῦτο δέν ἐν οἴκῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκείνου· καὶ εἰς Θεον· Εὐχαριστίας". Compare this with a sentence in a more complete form and in a more consistent way. —26.]—29.] Mark xiv. 22—24. Luke xxi. 19—21. 1 Cor. xiii. 23—25. We may remark on this important part of our narrative, (1) That it was demonstrably the Lord's intention to found an ordinance for those who should believe on Him; (2) that this ordinance had some analogy with that which He and the Apostles were then celebrating. The first of these assertions depends on the express word of the Apostle Paul; who in the words and manner indicated for the act of the celebration of the rite of the Lord's Supper, states in relation to it that he had received from the Lord the account of its institution which he then gives. He who can set this aside, must set aside with it all Apostolic testimony whatever. The second is shown by the fact, that what now took place was during the celebration of the Passover: that the very words of its institution were a part of the Paschal ceremony (see below): that the same Paul states that Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us; thus identifying the body broken, and blood shed, of which the bread and wine here are symbolic, with the Paschal feast. (3) That the key to the right understanding of what took place must be found in the Lord's discourse after the feeding of the five thousand in John vi., since He there, and there only besides this place, speaks of His flesh and blood in the connexion found there. (4)
KATA MATHAIAN.

It is impossible to assign to this event its precise place in the meal. Luke inserts it before the announcement of the treason of Judas; Matt. and Mark, after it. It is doubtful whether the accounts found in the Talmud and elsewhere of the ceremonies in the Paschal feast (see Lightfoot ad loc. De Wette) are to be depended on:—they are exceedingly complicated. Thus much seems clear,—that the Lord blessed and passed round two cups, one before, the other after the supper,—and that He distributed the unleavened cake during the meal. But it may also be that the dipping of the hand in the dish, and dipping and giving the sop, may also possibly correspond to parts of the Jewish ceremonial.—26.] While they were eating, during the meal, as distinguished from the distribution of the cup, which was after it,—No stress must be laid on the article before ἀρτον; even supposing it to be genuine, the bread would be unleavened, as the day was ἤ πρωτη τῶν ἀζύμων (see Exod. xii. 8).—εὐλογήσας and εὐχαριστήσας amount to the same in practice. The looking up to heaven and giving thanks was a virtual 'blessing' of the meal or the bread.—εὐλογεῖ, must be construed transitively (1 Cor. x. 16).—ἀρτον is governed by all four verbs, λαβὼν, εὐλογήσας, εἰλασθεν, ἔδιδον (see also Luke ix. 16, and the ref. to the text here). It was customary in the Paschal meal for the Master, in breaking the bread, to give thanks for the fruit of the earth. But the Lord did more than this: "Non pro veteri tantum creatione, sed et pro nova, cujus ergo in hunc orborn venerat, preces fudit, gratiaeque Deo egit pro redimione humani generis quasi jam peracta." Grotius.—From this giving of thanks for and blessing the offering, the Holy Communion has been from the earliest times also called εὐχαριστία, viz. by Justin Martyr, Cyril of Jerusalem, Origen, Clem. Alex., Chrysostom, &c. The passages may be seen in Suicer's Thesaurus, under the word. —εἰλασθεν It was a round cake of unleavened bread, which the Lord broke and divided: signifying thereby both the breaking of His Body on the Cross, and the participation in the benefits of His death by all His. Hence the act of communication was μετάνοιας τοῦ ἄρτος. Acts ii. 42. See 1 Cor. x. 16, also Isa. lviii. 7. Lam. iv. 4. —Δάβετα

A E F H K M S V, many mss. Bas. Chrys. txt B C D L Z abc.—for ἔδιδον, δός

φάγετε] Our Gospel alone has both words. φάγετε is spurious in Mark: both words, in 1 Cor. xi. 24. Here, they are doubted: and seem to show us (see note on Luke, ver. 17) that the Lord did not Himself partake of the bread or wine. It is thought by some however that He did: e. g. Chrysostom, Hom. lxxixii., τὸ ἱαυτῷ αἷμα αὐτός ἐκνών (!). But the analogy of the whole, as well as these words, and πιέσε ἐκ αὐτοῦ πάντως below, lead us to a different conclusion. The Lord's non-participation is however no rule for the administrator of the rite in after ages. In one sense He represents Christ, blessing, breaking, and distributing; in another, he is one of the disciples, examining himself, confessing, partaking. Throughout all Church ministrations this double capacity must be borne in mind. Olshausen (ii. 449) maintains the opposite view, and holds that the ministrant cannot unite in himself the two characters. But setting the inner verity of the matter for a moment aside, how, if so, should an unassisted minister euer communicare? —τρύποι ἐν τῷ ωμῷ μου] τρύπο, this, which I now offer to you, this bread. The form of expression is important, not being οὗτος οὗτος, οὗτος οὗτος, but τρύπο, in both cases, or τρύπο το πνεύματως, not the bread or wine itself, but the thing in each case, precluding all idea of a substantial change.—τρύπο] On this much controverted word itself no stress is to be laid. In the original tongue in which our Lord spoke, it would not be expressed: and as it now stands, it is merely the logical copula between the subject, this, and the predicate, My Body. The connexion of these two will require deeper consideration. First we may observe, as above of the subject, so here of the predicate, that it is not ἢ σάρξ μου, (although that very expression is didactically used in its general sense in John vi. 51, as applying to the bread,) but τῷ ωμῷ μου. The Body is made up of flesh and blood; and although analogically the bread may represent one and the wine the other, the assertion here is not to be analogically taken merely: τρύπο, this which I give you, (is) τῷ ωμῷ μου. Under this is the mystery of My Body:—the assertion is literal, and to be literally understood;—provided always we retain a true view of the subject and predicate. And it is the literal meaning which gives to the
symbolic and representative meaning its
fitness and fulness. In the literal meaning
then, this (is) my Body, we have bread,
the staff of life,' identified with the Body of
the Lord: not that particular ἀργος
with that particular σῶμα which at that
time constituted the Body before them,
nor any particular ἀργος with the present
Body of the Lord in Heaven: but τὸ οὖν,
the food of man, with τὸ σῶμα μου. Now
the mystery of the Lord's Body is, that in
and by it is all created being upheld: τὰ
πάντα οἰν ἀνάξιαν, Col. i. 17.
Iω τοῦ ζωή ἡ, John i. 4. And thus
generally, and in the widest sense, is the
Body of the Lord the sustenance and up-
holding of all living. Our very bodies are
dependent upon His, and unless by His
Body standing pure and accepted before
the Father, could not exist nor be nourished.
So that to all living things, in this largest
sense, τὸ ζωῆς, χρηστός. And all our nourish-
ment and means of upholding are Christ.
In this sense His Body is the Life of the
world: and τὸ οὖν, man's daily bread, is
τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ. And this general and
lower sense underlying, as it does, all the
spiritual and higher senses in John vi.,
brings us to the symbolic meaning which
the Lord now first and expressly attaches
to this sacramental bread—association of the
higher region of spiritual things,—in and by
the same Body of the Lord, standing before
the Father in accepted Righteousness, is
all spiritual being upheld, but by the in-
ward and spiritual process of feeding upon
Him by faith: of making that Body our
own, causing it to pass into and nourish
us, even as the substance of the bread passes
into and nourishes our bodies. Of this
feeding upon Christ in the spirit by faith,
the Sacramental bread the symbol to us.
When the faithful in the Lord's Supper
press with their teeth that sustenance, which
is even to the animal life of their bodies,
the Body of Christ, whereby alone all ani-
mated being is upheld,—they feed in their
souls on that Body of Righteousness and
Acceptance, by partaking of which alone
the body and soul are nourished unto ever-
lasting life. And as, in the more general
and natural sense, all that nourishes the
body is the Body of Christ given for all,—so
to them, in the inner spiritual sense, is the
Sacramental bread symbolic of that Body
given for them,—their standing in which, in
the adoption of Sons, is witnessed by the
sending abroad of the Spirit in their hearts.
This last leads us to the important addi-
tion in Luke and 1 Cor. (but omitted Cor.
but omitted in Mark) τὸ ὑπερ ὑμῶν (διδόμενον,
Luke, εὐαισθανόμεν, 1 Cor. but doubtful),
τὸ πρῶτον τῆς ὑμῶν ἀνάμνησιν. On
these words we may remark (1) that both
participles are present; and rendered with
reference to the time when they were
spoken, would be 'which is being given,'
which is being broken.' The Passion had
already begun; in fact the whole life on
earth was this giving and breaking,
summoned by His death. (2) That the
commemorant part of the rite here en-
joined strictly depends upon the symbolic
meaning, and that as strictly upon the liter-
al meaning. The commemoration is by
Him, in so far as He has come down into
Time, and enacted the great acts of Re-
demption on this our world,—and shown
Himself to us as living and speaking Man,
an object of our personal love and affec-
tionate remembrance:—but the other and
higher parts of the Sacrament have regard
to the results of those same acts of Redemp-
tion, as they are eternized in the counsels
of the Father,—as the Lamb is slain from
the foundation of the world (Rev. xii. 8).
[27.] This was after the meal was ended:
δεσπότης καὶ τῷ πνεύμῳ τοῦ γενν. τ. αὐτοῦ.
δεσπότης, (Luke and 1 Cor.) As remarked above,
it is quite uncertain whether the Lord fol-
lowed the Jewish practices, and we cannot
therefore say whether the cup was one of
wine and water mixed. From the expres-
sion of ver. 29, καὶ τοῦτον τοῦ γενν. τ. αὐτοῦ.
δεσπότης, it was probably of unmixed wine.
The word διδόμενος contains our λαβῶν καὶ
ὑποχρ., 1 Thess.—Πίετε ἵνα αὐτῶν πάντως]
Peculiar to Matthew, preserved however in
substance by Mark's καὶ ἐπέλαθεν ἵνα αὐτῶν
πάντως. The πάντως is remarkable, espe-
cially with reference to the practice of the
Church of Rome, which forbids the cup to
the laity. Calvin remarks: "Cur de pane
simpliciter dixit ut ederent; de calico, ut
omnes biberent? Ac si Satane caliabatxi ex
destinato occurrere voluisse," (cited in
Stier, vi. 143.) It is on all accounts pro-
bable, and this command confirms the pro-
bability, that Judas was present, and par-
took of both parts of this first communion.
The expressions are such throughout as to
lead us to suppose that the same persons,
οἱ δὲ Σατανα, were present. On the circum-
stance mentioned John xiii. 30, which has
mainly contributed to the other opinion, see note there. — τοῦτο [γὰρ] ἔστι τὸ αἷμα μου τῷ τῆς κ. διαθ. So Mark also, omitting γὰρ. In Luke and 1 Cor. there is an important verbal difference. τοῦτο τὸ σταυρὸν ἡ καὶνὴ διαθήκη. [ἵστοι] ἐν τῷ ἱμῷ ὑμῶν. But if we consider the matter closely, the real difference is but trifling, if any. Let us recur to the Paschal rite. The lamb (χρυσῶς τὸ πάσχα ἡμῶν) being killed, the blood (τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης, Exod. xx. 22) is sprinkled on the door posts, and is a sign to the destroying angel to spare the house. The blood of the covenant is the blood of the lamb. So also in the new covenant. The blood of the Lamb of God, slain for us, being not only sprinkled on, but in the former case actually partaken spiritually and assimilated by, the faithful, is the blood of the new covenant; and the sacramental cup is, signifies, sets forth, (καταγγέλλει, 1 Cor. xi. 26,) this covenant in His blood, i.e. consisting in a participation in His Blood. With this explanation let us recur to the words in our text. First it will be observed that there is not here that absolute assurance which τοῦτο λεῖτο τῷ σωμάτι μου conveyed. It is not τοῦτο λεῖτο τῷ αἷμα μου, absolutely. Wine, in general, does not represent by itself the effects (on the creation) of the Blood of Christ; it, like every other nourishment of the body, is nourishment to us by and in Him, forasmuch as in Him all things consist: but there is no peculiar propriety whereby it is to us His Blood alone. But it is made so by a Covenant office which it holds in His own declaration. Without shedding of blood was no remission of sins under the old covenant: and blood was, throughout, the covenant sign of forgiveness and acceptance. (see Heb. ix. 19, 20, where the Author, substituting τοῦτο for ἱδον in the LXX of Exod. xxiv. 8, seems to be alluding to this very formula.) Now all this blood of sacrifice finds its true reality and fulfilment in the blood of Christ, shed for the remission of sins. This is the very promise of the new covenant, see Heb. vii. 8—13, as distinguished from the old: the δόξης αἰματιῶν, once for all,—whereas the old had continual offerings, which could not do this, Heb. x. 3. And of this δόξης, the result of the outpouring of the blood of Christ, —first and most generally in bringing all creation into reconciliation with the Father (see Col. i. 20), —secondly and individually, in the application by faith of that blood to the believing soul,—do the faithful in the Lord's supper partake. —τὸ περὶ πολλῶν (Luke, ἱμῶν ἐκ.) On the present participle, see above. The situation of these words in Luke is remarkable: for τὸ ποτήριον is the subject of the sentence, and ἡ κ. διαθήκη the predicate. See note there. —πολλῶν] It may perhaps be the real meaning of πολλῶν, to remember that the mystery of the universality of redemption was not revealed as yet (see Acts x.). But much stress need not be laid on this, for we have πολλω ὑμων unquestionably used for πάντων in Rom. v. 15. 19. 1 Cor. x. 17, nor is this meaning imparted by the article, which in those places is demonstrative (multì illì de quibus agitur vel dictum est, Wahl). The Lord uses the word similarly in ch. xx. 28. See also Heb. ix. 28. — εἰς δόξαν αἰματιῶν] Peculiar to Matthew: see above. The connexion is not πιστεύειν...εἰς δόξαν ἐμ. In the Sacrament, not the forgiveness of sins itself, but the refreshing and confirming assurance of that state of forgiveness is conveyed. The disciples (with one exception) were clean before the institution: John xiii. 10, 11. Paul in 1 Cor. xi. 25 repeats the τοῦτο ποιεῖται (δόξας ἐν πνεύματι) εἰς τὴν ἱμὴν ἀνόμμοσιν. On the words in brackets, see note there.—In concluding this note I will observe that it is not the office of a commentator to enter the arena of controversy respecting transubstantiation, further than by his exegesis his opinions are made apparent. It will be seen how entirely opposed to such a dogma is the view above given of the Sacrament. Once introduce it, and it utterly destroys both the verity of Christ's Body, and the Sacramental nature of the ordinance. That it has done so is proved (if further need be) by the mutilation of the Sacrament, and disobedience to the Divine command, in the Church of Rome. See further notices of this in notes on 1 Cor. x. 16. 1 John v. 6, 8, and on John vi. —29.] This declaration I believe to be distinct from that in Luke xxii. 18. That was spoken over the first cup—this over one of
πιω ἀπ’ ἀρτι ἐκ τούτου τοῦ ἁγιασμοτος τῆς ἁματείας,

εἰς τῆς ἁμέρας ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ὅταν αὐτὸ πίω μεθ' ὑμῶν ἈΒΣΔ
καινοῦ ἐν τῷ βασιλείῳ τοῦ πατρὸς μου.  30 καὶ ἡ ἁμη-

σαντοί ἐξήλθον εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἡλίαν.  31 τότε λέγει

αὐτοῖς ὁ Ιησοῦς Πάντες ὑμεῖς ὁ σκανδαλισθέασθε ἐν ἑ

τοι ἐν νυκτὶ ταυτέρ' γεραται γὰρ Πατάξω τῶν

ποιμένων, καὶ διασκορπισθήσεται τὰ πρὸβατα τῆς ποιμν[.]

32 μετὰ δὲ τὸ εὐερθημαί με τραύω ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλι-

A C D L V. txt B.—for πιω, πιω D Clem. Ir. Chrys. —33. rec. Εἰ καὶ, but txt

the following. In addition to what has been said on Luke, we may observe, (1) that the Lord still calls the sacramental cup τὸ γεύμα τῆς ἁματείας, although by Himself pronounced to be His blood : (2) that these words carry on the meaning and continuance of this eucharistic ordinance, even into the new heavens and new earth. As Thiersch excellently says in his Lectures on Catholicism and Protestantism, ii. 276 (cited by Stier, vi. 195), “The Lord’s Supper points not only to the past, but to the future also. It has not only a commemorative, but also a prophetic meaning. In it we have not only to show forth the Lord’s death until He come, but we have also to think of the time when He shall come to celebrate His holy Supper with His own, new, in His Kingdom of Glory. Every celebration of the Lord’s Supper is a foretaste and prophetic anticipation of the great Feast at the second appearing of Christ. This import of the Sacrament is declared in the words of the Lord, ὅπερ μὴ πιω ἀπ’ ἀρτι, ἀπεκκ. κ.τ.λ. These words ought never to be omitted in any liturgical form of administering the Communion.”

30—38.] Here, accurately speaking, perhaps between ἁμησαντες and ἁησανθεν, come in the discourses and prayer of the Lord in John xiv., xv., xvi., xvii., spoken (see note on John xiv. 31) without change of place, in the supper-chamber.—The ἁμεσαντες was in all probability the last part of the Hallel, or great Hallel, which consisted of Psalms cxv., cxxxviii.; the former part (Psa. cxxiii., cxxiv.) having been sung during the meal. It is unlikely that this took place after the solemn prayer in John xvii.—[ἐν ἐξαιρέσεις] Luke adds κατὰ τὸ ἱδος—namely, of every evening since his return to Jerusalem.—31. Πάντες ὑμεῖς seems to be used as distinguishing those present from the one, who had gone out.—[κακωλ.] see note on ch. xi. 6. The word is here used in a pregnant meaning, including what followed, —desperation, and, in one case, denial. —γε-

ραστας γὰρ] This is a very important citation, and has been much misunder-

stood ; how much, may appear from Gro-

tius’s remark : ‘Tantum absest ut Zechariae

verbis directe Christianum putem repici, ut

multo magis credam agi mihi de aliquo

novo bono pastore,” &c. But, on the con-

trary, if we examine Zech. xi., xii., xiii.,

we must I think come to the conclusion

that the Shepherd spoken of xi. 7—14,

who is rejected and sold, who is said to

have been pierced (xii. 10), is also spoken

of in ch. xiii. 7. Stier (Reden Jesu, vi.

224 sq.) has gone at length into the mean-

ing of the whole prophecy, and especially

that of the word γεφυρ. ‘my fellow,’ and

shown that the reference can be to no oth-

er than the Messiah. The citation is verba-

tim after the Alexandr. MS. of the LXX,

except that πάραγωγον is changed into πα-

ράτα—God who commands the striking,

into God who Himself strikes. —33.] In

this announcement the Lord seems to have

in mind the remainder of the verse in Zechariah: “and I will turn (γυρίζω) reduce

cere manum, i.e. impius sublatius curam

agere, &c. Schröder) mine hand upon the

little ones." As this could not be cited in

any intelligible connexion with present cir-

cumstances, the Lord gives the announcement of its fulfilment, in a promise to pre-

cede them (προάγω, a pastoral office, see

John x. 4) into Galilee, whither they would

naturally return after the feast was over :

see ch. xxviii. 7. 10. 16.—Schleiermacher

thinks it “extremely improbable that Jesus, if He foresaw so exactly the days of His

resurrection, and therefore could not but

know that He should see His disciples

again more than once in Jerusalem, should

here have said that He would lead them

into Galilee” (English translation, p. 298).

I confess that I see no improbability in

the case; but the three references to

this promise just quoted make it surely
in the highest degree improbable that it should have been subsequently foisted in. We do not find such elaborate attempts to preserve the appearance of consistency in our Gospels. The reader who sees in it the reference to prophecy will form a very different opinion. — 33.] Nothing can bear a greater impress of exactitude than this reply. Peter had been before warned (see note on Luke, v. 31—34); and still remaining in the same spirit of self-confident attachment, now that he is included among the πάντες, not specially addressed;—breaks out into this asseveration, which carries completely with it the testimony that it was not the first. Men do not bring themselves out so strongly (οἱ πάντες, οὐκ ἴσως: and not only so, but o ἐδικτομο ὡς, as opposed to ἐν τῷ νυκτί τῇ αὐτῷ), unless their fidelity has been previously attested. — 34.] The very words in their order are, I doubt not, reported by Mark—Ἀμὴν λ. σοι, δι σήμερον, ἐν τῷ νυκτί τῇ αὐτῷ, πρὶν ὡς διὸ αὐτοί φωνῆσαι τ. ἀπ. μ. The contrast to Peter’s boast, and the climax, is in these words the strongest; and the inference also comes out most clearly, that they likewise were not now said for the first time.—The first cock-crowing is at midnight; but inasmuch as few hear it,—when the word is used generally, we mean the second crowing, early in the morning, before dawn. If this view be taken, the δικτομο φων. and δι ἀπ. φ. amount to the same—only the latter is the more accurate expression. It is most likely that Peter understood this expression merely as a mark of time, and therefore received it, as when it was spoken before, as merely an expression of distrust on the Lord’s part, it was this solemn and circumstantial repetition of it which afterwards struck upon his mind when the sign itself was literally fulfilled.—A question has been raised whether cockes were usually kept or even allowed in Jerusalem. No such bird is mentioned in the O. T., and the Mischana states that the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and the priests everywhere, kept no fowls, because they scratched up undec worma. But the Talmud is here not consistent with itself: and Lightfoot brings forward a story which proves it. And there might be many kept by the resident Romans, over whom the Jews had no power.—We must not overlook the spiritual parabolic import of this warning. Peter stands here as a representative of all disciples who deny or forget Christ—and the watchful bird that cries in the night is that warning voice which ‘speaketh once, yea twice’ to call them to repentance: see Rom. xiii. 11, 12. — 35.] This ἀν δὲ ἔδη again appears to have the precision of a repeated asseveration. Mark has the stronger expression ἐκ περιο- σοῦ δεδικτομο μᾶλλον, which even more clearly indicates that the συναπθανω ὡς was not now first said. The rest said it, but not so earnestly perhaps—at all events, Peter’s confidence cast theirs in the shade. — 36—46.] Mark xiv. 32—42. Luke xxii. 40—46. John xviii. 1. The account of the Lord’s temptation and agony in Gethsemane is peculiar to the three first Gospels. But it does not follow on this account that there is any inconsistency with John’s setting forth of the Person of Christ, in their accounts. I shall discuss this matter at length in the prolegomena, and notes on various passages in his Gospel. It may be sufficient at present to say, that, as we find in their accounts frequent manifestations of the Divine nature, and indications of future glory, about, and during this conflict,—in John’s account, which brings out more the Divine side of the Lord’s working and speaking, we find frequent allusions to His
human weakness and distress of spirit. For examples of the first, see Matt. xxvi. 13. 24. 29. 32. 53, and || in Mark and Luke; and Luke xxii. 30. 32. 37. 43; of the latter, John xii. 27. xiii. 21. 33. xiv. 30. xvi. 32.

—The right understanding of the whole important narration must be acquired by bearing in mind the reality of the manhood of the Lord, in all its abasement and weakness.—by following out in Him the analogy which pervades the characteristics of human suffering—the strength of the resolved spirit, and calm of the resigned will, continually broken in upon by the inward giving way of human feebleness, and limited power of endurance. But as in us, so in the Lord, these seasons of dread and conflict stir not the ruling will, alter not the firm resolve. This is most manifest in His first prayer—εἰ δὲν τινὰ ἵκετε—if consistent with that work which I have covenanted to do. Here is the reserve of the will to suffer—it is never stirred (see below). The conflict however of the Lord differs from ours in this,—that in us, the ruling will itself is human, and may be and is often carried away by the excess of depression and suffering; whereas in Him it was the Divine Personality in which the higher Will of the covenant purpose was eternally fixed,—struggling with the flesh now overwhelmed with an horrible dread, and striving to escape away (see the whole of Ps. iv.). Besides that, by that uplifting into a superhuman circle of Knowledge, with which the dread and anguish of the Godhead endowed His humanity, His flesh, with all its capacities and apprehensions, was brought at once into immediate and instantaneous contact with every circumstance of horror and pain that awaited Him (John xviii. 4), which is never the case with us. Not only are the objects of dread gradually unveiled to our minds, but ὁρᾷ (οὖν καθαρὸς παραμυθεῖν ὁδόν, Thuc. v. 103) is ever suggesting that things may not be so bad as our fears represent them.—Then we must not forget, that as the flesh gave way under dread of suffering, so the human ψυχή was troubled with all the attendant circumstances of that suffering—betrayal, desertion, shame (see Ps. iv. again, vv. 12—14. 20, 21—Ps. xxxviii. 11, 12. Ps. lxxxviii. 11. 12). Nor again must we pass over the last and deepest mystery of the Passion—the consideration, that upon the holy and innocent Lamb of God rested the burden of all human sin—that to Him, death, as the punishment of sin, bore a dark and dreadful meaning, inconceivable by any of us, whose inner will is tainted by the love of sin. See on this part of the Redeemer's agony Ps. xl. 12. xxxviii. 1—10 al.—See also as a comment on the whole, Heb. v. 7—10, and notes there.—The three accounts do not differ in any important particulars. Luke merely gives a general summary of the Lord's prayers and His sayings to the disciples, but inserts (see below) two details not found in the others. Mark's account and Matthew's are very nearly related, and have evidently sprung from the same source. —36.} Mark alone, besides our account, mentions the name of the place—Luke merely calls it ἄφωρος, in allusion to καλά τὸ ἱδρυμα. John informs us that it was a garden. The name is νεκρός γη or νεκρά, 'an oil press.' It was at the foot of the Mount of Olives, in the valley of the Kedron, the other side of the brook from the city (John xviii. 1). —Καθιεραστικός not strictly and literally 'sit,' but μειταιχτόνος, 'stay here.' —κατάστασις. Such is the name which the Lord gives to that which was coming upon Him, in speaking to the Eight who were not to witness it. All conflict of the holy soul is prayer: all its struggles are continued communion with God. In Gen. xxii. 5, when Abraham's faith was to be put to so sore a trial, he says, 'I and the lad will go yonder and worship.' The Lord (almost on the same spot) unites in Himself, as the Priest and Victim, as Siter strikingly remarks, Abraham's Faith and Isaac's Patience.—εἰσαγωγή—some spot deeper in the garden's shade probably. At this time the gorge of the Kedron would be partly in the moonlight, partly shaded by the rocks and buildings of the opposite side. It may have been from the moonlight into the shade that the Lord retired to pray.—37.} These three—Peter, the foremost in attachment, and profession of it—the two sons of Zebedee, who were to drink of the cup that He drank of—He takes with Him—not only nor principally as witnesses of His trial—this indeed, in the full sense, they were not—but as a consolation to Him in that dreadful hour—to 'watch with Him.' In this too they failed—yet from His returning to them between His times of prayer, it is manifest that in the abasement of His humanity, He regarded them as some comfort to Him. 'In magnis tentationibus juxta solutudinem, sed tamen ut in propinquo
sint amici.' Bengal. — ἥρπατο—not merely idiomatic here—He began—as He had never done before.—λυπώσασθαί = λευσμένος βίζίθαΐ Mark. 'Dict incursum objecti horribilia.' Bengal (see below on ver. 38). —δύναμεν] = λιαν λυπώσασθαι ἀπόρειαν, Suidas; τὸ βαρυθόμενον νοείται, Euthym.; ἀγνωσία, Hesychius; δύναμις, ὃ οὐ ἄδυν, ὃ οὐ εὖ χάρον τινός ἢ λύσις, ἀναπτυκτός ἀνάδυσθαι, τὸ θάνατον καὶ ἀσφαλέσθαι, Eustathius. —38.] The Lord's whole inmost life must have been one of continued trouble of spirit—He was a Man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief—but there was an extremity of anguish now, reaching even to the utmost limit of endurance—so that it seemed that more would be death itself. The expression is said to be proverbial (see ref.): but we must remember that though with us men, who see from below, proverbs are merely bold guesses at Truth,—with Him, who sees from above, they are the Truth itself, in its very purest form. So that although when used by a mere man a proverbial expression is not to be pressed to literal exactitude,—when used by the Lord, it is, just because it is a proverb, to be searched into and dwelt on all the more. The expression ἡ ψυχή μου, spoken by the Lord, is only found besides in John xii. 27. It is the human soul, the seat of the affections and passions, which is troubled with the anguish of the body; and it is distinguished from the πνεῦμα, the higher spiritual being. The Lord's soul was crushed down even to death by the weight of that anguish which lay upon Him—and that literally—so that He (as regards His humanity) would have died, had not strength (bodily strength, upholding His human frame) been ministered from on high by an angel (see note on Luke xxii. 41). —γρηγορεῖτε μετ’ ἐμοὶ not προεξεπέλεγον μετ’ ἐμοί, for in that work the Mediator must be alone; but (see above) watch with me—just (if we may compare our weakness with His) as we derive comfort in the midst of a terrible storm from knowing that some are awake and with us, even though their presence is no real safeguard.

39.] προελθὼν μηκέτι (Matt., Mark) = ἀπεκεκληθή απ’ αὐτῶν ὥστε λίθοι βολήν Luke, who in this description is the more precise. —/address. I cannot help thinking implies something more than mere removal from them—something of the reluctance of parting.—The distance would be very small, not above forty or fifty yards. Hence the disciples might well catch the leading words of the Lord's prayers, before drowsiness overpowered them. Luke has however only ἤτοι ὁ γῶνα, which is not so full as our account.—προεκλήσας.] Stier finely remarks: 'This was in truth a different prayer from that which went before, which John has recorded.' But still in the same spirit, uttered by the same Son of God and Redeemer of men. The glorifying (John xvii. 1) begins with suffering, as the previous words, Ἰδήνθητι ἡ ὥρα, might lead us to expect. The 'power over all flesh' shows itself first as power of the conflicting and victorious spirit over His own flesh, by virtue of which He is 'one of us.'—Mark expresses the endurance of the prayer, and interprets παρίσημον by ὥρα. Luke's report differs only in verbal expression from Matthew's. In the address, we have here πάντες μου—in Mark ἄνδρα ὁ παρίσημος, and in Luke πάντας only. In all, and in the prayer itself, there is the deepest feeling and apprehension in the Redeemer's soul of His Sonship and unity with the Father—the most entire and holy submission to His Will. We must not for a moment think of the Father's wrath abiding on Him as the cause of His suffering. Here is no fear of wrath,—but, in the depth of His human anguish, the very tenderness of filial love.—The variation in Mark and Luke in the substance of the prayer, though slight, is worthy of remark.—εἰ δύναται ἵκερ = πάντα δύναται σου, = εἰ βολήν. All these three find their union in one and the same inward feeling. That in the text expresses, 'If, within the limits of Thy holy will, this may be:'—that in Mark, 'All things are (absolutely) possible to Thee—Thou canst therefore—but not what I will, but what Thou wilt':—that in Luke, 'If it be Thy Will to remove, &c.
(Thou canst: but not My will, but Thine be done.' The very words used by the Lord, the Holy Spirit has not seen fit to give us—showing us, even in this solemn instance, the comparative indifference of the letter, when we have the inner spirit. That the Lord should have uttered all three forms of the prayer, is not for a moment to be thought of; and such a view could only spring out of the most petty and unworthy appreciation of the purpose of Scripture narrative. — ωραῖος - τίς as we should say of a threatening cloud, 'It has gone over.' — But what is the ωραῖον or ωρα, of which the Lord here prays that it may pass by? Certainly, not the mere present feebleness and prostration of the bodily frame: not any mere section of His sufferings—but the whole—the betrayal, the trial, the mocking, the scourging, the Cross, the grave, and all besides which our thoughts cannot reach. Of this all, His soul, in humble subjection to the higher Will, which was absolutely united and harmonious with the Will of the Father, prays that if possible it may pass over. And this prayer was heard—see Heb. v. 7— ἐπὶ τῷ κυρίῳ οὗ δοθεῖται ἐν εἰρήνῃ. On account of His pious designation to the Father's will, or, on the ground of it, so that it prevailed—He was strengthened from Heaven. He did indeed drink the cup to the dregs—but He was enabled to do it, and this ἵστρυσεν was the answer to His prayer. — αὐτὸν ὅμως . . . ] The Monothelite heresy, which held but one will in the Lord Jesus, is here plainly convicted of error. The distinction is clear, and marked by the Lord Himself. In His human soul, He willed to be freed from the dreadful things before Him—but this human will was overruled by the inner and Divine purpose—the Will at unity with the Father's will. — 40.] Mark agrees, except in relating the beginning of the address in the singular—no doubt accurately—for it was Peter (Simon, τὸν αὐτὸν λόγου ὑπάρχον. Stier), who had pledged himself to go with Him to prison and death. — ὅτε] see reff. 'adeo'—it implies their utter inability, as shown by their present state of slumber. 'Are ye so entirely unable,' &c. — μὴ δὲν need not imply that the Lord had been absent a whole hour:—if it is to be taken in any close meaning, it would be that the whole trial would last about that time. But most likely it is in allusion to the time of the Lord's trial, so often called by that name. — 41. Luke gives this command at the beginning and end of the whole; but his account is manifestly only a compendium, and not to be pressed chronologically. The command has respect to the immediate trial which was about to try them, and (for γυμνός is a word of habit, not merely, as ἴσον μετὰ ἐκκλησίαν v. 14, or ἵστρυσεν 1 Cor. xv. 34, one of immediate import) also to the general duty of all disciples in all time. — ἐπιλαμβάνεις ἐκ τίς is not to come into temptation merely, to be tempted; this lies not in our own power to avoid, and its happening is rather joy than sorrow to us—see James i. 2, where the word is παρεισχθέναι—but it implies an entering into temptation with the will, an entertaining of the temptation. Grotius compares ἰκτίσταναι εἰς πειρασμόν 1 Tim. vi. 9. 'Plenius Hebraei dicunt, intrare in manum tentationis, hoc est, in ejus potestatem atque dominium, ita ut ab ea subjegetur atque oneratur—on account of His pious designation to the Father's will, or, on the ground of it, so that it prevailed—He was strengthened from Heaven. He did indeed drink the cup to the dregs—but He was enabled to do it, and this ἵστρυσεν was the answer to His prayer. — αὐτὸν ἅμως . . . ] The Monothelite heresy, which held but one will in the Lord Jesus, is here plainly convicted of error. The distinction is clear, and marked by the Lord Himself. In His human soul, He willed to be freed from the dreadful things before Him—but this human will was overruled by the inner and Divine purpose—the Will at unity with the Father's will. — 40.] Mark agrees, except in relating the beginning of the address in the singular—no doubt accurately—for it was Peter (Simon, τὸν αὐτὸν λόγου ὑπάρχον. Stier), who had pledged himself to go with Him to prison and death. — ὅτε] see reff. 'adeo'—it implies their utter inability, as shown by their present state of slumber. 'Are ye so entirely unable,' &c. — μὴ δὲν need not imply that the Lord had been absent a whole hour:—if it is to be taken in any close meaning, it would be that the whole trial would last about that time. But most likely it is in allusion to the time of the Lord's trial, so often called by that name. — 41. Luke gives this command at the beginning and end of the whole; but his account is manifestly only a compendium, and not to be pressed chronologically. The command has respect to the immediate trial which was about to try them, and (for γυμνός is a word of habit, not merely, as ἴσον μετὰ ἐκκλησίαν v. 14, or ἵστρυσεν 1 Cor. xv. 34, one of immediate import) also to the general duty of all disciples in all time. — ἐπιλαμβάνεις εἰς τίς is not to come into temptation merely, to be tempted; this lies not in our own power to avoid, and its happening is rather joy than sorrow to us—see James i. 2, where the word is παρεισχθέναι—but it implies an entering into temptation with the will, an entertaining of the temptation. Grotius compares ἰκτίσταναι εἰς πειρασμόν 1 Tim. vi. 9. 'Plenius Hebraei dicunt, intrare in manum tentationis, hoc est, in ejus potestatem atque dominium, ita ut ab ea subjegetur atque oneratur—on account of His pious designation to the Father's will, or, on the ground of it, so that it prevailed—He was strengthened from Heaven. He did indeed drink the cup to the dregs—but He was enabled to do it, and this ἵστρυσεν was the answer to His prayer. — αὐτὸν ἅμως . . . ] The Monothelite heresy, which held but one will in the Lord Jesus, is here plainly convicted of error. The distinction is clear, and marked by the Lord Himself. In His human soul, He willed to be freed from the dreadful things before Him—but this human will was overruled by the inner and Divine purpose—the Will at unity with the Father's will. — 40.] Mark agrees, except in relating the beginning of the address in the singular—no doubt accurately—for it was Peter (Simon, τὸν αὐτὸν λόγου ὑπάρχον. Stier), who had pledged himself to go with Him to prison and death. — ὅτε] see reff. 'adeo'—it implies their utter inability, as shown by their present state of slumber. 'Are ye so entirely unable,' &c. — μὴ δὲν need not imply that the Lord had been absent a whole hour:—if it is to
At what precise time the angel appeared to Him is uncertain: I should be inclined to think, after the first prayer, before He came to His disciples.—The words are not exactly the same: 'the Lord knew that the Father always heard Him (John xii. 42); and therefore He understands the continuance of His trial as the answer to His last words, 'as Thou wilt.' Stier. Here therefore the prayer is, 'If it be not possible . . . Thy will be done.' It is spoken in the fulness of self-resignation. 'Jam addita bibendi mentione, propius ad bibendum se conferunt.' Bengel.—[43] Mark adds, and it is a note of accuracy, εἰς οὖν τό δρών τις αὐτῷ ἀποκριθηκεν. —[44] τῶν αὐτῶν, viz. as the last. This third prayer is merely indicated in Mark, by ἤρθαι τῷ ἐρωτώ, on the Lord's return. —[45] The clause ἐπεφεύρεσα τῷ λ. α. ἀνωμ. has been variously understood. To take it interrogatively, does not improve the sense, and makes an unnatural break in the sentence, which proceeds indicatively afterwards. It seems to me that there can be but two ways of interpreting it—and both with an imperative construction. (1) Either it was said bona fide,—Since ye are not able to watch with Me, now ye may sleep on—for My hour is come, and I am about to be taken from you—which sense however is precluded by the ἵτε χρησθη διαμαρτυρον below: or (2) it was said with an understanding of 'if you can'—as Bengel: 'si me excitantem non auditis, brevi aderunt alii qui vos excitent. Interea dormite, si vacat.' —[46] ἢ ἡμεῖς ἡμᾶς τοι ἔσται Mark. The ἢ ἡμεῖς implies 'It is enough'—enough of reproof to them for drowsiness—enough of exhortations to watch and pray—that was now coming which would cut all this short. This first ἢσθαι is hardly to be taken literally of the appearance of Judas and his band; it merely announces the approach of the hour, of which the Lord had so often spoken: but at the utterance of the second, it seems that they were in sight, and that may be taken literally.—This expression, παραδ. εἰς χίερας διαμαρτυριῶν, should be noticed, as an echo of the Redeemer's anguish—it was the contact with sin,—and death the wages of sin,—which all through His trial pressed heavily on His soul.
by an εὐθῶς.—47.] Judas is specified as εἷς τῶν δώδεκα, probably because the appellation, as connected with this part of his history, had become the usual one—thus we have in Luke ὁ λεγόμενος Ἰουδα. εἷς τῶν δώδεκα—fuller still. To the reader, this specification is not without meaning, though that meaning may not have been intended.—δύσλος πόλεως consisting of (1) a detachment of the Roman cohort which was quartered in the tower of Antonia during the feast in case of an uproar, called ἡ στίγμα, John v. 5.—12. (2) The ἀντιπροσώποι of the council, the same as the στραταρχοὶ τοῦ ἱεροῦ, Luke ver. 52. (3) Servants and others deputed from the high priest to assist, see ver. 51. (4) Possibly, if the words are to be taken exactly (Luke ver. 52), some of the chief priests and elders themselves, forward in zeal and enmity. There is nothing improbable in this (as Meyer, Schleiermacher, &c. maintain), seeing that we have these persons mixing among the multitude and stirring them up to demand the crucifixion of Jesus afterwards.—[δὲ] not clubs—but staves—or any tumultuary weapons. The intention of the chief priests evidently was to produce an impression to the effect that a seditious plot was to be crushed, and resistance might be expected. John mentions also lanterns and torches—to search perhaps in the dark parts of the garden, most of which would by this time be in the shade.—48.] The common rendering of ἕκκλησις as a plusrq. perf. is unnecessary and unwarranted: the sorit is simply historical, —'gave them a sign;' when, is not stated. On Mark's addition, καὶ ἀπειθέντες ἀσφαλῶς, see notes there.—49.] εὐθῶς—see above on ver. 47. The purpose of the Kies, supposing them, probably taken by John v. 4—8, (and it is surely out of the question to suppose it to have taken place before, contrary to the plain meaning of John ver. 4,) has been doubted. Yet I think on a review of what had happened, it is very intelligible—not perhaps, as some have supposed, to show that Jesus could be approached with safety—but at all events as the sign agreed on with the Roman soldiers, who probably did not personally know Him, and who besides would have had their orders from the city, to take Him whom Judas should kiss. Thus the Kiss would be necessary in the course of their military duty, as their authorization,—notwithstanding the previous declaration by Jesus of Himself—καὶ ὁ ἄνθρωπος only another word for ἐγώ, and not to be pressed.—50.] In Luke we have Ἰούδα, φιλάρμος τῶν πρυτ. ἀνδ. παραδίδωσι,—which sense is involved in the text also: that variation showing perhaps that one of the accounts is not from an eye-witness.—Ἐτέρας—see ch. xxii. 12 and note. ὁ ἴδιος ὁ πάντων φίλος, καὶ ἴδιος, oi ἐν συνεργίᾳ καὶ ἐν συνεργίᾳ πολῶν χρόνων γεγονότες, Ἀμμονίων.—ς ἵνα τὰρας is far more probably a question than an exclamation—a question not for information, but as an appeal to the conscience and heart of Judas, in which sense (see above) it agrees with the words spoken in Luke;—see note there. The fact that at this period the Lord was laid hold of and secured (by hand—not yet bound) by the band, is important, as interpreting Luke's account further on.—51.] The ἐξ, (or εἰς τις of Mark and Luke) was Peter;—John, ver. 10. Why he was not mentioned, is idle to inquire; one supposition only must be avoided—that there is any purpose in the omission. It is absurd to suppose that the mention of his name in a book current only among Christians, many years after the fact, would have been censured or comprehended, which did not take place at the time, although he was recognized as the
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striker in the palace of the High-priest.
(John, ver. 26). The real reason of the non-apprehension was, that the servant was
shamed by the Lord. — This is the first oppo-
sition to 'Thy will be done.' Luke ex-
presses it, that they saw what would happen
—and asked, 'Lord, shall we smite with the
sword?' Then, while the other (for there
were but two swords in the company) was
waiting for the reply, the rash Peter, in
the very spirit of ch. xvi. 22, smote with the
sword—the weapon of the flesh:—an out-
break of the natural man no less notice-
able than that more noticed one which followed before morning. — All four evan-
gelists agree in this account. Luke and John are most exact—the latter giving the name of the slave,—Malchus.—The aim was a
deadly blow—taking up the sword of his own will
—taking that vengeance which belongs to
God, into his own hand. — ἐν μαχαρῖς ἀπολ.
is a command; not merely a future, but an
imperative future; a repetition by the Lord
in this solemn moment of Gen. ix. 6. See the parallel in Rev. xiii. 10 δεὶ ἀνάξ
ἐν μαχ. ἀποστάθημα. This should be
thought of by those well-meaning but
shallow persons who seek to abolish
the punishment of death in Christian states.
— John adds the words τὸ ποιηθὸν ὑδά-
τὶ καὶ τὸ παιδί ὁ μητὶ αὐτοῦ; on which see
notes strongly expressed of the Lord and His Patience are both shown
here.—διὰ δὲ—not, perhaps, so much from
the number of the apostles, who were now
ὁ ἡγέας, but from that of the then com-
pany, viz. the Lord and the eleven.—λεγέων—because they were Roman soldiers
who were taking Him. The complement of
the legion was about 6000 men. This
ὁ δὲ διάδωσαι shows the entire and continued free self-surrender of the Lord through-
out—and carries on the same truth as He
expressed John x. 18. — 54. ὁτί—no,
'but:' — How then—considering these the
so,—that I voluntarily abstain from invoking
such heavenly aid,—shall the Scriptures be
fulfilled, that thus it must be, if thou in thy
rashness useth the help of fleshly weapons?
— 53, 54 are peculiar to Matthew. — 55.
Mark begins this with an ἀποκριθεὶς; it
was an answer to their actions, not to their
words. Luke, here minutely accurate, in—
forms us that it was to the chief priests and στρατηγοῦς τοῦ Ἱησοῦ and elders, that the Lord said this. It is strange that the exact agreement of this classification with μεθ' ἡμῶν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ did not prevent Schleiermacher from casting a doubt on the truth of the circumstance (English Translation, p. 302). In His submission to be reckoned among the transgressors, the Lord yet protests against any suspicion that He could act as such.—καθ' ἡμᾶς—during the week past, and perhaps at other similar times.—καθέσθησαν (Matt. only) to indicate complete quiet and freedom from attack.—καθέσθησαν διδομένων is the greatest possible contrast to λειτουργία.—66. It is doubted whether these words are a continuation of the Lord's speech or a remark inserted by Matthew. The use of τοῦτο δὲ διὸν γεγονὼν in this Gospel would lead us to the latter conclusion: but when we recall that the Greek genus would lose all its completeness, and that Mark gives in different words the speech going on to this same purport, we must think to decide for the other view. Besides, if the remark were Matthew's, we should expect some particular citation, as is elsewhere his practice: see ch. i. 22. xxii. 4. Mark gives it elliptically, ἀλλ' ἵνα πληρωθῶσιν αἱ γραφαι. The Passion and death of Christ were especially ἡ τῶν γραφῶν πληρώσεως. In this they all found their central point. Compare the dying words of the Lord on the Cross,—νυκτὶ ταύτῃ,—with this His assertion. On the addition in Luke, see note there. —There is an admirable sermon of Schleiermacher (vol. ii. of the Berlin ed. of 1843, p. 104) on vv. 55, 56.—τὸν οὓς ἐμαθ. Some of them did not(keys far. Peter and John went after Him to the palace of the High-priest; John, ver. 15. On the additional circumstance in Mark, ver. 51, see note there.
tyrion kata toj 'Ienou, ojwes auton 'bavatwsoi, 60 kai ojch evron, * kai pollov "psevdoarmtron prooelthoun ojch evron#. usteron de prooelthonke duo psevdoarm- 
tures 61 iipon Outoj ef ejj Dýnumai kataluyai ton vaou 
toj theou kai dia triouj hmerwn oikođomouai auton. 62 kai anastas o arxieres eipen autw 'Oudèn apokrinj 
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oiws toj theou. 64 lgej oujw o 'Ienous 'Sv eipacas. 
plin lejw wjw, t ap arj ouwthe toj ujou toj antworoun 
kathmenen ek dejwv tis 'Dynamew kai 'Irjumewn evi 
twn nepljw toj oujanoj. 65 tote o arxieres 66 dierprh taj 
'maria autou lejwv oti ejblassymenei ti ti 'chant 
'ihumen martrwrwn; 67 dein wjv hkojaste twn 'blassymwn 68 
Esek. xxvii. 12. - ch. xii. 51. 
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sent that they sought false witness, not that 
they would not take true if they could get 
it, but that they knew it was not to be 
had?—This hearing is altogether omitted in 
Lute, and only the indignities following 
related, vv. 63—65. 60.] ojch evron, i.e. 
sufficient for the purpose, or perhaps, 
consistent with itself. See note on 'Isai, Mark 
ver. 56. 61.] See ch. xxvii. 40: the 
'psevdomar. consisted in giving that sense 
to His words which it appears by ch. xxvii. 
63 they knew they did not bear. There is 
perhaps a trace, in the different reports of 
Matt. and Mark, of the discrepancy between 
the witnesses. There is considerable 
difference between ton wajj ton 'Ijw, . . . , 
aivov, and ton v. tojous ton 'Ijw. . . . . 
alloj, 'anwopamjvov. The instance likewise 
of His zeal for the honour of the 
temple which had so lately occurred, might 
tend to perplex the evidence produced to 
the contrary.—63.) 'Dost thou not answer 
what it is which these testify against Thee?' 
i.e. wilt Thou give no explanation of 
the words alleged to have been used by Thee? 
The Lord was silent; for in answering He 
must have opened to them the meaning of 
these His words, which was not the work 
of this His hour, nor fitting for that audi 
ence.—63.) [LXX. xvi. 10 (see also the junction 
of 6 vios v. 6 with 'ehrjw om. must be 
presssed beyond the meaning which Caisaphas 
probably assigned to it—viz. the title given 
to the Messiah from the prophecies respecting Him. It is however 
a very different thing when the Lord by 
His answer affirms this, and invests the 
words with their fullest meaning and digni 
ity.—64.) By j'woj iju: is a simple 
assertion; this refers to the convictions and 
admessions of Caisaphas (see John xi. 49). The expression is, I think, never used, un 
less some reason is latent in, or to be gathered 
from, the words of the questioner. — 'Pjwv 
—'but,—i.e. there shall be a sign of the 
truth of what I say, over and above this 
confession of Mine.' — [wujv —the glor 
ification of Christ is by Himself said to 
begin with His betrayal, see John xiii. 31: 
'from this time'—from the accomplishment of 
this trial now proceeding.—In what fol 
lows, the whole process of the triumph of the 
Lord Jesus even till its end is con 
tained. The j'woj is to the council, the 
representatives of the chosen people, so 
soon to be judged by Him to whom all 
judgment is committed—the tis 'Dynamew 
in contrast to His present weakness— 'kath 
menon —even as they now sat to judge 
Him; and the 'ehrj w. v. v. rjw. looks 
forward to the awful time of the end, when 
every eye shall see Him.—66. In Levit. 
xxii. 10 (see also the junction of 6 vios v. 6) the 
H in heaven is ordered not to read his clothes: but that 
appears to apply only to mourning for the 
dead. In 1 Macc. xi. 71, and in Josephus, 
B. J. ii. 16, 4, we have instances of High-
priests rendering their clothes. On rending the clothes at hearing blasphemy, see 2 Kings xviii. 37. - 66.] This was not a formal condemnation, but only a previous vote or expression of opinion. That took place in the morning, see ch. xxvii. 1, especially Luke xxii. 66—71. - 67.] Luke gives these indignities, and in the same place as here, adding, what indeed might have been suspected, that it was not the members of the Sanhedrim, but the men who held Jesus in custody, who inflicted them on Him. — kolap* # is to strike with the fist. — bawl, generally, to strike a flat blow with the back of the hand—but also, and probably here, since another set of persons are described as doing it, striking with a staff.

69—75.] Mark xiv. 66—72. Luke xxii. 66—62. John xviii. 17, 18. 25—27. This narrative furnishes one of the clearest instances of the entire independency of the four Gospels of one another. In it, they all differ, and, supposing the denial to have taken place thrice, and only thrice, cannot satisfactorily be reconciled. The following table may serve to show what the agreements are, and what the differences are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MATTHEW</th>
<th>MARK</th>
<th>LUKE</th>
<th>JOHN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st denial</td>
<td>Sitting in the hall without, is charged by a maid servant with having been with Jesus the Galilean. 'I know not what thou sayest.'</td>
<td>Warming himself in the hall below, &amp;c. as Matt. goes out into the vestibule — cock crows. 'I know not; neither understand what thou sayest.'</td>
<td>Sitting πρὸς τὸ φῶς is recognized by the maid and charged — replies, 'Woman, I know Him not.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd denial</td>
<td>He has gone out into the porch—another maid sees him. This man also was with Jesus of Naz. He denies with an oath, 'I do not know the man.'</td>
<td>The same maid sees him again, and says, 'This man is of them.' He denies again.</td>
<td>Another (but a male servant) says: 'Thou also art of them.' Peter said, 'Man, I am not.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd denial</td>
<td>After a little while, the standers-by say, 'Surely thou art of them; for thy dialect betrayeth thee.' He began to curse and to swear: 'I know not the man.'</td>
<td>As Matth. 'Thou art a Galilean, and thy dialect agrees.'</td>
<td>After about an hour, another persisted saying, 'Truly this man was with Him, for he is a Galilean.' Peter said, 'Man, I know not what thou sayest.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immediately the cock crew, and Peter remembered, &amp;c. — and going out he wept bitterly.</td>
<td>A second time the cock crew, and Peter remembered, &amp;c. — and ἱππαλάω he wept.</td>
<td>Immediately while he was yet speaking the cock crew, and the Lord turned and looked on Peter, and Peter remembered, &amp;c. — and going out he wept bitterly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
προεθύνειν αὐτῷ μία παιδική λέγουσα Καὶ οὐ μήθα μετὰ Ησαύ τοῦ Γαλιλαίου. ἦν δὲ "ηρνήσατο ἐμπροσθεν τῶν λέγων Οὐκ ὁ οἶδα τί λέγεις. ἦν εξελθόντα δι' αὐτόν εἰς τὸν πυλώνα εἶδον [αὐτόν] ἄλλη, καὶ λέγειν τοῖς εἰκὲ [Καὶ] οὕτως ἦν μετὰ Ἰσαάκ τοῦ Ναρώμου. καὶ πάλιν ἠρνήσατο μεθ' ὄρκον στὶ οὐκ οἶδα τὸν ἀνθρώπον. μετὰ μικρὸν δὲ προελθόντες οἱ εἰσώντες ἐποῦ τῷ Πέτρῳ ἦν Ἀληθὸς καὶ οὐ εἰς αὐτῶν εἰ, καὶ γὰρ al. Εὐα. x. 57. Βιβ. 1. 39. 

On this table I would make the following remarks:—(1) It is possible to harmonize the accounts of the first denial, supposing us bound to harmonize: but even for this purpose we must employ a little dishonesty, for οὐκ ὁ οἶδα τί λέγεις, οὐκ ὁ οἶδα αὐτόν, and οὐκ εἰμι, are not the same answer; and if they are differing reports of an answer distinct from all three, or from some two of them, why should not the reports of the fact itself be viewed in the same light? (2) The ἄλλη of Matt., ἡ παιδική πάλιν of Mark, ἑρασός of Luke, are absolutely irreconcilable on any principle of common honesty, supposing the event related to be one and the same, and the accounts of it to be strictly accurate. The ξέβλ. εἰς τὸ προαλώνιον εἰς τῶν πυλῶν Matt. and Mark, considering that he was θηρμανθέντος before, are irreconcilable with the present ἑκτὸς κ. θηρ- 

It was said, as on the two other occasions; and thereby also, leaving room for the occasion of the third denial in the others to have actually happened. I should also take the discrepancies in this second denial in the three others, as leaving room to suppose that in neither of them is it accurately reported, but that it really arose out of the occasion which comes third in John. But it seems to me that the main point to be here insisted on is, the absolute impossibility of either of these Evangelists having had before him the narratives of the others. Let any unbiased mind compare the four, and imagine either of them writing his own account with the others before him, and at the same time receiving them as authentic. If we can imagine this, then no difficulty of any other kind need perplex us; for we have mastered one greater than all the rest. — 69.] ‘An oriental house is usually built round a quadrangular interior court; into which there is a passage (sometimes arched) through the front part of the house, closed next the street by a heavy folding gate, with a small wicket for single persons, kept by a porter. In the text, the interior court, often paved or flagged, and open to the sky, is the ᾧ, where the attendants made a fire; and the passage beneath the front of the house from the street to this court, is the προαλών or τυλών. The place where Jesus stood before the High-priest may have been an open room or place of audience on the ground-floor, in the rear or on one side of the court: such rooms, open in front, being customary.’ Robinson, Notes to Harmony, p. 226. — 73.] ἡ λαλᾶ—Weitstein (ad loc.) gives many examples of various provincial dialects of Hebrew. The Galileans could not pronounce properly the gutturals, con-


CHAP. XXVII. 1, 2.) Mark xiv. 1. Luke xxii. 66 (who probably mixes with this morning meeting of the Sanhedrin what took place at their earlier assembly), xxiii. 1. John xviii. 28. The object of this taking counsel was ἵστατος οὐκ—inde, to devise the best means of putting Him to death, on which step they had already determined.—Ποντ. II. α. τ. ἵστατος, see note on Luke iii. 1:—and on the reason of their taking Him to Pilate, on John xviii. 31. Pilate ordinarily resided at Cesarea, but during the feast, in Jerusalem. — 3—10.] Peculiar to Matthew. This incident does not throw much light on the motives of Judas. One thing we learn for certain—that the Lord's being condemned, which he inferred from His being handed over to the Roman Governor, worked in him remorse, and that suicide was the consequence. Whether this condemntation was expected by him or not, does not here appear; nor have we any means of ascertaining, except from the former sayings of our Lord respecting him. I cannot (see note on ch. xxvi. 14) believe that his intent was other than the darkest treachery. To suppose that the condemnation took him by surprise, seems to me to be inconsistent with the spirit of his own confession, ver. 4. There παραδοῦς οἷον ἀφτόν expresses his act—his accomplished purpose. The bitter feeling in him now is expressed by ἰησοῦν, of which he is vividly and dreadfully conscious, now that the result has been attained. Observe it was τὰ τρία ἐν αὐτῷ, which he brought back—clearly, in the view of the Evangelist, the price of the Lord's betrayal—not earnest-money merely;—for by this time, nay when he delivered his Prisoner at the house of Annas, he would have in that case received the rest.—ἐν τῷ ναῷ in the holy place, where the priests only might enter. We must conceive him as speaking to them without, and throwing the money into the ναῷ.—ἀνεπλάγη εἶ hanged, or strangled himself.' A different account is given Acts i. 18: see note there. A third account of
the end of Judas was current, which see cited there.—6.] They said this probably by analogy from Deut. xxiii. 18.—τοὺς ἁφὲ, the price given for shedding of blood, the wages of a murderer.—7.] τὸν ἀγ. τ. κεφ., the field of some well-known potter—purchased at so small a price probably from having been rendered useless for tillage by excavations—for clay.—τοὺς ξ., not for Gentiles, but for stronger Jews who came up to the feasts.—8.] ἀγ. αἰμ., ἀπέθανον. See Acts i. 8. —ἐστὶ τῆς στῆμα. This expression shows that a considerable time had elapsed since the event, before Matthew's Gospel was published.—9.] The citation is not from Jeremiah (see marg.), and is probably quoted from memory and inaccurately; we have similar mistakes in two places in the apology of Stephen, Acts vii. 14, —and in Mark ii. 26. Various means of evading this have been resorted to, which are not worth recounting. Jer. xviii. 1, 2, or perhaps Jer. xxxii. 6—12, may have given rise to the mistake. The quotation here is very different from the LXX, which see,—and not much more like the Hebrew.


the hearing before Pilate is the least circumstantial of the four—having however two remarkable additional particulars, vv. 19 and 24. John is the fullest in giving the words of the Lord. Compare the notes there.—11.] Before this, Pilate had come out and demanded the cause of him, being delivered up; the Jews not entering the Praetorium.—The primary accusation against Him seems to have been that He ἔλεγεν τοὺς χριστούς βασιλεῖαν. This is presupposed in the inquiry of this verse.—Ξοὶ λέγεις is not to be rendered as a doubtful answer—much less with Theophylact, as meaning ' Thou sayest it, not I!'—but as a strong affirmative—see above on ch. xxvi. 64.—12—14.] This part of the narrative occurs only in Mark besides, but is explained by Luke, ver. 5. The charges were, of exciting the people from Galilee to Jerusalem. On the mention of Galilee, Pilate sent Him to Herod, Luke, vv. 6—12.

15—18.] Mark xv. 6—15. Luke xxiii. 17—25. John xviii. 39, 40. In the substance of this account the four are in remarkable agreement. John gives merely a compendium, uniting in one these three
attempts of Pilate to liberate Jesus, and omitting the statement of the fact of Barabbas being liberated, and Jesus delivered to them. Our narrative contains two remarkable particulars, vv. 19 and 24, peculiar to itself. — 15.] We have no historic mention of this practice. Livy (v. 13) says of the feast of the Lectisternium, ‘vincits quoque dempta in eos dies vincula.’ — 16.] The name Barabbas, γεν γις, ‘son of his father,’ was not an uncommon one.—Before Barabbas some few MSS. of third class authority, and some ancient ones mentioned by Origen, also the Arm. Version, read Ιησούν, and the reading has found some advocates lately in Germany. Feder and Theslendorf have inserted it in the text, and Meyer (ed. 2) defends it. But however probable the omission of Ιησούν may have been, from respect to the name, the testimony is far too feeble to authorize the insertion of the word into the text. All the plays on this name Barabbas (e. g. τόν μόνον το βαραβάς αὐτῶν, τοῦ διαβόλου, λέγησαντο . . . . . . Theophylact, see also Olshausen in loc. vol. ii. p. 607) are utterly unworthy of serious exegesis. It does not appear why this man was Ιησούς. The murderers in the insurrection in which he was involved were many (Mark, ver. 7). — 17.] In John’s narrative, the suggestion of liberating Barabbas seems to come from the Jews themselves; but not necessarily so: he may only be giving, as before, a general report of what passed. The συννημένον αὐτῷ seems to imply that a great crowd had collected outside the Praetorium while the trial was going on. —18.] The whole narrative presupposes what this verse and the next distinctly assert, that Pilate was before acquainted with the acts and character of Jesus. — 19.] The θύμα was in a place called in Hebrew Gabatha, the Pavement—John xix. 13—where, however, Pilate does not go thither, till after the scourging and mocking of the soldiers. He may however have sat there when he came out in some of his previous interviews with the Jews.——4 γινεται αὐτῷ. It was the custom in Augustus’s time and since, for the governors of Provinces to take their wives with them abroad; in Tacitus Hist. 33 ff. Cecina attempted to pass a law forbidding it, he was vehemently opposed (by Drusus among others) and put down. We know nothing more of this woman than is here related.——δικαιος εκείνος is a term which shows that she knew the character for purity and sanctity which Jesus had. —20.] So Mark also. Luke and John merely give, that they all cried out, &c. The exciting of the crowd seems to have taken place while Pilate was receiving the message from his wife. —21.] ἄρα ὥσπερ not necessarily to the incitements of the Sanhedrists which he overheard (Meyer); the word is often redundant. —22.] They choose crucifixion as the ordinary Roman punishment for sedition, and because of their hate to Jesus. —23.] γαρ implies a sort of concession—a placing one’s
καὶ τὴν ἑγέρθηκε τὸν Ἱσσοῦν ἵνα σταυρωθῇ. 27 Τότε οἱ στρατιώται τοῦ ἱγμονὸς ἀρματῶν τοῦ Ἱσσοῦν ἔσται τὸ πραγμάτων συνήγαγον ἕπτα αὐτὸν ὁλῆν τὴν σπείραν. 28 καὶ ἔκδωσαν αὐτὸν περιπεθήκαν αὐτῷ ἡμέρας ὑπὸ διάβολον. 29 καὶ πλέξαντες στέφανον εἶς ἀκανθῶν εἶπεν ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλήν αὐτοῦ καὶ θᾶλαμον ἐν τῷ θέκῳ αὐτοῦ καὶ γυναῖκας ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ. 30 καὶ ἐμπύταιες εἰς αὐτῶν.
with many small and sharp spines; soft, round, and pliant branches; leaves much resembling ivy, of a very deep green, as if in designed mockery of a victor's wreath. *Travels, 268. 1706. (cited by F. M.)—κάλαμον. *for a sceptre.—δι' ἑαυτῆς, nominative with art. for vocative, a Hebrewism, see reff.—Here follows the exhibition of Jesus by Pilate, and his last attempt to release Him, John xix. 4—16.

31—34.] Mark xv. 20—23. Luke xxiii. 26—33. John xix. 16, 17. The four accounts are still essentially and remarkably distinct. Matthew's and Mark's are from the same source, but varied in expression, and in detail; Luke's and John's stand each alone; Luke's being the fullest, and giving us the deeply interesting address to the daughters of Jerusalem.—31.] Fecund. *for Matt. and Mark.—ἐξῆγα, ἐξέγοαν. *Mark. Execution was actually at Calvary, not out of the camp, see Num. xv. 36, or city, 1 Kings xxii. 13. Acts viii. 68. Heb. xiii. 11—13. Grotius brings examples to show that the same was the custom of the Romans. —32.] Previously Jesus had borne His own cross: John, ver. 17. So Plutarch, de sera numinis vindicta, ἱκανότατος τῶν κακούργων ἱκανοί τούτον αὐτοῦ σταυροῦ, c. ix.—We have no data to ascertain any further particulars about this Simon of Cyrene. The only assumption which we are perhaps justified in making, is that he was afterwards known in the Church as a convert; see note on Mark, ver. 21. He was coming from the country, Luke, ver. 26. On ἄγωνος see note at v. 41. —33.] Ἐαυτῶν. *in Hebrew ἐαυτῶν, a skull: the name is by Jerome, and generally, explained from its being the usual place of executions and abounding with skulls—not however unburied, which was not allowed. This last consideration raises an objection to the explanation,—and as the name does not import κρανίων τότος, but κρανίων τ. or simply κρανίων (Luke), many, among whom are Cyril of Jerusalem, Reland, Paulus, Lücke, De Wette, Meyer, &c., understand it as applying to the shape of the hill or rock. But neither does this seem satisfactory, as we have no analogy to guide us (Meyer's justification of the name from κρανίων, or κρανίων, a wood near Corinth, does not apply: for that is so called from κρανίων, the cornel tree—De Wette), and no such hill or rock is known to have existed.—As regards the situation, I cannot help thinking that Williams ('The Holy City,' Lond. 1846), in the midst of much that is objectionable in the spirit of his book, has made a very strong case for the commonly-received site of Calvary and the sepulchre. —34.] It was customary to give a stupefying drink to criminals on their way to execution: of which the Lord would not partake, having by tasting it ascertained its purpose.—In Mark's account it is ἤμαρσανοις ὅπως—and though ὅπως and δόξα might mean the same, ἄμαρσανοις and μετὰ χρ. μεμυ. cannot. We may observe here, (and if the remark be applied with caution and reverence, it is a most useful one,) how Matt. often adopts in his narrative the very words of prophecy, where one or more of the other Evangelists give the matter of fact detail; see above on ch. xxvi. 15, and compare with this verse Ps. lix. 21.

35—38.] Mark xv. 24—28. Luke xxiii. 32—34. 35. John xix. 18—24. The four accounts are distinct from one another, and independent of any one source in common. —35.] Ἐπικαταστάσεις. The cross was an upright pale or beam, intersected

by a transverse one at right angles, generally in the shape of a T. In this case, from the title being placed over the Head, the upright beam probably projected above the horizontal one, as usually represented. To this cross the criminal, being stripped of his clothes, was fixed by nails driven through the hands and (not always, nor perhaps generally, though certainly not seldom—see note at Luke xxiv. 40) through the feet, separate or united. The body was not supported by the nails, but by a piece of wood which passed between the legs—ειρ ζ ειναγή η οι σταυρομίνων, Justin Mart. c. Tryph. p. 318. On the rest of the verse see notes on John.

The words omitted in the text are clearly interpolated from John, ver. 24, with just the phrase το μθην υπό (or ανα) του προφήτου assimilated to Matthew's usual form of citation. — 36.] ινθήου—this was usual, to prevent the friends taking crucified persons down. There were four soldiers, John, ver. 23; a centurion and three others.— 37.] ινθθ.—is not to be taken as a plasq. perf.—Matthew finishes relating what the soldiers did, and then goes back to the course of the narrative. 'The soldiers' need not even be the nominative case to ινθθ. The 'title' appears to have been written by Pilate (see below) and sent to be affixed on the cross. It is not known whether the affixing of this title was customary. In Dio Cassius (cited incorrectly by Meyer) we read of such a title being hung round the neck of a criminal on his way to execution. On the difference in the words of the inscription itself it is hardly worth while to comment, except to remark, that the advocates for the verbal and literal exactness of each gospel may here find an undoubted example of the absurdity of their view, which may serve to guide them in less plain and obvious cases. A title was written, containing certain words; not four titles, all different, but one, differing probably from all of these four, but certainly from three of them. Let us bear this in mind when the narratives of words spoken, or events, differ in a similar manner. Respecting the title, see further on John, vv. 20—22. These thieves were led out with Jesus, and crucified by the same soldiers—not, as Meyer says, by another band.

39—44.] Mark xv. 29—32. Luke xxiii. 35—37. 39—43. John xix. 25—27. Our narrative and that of Mark are from a common source. Luke's is wholly distinct. The whole of these indignities are omitted by John.— 39.] έ ψαρω. These words say nothing as to its being a working-day, or as to the situation of the spot. A matter of so much public interest would be sure to attract a crowd, among whom we find, ver. 41, the chief priests, scribes, and elders. These passers-by were the multitude going in and out of the city, some coming to see, others returning.
EYAGGELION XXVII.

Text not provided in the image.
never committed—and the conflict at Gethsemane was renewed. 'He Himself,' as the Berlemburg Bible remarks (Stier, vi. 548) 'becomes the Expositor of the darkness, and shows what it imports.' In the words however, 'My God'—there speaks the same union with the Divine Will, and abiding in the Everlasting Covenant purpose, as in those, 'Not my will, but Thine.'—These are the only words on the Cross related by Matt. and Mark—and they are related by none besides. —The form θαῦμα is very seldom used,—only in Judg. xvi. 28. Ezr. ix. 6. The LXX here has the usual vocative ὅθος: as also Mark. — 47.] This was not said by the Roman soldiers, who could know nothing of Elias; nor was it a misunderstanding of the Jewish speculators, who must have well understood the import of ἁλὴ: nor again was it said in any apprehension, from the supernatural darkness, that Elias might really come (Olah.); but it was replied in intended mockery, as óφος clearly indicates.—This is one of the cases where, in advocating of a Hebrew Gospel of Matthew, we are obliged to suppose that the Greek translator has retained the original words, in order to make the reason of the reply clear. — 48.] This was on account of the words 'I thirst' uttered by the Lord; see John, ver. 28. Mark's account is somewhat different; there the same person gives the vinegar and utters the scoff which follows. This is quite intelligible—contempt mingled with pity would doubtless find a type among the by-standers. There is no need for assuming that the soldiers offering vinegar in Luke, ver. 37, is the same incident as this. Since then the bodily state of the Redeemer had greatly changed; and what was then offered in mockery might well be now asked for in the agony of death, and received when presented, as in our text. I would not however absolutely deny that Lake may be giving a less accurate detail; and may represent this incident by his ver. 37. The ὅφος is the poesia, sour wine, or vinegar and water, the ordinary drink of the Roman soldiers. On the other particulars, see notes on John. — 49.] If we take our account as the accurate one, the rest—in mockery—call upon this person to desist, and wait for Elias to come to save Him: if that of Mark, the giver of the drink calls upon the rest (also in mockery) to let this suffice, and wait, &c. The former seems more probable.—I cannot so confidently pronounce the addition found here in B C L, &c., to be an interpolation from John, as De Wette and others have done. For if so, a considerable difficulty would be created,—as we should here have the piercing with the spear occurring before, and indeed occasioning, the death of Jesus. This is certainly very improbable; but we can hardly imagine an interpolator committing such a blunder, if it be one. The history of the addition must remain obscure, in our entire ignorance of the early history of the text. — 50.] It has been doubted whether the τῆλεσα of John (ver. 30) and πᾶρερ, ἐκ τῆς σαῦρας, τοῦ ἔλεοος of Luke (ver. 46) are to be identified with this crying out, or to be taken as distinct from it. But a nearer examination of the case will set the doubt at rest. The παράλλος of John implies the speech in Luke; which accordingly was that uttered in this φωνῇ μεγάλῃ. The τῆλεσα was said before; see notes on John.
Holies from the holy place, Exod. xxvi. 33. Heb. ix. 2, 3. This circumstance has given rise to much incredulous comment, and that even from men like Schleiermacher. A right and deep view of the O. T. symbolism is required to furnish the key to it; and for this we look in vain among those who set aside that symbolism entirely. — That was now accomplished, which was the One and Great Antitype of all those sacrifices offered in the holy place to gain, as on the great day of atonement (for that day may be taken as the representation of their intent), entrance into the holiest place, — the typical presence of God. What those sacrifices (ceremonially) procured for the Jews (the type of God’s universal Church) through their High-priest, was now (really) procured for all men by the sacrifice of Him, who was at once the victim and the High-priest. When Schleiermacher and De Wette assert that no use is made of this event in the Epistle to the Hebrews, they surely cannot have remembered, or not have deeply considered Heb. x. 19—21. Besides, suppose it had been referred to plainly and by name — what would then have been said? Clearly, that this mention was a later insertion, to justify that reference. And almost this latter, Strauss, recognizing the allusion in Heb., actually does. Schleiermacher also asks, how could the event be known, seeing none but priests could have witnessed it, and they would not be likely to betray it? To say nothing of the almost certain spread of the rumour, has he forgotten that (Acts vi.) “a great company of the priests were obedient unto the faith”? Neander, who gives this last consideration its weight (but only as a possibility, that some priests may have become converts, and apparently without reference to the above fact), has an unworthy and shuffling note (L. J. p. 757), ending by quoting two testimonies, one apocryphal, the other rabbinical, from which he concludes that ‘some matter of fact lies at the foundation of this according to him) mythical adjunct! — ἡ γὰρ κοιναθή — not an ordinary earthquake, but connected with the two next clauses, and finding in them its explanation and justification. — at τετρα ἀγαλματισμὸν. It would not be right altogether to reject the testimonies of travellers to the fact of extraordinary rents and fissures in the rocks near the spot. Of course those who know no other proof of the historical truth of the event, will not be likely to take this as one; but to us, who are firmly convinced of it, every such trace, provided it be soberly and honestly ascertained, is full of interest. — 52. καὶ τὰ μνημεία ABCD ἀνεκέςθησαν, καὶ πολλὰ σώματα τῶν κεκομιμένων ἁγίων ἡγέρθη — καὶ εξελθόντες ἐκ τῶν μνημείων μετὰ τὴν ἐγεραίν αὐτοῦ ἠσθλῆν οἰς τὴν ἁγίαν πόλιν καὶ x here only. Ps cx xxviii. 1. τὴν ᾧ ἑστιν, καὶ αἱ πέτραι ἐσχάθησαν, καὶ τὰ μνημεία ABCD ἀνεκέςθησαν, καὶ πολλὰ σώματα τῶν κεκομιμένων ἁγίων ἡγέρθη καὶ εξελθόντες ἐκ τῶν μνημείων μετὰ τὴν ἐγεραίν αὐτοῦ ἠσθλῆν οἰς τὴν ἁγίαν πόλιν καὶ x here only. Ps cx xxviii. 1.
is the result—not the immediate accompaniment, of the opening of the tombs. It is to prevent this being supposed, that the qualification μετ. τ. ί. αὐτ. is added. 

Τόν σωμαν καὶ τά γεν. = ήτινας κράτας ἔπευγεν Mark. Does the latter of these look as if compiled from the former? The circumstances of our vv. 61—53, except the rending of the veil, are unknown to Mark, of the minute accuracy of whose account I have no doubt. His report is that of one man—and that man, more than probably, a convert. Matthew’s is of many, and represents their general impression. Luke’s is also general. — τό γενόμενον points to the crying out, as in Mark—but see notes there. — θεῷ νόμος ἢ— which the Centurion had heard that Ηεγεν Ημίσεται out for, John xix. 7. It cannot be doubtful, I think, that he used these words in the Jewish sense—and with some idea of that which they implied. When Meyer says that he must have used them in a heathen sense, meaning a hero or demi-god, we must first be shown that θεῷ νόμος was ever so used. I believe Luke’s to be a different report: see notes there. 

54 ἵππων, the historic asor, in a relative clause, not for the pluperfect; see Acts i. 2. John xi. 30 al. fr. and Winer, § 41, 5, end. — ἡ Μαγδάλην, from Magdala: see ch. xv. 39. She is not to be confounded with Mary who anointed the Lord, John xii. 1, nor with the woman who did the same, Luke vii. 36: see Luke viii. 2. — Μαρία τ. Ἰακ. the wife of Alphæus or Clopas, John xix. 26: see note on ch. xiii. 55. — Ιακ. Mark adds τοῦ μικροῦ, to distinguish him from the son of Zebodeæ. — μικρ. τ. κ. Ηλ. Σαμ. — Χαλωμᾶ, Mark. Both omit Mary the mother of Jesus:—but we must remember, that if we are to take the group as described at this moment, she was not present, having been, as I believe (see note on John, ver. 26), led away by the beloved Apostle immediately on the speaking of the words, 'Behold thy mother.' And if this view be objected to, yet she could not be named here, nor in Mark, except separately from these three—for she could not have been one of the διακονοῦσαι αὐτῆς. — There must have been also another group, of His disciples, within sight;—e.g. Thomas, who said, 'Except I see in His hands the print of the nails,' &c.—and generally those to whom He afterwards showed His hands and feet as a proof of His identity. 

57—61. Mark xv. 43—47. Luke xxiii. 50—56. John xix. 38—42. The four accounts, agreeing in substance, are remarkably distinct and independent, as will appear by a close comparison of them. — 57.] Before sunset, at which time the sabbath, and that an high day, begun: see Deut. xxii. 23. The Roman custom was for the bodies to remain on the crosses till devoured by birds of prey. —Non passas in cruce corvos.' Hor. Epist. i. 16, 48. On the other hand Josephus, B. J. iv. 5, 2, says, 'Ἰουδαίων περὶ τὰς γαρφὶς πρόκειται ποιομένων ὡς καὶ τοὺς ἐκ καταπέδεις . . . ανασταυρομένων πρὸς δύναμις ἁλίων καθελεῖν καὶ βατίνων. — ἤλθεν' probably to the Praetorium. Meyer suppose, to the place of execution; which is also possible, and seems supported by the ἤλθεν φῶς καὶ ἦν John, ver. 38, and ἦλθε δὲ καὶ . . . ver. 39, which certainly was to Golgotha—παλαιόντος—he was also a counselor, i.e. one of the Sanhedrim: see Mark, ver. 43. Luke, ver. 51. — Σαμαρεύων. — Opinion are divided as to whether this was Rams in Benjamin (see ch. ii. 18), or Rama (Ramaethaim) in Ephraim, the birth-place of...
Samuel. The form of the name is more like the latter: see note on Luke.—68.] The repetition of τὸ σῶμα is remarkable, and indicates a common origin, in this verse, with Mark, who repeats it on account of the expression of Pilate's surprise, and the change of subject between. —69.] John (ver. 39) mentions the arrival of Nicodemus with an hundred pound weight of myrrh and aloes, in which also the Body was wrapped. The three know nothing of this—nor Matthew and John of the subsequent design of the women to embalm it. What wonder if, at such a time, one party of disciples should not have been aware of the doings of another? It is possible that the women, who certainly knew what had been done with the Body (see ver. 61), may have intended to bestow on it more elaborate care, as whatever was done this night was not expected,—see John, ver. 41, 42. —69.] Matt. alone relates that it was Joseph's own tomb. John, that it was in a garden, and in the place where He was crucified. All except Mark notice the nearness of the tomb. John does not mention, and apparently is not aware, that it belonged to Joseph—yet the expression ἐν φῷ ὀβιδὴν ὀβείς ἱππαῖ looks as if he knew more than he has thought it necessary to state. His reason for the Body being laid there, is that it was near, and the Preparation rendered his care necessary. But then we may well ask, How should the body of an executed person be laid in a new tomb, without the consent of the owner being first obtained? And who so likely to provide a tomb, as he whose pious care for the Body was so eminent?—All that we can determine respecting the sepulchre from the data here furnished is, (1) That it was not a natural cave, but an artificial excavation in the rock. (2) That it was not cut downwards after the manner of a grave with us, but horizontally, or nearly so, into the face of the rock—this I conceive to be implied in προκύπτοντας λίθον τῷ θύρα του μυ. (3) That it was in the spot where the crucifixion took place.—61.] Luke mentions more generally the women who came with Him from Galilee; and specifies that they prepared spices and ointments, and rested the sabbath-day, according to the commandment.—69. τῇ ἀρ. not on that night, but on the next day.—A difficulty has been found in its being called the day μετὰ τής παρασκευῆς, considering that it was itself the sabbath, and the greatest sabbath in Israel—least not to go to Pilate on the sabbath,—but in the evening, after the termination of the sabbath. Had the Evangelist said ἦσε ὁ λτ τῶν σάββατων, the incongruity would at once appear of such an application being made on the sabbath—and he therefore designates the day as the first after that, which, as the day of the Lord's death, the παρασκευή, was uppermost in his mind. The only really strange circumstance is, that he has not so called it before, but now for the first time.—The narrative following has been much impugned, and its historical accuracy very generally given up by even the best of the German commentators (Olahausen, Meyer; also De Wette, Hase, and others).
The chief difficulties found in it seem to be: (1) How should the chief-priests, &c. know of His having said, 'in three days I will rise again,' when the saying was hid even from His own disciples? The answer to this is easy. The meaning of the saying may have been, and was, hid from the disciples; but the fact of its having been said could be no secret. Not to lay any stress on John ii. 19, we have the direct prophecy of Matt. xii. 40—and besides this, there would be a rumour current, through the intercourse of the Apostles with others, that He had been in the habit of so saying. As to the understanding of the words, we must remember that hatred is keener sighted than love—that the raising of Lazarus would show, what sort of a thing rising from the dead was to be—and that the fulfilment of the Lord's announcement of His crucifixion would naturally lead them to look further, to what He had more announced. (2) How should the women, who were solicitous about the removal of the stone, not have been still more so about its being sealed, and a guard set? The answer to this has been given above—they were not aware of the circumstance, because the guard was not set till the evening before. There would be no need of the application before the approach of the third day—it is only made for a watch of the τρίτη ἡμέρα, ver. 64—and it is not probable that the circumstance would transpire that night—certainly it seems not to have done so. (3) That Gamaliel was of the council, and if such a thing as this, and its sequel ch. xviii. 11—16, had really happened, he need not have expressed himself doubtfully, Acts v. 39, but would have been certain that this was from God. But, first, it does not necessarily follow that every member of the Sanhedrim was present and applied to Pilate, or even had they done so, that all bore a part in the act of ch. xxviii. 12. One who, like Joseph, had not consented to their deed before, and we may safely say that there were others such, would naturally withdraw himself from further proceedings against the person of Jesus. Besides, I am not by any means sure that Gamaliel does express himself doubtfully in Acts v. 39. I can well suppose him convinced by what had happened, and implying, but in cautious words, this strong conviction. (4) Had this been so, the three other Evangelists would not have passed over so important a testimony to the Resurrection. But surely we cannot argue in this way—for thus every important fact narrated by one Evangelist alone must be rejected—e.g. (which stands in much the same relation) the satisfaction of Thomas—and other such narrations. Till we know much more about the circumstances under which, and the scope with which, each Gospel was compiled, all à priori arguments of this kind are good for nothing. — 65 ] "Exeunt more naturally, indicative, 'Ye have.' But then the question arises, What guard had they? and if they had, why go to Pilate? Perhaps we must understand some detachment placed at their disposal during the feast—but there does not seem to be any record of such a practice. That the guards were under the Sanhedrin is plain from ch. xxviii. 11, where they make their report (at noon, with the quod imperasset, Tacitus, Ann. i. 8), not to Pilate, but to the chief-priests. To take Exeunt as imperative (De Wette, Meyer) is very harsh; it should rather be λαypiata. — de oisav... as you know how? 'in the best manner you can.' There is no irony in the words, as has been supposed.—μετά belongs to ἡσαλλω, and implies the means whereby, as in reff.—The sealing was by means of a cord or string passing across the stone at the mouth of the sepulchre, and fastened at either end to the rock by sealing-clay.

Matthew means the evening of the sabbath, though ἄναγραφος is used of the day beginning at sunset (Luke xxiii. 54, and note). It is best to interpret a doubtful expression in union with the other testimonies, and to suppose that here both the day and the breaking of the day are taken in their natural, not their Jewish sense. μιαν σαββ. is a Hebraism; the Rabbinical writings use καμιν, καμιν, καμιν, &c., affixing ἀναγραφόμενος to each, for Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, &c. — Μαθ. ἑως Μ. μ. Κ. & Α. Μ. In Mark, Salome also. John speaks of Mary Magdalene alone. See note there. — ἡμερήσιον τ. τ. It was to anoint the Body, for which purposes they had that morning bought ointments and spices, Mark. — In Mark it is after the rising of the sun; in John, while yet dark: in Luke, at dim dawn: the two last agree with our text. — 2. This must not be taken as pluperfect, which would be altogether inconsistent with the text. — καὶ ἰδοὺ ὁ ἀρχὴ ἔγραψαν, must mean that the women were witnesses of the earthquake, and that which happened. — σωφρόνος was not properly an earthquake, but was the sudden opening of the tomb by the descending Angel, as the γὰρ shows. The rolling away was not done naturally, but by a shock, which was σωφρόνος. — It must not be supposed that the Resurrection of the Lord took place at this time, as sometimes imagined, and represented in paintings. It had taken place before. — ισχύρος are the words of the Angel. It was not for Him, to whom (see John xix. 20, 26) the stone was no hindrance, but for the women and His disciples, that it was rolled away. — 3.] ἢ ἵω, not his form, but his appearance; not in shape, (as some would explain it away,) but in brightness. — 4.] ὁ τοῦ ἐοί. subjective, 'of him;' as John vii. 13. Heb. ii. 18. — 5.] In Mark, a young man in a white robe was sitting in the tomb on the right hand: in Luke two men in shining garments (see Acts i. 10) appeared (τίτα.
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σταυρωμένον Ἰησοῦ. ὅσον ἐστὶν ὄς ἡγιάθη γὰρ
καθός εἰπε. ἑάνε ἐδεί τοῦ τόπου ὅπου ἐκεῖνο τὸν θύρας.
καὶ ταχὺ προευθείασα εἶπα τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ὅτι
ἡγέθη ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐπράγει ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν
Γαλιλαίαν· ἐκεῖ αὐτῶν ὤφησθε. ἰδοὺ ἔπον ὄμνιν, ὅσον
* ἐξελθοῦσα ταχὺ ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου μετὰ φῶς καὶ*
χαρὰς μεγάλης ἔδραμον ἀπαγγέλλαι τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ.

ἰδοὺ om. D abc. — 8. ἀπέλυσα B C L. —
txt A D. στησάν] to them. John relates, that Mary Magdalen looked into the tomb and saw (but this must have been afterwards) two angels in white sitting one at the head, the other at the feet where the Body had lain. All attempts to deny the angelic appearances or ascribe them to later tradition, are dishonest and absurd. That related in John is as definite as either of the others, and he certainly had it from Mary Magdalen herself. — ὁ τρίς is emphatic, addressed to the women. — 6.] καθός εἰπε is further expanded in Luke, v. 6, 7. See ch. xvi. 21. xvii. 23. — δὲ κύριος (see reff.) is emphatic; — gloriosi appellatio, Bengel. —
*] This appearance in Galilee had been formed as before His death, see ch. xxvi. 32. It is to be observed that Matthew records only this one appearance to the Apostles, and in Galilee. It is hardly possible that this can be the entire testimony of Matthew himself: for it is not likely that he would have omitted those important appearances in Jerusalem when the apostles were assembled, John xx. 19. 26, or that one which was closed by the Ascension. Our account is evidently fragmentary, consisting perhaps of the actual testimony of Matthew as far as it goes, — but not to be for a moment taken as complete (see below on ver. 29). — The προάγει here is not to be understood as implying the journeying on the part of the Lord Himself. It is cited from His own words, ch. xxvi. 32, and there, as here, merely implies that He would be there when they arrived. It has a reference to the collecting of the flock which had been scattered by the smiting of the Shepherd; see John x. 4. — ἐκεῖ αὐτῶν ὄψατο is determined, by καθά με δύναται below, to be part of the message to the disciples; not spoken to the women directly, but certainly indirectly including them. The idea of their being merely messengers to the Apostles without bearing any share in the promise, is against the spirit of the context: see further in note on ver. 17. — ἰδοὺ ἔποι ὄνιν is to give solemnity to the command. These words are peculiar to Matthew, and are a mark of accuracy. — 8.] μετὰ φῶς, ἥς ἐν ἁ οὐ παραδόθης μετὰ χαρᾶ ὅρε ἥς ἐνομαν ἐπαγελλέον, Ephes. —
9.] Neither Mark nor Luke recount, or seem to have been aware of, this appearance. Mark even says oúdei oúdei εἶπον ἐποιεῖτο χαλαρότερο γάρ. But (see above) it does not therefore follow that the narratives are inconsistent. Mark's account (see note there) is evidently broken off suddenly; and Luke's (see also note there) appears to have been derived from one of those who went to Emmaus, who had evidently but an imperfect knowledge of what happened before they left the city. We must at the same time remember that the genuineness of the words ὅς δὲ ἐκ τῷ ἀπ. τ. μ. αὐτοῦ is by no means certain, and ὅς is never used of time by Matthew. All this being taken into account, we may fairly require that the judgment should not be suspended in lack of further means of solving the difficulty. — ἐκατ. τ. π. partly in fear and as suppliants, for the Lord says μὴ φοβίζωσίς, — but showing also the χαρά with which that fear was mixed (ver. 8). — joy at having recovered Him whom they loved. — προάγει αὐτ. 'Jesum ante passionem alti potius alieniores adorant quam discipuli.' Bengel. — 10. τοῖς ἄδελφοι, so also to Mary Magdalen, John xx. 17.—The repetition of this injunction
by the Lord has been thought to indicate that this is a portion of another narrative inwoven here, and may possibly belong to the same incident as that in ver. 7. But all probability is against this: the passages are distinctly consecutive, and moreover both are in the well-known style of Matthew (e. g. καὶ Ἰωάννης in both). There is perhaps more probability that this may be the same appearance as that in John xx. 11—18, on account of the μὴ μονοὶ ἀπέτυχαν there and τοὺς διὰ φήμα του ἀπετύχαν,—but in our present imperfect state of information, this must remain a mere probability.

11—15.] Peculiar to Matthew.—11. τὸς Π. 8. as.] While they were going.—12. συνεχέστερες, i. e. ὁ ἄρχων, a change of the subject of the sentence, as in Luke xix. 4 al. This was a meeting of the Sanhedrin, but surely hardly an official and open one; does not the form of the narrative rather imply that it was a secret compact between those (the majority) who were bitterly hostile to Jesus? The circumstance that Joseph had taken no part in their counsel before, leads us to think that others may have withdrawn themselves from the meeting, e. g. Gamaliel, who could hardly have consented to such a measure as this.—14.] not only 'come to the ears of the governor,' but 'be borne witness of before the governor,' come before him officially: i. e. if a stir be made, and you be in trouble about it: see reff. —15.] Justin Martyr, Dial. c. Tryph. p. 335, says, καὶ οὐ μόνον οὐ μετανόησαν μὴ δωμάτεις αὐτῶν ἀναστάτη ἐκ μιρρορίων, ἀλλὰ ἄνθρωπος χειροτονησάντος ἐκλεκτός, εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν πάθους ἤπαθεν, εὐθυμοῦσαν τὴν κλήσην ἐπέκλεισαν, καὶ ἀνεβαίνοντες ἴησον τινὸς Γαλατίαν πλάνου (see ch. xxvii. 63) by σταυρωσάν-

**The text is a continuation of a Greek text, possibly an extract from a larger work. It appears to be discussing an event involving the Lord, with references to earlier parts of the New Testament (such as John and Matthew). The passage seems to be a narrative and possibly a commentary on the events described.**
ment of this meeting, and the repetition of that announcement by the angel, and by the Lord, that it probably included all the disciples of Jesus; at least, all who would from the nature of the case be brought together. — 18.] proesel. They appear to have first seen Him at a distance, probably on the top of the mountain. This whole introduction, proesel. ἐκεῖ. ἐν τῇ ἐγκαίρῳ. αὐτὸν, forbids us to suppose that the following words are a mere compendium of what was said on various occasions. Like the opening of ch. v., it carries with it a direct assertion that what follows was spoken then, and there.— ἐξείρησα. The words are a reference to Dan. vii. 14 LXX, which compare. Given,—by the Father, in the fulfilment of the Eternal Covenant, in the Unity of the Holy Spirit. Now first is this covenant, in its fulness, proclaimed upon earth. The Resurrection was the sign that the Father was taking possession of the Inheritance.— But the Inheritance is already won; and the Heir is only remaining on earth for a temporary purpose—the assuring His joint-heirs of the verity of His Possession. ‘All power in heaven and earth;’ see Eph. i. 20—23. Col. ii. 10. Heb. i. 6. Rom. xiv. 9. Phil. ii. 9—11. 1 Pet. iii. 22.— 19.] οὗ is probably a gloss, but an excellent one. It is the glorification of the Son by the Father through the Spirit which is the foundation of the Church of Christ in all the world. And when we baptize into the Name (i.e. into the fulness of the consequence of the objective covenant, and the subjective confession) of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, it is this which forms the ground and cause of our power to do so—that this flesh of man, of which God hath made πάντα τὰ ἰδήν, is glorified in the Person of our Redeemer, through Whom we all have access by one Spirit to the Father.—τῷ. μαθ. Demostably, this was not understood as spoken to the Apostles only, but to all the brethren. πάντες διεκάρμασαν. . . . πάντα τῶν ἀποστόλων (Acts vi. 2). οὗ μὲν οὖν διεκαρμάτων εἰδὴν, διεκαρμάτων τῶν λόγων (ibid. ver. 4).—There is peculiar meaning in μαθητεύεσθαι. All power is given Me—go therefore and . . . subdue? Not so: the purpose of the Lord is to bring men to the knowledge of the truth—to work on and in their hearts, and lift them up to be partakers of the Divine Nature. And therefore it is not ‘subdue,’ but ‘make disciples of,’ (see below.) πάντα τὰ ἐννοια. again is closely connected with πάντα ἐννοια ὑπὲρ γῆς. —πάντα τὰ ἐννοια 'all nations,' including the Jews. It is absurd to imagine that in these words of the Lord there is implied a rejection of the Jews, in direct variance with His commands elsewhere, and also with the world-wide signification of ἐννοια of γῆς above. Besides, the (temporary) rejection of the Jews consisited in the fact that they were not numbered among πάντα τὰ ἐννοια, and not a peculiar people any longer; and are become, in the providence of God, the subjects of that preaching, of which by original title they ought to have been the proclaimers. We find the first preachers of the gospel, so far from excepting the Jews, uniformly bearing their testimony to them first.—With regard to the difficulty which has been raised on these words,—that if they had been thus spoken by the Lord, the Apostles would never have had any doubt about the admission of the Gentiles into the Church,—I would answer, with Ebrard, Stier, De Wette, Meyer, and others, ‘that the Apostles never had any doubt whatever about admitting Gentiles,—only whether they should not be circumcised first.’ In this command the prohibition of ch. x. 5 is for ever removed.—βαπτίζομεν] The μαθητεύεσθαι consists of two parts—the initiatory, admissory rite, and the subsequent teaching. It is much to be regretted that the rendering of μαθ. ‘teach,’ has in our Bibles clouded the meaning of
these important words. It will be observed that in the Lord's words, as in the Church, the process of ordinary discipleship is from baptism to instruction—i.e. is, admission in infancy to the covenant, and growing up into υἱοί τῶν πάντων κ. τ. λ.—the exception being, what circumstances rendered so frequent in the early Church, instruction before baptism, in the case of adults. On this we may also remark that baptism as known to the Jews included, just as it does in the Acts (ch. xvi. 15. 33) whole households,—wives and children.—As regards the command itself, no unprejudiced reader can doubt that it regards the outward rite of baptism, so well known in this gospel as having been practised by John, and received by the Lord Himself. And thus it was immediately, and has been ever since, understood by the Church. As regards all attempts to explain away this sense, we may say,—even setting aside the testimony furnished by the Acts of the Apostles,—that it is in the highest degree improbable that the Lord should have given, at a time when He was summing up the duties of His Church in such weighty words, a command couched in figurative or ambiguous language— one which He must have known would be interpreted by His disciples, now long accustomed to the rite and its name, otherwise than He intended it.—εἷς τ. ἤμ. . . . . ] Reference is apparently made to the Baptism of the Lord Himself, where the whole Three Persons of the Godhead were in manifestation.—Not τὸ δόματος—but τὸ δόμα—setting forth the Unity of the Godhead.—It is unfortunate again here that our English Bibles do not give us the force of this sic. It should have been 'into,' (as in Gal. iii. 27 al.) both here and in 1 Cor. v. 2, and wherever the expression is used. It imports, not only a subjective recognition hereafter by the child of the truth implied in τὸ δόμα κ. τ. λ. but an objective admission into the covenant of Redemption—a putting on of Christ. Baptism is the contract of esposal (Eph. v. 26) between Christ and His Church. Our word 'in' being retained both here and in our formula of Baptism, it should always be remembered that the Sacramental declaration is contained in this word; that it answers (as Stier has well observed, vi. 902) to the τὸν κατὰ the other Sacrament. On the difference between the baptism of John, and Christian baptism,—see notes on Acts xix. 1—5, and the inferences and references there regarding infant baptism.—20.] Even in the case of the adult, this teaching must, in greater part, follow his baptism; though as we have seen, (on ver. 19,) in his exceptional case, some of it must go before. For this teaching is nothing less than the building up of the whole man into the obedience of Christ. In these words, inasmuch as the then living disciples could not teach all nations, does the Lord find the office of Preachers in His Church,—with all that belongs to it,—the duties of the minister, the school teacher, the scripture reader. This 'teaching' is not merely the εὐαγγελία of the gospel—not mere proclamation of the good news—but the whole catechetical office of the Church upon and in the baptized.—καὶ ὅσον . . . . ] These words imply and set forth the Ascension, the manner of which is not related by our Evangelist.—ἐγώ—Ι., in the fullest sense. Not the Divine Presence, as distinguished from the Humanity, of Christ. His Humanity is with us likewise. The vine lives in the branches. Stier remarks (vi. 964) the contrast between this 'I am with you,' and the view of Nicodemus (John iii. 2) 'no man can do these miracles—except God be with him.'—μάθετε ὑμεῖς . . . .] mainly, by the Promise of the Father which He has poured out on His Church. But the Presence of the Spirit is the effect of the Presence of Christ—and the Presence of Christ is part of the ἀποκάλυψις above—the effect of the well-pleasing of the Father. So that the mystery of His name θεονόμιστος is fulfilled—God is with us. And τὰς τῆς ἡμέρας—all the appointed days—for they are numbered by the Father, though by none but Him—ἐντὸς τῶν χρόνων τ. αἰώνιων—that time of which they had heard in so many parables, and about which they had asked, ch. xxiv.—the completion of the state of time. After that He will be no more properly speaking with us, but we with Him (John xvii. 24) where He is.—To understand μαθεῖσθαι only of the Apostles and their (?) successors, is to destroy the whole force of these most weighty words. Descending even into literal exactness, we may see that διδά-
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σκοτειν ἄνων γηρεῖν πάντα ὅσα ἑνεκελέλαμον ὑμῖν, makes ἄνων into ὑμῖν, as soon as they are μεμειγμένοι. The command is to the Universal Church—to be performed in the nature of things by her ministers and teachers, the manner of appointing which is not here prescribed, but to be learnt in the unfoldings of Providence recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, who by His special ordinance were the founders and first builders of that Church—but whose office on that very account precluded the idea of succession or renewal.—That Matthew does not record the fact or manner of the Ascension, is not to be used as a ground for any presumptions regarding the authenticity of the records of it which we possess. The narrative here is suddenly broken off: that in John terminates with an express declaration of its incompleteness. What reasons there may have been for the omission, either subjective, in the mind of the author of the Gospel, or objective, in the fragmentary character of the apostolic reports which are here put together, is wholly out of our power, in this age of the world, to determine. As before remarked, the fact itself is here and elsewhere in this Gospel (see ch. xxv. 14, 31. xxii. 44. xxiv. 50. xxvi. 64) clearly implied.
ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ

ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΡΚΟΝ.


N.B. Throughout Mark, the parallel places in Matthew are to be consulted. Where the agreement is verbal, or nearly so, no notes are here appended, except grammatical and philological ones.

CHAP. I. 1—3. Matt. iii. 1—12. Luke iii. 1—18. The object of Mark being to relate the official life and ministry of the Lord, he begins with His baptism; and as a necessary introduction to it, with the preaching of John the Baptist. His account of John’s baptism has many phrases in common with both Matt. and Luke; but from the additional prophecy quoted in ver. 2, is certainly independent and distinct (see prolegomena to the Gospels, ch. I. § 2).—Ἀρχὴ κ.τ.λ.] This is probably a title to what follows, and not connected with ver. 4, nor with ver. 2.—Ἰησοῦ χρ. γ' as its Author, and its Subject.—2, 3.] This again stands independently, not Ἰωάννης ἤγερ. βαπτιστὶ ὡς γέγραπται.—The reading ἐν τῷ Ἰ. B L ἀ. π. seems to have been inserted from Matt. iii. 3, and Luke iii. 4.—The citation here is from two prophets, Isaiah and Malachi; see ref. See notes on Matt. xii. 10. iii. 3.—4.] See on Matt. iii. 1.—βαπτίζων, the baptism symbolic of repent-
anct and forgiveness—of the death unto sin, and new birth unto righteousness. The former of these only comes properly into the notion of John’s baptism, which did not confer the Holy Spirit, ver. 8. See on ver. 10.—7.] κύψας λόγῳ... the expression is common to Mark, Luke, and John. It amounts to the same as bearing the sandal of the lame; the one who did the last would necessarily be also employed in loosing and taking off the sandal. But the variety is itself indicative of the independence of Matt. and Mark of one another. John used the two expressions at different times, and our witnesses have reported both. κύψας is added by Mark, who, as we shall find, is more minute in circumstantial detail than the other Evangelists.—8.] Matt. and Luke add και πυτί.

9—11.] Matt. iii. 13—17. Luke iii. 21—23. ἀναφέρεται is contained here only. The words with which this account is introduced, express indefiniteness as to time. It was (Luke iii. 21) after all the people were baptized; see note there. This commencement has no marks of an eye-witness; it is the compendium of generally current accounts. —10.] εὕθεως or εὕθως is a favourite connecting word with Mark. Either Mark has here taken the oral account verbatim and applied it to Jesus, ‘He saved’ &c.—and αὐτόν must mean Himself—or we must understand ‘Ἰησοῦν before εὐθεία, and take ἐναβῆς as absolute, which is very improbable.—The construction of the sentence is a remarkable testimony of the independence of Matt. and Mark even when parts of the narrative agree verbatim; see note on Matt. iii. 6. &c. Peculiar to Mark; and more descriptive than ἀναφέρεται, Matt. Luke.—11.] σὺ ἐστι, Mark and Luke; ὁ δὲ εστι, Matt.—ἰν ψυχ., Matt. and Mark; & τοῦ εὐθείαν, Luke. I mention these things to show how extremely improbable it is that Mark had either Matthew or Luke before him. Such arbitrary alteration of the documents before him could never have been the practice of any one seriously intent on an important work.

12, 13.] Matt. iv. 1—11. Luke iv. 1—13. 12, 13.] ἑβδόμῳ ἐν αὐτῷ Matt. & ἐν εὐθείαν Luke.—ἐφαρμακαταβαίνω, Matt. & Luke; see note, Matt. iv. 1.—It seems to have been permitted to the evil one to tempt the Lord during the whole of the 40 days, and of this we have here, as in Luke, an implied assertion. The additional intensity of temptation at the end of that period, is expressed in Matt. by the tempter coming Q 2
11 Μετὰ δὲ τὸ παραδοθῆναι τὸν Ἰωάννην, ἦλθεν ὁ ΑΒΔ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὴν Γαλαάδαν κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ [καὶ] λέγων ὅτι πεπλήρωται ὁ καιρὸς, καὶ ἡ γεγονεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ. ε ἐμπνεοῦτε καὶ πιστευεῖν εἰς τὸ εὐαγγελίον. 

16 *περιπατεύων δὲ παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν τῆς Γαλαάδας εἰς Σιμώνα καὶ Ἀνδριάν τὸν ἀδελφόν αὐτοῦ ἀμφίβαλλοντας ἀμφίβλητον ἐν τῷ θαλάσσῃ, ἤσαν γὰρ αἵλις. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι ὁ παράθυρος μου καὶ ποίησον μᾶς γενέσθαι ἀλλιώς ἈΒΓΔ ἀνθρώπων. καὶ εὐθεῖας ἀφέντες τὰ δίκτυα αὐτῶν ἤκολούθησαν αὐτῷ. καὶ προβὰς ἐκείθεν ὁ λόγον εἴδεν ἱάκωβον τὸν Ζεβεδαίον καὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ, καὶ αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ καταστρέφοντας τὰ δίκτυα. 


to Him—becoming visible and audible. Perhaps the being with the beasts may point to one form of temptation, viz. that of terror, which was practised on Him: but of the inward trials, who may speak?—οί δὲ γυναικεῖοι, as τῶν θηριών. There is nothing here to contradict the fast spoken of in Matt. and Luke, as De Wette maintains. Our Evangelist is perhaps not aware of it; or perhaps implies it in the last words of ver. 13. It is remarkable that those Commentators who are fondest of maintaining that Mark constructed his narrative out of those of Matt. and Luke (De Wette, Meyer) are also most keen in pointing out what they call irreconcilable differences between him and them! 14—20.] Matt. iv. 12—22. Luke iv. 14, 15.—14, 15.] παραδόθη. seems to have been the usual and well-known term for the imprisonment of John. See notes on Matt. iv. 12.—τὸ εἰσαγ. τ. β. τ. θ. A combination peculiar to Mark. τὸ εἴσ. τ. β. occurs Matt. iv. 23:—*the good news of the arrival of the kingdom of God spoken of in the prophets; see Dan. ii. 44.—πώλησαν δικαίωμα.] see Gal. iv. 4. 'The end of the old covenant is at hand; 'The Son is born, grown up, anointed (in his baptism), testiﬁed for, the testimony of faith. His witness is given, and now He witnesses Himself; now begins that last speaking of God, by His Son (Heb. i. 2), which henceforth shall be proclaimed in all the world till the end comes.' (Stier, Roden Jesu, i. 64).—καὶ προβας.] These words are in Mark only. They furnish us an interesting characteristic of the difference between the preaching of John, which was that of repentance—and of our Lord, which was repentance and faith. It is not in Himself as the Saviour that this faith is yet preached: this He did not proclaim much later in His ministry: but in the fulﬁllment of the time and approach of the Kingdom of God.—ἐν is not instrumental (as Frits.), by means of the Gospel but 'in the Gospel,' which, in its completion, sets forth Jesus Christ as the object of faith. 16—20.] Almost verbatim, as Matthew. The variations are curious: after Σιμώνα, Markomitsan λογομισμον Πηγρ.—although the name was prophetically given by the Lord before this, in John i. 43, it perhaps was not actually given, till the twelfth became a distinct body, see ch. iii. 16.—Matthew has εἰς τὴν θ. for, for our ἐν τ. θ., an inconceivable variation, if one copied the other.—Our ἀμφίβαλλον is no doubt the right reading, and suits the minute depicting of Mark.—γενέσθαι for ἀλλιώς for more accuracy.—ἀλλοὺς δὲ διδ. (Matt.) is here omitted as unnecessary.
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μ' ἀπῆλθον ὁπίσω αὐτοῦ. 21 Καὶ εἰςπροῖνταί εἰς Καπερ-
ναοῦ. καὶ εὐθέως τοῖς σάββασιν εἰςελθὼν εἰς συναγωγήν
ἐδίδασκε. 22 καὶ ἐξεπλήσσωντο ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ,
ὥστ' ἦν διάδακτης αὐτοῦ ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων καὶ οὐχ ὡς
οἱ γραμματεῖς. 23 καὶ ἦν ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ αὐτῶν ἀνθρώπων
ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ, καὶ ἀνέκραξεν 24 λέγων ἡμι 
τῇ ἡμῖν καὶ σοι Ἡσυγο Ναζάρην; ἢ λάθης ἀπολέσαι ἡμᾶς
οίδα σε τίς εί, ὃ ἀγνος τοῦ θεοῦ. 25 καὶ ἐπετίμησαν αὐτῷ
ἡ Ἡσυγος λέγων 21 Φιμώθητι καὶ ἔξηθε εἰς αὐτοῦ. 26 καὶ
σπαράζαν αὐτὸν τὸ πνεύμα τὸ ἀκάθαρτον καὶ κράζαν
φωνὴ μεγάλη ἔξηθεν εἰς αὐτοῦ. 27 καὶ ἱδαμβήθησαν
πάντες, ὡστε συζητεῖν πρὸς αὐτοὺς λέγοντας Τί ἐστι
τοῦτο; * τίς ἡ διδαχὴ ἡ καίνη αὐτῆ, ἢτι κατ᾽ εξουσίαν*
καὶ τοῖς πνεύμασι μας αὐτῶν ἀκαθάρτους ἐπέτασει, καὶ ὑπὸ-
ἀκούουσιν αὐτῷ; 28 ἔξηθε δὲ ἡ ἢ ἀκοὴ αὐτοῦ εὐθεῖας * εἰς
όλην τὴν περιοχήν τῆς Γαλατίας. 29 Καὶ εὐθέως ἐκ
τῆς συναγωγῆς ἢ εξελθοντες ἢ ἠλθον εἰς τὴν ὀχικάν


μετὰ Ζ. τ. παριστατεχν. (Matt.) is omitted here, and Z. inserted below, where Matthew has simply τ. παριστατεχν. — μετὰ τῶν μοθεσ. is inserted for particularity, and perhaps to soften the leaving their father alone. It gives us a view of the station of life of Z. and his sons: they were not poor fishermen, but had hired servants. — Matthew has ἡσυγοθησαν αὐτοῦ. — Now may we not venture to say that both these accounts came from Peter originally? Matthew’s an earlier one, taught (or given in writing perhaps) without any definite idea of making it part of a larger work; but this carefully corrected and rendered accurate, even to the omitting a name, which though generally known, and therefore mentioned in the oral account, was not yet formally given, and must be omitted in the historical.

21—23. Luke iv. 31—37. — 32.] Not immediately after the preceding. The calling of the Apostles, the Sermon on the Mount, the healing of the leper, and of the centurion’s servant, precede the following miracle. — 23.] A formula occurring entirely at the end of the Sermon on the Mount, Matt. vii. 28, and the first clause of it in the corresponding place to this in Luke iv. 32. — 33—38.] ἄνθρωπον, a man bound to, possessed by, an evil spirit; so χαρά in πν. ἀγ. Rom. xiv. 17. — This account occurs in Luke iv. 33—37, nearly verbatim; for the variations, see there. It is very important for our Lord’s official life, as showing that He rejected and forbade all testimony to His Person, except that which He came on earth to give. The devils knew Him, but were silenced. (See Matt. viii. 29. v. 7.) — How utterly impossible to understand such a testimony as that of the sick person, still less of the fever or disease! — Ναζα. —We may observe that this epithet usually occurs under strong contrast to His Majesty and glory; as here, and ch. xvi. 6, and Acts ii. 22—24. xxii. 8, and, we may add, John xix. 10. — Ecs, originally imperative of ἐλθεῖν, but used for an introduction of fright and anguish. It is a general fact, see Matt. viii. 29 (and note on the two men there). — σπαράξ: ἔχων κυνωπίζων, see reff. Luke adds, that he did not injure him at all. — 29—34.] Matt. vii. 14—17. Luke iv.
ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ.

30 η ΑΒCD δε πενθερα Σιμωνος κατηκειτο τυρεσσουσα, και ευθεως λεγουσι αυτω περι αυτης. 31 και προσελθουν ηγεμονι αυτου δ κρατησας της χειρος αυτης, και αφηκεν αυτην εις πυρετος ευθεως, και δικηκευε αυτοις. 32 ομως δε ε γενομεν, ότε ευνου η ηλιος, εφερον προς αυτου ταντας τους κακως έχουσας και τους δαιμονιζομενους, 33 και η πόλεις ολη επισηυμγήνην εν προς την θυραν. 34 και εθεραπευεν πολλους κακως έχοντας τουκιλαι νόσους, και δαιμονια πολλα εξεβαλε, και ουκ η φοιε λαελει τα δαιμονια οτι ίδεαν αυτων. 35 και πρωi έννυχον λιαν ανασας εξεβαλε και απληθεν εις ερημον τοπον, κακεν προσηκε, 36 και κατευδωκαν αυτων ο Σιμων και οι μετ' αυτων, και ευροντες αυτουν λεγουσι αυτων ότι παντες ζητουα αυτων. 37 και λέγει αυτους ο Γηουμων εις τας εξομινας και και και και και προς την θυραν. 38 και την πορφυραν εις τας συναγωνιας αυτων εις ολην την Γαλαλειαν, και τα δαιμονια εκβαλλουν.

40 Και ερηται προς αυτων λεπτος παρακαλω αυτων και λεγων αυτων [οτι] εαν 

38-41. The three accounts, perhaps from a common source (but see notes on Luke), are all identical in substance, but very diverse in detail and words. ήπιαν αυτων, of the fever, is common to all, and διηκόνει αυτοφές, but no more. (I should be disposed to ascribe the account to Peter.) Simon, Andrew, James, and John,—see ch. xiii. 3.—The same may be said of vv. 32-34—the words καλ ώδη δ.λ.τρ. ίδι... θυραν are added in our text, showing the accurate detail of an eye-witness.

39-38.] Luke iv. 42, 43, where see note. The Lord's present purpose was, not to remain in any one place, but to make the circuit of Galilee; not to work miracles, but to preach... δυνατον, acc. neut. of ιννυχον, acc. neut. of ιννυχος, as σιλερον, ανθρωπον, &c. form not so used in the classics. ηδηλον, from the house of Peter and Andrew, ver. 29. at ηδηλον. Andrew, John, and James, ibid. 38. ένθηλα = ένθηλαι, Luke—not have undertaken this journey; He had not yet begun any journey, and it cannot apply to ένθηλε above, for that was not to any city, nor to preach. The word has its more solemn sense, as in John xvi. 28, though of course not understood them by the hearers. 39.] Matt. iv. 23—κηρ ως [not for λεγων, but as εις τον διομον λεγων, Thucyd. v. 46, and similar expressions: see ref.
II. 1—7. KATA MARKON.

τὸλμησ δύνασαι με καθαρίσαι. 41 ὁ δὲ Ἰσσοῦς σπλαγχνισθείς, ἐκτείνος τὴν χεῖρα ἡπατο αὐτοῦ καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ Ἡθλω, καθαρίσατι. 42 καὶ [εἰσόητος αὐτοῦ] εὐθέως ἐφηλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα, καὶ ἐκαθαρίσθη. 43 Καὶ ἐμβρυομαμένους αὐτῷ εὐθέως ἐξῆβαλεν αὐτὸν 44 καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ Ὅρα μηδεν [μηδὲν] εἰπτε, ἀλλ' ὑπαγε σαυτὸν δείξον τῷ ἱερεί, καὶ προσενεγκε περὶ τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ σου α ἐπροσετέας Μωσῆς, εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς. 45 δὲ ὑπελθῶν ἐξῆκεν κηρύσσει πολλὰ καὶ διαφημίζεν τῶν λόγων, ὡστε μηκέτι αὐτὸν δύνασαί φανερῶς εἰς πολλὰ εἰσελθεῖν ἀλλ' ἐξω ἐν εἵρμοις τόποις ἦν, καὶ ἤρχοντο πρὸς αὐτὸν τάνταθεν.

II. 1 Καὶ πάλιν εἰπτεθεν εἰς ΚαπερναουῺ ἰερωμῶν 2 καὶ ἤκουσθη ὅτι 4 εἰς οἰκόν ἐστι, καὶ εὐθέως 5 συν ἦγοραν πολλοί, ὡστε μηκέτι ἠχωρεῖν μηδὲ τὰ πρός τιν θύμαν καὶ ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς τῶν λόγων. 3 καὶ ἤργονται πρὸς αὐτὸν παραλυτικὸν, ἐφοντεσμένον ὑποτρόφιον αὐτη ἐπεσάρων. 4 καὶ μὴ δυνάμενον προσεγγίσαι αὐτῷ διὰ τῶν ἁλῶν, 5 ἀπετέμασαν τὴν στέγην ὅπου ἦν, καὶ ἐξορύζαντες 6 καλώσα τὸν ἀρχαβατον ἐφ' οὗ ὁ παραλυτικός κατέκειτο. 7 ἵδων δὲ ὁ Ἰσσοῦς τὴν πλιστὴν αὐτῶν λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ Τέκνῳ, ἀφενται οἱ καὶ ἀμαρτιαί [σου]. 8 ἦσαν δὲ τίνες τῶν γραμματέων ἐκεῖ καθιμένοι καὶ δια λογιζόμενοι ἐν ταῖς καρδιαῖς αὐτῶν. 9 Τι ὦντος ὦντως λαλεῖ ἀμαρτησίας ἐστὶ δύναται ἀφεναι ἀμαρτιας ἐκ μη.


40—45.] Matt. viii. 2—4. Luke v. 12 — 14. The account here is the fullest, and evidently an original one, from an eye-witness. Luke mentions (ver. 15) the spreading of the fame of Jesus, without assigning the cause as in our ver. 45. See note on Matt. — 48.] ἐξῆβαλεν need not necessarily imply that the healing was in a house (Meyer); it might have been in a city, as in Luke. — 45. τῶν λόγων] not, 'what Jesus had said to him,' but 'the account,' of his healing.

ΧΑΡΑΚΤΗΡΙΑ 1. 1—12.] Matt. ix. 2—9, where see notes. Luke v. 17—28. — The three are evidently independent accounts; Mark's, as usual, the most precise in details; e. g. 'borne of four:' Luke's also bearing marks of an eye-witness (see ver. 19, end); Matthew's apparently at second hand. — 2. εἰς οἶκον, in doors; as εἰς ἄγρον, to the country, ch. xvi. 12: the εἰς combines motion with the construction,—that he had gone home, and was there. In this verse we have again the peculiar
The knowledge was immediate and supernatural, as is most carefully and precisely here signified. — 11. Σελ. λ.] The stress is on col. The words are precisely those used, as so often in Mark,—and denote the turning to the paralytic and addressing him.

13—23.] Matt. ix. 9—17. Luke v. 27—39. I have discussed the question of the identity of Matthew and Levi in the notes on Matthew. —The three accounts are in matter nearly identical, and in diction so minutely and unaccountably varied, as to declare here, as elsewhere, their independance of one another, except in having had some common source from which they have more or less deflected. (These remarks do not apply to the diversity of the names Matthew and Levi, which must be accounted for on other grounds. See, as throughout the passage, the notes on Matt.) — 13.] πάλιν, see ch. i. 16—15.] The entertainment was certainly in Levi's house, not in that of our Lord, which last is a pure fiction of Meyer's, &c., and is not any where designated in the Gospel accounts. The Lord, and those following Him as disciples, were ordinarily entertained where He was invited, which will account for ηκολούθησαν αὐτῷ—-and the change of subject in the two, αὐτῷ and αὐτῷ, is no uncommon thing; see a similar change in Luke xix. 3, where to be consistent Meyer ought to understand δι' τῆς ὑλ. μικ. ἕν of
KATA MARKON.
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telwvnon kai amartwlon, elanvnon toutis mabtaias auton
b Tì òti meta tvn telwvnon kai amartwlon evthei [kai kai
pivei]; 17 kai akousas o 'Ishou lege autous. Où ò chrêu
èxousmen i 'iskhyvnones iatroy, alli i kakws èxousmen. 
ouc ì 'hloron kalizai dikaious, alla amartwlon [eis i
metanoin].

18 Kai ò òsan ois mabtai 'Iwannov kai ois Ì Pharisaiov
v nystevontes, kai èrxontai kai legousin autou. Diati ois
mabtai 'Iwannov kai ois Pharisaiov nysteuvoun, ois
de sou mabtai ois nysteuvoun; 19 kai einen autois o Ì Ishou o
Mh dwnai ois ì uioi tou 9 nufwmou 5 eis ò nufwmos
met autwv esti v nysteuvoun; eis òsan chrwvno meb 9 evautwv
èxous ton nufwmo, ou dwnai nysteuvoun. 20 eis èlexwson,
tai de èmраs ois ton 8 aparibh 5 autwv o nufwmos, kai
tote nysteuvoun en Ì ekain 9 ò tv Ì tmira. 21 ò oudeis
v enplhima 9 rakois 5 anagwph 3 eiprappte eis 5 imatw
palaioi ev de mi, * afieu to ò plhreuma autov to kainov
ò to palaioi, * kai chrwmon svyma ginetai. 22 ò oudeis
b ballei ouvoun vion eis ò akous palaioi 5 ev de mi,
perasei o ò nous ois askous, kai o nous ekheita
ac.—for ì, aut. ish, kai idontes ois lethei B. L. kai idan ois sathan D. txt A.—for tì òri, dià tì D. òri B. txt A. quare abc.—kai pirum om. B D.—add o ì diidakalos
almost all const. MSS.—18. rec. bef. nysteuvontes, ois tvn Pharisaiov, with ac and
const. MSS., but txt A B C D K L Syr. Ì Eth. Arm.—21. rec. ev. with many const. MSS.,
but txt A B C D K L Syr. Ì Eth. Arm.—21. rec. ev. with many const. MSS.,
but txt A B C D K L Syr. Ì Eth. Arm. 18. pti mabtai autov ò autov. B.—19. from òsan . . . nysteuv
om. D a b.—20. daph C.—rec. leitseis vatis tmira with many const. MSS.,
but txt A B C D K L Syr. Ì Eth. Arm.—21. rec. ev. with many const. MSS.,
but txt A B C D K L Syr. Ì Eth. Arm. orle D G M ac.—18. imatwv palaioi B C D L
txt A.—alrei òn autou to ò pl. to kainov tov ò. A K
Syr. áp. tò òl. daph autov (daph eautou) B. ò. kó. ò. kainov ò. ò. kainov.
B L. áp. tò pl. to kainov tov ò. D abcv. txt C.—kai . . . ginetai om. L.—22. el ò de miy C L.
our Lord. To help out his interpretation, he makes kaliza, ver. 17. 'to in-
vite' (I) — òsan yph ... autph, peculiar to Mark. — 18. idontes aut. ish, having ob-
served Him eating, or, that He ate. The question was after the feast, at which, being
in the house of a Publican, they were not present. — 18.] Kai òsan k.t.l. Mark
here gives a notice for the information of his readers, as in ch. vii. 3, which places
show that his Gospel was not written for the use of Jews. It appears from this
account, which is here the more circum-
stantial, that the Pharisees and disciples of John asked the question in the third person,
as of others. In Matthew it is the dis-
ciples of John, and they join òmis kai oi
Phi. In Luke it is the Pharisees and
Scribes, and they ask as here. Meyer
understands it, that the disciples of J. and
the Pharisees were at that particular time
keeping a fast, and that this gave occasion
to the question; but this is contrary to the
usage of this construction. — 19.] òsan . . . nysteuv, this repetition, contained
neither in Matt. nor Luke, is inconsistent with the design of an abridger; and suf-
ciently shows the primary authority of this
report, as also the ev ekain tv òm. ver. 20.
— 21.] The addition here of ò pl. kainov
confirms the view taken of the parable in
the notes on Matthew.
καὶ οἱ ἁσκοὶ ἀπολούνται ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἁσκοὺς ABCD καὶ νοῦς \( \beta \)ηρίων.

22 Καὶ ἔγενετο ἀπαραποτέλεσθη αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς σάββασι διὰ τῶν ἐσπορίμων, καὶ ἤρχαντο οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ὁδὸν ποιεῖν τὰς πλούσιτέρας τὸς στάγειας. 23 καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ἔλεγον αὐτῷ, ἵδε τοιούτα ὑπὸ τοὺς σάββασιν ὁ οὐκ ἔζησεν. 24 καὶ αὐτὸς ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς: Οὐδὲτε ἀνέγνωτε τί ἐποίησας Δαυὶδ ὅτε ἠρεύνη σὺ καὶ ἐπείνασεν αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ; 25 πώς εἰςηθεῖς εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ ἔποιη Ἀβιασάρ τοῦ ἀρχιμεροῦ, καὶ τοὺς άρτους τῆς προθεσίως ἔφαγεν, οὔτε οὐκ ἔζησες φαγεῖν εἰ μὴ τοῖς ἱερεῖς, καὶ ἐδωκε καὶ τοῖς σὺν αὐτῷ συνα. 26 καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς, Τὸ σάββατον διὰ τὸν ἀνθρωπόν ἔγενετο; 27 ὁ οἶκος τοῦ τοῦ τοῦ σάββατον. 28 ὁτὲ κύριος ἐστιν ὁ νῖος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ τοῦ σαββᾶτον.

ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ II. 23—28.

23—28.] Matt. xii. 1—8. Luke vi. 1—5. The same may be said of the three accounts as in the last case, with continually fresh evidence of their entire independence of one another. — ἰδοὺ ποιῶν τὸν is matter of detail and minute depiction. — The interpretation upheld by Meyer, that they began to make a way for themselves by plucking off the ears (he maintains that according to this account they did not eat them !) see ver. 25) is too absurd to be seriously treated. The classical sense of ἰδοὺ ποιῶν must evidently not be pressed: it here = ἰδοὺ ποιῶσα — 26.] ἐκάλεσε τοῦ ἄβατος. 27. ἐς τὸ σάββατον. 28.] ἐς τὸ σάββατον. In the time of Abiathar the high-priest, not during the high-priesthood of Abiathar; but this does not escape the difficulty: for in 1 Sam. xxi., from which this account is taken, Abimelech, not Abiathar, is the high-priest. There is however considerable confusion in the names about this part of the history: Abimelech himself is called Ahiah, 1 Sam. xiv. 3; and whereas (1 Sam. xvi. 20) Abimelech has a son Abiathar, in 2 Sam. viii. 17, Abimelech is the son of Abiathar, and in 1 Chron. xviii. 16, Abimelech. Amidst this variation, we can hardly undertake to explain the difficulty in the text. — 27.] To σάββατον διὰ τοῦ ἵππου is peculiar to Mark, and highly important. The Sabbath is an ordinance for man; for man's rest, both actually and typically, as setting forth the rest which remains for God's people (Heb. iv. 9). But He who is now speaking has taken on Himself Manhood, the whole nature of Man; and is rightfult Lord over creation as granted to Man, and of all that is made for Man, and therefore of the Sabbath. The whole dispensation of time is created for man, for Christ as He is Man, and is in His absolute power.

III. 1—11. KATA MARKON.


7 Καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνεχώρησε μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὴν θάλασσαν, καὶ πολὺ πλῆθος ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλι- λαίας ἥκολούθησαν [αὐτῷ], καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας, καὶ ἀπὸ Ἰερουσαλήμ, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰδομείας, καὶ πέραν τοῦ Ἰερισόμου, καὶ [οἱ] τῇ Τώρῳ καὶ Ἰσδώμω, πλῆθος πολὺς, ἀκούσαντες ὅσα ἐπήρει θηλὼν πρὸς αὐτόν. * καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ἠν πλοιαρίων προσκαρτέρησε αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ ὄχλου, ἵνα μὴ θλίβωσιν αὐτῶν. 10 πολλοὺς γὰρ θερ- ράτευσεν, ὡστε ἐπιπτιτεὶν αὐτῷ ἢν αὐτῷ ἄφωνον ὅσοι ἢκόν μάστιγας 11 καὶ τὰ πνεύματα τὰ ἀκάθαρτα. οἶκαι

 materially adds that it was the Scribes and Pharisees who watched Him. — 4.] αὐτοῖς. Luke adds ἐπερωτήσατο ὑμᾶς τι.; as his ac- count is the most detailed, I refer to the notes there. — ἐκτούς. does not belong to ψυχὴν; i.e., save life, or to kill? — 5.] αὐτῶν—peculiar to Mark—συλλ. implies sympathy with their (spir- itually) miserable state of hard-hearted- ness. — 6. Ἰησοῦν] See note on Matt. xvi. 6, and xxii. 16. Why the Pharisees and Herodians should now combine, is not apparent. There must have been some reason of which we are not aware, which united these opposite sects in enmity against the Lord.—συμβ. Ἰησοῦν is an expression peculiar to Mark.

7—13.] A general summary of the Lord’s healing and casting out devils by the sea of Galilee: peculiar in this shape to Mark; but probably answering to Matt. xii. 15—21. Luke vi. 17—19. — The description of the multitudes, and places whence they came, sets before us more graphically than any where else in the Gospels, the com- position of the audiences to which the Lord taught, and whom He healed. The rep- etition of πλῆθος πολὺ (ver. 8) is the report of one who saw the numbers from Tyre and Sidon coming and going. — 10.] Luke vi. 19.
The document contains a passage from a religious text, possibly from a translation of the New Testament or a similar work. The text is in Greek and appears to be a verse from the Gospel of Luke, specifically Luke 20:24-26. The text discusses the concept of the Son of God and the understanding of who Jesus is and what role He played. The passage is translated into English and includes commentary, likely from a commentary on the New Testament, discussing the interpretation and theological implications of the passage.
in the open air (Matt., ver. 23), and now they retire into the house. The omission of this, wholly inexplicable if Mark had had either Matt. or Luke before him, belongs to the fragmentary character of his Gospel. The common accounts of the sources of this Gospel are most capricious and absurd. In one place Mark omits a discourse —'because it was not his purpose to relate discourses;' — in another he gives a discourse, omitting the occasion which led to it, as here! The real fact being, that the sources of Mark’s Gospel are generally of the highest order, and most direct, but the amount of things contained very scanty and discontinuous. see Proleg. —πάλιν resumed from ch. ii. 2. — δει πτής 8, showing that one of the αὐτῶν is the narrator. —21.] Peculiar to Mark —ολ’ ἄρα αὐτὸν = ‘His relations,’ beyond a doubt — for the sense is resumed by σῶν in ver. 31: see ref. —ἐξῆλθον. (perhaps from Nazareth, — or, answering to John ii. 12, from Caper- naum), ‘set out’; see ch. v. 14. They heard of His being so beset by crowds: see v. 7—11. — ἠλευνο — i.e. His relations — not τινί — ἠλευτήριον. ‘He is mad!’ thus B.V.; and the sense requires it. They had doubtless heard of the accusation of His having a devil: which we must suppose not to have first begun after this, but to have been going on throughout this course of miracles. —The understanding this that His disciples went out to repress the crowd, for they said, ‘It is mad!’ (l), is as contrary to Greek as to sense. It would require at least αὐτῶν and ἀλλοτριῶν, and would even then give no intelligible meaning. — 22.] αὐτῶν ἔκρατος; peculiar to Mark: see note on Matt. ver. 24. Here Matt. has αὐτὸν. —Luke τινίς ἐξ αὐτῶν, ἢ δὲ τῇ δικρίνῃ τινι — ἀλλ’ ἐπιστ. αὐτῶν; — 23.] προποπολομένος αὐτῶν is not inconsistent (De Wette) with His being in an house—He called them to Him, they having been far off. We must remember the large courts in the oriental houses. — ἐν παρ., namely, a kingdom, &c., a house, &c., the strong man, &c. —συναίνει σαρκ. The external unity of Satan and his Kingdom is strikingly declared by this simple
οχύς ἐστὶν αἰώνιον * κρίσεως. 30 οτι ἔλεγον Πνεῦμα ἀκά- ΑΒCD
θαρτον b ἔχει.
31 Ἐρχονται οὖν οἱ ἀδελφοὶ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἡ ἐστῶτες ἀπέστειλαν πρὸς αὐτοὺς, * ἡ φωνοῦντες αὐτῶν.
32 καὶ ἐκάθην ὁ χλός περὶ αὐτῶν. εἰσίν, διὰ αὐτῶν ἰδοὺ ἡ μήτηρ σου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί σου τοὺς ἅπαντες σε. 53 καὶ ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς λέγων Τίς ἦ στιν ἡ μήτηρ μου * οἱ ἀδελφοί μου; 54 καὶ περιβεβλημένος κύκλω τοὺς περὶ αὐτὸν καθημένος λέγει Ἰδο ἡ μήτηρ μου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί μου. 55 οἱ γὰρ ἂν τούτο θέλησα τοῦ θεοῦ, οὕτως ἀδελφός μου καὶ ἀδελφή μου καὶ μήτηρ ἐστί.

IV. 1 Καὶ πάλιν ἤρχατο διδάσκειν παρὰ τῆν θάλασσαν καὶ * συνήχθη πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ χλόος * σωλήν, ὅτε αὐτὸν ἐμβάντα εἰς τὸ πλοῖον καθησαί 1 εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ τὰς ὁ χλόος πρὸς τὴν θάλασσαν ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἦν.
2 καὶ εἰδίδασκεν αὐτοὺς εἰς παραβολάς πολλά, καὶ ἐλέγεν αὐτοῖς ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ. 3 Ακούετε. ἰδοὺ ἔξηλθέν ὁ σπείρων τοῦ σπείρας. 4 καὶ ἔγνενο εἰς τῷ σπείρειν, ὁ

for κρίσεως, ἀμαρτήματος B L. ἀμαρτίας D abcd. So unusual an expression as this can hardly have crept into the text, but is very likely to have been altered into the more usual κρίσεως. txt A C. —30. ἦσσιν D. ἦσσιν αὐτῶν C. —31. καὶ ἔγινεν BCL. καὶ ἔγινε D. —ιστηκότες G L. στηκότες B C. —for φων., καλούντες B C L. ζητοῦντες A. txt D. —32. for ὁ. π. αὐτ., πρὸς τὸν χλόον D. —rec. om. καὶ αἱ ἄλλοι σου, with B C L Copt. Arm. Αἰθ. Συρ. But ins. A D E F G M S U V, many ms. abc. I have inserted these words, as being more agreeable to the particularity of Mark, and as having very high MS. authority. —33. for ὁ, καὶ B C L V al. abc. txt A D E. —34. of. παραβολάς πολλά, καὶ ἐλέγεν αὐτοῖς ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ. 3 Ακούετε. ἰδοὺ ἔξηλθέν ὁ σπείρων τοῦ σπείρας. 4 καὶ ἔγνενο εἰς τῷ σπείρειν, ὁ

way of putting the question: see note on Matt. —26.] ἀλλὰ τ. ἔχ. peculiar to Mark. —29.] Most likely ἀμαρτίας or ἀμαρτήματος is the right reading, and κρίσεως a gloss to explain it: see on Matt. vv. 31, 32. —30.] explains the ground and meaning of this awful denunciation of the Lord.
31—35.] Matt. xii. 40—60. Luke viii. 19—21. —ἔγινεν ἢ τ. μ. another such. —34.] Matt. here has some remarkable and graphic details also: ἔστιν τῆς χρίστου. τ. μ. μαθητάς αὐτ. . . . . Both accounts were from eye-witnesses, the one noticing the outstretched hand; the other, the look cast round. Deeply interesting are such particulars,—the more so, as showing the way in which the records arose,—and their united strength, derived from their independence and variety.

Chap. IV. 1—9.] No fixed mark of date. Matt. xiii. 1, 9. Luke viii. 4—9. There is the same intermixture of absolute verbal identity and considerable divergence, as we have so often noticed: which is wholly inexplicable on the ordinary suppositions. In this case the vehicles of the parable in Matt. and Mark (see Matt. vv. 1—3. Mark vv. 1, 2) bear a strong, almost verbal, resemblance. Such a parable would be carefully treasured in all the Churches as a subject of catechetical instruction; and, in general, in proportion to the popular nature of the discourse, is the resemblance stronger in the reports of it. —8. Ἀκούετε,—this solemn prefatory word is peculiar to Mark.
μὲν ἔστει παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν, καὶ ἦλθε τὰ 'πετεινὰ [τοῦ υἱοῦ]
νοὺ] καὶ κατέφαγεν αὐτό. ἢ  ἀλλὰ δὲ ἔστει πέτο [τὸ 'πε-
τὸς [σώματος. τρώσεις ὁποὺ ὦι ἐσμὲν γὰρ πολλῆς, καὶ 
εὐθέως "ἐξαντεβίλε. [t takt. 1 Matt. 
να] διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔστει βάθος γῆς." "[τὸ ἄκανθας, καὶ ἀνέβησαν αἱ
κακοὶ καὶ ἐστειλαντος. [καὶ ὁ ἄλλος ἔστει [εἰς τὰς 
συνεπεδέναι αὐτό, καὶ καρπὸν ὦι [ἔφεβος. καὶ ἐστειλα
καὶ καὶ ἐστειλαντος. καὶ ἐστειλαντος. [ἀναβάνοντα καὶ 'ἀναβάνοντα καὶ ἐφέβος. [ἐπὶ πέτος. [τὴν ὁδὸν, καὶ ἔπει 
τρίκοντα καὶ ἐν ἐξώπι. καὶ ἐν ἔκατον. ἢ [εἰς εἰς τὸν 'πετει
'Ο ἐγὼ δὲ ἐσμὲν 'κατα
g νον αὐτὸν ὡς τὸς [ἔφεβος. καὶ ἐστειλαντος. [ἐφαγόμενον καὶ ἐφέβος. [ἐπὶ πέτος. 'τὸν πατρὸν τὸν καλὸν, καὶ ἐδίδον 
καὶ καρπὸν ὡς 'ἀναβάνοντα καὶ 'ἀναβάνοντα καὶ ἐφέβος. [ἐπὶ πέτος. [τὴν ὁδὸν, καὶ ἔπει 
νερο om. D δς.—τοῦ ωἰρονοῦ om. A B C E F H K L S V 56 ms. ἐν Ἐφρ. ὁ C h. 
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Matt. xiv. 19, 20 al. 

...
ήταν ἀκόουσαν, εὐθέως ἔρχεται ὁ σατανᾶς καὶ ἀφεῖ τῶν ABCD
λόγων τῶν ἐσπαρμένων ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν. καὶ οὔτω εἰσίν ὁμώς οἱ ἐπὶ τὰ πετροδέ στειρόμενοι, οἳ ἦταν ἀκούσαν τῶν λόγων, εὐθέως μετὰ χαρᾶς λαμβάνοντοι αὐτὸν, καὶ οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἐργάζοντο ἐν αὐτοῖς, ἀλλὰ πρὸς καταστάσιν, ἵστατο γενομένης τῆς θλίψεως ἡ δυνάμεν Δ ἔν τῶν λόγων εὐθέως σκανδαλίζονται. καὶ οὔτω εἰσίν οἳ εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας σπειρόμενοι,[οὔτοι εἰσίν] οἳ τῶν λόγων ἄκουσαν, καὶ οὐ μέριμναν τοῦ αἰῶνος [τοῦτον] καὶ ἡ ἀπάτη τοῦ πλούτου καὶ οἱ περὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἐπιθυμεῖ αὐς εἰς· 
πορευόμεναι ἵστατο· συμπνίγοντο τὸν λόγον, καὶ ἄκρης γίνεται. καὶ οὔτω εἰσίν οἳ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν τὴν καλὴν σπα· 
ρεῖτες, οἵτινες ἀκούσαν τὸν λόγον καὶ παραδεχόμεναι, καὶ καρποφοροῦσίν ἐν τριάκοντα καὶ ἐν ἐξήκοντα καὶ ἐν ἐκατόν. καὶ ἐλέγεν ἀυτοῖς Ἡ Μῆτι ὁ λόγχος ἔρχεται ἐν ὕπο τοῦ μοῖρον τῇ θητῇ ὑπὸ τὴν καλὴν κυρίαν, οὐχ ἵνα ἐπὶ τὴν λυγίαν ἐπιτεθῇ; ὃν γὰρ ἐστὶ τῇ κρυπτῇ, ἐν τῇ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε μετρηθήσεται ἡμῖν, καὶ προστεθήσεται ἡμῖν τοῖς ἀκούσαν]. ὃς γὰρ ἐν ἐχθρ. δοθήσεται αὐτῷ, καὶ ὃς οὔχ ἐχεῖ, καὶ ὃς ἐχεῖ, ἀρκεῖ ἀπὸ αὐτοῦ. καὶ ἐλέγεν
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Oútwc év tí w n p a s i l i a n t o u ò x θ e o ú w s [έαν] άνθρωπος
βάλη tòv σπόρων επί τής γῆς, 17 καὶ καθεύδη καὶ έγείρηται
ύκτα καὶ ήμέραν, καὶ ο ο σπόρους δλαστάναι καὶ μυ-κύνηται ὡς οὐκ οἶδεν αὐτὸς. 28 ἀυτομάτη ἢ γί ᾃ καρ-
ποφορίς πρῶτον ἵδρον, εἶτα σάχαν εἶτα *πλήρη
*σῖτον ἐν τῷ σάχαν. 29 ὅταν δὲ παραδῷ ὁ καρπὸς;
εὐθέως ἀποστέλλει τὸ ἄρεπαν, τοῦτο παρέστηκεν ὁ
θερισμὸς. 30 Καὶ ἔλεγε *Τίνι ὁμοίωσμεν τήν βασιλείαν
τοῦ θεοῦ; εν ποια παραβολή *παραβάλεις αὐτήν;

— 26. ἸΔΝ ομ. Β Ν Λ Α λ. ιν. Α Κ abcd.—βεφ. σφ. ομ. τὸν Δ.—27. καθεύδει κ. εγε-
ρηται Ε Φ Γ Μ αl. ἵερθη Δ.—βλαστά B C D L αl. τἄτη Α.—μεγενείται B D.—
28. διὰ αὐτομ. Δ.—rec. ins. γαρ, with ὄν. ομ. Α B C D L ΣΥΡ. Κοπτ. Οριγ.—στάχες D—
29. διὰ σίτος Β. τή. ο σίτος Δ. τάτς Α.—ομ. καὶ διὰ θάν D ὁμ. παραβολή D.
txt Α C.—30. τῶν, πῶς B C L K. Τά t A d ὁμ. οἰκον 27. ὁμοίωσις K.— t C D E—
31. for ως, ὧνιν ὁσιν D c.—κόκκον added—i. e. more knowledge—but I 
prefer the former interpretation.

28—29.] Peculiar to Mark. By com-
mentators of the Strauss'ian school it is sup-
possed to be the same as the parable of the
seeds, with the tares left out (41). If so, a
wonderful and most instructive parable has
arisen out of the fragments of the other, in
which the idea is a totally different one.
It is, the growth of the once-deposited seed
by the combination of its own development
with the genial power of the earth, all of
course under the creative hand of God,—
but independent of human care and anxiety
during this time of growth. —28.] καθεύ-
ρηται—some difficulty has been felt about
the interpretation of this word, as to whether
it is Christ, or His ministers. The former
idea is adopted; but it is thought by the
kāthēyei, ver. 27,—the latter by ἀναστ. ζ το δρ., ver.
29. But I believe it will be found that the
parable in its wide-embracing sense contemplates both these, as well as the case of
individual sowing and reaping in spir-
Itual things. (1) There is the general reference to the Lord as the Sower—who
having sown the seed of His Spirit in the
Church, absents Himself—answering to
the farmer leaving the field which he has
sown, and working by day and sleeping by
night,—i. e. elsewhere employed, while
the seed springs up, not in this case he knows
not how;—but from bodily absence, he
watches not how, witnesses not how. (2)
There is the reference to the ministers of
God—who sow the seed when a saying or
a prayer sinks into the heart of their hear-
ers, and then perhaps are comparatively
long absent. (3) Also to individual exer-
cition in the same way—we are often sow-
ers, when by meditation, or prayer, or reading,
we deposit the seed in the soil of our hearts

VOL. I.
braces the disciples, in their work of preaching and teaching,—and indeed gives all teachers an example to which they may liken the Kingdom of God. — 31. The repetition of expressions verbatim in discussions is peculiar to Mark: so ἐστιν, γῆς, here, and καὶ δὲν. σταθησάτας ch. iii. 24, 25, 26, — καὶ ποτὲ καὶ μέγες is also peculiar. — See notes on Matt. and Luke — 33.] καθὼς ἢ ἃκτιν ως, “according to their capacity of receiving”:—see note on Matt. xiii. 12.—34.] καὶ ἔσται δὲ . . . . . We have three such instances,—the sower, the tares, Matt. xiii. 36 ff, and the saying concerning defilement, Matt. xv. 18 ff. To these we may add the two parables in John,—ch. x. 1—18, which however was publicly ex-

plained,—and ch. xv. 1—19; — and perhaps Luke xvi. 9. xviii. 6—8. — 35—41.] Matt. xviii. 23—27. Luke xviii. 22—25. Mark’s words bind this occurrence by a precise date to the preceding: it took place in the evening of the day on which the parables were delivered: and our account is so rich in additional particulars, as to take the highest rank among the three as to precision. — 36.] ὡς ἦν—without any preparation,—“as he was,” E. V. — δὲν ἂν. These were probably some of the multitudes following, who seem to have been separated from them in the gale. — 37.] λαλ. ἢν is also in Luke, whose account is in the main so differently worded. — ἐνεβάλλαν—not ἔλαλησε ἐνεβάλλα τὸ κέρ. — but
V. 1. Καὶ ἦλθον εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν Ἔρανων. 2 καὶ ἐξῆλθον ἀυτῷ ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου εὐθέως ἀυτῷ ἐκ τῶν μυμημένων ἀνθρώπων εἰς τὴν κατοίκησιν ἐκείνην εἰς τὰς ἀλώσεις καὶ τὰς πέδας συντερίβαν, καὶ ὄδεις αὐτὸν ἐπιρρήτησαν καὶ ὅσα ἤσαν τὰς ἀλώσεις τοῦ ἠωσμένῳ τῶν κράτων καὶ κατακόπτων εαυτὸν λίθος. 3 ἔδωκεν δὲ τὸν Ἱσραήλ ἀπὸ καταργθὲν ἐδραμε καὶ προεκκύνησεν ἀυτῷ, καὶ κράζας φωνῆς μεγάλης εἶπεν· Ἐίμοι καὶ σοὶ τὸν Ἱσραήλ ἐις τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ψύστον, ὅρκιῶς ἐν τούς θεοὺς με βασανίσθης. Ἐλεγεν γὰρ αὐτῷ· Ἐξέθη τὸ πνεύμα τὸ ἀκάθαρτον ἐκ τοῦ ἄνθρωπου καὶ ἐπηρώτα αὐτὸν τί σοι ὄνομα; καὶ ἀνεκρίθη λέγων· λέγεις ὄνομά μοι, ὅτι πολλοί ἐσμέν, καὶ ἐπαρκεῖται αὐτὸν πολλὰ ἵνα μὴ αὐτοῦ αποστείλῃ ἐξω τῆς χώρας. 11 ἦν δὲ ἐκεῖ πρὸς τῷ ὅρει ἁγία και μεγάλη παρακλήσειν αὐτὸν τοῖς καταργθέντες ἀπὸ τῆς θαλάσσης. 12 καὶ παρεκλήσεις αὐτὸν.
[πάντες] [οἱ δαίμονες] λέγοντες Πέμψον ἡμᾶς εἰς τοὺς ἈΒΓΓΔΧ χοίρους, ἵνα εἰς αὐτοὺς εἰσέλθωμεν. 13 καὶ εὐπρεπες αὐτοῖς [ἐνθέως] ο Ἰησοῦς. καὶ ἐξελθόντα τὰ πνεύματα τὰ ἀκάρτατα εἰσῆλθον εἰς τοὺς χοίρους, καὶ ἐξηράσαν ἡ ἀγέλη κατὰ τοῦ κρημνοῦ εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν [ἡσαν δὲ] ως δισχῖλιοι, καὶ εἶναργον οὐ τῇ θαλάσσῃ. 14 οἱ δὲ βάσκοντες τοὺς χοίρους ἔφυγον καὶ ἀπήγγειλαν εἰς τὴν πόλιν καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἀγόρας. καὶ εἰς ἐλθόντος ἑδει τῇ ἐστὶ τὸ γεγονός. 15 καὶ ἔρχονται πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν, καὶ θεωροῦσι τὸν δαίμονιζομένον καθῆμον [καὶ] ἰματισμένοι καὶ σωφρονοῦντα, τὸν ἑσύχικτα τὸν λεγεώνα, καὶ εὐφθηθαν. 16 καὶ διηγήσαντο αὐτοῖς οἱ ἱδόντες πώς ἐγένετο τῷ δαίμονιζομένῳ, καὶ περὶ τῶν χοίρων. 17 καὶ ἤρεξαν παρακαλεῖν αὐτὸν ἀπελθεῖν ἀπὸ τῶν ὀρίων αὐτῶν. 18 καὶ ἔμβαινοντος αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ πλοῖον παρακάλει αὐτὸν ὁ δαίμονιζεις ἵνα ἐμπλήτω. 19 δὲ Ἰησοὺς ὑπαγε ἐκ τὸν οἶκον σου πρὸς τούς σους, καὶ ἀνάγγελον αὐτοῦ εἰς τῇ Δικαστῇ. 20 καὶ ἀπῆλθε καὶ ἤρεξαν κρίσαι εἰς τῇ Δικαστῇ. 21 Καὶ διαπεράσαντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦν ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ πάλιν

---

rise to the report of two demoniacs in Matt. —On λεγον see note, Luke, ver. 30. —10.] ἀποκριτ. εἰς. τ. Χ. χ. ἐντύχαντες αὐτ. εἰς τ. ἄβουσον ἀπελθηκαίντων Λουκ.: see on Matt. ver. 30. —13.] ἦναν δὲ ἐν διά η. Peculiar to Mark, who gives us usually accurate details of this kind: see ch. vi. 37,—where however John also mentions the sum, ch. vi. 7. —15, 16.] Omitted by Matthew, as also vv. 18—26—18.] Buthym. and Theophyl. suppose that he feared a fresh incursion of the evil spirits: which could hardly be, on account of the destruction of the swine. —19.] There was perhaps some reason, why this man should be sent to proclaim God's mercy to his friends. His example may in former times have been prejudicial to them:—see note on Matt. ver. 32 (4). —20.] Gadara was one of the cities of Decapolis: see on Matt. iv. 26. —ο μέν χριστός μετριωροφός τῷ πάτρι τῷ ἐργον ἀνέθηκαν, θεραπευθέντες εἰς ἡμῶν, τῷ χριστῷ τοῦτο ἀνεμέλθει. Buthym. He commands the man to tell this, for He was little known in Perea where it happened, and so could have no consequences to fear, as in Galilee &c.

ψυχής ἀπὸ τῆς μάστιγος σου. ἐγὼ δὲ αὐτὸν λαλοῦντος ΑΒΓΔ ἐρχομάντα απὸ τοῦ ἀρχισυναγώγου λέγοντες ὅτι ἐθυγατέροις σου ἀπέθανε· τί ἐστὶ σκῦλεις τῶν διδάσκαιλον; Τί οὖν ἦσαν [εἰνέχεις] ἀκούσας τῶν λόγων λαλοῦμενον λέγει τῷ ἀρχισυναγώγῳ Μὴ φοβοῦ, μόνον ἵνα πίστευς. Καὶ οὖν ἄφηκεν οὐδένα αὐτῷ· συνακολουθησαι εἰ μὴ Πέτρου καὶ Ιάκωβου καὶ Ιωάννου τῶν ἀδελφῶν Ἰακώβου. Καὶ ἦρχοταν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ ἀρχισυναγώγου, καὶ θεωρεῖ θόρυβον, κλαιόντας καὶ ἀλαλάζοντας πολλά. Καὶ εἰς τὸ παιδίον ὅπου ἀπέθανεν, ἀλλὰ καθέδευε. ἐγὼ δὲ κατεγέλων αὐτοῦ. Καὶ οὖν ἐκβαλὼν ἀπαντᾷ παραλαβήναι τὸν πάτερα τοῦ παιδίου καὶ τὴν μητέρα καὶ τοὺς μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐισπρόειν ὅπου τὸ παιδίον [ἀνακείμενον]. Καὶ κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς τοῦ παιδίου λέγει αὐτῷ· Ταλθᾶ κοῦμι, ὅ ἐστι μεθερμηνευόμενον Τὸ ἐκ παράσιον, σοι λέγω, εἰμι ἡμῶν ἁγία ἐκ τῶν δώδεκα. Καὶ ἐξεστησάνει ἐκστάσει μεγάλη. Ἰδεῖς ἐποίησαν οὖν ὁ παῖς ἐν μηδείς· γνώ τούτο, καὶ εἶπε διδοθήναι αὐτῷ· φαγεῖν.

VI. 1 Ἐγὼ δὲ ἐκέθεν ἐκείθεν καὶ ἠλέει εἰς τὴν πατρίδα καὶ ἀκολουθοῦντι αὐτῶν, ἐκείθεν ἅμαρταν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐκείθεν εἰς τὴν πατρίδα αὐτῶν.
VI. 1—7. KATA MARKON.

gevomenvou sambathou ἤρατον ἐν τῷ συναγωγῷ διδάσκειν, καὶ πολλοὶ ἄκουοντες οὐ ἐζηνήσουσαν λέγοντες: Πάθεν τούτῳ ταῦτα, καὶ ζής ἡ σοφία ἡ δοθεία αὐτῶν, ἢ τί; καὶ δυνάμεις τοιαύτα ἀν διὰ τῶν χειρῶν αὐτοῦ γίνονται; οὐχ ἄνθρωπος ἐστιν ὁ τέκτων, ὁ υἱὸς Μαρίας, ἁδελφὸς δὲ Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωσῆ καὶ Ἰωάννα καὶ Σίμωνος καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν αἱ ἄδελφαι αὐτοῦ ὡς πρὸς ἡμᾶς καὶ ἔστιν ἐκανθαλικόντο ἐν αὐτῷ. ἔλεγε δὲ αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν πρὸς ἡμᾶς τοῖς συγγενεσίς τοῖς ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ. καὶ οὐκ ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ ἐκεῖ οὐδεὶς δύνανται τοιχοῖς ἐν τῇ ἐρασίᾳ. Εἰ δὲ ἐστὶ διὰ τῆς ἀποστάσεως αὐτῶν.

Kerf, p. 116. 1. [The Greek text is not fully transcribed due to the complexity and length of the passage.]

where see notes. 1.] ἔθελον not, from the house of Jairus, by the expression την παρίδιν, adv. in the corresponding clause. I may go out of my own house into a neighbour's, but I do not say, I go out of my own house into Lincolnshire; the two members of such a sentence must correspond. — I go out of Leicester-shire into Lincolnshire — so, as corresponding to την παρίδιν, adv. ἐκείνος must mean from that city, i.e. Capernaum. This against Meyer, who tries on this misinterpretation to ground a difference between Matt. and Mark. — 3.] ὁ τέκτων. This expression does not seem to be used at random, but to signify that the Lord had actually worked at the trade of his reputed father. Justin Martyr, Dial. p. 316, C, says, ταῦτα γὰρ τὰ τεκτονικὰ ἤγαγεν ἵστημι ἐν ἄνθρωποις ἰὼ, ἀποτρέπας καὶ ζυγία. — 5.] οὐκ ἥβαλεν. — The want of ability spoken of is not absolute, but relative. The same Voice which could still the tempests, could any where and under any circumstances have commanded diseases to obey; but in most cases of human infirmity, it was the Lord's practice to require faith in the recipient of aid; and that being wanted, the help could not be given. However, from what follows, we find that in a few instances it did exist, and the help was given accordingly. — 6.] θαυμάζει: this need not surprise us, nor be construed otherwise than as a literal description of the Lord's mind: in the mystery of His humanity, as He was compassed by human infirmity, grew in wisdom, learned obedience, knew not the day nor the hour, ch. xii. 32; so He might wonder at the unbelief of His countrymen.

— καὶ παραπέμενε—see Matt. ix. 35.

7.—13.] Matt. x. 1—15. Luke ix. 1—5: see also Matt. ix. 36—38, as the introduction to this mission. The variations in the three accounts are very trifling, as we might expect in so solemn a discourse delivered to all the twelve. — See the notes to Matt.; and respecting the subsequent difference between Matt. (ver. 16 ff.) and Luke, — those on Luke x. — 7.] δύο δόω (see ref.) is a Hebraism. These couples are pointed out in Matthew's list of the Apostles — not however in Mark's, which again shows the
VI.

μᾶτων τῶν ἀκαθάρτων, καὶ παρῆγγειλεν αὐτοῖς ἵνα ἈΒCD

μηδὲν καὶ αἴρωσιν εἰς ὀδὰν εἰ μὴ ῥάβδον μόνον, μῆμ' τῆραν

μῆραν ἄροτρον, μὴ ἐστὶν τῇ ἁλκὼν, ἀλλ' ὑποδεδεμένους

σανδάλια, καὶ μῆμ' ἐνδύσηθε δύο χιτώνας. καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς ὅτι

καὶ ὅσοι ἂν μὴ δέξωσιν υἱὸν μὴ ἀκούσωσιν υἱόν, ἐκτεθέντων

β' ἔξω ἐξελθόντες καὶ εἰκόνων ἵνα μετανοήσωσι.

καὶ διαμόνια πολλὰ εξεβαλλόν, καὶ ἥλεφον ἐλαῖον

πάλλος ἄρρωστους καὶ εὐεργετεῖν, καὶ ἤκουσεν ὁ

βασιλεὺς Ἡρῴδης ἐφανερώθη γὰρ ἐγένοτο τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ

καὶ ἔλεγεν ὅτι Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτιζόμενος ἐκ νεκρῶν

* ἀνέφθη, καὶ διὰ τούτου ἐνεργοῦσαν αἱ δυνάμεις ἐν αὐτῷ.

καὶ ἤλλοι ἢ ἔλεγον ὅτι Ἰάλια ἐστίν αἱ ἄλλοι ἢ ἔλεγον

ὁ προφήτης ἐστὶν ὡς εἰς τῶν προφητῶν. ἀκούσας

dε ο Ἡρῴδης εἰπὲν ὅτι ὁ ἔνω ἀπεκαθάρισε Ἰωάννην,


total absence of connecting design in this Gospel, such as is often assumed. — 8.] Striking instances occur in these verses, of the independence of the three reports in their present form.—μηδὲ ῥάβδον Matt. = εἰ μὴ δ. μόνον Mark. = μηδὲ ῥάβδον Luke (or ῥάβδον).—See notes on Matt., also in the next clause. — 9.] ὑποδεδεμένους, scil. ἰσαια, or some equivalent infinitive. We have another change of construction in ἐνδύωσθεί. — 13.] Ἰαυνοῦ Ἰαυνοῦ —this oil was not used medicinally, but as a vehicle of healing power committed to them.—a symbol of a deeper thing than the oil itself could accomplish. That such anointing has nothing in common with the extreme unction of Romans 10, see proved in note on James v. 14. — See for instances of such symbolic use of external applications, 2 Kings v. 14. Mark viii. 23. John ix. 6, &c.

14—29.] Matt. xiv. 1—12, Luke ix. 7. — 14.] The account of John’s death is not in Luke.) Our account is, as usual, the fullest of details.—See notes on Matt. — 14.] Herod was not king properly, but only tetrarch: see above. He heard most probably of the preaching of the twelve. — 15.] He is a prophet, like one of the prophets!—i.e. in their meaning, ‘He is not The Prophet for whom all are waiting, but only some prophet like those who have gone before.’—Where did our Evangelist get this remarkable expression, in his supposed comp. from Matt. and Luke? — 16.] On this repeated declaration of Herod, with its remarkable attraction of construction. De Wette observes, Mark here combines...
KATA MARKON.

8—26.

οὐτός [ἐστιν] αὐτὸς] ἡγέρθη * ἐκ νεκρῶν. 17. Αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ Ἡρώδης ἀποστείλας ἐκράτησε τὸν Ἰωάννην καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτὸν ἐν φυλακῇ διὰ Ἡρώδιαδα τὴν γυναίκα Φιλίππου τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι αὐτὸν ἐγάμησεν. 18. Ἐλεημόνες γὰρ ὁ Ἰωάννης τῷ Ἡρώδῃ ὅτι οὐκ ἔζητε σοι ἐφεξῆς τὴν γυναίκα τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου. 19. ὁ Ἰωάννης ἐξῆκεν αὐτὸν, καὶ ἠθέλη αὐτὸν ἀποκτείνῃ, καὶ οὐκ ἤδη ὅδυνατο. 20. ὁ γὰρ Ἡρώδης ἐφοβεῖτο τῶν Ἰωάννην, εἰ ὁ Ἰωάννης ἀνεῴρηκε καὶ ἤγιον, καὶ συνετήρη ἐν αὐτῶν, καὶ ἀκούσας αὐτοῦ πολλὰ ἔποιει, καὶ ἠδεώς αὐτοῦ ἤκουσε. 21. καὶ γενομένης ἡμέρας ἐνυποί ὅτε Ἡρώδης τοῖς γενεσίοις αὐτοῦ ἐδίδον ἐπεί ὅτι μεγιστάζειν αὐτὸν καὶ τοῖς χιλιάρχοις καὶ τοῖς πρώτοις τῆς Γαλιλαίας, 22. καὶ εἰς εἰσηλθόντος τῆς θυγατρὸς αὐτῆς τῆς Ἡρώδιας καὶ ὀρθοσάμην καὶ ἀρεσάμην τῷ Ἡρώδῃ καὶ τοῖς συνανακειμένοις, εἶπεν ὁ βασιλεὺς τῷ κορασίῳ Ἀιτήσειν μὲ ἔαν θῆλης, καὶ δῶσον σοι. 23. καὶ ἡμόσεσιν αὐτῷ ὅτι ὃ εἶναι ἡμᾶς σοὶ δῶσον σοι. ἦς ἡμίσιος τῆς βασιλείας μου. 24. ἢ δὲ εἴδεσθαι εἰπε τῇ μπράτι αὐτής ἢ τῇ ἀιτήσει; ἢ δὲ ἔδει τῆς Κεφαλῆς Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ. 25. καὶ εἰς εἰσήλθοντος ἐνδόθη καὶ πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα μῆνά λεγόμενο "Θείλα ἡμῖν ἔμαρκις" ἢ τῆς αὐτής ἐπὶ πίνακα τῆς Κεφαλῆς Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ, καὶ ἐφέστη ἡμείς γενομένης ὁ βασιλεύς, ἀλλὰ τούς ὀρκούς τους.


The principal additional particulars in the following account of John's imprisonment and execution are,—ver. 19, that it was Herodias who persecuted John, whereas Herod knew his worth and holiness, and listened to him with pleasure, and even compiled in many things with his injunctions (on which see reff. and note Luke xxii. 53) — that the maiden went and asked counsel of her mother before making the request—and that a στιγμή — one of the body-guard (not from specularis... Speculatoribus... oervicum porrexit, Senec. de Benef. iii. 25, cited by Kuinoel) was sent to behead John. — 20.] σωφρ., 'preserved him,' not 'esteemed him highly.' — kept him in safety that he should not be killed by Herodias. — 21.] ἐκσαί, not a festal day, as Hammond and others interpret it, for this use of ἔκσαί is later—but, a convenient day (see ver. 31 and Acts xxiv. 26) for the purposes of Herodias: which shows that the dative, &c. had been all previously contained by her—σταυρος, a Macedonian word, which came.
into use at the Alexandrine conquest. — 23.] The contracted ἡμέρας belongs to later Greek, as does also ἄδειας, ver. 26.
30—44.] Matt. xiv. 13—21. Luke ix. 10—17. John vi. 1—13. This is one of the very few points of comparison between the four Gospels during the ministry of our Lord. And here again I believe Mark's report to be an original one, and of the very highest authority. Professor Bloek (Beiträge zur Evangelien Kritik, p. 200) believes that Mark has used the Gospel of John, — on account of the 200 denarii in our ver. 7 and John ver. 7: — and that he generally compiles his narrative from Matt. and Luke, ibid. p. 72—75, which has been elsewhere shown to be wholly untenable. I believe Mark's to be an original full account — Matthew's a compendium of this same account, but drawn up independently of Mark's: — Luke's a compendium of another account: John's, an independent nar-

ative of his own as eye-witness. — 30.] Mentioned by Luke, not by Matt. — 31—44.] One of the most affecting descriptions in the Gospels, and peculiar to Mark. Matt. has a brief compendium of it. Every word and clause is full of the rich recollections of one who saw, and felt, the whole. Are we mistaken in tracing the warm heart of him who said, 'I will go with thee to prison and to death'? — 32.] στο, not 's-foot,' but 'by land.' — 34.] ἱδιάς, 'having disembarked,' most probably. Meyer would render it 'having come forth from His solitude' in Matt., — and 'having disembarked' here: but I very much doubt this. There is nothing in Matt. to imply that He had reached His place of solitude before the multitudes came up. John indeed, vv. 3—7, seems to imply this; but He may very well have mounted the hill or cliff from the sea before He saw the multitudes, and this would be on His disembarkation.
ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ
VI. 46—56.

252 ανάλογα τω πλοίων καὶ προάγες εἰς τὸ πέραν πρὸς Βηθαζάν, ΔΒΔ

εἰς αὐτὸς * απολύσει τὸν ὄχλον. 46 καὶ ἀποταξάμενος αὐτοῖς ἐπὶ τὸ ὄρος προσεύκαθαι. 17 καὶ οἵμας γενομένης ἵνα τὸ πλοίον ἐν μίσῳ τῆς θαλάσσης, καὶ αὐτὸς μόνος ἔπι τῆς γῆς. 18 καὶ εἶδεν αὐτοὺς βασανιζομένους εἰς τὸν ἑλαύνειν ἵνα γὰρ ὁ ἁμαρτίας ἐναντίος αὐτοῖς καὶ περὶ τετάρτην φυλακῆν τῆς νυκτὸς ἐρχεται πρὸς αὐτοὺς περιπατόν ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης, καὶ ἦθελεν παρέλθειν αὐτοὺς. 49 οἱ δὲ ἱδόντες αὐτὸν περιπατοῦντα ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης ἔδοξαν φάντασμα εἶναι, καὶ ἀνέκραζαν. 50 πάντες γὰρ αὐτόν εἶδον, καὶ έταράξθησαν. καὶ ἐδόθη εἴλασεν αὐτῶν αὐτῶν, καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς Θαρσεῖτε, ἐγώ εἰμί, μη ἰδοὺμαι. 51 καὶ ἀνέβη πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ πλοίον, καὶ ἐκάσταν ὁ ἁμαρτίας καὶ λίαν εκ περισσοῦ εἰς αὐτοῖς οὐ εἰσέπεσεν καὶ έδάμαζον. 52 οὐ γὰρ ὁ σώματός ἐπὶ τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἦν γὰρ ἡ καρδία αὐτῶν εἰπωρωμένη. 53 καὶ διαπεράσαντες ἤλθον εἰς τὴν γῆν Γεννησαρ., b προσωρίζομεν. 54 καὶ εἰς εἰλαθεῖσθαι αὐτῶν εἰς τὸ πλοίον εὐθὺς εἰπεν ὁ πρὸ τοῖς ἐπιγυνότας αὐτῶν 55 περιδραμοῦντες ὅλην τὴν περιχώριον ἐκείνην ἤξεν ἐπὶ τοῖς κραββάταις τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας περιέβαινεν οὕτως εἰπον ὁ Κυρίῳ ὅτι


the fishes, are both peculiar to, and characteristic of Mark: but it would have been most inconsistent with his purpose to have omitted χωρίς γυν. κ. παλ. in ver. 44, had he had it before him.

45—52.] Matt. xiv. 22—33. John vi. 14 —21. Omitted in Luke. Matt. and Mark very nearly related as far as ver. 47. John's account altogether original, and differing materially in details: see notes there, and on Matt. —45.] Βηθαζάν — this was the city of Peter and Andrew, James and John, on the west side of the lake—and in the same direction as Capernaum, mentioned by John, ver. 17. The miracle just related took place near the other Bethsaida (Julias), —Luke ix. 10. —46.] ἀνέκραζα, in this sense belongs to later Greek. —48.] κ. παλ. απ. Peculiar to Mark. —50.] παντες ... ἀνασφάλθ., ditto. After this follows the history respecting Peter, which might naturally be omitted here if this Gospel were drawn up under his inspection—but this is at least doubtful in any general sense. —52.] Peculiar to Mark. —οὐ γὰρ εἰσπ. They did not, from the miracle which they had seen, infer the power of the Lord over nature.

53—56.] Matt. xiv. 34—36. The two accounts much alike, but Mark's the richer in detail: e. g. καὶ προσωρίζθησαν ver. 34, καὶ έστην τὸν Κ. —αντιδεικνύτας ver. 56. —53.] έστη τ. τ. Π. of the land of Gen., not τὸ. This is shown by what follows. —55.] περιφ. implies that they occasionally had wrong information of His being in a
ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΡΚΟΝ.

VII. 1. Και ἵνα συνάγονται πρὸς αὐτὸν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ τινὲς τῶν γραμματέων ἐλθόντες ἀπὸ Ἰεροσολύμων. 2 καὶ ἵνα τινὰς τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ 1 κοιναὶ λέγουν, τοντείν τινὶ ἀνίπτους, ἐσθίοντας ἄρτους [ἐμεμαύτοι], 3 οἱ γὰρ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ πάντες οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, οὐκ ἔσθιον τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων 4 καὶ ἀπὸ ἀγοράς οὐκ ἔπαθον, καὶ ἀλλὰ πολλά ἐστιν ἡ παρελάβον 5 κρατεῖν, ἵνα παρομοίωσι τῇ διατεχνίᾳ, καὶ ἐξετάσιμα καὶ κλινών. 6 ἤτοι ἐν εἰσὶν ἡ παρελάβον καὶ τῇ διατεχνίᾳ, τῇ παραδόσει τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, ἀλλὰ ἀνίπτους ἐσθιοῦσιν τῶν ἄρτων;

1 Κοιναὶ Λευκοὶ εὐκαίριοι εἰς Β."
ο ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὅτι ἐκάλεσε ἀνεφήτευσεν ἈΒΔ

Ἡσαίος περὶ ὑμῶν τῶν ὑποκριτῶν, ὡς γέγραπται ὦντος ὁ λαὸς τοῖς ἐξελέσι με τιμᾶ, ἤ ἐν καρδίᾳ αὐτῶν πόρῳ ἢ ἐν ὑμῖν ἑυμόι, μᾶτν δὲ σέβοναι με, διδακοῦντος ἡ διδασκαλίας ἐντάλματα ἀνθρώπων. τὰς ἀφεντικὰς τὴν εὐτολῆν τοῦ θεοῦ δρατεῖ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, βαπτίζομεν ἐξετάσαι καὶ ποιημένοι, καὶ ἄλλα παρόμοια τοιαύτα πολλά ποιεῖτε. καὶ ἐπελεγεν αὐτοῖς ἀνεφήτευσεν τὴν εὐτολῆν τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα τὴν παράδοσιν ὑμῶν τηρήσητε. Ὁ Μωυσῆς γὰρ εἶπεν τίμητε τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα σου, καὶ ὁ κακολογούν πατέρα καὶ μητέρα θανάτῳ τελευταῖο ὑμεῖς δὲ λέγετε Εἰς πατέρα καὶ μητέρα θανάτῳ τελευταῖο ὑμεῖς δὲ λέγετε. ἐναὶ ἀνθρώπων τῷ πατρὶ ή τῇ μητρί ποιεῖται καὶ ἐν ἀνθρώπων τῷ πατρί ή τῇ μητρί ποιεῖται τῇ μητρί, σὺν ἐν τῷ γάμῳ καὶ παρέδωκατε καὶ παρόμοια τοιαύτα πολλά ποιεῖτε. καὶ προκαλεσάμενος πάντα τὸν ὁχλὸν ἐγένετο αὐτοῖς ἀκούετε μοι πάντες καὶ συνίετε. οὗτοι οἱ ἐν τῇ θεῷ εἰς οὔτως εἰσελθοῦντες τὸ ἀνθρώπων εἰσελθοῦσαν εἰς αὐτοὺς δύναται αὐτοὺς κοινωνεῖ ἡ ἀνθρώπων μαθητεύσει εἰς αὐτοὺς ἔχει ὡς θρήνοις εἰς ὠφυνές αὐτοὶ καὶ ἐν τῇ κοινωνίᾳ μείζων παρά λατρείας καὶ συνελθοῦντες τῷ θεῷ καὶ τῷ θεῷ αὐτῶν καὶ τῷ θεῷ τῶν ἀνθρώπων.
ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΡΚΟΝ.

6—26.

ι. τις παραβολῆς. 18 καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς Οὐτὼ καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀσύνετοι ἐστε; οὐ νοεῖτε ὅτι πάν τοῦ ἐξωθην εἰς τὸν ἄνθρωπον οὐ δυνατί ἄνθρωπον κοινώσει,

τοῖς ἁπατημένοις εἰς τὸν ἄνθρωπον οὐ δύναται αὐτὸν κοινώσει,

ὅτι οὐκ εἶπον ἐκεῖνοι αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν καρδίαν ἀλλ' εἰς τὴν

κοιλίαν· καὶ εἰς τὸν ᾧ ἀφεθήναι εἰκαστέαται καθαρής.

λούντα τὰ βρώματα. 20 ἔλεγε δὲ ὅτι τοῦ ἁγίων ἅμα τοῦ ἔκστασιν εἰκονούμενον, ἐκείνῳ κοινώσεω ἄνθρωπον. 21 ἔσω·

δὲν ἄριστοι τῶν ἀνθρώπων οἱ δαλόγισμοι οἱ κακοὶ εἰκοστοῦται, μοιχείαι, πορνείαι, φόνοι, κλοπαί, πλευρεῖαι, πονηρία, δόλοι, ἁθλεῖαι, ὀφθαλμοὶ πυρὸς, βλασφημία, ύπερφανία, ἀφρούσην.

πάντα ταύτα τὰ πονηρά ἐσωθήναι εἰκαστέαται καὶ κοινώσει

tὸ ἄνθρωπον.

24 Καὶ ἐκεῖθεν ἀναστὰς ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὰ ἦλθεν γινωσκεῖν, καὶ Σιδώνος. καὶ εἰσελήθην εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, οὐδένα

ηθελε γινωσκεῖν, καὶ οὐκ ἠδύνατο εἰς ἄνθρωπον. 25 ἀκούσας

gαρ γυνη ἐλέος ἐλθοῦσα προσέπησε πρὸς τούτους

τοὺς αὐτοὺς. 26 ἦν δὲ ἡ γυνὴ Ἑλληνική. * Συροφοινίσσα

tῷ γενεί, καὶ ἡ ἀνωτέρω ἑνὸ ὁ δαιμόνιον ἑκβάλλει.
'wished to know no man,' but 'would have known no man.'—25.] The woman ('Ἐλληνή, a Gentile) had been following Him and His disciples before, Matt.—26.] Σωρόφ, because there were also Λυσσοφόρεις, Carthaginians. —27.] 'Ἀφες πρῶτον . . . This important addition in Mark sets forth the whole ground on which the present refusal rested. The Jews were first to have the Gospel offered to them, for their acceptance or rejection: it was not yet time for the Gentiles. —28.] καὶ γὰρ . . . see on Matt.—30.] These particulars are added here. —ββλ. ἐπ. τ. κ.Α.] which the torments occasioned by the evil spirit would not allow her to be before—κειμένην ἐν θερήμα, Euthym.

31—37.] Peculiar to Mark.—A miracle which serves a most important purpose; that of clearly distinguishing between the cases of the possessed and the merely diseased or deformed. This man was what we call 'deaf and dumb;' the union of which maladies is often brought about by the inability of him who never has heard sounds to utter them plainly:—or, as here apparently, by some accompanying physical infirmity of the organs of speech. —31.] We have the same journey related Matt. xv. 29; and εὐφρός λαλοῦντας, mentioned among the miracles, for which the people glorified the God of Israel. On Decapolis, see Matt. iv. 25.—He crossed the Jordan, and made a circuit to arrive at the lake. —33.] ἀναστίαναιν. No reason that we know can be assigned why the Lord should take aside this man, and the blind man ch. viii. 23; but how many might there be which we do not know,—such as some peculiarity in the man himself, or the persons around, which influenced the Lord's determination! —It is remarkable that the same medium of conveying the miraculous cure is there used. Meyer, who blames all the other assigned reasons as being 'αὐτὸ βρτ ἔφτι γεγρίφεν,' assigns one of which the charge is eminently true, Comm. ii. p. 79.—ββλ. τ. Ἐκκ. By the symbolic use of external means, our Lord signified the healing virtue for afflicted human kind, which resides in and proceeds from Him incarnate in our Flesh. He uses either His own touch—something from Himself,—or the cleansing element to which He so often compares His
καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ Ἔφθασα, ὦ ἵστα ἰδιανοίχητα. 35 καὶ [εὔθεως] δινοῖοχθαν αὐτὸν αἰ ἀκοί, καὶ ἐλύθη ὁ δεσμὸς τῆς γλώσσης αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐλάλει ἀφόθως. 36 καὶ διεστελλατο αὐτοῖς ἵνα μηδεὶς ἐπισώπον ὅσον δὲ [αὐτὸς]

παντά πεποίηκε, καὶ τοὺς κωποὺς ἐποιεῖ ἀκούειν καὶ τοὺς ἀλάλους λαλεῖν.

VIII. 1 ἔν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐπεμπόλλον ὁ χώλον ὅντος καὶ μὴ ἠχοντιν τὸ γάγωσι, προσκαλέσαμεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Ἐφηβαν χυμώμαι ἐπὶ τὸν χώλον, ὅτι ὄθη ἡμέρας τρέχει πρός μένουσι μοι, καὶ οὐκ ἔχωσι τὸ γάγωσι. καὶ ἐάν ἀπολύσω αὐτούς νύστες εἰς οἶκον αὐτῶν, ἐκλυθήσονται ἐν τῷ ὅδε; * τίνες γὰρ αὐτῶν μακροθεν οὕκουσί; καὶ ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ Πόθεν τούτους δυνάστεις τις ὦ, ἵνα σχίζωσιν ἄρτος ἐπὶ ἐρήμους; καὶ ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ ὁ Ὀνομάτης ἄρτους; Οἱ δὲ ἐἰπον Ἔπτα. καὶ παρῆγγελε τῷ όχλῳ ἀναπτενένεπ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. καὶ λαβὼν τοὺς ἐπῆ πάντα ἄρτους εὐχαριστησάς ἐκλαδερέω, καὶ ἐδωκὼς τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ἰνα παρασκευάζει καὶ παρέδωκεν τῷ όχλῳ. καὶ ἐκεῖνον ἑικθόδια ὁλίγα καὶ ἐυλογήσας εἰπε παραθείναι καὶ αὐτά. * ἐφε-
are not his own words, as in rec., but the Lord's; and again omits χωριος γυναικος. 

11—13.] Matt. xvi. 1—4, who gives the account at more length; without however the graphic and affecting άναστ. την θν. θν. ver. 12. — αλλα, a Hebrew form of strong abjuration: see ref.

14—21.] Matt. xvi. 4—12. Our account is fuller and more circumstantial,—relating that they had but one loaf in the ship, ver. 14; inserting the additional reproofs ver. 18, and the reference to the two miracles of feeding more at length, vv. 19, 21. — Mark however omits the conclusion in Matt., — that they then understood that He spake to them of the doctrine, &c. Possibly this was a conclusion drawn in the mind of the narrator, not altogether identical with that to be drawn from our account here—for the leaven of Herod could not be doctrine (καὶ τ. ζ. Ἰρ., ver. 15—Mark only), but must be understood of the irrereligious lives and fawning worldly practices of the hangovers of the court of Herod. — 14.] ἀκολούθοντο is not pluperfect: see on Matt. ver. 8. — 15.]
laughter unto Δώδεκα. 20 οτε δὲ τους ἐπὶ εἰς τοὺς τετρακιςεκατόν, πόσων σπυρίδων ἐπιρρώματα κλασμάτων εἰς τὰ χόρατα; οἰ δὲ εἶπον Ἐπτά. 21 καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς ἡ Πώς οὖν εὐνείετε;

22 Καὶ ἦρχηται εἰς Βηθσαϊδαν. καὶ φέρουσιν αὐτῷ τυφλὸν, καὶ παρακαλοῦσιν αὐτὸν ὅτι αὐτόν ἀθηναῖος. 23 καὶ ἔπιλαβομενός τῆς χειρὸς τοῦ τυφλοῦ ἐξῆγαγεν αὐτὸν ἐξ τῆς κωμῆς, καὶ πτύσας εἰς τὰ όμοσον τοῦτον ἀριθμόν. 24 εἶτα τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ ἐπηρῴα αὐτὸν ὡς ἐπηρῴαν, εἰς τὰς χεῖρας τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἐπέδηκε τὰς χεῖρας τοῦ τοῦ ὁφθαλμοῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ ηποίησεν αὐτὸν ἀναβελέσαι καὶ ἀποκατεσθάνει. 25 καὶ ἔνεβελε τατύλαγγος ἀπαντάς. 26 καὶ ἀπεστείλε τοὺς αὐτὸν εἰς ὅικον αὐτοῦ λέγων Μηδὲ ἐκείνης τοῦ κόμην εἰς ἐλθεῖν, μηδὲ ἔπειρας τινὶ ἐν τῷ κόμῃ.


ὄρος is merely take heed, and does not belong to ἀνῦν.—βλέπεις. ἀνῦν is not 'turn your eyes away from' (Tittman. and Kuin. in Meyer), but as in reff.

29—30.] Peculiar to Mark. This appears to have been Bethesda, Julias, on the n.e. side of the lake. Compare ver. 13. — 23.] The leading of this blind man out of the town appears as if it had been done from some local reason. In ver. 26 we find him forbidden expressly to enter into or set it in the town, and with a repetition of κοίμη, which looks as if the place had been somehow unworthy of such a work being done there. (This is a serious objection against Meyer’s reason, that the use of spittle on both occasions occasioned the same privacy here and in ch. vii. 33.)—Or we may perhaps find the reason in our Lord’s immediate departure to such a distance (ver. 27); and say, that He did not wish multitudes to gather about and follow Him.—πάντας... ἐπήρω... see above on ch. vii. 33.—We cannot say what may have induced the Lord to perform this miracle at twice—certainly not the reason assigned by Dr. Burton, “that a blind man would not, on suddenly recovering his sight, know one object from another, because he had never seen them before,” and so would require a double miracle;—a second, to open the eyes of his mind also, to comprehend what he saw. This assumes the man to have been born blind, which he was not, from ver. 24; for how should he know how trees appeared? and besides, the case of the man born blind in John ix. required no such double healing. These things were in the Lord’s power, and He ordered them as He pleased from present circumstances, or for our instruction. —24.] ‘I see men; for I see them walking as it were trees’: i.e. not distinct in individual peculiarity, but as trees in the hedgerow fit by the traveller. —25.] ἐνδειβίσατε αὐ. ἢ. He caused him to look up: not, to recover his sight, which would be superfluous, from what follows. —26.] See above in this note. S 2
27 Kaiv ei/xhtheiv oI ocous kai oI mahthai autoiv eis tas ABCD
kwcas Kaiasariaic tis Filippou. kai ev ty odoi epipw/ta
touc mahthac autoi lgoi autoci Tivn me legousai oiv
anerwpoic einaiv; 28 oI oA anepkri/thesan* Iwainan touc
baptisthna, kai alloi E/lan, alloi oA *ina touc profr-
twn. 29 kai autoic *legi autoci * Yeime oA Tivn me
legete einaiv; apokritheis oA o Pteros lgei autoiv Svo ei o
christos. 30 kai *epetimheisen autoic ina mhei/n lgewa
peri autou. 31 Kai h/ezato didaskein autous oti dei touc
u/voi tou anerwpos tovolla pathan kai *apodokimassei
*apto tov prososeirov kai *argyter瓯v kai *gymmai-
tes kai apoktanhv, kai meta treic hmeras *anasthe-
nai. 32 kai *parhphia touc lgoiv elalhcl. kai *pros-
xalomouc autoiv o Pteros h/ezato eipitumh autoir. 33 o
oA *epistrofeic kai idouc touc mahthac autoic *epetimhe
trpo Pterw lgoiv 'Upage ovtaio mou sataan, oti ou
kfronesi tv ta tou theou, alla ta tov anerwpos. 34 kai
proskaleasmouc touc *chlon sun toic mahthac autoiv
eivn autoic *Ocric thele *ptopo mou eltheiv, *apar-
nhassiv eautou kai aratw touc stauron autoiv kai ak-
koloutheiv moi. 35 oS gar an thel thn *psikh thn autou
sawai, apolosei autn * oS de an apolosei thn psikh
autou evkei emou kai tou evaggeleiou, [o/noc] swsei au-

18—21. With the exception of the intro-
duction in Luke, which describes the Lord
to have been alone praying and joined by
His disciples,—and the omission of the
praise of and promise to Peter by both
Mark and Luke, the three are in exact
accordance. On this latter omission no
stress must therefore be laid as to the
character of Mark's Gospel, as has been
done. (Theophylact in L.—cited by De
Wette.)

22—27. Luke omits the rebuke of Peter.
Mark adds, ver. 32, par/phiwv r. la. elalh/
and, in the rebuke of Peter, that the Lord
said the words idouc touc mahthac autou.
In vv. 34, 35, the agreement is verbal,
except that Luke adds kath' hmeran oE
ovn sv. autous, and Mark kai tou ega/
after lou, ver. 35; and informs us, in ver.
34, that the Lord said these words, hav-
ing called the multitude with His disciples.
This Meyer calls a contradiction to Matt.
and Luke,—and thinks it arose from a
misunderstanding of Luke's paswqa. Far
rather should I say that our account repre-
sents every detail to the life, and that the
paswqa contains traces of it. What
wonder that a crowd should here, as every-
IX. 1—7.

KATA MARKON.

tην. 26 τι γὰρ ὠφελήσαι * ἀνθρωπον, ἐὰν κερδώση τὸν κόσμον ὄλον καὶ ἐπιμωθῇ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ; 27 ἡ τί * δώσει ἀνθρωπος ἀντάλλαγμα τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ; 30 ὡς γὰρ ἐκτασινυθῇ καὶ τους ἐμοὺς λόγους ἐν τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτη τῇ μοιχαλίδι καὶ ἐμπαρτιλαφω, καὶ ὁ ἱερός τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπανορμήθηκεν αὐτῶν, οτιὰν ἐλθῇ ἐν τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῶν μετὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων τῶν ἁγίων.

IX. 1 Καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι εἰσὶν τοὺς ὑδὲ ἐστηκότων, ὅτι ὀνεὶς ὡς μὴ γείωσης θανάτου ἐως ἂν ἴδωσι τὸν βασιλέα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐλπισθῶν ἐν ἐνυμέμεν.

2 Καὶ μεθ’ ἡμέρας ἐξ οὐ παραλαμβάνει ο Ἰησοῦς τὸν Πέτρον καὶ τὸν Ἀκόλουθον καὶ τὸν Ἰωάννην καὶ ἁναφέρει αὐτοὺς εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλὸν καὶ ἰδίαν μόνονς, καὶ μετεμορφώθη ἐμπροσθεν αὐτῶν. 3 καὶ τὰ ἥματα αὐτῶν ἐγένετο ἑπιθύμησιν, λευκά λίαν ὡς χινον, σιὰ ἡ γναθεῖς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς οὐ δύναται ἡ λευκάναι. 4 καὶ ὁ βούτης αὐτὸς Ἡλίας σὺν Μωσεί, καὶ ἄσωσθαι κεκαθόντων τῷ Ἰησοῦ. 5 καὶ ἀποκρίθης ὁ Πέτρος λέγει τῷ Ἰησοῦ Ραβί, * καλὸν ἔστιν ἡμᾶς ως εἶναι, καὶ ποιῆσαι μὲν σκηνὰς τρεῖς, σοι μιᾶν καὶ Μωσεῖ μιᾶν καὶ Ἡλίᾳ μιᾶν. 6 οὐ γὰρ ἐδεί τί * λαλήσῃ, ὅτι ἔστω γὰρ ἐκτιθοί. 7 καὶ ἐγένετο νεφέλη ἐπισκέπτουσα αὐτοὺς καὶ ἤθελεν φωνῆ ἑκ τῆς νεφελῆς [ἐλέγουσα] ὡς ἐστὶν ὑιὸς μου. 8


where else, have collected about Him and the disciples? — 36.) Mark and Luke here agree: but Matt., ver. 27, bears traces of this verse, having apparently abridged it in transcribing his report, not to repeal what he had before said, in ch. x. 33.—On ροιχαλίδι, see Matt. xi. 39.  

CHAP. IX. 1–8. Matt. xvi. 28. xvii. 1–8. Luke ix. 27—36. Here again, while Matt. and Mark’s accounts seem to have one and the same source, they have delected from it, and additional particulars have found their way into our text. Luke’s account is from a different source. If we might conjecture, Peter has furnished the accounts in Matt. and Mark:—this latter being retouched,—perhaps by himself: while that of Luke may have had another origin. The additional particulars in our text are,—the very graphic and noble description in ver. 3, φταλθ. . . . λειποῦ, and οὐ γὰρ ἐδεί τι λαλ. . . . ἐκτιθοί.
Mark omits ἐν ᾧ εὐδοκήσα, Matt. ver. 5. (According to De Wette, Ex. Handb. i. 210. ὃς χαὶ is borrowed from Matt. xxviii. 17 (1).) What a remarkable borrower the text is:—[The scribe probably had Matt. xxviii. 17 (1).] 'none of those who appeared,' but (October) Jesus alone.

9—13.] Matt. xvii. 9—13. Two remarkable additions occur in our text;—ver. 10, which indicates Apostolic authority, and that of one of the Three;—and καὶ ... ἐρευ. in ver. 12.—10.] ἐκρι. τ. λ. not, 'they kept the command'—for σφηνγρ. explains it to mean kept secret the saying, as in ref.—τι λογ. τ. κ. &v. does not refer to the Resurrection generally, for it was an article of Jewish belief, and connected with the times of the Messiah;—but to His Resurrection as connected with His Death: the whole was eminential to them. —13.] Meyer and others place the interrogation after τοῦ ἀνθρώπου and regard ἵνα γλ. . . . as its answer. But not to mention that such a sentence would be without example in the Lord's discourses, the sense given by it is meagre in the extreme. As it stands in the text it forms a counter-question to that of the Apostles in ver. 11. They asked, 'How say the Saviour that Elias must first come?' The Lord answers it by telling them that it is even so; and returns the question by another: And how is it (also) written of the S. of Man, that He be? then comes the conclusion in ver. 13 with ἄλλα λέγεις, stating that Elias has come, and leaving it therefore to be inferred that the sufferings of the Son of Man were close at hand. Notice how the γίγν. καὶ αὐτοῖς binds both together. Just as the first coming of the Son of Man is to suffer and to die, so has the first coming of Elias been as it was written of Him; but there is a future coming of Elias ἀποκαθαρίσων τὰν, and of the Son of Man in glory. See further in notes on Matt.
such another contrast to be found in the Gospel as this, between the open heaven and the sons of glory on the mount, and the valley of tears with its terrible forms of misery and pain and unbelief.—15."

The Lord's countenance probably retained traces of the glory on the mount; so strong a word as εξεθαμβήσθη would hardly have been used merely of their surprise at His sudden approach; see Exod. xxxvii. 29, 30. That brightness, however, terrified the people: this attracts them; see 2 Cor. iii. 7.—16. Stier thinks that τότε γράφων is not the right reading—not for that the Lord would not ask the Scribes, but His own disciples. But we may say on the other hand that He came to the help of His own disciples, and thus naturally addresses Himself to the Scribes. They however are silent, and the father of the child answers.—17. πρὸς σε—i. e. intended to do so, not being aware of His absence. From Luke, ver. 38, we learn that he was his only son—Διαδόχον, causing deafness and dumbness, and fits of epilepsy; see Luke xi. 14.—18. ἕξειρα 'wastes or pines away,' as E. V. or perhaps 'become dry' or 'stiff.'—19. γενέω—not addressed to the men, but generally, to the race and generation among whom the Lord's ministry was fulfilled. The additional words καί εὐστραμομεν (Matt. Lake) are probably from Deut. xxiii. 6, 20, where διστάσεως is also expressed,—by πολλάς, καί ἐστιν νύμφην ἐν αὐτῶν. The question is not asked of a spirit of longing to be gone from them, but of holy impatience of their hardness of heart and unbelief. In this the father, disciples, Scribes, and multitude are equally involved.—20. 'The kingdom of Satan, in small and great, is ever stirred into a fiercer activity by the coming near of the kingdom of Christ. Satan has great wrath, when his time is short.' (Trench, Mir. 365.)—21. The Lord takes occasion to
enquire thus in the heart, to bring in the trial of his faith. — Ew. 21—27 are peculiar to Mark. — 22.] see Matt. ver. 15. — δέ τι δόνασαι. This bespeaks, if any faith, at most but a very ignorant and weak one. — ἂν —the wretched father counts his child’s misery his own: thus the Syrophoenician woman, Matt. xv. 25, Βοθήσει μόνα. — 23.] τις εἰς. The τις involves this in some difficulty. The most probable rendering is to make it designatory of the whole sentence: Jesus said to him the saying, ‘If thou hast faith, all things are possible.’ Some would set an interrogation after δόνασαι, and suppose the Lord to be citing the father’s words; ‘didst thou say, ‘if thou canst?’ — believe?’ — &c. Others, as Dr. Burton, suppose it to mean τις, ‘el δύνασαι, πιστεύεις (imperative)’ — Believe what you have expressed by your τις δύνασαι &c.’ — But both these renderings involve methods of construction and expression not usual in the Gospels. The εἰς δύνασαι is a manifest reference to the εἰς δύνασαι before, and meant to convey a reproof, as the father’s tears testify. The sentence also, unless I am mistaken, is meant to convey an intimation that the healing was not to be an answer to the εἰς τις δύνασαι, so that the Lord’s power was to be challenged and proved, — but an answer to faith, which (of course by laying hold on Him who πάντα δύναται) can do all things. — 24.] Nothing can be more touching and living than this whole most masterly and wonderful narrative. The poor father is drawn out into a sense of the unworthiness of his distrust, and ‘the little spark of faith which is kindled in his soul reveals to him the abyssal deeps of unbelief which are there’ (Trench, p. 367). “Thus,” remarks Olshausen, (B. Comm. i. 534), “does the Redeemer show Himself to the father as a μακρυγής πίστεως first, before He heals his son. In the struggle of his anxiety, the strength of Faith is born, by the aid of Christ, in that soul empty of it before.” — There is strong analogy, in the Lord’s treatment of the father here, for the sponsorial engagement in Infant baptism. The child is by its infirmity incapacitated; it is therefore the father’s faith which is tested, and when that is proved, the child is healed. The fact is, that the analogy rests far deeper: viz. on the ‘inclusion’ of ‘the old man’ in Adam and ‘the new man’ in Christ; see Rom. v. 12—21. — 25.] This took place at a distance from the crowd, among those who had run forward to meet the Lord, ver. 15. — εἰς τοὺς ἐκ thr. ] emphatic, as opposed to the want of power on the part of the disciples. This is the only place where we have such a charge as μητρέα ἐλαθεῖν. εἰς ἐκ, — showing the excessive malignity and tenacity of this kind (see ver. 29) of spirit. This is also shown by ver. 26. — 27.] as He had done on the mount,
KATA MARKON. 265

24—37.

Mark—the Lord asked them, on coming into a house, what had been the subject of their dispute;—they were silent from shame;—He sat down, delivered His sentence to the twelve,—and then took the child, &c.—Lastly turn to Matthew. There, the disciples themselves referred the question to the Lord, and He, the child, &c.—Who can forbear seeing in these narratives the unfettered and independent testimony of three witnesses, consistent with one another in the highest form and spirit of truthfulness, but differing in the mere letter? Mark’s account is again the richest and fullest, and we can hardly doubt that if the literal exact detail of fact is in question, we have it here. —33.] Between the coming to Capernaum, and this discourse, happened the demand of the tribute money, Matt. xvii. 20—27. —34.] There is no real difference in the matter in question here (and in Luke), and in Matt. The kingdom of heaven was looked on as about soon to appear: and their relative rank now would be assumed as their relative rank then. The difference in the expression of this is a mark of independence and authority. —35.] see Matt.
This saying is not inconsistent with that in Matt. xli. 30. They do not refer to the same thing. This is said of outward conformity—that of taking thought of purpose—two widely differing things. On that saying, see note there. On this, we may say—all those who, notwithstanding outward differences of communion and government, believe in and preach Jesus Christ, without bitterly and uncharitably opposing each other, are hereby declared to be helpers forward of each other's work. O that all Christians would remember this!  

—Even the smallest service done in My Name shall not be unrewarded—much more should not so great an one as casting out of devils be prohibited.
Fire, is the refiner's fire of Mal. iii. 3, to which indeed there seems to be a reference, —the fire of Matt. iii. 11 and Acts ii. 3—of Ezek. xxvii. 14; (see my Hulsean Lectures for 1841.—pp. 9—12.) Fire is the symbol of the Divine purity and presence:—our God is a consuming fire, not only to His foes, but to His people;—but in them, the fire shall only burn up what is impure and requires purifying out, 1 Cor. iii. 13. 1 Pet. i. 7. iv. 12. This very fire shall be to them as a preserving salt. The salt of the covenant of God (Lev. ii. 13) was to be mixed with every sacrifice: and it is with fire that all men are to be salted. This fire is the Divine purity and judgment in the covenant, whose promise is 'I will dwell among them.' And in and among this purifying fire shall the people of God ever walk and rejoice everlasting.
scandal must be burnt out of thee before thou canst enter into life.'—50.] The connexion of this, (elsewhere said in other references, Matt. v. 13. Luke xiv. 34) is nowplain. If this fire which is to purify and act as a preserving salt to you, have, from the nullity and validity of the grace of the covenant in you, no such power,—it can only consume—the salt has lost its savour—the covenant is void—you will be cast out as it is elsewhere added, and the fire will be no longer the fire of purification, but of wrath eternal.—I will just add that the interpretation of the sacrifice as the condenmed—and the fire and salt as eternal fire,—except in the case of the salt having lost its savour,—is contrary to the whole symbolism of Scripture, and to the exhortation with which this verse ends: 'Have this grace of God—this Spirit of adoption—this pledge of the covenant, in yourselves;' and, with reference to the strife out of which the discourse sprung,—'have peace with one another.'

Chap. X. 1. did rov om. C¹ D bev. for δ, τ., και B C L Copit.Æth. txt A.—

Χ. 1. Κακειθεν ἀναστάς ἤρχεται εἰς τὰ ὅρια τῆς Ιουδαίας * διὰ τοῦ * πέραν τοῦ Ιορδάνου. καὶ * συμπεριέβονται πάλιν ὁχλοί πρὸς αὐτόν, καὶ ὦς εἰσθαν πάλιν ἐπιδιασηχθείτε αὐτοῖς. 2 καὶ προσελθόντες [ὁ] Φαρισαῖος ἐπηρωθησαν αὐτὸν εἰ ἔξεστιν ἀνδρὶ γυναικα ἀπόλυσαι, 3 πειράζοντες αὐτόν. 0 ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Τί ὑμῖν ἐνετελίσατο Μωσῆς; 4 οἱ δὲ τοῦ Μωσῆς ἐπηρεασθήσατο ἄρρητως. 5 καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰσραὴλ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς • Πρὸς τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν ὑμῶν ἔγραψεν ὑμῖν τὴν ἐντολήν ταύτην 6 ἀπὸ ἀρχῆς οὐκ ἐξελεφαντήσεις τοῖς κτίσεσι, ἀφεν καὶ θηλὴ ἐποίησαν αὐτοὺς [ὁ θεὸς]. 7 οὐκ ἔνεκεν τοῦτοῦ ἐπιτελεῖεν ἀνθρώπου τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν μητέρα καὶ προκολλήθησαι πρὸς τὴν γυναίκα αὐτοῦ, 8 καὶ ἐσονται ὁ δύο ἔτη ταῦτα μακρὰ. 9 οὐκ εἰσὶν ὁ θεὸς συνιστοῦσεν ἐπὶ δύο ἄλλα μιᾶς. 10 ὅ ὁ συνιστεῖται περὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐπιρρέω


Chap. X. 1. did rov om. C¹ D bev. for δ, τ., και B C L Copit.Æth. txt A.—

scandal must be burnt out of thee before thou canst enter into life.'—50.] The connexion of this, (elsewhere said in other references, Matt. v. 13. Luke xiv. 34) is nowplain. If this fire which is to purify and act as a preserving salt to you, have, from the nullity and validity of the grace of the covenant in you, no such power,—it can only consume—the salt has lost its savour—the covenant is void—you will be cast out as it is elsewhere added, and the fire will be no longer the fire of purification, but of wrath eternal.—I will just add that the interpretation of the sacrifice as the condenmed—and the fire and salt as eternal fire,—except in the case of the salt having lost its savour,—is contrary to the whole symbolism of Scripture, and to the exhortation with which this verse ends: 'Have this grace of God—this Spirit of adoption—this pledge of the covenant, in yourselves;' and, with reference to the strife out of which the discourse sprung,—'have peace with one another.'

Chap. X. 1—12.] Matt. xix. 1—12.—

1] did rov τοῦ. The Lord retired, after His discourses to the Jews in John x. and before the raising of Lazarus, to Bethabara or Bethany (John i. 28) beyond Jordan, and thence made His last journey to Jerusalem; so that, with reference to this last journey, He might be said to go did rov τοῦ.—Matt. has πῆραν τ. ἱερ. without the didro, which is probably spurious in our text and inserted for explanation—see note there. —2—9.] see notes on Matt., with whose account ours is nearly identical. Compare however our vv. 3, 4, 5 with Matt. vv. 7, 8, 9, and we have testimony to the independence of the two
18. KATA MARKON.

τηας αὐτοῦ. 11 καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Κρής ἀπολύσῃ τὴν
gυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ γαμήσῃ ἀλλήν, μοιχαταὶ ἐπ' αὐτῶν.
12 καὶ εἶναι γυνὴ ἀπολύσῃ τὸν ἄνδρα αὐτῆς καὶ
μοιχαται.

13 Καὶ προσέφερεν αὐτῷ παιδία, ἵνα ἀφησῃ αὐτῶν.
οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ ἐπετίμων τοῖς προσφέρονσιν. 14 ἰδὼν
ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἡ γενάκτησε καὶ ἔτυγκα αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἀρτέμη
παιδία ἐρχεθα πρὸς μὲ, καὶ μὴ κωλύσει αὐτὰ τῶν
gάρ τοιούτων ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ. 15 ἀμὴν λέγω
μην, δέ εἰναι μὴ δεῖξῃ τὴν βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ὡς
παιδίου, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθῃ εἰς αὐτήν. 16 καὶ ἐναγκαλιασμὸς
αὐτὰ, τιτίσεις τὰς χεῖρας εἰς αὐτὰ ἐν αὐτά fittings αὐτά.
17 Καὶ ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ εἰς ὅδον, προσδέχονται ἐκ
και γονυπητής ἀυτον ἐπιροωτα αὐτον. "Διὰ τα κατ
ποιήσω ἑνα ἐτύγειον ἑνα κατηκομότιον: 18 ἐν το
τι μὲ λέγως αὐγάνω, ουδείς αὐτος εἰ μὴ εἰς τὸν θεόν.

reports—for such an arbitrary alteration of arrangement
is inconceivable. —10—12.] In Matt. this saying forms part of the
discourse with the Jews. Here again Mark
furnishes us with the exact circumstantial
account of the matter. On the addition,
Matt. vv. 10—12, see notes there.—We
may notice, that Mark omits Matthew’s
ekata πᾶσαν αἰριαν in ver. 2, and his ei
ἢ τινι πορνια in ver. 11. The one omission
seems to involve the other. The
report here gives the enquiry without this
particular exception. As a general rule,
Mark, so accurate in circumstantial details,
is less exact than Matthew in preserving
the order and connexion of the discourses.

13.] This verse corresponds to ἁπαλελυμαγνος γαμετας in Matt.
ver. 9—but it is expressed as if the woman
were the active party, and put away her
husband, which was allowed by Greek and
Roman law (see 1 Cor. vii. 13), but not by
Jewish (see Deut. xxiv. 1. Jos. Antt. xv.
7, 10). This alteration in the verbal
expression may have originated in the source
whereas Mark’s report was drawn. On
muχατας, Grotius remarks, ‘Mulier, cum
dominum sui non sit, ei, marito relicta, ad
alliud matrimonium se conferat, omnino
adolescentia committit, non interpretatione
alia, ut per consequiam, sed directe: ideo non debit hic addi, in αυτων.

15—17. The three are nearly identical:
from Matt. we have the additional reason
after ἐν ἀφ. αὐτ., και προσεξελθα, and
from Mark, ἐναγκαλ. αὐτα.—see on Matt.
18—23. There are some very trifling but
instructive variations, by which we may in
other cases form our judgment.—εἰ δὲ θαλ.
eic. εἰς τ. ζ. τῆρ. ἢ. ἐκ. λέγω αὐτῇ,
Ποιας; ἐν το Ιησου, ἐνεκ το. (Matt.) = τις
ἀντολαχιαδες (Mark and Luke) without
any break in the discourse. Similarly, in
Matt., the young (Matt.) ruler (Luke)
says, ver. 20, τι ἡν ὁπορω, but in Mark
and Luke, Jesus says to him, (and here
with the remarkable addition of ἀνασ. ἄνω.
ης. αὐτ.,) ἐν χων ὁπορεῖ (or λειτου).
Such notices as these show the point at
which, but not short of which, we may
expect the Evangelists to be in accord; viz.
in that inner truthfulness of faithful re-
port which reflects to us the teaching of
the Lord, but does not depend on slavish
literal exactitude; which latter if we re-
quire, we overthrow their testimony,


divine grace can and does accomplish even this—τὰ ἄρτα is remarkable, and a trace of exactitude; see John xxi. 6:—so also περιπλανάται. Here is an absence of a saying of Peter’s reported, without any distinction indicating that he had a share in the report.—See notes on Matt. for the promise here made to the Apostles. —29, 30.] Here our report is most important. To it and Luke we owe νῦν ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ, without which the promise might be understood of a future life only; and to it alone we owe the particularizing of the returns made, and the words μετὰ συνήχειας, which light up the whole passage, and show that it is the inheritance of the earth the higher sense by the mock which is spoken of:—see 1 Cor. iii. 21, 22. —Observe fathers and mothers—nature gives us only one of each—but love, many. We do not read, wives: because Christ does not promise aught which can point to sensual enjoyment, and because of that mystic relation to the soul united to Him, in which He Himself stands. —Here follows in Matt. the parable of the Labourers in the vineyard, ch. xx. 1—16. 33—34.] Matt. xx. 17—19. Luke xviii. 31—34. The interesting particulars of ver. 32 are only found here. —This was (see Matt. xvi. 21. xvii. 22,) the third declaration of His sufferings which the Lord had made to them, and it was His going before them, accompanied most probably by something remarkable in His gait and manner—a boldness and determination perhaps, an eagerness, denoted in Luke xii. 50,—which struck them with astonishment and fear. —33.] The circumstances of the passion are brought out in all three Evangelists with great particularity. The ‘delivery to the Gentiles’ is common to them
σήμεται. 35 καὶ προσπορεύονται αὐτῷ Ἰάκωβος καὶ ΑΒΓΔ
Ιώάννης οἱ υἱοὶ Ζεβεδαίου λέγοντες Διάδικαλε θέλομεν
ἐνα ὡς αὐτήσωμεν ἵνα τοίοτας ἦμιν. 36 ὡ δὲ εἰπεν
αυτοῖς Τί θέλετε * ποιησία με * υμῖν; 37 οἱ δὲ εἰπον αὐτῷ
Δός ἡμῖν ἕνα εἰς * ἐκ δεξιῶν σου καὶ εἰς ἐκ εὐνύμιων
[σου] καθὸσμέν ἐν τῇ δόξῃ σου. 38 ὡ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἰπεν
αυτοῖς Οὐκ ὁδηγείτε τι αἰτεῖσθε. δύνασθε πεῖν τῷ ἐπο-
τίῳ ὡς πῖν, καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα ὡς πῖν, ὡς πίεσθε, καὶ τὸ
βάπτισμα ὡς βπίζωμαι βαπτίζομαι. 39 οἱ δὲ εἰπον αὐτῷ Δυναμέθα. ὡ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἰπεν αὐτοῖς Τὸ μὲν ποτήριον ὡς πῖν πίεσθε, καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα ὡς βπίζωμαι βαπτίζομαι. 40 ὡ δὲ καθίσα ἐκ δεξιῶν μου * καὶ εἰς εὐνύμιων ὠν ἐστιν
ἐμὸν δοῦναι, ἀλλ' οἷς ἑτοίμαστα. 41 καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ
δέκα ἑξαντι ἐκ τανάκαις ἑπεὶ Ἰακώβων καὶ Ιωάννου.
42 ὡ δὲ Ἰησοῦς προσκαλεόμενος αὐτοὺς λέγει αὐτοῖς
Οἴδατε ὅτι οἱ δοκοῦντες ἂρχον τῶν ἐθνῶν ὡς κατα-
κυριεύονται αὐτῶν, καὶ οἱ μεγάλοι αὐτῶν ἑκατερο-
ζονται αὐτῶν. 43 οὐχ οὕτω δὲ * ἐσται ἐν ὑμῖν ἀλλ' ὡς
ἐνα ἑσθα γενέσθαι μέγας ἐν ὑμῖν, ἐσται διάκονος υμῶν
44 καὶ ὡς ἐν τῇ χαλκῷ * υμῶν * γενέσθαι πρῶτος, ἐσται πά-
νων δύσως. 45 καὶ γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὑπὸ ὑμῶν ἐλθεῖ
διακονηθῆναι, ἀλλὰ διακονηθῆναι, καὶ δοῦναι τῇ
ψυχῇ αὐτοῦ ἁπτὸν αὐτή πολλῶν.
46 Καὶ ἔρχοντας οἱ Ἰερεῖς καὶ ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ
ἀντὶ Ἰεριχὼ καὶ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ ὄχλου ὑπὸ καινοῦ,

---

**Note:** The text is in ancient Greek, and it appears to be a page from a document discussing a religious or historical event involving Jesus. The text includes references to Jesus' teachings, his miracles, and the reactions of his followers. The page contains annotations and references, indicating it is from a scholarly work or a commentary on the New Testament. The text is written in a style typical of Greek manuscripts, with some references to other parts of the Bible for context. The page is marked with numbers and references to specific verses, suggesting it is part of a larger commentary or study. The differences in context between the original Greek text and the English translation suggest that the document is a detailed commentary, possibly intended for scholars or religious scholars. The references to the Dead Sea Scrolls and other ancient manuscripts indicate a scholarly approach to interpreting the text. The page is well-organized, with clear references and annotations, making it a valuable resource for understanding the historical and religious context of the New Testament.
XI. 1, 2. KATA MAPKON.

*viōς Tμaίou Bαρτίμαιος [ὁ] τυφλὸς ἐκάθητο παρὰ τὴν ὀδὸν. *πρὸ ποροεῖται. 47 καὶ ἄκουσας ὑμῖν Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ὅναζω — p = John ix. 5. 50 ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐλέησον με. 48 καὶ ἡ πατέρων αὐτῶν παλιὸς ἦν ἔνα q Matt. xvi. 22. ὁ δὲ πολλοὶ μᾶλλον ἐκράζειν ὡς Ἰακώ ἐλέησον με. 49 καὶ στὰς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῶν ὁ φωνῆσαι. καὶ τοὐχόν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῶν ὁ φωνῆσαι. καὶ τοῦτο ἐκράζειν ὡς Ἰακώ ἐλέησον με. 50 "οὐκ ἀποσαλὼν τὸ ἱμάτιόν αὐτοῦ ἀναστάς ἤλθεν πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν. 51 καί ἀποκριθεὶς λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς Τί θέλεις ποιήσω σοί; ὁ δὲ τυφλὸς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς. 52 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν ἀναβλέψω. 53 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν ἀναβλέψω. 54 εἰ εἰς τὸν πάσας σου ἑσάσθε σε. καὶ εὐθείας ἀνεβάλεσθε. 55 ὁ δὲ τυφλὸς ἐκράζειν ὡς Ἰακώ ἐλέησον με. 56 εἰς τὴν ὄψιν. 57 καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς Τί θέλεις ποιήσω σοί; ὁ δὲ τυφλὸς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς. 58 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν ἀναβλέψω. 59 καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς Τί θέλεις ποιήσω σοί; ὁ δὲ τυφλὸς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς. 60 εἰς τὴν ὄψιν. 61 καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς Τί θέλεις ποιήσω σοί; ὁ δὲ τυφλὸς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς. 62 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν ἀναβλέψω. 63 καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς Τί θέλεις ποιήσω σοί; ὁ δὲ τυφλὸς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς. 64 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν ἀναβλέψω. 65 καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς Τί θέλεις ποιήσω σοί; ὁ δὲ τυφλὸς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς. 66 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν ἀναβλέψω. 67 καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς Τί θέλεις ποιήσω σοί; ὁ δὲ τυφλὸς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς. 68 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν ἀναβλέψω. 69 καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς Τί θέλεις ποιήσω σοί; ὁ δὲ τυφλὸς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς. 70 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν ἀναβλέψω. 71 καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς Τί θέλεις ποιήσω σοί; ὁ δὲ τυφλὸς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς. 72 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν ἀναβλέψω. 73 καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς Τί θέλεις ποιήσω σοί; ὁ δὲ τυφλὸς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς. 74 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν ἀναβλέψω. 75 καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς Τί θέλεις ποιήσω σοί; ὁ δὲ τυφλὸς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς. 76 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν ἀναβλέψω. 77 καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς Τί θέλεις ποιήσω σοί; ὁ δὲ τυφλὸς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς. 78 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν ἀναβλέψω. 79 καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς Τί θέλεις ποιήσω σοί; ὁ δὲ τυφλὸς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς. 80 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν ἀναβλέψω. 81 καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς Τί θέλεις ποιήσω σοί; ὁ δὲ τυφλὸς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς. 82 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν ἀναβλέψω. 83 καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς Τί θέλεις ποιήσω σοί; ὁ δὲ τυφλὸς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς. 84 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν ἀναβλέψω. 85 καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς Τί θέλεις ποιήσω σοί; ὁ δὲ τυφλὸς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς. 86 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν ἀναβλέψω.
άγαγετε *. 3 καὶ ἐάν τις ὑμῖν εἴπῃ Τί ποιεῖτε τοῦτο; ἀβδο
εἶπατε ὅτι ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ χρείαν ἰχεῖ, καὶ εἴθες αὐτοῦ
† ἀποστέλλει * ὅδε. 4 ἀπῆλθον δὲ καὶ έὗρον [τὸν] πῶ
λου δεδεμένου, πρὸς τὴν θυράν ἐκώ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀμφόδου,
καὶ λύσων αὐτῶν. 5 καὶ τινες τῶν ἐκεί ἐστηκότων ἐλέγον
αὐτοῖς Τί ποιεῖτε λύουτες τὸν πῶλον; 6 οἱ δὲ εἴπον αὐτοῖς
καθὼς ἐνετείλατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ 7 ἀφῆκαν αὐτούς.
καὶ ἠγαγὼν τὸν πῶλον πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν, καὶ
* εἵποντο αὐτῷ ὅταν ἦταν τοιοῦτοι, καὶ ἐκάθισαν ἐπ'
αὐτοῦ. 8 πολλοὶ δὲ τα ἰματα αὐτῶν ἐστρωσαν εἰς τὴν
ὁδον, ἀλλοι δὲ ἀποβλέποντες ἐκκοπόν ἐκ τῶν * δεινῶν
[καὶ εἰσερχόμενος εἰς τὴν ὁδον], 9 καὶ οἱ προάγοντες καὶ
οἱ ἀκολουθοῦντες ἐκραξοῦν [λέγουσιν] 10 ὡς· ἐλεον
γήν ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὑμνῷ κυρίου, ἐλεον γήν ὁ 
ἐρχόμενος βασιλεὺς ἐν ὑμνῷ κυρίου, τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν
Ναοῦ, ὡς ἦν ὁ νύσσος. 11 καὶ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς
Ἰεροσόλυμα ὁ Ἰησοῦς [καὶ] εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ 
περιβλέπει μενόνος πάντα, ὁμιλάτω ὅτι ὁ ὄσεις τῆς ὅρας ἐξήλθεν 
εἰς Βηθανιαν μετὰ τῶν δώδεκα.
12 Καὶ τῷ ἐπαύριον ἐξελθόντων αὐτῶν ἀπὸ Βηθανίας

φύλαρα B C L ε Copt. Sahid. Orig. Τστ Α D. — 3. τὶ λυετ ἐν τῶν πῶλον δό Οριγ.—
αντ. τούτου ins. καὶ Α; (τούτω ... εἰς;) — οἰν. Μ abc.—rec. ἀποστέλλει with α, but
.mkdir A B C D E F K L S V X al. be.—αντ. ἀποστ. ins. πάλιν Μ B D L, and bef. ἀποστ. Κ;
(...) τα Α. — 4. έ βελ. om. τῶν A B D E F G L M S V al. Orig. ins. Ι. Orig. C
Copt. Sahid. Eth.—7. καὶ ἤγοιν C al. καὶ φιλον Β L Orig. τα Α D εν.—διῖ
βάλλουσιν B C D L Οριγ. τα Α D εν. — τα Α D εν. αὐτῶν D.—καθιέρως D.—ἵν' αὐτῶν
B C D L τα A. — 8. ἐν τῷ ὀδή A K M al. ac Sahid.—στιβάδας B K L Ἀρμ. στιβάδας
D. στιβάδας E. τα Α C Orig.—for δινό, ἄραν B C L Orig. (twice) Sahid.
tα Α D abed.—εἰς om. D. ἐν τῷ ὀδή K M abd. καὶ ιπτή σ. τ. ὁμ. Μ B C L Sahid.
tα Α abed. — 9. λυγοντος om. Μ B C L ε Copt. Sahid. Orig. ins. Α D abed.—σαθεύδα
Tai D.—αντ. κατ. ins. Κ D.—10. ἐν αὐτοίῃν θεών Μ B C L abed Copt. Orig. (twice)
tα Α D abed.—καὶ οἱ έπερ. οἱ ξρόν. οἱ Μ B C L abed Copt. Orig.—τα Α D abed.—δὲ έ θέ
τα Α D.—τῆς ὁμοίας οἱ Μ. τῆς ομ. D.—αντ. δωδε. ins. μαθητῶν D abed.—12. for
ἐξελθόντων αὐτῶν, ἐν ελθόντα δα. — 13. συνὴ μιαν Κ Μ. — rec. om. ἀπὸ with many

Lord's birth, triumph, and burial were to be, in this, alike. A later tradition, sprung from the sacred destination of the beast (for beasts never yet worked were used for sacred purposes, Num. xix. 2. Deut. xxiii. 3. 1 Sam. vi. 7). Meyer.—But does it never strike such annotators, that this very usage would lead not only to the narrative being so constructed, but to the command itself having been so given? — 4. The report of one of those sent; qu. Peter?—see note on Matt. ver. 1. — ἀμφότεροι ὁ ὄσος. see reff. — 8. 9. On the interesting addition in Luke, vv. 37—40, see notes there. — στοιβ. = βασιλ. φοινίκων John, ver. 13. — 10. εὐ. ... Δαούδ—peculiar to Mark, clearly setting forth the idea of the people that the Messianic Kingdom, the restoration of the throne of David, was come. See Luke vv. 41—44, and notes. — II. See Matt. ver. 12, and notes on ver. 1: also on John ii. 13—18. — I am by no means certain that the solution proposed in the notes on Matt. is the right one, but I leave it for the present. When Mark, as here, relates an occurrence throughout, with such signs of an eye-witness as in ver. 4, it is very difficult to suppose that he has transposed anything; whereas Matt. certainly does not speak here so exactly, having transposed
"... and i did not see the vineyard in winter to be in leaf. But when the leaves fall, the vine is bare, and the trees are without fruit this time. But there were none—it was a barren tree. On the import of this miracle, see notes on Matt.

13—19.] Matt. xxi. 12, 13, where see notes: also Luke xix. 45—48. -... This was the court of the Gentiles, which was used as a thoroughfare; this desecration the Lord forbade. —οὐκ ἦν σπέρμα, omitted in Matt. and Luke, but contained in the prophecy: -... mentioned by Mark as writing for Gentile Christians—Meyer, but qu. -... ἐστὶ δὲ γὰρ... -... This remark, given by Mark and Luke, is omitted by Matt.: probably because he has given us so much of the ἰδίαχυ itself. -... See note on Matt. ver. 17. On the Monday and Tuesday evenings, the Lord appears to have gone to Bethany.

20—28.] Matt. xxi. 19—22. The an-
'Ραββί ἵδε ἡ συνή ἦν κατηράσω εὐθανατί. 22 καὶ ΑΒΓΔ ἀποκρίθης ὁ Ἰσαώς λέγει αὐτοῖς 'Εχετε πίστιν θεοῦ.

23 ἀμίν [γάρ] λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ὃς ἂν εἴπῃ τῷ ὅρει τούτῳ Ἀρθήσετε καὶ βλήσθητε εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, καὶ μὴ διακριθή ἐν τῷ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ, ἀλὰ πιστεύσῃ ὅτι ἂ λέγει γίνεται, ἔσται αὐτῷ ὃ ἐὰν εἴπῃ*. 24 διὰ τούτο λέγω ὑμῖν, πάντα ὧν ἄν πάντα ὥμῳ, ὃ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς αὐτὸς ὑμῖν ἡ παραπτῶματα ὑμῶν.

25 καὶ έσται σήκτης προσευχομένου, ἀφίστε οἱ εἰς 'Εχετε κατὰ τινος, ἢν καὶ ὁ πάντω ὑμῶν ἡν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς ὥμῳ, τὰ παραπτώματα ὑμῶν. 26 εἰ δὲ ὑμεῖς ὃκ λέγετε, οὐδὲ ὁ πάντω ὥμων ἡ ἡ παραπτῶματα ὑμῶν.

27 Καὶ ἔρχονται πάλιν εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα, καὶ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ περιπατοῦντος αὐτοῦ ἔρχονται πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁι ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ ὅτι ἢν τοι 'Εχετε ταύτα τοιούτα καὶ τίς ποιεῖ τὴν εὐσεβίαν ταύτην ἐδοκεῖ ἵνα ταύτα ποιῇς; 28 δὲ Ἰσαώς ἀποκρίθης ἐπεί αὐτοῖς Ἐπερετήσομος ὑμᾶς κἀγὼ ἡ ἡ λόγον καὶ ἀποκριθηκέν μοι, καὶ ἐρὼ ὑμῖν ἐν ποιεῖ εὐσεβίαν ταύτα ποιόν. Τὸ βάπτισμα ἢ τὸ Ἰωάννου εἰς οὐρανοῦ ἡ ἡ ἐκ ἀνθρώπων; ἀποκριθῆ τοίς. 30 καὶ εἴ έλογίζοντο πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς λέγοντες 'Εαν ἐρωμένοι Ἐξ ὑμῶν, ἔστησεν αὐτῷ ἡ ἡ λέγοντες 'Εαν ἐρωμένοι ἐπιστεύσατε αὐτῷ; 32 ἀλλ' ἡ ἡ εἶπομενοῖς Ἕξ ἀνθρώπων; ἔφοβοντο τὸν λαὸν ἀπαντήσαν γὰρ εἰς αὐτὸν Ἰωάννην ὅτι ὅτως προφητής

ΧΙ. 1-9. ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΡΚΟΝ.

δυτικ., ἀλήθειας D. δυτικ., ὅτι BCL.—33. for αὐτοῦ, αὐτῷ D.—ἐς τοιαίς ἱσομαν D. (in D.1)


ver. 6, πάς ὁ λεγ. ἴμ. (μ.) few and unimportant additions; see notes on Matt.—32. The law being omitted as spurious, a note of interrogation must be set after ἀνάφ.—a question which is answered by the Εὐαγγελιστ, 'quomiam hand facile quisquam sibi aperte timorem adscribere consuevit.' Rink. in Meyer.

ΧΑΡΓ. ΧΙΙ. 1-18.] This parable is, for the most part, identical with that in Matt. xxii. 33-46, and Luke xx. 9-19. The number, and treatment of the servants sent, is enlarged on here; and in ver. 4 there occurs the singular word κέφαλίσθαι, which appears to be used by a solocism, for κεφαλίζω, 'to wound in the head.' Some have rendered it, 'they made short work with him,' which is the more usual sense of the word, but not probable here; for they did not kill him, but sent him away. —I must not allow any opportunity to pass of directing the attention to the sort of difference, in similarity, between these three parables—and observing that no origin of that difference is imaginable, except the gradual deflection of accounts from a common, or a parallel, source.—see notes on Matt. throughout. —9.] Διανοεῖς, &c., is
10 οῦδε τὴν γραφήν ταύτην ἀνέγνωτε Λύθον δὲ ἀπεδο-ΑΒCD
κιμασάν οἱ οἰκοδομούντες, οὕτος ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν
γωνίας ἐν παρακινήτω αὐτὴν, καὶ ἐστι θαυμαστὴ ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν. 11 καὶ εἴσητον αὐτὸν
κρατᾶται, καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν τὸν ὀχλόν ἔγνωσαν γὰρ ὡς
ἔπρος αὐτῶν τὴν παραβολὴν εἰπε, καὶ ἄφησεν αὐτὸν
ἀπῆλθον, 12 καὶ ἀποστέλλουσα πρὸς αὐτὸν τινὰς τῶν
Φαρίσαων καὶ τῶν Ἰηροδιανών, ινα αὐτὸν ἐγρέωσαί
λόγῳ. 14 οἱ δὲ εἶλθοντες λέγουσιν αὐτῷ Διδάσκαλε ὁδη-
μεν ὅτι ἀλήθεια εἰ καὶ οὐ μέλει σοι περὶ ὀδηγοῖς, οὐ γὰρ
βλέπεις εἰς πρὸς ὄντων ἀνθρώπων, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ ἀληθείας
τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ θεοῦ διδάσκεις. 15 ἔξεστι κησον Καἰ-
σαρί \\under{-} δούμαι να οὗ; δέμεν μή μή δωμεν; ὁ δὲ εἰκὼς
ἀυτῶν τὴν ὑπόκρισιν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Τί με περιάστε;
φησετε μοι δηναρίων ἵνα ἴδων. 16 οἱ δὲ ἤγεταν, καὶ ἔλεγε
αὐτοῖς Τίνος ἐκ ἑαυτῆς αὐτὴ καὶ ἦτι ἐπεγραφή; Οἱ δὲ
εἶπον αὐτῷ Καίσαρος. 17 καὶ ἀποκρίθηεις ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν
αὐτοῖς ἂν ἄφορτες τὰ Καίσαρος Καίσαρι, καὶ τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ
τὸ θέω, καὶ ἐθαμασαν ἐπὶ αὐτῷ. 18 καὶ ἔρχονται
Σαμοκαίοι πρὸς αὐτὸν, ἀτιτε οὗ ἔκαστον, ἀνάστασι
μή εἴμαι, καὶ ἐπηρώτησαν αὐτὸν λέγοντες. 19 "Διδάσκαλε,
Μωσῆς ἐγραψεν ἦμιν ὅτι οὖν τὸν δαλόφον ἀποθανή-
καὶ καταλήγη γυναικα καὶ τέκνα μη 64 ἀφήνετε τον
dαλόφον την γυναικα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐξαναστήσῃ
σπέρμα τοῦ δαλόφον αὐτοῦ. 20 ἐπὶ οὗ ἀδελφοὶ ἦσαν
καὶ ὁ πρῶτος ἐλάβε γυναικα καὶ ἀποθνησκον ὅπως
ἀφήκε σπέρμα οὗ δὲ ὁ δεύτερος ἐλάβε άυτὴν καὶ
continuation of the Lord's discourse. — After
ver. 11 comes in Matt. v. 43—45. — 12.] Meyer makes ἐξαρκος the subject to ἰησούς,
but I think improperly. The fear of the people is increased by the consciousness
on the part of the rulers that He had spoken
the parable against them: they are as men
connected before the people.
20—23. The parable of the wedding-gar-
ment, Matt. xxiii. 1—14, is omitted. The
only matters requiring remark in these
verses are —14.] ἐξ ἀνθρ., 'truly,' 'indeed'
— see ver. 32 and ref. — 15.] δώματι ἢ μὴ ὅ τι οὐκ τοῦ Ἀρχ. — The originality of the report is shown by
these words. They wish to drive the Lord
to an absolute affirmation or negation. —
ἐγναφ. Mark and Luke = τὸ νόμου τοῦ
kήν. Matt.
27—40. The three reports are very much
alike in matter, and now and then coincide
verbally (Matt., ver. 27. Luke, ver. 32.
Mark, ver. 33 end. Luke, ver. 33). The
chief additions are found in Luke, ver. 34—
KATA MARKON.

ἀπέθανεν, καὶ οὖν ἀντίς ἠφίκε ἀναστάτως, καὶ οἱ τρίτος ωσείς ἡγέται, καὶ ἐπὶ ἑαυτὸν οὐκ ἠφίκαν στέρμα. ἔσχατες πάντων ἀπέθανεν καὶ ἡ γυνη. τῷ ἐν τῷ οὖν ἀναστάτες ὄσαν ἀναστώσαν, τίνος αὐτῶν ἔσται γυνῆ; οἱ γὰρ ἐπὶ ἑσύνοιν αὐτῆς γυναῖκα. καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Οὐ διὰ τοῦτο πλαγιάθεος μὴ ἐίδοτε τὰς γραφάς μὴ δεῖ τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ θεοῦ; οὗ τὰς ἐν κενρῶν ἀναστάσεις, οὐτε γαμοῦσιν οὖν γαμίσκονται, ἀλλ' εἰσίν ως ἄγγελοι οἱ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. περὶ δὲ τῶν κενρῶν οἵτι εὐγενεῖται, οὐκ ἀνέγνωσεν ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ ἡμῶν ἔπι τῆς βατόνς, ως οἱ I L. only. εἰτε ὁ θεὸς λέγων Ἐγώ οὗ τὸς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ ἤθελεν ἐνομίσα τοῦ θεοῦ, ἡ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ ὁ τοῦ Καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἐστιν οὗ κενρῶν, ἀλλ' ἡ ἡ γυνη τῷ συνήτοντων, ἡ γυνη τῷ συνήτοντων, εἰδὼς ὅτι καὶ τοῦ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

23 Καὶ προσελθὼν ἐκ τῶν γραμμάτων αὐτῶν τῶν γραμμάτων αὐτῶν, εἰπὼν ἡ γυνη τῷ συνήτοντων, ἡ γυνη τῷ οὐρανῷ εἰπών ἡ γυνη τῷ συνήτοντων, "ποια ἐστιν πρῶτη πάντων τούτοις ἐν τούτοις;" Ποια ἐστιν πρῶτη πάντων τούτοις ἐν τούτοις;" Ποια ἐστιν πρῶτη πάντων τούτοις ἐν τούτοις;" Ποια ἐστιν πρῶτη πάντων τούτοις ἐν τούτοις;" Ποια ἐστιν πρῶτη πάντων τούτοις ἐν τούτοις;" Ποια ἐστιν πρῶτη πάντων τούτοις ἐν τούτοις;"

36, where see notes, and on Matt. throughout.—28. ἐν τῷ βατόν (so also Luke);—either, 'in the chapter containing the history of God appearing in the bush,' or, 'when he was at the bush.' The former is the more probable, on account of the construction of the verse in our text. —In Luke, if we had his account alone, the other rendering might be admissible, 'Moses testified, at the bush;' but this will not answer in our text.

28—34.] Matt. xxii. 34—40, but with differing circumstances. There the question appears as that of one among the Pharisees' adherents, who puts this question, περί αὐτῶν, —and in consequence of the Pharisees coming up to the strife, after He had discomfited the Sadducees. I should be disposed to take Mark's as the accurate account, seeing that there is nothing in the question which indicates enmity, and our Lord's answer, ver. 34, plainly precludes it. The man, from hearing them disputing, came up, and formed one of the band who gathered together for the purpose of tempting Him; and Matthew's account seems to assign his question to this motive, clashing it with the other captious inquiries: Mark's report however, which here is wholly unconnected in origin with Matthew's, is that of some one who had taken accurate note of the circumstances and character of the man.

28.] The motive seems to have been, admiration of the Lord's wise answer, and a desire to be instructed further by Him. —πράγμα χαράς ιντρ.)—this was one of the μαχαῖ νυμίαὶ (Tit. iii. 9).—which was the greatest commandment. The Scribes had many frivous enumerations and classifications of the commands of the law: —παντων, not πασῶν. —πράγμα—παντων in both places is
280
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29 ὅ ἐστι Ἰησοῦς ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ ὅτι πρῶτη πάντων τῶν ΑΒCD ἐντολῶν Ἀκούει Ἰσραήλ, κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν κύριος εἰς ἑτέρας. 30 καὶ ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεὸν σου ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ΑΒD καρδίας σου, καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς σου, καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς διανοίας σου, καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ἱσχύος σου. [αὐτῇ πρῶτῃ ἐντολῇ] 31 καὶ δεύτερα ὁμοία αὐτῇ Ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πατέρα σου ὡς σεαυτόν, μεῖξον τούτων ἀλλή ἐντολῆ ὑπὲρ τέσσερας εἰς ἑτέρας. 32 καὶ ἐπετέλεσεν αὐτῷ ὁ γραμματέας Καλώς διδάσκει· ἐτέρας εἰς ἑτέρας ὑπέρ τέσσερας εἰς ἕτερας. 33 καὶ τὸ ἀγαπάν αὐτὸν ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας, καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς συνέσεώς, καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς, καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ἱσχύος, καὶ τὸ ἀγαπάν τὸν πατέρα ὡς αὐτόν, τὰ πλείον ἑτέρας ἀποκριθήκη, εἰπέν τῷ ὑπερτέρας ὡς καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ. καὶ οὐδεὶς οὐκέτι έτόλμα αὐτὸν


treated almost as one word, so that πάντων does not belong to τῶν ἐντ., but q.d. 'first of all of the commandments.' — 29.] Mark cites the passage entire,—Matt. only the command itself:—compare the LXX.—In this citation the Vat. reading διανοίας and the Alex. καρδίας are combined; and ἱσχύος = δυνάμεως. "Thou shalt love the Lord with spirit, soul, and body": with the inner spirit, and the outer life. This is faith working by love: for κ. ὁ ἰδεῖν is the language of faith. — 31.] The Lord adds this second, as an application or bringing home of the first,—The first is the Sos, so to speak, of the spiritual life:—this the lesser light, which reflects the shining of that other. It is like to it, inasmuch as both are laxes of love: both deduced from the great and highest love: both dependent on 'I am the Lord thy God,' Lev. xix. 18. — Stier (ii. 474) sets forth beautifully the strong contrast between the requirements of these two commands, and the then state of the Jewish Church: see John viil. 19.— 32, 33.] The Scribe shows that he had entered into the true spirit of the Lord's answer; and replies in admiration at its wisdom. — Observe συνέπες = διδασκάλιον. — ἐκκλησ. κ. θ., the things to which the outward literal observers paid all their attention. — 34.] νομικός—Attice, νομικόν τως, opposed to ἀφόρονος, Isocr. ν.7 (Meyer). — ὁ μακράν ... This man had hold of that principle in which Law and Gospel are one; he stood as it were at the door of the Kingdom of God. He only wanted (but what a want!) repentance and faith, to be within it. The Lord shows us here that even outside His flock, those who can answer νομικός—who have knowledge of the spirit of the great command of Law and Gospel, are nearer to being of His flock, than the formalist:—but then, as Bengel adds, 'Si non procul est, intra: alias praestiterit, procul fuisse.' — καὶ οὐδεὶς ... This is apparently out of its place here, as it is after the question which now follows, that Matt. relates this discomfiture of His adversaries. We must not however conclude too hastily, especially where the minute accuracy of Mark is at stake. The question just asked was the last put to the
Lord, and therefore the notice of its being the last, comes in fitly here. The inquiry which followed did more than silence their questioning: it silenced their answering too: both which things Matt. combines as the result of this day, in his ver. 46.

35—37.] Matt. xxii. 41—46. Luke xi. 41—44. The reports are apparently independent of any common original, and only agree verbally in the citation from the LXX. —See notes on Matt. —37.] κ. ὁ πολ. ἢ. οὐ. ἢ. is peculiar to Mark. —Observe ἐν τῷ νῦν τῷ ἄγιει (Mark and Matt.) = ἐν βίβλῳ ψαλμῶν Luke: a coincidence not to be passed over.

38—40.] Luke xxv. 45—47. These verses, nearly verbatim the same in the two Evangelists, and derived from a common report, seem an abridgment of the discourse which occupies the greater part of Matt. xxiii.—with the additions of θελ. ἐν στολ. παρέτ. , and οὕτω λέγ. παρέσ. κρίμα. The words ἐν τῷ 58. αὐτ. seem to imply that Mark understood it as a compendium. —κατεργασίας, a change of construction not without example in the classics: Herod. i. 51. Λαδιαδαμοινον ψαλμίνον τινων ἄνεθοι, σὺν ἄρθρω λέγοντες.

41—44.] Luke xxi. 1—4: probably a common origin. —41.] τοῦ γαλ. This is usually understood of thirteen chests, which stood in the court of the women, into which were thrown contributions for the temple, or the tribute (of Matt. xvii. 24). But it is hardly likely that they would be called τοῦ γαλ., and we hear of a building by this name in Joseph. Antt. xix. 6. 1. Λύκε. on John viii. 20, believes some part of the court of the women to be intended, perhaps a chamber in connexion with the synagogue. —The Lord had at this time taken Ἱεροσόλυμα, and was going out of it—between Matt. xxiii. end. and xxiv. —42.] λευκᾶ = μωσα, the smallest Jewish
XII. 43. 44.

καὶ προκαλεσάμενος τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ ἈΒΔ λέγει αὐτοῖς Ἀμὴν λέγω ὡμίν ὅτι ἡ χήρα αὐτὴ ἡ πτωχὴ πλείον πάντων * βεβληκέ τῶν ἀλλούν ἐκ τοῦ γαζο- φυλάκιον. τάντες γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ 1 περισσεύοντος αὐτοῦ ἀλλον, αὐτὴ δὲ ἐκ τῆς 1 νετορήσεως αὐτῆς πάντα ὁσα ἕχειν ἐβάλεν, ὅλον τὸν 1 βιον αὐτῆς. 11. 1 Καὶ ἐκτερευομένου αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ, λέγει αὐτῷ 1 εἰς τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ Διδάσκαλε ἵδε 1 ποταποὶ λίθοι καὶ ποταπαὶ 1 οἰκοδομαί. 2 καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς αποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτῷ Ἰδίες ταῦτα τὰς μεγάλας οἰκοδομάς; οὐ μὴ ἀφέθη 1 λίθος ἐπὶ 1 λίθῳ δὲς οὐ μὴ 1 καταλυθή. 3 καὶ καθήμενον αὐτοῦ 1 εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν Ἐλαίων 7 κατέ- ναντί τοῦ ἱεροῦ, ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν 4 καὶ ἱδίαν Πέτρον καὶ Λάκωνος καὶ Ἰωάννης καὶ Ἰωάννης 4 Ἐπεὶ ἦμιν πότε ῥατά ἔσται, καὶ τι τὸ 4 σημεῖον ὅταν μελλή πάντα ταῦτα 5 συντελεῖα; 5 ο ὁ Ἰησοῦς αποκριθεὶς αὐτοῖς πρόσαρτο λέγειν 6 Βλέπετε μὴ τις ἡμᾶς πλανήθην 6 πολλοὶ γὰρ ἔλευσονται ἐπὶ τῷ νόμον ἡμᾶς, λέγοντες ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι, καὶ πολλοὺς πλανήσουσιν. 7 ὅταν δὲ 8 αὐτούς πολέμους καὶ ἀκοὰς πολέμων, μὴ 9 θροεῖσθε, δὲ γὰρ γενέσθαι, ἀλλὰ ὡσπερ τὸ τέλος. 8 ἐγερθῆσαι γὰρ οὕτως εἰπὲν ἐξαιτοῦ ἐπὶ βασιλεία ἐπὶ βασιλείαν, καὶ ἐσοναι συμοι ἐκατὰ τόπους καὶ ἐσοναι λιμοὶ καὶ ῥαραχαί. 9 ἀρχαὶ ὅτι ἐξ ὁδών ταῦτα. 10 ἀρχαὶ ὅτι ἐξ ὁδών ταῦτα. 11 Βλέπετε ἐς ἡμᾶς ἐανοῦς: καὶ παραδο-
souci gar ὑμᾶς εἰς 1 συνέδρια, καὶ εἰς συναγωγὰς 2 δαρπν.-σοθὲ, καὶ ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνων καὶ βασιλέων 3 σταθμοθετεῖ.

1 Eunecen ἐμοῦ, εἰς 4 μαρτυρίων αὐτῶς, 10 καὶ εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη δεῖ πρῶτον κηρυχθῆναι τὸ εὐαγγελίον. 11 οταν δὲ ᾦ ἐγωσι ὑμᾶς παραδιδόντες, μὴ προμερμάτη τὰ λαλή-
στη [μα, μηδὲ μελετάτε, ἀλλὰ ο ἐαν δοθῇ ὑμῖν ἐν εἰκείνη τῇ ὠρᾷ, τοῦτο λαλεῖτε ο γὰρ ἐστε ὑμεῖς οἱ λαλοῦντες, ἀλλὰ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον, 12 παραδώσει δὲ ἀδελφὸς ἀδελφοῖς εἰς τίτανος, καὶ πατρί τέκνον, καὶ ἐπαναστα-
σονται τέκνα ἐν γονεῖς καὶ θανατώσουν αὐτοὺς. 13 καὶ ἐσθεθε μισοῦμεν ὑπὸ πάντων διὰ τὸ ὁμοία μοῦ. ὁ δὲ ὑπημίναις εἰς τέλος, οὕτως σωζόσθε. 14 Ὅταν δὲ ἴδῃς τὸ 5 βδέλυγμα τῆς 6 ἐφημέως [τὸ ἐπὶ ὑπὸ Δανιή] τοῦ προφήτου 7 εἰς τοὺς ὑπὸ δεῖ ὁ ἀναγίνωσκον

νοεῖς. τοτε οἱ ἐν τῇ Ιουδαίᾳ φιεναἰσπασιν εἰς τὰ ὄρη. 15 ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ ὀμίλου μὴ καταβάτω [εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν] μηδὲ εἰσελθήτω ἀραὶ τι ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ. 16 καὶ ὁ 8 ἐν τοῦ ἄγιον ἐπιστρέφῃ εἰς τὰ ὄρη ἀραὶ τὸ ἑαυτὸν αὐτοῦ. 17 οὐαὶ δὲ ταῖς ἐν γαστήρι ἐκχύσεις καὶ ταῖς 9 ἐκλαμβάνεις ἐν κείμενας τῆς ἁμέρας. 18 προει-
χεθε δὲ ἵνα μὴ 10 γένηται ἡ φυγὴ ὑμῶν χειμῶνος.*

ABCD 19 ἐσοφται γὰρ αἱ ἡμέραι ἱκανίαν ἐκεῖνην 11 βλέπεις, ῥ Ṱ οὐ ὑπὸ γήγον 1 ῥ τοιοῦτο ἡ ἐκχύσεως. 12 καὶ εἶ ἡ κύριος 13 ἐκλογ-

βωσὶς τὰς ἡμέρας, οὐκ ἀν ἐνδώθη 14 πάσα σάρξ, ἀλλὰ διὰ τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς οὓς ἐξελέξατο ἐκλογήσει τὰς ἡμέρας. 15

Wisd. iii. 9. 1 Pet. ii. 9. Col. iii. 12. 2 Tim. ii. 10. Tit. ii. 11.


the temple as part of a great series of events, which had now by frequent prophecy become familiar to them. 'All these things about which Thou so often speakest.'

—9.] de συνάω, a frequent construction—'ye shall be taken into the synagogues and beaten there.' So also in ver. 16. —11.] Mark has vv. 10, 11 peculiar to himself. Luke (vv. 14, 15) has something very like them—Matthew, nothing: but they occur Matt. x. 19, where see note. —12.] καὶ ἀλλήλους παραδώσωσι καὶ μισήσωσιν ἀλλήλους Matt. —14.] ὡσποῦ ὁ-lēi—see note on Matt. ver. 15. —18.] Matt. adds μηδὲ εἰ σαβαδίτης. Mark wrote mostly for Gentile readers, and thus perhaps was
ικαί τότε ἕαν τὶς ὑμῖν εἰπ' Ἰδοὺ ὤδε ὁ Χριστός ἡ ἴδιον ΑΒCD ἐκεῖ, μὴ πιστεύσητε. 21 ἂπειρον γὰρ ὁ Ψευδόχριστος ἐκεῖ, καὶ ὁ Ψευδοπρόφητος καὶ δύσωσι σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα πρὸς τοὺς αὐτούς καὶ τοὺς ἐκλεκτούς. 23 ὑμῖς ἐξευθείασθαι, καὶ ἕξεν αὐτὸ τὸ φέγγος αὐτοῦ, καὶ οἱ αὐτές ἐξουσίαι εἰς τούτον ὑμᾶς δεῖξις εἰς τὴν ἀνθρώπων ἀρχὴν καὶ σεβασμὸν. 25 καὶ τίς ὑμῶν τὸν ἀνθρώπον ὑμᾶς τούτοις ἀνακοινώσει τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, ἐξευθείασθαι, καὶ τίς ὑμῶν τὸν ἀνθρώπον ἀνακοινώσει τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, ἐξευθείασθαι, καὶ τίς ὑμῶν τὸν ἀνθρώπον ἀνακοινώσει τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, ἐξευθείασθαι, καὶ τίς ὑμῶν τὸν ἀνθρώπον ἀνακοινώσει τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, ἐξευθείασθαι. 27 καὶ τότε ἐξευθείασθαι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τοῖς ἀγγέλοις, ἐξευθείασθαι, καὶ τίς ὑμῶν τὸν ἀνθρώπον ἀνακοινώσει τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, ἐξευθείασθαι, καὶ τίς ὑμῶν τὸν ἀνθρώπον ἀνακοινώσει τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, ἐξευθείασθαι, καὶ τίς ὑμῶν τὸν ἀνθρώπον ἀνακοινώσει τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, ἐξευθείασθαι, καὶ τίς ὑμῶν τὸν ἀνθρώπον ἀνακοινώσει τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, ἐξευθείασθαι. 29 καὶ τίς ὑμῶν τὸν ἀνθρώπον, ὑμῖν γίγαται. 30 καὶ τίς ὑμῶν τὸν ἀνθρώπον, ὑμῖν γίγαται. 31 καὶ τίς ὑμῶν τὸν ἀνθρώπον, ὑμῖν γίγαται. 32 καὶ τίς ὑμῶν τὸν ἀνθρώπον, ὑμῖν γίγαται. 33 καὶ τίς ὑμῶν τὸν ἀνθρώπον, ὑμῖν γίγαται. 34 καὶ τίς ὑμῶν τὸν ἀνθρώπον, ὑμῖν γίγαται. 35 καὶ τίς ὑμῶν τὸν ἀνθρώπον, ὑμῖν γίγαται. 36 καὶ τίς ὑμῶν τὸν ἀνθρώπον, ὑμῖν γίγαται. 37 καὶ τίς ὑμῶν τὸν ἀνθρώπον, ὑμῖν γίγαται.
33. Βλέπετε, ἀγρυπνεῖτε [καὶ προσεύχεσθε]. Οὐκ οἶδατε γὰρ πότε ὁ καιρὸς ἐστίν. 34. ὡς ἀνδρωτὸς ἀπόδημος, ἀφεῖς τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ [καὶ] δούς τοις δύολοις αὐτοῦ. 35. θυρωφῶν ἐνετειλάτο ἵνα γρηγορεῖ. 36. γρηγορεῖτε οὖν ὁ οἶδατε γάρ πότε ὁ κύριος τῆς οἰκίας ἡ ἔρχεται. 37. μὴ μεσονυκτίον ἡ ἀλεκτροφωνίας ἡ πρώτη, ἐλθὼν ἡ ἐξαιρέσης ἐυρίσκεται ὡς καθευδοντας. 38. λίγω, πασί λίγω, γρηγορεῖτε.

XIV. 1. Ἡν δὲ τὸ πάσχα καὶ τὰ άκμα μετὰ δύο ἡμέρας, καὶ ἡ ἡμερία τῶν ἀρχιμερίας καὶ τῶν γραμματεῖς πῶς αὐτοὺς ἐν δόλῳ, κρατήσαντες ἀποκτείνουσιν. 2. ἐλέγον δὲ μὴ ἐν τῷ ἱοτρίῳ, καὶ μὴ ἔριδας ἐστὶ τοῦ λαοῦ. 3. Καὶ ὄντος αὐτοῦ ἐν Βηθανίᾳ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ Σιμώνων τοῦ λεπτοῦ, κατακεκαίμενος αὐτοῦ ἡ γυνὴ ἑτορία ἐχώσα ἐκλάω. 4. βαστὸς μύρου ἀνάρθον, πιστικὸς πολυτελοῦς, καὶ μετ' αὐτοῦ συντρίψασα τὸ ἀλάμβας στεφάνι κατέχεις. 5. — τὸ Acta xii. 8. Matt. xix. 3. Ch. xii. 18.


33—37.] Focaliar to Mark, and contains the condensed matter of Matt. vv. 43—47, and perhaps an allusion to the parable of the talents in Matt. xxv. —The porter is the door-keeper, whose office it would be to look out for approaching travellers, answering especially to the ministers of the word, who are (Ezech. xxxiii.) watchmen to God's Church. —The construction of vv. 33, 34 is remarkable: the participial clauses being in subordination to ἀφεῖς, and constituting part of the householder's arrangements of departure, and the direct tense being assumed at ἐνετειλατο, as signifying what took place at his very going out of the door, where the porter would be stationed: as if it had been ἀφεῖς τῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐνετειλατο...
of similarity with that of John,—and is used by Professor Bleek (Beitrage zur Evangelien-Kritik, p. 83) as one of the indications that Mark had knowledge of, and used the Gospel of John. My own view, as explained in the general Prolegomena, leads me to a different conclusion. —I have already remarked (note on Matt. xxi. 3), that while Matt. seems to have preserved the trace of the patriarchal nature of this narrative, by his τοῦ δὲ ἠμῶν (ver. 6), and τότε φωρεθεῖσα (ver. 14),—such trace altogether falls in our narrative. It proceeds as if continuans.—[várdos πιστεύει] It seems impossible to assign any certain, or even probable meaning, to πιστεύει (a word found here and in John's narrative only). The ancient commentators gave us nothing but conjecture. Euthymius and Theophylact interpret it 'generius,' καταπεπτυμάνης εἰς καθαρότητα, Euth.; δόλον καὶ μια πίστεως κατακεκατέφθειαν, Theophyl.; 'veram et absque dolo,' Jerome. Augustine supposes it to refer to some place from which the nard came. Origen's comment on the passage is lost. The expression nowhere occurs in the classics, nor in Clement of Alex., who gives a long account (Pedagog. ii. 8) of ointments. The word can therefore hardly signify any particular kind of ointment technically so called. —The modern interpretations of the word are principally of two kinds: (1) agreeing with Euth. and Theophyl., 'generius,' 'unadulterated;' which sense however of the word does nowhere else occur. It is used transitively for πιστεύω, 'persuasive,' by Aristotle (Rhet. 1. 2), and in some later writers for πιστεύει, as δο πιστεύεισκος τῶν θεραπόντων, Cedrenus, Annali, cited by Lücke on John xii. 3. Euseb. also uses the word (Demonstr. Evang. ix. cited as above), but in the sense of pertaining to the faith, as his Latin translator renders it, or, as Lücke thinks, perhaps 'potable,' as a derivative of πιστέω (from πίστις). —This brings us to the second, a modern interpretation, which makes πιστεύει 'liquid,' —'potable,' and derives it as above. There certainly was a kind of ointment which they drank; for Athenæus (xv. 39, p. 689) quotes from Hesiodus, τῶν μῶν δὲ μὲν ἄει χρήματα, δὲ ἀλλιμάτα. καὶ δοκίμαν μὲν πρὸς τότον ἔστινθέναι, Ἰτι δὲ μηρίσιν, μῆλινον τότε ἴσῳ καὶ ἐσθομαχεῖς καὶ λιθαρχεῖς χρῆσον ......... καὶ ἡ στασις δ' ἐστὶνθέναι πρὸς τότον, ἢτι δὲ νάρδον. The only objection to this interpretation is, that the word is nowhere somewhere in his Contemplations: 'nardo pistik.' —[συντρ. τα Διδ.] can hardly mean only having broken the resin with which the cork was sealed. In both the N.T. places referred to, the word is used of breaking, properly so called: and I see no objection to supposing that the αλαβαστον was crushed in the hand, and the ointment thus poured over His head. The feet would then (John xiii. 3) be anointed with what remained on the hands of Mary, or in the broken vase (see note on Luke vii. 38). —4, 5. τινες] see notes on Matt. The πραξικός. τινες is common to our narrative and that of John. ἡφασμα does not govern τρ. τινες: the genitive is of price.
καὶ ἀπέπεσεν ἐπὶ τὸν κόσμον, καὶ ὁ Ἰδού αὐτῶν, καὶ ὡς ἦν τὸ θέλημα δύνασθαι σύν τινι ἀνθρώπους εἰς γενέσεις. ἢ ἐσεξὼν ἀντὶ ἐποίησεν. πρόνεφες, προὸν καὶ μορφυρίας, ἵνα εἰς τὸν ἐνταφιασμόν. ἀκούσας ἔκρηξεν καὶ ἔφυγεν τοῦ εὐαγγέλιον τούτου εἰς ὅλον τὸν κόσμον, καὶ ἤποιησεν αὐτῷ λαληθεῖν εἰς καὶ μνημόσυνον αὐτῆς.  

10 Καὶ Ἰουδας [ὁ] Ἰσκαρίωτης, εἰς τῶν δώδεκα, ἀπεῖχε πρὸς τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς, ἵνα παραδοθῇ αὐτῷ αὐτοῖς. οἱ δὲ ἀκούσαντες ἐγκρίσαντες καὶ ἔπηγγειλαντο ἀριστοὺς ἐν αὐτῷ εὐκαίρων αὐτοῦ.  

12 Καὶ τῷ πρώτῳ ἡμέρα τῶν ἁζόμων, ἔτε τὸ πάντα ἐθνον, λέγουσιν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ Ποιεῖ τις ἐπελθόντες ἐκτιμάσσετε ἵνα φάγῃς τὸ πάσχα:  

18 Καὶ ἀποστέλλει δύο τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ, καὶ λέγει: 'Τάξαντες εἰς τὴν πύλην, καὶ ανοιτήσας ὑμῖν αὐτὸν.'  

17 ποὺ κεραιόν ὑδατος βαστάζων ἀκολουθήσατε αὐτῷ καὶ ὧν ἔστει πᾶσιν ὁμοθάλη εἰσῆτε τῷ ἕκκοδοστότη ὃτι ὁ Ἰησοῦς Ποιεῖ τὸ κατάλυμα, ὃν τὸν "


6.] ἀστ. also common to John, but as addressed to Judas. — 7.] The agreement verbatim here of Matt. and John, whereas our narrative inserts the additional clause καὶ ὅταν θέλημα δύνασθαι αὐτοῖς εἰς νοικήσαι, is decisive against the idea that Mark compiled his account from the other two. In these words there appears to be a reproach conveyed to Judas, and perhaps an allusion to the office of giving to the poor being his. — 8.] We have here again a striking addition peculiar to Mark — δέ ἐσχήν αὐτῆς, ἠσώσας — rightly rendered 'she hath done what she could,' a similar praise to that given to the poor widow, ch. xii. 44 — πάντα δέει σιχῆν ἐβαλεν. We have also the expression προσβάλει μνημοσύνεις, showing, as I have observed on Matt., that the act was one of prospective love, grounded on the deepest apprehension of the reality of the Lord's announcement of His approaching death. — 9.] See notes on Matt. ver. 13.  

10, 11.] Matt. xxvi. 14—16. Luke xxi. 3—6. The only word requiring notice as distinct, is ἐγκρίσας, implying, as does συνήθηντο in Luke, that the money was not paid now, either as full wages, or as earnest-money, — but promised, and paid (most probably) when the Lord was brought before the Sanhedrim, which was what Judas undertook to do.  

12—16.] Matt. xxvi. 17—19. Luke xxii. 7—13. Our account contains little that is peculiar. — ὡς τὸ π. Ἰουδ., like Luke's expression ἤ ἤρων ἠσώσας — ὡς τρίτην παροικίαν ἵνα εἰς τ. ὥν ὁ πρεσβυτέρος ἤρων τ. Χριστοῦ. — ἤρων, when they (i.e. the Jews) sacrificed the Passover, — that for the Lord ate His Passover on that day, and so in the usual sense, is the testimony of the three Evangelists: see notes on Matt. and Luke. — We may notice that if this Gospel, as traditionally reported, was drawn up under the superintendence of Peter, we could hardly have failed to have the names of the two disciples given; — nor again would our narrator have missed (and the omission is an important one) the fact that the Lord first gave the command, to go and prepare the Passover — which Luke only relates. —
πάσχα μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν μου φάγε; 15 καὶ αὐτὸς ὕμνιν ἈΒCD
δείχει * ἀνώγεων μέγα ἕστρωμένων ἐτοιμαζέατη ἤμιν. 16 καὶ ἔσηλθον οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἦλθον εἰς τὴν πόλιν, καὶ ἔφυτον καθὼς ἔπεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἤσπασαν τὸν πάσχα. 17 καὶ ὁ Ἰσραήλ γενομένης ἔρευξεν μετὰ τῶν ἱῶδεκα 18 καὶ ἀνακειμένων αὐτῶν καὶ ἐσθίοντες ἔδει πεῖν Ισραήλ ἁγία λέγει ὕμνιν ὑμῖν ἢτι εἰς ἔτι ὑμῶν παραδώσει με, ὅ εσθίων μετ' ἐμοῦ. 19 οἱ δὲ ἤρπαν λυπᾶνται, καὶ λέγειν αὐτῷ * εἰς καθ' εἰς 20. Μὴ τί εἴγω; [καὶ ἀλλος, Μὴ τί εἴγω.] 20 δὲ ἀποκρίθησαν εἰς αὐτοῦς Ἐκεῖ ἔτι τῶν ἱῶδεκα ὁ ἐμπαπτόμενος μετ' ἐμοῦ εἰς τὸ τρυβλίον. 21 ὁ μὲν οὖν τοῦ ἀνδρῳτοῦν ὑπάγει καθὼς γέγραπται περὶ αὐτοῦ ουκ ἔδει τῷ ἀνδρῳτῳ ἐκείνῳ διὸ οὐ ὁ οὐκ ἔδει τοῦ ἀνδρῳτοῦν παραδίδοιται; καὶ ὁ ἅγιος ἂν αὐτῷ εὐκλαμενή ἡ ἀνδρῳτος ἐκεῖνος. 22 Καὶ ἕσθιοντων αὐτῶν λαβὼν ὁ Ἰσραήλ ἁγία ἐνυγήσας ἐκλάου καὶ ἐδίκησεν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἔστε Λάββητε ἵ τοῦτο ἐστι τὸ σῶμα μου. 23 καὶ λαβὼν [το] ποτήριον ἐκχαριστήσας ἐδικήσεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἔστων εἰς αὐτοῦ πάντες. 24 καὶ ἔστε αὐτοῖς Τοῦτο ἐστι τοῦ αἰμά μου, [τό] τῆς [καρνίς] διαθήκης, τό περὶ πολλῶν * εἰκχυνόμενον. 25 ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι [ουκέτι] οὐ ὑμῖν πιή ἐκ τούτου γεννήματος τῆς ἀμπελοῦ ἐκ τῆς ἁμαρτίας. 18. In the midst of a verbal accordance with Luke we have here inserted ἠνώγεων, indicating that the great chamber was already prepared for the celebration of the Passover, as would indeed be probable at this time in Jerusalem. The disciples had therefore only to get ready the Passover itself.
17. Matt. xxvi. 20. Luke xxi. 14. 18. —The account of Luke supplies the important speech of our Lord respecting the fulfilment of the two parts of the Passover feast—see notes there. After this comes in the washing of the disciples' feet by the Lord, as related in John xiii. 1. 20.
18—21. Matt. xxvi. 21—25. Luke xxi. 21—23. John xiii. 21, 22. —The words ὁ λαλῶν μετ' ἐλεοῦ are peculiar to Mark, and, as we have seen before, bear a relation to John's account, where the Lord had just before cited ὁ τρωτός μετ' ἐλεοῦ κ.τ.λ., ver. 18.
καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰσσοῦς ὅτι πάντες σκανδαλίζονται, ἀλλ' ὁμίχως ἐγέρ-πράται ὁ Πατάξ τὸν πομάν, καὶ διακοπτηθήσεται τὰ πρόβατα. 28 ἀλλ' μετὰ τὸ ἐγερθῆναι με προάξω τὰ ὕμας εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν. 29 ο δὲ Πέτρος ἐφῆ αὐτῷ ἢ Καὶ εἰ * πάντες σκανδαλίζονται, ἀλλ' ὁμίχως ἐγέρ-ρον ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτην πρὸν ἢ [δίς] ἀλέκτορα ἡ φωνή-σαι τρις ἀπαρνήσῃ με. 31 ο δὲ ἐκ * περισσοῦ ἔλεγε

Α Τ Κ Λ Β αλ. Sahid. τῶν ο Κ Λ Β Α. της ἦμις Δ ακ. Syr. Sahid.-καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰσσοῦς ὅτι πάντες σκανδαλίζονται, ἀλλ' ὁμίχως ἐγέρ-πράται ὁ Πατάξ τὸν πομάν, καὶ διακοπτηθήσεται τὰ πρόβατα. 28 ἀλλ' μετὰ τὸ ἐγερθῆναι με προάξω τὰ ὕμας εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν. 29 ο δὲ Πέτρος ἐφῇ αὐτῷ ἢ Καὶ εἰ * πάντες σκανδαλίζονται, ἀλλ' ὁμίχως ἐγέρ-ρον ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτην πρὸν ἢ [δίς] ἀλέκτορα ἡ φωνή-σαι τρις ἀπαρνήσῃ με. 31 ο δὲ ἐκ * περισσοῦ ἔλεγε...

KATA MARKON.

39—61.

ἐπὶ γυμνοῦ καὶ κρατοῦσιν αὐτὸν [οἱ νεανίσκοι], ὁ δὲ καταλιπὼν τὴν συνόδον γυμνὸς ἐφυγεν [ἀπ’ αὐτῶν].

51 Καὶ ἀπῆγαγον τὸν Ἰησοῦν πρὸς τὸν ἀρχιερέα, καὶ συνέρχονται αὐτῷ πάντες οἱ ἄρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς. 54 καὶ οἱ Πάτροι αὐτὸ μακρὸθεν ἐκλύθησαν αὐτὸν ὡς ἐσώ εἰς τὴν αὐλὴν τοῦ ἄρχιερεως, καὶ ἦν συγκαθισμένος μετὰ τῶν ὑπηρετῶν καὶ θηραμματί-


ABCD πάλιν ἄρχιερεὺς ἐπήρητα αὐτὸν καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ Σὐ.

our Lord—see Matt. xxvi. 25. But we must not conclude from this with Bengal, that he never seems to have called Him Lord: see Matt. vii. 21, 22, 61.] It is impossible to determine, and therefore idle to inquire, who this was. It seems to have been some attached disciple of the Lord (probably well known to the readers of Mark), who had gone to rest, and had been aroused by the intelligence. The disciples were not laid hold of:—this person perhaps was throwing some obstacles in the way of the removal of Jesus; or he may have been laid hold of merely in wantonness, from his unusual garb.

63—68.] Matt. xxvi. 57—63. Luke xxii. 64—65. John xviii. 24. See throughout notes on Matthew. —63. ἄρχι.—Caiaphas, de facto, and in the view of our narrator;—so Matt. and Luke: but Jesus was first taken before Annas, who was de jure the high-priest: see John xviii. 12—23. —68.] ἵνα—consistent with one another. It was necessary that two witnesses should agree. Deut. xvii. 6. (ἵνα should not be accentuated as in Homer, ἵνα, but as in later writers, ἵνα.)—57.] των.—ἀντι: see Matt. 58. Some have imagined (De Wette, Meyer) that they find in these words χειρον. and ἀχρ. traces of later Christian tradition, and an allusion to Heb. ix. 11. Acts vii. 48; but such conjectures are at best very unsafe, and the words are quite as likely to have been uttered by the Lord as they here stand. The allusion is probably to Daniel ii. 34. —59.] Perhaps the inconsistency of their testimonies may be traced in the different reports here and in Matthew. —ἀντι: 'in asserting this' —i.e. they varied in the terms in which
ο ἡρωτάτος τὸν εὐλογητοῦ; 63 ὁ δὲ Ἰσσοῦς ἌΒΓΔ
εἶπεν Ἡγὼ εἶμι καὶ ὑμεῖς τὸν κύριον τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
καθήμενον εκ δεξιῶν τῆς δυνάμεως καὶ ἑρῴζομεν
μετά τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ υἱοῦ. 63 δὲ ἀρχιερεῖς διαφο-
ρῆκας τοὺς κινώνας αυτοῦ λέγει Τί ἐτὶ "χρείαν ἔχομεν
μαρτύρων; 66 λόγον γάρ σημασίας, ὃ ἦν 
διάβολος τῆς πρὸς ὑμᾶς αὐτῶν καὶ κολαφίζεσθαι αὐτοῦ,
καὶ λέγειν αὐτῷ Προφήτησις καὶ οἱ ὑπηρετίς εἰς 
ἀτιμίας αὐτῶν ἡ ἠθεσθ. 65 Καὶ ἦλθεν ἀντὶ τῶν ἀριστερῶν,
καὶ ἦλθεν μετὰ τοῦ Πέτρου ἐν τῇ ἀθυλή κάτω, ἔρχεται μιὰ 
παιδικόν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως,
καὶ ἤποιεσκα τὸν Πέτρον ἐν 
βεβαιωθεῖμον, εἰμι νεαρὰ 
ἀυτῷ λέγει Καὶ σὺ μετὰ τοῦ Ναζαρηνοῦ Ἰσσοῦ 
νόσθα. 65 ο δὲ ἦρξεν καὶ ἤρξεν ἄγνων ὅ τι οὐδὲν ἐπιστάμα 
καί ἐξήλθεν ἐκ τοῦ πρωτοῦ, [καὶ ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώ-
νησε.] 69 καὶ η παρεσταθή 
ἐν τῷ Πέτρῳ Ἀληθῶς ἐξ αὐτῶν εἶ καὶ γὰρ 
Γαλαλείας εἰ [καὶ ἦ 
λατὶ σου ὁμοιότερον] 71 ο δὲ 
ἐρχομαι ἐκ αὐτῶν καὶ ὁμοίως ὃ 
τὸν ἀνθρώπον τοῦτον ὅ ἦν 
λέγετη. 72 καὶ * ἐκ δευτέρου 
φρονον ἐκ Θεοῦ ΑΚΛ τῆς 
ΒΕΣ Ὁ ἢις ᾿Ο ὅ τιν Π. 
ἐν Τ. τῆς 
ἐνοικὸς ἐν Θεοῦ ΑΚΛ 
τεκ ΒΕΣ Ὁ ἢις ᾿Ο ὅ τι 

was expressed. — 61.] τοῦ τῆς θεοῦ. Θεοῦ. τῆς ἡσυχίας, the ordinary Name for God. — 62.] Κατακριβεῖται. Not his priestly robe, which was worn only in the temple, and when officiating: see on Matt. ver. 63.] Προφητῆς. Matt. and Luke explain this: Prophecy, who "speaks in
time of the world. — 66.] The significance of the words καὶ Λα. ἤφ. appears to be an attempt to harmonise the accounts. — 69.]
αλέκτωρ εφώνησε. καὶ ἀνεμνήσθη ὁ Πέτρος τῷ τῷ ῥῆμα,
ὡς εἶνεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι πρὶν αλέκτωρ φωνῆσαι διὸς
ἀπαρνήσης με τρίς καὶ ἐπιβαλὼν ἐκλαία.

ΧV. 1 Καὶ εὐθείως ὑποχθέντοις ἐπὶ τῷ πρῶτῳ συμβούλων ποιησάντες οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς μετὰ τῶν προσβυτέρων καὶ γραμματέων, καὶ ὁλὸν τὸν συνεδρίον, δύσαντες τοῖς Ἰησοῦν ἀντήγεγκαν καὶ παρεδόχων τῷ Πιλάτῳ. 2 καὶ ἐπηρότητες αὐτὸν ὁ Πιλάτος Σὺ εἰ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων; ὃς δὲ ἀποκρίθη εἶπεν αὐτῷ Σὺ λέγεις. 3 Καὶ κατηγοροῦντο αὐτοῦ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς πολλά. 4 ὃς ὁ Πιλάτος πάλιν ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτὸν λέγων Οὐκ ἀποκρίνη σοι; ἢ τόσα σου καταμαρτυροῦσαι. 5 ὃς τῷ Ἰησοῦν ὑπέκατεν σοι ἐπείραζαν τόν Πιλάτον. 6 καὶ κατὰ ἐστὶν x ἀπέλυνεν αὐτοῦ ἐνα 7 δίσμων ὃν περ ἐγὼν τοῦτον. 7 ἦν δὲ ὁ


ἡ ταύτ. . . . πάλιν—ἐν Matt. Ἀλλή, in Luke ἤτορει.—70.] μετὰ μικρῶν—δια- 

στάσεις ὥσπερ ὡς μίας, Luke. —73.] ἵπτοντας—no satisfactory meaning has yet been given for this word. 1) Hammond and Palae恕 supply τον ἰδιόστερας τῷ Ἰησοῦ—but besides this being most fanciful, the fact was not so: see Luke ver. 61. 2) The vulgate, Syr. Euthym. Theo- 

phylact (2), Luther, Kuinoel, take ἵπτοντας ἰδίοις for ἵπτοντας ἰδίοις, 'he began to weep.' But granting that this is a later meaning of the word (Kuinoel cites ἵπτοντας τῷ ἰδίον, cantillae cepit, Diog. Laërt. vi. 2, 4, and Suidas has ἵπτοντας ἰδίοις) yet this participial construction will not bear that interpretation. Acts xi. 4, which Kuinoel cites to support it, has quite another meaning—see note there. 3) Grotius, Le Clerc, and others render it 'addens fessit'—i.e. he continued weeping, (so ἵπτοντας ἱδρῶσαν Theophr. Char. B. ἵπτοντας φησὶ Diod. Sic. p. 345 B);—but then his beginning to weep would have been noticed before. Grotius wants to give it the sense of 'preferes.' 4) Beza, Raphel, Brotschneider, Wahl, and others say, 'quem se fores projicisset,' but although ἵπτοντας τῷ οἱ ἵπτοντας may mean 'to rush upon,' it cannot stand alone in this meaning. The chief support of this sense is the τῇ ἱδρῷ ἱδρῶν of Matt. and Luke: but this cannot decide the matter. 5) Theophylact and others supply τῷ ἱδρῶν τῷ ἱδρῶσαν. 7 casting or drawing his mantle over his head; but this, without any precedent for such an ellipsis, although it suits the sense very well, appears fanciful. 6) Wetstein and others take it for 'attendere,' and some supply τῷ ἰδιόστερας, others τῷ βήματος. Wet- 

stein has however shown that the word is used absolutely in this sense, in Polybius and other late writers.—The above list is taken mainly from De Wette (Ezeq. Handb. p. 247) who while preferring the last sense, yet thinks that it was before expressed in ἰδιόστερα. But ἵπτοντας contains more than ἰδίον.—that was the bare momentary remembrance—the ῥῆμα occurred to him—this is the thinking, or, as we sometimes say, casting it over; going back step by step through the sad history. This sense, though not wholly satisfactory, applies to me the best.


6—15.) Matt. xxvii. 15—26. Luke xxiii. 17—25. John xviii. 39, 40. Our account is nearly cognate to, but distinct from that of Matthew, where see notes. The principal points of distinction will be noticed.—6.) ἰδρῶσαν—imperfectum ubi solere notat, non nisi de re ad eum pertinentem.
The page contains a continuous block of Greek text, which appears to be a page from a book or manuscript. The text is written in an old Greek script typical of historical documents. The content seems to be a religious or philosophical discourse, possibly from a work of classical antiquity. The text is not easily translatable without knowledge of ancient Greek and the context in which it was written. The page also contains references to specific verses from the Bible, indicating that the text might be a religious commentary or an exegesis of biblical passages.
of the crown of thorns, in Matt. of the robe (see prolegg. ch. 1. § 3, 4.)—παραστασία is vaguely used, to signify different shades of red, and is especially convertible with crimson = κόκκινον Matt. 20—23, I Matt. xxvi. 31—34. Luke xxii. 26—33. John xix. 16, 17. See notes on these. —21] Ἀλέξανδρον κ. Ῥοφέου. It is quite uncertain whether Alexander be the person of that name mentioned Acts xix. 33, or the one in 1 Tim. i. 20, or different from both. There is a Rufus saluted Rom. xvi. 13. The words ἐφχαρία. ἐν' ἐπράξει determine nothing as to its being a working day or otherwise, any more than εἰς παραστασίαν, Matt. ver. 39:—nothing is said as to the distance from whence he came. —22] Καλλιάν. τόν. —perhaps Καλλιάν. is positive, as it would then answer to κρασίν in the interpretation,—τόν τόν. τ. καλλίαν. κρασίν. Luke. —23, εἰς. εἰς.] = δέος μετά γελός μεμ. Matt. which see. —δέος εἰς, 'they were giving,' i.e. 'they offered.'

24—28] Matt. xxvii. 35—38. Luke xxiii. 33, 34—38. John xix. 18—24. —25] ἔστε πράξης. This date is in agreement with the subsequent account, ver. 33, and its || in Matt. and Luke, but inconsistent with John, xix. 14, where it is said to have been about the sixth hour at the time of the exhibition of the Lord by Pilate. I own I see no satisfactory way of reconciling these accounts, unless it may be shown from other grounds than the difficulty before us, that John's reckoning of time differs from that employed in the other Evangelists. The difficulty is of a kind in no way affecting the authenticity of the narrative, nor the truthfulness of each Evangelist—but requires some solution to the furnishing of which we are not competent. It is preposterous to imagine that two such accounts as these of the proceedings of so eventful a day should differ by three whole hours in their apportionment of its occurrences. So that it may fairly be presumed, that some different method of calculation has given rise to the present discrepancy. Meanwhile the chronology of our text, as being carried on through the day, and as allowing time both for the trial, and the events of the crucifixion,—is that which will I believe generally concurred in. All the other solutions (so called) of the difficulty are
γραφὴ ἡ λέγουσα ἦν καὶ μετὰ ἀνόμων ἐλογίζετο. 29 καὶ ἀνεφόσομον "έβλασφήμων αὐτῶν, κινοῦντές τας κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν καὶ λέγοντες ὦ! ὁ πρὸ καταλῦν 
τόν ναὸν καὶ [ἐν] τρισὶν ἡμέραις οἰκοδομῶν, σωσον 
σαυτόν καὶ κατάβα ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ. 31 ὁμοίως [ἐκ] καὶ 
oi αἱ ἀρχιερεῖς ἐμπαιζόντες πρὸς ἀλλήλους μετὰ τῶν γραμ-
matikῶν ἐλέγων Ἀλλῶς ἐσώσων, αὐτοῖς δὲ δύναται σώσαι. 
32 ὁ χριστὸς ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ καταβατῶν νῦν 
ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ, ἵνα ἴδωμεν καὶ τι παρεστῶμεν. καὶ 
oi συνεσταυρωμένη αὐτῷ ὑνειδίζου αὐτὸν. 33 γενομένης 
de ωρας ἐκτις σκότος ἐγένετο ἐφ' ὅλην τὴν γήν, ἦς ὧρας ἑβαρτις. 34 καὶ τῇ ὥρᾳ τῇ ἑβαρτι ἐξέσον ὁ Ἰσσοῦς 
φωνῆς μεγάλης λέγων Ἐλλιω ἐλλιώ * λαμμα * σαβαχθανὶ; 
ὁ ἐστὶ μεθομονυμόνες; 35 καὶ τίνες τῶν παρεστηκῶν 
ἀκούσαντες ἐλέγων Ἰδοὺ Ἰλίαν φωνεὶ. 36 δραμὼν δὲ ἈΒΓΔ 
eis [καὶ] b γεμίσας c σπόγγων d ἰδίων e περιθεῖς τε 
καλῆς ἐπέτιξεν αὐτὸν λέγων Ἀφετε ἴδωμεν εἰ ἐρχε-
ται Ἰλίας β καθελὼν αὐτὸν. 37 ὁ δὲ Ἰσσοῦς ἁφείς φω-
νῆς μεγάλην ἐξέσωσεν. 38 καὶ τὸ κατάπτασμα τοῦ 
ναοῦ ἐχίσθη εἰς δύο καὶ ἀπὸ ἀνυμὸν ἔφερε κάτω. 39 ἦδα 
δὲ ὁ κεντυρίων ὁ παρεστηκὼς εἰς ἑαυτιάς αὐτοῦ ὁτι 
m Isa. xliii. 2. Zechar. xiv. 4. a Ezek. i. 27. 

not worth relating. — 29.] This verse is supported by only one first-class authority (V). Certainly all internal evidence is against it; such citations are not in Mark’s manner, nor is the expression ἀνομών ἐλογίζετο; — see John, ver. 24. 
27).—Our narrative, derived from a common source with that of Matt., omits the scriptural allusion ‘He trusted in God,’ &c. Matt. ver. 43.—śā, an expression of re-
proach; — sometimes, one of admiration and respect, as in Dio Cassius, lxiii. 20, where the Romans shout after Nero, on his tri-
umphal entry after his victories in the Grecian games, ἰθέμπονων, ἰθάνων, ἰθάνων. — 37.] k. 
ol συνετ.: — see notes on Luke. 
44—46. John xix. 28—30. Our account is 
early verbally the same with Matthew. 
— 34.] ἀλκ and λαμμα are the Syro-
chaldic forms, which Matt. has only pre-
served in σαβαχθανὶ. — 36.] On the dif-
ference in Matthew, see note there.
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ούτω κράζασ αἰτίωνυσεν, εἰπεν Ἀληθῶς ὁ ἀνθρωπος
οὗτος ἦν ἡ θεοῦ.

40 Ἡσαν δὲ καὶ γυναῖκες ἀπὸ μακράθεν θεωροῦσιν,
ἐν αἰς ἡ καὶ Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ καὶ Μαρία ἡ τοῦ
Ἰακώβου τοῦ μικροῦ καὶ Ἡσερ κυρίη καὶ Σαλώμη.

41 [α] καὶ οὗτ ἦν ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ ἤκολοῦσαν αὐτῷ [καὶ
διδόκοντον αὐτῷ], καὶ ἄλλοι πολλοὶ αἱ συναναβάζασαι
αὐτῷ εἰς Ἰεροσολύμα.

42 Καὶ ἦν ὁ φίλος γεννομένης, ἔπει ἦν παρασκευὴ, ὁ
εἶστι προσάβατον. 43 Ἡθίκαν Ἰωσήφ ὁ ἀπὸ Ἀρμα-
θαίας, ἔνσχημος ἄνωτης, δς καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν προς-
δέχομενος τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ, τοῦτο πρὸς Πιλάτον καὶ
ὑσάστατο τῷ σώμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. 44 ὁ δὲ Πιλάτος ἔθαμβαν εἰ
ὅδε τῆθηκεν καὶ προκαλε-

κράζας ἐν. B. ttx a c.—εἰπεν ὁ ὡμ. D d.—40. ἦν ὁ ὡμ. B L.—καὶ ὁ ὡμ. D s. Συγρ. Επιτ.——


all. Copt. Α.——txx D e d.—Ἀρμαθίας ὁ ὡμ. C e s.—txx A B C.—44. ἦν ὡμ. E F G.—txx A C.—45. ἦν ὡμ. B C

ce Α.——txx A C.—46. ἦν ὡμ. B C D L T xx A C.—add ἔστω D.


minute mark of accuracy, so common in Mark.——40.] τοῦ μικροῦ—either in the age, or in stature, so distinguished from James the son of Zebedee. This Mary is the wife of Alpheus or Clopas; see John xix. 25.——Σαλώμη ἦν η μήτρα τῶν ἡμῶν Ζεβε-

dαίου, Matt.: our Evangelist mentions that they had accompanied Him to Jerusalem;—

and we may observe a curious variation of the wording, in ἡμολογοῦντον αἰτίην ὧν ἦν ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ, and ἐκλεισθένησαν τῷ λ. ἐκ τῆς Γαλιλαίας.——the former rendering necessary the additional clause, αἱ συναναβάζασαι κ. t. l. 42—47.] Matt. xxvii. 57—61. Luke xxiii. 50—56. John xix. 31—42.——For all notes on the substance of the common narrative see Matt.——43.] παρασκ. δ. 44.] προσσεβά. The Friday afternoon, before sunset, at which time the Sabbath would begin, and the taking down, &c. would be unlawful. The three Evangelists do not imply that any thing is or had ever been especially in it, as John does, ver. 31. It is very remarkable, that even occurs only here in this Gospel, but is found in the corresponding clause of John, ver. 31, showing perhaps in this place a community of source in two accounts otherwise so essentially distinct.——43.] Ἡθίκαν is common to Matt. Mark, and John, but in different connexion—see on Matt.——εὐορχι-

μεν—probably in its later sense of 'noble,' 'honourable,' i. e. in station.——Σαλώμη, a member of the Sanhedrim;—see Luke ver. 51.—by σ. αὐτ. ἠν προσέβα. τ. β. τ. θ. common to Mark and Luke; and a phrase, having καὶ αὐτός in it, derived from their original source——συναναβάζασαι] characteristic of Mark's narrative.——44.] There is no inconsistency, or but very trifling, with the order in John, ver. 31, to break their legs and take them down. The circumstances related there had taken place,—but no report of them had been made to Pilate. And the Body of the Lord had
not been taken down, for some reason which does not appear, but which we can easily guess;—if Joseph had declared to the soldiers his intention of begging the Body, nay, had immediately gone (perhaps with them) to Pilate for that purpose,—and νεκρόμενος καθήλθε looks like a sudden and unannounced application, they would have left the Body for him to take down—κατὰ ἑξήκοντα The passage cited (Meyer, De Wette) from Cicero (in Verrem, v. 45) to show that it was customary to give money on such occasions, is not to the point;—mortis celeritatem pretio redimere cogerunt parentes' is not said of the body after death, but of a fee given to the officer 'ne ducia crucereta.'—46.] ἀγωγ. Therefore it was not the first day of unleavened bread, which was one of sabbatical sanctity—as indeed the whole of this narrative shows—but such expressions as this more strikingly.—ἐν μνημα. It is not said, but implied, both here and in Luke and John, that the tomb was his own—for how should he place the Body there otherwise? The newness of the tomb is not mentioned here—but by the other three Evangelists. —47.] M. Ἰωσήφ—understand, mother—see ver. 40. That she is so called here, and Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Ἰακώβου in the next verse, points to a difference of origin in the two accounts here of the execution and Resurrection.—The mother of the Lord had previously departed.—Luke generalizes, and says, the women who came with Him from Galilee.—Some have understood by M. Ἰωσὴφ or Ἰωσήφ, the wife or daughter of Joseph of Arimathæa—some, the mother of the Lord: but both unnecessarily, and without proof.

Διαδοθήκη. Luke xxiv. 1—10. On the general difficulties of this portion of the Gospels and my view respecting them, see notes on Matt. —1.] σύγκρ. τ. σ ε. It was strictly when the Sabbath was ended, i.e. at sunset, that they bought the spices. Luke xxiii. 55, places it on the evening before the Sabbath: a slight but valuable discrepancy, as showing the independence of the accounts. To suppose two parties of women (Grossetti) or to take ἡγούμενον as pluperfect (B Ezra, Grothus, &c.) is equally arbitrary and unwarranted. Ἀλλά. This had not been done as yet. Nicodemus—John xix. 40—had only wrapped the Body hurriedly in the spices with the linen clothes. —2.] ἀνασταλεῖται τ. ἡμ. This does not agree with Matt. τῇ ἑτέρῳ αἰ. μιᾶν σαβ. —Luke, δρόμων βασίλειου; or John, στοιχείον τής ώρας:—nor indeed with ἦν πρώτη of our narrative itself. If the sun was up, it would be between 6 and 7 o'clock; which in the East especially, where even public business was transacted very early, did not hold. The reading of D, ἀναστάλλωσα, would not help us much, as it was evi-
dently some time before sunrise. Even
Greswell virtually acknowledges a difficulty
here—3, 4.] It had been rolled away by
an angel, Matt.—γυ γαρ μεγ. σφω. is stated
as a reason why they could see that it was
rolled away on looking up, possibly at some
distance. This explanation is according to
Mark’s manner of describing minute cir-
cumstantial incidents; but to refer this
clause back as the reason why they ques-
tioned who should remove the stone, is not
only harah, but inconsistent with the usage
of this Gospel.—5.] In Matt.—an angel,
sitting on the stone which he had rolled
away. Here he is described as he ap-
ppeared, and we are left to infer what he
was. In Luke,—two angels ιστησαν
αυτος in the tomb. The incident to
which these accounts point, must be dis-
tinct from that related John xx. 11, which
was after Mary Magdalene returned from
the city. It is not worth while to detail
the attempts which have been made to
reconcile these various reports of the inci-
dent; they present curious examples of
the ingenuity, and disingenuousness, of
the Harmonists. I may mention that
Greswell supposes the angels in Matt. and
Mark to be distinct (!), and accounts for
the δεσμισθησαν in our text thus:
‘After seeing one angel without already,
they were probably less prepared than be-
fore to see another so soon after within’(!)
(Dissert. vol iii. p. 187).—6.] From the
deus of Matt. I should be inclined to
think that his is the strictly accurate ac-
count. This word implies that the angel
accompanied the women into the tomb—
and if so, an imperfect narrative like that
in the text might easily describe his whole
appearance as taking place within.—7.]
κα τε Π. It is hardly perhaps likely
that the denial of Peter was the ground of
this message, though it is difficult not to
connect the two in the mind. The men-
tion of him here is probably merely official
—as the ‘primus inter pares.’ We cannot
say that others of the Apostles may not
have denied their Master besides Peter.—
It must not be concluded from this that we
have a trace of Peter's hand in the narra-
tive. —[8.] The idea of our narrative here is,
that the women fled in terror from the
sepulchre, and did not deliver the message
at that time,—for they were afraid. All
tries to reconcile this with the other
Gospels are futile. It is a manifest evi-
dence that our narrative is here suddenly
broken off, and that no more information
about the women was in the possession of
its author. The subsequent verses are
quite disconnected from this; and contain
the substance of their author's information
respecting the other appearances of the
Lord.

9—18.] In this form, peculiar to Mark. An
authentic addition to the narrative, but
of a compendious and supplementary char-
acter, and bearing traces of another hand
from that which has shaped the diction and
construction of the rest of the Gospel.—This
homer must be readily assumed. The
reasons for and against the inference
will be found in the course of this note, and
a general statement of them at the end of
it. —[9.] πρωτη σεβπδανον = μια σεβ-
βαθων ver. 2, and is remarkable as occurring
so soon after it (see Luke xviii. 12). — ΔΙ
ηκει . . . . . . . This notice, coming so late,
after the mention of Mary Magdalene in
ver. 1, is remarkable. The instances quoted
by De Wette to show that this unexpected
introduction of notices contained in the
other Gospels is in Mark's manner, do not
seem to me to apply here. This verse
agrees with John xx. 1 ff. but is uncon-
ected with the former narrative in this
chapter. —[10.] διάφως is nowhere found
used absolutely by Mark—but always em-
phatically (see ch. iv. 11. vii. 15. 20. xiv.
21); whereas here and ver. 11 it is abso-
lutely used (not in vv. 13 (bis) and 20,
where it is emphatical). — προερευ. This
word, never used elsewhere by Mark, is
time contained in this passage (vv.
12. 15). — τοις μετ' αυτον γεν., though
found in the Acts (xx. 18), never occurs in
the Gospels. —[11.] see John xx. 18. Luke
xxiv. 11. — θεσθε εις αυτης is a construc-
tion only found here in N. T., and ἐνθρωπια
is not used by Mark, except here and ver.
14. — ἀποκλεισθαι is only used here and in
ver. 16 by Mark, and only in Luke xiv.
throughout the Gospels. —[12.] μετ' αυτωs
is not found elsewhere in Mark, and
many opportunities occurred for using it.
This verse epitomizes the events on the
journey to Emmaus, Luke xxiv. — ἐν ἑκατα
μορφη—a slight difference from Luke xxiv.
15, 16, which relates the reason why they
did not know Him to be that their eyes were
held, His being in His usual form being
declared by αναποθετεν την ἁγιασια: but see notes
there. —[13.] καταναλωσας—as Mary Magdal
had done before. — τοις λοιποις—ες τοις
μετ' αυτου γενομυνοις. —[14.] διάφως δια
περιβαλλεται—xxiv. 33, 34. — Here again the Harmonists
have used every kind of distortion of the
plain meaning of words to reconcile the
two accounts—assuming that some believed
and some doubted, that they first doubted
and then believed—or, according to Bengel,
first believed and then doubted (1). —[14.]
The following narrative, evidently intended
by its author to represent what took place
at one and the same time, joins together in
one, at least four appearances of the Lord:
(1) that related in this verse and Luke
xxiv. 36—49; (2) that on the mountain
in Galilee, when the words in ver. 16 were
spoken; (3) some unrecorded appearance
when the rest of these words (vv. 16—18)
were spoken,—unless we consider the whole
to have been said on the mountain in Galilee;
and (4) the appearance which terminated
with the ascension.—The latter part of this
ver. 14 appears to be an epitome of what
13 καὶ ἔτεν αὐτοῖς Πορευθέντες εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἀπαντᾷ ἐκ τοῦ εὐαγγέλιου πάση τῇ ἱκτείῃ. ἔπειτα πιστεύει καὶ βαπτίσθεις σώθησαι, ὁ δὲ ἀπαστήσας ἡ κατακρίθη- σεται. 17 σημεία δὲ τοῖς πιστεύσασι ταῦτα παρ- ακολουθεῖ· ἐν τῷ ὑμνομαί μον θαμομοί έκβαλουί, γλώσσαις λαλήσουι και καιναισι, ἢ θαμαίσιν τι πίσων, οὐ μὴ αὐτοὺς ἑλθοῦντο. 18 δὲ δοκεῖ ἄροις καὶ καταγείρεισιν καὶ καὶ καλώς ἐξουσιο-

S — ch. vi. 22. John viii. 60. 1 Mac. ix. 19. a here only. b Matt. xiv. 14 al. Mat. i. 8. c and const. Matt. xx. 15. ch. viii. 23. d here only. see John iv. 52.

—bes. κακ. ins. καὶ D. — 16. ἢ τὸ π. D. — 17. ἀκολουθεῖσα C (from ver. 15 to end are written in D by a later hand). — 18. αὐτὸς λαλήσ. (ομοι. καιναίς) καὶ ον τοῖς χριστοῖς Κοπτ. Αρμ. καιναίς καὶ ον τοῖς. C* X al.—rec. ἥλαις with many const. mas., but txt

the Lord said to them on several occasions — see Luke xxiv. 25. 38. John xx. 27. Matt. xxvii. 17. — 16.] τὸν κόσμον ἀπαντᾷ = πάντα τὰ ἵνα ηθην, Matt.: see note there. — κατακρίθησαι τοῦ εὐαγγέλιου, without the addition of τῆς βασιλείας (Matt.) or τοῦ θεοῦ (Luke), is in Mark’s manner (see i. 15. viii. 10). It only once occurs in Matt., and that passively, xxvi. 13. — τάρα τῇ πν. Not to men only, although men only can hear the preaching of the Gospel; all creation is redeemed by Christ—see Col. i. 15. 23. Rom. viii. 19—23. 'Hominibus, primario, ver. 16. reliquis creaturis, secundario. Sicut maledicto, in benedictio patet. Creatio per Filium, fundamentum redemptionis et regni: Bengel in loc.—ἐκκεντράν appears never in the N.T. to be used of mankind alone. Bengel’s ‘reliquos creaturis secundario’ may be illustrated in the blessings which Christianity confers on the inferior creatures and the face of the earth by bringing civilization in its wake.—By these words the missionary office is bound upon the Church through all ages, till every part of the earth shall have been evangelized.—[s.] These past participles must be noticed, as carrying on the thought to a time beyond the work of the preacher; when ὥσπερ, and καταγείρει. shall take place; and reserving the division of mankind into these two classes, till that day.—On βαπτ. see note on Matt. xxvii. 19. — There is no καὶ μὴ βαπτ. in the second clause here. Unbelief—by which is meant the rejection of the Gospel in heart and life, not weakness or doubt as in ver. 14—shall condemn a man, whether baptized or unbaptized. And, conversively, it follows that the Lord does not set forth here the absolute, but only the general necessity of Baptism to salvation as our Church also teaches. But that general necessity extends to all to whom Baptism is accessible—and it was well said 'Non privato Baptismi, sed contentus, damnav.'—These words cannot be taken, as those in Matt. xxvii. 19, 20, as setting forth the order in which faith and baptism must always come—belief and disbelief are in this verse the great leading subjects, and ποιόταται must on that account stand first. — On ὥσπερ, ἀκολουθεῖσα C (from ver. 15 to end are written in D by a later hand). — 18. αὐτὸς λαλήσ. (ομοι. καιναίς) καὶ ον τοῖς χριστοῖς Κοπτ. Αρμ. καιναίς καὶ ον τοῖς. C* X al.—rec. ἥλαις with many const. mas., but txt
EYAGGELION KATA MARKON.

19 O μὲν οὖν κύριος * μετά τὸ λαλῆσαι αὐτοῖς * ἀνελήμφη A C
eis tōn οὐρανὸν καὶ έκάθισεν ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ θεοῦ.
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τινα is in Mark's manner: see ch. viii. 25. x. 16. There is no mention of the anointing with oil here, as in James v. 14. — 19, 20.] The μὲν οὖν is not to be taken here as if there were no δὲ following: the μὲν answers to the δὲ as in Luke iii. 16, 19 — and the οὖν is the connecting link with what went before. — ὁ κύριος, and ὁ κύριος ὁ Ιησοῦς, are alike foreign to the diction of Mark, in speaking of the Lord: we have ὁ κύριος in the message (common to all three Gospels) ch. xi. 3— but that manifestly is no example. — μετὰ τὸ λαλ. can only in fairness mean, 'when He had spoken these words.' All endeavours of the Harmonists to include in them οὐ μόνον τοὺς λόγους τότεστοι, ἀλλὰ πάντας βους λαλήσεις (Euthym.) will have no weight with an honest reader, who looks to the evident sense of his author alone, and disregards other considerations. That other words were spoken, we know; but that this author intended us to infer that surely is not deducible from the text, and is too often allowed in such cases to creep fallaciously in as an inference. We never shall read or comment on Scripture with full profit, till all such subterfuges are abandoned, and the Gospel evidence treated in the clear light of intelligent and honest faith. We have an example of this last in Theophylact's exposition, ταύτα δὲ λαλήσεις.— ἀνελήμφη. I should hardly say that the author of this Fragment necessarily implies an ascension from the place where they were then assembled. The whole of these two verses is of a compendious character, and as ἀνελήμφη. ἐκ 8. τ. θ. must be understood as setting forth a fact not comprehended in the cycle of their observation, but certain in the belief of all Christians, so ἀνελήμφη. may very well speak of the fact as happening, not necessarily then and there, but (see remarks above) after these words were spoken: provided always, that these words are recognized as the last in the view and information of our Evangelist. I say this not with any Harmonistic view, but because the words themselves seem to require it. (See on the ascension, notes on Luke xxiv. 51.) — 20.] ἀνελήμφη — not, from the chamber where they were assembled (Meyer)—which would not answer to ιησοῦς πανταχοῦ, but would require some immediate action of that very day to correspond to it (see Matt. xii. 14)—but used in the more solemn sense of Rom. x. 18 (cited from Ps. xviii. 4 LXX), διὰ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν ἡ ἐξάλειψιν ὁ φθόγγος αὐτῶν: see ref. — πανταχοῦ] No inference can be drawn from this word as to the date of the fragment. In Acts ix. 32 Peter is said διωρχομένου διὰ πάντων, κατελθὼν . . . ; the expression being only a general one, indicating their performance, in their time and degree, of the Lord's ἐς τὸν κόσμον ἐπάνω. — τοῦ κυρ. 'The Lord,' i.e. Jesus: see Matt. xxviii. 20. Heb. ii. 3, 4, which last passage some have absurdly supposed to have been seen and used by our Evangelist.—ἀνελήμφη and παρακαλ. are both foreign to the diction of Mark, often as he uses the simple verb.

A few concluding remarks may be added respecting vv. 9—20. (1) On external grounds (see var. read.) its authenticity and authority are beyond any question. Our only inquiry then is as to its genuineness as a work of the Evangelist Mark. And here (2) internal evidence is, I think, very weighty against Mark's being the author. No less than seventeen words and expressions occur in it (and some of them several times), which are never elsewhere used by Mark,—whose adherence to his own peculiar phrasing is remarkable. (3) The inference therefore seems to me to be, that it is an authentic fragment, placed as a completion of the Gospel in very early times: by whom written, must of course remain wholly uncertain; but having just the same claim to reception and reverence as the rest of the Gospels.
CHAP. I. 1. έν ήμιν om. P al.—2. καθ' & D.—παρέδωσαν Α. —καν K.—4. for signed to Lake's Gospel: see Prolegomena to Luke, § 4. (4) I believe the only probable interpretation of the words to be, that many persons, in charge of Churches, or otherwise induced, drew up, here and there, statements (narratives, διηγήσεις) of the testimony of the eye-witnesses and ὑπηρ. τ. λ. (see below), as far as they themselves had been able to collect them. (I do not believe that either the Gospel of Matt. or that of Mark are to be reckoned among these; or if they are, that Lake had seen or used them.) That such narratives should not have come down to us, is no matter of surprise: for (1) they would be absorbed by the more complete and sanctioned accounts of our present Evangelists; and (2) Church-tradition has preserved very few fragments of authentic information of the Apostolic age. It is probable that in almost every Church where an eye-witness preached, his testimony would be taken down, and framed into some διηγήσεις, more or less complete, of the life and sayings of the Lord. — διηγήσεως თ‘ have undertaken; or, as E. V., 'taken in hand.' This does not necessarily imply the insufficiency of such διηγήσεις, as Orig. Theophyl. &c. have imagined. This is indeed implied in Lake's description of his own work—but that, more because it possessed completeness (whereas they were fragmentary) than from any difference in kind.—ανατέλεσθαι]
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καθὼς φαρέσαν ἤμεν οἱ ἄρχης αὐτῶται A B D F καὶ ὑπηρετάτη γενομένου τοῦ Λόγου, ἐσόδε καμοὶ τος παρη-

κολουθηκότι ἀνωθεν πάσιν ἄρκιβος καθεξής σοι γράφαι, κράτιστε Θεῷ βίοι, ἵνα ἐπεγνώς περὶ ὃν καντήχης

λόγων την ἀσφαλείαν.

'to draw up,'—to arrange.—[νῆγ.] a narration—history. —[νῆλα.] according to some, 'fulfilled.' De Wette supports this by the meaning of πληροῖον Acts xix. 21. xii. 25, which is beside the purpose. The more likely rendering is that of E. V., 'certainly believed.' [Meyer would render it,'which have found their completion among us,' i. e. 'us of the Apostolic times;' meaning 'Theophilus and himself,' &c. This, I think, gives too emphatic a sense to ἀνωθεν ἄρχης, which can only mean as ordinarily, 'among us,' unless accompanied with some qualifying expression. See ref. and note on 2 Tim. iv. 5. 17.—The use of the cognate noun πληροφορία supports this view: see 1 Thess. i. 5. Heb. vi. 11.—[ἐμῶν] to us Christians, to you and me, and all members of the Church of Christ—so also the ἠμῶν by-and-by.—2. καθὼς ὑπὲρ. The Apostles, &c., delivered these matters orally to the Churches in their teaching (see below on καθὼς), and others drew up accounts from that catechetical instruction.—It appears from this, that Luke was not aware of any ἀνωθεν drawn up by an eye-witness or ὑπ. τ. λ. He cannot therefore have seen (or, having seen, not recognized as such, which is highly improbable) the Gospel of Matthew. Compare 1 John i. 1.—3. ἀνωθεν άρχής] not, 'from the very beginning,' i. e. the birth of the Lord, &c., but the official beginning: see Acts i. 21.—It differs from ἀνωθεν below.—ἀνωθεν ὑπὲρ. τοῦ λ.] ἀνωθεν most probably stands alone: but it may well be taken with τ. λ. (see below.)—ὑπὲρ,—see ref.—ministering servants'—but in connexion with ἀνωθεν.—τ. λόγου—not, 'the ἀγων.' (i. e. Christ), which would be altogether alien from Luke's usage—nor 'the matter,' so that ὑπὲρ τ. λ. would signify those who by their labours contributed to bring the matter about, 'qui ipsi interfuerunt rebus, tanquam pars alius'—for this is alien from Luke's usage of ὑπὲρ—see Acts xxvi. 16;—but, 'the word,'—the word preached:—so that ὑπηρεταὶ τ. λόγ. = διάκονοι τ. λόγ. Acts vi. 1.—3. καθὼς καμοὶ] Luke by this classes himself with these παλαιοί, and shows that he intended no disparagement or blame to them, and was going to construct his own history from similar sources. There is here no expressed claim to inspiration, but at the same time no disclaimer of it. Some of the versions add, after καμοὶ, 'et spiritui sancto,'—which makes the following clause an absurdity.—[κατηχ.] having traced down (by research), and so become accurately acquainted with. The word is used in just this sense by Demosth., περὶ τ. στ., p. 256: λειτούρ γάρ καὶ ἣμερα λειτούρ γάρ μού ἐνόμων καὶ πλούσιον ἀνδρα βασιλεία, ἐλλα τα χαιροκολουθηκότα τοῖς πράγμασιν ἦ ἀρχής, καὶ συνελενυφιν μόρος τίνους ἐνέκα τῶν ἑστατίν ἕλι θεῖοι καὶ τι βούλιμον μοι. —[ὑπὲρ.] from the beginning—i. e. as in ver. 5;—as distinguished from those who only wrote of the official life of the Lord, or only fragments perhaps of that. —καθὼς, 'consecutively:' see ref. By this word we must not understand Luke to lay claim to any especial chronologica accuracy;—which indeed is not found in his Gospel. The word is of later usage, e. g. by Plutarch, Ἀλίας, &c. The classics have ἰδεῖς.—[καθώς, κατηχ.] It is wholly unknown who this person was. The name was a very common one. The conjectures about him are endless, and entirely without value. It appears that he was a person of dignity (see ref. on κράτιστος.), and a convert to Christianity.—The idea of the name being not a proper, but a feigned one, designating 'those who loved God,' is too modern for the usage of Luke, and not modern enough for the present state of Scripture criticism.—4. ἀγωνῖν—here in its stricter sense, of acquiring additional, more accurate knowledge—see ref.—καθὼς, κατηχ.] Theophilus had then been orally instructed in the narratives which form the subject of this Gospel: and Luke's intention in writing it, is that he might have a more accurate knowledge of these histories—καθως, κατηχ.] literally, catechized, 'catechetically taught.'—λόγων is not to be rendered 'things:' neither it, nor ῥήμα, nor ὅρη, ever have this meaning, as is commonly but erroneously supposed. In all the commonly-cited examples of this, 'things expressed in words' are meant: here, 'the histories,' 'accounts.' (See Proleg. to the Gospels, i. 3.)
5. The style now totally alters and becomes Hebraistic, signifying that the following is translated or compiled from an Aramaic oral narration, or perhaps (from the very distinct character of these two first chapters) document. — ἐγενετο ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Βασιλέως τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἠνέργος τις ὁ νόμος ἦν τῆς Ἰσαάκεως, εἰ ἐφημερίας "Ἀβία" καὶ η ἐγενετο ἐν τῷ Μεχʿ, καὶ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς Ἐλισάβετ. ἦν δὲ δικαίοι αἵματορεις ἐνώπιοι τοῦ θεοῦ, πορεύομενοι εἰς πάσας ταῖς ἐνεργίαις καὶ δικαίωμα τοῦ κυρίου ἀμέμποι. οὐκ ἦν αὐτοῖς τέκνον, καθότι ἡ Ἐλισάβετ ἦν στέρα, καὶ αἵματορεις προβοληθήκησαν εἰς ταῖς ἡμέραις αὐτῶν ἦσαν. ἦγενετο δὲ ἐν τῷ Ερατείας αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ τάξει τῆς ἐφημερίας αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐναντίον τοῦ θεοῦ. καὶ ταῦτα ἔφυγεν ἐκ τοῦ θυμίασι εἰς τὸν θυμιάματος. ἦν δὲ αὐτῶν ἅγιοι κυρίον ἐστός ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ θυσιαστήριου τοῦ θυμίαμα. ἓταν πάν τὸ πλήθος τοῦ λαοῦ ἡ γυνὴ τοῦ Ἰωάννου καὶ προευχομένων ἐξόν τῷ ἕρωτα τοῦ θυμίαματος. τῇ ἑβδομάδῃ ἐκέντρικος ἐν τῷ Αβία τῆς Ἐβραίας καὶ ἐν τῷ Κυρίῳ τῷ Βασιλείῳ.
is the favourable side: see Matt. xxv. 33. —13. He had then prayed for a son—but as appears below, long since—for he now had ceased to look for an answer to his prayer. —'Ιδοὺνεν λόγον, 'Ισαάκα
LXX, 1 Chron. iii. 24: —'αυτός, 4 Kings xv: 33: —'Ο δὲ, 2 Chr. xxviii. 12: —
'Ο λόγος τοῦ πατρός, or 'Ο is favourable.' —15. τοῦ θεοῦ, cf. the spiritual nature of his office and influence. —The priests were similarly prohibited to drink strong
drink; and the Nazarites even more rigidly: see ref. —σικ., from γυμνότευται, est.—
any strong liquor not made from grapes. —σικ., 4:11. w. is a contrast to, and a
reason for, the not drinking wine nor strong drink: comp. Eph. v. 18. —Olahhausen and Meyer think that (comparing
ver. 44) the meaning is, the Holy Spirit should in some wonderful manner act on the
child even before his birth. But (see ref.) this is not necessary.—nay, would it not
rather be in this case ἐν κοιλιᾷ . . . ? The ἐκ seems to fix the prior limit of the
indwelling of the Spirit, at his birth. —16.] The work of John was one of preparation
and turning men's hearts towards God.—For full notes on this see, on Matt. xi.—It may suffice here to repeat, that it was
a concentration of the spirit of the Law, whose office it was to convince of sin; and that he eminently represented the law
and the prophets in their work of preparing the way for Christ.—17.] ἐν αὐτῷ—i. e.
kυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ, manifest in the flesh. De Wette denies this interpretation, as contrary to all analogy: and yet himself explains the expression by saying that what the Messiah does, is in Scripture ascribed to God as its doer (similarly Meyer). But why, because Messiah is God with us.—This expression is besides used (see Zech. xiv. 5) in places where the undoubted and sole reference is to the Messiah. —ἐν τῷ κ. Bov.] As a type, a partial fulfilment, of the personal
coming of Elias in the latter days (see note on Matt. xi. 13, 14). —ἐως τ. . . . . . .] The first member only of the sentence
corresponds with Malachi, and that not verbatim. The angel gives the exposition of the second member,—καὶ κατ' ἀνθρώπον πρὸς τὸν ἡλίαν ἀνθρώπον τοῦ—for of course that must be understood in the better sense, of the good prevailing, and the bad becoming like them.—ἐν is elliptic for ἐν τῷ ἑως τ. . . . . . . see ref. —Augustin de Civ. Dei, xx. 29.—est sensus, ut ciam fili sec intelligi legem, id est, Judaei, quemadmodum parentes eam intellexerunt, id est Prophetae, in quibus erat et ipse Moyse;—so also Kinoel, but erroneously, for both articles would be expressed,—τῶν παρανομῶν καὶ τάς ἀνεπίβαστα. —18.] The birth of John, involving human generation, but prophetically announced, and supernatural, answers to the birth of Isaac in the O. T.—But
Abraham's faith was a strong contrast to the unbelief of Zacharias: see Rom. iv. 19. De Wette, without noticing the above remark (which is Olshausen's), says, "the same doubt, which Abraham also entertained in a similar case" (!) so that we have here, as often elsewhere, in the interpretation of Scripture (Gen. xvii. 17. xv. 6. 8. xviii. 12), De Wette versus Paul (!) (Rom. as above)—the fact being, that the case Gen. xv. 8 was not similar. — πρεσβύτερος] The Levites (see Num. iv. 3. viii. 24) became superannuated at the age of fifty; but it appears, by extracts from the Rabbinical writings given by Lightfoot, that this was not the case with the priests. — 19.] Γαβριήλ = γὰβρια, Man of God; see Dan. viii. 16. ix. 21, also Tobit xii. 15. — The names of the angels, say the Rabbis, came up with Israel from Babylon. We first read of both Michael and Gabriel in the book of Daniel. But we are not therefore to suppose that they were borrowed from any heathen system, as Strauss and the rationalists have done;—the fact being, that the persons and order of the angels were known long before, and their names formed matter of subsequent revelation to Daniel: see Professor Mill's Vindication of Luke i. and ii. § 4, and note A; also Josh. v. 13—15. — δ' παρευρ. ἐν τ. Θ.] one of the chief angels near the throne of God. They are called seven in Tobit (ibid.); see Dr. Mill's Tract, as above.—20.] We must not consider this dummness solely as a punishment—it was also a sign, as Zacharias had required. It is impossible for us to say what the degree of unbelief in Zacharias was, and therefore we can be no judges as to his being deserving of the punishment (against Strauss and the rationalists). — σώματος κ. μ. δινω λαλ.] This is not a repetition, but an intensification, of σωμών. — ἀνθ' ἐν is not a Hebraism, but good Greek: see Passow, and Matthie, § 480. — 21.] It was customary for the priest at the time of prayer not to remain long in the holy place, for fear the people who were without might imagine that any vengeance had been inflicted on him for some informality;—as he was considered the representative of the people.—23.] They know, by some excitement visible in his manner. It was not his office to pronounce the blessing, but that of the other incoming priest; so that his 'not being able to speak,' must mean, an answer to the inquiries which his unusual appearance prompted. This answer he gave by a sign: and the question was also by signs; for (see ver. 62) he was deaf, as well as dumb, which indeed is the strict meaning of κακός—ο-Methods λαλών, ὁ-Methods δικοῦν, Hebr. — 23.] ὥς ἐπήλθ. The week during which his course was on duty. Mr. Gresswell, by much elaborate calculation, has made it probable, but only as one out of several alternatives, that this week was Tisri 18-25, = September 30—October 6, of the sixth year before the Christian era (Prolegg. p. 55 sq.).—A deaf and
dumb person, we thus see, was not precluded from some of the sacrosanct
ministrations.

24, 25.] περιεκροθὲν—either, to avoid defilement: see Judges xiii. 13, 14,—to hide her pregnancy from her neighbours till it was certain and apparent,—or, from the precaution which the first months of pregnancy require.—Kuinoel suggests, that the reason may have been, that she might devote herself more uninterruptedly to exercises of devotion and thankfulness, and that this is expressed by the words following.—If so,—ἐντ клиент must mean 'for,' as indeed is the usage of these first chapters: see below on ver. 45; but it seems here to be only the usual particle by which a speech is introduced: see Gen. xxix. 33. —ἐνθείφην] There is no emphasis of ἐστὶ or ἐστὶν, ἐστὶν, nor is the meaning, 'heath looked upon me,' but ἐστὶ is to be taken with the infinitive following—'hath condescended to remove:' so ἐφοράω, Herod. i. 124.—το δενδομα] of barrenness: see Gen. xxx. 23.—26.] τις ἀντρίστῃ—referring to the πιετη in ver. 24.—

Nažareť] In this particular the information of our Evangelist appears to be fuller than that of Matthew, who seems not to be aware of any residence at Nazareth previous to the birth of our Lord: but see note on Matt. ii. 23.—27.] ο αυτής Δ. refers to Joseph in this place, who (see Matt. i.) was of the direct lineage of David. That Mary was so, is nowhere expressed in the Gospels, but is implied in ver. 32, and has been the general belief of Christians. The Son of David was to be the fruit of his body (Ps. cxxxix. 11); which He would not be, unless His virgin mother was of the house of David. See notes on the genealogy in ch. iii. —28. κεχαρισμως, not 'gratid plena,' as the Vulg.—for, though χαριτων is not found in classical writers, the analogy of all verbs in -δο must rule it to mean, the passing of the action implied in the radical substantive on the object of the verb—the 'confering of grace or favour, upon.' And this is its meaning in the only other place (see reff.) where it occurs in the N. T.—δ κ. ομηνιστης om. Κ. λειίν: see Judges vi. 12 LXX. —ελεγον] has a double meaning: that of blessed,—from above—blessed among women, i.e. beyond other women; and praised,—from below.—i.e. called blessed by women. The former is the best rendering here: and then ἐν γε will be the Hebrew superlative, as in Jer. xxi. 15 (LXX), and Cant. i. 8.—
καὶ βασιλεύει ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰακώβ eis τοὺς αἰῶνας. 35 ἐπεὶ δὲ Μαρίαμ πρὸς τὸν ἀγγέλον Πῶς ἦστας τοῦτο, ἐπεί ἀνδραὶ ἡ γυναῖκα; 35 Καὶ ἀποκρίθης ὁ ἄγγελος ἐπείν αὐτὴν Πνεύμα ἀγίον ἐπέλευσε τε καὶ ἑυμόρια νῦστοι εἰς ἐπικιάζει σοι, μὴ διὸ καὶ τὸ γεννυμένον ἂγιον κληθήσεται νῦν θεοῦ. 36 καὶ ἰδοὺ Ἔλειαβετ ἡ συγγενής σου καὶ αὐτὴ συνελήφθη οὖν εὖ ἐν γηρείᾳ αὐτῶν, καὶ οὗτος μὴν ἔκτος ἐστὶν αὐτὴ τῇ καλουμένῃ στείρᾳ. 37 ὅτι ὃς ἀδύνατος παρὰ τῷ θεῷ πάντα ρήμα. 38 ἐπεὶ δὲ Μαρίαμ Ἰδοὺ ἡ δούλη κυρίου † γεννήτωρ μοι κατὰ τὸ ρήμα σου, καὶ ἀπήλθεν ἀπ' αὐτῆς ὁ ἄγγελος.

38.] Ἀπάντα τοῦ π. αὐτ. This announcement would make it probable that Mary also was of the house of David. No astonishment is expressed by her at this part of the statement, and yet, from the nature of her question, it is clear that she did not explain it by supposing Joseph to be the destined father of her child. See 2 Sam. vii. 13. Ps. lxxix. 3. 4. Is. ix. 7. Jer. xxxii. 15. 34. 35.] This question arises from that raised by Zacharias above. It is merely an inquiry after the manner in which so wonderful a thing should take place—not, how shall I know this?—it takes for granted that it shall be, and only asks, How?—πώς ἕττον. 38. the Holy Spirit—the creative Spirit of God, of whom it is said, Gen. i. 2, that He ἐπιθύμησε ἑπάνω ἄλλος. But as the world was not created by the Holy Ghost, but by the Son, so also the Lord was not begotten by the Holy Ghost, but by the Father; and that, before the world. "No more is here to be attributed to the Spirit, than what is necessary to cause the Virgin to perform the actions of a mother. . . . As Christ was made of the substance of the Virgin, so He was not made of the substance of the Holy Ghost, whose essence cannot at all be made. And because the Holy Ghost did not beget Him by any communication of His essence, therefore He is not the Father of Him, though He were conceived by Him." (Pearson on the Creed, p. 166, 166.) —ἐπικιάζει. The figure is not from a bird (as Grotius), but from a cloud; see reff. —ἐγένετο] Some take this for the predicate of ὁ γενν., "shall be called holy, the Son of God." But it is more simple to take it as E.V., "that holy thing," &c., making ὁ γενν. ἔγ. the subject, and vi. 6 the predicate. On the latter expression, see note on Matt. iv. 3, and Luke xxiii. 47. —36.] συγγινή. What relation, nowhere appears in Scripture; and traditions are not worth recounting. Elizabeth was of the tribe of Levi; but this need not hinder connexion by marriage with other tribes. Aaron himself married into Judah, Exod. vi. 23. We find in Judges xii. 7 a young man of the family of Judah, who was a Levite. Philo de Monarch. ii. 11 (vol. ii. p. 229), says, προσεταθα χ' μὲν ἄρχωντος μνάσαβι μὴ μόνον γυναικά παρθένων, ἄλλα καὶ ἱρίων ἵππων . . . . . . οἰκοτράπατο βοῖος καὶ μὴ ἱρίων γαμεῖν νυγηρίς. —37.] The future, in Hebrew, expresses that which does not belong to any fixed time, but shall ever be so. —38.] Her own faithful and humble assent is here given to the Divine announcement which had been made to her. I believe that her conception of the Lord is to be dated from the utterance of these words. She was no unconscious vessel of the Divine will, but (see ver. 45) in humility and faith, a fellow-worker with the purpose of the Father; and therefore her own unity with that purpose was required, and is here recorded.
So Euthym. on ἡδ ἀνθή,—δή συλλαβοῦντι ἢμα τῷ λόγῳ αὐτοῦ.—39.] The situation of Elizabeth was not before this known to Mary: and on the intelligence of it from the angel she arose and went to congratulate her kinswoman.—But before this the events related in Matt. i. 18—25 had happened.—Mary being betrothed to Joseph, had no communications with him, except through the word of God; who, on the first indications of her pregnancy, represented it to him. This would not take longer time than the expression ἐπὶ τοῖς ἡμ., ταῦτα might include—possibly three or four weeks. Then happened Matt. i. 19, 20; and immediately Joseph took her home. As a betrothed virgin she could not travel; but now immediately, and perhaps for the very reason of the circumstances under which Joseph had taken her home, she visits Elizabeth—remaining with her about three months, ver. 56.—So that we have,—five months, during which Elizabeth hid herself, + the sixth month, during which takes place the Annunciation, the discovery of Mary’s pregnancy, her taking home by Joseph, + three months visit of Mary = nine months, nearly her full time: see ver. 57.—πόλιν τοῖς ἐκδ. may possibly mean the city of Juta, which (Jos. xxii. 13, 16) was given, together with Hebron and other neighbouring cities, to the children of Aaron the priest, and was in the hill country of Judæa: see Jos. xxii. 11.—But it may also mean a city of Judah; and this is perhaps more likely, as no place of residence is mentioned for Zacharias in ver. 23,—and one would hardly be introduced so abruptly here. See for Ἰουδα then used, Matt. ii. 6. Josh. xxi. 11.—It is not Jerusalem; for that would not have been described as in the hill country. —42.] The salutation uttered by Elizabeth is clearly implied to have been an inspiration of the Holy Spirit. No intimation had been made to her of the situation of Mary. The movement of the babe in her womb (possibly for the first time) was part of the effect of the same spiritual influence. The known mysterious effects of sympathy in such cases, at least lead us to believe that there may be corresponding effects where the causes are of a kind beyond our common experience. —τ. ἀνάμμην: not the salutation of Mary’ (the Annunciation), but Mary’s salutation: the former construction is not according to Luke’s usage. —43.] The word κυηπλοῦν, as applied to the unborn babe, can no otherwise be explained than as uttered in the spirit of prophecy, and expressing the Divine nature of the Lord: see especially Ps. cx. 1. —45.] Either (as E.V., Vulg., Krahm., Beza, Meyer) “blessed is she that believed,” for “&c.”—or “blessed is she believed that there shall be” &c. —The last is maintained by Bengel and De Wette, and supported by Acts xxvii. 26. But I own it seems to me very improbable here; the sense and the period would both suffer;—and the usage of these first chapters is to render a reason by so: see vv. 37, 48, 49, 68.—I much prefer the former rendering, as agreeable likewise to the analogy of Scripture, where faith, in the recipient of the Divine purposes, is so often represented as a co-ordinate cause of the fulfilment
46. for Μαρίαμ, Elisabet (or -bel) ab. — 47. for ἵπποι, in D abc Iren. — 48. for οὐσία, οὐσίας Ἄρ Ι 63. — 49. for μετὰ, μετὰ B D L D be. — 50. for ὁμοία, ὁμοία B C. — 51. for ἥμισυ, ἥμισυ F. — 52. for ἀληθεία, ἀληθεία B D L D be. — 53. for ἡμῶν, ἡμῶν D. — 54. for καθάπερ, καθάπερ Ἰν. — 55. for οὐκ εἰσήκουσα, οὐκ εἰσήκουσα B C. — 56. for καθαρός, καθαρός B C. — 57. for ἀνθρώπων, ἀνθρώπων B C.
'Ιωάννης. 61 καὶ εἶπον πρὸς αὐτὴν ὅτι οὐδεὶς ἔστιν ἐν τῷ ΑΒCD συγγενεῖ. 62 καὶ ὁ καλεῖται τῷ οὐ νόμιμα τοῦτος. 63 έν- ἔως ὅτι πατρὶ αὐτοῦ 64 ὁ τί ἄν θελοί καλεῖσθαι ἀνυμα- αὐτοῦ. 65 καὶ αἰτήσας πινακίδιον ἔγραψε ἠλέγων έν τῷ ἐφεσίῳ τῆς Ιουδαίας διελαλεῖτο πάντα τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα, καὶ ἔθεντο πάντες οἱ ἀκούσαντες εἰς τὴν καρδίαν αὐτῶν, λέγουν τὸ ἄρα τὸ παιδὸν τούτον ἐστι; καὶ ἵνα κυρίον ἡν μετ' αὐτοῦ. 66 καὶ Ζαχαρίας ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ ἐπλήθη πνευμάτων ἀγίων καὶ προέφθεισεν λέγων. 67 Εὐλογητός κύριος ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, οὗ τὸ ζητεῖται καὶ ἐποίησεν ἐν Λαών τούτων καθὼς ἠλάττης διὰ στάρματος αὐτοῦ, ἦν ἡμεῖς κέρας σωτηρίας ἤμιν εἰς δανίδαν οὗτος αὐτοῦ, καὶ τῶν αἰώνων τῶν ἀνθρώπων αὐτοῦ, καὶ λατρεύει εἰς τό ἁ γάντιν ἐν τῷ τοιούτῳ ἐν Τιττάνῃ. 68 Τοῦτο παοῦ τοῦτο, εἰς γάντι αὐτοῦ, καὶ τῆς καθος ἡν αὐτὸν ζητεῖται καὶ ἠλάττης διὰ στάρματος αὐτοῦ, καὶ λατρεύει εἰς τό ἁ γάντιν ἐν Τιττάνῃ.
the mere notion of a refuge is never connected with the Messiah's Kingdom.
—70.] Meyer cites τοις αυτον ρήμασιν. Longin. 34. — 72.] παντείμων. . . . for the infinitive, see ver. 84.—73.] δρκων διρ., for δρκων, διρ., see Gen. xxii 16—18. — 74, 75.] The attempts to remove the Jewish worship by Antiochus Epiphanes and by the Romans, had been most calamitous to the people.—This ἐν δικ. κ. δικαιοσ. sufficiently refutes the idea of some, that the whole subject of this song is the temporal theocratic greatness of the Messiah. —77.] The remission of sin is the first opening for the γνώσις σωτηρίας: see ch. iii. 7. The preposition ἐπί has its literal meaning, ‘on.’—78.] άναπόληθος is (see reff.) the LXX rendering for τοις, a branch or shoot—and thus, 'that which springs up or rises,' as Light—which, from the clauses following, is the meaning here. —δέ Φυ. may be taken with ἐνεαρωτ., as in E.V.—or perhaps better with the verb ἐνεάρωται. — 79.] See Is. ix. 1. Matt. iv. 16. Care must be taken on the one hand not to degrade the expressions of this song of praise into mere anticipations of temporal prosperity, nor, on the other, to find in it (except in so far as they are involved in the inner and deeper sense of the words, unknown save to the Spirit who prompted them) the minute doctrinal distinctions of the writings of St. Paul. It is the expression of the aspirations and hopes of a pious Jew, waiting for the salvation of the Lord, finding that salvation brought near, and expressing his thankfulness in Old Testament language, with which he was familiar, and at the same time under prophetic influence of the Holy Spirit. That such a song should be inconsistent with dogmatic truth, is impossible: that it should unfold it minutely, is in the highest degree improbable. —80.] A very similar conclusion to that in ch. ii. 40, and denoting probably the termination of that record or document of the birth of the Baptist, which the Evangelist has hitherto been translating, or perhaps transcribing already translated.—That this first chapter is such a separate document, appears from its very distinct style. Whether it had its history preserved in the holy family, or how otherwise obtained by Luke, no trace now appears. It has a certain relation to, and at the same time is distinguished from, the narration of the next chapter. The Old
Testament spirit is stronger here, and the very phraseology more in unison with Hebrew usage. — τάς ἐπ. The ὄρεια of Judea was very near this wilderness, and from the character of John's official life afterwards, it is probable that in youth he would be given to solitude and abstemiousness. It cannot be supposed that the Essebous, dwelling in those parts, had any, or only the most general kind of influence over him, as their views were wholly different from his. — ἄνα. opening of his official life: see note on 1. 1.

CHAP. II. 1—20.] — 1, 2. We go back again now to the birth of John, or shortly after it. — In annotating on these verses, I will first state the difficulty in which they are involved, — then the only way in which it appears to me that a solution can be sought. — The prima facie view of these verses would be this — that a decree went forth, &c., and that this (kind of) enrolment first took place when Cyrenius (Quirinus) was governor of Syria. It would then appear, either that this very enrolment took place under Quirinus, — or that the first did so, and this was subsequent to it. Now both of these senses are inadmissible. For Quirinus was not governor of Syria till the year 788 B.C., after the banishment of Archelaus, and the addition of his territory to the province of Syria. τῆς δ᾽ Ἀρχέλαου ὑποτελοῦσας προσβιβάσιας τῇ Σύρῳ, πέμπεται Κυρήνης ὕπο Καίσαρος, ἀνή υπάτης, ἀποτυπώμενος τῷ Ἱν Ερυθρῷ, καὶ τῶν Ἀρχελαοῦ ἀποδομώνος οἰκου. Joseph. Antt. xvi. 18, 6. And the birth of our Lord occurred at least eight years before this, previous to Herod's death, and when Sentiun Saturninus was governor of Syria. The prima facie view of the text then cannot be the right one. — I believe we must seek our solution in the word πρῶτος. Had Luke intended to say, 'this ἀνομεί τοκετάτη, when Quirinus was governor of Syria' this word πρῶτος would not have been used. Why then has it been inserted? It is evident that on if the whole force of the sentence depends, and the reason why the memorandum has been placed here. I can only assign it to one of two possible meanings — (1) that the ἀνομα was not completed now, but eight years afterwards, when Quirinus was governor of Syria; thus laying the stress on ἵναι — (but not reading αὐτή, as has been proposed (Ebrard and others), which would be contrary to usage, and the sense contrary to fact — for the enrolling itself did clearly take place, or begin to take place, now); (2) that πρῶτος may, by a usage otherwise confined to John among the Evangelists, be used for 'before,' and thus the sense be, — this enrolment took place before (that better known one, when) Quirinus was governor of Syria (Perizon., Usher, Petavi., Storr, Tholuck, Huschke, Wieseler). — I own that neither of these solutions satisfies me: all I wish to assert is, that if we are to seek one, this word must be interpreted, as being the key to the sentence. — The only other resource is, to infer that we are not to seek a solution in the text, but suppose either that it is corrupt, or that the date assigned is incorrect. — Corruption of the text by interpolation of ver. 2 is not probable, and must not be assumed to help us out of a difficulty, when MSS. give no countenance to the supposition. As early as Tertullian (about 190 A.D.) the difficulty in this passage was recognized. "Sed et consensus constat actus sub Augusto nunc in Judea per Sentium Saturnum" Adv. Marc. iv. 533 (Gresw. Diss. i. 452). And omission of this verse in any citation (as e.g. in one by Gregory Naz., quoted by Valckner) is no evidence, on account of its parenthetical character. — The other alternative, that the date assigned is incorrect, is only tenable on the supposition that Luke confounded this earlier census with that under Quirinus; and this, considering the accuracy of this Evangelist, we should be very slow to concede. Moreover, it appears, from Acts v. 37, that Luke himself has related Gamaliel's reference to an event which happened in the taxing of Quirinus; and although that is without mark of date, yet it would be absurd to suppose that two public events, which happened in the memory of living men, could be thus confounded by one who was a diligent inquirer after historic truth. (It is remarkable however that Justin Martyr three times distinctly asserts that our Lord was born under Quirinus, and appeals to the register then made, as if from it the fact might, if necessary, be confirmed: pp. 76 d. 83 h. 303 d.) The supposition that the ἀνομα here spoken of is that of Quirinus,
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καὶ ἐπορεύοντο πάντες ἀπογράφθαι, ἐκαστὸς εἰς τὴν Πολίν. 4 ἀνεβὰ δὲ καὶ Ἰωσὴφ ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλλίας ἐκ τοῦ Ναζαρέτ εἰς τὴν Ιουδαίαν εἰς τὸν Δαυὶδ ἦς καλεῖται Βαβλώτην, διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν ἐξ οἴκου καὶ πατρίδος Δαυὶδ. 5 ἀπογράφασθαι σὺν Μαρίαν τῷ μεμνημένῳ καὶ συμμετὸν αὐτῷ [γυναικί], οὐσὶ ἐγκύων. 6 Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ εἰς αὐτὸν ἐκείνον ἐπλησθανεν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι ποὺ τεκεῖν αὐτῷ, ἐκτὸς τῶν νῦν αὐτῆς τῶν πρωτοτοκίων, καὶ ἑισπαργάσωσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀνεκλίνην αὐτὸν ἐν γάρ χρόνῳ δίοτι οὐκ ἦν αὐτοῖς τόπος ἐν τῷ καταλύματι. 7

Eus. ins. A.C.—εὐφρενὸν Β αἰσχ. τεκτριόνες εἰς Α τὶν αὐτοῦ παραδίδει διὰ τοῦ Πολίν Β Λ Βουβ. τεκτριόνες A.—4. γιὰ τὴν Ιουδαίαν, γίνεται ἢ ἦταν D. τυπ. B C.—5. did ... Δαυὶδ is placed after ἐγκύων in D.—ἀπογράφασθαι A.D. τυπ. B C.—γυναικεῖς om. Β Β L Συρικ. Κοπτ. Ηαβ. Εορας. ins. A.—6. γιὰ τοῦ παραγόμενον ἐκθέτεσθαι D.—7. rec. bef. φάντασι ins. τῇ om. ΑΒΔ Λ Just.—8. for Κυρίνου. P. Sulpicius Quirinus (not Qurínum, for Κυρίνος is the Greek form of Quirinus, Meyer Η. 232: see Suett. Θ. 49. Tacit. Ann. iii. 48) was consul in A. u. c. 742: see Winer, Realwörterbuch, ii. 547. —5—5.] There is a mixture here of Roman and Jewish customs, which is not at all improbable, considering the circumstances. In the Roman census, men, women, and children were all obliged to go and be enrolled. Dion. Hal. iv. 15, ἀπαντὰς ἰδίως ὁ Τόλλας τοῖς ὄμοσάγοις παρὰ κεφαλῆς ἐρωτήματο ἡ συνειδήματα ἡ περίτροπος τοῖς ἢ τοῖς ἀνέρας, ἢ τοῖς τοῖς καθ' ἀνήδους. But when this census was made at their dwelling-place, not at that of their extraction. The latter practice springs from the Jewish genealogical habits, and its adoption in this case speaks strongly for the accuracy of the chronology. If this enrolment was by order of Augustus, and for the whole empire, its course would be made so as to include all, after the Roman manner: but inasmuch as it was made under the Jewish king Herod, it was done after the Jewish manner, in taking this account of each at his own place of extraction.—Mary being herself sprung from the lineage of David (see ch. i. 32), might on this account go to Bethlehem, being, as some suppose, an inerritress; but this does not seem to be the Evangelist's meaning; but that, after the Roman manner, she accompanied her husband. —No stress must be laid on μητέρας, as if she were only the betrothed wife of Joseph at this time;—she had been taken to his house before this: the history in our text happening

and that Lake has committed a parachronism by placing it here, will only be resorted to by those who disbelieve this part of the Gospel history; insomuch as it would tend to invalidate the account following.

On the whole, I believe that an αὐτογραφη and enrolment of names, with a view to ascertain the population of the empire, was commanded and put in force at this time, unaccompanied by any payment of money. Mr. Greswell (vol. i. p. 511) cites a passage of Suidas—τὴν Ἀδριανοῦ Καλαρε, δέξαν αὐτῷ, πάντας τοὺς εἰσήγησας Ρωμαίοις ... κατὰ πρόσωπον ἄρματι, βουλτυκαν γυναικας πόσον οἱ πλήθος: and has made it probable that, notwithstanding a difficulty in the numbers, this was a census of the empire, and not of the city. We know (see Suett, Ann. i. 1. Sumt. Aug. 26. 101. Dio lii. 30. Iri. 33) that Augustus drew up a rationarium or breviumtium totius imperii, which took many years to arrange and complete, and of which the enrolment of the inhabitants of the provinces would naturally form a part. Of the data for this compilation, the enrolment in our text might be one—and its completion may not have taken place immediately (the death of Herod and irregularities of Archelaus hindering it), but after the removal of Archelaus, under Quirinus. —That Judea was not a Roman province at this time, is no objection to our text; for the breviumtium of Augustus contained the 'regna' of the Roman empire, as well as the 'provinciae.' —See Wieseler, Chronol. Synops. i. 73—122. In Dio Cassius, where we might expect to find information, this portion of the reign of Augustus is apparently defective.
during the time indicated by Matt. i. 25.—7.] On προστάτευον see Matt. i. 25. The use of the word by both the Evangelists is remarkable, and seems to confirm the view advocated in this commentary with regard to the brethren of the Lord: see on Matt. xiii. 55. Ancient tradition states the birthplace of the Lord to have been a cave: thus Justin Martyr, p. 303, ἵνα Ἱωσήφ ὄντος ἐγένετο εἰς τῷ σαλαμίνι τῆς Κύπρου οὐάταύσια, ἵνα ἡ Μαρία τῶν χριστῶν, καὶ ἐν φάντασμα ιωνίαν ἐκεῖνον ὡς ἐκδόθη. And Origen, against Celsus, i. p. 40: ἵνα τῆς ἐν τῷ ἔσπασμα τῆς γενεσίας τούτου ἡ πατρίδα τούτων, ἐν τῷ ἐπαθήσεις ἡ Μαρία τῶν χριστῶν, καὶ ἐν φάντασμα ιωνίαν ὡς ἐκδόθη. Similarly Eusebius, Athanasius, and others. This tradition is nowise inconsistent with our text—for caves are usual in most rocky countries as stables. —κατάλημα = πανόραμα, ch. x. 34. 'A public inn, or place of reception for travellers;' not 'a room in a private house,' for then the expression would be, They found no κατάλημα. Of what sort this inn was, does not appear. —8.] Mr. Greswel has made it highly probable (Disc. x. vol. i.) that the Lord was born on the evening of (i.e. which began) the 6th of April, 10th of the Jewish Nisan; on which same day of April, and the 14th of Nisan, he suffered thirty-three years after. Before this time there would be abundance of grass in the pastures—the spring rains being over; but much after it, and till after the annual equinox again, the pastures would be comparatively bare: see note on John vi. 10.—Διήμ. φωλικάς t. v.] either, 'keeping watch by night,' or, 'keeping the watches of the night.' From ref. (where however φωλικάς has the art.) the latter seems most probable. On these watches, see note at Matt. xiv. 25.—8.] ἑβδομάδα—the brightness of the Lord's presence—the Shechinah, which also accompanied His angels when they appeared to men: see ref. It is agreeable at least to the analogy of the Divine dealings, to suppose, with Olahhausen, that these shepherds, like Simeon, were waiting for the consolation of Israel.—10, 11.] παρέλθω πρὸς λ., not (B.V.) 'to all people,' here: but 'to all the people'—the Jewish people. To them was the first message of joy, before the bursting in of the Gentiles—just as here the one angel gives the prefatory announcement, before the multitude of the heavenly host burst in with their 'peace on earth,' and 'good will towards men.'—σωτήρ] a Saviour, as R.V., —the name being particularised afterwards. —χρ. σπ. This is the only place where these words come together. In ch. xxiii. 2 we have χρ. βασιλεία, and in Acts ii. 36 κόρον καὶ χρ. (In Col. iii. 24 we have, in a somewhat different meaning (said to servants), τῷ γὰρ κυρίῳ χριστῷ ουσίατε.) And I see no way of understanding this κόρον, but as corresponding to the Hebrew יְהוֹנָה.—13.] Olahhausen hazards a conjecture that the stable or cave may possibly have belonged to these shepherds. But I think the words ἔσας B., by-and-by, do not look as if B. were their home. It seems clear that the place was somehow known to them by the angel's description. —πρόθεσιν—not 'the child,' —the angel in giving the sign, generalizes the term—they were to know the truth of his words, by finding a child wrapped in swaddling clothes,
καὶ τὸ ἀγγέλω 1 πλὴθος 2 στρατιάς οὐρανίου, 3 αἰνόν- 4 τῶν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ λεγόντων 5 Δέξαι 6 εἰν υψίστως θεί, καὶ ἔπι γῆς εἰρήνην, ἐν ἀνθρώποις 7 εὐδοκία. 8 καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς ἀπλήθου ἀπ' αὐτῶν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν οἱ ἄγγελοι, καὶ οἱ αὐτῶν οἱ ποιμένες εἰσώνε τοῖς ἀλλήλοις 9 Δείηθημεν δὲ ἐως Βιθλείμ καὶ ἴδωμεν τὸ ρύμα τούτῳ τὸ γεγονός ὃ κύριος ἐγνώρισεν ἡμῖν. 10 καὶ ἠλθον σπευσαντε καὶ ἀνεφερον τὴν τε Μαριάμ καὶ τὸν Ἰωσήφ, καὶ τὸ βρέφος κείμενον ἐν τῇ φάτνῃ. 11 ἴδοντες δὲ ἐγνώρισαν περὶ τοῦ ρήματος τοῦ λαλήθεντος αὐτῶς περὶ τοῦ παιδιὸν τούτου. 12 καὶ πάντες οἱ ἀκούσαντες ἐθαυμασαν περὶ τῶν λαλήθεντων ὑπὸ τῶν ποιμένων πρὸς αὐτούς 13 ἡ δὲ Μαριάμ πάντα συνετήρει τὰ ρήματα ταῦτα συμβάλλουσα ἐν τῷ καρδίᾳ αὐτῆς. 14 καὶ ὑπε- στρεφαν οἱ ποιμένες, δοξάσαντες καὶ αἰνοῦντες τὸν θεὸν ἐπὶ πάσιν όις ἦκουσαν καὶ εἶδον καθὼς ἐλαλήθη πρὸς αὐτούς. 15 Ἐγνώρισαν περὶ τοῦ ρήματος τοῦ λαλήθεντος αὐτῶς περὶ τοῦ παιδιὸν τούτου. 16 καὶ πάντες οἱ ακούσαντες ἐθαυμασαν περὶ τῶν λαλήθεντων ὑπὸ τῶν ποιμένων πρὸς αὐτούς.
κλεθὼν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀγγέλου πρὸ τοῦ * συλληφθῆναι αὐτῶν ἐν ABD τῇ κοιλίᾳ.

καὶ οἱ ζητεῖτε ἐπλησθῆσαι αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ αὐτῶν κατὰ τὸν νόμον Μωισέως, ἀνήγαγον αὐτῶν εἰς ἐρεσίματα παραστήσασα τῷ κυρίῳ, καθὼς γέγορασσι εἰς νόμον κυρίου ὅτι πᾶν ἁρσὲν δανοῦν ὁ μίτραν ἁγίου τῷ κυρίῳ κληθῆσαι, καὶ τῷ δύων θυσίαν κατὰ τὸ ἐφορμέον ἐν νόμῳ κυρίου, ζεύγος τρυγώνων ἡ δύο * νεοσσός περιστερῶν.

καὶ ἕνος ἔν τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐν ἐρεσίματος ὁ ὄνομα Συμεὼν, καὶ ὁ ἀνθρώπος οὗτος δίκαιος καὶ εὐλαβὴς, προσεχθὸν ὁ παράκλητος τοῦ Ἰσραήλ. καὶ πνεῦμα * σὺν αὐτῷ ἐν ἐν πνευματί συμμαχημένον ὑπὸ τοῦ πνευματός τοῦ ἁγίου μη ἱδεῖν καὶ θανάτον πριν ἴδῃ τὸν χριστόν κυρίου. καὶ ἠλθεν ἐν τῷ πνεύματι εἰς τῷ ἵερον, καὶ ἐν τῷ εἰσαγαγόν τοὺς γονεῖς τῷ παιδίῳ Ἰησοῦ, τοῦ ποιήσας αὐτοὺς κατὰ τὸ ἐδισμένον τοῦ


ness and bodily immirmity, from which legal uncleannesses arose. The body which He took on Him, though not a body of sin, was mortal, subject to the consequence of sin,—in the likeness of sinful flesh: but incorruptible by the indwelling of the Godhead (1 Pet. iii. 18). In the fulfilment therefore of His great work of redemption He became subject to legal rites and purifications—so as to have been absolutely necessary for Him, but were included in those things which were πρόκοπα for Him in His humiliation and 'making perfect:' and in His lifting up of that human nature, for which all these things were absolutely necessary, into the Godhead. (Gen. xvii. 14).

22 — 38] 22. See Levit. xii. 1—8, where however the child is not, as here, expressly included in the purification. (It is hardly possible that Joseph should be implied in the αὐτῶν, as Euthym., Meyer, interpret it.) The reading αὐτῶν is remarkable, and hardly likely to have been a correction. αὐτής, adopted by the E. V., is unlikely, without authority, being only found in the Complutian edition; and a manifest correction. — Bengel denies that either the Lord or His mother wanted purification; and mentions that some render αὐτῶν 'of the Jews,' but does not approve of it (compare however John ii. 6). See the last note, on the necessity of purification for both. — 23.] God had taken the tribe of Levi instead of the first-born that opened the womb, Num. iii. 12; but notwithstanding, required that such should be redeemed (Num. xvii. 16) with five shekels of the sanctuary. — 24.] The offering (see ref.) was a lamb for a burnt-offering, and a pigeon for a sin-offering: but if the parties were too poor to bring a lamb, then two pigeons. — 25.] It appears that this Symeon might have been Symeon the son of Hillel,—and father of Gamaliel, mentioned in Acts v. But we have no means of ascertaining this. It is no objection to it that he is here merely ἄνθρωπος: Gamaliel himself is only φαρσαλικὸς in Acts v. 34. — ψαράκι.] see Acts xxviii. 20. It was a common form of adjuration among the Jews, 'Its vident conclusionem, si...referring to Is. xi. 1. — On the general expectation of deliverance at this time, see on Matt. ii. 1. — 26.] Of
the nature of this interruption, nothing is said. Symeon was the subject of an especial indwelling and leading of the Holy Ghost, analogous to that higher form of the spiritual life expressed in the earliest days by walking with God—and according to which God's saints have often been directed and informed in an extraordinary manner by His Holy Spirit. —32.] ἀνοίξειν, not τοῦ ζην, or ἐν τῆς γῇς—but as being τοῦ δουλοῦ σου—He thinks of his death as the termination of, and so dismissal from, his service. Meyer.—33.] see Isa. xlix. 6.—34.] The true reading is probably ἐν παρῃ ἀντίον ζην ἑ. μ., which for doctrinal reasons has been changed to the present one. In verse 48 we have Joseph called by this name. Our Lord Himself would not speak of him thus, see ver. 49; but in the narrative we may read oi γονιῶν ἀντίον and such expressions, without any danger of forgetting the momentous history of the Conception and Nativity.—34, 35.] σκέπασθαι, 'is appointed for'—see Phil. i. 17, 1 Thess. iii. 3; not (Meyer) 'lies here, in

my arms.'—πτωτῶν, as a stone of stumbling and rock of offence (Isa. viii. 14. Rom. ix. 33), at which they should fall through unbelief.—ἐναντίον, 'raising up'—in the sense of ver. 52 of ch. i.—by faith and holiness;—or, the πτωτῶν and ἀντίον may refer to the same persons—as it is said by the Lord, 'He that humbleth himself shall be exalted.' I prefer this last interpretation, as cohering best with the next verse: see note on ii. 35.] This prophecy I do not believe to have its chief reference to the deep sorrows of the mother of our Lord on beholding His sufferings (Euthym. al.), much less to her future death by martyrdom (Epiph., Lightf.); for they stand in a totally different connexion. The prophecy is, of the struggle of many in Israel through repentance to faith in this Saviour—among which number even His mother herself was to be included. The sharp pangs of sorrow for sin must pierce her heart also; and the end follows—that the reasonings out of many hearts may be revealed—that they who receive the Lord
Jesus may be manifest, and they who reject Him: see John ix. 39. —37.] νηστικ. καὶ δέντρον. Not merely in the ordinary hours of prayer, at nine and three, or the ordinary fasts on Monday and Thursday, but in an ascetic—devotional method of life. —νίκτα is put first, because fasting were reckoned from one evening to another. Meyer. Is it not rather because the greater solemnity and emphasis rests on the religious exercise by which the faith is a little exercised? —37.] It was very possible at the hour of prayer,—as she spoke of Him to numbers, who would at such a time be flocking to the temple.

39, 40.] —39. Certainly the obvious inference from this verse is, that Joseph and Mary returned from Jerusalem to Nazareth direct. But it is only an inference, and not the assertion of the text. This part of the Gospel History is one where the Harmonists, by their arbitrary reconciliations of the two accounts, have given great advantage to the enemies of the faith. As the two accounts now stand, it is wholly impossible to suggest any satisfactory method of uniting them: every one who has attempted it has, in some part or other of his hypothesis, violated probability and common sense. But, on the other hand, it is equally impossible definitely to say that they could not be reconciled, by a thorough knowledge of the facts them-
Women, according to the maxims of the school of Hillel, were bound to go up once in the year—to the Passover. — τῇ ἑορτῇ 'at,' or 'in the feast;' not 'to the feast,' nor 'on account of the feast.'—[42.] At the age of twelve, a boy was called by the Jews γιος, 'son of the law,' and first incurred legal obligation. At that time, then, commences the second step (see note on ver. 52) of the life of the Lord—the time when the τὰ πρᾶγματα for Him begun—His course of blameless legal obedience (see note on ver. 21)—in His own person and by His own will. Now first (ver. 49) appear those higher consciousnesses to have found expression, which unfolded within Him, the full time of His public ministry arrived.—[43.] τὰς ἡμέρας, seven days, Exod. xii. 15. 17. —[44.] συνὸς, the company forming the caravan, or band of travellers—all who came from the same district travelling together for security and company.— ἡλικίας. . . . ἀνεξάρτητα. The interpretation that they went a day's journey, seeking Him, 'is simply absurd: for they would have turned back sooner—a few minutes might have sufficed for the search. It was not till they laid up for the night that they missed Him, as at that time (φίλος ἠπέβαινε καίδα) they would naturally expect His return to their own tent. Olshausen remarks, that being accustomed to His thoughtfulness and obedience, they were free from anxiety, till they discovered He really was not in the company.—[45.] γυναῖκας τότε as they went back, all the way.—[46.] Some (Grot., Kuin.) interpret the three days of their one day's journey out, one back, and one in Jerusalem: but they were more likely three days spent in search in Jerusalem (De Wette); or, at all events, reckoned from their discovery of His not being with them (Meyer).—ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ. In one of the rooms attached to the temple, where the Rabbis taught their schools. A tradition mentioned by Lightfoot, that till the death of Gamaliel the scholars stood in these schools, appears to be false, as Kuinoel has shown.—No stress must be laid on ἐν μέσῳ—it is only 'among.' Nor must it be supposed from ἐπεφορτ., that the Lord was acting the part of a master. It was the custom in the Jewish schools for the scholars to ask questions of their teachers; and a great part of the Rabbinical books consists of the answers of the Rabbins to such questions.—[48.—50.] The salient point of this narrative appears to lie in
II. 51, 52.
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d πατρίς σου contracted with του πατρός μου. This was the first time that those wonderful words of self-consciousness had been heard from the Holy Child—when He began to be a ‘son of the law.’ He first calls Him His Father, Who gave Him the work to do on earth, of perfectly keeping that Law.—Every word of these verses is of the first importance to modern combatents for sound doctrine. Let the adversaries answer us,—why should His mother here have spoken and not Joseph, if he were really but I will not finish the sentence. Again, let the mythical school of Strauss give us a reason, why an incident altogether (in their view) so derogating to the character of the subject of it, should have been inserted, if the myths arose out of an exaggerated estimate of the dignity of that character?—δ πατρ. σου] Then up to this time Joseph had been so called by the Holy Child Himself—but from this time, never. Such words are not chance—had Mary said εκεΐς, the strong contrast with what follows could not have been brought out.—της του θου.] This is no reproachful question. It is asked in all the simplicity and boldness of holy childhood . . . did ye not know? . . . it appeared as if that conviction, the expression of which now first breaks forth from Him, must have been a matter known to them before. —&ai this is that διο so often used by the Lord of His appointed and undertaken course. Analogous to this first utterance of His conviction, is the dawn, amongst ourselves, of the principle of duty in the youthful and well trained spirit about this same age,—this ‘caring time’ of human progress: see below on ver. 52. —&v ροις του ω.] primarily, 'in the house of My Father;' but we must not exclude the wider sense, which embraces all places and employments of My Father’s. The best rendering would perhaps be,—among My Father’s matters. The employment in which He was found, learning the word of God, would naturally be one of these. —adv. τω ουν.] Both Joseph and His mother knew in some sense, Who He was: but were not prepared to hear so direct an appeal to God as His Father: understood not the deeper sense of these wonderful words. Still (ver. 57) they appear to have awaked in the mind of His mother a remembrance of ἀληθινοτητα εις θου, ch. i. 35. And probably, as Steri remarks (I. 6), the unfolding of His childhood had been so gradual and natural, that even they had not been forcibly reminded by any strong individual notes, of That which He was, and which now showed itself.—It is a remarkable instance of the blindness of the rationalistic commentators to the richness and depth of Scripture narrative, that Mayer holds this ροις περιεχως to be altogether inconceivable as coming after the angelic announcement to Mary. Can he suppose that the περιεχως that announcement itself?—De Wette has given the right interpretation, ‘&r verthunben nicht βεν τιτηρη θιν,’ and refers to ch. xviii. 34: so also Olsch., Ebrard.—&ai.] The high consciousness which had manifested itself in ver. 56 did not interfere with His self-humiliation, nor render Him independent of His parents. This voluntary subjection probably showed itself in working at His reputed father’s trade: see Mark vi. 2 and note. From this time we have no more mention of Joseph;—the next we hear is of His mother and brethren (John ii. 13): whence it is inferred that, between this time and the commencement of our Lord’s public life, Joseph died. —και η μητρ.] These words tend to confirm the common belief that these opening chapters, or at least this narrative, may have been derived from the testimony of the mother of the Lord herself. She kept them, as in wonderful coincidence with the remarkable circumstances of His birth, and its announcement, and His presentation in the temple, and the offerings of the Magi; but in what way, or by what one great revelation all these things were to be gathered in one, did not yet appear, but was manifested to her afterwards, Acts i. 14: see note there. —&ai.] άλικ., probably not only ‘stature,’ but
'age,' which comprehends the other: so that σοφ. α. άλ. would be 'wisdom, as well as age.'—During these eighteen mysterious years we may, by the light of what is here revealed, view the Holy Child advancing onward to that fulness of wisdom and Divine approval which was indicated at His Baptism, by ιν ψ ψυκήσας. We are apt to forget, that it was during this time that much of the great work of the second Adam was done. The growing up through infancy, childhood, youth, manhood, from grace to grace, holiness to holiness, in subjection, self-denial, and love, without one polluting touch of sin,—this it was which, consummated by the three years of active ministry, by the Passion, and by the Cross, constituted "the obedience of one man," by which many were made righteous. We must fully appreciate the words of this verse, in order to think rightly of Christ. He had emptied Himself of His glory: His infancy and childhood were no mere pretence, but the Divine Personality was in Him carried through these states of weakness and experience, and gathered round itself the ordinary ascensions and experiences of the sons of men. All the time, the consciousness of His mission on earth was ripening—'the things heard of the Father' (John xv. 15) were continually imparted to Him; the Spirit, which was not given by measure to Him, was abiding more and more upon Him; till the day when He was fully ripe for His official manifestation,—that He might be offered to His own, to receive or reject Him,—and then the Spirit led Him up to commence His conflict with the enemy. As yet, He was in favour with man also—the world had not yet begun to hate Him; but we cannot tell how soon this feeling towards Him was changed, for He alleges (John vii. 7), "Me the world hateth, because I testify of that its deeds are evil;" and we can hardly conceive such testimony, in the years of gathering vigour and zeal, long witheld. The incident of ch. iv. 28, 29 can scarcely have arisen only from the anger of the moment.

III. 1—28.] Matt. iii. 1—17. Mark i. 4—11.—[These dates are consistent with the Δερμίδες πατροκλουθείν which Luke predicates of himself, ch. i. 3. In Matt. iii. 1 we have the same events indicated as to time by only ιν τοὺς ἡμ. ἱεραρχίας.—The fifteenth year of the sole principate of Tiberius begun Aug. 19, u.c. 781, and reckoning backwards thirty years from that time (see ver. 23), we should have the birth of our Lord in u.c. 751 or about then—for οὐκ ἔγινε, will admit of some latitude. But Herod the Great died in the beginning of the year 750, and our Lord's birth must be fixed some months at least before the death of Herod. If then it be placed in 749, He would have been at least thirty-two at the time of His baptism, seeing that it took place some time after the beginning of John's ministry. This difficulty has led to the supposition that this fifteenth year is not to be dated from the sole but from the associated principate of Tiberius, which commenced most probably at the end of u.c. 764. According to this, the fifteenth of Tiberius will begin at the end of u.c. 779—and our Lord's birth would be u.c. 749 or 50: which will agree with the death of Herod. This latter explanation has usually been adopted. Our present era was fixed by Dionysius Exiguus, in the sixth century, and places the birth of our Lord in 754 u.c. It may be doubted, however, whether in all these reckonings more accuracy has not been sought than the Gospel narrative warrants any expectation of our finding. The οὐκ ἔγινε τπ. is a wide expression, and might cover any age from thirty (see note there) to thirty-two or thirty-three.—See note on Matt. ii. 2, where it appears probable from astronomical considerations, that our Lord was born as early as u.c. 747. Mr. Greswell has devoted several Dissertations to this inquiry;—see his vol. i. p. 189 ff.—ἲγουρ. Π. Πλα] Pilate was only Procurator of Judaea—the words cognate to ἵγουρον being used promiscuously of the leading officers of the Roman government. Pontius Pilate was the sixth procurator from the deposition of Archelaus, and came to Judæa about u.c. 779. He held the province ten years, and was sent to Rome to answer for his conduct by Vitellius, prefect of Syria, u.c. 789, the year of the death of Tiberius.—Ἡρώδου] See note on Matt. xiv. 1. Herod Antipas became tetrarch of Galilee after the death of his father Herod, u.c. 750, and continued till he was deposed in Y 2.
III.

792.—Φιλίππης, Son of Herod the Great by Cleopatra, a woman of Jerusalem, Joseph. Antt. xvii. 1, 3. He was brought up at Rome, and after his father's death in u.c. 750 was made tetrarch of Bataneis, Gaulonitis, Trachonitis, Panias, Auranitis, (Bataneis + Auranitis = Iturea)—and continued till his death in u.c. 786 or 787. He built Cesarea Philippi. He was by far the best of Herod's sons, and ruled his portion mildly and well. He must not be confounded with his half-brother Philip, whose wife Herodias Herod Antipas seduced. This latter was disinherited by his father, and lived in privacy. See note on Matt. xiv. 1.—ΑυΚαταίκητος. Αβίδιλος. [This] Lysanias was the district round Abila, a town eighteen miles north of Damascus, now, according to Pococke, Nebi Abel. It must not be confounded with Abila in Decapolis. Josephus, Antt. xix. 5, 1, mentions it as among the districts which Claudius gave to king Agrippa I. under the name of Λυσανίου, and in B. J. ii. 11, 6, as Ιεροσολυμία Λυσανίου καλουμένη. In Antt. xx. 7, 1, he has Αβίδιλος Λυσανίου διὰ αὐτῆς ἐγγόνης τουτερφαία. This Lysanias however was son of Ptolemy, the son of Minneus (B. J. i. 13, 1), and was killed by Antony, at Cleopatra's instigation (u.c. 34). The Lysanias here mentioned may be some descendant of the other, since we find him here only ruling Abila, whereas the other is called by Dio (xlix. 32), king of Iturea. Now at his death we learn that the oikos τοῦ Λυσανίου was farmed by one Zenodorus (Antt. xv. 10, 1), whom (ib. § 3) Augustus deprived of his τήραεξ, and at his death, which immediately followed, gave the principal of his districts, Trachonitis, Auranitis (Antt. xvii. 11, 4), &c., to Herod, n.c. 23. Among these Abilene is not mentioned,—and it therefore is possible that it may have been granted to a descendant of the former possessor. The silence of Josephus is no reason against this supposition, as he does not minutely relate the fortunes of districts which do not lie in the path of his history. The appellation of Λυσανίου in the name of Claudius, after this appellation has disappeared so long, looks as if there had been another Λυσανίας between. See Wieseler i. 175 ff. Meyer Comm. in loc. —2.] Ananias (as Ananus, Joseph. Antt. xviii. 2, 2) the high-priest, was deposed by Valerius Gratus (u.c. 779), and after several changes, Joseph or Caiaphas (Joseph. as above), his son-in-law (John xviii. 13), was made high-priest. It would appear from this verse that Annas, as high-priest, and possibly retaining in the view of the Jews the legitimate high-priesthood, was counted still as having the office; he certainly (John xviii. 13) exercised the power—and had influence enough to procure the actual high-priesthood for five of his sons, after his own deposition, Jos. Antt. xx. 9, 1.—A substitute, or deputy to the high-priest, appears to have been
σάρξ τὸν ἑσπερίδου τοῦ θεοῦ. Ἑνδεχόμενος ἔξοχος ἐκτός τοῦ ἱνάματος ἑκάτων, τοὺς ὑπερεξεῖς ψυχές ἀπὸ τῆς μελλοῦσας ὀργῆς; 5 μονοπόλεμος ὑπὸ καρποὺς ἀξίους τῆς μετανοιασίας καὶ μὴ ἀφάντητον λέγειν εἴναι αὐτοῦ Πατέρα ἐξομοίως τοῦ Ἀβραάμ. 9 ἡ ἐγείρει τῆς τῆς ἁμαρτίας καὶ οὐ πάνω ἄνθρωπος ἀνθρώπου ἐκκοσμεῖται καὶ εἰς τοῦ πυρὸς βάλλεται. 10 καὶ τοπιθέσεις ἐν γὰρ κατά τοῦ τῶν ἀκρίτων κοιτάζει σαρκίζει καὶ εἰς ἀνθρώπους αὐτοὺς Μηθέων πλέον παρὰ τὸ διαταγμένον. 14 ἐπηρῴων ἐν αὐτῶ καὶ στρατεύοντες λέγοντες Καὶ ἀρκεῖ τοις σοφοῖς. 15 καὶ εἰπάντως ἱστομένως λέγειν ἐκείνης τοῦ ἱεροῦ ὡς ἔχουσιν ὡς ἔγνως δύο χίτωνας ἐπηρεάζεται καὶ οὐκ ἔχει καὶ σκωφαντήρισθε, καὶ ἀρκεῖσθαι τοῖς ὡς ὡς ἔχουσιν. 16 ἐπηρεάζεται καὶ στρατεύοντες λέγοντες Καὶ ἀρκεῖ τοις σοφοῖς. 17 καὶ εἰπάντως ἱστομένως λέγειν ἐκείνης τοῦ ἱεροῦ ὡς ἔχουσιν. 18 καὶ εἰπάντως ἱστομένως λέγειν ἐκείνης τοῦ ἱεροῦ ὡς ἔχουσιν.
Jesus was about thirty years old when He began His ministry; not, 'began to be about,' &c., which is ungrammatical. ἀρχόμενος τῆς εἰς τὸν λαόν ἀναδίκτυος αὐτοῦ, ἤτοι τῆς διδασκαλίας. Euthym., so also Orig. Bengel, Kuin. De Wette, Meyer, Wieseler; see also Acts i. 1.—This ἐστι τρ. admits of considerable latitude, but only in one direction—viz. over thirty years. He could not well be under, seeing that this was the appointed age for the commencement of public service of God by the Levites; see Num. iv. 3. 23. 43. 47. —If no other proof were in existence of the total independence of the present Gospels of Matthew and Luke, their genealogies would furnish what I conceive to be an undeniable one. Is it possible that either of these Evangelists could have set down his genealogy, with that of the other before him? Would no remark have been made on their many and (on such a supposition) unaccountable variations? It is quite beside the purpose of the present commentary to attempt to reconcile the two. It has never yet been accomplished; and every endeavour to do it has violated either ingenuousness or common sense. I shall, as in similar cases, only indicate the landmarks which may serve to guide us to all that it is possible for us to discover concerning them. (1) The two genealogies are both the line of Joseph, and not of Mary. Whether Mary were an heiress or not, Luke's words here preclude the idea of the genealogy being her's; for the descent of the Lord is transferred putatively to Joseph by the ἐστι μαθητῆς, before the genealogy begins; and it would be unnatural to suppose that the reckoning, which began with the real mother, would, after such transference, pass back through her to her father again, as it must do, if the genealogy be her's. The attempts of many, and recently of Wieseler, to make it appear that the genealogy is that of Mary, reading νικός (ὡς ἱνομ. τοῦ Ἰωσήφ) τοῦ Ἡλί, the son (as supposed, of Joseph, but in reality) of Eli, &c., are, as Meyer (Comm. in loc.) has shown, quite unsuccessful; see Dr. Mill's Vindication of the Genealogies. p. 160
reconcile them. It may suffice us that they are inserted in the Gospels as authentic documents, and both of them merely to clear the Davidical descent of the putative father of the Lord. His own real Davidical descent does not depend on either of them, but on ch. i. 32. 35, and is solely derived through His mother. See much interesting investigation of the various solutions and traditions, in Dr. Mill's tract referred to above. — 27.] τ. Σαλαθ. τ. Νηρί: in Matt. i. 12, Ιουνιας ἵμνων τ. Σαλαθ. — 31.] Ναθαν: see 2 Sam. v. 14. 1 Chron. iii. 5. Zech. xii. 12. — 33.] Καὶ δὲ τοῦτο. This name does not exist in our present Hebrew text, but in the LXX. Gen. xi. 12, 15, and furnishes a curious instance of one of two things: either (1) the corruption of our present Hebrew text in these chronological passages; or (2) the incorrectness of the LXX, and notwithstanding that, the high reputation which it had obtained in so short a time. Lightfoot holding the latter alternative: but I own I think the former more probable. — 28.] τ. ματθαίον τοῦ Αμώς om. αὐτ.—for ἵσταται, διδόμεθα ἔνωσις ἐν τῷ πνεύματι * ἢ τάσις.
to us in Scripture as the prince, or god, of this world,—by the Lord Himself, John xii. 31. xiv. 30. xvi. 11:—by Paul, 2 Cor. iv. 4 (Eph. vi. 12). On the signification of this temptation, see notes on Matt. —8.] The reading which omits ἐν ἐμ. μ. ἑ. is much the most probable. With these words, Luke commonly have left the record as it stands: being the first direct recognition by the Lord of His foe, after which, and in obedience to which command, he departs from Him. —10.] τοῦ διαβ. σω is wanting in Matt. The LXX adds in πάσας ταῖς ὅδεις σου.
13.] ἐπρ. καλ. see on Matt. v. 11, and note on ch. xxii. 43.

14—33.] Peculiar (probably) to Luke.

—14.] ἐν τῇ β. τ. πν., ‘under the power of that full anointing of the Spirit’ for His holy office, which He had received at His baptism—and also implying that this power was used by Him in doing mighty works.

—Here the chronological order of Luke’s history begins to be confused, and the first evident marks occur of indefiniteness in arrangement, which I believe characterizes this Gospel. And in observing this, I would once for all premise, (1) that I have no bias for finding such chronological inaccuracy, and have never done so where any fair and honest means will solve the difficulty; (2) that where internal evidence appears to me to decide this to be the case, I have taken the only way open to a commentator who would act uprightly by the Scriptures, and fairly acknowledged and met the difficulty; (3) that so far from considering the testimony of the Evangelists to be weakened by such inaccuracies, I am convinced that it becomes only so much the stronger (see Prolegomena to the Gospels).

These remarks have been occasioned by the relation of this account v. 14—30 to the Gospels of Matthew and John. Our verses 14 and 15 embrace the narrative of Matthew in ch. iv. 12—25. But after that comes an event which belongs to a later period of our Lord’s ministry. A fair comparison of our vv. 16—24 with Matt. xiii. 53—58, Mark vi. 1—6, entered on without bias, and conducted solely from the narratives themselves, surely can hardly fail to convince us of their identity. (1) That two such visits should have happened, is of itself not impossible—though (with the sole exception of Jerusalem for obvious reasons) the Lord did not ordinarily revisit the places where He had been rejected as in our vv. 28, 29. (2) That He should have been thus treated at His first visit, and then marvelled at their unbelief on his second, is utterly impossible. (3) That the same question should have been asked on both occasions, and answered by the Lord with the same proverbal expression, is in the highest degree improbable. (4) Besides, this narrative itself bears internal marks of belonging to a later period. The ἡκατ. γεν. ἐν τῇ Καπ. must refer to more than one miracle done there—indeed the whole form of the sentence points to the plain fact, that the Lord had been residing long in Capernaum. Compare too its introduction here without any notification, with its description as τῶν τῆς Γαλ. in ver. 31, and the separateness of the two pieces will be apparent: see further remarks in the notes below.

—Here however is omitted an important cycle of the Lord’s sayings and doings, both in Galilee and in Jerusalem; viz. that contained in John i. 29—iv. 54 included. This will be shown by comparing Matt. iv. 12, where it is stated that the Lord’s return to Galilee was after the casting of John into prison; with John iii. 24, where, on occasion of the Lord and the disciples baptizing in Judea, it is said John was not yet cast into prison: see note on Matt. iv. 12. —[οβατ] The report, namely, of His miracles in Capernaum, brought in τῇ δεκ. τ. πν., and possibly of what He had done and taught at Jerusalem at the feast.— 15.] Olhausen well remarks (Bibl. Comm. i. 190), that this verse, containing a general undefined notice of the Lord’s synagogue-teaching, quite takes from what follows any chronological character. Indeed we find throughout the early part of this Gospel the same fragmentary stamp. Compare ἐν τοῖς σαββάσιν, ver. 31—ἐν τῷ Τιττάνθῳ, ch. v. 1—ἐν τῷ Κησαρείαν αὐτῷ, ἐν μιᾷ τ. παλ., ch. v. 12—ἐν μιᾷ τ. ημερῶν, ch. v. 17. —ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ σαβ., ch. vi. 6—ἐν τοῖς ἄν. ταύτ., ch. vi. 12, &c. &c.—18.] ὥστε τοῦ τεθραμμένου = ἐν τῇ παραλίᾳ σου, ver. 23: see John iv. 44 and note.—κατα τό δὲ εἰσήκει to the whole of what He did—it is not merely that He had been in the habit
of attending the synagogues, but of teaching in them: see ver. 16. It was apparently the first time He had ever so taught in the synagogue at Nazareth.—ἀναγγ. The rising up was probably to show His wish to explain the Scripture; for so ἀναγγ. imports. Ezra is called an ἀναγγελτὴς τοῦ θεοῦ νόμον, Joseph. Antt. xi. 5, 1. The ordinary way was, for the ruler of the synagogue to call upon persons of any learning or note to read and explain. That the demand of the Lord was so readily complied with, is sufficiently accounted for by vv. 14, 15. See Acts xiii. 15, also Neh. viii. 5.—17.] It is doubtful whether the Rabbinical cycle of Sabbath readings, or lessons from the law and prophets, were yet in use; but some regular plan was adopted; and according to that plan, after the reading of the law, which always preceded, the portion from the prophets came to be read (see Acts xiii. 15), which, for that sabbath, fell in the prophet Isaiah. The roll containing that book (probably, that alone) was given to the Lord. But it does not appear that He read any part of the lesson for the day; but when He had unrolled the scroll, 'found' (the fortuitous, i. e. providential, finding is the most likely interpretation, not the searching for and finding) the passage which follows.—No inference can be drawn as to the time of the year from this narrative: partly on account of the uncertainty above mentioned, and partly because it is not clear whether the roll contained only Isaiah, or other books also.—18—20.] The quotation agrees mainly with the LXX:—the words ἀναγγέλει τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν ἀνάγγελῳ are inserted from the LXX of Is. lvi. 6. The meaning of this prophetic citation may be better seen, when we remember that it stands in the middle of the third great division of the book of Isaiah, that viz. which comprises the prophecies of the Person, office, sufferings, triumph, and Church of the Messiah (see ch. xlix.—lxvi.).—and thus by implication announces the fulfilment of all that went before, in Him who then addressed them. —ἐναντίον κ. see Is. xi. 2. xii. 1. —οὐ ἐν τ. because, = ἐν τ. see Is. xlvii. 1, and compare Matt. v. 3. ἀληθ. τῷ ἐν ἡμερίᾳ τῆς κυρίας. Thus rendered by the LXX, γεύσασθαι τῷ κόσμῳ, signify, 'to those who are bound, the opening of prison:' so that we have here the LXX and literal rendering both included, and the latter expressed in the LXX words of ch. lvi. 6.—ἐναντίον κυρίας. see Levit. xxv. 8—17, where in ver. 10 we find that liberty was proclaimed to all in the land in the year of jubilee. —κυρίας = καλισθαὶ LXX. —No countenance is given by this expression to the extraordinary inference from it of some of the Fathers (Clement of Alex., Origen), that the Lord's public ministry lasted only a year, and something over.
Compare John ii. 13. vi. 4. xiii. 1. — 20.] ἤκαστον. It was the custom in the synagogues to stand while reading the law, and sit down to explain it. The Lord on other occasions taught sitting, e. g. Matt. v. I. Mark iv. 1. xiii. 3. — The ἡεράπτως was the γυν, whose duty it was to keep the sacred books. — 21.] ἡφ. 8. λ. — implying that the following words are merely the substance of a more expanded discourse, which the Lord uttered to that effect: see another occasion in Matt. xii. 4, 5, where the same truth was declared by a series of gracious acts of mercy. — η γρ. κ. κ. λ. not 'this scripture which you have heard' — as the Syriac (cited by Dr. Burton); which would be η γρ. αὕρῃ η ἐν τ. χ. and even then an unusual form of construction: — but, is fulfilled in your hearing, by My proclaiming it, and My course of ministry. — 22.] εἰμιρρατ. ἀν., 'bore witness that it was so.' The λέγω τ. χ. must be the discourse of which ver. 21 is a compendium. — ἐξευ.] i. e. παντες, not τινες. While acknowledging the truth of what He said, and the power with which He said it, they wondered, and were jealous at Him as being the son of Joseph — saying πωδαν τοις ραντρα; see Mark vi. 2. — Between this verse and the next, the ισανδρακενος λαβετην λαβετην is implied, for that is in a tone of reproof. — 23.] θερ. σ. — not, 'raise thyself from thy obscure station,' but, 'exert thy powers of healing in thine own country,' as presently interpreted; the Physician being represented as an inhabitant of Naza-
21—33.

ΚΑΤΑ ΛΟΥΚΑΝ.
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καὶ πρὸς οὐδεμίαν αὐτῶν ἐπίμψαρ οὐλίῳ, εἰ μὴ εἰς
* Σάρπητα τῆς Ἡλίας, ἵνα οὕτως ἐπιησάσθη ἡ εἴσοδος τοῦ Λοουκαν, εἰ μὴ εἰς
* Ἐλλησαύου τοῦ προφήτου [ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ]. καὶ οὐδείς αὐτῶν ἐκαθαρίσθη, εἰ μὴ Νεμώ
* άγιος. 27 καὶ ἐπιλάθησαν πάντες θυμόν εἰς τῇ συναπ
γωγῇ ἀκονύντες τάντα, καὶ ἀναστάντες ἐξεβάλον
* αὐτὸν ἐξ ἡς πόλεως, καὶ ἤγαγον αὐτὸν ἐὼς [τῇς]
* ὕψος τού ὄρους ἐφ' ὑπ' ἡ πόλις αὐτῶν ψιχοίμην,
* εἰς τὸ **κατακρημνίσαι αὐτὸν. 30 αὐτός δὲ διελθὼν διὰ
* μέσον αὐτῶν ἐπορεύτω, καὶ καταλῆκεν εἰς Καπερναοῦν
* πόλιν τῆς Γαλατίας καὶ ἦν διδάσκων αὐτοῦς ἐν τοῖς
* σάββασι. 31 καὶ ἐκπλήσσοντο εἰπ' τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ, δὲν
* ἐν εξονάι ἦν ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ. 32 καὶ ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ ἦν


xii. 6. 14. Lightfoot (ii. 132) produces more instances from the Rabbinical writers.

—26.] Sarepta, now Sthefa, see Robinson, iii. 413,—a large village, inland, halfway between Tyre and Sidon,—the ancient city seems to have been on the coast. —27.] Stier remarks that these two examples have a close parallelism with those of the Syro-

Phenician woman (Mark vii. 24) and the ruler's son at Capernaum (John iv. 46). —

28—30.] The same sort of rage possessed the Jews (Acts xxii. 22), on a similar truth being announced to them. This whole occurrence, whenever it happened in the Lord's ministry, was but a foreshadowing of His treatment afterwards from the whole nation of the Jews—a foretaste of οἷς τῇ τίνι ἡ ἡλία, καὶ οἱ οἵς αὐτῶν οῖς παραλαβόν (John i. 11). And it is remarkable that the expression of St. Paul, Rom. xi. 25, πᾶρωσις ἐπ' ὑπ' ἡμῶν τῷ Ἰσραήλ γίγνομεν, corresponds with the judicial infliction on these Nazarenes, by means of which the Lord passed out from among them.—The modern Nazareth is at a distance of about two English miles from what is called the Mount of Precipitation; nor is it built literally on the brow of that mount or hill. But (1) neither does the narrative preclude a considerable distance having been traversed, during which they had the Lord in their custody, and were hurrying with Him to the edge of the ravine; nor (2) is it at all necessary to suppose the city built on the οἶκος, but only on the mountain, or range of hills, of

which the οἶκος forms a part—which it is: see Robinson, iii. 187.—The Lord's passing through the midst of them is evidently miraculous; the circumstances were different from those in John viii. 60, where the expression is ἐκρύβη καὶ ἔξελθεν. ἐκ τοῦ ἐξελθον, ἐξέλθων διὰ μέσον αὐτῶν: see note there. Here, the Nazarenes had Him actually in their custody.—31.] The view maintained with regard to the foregoing occurrence in the preceding notes, of course precludes the notion that it was the reason of the Lord's change of habitation to Ca-

pernaum. In fact that change, as remarked on ver. 14, had been made some time be-

fore; and it is hardly possible that such an expression as ἐκρύβη καὶ ἔξελθεν should be used, if He still resided there. That Luke regarded this occurrence as the reason, is possible, but not certain. The words πᾶλιν τῇ ί. come in usually after the mention of Κατερν. in ver. 23, and evidently show that this was originally in-

tended to be the first mention of the place. —What may have been the reason of the change of abode is quite uncertain. It seems to have included the whole family, except the sisters, who may have been married at Nazareth;—see note on John ii. 12, and Matt. iv. 13.—κατηρν., because Nazareth lay high, and Capernaum on the sea of Galilee. —32—37.] Mark i. 21—28, where see notes. The two accounts are very closely cognate—being the same narrative, only
slightly deflected; not more, certainly, than might have arisen from oral repetition by two persons, at some interval of time, of what they had received in the same words.—At end of ver. 33, καὶ οὐχ ὡς εἰ γραμματικός (Mark) is here omitted: see Matt. viii. 28—33.) πνῦμα is the influence, περίπτωσις, the personality, of the possessing demon.—35.) μὴ βλάψτητε ἀτῶς is here only. Mark's παρέδωκαν may mean 'having convinced him' and our text, 'without doing him bodily injury.'

38—41.] Matt. viii. 14—17. Mark i. 29—34. Our account has only a slight additional detail, which is interesting however as giving another side of an eye-witness's evidence—it is ἡμών ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν. Now this is implied in laying hold of her hand, as she was in bed; which particulars are both mentioned by Matt. and Mark;—this being one of those many cases where alteration (of εἰρήνης τοῦ χωρίου, into εἰρήνη εὐρύτερον, p. 315) is utterly inconceivable. 38. τοῖς ἱµατισίν] An epithet used by Luke, as a χαρακτηρισµὸς τοῖς λατρείοις ἰδρυµαῖοι τῶν µεγάλων τῶν καὶ µικρῶν τυφών. Galen de different. febr. i. (Wetstein).

40.] ὡς ἄτροφος τούτος ὑπὸ τοῦ εὐρύτερον is a detail peculiar to Luke, and I believe indicating the same as above: as also the έπειδή οὗτος...
κατά δούκαν.

42 γενομένης δὲ ἡμῖν ἐξελθὼν ἐπορεύθη εἰς ἔρημον τόπον, καὶ οἱ ὄχλοι τρὶς ἐπεζήτησαν αὐτὸν, καὶ ἦλθον ἐως αὐτοῦ, καὶ κατείχον αὐτὸν ὅτι τοῦ μὴ πορεύεσθαι ἀπ' αὐτῶν. 43 ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὁτι καὶ ταῖς ἐτέραις πόλεσιν εὐαγγελίσασθαι με δεῖ τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ, ὑπὲρ τοῦτο ἀπεσταλμαί. 44 καὶ ἦν θρόσων ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς τῆς Γαλιλαίας.

V. Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ πόλει τοῦ ὄχλου ἐπικείμενον αὐτῷ τοῦ ἀκοειν τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν εὐτυχὸς.


Chap. V. 1. for τοῖς, καὶ A B X 2, et audierunt c. —xt C D X ab.—for καὶ abv. ἦν λίγο... implied in the others, but not expressed.—41.] λαλῶν, etc... to speak, because they knew, &c.; not, 'to say that they knew:—λαλεῖν is never 'to say,' but 'to speak,' 'to discourse.'

43, 44.] Mark i. 35—38. The dissimilitude of wording in these two accounts is one of the most striking instances in the Gospels, of variety found in the same narration. While the matter related is nearly identical, the only words common to the two are τὸν ὄρμον τόπον. —43.] οἱ ἐχλοὶ δὲ ἦν οἱ ἔνας καὶ ἄνεντον αὐτοῦ, Mark. —The great number of sick which were brought to the Lord on the evening, and this morning, is accounted for by His departure having been fixed on and known beforehand.

44.] Mark i. 39; see Matt. iv. 23—25 and notes.—καὶ ἦν κρήν. —is a formal close to this section of the narrative, and chronologically separates it from what follows.

Chap. V. 1—II.] The question at once meets us, whether this account, in its form here peculiar to Luke, is identical in its subject-matter with Matt. iv. 18—22, and Mark i. 16—20. With regard to this, we may notice the following particulars. (1) Contrary to Schleiermacher's inference (Trans. p. 75, 76), it must be, I think, that most readers, that a previous and close relation had subsisted between the Lord and Peter. The latter calls Him ἐκούσατο (ποταμίω), and νῦν: evidently (ver. 5, end) expects a miracle; and follows Him with his partners, without any present express command so to do. Still all this might be, and yet the account might be identical with the others. For the Lord had known Peter before this, John i. 41 ff.; and, in all probability, as one of His disciples. And although there is here no express command to follow, yet the words in ver. 10 may be, and are probably intended to be, equivalent to one. (2) That the Evangelist evidently intends this as the first apostolic calling of Peter and his companions. The expressions in ver. 11 could not otherwise have been used. (3) That there is yet the supposition, that the accounts in Matthew and Mark may be a shorter way of recounting this by persons who were not aware of these circumstances. But then such a supposition will not consist with any high degree of authority in those accounts, which I believe them to have: see note on Mark. (4) It seems to me that the truth of the matter is nearly this:—that this event is distinct from, and happened at a later period than, the calling in Matt. and Mark—but that the four Apostles, when the Lord was at Capernaum, followed their occupation as fishermen. There is everything to show, in our account, that the calling had previously taken place; and the closing of it by the expression in ver. 11 merely indicates what there can be no difficulty in seeing even without it, that our present account is an imperfect one, written by one who found thus much recorded, and knowing it to be part of the history of the calling of the Apostles, appended to it the fact of their leaving all and following the Lord. As to the repetition of the assurance in ver. 10, I see no more in it than this, which appears also from other passages in the Gospels, that the Apostles, as such, were not called or ordained at any special moment, but by any one word of power alone; but that in their case as well as ours, there was line upon line, precept upon precept: and that what
parà tòn lìmòn Gennhsarêt, 2 kai eìde duo * plôia ABCD

6 tòu sôma tòn lìmòn" oi de álímés átopóntes àp' autòtou, * éstwta parà tòn lìmòn' ou de álímés átopóntes àp' autòtou, * ápetplhun tò diktna. 2 émbas de eis en tîn ploíon d' hîn [tou] Sîmwnos, * prôthn un autòtou atop tîs gîs' étanagagein olígon, kai ' kathísa éddisaske en tòu ploíon tòu óchlos. 3 wós de ' étauôsato lalav, éiwc proç tòn Sîmwna. 4 Étanagage eis tò báthos, kai * khaía-
sate tò diktna úmwn b eis' ágran. 5 kai atopkríthei o Sîmwn éipe autîw 'Epiástaga, di' olíns [tîns] uktòs
d koiniasthontes oûden elâboumen 6 eite de tòn rhamî tòu
khaíaos * tò diktnon *. 6 kai toûtô toûnasth tòn òyn-nê-
kleias iôthoun plîhous polû, * dierphnouto dé tò
diktnon autôn *. 7 kai b kathêusen tòn mètôchous [tòis]
êv eîn etêrf ploíw tòn elàntous ' suvlabèthai autôtous
kai ìlhoun, kai éplesan amforêta tò ploía, òste 1 vêthi-
leîthai autà. 8 òdhn de Sîmwn Pîrous prokteste tòis

6. was said generally to all four on the former occasion, by words only, was repeated
was said generally to all four on the former occasion, by words only, was repeated
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This sense of unworthiness and self-loathing is ever the effect, in the depths of a heart not utterly hardened, of the Divine Power and presence. 4 Below this, is the utterly profane state, in which there is no contrast, no contradiction felt, between the holy and the unholy, between God and man. Above it, is the state of grace, in which the contradiction is felt, the deep gulf perceived, which divides between sinful man and an holy God,—yet it is felt that this gulf is bridged over,—that it is possible for the two to meet,—that in One who is thankful with both, they have already been brought
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KATA DOUKAN.

2:17. together.' Trench on the Miracles, p. 132. The same writer remarks the miracle itself, 'Christ here appears as the ideal man, the second Adam of the eighth Psalm; Thou madest Him to have dominion over the works of Thy hands: Thou hast put all things under His feet. . . . the fowl of the air, and the fish of the sea, and whatsoever walketh through the paths of the seas' (vv. 6, 8). — 10. ἕξοροι Ἑωρών — compare, and indeed throughout this miracle, the striking parallel, and yet contrast, in John xxi.—with its injunction, 'feed My lambs,' 'shepherd My sheep,' given to the same Peter;—its net which did not burst; and the minute and beautiful appropriateness of each will be seen—this, at, or near, the commencement of the Apostolic course; that, at how different, and how fitting a time!

12. 13.Matt. viii. 2.—4. Mark i. 40,—45. In Mark, placed immediately after the Sermon on the Mount; in Mark and here, without any note of time: see notes on Matt.—πρὸς αὐτὸν ἔλθεν ἄνθρωπος αὐτὸν ὠφελεί τις, διότι ἡ ὁρμή προκύπτετι, in very close contact to the narrative.
διδάσκων, καὶ ἦσαν καθήμενοι Φαρισαῖοι καὶ ὁ νομο-ABCDE
διδασκαλοὶ οἱ ἦσαν *εληλυθότες εἰκ τάς χώμις τῆς
Γαλλαίας καὶ Ἰουδαίας καὶ Ἰερουσαλήμ, καὶ δύναμις
κυρίῳ ᾗ εἰς τὸ ιάσθαι αὐτοῦ. 18 καὶ ἵδον ἀνδρεὶς
φέροντες ἐπὶ κλίνης ἄνθρωπον ὅς ἢ παραλεμένοις,
καὶ ἔξητον αὐτὸν εἰς γεγεγεικεὶ καὶ θείαιν ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ.
19 καὶ μῆ *εὑρόντες δὲ ποίες εἰς εὐκακίας αὐτὸν διὰ τὸν
δολού, ἀναβάντες ἐπὶ τὸ δῶμα διὰ τῶν *κεράμων *καθήκαν
αὐτὸν σὺν τῷ *κλινίδιῷ εἰς τὸ μέσον ἐμπροσθὲν τοῦ Ἰσαοῦ.
20 καὶ ἵδον τὴν πίεν τῶν αὐτῶν ἐπείν [Αὐτῷ] ἀνθρωπε,
αφενται σοι αἱ ἀμαρτίαι σου. 21 καὶ ἤξαντο 1 διαλογίζο-
λασαι οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ ἦσαν καθήμενοι Ἰησοῦς ἐτῶν ὀντὸς ὅς *λαλεὶ βλασφημίας; τις δύναται αἵνει αἱ ἀμα-
tίαι εἰ μὴ μύονος ὁ θεός; 21 καὶ ἐπείγουσα δὲ ὁ Ἰσαῶς
tους ἐν διαλογίσμοις αὐτῶν, [ἀποκρίθης] εἶπε πρὸς αὐ-
tους Τί διαλογίζεσθαι εἰν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν; 22 τοῖς εὐ-
κοπώτεροι, εἶπεν Ἀφενταί σοι αἱ ἀμαρτίαι σου,
ὁ ἐπείν 2 ἢ ἦσαν καὶ περιττήσει, 23 ἵνα δο ἐδοτῇ
ὅτι ἐξοπλισάν ἔχει ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἄνθρωπον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς
ἀπέναι ἀμαρτίαις, εἰπε τῷ *παραλεμένων Σοι λέγων;
24 ἢ ἦσαν ἢ ἦσαν καὶ ἀρας τὸ κλινίδιον σου πορεύου εἰς τὸν οἶκον
σου. 25 καὶ παραχωμά ἀναστᾶς ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν, ἀρας

17—28. Matt. ix. 2—9. Mark ii. 1—12. This miracle is introduced by the indefinite words, καὶ ἐγ. ἐν μιᾷ τ. ἑαυτοῦ. In Matthew, viii. 6—end, a series of incidents are inter-
posed. The Lord there appears to have returned from the country of the Ger-
semites and the miracle on the demoniac there, to His own city, i.e. Capernaum.
The order in Mark is the same as here, and his narrative contains the only decisive
note of sequence (ch. iv. 38), which deter-
mines his order and that in the text to have
been the actual one, and the events in Matt.
viii. to be related out of their order,—17] ἡ
τ. κάμα, not to be pressed: as we say 'from
all parts.' —δικ. κρ. Does this mean the
power of God—or the power of the Lord, i.e. Jesus? Luke uses κρόνος frequently
for Jesus, but always with the article: see
ch. vii. 13. 31. x. 1. xi. 39. xii. 43. al. fr. :
—but the same word, without the article, for
the Most High: see ch. i. 11. 36. 58. 66.
ii. 9. iv. 19; whence we conclude that the
meaning is, 'the power of God (working in
the Lord Jesus) was present to heal them.'
For constr. see ruf. —18.] Borne of four.
Mark. —19.] This description is that of
an eye-witness. —20.] On ἡ πιστὴς αὐτ. see
note on Matt. vert. 2; also on ἀφενταί
τα.—24.] εἰς τ. μετ., probably not
κατὰ λογίαν.

εφ' ἔφ' ζευγαρία, ἀπληθεῖν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ, ἀς ὡς ἐν τὸν θεόν. 26 καὶ ἐκτασίας ἔλαβεν ἀπαντάς, καὶ ἐδόθην τὸν θεόν, καὶ ἐπήλθησαν φόβοι, λέγοντες ὅτι εἰσίνες ἐπὶ παραδόξα σήμερον. 27 Καὶ μετὰ ταύτα ἔξηλθει, καὶ ἐθέσατο τελώνιαν ὑνάματι Λευκὸν καθήμενον ἐπὶ τὸ τελώνιο, καὶ ἐπεν τῷ Ἀκολούθειι μοι. 28 καὶ καταλίπων ἀπαντάς ἐποίησεν. 29 καὶ ἐγώ ζεύγη ἔγγυγυζον οἱ γραμματεῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ Φαισίαν πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ λέγοντες Διατι μετὰ τῶν τελωνίων καὶ ἀμαρτολῶν ἐσθίετε καὶ πίνετε; 30 καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἔπει δι' αὐτοῦ ὤν χρείαν ἐγόνοισιν ὑγιαστές ἰατροὺς, ἀλλ' ὁι κακῶς ἐχόντες. 31 οὐκ ἐλθόντας καλέσας δικαίους, ἀλλὰ ἀμαρτολοὺς ἐν μετανοιαν. 32 δε σιν πρὸς αὐτοῦ διατί οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου νήστευον πυκνὰ καὶ δήσισες ποιοῦνται, ὁμοίως οἱ καὶ οἱ τῶν Φαισίων, ὡς σιν ἐσθίοντες καὶ πίνοντες; 33 δε σιν πρὸς αὐτοὺς Μὴ δύνασθε τοὺς νιώοντος τὸν νυμφώνος ἐν ὑπνίοις μετ' αὐτῶν ἔστι ποιήσας νήστευον; 34 ἔλευσαντες δὲ ἡμέρας, [καὶ] ὁ ἄπαραγόντα ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὁ νυμφίος, τότε νήστευον ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις. 35 ἔλεγε δε καὶ παραβολὴν πρὸς —ἐν τῷ κράβαττῳ δ. 25. ἄρας τῆς εὐλογίας τ. 26. εἰς τοῖς Α. C. E. K. L. S. V. X. 28. om. D. 27. τῶν ἑορτῶν θεόν. 28. ἐν τῷ ἑορτῶν θεοῦ. 29. ἡμέρας. 30. τοῖς ἑορτοῖς. 31. οἱ τῶν ἑορτῶν θεοῦ. 32. ἡμέρας. 33. τις ἡμέρας. 34. ἡμέρας. 35. ἡμέρας. 36. ἡμέρας. 37. ἡμέρας. | parenthetic: see in Matt. 26. | παραβολικῆς: θεοματικῆς, ἀπρόσδεκτης, Ἡσυχ. Compare the close of the accounts in Matt. and Mark. 27—39. Matt. ix. 17. Mark ii. 13—22. For all common matter—the discussion of the identity of Matthew and Levi, &c.—see notes on Matt. and Mark. I here only notice what is peculiar to Luke. 27. θεοματικῆς, not merely. He saw 'but He looked on.' He observed.' 28. κατ. δίκαιον, not merely, 'having left his books and implements,' but generally used, and importing not so much a present objective relinquishment, as the mind with which he rose to follow. 29. This fact is only expressly mentioned here— but may be directly inferred from Mark, and remotely from Matt. See on Matt. ver. 10. 30. On the difference in the persons who ask this question, see on Matt. and Mark. 31. ἔνθεσθαι: see ch. xi. 1. These prayers must be one and the same with the usual prayers of devout men. 34. I have remarked on the striking contrast between Z 2.
and the Lord asserts that this new wine was not immediately palatable to the Jews, who said διὸ παλαιὸς χρυσότερος ἔστω. Observe (against Do Wette, &c.) that there is no objective comparison whatsoever here between the old and new wine; the whole stress is on Θαλασσίαν ἔγνω, and the import of χρυσοτέρος is subjective:—in the view of him who utters it. And even if we were to assume such an objective comparison, it makes no difficulty, being provided for by the word εἴσεβης, which is here emphatical.—In time, the new wine will become older:—the man will become habituated to its taste, and the wine itself mellowed: and the comparison between the wines is not then which is the older, but which is intrinsically the better.—Stier observes (i. 372), that the saying is a lesson for ardent and enthusiastic converts not to be disappointed, if they cannot at once instil their spirit into others about them.

Chap. VI. 1—5.] Matt. xii. 1—8. Mark ii. 23—28. Between the discourse just related here and in Mark, and this incident, Matthew interposes the raising of Jairus’s daughter, the healing of the two blind and one dumb, the mission of the twelve, and the message of John.—I need not insist on these obvious proofs of independence in the construction of our Gospels.—On the question of the arrangements,
VI. 1—6. ΚΑΤΑ ΔΟΥΚΑΝ.

χερσί. 2 τινες δὲ τῶν Φαρισαίων εἶπον αὐτοῖς Τί ποιεῖτε ὃ ὦκ ἔξεστι [ποιεῖν ἐν] τοῖς σάββασι; 3 καὶ ἀποκρίθησαν πρὸς αὐτούς εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὦδὲ τοῦτο ἀνέγνωτε ὁ ἐποίησε Δαυίδ ἡ ἐπένευσαν αὐτός καὶ οἱ μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ ἐνεστὲ." 4 ὥς ιησοῦς εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοὺς ἀρτοὺς τῆς πρόβασεως ἐλάβει καὶ ἔφαγε, καὶ ἔδωκε τινις καὶ τοῖς μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ, οὕτως ἔξεστι φαγεῖν εἰ μὴ μόνος τοῦ ἱερέως; 5 καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς ἦτα κύριος ἐστιν ὁ οἶκος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ τοῦ σαββάτου. 6 Ἔγενε δὲ καὶ ἐν ἰδίᾳ μεταμ. ver. 1.


see on Matt. — 1.] δευτεροτρόπως. This word probably has much difficulty, as the word is found nowhere else, and can be only judged by analogy. (1) It is not altogether clear that the word ought to be here at all:—see var. read. Scholz supposes it to have arisen from putting together two separate glosses, in the margin of some MSS, one δευτεροτρόπως, the other πρώτως;—originally inserted,—the first, to distinguish this sabbath from that in ch. iv. 31,—the latter, from that in ver. 6.—(2) Chrysostom, Hom. xxxix. in Matt., p. 431, D, says, ὁ δὲ δούλως φησιν, ἐν σαββάτῳ δευτεροτρόπῳ. τι ἵπται, ἐν δευτεροτρόπως; ὡς δὲ, ἐάν ἄρα ἢ ἀρχία ἢ, καὶ τοῦ σαββάτου τοῦ κυρίου, καὶ ἐφάρσεις διαδόχων γίνεσθαι. Paulus and Olshausen also take this interpretation.—(3) Theophylact understands,—a sabbath, the day before which (παρασκευή) had been a Feast-day. — (4) Isidore of Pelusium, Euthymius, and others, think that the first day of the unfermented bread is meant, and is called δευτεράν., because it is deuteropa to the pascha, which had been slain on the evening before.—(5) Scaliger and Petavius interpret it to mean the sabbath following the second day of the Passover, from which the seven weeks to Pentecost were reckoned. This has been commonly followed; but is liable to the objection that the assumption σαββάτως δευτερότροπος = σαββάτως τῆς ἱδρυμάδος δευτεροτρόπου = σαββάτως τῆς ἱδρυμάδος, πρώτης μετὰ τήν δευτέραν τῶν ἄνωμών, is an unjustifiable one.—(6) To omit many other conjectures, I may mention that Wisseler (Chronologische Synopse der vier Evangelien, p. 231 ff.) suggests that it may mean the first sabbath in the second of the cycle of seven weeks, which completed the sabbatical period. He shows, by a passage from the ἐρυγμα πίρου (cited by Clem. Alex., Strom. vi. 5, p. 760), that the Jews did call the first sabbath of the year πρώτων— and that the years were reckoned as the first, second, &c., of the sabbatical cycle (see a decree of Julius Caesar in Jos. Antt. xiv. 10, 6). Thus the first sabbath of the first year would be πρώτωτον πρῶτον, that of the second δευτερότροπον, &c. And according to his chronology, which fixes this in A. D. 792, this year was the second of the sabbatical cycle. If we follow this conjecture, this day was the first sabbath in the month Nisan. — The point so much insisted on, that this must have been after the presentation of the first-fruits which took place on the 16th of Nisan,—on account of the prohibition in Levit. xxiii. 14,—is of no weight, as it is very uncertain whether the action mentioned here is included in the prohibition. — τῶς.] τ. π. is a detail peculiar to Luke: 'rubbing them and blowing away the chaff.'—2.] In Matt. and Mark, the Pharisees address the Lord, 'Why do Thy disciples,' &c. — 3.] ὀδιάματί ἔχεις . . . 'Have ye not read so much as this?' E. V. 'Are ye so utterly ignorant of the spirit of Scripture?'—see Mark xii. 10, where the same expression occurs. — The remarkable substitution in D d for ver. 5 seems to be an interpolation, but hardly an
EYAGGEION

VI.

ἔτερῳ σαββάτῳ εἰς τὴν συναγωγήν καὶ ἈΒΔ

καὶ ἦν ἀνθρώπους καὶ ἦχος αὐτοῦ ἦν
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12 εν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις, ἐκθέθην εἰς τὸ ὄρος προσεύθησαι, καὶ ἦν διανυκτερεύων ἐν τῷ προσευχῆ τοῦ θεοῦ. 13 καὶ οὗτος ἦν ἡμέρα, προσε-

εφώνησε τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔκλεξεν αὐτῶν δώδεκα, οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους οὐνόμασε, Σιμώνα καὶ Πέτρον καὶ Ἰάκωβον τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ,

Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννην, Φιλίππον καὶ Βαρθολομαίον, Μάθαυν καὶ Θωμᾶν, Ἰάκωβον τοῦ Ἀλφαίου καὶ Σιμώνα τοῦ καλοῦμενος Σιλωτήν, Ἰούδαν Ἰακώβου, καὶ Ἰούδαν Ἰακώβου ὡς καὶ ἐγένετο ἡ προδοσία:

12. ἦν τοῦτο, ἰκεῖνας τοὺς αὐτούς ΑΒDLX3. τὰ Q de Cyrpr.—καὶ προσ-


ται οὗ ἦν εἰς ἄλλος αὐτοῦ—i. e. He summoned to Him a certain larger number, out of whom He selected Twelve. We are not to suppose that this selection was now first made out of a miscellaneous number—but now first formally announced; the Apostles, or most of them, had had each their special individual calling to be, in a peculiar manner, followers of the Lord, before this. 

adds μετ᾿ ὀργῆς, αὐλοθυμοῦντος καὶ τοῦ πάρωσε τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν—one of the most striking and graphic descriptions in the Gospels.—It was thus that He bare (see Matt. viii. 17), even while on earth, our sins and infirmities. Their hearts were hardened,—but He grieved for it. —11.] ἀνελεῖ, madness, rage of a senseless kind: see reff.; also Herodot. vi. 69. Thucyd. iii. 48. —δολάζει. viz. the Pharisees and Herodians: Mark, where see note.

13—19.] Peculiar (in this form) to Luke: see Matt. xii. 15—21. Mark iii. 7—19. We may observe that Matt. does not relate the choosing of the Apostles, but only takes occasion to give a list of them on their being sent out, ch. x. 1, 2; and that Mark and Luke agree in the time of their being chosen, placing it immediately after the healing on the sabbath,—but with no very definite note of time. —13.] ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ ἄρχεται τοῦ προστάτου τοῦ Λουδήκου, τοῦ Ἀλφαίου, Σιμώνα τοῦ καλοῦμενος Σιλωτήν, Ἰακώβου τοῦ Ἀλφαίου, Ἰωάννην Ἰακώβου, καὶ Ἰούδαν Ἰακώβου ὡς καὶ ἐγένετο ἡ προδοσία: the frequency of the objective genitive (see Winer, § 30, 1), should have prevented the commentators (Hammond, Olearius, &c.) from making the blunder of imagining προσ-

ευχή here to be a proseucha or house of prayer: see note on Acts xvi. 13.—18. προσευχαὶ τ. p. αὐτ. ] expressed in Mark, προσκαλέ-

ται οὗ θέλειν αὑτοῦ—i. e. He summoned to Him a certain larger number, out of whom He selected Twelve. We are not to suppose that this selection was now first made out of a miscellaneous number—but now first formally announced; the Apostles, or most of them, had had each their special individual calling to be, in a peculiar manner, followers of the Lord, before this. 

... ἐναρείαν αὐτοῦς εἰρήσειν . . . . . . . . . . . III. 14. — 14.] On the catalogue, see notes on Matt. x. 1. — 18.] Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου—usually, and I believe rightly, rendered Jude the brother of James. For, besides the reasons for which otherwise exist, I believe it will hardly be found that Ἰωάννης Ἰακώβου—without any articles, can, in a sentence where the person is absolutely designated for the first time, bear the meaning of Jude the son of James. The two instances which seem to show the contrary are, (1) where Judas Iscariot is called, John vii. 71, τὸν Ἰούδα; Σιμώνος Ἰακώβου, and, ch. xii. 4, Ἰωάννης Ἰακώβου;—but in these places the local adjective precludes the insertion of τοῦ τοῦ· or ὁ τοῦ, just as we should have Ἰακώβου Ἀλφαίου (not ὁ τοῦ Ἀλφ.) Ναζωραίος: and (2) Ἰωάννης Ἰωάννης, John xxi. 16, 16, 17, in the vocative,
where articles are out of the question. Certainly, when we find unanswerable proper names elsewhere thus connected in the N.T., it is not son or daughter that is to be supplied: compare Mark xv. 40 and 47.—And even if the above distinction be set aside, it is improbable that ιδοθας ιακωβ, coming so soon after ιακωβος ο του Αλφαυον, should have the same meaning. On the question who this James was, see on Matt. x. 2, and xiii. 55.—17.] Having descended from the mountain, He stood on a level place—i.e. below the mountain: see on Matt. v. 1. Whether Luke could thus have written with the Gospel of Matthew before him, I leave the reader to judge: promising the identity of the two discourses.—19.] Luke uses the same expression concerning the Lord in ch. viii. 46.

50—49.] Peculiar (in this form) to Luke, answering to Matt. v.—vii. In Matthew I cannot doubt that we have the whole discourse, much as it was spoken; the connection is intimate throughout; the arrangement wonderfully consistent and admirable. Here, on the other hand, the discourse is only reported in fragments—there is a wide gap between ver. 26 and 27, and many omissions in other parts; besides which, sayings of the Lord, belonging apparently to other occasions, are inserted; see vv. 39, 40, 45; at the same time we must remember that such gnomic sayings would probably be frequently uttered by Him, and might very likely form part of this discourse originally. His teaching was not studious of novelty like that of men, but speaking with authority, as He did, He would doubtless utter again and again the same weighty sentences when occasion occurred. Hence may have arisen much of the difference of arrangement observable in the reports—because sayings known to have been uttered together at one time, might be thrown together with sayings spoken at another, with some one common link perhaps connecting the two groups.—50. εις τον ριον. The discourse was spoken to the disciples generally,—to the twelve particularly,—to the people prospectively;—and its subject, both here and in Matt., is, the state and duties of a disciple of Christ. [πνευματικα.] To suppose that Luke’s report of this discourse refers only to this world’s poverty, &c.—and the blessings to anticipated outward prosperity in the Messiah’s Kingdom (De Wette, Meyer), is surely quite a misapprehension. Comparing these expressions with other passages in Luke himself, we must have concluded, even without Matthew’s report, that they bore a spiritual sense; see ch. xvi. 11, where he speaks of ‘the true riches’—and ch. xii. 21, where we have εις θεον πλούτων. And to suppose any Ebionitish tendency in Luke would be quite inconsistent, as Meyer observes, with his connexion with the Apostle Paul.—Besides, who would apply such an interpretation to our ver. 21?—See on each of these beatitudes the corresponding notes in Matt.—η βασιλεια θεου. [εις θεον πλούτων Matt., but it does not thence follow that ουράνιον = θεος, but the two are different ways of designating the same kingdom—the one by its situation—
in heaven, where its polis is (ἡ ἄνω ἱεροσολύμων, Gal. iv. 26), the other by Him, Whose it is. —23.] ἀπορίσεως and ἀκέδεμα must not be understood of Jewish excommunication only, but of all kinds of expulsion from society.—τοῦ ἵππος.—literal: 'your name;'—either your collective name as Christians,—to which Peter seems to refer, 1 Pet. iv. 14—16;—or, your individual name. —23.] ἐν ἀν. τ. ἴππ., not in the most solemn sense of the words (see Matt. vii. 22), but 'in the day when men shall do thus to you.'—24.] Of course (see Prolegomena to the Gospels) I cannot assent to any such view as that taken by Meyer and others, that these 'woes' are inserted from later tradition (ῥητόν μὲν ἐγώ συνεργήσατο) but in other words, were never spoken by the Lord at all.—either we must suppose that they ought to follow Matt. v. 12, which is from the context most improbable,—or that they and perhaps the four preceding beatitudes with them, were on some occasion spoken by the Lord in this exact form, and so have been here placed in that form. —26.] Not said to the rich, but to the disciples. The very warning conveyed in ἐφευρέσω̇ρε̇ς shows this, and should have prevented Meyer from making the blunder. The mention of προφ. and ἐφευρέσω̇ρε̇ς has reference to the disciples' office as the salt of the earth. The address in ver. 27 is not (Meyer) a turning of the discourse to His own disciples, but τοῦ λέγω τοῖς ἀκούσασιν = ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ἤμισυ, which in-
VI.

provides the same command Matt. v. 44,—
and τοις ἀκόουσιν serves the purpose of the ὑπερ-\discretionary{\textit{to you who now hear Me.}}
The discourse being mutilated, the strong anti-
thesis could not be brought out. — 29.)
but here it seems somewhat out of con-
exion, for the sense of vv. 29, 30, has
been 'resist not evil,' whereas this precept
refers to the duty of man to man, injury
being out of the question. — 32.) This
verse again belongs to vers. 28, not to ver-
31; see Matt. v. 46 ff. — 33.] γὰρ =
μετοχικός, Matt. (see note on Matt. v. 12.)—
35.] ἀπελπισμότερα. Three renderings have
been given—(1) the ordinary one, μηδὲν
ἀν’ αὐτῶν ἐλπισμόνως, Euthym.;—but
this meaning of the word is unexamined,
though agreeing with the context. (2)
causing no one to despair," i.e. refusing no
one (reading μηδὲν)—so the Syr. renders it.
(3) 'not despairing,' i.e. 'without anxiety
about the result.' This last sense of the
word is best supported by examples, both
from Polybius,—and the Apocrypha,—see
ref. But as it is an ἀπελπισμένον in
the N. T., perhaps the force of the context
should prevail, and the ordinary meaning
be adopted, as there is nothing in analogy
(ἀπαθείω, ἀπολαμβάνω, . . .) to forbid the
meaning; and so Passow gives it in Lexis.—
vioλ νόστιμον) Moyer maintains that this
must mean 'sons of God' in the sense of
partakers of the glory of the Messiah's
Kingdom, but without reference to the
name of believers in this life, which last he
says is 'Paulinâscher, aber nicht κατακείσ,'
But surely this is sufficiently answered by
ο πατήρ ὑμῶν in the next verse, where
the actual present sonship to our heavenly
Father is a reason why we should imitate
Him.—38. oἰκτιροῦσιν. = τίλιοι, Matt. v. 48,
which last is the larger description, com-
prehending in it charity and mercy; see
note there. — 37.) = Matt. vii. 1, 2. The
saying is much enriched and expanded
here; perhaps it was so uttered by the
Lord on some other occasion; for the con-
exion is very strict in Matt., and would
hardly bear this expansion of what is not
in that place the leading idea. — 38.] The
similitude is taken from a very full measure
of some dry thing such as corn. That no liquid is intended by υπερεχεμον, as Bengel supposes, is evident—for the three present participles all apply to the same μετ. καλ. and form a climax—βεβαιωμαι] impersonal—anwering to the agents of μεταφηματι understood—such agents being indefinite, and the meaning thereby rendered solemn and emphatic; see on ch. xii. 20. If we are to find a nom., it should be the Angels, who are in this matter the ministers of the divine purposes (so Meyer).—This saying is found with a totally different import Mark iv. 24; one of the many instances how the Lord turned about, so to speak, the Light of Truth contained in His declarations, so as to shine upon different departments of life and thought. —38.] From this verse to the end is the closest connexion, and it is impossible that it should consist of sayings thrown together and uttered at different times.—(The connexion with what went before is not so evident, indeed the εις δι π. ασ. seems to show a break.) The parabolic saying, implying the unfitness of an uncharitable and unjustly condemning leader (the Lord was speaking primarily to His apostles) to perform his office, leads to, ver. 40, the assertion that no Christian ought to assume in this respect an office of judging which his Master never assumed; but rather will be ever well instructed Christian strive to be humble as his Master was. Then follows the reproof of vv. 41—43; and vv. 44, 45 and 46—49 show us, expanded in different images, what the beams in the eye is, to which our first efforts must be directed. —τυφλ. τ. 58.] See this in quite another connexion Matt. xv. 14, where Peter answers, φασον ἣν τε τον παραβολην γαρτην—meaning apparently the last uttered words, which the Lord however explains not specifically, but by entering into the whole matter. I believe this παραβολη to have been one of the usual and familiar sayings of the Lord. —40.] see above. καταργισάτοις (see ref.)—fully instructed—perfect, in the sense of well-conditioned, knowing what is his duty, and consistently endeavouring to do it. De Wette, Kiiuoel, &c., have given a strange rendering of this clause, making καταργνι. ὡς ἡ 8. adv. the predicate—every disciple will be instructed as his Master.' But if I will be instructed not, the position of καταργνι. as first in the sentence forbids this rendering. —41.] De Wette imagines a break in the sense here and a return to Matt. vii. 3 ff.;—but the whole is in the strictest connexion;
σατρόν ποιούν καρπόν καλὸν, ἔκαστον γὰρ δένδρον ἐκ ἀειέματι
tοῦ ἑδίου καρπὸν γίνονται, οὐ γὰρ ἔχει τοῦ γάρ ἡ ἀκαθόριστον συλ-
λέγουσι σύκα, οὐδὲ ἢ βάτον τρωντίων σταφυλίν. 45 ο ἄγαθος ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τοῦ ἄγαθο 
θησαυρός τῆς καρδίας αὐτοῦ προφέρει τὸ ἄγαθον, καὶ ὁ πονηρός 
[ἄνθρωπος] ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ [θησαυροῦ τῆς καρδίας αὐτοῦ] 
προφέρει τὸ πονηρόν ἐκ γὰρ [ν] περισσοματος [τῆς] 
καρδίας λαλεῖ τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ. 46 τί δὲ με καλείτε Κύριε 
κύριε, καὶ οὐ ποιεῖτε ἢ λέγω; 47 πάς ὁ ἐρχόμενος πρὸς 
με καὶ ἰκώνων μου τῶν ἀγίων καὶ ποιών αὐτοῦ, ἐπο-
δεῖξα υἱόν μεν ἐστίν ὁμοίου. 48 ὁμοίος ἐστιν ἄνθρωπω 
οἰκοδομοῦντι οἰκίαν, δι θεοῦ ἐσκαφεὶ καὶ ἢ βάθυνε καὶ ἠθικὲ 
θεμέλιον ἐπὶ τῶν πέτρων· 49 πλημμύρας ἔρχεται ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν 
ο ὁ δὲ αἰκώνας καὶ μὴ ποιῆσαι ὁμοίοι ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπω 
οἰκοδομῆσαι οἰκίαν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν χωρὶς θεμελίων· 50 
προφέρεται ὁ ποταμὸς, καὶ εὐθεῖα ἐπεσε, καὶ ἐγένετο τὸ 
ῥῆμα τῆς οἰκίας ἐκείνης μέγα.

VII. 1 * Ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐπλήρωσα πάντα τὰ ρήματα αὐτοῦ 
eis tás τοῦ ἀκούς τοῦ λαοῦ, εἰσῆλθεν εἰς Καπερναοῦμ. 
2 ἢ κατονάρχη δὲ τινος δοῦλος ἢ καὶ χώρον ἢ ἡμέρα 
τελευταί, ός ἡ αὐτῶν ἐντιμός. 3 ἀκούσας δὲ τοῦ τοῦ 
ὁ Ἰησοῦ ἀπέστειλε πρὸς αὐτοῦ προσβυτέρους τῶν Ἰουδαίων, 
4 ἢ ἐρωτῶν αὐτὸν ὅπως ἐλθὼν ἢ διασώσῃ τὸν δούλου αὐτοῦ.


beginning of the miracle, so not full at the end. See notes on Matt. — τὴν ῥήματα... διὰ τοῦτο ἒκεῖνοι εἰς... — 3.] ἐπλάσσοντος, not elders of the synagogue (who in Luke are ἄρχοντες ήμώνοι). Acts xiii. 15), but of the people. — 4.] If the received reading παρίσταται is retained, it may be remembered that it is not the second person of παρέχομαι (for which δῆσαι, βούλει, ὄνει are no precedents, being peculiar conventional forms), but third pers. fut. act. The second person in εἰ to does not occur in later Greek, with the above exceptions. — 5.] αὐτοῦ, at his own expense.—τὴν σ., 'our synagogue.' — 7.] διὰ, on account of his unworthiness, and because entering his house would entail ceremonial uncleanness till the evening. Matthew does not express this clause, having the narrative in a form which precludes it. See notes there. — 9.] After this there is an important addition in Matt. on the adoption of the Gentiles, and rejection of Israel who showed no such faith. — 10.] Here Matt. simply states the fact of the healing, not knowing of the oi τηρηθήше. — 11—18.] Peculiar to Luke. — 11.] εἰς τής... With regard to the variety of reading here, Schulz remarks, that Luke when χρόνων is understood, uses εἰς τής καθήσειν, see ch. viii. 1. On the other hand Meyer observes that when ημίχρονος is understood, he never prefixes εἰς; — see reff. — so that internal evidence is divided. — Νατά occurs no where else in the Bible. It was a town of Galilee not far from Capernaum, and a few miles to the south of Mount Tabor. A poor village has been found in this situation with ruins of old buildings. See Robinson, iii. 226. The κώμη καλομένη Ναταί (or Νατσί) of Josephus, B. J. iv. 9, 4, on the borders of Idumes, is a different place. See Weisser, Reallwörterbuch. — This is one of the three greatest recorded miracles of the Lord: of which it has been observed, that He raised one (Jairus's daughter) when just dead.
one on the way to burial.— and one (Lazarus) who had been buried four days. — 12. The Jews ordinarily buried outside the gates of their cities. The kings however of the house of David were buried in the city of David: and it was a denunciation on Jehoiakim that he should be buried with the burial of an ass, drawn forth and cast beyond the gates of Jerusalem. Jer. xxii. 19. — κ. αὐτ. χύρις some read this in the dative, καὶ αὕτη χύρις: but it is more agreeable to Luke’s usage to take it as a nominative. See ch. ii. 25. 36. and accentuate, as there, αὐτήν. — 14. The σωφος (= λάρναξ, Jos. Antv. xv. 3, 2) was an open coffin. — There was something in the manner of the Lord which caused the bearers to stand still. We need not suppose any miraculous influence over them. — All three raisings from the dead are wrought with words of power,—‘ Damsel, arise,’ — ‘ Young man, arise,’ — ‘ Lazarus, come forth.’

Trench quotes an eloquent passage from Massillon’s sermons (Miracles, p. 241), — ‘Elie ressuscite des morts, c’est vrai; mais il est obligé de se coucher plusieurs fois sur le corps de l’enfant qu’il ressuscite: il souffle, il se rétracte, il s’agite: on voit bien qu’il invoque une puissance étrangère: qu’il rappelle de l’empire de la mort une âme qui n’est pas soumise à sa voix: et qu’il n’est par lui-même le maître de la mort et de la vie. Jésus-Christ ressuscite les morts comme il fait les actions les plus communes: il parle en maître à ceux qui dorment un sommeil éternel: et l’on sent bien qu’il est le Dieu des morts comme des vivants, jamais plus tranquille que lorsqu’il opère les plus grandes choses.’ — 15. αὐτ. τῇ μ. αὐτ. Doubtless there was a deeper reason than the mere consoling of the widow, (of whom there were many in Israel now as beforetimes,) that influenced the Lord to work this miracle: Olshausen (vol. i. p. 271) remarks, ‘A reference in this miracle to the raised man himself is by no means excluded. Man, as a conscious being, can never be a mere means to an end, which would here be the case, if we suppose the consolation of the mother to have been the only object for which the young man was raised.’ He goes on to say that the hidden intent was probably the spiritual awakening of the youth; which would impart a deeper meaning to διακυβέρνηται τῇ μ. αὐτ. and make her joy to be a true and abiding one. — 16. ἐσκόβος, the natural result of witnessing a direct exhibition of divine power: comp. ch. v. 8. — προφ. μάγ. For they had only been the greatest of prophets who had before raised the dead, Elijah and Elisha, and the Prophet who was to come was doubtless in
their minds. Bornemann supposes the two δτι to be not merely δτι loquentia, but for that, and to be connected with ἵδοξαν.

18—35.] Matt. xii. 2—30. The incident there holds a different place, coming after the sending out of the twelve in ch. x.;—but neither there nor here is it marked by any definite note of time.—πάντων τούτων here, may extend very wide: so may τὰ ἱργα τοῦ χριστοῦ in Matthew. On the common parts, see notes on Matt., where I have discussed at length the probable reason of the inquiry.—2L.] This fact follows by inference from Matt. ver. 4: for they could not tell John ἀδιάλειπτον, unless the Lord was employed in works of healing at the time. Observe that Luke, himself a physician, distinguishes between the diseased and the possessed.—29.] verbast as Matt. The expression υπερτε ρη, does not necessarily imply that more than one such
352
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Iωάννου τού βαπτιστοῦ] ουδεὶς ἔστιν, ὦ δὲ μικρότερος ἈΒΔ ἐν τῷ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ μείζων αὐτοῦ ἐστί. 39 καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ἀκούσας καὶ οἱ τελῶναι εἰδικαίωσαν τοῦ θεοῦ, βαπτισθέντες τὸ βαπτισμά Ιωάννου. 39 οἱ δὲ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ νομικοὶ τῆν βουλὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ἀνέβησαν ἐς εἰς αὐτοὺς, μὴ βαπτισθέντες ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ †. 31 τίνι οὖν ὁ ὁμιλοῦν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης, καὶ τίνι εἰσίν ὁμοιοί; † οἱ δὲ παιδίσκοι τοῖς ἐν ἀγορᾷ καθή- ἌΒΔ! μένοις, καὶ προφητεύοντες ἀλλήλοις * καὶ λέγουσιν Ῥ Ἡλόσμαυν υμῖν, καὶ οὐκ ὑψήλατος ἠθησίμασθεν ὑμῖν, καὶ οὐκ ἐκλάσατε. 32 ἠλθεῦν γὰρ Ιωάννου ὁ βαπτιστὴς μῆτε ἄρον ἐσθίων μήτε ὄνομα πινών, καὶ λέγετε Δαμιάνον ἔχεις. 33 ἠλθεῦν οἱ οἱ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐσθίων καὶ πινῶν, καὶ λέγετε Ἰδοὺ ἀνθρώπως τὰς φάγος καὶ οἰνοποιίας, τελεύτων φιλος και ἀμφιστώλων. 34 καὶ ἦν ἑκάστος τῶν ἀνθρώπων τῶν Φαρισαίων ἱνα φάγη μετ' αὐτῶν καὶ εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ Φαρισαίου

---

mccm had taken place: the plural is generic. [29-28.] see Matt. 29, 30. It has been imagined that these words are a continuation of the Lord's discourse, (Grotius, De Wette, Meyer,) but surely they would thus be most unnatural. They are evidently a parenthetical insertion of the Evangelist, expressive not of what had taken place during John's baptism, but of the present effect of the Lord's discourse on the then assembled multitude. Their whole diction and form is historical, not belonging to discourse. Besides if άκούσας were meant to signify 'when they heard him' (John), then βαπτισθέντες should be βαπτισθέντες. [29-38.] see on Matt. vv. 16-19.

36-50.] Peculiar to Luke. It is hardly possible to imagine that this history can relate to the same incident as that detailed Matt. xiv. 3. Mark xiv. 7. John xii. 3. The only particular common to the two, is the anointing itself; and even that is not strictly the same. The character of the woman—the description of the host—the sayings uttered,—the time—all are different. And if the probability of this occurring twice is to be questioned, we may fairly say, that an action of this kind, which had been once commanded by the Lord, was very likely to have been repeated, and especially at such a time as 'six days before the last Passover,' and by one anointing Him for His burial.—I may add, that there is not the least reason for supposing the woman in this incident to have been Mary Magdalene. The mention of her so soon after (ch. viii. 2), and what is there stated of her, make the notion exceedingly improbable. [36-38.] The exact time and place are indeterminate—the occasion of Luke's inserting the history here may have been the τῆς σακάς φιλος κ. ἀμφιστώλων in ver. 34. Wieseler places it at Nain, which certainly is the last πόλις that has been named: but it is more natural to suppose
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b * ανεκλίθη. 37 καὶ ἵδον γυνή ἐν τῇ πόλει ἡς ἦν ἁμαρτωλός. c * εἶπεν ὑμῖν ὅτι d * ἀνάκειται ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ τοῦ Фαρίσαου, * κομίσασα ἄλαβαστρον μύρων 38 καὶ στάσα

2 παρὰ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ [ὁπώς] κλαίουσα, ἤρχατο

b βρέχειν τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ τοῖς δάκρυσιν, καὶ τοῖς θρήσκευται της κεφαλῆς αὐτῆς ἐξείμασα, καὶ k κατεφύλαξε τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ καὶ ἦλθεν τῷ μύρῳ. 39 ἦδον δὲ ὁ Фαρίσαιος ὁ m καλεσάς αὐτὸν ἔπειν ἐν έαντῷ λέγων Ὀντὸς εἶ ἐὰν προφθῆς, ἐνίσχυσεν ἀν τίς καὶ ποστάθη ἡ γυνὴ οὗτης ἀπετέλεται αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἁμαρτωλός ἐστι. 40 καὶ ἀποκρυθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτὸν Σίμων, ὅ ἐξω σοι τί εἰπεν, ὁ δὲ φησὶ Διδάσκαλε, εἶπε. 41 Δύο χρυσωφελέται ἦσαν q δανείται τινι ἐις ὅ φυτεῖ δηναυρία πεντάκοσιο, ὃ δὲ


τῇ πόλει to refer only to τῇ οἰκίᾳ before—

a woman in the place,' viz. where the house was.—Meyer thinks that the definite article points out Capernaum.—ἀμαρτωλός, in the sense usually understood—a prostitute: but, by the context, penitent.—_todo is not however to be taken as a pluperfect—she was, even up to this time (see ver. 39), a prostitute—and this was the first manifestation of her penitence. "Quid mirum, tales ad Christum confugisse, cum et ad Johannis baptizam venerate?" Matt. xxii. 32 (Grotius). It is possible, that the woman may have just heard the closing words of the discourse concerning John, Matt. xi. 28-30; but I would not press this, on account of the obvious want of sequence in this part of our Gospel. The behaviour of the woman certainly implies that she had heard the Lord, and been awakened by His teaching.—ἀλαβάνω: see on Matt. xxvii. 7. The Lord would, after the ordinary custom of persons at table, be reclining on a couch, on the left side, turned towards the table, and His feet would be behind Him. She seems to have embraced His feet (see Matt. xxviii. 9), as it was also the Jews' custom to do by way of honour and affection to their Rabbis (see Wetstein on this passage), and kissed them, and in doing so to have shed abundant tears, which, falling on them, she wiped off with her hair. It does not appear that this latter was an intentional part of her honouring the Lord: had it been, there would hardly have been an article before δάκρυς. As it stands, τῶν δάκρυσιν is the tears which she shed,—not merely 'her tears,' which would be δάκρυα only.—The sentiment here has a peculiar interest, as being the offering by a penitent of that which had been an accessory in her unhallowed work of sin.—39.] εἰπ. ἐν ἐκα. λέγων. This phraseology is perhaps a mark of translation from the Hebrew.—The Pharisee assumes that the Lord did not know who, or of what sort, this woman was, and thence doubts His being a prophet (see ver. 16); —the possibility of His knowing this and permitting it, never so much as occurs to him. It was the touching, by an unclear person, which constituted the defilement. This is all that the Pharisee fixes on; his offence is merely technical and ceremonial. —40.] ἀποκρύφη—perhaps to the disgust manifested in the Pharisee's countenance, for that must have been the ground on which the narrative relates ver. 39. We must not however forget that in similar cases ἔδωκα ὁ Ἰησ. τὰς ἰδνορήσεις αὐτῶν is inserted (Matt. ix. 4), and doubtless might also have been here.—There is an inner personal appeal in the words addressing the Pharisee. The calling by name—"the especial ἢμαρτωλός αὐτῶν ἢμαρτωλός αὐτῶν—refer to the inner thoughts of the heart, and at once bring the answer διαφέρειν, αὐτῷ, so different from ἢμαρτωλός αὐτῶν τῇ πόλει, τῇ οἰκίᾳ before—fitting the context. —41.] We must remember that
the Lord is here setting forth the matter primarily with reference to Simon's subjective view of himself, and therefore not strictly as regards the actual comparative sinfulness of these two before God. Though however not to be pressed, the case may have been so: and, I am inclined to think, was so. The clear light of truth in which every word of His was spoken, will hardly allow us to suppose that such an admission would have been made to the Pharisees, if it had not really been so in fact. But see more below. — ἅπερ χρ. The debtors are the prominent persons in the parable—the creditor is necessary indeed to it, but is in the background. And this remark is important—for on bearing it carefully in mind the right understanding of the parable depends. The Lord speaks from the position of the debtors, and applies to their case the considerations of ordinary gratitude and justice. And in doing so it is to be noticed, that He makes an assumption for the purpose of the parable:—that sin: the sense of sin, just as a debt is felt to the amount of the debt. That disorganization of our moral nature, which renders the greatest sinner the least ready for penitence,—that deadly sedative effect of sin in lulling the conscience, does not here come into consideration:—the examples being two persons, both aware of their debt. —This assumption itself is absolutely necessary for the parable: for if forgiveness is to awaken love in proportion to the magnitude of that forgiven, sin in such a connexion must be the subjective debt which is felt to exist, not the objective one, the magnitude of which we never can know, but God only: see on ver. 47 below. — πεντηκόντα . . . . πεντηκόντα—a very different ratio from the ten thousand talents and the hundred pence in Matt. xviii. 21—36, because there it is intended to show us how insignificant our sins towards one another are in comparison with the offence of us all before God. —
\[\text{the whole life—} \text{the bud, blossom, and fruit, to His service to whom we were in baptism dedicated. For even on the ground of the parable itself, in that life there is a continually freshened sense of the need, and the assurance, of pardon, ever awaking devoted and earnest love. — In the ἐνεργείᾳ of Simon, we have, understood, "that is, if they feel as they ought." — 44—46.} \]

It would not appear that Simon had been deficient in the ordinary courtesies paid by a host to his guests—for these, though marks of honour sometimes paid, were not (even the washing of the feet, except when coming from a journey) invariably paid to guests;—but that he had taken no particular pains to show affection or reverence for his Guest. Respecting water for the feet, see Gen. xviii. 4. Judg. xix. 21. Observe the contrasts here:—ἐξηλθεν, ἀφέων ("father lacryms, sanguinum cordis," Aug. Trench, Parables, p. 270) = ἐξηλθεν ὑμῖν (on the face) — καταφέουσα τῶν πόδας — ἐφέθη τὴν κεφ., μὐρῆ (which was more precious) τῶν πόδας. — ἐξηλθεν (ex elixiēth.) These words will explain one difficulty in the circumstances of the anointing, how such a woman came into the guest-chamber of such a Pharisee. — She appears by them to have entered simultaneously with the Lord and His disciples. Nor do vv. 36, 37 at all preclude this idea:—ἐξηλθεν μεν χριστοῦ may mean, "having knowledge that He was going to dine," &c. If she came in His train, the Pharisee would not exclude her, as He was accustomed to gather such to hear Him: it was the touching at which He wondered. — 47.] This verse has been found very difficult to fit into the lesson conveyed by the Parable. But I think there need be little difficulty, if we regard it thus. — Simon had been offended at the uncleanness of the woman who touched the Lord. He, having given the Pharisee the instruction contained in the parable, and having drawn the contrast between the woman's conduct and his, now assures him, "Wherefore, seeing this is so, I say unto thee, she is no longer uncleaner than her many sins are forgiven: for (thou seest that) she loved much; her condescension towards Me shows that love, which is a token that her sins are forgiven." Thus the διὰ is not the causative particle, "because she loved much;" but, as rightly rendered in E. V., "for she loved much;" "for she has shown that love, of which thou mayest conclude, from what thou hast heard, that it is the effect of a sense of forgiveness." Thus Bengel, "Remissio peccatorum, Simoni non cogitata, probatur a fructu, ver. 42, qui est evidens et in occultis incurrit, quum illa sit occulta;" and Calov., "probabat Christus a posteriori." — But there is a deeper consideration in this solution, which the words of the Lord in ver. 48 bring before us. The sense of forgiveness of sin is not altogether correspondent to the sense of forgiveness of a debt. The latter must be altogether past, and a fact to be looked back on, to awaken gratitude: the former, by no means so. The expectation, the desire, and hope of forgiveness, the πίστις of ver. 50, awoke this love; just as in our Christian life, the love daily awakened by a sense of forgiveness, yet is gathered under and summed up in a general faith and expectation, that in that day all will be found to have been forgiven. The ἄφεσις τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν, into which we have been baptized, and in which we live, yet waits for that great ἄφεσις τῶν αἵματων, which He will then pronounce. — The sorit ἀνεραθοῦν is in apposition with the sorists throughout vv. 44—46, as referring to the same facts. — Remark that the assertion regarding Simon is not αἱλιγια ἁμαρτιών, but ἁμαρτία ἁμαρτιών; stamping the subjective character of the part relating to him; — he felt, or cared about, but little forgiveness, — and his little love showed this to be so. — 49.] This appears to have been said, not in an hostile, but a reverential spirit. Perhaps the zeal alludes to the miracles wrought in the pre

VIII. 11. Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ καθεξῆς, καὶ ἀντίς ἢπε δὲ πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα 'Η ἈΒΔΡ.

πιστοίς σου σιωπώς, ἐπορεύετο εἰς εἰρήνην.

καὶ ἀμαρτίας ἀφίησον; 50 ἐπεὶ δὲ πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα ἠ ἈΒΔΡ. πιστοίς σου σιωπώς, ἐπορεύετο εἰς εἰρήνην.

καὶ ἀντίς ἢπε δὲ πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα 'Η ἈΒΔΡ.

πιστοίς σου σιωπώς, ἐπορεύετο εἰς εἰρήνην.

καὶ ἀμαρτίας ἀφίησον; 50 ἐπεὶ δὲ πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα ἠ ἈΒΔΡ. πιστοίς σου σιωπώς, ἐπορεύετο εἰς εἰρήνην.

καὶ ἀμαρτίας ἀφίησον; 50 ἐπεὶ δὲ πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα ἠ ἈΒΔΡ. πιστοίς σου σιωπώς, ἐπορεύετο εἰς εἰρήνην.

καὶ ἀμαρτίας ἀφίησον; 50 ἐπεὶ δὲ πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα ἠ ἈΒΔΡ. πιστοίς σου σιωπώς, ἐπορεύετο εἰς εἰρήνην.

καὶ ἀμαρτίας ἀφίησον; 50 ἐπεὶ δὲ πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα ἠ ἈΒΔΡ. πιστοίς σου σιωπώς, ἐπορεύετο εἰς εἰρήνην.

καὶ ἀμαρτίας ἀφίησον; 50 ἐπεὶ δὲ πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα ἠ ἈΒΔΡ. πιστοίς σου σιωπώς, ἐπορεύετο εἰς εἰρήνην.

καὶ ἀμαρτίας ἀφίησον; 50 ἐπεὶ δὲ πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα ἠ ἈΒΔΡ. πιστοίς σου σιωπώς, ἐπορεύετο εἰς εἰρήνην.

καὶ ἀμαρτίας ἀφίησον; 50 ἐπεὶ δὲ πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα ἠ ἈΒΔΡ. πιστοίς σου σιωπώς, ἐπορεύετο εἰς εἰρήνην.

καὶ ἀμαρτίας ἀφίησον; 50 ἐπεὶ δὲ πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα ἠ ἈΒΔΡ. πιστοίς σου σιωπώς, ἐπορεύετο εἰς εἰρήνην.

καὶ ἀμαρτίας ἀφίησον; 50 ἐπεὶ δὲ πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα ἠ ἈΒΔΡ. πιστοίς σου σιωπώς, ἐπορεύετο εἰς εἰρήνην.

καὶ ἀμαρτίας ἀφίησον; 50 ἐπεὶ δὲ πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα ἠ ἈΒΔΡ. πιστοίς σου σιωπώς, ἐπορεύετο εἰς εἰρήνην.

καὶ ἀμαρτίας ἀφίησον; 50 ἐπεὶ δὲ πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα ἠ ἈΒΔΡ. πιστοίς σου σιωπώς, ἐπορεύετο εἰς εἰρήνην.
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ακούτω. 9ον ἑπτήσων δὲ αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ [λέ γοντες] 7ος ἐνή ἡ παρασκολομ. αὐτῇ; 10ο δὲ εἶπεν Ὄμην δὲ δοταὶ 9γνώται τὰ 9μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ, τοις δὲ λοιποῖς ἐν παρασκολομ. ἕνα βλέποντες μὴ βλέπωσιν καὶ ἀκούοντες μὴ συνώσουν. 11 ἔστι δὲ ἡ 'παρασκολομ. ὁ ὁ πάρορος ἐστιν ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ. 12οι δὲ παρά τὴν ὃδον ἐναὶ ἰ ἀκούοντες, εἶτα ἔρχεται ἐν διάβολος καὶ ἀγία τὸν λόγον ἀπὸ τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν, ἵνα μὴ πιστεύσητε σωθῆσαι. 13οι δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς πέτας, οἱ δὲ αὐτοὶ ἀκούονται ὑπὲρ 'χαρᾶς ἐξονται τὸν λόγον, καὶ οὕτωι ῥίζαν οὐκ ἔχουσιν, ὅπερ καὶ παῖδες ἐφημερίου, καὶ ἐν ἵππῳ περασμοῦ ἀφιστανται. 14τὸ δὲ εἰς τὰς ἁκάνθας πέσον, οὐτοὶ ἐισὶν οἱ ἀκούοντες, καὶ ὑπὸ 9μεριμνῶν καὶ πλούτου καὶ ἱδίων τοῦ βίου πορευομένοι 6σωματίζονται καὶ οὐ τελεφροφούσι. 15τὸ δὲ ἐν τῷ καλῷ γῆ, οὐτοὶ εἰσὶν ὑπὲρ ἐν καρδίᾳ καλῇ καὶ ἀγαθῇ ἀκούσαντες τὸν λόγον κατέχουσι καὶ καρποφόρουσιν ἐν ὑπόμονῃ. 16Οὐδεὶς δὲ λόγον ἀληθῶς καλύπτει αὐτῷ.
of Matt. (v. 14. x. 26. xiii. 12), but in other
connections. Euthym. remarks well, 
εἶκε δὲ κατὰ διάφορας καύρος τὰ ρωσάτα
tὸν χριστόν εἰπὼν. On the meaning of
the separate sayings, see notes on the pas-
sages in Matt. Observe that ver. 18, τῶν
ἀκοῦσαν = ἥκακουσεν Mark, and δοκεῖ
ήκαν = ἤκαν Mark.
19—21] Matt. xii. 46—50. Mark iii. 31
—35. The incident is introduced here
without any precise note of sequence; not
so in Matt., who says, after the discourse in
ch. xii., ἦν δὲ αὐτὸς λαλοῦντας τοῖς
. . . . . . and Mark ἦργον ταῦτα οὖν . . .
having before stated, ver. 21, that His
relations went out to lay hold of Him,—for
they said, "He is beside Himself." We
must conclude therefore that they have it
in the exact place, and Luke only inserts
it among the events of this series of dis-
courses, as indeed it was, but without fixing
its place. His account is abridged, and
without marks of an eye-witness, which the
others have.
35—v. 20. The chronology of this occurre-
cence would be wholly uncertain, were it not
for the precision of Mark, who has in-
 introduced it by ἐν ἱεραγίῳ τῷ ἡμέρᾳ ὣς
obscurs,—i.e. on the same day in which the
preceding parables were delivered. How
it has come to be misplaced in Matthew,
must ever be matter of obscurity. The
fact that it is so, is no less unquestionable,
than the proof that it furnishes the inde-
pendence of the two other Evangelists. —
25] ἐν μὲν τ. ἡμ. This serves to show
that Luke had no data by which he could
fix the following events. If he had seen
the Gospel of Mark, could this have been
so?—25] ἀνήφω. belongs to the later Greek,
even there more commonly signifies
17—29.
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ἀνέμω καὶ τῷ κλίσιον τοῦ ὕδατος, καὶ ἐπάσαντο καὶ ἐγένετο γαλήνη. 26 εἰπε δὲ αὐτοῖς Πού [ἐστιν] ἡ πίστις καὶ ὁ υμῶν; φοβθήτες δὲ ἔθαμπασαν, λέγοντες πρὸς ἀλλήλους μετ᾿.

Τὸς ἄρα υἱὸς ἐστιν, ὅτι καὶ τοῖς ἀνέμοις ἐπητάσαι καὶ τῷ υδάτι, καὶ ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ.

26 Καὶ κατέπλευσαν εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν Ἰακαρνηνῶν, ητὶς ἐστιν ἀντιπέρα τῆς Γαλιλαίας. 27 ἐξελθοῦντι δὲ αὐτῷ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ὑπῆκοινεν αὐτῷ ἄνηρ τις ἐκ τῆς πόλεως, ὡς εἰχε δαιμόνια ἐκ χρόνων ἱκανῶν, καὶ ἦμινον οὐκ ἐνεδίοντο καὶ ἐν οἴκω οὐκ ἦμεν, ἀλλὰ ἐν τοῖς μνήμασιν. 28 ἱδὼν δὲ τὸν Ἰσσοῦν [καὶ] ἠναγκάζεται προετέρεις αὐτῷ καὶ φωνὴ μεγάλη εἶπεν 

Τί ἐμοί καὶ σοι, Ἰσσοῦ τι εἰς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦτο; δειομάι σοι μὴ με βασανίσῃ. 29 * παρηγγείλε μαρτύρε μου πνευμάτων ἀκαθαρτῶν ἐξελθείν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πολλοὶ γὰρ χρόνοι συνηρτάκατε αὐτῷ, καὶ ἐκείνον ἀλλοιοῦσας

καὶ πέτασις φιλασόμενος, καὶ διαφθοράς τα 
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to awaken.' —καταλήξις—from the sky—or perhaps from the mountain valleys around: see Matt. vii. 27. —συνέβη. They (= their ship) were 'filling.' —24.) see notes on Matt. 26.] In Matt. this reproof comes before the stilling of the storm. But our account, and that in Mark, are here evidently exact.

26—39.] Matt. viii. 28—34. Mark v. 1

—20, in both of which places see notes.

28.) ἄντ. τ. Γ. a more precise description than τὸ πέτασιν Matt., so τὸ π. τῆς θαλ. Mark. —27.) εἰ τῆς πολ. belongs, not to νῦντ. (Meyer and E. V.), but to ἀνήρ τις —'a certain man of the city.' The man did not come from the city, but from the tombs.—I put to any reader the question, whether it was possible for either Mark or Lake to have drawn up their account from Matt., or with Matt. before them, seeing that he mentions two possessed throughout? Would no notice be taken of this? Then indeed would the Evangelists be but poor witnesses to the truth, if they could consciously allow such a discrepancy to go forth. I believe that the plurality of the demons in the accurate accounts of Mark and Luke is the real key to the duality of persons in the evidently not so full nor precise account of Matt. —ἰδοὺ οὖν ἐστι —to be taken literally. The propensity to go entirely naked is a well-known symptom in certain kinds of raving madness: see Trench, Miracles, p. 167, note †. —29.] There is no occasion to render παρηγγ. as a pluperfect: perhaps the imperfect is the better reading, 'Jesus was ordering,' &c. On χρόνων ὡς see reff. Plutarch, Thea 6, uses χρόνως πέταλοι θεορούν —not, 'for many years," still less, 'oftentimes,' E. V., Grot. —but 'during a long time.' —ἀνεκτιμήθη —it seized him and carried him.' see reff. —ἀδημ. —notice the imperfect, giving the sense, 'it was attempted to bind him.' —διάφαν. τ. 8. The unnatural increase of muscular strength is also observed in cases
of raving madness: see Trench as above.—
30.] Lightfoot (on Mark v. 9) quotes instances of the use of ἔνοχος, for a great number, in the Rabbinical writings. The fact of many devils having entered into this wretched man, sets before us terribly the utter break-up of his personal and rational being. The words will not bear any figurative rendering, but must be taken literally (see ver. 2 of this chap., and ch. xi. 24 ff.); viz., that in the same sense in which other poor creatures were possessed by one evil spirit (see note on || Matt.), this man, and Mary Magdalene, were possessed by many.

31.] ἡράκλεια—most probably singular,
for the plural is used of the demons in the next verse. There is throughout this narrative an interchange of the personality of the man and the devils: see on Matt. as above. — τ. ἔνοχου. This word is sometimes used for Hades in general (Rom. x. 7), but more usually in Scripture for the abode of damned spirits: see Ref. This last is certainly meant here—for the request is co-ordinate with the fear of torment expressing above (see Greswell on the Parables, v. (pt. 2) 365, and note on ch. xvi. 23). —
35.] ἄνηγελα, viz. the people in the town and
στρεμέν. 38 ιδιότα ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ὁ ἁνὴρ ἀφοῦ ἐξαλυθήθη
tα δαίμονα εἶναι σὺν αὐτῷ. ἀπέλυσε δὲ αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰησοῦς. 39
λέγων ὑποστρέφει εἰς τὸν οίκον σου, καὶ διηγοῦν ὁσα ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός. καὶ ἀπήλθε, καθ’ ὅλην τὴν πόλιν
κηρύσσαν ὅσα ἐποίησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς. 40
Εγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ ὕποτρέφεται τῶν Ἰησοῦν, ἀπε
dεξάτο αὐτὸν ὁ ὀχλος ἢσαν γὰρ πάντες προσκοκώντες αὐτόν. 41 καὶ ἰδοὺ ἤλθεν ἀνήλικος ὁ Ἰακειρος, καὶ
αὐτὸς ἀρχὼν τῆς συναγωγῆς ὑπῆρχε καὶ πεζὸν παρὰ
tοὺς πόλεως τοῦ Ἰησοῦ παρεκάλει αὐτὸν εἰσελθείν ὑπὲρ τῶν
οίκων αὐτοῦ, 42 ὡς ὁ θυγάτηρ μονογενὴς ἦν αὐτῷ ὡς ἐτῶν
dωδέκα, καὶ αὐτὴ ἀπεθάνεσεν. 43 ἐν τῇ ὑπανείον ἀν
tοῦ, ὁ ὀχλος συνήθεισιν αὐτῶν. 44 καὶ γνωρίσα πόνον ἐν
dο ρουλαί αἰματος ἀπὸ εἰς τῶν δωδέκα, ητίς [ἐνα τρις προε
analóssasa ὅλον τῶν βίων] ὡς ἴσχυσεν ὑπὸ υδάτος ηπατουβήνη, 45 προελάµβασα ὡς θανατον ἤλθεν τοῦ κρα
pσίφου τοῦ ἰματίου αὐτοῦ, καὶ παραχώμενος ἐστὶν ἡ ρώσις

ins. A P. — 38. ιδιότα B L X. ιδιότα A P. ἱράτα δὲ δ. C. — αὐτὸν D. —
for εἶναι, ἢν P. — ἀπελύσεις L. — 39. for ὑπότρ., πορεύοντας C D — πρὸς τοὺς σοὺς
(ας in || Mark) X. — for καὶ διηγούμενος D. — for δεῖ, δ. D. — δεῖ σοι C. —
ἐν τῷ κύριῳ πεποιημένη καὶ ἠλέοντος C. — for (καὶ τοῦ) B L P X A C D F — πρὸς τοὺς
πόλεις εἰσήρθεν D. — 40. ἐν τῷ ὑποτρέφεται B L 4 (ὑποστρέφει L) Σyr. Κοpt.
ἔφυσαν καὶ τῆς συναγωγῆς πέντε D. — for αὐτός, εἶναι B D 7 ad. — τὸ ἐκ A P B (C uncertain)
42. for ὣς, ὅν D. — αὐτῷ ὁ μονομ. (om. ὃν and ὃς) C. — for καὶ αὐτ. οἰκία, αὐτοῦ
ἐν τῷ παρέσυρεν C D P abed. — for εἰς C. — συνεθείμιν C L 12. — τὸ A B D (αιν D) P. —
A P. — ὀδεῖ εἰς ἴσχυς θατοῦν D. — ἄπο ὅδνος A B. — τὸ C P. — 44. προελάβοα

country, = πᾶσα ἡ πόλις, Matt.; here under
derstood in ἰπήγ. εἰς τ. πολ. κ. εἰς τ. ἄγ. — παρὰ τ. π. τ. ίη. This particularity de
notes an eye-witness. The phrases common to Mark and Luke, e.g. Ἰπ. καὶ σωφ., οἱ ἰδιόντες denote a common origin of the two narratives, which have however become considerably deflected, as comparison will show. — 38, 39, see notes on Mark.

40—56. Matt. ix. 18—26. Mark v. 21—43. Our account is that of the three which brought out the most important points, and I have therefore selected it for full comment.—40.] ἐν τῇ ἑρωτ., 'when Jesus had returned.'—ἀν., 'welcomed Him;' see reff. — ἔφυσαν γ.: here we have an eye-wit
ness again. — 41.] ἔφυσαν — a ruler = εἰς τῶν ἱρακίσκουσαν τῶν Mark; in Matt. only ἔφυσαν. — 42.] μονογ., peculiar to Luke, but perhaps implied in τῷ θυγάτῃ τοῦ Mark.—ἀπευθ. was dying. In Matt. she is represented as already dead. He is not aware of the subsequent message to Jaecirus, and narrates conversely and generally.—The crowd seems to have followed to see what would happen at Jaecirus's house: see ver. 54.—43.] προελάβον, having, besides all her suffering, spent, &c. Mark adds, that she grew nothing better, but rather worse. — 44.] Her inner thoughts are given in Mark, ver. 23. — There was doubting weakness and error in this woman's view; — she imagined that healing power flowed as it were magically out of the Lord's person; and she touched the fringe of His garment as the most sacred, as well as the most accessible part: see Matt. xxi. 5. Num. xv. 37—40. But she obtained what
she desired. She sought it, though in error, yet in faith. And she obtained it, because this faith was known and recognized by the Lord. It is most true objectively that there did go forth from Him, and from His Apostles (see Mark vi. 56. Luke vi. 19. Acts v. 16. xix. 12), healing virtue; but it is also true that, in ordinary cases, only those were receptive of this whose faith embraced the truth of its existence, and ability to heal them. The error of her view was overborne, and her weakness of apprehension of truth covered, by the strength of her faith. And this is a most encouraging miracle for us to recollect, when we are disposed to think despondingly of the ignorance or superstition of much of the Christian world: that He who accepted this woman for her faith even in error and weakness, may also accept them. — 45.] We are not to imagine that the Lord was ignorant of the woman, or any of the circumstances. The question is asked to draw out what followed.—See, on the part of Jesus Himself, an undeniable instance of this, in ch. xxiv. 19—and note there. The healing took place by His will, and owing to His recognition of her faith:—see similar questions, 2 Kings v. 26, and Gen. iii. 9. —5 The verb to be understood here. —On the latter part of this verse many instructive remarks have been made in sermons—see Trench, Min., p. 192 note.—to the effect that many press round Christ, but few touch Him, only the faithful. Thus Augustine, 'Sic etiam nunc est corpus ejus, id est, Ecclesia ejus. Tangit eam fides paucorum, premit turbas multorum' (Serm. lxxi. 4). And Chrysostom, ὁ πιστεὺς εἰς τὸν Σωτῆρα ἄντεται αὐ—

to αἵματος αὐτῆς. 45 καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰσσοῦς Τίς ὁ ἀβαμένος Μου; 46 ὁ δὲ Ἰσσοῦς εἶπεν ὁ Ἱσσοῦς μου. 47 ὁ δὲ Ἰσσοῦς εἶπεν ὁ Ἱσσοῦς μου. Τίς ὁ ἀβαμένος μου; 48 ὁ δὲ Ἰσσοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῇ Ἰδοὺς τὸν Λαοῦ, καὶ ἦς καθαρόμενος, ἤ τὸς πιστεύσαι αὐτὴν ἢ τὴν αἰτίαν θαυμάτου αὐτῆς ἢ τὴν αἰτίαν θαυμάτου αὐτῆς. 49 οὐκ εἶπεν αὐτῇ Ἡνάγαγε ἢ πῦρ ἢ πῦρ, ἢ θάνατος οὐκ ἦν καὶ ὡς Ιδοὺς τὸν Λαοῦ, καὶ ἦς καθαρόμενος. 50 οὐκ εἶπεν αὐτῇ Ἡνάγαγε ἢ πῦρ ἢ πῦρ, ἢ θάνατος οὐκ ἦν καὶ ὡς Ιδοὺς τὸν Λαοῦ, καὶ ἦς καθαρόμενος. 51 οὐκ εἶπεν αὐτῇ Ἡνάγαγε ἢ πῦρ ἢ πῦρ, ἢ θάνατος οὐκ ἦν καὶ ὡς Ιδοὺς τὸν Λαοῦ, καὶ ἦς καθαρόμενος.
49 ἐτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος ἐρχεῖαι τις * παρὰ τοῦ ἀρχι-

ἈΒΚΔ συναγώγου λέγων αὐτῷ ὅτι τέθηκεν ἢ θυγάτηρ σου* μὴ ἔκλαιον δὲ Ιησοῦς ἀκούσας ἀπε-

κρίθη αὐτῷ λέγων Μή φοβοῦ, μόνον * πίστευε, καὶ ἵνα σωθήσῃαι. 61 [ἐκ] ἐλθὼν δὲ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν οὐκ ἀφίκειν εἰς εἰς ὅτι Πέτρον καὶ Ιάκωβον καὶ Ιωά-

νυν, καὶ τὸν πατέρα τῆς παιδὸς καὶ τὴν μητέρα. 62 ἔκλαιον δὲ πάντες καὶ ἐκόπτοντο αὐτὴν. οὗτος οὖν ἐίπες Μὴ κλαίεις, * οὐκ ἀπίστηνεν ἀλλὰ καθεύδει. 63 καὶ Κατεγέλων αὐτοῦ, εἰδότες ὅτι ἀπέθανεν. 64 αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ ἐκβάλλων ἐξω πάντας καὶ] ἐκ 

καὶ ἐκτένεις τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῆς ἐφώνησε λέγων Ἡ παῖς, ἐγείρομαι. 65 καὶ ἐπέστρεψε τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτῆς καὶ ἐκτένεις 

τοῖς εὐαγγέλιοι ὧν γονεῖς αὐτῆς· οὗτος δὲ παραγγελὼν ἀν 

tοὺς μηδενὶ εἰπεν τῷ γεγονός.


manent—that the healing about which she might otherwise almost have doubted, as being surreptitious obtained, was now openly ratified by the Lord's own word. — 49.] Little marks of accuracy come out in each of these two accounts. Here we have ἐρχονται τις, which was doubtless the exact fact—in Mark ἐρχονται, generally expressed. In Mark again we learn not only that Jesus heard,—but heard τῶν λόγων λα-

λούμενον, i.e. it was not reported to Him, but He overheard it being said, which is a minute detail not given here. Nothing could more satisfactorily mark the independent authority of the two narratives. — 50. καὶ σημ. is only here.—51.] The Lord had entered the house, where He found θερόμενον, τοὺς αὐλαχάς, καὶ τὸν ὄχλον . . . . (Matt., Mark), who were all following Him into the chamber of death. On this He declared who were to follow Him (οὖν ἀφήσεις, κ.κ.λ.), and uttered the words διακρίνομαι οὐ γὰρ κ.κ.λ. Then He entered with His three Apostles and the parents. I say this, not for the sake of harmonizing, but to bring out the sequence in our narrative here, which, unless they understood the right meaning for ἀφήσεις, seems disturbed. — 53.] The maiden was actually dead, as plainly appears from the εἰς τοὺς δώδε. The words οὐκ αὐτῷ. ἀλ. η. are no ground for surmising for the contrary; see note on Matt. ver. 25. — 54.] Mark gives the actual Aramaic words uttered by the Lord, ῥαλθά θοῦμα. — If we had only Luke's narrative, we should suppose, by the εἰςβάλλων έξω νάσαν, that the Lord was alone with the maiden. — 55.] 'Her spirit returned!': see ref., in the former of which death had not taken place, but in the latter it had:—so that no inference adverse to her actual death can be derived from the use of the word.—The command to give her to eat, shows that she was restored to actual life with its wants and weaknesses; and in that incipient state of convalescence, which would require nourishment.—The testimony of Mark here precludes all idea of a recovery from a mere paroxysm—καὶ πεπερικατήριθα. One who ἵκνουσι δέχεσθαι in the time of the father's coming, and then died, so that it could be said of the minstrels and others who had time to assemble, εἰς τοὺς δώδε. ἀφι-

θανατόν, could not pretend that they
IX. 1 Sigma kaleiteinomeno de touc; dokeca [μαθητας αυ- αβδ] t' edwkev autous d'vnamai kai k' eixousian epi pandeta ta daumia kai vousous therapeuein kai kai apastelev autous ekprouxin thn basileia tou theou kai idasai touc; *aspo- vountas.

2 kai eite proo autous Mhdon aiertai eis thn odon, mpti *rados mou mpti mpran mpti ar- gyroin, mpti [an] duo xitovnas echein. kai kai eis thn an oikiai ielhthei, ekei mhnetai kai ekhein en eexosei. kai osoi an mh *dezwontai umas, e'xoromenvi apo ths pollews ekeinh [kai] ton konorotou apo ton podon umon apo- tivazate eis martrorion ep' autous. e'xoromenvi de diarchontos kata ths kumas eunagelizoumeni kai therapeuontes pantachou. thkousa de 'Horwths o tetrarhix sas ginomena [up autou] pantata, kai diptora dia to le- gavon upo tinon oti Ioanthes *6 e'gstratei eke nekov, upo tinon de oti 'Hlasa efan, allws de oti profttis *eis ths arkaiws anaste. kai eite o 'Horwths Io- anhyn enw apiekaleisa, tis eis eistin ouc peri ou [e'gou]


were mistaken and she only was in a trance, now risen up and walked, and been in a situation to take meat, in so short a time after. Every part of the narrative combines to declare that the death was real, and the miracle a raising from the dead, in the strictest sense. — 66.] The injunction however was not observed; for we read in Matt., eijzshwv ohi e'ma eis 'lhn t'v 

CHAP. IX. 1—5. Matt. x. 5—14. Mark vi. 7—13. Mark's account agrees nearly exactly with the text. The discourse is given at much greater length in Matt., where see notes. — 1.] theaxwv belongs to deov. kal e'jonev as in 1 Cor. ix. 5; some join it with deov, as in John v. 26. Matt. xiii. 11. — 2.] mpti de a'ptov. x. e'jonev — a mixed construction; the form of the clause having been in the second person, this is added as if it had been in the infin, a'ptov. The infinitive for the imperative would not be in place here, see Winer Gram. 46, 7. — 5. It is remarkable that in Mark there is also a mixed construction, 'eis umon a'ptov ... allwv 'en a'movous ... kai mi eivdov. — 6.] for deis, see ref. — 7.] for a'ptov, 'against them;' — more determinate than a'ptov, Mark. — 7—9.] Matt. xiv. 1—12. Mark vi. 14—29. How inexplicable would be the omission of the death of John the Baptist, by the Evangelist who has given so particular an account of his ministry, (ch. iii. 1—20,) if Luke had had before him the narratives of Matt. and Mark! — 7.] for a'ptov, if it is to remain in the text, presents no difficulty. Herod (see Mark) heard the account of the miracles wrought by the twelves, but even then it was rod di'umov a'ptov which was spread abroad. These works were done in their Master's Name, and in popular rumour passed for
KATA DOUKAN.

1—15. άκων τοίαντα; και ἔζητε ιδίαν αὐτὸν. 10 Καὶ ὅποιοι διηγήσαντο αὐτῷ διήγησαν, καὶ παραλαβὼν αὐτὸς ὑπέχώρησε καὶ ἰδίαν ίδε· 
*tόπον ἔρημον πόλεως καλουμένης* Βηθσαία. 11 οἱ δὲ οὗλοι γνώτες ἤκολούθησαν αὐτῷ· καὶ δεξάμενος αὐτοὺς ἐλάλη αὐτοῖς περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ τοὺς ἱρεάν ἔχοντας θεοσεία ἱστο. 12 ἡ δὲ ἡμέρα ἤρετο 1 κλίνειν προσελθόντες δὲ οἱ δώδεκα ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ Ἀπόλυσαν τὸν οὖχλον, ἵνα ἀπέλθοντες εἰς τὰς ἐκκλήσιας καὶ τοὺς ἁγίους καταλύσασι καὶ ἐφοροῦν ἐπιστημὸν, ὅτι ὥστε ἐν ἔρημῳ τῷ ἐσμέν. 13 εἰπε δὲ πρὸς αὐτοὺς 'Δότε αὐτοῖς ἡμῖν φαγεῖν. οἱ δὲ εἶπον Ὁ γὰρ ἐστιν ἡμῖν πλεῖν ἡ πέντε ἄρτοι καὶ δύο ἱκεσίες, εἰ μὴ περιείλετε ἡμῖν 'ἀγοράσασθεν ἐς πάντα τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον βρωματα. 14 ἦσαν γὰρ ἐξ ἀνδρείς πεντακισχιλίοι, εἰπε δὲ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ ἐκαταλύσατο αὐτοὺς καὶ κλίσαις · 'ἀνὰ πεντήκοντα. 15 καὶ ἐποίησαν οὕτω, καὶ ἀνέκλιναν

His. — 9.] The repetition of ὤν implies personal concern and alarm at the growing convent of Jesus; see notes on Matt. 10—17.] Matt. xiv. 13—21. Mark vi. 30—44. John vi. 1—13. Compare the notes on each of these. —10.] He went in a ship (Matt. Mark, John), of which our Evangelist seems not to have been aware; for we should gather from our text, that it was by land. A great difficulty also attends the mention of Bethsaida here. It is apparently meant to be the well-known Bethsaida, on the western bank of the lake, not far from Capernaum. But 1 (the Lord was on this side before,—see ch. viii. 37; and 2 (Mark ch. vi. 45) relates that after the miracle of the loaves He caused His disciples to cross over to Bethsaida. But there were two places of this name:—another Bethsaida (Julia) lay at the top of the lake, on the Jordan. Now it is very likely that the Lord may have crossed the lake to this Bethsaida, and Luke, finding that the miracle happened near Bethsaida, and not being aware of the crossing of the lake, may have left the name thus without explanation, as being that of the other Bethsaida. Mark gives us the exact account: that the Lord and the disciples, who went by sea, were perceived by the multitude, who went by land, περιγύ, and arrived before Him. How any of these accounts could have been compiled with a knowledge of the others, I cannot imagine. —11.] see note on Mark ver. 34.—Βεγγα. This word includes what Mark tells us of His going forth from His solitude, or perhaps landing from the ship, and seeing a great multitude, and having compassion on them: —'having received them,’ i.e. not sent them away. —12.] As the three agree in their account here, and John differs from them, see the difference discussed in notes there. In his account, the inquiry proceeds from the Lord Himself, and is addressed to Philip, and answered by Philip and Andrew. —13.] ἐπὶ μήτη· unless indeed we were to go and buy, &c. On the constr. see 1 Cor. xiv. 5. Rev. xi. 5, and Winer, § 42. p. 243. —14.] ἀκοινοβοῦντι by companies—the accusative of the manner, or situation, or time, in which; see Winer,
\[\text{EYAGTLEION IX.}\]

\[\text{απαντάς.} \quad \text{λαβὼν δὲ τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς δύο ἄβδο}-\]

\[\text{χῆμας, ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ ἔλυγγεν αὐτοὺς} \quad \text{καὶ κατέκλασε, καὶ ἔδιδον τοῖς μαθηταῖς.} \quad \text{παρατιθέναι} \quad \text{ὡς ἀχλω.} \quad \text{καὶ ἔφαγον καὶ ἔχορος ἐθησαν πάντες, καὶ ἤρθη τὸ περισσεύςαν αὐτῶς κλασμάτως κόφινοι δώ-}\]

\[\text{ decea.}\]

\[\text{Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτῶν προσευχόμονος καταμόνας, ἠνήσαν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ.} \quad \text{ἐπροφητή-}\]

\[\text{σεν αὐτοὺς λέγων: Τίνα με λέγουσιν οἱ ἄγιοι εἶναι; οἱ δὲ ἀποκριθέντες εἰπον Ἰωάννην τὸν βαπτιστήν, ἀλλοι δὲ Ἕλιαν, ἀλλοι δὲ ἐν τῷ προφητείας τις τῶν ἀρχαίων ἀνέστη. ἐπεῖ δὲ αὐτοῖς Ὑμεῖς δὲ τίνα με λέγετε εἶναι; ἀποκριθείς δὲ ὁ Πέτρος εἶπε: Τὸν χριστὸν τὸν θεοῦ.} \quad \text{ὅτι ἐπὶ τῶν υἱών του ἀνθρώπου τολλὰ παθεῖν καὶ ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι ἀπὸ τῶν προσβυτέρων καὶ ἀρχιε-}\]

\[\text{ρών καὶ γραμματέων, καὶ ἀποκτανθῆναι, καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ}\]

\[\text{ἐν} \quad \text{αὐτοῖς Δ. ἀντίκειται om.} \quad \text{Χ. Στρ. Εὐθ.} \quad \text{καὶ σερ. om. D.} \quad \text{παράβαλλαι B C X S.} \quad \text{τινὶ Δ.} \quad \text{ἐν παρεσπέρῳ τῶν κληρικῶν D.} \quad \text{διάκονον D.} \quad \text{ἀρτοίς τοὺς ἐγχύμονας τις} \quad \text{ἀρχιερεῖς, διὰ τὸ προφητίζει} \quad \text{ἀρχιερεῖς,} \quad \text{ἐν προφητὴν Δ.} \quad \text{προφητικὸν σωματεῖα magnus c.} \quad \text{ἱεροὺς ὑπὸ D Orig. ma.} \quad \text{καὶ μεθ' ἡμέρας τριῶν D.} \quad \text{ἀποκτανθῆναι A C D F K 14 Orig.} \quad \text{§ 32, 6. ἀνὰ π.} \quad \text{Mark gives ἀνὰ καὶ ἐκατὸν καὶ ἐκατὸ τοῦ μεταφραστὶς with his usual precision.} \quad \text{Besides these companies, there were the women and children, unavenged; see on} \quad \text{John vi. 10.} \quad \text{On the symbolic} \quad \text{implication of the miracles, see notes on John} \quad \text{vi.} \quad \text{Matt. is joined with} \quad \text{τὸ παρεσπέρων, in Mark with κοίνων πάρος: here it may be taken with} \quad \text{παρεσπέρων, ordinary, and De Wette) or καὶ παρεσπέρων (Meyer, but best, it appears to me, the latter, because the article is not expressed as in Matt. Immediately after this miracle, Matt. Mark, and John relate the walking on the sea, which, and the whole series of events following as far as Matt. xvi. 13, the healings in the land of Gennesaret, the discourse about unwashed hands, the Syrophoenician woman, the healing of multitudes by the sea of Galilee, the feeding of the 4000, the asking of a sign from Heaven, and the forgetting to take bread, are wholly omitted by our Evangelist. Supposing him to have had Matt. before him, how is this to be explained? It is also an important observation, that the omission by Luke of the second miracle of feeding is not to be adduced against its historical reality, as Schleiermacher has done (transl. p. 144), since it is only omitted as occurring in the midst of a large section, which the accounts gathered by Luke did not contain. We see also, that the characteristic κοίνων of the first feeding is preserved, without any confusion of terms: σωματέως being also used in relating and referring to the second,} \quad \text{Mark xv. 37. xvi. 10. Mark viii. 8. 20.} \quad \text{Mark xiii. 12-28. Mark viii. 27. ix. 1. The Lord had gone into the neighbourhood of Cæsarea Philippi; see notes on Matthew.} \quad \text{19.} \quad \text{ἐν τῷ πρὸ τοῦ} \quad \text{ἀρχιερεῖς, ἀναρχικῶς D.} \quad \text{see ver. 8. There is no improbability, nor contradiction to John's account that the multitudes sought to make him a king, in the Lord's asking this question. We must remember that such inquiries were not made by Him for information, but as a means of drawing out the confessions of others, as here.} \quad \text{20.} \quad \text{See the important addition, the promise to Peter, in Matt. xv. 17. 20. as far as ἀπεκρινήτως, is verbatim with Mark: the last clause verbatim with Matt. And yet, according to the commentators, Mark has compiled his account from Matt. and Luke! The almost verbal agreement of the three in so solemn and sad an announcement, is what we might expect. Such words would not be easily forgotten.
23. ἢμέρᾳ ἐγερθήσαν. 24. ἔλεγε δὲ πρὸς πάντας Ἐι τις ἄρα τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀπολέσῃ αὐτὴν ἄρα τὸν ἁγίον κλητίς; 25. τί γὰρ ἐφεξήκοντα ἄνθρωπος καὶ ἀνήλθαν τοῦ κόσμου οὖς, ἀνεφέρετε τὸν ἁγίον καὶ ἀπολέσατε τὸν Αὸν ἁγίον καὶ ἀπεσακύνθησατε ἄνθρωπον τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου καὶ τῶν ἀγιῶν αὐτοῦ. 26. ἔγενετο δὲ μηδὲν ἀπεσακύνθη, ἀπεσακύνθη αὐτὸν καὶ παραλαβὼν τὸν ἐδώκει τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ. 27. ἔγενετο δὲ μετὰ τῶν λόγων τούτων ὡς ἦσαν ἡμέρας ἡμῖν γεννήθη εἰς τὸ ὁρὸς προσευχήσεως. 28. καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ προσευχῆσθαι αὐτὸν τὸ ἔδώκει τῷ προσώπῳ αὐτοῦ ἔδωκεν καὶ ἤματι μακρὸς ἡμῶν. 29. καὶ ἠκούσαν ὑμῖν ἀπεσακύνθη ἐν δόξῃ ἔλεγεν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ αὐτοῦ ἐμελέτη πληροῦν ἐν ἔρευσαν. 30. ταῦτα πρὸς τὴν παντοτέκνη ἔχασεν ἡμῖν ἠκούσαν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ αὐτοῦ ἐμελέτη πληροῦν ἐν ἔρευσαν.
by Divine appointment. — 38. ] δεινντο, not 'when they were awake,' as E. V.—but 'having kept awake' through the whole. The word is expressly used to show that it was not merely a vision seen in sleep. Meyer quotes from Herodian 3, 4, 8, πάντος τῆς εὐνοίας...διαγγοροφήσαντες. — 33.] 'while they were departing'—with a desire to hinder their departure.—μη εἴθισιν δ λ.—from fear and astonishment— ἵνα γὰρ ἐκφοβοί, Mark. — 34.] There is no difference in the accounts, as Meyer thinks: the ἐν τῷ διαχώρισθε...vers. 33, is only an additional particular, and the rest is exactly in accordance. — 36.] Luke gives the result of the Lord's command to them; the command itself is related in Matt. ver. 9, and Mark ver. 9. — 37—42. ] Matt. xvii. 9—21. Mark ix. 9—29. The narrative in Mark is by far the most copious, and I have commented at length on it. — 37.] ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ μετα τῆς νυκτός. The Transfiguration probably took place at night,—see on Matt. xvii. 1,—and this was in the morning. Luke omits the whole discourse concerning Elias (Matt. and Mark vv. 9—13). — 38.] μοῦ, ἵνα μοὶ is peculiar to Luke. — 39.] ἰδεῖν—i.e. the
καὶ οὖκ ἡδυνήθησαν. 41 ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰσσοῦς ἐίπεν ὁ Ἡγεία ἀπετείλησεν. "Ω γενεὰ ἀπίστως καὶ ἀδισταμένη, ἡς πότε ἔσώμαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς καὶ ἀνέξομαι ὑμῶν; προσέγαγε ὑμῖν τὸν νῦν σου. 42 ἐγὼ δὲ προερχομένου αὐτοῦ ἔφραξεν αὐτὸν τὸ δαμόνον καὶ συνεπάραξεν ἐπιτίμησε δὲ ὁ Ἰσσοῦς τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀκαθάρτῳ, καὶ ἱάσατο τὸν παῦδα καὶ ἀπέδωκεν αὐτὸν τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ. 43 ἐξεπλήσσοντο δὲ πάντες ἐπὶ τῷ μεγαλειώτητι τοῦ θεοῦ. πάντων δὲ θαυμαλότων ἐπὶ πάσιν οῖς ἐπετείλε ὁ Ἰσσοῦς, εἰπε δὲ τούς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ. 44 Θεὸς ὑμῖς εἰς τὰ ὠτα ὑμῶν τῶν λόγων τούτων. ὁ γὰρ νῦς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου μείλῃ παραδίδοσιν ἐς χειρός ἀνθρώπων. 45 οἱ δὲ ἡγοῦντον τὸ ἤμα τοῦτο, καὶ ἦν παρακεκλαμμένον ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἡμᾶς ἀπεδωκὼν καὶ ἐφοβοῦντο ἐρωτῶν αὐτόν περὶ τοῦ ἤματος τοῦτον.

46 Ἐσθησε δὲ διαλογισμός ἐν αὐτοῖς, τοῦτο τὸ τις ἐν εἰς μεῖων αὐτῶν. 47 ὁ δὲ Ἰσσοῦς ἤδον τὸν διαλογισμὸν τῆς καρδίας ἐπιτείλησεν μαθητῶν ἐπὶ ἐπιλαμβάνον οὐκ οὖν ἐστίν αὐτὸν.

—there is a rapid change of subject, see ch. xiii. 4. xlv. 2 al. and Winer, § 58, 7. εἰμι προσέχων is perhaps literal—brutishing him.

43—45] Matt. xvii. 22, 23. Mark ix. 30—32. —43 ff.] πάντες—the multitude—in contrast with ὧδε of ver. 44. τὸ δὲ λ. τ. not (Meyer), 'the foregoing discourses and wonders:'—that would give no sense—for the disciples were thinking exclusively of those already: nor strictly (Stier) 'what I am about to tell you,' so that τὸ δὲ λ. τ. should be [with τὸ ἤμα below: but 'these sayings,' of which this was now the second;—these intimations which I make to you from time to time respecting My sufferings and death.' The Resurrection, expressly mentioned in the others, is omitted here. —45] ἦν—not to be evaded by forcing it to mean 'so that they did not...,' but to be rendered 'that they might not,' as in Matt. i. 22 al. It was the Divine purpose, that they should not at present be aware of the full significance of these words.

Mark, where I have discussed the differences in the three narratives. —46.] There is not the least occasion to confine the sense of an inward doubt and questioning in the heart of each; indeed I will venture to say that no interpreter would have thought of doing so, had not the narratives of Matt. and Mark, by mentioning an outward expression of this thought, offered a temptation to discover a discrepancy,—of which Meyer, as usual, has not failed to avail himself. Had our narrative stood by itself, we should have understood it, as I do now, of a dispute which had taken place or was taking place, and which, though not actually spoken out before the Lord, was yet open to His disciples' eye, so that not only the words, but the disputing of their thoughts, was known to Him.—The idea of τὸ τίς δὲ ἐν αὐτῷ meaning that each one thought: "Who is greater than I?" (Meyer in loc.) is absurd enough. Still more absurd however is the Harmonistic attempt of Greewell, to make two distinct events out of (1) the incident in Mark and Luke, and (2) that in Matthew; one, 'absente Petro,' the other, 'reverso Petro,
D.  

The discourse as here related has the closest connexion and harmony:—the dispute had been, who (among the twelve) should be greatest,—i.e. greatest in the kingdom of heaven:—for other greatness is not to be thought of,—as the minds of the disciples were always on this, as just about to appear (against De Wette and Meyer);—the Lord reminds them that no such precedence is to be thought of among those sent in His name—for that even a little child, if thus sent, is clothed with His dignity—and, if there be any distinction among such, it is this, that he who is like that child, humblest and least, i.e. nearest to the spirit of his Lord, he is the greatest.—“The whole discourse in Luke is without connexion,” De Wette (11); who also says, εις τον Δὲ γὰρ μικρότερον ἐν τάσιν ὑμῖν ὑπάρχων, ὄντως εἰστι μέγας.  

The Lord had declared the absolute equality of all sent in His name—and that if there were any difference, it was to be made by a deeper self-renouncing. Then arises the thought in the mind of the ardent son of Zobedee, of the exclusive and peculiar dignity of those who were thus sent, the αὐστρολοι: of whom those who yet had done, as a proof of his fully appreciating this exclusive dignity. The link to what has preceded, is in the words ἐν τῷ ὑμῶν, εἶπε τῷ ὑμῶν Εὐαγγελιον. IX.  

The discourse as here related has the closest connexion and harmony:—the dispute had been, who (among the twelve) should be greatest,—i.e. greatest in the kingdom of heaven:—for other greatness is not to be thought of,—as the minds of the disciples were always on this, as just about to appear (against De Wette and Meyer);—the Lord reminds them that no such precedence is to be thought of among those sent in His name—for that even a little child, if thus sent, is clothed with His dignity—and, if there be any distinction among such, it is this, that he who is like that child, humblest and least, i.e. nearest to the spirit of his Lord, he is the greatest.—“The whole discourse in Luke is without connexion,” De Wette (11); who also says, εις τον Δὲ γὰρ μικρότερον ἐν τάσιν ὑμῖν ὑπάρχων, ὄντως εἰστι μέγας.

Discipuli sponte contentionem suam ad Jesum referunt; de qua Ille ut prius, sed uberius, dissertet.” (1) (Harmony p. 192, 3.) He has been led into this partly by the lower, literal-harmonistic spirit which pervades his school,—and partly by the assumption which connects this strife and discourse immediately with the incident about the tribute-money,—for which there is not the least ground in the text of Matt.—48.] The discourse as here related has the closest connexion and harmony:—the dispute had been, who (among the twelve) should be greatest,—i.e. greatest in the kingdom of heaven:—for other greatness is not to be thought of,—as the minds of the disciples were always on this, as just about to appear (against De Wette and Meyer);—the Lord reminds them that no such precedence is to be thought of among those sent in His name—for that even a little child, if thus sent, is clothed with His dignity—and, if there be any distinction among such, it is this, that he who is like that child, humblest and least, i.e. nearest to the spirit of his Lord, he is the greatest.—“The whole discourse in Luke is without connexion,” De Wette (11); who also says, εις τον Δὲ γὰρ μικρότερον ἐν τάσιν ὑμῖν ὑπάρχων, ὄντως εἰστι μέγας.

We live in times when such criticisms are making way among shallow minds: let the student judge from the above sample, what they are generally worth. Schleiermacher has some excellent remarks on this discourse and the circumstances, Essay on Luke, translation, pp. 159—162—49, 50.] On the connexion of this answer with the preceding, see on Mark. It is even more strikingly brought out here. The Lord had declared the absolute equality of all sent in His name—and that if there were any difference, it was to be made by a deeper self-renouncing. Then arises the thought in the mind of the ardent son of Zobedee, of the exclusive and peculiar dignity of those who were thus sent, the αὐστρολοι: of whom those who yet had done, as a proof of his fully appreciating this exclusive dignity. The link to what has preceded, is in the words ἐν τῷ ὑμῶν Εὐαγγελιον. IX.  

We live in times when such criticisms are making way among shallow minds: let the student judge from the above sample, what they are generally worth. Schleiermacher has some excellent remarks on this discourse and the circumstances, Essay on Luke, translation, pp. 159—162—49, 50.] On the connexion of this answer with the preceding, see on Mark. It is even more strikingly brought out here. The Lord had declared the absolute equality of all sent in His name—and that if there were any difference, it was to be made by a deeper self-renouncing. Then arises the thought in the mind of the ardent son of Zobedee, of the exclusive and peculiar dignity of those who were thus sent, the αὐστρολοι: of whom those who yet had done, as a proof of his fully appreciating this exclusive dignity. The link to what has preceded, is in the words ἐν τῷ ὑμῶν ἑ. See the rest in Mark.
either in time, or in the road chosen.
(3) that in each of the two other Gospels there is a journey placed at this very time, described Matt. xix. 1, μετὰ ταῦτα τῆς Γαλααίας καὶ ἡλθεν εἰς τὰ δραπετεύματα τῶν πολεμιστῶν τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, and Mark x. 1, έδέχθη ανάστασις έξηκένει εἰς τὰ δραπετεύματα τῆς Ιουδαίας. διὰ τού πολεμιστοῦ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, —which, in their narrative also, is the last journey from Galilee to Jerusalem. (4) that in John x. 22, we find the Lord at Jerusalem, at the feast of dedication, in the winter (about the end of December), without however any hint as to how or whence He came there. (5) that the whole time between that feast and His Passion is spent thus: —after the attempt to stone Him, ch. x. 31, He retired to Bethabara (or Bethany) beyond Jordan; —was summoned thence by the message from Martha and Mary to Bethany near Jerusalem, where He raised Lazarus; —retired to Ephraim, somewhere beyond Jericho, on the borders of the desert; —six days before the passover came to Bethany, and the anointing took place a week before the passover, three months and a few days. (6) I believe then that we have obtained a fixed critical point in all the four Gospels for the last journey from Galilee, after which He never returned (in the flesh) thither again. And this last journey was the feast of dedication, or at all events brought Him in time for that feast (for it does not look like a journey specially to a feast at Jerusalem). It was between the feast of tabernacles in John vii. 1, to which He went up privately (ver. 10), and the occasion when we find Him in Solomon’s porch, John x. 22. (7) The three first Evangelists know nothing (I mean by this, relate nothing) of the being in Jerusalem at the feast of dedication, or indeed at all, except at the last passover. We therefore find in them nothing of the retirements to Bethabara (Bethany) and Ephraim; but the removal of the Lord from Galilee to the confines of Judæa through the parts beyond Jordan is described as uninterrupted. (8) We are now I believe in a situation to appreciate the view with which our Evangelist inserts this portion. He takes this journey, beginning its narrative at the very same place where the others do, as comprehending —as indeed in strict historical fact it did —the last solemn farewell to Galilee (ch. x. 13, 16), the final resolve of the Lord to go up to Jerusalem (ch. ix. 51), and,—which in its wider sense (that sense being, however, unknown to our Evangelist) it did, —all the records which he possessed of miracles and discourses between this time and the triumphal entry. (9) As to arranging or harmonizing the separate incidents contained in this portion, as the Evangelist himself has completely by his connecting words in many places disclaimed it (see ch. ix. 57. x. 1. 25. 33. xi. 1. 14. xii. 1. xiiii. 1. 10. 22. xiv. 1. 25. xv. 1. xvii. 1. 5. 11. 20. xviii. 1. 9), —I do not suppose that we, at this distance of time, shall succeed in doing so. The separate difficulties will be treated of as they occur. —διὴ συνελημένη not past—not, 'when the days were fulfilled;' but 'were being fulfilled:' i.e. approaching their fulfilment. 'When the time was come, B. V. is too strong: 'when the days were come' would be better, for that would include the whole of the journey in those days. See ref. —ἀνάληψις can have but one meaning, (which, as the word itself is not found elsewhere, must be determined by the sense of the cognate verb; see ref.) —'His assumption,' i.e. ascension into heaven. ηὕτω διὰ τῆς ἀνάληψεως αὐτοῦ λέγεται τοῦ καρποῦ τῶν ἀφορισθέντων μισθών τῆς ἀνάληψεως αὐτοῦ τῆς ἀπὸ τῆς εἰς οὑρανόν. Enthym. —αὐτῷ the subject, not without some emphasis implying His own voluntary action —τῆς τῷ Θεῷ, αὐτῷ, a Hebraism, see ref., implying determined fixed purpose. —διὰ τῆς ἀνάληψεως, who have been assumed without reason to have been James and John. —Σαμαρ. On the enmity of the Jews and Samaritans, see note John iv. 9. The publicity now courted by the Lord is in remarkable contrast to His former avoidance of notice, and is a feature of the close of His ministry, giving rise to the accusation of ch. xxvii. 6. —ἐστιν ἡ ἀφήθημα, must mean something more, surely, than to provide board and lodging; there is a solemnity about the sentence which forbids that supposition. It must have been to announce

Bb 2
Πορευόμενον εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ. 51 Ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἄλκυβος καὶ Ἰωάννης εἰπον Κύριε, ἃθελε ἐπιτίθηται ἀναλώσασαι αὐτοὺς; ὡς καὶ Ἡλίας εἶπον ὅτι ἐπετίθησαν αὐτοῖς. [καὶ εἴπετε ὑμῖν ὅσα δὺς ἀκούσητε ἄνετος ἐστε;] 55 ἐπὶ ἐπορεύθησατ εἰς ἑτέραν κώμην. 57 ἐγένετο δὲ πορευόμενων αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ ὄδω ἐπεὶ τὸς πρὸς αὐτὸν Ἀκολούθησαν σοὶ ὅπου ἂν ἀνέφηξ [κύριε]. 58 καὶ εἴπετο αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς Ἀι ἀλώπηκες ὥστε ἔχουσι καὶ τὰ πεπεναί οὐρανοῦ κατακαταφέσωσι, ὡς ἐν οἴος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἔχει ποὺ τὴν κεφαλὴν ἐκλύει. 59 εἶπε δὲ πρὸς ἑτέρον Ἀκολούθητε μοι. ὃ δὲ εἴπετο Κύριε ἐπιτρέψοι. 59 — 52. for δὲς, ὡς Ἡ. — 53. for τῶν, εὑρίσκεις ὅ. — 54. for ἐπὶ, ἐς C D Chrys. ὅ. — txt A B. — ὡς κ. Ἡ. H. τ. om. B L al. v. ins. ACD abc. — 55. καὶ εἴπετο, .. ὅτι εἰσερχομένοις εἰς τὸν κόσμον διὰ τὴν ἀναγκαίαν ἀναλογίαν αἰτοῦσαν, ἃ ἔτυχεν, ἡ ἡγεμονία τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἢ οὐκ ἄνθρωπος ἤ χρήσις ὡς ἢ ὡς ἡ γενεαντια συνομονος. — 56. 57. — 59. for εἴπετο, ἐς C D Chrys. ὅ. — 60. for ἐπί, ἐς C D. — 61. ἢ πρὸς Μώσης ἢ πρὸς Μώσης ἢ πρὸς Μώσης ἢ πρὸς Ἰωάννης ἢ πρὸς Ἐχθρία. — 56. for ἀκολούθησαν, ἐς C D. — 57. for ἤτοι, ἐς C D. — 58. for ἐπειδή, ἐς C D. — 59. for ἀναπληρώσει, ἐς C D. — 60. for ἀναπληρώσει, ἐς C D. — 61. for ἀναπληρώσει, ἐς C D.
Χ. 1. ΚΑΤΑ ΔΟΥΚΑΝ.

μοι ἂπελθὼντι πρῶτον θάψαι τὸν πατέρα μου. 60 εἶπε δὲ αὐτῷ ὃ Ἰησοῦς ἀφεῖς τοὺς νεκροὺς θάψαι τοὺς ἐαυτοῦ νεκροὺς, καὶ δὲ ἀπελθὼν διὰ γεγένεται τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ. 61 εἶπε δὲ καὶ ἔτερος Ἀκολουθήσοι σοι κύριε, πρῶτον δὲ εἶπεν ταύτα ὅπως ἂν προσ ἄν Ἰησοῦς Οὐδεὶς ἐπιβαλὼν τὴν χειράν αὐτοῦ ὅπως τὰ δόρον καὶ βλέπων ὅπως τὸ ὄνομα τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἐστίν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ.

Χ. 1 Μετὰ δὲ ταύτα ἂνεδειξεν ὁ κύριος καὶ ἔτερος ἑξελάβοντα, καὶ ἀπεστείλεν αὐτῶς ἃν δόο πρὸ προσώπου τοῦ αὐτοῦ εἰς πάσαν πόλιν καὶ τούτον ὅπως ἂν εἰμέλλειν.
αὐτὸς ἔρχεσθαι. ἦλεγεν ὅπως ἀπό τοῦ αὐτοῦ. Ο μὲν ΑΒCD
θερισμὸς πολὺς, οἱ δὲ ἐργάζονται ἄλλοι, δεῦρετέ οὐν τοῦ
κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵπτετο ἐκ τῆς θερισμοῦ αὐτοῦ.

υπάγετος ἵνα ἀποστέλλω ὑμᾶς
ὡς ἄρας ἐν μεσίν ὑλῶν. 4 μὴ ἵσβαστητε οὕτως ἐργάζονται, μὴ ἐν πάσῃ λαίμῃ. 5 καὶ ἔδωκεν θῷον τῷ
ἰδίῳ τῷ τῷ ἵνα ἔριθην ἐπὶ οἴκῳ τούτῃ. 6 καὶ ἔδωκεν

ἐκεῖ [ὁ] ὑιὸς εἰρήνης, ὑιὸς οὗτος ἔστω ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ ἡ
εἰρήνη ὑμῶν. 1 εἰ δὲ μὴν, εἰ δὲ ὑμᾶς ἀνακάμψει. 7 ἐν

αὐτῷ δὲ τῇ οἰκίᾳ μένετε, ἐσθίοντες καὶ πίνοντες τα ἁρπαζόντες
ἀξίως γὰρ ἐξ ἐργάς τοῦ οἰκεῖου αὐτοῦ, 8 αὐτός ἐστιν. 

μὴ ὑποτάσσεσθε εἰς οἰκίας εἰς οἰκίαν. 9 καὶ εἰς ἐν

αὐτῷ ἐπὶ τῇ οἰκίᾳ μένετε, ἐσθίοντες καὶ πίνοντες τὰ παραπομποῦντες
ἀξίως γὰρ ἐξ ἐργάς τοῦ οἰκεῖου αὐτοῦ. 10 εἰς τῇ ἐπάνω

καιρίᾳ. Ὅτι γὰρ 

Ἀγγελοτάτων τῶν ἐκθέματα ὑμῶν ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ὑμῶν, ἐξελάθοντες εἰς τὰς πλατείας αὐτῆς ἐπάνω 11 Καὶ τοῦ

κοινορύθου τῶν ἐκθέματα ὑμῶν ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ὑμῶν, ἐξελάθοντες εἰς τὰς πλατείας αὐτῆς ἐπάνω 12 ἐγκεκρίσατο ὅτι 

ἡ ἐκθέματα τῶν ἐκθέματα ὑμῶν ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ὑμῶν ἐξελάθοντες εἰς τὰς πλατείας αὐτῆς ἐπάνω 13 ὅταν

ὁ Χαράλαμ,
οὔαι σοι Βῃσαϊδᾶ, ὅτι εἰ ἐν Τύρῳ καὶ Σίδωνι *ἐγένοντο 14 πλὴν Τύρῳ καὶ Σίδωνι ἀνεκτρέπεται ἐσται ἐν τῇ κρίσει ἡ ἁμαρτία. 15 καὶ σὺ Καπερναοῦμ * ἡ ἐως τοῦ οὐρανοῦ 16 ῥυθμοθείσα, ἡς ἀδικία ποιήσεις. 17 ὥστε ἐρχομένοις Κύριε, καὶ τὰ δαύδια ὑποτάσσεται ἡμῖν ἐν τῇ ὑπόματι σου. 18 εἰπὲ ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἐθέωρουν τὸν σατάναν ὡς ἀστραπὴν ὑπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πεσόντα. 19 ἐστὶ *δίδωμι ὑμῖν τὴν ἐκκουσίαν τοῦ "πατείνειν ἐπάνω ὅρθων καὶ σκορπίων, καὶ ἐπὶ πάσαν τὴν ὅνωμας τοῦ ἱεροῦ, καὶ ὁμοι ὑμᾶς οὐ μὴ ἀδικήσῃ. 20 πλὴν ὑποθέσεως ζήτησαν εἰς τὴν ἐκκουσίαν τοῦ "πατείνειν ἐπάνω ὅρθων καὶ σκορπίων, καὶ ἐπὶ πάσαν τὴν ὅνωμας τοῦ ἱεροῦ, καὶ ὁμοι ὑμᾶς οὐ μὴ ἀδικήσῃ. 21 μετὰ χαρᾶς λέγουσαι Κύριε, καὶ τὰ δαύδια ὑποτάσσεται ἡμῖν ἐν τῇ ὑπόματι σου. 22 εἰπὲ δὲ αὐτοῖς ἐθέωρουν τὸν σατάναν ὡς ἀστραπὴν ὑπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πεσόντα. 23 ἐστὶ *δίδωμι ὑμῖν τὴν ἐκκουσίαν τοῦ "πατείνειν ἐπάνω ὅρθων καὶ σκορπίων, καὶ ἐπὶ πάσαν τὴν ὅνωμας τοῦ ἱεροῦ, καὶ ὁμοι ὑμᾶς οὐ μὴ ἀδικήσῃ. 24 μετὰ χαρᾶς λέγουσαι Κύριε, καὶ τὰ δαύδια ὑποτάσσεται ἡμῖν ἐν τῇ ὑπόματι σου.
have a reference—and Rev. xii. 7—12.—18.] The Lord here,—including all the evil and poison in nature in the δύναμις τοῦ ἡφ.,—from the power given Him over that Enemy, gives to them, extended afterwards to all believers (Mark xvi. 10), authority to "call the head of the serpent" (Gen. iii. 15). There is an evident allusion to Ps. xci. 13—20.] The connexion is—seeing the power which the Lord grants you is so large, arising from My victory over the enemy,—make not one particular department of it your cause of joy, nor indeed the mere subjection of evil to you at all—but this,—the positive and infinite tide of God's mercy and goodness to you, that He hath placed you among His redeemed ones. 16] the πνεύμα is something different from τα δυσματα in these words above, and denotes a wider range of influence—influences, indeed, good for both, whereby the πνευματικά τῆς πυργίας are subjected to the believers in Christ. The θυράφη ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς is an expression in various forms frequent in Scripture, and is opposed to ἐν τῇ γῇ γραφήσωσαν, Jer. xvii. 13, said of the rebellious. But no immutable Predestination is asserted by it—in the very first place where it occurs, Exod. xxxii. 32, 33, the contrary is implied, see Ps. lxxv. 26. Is. iv. 3. Dan. xii. 1. Phil. iv. 3. Heb. xii. 23. Rev. iii. 5. xviii. 12. 15. The το ὕψος. ὦρ. seems to be a reference to το θν. τον σώματι for the spirit for both, as a medium of self-praise, as so often with Christians. The Lord says, the true cause of joy for you is, not the power shown forth by or in you in My Name, but that your names, are in the book of life— to be known by the πνεύμα which συμ- παρατίθεν τῷ θν. ἡμῶν ὦρ. τινὶ τινα θεός, Rom. viii. 16. And this brings us to ver. 21, where the Lord rejoices in the revelation of these things even to the babies of the earth by the will and pleasure of the Father: these things—not, the power over the Enemy—but all that is implied in θυράφη ἐν τῷ οὐρ. This, which is the true cause of joy to the believer, causes even the Saviour Himself to triumph, anticipating Is. liii. 11. The ascription of praise, and the verses following, are here in the very closest connexion, and it is perfectly unimaginable that they should have been inserted here arbitrarily. The same has been said of their occurrences in Matt. xi. 23; and, from no love of harmonizing or escaping difficulties, but from a deep feeling of the inner spirit of both discourses, I am convinced that the Lord did utter, on the two separate occasions, these weighty words; and I find in them a most instructive instance of the way in which such central sayings were repeated by Him. It was not a rejoicing before (in Matt.), but a confession—compare the whole discourse and notes.—That the introductory words εἰ τι ν. εἰρ. = εἰ τῇ γῇ γραφήσωσαν, may have been introduced from one passage into the other, and perhaps by some one who imagined them the same, I would willingly grant, if needful; not that, in the presence of such passages, such a thing is worth mention, but that the shallow school of modern critics do mention, and rest upon such—on ver. 21, 22. See notes on Matt. xi. 25—27, observing here the gra-
21—28. KATA LOUKAN.

καὶ ἰδιὰν ἄνοιξεν ὁ νῦν ἀποκαλύπτει. 23 καὶ στραφεὶς πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς καὶ ἰδιὰν εἶπε Μακάριοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ οἱ βλέποντες ἂν βλέπετε. 24 λέγω γὰρ ὡσὶν ὅτι πολλοὶ προφητεύμεναι καὶ βασιλεῖς ἠθέλησαν ἰδεῖν ὅτι μὲνες βλέπετε καὶ οὐκ ἤδειν· καὶ ἀκούωσι καὶ οὐκ ἤκουσαν.

25 καὶ ἰδιὰν ὅ νομικὸς τις ἀνέστη ἐκεῖπροφτός αὐτὸν καὶ λέγων Διδάσκαλε, τί ποιήσας ἰδιῶν αἰῶνιον κλήρονομῆσαι; 26 ὅ δὲ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτὸν Ἐν τῷ νόμῳ τί γέγραπται; πῶς ἀναγνωρίσεις; 27 ὅ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν Ἀναγνώσεις κύριον τὸν θεὸν σου ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδιὰς σου καὶ * ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς σου καὶ * ἐξ ὅλης τῆς διανοιας σου, καὶ τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτὸν. 28 εἶπε δὲ αὐτῷ Ἐρωθεῖς ἀπεκρίθης.

dual narrowing of the circle to which the Lord addresses Himself,—ver. 22, στραφεὶς τρ. τ. μ.,—then ver. 23 the same, with καὶ ἰδιὰν added.— 23.] This verse should not be marked off from ver. 22 by a new paragraph, as is done in the E. V.; much less, as in the Gospel for the 13th Sunday after Trinity, joined with what follows: except perhaps that the lesson taught us by its occurring there is an appropriate one, as showing us how the grace of Christ love, which is the subject of the following parable, fulfils and abounds over, legal obedience. It is in connexion with the preceding, and comes as the conclusion after the thanksgiving in ver. 21. A similar saying of the Lord occurs Matt. xiii. 16, 17, but uttered altogether on a different occasion and in a different connexion.— 24.] στραφεὶς κ. βασιλ. David united both these, also Solomon. There may be an special reference to the affecting last words of David, 2 Sam. xxiii. 1—5, which certainly are a prophecy of the Redeemer, and in which he says, ver. 5, "This is all my salvation, and all my desire, though He make it not to grow," see also Gen. xlix. 18.

25—27.] As Stier remarks (iii. 112), it is well that Luke has related the other incident respecting an inquiry of the same kind, for the critics would be sure to have maintained that this incident was another report of Matt. xix. 16. Such clear cases as this should certainly teach us caution, where no such proof is given of the independence of different narratives: and should show us that both questions addressed to the Lord, and answers from Him, were, as matter of fact, repeated.—See however a case to which this remark does not apply, ch. ix. 67 ff. — 25.] No immediate sequence from ver. 24 is implied.

—νομικάς, a kind of scribe = νομοδιδασκάλους, ch. r. 17—which especial office it was to teach the law, see Tit. iii. 13; ζύγισσας, Mark xii. 28. —There is no reason to suppose that the lawyer had any hostile intention towards Jesus,—rather perhaps a self-righteous spirit (see ver. 29), which wanted to see what this Teacher could inform him, who knew so much already. Thus it was a tempting or triying of Jesus, though not to entangle Him;—for whatever had been the answer, this could hardly have followed.—τι προσφέρεις—he doubtless expects to hear of some great deed—but the Lord refers him back to the Law of which he was a teacher.— 28.] τοι ἐς ἄν.; A common rabbinical formula for eliciting a text of Scripture. —τοιας is not merely τι, but implies how? i.e. to what purport—so that the answer should contain a summary of his reading in the Law. — 27.] The first part of this, together with Deut. xi. 13 ff., the Jews had written on their phylacteries, and recited night and morning,—but not the second; so that Kuinioel's idea that Jesus pointed to the phylactery of the lawyer,
tou tois, kai ζησ.

29 o de θελω * kai diakoun eauton ABCD

epi pros ton Ihsou Kai tis esti mou "πλησιον; 30 h upo-

λαβω de o Ihsous eis anbropotos tis 'katēsainen ato

Ierosulaim eis Iericho, kal lrgan keperesteven, oι kai

ekdounantos auton kal plagias eisixeis apeltheun apo

enotei o "θυμαντη [τα γυγανται]. 31 kata s synkuriain

2 de irgeis tis katēsainen en tη odo exekinei, kai idw

anatipareielen. 32 omoiws de kai Leuitis, genomenos

cata ton topicou, elwos kai idw * anatipareielen.

Σαμαριητις de tis d odoen υλη kal auton, kai idw

auton 'esplagynisht. 34 kai prokeleloun kai katedose tη

trapsa autou epiwem elaios kai oinoe eipiβαζας

κατα τον τοπον, ελών και ιδών * αντιπαρέλθουν.

will not hold.—Meyer thinks the man

answered thus, because he had before heard

the Lord cite these in connection, and with

an especial view to asking the question της

εις μοι πλησιον; It may have been so;

—but I should rather believe the same

spirit with which he begun, to have carried

him on to this second question. The

words Ἦλα, δικ. ἐπτυν, seem to imply this,

but see below.—20] Meyer explains this;

The questioner, having been by the Lord's

inquiry, πας ἀνωτερ., himself thrown into

the question, or as the answerer, ουτ, διων

dik. ανω, wishing to carry out the purpose

with which he asked at first, and to cover

what otherwise would be his shame at

being answered by so simple a reply, and

that his own,—asks τη.; . . . — I may ob-

serve that we need not take the whole

of this explanation, but may well suppose

that δικαιον λαυρ. may mean, 'to get him-

self out of the difficulty.' viz. by throwing

on Jesus the definition of o πλησιον,

which was very narrowly and technically

interpreted among the Jews, excluding

Samaritans and Gentiles.—30] θωλ.

'taking him up'—implies that the question

was made an occasion of saying more than

the mere answer. See Jer. vii 101.

Thucyd. v. 49. — κατββ. both because

Jerusalem was higher, and because 'to go

up' is the usual phrase for journeying

towards a metropolis. — αντ. 'ιερ. εἰς

'Iericho, about 150 stadia distant. The

road passed through a wilderness (Josh.

xvi. 1) which was notorious for the rob-

beries committed there. 'Arabas . . . qua

gena latrocinia dedita, usque hodie incurrat

terminos Palestine, et descendebant de

Hierusalem in Hiericho obsidet viss, cujus

rei et Dominus in Evangelio recordatur.'

Jerome, Comment. on Jer. iii. 2. The

same Father mentions that a part of the

road was so infamous for murders, as to

be called the red or bloody way, and that

in his time there was a fort there garrisoned

by Roman soldiers, to protect travellers

(De locis Hebr.).—So R. Ham. to

παρεν. exactly 'fell among.' They sur-

rounded him.—καθως, not merely of his

clothing, but of all he had;—despoliave-

rant eum!' Vulg. — 'γυγανται is not =

δυτα: δυτα is understood with ἦμεροι, 'in

a state of (being) half-dead.'—31] Many

priests journeyed this way, for Jericho was

a priestly city; this man is perhaps repre-

sented as having been up to Jerusalem in

the order of his course, and returning

(katēsainen).—The Law and Prophets en-

joined this act of mercy which this priest

refused; see Exod. xxiii. 4, 5. Deut. xxii.

1—4. In lviii. 7, not, it is true, literally,

—and therefore he neglected it.—κατββ.

θωλ., he did not even go up to him to

examine him—but passed by on the oppo-

site side of the road.—33] The Levite,

the inferior minister of the law, did even

worse; when he was at the place, he came

and saw him;—came near—and then

passed, as the other. — 33—35.] The
Samaritans were entirely, not half, Gentiles (= ἀλλογενῆς, ch. xviii. 18).—Why the Lord mentions the name here, see below.—ἐπιλεγμένος. This was the great difference between the Samaritan and the others,—the actions which follow are but the expansion of this compassion.—λαοὶ κ. οἴνων. These were usual remedies for wounds in the East; Galen, cited by Wetstein in loc., prescribes thus for a wound in the head, λαοῖς φύλλα τὰ ἀπαλωσάτα τρίφας παράχει λάοιοι καὶ οἴνῳ μίλαως καὶ κατάμασις:—see also Isa. i. 6.—ἐπὶ τὸ τῆς κτίσεως ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ τοῦ γενεσίου:—thence denying himself the use of the,—πανδοχεῖον, the Attic form is πανδοκεῖον. This is the only place where an inn, as we understand the word, a house for reception of travellers kept by a host, as distinguished from an empty caravanserai, is mentioned. The Rabbinical writings frequently speak of such, but under a name adopted from this word, γῆγα (Wetstein).

ἐξῆλθα... when he went on his journey. ὅσον ἴσων see in this, two days' wages (Matt. xx. 2).—36.] It will be observed that the Lord not only elicits the answer from the questioner himself, but that it comes in an inverted form. The lawyer had asked, to whom he was to understand himself obliged to fulfil the duties of neighbourliness? but the answer has for its subject one who fulfilled them to another. The reason of this is to be found,—partly in the relation of neighbourliness being mutual, so that if this man is my neighbour, I am his also,—but chiefly in the wish of the Lord to bring out a strong contrast by putting the hated and despised Samaritan in the active place, and thus to reflect back the ὄπολες more pointedly. —37.] The lawyer does not answer,—The Samaritan;—he avoids this; but he cannot avoid it in conviction and matter of fact.—τῶι μὲν, i.e. 'count all men thy neighbours and love them as thyself.' The student accustomed to look at all below the surface of Scripture, will not miss the meaning which lies behind this parable, and which,—while disclaiming all fanciful allegorizing of the text,—I do not hesitate to say that the Lord Himself had in view when He uttered it. All acts of charity and mercy done here below, are but fragments and derivatives of that one great act of mercy which the Saviour came on earth to perform. And as He took on Him the nature of us all, being 'not ashamed to call us brethren,' counting us all His kindred,—so it is but natural that in holding up a mirror (for such is a parable) of the truth in this matter of duty, we should see in it not only the present and prominent group, but also Himself and His act of mercy behind. And thus we shall not (in spite of the scoffs which are sure to beset such an interpretation, from the superficial school of critics) give up the interpretation of the Fathers and other divines, who see in this poor traveller, going from the heavenly to the accursed city (Josh. vi. 26. 1 Kings xvi. 34),—the race of man,—the Adam who fell,—in the robbers and murderers, him who was a murderer from the beginning (John viii. 44)—in the treatment of the traveller, the deep wounds and despisement which we have inherited from the fall,—in the priest and the Levite passing by, the inefficacy of the law and sacrifice to heal and clothe us: Gal. iii. 21. (Trench remarks, (Parables, 265, note) that the Church, by joining the passage Gal. iii. 16—23 as Epistle, with this Parable as Gospel for the 13th Sund. after Trinity, has stamped this interpretation with her ap—
proval)—in the good Samaritan, Him of whom it was latterly said, “Say we not well that thou art a Samaritan, and hast a devil?” (John viii. 48).—Who came to bind up the broken hearted, to give them the oil of joy for mourning (Is. lxi. 1 ff.);—Who for our sakes became poor, that we through His poverty might become rich,—Who, though now gone from us, has left with us precious gifts, and charged His ministers to feed His lambs, promising them when the Chief Shepherd shall appear, a crown of glory that fadeth not away (1 Pet. v. 2. 4). Further perhaps it is well not to go—or, if we do, only in our own private meditations, where if we have the great clue to such interpretations,—Knowledge of Christ for ourselves, and a sound mind under the guidance of His Spirit,—we shall not go far wrong. But many of the allusions are to the spiritual interpretation into dispute, and throw stumbling-blocks in the way of many, who might otherwise arrive at it.

38—42.] It surely never could be doubted who this Martha and Mary were, nor where this took place,—but that the harmonizing spirit has so beclouded the sight of our critics Bengal believes them not to be the sisters of Lazarus, but another Martha and Mary somewhere else;—and in spite of the deep psychological identity of characters which meets us in John xi.—Greswell believes the persons to be the same, but that they had another residence in Galilee (1), and endeavours to establish this from John xi. 1 (where he says ἰδό only indicates residence, ἐκ origin; and the κωμή is not Bethany but the village in Galilee (1), see notes there). I shall, as elsewhere, take the text in its most obvious and simple interpretation—and where nothing definite is asserted in it, throw light on it from what we know from other sources. And I believe most readers will agree with me in taking these for the sisters of Lazarus, and the village for Bethany. —38.] In της ἀναθ. need make no difficulty—the whole of the events related in this section of the Gospel are allotted, as in the widest sense they belonged, to the last journey of the Lord from Galilee, which ended in the triumphal entry into Jerusalem;—see note on ch. ix. 51. The Lord, as we know that He afterwards did, so now probably, when at Jerusalem (at the feast of Dedication), abode at Bethany, He ‘loved’—(only used in this sense by John with regard to this family, and to himself)—Martha and Mary and Lazarus—and this word implies surely hospitality and the sound spiritual interpretation into dispute,—it does not follow that Martha was a widow—the incident brings out the two sisters, and therefore no others are mentioned. She may have had a husband or a father living. At all events it is a consistency belonging to real life, that we find the same person prominent in the family in John, as here. —39.] It does not appear that the meal had begun—far rather is it likely that Martha was busy about preparing it. Mary sat at Jesus’ feet, as His disciple, while He was discourseing.—40.] ἀνασκονόµενον is a word of later Greek. It exactly answers to the Latin horrea, used in the same connexion by Horace, sat. ii. 8, 67, and to our midland provincial expression ‘to be put away,’ meaning, ‘to be distracted with officious care.’—ἀνασκόµενον generally, but not always, used by Luke of a sudden coming into presence. It looks here as if the Lord were teaching
in another apartment from that where the διακοιναὶα was going on;—this appears also in the κατὰ Λουκ.,—41, 43.] The repetition of her name indicates reproof,—μεριμναῖisses the inner anxiety (from μερίζω), τυρπᾶξης the outer bustle and confusion.—πολλά, 'many things'—ἐν, 'of one thing;' perhaps we should not express the two words more definitely, for fear of narrowing the wide sense in which they are spoken. I can hardly doubt that the Lord, in the first and most obvious meaning, indicated that simpler preparation would have been all that was needful, but the πολλά leads to the ἰν, and that to the ἀγαθὰς μιᾶς, the ἵν being the middle term of comparison between the natural πολλά and the spiritual ἀγαθὰς μιᾶς. So that the whole will imply—only within the circle of Christ's disciples, those who set from love (mistaken or otherwise) to Him, much as John vi. 27,—and set before us the bread which perisheth on one hand, and that which endureth to everlasting life on the other. The ἀγαθὰς μιᾶς, 'the good portion,' is the ἵν which is needful—see John vi. 53,—the feeding on the bread of life by faith,—which faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ which Mary was now receiving into her soul, and which (John vi. 54) shall never be taken away, but result in everlasting life.—The two types of character have ever been found in the Church; both, caring for Him, and for love to Him doing what they do; but the one busy and restless, anxious and stirring; the other, quiet and humble, content to sit at His feet and learn. We see here which of the two He praiseth. But on the other hand we must not derive any argument hence against an active Christian life of doing good: this is, in fact, to sit at His feet and learn—to take His yoke on us, and learn of Him. It is the bustling about the πολλά of which there is no need, which is blamed; not the working out the fruits of the Spirit, which are needful, being parts themselves of the ἅγαθάς μιᾶς.

CHAP. XI. 1—13.] The locality and time of the following incident are alike indefinite. The only limits are those of the great journey which is the subject of this section. There is no reason for supposing this to be the only occasion on which the Lord delivered this prayer to His disciples. In the Sermon on the Mount, it stands in close connexion with what goes before;—and here also. In so weighty a summary of His teaching as that was, He was not likely when speaking of prayer, to omit it;—when asked by His disciples to teach them to pray, He was not likely to depart from the form once given them. Such are ordinary probabilities, antecedent to every question affecting the two Gospels: and those critics who throw aside all such, are far more prejudiced in reality, than those who allow them full weight. "The peculiar and abridged form in Luke," says Meyer, "is a proof that the Apostolic Church did not use the Lord's Prayer as a form." Rather, we may say, a proof of the fidelity with which our Evangelist reproduced his original reports, not correcting them as others after him did (see var. read.) to suit the forms most probably in use. If the Apostolic Church did not use the Lord's Prayer as a form,—when did its use begin, which we find in every known Liturgy? (see Bingham, Antiq. xiii. 7.)—1] καθ. κ. Ἱς. . . . . of this fact we know.
nothing beyond the allusion here. — 2.] δὲν προς. λέγ. . . . more definite than ὥς προς. . . . in Matt. On the prayer itself, see notes on Matt. vi. 9-13. — 3.] τὸ καθ’ ἡμᾶς. . . . 'for that day's need,' or 'for that day,' a. d. day by day. No subroutine is supplied after τῇ. 4.] καὶ γὰρ. . . . expressed here more strongly than in Matt., as the plea for the exercise of the Divine forgiveness to us,—'for it is our own practice also to forgive;' but notice the difference,—there is no ἀμαρτία here between man and man, only the ordinary business word of this world, — ἐ. ἄφθασεν ὡς. This may serve to show how far 'Luke's reporter' (De Wette) was from misunderstanding the words of the Lord: that reporter, as Stier well observes, (Reden Jesu, iii. 149,) being no other than the Holy Spirit Himself, whose special guidance was promised in bringing to mind the things said by Jesus (John xiv. 26). — 5.] Now follows a parable on continuing instant in prayer, of the same nature as that in ch. xviii. 22 ff. In both parables, the argument is 'a fortiori;' 'if selfish man can be won by prayer and importunity to give, and unjust man to do right, much more certainly shall the bountiful Lord bestow, and the righteous Lord do justice.' Trench, Parables, p. 291, who further remarks, that here intercessory prayer is the subject of the Parable: there, personal. And, that we must remember that all reluctance on the part of God to answer our prayers is not real, but apparent only, and arises from deeper reasons working for our good: whereas the reluctance on the part of human beings in these two parables is real, arising from selfishness and contempt of justice.—The interrogative form continues to ποι., ver. 8, 'Who of you shall be in these supposed circumstances?' λέγει ὁ θεός. . . . c. — 6.] τω. δέ. In the East it was and is the custom to travel late at night, for coolness' sake.—Why τρίτα ἀποροῖ., does not appear. I forbear to give the allegorical interpretations of the number, which abound: the significance of the thing asked for, see below on ver. 13. — 7.] We have an interesting fragment of domestic life here given us. The door is barred,' not only 'shut;' there is the trouble of unbarring it: the father and children are in bed (ἐπὶ τ. κ. ἑλ. ellipt, for 'have gone to bed, and are in bed.' see ref.); (observe how in all the parables which place the Father, or the Husband, before us, the Mother, or the Bride, does not appear;) and he cannot (i. e. will not, cannot from being overcome by reluctance) rise and give to him. — 8.] ἄνηστος is too mildly rendered by 'importunity,' E. V.
It should be ‘shamelesseness.’ It is presupposed here that the postulant goes on knocking and asking. — 9.] What follows is in the closest connexion, and will not bear the idea that it is transferred here merely as being appropriate. The _airith_ (λυπή, κρούσιν, all answer to the features of the parable). — 10.] declares to us not merely a result observable here among men, (in which sense it is not universally true,) but a great law of our Father’s spiritual Kingdom; a clause out of the eternal covenant, which cannot be changed. — 11–13.] The Lord sets forth the certainty of our obtaining the Holy Spirit (the unspeakable gift, in which all other ἀγαθά δῶματα are included,) from our Father, by another ‘ temptation’ argument, drawn from the love of earthly parents, so far less careful and tenderly wise than He is over His children. —The construction, as before (ver. 5), is a mixed one: half interrogative, half hypothetical. For the rest, see notes on Matt. viii. 7 ff. The _egg_ and scorpion are added here. The _serpent_ and scorpion are the poisonous _mischievous_; the samples, ch. x. 19, of the δύναμις τοῦ Ιησοῦ— _the stone_,” that which is simply κατά τοῦ δαίμονος— _the stone_. So that God’s answers to our prayers consist of neither useless nor mischievous things, but of His best gift— _His Holy Spirit_— in all the various and fitting manifestations of His guidance and consolation and teaching in our lives. This is (because this takes of and imparts to us, by leading us continually to Him who is,) the _ἄρος_ of the parable; the _paterfamilias_ is our Father in Heaven, with whom however the night is as the day, who never slumber nor sleeps. It has been noticed how by the hungry traveller coming to the man, may be importuned, in the depth of the parable, the awakening in a man’s own soul (which is so precious to him of that hunger which he has nothing to satisfy, and which none but God can satisfy. The student may, as in the foregoing parable, follow out this clue for himself (provided it be done soberly) with much interest and profit. — Notice that when we _address God_ (ver. 9), He is of πατήρ ὃ ἐν του οὐρ. — when He _answers us_, He is _ὁ πατήρ ὃ δὲς υἱὸν_. In the former case we go up into Him and His abode; in the latter He comes down to us. The construction is not (Meyer) ὃ ἐν οὐρανοῖς μὲν ὡς, but the one so common in good Greek, ὃ ἐν Παλαιστίνῃ τῆς Ελλήνων, denoting the quarter whence the in-
fluence implied in the substantive comes, which here is the result of that relation implied in παρῆκα.

14—36.] Matt. xii. 25—45. Mark iii. 23—29. The reasonings of Greswell to show that Luke relates an entirely different incident from Matt. and Mark, able and well conducted as they are, fail to carry conviction to my mind. —The marks of identity are too many and striking to be mistaken; and on the plan of discrimination which he has adopted, I am persuaded that we might prove four distinct Crucifixions and Resurrections to have happened, just as easily. Besides, it is quite impossible to carry the hypothesis throughout this section of Luke’s Gospel: and when it has been once given up, a considerable difference is made in the way of regarding the various narrations. On the side of which Evangelist the strict accuracy lies, it is next to impossible for us now to decide. I am inclined to think with Schleiermacher (transl., p. 190), that the section from xi. 14—xii. 53 (or rather perhaps 59) is a connected whole, or, at all events, is intended to form such. But then the whole is introduced (ver. 14) without any mark of connexion with the preceding, and terminated abruptly. —On the other hand, the narrative in Matt. is introduced by his usual τότε, following upon a very general description of a retirement of the Lord, and his being pursued by multitudes, all of whom He healed; but whether the oi ὀχλοι are the same, and the τότε meant to specify that this incident occurred then and there, is by no means certain. Nor is the close of the section (xii. 50) bound very closely to xii. 1, which commences λέγεται γὰρ ἡμῖν, and can hardly be said with certainty to define the very same natural day. We may observe that the attendant circumstances, as introduced and closed in Mark iii. 20. iv. 1, are equally indeterminate. I therefore leave the difficulty where I found it, and where I believe it will ever remain, during our present state of imperfection; only observing, that the important incident and discourse grounded on it is no way thereby invalidated in authority. It seems to have been a portion of the evangelic history, the position of which was not exactly and satisfactorily fixed; of which there have been already some instances (see ch. ix. 57—62) and there are, as will be seen, yet more as we proceed. —16.] κακοφαντ.—and blind, Matt. ver. 22, where see notes on all the common matter. —18.] τώς ἐξ ἀντι. No inference can here be drawn that these persons were not Pharisees (as Greswell has done), and consequently that the charge proceeded from a different quarter. —18.] This is not mentioned here by Matt., but further on in the discourse, ver. 38. No distinction (Gresw.) can be drawn between σημαν. and σημ; ἐξ ὁρ., for (1) the Lord answers the demand in both places by the same reply, —the sign of Jonas, see also Matt. xvi. 1 —4; and (2) the ordinary Jewish idea attached to σημα. would imply ἐξ ὁρ.: see notes on Matt. xvi. 1. —17.] ἀλλὰ: so Matt., also ver. 25. —ἐκ. ἐκ τιν.] The ordinary rendering, ‘and house (divided) against house, falleth,’ is certainly right. Before Meyer charged this interpretation with having entirely arisen out of harmonistic considerations, he should have ascertained whether such an expression as a Kingdom falling ὀικὸς ἕκτα, oikos is even tolerable. The ruling idea of the saying having been given by the βασιλεύς, ὁ ἀνθρωπιστ., the emphatic pronoun need not be ex-
ΚΑΤΑ ΛΟΥΚΑΝ. 385

υμῶν αυτόν ἔσονται. 20 εἰ δὲ ἐν δακτύλῳ θεοῦ ἕκβαλλω τὰ δαίμονα, ἀρα ἕφθασεν εἴρι υμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ. 21 ὅταν οἱ ἰσχυροὶ καθωπλισμὸν φυλάσσει τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἑαυτήν, ἐν οἷον ἔστι τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτὸν 22 ἐπάν δὲ καὶ ἰσχυροὶ εὐθανάσται αὐτῶν, τὴν πανοπλίαν αὐτῶν ἀρεί τε ἐπετείθει, καὶ τὰ σκῦλα αὐτῶν διαδίωσαν. 23 ὁ μη ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ κατ' ἐμοῦ ἔστι, καὶ ὁ ὑπὲρ συνάγων μετ' ἐμοῦ ὁ σκορπίζει. 24 ὅταν τὸ ἀκάθαρτον πνεῦμα ἐξέλθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, διερχεται δὲ τὸ ἀνύδρων τῶν Ἵησου καὶ μή εὐρίσκων λέγει Υποστρέφω εἰς τὸν οἰκὸν μου οὐκ ἐξήλθων. 25 καὶ ἐθάνεται

* ἐθάνεται εὐρίσκεις ἐκκοσμήσεων καὶ εὐρίσκεται

26 τότε προέρχεται καὶ παραλαμβάνει ἐπὶ ἑτέρα πνεύματα πνεύματα ἑαυτῶν, καὶ εὐσέβεται κατοικεῖ ἑκεί, καὶ γίνει


pressed again. Similarly we have, 1 Cor. ii. 11, τις ὄλαν ἀνάρθρων τὰ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, εἰ μὴ τοῦ κατ' ἐμοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ; the ἐν αὐτῷ being the same throughout.— 20.] ἐν δακτύλῳ θεοῦ εἰς πνεύματι Θ. Matt. No distinction can be established, as Grew. attempts. The one expression explains the other. What was done (Hebraistically speaking) by the finger of God, was done by the Spirit of God. We have much greater variations than this in sayings demonstrably the same. And as to what the same author maintains about the relative magnitude of the works of the finger, hand, and arm of God, a reference to Ps. vii. 4, where the heavens are 'the works of Thy fingers,' will sufficiently show how little reliance is to be placed on such subtleties. 21.] This parabolic sentence is in close connexion with many prophetic sayings, Is. xi. 10 marg. liii. 12, and most pointedly Is. xlix. 24, 25. It will be remembered that the Baptist called the Lord by this name, ὁ ἱσχυρότερος—placing after it, it is true, μεν, but still using it as indicative of the Aimightiness of the Son of God, rather than in comparison with himself. See Col. ii. 15. The ἱσχυρότερος is the adversary, Satan; his ἐπαύλη, this present world,—John xii. 31. xiv. 30. xvi. 11. His goods, or tools, or spoils,—τὰ ὑπάρχοντα

Vol. I.
him in the abyss; and though loosed for the final conflict by His sufferance, shall cast him overthrown into the lake of fire for ever.—Rev. xx. 14.—33. I see on Matt. ver. 30.—29.—36.---27, 33. This little but most instructive incident, here interposed, serves to show the originality of Luke's account, and that, whatever its position may be, it is itself of the highest authority. The woman apparently was influenced by nothing but common-place and unintelligent wonder at the strange word doings of Jesus; and she broke out, with true womanly feeling, into a blessing of the mother who bore such a wonderful Teacher. Such seems to be the account of the incident itself.—The Lord's reply is indeed wonderful:—(1) In reproof. He corrects her in the unapprehensiveness of His word, which had caused her to go no further into the meaning of it than this ordinary eulogy imported,—and gives her an admonition how to profit better by it in future.---(2) In humility:—He disclaims all this kind of admiration for His humanity: and says not 'My word,' but 'the word of God,' which is in fact the same, but takes the view off from Him in His abstractness, unto the Father who sent Him.---(3) In truth: He does not deny the honour hereby pronounced upon His mother, but beautifully turns it to its true side—viz. that which was given her long since—μακαρία ἡ πατρότητα, ch. i. 45.---Her blessedness consisted not so much in being His mother, as in her lowly and faithful observance of the word of the Lord spoken to her. On φυλάσσων αὐτῶν, see ch. ii. 19. 51.---Nor again does He deny that to have borne Him was an honour—μνημόνευσε is 'imo vero'—'yes indeed, but.'---(4) In prophetic discernment. It will be seen that this answer cuts at the root of all Mariolatry, and shows us in what the true honour of that holy woman consisted,—in faith and obedience. As the mother of the Lord, she represents our human race, unto whom a child is born, a son is given; no individual exclusive honour is due to her, any more than to Cornelius, who was singled out from the Gentile world, and honoured by an angelic message relative to the divine purposes:—if she were, as there is every reason to conclude she was, a believer in her Son, the Son of Man, she bore Christ in a far higher and more blessed sense than by being His mother in His humanity. And this honour may all believers in Him partake of with her—therefore the Lord says not ἡ ἡσυχία τας τις ἡμάς καὶ τρίες νυνίας, but oi ἀνάφιοιν.---29. This is now in answer to those who sought of Him a sign from Heaven.—τω θελε παρείπ. perhaps in expectation, as He passed in His discourse, that the sign was now about to be shown:—see notes on Matt. for the main subject. Here we have one part of the sign of Jonas brought out, which is not touched on in Matt., viz. his preaching after his resurrection to the Ninevites—
announcing—for that would necessarily be involved in that preaching—the wonderful judgment of God in bringing him there, and thus making his own deliverance, that he might preach to them, a sign to that people; which sign (ver. 32) they received, and repented—but a greater than Jonas, showing and preaching a greater sign by the generation. 32. πλῆθων 'ισωά, not 'a greater than Jonas,' or 'than Solomon;' but Jonah = the sign of Jonah, so that πλῆθων is He who is the sign to this generation: a sign, πλῆθων, both in its actuality, its significance, and its consequences. The order, here, seems to be for the sake of climax—for the under-valuing and not appreciating His wisdom, will not lie so heavy on them in the judgment, as the rejection of His preaching of repentance. 33—38. The Lord goes on to speak of His teaching and miracles, which this generation despised, and demanded a sign from Heaven in preference; He tells them that they will not see the significance of them, because they shut the eyes of their understanding, which should be the light of the soul; this is set before them in a parable concerning the light of the body, which is the outward eye. The sentences are repeated from the Sermon on the Mount, see Matt. v. 16. vi. 32 f. (where see notes on all that is common,) and Luke viii. 16: but, as has been shown, the truth shines from a different side of them here. 33. κρύπτω, (for so it should be accentuated,) 'a crypt,' or covered passage; τῆς αὐτοκρατορίας, which Augustus, atheneus, v. 206, describing a splendid ship built by Ptolemy Philopator, speaks of a κρύπτη φραγμακις, and θυρία περιτομηθείν πάνωθι. 36. σκέπασεν... take heed, lest... and the οὖν, more forcible than ἢ, implies the actual existence, in the hearers, of the state against which they are cautioned:—σκέπασε, μὴ ὁ νοῦς ὁ φωταγωγὸς τῆς ψυχῆς σου σκοτίζῃ ὑπὸ τῶν παθῶν. Euthym. 36. "Tautological: the second member contains the same assertion as the first" (De Wette).—Let us examine this. When thine eye is single (ver. 34.), i.e. simple,—straight and single-seeing,—thy whole body will be light. Then (ver. 36), "if this be so,—if thy whole body be light, having no part dark,—then it shall all be light as when a lamp with its brightness illuminates thee." Of what is the Lord
speaking? Of His teaching, as apprehended by the simple, single-seeing soul. If then the soul be so,—having no part darkened by prejudice or selfish lusts, and approach thus to His teaching, it shall be wholly illuminated by it, as by the candle of the Lord searching its inward parts. So this saying, which, even as it stands, is not tautological,—for the second clause expresses the further result and waxing onward of the shining light, arising from the singleness of the eye,—becomes, in its spiritual significance, a weighty declaration of truth, answering to ch. viii. 15:—see also John viii. 12.

37—54.] There can be no antecedent improbability in the supposition that the Lord spoke on various occasions, and with various incidental references, the component parts of that great anti-Pharisaic discourse contained in Matt. xxiii. That was spake in the temple, during the last week of His ministry;—it formed the solemn close of His public teaching,—and at the end of it He departed out of the temple to return no more. I do not think it possible to suppose any part of that discourse in Matthew to be related otherwise than in its true place; all probability is against such an idea,—and so is the character of the reports of discourses in that Gospel, in general so strictly coherent and exact. There is then but one supposition left, unless we suppose Luke to have put together at random a number of fragments, and to have inserted them here, creating an occasion for them (for it amounts to this), which is equally inconceivable. And that is, that the Lord spoke at this meal, the occasion being the wonder of the Pharisees at His not washing before sitting down to meat, parts of that discourse, with which He afterwards solemnly closed His public ministry. See throughout, notes on Matt. xxiii.—37.] ἀριστήρα, the morning meal. —εἰσέλθων [i.e. without any delay] as soon as He had entered, He sat down.—38.] The expression of this wonder is not stated, but is probable. The Lord would hardly have so suddenly begun, ἡμείς of Φ., unless something had been said, to which by assent they were parties. See His proceeding when nothing was said,—ch. vii. 39. 40. ἄβατον . . . This use of the word shows that it did not imply necessarily immersion of the whole body;—for it was only the hands which the Pharisees washed before meat. —39.] There is not the least improbability or incongruity in the Lord’s having thus spoken as a guest at a meal (as Strasse, Schleiermacher, De Wette, &c., maintain)—His solemn work of reproof and teaching was never suspended out of mere compliment,—nor were the intentions of the Pharisees towards Him so friendly as these invitations seem to imply. They were given mostly from deference to popular opinion, and from no love to Him;—sometimes even with a directly hostile object: see vv. 63, 54, and comp. also ch. vii. 44—46. Observe also, that the severest parts of the discourse in Matt. (vv. 13—23. 33) were not uttered on this occasion.—νῦν, i.e. as instanced by your present conduct—‘Here is an instance of your’ &c.—τοῦ πῶς κ. τ. τίνω.—understand, ‘in the proverb’—or perhaps the application is left to be enthymematically filled up, for the next clause presupposes it.—τῷ ἐξώδει, and τῷ ἑξώδειν of a man, are not this outside, and inside of the body—but the outside apparent conduct, and the inner unseen motives.—40.] seems clearly to me to be a question, and to mean, as
37—46.
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txt A B b Tert. Aug.— τὰ ὄντα δότε ἐλεημοσύνην, καὶ ἰδοὺ πάντα καθαρά, ὅπως

καὶ ὑμῖν ἐστίν. 42 Ἀλλ' ὁ παρ᾽ ὑμῖν τῶν Φαρισαίων, ὥστε ἐτέλεσαν τὸν πόρον καὶ τὸν πῆγαν και πᾶν λάχανον, καὶ τὰ ἀνδρεία δεδομένα τὴν κρίσιν καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην τοῦ θεοῦ. ταύτα ἐδει ποιήσει, κακείνα μή ἦν ἀφίηναι. 42 ὁ παρὰ καὶ ὑμῖν τῶν Φαρισαίων, ὅτι ἀγαπᾶτε τὴν πρωτοκαθαρίαν ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς, καὶ τούς ἀσπασμοὺς ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς. 44 ὁ παρὰ, γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαίοι ὑποκριτές, ἐστὶ τοῦτο ὡς τὰ ἀνθρώπων, ὧδε, καὶ οἱ ἁπάντων οἱ περιστατότες ἐτάνει οὐκ ἐδοξασίον. 45 ἀποκριθείς δὲ τούτοις ἁρμόζειν λέγειν ἐπὶ τάς Διδασκαλίας, ταύτα λέγων καὶ ἡμᾶς ὑβρίζεις. 46 ὃς δὲ εἶπε Καὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς νομικοῖς o — ch. x. 16. i. 14. — Mark iv. 27. John i. 9 al. q Matt. xxii. 25 al.

E. V., 'Did not He, who made the outside, make the inside also?'-i. e. if His works have become unclean and polluted through sin, what is the use of only partially purging them,—not accomplishing the purgation?—must not the cleansing, to be good for anything, extend to the whole?—The making δ θέρας to mean 'he who has cleansed,' and a negative, instead of an interrogative sentence,—ye fools, he who has cleansed the outside has not cleansed the inside also,—gives, especially as the same was more strongly implied in ver. 39, the most frigid sense imaginable; and I can only wonder that Stier, after Kuinoel and others, should have adopted it. — 41.] Here again I am compelled entirely to differ from Stier, who, with Erasmus, Lightfoot, Kuinoel, Schleiermacher, &c., understands this as ironical,—'but ye give alms of their contents, and behold, all things are clean (in your estimation) to you.' But (1) this is inconsistent with the imperative δότα.

(2) It would require ι τῶν ἴδιον, for the Pharisees did not give τὰ ἐνόημα in this sense. (3) It would be altogether irrelevant to the matter in hand, which was reproof to the Pharisees for their care about outward cleanliness, when the inside was left unclean. (4) It would be altogether contrary to the Lord's usual habit of speaking about giving alms, to make Him cast a slur on it, as this would do: see Mark x. 21.

Luke xii. 33, where the expression is very similar to this.—The command is a rebuke for their contentiousness (see ch. xvi. 14), which follows in close connexion with ἀπαγωγή and παραρτήμα, ver. 39. The τὰ ἐνόημα are the contents of the vessel, which vessel (ver. 39) is ἡμῖν := therefore in its meaning the τὰ ὅπως of ch. xii. 33,—and the πάντα καθαρὰ ἄστιν answers to the θεσαύρως ἐν ὑμῖν of that verse, the result of which is the καθαρὰ ἐν ὑμῖν:—and such persons being καθαροὶ τῇ καθαρίᾳ,—to them, as to καθαροῖς, πάντα καθαρά (Tit. i. 15). — 42.] 'But woe unto you, ye do not this, but make the most trifling payments,' &c. The connexion, which is thus so close, is quite destroyed by the ironical interpretation of ver. 41. See note on Matt. xxiii. 23.—43.] Matt. xxiii. 6, 7. There doubtless was ample illustration of this at the time and place when it was spoken.—44.] see Matt. ver. 27;—but here the point of comparison is different. There (see note) the sepulchres are whitened, that men may not pass over them unawares; and the comparison is to the outside fairness, and inside abomination. Here, the graves are not seen, and men thinking they are walking on clean ground are defiled by passing over them. Perhaps the difference of expression may have been occasioned by the greater wealth and splendour and display of the Pharisees in the metropolis, where Matt. xxiii. was spoken.—45.] This man appears to have been not a common Pharisee merely, but besides, a νομοκράτης, whose duty it especially was to interpret the law. Perhaps he found himself involved in the censure

of ver. 42; or generally among the other Pharisæes. — 46.] see on Matt. ver. 4. — 47.] see on Matt. ver. 29—32. — 48.] see on Matt. vv. 34—36. —We have here a remarkable variation of expression in ver. 49. ή σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ οὖν here, = ίσω, Μatt. Various explanations have been given of this. The difficulty is not the variation just noticed, so much as that no such passage exists in the O. T. But I have little doubt that the true explanation is this: the whole saying is a reference to 2 Chron. xxiv. 18—22, and so marked a one, that I am surprised no commentators but Olshausen and Stier should have observed it, and they not thoroughly. That passage opens with remarks of the sacred historian on the delinquency of Judah and Jerusalem after the death of Jehoiada the priest:—then, ver. 19, He sent prophets to them, to bring them again to the Lord; and they testified against them: but they would not give ear. And the Spirit of God came upon Zechariah the son of Jehoiada the priest, which stood above the people, and said unto them . . . . . . And they conspired against him, and stoned him with stones at the commandment of the king in the court of the house of the Lord . . . . . . And when he died, he said, The Lord look upon it, and require it.' The words in our text are not indeed a citation, but an amplification of ver. 19 there—a paraphrase of them,—giving the true sense of what the wisdom of God intended by them;—enlarging the mere historical notice which laid hold of God's purpose only by one thread let down to the earth,—into the Divine revelation of the whole purpose of God as the counsel of His will in heaven. In Matt. the Lord Jesus Himself; as became the solemnity of that final and awful close of His testimony to His own who received Him not, stands forth as the Doer of this work,—the Sender of the Prophets and Apostles. (On 'son of Barachias' see on Matt. ver. 35.)—Perhaps the strangest solution of the difficulty above noticed is that of Meyer (second ed.), who supposes the words to have been inserted here from Matthew, and introduced as a quotation by ἡ σοφ. τ. θ. εἶπεν (! !), which Luke puts
into the mouth of Jesus Himself, 'Iâ€™d hâ€™t 
3 f i u n [ e e b t r e b n y . ' 0 3 . ] â€² p y r t 
E. tâ€™y gn. kâ€™l e tâ€™ y b a n t o. t o. b y 
nâ€™m p râ€™s e n t. y. tâ€™ y. M a t t. v e r. 1 4 , w h i c h 
words are the best explanation of our text: 
—the key of knowledge (i.e. not of, as ad-
mitting to, knowledge—but the key is the 
knowledge), being that right understanding 
of the Law and Prophets, which should 
show Him to the people, of Whom they 
testified; this the expounders of Scripture 
had taken away, neither themselves enter-
rising, nor permitting those to enter who 
were otherwise doing so—and thus shutting 
the kingdom of heaven in men’s faces.
—03.] â€³ X r. a b t o u r o n t e d, s e e r e f f., 
’t press vehemently upon Him’ with a 
honile view. — â€œ p t s o s. —â€œ p t s o t m a t i z e n 
â€œ tâ€™n dâ€™d e sâ€™k o n, dâ€™n e tâ€™ y tâ€™n 
pâ€™dâ€™a lâ€™gâ€™y tâ€™n â€œ tâ€™ s t o m â€™s, S u i d a s. 
So it will mean, to examine Him,—to 
question Him,—especially, we may sup-
pose, on such things as would require 
answers out of, or expostory of, the Law,
as they catechised in schools. —04.] â€³ X r. 
a b t o n. The accus. is Hellenistic, instead 
of the usual dative: so â€œ hâ€™r e n u s dâ€™s tâ€™s 
pâ€™dâ€™e sâ€™n tâ€™s J o s. A n t t. v. 9, 1 2 . 
—C h a p. X I I. 1—1 2.] A discourse spoken 
immediately or very soon after the former, 
and in connexion with it;—consisting for 
the most part of sayings repeated from 
other occasions, and found nearly verbatim 
in Matt. It is impossible that there should 
be any reasonable doubt of this view, when 
we remember that some of them have ap-
peared before, or appear again, in this very 
Gospel.—While the Lord was in the house 
of the Pharisees, the multitudes appear to 
have assembled together again; if, that is, 
the concluding verses of the last chap, are 
to be understood of an attack them and 
there made on Him by the Scribes and 
Pharisees. If so, â€œ o sâ€™l will mean, ‘during 
which things,’ viz. those related above.—
He comes forth to them in the spirit of the 
discourse which He has just completed, 
and cautions His disciples against that part 
of the character of the Pharisees which was 
most dangerous to them. The conclusion 
of these twelve verses may be thus enun-
cia[t:—Beware of hypocrisy (ver. 1), for 
all shall be made evident in the end (ver. 2), 
and ye are witnesses and sharers in this 
unfolding of the truth (ver. 3).—In this 
your work, ye need not fear men; for your 
Father has you in His keeping (vv. 4—7) 
—and the confession of My name is a glo-
rious thing (ver. 8), but the rejection of it 
(ver. 9), and especially the ascription of 
My works to the evil one (ver. 10), a fear-
ful one.—And in this confession ye shall 
be helped by the Holy Spirit in the hour 
of need (vv. 11, 12). —1] p râ€™s e r o v. I am 
not convinced by Olsh., De Wette, and 
Meyer, that this belongs to προσφέρω. —Every 
instance which they quote of προσφέρω being 
thus used, is where some definite matter 
is subsequent to the thing said or done; 
e.g. Matt. vi. 33. But here is no such 
matter:—πρ. would only mean, ‘earnestly’—
‘be sure that you’ . . . which meaning 
I do not think it bears. I have therefore 
coupled it with τοίς μ. αυτ., as distinguishing 
this section from what follows spoken 
to the crowd, ver. 13 ff. On the rest, see
Δέ συγκεκαλυμμένον ἐστὶν ὁ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται καὶ ΑΒΓΔ κρυπτὸν ὁ οὐ γνωσθήσεται. 3 ο ἀνθ᾽ οὐδὲ ὡς εἰ ἐπὶ τῇ σκοτίᾳ ἐπιτρέπεται, εἰ ἔρχεται ἀκούοντα ἀκούονται· καὶ ὃ πρὸς τὸ οὐς ἐλαλήσεται ἐν τοῖς τάμειοις, κρυφθήσεται ἐπὶ τῶν δωμάτων. 4 λέγω δὲ ὡς τοὺς φίλους μου Μὴ φοβηθήτε ΑΒΔ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποκτείνων τὸ σῶμα καὶ μετὰ ταύτα μὴ ἔξωθεν ἐπὶ περισσότερον τι ποίησας. 5 νῦν ὡς τοὺς φοβηθήτε φοβηθήτε τὸν μετὰ τὸ ἀποκτείνων τι ἔξωθα ἐπὶ εἰμιβαλειν εἰς τὴν γένναν, ναὶ λέγω ὡς τοὺς φοβηθήτε. 6 οὐχὶ πέντε ἑπτά ἄροι ἐπιτελεῖ. 7 ἀσσαρίων δύο; καὶ ἐν ἐς αὐτῶν οὐκ ἐστὶν ἐπίτελεν ἈΒΔΩ μένοι ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ. 8 ἀλλὰ καὶ αἱ τρίχες τῆς κεφαλῆς ὡς πάσα ἐνθίμηται. 9 μὴ ὃν φοβεῖτε πολλῶν στροφῶν διαφέρετε. 10 λέγω δὲ ὡς, πάς ὃς ἂν ἐν ὑμοὶ λογισάτων ἐν μνημονεύσει τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ ὃν τὸ ψυχόν ὑμῶν ὑπολογίζετο ἐν αὐτῷ ἐμπιστοφόρως τῶν ἀγίων ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ. 11 ὃ δὲ αρνησάμενος με ὡς ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀπαρνηθήσεται ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀγίων ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ. 12 καὶ πᾶς ὃς ἐρεί λόγον ἐς τὸν νῦν ὑμῶν ἐν αὐτῷ ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ τῷ δὲ εἰς τὸ ἀγίον πνεύμα βλασφημήσετε ὑμεῖς ἀφεθήσεται. 13 οὖν δὲ προφέρων γὰρ μὲν ἐπὶ τὰς συναγωγὰς καὶ τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας, μὴ μεριμνᾶτε πῶς ἡ τί ἀπολογήσετε ἡ τί ἐπιτρέπετε. 14 τὸ γὰρ ἀγίον πνεύμα διδασκεῖς ὑμᾶς ἐν αὐτῷ τῇ ὠρᾳ ἀπὸ ἐς εἰπτε. 15 Εἰπέ δὲ τίς αὐτῷ ἐκ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ θεοῦ Ἰδίδασκαλε, εἰπέ τῷ ἄδελφῳ μου μερισάσθαι.
KATA ΔΟΥΚΑΝ.

This inopportune request. — 14.] ἄφρ., a word of solemn reproof; see Rom. ii. 19. The ἄφρ. also forms a definite subject for ἵππας to refer to, . . . men,' i.e. mankind in general. This question is expressed in almost the very words of the Egyptian rejecting the arbitration of Moses, Exod. ii. 14.; and may show us the essential difference of the two offices of Moses and Christ. — 15.] αὖνως, i.e. τὸν δύσχον. He saw into the covetousness of the man's disposition, and made it an instructive warning for His hearers. — πάνετο πλ. There is a meaning in πάνετο—every kind of πλ. This kind, of which they had an example before them, was by no means one of the worst; but all kinds must be avoided. — οὐκ ἐν τ. . . .] 'not, because a man has abundance, does his life (therefore) consist in his goods.' That is, 'no man's life consist in what he possesses,' (οὐκ ἐν ᾧ ἰσχύς ζησίναι ἄνθρωπος . . . nor 'in τὴν περισσεύσην τινὶ, 'by his having abundance, can this be made to be the case.'—Man's life is of God, not of his goods, however abundant they may be. And this is the lesson conveyed by the following parable, and lying at the foundation of the still higher lesson conveyed in ver. 21.—ίνα is life in the pregnant sense, emphatically his life; including time and eternity. This is self-evident from the parable and its application. — 16.] The Lord in this parable acts before us one arrived at the very height of worldly prosperity, and that by no unfair means; 'non limite perturbato, non spoliato paupere, non circumvento simplici.' Augustine (Trench, p. 303). It was by God's blessing that he became thus rich, which might have been a real blessing, if he had known how to use it.—17.] 'character animi sine requie quieti, egestiae expressae.' Bengel. — οὐκ ἤχω τοῦ σων. . . . Habeas apotheces—inopum sinus, viduarum domus, ora infantum . . . Istam sunt apotheces quo mancens in inernum. Ambrose de Nabuthe, ch. vii. — 18.] 'His folly is fours fold—he forgets the Giver, (my fruits, my goods)—he greedily wishes all for himself, (συνάξω ἑαυτὸ παντα,)—he imagines such things to be food for his soul, (ψυχὴ . . . ἄνωτ., φ., π., εἴδορ.)—he forgets death, which is every day possible.' (Stier, iii. 166.) A very striking similarity is found in Sir. ix. 18, 19, ἵτι τίνι πλούτων ἀπὸ προσοχῆς καὶ σφιγγῆς αὐτῶν, καὶ αὔτὴ ἡ μείρο τοῦ μαθῆν αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ εἰπέτεν αὐτῶν ἔρων ἀνάπαυσιν, καὶ νῦν φαγμαί ἐκ τῶν ἄγαθων μου, καὶ οὐν οἷος τῆς καιρὸς παρελθεται, καὶ καταληκτίναι αὐτὰ ἵππος καὶ ἀποδιάναι. Stier thinks
this is a convincing proof that our Lord did occasionally refer to the Apocrypha (20.) άφεν, opposed to his worldly prudence; — τῆς την τοῦρα; — τῆς τῆς τοῦλα; — the ψυχή in the one case, at its ease, eating, drinking, and making merry, to the ψυχή in the other, demanded, rendered up, judged. — 'God said unto Him,' perhaps it is meant, by some unmistakable judgment; but more likely, as occurring in a parable, the words are to be literally taken. By supposing merely a divine decree to be meant, without personal communication, as Grotius, Kuinoel, and Trench do, we lose the impressive part of the parable, where the man's selfishness and folly is brought into immediate contact with the solemn truth of his approaching death, which certainly the Lord intends us to contemplate. — διανοούντως, not strictly impersonal; there are those whose business it is, even the angels, the ministers of the Divine purposes: see ch. vi. 38 and note. — δια τῆς τοῦλας, which thou hast made ready; but not for thyself. — 21.) ζητάω, thus: in utter confusion, and sudden destitution of all help and provision for eternity.
large increase. — 29.] μεταμόλυβδα, certainly not ‘nolite in sublime tollis,’ Vulg.; which Meyer approves, and Luther has adopted. For what have high thoughts to do with the present subject,—which is, the duty of dismissing anxiety and over-carefulness, in confidence on God’s paternal care? It is, ‘be not anxious,’ ‘at sea,’ tossed about between hope and fear. So Thucyd. (book ii. 8) describes Greece as being πάσα μεταμόλυβδος when the two first cities were at war.

32—34.] The Lord gives to His own disciples an assurance of the Father’s favour as a ground for removing all fear from them, and shows them the true riches, and how to seek them.—το μακ. π. Thus He sets Himself forth as their Shepherd (John x. 1 ff.), and them (as in 16. xii. 10—14) as a weak and despised people.——33.] Meyer endeavours to evade the force of this, by supposing it addressed only to the Apostles and then existing disciples. But it is said to the μικρὸν τοίμων, who are all the elect people of God.—πολ. This is the true way of investing worldly wealth:—‘He that giveth to the poor, lendeth to the Lord.’ See on Matt. vi. 19—21.

35—48.] The attitude and employment of the μικρὸν τοίμων is carried on— even to their duty of continual readiness for their Lord’s coming. These verses are connected with ver. 32—‘since your Father hath seen fit to give you the kingdom, be that kingdom, and preparation for it, your chief care.’ There are continual points of similarity, in this part of the discourse, to Matt. xxv. 42 ff., but no more:—and the close connexion quite forbids us to imagine that the sayings have been collected merely by the Evangelist. —35.] There is a slight reference to, or rather another presentation of the truth set forth in, the parable of the virgins, Matt. xxi. 1 ff. But the image here is of servants waiting for their lord to return from the wedding;—left at home and bound to be in readiness to receive him. There is only a hint at the cause of His absence—He is gone to a wedding; γάμος may mean almost any feast or entertainment—and the maia thought here only is that He is away at a feast, and will return. But in the back-ground lies the wedding in all its Truth—not brought out here, but elsewhere, Matt. xxii. 1 ff. xxv. 1 ff.—αλ. δειφ. περ. see John xiii. 4. Eph. vi. 14. 1 Pet. i. 13.—αλ. λύχνου, see note on Matt. xxv. 1. —36.] καί ὠμοιά—emphatic—distinguished from the δοφ. and
XI.


λυγ, above: — ye yourselves, i.e. your whole conduct and demeanour. — κρονε. adv. . . . αντα — a very common constr. of the Gen. abs. — see ch. xvii. 12. xii. 10 al. — and Winer, § 50, last Ann., for classical examples. — 37. see Rev. iii. 20, 21, where the same similitude is presented, and the promise carried on yet further, to the sharing of his throne. The Lord himself, in that great day of his glory, — the marriage-supper of the Lamb, — will invert the order of human requirements (see ch. xvii. 3), and in the fulness of his grace and love will serve his brethren: — the redeemer, his redeemed, — the shepherd, his flock — παραλλ., coming in turn to each. Compare the washing of the disciples' feet in John xiii. Iff, which was a foreshadowing of this last great act of self-abasing love. — 38. Olah. observes that the first watch is not named, because the marriage itself falls on it: but his view that because the fourth is not named, the Lord follows the ancient custom of the Jews and divides the night into three watches, is probably incorrect: it is more likely (Meyer) that the fourth is not named, because the return was not likely to be so long delayed: — for the duration of the parable. — 39. I am surprised that Schleiermacher can have imagined (transl. p. 198) that this verse has been inserted so as to break the connexion, and by a later hand. Nothing can be more exact and rigid than the connexion as it now stands. The Lord transfers, to show the unexpected nature of his coming, and the necessity of watchfulness, the relation between himself and the servants, to that between the thief and the oikouménas. For the purposes of this verse, they represent the oikouménas—collectively, as put in charge with the Lord's house and household (thus the verse is intimately connected with ver. 42) — and in the further application, individually — each as the oikouménas of his own σειας, to be kept with watchfulness against that day — Ηε is represented by the thief — ιεθ ἐρχομαι ως ελευθης, Rev. xvi. 15. III. 3 — Olshausen's view of the oikouménas is the ἔρχων τοι καθα ρουτου, is surely quite out of keeping with the main features of the parable. That he should be put in the place of the watching servants (κα τοις σειας oυν) seems impossible: besides that the πιστο γεων oμος below is this very oikouménas, being much in the absence of his Lord, but the oikouménas when He appears. — 41. την ναπ. τ. not, the two last verses (Stier);
ABD αὐτοῦ [τοῦ] διδόναι ἐν καιρῷ τῷ στιμότερων; 45 μακάριος ὁ δύολος ἐκείνος ὁν ἐλθὼν ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ ευρήσει ποιῶνα ὑπότως. 46 ἂν θεοῦ λέγω ὡς ὅτι ἐπὶ πάσι τοῖς υπάρχουσιν αὐτοῦ καταστήσει αὐτοῦ. 47 εἰ δέ εἰπή ὁ δύολος εκείνος ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ Χρονίζη αὐτοῦ κύριός μου ἐγκεκριμένος, καὶ ἀρξήσεται τύπτεν τῶν παιδίσκων καὶ τῶν παιδίσκων ἰδιότες τε καὶ πίνακι τε καὶ μεθοδεύσεως, 48 ἃ δὲ ὁ κύριος τοῦ δύολου ἐκείνου ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τῇ προδοσίᾳ καὶ ἐν ὑπαρ καὶ γνώσει καὶ διεισαγωγήσει αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ μέρος αὐτοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἄπτωτων θήσει. 49 εἴκοσι δὲ ὁ δύολος ὁ γνώνος τὸ θέλημα τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ καὶ μή ἑτοιμάσας μηδὲ ποιήσεις πρὸς τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ διὰ τοῦτο συνασσαίον τῶν παλλάζων. 50 ὁ δὲ μηδὲ ποιήσεις δὲν εἰσέλθη πάντως γινώσκει καὶ διανοηεῖ τὸ σελήνιον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς ἑχοντικής. 51 παντὶ δὲ τῆς ἑκάστης πολλῆς παλλάζων ἐνθαρρυνθήσεις παρ' αὐτοῦ καὶ παρ' ἑκατέρων πολλῆς περισσότερον ὑπάρχουσιν.

Orig.—τὸ bef. σιτ. om. B.—43. end, ὅπως ποιήσεις αὐτὸν D.—44. ἀρνήθη λ. D.—δὲν αὐτῷ Π.—45. τοιούτῳ D.—ὁδηγῶν τέ κ. πίνακα μεθοδοκόμησον D.—46. for τοῦ δ. ἑκατέρων ὑπάρχουσιν D—Iren.—47. for μηδὲ, ἢ B. ἑκατέρων μηδὲ om. D Orig.—48. for ἐκάστης, ἑκατέρων D—

but the whole:—'Who are they that are thus to wait and watch, and to be thus honoured at the Lord's coming?'—This question, coming in so suddenly and unexpectedly and remaining apparently unanswered, is among the many proofs of the originality and historic reality of this discourse (against De Wette, &c.).—42 f.] The Lord does not answer the question directly, but proceeds with His discourse, so as to furnish it with an answer—viz. that in its highest sense it applies to His Apostles and Ministers, insomuch as to them most has been given as of oikoumēnē—but that its application is gradually downwards through all those who know their Master's will, even to the lowest, whose measure both of responsibility and of reward is more limited. For the comment on vv. 42—46 see on Matt. xxiv. 45—51. Notice that ἕξις καὶ ποιήσας in Matt.—47, 48.—primarily, in reference to the question in ver. 41, at γνῶσις = ἑκατέρων, the disciples. αἱ μὴ γνώσεις = παλλάζων, the multitude—but the application is not limited to this:—the truth is one of universal extent. The 47th verse needs little explanation:—after both πολλὰς and δλίας, πάνηγυς is to be supplied, see ref.—τροφή, not ἑκατέρων, but 'matters,' πρὸς τ. θ. 49. αἰ.—it refers back to the γίνομεν τῶν τοῦ of ver. 40; this readiness being not only preparing himself, but the matters over which he has charge, ver. 35. There is reference to Deut. xxv. 2.—δὲ ἐμὲ γνώσεις. The case is of one (a disciple in the first reference, but then generally of all men) who bona fide is ignorant of his Lord's will. That such persons shall be punished, is both the sentence of the law, see Levit. v. 17—19, and an inference from the truth set forth ver. 57, and Rom. i. 10, 20, 32. ii. 14, 15, —that the natural conscience would have prevented the ἑκατέρων ποιήσας. (Observe that the two classes not included here, are ὁ γνῶνος καὶ ποιήσας, and ἐμὲ γνῶνος καὶ ποιήσας, as far as that can be said (see Rom. ii. 14)—the reference here being only to the μὴ ποιήσας in both cases, or rather to the μὴ π. in the first case and its equivalent πᾶσα παλλάσσα (in the second). But the difficulty seems to be to assign a spiritual meaning to the διανοηεῖ τὸ σελήνιον. That such will be the case, would ἀπροκάταρτος be consonant to the justice of the Judge of all the earth: and we have here declared, that it shall be so;—but how, is not revealed to us. It is in vain for the sinner to encourage himself in sin from such a declaration as this: for the very knowledge of the declaration excludes him from the exemption. "Our ears have heard the voice divine; We cannot be as they." (Christian Year).—παντὶ παρέχωται παρ' ἑκατέρων, παρ' ἑκατέρων παλλάζων παρ' ἑκατέρων παλλάζων. The second παλλάζων is not the παλλάζων that has been given, but a propor-
for so, a, par' ab, ζητήσαναν απ' αυτοῦ περισσότερον D al.—for περισσότερον, πλούς ἀπαγορεύσαινες D al.—for 49. for παρ' αυτοῦ Β Κ Λ Μ X XX 22, all. Syr. Sahid. Orig. (6 times) Eus. Chrys. Hil. Hier. Aug. text D év.—for καὶ ἔναν B, D év.—for καὶ ἔναν αὐτοῦ δὲ λέγει Orig.—50. rec. ἐν, with: text A B D Β Κ Λ Μ X 18 Orig.—51. for διαφέρειν D. mutters

fors an instance of a similar question, καί ἐστι; . . . . . and under similar circumstances, of His soul being troubled.—(3) What Theophyl., Kuinoel, Olah., De Wette, &c. adopt, taking τι = δικαίωσις, as some do in Matt. vii. 14 (but see note there), and τις = ὁρισθείσας, and rendering, How I wish that it were already kindled! But here we have serious difficulties of an idiomatic kind:—τις is apparently never thus used (see above)—and τις = ὁρισθείσας, and rendering, How I wish that it were already kindled! The context presents no construction, but a very great contextual difficulty; for by ver. 50 it evidently was not yet kindled: and even if this were overcome, the expression, evidently a deep one of personal anxiety (and be it remembered Who said it), would be vapid and unmeaning in the extreme.—I cannot say that I am satisfied with either of the above explanations, —but adopt the first, as the best at present suggested, brack the note of interrogation as doubtful. —50.] The symbolic nature of Baptism is here to be borne in mind.—Baptism = Death. The figure in the Sacrament is the drowning—the burial, in the water, of the old man, and the resurrection of the new man: see 1 Pet. iii. 20—22, and notes. The Lord's Baptism was, His Death, in which the Body inherited from the first Adam (ἐν όμοίωσιν σαρκὸς ἀμαρτίας) was buried, and the new Body (τὸ σῶμα τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ) raised again: see Rom. vi. 1—11, but especially ver. 10. And He was 'straitened' (the best possible rendering) till this was accomplished:—i.e. in anxiety and trouble of spirit. —The 8a here implies, but first, i.e. before that fire can be shed abroad. Here we have then, as Stier expresses it, a 'passio inchoata' of the Lord;—the first utterance of that deep anguish,
which afterwards broke forth so plentifully,—but coupled at the same time with holy zeal for the great work to be accomplished.—51—54.) The work of this fire, as it burns onward in the world, will not be peace, but division; see Mal. iii. 2, 3. 18. iv. 1, where we have the separating effect of this fire in its completion at the great day: see also Matt. iii. 12.—On the passage itself, see notes on Matt. x. 35, 36.

54—59.) The connexion of this with the foregoing is natural and close. ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν (ver. 52), the distinction shall begin to be made,—the discord and division between those who discern τοὺς καιροὺς τούτους (ver. 56) and those who do not. The Lord then turns to the crowd and reproaches them (1) for their blindness, in not being able to discern it, as they did the signs in the natural heavens; and (2) for their want of prudence (vv. 57—59), in not repenting and becoming reconciled to the law of God while yet there was time. Schleiermacher and De Wette can discover no connexion (1), and yet the latter thinks Luke inserted the sayings of vv. 54—56 out of Matt. xvi., because of ver. 49 ff. (1)—54.) There is a somewhat similar saying of the Lord at Matt. xvi. 2 ff., but differing both in its occasion and its substance.—τὴν ἡμέραν, just as τᾶς νεφέλαις,—the cloud,—that usually rises there: see 1 Kings xviii. 44. The west, in Judaea, would be the direction of the sea.—55.) ἐκανέν, ἐκ οἰκίας.—56.) τὸ πρὸ τῆς γῆς,—perhaps referring to other signs of rain or heat from the appearance of the hills, &c.—τὸν δὲ κ. τ. λ. The signs of this time were very plain,—the sceptre had departed from Judah,—the general expectation of the coming of the Messiah is testified even by profane authors,—the prophets had all spoken of Him, and the greatest of them, the Baptist, had announced His arrival.—57.) In what follows, the Lord takes occasion from the request about the inheritance, which had begun this discourse, to pass to infinitely more solemn matters. There is, I think, no denying that the κρίνειν τῇ δικαίῳ και τῷ ἀνάλληλῳ τῆς ἡμέρας. have a reference to that request, in the ability and duty of every man to judge what is right:—but the sense of the words far outruns that reference, and treats of loftier things.—Why do ye not discern of yourselves your true state—that which is just—the justice of your case as before God? You are going (the course of your life is the journey) with your adversary (the just and holy law of God) before the magistrate (God Himself); therefore, by the way, take pains (δοκεῖ ὑμᾶς), do operam—a Latinism: there is no reference to interest
of money, as Theophylact,—who also has the other interpretation,—supposes to be delivered from him (by repentance, and faith in the Son of God, see Ps. ii. ult.), lest he drag thee to the judge (ἐπιθετεῖ ὑμᾶς,—who adjudges the case and inflicts the fine; that is, the Son, to whom all judgment is committed), and the judge deliver thee to the exactor (see Matt. xiii. 41), and the exactor cast thee into prison' (dittò, ver. 42).

—59.] see on Matt. v. 25, and, on λειτουργ. Mark xii. 42.

CHAP. XIII. 1—9.] Peculiar to Luke.—In adv. τ. καρπ., may mean 'at that very time'—viz. as He finished the foregoing discourse;—but it is not necessary to interpret thus,—for, Matt. xii. 1. xiv. 1, the similar expression, ἐν καρποὶ τ. ε., is certainly indefinite.—φάρ. . . . ἀραγγ.,—'came with the news.'—not, as Stier supposed, were in the crowd, and remarked to the Lord concerning these Galileans, in consequence of what He had said ch. xii. 57:—such a finding of connexion is too fine-drawn, and is a fault which we may excuse in Stier, for his many services in interpreting the Lord's discourse, but must not imitate. It is obvious that no connexion is intended between this incident and the foregoing discourse.—ἐφεξεὶ σ. τ. Γ. The historical fact is otherwise unknown. The way of speaking here shows that it was well known to the writer. It must have occurred at some feast in Jerusalem, when riots often took place (see Jos. Antit. xvii. 3, 3. 10, 2), and in the outer court of the temple. Such slaughters were frequent, and would not be particularly recorded by the historians. This mingling of their blood with their sacrifices seems to have been thought by the narrators evidence that they were very depraved sinners,—for this was their argument, and is unconsciously that of many at this day,—'the worse the affliction, the more deserved':—see Gen. xiii. 21. Acts xxviii. 4. 2.] The Lord perceives this to be their reasoning—they did not express it, as is plain by the οὐκοινονίαν τοῦτον . . . He does not deny that all the Galileans were sinners, and deserved God's judgments, but that these were pre-eminently so. The ἐναντίων (the force of which is lost in the E. V., 'likewise') should be rendered 'as like manner,' as indeed the Jewish people did perish, by the sword of the Romans. —4, 5.] The Lord introduces this incident as showing that whether the hand of man, or (so called) accidents, lead to inflictions of this kind, it is in fact but one Hand which doeth it all—Amos iii. 6. There is also a
transference from the Galileans—a despised people—to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, on whom the fulness of God's wrath was to be poured out in case of impenitence. Of the incident itself, or of the tower in Siloam (probably in the district in which the fountain, John ix. 7, was situated,—though on the whole matter, and the situation of the fountain itself, there is considerable uncertainty), we know nothing. Josephus says of the wall of the ancient city, πρὸς νότον ὑπὸ τῆς Σιλωὰμ ἐπιστροφὸς παγῆν, B. J. v. 4, 2: see also Neh. iii. 15. In B. J. vi. 7, 2, he uses μὲν ροῦ Σιλωὰμ, as here, meaning apparently a district of the city; see on John i. c.—ἀφελέναι, 'sinners,'—see Matt. vi. 12;—perhaps the same thought pervades the saying as vv. 58, 59 of the last chapter. (No such idea as that the tower was a prison for debtors (1) is for a moment to be thought of.—ὁμοίως is emphatic: see on ὡσοντις above,—'similarly'—in the ruin of your whole city. This does not render it necessary that these words should have been spoken to actual dwellers in Jerusalem: for nearly the whole nation was assembled there at the time of the siege. —6—9.) This Parable has perhaps been interpreted with hardly enough reference to its own peculiar context, or to the symbolic language of Scripture in other places. Ordinarily (also in Trench, Par. 314 ff.) the owner of the vineyard is explained to be the Eternal Father; the dresser and intercessor, the Son of God—the fig-tree, the whole Jewish people—the vineyard, the world. But it may be objected to this, that the owner comes to seek the fruit, which can be properly said only of Him who εἰς τὰ τὰ ἢλπὶ—who is even in Matt. ὁ ἄρχων ὁμοίως—and by implication there, the possessor of the vineyard braw λάθυ (for that destruction He universally represents as His coming). The other objections will come out in the direct exposition of the Parable, which I take to be this:—The link which binds it to the foregoing is ἵνα μὴ μετανοήσῃ: ; —and it is addressed rather to individuals than to the whole nation—though of course to the whole nation as made up of individuals. The vineyard is not the world, which would be wholly inconsistent with Scripture symbolism (for Matt. xiii. 24 the comparison is to ὁ βασιλ. v. ὁπ.—the Gospel dispensation, in which the field—not the vineyard—is the whole world); but, as in Is. v. 7, the house of Israel, and the men of Judah (see notes on Matt. xxx. 33 ff.) The figtree planted in the vineyard—among the vines—an usual thing denotes an individual application,—fixing each man's thought upon one tree—and that one, himself—just as the guest without the weddinggarment in Matt. xxii. He who had the tree planted in His vineyard (—All things that the Father hath, are Mine—John xvi. 16), came seeking fruit, and found it not: see Matt. xxi. 19 and note. (The Vinedresser, see below.) He commands it to be cut down, as encumbering the soil (exhausting it, rendering it inactive: see reft.); three years has He been coming and seeking fruit in this tree, and He findeth none. Then, at the intercession of the vinedresser, He consents (for this is implied) to spare it this year also, until it has been manured; if that fail, the Intercessor himself has no more ples to urge—it is to be cut down—Now who is this Intercessor? First look at the matter of fact. Who were the vinedressers of God's vineyard? They were many. Moses, the Prophets, the Baptist, the Lord Himself, the Apostles and Teachers after Him. But what One Personality might be set forth as pervading all these, 'striving with man' in them all—as being ὁ ἀμφισβητόρος? Clearly, it seems to me, the Holy Spirit of God. In the passage just alluded to, Gen. vi. 3, we can hardly but recognize the main features of our present parable; especially when the days of Noah are compared by the Lord Himself to His own coming to vengeance. The intercessory office of the Spirit (ὁ παραστήτης; see on John xiv. 16), pleading with...
man and for man, and resigning that blessed conflict when met with invertebrate obduracy, is often set before us in Scripture. (See the whole history of Saul; Zech. vii. 12—14; Prov. i. 23—32; Is. lixii. 10; Neh. ix. 20; Rom. viii. 26, 27.) — 7.] τρέχει ἥτη ἕρχος. I have little doubt that an allusion is intended to the three years of our Lord's ministry. The objection to this, that the cutting down ought then to have taken place at the end of τοῦτο τὸ ἔρχος, does not apply; for all is left indefinite in the request and the implied answer. In the individual application, many thousands did bear fruit this very year; and of those who did not, who shall say when the Spirit ceased pleasing them, and the final sentence went forth? — καὶ τ. γ. κακῷ, 'Why, besides bearing no fruit, is it impoverishing the soil?' — 8.] σκ. καὶ βαλέι, i.e., dig holes about the root, and fill them with manure, as is done (Trench, p. 319) to orange-trees in the south of Italy. — 9.] After καρπῶν, λαίμει, τῷ τοῦ ἤχτι, Euth., but not without reason: to fill up the aposeiopia did not belong to the purpose of this parable. — τε τὸ μᾶλλον, not ἔτι τὸς (Meyer), but indefinite (see reft.), 'hereafter'! — and purpose so; — because, in the collective sense, the sentence lingered. — ἀσκόφασι, θορύβος: shall shake it down — not ἐκδύσει; and I find in this an additional proof of the correctness of the foregoing interpretation. It is the εὐρός τ. ἀμπελώνως, who ὅταν ἔδει, κακοὶ κακῶς ἀπολλυται αὑτοῖς. All judgment is committed to the Son: — it is not the work of the Holy Spirit to cut down and destroy, for He is the Lord and giver of life. — The above interpretation is partially given by Stier, who has however in my view quite missed the ἄμπελον γεωργος, understanding by him the husbandmen in Matt. xxi. — forgetting that they are destroyed in the sequel of that parable, and that their position, that of the tenants of the vineyard, does not appear at all in this, any more than does the ἀμπελώνας in that.

10—31.] Peculiar to Luke, except the parables, which are in Matt. xiii. 33-39. Mark iv. 31—10.] Time and place alike indefinite. — 11.] τω ἀσθ. Her weakness was the effect of permitted power of the evil one (ver. 16); but whether we are to find here a direct instance of possession, seems very doubtful. There is nothing in the Lord's words addressed to her, to imply it: and in such cases He did not say on His hands, or touch,—but only in cases of sickness or bodily infirmity. — ἐκ τε παντελῶς belongs to ἄνακψας, not to ὃνωμ.: see note on Heb. vii. 25. — 18.] There is no reason to suppose any eminence of faith in her — though we may fairly conclude that she was there with some expectation of a cure: see on ver. 14. — ἀναλλαγμ. expresses the setting free of her muscles from the power which bound
them down,—and then, ver. 13, the laying on of the Divine Hands confers upon her strength to rise and stand upright. It would be, in such a case, one thing to be loosed from the stiffening of years,—and another to have strength at once conferred to stand upright. —14.] The ruler speaks not either to Jesus or to the woman—but covertly and cowardly, as the multitude. Stier notices the self-identification of this speech, in making ἀνθρώπινη, a reception of Divine grace and help, a species of ἀνθρώπινη! —15.] ἐποκρίτης. The Lord saw the real thoughts of his heart, that they were false, and inconsistent with his pretended zeal. A man hardly could give forth a doctrine so at variance with common sense and common practice, without some by-end, with which he covered his violation of truth. That by-end here was eminence to and jealousy of Jesus.—The instance chosen exactly fits the circumstances. A beast tied to the manger is confined down as this poor woman was. —16.] The contrast is strongly drawn — between a dumb animal, and (not merely a human creature, but) a daughter of Abraham—one of the chosen people (I can see no necessity for a spiritual daughtership (Gal. iii. 7) being here implied).—between a few hours, since the watering of the morning, and 'lo these eighteen years' (comp. ver. 7, ἤδε τρ. ἤτοι.) —17.] So far am I from thinking a description of this kind to be a mere general close, put in by the Evangelist, that I would take it as an accurate and graphic account of the immediate effect of the Lord's power and irresistible words,
and the following parables as spoken immediately thereupon, showing the people the ultimate conquest which the Kingdom of God should obtain over all opposition, however strong. On the parables themselves, see on Matt. xiii. 31-33.

23-30.] The Lord repeats, occasion being given by a question peculiar to Luke, parts of His discourses spoken elsewhere, as referred to below.—23.] This notice includes what follows in the cycle of this last journey, but disclaims any definiteness of place or time for it. But certainly it seems to follow in natural order after the Lord's solemn warnings to repentance at the beginning of this chapter.—The inquirer can hardly have been a disciple of Jesus (see ver. 26), but most likely a Jew from the multitude, who had heard His discourses, and either from Jewish pride, or perhaps from real desire to learn from Him, put this question.—28.] aσεσάς, the multitude. Similar sayings have occurred in the Sermon on the Mount, but the connexion here is intimate and strict.—24.] see on Matt. vii. 13.—The description of the broad and narrow ways is not here inserted, as probably by this time οτί στενή πόλη was a familiar image.—ις τις εἰς κ. σώκ εἰς, not, 'shall seek to enter by it, and shall not be able.' The emphasis of the command is, 'seek to enter at the strait gate: for many shall seek to enter (elsewhere), and shall not be able.' After διέλθη, is to be supplied in both places, εἰς σωτηρίαν, or εἰς τ. βασιλ. τ. θεόν.—25.] A reason why this αγωνιζόμενοι is so important,—because there will be a day when the gate will be shut. The figure is the usual one,—of a feast, at which the Householder entertains (in this case) the members of his family. These being assembled, he rises and shuts the door, and none are afterwards admitted.—The τότε of extends to τοῦτω, end of ver. 25,—and the second member of the sentence begins with τότε.—οὐκ ἐστώμας καὶ κρούομαι both depend on ἀρξήσατο. 'Hearing that the door is shut, ye begin to stand and knock.' On the spiritual import, see note on Matt. xviiv. 11. —οὐκ εἰς ὁμ. τ. δόξην, 'Ye are none of my family,—have no relationship with me.'—26.] Ἰδαίν. ἐν σοὶ κ. ἐν. As applied to the then assembled crowd, these words refer to the miracles of feeding,—perhaps also to His having so often sat at meat in the houses of various persons (the κ. τὸ εἰσόμενον must not be pressed as meaning anything different from εἰσάγαγα; —the expression is a general one for taking a meal);—as applied to Christians, to the eating and drinking whereof those miracles were anticipatory.—Both these are ἐνσώματι—sou merci,—in His presence,—very different from the drinking μὲν ἐνομίζων of which He speaks Matt. xxvi. 29, and from the διενεχῶς μὲν αὐτῶν, καὶ αὐτὸς μὲν ἐμοὶ, Rev. iv. 20.—Ἐν τ. πλ. ἡμ. 48., applicable directly to those to whom the words were
κίαι. 28 εκεί ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βουγμός τῶν ὑδόν-
tων, ὅταν ὄψητε Ἀβραάμ καὶ Ἰσαάκ καὶ Ἰακώβ καὶ
πάντας τοὺς προφήτας ἐν τῷ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἦμας
δὲ ἐκβαλλομένους ζωήν. 29 καὶ ἦρουσαν ἀπὸ τὰν ἀνατολήν
dιὰ δύσμων καὶ [ἀπὸ] βορρᾶ καὶ νότου, καὶ ἀνακλι-
θοῦσαν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ. 30 καὶ ἰδοὺ εἰὼν
ἐσχάτοι οἱ ἐστιν πρῶτοι, καὶ εἰς πρῶτοι οἱ ἐστιν ἐσχατοι.

31 Ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ * ἡμέρα προσῆλθον τινες Φαρισαῖοι
λέγοντες αὐτῷ: Ἐξελθε καὶ παράνοι ἐντεῦθεν, ὅτι Ἡρῴδης
θέλει σε ἀποκτείναι. 32 καὶ εἰπεν αὐτοῖς Ἀπορεθέντες,
εἰπάτε τῷ ἄλωσεν ταύτη Ηἴνον ἐκβάλλω δαμόνια καὶ
ἰάσεις ἐπιτελώ * σήμερον καὶ αὐριον, καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ
* θηλεύομαι. 33 πλην δει με σήμερον καὶ αὐριων καὶ τῇ
ἐγκυμνή προέσθαν, ὅτι εὑρα


spoken,—and further, in its fuller sense, to all among whom the Gospel is preached, even till the end.—27.] ἐπάγω τ. 48. This unusual expression seems to mean, persons engaged in the hire and receiving the wages of unrighteousness:—see Matt. vii. 23, where οἱ ἐργάζομαι τ. ἀνωνίας is [[ to it. This meaning of ἐργάζομαι is very seldom found: see ref. — 28, 29.] See Matt. viii. 11, 12, and notes. The verses occur here in a different connexion: 1 Ye Jews, who neglect the earnest endeavour to enter now, shall weep and gnash your teeth when ye see all the saints, Jews and Gentiles, in the Kingdom of God, and yourselves excluded: (see ch. xvi. 23).—In these two verses is the real answer to the question of ver. 23 given:—they shall be many—but what is that to you, if you be not among them?—30.] As the words here stand—somewhat different from those in Matt. xx. 16—they seem to be a prophetic declaration of what shall be in the course of the ingathering of these guests:—viz. that some who were the first, or among the first, to believe, shall fall from their high place, and vice versa. This former has, as Stier notices (li. 200), been remarkably the case with the Oriental Churches, which were the first founded and flourishing:—and, we may add, with the mother church of Jerusalem, which has declined, while her Gentile offsets have flourished.

31—35.] Peculiar to Luke:—the apostrophe in vv. 34, 35 was spoken by the Lord also on another occasion, Matt. xxiii. 37—39. — 31.] ἐν αὐτῷ τ. ἤμαρ not necessarily definite,—nor even if ἦρουσα is read.—These Pharisees appear to have been sent by Herod for the purpose of getting rid of Jesus out of his jurisdiction. Considering his character, it is hardly possible that he should really have wished to kill one who was so popular:—he refused to do so when Jesus was in his power afterwards in Je-

usalem:—but, as great multitudes were now following Him about, and superstitions fears, as we know, agitated Herod,—he wished to be quit of Him, and took this means of doing so. I think this view is necessary to justify the epithet applied to Herod, which certainly implies cunning on his part. Stier thinks the Pharisees in-
vented the tale about Herod: but then how can the epithet applied to him be explained? I cannot for a moment believe, as he does, that the Lord saw through the lie of the Pharisees, and yet adopted it, meaning the ἀλογισία to signify themselves.—A fixed locality is given to the incident, as having happened in Galilee—see ch. xvii. 11. 32, 33.] The interpretation of this answer is difficult, for two reasons—(1) the signification of the σύμφωνος, ἀδεί, and ἔνδοξος is doubtful—(2) that the meaning of τελειοῦμαι is also doubtful.—The days men-
toned are ordinarily supposed to be pro-
verbially used; σὺν,... for His present work-
ing—αὐθγείον, for that between the present
time and His arrival at Jerusalem—ἡ τρ.,
for that arrival, and the end of His work
and course by His Death.—Against this,
is (1) the positive use of the three days,
in an affirmative sentence,—of which no in-
stance can be brought where the proverbial
meaning is implied:—(2) the πορεύεται
belonging to all three in ver. 33, whereas
thus it only belongs to the two first.—The
interpretation adopted by Meyer is this:—
In three days (literal days) the Lord’s
working of miracles in Galilee would be
ended, which had excited the apprehension
of Herod: and then He would leave the
territory, not for fear of Herod, but be-
because He was going to Jerusalem to die.
The objection to this is, that the sense—of
ending these present works of healing, &c.
does not suit as a reason for ἀναλήφθη;
μα. Meyer takes it as middle—but qu.,
is a middle present ever thus placed alone?
Is not such a form, when standing thus,
necessarily passive? And though the word
τῆλιοιμαί is not found earlier than the
writings of the Fathers in the sense of
'suffering martyrdom', it is found in that of
'being perfected'—which, as applied to the
Lord, included His death:—see reff.
I own that neither of the above interpreta-
tions satisfy me,—and still less the various
modifications of them which have been pro-
posed (e.g. by Stier and Wieseler; De Wette
adopts none). Nor can I suggest any less
open to objection:—but merely state my
conviction (1) that the days mentioned
must have some definite fixed reference to
three actual days: (2) that τῆλιοιμαί is
the pres. pass., and is used in the solemn
sense elsewhere (reff.) attached to the word.

—If Luke's Gospel had been a chrono-
logical calendar of the Lord's journey, the
meaning would probably have been clear:
but as we have none such, it is, and I
believe must remain, obscure.—τῷ ἔρα
τῷ πρεσbytero:—and is not less precise
(Schier).—πορεύεσθαι:—to journey—the
very word in which they had addressed
Him, ἔφη ἐκεῖνοι τω δικός. A V al. donec veniam et
dicatis c. rec. ἐξω with qu.?
XIV. 1 Kai eigneto ev tew elthein avton eis oikon tina
twv arxontwv twv Farsaiowv sabbatav phagin arton, kai
autow sa na paratropumenoi avton, kai idou
anbropo tois hyn xvorphikos emprosthein avton. 1 kai
apokritheis h Isous eite prois tois nomikous kai
Farsaiowv [lignwv] 1 [Ei] evesti taw sabbataw 2 kai therapeusin;
oi de h synagasan, kai eipelasmenos isasto avtoin kai
k atlepse, kai apokritheis prois avton eite Tivon imon
* onos h bovs eis 1 pheran 3 empeiteitai, kai ouk evdeis
1 aspasai avtoin [inv] o himea tos sabbatau; 2 kai
ouk 4 ischuvan anapokrithnai autw prois tuwta. 3 elge
2 prois tois keklmenous parabolwv, 1 eiphevwv pws tws
5 prwtkloiaias evelengo, lignwv prois avton 8 "Otan
klhres uypo twn imon eis gaimous, m <
1 kataklhres eis twn
2 prwtkloias, mypote
3 evntimotereos sou y keklmenos
4 p = Matt. viii. 28 al. — here only. see Rom. ix. 29. Jndg. v. 30 al. — constr. here only. Acts iii. 5. 3 Tim. iv. 10. see Job xvii. 2. 4 Matt. xxvi. 8 and 17. 5 ch. 2. 42. Gen. xiii. 11. 6 ch. ix. 14. xxiv. 30 only. 1 Kings xxi. 11. 7 ch. vii. 2. Phil. ii. 20. 1 Kings xxvi. 31.

—ei om. B D L Copt. ins. A. abe. —theopoiesai (8 eis B D L. taw. A. — 6. for docei,
tiles. — That the very words evdei. o arx.
1 k. λ. were used by the multitude at the
Lord's entry into Jerusalem, I should much
rather ascribe to a misunderstanding by them
and the disciples of this very declaration,
that for a moment suppose that these words
found any sufficient fulfilment in that entry
(Braunus, Paulus, Wieseler).

—1] an taw daw. aut., viz. during the
paroeseia, ch. xiii. 33. — t. arx. t. Phi.,
'of the chief men of the Pharisees;' not
'of the Pharisees who were rulers,' which
would be ungrammatical. Though the
Pharisees had no official rulers as such, they
had men to whom they looked up, as
Hillel, Schammai, Gamaliel, &c. (Meyer.)
—phi. arx. The Jews used to give entertainments on the Sabbath, see Neh. viii.
9—12. Tobit ii. 1. The practice latterly
became an abuse,—Hodiernus dies sab-
bati est: hunc in presenti tempore otho
quodam corporaliter languido et fluxo et
luxurioso celebrant Judaei.' Aug. Enarr. in
Ps. xci. 2. Again, 'observa diem Sabbati,
non Judaica deliciae . . . . ' Enarr. ii. in
Ps. xxxii. 6. — kal, usual after eigne:
not 'also,' or 'even.' — 2] eisph. aut.
not as a guest; see ver. 4. 'hyn istameno
kai μη τοκουμεν μη ζητησαι θεραπιαν
dia to sabb. kai toos Phar. faivnonces de
moun, ina idous oikterphse touton dφ
λανσον και παλαλαξη τουτου σαββων.

7—11.) The three first divisions of this
chapter consist of separate doings and
sayings of the Lord, all occurring at this Sab-
bath feast. It does not appear that the
foregoing miracle gave occasion to this
saying; so that it is no objection to it, that
it has no connexion with it. The Lord, as
was His practice, founds His instructions
on what He saw happening before Him.—
As Trench remarks, (Par. 321,) it is proba-
bly this was a splendid entertainment,
and the guests distinguished persons (ver.
12).—7] prwtkol., see Matt. xxiii. 6, the
middle place in the triclinium, which was
the most honourable. At a large feast
there would be many of these. — 8] The
whole of this has, besides its plain reference,
a deeper one, linked into it by the pregnant
EYAGGEION

XIV.

υπ’ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐλθὼν ὁ σὲ καὶ αὐτὸν καλέσας ἵπτι σοι ΑΒΔ.

Δὸς τούτῳ τότον, καὶ τῷ ἄρξῃ "μεν" αἰσχύνης τὸν

ἐσχατὸν τότον κατέχειν. 10 ἀλλ’ ὅταν κληθῆς, πορευ-

θείς τοῦ ἀνάπαυσθην ἀνώτερον

τῶν ἐσχατῶν τῶν "συνανακλήσεων σοι.

11 οἵ τις πάρ ὁ ὕψων ἑαυτοῦ ταπεινωθήσεται, καὶ ὁ ταπε-


eων ἑαυτὸν υψωθήσεται. 12 ἔλεγε δὲ καὶ τῷ κεκληκτῷ

ἀυτῶν "Ὅταν τοῖς αἰσχροῖς ἢ δειπνοί, μὴ φονεῖ

τοὺς φίλους σου μὴ δέ τοὺς ἀδέλφους σου μὴ δέ τοὺς συγ-

γενείς σου μὴ γείτονας πλούσιους, μήποτε καὶ αὐτοὶ σε

ἀντικαλέσουσι, καὶ γεννήσαι σοι ἀνταπόδομα. 13 ἀλλ’

"Ὅταν τοῖς δοχηνί, καλεῖ πτωχούς, ἢ ἀναπέραντους,

χωλοὺς, τυφλοὺς 14 καὶ μακάριος ἐση, ὅτι οὐκ ἔχουσιν

ἀνταποδόσαι σοι ἀνταποδόσαι γάρ σοι ἐν τῇ

fbc. v. 32. — ἀναπέρανται τῶν δικαίων.


τοικίαν ἀνάπαυσθην (omg. ρητορικικά) D.—for ἑκατον, ἔργα B L X 5 al. txt A D.—for ἑκατον.

ins. πάντων A B L X 10 al. Syrr. Copt. Sahid. ἑθος. —sai om. D abe. — 11, ἀπαντά-


word γάμος, relating to the Kingdom of

God. Both meanings are obvious, and only

one remark needed;—that all that false

humility, by which men put themselves

lowest and dispraise themselves of set pur-

pose to be placed higher, is, by the very

nature of the Lord's parable, excluded: for

that is not bona fide ταπεινών λατρείαν.

The exaltation at the hands of the Host is

not to be a subjective end to the guests,

but will follow true humility.—9, ἐβαλλεῖσθαι,

not, 'thyself also,' (see ch. ii. 36),

but 'thee and him,' as E. V., ἐβαλλεῖσθαι, not

dependent on μὴ, but future. — ἀμάχον. The

form of expression sets forth the reluc-

tance and lingering with which it is done.

— 10, ἀναπέρανται, not expressing the view

with which thou art to do it (Meyer, 'besetzen

bzw. beschäftigen'), but a consequence

which may follow; as the μίσχῳ in ver. 8. — 11. As an example of the first

clause, see Isa. xiv. 13—15; of the second,

Phil. ii. 5—11.

12—14. The composition of the company

before Him seems to have given oc-

casion for this saying of the Lord. The

Pharisaeus his host had doubts, with the view

mentioned in ver. 1, invited the principal

persons of the place, with the intention of

courting their favour and getting a

return. The Lord rebukes in him this spirit;

—and it has been well remarked, that

the intercourse and civilities of social life

among friends and neighbours are here

pre-supposed, (insuch as for them there

takes place an ἀνταπόδομα, and they are

struck off the list by this means), with this

caution,—that our means of course not to

be sumptuously laid upon them, but upon

something far better,—the providing for

the poor and maimed and lame and blind.

When we will make a sacrifice, and pro-

vide at some cost, let us not throw our

money away, as we should if an ἀνταπό-

δομα is made to us in this world: but give

to the poor, i.e. lend it to the Lord;

and then, as in ver. 14, there will be an

ἀναπέρανται τῷ ἀναπέρανται τῷ ἀναπέρανται.

—which shall not be a mere equivalent, but a rich reward.

—14. ἀναπέρανται τῷ ἀναπέρανται τῷ ἀναπέρανται, the first resurrection,

here distinctly asserted by the Lord; other-

wise τῷ ἀναπέρανται would be vapid and un-

meaning. See 1 Cor. xv. 22 f. 1 Thess. iv.

Rev. xx. 5, 6. 15—34. One of the guests takes this

literally, and imagines the great feast to

which the Jews looked forward to be

meant. He spoke as a Jew, and probably

with an idea that, as such, his admission to

this feast was sure and certain.—The Lord
answers him by the parable following, which showed him that true as his assertion was, (and He does not deny it,) the blessedness would not be practically so generally acknowledged nor entered into. — The Parable, whatever analogy it may bear with that in Matt. xxii. 1, is wholly different from that in many essential points. — 10.] The δικαίωμα, δικαίος, is the δικαίος T. θεοῦ, in the feast of faith things in Isa. xxv. 8; completed in the marriage-supper of the Lamb; but fully prepared when the glad tidings of the Gospel were proclaimed. — ἵκαλ. παλ. these first εἰκάλεσιν are the Pharisees and Scribes and learned among the Jews. — 17.] The δικαίωμα is one spirit, one message; but not necessarily, in the three cases, one and the same person. The three messages were delivered (1) by John the Baptist and the Lord; (2) by the Lord and the Apostles; (3) by the Apostles and those who came after. The elder prophets cannot be meant, for ἢκαίμα ἡ πάντα was the message = ἴγκαίωμι = βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ. — 18—20.] ἀκόμαι, μακαρίς, συμμόρφωσις; so ἀκοκές εἰς τῆς ἐποχής, Thucyd. i. 16; so (ch. vii. 30) they had rejected John's baptism, and (John vii. 48) the Lord Himself. The saying is not to be taken strictly without exception, e. g. Nicodemus; but generically. So also ver. 24.—The temerity of these self-excusers is three-fold; they excuse themselves are three-fold; their spirit is one. The first alleges an ἀνδρία,—he must go and see his land: the second not so much as this, only his own plan and purpose—περιφέρεια: the third not so much as either of these, but rudely asserts διὰ δυνάμεις (i. e. διὰ δυνατοῦ) ἀλήθεια. Also the excuses themselves are three-fold. The first has his worldly possession (one to his farm, Matt. xxii. 5) to go and see: the second his purchase (another to his merchandise, ibid.) of stock to prove: the third his home engagements and his lust to satisfy. All are detained by worldliness, in however varied forms. — 21.] τῆς πόλεως, still, in the city (Matt. xxii. 7); still, among the Jews.—πλατ. κ. ἐκκ., the broad and narrow streets; perhaps the ἐκκλησία κ. εἰς μιαν through which the Lord and His Apostles journeyed preaching. —Here appear again the very persons of ver. 13; the representatives of the wretched and despised: διὰ δυνατῆς διάλεκτος, Mark xii. 37: not perhaps without a hint, that only those who knew themselves to be spiritually poor and maimed and halt and blind would come to the Gospel feast. — 22.] The palace is large,
the hate is the general, not personal, feeling of alienation in the inmost heart,—so that this world's relationships, as belonging to the state of things in this world, are not the home and rest of the heart. This is evident from the ή ταύτα καὶ ταύτα ψυχήν which follows. Let the hate begin here, and little explanation will be further wanted. This addition also shows that the saying was not meant only for those times, in which more perhaps of the disruption of earthly ties was required, but for all time: for η ζωή τοῦ ψυχῆς is equally dear to every man in every age. It hardly need be observed that this hate is not only consistent with, but absolutely necessary to the very highest kind of love. It is that element in love which makes a man a wise and Christian friend,—not for time only, but for eternity. —28—30.] Peculiar to Luke. The same caution is followed out in this parable. This is to be borne in mind, or it will be misinterpreted. The ground of the parable is, that entire self-renunciation is requisite, to become a disciple of Christ. This man wishes to build a tower (there is a reference doubtless to the attempt at Babel, to raise a tower which might reach to heaven). He is advised to count the cost, to see whether he have enough thoroughly to finish it. If he begin, lay
the foundation,—however seemingly well it may be done, it is not well done, because he has not enough to complete it: and the attempt can only lead to shame. So it is with one who would be Christ's disciple: but with this weighty difficulty, lying in the background of the parable—that in his case the counting the cost must always issue in a discovery of the utter inadequacy of his own resources, and the entire relinquishment of them all, and the schema itself. For the tower must not be compared with the Christian life;—this is not meant: the building of the tower is altogether a vain idea, to be relinquished as soon as the discovery is made that he has not funds to finish it. To raise a tower on earth that may reach to heaven, is not the Christian's aim,—but to follow and go up into Christ. The train of thought is altogether different from that in Matt. vii. 24 ff. —31—33.] This same lesson is even more pointedly set before us in the following parable, which, as well as the other, is frequently misunderstood. The two kings here are,—the man desires to become a disciple, to work out his salvation,—and God, with whose just and holy law he is naturally at variance;—it is his aversions, see ch. xii. 58, and note;—these two are going to engage in war:—and the question for each man to sit down and ask himself is, 'Can I, with (να, because it is all that I have, all my instrument of war) my ten thousand, stand the charge of Him who cometh against me with (not ἐν, but μέτα, being only as many as He pleases to bring with Him for the purpose)—see Ps. lxviii. 17] twenty thousand?—'—see Job xv. 24—26. Here the inadequacy of man's resources is plainly set forth, not left, as in the former parable, to be inferred. Then, finding that he has no hope of prevailing, —ἐν αὐτῶν πάντως ὄντος, while there is yet time,—he sends an embassy, and aux for peace, abandoning the conflict:—throwing himself upon the mere mercy and grace of God;—ἀντιστασίας τοὺς αὐτῶν ὑπάρχοντας, in both cases. —The ordinary misinterpretation of this parable is in taking the king with twenty thousand to be the ἐρώτημα τοῦ κόσμου ὀρόσων—which destroys all the sense,—for with him the natural man is at peace, but the discipline of Christ at war. —31.] αἱ πόλεις belongs to συμβ., not to πορεύεται.—συμβαλλεῖσθαι πρὸς μήχαν—occurs Polyb. x. 37, 4 (the instance from Xenoph. Cyr. vii. 1, 20, cited by Meyer, does not apply, being συμβ. πρὸς τὸ μαχαίραν). —39.] τὰ πρὸς αὐτοῖς, τὰ πρὸς τὸν Χριστὸν, Anab. iv. 3, 10, but there 'the resources of war;'—here 'conditions, preliminaries, of peace.'—34, 35.] For the third time, the Lord repeats the saying concerning salt:—see Matt. v. 13, Mark ix. 50, and
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First three columns of the Greek text, followed by a short passage in English, highlighting specific words and concepts. The English text includes a note on the salt symbolism in Scripture, linking it to the role of the Good Shepherd in Christian theology.
must be understood the whole course of seeking and finding which the good Shepherd, either by Himself or His agents, now pursues in each individual case; even until He brings the lost sheep home into heaven to Himself—not in reality, so that it should not take place till the death of the penitent—but prophetically,—until the name is written in heaven,—till the sinner is penitent. This is clear from the interpretation in ver. 7. The φίλακα καὶ γείτονες = the angels (and spirits of just men made perfect?).—τὸ πρόβατον ἀπολαλοῖσαν breathes a totally different thought from τὴν δραχμὴν ἢν ἀπώλεσα. There is pity and love in it, which, from the nature of the case, the other does not admit of. —7.] λέγω μον. In these words the Lord often introduces His revelations of the unseen world of glory;—see Matt. xviii. 10.—On these διακοσμηται see note at Matt. ix. 12, 13. They are the subjectively righteous, and this saying respects their own view of themselves. (Or if it be required that the words should be literally explained, seeing that these ninety-nine did not err,—then I see no other way but to suppose them, in the deeper meaning of the parable, to be the worlds that have not failed;—and the one that has strayed, our human nature, in this our world.) But we have yet to inquire, what sort of sinner this parable represents: for each of the three sets before us a different type of the sinner sunk in his sin. Bengel, in distinguishing the three, says, 'Ovis, drachma, filius perditi—pecator (1) stupidus,—(2) sui plane nescius,—(3) scient et voluntarius.' This one is the stupid and heedless sinner, erring and straying away in ignorance and self-will from his Shepherd, but sought by the Shepherd, and fetched back with joy.

—8—10.] In the following wonderful parable, we have the next class of sinners set before us, sought for and found by the power and work of the Spirit in the Church of Christ. It will be seen, as we proceed, how perfectly this interpretation comes out, not as a fancy, but as the very kernel and sense of the parable. The γυνὴ cannot (as probably in Matt. xiii. 33) be the Church absolutely, for the Church herself is a lost sheep at first, sought and found by the Shepherd. Rather is the ἐκκλησία here the Church— as will come out by-and-by,—and the γυνὴ the indwelling Spirit, working in it. All men belong to this Creator Spirit—all have been stamped with the image of God. But the sinner lies in the dust of sin and death and corruption—'sui plane nescius.' Then the Spirit, lighting the candle of the Lord (Prov. xx. 27. Zeph. i. 12), searching every corner and sweeping every unseen place, finds out the sinner,—restores him to his true value as made for God's glory. This lighting and sweeping are to be understood of the office of the Spirit in the Church, in its various ways of seeking the sinner—by the preaching of repentance, by the Word of God read, &c. Then comes the joy again.—αἱ φίλαι κ. γείτονες are invited—but there is no return home now —nor in the explanation, ver. 10, is there any ἐν ὅλωσιν, because the Spirit abides in the Church—because the angels are present in the Church,—see 1 Cor. xi. 10:—nor is it ἡκταί (as in ver. 7 at the return of the Redeemer then future) but γίνεται—the ministering spirits rejoice over every soul that is brought out of the dust of death into God's treasure-house by the searching of the Blessed Spirit. In this parable then we have set before us the sinner who is unconscious of himself and his own real worth—who is lying, though
in reality a precious coin, in the mine of this world, lost and valueless, till he is searched out by the blessed and gracious Spirit. And that such a search will be made, we are here assured.

11.—32.] Peculiar to Luke. 'If we might venture here to make comparisons, as we do among the sayings of men, this parable of the Lord would rightly be called the crown and pearl of all His parables.' Stier, iii. 260.—We have here the glad and welcome reception of the returning sinner (sinner under the most aggravating circumstances) in the bosom of His Heavenly Father: and agreeably to the circumstances under which the discourse was spoken, the δίκαιος who murmured at the publicans and sinners are represented under the figure of the elder son:—see below.—11.] άνθρωπος—Our Heavenly Father—the Creator and Possessor of all: not, Christ, who ever represents Himself as a Son, although frequently as a possessor or lord.

12. in any direct sense of the Parable, the Jews and the Gentiles: that there may be a partial application to this effect, is only owing to the parable grasping the great central truths, of which the Jew and Gentile were, in their relation, illustrations,—and of which such illustrations are furnished wherever such differences occur.—The two parties standing in the foreground of the parabolic mirror are, the Scribes and Pharisees as the elder son—the publicans and sinners as the younger:—all, Jews: all belonging to God’s family. The mystery of the admission of the Gentiles into God’s Church was not yet made known in any such manner as that they should be represented as of one family with the Jews:—not to mention that this interpretation fails in the very root of the Parable,—for in strictness the Gentile should be the elder—the Jew not being constituted in his superiority till 2000 years after the Creation.—The Upholders of this interpretation forget that when we speak of the Jew as elder and the Gentile as younger, it is in respect not of birth, but of this very return to and reception into the Father’s house, which is not to be considered yet. The relations of elder and younger have a peculiar fitness for the characters to be filled by them, and are I believe chosen on that account; νεωτέρος δι’ ονομάτος τού νεωτέρου ἐστι καὶ εἰς κακόν του ἀνθρώπου. Euthym. —12, 13.] The part of the parable relating to the prodigal himself divides itself into three parts—1. his sin: 2. his misery: 3. his penitence. In these verses his sin is described. It consists in a desire to depart from his Father’s house and control, and to set up for himself,—to live a life of what the carnal man calls liberty.—13.] τοῦ ἐπιβάλλον μέρος is classical Greek—ἀπαλαχόντης τῶν ετησίων τοῦ ἐπιβάλλον, Herod. iv. 115.—Such a request as this is known by Orientalists to have been known in the East, though not among the Jews. —πίσω—behind:—no distinction is implied, as some (Paulus, Stier) have thought. The first-born had two-thirds of the property—see Deut. xxi. 17. The Father, as implied in the parable, reserves to himself the power during his life over the portion of the first-born—see ver. 31.—The Parable sets before us very strikingly the permission of free will to man. —13.] μακρᾶν—not adverbial (Stier), but agreeing with χώραν, see reff.—The images of both the preceding parables are united here:—in δραπέτηιων we have the straying sheep—in his state when he got into the far country, the lost piece of money. But in this case the search is to be carried on within himself— we are now on higher ground than in those two parables.—Regio longinquus est oblivio Dei,' Augustine. (Trench p. 351.)—ἀδόξως. The old English word ‘retchless’ expresses perhaps best the meaning, which is not ‘unsparingly’ (in which sense of ‘saving money’ I doubt σωζόω over being used), but ‘incorrigibly,’ past hope
of reclaim: — ἄσωτος, ὁ δὲ ἀνόητον ἀπολλυμένος. Aristot. Eth. iv. 1.—14. 18.] His misery is set forth in these verses. He soon spends all:—there is a fine irony as Stier remarks in δειον ἐστιν ἀνόητον, as compared with δικαίωσαν before—he spent his money for that which was no bread.—λύμφη λόγῳ. This famine is the Shepherd seeking his stray sheep—the woman sweeping to find the lost. The famine, in the interpretation, is to be subjectively taken—he begins to be in want (no stress on αὐτός, which is inserted on account of the change of subject from the last clause),—to feel the emptiness of soul which precedes either utter abandonment or true penitence. —16.] He sinks lower and lower—becomes the despised servant of an alien (is there here any hint at the situation of the publicans?) who employs him in an office most vile and odious to the mind of a Jew. —ἐκκαλεῖται—no emphasis—see reff. 'he attached himself.'—16.] ἐπεθύμω: not merely 'he desired,' see ch. xvi. 21, where the fact is surely implied that Lazarus did eat of the crumbs. The mistake has arisen from supplying a wrong object to ἔδωκα, and that from misunderstanding ἐσπάρα. These are not the husks or pods of some other fruit, as of peas or beans, but themselves a fruit, that of the carob tree (ἐσπάρων). ... They are in shape something like a bean pod, though larger and more curved, thence called ἐσπάραν or little horn, ... they have a hard dark outside and a dull sweet taste: the shell or pod alone is eaten.'—Trench, Par. 366. His appetite even drove him to these for food:—for—καλῶς, (implying his state of destitution) no man gave (aught) to him. Meyer, De Wette, Greewell, and others supply ἐσπάρα after ἔδωκα, but wrongly, I think; the absolute use of ἔδωκα being very frequent, and the other construction harsh and unusual.—We see him now in the depth of his misery,—the sinner reaping the consequences of his sin in utter shame and extremity of need.—17—20.] His penitence. And here we have a weighty difference between the permitted rational free will of man, and the stupid wandering on of the sheep, or the inanimate coin lying till it is picked up,—both these being however true, did not God seek and save the sinner: 'the grace of God by Christ preventing us that we may have a good will, and working with us when we have that good will.'—Article X. of the Church of England.—εἰς ἄνευν λόθιν. Similar expressions occur in the Heb. Deut. xxx. 1. 1 Kings viii. 47. Is. xlv. 9. Before this, he was beside himself. He now endures the dreadful torment of the lost, in fact that which constitutes their state of torment, will be this εἰς ταύροιν λόθιν, when too late for repentance.—He now recalls the peace and plenty of his Father's house:—μισθος, for he now was a μισθιος, but in how different a case!—18.] ἀναστά, see ver. 24, νεκρὸς ἐν και ἀνίψης. This resolution is a further step than his last reflection. In it he nowhere gives up his sonship: this, and the καρπος, lie at the root of his penitence:—it is the thought of having sinned against (in the parable itself, Heaven and) Thee, which works now in him. And accordingly he does not resolve to seek to be made live again, but δεῖ τινα μνήσθω: still a son, but as an hireling. 'And what is it that gives the sinner now a sure ground of confidence, that returning to God he shall not be
repelled, nor cast out? The adoption of sonship which he received in Christ Jesus at his baptism, and his faith that the gifts and calling of God are <i>without repentance or recall</i>.” (Trench, Par. 360. 30.) What he has resolved, he does: a figure not of the usual, but of the proper course of such a state of mind. —20—23.] μακρ. ἀνεύ. Who can say whether <i>this itself was not a seeking</i>? whether his courage would have held out to the meeting? —On what follows, see especially Jer. xii. 13. James iv. 8. Gen. xlvii. 29. 2 Sam. xiv. 33. —21.] The intended close of his confession is not uttered; —there is no abatement of his penitence—for all his Father’s touching and reassuring kindness, —but his filial confidence is sufficiently awakened to prevent the request, <i>that he might be as an hired servant</i>. —22.] All these gifts belong to his reception, not as a servant, but as a son: the <i>first</i> (best) robe, for him who came in rags,—Is. lxi. 10. Rev. iii. 18:—not—the robe which he used to wear—his former robe—this would not be consistent with the former part of the parable, in which he was not turned out with any disgrace, but left as a son and of <i>his</i> own accord.—The ring,—a token of a distinguished and free person,—see James ii. 2. Gen. xlii. 42. —The <i>shoes</i>, also the mark of a free man (for slaves went barefoot), see Zech. x. 12. Eph. vi. 15. These are the gifts of grace and holiness with which the returned penitent is clothed by His gracious Father, see Zech. iii. 4. 5. 23.] τ. μάσχ. τ. στέκ. So, Judg. vi. 25. Gideon is commanded to kill <i>the</i> (one) of the shepherds <i>the</i> last sheep; —some calf fatted for a particular feast or anniversary, and standing in the stall. No allusion must be thought of to the <i>sacrificing of the</i>—which would <i>be wholly out of place here</i>, and is <i>presupposed</i> in the whole parable.—ἐξεφάρσα. So ver. 6, “joy in heaven!—all rejoice.” —Some of these are δωδοί who have entered into <i>the</i> joy of their Lord. Matt. xxii. 21. 23. —24.] νεκ. κ. αντ., —the <i>lost money</i>: ἀποκλ. καὶ εὐρέθη,—the lost sheep; see 1 John iii. 14. Eph. ii. 1. 1 Pet. ii. 25. ἰδραυνεῖ, a contrast to the ἱδραυν in ver. 14. —25—28.] As far as regards the penitent, the parable is finished; —but those who murmured at his reception, who were the proud and faultless elder son,—always in the house and serving, but not, as will
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appear, either over-affectionate or over-
respectful,—they too must act their part,
in order to complete the instruction. As
regards the penitent, this part of the
parable sets forth the reception he meets
with from his fellow-men, in contrast to
that from his Father; see Matt. xvi. 27,
30.—28.] In γναφ. probably working,
in the course of his δουλείας as he expresses
it, ver. 28.—ἐρχόμενος, at meal time.—συρμός.
κ. χρ. This is one of those by-glances
into the lesser occupations and recreations
of human life, by which the Lord so often
stamps his tacit approval on the joys and
unbindings of men. Would these festal
employsments have been here mentioned by
Him on so solemn and blessed an occasion,
if they really were among those works of
the devil which He came into the world to
destroy? Let our rigid pietists answer
this.—28—32.] Stier well remarks (iii.
292) that this elder is now the lost son;
he has lost all childlike filial feeling;—he
betrays the hypocrite within. The love
and forbearance of the Father are eminently
shown—the utter want of love and humility
in the son strongly contrasted with them.
—29.] ἰδον τοὺς ἀδελφούς, the very
manner of speech of a Pharisee: as is
the continuation.—οὐδὲν ἐντ. σου τι 
Could the Jewish nation be introduced
saying this even in the falsest hypocrisy?—
ἐμοι οὖν ὁδηγεῖτε εἰς ἑαυτοῦ to the
young son’s δος μου in ver. 13;—it is a
separation of the individual son from his
Father, and, as there pointed out—the very
root and ground of sin.—ἐριφόν, of less
value than a calf.—τ. φλ. μου—may those
be these? this elder son also then has friends,
who are not his Father’s friends, see Matt.
xixii. 16, τ. μαθητάς αὐτῶν μετὰ τὸν
Προδέσποτα.—30.] διὰ τοῦ σοῦ ὅτι, the
last degree of scorn and contempt,—just
such as was shown by the Pharisees towards
the publicans and sinners (see xvii. 11), ‘I
will not count such an impure person my
brother.’—σοῦ τ. Βιβ. a covert reproach
of his Father for having given it to him.—
μετὰ τῶν πατέρων, a charitable addition on
the part of the elder brother, such as those
represented by him always take care to make
under similar circumstances.—θν. αὐτὸς.
τ. σ. parallel with ἀμερικωλος προ-
δέσποτα, καὶ συνεπίδυτο αὐτοῖς, ver. 2.
‘Thou hast not only made him equal to me,
but hast received him into superior favour.’
—31.] πάντως μ. ἔτ. εἰ, as a reason why
no extraordinary joy should be shown
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over him;—other reasons might be assigned, and lie indeed in the background, suggested by his tone and words: but this is the soft answer to turn away wrath.—

The Father still asserts the restored sonship of his returned prodigal; διδακτίς, ἀπόστολος. We may remark that the difficulties which have been found in the latter part of the parable, from the uncontradicted assertion in ver. 29, if the Pharisees are meant,—and the great pride and uncharitableness shown, if really righteous persons are meant,—are considerably lightened by the consideration, that the contradiction of that assertion would have been beside the purpose of the parable,—that it was the very thing on which the Pharisees prided themselves,—that, besides, it is sufficiently contradicted in fact, by the spirit and words of the elder son.—He was breaking his Father's commandment even when he made the assertion,—and the making it is part of his hypocrisy, see Trench, Par. pp. 374—376. The result of the Father's entreaty is left purposely uncertain:—is it possible that this should have been the case, had the Jewish nation been meant by the elder brother? But now, as he typifies a set of individuals who might themselves be (and many of them were) won by repentance,—it is thus broken off, to be closed by each individual for himself. For we are all in turn examples of the cases of both these brothers—containing the seeds of both evil courses in our hearts;—but, thanks be to God, under that grace, which is sufficient and willing to seek and save us from both.

CHAP. XVI. 1—5.] Peculiar to Luke. No parable in the Gospels has been the subject of so much controversy as this: while, at the same time, the general stream of interpretation is well defined, and, in the main, satisfactory. It would be quite beyond the limits of a note to give any thing like a recension of the different views respecting it: the principal ones which differ from that which I have adopted, will appear in the course of my remarks. —1.] Thev &; not a continuation, I believe, of the foregoing:—certainly closely connected in subject with it, as is the second parable in this chapter also:—see below.—ἐκ τοῦ μ. αὐτ., not to the twelve only, but to the multitude of his disciples,—and more immediately perhaps to the publicans, whose reception by Him had been the occasion of His discourse. I say this because I believe them to hold a place, though not a principal or an exclusive one, in the application of the parable which follows.—ἀναφ. τ. ἕως τοῦ πάλαιον . . . . . . The history in this parable is, in itself, purely worldly. The master is a υἱὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦου, as well as his steward: bear this in mind,—the whole parabolic machinery is from the standing-point of the children of this world. In the interpretation, this rich man is the Almighty Possessor of all things. This is the only tenable view. Meyer, who supposes him to be Mammon, (defending it by the consideration that dissimilarex, from his service, (entirely) being received into everlasting habitations, which it does not, (see below) is involved in inextricable difficulties further on. Othannese's view, that he is the Devil, the ἀγωναί τοῦ ἐκμισθοῦ, will be found equally untenable. Schleiermacher's, that the Romans are intended, whose stewards the Publicans were, and that the debtors are the Jews, hardly needs refuting:—certainly not more refuting, than any consistent exposition will of itself furnish.—ἐκείνως, a general overseer.—very much what we understand by an agent, or a 'man of business,' or, in the larger sense, a steward. They were generally of old, slaves: but this man is a freeman, from vv. 3, 4. This steward—especially the Publicans, but also all the disciples, i. e. every man in Christ's Church. We are all God's stewards, who commit to our trust His property:—each one's office is of larger or smaller trust and responsibility, according to the measure entrusted to him. I say, especially the Publicans,—because the twelve, and probably others, had distinguished all and followed Christ, and therefore the application of the parable to them would not be so direct:—and also because I cannot but put together with this parable, and consider as perhaps prompted by it or the report of it, the profession of Zacchaeus, ch. xix. 8. Other interpretations have been,—the Pharisees (Vitringa, and recently Zyro, Theol. Stud. und Krit. for 1851)—but then the parable should have been addressed to them, which it was not,—and this view entirely fails in the application:—Judas Iscariot (Berthold), of the vindication of
which view I am in possession of, and therefore can only generally say, that it is perfectly preposterous: — Pontius Pilate (!), &c. &c. — διασκεδάζεται — not wrongly, which word does not imply necessarily — but maliciously, which it does imply. The reason why it has come so generally to signify 'wrongful accusation,' is, that malicious charges are so frequently slanderous. The steward himself does not deny it.— Meyer (see above), in carrying out his view, would interpret this charge as an accusation by the Pharisees against the disciples that they wasted the goods of Mammon by entering the service of Christ; — but then (1) this other service never once appears on the face of the parable; and (2) surely it would hardly be within the bounds of decorum that this διασκεδάζεται should be the entering Christ's service; — this would bring a train of false interpretations with it, and even stand up the όνομα of the steward, as such, for imitation. — διασκεδάζω — not that he had wasted (E. V.), but 'was wasting,' his goods. ος διασκεδάζονται = διασκεδάζεται. — So, διαβάλλων ος λυμαίνοντον τὴν πολίτιον, Xen. Hell. ii. 3, 25. In this charge (spiritually) we may see the real guilt of every man who is entrusted with the goods of our Heavenly Father. We are all 'scattering His goods.' If some one is to be found to answer to ος διαβάλλουσι, the analogy of διαβάλλον, 'the accuser of the brethren,' is too striking to escape us. — 2. π' αυτον . . . It makes very little difference either in admissibility of construction or of sense, whether we render 'why do I hear this of thee?' i. e. 'what is the ground of this report?' — what occasion hast thou given for this being brought to me?' or, 'What is this that I hear of thee?' i. e. 'give some account of it.' I prefer rather the former — because no opportunity of explanation what it is, is given him — but he is commanded to produce his books, to show how it has arisen. — διασκεδάζεται . . . 'give up the account of thy stewardship; for (taking for granted the correctness of the report, the steward not denying it) thou wilt not be able to retain thy stewardship any longer,' — in ordinary English, 'thou camst not,' &c., — oδιασκεδάζεται — in the nature of things — thou wilt be precluded from.' — The interpretation of this announcement to the steward, is the certainty, spoken by God in every one of our consciences, that we must give up and give an account of our stewardship at death. The great truth lies in the background, that that dismissal, death itself, is the consequence of the διασκεδάζοντος τινας υπάρχεισται αὐτοῦ. — the wages of sin. — 3.] The steward sets before himself the certainty of poverty and misery. He has not by his waste of his lord's property been laying up any store for himself; — that is not the point of the parable; — he has lived softly and effeminately, and cannot do an honest day's work: — σκάπτεται, for all manual labours, so Aristoph. Av. 1452, σκάπτων γὰρ οἰκίσταμαι. This speech, of digging and begging, must not be sought for in the interpretation — it belongs to the truth of the parable itself as introducing the scheme which follows, but has no ulterior meaning. — 4.] ἔγγυα — not=ἐγγύεσθαι, which would be, 'I know, as part of my stock of knowledge, I am well aware,' — but implying, 'I have just arrived at the knowledge,' 'an idea has just struck me' — 'I have a plan.' — ἀκούασθαι — viz. those who are about to be spoken of, — the χρωματίσται. He has them in his mind. — Observe, the aim of his scheme is, that they may receive him into their houses —
give him shelter. This is made use of afterwards in the interpretation, for which see on ver. 9. — 5.] It is more natural to suppose that these χρωματίας had borrowed, i.e. not yet paid for, the items of food out of the stores of the rich man, than that they were contractors to the amounts specified.—τὸν κ. κατοικεῖ, of his own lord—showing the unprincipledboldness of his plan for saving himself; as we express the same when we say, 'he robbed of his own father.'—βάτους—οἱ δὲ βάτους δύναται χωρίας ἔσσείς ἑβδομηκοντα δύο. Jas. Antt. viii. 2, 9;—the same for liquids as the ephah for solids.—σέβας e. τ. γρ. The steward, not yet out of office, has all the vouchers by him, and returns each debtor his own bond for him to alter the figure (not, to make another, which would imply the destruction of the old bond, not its return).—καθ. ταχ. καθίσας is graphic. ταχὺς implies the hurry with which the furtive business is transacted. The debtors seem to be all together, that all may be implicated and none may tell of the other.—7.] κόρος—οἱ δὲ κόροι ἐνεργείας μέμοντος ἐτερικῶς δίκαιον. Jas. Antt. xx. 9, 2. There does not appear to be any designed meaning in the variation of the amount deducted. We may easily conceive a reason, if we will, in the different circumstances of the debtors. — 8.] ὁ κύριος—of course, the lord of the steward. The E. V. ought to have been expressed his lord, and there would have been no ambiguity.—τ. ὁλ. τῆς δῆ, not 'the steward for his injustice,' but 'see reff.' the unjust steward.' He is not praised for his injustice, see below.—δυτ. φρονίμως ἔτως, because he had acted shrewdly, cleverly for his own interest. The point brought out is not merely the shrewdness of the steward, but his lord, whose injury was wrought by this very shrewdness, praising it: 'for,' our Saviour adds, 'the children of this world, —to which category he belonged—he who conceived and he who praised the shrewdness—'are more shrewd, εἰς τ. γ. τ. δικαίωμα.—for the purposes of their self-interest,—'than the children of light.' But this very τὸν δικαίωμα indicates that there is a better and a higher γενεὰ, the family of light (John xiii. 36; Rom. xiii. 12; 1 Thess. v. 5; Eph. v. 8), whose interests require a higher and better wisdom and foresight. — 9.] We now pass to the application at once—from the mouth of the Lord Himself. That all is dishonest and futile in the character of the steward belonged entirely to him as a νίκης τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ τοῦν.—but even in this character there was a point to praise and imitate. And the dishonesty itself is not inserted without purpose—vis. to show us how little the vioi τ. αἰ. τ. σπέρμα τούτοις—to use it—and how natural it is to them. Now, however, we stand on higher ground:—καθαρὸς πάντας καθαρά—'in bringing up the example into the purer air which the children of light breathe, its grosser parts drop off,
and the finer only remain.—κάγω ὡς ἤν λ. seems to recognize a necessary difference in the two situations: —although you are children of the light and the day, and can do no such furtive acts, yet I say to you’. 

**This view will explain how we may make φίλους ἐκ τοῦ μαμ. τῆς ὁμ. just as we can make an example for ourselves out of the ὁκονύμος τῆς ἁμ. that which is of itself τῆς δικίες—which belongs to, is part of a system of, δικία—which is the very ἴδια πάνων ὑπὸ κακῶν, the result, and the aptest concretion, of that system of meum and tuum (see ch. xxv. 12) which is itself the result of sin having entered into the world. And we are to use this Mammon of unrighteousness to make ourselves—not palaces, nor barns, nor estates, nor treasures—but friends;—i.e. to bestow it on the poor and needy—(see ch. xiii. 33, which is the most striking parallel to our text—compare ἐκείνης, with θεραπευτὸν ἀνεκπίπτον there) that when we fail (die, see reff.), —or, according to the reading ἐκείνης, when it fails, —they, i.e. the φίλοι—compare the joy in heaven ch. xv. and Baxter’s remark cited there by Stier—‘Is there joy in heaven at thy conversion, and will there be none at thy glorification?’ may receive you into the (or their) everlasting tabernacles. See also ch. xiv. 13, 14.—God repays in their name. They receive you there with joy, if they are gone before us: they receive us there by making us parakers of their prayers, which move the Hand that moves the world,’ even during this life. Deeds of charity and mercy are then to be our spiritual shrewdness, by which we may turn to our account the ἄδικον μαμωνᾶ,—providing ourselves with friends out of it; —and the debtors are here perhaps to be taken in their literal, not parabolic sense —we are to lighten their burdens by timely relief—the only way in which a son of light can change the hundred into fifty, by fourscore, see Isa. lvi. 6—8.—10—18.] Closely connected with the foregoing (against De Wette and Strauss):—the faithfulness in the least is the same as the prudence and shrewdness just spoken of;—in the case of the children of light they run up into one—τὶς ἵστω ἐκ πιστῶν οἰκονόμους καὶ φρονίμους, ch. xii. 42;—the δακτυλίος = ἄδικος μαμωνᾶς = τὸ ἀλληλον —the wealth of this present world, which is not the Christian’s own, nor his proper inheritance. The ποιεῖ διδαχαίνων = ἔδωκα τῷ ἀδίκῳ ὑπὸ τοῦ τιτρωτοῦ: the true riches of God’s inheritance: of which the earth (see Matt. v. 6) forms a part, which οὐκ ἔχει (implied in the τίς—for there will be none to give it you if you be untrue during this state of probation;—He will not be your God) shall give to you. The wealth of this world is ἀλληλον —forfeited by sin—only put into our hands to try us, and to be rendered an account of.—13.] See note on Matt. vi. 24. The connexion here is,—that we must, while put in trust with the ἄδικος μαμωνᾶς, be serving not it, but God. The saying here applies (as Olshausen remarks) admirably to the Pharisees and Publicans: the former were to outward appearances, the servants of God, but inwardly served Mammon;—the latter,—by profession in the service of Mammon,—were, by coming to Jesus, showing that they inwardly served God.

14—31.] The Pharisees were not slow in perceiving that the scope of τὰντα πάντα was to place this world’s goods, and all that the covetous seek after, at a very low price. It will be observed that the sayings which follow, are in reference to matters mentioned during the discourse, or arising out
of the character of the Pharisees as commented on in them. — [15.] see last note, end. — ἴσαντες... ἤδειαν τ. ἄμφ.—
a contrast to ἰδιαργυροι ἰνεπότους, ch. xv. 18; and βαλλες ἰδιόπτων τ. θεοῦ ὑπὲρ ἰνεπότους τ. ἄγγ. τ. θεοῦ, ch. xv. 10. — [16.] see Matt. xi. 12 and note. After προφ. supply προσφέρεσιν, not (Meyer) ἰπρόνοιαν, which would be inapplicable to the law and the prophets. —The connexion is, — Ye are they that justly yourselves before men; ye are no publicans and sinners, —no poor and needy, —but righteous, and increased with this world's goods. —But, since John, a kingdom has been preached, into which every one, publicans and sinners too (πάντας, ch. xv. 1), are pressing in. The true relation however of that kingdom to the law is not as ye suppose, to destroy the law (Matt. v. 17), but to fulfīl.' Then, as an example, the Lord reiterates the decision which He had before given on a point much controverted among the Jews —the law of adultery. But this He does, not without occasion given, and close connexion with the circumstances, and with what had been before said. As early as Tertullian, cont. Marc. iv. 34 (Meyer), it was remarked, that an allusion was meant here to the adultery of Herod Antipas with his brother Philip's wife, which the Pharisees had tacitly sanctioned, thus allowing an open breach of that law which Christ came to fulfīl. To this mention of Herod's crime the ἵως ἰδίωννου gave relevance. See on Matt. v. 32. —[19—31.] The Lord in this closing parable grasps the whole covetous and self-seeking character of the Pharisees, shows them a case in which it is carried to the utmost, by one who 'made no friends' with the unrighteous Mammon, —places in contrast with it a case of extreme destitution and poverty,—the very thing which the φαλάγγανος most abhorred; —and then passes over into the region beyond the grave, showing them the contrast there also,—and ending with a mysterious prophetic hint at the final rejection of the Kingdom of God and Himself by those for whom the law and prophets were insufficient to bring them to repentance. And while it does not appear that the φαλάγγανος of the Pharisees showed itself in this particular way, the Lord here grasps the depravity by its root, which is, a godless and loveless self-seeking —saying in the heart, 'There is no God' —and acting accordingly.—'The explanation of particular points,' see below. —[19.] 34 connects this directly with what goes before,—being an answer, not immediately to any thing said by the Pharisees, but to their scoffs at Him; —q. d. 'hear now a parable.' —&c. &c. Tertullian thought (L. c.) that Herod was meant, and by Lazarus John; and this view has been taken by Paulus and Schleiermacher also; but surely with no probability. The Lord might hint with stern rebuke, as in ver. 19, at the present notorious crime of Herod,—but can hardly be thought to have spoken thus of him. That the circumstances will in some measure
apply to these two, is owing, as above in
ch. xv., to the parable taking the general case, of which theirs was a particular instance. — Observe, that this rich man is not accused of any flagrant crimes;—he lives, as the world would say, as became his means and station;—he does not oppress nor spoil other men;—he is simply a χαλκός τοι αἰώνος τούτου, in the highest form. — ψωφ. κ. βός, the Tyrian costly purple—and the fine linen (for under clothing) from Εγγύτην. — έφερ. λαμπ. probably the E. V. is right—'fared sumptuously,'—equabatur haute,' Vulg. Others render it 'enjoyed himself sumptuously.'—20.] The significant name Lazarus (= Eleazarus = יֵץ, Deus auxilium) should have prevented the expositors from imagining this to be a true history. — Perhaps by this name the Lord may have intended to fill in the character of the poor man, which indeed must otherwise be understood to be that of one who feared God.—48β. 'was,' or 'had been cast down,' i.e. was placed there on purpose to get what he could of alms. — πυλών, see on Matt. xxvi. 71: it was the portal, which led out of the προ- αἰώνον into the αἰών. — 21.] It would seem that he did obtain this wish, and that, as in ch. xv. 16, the κατά must mean, he 'looked for' it, 'willingly took' it. — The Δικαίον καὶ seems also to imply, that he got the cramps: this verse relating the two points of contrast to the rich man: his only food—the cramps, with which he longed to fill his belly, but could not:—his only clothing—nakedness and sores, and instead of the boon companions of the rich man, none to pity him but the dogs, who ἀνέλαιμος—certainly in pity, not 'do- lorem exasperantes' (Bengel)—his sores, as they do their own. Such was the state of the two in this world.—23.] The burial of Lazarus is not mentioned, did τὸ ἀνεβαίνων γὺς τῶν πτωχῶν ταφῆς, Bethany. This is the only admissible reason. Meyer rejects it as arbitrary, and not consistent with the received notions about Hades, in which not the soul only, but the whole man was after death—believing it to be meant that the angels carried Lazarus bodily into Paradise. But then his interpretation halts, when he comes to the burial of the rich man, whom he makes go down out of his grave into Hell. The fact is, that in both cases the material corpse remains on this earth, buried or unburied;—while that Personality to which universal consent rightly attributes sensibility to bliss and woe, and the feelings and parts of the body, the man's real self, is translated into the other world. (If, when parts of the body are removed, we still believe that we possess those limbs, and feel pain in them, why may not the disembodied spirit still subjectively exist in, and feel the sensations of, that corporeal system from which it is temporally separated?) — ἀνεπ. ἀν. . . . In the whole of this description, the following canon of interpretation may be safely laid down:—Though it is unnatural to suppose that the Lord would in such a parable formally reveal any new truth respecting the state of the dead,—yet, in confronting Himself to the ordinary language current on these subjects, it is impossible to suppose that He, whose essence is Truth, could have assumed as existing any thing which does not exist. It would destroy the truth of the Lord's sayings, if we could conceive Him to have used popular language which did not point at truth. And accordingly, where such language was current, we find Him not adopting, but protesting against it: see Matt. xv. 5.—The bearing of the spirits of the just into bliss by the holy angels is only analogous to their other employments: see Matt. xiii. 41. Heb. i. 14. — τ. καλν. τ. Ἀβραάμ. The last remark does not apply
here—for this, as a form of speech among
the Jews, was not even by himself understood
understood in its strict literal sense; and
though the purposes of the parable require
this, ver. 23, no one would think of pressing it
into a truth, but all would see in it the
graphic filling up of a state in which itself
is strictly actual.
The expression γερή
πάχτες signified the happy side of Hades,
where all the Fathers were conceived as
resting in bliss. In 4 Macc. xiii. 16 (cited
by De Wette) we have διό νυφ του σωτηρία της 'Αβραάμ κ. 'Νεκ. κ. ἥτοι ὑπεκτείνουν σοι τούς κόλπους αὐτῶν.—No pre-eminence is
signified, as in John xiii. 23;—all the
blessed are spoken of as in Abraham's
bosom. See also John i. 18.—The death of
the rich man last should be remarked;—
Lazarus was taken soon from his sufferings;
—Dives was left longer, that he might
have space to repent. — κ. τίθην. There
can be no doubt that the funeral is men-
tioned as being congruous to his station
in life—and, as Trench observes, 'in a
sublime irony,'—implying that he had all
things properly cared for—the purple and
fine linen which he wore in life, not spared
at his obsequies. See Meyer's interpreta-
tion above.—23.] το ευλογημένον. Hades, ἡ ἄγιος, is the abode of all dismembered spirits till the resurrection—not, the place of torment,
—much less hell, as understood commonly,
in the E. V.—Lazarus was also in Hades,
but separate from Dives,—one on the bliss-
ful, the other on the reprobate side. It is
the gates of Hades, the imprisonment of
Death, which shall not prevail against the
Church (Matt. xvi. 18);—the Lord holds
the key of Hades (Rev. i. 11)—Himself
went into the same Hades, of which Paradise
is a part.—κ. σωτήρας—not eternal
condemnation;—for the judgment has not
taken yet place; men only can be judged in
the body, for the deeds done in the body:
—but the certainty and anticipation of it.—κ. τίθην, not necessarily to a higher
place, though that may be meant.—see
ref. —24.] το εὐλογημένον. Hades, ἡ ἄγιος, is the abode of all dismembered spirits till the resurrection—not, the place of torment,
—much less hell, as understood commonly,
in the E. V.—Lazarus was also in Hades,
but separate from Dives,—one on the bliss-
ful, the other on the reprobate side. It is
the gates of Hades, the imprisonment of
Death, which shall not prevail against the
Church (Matt. xvi. 18);—the Lord holds

precious word is this σως: were it not for it, De Wette and the like, who maintain, 'the only meaning of the parable is, 'Woe to the rich, but blessed are the poor (!!!)'—would have found in this verse at least a specious defence for their view:—though even then τα αυτοτ would have implied the same, in fair interpretation.—τα κακα not αυτοι—for to him they were not so.—παρακαλ.: see ch. vi. 24.—26.] Even if it were not so, however, and for whatsoever reason, God's decree hath placed thee there—and thy wish is impossible.—χαριμ μεγα.

In the interpretation,—the irresistible decree—then truly so, but no such on earth—by which the Almighty Hand hath separated us and you. In the graphic description, a yawning chasm impassable.ιωνηρωται, is fixed for ever. This expression precludes all ideas that the following verse indicates the beginning of a better mind in the rich man.—27.] This is the believing and trembling of James ii. 19. His eyes are now open to the truth—and no wonder that his natural sympathies are awakened for his brethren.—That a lost spirit should feel and express such sympathy, is not to be wondered at; the misery of such will be very much heightened by the awakened and active state of those higher faculties and feelings which selfishness and the body kept down here.—29.] ἐκ σως ἕκ ἀκοι, ἐξ ἐκεινοι δῆμαρχου: οἰκούν. Rom. x. 17. 'Audita fideli salvamur, non apparitionibus.' Bengel. This verse furnishes a weighty testimony from the Lord Himself of the sufficiency then of the O. T. Scriptures for the salvation of the Jews. It is not so now.—30, 31.] οὐχι—not, 'they will not hear them.' he could not tell that, and besides, it would have taken away much of the ground of the answer of Abraham:—the word depreciates leaving their salvation in such uncertainty, as the chance of their being Moses and the prophets seems to Him to imply.—'Leave it not so, when it might be at once and for ever done by sending them one from the dead.'—Abraham's answer, besides opening to us a depth in the human heart, has a plain application to the Pharisees, to whom the parable was spoken. They would not hear Moses and the Prophets:—Christ rose from the dead, but He did not go to them;—this verse is not so worded, 'they would have rejected Him, had He done so.'—the fact merely is here supposed, and that in the very phrase which so often belongs to His own resurrection. They were not persuaded—did not believe, though One rose from the dead. To deny altogether this allusion, is to rest contented with merely the surface of the parable.—Observe, Abraham does not say, 'they will not repent'—but, 'they will not believe, be persuaded;' which is another and a deeper thing.—Luther does not seem to conclude rightly, that this disproves the possibility of appearances of the dead. It only says, that such appearances will not bring about faith in the human soul: but that they may not serve other ends in God's dealings with men, it does not assert. There is no gulf between the earth and Hades: and the very form of Abraham's answer—setting forth no impossibility in this second case, as in the former, would seem to imply its
[Text from the page, converted to plain text]
fore endurance is required of you,—faith and trust to endure out your day's work before you enter into your rest.—Your Master will enter into His, but your time will not yet come;—and all the service which you can meanwhile do Him, is but that which is your bounden duty to do,—seeing that your body, soul, and spirit are His.'—7.] εἴδομεν in the E. V. is wrongly joined with ἔρα: it corresponds to μετὰ τὰς νύν in ver. 8. Construeendum; 'cito accumune; cito cupiunt accumbere qui misquis cetera officiis fidem sibi summam conferri oportere putant.' Bengel.—8.] ἔρα φ. κ. τ., 'till I shall have eaten and drunken;' see ch. xii. 37,—where a different assurance seems to be given. But the Lord is here speaking of what we in our state of service are to expect—there, of what in our state of manumission ('menasse servos adhibere manumissionis est species.' Grotsius, citing from Ulpius) and adoption, the wonders of His grace will confer on us. Here the question is of right: there, of favour. —9.] The Lord is not laying down rules for the behaviour of an earthly master to his servants,—but (see above) is speaking of the rightful state of relation between us, and Him Whose we are, and Whom we serve.—10.] This shows the sense of the parable, as applying to our own thoughts of ourselves, and the impossibility of any claim for our services to God.—In Rom. vi. 23 (see also the foregoing verses) we have the true ground on which we look for eternal life set before us;—viz. as the gift of God whose servants we are,—not the wages, as in the case of sin, whose we are not. In the case of men this is different—a good servant is ἀγγέλων (Phil. ver. 11), not ἄγγελοι, i.e. ou ἐν ἦσαν τις ἡρατινιν.—'Eκκλ. Mag. Acts xvii. 26. —The case supposed introduces an argument a fortiori: 'how much more, when ye have failed in so many respects.' 'Miser est quem Dominus servum inutilis appellat Matt. xxv. 30, beat us, qui se ipec.' Bengel.—Thus closes the series of discourses which began with ch. xv. 1.

11—19.] It does not appear to what part of the last journey this is to be referred. There is no reason for supposing it to have been subsequent to what has just been related,—this is not implied. It may have been at the very beginning of the journey. From the circumstance that these lepers were a mixed company of Jews and Samaritans, ἔεν μ. Σ. Κ. Ἐ. probably means 'between Samaria and Galilee,' on the frontiers of both. Meyer supposes αὐτόν to mean 'He for his part'—separate from the others going up to the feast, who would go direct through Samaria.——Xen. has διὰ μικρὸν δὲ ραί τούτων ποιμαί, i.e. 'between these walls.' Anat. i. 4, 4.—This seems to be || with Matt. xix. 1.—The journey mentioned there would lead Him διὰ μικρὸν τ. Σ. Κ. Ἐ. —19.] τὸπέθως, see Levit. xiii. 46. Num.
καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν ἡμών ἱερέως ἐκ Πορευθέντες
καὶ ἵνα καὶ ἵνα ἐπισκέψατο καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ
ὑπάγειν αὐτούς ἐκαθαρίσθησαν. 15 εἰς δὲ εἰς αὐτῶν ἱδὼν
τῇ ἱδών ἐκαθαρίσθησαν. 16 καὶ ἔτεκεν ἐπὶ πρώτῳ παρὰ τῶν πόλεων
αὐτοῦ, ἐν γενεαλογίας αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀντικριτικῆς.
17 άποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν Οὐχὶ οἱ δίκαι ἐκαθαρίσθησαν;
οἱ δὲ ἐνείαν πολὺ; 18 οὐτώ δὲ ἐπιστῆσαν ὑποστρέφαντες
δοῦναι δόξαν τῷ θεῷ, εἰ μὴ ὁ ἀλλογενὴς οὐς;
19 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἱησοῦς πορεύσετε ἡ πίστις σου σοις σε.
20 ἐπηρωθεὶς δὲ ὡς τῶν Φαρισίων πότε ἐρχεται
ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀπεκρίθη ἀυτοῦ καὶ εἶπεν Οὐχ

v. 2.—The Rabbinical prescriptions as to the distance are given in Wetstein.—Their misread had broken down the national distinction, and united them in one company.—On the nature of leprosy and its significance see on Matt. viii. 2.—14.] One of the Lord’s first miracles had been the healing of a leper; then he touched him and said, ‘Be thou clean!’—Now he elects us as it were the keeping, and keeps it in the background:—and why so? There may have been reasons unknown to us;—but one we can plainly see, and that is, to bring out for the Church the lesson which the history yields. In their going away, in the absence of Jesus they are healed: what need to go back and give Him thanks? Here was a trial of their love—faith they had, enough to go, and enough to be cleansed: but love (with the one exception)—gratitude, they had not.—Ἐλπίζω, I see note on Matt. vii. 4.—ἐν τῷ ἔννομῳ.—they could not understand; ‘while on their way,’—the meaning evidently being that they had not gone far, and that the whole took place within a short time. They had not been to the priests, as some suppose.—15.] The Ἀπετίθεμα πρὸς ἔννοιαν, and ἐντολή μ. φ. μ. v. θεοῦ, set before us something immediate, and I should be inclined to think, witnessed by the narrator. —ἀπετίθεμα εἰς Σαμαρίτας.] Strauss supposes (and Hase, but doubtfully) from this that the whole narrative arose out of a parable about Jews and Samaritans (11). Such an absurd notion is however not without its use for believers.—Every miracle is a parable—the Lord did not work mere feats of supernatural power, but preached by His miracles, as well as by His discourses.—17.] Were not the lepers cleansed?—18.] ἐν ἀλλήλον συν. The Samaritans were Gentiles:—not a mixed race, as is sometimes erroneously supposed. They had a mixed religion,—but were themselves originally from other countries: see 2 Kings xii. 24—41. There may have been a reason for the nine Jews not returning,—that they held the ceremonial law was imposed on them to be paramount, which the Samaritan might not rate so highly. That he was going to Mount Gerizim does not appear: from his being found with Jews, he probably would act as a Jew.—19.] ἐδόθη.—in a higher sense than the mere cleansing of his leprosy—his was merely the beholding of the brazen serpent with the outward eyes,—but his, with the eye of inward faith; and this faith saved him;—not only healed his body, but his soul.
might be matter of saccastion.—mer. παρατακτ. 'with (accompanied with) anticipation,' or 'observation.' The word is used ch. xiv. 1 of the Pharisees 'watching' Jesus.—21.) ἐν τοῖς ὑμῖν ... Its coming shall be so gradual and unobserved, that none during its waxing onward shall be able to point here or there for a proof of its coming.—21.) 'For behold the kingdom of God is (already) among you.' The misunderstanding which rendered these words 'within you,' meaning this in a spiritual sense, 'in your hearts,' should have been prevented by reflecting that they are addressed to the Pharisees, in whose hearts it certainly was not. We have the very expression Xen. (πρ. 10), 3. —ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ἰσωσαν (ἐλεγχον) καὶ ἄλλα ὄντα ἐντός ἀυτῶν καὶ χρώματα καὶ ἀνθρώπου ἵματα πάντα ἰσωσαν: see also John i. 26. xii. 35, both of which are analogous expressions.—The kingdom of God was begun among them, and continues making its way in the world, without observation of men;—so that whenever men say 'lo here or lo there,'—whenever great 'revivals' or 'triumphs of the faith' can be pointed to, they stand self-condemned as not belonging to that kingdom. Thus we see that every such marked event in the history of the Church is by God's own hand as it were biotted and marvelled, so as not to deceive us into thinking that the kingdom has come. So it was at the Pentecostal era:—so at that of Constantine;—so at the Reformation.—The meaning 'among you,' includes of course the deeper and personal one 'within each of you,' but the two are not convertible.—29.) This saying is taken up from τοῖς ὑμῖν ἵματαν. —31.) 'He is among you, who is the Bridegroom,—the Son of Man;'—during whose presence ye cannot mourn, but when He shall be taken from you, you shall wish in vain for one of these days of His presence. —Stier (iii. 419) thinks this addressed to the Pharisees also, and to apply to their recognizing too late in their future misery the Messiaship of Jesus;—but this does not appear from the text.—Meyer tries to prove this interpretation altogether wrong, from the ἵματα τῆς ἡμέρας τότε ἵματα τοῖς ἰσωσαν, ver. 26. But the words have the general meaning of the days of the Son of Man's Presence, and this extends on to His future presence, or parousia, as well. His course, if they hereafter desired to see one of the days of His Presence, it would be a second or future Presence. —23.) καὶ οἱ. θα. 'Ye shall not see one;—therefore do not run after false reports of My coming.' A warning to all so-called expositors, and followers of expositors, of prophecy, who cry ἵματα τῶν ἱδον, and ἵματα τῶν, every time that war breaks out, or revolutions occur.—See on these verses 23, 24, Matt. xxiv. 23—27 and notes.—ἐκ τῆς ... ἵματα τῶν ... supply χρώματα ... χρώμα: 25—30.] The events which must precede the coming:—(1) ver. 26, as regards the Lord Himself,—His sufferings and rejection, primarily by this generation,—but in implications by the world;—(2) vv. 26—30, which unfold this implication as regards the whole world, which shall be in its state of carelessness and sensuality at that time;—see
34. The example of the days of Lot is added here, and thereby the sanction of the Lord of Truth given to another part of the sacred record, on which modern criticism has laid its unshallowed hands. In Matt. xiv. 37—39. The example of the days of Lot is added here, and thereby the sanction of the Lord of Truth given to another part of the sacred record, on which modern criticism has laid its unshallowed hands. In Matt. xiv. 37—39. In connexion here, it leads the way to vv. 34, 35.—[Christianity should be rendered literally—'shall have sought,' i.e. during his preceding life,—'shall lose it'; then—34—36.] see on Matt. xiv. 40, 41. Here, there are two references: (1) to the servants of the Lord in the midst of the world out of which they shall be separated; (2) to the separation of the faithful and unfaithful among themselves. [34.] indicates a closer relationship than that of mere fellow-workmen, and sets forth the division of even families in that day. [37.] өэы, not 'how'? (Kuinoel) but literal—'where shall this happen?' The disciples know not the universality of this which the
Lord is announcing to them, and which His dark and awful saying proclaims, see note on it Matt. xxiv. 28.—Observe, there is not a word, except so far as the greatest coming includes the lesser, in all this, of the destruction of Jerusalem. The future yapoueia of the Lord is the only subject: and thus it is an entirely distinct discourse from that in Matt. xxiv., or our ch. xxi.

CHAP. XVIII. 1.—8.] This parable, though not perhaps spoken in immediate unbroken sequence after the last discourse, evidently arose out of it;—perhaps was the fruit of a conversation with the disciples about the day of His coming and the mind with which they must expect it. For observe that in its direct application it is ecclesiastical; and not individual, but by a legitimate accommodation. The widow is the Church; the Judge, her God and Father in heaven. The argument, as in the Parable of the steward ῥής ἄδικιας, so in this of the ἔργης τῆς ἄδικιας, is fortiori: ‘If such be the power of earnest entreaty, that it can win right even from a man sunk in selfishness and fearing neither God nor men, how much more will the right be done by the Just and Holy God in answer to the continued prayers of His Elect:’ even though when this very right is asserted in the world by the coming of the Son of Man, He may hardly find among his people the power to believe it—though few of them will have shown this unwearyness of entreaty which the poor widow showed. — 1.] προς, ‘with reference to,’ see reff.—κατὰ τοῦτο] see 1 Thess. v. 17.

—The mind of prayer rather than, though of course including, the outward act, is here intended. The earnest desire of the heart, is prayer.—ἐγκαταστάς = ἐκκαταστάς, 2 Cor. iv. 1;—to languish,—to give up through the weight of overpowering evil.— 2.] see Deut. xvi. 18 and Matt. v. 21, 22.—τὸν θ. μη ψ. κ. δίδ. μη ἄνω] a common form of expression for an unprincipled and reckless person—see instances in Weststein.—3. ἐκβιαὶ.] ‘deliver me from’—the justice of her cause being presupposed—this adversary being her oppressor on account of her defenceless situation—and she wanting a sentence from the judge to stop his practices.— 4.] ἐκ χρόνιον . . . for some time, not, ‘for a long time.’ τὴν ἡμέραν, φίλος, καὶ μάχης ἧπ. χρόνων; II. B. 299 ὑπὲρ τῆς ἁλομοίας, and adj. of a person in a state of activity and movement, acting, in the midst of strife and danger, squarely facing the enemy. — 5.] τις ἀδικίας, belonging to, being of, the iniquity which prevails in the world. — 6.] τῶν belongs to ἐκκαταστάς, as in E. V., but has a stronger force than there—‘lest coming for ever,’ she . . . ὠριστήριον, the part of the cheek immediately beneath the eyes, signifies literally ‘to smile in the face’;—and proverbially (see reff), ‘to manifest or inconsistently annoy.’ It answers exactly to the Latin obtundó, which Terence has in this sense, Ne me obtundas hac de re sepius, Adelph. i. 2, 33; and al. fr.—Livy, Neque ego obtundam, sepius eadem nequiquam agendo. ii. 15. The Greek word does not appear to be anywhere used in this sense;—so that the use of it here may be a Latinism, as Grotius thought. Meyer inter-
Yeeggeegion Xviii.
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pret's it literally—'last at last she should become desperate and come and strike me in the face' (!). It has been observed that the apostles acted from this very motive when they besought the Lord to send away the Syrophoenician woman, 'for she cried after them.' Matt. xiv. 23.—6.] on de ev.

t. de. see above, and on chap. xvi. 8.—7.] The poor widow in this case (the forsaken Church, contending with her adversary the devil, 1 Pet. v. 8) has this additional claim, in which she is right of her cause consists,—that she is the Elect (2 John 1. 3 John 1.) of God.—His Beloved.---Boon. pr. aivt... This answers to the 'eai'nter... in ver. 1, but is an amplification of it.---e. makro-

thetai... ] and He delays His vengeance in their case!' 'and He, in their case, is long-suffering.' 'Est in hac voce dilatios

significatio, quae ut debitori prodest, its graviss est ei qui vim patitur.' Grotius. The rec. reading, macrothetai, conveys the same meaning, and being understood as eai'ter. This is perhaps what the E. V. means by 'though He bear long with them,' which is ambiguous as it stands. The makrothetai has no doubt a general refer-
ence to God's dealing with man, see 2 Pet. iii. 9, 15.—8.] ev tayces will not bear the meaning 'swiftly,' i.e. 'suddenly, when it comes,' but (see ref.) is 'shortly' ---'soon,' 'speedily.' As Greswell. And this is no inconsistency with makrothetai: see 2 Pet. iii. 8, 9.—<p>...> see the beginning of this note. This can hardly be, as Meyer interprets it, that the painful thought suddenly occurs to the Lord, how many there will be even at His coming who will not have received Him as the Messiah: for 'p'istov, though 'faith' generally, is yet 'faith' in reference to the object of the parable—faith which has end-
dured in prayer without fainting. 9—14.] This parable is spoken not to the Pharisees, for the Lord would not in their presence have chosen a Pharisee as an example; nor concerning the Pharisees, for then it would have been no parable—but to the people, and concerning some among them (then and always) tovs p'ev. ev el'c ev.---who trusted in themselves that they were righteous, and despised other men.—The parable describes an every day occurrence: the parabolic character is given by the concurrence and grouping of the two, and by the fact that each of these represents psychologically a class of persons.---9.] podo, to, not concerning: it was concerning them, it is true—but this word expresses that it was spoken to them. The usage of podo in ver. 1 is no example for the sense concerning, for it is not there so used of persons, but with a neuter arti-
cle and infinitives: eis podo aivtov p'ev, is too general a phrase, to allow of any other interpretation than the ordinary one, where the context will bear it.---<p>dpia. d' ev. not 'were persuaded of them-
selves,' as Greswell renders; but as E. V. see ref.---10, 11.] podo, d' ev. belongs
and remaining, in no studied place or posture. So Tacitus, Hist. iv. 72, 'stabent conscientia flagitia mocestatis in terram occultas;' see also Eason, 6. § 2. E., 'φησις τοναγαν. 'νομος δε των θειων, η γε λατινος, ΑΕΖΗΚΟΜΟΡΩΣΕΥΣ ΣΥΒΕΛΛΑΣ ΑΙΓΟΛΟΛΙΟΣ ΜΙΑΡΟΙΟΝ ΒΛΙ ΑΡΙΟΝ ΟΡΙΚΟΤΟΜΕΥΩΝ. "—for δε δει, και Δ αβελ διερως του διερως των διερως. ——for δε δει, και Δ αβελ διερως του διερως των διερως. ——for δε δει, και Δ αβελ διερως του διερως των διερως. "—for τοις ζητωμενοις, Mark xiv. 6, not το σατανας: that would be καθ αυτων, see James ii. 17. He stood (in the ordinary place), and prayed thus with himself, as E. V., — απο τον αγαθον καθαρισμον: —such a prayer he would not dare to put up aloud. (Meyer.) The Church has admirably fitted to this parable the declaration of thankfulness in 1 Cor. xv. 9, 10 (the two being the Epistle and Gospel for the Eleventh Sunday after Trinity), also made by a Pharisee, and also on the ground 'that he was not as other men:' but how different in its whole spirit and effect! There, in the deepest humility, he ascribes it to the grace of God that he laboured more abundantly than they all; — yet not I, but the grace of God that was with me.'—12.] γευσται... τη γε}
15 Προσέφερον δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ ἦν αὐτῶν ἀπετρείπται ἱδόντες δὲ οἱ μαθηταὶ ἐπετιμήσαν αὐτοῖς. Ἄβδπ
16 δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς προσκαλεσάμενος αὐτὰ εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς τὰ παιδία ἐφέστηκα πρὸς με, καὶ μὴ ἐκεῖ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ. 17 ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, δὲ εἰς ὑμᾶς ἐξεπείθη ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπίστου, όμοιώθη εἰς αὐτήν. 18 καὶ ἔπερωθήσετε τις αὐτὸν ἄρχων, λέγων Διδάσκαλε ἀγαθε, τί ποίησας ἡμῖν ἀλώνιον ἡ λημονομησίως; 19 εἶπε δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ με λέγεις ἀγάθον; οὔτες ἀγάθως, εἰ μὴ εἰς τὸ θεὸς. 20 τὰς ἐντολὰς οἶδας, Ἄμη μοιχεύσας, μὴ φονεύσας, μὴ κλέψῃς, μὴ ψευδομαρτύρῃς, τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα. 21 δὲ εἶπε Τάῦτα πάντα ἐφευακάζαμην ἐκ νόστητος [μου]. 22 ἀκούσας δὲ ταῦτα ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ Ἑτε ἐν σοι ἀλητεία πάντα ὀσα ἔχεις, πώς λέγεις ἀλητεία; 23 δὲ διὰ ἄδειας πτωχοῖς, καὶ εξεías θεσαυροῦ ἐν ὑφαντερίᾳ καὶ ἐκφυακάζαμην ἐπὶ τὸν λόγον ἐγένετο, ἦν ἀνήπους σφόδρα. 24 ἔσων δὲ αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰησοῦς περιλύον μενομόνον ἐπὶ τῶν δικαίων ἡ τροχία ἔγοντες εἰςελέύσοται εἰς τὴν βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ. 25 εὐκοπῶντες γὰρ ἐς καμήλου διὰ τὴν μαλάκας ἐν αὐτῷ ἐπηλεύσατε εἰς τὴν βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ εἰςελέυσατε. 26 εἶπον δὲ οἱ ἀκούσαντες. Καὶ τίς δύναται σωμφονία; 27 δὲ εἶπε Τὰ ἀδύνατα τὰ ἀνθρώπων δυνάτα ἐς τοῦ ἰησοῦ. 28 ἐπεὶ δὲ ὁ Πέτρος ἤδει καὶ ἀφήκα μαν πάντα καὶ ἦκολοθσάμενοι σοι. 29 δὲ εἶπε αὐτοῖς Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐδὲς ἐστῶς ὅσα ἀφήκαν σοι ἡ γονεῖς ἡ ἀδελφοίς ἡ γυναῖκας ἡ τέκνα ἐνεκεν τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ. 30 ὅς οὐ μὴ ἀπολάβη
from xviii. 11. —15. καὶ οἱ βρέφες— the infants also; not the people only, but also brought their children. —b. points out more distinctly the tender age of the children than παιδία.
17 — 22. The only addition in our narrative is that the young man was a ruler, — perhaps of the synagogue: see notes on Matt. and Mark.
23 — 31; where see notes. — 30. ὅτι οὐ μὴ
The narrative of the journey now passes to the last section of it,—the going up to Jerusalem, properly so called,—that which in Matt. and Mark forms the whole journey. We know from John xi. 34 that this journey took place from Ephraim, a city near the desert. —31.] The divine υἱὸς belongs to γεγραμμένος—as in E. V. —32.] The betrayal is omitted here, which is unaccountable if Luke saw Matthew's account, as also the omission of the crucifixion,—this being the first announcement of it; see a similar omission in ch. ix. 45. —34.] Peculiar to Luke.—οὐδὲν τούτων—i.e. neither the sufferings nor the resurrection. All was as yet hidden from them, and it seems not to have been till very shortly before the event itself that they had any real expectation of its happening. —52, where see notes.—I have on Matt. spoken of the discrepancy of this narrative from the two others. The supposition that they were two miracles is perfectly monstrous; and would at once destroy the credit of Matthew as a truthful narrator. If further proof of their identity were wanting to any one, we might find it in the fact that the following expressions are common verbatim to Mark and Luke.—In Matt. of course they are in the plural, as he has two blind men. —λέγοντες παρὰ τὸν διδάσκαλον.—Ιησοῦς οὖν Ναζαρηνός ἐκείνου τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ποιήσεως; οὐ δὲ εἶπε· Κύριε, ἰνα ἀναβλέψῃ· ἵνα ὡς ἰδοὺ οἱ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ.
and the narrative does not absolutely exclude the supposition of a personal knowledge of Zacchaeus on the part of some around Him. But of what possible import can such a question be, when the narrative plainly shows us that Jesus saw into His heart? Cannot He who knows the thoughts, call by the name also? — μανή, probably over the night. See John i. 40. — ἐξί, 'it is my purpose,' or even more, 'I must;' for especially in these last days of the Lord's ministry, every event is fixed and determined by a Divine plan. — 7.] The murmurers are Jews who were accompanying Him to Jerusalem, on the road to
which Zacczeus’s house lay (see ver. 1). — παρὰ δὲ ἀνδρὶ belongs to καταλύουσαν. — 8.] This need not have taken place in the morning; much more probably it was immediately on the Lord’s entrance into the house, while the multitude were yet muttering in the court, and in their presence. The Lord’s answer, σήμερον ἐκεῖνος ἐστιν, looks as if He were just entering the house, not just leaving it; and the σήμερον must be the same with that in ver. 5. — τὰ ἡμέραν see note on ch. xvi. 9. Zacczeus may well have heard of that parable from one of his publican acquaintances, or perhaps repentance may have led him at once to this act of self-denial. — ἀνέρρασθαι. There is no uncertainty in εἰ τι; it may be whatever I have unfairly exacted from any man; see Lexicona. — 9.] πρός, to him, not ‘concerning him.’ The announcement is made to him, though not in the second person. — σωτηρία in the stronger sense, ‘salvation.’ — ἄβ. ιστην not, has become (γίγνεται) a son of Abraham by his repentance (Kuinoel, &c.), but is a son of Abraham: though despised by the multitude, has his rights as a Jew, and has availed himself of them by receiving his Lord in faith and humility. — 10.] For, the greater sinner he may have been, the more does he come under the description of those (sheep) whom the good Shepherd came to seek and save.

11.—37.] Peculiar to Luke. By the introductory words, the parable must have been spoken in the house of Zacczeus, i.e., perhaps in the open room looking into the court, where probably many of the multitude were assembled. — A parable very similar in some points to this was spoken by the Lord in His last great prophetic discourse, Matt. xxv. 14—30. Many modern commentators (Calv. Olah. Meyer (on Matt.), but not Schleierm. or De Wette) maintain that the two parables represent one and the same: if so, we must at once give up, not only the pretensions to historical accuracy on the part of our Gospels, (see ver. 11,) but all idea that they furnish us with the words of the Lord any where: for the whole structure and incidents of the two are essentially different. If oral tradition thus varied before the Gospels were written, in the report of the Lord’s spoken words, how can we know that He spoke any thing which they relate? If the Evangelists themselves altered, arranged, and accommodated those discourses, not only is the above the case, but their honesty is likewise impugned (see Prolegomena to Gospels). Besides, we shall here find the parable in its very root and point of comparison, individual and distinct. Compare throughout the notes on Matt. — 11.] The distance of Jericho from Jerusalem was 160 stadia = 15 English miles. — ἐν τῷ παρασκέυᾳ. They imagined that the present journey to Jerusalem, undertaken as it had been with such publicity and accompanied with such wonderful miracles, was for the purpose of revealing and establishing the Messianic Kingdom. — 12.] The groundwork of this part of the parable seems to have been derived from the history of Archelaus, son of Herod the Great. The kings of the Herodian family made journeys to Rome, to receive their βασιλείαν. On Archelaus’s doing so, the Jews sent after him a protest, which however was not listened to by Augustus. Joseph. Ant. xvii. 11, 1 ff. The situation was appropriate; for at Jericho was the royal palace which
δέκα δούλους ἐαυτοῦ, ἐδωκεν αὐτοῖς δέκα μνᾶς καὶ ἔπει ΑΒΔ πρὸς αὐτοὺς. Πραγματεύσατο ἐν τίς ἵρχομαι. 14 οἱ δὲ πολίται ἀυτοῦ ἐμίσουν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀπέστειλαν ζραβεῖαν ὁπίσω αὐτοῦ λέγοντες Οὐ θέλουν τοῦτον βασιλεύσαι ἐφ᾽ ἡμᾶς. 15 καὶ ἔγενεν ἐν τῷ ἐπανελθεὶν αὐτοῦ λαβοντα τὴν βασιλείαν, καὶ ἔπει φωνῆθη αὐτῷ τοὺς δούλους τούτους οἷς ἐδωκε τὸ ἀργύριον, ὡς γνως τίς τί διεπραγματεύσατο. 16 ἐπανέγενεν δὲ ὁ πρώτος λέγων Κύριε, ἡ μὰ σου προσευχῆσαι δέκα μνᾶς.

17 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Ἡ αὕση δοῦλε, ὅτι ἐν ἐλαχῖστῳ πιστεύσατε ἐγένον, ἵσθι ἐξουσίαν ἐχων ἐπᾶν δέκα πόλεων. 18 καὶ ἠλθεν ὁ δεύτερος λέγων Κύριε, ἡ μὰ σου ἐπούρησις πέντε μνᾶς. 19 εἶπε δὲ καὶ τοῦτο Καὶ σὺ γίνου επάνω πέντε πόλεων. 20 καὶ ἔτερος ἠλθε Λέγων Κύριε, ἵνα τὸν μοῦ σου τὴν ἰχνὶν ἀποκειμένην ἐν σου διαρίσκῃ. 21 ἐφοβοῦμαι γὰρ σε, ὅτι ἀνθρωπος ἀνυστροφος εἰ, ἀφείς ὁ ὅπες ἐθέκα καὶ ἀπειρίζεις ὁ ὅπες ἐσπερνα. 22 λέγει δὲ αὐτῷ, Ἐκ τοῦ στόματος σου κρωὶ σε, πονηρῇ δουλε. ὅσις ὅτι ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπος ἀνυστροφος εἰμι, ἀφεῖς ὁ ὅπες ἐθέκα καὶ ἀπειρίζεις ὁ ὅπες ἐσπερνα 23 καὶ διατῇ ὅπες ὅπες τὸ ἀργύριον μου ἐπὶ τὴν τράπεζαν, καὶ ἐγὼ ἐλθὼν σὺν τοκῳ ἀν ἐπέρασα αὐτῷ; 24 καὶ τοῖς παρέθισαν εἰπεν Ἀρατε ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ τὴν μνᾶν, καὶ ὅπες τῷ τὰς δέκα μνας.

A B D K L 9 al. Orig. dum ἑδρὰ Lucif. donec a. — 14. αὐροῦ (1st) om. D ἐν Lucif.—for ἱστερ., ἔντιμοιν D. — 15. ἐν τῷ om. D Δ.—αὐτοῦ τοὺς δ᾽ om. om. τοῦτος D Orig.—διόδει B D L a. txt A bc.—γνοὺ D B D L. txt A Orig.—τὶ διεπραγματεύσατο B D L Cop. (Tisch. ed. 2. τίς τι B Lachhm.) txt A abc.—17. ἕσει B Dcov Orig. txt A.—18. ἐτερος D D Lucif.—20. το ἐν τῷ D D L 2. txt A.—21. ἀφατι D abed. —23. διατὶ ὁν τῇ om. A D E F G L M S U V Δ Δ 22 all. ins. B. — 24. τὴν μνᾶν om. D a. — for δότα, ἐπενεγκατε DΔ. — 25. om. D ἐν Lucif.—26. γὰρ Ἀραχελας had built with great magnificence. Jos. Antt. xvii. 13, 1.—13.] δέκα, see on Matt. xxv. 1. The giving the μνα to each, is a totally different thing from giving to one five, to another two, and to a third one talent. The sums given are here all the same, and all very small. The (Attic) mina is a talent, and equal to about £2 of our money. —In Matt. the man gives his movable property to his servants; here he makes trial of them with those small sums (ἀγαπτον, see ver. 17.) —πραγμ. = ἀργαλείᾳ, Matt. —ἐν ἡ ἁμᾶς. 'while I go and return,' 'till I come.' —14.] The nobleman, Son of a King, εὐγενής, is the Lord Jesus; the Kingdom is that over His own citizens, the Jews. They sent a message after Him; their cry went up to Heaven, in the persecutions of His servants, etc.: 'we will not have this man to reign over us.' The parable has a double import: suited both to the disciples (οἱ δοῦλοι λαυροῦ), and the multitude (οἱ πολίται αὐτοῦ). —15.] τίς τι, see Mark xv. 24.—διεπρ. 'what business each had carried on:' not, 'what each had gained.' Dion. Hal. iii. 72, has the word signifying 'to arrange a matter,' which however was not then executed. The sons of Ancus having often arranged (διεπραγματεύσατο) a plot to kill Tarquinus... — 18—23.] see on Matt. It is observable here how exactly and minutely in keeping is every circumstance. 'They pound bath gained ten pounds;' the humility with which this is stated, where no account of ἡ ἐδία ἐδώκας is taken as in Matt., and then the proportion of the reward.—Δέκα.
14—37. **KATA ΛΟΥΚΑΝ.**

**éxonti.** 25 καὶ εἶπον αὐτῷ, Κύριε, ἐχεῖς δέκα μνάς. 26 λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, ὅτι παντὶ τῷ ἑξοντι δοθήσεται, ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ μὴ ἑξοντος καὶ ὁ ἐχεῖ ἀράθησαι ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ.

27 ἵ πλὴν τῶν ἑξθρούς μου *ἐκείνου τὸν μὴ ἀμβλητός* ἀπὸ τοῦ κατασφάζετε ἐκμπροσθεθεὶ μου. 28 καὶ εἰπὼν ταῦτα ἐπέρευνεν ἐκμπροσθεθείν, ἀναβαίνων εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα. 29 καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς ἦγαγον εἰς Βηθσαϊν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὁρόσ τοῦ καλούμενον Ἑλαιών, ἀπέστειλε δύο τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ 30 εἰπὼν ὡς ἤγαγετε εἰς τὴν κατέναντι κώμην ἐν ὕστεραι ἐιστροφούμενοι εὐρήσετε πώλων δεδεμένον, ἐφ’ ὅν οὐδεὶς πώποτε ἄνθρωπον ἐκάθισεν ἵππας αὐτῶν ἄγαγετε.

31 καὶ εἰς τὸν μήν Βασιλεία τοῦ Ἠσίων τοῖς ἐν αὐτῷ ἁπατωλομένοι εὐρόν καθὼς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς 32 λύσοντοι δὲ εἰς τὸν πώλων εἶπον εἰς τὸν κύριον αὐτοῦ ἡ πρὸς τὴν καταβάσει τῶν ὑπὸ τῇ θεοῦ πλῆθος τῶν μαθητῶν φανερώσει αἰνεῖν τὸν θεοῦ

om. B L 6 a Copt. Arm. Theophyl. antem d. de Lucif.—for δοθήσεται, προφητῆται D.—αὐτῶν om. B L 7 al. Lucif. —27. for καὶ ἐπεξέβαλε Β Κ Λ Μ al. τῶν A D bce Orig. Lucif.—aft. καταφερ. ins. B F L 3.—aft. μου ins. καὶ τὸν ἄρχοντος δικαίωτος ἐκβαλέτοι εἰς τὸ σκότος τοῦ ἐξέστου εἰς ἴσατα δ’ ἐλασθείρα καὶ ἀναβαίνων τῶν ἀπεκρίθησαν ἐν τη ἡμέρᾳ τῆς ἡμέρας τῆς ἱστορίας ἐν τῷ ἐνν. 32. for καὶ ἐπεξέβαλε Α B C D E F G bcd e f g h i j k l m n o p q r s t u v w x y z Orig. (once) Al. B C D E F G bcd e f g h i j k l m n o p q r s t u v w x y z. —33. διακρίνεις om. D c. —32. for τινός τοῦ καθότι θαυματουργὸν αὐτῶν ἡμῶν τὸν κλητόν καταβάσει τῶν ὑπὸ τῇ θεοῦ πλῆθος τῶν μαθητῶν φανερώσει αἰνεῖν τὸν θεοῦ

πολείως...so according with the nature of what the Prince went to receive, and the occasion of His return. —26.] is parenthetical, spoken by the standers-by in the parable, in surprise at such a decision: then in ver. 26, the King answers them. —27.] This command brings out both comings of the Lord,—at the destruction of Jerusalem, and at the end of the world: for we must not forget that even now ‘He is gone to receive a Kingdom and return: ’ we see not yet all things put under His feet.’

28.] Not immediately after saying these things; —see on ver. 5: unless they were said in the morning on His departure.

29—33.] Matt. xxi. 1—9. Mark xi. 1—10. John xii. 12—26, where see notes.—29.] The name, when thus put, must be accentuated ἔλαιον, for when it is the genitive of ἔλαιον the article is prefixed (ver. 37). Luke uses this same expression again Acts i. 12. Josephus has ἔλαιον ἔλαιον ἔλαιον ἐρωτεύεται, ἀντί. vii. 9. 2. —33.] τῶν τοι χειρισμόνων said this, as in the probably more precise account of Mark:—οἱ κύριοι αὐτὸς τὸν κύριον αὐτοῦ ἀπεκρίθησαν δι’ ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐπιβίωσαν τῇ ἑσπερίᾳ τῷ ἤλιῳ ἰσοτιμίᾳ τὸν κύριον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐπηκοφθήσαν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς ἡμέρας. —34. rec. om. δι’ ἔσοχεν τῆς ἡμέρας: the middle sense; = ὡς ἤλιον, Matt. —The δύναμις which dwelt
mostly on their minds, was the raising of Lazarus.—John xii. 17, 18—but as this perhaps was not known to Luke, we must understand him to mean, "all that they had seen during their journey with Him."—by this expression, eis tis ev de
e

μεν έχως έτσι των Φαρισαίων ἀπὸ τοῦ οἴχου εἰπὼν πρὸς αὐτὸν

Δίδασκαλε, ἔπιτίμησον τοὺς μαθητάς σου. 41 καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι εὰν οὐκ οὐδὲν ἱστορήσωσιν, οἱ λίθοι κεκράζονται. 42 καὶ ὥς ἦν γιγαντία, ἵδων τὴν πόλιν ἐκλαυσαν εἰτ' ἀντὶ, 43 λέγων ὅτι ἐγώ έστι, καὶ οὐ καὶ γε εν τῷ ἱμέρα ταύτην τὰ πρὸς εἰρή

nυν [σου], νῦν δε εἰρήκην αὐτῷ Ὀρθομελῶν σου. 45 οὐτως εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Περιβαλοῦσαν οἱ ἄγνωστοι σου ἵππος καὶ περικυκλώσωσι σε καὶ συνεξοῦσαι σαν παντοθέν, 44 καὶ ἔδαφος σε καὶ τὰ τέκνα σου εν οὐ, καὶ οὐκ ἐξάφθωσαν εἰς σοι λίθων ενίπ αἰθίων ὡν

κατάβαινεν Θα. ωδώ μελην εις ΘΑ.——μεταρρυθμίσασε γονιμωνίαν ΘΑ.—δι'-γινομ' εις ΘΑ.—δι'-γι

...
ΚΑΤΑ ΔΟΥΚΑΝ.

45 Καὶ εἶσελθὼν εἰς τὸ ιερὸν ἤρετο ἐκβάλλειν τούς πωλοῦντας [ἐν αὐτῷ] καὶ ἀγοράζοντας, 46 λέγων αὐτοῖς Γέγραται ὦ Οἶκός μου οἰκός προσευχῆς ἔστιν ὑμεῖς δὲ αὐτὸν ἐποίησατε σπῆλαιον λῃστῶν.

47 Καὶ ἡ διάδασκον 47 τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν ἐν τῷ ιερῷ οἱ δὲ ἁρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς ἐξῆτοναυτὸν ἀπολέσαντα καὶ οἱ πρῶτοι τοῦ λαοῦ, 48 καὶ οὐχ ὕψισκον τὸ τί ποιήσωσιν ὁ λαὸς γὰρ ἄτας ἐξεκράματο αὐτοῦ ἀκούων.


46. 47. See on Matt. xxi. 12. Mark xi. 16.—17.

47. 48. A general description of His employment during these last days, the particulars of which follow. It is rightly however placed at the end of a chapter—for it forms a close to the long section wherein the last journey to Jerusalem has been described.

Chap. XX. 1—8.] Matt. xxi. 23—27.
ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ

τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην. 'Ανθρωπός [τίς] ἐφεύτευσεν ΑΒCD
ματέλωνα καὶ ἐξίδευσεν αὐτὸν γεωργοῖς, καὶ ἀπεδήμησε
χρόνους ἰκανοὺς. 10 καὶ ἐν καιρῷ ἀπέστειλε πρὸς τοὺς γεωργοὺς δοῦλον, ἵνα ἀπὸ τοῦ καρποῦ τοῦ ἀμπελώνος *δωσίν αὐτῷ* οἱ δὲ γεωργοὶ διάφανες αὐτῶν, ἐξαπέστειλαν κενὸν. 11 καὶ προσέθεν θέματι ἔτερον δοῦλον οἱ δὲ κακεῖνον διάφανες καὶ ἀτιμάσαντες εξαισθητείσαν κενὸν. 12 καὶ προσέθεν τιμὰς τριτὸν οἱ δὲ καὶ τούτον ἀτραματισάντες ἐξεβάλον. 13 εἶτε δὲ ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελώνος Τί ποίησο; πέμψω τὸν νῦν μου τὸν ἀγαπητὸν ἰδίον τούτον [ἰδόντες] ἐνετρισθήσατο. 14 ἴδοντες δὲ αὐτὸν οἱ γεωργοὶ διελογίζοντα πρὸς ἐναυ τοὺς λέγοντες Οὐδὲς ἐστίν ὁ κληρονόμος τήν δε στρατεύσαμεν τὸ ποίησο ἱμῶν γένεται ἡ ἱ κληρονομία. 15 καὶ ἐκβάλοντες αὐτὸν ἐξω τοῦ ἀμπελώνος ἀπέκεναν. τί οὖν ποίησε αὐτὸς ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελώνος; 16 ἐλεύσεται καὶ ἀπολέσει τοὺς γεωργοὺς τούτους καὶ δώσει τὸν ἀμπελώνα ἄλλος, ἀκούσαντες δὲ εἶπον Μὴ γένοιτο. 17 ο δὲ ἐμβλέψας αὐτοῦ εἶπε τί οὖν ἐστί τὸ γεγραμμένον τοῦ συνθήκης μένων τούτω, Λίθων δὲ ἀπεδημήκαναι οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες, οὕτως ἐνενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας; 18 πάς ὁ πεσὼν ἐπὶ ἐκεῖνον τὸν λίθον 9 συνθηκόθηκεν, ἐφ' ὑμῖν ἐν πέχω, λικάμασε αὐτὸν. 19 καὶ ἐζήτησαν οἱ ἀρχεῖες καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς εἰς ἐπὶ αὐτόν τὰς χειρὰς εἰς αὐτή τῇ ὁρᾷ, καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν τὸν λαὸν· ἐγνωσαν γὰρ ὅτι πρὸς αὐτοὺς τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην εἶπε.
ΚΑΤΑ ΔΟΥΚΑΝ.

10—32.

"Καὶ ἐπαραπήσαντες ἀπέστειλαν ἑγκαθέτους ὑποκρινομένους· ἐν αὐτοῖς δικαίους εἶναι, ἵνα ἐπιλάβωμεν τῆς ἀντιλαβωμένης ἑνόχος. Ἀλλὰ ἔπρωτησαν αὐτὸν τὴν ἤγουσαν τῆς διδάσκαλα, ὀδίμον ὑπὸ ὀρθώς λέγεις καὶ διδασκαλεῖς, καὶ οὐ λαμβάνεις πρόςωπον, ἀλλὰ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ τὸν Θεόν τοῦ Διδάσκαλον. Εἰς τινὰ ὀδόν τοῦ Θεοῦ διδάσκαις, ἔξεστιν ἡμῖν Καίσαρι ὑπὸ φόρον δοῦναι, ἦ νῦν; διὰ κατανομῆσαι δὲ αὐτῶν τὴν πανορμίαν ἔτει πρὸς αὐτούς Τί με οἰκονομεῖτε; Εἰς τί πατητῆτε οἰκονομεῖτε. Ἀπόδοτε τῶν τὰς Καίσαρας Καίσαρι, καὶ τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ τῷ Θεῷ. οὐκ ἴσχυσαν ἑπιλαβῆσαι αὐτοῦ ῥήματος ἐναντίων τοῦ λαοῦ, καὶ θαυμάσαντες ἐπὶ τῆς ἀποκατάστασις αὐτοῦ ἐξήγαγαν. ἔπρωτητε δὲ τινες τῶν Σαδουκαίων, οἱ ἀντιλέγοντες ἀνάστασιν μὴ ἀνέλεγον τινὰς ἡμῖν." Εἰς τινὰς τήν Διδάσκαλον, Μωσῆς ἔγαγεν ἡμῖν, εἷς τὸν αὐτοῦ ἀποθάνας ἐκ τῶν γυναικῶν, καὶ οὗτος ἀνέργειας ἀποθάνει ἡμῖν. Ἐξανεστήσατο στήριμα τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ ἐν τὴν γυναῖκα καὶ ἐκατέθηκεν στήριμα τῷ αὐτοῦ." Ἐπεὶ "οὖν ἀδελφοὶ ἦσαν, καὶ ὁ πρώτῳ λαβὼν γυναίκα ἀπείδηκεν ἀνέκαθεν, καὶ ἐλάβες ὁ δεύτερος τὴν γυναίκα." Οὗτος ἀπείδηκεν ἀνέκαθεν, καὶ ὁ τρίτος ἐλάβει αὐτὴν ὑπὸ δικαιοσύνης καὶ οἱ ἐπὶ τῶν κατέληκε. Εἰς τέκνα καὶ ἀπείδηκεν. Ἔστερον δὲ πάντων ἀπείδηκεν. Οἱ φορμαίοι τοῖς ἄρχονται A B L ἐδρ.-28. ἐν τοῖς δεικτέοις. Ὡς ἐν τοῖς δεικτέοις. Ὡς ἐν τοῖς δεικτέοις. Ὡς ἐν τοῖς δεικτέοις. Ὡς ἐν τοῖς δεικτέοις. Ὡς ἐν τοῖς δεικτέοις. Ὡς ἐν τοῖς δεικτέοις. Ὡς ἐν τοῖς δεικτέοις.
the 'quick' at the time of His coming, it must be remembered that the 'change' which shall pass on them (1 Cor. xv. 51—54) shall put them into precisely the same ἀρδευσία as the risen (compare ver. 42 ibid.). He refers to some striking remarks of Calvin in the Saxon Studies for 1843, p. 292 ff. (to which I have not access) as showing that saying ἡμέρα τοῦ θανάτου is used by Matt. and Luke, only of the state after the Lord's coming. —37.] καὶ Μ., that very Moses, whom you allege as showing by inference the contrary.—38. On ἐνεπάνω. γ. αὐτ. ι. see on Matt. xxiv. 31—33: but we have in this argument even a further generalization than in Matt. and Mark. There, it is a covenant relation on which the matter rests: here, a life of all, living and dead, in the sight of God,—so that none are annihilated,—but in the regard of Him who inhabiteth Eternity, the being of all is a living one, in all its changes. —39, 40.] Peculiar to Luke:—implied however in Matt. ver. 34, and Mark ver. 28. —41—44.] —45. Mark xii. 36—37, where see notes. Luke omits the question of the lawyer, which occurred immediately on the gathering together of the Pharisees after the last incident. This question of the Lord seems to have followed close on that, which (and not that in ver.
KATA LOYKAN.

445

XXI. 1—5.

χριστον υιον Δαυιδ ειναι, και αυτος Δαυιδ λεγει εν
βιβλω φαλμων. Ετεν ο κυριος τω κυριω μου Καθου
εκ δεξιων μου 43 εις αν τω τους εχθρους σου 44
ποδους σου; 45 Δαυιδ ου κυριον αυτων καλει, και πως
υιος αυτων εστι; 46 ακοντος δε παντος του λαου ειπε
τοις μαθηταις αυτου. 46 Προσεχετε απο των γραμματων
των θελοντων περιστατει εν στολαις, και φιλουνων
ασπαςομεν εν ταις αγοραις και πρωτοκαθεδριας εν
tais συναγωγαις και πρωτοκληταις εν τοις δειπνοις.
οι κατεσθιοντι τας οικιας των χριστου, και προφασει
μακρα προσεχονται. Ουτοι ληψονται περισσοτερον
κριμα. XXI. 1. τε αναβληθεσαι δε εις τους βαλλουντας
ta doura autou εις το γαζοφυλακιαν πλουσιους, εις δε
tαι και τινα χρηναν πενεχραν βαλλονταν εκει δυο εις
εκ του υπερηφανους αυτους fp
και ειπεν αληθως λεγω υμιν οτι η χηρα η πτωχη
αυτη πλειον παντων εβαλεν δε ετοιμασες αυτων εις το
περισσουντος αυτως εβαλον εις τα δωρα του θεου, αυτη
de εκ του υπερηφανους αυτους η πλειον εις τον εις
dε εν ευαθειαν. Και τινων λεγοντων περι του ιερου, οτι

43 Μω. και Οθον. 52. 2 Μακκ. v. 18 al. b here only. Exod. xlii. 26 al. c I Mith. ch. xii. 95 only. d ch. xill. 44. John i. 48 al. etc. xxv. 6. e I Mith. John vi. 38 al. I Kings ii. 85. f here only in Gospels. 2 Cor. viii. 14, 15 al. f ch. viii. 48 al. Cant. viii. 7.

40 here was their last to Him, Mark xii. 34. — 41] προς ανδροες, i.e. the Scribes. The same thing is signified by πις λιγουσης of γραματειας. In Mark. In Matt. the question is addressed to the Pharisees. I mention these marks as marks of the independence of the accounts. The underlying fact is, the Lord addressed the Pharisees and Scribes on a view which they (the Scribes, the Pharisees agreeing) entertained about the Messiah. Hence the three accounts diverge. 45—47] Matt. xxi. 6, 7. 15. Mark xii. 34—40, with which latter our text almost verbally agrees: see notes there. — 45. This particular, κομων. 3. π. τ. λ., and that the words were spoken to His disci-

41—44. Mark xii. 41—44, where see note. — 1] αναβληθεσαι. The Lord as yet has been surrounded with His disciples (see ver. 45 of last ch.), and speaking to them. — He now lifts up His eyes, and sees at a distance, &c. — where belongs to τος βαζ., and διατος is not to be supplied, nor a comma put after γαλ. It was not the rich only, which that would imply—but διαλογος (Mark), who were casting gifts in. — 42] εις τα δαπανας, among (into) the gifts of (to) God; not quae donarent (Beza), 'as, or 'for, gifts,' which would require the omission of the article.—nor so that τα δαπανας. — 43—46. Matt. xxiv. 1—51 (xxv. 1—46). Mark xiii. 1—37. See notes on both, but especially on Mark. Meyer says truly in loc. that there is no trace in Luke of the discourse being delivered on the Mount of Olives—but he adds, that it belongs to the discourses 'in the temple' which begin ch. xx. 1, and that therefore Luke alone mentions αναβληθεσαι. He seems to have overlooked the break after ver. 7, corresponding to the change of scene. All three speak of the opening incident as happening while He was departing from the temple—and Matt. and Mark of the inquiry He made afterwards, on the Mount of Olives, i.e. in the evening, when He had retired.
λίθοις καλοίς καὶ ἀναθήματι  θεωρεῖτε, ἐλεύθεροι οὐκ ἁφθαζονται

ταῦτα ΑΔΒΓ

θεωρεῖτε, ἐλεύθεροι οὐκ ἁφθαζονται ἐν αἰσ ὑμῶν

λίθοις ἐπὶ λίθῳ ὅς οὐ "καταλυθήσεται.

τῇ πρωτάτην

ἀποφθέγγεται ἐν αὐτῶν λέγωντες Διδάσκαλε, πότε ὑμᾶν ταῦτα ἔσται; καὶ

τοῦ "σεμιῶν ὅταν μέλλῃ ταῦτα γίνεσθαι; ὃς ἐίπε

"θέλετε μὴ παλανθήσητε πολλοὶ γὰρ ἐλεύθερον ἐπὶ ΒΔ

τῷ ὁμόροι μου λέγοντες ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι καὶ ὁ καθὼς "γνικε. μὴ [οὖν] πορευθήσεται ὅπως αὐτῶν.

ὅταν δὲ ἀκούσῇ πολέμους καὶ ἀκαταστασίας, μὴ ἄποφθεγγετε

ἃ δὲ γὰρ ταῦτα γενέσθαι πρῶτον, ἀλλὰ οὐκ εὐθὺς τὸ τέλος.

ὁτί ἐλεγεν αὐτῶν Ἑιθὸς ἐπὶ θεοῦ καὶ βασιλείᾳ ἐπὶ βασιλείᾳ,

ἐφεσσιν τοὺς καὶ λυμοὶ ἑσονται, ἄφθοντα ταῦτα

κατὰ τότος καὶ λυμοὶ καὶ λυμοὶ ἑσονται, ἀφθοντα ταῦτα

καὶ σημεῖα ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ μεγάλα ἔσται.

ἐπὶ τούτων ἀπαντῶν ἐπὶ βασιλείας ἐφ' ἑαυτούς τὰς χειρας αὐτῶν καὶ

διοικούσι, γεγονότασι ἐς συναγωγας καὶ ἀφθονοι διώκουσι

ἀγομένους ἐπὶ βασιλείᾳ καὶ ἱγμονας, ἐνεκεν τοῦ ὀνόματος τούτων.

ἀποφθέγγεται δὲ ὑμῖν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν.

θεοῦ καὶ βασιλείας ἐπὶ βασιλείᾳ, ἔσσωμεν τοὺς καὶ λυμοὶ ἑσονται, ἀφθονοὶ ταῦτα

καὶ σημεῖα ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ μεγάλα ἔσται.

ἐπὶ τούτων ἀπαντῶν ἐπὶ βασιλείας ἐφ' ἑαυτούς τὰς χειρας αὐτῶν καὶ

διοικούσι, γεγονότασι ἐς συναγωγας καὶ ἀφθονοι διώκουσι

ἀγομένους ἐπὶ βασιλείᾳ καὶ ἱγμονας, ἐνεκεν τοῦ ὀνόματος τούτων.

ἀποφθέγγεται δὲ ὑμῖν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν.

ἀποφθέγγεται δὲ ὑμῖν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν.

ἀποφθέγγεται δὲ ὑμῖν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν.

ἀποφθέγγεται δὲ ὑμῖν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν.

ἀποφθέγγεται δὲ ὑμῖν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν.

ἀποφθέγγεται δὲ ὑμῖν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν.

ἀποφθέγγεται δὲ ὑμῖν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν.

ἀποφθέγγεται δὲ ὑμῖν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν.

ἀποφθέγγεται δὲ ὑμῖν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν.

ἀποφθέγγεται δὲ ὑμῖν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν.

ἀποφθέγγεται δὲ ὑμῖν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν.

ἀποφθέγγεται δὲ ὑμῖν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν.

ἀποφθέγγεται δὲ ὑμῖν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν.

ἀποφθέγγεται δὲ ὑμῖν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν.

ἀποφθέγγεται δὲ ὑμῖν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν.

ἀποφθέγγεται δὲ ὑμῖν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν.

ἀποφθέγγεται δὲ ὑμῖν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν.

ἀποφθέγγεται δὲ ὑμῖν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν.

ἀποφθέγγεται δὲ ὑμῖν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν.

ἀποφθέγγεται δὲ ὑμῖν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν.

ἀποφθέγγεται δὲ ὑμῖν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν.

ἀποφθέγγεται δὲ ὑμῖν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν.

ἀποφθέγγεται δὲ ὑμῖν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν.

ἀποφθέγγεται δὲ ὑμῖν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν.

ἀποφθέγγεται δὲ ὑμῖν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν.

ἀποφθέγγεται δὲ ὑμῖν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν.

ἀποφθέγγεται δὲ ὑμῖν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν.

ἀποφθέγγεται δὲ ὑμῖν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν.

ἀποφθέγγεται δὲ ὑμῖν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν.

ἀποφθέγγεται δὲ ὑμῖν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν.

ἀποφθέγγεται δὲ ὑμῖν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν.

ἀποφθέγγεται δὲ ὑμῖν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν.

ἀποφθέγγεται δὲ ὑμῖν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν.

ἀποφθέγγεται δὲ ὑμῖν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν.

ἀποφθέγγεται δὲ ὑμῖν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν.

ἀποφθέγγεται δὲ ὑμῖν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν.
A BCD G

γικε την ε' ἐρήμωσιν αυτής.

21. τοις οι εἰς τῇ Ιουδαίᾳ φευγότας εἰς τὰ ὄρη, καὶ οἱ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῆς ἐκχωρείσαν,

22. ὡς οἱ τὰς χωρίας μὴ εἰςερχόμενοι εἰς αυτήν.

23. ἔσται γὰρ ἀνάγκη μεγάλη ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ ὁργή ἐπὶ τὸ

24. λαῷ τοῦ ἤτοι, καὶ οἱ στροφαὶ μαχαίρως καὶ τὰ

25. πατούμεναι ὑπὸ ἐθνῶν, * m ἀχρί ν πληρωθῆναι

{Luke follows a later modification of the tradition, ex events, Meyer (! !) ;—similarly De Wette.—13. εἰς μαρτ. viz. of your faithfulness; and (Mark), αὐτοῖς, against them. —18. Luke only. ἀντων. corresponds to στόμα, ἀντιστ. to σοφία. —18. kal.—'non modo ab alienia,' Bengel.—θαν. ἐξ ὑμῶν of the Apostles. One of the four who heard this discourse was put to death, Acts xii. 2. —18. Not literally, but really true; not corporeally, but in that real and only life which the disciple of Christ possesses. —19.} By your endurance (of all these things), possess ye your souls: this endurance being God's appointed way, in (in and by) which, your salvation is to be put in your possession. —κτήσει. Matt. xvi. 26. —σωτήρ, Luke ix. 24. —30. κυρία, not circumdari, but participial, graphically setting forth the scene before them, as it should then appear. On the variation of expression from Matt. and Mark, see note on Matt. ver. 16. —31.] αὐτῆς belongs to the αὐτοῦ of ver. 20, and signifies not Judea, but Jerusalem. —τὰς. —29.] ἀμαρτ. a hint perhaps at ch. xviii. 3. The latter part of the verse alludes probably to the prophecy of Daniel, which Luke has omitted, but referred to in ἡ ἐρήμωσις αὐτῆς. ver. 20. —33.] ἐν τῇ γεν. general—νῶ ο. τ. ν., particular. The distress on all the earth is not so distinctly the result of the Divine anger, as that which shall befall this nation. —34.] A most important addition, serving to fix the meaning of the other two Evangelists,—see note there,—and carrying on the prophetic announcement, past our own times, even close to the days of the end. —κυρία, viz. this
καιροὶ ἔθνων, καὶ ἐστὶν σημεία ἐν ἥλιῳ καὶ σελήνῃ ἀβεβαιοτάτος καὶ ἀκορασιάς, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς συννοχὴ ἔθνων ἐν ἀπορία, ἡ ἥχος τῆς βαλασίας καὶ τὸ ὀνόματι, ἀποφυγόμενοι ἀνθρώπων ἀπὸ φόβου καὶ προδοκίας τῶν ἐπερχόμενων τῇ οἰκομενῇ αἰ γὰρ δυνάμεις τῶν ὀφειλομένων σαλαβοῦνται. καὶ τότε ὄντων τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου εὑρόμενον ἐν φερεξεῖ μετὰ δυνάμεις καὶ δοξῆς πολλῆς ἀρχηγοῦντες τοὺς γίνεσαι, ἀνακύπτει καὶ ἐπι- ἀρατείς τὰς κεφαλὰς υἱῶν, διὸ ἐγίνετε ἡ ἀπολύτρωσις υἱῶν. καὶ παραβολὴν αὐτῶν. ἢ ἴδετε τὴν σκύλην καὶ πάντα τὰ δέντρα. οὕτως καὶ ρηματικῶν ἐφέ αὐτῶν γινόμενα ὡς ἐγγὺς τὸ θέρος ἐστὶν. ὦτῳ καὶ ύμεῖς ὄταν ἰδήτε ταῦτα γινόμενα, γινόμενα ὡς ἐγγὺς ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ. ἄρην λέγω υἱῶν ὧν μὴ παρέλθῃ τῇ γενεᾷ αὕτη ἐως ἂν πάντα γενήσεται. ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ παρελθείσαι ναί, διὸ λογία μοι μὴ παρέλθσαι. προσέχει δὲ αὐτοὶ, μήτοτε ἡ βαρυνθήσαντι υἱῶν αἱ καρδίαι ἐν ἀκαταλακτικῇ καὶ μυθῷ καὶ μερίμναις βιωτικαῖς, καὶ αἰθίδοις εὐμεσά ἐπίστη τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἑκείνῃ, ὡς παγις ἡ γᾶρ ἐπελεύεται τῶν πάντων τῶν καθημένων εἰπὶ πρὸς ὁπον πάσης τῆς γῆς. ἀγρυπνήσατε ὡς ἐν παντὶ καρπῷ δόμενους ἐνα καταζωοθετεῖ ἐκφυγεῖν ταῦτα πάντα ἡμᾶς ἀρνοῦντα γίνεσθαι, καὶ ἡ σταθῆναι ἐμπροσθοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

ΚΑΤΑ ΛΟΥΚΑΝ.

Διέθεσε έν τῷ ιερῷ διδάσκων, τάς δὲ νύκτας εξεργάζομεν ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦ Ελαίων. καὶ πάς ὁ λαὸς ἐφοβήττε οὓς αὐτούς ἐν τῷ ιερῷ ἀκούειν αὐτούς. 

Διέθεσε δὲ ἡ ἁγισμὴ τῶν ἀξίων ἡ λειμπρομένη πάσα. καὶ εἴητον οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς 

ΛΑΟΝ ὁ Ἱσαάκιτὴν, ὡς τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ τῶν δώδεκα 

καὶ ἀπέλθων 

συνελάβας τοὺς ἁρχιερείς καὶ τοὺς στρατηγοὺς 

καὶ εὐαγγελισά, καὶ συνέβην αὐτῷ ἁργύριον δοῦναι

καὶ εἰς 

ἐμολογοῦσιν, καὶ εἴητε ῥειχαινιὸν τοῦ παραδοθήναι αὐτοὺς

τῇ τοῦ οἶκου ἢ χολοῦ. Ἡ ΚΑΤΑΛ ἡ ἤμερα τῶν ἀξίων.

d — here only. see Matt. al. 36. i Chron. vi. 4. c — only. Ps. lx. 9. Macc. xii. 49. b Cor. ix. 6. Rom. xv. 28. g ver. 26 only. 3 Macc. xii. 16. h — Acts xiv. 18.

καταξιοθ. κατασχήνευτο Β Λ. 6 Copt. Αθ. — for σταθήσαν, στήσωσι D ad pres. — 37. τὰς δὲ νῦν ἢ τις om. D.

C HAP. XXII. 2. for ἀνήλ. ἀπολήθησαν D — for γὰρ, δὲ D 26 syr. al. — 3. bef. 

syr. om. οὐ A D C K L M P S V 21 all. Orig. ins. B U — καλοκαίριν Β Δ L X 3 al. — 


καὶ οἰκίας. Ε. κ. διμολ. P. τὰ τῆς ἀπαθείας ἤκραμμα A B v — ἡ ἄκραμμα P BC — αὐτοὺς om. D. a. — 7. bef. ἡμισ. to be insisted on. It is plural, because the ἁγισμὴ are plural. — 25. 26. 27. The greater part 

of these signs are peculiar to Luke. — kal 

bef. οὐκένοι — vocem angustiorem annexit 

λατιν. Kyriak (in Meyer). — The same may 

be said of the kal bef. προέκοψ. in ver. 26 

— 28. ἐκαστ. i.e. ' the completion of it 

by my appearing.' — 24. 25. 26. Peculiar to 

Luke. — παραδοθήσονται ἢ δοθήσονται, are emphatic, recalling the thoughts to themselves, after 

the recounting of these outward signs. — 

35. There is meaning in καθισμ. — ' sitting 

seriously.' — 36. σταθήσον, to be set, i.e. by 

the angels — see Matt. ver. 31. — before 

the glorified Son of Man.

37. 38. Peculiar to Luke. These verses 

close the scene of the Lord's discourses in 

Jerusalem which began ch. xxi. 1. It does 

not appear, as Meyer will have it, that Luke 

believed the Lord to have taught after this 

in the temple. Nothing is said to imply 

— a general closing formula like this ap 

plies to what has been related. — 38. 39. δὲ 

ἐπιστ. is literal, — not figurative, ' came eagerly,' as 

De Wette, &c. think, from several places 

in the LXX. There is no occasion for a 

figure here. — Luke appears to know nothing 

of any visits to Bethany. He has the name 

incidentally only in ch. xix. 29 and ch. 

xxiv. 50, where see note. — Here some MSS. 

insert the much controverted passage of 

John, ch. viii., — the history of the woman 

taken in adultery. — On the whole question 

regarding it, see notes there.


Mark xiv. 1. 2. The account of Matt. is 

the fullest; — see notes there. The words 

here give us a mere compendium of what 


10. 11. Our account is strikingly partic 

ular and independent of the others. The 

expression ἐστιν ἢ τὸ σταθήσατο is peculiar to Luke: the others 

have merely the chief priests. — On σταθή 

σι, see Acts iv. 1. The Levitical guard of 

the temple would be consulted, because it had 

been of late especially in the temple that 

the Lord had become obnoxious to them 

(see ver. 83). The words σταθήσατο and 

ἐγερμοῦνται seem clearly to imply that 

the money was not now paid, but afterwards, 

when the treachery was accomplished; — see 

note on Matt. xxvi. 15. — ἄκραμμα = καθι 

σμάντος, Theophyl. or perhaps χωρίς θο 

ρόβου, Euthym. 

G g
7—14.] Matt. xxvi. 17—19. Mark xiv. 15—16. Our account is the fullest of the three, related however nearly to Mark's—
17 μεθ' υμών πρὸ τοῦ με παθεῖν. —it was the solemn message, and in the report of Matthew the suggestion is repre-
18 και ἐκεῖ οὐκέτι. —it was that particular Passover, not merely the Passover generally, —or was in the kingdom of God. And to this fulfillment the Lord alludes again in ver. 30, ἵνα ἔσθητε καὶ πάντες ἐκ τῆς τρο-
19 ησαίων. οὐ εἰσόδευε. 11 καὶ ἐξέτει τῷ οἴκοις τῆς ὀικίας. 12 καὶ ἔτην αὐτῶν. 13 ἀπελθόντες 14 διδάσκαλος αὐτῶν. 15 καὶ ἔτην αὐτῶν. 16 διὰ τοῦτο. 17 ἔσταν ἦν ἀκοὐσόμενον. 18 αὐτῶν. 19 ὀν καὶ ὁ ὈΡΕΙΣΤΟΣ 17 καὶ ἐξένει τῷ 18 αὐτών. 19 αὐτῶν. 20 καὶ ὁ ὈΡΕΙΣΤΟΣ 21 αὐτών. 22 καὶ ὁ ὈΡΕΙΣΤΟΣ 23 αὐτών. 24 καὶ ὁ ὈΡΕΙΣΤΟΣ 25 αὐτών. 26 καὶ ὁ ὈΡΕΙΣΤΟΣ 27 αὐτών. 28 καὶ ὁ ὈΡΕΙΣΤΟΣ 29 αὐτών. 30 καὶ ὁ ὈΡΕΙΣΤΟΣ 31 αὐτών. 32 καὶ ὁ ὈΡΕΙΣΤΟΣ 33 αὐτών. 34 καὶ ὁ ὈΡΕΙΣΤΟΣ 35 αὐτών. 36 καὶ ὁ ὈΡΕΙΣΤΟΣ 37 αὐτών. 38 καὶ ὁ ὈΡΕΙΣΤΟΣ 39 αὐτών. 40 καὶ ὁ ὈΡΕΙΣΤΟΣ 41 αὐτών. 42 καὶ ὁ ὈΡΕΙΣΤΟΣ 43 αὐτών. 44 καὶ ὁ ὈΡΕΙΣΤΟΣ 45 αὐτών. 46 καὶ ὁ ὈΡΕΙΣΤΟΣ 47 αὐτών. 48 καὶ ὁ ὈΡΕΙΣΤΟΣ 49 αὐτών. 50 καὶ ὁ ὈΡΕΙΣΤΟΣ 51 αὐτών. 52 καὶ ὁ ὈΡΕΙΣΤΟΣ 53 αὐτών. 54 καὶ ὁ ὈΡΕΙΣΤΟΣ 55 αὐτών. 56 καὶ ὁ ὈΡΕΙΣΤΟΣ 57 αὐτών. 58 καὶ ὁ ὈΡΕΙΣΤΟΣ 59 αὐτών. 60 καὶ ὁ ὈΡΕΙΣΤΟΣ 61 αὐτών. 62 καὶ ὁ ὈΡΕΙΣΤΟΣ 63 αὐτών. 64 καὶ ὁ ὈΡΕΙΣΓΟΣ.
ABCD εν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ. 17 καὶ ἐδέξαμεν  
ποτήριον εὐχαριστίας εἰς Δάβετο τούτο καὶ διαμερι-
σατε ἵνα τούτο δοθῇ. 18 λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐ μὴ πῖον ἀπὸ τοῦ  
γεννήματος τῆς ἀμπελου ἴνα ἔσω οὗ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ  
θεοῦ ἔλθῃ. 19 Καὶ λαβὼν ἠρων εὐχαριστίας ἕκλαν  
καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ λέγων Τούτῳ ἕστι τὸ σῶμα μου τὸ  
ὐπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον τοῦτο ποιεῖτε ἵνα τὴν  
εἰς τὴν ἀνάμνησιν. 20 ὦσάνων καὶ τὸ ποτήριον μετὰ τὸ  
διατηρῆσαι, λέγων Τούτῳ τὸ ποτήριον ἥ  
δια θυσία ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ λέγων Τούτῳ τὸ εἰς τὴν  
διατήρησαν, μετὰ τοῦ παραδόθηκαν μετὰ ἐμου  
τηρεῖται. 22 καὶ ὁ μῖν νῦς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπορεύεται  
κατὰ τὸ ὑπὲρ μὲν εἰς τὸν ἀνθρώπον ἐκείνον ἕ 
ου παραδόθηκαν. 23 καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔπραξαν λήμμα ἐπὶ  
τῆς ἀρά εἰς τοῦτο μέλλουν

parable Matt. xxii. 1—14 in its ultimate application refers: nor can we help thinking on the faithless apostle at this very supper, in vv. 11—13:—see notes there. 17. Some (e.g. De Wette) suppose that it is here implied that the Lord did not drink of the cup Himself. But surely this cannot be so. The two members of the speech are strictly parallel: and if he desired to eat the Passover with them, He would also drink of the cup, which formed a usual part of the ceremonial. This seems to me to be implied in δὲ άφησεν: λαβὼν is the word used by all afterwords, when He did not partake of the bread and wine. This most important addition in our narrative, amounts I believe to a solemn declaration of the fulfilment of the Passover rite, in both its usual divisions,—the eating of the flesh of the lamb, and drinking the cup of thanksgiving. Henceforward, He who fulfilled the Law for man will no more eat and drink of it. I remark this, in order further to observe that this division of the cup is not only not identical with, but has no reference to, the subsequent one in ver. 20. That was the institution of a new rite,—this the abrogation of an old one, now fulfilled, or about to be so, in the person of the true Lamb of God.—This is generally supposed to have been the first cup in the Passover-meal, with which the whole was introduced. On the possible connexion of this speech of the Lord with the celebration of the Passover at this particular time, see note on Matt. xxvi. 17. After these verses, in order of time, follows the washing of the disciples' feet in John xiii. 1—20, referred to in our ver. 27.

21—23. See notes on Matt. xxvi. 21—25. I would not venture absolutely to maintain that this announcement is identical with that one; but I own the arguments of Stier and others to prove them distinct, fail to convince me.
expression πληθωρικας bears marks of verbal accuracy, and inclines us to believe that this announcement was made after the institution of the cup, as here related. 'Notwithstanding this My declaration of love, in giving My Body and Blood for you, there is one here present who shall betray Me.'—εἰς τ. τρ. viz. in dipping into the dish with the Lord.

24—30.] Without attempting to decide the question whether this incident is strictly narrated in order of time, or identical with one of those strifes on this point related Matt. xviii. 1. xx. 20, I will offer one or two marks on it as it here stands. (1) Its having happened at this time is not altogether unaccountable. They had been just inquiring among themselves (ver. 23), who among them should do this thing. May it not reasonably be supposed, that some of them (Judas at least) would be anxiously employed in self-justification, and that this would lead, in some part of the table, to a dispute of the kind here introduced? The natural effect of the Lord’s rebuke would be to give rise to a different spirit among them, and that this would lead, in some part of the table, to a dispute of the kind here introduced. Whether this answer is the offspring of this better mind;—but see note on Matt. v. 20—25. (2) That it is surprising to find the very declaration of the Lord on the former strifes related in this Gospel (ch. ix. 46—48), repeated as having been made at this Paschal meal,—by John xiii. 20. May not this lead us to suppose that there has been a transposition of some of the circumstances regarding these various contentions among the apostles, and that these words occurring in John may possibly point to a strife of this kind? (3) The αὐτῷ in μίσος ὑμῶν ως ὁ διακόνων is too clear an allusion to the washing of their feet by the Lord, to have escaped even those Commentators who are slow to discern such hints (e. g. De Wette). The appeal, if it had taken place, is natural and intelligible; but not otherwise. (4) The diction is repeatedly allusive to their then employment;—αὐτῷ—στιχεῖαν καὶ πίνειν—ἐν τῷ βασιλείῳ μου—these have reference to things present, or words spoken, during that meal. I therefore infer that the strife did happen at this time, in the order related here.—25.] see on Matt. xx. The expression here of ἐπ" αὐτῷ εἰς κ. κ. κ. also seems to be connected with what had just taken place. 'Among them the εὐρηγίαι are those who ἐξουσιάζουσιν αὐτῶν—but among you, I, your εὐρηγίας (see vv. 19, 20, ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, his), do not so, but am in the midst of you as your servant.—Prolemy εὐρηγίας at once occurs to us;—numerous other examples are given by Wetstein. —26.] οὖν, i. e. ἐστάλοντος.—27.] compare John xiii. 13—17.—28.] These words could hardly have been spoken except on this occasion, when τά πιστά ἤμων τέλος ἔχει, ver. 37.—29, 30.] see above, and note on Matt. xix. 28, see also Rev. ii. 27. The word βασιλείαν
belongs to both verbs—not, 'I appoint to you (as my Father hath appointed to me a kingdom) that ye &c.' but, 'I appoint to you, as my Father hath appointed to me, a kingdom, that ye &c.'—cp. τὰ τρία τερπέσθαι, see above ver. 21, and note on ver. 16.

31—34.] I cannot help believing that here again Luke's narrative proceeds continuously. There are marks in these words of the Lord, of close connexion with what has gone before. His way which the Father bideth to Him, is to His kingdom—but it is through πιστευμι. To these, who have been with Him in these trials, He saith, 'I will be with you always,'—but His way to it must be their way,—and here is the πιστευμι,—the sifting as wheat. The sudden address to Simon may perhaps have been occasioned by some remark of his,—or, which I think more probable, may have been made after a slight pause, in consequence of some part taken by him in the preceding strife for precedence. Such sudden and earnest addresses spring forth from deep love and concern awakened for another. ἐγωμὲν not only 'hast desired to have you,' E. V., but 'hast obtained you;'—his desire is granted.—παρέμενε—all. This must include Judas, though it does not follow that he was present.—The sifting separated the chaff from the wheat, which chaff he was, see Amos ix. 9.—33.] ἢςκόλις, τὸν σοῦ. As Peter was the foremost, (the rest are here addressed through him,) so he was in the greatest danger. It must not be supposed that the Lord's prayer was not heard, because Peter's faith did fail in his denial; ἐκλήσια implies a total extinction (see reff.) which Peter's faith did not suffer.—Although the ὑπὸ included Judas, he is not included in the prayer;—see John xvii. 6—12. We may notice here, that the Lord speaks of the total failure of even an Apostle's faith, as possible.—Ἐπεκτόκας. There can, I think, be little doubt that this word is here used in the general N. T. sense, of returning as a penitent after sin,—turning to God,—and not in the almost expletive meaning which it has in such passages as Psa. cxxvi. 6, ὁ θάνατος, σὺ πεπεράσασμαι ζωώς ἡμᾶς (although even here it may have a somewhat similar sense to the above—see Acts vii. 42).—στάμνων.] The use of this word thrice by Peter in his two epistles (see reff.), and in the first passage in a connexion with the mention of Satan's temptations, is remarkable.—33, 34.] Whether these words are in close connexion with the preceding, may I think he doubted. They may represent the same reply of the Lord as we have recorded in John xiii. 38.

—One thing seems clear, without any attempt at minutely harmonizing: that two very different professions of his. This,—during the last meal, i.e. before going out, and occasioned by Peter's professed readiness to go to prison and to death (＝ to lay down his life) for and with the Lord—the other,—on the way to the Mount of Olives, after the declaration that all should be offended, and occasioned by Peter's profession that though all should be offended, yet would not be. Nothing is more natural or common than the repetition, by the warm-hearted and ardent, of professions like these, in spite of warning:—and when De Wette calls such an interpretation 'eine Ρήξηίζειε,' all that we can say is, to disclaim any wish to clear up difficulties, except by going into their depths and examining them honestly and diligently. If the above view be correct, I conceive that the account in John of this profession and the Lord's answer, being in strict coherence, and arising out of the subject of conversation, must be taken as the exact one: and Luke must be sup-
posed to have inserted them here without being aware of the intermediate remarks which led to them.

38–39.] Peculiar to Luke. The meaning of the Lord in this much controverted passage appears to be, to forewarn the Apostles of the outward dangers which will await them henceforward in their mission.—Unlike the time when He sent them forth without earthly appliances, upheld by His special Providence, they must now make use of common resources for sustenance, yet and even of the sword itself for defence. This they misunderstand, and point to the two swords which they have for defence,—for which they are rebuked (see below).—36.—see ch. x. 4. ix. 3, also Matt. x. 9.—38.] ἐκραύγασεν was the very word used in the prohibition before.—There is a question what should be supplied after μὴ ἐχων. Very many authorities make μάχαραν understood (as in E. V.);—but the simpler construction and better sense is to place μὴ ἐχων in contrast with ἐχων. He who has a purse, &c., and he who has none, let him &c.” see reff. Thus the sense will be complete—for he who has a purse, can buy a sword without selling his garment.—μάχαρα must be here used in the sense of a sword.—compare ver. 49:— and not a knife to eat with, which some have understood. The ‘sword of the Spirit’ (Olahhausen and others) is wholly out of the question. The saying is both a description to them of their altered situation with reference to the world without, and a declaration that self-defence and self-provision would henceforward be necessary. It forms a decisive testimony, from the mouth of the Lord Himself, against the views of the Quakers and some other sects on these points. But it does not warrant aggression by Christians, nor spreading the Gospel by the sword.—37.] The connexion is this:—‘your situation among men will be one of neglect and even of danger;—for I Myself (see Matt. x. 24, 26) am about to be reckoned among transgressors.’—By the very form of the expression it is evident that the sword alluded to could have no reference to that night’s danger, or the defending Him from it.—τὰ ψαλιδία. The prophecy cited closes the section of Isaiah which eminently predicts the Lord’s sufferings (ch. ili. 13–iii. 13).—τὰ ψαλιδία does not merely mean ‘must be fulfilled,’ which would be an assertion without any special reference here,—but (as E. V.) ‘have an end;’—are coming to the completion of their accomplishment.—So τελεσθεναι, John xix. 30.—τὰ ψαλιδία—supply γεγραμμένα, or perhaps more generally, ‘determined in the counsel of God.’—38.] Two of them were armed,—either from excess of zeal to defend Him, excited by His announcement of His sufferings during this feast,—or perhaps because they had brought their weapons from Galilee as protection by the way. The road from Jericho to Jerusalem (see ch. x. 30) was much infested with robbers;—and it was the custom for the Priests, and even the quiet and ascetic Essenes, to carry weapons when travelling. Chrysostom (Hom. in Matt. lxxiv. p. 797 E) gives a curious explanation of the two swords: ἰδὼν οὖν καὶ μαχαίρας οίναι λατιν διά το ψαλιδίον. This certainly agrees with the number of the disciples sent to get ready the Passover: but it has nothing else to recommend it. They exhibit their swords, misunderstanding His words and supposing them to apply to that night. The Lord breaks off the matter with ἵκαρος ἐρει—
KATA DOYKAN.
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It is enough: not, they are sufficient;—but, it is well,—we are sufficiently provided—it was not to this that My words referred. The rebuke is parallel with, though milder than, the one in Mark viii. 17.—as the misunderstanding was somewhat similar.

39—46.] Matt. xxvi. 36—46. Mark xiv. 32—42. John xviii. 1. For all comment on the general narrative, see notes on Matthew. Our account is compendious, combines the three prayers of the Lord into one, and makes no mention of the Three Apostles being taken apart from the rest. On the other hand it inserts the very important additional details of vv. 43, 44, besides the particularity of ὑμῖν λίθου ἀκριβές, ver. 41.—42.] κ is not 'utinam,' but 'si,' and the sentence is broken off at ἐνδ ου. Some suppose ἐπερηκεῖτο to be an inf. for an imperative, but incorrectly.—43.] The omission of this and the following verse in A B, &c. may have arisen from doctrinal motives, as De Wette, &c. suppose: but this is an assumption with which we have no means of dealing, and the authority of ancient MSS. must weigh independently of it. See proleg. to various readings. If there be a question raised as to the source whence the account of the angelic appearance and the bloody sweat could be derived, I will only remark (1) that the same difficulty rests on several portions of our narrative; and (2) that the close agreement between Luke and Paul in the words of the institution of the Lord's Supper (compare vv. 19, 20 with 1 Cor. xi. 23—25) may perhaps indicate a source beyond human testimony; though I am far from supposing that Luke used this source considerably or continuously. The strengthening by means of the angel is physical—and the appearance likewise.—It is strange how Olausen can have so far deceived himself as to imagine that ἐγεῖνετο αὐτοῦ ὑμεῖς θρόμβοι can imply a merely inward and spiritual accession of strength from above. It is strange likewise that the analogy of the ministration of angels in the Lord's former temptation should not have occurred to those modern commentators who have objected to this circumstance as improbable. —This strengthening probably took place between the first and the second prayer;—and the effect of it is the εὐκατανεμηθέντων προσευχής of ver. 44., and the entire re-signation expressed in the second and third prayer of Matthew's narrative. —44.] The intention of the Evangelist seems clearly to be, to convey the idea that the sweat was (not fell like, but was) like drops of blood;—i.e. coloured with blood,—for so I understand the ὑμεῖς, as just distinguishing the drops highly coloured with blood, from pure blood. Aristotle, speaking of certain morbid states of the blood, says, ἐγκυαρυσμένον δὲ λιγα γενεται γαρ ἐν εχθρία, και διαβολοῦται, ὁδὲς ὑποκεισθαι τινες θέουν αμαρταν ἢ ἐκφοβον. Hist. Anim. iii. 19. To suppose that it only fell like drops of blood (why not drops of any thing else? and drops of blood from what, and where?) is to nullify the force of the sentence, and make the insertion of
11. εἰς τὴν γῆν. 45 καὶ ἀναστὰς ΑΒΔΩ ἀπὸ τῆς προαίοντος, ἐλθὼν πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς ἕφθασε· 46 καὶ εἰπεν αὐτοῖς ΑΒΔΩ: Τί καθεύθετε; ἔστάντες προεύχεσθε ἵνα μὴ ἄθλιτα εἰς περισσον.

47 ἐτὶ δὲ αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος ἢδον ὡχλος, καὶ ο λε- γόμενον Ἰουδαίος, εἰς τῶν δώδεκα, ἐπορηκτεύοντο αὐτῶν, καὶ ἤγγισε τοῦ Ἰσοῦ, φιλάσαι αὐτῶν. 48 ο δὲ Ἰσοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ Ἰουδαίος, φιλήματι τὸν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων παραδίδεις, εἶδοντες οἵ τε οἱ περὶ αὐτοῦ τὸ ἐσόμενον, εἶπον αὐτῷ Κύριε, εἰ πατάξωμεν ἐν μαχαίρᾳ; 50 καὶ ἐπέταξεν εἰς τοὺς τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ δούλου τοῦ ἀρχιμέρου, καὶ ἀφείλεν αὐτὸν τὸ όυς τὸ δείχνον. 51 ἀποκρίθησε δὲ ὁ Ἰσοῦς εἶπεν Εἴητε ἵνα τούτου καὶ ἀφάμενος τοῦ γινόμενος αὐτοῦ ἰάσασθαι αὐτοῦ. 52 εἶπε δὲ ὁ Ἰσοῦς πρὸς τοὺς παραγονομούσως ἐπὶ αὐτῶν ἀρχιμέρους καὶ ἅμαινοντος τοῦ ἱεροῦ καὶ προσβυτηρίους, ὡς ἐπὶ ἀργατὴν ἐξαλάθατο μιτᾷ μαγαίρων καὶ κύκλωμι. 53 καθ' ἡμᾶς ἄνόητος μοι μεθ' ὑμῶν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ οὐκ ἔξετενίται τὰς χεῖρας ἐπὶ ἑμῖν ἀλλ' αὐτὴ ὑμῶν ἐστίν ἡ ὁμα καὶ ἡ ἐξουσία τοῦ κυρίου.
45.—62. KATA DOUKAN.

54. [Matt. xxvi. 55—57. Mark xiv. 15.] Our narrative leaves it undecided who this high-priest was,—inasmuch as, ch. iii. 2, Annas and Caiaphas are mentioned as high-priests. From John we find that it was Annas,—who having questioned Jesus, sent Him bound to Caiaphas, before whom His trial took place. Luke omits this trial altogether—or perhaps gives the substance of it in the account (vv. 66—71) of the morning assembly of the Sanhedrin. See notes on Matt.

55—59.] Matt. xxvi. 57. Mark xiv. 15. Our narrative leaves it undecided who this high-priest was,—inasmuch as, ch. iii. 2, Annas and Caiaphas are mentioned as high-priests. From John we find that it was Annas,—who having questioned Jesus, sent Him bound to Caiaphas, before whom His trial took place. Luke omits this trial altogether—or perhaps gives the substance of it in the account (vv. 66—71) of the morning assembly of the Sanhedrin. See notes on Matt.

56. [Matt. xxvi. 57. Mark xiv. 15.] Our narrative leaves it undecided who this high-priest was,—inasmuch as, ch. iii. 2, Annas and Caiaphas are mentioned as high-priests. From John we find that it was Annas,—who having questioned Jesus, sent Him bound to Caiaphas, before whom His trial took place. Luke omits this trial altogether—or perhaps gives the substance of it in the account (vv. 66—71) of the morning assembly of the Sanhedrin. See notes on Matt.

57. [Matt. xxvi. 57. Mark xiv. 15.] Our narrative leaves it undecided who this high-priest was,—inasmuch as, ch. iii. 2, Annas and Caiaphas are mentioned as high-priests. From John we find that it was Annas,—who having questioned Jesus, sent Him bound to Caiaphas, before whom His trial took place. Luke omits this trial altogether—or perhaps gives the substance of it in the account (vv. 66—71) of the morning assembly of the Sanhedrin. See notes on Matt.
We need not inquire, how the Lord could hear what was going on round the fire in the court, as some commentators have done. But even were such an inquiry necessary, I see no difficulty in answering it. The anathemas of Peter, spoken to oi παρατώρεις with vehemence, and the crowing of the cock,—were not these audible? But the Lord needed not these to attract His attention.

68—69.] Luke does not, as some commentators say, place this mocking before the trial in Caiphas’s house, but in the same place as Matt. xv. 67, 68, and Mark ver. 65, viz. after what happened there. The trial he omits altogether,—having found no report of it. How those who take this view of Luke’s arrangement can yet suppose him to have had Matt. and Mark before him while writing, I am wholly at a loss to conceive.

69—71.] (probably) Matt. xxvi. 59—66. Mark xiv. 65—64. I must own that Säfer, with all his discovery of meaning and particular in each word here related, has failed entirely to convince me that Luke here gives us a second and formal judgment held in the morning. I still incline to the belief that this hearing is identical with that related in Matt. xxvi. and Mark xiv., as taking place before Caiphas. The similarity of the things said is surely too striking for us to imagine them said twice over: and we must also bear in mind how generally unprecise as to arrangement the narrative of Luke in this part of the Gospel history has been, and not attribute to it a precision here which demonstrably it had not before. I believe the grand mistake here, as so often, has arisen from supposing Luke to have had the other Gospels before him, in which case it became necessary to assign this narrative its particular place, according to the supplementary theory.—69.] δύναμεν το θεόν. Some trace of a meeting of the Sanhedrim after daylight I believe our Evangelist to have found, see Matt. xxvii. 1—and to have therefore related as then happening, the following account of what really took place at the former meeting.—λέγοντες—but first took place the μαρτυρία referred to in ver. 71; and the person who said this was the high-priest, and with an adjuration, Matt. ver. 63. —67.] The ordinary rendering is the most natural and correct: if thou art (not if thou be) the Christ, tell us. The others, ‘Tell us whether thou be the Christ;’ and, ‘Art thou the Christ? tell us’ (see the question in ver. 49), are forced and unusual.—68.] I believe these words to have been said as a formal protest on the part of the Lord against the spirit and tendency of the question asked Him, before He gives an answer to it: and as such, I regard them as an original and most valuable report.—It is with no view to examine and believe that you ask this question: nor, were I to attempt to educe from your own mouths my innocence, would you answer Me, nor let Me go. I am well aware of the intention of this question; but (πάντες, Matt. ver. 64) the time is come for the confession to be made:—ἀνέσκη τού πάντες.

3. τ. Ἰνν. is common to all three only Luke adds τοῦ Θεοῦ.—On ἄνευ τ. τ. v. see notes on Matt. — 70.] We find ὅ τις τ. θ. used as synonymous with ὅ ὅλ. τ. ἀνεξ. καθ. ἐκ 8. τῆς θεοῦ τοῦ Θ. i.e. with the glorified Messiah.—On ὑπ. λευ. . . . see note on Matt. ver. 64. — 71.] How would it have been impossible that these words should have been said, if no μαρτυρία had been brought forward at this examination, and if the very same question had been asked under the termination of the former one?

CHAP. XXIII. 1.—5.] Matt. xxvi. 1. 11—14. Mark xv. 1—5. John xvii. 25—38. Our account, not entering at length into the words said, gives a particular and original narrative of the things transacted at this interview. — 2.] This charge was intended to represent the result of their previous judgment, ἐφορέσων, whereas in fact no such matter had been before them: but they falsely allege it before Pilate, knowing that it was on the point on which his judgment was likely to be most severe. The words themselves which they use are not so false, as the spirit, and impression which they convey. The καθότα ποτι. Φ. 552. was, however, false entirely, and is just one of those instances where those who are determined to effect their purpose by falsehood do so, in spite of the facts having been precisely the contrary to that which they assert. — 3.] This question is related in the four Gospels. But in John the answer is widely different from the distinct affirmation in the other three, amounting perhaps to it in substance—at all events affirming that He was 'a King,' which was the form of their charge. I believe therefore that the three give merely the general import of the Lord's answer, which John relates in full. It is hardly possible, if Jesus had affirmed the fact so strongly and barely as the three relate it, that Pilate should have made the avowal in ver. 4, which John completely explains. — 4.] The preceding question had been asked within the praetorium—a fact of which our narrator is not aware, representing the whole as a continuous conversation in presence of the Jews; see John ver. 38. We may remark (and on this see Matt. ver. 18. Mark ver. 10) that Pilate must have known well that a man who had really done that, whereof Jesus was accused, would be no such object of hatred to the Sanhedrin. This knowledge was doubtless accompanied (as the above cited verses imply) with a previous acquaintance with some of the sayings and doings of Jesus, from which Pilate had probably formed his own opinion that He was no such King as His foes would represent Him. This is now confirmed by His own words (as related by John); and Pilate wishes to dismiss Him, finding no fault in Him.— 5.] Possibly they thought of the matter mentioned ch. xiii. 1, in introducing Galilee into their
καθ’ ὁλης τῆς Ἰουδαίας, ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλι-λαίας ἢ ἠς ἀντί. 6 Πιλάτος δὲ ἀκούσας Γαλιλαίαν ἐπιρρωτήσαν ἤ ἀνθρώπους Γαλαλλίος ἐστι, καὶ ἐπιγνώσες ὅτι ἐκ τῆς ἐξουσίας Ἰρωθοῦ ἡταῖν, ἀνέπεμψεν αὐτὸν πρὸς Ἰρωθήν, ὅταν καὶ αὐτὸν ἐν Ἰεροσολύμως ἐν ταύταις ταῖς ἡμέραις. 7 ὁ δὲ Ἰρωθὸς ἠδον τῶν Ἰσραήλ ἐξ ὀρθίης λαῶν. 8 ἦν γὰρ θέλων ἐς ἵκανον ἵδειν αὐτὸν διὰ τὸ ἀκούσαν πολλὰ περὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἠπείξε τις ἰσχεῖαν τίνι ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ γινόμενον. 9 ἐπιρράτα δὲ αὐτῶν ἐν ἔναν λόγον ἵκανοι, αὐτὸς δὲ οὐδὲν ἀπεριγνωσαν αὐτῷ.

10 οὗτοι δὲ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς ἀνυψωσαν τὴν ἡμέραν ἑνὸς τοὺς σφαγεμενίν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐμπαιξάς, ἐν παραβάλοις αὐτῶν ἑπιστήμης λαμπράν, ἀνέπεμψεν αὐτὸν τῷ Πιλάτῳ. 11 ἐγενότο ἐς φίλοις τοῖς Πιλάτος καὶ Ἰρωθὸς ἐν αὐτῷ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐν ἐν αὐτῷ ἐν ἐν ἐν ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ μετὰ ἀλλήλων. 12 ἐπευγενοῦσαν γὰρ ἐν ἐν ἐν ἐν ἐν Ξεφρά xiii. 28.

by his treatment of Him, shows that he thought Him beneath his judicial notice.—This remission of Jesus to Herod seems not to have been known to either of the other three Evangelists. It is worthy of notice that they all relate the mocking by the soldiers of Pilate, which Luke omits,—whereas he gives it as taking place before Herod. This is one of the very few cases where the nature of the history shows that both happened.—Let the student ask himself, How could John, if he composed his Gospel with that of Luke before him, have here given us a narrative in which so important a fact as this is not only not related, but absolutely cannot find any place of insertion? Its real place is after John ver. 38;—but obviously nothing was further from the mind of that Evangelist, for he represents Pilate as speaking continuously.——13 ff.] The second declaration of the Lord’s innocence by Pilate,—in John’s account united with the first, ver. 38. In the three first Gospels, as asserted in our ver. 14, the questioning takes place in the presence of the Jews; not so, however, in John (see xviii. 28).——15.] and www. aînôs—is done by him—not to him—see ch. xxiv. 35, kyvôsion aînôs.——16.] ‘Hic cepit nimium concedere Pilatus.’ Bengel. If there were no fault in Him, why should He be corrected at all?—The Jews perceive their advantage, and from this moment follow it up.——17—25.] Matt. xxvii. 15—26. Mark xv. 6—15. John xviii. 38, 40. Our account, while entirely distinct in form from the others, is in substance nearly allied to
there. In a few points it approaches John very nearly, comp. ver. 18 with John ver. 40, also Isa ver. 17 with John ver. 39. — 33.] κατὰ γὰρ χρισμὸν — got the upper hand, prevailed. see ref. — 35.] τῶν ὀνόματων λαοῦ. The description is inserted for the sake of contrast; — see Acts iii. 14. Luke omits the scourging and mocking of Jesus. It is just possible that he might have omitted the mocking, because he had related a similar incident before Herod: but how shall we say this of the scourging, if he had seen any narratives which contained it? The break between vv. 25 and 26 is harsh in the extreme, and if Luke could have filled it up, I have no doubt he would.

26—33.] Matt. xxvii. 31—34. Mark xv. 26—23. John xix. 16, 17. Our account is original — containing the affecting narrative vv. 27—32, peculiar to itself. — 26.] ἀργυρίων ἀργυρίων see on Mark. — 27.] αὐτὸς οὗτος. The Q is peculiar to Luke, and a note of accuracy. — 27.] These were not the women who had followed Him from Galilee, but the ordinary crowd collected in the streets on such occasions, and consisting, as is usually the case (and especially at an execution), principally of women. Their weeping appears to have been of that kind of well-meant sympathy which is excited by any affecting sight, such as that of an innocent person delivered to so cruel a death. This description need not of course exclude many who may have wept from deeper and more personal motives, as having heard Him teach, or received some benefit of healing from Him, or the like. — 28.] στραφεὶς — after He was relieved from the burden of the Cross. This word comes from an eye-witness. — 28.] ἢ — His future course was not one to be bewailed — see especially on this saying, Heb. xii. 2 — δόται τῆς προσωπικῆς αὐτῷ χαρᾶς, εὐθὺς σταυροῦ, αὐτῶν καταφρονήσας. Nor again were His sacred sufferings a mere popular tragedy for street-bewailing; — the sinners should weep for themselves, not for Him.

— 29.] ἰδὼν οὖν τοὺς προσωπικούς αὐτῷ χάρας, εὐθὺς σταυροῦ, αὐτῶν καταφρονήσας.
which might save both themselves and their children;—see Acts ii. 37, 38—but of which few availed themselves. These few are remarkably hinted at in the change to the third person, which excludes them—ἀρχονταί, i.e. not 'men in general,' nor 'My enemies'—but 'the impenitent among you,' those who weep merely tears of idle sympathy for Me, and none of repentance for themselves;—those who are in Jerusalem and its misery, which My disciples will not be.'—On the saying itself, compare the whole of Hosea ix., especially vv. 12—16. —30.] This is cited from the next chapter of Hosea (x. 8).—This was partially and primarily accomplished when multitudes of the Jews towards the end of the siege sought to escape death by hiding themselves in the subterranean passages and sewers under the city....οὖς δὲ ἐν τοῖς ὑπόγειοις ἀνήλθον, καὶ τὸ εἰδῆς αναβρέχουσιν δοὺς μὲν ἐντυγχάνοντο ἄνεκλεος. εὑρίσκετο δὲ καὶ ἐκεί μερικῶς βλέποντας δισχώλων. Jos. B. J. vi. 9, 4. But the words are too solemn, and too often used in a more awful connexion, for a further meaning to escape our notice;—see Lk. ii. 10, 19, 21, and Rev. vi. 16, where is the striking expression ἀνὰ τῆς ὄργης τεῦ ἄρεω of Him who now was the victim about to be offered! And the whole warning—as every other respecting the destruction of Jerusalem—looks through the type to the antitype, the great day of His wrath. Now, ἔρχεται ἡ ἁμαρία—...then ἡ ἁμαρία ἡ μεγάλη τῆς ὄργης αὐτοῦ. Rev. vi. 17.—It is interesting to see how often David, who had passed so long in hiding among the rocks of the wilderness from Saul, calls the Lord His Rock;—(see Ps. xviii. 2, 46. xlii. 9, &c.) They who have this defence will not need to call on the rocks to hide them. —81.] This verse—the solemn close of the Lord's teaching on earth—compares His own sufferings with that awful judgment which shall in the end overtake sinners—the unrepentant human kind—the dry tree. These things were εἰσὶν ἡμῖν, &c. on sin;—He bore our sins;—He, the vine,—the green tree,—the fruit-bearing tree,—of whom His people are the branches,—if He, if they in Him and in themselves, are so treated, so tried with sufferings,—what shall become of them who are cast forth as a branch and are withered?—Read 1 Peter iv. 12—18;—ver. 18 is a paraphrase of our phrase. Theophylact's comment is excellent: εἰ ταῦτα ποιοῦν ἐν Ἰησοῦ Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἀνάμνησιν ἅμα ἑκείνων τῆς θεωτικού, τὸ γίνεται ἐν ἤμοι άκραν καὶ πάσῃ διακοινοῦσιν ζωοτροποίησις ἠκβαρνήσις;—The explanations which make the green-tree = the young, and the dry = the old (Bengal), —or the green-tree = the women, comparatively innocent, the dry = the guilty (Baumgarten-Crusius), at the destruction of Jerusalem, —are quite unworthy of the place which the words hold,—and, which is worse, at variance with the whole of Scripture symbolism. —82.] &c. κακ. do not go together, see ch. x. 1 and note;—the comma usually placed after 'two' in the E.V. is right, although not required in the Greek because implied in ίπτερον. The best translation is 'two others, malefactors.'

33—38.] Matt. xxvii. 35—38. Mark xv. 24—28. John xix. 18—24; with however some particulars inserted which appear later in the other gospels. —84.] Spoken apparently during the act of the cruci-
fission, or immediately that the crosses were set up. Now first, in the fullest sense, from the wounds in His Hands and Feet, is His Blood shed, εἰς ἑφθον ἄμαρτίων (Matt. xxvi. 28), and He inaugurates His intercessional office by a prayer for His murderers,—ἐφεσ ἀνθρώπων. This also is a fulfilment of Scripture, Isa. liii. 12,—where the contents of our verses 33, 34 are remarkably pointed out.—His teaching ended at ver. 31. His High Priesthood is now begun. His first three sayings on the Cross are for others: see ver. 45. John xix. 26, 27.—ἀπέστ. He is the Son of God, and He speaks in the fulness of this covenant relation,—ἐγὼ ἐστιν δι' αὐτοῦ μωϋσῆς:—it is not merely a prayer—but the prayer of the Great Intercessor, which is always heard. Notice that though on the Cross, there is no alienation, no wrath of condemnation, between the Father and the Son.—ὡς ἀνθρώπως—who are here intended? Doubtless, first and directly, the four soldiers, whose work it had been to crucify Him. The ποιεῖν points directly at this: and it is surely a mistake to suppose that they wanted no forgiveness, because they were only doing their duty. Stier remarks, "This is only a misleading fallacy, for they were sinners even as others, and their obedient and formal performance of their duty was not without a sinful pleasure in doing it, or at all events formed part of their entire standing as sinners, included in that sin of the world, to which the Lord here ascribes His Crucifixion" (vi. 501). But not only to them, but to them as the representatives of that sin of the world, does this prayer apply. The nominative to ποιεῖν is of ἀνθρώπων—mankind,—the Jewish nation, as the next moving agent in His death,—but all of us, insomuch as for our sins He was bruised.—καὶ γὰρ οἱ αἰχμαλώται τοῦ Πατρὸς. Primarily, as before, spoken of the soldiers,—then of the council who delivered Him up, see John xi. 49, ὑμῖς εἰς σῴζεσθαι ὁ σῶτος,—then of all whose sin is from lack of knowledge of the truth, of what sin is, and what it has done— even the crucifixion of the Lord. But certainly from this intercession is excluded that one sin—strikingly brought out by the passage just cited as committed by him who said it, viz. Caiphas,—and hinted at again by the Lord, John xix. 11—and perhaps also by the awful answer Matt. xxvi. 64, σὺ ἂν ἦν—thou hast said it—viz. in prophecy. John xi. 49, see also Matt. xxvi. 25, and on the sin alluded to, Matt. xii. 31. 1 John v. 16.—Observe that between the two members of this prayer lies the work of the Spirit leading to repentance—the prayer that they may have their eyes opened, and know what they have done: which is the necessary subjective condition of forgiveness of sins, see 2 Tim. ii. 25, 26. —35.] The insults of the people are by no means excluded, even if ἀνθρώποι be omitted. To find a discrepancy with Matt. and Mark here, is surely unfair. (Meyer—De Wette.) The people's standing looking on, does not describe their mind towards Jesus: Luke reports no more than he knew: and the inference may be drawn that those whom he has related to have cried out an hour ago, 'Crucify Him,'—would not have stood by in silence.—On ver. 46, see note there. —οἱ ἄρχοντες are the chief priests and members of the Sanhedrim. Matt. ver. 41.—οἱ ἄρχοντες.—Matt. ver. 43. Mark ver. 36. John xv. 28, 29. It was about the time of the mid-day meal of the soldiers,—and they in
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Εἰς δὲ τῶν κρεμασθέντων κακούργων ἐβλασφήμη, αὐτὸν λέγων. Εἰ σὺ εἰ ὁ χριστός, σώσον σαυτόν καὶ ἡμᾶς. ἀποκρίθησε δὲ ὁ ἐπετρόμων ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, ὡσ τις αὐτῷ κρίσιν ἔχει; 41 καὶ ἡμεῖς μὲν δικαίως. Αὕτη γάρ ὁν ἐπράξαμεν ἀπὸ λαμβάνομεν οὖν δὲ οὕτως ἀτοπον ἔστηξε. 42 καὶ ἐλέγετ "Ιησοῦ Μόστητι μου [κύου] [ὁταν ἐκλέγε] ἐν τῷ βασιλεία σου. 43 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς Ἀμνον λέγω, σοι, σήμερον μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ παραδίσῳ.

Copt. Sahid. txt (πῶς ἀνέβη, ὅ τι ἐπέρασε) C Χ α. ὑπ. Μ. B C L A. Τοῦ ἀνίθων ἀποκρίθησε δὲ ὁ ἐπετρόμων ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, ὡσ τις αὐτῷ κρίσιν ἔχει; 41 καὶ ἡμεῖς μὲν δικαίως. Αὕτη γάρ ὁν ἐπράξαμεν ἀπὸ λαμβάνομεν οὖν δὲ οὕτως ἀτοπον ἔστηξε. 42 καὶ ἐλέγετ "Ιησοῦ Μόστητι μου [κύου] [ὁταν ἐκλέγε] ἐν τῷ βασιλεία σου. 43 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς Ἀμνον λέγω, σοι, σήμερον μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ παραδίσῳ.

mockery offered Him their posca or sour wine, to drink with them. — 38.] see on Matt. ver. 77. — ἐστὶν αὐτῷ, Ὠν ἤμιστον, on the projecting upright beam of the cross.

39—43.] Peculiar to Luke.—Matthew and Mark have merely a general and less accurate report of the same incident. —All were now mocking —the soldiers, the rulers, the mob: —and the evil-minded thief, perhaps out of bravado before the crowd, puts in his scoff also. — 40.] Bengel supports the notion that this penitent thief was a Gentile. But surely this is an unwarranted assumption. What should a Gentile know of Paradise, or of the kingdom of the Messiah as about to come? —The silence of the penitent is broken by the ἡμᾶς of the other compromising him in the scoff. —οὐδὲ alludes to the multitude —Dost thou too not fear God? σὺ — (as thou oughtest to do), seeing that .... — 41.] ἡμᾶς. He classes himself with the other in condemnation, but not in his prayer afterwards. —grow, 'unseemly.' This is a remarkable testimony to the innocence of Jesus from one who was probably executed for his share in those very tumults which He was accused of having excited. — 42.] The thief had heard of the announcements which Jesus had made, —or at all events of the popular rumour concerning His Kingdom. His faith lays hold on the truth that this is the King of the Jews, in a higher and immaterial sense. There is nothing so astounding in this man’s faith dogmatically considered, as De Wette thinks; he merely joins the common belief of the Jews of a Messianic Kingdom, in which the ancient Fathers were to rise, &c., —with the conviction that Jesus is the Messiah. What is really astounding, is the power and strength of that faith, which amidst shame and pain and mockery could thus lift itself to the apprehension of the Crucified as this King. This thief would fill a conspicuous place in a list of the triumphs of faith supplementary to Heb. xi.—ἐν τῷ βασιλεία σου. The Vulgate, which is followed by Luther,—and the E. V., —renders this as if it were εἰς τῷ βασιλεία σου, which is a sad mistake, as it destroys the force of the expression. It is ‘in thy Kingdom’ —'with thy Kingdom,' so ὅλος ἐν τῷ βασιλεία σου, Matt. xxv. 31, which we (E. V.) have transliterated rightly. The above mistake entirely loses the ὅλος making it merely 'comest into; just as we say 'come into' an estate: whereas it is the chief word in the clause, and ἐν τῷ βασιλεία σου its qualification, 'at Thy coming in Thy Kingdom.' — It will be seen that there is no necessity for supposing the man to have been a disciple, as some have done. —It is remarkable how, in three following sayings, the Lord appears as Prophet, Priest, and King: as Prophet, to the daughters of Jerusalem—

VOL. I.
Priest, interceding for forgiveness—King, acknowledged by the penitent thief, and answering his prayer. — 43. ἰδὼν λ. σωτ. ... The Lord surpasses his prayer in the answer; the ἐμοὶ λέγω σοι, στήριζον, is the reply to the uncertain σωτήρ of the thief. στήριζον, 'This day!' before the close of this natural day. The attempt to join it with λέγω σοι, considering that it not only violates common sense, but destroys the force of the Lord's promise, is surely something worse than silly; see below. — μετ' ἐρωτήσεως—cannot bear no other meaning than 'shoul shalt be with Me,' in the ordinary sense of the words. 'I shall be in Paradise, and thou with Me.' - ἐν τῇ ἀβασβ. On these words rests the whole exegesis of the saying. What is this Paradise? The word is used of the garden of Eden by the LXX, Gen. ii. 8, &c., and subsequently became, in the Jewish theology, the name for that part of Hades, the abode of the dead, —where the abode of the righteous awaits the resurrection. But it was also the name for a supernal or heavenly abode, see 2 Cor. xii. 4. Rev. ii. 7. — The former of these is, I believe, here primarily to be understood; —but only as introductory, and that immediately, to the latter. By the death of Christ only was Paradise first opened, in the true sense of the word. He Himself when speaking of Lazarus (ch. xvi. 22) does not place him in Paradise, but in Abraham's bosom — in that place which the Jews called Paradise, but by an anticipation which the Lord did not sanction. I believe the matter to have been thus. The Lord spoke (as Grotius has remarked) to the thief so as He knew the thief would understand Him; but then He spoke with a fuller and more blessed meaning than he could understand then. For that day, on that very evening, was 'Paradise' truly 'regained' — opened by the death of Christ. We know (Eph. ii. 17. 1 Pet. iii. 18, 19. iv. 6), that the Lord went down into the depths of death, — announced His triumph (for His death was His triumph) to the imprisoned spirits; — and in that moment — for change of state, to the disembodied, is all that change of place implies — they were in the Paradise of God, — in the blessed heavenly place, implied by the word, 2 Cor. xii. That this is not fulness of glory as yet, is evident; — for the glorified body is not yet joined to their spirits, — they are not yet perfect (Heb. xi. ult.) — but it is a degree of bliss compared to which their former degree was but an imprisonment. — This work of the Lord I believe to have been accomplished on the instant of His death, and the penitent to have followed Him at His death — some little time after — into the Paradise of God. That the Lord returned to take His glorified Body, was in accordance with His design, and He became thereby the first-fruits of the holy dead, who shall like Him put on the body of the resurrection, and be translated from disembodied and imperfect bliss in the Paradise of God, to the perfection of glorified humanity in His glory, and with Him, not in Paradise, but at God's right hand. — 44—46.] Matt. xxvii. 45—50. Mark xv. 38—37. John xv. 28—30. Our account is very short and epitomizing—containing however, peculiar to itself, the last word of our Lord on the cross. — The impression conveyed by this account, if we had no other, would be that the veil was rent before the death of Jesus; — but the more detailed account of Matthew corrects this. — 45.] It does not quite appear whether αὐξόμενος ὅ ἡσ. is intended to describe a new sign, or what took place during the darkness. — 46.] The use of ἐφύλαξεν shows that this was the cry to which Matt. and Mark allude. The words are from the LXX, according to the common reading παραθηκέων. The Hebrew (יִתְנָה) is present. These words have in them an important and deep meaning. They accompany that which in the Lord's case was strictly speaking the act of death. It was His own act — no 'feeling the approach of death,' as some, not apprehending the matter, have commented — but a determi-
nate delivering up of His spirit to the Father,—παραδέχεται τὸ πνεῦμα, John; see John x. 18—ουδ' εἰπεν αὐτῷ ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, ἀλλ' ἐγὼ τίθημι αὐτῷ ἀπ' ἐμαυτόν. None of the Evangelists say 'he died;' although that expression is ever used after the death stated as one great fact:—but it is, doubtless a sign that Luke, παραδέχεται τὸ πνεῦμα, John. The πνεῦμα here is the Personality— the human soul informed by the Spirit, in union: not separated, so that His soul went to Hades, and His Spirit to the Father (Olshausen). Both are delivered into the hand of the Father—by whose Eternal Spirit quickened (ζωοποιθεῖσα τῷ πνεύματι, quickened in the spirit—by the Spirit is understood in ζωοποιθέντι) He worked His great victory over death and Hell.—See again 1 Pet. iii. 18, 19, and Rom. viii. 10, 11.—The latter part of the verse in Ps. cxxxi. 4 for Thou hast redeemed me. O Lord thou God of truth, is not applicable here. The whole Psalm is not strictly prophetic, but is applied by the Lord to Himself.

47—49. [Matt. xxvii. 54—56. Mark xv. 38—41. Our account, as well as that of Mark, ascribes the impression made on the centurion to that which took place at the death of Jesus,—1. e. οὐδὲν θαύμα ἔγνωσεν. Something in the manner and words convinced him that this man was the Son of God,—which expression he uses doubtless with reference to what he had before heard, but especially to the words just uttered,—“Father, into Thy hands I commend my spirit.” Luke has not so exactly expressed the words,—but the E. V. has wrongly and ungrammatically rendered them, and made "a righteous man" = "the Son of God;"—whereas they only give the general sense of the persuasion of the centurion, "Truly this man was innocent:"—and if innocent (nay, more, δίκαιος, just, truthful), He was the Son of God, for He had asserted it.—48.] Peculiar to Luke. —τὰ γενόμενα are the darkness and other prodigies, after which we have no more raiment—men's tempers are changed, and we here see the result. —τὸν τρόπον is a sign of self-accusation, at least for the time,—which is renewed on the preaching of Peter, Acts ii. 37. —49.] see on Matt. and Mark.

50—56. [Matt. xxvii. 57—61. Mark xv. 14—15. John xix. 28—30. Mark xv. 28—29. Our account, according to the verse here quoted, not only shows that the centurion believed the death of Jesus as that of the true Messiah, but is also the earliest report of the crucifixion. It is similar to the account of the centurion in Matt. xxvii. 54—56, and Mark xv. 38—41. However, there are some differences in the wording and context of the two accounts, which may indicate different perspectives or sources. The account in John places a greater emphasis on the centurion's belief in the identity of Jesus as the Messiah. The centurion, at the moment of Jesus' death, acknowledges the historical and religious significance of the event, stating, "Verily this was the Son of God." This admission is a significant moment in the narrative, as it marks a change in the centurion's perspective and understanding of the event. The account in John is also notable for its inclusion of the witness of the centurion, which provides a first-hand account of the crucifixion and speaks to the centrality of the event in the ongoing story of salvation. The account in John, with its emphasis on the centrality of the crucifixion and the centurion's testimony, offers a unique perspective on the implications of Jesus' death and its significance for the world. This account in John, therefore, contributes to a deeper understanding of the centurion's role as a witness to the crucifixion and the broader implications of Jesus' sacrifice for salvation. —H. L.
* αὐτὸ ἐν τοῖς μνήματι ἰαζευτῷ, οὐ δὲ οὐκ ἦν οὐδὲν ἀπὸ τῶν οὐδεὶς κείμενος. 54 καὶ ἡμέρα τῆς παρασκευῆς καὶ ἡμέρα βαπτιστική ἐπέφυλακε. 55 κατακολούθησαν δὲ ἐν γυναικεῖς κεῖσαι τὸν μνημείον καὶ ὡς έτέθη τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ, 56 υποστρέφειν δὲ ἦτοι μασαναν ἀρώματα καὶ μέρα. καὶ τὸ μὲν σάββατον ἰσόγλασαν κατὰ τὴν ἐντολήν, τὸ δὲ μὲν τῶν σάββατων ὀρθῶν ἢ βαθεῖος ἢ λογία ἐπὶ τὸ μνήμα φέροντες ἢ ἦτοι μασαναν ἀρώματα καὶ τῶν νατασιαίων ταῖς αὐταίς 57 ἑυρόν ἐν τὸν λίθον ἀποκεκυλισμένο ἐκ τοῦ νυμνείου, 58 καὶ ἐκείθεσαν σύμφωνα πρὸς τὸν αὐτόν ἵππος. 59 καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ πόλεμῳ πολιορκείσθαι αὐτῶν περὶ τούτου, καὶ ἐδόθη δύο ἐκδρες ἐπέστρωσαν αὐταῖς ἑν ἑσθήσεις ἑν ἀστραπτοσίας ἡμέραν τῆς σάββατος. 60 καὶ δοκεῖν αὐτὸν ἰσόγλασαν κατὰ τὴν ἐντολήν, 61 ἢ λογία ἐπὶ τὸν λίθον ἀποκεκυλισμένο ἐκ τοῦ νυμνείου, καὶ εἰς κατά λίθον ἀποκεκυλισμένον ἐκ τοῦ νυμνείου, καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῇ ἱππικῇ πολιορκείσθαι αὐτῶν περὶ τούτου, καὶ ἐδοθή δύο ἐκδρες ἐπέστρωσαν αὐταῖς ἑν ἑσθήσεις ἑν ἀστραπτοσίας ἡμέραν τῆς σάββατος.
It is merely ‘came upon them,’ under ordinary circumstances;—‘appeared to them,’ in a supernatural connexion: see reff. On the two angels here, see note on Mark ver. 5; to which I will just add, that the Harmonistic view, as represented by Greswell (loc. cit.), puts together the angel in Matthew, and the angel in Mark, and makes the two angels in Luke (!!!)—see Acts i. 10.—*ἀνάγκη*—to all appearance; the Evangelist does not mean that they were such, as clearly appears from what follows. — 5.] τῶν ζωτῶν, simply ‘the living,’ ‘Him who liveth,’ as addressed to the women: but Olhausen’s view of a deeper meaning in the words (Bibl. Com. ii. 47) should be borne in mind;—τὸ κυρίος τῆς παραμίνων κυρίος ῥυγχάνει. Orig. in Joan. (Olah. loc. cit.)—6, 7.] see ch. ix. 22. xviii. 32. The mention of Galilee is remarkable, as occurring in the angelic speeches in Matt. and Mark in quite another connexion. Here it is in the manner of women, as being from Galilee, see ch. xxiii. 55—and meaning, ‘when He was yet with you.’—8.] see note on Mark ver. 8. — 10.] It seems as if the testimony of one of the disciples who went to Emmaus had been the ground of the whole former part—perhaps of the whole—of this chapter. We find consequently this account exactly agreeing with his report afterwards, vv. 23, 24.—Joanna was the wife of Chuza, Herod’s steward, ch. xvii. 2.—It will be observed that the omission of the rec. αί, will make this verse mean; ‘It was Mary, &c., also the rest with them told the Apostles these things.’—11.] *φανερῶν,* a plural, with τά διήκ., is not without meaning. The διήκασα were the (perhaps slightly differing) accounts of many persons.—15.] This verse cannot well be interpolated from John xx., for in that case it certainly would not mention Peter alone. That Cleopas says, ver. 24, that ‘some of us went,’ &c. must not be pressed too much, although it does certainly look as if he knew of more than one (see note there). The similarity in diction to John xx. 10 (παρακεφάσας βλέπει τά θεόνα κτίσμα εἰς και διαθέτει τὰ) being common to the two verses) indicates a common origin, and, if I mistake not, one distinct from the rest of the narrative in this chapter. The meaning of ἐρχ
Our Emmaus is now called Cobeiibi (?)—

15. καὶ ἐγάφη. . . . . . καὶ . . . . . . . . . . . . . . the ordinary construction. The last καὶ does not mean 'also.' — αὐτὸς ὁ Ἰ. Jesus Himself, of whom they had been speaking. But this expression forbids the supposition that He was here, strictly speaking, ἐν τρίγος μορφῇ, as we find it less precisely expressed in Mark xvi. 12. The reason why they did not know Him was (ver. 16), that their eyes were supernaturally influenced so that they could not,—see also ver. 31. No change took place in Him—nor apparently in them, beyond a power upon them, which prevented the recognition just so much as to delay it till aroused by the well-known action and manner of His breaking the bread. The cause of this was the Will of the Lord Himself, who would not be seen by them till the time when He saw fit—

ἀγγελός—from behind: see ver. 18, where they take Him for an inhabitant of Jerusalem.—17. He had apparently been walking with them some little time before this was said.—ἀποβάλλειν λόγον implies to dispute with some earnestness: but there is no blame implied in the words. Possibly, though both were sad, they may have taken different views:—and in the answer of Cleopas we have that of the one who was most disposed to abandon all hope.—

18. μόνος παρ. They took Him (but we must not think of a peculiar dialect as giving that impression) for one who had been at Jerusalem at the feast:— and asked,
Dost thou lodge alone at Jerusalem?—παρέβαλ• (with or without ἐκ, see reff.) in the LXX is to sojourn in—not to dwell in.—19—24. Stier well remarks, that the Lord here gives us an instructive example how far, in the wisdom of Love, we may carry dissimulation, without speaking untruth. He does not assert, that He was one of the strangers at this Feast at Jerusalem, nor does He deny that He knew what had been done there in those days, but He puts the question by, with 'What things?'—οί δὲ εὐνοία.] Either, one spoke and the other assented; or perhaps each spoke, sometimes one and sometimes the other;—only we must not break up these verses and allot an imagined portion to each. They contain the substance of what was said, as the reporter of the incident afterwards put it together. —δὲ εὐν. κ. κ. λ.: see a similar general description of Him to the Jewish people, Acts i. 22. They had repeatedly acknowledged Him as a Prophet: see especially Matt. xxi. 11, 46. The phrase διν. ἐν λόγῳ κ. ὑψόμεν occurs of Moses, Acts vii. 25. —ἐγένετο, 'was,' not 'became' (or 'was becoming'), as Meyer renders it. They speak of the whole life of Jesus as a thing past. —20.] ἐκάθεν depends on οὐκ ὑψόμεν, ver. 18.—ὁμοιόμοιος. Therefore the two disciples were Jews, not Hellenists, as some have supposed. They say 'our,' not as excluding, but as including the stranger. —παρέβαλαν, to Pilotae.—31.] ἠλλάκι is a word of weakened trust, and shrinking from the awrival that they 'believed' this. —ἀνοίγοντοσ—in the theocratic sense—including both the spiritual and political kingdom: see ch. i. 68, 69, 75, and compare Acts i. 6.—σὺν π. τ., rightly rendered in E. V. 'beside all this:'—see reff.—大型多人, not impersonal, nor to be supplied with a nom. case θεος, or ο ἡλιος, &c., but spoken of Jesus. 'He is now in the third day, since' &c. This is the usage of later Greek:—and the words are spoken not without a reference, in the mind of the speaker, to His promise of rising on the third day.—32. ἀλλά καί, 'but moreover'—equivalent to 'certainly, thus much has happened, that.'——ὁμοίου, an Attic form—the latter is ἀφθαρσία, which is probably the right reading. —ὁμοίων—'disciples, as we are.' The Apostles are distinguished presently as οἱ οὖν ἦμιν, ver. 24.—23.] This agrees exactly with Luke's own narrative, but not with Matthew's, in which they had seen the Lord Himself. There seems however to be some hint that the women had made some such report, in the abōν δὲ οὖν εἴδον said below of the τινις τῶν συν ἦμιν.—24.] τινὲς . . . see ver. 12 and note. It is natural, even in accordance with ver. 12, that the apostles to τινις before, and the loose way of speaking to a stranger, who (they believed)
This general leading into the meaning of the whole, as a whole, fulfilled in Him, would be much more opportune to the place, and time occupied, than a direct exposition of selected passages. — The things concerning Himself (E. V.) is right: not, "the parts concerning Himself." — Observe the testimony which this verse gives to the Divine authority, and the Christian interpretation, of the O. T. Scriptures: so that the denial of the references to Christ's death and glory in the O. T. is henceforth nothing less than a denial of His own teaching.

28] ἔρχεται belongs to both the following clauses, and cannot, as Stier would take it, stand by itself, leaving ἐκεῖ in both clauses to be construed with διήρκη. A similar expression is found Acts iii. 24. He began with Moses first; — He began with each as He came to them. De Wette remarks, "It was much to be wished that we knew what Prophecies of the death and triumph of Jesus are here meant. There are but few that point to the subject." But I take the τα παρὰ τῶν ἀποκ. to mean something very different from mere prophetic passages. The whole Scriptures are a testimony to Him: — the whole history of the chosen people, with its types, and its law, and its prophecies, is a showing forth of Him; — and it was here the whole, — πᾶσα ἡ ἱστορία τῆς ἱστορίας, — that He laid out before them.
show that it was not their house, but an inn), perhaps on account of the superior place which His discourse had won for Him in their estimation: — and as the Jewish rule was, that "three eating together were bound to give thanks" (Berac. 45, 1, cited by Meyer), He fulfils this duty. In doing so, perhaps the well-known manner of His taking bread, &c., perhaps the marks of the nails in His hands then first noticed, or these together, as secondary means,—but certainly "His own will and permission to be seen by them," opened their eyes to know Him. — 31.] ἀφοτες, not ἀφροίς, which would imply His body to have remained but invisible to them: but ἀπ' ἄφων, implying, besides the supernatural disappearance, a real objective removal from them. — 32.] Was there not something heart-kindling in His discourse by the way, which would have led us to suppose that it was none but the Lord Himself? not that they did suppose it,—but the words are a sort of self-reproof for not having done so. Comp. Matt. vii. ult. — ἔλαβεν Ἰησοῦν, as Bengel remarks, is more than ἐνεκαλεί Ἰησοῦν: — "He spoke to us," not merely 'with us,' as E. V. — 33.] 'Jam non timet iter nocturnum, quod antea disuaserant ignoto comiti.' Bengel. — 34.] The whole eleven were not there—Thomas was not present, if at least the appearance which follows be the same as that in John xx. 19, which there seems no reason to doubt. Some have derived an argument from this incompleteness in their number for the second appearance of the travellers being also an Apostle; Wieseler (Chron. vol. i. p. 431) believes it to have been James the son of Alpheus or Cleopas or Clopas (but see above) journeying with his father, and the appearance on the road to Emmaus to be the same as ὡθηθ' ἱεροσοφία, I Cor. xv. 7.—Who these οἱ σὺν ἀφροίς are, we learn from Acts i. 14. — 35.] This appearance to Simon (i.e. Peter—the other Simon would not be thus named without explanation;—see ch. v. 3 ff.) is only hinted at here,—but is asserted again, I Cor. xv. 5, in immediate connexion with that which here follows. It is not clear whether it took place before or after that on the way to Emmaus. — 35.] 'And they'—the travellers, distinguished from the others—"not 'they also,'" for then the clause would be left without a copula. — ἐν τῇ ἥλι.—We can hardly after ἐφοροθεῖ excludo that sense of 'in,' which gives that which follows a share in the instrumentality. The example cited by De Wette, ἐν τῷ ἀναρκτῖ, Matt. xxii. 28, for the sense, 'during the breaking,' &c. does not apply, insomuch as there is no verb: John xix. 35 is far more to the point, and also deserves for the other sense. That this should have been so, does not exclude the supernatural opening of their eyes: see above, on ver. 31. — 36—49.] Mark xvi. 14. John xx. 19—24. The identity of these appearances need hardly be insisted on. On Mark's narrative see notes there. That of John presents no difficulties, on one supposition,—that he had not seen this of Luke. The particulars related by him are mostly additional, but not altogether so.—36.] δὲ τῇ ἐν μέρεσι—while they were speaking of these things,—possibly not entirely by crediting the account, as seems hinted at in Mark xvi. 13,—the Lord appeared, the doors being shut, in the midst (John xx. 19 and notes). — ὡμ., the ordinary Jewish salutation, cf. ἀλληλού, see ch. x. 5, but of more than
ordinary meaning in the mouth of the Lord: see John xiv. 27. — 37.] On account of His sudden appearance, and the likeness to one whom they knew to have been dead. — 38.] θεάμα is a ghost or spectre—an appearance of the dead to the living; not exactly as φάντασμα, Matt. xiv. 26, which might have been any appearance of a supernatural kind.— 39.] διάλογος; not merely 'thoughts' as E. V., but 'questionings.' — 42.] This seems to be some doubt whether the reference to His hands and feet were on account of the marks of the nails, to prove His identity,—or as being the uncovered parts of His body, and to prove His corporeity. Both views seem supported by the text, and I think both were united. The sight of the Hands and Feet, which they recognized as His, might at once convince them of the reality of the appearance, and the identity of the Person. The account of John confirms the idea that He showed them the marks of the nails, both by His side being added, and by the expressions of Thomas which followed. The same seems also implied in our ver. 40.—The assertion of the Lord must not be taken as representing merely 'the popular notion concerning spirits' (Dr. Burton); *He who is the Truth, does not speak thus of that which He knows, and has created.* He declares to us the truth, that those appearances to which He was now likened by the disciples, and spirits in general, have not flesh and bones. Observe σάρξ κ. σώμα—but not αὐτό. This the resurrection Body had not,—as being the *material life* :—see notes on John vi. 51, and John xx. 27.— 41.] Wetstein quotes Livy, xxxix. 49, *sibimet ipse prae necopinato gaudio credentes.* — 43.] This was done further to convince them of His real corporeity. The omission of the words καλ. . . . κηρίου in the best MSS. is remarkable: it may perhaps have originated in the καλ. . . . κηρίου; or perhaps from some idea in some transcriber that this meal is the same as that in John xxi. 9. The words could hardly have been an interpolation. — 44.] Certainly, from the recurrence of κηρίον, which implies immediate sequence, Luke, at the time of writing his Gospel, was not aware of any Galilean appearances of the Lord, nor indeed of any later than this one. That he corrects this in Acts i. shows him meantime to have become acquainted with some other sources of information, not however perhaps including the Galilean appearances (see Prolegomena to Luke).— The following discourse apparently contains a summary of many things said during the last forty days before the ascension;—they
cannot have been said on this evening; for after the command in ver. 49, the disciples would not have gone away into Galilee. Whether the Evangelist regarded it as a summary, is to me extremely doubtful. Knowing apparently of no Galilean appearances, he seems to relate the command of ver. 49, both here and in the Acts, as intended to apply to the whole time between the Resurrection and the Ascension.

οὐποτε ἐπὶ λ., 'behold the realization of the words,' &c. — οὕτω δ.: see ch. xviii. 31—xxii. 37. Matt. xxvi. 56 al.; but doubtless He had often said things to them on these matters which have not been recorded for us. So in John v. 25 we have apparently a reference to a saying not recorded. —This threefold division of the O. T. is the ordinary Jewish one, into the Law (τῆς), Prophets (τῆς), and Hagiographies (τῆς), —the first containing the Pentateuch;—the second Joshua, Judges, the four books of Kings, and the Prophets, except Daniel;—the third the Psalms, and all the rest of the canonical books:—Daniel, Esther, Ezra, and Nehemiah being reckoned as one book, and the Chronicles closing the canon. —47.] ἐξαφάνεια, a nether absolute—'it having begun': see reff. The substance of the preaching of the Gospel literally corresponded to this description—see Acts ii. 38, μετανοήσατε, καὶ βαπτίσητε ἵνα υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ κοινωνία ἀμαρτιών, —were the words of the first sermon preached at Jerusalem. —48.] φανέρω. From what follows, Acts i. 22, if these words are to be taken in their strict sense, they must have been spoken only to the ἄποστολοι:—they may however have been more general, and said to all present. —49.] This promise is explained (Acts i. 5) to be the baptism with the Holy Ghost, and the time is limited to 'not many days hence.' —ἀποκάλυψε. The procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son is clearly here declared, as well as that from the Father. And consequently we find Peter, in Acts ii. 33, referring back to these very words, in ascribing the outpouring of the Spirit to the now exalted Saviour. In that verse also the ἐγὼ of this is filled up by τοῖς δι' ἐμοί πάντες φωνῆσαι—the proper supplement of it here also. —The promise itself is not found in the three Gospels, but expressly and frequently in John xiv—xvi.: see ch. xiv. 16. 26. xv. 26. xvi. 7—11. 13. 14. —The present, ἀνασταλέω, is not = a future, but implies that the actual work is done, and the state brought in, by which that sending is accomplished:—viz. the giving of the πνεῦμα θεότητος ἐκ Θεοῦ: see reff. —The word 'ἰπποῦς. is probably interpolated by some who, believing these words to represent the Galilean discourse, placed it here for an explanation: or perhaps Acts i. 4 gave occasion to it. This command must have been (historically) uttered after the return from Galilee: see above.—ἀναφέρει. Though the expression (see reff.) is used in the O. T. of inspiration by the Spirit, it here has its full meaning, of abiding upon and characterizing, as a garment does the person. This, as Stier remarks, was the true and complete clothing of the nakedness of the Fall. —50.] The ascension appears to be related as taking place after the above words were spoken—but there is an uncertainty and want of specification about the narrative, which forbids us to conclude that it is intended as following immediately upon
them. This however can only be said as taking the other Gospels and Acts i. into account—"if we had none but the Gospel of Luke, we should certainly say that the Lord ascended after the appearance to the Apostles and others, on the evening of the day of His resurrection."—ἐκεῖνος. ἐκεῖ, i. e. from Jerusalem: see Matt. xxvi. 75. —ἐκεῖνος B.—not quite to the village itself, but over the brow of the Mount of Olives where it descends on Bethany: see Acts i. 12. (The synonymousness of these two expressions may show that the same is meant, when, Mark xi. 11, the Lord is said to have gone out at night to Bethany, and, Luke xxi. 37, to the Mount of Olives.)—ἐξῆλθος not, 'He went a little distance from' the village, but His ascension, as Mayer would interpret it; but the two verbs belong to one and the same incident—'He was parted from them and borne up into heaven.' We need not understand, 'by an angel,' or 'by a cloud,' nor need ἀνέφη. be middle; the absolute passive is best.—The tense is imperfect, signifying the continuance of the going up during the προσκυν. of the next verse.—The more particular account of the Ascension is given Acts i. 9—12, where see notes. That account is in perfect accordance with this, but supplementary to it.—οὐκ ἐξῆλθος. This had been done before by the women, Matt. xxviii. 9, and by the disciples on the mountain in Galilee. This however was a more solemn act of worship, now paid to Him as exalted to God's right hand.—διανείβαι, 'continually'—not 'all their time;'—daily, at the hours of prayer: see Acts i. 13. iii. 1.

A few words must be appended here on a point which has been much stirred in Germany even among the more orthodox commentators; the HISTORIC REALITY OF THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE ASCENSION. On those among them who doubt the fact of an Ascension at all (1), I have nothing to say, standing as I do altogether on different ground from them.—The Lord Himself foretold His Ascension, John vi. 62. xx. 17:—it was immediately after His disappearance from the earth expressly announced by the Apostles, Acts ii. 33, 34. v. 31:—continued to be an article of their preaching and teaching, 1 Pet. iii. 22. Eph. ii. 6. iv. 10. 1 Tim. iii. 16. So far should we have been assured of it, had we not possessed the testimonies of Luke, here and in the Acts:—for the fragment super-added to the Gospel of Mark merely states the fact, not the manner of it. But, to take first the account of Luke, is it possible, that the Lord would have left so weighty a fact in His history on earth without witnesses? And might we not have concluded from the wording of John vi. 62, that the Lord must have intended an ascension in the sight of some of those to whom He spoke, and that the Evangelist himself gives that hint, by recording those words without comment, that He had seen it?—Then again, is there any thing in the bodily state of the Lord after His resurrection which raises any even the least difficulty here? He appeared suddenly and vanished suddenly, when He pleased:—when it pleased Him, He ate, He spoke, He walked; but His Body was the Body of the Resurrection;—only not yet His ὄμοια τῆς δόξης (Phil. iii. 21), because He had not yet assumed that glory: but that He could assume it, and did assume it at His ascension, will be granted by all who believe in Him as the Son of God. So that it seems, on à priori grounds, probable that, granted the fact of the ascension, it did take place in such some manner as our
accounts relate:—in the sight of the disciples, and by the uplifting of the risen Body of the Lord towards that which is to those on this earth the visible Heaven. —This being so, let us now, secondly, regard the matter a posteriori. We possess two accounts of the circumstances of this ascension, written by the same person, and that person a contemporary of the Apostles themselves. Of the genuineness of these accounts there never was a doubt. How improbable that Luke should have related what any Apostles or apostolic persons might have contradicted! How improbable that the universal Church, founded by those who are said to have been eye-witnesses of this event, should have received these two accounts as authentic, if they were not so! That these accounts themselves are never referred to in the Epistles, is surely no argument against them. If an occasion had arisen, such as necessitated the writing of 1 Cor. xv,—there can be little doubt that Paul would have been as particular in the circumstances of the Ascension, as he has been in those of the Resurrection. The fact is, that by far the greatest difficulty remains to be solved by those who can imagine a myth or fiction on this subject to have arisen in the first age of the Church. Such a supposition is not more repugnant to our Christian faith and reverence, than it is to common sense and historical consistency.
CHAP. I. 1—18.] Prologue: in which is contained the substance and subject of the whole Gospel. The Eternal Word of God, the source of all existence, life, and light, became flesh, dwelt among us, was witnessed to by John, rejected by His own people, but received by some, who had power given them to become the sons of God. He was the perfection and end of God’s revelation of Himself; which was partially made in the law, but fully declared in Jesus Christ.

1. a Aν ἡρέχνη ἶν τοῦ λόγου, ἵνα πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, καὶ θεὸς ἵνα τῷ λόγῳ. b ὁ λόγος ὁ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, καὶ θεὸς ἵνα τῷ λόγῳ. c οὗτος ἴν τῷ ἀρχέῳ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν.

I. 18.] The eternal pre-existence of the λόγος: His personal distinctness; but essential unity with God. His working in Creation, and in the enlightening of men, before His manifestation in the flesh; His non-apprehension by them. —1.] Before commenting on the truths here declared, it is absolutely necessary to discuss the one word on which the whole turns: viz. δόλαγος. a (a) This term is used by John without explanation, as bearing a meaning well-known to his readers. The inquiry concerning that meaning must therefore be conducted on historical, not on mere grammatical grounds. And the most important elements of the inquiry are, (I.) the usage of speech as regards the word, by John himself and other biblical writers; and (II.) the purely historical information which we possess on the ideas attached to the word. —(3) From the first consideration we find, that in other biblical authors, as well as in John, the word is never used to signify the Divine Reason, or Mind; nor indeed those of any human creature. These ideas are expressed by πνεῦμα, or καρδία, or νοῦς, or ἡ σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ. In the classics the word λόγος never signifies the subjective faculty of reason, but the reason to be given, objectively, of any thing or things. The usual scripture meaning of λόγος is speech, or word. —δόλαγος τοῦ Θεοῦ is the creative, declarative, injunctive Word of God. (γ) That this is also the import in our prologue, is manifest, from the evident relation which it bears to the opening of the history of creation in Genesis. —δόλαγος is not an attribute of God, but an acting reality, by which the Eternal and infinite is the Great First Cause of the created and finite. (δ) Again this λόγος is undoubtedly in our prologue, personal — not an abstraction merely, nor a personification, — but a Person; for δόλαγος ἴν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, καὶ λόγος ἀληθής ἐκτίθετο. —(ε) Moreover, the λόγος is identical with Jesus Christ, as the pre-existing Son of God. A comparison of vv. 14 and 15 will place this beyond doubt. —(ζ) And Jesus Christ is the Word of God, not because He speaks the word (as if δόλαγος = δόλαγος, which is contrary to all usage, in which it = not δόλαγος, but τὸ λεγόμενον); — nor because He is the One promised or spoken of, = δόλαγος, — which is even less according to analogy; — nor because He is the Author and source of the λόγος as spoken in the

Scriptures, &c.—any more than His being called Ἰησοῦς φως implies only that He is the Giver of life and light;—but because the Word dwells in and speaks from Him, just as the Light dwells in and shines from, and the Life lives in, and works from, Him. (γ) This λόγος which became flesh, is not from, nor of, Time nor Space (ch. iii. 31. viii. 68); but eternally pre-existent,—and manifested in Time and Space, for the gracious ends of Divine Love in Redemption (ch. iii. 16. 17). (θ) This λόγος spoke in the law and prophets, yet partially and imperfectly (ver. 17. ch. ν. 39. 46); but in the personal λόγος, spoke forth in fulness of grace and truth. It was He who made the worlds (ver. 3); He, who appeared to Isaiah (Isa. vi. comp. ch. xii. 41); He, whose glory is manifested in His power over nature (ch. ii. 11); He, by reception of whom the new birth is wrought (ch. i. 12. 13); Who has power over all flesh (ch. xvii. 2),—and can bestow eternal life (ibid.); whose very sufferings were His glory, and the glorifying of God (ch. xvii. 1 al.); and Who, after those sufferings, resumed, and now has, the glory which He had with the Father before the world began (ch. xvii. 24).

II. (a) We are now secondly to inquire, how it came that John found this word λόγος so ready-made to his hands, as to require no explanation. The answer to this will be found by tracing the gradual personification of the Word, or Wisdom of God, in the O.T. and Jewish writings. (ε) We find faint traces of this personification in the book of Psalms: see Ps. xxxii. 4. 6. cxix. 90. 106. civii. 20. cxlvi. 18. 18. But it was not the mere offshoot of poetic diction. For the whole form and expression of the O.T. revelation was that of the Word of God. The Mosaic History opens with "God said, Let there be light." Spoken commands, either openly, or in visions, were the communications from God to man. It is the Word, in all the Prophets; the Word, in the Law; in short, the Word, in all God's dealings with His people: see further, Isa. iv. 10. 11. xl. 8. Jer. xxiii. 29 al. (λ) And as the Word of God was the constant idea for His revelations relatively to man, so was the wisdom of God, for those related to His own essence and attributes. That this was a later form of expression than the simple recognition of the Divine word in the Mosaic and early historical books,—would naturally be the case, in the unfolding of spiritual knowledge and Divine contemplation. His Almightiness was first felt, before His Wisdom and moral Purity were appreciated. In the books of Job (xxviii. 12 ff.) and the Proverbs (ch. viii. ix.) we find this Wisdom of God personified; in the latter in very plain and striking terms: and this not poetically only, but practically; ascribing to the Wisdom of God all His revelation of Himself in His works of Creation and Providence. So that this Wisdom embraced in fact in itself the Power of God; and there wanted but the highest Divine attribute, Love, to complete the idea. But this was reserved for the N. T. manifestation. (μ) The next evidences of the gradual personification of the Wisdom of God are found in the two Apocryphal Books, the Wisdom of Jesus the son of Sirach, and the Wisdom of Solomon. The first of these, originally written in Hebrew (see Winet, Reallwörterbuch, i. 652 ff.), belongs probably to the latter half of the second century before Christ. In ch. i. 1—10, Wisdom is said to be παρὰ κυρίου, και μετὰ αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνα: and in ver. 4, προῆρε πάντων ἐκεῖνος σοφία. Then in ch. xxiv. 9—21, the same strain is continued: πρὸ τοῦ αἰῶνα ἐκ τοῦ ἀρχαιοῦ λόγους ἐκ μετὰ κυρίου, καὶ ὁ πάντως ἐκ τοῦ διαφόρου. In the book of the Wisdom of Solomon, dating probably about 100 a.c., we find (in ch. vi. 22—ch. ix.) a similar personification and enology of Wisdom. In this remarkable passage we have Wisdom called πάρεδρος τῶν σῶν τρόπων (ch. ix. 4)—said to have been παρά αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου (ch. ix. 9)—parallelized with ὁ λόγος σοῦ (ch. ix. 1, 2. see also ch. xvi. 12). In ch. xviii. 16, 16 the πανεκδιανοομένος λόγος is set forth as an Angel coming down from heaven, and destroying the Egyptians. It seems highly probable that the author's monotheistic views were
already confused by the admixture of Platonism, and that he regarded Wisdom as a kind of soul of the world. He occasionally puts her for God, occasionally for an attribute of God. But he had not yet attained that near approach to a personal view which we shall find in the next step of our inquiry. (α) The large body of Jews resident in Alexandria were celebrated for their gnosia, or religious philosophy. The origin of this philosophy must be referred to the mixture of the Jewish religious element with the speculative philosophies of the Greeks, more especially with that of Plato, and with ideas acquired during the captivity from Oriental sources. One of these Alexandrine writers in the second century A.C. was Aristobulus, some fragments of whose works have been preserved to us. He tells us that by the θεία φωνή we are not to understand a μὴν λόγος, but ἡ γέννησις—the whole working of God in the creation of the world.—But the most complete representation of the Judeo-alexandrine gnosia has come down to us in the works of Philo, who flourished c. A.D. 40—60. It would be out of the province of a notice to give a review of the system of Philo: the result only of such review (see Lücke, vol. i. 272—283) will be enough. He identifies the λόγος with the σοφία of God; it is the εἰκών θεοῦ (Mangey, vol. i. p. 6 al. fr.): the αρχήν τοῦ παραδείγματος φωτός; αὐτός δὲ οὐδεὶς τῶν γενόμενων ἄτομος (i. 652): ὁ προσδεξτήρ τῶν γένεσιν εἰληφόρων (i. 457): προσδεξτήρ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ (i. 414): οὐ πρωτόγονος αὐτός, οὖ δὲ γένος προσδεξτήρος, ὡς ἀρχάγγελος πολλούκων υἱῶν χρίστων (i. 427): σαίρε καθάρε υἱὸν Χριστοῦ καισομοσιοῦντος (i. 106): διὸ οὗ κατοσμοσιοῦντος (i. 162): τῷ δὲ αρχαγγέλῳ κ. προσδεξτάτῳ λόγῳ διωρίζεται ἤλειφόρῳ θεῷ, εἰς τὰ δὲ γενόμενα παθή, ἵνα μεθρόοι στὰ τὸ γενόμενον διάκρισιν τὸ παπαρόκτονος.—καὶ διδάσκεται διὰ τὴν τροφὴν . . . . συνειδητοῦ τὸν θεόν, οὐδὲ γεννημα τὸν ὑμᾶς τῶν αὐτῶν, ἡμᾶς μὲν δὲν εἰσίν, ἐρρεῖς, ἅλα μίσος τῶν διάχων, αὐτοκρατόρων ὑμεραίων (i. 601, 2):—δύο γὰρ, ἑνὶ θεὸν, ἑνὶ μὲν δὲν οὗ κόσμος, ἑνὶ θεῷ καὶ ἐρρεῖς εἰσίν, ἥματι τοῦ πρωτόγονος αὐτοῦ θεὶος λόγος (i. 653):—οὗ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐναρχὼς (i. 358): παρείχειν πάντα καὶ πατέρασκεν (ii. 656):—ἐναρχήσεσθε θεοὶ, ὅ τιν εἴσηκα θεῖος λόγος (ii. 620, fragment, from Eusebius Prep. Evang. vii. 13). These instances, the number of which might be much enlarged, will serve to show how remarkably near to the diction and import of some passages in our Gospel Philo approached in speaking of the λόγος.—At the same time there is a wide and unmistakable difference between his λόγος and that of the Apostle. He does not distinguish it from the Spirit of God (Lücke, i. p. 278), nor does he connect it with any Messianic ideas, though these latter were familiar to him. Besides, his views are strangely compounded of Platonism and Judaism. The λόγος seems to be one comprehending, or ruling, the δύναμις or ψευδάς of God, which, although borrowed from Plato, he judicially calls ἄγγελοι, and the λόγος their ἄρχ-ἀγγέλοι. We see by this however how fixed and prepared the term, and many of its attributes, were in the religious philosophy of the Alexandrine Jews. (On the question whether the λόγος of Philo is to be taken as strictly personal, see Darmen's remarks on Lücke, in his Lehre von der Person Christi, i. p. 22 note.) (τ) Meanwhile the Chaldee paraphrases of the O. T. had habitually used such expressions as κριτικός, or τριτικός, or ἰδρυτικός, 'the glory,' or 'the presence,' or 'the word,' of God,—in places where nothing but His own agency could be understood. The latter of these—the Menma, or word of God,—is used in so strictly personal a sense, that there can be little doubt that the Paraphrases understood it by a Divine Person or Emanation. (π) From these elements, the Alexandrine and Jewish views of the λόγος or σοφία of God, there appears to have arisen very early among Christians, both orthodox and heretic, formal expressions, in which these or equivalent terms were used. Of this the Apostle Paul furnishes the most eminent example. His teacher Gamaliel united in his instruction both these elements, and they are very perceptible in the writings of his pupil. But we do not find in them any direct use of the term λόγος, as personally applied to the Son of God. This shows him to have spoken mainly according to the Jewish school,—among whom, as Origen states, he could find none who held τὸ τῶν λόγων τὸν τοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ (cont. Cels. ii. 51). (ρ) We find a much nearer approximation to the Alexandrine method of speech in the Epistle to the Hebrews, written, if not by Apollonius, by some other disciple intimately acquainted with the Alexandrine gnosia (see the opening verses, and especially σφόν τα πάντα τῷ φήματι τῆς δύναμεως αὐτοῦ). But even there we have
not the λόγος identified personally with the Lord Jesus Christ, nor indeed personally spoken of at all,—however near some passages may seem to approach to this usage (ch. iv. 12, 13. xi. 3). (σ) The Alexandrine gnosticism was immediately connected with Epheusis, where the Gospel of John was probably written. Apollos (Acts xviii. 24) came thither from Alexandria; and Cerinthus is related by Theodoret (fab. her. ii. 3, cited by Lücke, i. 284a) to have studied and formed his philosophic system in Egypt, before coming to Epheusis. (ρ) These notices will serve to account for the term λόγος being already found by John framed to his use; and the anti-gnostic tendency of his writings will furnish an additional reason why he should rescue such important truths as the pre-existence and attributes of the Divine Λόγος from the perversions which false philosophy had begun to make of them. (υ) In all that has been said in this note, no insinuation has been conveyed that either the Apostle Paul, or the writer to the Hebrews, or John, adopted in any degree their teaching from the existing philosophies. Their teaching (which is totally distinct from any of those philosophies, as will be shown in this commentary) is that of the Holy Spirit; and the existing philosophies, with all their follies and inadequacies, must be regarded, in so far as they by their terms or ideas subserved the work which the Spirit had to do by the Apostles and teachers of Christianity, as so many providential preparations of the minds of men to receive the fuller effulgence of the Truth as it is in Jesus, which akins forth in these Scriptures.

The substance of this note has been derived from Dr. Lücke’s Commentary, vol. i. p. 249—284; De Wette’s Handbuch, on John i. 1; Dorner, Lehre von der Person Christi, i. p. 15 ff.; Olahausen, Comm. ii. p. 30 ff.

In δράχμα = πρὸ τοῦ τῶν κόσμων χίλιων, ch. xvii. 6. The expression is indefinite, and must be interpreted relatively to the matter spoken of. Thus in Acts xi. 15, it is the beginning of the Gospel; and by the same principle of interpretation, here it is the beginning of all things, on account of the συνάγω δὲ ἀπρ. ἔγ. ver. 3.—These words, if they do not assert, at least imply, the eternal pre-existence of the Divine Word. For τὸν δραχμήν ἢ is not said of an act done τὸν δραχμήν (as in Gen. i. 1), but of a state existing τὸν δραχμήν, and therefore without beginning itself. — ἢ τοῦ, not equivalent to ἡσυχία (see ἡσυχία, ch. viii. 68 al.), as Euthymius and others have supposed; but Origen has given the true reason for the indefinite past being used, — ἢ μὲν κυρὶωτέρως ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου τὸ Ἑκτέριν τοῖς καθ’ ἑαυτόν πρὸς διαθήκην τῆς εἰκότως ἐκεῖνης γενομένης ἐκ τῶν καυσίμων, ἀντὶ τοῦ θεοῦ τῷ ἢ ἢ ἄνω γεγονότις εἰς ἀξίωτα (in Catena, Lücke, p. 296).

The existence of an enduring and unlimited state of being implied in ἢ is contrasted with ἐγένετο in ver. 3, and especially in ver. 14.—καὶ λ. ἢ πρὸς τ. ἢ. The usage of πρὸς here, as with (i.e. 'chez'), is sufficiently borne out by the ref. — Basil remarks (Lücke, i. 297) that John says πρὸς τὸν θ., not τὸν τ. ἢ, ἢ τὸ πρὸς τοῦ ὑποστάσεως παράστασιν. ἢ τῶν ἢ τῆς ὑποστάσεως. Both the inner substantial union, and the distinct personality of the λόγος are here asserted. The former is distinctly repeated in the next words.—κ. θ. ἢ τὸ λ. ἢ τὸ κατ’ ἄλλα ʿet al. the Word was God.’ No other rendering will satisfy the grammatical construction. The omission of the article before the predicate, when the predicate stands before the copula, is the usage of the N. T. writers. We have a striking example of this in Matt. xiii. 37—39: ὁ σκέφτεται τ. ἡμέραν τ. οἰκονομίας τ. ἀνθρ. — ὁ αγρός ἦτοι ὁ κόσμος—&c. &c.; but δὲ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, συναντά τὸν αἰώνα ἦτοι αἱ δὲ ἔρευναι, ἐγγελεῖ ἐκεῖν. I make this remark merely to justify the above rendering, as far as the form of the sentence is concerned (see also πνεῦμα ὁ θ. ch. iv. 24). But the sense to be conveyed here is as weighty a consideration as the form of the sentence. Had John intended to say, ‘God was the Word,—what meaning could his assertion possibly have conveyed? None other than a contradiction to his last assertion, by which he had distinguished God from the Word. And not only would this be the case, but the assertion would be inconsistent with the whole historical idea of the λόγος, making this term to signify merely an attribute of God, just as when it is said ὁ θεός ἀγάπη ἡσυχία. Not to men-
tion the unprecedented inversion of subject and predicate which this would occasion; ὁ λόγος having been the subject before, and again resumed as the subject afterwards.—The rendering of the words being then as above, their meaning is the next question. The omission of the article before θεός is not mere usage; it could not have been here expressed, whatever place the words might hold in the sentence. ὁ λόγος ἤτοι ὁ θεός would give a sense liable to the objections first stated, and destroy the idea of the λόγος altogether. Θεός must then be taken as implying ‘God,’ in substance and essence,—not ὁ θεός, ‘the Father,’ in person. It does not mean θεός, nor is it to be rendered a God—but, as in αὐτῷ τῷ θεῷ, ἀπέκτησε expresses that state into which the Divine Word entered by a definite act, so in θεός ἐστι, ἀπέκτησε expresses that essence which was Ἰησοῦς ἀρχή—that He was the very God. So that this first verse might be connected thus: ‘This Logos was from eternity,—was with God (the Father),—and was Himself God. —2.] In order to direct the mind to the difference (in unity) between this λόγος and ὁ θεός, John recalls the reader’s attention to the two first clauses of ver. 1, which he now combines, in order to pass on to the creative work, which distinctly belongs to the λόγος. Thus also this verse fixes the reference of ἀνάβω in ver. 3, which might otherwise, after the mention of θεός, have seemed ambiguous.—3.] πάντα = ὅλα πάντα (1 Cor. viii. 6. Col. i. 16), = ὁ κόσμος, ver. 10. This parallelism of itself refutes the Socinian interpretation of πάντα, ‘all Christian graces and virtues,’ the ‘whole moral world.’ But the history of the term λόγος forbids such an explanation entirely. For Philo (i. 162) says, ‘ὡς ἔρχεται αὕτως ἀπὸ αὐτοῦ ὁ κόσμος’ τὸν θεοῦ, ἢ ὁ θεός ἑαυτὸν ἐθάνατο διὰ τὰ πάντα τοὺς εἰσερχόμενος ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τῷ θεῷ, καὶ ὁ θεός ἐτέρωσεν τὴν εἰσέρχομαι τῷ κόσμῳ τῷ θεῷ, καὶ ὁ θεός ἐτέρωσεν τὸν κόσμον, ‘see also Col. i. 16, and Heb. i. 2. Olshausen observes, that we never read in Scripture that ‘Christ made the world;’ but ‘the Father made the world διὰ τὸν Σωτήρα, or ‘the world was made ὑπὸ τὸν Θεόν,’ because the Son never works of Himself, but always as the revelation of the Father: His work is the Father’s will, and the Father has no Will, except the Son, who is all His will (ἐν ὑμῖν ἐνδόξησι). The Christian Fathers rightly therefore rejected the semi-arian formula. The Son was begotten by an act of the Father’s will; for He is that Will Himself.—καὶ χειρὶ εὐθυρ. This addition is not merely a Hebraistic parallelism, but a distinct denial of the eternity and uncreatedness of matter as held by the Gnostics. They set matter, as a separate existence, over against God, and made it the origin of evil:—but John excludes any such notion. Nothing was made without Him (the λόγος): all matter and implicitly evil itself, in the deep and inscrutable purposes of creation (for it ὁ θεὸς ἐστιν ὁ ἄρχοντας ἐν τῷ ἀρχαῖον), δι’ αὐτοῦ γενέων. The punctuation of the end of the verse is uncertain, if we regard solely MSS. authority, but rests on the sense of the passage, which is rendered weak, and inconsistent with analogy, by placing the period after ὃς ἐστιν,—weak, because in that case we must render ‘That which was made by Him was life (i. e. having life), and that life was the light of men;’ but how was that life, i.e. that living creation which was made by Him, the light of men?—inconsistent with grammatical analogy, for John never uses γενεσίαν ἐστιν ὁ τὸν κόσμον ἐκ τοῦ ἐργασίαν. I have determined therefore for the ordinary punctuation, still marking it as doubtful. It is said to have been first adopted owing to an abuse of the passage by the Macedonian heretics, who maintained that if the exclusion was complete, the Holy Spirit can also not have been without His creating power, i.e. was created by Him. But this would be refuted without including διὰ γινομένων, for the Holy Spirit ἐστιν, not ἐγένετο. —4.] ἐν αὐτῷ. ὁ ἅγιος ὁ θεός—compare 1 John v. 11. 1 i., and ch. vi. 33. ἐν αὐτῷ is not merely ‘spiritual life,’ nor ‘the recovery of blessedness,’—as Tholuck, Knebel, &c. explain it: the λόγος is the source of all ἀποκατάστασις to the creature, not indeed ultimately, but mediately (see ch. v. 26. 1 John v. 11).—κ. θ. ὁ ἅγιος ὁ θεός τοῦ ἁγίου τοῦ θεοῦ. This is not to be understood of the teaching of the Incarnate Logos, but of the enlightening and life-sustaining influence of the eternal Son of God, in Whom was life. In the material world, light, the offspring of the Word of God, is the condition of life, and without it life degenerates and expires:—so also in the spiritual world, that life which is in Him, is to the creature the very condition of all development and furtherance of the life of the spirit. All knowledge, all purity, all love, all happiness, spring up and grow from this life, which is the light to them all. It is not φῶς, but τὸ φῶς:—because
this is the only true light: see ver. 9, also 1 John i. 5. — 5.] As light and life are closely connected ideas, so are death and darkness. The whole world, lying in death and in darkness, is the σκοτία here spoken of:—not merely the ἱσομερέαν (Eph. v. 7, 8), but the whole mass, with the sole exception (see below, ver. 12) of ὅσιον ἀνθρώπων (compare ch. iii. 19. 1 John v. 19). This φῶς is not merely the historical present, but describes the whole process of the light of life in the Eternal Word shining in this evil and dark world; both by the O. T. revelations, and (see ch. x. 16. xii. 52) by all the scattered fragments of light glittering among the thick darkness of heathendom. — καὶ...καὶ ἡμεῖς] 'and the darkness comprehended (understood, apprehended) it not.' That this is the meaning, will be clear from the context. John states here as a general fact, what he afterwards states of the appearance of the Incarnate Word in the chosen people, ver. 11. The sentences are strictly parallel. τὸ φῶς ἐν τῷ σε. φαίνει...καὶ η ἡμ. σε. αὐτῷ εἰς καὶ διὰ τῆς ἀληθείας, and καὶ η ἡμ. αὐτῶν εἰς τὸ παραδίσχον. In the first, he is speaking of the whole shining of this light over the world; in the second, of its historical manifestation to the Jews. In both cases, the Divine Word was rejected. παραδίσχον is used in the second case as expressing the personal assumption to oneself as a friend or companion: see reff.—Lücke observes (i. 313), that the almost tragic tone of this verse is prevalent through the Gospel of John and his first Epistle, see ch. ii. 19. xii. 37 ff. al.; and is occasionally found in Paul also, see Rom. i. 18 ff.—The other interpretation of καίδεσκαν, 'overtook, came upon' (for that of 'overcame' (Orig., Theophyl., Euthym.) is not admissible, the word never importing this), is unobjectionable as far as the usage of the word is concerned (see ch. xiii. 35. Mark ix. 18); but yields no sense in the context. The connection of the two members of our verse by καὶ is not, 'The Light shineth in the darkness, and therefore (i. e. because darkness is the opposition to light, and they exclude one another) the darkness comprehends it not:' but, 'The Light shineth in the dark, and yet (notwithstanding that the effect of light in darkness is so great and immediate in the physical world) the darkness comprehends it not:' see καὶ below, ver. 11.

6—18.] The manifestation and working of the Divine Word, Jesus Christ, the Son of God, incarnate in our flesh. — 6.] The Evangelist now passes to the historic manifestation of the Word. μεταφημίσθης ἐις τὸν ἱσομερέαν τοῦ νοὸν, τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐς εἰς τὰ καθ' ἡμᾶς: (Theodor. Moppeust. cited by Lücke, p. 314.) He enunciates briefly in these verses 6, 7, what he afterwards, ver. 19—36, narrates with historical detail.—ηὐγνωτείτε—not belonging to ἐπιστολέαν, but to ἀναλήφτη: the ordinary opening of an historical period, see Luke i. 5. No stress on ηὐγνωτείτε, as distinguished from ήγκα, ver. 1: (Olahhausen), see ch. iii. 1. There was—a man sent, &c. In ἢγκα...ἀναλήφτη we have possibly a reference to Mal. iii. 1. — 7.] The purpose of John's coming was to bear witness to a fact,—which fact (ver. 35) was made known to him by divine revelation. ἐν οἷς μαρτυρεῖ...is an expansion of ἐν μαρτυρίαις. — the subject of his witness was to be the Light, and the aim of it, that all might believe (ἐλεγκτικά, see ch. xiii. 36) through him, i. e. John: not τοῦ φωτός (Grot.), which confuses the whole, for then we must understand εἰς θεόν after παραδίσχον. which is here out of place. — 8.] John was himself δόλυναι καὶ φαίνεσθαι (ch. v. 35), see note on Matt. v. 14, but not τὸ φῶς. — On ηὐγνωτείτε: it belongs to ήγκα, not to ηὐγνωτείτε above.— 9.] The word ἅλθεσθαι (see reff.) in this connection imports 'original,' 'archetypal,' and is used of the true genuine sources and patterns of those things which we find here below only in fragmentary imitations and derivations. Such an original was the Light here spoken of;—but John was only a derived light,—not lumen illuminantis, but lumen illuminatun.—The construction of this verse has been much disputed. ἐν τῷ ξυρότων (as Orig. Syr. Chrysost. Cyril. Theophyl. Euthym. Vulg. and most of the ancient comm. and E. V.), or does it belong to ηὐγνωτείτε τῷ ἀλ. ?—The former construction can only be defended by a Rabbinical usage, by which γνωρίζεις means 'all men' (Schöttgen, i. 223). But it is very questionable whether John ever speaks thus. Certainly he does not in any of the passages commonly cited to defend this rendering, xviii. 37 (which is spoken by Christ of Himself and His Mission), xvi. 21. 28. xii. 46. And even if he had,
κόσμῳ ἦν, καὶ ὁ κόσμος δὲ αὐτοῦ ἡγέτης, καὶ ὁ κόσμος ABCD αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἐγένω. 11 εἰς τὰ ιδία ἦλθε, καὶ οἱ ἱδίοι αὐτοῦ οἱ "παριλάβον. 12 δοὺς ἢ ἢ ἐλαβον αὐτοῦ, ἐδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐχοῦσιν τέκνα θεοῦ γενέσαι, τοὺς πιστεύοντις εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, 13 οὐκ ἐκ ἢ εἰς ἀιμάτων, οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος σαρκὸς, οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος ἀνδρός, ἀλλ' ἐκ θεοῦ ἐγεννηθησαν.

(ονο) Aug. (sometimes.) — 12 δὲ om. D Tert. Cypr. ins. A B C Fr. Hil. — 13. οἱ om. D*. Iren. and Tert. quote δὲ ... ἐγεννηθη, and the latter attributes the plural γεννηθησεν knew, recognized Him not. — καὶ is as in ver. 5. — αὐτοῦ, not αὐτῷ, because though τὸ φῶς has been the subject, yet the δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο brings in again the creative λόγος, Who is the Light. The three members of the sentence form a climax: He was in the world (and therefore the world should have known Him), and that very world made Him known to them (much more than should it have known Him), but the world knew Him not. — 11.] τὰ θέα here cannot well mean the world, or οἱ θεοὶ mankind in general: it would be difficult to point out any Scripture usage to justify such a meaning. But abundance of passages bear out the meaning which makes τὰ θεοὶ His own inheritance or possession, i.e. Judea; and of θεοὶ, the Jews; compare especially the parable Matt. xxi. 33 ff. and Sir. xxiv. 7 ff. And thus ἦλθε forms a nearer step in the approach to the declaration in ver. 14.—He came to His own. On ταπαλ., see reff., and above on ver. 5. — 13.] The σερ... primarily refers to the λογος among the Jews who have just been spoken of: but also, by implication, being opposed to both δ κόσμος and οἱ θεοὶ, the λογος in all the world.— Παραλαβον = παραλαβον above as many as recognized Him as that which He was—the Word of God and Light of men.— οἰκον. τοις. θεον.] θεον. is not merely capability = δύναμιν (Lücke),—still less privilege or prerogative (Chrysost. and others),—but power (De Wette); involving all the actions and states needful to their so becoming, and removing all the obstacles in their way (e.g. the wrath of God and the guilt of sin).—ταῦτα θεον. γενέσει.] The spiritual life owes its beginning to a birth from above, ch. iii. 3—7. And this birth is owing to the Holy Spirit of God; so that this is equivalent to saying, 'As many as received Him, to them gave He His Holy Spirit.' And we find that it was so: see Acts x. 44.—ταῦτα θεον. is a more comprehensive expression than τιοι θ. which brings out rather our adoption, and hope of inheritance (Rom. viii. 15, 17), whereas the other involves the whole generation.
and process of our life in the Spirit, as being from and of God— and consequently our likeness to God, walking in light as He is in light (1 John i. 5—7)—free from sin (1 John iii. 9. v. 18) and death (ch. viii. 51).—to wv π. πλατ. τ. ἐν. αὐτ. τὸ δύναμιν αὐτοῦ ἡ ἔσχα is His manifestation as a Saviour from sin: see Matt. i. 21, καὶ οὗτος τὸ δύναμιν αὐτοῦ ἡ ἐσχά ἑαυτοῦ ἀνέγερε ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἀνάμικρον ἀνεγέρθη ἵνα σώσῃ τὴν λαόν αὐτοῦ ἀνάμικρον ἀνεμέλλων.—13.] The Jews grounded their claim to be children of God on their descent from Abraham. John here negatives any such claim, and asserts the exclusive Divine birth of all who become children of God by faith. It is to be noticed that the conjunctive ἀνέγερθη is used; while in the disputed verse oneś ἐσχά ... ἐσχά, which would necessitate the giving a special and distinct reference to each clause, but αὐτοὶ ... αὐτοί, which merely couple together the negative clauses (see examples of ἐσχά, Matt. xii. 32: of αὐτοί, Matt. vi. 26). This remark is important, because many Interpreters have seen in θελήμα ἄνδρος the male, and in θελήμα σαρκός the female side of human concupiscence (so Augustine, Theophylact, &c.); or in the former the higher and more conscious, in the latter the lower and animal side (Bleek). Besides the above, objections lie against both these interpretations. — (1) that αὐτοί is never so used (Eph. v. 29) is no instance in point; — (2) that θελήμα is ascribed to both. Euthymius seems to give the right interpretation: εἰπὸν δὲ ἐνικὸν ἐξ αἰμάτων, ἐνθέγας φανερώσεται ὁ δύναμις ἐν τῇ θελήματος σαρκῶν ἡ ἐσχά καὶ τοῦτο τελευτηρικον ἐφιμαντήσεις, προμηθές δὲ ὁ δύναμις ἐν τῇ θελήματος ἄνδρος ἀλήθεια γάρ καὶ αὐτοῖς, ἐν τῷ δύναμιν ἐν τῷ νοτί τὴν κατατεθείαν τὴν συνούσιαν: in loc. ii. 421.—The plural usage of αἰμάτων is only found in one other place in this signification—Earp. Ion, 652 Dind. 706. Herm. ἔχει δελθὸν τόκων τὸν εἴ χ' ἐλλοιον τραφεῖν ἐσχά, αἰμάτων. The other usage of the plural, for murder, is frequent in the LXV and the classics.—ἀνερπ, in the sense of man generally, is not uncommon; we have in plur. πατρίδος ἄνδρον τι θείον τι, in Hom. passim; and in sing. υ. xii. 321. xviii. 452, 453.—As remarks De Wette, denotes, the first time, the material; the second and third time, the mediate cause; the fourth time, the immediate cause, of the generation. —14.] καὶ must not be understood (Chrysost. Grot. Lampe, Theophylact, al.), as giving a reason for the verse before; it is only the same copula as in vv. 1, 3, 4, 5; passing on to a further assertion regarding the Word.—σαρκις ἐγένετο became flesh: the most general expression of the great truth that He became man. He became that, of which man is in the body compounded. There is no reference here to the doctrine of the Lord Jesus being the second Adam, as Oehlerhausen thinks; but although there may be no reference to it, it lies at the ground of this wideness of expression. The doctrine in this form may have been, as Lücke observes, alien to John's habits of thought, but not that which is implied in the doctrine,—that the taking of the nature of man by the Eternal Word. The impropriety of this expression is no doubt directed against the Docetism of the Apostle's time, who maintained that the Word only apparently took human nature. Therefore he says σαρκίς ἐγένετο, absolutely and literally became flesh:—see 1 John iv. 2. The expression is not guarded against the interpretation of the Apollinarian heretics, who held that the Lord had not a human soul (ψυχή); but this error was not in the Apostle's view, and is abundantly refuted elsewhere (see Matt. xxvi. 38 and note on 36—46, and the references there made to John's Gospel).—ἀνεγέρθη There is no reference to the flesh being the tabernacle of the Spirit;—but the word is one technically used in Scripture to import the dwelling of God among men. See besides ref., Levit. xxvi. 11, 12. Ezek. xiii. 7. xxxvii. 27. Sir. xxiv. 8, 10.—ἡμῶν] hominibus, qui caro sumus. Bengel.—καὶ τά. τ. δικ. αὐτ. we saw, see 1 John i. 1. 2 Pet. i. 16.—This is the Apostle's testimony as such, see Acts i. 21. —The mention of δύναμις seems to be suggested by the word δυνητός, so frequently used of the Divine Presence or Shechinah and cognate in its very form with it: 'cum lumen litterae in typum et viget.' Bengel.—This glory was seen by the disciples, ch. ii. 11. xi. 4: also by Peter, James, and John, specially, on the mount of transfiguration; to which occasion the words ἐς μονογενοῦς παρα πατρός seem to refer: but mainly, in the whole converse and teaching and suffering of the Lord, which was full of grace and truth: see below. — On δύναμις, Chrysostom remarks (Lücke, p. 348), οὐκ ὁμοίωσις, οὐδὲ παραβολή, ἀλλὰ μιασμὸς καὶ αὐτος ἀμφίβλητον θερισμὸν ἔχοιτι θεγέν τὸ
reading to the Valentinian heretics. — 14. πάρηγμα D. txt A B C. plenum b Iren. Hil. — 15. λίγων om. D b.— aft. εἴπεων ins. ὑμῖν D X.— for δν εἴπεων, δν εἴπεων C'. — 16. for δόξαν, οὖν ἄρθρα καὶ εἰσεχθήσαν μονογενής καὶ γέννησαν ὑμᾶς ἁπλά τινα τοὺς πάντας βασιλέας θεού (see reff.) — μονογενής. This word applied to Christ is peculiar to John: see reff. In the N. T. usage it signifies the only son;—in the LXX, Ps. xxii. 20, the beloved, and Ps. xxxiv. 16, one deserted, left alone. It has been attempted to render the word in John, according to the usage in Ps. xxii. 20. But obviously in the midst of ideas reaching so far deeper than that of regard, or love, of the Father for the Son, the word cannot be interpreted except in accordance with them. It refers to, and contrasts with, the τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ in vv. 12, 13. They receive their Divine birth both in Him, and through Him; but He is the μονογενής of the Father in the higher sense, in which He is γεννηθείς the Son of God. — παρὰ πάντος belongs to μονογενείας, not to δόξαν as Theophyl. Erasm. Grot. suppose. — The ellipse is to be supplied by considering the state in which the λόγος here appears,—that of having become σάρξ and dwelling among us; see reff. — πάρηγμα χ. κ. Ἀλ. — These words have been variously connected. The view of Erasmus, who places the period at παράρηγμα, and connects these words with ἰδωνίαν, scarcely needs refutation, whether we regard the construction, or the meaning of the sentence. The reading πάρηγμα has probably arisen from a correction, to connect the adj. with δόξαν. Some do this even with πάρηγμα, but both the construction and the sense are against it. It was not the δόξα, but He Himself, that was παρηγμένος χ. κ. Ἀλ.: see below, ver. 17. Others suppose πάρηγμα to refer directly to μονογενείας, and justify this by Eph. iii. 17. But besides the unnecessary harshness of this, the sense is against it also; for it cannot be said ‘we saw His glory, the glory as of one who was full of grace and truth,’ we must have the ως referring, in the sense of ὁ δὲ ἵνα ὑμῖν (see above), to some mysterious hidden character which the glory testified, whereas the παρηγμένος χ. κ. Ἀλ. is itself a mere matter of fact, to which the Apostles themselves could (ver. 17) bear witness. The only legitimate construction is (as usually done and in E. V.) to take καί . . . παράρηγμα as parenthetical, and connect πάρηγμα immediately with ἰδωνίαν. Such parentheticals are common in the style of this Gospel: see ch. vi. 22, 24. xi. 2. xix. 23, 24. ib. 31.—γέρα. κ. Ἀλ.] not γεράς χ. Ἀλ., which destroys the precision of the expression, and itself conveys no sense whatever; but setting out the two sides of the Divine manifestation in Christ,—χάρας, as the result of Love to mankind,—ἀληθεύμα (see reff. and ch. xiv. 6), as the unity, purity, and light of His Own Character. — 15. The testimony of John, so important as being the fulfilment of the very object for which he was ἀποσταλμένος παρά θεοῦ, is in this prologue ranged, so to speak, parallel with the assertions and testimony of the Evangel. himself. So that this verse does not interrupt the train of thought, but confirms by this important testimony the assertion ὁ λόγος σάρξ καὶ ἐγέρθη, showing that John bore witness to His pre-existence. Then (ver. 16) the πάρηγμα χ. κ. Ἀλ. is again taken up. Euthymius paraphrases: εἰ καὶ μὴ ἤγγισα φησι, διὸ καὶ τις καὶ ἠδών ἀλήθειας, ἀλά πρὸ ἑμών ἦν ἰδωνίας μαρτυρεῖ περὶ τῆς θεοτητος αὐτοῦ, ἰδωνίας καὶ των πριν ἔστηκεν παρὰ τὰς τοῖς Ιουδαίοις. — καὶρ. Λογ. gave out openly, see ch. vii. 37.—οὕτως ἄν ἦν ἐκείνως . . . [This form of the verse seems to show, as indeed would appear from the announcement of his own office by the Baptist, that he had uttered these words in the power of the Spirit concerning Him whose forerunner he was, before he saw and recognized Him in the flesh. Then, on doing so, he exclaimed, 'This was He of whom I said,' &c. This view seems to be borne out by his own statement, ver. 33, and by the order of the narrative in Matt. iii. 11, 12, 13. — οὐτωσ μ. ἀρχ.] In point of time; not of birth merely or principally, nor of commencement of official life; but, inasmuch as John was His Forerunner, on account of official position. — ἰδωνίαν μ. γέραν] The E. V. is here very accurate,—is preferred before me; the γέραν setting forth the advancement to official dignity before which John's office was waned and decreased (ch. iii. 30), which took place even while John's course was being fulfilled. This sense of ἰδωνίας (besides ref.) is justified by classical usage in Plato.
who uses ἑπταπλοῦσθεν τιθιμαία for preposenere, Legg. vii. 805. See also i. 631. v. 743. Also Demosthenes, κατὰ Διονυσιόδορον, p. 1296, 26... τὰς αἰγίας τῶν ἑκατέρες ἑπταπλοῦσθεν οὐσίας τοῦ θεϊον. — ἢ προ-
ήθητον ὑμῖν ὑπο. The only sense which these words will bear, is, 'because (or, for) He was (not ἐγείροντο, but ὑπὸ as in ver. 1) before me;' i.e. 'He existed, was in being, before me.' The question raised by Lücke and De Wette, whether it is probable that the Baptist had, or expressed, such views of the pre-existence of Christ, is not one for us to deal with, in the face of so direct a testimony as is given to the fact, here and in ch. iii. 27 ff. In all probability, the Evangelist was himself a disciple of the Baptist: and if he has given us a fuller and more exact account of the testimony given to Christ, it is because he means of information were ampler than those of the other Evangelists. The questioners seem to forget that the Baptist was divinely raised up and commissioned, and full of the Holy Ghost, and spoke in that power: his declarations were not therefore merely conclusions which he had arrived at by natural means,—the study of the prophecies, &c. (Lücke, p. 353); but inspirations and revelations of the Spirit. This last is fully recognized by Olshausen (ii. 61). — 16.] Origen (in Evang. Joh. vii. 2) blames Hieracleon for terminating the testimony of John at the end of ver. 17, and makes it continue to the end of ver. 18. But this can hardly be, for then πάντες ἡμῖν would bear no very definite meaning, and the assertions in ver. 17 would be alien from the character of the Baptist, belonging as they do to the more mature development of Christian doctrines. I cannot doubt that this and the following verses belong to the Evangelist, and are a carrying onwards of his declarations concerning the Divine Word.—Ver. 15 is not parenthetical, but confirmatory of ver. 14, and this verse proceeds itself on the fact of ver. 14, corroborated by the testimony of ver. 15,—that we saw His glory, and that He dwelt among us, full of grace and truth. — τὸ πληρωμα is His being πλήρης, ver. 14, and is not connected with the Gnostic πλώρμα at all. See reff. — πάντες ἡμῖν] All who believe on Him; see ver. 12. — ἑλάμβανον 'have received, and that'... our relation to Him has been that of recipients out of His fulness, and the thing received has been... — χάριν 'grace.' The ancient interpretation, τὴν κατάνοια διαθήκην ἀντὶ τῆς παλαιᾶς (Bathyn.) is certainly wrong, for the ἑλάμβανον is spoken entirely of the times of the Incarnate Word; and besides, διὰ νόμος and χάρις are distinctly opposed to one another in the next verse.—The prep. ἀντὶ is properly used of any thing which superseded another, or occupies its place. This is in fact its ordinary usage when exchange is spoken of; the possession of the thing gotten succeeds to, superseded, the possession of the thing given in exchange, and I possess not only ἀντὶ αὐτοῦ. Thus also we have received χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος, continual accessions of grace; new grace coming upon and superseding the former. Thus in Theognis, Sentt. 343 ff. (Lücke), τιθεμένην δὲ αὐτῷ τοὺς κατὰ διαθήκην μεταμόρφωσις τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, δοθῆς δὲ ἀντὶ αὐτῶν ἐκάθεν. And Chrysostom, de Sacerdotio, 6, 13, (Bengel,) οὐ δὲ με κατημόρφωσιν, τεθέντων ἀντὶ τῆς φωνῆς ἐνθεοῖς. Also Philo, i. 254. speaking of this very word χάρις; —τὰς πρώτας αἱ χάριτος... ἑκατοστάσις καὶ ταμιευ-
σάμους ἑκάστως τῆς καθαροῦ κεραυνοῦ, καὶ τρίτως ἀντὶ διαθήκης, καὶ δὲ τέσσαραν ἀντὶ παλαιστράτων τῶν μετὰ τεθείην τοῦ εστὶν καὶ τὰς αὐτῶν ἀπόκεισθαι. — 17.] The connexion of this verse with the foregoing lies in the words τοῦ πληρώματος αὐτοῦ (ver. 16), and in χάρις κ. ἀλ. (ver. 14.) 'We received from His fulness continual additions of grace, because that fulness is not, like the law, a positive enactment, finite and circumscribed, of which it could be said that it ἐξῆλθε, but the bringing in of grace and truth, which ἐγένετο by Jesus Christ. — ἐληλύθη and ἐγένετο have been variously distinguished,—αὐτόνως μὲν τὸ ἐγένετο, διὰ καὶ ἔληλυσεν τὸ ἐγένετο, Theophyl. Similarly Bengel, Moses non sunt lex sed Christi sua est gratia et veritas.' Clem. Alex. Ped. i. 7, says: διὰ καὶ φθάνει ἡ γραφή "ὁ νόμος διὰ Μωσέως ἔληλυσεν," οὐχ ὡς Μωσής, ἀλλὰ ὡς μὲν τοῦ λόγου, διὰ Μωσέως δὲ τοῦ θεράποντος αὐτοῦ, διὰ καὶ πρόεκασος ἐγένετο, ἡ δὲ ἄδικος
χάρας καὶ ἡ ἀληθεία διὰ Ἡσυχοῦ χριστοῦ ἡγίατος, εἰς τὸν Κόλλον τοῦ πατρὸς, ἐκεῖνος ἐκτιθεμένος.

The expression must not be understood as referring to the custom of reclining in τῷ κόλπῳ, as in ch. xxii. 23: for by this explanation confusion is introduced into the imagery, and the real depth of the truth hidden. The expression signifies, as Chrysostom observes, ἀληθὴς καὶ ἱστομένης τῆς θείας, and is derived from the fond and intimate union of children and parents. — The present participle, as in ch. iii. 13, is used to signify essential truth, without any particular regard to time. — On the use of εἷς, see reff. It is not 'put for' in: indeed it would be well for the student to bear in mind as a general rule, that no word or expression is ever 'put for' another: words are the index of thoughts,—and where an unusual construction is found, it points to some reason in the mind of the writer for using it, which reason is lost in the ordinary shallow method of accounting for it by saying that it is 'put for' some other word. So here, εἷς τῶν κόλπων is not = ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ, but is carrying on of the thought expressed in ver. 1, by πρὸς τῶν θεῶν: it is a pregnant construction, involving in it the begetting of the Son and His being the λόγος of the Father.—His proceeding forth from God. It is a similar expression, on the side of His Unity with the Father, to εἰμὶ παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ, on the side of His manifestation to men. — ἔστω as 'He, and none else;' an emphatic exclusive expression. — ζηγγίσθαι] ζηγγίσμα, ζηγγήσεις, and ζηγγήσεως are technical terms used of the declaration of Divine matters. Wetstein has collected abundance of passages in illustration of this usage.—See also Müller's Eumenides, Excursus D. on the ζηγγήσατι. But Lücke (and I think rightly) believes it more in accordance with the simple style of John to take the word here in its ordinary, not its technical meaning.—The object to be supplied after the verb is most likely αὐτόν, i.e. τῶν θεῶν. De Wette thinks this too definite, and supplies 'that which He has
19 Kaı̂ αὐτὴ ἔστιν ἡ μαρτυρία τοῦ Ἰωάννου, ὁ ὅτε ἔτη 3 γεννηθεῖς. 20 ἀπέστειλαν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἐξ Ἰεροσολύμων ἱερεῖς καὶ ἱερέων τοῖς Ἀββάνταις, οὓς ἐρωτήσαν αὐτὸν ἦκεῖ εἶναι ἀνήκος. 21 Καὶ ἦρωτοι αὐτὸν Τί ὑμᾶς εἴπετε; Ἡλίας εἶ σὺ; καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς ὅτι ὅπως ἦκεῖ ἀνήκος. 22 Ἡ καὶ ὁ προφήτης ἦκεσύνατο καὶ ἡμολύγησαν ὅτι Ὠπο δικαίως εἰμι ἔνοικός καὶ χριστός; 23 καὶ ἦρωτοι αὐτὸν ἦκεῖ Τίς εἶ οὖν; Ἡλίας εἶ σὺ; καὶ ἦχεῖ αὐτοῖς ὅτι Ὁ προφήτης εἶ σὺ; καὶ ἦχεῖ ἀπεκριθῇ Οὔ. 24 εἶπον οὖν αὐτῷ Τίς εἶ; Ἡ ἡμεῖς ἠτέλκοςαι τίς μεταφασίζη ἡμᾶς, τί λέγεις περί σεαυτοῦ;
see ch. vii. 40, 41. In Matt. xvi. 14 we seem to have "Jeremiah, or one of the prophets," apparently as this expected prophet. There seem to have been various opinions about him; all however agreeing in this, that he was to be one of the old prophets raised from the dead (see also 2 Macc. ii. 1—6). This John was not; and therefore answers this also in the negative. —28. These words, which by the other Evangelists are spoken of John as the fulfilment of the prophecy, appear from this place to have been first so used by himself. They introduce the great closing section of the prophecy of Isaiah (ch. xl—xlvii), so full of the rich promises and revelations of the Messiah and His Kingdom. —έφηναι is used as comprehensively expressing ἐτοιμάσατε ... ἐτοιμάσατο τοὺς. —By implication, the Baptist, quoting this opening prophecy of himself, announces the approaching fulfilment of the whole section. —29. The reason of this explanation being added is not very clear. Lücke, with whom De Wette agrees, refers it to the apparent hostility of the next inquiry: but I confess I cannot see that it is more hostile than the preceding. Might it not be to throw light on their question about baptism, as the Pharisees were the most precise about all ceremonies, lustrations, &c.? Origen, who read the verse without οὐ (see var. read.), makes this a new deputation: but he is plainly wrong: see the οὐ below. Euthymius gives another reason yet: ἐκσημαντάτο καὶ τὴν αἰρεσιν αὐτῶν, ἐτοιμάσαν τοῖς περιήγησι καὶ σκελοί. —If the οὐ is abandoned, as I think it should be, we must render, 'And they were (or had been) sent by the Pharisees,' which will make it more probable that the explanation refers to the nature of the following question. —25. On οὐδέ, οὐδέ, see note on ver. 13. This question shows probably that they did not interpret Isa. xl. 3 of any herald of the Messiah. They regarded baptism as a significant token of the approach of the Messianic Kingdom, and they asked, Why baptizest thou, if thou art no forerunner of the Messiah?—26, 27. The probable reading of these verses, μόσος ὅμων ἐπικήνω, ὦ ὅμως αὐτοὶ, δότως μου ἐρχόμενος, ὦ γάρ κ.ἀ., gives ὦ δότως μου ἑρχόμενος, as the subject of the sentence; He that cometh after me, &c., stands among you. —The insertions have perhaps been made by some one not aware of this, and also wishing to square the verse with ver. 15. —The answer of the Baptist seems not to correspond to the question in ver. 26. This was noticed as early as Heracleon (Origen, ed. Lommatzsch, i. 222), who said, ἀπεκρίνεται ὁ ἱωάννης τοῖς ἐκ τῶν Φαρισαίων περιηγητίοις, ὦ πρὸς ὦ διδάσκειν ἑπιτρήσω, ἀλλ' ὦ αὐτοὶ ἔδοθέντο. This however is impugned at some length by Origen, but not on any convincing grounds. The truth seems to have been apprehended by Olson-,—that the declaration of John that the Messiah was standing among them at that moment unknown to them, was an answer to their question demanding a legitimation of his prophetic claims; a σημεῖον that he was sent from God:—see ch. ii. 18. Olah. also suggests that this may clear up the saying of the Jews in ch. x. 41 (see note there). In repeating this saying at other times (see Matt. iii. 11 and 13), the Baptist plainly states of the Mes-
siah that he should baptize them with the Holy Ghost and fire, as here in ver. 33. Here, in speaking to those learned in the offices of the Messiah, he leaves that to be supplied. — ἄκος ἀντί τ. ἡμ. . . . . ] see note on Matt. iii. 11.—28.] The common reading, Βαθαραϊς, is owing to a conjecture of Origen, the grounds of which he thus states: δι' ευθείαν το ισραηλίτην χωρίς τινὸς τῶν ἀντιγράφων κινεῖ. "τούτα ἐν Βαθαραΐς ἔγνετο ὡς ἀγνοοῦντοι, καὶ ἐκείνοι τότε καὶ ἐκ τούτων γεγονότα" καὶ παρὰ Ἰωάννας γενέθλιος Βαθαραϊς καί γενεαλογίας θρια, ἡ παρθενισμος καὶ Μαρθας καὶ Μαριας, ἀπό των Ἰσραηλίτων σταθεροτερίων, σπόρων ὁλοτοῖς ὁ Ἰσραηλίτης σπόρῳ, ὡς αὐτῆς σπορῳ πλατεία μύον β' (180). ἀλλ' ὁδείς ὁμονίμως τῷ Βαθαραϊς τόσο ἡμ. περὶ τοῦ Ἰσραηλίτης δεδομένως. δι' ἄλλ' εὐθείας τῷ Βαθαραϊς τῷ Ἰσραηλίτης ἐν Μαρθας καὶ Μαρίας καὶ Ἕλληνας καὶ Ἰουδαίως καὶ παρακλήσεις. 28. —29. rec. Βαθαραϊς with C K У (βαθαραϊς U) 19 mss., and the approval of Orig. Eus. Suid. Jer. &c., in many of whom the variety is noticed, but text A B C E G H L M S V X Δ 69 all. Β C S. Suppt. Sahid. Heracleon. Chrys.—aft. βαπτ. ins. τῷ πρῶτον C 1.—29. rec aft. βαπτ. ins. ὁ Ἰωάννας with many const. mss., &c. Orig. Cypr., but om. the Baptism is identical with that given by the three other Evangelists, especially by Luke (i. 16), is, after all that has been said on it (Lücke, De Wette, Olscheweis, &c.), not of great importance. The whole series of transactions here recorded, from ver. 15 onwards, certainly happened after the baptism of our Lord;—for before that event John did not know Him as ὁ Ἰησοῦς: and μισός ὑμῶν ἤσανεν ver. 26 shows that he had so recognized Him (see below on τῇ ἑαυτῷ): whereas the testimony in Luke iii. 16 and || is as certainly given before the baptism. But since the great end of John’s mission was to proclaim Him who was coming after Him, it is not only probable, but absolutely necessary to suppose, that he should have delivered this testimony often, and under varying circumstances: before the baptism, in the form given by Luke, ἔρχεται ὁ Ἰησοῦς μου εἰς τ. λ. e., and after it in this form, ὁ γενετος ἐν δε ἐπιυσ (ver. 15), where his former testimony is distinctly referred to. And among John’s disciples and the multitudes who frequented his baptism, many reports of such his sayings would naturally be current. So that there is neither a real nor even an apparent contradiction between John and the other Evangelists.—It is a far more important question, in what part of this narration the forty days’ Temptation is to be inserted. From ver. 19 to ch. ii. 1 there is an unbroken sequence of days distinctly marked. Since then ver. 19 must be understood as happening after the baptism, it must have happened after the Temptation also. And in this supposition there is not the slightest difficulty. But when we have made it, it still remains to say whether at that time our Lord had returned from the Temptation or not. The general opinion of Harmonists has been, that the approach of Jesus to John in ver. 29 was His return after the Temptation. But this I think questionable, on account of the μισός ὑμῶν ἤσανεν, ver. 26; which I can only understand literally. I therefore believe that the return from the Temptation to Bethany beyond Jordan had taken place before the
deputation arrived. (On the probable reason of our Evangelist omitting the Temptation, see Prolegomena to John.)

29-34.] Another witness borne by John to Jesus; apparently before his disciples, or the multitude (?).—29.] τῆς ἐκατομμυρίου, ‘the day after.’ Those who wish to introduce the Temptation between vv. 28 and 29, interpret it, ‘on some day after.’ Thus Euthym. τῆς ἡμέρας, μετὰ τοῦ ἀνήρ ισόμετρον κάθεδον αὐτόν ἕξεγεῖτο. But this sense of τῆς ἡμέρας, although certainly found in the LXX.—see Gen. xxx. 33,—is not according to the usage of John (see ref.), and would be quite alien from the precision of this whole portion of the narrative, which, ver. 39, specifies even the hours of the day. I understand it therefore literally, both here and in vv. 38 and 43.—ἐρχείται τῷ καιρῷ. It is not said séhence, or why, or whether for the purpose of an interview, nor does the action merely is related, for the sake of the testimony which follows. I mention this, because on these points difficulties have been raised.—καὶ ἐστὶν ἀμαρτίας τοῦ κόσμου. (a) The title must refer to some known and particular Lamb,—and cannot be a mere figure for a just and holy man, as Kinoel and Gabler! It is inconceivable, that δὲ ἐν εἰς τοῦ θεοῦ should, in a testimony so precise and formal as this, of the Baptist, be nothing but an hyperbole, and that one wholly unprecedented, and to his hearers unintelligible. Had no doctrinal considerations been at stake, we may safely say that this interpretation would never have been proposed. In its bearing on the latter clause of the verse, it is equally untenable. These interpreters make δὲ ἐν εἰς τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ κόσμου, καὶ προβάτινος χρώματι, a new and strange creature of the Baptists. Gabler, or, ‘His removebit peccata hominum, i.e. pravitatem e terrâ.’ The first of these meanings of καὶ κόσμου is altogether without example,—that cited from 1 Macc. xiii. 17, not being applicable. The second, though common enough in other connexions, is never found with ἀμαρτίας; see ref.—The common sense account of this part of the matter is:—John wished to point out Jesus as the Messiah: he designates Him as the Lamb of God; he therefore referred to some definite Lamb,—revealed by God,—sent by God,—pleasing to God,—or in some meaning especially, τὸ θεός. Whence did this idea come?—(8) Can John have referred to the Paschal Lamb? Further than the very use of the name brings in with it the general typical use of the animal, and thus this particular use may lie in the background, I think not,—and for this reason,—The dominant idea in the Paschal sacrifice has no connexion, in any sense of the words, with αἱρεῖν τῷ ἀμαρτίας. However by the light now thrown back on it since the Spirit has opened the things of Christ, we discern this typical meaning in the sprinkling of the blood (see 1 Cor. v. 7),—in the Jewish mind, no mention being made of sin or the removing of sin in any connexion with the paschal lamb, the two could not be brought forward, in such an announcement as this, in close connexion with one another.—(γ) Can the reference be to the lamb of the daily morning and evening sacrifice? or to the sacrificial lamb generally? With the same reservation as above, I think not: for (1) this expression is too definite to have so general and miscellaneous a reference; (2) of many animals which were used for sacrifice, the lamb was only one,—and that one not by any means so prominent as to serve as a type for the Baptist: and (3) the lamb (with only two exceptions, Levit. iv. 32. Num. vi. 14, in both which cases it was to be a female, as if for express distinction from the ordinary use of the lamb) was never used for a sin-offering, properly so called and known. The question is not, whether Christ be not typified by all these offerings, which we now know to be the case (1 Pet. i. 19 al.), but whether the Baptist is likely to have referred to them in such words as these. (8) There remains but one reference, and that is, to the prophetic announcement in Isa. liii. 7. The whole of that latter section of Isaiah, as before remarked on ver. 23, is Messianic, and was so understood by the Jews (see my Hulsean Lectures for 1841, pp. 62—66). We have there the servant of God (the Messiah) compared to a lamb brought to the slaughter (liii. 7), and it is said of Him (liii. 4), ως ἀμαρτίας
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πρώτος μου ὢν. 51 καὶ γὰρ οὐκ ἦδεν αὐτὸν, ἀλλ' ἐναντιών αὐτῶν, ἐν τῷ Ἱεροσόλυμω, οὗ θανάτων, ἀπὸ τῶν τάξιν τῆς ἁρματίας ἢμῶν—ver. 5, ἀπὸ τῆς τῆς ἡμέρας τῶν ἢμῶν—ver. 6, καὶ κύριος ἡμῶν ἀπὸ τῶν ἢμων ἡμῶν—ver. 8, ἀπὸ τοῦ τῶν ἢμων ἡμῶν—ver. 12. In both instances, the reference is to the experience of the seven brothers, as recorded in the previous verses.

So that here, and here only, we have the connexion which we are in search of, between the Lamb and the bearing or taking away of sin, expressly stated, so that it could be formally referred to in a testimony like the present. And I have therefore no doubt that this was the reference. (a) We have now to inquire into the specific meaning of ὢν ἀπὸ τῶν ἢμων, ἡμῶν—ver. 12, ἀπὸ τῶν ἢμων ἡμῶν—ver. 8, and to some extent in the O. T. in connexion with ῥήσις or ἰρακίς, in the sense of peccati postas luce.—see Levit. xxiv. 15. Num. v. 31. xiv. 34. Ezek. iv. 5. xxiii. 35 al.:—and variously rendered in the LXX by ἔναρξις, as above, Is. lii. 11,—of πέντε, ib. ver. 12,—or λαμβάνειν, Ezek. iv. 5. xviii.—or λαμβάνεινα, as Numbr. v. 31. xiv. 34. Levit. xxiv. 15. The word is also used in the sense of 'taking away of sin and its guilt,' but taking it away by expiation: see Levit. x. 17. Exod. xxxiv. 7. Num. xiv. 16.—The word in our verse will bear either of these meanings, or both conjoined; for if the Lamb is to suffer the burdens of the sins of the world, and to take away sin and its guilt by expiation, this result must be accomplished by the offering of Himself. But (c) it is objected, that this view of a suffering Messiah and of expiation by the sufferings of one, was alien from the Jewish expectations;—and that the Baptist (see Matt. xi. 3 and note) cannot himself have had any such view. But the answer to this may be found in the fact that the view, though not generally prevalent among the Jews, was by no means unknown to many. The application by the early Jewish expositors of Is. lxxii. to the Messiah, could hardly have been made without the idea of the suffering and death of their Messiah being presented to their minds. The same would be the case in the whole sacrificial economy:—the removal of guilt (which was universally ascribed to the Messiah) by suffering and death would be familiarized to their minds. Traces of this are found in their own writings. In 2 Macc. vii. 37, 38 the last of the seven brethren thus speaks before his martyrdom: "καὶ ἔδωκαν τὴν ὀψίνην μου καὶ σῶμα καὶ ὕπαρξιν προδότης τηρήσων τὴν ἀδικίαν τῶν βασιλευμάτων καὶ σωτηρίαν τῶν παντοκράτορος." And Josephus de Maccab. § 17, says of these same martyrs, that they were νεκροὶ ἐν πάντων ἢμων γίνοντο δικαιῶν ἐνεργούσις. And Josephus de Maccab. § 17, says of these same martyrs, that they were νεκροὶ ἐν πάντων ἢμων γίνοντο δικαιῶν ἐνεργούσις. And Josephus de Maccab. § 17, says of these same martyrs, that they were νεκροὶ ἐν πάντων ἢμων γίνοντο δικαιῶν ἐνεργούσις. And Josephus de Maccab. § 17, says of these same martyrs, that they were νεκροὶ ἐν πάντων ἢμων γίνοντο δικαιῶν ἐνεργούσις. And Josephus de Maccab. § 17, says of these same martyrs, that they were νεκροὶ ἐν πάντων ἢμων γίνοντο δικαιῶν ἐνεργούσις. And Josephus de Maccab. § 17, says of these same martyrs, that they were νεκροὶ ἐν πάντων ἢμων γί

51 καὶ γὰρ οὐκ ἦδεν αὐτὸν, ἀλλ' ἐναντιών αὐτῶν, ἐν τῷ Ἱεροσόλυμω, οὗ θανάτων,
had no certain knowledge of Him. Lücke's whole note proceeds upon the unworthy view of the historical character of the Gospels which his school has adopted. The same may be said of Neander, Leben Jesu, pp. 86 ff.—De Wette gives the sense well: 'This testimony (ver. 30) does not rest upon my long personal acquaintance with Him, but on that which happened during my work of baptizing.'—Διὸ οὖν Ἐφ. justin Martyr represents Trypho the Jew saying, χριστὸς δὲ εἶ καὶ γείγνιται, καὶ ἐστι που, ἀγνωστός ὁσι, καὶ οὐδὲ αὐτὸς πειλ αὐτοῦ ἑκατότατον, οὐδὲ ἤκου ἕκατον ἡλικίας χριστὸν αὐτῶν, καὶ φανερῶν πᾶσι ποιούσι, p. 230 B. But our narrative is not built upon any such Jewish belief, for it is evidently only as a spiritual preparation, through repentance, for the knowledge of Him, that John regarded his baptism, not as anything ἐκεῖνον φανερὸν πᾶσι ποιούσι. —32, 33.] Quae sequuntur, erant testimonii; quae ex ver. 39 sqq. dicitur, erant demonstrationes ex testimonio. Coherentibus Baptismae verbis Evangelista quasi parenthein interponit; καὶ ἐμπόροιον Ἰωάννης λέγων. Bengel.—The occurrence related by John happened at the baptism of Jesus, which is therefore here presupposed as known. Although this has been questioned (Usteri, Nachrichten über den Tauffier J. u. s. w., cited by Lücke i. 423), I cannot see how it can be reasonably doubted. We cannot surely suppose that such a sign was twice shown. On the appearance itself, see note Matt. iii. 16. The account here given confirms the view which I have there maintained, that the appearance was confined to our Lord and the Baptist: he was to receive the sign, and then to testify to the others, who were not themselves yet the hearers, but the recipients of testimony. κατὰ τὸν ἰησοῦντος πάντας αὐτὸς μόνος τῷ Ἰωάννῃ (Theod. Mops. in Caesn., Lücke, ib.).—εἴρητον ἐκ τοῦ. By some appearance which is not described, the Holy Spirit was manifested to John as not removing from Jesus again, but abiding on Him. But we are not to understand that he had seen the Spirit descending on others, and not abiding; for (see ch. vii. 39. Acts i. 5. xix. 2 ff.) the gift of the Holy Spirit did not ordinarily accompany John's baptism, but only in this one case: and its occurrence was to point out to him the Messiah. —οὖν ὅτι ὁ Ἰ. ἐν σ. ν. ἁγ. Here again we seem to have a reference to the synoptic cycle of narratives, for our Evangelist has not before mentioned this office of the Messiah. —34.] A solemn reiteration of his testimony, after the mention of the giving of this token by Him who sent him; —And I saw (accordingly), &c.—The token must have been given to the Baptist by a special revelation, which also revealed to him his own errand and office; so Luke iii. 2, ἄγνωστο ρῆμα οὖν ἡ Ἰωάννης τοῦ τ. Ἡμῶν ἐν τῇ ἡράμῃ. —μεμπόροιον is stronger than μαρτυράω; —'I have seen and have borne testimony'—it is a reference to his testimony at the time, as a thing on record in their memories.—ὡς κ. τ. ὅ. see ver. 18 = the Ἀγγείυς made flesh, the Messiah.—On the import of the Descent of the Spirit on Jesus at His Baptism, those who can do so should consult Lücke's very able Excursus, i. 433—443. In this commentary, see notes on Luke ii. 41—52. —I may just remark, that the Personal Logos, which σάρξ ἱνωσκεῖ in the Lord, and which was subjected to all the laws of human development in infancy, childhood, youth,—evermore in an especial degree under the leading of the Holy Spirit by Whose agency the Incarnation had taken place,—was in the Lord the Recipient (τῷ δεχόμενῳ) of this fulness of the indwelling of the Holy Ghost; and that herein consisted the real depth and propriety of this sign;—the abiding of the
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35 Τῇ επαύρων πάλιν ειστήκει ὁ Ἰωάννης καὶ ἐκ τῶν ε. v. 39, 42. μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ δύο, καὶ εἰμι πλέον τῷ Ἰησοῦ περιπατοῦντι λέγει Ἰδε ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ. καὶ ἠκουσαν αὐτού ὁ δύο μαθηταὶ λαλοῦσι, καὶ ἠκολούθησαν τῷ Ἰησοῦ. 36 στοιχεῖα δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ θεασάμενος αὐτοὺς ἀκολουθῶντας λέγει αὐτοῖς. 37 Τῇ ζητεῖτε; οἱ δὲ εἶπον ἀυτῷ Ἡρῴζει (ὁ λέγεται εἰρημενοῦν διδασκαλε) ποὺς μένεις; 40 λέγει αὐτοῖς Ἐρχόμεθα καὶ ἔδειτε ἕλθον καὶ εἰδον μένει καὶ παρὰ αὐτῶν ἔμειναν τὴν ἕμεραν ἐκείνην ὥρα ἡ ἐς δικαίωτα. 41 ἢν Ἀνδρέας ὁ ἄνελαφος Σιμώνος Πέτρου εἰς ἐκ τῶν δύο τῶν ἀκούσαντων παρὰ Ἰωάννου καὶ ἀκολουθοῦσαν αὐτῶ. 42 εὐφράσιες αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὸν ἄνελαφον τὸν ἤδειον Σιμώνη καὶ λέγει

Ambr.—36. aft. θ. ins. ὁ αἰρεῖ τὴν ἀμαρτίαν του ἐκδομοῦ C 2 a Ἐθ. Cyt. —39. μεθ᾽ ημῶν A B C L X 3 al. a Orig. ὑπὲρ τῆς F. —40. for ἐδέειτε, δύο C B 3 Ὑστ. Orig. τῆς A F. — assaulting, άλλα ins. συν A B C L X 4 al. a Ὑστ. Cpt. ᾿Εθ. Theophyl. om. F c. — rec. e. h. ins. 6 ὑπὲρ ἀλ. ἐκ τῆς C B 3 Ὑστ. c. p. — 38.] On account of the testimony of John, Andrew, and another of his disciples, and through Andrew, Simon Peter, before the crowd of witnesses. —38 ] τῇ ἦς ἔχει, see on ver. 29. I can hardly support with Do We, that the two had been absent on the preceding day. Rather, what they then heard seems to have made a powerful impression on their minds, so that the repetition of the notice is now the signal for them to follow Jesus. (On the second disciple, see below on ver. 41.) —37] We must not understand ἠμαρτα, in the narrower sense which it bears when they left all and followed Him; but here only of mechanical going after Him, βουλόμενοι περάν καθῆς αὐτοῦ, Euthym.—38] On τῇ ἑκτῇ. Euthym. remarks, ὁς αἴγεων, τοὺς λογισμοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἰρμάτων. ἄλλτοι δὲ τῆς ἰρμάτως οἰκεῖον εἰς τοῦτο καὶ παρὰ χρεὶα βλέπον, εἰς γὰρ αὐτός ἱρμάτων ἐκ καὶ αἰμοῦ, ὡς αἴγεων. —40] They ask ὡς μ., βουλόμενοι καταμόνας ἐνυπναῖς αὐτῷ καὶ μεθ᾽ ἐνυπνίας. Euthym. They inquire after His place of lodging for the night, intending to visit Him there; or perhaps He was then apparently going thither, as it was late in the day. But He further's their wish by inviting them to follow and see. — σε δεικτάς] i. e. 4 P.M., according to the Jewish reckoning; not, as some have thought, 10 A.M., according to that of the Romans. Our Evangelist appears always to reckon according to the Jewish method, see ch. iv. 6, 52. xii. 14, and notes, but especially ch. xi. 9. And as Rücke remarks, (i. 446,) even among the Romans, the division of the day into twelve equal hours was, though not the civil, the popular way of computing time. So Persius, Sat. iii. 5. Stertinius … cuncta deae umbra. They remained with Him the rest of that day, which would be four or five hours, and need not strictly be limited by sunset. —41] Who the other disciple was, is not certain: but considering (1) that the Evangelist never names himself in his Gospel, and (2) that this account is so minutely accurate as to specify even the hours of the day, and in all respects bears marks of an eye-witness, and again (3) that this other disciple, from this last circumstance, certainly would have been named, had not the name been suppressed for some especial reason, we are justified in inferring that it was the Evangelist himself. And such has been the general opinion. Euthymius gives an alternative which is hardly probable: διότι ὃς ἦν τῶν ἱσταμένων καὶ γνωριμοὶ ἦν τοῖς κείμενοι, ὡς αὐτός ἦν ὁ τάφως γραμμω. —42] The reading πρῶτον has been probably a correction for the apparently
more difficult ἱράτον. It is implied that both disciples went together to seek Simon, but that Andrew found him first. So ch. xx. 6, πρὸ κρόπ. τὰχάνω τοῦ Πέτρου, κ. Χριστός ἱράτον εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον. — Ἰωάν] not merely ‘for the possessive pronoun’ (according to Winer, § 22, 7) but referring to ἱράτον, and furnishing a reason for it. — μετον.] = μενε = not δ χειρότος, but χειρότος. — 43.] This is evidently the first blessing of the new name on Simon: and it is done from the Lord’s prophetic knowledge of his future character; see note on Matt. xvi. 18. — Κηφᾶς = κῆφας Aramaic, πο Hebrew, ‘a stone.’ The Greek name Peter became the prevalent one in the Apostolic Church very soon: Paul uses both names indiscriminately. It is uncertain whether Ἰωάν or Ἰωάνων should be read, here and in ch. xxi. 15 ff., but in Matt. xvi. 17 all the MSS. read Ἰωάν.—I own I cannot but think with Bengel, Paulus, and Strauss, that the knowledge shown by the Lord of Simon is intended to be miraculous. So also Stier, i. 35, “I know who and what thou art from thy birth till thy present coming to me. I name thee, I give thee a new name, I know what I will make of thee in thy following of Me and for My Kingdom.” The emphatic use of ἵμβλητος is hardly accountable except on this explanation of supernatural knowledge. Similarly Abram, Sara, Jacob, received new names in reference to the covenant and promises of God to them.

44—52. The calling of Philip and Nathanael. — τῷ ἐκατόπ. Apparently, the day after the naming of Peter; and if so, the next but one after the visit of Andrew and the other disciple, and the fourth day after ver. 19. — The Lord is on the point of setting out from the valley of the Jordan to Galilee, and finds Philip, with whom there is every reason to believe He was previously acquainted (see ver. 45). Here we find Jesus Himself calling a disciple, for the first time. But ἄκολοθος does not here bear its strict Apostolic sense; the ἵρατος afterwards, and the going to search for others to be disciples, unites Philip to the company of those who have been before mentioned, who we know were not immediately or inseparably attached as followers to Jesus. — 45. On the futility of Mr. Greswell’s distinction between ἵμβα as signifying mere habitation, and ἵμβλητος as being native, see reff. and note on ch. xi. 1. This is Bethsaida on the Western bank of the Lake of Gennesareth; another Bethsaida (Julias) lay at the top of the lake, on the Jordan. — See note on Luke ix. 10. — 46.] It does not appear where Nathanael was found: but he is described, ch. xxi. 2, as δ ἀνδρὸν Γαλαλαίῳ; and as we find Jesus there, ch. ii. 1, it is probable the call may have taken place in its neighbourhood. Nathanael is mentioned only in these two places. From them we should gather that he was an apostle; and as his name is no where found in the catalogues of the twelve, but Philip is associated in three of them, Matt. x. 3. Mark iii. 16. Luke vi. 14, with Bartholomew, it has been supposed that Nathanael and Bartholomew were the same person (see note on Matt. x. 3). This is however more in accordance with the Messēs τοῦ τ. v. probably in Deut. xviii. 15; but also in the promises to Abraham,
first to blame. Compare ch. ii. 25. — ἀληθ. ἰσρ. ] 'An Israelite who truly answers to the inner and honorable meaning of the name.' When we reflect what was contained in that name, and Who it is that speaks, we can hardly agree with De Wette that the words are spoken merely in the spirit in which every nation attaches some peculiar virtue, and especially those of openness and straightforwardness, to itself, as 'breutfic herouvogen,' 'breutfic στρετ,' or Cicero's 'Romano more loqui.'—Our Lord probably referred to Ps. xv. 49.] The remark was overheard by Nathanael, and recognized as indicating perfect knowledge of his character. The question μ. γν. is one of astonishment, but not perhaps yet of suspicion of any thing supernatural. The Lord's answer first opens this to him.—προ τού κ.τ.λ.] It would be doubtful whether δια τον ταο τ. σ. belong to φωνησαι or to ειδον συ, did not ver. 51 decide for the latter construction.—The whole form of the Lord's answer seems to indicate that the place where Philip called Nathanael was not now in sight, nor long since. The declaration that Jesus had seen him there, at once brings the conviction which he expresses in the next verse. This would not have been the case, unless the sight had been evidently and unquestionably supernatural: and unless the words δια ταον υπο την συνην involved this. Had Jesus merely seen Nathanael without being seen by him, (De Wette,) or had ειδον συ only expressed 'I knew thy character,' at first sight, 'although at a distance' (Lücke), no such immediate conviction would have followed. —50.] —Thou art the Messiah; see Ps. ii. 7. ch. xi. 9. Matt. xxvii. 16. Luke xxii. 70. Olshausen (ii. 77 ff.) maintains that συ ευ τ. θ. was not a Jewish appellation for the Messiah,—on account of the Jews taking up stones to cast at Jesus K K
when He so called Himself, ch. x. 33. But as Lücke observes (i. 456, note), it was not for the mere use of this Name,—but for using it in a close and literal sense which was unintelligible and appeared blasphemous to them, ἵνα κ. ὅ παρτάρ ἤ ἐφεύρεν,—that they wished to stone Him; see note on ch. x. 36. It was certainly not so common a name as 'the Son of David,' for the Messiah.—Nathanael can hardly have meant the Name in other than its popular meaning; and the synonymous and better known appellation which he adds, confirms this.—51.] The Lord says this not in blame, rather in praise of the simple and honest expression of Nathanael's conviction; but principally to show him that if he believed by reason of this comparatively small proof of His divine power, his faith would increase from strength to strength at the greater proofs which should come from that time forward be given.—It is perhaps best to set a question at πιστεύεις; but see notes on the parallel sentences, ch. xvi. 31, and ch. xx. 29.—52.] ἄπων ἄπων is peculiar to John. The other Evangelists use ἄπων once only in such asseverations. The LXV do not use it in this sense. Sierer remarks (i. 40), that the 'Verily, verily, I say unto you' of the Lord, answers to the 'Thus saith the Lord!' of the prophets.—53] The words following are then spoken to all the disciples present, not only to Nathanael. — ἄπων ἄπων is probably genuine, and has been erased because it would not square with the literal interpretation of what follows. Its meaning is the usual one, 'from this time forward.' The glories of a period beginning from the opening of the Lord's public ministry, and at this day not yet completed, are described. For it is not the outward visible opening of the maternal heavens, nor ascent and descent of angels in the sight of men, which the Lord here announces; but the series of glories which was about to be unfolded in His Person and Work from that time forward.
KATA IOANNHN.

II. 1 Kai τῷ ἱμάρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ καὶ μόσος ἓν ἱντο ἐν Κανφ — Matt. xvi. 3, 4.

II. τῆς Γαλατίας, καὶ τὴν ἡ μήτηρ τοῦ Ἰσαοῦ εκεῖ. ἢ Χριστου — Matt. xxvii. 56.

δὲ καὶ ὁ Ἰσαοῦς καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν γάμον.

καὶ ὁ ἠστήρaque εἶχον λέγει ἡ μήτηρ τοῦ Ἰσαοῦ πρὸς


tion—in the passages of the Revelations (ch. i. 13. xiv. 14) which are almost citations from Daniel.

CHAP. II. 1—II. The first fulfilment of the announcement in ch. i. 52: see ver. 11. 1. τῇ τρίτῃ—reckoned from the day of Nathanael's calling. There would thus be but one day between that event and the marriage.—Κανφ τ. Γ., see ch. iv. 46; not far from Capernaum. Josephus (Life, § 16) calls it κύμη τῆς Γαλατίας. There is a Kana in Josh. xix. 20, in the tribe of Asher, which is that from which he derived his surname. Jerome however in his Onomasticon believes it to have been the same. It was the character which He gives of Himself Matt. xi. 18, 19, as distinguished from the asceticism of John. He also, as Trench admirably remarks (Miracles, p. 98 note), gives us His own testimony against the tendency which our indulgence ever favours, of giving up those things and occasions to the world and the devil, which we have not Christian boldness to mingle in and purify. Even Cyprian, for instance, proscribes such festivals,—'nuptiarum festa improba et contraria lasciva vitentur, quorum periculosus contagio est.' Chrysostom, ibidem, calls it 'nuptiarum festa improba.' And such is the general verdict of modern religionism—which would keep the leaven distinct from the lump, for fear it should become unleavened.—The special honour conferred upon marriage by the Lord should also be noticed. He here 'adorned and beautified it with His presence, and first miracle that He wrought.'—3. There is no necessity to suppose that the feast had lasted several days, as De Wette and Lücke do. It has been suggested that the unexpected presence of the disciples may have occasioned a failure in the previously sufficient supply.—The mother of Jesus evidently is in a position of authority (see ver. 6) in the house, which was probably that of a near relative. The conjectures and traditions on the subject are many, but wholly unsatisfactory.—A graver question arises as to the intent with which this ῥαντον ὄνωκ ζ. was said. She cannot have had from experience any reason to suppose that her Son would work a miracle, for this (ver. 11) was His first. Chrysostom suggests (so also Theophyl., Euthym., and Neander, L. J. p. 271) that, knowing Him to be Who He was, she had been by the recent Divine acknowledgment of Him and His calling disciples to Himself, led to expect the manifestation of His Messianic power about this time; and here seemed an occasion for it. Some of the other explanations are: that she had always found Him a wise counsellor, and mentioned the want to Him merely that He might suggest some way of remedying it.' Cocceius, cited by Trench. 'Velem discédas, ut ceteri item discédant, antequam penuria patet.' Bengel. 'Ut plia alia exhorations convivis tedium eximere, ac simul levaret pudorem sponsi.' Calvin, K k 2
non habebant, quoniam consummatum (finitum) erat vinum nuptiarum ab. — 4. exi

λιγ. A G K L U X Δ 10 sl. cev Copt. Arm. Syr. Cyr. txt B a. (I have not asterized this and similar insertions, because the abrupt style of John is of itself an evidence which

alleged above. — οὖν. οὐκ ἢ ὑπάρχει] This expression is generally used in John of the time of the death of Christ:—see ch. vii. 30. viii. 20. xii. 23. 27. xiii. 1. But it is only so used because His Death is in those passages the subject naturally underlying the narrative. It is, any fixed or appointed time;—and therefore here, the appointed time of His self-manifestation by miracles. This time was not yet come, but was close at hand. Some have supposed that the wine was not yet wholly exhausted, and that the Lord would wait till the miracle should be undoubled (so Trench, p. 102); but Stier well remarks that the known depth of all His early sayings forbids us from attaching only this meaning to it;—and he sees in it a reference to the great marriage-feast and the new fruit of the vine in the Kingdom of God (i. 46). If this be so, it can be only in the background; the words must have had a present meaning, and I believe it to be: 'My time, the time at which, from the Father's appointment and My own concurring will, I am to begin miraculous working, is not yet arrived: forestall it not.' Very similarly He speaks, ch. viii. 6, to His brethren, and yet afterwards goes up to the feast. — 6.] There certainly seems beneath this narrative to lie some incident which is not told us. For not only is Mary not reproved by the answer just given, but she is convinced that the miracle will be wrought, and she is not without an anticipation of the method of working it: for how should He require the aid of the servants, except the miracle were to take place according to the form here related? I believe we shall find, when all things are opened to us, that there had been a previous hint given her,—where or how I would not presume to say,—by the Lord, of His intention and the manner of performing it, and that her fault was, the too rash hastening on of what had been His fixed purpose.— 6.] These vessels were for the washings usual at feasts; see Mark vii. 4. There could be no collusion or imposture here, as they were water-vessels, and could have no remnants of
ΚΑΤΑ ΙΩΑΝΝΗΝ.

4—11.

δύο ή τρεῖς. ἦ λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἡ Γεμίσατε τὰς ὕδριας ὕδατος. καὶ ἔγειραν αὐτάς ἐς ἀνω. καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς ᾧν καὶ φέρετε τὸ ἀρχιτρικλίνων. ἀντλήσατε ἰνν καὶ φέρετε τὸ ἀρχιτρικλίνων.

καὶ ἦγεγκα. ἦ ἐγέλασο τὸ ἀρχιτρικλίνων τὸ ἑως ἕως ὁ ἱμαρικλίνων ἱερομένων, καὶ οὐκ ἦδει πόθεν ἐν ἑστίν. οἱ δὲ διάκονοι ὧδεισαν οἱ ἤτομος τὸ ἀρχιτρικλίνων καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ Πάσα ἀνθρώπους πρῶτον τὸν καλὸν ὀίνον ποίησον, καὶ ὅταν μεθυσθεῖσαν

στούτε τὸν ἐλάσσῳ σὺ τετρήκης τὸν καλὸν ὀίνον ἐως ἁρτί. ταύτην ἐποίησεν ἀρχιτρικλίνων. τῶν σπειρῶν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν Κανά τῆς Γαλιλαίας καὶ ἦ ποζάρωσε τὴν

wine in them (see also ver. 10). And the large quantity which they held could not have been brought in unobserved. The metrychēs is probably = the Jewish ἅρ [which, Jos. Antt. vii. 2, 9, held 72 ἱλαρῖα = the Attic metrychēs = 8 gall. 74 pints], and stands for it in the LXX. 2 Chron. iv. 5. According to this, the quantity of wine thus created would = 6 × (2 or 3) × (8 gallons 74 pints) = 6 × (between 17 and 25 gallons) = say, 6 × 21 gall. = 126 gallons. The large quantity thus created has been called at by unbelievers. We may leave them to their cavils with just one remark,—that He who creates abundance enough in this earth to "put temptation in the way of men's way", acted on this occasion analogously with His known method of dealing. We may answer an order on the other side (if it be on the other side), by saying, that the Lord here most effectually and once for all stamps with His condemnation that false system of moral-reformation, which would commence by pledges to abstain from intoxicating liquors. He pours out His bounty for all, and He vouchsafes His grace to each for guidance; and to endeavour to evade the work which He has appointed for each man,—by refusing the bounty to save the trouble of seeking the grace, is an attempt which must ever end in degradation of the individual motives, and in social demoralization,—whatever present apparent effects may follow its first promulgation.—The filling with water, and drawing out wine, is all that is related. 'The moment of the miracle,' says Lücke, 'is rather understood than expressed. It seems to lie between vv. 7 and 8' (i. 471). The process of it is wholly out of the region of our imagina-
x ch. l. 14.  
y ch. l. 12.  

*δύσαν αὐτοῦ* καὶ ἕπιστευαν εἰς αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ ΑΒ αὐτοῦ.

12 Μετὰ τοῦτο *κατεβη εἰς Καπερναοῦν αὐτὸς καὶ ἐπὶ* 

μήτηρ αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ [αὐτοῦ] καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, 

καὶ ἐκεῖ *ἐμείναν οὐ πολλὰς ἡμέρας.* 13 καὶ ἐγγὺς ἦν ΑΒΡ 

τὸ πάσχα τῶν Ἰουδαίων, καὶ ἀνέβη εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα ὁ Ἰσσοῦς, 

14 καὶ ἔφευ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τούτῳ πυλών τας βόας 

καὶ πρόβατα καὶ περιστεράς καὶ τοὺς κεραμιστὰς 

last sometimes have it.) — 12. aft. ἀδελφ., om. αὐτοῦ B ac Orig. ins. A b. — ἔφευγεν

tice here described is not precisely that of which Pliny speaks, nor is there any mea-

siness to be charged on it: it is only that when a man has some kinds of wine 

choicer than others, he naturally produces the choicest, to suit the most discriminating 
taste. — 11. ] With the article it is, as E. V., 

'This beginning of miracles did Jesus' ; — 

without it, 'Thus brought Jesus as the beginning of His miracles': — ἄρχη without 

the article being the predicate. — This assertion 
of John excludes all the apocryphal 
miracles of the Gospel of the Infancy, and 
such like works, from credit. — τὴν Ῥώμην αὐτῆς ἀνυφέω. ] The glory, namely, which is referred 
to in ch. l. 14, where see note. It was a miracle 
eminently showing forth the glory of the λόγος, δι' ὁ πάντα ἐγένετο, in His 
state of having become flesh. And this 
'believing on Him,' here predicated of the 
disciples, was certainly a higher faith than 
that which first led them to Him. They 
obtained new insight into His power; —

not yet reflectively, so as to infer what 
all this implied, but so as to increase their 
faith and trust in Him. Again and again 
'they believed,' new degrees of faith being 
atained; just as this has since been the 
case, and will continue to be, in the Church, 
in the continual providential development of 
the Christian spirit,—the leavening of 
the whole lump by degrees. — This 
important miracle, standing as it does at the very 
entrance of the official life of Christ, has 
been the subject of many doubts, and at-
tempts to get rid of, or explain away, the 
Power which was here manifested. But 
never did a narrative present a more stub-
born inflexibility to the wresters of Scripture : —never was simple historical veracity 
more strikingly stamped on any miracle 
than on this. And doubtless this is provi-
dentially so arranged : see the objections to 
it treated, and some admirable concluding 
remarks, in Lücke, i. 478. — To those who 
yet seek some sufficient cause for the mi-

racle being wrought, we may—besides the 
clear answer that we are not in a position 
to treat this question satisfactorily, 
—assign the unmistakable spiritual import of 
the change here made, as indicating the 
general nature of the beneficent work which 
the Lord came on earth to do. — So Cor-
nelius a Lapide (Trench, p. 113): 'Chris-
tus initio sue predicationis mutans aquam 
in vinum significat, quod se legem Mosaicam, 
instar aque insipidam et frigidam, convers-
surum in Evangelium gratiae quæ instar 
vini est, generosa, sapida, ardens, et efficax.' 
Similarly Eusebius, Augustine, Bernard, 
and Gregory the Great. Trench, ibid. 
12. ) κατεβη, because Capernaum lay on the 

lake.—Cana higher up the country. There 
is no certainty as to this visit, whether or 
not it is the same with that hinted at in 
Luke iv. 23 : so that no chronological 
ferences can be built on the hypothesis 
with any security. — On οἱ ἀδελφ. αὐτῆς see 
Matt. xiii. 55 and note.

13—22. ] The first official visit to Jeru-

salem, at a passover: and cleansing of the 
temple. — 13. ] No data are given to de-

termine whether the reason of the short 
stay at Capernaum was the near approach 
of the Passover. — Nothing is said of those 
who accompanied Jesus: but at all events, 
His already called disciples would be with 
Him (see ver. 22, and ch. iii. 22),—and 
among them in all probability the Evan-
glelist Himself:—but not the rest of the 
twelve, who were not yet called. Of this 
visit the synoptic narrative knows nothing. 
— 14. ] On the distinctness of this cleans-
ing from that related in Matt. xxi. 12 ff., 
see note there. — ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ. ] In the court 
of the Gentiles, the ἐκκεντρὸν ἱερόν, as dis-
tinguished from the ναὸς, the inner temple. 
This market appears to have sprung up 
since the captivity, with a view to the con-
venience of those Jews who came from a 
distance, to provide them with the beasts 
for offering, and to change their foreign 
money into the sacred shekel, which alone 
was allowed to be paid in for the temple 
capitation-tax (Matt. xvii. 24 ff.). This 
tax was sometimes, as in Matt. i. c., paid
kathménous. 15 kai poiásas b phageileión e k' e'chovinw
pántas ézēbalen e k' to ierou, t' é proátheta kai touc
bous, kai tôn d kolouèstwv *ēzēxei *tô *kérma
kai tao t' raptièzis h anastrepe's 16 kai t'g t' perištara
pauçovn eitev "Arate tauta 17 eunthôn' m' prioite t'ou
oiqon t'ou patròs mou t'ou oiqon k' émporíou. 17
b = here only b
c = Acts xxviii. 8 only.
d = Klagvst' il. 2.
e = Matt. xxii. 18
f = here only.
g = John xix. 30.
h = here only.
i = Matt. xxxi. 30 al.
j = here only.
k = Acts i. 18.
l = Acts i. xxii. 19.
m = Acts i. xxiii. 19.
[28] o' i.e., emphatically. 
[29] or in the singular. 
[30] for to the last. 
[31] Anathema. 
[32] or in the singular. 
[33] or in the singular. 
[34] or in the singular.
[36] and the same words, coupled with the expectation which the confession of John the Baptist would arouse, could leave no doubt on the minds of the Jews as to their import: — see on ch. iii. 2. — wv. 4. wv. not yet σπήλαιον lóguws, as at the end of His ministry; see above. — 17. μακρινασων, at the time, not afterwards, which would have been expressed, as in ver. 22. — 18. On the demand of the Jews, see Deut. xiii. 1 — 3. It was not only to justify His having driven out the abominations; this any one might have done; — but to justify the mission and the whole course of John's work, of which the words το δια τατρος μου implied. They used the same expression at the end of His ministry, Matt. xxiii. 20. — 19. This answer of the Lord has been involved in needless difficulty. That He pointed to His own Body, is inconceivable; — for thus both the Jews and His own disciples must have understood Him, which (see vv. 20, 22) neither of them did. That He implied that their lawless proceedings in the temple would at last bring it to an end, is equally inconceivable; both on account of the latter part of His declaration, which would thus have no meaning, — and because of the use of the word νοεων — which is holy and the holiest place, the temple itself — as distinguished from τε λεπων, the whole enceinte of the sacred buildings. Stier has well remarked (i. 53—55) that the Lord in this saying comprehended in the reality, — His own Body, — its type and symbol, the temple then before them. That temple, with all its ordinances and
2. (2) The words ἐγείρεις αὐτον,—seeing that the resurrection of the Lord is ever spoken of as the work of the Father. Yes,—but by power committed to Christ Himself;—see ch. x. 18, where this is distinctly asserted: and ch. vi. 39, 40, 44, where it is implied, for He is the first-fruits of them that sleep,—and (though the whole course of His working was after the will of the Father,—and in the Spirit, which wrought in Him) strictly and truly raised Himself from the dead in the sense here intended.

(3) The utterance of such a prophecy at so early a period of His official life. But it was not a prophecy known and understood,—but a dark saying, from which no one could then draw an inference as to His death or resurrection. The disciples did not understand it; and I cannot agree with Stier that the Jews could have had any idea of such being His meaning.—Lücke remarks that the circumstance of the words being spoken so long before His trial by the Sanhedrim, would make it more easy for the false witnesses to distort them. This they did, but not so as to agree with one another. They report it, 'I can destroy,' &c. which makes a wide difference, and represents the Lord as an enemy of the temple (Matt. xxvi. 61), and some added to τὸν τ. τ.,—τ. χυσομποστὸν, and that He would raise another ἀνθρωποστούν (Mark xiv. 58).—20.] The building of the temple by Herod the Great is stated by Josephus, in Antt. xvi. 11, 1, to have been begun in the eighteenth year of his reign; in B. J. i. 21, 1, in the fifteenth; the difference being made by counting his reign from the death of Antigonus, or from his appointment by the Romans, see Antt. xvii. 9, 1. Reckoning from this latter, we shall have twenty years till the birth of Christ, and thirty years since that event, from which fifty, however, four must be taken, since our era is four years too late. This gives forty-six. The temple was not completed till A. D. 64, under Herod Agrippa II., and the procurator Albinus; so that ἐκδομηθῇ must have its proper sense of 'has been in building.'
KATA IOANNHN.

23. Ως δὲ ήν ἐν † τοῖς Ἱεροσολύμων ἐν τῷ πᾶσχα [ἐν]
τῷ ἐορτῇ, πολλοὶ ἔπιστευσαν εἰς τὸ ὅνομα αὐτοῦ ἐκατοντών.

24. αὐτός δὲ ὁ Ιερουσαλημίτης ἐπίστευσεν τὸ σείμα ἡ ἐποίησις.

25. ΑΒ γινώσκεις πάντας, καὶ [ὁ] ὁ χρισάλα εἶχεν ἵνα τις

μαρτυρήσῃ περὶ τοῦ ἀνθρωποῦ αὐτοῦ γὰρ ἐγνώσκε τὸν ἐν τῷ ἄνθρωπῳ.

ΠΡΩΤΟΣ. Ἡν δὲ ἁνθρωπος ἐκ τῶν Φαρισαίων, Νικόδημος
ὀνομα αὐτῷ, ἀρχων τῶν Ἰουδαίων. ὁ ἄνδρος ἧλθε πρὸς αὐτὸν

γινώσκεις πάντας, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Παύλος, σύμφωνον ἡ ἀρχὴ ἔληλυθας
διδάσκαλος, εὐθείας γὰρ ταῦτα τὰ σημεῖα δύναται ποιεῖν ἃ σὺ ποιεῖς, ἐὰν μὴ ἦν ὁ θεὸς καὶ μετ' αὐτοῦ.


28. τῇ γραφῇ, by all analogy, must mean the O. T. scriptures. That the resurrection of the Lord is the subject of O. T. prophecy, we find in several passages of the N. T. see ch. xx. 9. Luke xxiv. 26, 27. 1 Cor. xv. 4. At first sight it appears difficult to fix on any passage in which it is directly announced: but with the deeper understanding of the Scriptures which the Holy Spirit gave the Apostles and still gives the Church, such prophecies as that in Ps. xvi. are recognized as belonging to Him in Whom alone they are properly fulfilled; see also Hos. vi. 2.

29. Many believe on Jesus at the Paraclete: His knowledge of their character, and withholding of Himself from them. — 28. as analogous with τῷ τῶν πάσχα, τῷ ἐορτῇ — see ch. 4. — theor. αὐτ. τ. σ. δὲ ἐκ τῆς ἐπιστήμης εἰς αὐτὸν, ἀλλ' οὐ βεβαιω. ἐκ τούτων γὰρ ἀκριβείον ἐπιστήμων, δουσι μὴ διὰ τὰ σημεῖα μόνον, ἀλλ' καὶ διὰ τὴν διδασκαλίαν αὐτοῦ ἐπιστήμων. Euthym. — 24. 25. The repetition of ἐπιστήμη has been regarded (Lücke, De Wette) as a sort of play on the word. But I should rather set it down to the simplicity of John's style. — The meaning is, 'He did not trust Himself to them,' — i.e. treat them as true and earnest disciples. The fact of this being narrated shows that it made an impression on the Evangelist, and led him perhaps first to the conclusion which he here expresses, and which higher knowledge enabled him afterwards to place, as he here does, on its right ground — His knowing what was in man. Nothing less than Divine knowledge is here set forth; the words are even stronger than τῷ ἄνδρα and ἐν
be merely an allusion to others who had come to the same conclusion, e.g. Joseph of Arimathea; or it may express that Nicodemus was sent in the name of several who wished to know the real character of this Person who wrought such miracles. It is harsh, in this private conversation, to take the plural as merely of singular import, as Lightfoot seems to do. His other rendering, 'vulgo agnoscror,' is better,—but not satisfactory,—for the common people did not generally confess it, and Nicodemus, as an ἄρχων, would not be likely to speak in their name (see ch. vii. 49). I would rather take it to express the true conviction respecting Jesus, of that class to which Nicodemus belonged—the ἄρχοντες: and see in it an important fact, that their persecutions and murder of the Prince of Life hence found their greatest aggravation, that they were carried on against the conclusions of their own minds, out of bitter malice, and worldly disappointment at His humble and unobtrusive character, and the spiritual purity and self-sacrifice which He inculcated. Stier (iv. 12 ff.) seems to think that Nicodemus, by using the plural, is sheltering himself from expressing his own conviction, so as to be able to draw back again if necessary.—Ἀλλά Q. Stier (and Schleiermacher, cited by Stier, iv. 16 note) thinks that there is involved in this word a recognition by Nicodemus of the Messianic mission of Jesus:—that it expresses His being ὁ ἄρχων (Matt. xi. 3 a.l.). It is never used of any but the Messiah, except by the Lord Himself, when speaking of John the Baptist as the subject of prophecy (see Matt. xi. 14 a.l.).—ὁ διδασκάλος. In this and the following words, Nicodemus seems to be cautiously withdrawing from his admission being taken as expressing too much. For who of the Jews ever expected a teacher to come from God? They looked for a King, to sit on David's throne,—a Prophet, to declare the Divine will;—but the Messiah was never designated as a mere teacher, till the days of modern Socinianism. So that he seems trying to qualify or recall his λόγος by this addition.—The following words exhibit the same cautious inconsistency. 'No one can do, &c., unless'—we expect some strong expression of the truth, such as we had from Nathanael in ch. i. 49, but the sentence drops to merely—'God be with him,' which is a very poor and insufficient ex-

ponent of ἄρα θ. ἡμῶν. Against this inconsistency,—the inner knowledge that the Kingdom of God was come, and He who was to find it, on the one hand,—and the rationalizing endeavour to reduce this heavenly kingdom to mere learning, and its Founder to a mere Teacher, on the other,—is the following discourse directed. —3.] We are not to imagine that anything is wanting to complete the sense or connexion. The Lord replies, It is not learning, but life, that is wanted for the Messiah's Kingdom; and life must begin by birth. Luther (Stier, iv. 21) says: "My teaching is not of doing and leaving undone, but of a change in the man (nicht von Σωφροσύνη und Κανφόσιον, sondern von ζωή und ζωή);—so that it is, not new works done, but a new man to do them; not another life only, but another birth." And only by this means can Nicodemus gain the teaching for which he is come.—ὅμως ὁ β. τ. θ.,—become a disciple of Christ—ἴσται τουρίστα νόησον, Theophyl.,—'understand by sharing'—'have any conception of.'—ἀνωθ'—οἱ μικροί τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ φα爱吃οι, οἱ δὲ ἐκ ἄρχων. Chrysost.,—who, as also Euthym., explains γεν. κυριακοστος.—Origen, Cyril, and Theophyl. taking the other meaning.—The true meaning is to be found by taking into account the answer of Nicodemus, who obviously understood it of a new birth in mature life. 'Born of water' would be a better rendering than 'born again,' being closer to the meaning of ἀνωθ', from the very beginning;'—'unless a man begins his life anew altogether (καὶ ἰδίων ἀνωθ', Gal. iv. 9), he cannot.' &c.—It is not impossible that the other meaning may lie beneath this,—as the βασιλεία is of τοῦ Θεοῦ, and so must the birth be;—but Grotius has remarked that in Hebrew and Aramaic (in one of which languages our Lord, discoursing with a Rabbinical Jew, certainly spoke) there is no word of double meaning corresponding to ἀνωθ',—so that He must have expressed it, as Nicodemus understood it, of an entirely new birth. That John never uses the word elsewhere in this sense (Lücke) is here of little weight, for he only uses it three times more, and never with a verb cognate to γενεσθαι. The Evangelist most likely chose the Greek expression γεν. κυριακοστος, which, when he wrote, was in common use in the Church:
The most part the ancients: so Lücke (in his last edition), De Wette, Neander, Stier, Olshausen (on ver. 5), &c.—This being then recognized, to what does δισωρ refer? At that time, two kinds of baptism were known: that of the proselytes, by which they were received into Judaism,—and that of John, by which, as a preparatory rite, symbolizing repentance, the people were made ready for Him who was to baptize them with the Holy Ghost. But both these were significant of one and the same truth; namely, of the entire cleansing of the man for the new and spiritual life on which he was to enter, symbolized by water cleansing the outward person. Both were appointed means,—the one by the Jewish Church,—the other, stamping that first with approval, by God Himself,—towards their respective ends. John himself declared his baptism to be incomplete,—it was only with water; One was coming, who should baptize with the Holy Ghost. That declaration of his is the key to the understanding of this verse. Baptism, complete, with water and the Spirit, is the admission into the Kingdom of God. Those who have received the outward sign and the spiritual grace, have entered into that Kingdom. And this entrance was fully ministered to the disciples when the Spirit descended on them on the day of Pente-cost. So that, as spoken to Nicodemus, these words referred him to the baptism of John, which probably (see Luke vii. 30) he had slighted. But they were not only spoken to him. The words of the Lord have in them life and meaning for all ages of His Church: and more especially so these opening declarations of His ministry. He here unites together the two elements of a complete Baptism which were Sundered in the words of the Baptist, ch. i. 33—in which united form He afterwards (Matt. xxvii. 20. Mark xvi. 16) ordained it as a Sacrament of His Church. Here He speaks of spiritual Baptism, as in ch. vi. of spiritual Communion, and in both places in connexion with the outward conditions and media of these sacraments. It is observable that here, as ordinarily (with a special exception, Acts x. 45), the outward sign comes first, and then the spiritual grace, vouchsafed in and by means of it where
duly received. — εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ, N 6 τὸ γεγεννημένον ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς σάρξ ἐστί, καὶ τὸ γεγεννημένον ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος πνεῦμα ἐστί. ἦ μὴ θαυμάσῃ ὁτι εἰπών σοι, ὅτι ὅμως γεννηθήναι ἄνωθεν. 6 ὁ τὸ πνεῦμα ὅπου θέλει πνεύμα ἐστίν, καὶ τὴν ἡ φωνὴν αὐτοῦ ἀκούεις, ἀλλ' ὡς οὖν οἶδας πόθεν ἐρχεται καὶ 'πῶς ὑπάγει' ὄντως ἐστὶν πας ὁ

Theophyl. in L U (B 83). — 5. ἀρρήν (once) om. A al. — 8. for καὶ bef. ποῦ ὑπ—
e spiritu respirat." Bengal.—This saying of the Lord—in contradiction to all so-called Methodism, which prescribes the time and manner of the working of the Spirit—assures us of the manifold and unendurable variety of both these. 'The physiognomies of those who are born again, are as various as those of natural men' (Drieseke, cited by Stier, iv. 61).—9.] The question of Nicodemus is evidently still one of unbelief; see ver. 12.—10.] I believe the E. V. is right in rendering 3 56 a teacher; the article is inserted as required by ร of before 'Israel,' which is expressed as giving a solemnity to ร as the people of God. Or it is possible that ร διδασκαλος may merely be meant as one of ร διδασκαλοι. I prefer either of these reasons for the presence of the article, to supposing it to have any emphatic meaning. Nicodemus was manifestly in no supereminent place among the ผรละ : see ch. vii. 50—53. Still less can I with Bp. Middleton, Gr. Art. p. 242, 3, believe any blame conveyed in the title.—11.] Henceforward the discourse is an answer to the unbelief, and in answering that, to the question (ผรแ ร. r. gnr.) of Nicodemus: by showing Him the appointed means of this new birth, and of being upheld in the life to which it is the entrance, viz.—faith in the Son of God.—δ ผรละ λθων λ. . . . . Why these plurals? Various interpretations have been given: δ περι ιατρου και τοι ιατρα τουτο φησιν, δ περι λαυρου μουν (Euthym.) ;—Loquitur de se et de Spiritu' (Bengal) ;—Of Himself and the Prophets (Beza, Tholuck) ;—Of Himself and John the Baptist (Knapp) ;—Of Teachers like Himself (Meyer) ;—Of all the born of the Spirit (Lange, Wesley) ;—Of the three Persons in the Holy Trinity (Stier) ;—or, the plural is only rhetorical (Lucke, De Wette). I had rather take it as a proverbial saying; q. d. 'I am one of those who,' &c. The Lord thereby brings out the unreasonableness of that unbelief which would not receive His witness, but made it an exception to the general pro-

verbial rule.—ณ ผรละ, addressed still to Nicodemus, and through him to the Jews: not to certain who were present, as Olsh. supposes. —12.] The words μαρτυρων λαιδαδιαν prepared the way for the new idea which is brought forward in this verse—πιστευειν. Faith is, in the most pregnant sense, 'the receiving of testimony;' because it is the making subjectively real the contents of that testimony. So the πιστευειν ες αυτων is, the full reception of the Lord's testimony; because the burden of that testimony is, grace and truth and salvation by Himself. This faith is not reasoning, nor knowledge, but a reception of Divine Truth declared by One who came from God; and so it is far above reasoning and knowledge: —πιστευειν above ผรละ. —But what are the ἐναρξια; The matters relating to the new birth which have hitherto been spoken of;—called so because that side of them has been exhibited which is upon earth, and happens among men. δ τοις κτι γης εις διαγραφοιν ανθρωπων δυνατα υπαρξαι τε και νοηθαι. Origen. That the para-

ble about the wind is not intended, is evident from κ. ου πιστευειν, which in that case would be 'do not understand.' And the ἐναρξια are the things of which the discourse goes on to treat from this point: viz. the heavenly side of the new birth and salvation of man, in the eternal counsels of God regarding His only-begotten Son.—Stier supposes a reference in this verse to Wisd. ix. 16. και μαλις εικαζων τα κτι της γης, και τα εχειν ευρισκο-

μεν μετα ποιου, τα δε ειν ουρανος της ουριας: —13.] The whole verse seems to have intimate connexion with and reference to Prov. xxx. 4; and as spoken to a learned doctor of the law, would recall that verse—especially as the further question is there asked, 'Who hath gathered the wind in His fists?' (τας ς γνωρισ τηρεται τυλικες της γης) and 'What is His name, and what His Son's name?' See also Deut. xxx. 12, and the
citation Rom. x. 6—8. — All attempts to explain away the plain sense of this verse are futile and ridiculous. The Son of Man, the Lord Jesus, the Word made Flesh, was in, come down from, heaven, and was in heaven (heaven about Him, heaven dwelling on earth, ch. i. 52), while here, and ascended up into heaven when He left this earth;—and by all these proofs, speaking in the prophetic language of accomplished Redemption, does the Lord establish, that He alone can speak of τα ἰδεωδιανα to men, or convey the blessing of the new birth to them. Be it remembered, that He is here speaking proleptically, of results of His course and sufferings on earth, of the way of regeneration and salvation which God has appointed by Him. He regards therefore this passage, the great facts of redemption as accomplished, and makes announcements which could not be literally acted upon till they had been so accomplished. See ver. 14 ff., whose sense will be altogether lost, unless this ἀνασιμένει be understood of His exaltation to be a Prince and a Saviour. — δ ὑπ ἐν τ ὑφ. [see ch. i. 18 and note. Doubtless the meaning involves 'whose place is in heaven,' but it also asserts the 'being in heaven' of the time then present: see ch. i. 51. — To explain such expressions as ἀνασιμένει σε τ ὑφ., &c. as mere Hebrew metaphors (Lücke, De Wette, &c.) is no more than saying that Hebrew metaphors were founded on deep insight into Divine truth:—these words in fact express the truths on which Hebrew metaphors were constructed. Socinus is quite right, when he says that those who take ἀναβ. σε τ ὑφ. metaphorically, must in all consistency take δ κασσιασκε in τ ὑφ. metaphorically also—'qualis descendens, talis estiam ascensus.'—18.] From this point the discourse passes to the Person of Christ, and Redemption by His Death. — The Lord brings before this doctor of the Law the mention of Moses, who in his day by Divine command lifted up a symbol of forgiveness and redemption to Israel. — καθος. We must avoid all such ideas as that the Lord merely compares His death to the elevation of the brazen serpent, as if only a fortuitous likeness were laid hold of by Him. This would leave the brazen serpent itself meaningless, and is an explanation which can only satisfy those who do not discern the typical reference of all the ceremonial dispensation to the Redeemer. — It is an important duty of an expositor here, to defend the obvious and only honest explanation of this comparison against the tortuous and inadequate interpretations of modern critics. The comparison lies between the exalted serpent of brass, and the exalted Son of Man. The brazen serpent sets forth the Redeemer. This by recent Commentators (Lücke, De Wette, and others) is considered impossible: — and the tertium comparationis is held to be only 'the lifting up.' But this does not satisfy the construction of the comparison. 'The brazen serpent was lifted up: every one who looked on it, lived,' — 'The Son of Man must be lifted up: every one who believes on Him, shall live.' The same thing is predicated of the two; — both are lifted up; — cognate consequences follow, — body-healing, and soul-healing (as Erskine, On the Brazen Serpent). There must then be some reason why the only two members of the comparison yet unaccounted for stand where they do,—considering that the brazen serpent was lifted up not for any physical efficacy, but by command of God alone. Now on examination we find this correspondence fully established. The 'serpent' is in Scripture symbolism, the devil, — from the historical temptation in Gen. iii. downwards. But why is the devil set forth by the serpent? How does the bite of the serpent operate? It pervades with its poison the frame of its victims: that frame becomes poisoned, — and death ensues. So sin, the poison of the devil, being instilled into our nature, that nature has become ἀρξ ἀμαρίας, — a poisoned nature, — a flesh of sin. Now the brazen serpent was made in the likeness of the serpents which had bitten them. It represented to them the poison which had gone through their frames, and it was hung up there, on the banner-staff, as a trophy, to show them that for the poison, there was healing: — that the plague had been overcome. In it, there was no poison; only the likeness of it. Now was not the Lord Jesus made in ὑμοιωματι σαρκος ἀμαρίας, Rom. viii. 3? Was not 'He made Sin for us, who knew no sin?' (2 Cor. v. 21.)—Did not He, on His Cross, make an open show of, and triumph over, the Enemy, so that it was as
Eπὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, 15 ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἀπόλογται, ἀλλ’ ἐξ ἐνότητος ἡμῶν αἰωνίων. 16 οὖν


If the Enemy himself had been nailed to that Cross (Col. ii. 15)? Were not Sin and Death and Satan crucified, when He was crucified? Is it μὲν, ἵτι δι’ ἰδεῖς ἡ βλάβη, ἵτι δι’ ἰδεῖς καὶ ἡ θανατικὴ ἲσταντα δι’ αὐτὸν ἰδία ἄνθρωπον ἡ θανατος εἰς ἔθνων εἰς τῶν κόσμων, ἄλλα ἀνθρώπου καὶ ἡ ζωὴ παρεγίσατο. Kethum.—But, it is necessary, in the Father’s counsel—it is decreed, but not arbitrarily;—the very necessity of this, which is in fact but the execution of the Divine will, made it requisite that the pure and sinless Son of Man should thus be uplifted and suffer; see Luke xxiv. 26. ὅμως δέ. In this word there is more than the mere crucifixion. It has respect in its double meaning (of which see a remarkable instance in Gen. xi. 13, 19. E.V.) to the exaltation of the Lord on the Cross, and through the Cross to His Kingdom; and refers back to διάβλασπησεν εἰς τ. οἰκ. before. Stier quotes the Christian proverb, Crux sacra cessi. —16. The corresponding clause applying to the type is left to be supplied. And as every one who looked on it was healed, so...—παν. εἰς αὐτοῖς. This expression, here first used by the Lord, implies His exaltation, see ch. xii. 32. It is a belief in His Person being what God by His sufferings and exaltation hath made Him to be, and being that to μα. This involves, on the part of the believer, the anointing of the body of the fiery serpent,—and the earnest looking on Him in Whom sin is crucified, with the inner eye of faith.—μη ἄρ ως ἀλλ’ ἐξ ἐνότητος καὶ. Just as in the type, God did not remove the fiery serpents,—or not all at once,—but healing was to be found in the midst of them by looking to the brazen serpent (πάντα ἐν ἡμείς Ἀβραάμ εἰσένεσθαι, LXX).—so the temptations and conflicts of sin shall not leave the believer,—but in the midst of these, with the Eye of Faith fixed on the uplifted Son of Man, he has eternal life; perishes not of the bite, but ἡξεταίρησε. See on this verse the remarkable passage, Wisd. xvi. 5—13, where as much of the healing sign is opened as could be expected before the great Antitype Himself appeared. —16] Many Commentators—since the time of Erasmus, who first suggested the notion,—have maintained that the discourse of the Lord breaks off here, and the rest, to ver. 21, consists of the remarks of the Evangelist. (So Tholuck, Olschhausen, Lütcke, De Wette; which last attributes vv. 13, 14 also to John.) But to those who view these discourses of the Lord as intimately connected wholes, this will be as inconceivable, as the absurd idea of Matthew having combined into one insulated sayings of his Master. This discourse would be altogether fragmentary, and would have left Nicodemus almost where he was before, had not this most weighty concluding part been also spoken to him. This is, which expands and explains the assertions of vv. 14, 15, and applies them to the present life and conduct of mankind.—The principal grounds alleged for supposing the discourse to break off here seem to be, (a) that all allusion to Nicodemus is henceforth dropped. But this is not conclusive, for it is obvious that the natural progress of such an interview on his part would be from questioning to listening; and that even had he joined in the dialogue, the Evangelist would not have been bound to relate all his remarks, but only those which, as vv. 2, 4 and 9, were important to bring out his mind and standing point. (b) that henceforth past tenses are used; making it more probable that the passage was added after the great events alluded to had taken place. But does not the Lord speak here, as in so many other places, proleptically, of the fulness of the accomplishment of those designs, which in the Divine Counsels were accomplished? Is not this way of treating natural to a discourse which is treating of the development of the new birth, itself not yet brought in till the Spirit was given? See a parallel instance, with the Evangelist’s explanation, ch. vii. 37—39. (c) on account of the use of μια τινς, vv. 16, 18, which is peculiar to John. But, as Stier well inquires (iv. 101), whence did John get this word, but from the lips of his divine Master? Would he have ventured on such an expression, except by an authorization from Him? (d) It is asserted that John often continues the Lord’s discourses with additions of his own;—and ch. i. 16, and ch. iii. 31, are alleged as instances. Of these, ch. i. 16 is beside the question;—for the whole prologue is spoken in the person of the Evangelist, and the Baptist’s testimony in ver. 18 is merely confirmatory of ver. 14, and then the connexion goes on with ver. 16. On the unenableness of the view with
regard to ch. iii. 31 ff., see notes there.—It would besides give us a very mean idea of the honesty or reverence of one who sets forth so sublime a view of the Divinity and Authority of the Lord, to suppose him capable, in any place, of attributing to his Master words and sentiments of his own invention. And that the charge amounts to this, every simple reader can bear testimony. The obvious intention of the Evangelist here is, that the Lord shall have said these words. If the Lord did not say them, but the Evangelist, we cannot stop with the view that he has added his own remarks to the Lord's discourse, but must at once pronounce him guilty of an imposture and a forgery. (See Stier, iv. 99—107.) I conclude therefore on all these grounds that the words following, to ver. 21, cannot be otherwise regarded than as uttered by the Lord in continuation of His discourse.—καὶ γὰρ ὁ κόσμος, the world, in the most general sense, as represented by, and included in, man.—Gen. iii. 17, 18, and i. 28; not, the elect, which would utterly destroy the force of the passage; see on ver. 18.—The Lord here reveals Love as the one ground of the Divine counsel in redemption, salvation of men, as its one purpose with regard to them.—τὸν μόνον. The reference is to the offering of Isaac, of whom (Gen. xxii. 2, Heb.:—the LXX have ἀγαπητός) this term is used: and Nicodamus would at once be reminded by it of the love there required, the substitution there made, and the prophecy there uttered to Abraham, to which ἦν πρᾶξις ἡ πρωτ. so nearly corresponds.—ἐδωκέναι, absolute, not merely τῷ κόσμῳ—'gave up,'—παρίδωκεν,—Rom. viii. 32; where, as Stier remarks, we have again, in the ὡς ἵππος, an unmistakable allusion to the ὡς ἵππος said to Abraham, Gen. xxii. 16.—ηὐα. . . . By the repetition of this final clause verbatim from ver. 16, we have the identity of the former clauses established: i.e. the uplifting of the Son of Man like the serpent in the wilderness is the manifestation of the Divine Love in the gift of the Son of God:—ὁ νόεις τοῦ αὐτοῦ, i.e. in the strictest sense, αὐτός αὐτοῦ. The κόσμος, all mankind, is the universe, the Gentile world—was according to Jewish ideas to be judged and condemned by the Messiah. This error the Lord here removes. The assertion ch. ix. 39, εἰς κρίσιν ἐκ τῆς κόσμου τοῦ ἄνθρωπον is no contradiction to this. The κρίσις there, as here, results from the separation of mankind into two classes, those who will and those who will not come to the light; and that result itself is not the purpose why the Son of God came into the world, but is evolved in the accomplishment of the higher purpose, viz. Love, and the salvation of men. Observe, the latter clause does not correspond to the former—it is not ἦν πρῶτος τῷ κόσμῳ, but ἦν σωθῆς ὁ κόσμος αὐτοῦ: the free will of the κόσμος is by this strikingly set forth, in connexion with vv. 19, 20. Not that the Lord is not the σωτῆρ τοῦ κόσμου (iv. 43), but that the peculiar cast of this passage required the other side of the truth to be brought out.—18.] On ἐκατ. εἰς αὐτ. see above, ver. 15.—κρίνεται.—see ch. v. 24, where the same assertion is made more fully; and note there.—ἐκατ. καταργοῦται, implying,—by no positive act of judgment of Mine,—but by the very nature of things themselves. God has provided a remedy for the deadly bite of sin; this remedy the man has not accepted, not taken: he must then perish in his sins; he is already judged and sentenced.—μὴ παρελθεῖν. The perfect implies more than 'that faith is a definite act in time' (Lücke, De Wette); it sets before us the deliberate choice of the man, q. d. 'he hath not chosen to believe' (Lange, in Stier iv. 113); see 2 Thess. ii. 11, 12.—ἐκ τοῦ δὲ, not without meaning: that name was Ἰσραήλ, αὐτός γὰρ σώζει τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν

which is an event, a thing of the past, a source to him only of condemnation, for he has nothing to show for it, for it is also φαῦλον, worthless; whereas he that παίρνει, has his ποιήμα, he has abiding fruit; his works do follow him. So that the expressions will not admit of being interchanged. There may possibly be a hint at the coming by night of Nicodemus, but surely only by a distant implication. He might gather this from what was said, that it would have been better for him to make open profession of Jesus; but we can hardly say that the Lord reproves him for coming, even as he did. — 21.] Who is this παίνων τ. ἀλλήλων? The end of ch. i. will best explain to us: ἐν ᾗ δόκοις οὐκ ἐστὶν, see also Luke viii. 15, and Ps. xv. The πάσας πονηρά is crooked and perverse; he has a light, which he does not follow; he knows the light, and avoids it; and so there is no truth, singleness, in him; he is a man at variance with himself. But the simple and single-minded is he who knowing and approving the light, consenteth to that which may be carried onward in this spirit of truth and single-mindedness to higher degrees of communion with and likeness to God. ‘The good man seeks the Light, and to place his works in the Light, not from a vain love of praise, but from a desire for communion wherein he finds strength and security.’ De Wette. But this is not all: the manifesting his works that they are wrought in God, is and can only be by the candle of the Lord being kindled within him and he himself born again in the Kingdom of God; see Ps. cxxxix. 25, 26. We bear nothing of the effect produced on Nicodemus by this interview. It certainly did not alienate him from Jesus, see ch. vii. 50. xix. 30, also ch. xii. 42. “It speaks for the simplicity and historic truthfulness of our Evangelist, that he adds nothing more, and even leaves un told the immediate result which the discourse had,” (Baumgarten-Crusius, in Stier, iv. 124.)
disciples into the neighbourhood of the Baptist, who, upon occasion given, bears another notable testimony to Him. — 23.] προς τον δεικτήν. — the sequence is not immediate; for this, John uses μετὰ τοῦ — τον Ἰωάννην καὶ τῆς μητρὸς τοῦ Ἰωάννου καὶ τῶν μαθητῶν τοῦ Ἰωάννου μετὰ τὸν Ἰωάννην καὶ τὶν οὕτω Ῥαββί, ὡς ἦν μετὰ τοῦ πέραν τοῦ Ἱορδάνου. 

— 24. ἐν τούτῳ συμπεριφέρονται πρὸς τὸν Ἰωάννην καὶ εἰτέν ἑκ τῶν μαθητῶν Ἰωάννου μετα τῷ Ἱορδανίῳ περί καθαρισμοῦ. — ἐν τῷ συμπεριφέρονται πρὸς τὸν Ἰωάννην καὶ εἰτέν ἑκ τῶν μαθητῶν Ἰωάννου μετα τῷ Ἱορδανίῳ περί καθαρισμοῦ. — οὗ συμπεριφέρονται πρὸς τὸν Ἰωάννην καὶ εἰτέν ἕκ τῶν μαθητῶν Ἰωάννου μετα τῷ Ἱορδανίῳ περί καθαρισμοῦ.

The rural districts of Judaea, in distinction from the metropolis. — Ἰωάννην. — by means of His disciples; — see ch. iv. 2, and note. The place is not named; perhaps He did not remain in one fixed spot. — 25. The situation of these places is uncertain. Eusebius and Jerome place Salim eight Roman miles south of Scythopolis, and Ξενόν at the same distance, on the Jordan. If Scythopolis was the ancient Bethshan, both places were in Samaria: and to this agree Epiphanius and the Samaritan chronicle called Abul Phastach. In Judith iv. 4, we find mention of δαλὼν Σαλίμ in Samaria. An Ξενόν in the wilderness of Judah is mentioned Josh. xv. 61, and ib. ver. 32, ἦσσαρι καὶ ἡγ. Σαλίμ. 

κ. 'Αλίν (Alex.), both in Judah, where it is certainly more probable, both from the text here and from a priori considerations, that John would have been baptizing, than in Samaria. The name ἡγ. is an intensive form of ἡγ. a fountain, which answers to the description here given. Both places were West of the Jordan, see ver. 26, and compare ch. i. 28. — παρευ. κ. ἡγ., i.e. the multitudes. — 26.] There is much difficulty, which probably will never be cleared up, about the date of the imprisonment of John, and its reference to the course of our Lord's ministry. Between Matt. iv. 11, 12, there seems to be a wide hiatus, in which the chief (note there) the first chapters of this Gospel should be inserted. But the records from which the three synoptic Gospels have arisen were apparently unconscious of any such interval. Our Evangelist seems here to refer to such records, and to insert this remark, that it might not be imagined, as it would be from them, that the Lord's public ministry (in the wider sense, see below on ver. 26) began with the imprisonment of the Baptist. — 27.] The circumstances under which this dispute arose seem to have been these: John and our Lord were baptizing near to one another. (On the relation of their baptisms see below on ver. 26.) They were both watched jealously (see ch. iv. 1) by the Pharisees. One of these (Ἰωάννης, i.e. Ἰωάννης. r. c.) appears to have entered into dispute with the disciples of John about the relative importance of the two baptisms; they perhaps maintaining that their master's καθαρισμὸς preparatory to the Messiah was absolutely necessary for all, and ἰκτίζειν (the 'Ἰσχίζειν) pointing out to them the apparent insufficiency of that of this Messiah Himself authorizing a baptism in His name, and alleging that if so, their master's baptism was rendered superfluous. We are driven to these conjectures because the text gives us no further insight into the fact than what the circumstances and the answer of John render probable. — 28.] In dispersing the narrative, see ch. ii. 28. — παρευ. κ. ἡγ. Not, probably, any who had been baptized already by John; but multitudes of persons. The baptism now carried on by the disciples appears to have stood very much in the same position as that of John. It was preparatory to the public ministry of the Lord properly so called, which began in Galilee after the imprisonment of John. It was not accompanied with the gift of the Spirit, see ch. vii. 39. As John's commission was now on the wane, so the Lord's was expanding. The solemn cleansing of the temple was its opening; and now it is proceeding onwards, gathering multitudes around it (see ch. iv. 1). — 29.] The subject of this answer is,—the divinely appointed humiliation and eclipsing of the
Baptist himself before the greater Majesty of Him who was come after him. Accordingly he begins in this verse by answering to the seal of his disciples, 'that he cannot go beyond the bounds of his heaven-appointed mission.' 'Non posseum mihi arro-gare et capere quae deus non dedit.' (Wetstein.) Some apply the words to Jesus:—et eli lambrotiva ta keivno, ei pantes prods auton erxovnai, thumamavon ov chrh toinata yap to theia. Chrysost. But the whole tone of the answer makes the other view more likely. Of course the remark, being general, may in the back-ground have reference to the greater mission of Jesus; but not primarily. The parallelism of andrewos here and himself as the subject of elipon in the next verse, also supports this. See Heb. v. 4. — 28. [Not only so, but I have always given the same consistent testimony; that I was only the prerunner of One greater than myself.' keivno does not refer to o chrh-stos, in which case it would have been abro (see, however, apparent exceptions to this, ch. vii. 45. Acts iii. 13; see also Winer, Gr. § 23. 1): but to Jesus, as the subject of ver. 26; and thus is not merely a general testimony with regard to the Messiah, but a personal one to Jesus. — 28.] Here first, (and here only in our Gospel), comes, from the mouth of the Forerunner, that great symbolic reference which is so common in the other Gospels and the Epistles. It is remarkable that the Lord brings it forward in His answer to the disciples of John respecting fasting, Matt. ix. 15; where see note on the further import of the terms used.—The filos tou nymiou (Heb. χρήστης) was the regular organ of communication in the preliminaries of marriage, and had the ordering of the marriage feast. It is to this last time, and not to any ceremonal custom connected with the marriage rites, that this verse refers. The friend rejoiced at hearing the good news of a marriage, (see Jer. vii. 34. xvi. 9. xxv. 10. Rev. xviii. 23,) in his triumph and joy, at the marriage. He could say, 'την δοξα του χρηστης.' 1 Thess. iii. 9, is not a parallel case as to construction, for there is only by attraction (because he hears in the voice of the Bridegroom an assurance of the happy completion of his mission, and on account of the voice itself,—την αυτη χρηστης την ομοια ειπαστον, την ομοια σωτηριαν.—σωτηρια kai belongs merely to the graphic setting forth of the similitude.—ορθα . . . παραδοντος κεινης την νυφην, και πεηρυμονωτος, ως ερημη, την εγχειρουθεσθαι μοι διακονην.' Euthym. — 30.] λαρισθοιτα, ως, ημων εν ανατελλου, ωσανθεν. Euthym. See note on Matt. xi. 2. — 51.] Many modern critics, beginning with Bengel and Wetstein, and including Lücke, Kuinoel, Olshausen, Tholuck, De Wette, and others, maintain that after verse 30 we have the words, not of the Baptist, but of the Evangelist. Lücke and De Wette assume that the Evangelist has put his own thoughts into the Baptist's mouth, or at least mixed them with his words. The reason of this arbitrary proceeding is, (a) That the sentiments of the following verses seem to them not to be congruous with the time and position of the Baptist. But some of them confess (e. g. Lücke, De Wette) that this very position of the Baptist is to them yet unexplained, and are disposed to question the applicability to their idea of it of very much which is undoubtedly recorded to have been said by him. So that we cannot allow such a view much critical weight, unless it can be first clearly shown, what were the Baptist's convictions concerning the Person and Office of our Lord. (b) That the diction and sentiments of the following verses are so
entirely in the style of the Evangelist. But first, I by no means grant this, in the sense which he is here meant. It will be seen by the reff. that the Evangelist does not so frequently repeat himself as in most other passages of equal length. And even were this so, the remark made above on vv. 16—21, would apply here also; that the Evangelist's peculiar style of theological expression was formed on some model; and on what more likely than in the first place the discourses of his Divine Master, and then such sententious and striking testimonies as the present? But there is a weightier reason than these for opposing the above view, and that arises from what modern criticism has been so much given to overlook,—the inner coherence of the discourse itself; in which John explains to his disciples the reason why His must increase; whereas his own dignity was to be eclipsed before Him. This will be seen below as we proceed.—And there is nothing inconsistent with what the Lord Himself says of the Baptist in these verses. He (the Baptist) ever speaks not as a disciple of Jesus, not as within the Kingdom,—but as knowing the blessedness of those who should be within it; as standing by, and hearing the Bridegroom's voice. Nor again is there anything inconsistent with the evident weakening of his own faith afterwards in the onward waning of his days in prison; see note on Matt. xi. 2. ἀπελθ. ἔρχ. This gives us the reason why His must increase: His power and His words are not from below, temporary, limited; but are divine and inexhaustible; and, ver. 32.] His witness is not, like John's, only of what he has been forewarned to expect, but of that which He has seen and heard. But 郤_deck, i.e. in reference to the κόσμος into which He is come, the σκοτία in which His light shines,—no one comparatively,—receives His testimony. The state of men's minds at Jerusalem with regard to Jesus must here be this have been well known to the Baptist. —32, 33.] This exception shows the correctness of the sense just assigned to οὐδείς.—ο λαβὼν αὐτοῦ τήν μαρτυρίαν καὶ πιστεύων αυτῷ ἠβαθμώσεν, ἠβαθμώσεν, ἠβαθμώσεν, ἦτοι ο θεός ἀληθής ἰστοι ὁ ἀποστικός αὐτόν, ὁ δὲ ἰδιώς ἵστατ αὐτῷ, καὶ οπίσων αὐτῷ, τοϋκαίναι τοίς καὶ συνένενη τῷ ἔργῳ καὶ τῷ ἐμφάνισθαι πρὸς τοὺς ἐν ταξινομίαις. Euthym. —The middle σφαγιώματι is more usual in this significance. See instances in Wetstein.—Ἀλήθης, not as Wetstein, 'Deum versus esse, et quere per prophetas promiserat, praetissime;' this does not suit the context, and besides would require πιστεύω, not ἀλήθης (see 1 John i. 9): but, as above from Euthym., 'true.' ἦν γὰρ ἐκ π. . . . Seeing that the contrast is between the unlimited gift of the Spirit to Him that comes from above, and the limited participation of Him by those who are of the earth; we must not understand the assertion generally, but supply αὐτῷ, as has usually been done, after διδοῦν. 'Spiritus sanctus non habitabilis super Prophetas, nisi mensura quaedam; quidam enim librum unum, quidam duos vaticiniorum oderidentur.' (Vajkira rabba, in Wetstein.) This unmeasured pouring of the Spirit on Him accounts for His speaking the words of God. —35.] This, again, is the ground why the Father 'gives not the Spirit by measure to Him.' see Matt. xi. 27—29, with which this verse forms a remarkable point of connexion, showing that what is commonly known as the Johannic form of expression was not confined to Him, but originated higher, having its traces in the synoptic narrative, which is confessedly, in its main features,
IV. 1. Ως οὖν ἔγνω ὁ κύριος ὅτι ἤκουσαν οἱ Φαρισαίοι ὅτι Ἰησοῦς πλείονας μαθητάς ποιεῖ καὶ βαπτίζει ἦν Ἰωάννης. 2. καί τοιούτῳ Ἰησοῦς αὐτὸς ὦκ ἔβαπτίζετο, ἀλλ' ὁ μαθηταί αὐτοῦ, 3. ἀφίκε τὴν Ἰουδαίαν καὶ ἀπέθανεν τάλιν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν. 4. εἶδε δὲ αὐτὸν διέρχεσθαι διὰ τῆς Σαμαρείας. 5. ἐρχεται ὁ οὖν τοῖς τοῦ Σαμαριτῶν ἔρεισα λεγομένην † Συχαρ, ἀ πλησίον τοῦ χωρίου ἐδεχθηκεν Ἰακὼβ Ἰωάνη τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ. 6. ἦν εἰς εἰκε τῇ τοῦ Ἰακώβ, ὁ οὖν Ἰησοῦς κεκοπηκὼς ἐκ τῆς ὦδος πορίας ἐκαθείλετο ὑπὸ τῆς πηγῆς, ὥρα ἦν ἡ ἡ ἐκτροχίαν. 7. c = Matt. xii. 22. b = Acts xx. 15. c = Rev. ii. 8. 3 Matt. xii. 19. d = Luke xii. 6. xii. 36. c = Acts xxi. 17. 5. c = Acts xx. 17. 7. c = Matt. iv. 11.

CHAP. IV. 1. for τοῦ ἱ. ὁ Ἰησοῦς D 10 al. acev Syrr. Κopt. Arm. Chrys. Aug. txt A B C.—bef. Ἰωάννης ὁ Ά L 1. 2. κατεις Κ.—3. τῶν ἱερ. γνών D al. add Ἡθ. Arm. Chrys. Theophyl Aug.—παλαμὶ ὁμ. Α Ε Φ Γ Η Κ Σ Υ Ω Δ 44 all. Syr. Orig. Chrys. ins. B C D L M abe.—5. rec. sygarp with c. txt A B C D K L S V 36 a Copt. Arm. Cyr. Chrys. Theophyl. Ambr.—οycling independent of him.—36.] Comp. ch. i. 12, 13. iii. 15.—ἀκεραίως may mean diabolical, see reff. Unbelief implies disobedience.—μάνα. It was on him, see ver. 18, in his state of darkness and nature, and can only be removed by faith in the Son of God, which he has not.

CHAP. IV. 1—42.] The Lord, on His way back to Galilee through Samaria, discourses with a Samaritan woman. Confession of His Messiahship by the Samaritans.—1. An inference may be drawn from this, that the Lord knew the anger of the Pharisees to be more directed against Him than against the Baptist,—probably on account of what had passed in Jerusalem.—5ν Ἰησοῦς, not Ἰησοῦς ... because the report which the Pharisees had heard is given verbatim: the 5ν is 'recitantis' merely.—2. Probably for the same reason that Paul did not baptize usually (1 Cor. i. 14—16); viz. because His office was to preach and teach;—and the disciples as yet had no office of this kind. To assume a further reason, e.g. that there might not be ground for those whom the Lord Himself had baptized to boast of it, is arbitrary and unnecessary.—Johannes, minister, sua manu baptizavit; discipli ejus, ut videtur, neminem. At Christus baptizat Spiritu Sancto.' Bengal. —4.] If He was already on the borders of Samaria, not far from Αἴγυον (see note on ch. iii. 23), the direct way was through Samaria. Indeed without this assumption, we know that the Galileans ordinarily took this way (Jos. Antt. xx. 6, 1, beginning). But there was probably also in the journey. It could not have been mere speed (πάντως ἐξί τοὺς ταχύ βουλήμανος ἄπελθην δι' ἥλιον

This is traditional: it finds however support from Gen. xxxiii. 19, where we find Jacob buying a field near Shechem, and Josh. xxiv. 32, where, on the mention of Joseph's bones being laid there, it is said that it became the inheritance of the children of Joseph. This form of the traditional is supposed to have arisen from the mistranslation by the LXX of Gen. xlvii. 22, ἵππος δὲ διδομένος σοι Σίμων Καίρατον (Ὑς οὑς, 'one share') ὑπὲρ τῶν δυναμών ὁφνυ. The Lord does not allude to it in the conversation, though the woman does. —8.] Robinson (iii. 112) can only
solve the difficulty of the present well standing in a spot watered by so many natural fountains, by supposing that it may have been dug, according to the practice of the patriarchs, by Jacob, in connexion with the plot of ground which he bought, to have an independent supply of water.—

solve—see reff.—refers to κακώπαζος ἐκ τ. 58, and may be rendered 'accordingly.' There is no authority for the meaning ἄνεξ ὡς γραμεῖς, 'just as he was,' or 'just as it happened,' i.e. on the bare stone.—

solve. ... serve, mid-day. Townsend supposed the sixth hour, according to John, to mean six in the evening, 'after the way of reckoning in Asia Minor:'—but, as Lücke observes (i. 580), this way of reckoning in Asia Minor is a pure invention of Townsend's. A decisive answer however to such a supposition here, or anywhere else in our Evangelist, is, that he would naturally have specified whether it was 6 A.M. or P.M. The unæssfulness of a woman coming to draw water at mid-day is no argument against the woman's possibility; and how being alone seems to show that it was not the common time.—7.] ἐκ τ. Σ., i.e. a Samaritan—so γυνὴ Χαναν. ἀντὶ τῶν δρόμων κεκοιμών ἔλθον, Matt. xv. 32.—

8.] The disciples had probably taken with them the baggage, among which would be the ἄνθήμα,—see ver. 11. —The Rabbis say that a Jew might not eat the bread or drink the wine of a Samaritan: but that appears from this verse to be exaggerated. —

9.] Ἰουδαῖος ἂν. She knew this perhaps by His dress, more probably by His dialect. There seems to be a sort of playful triumph in the woman's question, q. d. 'even a Jew, when weary and a-thirst, can humble himself to ask drink of a Samaritan woman.'—οὐ γὰρ συγγρ. . . . . are the words of the Evangelist to explain her question. συγγράμματι properly spoken of trade,—but here is in a wider signification. Wetstein quotes from Polybius, παρὰ Τραπανίνων καὶ Δοκρῶν συγγρα-
On the question, how this living water could be now given, before Jesus was glorified, see on ch. vii. 38.-11.] Though κρέας is not to be pressed as emphatic, it is not without import; it surely betokens a different regard of the Stranger than στὸ ἰδιεῖσθαι ἐκ διδόναι· κρίναμεν αὐτὸν προσηγόρισά, νομίζομεν μίαν εἶναι τινα. Euthym. The course of her thoughts appears to be: ‘Thou canst not mean living water (ἀνβαλόμενον καὶ ἀλόμενον, Euthym.), from this well, because thou hast no vessel to draw with, and it is deep; whence thou hast thou (knowest thou of, drawest thou) the living water of which thou speakest? Our father Jacob was contented with this, used it, and bequested it to us: if thou hast better water, and canst give it (notice the ἐδώκας in both verses), thou must be greater than Jacob.’ There is something also of Samaritan nationality speaking here. Claiming Jacob as her father (ὅταν μὲν εἴ πράτωνας διάκωσας τοὺς ἱδρούσας, συγγενεῖς ἀνεχλούσας, ὡς ἦν ἴσον στίχον, ἵνα δὲ πιστεύσας ἰδέας, οὐδὲμόνιν αὐτοῖς προσήκουσι λέγοντων. Jos. Antt. ix. 14, 3), she expresses by this question an appropriation of descent from him, such as almost to exclude, or at all events set at a greater distance, the Jews, to one of whom she believed herself to be speaking.—13, 14.] The Lord, without noticing this, by His answers leaves it to be implied, that, assuming what she has stated, He is greater than Jacob: for his (Jacob’s) gift was of water which cannot satisfy; but the water which He should give has living power, and becomes an eternal fountain within. This however, ‘that He was greater than Jacob,’ lies only in the background: the water is the subject, as before.—The words apply to every similar quenching of desire by earthly means: the desire springs up again;—is not satisfied, but only postponed. The manna was as insufficient to satisfy hunger,—as this water, thirst, see ch. vi. 49, 53: it is only the ἐδωρ ἰδωρ, and the ἄργος τῆς ἰδωρ, which can satisfy.—The δ πίνων sets forth the recurrence, the interrupted seasons of drinking of earthly water;—the ὑπὲρ τῆν—once having tasted, and ever continuing in the increasing power, and living forth-flowing, of that life-long draught. —οὔ μὴ διψηθήσῃ, shall never have to go away and be exhausted, and come again to be filled;—but shall have the spring at home, in his own breast, —so that he can ‘draw water with joy out of the wells of salvation’ (Isa. xii. 3) at his pleasure. ‘Ubi sita recurrunt, hominis, non aquea defectus est.’ Bengel. —γεννησαν πηγή. All earthly supplies have access only into those lower parts of our being where the desires work themselves out— are but local applications; but the heavenly gift of spiritual life which Jesus gives to those who believe on Him, enters into the very secret and highest place of their personal life, the source whence the desires spring out—and, its nature being living and spiritual, it does not merely supply, but it lives and waxes onward, unto everlasting life, in duration, and also as producing and sustaining it.—It should not be overlooked, that this discourse had, besides its manifold and wonderful meaning for us all, an especial moral one as applied to the woman,—who, by successive draughts at the ‘broken cistern’ of carnal lust, had been vainly seeking solace:—and this consideration serves to bind on the following verses (ver. 16 ff.) to the preceding, by another link besides those noticed below.
15. This request seems to be made still under a misunderstanding, but not so great an one as at first sight appears. She apprehends this water as something not requiring an ἄντλημα to draw it; as something whose power shall never fail; which shall quench thirst for ever; and half in banter, half in earnest, wishing perhaps besides to see whether the gift would after all be conferred, and how; she mingles in with the τοῦτο τὸ ὕδωρ, implying some view of its distinct nature, 'her not coming hither to draw,'—her willing avoidance of the toil of her noonday journey to the well. We must be able to enter into the complication of her character, and the impressions made on her by the strange things which she has heard, fully to appreciate the spirit of this answer. — 16. The connexion of this verse with the foregoing has been much disputed; and the strangest and most unworthy views have been taken of it. Some (Grotius) have referred it to the supposed indecorum of the longer continuance of the colloquy with the woman alone (!); some (Cyril Alex. in Catena, Lücke, p. 583) to the incapacity of the female mind to apprehend the matters of which He was to speak (!). Both these views surely need no refutation. The band of women from Galilee, 'last at the cross, and earliest at the tomb,' are a sufficient answer to them. — Those approach nearer the truth, who believe the command to have been given to awaken her conscience (Maldonatus and al.); or to show her the Divine knowledge which the Lord had of her heart (Meyer). But I am persuaded that the right account is found, in viewing this command as the first step of granting her request, δός μοι τὸ τὸ ὕδωρ. The first work of the Spirit of God, and of Him who here spoke in the fulness of that Spirit, is to convince of sin. The 'give Me this water' was not so simple a matter as she supposed. The heart must first be laid bare before the Wisdom of God: the secret sins set in the light of His countenance; and this the Lord here does. The command itself is of course given in the fulness of knowledge of her sinful condition of life. In every conversation which our Lord held with men, while He connects usually one remark with another by the common links which bind human thought, we perceive that He knows, and sees through, those with whom He speaks. Euthymius, though not seeing the whole bearing of the command, expresses well this last remark:—ἐγκειμένης καὶ ἐγνωσμένης λαβεῖν, λείγει ὑπαγε ἐκλ. προσωπούμενως δη χρή καίεσθαι κοιμώμεθα τάσσον τὸ ῥήμαν. καὶ δῆ μὴ ὑπό ἀλλα γόμομεν, ἵνα ὁ πάντα εἴδητο δοθήσεται τάς τιν υπό ὑπέρ ἀλλά υπό καίεσθαι καί ὑποκοιμησθῆναι τέσσερις ἑκάστην καὶ διαφωσκοῦσαι τέσσερις, ὧν γὰρ τῶν προβρίσκων καὶ τῶν θαμάζων τὰς ἀφρόματις παρ' αὐτῶν λαμβάνιν τῶν προειδωμάτων, ὥστε καὶ τὴν τὴν εἰκονοδοξίαν ὑπόσωμα διαφέρειν, καὶ ὁμοιοθετήθη μάλλον αὐτῶς. — 17. This answer is not for a moment to be treated as something unexpected by Him who commanded her (Lücke). He has before Him her whole life of sin, which she in vain endeavours to cover by the doubtful words of both these. This was literal truth, but no more, in the woman's answer: and the Lord, by His Divine knowledge, detects the hidden falsehood of it. Notice it is ἐλήμως, not ἐλήσθω: this one word was true. — ἕκαν φως ὑπ' ὑπέρ ἑρῶν. These five were certainly lawful husbands; they are distinguished from the sixth, who was not;—probably the woman had been separated from some by divorce (the law of which was but loose among the Samaritans),—from some by death,—or perhaps by other reasons more or less discreditiable to her character, which had now become degraded into that of an openly licentious woman. The conviction of sin here lies beneath the surface: it is not pressed, nor at the moment does it seem to have worked deeply; for she goes on with the conversation with apparent indifference to it; but the Lord's words in
19 λέγει αὐτῷ ἡ γυνὴ Κύριε, θεωρῶ ὅτι προφήτης εἰσίν. 20 οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν εἰς τοῦτο τῷ ὀρεί προσευχησάντων, καὶ ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι ἐν Ἰεροσολύμων ἐστίν ὁ τόπος ὅπου δεῖ προσκυνεῖν. 21 λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ισσώς Γύναι, πιστεύσον μοι ὅτι ἔρχεται ὑμᾶς ὡς οἱ ὄψει ἐν τῷ ὀρεί τούτῳ ὑμῶν ἐν Ἰεροσολύμωι προσκυνήσετε τῷ πατρί. 22 ὑμεῖς Ἰερωσολύμωι προσκυνεῖτε τῷ σώματι." 

Hercleon.—19. οὕτως οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν εἰς τοῦτο τῷ ὀρεί προσευχησάντων, καὶ ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι ἐν Ἰεροσολύμων ἐστίν ὁ τόπος ὅπου δεῖ προσκυνεῖν. 21 ὁ Ἰσσώς Γύναι λέγει αὐτῷ ὅτι ἔρχεται ὑμᾶς ὡς οἱ ὄψει ἐν τῷ ὀρεί τούτῳ ὑμῶν ἐν Ἰεροσολύμωι προσκυνήσετε τῷ πατρί." 

vv. 25, 26 would tend to infix it more deeply, and we find at ver. 29, that it had been working during her journey back to the city.—18.] In speaking this her conviction she virtually confesses all the truth. That she should pass to another subject immediately, seems, as Stier remarks (iv. 163), to arise, not from a wish to turn the conversation from a master so unpleasing to her, but from a real desire to obtain from this Prophet the teaching requisite that she may pray to God acceptably. The idea of her endeavouring to escape from the Lord's rebuke, is quite inconsistent with her recognition of Him as a prophet. Rather we may suppose a pause, which makes it evident that He does not mean to proceed further with His laying open of her character.—20. οἱ πατέρες τῷ ὀρεί—Mount Gerizim, on which once stood the national temple of the Samaritan race. In Neh. xiii. 28 we read that the grandson of the high-priest Eliashib was banished by Nehemiah because he was son-in-law to Sanballat, the Persian satrap of Samaria. Him Sanballat not only received, but (Joseph. Ant. xi. 8, 2—4) made him high-priest of a temple which he built on Mount Gerizim. Josephus makes this appointment sanctioned by Alexander, when at Tyre;—but the chronology is certainly not accurate, for between Sanballat and Alexander is a difference of nearly a century. This temple was destroyed 200 years after by John Hyrcanus (s. c. 129), see Jos. Ant. xiii. 9, 1; but the Samaritans still used it as a place of prayer and sacrifice, and to this day the few Samaritans resident in Naplusa (Sichem) call it the holy mountain, and turn their faces to it in prayer. —They defended their practice by Deut. xxvii. 4, where our reading and the Heb. and LXX is Ebal, but that of the Samaritan Pentateuch, Garizim (probably an alteration): also by Gen. xii. 6, 7, xiii. 4, xlviii. 18. 20. Deut. xi. 26 ff.—Our fathers' most likely mean not the patriarchs, but the ancestors of the then Samaritans.—ἵ τὸν ἑαυτοῦ. The definite place spoken of Deut. xii. 5.—She pauses, having suggested, rather than asked, a question,—seeming to imply, 'Before I can receive this gift of God, it must be decided, where I can acceptably pray for it,' and she leaves it for Him whom she now recognizes as a prophet, to resolve this doubt.—21.] The Lord first raises her view to a higher point than her question implied, or than indeed she, or any one, without His prophetic announcement, could then have attained.—οὕτως...οὕτως are exclusive; 'Ye shall worship the Father, but not (only) in this mountain, nor in Jerusalem:'—had it been οὕτως...οὐδὲ, it would have meant, 'Ye shall not worship the Father, either in this mountain, or in Jerusalem.'—The προσκυνήσετε, though embracing in its wider sense all mankind, may be taken primarily as foretelling the success of the Gospel in Samaria, Acts viii. 1—25.—τῷ σῶματι, as implying the One God and Father of all. There is also, as Calvin remarks (Stier, iv. 165), a 'tacita oppositio' between τῷ σῶματι, and τῷ ἱματι, ver. 26. 22.] But He will not leave the temple of Zion and the worship appointed by God without His testimony. He decides her question not merely by affirming, but by proving the Jewish worship to be the right one. In the Samaritan worship there was no leading of God to guide them, there were no prophetic voices revealing more and more of His purposes. The neuter δὲ is used to show the want of personality and distinctness in their idea of God:—the second δὲ, merely as corresponding to it in the other member of the sentence. The ημείς is remarkable, as being the only instance of our Lord thus speaking. But the nature of the case accounts for it. He never elsewhere is speaking to one so set in opposition to the Jews on a point where Himself and the Jews stood together for God's truth. He now speaks as a Jew. The nearest approach to it is in His answer to the Canaanitish woman, Matt. xv. 24, 26.—ἡ σωτ. ἐν τῷ γαρ. It was
in this point especially, the promised salvation by the great Deliverer (see Gen. xlix. 18), that the Samaritan rejection of the prophetic word had made them so deficient in comparison of the Jews. But not only this;—the Messiah Himself was to spring from among the Jews, and had sprung from among the Nations, but he was.

—See Isa. ii. 1—3.—Et, because; this is the reason why we know what we worship, because the promises of God are made to us, and we possess them and believe them; see Rom. iii. 1, 2.—23.] The discourse returns to the ground taken in ver. 21, but not so as to make ver. 22 parenthetical only: the spiritual worship now to be spoken of is the carrying out and consequence of the σωτηρία just mentioned, and could not have been brought in without it.

—καὶ τὸν κτῖσμα.—Hoc (versu 21 non additum) nunc additur, ne muller putet, sibi tantisper sedem in Judaea quercandum esse. Bengel.—οἱ ἄλλοι προσκ. as distinguished (1) from hypocrites, who have pretended to worship Him: (2) from all who went before, whose worship was necessarily imperfect.—The εἰ πνεύματι καὶ ἅγιοι (not without an illusion to εἰ τοῦτο τῷ δαιμόνι) is, in its first meaning, opposed to εἰ ἐν τῷ καὶ παραδοχ. and denotes the earnestness of spirit with which the true worshippers shall worship; so Ps. cxlv. 18, ἐγὼς παντοῖς παίδι τῶν ἁγιασμένων αὐτὸν ἐν ἁγίῳ. A deeper meaning is brought out where the ground of this kind of worship is stated, in the next verse.—Διὸς—not only ‘requires,’ from His very nature, but 'seeks,'—‘is seeking.' This seeking on the part of the Father naturally brings in the idea, in the woman’s answer, of the Messiah, by Whom He seeks (Luke xix. 10) His true worshippers to gather them out of the world.

—τὸν προσκ. The construction is, the Father is seeking for such to be the οἱ προσκυνούντες αὐτὸν—for οἱ προσκ. αὐτ. of this kind.—24.] πνεύμα δὲ θεός, was the great Truth of Judaism, whereby the Jews were distinguished from the idolatrous people around them. And the Samaritans held even more strongly than the Jews the pure monothestic view. Traces of this, remarks Lücke (from Gesenius), i. 599 note, are found in the alterations made by them in their Pentateuch, long before the time of this history. This may perhaps be partly the reason why the Lord, as Bengel remarks, 'Discipulis non tradidit sublimior,' than to this Samaritan woman.

—God being pure Spirit (perhaps better not, a Spirit, since it is His Essence, not His Personality which is here spoken of), cannot dwell in particular spots or temples (see Acts vii. 48. xviii. 26);—cannot require, nor be pleased with, earthly material offerings nor ceremonies, as such: on the other hand, is only to be approached in that part of our being, which is Spirit,—and even there, inasmuch as He is pure and holy, with no by-ends nor hypocritical regards, but in truth and earnestness. But here comes in the deeper sense alluded to above. How is the Spirit of man to be brought into communion with God? In templi via orate; in te ora. Sed prius est templum Dei. Aug. (Stier, iv. 165.) And how is this to be? Man cannot make himself the temple of God. So that here comes in the gift of God, with which the discourse begun,—the gift of the Holy Spirit, which Christ should give to them that believe on Him. So we have, ‘praying εἰ πνεύματι δύναις,’ Jude ver. 20. So beautifully does the expression εἰ πνεύματι δύναις, here bring with it the new birth by the Spirit,—and for us, the readers of the Gospel, doe the discourse of ch. iii. reflect light on this. And so wonderfully do these words form the conclusion to the great subject of these first chapters: ‘God is become one flesh with us, that we might become one Spirit with Him.’—26.] These words again seem uttered under a complicated feeling. From her ‘saying,’ ver. 29, she certainly had some suspicion that He who had told her all things, &c., was the Christ; and from her breaking in with this remark after the weighty truth which had been just spoken, it seems as if she thought thus,—‘How these matters may be, I cannot understand;—they will be all made clear when the Christ shall come.'
The question of ver. 20 had not been answered to her liking or expectation: she therefore puts aside, as it were, what has been said, by a remark on that suspicion which was arising in her mind. It is not certain what expectations the Samaritans had regarding the Messiah. The view here advanced might be well derived from Deut. xviii. 15; and the name, and much that belonged to it, might have been borrowed from the Jews originally. ὅ λεγεται, χριστός appear to me to be the words of the woman, not of the Evangelist: for in this latter case he would certainly have used ὁ μαθητας again in ver. 29. See also the difference of expression where he inserts an interpretation, ch. i. 42. xix. 13. 17. It is possible that the name ὁ χριστός had become common in popular parable, like many other Greek words and names. ἀναγγέλλει is used especially of enunciating or propounding by divine or superior authority, see ref. 26. Of the reasons which the Lord had, thus to declare Himself to this Samaritan woman and through her to the inhabitants of Sichem (ver. 42), as the Christ, thus early in His ministry, we surely are not qualified to judge. There is nothing so opposed to true Scripture criticism, as to form a pre-conceived plan and rationale of the course of our Lord in the Flesh, and then to force recorded events into agreement with it. Such a plan will be formed in our own minds from continued study of the Scripture narrative:—but by the arbitrary and procrustean system which I am here condemning, the very facts which are the chief data of such a frame, are themselves set aside. When De Wette says, 'This early and decided declaration of Jesus is in contradiction with Matt. viii. 4, and xvi. 20,'—he forgets the very different circumstances under which both those injunctions were spoken:—while he is forced to confess that it is in agreement with the whole spirit of the Sermon on the Mount. He who knew what was in man, varied His revelations and injunctions, as the time and place, and individual dispositions required. ἐγὼ εἰμί. The verb involves in it the predicate. ὁ λαὸς σου has a reference to her words διαγγέλλει ὑμῖν πάντα.—'I am He, who am now speaking to thee,'—fulfilling part of this telling all things, see also her confession, ver. 29. 28.] μετὰ γυνῆς, 'with the woman;' as E. V. No inference can be drawn as to the indefiniteness of the noun, from the omission of the article after a preposition, see Bp. Middleton, ch. vi. § 1.—τι [ . . . ] either, to the woman, 'What seekest thou?' and to the Lord, 'Why talkest Thou with her?'—or perhaps both questions to Him: and then we must suppose a mixture of two constructions, of τι ζ. παρ' αὐτῆς; and τι λαλεῖς με' αὐτῆς:—I rather prefer the former interpretation. 29—30. She does not mention to the men His own announcement of Himself,—but as is most natural under such circumstances rests the matter on the testimony likely to weigh most with them,—her own. We often, and that unconsciously, put before another not our strongest, but what is likely to be his strongest reason. At the same time she shows how the suspicion expressed in ver. 26 arose in her own mind.—ἐρχομένω—'were coming,'—had not arrived, when what followed happened. 31, 32.] The bodily thirst (and hunger probably, from the time of day) which the Lord had felt before, had been and was forgotten in the
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carrying on of His divine work in the soul of this Samaritan woman. Although 6vy and ounex are emphatic, the words are not
spoken in blame, for none was deserved: but in fulness and earnestness of spirit;—
in a feeling analogous to that which comes
upon us when called from high and holy
employment to the supply of the body or
business of this world.—Prosev, generally
distinguished, as eating, from 7poa, 'food' (see 1 Cor. viii. 4), is here equivalent to it. —33.] It is very characteristic of the
first part of this Gospel to bring forward
instances of unreceptivity of spiritual meaning;
compare ch. ii. 20. iii. 4. iv. 11. vi. 42,
52.—They probably have the woman in
their thoughts. —34.] Christ alone could
properly say these words. In the believer
on Him, they are partially true,—true as far
as he has received the Spirit, and entered
into the spiritual life;—but in Him they
were absolutely and fully true. His whole
life was the doing of the Father's will. We
can see and think, and to the glory of God,—
but in Him the hallowing of the Father's name, doing His will, bringing
about His Kingdom, was His daily bread,
and superseded the thoughts and desires for
the other, needful as it was for His humanity.
—7poa is not 571. The latter
would imply what was true (but not here
expressed), that the absolute doing, &c.
was His food;—as it now stands, it implies
that it was His food to carry onward to
completion that work: to be ever, step
after step, having regard to its being
completed. My meat is (not to do, as Eng.
Ver., but) that I may do, &c. In the
teleiwsa autw to egron, the way is prepared
for the idea introduced in the next
verse. These words give an answer to the
questioning in the minds of the disciples,
and show that He had been employed in
the Father's work during their absence.—
35.] The sense of these much-controverted
words will be best ascertained by narrowly
observing the form of the sentence. oun
ounex ligerete, 571 . . . surely cannot be
the introduction to an observation of what
was matter of fact at the time. Had the
words been spoken at a time when it wanted
four months to the harvest, and had the
Lord intended to express this,—is it conceivably
that He should have thus introduced the remark? Would not,
would not, the question have been a direct one in that
case,—are there not four months? &c.
I know not how to account for this o0v
ounex ligerete, 571 . . . except that it introduces
some common saying which the Jews,
or perhaps the people of Galilee only, were
in the habit of using. 'Are not ye accustomed
to say, that...?' —That we hear
of no such proverb elsewhere, is not to the
point,—for such unrecorded sayings are
among every people. That we do not
know whence to date the four months, is
again no objection,—there may have been,
in the part where the saying was usual
(possibly in wN land west of the lake of
Tiberias, for those addressed were from
thence, and the ounex seems to point to
some particular locality), some fixed period
in the year,—the end of the sowing, or
some religious anniversary,—when it was a
common saying that it wanted four months
to harvest. And this might have been the
first date in the year which had regard to
the harvest, and so the best known in
connexion with it.—If this be so, all that has
been built on this saying, as giving a chro-
nological date, must fail to the ground.
(Lightfoot, Meyer (1), Wieseler, i. p. 216 f.,
and others, maintain, that since the lake of
Nisan began on the 16th of Nisan, we must reckon
four months back from that time for this
journey through Samaria, which would
bring it to the middle of Chisleu, i.e. the
beginning of December.) —To get the
meaning of the latter part of the verse, we
must endeavour to follow, as far as may be,
the train of thought which pervades the
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χώρας, ὃτι λευκά ἐστιν πρὸς θερείζον ἡν. 36 [καὶ] ἐστιν ὁ θερείζων μισθὸν λαμβάνει, καὶ συνάγει καρπὸν ἐκ τῶν ἑωθίνων ἵνα καὶ ὁ σπείρων ὁμοίως χαίρῃ καὶ ὁ θερείζων. 37 ἐν γὰρ τούτῳ ὁ λόγος ἐστιν ὁ ἄλλης, ὃτι ἂν ἐστὶν ὁ σπείρων καὶ ἂν λέγῃ οὗτοι ζωήν ἐκείνην καὶ ἂν λέγῃ καὶ ἂν λέγῃ ἔγω ἀπεστειλα ὡς θερείζων ἧν ὑμῖν ἐκείνης ἐκειπιάκατο ἂλλοι κεκοπιάκασι, καὶ υμεῖς εἰς τῶν κόπων αὐτῶν ἐισελήλυθατε. 38 Εἰ δὲ τῆς πόλεως εἰκόνης τούτων ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτῶν τῶν Σαμαριτῶν, διὰ τοῦ λόγου τῆς γυναικὸς μαρτυροῦσας


Discourse. He saith the good seed is the Son of Man; the Lord had now been employed in this His work. But not as in the natural year, so was it to be in the world's life-time. One-third of the year may elapse, or more, before the sown seed springs up; but the sowing by the Son of Man comes late in time, and the harvest should immediately follow. The fields were whitening for it;—these Samaritans (not that I believe He pointed to them approaching (Chrys. and most expositors), but had them in His view in what He said), and the multitudes in Galilee, were all nearly ready. In the discourse as far as ver. 38, He is ὁ σπείρων, the disciples (see Acts viii.) were the ὁ διδασκόντες:—He was the κεκοπιάσας, they were the εἰς τῶν κόπων αὐτῶν ἐισελήλυθαν. The past is used, as descriptive of the office which each held, not of the actual thing done. I cannot also but see an allusion to the words spoken by Joshua (xxiv. 13), on this very spot:—'I have given you a land for which ye did not labour'—ἀφήνετε ἡμῖν καιρόν ἐν αὐτῶν. Taking this view, I do not believe there was any allusion to the actual state of the fields at that time. The words ἐστηκαν κ.λ. are of course to be understood literally:—they were to lift up their eyes and look on the lands around them;—and then came the assurance:—they are whitening already towards the harvest. And it seems to me that on this view—of the Lord speaking of spiritual things to them, and announcing to them the approach of the spiritual harvest, and none else,—the right understanding of the following verses depends.—It is of course possible that it may have been seed-time;—possible also, that the fields may have been actually whitening for the harvest;—but to lay down either of these as certain, and build chronological inferences on it, is quite unwarranted. — θησία belongs certainly to ver. 36, and refers back to ἡ σκοτειναῖς. Taken with ver. 36, it would not agree with the truth of the comparison. The harvest was not yet come. —36.] The μορφής of the θερείζων is in the ἓρει of ἐστιν, implying, in having gathered many into eternal life, just as the βρώος of the σπείρων was His joy already begun in His heavenly work. —37.] ὁ λόγος, ὁ λόγος, i.e. ἄλλης πολεμίης, applies ζωήν ἐκείνην in 2 Pet. ii. 22. So Winer, Meyer (1), Stier, but contr. Lücke, De Wette, who question the propriety of the art., and take (ὁ) ἄλλης for the predicate, and as ἄλλης; John's usage however is to join ὁ λόγος ἀλληνως: see ch. xz. 1. —38.] Here, as often, the Lord speaks of the office and its work as accomplished, which is but beginning (see Isa. xiv. 10).—By ἄλλοι here He cannot mean the O.T. prophets (Grotius, Bengel, Lange), for then His own place would be altogether left out;—and besides, all Scripture analogy is against the idea of the O.T. being the seed of which the N.T. is the fruit;—nor can it be right, as Olshausen maintains, to leave Him out, as being the Lord of the harvest:—for He is certainly elsewhere, and was by the very nature of the case here, the Sower. —The plural is I believe merely inserted as the correspondent word to ὑμῖν in the explanation, as it was ἄλλος —ἄλλος, in the proverb. (So Lücke, Tholuck, Stier. De Wette denies their interpretation, but gives none of his own.)—39—43.] The truth of the saying of ver. 35 begins to be manifested. These Samaritans were the foundation of the church.
afterwards built up there. It does not seem that any miracle was wrought there: ἀυτοὶ δὲ ἔνεσθεν was enough to raise their faith to a point never attained by the Jews, and hardly as yet by the disciples,—that He was the Saviour of the world. Their view seems to have been less clouded by prejudice and narrow-mindedness than that of the Jews; and though the conversion of this people lay not in the plan of the official life of the Lord, or working of His Apostles during it (see Matt. x. 5),—yet we have abundant proof from this history, of His gracious purposes towards them. A trace of this occurrence may be found ch. viii. 48, where see note. Compare throughout Acts viii. 1—26. (In ver. 42 άλαλά is not to be distinguished from χάλας before: see ch. viii. 43.)

[44.] The second miracle of Jesus in Galilee. The healing of the ruler's son.

—43.] òτα should have been expressed in E. V. ' after the two days.'—We find no mention of the disciples again till ch. vi. 3, see note there. — ἐξήλθεν εξ is more in John's style than the received text (see ch. i. 44);—probably καὶ ἐξήλθεν is interpolated: see var. read.—44.] Much difficulty has been found in the connexion of this verse, but unnecessarily. Some have supposed that the Evangelist means Judea by ἂν ἴδω παρίσ (Orig. Λυκκο, second edit., but see below), Ebrard, &c.,—which cannot be, for there is no allusion to Judea at all here, as He came from Samaria, and the verse manifestly alludes to His journey into Galilee:—some, that Capernaum is meant, or Nazareth, and ' He went into Galilee,' as distinguished from one or other of these places (Chrys., Euthym., Cyril, Olah.);—but neither can this be, for our Evangelist does not so lightly pass over the reasons of the remarks he makes, and there is no allusion to any city in Galilee, but to His going into Galilee before, and being in Judea and Samaria (Theophyl., Meyer (1), and somewhat similarly Neander (L. J. 356) and Jacobi); this however would be equally alien from the simplicity of John's style, and not in accordance with the fact of almost all His teaching and working being in Galilee. Nor is γὰρ to be rendered 'although' (Kinoel)—a sense (Lücke, i. 613) which it never has. The only true and most simple view is (Tholuck, Lücke, third edit., De Wette), that this verse refers to the next following, and indeed to the whole narrative which it introduces. It stands as a preliminary explanation of the 'Except ye see signs and wonders, ye will not believe,' and as indicating the contrast between the Samaritans, who believed on Him for His word,—and His own countrymen, who only received Him because they had seen the miracles which He did at Jerusalem. Such use of γὰρ is not unexampled (see Hartung, Partikelvors., i. p. 467; Lücke, 467; Thol.; De Wette; and Matthies, Gr. Gr. § 615). In Herod. i. 134 we have ἵνα καὶ Καμπάσιν, οῖς γὰρ θεῷ ἐπορώνων  γὰρ ἄν εἰς τοίς τοιούτοις γάρ ἄνεσαν τὸν ἄρτους ἄνεσαν τὸν τουτοῦτος φάσιν τινα. Soph. Antig. 358: ἀλλ' ἃ γὰρ ἐκείνα καὶ παρ' ἄλλως χαρέ ίσους ἄλλοι μηπος οὔδεν ἄλλον ἢ ἔσα ἐκ. And the οὖν in the next verse is a particle connecting it with this preliminary reason given.—But ἔμφασις is not to
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οὖν ἤδειν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν, ἀνεδέχμηντο αὐτὸν οἱ Γαλι-και ι. ε. α. 18.

λαϊς, πάντα ἐσφακότες ἠ ἐποίησαν ἐν Ἰεροσολύμωι ἐν τῷ εορτῇ καὶ αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἤθυιν εἰς τὴν εορτὴν.

41 ἤθυιν ὁ Ἰσσως ἔτοιμο τῶν θυσίων αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἦν τοις βασιλικὸς, οὗ τὸ νῦν ἤσθεν εἰς Καρπενναόμι. 41 οὐτος ἀκούσας ὅτι Ἰσσως ἤκει εἰς τὴν Ιουδαίαν εἰς τὴν Γαλι-

λαίαν, ἄπηλθε πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ ἤρωτα [αὐτὸν] ἐν καταβυ καὶ ἦσθην αὐτοῦ τὸν νῦν ἢμελλε γὰρ ἀποθνῄσκειν. 41 ἦτεν ὁ Ἰσσως πρὸς αὐτὸν Ἔλεν μὴ σημεῖα καὶ ἐρεθαὶ ἢπτε, οὐ μὴ πιστεύσῃ. 41 λέγει πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ βασιλικὸς Κύριε, καταβήθη πρὸς ἀποθανεῖν σι — Acts ii. 22.


be taken as a pluperfect. — 45.] They received Him, but in accordance with the proverbial saying just recorded; not for any honour in which they themselves held Him, or value which they had for His teaching; but on account of His fame in Jerusalem, the metropolis, —which set them the fashion in their estimate of men and things. — καὶ αὐτῶν γὰρ, inserted for those readers who might not be aware of the practice of the Galileans to frequent the feasts at Jerusalem. — 46.] εὖν, because of the receptivity of Him from signs and wonders merely, —not as a Prophet from His teaching. — βασιλικὸς. ἐν γίγνουσι βασιλικὸς, ἡ ἡ διδυμα τι εἰκετηρίζειν ἵπτεν ἐν θεσπὸν βασιλικὸς (Euthym., Chrys.), ἡ ἡ ἐν προτητῇ βασιλικὸς (Euthym.). Origen thinks he may have been one of the household of Caesar, having some business in Judea at that time. But the usage of Josephus is perhaps our surest guide. He uses βασιλικὸς, to distinguish the soldiers, or courtiers, or officers of the kings (Herod or others), from those of Rome, —but never to designate the royal family: see B. J. vii. 5, 2. Ant. x. 8, 4. So that this man was probably an officer of Herod Antipas. He may have been Chusa, Herod's steward, Luke viii. 3: but this is pure conjecture. The man seems to have been a Jew: see below. — 47, 48.] This miracle is a notable instance of the Lord 'not quenching the smoking flax,' just as His reproof of the Samaritan woman was of His 'not breaking the bruised reed.' The little spark of faith in the breast of this nobleman is by Him lit up into a clear and enduring flame for the light and comfort of himself and his house. — καταβηπτι — see on ch. ii. 12. — The charge brought against them, ἄπω μὴ ἀν., does not imply, as some (Raphael and Storr) think, that they would not believe signs and wonders heard of, but required to see them (thus laying the stress on ἴδον) — for in this case the expression would certainly have been fuller, ἴδον τοῖς δόξαλοις, or something similar; —and it would not accord with the Lord's known low estimate of all mere miracle-faith, to find Him making so weighty a difference between faith from miracles seen and miracles heard. The words imply the contrast between the Samaritans, who believed because of His word, and the Jews (the plural reckoning the βασιλικοί among them), who would not believe but through signs and prodigies: — see 1 Cor. i. 22. And observe also that it is not implied that even when they had seen signs and wonders, they would believe; —they required these as a condition of their faith, but even those were rejected by them: see ch. xii. 37. — But even with such inadequate conceptions and conditions of faith, the Lord receives the nobleman, and works the sign rather than dismiss him. It was otherwise in Matt. xvi. 1 ff. — 49.] Here is the same weakness of faith, —but the Lord's last words have made visible impression. It is like the Syrophoenician woman's rejoinder, —'Yes, Lord; but...,' only the faith is of a far less noble kind than hers. He seems to believe it necessary that Jesus should be on the spot; —not that there was any thing strange or
BLAMEABLE IN THIS, FOR MARTHA AND MARY Did the same, ch. xi. 32;—and to think that it would be too late when his child had expired;—not imagining that He to whom he spoke could raise the dead. —50.] The bringing out and strengthening of the man’s faith by these words was almost as great a spiritual miracle, as the material one which they indicated. —We may observe the difference between the Lord’s dealing here and in the case of the centurion (Matt. viii. 8 and 9). There, when from humility the man requests Him to speak the word only, He offers to go to his house: here, when pressed to go down, He speaks the word only. This may be noticed (see also Chrysostom) the weak faith of the nobleman is strengthened, while the humility of the centurion is honoured. —51.] He appears to have gone leisurely away—for the hour (1 p.m.) was early enough to reach Capernaum the same evening (twenty-five miles): in confidence that an amendment was taking place, which he at present understood to be only a gradual one.—52, 53.] κομψῶς ἐχεῖν in this sense is found in Arrian. Dissert. Epictet. iii. 10, cited by most of the commentators. ὥσπερ δὲ τάρρως εἰς ἐξοχὴν, μὴ φοβεῖσθαι τι πιστήν· μὴ ἐντευκτῷ, κομψῶς ἀποκλίνειν...ὑπερεχοῖτο...μὴ ἐν πίστει κακῶς ἔτης, ἀποτηλεῖν...—ἀψίδήν ἀντί τε νῦν. This was probably more than he expected to hear; and the coincidence of so sudden a recovery with the time at which Jesus had spoken the words to him (ἀφίησα, τῷ Λόγῳ ἐπιστρέφοντα), raises his faith at length into a full Messiahship of Him, Who had by word commanded the disease, and it had obeyed. The ἐπιστρέψεως, absolutely, implies that in the fullest sense he and all his became disciples of Jesus. It is very different from ἐπιστρέψεως τοῦ Λόγου ὧν ἐπέμενεν. Ἰησ. in ver. 60—as believing on Him must be always different from believing on any thing else in the world, be it even His own word or His own ordinances.—54.] The meaning of the Evangelist certainly is, that this is the second Galilean miracle (see ch. iii. 2 iv. 46). But (1) how is that expressed in the words? I believe the πάλιν to refer (not in the construction, but in the sense) to ἠλθὼν εἰς Τ. i., &c., and to mean,—‘On His second Galilean manifestation of Himself.’ ‘This second miracle did Jesus, saperāt (on His new visit to Galilee), after He had come,’ &c. And then (2) why should this so particularly be stated? It would seem as if John, as well as the other Evangelists, regarded, in some sense, Galilee as the proper theatre of the Lord’s manifestation of Himself; though, on account of the usual apostolic records of healing so much with Galilean events, he relates only those which served the purpose he had in view. Or it may be that he was anxious to
deliver a definite chronological testimony to the succession of the early miracles in Galilee, just discriminating these two, and then leaving those recorded in Matt. viii. and ii. to follow. — It is an interesting question, whether or not this miracle be the same as the healing of the centurion’s servant (or son, Matt. ?) in Matt. viii. 5. Luke vii. 1. Irenaeus appears to hold the two narratives to be the same history (appears only; for his words are, ‘Filium centurionis absens verbo curavit dicens Vade, filius tuus vivat.’ Herr. ii. 22: which remark may be simply explained by his having cited from memory, and thus either made this βασιλικός a centurion,—or, which is more probable, having understood the σάτρα in Matt. viii. as a son, and made the Lord there speak other words from those really uttered by Him, but which are in reality found here): so Eusebius also in his canons. Chrysostom notices, but opposes the view: — and it has never in modern times gained many advocates, being only held by Semler, Seiffarth, and the interpreters of the Strausseian school. Indeed, the internal evidence is all against it: not only (Chrys.) διά τοῦ δίξωμας, ἀλλὰ καὶ καὶ πιστεύω, does the man in one case differ from the man in the other. The inner kernel of the history is, in our case here,—the elevation of a weak and mere wonder-seeking faith into a deep conviction of the personal power and love of the Lord,—in the other, the commendation of a noble confession of the Lord’s divine power, indicating great strength and grasp of faith, and inducing the greatest personal humility. And the external point brought out in the commendation, όδοι ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ, is not only different from, but stands in absolute contrast with, the depreciating charge here, ἵνα μὴ σημεία καὶ τέρατα ἔχῃ, οὗ μὴ πιστεύηται. — Olshausen (whose observation on John is far less elaborate than on the other Gospels, which may account for my referring less often to it) well remarks, that this narrative may be regarded as a sequel to the foregoing one.

CHAP. V. 1.—47.] Healing of a cripple at the pool of Bethesda, during a feast; and the discourse of Jesus occasioned by the persecution of the Jews arising thereupon. — 1.] μετὰ ταύτα. Lücke remarks that when John wishes to indicate immediate succession, he uses μετὰ ταύτα, ch. ii. 12. xi. 7, xix. 28; when mediate, after an interval, μετὰ ταύτα, ch. iii. 22. v. 14. vi. 1. vii. 1. xix. 38. So that apart from other considerations which would lead us to the same conclusion, we may infer that some interval has elapsed since the last verse of ch. iv. — ἠστραγγία τῶν Ἰουδαίων. Few points have been more controverted, than the question, what this feast was. I will give the principal views, and then state my own conclusion. (I have abridged the following statement principally from Lücke’s note, ii. 1—15.) (1) Irenaeus understands it (Herr. ii. 39) to be the second Passover of the Lord’s ministry. Origen (whose commentary on this chapter is lost) mentions this view, (tom. xii. 36,) but apparently does not approve it. This is the view of Luther, Calvin, Lightfoot, Lampe, Kinoel. (2) Cyril, Alex. and Chrysostom think it to be the Pentecost; similarly Euthym. and Theophyl. This opinion prevailed in the Greek Church; and has been defended by Erasmus, Calvin, Beza, &c., and more recently by Bengel in his Harmony. (3) Kepler first suggested the idea that it might be the feast of Purim, (Esth. ix. 21, 26,) almost immediately preceding the Passover (the 14th and 15th of Adar.) This was adopted by Petavius, and has been the general view of the modern chronologists. So Lamy, apparat. chronol., Hug, Lücke (1st ed.), Olshausen, Meyer, Wieseler, Stier, Neander, Winer. (4) The feast of tabernacles has been suggested by Cocceius, and is supported by one MS. (131) which has ἡν ἠστραγγία τῶν Ἰουδαίων. (5) Kepler and Petavius thought it also possible that the feast of Dedication (see ch. x. 22) might be meant.—So that almost every Jewish feast finds some supporters. — I believe with Lücke (3rd ed.), De Wette, and Tholuck, that we cannot with any probability gather what feast it was. Seeing as I do no distinct datum given in ch. iv. 35, nor again in ch. vi. 1, and finding nothing in this chapter to determine the nature of this feast, I cannot attach any weight to most of the elaborate chronological arguments which have been raised on the subject. It can hardly have been a Passover, on account of the omission of the article before ἠστραγγία (see ch. vi. 4), and because if so, we should have an interval of a whole year between this chapter and the next, which is not probable. Nor can it...
have been the Dedication, in the winter; for then the multitude of sick would have hardly been waiting for the moving of the water. The feast of Purim would nearest agree with the subsequent events; and it seems as if the Lord did not go up to Jerusalem at the Passover next following (ch. vi. v. 1), so that no difficulty would be created by the proximity of the two feasts, unless, with De Wette, we believe that the interval was too little for what is related ch. vi. 1—3 to have happened. But it may be doubted, (1) whether it was a general practice to go up to Jerusalem at the Purim; (2) whether our Lord would be likely to observe it, even if it was. No reason need be given why John does not name the feast; it is quite in accordance with his practice of mentioning nothing that does not concern his subject-matter. Thus the Passover is mentioned ch. ii. 13, because of the buying and selling in the temple; again, ch. vi. 4, to account for the great multitude; the feast of Tabernacles, ch. vii. 2, because of the practice alluded to by the Lord in ver. 37; that of the Dedication, ch. x. 22, to account for His being in Solomon’s porch because it was winter; but in this chapter, where there is nothing alluding to the time or nature of the feast, it is not specified. —τὸ προσάρτος — possibly His disciples; for the same expression is used ch. ii. 13, whereas we find, ch. iii. 22, that His disciples were with Him; compare also ch. vii. 10 and ch. ix. 2. — ἔχει has been thought by Bengel and others to import that John wrote His Gospel before the destruction of Jerusalem. But this must not be pressed. He might have spoken in the present without meaning to be literally accurate at the moment when he was writing (see Proleg. to John, § iv. 6).

—ἐκ τῆς προσκυνήσεως, probably, ‘near the asepsegate,’ mentioned by Nehemiah, iii. 1, 32. xii. 39. The situation of this gate is unknown; —it is traditionally supposed to be the same with that now called St. Stephen’s gate; but inaccurately, for no wall existed in that quarter till the time of Agrippa (Robinson, i. 472). Eusebius, Jerome, and the Itinerarium Hieros. speak of a προσκυνησε κολουμβήθρα, so also probata piscina, Vulg. — The reading λαγετήρι would be more usual; perhaps ἀνάλημμα implies that it had another name. — Βηθσαϊδὰ = Συρ. γην που, ‘the house (place) of mercy, or of grace.’ Its present situation is very uncertain. Robinson established by personal inspection the fact of the subterranean connexion of the pool of Siloam and that called the Fountain of the Virgin (i. 501 f.); and has made it probable that the Fountain under the grand Mosque is also connected with them (i. 500 f.); in fact that all these are but one and the same spring. (See also some interesting particulars respecting an attempt made subsequently to prove this connexion, and mention of a fourth fountain with the same peculiar taste as the water of Siloam, in Williams’s Holy City, pp. 381 f.) Now this spring, as he himself witnessed, (i. 506,) is an intermittent one, as indeed had been reported before by Jerome, (on Isa. viii. 6,) Prudentius (in Trench, Mir. 247), William of Tyre, and others. There might have been, then, it is obvious, some artificially constructed basin in connexion with this spring, the site and memory of which have perished, which would present the phenomenon here described: see below.—The spot now traditionally known as Bethsaida is a part of the fosse round the fort or tower Antonia, an immense reservoir or trench seventy-five feet deep. But, as Robinson observes (i. 489), there is not the slightest evidence that can identify it with the Bethsaida of the N. T.—This pool is not mentioned by Josephus. — πάντες οὖν ἐκεῖ. Probably these were for the shelter of the sick persons, and were arches or porticoes, opening upon and surrounding the reservoir. οὖν ἔτην ἄντε νην λαγετήρι αὐτηρα, ὡς καὶ ὀδόλος. Bathym. — 3.] ἐπὶ τῶν, those who were afflicted with the loss of vital power in any of their limbs by stiffness or paralysis. Of this kind was the man on whom the miracle was wrought. — ἄγνωστος; ... κίνησιν. This clause (as well as ver. 4) labours under strong suspicion of spuriousness; see var. read. The authority in their favour is about equal: D alone of the first class MSS., containing this clause, and A alone, ver. 4. In many MSS. both are marked with an obelus or asterisk. And those which contain them vary exceedingly
in their readings, which, in so short a passage, is a bad sign. E. g. A has instead of κατεβαίνειν, ἵλωσον.—Internal evidence is very strong against the whole. For in this short space (see ref.) there are no less than seven words either used here only, or here only in this sense.—Still the addition found its way very early into the text. For Tertullian refers to it in a way which leaves no doubt that he read it entire. 'Piscinam Bethsaida (see var. read.) angelus interveniens commovebat: observabat qui valentudinem querebantur. Nam si quis prevenientur descendere illicum, quia post lavarium desinebat.' De Bap.t. c. 5. (Lücke ii. 22.)—The genuineness of the passage must therefore remain doubtful. If spurious, it was the expression of the belief of the Jews, remembered in the early days of the Christian Church, and noted in the margin; and thus has found its way into the text: which would account for the variations observed in it. If genuine, it is a declaration by the Evangelist of a matter which must necessarily be understood to express the popular (but not therefore inaccurate) belief respecting the cause of the healing virtue experienced on the moving of the water. It is not implied that the angel was visible, even if ἱλοστον be received into the text. In the deeper truth of causes and effects in Nature, which the mere rationalist always overlooks, divine appointment and divine interference are ever present in the faithful Christian's mind; and believing as he does that the holy angels are the ever-acting ministers of God's will, he will find no difficulty in receiving the account before us, nor any inconsistency in its forming part of the sacred text.—It certainly is in favour (as Stier remarks) of the genuineness of the passage, and the miraculous view of the whole, that so many different kinds of afflicted persons lay here: and another strong argument is that noticed by De Wette, that the connexion of the account almost requires this passage as its explanation. For why should the sick be lying there; and why should the man have been so anxious to be put in, unless some known effect followed on the troubling of the water, which he himself (ver. 7) mentions as the time when he would be put in, but could not? —κατεβαίνειν, heere, apparently, 'at intervalls;' and those irregular ones, or the sick need not have waited there for them.—κατεβαίνειν. If the passage be retained, ἱλοστον should be read. I have not admitted it, because A is our only first class authority. —οὖν τὰ πρ. ἐφ. β. certainly the intention here is to set forth a miraculous healing, consequent on being the first to go in; and I see not how we can clear ver. 7 of a similar implication. The man was not healed, because he could not get in first.—The idea of the virtue of the water being exhausted by the first who stepped in, is wholly unsatisfactory and absurd. —5) There are two ways of taking the construction of ἰχνων: (1) to regard ἰχνων in τῇ ἀδείᾳ as = ἀδεινός ἰχνων, and τρίακοντα δεύτερο ἵγη as the accus. of duration; which is objectionable on account of the article τῇ, (not on account of the present participle, as De Wette, for it is often found with duration of time,) and as being alien from John's usage, which is (2) to place ἰχνων in this sense with an accusative of the time; see ref., and ver. 6. So that the construction is ἰχνων τρὶακοντα δεύτερο ἵγη in...
...γυνὴς γενεσθαι; ἡ ἀπεκρίθη ἀυτῷ ὁ ἄθενών Κύριε, ἀνθρώπον οὐκ ἔγνω, ἵνα ὅταν παρασκεύῃ τὸ ὤδερ, ἐβάλῃ με εἰς τὴν κυλιμβήθραν. ἐν ψυχῇ δὲ ἔρχομαι ἐγώ, ἀλλος πρὸ ἐμοῦ καταβαίνει. Λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰσσώνς Ἔγειρε ἄρον τὸν κράββατόν σου καὶ περιπατεῖ. καὶ ἐκεῖς ἐγένετο ὡς ὁ ἄνθρωπος, καὶ ἤρε τὸν κράββατόν αὐτοῦ καὶ περιπατεῖ. τὴν δὲ σάββατον ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ. ἔλεγον οὖν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι τῷ τεθεραπευμένῳ Σάββατόν ἐστίν * οὐκ ἔξεστι σοι ἅραι τὸν κράββατόν. ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῶι ὁ  δ' ποιήσας με ὡς γυνή, ἐκεῖνος μοι ἐπὶ τῶν ἄρων τῶν


τῷ ἀνθ. ἀνθ. ἀνθ. τῇ ἡμέρᾳ. —Observe, he had been lame thirty-eight years, not at Bethsaida all that time. — 6.] γενώθη, ἡ ἐν ταύτῃ, as on other similar occasions. The Lord singled him out, being conscious of the circumstances under which he lay there, by that supernatural knowledge of which we had so striking an example in the case of the woman of Samaria. — ἤθελεν τῇ ν. τῇ; Lightfoot and Semler would supply, 'hic est sabbatum.' But this is very improbable, see ver. 17. The Lord did not thus appeal to His hearers' prejudices, and make His grace dependent on them. Besides, the γυνής γενεσθαι had in the mind of the man no references as such as there would be any objection to on the Sabbath; but to the cure by means of the water, which he was there to seek. —The question is one of those by which He so frequently testified His compassion, and established (so to speak) a point of connexion between the spirit of the person addressed, and His own gracious purposes. Possibly it may have conveyed to the mind of the poor cripple the idea that at length a compassionate person had come, who might put him in at the next troubling of the water. — It certainly is possible that the man's long and apparently hopeless infirmity may have given him a look of lethargy and despondency, and the question may have arisen from this: but there is no ground for supposing (Schleiermacher) blame conveyed by it, still less that he was an impostor labouring under some trifling complaint (Paulus and others), and wishing to represent it more important than it was. — 7.] Bauer asks why the person who brought him there every day, could not have put...
healing, God's work. The authority which had overruled one appointment of Providence, could overrule another. I do not mean that this reasoning was present to the man's mind;—he very likely spoke only from intense feeling of obligation to One who had done so much for him;—but it lay beneath the words, and the Jews recognized it, by transferring their blame from the man to Him who healed him. — 12.] Not, 'who is he that healed thee?' but they carefully bring out the unfavourable side of what had taken place, as malicious persons always do. — 13.] Difficulty has been found here from the supposed improbability that some should not have told him, seeing that Jesus was by this time well known in Jerusalem. But this is wholly unnecessary. His fame had not been so spread yet, but that He might among the crowd of strangers at the feast pass unnoticed. — ἐξείνευσεν, 'passed on unobserved;' just spoke the healing words, and then went on among the crowd; so that no particular attention was attracted to Himself, either by the sick man or others. The context requires this interpretation: being violated by the ordinary one, that Jesus 'conveyed Himself away, because a multitude was in the place;' for that would imply that attention had been attracted towards Him which He wished to avoid; and in that case He could hardly fail to have been known to the man and to others. Observe, ἐξείνευσεν has for its understood object, the man, subjectively; — 'had escaped his notice;' not referring to any thing which Jesus had done Himself. — 14.] The knowledge of the Lord extended even to the sin committed thirty-eight years ago, from which this long sickness had resulted, for so it is implied here. The χάριν τι, as Trench observes (Mir. 254), 'gives us an awful glimpse of the severity of God's judgments;'—see Matt. xii. 45. — 15.] The man appears to have done this partly in obedience to the authorities; partly perhaps to complete his apology for himself (Bengel). We can hardly imagine ingratitude in him to have been the cause; especially as ἀφόφαντος αὐτῶν ἀφόφαντος speaks so plainly of the benefit received; comp. ver. 11 and note. — 16.] ἔξοδος is not used in the sense of legal prosecution in the N. T.;—'persecuted' is the best word for it. — 17.] The true keeping of the rest of the Sabbath was not that ciouse and unprofitable cessation from even good deeds which they would enforce: the sabbath was made for man;—and, in its Jewish form, for man in a mere state of legal discipline (which truth could not yet be brought out to them, but is implied in this verse, because His people are even as He is—in the liberty wherewith He hath made them free); whereas He, the only-begotten of the Father, doing the works of God in the world, stands on higher ground, and hallows, instead of breaking the Sabbath, by thus working on it. — "He is no more a breaker of the Sabbath than God is, when He upholds with an energy that knows no pause the work of His creation from hour to hour, and from moment to moment; 'My Father worketh hitherto, and I work;' My work is but the reflex of His work. Abstinence from outward work belongs not to the idea of a
Sabbath, it is only more or less the necessary condition of it for beings so framed as ever to be in danger of losing the true collection and rest of the spirit in the multiplicity of earthly toil and business. Man indeed must cease from his work if a higher work is to find place in him. He scatters himself in his work, and therefore he must collect himself anew, and have seasons for so doing. But with Him who is one with the Father, it is otherwise. In Him the deepest rest is not excluded by the highest activity." (Trench, Mir. p. 267.) — 18.] The ground of the charge is now shifted; and by these last words (ver. 17), occasion is given for one of the Lord's most weighty discourses.—The Jews understood His words to mean nothing short of peculiar personal Sonship, and thus equality of nature with God. And this their understanding was the right one, the discourse testifies. All might in one sense, and the Jews did in a closer sense, call God their, or our, Father; but they at once said that the individual use of 'My Father' by Jesus had a totally distinct, and in their view a blasphemous, meaning. Thus we obtain from the adversaries of the faith a most important statement of one of its highest and holiest doctrines. — 19.] The discourse is a wonderful setting forth of the Person and Office of the Son of God in His Ministries as the Word of the Father. It still has reference to the charge of working on the Sabbath, and the context takes in both the Lord's answer to this, ver. 17, and to the Jews' accusation, ver. 18. In this verse, He states that He cannot work any but the works of God: censures the people by whose obedience He was not moved; by degrees advance Him to exaltation and put His Enemies under His feet. Of the
latter of these mention is made (ver. 20)
in the future, of the former in the present.
The former belong to the Son as His proper and essential work: the latter are opened out before Him in the process of His passing onward in the humanity which He has taken. And the unfolding of these latter shall all be in the direction of, and in accordance with, the eternal attributes of the Son; see ch. xvii. 6: resulting in His being exalted to the right hand of the Father. So here,—as it is the Father's essential work to vivify the dead (see Rom. viii. 11. 1 Sam. li. 6 al.), so the Son vividly whom He will: this last αὐτὸς θεός not implying any selection out of mankind, nor said merely to remove the Jewish prejudice that their own nation alone should rise from the dead,—but meaning, that in every instance where His will is to vivify, the result invariably follows.—Observe, this ζωοτροφεύεται lays hold of life in its innermost and deepest sense, and thus finds its illustration in the waking both of the outwardly and the spiritually dead.—22.] In the case of yea is implied. That the Father does not Himself, by His own proper act, vivify any, but commits all quickening power to the Son:—so is it with judgment also. And judgment contains eminently in itself the αὐτὸς θεός,—when ζωοτροφεύεται is understood—as must be now of bestowing everlasting life. Again, the raising of the outwardly dead is to be understood as a sign that He who works it is appointed Judge of quick and dead, for it is a part of the office of that Judge:—in the vivifying, the judgment is made; see below, ver. 29, and Ps. lxvii. 1—6. 23.] This being so, the end of all is, the honour of the Father in and by the Son. His (the Son) is the Lord of life, and the Judge of the world;—all must honour Him with equal honour to that which they pay to the Father:—and whosoever does not, however he may imagine that he honours or approaches God, does not honour Him at all;—because He can only be known or honoured by us as 'the Father who sent His Son.'—24.] What follows, to ver. 30 incl., is an expansion of the two assertions in ver. 21, 22,—the ζωοτροφεύεται and the κρίνεται, intimately bound up as they are together. There is a parallelism in ver. 24 and 25 which should be noticed for the right understanding of the words. ὁ τῶν λόγων μου ἀκούων καὶ πιστεύων const. Acts xvi. 30. Titus iii. 10. 25.] Where the necessity and the desire of the Father is set before us as an enduring faith,—and its effects described in their completion (see Eph. i. 19, 20).—εἰς κρίνειν αὐτῶν ἐπερημένον κρισίς being the separation, —the effect of which is to gather out of the Kingdom all that offends;—and thus regarding especially the damnatory part of judgment,—he who believes comes not into, has no concern with, κρίσις. Compare Ps. cxliv. 2. The reckoning which ends with τοῦ δικαίου δικαίου, is not κρίσις: the reward is of free grace. In this sense, the believers in Christ will not be judged according to their works; they are justified before God by faith, and by God—οἰς ὀ δικαιών, τις ἐκ πατρικρίνων: Their 'passage over' from death into life has already taken place,—from the state of spiritual death into that ἀναλύειν, which in their believing state they ὄγνοις already. It is to be observed that the Lord speaks in very similar terms of the unbelieving being condemned already, in ch. iii. 18.—The perfect
sense of μεταβολήν must not be weakened nor explained away,—see 1 John iii. 14. —28.] This verse continues to refer to spiritual awakening from the dead. The ἀρχήν ἑρά π. νῦν ἐστιν is an expression (see ref.) used of those things which are to characterize the spiritual Kingdom of Christ, which was even now begun among men, but not yet brought (until the day of Pentecost, Acts ii.) to its completion. Thus 'it cometh,' in its fulness,—and 'even now is begun.' —οἱ νεκροὶ, in reference to ἐκ θανάτου of the preceding verse, — the spiritually dead; — see below on ver. 28.—
The call, His call to awake, in its widest and deepest sense,—by His own preaching, by His Apostles, His ministers, &c., &c. In all these He speaks to the spiritually dead. —οἱ ζωοῦσαι, not ζωούσαι merely, which would be 'and having heard it, shall live;' but ζωοῦσαι, 'and they who have heard it (or, who hear it) shall live.' This determines the verse to be spoken of spiritual, not bodily awakening. —Οἱ ζωοῦσαι are the persons to whom the Lord cried so often οἱ ἑχοῦσα τὴν ζωὴν, —the persons who stand opposed to those addressed in ver. 40, οἵ τινες ζῶνται πρὸς με, ἵνα ζωὴν ἴχνην.— ἔχοσαντες is explained in the next verse.—26, 27.] We have here again ζωοῦσαι and κρίνειν bound together as the two great departments of the Son's working; —the former, as substantiating the ἔχοσαντες just uttered; the latter, as leading on to the great announcement of the next verse. But the two departments spring from two distinct sources, united in the Person of the Incarnate Son of God. The Father hath given Him to have life in Himself, as Lord of the Son of God. We have none of us life in ourselves: in Him we live and move and have our being. But He, as the Father hath given Him power to pass judgment, because He is the Son of Man; man is to be judged by Man,—by that Man whom God hath appointed, who is the inclusion Head of humanity, and to whom mankind, and man's world, pertain by right of covenant-purchase. This κρίσιν τοιοῦτος leads the thought to the great occasion when judgment shall be executed; which accordingly is treated of in the next verse.—28.] μὴ θ., as ch. iii. 7, introduces a matter of even greater wonder to them; —the astounding proof which shall be given in the face of the universe that this is so.—

观察到此处，根据作品的风格，这是福音派的风格。它在Mccxv. 31 —46，其中（带注释）比较。我们在这里没有提到两个Katánstasen和οἱ μὴ θ. Katánstasen, but the categories reach far wider, including indeed in this most general form the first resurrection unto life also,—and the two great classes are described as οἱ τ. ἀγ. πνευματικαὶ and οἱ τὰ φαύλα πράξεις. On the difference, here most striking, between πνεῦμα and πρᾶσισ, see note on ch. iii. 20, 21.—

Observe, that ἐκκλ. and κρίνω stand opposed here, as in ver. 24: —not that there is such thing as ἀνάστασις θανάτου (Schleiermacher, in Stier, iv. 233), but that it is involved in this κρίσις. —Olahsen observes (li. 153), that this, and Acts xxiv. 15, are the only direct declarations in the N. T. of a bodily resurrection of the unjust as well as of the just. It is implied in some places, e.g. Matt. x. 28, and less plainly in Matt. xxv. 34 ff. Rev. xx. 5, 12, and directly asserted in the O. T., Dan. xii. 2. In
KATA IOANNHN.

26—35.

ποιεῖν ἐν ἐμαυτῷ οὐδὲν, καθὼς ἀκούω κρίνω, καὶ ἡ ἡ n ver. 19.

κρίσις ἡ ἐκ εἰκοῦσα ἐστὶν, ὅπως Ληθ χίλια τὸ "ἐμῶν" τοῖς γυμνάοις με ῥᾷ σιν. 31 Ἔλεγε γὰρ μαρτυρὶς περὶ ἐμαυτόν, ἡ μαρτυρία μου οὐκ ἦστιν ἀληθῆς.

32 ἄλλος ἐστίν ὁ μαρτυριῶν περί ἐμοῦ, καὶ οἶδα ὅτι ἀληθῆς ἐστίν ἡ μαρτυρία ἡ μαρτυρεῖ ἐπὶ ἐμοῦ. 33 ὑμεῖς ἂν ἐστάλκατε ἀπὸ Ἰωάννου, καὶ μεμαρτύρηκε τῇ ἀληθείᾳ.

34 ἐγὼ δὲ οὐ παρέτρωσα τὴν μαρτυρίαν λαμβάνω, ἀλλὰ ταῦτα λέγω ἵνα ὑμεῖς σωθῆτε. 35 ἐκεῖνος ἦν ὁ λύχνος ὁ καὶ καίομενος καὶ φαινόμεν, ὑμεῖς δὲ ἠθέλησατε.


1 Cor. xv.—as the object was to convince believers in Christ of the truth of the resurrection of their bodies, no allusion is made to those who are not believers. 30. Here begins (see Steier, iv. 233) the second part of the discourse.—but bound on most closely to the first, treating of the testimony by which these things were substantiated, and which they ought to have received. This verse is, however, perhaps rather a point of transition to the next, at which the testimony is first introduced.—As the Son does nothing of Himself, but His working and His judgment all spring from His deep unity of will and being with the Father,—this His great and last judgment, and not be judged of God (He being not separate from God, but one with Him); and therefore His witness given of Himself ver. 17, and called by them blasphemously, is true and holy also. —Observe, the discourse here passes into the first person, which was understood before, because He had called Himself the Son of God, but is henceforth used expressly. —31. This assertion is not to be trifled away by an accommodation, or supposed to be introduced by 'Ye will say to Me'—see all means ch. viii. 19—14 and notes. —The words are said in all earnestness, and are strictly true. If such a separation, and independent testimony, as is here supposed, could take place, it would be a falsification of the very conditions of the truth of God as manifested by the Son,—Who being the Logos, speaks, not of Himself, but of the Father. And in this sense ch. viii. 14 is eminently true also, the φῶς being the αἴαναγμα τῆς δόξας τοῦ πατρός.—32. ἄλλος can, by the inner coherence of the discourse, be no other than the Father, of Whom so much has been said in the former part, but Who is hinted at rather than mentioned in this (παρὰ in ver. 30 is spurious). It cannot be John, from whom (ver. 34) the Lord took not His testimony. Similar modes of alluding to the Father occur ch. viii. 50. 54: see also ch. viii. 18, and Matt. xii. 19 and 30. Many interpreters however understand it of John, Chrysostom, Nonnus, Theophylact, Kethym,—and lately De Wette has defended the view with some acuteness. But he has certainly missed the inner coherence of the passage. The reason why the Lord mentions John is not 'as descending from the lesser witness to the greater,' but purpose to remove the idea that He meant him only or primarily to himself, and to set his testimony in its right place; then at ver. 36 He returns again to the ἄλλος μαρτυριῶν ἵνα ἔλθητε. 35. This is the Son's testimony to the Father's truth: see ch. (iii. 33.) vii. 28. viii. 26. 55. It testifies to the full consciousness on the part of the Son, even in the days of His humiliation, of the righteousness of the Father: and (for the testimony of the Father to the Son is contained in the Scriptures) also to His distinct recognition and approval (Ps. xlii—5) of Psalm and type and prophecy, as applied to Himself and His work.—33. See ch. i. 19. The connexion is, 'another testifies of Me' (ver. 32) 'not John only, although he, when sent to, did certainly testify to the truth; for' &c. —τὴν ἀληθείαν, not merely (Grot.) modestis dictum—but necessarily. ἵνα would have been asserting what the next verse denies. —34. 'I take not My testimony (the testimony to Me of which I have spoken) from man, but I mention John's testimony, that you may make the intended use of it, to be led to Me for
salvation."—36.] This ἵνα shows, as Stier rightly points out, that John was now cast into prison, if not executed. —οἱ λόγοι. The article has been taken by some (e.g. Bengel, Lücke, Stier) to point to the prophecies concerning John. But we have no passage in the O. T. which designates Elias in such terms. In Sirach xvii. 1, we read of him, ἀνείπη προφήτης ὡς τῆς, καὶ οἱ λόγοι αὐτοῦ ὡς λαμπὸς ἱερίου, which Stier thinks may be referred to here. We may, as indeed he also suggests, believe that those words represent or gave rise to a common way of speaking of Elias, as certain Rabbis were called "The candle of the Law," &c. (Lightt.) De Wette takes the article as meaning, 'the lamp which was to lead you,' &c. —καίμανεν, not καὶοιον, as it is ὁ λόγος, not τὸ φῶς: lumen illuminatum, not lumen illuminans: see Paul. (Rom. v. 10) —καὶ φῶς. The description sets forth the derived, and transitory nature of John's light.—ἡμασὶ 84 . . . . 'But you wished only to disjoint yourselves in his light for a time—came out to him in crowds at first,—and—like silly children who play with the fire till it burns and hurts them, and then shrink from and loathe it,—when he began to speak of deep repentance as the preparation for God's Kingdom, and laid the axe to the root of the trees, you left him.' No one cared, when he was imprisoned and put to death. And even those few who remained true to him, did not follow his direction to Christ. For the mass of the people, and their leaders, his mission was in vain (Lücke, ii. 78).—36.] ἢκω τὴν μ. μαθ. The witness which I have is greater.—τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, not, than that of John—but, than John himself. John was a testimony.—τὸ γάρ ημερά, not His miracles alone, although those principally; but the whole of His life and course of action, full as it was of holiness, in which, and as forming harmonious parts of which, His miracles were testimonies of His divine mission. His greatest work (ch. vi. 29) was the awakening of faith, the ζωέων, of which we have heard before, to which the miracles were but as means to an end. —ἄλλος . . . ἢν τελ.: see ch. xvii. 4 and note.—ἐπί δὲ τοῖς. The repetition is to show that His life and working was an exact fulfilment of the Father's will. 'The works which the Father hath given Me to do, those very works which I am doing,' . . . —37–39.] The connexion of these verses has been much disputed. I believe it will be found to be this: 'The works of which I have spoken, are only indirect testimonies: the Father Himself, who sent Me, has given direct testimony concerning Me. Now that testimony cannot be derived by you, nor any man, by direct communication of His voice: 'Get ye behind me, children of generation evil: for the revealed knowledge of God can never have heard His voice nor seen His shape. (Or perhaps have not heard His voice, as your fathers did from Sinai,—nor seen His visioal appearance, as the Prophets did.)' Nor (ver. 38), in your case, has it been given by that inward witness (ch. iii. 33. 1 John iv. 13, 14) which those have (and had in a measure, even before the gift of the Spirit—see al. Ps. li. 11), in whom His word abides; for ye have not His word abiding in you, not believing on Him whom He hath sent. Yet (ver. 39) there is a form of this distinct testimony of the Father, accessible even to you;—search the Scriptures,' &c. Chrysostom, Euthymius, Lampes, Bengel, &c., understand φῶς to refer to the voice at the Lord's baptism: but, as Lücke observes, φῶς forbids this. I may also add that the perfect, ἀνείπα, excludes it. Had reference been to a distinct event, it must have been ἡμετέρας, and (Lücke) τὴν φωνὴν.—Observe that the testimony in the Scriptures is not the only, nor the chief
one, intended in ver. 37, but (as De Wette well maintains) the direct testimony in the heart of the believer,—which, as the Jews accused, they are directed to,—another form of the Father's testimony, that in the Scriptures,—ερωτάται, either indicative (Cyriacus, Erasm. Beza, Lampe, Bengel, Kuinoel, Lücke, Tholuck, Olshausen, De Wette), 'Ye search the Scriptures, for ye believe ye have &c., and they are they that testify of Me': and (yet, ver. 40) ye will not come to Me that ye may have life:'—or imperative (Chrys., Theophyl., Bathyn., August., Luther, Calvin, Wetst., Paulus, Stier), in which case generally a period has been placed after ἐρωτάται, and a fresh sentence begins at καὶ ὑμεῖς. I believe the imperative sense only will be found to cohere with the previous verses:—see above, where I have given the context. And no other sense will suit the word ἐρωτάται, which cannot be used, as in the indicative it would be, with blame attached to it,—'ye make nice and frivolous search into the letter of Scripture;' but, as in Ps. cxviii. 2, implies a thorough search into the contents and spirit of Scripture. —ὅτι ὑμᾶς. Ye imagine that in them ye have eternal life (Schüttgen quotes anecdotes from the Rabbins: On account of sibi verbs sibi, is acquirit sibi vitam aeternam, &c.):—but they, like all other secondary ordinances, have a spiritual end in view, and that end is to testify, from first to last (it is their office, i.e. εἰς αὐτὸν αἱ μαρτυρίαιν), of Me. —40. I shall connect these words with the former, and regard them as describing the inconsistency of those who think that they ζωὴν ἐχεῖν in the Scriptures, and yet will not come to Him of whom they testify, ἵνα ζωὴν ἔχωσιν. So that καὶ will be spoken in a fine irony,' And ye will not come to Me!'—Observe, this command to the Jews to search their Scriptures, applies ἀπὸ τῶν κατὰ τοὺς Ἰουδαίους to Christians; who yet are, like them, in danger of Bibilolatry, believing that in the Bible they have eternal life, and missing the personal knowledge of Him of whom the Scriptures testify.—The αἱ...
which the Jews have more or less received those false Messiahs who have been forerunners of the great Antichrist. — 44.] No would Œnéaou is grounded on θιασεις is the consequence of the carnal regards in which they lived. — Let them receive these implies ‘captantes,’—παρα τού κινδύνου θεοῦ, not, from God only (E. V. and De Wette), which is ungrammatical (requiring μόνον to be either after θεοῦ, see Matt. iv. 4. xii. 4. xviii. 8, or before τοῦ θεοῦ, Luke v. 21. vi. 4. Heb. ix. 7. Lücke); but, from the only God: in contradistinction to the idolatry of the natural heart, which is ever setting up for itself other sources of honour, worshipping man, or self,—or even, as in the case alluded to in the last verse, Satan,—instead of God. The words τοῦ μόνον θεοῦ are very important, because they form the point of passage to the next verses; in which the Jews are accused of not believing the writings of Moses, the very pith and kernel of which was the unity of God, and the having no other gods but Him. — 45.] The work of Christ is not καταγγελία, even as He is Judge; — but κρίνω, by the appointment of the Father. And therefore—though He has said so much of the unbelief of the Jews, and charged them in the last verse with breach of the central law of God — He will not accuse them; nay, it is not needful—for Moses, whom they disbelieved, while vainly hoping in him (see above on ver. 39), — ἰκανοποιημένοι τῷ νόμῳ, Rom. ii. 17, — already accused them: see Deut. xxxi. 21. 26, and ch. vii. 19. — 46.] ἔφρασεν—nusquam non, Bengel. This is an important testimony by the Lord to the subject of the whole Pentateuch; — it is ἔφρασεν Ἰσραήλ. It is also a testimony to the fact, of Moses having written those books, which were then, and are still, known by his name. — 47.] γράψας ἤν is the point of the sentence, for ταῖς εἰκονις γραφαῖς could not be used; — the γραφή being ἡ θεια γραφή, not ἡ τοῦ Μωσίου γραφή, — but the γράμματα were those of Moses; — the outward expression of the γραφή, — the letters, and words, as found on paper; — just as the βίβλα in the other case are the outward expression of the λόγος. The meaning is: —men give greater weight to what is written and published, the letter of a book, than to mere word of mouth; — and ye in particular give greater honour to Moses, than to Me: if then ye believe not what He has written, which comes down to you hallowed by the reverence of ages, — how can you believe the words which are uttered by Me, to whom you are hostile? ' This however is not all: — Moses leads to Christ: — is one of the witnesses by which the Father hath testified of Him: — if then ye have rejected the means, how shall ye reach the end? 'If your unbelief has stopped the path, how shall ye arrive at Him to whom it leads?' — Those who can, should by all means consult Stier, whose exposition of the above important discourse is very elaborate and valuable: — Reden Jesu, vol. iv. pp. 202—268.

CHAP. VI. 1—15.] Matt. xiv. 13—21. Mark vi. 30—44. Luke ix. 10—17, in each of which compare the notes throughout. Here we have another example of John relating a miracle with the view of introducing a discourse. — [1] μὴ ἔπειτα gives us no fixed date; — see on ch. v. 1. As Lücke remarks, the ἀνωθέν τῆς τοῦ...; if connected with the preceding discourse, would be unintelligible, — and can only be understood by the fragmentary character of this Gospel, and the well-known fact being pre-supposed that His Ministry principally took place in Galilee. — Matt. gives this passage over the lake in connexion with the execution of John the Baptist: Mark and Luke, with the return of the twelve from their mission. (The
VI. 1—5. ΚΑΤΑ ΙΩΑΝΝΗΝ.

θαλάσσης τῆς Γαλαλαίας τῆς Ἐκβιερίδος 2 καὶ ἱκλολούθη αὐτῶν ὄχλος πολύς, ὅτι ἤθεωρον ἢ σημεία ἢ ἐπιτέχνων. 3 καὶ ἠνάληθε δὲ εἰς τὸ ὄρος οὐ Ισραήλ, καὶ εἰς ἢ κατάλη τῶν μαθητῶν ἀυτῶν. 3 πῶς ἦν δὲ εὐγενεῖ τὰ πάσχα ἔφοβα τῶν Ἰουδαίων. 5 ἔπαρακαὶ οὖν ῥ Ἰσραήλ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς καὶ θαυμάσμενος ὁ πολῶν ὄχλος ἢ μεθετεῖση, ἐγένετο ἐγενέτος ἐφεύληθην δὶς, ἦν δὲ εὐγενεῖ τὸν Φίλιππον Παθέων.


twelve were probably gathered, or their gathering finished, in the interval since ch. v. 47, during which time their mission also had taken place. — τῆς τῆς Τίβις. The last appellation is probably inserted for the sake of Gentile readers, to whom it was best known by that name: thus Pausan. ν. 7, 3, αὐτός ὁδός Ἰορδανική λίμνης Τιβερία διαφανεῖσθαι διδοσκοντα: but was more usually called, as by Josephus, Γεννησαρης or Γεννησαριτις, 1 Μακκ. xi. 57, Strabo xvi. 2 (Ptol. ν. 15, Lücke). — τῆς τίβις. cannot mean that He came from Tiberias, however true that may have been. That would have been ἄνω or ἀνεφθέρον. It is possible, though not likely, that τῆς τίβις may have been a gloss, and have found its way into the text very early. But at all events we must not adopt the reading of D, &c. εἰς τὰ μέρη τῆς τίβις, — for the fact was just otherwise; compare ν. 2 and 23. — 2. It is evident from this that a circuit in Galilee and works of healing are pre-supposed (see Matt. ver. 13. Mark ver. 33. Luke ver. 11). — 3. τὸ ὄρος, perhaps Ἰιρμωνίαν τῆς Ἰουδαίας, the shore of the lake = Ἰορδαν τὸν νῦν κατ' ἱλιαν, Matt. The expression is used by John only here and in ver. 15, but no inference can be drawn from that, for this is the only portion of the Galilean Ministry related by him. — 4.) This will account, not for so great a multitude coming to Him, but for the circumstance that the people at that time were gathered in multitudes, ready to set out on their journey to Jerusalem. — 5.) Here there is considerable difficulty, on account of the variation from Matt., Mark, and Luke, who relate that the disciples came to the Lord after He had been teaching and healing the multitudes, and when it was now evening,—and asked Him to dismiss the multitudes, that they might buy food; — whereason He commanded, 'Give ye them to eat:'—whereas here, apparently, on their first coming, the Lord Himself suggests the question, How they were to be fed, to Philip. This difference is not to be passed over, as it has usually been by English commentators, without notice. Still less are we to invent improbable and hardly honest harmonistic shifts to piece the two narratives together. There can be no doubt, fairly and honestly speaking, that the narratives, in their mere letter, disagree. But those who are not slaves to the mere letter will see here that inner and deeper accordance of which Augustine (de Consensu Evang. ii. 49) speaks in commenting on this passage: 'Ex qua universa varietate verborum, rerum autem sentientiarumque concordia, satis apparat salubriter nos doceri, nihil quendam in verbis nisi loquentium voluntatem; cui demonstrandae invigilare debent omnes veridici narratores, cum de homine vel de angelo vel de Deo aliquid narratur.' I repeat the remark so often made in this Commentary,—that if we were in possession of the facts as they happened, there is no doubt that the various forms of the literal narrations would fall into their places, and the truthfulness of each historian would be apparent;—but as we cannot, we must reconcile them in this way, the humble and believing Christian will not be tempted to handle the word of God deceitfully, but to admire the gracious condescension, which has given us the evidence of so many independent witnesses, whose very difference in detail makes their accordance in the great central truths so much the more weighty. On every point of importance here, the four sacred historians are entirely and absolutely agreed. That every minor detail related by them had its ground in historical fact, we fully believe; it is the tracking it to this ground in each case, which is now beyond our power; and here comes in the simplicity and reliance of faith: and the justification of those who believe and receive each Gospel as they find it written. — πρὸς τ. Φ. Why to Philip, does not appear—perhaps some
reason lay in the πείραξις αὐτῶν, which is now lost to us. From his words in ch. xiv. 8, we cannot infer, as has been done by Cyril Alex. (in Cramer’s Catena) and others, that he was weaker in faith, or tardier in spiritual apprehension, than the rest. Of all the Apostles who appear in the sacred narrative, something might be quoted showing equal unreadiness to believe and understand. I would take the circuit of the country under the direction of the Lord, implying that Philip was nearest to the Lord at the moment. — 6.] He knew—such remarks as this must be received as the testimony of one who had perhaps more right than any living man to speak with confidence of the thoughts and purposes of Him of whom He wrote. But even apart from this, what believer in Christ could not himself have supplied the remark? — 7.] See notes on Mark.—8.] In the three other Evv., the loaves and fishes appear as the disciples’ own;—and we have thus a very simple but very instructive instance of the way in which differences in detail arose. They were their own,—but not till they had bought them;—of which the other Evv. were not aware.—κριθήνους, the usual barley bread of the lower orders. ἰερόδομα = ἰερόδομα, Suidas; but of later Greek usage,—at first used to signify any thing subsidiary to bread as a relish, such as meat of all kinds, and condiments. Later however, from fish being in the deeply coast-inclined country of Greece the most commonly animal food, it came to be applied to that alone or principally.—(see art. Opsonium in the Dictionary of Gr. and Rom. Antiquities.) — 10.] χόρτος ρῶλας, in accordance with the time of year, the latter end of spring, after the rainy season.—On ἄνωθεν see Mark and Luke, who describe the manner. — ἀνθήγασις. This is a particular touch of accuracy in the matter of fact, implying which has not I think been noticed. Why in the other accounts should mention be made only of the μεθ xls numbering them? Matt. has, it is true, χωρίς γυν. κ. χαίρει, leaving it to be inferred that there was some means of distinguishing;—the others merely give ὑς ἀνθήγασις πεντάχροι, without any explanation. But here we see how it came to be so—the men alone were arranged in companies, or alone arranged so that any account was taken of them: the women and children being served profusely; who indeed, if the multitude were a pæchal caravan, or parts of many such, would not be likely to be very numerous;—and here again we have a point of minute truthfulness brought out. — 11.] On the process of the miracle, see notes on Matt. Probability is against the words in brackets, internal as well as external;—it is more like John to describe the διάδοσις as being the act of the Lord Himself, and leave the intervention of the
disciples to be understood.—σχηματίζεται here answers to ἑλάγησα in the other Ἐνν. It was the ‘grace’ of the father of the family; perhaps the ordinary one in use among the Jews. John seems to connect with it the idea brought out by Luke ἑλ. στρατ. ἐκ τοῦ ἐρυθοῦ; see ver. 23. — 12.] Peculiar to John. The command, one accorded to all the disciples of the power which had wrought the miracle, is given by the Lord a moral bearing also. They collected the fragments for their own use, each in his κόφινος, the ordinary furniture of the travelling Jew (qurator cophinus fromumque superex, Juv. Sat. iii. 14), to carry his food, lest he should be polluted by that of the people through whose territory he passed; see note on Matt. xv. 33. — 14.] On δ' ἐνδοχ. see note on ch. i. 21, — δ' ἐνδοχ. εἰκόνι; — 15.] After such a recognition, nothing was wanting but that the multitudes who were journeying to the Passover should take Jesus with them and proclaim Him King of the Jews in the holy City itself. The three other Ἐνν., while they do not give any intimiation of this reason of the Lord’s withdrawal, relate the fact, and Luke preserves in the very next verse a trace of its motive,—by the question ‘Whom do the people say that I am?’ and the answer, expressing the very confession of the people here (see ver. 26 and note). — 16—21.] Matt. xiv. 22—33. Mark vii. 45—63. Omitted by Luke. — 16.] φῶς, the second, or real evening: see on Matt. xiv. 15. — κατάξατον. By the command of Jesus (Matt., Mark). — 17.] ἔννοες de notating the unfinished action—they were making for the other side of the sea, in the direction of Capernaum; πρὸς Βασιλείαν, Mark, which would be the same thing. It would appear as if the disciples were lingering along shore, with the expectation of taking in Jesus; but night had fallen, and He had not come to them, and the sea began to be stormy (ver. 18). Having therefore (ὥστε) set out (ver. 19), and rowed, &c.—The ὅστε seems to me to render this supposition necessary,—to bind their having rowed twenty-five or thirty stadia, with the fact that the Lord had not come, and it was dark, and the sea swelling into a storm. The lake is (Jos. B. J. iii. 10, 7) forty stadia wide: so that, as we can hardly assume the passage to have been to a point
directly opposite, they were somewhere about μίσον τῆς θαλάσσης; Matt. ver. 24. — τῷ τῆς θαλ.

There surely can be no question in the mind of an unprejudiced reader, that it is John's intention to relate a miracle; nor again, that there could be in the minds of the disciples no doubt about that miracle,—no chance of a mistake as to what they saw. I have treated of ἵνα τῆς θαλ. on Matthew, ver. 25. They were afraid;—but upon being reassured by His voice, they were willing to take Him into the ship; and upon their doing so, the ship in a comparatively short time (or perhaps immediately, by miracle, but I prefer the other) was at the land to which they had been going, viz. by the storm ceasing, and the ship making smooth way (κατασκευάζων ὁ ἄνωκος, Matt., Mark).

It seems to me that the above interpretation of ἰδοὺν σὺν λαβάσαν is absolutely necessary to account for the σύν, and quite in accordance with the Johannean usage of θαλῶ (ch. i. 44. v. 36.). Some of the German commentators (even De Wette among them) have created a difficulty, by rendering ἰδοὺν 'they wished' (implying, 'but did not'), but (καὶ 1) the ship was immediately, &c. — i.e. they were already close to the land, and so there was no occasion. Prof. Bleek (Beiträge, pp. 103, 4) half adopts this view; — adding to it, I am sorry to see, that perhaps Jesus was on the land, and the disciples in the storm and darkness thought Him to be on the sea (—!)

22—50.] The multitudes follow Jesus to Capernaum, where, in the synagogue, He discoursed to them on the Bread of Life. — 22—24.] These verses are involved and parenthetical in construction, but very characteristic of the minute care with which the Evangelist will account for every circumstance which is essential to his narrative. — ἰδοὺν. We are not to understand the whole multitudes who were fed, but that portion of them which had remained on the coast over the night. Many had probably dispersed to the villages about, or perhaps taken up their night quarters more inland. — πέραν τῆς θάλ., i.e. on the east coast. We are supposed to be at Capernaum. — ἵνα is not pluperfect in sense—the meaning is regulated by ἰδοὺν, 'having been aware that there was no other ship, &c., and that Jesus did not' &c. Then the ἰδοὺ afterwards, belonging to the same set of facts, is in the same tense, but not pluperfect: 'came,' not 'had come.' The πλοιάριον had perhaps brought some of them thither, or the spot ἄγνων τ. τοῦτον, &c. might have been some landing-place of merchandise. — 25. πέραν τ. θ. is now the
this βρωσις remains to eternal life, it must be spiritual food. — ἀν. . . . δέον: see ch. iv. ib. ἰησοῦν agrees with βρωσιν, not with ἴησον. δέον: future, because the great Sacrifice was not yet offered: so in ch. iv. —δὲ νῦν τ. ἐσθ., emphatic here, since it is of His Flesh that He is about to speak. —τοῦτον γὰρ . . . . . . 'For Him hath the Father sealed, even God.' — ἐρήμως, by undoubted testimony, as at His baptism; and since, by His miracles, see ch. x. 36: not 'stamped with the image of His Person,' which is altogether beside the present subject, and inconsistent with the meaning of σφαγίζω. — 28.] The people understand His ἵργακτεθα literally, and dwell upon it. They quite seem to think that the food which is to endure for ever is to be spiritually interpreted; and they therefore ask this question, referring the ἵργακτα to the works of the law. — τὰ ἵργα τοῦ θεοῦ must not be taken to mean 'the works which God works,' but, as in Jer. xxliii. 10 (xxxi. 10 LXX). 1 Cor. xv. 27, 'the works well pleasing to God.' — 29.] The meaning is not—that faith is wrought in us by God, is the work of God; but that the truest way of working the work of God is to believe on Him whom He hath sent. — ἰησοῦν, not ἰησοῦ, because there is but this one, properly speaking, and all the rest are wrapt up in it (see James i. 26).— This is a most important saying of the Lord, as containing the germ of that teaching afterwards so fully expanded in the writings of Paul. "I know not," says Schleiermacher (cited by Stier, iv. 277), "where we can find any passage, even in the writings of the Apostles, which says so clearly, and in so explicit a form, that all eternal life in men proceeds from nothing else than faith in Christ." — 30, 31.] This answers to ch. N n

```

west bank;—we have been crossing the sea with the multitude.—οὖν, as Stier includes, ποιεῖ in its meaning. The Lord leaves the question unanswered, because it was not for a sign to these people that He had miraculously crossed the lake. — 26.] The seeking Him, on the part of these people,—to Him who saw the hearts,—was merely a low desire to profit by His wonderful works,—not a reasonable consequence of deduction from His miracles that He was the Saviour of the world. And from this low desire of mere satisfaction of their carnal appetite, He takes occasion in the following discourse to raise them to spiritual desire after Himself, the Bread of Life. The discourse forms a parallel with that in ch. iv. — 27.] ἵργακτα, imperative: another instance of the constr. which I have advocated in ver. 39. — The E. V., 'Labour not for,' does not give the sense of ἵργακτα. They had not labourd in this case for the βρωσις ἀποκλεíων, but it had been furnished miraculously. A better rendering would be, 'Busy not yourselves about;' 'Do not weary yourselves for;'—which they were doing, by thus coming after the Lord. — τὸν ἀσταλλά, 'whose nourishing power passes away,' De Wette. Rather perhaps more literally, 'which perisheth,' E. V.:—the useless part of it, in being cast out;—the ἔνεστε, in becoming part of the body which perishes (see 1 Cor. vi. 13). — ἄλλα τ. β. It is important to bear in mind that the ἵργακτα spoken of above, which also applies to this, was not a 'working for,' or 'bringing about of,' but a following Christ in order to obtain. So the meaning will be, 'Do not seek to obtain, by following after Me.' — And thus our . . . ἄλλα keeps its true literal force, 'Do not . . . . but.' — τὸν μὲν ὑμᾶς ἐκ τ. ak.: see ch. iv. 14. If Vol. I
```
The words 'kareb ... are the predicate of ὁ ἄρος, and do not apply, in the construction of this verse, to Christ personally, however truly they apply to Him in fact. The E.V. is here wrong: it should be, 'The bread of God is that (not He) which cometh,' &c. Not till ver. 36 does Jesus first say, 'I am the bread of life.' The manna is still kept in view—ὅταν καταβὰ ἡ δροσῆς ... καταβὰ τὸ μάννα ἐκ αὐρής, Num. xi. 9. And the present participle, here used in reference to the manna, is dropped when the Lord Himself is spoken of: see vs. 38. 41. 58, and especially the distinction between ver. 50 and ver. 51 (so Lücke, De Wette, Stier, Bengel).—34.] ch. iv. 15 is exactly parallel. The Jews understand this bread, as the Samaritan woman understood the water, to be some miraculous kind of sustenance which would bestow life everlasting:—perhaps they thought of the heavenly manna, which the Rabbis speak of as prepared for the just in the future world;—see quotations in Lücke, ii. 132, also Rev. ii. 17. —35.] As in ch. v. 50, so here, the Lord passes from the indirect to the direct form of speech. Henceforward it is 'I,' 'Me,' throughout the discourse. In the genitive τῆς ὕμης is implied ὁ καταβὰς ἐκ τοῦ οὐρ. και ἦμην διδωσι τ. κομ. So ὡσε ὄνω in ch. iv.—On the assurance of never hungering or thirsting see note at ch. iv. 14. It is possible that the Lord placed the all-satisfying breed of life in contrast to the manna, which was no sooner given, Exod. xvi., than the people began to thirst, Exod. xvi.;—but I would not lay any stress on this.—ὁ ἄρος, τ. ἁμ. is in the same sense as in ch. v. 40—that of acceptance of and faith in Him.—36.] ἐδώς ἑαυτὸν—κύριε ὁ υἱὸς
KATA IΩANNHN.

31—40. eipon υμιν ότι και εωράκατε με και ου πιστεύετε. 37 πάν
ο διδωσαι μοι ο πατήρ προς εμε ηζει, και τον ερχόμενον
προς με ου μη εκβάλω εξω, 38 ώτι καταβέβακα * εκ

A B C

D T
tου ουρανου ουχ ινα 4 poiv το θελημα το εμον αλλα το
θελημα του πεμψαντος με. 59 τουτο δε εστι το θελημα
tου πεμψαντος με υπακον, μη ε απολεισιν
ε ε αυτου, αλλα η ανασθησιν αυτο [ευ] τη εσχάτη ημερα.

τουτο τα γαρ εστι το θελημα του πεμψαντος με, ινα
πας η θεωρουν τον ινον και πιστευων εις αυτον
εχ ζωην αιωνιον, και ανασθησιν αυτον [εγω] * την

t D ac Hil. —ποιον D. —from τοι πιεις . . . το θελημα, ver. 39] om. C Kal. —ας
—μη add παρος D K 7 al. a. Tert. Theophyl. —39. rec. ατι μη ins. παρος with au, but
ε αυτοι, μηδεν D.—αλλ ινα D.—for αυτό, αυτον EGH L'S V Δ 23 all. —add
A B C D E L T 13 all. —ιν om. C E L G H L S T U V Δ 34 all. ins. A B D K
ab.—40. rec. τουτο δι, with many const. mss., but add A B C D K L 13 all. abe
to π. μη παρος Μ Δ abe Syr. —τα Α (B Lachm.) —ιν ων om. A D 8 al. Ε Copt. Clem. Chrys.

elπεν αυτοις; εικος, τουτο δηθναι μην, μη γραψαιν δι. Euthym. But perhaps,
as Euthym. himself seems to suggest, and as Lücke and De Wette are inclined to think,
the reference may be to ch. v. 37 —44, and the υπακο may be said generally.
Stier and others think that ver. 26 is referred to: but this is far-fetched. We have
instances of reference to sayings not referred to in ch. x. 26. xii. 34. —Ye have
seen the true Bread from heaven, the σωματιον greater than the manna, even Me
Myself: and yet have not believed.'—37.}

'Known unto God are all His works from the beginning;' and the whole body of
believers on Christ are spoken of by Him, here and in ch. xvii., as given to Him by
the Father. But Bengal's observation is very important: that is vocula momento
sissina, et, collatis iis que sequuntur, considerata dignissima. Nam in sermonibus
Jesu Christi, quod Pater ipsi dedit, id, et singulares numero et neutro genere, appellatu
omnia; qui ad ipsum, Filium, nominavit, il masculino genere vel, elam plural numero
descibuntur, ornis, vel illi. Pater Filio
totam quaas mssabit dedit, ut omnes quae
dedit unam sint; id universum Filii singulatim evoluit, in executione. Hinc illud
in ch. xvi. 2, ut omne quod dedit ei, det
εις vita eterna.' See also 1 John v. 4.

—See further on παν διδωσαι μοι ο πατήρ,
on ver. 44.—ου μη εκβ. ινα does not refer
to the office of the Son of God as

Judge,—but is another way of expressing
the grace and readiness with which He will receive
even all who come to Him.—38, 39, 40.)

His reception of men is not capricious, nor
even all of His own arbitrary choice; but as
He came into the world to do the Father's will,
and that will is that all who come to Him by faith shall have life, so He receives
ally such:—loses none of them;—and will raise them all up (here, in the fullest sense,
the blessed sense) at the last day. (Ἀκολουθος
again is not 'destroy,' 'condemn,' but
'lose.' see ch. xii. 25. xvii. 12. ινα μη
ι ε υμις αδιακατ απολογησει τις. Euthym.)

Olahausen remarks, that 'in ch. iv. we had
only the inexpressible refreshing of the

soul by the water of life; but this discourse
goes further;—that not even death itself
shall destroy the body of him who has been
nourished by this bread of life' (ii. 167).-

ἀναστήσων refers to the only resurrection
which is the completion of the man in his
gracified state;—it does not set aside the
αναστήσας εκπεσον, but that very term is
debasement of αναστήσας: its true sense
is only ανάστασις ζωης. In this declaration
(τυ, 39, 40) is contained the key of the
following discourse, τυ 44—59.
The end of the world of God, as regards man, is
the glorification of his restored and sancti-
fied nature,—body, soul, and spirit,—in
eternity. Without this,—salvation, resti-
tution, would be incomplete. The adoption
cannot be consummated without the

N n 2
redemption of the body. Rom. viii. 18—23. And the glorification of the body, soul, and spirit,—of the whole man,—cannot take place but by means of the glorified Body of the second Adam. 'He who does not see this, will never understand either the Holy Communion, or this testimony of the Lord in its inner meaning.' Stier, iv. 291.—The translation here is a different thing from the more δρόμος of ver. 36. It is the awakening of the attention preparatory to faith—answering to the looking on the serpent of brass: τοῖς δρακάνιοι τῆς ψυχῆς, Euthymus; but afterwards he makes the θεωρεῖν = πιστεύειν, to which it is only preparatory. —41.] Not different hearers, nor does the scene of the discourse here change: they were the same,—perhaps the principal among them, the official superintendents of the synagogue;—for John generally uses of 'Ioudaioi in this official sense. —42.] They rightly supposed that this καταβας εκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ must imply some method of coming into the world diverse from ordinary generation. —43.] The Lord does not answer their objection, because it lay far from His present purpose to disclose aught of those mysteries which the answer must have indicated. It was not till the faith of the Apostolic Christians was fully fixed on Him as the Son of God, and the outline of the doctrine of His Person was firmly sketched out, that the Spirit brought out those historical records which assure us of His supernatural conception (see Nitzsch, cited by Stier, iv. 290). —44.] The connexion seems to be this: They were not to murmur among themselves because He had said this; for the right understanding of what He had said is only to be gained by being taught of God,—by being drawn by the Father, who alone can give the desire to come to Christ,—and bring a man to Him. That this 'drawing' is not irresistible grace, is confessed even by Augustine himself, in his Tractatus on this passage. 'Si trahitur, ait aliquid, invinitus venit. Si invitus venit, nec credit: si non credit, nec venit. Non enim ad Christum ambulando currimus, sed credendo; nec motu corporis sed voluntate cordis accedimus. . . . Noli te cogitare invitus trahere; trahitur animus et amore.' And just before: 'Intrare quisquam ecclesiam potest nonolens, accedere ad altare potest nonolens; accipere sacramentum potest nonolens: credere non potest, nisi volens.' He quotes, 'trahit sua quemque voluptas' (Virg. Eccl. ii. 68), to show that the drawing is that of delight and choice, not of obligation and necessity. Calvin, Beza, and Lampe understand irresistible grace to be here meant: 'Falsum est et profanum, non nisi voleant trahsi' (Calv., Lücke, ii. 144 note). The Greek expositors, Cyril, Chrysostom, Euthymius, Theophylact, take the view which I have adopted above. Chrysostom says, ὁ καὶ αὐτὸ ὁ τῷ Ἑλληνικῷ ἀναίρετος, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον μιαίνεται ἢ μᾶς διαφορών. See Article X. of the Church of England in fine. 'This drawing towards Christ may be exemplified in the legal dispensation, which was to the Jews a παραγωγική τις
κατὰ Ἰωάννην.

46 ὡν ὑπὸ τὸν πατέρα τῆς ἐώρακεν, εἰ μὴ ὁ ἅγιος παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ, ὡς ἐώρακε τὸν πατέρα. 47 ἀμήν λέγω υμῖν, ὁ πατέρας ἐμὴν ἐγείρει, 48 ἦσαν ἤμεν ὕπο τις ἤμεν ἐγείρομαι ὑμῖν. 49 ἂν τὸ κέντρον ἐν τῇ ἐρημῇ καὶ ἀπίσταις, 50 δὴ ὡς ἂν ἐστιν ὁ πατέρας τοῦ ὑπάρχουσαν φῶς καὶ μὴ ἀποθάνῃ. 51 ἦσαν ἤμεν ὅτι ὁ πατέρας ἦσαν ὁ ζων ὁ ἐκ τοῦ ὑπάρχουσαν καταβιώσεως, ἐν τῷ φῶς ἐκ τούτου τοῦ ἀρτοῦ, ἦσαν εἰς τὸν αἰώνα καὶ ὃ ἄροι δὲ ὅν ἔγω δῶσῳ ἡ

Now it is being exerted on the whole world—(in accordance with the Lord’s prophesy ch. xxi. 38. You have this text, and His command Matt. xxviii. 20, by Christian preaching and missions; but, after all, the individual will must be turned to Christ by the Father. Whose covenant is promised, that He will so turn it in answer to prayer. ‘Nondum traheris? ora ut traharis’ (Augustine, ibid.).—45.] ἦν τοῦ προφ. may be a general form of citation (Mark i. 2. Acts vii. 42. xiii. 49), or may mean that the sense is found in several places of the prophets: see besides ref., Jer. xxxii. 23, 34. This clearly intimates the kind of drawing meant in the last verse—the opening the eyes of the mind by Divine teaching.—ἀπόκεντρος κ. μαθητής is an expansion of ἀπίστης.—[ἐρχ. προφ. μ.] This is the final decision of the human will, acted on by the Divine attraction to Christ. The beginning is, The Father draws him: the progress, he hears and learns—here is the consenting will—Speak, Lord, for thy servant heareth:—the end, he cometh to Christ—here is the will acting on the whole man.—46.] The connexion is: the mention of ἀπόκεντρος παρὰ τοῦ πατρός might lead them to think of a personal communication from the Father to each man, and thus the necessity of the mission of the Son might be invalidated. This was the only way in which a Jew could misunderstand ver. 46; he could not dream of a seeing of the Father with bodily eyes.—ὁ ἅγιος παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ, is Jesus Himself; see ch. vii. 29. His knowledge of the Father is complete and immediate; ours, partial, and derived through Him only. —47.] The Lord now recur to the subject of their murmurs, and gives the answer for which He has been preparing the way, repeating nearly ver. 40, and adding,—48.] If so, (see ver. 47,) there is full reason for My naming Myself the Bread of Life. —49.] That bread from heaven had no power to keep off death, and that, death tending to unbelief—the Lord by thus mentioning of παρὰ τοῦ πατρός ὑμῶν and their death, certainly hints at the similar unbelief of these Jews. And the same dubious sense of ἀπόκεντρος prevails in ver. 50. Death is regarded as being swallowed up in the glory of the resurrection, and the second death—which was hidden in the former ἀπίσταιν—has over him who eats this Bread of Life, no power: nay, he is brought, even here, into a resurrection-state from sin and death; see Rom. vi. init. and Col. iii. init. —61.] ἦσαν, containing life in itself, not merely supplying the waste of life with lifeless matter; see on ch. iv. 13, 14.—καὶ ἄροι . . . From this time we hear no more of ἄροι; this figure is dropped, and the reality takes its place.—Some difficult questions arise regarding the sense and reference of this saying of the Lord. (1) Does it refer to His Death? and, (2) is there any reference to the Ordinance of the Lord’s Supper ?—(1) In treating this question I must at once reject all metaphorical and side-interpretations, as, that the teaching of Christ is the Bread, and to be taught by Him is feeding upon it (so Grotius, and the modern rationalists): that the Divine Nature of Christ, or His sending of the Holy Spirit, or His whole life of doing good on earth, can be meant: all such have against them the plain sense of the words, which, as Stier observes, are very simple ordinary words; the only difficulty arising, when we come to inquire into their application to His own Person. The Bread of Life is Himself: and, strictly treated, when we come to inquire what, of that body, soul, and spirit, which constituted
Himself, this Bread specifically is, we have His answer that it is His Flesh which He will give (for which will be the meaning, whether the words ὑπὸ τοῦ κόσμου ἐστὶν or not) on behalf of the life of the world. We are then specifically directed to His Flesh as the answer.—Then, what does that Flesh import? The flesh of animals is the ordinary food of men: but not the blood. The blood, which is the life, is split at death, and is not in the flesh when eaten by us. Now this distinction must be carefully borne in mind. The flesh here, (see ver. 53,) and the eating of the flesh, are distinct from the blood, and the drinking of the blood. We have no generalities merely, to interpret the passages in question: but the terms used are precise and technical. It is then only through or after the Death of the Lord, that by any propriety of language, His Flesh could be said to be eaten. —Then another distinction must be remembered: The flesh of animals which we eat is dead flesh. It is already the prey of corruption; we eat it, and die (ver. 49). But this Bread, is living Bread; not dead flesh, but living Flesh. And therefore manu- duction by the teeth materially is not to be thought of here; but some kind of eating by which the living Flesh of the Son of God is made the living sustenance of those who partake of it. Now His Flesh and Blood were wondrously by death. Death was the shedding of His Precious Blood, which He did not afterwards resume; see ch. xx. 27, and Luke xxiv. 39. His Flesh is the glorified substance of His resurrection Body, now at the right hand of God. It is then in His Resurrection form only that His Flesh can be eaten, and be living food for the living man. I cannot therefore see how any thing short of His Death can be here meant. By that Death, He has given His Flesh for the life of the world: not merely that they who believe on Him may, in the highest sense, have life; but that σῶμα πνεύμα it may have life. The very existence of all the created world is owing to, and held together by, that Resurrection Body of the Lord. In Him all things are gathered together and reconciled to God: τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνώνυμα. Col. i. 17. —(2) The question whether there is here any reference to the Ordinance of the Lord’s Supper has been inaccurately put. When cleared of inaccuracy in terms, it will mean, Is the subject here dwell upon, the same as that which is set forth in the ordinance of the Lord’s Supper? And of this there can surely be no doubt. To the ordinance itself, there is here no reference; nor could there well have been any. But the spiritual verity which underlies the ordinance is one and the same with that here insisted on; and so considered, the discourse is, as generally treated, most important towards a right understanding of the ordinance.—On the history of the exegesis of this passage, see Lüke ii. pp. 149—150 (3rd ed.), and Exeurgus ii., in his 2nd ed. (omitted in his 3rd);—also Tho- luck and Olshausen, in loc. To attempt to recount the various opinions, would exceed the limits of a note. The whole Testament: for the present subject is one in which the manifold dogmatical variations of individual belief have influenced Commentators to such an extent as to render accurate classification impossible. I may roughly state, that three leading opinions may be traced: that of those who hold (a) that no reference to the Holy Communion can be intended,—among whom are Origen and Basil, of the ancients; and of the moderns, the Swiss Reformers, Zwingle and Calvin (the former however not very decidedly, see Osl. ii. 173 note); Luther, Melanchthon. (β) That the whole passage regards exclusively the Holy Communion,—among whom are Chry- sostom, Cyril, Theophylact, Euthymius, the Schoolmen, and the Roman Catholic expositors, with a few exceptions. (γ) That the subject and idea of the Holy Communion, not the ordinance, is referred to: to which class belong the best modern commentators in Germany, e.g. Lücke, Thol- luck, Olshausen, Stier. Bengel’s note to the same effect is important: ‘Jesus verba sua scintier ita formavit, ut statim et semper illa quaerenda semper vivi et perenne spirituales frui viverent, esse autem esse, sicut residet et sequentiam estiam in augustissimum S. Cenam mystericum, quam id institutum foret, conveniret. Etenim ipsum rem hoc sermo propositam in S. Cenam contulit; tantique hoc sacramentum est momenti, ut facile existimari possit, Jesum, ut pradictionem Judæ ver. 71, et mortem sumum hoc vera, ita etiam S. Cenam, de qua inter haec verba certissime secum cogitavi, uno ante anno prædixisse, ut discipuli possent praedictionis postes recordari. Tota hæc de carne et sanguine J. C. oratio Passionem
spectat, et cum ea S. Coenam. Hinc separata carnis et sanguinis mentio constant. Nam in passione sanguinis ex corpore oductus est, Agnusque matutatis. — άρωμα : compare όυπρον γνωμών, Luke xxii. 19.—The construction is an involved one, ἢ γιώ δώσω having to be supplied again before ύπρον, which no doubt has led to its insertion in the later MSS. — 53.] The inference conveyed in φαγεῖν, which first comes from the Jews themselves, is yet a right one. If He is the Bread, and that Bread is His Flesh, we must eat His Flesh, though not in the sense here meant by them. They contended against one another, probably some having more insight into the possibility of a spiritual meaning than others. — 53.] The Lord not only ratifies their φαγεῖν, but adds to it a more wonderful thing; that they must also do that against which a prohibition might seem to have existed from Noah downwards,—drink His Blood. But observe, this Blood is not to be eaten in the Flesh, which was the form of the drink-offering in the Old Testament (Lev. xvii. 10—16), in its strict literal form; but to be drunk, separate from the flesh; again presupposing death. Now as the Flesh of Christ (see above) is the Resurrection Body which He now has, and in which all things consist; so is His Blood, “the blood is the life,” Lev. xvi. 11, 14,) the Life which He gave up, paid down, as the penalty for the sin of the world. By the shedding, pouring forth, of that Blood, is remission of sin.—It is quite impossible that these words should, as De Wette maintains, be merely an expansion of τὴν σάρκα φαγεῖν. Even had the idea of τὸ άλωμα πίνειν been one familiar to the Jews, the construction would not have allowed such an interpretation:—but new as it was, and abhorrent from their habits and laws, we must regard it as specially and purposely added.—But what is this eating and drinking? Clearly, not merely faith: for faith answers to the hand reached forth for the food,—but is not the act of eating. Faith is a necessary condition of the act, but we must not say, ‘crede, et manducasti’ (Aug.); but ‘crede et manducabis.’ Inasmuch as Faith will necessarily in its energizing lead to this partaking, we sometimes incorrectly say that it is Faith:—but for strict accuracy this is not enough. To eat the flesh of Christ, is to realize, in our inward life, the mystery of His Body now in heaven, to digest and assimilate our own portion in that Body. To drink His Blood, is to realize, in our inward life, the mystery of His satisfaction for sin,—to digest and assimilate our own portion in that satisfaction, the outpouring of that Blood. And both these definitions may be gathered into one, which is: The eating of His Flesh and drinking of His Blood import the making to ourselves and using as objectively real, those two great Truths of our Redemption in Him, of which our Faith subjectively convinces us. And of this realizing of Faith He has appointed certain twin symbols in the Holy Communion, which He has commanded to be received;—to signify to us the spiritual process, and to assist us towards it. οἷα καὶ τῷν τὰ φιλτρα. Ye have not in you that spring of life which shall overcome death, and lead to the resurrection in the true sense (see above, ver. 44).—τρώγον. It is not necessary to see any more literal ‘eating’ in the word than in φαγεῖν:—it expresses the present of φαγεῖν, which must be either τρώγον or πίνον, and the real sense conveyed is, that by the very act of inward realization, which is the ‘manducatio,’ the possession of eternal life is certified.—56.] ἀληθίς, if here received, would give, in its ordinary sense, an unapplicable meaning. It must = ἀληθινὸς, as this latter = ἀληθίς, iv. 37. xix. 35. But the comm. reading seems the best, which in sense = ἀληθινὸς,—is really meat, &c.
All other food perishes in the using;—this only endures, and becomes, by that inner union between Christ and the believer (see ver. 58), the source of eternal life. This verse is decisive against all explaining away or metaphorizing the passage. Food and drink are not here mere metaphors;—rather are our common material food and drink mere shadows and imperfect types of this only real reception of refreshment and nourishment into the being. —58.] He who thus lives upon Me, abides in Me (see ch. xv. 5 and note)—and I (that living power and nourishment conveyed by the άρτος τῆς ζωῆς which = ἰσω) abide in him. —57.] The same expanded further—see ch. v. 26. The two branches of the feeding on Christ are now united under the general expression, τρώγων με.—διὰ expresses the efficacious cause. The Father is the Fountain of All Life: the Son lives in and by the Father; and all created being generally, lives (in the lower sense) in and by Him; but he that eateth Him, shall (eternally and in the highest sense) live by Him. —58.] forms the solemn conclusion of the discourse—referring back to the Bread with which it began, its difference from the perishable food which they had extolled, and its effects from those of that sustenance.—οὕτως δέννυ, 'such is.'—καταβάς,—past, now: because He has clearly identified it with Himself. If ἵνα τὸ μάννα is to stand, the constr. must be filled up of καθὼς τὸ μ. δ ἐφ. κ.λ.—if not, καθὼς must = γοάου, δει. —60—65.] Murrumin of some of the disciples at the following discourse, and the answer of Jesus to them. —60.] Lampe, cited by Stier (iv. 322, note), shows by ref. and other citations that σκάληρος non tam absurditatem quam improientatem designat. It seems clear that it was not the difficulty so much as the strangeness of the saying which scandalized them. It is the whole discourse,—the turn given to it,—the doctrine of the Bread of Life,—the giving His Flesh and Blood to eat,—at which they take offence.—καταβάς, to listen to it—'Who can stay and bear such sayings as this?' not, 'to understand it.'—61.] In tauté, by His Divine Knowledge. —62.] οὖν οὖν θε., 'what then, if ye see'...not meaning 'will ye not then be much more scandalized?' or, 'what will ye say (or do), then?'—but appealing to an event which they should witness, as a certain proof of one part of the σκάληρος λόγος, with which the rest of it was bound up,—His having descended from heaven. All attempts (as those of Lücke, De Wette, and others) to explain this otherwise than of His ascent into heaven, are simply dishonest,—and spring from
laxity of belief in the historical reality of that event. That it is not recorded by John, is of no moment here: see Prolegomena. And that none but the Twelve saw it, is unimportant; for how do we know that the Lord was not here speaking to some among the Twelve?—To explain it of His death, as part of His going up where He was before, is hardly less disingenuous. Lücke maintains that ἐστίν need not mean bodily sight; which is true enough in some constructions in John (ch. viii. 51 al.); but surely, as joined with ἀναβαλλοντα, it must. The whole exegesis of the passage in the above-named Commentators is a remarkable instance of the warping of the judgment by unsoundness of belief in the historical truth of the Evangelistic tradition. 66—69. "This, then," says Gr. "does not mean the spiritual and carnal sense of the foregoing discourse, as many commentators explain them: for the Lord is speaking, not of teaching merely, but of sacrificing; He is explaining the life-giving principle of which He had been before speaking. 'Such eating of My flesh as you imagine and find hard to listen to, could profit you nothing,—for it will have ascended, &c.; and besides, generally, it is the Spirit that only can vivify the spirit of man; the flesh (in whatever way used) can profit nothing towards this.' He does not say My flesh profeth nothing, but the flesh. To make Him say this, as the Swiss Anti-sacramentalists do, is to make Him contradict His own words in ver. 61.—τὰ ἴδρυμα & τὰ πνεύμα ζωήν μοί τούτων: viz. the words μοι τὸν σάρκα and μοι τὸ σῶμα, above. They are πνεύμα and ζωὴ—spirit, not flesh only:—living food, not carnal and perishable. This meaning has been missed by almost all commentators: Stier, as far as I know, first suggested it; and it seems to me beyound question the right one. The general interpretation is, 'the words which I have spoken,' i.e. 'My discourses,' are πνεύμα, 'to be taken in a spiritual sense,' (?! this sense of πνεύμα) 'and are life.' But this is anything but precise, even after the forcing of πνεύμα. 64.] ἀλλ’ εἰσάγω... 'This accounts for your murmuring at what I said, that ye do not believe.' —ςτοιχεία. De Wette remarks, that the foreknowledge of the Lord with regard to Judas renders it impossible to apply the ordinary rules of moral treatment, as 'Why did He then continue him as an Apostle? Why did He give Him the charge of the purse, knowing him to be a thief? and it is therefore better not to judge at all on the matter. —The fact is, we come here to the beginning of the problem of Divine foreknowledge and human free-will, which, in any of its endless combinations of expression, it is equally impossible for us to solve.—εἰ ἀρχή, from their first coming to Him;—the beginning of their connexion with Him. 65.] These unbelievers had not that drawing to Christ which leads (ver. 44) to true coming to Him. Observe the parallelism between ζητοῦν ἀέρις here and διδαχῇ μοι, ver. 37. Both these gifts are in the Father's power. 66-71.] Many of the disciples leave Him. The confession of the Twelve through Peter: and the Lord's warning to them. 66.] ἀπόλλων, viz. of the μη πιστεύοντι; but not all. —67.] The first mention of the Twelve by John. The
question is asked in order to extract from them the confession which follows, and thus to bind them closer to Himself. We must not forget likewise, in the mystery of the Lord's human nature, that at such a moment of desertion, He would seek comfort in the faith and attachment of His chosen ones. — 68.] Peter answers quickly and earnestly for the rest, as in Matt. xvi. 16. — ἐρώτησε τίνα. What they had heard and seen had awakened in them the desire of being led on by some teacher towards eternal life—and to whom else should they go from Him who had, and brought out of His stores for their instruction, the words (see ver. 63) of eternal life? — 69. ἐπιστολοκαμάν seems to be used absolutely, as in ver. 64: 'we believe, and have ever done so.'—In the following words the readings vary; the common text having been to all appearance introduced from Matt. xvi. 16. The circumstance of the Lord not being elsewhere called ὁ ἐγώ τυ σοι by John, is of course in favour of the reading. The idea however is found (ch. x. 36). I regard the coincidence with the testimony of the demoniacs, Mark i. 24. Luke iv. 34, as a remarkable one. Their words appear to have been the first plain declaration of the fact, and so to have laid hold on the attention of the Apostles. — 70.] The selection of the Twelve by Jesus is the consequence of the giving of them to Him by the Father, ch. xvii. 6,—in which also there Judas is included. So that His selecting, and the Father's giving and drawing, do not exclude final falling away. — διάβολος. It is doubtful in what sense this word should be taken. Whether we render it διαβολικός (ὑπονομοῦ), or λίτουσι, (both given by Euthym.) it will be an ἄπαξ λεγόμενον in the N. T. Of the two however the latter is the harsher, and less applicable to N. T. diction. Certainly, in the dark act here prophesied, Judas was under the immediate instigation and of yielded himself up to Satan; and I would understand this expression as having reference to that league with and entertainment of the Evil One in his thoughts and purposes, which his ultimate possession by Satan implies. This meaning can perhaps hardly be rendered by any single word in another language. The K. V. 'a devil,' is certainly too strong; 'devilish' would be better, but not unobjectionable. Compare ὁ τύ καὶ ἄκουλας, ch. xvii. 6.— 71.] On the name 'Ισκαρίωτας (here applied to Simon, Judas's father), see on Matt. x. 4. — ἰμαλλεν, not, 'intended;' see ch. xiii. 2: but simply future, = ἐν τῷ παραδόσεων αὐτῶν, see ch. vii. 39. xi. 51 al. 

CHAP. VII. 1—13. — Jesus goes up to the Feast of Tabernacles at Jerusalem, but secretly, and after His brethren. The judgment of the people concerning Him. — 1.] The chronology of this period is very doubtful. I have remarked on it in my note on Luke ix. 51. Thus much we may observe here, that μετὰ ταῦτα cannot apply emphatically to ch. vi., but must be referred back to ch. v., as indeed must the Jews' seeking to kill Him, and the miracle referred to in ver. 23. But it will not follow from this, that ch. vi. is not in its right place: it contains an independent memoir of a miracle and discourse of the Lord in Galilee which actually happened in the interval, and only serves to show us the character of this Gospel as made up of
KATA IOANNHN.

VII. 1—9.

εἰς τοὺς αὐτοὺς ὁ Ἰούδαιος ἀποκτείνα. 2 Ἡ ψυχὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἡ σκηνοπηγή. 3 οἱ ἁγιοί αὐτὸς πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἄνθρωποι ἄνθρωποι ἣ ἐν παρθένῳ καὶ ἐν παρθένῳ

ὑπάγει εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν, ἵνα καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ σου θεωρήσω ἡ ἐργασία σου ἄνατες σας ἐν κρυπτῷ τῷ ποιεῖται καὶ ζητεῖ αὐτοὺς ἐν παρθένῳ εἰναι. εἰ ταῦτα ποιεῖται, μὴ ἐναίσθητοι σεαυτοῦ τῷ κόσμῳ. 6 οὐδέ γὰρ οἱ ἄνθρωποι αὐτοῦ ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτοῦ. 7 λέγει οὖν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς

BDT

Ὁ καιρὸς ὁ ἡμὸς οὑπὸ πάρεστιν ὃ δὲ καιρὸς ὁ ὑμετέρος, πάντοτε ἦστιν ἐν τοῖς ὑμῖν, ἐμὲ δὲ μαίει, ὅτι ἐγὼ μαρτυρῶ περὶ αὐτοῦ ὅτι τὰ ἐργά αὐτοῦ ποιημένα ἐστίν. 8 ὑμεῖς ἀνάβησις εἰς τὴν ἐορτὴν ἡ ἐγὼ ὁ ἀναβάινω ἐν τῷ ἐργεῖ τῇ ταύτῃ, ὅτι οἱ καιροὶ ὁ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐκεῖνος ἐπέλθῃ. 9 ταῦτα δὲ ἐμῶν.


such mores more or less connected with one another. I would understand this verse as merely carrying on the time from ch. v. and ch. vi., and its contents as introductory to the account of Jesus not going up at first to the feast. Ch. vi. is in some measure presupposed in our ver. 3, as indicating that He had not constantly observed the festive journeys of late. — 2.] See Deut. xvi. 13—15. Josephus, Ant. viii. 3. 1—2. the ἐορτασμός. It began on the 15th (evening of 14th) of Tisri, and lasted till the evening of the 22nd: — see below on ver. 14. — 3—5.] Respecting the breach of the Lord, see note on Matthew xiii. 55. They seem to have had at this time a kind of belief in the Messianic character of Jesus, but of the very lowest sort, not excluding the harsh and scoffing spirit visible in these words. They recognized His miracles, but despised His apparent want of prudence and consistency of purpose, in not showing Himself to the world. In the τοις καλοῖς ἔναθ. C 6 κα. there is perhaps a reference to the desertion of many of His disciples just before. — In ver. 5 (as well as by C 6 καλ. καταθέτασιν, ver. 3), we have these brethren absolutely excluded from the number of the Twelve (see ch. vi. 69); and it is impossible to modify the meaning of ἐπιστεύειν so as to suppose that they may have been of the Twelve, but not believers in the highest sense. This verse also excludes all of His brethren: it is inconceivable that John should have so written, if any among them believed at that time. The expression, οὕτως γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἐμῶν, is a strong corroboration of the view that they were really and literally brethren. — see also Ps. lxix. 8. — 6—9.] ἐστίν ἐν τῷ μονοτροπεῖν ce. — 7. ἐστίν ἐν τῷ μονοτροπεῖν ce. — 8. ἐστίν ἐν τῷ μονοτροπεῖν ce. — 9. ἐστίν ἐν τῷ μονοτροπεῖν ce. — 10. ἐστίν ἐν τῷ μονοτροπεῖν ce. — 11. ἐστίν ἐν τῷ μονοτροπεῖν ce. — 12. ἐστίν ἐν τῷ μονοτροπεῖν ce.
Luke ix. 61 and note. — 10.] εἰς ἄλλοις τοὺς ἄγαντας ἀπεκρίθη ἢ ἠγαθόν διδασκάλον. These words are spoken in the true bigotry and prejudice of so-called learning.'—16.] Here only does the Lord call His teaching διδασκαλία, as being now among the διδάσκαλοι, the Rabbis, in the temple. It is often so called by the Evangelists, see ref.—The words may bear two meanings:—either, 'the sense of Scripture which I teach is not My own, but that in which it was originally penned as a revelation from God;' or, 'My teaching (generally) is not Mine, but that of Him who sent Me.' The latter is preferable, as agreeing better with what follows, and because the former assumes that He was expounding Scripture, which, though probable, is not asserted.—17.] θεσαλ. το θ. αὐτ. τοῦ ἔχειν to θεοῦ εἶναι ἐν αὐτοῖς, ver. 42. The διδάσκαλον should not have been slurred over in the E. V., for it is important. 'If any man's will be, to do His will,' &c. As it now stands in the E. V. a wrong idea is...
conveyed; that the bare performance of God's outward commands will give a man sufficient acquaintance with Christian doctrine, and that the Jews is, that if the will be set in His ways, if a man be really anxious to do the will of God, and thus to fulfill the first great commandment of the law,—this singleness of purpose, and subjection to the will of God, will lead him on to faith in the promised and then apparent Messiah, and to a just discrimination of the divine character of His teaching.—18.] This gives us the reason why he who wishes to do God's will will know of the teaching of Christ;—viz. because both are seeking one aim—the glory of God;—and the humility of Him, whose will it is to do God's will, can best appreciate that more perfect humility of the Divine Son, who speaks not of Himself but of Him that sent Him,—see ch. v. 41—44, of which this verse is a repetition with a somewhat different bearing. In its general sense, it asserts that self-exaltation and self-seeking necessarily accompany the unaided teaching of man, but that all true teaching is from God. But then we must remember that, simply taken, the latter part of the sentence is only true of the Holy One Himself; that owing to human infirmity, purity of motive is no sure guarantee for correctness of doctrine;—and therefore in this second part it is not τοῖς θεοῖς, which would generalize it to all men, but τοῖς περὶ ἀντέχοντι, which confines it to Himself.—19.] There is a close connexion with the foregoing. The θείειν τῷ θελήμα αὐτοῦ παίνων was to be the great key to a true appreciation of His teaching; but of this there was no example among them,—and therefore it was that they were no fair judges of the teaching, but bitter opponents and persecutors of Jesus, of Whom, they were convinced to fulfill the law, they would have been earnest and humble disciples (ch. v. 46). The law was to be read before all Israel every seventh year in the feast of tabernacles (Deut. xxxi. 10—13):—whether this was such a year is uncertain: but this verse may well elucidate the practice, even if it was not. Ἰσραήλ. In their killing the Lord of Life was summed up all their transgression of God's law. It was the greatest proof of their total ignorance of and disobedience to it.—20.] The multitude, not the rulers, replied this. It would not now be their purpose to represent Him as possessed.—21.] The 'one work' was the sabbath-healing in ch. v. διὰ τοῦ ἀνέμου is variously placed; either at the end of this verse, so as to come after θαυμάζετε, (Theophyl., Beza, and many of the moderns, Läcke, De Wette, Stier, Lachmann, &c.)—or at the beginning of ver. 22 (Estethyn., Chrys., Cyril, Grotius, &c.). I prefer the latter arrangement:—because (1) I believe ρέο να would not be used in the sense required by the other, but αὐτόν: and (2) because I find διὰ τοῦρον joined with δύι to be a usual mode of speaking with our Evangelist, see v. 16. 18 (vi. 65), viii. 47, (θαυμάζειν διὰ τοῦ is used Mark vi. 6. Rev. xvii. 7, see also John iii. 29). (3) I see an appropriateness of meaning in ver. 22 with the διὰ τοῦρο, which it has not without. Moses on this account gave you circumcision, not because it is of Moses, but of the fathers;—i. e. it is no part of the law of Moses, properly so called,—but was adopted by Moses, and thereby becomes part of his law. Now you circumcise on the Sabbath, to avoid breaking the law of Moses,' &c. If the Lord had said these last words (in ver. 23) merely, the argument would not have been strict: they might have answered, that circumcision was not only a command of the law, but anterior to it; whereas ver. 22 takes this answer from them; reminding them that though they regarded its sanction as derived from Moses, it was in fact older,—and tacitly
approving their doing it on the Sabbath. Then the argument is, If this may be done on the Sabbath;—if an ordinance strictly Mosaic (which the Sabbath in its Jewish observation was) may be set aside by another, Mosaic also, but more ancient, and borrowed from a more general and direct command of God ('circumcisio est antiquior rigido ostio sabbatio per Mosen imperato'—Gratius), how much more may it by a deed of mercy, a benevolent exercise of divine power, the approval of which is anterior to and deeper than all ceremonial enactment?—23. Ινα μὴ λυθή, not, 'ita ut non solvatur,' 'salva lege,' which is ungrammatical;—but 'in order that the Law of Moses may not be broken,' viz. that which (after the Fathers) ordains circumcision on the eighth day.—Δον ψ. and ψ. The distinction is between circumcision, which purified only part of a man, by which he received (Inαs) ceremonial cleanliness,—and that perfect and entire healing which the Lord bestowed on the cripple. Stier (after Bengel) thinks the Δον refers to body and soul,—see ch. v. 14,—whose healing is a much greater benefit than circumcision, even viewed as a sacrament: 'nam circumcision est medium, sanitio animae finis.' But this is perhaps too subtle. The Jews could not have appreciated this meaning, and the argument is especially addressed to them. Besides, it is by no means certain from ver. 14 that such was the case.—24. No stress must be laid on the article (ψ.) with ψ. It is merely expressive of habit,—Let your judgment (ἢ ψ. ψ.) be a just one. With ψ. it might imply, the right judgment on the present occasion: the aorist directing the attention on what had happened, whereas the present regards a habit. 

25–36.] Surmises and questionings of the people concerning Him. The Pharisees send officers to take Him. —25. The inhabitants of Jerusalem know better than the δολος the mind of their rulers towards Jesus; and suspect some change in their purpose on account of His being thus permitted to teach freely. —27. Perhaps they refer to the idea (see Justin Mart., Dial. c. Tryph. 226 and 336) that the Messiah would not be known (ἀγνωστος ἵνα καὶ οὐδὲ αὐτός οὐκ ικνισταται) until anointed by Elias, when He would suddenly come forth from obscurity.—They may allude to Is. lii. 8.—The place of the Messiah's birth was known, ver. 42.—At all events, we see here, that the Jews regarded their Messiah not as a mere man, but one to be supernaturally sent into the world.—28. The same open undisguised manner referred to in παρθησιων λαλη above; but διδασκων, in the course of His teaching. —καὶ οἰκεῖω ποιεῖ... It has been questioned whether these words are to be taken ironically, interrogatively, or affirmatively. I incline to the latter view, for this reason:—obviously no very
high degree of knowledge ‘whence He was’ is implied, for they knew not Him that sent Him (see also ch. viii. 14, 19), and therefore could not know ‘whence He was,’ in this sense. The answer is made in their own sense:—they knew that He was from Nazareth in Galilee, see ver. 41,—and probably that He was called the son of Joseph. In this sense they knew ‘whence He was,’ but further than this they knew not.—καὶ ἐξ ἐμοί . . . . and moreover — and besides this— not = but.— The sense of ἔλθων must be gathered from the context. 1: we have not come of Myself, but He who sent Me is ἔλθων—ye know Him not, but I know Him,—for I came from Him, and He sent Me.— The matter here impressed on them is the genuineness, the reality of the fact,—that Jesus was sent, and there was One who sent Him, though they knew Him not, and consequently knew not πῶς ἦσσαν ιστοριον. The nearest English word would be ‘real!’ but this would not convey the meaning perspicuously to the ordinary mind;—perhaps the E. V. ‘true’ is better, provided it be explained to mean objectively, not subjectively, true; ‘really existing,’ not ‘truthful,’ which the word ἔλθων will not bear, although it is so maintained by Euthym., Cyril., Chrys., Theophylact, Lampe, Baumgarten-Crusius, Tholuck, and many others.—The 8a is better omitted for the sense, which becomes more emphatic. It was probably inserted on account of the apparent want of connexion, as has been the case throughout the Gospel. I am persuaded that John wrote almost with-out copula. — 30.] Namely, the rulers,—instigated by what had been above remarked by the people, v. 25, 26. There was some secondary hindrance to their laying hands on Him,—possibly the fear of the people: but the Evangelist passes at once to the real cause,—that God’s appointed time was not yet come. — 31.] The 8a here contrasts with what went before—‘nay, many,’ &c.—The indefiniteness of οὖν Ἐλληνικῶν implies their belief that the Christ had come,—I have left ἡμιν and τουτων in the text in the deficiency of satisfactory first-class evidence, and because both were more likely to have been purposely omitted than inserted.— 32.] The wavering of the multitude appears to the Pharisees a dangerous sign; and the Sanhedrim (of Φ. κ. οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς) send officers specially to lay hold on Him. — 33, 34.] The omission or insertion of αὐτοίς (see above) makes very little difference. The words were spoken, not to the officers only, but to all the people.—καὶ ὁ μ. . . . . This appears to be said in reference to ver. 30, to show them the uselessness of their attempting to lay hands on Him till His hour was come, which it soon would do.—πρὸς τ. ῥ. . . . It has been asked, ‘If Jesus thus specified where He was going, how could the Jews ask the question in ver. 35?’ but De Wette answers well, that the Jews knew not ἐν τῷ ποιει-ναρστα, and therefore the saying was a dark one to them.—γρ. μ. κ. ὁ δ. φυσικος. These words must not be pressed too much, as has been done by many interpreters (Chrysost., Theophyl., Euthym., Meyer,
Tholuck, but not in his sixth ed., who would make them mean 'Ye shall seek My help and not find it' (viz. in your need, at the destruction of Jerusalem); for this would not be true even of the Jews, any one of whom might have at any time turned and looked on Him whom he had pierced, by faith, and have been saved;—nor again must it be taken as meaning, 'Ye shall seek to lay hands on Me, and shall not be able,' (Orig., Grot.)—which is vapid and unmeaning. Neither of these interpretations, nor their cognates, will agree with the parallel place, ch. xiii. 33, where the same words are used to the disciples. The meaning is simply (as in reff.), 'My bodily presence will be withdrawn from you; I shall be personally in a place inaccessible to you!' see ch. xiii. 36.—ἐλι', 'am,' not ἐλι', 'go,' which is never used in the N. T. Nor need we supply τὸς (as even Stier does, which I am surprised at); the present tense is used in the solemn sense of ch. iii. 13, and ch. i. 16, to signify essential truth. Compare ὃ ζώνασι addressed to the Jews, with ὃ ζώνασα πῶς, ὄστρον ἢ . . . to Peter, ch. xiii., and it will be evident that the Lord had their spiritual state in view: 'Ye cannot, as ye are now, enter there.'—On the whole, see Luke xvii. 22.—35, 36.] The Jews understood not His Death to be meant, but some journey which He would take in the event of their rejecting Him. The διασ. τ. 'Ελλ. must not be interpreted 'the Hellenistic Jews,' for the Ἐλλῆνες are always distinguished from the Jews;—and this would convey hardly any meaning. The sense of διασ. as is,—see James i. 1. 1 Pet. i. 1,—'the country where Jews lay scattered,' as qualified by the succeeding genitive, where one occurs, as here. So here § 8. τ. 'Ελλ. means 'the Gentile-world.' And in this sense, it is, to convey contempt and mockery. They do not however believe the hypothesis;—but ask again, τίς ἔτην ὁταν ὁ λόγος;
some supposed—as the dwelling in tabernacles represented their life in the desert of old—to refer to the striking of the rock by Moses—by others, to the rain, for which they then prayed, for the seed of the corn grown by the one or the other Rabbi (Malmendorf cited by Stier, iv. 398), to Isa. xii. 3, and the effusion of the Holy Spirit in the days of the Messiah. But it was universally agreed (with the single exception of the testimony of R. Juda Hakkadoth, quoted in the tract Succa, which itself distinctly asserts the contrary), that on the eighth day this ceremony did not take place. Now, out of this difficulty I would extract what I believe to be the right interpretation. It is the eighth day, and the pouring of water did not take place. But is therefore (as Lücke will have it) all allusion to the ceremony excluded? I think not: nay, I believe it is the more natural. For seven days the ceremony had been performed, and the Hallel sung. On the eighth day the Hallel was sung, but the outpouring of the water did not take place: 'desideraverunt aliquid.' Then Jesus stood and cried, &c. Was not this the most natural time? Was it not probable that He would have said it at such a time, rather even while the ceremony itself was going on?—An attempt has been made to alter the punctuation thus: εἶναι τις δέης, λόγος μὲ τινὰ πετυχὼν τὸν κηρύχος εἴναι εγὼ, ποσάμοι τι.λ. of this I can only say, that it is surprising to me how any one accustomed to the style of our Evangelist can for a moment suppose it possible. The harshness of καὶ πετυχὼν δὲ τὸν κηρύχος is beyond all example. The ordinary punctuation, making καὶ πετυχών τὸν κηρύχος a nom. abs., see ch. vi. 39, is the only admissible one,—even were it beset with far greater difficulties than it is.—On the first clauses see notes on ch. iv. 13, 14. —καθὼς αὐτῶν ἐγώ. These words must apply to ποσάμοι in ι. e. . . . ., since δὲ πετυχὼν τὸν κηρύχος could not form part of the cited.
trary to his own principles, has admitted into the text), δοθείν, ἵνα αὐτοῖς, are all glosses, to avoid a misunderstanding which no intelligent reader could fall into. It is obvious that ἦν cannot refer to the essential existence of the Holy Spirit, as this would be not only in flat contradiction to ch. i. 32, 33. iii. 5. 8. 34, but to the whole O. T. in which the agency of the Spirit in the outward world is recognized even more vividly than in the N. T. - The ἦν implies not exactly δεδομένον, but rather ἰπτργον, or some similar word: 'was not,' - had not come in; 'the dispensation of the Spirit was not yet.' - διόκατος, through death. The glorified Body of the Lord is the temple from under whose threshold the Holy Spirit flows forth to us; see Rom. viii. 11. Col. ii. 9. John i. 16. - 40. ὁ προφήτης is here clearly distinguished from ὁ χριστός: see note on i. 21, and Deut. xviii. 15. - 41. - 43. The mention of the question about Bethlehem seems to me rather to corroborate our belief that the Evangelist was well aware how the fact stood, than (De Wette) to imply that he was ignorant of it. That no more remarks are appended, is natural. John had one great design in writing his gospel, and does not allow it to be interfered with by explanations of matters otherwise known. Besides, we may note that De Wette's "probability, that John knew nothing of the birth at Bethlehem," reaches much further than may appear at first. If John knew nothing of it, and yet the mother of the Lord lived with him, the inference must be that she knew nothing; of it,-in other words, that it never happened! - σχέσις implies a violent dissection,—some taking up His cause, some wishing to lay hands on Him. - 44.] These were from among the multitude.

45-53. Return of the officers to the Sanhedrin; consultation on their report.

Either these officers had been watching Jesus for some days, or the present section goes back a little from what has proceeded. The latter is more probable. - 49.] There is no intention to pronounce a formal bann upon the followers of Jesus; - the words are merely a passionate expression of contempt. The putting a stop at ρήμα, and supplying ἰπτργον εἰς αὐτοῖς, and then making εἰκὸς else! an exclamation (Paulus, Kuinoel) is not to be thought of. - 50]
VIII. 1. KATA IOANNHN.

The Jews had, since the sabbath-healing, condemned Jesus, and were seeking to kill Him. But in Exod. xxiii.1. Dent. i.16, 17, justice is commanded to be done in the way here insisted on by Nicodemus. There is no need of supplying ἐρήμη before ἔκοψεν and γεγραφας—the judge is implied in δόμοις. He is only its representative and mouthpiece.—68. They taunt him with being disposed to join those (mostly Galileans) who had attached themselves to Jesus. Whether we read ισόγειαι or ισόγειαι, the assertion is much the same: for ἀρετή cannot mean the Prophet,—or the Messiah. It was not historically true—for two prophets at least had arisen from Galilee: Jonah of Gathhepher,—and the greatest of the prophets, Elijah of Thisce; and perhaps also Nahum and Hoesa. Their contempt for Galilee made them lose sight of historical accuracy. (Bretschneider lays the inaccuracy to the charge of the Evangelist!)}

[53—CHAP. VIII. 11.] The history of the woman taken in adultery.—See var. read., and a very complete discussion of the authorities for and against the passage in Lücke (third edition), ii. 243—256. I am disposed to agree with his conclusion, that it was an authentic fragment of apostolical teaching, which was esteemed too valuable to be lost, and was therefore in or soon after the fourth century adopted into the sacred text. The very uncertainty of its position (after Luke xxii., and after John viii. 16, or at the end of John) tells strongly against its genuineness,—as also the circumstance (unparalleled in John) of there being three distinct and inconsistent texts of it,—the received one,—that of D,—and that of a large portion of the other manuscripts, which contain it. The other particulars of internal evidence will be noticed as we proceed.—63. The circumstance that this verse is included in the dubious passage remains remarkable, and seems to show that the doubt has not arisen from any ethical difficulty, as Aug. hints (var. read.)—for then the passage would have begun with ch. viii. 1. Nor can this verse have been expunged to keep up the connexion with ch. viii. 12—for that is just as good with it,—if understood, as usually, of the members of the Sanhedrin. We must now regard it as fragmentary, forming the beginning of the account of the woman taken in adultery. It is therefore not clear to what the words apply. Taken in conjunction with what follows (see on ver. 6), I should say that they indicate some time during the last days of the Lord's ministry, when He spent the nights on the Mount of Olives, as the date of the occurrence. Certainly the end of Luke xxi. seems to be its fitter place.—CHAP. VIII. 1.] John never elsewhere mentions the Mount of Olives (not even in ch. xviii. 1); and when he introduces a new place, it is his habit to give explanations (see ch. i. 45. v. 2, and λεγομένην ch. iv. 5. xii. 13. 17).
CHAP. VIII. 1. ἐπορεύθη εἰς τὸ ὅρος τῶν Ἐλαίων. ἡ ὀρθοῦν δὲ ἡ πάλιν "παρεγένετο εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν, καὶ πάς ὁ λαὸς ὅρχετο πρὸς αὐτοῦ[. καὶ καθὼς ἐδίδακεν αὐτοῖς]. ζ. ἄγουσι δὲ οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι [πρὸς αὐτοῦ] γυναίκα ἐν εἰς μοιχείᾳ δεῖ καταλημμένην. καὶ στήσαντες αὐτὴν εἰς μέσῳ λέγουσιν αὐτῇ θ. Διδάσκαλε, αὐτὴν ἡ γυνὴ κατελήφθη ἕπαντος μοιχεύσας. 5 εἰς τῷ τῷ νομῷ Μωσῆς ἦμιν ἐνεπελευδάλα τοις τοις ἕλθεν· ἵνα τι λέγες; [τοῦτο δὲ ἐλέγων πειραζόντες αὐτοῦ, ἵνα ἔχως κατηγορεῖν αὐτοῦ.] ὥς ἰησους κατωτίς κύριας τῷ δακτύλῳ ἐκ τῆς γῆς;konstr. ver., 20. ch. xi. 13. Eph. iv. 28 al. 3 John 12. 5 John 18. 1 Mark 1. 7 only. Exod. iv. 80. ].[here only.]

πορεύματι with εἰς is not found elsewhere in John; but only in Matt. and Luke, and is rare. Mark xvi. fin. Nor is ὁρθοῦν, nor παρεγενέσθαι εἰς, nor ὁ λαὸς in this sense, but always ὁ δήλος (see ὁ λαὸς ch. xi. 50. xviii. 14); nor such an expression as καθώς ἐδίδακεν αὐτοῖς—but all these are found in Luke. It is not in John's manner to relate that Jesus taught them, without relating what He taught.—3.] John does not usually connect with δὲ, more commonly with ὅπως: but δὲ is found thus used hære, vv. 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 [twice], 7, 9, 10, 11 [twice]. Thence, there is not one δὲ of mere connexion (ver. 35 is an exception) through the remaining forty-eight verses of the chapter. Nor does he ever mention of γραμματεῖς elsewhere, but usually calls the opponents of Jesus οἱ ἰδιαίτεροι, or οἱ ἀρχηγοί. οἱ γρ. κ. οἱ φ. is a very common expression in the synoptic narrative.—The account gives no light as to the capacity in which these Scribes and Pharisees brought the woman. Probably, only as tempting Jesus, and not in the course of any legal proceedings against her. Such would have required (Lev. xx. 10. Deut. xxii. 22) that the man also should have been put to death. —5.] I will just remark that the very fact of the questioner thus, "Moses commanded, ... but what saiest Thou," belongs to the last days of the Lord's ministry, and cannot well be introduced chronologically where it here stands.—The command here mentioned is not to be found, unless putting to death; generally, is to be interpreted as = stoning:—compare Exod. xxxi. 14. xxxv. 2, with Num. xv. 36, 36, in which the special order given by God would sanction such a view. But the Rabbins taught 'omne mortis supplicium in scriptura absolute postumum esse strangulationem.' Tract Sanhedr. ch. x. (Lücke, De Wette). The passage Ezek. xxxi. 36. 40 proves nothing, or proves too much; for it is added, and thrust thee through with their swords."—I would rather suppose that from Deut. xxii. 34, 34, an inference was drawn with kind of a death was intended in ver. 22, the crime being regarded as the same; "he hath humbled his neighbour's wife." We have similar indefiniteness in ib. ver. 25, where evidently the same punishment is meant: see the whole matter discussed in Lücke, ii. 257 ff. —6.] The difficulty is even greater than the last, to say, in what sense this was a temptation, to lead to His accusation. The principal solutions of it have been, (1) that the command of the law had fallen into disuse from the frequency of the crime, and to re-assert it would be the very fact of its having been questioned thus, 'Moses commanded, ...' but what saest Thou," belongs to the last days of the Lord's ministry, and cannot...
to destroy it,—given them to expect such mildness in this case? And suppose He had re-asserted the law,—how could they have accused Him? (2) That some political mare was hereby laid for Him, whereby the Roman power might have been brought to bear against Him (Grotius and others). But this does not in any way appear; for (a) the Romans certainly allowed to the Jews (by connivance) the power of putting to death according to their law,—as they did in the case of Stephen: (3) But our Lord's answer need not have been so worded as to concern upon this matter: and (γ) the accusers would have been more deeply involved than Himself, if such had been the case, being by the law the prominent persons in the execution. —So that I leave the difficulty unsolved. Lücke (whose discussion on it see, ii. 261 ff.) observes: 'Since Jesus seems to avoid every kind of decision on the question put to Him, it follows that He found it in no reference to the great subjects of His teaching, but treated it as a purely civil or political matter, with which He had no concern. Some kind of civil or political collision the question certainly was calculated to provoke: but from the brevity of the narration, and our want of more accurate knowledge of criminal proceedings at the time, it is impossible to lay down definitely, wherein the collision had to have consisted.' p. 267. —καθότι ἐκ τ. γέν. ἔτερον ἢδεσις πολλάκις ποιεῖν, οἱ μὴ θλινόντες ἀνακρίνεισιν πρὸς τοὺς ἱροτόντας ἐμπρος καὶ ἀνάδεικνυται. γωνιῶν γὰρ αὐτῶν τῷ μεγαλύτερῳ προσφέροντα γραφεῖς εἰς τὴν γέν. καὶ μὴ προσφέροντας ἐκ λεγέν. Εὐσθομ. The habit was a usual one to signify pre-occupation of mind, or intentional intention;—see instances in Weststein and Lücke. The one ordinarily cited from Ἁλιαν is irrelevant: see Lücke, ii. 269 note. The additions προσφέροντας ἐκ μὴ προσφέροντας are glosses. —It does not follow that any thing was actually written. Stier refers to J er. xvii. 13, but perhaps without reason. —This minute circumstance speaks strongly for the authenticity of the narration. —7.] ἀναμαρτητ. is common in the classics: see instances in Lücke. It is not here used in the general sense, 'without sin' (E. V.), nor in the strictest, 'free from the crime of adultery' (it can hardly be that any of the Pharisees should have held themselves sinless,—or that all should have been implicated in adultery);—but—αὐθανασίας, Luke vii. 37,—of the sin of uncleanness generally. Stier, who contends strongly for the genuineness of this narrative in this place, finds in ver. 46 an allusion to this saying. I cannot say that his attempts to establish a connexion with the subsequent discourse are to me at all satisfactory. —The Lord Jesus was not sent to be a ruler and a judge in this or in that particular case of crime, but the Ruler and Judge of all: and His answer expresses this, by convicting them all of sin before Him: see Luke xii. 14.—τὸν ἠχούμενον in reference to the hard stone, which by Deut. xvii. 7 the witnesses were to cast. —9] ίνα μὴ, βλαβοντος εἰς ἀφρός, αἰσχύνεται, ὅμως οὐκ ἠλευθερόθη, καὶ ίνα, ώς αὐτῶν δὴν ἀμφοτερον ἀμφοτερον εἰς τὸ γράφω κτίσεως, ἠξίως ὑπαναχωρήσατο πρὸ φανερωτέραις καταγωγῶς καὶ αὐτῶν γὰρ ἤδεισε διὰ ἐν προσβολήν χρηστότητος. Euthym. The gloss in U (see var. read.) is curious: compare the citation of J er. xvii. 13 above. —9] They had said, τὰς τοιούτας,—they now perceive that they themselves were τοιούτα. There is no historical difficulty in this conduct of the Pharisees, as Olahausen finds;—they were struck by the power of the word of Christ. It was a case somewhat analogous to that in which His ἵνα εἰμι struck His foes to the ground, ch. xviii. 6. —The variations of reading are very wide (see var. read.) in the latter part of the
μόνος [ὁ Ἰησοῦς], καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἐν μέσῳ ὑσ.  

/* Οἱ ἄνακτοι δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς [καὶ μινδένα θεσσάμενος πλὴν τῆς γυναικὸς,] εἶπον αὐτῷ */ "Τις γυνὴ, τοῦ ἐστιν [ἐκείνοις οἱ «κατηγοροῦσιν»; ὑσ. εἰς ἐκείνους] ὑσ. εἶπεν οἱ Ἰησοῦς ὑσ. οὐδὲ ἐγὼ σε κατακρίνως * πορεύομαι καὶ μηκέτει ἀμάρατεν. 

12 Πάλιν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς αὐτοῖς ἐξάλησε λέγων "Εγώ ΒΔΙ ἐμί τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου ὁ ἄκολουθός ἐμοί οὐ μὴ διπλασίας ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ, ἀλλ' ἐξεῖ τὸ φῶς τῆς Ἰωνᾶς. 

13 εἶπον οὖν αὐτῷ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι Σὺ περὶ σαυτοῦ μαρτυρεῖς"  


for καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔδρας D M S 82 al. c Syr. Copr. Hier. Ambr. txt qu.—for μὴ πορεύς, μὴ U.—add τὸν ἐπὶ αὐτῶν περὶ ἀνάξιας αὐτῶν, ἵνα ἤκουσαν κατηγοριών ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἑ.  

verse. Certainly ὁρθ. looks like a gloss to explain the harder ὑσ.  

At all events we can lay no stress on it, as has been done. If the consciences of older sinners have heavier loads on them, those of younger ones are more tender. — μόνος, i.e. with the multitude and the disciples; the woman standing between Him and the disciples on one hand,—and the multitude on the other.—10, 11. ἡ γυνὴ is only found here in John.—κατακρίνω also is not found elsewhere in John, who uses κρίνω in its strict sense for it. The question is evidently so worded for the sake of ὅτι γιὰτ σα κατακρίνω: but it expresses the truth in the depth of their hearts. The Lord's challenge to them would lead to a condemnation by comparison with themselves, if they condemned at all; which they had not done. The words of Jesus were in fact a far deeper and more solemn testimony against the sin than could be any mere penal sentence. And in judging of it we must never forget that He who thus spoke knew the hearts,—and what was the peculiar state of this woman as to penitence. We must not apply in all cases a sentence, which requires His Divine Knowledge to make it a just one.  

12—30.] Further discourses of Jesus, in the treasury at Jerusalem.  

The attempts of Bengel, Schulthees, and Stier, to establish a connexion with the preceding verses are forced and harsh. It was, say they, the early morning (ver. 2) and the sun was just rising, to which these words τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου allude,—and the walking in darkness is an allusion to the woman, whose deed of darkness had been detected in the temple. But not to dwell on other objections to this view,—e.g. that such an allusion to the woman would be wholly out of character after the Lord's previous treatment of her,—how come these Pharisees, who on the hypothesis of the above comm. are the same as those who accused the woman, to be again so soon present? Was this at all likely?—On the other hand, this discourse comes in very well after ch. vii. 52. The last saying of Jesus (ch. vii. 37, 38) had referred to a festal usage then just over: He now adds another of the same kind. It was the custom during the first night, if not every night, of the feast of tabernacles (see authorities in Wetstein) to light up two large golden chandeliers in the court of the women, the light of which illuminated all Jerusalem. All that night they held a festal dance by the light.—Now granted that this was on the first night only,—what is there improbable in the supposition that the Lord—standing in the very place where the candlessticks had been or perhaps actually were—should have alluded to that practice, as He did to the outpouring of water in ch. vii. 37, 38? Surely to say in both cases, as Lübeck and De Wette do, that the allusion could not have been made unless the usage took place on that day, is mere trifling. While the feast lasted, and the remembrance of the ceremonies was fresh, the allusion was perfectly natural.—τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου. See on ch. i. 9, and xi. 9, 10. See also Is. xliii 6. Mal. iv. 2; and on τὸ φῶς τῆς ζωῆς, ch. i. 4, and vi. 48. 13.] See

ch. v. 31. The assertion there was, that His own unsupported witness (supposing that possible) would not be trustworthy, but that His testimony was supported by, and in fact coincident with, that of the Father. The very same argument is here used, but the other side of it presented to us. He does witness of Himself, because His testimony is the testimony of the Father;—He being the λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, and the Father witnessing in Him.—14. ὅτι ὁ ἴδια εἰς τα τοῖς ὁμ. — see on ch. vii. 29. This reason binds His testimony to that of the Father;—for He came forth from the Father, ch. xvi. 28, and was returning to Him.—'I solemnly say, says Augustine (Lücke, ii. p. 284), 'et alia demonstrat et seipsum. Testimonium sibi perhibet lux; sperit sanos oculos et sibi fessa testis est.'—Then again, he only who knows can witness: and Jesus only knew this.—Notice ὄλοις ἐν εἰρήνη, and ἐπαραται.—I know whence I came,—this goes back to the ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν of ch. i. 1; but ye know not whence I come,—do not recognize even My present mission. — We must not for a moment understand καί ἐγὼ μαρτ. with Grotius, 'even though I should witness,' &c., 'etiam nulls essent de Me pregressa prophetarum, nulla Joannis Baptist. testimon.'—It does not suppose a case, but allows the fact.—16, 18. There is no allusion to the foregoing history; the train of thought is altogether another.—'The end of all testimony, is the forming, or pronouncing, of judgment. Ye do this by fleshly rules, concerning Me and My mission: I judge no man, i.e. it is not the object nor habit of this My mission on earth: but even if I be called on to exercise judgment, My judgment is decisive;—not ἀληθής, but ἀληθευς, genuine, which a judgment can only be by being true and final;—see ch. v. 30 and note.—17.] The ἔμερεν seems to give this sense to the clause:—'So that if you will have the mere letter of the law, and judge my testimony by it, I will even thus satisfy you.' ἐμερευσθείς, thus implies, 'The law which you have made so completely your own by your kind of adherence to it.'—19.] Augustine (Stier, iv. 441) and others imagine that the Jews thought of a human father, in thus speaking. But surely before this, as Stier remarks (ib.), the Jews must have become accustomed to πατρίγμην as not only well to mistake its meaning. It is rather a question asked in mere scorn, by persons who know, but will not recognize, the meaning of a word uttered by another. — at ἦμ. ἀν. see ch. xiv. 9 ff. and notes.—20.] γελ. see Luke xxi. 1, and note on Mark xii. 41. It was in the court of the women.—ἀνέβαν ἰλ. . . . see ch. vii. 8. 30. — 33—39.] Further discourses of Jesus. The Jews attempt to stone Him.—This forms the great conclusion of the series of
discourses to the Jews. In it the Lord testifies more plainly still to His divine origin, and sinlessness, and to the cause of their unbelief; until at last their enmity is worked up to the highest pitch, and they take up stones to cast at Him. It may be divided into four parts: (1) vv. 21—24,—announcing to them the inevitable consequence of persistence in their unbelief on His withdrawal from them: (2) vv. 24—29,—the things which He has to say and judge of them, and the certainty of their own future recognition of Him and His truthfulness: (3) vv. 30—47,—the first springing up of faith in many of them is by Him corrected and purified from Jewish pride, and the source of such pride and unbelief detected: (4) vv. 48—53,—the accusation of the Jews in ver. 48, gives occasion to Him to set forth very plainly His own Divine dignity and preexistence.

21.] The time and place of this discourse are not definitely marked; but in all probability they were the same as before. Only no stress must be laid on the αὐτῷ as connected with ver. 30, for it is only the occasioned copula in John's style. 

—ἐγὼ με. includes the idea 'and shall not find Me,' which is expressed in ch. vii. 36:—'ye shall continue seeking Me.'—καὶ ἐν τ. ἀμ... and shall die (perish) in (not because of (Lampe, Kuinoel)) your sin. This sin is not unbelief, for, ver. 24, it is clearly distinguished from that: but, 'your state of sin, unremedied, and therefore abiding, and proving your ruin' (see on ver. 24).—The words do not refer to the destruction of Jerusalem but to individual perdition. In these discourses in John, the public judgment of the Jews is not prominently brought forward, as in the other ἔνν.—ἐγὼ με. ἂν... is the consequence, not the cause (by any absolute decree) of dying in their sins (see ch. vii. 34. xiii. 33). This latter sense would have required ὑπό γέρω. —22.] It is at least probable that they allude to the ideas mentioned by Josephus, himself a Pharisee, in his speech to Jotapata, B. J. iii. 8, 5:—δοτι εἰ καθ' ἑαυτῶν ημᾶς καὶ θεός διὰ τούτου πληγάζει τὰς ψυχὰς σκοτώσετον: and with the bitterest malice taunt Him with thus being about to go where they, the children of Abraham, could never come. ὧδε Ἰσραήλ... ὃς διὸ πονηρός διαλογιζόμενος εἰ Ιουναια ταῦτα ἔλεγον, καὶ μείζων λατρευτός ἀποφαίνεμαι τοῦ Σωτῆρος, καὶ ἀποκαλύψατος διὸ ἀποτιθῆκα τοῖς θεῖοι τις ἀπάνων αἰώνων, ὦ λατρείᾳ εἰς φθορὰν καὶ εἰς τάναν τον Ισραήλ συγχαρήσαντος, ὡς θεοῦ συν ἐλεησόμενο ἀπάθειάς. Orig. Tom. xix. c. 4.—De Wette thinks this too refined, and that such a meaning would, if intended, have been marked in the Lord's answer. —23.] 'Ye cannot come where I am going, because we both shall return thither whence we came: I to the Father from Whom (ἐκ τῶν ἄνω) I came: ye to the earth and under the earth (for that more awful meaning surely is not excluded) whence ye came' (ἐκ τῶν κάτω).—Then ὑπὸ γέρω of course does not only imply 'this present state of things,' but involves the deeper meaning, of the origin of that state of things (see ver. 44) and its end, ver. 24. —24.] Since this (ver. 23) is the case,—'if ye do not believe that I am He, the Deliverer, and be renewed by Faith, ye shall die in your sins' (plural here, as struck nearer home to their sciences, and implying individual acts of sin, the results of the carnal state). On ἔγω με. see note, ch. iv. 26. —25.] Their question follows on ἔγω με. ἐπίστασθαι, ver. 23, and the dubious elliptical expression ἔγω με. of the last verse. It is
intended to bring out a plain answer on which their enmity might fasten. — The Lord's reply has been found difficult, principally from the ambiguity of ὅτι and ὃ τι. No sense can however be given by ὅτι which will fit all the parts of the text. Lücke's interpretation (3rd edit.) after Euthym. 'Why do I speak with you at all?' is not only ungrammatical, but most alien from the whole character of the Lord's discourses. — I assume then that ὃ τι is to be read. Then comes another question: what does ἀλήθεια mean? It has been usually rendered 'say' or 'tell:' 'even the same that I said unto you from the beginning,' E. V. But as De Wette has observed, ἀλήθεια will not bear this. It is never 'to say' simply, but 'to discourse,' or 'to hold converse,' 'to speak.' Again, what is τῆς ἀρχῆς? not to be taken substantively (as Aug. Ambr. vulg. principium), so as to mean 'The beginning, as 1, 26.' but adverbially, with all Greek interpreters (see ref). And adverbially it may mean (1) in the beginning,' from the beginning,' but not, 'firstly;' (2) 'generally,' 'at all,' usually with a neg. clause, but sometimes with an aff. — The common rendering takes the first of these meanings; — but the above remarks on ἀλήθεια will set that rendering aside; — and together with the assumption of τῆς ἀρχῆς = τῆς ἀρχῆς, the meaning 'in the beginning,' or 'at first,' or 'from the beginning,' falls to the ground. We have then the second meaning of τῆς ἀρχῆς, 'generally,' or 'traced up to its principle,' — for such is the account to be given of this meaning of the word. — The rendering of καὶ 'even,' and placing it before τῆς ἀρχῆς, as done in E. V., is ungrammatical. It must come with ἀλήθεια, being inseparable from it by its position between the relative ὅτι and the verb: as in the clause, δι' αὐτῶν παραθάλασσα ἀντέχον. — This being premises the sentence must be rendered (literally) thus: Essentially, that which I also discourse unto you: or I am very deed, that same which I speak unto you. He is the λόγος—His discourse are the revelation of Himself. And there is especial propriety in this: — When Moses asked the name of God, 'I am that which I am,' was the mysterious answer; the hidden essence of the God unrevealed. One could only be expressed by self-comprehension; — but when God manifest in the flesh is asked the same question, it is 'I am that which I speak:' what He reveals Himself to be, that He is (see on next verse). The above sense is maintained by De Wette, and strikingly expanded and illustrated by Stier, iv. 460 ff. — 26.] He is, that which He speaks; and that, He has received from the Father; — He has His definite testimony to give, and His work to do: and therefore, though He has much that He could speak and judge about the Jews, He does it not, but overlooks their malice,— not answering it,— to go forward with the λόγος ἐν τοῖς κόσμοις, the revelation of Himself; the ἀλήθεια of which is all-important, and excludes less weighty things. — ἐν τοῖς κόσμοις, 'out into the world,' as εἰς τὸν ἄνω κόσμον, 1 Cor. xiv. 9; see Luke xxiv. 47. Mar. xiii. 10. This verse is in the closest connexion with the foregoing. — 27.] They did not identify δι' ἀρχῆς με with δι' ἀρχῆς μου. However improbable this may be after δι' ἀρχῆς, ver. 18 (De Wette), it is stated as a fact; and the Evangelist certainly would not have done so without some sure ground: — ἐκδιήλογων διακορισμοῖς πρὸς ἀλήθειας λόγοντος τίς κοσμούν τὸν πιστεύειν αὐτόν; Euthym.— There is no accounting for the ignorance of unbelief, as any minister of Christ knows by painful experience. — 28.] This connects (ἀπὸ being merely the continuation of the foregoing) with ver. 26. On ἀπὸ see ch. iii. 14. 'When ye shall have been the instruments of accomplishing that death by which He shall enter into His glory:' for the latter idea is clearly implied here. — τῶν γενόμ. Perhaps, in different ways: — some, by the power of the Holy Spirit poured out after
The knowledge of the truth answers to the feeding on Christ;—is the inner realization of it in the man. And in the continuing increase of this comes true freedom from all fear and error and bondage.—33.] The answerers are the πεπιστευόμενοι, not some others among the hearers, as many commentators (Lampe, Kuinoel, De Wette, Lücke, third edit.) have maintained;—see, as a proof of this, ver. 36, addressed to these same persons. They had not yet become διάθεσις μαθητής, were not yet distinct from the mass of the unbelieving; and therefore, in speaking to them, He ascribes to them the sins of their race, and addresses them as part of that race.—σωφρ. 'Α. ι.ρ.: see Matt. iii. 9. The assertion σαφές διάθεσις so was so contrary to historical truth, that we must suppose some technical meaning to have been attached to διαθέσιμον, in which it may have been correct. The words cannot be meant of that generation only, for it connects with σωφρ. 'Α. ι.ρ., and generalizes the assertion.—As usual (see ch. iii. 4. iv. 11. vi. 62), they take the words of our Lord in their outward literal sense. Perhaps this was not always an assumption misunderstanding. 

34.] των τῆς ἀμαρτίας, not = ἀμαρτάνοντος, for that all do; but ἁγιασθήσωσέ τιν ἀνθρώποι, Matt. vii. 23. It implies 'living in the practice of sin,' 'doing sin,' as a habit: see ref. The mere moral sentiment of which this is the spiritual expression, was common among the Greek and Roman philosophers. See Westein: see also Rom. vi. 12. 2 Pet. ii. 19. —35.] I believe, with Stier and Bengal, the reference to be to Hagar and Ishmael, and Isaac:—the bond
and the free. They had spoken of themselves as the seed of Abraham. The Lord shows them that there may be, of that seed, two kinds: the son properly so called, and the slave. The latter does not abide in the house for ever: it is not his right nor his position—'Cast out the bondwoman and her son.' But the son abideth ever.' For the application, see on following verses. — δὲ δὲ δέλοι and ἡ δεόται are in this verse generic merely.—36.] Ye then being in sin, are carnal: the sons of the bondwoman, and therefore need liberation. Now comes in the spiritual reality, into which the discourse passes from the figure. This liberation can only take place by means of Him of whom Isaac was the type—the Seed according to promise; those only who of His Spirit are born again, and after His image, are δύναται ἑλένθροι—true sons of God, and no longer children of the bondwoman, but of the free. See by all means Gal. iv. 19 (where the subject really begins, not at ver. 21) to end, which is the best commentary on this verse. —There is, and can be here, no allusion either to the liberation of the Sabbatical year (Ecolampadius); nor to the subject of Heb. iii. 5 (Euthymius).—37.] 'Ye are Abraham’s seed, according to the flesh and the covenant: but—and here the distinction appears—'ye ποιεῖτε τὴν διαφοράν by seeking to kill Me—because My λόγος (see above on ver. 31) χωρεῖ—does not work (spread, go forward, —'ne marche pas')—in you' (not, among you). — Herodian, v. 3, 31 (cited by Lücke, ii. 327), says of a report, ὡστε εἰς πάντα χωρεῖται ς το στρατωμακιν, 'it spread through the whole army.'—38.] (The readings in this verse are very uncertain).—We have the same remarkable relation between λαλίν and πουτίν, as in ver. 28: except that here the πουτίν is applied to the Jews only; λαλίν being used in the same comparative sense as the former; πουτίν is certainly the preferable reading: but it is impossible to say which has been substituted for the other. The συν implies 'accordingly,' 'by the same rule.' — The omission of πουτίν and λαλίν makes the contrast more striking, without altering the sense, the articles being in that case possessive. —39, 40.] There is a distinction between σώφραν and τάφων. The former the Lord grants that they were (ver. 37), but the latter He denies them. — See Rom. ix. 7, o γάρ πάντες οι εἰς Ἰσραήλ, οὕτως Ἰσραήλ οὖν ἄλλοι σώφρα, ἄλλοι τάφων. The latter betokens likeness, true genuine descent in character and habits.—If the reading οὐτοί be adopted, πουτίν must follow it, as in Orig., &c., not ίσοι, ἤν, which is ungrammatical, and has arisen from mixing the two readings. — τοῦτο, 'this,' not, 'tale quid;' and ἔστω, 'fecit,' not 'fecisset;' for the statement is one of a fact: — 'this did not Abraham,' as E. V.: see Gen. xviii.—41.] πουτίνον — not imperative, which destroys the sense.—ἐκ ὑμῶν. Stier remarks, that
they now let fall Abraham as their father, being convicted of unlikeness to him. They see that a spiritual paternity must be present, and accordingly refer to God as their Father. This consideration will rule the sense of ἐκ παρ., which must therefore be spiritual also. And spiritually the τόκων παρονίας, Hos. ii. 4, are idolaters. πολεοδόμοι ὃ ἐκ πόρνης, τυγχάνων περὶ τοῦ ἄλθης πατηρίας, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο πολλοὺς ἀνθρώπους γονεῖς αἰνίασαι. Philo de Migr. Abr. p. 447, M. — Ishmael cannot well be alluded to; for they would not call the relation between Abraham and Hagar one of παρονίας. — Still less can Origen's interpretation be adopted, ἔλεγον ἡμίς, μαλακεύσῃ, τινών τινών; τόν θεόν, τὸν σύ, ὁ φαύσαν μιν ἐκ παρθένων γεγεννήσατο, ἐκ παρονίας δὲ γεγεννήσατο, καὶ διὰ τοῦτον τὸ ἐκ παρθένων γεγεννήσατο λίγων ἡ πατήρ ἔχων μόνον, τὸν θεόν, tom. xx. p. 232,—for the Lord never proclaimed this of Himself. — There may possibly be a reference to the Samaritans (ver. 48), who completely answered in the spiritual sense to the children of circumcision: see Deut. xxxi. 16. Is. i. 21. Esekh. xvi. 18 ff. xx. 30 al. — 42.] 'If you were the children of God, you would love Me, who am not what you have known the Son of God, and who am come by the mission, and bearing the character, of God.'—43.] αἰσθανόμενος is to understand the idiom or dialect in which a man speaks, λαθευμεν, being his manner of speech;—see Matt. xxvi. 73, and Cant. iv. 3, LXX. 'Why do ye not understand my speech?' as E.V. But this of course does not here refer to the mere outward expression of the Lord's discourses, but to the spiritual idiom in which He spoke, and which can only be spiritually understood. — Then ὁ λόγος ἐκ λογεῖς is the matter of those discourses, the Word itself. — The connexion of the two classes is, 'Why?' &c.? Because you cannot receive, hear with the inner ear (see refd. and ch. vi. 60), that which I say.' And the verification and ground of this cannot, is in the next verse. — 44.] The first article τοῦ is important, and to be rendered as in E.V., 'your father the devil.' This verse is one of the most decisive testimonies for the objective personality of the devil. It is quite impossible to suppose an accommodation to Jewish views, or a metaphorical form of speech, in so solemn and direct an assertion as this.—Where παρεῖν is important, and should be so in E.V. more marked: 'Your will is, to do.' It indicates, as in ver. 40, the freedom of the human will, as the foundation of the condemnation of the sinner.—ἀνθρωποστολάς. The first reference seems to be, to the murder of Abel by Cain: — see the Apostle's own comment on these words, 1 John iii. 12, 16. But this itself was only a result of the introduction of death by sin, which was the work of the devil: Adam and Eve were the first whom he murdered. But then again these were only manifestations of the fact here stated by Divine omniscience respecting him: that he was ἀνθρωποστολάς: — ἀνθρωποστολάς, the author and bringer in of that hate which is ἀνθρωποστολαί, 1 John iii. 16. — The mention of 'murder' is introduced because the Jews went about to kill Jesus; and the typical parallel of Cain and Abel is certainly hinted at in the words: see Lücke's note, ii. 338 ff., and Stier, iv. 494 ff. — ἀνθρωποστολάς, not 'abode not,' E.V.; a sense which ἀνθρωποστολάς will not bear, being always present in
expressly) Bas. Chrys. Cyr. Theophyl. — 45. δι ουν Δ. dcb.—λαλείν D d.—λ. ημών C (apparently).—μειον ους D. — 46. om. D 2.—rec. el 21 with qu. ? but txt B C K L X 11 al. abc Syrr. Capt. Sahid. Arm. Orig. Cyr.—47. δι τω ἑαυτῷ om. D G.—48. rec. δι των om. with many mss., but txt B C D L X 8 abc Capt. Sahid. Arm. Orig. Cyr.—51. for meaning, and = 'I have placed myself,' i.e. I stand; see Matt. xii. 47. xx. 6. Mark ix. 1. xi. 5. John i. 26. iii. 29. Acts i. 11. vii. 33. Rom. v. 2. xi. 29 al. ετ. : whereas 'the imperfect, ἅλεγχεν, 'I had placed myself,' i.e. I stood, is imperfect in sense; see Matt. xii. 46. And that this place forms no exception, is shown by δι των (not ἰδιων) immediately following. But as the account of the present sense shows, it is not a mere present, but a present dependent on and commencing with an implied past fact. And that fact here is, the fall of the devil, which was not an insulated act, but in which state of apostasy from the truth he ἄλεγχε, it is his status. — δι' ἄλεγχου, as De Wette remarks, is objective: the truth of God:—in this he standeth not, because there is no truth ('truthfulness,' subjective) in him. His lie has become his very nature, and therefore he is thoroughly alien from the truth of God. — To take δι' as 'not the cause, but the proof' (for, i.e. for we see it by this that . . . . . ), is not only to do violence to construction, but to overthrow the whole sense of the passage.—τοῦ φεύδον, a lie; generic: we in English have retained the article in the expression 'to speak the truth,' but not in the corresponding one. — He ἄλεγχε τοῦ φεύδον to Eve.—ix. 18, 'of his own,' as K. V., not, 'according to his character' (De Wette),—but 'out of his own resources,' 'treasures;' see Matt. xii. 35.—δ παρ. αὑτοῦ i.e. either τοῦ φεύδον, absolutely, or as understood in φεύδοντι,—Orig., Euthym., Theophyl., &c. Nitzsch (Theol. Zeitschrift, 1822), De Wette, Lücke, or τοῦ φεύδον (= τῶν φεύδων), of the liar generally. The former is not the fact,—for the devil is not the father τοῦ φεύδον, but τῶν φεύδων, by being himself one whose very nature has become τοῦ φεύδον. Certainly by this he became the chief promoter of falsehood among men; but this kind of paternity is not here in question: the object being to show that he was the father of these lying Jews. I therefore hold the latter interpretation, with Bengel, Meyer, and Stier.— 45.] And the very reason why ye do not believe Me (as associated with him) is, because I speak the truth;—you not being of the truth, but of him who is falsehood itself. This implies a charge of worthless striving against known and recognized truth. Euthymius fills up the context—ιδιν ληγον φευδοκ, ἵπποιχοσιν μοι ἀν, ὥσ το ἴδιον τοιν πατρός ὑμον λέγοντα: see ch. v. 43. — 46. αμαρτία here is strictly 'sin;' not 'error in argument,' or 'falsehood.' These two latter meanings are found in classical Greek, but never in the N. T. or LXX. And besides, they would introduce in this most solemn part of the Lord's discourse, a rapid change of subject.—The question is an appeal to His sinlessness of life, as evident to them all,—as a pledge for His truthfulness of word: which word asserted, be it remembered, that He was sent from God.—And when we recollect that He who here challenges men to convict Him of sin, never could have upheld outward spotlessness merely (see Matt. xxiii. 26—28), the words amount to a declaration of His absolute sinlessness,—in thought, word, and deed. — el (82) Αλ. Μη:) 'And if it be thence (from the impossibility of convicting Me of sin) evident, that I speak the truth, why do ye not believe Me?' (not πιστ. εἰς ἐμαυ, but simply μοι, 'give credence to Me').— 47.) gives the answer to the άμαρτι, and concludes the discourse with the final disproof of their assertion ver. 41,—with, as it were, a 'quod erat demonstrandum.'—This verse is cited Is 1 John iv. 6.—48.) The Jews attempt no answer, but commence reviling Him. These are now properly of ἵνα, the principal among the Jews.—Σαρ. So they called 'outcasts from the commonwealth of Israel;' and so afterwards they called the Christians (τοις, from τῶν, 2 Kings xvii. 24). They imply, that He differed from their interpretation of the law,—or perhaps, as He had convicted
they of not being the genuine children of Abraham, they cast back the charge with a senseless 'Tu quoque.' There may perhaps be a reference to the occurrence ch. iv. 5 ff. — ος δι᾽ ἐμοῖς. Εἰς. 'As in the first clause they ventured Him from the communion of Israel, so now from that of Israel's God.' Stier. Or perhaps they mean the reproach more as expressing aggravating malice than as demonising possession. The καλέσαντες connects with the charge twice brought against Him by the Pharisees, 'casting out devils by the prince of the devils.'—48. The former term of reproach Jesus passes over (sum jam inter Samarianos haberet, qui in eum credentant. Lampe (?)), and mildly answers (1 Pet. ii. 23) the malicious charge of having a devil, by an appeal to His whole life and teaching (see ch. iv. 34), which was not the work of one having a devil.—κ. ἔμοῖς. Εἰς. The ἐγὼ and ἐμεῖς correspond strictly to the μικρία and σοῦ of the preceding verse. 'Our mutual relation is not that, but this: that I honour Him that sent Me, and ye, in dishonouring Me, dishonour Him.' It is the same contrast, the ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ and ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, as before, ver. 47, which lies at the root. — 50. 'Ye dishonour Me;—not that I seek My own honour, but His who sent Me. There is One who seeketh My honour (ch. v. 23), and will have Me honoured; and who judgeth between Me and you, between truth and falsehood.'—Supply τ. δόξαν μου after ζητοῦν, but not after κρίνων.—51. There is no pause (De Wette) between ver. 50 and this. This is the direct carrying on of the discourse, arising out of κρίνων in the last verse, and forming a 'novum tentamen gratiae' (Lampe). Ye are now children of the devil, but if ye keep My word ye shall be bearer of this divine seed. 'Απεκρίθη Ἡσυχὸς Ἔγώ νοον ὑμῖν. — 52.κρίνω τοῦ τόν λόγον μου ἈΒΓΔ τηρήσα, οὐ μὴ γεύσητε θανάτου εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. 'If ye do not keep My word, ye shall taste death, ye shall die.'— 53.καὶ ποιεῖ, 'Aβρααμ ἀπέθανε καὶ οἱ προφήται, καὶ σὺ λέγεις 'Εαν τὸν λόγον μου ἈΒΓΔ τηρήσα, οὐ μὴ γεύσητε θανάτου εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. 'If ye do not keep My word, ye shall taste death, ye shall die.'
αὐτὸν, ἑσομαι δομιος * ὑμῶν ἑσύστης ἀλλ' οἴδα αὐτὸν καὶ τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ τηρῶ. 56' Ἀβραὰμ ο ν πατὴρ ὑμῶν καὶ γαλαζαστὸ ἱνα ἵνα τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ἐμῖν, καὶ ἢδε καὶ ἵχαρ. 57' εἰπον ὅτι οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι πρὸς αὐτῶν Πιντήκουτα ἕτεν οὕτω ἔχεις, καὶ Ἀβραὰμ έώρακας; 58 εἰπεν αὐτοῖς ο Ισσοὺς Ἀμὶ ἐμῖν λέγω ὑμῖν, πρὶν Ἀβραὰμ γενέσθαι ο ἐγὼ ἐμῖ. 59' ἔριον ὅν λίθους ἐνα γάλωσιν ἕτεν αὐτῶν Ισσοὺς δι' ἐκρύβη καὶ ἐξηλθέν
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honours (glorifies) Me, and it is His word that I keep. I was promised by Him to Abraham." — δομιος, 'glorify Myself to this high designation, of being able to deliver from death.' — ἑσύστης. Whom you are in the habit of calling your God—i.e. the God of Israel. A most important identification, from the mouth of our Lord Himself, of the Father, with the God of Israel in the O. T. The say here is not ' but,' the sense is, 'of Whom ye say that He is your God, and know Him not.' Then what follows sets forth the contrast between them, the pretended children of Abraham, who know not Abraham's God (the Iaas), and Him who knows Him, and keeps His word, so that His word works in and by Him; yes, He is δομιος τοι θου. His allowing their denial of this state of knowledge and union would be as great a lie in Him, as their assumption of it was in them. —δομιος, instead of ὑμῖν, signifies more the being 'one of them,' as we say, 'the like of them.' — 58.] The Lord does not deny them their ostead title of children of Abraham:—it is of spiritual things that He has been speaking, in refusing them the reality of it. — ἑσύστης. We are, rejoiced, that he should see; not (Grotius, Calov., Kuhn., &c.) 'wished that he might see.' The object is to show that Abraham did in his time keep Christ's word, viz. by a prospective realizing faith; and therefore he, in the sense of ver. 61, had not seen death. This is expressed by κ. ἐμὲ κ. ἵχαρ; see below. But what is τ. ἑμῖ. τ. ὑμῖν? Certainly, the day of Christ's appearance in the flesh (ὑν τις ἐπίστημας αὐτῶν καυχός, Cyril Alex.). When that was over, and the attention was directed to another future and directed to another future and promised of God') (Grotius and the Socinian interpreters!), But this, as well as the day of His Cross (Euthym. al.), is out of the question here;—and the word Rabbinically was used for the time of the Messiah's appearance. So we have it, Luke xvii. 22. —And to see that day, is to be present at, witness, it;—to have experience of it. — κ. ἑσύστης κ. ἵχαρ; viz. in his Paradisical state of bliss. Maldonatus has a striking note here (Stier, iv. 530): 'Cum dicit, vidit, haud dubium quin eo modo vidisse dicat, quo videre dixerat tantopere concupisse. Non autem concupiverat sola videre fid. . . . quis fide jam Christi diem videbat? Vidit ergo diem Christi re ipsam, quem ad modum et ille et patres omnes videre concupierant. Quis enim dubitaret Abraham et ceteros patres qui cum eo erant (sive revelationes, quam in hac vita habuissent, sive ex revelatione, quam tunc, quum Christus venit, habuerint ex ejus adventu) non ignorasse Christum venisse, etiam antequam ad eos post mortem veniret?—Only that I would rather believe, as Stier does, that the 'seeing of Christ's day' was not by revelation, but actual—the seeing of a witness.—' Abraham then has not seen death, but lives through My word—having believed and rejoiced in the promise of Me, Whom he has now seen manifest in the flesh.'—57.] No inference can be drawn from this verse as to the age of our Lord at the time, according to the flesh. Fifty years was with the Jews the completion of manhood. The reading τοπορκάσαντα—δι ποτε δοκὲ ἐκριστον, says Euthym.,—has probably been introduced for that very reason. — 58.] As Lücke remarks, all unbiassed exegetes of these words must recognize in them a declaration of the essential preexistence of Christ. All such interpretations of πρων, 'A. γεν., as ' before Abraham became Abraham,' i.e. father of many nations (Socinus and others), and of ἕχω σιμα, as 'I was predetermined, promised by God' (Grotius and the Socinian interpreters!), But this is little better than dishonest quibbles.—The distinction between γενέσθαι and εἰμί is important. 'Antequam nascetur Abr., ego sum' (Erasmus).

—The present ἐμι expresses essential existence, as in reff., and Col. i. 17.—In this verse the Godhead of Christ is involved; and this the Jews clearly understood, by their conduct to Him. — 59.] Probably there were stones (for building) lying about in the outer court of the temple, where these words seem to have been spoken. The reason of the Jews' doing this is given by them on a similar occasion, ch. x. 33: διʼ αὐτοῦ, ἀνθρώπων ὄν, ποιεῖται σωτήρ θεών. —There does not appear to be any miraculous escape intended here, although certainly the assumption of one is natural under the circumstances. Jesus was probably surrounded by His disciples, and might thus hide Himself (see ch. xii. 36), and go out of the temple. The concluding clause has been considered spurious. It certainly (see especially the reading of C L I Copt.) resembles closely Luke iv. 30, and the latter words seem to introduce ch. ix. 1. But MSS. authority is too strong to allow of its being cancelled.

Chap. IX. 1—X. 21.] The healing of one born blind; the incidents following therupon; and the discourse of the Lord concerning the true, and false shepherds.

1.] This, if the concluding words of ch. viii. iii. appear to have happened on the same day; which is hardly likely, for we should thus have the whole incidents from ch. vii. 37 (omitting ch. vii. 33—viii. 12), belonging to one day, and that day a sabbath (ver. 14). And besides, the circumstances under which Jesus here appears are too usual and tranquil to have succeeded immediately to His escape in ch. viii. 59. I would rather therefore suppose that there is a break before this verse: how long, we cannot of course say. Thus we have the commencement of a new narrative here, as in ch. vi. 1, and vii. 1. This is the view of d. Theol, and De Wette; Olahausen and Stier believe it to have been the same day; and the former refers the ἦν αὐτῆς. (ver. 14) to its being the last day of the feast (ch. vii. 37, where see note).—The blind man was sitting, begging (ver. 8),—possibly proclaiming the fact of his having been so born; for otherwise the disciples could hardly have asked the following question. The incident may have been in the neighbourhood of the temple (Acts iii. 2): but doubtless there were other places where beggars sat, besides the temple entrances. —2.] According to Jewish ideas, every infirmity was the punishment of sin (see ver. 34). From Exod. xx. 5, and the prevailing views on the subject, the disciples may have believed that the man was visited for the sins of his parents:—but how could he himself have sinned before his birth? Bensa and Grothus refer the question to the doctrine of metempsychosis:—that he may have sinned in a former state of existence:—this however is disproved by Lightfoot and Lampe. The Pharisees believed that the good souls only passed into other bodies, which would exclude this case (see Joseph. Antt. xviii. 1, 3, and B. J. ii. 8, 14).

Lightfoot and Lücke refer it to the possibility of sin in the womb: Tholuck to predestinated sin, punished by anticipation: De Wette to the general doctrine of the preexistence of souls, which prevailed both among the Rabbis and Alexandrians; see Wisd. viii. 19, 20 (the applicability of which passage is doubted by Stier, iv. 544 note). So Isidore of Pelusium in the Catena (Lücke, ii. 372), οὗτος, δὐς φανερὸν Ἑλληνες,—ὅ οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ, δὐς φανερὸν ἵσωσθαι. The question may have been asked vaguely without any strict application of it to the circumstances,—merely taking for granted that some sin must have led to the blindness, and hardly thinking of the non-applicability of one of the suppositions to this case. Or perhaps, as Stier inclines to suppose, the ἐνοτε, δὐς may mean 'this man, or, for that is out of the question (βιβερίζων, oben, da er nicht ächt bénnt, nicht...) his parents? —I use as a cause why he should be.... —used ἐνοτε:—not ἐκαθαρίσεως (Olah.),
expressing the mere succession of events. —3.] after αὐτοῦ supply ἵνα τ. γεν. — 'neither of these was the cause; but τῇ ἡμερᾷ ἴδινην, in order that . . . . . But how so? σὺ κολαστικῶς, ἀλλ' οἰκονομικῶς. Euthym. In the economy of God's Providence, his suffering had its place and aim, and this was to bring out the ἐργα τοῦ θ. in his being healed by the Redeemer (see Rom. xi. 11 and note). So Lücke:—

De Wette denies the interpretation, and refers the saying merely to the view of our Lord to bring out His own practical design, to make use of this man to prove His Divine power. But see ch. xi. 4, which is strictly parallel. —4.] Connected by ἐργάζ. τ. ἐργα to the former ver. There certainly seems to be some reference to its being the sabbath; see the same expressions in ch. v. 17. From ἔτραφ . . . . in ver. 5, it seems evident that ημέρας is the appointed course of the work of Jesus on earth, as the close of it (see the parallel, ch. xi. 9, 10). It is true, that, according to John's universal diction, the death of Jesus is His glorification; but the similitude here regards the effect on the world, see ver. 5, and the language of Rom. xiii. 12, is in accordance with it, as also Luke xxiii. 53. John xiv. 30. —5.] This partly explains the ημ. and νόης of the former ver., partly alludes to the nature of the healing about to take place. As before the raising of Lazarus (ch. xi. 25), He states that He is the Resurrection and the Life;—so now, He sets forth Himself as the source of the archetypal spiritual light, of which the natural, now about to be conferred, is only a derivation and symbol. —6.] see Mark vii. 33. viii. 23. The virtue especially of the salvia jeguna, in cases of disorders of the eyes, was well known to antiquity. Pliny, H. N. xxvii. 7, says, Lippitidines matutina quotidie velut inunctiones acerri. In both accounts (Suet. Vesp. 7; Tacitus, Hist. iv. 8) of the restoring of a blind man to sight attributed to Vespasian, the use of this remedy occurs. See also Wetsstein in loc. (Trench, Miracles, 293 note.) The use of clay also for the healing of the eyes was not unknown. Serenus Sammonicus (in the time of Caracalla) says: Sī tumor insolitus typho se tollat inani, Turgentes oculos vill circumline censo (!)—No rule can be laid down which the Lord may seem to have observed, as to using, or dispensing with, the ordinary human means of healing. He himself determined, by considerations which are hidden from us. Whatever the means used, the healing was not in them, but in Him alone. The 'conductor' of the miraculous power was generally the faith of the recipient: and if such means served to awaken that faith, their use would be accounted for. —7.] The reason of his being sent to Siloam is uncertain. It may have been as part of the cure,—or merely to wash off the clay. The former is most probable. A beggar blind from his birth would know the localities sufficiently to be able to find his way; so that there is no necessity to suppose a partial restoration of sight before his going.—The situation of the fountain and pool of Siloam is very doubtful. Robinson makes both at the mouth of the ancient Tyropoion, s.e. of the city. He himself explored a subterranean passage from this spot to the Fountain of the Virgin higher up on the banks of the Kedron. Josephus, B. J. v. 4, 1, says, ή ἐκ τῶν νυστατῶν προσαγωγομένης φάραγγι ... καθεύχει μέρις Σιλωάς αὐτῶ γὰρ τὴν πτηγνη, γλυκεὶς τε καὶ πολλὰς υδάσαν, ἱκαλοῦμεν. Jerome sets it 'ad radices montis Zion' (on Isa. viii. 6), and mentions its intermittent character: but he also says (on Matt. x. 28), 'ad radices montis Moria, P F
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IX.

καὶ ἐνίψατο, καὶ ἑλθε βλέπων. 8 Οὶ οὖν γείτονες καὶ οἱ ἄνδροι

θεωροῦντες αὐτὸν τὸ πρότερον οτι Ι ἥρας της προσευχής ἦν,

ἐλέγον Οὐχ οὗτος ἔστιν ὁ καθήμενος καὶ ἐπὶ προσευχῆς;

Ἀλλοι ἐλέγον ἢτι οὗτος ἔστιν ἀλλοι δὲ ὤτι οὗτος

ἀυτῷ εἶστιν. ἐκεῖνος ἐλέγεν ὧτι ἐγὼ εἰμὶ. 10 Ἐλέγον

αὐτῷ Πῶς ἦν ἀνεμέλθασα ὧτι οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ;

11 ἀπεκρίθη ἐκεῖνος [καὶ εἶπεν] Ἀνθρωπος λεγόμενος

Ἰησοῦς 5 πηλὸν ἐποίησα καὶ ἐν τῷ ὑπότοιον τους ὀφθαλμοὺς

καὶ ἔπει μοι ὡς ἡ παγα εἰς τὴν κολομβήθραν του ΑΒΔ.

Συλλαμά καὶ νίψαν. ἀπελθόντως δὲ καὶ νιφάδος ἀνεπέλευσεν.

12 ἐπιτυγχάνων οὖν αὐτῷ Πῶς ἔστιν ἢτιν ἐκεῖνος; λέγει ὕπερ ὑδά.

Ἀγωνίζετο αὐτὸς πρὸς τους Φαρισαίους, τῶν ποτὲ

τυφλών. 14 ὦ τω σάββατον ὧτι ὁ τετίλον ἐποίησα ὧτι

Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἀνέψεων αὐτοῦ τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς. 15 τάλιν οὖν

ἡρῴων αὐτὸν καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι, τῶς ἀνεπέλευσεν. οὐ δὲ

καὶ ἡλό. om. B. — 8. rec. δὴ τοῦ τυφλῶν οὖν, with many ms., but tmt ΑΒCDΚΛX7


ἐν quibus Siloe fluit; so that his testimony exactly agrees with Josephus and Robinson (see Robins. i. 493 ff.). It is mentioned Neh. iii. 15. Is. vii. 6. — δ ἐυρ. άνωτέρω. The reason of this derivation being stated has been much doubted. Some (e. g. Lücke) consider the words to have been inserted as an early gloss of some allegorical interpreter. But there is no external authority for this;—every MS. and vers.

containing them, except the Syr. and Perm.Botham says, οἱ μαία διὰ τὸν ἀποσταλμένον ἦν τῶν τυφλῶν. But this would be a violent transfer,—of the name of the fountain, to the man who was sent thither. I should rather regard the healing virtue imparted to the water to be denoted, as symbolic of Him Who was sent, and whose mission it was to give the healing water of life. Aug. and Chrys. similarly refer ἀποσταλμένοι to the Lord Jesus: Sietz, to the Holy Spirit,—but as one with, and proceeding from Christ. — ἡλό, ' came back;'—apparently to his own house, by the next verse. — 8. θεωροῦντες, belongs to τὸ πρότερον, and thus expresses the present relatively to that time,—οἱ δὲ καὶ τὸ πρότερον. θεωροῦντες. — The reading τυφλῶν was most likely a correction of some one

who thought προσευχής did not express plainly enough the change in him. The question of identity would be much more likely to turn on whether he was really the person who had sat and begged (the blindness being involved in it), than on the fact of his having been blind. — 11.] ἀνεβάλλα, strictly speaking, is inaccurate, of one born blind. Lücke refers to Aristotle as using the word thus, and cites Pausanias, who speaks of ὡφυνία . . . τῶν ἐν γενετήρι τυφλῶν, whom ἐπέλαβε τῆς εσχαλής ἀν- γυμνόν καὶ ἀνέβαλε απ' αὐτοῦ. Sight being natural to men, the deprivation of it is regarded as a loss, and the reception of it, though never enjoyed before, as a recovery. — 13.] The neighbours appear to have brought him to the Pharisees, out of hostility to Jesus (see ver. 12): and ver. 14 alludes the meaning of this:—or perhaps from fear of the sentence alluded to in ver. 22. The Phar. here may have been the court presiding over the synagogue, or one of the lesser local courts of Sanhedrin: but Lücke inclines to think it was an assembly of the great Sanhedrin, whom John sometimes names Οἱ Φαρ.,—see ch. vii. 47. xi. 46. — 14.] Lightly. cites from a Rabbinical treatise on the Sabbath,
καὶ ἐπεύθηκεν ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς μού, καὶ ἐνυφάσμην, καὶ βλέπων. 16 ἔλεγον οὖν ἐκ τῶν Φαρισαίων τινὲς Οὖν ὁ ἀνθρωπός οὐκ ἐστὶν παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἢ ἐπὶ τὸ σάββατον οὖν ταρτεῖ. ἀλλοι ἔλεγον Πῶς δύναται ἀνθρωπός ἀμαρτωλός τιοιμαται σημεία ποιεῖν; καὶ σὺν τί λέγεις περὶ αὐτοῦ ὃ ἦν αὐτοῖς. 17 λέγουσιν ἢ οὖν τῷ τυφλῷ πάλιν Σὺ τί λέγεις περὶ αὐτοῦ ὃ ἦν ἵνα σου τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς; ὃ ὃς εἶπεν ὃτι προφήτης ἦστιν. 18 οὖν ἔπεισαν οὖν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι περὶ αὐτοῦ, ὃτι τυφλὸς ἦν καὶ ἀνεβλέπων, ἢ ἐστίν ὁ νίκος ήμῶν, ὃν ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὃτι τυφλὸς ἐγεννήθη; πῶς οὖν ἢ ἀρτί βλέπει; 20 ἀπεκαθίσαν οἱ δυνατοὶ ὁ οὖν οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ εἶπον Οἶδαμεν ὃτι οὗτος ἦστιν οὔς ήμῶν καὶ ὃτι τυφλὸς ἐγεννήθη; πῶς δὲ νῦν βλέπει οὐκ οἴδαμεν, ἢ τις ήνοιξεν αὐτοῦ οὖν αὐτοῖς ἡλικίαν ἢ οἴδαμεν, ἢ οὕτως ἦν ὁ τούτων λάλησα. 22 ταύτα εἶπον οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ, ὃτι εἴφασεν τούς Ἰουδαίους ἢ σατά ἢ καὶ ἀνεβλέπων οἱ Ιουδαίοι ἢν γὰρ ἂν εἰς τούτοις οἱ Ἰουδαίοι ἢν ἢ ἐπιθύμων ἢν ἢ ἠρείῃ οἱ οὐκ ἤξι ἢν τις αὐτῶν ὃ μοιολόγησα χριστὸν ἢ καὶ ἀνεβλέπων οἱ Ιουδαίοι εἰς τούτοις οἱ οὕτως. 23 διὰ τούτοις οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ εἰς τούτο ἢ ἠλικίαν ἢ ἢ ἔχει, αὐτῶν ἢρωτήσατε. 24 εἴπον ἢ ἠλικίαν ἢ ἦν αὐτῶν ἢρωτήσατε. 25 εἰς ἐγεννήθησαν τῷ ἑυφόροις, τῇ μακραίᾳ, καὶ τῷ καταχρηματίζει αὐτοῖς ἢ ἂν ἤρωτήσαντες. 26 τῇ μακραίᾳ, καὶ τῷ καταχρηματίζει αὐτοῖς ἢ ἂν ἤρωτήσαντες. 27 τῇ μακραίᾳ, καὶ τῷ καταχρηματίζει αὐτοῖς.
private man to anticipate their decision on this point by confessing Him. (24.)


private man to anticipate their decision on this point by confessing Him (?). — 24.] 30. ἦν τινί, τὸ θεὸς, οὐκ οἶδα. "Give God the praise" (E. V.), i.e. "the glory of thy healing." for the Pharisees want to overawe the man by their authority, and make him deny the miracle altogether. The words are a form of adoration (see Josh. vii. 19), to tell the truth, q. d. "Remember that you are in God's presence, and speak as unto Him." — 26.] ὡς, see on ver. 8. The man shrewdly evades the inference and states again the simple fact. — 36.] They perhaps are trying to shake his evidence,—or to make him state something which should bring out some stronger violation of the sabbath. — 27.] οὐκ ἔκαστο must be in its special meaning of 'did not need it.' The latter clause is of course ironical: 'you seem so anxious to hear particulars about Him, that you must surely be intending to become His disciple.' — 29.] ἠρεθα—whether from God or not.—But see ch. xvii. 27, 29, where a very different reason is given for disbelieving Him to be the Christ. — 30.] ἐν γὰρ τ. is well expressed in E. V. "Why herein is" &c. — 31.] He expresses a general popular conviction, that one who could do these things, must be a pious man: and (ver. 32) very eminently so, since this miracle was unprecedented. — 33.] αὐτοῖς, nothing of this kind, much less such a thing as this.— 34.] see on ver. 2. 35.] together, deeply and entirely, as thy infirmity proved. 'They forget that the two charges,—one that he had never been born blind, and so was an impostor, —the other, that he bore the mark of God's anger in a blindness that reached back to his birth,—will not agree together.' (Trench, Mir. 306, note.) — 36.] They. They communicated him: see on ver. 22. It cannot merely mean, 'they cast him out of the court' (Chrys. Mald. Grot. Fritzsche, Tholuck); see next verse. — 35.] 'Tune ille es, qui propter fidem in Jesum quem dicunt Christum, acerbitate nostrorum magistrorum expertus est? An tu post
has molestias etiamum in filium Dei credis?" Lampe (Stier, iv. 565).—36.] This vis  1. t. d. surpasses his present comprehension: and therefore, true to his simple and guileless character, he asks for further information about Him.—[kai] t  2. See Mark x. 26. Luke x. 29. 2 Cor. ii. 2.— 37.] These words Kai ap  3. serve to remind the man of the benefit he has received, and to awaken in him the liveliest gratitude; compare Luke ii. 30.—They do not refer to a former seeing, when he was healed. —39.] There seems to be an interval between the last verse and this, and the narrative appears to be taken up again at some subsequent time when this miracle became again the subject of discourse.— The blind man had recovered sight in two senses,—bodily and spiritual. And as the Lord always treats the spiritual as paramount, including the bodily, so here he proceeds to speak of spiritual sight.— aphor, the effect of apostasias, not merely distinction, but judgment; the following out of the divine εὐδοκία, Matt. x. 25. 26.— 40 We are all, according to the spirit of nature, no better than persons born blind; and to know and confess this our blindness, is our first and only true sight, out of which the grace of the Lord can afterwards bring about a complete receiving of sight. The "becoming blind," on the other hand, is partly an ironical expression for remaining blind, but partly also has a real sense in the increasing darkening and hardening which takes place through unbelief." (Stier, iv. 568.) The "blindness" here answer to the δικαίωμα of Matt. ix. 13; see note there. —40.] They ask the question, not understanding the words of Jesus in a bodily sense, but well aware of their meaning, and scornfully rejoicing, 'Are then we meant by these blind, we, the leaders of the people?'—41.] The distinction in question between the two clauses must be carefully borne in mind. The Lord is referring primarily to the unbelief of the Pharisees and their rejection of Him. And He says, 'If ye were really blind, (not, 'confessed yourselves blind'); Kuname, Stier, De Wette,) ye would not have incurred guilt; but now ye say,'We see;' ye believe ye have the light, and boast that ye know and use the light; and therefore your guilt abideth, remaineth on you.' Observe there is a middle clause understood, between 'ye would never have incurred guilt, and 'your guilt remaineth;' and that is, 'ye have incurred guilt;' which makes it necessary to take the λέγετε στις βλέποντες as in a certain sense implying βλέπετε: viz. 'by the Scriptures being committed to you, by God's grace, which ought to have led you to faith in Me.'—CHAP. X. 1.] This discourse seems to be connected with the preceding miracle,—and the conduct of the
Pharisees towards the man who had been blind, to have given occasion to this description of false shepherds, which again introduces the testimony of Jesus to Himself as the true Shepherd. I say, seems: for I would not lay so much stress as Stier has done on this connexion, seeing that John so frequently passes without notice to an entirely different and disjointed occurrence or discourse. —See on the whole subject of the parable, Jer. xxiii. 1-4. Ezek. xxxiv. Zechar. xi. 4-17. —These opening verses (to ver. 5) set forth the distinction between false and true shepherds. Then (vv. 7, 8, 9) He brings in Himself, as the door, by which both shepherds and sheep enter the fold. —Then (ver. 10) He returns to the imagery of the first verses, and sets forth Himself as the Good Shepherd; and the rest (to ver. 18) is occupied with the results and distinctions dependent on that fact. τὴν ἀλ. ὁ περιτειχισμὸς σ. πρωτοφανός τόπος (Phavorinus, Lücke ii. 403); just answering, except in this being a permanent enclosure, to our fold. This fold is the visible Church of God, primarily, as His people Israel were His peculiar fold; afterwards, the fold comprehends all the faithful. —The terms in this first part are general, and apply to all leaders of God's people; in ver. 1, to those who enter that office without having come in by the door (i.e. Christ, in the large sense, in which the O. T. faithful looked to and trusted in Him, as the covenant promise of Israel's God); and in ver. 2, to those who do enter by this way; and whosoever does, is a shepherd of the sheep (not the Shepherd, as E. V.; see ver. 11). —The sheep throughout this parable are not the mingled multitude of good and bad; but the real sheep, the faithful, who are, what all in the fold should be. The false sheep (goats, Matt. xxv. 32) do not appear; for it is not the character of the flock, but that of the shepherd, and the relation between him and his sheep, which is here prominent. —3.] Perhaps the θεωρούσα should not be too much pressed as significant; but certainly the Holy Spirit is especially He who opens the door to the shepherds; see frequent uses of this symbol by the Apostles, Acts xiv. 27. 1 Cor. xvi. 9. 2 Cor. i. 2. Col. iv. 3; and instances of the θεωρούσα shutting the door, Acts xvi. 6. 7. (So Theodorus Heracleota, and Stier, iv. 578.) —τα πρ. τ. φ. αὐ. ἡκ. The voice of every such true shepherd is heard (heeded, understood) by the sheep (generally): and he calls by name (see var. read.) his own sheep, that portion of the great flock entrusted to him, and leads them out to pasture, as his office is. —This distinction between πρόβας and τὸ ἱδαν πρόβας has given rise to exegetical and doctrinal mistakes, from not observing ποιμήν above. It has been imagined that Christ is here spoken of, and that therefore these two descriptions of sheep must be different, and so the whole exposition has been confounded. Even Stier has fallen into this mistake. —4.] The reading ωάντα (for πρόβας) is interesting, and probably genuine. When he has led forth (κεβδάλλων = ἑξάγων) to pasture all his sheep (there shall not an hoof be left behind), he goes before them; in his teaching pointing out the way to them; they follow him, because they know his voice; his words and teaching are familiar to them. But observe that the expression here becomes again more general; not τὰ πρ., but τὰ πρ. as in ver. 2.
The <i>sheep</i> know the voice of every sheep <span class="redactor-comment">the shepherd</span>. — 6.) So that the <i>αλλόρποες</i> is not the shepherd of another section of the flock, but an alien: the <i>λοιποί</i> of ver. 1;—<i>καὶ τὸν ἄλλην</i> is general, as in E. V.— 8.) <i>παρουμά</i>s is not = <i>παραβολής</i>, as so generally set down. This is not properly a parable; but rather a parabolic allegory. The <i>parable</i> requires narrative to set it forth; and John relates no such. The right word for <i>παρουμά</i> would be <i>allegory</i>. We have another example of such in ch. xv. 1 ff. (Matt. ix. 37, 38.) — 7.) What follows is not so much an exposition, as an expansion of the allegory.—The key to this verse is the right understanding of what went before. Bear in mind that vv. 1—5 were of shepherds in general. But these shepherds themselves go into and out of the fold by the same door as the sheep: and Christ is that door; THE DOOR OF THE SHEEP: the one door both for sheep and shepherds, into the fold (see Ἡ Θέρα, absol. ver. 9), into God's Church, to the Father. — 8.) I believe that the right sense of these words, δομὶ πρὸ ἴμων ἠλθόν, has not been apprehended by any of the Commentators.—First, they can only be honestly understood of time: all who came before Me (not, ‘without regard to Me,’ Osh. &c., or, ‘passing by Me as the door,’ Camer., or, ‘instead of Me,’ Lamp., &c.: ‘pressing before Me,’ (ch. v. 7), which would have been ἑρχόνται, not ἠλθό: nor any other of the numerous shifts which have been adopted).—What pretended teachers then came before Christ? Remember the connexion of these discourses. He has taught the Jews that Abraham and the prophets entered by Him (ch. viii. 58): but He has set in strong opposition to Himself and His, them (these Jews) and their father, the Devil (ch. viii. 44). He was the first thief who clomb into God's fold; and all his followers are here spoken of inclusively in the language of the allegory, as coming in by and with Him. His was the first attempt to lead human nature, before Christ came; before the series of dispensations of grace begun, in which pasture and life is offered to man by Him. — δομι, not θέρα, because their essential nature as belonging to and being of the evil one is set forth, and the inclusion of these present Pharesises in their ranks. —<i>ἄλλη</i> &c. . . . This course of events cannot be understood absolutely—‘the sheep never for one moment listened to them;’ but, did not listen to them in the sense of becoming their disciples eventually. So that the fall of our first Parents would be no exception to this; whom of all men we must conclude, by the continuing grace and mercy of God to them after that fall, to have been of His real sheep. And since then, the same is true; however the sheep may for a while listen to these false shepherds, they do not hear them, so as to follow them. — 9.) expands and fixes ver. 7. - ‘Non est salutarius aditus in ecclesiis, nisi per Me, sive pastor esse velis, sive ovis.’ Erasmus (Stier, iv. 590). — 10.) the gracious intent of the Saviour in this;—to give life, and is abundance. This verse forms the transition from Him as Ἦθος, to Him as δόμιναιν. He is here set in opposition to <i>δόλις</i>s (see on ver. 8), and thus inemissly passes into the place of a <i>παρουμά</i> who has been hitherto thus opposed. Then the <i>γεννησε</i> binds on to <i>γεννησεν</i> ἡμᾶς—and καὶ <i>παρουμ</i> <i>εἶκος</i>: q. d. not merely as a door to pass through, but actively, abundantly, to <i>δοῦν</i> abundance of life. We are thus prepared for— 11.) the announcement of Himself as δ. <i>παρουμ</i> <i>καλός</i>—the great antagonist of <i>δόλις</i>s—the pattern and Head of all good shepherds, as αἱ of all thieves and robbers. But He in δ. <i>παρουμ</i> καλός, in this verse, as having
most eminently the qualities of a good shepherd, one of which is to lay down His life for the sheep. These words here are not so much a prophecy, as a declaration, implying however that which ver. 16 asserts explicitly.—12.] The imagery is here again somewhat changed. The false shepherds are here compared to hirelings, i.e. those who serve merely for gain; the μισθωτος who fulfils the character implied by the word. The idea is brought in by τὴν ψυχ. 

α̣β. τ. ἐντ. υ̣φερ τ. τρ., which introduces a time of danger, when the true and false shepherds are distinguished. — τ. λαῶν The purposes of the θεός are the same as those of the thief in ver. 10, and in the allegory he is the same;—the great θεος of the sheep of Christ. Lücke and De Wette deny this, and hold 'any enemies of the theocracy' to be meant;—but no deep view of the parable will be content with this,—see Matt. vili. 16, where the λύκος ἄμαρται is not μισθωτος, but the καταθεται κ. λειτουργ. of ver. 8;—and their chief and father would therefore be ἡ λύκος, just as ἡ φωκή is the Shepherd. —14, 15.] The knowledge of His sheep here spoken of is more than the mere knowing by name; it is a knowledge corresponding to the Father's knowledge of Him;—i.e. entire, perfect, all comprehensive; and their knowledge of Him corresponds to His of the Father,—i.e. is intimate, direct, and personal:—both being bound together by holy and inseparable Love. — ὑποτρ. τ. τρ.] "for those my sheep"—not for all: that, however true, is not the point brought out here: the Lord lays down His life strictly and properly, and in the depths of the Divine counsel, for those who are His sheep. —16.] The θεός are the Gentiles;—not the dispersion of the Jews, who were already in God's αὐλῇ. By these wonderful words, as by those in ch. xi. 52. Acts xviii. 10, and by the conclusion of Matt. xxv. (see notes there), the Lord shows that, dark and miserable as the Gentile world was, He had sheep even there. Observe they are not in other folds, but scattered (ch. xi. 52).—με δὲ ἄγετο i.e. in the purpose and covenant of His bringing them, and their hearing His voice: meaning that His servants in His name and by His power would accomplish this work. Admirably illustrative of the converse method of speaking which He employs Matt. xxv. 40. 45. The μοι τιμή is remarkable—not μοι ἀξία, as erroneously rendered in E. V.:—not one fold, but one flock; no one exclusive enclosure of an outward church,—but one flock, all knowing the one Shepherd and known of Him. Οὐ καὶ τιμήν comp. Heb. xii. 20. —17.] The λαῶν ἐν παραμορφώσει is now over, and He speaks plainly,—"My Father." In this wonderful verse lies the mystery of the love of the Father for the Son:—because the Son has condescended to the work of humiliation, and to earn the crown through the cross (see Phil. ii. 8, 9, 12). The ἐν here is strictly τῆς ἐκκ.,—in order that. "Without this purpose in view," says Stier.
the ψυχήν μου ίνα πάλιν ἀλάβω αὐτήν. 18 οὖν, εἰς αὐτήν, ἀλλ' ἐγώ τίθημι αὐτήν, ἁπ' ἐμαυτοῦ. 19 εξοσιάν ἐγὼ θείωνα αὐτήν, καὶ εξοσιάν ἐχω πάλιν ἐπ. 1 ch. 12, xix. 10. 10. 21, 6. ἰουδαίοις δη τοὺς λόγους τούτους. 20 ἐλέγω δη πολλοὶ εἰς αυτῶν Δαμιόνων ἕξει καὶ μαίνεται τί αυτοῦ ἀκούει; 21 ἄλλοι ήλεγον Ταύτα τα μήμATA ὡν ἔστι Δαμιονικούμενον 1 Matt. iv. 94 al. fr. k ch. ix. 10 ref. see 1 Mac. 1. 58. Heb. ix. 18. x. 20. 8 Kings xi. 15. 25 n ch. v. 2 ref. 2 n Acts xiv. 20 ref. a Matt. xii. 21. ref. see Gen. xlv. 20. p = here only. see Ezek. 19. 10. Ps. xili. 1. q = ch. xii. 14. xvi. 38, 39. ἰουδαίοις δη τοὺς λόγους τούτους. 20 ἐλέγω δη πολλοὶ εἰς αυτῶν Δαμιόνων ἕξει καὶ μαίνεται τί αυτοῦ ἀκούει; 21 ἄλλοι ήλεγον Ταύτα τα μήμATA ὡν ἔστι Δαμιονικούμενον 1 Matt. iv. 94 al. fr. k ch. ix. 10 ref. see 1 Mac. 1. 58. Heb. ix. 18. x. 20. 8 Kings xi. 15. 25 n ch. v. 2 ref. 2 n Acts xiv. 20 ref. a Matt. xii. 21. ref. see Gen. xlv. 20. p = here only. see Ezek. xlv. 20. 25 n ch. xii. 14. xvi. 38, 39.


22—28.] Discourse at the Feast of Dedication. —In all probability Jesus remained at, or in the neighbourhood of, Jerusalem during the interval (two months) between the Feast of Tabernacles and that of the Dedication. Had He returned to Galilee, we should have had some mention of it. —Still, by the words ἐν τοῖς ἰεροσολύμοις, it would seem as if a fresh period and a new visit began; for why should such a specification be made, if the narrative proceeded continuously? — 28.] This feast had become usual since the time when Judas Macc. purified the temple from the profanations of Antiochus. It was held on Chislev (December) 26, and seven following days: see 1 Macc. iv. 41.—50. 2 Macc. x. 1—9. Jos. Antt. xii. 7, 7.—γιὰ γού.] To explain to Gentile readers the reason of the Lord’s walking in Solomon’s portico. This latter was on the east side of the temple, called also by Jos. στὸν ἅγιον ἁγίον, He says, Antt. xx. 9, 7, that it was an original work of Solomon, which had remained from the former temple. —24.] ψυχήν αὐτῶν in generally explained 'Keep us in doubt,' αἰμαίοις, ἀναρρίξας μεταξύ πιστῶν κ. ἀνισισίων, Euthym. But there is some question whether φ. αἰμα is ever so used. In Jos. it signifies 'to uplift the soul,' raise the courage.' — 28. ἐκ τοῦ ἐναθῆναν, ἀπὸ πολλῶν ἐκ τοῦ εἰς τοῦ. γιὰ τ. ἤμ., Antt. iii. 2, 3, 5, 1. —So also Aquila, Prov. xix. 18, πρὸς τοῦ τιθημένου αὐτῶν μη δοκεῖσαι ἵνα συν. σοτ. These usages however, as all the examples adduced in the commentary, are confined to the act of a man on his own soul: when the term applies to effects produced on another, it seems to imply any strong excitement of mind, whether for hope or fear. — 29.] How long dost thou
excite our minds." — 25.] He had often told them, in unmistakable descriptions of Himself: see ch. v. 18. viii. 36. 36. 58. &c., &c. But the great reference here is to His words, as in ver. 36. — 26.] The difficulty, and MS. authority, of the words in brackets are sufficient warrant for their genuineness: and they come much more naturally with this than with the following verse. I believe them to refer more to the whole parable, than to any explicit saying of this kind; and this is shown to my mind by the following words in ver. 27:—the minor proposition, 'but ye hear not My voice,' being understood. This was a corollary from the parable, and thus it might be said καθώς ἐπήκοαν ὑμῖν. — 27-29.] This leads to a further description of these sheep. The form of the sentence is a climax: rising through the ἐγώ διδάσκω and ἐκ τῆς ἤχης μου, to ἐκ ταύτης μου, διδασκόντας, καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἤχης τοῦ πάτρος μου. Then the apparent diversification of the two expressions, ἐκ τῆς ἤχης μου and ἐκ τῆς ἤχης τοῦ πάτρος μου, gives occasion to the assertion in ver. 30, that Christ and the Father are one: one in working, and in power, and in will. ἐν, κατὰ δύναμιν, ἐνίαυτον, παντοδεξαμενον. Sutrum; who adds, εἰ δὲ ἐν κατά δύναμιν, ἐν ἀργὰ καὶ κατὰ τὴν δικαιοσύνην τῶν ἑλκύσεων τοῦ θεοῦ. — 23.] This certainly is implied in the words, and so the Jews understood them, ver. 33. Bengel strikingly remarks, 'per suavem refutatur Sabellicus, per suavem, Arius.' — &c., not ets: not personally one, but essentially. — 31.] i.e. as having spoken blasphemy, Levit. xiv. 10 ff. — 32.] See Mark vii. 37. 38. ἡλεξα, because they were part of the manifestation of Himself as the Son of God.—λαβέτερα, 'are ye stoning (preparing to stone) Me?' — 33.] Θεὸν = ἵκον τῆς, ver. 18. — 34.] νόμος here is in its widest acceptance, —the whole O. T.—as ch. xii. 34. xv. 25. The Psalm (lxxxi.) is directed against the injustice and tyranny of judges (not, the Gentile rulers of the world (De Wette), nor, the angels (Block)) in Israel. And in the Psalm reference is made by εἰσα to previous places of Scripture where judges are so called, viz. Exod. xxi. 6. xxii. 9. 22-35.] πρὸς οὖς ἐδ. λ. τ. ὑ. ὑ., 'to whom God (in those passages) spoke.' — The
eute theou's, pro's o'de o'l ogos tou theou "e'givos, kai o' u'm - Luke ii. 1, 341.

'thatai "lith', h 'graphi. 38 o'v o' pat'ho - h'giasa kai ap'estelven eis t'v k'smon 'umes. 'l'gete o'ti blasph'meis, o'ti e'piv Yio'v tou theou e'mi; 37 ei o' v pivo'v ta 'rga tou pat'ro's mou, me' piest'vte mo' 38 ei de' pivo', kai emoi me'.

* piest'vte, tois 'rgo'v * piest'vte, i'na gvo'v kai ei * piest'vte ei'ti en emoi o' pat'ho ka'gvo e'v * a'tuv.

29 e'pivou o'v pali'v aut'v "pivai'v kai ei'vpl', e'v ke'vri'v aut'v, 40 kai av'ple'v pali'v pivo'vn tou 'Ior'dano'v eis tou t'pov o'tou 'n'v 'Ivan'v'h to pr'v'tov bap'ti'koi, kai e'mi'vne e'kai. 41 kai polloi 'hld'v pr'v aut'v, kai el'vng o'ti 'Ivan'v'h m'v spim'v e'to'sen'v o'vde'v' panto'v de' o'sa e'piv 'Ivan'v'h peri t'tov'tov a'lethi'nh.

42 kai e'vpe'ta'sen palloi e'kai eis aut'v.

XI. 1' Hnv de' tis 'asvne'vavn L'xaro'v "ap'v B'vnaia'n,

'ek tis'v k'w'v M'v'ias kai M'rv'as t'v adelphi'v aut'v'


" - B al. - for "piet'se, p'vte B D K L U al. 


" - Eus. Terr. 

(parenthesis, kal o' e'vov. L. g. gr. , implies, 'you cannot explain this expression away,' -it cannot mean nothing,-for it rests on the testimony of God's word.' - 36.] The argument is a minor ad majus. -If in any sense they could be called 'gods,' -how much more properly He, Whom &c. -They were only officially so called, only keph'ovs &c.-but He, the Holy One, sealed and baledoed by the Father and sent into the world, is essentially theos, inasmuch as He is elo theou. -The deeper aim of this argument is, to show them that the idea of man and God being one, was not alien from their O. T. spirit, but set forth in these types and shadows of Him, the real God-man. - 37, 38.] Having put the charge of blasphemy aside, the Lord again has recourse to the testimony of His works, at which He hinted ver. 32; and here, to their character, as admitted by them in ver. 33. 'If they bear not the character of the Father, believe Me not: but if they do (which even yourselves admit), though ye may hate and disbelieve Me, recognize the unquestionable testimony of the works:-that ye may be led on to the higher faith of the unity of Myself and the Father.' - 38.] The attempt to stone Him seems to have been abandoned, but (see vii. 30) they tried again to take Him into custody: and, as before, He (miraculously?) withdrew Himself from them.

40-43.] Jesus departs to Bethany beyond Jordan, and is there believed on by many. -40.] See ch. i. 28 and note. -41.] The locality reminds them of John and his testimony. The remark seems to have a double tendency: -to relate their now confirmed persuasion, that though John did not fulfil their expectations by showing a sign or working miracles, yet he was a true prophet, and really, as he professed, the forerunner of this Person, who in consequence must be, what John had declared Him to be, the Messiah. And (ver. 42) the result followed: many believed on Him.

CHAP. XI. 1-44.] The raising of Lazarus. -On the omission of this, the chief of the Lord's miracles, by the three other Evangelists, see Prollegg. ch. i. 5, 1-1.] Meyer, and Mr. Greswell, maintain that &c. means present residence,-i.e. nativity. But this distinction is wholly untenable; and all the inferences drawn from it in Mr. G.'s dissertation (vol. ii. p. 481 ff.) fall to the ground (see ref., especially last).
XI.

Bethany is designated as ‘the village of Martha and Mary,’ to distinguish it from that Bethany beyond Jordan, which has just been alluded to (not named perhaps to avoid the confusion), ch. x. 40.—Mary and Martha are mentioned as already well known from the current apostolic teaching (see Prolegg. to John, § ii. 11).—3. Another reference to a fact which, as the Lord prophesied, was known wherever the Gospel was preached. This reference containing, as it does, the expression τον κύριον (‘our Lord’), q. d. ‘as we all well know,’—is a striking illustration of that prophecy. John himself relates the occurrence, ch. xii. 34, being necessary for the course of his narrative. —4. The message (see vv. 21, 32) evidently was to request the Lord to come and heal him; and implies that the sickness was of a dangerous kind. —4. The only right understanding of this answer, and the Lord’s whole proceeding here, is,—that He knew and foretold all from the first,—as well as the termination of Lazarus’ sickness and his being raised again,—as the part which this miracle would bear in bringing about the close of His own ministry. —ἀνήγγειλα τὴν ζωὴν. O Gest. Christus, notum sibi, quod tanguam nescienti indicabat. —Grot. —καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ τὸ ἔργον τῆς ζωῆς τοῦ κυρίου. —Its result as regards Lazarus will not be death (see Matt. ix. 24 and xii. and notes) ;—but (see ch. ii. 11. ix. 3) it has a higher purpose,—the glory of God;—the glorification, by its means, of the Son of God. And this ἀνήγγειλα—how was it accomplished? By this miracle leading to His Death,—which in John’s dictum is so frequently implied in that word. (It need hardly be remarked, with Olah and Trench, that the glorifying of the Son of God in Lazarus himself is subordinately implied. Men are not mere tools, but temples, of God.)—It is doubtful whether these words were the answer sent back to the sisters, or were said to the disciples. In either case, they evidently carried a double meaning, as again those in ver. 11,—5. explains ἀνήγγειλα.—6. ἀνήγγειλα connects with ver. 4, ‘Having thus said this,—although He loved, &c., He abode,’ &c.—In all probability Lazarus was dead, when He spoke the words ver. 4 :—or at all events before the messenger returned. —7. If the αὐτῷ in ver. 6 referred to this verse, the connexion must have been made by καὶ μετὰ τῆς: the σκέπασμα or σκέπασμα cut off all connexion (Gal. i. 18), and throws back the αὐτῷ as explained above. —8. ἀνήγγειλα —ἀνήγγειλα —but now. —9, 10. The Lord’s answer is first general, ver. 9, 10,—then particular, ver. 11.—ἐσπέρα. See on ch. ix. 4, where the same thought is expressed. But here it is carried further,—I have a fixed time during which to work, appointed
Me by My Father; during that time I fear no danger, I walk in His light, even as the traveller in the light of this world by day: and (by inference) ye too are safe, walking in this light, which light to you is Myself,—walking with Me:—whosoever walks without this light,—without Me,—without the light of the Divine purpose illuminating the path of duty,—stumbles, because he has no light in him.' A few lines here for the light of the body is the ‘eye,’ and the light must be in us in order to guide us. Shut it out by blinding the eyes, and we are in darkness. So too of spiritual light.—The twelve-hour division of the day was common among the Jews by this time, being probably borrowed from Babylon (of 'E-lam' τα δυο μερα της ημερας παρα Βαβυλωνιων ιμαθον. Herod. ii. 109). As the day in Palestine varied in length from 14h. 12m. in summer to 9h. 48m. in winter, these hours must also have varied considerably in length at the different seasons (see Winer, Realwörter, art. 'Tag'). —11.] The special reason for going, which the disciples appear not to have borne in mind, having probably supposed from ver. 4 that Lazarus would recover. —ο φωλ. ἡμ. 'quanta humanitate Jesus amicitiam suam cum discipulis communicavit!' Bengel. And the ēōs gives a reason why they should go too.—
mourning with them. Lightfoot (Hor. Hebr. in loc.) gives an account of the ceremonies practiced during the thirty days of mourning. — 20.] The behaviour of the two sisters is quite in accordance with their character, Luke x. 38–42:—and thus we have a most interesting point of connection between two gospels so widely various in their contents and character. —Stier thinks (v. 22), as also Trench (Mir. 308), that Mary did not hear of the approach of Jesus, and that we must not bring the characters to bear on this case (?). —21.] This saying has evidently been the leading thought of the four days since their brother’s death. Mary repeats it, ver. 32.—23.] She seems to express some expectation of the raising of her brother;—but it is too great a thing for her to venture to mention;—possibly she had not dared to form the thought fully, but had some vague feeling of it up, such as she knew He would give. I can hardly see, as some have done, a ‘verbum minus dignum’ (Bengel) in the form of her expression, οὐ σὰς αἰρήσας τῶν Θ. ἐκλ. It was said in the simplicity of her faith, which it is true, was not yet a fully ripened faith: but it differs little from the Lord’s own words, ver. 41.—25.] I believe these words of the Lord to contain no allusion to the immediate restoration of Lazarus; but to be pedagogically used, to lead on to the requisite faith in her mind. I have to learn whether ἀναστασίας in this direct absolute sense could be used of his recast into human life. —24.] She understands the words rightly, but gently repels the insufficient comfort of his ultimate resurrection. —25, 26.] These words, as Stier observes, are the central point of the history; of which the subsequent miracle is the proof. The interpretation of the saying seems to have been, to awaken in Martha the faith that He could raise her brother from the dead, in its highest and proper form. This He does by announcing Himself as ‘the Resurrection and the Life’ (q.d.—that resurrection in the last day shall be only by My Power, and therefore I can rise now as well), and more than that, the Life itself: so that He that believeth in Me (= Lazarus, in her mind), even though he have died (ἀναθάνη, past), shall live; and he that liveth and believeth in Me, shall never die:’ i.e. ‘faith in Me is the source of life, both here and hereafter; and those who have it, have Life, so that they shall never die:’—physical death being overlooked and disregarded, in comparison with that which is really and only death. The ζωή must be (against Lampe, Olshausen, and Stier) taken of physical life, for it stands opposed to καὶ οὐκ ἄνωθεν. Olshausen’s remark, that ζωή and ἄνωθεν in the second clause must both be physical, if one is, is wrong; the antithesis consisting, in both clauses, in the reciprocation of the two senses, physical and spiritual; and serving in the latter clause, as a key hereafter to the condition of Lazarus, when raised from the dead.—There can hardly be any reference in ver. 26 to the state of the living faithful at the Lord’s coming (καινότες μον οὐ κομψομαχοῦσα, καίνατε οὐ λαλάγομεν ῥέμα, 1 Cor. xv. 51).—for although the Apostle there, speaking of believers primarily and especially, uses the first person, —the saying would be equally true of unbelievers, on whose bodies the change from τὸ θαματόν to ἀφαρώσει will equally pass, and of whom the οὐ μη ἄνωθεν here
27. ἔγει αὐτῷ. Ναί κύριε, ἔγει πεπλευμα ὧτι σοι εἰ ὁ χριστός ὁ νικός του θεου ὁ εἰς τον κόσμον ἐρχόμενος. 28 καὶ ταῦτα οὗτα σα ἀπήλθε καὶ εἶπεν Μαριάν την ἁδελφήν αὐτής λάθρα εἰπόνα ὁ διδάσκαλος πάρεστι καὶ φωνεῖ σε. 29 εἴκειν ὡς ἤκουσέν, εἴγειται ταῦτα, καὶ ἐργιάνει πρὸς αὐτόν. 30 οὖτω δὲ ἔληλυθε ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὴν κωμήν, ἀλλ' ἦν ἐν τῷ τόπῳ ὅπου ὑπήρχεν αὐτῶν ἡ Μάρθα. 31 οἱ οὖν Ιούδαῖοι οἱ ὄντες μετ' αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ καὶ παραμυθοῦντοι αὐτὴν, ἴδον τὴν Μαρίαν 32 ὅτι ταχέως ἀνάστη καὶ ἐκέλευς, ἠκολούθησάν αὐτῷ. 33. ἔληγοντες οὖν ὑπάγει εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον ἵνα κλαύσῃ ἐκεί. 34 ὅτι οὖν Μαρία ὥς ἦλθεν ὅπου ἦν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ἴδον αὐτὸν ἐπεσαν εἰς τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ λέγουσα αὐτῷ, Ἐρση, εἰ ἦς ὁδε, οὐκ ἦν ἀπεθάνει μοι αὐτὸς. 35 Ἰησοῦς οὖν ὡς ἔδειν αὐτὴν κλαύσουσα καὶ τοὺς συνελθόντας αὐτῷ Ἰούδαῖους κλαύσαι, ὅτι ἐνεβριμήση τῷ ἐπιματεῖ. 27. αὐτῷ om. D.—for ναὶ κύριε, ὁ Ἰησοῦς A.—26. τοῦτο B C L X. txt A D abc.—for λάθρα, εἰπόμενον B D abc.—εἰπάσα λ B C1 (apparently). txt A C2 D.—29. ἠγέρθη Β C D L abed Syr. Copt. txt A C1.—ἡγέρθη Β C1 (not ἠγέρθη C as Scholz). txt A C2 D.—30. οὐ γὰρ D.—aff. ἦν ins. εἰς B C X 3 al. abc Covt. Sahid. —31. ἦν ins. om. καὶ D dc.—for λευκόν, δύσαντες B C (prob.) D L X Covt. Ἑβ. Arm. txt A C2 abc.—32. rec. τὸν Ἰησ. txt A B C1 D X 4.—αὐτῶν om. D.—πρὸς τ. Ἄ C D L 5. txt A B.—αὐτῷ betr. τοὺς πόδ. A C E F G H K L M S U X Δ all. Theophyl. txt would be equally true, whereas this saying is one setting forth an exclusive privilege of ὁ ζων κ. πιστεύων εἰς ἐμί. Besides, such an interpretation would set aside all reference to Lazarus, or present circumstances. —27.] Her confession, though embracing the great central point of the truth in the last verse, does not enter fully into it. How does she (ver. 15) seem to have adequately comprehended its meaning? ἀν ὡς μὴν μεγάλα περὶ λαυτοῦ εἴπειν ἐγὼ πῶς ταῦτα εἴπειν, γνῶσες ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἑρωτηθῆσαι, ἱεροῦ ἀπεστείλαται. Bathym. —ὁ ἐρυθρ. ‘Who should come?’ see reff. 28.] Her calling her sister is characteristic of one who (as in Luke x. 40) had not been much habituated herself to listen to His instructions, but knew this to be the delight of Mary. Besides she evidently has hopes raised, though of a very faint and indefinite kind. προδοσεῖσθαι τι ἀγάθος ἀπὸ τῶν λόγων αὐτῶν. Bathym. —λάθρα] ἴνα μὴ οἱ παρόντες ἴοου αὐτῷ τοῦτο γενῶσιν, καὶ οὓς καταμενόντων αὐτῶν τοῖς εἰρήκολον ἔσται. Bathym. This fear was realized (ver. 46).—οἴκων ἐκ] This is not recorded. Stier thinks that the Lord had not actually asked for her, but that Martha sees such an especial fitness for her hearing in the words of vv. 25, 26, that she uses this expression. But is it not somewhat too plainly asserted, to mean only calling by inference? —31.] ις αἰ. ἐκεί—as is the custom even now in the East.—32.] The words of Mary are fewer, and her action more impassioned, than those of her sister.—33.] In explaining this difficult verse, two things must be borne in mind: (1) that ἐνεβριμήσατο can bear but one meaning, that of indignor ('infrenuit,' Vulg.), —the expression of indignation and rebuke, not of sorrow. This has been here acknowledged by all the expositors who have paid any attention to the usage of the word. (2) That both from ἐν καὶ ἄλλω, &c.,—from καὶ ἀπεραγ. ἔσται, and ver. 35,—the feeling in the Lord was clearly one of rising sympathy, which voted itself at last in tears. —These two things being premised, —I think the meaning to be, that Jesus, with the tears of sympathy already rising and overcoming His speech, checked them, so as to be able to speak the words following. I would read ἐκπ. τ. ἄν, καὶ ἐρ. κερ., καὶ ἐποίησε in immediate connexion, as expressing the temporary check given to the flow of His tears,—the effort used to utter the following question. And I would thus divest the self-restraint of all stoical and unworthy character, and consider it as
merely physical, requiring indeed an act of the will, and a self-restraining—a complication of feeling,—but implying no deliberate disapproval of the rising emotion, which indeed immediately after is suffered to prevail. What minister has not, when burying the dead in the midst of a weeping family, felt the emotion and made the effort here described? And surely this was one of the things in which He was made like unto His brethren. Thus Bengel: 'Ita Jesus ante mortem affecta lacrmas hic cohbit,' et max. ver. 38 abrupti. Eoque major earum fuit auctoritas.'—της πνευματικῆς, 'rebuked His Spirit,'—but 'in spirit': see ἐν πνεύματι ver. 38.—
Indignation over unbelief, and sin, and death the fruit of sin, doubtless lay in the background: but to see it in the words (with Ols., Stier, and Trench), seems unnatural.—35—38. It is probable that the second set of Jews (ver. 37) spoke with a scoffing and hostile purpos: for John seldom uses δι' as a mere copula, but generally as 'but,' see vv. 46. 49. 61. —It is (Trench, p. 407) a mark of accuracy in the narrative that these dwellers in Jerusalem should refer to a miracle so well known among themselves, rather than to the former raisings of the dead in Galilee (Strauss has made this very point an objection !), of which they probably may have heard, but naturally would not thoroughly believe on rumour only.—Again, of raising Lazarus none of them seem to have thought, only of preventing his death.—This second ἱμβρύωνθαι of the Lord I would refer to the same reason as the first. τῶν ἡμερῶν μετ' αὐτῶν, ἵνα τῷ φῶς ἵνα ἴδεται ὁ Ἰσσαής. . . . . . τὴν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἱμβρύωνθαι τοῦ Πετροῦ. Euthym. Only be assigns a didactic purpose, to teach us moderation in our tears; I should rather believe the self-restraint to have been exercised as a preparation for what followed. —The caves were generally horizontal, natural or artificial,—with recesses in the sides, where the bodies were laid. There is no necessity here for supposing the entrance to have been otherwise than horizontal; see reff.—
Probably, from this circumstance, as from 'the Jews' coming to condole,—and the costly ointment,—the family was wealthy.—38. The corpse had not been embalmed, but merely 'wrapped in linen clothes with spices, as the manner of the Jews is to bury,'—see ch. xix. 40, and ver. 44 below.—There is no reason to avoid the assumption of the plain fact (see below) stated in ἐν πνεύματι. I cannot see that any monstrous character (Ols. Trench) is given to the miracle by it; any more than such a character can be predicated of restoring the withered hand. In fact, the very act of death is the beginning of decomposition. I have no hesitation with almost all the ancient, and many of the best modern commentators, in assuming ἐν πνεύματι as a fact, and indeed with Stier, believing it to be spoken not as a supposition, but as a fact. The entrances to these vaults were not built up,—merely defended, by a stone being rolled to them, from the jackals and beasts of prey. —40.] I can hardly think she supposed merely that Jesus desired to look on the face of the dead;—she expected something was about to be done, but in her anxiety for decorum (Luke x. 40) she was willing to avoid the consequence of opening the cave. This feeling Jesus here rebukes, by referring her to the plain duty of simple faith, insisted on by
KATA IΩANNHΝ.

34—47.

τοῦ θεοῦ; 44 ἦραν οὖν τὸν λίθον [οὐ ἦν †]. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἦν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἄνω καὶ εἶπε Πάπερ, ἐνυχαριστῶ σοι ὅτι ἠκούσας μοι. 45 ἐγὼ δὲ ὕδευν ὅτι πάντοτε μου ἀκούεις ἀλλὰ διὰ τῶν ὄχλων τὸν περισσότερον εἶπον, ἵνα πιστεύσωσιν ὅτι σὺ με ἀπίστευσας. 46 καὶ ταύτα εἰπὼν ὁ Ματθ. xii. 19 ἀλ. φωνὴν μεγάλην ἐκραύγασε Λάζαρε, ἐξόρῳ ἐξώ. 44 καὶ ἐζητεῖν ὁ τιθυμικὸς θεωμένος τοὺς ποδᾶς καὶ τὰς χειρὰς κερίας, καὶ ἡ δόξη αὐτοῦ ὑπερλέξει. 45 λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἰδίατε αὐτῶν καὶ ἐφετε ὑπάγειν.

45 Πολλοὶ οὖν ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων οἱ ἑλθόντες πρὸς τὴν Μαρίαν καὶ θεσάμενοι ἀπὸ τούτων ἀπέπληθον πρὸς τοὺς Φαρισαίους καὶ εἶπον αὐτοῖς ἡ ἐπιστάσεις ὁ Ἰησοῦς.

ABD

Orig.—γάρ om. D. — 40. rec. δύο with K U al. txt A B C D E F G H L M S X a 5 al. Orig. Cyr. — 41. δόσει ἄνθρωπον D.—οὐ δὲ om. B C D L X 3 abc Syr. Sahid. Ἐθ. Arm. Orig. Chrys. ins. A.—rec. ἐπὶ τιθυμικούς κεκεῖνον with qu. om. ABCDKLX 3 abc Syr. Sahid. Ἐθ. Arm. Orig. Chrys. — 42. δὲ om. D.—ἐπὶ ἐφέτερην C'. txt A B D Orig. — 44. και om. B C L Q T 2 Copt. Sahid. Orig. ins. (και εἴθες δ') ἄβαστας om. A X a al.—ἀπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ B C L 2 Copt. Sahid. Orig. Basil. Chrys. om. A D abc. — 45. ἐκ om. D d. τῶν λαθ. D.—for κ. θ., ἰωβακεῖος D Copt. Arm.—for α, 3 A B C D 3 Syr. txt A abc Orig.—ο Ἰησ. om. A B C' (prob.) K L X be Orig. Copt. Sahid. Arm. txt D a Orig. — 46. for δ, 3 C D M 3 Copt. δοᾶ A K ? θ al. txt B.— 47. δότι om. D.—for παλ., Him before (v. 26, 28? or in some other teaching?) as the condition of beholding the glory of God (not merely in the event about to follow,—for that was seen by many who did not believe,—but in a deeper sense,—that of the unfolding of the ἀναστάσεως εὐθεία in the personal being).—45, 46.] In the filial relation of the Lord Jesus to the Father, all power is given to Him: the Son can do nothing of Himself:—and during His humiliation on earth, these acts of power were done by Him, not by that glory of His own which He had laid aside, but by the mighty working of the Father in Him, and in answer to His prayer: the difference between Him and us in this respect being, that His prayer was always heard,—even (Heb. v. 7) that in Gethsemane. And this γευομας μου He states here for the benefit of the standers-by, that they might know the truth of His repeated assertions of His mission from the Father. At the same time He guards this, ver. 42, from future misconstruction, as though He had no more power than men who pray, by ἵνα δὲ γένει 51 πάντοτε μου ἀκούεις, 'because Thou and I are One.'—When He prayed, does not appear. Probably in Peræa, before the declaration in ver. 4. —43.] Some (Chrys. Lampe) suppose that the re-vivification had taken place before ἐγκαύκησεν σοι,—and these words were merely a summoning forth. But this is highly improbable. The comparison of ch. v. 25, 26, which are analogically applicable, makes it clear that ἐκκαύκησεν σοι was the physical as well as spiritual order of things. —κραυγάζων was not His wont; see ref. This cry signified that greater one, which all shall hear, ch. v. 28.—44.] It does not appear whether the bands were wound about each limb, as in the Egyptian mummies, so as merely to impede motion,—or were loosely wrapped round both feet and both hands, so as to hinder any free movement altogether. The latter seems most probable.—The συνδέοντας appears to have tied up his chin. —ἐλευθέρως, probably, to his home. —45—57.] Consequences of the miracle. Meeting of the Sanhedrim and final determination to put Jesus to death. He retires to Ephraim. —48.] The 84 (see on ver. 37) certainly shows that this was done with a hostile intent: not in doubt as to Q a
the miracle, any more than in the case of the blind man, ch. ix., but with a view to stir up the rulers yet more against Him. —This Evangelist is very simple, and at the same time very consistent, in his use of *particles*: almost throughout His Gospel the great subject, the manifestation of the Glory of Christ, is carried onward by *όπως*, whereas *οὐ* as generally prefaces the development of the antagonist manifestation of hatred and rejection of Him. —47.] Their words may be read two ways: with, or without, a question after *ποιεῖν*. (1) is the ordinary way. (2) *What do we, seeing that, because this man doeth many miracles?* —48.] They evidently regarded the result of *all believing on Him*, as likely to be, that He would be *set up as king*; which would soon bring about the ruin here mentioned. Augustine (in Ev. Joh. Tract xlix.) understands it differently: that, all men being persuaded by Him to peaceful lives, they would have no one to join them in revolt against the Romans; but this seems forced: for no *διάσωσιν* would in that case be provoked. —τῶν *τῶνων* not, the temple (sc. *αὐτῶν, Acts vi. 13. 2 Mac. v. 19 hardly applies, being the place which the Lord chose to put His Name there, not τῶν ζωάν *τῶνων*) but *our place,* as in ref.: i. e. our local habitation, and our national existence. Both these literally came to pass.—Whether this fear was earnestly expressed, or only as a covert for their enmity, does not appear. —49—52.] The counsel is given in political subtilty, and was intended by Caiaphas in the sense of political expediency only. But it pleased God to make Him, as High Priest, the special though involuntary organ of the Holy Spirit, and thus to utter by him a prophecy of the death of Christ and its effects. That this is the only sense to be given, appears from the consideration that the whole of vv. 51, 52 cannot for a moment be supposed to have been in the mind of Caiaphas; and to divide it and suppose the latter part to be the addition of the Evangelist, is quite unjustifiable.—*And* τούτων ἐκείνων *repeated again, ch. xviii.*—He was High Priest during the whole Procuratorship of Pontius Pilate, eleven years: Jos. Antt. xviii. 2, 2, and 4, 3.—We can hardly understand τού ἤν, ἐκ. *in that remarkable year,* as we have no instance of time being so specified. Rather, as there certainly is a doubt about the legitimacy of Caiaphas’s High Priesthood, I should understand the words to refer to some official distinction from Annas (the High Priest de jure), the exact nature of which is lost to us.—οὖν *ἐκείνων:* probably various methods of action had been suggested. —*καὶ* *τούτων* *ἐκείνων* repeated again, ch. xviii. —*We can hardly understand τοῦ ἤν, ἐκ.* *in that remarkable year,* as we have no instance of time being so specified. Rather, as there certainly is a doubt about the legitimacy of Caiaphas’s High Priesthood, I should understand the words to refer to some official distinction from Annas (the High Priest de jure), the exact nature of which is lost to us.—οὖν *ἐκείνων:* probably various methods of action had been suggested. —*καὶ* *τούτων* *ἐκείνων* repeated again, ch. xviii.
of his prophecy. And τοῦ Ítvν. is guarded from misunderstandings by what follows. — τ. τά. τ. θεόν. ... are the παρασκευής eis γένος τινας of ch. x. 12, among all nations; see ch. x. 16. — 53.] The decision, to put Him to death, is understood: and from that day they plotted that they might slay Him (not, how they might slay Him). — 54.] Ephraim is mentioned 2 Chron. xiii. 19 in connexion with Bethel, as also by Jos. B. J. iv. 9, 9. — ἄγγ. τ. ἑρ., near the desert of Judah. Its situation is at present unknown. Robinson (Harmony, p. 204) supposes it to be the same with Ophirah and Ephron of the O. T., and the modern el-Taybeh, twenty R. miles from Jerusalem. — 55.] In τ. χερ. not, from the country, but, from the country generally. — ἀν τ. ἴτ. To purify themselves from any Levitical uncleanness, that they might be able to keep the Passover; see Num. ix. 10. 2 Chron. xxxix. 17. Acts xxii. 24. — 56.] τι Σκ. ἣμα.; and ἢλιον ὑπὸ μὴ Ἕλθα. ... are two separate questions, as in E. V. The making them one, is hardly grammatical. — ὑπὸ μὴ Ἕλθα. must have a future sense; whereas in that case it would be past: 'what think ye, that He is not (i. e. of His not having) come to the feast?' — 57.] The import of this ver. depends on the insertion or omission of the κατ. Without it, it is merely an explanation of the people's question: 'For the chief priests ' &c.: with it, it would mean, 'And besides, the chief priests' &c. i. e. not only did the people question, but' &c. The former is in my view most probable; for the command, having been given, would satisfactorily account for the questioning, and not be stated merely as co-ordinate with it.
±εις την ήμεραν τουν τον Ισσους. 5) Aφες αυτην. 6) εις την ήμεραν τουν τον Ισσους.

or whether He arrived at the commencement of the Sabbath, i. e. sunset.—or a little after, on Friday evening, from Jericho.

3.) See notes on Matt. —3.) λύπαν. 4.) See note on Luke vii. 38. —4.) For Judas, we have αυτος, αντιβα. Matt. —των merely, Mark. See note on Matt. ver. 8. —5.) τρακκορ. 4ην. —Common to our narrative, and Mark. See note on Mark, cir init. The sum is about 97. 16s. of our money (Friedlieb, p. 31). —6.) γραφαις, των μεν εκλεκτων γλωττων. Phryn. (De Wette), to keep the reeds, or tongues, of wind instruments:—thus, generally, any kind of pouch, or money-chest. —διαστατεν}
12. Τῇ ἐπαύριον ὀχλος πολὺς ὡς ἐλθὼν εἰς τὴν ἐντρήν, ἀκούσαντες ὅτι ἐρχεται ὁ Ἰσσοῦς εἰς Ιεροσολύμα, 13. ἔλαβον τα ὑβα τῶν φανικῶν καὶ ἐξῆλθον εἰς ὑπάντησιν αὐτῶ, καὶ ἐκατον ὁμοναὶ ἢσαν ἐκάθεν ἐπ' αὐτῷ, καθὼς ἐστὶ γεγραμμένον ἢσαν ἐκάθεν ἐπί τῶν ὄνων.

14. ὁ Ἰσσοῦς ἀνάριον ἐκάθεν ἐπί αὐτῷ, καθὼς ἐστὶ γεγραμμένον ἢσαν ἐκάθεν ἐπί τῶν ὄνων. 15. ἢσαν μφοβοὺς ἡ θυγατὴ Σώφων ἴδου ὁ βασιλεὺς σου ἔρχεται καθήμενος ἐπί τῶν ὄνων, ᾿αλλ’ ἢσαν ζουκάσθη ὁ Ἰσσοῦς, τότε ἐκνήθησαν ὅτι ταῦτα ἦν ἐπὶ αὐτῷ, γεγραμμένα καὶ ταῦτα ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ. 16. ἢσαν ἐμπρπηρεύον ὁ ὄχλος ὃν μετ' αὐτοῦ, ὅτι τοῦ Λάξαρον ἔφωνησεν ἐκ τοῦ μνημείου καὶ ἡγείρεν αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν. 17. διὰ τὸ τοῦτο καὶ ἤπνηθησαν αὐτῷ ὁ ὄχλος, ὅτι ἤκουσε τοῦτο αὐτὸν πεποιηκέναι τὸ σημεῖον. 18. ὁ Θεὸς ὁ Θεοσαίοι ἐπέν αὐτοὺς ἡμεῖς ὧν ἢσαν ἐκκολλητεῖ ὑπεν' ὁ κόσμος ὁπίσω αὐτοῦ ἀπήλθην.

—10.] ἢσαν, not 'came to a (formal) resolution,' but 'were in the mind,' 'had an intention:' see Acts v. 33. xv. 37.—The High Priests, named here and in ch. xi. 67, were of the sect of the Sadducees; and therefore disbelieved the fact of the raising of Lazarus; only viewing him as one whom it would be desirable to put out of the way as an object of popular attention in connexion with Jesus.

19—20.] The triumphal entry into Jerusalem. Matt. xxi. 1—17. Mark xi. 1—11. Luke xix. 29—44. On the chronology, see note on Matt. xxi. 1.—12.] τῇ ἐντρή, i.e. on the Sunday:—see on ver. 1.—ἀκούσαν.] From the multitude who had returned from Bethany, ver. 9. The order of the narrative seems to require that these people should have visited Bethany late on the Sabbath, after sunset, and the anointing. 13. τα ὑβα τ. τ. φ. The articles show that the palm-trees were on the spot; 'the branches of the palm-trees;' or perhaps (Lücken) that the custom was usual at such festivities.—14—16.] The Evangelist seems to suppose his readers already acquainted with the circumstances of the triumphal entry, and therefore relates it thus compendiously.—ἀπῆλθαν does not involve any discrepancy with the three Evangelists, but is a compendious term implying their details. —15.] The prophecy is more fully cited by Matt. —16.] Important, as showing that this, and probably other prophetic citations under similar circumstances, were the effect of the light poured into the minds of the apostles by the Holy Spirit after the Ascension. —.FileWriter ὁσαντα ῦτα αἰφής.] viz. the going out to meet Him, strewing clothes and branches in the way, and shouting ' Hosanna' before Him: also perhaps, the setting Him on the ass, implied in the concise narrative.—17.] Retaining ὁραία, I would not render it 'that,' but 'because,' and leave ἄφθαρτος unconnected with it, and absolute, as in ch. i. 18. 32. The testimony in Luke xix. 37, 38. —18.] I see no necessity for supposing this multitude distinct from that in the last verse. We have had no account of any
multitude coming from Bethany with Him, nor does this narrative imply it: and surely δέχομαι in the two verses must mean the same persons. The καί here does not imply another δέχομαι, but 'And on this account too the multitude' &c. i.e. their coming out to meet Him and their ἡμερία on the Mount of Olives, had one and the same cause,—the raining of Lazarus. — 19.] κόσμον, τὰ πλήθη λέγουσιν. Euthyn. — ἀναβαύνεσθαι must not be pressed to signify, apostasy from Judaism. It is merely used to signify entire devotion to Him whithersoever He might lead them, as in Mark i. 20.

20. — 26.] More public discourses of Christ. — 20. These Ἑλληνες were not Greek Jews,—who would not have been so called: but Gentiles, 'proselytes of the gate,' who were in the habit (implied by the pres. part., ἀναβαύνεσθαι) of coming up to the feast;—see ch. vii. 35 and note: also Acts viii. 26. — 21.] For what reason Philip was selected, it is impossible to say. The Greek form of his name may imply some connexion with Hellenistic Jews, who may have been friends or relatives of these Greeks. They could hardly have been from the neighbourhood of Bethsaida, or they would have been familiar with the person of Jesus. — 22.] Andrew (ch. i. 44) was of the same city as Philip: and this reason of Philip conferring with him is perhaps implied in the τῆς Ἰωάννου τῆς Β. τ. Γ. — 23.] Did the Greeks see (i.e. speak with) Jesus, or not? Certainly not, if I understand His discourse rightly. But they may have been present at, and have understood it. The substance of His answer (στρέφεται, to Philip and Andrew, not to the Greeks) is, that the time was now come for His glorification, which should draw all nations to Him: —but that glorification must be accomplished by His Death. The very appearance of these Greeks is to Him a token that His glorification is at hand. Stier strikingly says, 'These men from the West at the end of the Life of Jesus, set forth the same as the Magi from the East at its beginning—but they come to the Cross of the King, as those to His crucible.' (A. J. v. 78.) The rejection of these Greeks shows their unbelief is the secondary subject, and is commented on by the Evangelist vv. 37—43. — 24.] The grain of wheat perishes, and is not apparent (as the seeds of dicotyledonous plants are) in the new plant:—see 1 Cor. xv. 36. The saying is more than a mere parabolic similitude: the Divine vine which has fixed the law of the springing up of the wheat-corn, has also determined the law of the glorification of the Son of Man, and the one in analogy with the other: i.e. both through Death. —The symbolism here lies at the root of that in ch. vi., where Christ is Ἰησοῦς τῆς γενεάς (w. c.—25.) And this same Divine Law prevails for the disciples, as well as for their Master;—see Matt. x. 39 and note. But the saying here proclaims more plainly its true extent,—by its immediate connexion with ver. 24, and by οὗτοι ἐμοί, ἡμείς. —ψωψήσεται is not really in a double sense: as the wheat-corn retains its identity, though it
die, so the ψυχή: so that the two senses are, in their depth, but one. ψυχή is the life in both cases; not the soul, in the present acceptance of that term. — 26.] Connexion: — The ministering to Christ (the position of Philip and Andrew and the rest, and that into which these Greeks seemed desirous to enter) implies following Him. 
—and that, through tribulation to glory. — εἰμι] the essential present — in My true place, i.e. (ch. xvii. 24) in the glory of the Father. — τῷ Θεῷ] By glorifying Him in My glorification, ch. xvii. 24.— 27.] 'Concurrebat horror mortis et ardor obedientiae' (Bengel). And to express both these together in human speech was impossible: therefore τί εἰπώ; — The following words must not be taken interrogatively (as by Theophyl., Grot., Tholuck, al.); for thus the whole sense is destroyed, besides the sentiment being most unworthy of Him Who uttered it. The prayer is a tender prayer; and answers to the prophetic Messianic prayers in the Psalms, which thus run — 'My soul is troubled; Lord, help me' (Ps. lxxix. 1. xi. 12, 13. xxv. 17. vi. 3, 4 al.); and to that prayer afterwards in Gethsemane, Matt. xxvi. 39. — διὰ τοῦτοι The misunderstanding of these words has principally led to the erroneous punctuation just noticed. διὰ τοῦτο = ἐν συνεδρίᾳ τῆς ὁρας ταυτῆς. 'I came to this hour for this very purpose—that I might be saved from this hour!' i.e. 'the going into, and exhausting, this hour, this cup, is the very appointed way of My glorification.' 
Das Ehreteinmen men ist selbst kein Ehrenbrest, sondern Leiden selbst die Erhebung! (Stier, v. 89.—28.) The glorifying the Name of the Father can only take place by the glorification of the Son; and this latter only by His death: so that this is the 'ardor obedientiae' triumphant. — φωνή] This 'voice' can no otherwise be understood, than as a plain articulate sound, miraculously spoken, heard by all, and variously interpreted. On the saying of the crowd (ver. 29) has been built the erroneous and unworthy notion, that it was only thunder, but understood by the Lord and the disciples to mean as here stated (!1). — The Jewish Bath Kol has no applicability here. — ἐνδυσάμενος] In the manifestation hitherto made of the Son of God, imperfect as it was (see Matt. xvi. 16, 17); in all O. T. type and prophecy; — in creation; — and indeed (Aug.) 'antequam facierum mundum.' — πάλιν is here no mere repetition, but an intensification of the δοξάσεως, a 'yet once more.' — 29.] Some heard words, but did not apprehend their meaning; others a sound, but no words. I should rather believe this difficult verse has been proportioned to each man's inner relation to Christ, than fortuitous. — 30.] άυστος ή φωνή could not by any possibility have been said to them, if it had only thunderted. — The Lord does not say that the assurance was not made for His sake; — He had prayed, and His prayer had been answered; — but that it had not been thus outwardly expressed for His, but for their sake. This is likewise true in the case of all testimonies to Him; — and especially those two other voices from heaven,— at His Baptism and His Transfiguration. — ως is the whole multitude, viz. merely the disciples. All heard, and all might have understood, the voice; see ch. xi. 42. — 31.] All this is a comment on διὰ τοῦτο εἰς τῆς ὁρα, ver. 23: and now a different side of the subject is taken up, and one having
immediate reference to the occasion: viz. the drawing of the Gentile world to Him. —now He speaks of Himself as having actually entered the hour of His passion, and views the result as already come. —καταθήκη] not (Chrys., Cyril, Aug., Grøn.) 'the deliverance of this world from the devil,' — nor, 'decision concerning this world, who is to possess it (Bengel):' — but (see ch. xvi. 11) judgment, properly so called, the work of the Spirit who was to come, on the world, which διὰ καὶ τῷ πνεύματι εἰσήκουσαι, 1 John x. 19. — δὲ εἰσχ. τ. κ. τ. Τ.] The ἐπώνυμον of the Jews, Satan, the δὲ τὸ ποιμέν τῷ συντόνων of 2 Cor. iv. 4: see also Eph. ii. 2. vi. 12. Observe it is ἐκλάθηται, not ἐκλάθησαται, because the casting out (ἐκς, ἐκ τῆς ἀρχῆς, Buthym., Grøn.) shall be gradual, as the drawing in the next verse. But after the death of Christ the casting out began, and its first-fruits were, the coming in of the Gentiles into the Church. —33.] See ch. iii. 14. viii. 26. Here there is more perhaps implied in ἔπειτα than in either of those places; viz. the Death, with all its consequences. The Saviour crucified, is in fact the Saviour glorified; so that the exalting is set forth by that uplifting on the cross. —Θάνατος] By the diffusion of the Spirit in the Church: —so (Rev. xxii. 17) τὸ πνεύμα κ. κ. νῦν ἐν ἤγγελων, ἀληθ.: manifested in the preaching of the Word mediatly, and the pleading of the Spirit immediately. Before the glorification of Christ, the Father drew men to the Son (see ch. vii. 44 and note), but now the Son Himself to Him-
37 Τοσοῦτα δὲ αὐτοῦ ἢ σημέα πεποιηκότος εἰμι προσθέν αὐτῶν ὤκ ἐπίστευον ἐις αὐτόν. 38 ἢ ἰα ὁ λόγος Ἡσαίου τοῦ προφήτου πληρώθη ὑμῖν ἐπὶ, Κύριε, τίς ἐπίστευε τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν; καὶ ὁ Ἰσραὴλ κυρίον τίνι ἄπικαλύφθη; 39 διὰ τούτο ὠκ ἠδυναμοῖ πιστεύειν ὅτι πάλιν εἶπεν Ἡσαίας. 40 Ὁ τενύθλωκεν αὐτῶν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς, καὶ ἐφερέωκεν αὐτῶν τὴν καρδίαν, ἵνα μὴ ἴξωσι τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς καὶ νοῆσαι τῇ καρδίᾳ καὶ ἐπιστραφούσι καὶ ἵσαροι αὐτούς. 41 ταύτα εἶπεν Ἡσαίας ὅτε εἶδε τὴν δοξαν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐλάλησε περί αὐτοῦ. 42 ὅμως μένει· ἐκ τῶν ἀρχικῶν πολλοί ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτούς, ἀλλὰ διὰ τῶν Φαρισαίων ὑπὸ ἱμαλογίου, ἵνα μὴ ἀποσυνάπτων γίνεται. 43 γηγήπησαν γὰρ τὴν δοξαν τῶν ἀνθρώπων μαλλον ἄπερ τὴν δοξαν τοῦ θεοῦ. 44 Ἡσαίας ἐς ἐξερήτησε καὶ εἶπεν Ο πιστεύων εἰς εἰμέ, ὁ to: 'His (David's) seed shall endure for ever, and his throne as the sun before Me.' 

—περπατ. i.e. 'make use of the Light, do your work in it, and by it.' —οὐκ οἰδ. τινα. 'Has no guide nor security, no principle to lead him.' —36. It is by believing on the Light, that men become sons of light:—see ch. i. 12. —The Lord probably went to Bethany, Luke xxi. 37.

37—43.] Remarks of the Evangelist on the unbelief of the Jews. —I do not regard these verses as forming the conclusion to the narrative of the public ministry of the Lord, on account of vv. 44—50 (where see note); but doubtless the approaching close of that ministry gives occasion to them, and is the time to which they refer. —37. τοσοῦτα, so great:—see ch. ix. 16. xv. 24. —οὐκ εἰςτοιων. i.e. the generality did not:—they did not, as a people:—see ver. 42.—38. on Ἰνα πληρ. see note, Matt. i. 22. —39. διὰ τοῦτο refers to the last verse, and Ἐρυς gives another reason for the same:—see ch. v. 16. 1 John iii. 1. Matt. xxiv. 44. I have punctuated accordingly. The common interpretation (Theophyl., Vulg., Lampe, Tholuck, Ols., Meyer, al.), by which διὰ τοῦτο is referred forward to Ἐρυς, would require some particle, eai, or ὅτι, to denote a transition to the fresh subject. De Wette, Lücke 3, Grot. al.—οὐκ ἐμπώς. 'could not'—i.e. it was otherwise ordained in the Divine counsels. No attempt to escape this will agree with the prophecy cited ver. 40. But the inability, as thus stated, is coincident with the fullest fulfillment of the human will:—compare οὐθές, ch. v. 40. —ἐρυς, not 'for,' but 'because.' A second ground is alleged why they could not believe:—see above. —40.] The prophecy is freely cited, after neither the Heb. nor the LXX, which is followed in Matt. xiii. 14 f. What God bids the prophet do, is here described as done, and by Himself: which is obviously implied in the Heb. text. —The reading αὐτῶν (Morav.), supplying οὐ μὴν αὐτός as the subject of τιμήθη, and πρῶτος, is out of the question,—as ungrammatical, and inconsistent with the context, which will only allow of οὐ κύριος (i.e. Jehovah) as the subject. —41.] αὐτός, of Christ. The Evangelist is giving his judgment, —having (Luke xxiv. 45) had his understanding opened to understand the Scriptures,—that the passage In Isa. is spoken of Christ. And indeed, strictly considered, the glory which Isa. saw could only be that of the Son, Who is the διάφορος τῆς δόξας of the Father, Not only that I have seen, —43. e.g. Nicodemos, Joseph, and others like them.—On ἰδον, see note, ch. ix. 22.—43.] is a reference to ch. v. 44.
unbelief, from the words of Jesus Himself.

—It was by the older commentators generally thought that these verses formed part of some other discourse delivered at this period. But this is improbable, from no occasion being specified,—from ver. 36,—and from the form and contents of the passage, and its reference to the foregoing remarks of the Evangelist. I take it—

with almost all modern commentators—to be a continuation of those remarks, substantiated by the circumstances of the Lord Himself. The words are taken mostly, but not altogether, from discourses already given in this Gospel. —44, 45.] ἐκ π. εἰρ. not pluperf. but indef. however, as ἠστενεσαν, ἀγαπ., and ἡγα. above.—

ἐκ. is used of open public teaching, see reff.—see ch. v. 24, 38. viii. 19, 42. xiv. 10. The words are in close connexion with ver. 41, in which the Evangelist has said that the glory of Jehovah and His glory were the same. —46.] See ver. 55. ch. viii. 12. ix. 5. The μαθηταί here expresses that all are originally in darkness,—as μινα, ch. iii. 36. —47.] See ch. iii. 17. v. 45. viii. 16. The omission of με (see var. read.) appears to have been occasioned by a mistaken idea that vv. 46 and 47 were in contrast to one another. —48.] See ch. iii. 18, also v. 45 ff., and Heb. iv. 12.—On ἡμέραν and με σα. see reff.—49.] See ch. v. 30. vii. 16, 17, 28, 29. viii. 26, 28, 38. On ἐνθλαθ., x. 18.

—There does not appear to be any real difference here, though many have been suggested, between ἐνθλαθε and ἐλαθε: both are summed up in ἐλαθε in the next verse:—comp. Matt. x. 19.—50.] See ch. vi. 63 (and note). 69. On οὐδη, ch. iii. 11. v. 32. viii. 55.—The ἐνθλαθε αὐτῶν is, results in, not as a means merely, but in its accomplishment and expansion, eternal life: see ch. iii. 15. v. 24. vi. 40.—Thus all who do not believe are without excuse;—because Jesus is not come, and speaks not of Himself, but of the Father, Whose will and commandment respecting Him is, that He should be, and give, Life to all. They who reject Him, reject Life, and (ch. iii. 19) prefer darkness to Light.

CHAP. XIII. I.—90.] Jesus washes the disciples’ feet.—On the chronological difficulties, see note, Matt. xxvi. 17.—There can be no reasonable doubt that this meal was the same as that at which the Lord’s Supper was instituted, as related in the three Evangelists.—The narrative proceeds without any break until ch. xvii. 26, after which the Lord and the disciples go to Gethsemane. —1.] ποῦ ῥεῖ πάσα ῥ. —How long, is not said: but probably, a very short time:—not more than one day at the most;—see ch. xviii. 28 and note. The words belong to the whole narrative following, not to ἰδίως or οὐδαμῶς.—ἔλθει: The view with which the Lord washed His disciples’
feet, is shown by the repeated εἰδὼς, and by ἀγαπᾶσας...αὐτοῦ. The connexion is:—'Jesus loved His own even to the end (of His life in the flesh), and gave them in the washing of their feet a proof of His love; and to this act He was induced by the knowledge that He must soon leave this world; and although this knowledge was united (ver. 3) with the highest consciousness of His Divine mission and speedy glorification, yet this latter did not prevent Him from giving this proof of His self-humiliation (see following).’ (Delitzsch).—See ch. xvii. 11.—Σ. B. ἦν: not as E. V. ‘supper being ended,’ for (ver. 12) He reclined again, and in ver. 26, the supper is still going on;—but, ‘supper being prepared,’ or, ‘going on,’—see ἐν τῷ γεύματι ἐν Βηθ. Matt. xxvi. 6. ‘While Jesus was at B.;’—and πρὸς γεωργοῦντα, ‘when it was morning,’ ch. xxi. 4.—τοῦ δ. Ἡσ. β. ἦσ. Judas had before this covenanted with the Sanhedrin to betray Him, Matt. xxvi. 14 and 15, which must here be meant by the devil having put it into His heart;—the thorough self-abandonment to Satan which led to the actual deed, being designated ver. 27.—Luke (xxii. 3) expresses the steps of his treasonable purpose otherwise,—meaning the same. The fact is here stated, to enhance the love which Jesus showed in the following action. —3. See above. He did what follows with a full sense of the glory and dignity of His own Person. ‘Praefatio glorise est instar protestationis, ne quid indignum faciebam existimetur Dominus pedes suorum lavans.’ Bengal.—The perfect, δισελέας, and present, δισελέω, are used indefinitely: of *things fixed in the counsel of God.*—4.] τὰ ὑπ’ ἐσθήσασα, hos, que lotionem impedirent.’ Bengal. He put Himself into the ordinary dress of a servant. —5.] τῶν νυν, the vessel usually at hand for such purposes. The context shows that He had washed the feet of one or more before the incident of the next verse. —ἔρημεν expresses His doing something unusual and unlooked for. —6.] Aug., Beza. Grot., Baumgarten-Crusius, suppose Peter to have been first, and this οὖν to be a new taking up of the narrative: ‘οὖν hic est specialius rem arrantia.’ Grot. But this is to do violence to the narrative. —νῦντες ‘art θάλασ σ washing (intending to wash) my feet?’ Every word rises in emphasis. He thinks the act unworthy of the Lord; even as many think that great act of Love to have been, which was typified by it. —7.] Hitherto the Lord had been silent. He repeats the εὕρω and ὅτι, but so as to set forth Himself as the Master, Peter as the disciple, not wholly cognizant of His will and purpose, and therefore more properly found in subjection to it.—ἐν εὐθείᾳ] i. e. (1) this washing itself, as a lesson of humility and love, ver. 14. (2) Its symbolical meaning, vv. 9, 10. (3) The great Act of Love, the laying aside My glory, and becoming in the form of a servant, that the washing of the Holy Spirit may cleanse men,—μετὰ ταύτα] (1) was known very soon, but
(2) and (3) not till after the Spirit was given. — 8.] The rash and self-opinionated Peter opposes to μετὰ τὰύτης his αὐτῷ...[el.] alone. In interpreting the Lord's answer, we must remember, that He replies more to the spirit of Peter's objection, than to his words. The same well-meaning but false humility would prevent him (and does prevent many) from stooping to receive at the hands of the Lord that spiritual washing which is absolutely necessary in order to have any part in Him, Rom. viii. 9. That the outward washing only is not here meant, is plain from the fact, that Judas was washed, but yet had no part in Jesus. — 8.] The warm-hearted Peter, on learning that excusation would be the consequence of not being washed, can hardly have enough of a cleansing so precious. There surely is implied in this answer an incipient apprehension of the meaning of the Lord's words. The ἄνω μῆν υἱὸς σω ἔχω has awakened him, as the Lord's presence did, Luke v. 8, a feeling of his own want of cleansing, his entire pollution. This sense (Stier, Bengel, Baumgarten-Cruses) is denied by Lücke and Olah. — 10.] Reference appears to be made to the fact that one who has bathed, after he has reached his home, needs not entirely washing, but only to have his feet washed from the road. This bathing, the bath of the new birth, but only yet in its foreshadowing, in the purifying effect of faith working by love, the Apostles, with one exception, had; and this foot-washing represented to them, besides its lesson of humility and brotherly love, their daily need of cleansing from daily pollution, even after spiritual regeneration, at the hands of their Divine Master. See 2 Cor. vii. 1. James i. 21. Acts xv. 8, 9. 2 Pet. ii. 22.—On καθ. ἐστι, see note, ch. xv. 3. —11.] τὸν παραδίδοντα, as ὁ ἱράχμενος, 'him that should betray Him,' the indefinite characteristic present. — 12.] As Peter was not the first, so neither was he the last. Judging by the sequel, John was probably first, then Peter, then the rest. —γνώσε. τὶ τοῖς. [el. These words, are uttered, not so much in expectation of an answer, as to direct more attention to the following. —13.] ὁ δὲ δεικνύεται: and δὲ are titular nominatives, as in Rev. vi. 8. viii. 11 (Winer, § 29. 2). —14.] 'Pedilavium, quod Dominus discipulis adhibuit, pertinebat et ad beneficium conferendæ puritatis totalis, et ad warfare docendæ diœctionis humilis, ver. 34, coll. ver. 1. Inde pedilavium disciplorum inter se eon pertinet, ut alter alterum quoque modo adjuvet ad consequendum puritatem anime; et ut alter alteri pedes lavet...—vel propriæ, l Tim. v. 16, idque serio, si soli, accidet, ut opus sit: est enim præceps appetitum affirmativum, obligans semper, sed non ad semper: quæ estiam illud, 1 John iii. 16. —vel synchocis per omne genus officiorum, quæ alteri etiam servilia et sordida, modo opportuna, presumptio testat. Dominus igitur per ipsum
pedialium purificavi; discipulos; quare etiam Petrum amanter coeget: sed discipulorum pedialium mutuum non hoc nomine precepit; neque adeo tanta est pedialis literatus imitandi necessitas, quantum nonnulli statuerunt; quam Johannes v. gr. Thome pedes nusquam laverit; et tamen major pedialium Dominici et fraterni similitudo, quam plerique agnoscent. Hodie pontifices et principes pedialium ad litteram imitantur: magis sicut admirandus foret, v. gr. pontifici, unius regis, quam duodecim præfragrum pedes, seris humbleitate, v. Lasius, in Act. xxi. 38. Bengel. The custom of literally and ceremonially washing the feet in obedience to this command, is not found before the fourth century. —15.] καθώς, not 3, ἤγω ἢν. The Lord's action was symbolical, and is best imitated in His followers by endeavouring, 'if a man be overtaken in a fault, to restore (καταργιζων) such an one in the spirit of meekness;' Gal. vi. 1. —16. 17.] The proverbial expression ὁκ ὅτι λα. is used here in a different sense from ch. xv. 20. Here it is, 'If the Master thus humbles Himself, much more should His servants and messengers;' see Matt. x. 24. Luke vi. 40; and on ver. 17. Luke xii. 48. The mere recognition of such a duty of humility, is a very much more easy matter than the putting it in practice. —18.] 'I say it not (viz. the λα. ποιήσα αὐτῇ) of you all: for there is one who never can be μαράτος.' The Lord repeats His ἀλλ' οίχε πάντως of ver. 10, and the sad recollection leads to His trouble in spirit, ver. 21. — ἦν ὦ ἄν.; The ἦν is emphatic; and the reason of its emphasis is given in ver. 19. —Connexx. 'It might be supposed that this treachery has come upon Me unawares; but it is not so: I know those whom I have selected (viz., the whole twelve; see ch. vi. 70, not only the true ones (Stier), as in ch. xv. 16, said when Judas was not present): but this has been done by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, declared in the Scriptures.'—On the citation, see LXX. The words here are given freely, μισέω τὸν ἀποκ. B C L 1 Orig. (thrice) only. —20. καὶ ὁ λ. μικρ. D.—pedialium purificavi: discipulos; quare etiam Petrum amanter coeget: sed discipulorum pedialium mutuum non hoc nomine precepit; neque adeo tanta est pediali literaturae imitatione necessitas, quam nonnulli statuerunt; quam Johannes v. gr. Thome pedes nusquam laverit; et tamen major pedialium Dominici et fratris similaritate, quam plerique agnoscent. Hodie pontifices et principes pedialium ad litteram imitantur: magis sicut admirandus foret, v. gr. pontifici, unius regis, quam duodecim præfragrum pedes, seris humilitate, v. Lasius, in Act. xxi. 38. Bengel. The custom of literally and ceremonially washing the feet in obedience to this command, is not found before the fourth century. —15.] καθώς, not 3, ἤγω ἢν. The Lord's action was symbolical, and is best imitated in His followers by endeavouring, 'if a man be overtaken in a fault, to restore (καταργιζων) such an one in the spirit of meekness;' Gal. vi. 1. —16. 17.] The proverbial expression ὁκ ὅτι λα. is used here in a different sense from ch. xv. 20. Here it is, 'If the Master thus humbles Himself, much more should His servants and messengers;' see Matt. x. 24. Luke vi. 40; and on ver. 17. Luke xii. 48. The mere recognition of such a duty of humility, is a very much more easy matter than the putting it in practice. —18.] 'I say it not (viz. the λα. ποιήσα αὐτῇ) of you all: for there is one who never can be μαράτος.' The Lord repeats His ἀλλ' οίχε πάντως of ver. 10, and the sad recollection leads to His trouble in spirit, ver. 21. — ἦν ὦ ἄν.; The ἦν is emphatic; and the reason of its emphasis is given in ver. 19. —Connexx. 'It might be supposed that this treachery has come upon Me unawares; but it is not so: I know those whom I have selected (viz., the whole twelve; see ch. vi. 70, not only the true ones (Stier), as in ch. xv. 16, said when Judas was not present): but this has been done by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, declared in the Scriptures.'—On the citation, see LXX. The words here are given freely, μισέω τὸν ἀποκ. B C L 1 Orig. (thrice) only. —20. καὶ ὁ λ. μικρ. D.
this likely, in a discourse of the Lord?—I rather believe that the saying sets forth the dignity of that office from which Judas was about to fall: q. d. 'not only was he in close intercourse with Me, (ver. 18,) but invested with an ambassadorial commission for Me, and in Me, for the Father;' and yet He will lift up his head against Me.' And the consideration of this discourse in its connection, as contrasted with the sad announcement just to be made, leads on to the ἵππαρχη τῷ πν. of the next verse.

21—30.] Announcement of the treason of Judas, and his departure from the supper-room. See notes on Matt. xxvi. 21—25. Mark xiv. 18—21. Luke xxi. 21—23. 31.] see above. One of those mysterious outbursts of spirit, which passed over the Lord,—ch. xi. 33 and xii. 27,—εἰμι υἱός, implies the delivery of some solemn and important announcement. —This was the first time He had ever spoken so plainly. All four Evangelists agree in the substance of the announcement. —32.] So, exactly, Luke, ver. 23. In Matt. and Mark they express their questioning in words. The exact coincidence of Luke's narrative may help us to decide a much controverted question,—where in John's narrative the institution of the Lord's supper is to be inserted? I believe certainly before this announcement, as in Luke; and if before it, perhaps before the washing of the disciples' feet: for I see no break which would admit it between our ver. 1 and ver. 21. —33.] Since the captivity, the Jews lay at table in the Persian manner, on divans or couches, each on his left side, with his face towards the table, his left elbow resting on a pillow and supporting his head. Thus the second guest to the right hand lay with his head near the back of the first, and so on (Lücke ii. 565).—The disciple meant is John himself, see ch. xxi. 20; also designated thus, ch. xix. 26. xxi. 7. 20 (see Prolegomena to John, § 1. 6.). —34—36.] See note on Matt. ver. 23. —The reading (see var. read.) καὶ λέγει αὐξ Ἐκτις τις ἰσιν περὶ ὧν λέγει, is remarkable, and probably genuine. According to it, Peter imagines that John, as the beloved disciple, would know: but he, not knowing, asks of the Lord.—It is an argument for this reading that (Schulz) John never elsewhere uses the ὑπόθεσις.—36.] ἀναγράφω, adopted by Lachm., is only (De Wette) used in N. T. of sitting (lying) at meal.—ὁδῷς after ἐκτις is probably genuine, as in ch. iv. 6. I understand it, that John, who was before lying close to the bosom (ἐκ τοῦ κόλπῳ) of Jesus, now leaned his head absolutely upon His breast, to ask the question. This escaped the notice of the rest at the table: see on Matt. as above. —36.] This = Matt. ver. 23, Mark, ver. 20. —τὸ ψ., probably a piece of the unlearned
bread, dipped in the broth made of bitter herbs.—27.] *post officiam, non cum officia.* Bengel. This giving the sop was one of the closest testimonies of friendly affection. —*εἰσαθεν τε κατὰ τὸν σπαθικον.* See ver. 3 and note. Satan entered full into him, took full possession of him; so that his will was not only bent upon doing the deed of treachery, but fixed and determined to do it *then and there.* —δι' αυτόν... ] These words are not to be evaded, as being permissive (Grot.) or dismissive (οὔτε προσκάτωνος οὔτε συμβολουντός, ἀλλ' ἐνειδιζόντος καὶ διεισνόντος δι' αὐτὸς μὲν ἢς ἀκόλουθον διαδρόμωσας, εἰπὼν δὲ εἰδοφθόνως εἰχὼν, ἀφισάμεν αὐτόν. Chrys.).—They are like the saying of God to Balsam, Num. xxii. 20,—and of our Lord to the Pharisees, Matt. xxiii. 32. The course of sinful action is presupposed, and the command to go on is but the echo of that mysterious appointment by which the sinner in the exercise of his own corrupted will becomes the instrument of the purposes of God. Thus it is not δ, or εἰ τι, πουσένα, but δι' αυτόν:—that which thou art doing, hast just now determined to put in present action, do more quickly (than thou seemest willing); reproving his lingering, and his pretending—(Matt. ver. 28.)—to share in the general doubt.—28.] Not even John: who knew he was the traitor, but had no idea the deed was so soon to be done (Lücke, De Wette). Stier supposes John to exclude himself in saying ἀπελθεῖς τε, ἀπεκριθαίνης, and that he knew.—29.] The first supposition agrees with ver. 1,—that it was πρὸ τῆς ἐρήμης τοῦ πάσχα. Had it been the night of the passover, the next day being hallowed as a sabbath, nothing could have been bought. On the second supposition, see ch. xii. 5. The gift to the poor might be, to help them to procure their paschal lamb.—30.] The remark ἤ τε ὅτι (which certainly concludes this period, see οὕτως ὅτι, ver. 12.) seems to be added to bring the whole narrative from ch. xiii. 1 to ch. xviii. 3 into precision, as happening on one and the same night. It is fanciful to see, as Orig., Olsch., Stier, &c. have done, an allusion to the *sera* in Judas's soul, or the hour of darkness, Luke xxii. 53; though doubtless *there* the Lord alludes to its being *also night.*
is the glorifying of God by Christ on earth, in His course of obedience as the Son of Man, which was completed by His death (οὐχίσεως μετὰ δοθέων, Phil. ii. 8). And His death was the transition-point between God being glorified in Him, and He being glorified in God—manifested to be the Son of God, with power by His resurrection, and received up to the Father, to sit at the right hand of God. This latter (ver. 32) is spoken of by Him here as future, but immediate (ἦδοθε) on His death, and leads on to the address in ver. 33. —ἐν δάφνι is in God (the Father), not in Christ. —ἐναντίως reflects back on the subject of the sentence: —and ἐν is not 'by means of,' 'but in,' by the resurrection of Him into that glory, which He had indeed before, but now has as the Son of Man, with the risen Manhood: so παρά σοι in Gal. xvii. 5.—Grotius compares 1 Sam. ii. 50 (τοῖς δοκάζων ἡμῖν δοκάζων, LXX.). —ἀντιπαραστάτη εἰς τὸ παθῆν τὸ μεῖζον, ὥς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πειράσεως. Origen.—32.—καθότι—here only used by Christ—affectingly expresses His not only brotherly, but fatherly love (Is. ix. 6) for His own, and at the same time their immature and weak state, now about to be left without Him.—καθότι εἰς ἑαυτόν. But naturally the two clauses, 'Ye shall seek Me and not find Me, and shall die in your sins,' also spoken to the Jews (ch. viii. 33. viii. 21), are here omitted: and by this omission the connexion with ver. 34 is supplied:—'Ye shall be left here: but, unlike the Jews, ye shall seek Me and shall find Me, and the way is that of Love—to Me, and to one another (so Stier, v. 169)—forming (ver. 35) an united Body, the Church, in which all shall recognize My presence among you as My disciples.'—33.—The καυνός of this commandment consists in its simplicity and (so to speak) unicity. The same kind of love was prescribed in the O. T. (see Rom. xiii. 8): —'as thyself' is the highest measure of love, and it is therefore not in degree that the new commandment differs (Cyr., Euthym.) from the old, nor in extent, but in being the commandment of the new covenant,—the first-fruit of the Spirit in the new dispensation (Gal. v. 22): see 1 John ii. 7, 8 (and note), where καυνός is commented on by the Apostle himself. —I cannot agree with Stier (v. 171), that ἵνα in the second sentence is not ως with ἵνα in the first, but signifies 'in order that.' The sentence is analogous to ver. 14, and the new point in it is the καυνός ὑμῶν, which is therefore set first, and should be (as in R. V.) retained so. —35.—πάντες,—all the world—and not for mere vain praise or display before the world, but that men may be attracted by the exhibition of the Spirit of Christ, and won over to Him. The world, notwithstanding this proof of His presence among them, shall hate them: see 1 John iii. 10—15. —But among πάντες they themselves are also included—brotherly love is the true sign to them of being children of God, 1 John ii. 3—5. —36.—This announcement of Peter's denial is probably the same with that in Luke xxii. 33 ff., where see notes: but distinct from that on the way to Gethsemane, Matt. xxvi. 34. Mark xiv. 29.—6στρ. 6δ. ἄκριτον:] alluding probably both to the future reception of His Apostle into His glory, and to the particular path by
[μοι]. 37 λέγει αυτῷ ὁ Πέτρος Κύριε, διατι οὐ δύναμαι b Matt. ix. 11, σοι. * ἀκολουθήσας ἀρτί; τίνι ψυχήν μου ὑπέρ σου ἔσων. c Ex. x. 11, 15 38 ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς Τίνι ψυχήν σου ὑπέρ ἐμοῦ ἔσων; * ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, οὐ μη ἀλήκτωρ  ὑφίσται, εἶ ἐς τοὺς γ νωστοῖς με τεῖς. XIV. 1 Μη γὰρ ταρασσόμενοι ἢ μὲν ἡ καρδία: πιστεύετε εἰς τὸν θεὸν, καὶ εἰς ἐμὲ πιστεύετε. 2 ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ τοῦ πατρὸς μου ἕκαστο εἰς ἐμέ δὲ, μη, εἰπον ἄν ἢ μὴν ἢ πορεύομαι ἢ ἐρωτάσασθαι τόπον ὑμῖν. 3 ἐὰν πορεύθω καὶ ἐτοιμάσω ὑμῖν τόπον, πάλιν ἐρχομαι καὶ ἐγὼ με ἐμαυτόν, ἵνα ὑμῖν εἰμί ἐγώ.


which he should come to that glory; as in ch. xxi. 18, 19. — 37. Peter understands the Lord's death to be meant;—see Luke, ver. 33. — 38. The διατί is not answered—but Peter's boast solemnly questioned. See a similar question, ch. i. 51. There was at the same time a startling inversion of the subsequent facts, in this boast; to which the Lord, I think, alludes in His question,—r. ψ. σου ὑπέρ ἐμοῦ ἔσων;—The υνὶ ἀκολ. φαιν. necessarily implies, as it was night, ἵνα νυκτὶ πάρηση,—and binds the whole events of this chapter to ch. xviii.

Chap. XIV. 1—31.] This first division of the great discourse is spent in comforting the disciples for their Lord's departure. — 1.] A pause has intervened; 'Peter is humbled and silent' (Lücke); the rest are ταρασσόμενοι τῇ καρδίᾳ on account of the sad things of which they had been hearing;—Judas's treachery,—Peter's denial,—the Lord's departure from them.—πιστεύετε both times is imperative. So Cyril, Nonnus, Theophylact, Euth., Aug., Hil.,—Lampe, Lücke, De Wette, Stier, Tholuck (ed. 6). Many (Erasmus, Bez., Grot., Olah., also E. V.) take the first as indic., the second as imper., 'Ye believe in God; believe also in Me.' But this is inconsistent with the whole tenour of the discourse, which presupposes a want of belief in God in its full and true sense, as begetting trust in Him. The command is intimately connected with ch. xiii. 31, 32, faith in the glorification of Christ in the Father, and of the Father in Him. — 2.] This comfort—of being reunited to their Lord—is administered to them as τεκνία, in forms of speech simple, and adapted to their powers of apprehension of spiritual things. The oikia is Heaven: Ps. xxxiii. 13, 14. Isa. lxxii. 15. In it are many (in number—not in degree of dignity, as Clem. Alex., Basil, Theod., Chrys., Theophylact, Tert., Hil., Aug., &c., at least no such meaning is here conveyed) abiding places; room enough for them all;—καὶ δὲ διὰ αὐτοῦ ἤμασταν καὶ ὑμᾶς συνεργοῦμεν μὴν ἀπῆκομεν. Euthym. If not,—if they could not follow Him thither, He would not have concealed this from them. This last assurance is one calculated to begot entire trust and confidence; He would not in any matter hold out vain hopes to them;—His word to them would plainly state all difficulties and discouragements,—as indeed He does, ch. xv. 18. xvi. 1. 4, which last verse ἢν μὴ μισώσεις... δὲ ἐγὼ ἐπιστρέφων ἢν, is decisive for the above interpretation here, against those who would join δὲ πορεύομαι:... with ἐπιστρέφων ἢν (Euthym., Aug., Erasm., Luther, Bengel):—which besides does violence to the next verse, where the 'going to prepare a place' is stated as a fact.—

The ἐνοχής may have been inserted as a δὲ recit. to favour the view just controverted; but it may also be 'for,' and belong to the whole sense of vv. 1, 2, as a reason why their heart should not be troubled.—The ἐπιστρέφων τόπων is that of which we sing, —When Thou hast overcome the sharpness of death: Thou didst open the Kingdom of Heaven to all believers:—see note on Luke xxiii. 43. And thus it is τόπων, not τὰς μονὰς:—the place as a whole, not each man's place in it. — 3.] In order to understand this, we must bear in mind what...
Stier well calls the 'perspective' of prophecy. The coming again of the Lord is not one single act,—as His resurrection, or the descent of the Spirit, or His second personal advent, or the final coming to judgment; but the great complex of all these, the result of which shall be, His taking His people to Himself to be where He is. This ἐξορία is begun (ver. 18) in His Resurrection—carried on (ver. 23) in the spiritual life (see also ch. xvi. 22 ff.), the making them ready for the place prepared,—further advanced when each by death is fetched away to be with Him (Phil. i. 23)—fully completed at coming in glory, when they shall for ever be with Him (1 Thess. iv. 17) in the perfected resurrection state. —4. They might have known, and doubtless did know in some sense;—but, as Lampe remarks, 'interdum quis laudatur ut officii sui monerat.' We use thus 'you know,'—leaving to be supplied, 'if you would give the matter thought.'—διώκειν, to the Father; τὴν ὀφθαλμον (in the Lord's own case, of which this ver. treats), His death. —5.] Thomas is slow of belief and apprehension. The answer to σκοτεινεῖς; ch. xiii. 37, which Peter seems to have apprehended, was not sufficient for him; see ch. xx. 25. —8.] The Lord, as Lücke (after Bengel) remarks (li. 596), inverts the order of Thomas's question, and in answering it practically, for them, speaks of 'the Way' first. He is the way; not merely the forerunner; which would imply on our part only an outward connexion with Him as His forerunner;—but the way, in and on which we must go, having an inner union with and in Him (De Wette) (see Heb. x. 20). —9.] more than διὰ αἰλθινοῦ κ. πάντως ἵσταται ταῦτα. Euth. —It is another side of the same idea of the Way;—God being true and only approached by and in truth, Christ is the Truth (Col. ii. 3), in Whom only that Knowledge of Him is gained, which (ch. xvii. 3) is eternal life. —9. [ἐνωτίς not merely because ὁ δὲ κύριος διαστήσα ὑμᾶς ἔμω. Euth.,—but as being the Life of all His, in Whom only they who live can come to the living Father (ch. vi. 57).]—οὐδεὶς ἐπ. This plainly states the πάντως ὀπίγιον, and the way also. —τοις ὀφθαλμοῖς τῆς ὀφθαλμοῦ. —7. See ch. viii. 19.—4ἀπ' ἀρχῆς. There is no difficulty, if we bear in mind the νῦν of ch. xiiii. 31. The 'henceforth' is the future time, beginning with the Lord's glorification, which was now at hand. Lücke remarks: 'ἀπ' ἀρχῆς is not entirely future nor entirely present, but the moment of transition, the identification of the present and future. Christ speaks here prophetically, in reference to the hour of His glorification being come' (ii. 696). We have ἐπάνω προηγούμενον, ch. ix. 37. —8.] Philip misunderstands ἐν ἑαυτῷ mean 'solely in a vision,'—and infers that one such sight of God would set at rest all their fears, and give them perfect confidence. —9.] The Son is the only Exponent of the Father to men: see ch. xii. 44, 45. Col. i. 15. Heb.
The work which He did by Peter's sermon, Acts ii., was one of these μείζωνα τοινών, —the first-fruits of the unspeakable gift.

This union of them with and in Him is expressed here by τα ἵστη. (ἐγὼ Πνεῦμα, κάκειφος ποιήσα.) —‘He has sown, we reap; and the harvest is greater than the seed-time.’ Stier, v. 220. —13.) I have retained the period after πορεύσαμαι (Grot., Griseb., Lachm., Knapp, Lücke, Meyer, Stier place a comma only, and connect this verse with the 5th), because the sense remains much the same, and the style is better preserved —αὐτογενές, scil. τον παραλογος; so ch. xvi. 23. But this does not exclude, but distinctly includes, prayer to Christ; so blended are these two (as the δόξα, ver. 9), that we have not ποιήσας, but ποιήσας, and, ver. 14, emphatically, ἐγὼ ποιήσῳ. He who prays to the Father, prays to the Son.—This ποιήσαι answers to the ποιήσας in ver. 12; the reason why you shall do these greater works, is, on account of the all powerful Spirit of grace and supplication which My going to the Father shall bring down upon the Church; in answer to which Spirit, I will do by you whatever in My Name (i.e. in union with Me, as being Mine, manifesting forth Jesus as the Son of God), ye shall ask. And the end of this is, that by these μείζωνα τοινών, the wonders of grace and triumphs of the Spirit, the Father may be glorified (His glory shown forth) in and by the Son.—14.) solemnly repeats as a promise, what was incidentally asserted before: — For this...
is a truth, that whatever &c. And besides, adds the εἶπεν: 'it is I that will do it.' showing that the use of the first person before was emphatic. — 18.] is a following out of ἐν τῷ ὑμνημων: 'That way of prayer is the way of loving obedience, in which the Spirit is ever found, and which is unhindered by His help,' and also of τινα διδ. ὡς εἰν τῷ ζω, 'As the Father is honoured in the Son, so must the Son be honoured in you.' —see ch. x. 10. — 18.] And then the Spirit shall proceed forth upon you. Not αἰρήσω, but ἐρωτήσω—'familiaris potendi modus,' Bengel: rather perhaps, a manner of asking implying actual presence and nearness,—and here used of the mediatorial office in Christ's ascended state.—παράκλητον. Oehler remarks that the interpretations of this word range themselves in two classes, which again by no means exclude one another—those of 'Comforter,' and those of 'Advocate.'—[Teacher (The Dome of Mommsen and Emsen) is out of the question.—] The etymology of the word requires the latter as its strict meaning, and in this strict meaning it satisfies 1 John ii. 1, παράκλητον ἠγομον πρὸς τῶν πατέρων, ἦσον τούτων; but so not all the places where it is used is the Holy Spirit,—nor this verse, where of the Son and Spirit both. And therefore the other meaning, Comforter, including as it does in its fulness (see Rom. viii. 26, where both, the συναντάμεναισθαί and the ὑπερνευχάναισθαί, are united) the Advocate also, has been both here and in Germany (Zwölf, Luther) sanctioned by Christian usage as the most adequate rendering. See Archdeacon Hare's Mission of the Comforter, vol. ii. note 18. He shows that Wiclif, from whom we have our 'Comforter,' often used comfort for the Latin confortari, as e.g. Luke xxii. 43. Acts ix. 19 al. Thus the idea of help and strength is conveyed by it, as well as of consolation. —It was this office (comfortari) which Jesus had filled to His disciples while with them; and which the Holy Spirit was to fill even more abundantly (and in a higher sense, because their state would be higher) on the removal of Jesus from them. —27.] τὸ πνεύμα τὸ αληθινόν, 1 John v. 6: —of Whom alone comes, and Who alone leads into the whole truth, the truth of God, ch. xvi. 13.—ὁ κόσμος, ὃς εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἐρχόμενον, ὁ παρ' ὑμῖν, καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν, 17: 18. —οὐκ ἀφέσας ὑμᾶς ὁ οὐρανός, ὃς εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ὃς εἰς τὸν κόσμον.
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έτι θωρείτη, ύμεις δὲ θωρείτε με. ὅτι ἐγὼ ᾽Ω, καὶ ύμεις ζήσατε. 20 ἐν ἐκείνη τῇ ἡμέρᾳ γνώσασθαι ύμεῖς ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρί μου καὶ ύμεῖς ἐν ἐμοί κἀγὼ ἐν ὑμῖν. 21 ὃ ἐχον ἀ.— ch. v. 38. τὰς ἑντολάς μου καὶ τηροῦν αὐτὰς, εἰκείνοις ἄστιν ὁ b ver. 15. ἀγαπῶν με· ὃ δὲ ἀγαπῶν με ἀγαπηθήσεται ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς μου, καὶ ἐγὼ ἀγαπήσω αὐτὸν καὶ ἐμφανίσω αὐτῷ ἐμαυτόν. 22 Λέγει αὐτῷ Ἰσαάκα, οὐχ ὁ Ἰσακαρίωτης, ὁ Ἰσαϊς, οὐκ εἰς ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Ἠσιων ἄπεκριθη ὁ Ἰσαϊς, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Ἠσιων. 23 Εἀν τις ἀγαπᾷ με, τὸν λόγον μου τηρήσει, καὶ τὸ πατήρ μου ἀγαπήσει αὐτὸν καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐλευσόμεθα καὶ μονὴν παρ᾽ αὐτῷ ποιήσωμεν. 24 ὁ μὲν ἀγαπῶν με τοὺς ἐν τῃριμ. 22 ref. λόγους μου οὐ τηρεῖ καὶ ὁ λόγος ὃν ἀκούει οὐκ ἐστιν ἐμὸς, ἀλλὰ τοῦ πνευματός με πατρὸς. 25 Τάυτα λελάληκα ὑμῖν τῷ πατρὶ μου ἐν τῷ οὐνόματί μου, εἰκείνοις

ABD καὶ οὐχὶ τῷ κόσμῳ; 23 ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰσαϊς, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Ἠσιων.

Resurrection, which was but a pledge of His lasting presence in the Spirit: see on ver. 3. ἐρχομαι is (as there) the complex of these—the great Re-vivification, in all its blessed progress. 19—21.] This ἐρχομαι is explained to consist in His presence among them by the Life of His Resurrection, which is that by (ver. 20) the witness of the Spirit in their hearts: and (ver. 21) their sanctification by the Spirit in love, and the consequent manifestation of Jesus to them.

19.] The immediate reference of this θωρείτε is to the forty days (see Acts x. 41),—but only as leading on to its wider and deeper reference to the spiritual life. ξέω, not ξησάω—the principle of Life being immanent in Him.—ζήσασθε, in all its fulness, including the most blessed sense of ζητεῖ, the life of the Spirit, here and hereafter.

20.] ἤκαθεν, no particular day: but 'each of these periods, as its continually increasing light breaks upon you, shall bring increased knowledge of your unity in Me with the Father, and My dwelling in you by the Spirit.'—21.] ἔχον κ. τηροῦν, 'qui habet in memoria et servat in vita.' Aug. Or perhaps more accurately (with Stier), 'He who has my com. as being My disciple by outward profession, and keeps them:'—see Luke xi. 28.—And τηρ. is more of the inner will to keep them, than the absolute observance, which can only follow on high degrees of spiritual advancement.—ἡμφ. adv. 4.] by the Holy Spirit: see ch. xvi. 14. This (as Stier observes) is the highest promise which can be made to man (see ver. 23), and yet it is made to every man who ἰησ. τηρητις the com. of the Lord Jesus. 22.] Ἰσαϊς, εὑρ. δ Ἰσαϊας ὁ Ἰσαϊῶν ἤστε τηρητις τοῦ Λουκᾶν. 16: see note on Matt. x. 3. The question seems to be put with the Jewish idea, that the Messiah, the King and Judge of the nations, must necessarily manifest Himself to the world.—τι γέγ. ὅτι, 'What has happened, that . . .?' i.e., 'how is it, that . . .?'—23, 24.] These verses contain the answer to the question in both its parts,—ἡμῖν, because love to Christ, leading to the keeping of His word, is the necessary condition of the indwelling and manifestation in man of the Father and the Son;—οὑ χ. τῇ κασάω, because want of love to Christ, leading to neglect of His words, necessarily excludes from communion with the Father and the Son, and the Spirit, who reveals the Son in man. 'For the word which ye hear (and which the world ob τηρητις οὖν, is not Mine, but the Father's.' On the gracious and wonderful promise of ver. 23, see Rom. viii. 15.—25.] λελάληκα is proleptic, referring, as ἐτοι (ver. 26), to the futures διάδεξεν κ. ὑπομονής—26.] q. d. 'I know that ye do not understand
them yet: but &c. — to τον να την συν. The Paraclete is now more closely defined by this well-known Name, and by θ πιστεύονται τον πατέρα, kai εἰστὶν &c. . . . designated personally, as One sent, and One acting on them. — ἐν τῇ ὥρᾳ μου] not, 'in My stead,' but in regard of Me—in answer to My prayer, and prayers in My name, —to those who bear My name, —as a means of manifesting Me. — τὰ δέ ματὶ, τὰ stands by itself, not with &c.:—shall teach you all things—all that can and may be learnt by you, all that belongs to your work and life in Me. — ὁ υἱός ὁ μου What is not understood is liable to be forgotten; and therefore in this word is implied the giving them a right understanding of, as well as recalling, what Jesus had said to them: see ch. ii. xii. 16. — It is on the fulfillment of this promise to the Apostles, that their sufficiency as Witnesses of all that the Lord did and taught, and consequently the authenticity of the Gospel narrative, is grounded. — 27.] This is introduced by ver. 25, which suggests the speedy close of the discourse. It was customary to take leave with wishes of peace:—so I Sam. i. 17. Luke vii. 50. Acts xvi. 36. 1 Pet. v. 14. 3 John 15. Also, to re-assure by such words, see Gen. xxii. 23. Judg. vi. 23. But the Lord distinguishes His peace, true peace, 'the peace which I have and give' (see John xv. 11), from the mere empty word used in the world's forms of greeting. Peace (in general) He leaves with them;—His peace He gives to them, and above and above that other. The καθὼς δὲ κ. διδ. must refer, I think (with Lampe, Lücke, and Stier), to the world's manner of giving—not to the unreality of the world's peace, of which, however true, there is no direct mention here. The world can only give peace in empty formular, saying 'Peace, peace,' when there is no peace: Jer. vi. 14 al. — 28.] as far as υἱός is a reason why their heart should not be troubled:—then the rest of the verse removes all ground of διαλείψεως, since it is an exaltation of Him whom they loved, which is about to happen; and therefore a ground of joy, and not of fear.—μακαρία This word, as Luther well remarks (Stier, v. 266), is not here used as referring to the Nature or Essence of the Son as related to the Father,—but as indicating that particular subordination to the Father in which the Lord Jesus then was,—and the cessation of the state of humiliation, and entering into His glory, which would take place on His being received up to the Father. So also Calvin: 'Non confert hic Christus Patris Divinitatem cum suis, nec humanum suam naturalum divinam Patris essentialis comparat, sed potius statum presentem coelesti glorie ad quam mox recipiendus erat.' And Cocceius: 'non intelligent hic minoritas secundum naturam humanam, — quia intelligentur minoritas quae per profectionem ad Patrem deposita est (Stier, ibid. Similarly De Wette, Tholuck).—And this removes all reason for fear, as they will be exalted in Him. — The whole doctrinal controversy which has been raised on these words (especially by the Fathers against the Arians, see Suicer, Thes. ii. p. 1368, 9), seems not to belong to the sense of the passage. That there is a sense in which the Father is greater than even the glorified Son, is beyond doubt: but as on the one hand that concession is no concession to Arianism, because it is not in the essential being of the Son, but in His Mediatorial office that this minoritas consists, —so on the other hand this verse implies in itself no such minoritas, the discourse being of another kind. — 39.] εἰρήνη — viz. 'all this,'—esp. the prophecies of My Resurrection and Ascension,' &c.—πώς.* See ch. xii. 19, where ὅτι εἰρήνη et εἰς is supplied. 'That ye may believe,' in the fullest sense of the word. 'Neque enim Eum Dei Filium
non et ante credebat: sed cum in Iutto factum esset quod antre predixit, fides illa que tunc quando illis logebatur fuit parva, et cum moreretur pene jam nulla, et revixit et crevit. Aug. in Joh. Tract. 79. — 56.] οὐκ ἔστιν οὐκ ἡ λ. — then, as Stier remarks, He had some words more to say, and was not about to break off at ver. 31, as some have supposed. — ὁ τ. κ. ἐρχεται | i. e. Satan: — not, Satan in Judas, but Satan himself, with whom the Lord was in conflict during His passion: see Luke iv. 13 (and note), and ch. xxii. 53. — τὸ έμελεμον οὐκ έχει οὐδέ, οὐδέ, | nullum sediscit omnino peccatum. Aug. This is the only true interpretation: ' has nothing in Me' — no point of appliance whereon to fasten his attack. De Wette, Lücke, Tholuck, and many others render it, ' has no power over Me.' — οὐκ δέν αἰτεών θανάτου, Euthym. — 31.] ' But My death is an act of voluntary obedience, that it may be known that I love and obey the Father— that the glory of the Father in and by Me may be manifested.' — The construction is elliptic: supply, 'But (his power over Me for death will be permitted by Me) that,' &c. — And set a period at τοῦ, as usually done. — έγειρε. έγινε. έσται.] These words imply a movement from the table to depart. Probably the rest of the discourse, and the prayer, ch. xvii., were delivered when now all were standing ready to depart. There would be some little pause, in which the preparations for departure would be made. But the place is clearly the same, see ch. xviii. 1, ταύτα εἰσεῖν δ' ἵσθος . — besides which,— we can hardly suppose (Grot., &c.) discourses of a character like those in ch. xv. xvi. to have been delivered to as many as eleven persons, while walking by the sea, and in a time of such publicity as that of the Passchal Feast. Still less is the supposition of Bengel and Beausobre probable,—that ch. xiii. xiv. happened outside the city, and that between ch. xiv. and xv. the paschal meal takes place. Compare also ch. xiii. 30 and ch. xviii. 28, which are decisive against this idea.

CHAP. XV. 1—8.] Parabolic allegory of the vine and branches. — Various suggestive circumstances have been imagined, but none of them are satisfactory. The vineyards on the way to Gethsemane (Lampe), — the carved vine on the great doors of the temple (Rosenmuller, bibl. exeq. Repert. i. 166 (Lücke), — see Joseph. B. J. v. 5, 4. Antt. xv. 11, 3); a vine trained about the window of the guest-chamber (Knapp. Lücke conj. Tholuck, 6), are all fanciful, and the two first (see on ch. xiv. 31) inapplicable. But I believe with Lücke that most probably the Lord did not take the similitude from any outward suggesting occasion, but as a means of illustrating the great subject, the inner unity of Himself and His. Occasion enough was furnished, by the O. T. symbolism of the vineyard and the vine, — Isa. v. 1 ff. Jer. ii. 11. Ezek. xix. 10 ff., and especially Ps. lxxx. 8—19; by intimate analogy of vegetable life (of which the tree bearing fruit is the highest kind, and of such trees the vine the noblest,) with spiritual, and perhaps also by the γίνεσθαι τῆς ἀμυρικής having been so recently the subject of their attention and the Lord's prophecy, Luke xxii. 18 and ||. — 1.] The Vine and branches stand in a much nearer connexion than the Shepherd and the sheep, or the lord of the vineyard and the vines; and answer to the Head and members in Eph. v. 23. 30. Col. ii. 19, linked together by a common organization, and informed by one and the same life. — ἀμυρικήτα] not only, ' by which prophecy is fulfilled,' but only, 'in which the organism and qualities of the vine are most nobly realized' (Tholuck), but, as in ch. i. 9, original, archetypal. The mate-
rial creations of God are only inferior examples of that finer spiritual life and organism in which the creature is raised up to partake of the divine nature; only ἅγιοι τῶν ἁλότοιν, Heb. ix. 24; ὑποτιθεμένα τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐδ., ib. 23; see ch. vi. 32. — ἡ γεωργία) Not only the tiller of the land, but the vine-planter and dresser: He Who has originated the relation between the Vine and branches by planting the Vine in this earth (the nature of man), and Who looks for and ensures the bringing forth of fruit. — 2. The Vine contains fruitful, and unfruitful branches. Who are these unfruitful branches? Who are the branches? Clearly, all those who, adopting the parallel image, are made members of Christ by baptism, Rom. vii. 8. 4; considered under v. 4, and also Rom. xi. 17 f.f. The Vine is the visible Church here, of which Christ is the inclusive Head: the Vine contains the branches; hence the unfruitful, as well as the fruitful, are ἐν γοργοῖς. — Every such unfruitful branch the Father αἰμων — pulls off and casts away: and every such that beareth fruit He καθαρίσει (an allusion to αἰμων, but only in the Greek (?) prunes, by cleansing it of its worthless parts and shortening its rank growth, that it may ripen and enlarge its fruit better. — The two, πᾶν κλ., καὶ πᾶν, are pendent nominatives; a construction usual with John in connexion with πᾶν, see ch. iii. 29, xvii. 2. — 3. καθαρίσει, see ch. xiii. 10. In Eph. v. 26 we have both the washing and the word united. The word of Christ dwelling in them by Faith (see ver. 7) is the purifying principle (ch. xvii. 17). But the καθαρισμένον, pruned, in the sense of ver. 2. The δὲ limits it to their present capacities and standing. There was more pruning at hand, when the sap should begin to flow; when the Spirit should be shed abroad; and this future handling of the γεωργία is indicated by μειώνεται ἐν ἑμοί. . . . — 4. καθήθη ἐξ ὦς τὸ κλῆμα καὶ ἐξηράνθη, καὶ ἐν συνάγουσιν αὐτὰ καὶ εἰς

Chap. XV. 1. bef. γεωργ. om. ὁ Δ Δ.— 2. τὸ καρποφόρον D.—καθαρίσει D. B.—3. from θάνος to φέρειν, ver. 4. om. D.— 4. μίνια ἂν ὁμοιότ. ὁ Β Β Ἰ Ἰ d. — 5. αἴτω ἴον, γάρ D. a. — 6. ὁμοίως ἐν τῇ ἑμοί, not (with Euthym. and Lücke) be taken as a promise, which (see on ἑμοί above) would be contrary to the sense: but (with Aug. Tholuck, Bengel, Stier, who however modifies it by rendering 'so abide in Me that I may abide in you') as a clause dependent on μειώνεται ἐν ἑμοί. 'Take care that ye abide in Me and I in you: both these being necessary to the bringing forth fruit: see ver. 8, where the two are similarly bound together.—Here the natural strictness of the similitude is departed from. The branch cannot sever itself from the vine: but, such a case supposed, every one will see the inevitable consequence. — It is the permitted freewill of the creature which makes the difference between the branches in the two cases. — 5.] The interpretation of the allegory which each mind was forming for itself, the Lord solemnly asserts for them. — ἡ χειρὶς ἡμ. is more than 'without Me,' it is, separate from Me, from being in Me and I in you. The δὲ regards what is implied in χειρὶς ἡμ. ob d. p. obb. rather than the words themselves: 'for union with Me is the sole efficient cause of fruit being produced, you having no power to do any thing (not, ταῖς καρπῶν: for φέρειν is here used throughout), to bring any thing to perfection, to do any of the αἴτω of that which ye are, separate from Me. — 6.] This verse is a most important testimony against supra-lapsarian error, showing
us that falling from grace is possible, and pointing out the steps of the fall. Observe this is not said of the unprofitable branch, which the Father takes away (in judgment) : but of one who will not abide in Christ, becomes separate from Him: (1) is cast out (of the vineyard, or of the Vine) like a (τὸ κλῆρον τῆς ἐρυθράνθεος. Euth.) branch in such a case: (2) becomes dried up, having lost the supply of life-giving sap (‘quenched the Spirit,’ 1 Thess. v. 19): (3) is gathered up with other such (Matt. xiii. 41) by the angels at the great day: (4) is cast into the fire, in any sense of being consumed; ‘unbửw μὴ βρέχεις,’ Luther. 7. — Exhortations and assurances following on the foregoing parable. — 7.] All bringing forth fruit is the result of answered prayer for the assisting grace of God: and therefore the answer of all prayer is here promised to those who abide in Christ and have His word (Heb. vi. 5) abiding in them. — αἰτήσεως is the imperative used prophetically of the future time. This not having been seen, it has probably been altered to αἰτήσεως: see ch. xiv. 13. — δὲ ἐὰν θηλήτη, in the supposed case, is necessarily in the way of God’s will, and as tending to τὸ κλῆρον καρπῶν δέρειν. — 8.] ὶν τοῦτο belongs to the following, not the preceding: ἵνα τοῦτο, ἵνα ... as in E. V., see ref. — ἄνθρωπος, again is prophetical, representing that in the spiritual dispensation the fact is habitually so. See on this sense of the aorist, Winer, § 41. 5. 1. — The τὸ κλῆρον καρπῶν is not merely ‘large success in the Apostolic mission,’ but ‘individual advance in bringing forth the fruits of the Spirit.’ — καὶ γεννησεθείναι, while this will be the same, may be rendered the love of Me, as in ref., — but the sense is not good, and the expression is not parallel with τῇ ᾽Ι. μου in ver. 10: so that I prefer ‘My love,’ the love which I have towards you; remain in it; do not cast yourselves out of it. The other sense is implied in this, but not expressed. — 10.] The way thus to remain is prescribed; even that way of simple obedience to His Will, which He followed to the Will of the Father. — 11.] λειαδ. again prophetical, hastening to the end of the discourse, and treating it as ended. — ἔχει, ἔχει] not ‘joy concerning Me’ (Euthym.), nor joy derived from Me (De Wette), nor ‘My joy over you’ (Aug. Lampe, Lücke, former edd.), but ‘My Joy,’ properly speaking: ‘His own holy exultation, the joy of the Son in the consciousness of the love of God, of His Unity with the Father; see ver. 10.’ (Lücke, 3rd ed.)
that His Joy, be uplifted and ennobled (Ἀληθεύοι) even to fulness—to the extreme of their capability and satisfaction,—and might remain so. — 12.] That He may show them that it is no rigid code of keeping commandments in the legal sense, ver. 11 is inserted, and now the commandment (as including all others) is again explained (see ch. xiii. 34) to be, mutual love,— and that, after His example of Love to them. — 13.] A difficulty has been unnecessarily found in this verse, because Paul, Rom. v. 6 ff., cites it as a nobler instance of love, that Christ died for us when we were enemies. But manifestly here the example is from common life, in which if a man did lay down his life it would naturally be for his friends; and would be, and is cited as, the greatest example of love. Nor again is there any doctrinal difficulty: the Lord does not assert of Himself, that He laid down His life only for His friends (as defined in the next verse), but puts forward this side of His love as a great and a practicable example for His followers. His own great Sacrifice of Himself lies in the back-ground of this verse; but only in the back-ground, and with but one side of it seen, viz., His love to them. See 1 Tim. iv. 16, and comp. 1 John iii. 16. — ἰδαν, as in ver. 8, depends on αὐτή, not on any will implied in ἄγαπη (De Wette), nor used ἀρκητεχως (Olah.), and answers to scriblicet, ut. — 14.] Parallel to ver. 16, — and, like it, guided in vv. 15, 16, 17, from legal misinterpretation. — 15.] proleptically spoken, of the state in which He would place them under the Spirit. Nor is there any discrepancy with ch. xiii. 13, 16, and ver. 20, here, which are also spoken of their future condition: for in that sense both relations subsist together. It is the lower sense of δοῦλος which is brought out in this verse. — The proleptical character of the saying is clearly shown in the ὁδε γάρ τι ποιεῖται τὸ καθορισμένον ἀνθρώπου. The word, ᾠδή, is used in this sense of the future condition and its results. — 16.] ὁμοιότατον μὲν ὡς, ὡς ἡμέρα τοῦ πατρὸς οὐκ ἐνσήμαντο. ἐνσήμαντο: begins a new section, — 17.] ἄλλοι, ἐν γάρ ἐξελέξατο, αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἐξελέξαμεν, καὶ ἐκεῖνος ἧμας ἵνα ἦμεθα ἢμείς ἡμᾶς ὑπάγησε καὶ καρπὸν φέρετε καὶ οὗτος ἦμας ἴνα ὃ τι ἀν θησεῖτε τὸν πατέρα ἐν μιᾷ.
but (vv. 7, 8) the bearing fruit to God's glory is of the greater, being the result and aim of the other. — 17.] οὖτε refers (as almost always in John, see vv. 11. 21. xvi. 1. 25. 33. xvii. 1. xviii. 1. al.) back to what has gone before. — The object of My enjoining these things on you is, (for all since ver. 12 has been an expansion of καθώς ἡγ. ψ.) that ye love one another' (see 1 John iv. 11). Then from the indefiniteness of this word ἀλλήλους the Lord takes occasion to forewarn them that however wide their love to one another, they cannot bring all within this category; there will be κόσμος, which will hate them. 18.—CHAP. XVI. 4.] The Lord forewarns them of the hate and persecution of the unbelieving world. On the connexion, see above. — 18.] See ch. vii. 7. The great proof of this hatred to Him was yet to come, but is viewed as past.—This knowledge brings comfort, 1 Pet. iv. 12, 13. — 19.] not only explains this hatred, but derives additional comfort from it, as a sign that they were not (any longer) of the world; but chosen out of it by Him, and endowed with a new life from above. — In τὸ θεῖον θηλή, not ὑμᾶς ἰπ., we have the true practice of the world hinted at, and the false character of the world's love, as a mere φιλεία, set forth. In this 'loving their own,' the children of this world fall into hating one another. — 20.] ch. xiii. 16, but with a different reference: the sense here being, 'Remember the saying, for it is true in this matter also;' see Matt. x. 24, where it is used in the same sense.—A difficulty has been raised on θηράσαν... τρίχασιν, and some have wanted to give this word a hostile sense, as παρατηρεῖν, quoting Matt. xxvii. 36 (!) and Gen. iii. 15 (which is altogether an exceptional use if the reading is genuine). But in John this cannot be.—The words simply mean, 'the keeping My word and the keeping yours are intimately joined, and when you find the world or any part of the world do the first, you may infer the other.' The issue of εἰ τ. λ. μ. θηρ. was to be proved by their rejection and killing of the Lord Jesus. — 21.] τὰν οὖν—all that is implied in ματὸν and δικαιον.—It was on account of bearing the Name of Christ that the Christians were subjected to persecution in the early ages, and that they are even now hated by those who know Him not.—σὺν (οὐκ ἀποκρ.) not, 'they know Him not as having sent Me'—but 'they know not (absolutely) Him who has sent Me,' Ignorance of God (not desiring the knowledge of His ways) is the great cause of hostility to Christ and His servants. — 22.] See ch. ix. 41 and note.—Διὰ διάφορα, 'discoursed, generally: not, acquainted them with their sin. The sin spoken of is, not the generally sinful state of the world,—nor the sin of unbelief in Christ, which they of course could not have committed, had He never come; but the sin of hatred to Him and His, which might have been excused otherwise, but now that He had come and discoursed with them, had no excuse, since He had plainly shown them the proofs of His mission from the Father.
— 28.] See ch. xiv. 9. Human regards, whether of love or of hatred, towards Him who is the only manifestation of the Father to His creatures, are in fact directed towards the Father Himself; see Ps. lxxix. 9, cited in Rom. xv. 3. — 24.] He refers to the testimony of His works among them also, as leaving them again without excuse; — they had had ocular witness of His mission. — ιν αντότι — not to them (as Aug.), but as Acts ii. 22, "ιν μισον ομόν. — πεποίησαν is not, not only by external evidence, but also by internal, the right reading. πεποίησαν (as Lücke remarks, ii. 641) would imply that the ἄλλος referred to were contemporaries of our Lord; — or, at all events, that their works still lasted. — ισωμαται does not refer to the works (as Lücke), but to και ίδον και τον πατέρα μου, see ch. xiv. 9. — 25.] ἄλλα, — but all this not as an accidental thwarting of My word and work among them, but as a matter predicted in Scripture. — ιν το γ νόμον αυτών, see ch. x. 34 and note. — διερεύνω not, to no purpose, as Bengel (φρονημάτω), but as E. V. without a cause, answering to πρόφασιν ὑπὲρ ἰδον, ver. 22. — The citation is probably from the Messianic Psalm lxix. — 26.] This assurance carries on the testimony concerning Christ, — which the world should see and hear, and yet reject and hate Him, — even to the end of time, by means of the Spirit of Truth: so that on the one hand this seeing and hating must not be expected to cease as long as the Spirit bears this witness; — and on the other, He, the Spirit of Truth, will never cease to overcome the hating world by this His testimony. — δ παράκλητον See ch. xiv. 16 and note. — δν ἰγω πέμπω Stier (whose comment on this verse should be consulted) notices the adequate division of the clauses here, δ παράκλητον, δν ἰγω πέμπω, — but το πνεύμα τ ἁλ δ παρά τ πατέρα έκποιηται. The first clause being spoken economically, of the Spirit in His office as Paraclete, sent from the Father by the glorified Son (or, by the Father in the Son's name, ch. xiv. 26), and bringing in the dispensation of the Spirit; — the second ontologically, of the essential nature of the Spirit Himself, that He proceeded forth from the Father. (And if from the Father, from the Son also, see ch. xvi. 16, and those passages where the Spirit is said to be His Spirit, Rom. viii. 9. Gal. iv. 6. Phil. i. 19. i Pet. i. 11, also Rev. xxii. 1.) — 27.] The disciples are not, as some have supposed, here mentioned as witnesses separate from and working with the Holy Spirit. The witness is one and the same; the Spirit will witness in and by them: the θαν Δηθ ο παρ. belongs to the whole; see Luke xxiv. 48, 49, where this is strongly expressed. This verse alludes to the historical witness which the Holy Ghost in the ministers and eye-witnesses of the word, Luke i. 2, should enable them to give, — which forms the human side (καυματικά, quin et vos, Ersami.) of this great testimony of the Spirit of truth, and of which our inspired Gospels are the summary: the Divine side being, His own indwelling testimony in the life and heart of every believer in all time. But both the one and the other are given by the selfsame Spirit; — neither of them inconsistent with, or superseding the other. — τε άρχης, as in Luke i. 2, and in the sense of Acts i. 21: — from the beginning of the Lord's ministry. — The present tenses set forth the connexion between the being (continuing to be) witnesses, and the being (having been) companions of the Lord in His ministry. — Chap. XVI. 1.] ταύτα, scil. ch. xv. 18—27, — not only the warning
of the hatred of the world, but the promise of the testifying Spirit (Stier).—8.] See ref. similarly ἀλλὰ 2 Cor. vii. 11. Phil. iii. 8.—λατρείαν ἃ Quisquis effundit sanguinem impii, idem factit ac si sacrificium offerat. Jalkut Schimonsen, cited by De Wette &c.—But the sense of ‘sacrificium’ must not be too much pressed, as Stier remarks, to mean in every case an expiatory offering; see ref. —3.] See ch. xvii. 21, and 1 Tim. i. 13.—4.] ἵνα before εἰρήν is emphatic, ἵνα I myself. A difficulty has been found in the latter part of the verse, because the Lord had repeatedly announced to them future persecutions, and that at least as plainly as here, Matt. v. 10. x. 16, 21—28. al. freq. And hence, De Wette and Lisco, and even Olsh., find ground for supposing that the chronological order of the discourses has not been followed, in the Synoptic Gospels. But there is in reality no inconsistency, and therefore no need for such a supposition. This declaration, as here meant, was not made before, because He was with them. Then clearly it is now made, in reference to His immediate departure. And if so, to what will ταύτα most naturally refer? To that full and complete account of the world’s motives, and their own office, and their comfort under it, which He has been giving them. This He had never before done so plainly, though occasional mention has been made even of the help of the Spirit under such trials, see Matt. x. 19, 20.—μαθὴν ὑμ. ἵνα. While the Lord was with them, the malice of the world was mainly directed against Him,—and they were overlooked : see ch. xviii. 8.—In ἐμὸν we have the proleptical character of the discourse again manifest.

5—16.] The departure of the Lord as the condition of the coming of the Comforter. His office and work.—5.] This is occasioned by the foregoing, but in fact begins the new subject.—καί ὅτι They had (see ch. xiii. 36. xiv. 5) asked this verbally before: the Lord therefore uses the question here in some other and deeper sense than they had done. I believe the meaning to be: ‘None of you inquires into the nature of My departure, so as to appear anxious to know what advantages are to be derived from it: but (ver. 6) you are all given up to grief on account of what I have said,’ expavescebatur, neque repudiatas quo dolet, sed aut quaeque finem. Calvin (Stier).–ἀλλὰ λόγῳ παρὰ μ. ἵνα. Your grief has filled, entirely occupied, your heart (not τὰς κ., but singular, as common to all, see Rom. i. 21), to the exclusion of any regard of My object in leaving you. ‘These are the same disciples who afterwards when their risen Lord had ascended to heaven,—without any pang at parting with Him, returned with great joy to Jerusalem, Luke xxiv. 52’ (Stier). ‘Subest huic blandae incipienti tacta consolatio. Dun enim improbat, quod questionem, quo vaderet, negligent, sibi iid optimo perspectum esse docet. Dun negligentiz incusat, ad excussationem tamen afferit, quod ea ex tantamenemt affectu tristiti orundas sit.’ Lampe. —7.] ἀλλὰ—refers to the last clause: ἵνα, to ὧδε εἰ ὑμ. κ.τ.λ. I Myself tell you the real state of the case.—συμφέρει ὑμ. implies that the dispensation of the Spirit is
a more blessed manifestation of God than was even the bodily presence of the risen Saviour.—Every rendering of this verse ought to keep the distinction between ἀπεστάλη and πορευθέντα, which is not sufficiently done in E. V. by ‘go away’ and ‘depart.’ ‘Depart,’ and ‘go’ would be better: the first expressing merely the leaving them, the second, the going up to the Father.—This σὺ πλησίον ... is a convincing proof, if one more were needed, that the gift of the Spirit at and since the day of Pentecost, was and is something totally distinct from any thing before that time: a new and loftier dispensation.—8—11.] We have here, in a few deep and wonderful words, the work of the Spirit on the world set forth. This work He shall begin ἀπεστάλη, scil. πρὸς ὑμᾶς: not, however, merely by your means, but personally: so that it is not the work and witness of the Apostles which is spoken of, except in so far as they are servants of the Holy Spirit, but (ἰσχύσεως) His own immediate personal working.—λέγει.] It is difficult to give in one word the deep meaning: ‘convince’ approaches perhaps the nearest to it, but does not express the double sense of λέγει, which is manifestly here intended—of a convincing unto salvation, and a convicting unto condemnation:—‘reprove’ is far too weak, conveying merely the idea of an objective rebuke, whereas λέγει reaches into the heart, and works subjectively in both the above-mentioned ways. See the whole question admirably discussed in Archdeacon Hare’s Mission of the Comforter, vol. ii. note K.

—Lücke’s comment is valuable: ‘The testimony of the Holy Ghost in behalf of Christ as opposed to the unbelieving world (ch. xv. 26) is essentially a reiteration, ἐλέγχος, a demonstration of its wrong and error. All the apostolic preaching, as addressed to the world, takes necessarily this polemical form (1 Tim. v. 20. 2 Tim. iv. 2. iii. 16. Titus i. 9. 13. ii. 15). And the more difficult was the disciples’ conflict against the power of this world with only the Word for their weapon, the more comfort was it for them, that the power of God the Spirit working by this ἐλέγχος was their help. In Matt. x. 19. 20. Luke xii. 11. 12, the apologetic side of their conflict, which was in close conjunction with the polemical, is brought into view.—In ἐλέγχος is always implied the refutation, the overcoming of an error, a wrong, by the truth and the right. And when, by means of the ἐλέγχος, the truth detects the error, and the right the wrong, so that a man becomes conscious of them,—then arises the feeling of guilt, which is ever painful. Thus every ἐλέγχος is a chastening, a punishment. And hence this office has been called the ἑρατόματος (punitive office) of the Spirit. The effect of the ἐλέγχος of the Divine Spirit in the world may be to harden: but its aim is the deliverance of the world.—ὁ κόσμος, in John, includes those who are not yet delivered (from the power of Satan to God), who may be yet delivered,—not the condemned. If the ἐλέγχος of the world is a moral process, its result may just as well be conversion, as non-conversion.—Only thus did the ἐλέγχος of the Spirit answer the end of Christ’s coming;—only thus could it be a cheering support to the Apostles. Certainly, the κρίσις with which the ἐλέγχος closes is condemnation, not however of the world, but of the Prince of the world’ (ii. 649 f.).—De Wette denies the salutary side of this ἐλέγχος—but he is certainly wrong—see below.—These three words, ἀμαρτία, δικαιοσύνη, κρίσις, comprehend the three great steps of advance in spiritual truth among men. Of itself the world does not know what Sin is, what Righteousness is, what Judgment is. Nor can either of these be revealed to any man except by the Spirit of God working within him. Each man’s conscience has some glimmering of light on each of these; some consciousness of guilt, some sense of right, some power of judgment of what is transitory and worthless—but all these are unreal and impractical, till the ἐλέγχος of the Spirit has wrought in him (see Stier, v. 360).—9.] And the great opening of Sin to the world is to show them that its root and essence is, unbelief in Christ as the Son of God. UNBELIEF:—for, mankind being alien from God by nature, the first step towards their recovery must be to lay hold on that only safety which He has provided for them; and that laying hold is faith, and the not doing it, when revealed and placed before them, is sin. Beforetime, it was also unbelief,—‘The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God;’—but now,—for we can only believe as God has revealed
Himself,—it is unbelief in Christ the Son of God,—the only θεοτὸς ἵρωθαί πρός με: see this pointedly asserted 1 John v. 10—12. Remember, this unbelief is not a mere want of historical faith,—but unbelief in its very root,—the want of a personal and living recognition of Jesus as the Lord (1 Cor. xii. 3), which, wherever the Spirit has opened His commission by the planting of the visible Church, is the condemning sin of the world. Of this He shall convince those who are brought out of the world, and ultimately convict those who remain in it and die in their sins (see Hare, Mission of the Comforter, vol. ii. note Q).—10.] θεοτὸς is not only the righteousness of Christ, the mere conviction of which would only bring condemnation to that world which rejected and crucified Him;—but, as Stier remarks rightly (v. 307), τὸ κόσμου must be supplied after each of the three, ἀμαρία, δικαιοσύνη, εἰκὼν,—the convictions being of a sin that is theirs, a righteousness that is (or, in the case of condemnation, might have been) theirs, a judgment which is theirs (see below).—Then, what is the world's righteousness? Not their own, but that of the accepted Man Christ Jesus, standing at the right hand of God (seen by us no more, but by that very withdrawal testified to be the Son of God, THE RIGHTEOUS ONE), manifested in the hearts of men by the Spirit to be their only righteousness; and thereby that righteousness, which they had of their own before, is demonstrated to be worthless and as filthy rags,—It is the πάγως πρὸς τὸν πάγως by which this righteousness is assured to us, and by the effect of which, the Spirit, the conviction respecting it is wrought in our hearts (see Hare, as above, note T). The condemnation side of this part of the γῆς is,—that removes, where with their whose day of grace is past shall look on the perfect righteousness which might have been theirs, and on the miserable substitute with which they contented themselves.—11.] As δικαιοσύνη was the world's righteousness, and the ἡγίασμα of it was the manifesting to them how worthless it was of their own by nature, but how perfect and complete in and by Christ,—so now εἰκὼν is the world's judgment,—on the one side, their judgment or estimate or discrimination of things,—on the other side, God's judgment, to which it is opposed. This their judgment by nature they form in subjection to the prince of this world, the Devil,—of whose power they are not conscious, and whose existence they even deny: but the Spirit of God ἡγίασσα, shall convict this judgment of wrong;—shall show them how erroneous and destructive it is, and that a bondage they have been under;—shall detect to them the Prince of this world reigning in the children of disobedience, and give them a better judgment,—by which they shall not be ignorant of his devices (2 Cor. ii. 11). But this better judgment itself is that very truth of God manifested in the Lord Jesus, by which (ch. xii. 31) the Prince of this world is cast out;—by which the follower of Christ is enabled to say, 'Get thee behind me, Satan;'—by which the unbelieving world, and its Prince, are finally condemned in the judgment hereafter (see Hare, as above, note V).—I have preferred giving pointedly what I believe to be the sense of this most important passage, to stringing together a multitude of opinions on it: seeing that of even the best commentators no two bring out exactly the same shade of meaning, and thus classification is next to impossible. I sincerely recommend the student to read the notes in Archdeacon Hare's work, where he will find the whole literature of the subject, with the exception of Stier's more recent commentary.—It will be seen that in my view, the subjective and objective bearing of the three words are both to be kept in sight, and that the great convulsive work of the Spirit is to bring men over to Himself into Christ, Who (in His objective manifestation) must be made unto Him (subjectively), I. ἀνελθόμεναι, 2. δικαιοσύνη, 3. σωτία (the fourth, ἀγίασμα, not being here treated of, as being another part of the Spirit's work, and on those who are no longer the κόσμος, see ch. xvii. 16, 17); and to condemn those who remain in the world finally, in all these points, as having rejected Christ. And this convictive work of the Spirit is a complex and progressive work;—including the ministry of the Apostles, and every step taken towards Divine truth in the history of the Church,—as well as the conversion of individuals, and condemnation of the unbelieving. —12.] The πολλαὶ are the things belonging to πάγως ἡ ἀληθεία in the next verse, which were gradually unfolded
after the Ascension, by the Spirit. — 18.] δεικνύω, emphatical, as in ver. 8. — πᾶσαν τὴν ἁλήθ. πᾶσαν, all the truth, viz. on those points alluded to in ver. 12. Lücke observes that the rec. reading connects πᾶσαν more with ἰδονήσει, the other with ἁλήθ. — The Lord had ever told them the truth, and nothing but the truth, in spiritual things—but not yet the whole truth, because they could not bear it. This the Spirit should lead them into, open the way to it, and unfold it by degrees.—No promise of universal knowledge, nor of infallibility, is hereby conveyed; but a promise to them and us, that the Holy Spirit shall teach and lead us, not as children, under the tutors and governors of legal and imperfect knowledge, but as sons (Gal. iv. 6), making known to us the whole truth of God. This was in an especial manner fulfilled to them,—as set to be the founders and teachers of the Churches,—οἵ γὰρ Λ. ἄγας εὐε. — The Spirit does not, any more than the Son, work or speak of Himself; both are sent, the One from the Father, the other from the Father and Son:—the One to testify οὗτος ἐστιν διά διδασκῆς of the Father,—the other of the Father and the Son.—τὰ ἐρχ. ἀνα. τιμ. As the direct fulfilment to the Apostles of the leading into the whole truth was the unfolding before them those truths which they have delivered down to us in their Epistles,—so, though scattered traces of the fulfilment of this part of the promise are found in the Acts and those Epistles, its complete fulfilment was the giving of the Apocalypse, in which τὰ ἐρχοµένα are distinctly the subject of the Spirit's revelation, and with which His direct testimony closes: see Rev. i. 10. xxii. 16, 17. On the whole of this verse, see Eph. iv. 7—16. — 14.] This is in conexin with ver. 12—and sets forth that the Spirit guiding into truth is in fact the Son declaring the truth, for He shall show forth the glory of Christ, by revealing the matters of Christ,—the riches of the Father's love in Him (ver. 15).—This ver. is decisive against all additions and pretended revelations subsequent to and besides Christ; it being the work of the Spirit to testify to and declare the things of Christ, not anything new and beyond Him. And this declaration is coincident with inward advance in the likeness and image of Christ (2 Cor. iii. 17, 18), not a mere external development.—15.] Here we have given us a glimpse into the essential relations of the Blessed Trinity. The Father hath given the Son to have life and all things in Himself (Col. i. 19. ii. 3), the relation being, that the Son glorifies not Himself but the Father, by revealing the Father, Whom He alone knows (Matt. xi. 27). And this Revelation—the Revelation of the Father by Christ—is carried on by the blessed Spirit in the hearts of the disciples of Christ; Who takes (λαμβάνει, indefinite, of the office of the Spirit, is the better, as well as the better supported, reading) of the things of Christ, and declares, proclaims, to them.—καὶ πάντα θέω] Therefore I (rightly) said' . . . i.e. 'this was the ground of My asserting:'—not the reason why it was said, but the justification of it when said.—This ver. contains the plainest proof by inference of the orthodox doctrine of the Holy Trinity. — 16—24.] The Lord speaks of His withdrawal, and its immediate mournful, but ultimate (and those soon to begin) joyful consequences for His disciples.—The connexion is: 'Very soon will the Spirit, the Comforter, come to you; for I go to the Father, without any real cessation of the communion between you and Me.' Lücke.
The mode of expression is (purposefully) enigmatical; the deixis and ὃς ὁμόθετον not being co-ordinate; the first referring merely to physical, the second also to spiritual sight. So before, ch. xiv. 19, where see note. The ὃς ὁμόθετον begun to be fulfilled at the resurrection; then received its main fulfilment at the day of Pentecost; and shall have its final completion at the great return of the Lord hereafter. Remember again, that in all these prophecies we have a perspective of continually unfolding fulfilments presented to us: see note on ch. xiv. 3. The words in brackets have manifestly been wrongly omitted, probably because they do not occur in ver. 19, and their repetition in ver. 17 had not been observed. They refer to both clauses. This going to the Father was the great end of His departure, as it was the efficient cause of their seeing Him again in the coming of the Spirit, and at the consummation of all things—of which the forty days seeing was the earnest and type. —17, 18.] It was these last words especially which they could not understand. The former two clauses would have been intelligible enough; for the Lord had before declared this to them, ch. xiv. 3, but it was the μετάφρασις, in connexion with the ὑπάγειν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, which seemed to them a hopeless withdrawal—that was too hard for them. —19. The real difficulty being in τὸ μετάφρασις, the Lord does not repeat the ὃς ὁμόθετον πρὸς τῷ πατέρα, but leaves it to be understood. —20.] μ. κ. θ. are to be literally taken: see Luke xxiii. 27. They would mourn for Him as dead; see also ch. xx. 11. And the joy of the world found its first exponent in the scoffs of the passers-by at the crucifixion. —λυποθῃ] This goes deeper than the weeping and wailing before; and plainly shows that the whole does not only refer to the grief while the Lord was in the tomb, but to the grief continually manifesting itself in the course and conflict of the Christian, which is turned into joy by the advancing work of the Spirit of Christ; and, in the completion of the sense, to the grief and widowhood of the Church during her present state, which will be turned into joy at the coming of her Lord. —ἐξέχειν, not merely changed for joy, but changed into, so as itself to become, so that the very matter of grief shall become matter of joy; as Christ's Cross of shame has become the glory of the Christian, Gal. vi. 14. —21.] The tertium comparationis is ἡ λύπη τις τοῖς χριστιανοῖς: but the comparison itself goes far beyond this mere similitude. —ἡ γνώσις is not merely generic, but allusive to the frequent use and notoriety of the comparison. —We often have it in the O. T., — see Mic. iv. 9, 10. Hos. xiii. 13, 14. Is. lx. 7th. xxvi. 17, 19. xxii. 3, —τίμημα is bringing forth, viz. παλινδρομικ, expressed in τὸ τῷ, below. —ἡ ὑπάγειν πρὸς τῷ πατέρα, which seemed to them a hopeless withdrawal— was too hard for them.
ἀνθρωπὸς εἰς τὸν κόσμον. 22 καὶ ύμεῖς οὐν λύπην μὲν ἀβδο

υν* ἐξετεε ταλιν δε ὄθομαι ὦμας, καὶ χαρῆσαι ὦμων

ἡ καρδία, καὶ τὴν χαρᾶν ὦμων οὐδεὶς * αἰτεὶ ἄρ ύμων,

23 καὶ εν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐμὲ ὦμκ ἐρωτήσατε οὐδέν.

ἀμὴν ἂμὴν λέγω ὦμων [ὅτι] ἂν τε αἰτήσητε τὸν πατέρα

* ἐν τῷ ὄνοματί μου, δώσει ὦμειν * 24 ἐκεῖς ἄρτι ὦμκ ὑπῆρχατε οὐδέν ἐν τῷ ὄνοματί μου* αἰτείτε, καὶ λήφθετε,

ἐνα ἡ χαρὰ ὦμων 1 πεπληρωμένη. 25 Ταῦτα ἐν παροιμίαις λελάθη ωμων [ἀλλά] ἐξεταί ὁρα ὅτε ὦμκ

ἐτι ἐν παροιμίαις λαλήσω ωμων, ἀλλά ὁ παράσημος περί τοῦ
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adv.] her (appointed) time. — τε ἂν.] not necessarily masculine (non puella sed puer, Aug.), but indefinite.—The deeper reference of the comparison has been well described by Olahausen: 'Here arises the question, how we are to understand this similitude? We might perhaps think that the suffering Manhood of Christ was the woman in her pangs, and the same Christ glorified in the Resurrection, the Man born; but the Redeemer (ver. 22) applies the pangs to the disciples: how then will the ἄνθρωπος who is born apply to them?' Then, after condemning the shallow and unsatisfactory method of avoiding deep research by asserting that the details of parables are not to be interpreted, he proceeds: 'Hence the proper important of the figure seems to be, that the Death of Jesus Christ was as it were an anguish of birth belonging to all Humanity (ein schmerzoller Geburtstact br ganzen Menchheit) in which the perfect man was born into the world; and in this very birth of the new man lies the spring of eternal joy, never to be lost, for all, inasmuch as through Him and His power the renovation of the whole is rendered possible' (ii. 570).—And indeed the same is true of every Christian who is planted in the likeness of Christ. His passing from sorrow to joy—till Christ be formed in him,—is this birth of pain.—And the whole Church, the Spouse of Christ,—nay even the whole Creation, συνωσίας, till the number of the elect be accomplished, and the eternal joy brought in. — 23.] ὄμης—i.e. the same manifold meaning as before-noticed—will see you—at My Resurrection—by My Spirit—at My second Advent.—alphes, present indefinite,—indicating the quality and essence of the joy,—that it cannot be taken away. — 23.] ἐν τῷ ὄν. ἂν., in its full meaning, cannot import the forty days: for, Acts i. 6, they did then ask the Lord questions (the sense of ἰπρών, see vv. 19. 30, not ver. 26, where the construction is different);—nor this present dispensation of the Spirit, during which we have only the first-fruits, but not the full understanding so as not to need to ask anything; (for (Stier) is not prayer itself an asking?—but that great completion of the Christian's hope, when he shall be with his Lord, when all doubt shall be resolved, and prayer shall be turned into praise. The Resurrection-visitating, and the three gifts, which were but foretastes of this.—Stier well remarks, 'The connexion of the latter part of this verse is,—The way to ὀνῆν ἰπρών any more, is to ask and to pray the more diligently, till that day comes.'—It has been supposed wrongly that ἰμε καὶ τῶν ψαρίων are in opposition in this verse, and hence gathered (Origen de Orat. § 50, Stier) that it is not lawful to address prayer to Christ. But such an opposition is contrary to the whole spirit of these discourses, —and asking the Father in Christ's name, is in fact asking Him.—On the latter clause see note, ch. xv. 7. — 24.] It was impossible, up to the time of the glorification of Jesus (ἐν θρή δρατι, proleptical, as before), to pray to the Father in His Name. It is a fulness of joy peculiar to the dispensation of the Spirit, to be able so to do, Eph. ii. 18. ——αὐτε: see Matt. vii. 7, and mark the difference between the command then and now,—that in τῷ ὄν. μου is added. — 25—28.] The solemn close of the whole discourse. — 28.] παροιμία, property, a
proverbs;—but implying generally in Scriptural and oriental usage something dark and enigmatical;—see especially Sir. vi. 35. viii. 3. xxxix. 3. xlvii. 17.—This is true of the whole discourse—and of the discourses of the Lord in general, as they must then have seemed to them, before the Holy Spirit furnished the key to their meaning.  — ἑρμῆς ἔρμα] viz. the same as that indicated in ver. 16 and 23;—but here again, not one ἔρμα only exclusive of all others, but to be understood of the several steps of spiritual knowledge.—Olahansen finely remarks, that all human language is a παραφηγία, only able to hint at, not to express fully, the things of God; and that the Lord contrasts the use of this weak and insufficient medium, with the inward teaching of the Holy Spirit. This inward teaching, because it is a real imparting of the Divine Nature and Life, brings with it not only prayer in the name of Jesus, but a free access to the Father Himself. This παραφηγία λαλίων however, he continues, is spoken of here by the Lord in its ideal perfection (as it will hereafter be); and is only approximated to on earth; for, as long as the old man yet lives in us, we require still the Lord’s intercessory prayer (xvii. 16), daily washing from the pollution of the world; by which Intercession alone the faithful man notwithstanding his imperfection can enjoy in peace the grace of God vouchsafed to him. —28.] ‘The more knowledge, the more prayer in the name of Jesus,’ Lücke. The approaching the Father through Him shall be a characteristic of their higher state under the dispensation of the Spirit. — σή λάγα ἑρμ.] This has been variously understood. Gro- titius’s rendering, ‘pretetereo hoc, quasi minus unmod jam internum,’ I believe the nearest to the truth, though it does not express the whole meaning. — The Lord is now describing the fulness of their state of communion with Himself and the Father by the Spirit. He is setting in the strongest light their reconciliation and access to the Father. He therefore says, ‘Ye shall ask the Father in My name; and I do not now say to you,—I do not now state it in this form,—that I will ask the Father for you—as if there were no relation of love and mercy between the Father and yourselves; —for (27) The Father Himself (ἀντίστροφος, i.e. ἀντικλίνοντος) (Nounus) — ‘proprio motu’) loveth you; — why? Because ye love and believe on Me.—The whole mind of the Father towards mankind is Love; both in Redemption itself (iii. 16),—and then in an especial manner by drawing those who come to Christ (vi. 44), —and again by this fuller manifestation of His love to those who believe on and love Christ. —The aim of this saying is to show them that His intercession (which is still going on under the dispensation of the Spirit, 1 John ii. 1) does not imply their exclusion from access to the Father, but rather ensures that access, by the especial love which the Father bears to them who believe in and love His Son.—No stress must be laid (Lücke) on περιφέρεια here coming before παραλαλεῖται, as to Faith coming after Love: probably παραλαλεῖ is placed first as corresponding to φιλεῖ just before: —and it might be said with just as much reason that καί παραλαλεῖται ... contains the ground of the παραλαλεῖ, as the converse. —28.] ‘And your belief is sound: for I did indeed come forth ... see ch. xiii. 3. ‘Exit a Patre, quis de Patre est; in mundum venit, quis mundo sum corpus ostendit quod de virgine assumptis; relictum munudem corporali discensione, perrexit ad Patrem hominis adsecusione, nec mundum secundum presentiam subversione.’ Aug. Tract. cii. —29. 30.] The hour was not yet come for the παραφηγία λαλίων; so that we must understand the disciples’ re-
MARK to be made in weakness, however true their persuasion, and heartfelt their confession. 'Usque ado non intelligent, ut nec saltam se non intelligere intelligent,' Aug. Tract cii.—Dolent, se a Magistro pro imperitis haberi, qui conciones ejus non intelligent, alioque Doctore, promesso Spiritu, indigent. Quare eo usque pro-graduuntur, ut Christo contradicent, et clarissima ejus verba inverunt, eumque paradigmatis locutum esse negent.' Lampe (Stier, v. 433). But by νῦν they probably only mean in ver. 26-28. —30.] 'Thou hast spoken so clearly of our feeling towards Thee, and of Thyself, that we have no occasion to ask Thee any thing; and this was what Thou didst announce would be;—we know therefore, by its being so, that Thou knowest the secrets of our hearts (νάρα by inference),—and hence believe that Thou comest forth from God.'—The whole being a misunderstanding of what had gone before, ver. 23, 25.—31.] The Lord does not clear up their misunderstanding, but leaves that for the coming day of the Spirit. He only assures them that their belief, though sincere and loving, was not so deeply grounded in knowledge of Him and His appointed course as they imagined.—'Αρτι πιστ. is not a question: this very belief was by the Lord recognized and commended, see ch. xvii. 8, also Matt. xvi. 17, 18. And, as Stier remarks (v. 435), 'it was the aim and purpose of the whole prophetic office of Jesus, to prepare some first disciples (not the Apostles alone) for the reception of the Spirit of Truth and the fruits of His Death, by grounding in them firm belief in His Person.' He therefore recognizes their faith; but shows them how weak it is as yet was.—32.] See Matt. xxvi. 31, to which same prophecy the reference here is. εἰς τὰ 32.] 'ique antea propter Me reli- quisistis.' Bengel.—καὶ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἡμῖν. μ.] 'and (not but) I am not alone': the Father can never leave the Son, even in the darkest hour of His human suffering:—the apparent desertion implied in the cry 'Why hast Thou forsaken Me?' being perfectly consistent with this, see note Matt. xxvii. 46. —33.] On the first clause, especially ἐν Ἰωάν, see xv. 7. This presupposes the return from the scattering in ver. 32,—the branches again gathered in the vine.—ἐξηρίστα seems the better reading, and has been adopted by Griesb. Schols. &c. but not by Lachm.—This θλίψις is not only persecution from the world, but trouble, inward distress, while we are in the world, —xvii. 11:—a comforting sign that we are not of the world (see Stier, v. 440).—And this latter idea is implied between the two clauses: 'Of good cheer; for ye belong not to the world, but to Me, who have (proleptically again, by that which is now at hand) overcome the world, so that it shall have no power over you, externally by persecution, or internally by temptations or discouragements.' See 1 John v. 4, 5. —38.] The parting prayer of the Lord Jesus. 'Hoc caput in tota scriptura est verbis facillimum, sensibus profundissimum.' Bengel. 'Poterat Dominus noster unigenitus et coeternus
Patri in forma servi et ex forma servi, si hoc opus esset, orare silentio; sed ipsis se Patri exhibere voluit precatorem, ut ministrum, nostrum se esse doctorem. Proinde eam, quam fecit, orationem pro nobis, notam fecit et nobis: quoniam tanti Magistri non solum apud ipsos sermocinatio, sed etiam ipsius pro ipsis ad Patrem oratio discipulorum est edificatio. Et si illorum qui haec dicta erant auditui, profecto et nostra, qui fueramus conscripta lecturis. *Aug. Ty. cir.*—The Prayer divides itself naturally into three parts:—vv. 6—8, are the Lord's words for His glorification with the Father:—vv. 8—19, where He prays for His disciples:—vv. 19—26, where He prays for all future believers in Him.—L. ταῦτα, the foregoing discourse. Lachm. reads καὶ πάρας... ἄλλα, which looks very like a correction of the simple words of the text.—John very seldom depicts the gestures or looks of the Lord as here. But this was an occasion of which the impression was indelible, and the upward look could not be passed over. —ἐν τῶν ὑστ. Nothing hereby is determined as to the locality. The guest-chamber no doubt was the place of this prayer. The eyes may be lifted to heaven in as well as out of doors; heaven is not the sky, but that upper region, above our own being and thoughts, where we all agree in believing God to be especially present; and which we indicate when we direct our eyes or our hands upward. The Lord, being in all such things like as we are, lifted His eyes to heaven when addressing the Father (not His hands, for He prays not here as a supplicant—but as an Intercessor and a High Priest, standing between earth and heaven, see ver. 24, ἐπὶ τὸν θάνατον τινα...).—καὶ ἐστιν] It is impossible to regard the following prayer otherwise than as the very words of the Lord Himself, faithfully rendered by the beloved Apostle in the power of the Holy Spirit. The view which has led so many of the best German commentators (even Olshausen!) to see in parts of it the words of the Evangelist, and not of the Lord, is wholly impossible with any earnest reception of the Gospels as truthful, and happily finds little or no sympathy in England. If such a promise as xiv. 26 was made, and fulfilled, then these must be the words of the Lord Himself; and the Greek form of them only can be regarded as bearing evidence of the style and manner of John.—φανερῶν not, Our Father,—which He never could say,—nor, My Father,—which would be too great a separation between Himself and His for such a prayer (see Matt. xxvi. 39, 42, where He prays for Himself only)—but simply, Father; that Great Name in which all the mystery of Redemption is summed up.—ἐλαχίστος. See xii. 23, 26. xiii. 31, 32. The Glorification is—the exaltation by Death and Resurrection: He prays in the Name, and for the exaltation of the Manhood, but in virtue of His Godhead, ver. 5.—τῶν ὑστ. He prays first objectively, to set the great matter forth in all its majesty; then subjectively, δόξας... ver. 5, putting Himself into the place of τῶν ὑστ. ουκ here.—Iwa... "These words are a proof that the Son is equal to the Father as touching His Godhead. What creature could stand before His Creator and say, 'Glory Thou me, that I may glorify Thee?" (Stier.)—This glorifying of the Father by the Son is, the whole great result of the glorification of the Son by the Father,—the manifestation of God to and in men by the Son through the Spirit.—2.] 'The causal connexion expressed by καθὼς is this, that the glorification, the end, must correspond to the beginning, to the sending, the preparation, and office of the Son.' (Lücke.) We must also bear in mind that the 'giving of power' in this verse is the ground, as well as the type, of the glorification, see Rom. i. 28. 1 Cor. i. 6: so Stier (v. 453).—ἐναντίως... is not only 'all mankind,' but (see Gen. vi. 3, 12) *all that has life,* all that is subject to death,—all that is cursed on account of sin. But of this all, mankind is the head and crown, and in the full blessings of the Lordship of Christ mankind only can participate. ἐναντίως... is given by the Father from before the foundation of the world to Christ;—the whole creation is His to rule, His to judge, by virtue of His being, in the root of that human nature, to which sovereignty over the world was given, the Second and Righteous Adam. —But in this wide gift, there is a more special gift,—δι' ἐναντίως... in the stricter sense,—the chosen, the who believe on Him. And to them, and them only, He imparts the further and ineffable
gift consequent on union with Him their God in the Spirit. — vix. ETERNAL LIFE (comp. v. 26, 27. also vi. 37). — 3. See a similar definition of a term just used in iii. 19. — διήνυστ — is; not is the way to. The knowledge spoken of is no mere head or heart knowledge, — the mere information of the mind, or excitation of the feelings, — but that living reality of knowledge and personal realization, — that oneness in will with God, and partaking of His nature, which is itself life eternal: — the knowledge, love, enjoyment, of Him who is infinite, being themselves infinite. — οὐκ ἐστιν ἵνα ἐκ τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ παρέχεται μετοχής μετοχής διὰ θεοῦ ἐπεί τὸ γνώσασθαι θεόν καὶ ἀποκάλυψιν τῆς χριστιανῆς αὐτοῦ, Iren. adv. Hær. iv. 20, cited by Olsh. — The accusations after γινώσκεσθαι are purely accusations of the person, and the emphasis is on γινώσκεσθαι. From not seeing this, various mistakes have arisen — e.g. the making τῶν μον. αὐ. θεὸν of the predicate, 'Thee to be the only true God,' — and similarly with χριστιανος, (which would require τῶν χρ.), or with τῶν αἰωνίων — 'Jesus Whom Thou hast sent, to be (the) Christ,' — or 'Jesus Christ to be Him whom Thou hast sent.' — It is rightly rendered in E. V. — The Latin Fathers (Aug. Amb. Hil.), anxious to avoid the inference unwarrantably drawn by some from this verse against the Godhead of Christ, construed: ίνα γιν. αὐτ. η. χ. δυν ἂν, τῶν μον. αὐ. θεόν — which is of course inadmissible. Others (Chrys. Euth., construing correctly, yet regarded Jesus Christ as included in the words μον. αὐ. θεόν. — But all such violences to the text are unnecessary. For, first, the very juxtaposition of Jesus Christ here with the Father, and the knowledge of both being defined to be eternal life, is a proof by implication of the Godhead of the former. The knowledge of God as such could not be eternal life, and the juxtaposition of the two would be inconceivable. Secondly, the τῶν αἰωνίων most distinctly expresses the ἐκλείστην from God, ver. 8,—implies the ημερίς ἐν ἑαυτοῖς of ver. 22, and cannot in connexion with what follows possibly be understood in a Socinian, or an Ariaristian sense. — I do not scruple to use and preach on the verse as a plain proof of the co-equality of the Lord Jesus in the Godhead. — A difficulty has been found in the use of the name Jesus Christ by the Lord Himself: — and inferences have been hence made that we have John's own language here: — but surely without any ground. He who said σου τῶν φῶν, ver. 1, might well here, before the ἵων of ver. 4, use that prophetic Name which had been divinely given Him as the Saviour of men, and its weighty adjunct χριστιανος (οὐχ ὑπο τοῦ θεοῦ, 1 John v. 1, 5), in which Names are hidden all the treasures of that knowledge of which He here speaks. — And as to the later use of the two names together having led to their insertion here by the Apostle (gegrn basi gejstihtide Xertorum (!), De Wette, similarly Lücke, and even Olshausen), — what if the converse were the case, and this solemn use of them by the Lord had given occasion to their subsequent use by the Church? This is to me much more probable than the other. — 4, 5.] The past tenses are proleptical, as in 2 Tim. iv. 6, 8. — τὸ ἐγὼ is not only the ministerial life of the Lord, but the whole Life, with all its appointed manifestations of humility and purity; — the perfect righteousness which by that life He has planted in our nature, — and His prophetic and declarative office, terminated by His Passion and Death. — δέξασον με The same Person (ἰγὼ) Who had with the Father glory before the world, also glorified the Father in the world, and prays to be again received into that glory. A decisive proof of the unity of the Person of Christ, in His three estates of eternal pre-existence in glory, humiliation in the flesh, and glorification in the Resurrection Body. — This direct testimony to the eternal pre-existence of the Son of God has been evaded by the Socinian and also the Arminian interpreters, by rendering αὐτον, 'habe-
6. (δίδωκας and δίδωκας are variously read through these verses 6—9.)—καταρθεὶς
and Chrys. txt A B C D, &c.—διδωκας B (and in next verse). — 8. πρήμ. σου D. — και

bam destinatione tua' (!) Grot. Weitzt.
On the relation of the δέκα in ver. 22 to this δέκα, see there.—δύον] 'Hic non
dicit accepti. Semper habebat: nunquam ccepit habere.' Beng.—πρὸ τοῦ τ. κ.
ἀν.] before the καταρθηκὸς κόσμος, ver. 24;—before all creation.' Anonsum fieret
mundus, gloriam illam habebat Filium; sed cum fieret mundus, gloria illa se ccepit
exssere.' Beng.—παρὰ σου = πρὸς τὸν θεόν, ch. i. 1; eis τὸν κόσμον τοῦ
πατρὸς, ch. i. 18. — 6—19.] He prays for His disciples. — 6.] This ver.
particularises ver. 4, and forms the transition to the in
tercessory prayer.—σὺν τῷ δόμα] Thy
Name of Father, which was so constantly
on the lips of the Lord;—and which de
erived its living meaning and power from
His teaching; see Exod. xxiii. 21.—οὐς
δ. e.] The Father gave them to Christ, by
leading them to Christ, see ch. vi. 37, 44,
45.—οὐκ ἔγνω] 'They were Thine—Israelites—Thine people, before!'—not only out
wardly, but Israelites indeed, see ch. i. 43,
and thus prepared to receive Christ (so
Stier, v. 486 ff.). And thus the ἐκ τοῦ
cōsmon answers to λαβὲν ἢνων τὸν
c μίων ἢνων, Deut. iv. 34. But see
the fuller sense below, on ver. 9.—τῶν λ.
σου τεταρτάς.] They have observed Thy
word—walked in the path of Thy com
mandments;—for so λόγον τοῦν means;
see ch. xiv. 23—and ref. Stier under
stands their walking in the O. T. ordinances
blameless, as Luke i. 6,—and thus (comp.
ch. i. 42, 46) recognizing Christ as the Messiah when He came. But this is
perhaps hardly likely to have been set at
the end of the sentence, after ἵματι αὐτοῖς
δίδωκας. It is more likely that τὸν λόγον
σου = τὰ πρῆματα ἃ δίδωκας μοι, ver. 8.
—9. In prophecics it is common to invit
the receiver of a promise to refer to the
message. 'My whole words and works.' On this their conviction, which
however had not reached its ripeness yet, see ch. xvi. 30.— 9.] ἤ γάκα, αὐτοῖς,
and the similar sayings ch. xv. 15 al., seem to be a reference to Deut. xviii. 18, 19,
where it is said that 'the Prophet shall speak unto them all that I shall command
Him.' The imparting to them of these πρῆματα was the efficient cause of their
faith:—see their confession ch. vi. 68,
where πεπιστεύκαμεν and ἐγνώκαμεν are
cited as connected here.—On the two last clauses we may notice that παρὰ σου ἐγνώκαν is
more a matter of conviction from inference
(see ch. iii. 2).—ἐγνωσαν:—whereas the
other side of the same truth, σὺν μας ἐπε
τηρησάμεν, the act of the Father unseen by us, is more a matter of pure faith,—καταρθή
σαν. In the first, the ἐγνωσαν ἄλλας stamps the Lord's approval on their knowl
dedge, and distinguishes it from such knowl
dedge as the bare οἴδαμεν of Nicodemus
and his colleagues. — 9.] Stier remarks
that the Lord here begins to fulfill His pro
mise Matt. x. 32.—οὐ παρὰ τ. κόσμ. ἄρ.] The
misconceptions which have been made of
this verse (Calvin, Lampe, and even
Luther, who elsewhere corrects himself, see
Tholuck on John, ed. 6. p. 362) in ap
dying a decree of exclusion for the vessels
of wrath, may be at once removed by con
templating the usage of δ κόσμος in this
Prayer. The Lord does pray distinctly for
d κόσμος, vv. 21, 23, that they may believe
and know that the Father hath sent Him.
He cannot therefore mean here that He
does not pray (absolutely for the world,
but that He is not now asking for the
world, does not pray this thing for the
world. These οὖς δίδωκας μοι have
already believed and known; the prayer
for them is therefore a different one, viz.
that in vv. 11, 15. The mistake would be
at once precluded for English readers by
rendering, 'I am praying for them; I am
not praying for the world.'—Σὺς σοι ἐλοι in a fuller sense than σοι σῶ, ver. 6. That was their preparation for Christ; this is their abiding in Him, which is abiding in the Father, see next ver.—10.] Comp. ch. xvi. 16 and note. "It were not so much if he had only said, 'All Mine is Thine,' for that we may all say, that all we have is God's. But this is a far greater thing, that he inverts this and says, 'All Thine is Mine.' This can no creature say before God."—Luther, Stier v. 495.—The E. V.—'All Mine are Thine,' &c.—gives the erroneous impression that persons only are meant, whereas it is all things, in the widest meaning,—the Godhead itself included.—of which this is asserted.—ἐν αὐτῷ not, by their means, but, in them; by that ἐγὼ ἐν αὐτῷ of ver. 23, the life of the vine in the branches, so that the fruit of the branches is the glory of the vine, by the sap of the vine living in the branches. All this again is proleptic.—11.] The occasion, and substance of His prayer for them.—ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀξίως ἐν τῷ Κ. This shows us that ὁ κόσμος is not said of place alone, for the Lord Jesus is still here; but of state, the state of men in the flesh; sometimes viewed on its darker side, as overcoming men and bringing in spiritual death, sometimes, as here used, in the most general sense.—καὶ, not but; it expresses the simultaneous state of the Lord and His, see ch. vi. 32, and note.—&c.] Holy, as applied to God, peculiarly expresses that penetration of all His attributes by Love, which He only who here uttered it sees through in its length, breadth, and height.—which angels (15a vi. 3 Rev. iv. 8) feel and express:—which men are privileged to utter, but can never worthily feel:—but which devils cannot feel nor utter. They know His Power and His Justice only.—But His Holiness is especially employed in this work of precept now spoken of.—ἐν τῷ θεῷ, &c not, 'through Thine own Name,' as E. V. which renders 'is Thy Name' ver. 12 (!) (so Chrys. Theophyl. Euthym.)—but is the δόμα of vv. 6 and 12; see below.—&c not only the best supported, but the best reading, though Stier maintains that it can bear no meaning χρωστήρως.‘—The Name of God is that which was to be in the Angel of the Covenant, Exod. xxiii. 21, see also Is. ix. 6. Jer. xxiii. 6. —This Name, not the essential Godhead, but the covenant name, ἸΕΙΟΒΑΝ ΟΥΡ ΡΩΤΟΙΟΥΣΗΣ, the Father hath given to Christ; and it is the being kept in this, the truth and confession of this, for which He here prays.—γὰρ δέων ἐν καθ. ἡμέρας The oneness here is not merely harmony of will or of love, as some have interpreted it, and then tried to weaken the Oneness of the Godhead by the καθεστως;—but oneness by the indwelling of the Spirit of Christ, the gift of the covenant (1 Cor. vi. 17), and ultimately oneness of nature, 2 Pet. i. 4, where the ἰκαθύλλημα διδώρημα answers to the δόμα διδώρημα μοι here. 'Non sit, ut nobiscum sint summi, —aut simul summi ipsi et nos, sicunt unum sumus nos,—sed sit, ut sint unum sicet et nos.' Aug. Tract. civ. —12.] ἐφώθα: see ch. x. 28—30. The Lord here, as Cyril remarks, compares His keeping of His own, to that by the Father,—in a way only accountable by both Persons being of equal Power and Dignity.—&c]—αὶ μὴ... So that Judas was of the number of those ὁ διδώρημα μοι—showing us (1) the sense in which those words must be understood (see above); and (2) that of such persons it is true that there is for them no 'gratia irresistibilis,' no 'keeping in God's Name.'
KATA IOANNNHN.

13 νῦν δὲ πρὸς σέ ἑρῴμαι, καὶ ταῦτα λαλῶ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, ἵνα ἐγώσα τὴν χαράν τὴν ἐμὴν τεπληρωμένην ἐν αὐτοῖς.

14 ἐγὼ δὲ δεῖδωκα αὐτοῖς τὸν λόγον σου, καὶ ὁ κόσμος ἐμίσησεν αὐτούς, ὅτι οὐκ ἔθεσεν τοῦ κόσμου καθὼς ἔγω ὡς ὁ κόσμος, ἀλλὰ ἵνα τηρήσῃς αὐτοὺς ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου.

15 Ὁ κόσμος ἀπέστειλεν αὐτούς ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου, ἀλλὰ ἵνα τηρήσῃς αὐτοὺς τοῦ πονηροῦ.

16 ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου οὐκ εἰσὶν, καθὼς ἔγω ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου οὐκ εἰσί. ὃς ἀγίασεν αὐτούς ἐν τῷ ἀληθείᾳ ὁ λόγος ὁ σωτήρια ἐστιν.

17 ὃς ἀγίασεν αὐτούς ἐν τῷ ἀληθείᾳ ὁ λόγος ὁ σωτήρ ἐστιν. ἵνα ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου ἀπεστείλῃ αὐτοὺς ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου.

18 καὶ ἵνα ὃ ἀπεστείλη αὐτοὺς ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου, καὶ ἵνα ἐμαυτόν, ἵνα καὶ αὐτῷ ὅσαν ἔγαγεν ἀπεστείλη αὐτοὺς ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου.

19 καὶ ὃ ἀπεστείλη αὐτοὺς ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου, καὶ ἵνα ἐμαυτόν, ἵνα καὶ αὐτῷ ὅσαν ἔγαγεν ἀπεστείλη αὐτοὺς ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου.


independently of their 'keeping God's word,' ver. 6, which Judas did not do. — δ᾽ εὐλ. τ. ἐκ. See 2 Thess. ii. 3. As the other disciples by true τῆρησις of the Divine ρήματα given to them, rose from being natural men to be the children of God, so Judas, through want of the same, sunk from the state of the natural man to that of the lost—the children of the Devil (Olah. nearly). — Remark, it is not ἄνδρας...

ἐλι μὴ τὸν ὑνῖ τῆς ἡμῶν. Christ did not lose him (comp. ch. xviii. 9, where there is no exception), but he lost himself. — ἡ γραφή] in which this was indicated, viz. that alleged by Peter, Acts i. 20: see ch. xiii.

18. — 19. See ch. 24; also the reference to these words in 1 John i. 4. — 14. — 15. See ver. 8. — Ver. 14 contains the manner in which He ἰδολολάτην αὐτοῖς, by giving them the Divine Word; — and the reason of the τῆρησις prayed for, because they would be objects of hatred to the world. — καθὼς ἐγὼ] See ch. xv. 18. — οὐκ ἂστρεῖ] Said mostly for their sakes, for whom it was necessary that they should abide yet in the flesh, to do God's work, and (ver. 17) to be sanctified by God's truth. — τοῦ πῶς. — See Matt. v. 37 and note. The sense in all places is better neuter; even in 1 John v. 19, where see note. — From the evil,' as B. V. — i. e. from all its forms, in all its conditions. — 16. repeated, as the ground both of the ὁποῖον ἐστιν, for they are already not of the world, so that they need not be removed from it in order to distinction from it; — and of the ἄλλα ἵνα, for they are clean (ch. xiii. 10); — 'Keep them from pollution.' This leads on to 17 — 19. the process of sanctification through the knowledge of the truth imparted to them by Christ, and expanded in them by the Spirit. — ἰδολολάτῃ here and in ver. 19 carries the meaning, which unites the two uses, of consecration to God. But in them, this setting apart for Him was a long and gradual process, to be accomplished by conflicts, and the deeper sinking in of the Truth by the blows of affliction, and the purifying fire of the Spirit: in them it was strictly sanctification, the making holy: but in Him it was that pure and entire self-consecration by His submission to the Father's holy will, the entire possession of His sinless humanity with the living and speaking Truth of God, which should be at the same time the efficient cause of their sanctification, and their Pattern. Such an High Priest became us (see Heb. vii. 26), who are to be ourselves priests unto God. Rev. xx. 6. — ἰδον, not by, but in: see on ver. 11. — ἰδον, etc. comp. Acts xx. 32. Thy word, in its inner subjective power. — Ver. 18 is proleptic, — and received its fulfilment ch. xx. 21. He does not merely leave them in the world, but sends them into it, to witness to this same truth of God: see ch. xv. 16. — 19. See above, on ver. 17. It is clear, against all Socinian inferences from this ver., that all that part of ἰδολολατήσω is here excluded: and only that intended which is expressed Heb. ii. 10 by ἰδον παθήματως τελεούσα. Of this, His death was
ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ

ΧVII. 20—26.

1 ver. 9. ἐν ἀληθείᾳ. 20 Οὐ 1 περὶ τούτων δὲ ἵωτῷ μόνον, ΑΒΓΔ ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τῶν πιστεύοντων διὰ τοῦ λόγου αὐτῶν εἰς ἐμὲ, 21 ἵνα πάντες εὖ ἐν ζωϊ, καθὼς σὺ πάτερ ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐκάγω ἐν σοί, ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἐμῖν Ἰ. ὅσιον, ἵνα ὁ κόσμος πιστεύῃ ὅτι σὺ με ἀπέστειλας. 22 καὶ ἐγὼ τῇ δόξῃ ἥν διδάσκασκα μοι δεδωκα αὐτοῖς, ἵνα ἔσυ ἐν καθὼς ἤμειν ἐν ἐμίν. 23 ἐγὼ ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ σὺ ἐν ἐμοί, ἵνα ὡσι

1 John ii. 5. ἵνα με ἀπέστειλας καὶ ἡγάπησας αὐτοὺς καθὼς ἐμὶ ἡγάπησας.


the crowning act, and was also the one to which the ὑπὲρ ἄλλῃς most directly applies: but the whole is included. The confining the meaning to His Sacrifice (Chrys., Buth, and the ἵνα καὶ αὐτοῖς ... to their martyrdom, or their spiritual self-offering, Rom. xii. 1 (Buthym.), is insufficient for the depth of the words.—ἐν ἀληθ.] is truth: what truth, is evident from ver. 17, where, in the repetition, ὁ λόγος ὁ σὸς ἀλήθεια λοτιν. the article is also wanting: see also ch. i. 14. 3 John 3.—for ἅλλῳ without the article. —20.] The connexion is the ἀπίστευτος αὐτοῖς ἐς τ. κοσμ. ver. 18.—πιστεύων has most probably been a correction. The present part expresses the state of faith in which all believers are found: the future would refer more to the act of belief by which that state is begun. —It is strikingly set forth here that all subsequent belief on Christ would take place through the Apostolic word: see Rom. x. 16, 17.—21.] The ἵνα here hardly can regard the subject-matter of the ὑπὲρ, ver. 20, but rather we should supply after that word rāurā, and understand this ἵνα as expressing the object of the prayer respecting both. The subject-matter of the prayer is, that they may be kept in God’s name and sanctified in God’s truth; and if this be so, their union with the Son and the Father follows. 1 John i. 3.—But here it is not merely ‘with,’ but ‘in,’ the Son and the Father;—because the Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, and ‘He that is joined to the Lord, is one spirit:’ see ver. 11.—This unity has its true and only ground in faith in Christ through the Word of God as delivered by the Apostles; and is therefore not mere outward uniformity, nor can such uniformity produce it. At the same time its effects are to be real and visible, such that the world may see them. —ἐν αὐτοῖς not parallel with the former ἵνα, as if πιστ. ὁ κόσμος meant the same as πάντες ὡς, that all may be brought to believe.—Nor again can the words mean that the unbelieving and condemned world, at the end, may be persuaded, ‘that Thou hast sent Me.’ Such a rendering would surely be repugnant to the spirit of the prayer, and the use of the word πιστεύω in our Gospel. Rather is it,—that this their testimony, being borne by them all, and in all ages, may continue to convince the world, so that many in the world may believe, &c.—The ἵνα σῷ μι ἀπεστείλας implies belief in the whole Work and Office of Christ. Here the Lord certainly prays for the world,—see above on ver. 9.—See a remarkable parallel Rev. iii. 9, where Stier truly remarks, that the persons spoken of are penitents. —22, 23.] Grotius and others interpret this δόξα potestas faciendi miracula, and refer to ch. ii. 11 and ch. xi. 40; but wrongly:—for if so, the αὐτοῖς must mean the Apostles only, whereas it is distinctly referred to the believers of all time. The δόξα (Lücke, De Wette, Stier) is the glory of Christ as the only-begotten Son (i. 14), full of grace and truth, which by virtue of His exaltation and the unity of all believers in Him through the Spirit, has become (not, shall be) theirs, Eph. ii. 6. Rom. viii. 30. Eph. i. 18; not yet fully, nor as it is His, but as each can receive and show it forth. The perfection of it is spoken of, ver. 24.—We have the same recurrences of ἵνα as in ver. 21. The second of them
here expresses not merely the similarity of their unity to that of the Son and Father,
—but the actuality of its subsistence, in Christ abiding in them and the Father in Christ.—On τάκτον, etc., see ref. —γνώσις here, parallel as it is to πνευματικός above, cannot be interpreted of a bare recognition, or of a recognition at the final judgment—but must be taken to mean that salutary knowledge by which from time to time the children of the world are by God called to become the children of light. See the same words, and note, ch. xiv. 31, also ch. xiii. 35, and observe that in all three places the recognition is that of love;—in ch. xiii. 35, of the disciples one to another; in ch. xiv. 31, of Jesus to the Father; here, of the Father to believers, as perfected into unity in the Son of His love.—24.] θεϊς is not the θεϊς of ch. xii. 21. Cor. vii. 7, but more like that of Mark vi. 25,—an expression of will founded on acknowledged right: compare διαρθώμα, Luke xxii. 29. —Compare also the θεϊς and αὐτός διέλθη, μοι, with ch. v. 21. vi. 44. —ἐκ τούτων ἡ μορφὴ 1. c. in the glorified state:—see ch. xii. 26 and note.— ''); see θεϊς] This is the completion of ver. 22. The open beholding of His glory spoken of 1 John iii. 2, which shall be coincident with our being changed into His perfect image.—θεϊς is to see and partake—the very case supposes it. No mere spectator could see this glory. See Rom. viii. 17 end and 2 Cor. iii. 18.—ὅτι ἦν, etc. . . .] The most glorious part of this sight of glory will be to behold the whole mystery of redemption unfolded in the glory of Christ’s Person,—and to see how before the being of the creature, that eternal love which gave the glory to Christ of which all the worlds are but the exponents.—On κατ. κόσμον, see ref. — 25, 29.] Βίκαια is connected with the final clause of ver. 24. The Righteousness of the Father is witnessed by the beginning (γρηγόρεως) of Redemption, and (ἐκαίνιος ὅς) by the glorification of the elect with Christ; but also by δόκῃς σοι ἄνω, the final distinction made by His Justice between the world and His.—The first s[ec] contrasts with the θατ[er] immediately following: the more classical construction would be τοῦ—δί (Lücke). The second s[ec] merely couples the preceding to the following as depending upon it: see Matt. xxvi. 37. This ἔχω, ἔγνωσα, ἔγνωσαν, γνωρίζω, show that the Lord spoke here of the then present time and disciples again, at the close of His prayer. The γνωρίζω is by the whole work and testimony of the Spirit completed in the Kingdom of God. This promise has been in fulfilment through all the history of the Church. —And the great result of this manifestation of the Father’s Name is, that that wonderful Love wherein He loved Christ, may dwell in (not the Apostles merely—the future γνωρίζω has again thrown of the meaning outward to the great body of believers) them,—i.e. the perfect, living knowledge of God in Christ, which reveals, and in fact is, this love. And this can only be by κατα πνεύμα τοῦ—Christ dwelling in their hearts by faith, and renewing and enlightening them by His Spirit. He does not say, ‘Thou in them’—but ‘I in them and Thou in Me.’ see ver. 23. —

CHAP. XVIII. 1.—3.] Matt. xxvi. 30—47. Mark xiv. 26—43. Luke xxii. 39—53. On the omission by John of the conflict of the Redeemer’s soul in Gethsemane, I would remind the reader of what has been said in the Prolegomena on the fragmentary nature of this Gospel. The attempt to find in this omission a discrepancy between the setting forth of the Redeemer by John and the
Synoptic Gospels, is, as usual, unsuccessful. John presents us with the most striking instances of the troubling of the human soul of Christ by the suffering which was before Him: see ch. xii. 27. xiii. 21. See notes on Matt. ver. 36, and throughout the section. — 1.] τῶν κλάδων, 'of the cedars,' has apparently been a mistaken rendering of the Hebrew name of the brook, γύνη, to whom due, is not plain. We may however be quite sure that it would not be owing to John himself, but to some Greek transcriber unacquainted with Palestine. Josephus calls it χιμ. κεδρώνος, or φάραγγες κεδρώνος. Antt. viii. 1, 6. ix. 7, 3: — see 2 Sam. xv. 23. 2 Kings xxiii. 6. —The ravine in the bottom of which flows the Kidron, is to the east of Jerusalem, between the city and the Mount of Olives.—κύπαρις Lücke suggests that the owner of this garden may have been friendly to (or a disciple of?) Jesus. It was called Gethsemane.—Matt., Mark.—Traditions as to its site are, as usual, various. A square plot of ground in the depth of the ravine is now usually pointed out, and seems to have been fixed on at the time when the empress Helena visited Jerusalem, a.d. 326. Euseb. says Gethsemane was at the Mount of Olives: Jerome, at the foot of the mount. The language of Luke xxi. 37 leads to a belief that it may have been higher up the mount. Robinson, i. 346. 2.] 'often,' — see Luke xxi. 37. John viii. 1.—3. See, on this band of men, note on Matt. ver. 47. Lücke refers to Dion. Hal. ix. (ἐξετασκόν ἐπάντες ἐι τῶν σεμνῶν άδροί, φανούς ἔχοντες κ. λαμ-πάζας) to show that lanterns and torches were part of the utensils of military on a night march.—φανοί appear to be strictly 'torches,'—any blazing substance held in the hand; — ψηφήδας, 'lights fed with oil.' —The weapons were swords and staves, — Matt., Mark. — 4—11. ] Matt. xxvi. 48—56. Mark xiv. 44—52. Luke xxii. 48—53. —4. ] On ἔλθειν πάντων τ. ἡμ. see Matt. xxvi. 45. — ἔλθειν probably, from the shade of the trees into the moonlight; — hardly, as De Wette and Lücke suggest, from some building in the garden. ἐξῆλθει καὶ ἠγέτης is more in John's manner, and less likely to have been substituted for ἐξῆλθον ἐλθεῖν than the converse. — τίνα [ἐτ.] asked, —as the question ἐσ' ἐν πάρι, Matt. xxvi. 50, — to carry reproof to the conscience of those addressed: and also to obtain for so solemn a visit as the delivering Himself up to them, the formal declaration of their intention to take Him. — "When men sought Him to make Him a king, He fled: now that they seek Him to put Him to death, He goes forth to meet them." Stier, vi. 312. —5. ] Some among them knew Him (Matt. xxvi. 55), others probably not. This answer may have been given by some one in authority among the Roman soldiers, who had it in command to 'apprehend Jesus of Nazareth.' — ἐλευθερίας . . . μετ' αὐτῶν ] I believe these words to be the description of an eye-witness:—John detected Judas standing among them, and relates it. The synoptic narrative related the kiss which presently took place: but this self-tradition of the Lord was not related in it. John therefore adds this touch of exactness, to show that the answer ἰδοῦν τ. N. was not given because they were ignorant of His person, so as not to be able to say 'Thee':—but because they feared to say it. — 6. ] The
question on the miraculous nature of this incident is not whether it were a miracle at all (for it is evident that it must be regarded as one), but whether it were an act specially intended by our Lord, or a result of the superhuman dignity of His Person and the majestic calmness of His reply. I believe the latter alternative to be the right one. Commentators cite various instances of the confusion of the enemies of innocent men before the calmness and dignity of their victims: how much more was this likely to be the case when He in Whom was no sin and Whose spake as never man spake, came forth to meet His implacable foes as the self-sacrificing Lamb of God. So that I regard it rather as a miracle consequent upon which Christ said and did, and the state of mind in which His enemies were,—than as one, in the strict sense, wrought by Him: bearing however always in mind that to Him nothing was unexpected, or a mere result, but everything fore-known. With this view what follows is also consistent, rather than with the other. —8.] Bengel strikingly says of this "γυν. εἷμα, 'Tertio dicit olim.' And Augustine, 'Quid judicatur faciebat, qui judicandus hoc fecit? Quid regnaturus poterit, qui moriturus hoc potuit?' Tract. cxii.—'αφετε τούτους' 'quos ills ceci adorium-bantur.' Bengel. This saying was sufficient to show Peter and the rest what was the appointed course for them;—the ἀρ. τούτων, ὑπάγων to the band, is ὑπάγετε μετὰ to the Apostles.—8.] See ch. xvii. 12. An unquestionable proof, if any were wanted, that the words of ch. xvii. are no mere description of the mind of the Lord at the time, nor free arrangement of His words, but His very words themselves. This is recognized even by De Wette.—On the application of the saying, we may remark that the words unquestionably had a much deeper meaning than any belonging to this occasion; but that the remarks so often made in this commentary on the fulfilment of prophecies must be borne in mind;—that to fulfil, is not to exhaust a prophecy;—that the words of the Lord have many stages of unfolding;—and that the temporal deliverance of the Apostles now, doubtless belonged to the great spiritual safe-keeping which the Lord asserted by anticipation in these words. —10.] At this time took place the kiss of Judas, in accordance with the agreement entered into, and to assure the captors that the person thus offering Himself was indeed Jesus of Nazareth, and no substitute for Him:—see note on Matt. ver. 49. The other view, that the kiss took place first, before the incidents of our vv. 4—9 (Friedlieb, Archäologie der Leidsens-geschichte, p. 68), is to me quite inconceivable.—On Peter's act, see Matt. ver. 51. The names of Peter and Malchus are only found here.—τὸ ἕσσον only here and in Mark.—The (external) ear, though severed, was apparently still hanging on the cheek;—for it was healed with a touch.—11.] τὴν θ. = τὸν τόν. αὐτῆς, Matt.,—where see notes.—τὸ ωρ. A striking allusion to the prayer in Gethsemane; for the image does not elsewhere
om. A B C D E K L M S U ? X ( Y A ? ) 13 all. abcD Syrr. Copt. Arm. —13. Ἰγγαυον B D 4 a Copt. txt A C — aὐτῶν om. B C D X Δ 2 ac Cyrh. Chrys. Theophyl. ins. ἀν. —καῖαι D abcD (D is supplied by a later hand from ch. xviii. 13 to xx. 13.) — 14. for ἀναληθεύ, ἀναθανάντων B C D 3 4 LX abcD 13 Syrr. Copt. Sahid. ἕκασθι. Arm. Cyrh. Chrys. txt A C E G 3 H K M S U Y D al. — 15. ὁ bef. αὐτόν om. A D 3 — txt B C — 16. for ἥν τῶν τῶν τῶν ἀρχ. — ὧν τῶν ἀρχ. B C L X (3 4 = γνῶν. X) Copt. txt A C D abcD — occur in our Evangelist. See Matt. xx. 22 and [— ὃς μὴ πίνω] ’Αμιν ιτο μη νά δίκατο! ’ — Vulg. Sext.— ‘Αμιν θεον τιμήτων. ’ — Bengel. — 12—12.] Peculiar to John. The preliminary hearing before Annas:—see below. — 13.] See Acts xxi. 31 al. The σφυρετ. τ. ’Α — were the officers sent by the Sanhedrin. — 13.] On Annas, see note Luke iii. 2. The influence of Annas appears to have been very great, and Acts iv. 6, he is called the High Priest, in the year following this. The whole matter is discussed in Friedlieb, Arch. der Leid. § 22. He ends by saying that the narrative evidently rests upon some arrangement with regard to the High Priesthood now unknown to us, but accountable enough by foreign influence and the deterioration of the priestly class through bribes and intrigues, to which Josephus and the Talmud sufficiently testify. — This hearing is entirely distinct from that in the other Gospels. There, no questions are asked of Jesus about His disciples or doctrine (ver. 10); there witnesses are produced; he is called the High Priest, in the year following this. The whole proceedings are after a legal form. That hearing was in a public court of justice, before the assembled Sanhedrin; this was a private and informal questioning. That Annas should be so often called the High Priest, is no objection to this view: see on Luke as above: see also note on ver. 24. The two hearings are maintained to be one and the same by Luther, Grot., Bengel, Lampe, Tholuck, Lücke, De Wette, Friedlieb, &c.; — the view here taken is maintained by Chrysost., Aug., Euthym., Ohl., Neander, Baumgarten - Crusius, Ebrard, Weissner, Hase, Lange, Hess, von Meyer, von Gerlich, and Skjer (vi. 352).—14.] See ch. xi. 80 and notes; also on τοῦ ἱσπυρφ. 15.] αὐτόν. αὐτόν. is here mentioned for the first time. There is no reason to doubt the universal persuasion that by this name John intends himself, and refers to the mention in ch. xii. 23 of a disciple whom Jesus loved. How he was known to the High Priest we have no means of forming a conjecture. — The palace of the High Priest was probably the dwelling of both Annas and Caiaphas. — It was not unexamined to have female porters among the Jews: see ref. — 17.] See the whole subject of Peter's denials discussed in notes on Matt. v. 29-33. — This first denial was to all appearance rashly and almost inadvertently made, from a mere feeling of shame. Lücke suggests that Peter may have set himself among the servants of the High Priest to bear out his denial.
13—27.
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μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ περὶ τῆς ἀποκρίθη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰσαῖος 'Εγὼ παρρησίαν ἀνάλαληκα τὴν κόσμως ἐγὼ πάντοτε ἐδίδαξα ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ καὶ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, ὅπου πάντες οἱ Ιουδαῖοι συνέρχονταί, καὶ ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ ἐλάλησα οὐδέν 21 τί με ἥρωτε; διὰ ἐπερώτησον τούτων ἀκύκλωτα, τί ἐλάλησα αὐτοῖς ἵνα οὖν ὦσιν διὰ ἐπιοῦ ἐγὼ. 22 τούτῳ δὲ αὐτοῦ εἰπόντος εἰς τῶν ὑπηρετῶν ἀρχηγιακῶς ἐδώκει ἡ ράπασμα τῷ Ἰσαίῳ, εἰπών Οὕτως ἀποκρινθη ἐκ ἀρχιερείας; 23 ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰσαῖος, ἐκακὸς ἐλάλησα, ἤσαρκος αὐτοῦ περὶ τούτου κακοῦ εἰ δὲ καλοὶ, τί με δέρεις; 24 Ἀπάτεηλεν [οὖν] αὐτὸν ὁ Ἀννας δεδεμένον πρὸς Καίαφαν τὸν ἀρχιερέα.

25 Ην δὲ Σιμὼν Πέτρος ἐκσκέους, καὶ ἐφημαίνομεν εἰπὼν οὖν αὐτῷ Ἄννη καὶ οὐ ἔκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ εἰ; ἢ ἤνησατο εἰκείνως, καὶ εἰπών Οὐκ εἰμὶ. 26 Ἀλεξείς εἰς εἰς τῶν δούλων τοῦ ἀρχιερείας, συγγενέων ὦν ἀπεκοφυεῖ Πέτρος τὸ ὁμόν τοῦ, Οὐκ ἐγὼ σε εἰδών ἐν τῷ κητῷ μετ' αὐτῶν; 27 Πάλαι οὖν ἤνησατο Πέτρος, καὶ εἰδικεῖς ἀλέκτωρ ἕφωνεν.

20. rec. ἐλάλησα, with q. τ. λελάληκα A B C 1 L X Y Δ ΣΥΡ.—rec. bef. συν. ins. ῥῆ, with B; but om. A B. 21. rec. παρρησία ἀνάλαληκα τὴν κόσμως ἐδίδαξα ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ καὶ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, ὅπου πάντες οἱ Ιουδαῖοι συνέρχονταί, καὶ ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ ἐλάλησα οὐδέν 21 τί με ἥρωτε; διὰ ἐπερώτησον τούτων ἀκύκλωτα, τί ἐλάλησα αὐτοῖς ἵνα οὖν ὦσιν διὰ ἐπιοῦ ἐγὼ. 22 τούτῳ δὲ αὐτοῦ εἰπόντος εἰς τῶν ὑπηρετῶν ἀρχηγιακῶς ἐδώκει ἡ ράπασμα τῷ Ἰσαίῳ, εἰπών Οὕτως ἀποκρινθη ἐκ ἀρχιερείας; 23 ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰσαῖος, ἐκακὸς ἐλάλησα, ἤσαρκος αὐτοῦ περὶ τούτου κακοῦ εἰ δὲ καλοὶ, τί με δέρεις; 24 Ἀπάτεηλεν [οὖν] αὐτὸν ὁ Ἀννας δεδεμένον πρὸς Καίαφαν τὸν ἀρχιερέα.

19.] This preliminary inquiry seems to have had for its object to induce the prisoner to criminate himself, and furnish matter of accusation before the Sanhedrin. — τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ ὁ Ἰσαῖος ὥσιν διὰ εἰς εἰς τῶν ὑπηρετῶν ἀρχηγιακῶς ἐδώκει ἡ ράπασμα τῷ Ἰσαίῳ, εἰπών Οὐκ εἰμὶ. 26 Ἀλεξείς εἰς εἰς τῶν δούλων τοῦ ἀρχιερείας, συγγενέων ὦν ἀπεκοφυεῖ Πέτρος τὸ ὁμόν τοῦ, Οὐκ ἐγὼ σε εἰδών ἐν τῷ κητῷ μετ' αὐτῶν; 27 Πάλαι οὖν ἤνησατο Πέτρος, καὶ εἰδικεῖς ἀλέκτωρ ἕφωνεν.
very possible; as also would the incident related by Luke xxii. 61:—see the extract from Robinson, Matt. xxvi. 69.

28—29.] Matt. xxvi. 71—74. Mark xiv. 69—72. Luke xxii. 58—61:—see note on Matt. xxvi. 68. Peter was in the courtyard of the house—the αὐλή. —29.] This was about an hour after the former,—Luke v. 39.

28—CHAP. XIX. 16.] Matt. xxvii. 1, 2. 11—26. Mark xv. 2—15. Luke xxiii. 2—24. Christ before Pilate.—Before this comes in the section of Luke, ch. xxii. 66—71, containing the close of the examination before the Sanhedrin, which did not happen till the morning. This undesigned agreement between Luke and John further confirms the justice of the view respecting the two hearings maintained above; see note on Luke xxiii. 66—71. —28.] αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς ἐξίστηκε. I have already discussed the difficulties attending the subject of our Lord’s last Passover, in the note on Matt. xxvii. 17—19. I will only add here some remarks of Friedlieb’s, Arch. der Leid. § 30. ‘The Jews would not enter the Praetorium that they might not be defiled, but that they might eat the Passover. For the entrance of a Jew into the house of a Gentile made him unclean till the evening. It is surprising, that according to this declaration of the holy Evangelists, the Jews had yet to eat the Passover, whereas Jesus and His disciples had already eaten it in the previous night. And it is no less surprising, that the Jews in the early morning should have been afraid of rendering themselves unclean for the Passover, since the Passover could not be kept till evening, i.e. on the next day, and the uncleanness which they dreaded did not, by the law, last till the next day. For this reason, the passage

in John labours under no small exegetic difficulties, which we cannot altogether solve, from want of accurate knowledge of the customs of the time. Possibly the law concerning Levitical defilements and purifications had in that age been made more stringent or otherwise modified; possibly, they called some other meal, besides the actual Passover, by its name. This last we certainly, with our present knowledge of Hebrew antiquities, must assume; for the law respecting uncleanness will not allow us to interpret this passage of the proper Passover on the evening of the 14th of Nisan, nor indeed of any evening meal at all.’ The whole depends on this: can φαγεῖν τὸ πάσχα mean anything else besides eating the paschal lamb in the strict sense? This is a question which in our day we have no power of answering; and, as De Wette has shown (in loc.), none of the instances cited in the affirmative side are applicable.—See note on ch. xix. 14. —29.] Though Pilate, having granted the service of the στριφὼν to the Sanhedrin, must have been aware of the circumstances under which Jesus was brought before him, he demanded a formal accusation on which legally to proceed. —30.] They do not mention the charge of blasphemy brought against Him by the Sanhedrin, for fear of the entire rejection of their cause, as by Gallio, Acts xviii. 16. The Procurators in such cases had a discretionary power. —31.] This answer is best regarded as an ironical reproach founded on their apparently proud assertion, in ver. 30—and amounting to this:—If you suppose I am to have such implicit confidence in your word as to take his guilt on your word, take him and put him to death (for κρίνετε must be
thus understood,—see below) according to your law; reminding them that the same Roman power which had reserved capital cases for his jurisdiction, also expected proper cognizance to be taken of them, and not that he should be the mere executioner of the Sanhedrin.—ἡμ.: ὁκ. 42.] From this time hencewards he was deposed (A.D. 6 or 7), and Judea became a Roman province, it would follow by the Roman law that the Jews lost the power of life and death. Josephus tells us, Antt. xx. 9, 1, that ὁκ. ἦν ἴδιον τῆς ἱερατίας τῆς ἱερατίας (the Procurator's) γνώμης καθίσας συνάχονος,—i.e. to hold a court of judgment in capital cases. Some have thought that this power was reserved to them in religious matters, as of blasphemy and sacrilege; but no proof has been adduced of this; the passages commonly alleged—Jos. Antt. xiv. 10, 2. B. Jud. vi. 2, 4, and Acts vii. 56, not applying (see note on Acts ut supra). The Talmud relates that this had taken place forty years (or more, see Lücke, ii. 737 note) before the destruction of Jerusalem.—Biscoe, on the Acts, pp. 134—167, argues at great length that the Jews had this power; and that the words here merely mean that they could not put to death on the Sabbath, which, according to the usual custom of executing the next day after judgment, would now have been the case. But this treatment of the words is unjustifiable. Can we suppose for a moment that this can have been meant, when there is not a word in the text to imply it? We may hope that the day for such forced interpretations is fast passing away.—Friedlieb (§ 31) gives the most consistent account of the matter. In the Roman provinces generally the Propurator or Proconsul conducted judicial proceedings. But Judea, which belonged to the province of Syria, was an exception. There was a Procurator cum potestate, who exercised the right of judicial cognizance. Jerusalem however possessed the privilege of judging all lighter causes before the three-and-twenty, and heavier causes, with the sole exception of judicia de capite, before the great Sanhedrin; so that none but these reserved cases remained for the Procurator. Pilate seems to have judged these cases at his visits during the festivals; which would fall conveniently for the purpose, it being the custom in Jerusalem to execute great criminals in a day or two. In other provinces the governors made circuits and held assizes throughout their jurisdictions. See on this subject Lücke's note. ii. 736. —32.] See Matt. xx. 19 al.; —ch. xii. 32, 33. —33.] It is implied, that between ver. 31 and this, a charge must have been made that He gave Himself out for the King of the Jews; see Luke xxiii. 2. —Pilate summoned Jesus in, who had been as yet outside with the Jews. This was the formal reception of the case before him;—as the Roman soldiers must now have taken charge of Jesus. —The judgments of the Romans were always public and sub dio, see ver. 13;—but the enquiries and examinations might be private. In this case Pilate appears to have wished to obtain an account from Jesus apart from the clamours of the chief priests and the mob. —84.] On this whole interview see note on Luke, ver. 4.—I regard this question ὁπ. ἑαυτ. κ.τ.λ., as intended to distinguish the senses of the word King as applied to Jesus: and of course not (De Wette, Lücke) for the information of Him who asked it, but to bring out this distinction in Pilate's mind. If he asked of Himself, the word could certainly have but one meaning, and that one would be wrongly applied;—if from information derived from the Jews, this very fact would open the way to the true meaning in which He was King of the Jews. Stier and Ebrard think there may be some reference in ὁπ. ἑαυτοῦ to a momentary earnestness in Pilate's own mind,—a suspicion that his Prisoner was what He was charged with being (see ch. xix. 8, 12), from the mention of which he immediately (ver. 35) recoils, and implies the other side of the dilemma.
of his having any share in Jewish expectations, or taking any personal interest in Jewish matters: all his information he has derived from the public accustomation of the people and chief priests. Then in \(\tau \varepsilon \nu\) is implied, 'There is no definiteness in their charge: let me have thine own account, thy ex-\(\epsilon\) parte statement, that I may at least know something definite of the case.' — 36.] This answer goes to explain the injustice of the charge of \(\delta \alpha \alpha \rho \iota \rho \iota \kappa \iota \varepsilon \) \(\tau \delta \varepsilon \nu\) (Luke xxiii. 2), and to show Pilate something of the nature of the kingdom which Jesus really came to establish.

—\(\sigma \kappa \varepsilon \ldots \kappa \tau \varepsilon \nu \) not belonging to (ch. viii. 23. x. 16) this world; — and therefore not to be supported by this world's weapons. There is no denial that His Kingdom is over this world—but that it is to be established by this world's power. — The words not only deny, they affirm: if not of this world, then of another world. They assert this other world before the representative of those who boasted of their 'orbis terrarum.' —\(\sigma \delta \varphi \rho \) certainly not angels (as Stier) nor angels and disciples (as Lampke). The sentence is elliptical, and of \(\upsilon \pi \rho \rho \) is included under the supposition introduced by \(\iota \). 'If \& c.,—I should have had servants, and those servants would have fought.'—\(\pi \alpha \rho \delta \sigma \delta \) This delivering up is referred to ch. xix. 16—\(\pi \alpha \delta \omega \varepsilon \nu \alpha \tau \nu \alpha \rho \kappa \alpha \iota \) —\(\nu \nu\) is absolutely pressed by the Romanist interpreters to mean that at some time His Kingdom would be \(\iota \nu \gamma \varepsilon \theta \zeta \nu \) — i.e. \(\tau \delta \nu \varepsilon \kappa \sigma \mu \nu \tau \omicron \omicron \) (!)—as if its essential character could ever be changed! — \(\nu \nu\) implies, 'as the case now stands; — a demonstration ad oculos from the fact that no servants of His had contended or were contending in His behalf; see similar usages of \(\nu \nu\), ch. viii. 40. ix. 41. xv. 22, 24. Rom. vii. 16, 17 al. — 87.) It is best to take \(\sigma \kappa \varepsilon \) as affirmative, — 'Thou art a King then:' on account of what follows. —\(\sigma \nu \) \(\lambda \gamma \eta \gamma\) A formula neither classical nor found in the LXX, but frequent in the Rabbinical writings; see Schöttgen, Hor. Hebr. on Matt. xxvi.

26.—\(\gamma \omega \ldots \) \(\tau \varepsilon \alpha \lambda \sigma \iota \sigma \) — The Lord here preached the Truth of His mission, upholding that side of it best calculated for the doubting philosophic mind of the day, of which Pilate was a partaker. He declares the unity and objectivity of Truth; — and that Truth must come from above, and must come through a Person sent by God, and that that Person was Himself. — \(\varepsilon \lambda \tau \nu \tau \nu \) \(\gamma \gamma \eta \eta \mu \mu \) implies that He was born a King, and that He was born with a definite purpose. The words are a pregnant proof of an Incarnation of the Son of God. This great truth is further expressed by \(\alpha \lambda \delta \kappa \eta \) \(\varepsilon \iota \tau \kappa \) — I was born, but not therein commencing My being— I came into the world. Thus certainly are the words to be understood, and not of His public appearance, His \(\alpha \dot \omega \delta \iota \zeta \iota \) (as Lücke, De Wette), nor as synonymous with \(\gamma \gamma \eta \eta \mu \mu \). It is this saying which began the fear in Pilate, which the charge of the Jews, ch. xix. 7, increased. —\(\tau \varepsilon \alpha \lambda \sigma \iota \sigma \) not \(\tau \varepsilon \alpha \lambda \delta \kappa \eta \) not 'the truth,' so that what He said should be true, — but 'to the Truth,' in its objective reality: — see ch. xvii. 17, 19, of which deep saying this is the popular exposition for His present hearer. — The Lord, besides, sets forth here in the depth of these words, the very idea of all kingdom. The King is the representative of the truth: the truth of dealing between man and man; — the truth of that power, which in its inmost truth belongs to the great and only Potentate, the King of Kings. — Again, the Lord, the King of Manhood and the world, the second Adam, came to testify to the Truth
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φωνής. 38 λέγει αυτῷ ὁ Πιλάτος Τί ἦστιν ἅλληθε; καὶ τοῦτο ἀπὸ τοῦ πάλιν ἐξῆλθε πρὸς τοὺς Ἰουδαίους, καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς Ἐγὼ οὐδεμίαν ἕτειν εὑρίσκω ἐν αὐτῷ. 39 ἔστι δὲ μυστήριον ὧν ἡ ἐπίσκοπον ἐν τῷ πάλα: 38 βούλευσθε ὑμῖν ἀπολύσω ὑμῖν τὸν βασιλέα τῶν Ἰουδαίων; 40 ἐκράψασαν ὡς πάλιν [πάντες], λέγοντες Μη τούτον, ἀλλὰ τὸν Βαραββάν. ἦν δὲ ὁ Βαραββᾶς λυστής.

XIX. 1 Τότε ὦν ἐλάβεν ὁ Πιλάτος τὸν Ἰησοῦν καὶ ἐματίγνωσε, 2 καὶ οἱ στρατιώται πλέξαντες στέφανον ἐξ ἀκανθῶν ἐπέθηκαν αὐτὸν τῇ κεφαλῇ, καὶ μάτιον πορφυροῦ περίμβαλον αὐτὸν, 3 καὶ ἔλεγον Χαῖρε ὁ βασιλέας τῶν Ἰουδαίων καὶ ἐδίδουν αὐτῷ βασίλεια. 4 καὶ ἔβληθεν πάλιν ἐξω ὁ Πιλάτος, καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς ἵνα ἵψω ὑμῖν ἀυτὸν ἔξω, ἵνα γνωτε ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ. 5

[Lake xli. 27 and i. const. Lake xxii. 11. x Mark x. 47. Lake xlii. 8. xxvii. 11, 18 al. y ch. xviii. 22 ref. s lfd.]


CHAP. XIX. 2. ἵππη τήν εἰρ. Α. txt B. — 3. bef. Πλεγεν ins. ἠρχοντο πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ B L U X 10 ab. ev. Syr. Capt. Sahid. Eth. Arm. Cyr. Aug. om. A al. — ἑδεσσάν B L X — σώφιαν L X 2 Cyr. txt A. — 4. rec. ἤγείθη. ὑμ. with EGM (HS) U Y L ∆. txt of Manhood and the world, which Sin and Satan had concealed.—This testimony to the Truth is to be the weapon whereby His Kingdom will be spread;—every one who is of the truth, i.e. here in the most general sense, every one who is a true dealer with his own heart, who has an ear to hear,—of such are My subjects composed;—they hear My voice. 3 But for the putting this true dealing upon its proper and only ground, see ch. viii. 47. vi. 44. — 38.] To this number Pilate did not belong. He had no ear for Truth. His celebrated question is perhaps more the result of indifference as much as of scepticism; it expresses, not without scoff and irony, a conviction that truth can never be found: and is an apt representative of the state of the polite Gentile mind at the time of the Lord's coming. It was rather an inability than an unwillingness to find the truth.—He waits for no answer, nor did the question require any. Nay, it was no real question, any more than τι λοι κ. srt, or any other, behind which a negation lies hid. — ἐγὼ σοι εἰ ει
conduct of Pilate appears to have had for its object to satisfy the multitude by the mockery and degradation of the so-called King of the Jews: and with that view he now brings forth Jesus. His speech is equivalent to — 'See what I have done purely to please you—for I believe Him innocent.'—[5.] is the accurate and graphic delineation of an eye-witness.—The δέ δέ ἄνθρωπος to move their contempt and pity;—[4.] this man who submits to and has suffered these indignities—how can He ever stir up the people, or set Himself up for king? Now cease to persecute Him; your malice surely ought to be satisfied.'—[8.] This had been cried before,—see Matt. ver. 22 and 1. Possibly John had not heard the cry. According as men have been in different parts of a mob, they will naturally report differently, according as those nearest to them cried out.—λέγετε. abv. vps.] The words of Pilate show vacillation between his own sense of the innocence of Jesus and his fear of displeasing the Jews and their rulers. He now, but in ironical mockery, as before, ch. xviii. 31, delivers the matter entirely into their hands: perhaps after having received the message from his wife, Matt. ver. 19.—[7.] In consequence of this taunt, they now declare the cause of their condemnation of Him—see Levit. xxiv. 16—and their demand that, though found innocent by the governor, He should die.—[8.] This charge served to increase the fear which Pilate had before: see note on ch. xviii. 37. The name Ἰωάννης θεοῦ served also to confirm the omen already furnished by the dream of his wife. That this fear was not a fear of the Jews, nor of acting unjustly, but of the Person of Jesus, is evident from what follows.—[8.] He entered, taking Jesus with him.—ἰδὼν i.e. not 'from what province?'—for he knew this, Luke xxiii. 6, 7, nor, 'of what parents?—but 'whence?' in reference to Ἰωάννης θεοῦ. Observe that the fear of Pilate is not mere superstition, nor does it enter into the Jewish meaning of Ἰωάννης θεοῦ: but arises from an indefinite impression made on him by the Person and bearing of our Lord. We must not therefore imagine any fear of Him as being a 'son of the gods,' in Pilate's mind: this gives a wrong direction to his conduct, and misses the fine psychological truth of the narrative.—The Lord, in His silence, was acting according to His own precept, Matt. vii. 6. Notwithstanding Pilate's fear of Him, he was not in earnest;—not determined to be led by his conscience, but had already given way to the unjust demands of the people; and He who saw his heart knew how unworthy he was of an answer to so momentous a question. Besides, this silence was the most emphatic answer to all who had ears to hear it;—was a reference to what He had said before, ch. xviii. 37, and so a witness to His Divine origin. Would any more
man, of true and upright character, have refused an answer to such a question, so put? Let the modern rationalist consider this. — 10.] As in ch. xvi. 36, Pilate at once recoils from his better conscience into the state-pride of office. ' Objurgans increpatio timori precedenti plane contraria.' Lamp. — This very boast was a self-con- viction of injustice. No just judge has any such power as this, to loose or to punish (see 2 Cor. xiii. 6); but only patiently to inquire and give sentence according to the truth. — 11.] This last testimony of the Lord before Pilate is a witness to the truth: opening in a wonderful manner the secret of Pilate's vaunted power, of His own humble submission, and the sinfulness of His enemies. The great stress is on the word ἀνουθῶν, on which Grotius strikingly says (ungestritten treffend, Stier), 'inde scilicet, unde ortus sum!' so that it answers remarkably to the πάθος above. We must not dream of any allusion to Rome, or the Sanhedrin, in this ἀνουθῶν, as the sources of Pilate's power: — the word was not so meant, nor so understood: see ver. 12. — διὸδομένων, not διὸδομῆν: — the neuter is more general, and embraces in itself the whole delegation from above, included in the ἀποστολάς above. — the neuter is more general, and embraces in itself the whole delegation from above, included in — except by appointment from above. Lamp remarks: ' Concedit Pilato primum, — potestatem. Agonoschat for human anuctoritatem, quia regnum ejus non erat terrenum, humanos magnistros non destruens. Necque Pilato et Romanis justus in Judeos disputatibus. Secundo, exagerat illum potestatem, ut supernae datam. Hec est doctrina Christiana, omnem potestatem esse a Deo. Tertio, agnosticit potestatem illum sem in Seipsum extendere, cum omnia secum ex decreto divino agerentur' (Stier, vi. 461). — διὰ τοῦτο on this account, viz. because of what has just been asserted, οὐκ ἔχει κ. τ. L. — The connexion is, somewhat difficult. I take it to be this: ' God has given to thee power over Me; — not insight into the character which I claim, that of being the Son of God, — but simply power: that insight belonged to others, viz. the Sanhedrin, and their president, whose office it was to judge that claim; they have judged against the clearest evidence and rejected Me, the Son of God; thy sin, that of blindly exercising thy power, sin though it be, is therefore less than theirs, who being God's own people, and with God's word of prophecy before them (and the High Priest, with his own prophetic word before him, — see ch. xviii. 14), deliberately gave Me over into thy hand. It is important to this, which I believe to be the only right understanding of the words, to remember that Pilate from ver. 6 was making himself simply their tool; — He was the sinful, but at the same time the blind, instrument of their deliberate malice. Nearly so Lücke and De Wette. Bengel and Stier understand 'quia Me non nosti' as the subject of διὰ τοῦτο, but Lücke rightly says that διὸδομ. ἀνουθῶν, and nothing else, must be that subject. — διὰ τοῦτο. Beyond question, Caiaphas, — to whom the initiative on the Jewish side belonged; ' cujus autoritate omnia agebantur,' Lampe. At the same time the whole Sanhedrin are probably included under the guilt of their chief. — In this ἀμαρτίαν is an implied reference to a higher Judge — nay, that Judge Himself speaks! — 12.] ἐκ τ., from this time; — but not as a mere date; — with reference to what had just been said. Pilate himself was deeply struck by these words of majesty and mildness, and almost sympathy for his weakness, and made a last, and, as ἐκ τ. seems to imply, a somewhat longer attempt than before, to deliver Him. — Φιλο τ. K. — There does not seem to be any allusion to a title of honour, amicus Cæsaris; indeed, to judge from the citations in Wetstein, a good deal of fancy has been employed in making out the fact of such a title having been in use, any further than that the appellation would naturally arise and be accounted honourable. — Φιλο τ. K. here is, — well affected to Cæsar.' — This was a terrible saying, especially under Tiberius, with whom (Tosit. Ann. iii. 38) ' majestatis crimen omnium
accusationem complementum erat:' — ἡδὲ δὲ θέλω . . . . . . This was true: their application of it to Christ, a lie. But words, not facts, are taken into account by tyrants, and this Pilate knew. — 13.] τ. λόγων τούτων—viz. these two last remarks. 'In such a perplexity, a man like Pilate could not long hesitate. As Caiphas had before said it were better that One even innocent man should die, than that all should perish: so now, in like case Pilate decided rather to sacrifice Jesus though innocent, than to expose himself to so great danger.' Friedlieb, Arch. der Leid. § 34. — See: see on ch. xviii. 33.—The βῆμα was in front of the praetorium, on an elevated platform; — Gabbatha, probably from γαβ, altus fuit, — which was paved with a tessellated pavement. Such a pavement Julius Caesar carried about on his expeditions, Suet. Ces. c. 46. — 14. παρασκευὴ τοῦ π.] The significan, 'Friday in the Passover week' (using παρασκευὴ) for 'day before the sabbath,' as Matt. xxvii. 62. Luke xxvii. 54, and τοῦ π. as in σάββατον τοῦ π. Ign. ad Phil. c. 13. De Wette), has found many, and some recent defenders: see especially Wieseler, Chron. Synops. 1. 395 f. But this is not its natural meaning, nor would it ever have been thought of in this place, but for the difficulty arising from the whole Passover question, which I have discussed on Matt. xxi. 17—19.—ταρ. τοῦ π. answers to τὴν τετάρτην, and is 'the vigil of the Passover,' i.e. the day preceding the evening when the passover was killed. And so it must be understood here, especially when connected with ch. xviii. 28. See on the whole matter the note above referred to. — ἄρα ἦσαν ἐκείνη some intermediate time may be described by both Evangelists. But this is not satisfactory: see note on Mark xv. 26.—The words ἐστὶν ὀνείρο. ἐστὶ seem to have been spoken in irony to the Jews—in the same spirit in which afterwards the title was written over the cross:—partly perhaps also, as in that case, in consequence of the saying in ver. 12,—to sever himself altogether from the suspicion there cast on him. — 15.] ἐν ὑπ' ἵππῳ, εἰς τὸν λύκον, — a degrading confession from the chief priests of that people of whom it was said, 'The Lord your God is your King,' 1 Sam. xii. 12.—However, it furthered the present purpose, and to this all was sacrificed,
including truth itself; for the confession was not only degrading, but false in their mouths. Some of those who now cried this, died miserably in rebellion against Caesar forty years afterwards. —16.] Here the scourging seems (Matt., Mark) to have taken place, or perhaps to have been renewed, since the former one was not that customary before execution, but conceded by Pilate to the mob in hope of satisfying them.

17—42.] Matt. xxvii. 31—66. Mark xv. 20—47. Luke xxiii. 26—56. The crucifixion, death, and burial of Jesus. Compare the notes on the four throughout. —[17.] See on Matt. ver. 33.—[19.] ditto, ver. 37.—[20—28.] The same spirit of mockery of the Jews showed itself in the title, as before, ver. 14. They had prevailed on Pilate by urging this point, that Jesus had set Himself up for a king; and Pilate is willing to remind them of it by these taunts. Hence their complaint and his answer.—The Latin was the official language, the Greek that usually spoken,—the Hebrew (i.e. Aramaic) that of the common people.—Δὲ γύριν γύριν. The first perfect denotes the past active; the second, that it was complete and unalterable.—23, 24.] oὐς goes back to ver. 18.—There were four soldiers, a τέσσαρες, Acts xii. 4, and a centurion?—centurio supplicio prepositus; Semecas de Ira, 16 (Friedlieb).—The garments of the executed were by law the perquisite of the soldiers on duty. Dig. xlviii. 20, 6 (Friedlieb).—On tunic was the so-called 'toga occulta,' or 'byzina.' It reached from the neck to the feet, and was fastened round the throat with a clasp. It was properly a priest's garment (see Jos. Antt. iii. 7, 4), and was woven of linen, or perhaps of wool (Friedlieb).—The citation is verbatim from the LXX. In it, ἰμάτια = the upper gar-
John had a house in Jerusalem. It would equally apply to his lodging during the feast; only meaning, that henceforth, wherever he was, he was an inmate with him; and certainly that his usual habitation was fixed, and was his own. — (29.) μετὰ τὸν γενέτερον is generally, but not necessarily, immediate. Here we must suppose the ἐλλιπτικὸν to have been said meantime, and the three hours' darkness to have taken place. Perhaps during some of this time John was absent: see above. — ἐν ταλ. ἐκ γερανίνων. Various needless objections have been raised to the application of these words to the saying of the Lord which follows, and attempts have been made to connect them with τελικείας (τελικείας, ἵνα τελικέω). That John does use ἐνω... as applying to what follows, ch. xiv. 31 shows. And so here,—that the Scripture might be accomplished (not πληρωθέντος), having it in view to leave no pre-appointed particular of the circumstances of His suffering unfulfilled, Jesus, speaking doubtless also in intense present agony of thirst, but only speaking because He so willed it, but because it was an ordained part of the course which He had taken upon Him, said this word. 'Nec hoc levamentum petisset, nisi sciisset id quoque ad criteria Messiae secundum Prophetae spectare; unde hac altera motiva additur; ut consummaretur Scriptura.' Lampre (Stier, vi. 673). — (29.) The ὅσος was the posca, the sour wine, or vinegar and water, the common drink of the Roman soldiers. — (30.) Ἀραβικὸν} An aromatic plant growing on walls, common in the south of England.
όδος ο Ισούς, είπε "Τετελεσταί, καὶ κλίνας τήν κεφάλην, παρέδωκε το πνεύμα. Οι ουν Ιουδαίοι, εις μη μείνη ἐπὶ τοῦ σαυροῦ τὰ σώματα τοις σαββάτιοις τὸν σαββάτου, ἤψωσαν τὸν Πιλᾶτον οὕτω κατεγώγην αὐτῶν τὰ σκέλη καὶ ἀρδώσων. Ηλθον οὖν οἱ στρατιωται, καὶ τοῦ μὲν πρώτου καταζάκαν τὰ σκέλη καὶ τοῦ άλλου τού συσταυρωθέντος αυτοῦ, ἐλθόντες ὡς εἰδον αὐτῶν ἡδ πτευνικότα, οὐ καταζάκαν αὐτοῦ τὰ σκέλη, ἐλλα ἦς τῶν στρατιωτῶν ἀλήχως αὐτοῦ τῆν πλευράν ἐνυξε, καί ἐνθύς ἐξήλθεν αἷμα καὶ ὑδωρ. καὶ ο ἐρακως διεμαρτύρηκα, καί ἀληθήνων αὐτοῦ ἠμαρτησα, κακείων οἴδεν ὅτι ἀληθῆ λύει."
whole circumstances of the death of Jesus. —The use of πιστεύων in John makes it probable that he lays the weight on the proof of the reality of the death, as above. The ἵνα depends on the three preceding clauses, without any parenthesis, as the final aim of what has gone before: 'in order that,' not so the LXX. —On ἵνα 6 ff. see note there. —36.] "Fox" —i.e. as connected with the true Messianship of Christ, 'these things were a fulfilment of Scripture.' It is possible that Ps. xxxi. 20 (LXX) may be also referred to; but no doubt the primary reference is to the Paschal Lamb of Exod., as in ref. — see 1 Cor. v. 7. —37.] LXX., ἰτιβλίσθωσα τρός με, ἀνθή ὑν κατωρχησαντο—but the Evangelist has given the literal and, as now acknowledged (Lücke), true sense of the word ἵνα. The δεύτερα does not refer to the Roman soldiers,—but to the repentant in the world, who, at the time the Gospel was written, had begun to fulfill the prophecy. —38.] gen. ταύτη—not, 'immediately after this'—but 'soon after.' The narrative implies, though it does not mention (as Mark and Leuke do), that Joseph himself took down the Body from the cross. Lücke thinks the soldiers would have done this: but their duty seems only to have extended to the ascertaining of the fact of death.—The δεύτερον of ver. 31 need not imply, 'by their hands.' —It was customary to grant the bodies of executed persons to their friends. —Percusso sepulcri carnifex non vetat.' Quintil. Declam. vi. —On Joseph, and the other particulars, see notes on Matt.—ἡδε—το Golgotha.—39.] John alone mentions Nicodemus. The Galilean narrative had no previous trace of him, and does not recognize him here. Joseph bore too prominent a part not to be mentioned by all.—σμόρφησα μυρρ.—the gum of an aromatic plant, not indigenous in Palestine, but in Arabia Felix, see ref. and Exod. xxv. 23. Cant. iii. 6. Esth. ii. 12. Prov. vii. 17, and Winer, Realwörterbuch, ii. 148.—Ἀλάνης] The name of various sorts of aromatic wood in the East, —see Winer, Realw. i. 54. Both materials appear to have been pulverised (the wood by scraping or burning?) and stewed in the folds of the linen in which the Body was wrapped (De Wette). The quantity is large,—but perhaps the whole Body was wrapped, after the wrapping, in the mixture, and an outer wrapper fastened over all. The proceeding was hurried, on account of the approaching Sabbath: and apparently an understanding entered into with the women, that it should be more completely done after the Sabbath was over. This plentiful application of the aromatic substances may therefore have been made
with an intention to prevent the Body, in its lacertated state, from incipient decomposition during the interval. — 40.] See ch. xi. 44. Little is known with any certainty, except from these passages, of the Jews' ordinary manner of burying. Winer, Friedlieb. — 41.] See note on Matt. v. 60. The words in τω τόπω δι' θου ἱσταυρωθή, are so far in favour of the traditional site of the Holy Sepulchre, that Calvary and the Sepulchre are close together, under the roof of the same church. And those who have found an objection in that circumstance, have forgotten this testimony of John.—κωινά... ] And therefore given for the purpose — so that the additional particular not here mentioned, that it belonged to Joseph, is almost implied. — 42.] τίνης παρασκ. τ. Ἰουδ. seems to indicate clearly the παρασκευή of the Passion, as I have before maintained that the words mean; not the mere day of the week so called, which, as it was by the Christians also in the Apostles' time named παρασκ., would not be qualified by τοῦ Ἰουδ. — the words δεύτερα. ην το μν. certainly appear as if John were not aware that the tomb belonged to Joseph; — but it is still more likely that the thought of asking for the Body may have been originally suggested to Joseph by his possessing a tomb close to the place of crucifixion, and so δεύτερα. ην το μν. may have been the real original reason of the whole proceeding; and John, not anxious to record every particular, may have given it as such.

1. Mark xvi. 1. Luke xxiv. 1. — On the chronology of the events of the Resurrection, see note on Matt. xxviii. 1. I attempt no harmony of the accounts: — I believe all attempts to be fruitless; — and I see in their failure strong corroboration of the truth of the Evangelic narratives. It is quite impossible that so astounding an event, coming upon various portions of the body of disciples from various quarters and in various forms, should not have been related, by four independent witnesses, in the scattered and fragmentary way in which we now find it. In the depth beneath this varied surface of narration rests the great central fact of the resurrection itself, unmovd and immovable. As it was this above all other things to which the Apostles bore their testimony, so, in their testimony to this, we have the most remarkable proof of each having faithfully elaborated into narrative those particular facts which came under his own eye or were reported to himself by those concerned. Hence the great diversity in this portion of the narrative: — and hence I believe much that is now dark might be explained, were the facts themselves, in their order of occurrence, before us. Till that is the case, (and I am willing to believe that it will be one of our delightful employments hereafter, to trace the true harmony of the Holy Gospels, under His teaching of Whom they are the record,) we must be content to walk by faith, and not by sight. — 1, 2.] Map. καί Ματθ. She was not alone (Mt., Mk., L.). Does this appear in the διάθεσις below? — One thing we may conclude for certain, that she, for some reason, did not see the vision of Mk., and L. — 3.] Luke, ver. 12, knows only of Peter's going. — 4—8.] Full of most interesting and characteristic detail. John, probably the younger, outruns Peter; — but when there, reverently abstains from enter-
ing the sepulchre. The ardent and im-
petuous Peter goes directly in—John
follows—and believes. What can exceed
the inner truth of this description? And
what is not related, is as full of truth as
that which is. For, vv. 6, 7, we seem to
hear the very voice of Peter describing to
his companion the inner state of the tomb.
—On συναινεῖται see ref. —8.] ἐκεῖνοιον.
Nothing is said of Peter—did he believe too?
I think not; and that John modestly
suppresses it. But what did John believe?
Was it merely, 'corpus fuisset translatum,
at dictar Maria?' (Bengel, so August.,
Erasm., Grot., Stier, Ebrard.) Surely not;
John does not so use the word προσέκληθη.
He believed that Jesus was risen from the
dead. He received into his mind, em-
braced with his assent, the fact of the
resurrection, for the first time. He did
this, on the ocular testimony before him;
for as yet neither of them knew the Scrip-
ture, so as to be a priori convinced of the
certainty that it would be so. But (see
above) Peter does not seem to have as yet
received this fact;—accounting probably
for what he saw as Mary had done.—10.] 
Luke has the very same expression ἀπὸ
πρὸς ταύτα. This is remarkable, as he
evidently has a fragment of the same inci-
dent. πρὸς ταύτα, to their lodging. —11.] 
She had come with them, but more slowly.
—12.] From what has been said above,
my readers will not expect me to compare
the angelic appearances in the four Gospels.
What wonder, if the heavenly hosts were
variously and often visible on this great
day, when 'the morning stars sang togeth-
er, and all the sons of God shouted for
joy?'—What can be more accurate in de-
tail than this description of the vision of
Mary? Every word was no doubt care-
fully related to the apostle, and as care-
fully recorded. —13.] Here again the finest
psychological truth underlies the narrative.
The other women (Mark, ver. 5. Luke, ver.
5) were afraid at the vision; but now
Mary, having but one thought or desire, to
recover the lost Body of her Lord (ὁν
cύριόν μου), feels no fear.—The angels
doubtless are proceeding further to assure
her as they did the women before:—but
this is broken off by the appearance of the
Lord Himself, or perhaps by Mary's turn-
ing away. —14.] ἐστραφή—having her
attention attracted by the consciousness of
some one present near her—not perhaps by
the approach of Jesus. Or it might be
(Stier, Ebrard) with intent to go forth and
weep again, or further to seek her Lord.
We need not surely inquire too minutely,
why she did not know Him. The fact
may be psychologically accounted for—she
did not expect Him to be there, and was
wholly preoccupied with other thoughts:—
or even her face may not have been turned
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7—18. *στώτα, καὶ οὖν ἐδει ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐστι.* 15 λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς Γάνναι, τί κλαίως; τίνα ζητεῖς; ἐκείνη δοκούσα ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ κηπουρᾶς ἐστι, λέγει αὐτῷ Κύριε, εἰ σὺ ἓβαστασας αὐτοῦ, εἰπὲ μοι ποῦ αὐτὸν ἔθηκας, κἀγὼ αὐτόν ἀρῶ.
16 λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς Μαρία. ἡ στραφεῖσα εκείνη λέγει λέγει τῇ αὐτῇ. 17 λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς Μή μου ἀπτῶν ὦπω γὰρ ἀναβάσθηκα πρὸς τὸν πατέρα [μου], πορεύον [δὲ] πρὸς τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς μου, καὶ ἐπὶ αὐτῶν Ἄναβαιν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα μου καὶ πατέρα ὑμῶν καὶ θεοῦ μου καὶ θεοῦ ὑμῶν. 18 εἶρχεται.

—15. for ἰδίατε, Ἰησοῦς D.—ἡθικάς D.—16. ἰδίατο ins. ἰδίατοι B D L 0 X Ἄ σ. al. by Syr. Capt. Sahid. Lth. Arm. txt A K a.—κύριε διδάσκαλε D.—17. ἰδίατον om. μου B D X b Orig. Iren. ins. A al. aev Orig. — ἰδίατον D L ἰδ io Orig. txt B ab Orig.—ἀφιέρων om. μου D Orig. (some ms.) and Iren.—to Him (see ver. 16):—or, as Draseke (cited by Stier, vi. 634) says, 'Her tears wore a veil, which concealed Him who stood before her. The seeking after the Dead prevents us from seeing the Living.’—15.] The same kind of repetition by the Lord of what the angel had before said is found in Matt. xxviii. 7, 10.—It is idle to inquire why she thought Him to be the gardener (see specimens of such speculations in Lucke and Stier in loc.): but I may once for all observe that we must believe the clothing of His risen Body to have been that which He pleased to assume; not earthly clothing, but perhaps some semblance of it. Certainly, in this case, He was clothed; or she must at once have recognized Him—κύριε, the appellation of courtesy to an unknown person. —18.] With one word, and that one word, Her name, the Lord awakens all the consciousness of His presence: calling her in that tone doubtless in which her soul had been so often summoned to receive Divine Knowledge and precious comfort. —στραφεῖσα] seems to imply that she had not been looking full at Him before.—ραββούνι See Mark x. 51. γιὰγ either ' my Master,'—or merely ' Master,'—the being merely paragogic; which last appears (from διδάσκαλος) to be the case here.—That she gives way to no impassioned exclamations, but pours out her satisfaction and joy in this one word, is also according to the deepest psychological truth. One ms. (13) adds καὶ προδέραμεν ἄφωθεν αὐτῷ—an explanatory gloss to μή μου ἄφωθα— but doubtless a correct one. —17.] The connexion between the prohibition and its reason is difficult, and has been very variously given. See a complete discussion of the exegetical literature of the passage in Stier, vi. 640—667. The sense seems to me to be connected with some gesture of the nature alluded to in the gloss above quoted, but indicating that she believed she had now gotten Him again, never to be parted from Him. This gesture He reproves as unsuited to the time, and the nature of His present appearance. 'Do not thus—for I am not yet restored finally to you in the body—I have yet to ascend to the Father.'—This implies in the background another and truer touching, when He should have ascended to the Father. ‘Vis me tangere, Maria; vis omnino frui amicitia mea: id nunc non licet, quum tandem oikoumenew;’ ad fidem vestrum roborandum me do conspiciendum. At ubi ad Patrem ascendero, veniet tempus quam frui mea amicitia perfectissimae polaris, non terrestri contactu, sed tali qui loci illi, id easce consentia, spirituallis. Grotius. With this my view nearly agrees, except that I should not confine the latter enjoyment to in caelo, but should understand it to have begun here below. So Leo the Great, Serm. Ixxii. 4, cited by Archdeacon Wilberforce, Doctrine of the Incarnation, p. 279: ‘I would not have you come to Me in bodily-wise, nor recognize Me by carnal touch: I put you off to something higher, I prepare you for something greater; when I am ascended to My Father, then you shall touch Me in a more true and perfect manner, when you shall lay hold of that which you do not touch, and believe that which you do not behold.'—The two renderings of ἄφωθα to be guarded against are: (1) a laying hold of to retain (μή μου ἄφωθα), (2) a laying hold of to worship (ἐκπροσώπου αὐτοῦ ὑμῶν τοὺς πόδας, Matt. xxviii. 9). Neither of these senses can be extracted from the word without forcing.—τὸρευόν ὑμῖν
Maria ἡ Μαγδαληνή ἐκ γεγένθασα τοῖς μαθηταῖς ΑΒΔ ὅτι έφραξε τὸν κύριον καὶ ταύτα εἶπεν αὐτῷ.

19 Οὖν οὖν ὅτι ὁ μᾶς ἐκεῖν ἐγένετο τῷ μαθηταῖς.

20 Καὶ τούτῳ εἰπών ἔδειξεν αὐτοῖς τοὺς εἰρήνης ὁ Ισσών καὶ ἔδειξεν ἀνωτέρως, καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς Ἐιρήνης ὑμῖν.

21 Εἰπεν οὖν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰσσών πάλιν Ἐιρήνη ὑμῖν καθὼς ἦτο ἐκ γεγένθασον τοῖς μαθηταῖς ΑΒΔ.

Stier remarks that this was a far greater honor than that which had been forbidden her;—just as the handling of the Lord allowed to Thomas was a far less thing than the not seeing and yet believing.—τοὺς δὲ ἄνδρας, μου. By this term He testifies that He has not put off His humanity, nor His love for His own, in His resurrective state: see Heb. ii. 11. —πατρία μου κ. τ. λαρ. This distinction, μου κ. τ. λαρ., when ἦν ὁ ὁ μου seems so likely to have been said, has been observed by all commentators of any depth, as indicating an essential difference in the relations. Curr. Jer. (Stier) —ἀλλος ἦν αὐτοῖς κατὰ φύσιν ἄλλος ἦν αὐτοῖς, κατὰ θείν. Aug. —Non alt, Patrem nostrum; alter ergo meum, alter vestrum; natura mea, gratia vestra. Et, Deum meum et Deum vestrum. Neque hic dixit Deum nostrum; ergo et hic alter meum, alter vestrum. Deum meum, sub quo et ego sum homo: Deum vestrum, sustineri et Ipse Mediator sum. Track. cxxi. —The μου is the ground and source of the ἦν αὐτοῖς, therefore the Lord so speaks. Stier, vi. 659. 'Nos, per illum: Ille, singularissime et primo, Bengel. —In the αὐτοῖς is included His temporary stay which He was now making with them—'I am ascending.' —q. d. 'I am on my way.'

19—22] With vv. 19—24 comp. Luke xxiv. 36—49. Mark xvii. 14—18. —vv. 24—29 is peculiar to John. —19.] The circumstance of the doors being shut is mentioned here and in ver. 26, to indicate what sort of appearance these were. Suddenly, unaccounted for by any approach, the Lord rendered Himself visible to His disciples. Nor did this affect the truth of that resurrection Body, any more than His withdrawing Himself from mortal sight occasionally affected the truth of His fleshly Body. Both were done by that supernatural Power dwelling in Him, by which His other miracles were wrought. It was the attribute of His fleshly Body to be visible to mortal eyes:—of His risen Body, not to be. But both these He could suspend when He pleased, without affecting the substance or truth of either. —καὶ ὁ τ. φ. τ. Ισσ. This was natural enough:—the bitter hatred of the Jews (both people and rulers) to their Master,—and His own prophetic announcements,—would raise in them a dread of incipient persecution, now that He was removed. —ἡμῶν not, by ordinary approach;—nor, through the closed doors;—nor in any visible manner;—but (subjectively, of Himself) relating to that unseen arrival among them which preceded His becoming visible to them.—ὅταν τε τ. μ. Comp. Luke, ver. 36, ἐγὼ ἐν μοι. The ἐν, as in ch. xxi. 4, denotes the coming, and standing, in one the standing without motion thither, which in ordinary cases would be standing as the result of motion thither. —so in that case ἐν is the verb of motion. —ἐν τοι. See on Luke, ver. 36, and ch. xiv. 27. —20.] answers to Luke, ver. 36. —ἐγείρατον] The first and partial fulfilment of ch. xvi. 22: see note there. —The disciples seem to have handled Him:—see Luke, ver. 39. 1 John i. 1, and below, ver. 25. —21.] 'Peace be with you' is solemnly repeated, as the introduction of the sending which follows. The ministers and disciples of the Lord are messengers of peace. This view is more natural than that of Buthym. —σῶ τοι πολλῆς χαρᾶς, ὡς εἰδε, θυρωβοῦντα κατατείλατε, ταν προσέκοψαν αἰτία μήλης ἑστιν. —καθὼς] He confirms and grounds their Apostleship on the present glorification of Himself, whose Apostleship (Heb.}
ii. 1) on earth was now ended, but was to be continued by this sending forth of them. This commission was not now first given them, but now first fully assured to them: and their sending forth by Him their glorified Head, was to be, in character and process, like that of Himself by the Father.—

23. To understand this verse as the outpouring of the Spirit, the fulfilment of the promise of the Comforter, is against all consistency, and most against John himself:—see ch. xvi. 7, and ch. xx. 17. —To understand it rightly, we have merely to recur to that great key to the meaning of so many dark passages of Scripture, the manifold and gradual unfolding of promise and prophecy in their fulfilment. The presence of the Lord among them now was a slight and temporary fulfilment of His promise of returning to them; and so the imparting of the Spirit now, was a symbol and foretaste of that which they should receive at Pentecost:—just as, to mount a step higher, that itself, in its present abiding with us, is but the first-fruits and pledge (Rom. viii. 23. 2 Cor. i. 22) of the fulness which we shall hereafter inherit.—

Further: this giving of the Spirit was not His personal imparting of Himself to them, but only a partial instilling of His influence. He proceeds forth in His work (as in His essence) from the Father and the Son: this breathing of His influence was an imparting of Him from the Son in His risen Body, but that Body had not yet been received up, without which union of the God-manhood of the Son to the glory of the Father the Holy Spirit would not come.—What was now conferred is plain from our ver. 23.—by which authority to discern spirits and pronounce on them is re-assured (see Matt. xviii. 18)—and from Luke, ver. 45, by which a discerning of the mind of the Spirit is given to them. We find instances of both these gifts being exercised by Peter in Acts i., in his assertion of the sense of Scripture, and his judgment of Judas. Both those however were only temporary and imperfect.—That no final gifts of Apostleship were now formally conferred, is plain by the absence of Thomas, who in that case would be no apostle in the same sense in which the rest were. —ἐνεφώσεως (see ref.) was the word expressing the act of God in the original infusion of the spirit of life into man. This act is now by God incarnate repeated, sacramentally (see λάβεται, Matt. xxvi. 26), representing the infusion of the new life, of which He is become by His glorified Humanity the source to His members:—see Job xxxii. 4. Ps. xxxiii. 6. 1 Cor. xv. 45. —

The present meaning of these words has been spoken of above. They reach forward however beyond that, and extend the grant which they re-assure, to all ages of the Church.—The words, closely considered, amount to this: that with the gift and real participation of the Holy Spirit, comes the conviction, and therefore the knowledge, of sin, of righteousness, and judgment:—and this knowledge becomes more perfect, the more men are filled with the Holy Ghost. Since this is so, they who are pre-eminent filled with His presence are pre-eminently gifted with the discernment of sin and repentance in others, and hence by the Lord’s appointment authorized to pronounce pardon of sin and the contrary. The Apostles had this in an especial manner, and by the full indwelling of the Spirit were enabled to discern the hearts of men, and to give sentence on that discernment:—see Acts v. 1—11. viii. 91. xili. 9. —And this gift belongs especially to those who by legitimate appointment are set to minister in the Churches of Christ; not by successive delegation from the Apostles,—of which I find in the N. T. no trace,—but by their mission from Christ, the Bestower of the Spirit for their office, when orderly and legitimately conferred upon them by the Churches. Not however to them exclusively,—though for decency and order it is expedient that the outward and formal declaration should be so:—but in proportion as any discipule shall have been filled with the Holy Spirit of wisdom, is the inner discernment, the σκόπειν, his. —σπέρμα here (see ref.) corresponds to σπέρμα in Matt.;
EYAIITOEIIO

25. 25 ΄Έλεγον οὖν αὐτῷ οἱ ἄλλοι μαθηταὶ ἈΒΔ Epwράκειμεν τὸν κύριον. ὦ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Ἐὰν μὴ ἔδω ἐν ταῖς χερισίν αὐτοῦ τὸν 5 τύπον τῶν ἰδιων καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀκτιλῶν μου εἰς τὸν * τύπον τῶν ἱλιῶν καὶ βάλω τὴν χειρὰ μου εἰς τὴν πλευρὰν αὐτοῦ, ὦ μὴ πιστεύσω. 26 Καὶ μεθ’ ἡμέρας οκτώ πάλιν ἦσαν ἔσω οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ Ὠμᾶς μετ’ αὐτῶν. ἔρχεται ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῶν θυρῶν κεκλεισμένων, καὶ ἔστη τ’ εἰς τὸ μέσον καὶ εἶπεν Ἐρήνη ύμῖν. 27 εἶτα λέγει τῷ Ὠμᾶς Κάτω τὸν ἄκτιλὸν σου ὄψε καὶ ἔδε τὰς χειρὰς μου, καὶ φέρε τὴν χειρὰ σου καὶ βάλε ἐκ τῆς πλευράς μου, καὶ μὴ γίνου ἀπίστος ἀλλ’ πιστός. 28 ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ὠμᾶς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ΑΒCD

24. bef. λέγω, om. ὁ Δ. ins. Α. Β, &c. — 25. ἐς τὰς χειρὰς D c.—for τύπον (2nd), τύτον Α abce Syr. Arm. Orig. Hil. Ambr. ττ B D (the two clauses καὶ βάλω are transposed in D).—μοῦ τὴν χειρὰ B L τὰς χειρὰς D ad. —26. ἔρχεται οὖν ὁ Ἰ. D. —27. μὴ τεθῇ D. —28. rec. καὶ πάν. ὁ Θ., but ττ A B C D X καὶ abe Cyr. Cyr.—b. see the distinction there; —φίλοις to λίσιν. —24. ἐς ἣν—for what reason, does not appear. But I incline, with Stier, vi. 763, to think that it could not have been accidentally (Lücke), nor ‘negotio aliquo occupatus’ (Grot.). On such a day, and in such a man, such an absence must have been designed. Perhaps he had abandoned hope;—the strong evidence of his senses having finally convinced him that the pierced side and wounded hands betokened such a death that revivification was impossible. — 25.] He probably does not name the feet, merely because the hands and side would more naturally offer themselves to his examination than the feet, to which he must stoop. —He requires no more than had been granted to the rest; but he had their testimony in addition,—and therefore ample ground for faith to rest on. Olshausen calls him the ‘Rationalist among the Apostles.’—26.] There is not the least reason for supposing, with Olshausen, that this appearance was in Galilee. The whole narrative points out the same place as before. —The eight days’ interval is the first testimony of the recurring day of the resurrection being commemorated by the disciples;—but, it must be owned, a weak one;—for in all probability they had been thus assembled every day during the interval. —27.] Happily, for English readers, the Lord’s knowledge of Thomas’s unbelief needs no hypothesis to account for it; alas that this should be the case with such men as Lücke! —The Lord says nothing of the τύτον ἰδιων—He does not recall the malice of His enemies. —The words imply that the marks were no scars, but the veritable wounds themselves;—that in His being large enough for a hand to be thrust into it. This of itself would show that the resurrection Body was bloodless. —μὴ γ. ἐσώτ.] not merely, ‘Do not any longer disbelieve in My Resurrection’;—but, ‘Be not’—as applied generally to the spiritual life, and the reception of God’s truth—faithless, but believing. The E. V. is excellent.—That Thomas did not apply his finger or his hand, is evident from ὁ δὲ λύσις με κάτω. —28.] The Socinian view, that these words, δὲ μοῦ κ. δ’ ἡμῖν μοῦ, are merely an exclamation, is refuted, (1) By the fact that no such exclamations were in use among the Jews. (2) By the ἔσω αὐτῷ. (3) By the impossibility of referring δ’ ἡμῖν μοῦ to another than Jesus: see ver. 13. (4) By the N. T. usage of expressing the vocative by the nom. with an article. (5) By the utter psychological absurdity of such a supposition:—that one just convinced of the presence of Him whom he deeply loved, should, instead of addressing Him, break out into an irrelevant cry. (6) By the further absurdity of supposing that if such were the case, the Apostle John, who of all the sacred writers most constantly keeps in mind the object for which he is writing, should have recorded any thing so beside that object. (7) By the intimate conjunction of πιστεύεις—see below.—Dismissing it therefore, we observe that this is the highest confession of faith which has yet been made;—and that it shows that (though not yet fully) the meaning of the previous confessions of His being ‘the Son of God’ was understood. Thus John, in the very close of his Gospel
XXI. 1. Metà taútà ἐφανέρωσεν εαυτὸν τάλιν οὖν ἐκ τῆς θαλάσσης τῆς Τιβεριάδος ἐφανέρωσε δε' οὕτως. ἡ σαν ὁμοί Σίμων Πέτρος καὶ Θωμᾶς ὁ λέγομένος Διδυμός καὶ Ναθαναὴλ ὁ ἀπὸ Κανᾶ τῆς Γαλιλαίας καὶ οἱ τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου καὶ ἀλλοι ἐκ τῶν Χ. Δ. Ε. 30. 31. Formal close of the Gospel (see notes on ch. xxii.). — 30. μᾶν οὖν — 'yes, and,' — meaning. 'This book must not be supposed to be a complete account.' — σημεῖα not, as Theophyl., Euthym. i., Lücke, Olah, 'proofs of His resurrection,' —but, as ch. xii. 37 and elsewhere in this Gospel, 'miracles' in the most general sense —these after the resurrection included: —for John is here reviewing his whole narrative, τῆς βιβλίων τούτων. — 31. The mere miracle-faith so often reproved by the Lord is not that intended here. This is faith in Himself, as the Christ the Son of God: and the Evangelist means, that enough is related in this book to be a ground for such a faith, by showing us His glory manifested forth (see ch. ii. 11). — τοῦ ἕος. Thus he closes almost in the words of his prologue, ch. i. 4. 12. — ἐν τῷ οὖν αὐτῷ. (see ref.) is the whole standing of the faithful man in Christ,—by which and in which he has life eternal. — It will only state here, that whether written by John himself or not, it is evidently an appendix to the Gospel, which concludes by a formal review of its contents and object at ch. xx. 30. 31. — 1. μετὰ ταύτα, comp. ch. vi. 1, 'at a subsequent time.' — ἐφαν. ἑαυτῷ. This expression is nowhere else used by John of the Lord's appearances, but only in Mark xvi. 12. 14. We have however ἐφανέρωσον οὐκ άυτον, ch. vii. 4; and οὐκ ἐν τῷ δόξαν αὐτοῦ, ch. ii. 11; and the passive of φανηκένω is very usual with him. — ἐν τῇ ὁ ἐκείνωσεν elsewhere, see ref., used by John with a dativus in this sense. —The expression indicates the locality, not the manner, of the appearance; on, i.e. on the shore of the sea of Galilee: see note on Matt. xiv. 25. — ἐφαν. διὸ δε' οὖν must not be too rashly cited as unlike John's style. We must remember that, in
οι μαθητές αυτοῦ ὄν. 3 λέγει αὐτοῖς Σίμων Πέτρος ἢ Ἡσαύνων αὐτῷ Ἐρυγόμεθα καὶ Ἰμιαὶ σὺν σοί. 

αὐγήν DWGAC 

ἀλευζεῖν. λέγονυ αὐτῷ Ἐρυγόμεθα καὶ Ἰμιαὶ σὺν σοί. 2 ἔξελθην καὶ ἐνέβισαν εἰς τὸ πλοῖον [ἐνυθ], καὶ ἐν ἕκεινη τῇ νυκτὶ ἐπίσαν ὤδεν. 4 πρωΐς Ἡ ἑτή ἐνυθ 

μύνεις ἔσθη ὡς Ἰςοὺς ἐς τοὺς αἰγαλοὺς οὐ μένεται ἄρειοι ὁ μαθητὴς ὁ Ἰςοὺς 1 Παῦλοι, μὴ τι προφάγων ἐξει; ἀπέκριθαν αὐτῷ Οὐ. 6 ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ πλοίου τὸ δίκτυν, καὶ ἐνυθήσεται. ἔβαλον ὄν, καὶ ὅπι ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκλύσαι ἐστι 4 ἢσχαν ἢ ὀπὸ τοῦ πλήθους τῶν ἰχθυών. 7 λέγει οὖν ὁ μαθητὴς ἐκεῖνος ὁν ἡμῖν ὁ Ἰςοὺς τῷ Πέτρῳ ὁ κύριος ἐστι. Σιμώνοι οὖν Πέτρος, ἀκούσας ὅτι ὁ κύριος ἐστι, τῶν ἐπενδύθην διεξάστη ἡ ἐκλύσας ὁ γάρ γυμνοῖς καὶ ἐβαλεν ἐαυτῶν εἰς τὴν τάλαισαν 6 ὁ δὲ ἀλλοι μαθητὰ τῷ πλοιαρίῳ ἔλαθον (οὐ γάρ ἦσαν μακάρι ἀπὸ τῆς γης, ἀλλὰ ἐς ἀπὸ τὴν πηνή χικοσίῶν) ὑπονετες τῷ δικτύν τῶν ἰχθυῶν. 9 ὡς ὁν ἐπέβισαν 

adding an appendix, expressions of this kind would occur, which the narrative itself would not contain. 2) ἐνυθ is used by John only in the N. T. see ref. 2a. - The esta after ἔνυθων is quite in John's manner: see ref. 5) λγ. ὁν is in John's manner. —βάθηλα, see 1 John ii. 18. In ch. xiii. 33, and usually, he has κηπεια. — 6) See Luke v. 6. - 7.) The ὁν here seems distinct to allude to the former occasion— the similarity of the incident having led the beloved Apostle to scrutinize more closely the person of Him who spoke to them—Διορυκτέρος μήν ὁ Ἰωάννης . . . θερμότερος δὲ ὁ Πέτρος. Διό γυμνωθεὶς μήν αὐτῶν ὁ Ἰωάννης, πρὸ τοῦ Πέτρου ἐξῆκε δὲ πρὸς αὐτῶν ὁ Πέτρος πρὸ τοῦ Ἰωάννου. Euthymum. — τὸν ἐπαίνη, δικτ). He bound round him his fisher's coat or shirt, to facilitate his swimming— ἐν γαρ γ.' i.e. as above, he was stripped for his fisher's work—without his upper garment. Some take it literally, and understand that he gird round him his ἱπποδήνη as a subligaculum. Theophylact— ἐπεῖδη λιγνῶν το ὀδόνων, ὥστε το Φοίνικες τοί Ἐφεσος ἀλλικαῖς περιλιγγωτοῖς ἱπποδήν. — 8) 200 cubits = 100 yards. The lake was about five miles broad. Joseph.
3—15. KATA IOANNH.

εἰς τὴν γῆν, βλέπουσιν ἀνθρακίαν κειμένην καὶ ὀφάριον ἐπικειμένον καὶ ἀρτὸν. 10 λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς Ἔνεγκατε ἀπὸ τῶν ὦφαρίων ἡν ἐπίσατε νῦν. 11 ἀνέβη πέραν τῶν συναυλίων ἐν τῇ ἱερατείᾳ καὶ τῶν πνευματισμῶν καὶ τῶν σωσίων

ΑΒCD ὄντων οὐκ ἐσχάζη τὸ δίκτυν. 12 λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς δεδεμένος ἄρτοις. Οἱ ἔρχεται οἱ ἱερεῖς τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἐστίν. 13 ὥστε ἐστάσατε τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦ ἱεροῦ καὶ λαμβάνετε τὸν ἀρτόν καὶ δίδασκοντες αὐτοῖς, καὶ τὸ ὦφαρῖον ὅμοιον. 14 οὗτοι ἡ διδασκαλία ἡ ἱεροτοσπάδα ἡ Ἱεροσολύνη ἡ μαθητία αὐτοῦ ἐφερεθεὶς τῷ Ερυθρῷ. 15 Ὅτε ὄννηστήν ὁ Ἰησοῦς Σίμων Πέτρος ὁ Πέτρος λέγει τῷ Σίμωνι Πέτρῳ ὁ Ἰησοῦς Σίμωνι Πέτρῳ ὁ Ἡμών, ἀγαπάς με ἢ πλείον τούτων;

πάρθενον. — 9. ὥστε ἀνθ. Π. β.— 10. ἐκ τοῦ ἐν. D L b.— 11. ἐν. ὄνν. B C L X 4 Syrr. Χ Copt. Cyr. txt A D P—rec. ἐν τῇ γῇ; ἔχει εἰς ἘΓΚ Κ (H ?) U al. ἐν τῇ γῇ; D7 (and B Birch). txt A B (Bentl. expressly) C L P X Δ 11 al. — 12. ἐν. ὄνν. om. B C ins. A D bed. — 13. ὄνν. om. B C D L X 12 al. ab Sahid. Arm. Cyr. ins. A K—for καὶ διδ. ἐσχάζης ἐσχάζης D (et beneficios) d—15. for Ἡμών, Ἡμῶν ορ αἰνοῦν B C D L ab ab Copt. Sahid. Hier. Ambr. txt A C 4 b (barions) and below—πλείον (Lücke, ii. 809.)—ἐν ἄρτῳ, see ch. xi. 16, a mode of speech peculiar to John. — 9. The rationalist and semi-rationalist interpreters have taken great offence at the idea of a miracle being here intended. But is it possible to understand the incident otherwise? As Stier says, let any child, reading the chapter, be the judge. And what difficulty is there in such a fire and fish being provided, either by the Lord Himself, or by the ministry of angels at His bidding? —διδάσκας] see ref., a word peculiar to John, and = ἔμπνησε, Matt. xv. 34. Mark viii. 7. It is probably here not a fish, but ἐσχάζης, into the boat, which apparently was now on the beach, in the shallow water. — [ἐκατερίν] w. This enumeration is singular, and betokens the careful counting which took place after the event, and in which the narrator took a part,—οὐκ ἐπικειμένον καὶ ἀρτὸν καὶ ἐσχατον τοῦτο καὶ διδοῦν τῶν σωσίων καὶ τῶν πνευματισμῶν καὶ τῶν σωσίων. I take these words to imply that they sat down to the meal in silence,—wondering at, while at the same time they well knew, Him who was thus their Host,—τολμᾶν and ἐστάσαν are not elsewhere in John. —τοῦτο again, after τίλαμα, in John's manner. — 13. ἐσχάζης, from the spot where they had seen Him standing, to the fire of coals. λαμβ. κ. διδοῦν. bears evident trace of the labān ἔσχατον of another occasion, and reminds us of the similar occurrence at Emmaus, Luke xxiv. 30.—14.] τῶν. ἐκατερίν, —compare τούτο πάλιν διδοῦν, ch. iv. 54. The number here is clearly not that of all appearances of Jesus up to this time, for that to Mary Magdalen is not reckoned; but only those to the disciples,—i.e. any considerable number of them together. This one internal trait of consistency speaks much for the authenticity and genuineness of the addition.—ἐσχάζης, not elsewhere in John, but the participial construction is found in ch. iv. 54.—Without agreeing with all the allegorical interpretations of the Fathers,—I cannot but see much depth and richness of meaning in this whole narrative. The Lord appears to His disciples, busied about their occupation for their daily bread; speaks and acts in a manner wonderfully similar to His words and actions on a former memorable occasion, when we know that by their toiling long and taking nothing, but at his word enclosing a multitude of fishes, was set forth what should befall them as fishermen of men. Can we miss that application at this far more important epoch of their Apostolic mission? Besides, He graciously provides for their present wants, and invites them to be His guests? why, but to show them that in their work hereafter they should never want but He would provide? And as connected with the U 2
parable, Matt. xiii. 47 ff., has the net enclosing a great multitude and yet not broken, no meaning? Any one who recognizes the teaching character of the acts of the Lord, can hardly cast all such applications from him;—and those who do not, have yet the first rudiments of the Gospels to learn.

16—23.] *Sayings of the Lord after the meal.*—[16.] ἔρχεται ἄνωθεν ἡ θέσις. There appears to have been nothing said during the meal. Surely every word would have been recorded.—One great object of this appearance, observes Stier, certainly was the confirmation and encouragement of the *fisher of men* in his apostolic office.—Σημείως ἡ ἱστορία] A reminiscence probably of his own name and parentage, as distinguished from his apostolic name of honour, Cephas, or Peter, see ch. i. 43. Thus we have Σ. Ἡσίαν τοιαῦτα, Matt. xvi. 17, connected with the mention of his natural state of flesh and blood, which had not revealed to him the great truth just confessed,—and Luke xxii. 31, 'Simon, Simon,' when he is reminded of his natural weakness. See also Mark xiv. 37, and Matt. xvii. 25, where the significance is not so plain.—κλέανον τοῦτον] more than these thy fellow-disciples,' compare Matt. xxvi. 33. Mark xiv. 20, 'Though all should be offended, yet not I.' That John does not record this saying, makes no difficulty here; nor does it tell against the genuineness of this appendix to the Gospel. The narrator tells that which he heard the Lord say, and tells it faithfully and literally. That it coincides with what Peter is related to have said elsewhere, is a proof of the authenticity, not of the connexion, of the two accounts.—τοῦτων has been strangely enough understood (Whitby, Bolten) of the fish, or the 'employment and furniture of a fisherman:—Olshausen sees a reference to the preeminence given to Peter, Matt. xvi. 18,—and regards the words as implying that on that account he really did love Jesus more than the rest;—but surely this is most improbable, and the other explanation the only likely or true one. Perhaps there is also a slight reference to his present just-shown zeal, in leaping from the ship first to meet the Lord. ¹ Has thy past conduct to me truly borne out thy former and present warmth of love to Me above these thy fellows?—Mira Christi sapientia, qui tam paucis vocibus efficat, ut Petrus et sibi satisfaceret, quem ter negaverat, et collegia quibus se prestaret.—exemplum dans discipline ecclesiasticæ.' Grot. —Peter's answer shows that he understood the question as above. He says nothing of the πλεῖον τούτων,—but dropping all comparison of himself with others, humbly refers to the Searcher of hearts the genuineness of his love, however the past may seem to have called it in question.—The distinction between ἄγαπαν and φιλῶν must not here be lost sight of, nor must we superficially say with Grotius, 'Promiscue hic usurpavit Joannes ἄγαπαν et φιλίν, ut mox βοσκείν et τουμαίνειν (see below). Neque hic querendum sunt substantias.'—If so, why do the Lord's two first questions contain ἄγαπαç while Peter's answers have φιλῶν—whereas the third time the question and answer both have φιλῶν? This does not look like accident.—The distinction seems to be that ἄγαπαν is more used of that reverential love, grounded on high graces of character, which is borne towards God and man by the child of nature;—whereas φιλίν expresses more the personal love of human affection. Peter therefore uses a less exalted word, and one implying a consciousness of his own weakness, but a persuasion and deep feeling of personal love. (Hence it will be seen that in the sublimest relations, where, all perfections existing, love can only be personal, φιλίν only can be used, see ch. v. 20.) Then in the third question, the Lord adopts the word of Peter's answer, the closer to press the meaning of it home to him.—The τὸ εὐθές, the *two first times,* seems to refer to the Lord's personal knowledge of Peter's heart—in His having given him that name, ch. i. 43, in Matt. xvi. 17. Luke xxii. 31, and the announcement of his denial of Him. The last time, he widens this assertion 'Thou knowest me,' into 'Thou knowest all things,' being grieved at the repetition of a question which brought this Omniscience so painfully to his mind. —Βούκα τ. ἄγαν. μου] This and the following answers of the Lord can hardly be regarded as the re-insisting of Peter in his apostolic office, for there is no record of his ever having lost it: but as a further and higher setting forth of it than that first one Matt. iv. 18,—both as belonging to all of them on the present occasion, and as tending to comfort Peter's own mind after his fall, and reassure him of his holding the same place.
among the apostles as before, owing to the gracious forgiveness of his Lord.—We can hardly with any deep insight into the text hold βόσκων and ποιμ. to be synonymous (Grot. above, Lücke, De Wette, Trench), or φιλος and πρόβατα. The sayings of the Lord have not surely been so carelessly reported as this would assume. Every thing here speaks for a gradation of meaning. The variety of reading certainly makes it difficult to point out exactly the steps of that gradation, and unnecessary to follow the various interpreters in their assignment of them: but that there is such, may be seen from Isa. xi. 11. 1 John ii. 12, 13. Perhaps the feeding of the λάμας was the furnishing the Apostolic testimony of the resurrection and facts of the Lord’s life on earth to the first converts; the shepherding or ruling the sheep, the subsequent government of the Church as shown forth in the early part of the Acts : the feeding of the sheep, the furnishing the now maturer Church of Christ with the wholesome food of the doctrine contained in his Epistles. But those must strangely miss the whole sense, who dream of an exclusive primatial power here granted or confirmed to him. A sufficient refutation of this silly idea, if it needed any other than the δυνάμεις of this passage, is found in the συμπροσβύτερος of 1 Pet. v. 1, where he refers apparently to this very charge; see note on Matt. xvi. 17. "Ibid, ‘plus his’ (πάλιν τούτων), indicio est, Petrum hic restitui in locus sum, quem amiserat per abnegationem (but see above) simulque quiddam ei prae condici- pulsus tribui, sed nihil a quo caseri excludantur. Nam sane etiam hi amabant Jesum. Designat tandem hoc ad se, et ad se unum rapere, qui nec amat nec pacet, sed despexit, per successoris Petris simu- lationem." Bengel. —16.] πάλιν δυνάμεις, an expression found in John iv. 54. —17.] φιλείς: see above on ver. 18. —18.] not merely on account of the repetition of the question, but because of τό τρίγων, the number of his own denials of Christ.—πάντα φίλοι. see above. —18.] The end of his pastoral office is announced to him:—a proof of the πάντα φίλοι which he had just confessed;—a contrast to the denial of which he had just been reminded;—a proof to be hereafter given of the here recognized genuineness of that love which he had been professing. There is no implied ques- tion, as Lücke thinks:—the futures are prophetic.—διηλ. διηλ. John’s manner again.—διηλ. προσβύτερος in contrast to διηλ. γηρ. It includes his life up to the time prophesied of.—[Σων. σ.] As in ver. 7, he had girt his fisher’s coat to him: but not confined in its reference to that girding alone,—’thou girdedst thyself up for My work, and wentest hither and thither—but hereafter there shall be a service for thee ‘paulo constrictior’—εκτείνεται τὰ χώ- σων, but not as just now, in swimming;—in a more painful manner, on the transverse beam of the cross—and another—the executioner—shall gird thee—with the cords binding to the cross’—(tunc Petrus ab altero vincitur, cum cruici adstringitur, Tertull. in De Wette). Such is the tradi- tory account of the death of Peter, Euseb. ii. 25. iii. 1, where see notes in Heinichen’s ed.—οὐχι σοι vts. in the lifting up after the fastening to the cross—or perhaps, by a ọ̄προτος προτότον, in making thee go the way to death, bearing thy cross.—διηλ. οὐ θ. ] Quis enim vult mori? Prorus nemo: et ita nemo ut B. Petro siciteretur, Alter te cinget, et feret quo tu non via. Aug. (Trench, Mir. p. 402 note.)—Prof. Bleek (Beiträge zur Evan-
gelien Kritik, p. 235, note) suggests an interpretation of this prophecy which is surely contrary to ver. 19:—that the former part, ὅτε ηὸς ν. . . . . . . applies to the life of Peter before his calling,—the latter ἱστε-νείπ. . . . . to his life in the service of the Lord, who is the ἄλλος,—who was to strengthen him for his work (ζωσι),—that he was to stretch out his hands in the sense of his own weakness, not merely in the feebleness of old age (in prayer!), and finally this ἄλλος, the Lord Whom he served, would carry him whither he would not, i.e. to a death of martyrdom. But this says nothing of τοὺς θανατώς, on which the stress evidently is, and which Bleek, while he recognizes, endeavours to get rid of by supposing the idea to have arisen after the death of Peter!—19.] This remark is entirely in John’s manner, as is the δοξεῖν τ. λ. used of such a death; see ch. ii. 21. vi. 6. vii. 39. xii. 33. ἀκολούθησι μετά] Not to be understood I think of any present gesture of the Lord calling Peter aside;—but, from the next verse, followed perhaps by a motion of Peter towards Him, in which John joined. The words seem to be a plain reference to ch. xiii. 36;—and the following,—a following through the Cross to glory:—see Matt. xvi. 24. Now, however, ἄρα τὸν σταυρὸν is omitted. He had made this so plain, that it needed not expressing. There was also a forcible reminding Peter of the first time when he had heard these words on the same shore, Matt. iv. 18. —20.] The details necessary to complete the narrative are obscure, and only hinted at in the background. It seems that Peter either was at the time of the foregoing conversation walking with Jesus, and turned round and saw John following,—or that he moved towards Him on the termination of it (but certainly not from a misunderstanding of the words ἀκολούθησι, see ver. 21). I can hardly conceive Him moving away on uttering these words, and summoning Peter away in private. It seems in the highest degree unnatural.—The description of the disciple whom Jesus loved is evidently inserted to justify his following, and is a strong token of John’s hand having written this chapter; see ch. xiii. 23. —21.] Peter’s question shows that he had rightly understood the Lord’s prophecy respecting him. He now wishes to know what should befall his friend and colleague,—ἀπολίθος αὐτῆς τὴν ἀμοιβὴν (for his similar service in ch. xiii. 23 just referred to) καὶ νομίσας αὐτῶν βούλευσαι ἱστεναν τὰ καθ’ αὐτὸν, ἡμα μὴ δαβδαίν, αὐτὸς ἀναλίθανα τὴν ἵστεναν. Chrysost. (Stier vi. 864.)—This was not mere idle curiosity, but that longing which we all feel for our friends; of which Bengel says,—Facilius nos ipsos voluntari divinae expressum, quam curiositatem circa aiosis, equalis presens anima suppanes, depomimus. —23.] The words τὰ πρὸς σέ; imply a rebuke;—not perhaps however so sharp a one as has been sometimes seen in them. They remind Peter of the distinctness of each man’s position and duty before the Lord; and the σέ δὲ κα. με, which follow, direct his view along that course of duty and suffering which was appointed for him by his Divine Master.—On the ὅδε ἄλλα . . . . , three opinions have been held (for that which refers the words to John’s remaining where he then was, on the shore, till the Lord returned from His colloquy with Peter, is not worth more than cursory mention): (1) that of Aug., Mal- don, Grot., Lampe, Olah, &c. (it being allowed on all hands, that μιαῖς means ‘to remain in this life.’) see Phil. i. 24, 25 1 Cor. xv. 6. John xii. 34), ‘If I will that he remain till I fetch him,’ i.e. by a natural death. But this is frigid, and besides inapplicable here. Peter’s death, although by the hands of an ἄλλος, was just as much the Lord’s ‘coming for Him,’ as John’s, and there would thus be no contrast. (2) That that ‘coming of the Lord’ is meant which is so often in the three Gospels
alluded to, (see especially notes on Matt. xxiv.) viz. the establishment in full of the dispensation of the kingdom by the destruction of the nation and temple of the Jews. This is the view of some mentioned by Theophyl., of Bengel (see below), Stier, Dräseke, Jacobi, &c.—and is upheld by the || place, Matt. xvi. 28. (3) That the Lord here only puts a case,—Even should I will that he remain upon earth till My last coming—what would that be to thee? This view is upheld by Trench, Miracles, p. 466; but I think must be rejected on maturer consideration of the character of the words of our Lord, in Whose mouth such a mere hypothetical saying would be strangely incongruous, especially in these last solemn days of His presence on earth.—The second view seems then to remain, and I adopt it with some qualification.—At the destruction of Jerusalem began that mighty series of events of which the Apocalypse is the prophetic record, and which is in the complex known as the ‘coming of the Lord,’ ending, as it shall, with His glorious and personal Advent. This the beloved Apostle alone lived to see, according to ancient and undoubted tradition (Euseb. H. E. iii. 23). When De Wette (whom Lücke in the main follows) calls this interpretation ‘γαρι νικήτης,’ and would interpret this answer by the current idea in Apostolic times, that His coming was very near, he is assuming (1) that this was the idea of the Apostles themselves (see 2 Thess. ii. 2 Pet. iii. 3, 4, 8, 9); (2) That this answer is not that of our Lord, but apocryphal (!).—If all that he says about the early expectations of the Church were granted, it would not follow that the view above taken is erroneous. And as to the chapter having been written after the death of John and the destruction of Jerusalem, see below.—24.] καὶ ἀποθνῄσκει, an expression of later date than the Gospels, but frequent in the Acts: see reff. and ch. xi. 11, &c.—[ἐξασθάλ. εἰς (see reff.) is more in the manner of the other Gospels.—καὶ οὐκ εἰσίν τοις ἀπο- θνῄσκεις D. — ri πρ. οἱ οἴν. D. — 24. 25. see below, A C X 3 Orig. Cyp. Crys. — txt A C D E G K M (H ?) U Δ al.— for τῷ Ἰησ., αὐτῷ D. — 22. μαθητὴς τούτων δ — 23. aff. ἀπαθής. ins. καὶ θεός. D.—αὐτῷ D.—οὐκ ἔσται δι αὐτῆς B C C Orig. — txt A D ab. — for ἦν οὐκ ἐστών, οὐκ ἀποθνῄσκεις D. — ri πρ. οἱ οἴν. D. — 24. δι καὶ μ. B.—σα — 25. for ἑαυτ. αὐτῷ D. — 26. for οὐκ, Ἰησ. C Orig. Cyp. Crys. — txt A C D E G K M (H ?) U Δ al.—
strongest terms,—and in terms which certainly look as if fault had been found with this Gospel for want of completeness, by some objectors. The reader will have perceived in the foregoing comment on the chapter a manifest leaning to the belief that it was written by John himself. Of this I am fully convinced. In every part of it, his hand is plain and unmistakable. I believe it to have been added some years probably after the completion of the Gospel; partly perhaps to record the important miracle of the second draught of fishes, so full of spiritual instruction, and the interesting account of the sayings of the Lord to Peter;—but principally to meet the error which was becoming prevalent concerning himself. In order to do this, he gives a complete account with all minute details,—even to the number of the fish caught,—of the circumstances preceding the conversation,—and the very words of the Lord Himself; not pretending to put a meaning on those words, but merely asserting that they announced no such thing as that he should not die. Surely nothing can be more natural than this.—External evidence completely tallies with this view. The chapter is contained in all the principal MSS.; and there is no greater variety of reading than usual. In these respects it differs remarkably from John vii. 53—viii. 11, and indeed from even Mark xvi. 9—20. Internal evidence of style and diction is nearly balanced. It certainly contains several words and constructions not met with elsewhere in John; but, on the other hand, the whole cast of it is his;—the copulae are his;—the train of thought, and manner of narration. And all allowance should be made for the double alteration of style of writing which would be likely to be brought about, by lapse of time, and by the very nature of an appendix,—a fragment,—not forming part of a whole written continuously, but standing by itself. The last two verses, from their contents, we might expect to have more of the epistolary form; and accordingly we find them singularly in style resembling the Epistles of John.

On the whole, I am persuaded that in this chapter we have a fragment, both authentic and genuine, added for reasons apparent on the face of it, by the Apostle Himself; bearing evidence of his hand, but in a ‘second manner,’—a later style;—probably (as I think is shown in the simplicity of the οἴμαι in ver. 25) in the decline of life.
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