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GENERAL EDITOR'S PREFACE

The Expositor's Greek Testament is intended to do for the present generation the work accomplished by Dean Alford's in the past. Of the influence of Dean Alford's book there is no need to speak. It is almost impossible to exaggerate the success and usefulness of Dean Alford's commentary in putting English-speaking students into possession of the accumulated results of the labours of scholars up to the time it was published. He made the best critical and exegetical helps, previously accessible only to a few readers, the common privilege of all educated Englishmen. Dean Alford himself would have been the first to say that he undertook a task too great for one man. Though he laboured with indefatigable diligence, twenty years together, from 1841 to 1861, were occupied in his undertaking. Since his time the wealth of material on the New Testament has been steadily accumulating, and no one has as yet attempted to make it accessible in a full and comprehensive way.

In the present commentary the works have been committed to various scholars, and it is hoped that the completion will be reached within five years from the present date, if not sooner. As the plan of Alford's book has been tested by time and experience, it has been adopted here with certain modifications, and it is hoped that as the result English-speaking students will have a work at once up to date and practically useful in all its parts.
It remains to add that the commentators have been selected from various churches, and that they have in every case been left full liberty to express their own views. The part of the editor has been to choose them, and to assign the limits of space allowed to each book. In this assignment the judgment of Dean Alford has appeared to be sound in the main, and it has been generally followed.

W. ROBERTSON NICOLL.
PREFACE

In this Commentary on the Synoptical Gospels I give to the public the fruit of studies carried on for many years. These Gospels have taken a more powerful and abiding hold of me than any other part of the Scriptures. I have learnt much from them concerning Christ in the course of these years; not a little since I began to prepare this work for the press. I have done my best to communicate what I have learned to others. I have also laid under contribution previous commentators, ancient and modern, while avoiding the pedantic habit of crowding the page with long lists of learned names. I have not hesitated to introduce quotations, in Latin and Greek, which seemed fitted to throw light on the meaning. These, while possessing interest for scholars, may be passed over by English readers without much loss, as their sense is usually indicated.

In the critical notes beneath the Greek Text I have aimed at making easily accessible to the reader the results of the labours of scholars who have made the text the subject of special study; especially those contained in the monumental works of Tischendorf and Westcott and Hort. Readers are requested to peruse what has been stated on that subject in the Introduction, and, in using the commentary, to keep in mind that I have always made what I regard as the most probable reading the basis of comment, whether I have expressly indicated my opinion in the critical notes or not.

In these days one who aims at a competent treatment of the Evangelic narratives must keep in view critical
methods of handling the story. I have tried to unite some measure of critical freedom and candour with the reverence of faith. If, in spite of honest endeavour, I have not succeeded always in realising this ideal, let it be imputed to the lack of skill rather than of good intention.

I rise from this task with a deepened sense of the wisdom and grace of the Lord Jesus Christ. If what I have written help others to a better understanding of His mind and heart, I shall feel that my labour has not been in vain.

In the table of errata only such mistakes as more or less affect the sense are included; omissions and misplacements of aspirates and accents in Greek words, and the like, being omitted. In the preparation of this table I have received valuable aid from Mr. Vernon Bartlet, of Mansfield College, Oxford, and from Mr. John MacFadyen, of the Free Church College, Glasgow. I enjoyed the benefit of Mr. MacFadyen's assistance in reading the proofs of the second half of the work, and owe him earnest thanks, not only for increased accuracy in the printed text, but for many valuable suggestions.

The works of Dr. Gould on Mark and Dr. Plummer on Luke, in the *International Critical Commentary*, appeared too late to be taken advantage of in this commentary.

A. B. BRUCE.
THE GOSPELS

ACCORDING TO

MATTHEW, MARK AND LUKE
**TABLE OF ERRATA**

Page 70, col. 1, line 21 from top, delete comma after "errand ".

72, 2, line 17 from top, for ψίφας read ψίφος.

74, 2, line 31 from top, for "particle " read " participle ".

85, 1, line 3 from foot, for "Sadducaic " read " Sadoicaic ".

88, 2, line 13 from foot, for νεκρόν read νεκρός.

92, 2, line 17 from top, for "Phrynicus" read " Phrynichus "; again, p. 333, col. 2, line 6 from foot.

96, critical note, for "and old Latin and Syr. versions " read " most old Latin texts, and in Syr. Cur. ".

103, col. 1, line 20 from foot, for ναπά read νομά.

107, 2, line 4 from foot, for "vv. 34, 35 " read " vv. 35, 36 ".

109, 1, line 13 from foot, for " substantive " read " subjunctive ".

114, critical note, invert the two last clauses.

114, col. 2, line 7 from top, delete semicolon after " use ".

117, 1, line 11 from foot, for θεόμενος read θεόμενον.

119, 2, last line, insert "into" before "law ".

120, 2, line 11 from top, for ἀνάνυν read ἀνάνυ (in some minusc.).

137, 1, line 2 from foot, for " ver. " read " v. ".

153, 2, line 2 from foot, for " makes " read " make ".

156, 1, line 13 from foot, for σπάνιονας read σπάνιονα.

158, 2, lines 17 and 3 from foot, for " tibicines " read " tibicines ".

158, 1, line 25 from top, for θανάσαν read θανάσαν.

160, 2, line 24 from top, for διαζεύκα read διαζεύκα.

161, 2, line 4 from foot, for ἱστοφύλάζεστε ἵστοφύλαζε 

163, 1, line 14 from foot, for " Vv. 31, 32 " read " Vv. 32, 33 "

172, 1, line 17 from top, for " ver. 47 " read " ver. 47 "

190, 2, line 8 from top, for αὐτός read αὐτός.

202, 2, line 5 from top, for " profiscitetur " read " profiscitetur ".

212, 2, line 22 from top, for " tibicines " read " tibicines ".

235, 1, line 13 from foot, for " praeedit " read " praeedit ".

238, 1, line 16 from top, for " imperiantiores " read " imperiantiores ".

275, 1, line 3 from foot, for " deceased " read " deceased ".

280, 2, line 5 from top, for " dux " read " dux ".

286, Greek text, line 6, for ἐξεκείνοις read ἐξεκείνοις.

289, col. 1, line 18 from foot, for " preclusus " read " preclusus ".

295, 2, line 14 from top, for " discunt " read " dicunt ".

300, 2, line 16 from top, for " tenebant " read " tenebant ".

305, 2, line 14 from top, for " tenebant " read " tenebant ".

320, 2, lines 12 and 10 from top, for " to strike " read " a stroke ".

328, 2, line 8 from top, for " antenna " read " antenna ".

332, 1, line 8 from top, for " taint " read " taunt ".

340, 1, line 15 from top, place a rule after " Holy Ghost ".

348, 2, line 2 from top, for " ver. 34, Mt. viii 19 " read " ver. 34, Mt. viii. 20 ".

354, line 13, Greek text, insert πῶρ after ἀνωρ.

355, col. 2, line 15 from foot, for " He " read " Jesus ".

361, 2, line 3 from foot, for " 30 " read " 31 ".

364, critical note 0, for 

592, col. 1, line 8 from top, for " big " read " fig ".
INTRODUCTION.

CHAPTER I.

CONCERNING THE THREE GOSPELS.

Section I. The Connection.

1. The three first Gospels, bearing the names of Matthew, Mark and Luke, have, during the present century, been distinguished by critics from the fourth by the epithet synoptical. The term implies that these Gospels are so like one another in contents that they can be, and for profitable study ought to be, viewed together. That such is the fact is obvious to every reader. A single perusal suffices to shew that they have much in common in contents, arrangement and phraseology; and a comparison with the fourth Gospel only deepens the impression. There everything appears different—the incidents related, the thoughts ascribed to Jesus, the terms in which they are expressed, the localities in which the Great Personage who is the common subject of all the four narratives exercised His remarkable teaching and healing ministries.

2. Yet while these three Gospels present obtrusive resemblances, they also exhibit hardly less obtrusive differences. The differences are marked just because the books are on the whole so like one another. One cannot help asking: Seeing they are so like, why are they not more like? Why do they differ at all? Or the question may be put the other way: Seeing there are so many idiosyncrasies in each Gospel, how does it come about that notwithstanding these they all bear an easily recognisable family likeness? The idiosyncrasies, though not always so obvious as the resemblances, are unmistakable, and some of them stare one in the face. Each Gospel, e.g., has some matter peculiar to itself; the first and the third a great deal. Then, while in certain parts of their narratives they follow the same order, in other places they diverge widely. Again, one cannot but be struck with the difference between the three records in regard to reporting the words of Jesus. Mark gives com-
paratively few; Matthew and Luke very many, and these for the most part very weighty and remarkable, insomuch that one wonders how any one undertaking to write a history of Christ's life could overlook them. Matthew and Luke again, while both giving much prominence to the words of Jesus, differ very widely in their manner of reporting them. The one collects the sayings into masses, apparently out of regard to affinity of thought; the other disperses them over his pages, and assigns to them distinct historical occasions.

3. These resemblances and differences, with many others not referred to, inevitably raise a question as to their cause. This is the synoptical problem, towards the solution of which a countless number of contributions have been made within the last hundred years. Many of these have now only a historical or antiquarian interest, and it would serve no useful purpose to attempt here an exhaustive account of the literature connected with this inquiry. While not insensible to the fascination of the subject, even on its curious side, as an interesting problem in literary criticism, yet I must respect the fact that we in this work are directly concerned with the matter only in so far as it affects exegesis. The statement therefore now to be made must be broad and brief.

4. All attempts at solution admit of being classified under four heads. First may be mentioned the hypothesis of oral tradition. This hypothesis implies that before our Gospels there were no written records of the ministry of Jesus, or at least none of which they made use. Their only source was the unwritten tradition of the memorabilia of that ministry, having its ultimate origin in the public preaching and teaching of the Apostles, the men who had been with Jesus. The statements made by the Apostles from time to time, repeated and added to as occasion required, caught up by willing ears, and treasured up in faithful memories: behold all that is necessary, according to the patrons of this hypothesis, to account for all the evangelic phenomena of resemblance and difference. The resemblances are explained by the tendency of oral tradition, especially in non-literary epochs and peoples, to become stereotyped in contents and even in phraseology, a tendency much helped by the practice of catechetical instruction, in which the teacher dictates sentences which his pupils are expected to commit to memory.1 The differences are accounted for by the original diversity in the memorabilia communicated by different Apostles, by the measure of

1 On the function of catechists as helping to stereotype the evangelic tradition vide Wright, The Composition of the Four Gospels, 1890. Mr. Wright is a thorough believer in the oral tradition.
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fluidity inseparable from oral tradition due to defective memory, 
and of course in part also by the peculiar tastes, aims and individualities of the respective evangelists. This hypothesis has been chiefly in favour among English scholars, though it can boast likewise of influential supporters among continental critics, such as Gieseler and Godet. It points to a vera causa, and cannot be wholly left out of account in an endeavour to explain how written records of the evangelic tradition arose. There was a time doubtless when what was known of Jesus was on the lip only. How long that primitive phase lasted is matter of conjecture; some say from 30 to 60 A.D. It seems probable that the process of transferring from the lip to the page began considerably sooner than the later of these dates. When Luke wrote, many attempts had been made to embody the tradition in a written form (Luke i.1). This points to a literary habit which would naturally exert its power without delay in reference to any matter in which men took an absorbing interest. And when this habit prevails writers are not usually content to remain in ignorance of what others have done in the same line. They want to see each other's notes. The presumption therefore is that while oral tradition in all probability was a source for our evangelists, it was not the only source, probably not even the chief source. There were other writings about the acts, and words, and sufferings of Jesus in existence before they wrote; they were likely to know these, and if they knew them they would not despise them, but rather use them so far as serviceable. In Luke's case the existence of such earlier writings, and his acquaintance with them, are not mere presumptions but facts; the only point on which there is room for difference of opinion is how far he took advantage of the labours of his predecessors. That he deemed them unsatisfactory, at least defective, may be inferred from his making a new contribution; that he drew nothing from them is extremely improbable. Much can be said for the view that among these earlier writings known to Luke was our Gospel of Mark, or a book substantially identical with it in contents, and that he used it very freely.

5. The last observation naturally leads up to the second hypothesis, which is that the authors of the synoptical Gospels used each other's writings, each successive writer taking advantage of earlier contributions, so that the second Gospel (in time) borrowed from the first, and the third from both first and second. Which borrowed from which depends of course on the order of time in which the three Gospels appeared. Six permutations are possible, and every
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one of them has had its advocates. One of the most interesting, in virtue of the course it ran, is: Matthew, Luke, Mark. This arrangement was contended for by Griesbach, and utilised by Dr. Ferdinand Christian Baur in connection with his famous Tendency-criticism. Griesbach founded on the frequent duality in Mark's style, that is to say, the combination of phrases used separately in the same connection in the other synoptical Gospels: e.g., "at even when the sun did set" (i. 32). In this phenomenon, somewhat frequently recurring, he saw conclusive proof that Mark had Matthew and Luke before him, and servilely copied from both in descriptive passages. Baur's interest in the question was theological rather than literary. Accepting Griesbach's results, he charged Mark not only with literary dependence on his brother evangelists, whence is explained his graphic style, but also with studied theological neutrality, eschewing on the one hand the Judaistic bias of the first Gospel, and on the other the Pauline or universalistic bias of the third; both characteristics, the literary dependence and the studied neutrality, implying a later date. Since then a great change of view has taken place. For some time the prevailing opinion has been that Mark's Gospel is the earliest not the latest of the three, and this opinion is likely to hold its ground. Holtzmann observes that the Mark hypothesis is a hypothesis no longer, meaning that it is an established fact. And he and many others recognise in Mark, either as we have it or in an earlier form, a source for both the other synoptists, thereby acknowledging that the hypothesis of mutual use likewise has a measure of truth.

6. The third hypothesis is that of one primitive Gospel from which all three synoptists drew their material. The supporters of this view do not believe that the evangelists used each other's writings. Their contention is that all were dependent on one original document, an Urevangelium as German scholars call it. This primitive Gospel was, ex hypothesi, comprehensive enough to cover the whole ground. From it all the three evangelists took much in common, hence their agreement in matter and language in so many places. But how about their divergencies? How came it to pass that with the same document before them they made such diverse use of it? The answer is: it was due to the fact that they used, not identical copies of one document, but different recensions of the same document. By this flight into the dark region of conjectural recensions, whereof no trace remains, the Urevangelium hypothesis

1 Hand-Commentar, p. 3.
was self-condemned to oblivion. With it are associated the honourable names of Lessing and Eichhorn.

7. The fourth and last hypothesis was propounded by Schleiermacher. He took for his starting-point the word διηγήματι in the introduction of Luke's Gospel, and found in it the hint that not in one primitive Gospel of comprehensive character was the source exploited by our Gospels to be found, but rather in many Gospels containing a record of some words or deeds of Jesus with which the writer had become acquainted, and which he specially desired to preserve. Each of our evangelists is to be conceived as having so many of these διηγήματα or Gospels in his possession, and constructing out of them a larger connected story. In so far as they made use of copies of the same διηγήμα, there would be agreement in contents and style; in so far as they used Gospels peculiar to their respective collections, there would be divergence; and of course diversity in the order of narration was to be expected in writings compiled from a handful of unconnected leaflets of evangelic tradition. In spite of the great name of its author, this hypothesis has found little support as an attempt to account for the whole phenomena of the Gospels. As a subordinate suggestion to explain the presence in any of the synoptists of elements peculiar to himself, it is worthy of consideration. Some of the particulars, e.g., peculiar to Luke may have been found by him not in any large collection, but in a leaflet, as others may have been derived not from written sources large or small, but from a purely oral source in answer to local inquiries.

8. None of the foregoing hypotheses is accepted by itself as a satisfactory solution of the synoptical problem by any large number of competent critics at the present time. The majority look for a solution in the direction of a combination of the second and third hypotheses under modified forms. To a certain extent they recognise use of one Gospel in another, and there is an extensive agreement in the opinion that for the explanation of the phenomena not one but at least two primitive documents must be postulated. In these matters certainty is unattainable, but it is worth while making ourselves acquainted with what may be called the most probable working hypothesis. With this view I offer here a brief statement as to the present trend of critical opinion on the subject in question.

9. It is a familiar observation that, leaving out of account the reports of the teaching of Jesus contained in the first and third Gospels, the matter that remains, consisting of narratives of actions and events, is very much the same in all the three synoptists. Not
only so, the remainder practically consists of the contents of the second Gospel. It seems as if Matthew and Luke had made Mark the framework of their story, and added to it new material. This accordingly is now believed by many to have been the actual fact. The prevailing idea is that our Mark, or a book very like it in contents, was under the eye of the compilers of the first and third Gospels when they wrote, and was used by both as a source, not merely in the sense that they took from it this and that, but in the sense of adopting it substantially as it was, and making it the basis of their longer and more elaborate narratives. This crude statement of course requires qualification. What took place was not that the compilers of the first and third Gospels simply transcribed the second, page by page, as they found it in their manuscript, reproducing its contents in the original order, and each section verbatim. If that had been the case the synoptical problem would have been greatly simplified, and there would hardly have been room for difference of opinion. As the case stands the order of narration is more or less disturbed, and there are many variations in expression. The question is thus raised: On the hypothesis that Mark was a source for Matthew and Luke, in respect of the matter common to all the three, how came it to pass that the writers of the first and third Gospels deviated so much, and in different ways, from their common source in the order of events and in style? The general answer to the question, so far as order is concerned, is that the additional matter acted as a disturbing influence. The explanation implies that, when the disturbing influence did not come into play, the original order would be maintained. Advocates of the hypothesis try to show that the facts answer to this view; that is to say, that Mark's order is followed in Matthew and Luke, except when disturbance is explicable by the influence of the new material. One illustration may here be given from Matthew. Obviously the "Sermon on the Mount" exercised a powerful fascination on the mind of the evangelist. From the first he has it in view, and he desires to bring it in as soon as possible. Therefore, of the incidents connected with the commencement of the Galilean ministry reported in Mark, he relates simply the call of the four fisher Apostles, as if to furnish the Great Teacher with disciples who might form an audience for the great Discourse. To that call he appends a general description of the Galilean ministry, specifying as its salient features, preaching or teaching and healing. Then he proceeds to illustrate each department of the ministry, the teaching by the Sermon on the Mount in chapters v.–vii., the healing by a group of
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miracles contained in chapters viii. and ix., including the cure of Peter's mother-in-law, the wholesale cures on the Sabbath evening, and the healing of the leper, all reported in the first chapter of Mark. Of course, in regard neither to the sermon nor to the group of miracles can the first Gospel lay claim to chronological accuracy. In the corresponding part of his narrative, Luke follows Mark closely, reporting the cure of the demoniac in the synagogue of Capernaum, of Peter's mother-in-law, of many sick people on the Sabbath evening, and of the leper in the same order. There is only one deviation. The call of Peter, which in Luke replaces that of the four, Peter and Andrew, James and John, comes between the Sabbath evening cures and the cure of the leper.

The variations in style raise a much subtler question, which can only be dealt with adequately by a detailed comparative exegesis, such as that so admirably exemplified in the great work of Dr. Bernhard Weiss on the Gospel of Mark and its synoptical parallels. Suffice it to say here that it is not difficult to suggest a variety of causes which might lead to literary alteration in the use of a source. Thus, if the style of the source was peculiar, markedly individualistic, colloquial, faulty in grammar, one can understand a tendency to replace these characteristics by smoothness and elegance. The style of Mark is of the character described, and instances of literary correction in the parallel accounts can easily be pointed out. Another cause in operation might be misunderstanding of the meaning of the source, or disinclination to adopt the meaning obviously suggested. Two illustrative instances may be mentioned. In reporting the sudden flight of Jesus from Capernaum in the early morning, Mark makes Him say to the disciples in connection with the reason for departure, "to this end came I forth," i.e., from the town. In Luke this is turned into, "therefore was I sent," i.e., into the world. In the incident of the triumphal entry into Jerusalem, Mark makes Jesus bid the two disciples say to the owner of the colt, "straightway He (Jesus) will send it back," i.e., return it to its owner when He has had His use of it. In Matthew this is turned into, "straightway he (the owner) will send them (the ass and her colt)". Yet another source of verbal alteration might be literary taste acting instinctively, leading to the substitution of one word or phrase for another, without conscious reason.

10. Thus far of the matter common to the three Gospels, or what may be called the triple tradition. But Matthew and Luke contain

1 Das Marcusevangelium und seine synoptischen Parallelen, 1872.
2 Mark i. 38, Luke iv. 43.
3 Mark xi. 3, Matthew xxi. 3.
much more than this, the additional matter in both consisting mainly of *words and discourses* of Jesus. Each Gospel has not a little peculiar to itself, but there is a large amount of teaching material common to the two, and though this common element is very differently reproduced as to historic connection and grouping, yet there is such a pervading similarity in thought and expression as to suggest forcibly the hypothesis of a second source as its most natural explanation. Assuming that the first and third evangelists borrowed their narrative of events from Mark, and that what needs accounting for is mainly the didactic element, it would follow that this hypothetical second source consisted chiefly, if not exclusively, of sayings spoken by the Lord Jesus. Whether both evangelists possessed this source in the same form, and had each his own way of using it, as dictated by his plan, or whether it came into their hands in different recensions, formed under diverse influences, and meant to serve distinct purposes, are questions of subordinate moment. The main question is: Did there exist antecedent to the composition of our first and third Gospels a collection of the words of Christ, which both evangelists knew and used in compiling their memoirs of Christ’s public ministry? Modern critics, such as Weiss, Wendt, Holtzmann, Jülicher, concur in answering this question in the affirmative. The general result is that for the explanation of the phenomena presented by the synoptical Gospels, modern criticism postulates two main written sources: a book like our canonical Mark, if not identical with it, as the source of the narratives common to the three Gospels, and another book containing sayings of Jesus, as the source of the didactic matter common to Matthew and Luke.

11. These conclusions, which might be reached purely by internal inspection, are confirmed by the well-known statements of Papias, who flourished in the first quarter of the second century, concerning books about Christ written by Mark and Matthew. They are to this effect: “Mark, being the interpreter of Peter, wrote carefully, though not in order, as he remembered them, the things spoken or done by Christ”. “Matthew wrote the *Logia* in the Hebrew language, and each one interpreted these as he could.”¹ The statements point to two books as the fountains of evangelic written tradition containing matter guaranteed as reliable as resting on the authority of two apostles, Peter and Matthew. The first of the two books is presumably identical with our canonical Mark. It is not against this

that Papias represents Mark's work as including things spoken as well as done by Christ. For this is true of canonical Mark. Though, by comparison with Matthew and Luke, Mark is extremely meagre in the didactic element, yet he does report many very remarkable sayings of Jesus. But what of the other book? Is it to be identified with our Matthew? Prima facie one would say no, because the Matthew of Papias is a book of Logia, which we naturally take to mean a book of oracles, or weighty words spoken by the Lord Jesus. But, on the other hand, it might be argued that Logia is simply a designation from the more prominent or characteristic part, and by no means excludes such narratives of events as we find in canonical Matthew. Indeed, it might be said that it would be difficult to compile a collection of sayings that should be interesting or even intelligible without the introduction of more or less narrative, if it were only by way of preface or historical setting. Granting that the leading aim was to report words, a minimum amount of narrative would still be necessary to make the report effective. And it might be added that it is, in many instances, only a minimum of narrative that we find in canonical Matthew, his historic statements being generally meagre in comparison with those in Mark and Luke. Hence, not a few critics and apologists still hold by the old tradition which practically identified the Logia of Papias with the Matthew of the New Testament. But the Logia, according to Papias, was written in Hebrew, and our canonical Matthew is in Greek which does not wear the aspect of a translation. This difficulty 'defenders of the old view do not find insurmountable. Yet the impression left on one's mind by such apologetic attempts is that of special pleading, or perhaps, one ought to say, of an honourable bias in favour of a venerable tradition, and of a theory which gives us, in canonical Matthew, a work proceeding directly from the hand of an apostle. If that theory could be established, the result would be highly satisfactory to many who at present stand in doubt. Meantime we must be content to acquiesce, provisionally, in a hypothesis, according to which we have access to the apostle Matthew's contribution only at second hand, in a Gospel from another unknown author which has absorbed a large portion, if not the whole, of the apostolic document. Even on this view we have the satisfaction of feeling that the three synoptists bring us very near to the original eye and ear witnesses. The essential identity, amid much diversity in form, of the words ascribed to our Lord in the two Gospels which draw upon the Logia, inspires confidence that the evangelic reports of these words, though secondary, are altogether reliable.
12. We cannot but wonder that a work so precious as the *Logia* of Matthew was allowed to perish, and earnestly wish that, if possible, it might even yet be restored. Attempts at gratifying this natural feeling have recently been made, and conjectural reconstructions of the lost treasure lie before us in such works as that of Wendt on the *Teaching of Jesus*,¹ and of Blair on the *Apostolic Gospel*.² A critical estimate of these essays cannot here be given. Of course they are tentative; nevertheless they are interesting, and even fascinating to all who desire to get behind the existing records, and as near to the actual words of our Lord as possible. And, though an approach to a consensus of opinion may never be reached, the discussion is sure to bear fruit in a more intimate acquaintance with the most authentic forms of many of our Lord’s sayings. As another aid to so desirable a result, one must give a cordial welcome to such works as that of Resch on *Extracanonical Parallel Texts to the Gospels*.³ Resch believes it possible, through the use of Codex Bezae, the old Italian and Syriac versions, and quotations from the Gospels in the early fathers, to get behind the text of our canonical Gospels, and to reach a truer reflection in Greek of the Hebrew original in the case of many sayings recorded in the *Logia* of Matthew. There will be various estimates of the intrinsic value of his adventurous attempt. Personally, I am not sanguine that much will come out of it. But one cannot be sorry that it has been made, and by one who thoroughly believes that he is engaged in a fruitful line of inquiry. It is well to learn by exhaustive experiment how much or how little may be expected from that quarter.

13. Among those who accept the hypothesis of the two sources a difference of opinion obtains on two subordinate points, *viz.*, first, the relation between the two sources used in Matthew and Luke, and, second, the relation between these two Gospels. Did Mark know and use the *Logia*, and did Matthew know Luke, or Luke Matthew? Dr. Bernhard Weiss answers the former question in the affirmative and the latter in the negative. From certain phenomena brought to light by a comparative study of the synoptists, he thinks it demonstrable that in many parts of his narrative Mark leans

¹ Wendt, *Die Lehre Jesu*, Erster Theil. This part of Wendt’s work has not been translated. His exposition of Christ’s words has been translated by Messrs. T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh.

² *The Apostolic Gospel, with a Critical Reconstruction of the Text*, by J. Fulton Blair, 1896. Mr. Blair’s critical position differs widely from Wendt’s, and his *Apostolic Gospel* contains much more besides words.

³ *Aussercanonische Paralleltexte zu den Evangelien.*
on an older written source, whose accounts of evangelic incidents are reproduced in a more faithful manner in the companion Gospels, and especially in Matthew. This source he takes to be the Logia of the apostle Matthew. It follows from this, of course, that the Logia was not a mere collection of sayings, but a book containing histories as well, such narratives, e.g., as those relating to the palsied man, the feeding of the 5000, and the blind man at Jericho. The phenomena on which Weiss rests his case are of two kinds. One group consists of minute agreements between Matthew and Luke against Mark in narratives common to the three, as, e.g., in the use of the words ἵνα and ἦν καὶ ἦν in the opening sentence of the story of the palsied man. The inference is that these phrases are taken from the Logia, implying of course that the story was there for those who chose to use it. The other group consists of sayings of Jesus found in Mark’s Gospel, and reproduced also in Matthew and Luke in nearly identical form, yet not taken, it is held, from Mark, but from the Logia. The contention is that the close similarity can be accounted for only by the assumption that Mark, as well as his brother evangelists, took the words from the Logia. An instance in point may be found in the respective accounts of the reply of Jesus to the charge of being in league with Beelzebub. Wendt dissents from the inference of Weiss in both classes of cases. The one group of facts he explains by assuming that Luke had access to the first canonical gospel; in the second group he sees simply accidental correspondences between independent traditions preserved respectively in the Logia and in Mark.  

SECTION II. Historicity.

1. The Gospels prima facie wear the aspect of books aiming at giving a true if not a full account of the life, and more especially of the public career, of Jesus Christ, the Author of the Christian faith. For Christians, writings having such an aim must possess unique interest. There is nothing an earnest believer in Christ more desires to know than the actual truth about Him: what He said, did, and experienced. How far do the books, the study of which is to engage our attention, satisfy this desire? To what extent are they historically reliable?

2. The question has been recently propounded and discussed:

1 Die Lehre Jesu, Erster Theil, pp. 191-3. On the question whether the third evangelist used canonical Matthew, vide the Abhandlung of Edward Simons, Bonn, 1880.
What interest did the apostolic age take in the evangelic history, and the conclusion arrived at that the earthly life of Jesus interested it very little?\textsuperscript{1} Now, there can be no doubt that, comparing that age with the present time, the statement is true. We live in an age when the historical spirit is in the ascendant, creating an insatiable desire to know the origins of every movement which has affected, to any extent, the fortunes of humanity. Moreover, Christianity has undergone an evolution resulting in types of this religion which are, on various grounds, unsatisfactory to many thoughtful persons. Hence has arisen a powerful reaction of which the watchword is—"Back to Christ," and to which additional intensity has been given by the conviction that modern types of Christianity, whether ecclesiastical, philosophical, or pietistic, all more or less foster, if they do not avow, indifference to the historic foundations of the faith. We have thus a religious as well as a scientific reason for our desire to know the actual Jesus of history. In the primitive era, faith was free to follow its native tendency to be content with its immediate object, the Risen Lord, and to rely on the inward illumination of the Holy Spirit as the source of all knowledge necessary for a godly life. This indifference might conceivably pass into hostility. Faith might busy itself in transforming unwelcome facts so as to make the history serve its purpose. For the historic interest and the religious are not identical. Science wants to know the actual facts; religion wants facts to be such as will serve its ends. It sometimes idealises, transforms, even invents history to accomplish this object. We are not entitled to assume, \textit{à priori}, that apostolic Christianity entirely escaped this temptation. The suggestion that the faith of the primitive Church took hold of the story of Jesus and so transfigured it that the true image of Him is no longer recoverable, however sceptical, is not without plausibility. The more moderate statement that the apostolic Church, while knowing and accepting many facts about Jesus, was not interested in them as facts, but only as aids to faith, has a greater show of reason. It might well be that the teaching of Jesus was regarded not so much as a necessary source of the knowledge of truth, but rather as a confirmation of knowledge already possessed, and that the acts and experiences of Jesus were viewed chiefly in the light of verifications of His claim to be the Messiah. It does not greatly matter to us what the source of interest in the evangelic facts was so long as they are facts; if the primitive Church in its traditions concerning Jesus was simply utilising and

\textsuperscript{1} Vide Von Soden's essay in the \textit{Theologische Abhandlungen, Carl von Weiszäcker Gewidmet}, 1892.
not manufacturing history. There is good reason to believe that in the main this is the true state of the case. Not only so, there are grounds for the opinion that the historic spirit — interest in facts as facts — was not wanting even amid the fervour of the apostolic age.

It may be worth while to mention some of these, seeing they make for the historicity of the main body of the evangelic tradition concerning the words, deeds, and sufferings of Jesus as these are recorded, e.g., in the Gospel of Mark.

3. In this connection it deserves a passing notice that there existed in the primitive Church a party interested in the fact-knowledge of Jesus, the knowledge of Christ “after the flesh” in Pauline phrase, a Christ party. From the statement made by St. Paul in the text from which the phrase just quoted is taken, it has been inferred that the apostle was entirely indifferent to the historical element. The inference seems to me hasty, but, be this as it may, what I am now concerned to point out is that, if St. Paul undervalued the facts of the personal ministry, there were those who did not. There was a party who made acquaintance with these facts a necessary qualification for the apostleship, and on this ground denied that St. Paul was an apostle. The assumption underlying the Tübingen tendency-criticism is that there were two parties in the apostolic Church interested in misrepresenting Jesus in different directions, one virtually making Him a narrow Judaist, the other making Him a Pauline universalist, neither party being worthy of implicit trust. This hypothesis presents a somewhat distorted view of the situation. It would be nearer the truth to say that there was a party interested in facts and another interested chiefly in ideas. The one valued facts without seeing their significance; the other valued ideas without taking much trouble to indicate the fact basis. To the bias of the former party we might be indebted for knowledge of many facts in the life of Jesus, the significance of which was not understood by the transmitters of the tradition.

4. Even within the Pauline party there were those who were interested in facts and in some measure animated by the historical spirit. So far from regarding Paulinists in general as idealists, we ought probably to regard St. Paul, in his passion for ideas and apparent indifference to biographic detail, as an exception, and to think of the majority of his followers as men who, while sympathising with his universalism, shared in no small measure the common Jewish realism. Of this type was Luke. The absence from his

1 2 Corinthians v. 16.
Gospel of even the rudiments of a doctrine of atonement, so conspicuous a topic in the Pauline epistles, will be remarked on hereafter; meantime I direct attention simply to its opening sentence. That prefatory statement is full of words and phrases breathing the fact-loving spirit: \( \text{Πεπληρωμένων πραγμάτων, ἀκριβῶς αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται, ἀκριβῶς, ἀσφάλειαν.} \) The author wants to deal with facts believed; he wishes, as far as possible, to be guided by the testimony of eye-witnesses; he means to take pains in the ascertainment of the truth that the friend for whose benefit he writes may attain unto certainty. The question here is not how far he succeeded in his aim; the point insisted on is the aim itself, the historical spirit evinced. Luke may have been unconsciously influenced to a considerable extent by religious bias, preconceived opinion, accepted Christian belief, and therefore not sufficiently critical, and too easily satisfied with evidence; but he honestly wanted to know the historic truth. And in this desire he doubtless represented a class, and wrote to meet a demand on the part of Christians who felt a keen interest in the memorabilia of the Founder, and were not satisfied with the sources at command on account of their fragmentariness, or occasional want of agreement with each other.\(^1\)

5. The peculiar character of the apostle who stood at the head of the primitive Jewish Church has an important bearing on the question of historicity. For our knowledge of Peter we are not wholly dependent on the documents whose historicity is in question. We have a rapid pencil-sketch of him in the epistles of St. Paul, easily recognisable as that of the same man of whom we have a more finished picture in the Gospels. A genial, frank, impulsive, outspoken, generous, wide-hearted man; not preoccupied with theories, illogical, inconsistent, now on one side, now on the other; brave yet cowardly, capable of honest sympathy with Christian universalism, yet under pressure apt to side with Jewish bigots. A most unsatisfactory, provoking person to deal with for such a man as St. Paul, with his sharply defined position, thorough-going adherence to principle, and firm resolute will. Yes, but also a very satisfactory source of first-hand traditions concerning Jesus; an excellent witness, if a weak apostle. A source, a copious fountain of information he was bound to be. We do not need Papias to tell us this. This disciple, open-hearted and open-mouthed, must speak concerning his beloved Master. It will not be long before everybody knows what he has to tell concerning the ministry of the Lord.

\(^1\) Von Soden, in the essay above referred to, takes no notice of Luke's preface.
Papias reports that in Mark's Gospel we have the literary record of Peter's testimony. The statement is entirely credible. Peter would say more than others about Jesus; he would say all in a vivid way, and Mark's narrative reflects the style of an impressionable eye-witness. If it be a faithful report of Peter's utterances the general truth of its picture of Jesus may be implicitly relied on. For Peter was not a man likely to be biased by theological tendency. What we expect from him is rather a candid recital of things as they happened, without regard to, possibly without perception of, their bearing on present controversies; a rough, racy, unvarnished story, unmanipulated in the interest of ideas or theories which are not in this man's line. How far the narratives of the second Gospel bear out this character will appear hereafter.

6. The other fact mentioned by Papias, viz., that the apostle Matthew was the source of the evangelic tradition relating to the words of Jesus, has an important bearing on historicity. Outside the Gospels we have no information concerning this disciple such as we have of Peter in the Pauline letters. But we may safely assume the truth of the Gospel accounts which represent him as having been a tax-gatherer before he was called to discipleship. The story of his call, under the name of Matthew or Levi, is told in all the three synoptists, as is also the significant incident of the feast following at which Jesus met with a large company of publicans. There is reason to believe that in calling this disciple our Lord had in view not merely ultimate service as an apostle, but immediate service in connection with the meeting with the publicans; that, in short, Jesus associated Matthew with Himself that He might use him as an instrument for initiating a mission to the class to which he had belonged. But if the Master might call a fit man to discipleship for one form of immediate service, He might call him for more than one. Another service the ex-publican might be able to render was that of secretary. In his old occupation he would be accustomed to writing, and it might be Christ's desire to utilise that talent for noting down things worthy of record. The gift would be most in demand in connection with the teaching of the Master. The preservation of that element could not be safely trusted to memories quite equal to the retention of remarkable healing acts, accompanied by not less remarkable sayings. The use of the pen at the moment might be necessary. And of all the members of the disciple-circle the ex-publican was the likeliest man for that service. We are not surprised, therefore, that the function assigned to Matthew in connection with the evangelic tradition is the preservation of the Logia.
That is just the part he was fitted to perform. As little are we surprised that Mark's Gospel, based on Peter's recollections, contains so little of the teaching. Peter was not the kind of man to take notes, nor were discourses full of deep thought the kind of material he was likely to remember. What would make an indelible impression on him would be, not thought, but extraordinary deeds, accompanied by striking gestures, original brief replies to embarrassing questions and the like; just such things as we find reported in the second Gospel.

From Matthew the publican might be expected not only a record of Christ's teaching as distinct from His actions, but an impartial record. We should not suspect him any more than Peter of theological bias; least of all in the direction of Judaism. As a Galilean he belonged to a half-Gentile community, and as a publican he was an outcast for orthodox Jews. It was probably the humane spirit and wide sympathies of Jesus that drew him from the receipt of custom. If, therefore, we find in the Logia any sayings ascribed to Jesus of a universalistic character we do not feel in the least tempted to doubt their authenticity. If, on the other hand, we meet with words of an apparently opposite character we are not greatly startled and ready to exclaim, Behold the hand of an interpolator. We rather incline to see in the combination of seemingly incongruous elements the evidence of candid chronicling. It is the case of an honest reporter taking down this and that without asking himself whether this can be reconciled with that. That a deep, many-sided mind like that of Jesus might give birth to startling paradoxes is no wise incredible. Therefore, without undertaking responsibility for every expression, one may without hesitation endorse the sentiment of Jülicher, "that Jewish and anti-Jewish, revolutionary and conservative, new and old, freedom and narrowness in judgment, sensuous hopes and a spiritualism blending together present and future, meet together, by no means weakens our impression that Jesus really here speaks".1

7. The mere fact of the preservation of Mark's Gospel is not without a bearing on the question of historicity. In its own way it testifies to the influence of the historic as distinct from the religious spirit in the early period of the Christian era. It would not have been at all surprising if that Gospel had fallen out of existence, seeing that its contents have been absorbed into the more comprehensive Gospels of Matthew and Luke. Assuming the correctness

1 Einleitung in das Neue Testament, p. 231.
of modern critical views, the Logia of the Apostle Matthew has disappeared; how did it come about that the second Gospel did not disappear also, especially in view of its defects, as they would be regarded, comparing it with the longer narratives of the same type? Whether the authors of the first and third Gospels aimed at superseding the Logia and Mark is a question that need not be discussed. From Luke's preface it might plausibly be inferred that he did aspire at giving so full and satisfactory an account of the life of Jesus as should render earlier attempts superfluous. If he did he was not successful. The Gospel without the story of the infancy, and the Sermon on the Mount, and the detailed appearances after the resurrection survived. It might be undervalued. There is evidence of preference and partiality for one Gospel as against another in Patristic literature. Clement of Alexandria, true to his philosophy, undervalued all the synoptists as compared with the fourth Gospel, because they showed merely the body of Jesus, while the fourth Gospel showed His spirit. Augustine regarded Mark as a mere pedissequus to Matthew, en laquais, as D'Eichthal irreverently but not incorrectly renders the word. Still Mark held his place, mere lackey to Matthew though some supposed him to be. The reason might be in part that he had got too strong a hold before the companion Gospels appeared to be easily dislodged, and had to be accepted in spite of defects and apparent superfluousness. But I think there was also a worthier reason, a certain diffused thankfulness for every scrap of information concerning the Lord Jesus, especially such as was believed to rest on apostolic testimony. Mark's Gospel passed for a report of St. Peter's reminiscences of the Master; therefore by all means let it be preserved, though it contained no account of the childhood of Jesus, and very imperfect reports of His teaching and of the resurrection. It was apostolic, therefore to be respected; as apostolic it was trustworthy, therefore to be valued. In short, the presence of the second Gospel in the New Testament, side by side with Matthew and Luke, is a witness to the prevalence in the Church of the first century of the historical spirit acting as a check on the religious spirit, whose instinctive impulse would be to obliterate traces of discrepancy, and to suppress all writings relating to the Christian origins, which in their presentation of Jesus even seemed to sink below the level of the Catholic faith.

8. The foregoing five considerations all tend to make a favour-

1 Vide his work Les Evangiles, p. 66.
able impression as to the historicity of the evangelic tradition in general. More special considerations are needful when the tradition is broken up into distinct divisions. The tradition consists of three layers. Faith would make three demands for information concerning its object: what did He teach? what did He do? how did He suffer? Some think that the first and most urgent demand would be for information concerning the teaching, and that only in the second place would there grow up a desire for narratives of facts and experiences. According to Holtzmann the order was: first the Logia, then the passion-drama, then the anecdotes of memorable acts. I should be inclined to invert the order of the first two items, and to say: the Passion, the Logia, the memorable incidents. But the more important question is: how far can the evangelic records concerning these three departments of the tradition be trusted? Only a few hints can be given by way of answer here.

9. The narratives of the Passion, given in all the four Gospels with disproportionate fulness, have lately been subjected to a searching analysis in a sceptical spirit rivalling that of Strauss. Dr. Brandt, after doing his utmost to shake our faith in the trustworthiness of these pathetic records, still leaves to us eight particulars, which even he is constrained to recognise as historical. These are: betrayal by one of the twelve; desertion by all of them; denial by Peter; death sentence under the joint responsibility of Jewish rulers and Roman procurator; assistance in carrying the cross rendered by Simon of Cyrene; crucifixion on a hill called Golgotha; the crime charged indicated by the inscription, "King of the Jews"; death, if not preceded by a prayer for the murderers, or by the despairing cry, "My God, my God," at least heralded by a loud voice. In these particulars we have the skeleton of the story, all that is needful to give the Passion tragic significance, and even form a basis for theological constructions. The items omitted, the process before the Sanhedrim, the interviews with Pilate and Herod, the mockery of the soldiers, the preferential release of Barabbas, the sneers of passers-by, the two thieves, the parting of the raiment, the words from the cross, the preternatural accompaniments of death, are all more or less of the nature of accessories, enhancing greatly the impressiveness of the picture, suggesting additional lessons, but not altering the character of the event as a whole.

But even accessories are important, and not to be lightly given

1 Vide Hand-Commentar, pp. 13-17.
2 Die Evangelische Geschichte und der Ursprung des Christenthums, 1893.
over to the tender mercies of sceptical critics. The reasons assigned for treating them as unhistoric are not convincing. They come mostly under three heads: The influence of Old Testament prophecy, the absence of witnesses, and the bias manifest in the accounts of the trial against the Jews and in favour of the Gentiles. By reference to the first a whole group of incidents, including the cry, "Eli, Eli," are summarily disposed of. Texts taken from Psalm xxii. and Isaiah liii. created corresponding facts. This is a gratuitous assumption. The facts suggested the prophecies, the prophecies did not create the facts. The facts were there, and the primitive disciples looked out for Messianic oracles to suit them, by way of furnishing themselves with an apologetic, for the thesis, Jesus is the Christ. In some cases the links of proof are weak; no one could have thought of the texts unless the facts had been there to suggest them. The plea of lack of witnesses applies to what took place between Jesus and the various authorities before whom He appeared: the High Priests, Pilate, Herod. Who, it is asked, were there to see or hear? Who likely to be available as witnesses for the evangelic tradition? We cannot tell; yet it is possible there was quite sufficient evidence, though also possible, doubtless, that the evangelists were not in all cases able to give exact verifiable information, but were obliged to give simply the best information obtainable. This, at least, we may claim for them, that they did their best to ascertain the facts. As to the alleged prejudice leading to unfair distribution of blame for our Lord's death between the Jewish authorities and the Roman governor, we may admit that there were temptations to such partiality, arising out of natural dislike of the Jews and unequally natural desire to win the favour of those who held the reins of empire. Yet on the whole it may be affirmed that the representation of the evangelists is intrinsically credible as in harmony with all we know about the principal actors in the great tragedy.

10. With regard to the teaching, it is of course obvious that all recorded sayings of Jesus do not possess the same attestation. Some words are found in all three synoptists, some in two, and not a few in only one. Yet in many instances we can feel as sure of the authenticity of sayings found in a single Gospel as of that of sayings occurring in all the three. Who can doubt, e.g., that the word, "the Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath," emanated from the great Master? It is well in this connection to have before our minds the rules by which judgment should be guided. The following canons may legitimately be relied on: —
(a) Sayings supported by full synoptical attestation may be regarded as in substance authentic.

(b) Sayings unsupported by full synoptical attestation may be regarded as authentic when their absence from a particular Gospel can be explained by its plan, or by the idiosyncrasy of its author. This covers not a few omissions by Luke.

(c) Sayings found only in a single Gospel may be accepted as authentic when they sympathise with and form a natural complement to other well-attested sayings. This remark applies to the sayings in Luke vii. 47, xv. 7, concerning the connection between little forgiveness and little love, and about the joy of finding things lost, which are complementary to the saying in all three synoptists: "the whole need not a physician;" the three sayings together constituting a full apology for the relations between Jesus and the sinful.

(d) All sayings possess intrinsic credibility which suit the general historical situation. This applies to Christ's antipharaic utterances, an element very prominent in Matthew, and very much restricted in Luke.

(e) All sayings may be accepted as self-attested and needing no other attestation which bear the unmistakable stamp of a unique religious genius, rise above the capacity of the reporters, and are reported by them simply as unforgettable memories of the great Teacher handed down by a faithful tradition.

The chief impulse to collecting the sayings of Jesus was not a purely historical interest, but a desire to find in the words of the Master what might serve as a rule to believers for the guidance of their life. Hence may be explained the topical grouping of sayings in Matthew and Luke, especially in the former, e.g., in the tenth chapter, whose rubric might be: a directory for the mission work of the church; and in the eighteenth, which might be headed: how the members of the Christian brotherhood are to behave towards each other. The question suggests itself, Would the influence of the practical aim be confined to grouping? Would it not extend to modifications, expansions, additions, even inventions, that the words of the Master might cover all present requirements and correspond fully to present circumstances and convictions? On this topic Weizsäcker makes the following statement: "From the beginning the tradition consisted not in mere repetition, but in repetition combined with creative activity. And from the nature of the case this activity increased as time went on. Elucidations grew into text. The single saying was multiplied with the multiplication of its uses, or the words were referred to a definite case and correspondingly
modified. Finally, words were inserted into the text of Jesus' sayings, especially in the form of instances of narrative, which were only meant to make His utterances more distinct."¹ This may seem to open a door to licence, but second thoughts tend to allay our fears. The aim itself supplied a check to undue freedom. Just because disciples desired to follow the Master and make His words their law, they would wish to be sure that the reported sayings gave them the thoughts of Jesus at least, if not His ipsissima verba. Then there is reason to believe that the process of fixing the tradition was substantially completed when the memory of Jesus was recent, and the men who had been with Him were at hand to guide and control the process. Weizsäcker remarks that very little of the nature of accretion originated elsewhere than in the primitive church, and that the great mass of the evangelic tradition was formed under the influence of the living tradition.² That is to say, the freedom of the apostolic age was controlled by knowledge and reverence. It was known what the Master had taught, and great respect was cherished for His authority. If there was no superstitious concern as to literal accuracy, there was a loyal solicitude that the meaning conveyed by words should be true to the mind of Christ.

11. The incidents of the Healing Ministry, which form the bulk of the narrative of events, are complicated with the question of miracle. Those for whom it is an axiom that a miracle is impossible are tempted to pronounce on that ministry the summary and sweeping verdict, unhistorical. This is not a scientific procedure. The question of fact should be dealt with separately on its own grounds, and the question of expicability taken up only in the second place. There are good reasons for believing that the healing ministry, miraculous or not miraculous, was a great fact in the public career of Jesus. Healing is associated with teaching in all general notices of our Lord's work. Nine acts of healing, some of them very remarkable, are reported in all the synoptical Gospels. The healing element in the ministry is so interwoven with the didactic that the former cannot be eliminated without destroying the whole story. This is frankly acknowledged by Harnack, who, if he does not doubt the reality of miracles, attaches very little apologetic value to them.³ The occasional notices in the Gospels of contemporary opinions, impressions, and theories regarding Christ's actions speak to something extraordinary over and above the preaching and teaching.

Mark's graphic report of the impression produced by Christ's first appearance in the synagogue of Capernaum may be cited as an instance. "What is this? A new teaching!—with authority He commandeth even the unclean spirits, and they obey Him." 1 This is a veritable reminiscence, and it points to a double surprise created by an original style of preaching, and by an unprecedented power. Still more significant are the theories invented to explain away the power. The Pharisees accounted for it, as displayed in the cure of demoniacs, by the suggestion of an alliance with Beelzebub. Herod said: "It is John whom I beheaded risen from the dead and exercising the power of the spirit world". The one theory was malevolent, the other absurd, but the point to be noticed is the existence of the theories. Men do not theorise about nothing. There were remarkable facts urgently demanding explanation of some sort.

The healing acts of Jesus then, speaking broadly, were to begin with facts. How they are to be explained, and what they imply as to the Person of the Healer, are questions for science and theology. It is not scientific to neglect the phenomena as unworthy of notice. As little is it scientific to make the solution easy by under-statement of the facts to be explained, as, e.g., by viewing demoniacal possession as an imaginary disease. Demoniacal possession might be an imaginary explanation of certain classes of diseases, but the diseases themselves were serious enough, as serious as madness and epilepsy, which appear to have formed the physical basis of the malady.

Finally, it is not to be supposed that these healing acts, though indubitable facts, have no permanent religious value. Their use in the evidences of Christianity may belong to an antiquated type of apologetic, but in other respects their significance is perennial. Whether miraculous or not, they equally reveal the wide-hearted benevolence of Jesus. They throw a side light on His doctrine of God and of man, and especially on His conception of the ideal of life. The healing ministry was a tacit but effective protest against asceticism and the dualism on which it rests, and a proof that Jesus had no sympathy with the hard antithesis between spirit and flesh.

12. Before leaving the topic of historicity, it may be well here to refer to a line of evidence which, though not worked out, has been suggestively sketched by Professor Sanday in his Bampton Lectures

1 Mark i. 27.
on *Inspiration*. The thesis to be proved is "that the great mass of the narrative in the first three Gospels took its shape before the destruction of Jerusalem, *i.e.*, within less than forty years of the events".\(^1\) "Was there ever," asks Dr. Sanday, "an easier problem for a critic to decide whether the sayings and narratives which lie before him came from the one side of this chasm or the other?" Among the instances he cites are such as these: "If, therefore, thou art offering thy gift at the altar, and then rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee," etc. "Woe unto you, ye blind guides, which say, whosoever shall swear by the temple, it is nothing," etc. "See thou tell no man, but go thy way, show thyself to the priest," etc. That is to say, the altar, the temple, the priesthood are still in existence. This is not decisive as to the date of our Gospels, but it is decisive as to much of the material contained in them having assumed fixed shape, either in oral or in written form, before the great crisis of Israel.

13. Historicity, be it finally noted, is not to be confounded with absolute accuracy, or perfect agreement between parallel accounts. Harmonistic is a thing of the past. It was a well-meant discipline, but it took in hand an insoluble problem, and it unduly magnified the importance of a solution, even if it had been possible. Questions as to occasions on which reported words and acts of Jesus were spoken or done, as to the connections between sayings grouped together in one Gospel, dispersed in the pages of another, as to the diverse forms of sayings in parallel reports, are for us now secondary. The broad question we ask as to the words of Jesus is: have we here, in the main, words actually spoken by Jesus, once or twice, now or then, in this connection or in that, in separate aphorisms or in connected discourse, in the form reported by this or that evangelist, or in a form not exactly reproduced by any of them, yet conveying a sense sufficiently reflected in all the versions? Is the Lord's prayer the Lord's at whatever time given to His disciples? Is the "Sermon on the Mount" made up of real utterances of Jesus, whether all spoken at one time, as Matthew's report seems to imply, or on various occasions, as we should infer from Luke's narrative? Did Jesus actually say: "I came not to call the righteous, but sinners," whether with the addition, "to repentance," as it stands in Luke, or without, as in the genuine text of the same *Logia* in Matthew and Mark? Did He speak the parable of the lost sheep—whether in Matthew's form or in Luke's, or in a form differing verbally from

\(^1\) Page 283.
both — to disciples, to Pharisees, or perhaps to neither, but to publicans, yet conveying in some form and to some audience the great thought that there was a passion in His heart and in the heart of God for saving lost men? It is greatly to be desired that devout readers of the Gospels should be emancipated from legal bondage to the theological figment of inerrancy. Till this is done, it is impossible to enjoy in full the Gospel story, or feel its essential truth and reality.
CHAPTER II.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MARK.

SECTION I. CONTENTS.

1. The second Gospel has no account of the birth and infancy of Jesus. The narrative opens with the prelude to the public ministry, the preaching and baptism of the prophet John; and the sequel consists of a rapid sketch of that ministry in a series of graphic tableaux from its commencement in Galilee to its tragic close in Jerusalem. This fact alone raises a presumption in favour of Mark's claim to be the earliest of the three synoptical Gospels. Other considerations pointing in the same direction are its comparative brevity and the meagreness of its account of Christ's teaching. This Gospel wears the aspect of a first sketch of the memorable career of one who had become an object of religious faith and love to the circle of readers for whose benefit it was written. As such it is entitled to precedence in an introduction to the three synoptists, though, in our detailed comments, we follow the order in which they are arranged in the New Testament. It is convenient to take Mark first for this further reason, that from its pages we can form the clearest idea of the general course of our Lord's history after He entered on His Messianic calling. In none of the three Gospels can we find a definite chronological plan, but it is possible from any one of them to form a general idea of the leading stages of the ministry, and most easily and clearly from the second.

2. The first stage was the synagogue ministry. After His baptism in the Jordan and His temptation in the wilderness, Jesus returned to Galilee and began to preach the "Gospel of the Kingdom of God". The synagogue was the scene of this preaching. The first appearance of Jesus in a synagogue was in Capernaum, where He at once made a great impression both by His discourse and by the cure of a demoniac. This was simply the commence-

1 Mark i. 14.  
2 Mark i. 27.
ment of a preaching tour in the synagogues of Galilee. Jesus made no stay in Capernaum. He left the town the day after He preached in its synagogue, very early in the morning. He left so early in the day because He feared detention by the people. He left in such haste because He knew that He could preach in the synagogues only by the consent of the authorities, which might soon be withheld through sinister influence. This synagogue preaching naturally formed the first phase in Christ's work. The synagogue presented a ready opportunity of coming into contact with the people. Any man might speak there with the permission of the ruler. But he could speak only so long as he was a persona grata, and Jesus, conscious of the wide cleavage in thought and feeling between Himself and the scribes, could not but fear that He would not remain such long. It was now or never, at the outset or not at all, so far as the synagogue was concerned.

3. How long this synagogue ministry lasted is not expressly indicated. A considerable period is implied in the statement: "He preached in their synagogues throughout all Galilee". It is not necessary to take this strictly, especially in view of the populousness of Galilee, and the multitude of its towns large and small, as indicated by Josephus. But the statement must be taken in earnest so far as to recognise that Jesus had a deliberate plan for a synagogue ministry in Galilee, and that He carried it out to a considerable extent. It is not improbable that it was interrupted by the influence of the scribes, whom we find lying in wait for Him on His return from the preaching tour to Capernaum.

4. With the anecdote in which the scribes figure as captious critics of Jesus a new phase in the story begins. The keynote of the first chapter is popularity; that of the next is opposition. In this juxtaposition the evangelist is not merely aiming at dramatic effect, but reflecting in his narrative a real historical sequence. The popularity and the opposition were related to each other as cause and effect. It is true that having once entered on this second topic, he groups together a series of incidents illustrating the hostile attitude of the scribes, which have a topical rather than a temporal connection, in this probably following the example of his voucher, Peter. These extend from chap. ii. 1 to chap. iii. 6, constituting the

1 Mark i. 35.  
2 Mark i. 39.  
3 Josephus gives the number of towns at 204, the smallest having 15,000 inhabitants. Vide his Vita, chap. xiv., and Bel. Jud., iii., 2, 3.  
4 Chap. ii. 1.
second division of the story, chap. i. 14-45 being the first. The two
together set before us the two forces whose action and interaction
can be traced throughout the drama, and whose resultant will be
the cross: the favour of the people, the ill-will of their religious
leaders.

5. Within the second group of anecdotes illustrating the hos-
tility of the scribes, a place is assigned to an incident which ought
not to be regarded as a mere subordinate detail under that general
category, but rather as pointing to another phase of our Lord's
activity co-ordinate in importance with the preaching in the syna-
gogues. I refer to the meeting with the publicans, and in con-
nection with that the call of Levi or Matthew.¹ That action of Jesus
had a decisive effect in alienating the scribes, but meantime that
is not the thing to be emphasised. We have to recognise in
this new movement a second stage in the ministry of Jesus. First,
preaching in the synagogues to the Jews of respectable character
and good religious habit; next, a mission to the practically excom-
municated, non-synagogue-going, socially outcast part of the com-

unity. Mark, more than his brother evangelists, shows his sense
of the importance and significance of this new departure, especially
by the observation: "there were many (publicans and sinners), and
they followed Him".² That is to say, the class was large enough to
demand special attention, and they were inviting attention and
awakening interest in them by the interest they on their side were
beginning to take in Jesus and His work. Without doubt this
mission to the publicans bulked much larger in fact than it does in
the pages of the evangelists or in the thoughts of average readers of
the Gospel, and it must be one of the cares of the interpreter to
make it appear in its true dimensions.³ There is nothing in the
Gospels more characteristic of Jesus, or of deeper, more lasting sig-
nificance as to the nature and tendency of the Christian faith.

6. The third stage in the ministry of Jesus was the formation of a
disciple-circle. Of the beginnings of this movement Mark gives us
a glimpse in chap. i. 16-20, where he reports the call of the four
fishermen, Peter and Andrew, James and John; and in the words
Jesus is reported to have spoken to the first pair of brothers there
is a clear indication of a purpose to gather about Him a band of men
not merely for personal service but in order to training for a high
calling. Levi's call, reported in chap. ii., is another indication of

¹ Chap. ii. 13-17. ² Chap. ii. 15. ³ Vide notes on this section in Matthew and in Mark.
the same kind. But it is in the section of the Gospel beginning at chap. iii. 7, and extending to chap. vi. 13, that the disciples properly come to the front. An intention on the part of the evangelist to give them prominence is betrayed in the pointed way in which he refers to them in iii. 7: "And Jesus with the disciples withdrew towards the sea".\(^1\) A little further on in the same chapter we read of the retirement of Jesus to the mountain with a band of disciples, out of which He selects an inner circle of twelve.\(^2\) And at various points in this division of the Gospel the disciple-band is referred to in a way to indicate that they are assuming a new importance to the mind of Jesus.\(^3\)

7. This importance was due in part to dissatisfaction with the result of the general ministry among the people. Jesus had preached often, and healed many, in synagogue and highway, and had become in consequence the idol of the masses who gathered in increasing numbers from all quarters, and crowded around Him wherever He went, as we read in chap. iii. 7-12. But this popularity did not gratify Him; it rather bored Him. He did not weary in well-doing, but He was disappointed with the outcome. This disappointment found expression in the parable of the sower, which was really a critical estimate of the synagogue ministry to this sad effect: much seed sown; little fruit. From this comparatively fruitless ministry among the many, Jesus turned with yearning to the susceptible few in hope to find in them a good soil that should bring forth ripe fruit, thirty, sixty, or even an hundred fold. After a long enough time had elapsed to make it possible to form an estimate of the spiritual situation, He judged that in a disciple-circle lay His only chance of deep permanent influence. Hence He naturally sought to extricate Himself from the crowd, and to get away from collisions with unsympathetic scribes, that He might have leisure to indoctrinate the chosen band in the mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven. Leisure, quiet, retirement— that more and more was His aim.

8. This desire for opportunity to perform the functions of a master is made more apparent by Mark than by the two other synoptists. He comes far short of them in his report of Christ's teaching, but he brings out much more clearly than they Christ's desire for undisturbed intercourse with the twelve, the reasons for it, and the persistent efforts of the Master to accomplish His object. It is from his pages we learn of the escapes of Jesus from the crowds

\(^1\) μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν stands before ἀνεχάρησαν in the best texts.
\(^2\) Chap. iii. 13.
\(^3\) Vide iii. 31-35; iv. 10-25; vi. 7-13.
and from the scribes. These escapes, as reported by Mark, take place in all directions possible for one whose work lay on the western shore of the Sea of Galilee: towards the hill behind, towards the eastern shore, towards the northern borderland. Five in all are mentioned: one to the hill;\(^1\) two to the eastern shore, first in an eastward,\(^2\) then in a northerly direction;\(^8\) two to the north, first to the borders of Tyre and Sidon,\(^4\) next to the neighbourhood of Caesarea Philippi.\(^6\) All had the same end in view: the instruction of the disciples. It was in connection with the first that the “Sermon on the Mount,” or the Teaching on the Hill, though not mentioned by Mark, was doubtless communicated. The second and third attempts, the flights across the lake, were unsuccessful, being frustrated in the first case by an accidental meeting with a demoniac, and in the second by the determination of the multitude not to let Jesus get away from them. Therefore, to make sure, the Master had to retire with His disciples to the northern limits of the land, and even beyond them, into Gentile territory, that there He might, undisturbed, talk to His disciples about the crisis that He now clearly perceived to be approaching.

9. These last flights of Jesus take us on to a point in the story considerably in advance of the end of the third section, chap. vi. 13. The material lying between this place and chap. viii. 27 shows us the progress of the drama under the ever-intensifying influence of the two great forces, popularity and hostility. The multitude grows ever larger till it reaches the dimensions of 5000,\(^6\) and the enmity of the scribes becomes ever more acute as the divergence of the ways of Jesus from theirs becomes increasingly manifest, and His abhorrence of their doctrines and spirit receives more unreserved expression.\(^7\) After the encounter with the scribes occasioned by the neglect of the disciple-circle to comply with Rabbinical customs in the matter of ceremonial ablutions, Jesus felt that it was a mere matter of time when the enmity of His foes would culminate in an effort to compass His death. What He had now to do therefore was to prepare Himself and His disciples for the end. Accordingly, Mark reports that after that incident Jesus went thence into the borders of Tyre and Sidon, desiring that no one should know.\(^8\) He could not be hid even there, and so to make sure of privacy He seems to have made a wide excursion into heathen territory, through Tyre and Sidon, possibly across the moun-

\(^1\) Chap. iii. 13. \(^2\) Chap. iv. 35. \(^3\) Chap. vi. 30. \(^4\) Chap. vii. 24.
\(^5\) Chap. viii. 27. \(^6\) Chap. vi. 44. \(^7\) Chap. vii. 1-23. \(^8\) Chap. vii. 24.
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tains towards Damascus, and so through Decapolis back to Galilee.\(^1\) Then followed, after an interval, the excursion to Caesarea Philippi, for ever memorable as the occasion on which Peter confessed his belief that his Master was the Christ, and the Master began to tell His disciples that He was destined ere long to suffer death at the hands of the scribes.\(^2\)

10. From that point onwards Mark relates the last scenes in Galilee, the departure to the south, with the incidents on the way, the entry into Jerusalem, with the stirring incidents of the Passion Week, and, finally, the tragic story of the crucifixion. Throughout this later part of his narrative it is evident that the one great theme of conversation between Jesus and His disciples was the cross: His cross and theirs, the necessity of self-sacrifice for all the faithful, the rewards of those who loyally bear their cross, and the penalties appointed for those whose ruling spirit is ambition.\(^3\)

Section II. Characteristics.

1. The outstanding characteristic of Mark is realism. I have in view here, not the graphic, descriptive, literary style which is generally ascribed to Mark, but the unreserved manner in which he presents the person and character of Jesus and of the disciples. He states facts as they were, when one might be tempted not to state them at all, or to exhibit them in a subdued light. He describes from the life, avoiding toning down, reticence, generalised expression, or euphemistic circumlocution. In this respect there is a great contrast between the second Gospel and the third, and it is only when we have made ourselves acquainted with the peculiarities of the two Gospels that we are able fully to appreciate those of either. The difference is this. Luke's whole style of presentation is manifestly influenced by the present position of Jesus and the disciples: Jesus the risen and exalted Lord, the disciples Apostles. For Mark Jesus is the Jesus of history, and the disciples are simply disciples. Luke writes from the view-point of reverential faith, Mark from that of loving vivid recollection. It is impossible by rapid citation of instances to give an adequate idea of these distinguishing features; all that can be done is to refer to a few examples in explanation of what I mean. In Mark's pages, Jesus before He begins His public career is a carpenter.\(^4\) At the temptation He is driven by the Spirit

\(^1\) Chap. vii. 31.  
\(^2\) Vide chap. ix. 33-90; x. 23-45.  
\(^3\) Chap. viii. 27-33.  
\(^4\) Chap. vi. 3.
into the wilderness. His first appearance in the synagogue of Capernaum is so remarkable that people say to each other: "What is this? A new teaching! With authority commandeth He even unclean spirits, and they obey Him." Early the following morning He makes what has the aspect of an unaccountable and undignified flight from Capernaum. By-and-by when He is fully engrossed in His teaching and healing ministries His relatives come to rescue Him from His enthusiasm, deeming Him beside Himself. On the day of the parable-discourse from the boat He makes another flight, He saying to the disciples: Let us go over to the other side; they promptly obeying orders suddenly given and carrying Him off from the crowd, even as He was. Towards the end, on the ascent to Jerusalem, Jesus goes before the disciples, and His manner is such that those who follow are amazed. When He sends for the colt on which He rides into the Holy City, He bids the two disciples promise to the owner that the colt will be returned when He has had His use of it.

2. The realism of Mark makes for its historicity. It is a guarantee of first-hand reports, such as one might expect from Peter. Peter reverences his risen Lord as much as Luke or any other man. But he is one of the men who have been with Jesus, and he speaks from indelible impressions made on his eye and ear, while Luke reports at second-hand from written accounts for the most part. The same realism is a strong argument in favour of Mark's priority. It speaks to an early date before the feeling of decorum had become controlling as it is seen to be in Luke's Gospel. Mark is the archaic Gospel, written under the inspiration not of prophecy like Matthew, or of present reverence like Luke, but of fondly cherished past memories. In it we get nearest to the true human personality of Jesus in all its originality and power, and as coloured by the time and the place. And the character of Jesus loses nothing by the realistic presentation. Nothing is told that needed to be hid. The homeliest facts reported by the evangelist only increase our interest and our admiration. One who desires to see the Jesus of history truly should con well the pages of Mark first, then pass on to Matthew and Luke.

3. By comparison with the companion Gospels Mark lacks a conspicuous didactic aim. The purpose of the writer seems to be

1 Chap. i. 12.  2 Chap. i. 27.  3 Chap. i. 35-38.  4 Chap. iii. 21.
5 Chap. iv. 35.  6 Chap. x. 32.  7 Chap. xi. 3.
mainly just to tell what he knows about Jesus. Some have tried to show that this Gospel is an endeavour to read into the evangelic history the ideas of Paulinism. Others have maintained that the purpose of the writer is to observe a studied, calculated neutrality between Paulinism and Judaism. These opposite views may be left to destroy each other. Others, again, have found in the book a contribution towards establishing Christians in the faith that Jesus was the Messiah, when that faith was tried by a delayed second coming. A didactic programme has been supposed to be hinted at in the opening words: The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, and attempts have been made to show that in the sequel this programme is steadily kept in view. I am by no means anxious to negative these last suggestions; all I say is that the didactic purpose is not prominent. The writer seems to say, not: "These are written that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God," but more simply: "These are written that ye may know Jesus". This also makes for the historicity and early date of the archaic Gospel.

4. Among the more obvious characteristics of Mark's literary style are the use of dual phrases in descriptive passages, a liking for diminutives, occasional Latinisms, the frequent employment of etiōs in narrative, and of the historical present, both tending to vividness, and giving the impression of an eye-witness. The rough vigour and crude grammar frequently noticeable in Mark's reports strengthen this impression. The style is colloquial rather than literary. To this in part is due the unsatisfactory state of the text. Mark's roughness and originality were too much for the scribes. They could not rest till they had smoothed down everything to commonplace. Harmonising propensities also are responsible for the multiplicity of variants, the less important Gospel being forced into conformity with the more important.

Section III. Author, Destination, Date.

1. The Gospel itself contains no indication as to who wrote it. That the writer was one bearing the name of Mark rests solely on an ecclesiastical tradition whose reliableness there has been no disposition to question. The Mark referred to has been from the

1 So Pfleiderer in his Urchristenthum.
2 So Dr. Baur and other members of the Tübingen school.
3 So Dr. Bernhard Weiss, vide Das Marcus Evangelium, Einleitung, p. 23.
earliest times till now identified with the Mark named in Acts xii. 12, as the son of a Mary; in xiii. 5, 13, as the attendant of Paul and Barnabas on their mission journey; and in xv. 39, as the travelling companion of Barnabas alone after he had separated from Paul; also, in Colossians iv. 10, as the cousin (ἀδελφός) of Barnabas; and, finally, in 2 Timothy iv. 11, and Philemon 24, as rendering useful services to Paul.

2. The explanations of Jewish customs, e.g., ceremonial washings (chap. vii. 3-4), and words such as Talitha cumi, and Ephphatha, and the technical term "common" or "unclean" (v. 41, vii. 34, vii. 2) point to non-Jewish readers, and the use of Latinisms is most naturally accounted for by the supposition that the book was written among and for Roman Christians.

3. The dates of the Gospels generally have been a subject of much controversy, and the endless diversity of opinion means that the whole matter belongs largely to the region of conjecture. The very late dates assigned to these writings by the Tübingen school are now generally abandoned. By many competent critics the Synoptical Gospels are placed well within the first century, say, between the years 60 and 80. To condescend upon a precise year is impossible. One cannot even determine with absolute confidence whether the earliest of them, i.e., Mark, was written before or after the destruction of Jerusalem. The point of practical importance is not the date at which a Gospel was composed, but the historical value of its materials. In this respect the claims of Mark, as we have seen, stand high.¹

¹ On the Appendix of Mark, chap. xvi. 9-20, vide Notes ad loc.
CHAPTER III.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MATTHEW.

SECTION I. CONTENTS.

1. As has been stated in chap. i., the bulk of Mark's narrative is substantially taken up into Matthew's longer story. But to that narrative of the archaic Gospel is added much new material, consisting mainly of the teaching of our Lord. This teaching as reproduced in the first Gospel consists not of short pregnant sentences such as Mark has preserved, but of connected discourses of considerable length — the longest and the most important being that familiarly known as the "Sermon on the Mount". Whether this connected character is due to the Teacher or to the evangelist has been disputed, the bias of critical opinion being strongly in favour of the latter alternative. Extreme views on either side are to be avoided. That Jesus uttered only short pithy sayings is a gratuitous assumption. In connection with deliberate efforts to instruct the disciples, the presumption is in favour of continuous discourse. On the other hand, in some of the discourses reported in Matthew, e.g., that in chap. x. on apostolic duties and tribulations, agglomeration is apparent. To what Jesus said to the twelve in sending them forth on their Galilean mission the evangelist, naturally and not inappropriately, adds weighty words which bear on the more momentous mission of the apostles as the propagandists in the wide world of the Christian faith. A similar instance of editorial combination of kindred matter only topically connected may be found in the parabolic discourse. Matthew's seven parables were doubtless all spoken by Jesus, but not that day. The parables spoken from the boat were probably all of one type, presenting together a critical review of Christ's past ministry among the people. On the other hand, I am inclined to think that the contents of chaps. xviii. and xxiii. for the most part belong to the respective occasions with which they are connected in the Gospel. The call for careful admonition to the twelve at Capernaum was urgent, and the Master
would have much to say to His offending disciples. Then nothing could be more fitting than that Jesus should at the close of His life deliver a final and full testimony against the spurious sanctity which He had often criticised in a fragmentary way, and which was now at last to cause His death.

2. The main interest of the question now under consideration revolves around the "Sermon on the Mount". That a discourse of some length was delivered on the mountain Luke's report proves. Luke, even in this case, breaks up much of Matthew's connected matter into short separate utterances, but yet he agrees with Matthew in ascribing to Jesus something like an oration. Though much abbreviated, his report of the discourse is still a discourse. The only question is which of the two comes nearer the original in length and contents. Now, the feeling is a very natural one that Jesus could hardly have spoken so long a discourse as Matthew puts into His mouth at one time, and to a popular audience. But two questions have to be asked here. Did Jesus address a popular audience? Did He speak all at one time in the sense of a continuous discourse of one hour or two hours' length? I am strongly inclined to answer both questions in the negative. Jesus addressed Himself to disciples; His discourse was teaching, not popular preaching—Didache, not Kerygma. And the time occupied in communicating that teaching was probably a week rather than an hour. Matthew's report, in chaps. v.-vii., in that case will have to be viewed as a summary of what the Great Teacher said to His disciples in a leisurely way on sundry topics relating to the Kingdom of Heaven, during a season of retreat on the summit of the hills to the west of the Galilean Lake. Instead of calling it the Sermon on the Mount, we should more properly designate it the Teaching on the Hill.¹

3. The insertion of great masses of didactic matter into the framework of Mark's narrative weakens our sense of the progress of the history in reading Matthew. The didactic interest overshadowed the historical in the evangelist's own mind, with the result that his story does not present the aspect of a life-drama steadily moving on, but rather that of a collection of discourses furnished with slight historical introductions. The "Sermon on the Mount" comes upon us before we are prepared for it. To appreciate it fully we must realise that before it was spoken Jesus

¹ For further remarks on this point vide Notes on the Sermon at the beginning and throughout.
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had preached in many synagogues and to many street crowds, and that a long enough time had elapsed for the Preacher to feel that His ministry had been to a large extent fruitless, and that to establish and perpetuate His influence He must now devote Himself to the careful instruction of a disciple-circle. The miscellaneousness of the parable-collection in chap. xiii. hides from us the fact that that day Jesus was sitting in judgment on His own past ministry and pronouncing on it the verdict: Much seed, little fruit; so justifying Himself for attending henceforth less to the many and more to the few.

4. While the connections of Matthew's discourses are topical rather than temporal, and the sense of progress in his narrative is comparatively weak, there is a manifest correspondence between the discourses he imputes to Jesus and the whole circumstances of the times in which Jesus lived. This remark applies especially to the criticism of Pharisaism, which occupies so prominent a place in the first Gospel, as compared, e.g., with the third, in which that element retires comparatively into the background. Keen conflict between our Lord and the Scribes and Pharisees was inevitable, and the amount of controversial material in the first Gospel speaks strongly in favour of its fidelity to fact in this part of its record, even as the unique quality of the anti-Pharisaic sayings ascribed to Jesus bears witness to their originality. In the Teaching on the Hill the references to Scribism and Pharisaism are, as was fitting, the criticised parties not being present, didactic rather than controversial, but there can be little doubt that Jesus would take occasion there to indicate the difference between His religious ideas and those in vogue at the time. Here it is not Matthew that adds, but Luke that omits.

5. It has been maintained that Matthew's account of our Lord's teaching is not uniform in character—is, indeed, so discrepant as to suggest different hands writing in diverse interests and with conflicting theological attitudes. D'Eichthal, e.g., is of opinion that the primitive Matthew was the earliest written Gospel, and that its contents were much the same as those found in canonical Mark; but that, through being the earliest, it had exceptional authority, and was therefore liable to be added to with a view to furnishing it with support in the teaching of Christ for developing Christianity. D'Eichthal counts as many as forty-five "Annexes," gradually introduced in this way, including the history of the infancy, many

1 Les Evangiles.
parables, numerous passages bearing on the Person of Christ, the Church, the Resurrection, the Second Advent, etc. From this questionable honour of becoming "a place of deposit" for new material, as Dr. Estlin Carpenter calls it, Mark, according to D'Eichthal, was protected by its greater obscurity and inferior authority; hence its modest dimensions, and superior reliableness in point of fidelity to actual historic truth.

This theory is plausible, and we are not entitled to say à priori that it has no foundation in fact. Additions to the Gospels might creep in before they became canonical, as they crept in afterwards through the agency of copyists. The sayings about the indestructibility of the law (v. 17-19) and the founding of the Church (xvi. 18, 19) might possibly be examples in point. But possibility is one thing, probability another. To prove diversity of hand or successive deposits of evangelic tradition by men living at different times, and acting in the interest of distinct or even opposing tendencies, it is not enough to point to apparently conflicting elements and exclaim: "Behold a Gospel of contradictions". On this topic I may refer readers to what has been already stated in discussing the subject of the historicity of the Gospels. And I may here add that it would not be difficult to conceive a situation for which the Gospel might have been written by one man, as it now stands. Dr. Weiss, indeed, has successfully done this in his work on the Gospel of Matthew and its parallels in Luke. He conceives the Gospel substantially as we have it to have been written shortly after the destruction of Jerusalem and the Jewish State, when the faith of Jewish Christians in the Messiahship of Jesus would be sorely shaken by the events: the promised Messianic Kingdom passing away irretrievably from Israel and taking up its abode among Gentiles. The Gospel that was to meet this situation would have to show that Jesus was indeed the Messianic King, in whose history many prophetic oracles found their fulfilment; that He did His utmost to found the kingdom in Israel, but was frustrated by the unbelief of the people, and especially of its rulers; that, therefore, the kingdom was driven forth from Jewish soil, and was now to be found mainly in the Gentile Church, and there had been left to Israel only an inheritance of woe; that though Jesus had predicted this doom He nevertheless loved His people, had loyally and

1 The First Three Gospels, p. 370.

2 Dr. Estlin Carpenter, in the above work, p. 363, remarks: "Truly has the first Gospel been called a 'Gospel of contradictions'".
lovingly sought her good, had spoken with reverence of her God-
given law (while treating with disrespect Rabbinical traditions), and
honoured it by personal observance. This hypothesis fairly meets
the requirements of the case. It covers the phenomena of the
Gospel, and it is compatible with unity of plan and authorship.¹

Section II. Characteristics.

1. The most outstanding characteristic of the first Gospel is that
it paints the life-image of Jesus in prophetic colours. While in
Mark Jesus is presented realistically as a man, in Matthew He is
presented as the Christ, verified as such by the applicability of many
prophetic oracles to the details of His childhood, His public ministry,
and His last sufferings.

2. If the realism of Mark makes for the historicity of this Gospel,
the prophetic colouring so conspicuous in Matthew need not detract
from the historicity of its accounts. This feature may be due in
part to the personal idiosyncrasy of the writer and in part to his
didactic aim. He may have set himself to verify the thesis, Jesus
the Christ, for his own satisfaction, or it may have been necessary
that he should do so in order to strengthen the faith of his first
readers. In either case the presumption is that the operation he
was engaged in consisted in discovering prophetic texts to answer
facts ready to his hand, not in first making a collection of texts and
then inventing facts corresponding to them. The facts suggested
the texts, the texts did not create the facts, though in some instances
they might influence the mode of stating facts. In this connection
it is important to note that the evangelist applies his propheti
c method to the whole of his material, including that which is common
to him with Mark. He has his prophetic oracles ready to be attached
as labels to events which Mark reports simply as matters of fact.
Thus Mark’s dry statement, “they went into Capernaum,”² referring
to Jesus and His followers proceeding northwards from the scene of
the baptism, in Matthew’s hands assumes the character of a solemn
announcement of an epoch-making event, whereby an ancient oracle
concerning the appearing of a great light in Galilee of the Gentiles
received its fulfilment.³ Again, Mark’s matter-of-fact report of the
extensive healing function in Capernaum on the Sabbath evening is
in Matthew adorned with a beautiful citation from Isaiah’s famous

² Mark i. 21.
³ Matt. iv. 12-17.
oracle concerning the suffering servant of Jehovah.\(^1\) Once more, to Mark’s simple statement that Jesus withdrew Himself to the sea after the collision with the Pharisees, occasioned by the healing on a Sabbath of the man with a withered hand, the first evangelist attaches a fine prophetic picture, as if to show readers the true Jesus as opposed to the Jesus of Pharisaic imagination.\(^2\) From these instances we see his method. He is not inventing history, but enriching history with prophetic emblazonments for apologetic purposes, or for increase of edification. Such is the fact, we observe, when we have it in our power to control his statements by comparison with Mark’s; such we may assume to be the fact when we have not that in our power, as, e.g., in the narrative relating to the birth and infancy of Jesus, in which prophetic citations are unusually abundant. The question as to the historicity of that narrative has its own peculiar difficulties, into which I do not here enter. The point I wish to make is that the numerous prophetic references cast no additional shadow of doubt on its historicity. Here too the evangelist is simply attaching prophetic oracles to what he regards as historic data. If invention has been at work it has not been in his imagination. This is manifest even from the very weakness of some of the citations, such as “Out of Egypt have I called my Son,” “Rachel weeping for her children,” and “He shall be called a Nazarene.” Who could ever have thought of these unless there had been traditional data accepted by the Christian community (and by the writer of the Gospel) as facts? The last citation is especially far-fetched. It is impossible to say whence it is taken; it could never have entered into the mind of any one unless the fact of the settlement in Nazareth had been there to begin with, creating a desire to find for it also, if at all possible, some prophetic anticipation.

These prophetic passages served their purpose in the apologetic of the apostolic age. For us now their value is not apologetic, except indeed in a way not contemplated by the evangelist. Their occasional weakness as proofs of the Messiahship of Jesus can be utilised in the manner above hinted at in support of the historicity of the evangelic tradition. But the chief permanent value of these citations lies in the light they throw on the evangelist’s own conception of Jesus. We see from them that he thought of Jesus as the Light of Galilee, the sympathetic Bearer of humanity’s heavy burden, the Beloved of God, the Peacemaker, the Friend of weak-

ness, the Man who had it in Him by gifts and graces to perform a
Christ's part for all the world. Truly a noble conception, which lends
perennial interest to the texts in which it is embodied.

3. In the foregoing remarks I have anticipated to a certain
extent what relates to the question of didactic aim. That the first
Gospel has such an aim is obvious from the careful manner in which
the prophetic argument is elaborated. The purpose is to confirm
Jewish Christians in the faith that Jesus is the Christ. The purpose
is revealed in the very first sentence and in the genealogy to which
it forms a preface. "The book of the generation of Jesus Christ,
the Son of David, the Son of Abraham." The Son of David first,
because on that hangs the Messianic claim; the Son of Abraham like-
wise, because that makes Him a Jew, a fellow-countryman of those
for whose benefit the Gospel is written. The genealogy is the first
contribution to the apologetic argument. The logic of it is this:
"The Psalms and Prophets predict the coming of a great Messianic
King who shall be a descendant of the house of David; this genealogy
shows that Jesus possessed that qualification for Messiahship. He
is the rod out of the stem of Jesse." Whoever compiled the
genealogy did it under the impression that physical descent from
David was indispensable to Jesus being the Christ. But it does not
follow that the genealogy was manufactured to serve that purpose.
The descent from David might be a well-known fact utilised for an
apologetic aim. For us, though a fact, it is of no vital consequence.
Our faith that Jesus is the Christ does not rest on any such external
ground, but on spiritual fitness to be the world's Saviour. We
reverse the logic of the Jewish Church. They reasoned: because
David's Son, therefore the Christ. We reason: because the Christ,
therefore David's Son at least in spirit.¹

4. In speaking of the literary characteristics of Matthew it is
necessary to keep in mind that some of these may come from the
Logia of the apostle Matthew, and that others may be due to the
evangelist. Critics ascribe to the apostolic source certain phrases
of frequent recurrence, such as καὶ ἰδοὺ, ἀμὴν λέγω ἵματι, ὁ πατὴρ ὁ ἐν
τοῖς αἰθρανοῖς. Among the features of the evangelist's own style they
recognise the frequent use of such words as τὸς, λέγω, προσελθὼν,
ὀχλος, ἀποκριθείς, ἀναχωρεῖν, λεγόμενος, and such phrases as τί σοι δοκεῖ,
σοφοίδιον λαμβάνειν, κατ' ὀναρ, ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ.² By comparison
with Mark, the style of this Gospel is smooth and correct.

¹ Vide notes on Matt. i. ² Vide Weiss, Matthäus-Evangelium, pp. 23-4.
THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MATTHEW

SECTION III. AUTHOR, DESTINATION, DATE.

1. If the views of modern critics as to the relation of the first Canonical Gospel to the Logia, compiled by the apostle Matthew, be well founded, then that apostle was not its author. Who the evangelist was is unknown. That he was a Jew is highly probable, that he was a Palestinian Jew has been generally assumed; but Weiss calls this in question. That he wrote in Greek is held to be proved by the use which he makes of the Septuagint in his citations of Old Testament prophecy, and by traces of dependence on the Greek Gospel of Mark. But the view that our Greek Gospel of Matthew is a translation by some unknown hand from a book with the same contents in the Hebrew tongue still has its advocates, among whom may be mentioned Schanz, of Tübingen.¹

2. The destination of the Gospel was in all probability to a community of Jewish Christians, whose faith it was designed to strengthen. How it was fitted to serve this end has been indicated in Section I. § 5.

3. The probable date is shortly after the destruction of the Jewish State. Some things have been supposed to imply a much later date, e.g., the commission to the disciples in chapter xxviii. 18, with its explicit Trinity, its pronounced universalism, and its doctrine of a spiritual presence. On these points the reader is referred to the commentary.

¹ Vide bis Commentar über das Evangelium des heiligen Matthaus, Einleitung.
CHAPTER IV.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO LUKE.

SECTION I. THE CONTENTS.

1. Luke's Gospel includes much of the narrative of Mark and large portions of the didactic matter contained in Matthew. There are numerous omissions in both departments, but on the other hand also considerable additions, especially in the didactic element. The third evangelist has greatly enriched the treasure of the parables, for it is in this important division of our Lord's teaching that his peculiar contribution chiefly lies. The amount of new matter suffices to raise the question as to its source. It can hardly be thought that the author of the first Gospel would have omitted so much valuable material, had it lain before his eye in the Logia. The hypothesis of a third source, therefore, readily suggests itself—a collection of reminiscences distinct from Mark and the book of Logia, whence Luke drew such beautiful parables as the Good Samaritan, the Selfish Neighbour and the Unjust Judge, the Prodigal Son, the Unjust Steward, Lazarus and Dives, and the Pharisee and Publican. The chapters on the infancy and on the resurrection, so entirely different from the corresponding chapters in Matthew, might suggest a fourth source, unless we suppose that the third included these.

2. The distribution of the material in this Gospel arrests attention. In the early part of the history, from chapters iv. 31 to vi. 16, the author follows pretty closely in the footsteps of Mark. Then comes in a digression, extending from vi. 17 to viii. 3, containing a version of the Sermon on the Mount, the stories of the Centurion and the Widow of Nain, the Message of the Baptist with relative discourse, and the woman in Simon's house. Thereafter Luke's narrative again flows in Mark's channel from the parable of the Sower onwards to the end of the Galilean ministry, as reported in the second Gospel (Mark iv. 1 to ix. 50. Luke viii. 4 to ix. 50), only
THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO LUKE

that the whole group of incidents contained in Mark vi. 45 to viii. 26 is omitted in Luke. Then at ix. 51 begins another longer digression, extending from that point to xviii. 14, consisting mainly of didactic matter, and containing the larger number of Luke's peculiar contributions to the evangelic tradition. Thereafter our author joins the company of Mark once more, and keeps beside him to the end of the Passion history.¹

3. This lengthy insertion destroys the sense of progress in the story. The stream widens out into a lake, within which any movement perceptible is rather circular than rectilinear. It is a dogmatic section, and any indications of time and place it contains are of little value for determining sequence, or pointing out the successive stages of the journey towards Jerusalem mentioned in ix. 51. It may be affirmed, indeed, that throughout this Gospel the interest in historic sequence or in the causal connection of events is weak. Sometimes, as in the incident of Christ's appearance in the synagogue of Nazareth, the author, consciously and apparently with deliberate intention, departs from the chronological order.² Whatever, therefore, he meant by καθεξής in his preface, he cannot have intended to say that he had made it a leading aim to arrange his material as far as possible in the true order of events. Still less can it have been his purpose so to set forth his story that it should appear a historic drama in which all events prepare for and steadily lead up to the final catastrophe. When at ix. 22 we find Jesus announcing for the first time that "the Son of Man must suffer many things," it takes us by surprise. No reason has appeared in the previous narrative why it should come to that. It has indeed been made clear by sundry indications—at chapter v. 21; v. 30, 33; vi. 7-11; vii. 34, 50—that there was not a good understanding between Jesus and the Scribes and Pharisees; but from Luke's narrative by itself we could not have gathered that matters were so serious. Two important omissions and one transposition are largely responsible for this. Luke leaves out the collision between Jesus and the Pharisees in reference to the washing of hands (Mark vii. 1-23. Matt. xv. 1-20), and the demand for a sign (Mark viii. 11. Matt. xvi. 1); he throws the blasphemous insinuation of a league with Beelzebub into chapter xi., beyond the point at which he introduces the first announcement of the Passion. Therefore, the

¹ In the main, that is to say, for Luke's Passion history contains a number of peculiar elements.
² Chap. iv. 16-30; vide v. 23.
necessity (δεί) of that tragic issue is not apparent in the sense that it is the inevitable result of causes which have been shown to be in operation. For Luke the δεί refers exclusively to the prophetic oracles which predicted Messiah's sufferings. Jesus must die if these oracles are to be fulfilled. And for him it is a matter of course, and so he treats it in his narrative. The announcement of the Passion is not brought in as a new departure in Christ's communication with His disciples, as in the companion narratives, with indication of the place, and solemn introductory phrase: "He began to teach them." It is reported in a quite casual way, as if it possessed no particular importance. In connection with this it may be noted that Luke gives a very defective report of those words of our Lord concerning His death which may be said to contain the germs of a theory as to its significance. For particulars readers are referred to the notes.

SECTION II. CHARACTERISTICS.

1. One very marked feature of this Gospel is what, for want of a better word, may be called the *idealisation* of the characters of Jesus and the disciples. These are contemplated not in the light of memory, as in Mark, but through the brightly coloured medium of faith. The evangelist does not forget that the Personages of whom he writes are now the Risen Lord, and the Apostles of the Church. Jesus appears with an aureole round His head, and the faults of the disciples are very tenderly handled. The truth of this statement can be verified only by a detailed study of the Gospel, and readers will find indications of proof at appropriate places in the notes. It applies equally to the Master and to His disciples, though Von Soden, in the article already referred to, states that the tendency in question appears mainly in the presentation of the conduct of the disciples, drawing from the supposed fact the precarious inference that the Apostolic Church cared little or nothing for the earthly history of Jesus.¹ The delicate treatment of the disciples is certainly very apparent. Luke, as Schanz remarks, ever spares the twelve; especially Peter. The stern word, "Get thee behind me," is not in this Gospel. The narrative of the denial is an interesting subject of study in this connection. But the whole body of the disciples are treated with equal consideration. Their faults—ignorance, weak faith, mutual rivalries—are acknowledged, yet

¹ Vide *Theologische Abhandlungen*, p. 138.
touched with sparing hand. Some narratives in which these faults appear very obtrusively, e.g., the conversation about the leaven of the Pharisees, the ambitious request of James and John, and the anointing in Bethany, are omitted, as is also the flight of all the disciples at the apprehension of their Master. The weak faith of the disciples is very mildly characterised. "Where is your faith?" asks Jesus in the storm on the lake, in Luke's version of the story, instead of uttering the reproachful word: "Why are ye cowardly? Have ye not yet faith?" Their failure to watch in the garden of Gethsemane is apologetically described as sleeping for sorrow. In his portraiture of the Lord Jesus the evangelist gives prominence to the attributes of power, benevolence, and saintliness. The pictorial effect is brought out by omission, emphasis, and understatement. Among the omissions are the realistic word about that which defileth, about "dogs" in the story of the woman of Canaan which is wholly wanting, and the awful cry on the Cross: "My God, my God!" Among the things emphasised are those features in acts of healing which show the greatness of Christ's might and of the benefit conferred. Peter's mother-in-law suffers from a great fever; and the leper is full of leprosy. The hand restored on the Sabbath is the right hand, the centurion's servant is one dear to him, the son of the widow of Nain is an only son, the daughter of Jairus an only daughter, the epileptic boy at the hill of Transfiguration an only child. The holiness of Jesus is made conspicuous by the prominence given to prayer in connection with critical occasions, and by understatement where the incidents related might to ill-instructed minds seem to compromise that essential characteristic. Luke's narratives of the cleansing of the temple and the agony in Gethsemane may be referred to as striking illustrative instances of the latter. To the same category may be referred the treatment by Luke of the anti-Pharisaic element in Christ's teaching. Much is omitted, and what is retained is softened by being given, much of it, not as spoken about, but as spoken to, Pharisees by Jesus as a guest in their houses.1

2. The influence of the Christian consciousness of the time in which he wrote is traceable not only in Luke's presentation of the characters of Jesus and His disciples, but in his account of Christ's teaching. He seems to have in view throughout the use of the Lord's words for present guidance. Weizsäcker has endeavoured to analyse the didactic element in the third Gospel into doctrinal pieces

---

bearing on definite religious questions and interests of the primitive Church. This may be carried too far, but the idea is not altogether baseless. In this Gospel the so-called "Sermon on the Mount" is really a Sermon (Kerygma not Didache) delivered to a Christian congregation with all the local and temporary matter eliminated and only the universal and perennial retained. The same adaptation to present and general use is apparent in the words, καλ' ἡμῖν, added to the law of cross-bearing (ix. 23).

3. The question may be asked whether this adaptation of the matter of the evangelic tradition to present conceptions and needs is to be set down to the account of Luke as editor, or is to be regarded as already existing in the documents he used. On this point there may be room for difference of opinion. J. Weiss in his commentary on Luke (Meyer, eighth edition) inclines to the latter alternative. Thus, in reference to Luke's mild version of Peter's denial, he remarks: "A monstrous minimising of the offence if Luke had Mark's account before him"; and he accordingly thinks he had not, but used instead a Jewish Christian source, giving a mitigated account of Peter's sin. Of such a source he finds traces throughout Luke's Gospel, following in the footsteps of Dr. Paul Feine, who had previously endeavoured to establish the existence of a precanonical Luke, i.e., a first attempt to work up into a single volume the evangelic traditions in Mark, the Logia, and other sources, after the manner of the third Gospel. This may be a perfectly legitimate hypothesis for solving certain literary problems connected with this Gospel, and the argument by which Feine seeks to establish it is entitled on its merits to serious consideration. But I hardly think it suffices to account for all the traces of editorial discretion in Luke's Gospel. It does not matter what documents Luke used; he exercised his own judgment in using them. If he did not, his relation to the work of redacting the memoirs of Jesus becomes so colourless that one fails to see what occasion there was for that imposing prefatory announcement in the opening sentence. A primitive Luke was ready to his hand, and he did not even contribute to it the colour of his own religious personality. Intention, bias, purpose to utilise the material for edification of believers were all there before he began. He did what? Added, perhaps, a

1 Vide his Untersuchungen über die Evangelischen Geschichte, and his Apostolic Age, vol. ii.

2 Eine vorkanonische Überlieferung des Lukas in Evangelium und Apostelgeschichte, 1891.
few anecdotes and sayings gleaned from other sources, oral or written!

4. Notwithstanding this pervading regard to what may be comprehensively called *edification*, the author of the third Gospel cannot justly be charged with indifference to historic truth. He professes in his preface to have in view *acribea*, and the profession is to be taken in earnest. But he is writing not as a mere chronicler, but as one seeking to promote the religious welfare of those for whom he writes, and so must strive to combine accuracy, fidelity to fact, with practical utility. The task is a delicate one, and execution without error of judgment not easy. Even where mistakes are made, they are not to be confounded with bad faith. Nor should it be forgotten that Luke's peculiarities can be utilised for the apologetic purpose of establishing the general credibility of the evangelic tradition. Luke omits much. But it does not follow that he did not know. He may omit intentionally what he knows but does not care to report. Luke often understates. What a writer tones down he is tempted to omit. By simply understating, instead of omitting, he becomes a reluctant and therefore reliable witness to the historicity of the matter so dealt with. Luke often states strongly. Either he adds particulars from fuller information or he exaggerates for a purpose. Even in the latter case he witnesses to the truth of the basal narrative. A writer who has ideas to embody is tempted to invent when he cannot find what will suit his purpose. Luke did not invent but at most touched up stories given to his hand in trustworthy traditions.

5. The author of the third Gospel avowedly had a didactic aim. He wrote, so it appears from the preface, to confirm in the faith a friend called "most excellent (κράτωτε) Theophilus," expecting probably that the book would ultimately be useful for a wider circle. But there is no trace of a dominant theological or controversial aim. The writer, e.g., is not a *Paulinist* in the controversial sense of the word. He is doubtless in sympathy with Christian universalism, as appears from his finishing the quotation from Isaiah beginning with "The voice of one crying in the wilderness," and ending with, "All flesh shall see the salvation of God" (iii. 6). Yet, in other places, e.g., in the history of the infancy, the salvation brought by Jesus is conceived of as belonging to Israel, the chosen people (τὸ λαὸς ἀνθρώπων, i. 68; cf. ii. 10; vii. 16; xiii. 16; xix. 9). The author is not even Paulinist in a theological sense, as the absence from his pages of all words of Jesus bearing on a theory of atonement, already remarked on, sufficiently proves. He appears to be an
eclectic, rather than a man whose mind is dominated by a great ruling idea. Distinct, if not conflicting, tendencies or religious types find houseroom in his pages: Pauline universalism, Jewish particularism, Ebionitic social ideals, the blessedness of poverty, the praise of almsgiving. Geniality, kindliness of temper, is the personal characteristic of the evangelist. And if there is one thing more than another he desires to inculcate on his readers it is the graciousness of Christ. "Words of grace" (iv. 22) is his comprehensive title for the utterances of Jesus, and his aim from first to last is to show the Saviour as the friend of the sinful and the social outcast, and even of those who suffer justly for their crimes (vii. 36-60; xix. 1-10; xxiii. 39-43).

6. The literary aspect of this Gospel is a complex phenomenon. At times, especially in the preface, one gets the impression of a writer having at his command a knowledge of Greek possible only for one to whom it was his native tongue, an expert at once in the vocabulary and the grammatical structure of that language. But far oftener the impression is that of a Jew thinking in Hebrew and reflecting Hebrew idiom in phrase and construction. Hebraisms abound, especially in the first two chapters. Two explanations are possible: That the author was really a Jew, that his natural style was Hebrew-Greek, in which case it would have to be shown that the preface was no such marvellous piece of classicism after all; or that he was a Gentile well versed in Greek, but somewhat slavish in his copious use of Jewish-Christian sources, such as the primitive Luke for which Feine contends.

SECTION III. AUTHOR, DESTINATION, DATE.

1. The author of the third Gospel was also the author of the Acts of the Apostles, as appears in chap. i. 1 of the latter work, where the name of Theophilus recurs. Neither book bears the name of the writer, but uniform ancient tradition ascribes it to Luke, the companion of Paul, and by occupation a physician (Col. iv. 11). From the preface to the Gospel we gather that he had no personal knowledge of Jesus, but was entirely dependent on oral and written tradition.

2. From the prefaces of the Gospel and the book of Acts we learn that the author wrote for the immediate benefit of a single individual, apparently a man of rank, say a Roman knight. It is not necessary to infer that a larger circle of readers was not contemplated either by the writer or by the first recipient of his work.
3. The date cannot be definitely fixed. Opinion ranges from A.D. 63 to the early years of the second century. As late a date as say A.D. 90 is compatible with the writer being, in his younger years, a companion of St. Paul in his later missionary movements. The still later date of A.D. 100 or 105 would be required if it were certain, which it is not, that the writer used the *Antiquities* of Josephus, which were published about the year 93-94. Dr. Sanday, in his work entitled *Inspiration*, expresses the view that Acts was written about A.D. 80, and the Gospel some time in the five years preceding.
CHAPTER V.

THE TEXT, CRITICAL LANDMARKS, CRITICAL TESTS OF READINGS.

SECTION I. THE TEXT.

The Greek text given in this work is that known as the Textus Receptus, on which the Authorised Version of the New Testament is based. Representing the Greek text as known to Erasmus in the sixteenth century, and associated with the names of two famous printers, Stephen and Elzevir, whose editions (Stephen's 3rd, 1550, Elzevir's 2nd, 1633) were published when the apparatus at command for fixing the true text was scanty, and when the science of textual criticism was unborn, it may seem to be entirely out of date. But it is an important historical monument, and it is the Greek original answering to the English Testament still largely in use in public worship and in private reading. Moreover, while the experts in modern criticism have done much to provide a purer text, their judgments in many cases do not accord, and their results cannot be regarded as final. It is certain, however, that the texts prepared by such scholars as Tischendorf, Tregelles, Westcott and Hort, and the company of experts to whom we are indebted for the Revised Version, are incomparably superior to that of Stephen or of Elzevir, and that they must be taken into account by every competent commentator. That means that to the text must be annexed critical notes showing all important various readings, with some indication of the documentary authority in their favour, and of the value attached thereto by celebrated editors. This accordingly has been done, very imperfectly of course, still it is hoped sufficiently for practical purposes. Variations not affecting the sense, but merely the spelling or grammatical forms of words, have been for the most part disregarded. There are many variations in the spelling of proper names, of which the following are samples:—
Among other insignificant variations may be mentioned the presence or absence of ν final in verbs (ἐλεγε, ἐλεγεν); the omission or insertion of η (λήφωμαι, λήφομαι); the assimilation or non-assimilation of ἐν and σὸν in compound verbs (συζητεῖν, συζητεῖσιν; ἐκκαθεῖν, ἐκκαθεῖσιν); the doubling of μ, ν, ρ or the reverse (μαμωνᾶς, μαμωνᾶς; γέννημα, γέννημα; ἐπιράπτειν, ἐπιράπτετε); the conjunction or disjunction of syllables (οὐκ ἐν, οὐκεῖν); οὖν for οὔτω; the aorist forms ἤλθον, ἤλθων, etc., replaced by forms in a (ἐπαν, ἠλθαν); single or double augment in certain verbs (ἴδωμαι, ἠδωματι; ἔμελλον, ἔμελλον).

Section II. Critical Landmarks.

1. Up till 1831 editors of the New Testament in Greek had been content to follow in the wake of the Textus Receptus, timidly adding notes indicating good readings which they had discovered in the documents accessible to them in their time. Lachmann in that year inaugurated a new critical era by printing a text constructed directly from ancient documents without the intervention of any printed edition. It is not given to pioneers to finish the work they begin, and Lachmann’s effort judged by present-day tests was far from perfect. “This great advance was marred by too narrow a selection of documents to be taken into account, and too artificially rigid an employment of them, and also by too little care in obtaining precise knowledge of some of their texts” (Westcott and Hort’s New Testament, Introduction, p. 13). Tischendorf in Germany and Tregelles in England worthily followed up Lachmann’s efforts, and made important contributions towards the ascertainment of the true text by adopting as their main guides the most ancient MSS., in place of the later documents which had formed the basis of the early printed editions. The critical editions of the Greek New Testament by these scholars appeared about the same time; Tischendorf’s eighth edition (the important one which superseded the earlier) bearing the date 1869, and the work of Tregelles being published in 1870. The characteristic feature of Tischendorf’s edition is the predominant importance attached to the great Codex Sinaiticus (κ), with the discovery of which his name is connected.
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The defect common to it with the edition of Tregelles is failure to deal on any clear principle with the numerous instances in which the ancient texts on which they placed their reliance do not agree. All goes smoothly when Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus (B) and Codex Bezae (D) and the most ancient versions bear the same testimony; but what is to be done when the trusted guides follow divergent paths?

2. It is by the answer which they have given to this question that Westcott and Hort have made an epoch-making contribution to the science of Biblical Criticism in the first volume of their monumental work, *The New Testament in the Original Greek*, published in 1881. Following up hints thrown out by earlier investigators, like Bengel and Griesbach, they discriminated three types of text prevalent in ancient times, before the period of eclectic revision which fixed to a great extent the character of the text in actual use throughout the Middle Ages and on to the dawn of modern criticism. To these types they gave the names *Western*, *Alexandrian*, and *Neutral*. The last epithet is to be understood only when viewed in relation to the other two. The Western and Alexandrian types of text had very well-marked characteristics. The Western was *paraphrastic*, the Alexandrian *literary*. The tendency of the one was to alter the primitive text by explanatory additions with a view to edification, made by men who combined to a certain extent the functions of copyist and commentator. The tendency of the other was to improve the text from a literary point of view by scholarly refinements. The *neutral* text is neutral in the sense of avoiding both these tendencies and aiming steadily at the faithful reproduction of the exemplar assumed to approach in its text as near as possible to the autographs. A text adhering honestly to this programme ought to be the most reliable guide to the original Greek Testament as it proceeded from the hands of the writers, making due allowance for errors in the exemplar and for mistakes in transcription. The result of investigation has been to justify this expectation.

3. The main representative of the Western text is Codex Bezae (D), containing the Gospels and the Acts. Of the Alexandrian text there is no pure example. This divergent stream broke up into rills, and lost itself as a mere element in mixed texts, like those of Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Ephraemi (C). It is important to note by the way that these names do not denote local prevalence. The *Western* text was not merely Western. This divergent stream overflowed its banks and spread itself widely over the Church,
reaching even the East. Hence traces of its influence are to be found not merely in the old Latin versions, but also in the Syriac versions, e.g., in what is called the Curetonian Syriac, and in the recently discovered Syriac version of the Four Gospels, which may be distinguished as the Sinaitic Syriac. Of the neutral text, the great, conspicuous, honourable monument is Codex Vaticanus (B), containing the Gospels, Acts, and Catholic epistles, and the epistles of St. Paul, as far as Heb. ix. 14; and being, especially in the Gospels, a nearly pure reproduction of a text uninfluenced by the tendencies of the Western and Alexandrian texts respectively. To this MS., belonging like Codex Sinaiticus to the fourth century, Westcott and Hort, after applying to it all available tests, assign the honour of being on the whole the nearest approach to the original verity in existence, always worthy of respect and often deserving to be followed when it stands alone against all comers. A very important conclusion if it can be sustained.

4. In recent years a certain reaction against the critical results of Westcott and Hort has been manifesting itself to the effect of imputing to them an overweening estimate of Codex B, analogous to that of Tischendorf for Codex \( \text{M} \). Some scholars, such as Resch in Germany and Ramsay in this country, are disposed to insist that more value should be set on Codex D; the former finding in it the principal witness for the text of the Gospels in their precanonical stage, the assumption being that when the four-Gospel canon was constructed the text underwent a certain amount of revision. The real worth of this Codex is one of the unsettled questions of New Testament textual criticism. Interesting contributions have been made to the discussion of the question, such as those of J. Rendel Harris, and more may be expected.

Section III. Critical Tests of Readings.

1. The fixation of the true text is not a simple matter like that of following a single document, however trustworthy, like Codex B. Every editor may have his bias in favour of this or that MS., but all editors recognise the obligation to take into account all available sources of evidence — not merely the great uncial MSS. of ancient dates, but the cursive of later centuries, and, besides Greek MSS. of both kinds containing the whole or a part of the New Testament, ancient versions, Latin, Syriac, Egyptian, etc., and quotations in the early Fathers. The evidence when fully adduced is a formidable affair, demanding much space for its exhibition.
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(witness Tischendorf's eighth edition in two large octavos), and the knowledge of an expert for its appreciation. In such a work as the present the space cannot be afforded nor can the knowledge be expected even in the author, not to say in his readers. Full knowledge of the critical data through first-hand studies belongs to specialists only, who have made the matter the subject of lifelong labour. All one can do is to utilise intelligently their results. But because all cannot be specialists it is not profitless to have a jurymen's acquaintance with the relative facts. It is the aim of the critical notes placed beneath the Greek text to aid readers to the attainment of such an acquaintance, and to help them to form an intelligent opinion as to the claims of rival readings to represent the true text. Fortunately, this can be done without adducing a very long array of witnesses.

2. For it turns out that there are certain groups of witnesses which often go together, and whose joint testimony is very weighty. Westcott and Hort have carefully specified these. They may here be indicated:

For the Gospels the most important and authoritative group is \( \text{N} \text{BCDL} \ 33.\)

In this group L and 33 have hitherto not been referred to. L (Codex Regius), though belonging to the eighth century, represents an ancient text, and is often in agreement with \( \text{N} \) and B. 33 belongs to the cursive class (which are indicated by figures), but is a highly valuable Codex, though, like all cursive, of late date. In his Prolegomena to Tischendorf's New Testament, Dr. Caspar René Gregory quotes (p. 469) with approval the opinion of Eichhorn that this is the "queen of the cursives". In the above group, it will be noticed, representatives of the different ancient types — Western, Alexandrian, Neutral (D, \( \text{N} \), C, B) — are united. When they agree the presumption that we have the true text is very strong.

When D falls out we have still a highly valuable group in \( \text{NBCL} \ 33.\)

When DC and 33 drop out there remains a very trustworthy combination in \( \text{NB} \text{BL}.\)

There are, besides these, several binary combinations of great importance. The following is the list given by Westcott and Hort for the Gospels:

\( \text{BL}, \text{BC}, \text{BT}, \text{BE}, \text{BD}, \text{AB}, \text{BZ}, \text{B} \ 33, \) and for St. Mark \( \text{BD}.\)

In these combinations some new documents make their appearance.

E = fragments of St. Luke (cent. viii., comparatively pure, though showing mixture).

\(\Delta =\) the well-known Codex Alexandrinus of the fifth century, a chief representative of the "Syrian" text, that is, the revised text formed by judicious eclectic use of all existing texts, and meant to be the authoritative New Testament. This Codex contains nearly the whole New Testament except Matthew as far as chapter xxv. 5. For the Gospels it is of no independent value as a witness to the true text, but its agreements with B are important.

\(\Lambda =\) Codex Sangallensis, a Graeco-Latin MS. of the tenth century, and having many ancient readings, especially in Mark.

To these authorities has to be added, as containing ancient readings, and often agreeing with the best MSS., Codex Purpureus Rossanensis (E), published in 1883, edited by Oscar Von Gebhardt; of the sixth century, containing Matthew and Mark in full. Due note has been taken of the readings of this MS.

The foregoing represent the chief authorities referred to in the critical notes. In these notes I have not uniformly indicated my personal opinion. But in the commentary I have always adopted as the subject of remark the most probable reading. Reference to modern editors has been chiefly restricted to Tischendorf, and Westcott and Hort, meaning thereby no depreciation of the work done by others, but simply recognising these as the most important.

MSS. were corrected from time to time. Corrected copies are referred to by critics by letters or figures: thus, \(\mathbf{N}^*\) (4th cent.), \(\mathbf{M}^6\) (6th cent.), \(\mathbf{K}^6\) (7th cent.), \(\mathbf{B}^2\) (4th cent.), \(\mathbf{B}^9\) (10th cent.).

Besides the above-named documents the following uncials are occasionally referred to in the critical notes:

E cod. Basilensis. 8th century (Gospels nearly entire).
G cod. Seidelii. 9th or 10th century (Gospels defective).
K cod. Cyprus. 9th century (Gospels complete).
M cod. De Camps, Paris. 9th century (Gospels complete).
N cod. Purpureus. 6th century (fragments of all the Gospels).
P cod. Guelpherytanas I. 6th century (fragments of all the Gospels).
U cod. Nanianus Venetus. 9th or 10th century (Gospels entire).
X cod. Monacensis. 9th or 10th century (fragments of all the Gospels).
Z cod. Dublinensis. 6th century (fragments of Matthew).
\(\Gamma\) cod. Oxonensis et Petropolitanaus. 10th century (four Gospels, Matthew and Mark defective).
\(\Delta\) cod. Oxonensis Tisch. 9th century (Luke and John entire).
\(\Pi\) cod. Petropolitanaus Tisch. 9th century (Gospels nearly complete).
\(\phi\) cod. Beratinus. 5th century (Matthew and Mark with lacunae).
CHAPTER VI.

LITERATURE.

The following list of works includes only those chiefly consulted. Many others are occasionally referred to in the notes.

1. To the pre-Reformation period belong—

Origen's *Commentary on Matthew*. Books x.-xvii. in Greek (Matt. xiii. 36—xxii. 33), the remainder in a Latin translation (allegorical method of interpretation).

Chrysostom's *Homilies on Matthew*. The Greek text separately edited in three vols. by Dr. Field (well worth perusal).

Jerome's *Commentarius in Matthaeum* (a hasty performance, but worth consulting).

Augustine. *De Sermone Domini in monte*.


Euthymius Zigabenus (Greek monk, 12th century). *Commentarius in quatuor Evangelia, Graecae et Latine*. Ed. C. F. Matthaei, 1792 (a choice work).

2. From the sixteenth century downwards—

Calvin. *Commentarii in Harmoniam ex Evangelistis tribus . . . compositam*.


Malдонатус. *Commentarius in quatuor Evangelistas* (Catholic). 1596.


Lightfoot. *Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae*. 1644.


LITERATURE

KYRKE. Observationes sacrae in N. T. libros. 1755.
ELSNER. Observationes sacrae in N. T. libros (the three last named, like Præcieus, abound in classic examples). 1767.
LOESNER. Observationes ad N. T. e Philone Alexandrino (of the same class as Raphel). 1777.
KUINOR. Commentarius in libros N. T. historicos. 1807.
FRIETSCHE. Evangelium Matthei recensuit. 1826.
FRIETSCHE. Evangelium Marci recensuit (both philological). 1830.
BORNEMANN. Scholæ in Lucæ Evangelium. 1830.
FIELD. Otium Norvicense. 1864.
BLEEK. Synoptische Erklärung der drei ersten Evangelien. 1862.
MEYER. Eighth edition by Dr. Bernhard Weiss (Matthew and Mark, largely Weiss). 1892.
MEYER. Eighth edition by J. Weiss (son of Bernhard Weiss; Luke, also largely the editor's work). 1892.
WEISS. Das Marcusevangelium und seine synoptischen Parallelen (a contribution to comparative exegesis in the interest of his critical views on the synoptical problem). 1872.
WEISS. Das Matthäusevangelium und seine Lucas-parallelen (a work of similar character). 1876.
LUTTEROTH. Essai d'Interpretation de quelques parties de l'Evangile selon Saint Matthieu. 1864-76.
SCHANZ. Commentar über das Evangelium des heiligen Matthäus. 1879.
SCHANZ. Commentar über das Evangelium des heiligen Marcus. 1881.
SCHANZ. Commentar über das Evangelium des heiligen Lucas (these three commentaries by Schanz, a Catholic theologian, are good in all respects, specially valuable for patristic references). 1883.
GODET. Commentaire sur l'Evangile de Saint Luc. 3me edition. 1888-89.
HAHN. Das Evangelium des Lucas. Two vols. 1892-94.
HOLTZMANN. Die Synoptiker in Hand-Commentar zum Neuen Testament (advanced but valuable). 1892.

The well-known lexical and grammatical helps, including Grimm, Cremer, Winer, and Buttman, have been consulted. Frequent reference has been made to Burton’s Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament (T. & T. Clark, 1894), both because of its excellence and its accessibility to students.

A new edition of Winer’s Grammatik (the eighth) by Schmiedel is in course of publication; also of Kühner by Blass.

In the notes, the matter common to the three Gospels is most fully treated in Matthew, the notes in the other two Gospels being at these points supplementary and comparative.

The marginal references to passages of Scripture are simply supplementary to those in the notes.

It is hoped that most abbreviations used will need no special explanation, but the following table may be helpful:
Mt. = Matthew.
Mk. = Mark.
O. T. = Old Testament.
Sept. = Septuagint.
A. V. = Authorised Version.
R. V. = Revised Version.
Tisch. = Tischendorf.
Treg. = Tregelles.
W. H. = Westcott and Hort.
Ws. = Weiss (Dr. Bernhard).
Egypt. = Egyptian versions (viz., the two following).
Cop. = Coptic (called Memphitic by W. H.).
Sah. = Sahidic (called Thebaic by W. H.).
Syrr. = Syriac versions.
Pesh. = Peshito (= Syrian Vulgate).
Syr. Sin. = Sinaitic Syriac (recently discovered).
Latt. = Latin versions.
Vulg. = Vulgate (Jerome's revision of old Latin version).
Vet. Lat. = Vetus Latina (Old Latin, referred to also as It. = Itala).
The codices of the old Latin are distinguished by the letters a, b, c, etc.
Minusc. = Minusculi (Codices), another name for cursive.
TO KATA MATΘAION

ATION EYΑΙΤΕΛΙΟΝ,1

I. 1. ΒΙΒΑΟΣ 2 γενέσεως ἸΗΣΟΥ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ, 3 ινιόν Δαβίς,4 ινιόν γ 2 ΑΒΡΑΑΜ. 2. ΑΒΡΑΑΜ ἡγέννησεν τὸν Ἰσαὰκ. Ἰσαὰκ δὲ ἡγέννησεν τὸν Λк. ill. 4: xx. 32. b ver. 18.

Gen. xxii. 13; xxvii. 9. Lк. i. 23; iii. 6. c xii. 23; xx. 19; xxii. 42.

1 The title in T.R. (as above) is late. ΝΒ have simply Κατα Μαθαου. Other expanded forms occur.

2 Δαβίς is found only in minusc. ΝΒ have Δαυίς. This is one of several variations in spelling occurring in the genealogy, among which may be named Μαξιλάρι (ver. 3) — Μαξιλαρί in W. H.; Μαξιλάρι (ver. 5) — Μαξιλάρι, W. H.; Μαξιλαρί (ver. 15) — Μαξιλαρί, W. H. For a list of such variations in the spelling of names in the three first Gospels vide p. 53.

The Title. The use of the word ἐγέννησεν in the sense of a book may be as old as the Teaching of the twelve Apostles (Didache, 8, xi. 15. Vide Sanday, Bampton Lectures, 1893, p. 317, n. 1). The word passed through three stages in the history of its use. First, in the older Greek authors (Hom., Od., 1,52, 166), a reward for good tidings; also a thank-offering for good tidings brought (Arist., Eq. 656). Next, in later Greek, the good tidings itself (2 Sam. xviii. 20, 22, 26, in Sept. in 2 Sam. iv. 10, ἐγέννησεν occurs in the earliest sense). This sense pervades the N. T. in reference to the good news of God, the message of salvation. Finally, it came very naturally to denote the books in which the Gospel of Jesus was presented in historic form, as in the Didache and in Justin M., Apol. i. 66, Dial. con. Tryph. 110. In the titles of the Gospels the word retains its second sense, while suggesting the third. ἐγέννησεν μέν means the good news as reduced to writing by M. εὐαγγ. κακά M. means the good news as reduced to writing by M. εὐαγγελία is not of, nor εὐαγγελικός Mατθαίου = Μαθαου, as if the sense were: The book called a "Gospel" written by Matthew. (Vide Fritzsche against this the older view, supported by Kuinoel.)

Chapter I. The Genealogy and Birth of Jesus.—The genealogy may readily appear to us a most ungenial beginning of the Gospel. A dry list of names! It is the tribute which the Gospel pays to the spirit of Judaism. The Jews set much store by genealogies, and to Jewish Christians the Messiahship of Jesus depended on its being proved that He was a descendant of David. But the matter can hardly be so vital as that. We may distinguish between the question of fact and the question of faith. It may be that Jesus was really descended from David—many things point that way; but even if He were not He might still be the Christ, the fuller of O. T. ideals, the bringer-in of the highest good, if He possessed the proper spiritual qualifications. What if the Christ were not David"s son in the physical sense? He was a priest after the order of Melchisedec, though ἄγενναλόγητος; why not Messiah under the same conditions? He might still be a son of David in the sense in which John the Baptist was Elias—in spirit and power, realising the ideal of the hero king. The kingdom of prophecy came only in a spiritual sense, why not also the king? The two hang together. Paul was not an apostle in the legitimist sense, not one of the men who had been with Jesus; yet he was a very real apostle.
So might Jesus be a Christ, though not descended from David. St. Paul writes (Gal. iii. 29): "If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed". So might we say: If Jesus was fit to be the Christ in point of spiritual equipment, then was He of the seed of David. There is no clear evidence in the Gospels that Jesus Himself set value on Davidic descent; there are some things that seem to point the other way: e.g., the question, "Who is my mother?" (Matt. xii. 47; Mk. iii. 33), and the other, "What think ye of the Christ, whose son is He?" (Matt. xxii. 42, et par.). There is reason to believe that, like St. Paul, He would argue from the spiritual, not the literal. versed: not Christ because from David, but from David, at least ideally, because Christ on other higher grounds.

Ver. 1. βιβλίος γενεαλογίας κ. τ. λ. How much does this heading cover: the whole Gospel, the two first chapters, the whole of the first chapter, or only i. 1-17? All these views have been held. The first by Euthy. Zigab., who argued: the birth of the God-man was the important point, and involved all the rest; therefore the title covers the whole history named from the most important part (ἀπὸ τοῦ προγενομένου μορφῶν). Some moderns (Ebrard, Keil, etc.) have defended the view on the ground that the corresponding title in O. T. (Gen. vi. 9; xi. 27, etc.) denotes not merely a genealogical list, but a history of the persons whose genealogy is given. Thus the expression is taken to mean a book on the life of Christ (liber de vita Christi, Maldon.). Against the second view and the third Weiss-Meyer remarks that at i. 18 a new beginning is made, while ii. 1 runs on as if continuing the same story. The most probable and most generally accepted opinion is that of Calvin, Beza, and Grotius that the expression applies only to i. 1-17. (Non est haec inscriptio totius libri, sed particularis primae quae velut extra corpus historiae prominet. Grotius.)

'Ισωρογ Χριστον. Christ here is not an appellative but a proper name, in accordance with the usage of the Apostolic age. In the body of the evangelistic history the word is not thus used; only in the introductory parts. (Vide Mk. i. 1; John i. 17.)

υλοῦ Δ., υλοῦ Α. Of David first, because with his name was associated the more specific promise of a Messianic king; of Abraham also, because he was the better known, as the less remote, as a great prophet and a renowned king. (ἀπὸ τοῦ γενομένου μόλις ἄρθρων, ἐπὶ τὸν τελευταίον ἀνθρώπον.) The word υλοῖ in both cases applies to Christ. It can refer grammatically to David, as many take it, but the other reference is in accordance with the fact that ver. 1 forms the superscription of the following genealogy. So Weiss-Meyer. Vv. 2-16. The genealogy divides into three parts: from Abraham to David (vv. 2-6a); from David to the captivity (vv. 6b-11); from the captivity to Christ. On closer inspection it turns out to be not so dry as it at first appeared. There are touches here and there which import into it an ethical significance, suggesting the idea that it is the work not of a dry-as-dust Jewish genealogist, but of the evangelist; or at least worked over by him in a Christian spirit, if the skeleton was given to his hand. To note these is the chief interest of non-Rabbinical exegesis.

Vv. 2-6a. καὶ τοῦ διδασκόντος αὐτοῦ. This is not a reference to the genealogical line, but added to say by the way that he who belonged to the tribe of Judah belonged also to all the tribes of Israel. (Weiss, Matthäusevang.) ... Ver. 3. τον Φαρέα καὶ τὸν Ζαχα. Zerah added to Perez the continuator of the line, to suggest that it was by a special providence that the latter was first born (Gen. xxxviii. 27-30). The evangelist is on the lookout for the unusual or preternatural in history as prelude to the crowning marvel of the virgin birth (Gradus futurus ad credendum partum ex virgine. Grot.).— ἐκ τῆς Θαμά. Mention of the mother wholly unnecessary and unusual from a genealogical point of view, and in this case one would say, primâ facie, impolitic, reminding of a hardly readable story (Gen. xxxviii. 13-26). It is the first of four references to mothers
in the ancestry of Jesus, concerning whom one might have expected the
genealogy to observe discreet silence: Tamar, Rahab, Ruth, Bathsheba: three
of them sinful women, and one, Ruth, a foreigner. Why are they mentioned?
By way of defence against sinister mis-

construction of the birth of Jesus? So
Wetstein: Ut tacite Judaecorum objec-
tioni occurreretur. Doubtless there is a
mental reference to the birth under some
aspect, but it is not likely that the evan-
gelist would condescend to apologise
before the bar of unbeliev, even though
he might find means of doing so in the
Jewish habit of glorying over the mis-
deeds of ancestors (Wetstein). Much
more probable is the opinion of the
Fathers, who found in these names a
foreshadowing of the gracious character of
the Gospel of Jesus, as it were the
Gospel in the genealogy. Schanz follows
the Fathers, except that he thinks they
have over-emphasised the sinful element.
He finds in the four cases under the cate-
gory of the extraordinary exemplified by
the case of Perez and Zerah. These
women all became mothers in the line of
Christ's ancestry by special providence
(Weiss-Meyer). Doubtless this is at least
part of the moral. Nicholson (New Com.)
thinks that the introduction of Tam-

ar and Ruth is sufficiently explained by
Ruth iv. xi, xii, viewed as Messianic, of
Rahab by her connection with the
earlier Jesus (Joshua), and of Bathsheba
because she was the mother of a second
line culminating in Christ, as Ruth of a
first culminating in David.—Ver. 6a,
to the David the King, the title being added to distinguish him
from the rest. It serves the same pur-
pose as if David had been written in
large letters. At length we arrive at the
great royal name! The materials for
the first part of the genealogy are taken
from Ruth iv. 18-22, and 1 Chron. ii.
6-15.

6b-10, ἐκ τῆς τοῦ Ὀδρίου, vide above. The chief feature in this second
division of the genealogical table is the
omission of three kings between Joram
and Uzziah (ver. 8), viz., Ahaziah, Joash,
Amaziah. How is the omission to be
explained? By inadvertence, or by
intention, and if the latter, in what view?
Jerome favoured the second alternative,
and suggested two reasons for the inten-
tional omission—a wish to bring out the
number fourteen (ver. 17) in the second
part of the genealogy, and a desire to
brand the kings passed over with the
stomp of theocratic illegality. In effect,
manipulation with a presentable excuse.
But the excuse would justify other omis-
sions, e.g., Ahaz and Manasseh, who,
were as great offenders as any. One can,
indeed, imagine the evangelist desiring to
exemplify the severity of the Gospel as
well as its grace in the construction of
the list—to say in effect: God resistent
the proud, but He giveth grace to the
lowly, and even the low. The hypo-
thesis of manipulation in the interest of
symbolic numbers can stand on its own
basis without any pretext. It is not
to be supposed that the evangelist was at
all concerned to make sure that no link
in the line was omitted. His one concern
would be to make sure that no name appeared that did not belong to the line. He can hardly have imagined that his list was complete from beginning to end. Thus Nahashon (ver. 4) was the head of the tribe of Judah at the Exodus (Num. i. 7), yet between Hebron and him only two names occur—four names for 400 years. Each name or generation represents a century, in accordance with Genesis xv. 13-16. The genealogist may have had this passage in view, but he must have known that the actual succession embraced more links than four (vide Schans on ver. 4). The hypothesis of inadver
tence or error in consulting the text of the O. T., favoured by some modern commentators, is not to be sum
mrry-negativedon the ground of an a priori theory of inerrancy. It is pos
sible that in reading 1 Chron. iii. 11 in the Sept. the eye leapt from Ὠχώλας to 'Οχιλας, and so led to omission of it and the two following names. (Ἀκοπλας, not 'Οχιλας, is the reading in Sept., but Weiss assumes that the latter, Azariah's original name, must have stood in the copy used by the constructor of the genealogy.) The explanation, however, is conjectural. No certainty, indeed, is attainable on the matter. As a curiosity in the history of exegesis may be mentioned Chrysostom's mode of dealing with this very passage. Having propounded several problems regarding the genealogy, the omission of the three kings included, he leaves this one unsolved on the plea that he must not explain everything to his hearers lest they become listless (ἐν τοις μη διακοσμηται, Hom. iv.). Schans praises the prudence of the sly Greek orator.

Ver. 11. Ἀποκαλοῦν τοῦ Ἰσαχαρ. There is an omission here also: Eliakim, son of Josiah and father of Jeconiah. It was noted and made a ground of reproach to Christians by Porphyry. Maldonatus, pressed by the difficulty, proposed to substitute for Jeconiah, Jehoiakim, the second of four sons ascribed to Josiah in the genealogist's source (1 Chron. iii. 14), whereby the expression νῦν ἀποκαλοῦν κάτω would retain its natural sense. But, while the two names are perhaps similar enough to be mis
taken for each other, it is against the hypothesis as a solution of the difficulty that Jehoiakim did not share in the captivity (2 Kings xxiv. 6), while the words of ver. 11 seem to imply that the descend
dant of Josiah referred to was associated with his brethren in exile. The words ἀπὸ τῆς μετοχείας Βαβολῶνος probably supply the key to the solution. Josiah brings us to the brink of the period of exile. With his name that doleful time comes into the mind of the genealogist. Who is to represent it in the line of succession? Not Jehoiakim, for though the deporta
ton began in his reign he was not himself a captive. It must be Jeconiah (Jehoiakin), his son at the second re
move, who was among the captives (2 Kings xxiv. 15). His "brethren" are his uncles, sons of Josiah, his grandfather; brethren in blood, and brethren also as representatives of a calamitous time—(vide Weiss-Meyer). There is a pathos in this second allusion to brother
tood. "Judah and his brethren," par
takers in the promise (also in the sojourn in Egypt); "Jec
oriah and his brethren," the generation of the promise eclipsed. Royalty in the dust, but not without hope. The omission of Eliakim (or Jehoiakim) serves the subordinate pur
pose of limiting the second genealogy within the number fourteen. —
Μετοχείας: literally change of abode, deportation, "carrying away," late Greek for μετοχία or μετοχίαν.—Βαβολῶνος: genitive, expressing the terminus ad quem (vide Winer, § 30, 2 a, and cf. Matt. iv. 15, ἐξ ἐκκοιλίαν, x. 5, ἐξ ἐκκοιλίαν).—ἐκ τ. μ., at the time of, during, the time being of some length; the process of deportation went on for years. Cf. Mk. ii. 26, ἦλθεν ἀφιερωθεὶς, under the high priesthood of Abiathar, and Mk. xii. 26 for a similar use of ἐκ in reference to place, ἦλθεν ἐκ διαθήκης—at the place where the story of the bush occurs. Metà τ. μ., in ver. 12 means after not during, as some have supposed, misled by taking μετοχείας as denoting the state of exile. Vide on this Fritzsche.

Vv. 12-15. In the last division the
genealogical table escapes our control. After Zerubbabel no name occurs in the O. T. We might have expected to find Abiud in 1 Chron. iii. 19, where the children of Zerubbabel are given, but Abiud is not among them. The royal family sank into obscurity. It does not follow that no pains were taken to preserve their genealogy. The priests may have been diligent in the matter, and records may have been preserved in the temple (Schans). The Messianic hope would be a motive to carefulness. In any case we must suppose the author of the genealogy before us to give here what he found. He did not construct an imaginary list. And the list, if not guaranteed as infallibly accurate by its insertion, was such as might reasonably be expected to satisfy Hebrew readers. Amid the gloom of the night of legalism which broods over all things belonging to the period, this genealogy included, it is a comfort to think that the Messiahship of Jesus does not depend on the absolute accuracy of the genealogical tree.

Ver. 16. Ἰακὼβ... τὸν Ἰακώβ: the genealogy ends with Joseph. It is then presumably his, not Mary’s. But for apologetic or dogmatic considerations, no one would ever have thought of doubting this. What creates perplexity is that Joseph, while called the husband (τὸν ἀνδρὰ) of Mary, is not represented as the father of Jesus. There is no ἐγέννησε in this case, though some suppose that there was originally, as the genealogy came from the hand of some Jewish Christian, who regarded Jesus as the Son of Joseph (Holtzmann in H. C.). The Sinaritic Syriac Codex has “Joseph, to whom was betrothed Mary the Virgin, began Jesus,” but it does not alter the story otherwise to correspond with Joseph’s paternity. Therefore Joseph can only have been the legal father of Jesus. But, it is argued, that is not enough to satisfy the presupposition of the whole N. T., viz., that Jesus was the actual son of David (κατὰ γένος, Rom. i. 3); therefore the genealogy must be that of Mary (Nösgen). This conclusion can be reconciled with the other alternative by the assumption that Mary was of the same tribe and family as Joseph, so that the genealogy was common to both. This was the patristic view. The fact may have been so, but it is not indicated by the evangelist. His aim, undoubtedly, is to set forth Jesus as the legitimate son of Joseph, Mary’s husband, at His birth, and therefore the proper heir of David’s throne.—ἐξ ἕνανθρόπου i. The peculiar manner of expression is a hint that something out of the usual course had happened, and prepares for the following explanation: ὁ λεγόμενος Χριστός; not implying doubt, but suggesting that the claim of Jesus to the title Christ was valid if He were a legitimate descendant of David, as the genealogy showed Him to be.

Ver. 17. The evangelist pauses to point out the structure of his genealogy: three parts with fourteen members each; symmetrical, memorable; παροιμία does not imply, as Meyer and Weiss think, that in the opinion of the evangelist no links are omitted. He speaks simply of what lies under the eye. There they are, fourteen in each, count and satisfy yourself. But the counting turns out not to be so easy, and has given rise to great divergence of opinion. The division naturally suggested by the words of the text is: from Abraham to David, terminating first series, 14; from David, heading second series, to the captivity as limit, i.e., to Josiah, 14; from the captivity represented by Jeconiah to Christ, included as final term, 14. So Bengel and De Wette. If objection be taken to counting David twice, the brethren of Jeconiah, that is, his uncles, may be taken as representing the concluding term of series 2, and Jeconiah himself as the first member of series 3 (Weiss-Meyer). The identical number
in the three parts is of no importance in itself. It is a numerical symbol uniting three periods, and suggesting comparison in other respects, e.g., as to different forms of government—judges, kings, priests (Euthy. Zig.), theocracy, monarchy, hierarchy (Schanz), all summed up in Christ; or as to Israel’s fortunes: growth, decline, ruin—redemption urgently needed.

Vv. 18-25. THE BIRTH OF JESUS. This section gives the explanation which has been left (ver. 16) leads us to expect. It may be called the justification of the genealogy (Schanz), showing that while the birth was exceptional in nature it yet took place in such circumstances, that Jesus might justly be regarded as the legitimate son of Joseph, and therefore heir of David’s throne. The position of the name THO B I. X. at the head of the sentence, and the recurrence of the word γένεσις, point back to ver. 7: γένεσις, not γέννησις, is the true reading, the purpose being to express the general idea of origin, ousia, not the specific idea of generation (ὁ ευαγγελιστὴς εικονοτομεῖ τὸ κατὰ φύσιν δύομα τῆς γεννησιάς, γέννησις αὐτῷ καλαίσκε. Euthy. Zig. on ver. 1).

Ver. 18. μετατροπή . . . αὐτοῦ indicates the position of Mary in relation to Joseph when her pregnancy was discovered. Briefly it was—betrothed, not married. Πρὶν ὡς συναδέλφου means before they came together in one home as man and wife, it being implied that that would not take place before marriage. συναδέλφου might refer to sexual intercourse, so far as the meaning of the word is concerned (Joseph. Antiq. vii. 9, 5), but the evangelist would not think it necessary to state that no such intercourse had taken place between the betrothed. That he would regard as a matter of course. Yet most of the fathers so understood the word; and some, Chrysostom, e.g., conceived Joseph and Mary to be living together before marriage, but <i>sine concubitu</i>, believing this to have been the usual practice. Of this, however, there is no satisfactory evidence. The sense above assigned to συναδέλφου corresponds to the verb παραλαβέω, ver. 20, παρέλαβε, ver. 25, which means to take home, <i>domum ducere</i>. The supposed reason for the practice alleged to have existed by Chrysostom and others was the protection of the betrothed (δι’ ἀφόθαλαμος, Euthy.). Grammarians (vide Fritzschke) say that πρὶν ὡς is not found in ancient Attic, though often in middle Attic. For other instances of, with infinitive, vide Mk. xiv. 30, Acts vii. 2; without ὡς, Mt. xxvi. 34, 75. On the construction of πρὶν with the various moods, vide Hermann ed. Viger, Kloetz ed. Devarius, and Goodwin’s Syntax—εὑρήκω . . . ξύνομα: εὑρήκα, not ἤρ. (So Olearius, Obserr. ad Ev. Mat., and other older interpreters.) There was a discovery and a surprise. It was apparent (de Wette); διὰ τὸ ἀπροσδόκητον (Euthy.). To whom apparent not indicated. Jerome says: “Non ab alio inventa est nisi a Joseph, qui pene licentia matrimonii futurae uxoris omnia novaret.”—Lk xv. 67. This was not apparent; it belonged to the region of faith. The evangelist hastens to add this explanation of a painful fact to remove, as quickly as possible, all occasion for sinister conjecture. The expression points at once to immediate divine causality, and to the holy character of the effect: a solemn protest against profane thoughts.

Ver. 19. I. οὐκ ἦν: proleptic, implying possession of a husband’s rights and responsibilities. The betrothed man had a duty in the matter: δίκαιος . . . ἠγαθός.
22. **EYAGGELEION**

δειματισμός, ἐβουλήθη λάβειν αὐτὴν. 20. τοῦτο δὲ αὐτῷ ἐνθυμηθέντος, ἵδιον, ἐγγελός Κυρίου = κατ' ἑαυτῷ ἐφάνει αὐτῷ, ἀπολάβειν Μαρίαν. 8

Τὸν γυναῖκα σου τὸ γὰρ ἐν αὐτῇ γεννηθήν ἐν Πνεύματος Ὀσίων, ἀγίου. 21. τέθησα δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ ἀλλάξεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν. αὐτὸς γὰρ σώσει τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν. 22. αὐτὸς γὰρ σώσει τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν. 23. ἂν γενέσθαι... 24. ὡς ἐκ τοῦ Κυρίου.

1. B and ἡ δὲ have the simple verb (δειματισμός).

2. Λάβα in W.H.


4. The article τοῦ before κυρίου is omitted in the best MSS.
Vv. 22-23. The prophetic reference. Acts is the evangelist’s habit to cite O. T. prophecies in connection with leading incidents in the life of Jesus; it is natural, with most recent interpreters, to regard these words, not as uttered by the angel, but as a comment of the narrator. The ancients, Chry., Theophy., Euthy., etc., adopt the former view, and Weiss-Meyer concurs, while admitting that in expression they reveal the evangelist’s style. In support of this, it might be urged that the suggestion of the prophetic oracle to the mind of Joseph would be an aid to faith. It speaks of a son to be born of a virgin. Why should not Mary be that virgin, and her child that son? In favour of it also is the consideration that on the opposite view the prophetic reference comes in too soon. Why should not the evangelist go on to the end of his story, and then quote the prophetic oracle? Finally, if we assume that in the case of all objective preternatural manifestations, there is an answering subjective psychological state, we must conclude that among the thoughts that were passing through Joseph’s mind at this crisis, one was that in his family experience as a “son of David,” something of great importance for the royal race and for Israel was about to happen. The oracle in question might readily suggest itself as explaining the nature of the coming event. On all these grounds, it seems reasonable to conclude that the evangelist, in this case, means the prophecy to form part of the angelic utterance.

V. 22. τοῦτο δὲ ἦν πάλιν:" This is to be taken here, and indeed al-

ways in such connections, in its strict teleic sense. The interest of the evangelist, as of all N. T. writers, in prophecy, was purely religious. For him O. T. oracles had exclusive reference to the events in the life of Jesus by which they were fulfilled. The virgin, ἡ παρθένος, supposed to be present to the eye of the prophet, is the young woman of Nazareth betrothed to Joseph the carpenter, now found to be with child.—Ἰησοῦς . . . Ἔμμανουὴλ: in the oracle as here quoted, Ἐμμανουήλ (cf. Ἐμμανουα, ver. 18), is substituted for Ἀμαν, and καλέσαι changed into the impersonal καλέσων. Emmanuel = “with us God,” implying that God’s help will come through the child Jesus. It does not necessarily imply the idea of incarnation.

V. 24-25. Ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὑποστάσεις μετάλαμψα: immediate energetic action takes the place of painful doubt. Euthymius asks: Why did God allow this thought in so great a matter? and answers: because the angel revealed to him the thought of his own heart, for he understood that the messenger must have come from God, for God alone knows the thoughts of the heart.—ἐγέρθη . . . Κυρίων: rising up from the sleep (τὸν ἐγείρον), in which he had that remarkable dream, on that memorable night, he proceeded forthwith to execute the Divine command, the first, chief, perhaps sole business of that day.

—καὶ παραλάβασι . . . αὐτόν. He took Mary home as his wife, that her offspring might be his legitimate son and heir of David’s throne.—Ver. 25. καὶ οὐκ ἐγέρνουσα . . . ἦν: absolute habitual (note the imperfect) abstinence from
marital intercourse, the sole purpose of the hastened marriage being to legitimise the child.—μοί: not till then, and afterwards? Here comes a \textit{quassio vexata} of theology. Patristic and catholic authors say: not till then and never at all, guarding the sacredness of the virgin's womb. \textit{Ies} does not settle the question. It is easy to cite instances of its use as fixing a limit up to which a specified event did not occur, when as a matter of fact it did not occur at all. \textit{E.g.:} Gen. vii. 7: the raven returned not till the waters were dried up; in fact, never returned (Schanz). But the presumption is all the other way in the case before us. Subsequent intercourse was the natural, if not the necessary, course of things. If the evangelist had felt as the Catholics do, he would have taken pains to prevent misunderstanding.—δώρ: the extended reading (T. R.) is imported from Luke ii. 7, where there are no variants. \textit{πρωτότοκον} is not a stumbling-block to the champions of the perpetual virginity, because the \textit{first} may be the \textit{only}. Euthymius quotes in proof Isaiah xliv. 6: “I am the first, and I am the last, and beside Me there is no God.”—καὶ ἐκδικεῖν, he (not she) called the child Jesus, the statement referring back to the command of the angel to Joseph. Wünsche says that before the exile the mother, after the exile the father, gave the name to the child at circumcision (\textit{Neue Beiträge zur Erläuterung der Evangelien}, p. 11).

\textbf{Chapter II. History of the Infancy continued.} The leading aim of the evangelist in this chapter is not to give biographic details as to the time and place of Christ's birth. These are disposed of in an introductory subordinate clause with a genitive absolute construction: “Jesus being born in Bethlehem of Judaea in the days of Herod the King”, that is all. The main purpose is to show the reception given by the world to the new-born Messianic King. Homage from afar, hostility at home; foreshadowing the fortunes of the new faith: acceptance by the Gentiles, rejection by the Jews; such is the lesson of this new section. It is history, but not of the prosaic sort: history with a religious bias, and wearing a halo of poetry. The story forms a natural sequel to the preceding account. 

\textit{Ies} in ver. 1, as in i. 18, is adversative only to the extent of taking the attention off one topic and fixing it on another connected and kindred. This, according to Kloster, who regards \textit{Ies} as a weak form of \textit{Ies}, is the original force of the particle. He says (in \textit{Devarius}, p. 355): “Illa particula eam vim habet, ut abducat nos ab ea re, quae proposita est, transferat que ad id, quod, missa illa priore re, jam pro vero ponendum esse videatur.”

\textit{Vv. 1-12. Visit of the Magi. Ver. 1, ἐν Βηθλεέμ:} The first hint of the birthplace, and no hint that Bethlehem is not the home of the family.—

—\textit{ἡς Λαώς}: to distinguish it from another Bethlehem in Galilee (Zebulon), named in Joshua xix. 15. Our Bethlehem is called Bethlehem-Judah in x Sam. xvii. 12, and Jerome thought it should be so written here—Bethlehem of Judah, not of Judaea, taking the latter for the name of the whole nation. The name means “house of bread,” and points to the fertility of the neighbourhood; about six miles south of Jerusalem.—ἐν ἡμέραις, “in the days,” a very vague indication of time. Luke aims at more exactness in these matters. It is enough for our evangelist to indicate that the birth of Jesus fell within the evil time represented by \textit{Herod}. A name of evil omen; called the Great; great in energy, in magnificence, in wickedness; a considerable personage in many ways in the history of Israel, and of the world. Not a Jew, his father Antipater an Edomite, his mother an Arabian—the sceptre has departed from Judah—through the influence of Antony appointed King of Judaea by the Roman senate about forty years before the birth of Christ. The event here recorded therefore took place towards the close of his long reign; fit ending for a career blackened with many dark deeds.—ἐδοξάσαν μέγας: “Behold!” introducing in a lively manner the new theme, and a very different class of men from the reigning King of Judaea. Herod, \textit{Magi}; the one representing the ungodly element in Israel, the other the best element in the Gentile world; \textit{Magi}, not kings as the legend makes them, but having influence with kings, and intermeddling much by astrological lore with the fortunes of individuals and peoples.
homage of the Gentiles could not be offered by worthier representatives, in whom power, wisdom, and also error, superstition meet. — The Magi, therefore, came from the east; so the words must be connected: not "came from the east"; from the east, the land of the sunrise; vague indication of locality. It is vain to inquire what precise country is meant, though commentators have inquired, and are divided into hostile camps on the point: Arabia, Persia, Media, Babylon, Parthia are some of the rival suggestions. The evangelist does not know or care. The east generally is the suitable part of the world for Magi to come from on this errand. — The Gentiles: they arrived at Jerusalem, the capital, the natural place for strangers to come to, the precise spot connected with their errand to be determined by further inquiry. Note the Greek form of the name, usual with Matthew, Mark and John. In Luke, the Hebrew form is used. Beforehand, one would have expected the first evangelist writing for Jews to have used the Hebrew form, and the Pauline evangelist the Greek.

Ver. 2. 

The inquiry of the Magi. It is very laconic, combining an assertion with a question. The assertion is contained in the next verse. That a king of the Jews had been born was their inference from the star they had seen, and what they said was in effect thus: that a king has been born somewhere in this land we know from a star we have seen arising, and we desire to know where he can be found: "insigne hoc concisae orationis exemplum," Fritzsche. The Messianic hope of the Jews, and the aspiration after world-wide dominion connected with it, were known to the outside world, according to the testimony of non-Christian writers such as Josephus and Tacitus. The visit of the Magi in quest of the new-born king is not incredible. — 

The star is its rising, not in the east, as in A. V., the plural being used for that in ver. 1. Always on the outlook, no heavenly phenomenon escaped them; it was visible as soon as it appeared above the horizon. — 

What was this celestial portent? Was it phenomenal only? an appearance in the heavens miraculously produced to guide the wise men to Judaea and Bethlehem; or a real astronomical object, a rare conjunction of planets, or a new star appearing, and invested by men addicted to astrology with a certain significance; or mythical, neither a miraculous nor a natural phenomenon, but a creation of the religious imagination working on slender data, such as the Star of Jacob in Balaam's prophecies? All these views have been held. Some of the fathers, especially Chrysostom, advocated the first, viz., that it was a star, not φως, but φωτις ἡμῶν. His reasons were such as these: it moved from north to south; it appeared in the daytime while the sun shone; it appeared and disappeared; it descended down to the house where the child lay, and it appeared and disappeared; which could not be done by a star in the sky (I hom. vi.). Some modern commentators have laid under contribution the investigations of astronomers, and supposed the διστήρ to have been one of several rare conjunctions of planets occurring about the beginning of our era or a comet observed in China. Vide the elaborate note in Alford's Greek Testament. The third view is in favour with students of comparative religion and of criticism, who lay stress on the fact that in ancient times the appearance of a star was expected at the birth of all great men (De Wette), and who expect mythological elements in the N. T. as well as in the Old. (Vide Fritzsche, Strauss, L. J., and Holtzmann in H. C.) These diverse theories will probably always find their abettors; the first among the devout to whom the miraculous is no stumbling-block, the second among those while accepting the miraculous desire to reduce it to a minimum, or at least to avoid its unnecessary extension, the third among men of naturalistic proclivities. I do not profess to be able to settle the question. I content myself with expressing general acquiescence in the idea thrown out by Spinoza in his discussion on prophecy in the Tractatus theologico-politicus, that in the case of the Magi we have an instance of a sign given, accommodated to the false opinions of men, to guide them to the truth. The whole system
of astrology was a delusion, yet it might be used by Providence to guide seekers after God. The expectation of an epoch-making birth was current in the east, spread by Babylonian Jews. That it might interest Magians there is no wise incredible; that their astrological lore might lead them to connect some unknown celestial phenomenon with the prevalent expectation is likewise credible. On the other hand, that legendary elements might get mixed up in the Christian tradition of the star-guided visit must be admitted to be possible. It remains to add that the use of the word ἀστρονομία, not ἀστρονομία, has been supposed to have an important bearing on the question as to the nature of the phenomenon. ἀστρονομία means an individual star, ἀστρονομία a constellation. But in the N. T. this distinction is not observed. (Vide Luke xxi. 5; Acts xxvii. 20; Heb. xi. 12; and Grimm's Lexicon on the two words.)

Ver. 3. ἐν Βασιλείᾳ Ἡρῴδει ἑταρθή: τοῦτο ἐν τῷ ὄντω, not ἐν τῷ ἐπὶ τῷ, as in ver. 1, the emphatic position suggesting that it was as king and because king that Herod was troubled. The foreigner and usurper feared a rival, and the tyrant feared the rival would be welcome. It takes little to put evil-doers in fear. He had reigned long, men were weary, and the Pharisees, according to Joseph (A. J. xvii. 2-4), had predicted that his family would long lose its place of power. His fear therefore, though the occasion may seem insignificant, is every way credible.—καὶ πίστεως Ι., doubtless an exaggeration, yet substantially true. The spirit of the city was servile and selfish. They bowed to godless power, and cared for their own interest rather than for Herod's. Few in that so-called holy city had healthy sympathies with truth and right. Whether the king's fears were groundless or not they knew not nor cared. It was enough that the fears existed. The world is ruled not by truth but by opinion.—πίστεως: is ἤστολλα a feminine here, or is ἤστολλα understood? or is it a construction, ad sensum, of the inhabitants? (Schane).

Ver. 4. Theodor's measures. — καὶ συναγγελικῶν... τοῦ λαοῦ. Was this a meeting of the Sanhedrin? Not likely, as the elders are not mentioned, who are elsewhere named as the representatives of the people, vide xxvi. 3, "the chief priests, scribes and elders of the people". Here we read only of the chief priests and scribes of the people. The article is not repeated before ἱεραρχῶν, the two classes being joined together as the theological experts of the people. Herod called together the leading men among the priests and scribes to consult them as to the birth-place of Messiah. Holtzmann (H. C.,) assuming that a meeting of the Sanhedrin is meant, uses the fact as an argument against the historicity of the narrative. The Herod of history slew the Sanhedrists wholesale, and did his best to lull to sleep Messianic hopes. It is only the Herod of Christian legend that convenes the Sanhedrin, and makes anxious inquiries about Messiah's birth-place. But the past policy of the king and his present action, as reported by the evangelist, hang together. He discouraged Messianic hopes, and, now that they have revived in spite of him, he must deal with them, and his first step is to consult the experts in as quiet a way as possible, to ascertain the whereabouts of the new-born child—ἕως ὅτε...: it is not a historical question he submits to the experts as to where the Christ has been born, or shall be, but a theological one: where, according to the accepted tradition, is His birth-place? Hence γενέσθαι, present tense.

Vv. 5-6. The answer of the experts.—οἱ δὲ ἔλεγον, etc. This is not a Christian opinion put into the mouth of the scribes. It was the answer to be ex-
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pected from them as reflecting the current opinion of the time. The Targum put
upon the oracle in Micah a Messianic interpretation (Wetstein, and Wunsche,
Beitrage). Yet with the Talmudists the Messiah was the one who should come
Vide on this point Schanz, who quotes Schegg as denying the statement of
Wetstein, and refers to Celsus as objecting
that this view about Messiah's birth-
place was not current among the Jews.
27, and 42.) -oumen gar gepraatai, etc.:
The Scripture proof that Messiah's birth-
place was Bethlehem is taken from
Micah v. 2. The oracle put into the
mouth of the experts consulted by Herod
receives its shape from the hand of the
evangelist. It varies very considerably
both from the original Hebrew and
from the Sept. The "least" becomes
"by no means the least," "among the
thousands" becomes "among the
princes," and the closing clause, "who
shall rule my people Israel," departs
from the prophetic oracles altogether,
and borrows from 2 Sam. v. 2, God's
promise to David; the connecting link
apparently being the poetic word de-
scriptive of the kingly function common
to the two places—\pomwet in Micah
v. 3, \pomwet in 2 Sam. v. 2. The second variation arises from a
different pointing of the same Hebrew
word: alis, = among the
thousands, = among the heads
of thousands. Such facts are to be
taken as they stand. They do not cor-
respond to modern ideas of Scripture
proof.

Vv. 7, 8. Herod's next step.—"Agato
Heordhs ... diastros; toto, frequent
formula of transition with our evangelist.
Cf. vv. 16, 17; iii. 1, 5, 11, etc. Herod
wished to ascertain precisely when the
child the Magi had come to worship was
born. He assumed that the event would
synchronize with the ascent of the star
which the Magi had seen in its rising,
and which still continued to be seen
(faumonen). Therefore he made par-
ticular inquiries (\hpronon) as to the
time of the star, i.e., the time of its first
appearing. This was a blind, an affec-
tration of great interest in all that related
to the child, in whose destinies even the
stars were involved.—Ver. 8. \fwpas
\atop: his hypocrisy went further.
He bade the strangers go to Bethlehem,
find out the whereabouts of the child,
come back and tell him, that he also
might go and worship Him. Worship,
i.e., murder! "Incredible motive!"
(H.C.). Yes, as a real motive for a
man like Herod, but not as a pretended
one, and quite likely to be believed by
these simple, guileless souls from the
east.—\fwpas \etn: the sending was
synchronous with the directions accord-
ing to De Wette, prior according to Meyer.
It is a question of no importance here,
but it is sometimes an important ques-
tion in what relation the action expressed
by the aorist participle stands to that
expressed by the following finite verb.
The rule certainly is that the participle
expresses an action going before: one
thing having happened, another there-
after took place. But there is an im-
portant class of exceptions. The aorist
participle "may express time coincident
with that of the verb, when the actions
of the verb and the participle are prac-
tically one." Goodwin, Syntax, p. 52,
and vide article there referred to by
Prof. Ballantine in Bibli. Sacra., 1884, on the application of this rule to the N. T., in which many instances of the kind occur. Most frequent in the Gospels is the expression διακριθείτω εἰς, which does not mean "having first answered he then proceeded to say," but "in answering he said". The case before us may be one of this kind. He sent them by saying "Go and search," etc.

Vv. 9, 10. The Magi go on their errand to Bethlehem. They do not know the way, but the star guides them. ἥγεσεν δὲ διακριθείτω: looking up to heaven as they set out on their journey, they once more behold their heavenly guide.—ἐν εἰδον εἰς τ. ἀνατολὴν; is the meaning that they saw the star only at its rising, finding their way to Jesus without its guidance, and that again it appeared leading them to Bethlehem? So Bengel, and after him Meyer. Against this is φωνεῖν, ver. 7, which implies continuous visibility. The clause by εἰδον, etc., is introduced for the purpose of identification. It was their celestial guide appearing again.—φωνής: it kept going before them (imperfect) all the way till, arriving at Bethlehem, it took up its position (καταβάς) right over the spot where the child was. The star seemed to go before them by an optical illusion (Weiss-Meyer); it really, in the view of the evangelist, went before and stopped over the house (De Wette, who, of course, regards this as impossible in fact). Ver. 11. The Magi enter and do homage.—καὶ εὐλογησάντες: verse has εὐλογήσαντες, which Grotius, with probability, regards as an interpretative gloss that had found its way into the text, vide Epiphanius Adv. Haer. Alogi, c. 8), and bring forth gold, frankincense and myrrh, the two latter being aromatic gums distilled from trees.—ὄθλαν, in classic Greek, the tree, in later Greek and N. T., the gum, τὸ ὀθέλημαν = ὀθέλοιν, vide Phryn. ed. Lobec, p. 187. The gifts were of three kinds, hence the inference that the Magi were three in number. That they were kings is deduced from texts in Psalms and Prophecies (e.g., Psalm lxxxii. 10, Isaiah lx. 3), predicting that kings would come doing homage and bringing gifts to Messiah. The legend of the three kings dates as far back as Origen, and is beautiful but baseless. It grew with time; by-and-by the kings were furnished with names. The legendary spirit loves definiteness. The gifts would be products of the givers' country, or in high esteem and costly there. Hence the inference drawn by some that the Magi were from Arabia. Thus Grotius: "Myrrha nonnisi in Arabiam nascitur, nec thus nisi aperit Jabaeos Arabum portionem: sed et aurífera est Felix Arabia". Gold and incense


II.

πατίνιν μετά Μαρίας τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ποιεῖται προσεκχῆσαι

καὶ ἐρατομένην τοὺς θεαυροὺς αὐτῶν προσήγγικαν αὐτῷ

δῷρα, χρωμα καὶ λίβανον καὶ σμύρναν.  

καὶ χρυσαποθέτησεν

καὶ ἀνάκυψα εἰς ἡρῴδην, δι' ἄλλης ὀδὸς ἄνεχθησαν

Rev. xviii. εἰς τὴν χώραν αὐτῶν.

v v. xix. 13. Ἀνακύψατων δὲ αὐτῶν, ὑδίῳ, ἀγγέλου Κυρίου φαίνεται

καὶ ἀνάκυψα

ἐκ τῆς ἱσταφ, λέγων, ἢ ἐγγερθεὶς παραλαῦαι τὸ παιδίον καὶ

καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ, καὶ φεύγει αἰς Ἀγγυτον, καὶ ἵνα ἐκεῖ ἀναθεῖν αὐτὸ 

καὶ τοὺς ἀνδρεύσαι τὸ παιδίον καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ, καὶ άνεκχήσαναν εἰς Ἀγγυτον, καὶ ἤν ἐκεῖ ἑως τῆς

B has καὶ ὑπαρ οὕνει as in i. 20 (W.H. margin).

(λίβανος) are mentioned in Isaiah lx. 6 among the gifts to be brought to Israel in the good time coming. The fathers delighted in assigning to these gifts of the Magi mystic meanings: gold as to a king, incense as to God, myrrh as to one destined to die (ὡς μέλλοντι γεγονα-

σθαι δανέστω). Grotius struck into a new line: gold = works of mercy; incense = prayer; myrrh = purity—to the dis-

of Fritzsche, who thought such mystic interpretations beneath so great a scholar.

Ver. 12. Their pious errand fulfilled, the Magi, learned to keep out of Herod's way, return home by another road.—χρησμοκα-

θέντας points to divine guidance given in a dream (καὶ ἐν όψιν); responsa accepta, Vulg.

The passive, in the sense of a divine oracle given, found chiefly in N. T. (Fritzsche after Casaubon).

Was the oracle given in answer to a prayer for guidance? Opinions differ. It may be assumed here, as in the case of Joseph (i. 20), that the Magi had anxious thoughts corresponding to the divine communication. Doubts had arisen in their minds about Herod's intentions. They had, doubtless, heard something of his story and character, and his man-

mer on reflection may have appeared suspicious. A skilful dissembler, yet not quite successful in concealing his hidden purpose even from these guileless men. Hence a sense of need of guidance, if not a formal petition for it, may be taken for granted. Divine guidance comes only to prepared hearts. The dream reflects the antecedent state of mind.—μὴ ἀνακύψαναι, not to turn back on their steps towards

Jesus and Herod. Fritzsche praises the felicity of this word as implying that to go by Jerusalem was a roundabout

for travellers from Bethel to the east. Apart from the question of fact, such a thought does not seem to be in the mind of the evangelist. He is thinking, not of the shortest road, but of avoiding Herod—ἀνεκχήσαναν, they withdrew not only homewards, but away from Herod's neighbourhood. A word of frequent occurrence in our Gospel, four times in this chapter (vv. 13, 14, 22).

Vv. 13-23. Flight to Egypt, massacre in Bethlehem, return to Nazareth. These three stories have one aim. They indicate the omens which appear in begin-

nings— omina principiis inesse solent (Ovid). The fortunes of Christianity foreshadowed in the experiences of the holy child welcomed by Gentiles, evil entreated by Jews. “The real contents of these sections embody an ideal aim” (Schanz).

Vv. 13-15. Flight to Egypt. Ver. 13, διασειρα: assuming that this is the cor-

rect reading, the flight to Egypt is represented as following close on the departure of the Magi; the historic present, vividly introducing one scene after another. A subjective state of anxiety is here also to be presumed. Whence arising we can only conjecture. Did the Magi give a hint, mentioning Herod's name in a significant manner? Be that as it may, Joseph also gets the necessary direction.—Ἐγγέθη... 

δι' Ἀγγυτον: Egypt—near, friendly, and the refuge of Israel's ancestors in days of old, if also their house of bondage.—παράδεισθαι, take with a view to taking care of (cf. John i. 11, “His own re-

ceived Him not,” παράδεισθαι; δεινογενὲς, Fritzsche—ὡς ... υπό: either gene-

rally, till I give thee further orders (Fritzsche); or till I tell thee to return
The massacre. Tóte: ominous then. When he was certain that the Magi were not going to come back to report what they had found at Bethlehem, Herod was enraged as one who had been befooled (πέτυχεν). Mad- dened with anger, he resolves on more truculent measures than he at first inten- tended: kill all of a certain age to make sure of the one—such is his savage order to his obsequious hirelings. Incredible? Anything is credible of the man who murdered his own wife and sons. The deed shocks Christians; but it was a small affair in Herod’s career, and in contemporary history.—ἐν Βηθ. καὶ ἐν παις τοις ὄριοις αὐτῆς, in Bethlehem, and around in the neighbourhood, to make quite sure.—καὶ ἔστω καὶ κατωτέρω: the meaning is clear—all children from an hour to two years old. But ἔστω καὶ may be taken either as masculine, agreeing with παις understood = from a two-year-old child, or as a neuter adjective used as a noun = from the age of two years, ἄτιμα as in Vulg. There are good authorities on both sides. For a similar phrase, vide 1 Chron. xxvii. 23, ἐκκλησιάστως. Herod made his net wide enough; two years ensured an ample margin.—κατὰ τ. ἔτη . . . μάγων. Euthy. Zig. insists that these words must be con- nected, not with διέτησι, but with ταυτάρατον, putting a comma after the former word, and not after the latter. If, he argues, Herod had definitely ascertained from the Magi that the child must be two years old, he would not have killed those younger. They made Mary’s child younger; Herod kept their time and added a margin: πλάτος ἔτους αὐτῆς προσθήκη. It does not seem to matter very much. Herod would not be very scrupulous. He was likely to add a margin in either case; below if they made the age two years, above if they made it less—ver. 18: still another prophetic reference, Jerem. xxxi. 15, freely reproduced from the Sept.; pathetic and poetic certainly, if the relevance be not conspicuously apparent. The evangelist introduces the prophetic passage in this case, not with ἄνα, but with τότε, sug-
gestive of a fulfilment not regarded as exclusive. The words, even in their original place, are highly imaginative. The scene of Rachel weeping for her children is one of several tableaux, which passed before the prophet’s eye in a vision, in a dream which, on awaking, he felt to be sweet. It was poetry to begin with, and it is poetry here. Rachel again weeps over her children; here, because she was buried there, the prophet’s Ramah, near Gibeah, north of Jerusalem, standing for Bethlehem as far to the south. The prophetic passage did not create the massacre; the tradition of the massacre recalled to mind the prophecy, and led to its being quoted, though of doubtful appositeness in a strict sense. Jacob’s beloved wife seems to have occupied an imaginative place also in Rabbinical literature. Wünsche quotes this from the *Midrasch*: ‘Why did Jacob bury Rachel on the way to Ephratah or Bethlehem? (Gen. xxxv. 16). Because he foresaw that the exiles would at some future time pass that way, and he buried her there that she might pray for them’ (*Beiträge*, p. 11). Rachel was to the Hebrew fancy a mother for Israel in all time, sympathetic in all her children’s misfortunes.

**Vv. 19-21. Joseph’s return.** Ῥωμ. vi. 13. Hp: Herod died in 750 u.c. in his 70th year, at Jericho, of a horrible loathsome disease, rotten in body as in soul, altogether an unwholesome man (*vide* Joseph, Bell, i. 33, 1-5; Antiq., xvii. 6, 5; Euseb., H. E., I. 6, 8). The news of his death would fly swiftly, and would not take long to reach Egypt. There would be no need of an angel to inform Joseph of the fact. But his anxieties would not therefore be at an end. Who was to succeed Herod? Might he not be another of the same type? Might disorder and confusion not arise? Would it be safe or wise to return to Palestine? Guidance was again needed, desired and obtained.

—*Ἰησοῦς Ὀρθοδόξος... Ἰσραήλ*: the guidance is given once more in a dream (*κατ’ ἑναρχήν*). The anxious thoughts of the daytime are reflected in the dream by night, and the angelic message comes to put an end to uncertainty.—ver. 20. Ἰησοῦς Ὀρθοδόξος... Ἰσραήλ: it is expressed in the same terms as those of the message directing flight to Egypt, except of course that the land is different, and the order not *flee* but *return*. “Arise, take the child and His mother.” The words were as a refrain in the life of Joseph in those critical months.—τοῦτον γὰρ: in this general manner is the death of Herod referred to, as if in studious avoidance of the dreaded name. They are dead. The plural here (of ἤγγελοις), as often, expressed a general idea, a class, though only a single person is meant (*vide* Winer, § 27, 2, and Exodus iv. 19). But the manner of expression may indicate a desire to dissipate completely Joseph’s apprehensions. There is nothing, no person to fear: go! *Ver. 21. ὁ Ἰησοῦς Ὀρθοδόξος... Ἰσραήλ*: prompt obedience follows, but *πρὸς* (ver. 14) is omitted this time. Joseph may wait till day; the matter is not so urgent. Then the word was *φέρεται*. It was a flight for life, every hour or minute important.

**Vv. 22-23. Settlement in Nazareth in...
Galilee. Joseph returns with mother and child to Israel, but not to Judea and Bethlehem. — ἀπελθεν. Archelaos reigns in his father's stead. A man of kindred nature, suspicious, truculent (Joseph., Ant., 17, 11, 2), to be feared and avoided by such as had cause to fear his father. — ἀπελθεν, reigns, not in the strict sense of the word. He exercised the authority of an ethnarch, with promise of a royal title if he conducted himself so as to deserve it. In fact he earned banishment. At Herod's death the Roman emperor divided his kingdom into four parts, of which he gave two to Archelaus, embracing Judea, Idumaea and Samaria; the other two parts were assigned to Antipas and Philip, also sons of Herod: to Antipas, Galilee and Perea; to Philip, Batanea, Trachonitis and Auranitis. They bore the title of Tetrarch, ruler of a fourth part (Joseph., Ant., 17, 11, 4). — ἔποιησεν ἀπελθεν. It is implied that to settle in Judaea was the natural course to follow, and that it would have been followed but for a special reason. Schanz, taking a hint from Augustine, suggests that Joseph wished to settle in Jerusalem, deeming it the most suitable home for the Messiah, but that God judged the despised Galilee a better training school for the future Saviour of publicans, sinners and Pagans. This hypothesis goes on the assumption that the original seat of the family was Nazareth. — ἐκεί: late Greek for ἐκεῖον. In later Greek authors the distinction between ποιεῖ τοῦ, of ὦ, ἐκεῖ τοῦ, ἐκεί and ἐκεῖo practically disappeared. Rutherford's New Prynchius, p. 314. Vide for another instance, Luke xxi. 2. Others explain the substitution as a case of attraction common in adverbs of place. The idea of remaining is in the mind = He feared to go thither to abide there. Vide Lobeck's Philos., p. 44, and Fritzsche. — χρηματισθεὶς τῆς Ἐφεσίας: again oracular counsel given in a dream, implying again mental perplexity and need of guidance. Going to Galilee, Judaea being out of the question, was not a matter of course, as we should have expected. The narrative of the first Gospel appears to be constructed on the assumption that Nazareth was not the original home of the holy family, and to represent a tradition for which Nazareth was the adopted home, Bethlehem being the original. — The evangelist did not know that Nazareth was the original seat of the family.
This spelling is found in BDL and adopted by W.H. Nazaret in CE. Other forms occur.

spring out of Jesse's root. This view is accepted by most modern scholars, Catholic and Protestant, the name of the town being viewed as a derivative from the Hebrew word (a feminine form). The epithet Nazaraios will thus mean: "the man of Nazareth, the town of the offshoot". De Wette says: "In the spirit of the exegetical mysticism of the time, and applying what the Jews called Midrasch, deeper investigation, the word is used in a double sense in allusion at once to Isaiah xi. 1, sprout, and to the name of Nazareth". There may be something in the suggestion that the reference is to Judges xiii. 7: oth Nazaraios hodos neat, and the idea: one living apart in a secluded town. (So Furrer in Die Bedeutung der bibl. Geographie für d. bib. Exegese, p. 15.)

This final prophetic reference in the history of the infancy is the weakest link in the chain. It is wasted effort to try to show its value in the prophetic argument. Instead of doing this, apologists would act more wisely by frankly recognizing the weakness, and drawing from it an argument in favour of historicity. This may very legitimately be done. Of all the incidents mentioned in this chapter, the settlement in Nazareth is the only one we have other means of verifying. Whether it was the original or the adopted home of Jesus may be doubtful, but from many references in the Gospels we know that it was His home from childhood till manhood. In this case, therefore, we certainly know that the historic fact suggested the prophetic reference, instead of the prophecy creating the history. And the very weakness of the prophetic reference in this instance raises a presumption that was the nature of the connection between prophecy and history throughout. It is a caveat against the critical theory that in the second chapter of Matthew we have an imaginary history of the infancy of Jesus, compiled to meet a craving for knowledge on the subject, and adapted to the requirements of faith, the rudiments of the story consisting of a collection of Messianic prophecies—the star of Jacob, princes bringing gifts, Rachel weeping for her children, etc. The last of the prophetic references would never have occurred to any one, whether the evangelist or any other unknown source of the tradition, unless there had been a fact going before, the settlement in Nazareth. But given the fact, there was a strong desire to find some allusion to it in the O. T. Faith was easily satisfied; the faintest allusion or hint would do. That was in this case, and presumably in most cases of the kind, the problem with which the Christian mind in the Apostolic age was occupied: not creating history, but discovering in evangelic facts even the most minute, prophetic fulfilments. The evangelist's idea of fulfillment may provoke a smile, but it might also awaken a feeling of thankfulness in view of what has been stated. It is with the prophetic references in the Gospels as with songs without words. The composer has a certain scene or state of mind in his view, and writes under its inspiration. But you are not in his secret, and cannot tell when you hear the music what it means. But let the key be given, and immediately you find new meaning in the music. The prophecies are the music; the key is the history. Given the prophecies alone and you could with difficulty imagine the history; given the history you can easily understand how religious fancy might discover corresponding prophecies. That the prophecies, once suggested, might react on the facts and lead to legendary modifications is of course not to be denied.

Chapter III. The Ministry of the Baptist, and the Baptism of Jesus. This chapter and part of the next, containing the narrative of the Temptation (iv. 1-11), form the prelude to the public ministry of Jesus. John, of whom we have not heard before, appears as consecrating Jesus to His Messianic calling by baptism, and from the baptism Jesus passes to the scene of moral trial. In what year of Christ's life these events happened is not indicated. The new narrative begins with the vague phrase,
III. 1–3.

**ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ**

III. 1. *ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις ἔκειναι b παραγίνεται Ἰωάννης δὲ βαπτιστής καὶ προσήνει ἐν τῇ ἡράμῳ τῆς ἱδρύας, καὶ λέγων, μετανοεῖτε· μὴ γίγνετε γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τῶν ὀφράνων.* 3. Οὖν ἐφέστηκεν, ὡς ὁ Κριτικὸς, γιὰ ὑπερήφανος ὁ βασιλεύς τῶν ὀφράνων. *c. Οὖν ἐφέστηκεν ὁ Κριτικὸς, γιὰ ὁ βασιλεύς τῶν ὀφράνων.*

1 was omitted in ΝΒ and Egypt. vers. versa.

"in those days". But it is obvious from the contents that Jesus has now reached manhood; His thoughts and experiences are those of mature years. From childhood to manhood is an absolute blank in our Gospel. The evangelist gives a genesis of Christ's body, but no genesis of His mind. As we see it in the sequel, it is a miracle of wisdom. It too, doubtless, had its genesis and history, but they are not given or even hinted at. Christ is ushered on the scene an unexplained prodigy. One would like to know how He reached this unprecedented height of wisdom and grace (Luke ii. 52). The only possible source of knowledge is reasoning back from the outcome in the full-grown man. Jesus grew, and the final result may reveal in part the means and process of growth. The anti-Pharisaic spirit and clean-cut descriptions of Pharisaic ways imply antecedent study, perhaps in Rabbinical schools. The parables may not have been so extemporized as they seem, but may be the ripe fruit of long brooding thought, things new and yet old.

Vv. 1-6. *John the Baptist appears* (Mark i. 1-6, Luke iii. 1-6). *ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις ἔκειναι: the time when most vaguely indicated. Luke's narrative here (iii. 1) presents a great contrast, as if with conscious intent to supply a want. John's ministry is there dated with reference to the general history of the world, and Christ's age at His baptism is given. Luke's method is more satisfactory in a historical point of view, but Matthew's manner of narration is dramatically effective. He passes abruptly to the new theme, and leaves you to guess the length of the interval. A similarly indefinite phrase occurs in the story of Moses (Ex. ii. 11). There has been much discussion as to what period of time the evangelist had in view. Some say none, except that of the events to be related. "In those days," means simply, "in the days when the following events happened" (so Euthy. Zigm.). Others suggest explanations based on the relation of our Gospel to its sources, e.g., use of a source in which more was told about John, or anticipation of Mark i. 9, where the phrase is used in reference to Christ's coming to be baptised. Probably the best course is to take it as referring back from the apostolic age to the great creative epoch of the evangelic history=

"In those memorable years to which we look back with wistful reverent gaze"—σαρώνεσθαι d l.: John appears on the stage of history—historical present, used "to give a more animated statement of past events" (Goodwin's Syntax, p. 14). John ἐπιστρέφεται, well known by this epithet, and referred to under that designation by Josephus (Antiq. xviii. 5, 2, on which vide Schurer; Jewish History, div. i., vol. ii., p. 23). Its currency naturally suggests that John's baptism was partly or wholly an originality, not to be confounded with proselyte baptism, which perhaps did not even exist at that time.—κύριος προφήτης, preaching as well as baptising, heralding the approach of the Kingdom of Heaven, standing especially in N. T. for proclamation of the good news of God, distinct from διδάσκων (iv. 23); a solemn word for a momentous matter.—ἐν τῇ ἱδρύᾳ τῆς Ιουδαίας: scene of the ministry, the pasture lands lying between the central range of hills and the Jordan and the Dead Sea, not all belonging to Judaea, but of the same character; suitable scene for such a ministry.

Vv. 2. *λέγων introduces the burden of his preaching.—μετανοεῖτε. Repent. That was John's great word. Jesus used it also when He began to preach, but His distinctive watchword was Believe. The two watchwords point to different conceptions of the kingdom. John's kingdom was an object of awful dread—Jesus' of glad welcome. The message of the one was legal, of the other evangelic. Change of mind John deemed very necessary as a preparation for Messiah's advent.—δύναται τῶν ἄνθρωπων. The Kingdom of Heaven. This title is peculiar to Matthew. In the other Gospels it is called the Kingdom of God. Not used either by John or by
Jesus, says Weiss, but to be ascribed to the evangelist. There does not seem to be any urgent reason for this judgment. In Daniel ii. 44 the kingdom is spoken of as to be set up by "the God of heaven," and in the Judaistic period previous to the Christian era, when a transcendent conception of God began to prevail, the use of heaven as a synonym for God came in. Custom might cause it to be employed, even by those who did not sympathise with the conception of God as transcendent, outside and far off from the world (vide note in H. C., p. 55).

Ver. 3. οὕτως γὰρ ἦτοι, etc.: the evangelist here speaks. He finds in John the man of prophecy who proclaims in the desert the near advent of Jehovah coming to deliver His people. He quotes Isaias only. Mark (i. 2) quotes Malachi also, identifying John, not only with the voice in the desert, but with Elijah. Isaiah's herald is not merely a type of John in the view of the evangelist; the two are identical. The quotation follows the Sept., except that for τοῦ θεοῦ ημῶν is substituted αὐτοῦ. Note where Matthew stops. Luke, the universalist, goes on to the end of the oracle. The mode of introducing the prophetic citation is peculiar. "This is he," not "that it might be fulfilled." Weiss (Meyer) thinks this an indication that the passage is taken from "the apostolic source".

Ver. 4. οὕτως δὲ ἦν. The story returns to the historical person, John, and identifies him with the herald of prophecy. "This same John." Then follows a description of his way of life—his clothing and his food, the details conveying a life-like picture of the manner of the man: his habits congruous to his vocation. —τὸ θυμια ἀνδρὸς πριγνὸν καμήλα: his characteristic (ἀντικείμενο) piece of clothing was a rough rude garment woven out of camel's hair, not as some have thought, a camel's skin. We read in Heb. xi. 37, of sheep skins and goat skins worn by some of God's saints, but not of camel skins. Fritzsche takes the opposite view, and Grotius. Euthy., following Chrysostom, says: "Do not ask who wove his garment, or whence he got his girdle; for more wonderful is it that he should live from childhood to manhood in so inhospitable a climate." John took his fashion in dress from Elijah, described (2 Kings i. 8) as "an hairy man, and girt with a girdle of leather about his loins." It need not be doubted that the investment is historical, not a legendary creation, due to the opinion that John was Elijah redivivus. The imitation in dress does not imply a desire to pass for Elijah, but expresses similarity of mood.—ἡ δὲ τροφή: his diet, as poor as his clothing, was mean.—ἀρνίδια: the last of four kinds of edible locusts named in Lev. xi. 22 (Sept.), still it seems used by the poor in the east; legs and wings stripped off, and the remainder boiled or roasted. "The Beduins of Arabia and of East Jordan eat many locusts, roasted, boiled or baked in cakes. In Arabia they are sold in the market. They taste not badly" (Benzinger, Hebräische Archäologie). Euthy. reports to the same effect as to his own time: many eat it in those parts παραφρυγμένον (pickled). Not pleasant food, palatable only to keen hunger. If we may trust Epiphanius, the Ebionites, in their aversion to animal food, grudged the Baptist even that poor diet, and restricted him to cakes made with honey (ἀρνιδίας ἐν μαλέσι), or to honey alone. Vida Nicholas's Gospel according to the Hebrews, p. 34, and the notes there. Also Suicer's Thessauras, sub. v. ἀρνίον.—μελὶ ἄρνιον. Opinion is divided between ἔστι honey and ἔστι honey, i.e., honey made by wild bees in trees or holes in the rocks, or a liquid exuding from palms and fig trees. (On this also consult Nicholson, Gospel of Hebrews, p. 35.) Both were used as food, but our decision should incline to
vegetable honey, on the simple ground that it was the poorer food. Bee honey was a delicacy, and is associated with milk in Scripture in descriptions of a fertile land. The vegetable product would suit best John's taste and state. "Habitat or solitudinis congruum est, non delicia ciborum, sed necessitatem humanae carnis explore." Jerome.

Vv. 5-6. Effects of John's preaching. Remarkable by his appearance, his message, and his moral intensity, John made a great impression. They took him for a prophet, and a prophet was a novelty in those days. His message appealed to the common Messianic hope, and proclaimed fulfilment to be at hand.—Τοῖς, then, general note of time, frequent in this Gospel—ἐξετασμένοι imperfect, denoting continued action. The movement of course was gradual. It began on a small scale and steadily grew till it reached colossal dimensions. Each evangelist, in his own way, bears witness to this. Luke speaks of crowds (iii. 7), Mark and Matthew give graphic particulars, similar, but in diverse order. "All Judea and all the Jerusalemites," says Mark. Jerusalem and Judea form the eastern country. Matthew. The historical order was probably the reverse of that in Matthew's narrative. First came those from the surrounding country—people living near the Jordan, on either side, in what is now called El. Ghur. Then the movement extended in widening circles into Judea. Finally it affected conservative, disdainful Jerusalem, slow to be touched by new popular influences—Ἰερουσαλήμ, the Greek form here as in ii. 3, and generally in this Gospel. It is not said all Jerusalem, as in Mark. The remarkable thing is that any came from that quarter. Standing first, and without the "all," the reference means even Jerusalem. The ἀντις in the other two clauses is of course an exaggeration. It implies, not that every human being went to the Jordan, but that the movement was general. The evangelist expresses himself just as we should do in a similar case. Πάντες with the article means "the whole," without "every".—Ver. 6. καὶ ἐξετασμένος, the imperfect again. They were baptised as they came—ἐν τῇ ἄλογῳ πτωμα. The word πτωμα, omitted in T. R., by all means to be retained. Dull prosaic scribes might deem it superfluous, as all men knew the Jordan was a river, but there is a touch of nature in it which helps us to call up the scene.—ἐν τῇ ἄλογῳ, by him, the one man. John would not want occupation, baptising such a crowd, one by one.—ἐξετασμένοι: confession was involved in the act of submitting to baptism at the hands of one whose preaching had for its burden, Repent. But there was explicit confession, frank, full (ἐκ intensifies), on the part of guilt-burdened men and women glad to get relief so. General or special confession? Probably both, now one, now the other, according to idiosyncrasy and mood. Confession was not exacted as a condi tens qua non of baptism, but voluntary. The participle means while confessing; not, provided they confessed. This confession of sins by individuals was a new thing in Israel. There was a collective confession on the great day of atonement, and individual confession in certain specified cases (Numb. v. 7), but no great spontaneous self-unburdenment of penitent souls—every man apart. It must have been a stirring sight.

Vv. 7-10. Words of rebuke and warning to unwelcome visitors (Luke iii. 7-9). Ver. 7. οὕτως ἐκεῖνοι, etc.: among those who visited the Jordan were some, not a few, many indeed (πολλοὶ) of the
PHARISEES and Sadducees. The first mention of classes of whom the Gospels have much to say, the former being the legal precisionists, virtuosi in religion, the latter the men of affairs and of the world, largely belonging to the sacerdotal class (consult Wellhausen, Die Phariser und die Sadduzäer). Their presence at the scene of John's ministry is credible. Drawn doubtless by mixed motives, as persons of their type generally are, moral simplicity not being in their line; partly curious, partly fascinated, partly come to spy; in an ambiguous state of mind, neither decidedly in sympathy nor pronouncedly hostile. In any case they cannot remain indifferent to a movement so deep and widespread. So here they are; coming to (ἐρχομένων) John's baptism, not to be baptised, nor coming against, as some (Olearius, e.g.) have thought, as if to put the movement down, but coming to witness the strange, novel phenomenon, and form their impressions. John did not make them welcome. His spirit was troubled by their presence. Simple, sensitive, moral natures instinctively shrink from the presence of insincerity, duplicity and craftiness.—ἐρχομένων: how did they come under his observation? By their position in the crowd or on the outskirts of it, and by their aspect? How did he identify them as Pharisees and Sadducees? How did the hermit of the desert know there were such people? It was John's business to know all the men of his time. These were the matters in which he took supreme interest, and he doubtless had means of informing himself, and took pains to do so. It may be assumed that he knew well about the Essenes living in his neighbourhood, by the shores of the Dead Sea, somewhat after his own fashion, and about the other two classes, whose haunts were the great centres of population. There might be Essenes too in the crowd, though not singled out, the history otherwise having no occasion to mention them.—μέσημας εὐθέως: sudden, irrepressible outburst of intense moral aversion. Why vipers? The ancient and medieval interpreters (Chrysos., Aug., Theophy., Euthy.) had recourse in explanation to the fable of the young viper eating its mother's womb. The term ought rather to be connected with the following words about fleeing from the coming wrath. The serpents of all sorts lurking in the fields flee when the stubble is set on fire in harvest in preparation for the winter sowing. The Baptist likens the Pharisees and Sadducees to these serpents fleeing for their lives (Furrer in Zeitschrift für Missionskunde und Religionswissenschaft, 1890). Professor G. A. Smith, Historical Geography of the Holy Land, p. 495, suggests the fires among the dry scrub, in the higher stretches of the Jordan valley, chasing before them the scorpions and vipers, as the basis of the metaphor. There is grim humour as well as wrath in the similitude. The emphasis is not on vipers but on fleeing. But the felicity of the comparison lies in the fact that the epithet suits very well. It implies that the Pharisees and Sadducees are fleeing. They have caught slightly the infection of repentance; yet John does not believe in its depth or permanence.—τις ἔρχομεν: there is surprise in the question. Can it be possible that even you have learned to fear the approaching crisis? Most unlikely scholars.—φυγεῖν ἑκεῖ: pregnant for "flee and escape from" (De Wette). The aorist points to possibility, going with verbs of hoping and praying in this sense (cf. 1 Peter 3: 14). The implied thought is that it is not possible = who encouraged you to expect deliverance? The aorist further signifies a momentary act: now or never.—τῆς μαθήματος ἀργίης, the day of wrath impending, precluding the advent of the Kingdom. The idea of wrath was prominent in John's mind: the coming of the Kingdom an awful affair; Messiah's work largely a work of judgment. But he rose above ordinary Jewish ideas in this: they conceived of the judgment as concerning the heathen peoples; he thought of it as concerning the godless in Israel—Ver. 8. ωδε ἰησοῦς
If, then, ye are in earnest about escape, produce fruit worthy of repentance; repentance means more than confession and being baptised." That remark might be applied to all that came, but it contained an innuendo in reference to the Pharisees and Sadducees that they were insincere even now. Honest repentance carries amendment along with it. Amendment is not expected in this case because the repentance is disbelieved in.—κατέργασις, collective, as in Gal. v. 22, fruit; the reading in T. R. is probably borrowed from Luke iii. 8. The singular is intrinsically the better word in addressing Pharisees who did good actions, but were not good. Yet John seems to have inculcated reformation in detail (Luke iii. 10-14). It was Jesus who proclaimed the inwardness of true morality. Fruit: the figure suggests that conduct is the outcome of essential character. Any one can do (φονιεύεται, wide Gen. i. 11) acts externally good, but only a good man can grow a crop of right acts and habits.

Vv. 9-10. Protest and warning. καὶ ἐὰν δῶθην... with Abraham: the meaning is plain. John does not imagine that having Abraham for father will do instead of repentance—that all children of Abraham are safe whatever betide. But the expression is peculiar: do not think to say within yourselves. One would have expected either: do not think within yourselves, or, do not say, etc. Wetstein renders: "ne animum inducite sic apud vosmet cognite," with whom Fritzsche substantially agrees = do not presume to say, cf. Phil. iii. 4.—πατέρας, father, in the emphatic position = we have as father, Abraham; it is enough to be his children: the secret thought of all unspiritual Jews, Abraham's children only in the flesh. It is probable that these words (vv. 9, 10) were spoken at a different time, and to a different audience, not merely to Pharisees and Sadducees, but to the people generally. Vv. 7-12 are a very condensed summary of a preaching ministry in which many weighty words were spoken (Luke iii. 18), these being selected as most representative and most relevant to the purpose of the evangelist. Vv. 7-8 contain a word for the leaders of the people; vv. 9-10 for the people at large; vv. 11-12 a word to inquirers about the Baptist's own relation to the Messiah.—Ver. 10. ἐνίωθεν ἐστὶν ἡ διάθεσις... κατὰ: judgment is at hand. The axe has been placed (κείμενος = perfect passive of κείμαι) at the root of the tree to lay it low as hopelessly barren. This is the doom of every non-productive fruit tree.—ἐκκοσμεῖται, the present tense, expressive not so much of the usual practice (Fritzsche) as of the near inevitable event.—μὴ ποιῶν κατέργασιν καλὸν: in case it produce not (μὴ conditional) good fruit, not merely fruit of some kind, degenerate, unpalatable.—καὶ πῦρ βάλλεται, useless for any other purpose except to be firewood, as the wood of many fruit trees is.

Vv. 11, 12. John defines his relation to the Messiah (Mark i. 7-8; Luke iii. 15-17). This prophetic word would have come late in the day when the Baptist's fame was at its height, and men began to think it possible he might be the Christ (Luke iii. 15). His answer to inquiries plainly expressed or hinted was unhesitating. No, not the Christ, there is a Coming One. He will be here soon. I have my place, important in its own way, but quite secondary and subordinate. John frankly accepts the position of herald and forerunner, assigned to him in ver. 3 by the citation of the prophetic oracle, as descriptive of his ministry.—ἔστω μὲν, etc. ἡς emphatic, but with the emphasis of subordination. My function is to baptise with water, symbolic of repentance.—ὁ δὲ οἱ ἐκκοσμεῖται. He who is just coming (present participle). How did John know
the Messiah was just coming? It was an inference from his judgment on the moral condition of the time. Messiah was needed; His work was ready for Him; the nation was ripe for judgment. Judgment observe, for that was the function uppermost in his mind in connection with the Messianic advent. These two verses give us John’s idea of the Christ, based not on personal knowledge, but on religious preconceptions. It differs widely from the reality. John can have known little of Jesus on the outer side, but he knew less of His spirit. We cannot understand his words unless we grasp this fact. Note the attributes he ascribes to the Coming One. The main one is strength—λέγεται fully unfolded in the sequel. Along with strength goes dignity—οὐδὲ ὁ σῶλον, etc. He is so great, august a personage, I am not fit to be His slave, carrying to and from Him for and after use His sandals (a slave’s office in Judaea, Greece and Rome). An Oriental magnificatiexaggeration—andαὐτὸς ἀπὸ βασιλείας, returns to the Power of Messiah, as revealed in His work, which is described as a baptism, the better to bring out the contrast between Him and His humble forerunner.—ἐν πνεύματι δύναμιν πυρ. Notable here are the words, ἐν πνεύματι. They must be interpreted in harmony with John’s standpoint, not from what Jesus proved to be, or in the light of St. Paul’s teaching on the Holy Spirit, as the immanent source of sanctification. The whole baptism of the Messiah, as John conceived it, is a baptism of judgment. It has been generally supposed that the Holy Spirit here represents the grace of Christ, and the fire His judicial function; not a few holding that even the fire is gracious as purifying. I think that the grace of the Christ is not here at all. The πνεῦμα δύνας is a stormy wind of judgment; holy, as sweeping away all that is light and worthless in the nation (which, after the O. T. manner, is conceived of as the subject of Messiah’s action, rather than the individual). The fire destroys what the wind leaves. John, with his wild prophetic imagination, thinks of three elements as representing the functions of himself and of Messiah: water, wind, fire. He baptizes with water, in the running stream of Jordan, to embody the only way of escape, amendment. Messiah will baptize with wind and fire, sweeping away and consuming the impenitent, leaving behind only the righteous. Possibly John had in mind the prophetic word, “our iniquities, like the wind, have taken us away,” Is. lxv. 6; or, as Furrer, who I find also takes πνεῦμα in the sense of “wind,” suggests, the “wind of God,” spoken of in Is. xi. 7: the strong east wind which blights the grass (Zeitschrift für Missionskunde und Religionswissenschaft, 1890). Carr, Cambridge G. T., inclines to the same view, and refers to Is. xli. 16: “Thou shalt fan them, and the wind shall carry them away.”

Ver. 12. This ver. follows up ver. 11, and explains the judicial action emblazoned by wind and fire.—οὐ νῦν αὐτὸν ἤν. The construction is variously understood. Grotius takes it as a Hebraism for οὐδὲ ὁ σῶλον τοῦ πνεύματι. Fritzsche takes ὁ τ. χειρὶ αὐτοῦ as epxegetical, and renders: “whose will be the fan, τίς, in His hand”; Meyer and Weiss take οὐδὲ as assigning a reason: “He (οὐδὲ of ver. 11) whose fan is in hand and who is therefore able to perform the part assigned to Him.” Then follows an explanation of the modus operandi.—διακαθιστάται from διακαθιστᾶται, late for classic διακαθιστᾶται. The idea is: He baptizes with fire, as John wills it, mixed with the chaff, that the wind may blow the chaff away; He will then collect the straw, δύνας (in Greek writers usually plural τα δύνα, vide Grimm), and burn it with fire, and collect the wheat lying on the threshing floor and store it in His granary. So shall He thoroughly (σα ν intensifying) cleanse His floor. And the sweeping wind and the consuming fire are the emblems and measure of His power; stronger than mine, as the tempest and the devastating flames are mightier than the stream which I use as my element.—δαίμων, a place
13. Ὅτε παραγίνεται ὁ ἤσχος ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλαής ἐπὶ τὸν ἂντοῦ γιὰ τὸν ἰδίῳ, τὸν βαπτισθῆναι ὢν ἀντὶ τὴν ἰδίαν ἐντοῦ ὀψω ἀντὶ τὴν ἤσχον ἀντὶ τὴν ἰδίαν. 
14. Ὅτε παραγίνεται ὁ ἤσχος ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλαής ἐντοῦ ἰδίῳ, τὸν βαπτισθῆναι ὢν ἀντὶ τὴν ἰδίαν ἐντοῦ ἀντὶ τὴν ἰδίαν. 
15. Ἄποκρίνεσθαι ὁ ἤσχος ἀπὸ τὴν ἰδίαν ἐντοῦ ἀντὶ τὴν ἰδίαν ἐντοῦ ἀντὶ τὴν ἰδίαν. 
16. Ἀποκρίνεσθαι ὁ ἤσχος ἀπὸ τὴν ἰδίαν ἐντοῦ ἀντὶ τὴν ἰδίαν ἐντοῦ ἀντὶ τὴν ἰδίαν.

13. John refuses. It is instructive to compare the three synoptical evangelists in their respective narratives of the baptism of Jesus. Mark (iii. 9) simply states the fact. Matthew reports perplexities created by the desire of Jesus to be baptised in the mind of John, and presumably in the minds of Christians for whom he wrote. Luke (iii. 21) passes lightly over the event in a participial clause, as if conscious that he was on delicate ground. The three narratives exhibit successive phases of opinion on the subject, a fact not without bearing on the dates and relations of the three Gospels. Matthew represents the intermediate phase. His account is intrinsically credible.—Ver. 14. 

14-15. John refuses. It is instructive to compare the three synoptical evangelists in their respective narratives of the baptism of Jesus. Mark (i. 9) simply states the fact. Matthew reports perplexities created by the desire of Jesus to be baptised in the mind of John, and presumably in the minds of Christians for whom he wrote. Luke (iii. 21) passes lightly over the event in a participial clause, as if conscious that he was on delicate ground. The three narratives exhibit successive phases of opinion on the subject, a fact not without bearing on the dates and relations of the three Gospels. Matthew represents the intermediate phase. His account is intrinsically credible.—Ver. 14.

These words at once suggest a contrast between Jesus and the Pharisees and Sadducees. They came to the Jordan, and entered into personal friendly relations with him (vide John i. 1, πρὸς τὸν Θεόν), in order to be baptised by him (genitive of the infinitive expressing purpose). Jesus comes thoroughly in sympathy with John's movement, sharing his passion for righteousness, fully appreciating the symbolic significance of his baptism, and not only willing, but eager to be baptised; the Jordan in His mind from the day He leaves home. A very different person this from the leaders of Israel, Pharisaical or Sadduceical. But the sequel suggests a contrast also between Him and John himself.
Himself, a brother of the sinful. In the light of this contrast we are to understand the baptism of Jesus. Many explanations of it have been given (for these, *vide Meyer*), mostly theological. One of the most feasible is that of Weiss (Matt.-Evan.), that in accordance with the symbolic significance of the rite as denoting death to an old life and rising to a new, Jesus came to be baptised in the sense of dying to the old natural relations to parents, neighbours, and earthly calling, and devoting Himself henceforth to His public Messianic vocation. The true solution is to be found in the ethical sphere, in the sympathetic spirit of Jesus which made Him maintain an attitude of solidarity with the sinful rather than assume the position of critic and judge. It was impossible for such an one, on the ground of being the Messiah, or even on the ground of sinlessness, to treat John's baptism as a thing with which He had no concern. Love, not a sense of dignity or of moral faultlessness, must guide His action. Can we conceive sinlessness being so conscious of itself, and adopting as its policy aloofness from sinners? Christ's baptism might create misunderstanding, just as His associating with publicans and sinners did. He was content to be misunderstood.

Ver. 15. The reasoning with which Jesus replies to John's scruples is characteristic. His answer is gentle, respectful, dignified, simple, yet deep.— *Ades ἀπει—* deferential, half-yielding, yet strong in its very gentleness. Does ἀπει imply a tacit acceptance of the high position assigned to Him by John (Weiss-Meyer)? We may read that into it, but I doubt if the suggestion does justice to the feeling of Jesus.— *εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ* where the same word is used in reference to the relation of God to Christ's sufferings. “It became Him.”—πνευματικόν: this means more than meets the ear, more than could be explained to a man like John. The Baptist had a passion for righteousness, yet his conception of righteousness was narrow, severe, legal. Their ideas of righteousness separated the two men by a wide gulf which is covered over by this general, almost evasive, phrase: all righteousness or every form of it. The special form meant is not the mere compliance with the ordinance of baptism as administered by an accredited servant of God, but something far deeper, which the new era will unfold. John did not understand that love is the fulfilling of the law. But he saw that under the mild words of Jesus a very earnest purpose was hid. So at length he yielded—τούτο ἄφησεν αὐτῷ.
all events is real: the thoughts reflected and symbolised in the vision and the voice.

Ver. 16. evovv may be connected with aorist, or with ἐπιθυμηθην compound clause by a hyperbaton (Grotius). It is commonly and correctly taken along with ἀνέφερεν. But why say straightway ascended? Euthy. gives an answer which may be quoted for its quaintness: "They say that John had the people under water up to the neck till they had confessed their sins, and that Jesus having none to confess tarried not in the river". Fritzsch. laughs at the good monk, but Schanz substantially adopts his view. There might be worse explanations.—καὶ ἦσαν ἄνεφερθον, etc. When Jesus ascended out of the water the heavens opened and He (Jesus) saw the spirit of God descending as a dove coming upon Him. According to many interpreters, including many of the Fathers, the occurrence was of the nature of a vision, the appearance of a dove coming out of the heavens. διανεύρεται συν ἐπιπέσω ὅτι ἐν φωτεινῷ περιστεράς, ἆναυγείου περιστεράς—Chrys. Dove-like: what was the point of comparison? Swift movement, according to some; soft gentle movement as it sinks down on its place of rest, according to others. The Fathers insisted on the qualities of the dove. Euthy. sums up these thus: Φωτεινῷν γάρ ἔτει καὶ ἀνεφέρεται· ἀνεφέρεται γὰρ τῶν κοσμίων ὑπνομένων, καὶ ἐναυγεῖ ἄνεφων τοις ἀνεφέροντας προσεῖται. Kaβ καθαρότατον ἑαυτ ἔτει, καὶ τῇ εὐσεβείᾳ χαιρεί. Whether the dove possesses all these qualities—philanthropy, patient endurance of wrong, coming lovingly to those who have robbed it of its young, purity, delight in sweet smells—I know not; but I appreciate the insight into the spirit of Christ which specifying such particulars in the emblematic significance of the dove implies. What is the O. T. basis of the symbol? Probably Gen. viii. 9, 10. Grotius hints at this without altogether adopting the view. Thus we obtain a contrast between John's conception of the spirit and that of Jesus as reflected in the vision. For John the emblem of the spirit was the stormy wind of judgment; for Jesus the dove with the olive leaf after the judgment by water was past.

Ver. 17. οὐτός ἦν: this is as if addressed to the Baptist; in Mk. i. 9, ὁ ἐφάνετο as if addressed to Jesus.—ἐν τῷ ἐδακνήσα τῷ Ἑβραϊσμῷ: ἡ ὕπομνα ἐδακνήσα, aorist, either to express habitual satisfaction, after the manner of the Gnomic Aorist (vide Hermann's Viper, p. 169), or to denote the inner event—my good pleasurable decided itself once for all for Him. So Schanz; cf. Winer, § 40, 5, on the use of the aorist. εὐδοκοῦν, according to Sturz, De Dialecto Macedonica et Alexandrina, is not Attic but Hellenistic. The voice recalls and in some measure echoes Is. xii. 1, "Behold My servant, I uphold Him; My chosen one, My soul delights in Him. I have put My spirit upon Him." The title "Son" recalls Ps. ii. 7. Taking the vision, the voice, and the baptism together as interpreting the consciousness of Jesus before and at this time, the following inferences are suggested. (1) The mind of Jesus had been exercised in thought upon the Messianic vocation in relation to His own future. (2) The chief Messianic charm appeared to Him to be sympathy, love. (3) His religious attitude towards God was that of a Son towards a Father. (4) It was through the sense of sonship and the intense love to men that was in His heart that He discovered His Messianic vocation. (5) Prophetic texts gave direction to and supplied means of expression for His religious meditations. His mind, like that of John, was full of prophetic utterances, but a different class of oracles had attractions for Him. The spirit of John revolved in images of awe and terror. The gentler spirit of Jesus delighted in words depicting the ideal servant of God as clothed with meekness, patience, wisdom, and love.

CHAPTER IV. THE TEMPTATION, AND THE BEGINNING OF THE GALILEAN MINISTRY. It is in every way credible that the baptism of Jesus with its con-
nected incidents should be followed by a season of moral trial, or, to express it more generally, by a period of retirement for earnest thought on the future career so solemnly inaugurated. Retirement for prayer and meditation was a habit with Jesus, and it was never more likely to be put in practice than now. He had left home under a powerful impulse with the Jordan and baptism in view. The baptism was a decisive act. Whatever more it might mean, it meant farewell to the past life of obscurity and consecration to a new, high, unique vocation. It remained now to realise by reflection what this calling, to which He had been set apart by John and by heavenly omens, involved in idea, execution, and experience. It was a large, deep, difficult subject of study. Under powerful spiritual constraints Jesus had taken a great leap in the dark, if one may dare to say so. What wonder if, in the season of reflection, temptations arose to doubt, shrinking, regret, strong inclination to look back and return to Nazareth?

In this experience Jesus was alone inwardly as well as outwardly. No clear, adequate account could be given of it. It could only be faintly shadowed forth in symbol or in parable. One can understand how in one Gospel (Mk.) no attempt is made to describe the Temptation, but the fact is simply stated. And it is much more important to grasp the fact as a great reality in Christ's inner experience than to maintain anxiously the literal truth of the representation in Matt. and Luke. In the fight of faith and unbelief over the supernatural element in the story all sense of the inward psychological reality may be lost, and nothing remain but an external miraculous, theatrical transaction which utterly fails to impress the lesson that Jesus was veritably tempted as we are, severely and for a length of time, before the opening of His public career, in a representative manner anticipating the experiences of later date. All attempts to dispose summarily of the whole matter by reference to the legend in later Jewish tradition in the case of other religious initiators like Buddha are to be deprecated. Nor should one readily take up with the theory that the detailed account of the Temptation in Matt. and Luke is simply a composition suggested by O. T. parallels or by reflection on the critical points in Christ's subsequent history. (So Holtmann in H. C.) We should rather regard it as having its ultimate source in an attempt by Jesus to convey to His disciples some faint idea of what He had gone through.

**Vv. 1-11.** The Temptation (Mk. i. 12, 13; Luke iv. 1-13). Ver. 1. **Τότε** then, implying close connection with the events recorded in last chapter, especially the descent of the Spirit.—**Διά τοῦ δαίμονος** was led up, into the higher, more solitary region of the wilderness, the haunt of wild beasts (Mk. i. 13) rather than of men.—**ἐν τότε τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ**. The divine Spirit has to do with our darker experiences as well as with our bright, joyous ones. He is with the sons of God in their conflicts with doubt not less than in their moments of noble impulse and heroic resolve. The same Spirit who brought Jesus from Nazareth to the Jordan afterward led Him to the scene of trial. The theory of desertion hinted at by Calvin and adopted by Olshausen is based on a superficial view of religious experience. God's Spirit is never more with a man than in his spiritual struggles. Jesus was mightily impelled by the Spirit at this time (cf. Mk.'s ἐκβάλλει). And as the power exerted was not physical but moral, the fact points to intense mental preoccupation.—**καταθλίψειν, to be tempted**, not necessarily covering the whole experience of those days, but noting a specially important phase: to be tempted *inter alia.*—**διαβάλλω**, a later form for *διαβάλω*, in classic Greek, primary meaning to attempt, to try to do a thing (*sidē for this use* Acts ix. 26, xvi. 7, xxiv. 6); then in an ethical sense common in O. T. and N. T., to try or tempt either with good or with bad intent, associated in some texts (e.g., 2 Cor. xii. 5) with δοκίμασι, kindled in meaning. Note the omission of τού before infinitive.—**ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς διαβάλλεισθαι**, in later Jewish thought the devil is the agent in all temptation with evil design. In the earlier period
the line of separation between the divine and the diabolic was not so carefully defined. In 1 Sam. xxiv. 11 God tempts David to number the people; in 1 Chron. xxi. 1 it is Satan.—Ver. 2. καὶ γνωρίστε. The fasting was spontaneous, not ascetic, due to mental preoccupation. In such a place there was no food to be had, but Jesus did not desire it. The aorist implies that a period of fasting preceded the sense of hunger. The period of forty days and nights may be a round number.—ἐν φαντασίᾳ. He at last felt hunger. This verb like διψάω contracts in a rather than ψ in later Greek. Both take an accusative in Matt. v. 6.

Vv. 3-4. First temptation, through hunger. —Ver. 3. προσελθὼν, another of the evangelist’s favourite words, implies that the temptation is conceived by the narrator as approaching outwardly in visible form.—ἐδείκτα ἑαυτῷ: literally “speak in order that”. Some grammarians see in this use of ἑαυτῷ with the subjunctive a progress in the later Macedonian Greek onwards towards modern Greek, in which ἑαυτῷ with subjunctive entirely supersedes the infinitive. Buttmann (Gram, of the N. T.) says that the chief deviation in the N. T. from classic usage is that ἑαυτῷ appears not only after complete predicates, as a statement of design, but after incomplete predicates, supplying their necessary complements (cf. Mk. vi. 25, ix. 30). ἑαυτῷ here may be classed among verbs of commanding which take ἑαυτόν after them.—οἱ λίθοι οὗτον, these stones lying about, hinting at the desert character of the scene.—ἁρπαζἐν, that the rude pieces of stone may be turned miraculously into loaves. Weiss (Meyer) disputes the usual view that the temptation of Jesus lay in the suggestion to use His miraculous power in His own behoof. He had no such power, and if He had, why should He not use it for His own benefit as well as other men’s? He could only call into play by faith the power of God, and the temptation lay in the suggestion that His Messianic vocation was doubtful if God did not come to His help at this time. This seems a refinement. Hunger represents human wants, and the question was: whether Sonship was to mean exemption from these, or loyal acceptance of them as part of Messiah’s experience. At bottom the issue raised was selfishness or self-sacrifice. Selfishness would have been shown either in the use of personal power or in the wish that God would use it.—Ver. 4. ἐν δὲ ἓν ἐποίησε ἑαυτῷ: Christ’s reply in this case as in the others is taken from Deuteronomy (viii. 3, Sept.), which seems to have been one of His favourite books. Its humane spirit with laws even for protecting the animals would commend it to His mind. The word quoted means, man is to live a life of faith in and dependence on God. Bread is a mere detail in that life, not necessary though usually given, and sure to be supplied somehow, as long as it is desirable. Ζήτω ἑαυτῷ is unusual, but good Greek (De Wette).

Vv. 5-7. Second temptation. τότε παραλαμβάνει... τοῦ λαοῦ: τότε has the force of “next,” and implies a closer order of sequence than Luke’s καὶ (v. 5). παραλαμβάνει, historical present with dramatic effect; seizes hold of Him and carries Him to.—ἡ δύναμις πολύς: Jerusalem so named as if with affection (vide v. 35 and especially xxvii. 53, where the designation recurs).—το
here and the temple bearing the name of "the winglet," and overhanging a precipice. Commentators busy themselves discussing what precisely and where it was.—Ver. 6. βδελε συναντον κατα: This suggestion strongly makes for the symbolic or parabolic nature of the whole representation. The mad proposal could hardly be a temptation to such an one as Jesus, or indeed to any man in his senses. The transit through the air from the desert to the winglet, like that of Ezekiel, carried by a lock of his hair from Babylon to Jerusalem, must have been "in the visions of God" (Ezek. viii. 3), and the suggestion to cast Himself down a parabolic hint at a class of temptations, as the excurses in the parable of the supper (Lk. xiv. 16) simply represent the category of preoccupation. What is the class represented? Not temptations through vanity or presumption, but rather to reckless escape from desperate situations. The second temptation, like the first, belongs to the category of need. The Satanic suggestion is that there can be no sonship where there are such inextricable situations, in proof of which the Psalter is quoted (Ps. xci. 11, 12).—γεγραπται, it stands written, not precisely as Satan quotes it, the clause του διαβόλου αν εν πατερα του διων σου being omitted. On this account many commentators charge Satan with mutilating and falsifying Scripture.—Ver. 7. Jesus replies by another quotation from Deut. (vi. 16).—σωλην, on the other hand, not contradicting but qualifying: "Scriptura per scripturam interpretanda et concilianda," Bengel. The reference is to the incident at Rephidim (Ex. xvii. 1-7), where the people virtually charged God with bringing them out of Egypt to perish with thirst, the scene of this petulant outburst receiving the commemorative name of Massah and Meribah because they tempted Jehovah, saying: "Is Jehovah among us or not?" An analogous situation in the life of Jesus may be found in Gethsemane, where He did not complain or tempt, but uttered the submissive, "If it be possible." The leap down at that crisis would have consisted in seeking escape from the cross at the cost of duty. The physical fall from the pinnacle is an emblem of a moral fall. Before passing from this temptation I note that the hypothesis that it was an appeal to vanity presupposes a crowd at the foot to witness the performance, of which there is no mention.

Vv. 8-10. Third temptation. εις δροσο υψηλον λαιν, a mountain high enough for the purpose. There is no such mountain in the world, not even in the highest ranges, "not to be sought for in terrestrial geography," says De Wette. The vision of all the kingdoms and their glory was not physical.—τον κοσμου. What world? Palestine merely, or all the world, Palestine excepted? or all the world, Palestine included? All these alternatives have been supported. The last is the most likely. The second harmonises with the ideas of contemporary Jews, who regarded the heathen world as distinct from the Holy Land, as belonging to the devil. The tempter points in the direction of a universal Messianic empire, and claims power to give effect to the dazzling prospect.—Ver. 9. ένεν πανω προς κυνηγησις μου. This is the condition, homage to Satan as the superior. A naive suggestion, but pointing to a subtle form of temptation, to which all ambitious, self-seeking men succumb, that of gaining power by compromise with evil. The danger is greatest when the end is good. "The end sanctifies the means." Nowhere is homage to Satan more common than in connection with sacred causes, the interests of truth, righteousness, and God. Nothing tests purity of motive so thoroughly as tempta-
6–13. 

ΔΕΙΚΓΕΛΙΟΝ

λέγω 1 αὐτῷ, 9. Ἕταν πάντα σου ἡ δόσις, ἐὰν περὶ προσκυνήσεως ἑαυτοῦ ἐν τῇ σεβασμῷ τῶν ἡσυχίων ὑμῶν. 10. ὅτε λέγεις αὐτῷ ὅτι ἐστίς ἡ σοφία, ἡ ἱστορία ἡ ἑγγύταται, διὸ ἐγὼ ἔγραψα· ἄγγελοι, καὶ προσκυνήσεις, καὶ αὐτῷ μόνῳ λατρεύσεις, καὶ σοὶ δεικνύσων αὐτῷ.

12. ἈΚΟΥΣΕΣ δή ὁ ἤχος, ὅτι ἐνώπιον παρεπαθῇ, ἀνεχθῆς εἰς τὴν γενεάν ἡ Ναζαρέτ. 13. καὶ ὁ καταλιγὼν τὴν Ναζαρέτ, ἑδύνης λέγει τῇ αὐτῇ, ἠρμὴν ἐν τῇ γενεάς εἰς τὴν γενεάν ἡ Ναζαρέτ, ἐν ὁδίον πρὸς Καπernaüm.

1. ΝΒCDZ have αὐτῷ (most mod. edd.).

2. ἔτοι σου τῆς ΝΒBCZ with several cursives.

3. Some MSS. (DLZ) insert συντομως μνών, obviously imported from xvi. 23.

4. Ο. omit ΝΒCDZ ; probably the insertion is due to ver. 12 commencing a lesson in Lectionaries.

5. This name is spelt καφαρ in the older MSS. (ΝΒDZ), which is adopted throughout by W.H.

6. Ν世代 have αὐτῷ (most mod. edd.).

7. ἔτοι σου τῆς ΝΒBCZ with several cursives.

8. Some MSS. (DLZ) insert συντομως μνών, obviously imported from xvi. 23.

9. Ο. omit ΝΒCDZ ; probably the insertion is due to ver. 12 commencing a lesson in Lectionaries.

10. This name is spelt καφαρ in the older MSS. (ΝΒDZ), which is adopted throughout by W.H.

11. Ν世代 have αὐτῷ (most mod. edd.).

12. ἄρα ἡ σοφία μοι καθηγούμεν ἐν τῇ γενεάς. 13. ἦν δὴ ἡ σοφία τῆς χριστιανικῆς εἰς τὴν γενεάν τῆς τῶν Ναζαρηνῶν εἰς τὴν γενεάν τῆς Ναζαρέτ. Προσκυνήσεις ἐν τῇ γενεάς εἰς τὴν γενεάν τῆς Ναζαρέτ, καὶ ἵππος ἐν τῇ γενεάς εἰς τὴν γενεάν τῆς Ναζαρέτ.

1. In the older MSS. (ΝΒDZ), which is adopted throughout by W.H.

2. In the older MSS. (ΝΒDZ), which is adopted throughout by W.H.

3. In the older MSS. (ΝΒDZ), which is adopted throughout by W.H.

4. In the older MSS. (ΝΒDZ), which is adopted throughout by W.H.

5. In the older MSS. (ΝΒDZ), which is adopted throughout by W.H.

6. In the older MSS. (ΝΒDZ), which is adopted throughout by W.H.

7. In the older MSS. (ΝΒDZ), which is adopted throughout by W.H.

8. In the older MSS. (ΝΒDZ), which is adopted throughout by W.H.

9. In the older MSS. (ΝΒDZ), which is adopted throughout by W.H.

10. In the older MSS. (ΝΒDZ), which is adopted throughout by W.H.

11. Ver. 11. τοῦτο ἐδύνατον: Then, when the peremptory ὅτι had been spoken.

Nothing was to be made of one who would not do evil that good might come. —καὶ ἐδύνατο δὲ γίγνεσθαι. The angels were ministering to Him with food, presumably, in the view of the evangelist. It might be taken in a wider sense as signifying that angels ministered constantly to one who had decidedly chosen the path of obedience in preference to that of self-pleasing.

Vv. 12–25. Beginnings of the Galilean ministry (Mk. i. 14, 15; Lk. iv. 14, 15). 12. A few rapid strokes the evangelist describes the opening of the Messianic work of Jesus in Galilee. He has in view the great Sermon on the Mount, and the group of wonderful deeds he means thereafter to report, and he gives first a summary description of Christ’s varied activities by way of introduction.

Vv. 12, 13. ἡ Ναζαρέτ ἡ Ἀλαμαῖν ἡ ἐν ὁδίον πρὸς Καπernaüm: note of time. Jesus returned to Capernaum on hearing that John was delivered, i.e., in the providence of God, into the hands of his enemies. Further particulars as to this are given in chapter xiv. Christ’s ministry in Galilee began when the Baptist’s came to an end: how long after the baptism and temptation not indicated. Weiss (Meyer) thinks that in the view of the evangelist it was immediately after, and that the reference to John’s imprisonment is meant simply to explain the choice of Galilee as the sphere of labour.—Ver. 13. Ναζαρέτ. Jesus naturally went to Nazareth first, but He did not tarry there.—καθηγούμεν ἐν τῇ Καπernaüm. He went to settle (as in ii. 23) in Capernaum. This migration to
Capernaum is not formally noted in the other Gospels, but Capernaum appears in all the synoptists as the main centre of Christ’s Galilean ministry. — τὴν παρασαλαβοστάνων, etc.: sufficiently defined by these words, “on the sea (of Galilee), on the confines of Zebulun and Naphthali”. Well known then, now of doubtful situation, being no longer in existence. Tel Hüm and Khan Minyeh compete for the honour of the site. The evangelist describes the position not to satisfy the curiosity of geographers, but to pave the way for another prophetic reference.

Vv. 14-16. Jesus chose Capernaum as best suited for His work. There He was in the heart of the world, in a busy town, and near others, on the shore of a sea that was full of fish, and on a great international highway. But the evangelist finds in the choice a fulfilment of prophecy — ἤν πληρωθῇ. The oracle is reproduced from Isa. viii. 22, ix. 1, freely following the original with glances at the Sept. The style is very laconic: land of Zebulun and land of Naphthali, way of the sea (ὁδὸν absolute accusative for ἄπειρον = versus, vide Winer, § 23),

Galilee of the Gentiles, a place where races mix, a border population. The clause preceding, “beyond Jordan,” is not omitted, because it is viewed as a reference to Perea, also a scene of Christ’s ministry. — Ver. 16. ἐν σκοτεινῇ, the darkness referred to, in the view of the evangelist, is probably that caused by the imprisonment of the Baptist (Fritzsche). The consolation comes in the form of a greater light, φῶς μέγα, great, even the greatest. The thought is emphasised by repetition and by enhanced description of the benighted situation of those on whom the light arises: “in the very home and shadow of death”; highly graphic and poetic, not applicable, however, to the cities of the plain more than to other parts of the land; descriptive of misery rather than of sin.

Ver. 17. ἀπὸ τότε ... θηρόον: After settling in Capernaum Jesus began to preach. The phrase ἀπὸ τότε offends in two ways, first as redundant, being implied in ήρξατο (De Wette); next as not classic, being one of the degeneracies of the koine. Phrynichus forbids ἐκ τότε, and instructs to say rather ἐκ ἀκίνητον (Lobeck’s ed., p. 45) — κηρύσσων, the same word as in describing the ministry of the Baptist (iii. 1). And the message is the same — Μετανοεῖτε, etc. “Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.” The same in word but not in thought, as will appear soon. It may seem as if the evangelist meant to represent Jesus as simply taking up and continuing the arrested ministry of the Baptist. So He was in form and to outward appearance, but not in spirit. From the very first, as has been seen even in connection with the baptism, there was a deep-seated difference between the two preachers. Even Euthy. Zig, understood this, monk though he was. Repent, he says, with John meant “in so far as ye have ered” — amendment; with Jesus, “from the old to the new” (ἀπὸ τῆς παλαιᾶς ἐν τῇ καινῆ) = a change from within. For the evangelist this was the absolute beginning of Christ’s
ministry. He knows nothing of an earlier activity.

Vv. 18-22. Call of four disciples. The preceding very general statement is followed by a more specific narrative relating to a very important department of Christ's work, the gathering of disciples. Disciples are referred to in the Sermon on the Mount (v. 1), therefore it is meet that it be shown how Jesus came by them. Here we have simply a sample, a hint at a process always going on, and which had probably advanced a considerable way before the sermon was delivered.—σφηναντας δὲ: δὲ simply introduces a new topic, the time is indefinite. One day when Jesus was walking along the seashore He saw two men, brothers, names given, by occupation fishermen, the main industry of the locality, that tropical sea (500 feet below level of Med. Sea). Meanest, abounding in fish. He saw them, may have seen them before, and they, Him and thought them likely men, and He said to them, ver. 19: Δεῦτε . . . ἀπολύων. From the most critical point of view a genuine saying of Jesus; the first distinctively individual word of the Galilean ministry as recorded by Matthew and Mark. Full of significance as a self-revelation of the speaker. Authoritative yet genial, indicating a poetic idealistic temperament and a tendency to figurative speech; betraying the rudiments of a plan for winning men by select men. Δεῦτε plural form of δεῦσο = δεῦσον τε, δεῦσο being an adverb of place with the force of command, a verb of commanding being understood: here! after me; imperial yet kindly, used again in Matt. 23. 28 with reference to the labouring and heavy-laden. άπειρον and ἀλίεις (= sea-

people) are samples of old poetic words revived and introduced into prose by later Greek writers.—Ver. 20. The effect was immediate: εὐθὺς ἀπελθόντες. This seems surprising, and we naturally postulate previous knowledge in explanation. But all indications point to the uniquely impressive personality of Jesus. John felt it; the audience in the synagogue of Capernaum felt it on the first appearance of Jesus there (Mk. i. 27); the four fishermen felt it.—διήκουσαν, ἀμφιβληστρον in ver. 18. In xiii. 47 occurs a third word for a net, σανγηγια; διήκουν (from διάκινον, to throw) is the general name; ἀμφιβληστρον (ἀμφίβλητα), anything cast around, e.g., a garment, more specifically a net thrown with the hand; σανγηγια, a sweep-net carried out in a boat, then drawn in from the land (side Trench, Synonyms of N. T., § 64).—Ver. 21. ἄλλος δὲ, another pair of brothers, James and John, sons of Zebedee, the four together an important instalment of the twelve. The first pair were casting their nets, the second were mending them, καταρτίζοντες, with their father. —Ver. 22. οἱ δὲ εὐθὺς ἀπελθόντες. They too followed immediately, leaving nets, ship, and father (side Mk. i. 20) behind.

Vv. 23-25. Summary account of the Galilean ministry. A colourless general statement serving as a mere prelude to chapters v.-ix. It points to a ministry in Galilee, varied, extensive, and far-famed, conceived by the evangelist as antecedent to the Sermon on the Mount; not necessarily covering a long period of time, though if the expression “teaching in their synagogues” be pressed it must imply a good many Sabbath days.
The ministry embraced three functions: didaskōn, kerysōn, ἄρταντων (ver. 23), teaching, preaching, healing. Jesus was an evangelist, a master, and a healer of disease. Matt. puts the teaching function first in accordance with the character of his gospel. The first gospel is weak in the evangelistic element compared with the third: διδαχή is more prominent than κήρυξις. The healing function is represented as exercised on a large scale: πάναν νόσον καὶ πάσαν μαλακίαν, every form of disease and ailment. Euthy. Zig. defines νόσος as the chronic subversion of health (ἡ χρόνια παρατροπὴ τῆς τοῦ σώματος ζωῆς), malacia as the weakness in which it begins (ἐρχθὶ χανώνων σώματος, προσέγγισθαι νόσου). The subjects of healing are divided into two classes, ver. 24. They brought to Him πάντας τ. κ. ἡ τοιχία νόσον, all who were afflicted with various diseases (such as fever, leprosy, blindness); also those βασάνους συνεχομένους, seized with diseases of a tormenting nature, of which three classes are named—the καὶ in T. R. before δαμοῦ, is misleading; the following words are epechegetical: δαμούσι ταῦτα, συνεχομένους, ἀρταντικοὺς = demonsiacs, epileptics (their seizures following the phases of the moon), ἔρευνας διὰ καὶ χρόνου ἐν βασάνος πρέπει καὶ νόσον ὅρθος; then an instrument of torture to extract truth; then, as here, tormenting forms of disease.) The fame, ή γὰρ, of such a marvellous ministry naturally spread widely, ἐλευθὺν τῆν Συμβολήν, throughout the whole province to which Palestine belonged, among Gentiles as well as Jews. Crowds gathered around the wonderful Man from all quarters: west, east, north, south; Galilee, Decapolis on the eastern side of the lake, Jerusalem and Judaea, Perea. With every allowance for the exaggeration of a popular account, this speaks to an extraordinary impression.

**Chapters V., VII. The Sermon on the Mount.** This extended utterance of Jesus comes upon us as a surprise. Nothing goes before to prepare us to expect anything so transcendently great. The impression made on the Baptist, the people in Capernaum Synagogue (Mk. 1. 27), and the four fishermen speak to wisdom, power, and personal charm, but not so as to make us take the sermon as a thing of course. Our surprise is all the greater that there is so little antecedent narrative. By an effort of imagination we have to realise that much went before—preaching, teaching, interviews with disciples, conflicts with Pharisees, only once mentioned hitherto (iii. 7), yet here the leading theme of discourse.

The sermon belongs to the didache, not to the kerygma. Jesus is here the Master, not the evangelist. He ascends the hill to get away to the crowds below, and the disciples, now become a considerable band, gather about Him. Others are not excluded, but the μαθηταὶ are the audience proper. The discourse may represent the teaching, not of a single hour of a period of retirement from an exciting, exhausting ministry below, and all over Galilee; rest being sought in variation of work, evangelist and teacher alternately. A better name for these chapters than the Sermon on the Mount, which suggests a concio ad populum, might be The Teaching on the Hill. It may be a combination of several lessons. One very outstanding topic is Pharisaic righteousness. Christ evidently made it His business in one of the hill lessons to define controversially His position in reference to the prevailing type of piety, which we may assume to have been to
V. i—3. ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ

V. 1. ΙΑΩΝ θεος χρυσος και δυνη εις το δρος και καθισαντος αυτοι αντων, προσηληθεν αυτω και δοσα το στομα αυτων, εδιθασεν αυτους, λεγων, τις μακαριοι οι επτωχοι?

Hi omits ερωτος; bracketed as doubtful in W.H.

Him a subject of long and careful study before the opening of His public career. The portions of the discourse which bear on that subject can be picked out, and others not relating thereto eliminated, and we may say if we choose that the resulting body of teaching is the Sermon on the Mount (so Weiss). Perhaps the truth is that these portions formed one of the lessons given to disciples on the hill in their holiday summer school. The Beatitudes might form another, instructions on prayer (vi. 7-15) a third, admonitions against covetousness and care (vi. 19-34) a fourth, and so on. As these chapters stand the various parts cohere and sympathetic wonderfully so as to present the appearance of a unity; but that need not hinder us from regarding the whole as a skilful combination of originally distinct lessons, possessing the generic unity of the Teaching on the Hill. This view I prefer to that which regards the sermon as a compendium of Christ's whole doctrine (De Wette), or the magna charta of the kingdom (Tholuck), though there is a truth in that title, or as an ordination discourse in connection with the setting apart of the Twelve (Ewald), or in its original parts an anti-Pharisaic manifesto (Weiss-Meyer). For comparison of Matthew's version of the discourse with Luke's see notes on Lk. vi. 20-49.

Chap. v. 1-2. Introductory statement by evangelist. Ἰδον δὲ ἔρωμα τῶν δρόμων. Christ ascended the hill, according to some, because there was more room there for the crowd than below. I prefer the view well put by Euthy. Zig.: "He ascended the near hill, to avoid the din of the crowd (δορδοσθε) and to give instruction without distraction; for he passed from the healing of the body to the cure of souls. This was His habit, passing from that to this and from this to that, providing varied benefit." But we must be on our guard against a double misunderstanding that might be suggested by the statement in ver. 1, that Jesus went up to the mountain, as if in ascetic retirement from the world, and addressed Himself henceforth to His disciples, as if they alone were the objects of His care, or to teach them an esoteric doctrine with which the multitude had no concern. Jesus was not monastic in spirit, and He had not two doctrines, one for the many, another for the few, like Buddha. His highest teaching, even the Beatitudes and the beautiful discourse against care, was meant for the million. He taught disciples that they might teach the world and so be its light. For this purpose His disciples came to Him when He sat down (καθισαντος αυτω) taking the teacher's position (cf. Mk. iv. 1, ix. 35, xiii. 3). Lutteroth (Essai d'Interpretation, p. 65) takes καθισαντος as meaning to camp out (camper), to remain for a time, as in Lk. xxiv. 49, Acts xvii. 11.

He, I find, adopts the view I have indicated of the sermon as a summary of all the discourses of Jesus on the hill during a sojourn of some duration. The hill, το δρος, may be most naturally taken to mean the elevated plateau rising above the seashore. It is idle to inquire what particular hill is intended.—Ver. 2. δοθησαν το στομα: solemn description of the beginning of a weighty discourse.—Εἰδονδεικτικον, imperfect, implying continued discourse.

Vv. 3-12. The Beatitudes. Some general observations may helpfully introduce the detailed exegesis of these golden words.

1. They breathe the spirit of the scene. On the mountain tops away from the bustle and the sultry heat of the region below, the air cool, the blue sky overhead, quiet all around, and divine tranquillity within. We are near heaven here.

2. The originality of these sayings has been disputed, especially by modern Jews desirous to credit their Rabbis with such good things. Some of them, e.g., the third, may be found in substance in the Psalter, and possibly many or all of them, even in the Talmud. But what then? They are in the Talmud as a few grains of wheat lost in a vast heap.
of chaff. The originality of Jesus lies in putting the due value on these thoughts, collecting them, and making them as prominent as the Ten Commandments. No greater service can be rendered to mankind than to rescue from obscurity neglected moral commonplace.

3. The existence of another version of the discourse (in Lk.), with varying forms of the sayings, has raised a question as to the original form. Did Christ, e.g., say "Blessed the poor" (Lk.) or "Blessed the poor in spirit" (Matt.)? This raises a larger question as to the manner of Christ's teaching on the hill. Suppose one day in a week of instruction was devoted to the subject of happiness, its conditions, and heirs, many things might be said on each leading proposition. The theme would be announced, then accompanied with expansions. A modern biographer would have prefaced a discourse like this with an introductory account of the Teacher's method. There is no such account in the Gospels, but there are incidental notices from which we can learn somewhat. The disciples asked questions and the Master answered them. Jesus explained some of His parables to the twelve. From certain parts of His teaching, as reported, it appears that He not only uttered great thoughts in aphoristic form, but occasionally enlarged. The Sermon on the Mount contains at least two instances of such enlargement. The thesis, "I am not come to destroy but to fulfill" (ver. 17), is copiously illustrated (vv. 21-48). The counsel against care, which as a thesis might be stated thus: "Blessed are the care-free," is amply expanded (vv. 25-34). Even in one of the Beatitudes we find traces of explanatory enlargement; in the last, "Blessed are the persecuted.". It is perhaps the most startling of all the paradoxes, and would need enlargement greatly, and some parts of the expansion have been preserved (vv. 10-12). On this view both forms of the first Beatitude might be authentic, the one as theme, the other as comment. The theme would always be put in the fewest possible words; the first Beatitude there-

---

1 The 2nd and 3rd Beatitudes (vv. 4, 5) are transposed in D, most old Latin texts, and in Syr. Cur. Tisch. adopts this order.

4. Each Beatitude has a reason annexed, that of the first being "for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." They vary in the different Beatitudes as reported. It is conceivable that in the original themes the reason annexed to the first was common to them all. It was understood to be repeated like the refrain of a song, or like the words, "him do I call a Brahmana," annexed to many of the moral sentences in the Footsteps of the Law in the Buddhist Canon. "He who, when assailed, does not resist, but speaks mildly to his tormentors—him do I call a Brahmana." So "Blessed the poor, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven"; "blessed they who mourn, for," etc.; "blessed the meek, the hungry, for," etc. The actual reasons annexed, when they vary from the refrain, are to be viewed as explanatory comments.

5. It has been maintained that only certain of the Beatitudes belong to the authentic discourse on the mount, the rest possibly based on true logia of Jesus spoken at another time, being added by the evangelist, true to his habit of massing the teaching of Jesus in topical groups. This is the view of Weiss (in Matt. Evan., and in Meyer). He thinks only three are authentic—the first, third, and fourth—all pointing to the righteousness of the kingdom as the summum bonum: the first to righteousness as not yet possessed; the second to the want as a cause of sorrow; the third to righteousness as an object of desire. This view goes with the theory that Christ's discourse on the hill had reference exclusively to the nature of true and false righteousness.

6. A final, much less important ques-
tion in reference to the Beatitudes is that which relates to their number. One would say at a first glance eight, counting ver. 9 as one, vv. 11, 12 being an enlargement. The traditional number, however, is seven—vv. 10, 12 being regarded as a transition to a new topic. This seems arbitrary. Delitzsch, anxious to establish an analogy with the Decalogue, makes out ten—seven from ver. 3 to ver. 9, ver. 10 one, ver. 11 one, and ver. 12, though lacking the παράδος, the tenth; its claim resting on the exulting words, χαίρετε καὶ ἀγαλλίασθε. This savours of Rabbinical pedantry.

Ver. 3. παράδος. This is one of the words which have been transformed and ennobled by N. T. use; by association, as in the Beatitudes, with unusual conditions, accounted by the world miserable, or with rare and difficult conduct, e.g., in John xiii. 17, "if ye know these things, happy (παράδος) are ye if ye do them". Notable in this connection is the expression in 1 Tim. i. 11, "The Gospel of the glory of the happy God". The implied truth is that the happiness of the Christian God consists in being a Redeemer, bearing the burden of the world's sin and misery. How different from the Epicurean idea of God! Our word "blessed" represents the new conception of felicity.—οἱ πτωχοὶ: πτωχός in Sept. stands for ἄβαρος Ps. cix. 16, or ἄρσις Ps. xl. 18: the poor, taken even in the most abrupt sense, mendici, Tertull. adv. Mar. iv. 14. πτωχός and πτέρνη originally differed, the latter meaning poor as opposed to rich, the former destitute. But in Biblical Greek πτωχός, πτηνής, πτηνος, πτενοι are used indiscriminately for the same class, the poor of an oppressed country. Vide Hatch, Essays on Biblical Greek, p. 75. The term is used here in a pregnant sense, absolute and unqualified at least to begin with; qualifications come after. From πτωχός, to cower in dispiritment and fear, always used in an evil sense till Christ taught the poor man to lift up his head in hope and self-respect; the very lowest social class not to be despised of, a future king, the mendicant. Blessedness possible for the poor in every sense; they, in comparison with others, under no disabilities, rather contrari-wise—such is the first and fundamental lesson.—τῷ πνεύματι: Possibilities are not certainties; to turn the one into the other the soul or will of the individual must come in, for as Euthy. Z. quaintly says, nothing involuntary can bless (οὐδὲν τῶν ἀπροκαταστημένων μακαριστῶν). "In spirit" is, therefore, added to develop and define the idea of poverty. The comment on the theme passes from the lower to the higher sphere. Christ's thought includes the physical and social, but it does not end there. Luke seems to have the social aspect in view in accordance with one of his tendencies and the impoverished condition of most members of the apostolic Church. To limit the meaning to that were a mistake, but to include that or even to emphasise it in given circumstances was no error. Note that the physical and spiritual lay close together in Christ's mind. He passed easily from one to the other (John iv. 7-10; Lk. x. 42, see notes there). τῷ πν. is, of course, to be connected with πτωχοὶ, not with παράδος. Poor in spirit is not to be taken objectively, as if spirit indicated the element in which the poverty is manifest—poor intellect: "homines ingenio et eruditione parum florentes" (Fritzsche) = the πτωχοὶ in Matt. xi. 25; but subjectively, poor in their own esteem. Self-estimate is the essence of the matter, and is compatible with real wealth. Only the noble think meanly of themselves. The soul of goodness is in the man who is really humble. Poverty laid to heart passes into riches. A high ideal of life lies beneath all. And that ideal is the link between the social and the spiritual. The poor man passes into the blessedness of the kingdom as soon as he realises what a man is or ought to be. Poor in purse or even in character, no man is beggared who has a vision of man's chief end and chief good.—αὐτῶν, emphatic possession theirs, note it well. So in the following verses αὐτοῖς and αὐτὴν, not merely in prospect, but in present possession. The kingdom of heaven is often presented in the Gospels apocalyptically as a thing in the future to be given to the worthy by way of external recompense. But this view accords rather to the form of thought than to the essence of the matter. Christ speaks of the kingdom here not as a known quan-
tity, but as a thing whose nature He is in the act of defining by the aphorisms He utters. If so, then it consists essentially in states of mind. It is within. It is ourselves, the true ideal human.

Ver. 4. of παινοῦντες. Who are they? All who on any account grieve? Then this Beatitude would give utterance to a thoroughlygoing optimism. Pessimists say that there are many griefs for which there is no remedy, so many that life is not worth living. Did Jesus mean to meet this position with a direct negative, and to affirm that there is no sorrow without remedy? If not, then He propounds a puzzle provoking thoughtful scholars to ask: What grief is that which will without fail find comfort? There can be no comfort where there is no grief, for the two ideas are correlative. But in most cases there is no apparent necessary connection. Necessary connection is asserted in this aphorism, which gives us a clue to the class described as of παινοῦντες. Their peculiar sorrow must be one which combines itself, a grief that has the thing it grieves for in the very grief. The comfort is then no outward good. It lies in a right state of soul, and that is given in the sorrow which laments the lack of it. The sorrow reveals love of the good, and that love is possession. In so far as all kinds of sorrow tend to awaken reflection on the real good and ill of human life, and so to issue in the higher sorrow of the soul, the second Beatitude may be taken absolutely as expressing the tendency of all grief to end in consolation.—παρακληθοῦντες, future. The comfort is laten in the very grief, but for the present there is no conscious joy, but only poignant sorrow. The joy, however, will inevitably come to birth. No noble nature abides permanently in the house of mourning. The greater the sorrow the greater the ultimate gladness, the "joy in the Holy Ghost" mentioned by St. Paul among the essentials of the Kingdom of God (Rom. xiv. 17).

Ver. 5. of παρακληθοῦντες: in Sept. for ὑμᾶς. In Ps. xxxvii. 11, of which this Beatitude is an echo. The men who suffer wrong without bitterness or desire for revenge, a class who in this world are apt to go to the wall. In this case we should have expected the Teacher to end with the common refrain: theirs is the kingdom of heaven, that being the only thing they are likely to get. Jean Paul Richter humorously said: "The French have the empire of the land, the English the empire of the sea; to the Germans belongs the empire of the air." But Jesus promises to the meek the empire of the solid earth—ἐλπιστὶν ἑαυτῷ τὴν γῆν. Surely a startling paradox! That the meek should find a foremost place in the kingdom of heaven is very intelligible, but "inherit the earth"—the land of Canaan or any other part of this planet—is it not a delusive promise? Not altogether. It is at least true as a doctrine of moral tendency. Meekness after all is a power even in this world, a "world-conquering principle" (Tholuck). The meek of England, driven from their native land by religious intolerance, have inherited the continent of America. Weiss (Meyer) is quite sure, however, that this thought was far (gans fern) from Christ's mind. I venture to think he is mistaken.

The inverse order of the second and third Beatitudes found in Codex D, and favoured by some of the Fathers, e.g., Jerome, might be plausibly justified by the affinity between poverty of spirit and meekness, and the natural sequence of the two promises: possession of the kingdom of heaven and inheritance of the earth. But the connection beneath the surface is in favour of the order as it stands in T. R.

Ver. 6. If the object of the hunger and thirst had not been mentioned this fourth Beatitude would have been parallel in form to the second: Blessed are the hungry, for they shall be filled. We should then have another absolute affirmation requiring qualification, and raising the question: What sort of hunger is it which is sure to be satisfied? That might be the original form of the aphorism as given in Luke. The answer to the question it suggests is similar to that given under Beatitude 1. The hunger whose satisfaction is sure is that which contains its own satisfaction. It is the hunger for moral good. The passion for righteousness is rightfulness in the deepest sense of the word.—παρακληθοῦντες καὶ διψοῦντες. These verbs, like all verbs of desire, ordinarily take the genitive of the object. Here and in
other places in N. T. they take the accusative, the object being of a spiritual nature, which one not merely desires to participate in, but to possess in whole. Winer, § xxx. 10, thus distinguishes the two constructions: διψήφις φιλοσοφίας = to thirst after philosophy; διψήφις φιλοσοφίας = to thirst for possession of philosophy as a whole. Some have thought that δὲ is to be understood before διψήφις, and that the meaning is: "Blessed they who suffer natural hunger and thirst on account of righteousness." Grotius understands by διψήφις the way or doctrine of righteousness.

Ver. 7. This Beatitude states a self-acting law of the moral world. The exercise of mercy (δικαιοσύνη, active pity) tends to elicit mercy from others—God and men. The chief reference may be to the mercy of God in the final awards of the kingdom, but the application need not be restricted to this. The doctrine of Christ abounds in great ethical principles of universal validity: "he that humbleth himself shall be exalted," "to him that hath shall be given," etc. This Beatitude suitably follows the preceding. Mercy is an element in true righteousness (Mic. vi. 8). It was lacking in Pharisaic righteousness (Matt. xxiii. 23). It needed much to be inculcated in Christ’s time, when sympathy was killed by the theory that all suffering was penalty of special sin, a theory which forgets the presence of righteousness (Schanz). Mercy may be practised by many means: "not by money alone," says Euthy. Zig., "but by word, and if you have nothing by tears" (δια δαιρέων).

Ver. 8. οἱ καθαροὶ τῆς καρδίας: τ. καρπ. may be an explanatory addition to indicate the region in which purity shows itself. That purity is in the heart, the seat of thought, desire, motive, not in the outward act, goes without saying from Christ’s point of view. Blessed the pure. Here there is a wide range of suggestion. The pure may be the spotless or faultless in general; the continent with special reference to sexual indulgence—those whose very thoughts are clean; or the pure in motive, the single-minded, the men who seek the kingdom as the sumnum bonum with undivided heart. The last is the most relevant to the general connection and the most deserving to be insisted on. In the words of Augustine the munus cor is above all the simples cor. Moral simplicity is the cardinal demand in Christ’s ethics. The man who has attained to it is in His view perfect (Matt. xix. 21). Without it a large numerical list of virtues and good habits goes for nothing. With it character, however faulty in temper or otherwise, is ennobled and redeemed.—τὸν θεὸν διαφωναῖ: Their reward is the beatific vision. Some think the reference is not to the faculty of clear vision but to the rare privilege of seeing the face of the Great King (so Fritzsche and Schanz). “The expression has its origin in the ways of eastern monarchs, who rarely show themselves in public, so that only the most intimate circle beheld the royal countenance” (Schanz) = the pure have access to the all but inaccessible. This idea does not seem to harmonise with Christ’s general way of conceiving God. On the other hand, it was His habit to insist on the connection between clear vision and moral simplicity; to teach that it is the single eye that is full of light (Matt. vi. 22). It is true that the pure shall have access to God’s presence, but the truth to be insisted on in connection with this Beatitude is that through purity, singleness of mind, they are qualified for seeing, knowing, truly conceiving God and all that relates to the moral universe. It is the pure in heart who are able to see and say that “truly God is good” (Ps. lxxiii. 1) and rightly to interpret the whole phenomena of life in relation to Providence. They shall see, says Jesus, casting His thought into eschatological form, but He means the pure are the men who see; the double-minded, the two-souled (δύσψης, James i. 8) man is blind. Theophylact illustrates the connection between purity and vision thus: οὐτε γὰρ τὸ κανών, οὐτε καθαρὸν, τότε δεῖχεται τὸν ἀμφίσοις, οὖτι καὶ ἡ καθαρὰ ψυχή δεῖχεται δεινὸν θεόν.

Ver. 9. οἱ εὐθυνονοί: not merely those who have peace in their own souls
through purity (Augustine), or the peace-loving (Grotius, Wetstein), but the active heroic promoters of peace in a world full of alienation, party passion, and strife. Their efforts largely consist in keeping aloof from sectional strifes and the passions which beget them, and living tranquilly for and in the whole. Such men have few friends. Christ, the ideal peace-maker, was alone in a time given up to sectarian division. But they have their compensation—καὶ ὕπαρκέν ἐν καθημε-ιστραί. God owns the disowned and distrusted as His sons. They shall be called because they are. They shall be called at the great consummation; nay, even before that, in after generations, when party strifes and passions have ceased, and men have come to see who were the true friends of the Divine interest in an evil time.

Vv. 10-12. οἱ ἁγιάσμενοι τοῦ Θεοῦ. The original form of the Beatitude was probably: Blessed the persecuted. The added words only state what is a matter of course. No one deserves to be called a persecuted one unless he suffers for righteousness’ sake. The persecuted! They are not merely men who have passed through a certain experience, but men who bear abiding traces of it in their character. They are marked men, and bear the stamp of trial on their faces. It arrests the notice of the passer-by: commands his respect, and prompts the question: ‘Who are these?’ They are the Roman soldier of righteousness with an unmistakable air of dignity, serenity, and buoyancy about them.—ὁμών εὐγενικοί εἶτε. The common refrain of all the Beatitudes is expressly repeated here to hint that theirs emphatically is the Kingdom of Heaven. It is the proper reward of the soldier of righteousness. It is his now, within him in the disciplined spirit and the heroic temper developed by trial.—Ver. 11. μᾶκαριοί εἶτε. The Teacher expatiates as if it were a favourite theme, giving a personal turn to His further reflections. “Blessed are ye.” Is it likely that Jesus would speak so early of this topic to disciples? Would He not wait till it came more nearly within the range of their experience? Nay, is the whole discourse about persecution not a reflection back into the teaching of the Master of the later experiences of the apostolic age, that suffering disciples might be inspired by the thought that their Lord had so spoken? It is possible to be too incredulous here. If it was not too soon to speak of Pharisaic righteousness it was not too soon to speak of suffering for true righteousness. The one was sure to give rise to the other. The disciple circle may already have had experience of Pharisaic disfavour. In any case Jesus saw clearly what was coming. He had had an apocalypse of the dark future in the season of temptation, and He deemed it fitting to lift the veil a little that His disciples might get a glimpse of it.—διὰ τὸν ὄντως δικαίωσαν μιᾶν ἐν τοῖς ἐθνουσι—Christ is the only true friend of the Divine interest in a time of evil. The Teacher expatiates as if it were a favourite theme, giving a personal turn to His further reflections. "Blessed are ye." Is it likely that Jesus would speak so early of this topic to disciples? Would He not wait till it came more nearly within the range of their experience? Nay, is the whole discourse about persecution not a reflection back into the teaching of the Master of the later experiences of the apostolic age, that suffering disciples might be inspired by the thought that their Lord had so spoken? It is possible to be too incredulous here. If it was not too soon to speak of Pharisaic righteousness it was not too soon to speak of suffering for true righteousness. The one was sure to give rise to the other. The disciple circle may already have had experience of Pharisaic disfavour. In any case Jesus saw clearly what was coming. He had had an apocalypse of the dark future in the season of temptation, and He deemed it fitting to lift the veil a little that His disciples might get a glimpse of it.—διὰ τὸν ὄντως δικαίωσαν μιᾶν ἐν τοῖς ἐθνουσι—Christ is the only true friend of the Divine interest in a time of evil.
temper. It is the joy of the Alpine climber standing on the top of a snow-clad mountain. But the Teacher gives two reasons to help inexperienced disciples to rise to that moral elevation.—εἰ δὲ μαθῶς οὐ πάντως. For evil treatment on earth there is a compensating reward in heaven. This hope, weak now, was strong in primitive Christianity, and greatly helped martyrs and confessors.—οὗτος γὰρ εἷς τῶν προφήτων. If we take the γὰρ as giving a reason for the previous statement the sense will be: you cannot doubt that the prophets who suffered likewise have received an eternal reward (so Bengel, Fritzsche, Schanz, Meyer, Weiss). But we may take it as giving a co-ordinate reason for joy = ye are in good company. There is inspiration in the "goodly fellowship of the prophets," quite as much as in thought of their posthumous reward. It is to be noted that the prophets themselves did not get much comfort from such thoughts, and more generally that they did not rise to the joyous mood commended to His disciples by Jesus; but were desponding and querulous. On that side, therefore, there was no inspiration to be got from thinking of them. But they were thoroughly loyal to righteousness at all hazards, and reflection on their noble career was fitted to infect disciples with their spirit.—καὶ ὡς φωνὰ δυνατή: words skilfully chosen to raise the spirit. Before you not only in time but in vocation and destiny. Your predecessors in function and suffering; take up the prophetic succession and along with it, cheerfully, its tribulations.

Vv. 13-16. Disciple functions. It is quite credible that these sentences formed part of the Teaching on the Hill. Jesus might say these things at a comparatively early period to the men to whom He had already said: I will make you fishers of men. The functions assigned to disciples here are not more ambitious than that alluded to at the time of their call. The new section rests on what goes before, and postulates possession of the attributes named in the Beatitudes. With these the disciples will be indeed the salt of the earth and the light of the world. Vitally important functions are indicated by the two figures. Nihil rectius utilet was a Roman proverb (Pliny, H. N., 31. 9). Both harmonise with, the latter points expressly to, a universal destination of the new religion. The sun lightens all lands. Both also show how alien it was from the aims of Christ to be the teacher of an esoteric faith.

Ver. 13. ἄλογος, a late form for ἄλογος, ἄλογος, masculine. The properties of salt are assumed to be known. Commentators have enumerated four. Salt is pure, preserves against corruption, gives flavour to food, and as a manuring element helps to fertilise the land. The last mentioned property is specially insisted on by Schanz, who finds a reference to it in Lk. xiv. 35, and thinks it is also pointed to here by the expression τῆς γίνης. The first, purity, is a quality of salt per se, rather than a condition on which its function in nature depends. The second and third are doubtless the main points to be insisted on, and the second more than the third and above all. Salt arrests or prevents the process of putrefaction in food, and the citizens of the kingdom perform the same function for the earth, that is, for the people who dwell on it. In Schanz's view there is a confusion of the metaphor with its moral interpretation. Fritzsche limits the point of comparison to indispensableness = ye are as necessary an element in the world as salt is; a needlessly bald interpretation. Necessary certainly, but why and for what?—τῆς γίνης might mean the land of Israel (Achelis, Bergpredigle), but it is more natural to take it in its widest significance in harmony with κοσμίου. Holtzmann (H. C.) sets κοσμίου down to the account of the evangelist, and thinks γίνη in the narrow sense more suited to the views of Jesus.—Ver. 14. μακραφή. The Vulgate renders the verb reanuerrit. Better Beza and Erasmus, infusatus fuerit. If the salt become insipid, so as to lack its proper preserving virtue. Can this happen? Weiss and others reply: It does not matter for the point
of the comparison. Perhaps not, but it does matter for the felicity of the metaphor, which is much more strikingly apt if degeneracy can happen in the natural as well as in the spiritual sphere. Long ago Maundrell maintained that it could, and modern travellers confirm his statement. Furrer says: "As it was observed by Maundrell 300 years ago, so it has often been observed in our time that salt loses somewhat of its sharpness in the storehouses of Syria and Palestine. Gathered in a state of impurity, it undergoes with other substances a chemical process, by which it becomes really another salt, losing its old appearance." (Ztsch. für M. und R., 1890). A similar statement is made by Thomson (Land and Book, p. 381).

There is no room for doubt as to whether the case supposed can happen in the spiritual sphere. The "salt of the earth" can become not only partially but wholly, hopelessly insipid, losing the qualities which constitute its conservative power as set forth in the Beatitudes and in other parts of Christ's teaching (e.g., Mat. xviii.). Erasmus gives a realistic description of the causes of degeneracy in these words: "Si vestri mortua fuerint amore laudis, cupidine pecuniarum, studio voluptatum, libidine vindicandi, metu infamiae damnorum aut mortis infatuiti," etc. (Paraph. in Evan. Matt.).

-ἐν τίνι ἄλας. Not with what shall the so necessary salting process be done? but with what salt shall the insipid salt be salted? The meaning is that the lost property is irrecoverable. A stern statement, reminding us of Heb. vi. 6, but true to the fact in the spiritual sphere. Nothing so hopeless as apostate discipleship with a bright past behind it to which it has become dead—begun in the spirit, ending in the flesh.—ἐς οὖσιν, useless for salting, good for nothing else any more (fr.). —ἐν μῇ βληθῆναι, etc. This is a kind of humorous afterthought: except indeed, cast out as refuse, to be trodden under foot of man, i.e., to make footpaths of. The reading βληθῆναι is much to be preferred to βληθήναι, as giving prominence to καταπατήσωσα as the main verb, pointing to a kind of use to which insipid salt can after all be put.

But what a downcome: from being saviours of society to supplying materials for footpaths!

Ver. 14. τὸ φῶς τ. κ. The light, the sun of the moral world, conceived of as full of the darkness of ignorance and sin. The disciple function is now viewed as illuminating. And as under the figure of salt the danger warned against was that of becoming insipid, so here the danger to be avoided is that of obscuring the light. The light will shine, that is its nature, if pains be not taken to hide it,—οὐ δύναται τολάς, etc. As a city situate on the top of a hill cannot be hid, neither a light fail to be seen unless it be expressly prevented from shining. No pains need to be taken to secure that the light shall shine. For that it is enough to be a light. But Christ knew that there would be strong temptation for the men that had it in them to be lights to hide their light. It would draw the world's attention to them, and so expose them to the ill will of such as hate the light. Therefore He goes on to caution disciples against the policy of obscuration.

Ver. 15. A parabolic word pointing out that such a policy in the natural sphere is unheard of and absurd.—καλόω, to kindle, accendere, ordinarily neuter = urere; not as Beza thought, a Hebraism; examples occur in late Greek authors (vide Kykpe, Obser. Sac.). The figure is taken from lowly cottage life. There shall be light upon the lamp, on which the lamp was set. The house consisted of a single room, so that the tiny light sufficed for all. It might now and then be placed under the modius, an earthenware grain measure, or under the bed (Mk. iv. 21); high, to keep clear of serpents, therefore without danger of setting it on fire (Koetsveld, De Ge- lijkenissen, p. 305). But that would be the exception, not the rule—done occasionally for special reasons, perhaps during the hours of sleep. Schanz says the lamp burned all night, and that when they wanted darkness they put it on the floor and covered it with the "bushel". Tholuck also thinks people might cover the light when they wished to keep it burning, when they had occasion to leave
the room for a time. Weiss, on the other hand, thinks it would be put under a cover only when they wished to put it out (Matt.-Ev., p. 144). But was it ever put out? Not so, according to Benzinger (Heb. Arch., p. 124).

Ver. 16. ὑπὲρ. Do ye as they do in cottage life; apply the parable.—λαμπρά, let your light shine. Don't use means to prevent it, turning the rare exception of household practice into the rule, so extinguishing your light, or at least rendering it useless. Cowards can always find plausible excuses for the policy of obscuration—reasons of prudence and wisdom; gradual accustomedness of men to new ideas; deference to the prejudices of good men; avoidance of rupture by premature outspokeness; but generally the true reason is fear of unpleasant consequences to oneself. Their conduct Jesus represents as disloyalty to God—διαπειράματα, etc. The shining of light from the good works of disciples glorifies God the Father in heaven. The hiding of the light means withholding glory. The temptation arises from the fact—a stern law of the moral world it is—that just when most glory is likely to accrue to God, least glory comes to the light-bearer; not glory but dishonour and evil treatment his share. Many are ready enough to let their light shine when honour comes to themselves. But their "light" is not true heaven-kindled light; their works are not καλά, noble, heroic, but πονηρά (vii. 17), ignoble, worthless, at best of the conventional type in fashion among religious people, and wrought often in a spirit of vanity and ostentation. This is theatrical goodness, which is emphatically not what Jesus wanted. Euthy. Zig says: οἱ κάλει τὴν ἄρτην τὴν ἄρτην.

Note that here, for the first time in the Gospel, Christ's distinctive name for God, "Father," occurs. It comes in as a thing of course. Does it presuppose previous instruction? (So Meyer.) One might have expected so important a topic as the nature and name of God to have formed the subject of a distinct lesson. But Christ's method of teaching was not scholastic or formal. He defined terms by discriminating use; Father, e.g., as a name for God, by using it as a motive to noble conduct. The motive suggested throws light on the name. God, we learn, as Father delights in noble conduct, as human fathers find joy in sons who acquit themselves bravely. Jesus may have given formal instruction on the point, but not necessarily. This first use of the title is very significant. It is full, solemn, impressive: your Father, He who is in the heavens; so again in ver. 45. It is suggestive of reasons for faithfulness, reasons of love and reverence. It hints at a reflected glory, the reward of heroism. The noble works which glorify the Father reveal the workers to be sons. The double-sided doctrine of this logion of Jesus is that the divine is revealed by the heroic in human conduct, and that the moral hero is the true son of God. Jesus Himself is the highest illustration of the twofold truth.

Vv. 17-20. Jesus defines His position. At the period of the Teaching on the Hill Jesus felt constrained to define His ethical and religious position all round, with reference to the O. T. as the recognised authority, and also to contemporary presentations of righteousness. The disciples had already heard Him teach in the synagogues (Matt. iv. 23) in a manner that at once arrested attention and led hearers to recognise in Him a new type of teacher (Mk. i. 27), entirely different from the scribes (Mk. i. 22). The sentences before us contain just such a statement of the Teacher's attitude as the previously awakened surprise of His audiences would lead us to expect. There is no reason to doubt their substantial authenticity though they may not reproduce the precise words of the speaker; no ground for the suggestion of Holtzmann (H. C.) that so decided a position either for or against the law was not likely to be taken up in Christ's time, and that we must find in these vv. an anti-Pauline programme of the Judaists. At a first glance the various statements may appear inconsistent with each other. And assuming their genuineness, they might easily be misunderstood, and give rise to disputes in the apostolic age, or be taken hold of in rival interests. The words of great epoch-making men generally have this fate. Though apparently contradictory they might all proceed...
from the many-sided mind of Jesus, and be so reported by the genial Galilean publican in his Logia. The best guide to the meaning of the momentous declaration they contain is acquaintance with the general drift of Christ's teaching (vide Wendt, Die Lehre Jesu, ii., 330). Verbal exegesis will not do much for us. We must bring to the words sympathetic insight into the whole significance of Christ's ministry. Yet the passage by itself well weighed is more luminous than at first it may seem.

Ver. 17. Μη νομίστητε: These words betray a consciousness that there was that in His teaching and bearing which might create such an impression, and are a protest against taking a superficial impression for the truth.—καταλῦσα, to abrogate, to set aside in the exercise of legislative authority. What freedom of mind is implied in the bare suggestion of this as a possibility! To the ordinary religious Jew the mere conception would appear a profanity. A greater than the O. T., than Moses and the prophets, is here. But the Greater is full of reverence for the institutions and sacred books of His people. He is not come to disannul either the law or the prophets. ἦν ἀντικήθην ἐν τῷ ἑαυτῷ δοῦλῳ τῷ καιρῷ. He protests that He came not as an abrogator, but as a fulfiller. What rôle does He thereby claim? Such as belongs to one whose attitude is at once free and reverential. He fulfils by realising in theory and practice an ideal to which O. T. institutions and revelations point, but which they do not adequately express. Therefore, in fulfilling He necessarily abrogates in effect, while repudiating the spirit of a destroyer. He brings in a law of the spirit which cancels the law of the letter, a kingdom which realises prophetic ideals, while setting aside the crude details of their conception of the Messianic time.

Vv. 18-19. These verses wear on first view a Judaistic look, and have been regarded as an interpolation, or set down to the credit of an over-conservative evangelist. But they may be reconciled with ver. 17, as above interpreted. Jesus expresses here in the strongest manner His conviction that the whole O. T. is a Divine revelation, and that therefore every minutest precept has religious significance which must be recognised in the ideal fulfilment.—Ἀριστήρα, formula of solemn asseveration, often used by Jesus, never by apostles, found doubled only in fourth Gospel. —Ἀσιναὶ, the smallest letter in the Hebrew alphabet. —καταλῦει, the little projecting point in some of the letters, e.g., of the base line in Beth; both representing the minutiae in the Mosaic legislation. Christ, though totally opposed to the spirit of the scribes, would not allow them to have a monopoly of zeal for the commandments great and small. It was important in a polemical interest to make this clear.—οὐ μὴ τ., elliptical = do not fear lest. Vide Kühner, Gram., § 516, 9; also Goodwin's Syntax, Appendix ii.—ὁ ἀνὴρ ἄν. γεν., a second protasis introduced with ἀν. explanatory of the first ἀν. καταλῦει; vide Goodwin, § 510; not saying the same thing, but a kindred: eternal, lasting, till adequately fulfilled; the latter the more exact statement of Christ's thought.
Ver. 19. de εδών λόγον, etc.: de εδών pointing to a natural inference from what goes before. Christ's view being such as indicated, He must so judge of the settler aside of any laws however small. When a religious system has lasted long, and is wearing towards its decline and fall, there are always such men. The Baptist was in some respects such a man. He seems to have totally neglected the temple worship and sacred festivals. He shared the prophetic disgust at formalism. Note now what Christ's judgment about such really is. A scribe or Pharisee would regard a breaker of even the least commandments as a miscrant. Jesus simply calls him the least in the Kingdom of Heaven. He takes for granted that he is an earnest man, with a passion for righteousness, which is the key to his iconoclastic conduct. He recognises him therefore as possessing real moral worth, but, in virtue of his impatient radical-reformer temper, not great, only little in the scale of true moral values, in spite of his earnestness in action and sincerity in teaching. John the Baptist was possibly in His mind, or in some others known to us from the Gospels.—de οὕτως λέγεται καὶ διδάσκεται, etc. We know now who is least: who is great? The man who does and teaches to do all the commands great and small; great not named but understood—οὕτως μέγες. Jesus has in view O. T. saints, the piety reflected in the Psalter, where the great ethical laws and the precepts respecting ritual are both alike respected, and men in His own time living in their spirit. In such was a sweetness and graciousness, akin to the Kingdom as He conceived it, lacking in the character of the hot-headed law-breaker. The geniality of Jesus made Him value these sweet saintly souls.

Ver. 20. Here is another type still, that of the scribes and Pharisees. We have had two degrees of worth, the little and the great. This new type gives us the moral zero.—λέγει γάρ. The γάρ is somewhat puzzling. We expect δι', taking our attention off two types described in the previous sentence and fixing it on a distinct one. Yet there is a hidden logic latent in the γάρ. It explains the ἰδιαίτερον of the previous verse. The earnest reformer is a small character compared with the sweet wholesome reformer, but he is not a moral nullity. That place is reserved for another class. I call him least, not nothing, for the scribe is the zero.—πλέον τῶν γρ. κ. φ, a compendious comparison, the δικαιοσύνη being understood after πλέον. Christ's statements concerning these classes of the Jewish community, elsewhere recorded, enable us to understand the verdict He pronounces here. They differed from the two classes named in ver. 18, thus: Class 1 set aside the least commandments for the sake of the great; class 2 conscientiously did all, great and small; class 3 set aside the great for the sake of the little, the ethical for the sake of the ritual, the divine for the sake of the traditional. That threw them outside the Kingdom, where only the moral has value. And the second is greater, higher, than the first, because, while zeal for the ethical is good, spirit, temper, disposition has supreme value in the Kingdom. These valuations of Jesus are of great importance as a contribution towards defining the nature of the Kingdom as He conceived it.

Nothing, little, great: there is a higher grade still, the highest. It belongs to Christ Himself, the Fulfiller, who is neither a sophistical scribe, nor an impatient reformer, nor a strict performer of all laws great and small, walking humbly with God in the old ways, without thought, dream or purpose of change, but one who lives above the past and the present in the ideal, knows that a change is impending, but wishes it to come gently, and so as to do full justice to all.
that is divine, venerable, and of good
tendency in the past. His is the unique
greatness of the reverently conservative
yet free, bold inaugurator of a new time.

Vv. 21-26. First illustration of Christ's
ethical attitude, taken from the Sixth
Commandment. In connection with
this and the following exemplifications of
Christ's ethical method, the interpreter
is embarrassed by the long-continued
strifes of the theological schools, which
have brought back the spirit of legalism,
from which the great Teacher sought to
deliver His disciples. It will be best to
ignore these strifes and go steadily on
our way.—Ver. 21. Ἰκανοῦσα. The
common people knew the law by hearing it
in the synagoge, not by reading it themselves. The aorist
expresses what they were accustomed to hear, an instance of the "gnomic" use.
Tholuck thinks there may be an allusion to the tradition of the scribes, called
Shema.—τοῖς ἀρχαῖοι might mean: in
ancient times, to the ancients, or by
the ancients. The second is in accord with N.
usage, and is adopted by Meyer, Weiss and Holtzmann (H. C.). How far
back does Christ go in thought? To Moses or to Ezra? The expression is
vague, and might cover the whole past, and perhaps is intended to do so. There
is no reason a priori why the criticism should be restricted to the interpretation
of the law by the scribes. Christ's position as fulfiller entitled Him to point
out the defects of the law itself, and we
must be prepared to find Him doing so,
and there is reason to believe that in the
sequence He actually does (so Wendt, L. Ἡ., ii., 332).—Of ἐπειδὴ ἦ... ψέλνεσθα.
This is a correct statement, not only of
the Pharisaic interpretation of the law,
but of the law itself. As a law for
the life of a nation, it could forbid and punish
only the outward act. But just here lay
its defect as a summary of human duty.

It restrained the end not the beginning of
transgression (Euth. Zig.).—ἐπειδὴ ἦ... ἐπεξεργάζεσθαι, with dative of the tribunal
here.—Ver. 22. ἦ... ἐν ἔχων ὁμιλεῖνον.
Christ supplies the defect, as a painter
fills in a rude outline of a picture
(exeget. adv.). says Theophy. He goes
back on the roots of crime in the feel-
ings: anger, contempt, etc.—ὡς... ἀντί.
Every one; universal interdict of
angry passion.—ἀδελφός, not in blood
the classical meaning) or in faith, but
by common humanity. The implied
doctrine is that every man is my brother;
compassion doctrine to the universal
Fatherhood of God (ver. 45).—ἐκή is of
course a gloss; qualification of the
interdict against anger may be required,
but it was not Christ's habit to supply
qualifications. His aim was to impress
the main idea, anger a deadly sin.—
ἐκῆ, here as in ver. 21. The reference
is to the provincial court of seven (Deut.
xvi. 18, 2 Chron. xix. 5, Joseph. Ant. iv.
8, 14) possessing power to punish capital
offences by the sword. Christ's words
are of course not to be taken literally as
if He were enacting that the angry man
be tried as a criminal. So understood
He would be simply introducing an ex-
tension of legalism. He deserves to go
before the seven, He says, meaning he is
as great an offender as the homicide
who is actually tried by them.

'Ράκα: left untranslated in A. V. and
R. V.; a word of little meaning, rendered
by Jerome "inians aut vacuus absque
cerebro". Augustine says a Jew told him
it was not properly a word at all, but an
interjection like Ἡμ. Theophy. gives
as an equivalent εἴ σπουδαί πρὸς ἡνGLISH
οὐκ ὁ τύπος τοῦ νησίου. ἀναχαίνεται ἐν τῷ
μεταμορφούμεθα εἰς τῆς μητρὸς ἡμῶν
συνελεηθή μέντοι ἔντολον ἄνθρωπον

1 ἐπειδὴ in BD; text in ἘΛΜΔ al. pl. (W.H.). ἐπειδὴ was more usual in later
Greek.

2 ἐκή is an ancient gloss found in many late MSS. but omitted in ἘΒ, Origen,
Vulgate, and in the best modern editions.

3 ράκα in ἘνD abc (Tisch.); text in ἘνBE (W.H.).
penalties, e.g., death by stoning! Trivial in appearance, the offence is deadly in Christ's eyes. It means contempt for a fellow-man, more inhuman than anger; a violent passion, prompting to words and acts often bitterly regretted when the hot temper cools down. *Mórph* is a Greek word, the equivalent for πονηρός = fool, good for nothing, morally worthless. It may, as Paulus, and after him Nösgen, suggests, be a Hebrew word, רָעִי (Num. xx. 24; Deut. xxi. 18), a rebel against God or against parents, the most worthless of characters. Against this Field (Otium Norvicense) remarks that it would be the only instance of a pure Hebrew word in the N. T. In either case the word expresses a more serious form of contempt than Ráca. Ráca expresses contempt for a man's head = you stupid! More expresses contempt for his heart and character = you scoundrel. The reckless use of such opprobrious epithets Jesus regarded as the supreme offence against the law of humanity.— δραματικά . . . ψεύδα. He deserves to go, not to the seven or the seventy, but to hell, his sin altogether damnable. Kuinoel thinks the meaning is: He deserves to be burned alive in the valley of Hinnom: is dignus est qui in vales Hinnoni visus combaratur. This interpretation finds little approval, but it is not so improbable when we remember what Christ said about the offender of the little ones (Matt. xviii. 6). Neither burning alive nor drowning was actually practised. In these words of Jesus against anger and contempt there is an aspect of exaggeration. They are the strong utterance of one in whom all forms of inhumanity roused feelings of passionate abhorrence. They are of the utmost value as a revelation of character. Vv. 23, 24. Holtzmann (H. C.) regards these verses, as well as the two following, as an addition by the evangelist. But the passage is at least in thorough harmony with what goes before, as well as with the whole discourse.—Εἶν αὐτόν προσφέρον, if thou art in the very act of presenting thine offering (present tense) at the altar,— καὶ προσφέρεις τὸν αὐτόν, and it suddenly flashes through thy mind there that thou hast done something to a brother man fitted to provoke angry feeling in him. What then? Get through with thy worship as fast as possible and go directly after and make peace with the offended? No, interrupt the religious action and go on that errand first.—δοξάς έκεί. Lay it down on the spur of the moment before the altar without handing it to the priest to be offered by him in thy stead.—καὶ ξυπνάς προσφέρων. The προσφέρων is to be joined to ξυπνάς, not to the following verb as in A. V. and R. V. (προσφέρων stands after the verb also in chaps. vi. 33, vii. 5). First *go*: remove thyself from the temple, break off thy worship, though it may seem profane to do so.—διαλήψας . . . καὶ τότε . . . προσφέρεις: no contempt for religious service expressed or implied. Holtzmann (H. C.) asks, did Jesus offer sacrifice? and answers, hardly. In any case He respected the practice. But, reconciliation before sacrifice: morality before religion. Significant utterance, first announcement of a great principle often repeated, systematically neglected by the religion of the time. *Placability* before sacrifice, *mercy* before sacrifice, *filial affection* and *duty* before sacrifice; so always in Christ's teaching (Matt. ix. 13, xv. 5). προσφέρεις: present; set about offering; plenty of time now for the sacred action.

Vv. 25, 26. There is much more reason for regarding this passage as an interpolation. It is connected only externally (by the references to courtes
with what goes before, and it is out of keeping with the general drift of the teaching on the hill. It occurs in a different connection in Luke xii. 58, there a solemn warning to the Jewish people, on its way to judgment, to repent. Meyer pleads that the *legion* might be repeated. It might, but only on suitable occasions, and the teaching on the hill does not seem to offer such an occasion. Kuinoel, Bleek, Holtzmann, Weiss and others regard the words as foreign to the connection. Referring to the exposition in Luke, I offer here only a few verbal notes mainly on points in which Matthew differs from Luke.— τὸν ἐδούων, be in a conciliatory mood, ready to come to terms with your opponent in a legal process (ἀντίδικος). It is a case of debt, and the two, creditor and debtor, are on the way to the court where they must appear together (Deut. xxii. 18, xxv. 1). Matthew’s expression implies willingness to come to terms amicably on the creditor’s part, and the debtor is exorted to meet him half way. Luke’s δὸς ἐργασιάν throws the willingness on the other side, or at least implies that the debtor will need to make an effort to bring the creditor to terms.—παράδοθος, a much milder word than Luke’s *ἐκατόστηρος*, which points to rough, rude handling, dragging an unwilling debtor along whether he would rather not go.—ἀπεξῆρτο, the officer of the court whose business it was to collect the debt and generally to carry out the decision of the judge; in Luke ἀρβάτηρ.—κοράντην = quadrans, less than a farthing. Luke has λείπον, half the value of a *kôd*, thereby strengthening the statement that the imprisoned debtor will not escape till he has paid all he owes.

Vv. 27-30. Second illustration, taken from the seventh commandment. A grand moral law, in brief lapidary style guarding the married relation and the sanctity of home. Of course the Hebrew legislator condemned lust after another man’s wife; it is expressly prohibited in the tenth commandment. But in practical working as a public law the statute laid main stress on the outward act, and it was the tendency of the scribes to give exclusive prominence to this. Therefore Christ brings to the front what both Moses and the scribes left in the background, the inward desire of which adultery is the fruit—Ver. 28.—δὲ βλέπων: the looker is supposed to be a husband who by his look wrongs his own wife.—γυναῖκα, married or unmarried.—πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμησίαν. The look is supposed to be not casual but persistent, the desire not involuntary or momentary, but cherished with longing. Augustine, a severe judge in such matters, defines the offence thus: “Qui hoc fine et hoc animo attendantur ut eam concupiscat; quod jam non est titillari delectatione carnis sed plene consentire libidini” (De ser. Domini). Chrysostom, the merciless scourge of the vices of Antioch, says: “ὁ ἀντί τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν συλλέγων, ὁ μηθενδος ἀναγκάζοντος τὸ θηρίον ἐπισω- ἐγὼν, ἤρεμνυτὶ τῷ λογισμῷ. Hom. xvii. The Rabbis also condemned unchaste looks, but in how coarse a style compared with Luke’s. A quotation given by Fritzsche show: “Intus ens vel in minimum digitum feminae est ac si intueretur in locum pudendum”. In better taste are these sayings quoted by Wünsche (Beiträge): “The eye and the heart are the two brokers of sin”; “Passions lodge only in him who sees”. —ἀπειρή (bracketed as doubtful by W. H.): the accusative after ἔπιθε, is rare and late. —We cannot but think of the personal relations to woman of One who understood so well the subtle sources of sexual sin. Shall we say that He was tempted in all points as we are, but desire was expelled by the mighty power of a pure love to which every woman was as a daughter, a sister, or a betrothed: a sacred object of tender respect?
Vv. 29, 30. **Counsel to the tempted**, expressing keen perception of the danger and strong recoil from a sin to be shunned at all hazards, even by excision, as it were, of offending members; two named, eye and hand, eye first as mentioned before.—οἱ ἵπποι, the right eye, deemed the more precious (1 Sam. xi. 2, Sach. xi. 17). Similarly ver. 30 the right hand, the most indispensable for work. Even these right members of the body must go. But as the remaining left eye and hand can still offend it is obvious that these counsels are not meant to be taken literally, but symbolically, as expressing strenuous effort to master sexual passion (vide Grotius). Mutilation will not serve the purpose; it may prevent the outward act, but it will not extinguish desire.—σκανδαλίζει, cause to stumble, not found in Greek authors but in Sept. Sirach. and in N. T. in a tropical moral sense. The noun σκάνδαλος, vexation, inconvenience, a late form for σκανδάλησθαι, a trap-stick with bait on it which being touched the trap springs. Hesychius gives as its equivalent ἐπιστημωμένος. It is used in a literal sense in Lev. xix. 14 (Sept.).—συμψάλλεται. . . ίνα ἀπολ. ίνα with subjunctive instead of infinitive (vide on ch. iv. 3). Meyer insists on ἵνα having here as always its telic sense and praises Fritzsche as alone interpreting the passage correctly. But, as Weiss observes, the mere destruction of the member is not the purpose of its excision. Note the impressive solemn repetition in ver. 30 of the thought in ver. 29, in identical terms save that for βλέψις is substituted, in the true reading, αἰτία. This logion occurs again in Matthew (xviii. 8, 9). Weiss (Marc.-Evang., 326) thinks it is taken here from the Apostolic document, i.e., Matthew’s book of Logia, and there from Mark ix. 43-47.

Vv. 31-32. **Third illustration**, subordinate to the previous one, connected with the same general topic, sex relations, therefore introduced less formally with a simple ἀρέτη σα. This instance is certainly directed against the scribes rather than Moses. The law (Deut. xxiv. 1) was meant to mitigate an existing usage, regarded as evil, in woman’s interest. The scribes busied themselves solely about getting the bill of separation into due legal form. They did nothing to restrain the unjust caprice of husbands; they rather opened a wider door to licence. The law contemplated as the ground of separation a strong loathing, probably of sexual origin. The Rabbis (the school of Shammait excepted) recognised whimsical disposition, even a fancy for another fairer woman, as sufficient reasons. But they were zealous to have the bill in due form that the woman might be able to show she was free to marry again, and they probably flattered themselves they were defending the rights of women. Brave men! Jesus raised the previous question, and asserted a more radical right of woman—not to be put away, except when she put herself away by unfaithfulness. He raised anew the prophetic cry (Mal. ii. 16), I hate putting away. It was an act of humanity of immense significance for civilisation, and of rare courage, for He was fighting single-handed against widely prevalent, long established opinion and custom.
the corresponding word in Greek authors is ἀποστάσις. — ἀποστάσις = ἄπαθος ἀποστάσιος in Deut. xxiv. The tendency in later Greek was to substitute ἐν for εἰς, the plural ending. *Vide* Lobbeck, *Phryn.*, p. 517. — *vap. A. πορνεῖα: a most important exception which has given rise to much controversy that will probably last till the world's end. The first question is: Did Christ really say this, or is it not rather an explanatory gloss due to the evangelist, or to the tradition he followed? De Wette, Weiss, Holtzmann (H. C.) take the latter view. It would certainly be in accordance with Christ's manner of teaching, using strong, brief, unqualified assertions to drive home unfamiliar or unwelcome truths, if the word as He spoke it took the form given in Lk. xvi. 18: "Every one that putteth away his wife and marryeth another committeth adultery". This was the fitting word to be spoken by one who hated putting away in a time when it was common and sanctioned by the authorities. A second question is: What does ἡμεῖς mean? Schanz, a master, as becomes a Catholic, in this class of questions, enumerates five senses, but decides that it means adultery committed by a married woman. Some, including Döllinger (*Christenthum und Kirche: The First Age of Christianity and the Church*, vol. ii., app. iii.), think it means fornication committed before marriage. The predominant opinion, both ancient and modern, is that adopted by Schanz. A third question is: Does Christ, assuming the words to have been spoken by Him, recognise adultery as a ground of absolute divorce, or only, as Catholics teach, of separation or monogamy? Is it possible to be quite sure as to this point? One thing is certain. Christ did not come to be a new legislator making laws for social life. He came to set up a high ethical ideal, and leave that to work on men's minds. The tendency of His teaching is to create deep aversion to rupture of married relations. That aversion might even go the length of shrinking from severance of the tie even in the case of one who had forfeited all claims. The last clause is bracketed by W. H. as of doubtful genuineness. It states unqualifiedly that to marry a divorced wife is adultery. Meyer thinks that the qualification unjustly dismissed, i.e., not for adultery, is understood. Weiss (Meyer) denies this.

*Vv. 33-37. Fourth illustration: concerning oaths. A new theme, therefore formally introduced as in ver. 31. πάλιν points to an illustration (Weiss, Mt.-Evan., p. 165). The first series is based on the Decalogue. Thou shalt not swear falsely (Lev. xix. 12), and thou shalt perform unto the Lord thy vows (Num. xxx. 3; Deut. xxiii. 22). What is wrong in these dicta? Nothing save what is left unsaid. The scribes misplaced the emphasis. They had a great deal to say, in sophistical style, of the oaths that were binding and not binding, nothing about the fundamental requirement of truth in the inward parts. Again, therefore, Jesus goes back on the previous question: Should there be any need for oaths? — Ver. 34. ἄλλας, emphatic = παντέλον, don't swear at all. Again an unqualified statement, to be taken not in the letter as a new law,
but in the spirit as inculcating such a love of truth that so far as we are concerned there shall be no need of oaths. In civil life the most truthful man has to take an oath because of the untruth and consequent distrust prevailing in the world, and in doing so he does not sin against Christ's teaching. Christ Himself took an oath before the High Priest (Mt. xxvii. 63). What follows (vv. 34-6) is directed against the casuistry which laid stress on the words τῶν εὐαγγ., and evaded obligation by taking oaths in which the divine name was not mentioned: by heaven, earth, Jerusalem, or by one's own head. Jesus points out that all such oaths involved a reference to God. This is sufficiently obvious in the case of the first three, not so clear in case of the fourth. —ἐυνεκὴν ἡ μᾶλλον: white is the colour of old age, black of youth. We cannot alter the colour of our hair so as to make our head look young or old. A fortiori we cannot bring on our head any curse by perjury, of which hair suddenly whitened might be the symbol. Providence alone can blast our life. The oath by the head is a direct appeal to God. All these oaths are binding, therefore, says Jesus; but what I most wish to impress on you is: don't swear at all. Observe the use of μὴν (not μηδεῖ) to connect these different evasive oaths as forming a homogeneous group. Winer, sect. lv. 6, endorses the view of Herrmann in Viger that ὑπὲρ and πρὸς are adverbials, ὑπὸ and μηδεῖ disjunctival, and says that the latter add negation to negation, while the former divide a single negation into parts. Jesus first thinks of these evasive oaths as a bad class, then specifies them one after the other. Away with them one and all, and let your word be val val, so so. That is, if you want to give assurance, let it not be by an oath, but by simple repetition of your yes and no. Grotius interprets: let your yea or nay in word be a yea or nay in deed, be as good as your word even unsupported by an oath. This brings the version of Christ's saying in Mt. into closer correspondence with Jas. v. 12. ἐκ τοῦ τοῦτον the surplus, what goes beyond these simple words.—ἐκ τοῦ τοῦτον, hardly "from the evil one," though many ancient and modern interpreters, including Meyer, have so understood it. Meyer says the neuter "of evil" gives a very insipid meaning. I think, however, that Christ expresses Himself mildly out of respect for the necessity of oaths in a world full of falsehood. I know, He means to say, that in certain circumstances something beyond yea and nay will be required of you. But it comes of evil, the evil of untruthfulness. See that the evil be not in you. Chrysostom (Hom. xvii.) asks: How evil if it be God's law? and answers: Because the law was good in its season. God acted like a nurse who gives the breast to an infant and afterwards laughs at it when it wants it after weaning.

Vv. 38-42. Fifth illustration, from the law of compensation. Ver. 38 contains the theme, the following vv. Christ's comment.—Ὀφθαλμόν ... δόντως. An exact quotation from Ex. xxi. 24, Christ's criticism here concerns a precept from the oldest code of Hebrew law. Fritzschke explains the accusatives, ὄφθαλμον, δόντως, by supposing εἰρατο to be understood: "Ye have heard that Moses wrote that an eye shall be for an eye". The simplest explanation is that the two nouns in the original passage are under the government of δῶσαι, Ex. xxi. 23. (So Weiss and Meyer after Grotius.) Tersely expressed, a sound principle of civil law for the guidance of the judge, acted on by almost all peoples, Christ does not condemn it: if parties come before the judge, let him by all means give fair compensation for injuries received. He simply leaves it on one side.
"Though the judge must give redress when demanded, you are not bound to ask it, and if you take My advice you will not." In taking up this position Jesus was in harmony with the law itself which contains dissuasives against vindictiveness, e.g., Lev. xix. 18: "Thou shalt not avenge nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people." The fault of the scribes did not lie in gain saying this and introducing the jus talionis into private life, but in giving greater prominence to the legal than to the ethical element in the O. T. teaching, and in occupying themselves mainly with discussing the casuistry of compensation, e.g., the items to be compensated for in a case of wounding—the pain, the cure, the loss of time, the shame, etc., and the money value of the whole. Jesus turned the minds of His disciples away from these trivialities to the great neglected ethical commonplace.

Ver. 39. μὴ διπλώτευαι: resist not, either by endeavouring to prevent injury or by seeking redress for it.—τῷ ῥιπτόντα, not the devil, as Chrys. and Theophy. thought; either the evil doer or the evil doing or done. Opinion is much divided between the last two meanings. The sense is the same in either case. The A. V. takes ῥιπτόντα as neuter, the R. V. as masculine. The former is on the whole to be preferred. Instances of injury in various forms are next specified to illustrate the general precept. These injuries have been variously distinguished—to body, and property, and freedom, Tholuck; exemplum citatur injuriae, privatæ, forensis, curialis, Bengel; injuries connected with honour, material good, waste of time, Achelis, who points out that the relation of the three, Ex. in vv. 39–41, is that of an anti-climax, injuries to honour being felt most, and those involving waste of time least.—δοτις . . . ἄλλην. In the following instances there is a climax: injury proceeds from bad to worse. It is natural to expect the same in this one. But when the right cheek has been struck, is it an aggravation to strike the left? Tholuck, Bleek, and Meyer suggest that the right cheek is only named first according to common custom, not supposed to be struck first. Achelis conceives the right cheek to be struck first with the back of the hand, then the left with a return stroke with the palm, harder than the first, and expressing in a higher measure intention to insult.—παρεῖναι in class. Greek = to beat with rods; later, and in N. T., to smile with the palm of the hand; vide Lobeck, Phryn., p. 175.—Ver. 40, κρατῶν = κρατοῦσαι in 2 Cor. vi. 1, to sue at law as in A. V. Grotius takes it as meaning extra-judicial strife, while admitting that the word is used in the judicial sense in the Sept., e.g., Job ix. 3, Eccles. vi. 10. Beza had previously taken the same view.—χιτωνα, ἵματιον. The contention is supposed to be about the under garment or the tunic, and the advice is, rather than go to law, let him have not only it but also καλ, the more costly upper robe, mantle, toga. The poor man might have several tunics or shirts for change, but only one upper garment, used for clothing by day, for bed-cover by night, therefore humbly forbidden to be retained over night as a pledge, Ex. xxii. 26.

Ver. 41. ἄγαραπρόει, compel thee to go one mile in A. V. and R. V. Hatch (Essays in Biblical Greek, p. 37) thinks it means compel thee to carry his baggage, a very probable rendering in view of the history of the word as he gives it. A Persian word, originally, introduced into the Greek, Latin, and Rabbinic languages, it denoted first to requisition men, beasts, beasts or conveyances for the courier system described in Herod. viii. 98, Xen. Cyr. viii. 6, 17; next in post-classical use under the successors of the Persians in the East, and under the Roman Empire, it was applied to the forced transport of military baggage by the inhabitants of a country through which troops were passing. Hatch remarks: "The
extant to which this system prevailed is seen in the elaborate provisions of the later Roman law: angariae came to be one of those modes of taxing property which, under the vicious system of the empire, ruined both individuals and communities. An instance in N.T. of the use of the word in this later sense occurs in Mt. xxvii. 32, Mk. xv. 31, in reference to Simon compelled to carry Christ's cross. We may conceive the compulsion in the present case to proceed from a military man—µιλιον, a Roman mile, about 1600 yards, a late word. —§46, in point of time, the additional mile = two, there and back, with proportional fatigue, a decided climax of hardship. But it is not merely a question of time, as Achelis thinks. The sense of oppression is involved, subjection to arbitrary military power. Christ's counsel is: do not submit to the inevitable in a slavish, sullen spirit, harbouring thoughts of revolt. Do the service cheerfully, and more than you are asked. The counsel is far-reaching, covering the case of the Jewish people subject to the Roman yoke, and of slaves serving hard masters. The three cases of non-resistance are not meant to foster an abject spirit. They point out the higher way to victory. He that magnanimously bears overcomes.

Ver. 42. This counsel does not seem to belong to the same category as the preceding three. One does not think of begging or borrowing as an injury, but at most as a nuisance. Some have doubted the genuineness of the logion as a part of the Sermon. But it occurs in Luke's redaction (vi. 30), transformed indeed so as to make it a case of the sturdy beggar who helps himself to what he does not get for the asking. Were there idle, lawless tramps in Palestine in our Lord's time, and would He counsel such treatment of them? If so, it is the extreme instance of not resisting evil. —µη ἀποστραφῆς with τὸν δίνον in accusative. One would expect the genitive with the middle, the active taking an accusative with genitive, e.g., 2 Tim. iv. 4, τὴν ἐκοφὴν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀληθείας. But the transitive sense is intelligible. In turning myself away from another, I turn him away from me. Vide Heb. xii. 25, 2 Tim. i. 15.

Vv. 43-48. Sixth and final illustration: from the Law of Love. To an old partial form of the law Jesus opposes a new universal one. —Ver. 43. Ἰησοῦν ἐν τῷ ἔρημῷ: said where, by whom, and about whom? The sentiment Jesus supposes His hearers to have heard is not found in so many words in the O. T. The first part, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour," occurs in Lev. xix. 18. The contrary of the second part is found in Ex. xxiii. 4, where humanity towards the straying or overburdened beast of an enemy is enjoined. It is to be hoped that even the scribes did not in cold blood sin against the spirit of this precept by teaching men to love their private friends and hate their private enemies. Does ἠλπίζειν then mean an Israelite, and ἐξέβρασε a Gentile, and was the fault of the traditional law of love that it confined obligation within national limits? The context in Lev. xix. 18 gives ἔνα that sense: "Thou shalt not bear any grudge against the children of thy people." On the other hand, the tendency of Israel's
transitive. ὑμᾶς. 45. ὅπως γένησθε ὑιόι τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς, ὥστε
only in N. τῶν ἥλιον αὐτῶν ἄνατελλει ἐπὶ ποιμνῷ καὶ ἄγαθῷ, καὶ ἐφέξεις
iedades ἐπὶ δικαίους καὶ δίκαιος. 46. ἐὰν γὰρ ἀγαπήσῃς τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας
T.; vides ἐπὶ δικαίους καὶ δίκαιους. 18. γ. Lk. vii. 38. ὑμᾶς, τίνα μοσθὸν ἔχετε; οὐκ ἔκακός
καὶ οἱ τελῶναι τῷ αὐτῷ 1 ποιοῦσιν;
114 κατὰ μαθαίον

1 Some editors, following DZ, prefer ὄντως to το αὐτό. W.H., while retaining
the αὐτό, which has the support of ΝBL, put ὄντως on the margin.

election, and of certain texts (vide Ex. xxiii, Deut. vii.), was to foster aversion
to the outside nations, and from Ezra onwards the spirit of Judaism was one of
increasing hostility towards the gentile——
vide Esther. The saying quoted by
Jesus, if not an exact report of Rabbinical
teaching, did no injustice to its general
attitude. And the average Jew in this
respect followed the guidance of his
teachers, loving his own countrymen,
regarding with racial and religious
aversion those beyond the pale.—Ver.
44. ἄγαθος may be taken in all senses:
national, private, religious. Jesus abso-
lutely negatives hatred as inhuman.
But the sequel shows that He has in view
the enemies whom it is most diffi-
cult to love—διακόνων: those who
persecute on account of religion. The
clauses imported into the T. R. from
Luke have a more general reference
to enmities arising from any cause, although
they also receive a very emphatic mean-
ing when the cause of alienation is
religious differences. There are no
hatreds so bitter and ruthless as those
originating therein. How hard to love
the persecutor who thinks he does God
service by heaping upon you all manner
of indignities. But the man who can
rejoice in persecution (ver. 12) can love
and pray for the persecutor. The
clavage between Christians and un-
believers took the place of that between
the chosen race and the Gentiles, and
tempted to the same sin.

Vv. 45-47. Characteristically lofty in-
ducements to obey the new law; like-
ness to God (ver. 45); moral distinction
among men (vvs. 46, 47).—νομιμὸν τοῦ
πατρὸς ὑμῶν: in order that ye may be
indeed sons of God: nobilesse oblige; 
God’s sons must be Godlike. “Father”
again. The new name for God occurs
sixteen times in the Sermon on the Mount;
to familiarise by repetition, and define
by discriminating use.—στι, not εἰκοστά, but
meaning “because”: for so your Father
acts, and not otherwise can ye be His
sons.—ἄνατελλει, sometimes intransitive,
as in Mt. iv. 16, Lk. xii. 54, here
transitive, also in Sept., Gen. iii. 18,
etc., and in some Greek authors (Pindar.
Isth. vi, i10, e.g.) to cause to rise. The
use of καλόν (ver. 15) and ἄνατελλει in
an active sense is a revival of an old
poetic use in later Greek (exx. of the
former in Eusner).—πρέξει = pluit (Vulg.),
said of God, as in the expression ἔφη 
τοῦ Διὸς (Kypke, Observ. Sac.). The
use of this word also in this sense is a
revival of a poetical usage.——ποιμνῷ,
ἄγαθῷ: δικάω, δίκαιος, not mere
repetition. There is a difference between
ἄγαθος and δίκαιος similar to that
between generous and just. ποιμνῷ
may be renderediggishly—vide on vi.
23. The sentiment thus becomes: “God
makes His sun rise on niggardly and
generous alike, and His rain fall on just
and unjust”. A similar thought in
Seneca, De benif. iv. 26: “Si deos
imitaris, da et ingratis beneficia, nam et
sceletaris sol oritur, et piratis patent
maria”. The power of the fact stated
to influence as a motive is wholly
destroyed by a pantheistic conception of
God as indifferent to moral distinctions,
or a deistic idea of Him as transcendent,
too far above the world, in heaven, as it
were, to be able to take note of such
differences. The divine impartiality is
due to its animating character; by no means
a matter of course in a Jewish teacher,
the tendency being to insist on exact
correspondence between lot and charac-
ter under a purely retributive conception
of God’s relation to man.—Ver. 46. μισθὸν
here, and three times in next chapter; one
of several words used in this connection of
thought—περισσῶν (ver. 47), τελείοις (ver.
48)—having a legal sound, and capable
of being misunderstood. The scribes
and Rabbis had much to say about merit
47. and 


1 Many copies have φιλος, but άδελφος is the reading of ΝΒΔΖ.
2 ΝΒΔΖ have ούκοι instead of τελεωναι and το αυτον for ουν. See below.
3 ye love those who love you what new thing do ye? for even fornicators do this."—δευκολ, here as elsewhere in the Gospels associated with τελεωναι (Mt. xviii. 17). A good many of the publicans would be Gentiles. For a Jew it was a virtue to despise and shun both classes. Surely disciples will not be content to be on a moral level with them! Note that Jesus seems some good even in despised classes, social outcasts.

Ver. 48. Concluding exhortation. ὅτι, from an ancient form of the participle of the verb ὅται (Klotz, Deser.) = "things being so," either a collective inference from all that goes before (vv. 21-47) or as a reflection on the immediately preceding argument. Both come to the same thing. Godlike love is commended in vv. 44-47, but the gist of all the six illustrations of Christ's way of thinking is:—Love the fulfilling of the law; obviously, except in the case of oaths, where it is truth that is enjoined. But truth has its source in love; Eph. iv. 15: "δείκται εν δείκτῃ, "testifying it in love".—ὁμοιον, future, "ye shall be = be.—ομοιον, ye, emphatic, in contrast with τελεωναι, and ὅτι, who are content with moral commonplace and conventional standards.—Τελεωναι, in general, men who have reached the end, touched the ideal, that at least their purpose, not satisfied with anything short of it. The τελεωναι are not men with a conceit of perfection, but aspirants—men who seek to attain, like Paul: διότι ελ ο έπαι καταλάβασα, Phil. iii. 12, and like him, single-minded, their motto: υπ τε άδηλον. Single-mindedness is a marked characteristic of all genuine citizens of the kingdom (Mt. vi. 33), and what the Bible means by perfection. All men who attain have one great ruling aim. That aim for the disciple, as here set forth, is Godlikeness—ος ο τελεων έτεινιν. God is what His sons aspire to be; He never sinks below the ideal: impartial, benignant, gracious love, even to the unworthy; for
VI. 1. "*PROSEKETE* tēn ἀληθευσάνθην ὑμῶν μη τοιεῖν ἐμπροσθέν τῶν ἄνθρωπων, πρὸς τὸ θεάθηναι αὐτοῖς. εἰ δὲ μὴν, μυσθὸν οὖκ ἔχων τῷ ἐμπροσθέν παρὰ τῷ πατρὶ ὑμῶν τῇ ἐν τοῖς ὁραμαῖς. 2. δότων οὖν


that, not all conceivable attributes, is what is in view. δὲ not in degree, that were a discouraging demand, but in kind. The kind very necessary to be emphasised in view of current ideas and practice, in which holiness was dis-associated from love. The law "Be holy for I am holy" (Lev. xi. 44) was taken negatively and worked out in separation from the reputedly sinful. Jesus gave it positive contents, and worked it out in gracious love. 

Chapter VI. The Sermon Continued. From Scribe law, the main theme of vv. 21-48, the Teacher passes to speak of Pharisaic practice. Ver. 1 describes the general character of Pharisaic righteousness. Then follow three special examples: alms, vv. 2-4; prayer, vv. 5-6; fasting, vv. 16-18. The transition from the one theme to the other was almost inevitable, and we may be sure that what follows formed part of the instruction on the hill. 

Ver. 1. ὁτι υἱόν προσπεπνέμων· τῷ ἐμπροσθέν τῶν νορών, understood, to attend to; here, with μὴ following, take heed, be on your guard against. Dictamen, not ἀληθευσάνθην (T. R.), is there demanded in a general introductory statement. Alms formed a very prominent part of Pharisaic righteousness, and was in Rabbinical dialect called righteousness, ἡ τής (vide Weber, p. 273), but it was not the whole, and it is a name for the whole category that is wanted in ver. 1. If Jesus spoke in Aramaic He might, as Lightfoot (Hor. Hebr.) suggests, use the word tserakah both in the first and in the following three verses; in the first in the general sense, in the other places in the special sense of alms—ἐμπροσθέν τῶν ἄνθρωπων. In chap. v. 16 Christ commands disciples to let their light shine before men. Here He seems to enjoin the contrary. The contradiction is only apparent. The two places may be combined in a general rule thus: Show when tempted to hide, hide when tempted to show. The Pharisees were exposed, and yielded, to the latter temptation. They did their righteousness, πρὸς τὸ θεάθηναι, to be seen. Their virtue was theatrical, and that meant doing only things which in matter and mode were commonly admired or believed by the doers to be. This spirit of ostentation Christ here and elsewhere represents as the leading feature of Pharisaism.—εἰ δὲ μὴν, a combination of four particles frequently occurring in the Gospels, meaning: if at least ye do not attend to this rule, then, etc. γὰρ is a very expressive particle, derived by Klotz, Devar. ii. 272, from ἐκα, i.e., ΕΑΩ, or from δέγα, and explained as meant to render the hearer attentive. Bäumlein, dissenting from Klotz’s derivation, agrees substantially with its view of its meaning as isolating a thought from all else and placing it alone in the light (Untersuchungen über Griechische Partikel, p. 54) = “Mark my words, for if you do not as I advise then,” etc. μυθον λοι αἰτεῖν; on μυθον, vide v. 46. The meaning is that theatrical virtue does not count in the Kingdom of God. Right motive is essential there. There may be a reward, there must be, else theatrical religion would not be so common; but it is not ἡ τῆς προσπεπνέων.
EYAGGEION

mosti gaiti. 3. sou de pousotis leptomoush, v' gunoiv h
krata. tis stis tis tois h deidh sou. 4. etas h sou h leptomoush 1 en
5. xwris. kai o pathe sou o belten en tis krate, authe 2 o Rom. ii. 20
(phrase).

1 Tisch. has he sou leptomoush a, following ND (et al. et). Most modern
editors as in text.

2 Tisch. omits antes, which is found in D.

Vv. 2-4. Almsgiving. Ver 2. leptom-
sous, mercy in general, but specifically
alms, as a common mode of showing
mercy. Compare our word charity,—
svakrion : to be understood metaphori-
cally, as there is no evidence of the
literal practice. Furrer gives this from
Consul Wetstein to illustrate the word.
When a man (in Damascus) wants to do
a good act which may bring a blessing
by way of divine recompense on his own
family, e.g., healing to a sick child, he
goes to a water-carrier with a good
voice, gives him a piece of money, and
says "Sellis," i.e., give the thirsty a
fresh drink of water. The water-carrier
fills his skin, takes his stand in the
market, and sings in varied tones: "O
thirsty, come to the drink-offering," the
giver standing by, to whom the carrier
says, as the thirsty drink, "God forgive
thy sins, O giver of the drink." (Zacht.
fur M. und R., 1890. Vide also his Wand-
errungen d. d. H. L., p. 437.)—πορκριτωλ,
stage-players in classics, used in N. T.
in a moral and sinister sense, and for
the Christian mind heavily burdened with evil
connotation—hypocrites ! What a deep-
ening of the moral sense is implied in
the new meaning! The abhorrence of
acting for effect in religion is due to
Christ's teaching. It has not yet quite
banished the thing. There are religious
actors still, and they use good houses.
—σωματικαι : where alms were col-
clected, and apparently also distributed.—
πρας, streets, in eastern cities narrow
lanes, a late meaning; in earlier Greek =
impetus—onst. Vide Rutherford's New
Phryn., 488. Cf. πλατεια, ver. 5.
πλατεια, supp. διας = a broad street.

δεσμιον : in chap. v. 16 God is
conceived as recipient of the glory;
here the almsgiver, giving for that
purpose.—δεσμον introducing a solemn
statement, and a very serious one for
the parties concerned.—σωματικαι, they
have in full; they will get no more,
nothing from God : so in Lk. vi. 24,
Phil. iv. 18 (vide on Mk. xiv. 41). The
hypocrite partly does not believe this,
partly does not care, so long as he gets
the applause of his public.—Ver. 3. v'
γνοι : in proverbial form a counsel to
give with simplicity. Let not even thy
left hand, if possible even thyself, know,
still less other men; give without self-
consciousness or self-complacency, the
root of ostentation,—en tis krate :
known to the recipient, of course, but
to no other, so far as you are concerned,
hardly even to yourself. "Pii lucent, et
tamen latent," Beng.—δ βλεπων e. t. κ.,
who seeth in the dark. "Acquainted
with all my ways." Ps. cxxxix., a
comfort to the sincerely good, not to
the counterfeiters.—σωματικαι σοι : a cer-
tainty: and not merely of the future.
The reward is present; not in the form
of self-complacency, but in the form of
spiritual health, like natural buoyancy,
when all physical functions work well.
A right-minded man is happy without
reflecting why; it is the joy of living
in summer sunshine and bracing moun-
tain air. The en tis φανεω here and in
vv. 6 and 18, a gloss by some superficial
copist, ignores the inward present re-
ward, and appeals in a new form to the
spirit of ostentation.

Vv. 5-6. Prayer, ἵνα οἱ ὡορκριτα, as the actors. We shrink from
the harshness of the term "hypocrite".
Jesus is in the act of creating the new
meaning by the use of an old word in
a new connection.—φυλακη stands in
place of an adverb. They love to, are
wont, do it with pleasure. This con-
struction is common in classics, even in
reference to inanimate objects, but here
only and in Mt. xxviii. 6-7 in N. T.—
ὡτοιωθε, ordinary attitude in prayer.
συγκλήτων and καθηθαι seem to be used
sometimes without emphasis to denote
simply presence in a place (so Priceaus).
—σωματικαις, γυναικας ὑπλα : usual
places of prayer, especially for the
"actors," where men do congregate, in
the synagogue for worship, at the
corners of the broad streets for talk or
business; plenty of observers in both
cases. Prayer had been reduced to
system among the Jews. Methodising,
with stated hours and forms, began after
Ezra, and grew in the Judaistic period; traces of it even in the later books of O. T., e.g., Dan. vi. 10, 11 (vide Schultz, "Alt. Theol."). The hour of prayer might overtake a man anywhere. The "actors" meant, as De Wette suggests, to be glad to be overtaken, or even arrange for it, in some well-frequented place. — δῶρας φανερῶν τ. ο. in order that they may appear to men, and have it remarked: how devout! Ver. 6: true prayer in contrast to the theatrical type.—ςού δαί, thou, my disciple, in opposition to the "actors"—δείκνυσθαι, when the spirit moves, not when the customary hour comes, freedom from rule in prayer, as in fasting (Mt. ix. 14), is taken for granted —τα ταμεία, late form for ταμεία (Lobeck, "Phryn.", 493), first a store-chamber, then any place of privacy, a closet (Mt. xxiv. 26). Note the σοι after ταμεία, and θύρα and παρθένι, all emphasizing isolation, thy closet, thy door, thy Father. —κλείσαι, carefully shutting thy door, the door of thine own retreat, to exclude all but thy Father, with as much secrecy as if you were about a guilty act. What delicacy of feeling, as well as sincerity, is implied in all this; greatly to be respected, often sinned against.—το ἐν τοῖς κρυπτοῖς. He who is in the secret place; perhaps with allusion to God's presence in the dark holy of holies (Acheldas). He is there in the place from which all fellow-men are excluded. Is social prayer negatized by this directory? No, but it is implied that social prayer will be a reality only in proportion as it proceeds from a gathering of men accustomed to private prayer.

Vv. 7-15. Further instruction in prayer. Weiss (Mt.-Evan.) regards this passage as an interpolation, having no proper place in an anti-Pharisaic discourse. Both the opinion and its ground are doubtful. As regards the latter, it is true that it is Gentile practice in prayer that is formally criticised, but it does not follow that the Pharisees were not open to the same censure. They might make long prayers, not in ignorance, but in ostentation (Lutteroth), as a display of devotional talent or zeal. But apart from the question of reference to the Pharisees, it is likely that prayer under various aspects formed one of the subjects of instruction in the course of teaching on the hill whereof these chapters are a digest.

Ver. 7. Βετταλειφρέττε, a δωτακε. in N. T., rarely used anywhere, and of doubtful derivation. Some (Erasmus, e.g.) have thought it was formed from Battus, the stammerer mentioned by Herod. (iv. 155), or from a feeble poet of the name who made long hymns full of repetitions (Suidas, Lexicon), but most now incline to the view that it is onomatopoetic. Hesychius (Lex.) takes this view of the kindred word, βετταλειφρέττε. (ἐμοὶ μέν δοκεῖ κατὰ μήπως τὴν φωνήν πενηθείσαν). It points to the repetition without end of the same forms of words as a stammerer involuntarily repeats the same syllable, like the Baal worshippers.
shouting from morning till noon, "O Baal, hear us" (1 Kings viii. 26. cf. Acts xix. 34, "Great is Diana of the Ephesians"). This repetition is characteristic of Pagan prayer, and when it recurs in the Church, as in saying many Aves and Paternosters, it is Paganism redivivus.—θονωλ, the second of three references to Pagans (v. 47, vi. 34) in the Sermon on the Mount, not to be wondered at. The Pagan world was near at hand for a Jew belonging to Galilee with its mixed population. Pagan customs would be familiar to Galileans, and it was natural that Jesus should use them as well as the theory and practice of scribes and Pharisees to define by contrast true piety. —πολυλογις, epexegetical of πατεραυς. The Pagans thought that by endless repetitions and many words they would inform their gods as to their needs and weary them ("fatigare deos") into granting their requests. Ver. 8, αυτος, infers that disciples must not imitate the practice described, because it is Pagan, and because it is absurd. Repetition is, moreover, wholly uncalled for—ονειν γαρ. The God whom Jesus proclaims"—your Father"—knows beforehand your needs. Why then, pray at all? Because we cannot receive unless we desire, and if we desire, we will pray; also because things worth getting are worth asking. Only pray always as to a Being well informed and willing, in few words and in faith. With such thoughts in mind, Jesus proceeds to give a sample of suitable prayer.

Vv. 9-13. The Lord's Prayer. Again, in Lk. xi. 1-4—wide notes there. Here I remark only that Luke's form, true reading, is shorter than Matthew's. On this ground Camphausen (Das Gebet des Herrn) argues for its originality. But surely Matthew's form is short and elementary enough to satisfy all reasonable requirements! The question as to the original form cannot be settled on such grounds. The prayer, as here given, is, indeed, a model of simplicity. Besides the question as to the original form, there is another as to the originality of the matter. Wetstein says, "tota haec oratio ex formulae Hebraeorum concinnata est". De Wette, after quoting these words, asserts that, after all the Rabbinical scholars have done their utmost to adduce parallels from Jewish sources, the Lord's Prayer is by no means shown to be a Cento, and that it contains echoes only of well-known O. T. and Messianic ideas and expressions, and this only in the first two petitions. This may be the actual fact, but there is no need for any zeal in defence of the position. I should be very sorry to think that the model prayer was absolutely original. It would be a melancholy account of the chosen people if, after thousands of years of special training, they did not yet know what to pray for. Jesus made a new departure by inaugurating (1) freedom in prayer; (2) trustfulness of spirit; (3) simplicity in manner. The mere making of a new prayer, if only by apt conjunction of a few choice phrases gathered from Scripture or Jewish prayer-books, was an assertion of liberty. And, of course, the liberty obtains in reference to the new form as well as to the old. We may use the Paternoster, but we are not bound to use it. It is not in turn to become a fetish. Reformers do not arise to break old fetters only in order to forge new ones. Ver. 9. ουτως, thus, not after the ethnic manner.—προσευχεχς: present, pray so habitually.—ομας: as opposed to the Pagans, as men (i.e.) who believe in an intelligent, willing God, your Father. The prayer which follows consists of six petitions which have often been elaborately explained, with learned discussions on disputed points, leaving the reader with the feeling that the new form is any thing but simple, and wondering how it ever came into universal use. Gospel has been turned into law, spirit into
letter, poetry into prose. We had better let this prayer alone if we cannot catch its lyric tone.—Πάτερ. In Luke's form this name stands impressively alone, but the words associated with it in Matthew's version of the address are every way suitable. Name and epithet together—Father, in heaven—express reverential trust.—Ἀμην ἐστιν ὁ πατήρ ὁ θεός. In the second petition—sanctified, hallowed be Thy name. Fritzsche holds that σων in this and the next two petitions is emphatic, σου not σου enclitic. The suggestion gives a good direction for the expositor=may God the Father-God of Jesus become the one object of worship all the world over. A very natural turn of thought in view of the previous reference to the Pagans. Pagan prayer corresponded to the nature of Pagan deities—indifferent, capricious, unrighteous, unloving; much speaking, iteration, dYNAMIC was needed to gain their ear. How blessed if the whole pantheon could be swept away or fall into contempt, and the one worshipful Divinity be, in fact, worshipped, ὁ πατήρ ὁ θεός γις; for this clause appended to the third petition may be conceived as common to all the first three. The One Name in heaven the One Name on earth, and reverenced on earth as in heaven. Universalism is latent in this opening petition. We cannot imagine Jesus as meaning merely that the national God of Israel may be duly honoured within the bounds of His own people.

Ver. 10. Ἐλθὼν ἡ βασιλεία σου: second petition. The prayer of all Jews. Even the Rabbis said, that is no prayer in which no mention of the kingdom is made. All depends on how the kingdom is conceived, on what we want to come. The kingdom is as the King. It is the kingdom of the universal, benignant Father who knows the wants of His children and cares for their interests, lower and higher, that Jesus desires to come. It will come with the spread of the worship of the One true Divine Name; the paternal God ruling in grace over believing, grateful men. Thus viewed, God's kingdom comes, is not always here, as in the reign of natural law or in the moral order of the world.—γεννηθήτω τ. σ.: third petition. Camphausen, bent on maintaining the superior originality of Luke's form in which this petition is wanting, regards it as a mere pendant to the second, unfolding its meaning. And it is true in a sense that any one of the three first petitions implies the rest. Yet the third has its distinct place. The kingdom, as Jesus preached it, was a kingdom of grace. The second petition, therefore, is a prayer that God's gracious will may be done. The third, on the other hand, is a prayer that God's commanding may be done; that the right as against the wrong may everywhere prevail.—σωτερ ἤστε γις. This addendum, not without application to all three petitions, is specially applicable to this one. Translated into modern dialect, it means that the divine will may be perfectly, ideally done on this earth: as in heaven, so also, etc. The reference is probably to the angels, described in Ps. ciii., as doing God's commandments. In the O. T. the angels are the agents of God's will in nature as well as in Providence. The defining clause might, therefore, be taken as meaning: may God's will be done in the moral sphere as in the natural; exactly, always, everywhere.

The foregoing petitions are regarded by Grotius, and after him Achelis, as pia desideria, σωτερ, rather than petitions proper—ἀνάγνωστα, like the following three. The distinction is not gratuitous, but it is an exegetical refinement which may be disregarded. More important is it to note that the first group refers to the great public interests of God and His kingdom, placed first here as in vi. 33, the second to personal needs. There is a corresponding difference in the mode of expression, the verbs being in the third person in Group I., objective, impersonal; in the second in Group II., subjective, personal.

Ver. 11. Fourth petition. τὸν ἐρωτήτω: whatever the adjective qualifying ἐρωτήσον may mean, it may be taken for granted that it is ordinary bread, food for the body, that is intended. All spiritualising mystical meanings of ἐρωτήσον are to be discarded. This is the one puzzling word in the prayer. It is a ζωλή, not only in O. and N. T., but in Greek literature, as known not only to us, but even to Origen, who

(De Orat. cap. xvii.) states that it
not found in any of the Greeks, or used by private individuals, and it seems to be a coinage (δουκε πεντάλοθα) of the evangelists. It is certainly not likely to have proceeded from our Lord. This one word suffices to prove that, if not always, at least in uttering this prayer, Jesus spoke in Aramaean. He would not in such a connection use an obscure word, unfamiliar, and of doubtful meaning. The problem is to account for the incoming of such a word into the Greek version of His doubtless simple, artless, and well-understood saying. The learned are divided as to the derivation of the word, having of course nothing but conjecture to go on. Some derive it from ἐν and οὐσία, or the participle of ἐλήνη; others from ἐννοια, or ἐννοια = the approaching day (ἡμέρα understood). In one case we get a qualitative sense—bread for subsistence, bread needed and sufficient (τὸ δίστηκα καὶ αὐτέρα). Prov. xxx. 8, Sept.), in the other, a temporal—bread of the coming day, fænem quotidianum (Vulg., Lk., xi. 3), “daily bread”. Either party argues against the other on grammatical grounds, e.g., that derived from οὐσία the word should be ἐννοια, but the Greek equivalent for the day was ἐννοια, the adjective ἐννοιας was coined to make the prayer suitable at all hours. In the morning it would mean the bread of the day now begun, in the evening the bread of to-morrow. But devotional conservatism, while adopting the new word as convenient, would cling to the original “of the day”; hence σημερον in Matt. and τὸ καὶ ἡμέρα in Luke, along with ἐννοιας. On the whole the temporal meaning seems to have the weight of the argument on its side. For a full statement of the case on that side vide Lightfoot as above, and on the other the article on ἐννοιας in Cremer’s Bib. Theol., W. B., 7th Aufl., 1893.

Ver. 12. Fifth petition. υφίλημα, in classics literal debts, here moral debts, sins (ἀμαρτίας in Lk. xi. 4). The more men desire God’s will to be done the more conscious they are of shortcoming. The more conscious of personal shortcoming, the more indulgent towards the faults of others even when committed against themselves. Hence the added...
VI.

KATA MATHEION


The Doxology omv stv...aivav is wanting in NBDDZ and is regarded by most modern critics as an ancient liturgical insertion. It is found in LΔΣ sl.

the parastotomata autov wanting in ND, omitted by Tisch., bracketed by W.H., though found in BL.

For avtov B has autov.

T. R. has avtov with L. NBDD omit.

words: δέ καὶ ἂν ἢ. ἀφίησαν, etc. It is natural and comforting to the sincere soul to put the two things together. δέ must be taken very generally. The prayer proceeds from child-like hearts, not from men trained in the distinctions of theology. The comment appended in vv. 14, 15 introduces an element of reflection difficult to reconcile with the spontaneity of the prayer. It is probably imported from another connection, e.g., Mt. xviii. 35 (so Weiss-Meyer).

Ver. 13. Sixth petition: consists of two members, one qualifying or limiting the other.—μὴ...πειρασμοί, expose us not to moral trial. All trial is of doubtful issue, and may therefore naturally and innocently be shirked from, even by those who know that the result may be good, confirmation in faith and virtue. The prayer is certainly in a different key from the Beatitude in V. 10. There Jesus sets before the disciple a heroic temper as the ideal. But here He does not assume the disciple to have attained. The Lord's Prayer is not merely for heroes, but for the timid, the inexperienced. The teacher is considerate, and allows time for reaching the heights of heroism on which St. James stood when he wrote (i. 2) πᾶσαν χάραν ἥγησαν, ἀδελφοί μου, δαντὶ πειρασμοὶ περίποτε τιμᾶτοι. — ἀλλὰ, not purely adversative, cancelling previous clause, but confirming it and going further (Schanz), in accordance with original meaning of ἀλλὰ, derived from ἀλλος or ἄλλο, and signifying that what is going to be said is another thing, alined, in relation to what has been said, Klotz, Devar. ii., p. 2 = Lead us not into temptation, or so lead us that we may be safe from evil: May the issue ever be beneficial.—πορεία ἀνδρί, not ἄνα; the latter would imply actual implication in, the former implies danger merely. Both occur in N. T. (on the difference cf. Camphhausen, Das G. des H.) — τοῦ πονηροῦ, either masculine or neuter, which? Here again there is an elaborate debate on a comparatively unimportant question. The probability is in favour of the masculine, the evil one. The Eastern naturally thought of evil in the concrete. But we as naturally think of it in the abstract; therefore the change from A. V. in R. V. is unfortunate. It mars the reality of the Lord's Prayer on Western lips to say deliver us from the evil one. Observe it is moral evil, not physical, that is deprecated.—στὴ σοῦ ἐκτίνα...Ἀμὴν: a liturgical ending, no part of the original prayer, and tending to turn a religious reality into a devotional form.


Vv. 16-18. Fasting. Ver. 16. ἄνα: transition to a new related topic.—σκυθρώσις, of sad visage, overdone of course by the "actors". Fasting, like
prayer, was reduced to a system; twice a week in ordinary Pharisaic practice: Thursday and Monday (ascent and descent of Moses on Sinai), artificial gloom inevitable in such circumstances. In occasional fasting, in circumstances of genuine affliction, the gloom will be real (Lk. xxiv. 17).—αὐλήται, a play upon words, may be rendered in English "they disfigure that they may figure." In German: Unsichtbar machen, sichtbar werden (Schanz and Weiss).—Ver. 17. ἀλυσία, νίψαι: not necessarily as if preparing for a feast (Meyer and Weiss), but performing the usual daily ablutions for comfort and cleanliness, so avoiding parade of fasting by neglect of them (Bleeck, Aehlisa).

The foregoing incitations of sincerity and reality in religion contribute indirectly to the illustration of the divine name Father which is here again defined by discriminating use. God as Father desires these qualities in worshipers. All close relations (father, son, husband, wife) demand real affection as distinct from parade.

Vv. 19-34. Counsels against covetousness and care (reproduced in Lk. xii. 22-34, with exception of vv. 22-23, which reappear in Lk. xi. 34-36). An interpolation, according to Weiss. Doubtless, if the Sermon on the Mount was exclusively an anti-Pharisaic discourse. But this homily might very well have formed one of the lessons on the hill, in connection with the general theme of the kingdom which needs to be defined in contrast to worldliness not less than to spurious types of piety.

Vv. 19-21. Against hoarding. ἑθαυμάζετε ὑμῖν θησαυρούς ἕκατεν τῆς γῆς, etc, (Mk. vi. 13, Lk. vii. 38, 46. James v. 14.)

B places νηστείαν before τοὺς ἀνθρώπους.

κρυφαίοι in ΝΒΔ.

ΝΒΔL omit οὐ τοῖς φανερώ.

*NB have οὕτως, which makes the reflection more pointed.

B omits καὶ.

B adds σοῦ.

V. 19. "My father, the King of heaven and of earth, hath hid treasure in the earth; and he calleth his servants and交付 them his goods.

V. 20. "Whosoever therefore shall humble himself as this little child, the same is greatest in the kingdom of heaven.

V. 21. "Whoever therefore shall be ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and perverted generation: my Father shall also be ashamed of him in the presence of his holy angels.

V. 22. "The eye is the lamp of the body. If then thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light; but if thine eye be double, then shall thy body be full of darkness.

V. 23. "No one can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other, or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon.

V. 24. "Therefore I say unto you, Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on. Is not the life more than meat, and the body than raiment?

V. 25. "Consider the birds of the air: for they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns; yet your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are ye not much better than they? Who of you by taking thought can add anything to his stature? 

""V. 26. "If ye then be not able to do little things on earth, why take ye thought for things which are in heaven? Which is of more value, the body or the soul? Ye cannot serveth both God and mammon.

V. 27. "Therefore I say unto you, Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on. Is not the life more than meat, and the body than raiment?

V. 28. "Consider the birds of the air: for they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns; yet your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are ye not much better than they? Who of you by taking thought can add anything to his stature? 

""V. 29. "If ye then be not able to do little things on earth, why take ye thought for things which are in heaven? Which is of more value, the body or the soul? Ye cannot serveth both God and mammon.

V. 30. "Therefore I say unto you, Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on. Is not the life more than meat, and the body than raiment? 

""V. 31. "Consider the birds of the air: for they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns; yet your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are ye not much better than they? Who of you by taking thought can add anything to his stature? 

""V. 32. "If ye then be not able to do little things on earth, why take ye thought for things which are in heaven? Which is of more value, the body or the soul? Ye cannot serveth both God and mammon.

V. 33. "Therefore I say unto you, Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on. Is not the life more than meat, and the body than raiment? 

""V. 34. "Consider the birds of the air: for they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns; yet your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are ye not much better than they? Who of you by taking thought can add anything to his stature? 

""V. 35. "If ye then be not able to do little things on earth, why take ye thought for things which are in heaven? Which is of more value, the body or the soul? Ye cannot serveth both God and mammon.
and the evangelic report apparently imperfect. The parallel passage in Luke (xi. 33-36) gives little help. The figure and its ethical meaning seem to be the organ of vision, is the seat of expression, revealing inward dispositions. Physically the qualities on which vision depends are health and disease. The healthy eye gives light for all bodily functions, walking, working, etc.; the diseased eye more or less fails in this service. If the moral is to be found only in last clause of ver. 23, all going before being parable, then ἀμβλούω must mean sound and φωνηρός diseased, meanings which, if not inadmissible, one yet does not expect to find expressed by these words. They seem to be chosen because of their applicability to the moral sphere, in which they might suitably to the connection mean “liberal” and “niggardly”. ἀμβλούω occurs in this sense in Rom. xii. 8, and Hatch (Essays in B. G., p. 80) has shown that φωνηρός occurs several times in Sept. (Sir.) in the sense of niggardly, grudging. He accordingly renders: “The lamp of the body is the eye. If therefore thine eye be liberal thy whole body shall be full of light; but if thine eye be grudging, thy whole body shall be full of darkness.” Of course this leaves the difficulty of the mixing of natural and moral untouched. The passage is elliptical, and might be paraphrased thus: The eye is the lamp of the body: when it is healthy we see to do our daily work, when diseased we are in darkness. So with the eye of the soul, the heart, seat of desire: when it is free from covetousness, not anxious to hoard, all goes well with our spiritual functions —we choose and act wisely. When sordid passions possess it there is darkness within deeper than that which afflicts the blind man. We mistake the relative value of things, choose the wrong, neglect the better, or flatter ourselves that we can have both.

Ver. 24. Parable of the two masters. Oiketes: In the natural sphere it is impossible for a slave to serve two masters, for each claims him as his property, and the slave must respond to one or other of the claims with entire devotion, either from love or from interest.—ἡ γὰρ . . . μυριαόχα . . . ἀγαπώνα: We may take this clause as referring to the case of honest preference. A slave has his likes and dislikes like other men. And he will not do things by halves. His preference will take the form of love, and his aversion that of hate. —ἡ ἄρεις ἀνθελλεται, etc.: this clause may be taken as referring to the case of interest. The slave may not be in his heart care for either of the rival masters. But he must seem to care, and the relative power or temper of one as compared to the other, may be the ground of his decision. And having decided, he attaches himself to the one, and ostentatiously disregards the other. In ordinary circumstances there would be no room for such a competition of masters. But a case might occur in time of war when the conquered were sold into slavery.—ὁ δὲ ἄνθρωπος, etc.: Application of the parable to God and earthly possessions. μαμωνᾶς, wealth personified = Plutus, a Chaldee, Syriac, and Punic word (“lucrum punice mammon dicitur,” Aug. de S. D.) derived from λομος = to conceal or προφυλάσσω to trust (vide Buxtorf, Lex. Talm., p. 1217). The meaning is not, “ ye cannot serve God and have riches,” but “ye cannot be faithful to God and make an idol of wealth.” “Non dixit, qui habet divitias, sed qui servit divitias,” Jerome. Vv. 25-34. Counsels against care. More suitable to the circumstances of the
disciples than those against amassing treasures. "Why speak of treasures to us who are not even sure of the necessities of life? It is for bread and clothing we are in torment" (Luteroth).—Ver. 25, διὰ τοῦτο: because ye can be unfaithful to God through care as well as through covetousness.—μὴ μαρτυρήσατε: μαρτυρεῖν from μάρτυς, μαρτυρία, because care divides and distracts the mind. The verb is used in N. T. in various constructions and senses; sometimes in a good sense, as in 1 Cor. vii. 32: "The unmarried care for the things of the Lord," and xii. 25 in reference to the members of the body having the same care for each other. But the evil sense predominates. What is here deprecated is not work for bread and raiment, but worry, "Labor exercendus est, sollicitudo tollenda," Jerome.—σῶς ἡ ψυχή . . . ἀνάφηκατ: the life not the soul, the natural life is more than meat, and the body more than the clothing which protects it, yet these greater things are given to you already. Can you not trust Him who gave the greater to give the less? But a saying like this, life is more than meat, in the mouth of Jesus is very pregnant. It is the direct contrast of materialism to a lofty conception of man's chief end. It is more than an argument against care, it is a far-reaching principle to be associated with that other logion—a man is better than a sheep (Matt. xii. 13).—Ver. 26, ἐμπλήκατε ἐσί, fix your eyes on so as to take a good look at (Mk. x. 21, xiv. 67).—τὰ πετεινὰ τ. οὐ, the birds whose element is the air; look, not to admire their free, careless movements on the wing, but to note a very relevant fact—ὅτι, that without toil they get their food and live—σείαρεωτω, διεξογνωσα—συνέγνωσε α. i. the usual operations of the husbandman in producing the staff of life. In these the birds have no part, yet your Father feedeth them. The careworn might reply to this: yes; they feed themselves at the farmer's expense, an additional source of anxiety to him. And the cynic unbeliever in Providence: yes, in summer; but how many perish in winter through want and cold? Jesus, greatest of all optimists, though no shallow or ignorant one, quietly adds: ὅν ὁμιλεῖς μᾶλλον διαφέρεις αὐτῶν: do not ye differ considerably from them? They fare, on the whole, well, God's humble creatures. Why should you fear, men, God's children?—Ver. 27, τὰς ἀθηναῖας, etc. The question means: care is as bootless as it is needless. But there is much difference of opinion as to the precise point of the question. Does it mean, who by care can add a cubit to his height or who can add a short space of time, represented by a cubit, to the length of his life? ἡμικείν admits of either sense. It means stature in Lk. xix. 3; ἀγε in John ix. 21, Heb. xi. 37. Most recent commentators favor the latter interpretation, chiefly influenced by the monstrosity of the supposition as referring to stature. Who could call adding a cubit, 16 feet, to his height a very small matter, the expression of Lk. (δᾷκεντον, xii. 26)? The application of a measure of length to the length of days is justified by Ps. xxxix. 5: "Thou hast made my days as handbreadths." But Dr. Field strongly protests against the new rendering. Admitting, of course, that ἡμικείν is ambiguous, and that in classic authors it often means age than stature, he insists that τχεν is decisive. "τχεν," he remarks (Ot. Nor.), "is not only a measure of length, but that by which a man's stature was properly measured." Euthy. on this place remarks: "καὶ μὴν οἴδας σωθείμαν (half a cubit) οὐ διὰ δάκτυλον (a 24th part): λοιπὸν οὖν τὴν τχεν ἐκείνη, δέκα δύο ἄρθρα μέτρον τῶν ἡμικεύων οὖν τχεν ἐστι. Thus a short man is τχεν, a tall man τρχεν." But how are we to get over the monstrosity of the supposition?
Lutteroth helps us here by finding in the question of Jesus a reference to the growth of the human body from infancy to maturity. By that insensible process, accomplished through the aid of food, God adds to every human body more than one cubit. How impossible for you to do what God has done without your thinking of it! And if He fed you during the period of growth, can you not trust Him now when you have ceased to grow?

Vv. 28-30. Lesson from the flowers. καταμαθέτες, observe well that ye may learn thoroughly the lesson they teach. Here only in N.T., often in classics. Also in Sept., e.g., Gen. xxiv. 21: The man observed her (Rebekah), learning her disposition from her actions.—τὰ κρίνα, the lily of Persica, Emperor’s crown, according to Rosenmüller and Kunoel; the red anemone, according to Furrer (Zacht. für M. und R.) growing luxuriantly under thorn bushes. All flowers represented by the lily, said Euthy. Zig. long ago, and probably he is right. No need to discover a flower of human beauty as the subject of remark. Jesus would have said the same thing of the snowdrop, the primrose, the bluebell or the daisy. After ἀγροῦ should come a pause. Consider these flowers! Then, after a few moments’ reflection: πώς, not interrogative (Fritzsche), but expressive of admiration; vague, doubtful whether the growth is admired as to height (Bengel), rapidity, or rate of multiplication. Why refer to growth at all? Probably with tacit reference to question in ver. 27. Note the verbs in the plural (vide critical notes) with a neuter nominative. The lilies are viewed individually as living beings, almost as friends, and spoken of with affection (Winer, § 58. 3). The verb ἀδέξω in active voice is transitive in class., intransitive only in later writers.—κοπτώνων, γῆβοινυ: illud virorum est, qui agrum colunt, hoc mulierum domisdarum (Rosenmüller). The former verb seems to point to the till whereby bread is earned, with backward glance at the conditions of human growth; the latter to the lighter work, whereby clothing, the new subject of remark, is prepared.—Ver. 29. Λέγει δὲ: the speaker is conscious He makes a strong statement, but He means it.—οὖν, not even Solomon the magnificent, most glorious of the kings of Israel, and on state occasions most gorgeously attired. —ἐν τοῖς; the lilies are in view, and one of them is singled out to vie with Solomon.—Ver. 30. ζῷον τὸν χρύσουν Application. The beautiful flowers now lose their individuality, and are merged in the generic grass: mere weeds to be cut down and used as fuel. The natural sentiment of love for flowers is sacrificed for the ethical sentiment of love for man, aiming at convincing him of God’s care.—κλαδίνων (Attic κριβάνων, vide Lobeck, Phryn., 179), a round pot of earthenware, narrow at top, heated by a fire within, dough spread on the sides; beautiful flowers of yesterday thus used to prepare bread for men! Διδυμώτως: several times in Gospels, not in classics; not reproachful but encouraging, as if bantering the careworn into faith. The difficulty is to get the careworn to consider these things. They have no eye for wild flowers, no ear for the song of birds. Not so Jesus. He had an intense delight in nature. Witness the sentiment, “Solomon in all his glory,” applied to a wild flower! These golden words are valuable as revealing His genial poetic nature. They reflect also in an interesting way the holiday mood of the hour, up on the hill away from heat, and crowds, and human misery.

Vv. 31-33. Renewed exhortation.
against care. Ver. 31. οὖν, goes back on ver. 25, repeating the counsel, re-

inforced by intervening argument.— Ver. 32. τὰ πῶμα, again a reference to 

heathen practice; in vi. 7 to their 

battiology in prayer, here to the kind of 

blessings they eagerly ask (ἐπιληπτόνων) : 

material only or chiefly; bread, raiment, 

wealth, etc. I never realised how true 

the statement of Jesus is till I read the 

Vedic Hymns, the prayer book and song 

book of the Indian Aryans. With the 

exception of a few hymns to Varuna, 

in which sin is confessed and pardon 

begged, most hymns, especially those to 

Indra, contain prayers only for material 

goods: cows, horses, green pastures, 

good harvests.

To wishless men thou givest wives, 

And joyful make their joyless lives; 

Thou givest sons, courageous, strong, 

To guard their aged sires from wrong, 

Lands, jewels, horses, herds of kine, 

All kinds of wealth are gifts of thine, 

Thy friend is never slain; his might 

Is never worsted in the fight.

—Dr. Muir, Sanskrit Texts, vol. v., p. 137.

—οὖν γὰρ ὁ πῶμα ν.: Disciples must 

rise above the pagan level, especially as 

they worship not Indra, but a Father in 

heaven, believed in even by the Indian 

Aryans, in a rude way, under the name 

of Dyus-Pitar. Heaven-Father. γὰρ 

explains the difference between pagans 

and disciples. The disciple has a Father 

who knows, and never forgets, His 

children’s needs, and who is so regarded 

by all who truly believe in Him. Such 

faith kills care. But such faith is 

possible only to those who comply with 

the following injunction.— Ver. 33. 

ἐπιληπτεῖς πρῶτον. There is considerable 

variation in the text of this counsel. 

Perhaps the nearest to the original is 

the reading of B, which omits τοῦ θεοῦ 

with θῶν, and inverts the order of βασι 

and δικαίωμα. Seek ye His (the Father’s) 

righteousness and kingdom, though it 

may be against this that in Luke (xii. 31) 

the kingdom only is mentioned, πρῶτον 

also being omitted: Seek ye His king 

dom. This may have been the original 

form of the λογία, all beyond being in 

terpretation, true though unnecessary. 

Seeking the kingdom means seeking 

righteousness as the summum bonum, 

and the πρῶτον is implied in such a 

quest. Some (Meyer, Sevin, Achelis) 

think there is no second, not even a 

subordinate seeking after earthly goods, 

all that to be left in God’s hands, our 

sole concern the kingdom. That is in 

deed the ideal heroic attitude. Yet 

practically it comes to be a question of 

first and second, supreme and subordi 

nate, and if the kingdom be indeed first 

it will keep all else in its proper place. 

The πρῶτον, like the prayer against 

temptation, indicates consideration of 

weakness in the sincere.—προσέθησαται, 

shall be added, implying that the main 

object of quest will certainly be secured.

Ver. 34. Final exhortation against 

care. Not in Luke’s parallel section, 

therefore regarded by Weiss as a re 

flection appended by the evangelist, 

not drawn from apostolic doctrine. But it 

very fitly winds up the discourse. In 

stead of saying, care not about food and 

raiment, the Teacher now says finally, 

care not with reference to to-morrow, 

εἰς τὴν αὔριον ἡμέραν ἔρχεται. It 

comes to the same thing. To restrict 

care to to-day is to master it absolutely. 

It is the future that breeds anxiety and 

leads to hoarding.—μεριμνήσατε: future, 

with force of an imperative = let it, with 

genitive (ἀυτῆς, W. H.) like other verbs of 

care; in ver. 25, with accus.—ἀρκετὸς: a
neuter adjective, used as a noun; a sufficiency. — ἐξ ἄλλων, for each successive day, the article distributive. — ἀλλὰ κακία, the moral evil but the physical, the misery or affliction of life (not classical in this sense). In the words of Chrys. H. xxii., κακίαν φήσι, οὐ τὴν πονηρίαν, μὴ γένοιτο, ἀλλὰ τὴν ταλαντίαν, καὶ τὸν πόνον, καὶ τὸν σοφότερον. Every day has some such troubles: "suas afflic- tiones, quas nihil est necesse metu duplicare". Erasmus, Paraph. Fritzsche proposes a peculiar arrangement of the words in the second and third clauses. Putting a full stop after μικρομετρέω, and retaining the τῶν of T.R. before λέγεται, he brings out this sense: The things of itself are a sufficiency for each day, viz., the evil thereof.

CHAPTER VII. THE SERMON CONTINUED AND CLOSED. The contents of this chapter are less closely connected and more miscellaneous than in the two preceding. In vv. 1-12 the polemic against Pharisaism seems to be continued and concluded. Vv. 6-11 Weiss regards as an interpolation foreign to the connection. It seems best not to be too anxious about discovering connections, but to take the weighty moral sentences of the chapter as they stand, as embody- ing thoughts of Christ at whatever time uttered, on the hill or elsewhere, or in whatever connection. Section 1-5 certainly deals with a Pharisaic vice, the having of a name for an exact fulfillment of the law, our persecuting others, a very cheap way of attaining moral superiority. Jesus would have His disciples rise above Pagans, publicans, Sadducees, Pharisees, but not by the method of detraction.

Vv. 1-5. Against judging. Ver. 1. μὴ κρίνετε, judge not, an absolute prohi- bition of a common habit, especially in religious circles of the Pharisaic type, in which much of the evil in human nature reveals itself. "What levity, haste, prejudice, malevolence, ignorance; what vanity and egotism in most of the judgments pronounced in the world" (Lutteroth). Judge not, said Christ. Judge, it is your duty, said the Dutch pietists of last century through a literary spokesman, citing in proof Matt. xxvii. 33, when the Pharisees are blamed for neglecting "judgment". Vide Ritschl, Geschicht des Pessimismus, i., p. 328. How far apart the two types! — ἦν μὴ κρίνετε: an important, if not the highest motive; not merely a reference to the final judgment, but stating a law of the moral order of the world: the judge shall be judged; to which answers the other: who judges himself shall not be judged (τ Cor. xi. 31). In Rom. ii. 1 St. Paul tacitly refers to the Jew as ὃ κρίνεται. The reference there and here defines the meaning of κρίνεται. It points to the habit of judging, and the spirit as evinced by the habit, censorious- ness leading inevitably to sinister judging, so that κρίνεται is practically equivalent to κατακρίνεται or κατακρίνεται (Lk. vi. 37).

— ἐν τῷ ἀρπαγμόν, etc.: Vulgatisimum hoc apud Judaeos Adagium, says Lightfoot (Hor. Heb.). Of course: one would expect such maxims, based on experience, to be current among all peoples (vide Grotius for examples). It is the lex talionis in a new form: character for character. Jesus may have learned some of these moral adages at school in Nazareth, as we have all when boys learned many good things out of our lesson books with their collections of extracts. The point to notice is what the mind of Jesus assimilated—the best in the wisdom of lost peoples—and the emphasis with which He inculcated the best, so as to ensure for it permanent lodgment in the minds of His disciples and in their records of His teaching.

Vv. 3-5. Proverb of the mote and beam. Also current among Jews and Arabs (vide Tholuck).—κάρφος, a minute dry particle of chaff, wood, etc.—βραχύς, a wooden beam (let in, from δύομαι) or joist, a monstrous symbol of a great fault. A beam in the eye is a natural impossibility; cf. the camel and the needle eye. The Eastern imagination was prone to exaggeration. This is a case of tu quoque (Rom. ii. 2), or rather of "thou much more". The faults may
be of the same kind: κάρφος, a petty theft, δοκός, commercial dishonesty on a large scale—"thou that judgest doest the same things" (Rom. ii. 2); or of a different sort: moral laxity in the publican, pride and inhumanity in the Pharisee who despised him (Lk. xviii. 9-14).—βλέπων, οδι κατανοεῖ: the contrast is not between seeing and failing to see, but between seeing and not choosing to see; ignoring, consciously overlooking. The censorious man is not necessarily ignorant of his own faults, but he does not let his mind rest on them. It is more pleasant to think of other people's faults.

—Ver. 4. ἐκβάλω, hortatory conjunctive, first person, supplies place of imperative which is wanting in first person; takes such words as ἔγειρα, ὕπνα, or as here ἔφαγεν, before it. Vide Goodwin, section 255. For ἔφαγεν modern Greek has ἔα, a contraction, used with the subjunctive in the first and third persons (vide Vincent and Dickson, Modern Greek, p. 322).—Ver. 5. ἔπανοικέα: because he acts as no one else would, act as a reformed feeds himself. "What hast thou to do to declare my statutes?" Ps. l. 16.—μεταβλέπως, thou wilt see clearly, vide Mk. viii. 24, 25, where three compounds of the verb occur, with ἄνι, διὰ, and ἐν. Fritzschetakes the future as an imperative and renders: se comprehender ad aliud, curare; i.e., set thyself then to the task of, etc.

Ver. 6. A complementary counsel. No connecting word introduces this sentence. Indeed the absence of connecting particles is noticeable throughout the chapter: vv. 1, 6, 7, 13, 15. It is a collection of ethical pearls strung loosely together. Yet it is not difficult to suggest a connecting link, thus: I have said, "Judge not," yet you must know people, else you will make great mistakes, such as, etc. The censor's own eye due emphasis. Weis suspects conformity to the ἐκ in ἐκβάλω.

1 NBC have ex, which is preferred by most modern edd. Weiss suspects conformity to the ἐκ in ἐκβάλω.

2 NBC place ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθ. σου before τὴν δοκὰν, so giving to the censor's own eye due emphasis.

1 Corinthians 13:1-6
Before passing from these verses (1-6) two curious opinions may be noted. (1) That ἀγαθές represents an Aramaic word meaning ear-ornaments, answering to pearls. This view, once favoured by Michaelis, Bolten, Kuinoel, etc., and thereafter discredited, has been revived by Holtzmann (H. C.). (2) That ἀφθαλιμμένος (vv. 3, 5) means, not the eye, but a village well. So Furrer. Strange, he says, that a man should need to be told by a neighbour that he has a mole in his eye, or that it should be a fault to propose to take it out! And what sense in the idea of a beam in the eye? But translate the Aramaic word used by Jesus, well, and all is clear and natural. A neighbour given to fault-finding sees a small impurity in a village’s well and tauntingly offers to remove it. Meantime his own boys, in his absence, throw a beam into his own well (Zeitsch. für M. und R. Vide also Wanderungen, p. 222).

Vv. 7-11. Admonition to prayer: presupposes deferred answer to prayer, tempting to doubt as to its utility, and consequent discontinuance of the practice. A lesson more natural at a later stage, when the disciples had a more developed religious experience. The whole subject more adequately handled in Luke xi. 1-13.—Ver. 7. Αληθεία, ἀλήθεια, κροτήρια, threefold exhortation with a view to impressiveness; first literally, then twice in figurative language: seek as for an object lost, knock as at a barred door, appropriate after the parable of the neighbour in bed (Lk. xi. 5-8). The promise of answer is stated in corresponding terms.—δοθήσεται, δοθήσεται, ἀνοίγησαι.—Ver. 8, iteration in form.
of a general proposition: τὰς γὰρ, for every one, etc.—Ver. 9, answers to a state of mind which doubts whether God gives in answer to prayer at all, or at least gives what we desire—τὰς ἐκ τοῖς ἐν τῷ "argument from analogy, from the human to the divine. The construction is broken. Instead of going on to say what the man of the parable will do, the sentence changes into a statement of what he will not do. Well indicated in W.H.'s text by a — after ἐρωτοῦν. The anaclouthen could be avoided by omitting the ἐν τῷ of T. R. after τὰς and μή before λέγων, when the sentence would stand: τὰς ἐκ τῶν ἐν τῷ οὐκ ἔσται ἐρωτοῦν λέγων, λέγων ἐκτιθένηται αὐτῷ. But the broken sentence, if worse grammar, is better rhetoric.—μή λ. λέγων, he will not give him a stone, will he? Bread, stone; fish, serpent. Resemblance is implied, and the idea is that a father may refuse his child's request but certainly will not mock him. Grotius quotes from Plautus: "Altera manu fert lapidem, panem ostentat altera." Furrer suggests that by δώσω is meant not a literal serpent, but a scaleless fish, therefore prohibited to be eaten (Lk. xxi. 12), serpent-like, found in the Sea of Galilee, three feet long, often caught in the nets, and of course thrown away like the dogfish of our waters.—Ver. 11, πονηροί, morally evil, a strong word, the worst fathers being taken to represent the class, the point being that hardly the worst will treat their children as described. There is no intention to teach a doctrine of depravity, or, as Chrysostom says, to calumniate human nature (οὐ διαβάλλοντι τὴν ἀνθρωπινὴν φύσιν). The evil specially in view, as required by the connection, is selfishness, a grudging spirit: "If ye then, whose own nature is rather to keep what you have than to bestow it on others, etc." (Hatch, Essays in B. Gr., p. 81).—οὐκ εἶπον δὲναι solisus dare, Maldon. Westein; rather, have the sense to give; with the infinitive as in Phil. iv. 12, ἧς εἰς ἀντίθεσις ἀπειθέων πατέρων.

o here only in N. T., several times in Sept. p here only in N. T., Sept. Pa. ciii. (iv.) 25. q here only in the sense of contracted.

1 τὰ πόρια is wanting in β and many Fathers (Clem. Orig.), and omitted by W. H. and bracketed by Tisch. Weiss thinks it very suspicious.

2 Some copies have αί for ἀναί and omit τὰ πόρια, but the text as it stands is approved by W. H. Tisch. brackets τὰ πόρια.

iv. 15. ὅ μετανοεῖ, μὴ ἅπειρον τοῦ φόβου, quoted by Hillel in reply to one who asked him to teach the whole law while he stood on one leg. So also in the saying of Confucius: "Do not to others what you would not wish done to yourself," Legge, Chinese Classics, i. 191 E. The negative confines us to the region of justice; the positive takes us into the region of generosity or grace, and so embraces both law and prophets. We wish much more than we can claim—to be helped in need, encouraged in struggles, defended when misrepresented, and befriended when our back is at the wall. Christ would have us do all that in a magnanimous, benignant way; to be not merely δίκαιοι but ἀγαθοί. — νόμος καὶ προφήται: perhaps to a certain extent a current phrase = all that is necessary, but, no doubt, seriously meant; therefore, may help us to understand the statement in v. 17, "I came not to destroy, but to fulfill." The golden rule was Law and Prophets only in an ideal sense, and in the same sense only was Christ a fulfiller.— Vide Wendt, L. J., ii. 341.

Vv. 13, 14. The two ways (Lk. xiii. 23-25). From this point onwards we have what commentators call the Epilogue of the sermon introduced without connecting particle, possibly no part of the teaching on the hill, placed here because it sums up the teaching, was regarded as the best guide to the right way. The passage itself contains no clue to the right way except that it is the way of the few. The allegory also is obscure from its brevity. Is the gate at the beginning or end of the way, or are gate and way practically one, the way narrow because it passes through a narrow doorway? Possibly Christ's precept was simply, "enter through the narrow gate" or "door" (ϋπόθηκα, Luke's word), all the rest being gloss.—ὑπόθηκα, the large entrance to an edifice or city, as distinct from θύρα, a common door; perhaps chosen by Lk. because in keeping with the epithet στενῆς.—στενῶς, etc.: explanatory enlargement to unfold and enforce the precept.—ὁ δύσης: two ways are contrasted, either described by its qualities and end. The "way" in the figure is a common road, but the term readily suggests a manner of life. The Christian religion is frequently called "the way" in Acts (ix. 2, xix. 9, etc.). The wrong road is characterised as στενωτατα and ἄνοιξιν, broad and roomy, and as leading to destruction (ἀνάλυεια). The right way (and gate, ἡ πύλη, is to be retained in ver. 14, though omitted in ver. 13) is described as στενή καὶ τεθλιμμυθή, narrow and contracted, and as leading to life.—ζωή, a pregnant word, true life, worth living in, which men realise the end of their being—the antithesis of ἀνάλυεια. The one is the way of the many, πολλοὶ εἶσον εἰς ἑσπερ.: the other of the few, δίλιγοι . . . εὐφροσυνε. Note the word "finding". The way is so narrow or so untrodden that it may easily be missed. It has to be sought for. Luke suggests the idea of difficulty in squeezing in through the very narrow door. Both points of view have their analogue in life. The practical application of this counsel requires spiritual discernment. No verbal directory will help us. Narrow? Was not the Pharisaic life, the ascetic life and pietism with its severe rules for separation from the "world" in amusement, dress, etc.? Vv. 15-20. Warning against pseudo-prophets. Again, without connecting particle and possibly not a part of the Sermon on the Mount. But the more important question here is: Does this section belong to Christ's teaching at all, or has it been introduced by the Evangelist that false teachers of after days appearing in the Church might be condemned under the authority of the Master? (Holtz., H. C.). What occasion had
Christ to speak of false prophets? The reference can hardly be to the Pharisees or the Rabbis. They were men of tradition, not prophetic, either in the true or in the false sense. But, apart from them, there might be another class of men in evidence in our Lord's day, who might be so characterized. It was a time of religious excitement; the force of custom broken, the deep fountains of the soul bursting forth; witness the crowds who followed John and Jesus, and the significant saying about the kingdom of heaven suffering violence (Matt. xi. 12). Such times call forth true prophets and also spurious ones, so far in religious sympathy with prevalent enthusiasms, but bent on utilising them for their own advantage in gain or influence, men of the Judas type. If such men, as is likely, existed, Jesus would have something to say about them, as about all contemporary religious phenomena.

Ver. 15. Προσέχετε ἀντί to and beware of.—ὁ σάν, I mean, such as—ἐν ἀνδρώπαις φραστάτων. Grotius, Rosenm. and Holts. (H.C) take this as referring to the dress worn (ἐν μαλακοῖς, Heb. xi. 37) as the usual badge of a prophet, but without reference to the plausible manner of the wearer; deceptive and meant to deceive (Zechar. xii. 4); gentle, innocent as sheep; speaking with “unction,” and all but deceiving “the very elect.” The manner more than the dress is doubtless intended. σάν: manner and nature utterly different; within, λίκος ἄρταιας; greedy, sometimes for power, ambitious to be first; often for gain, money. The Didache speaks of a type of prophet whom it pitifully names a χρυσομεγαλός (chap. xii.), a Christ-merchant. There have always been prophets of this type, “each one to his gain” (Is. lvi. 11), Evangel-merchants, traders in religious revival.—Ver. 16. ἀντί τ. καρπῶν. By the nature of the case difficult to detect, but discernible from their fruit.—ἐπιγνώσθηντες. Ye shall know them through and through (ἐπιγώνωσθεν) if ye study carefully the outcome of their whole way of life.

Vv. 16-20. An enlargement in parabolic fashion on the principle of testing by fruit. Ver. 16. μὴ γάρ, do they perhaps, νικ suggesting doubt where there is none = men never do collect, or think of collecting, grapes from thorns or figs from thistles. And yet the idea is not absurd. There were thorns with grape-like fruit, and thistles with heads like figs (Holtz., H.C). But in the natural sphere these resemblances never deceived; men saw at a glance how the matter stood.—Ver. 17. Another illustration from good and bad trees of the same kind. ἀγαθόν, sound, healthy; σαρώδες, degenerate, through age or bad soil. According to Phryn., σαρώδες was popularly used instead of ἀπάθεα, a moral sense (σαρώδες οί πολλοί ἐγίνασα τοίς αἰσχροῖς, p. 377). Each tree brings forth fruit answering to its condition.—Ver. 18. οὐ δώσατε, etc. Nothing else is possible or looked for in nature.—Ver. 19. Men look on this as so certain that they do not hesitate to cut down and burn a degenerate tree, as if it were possible it might bring forth good fruit next year.—μὴ ποιεῖν, if it do not, that once ascertained. Weiss thinks this verse is imported from iii. 10, and foreign to the connection.—Ver. 20. ἐργα: final inference, a very lively and forcible composite particle, again with similar effect.
in Matt. xvii. 26. The ye should have its full force as singling out for special attention; "at least from their fruits, if by no other means". It implies that to know the false prophet is hard. Ver. 23 explains why. He has so much to say, and show, for himself; devils cast out, souls saved, spiritual if not physical miracles done. What other or better "fruit" would you have? What in short is the test? Doctrine, good moral life? Is the false prophet necessarily a false teacher or an immoral man? Not necessarily though not unfrequently. But he is always a self-seeking man. The true prophet is Christ-like, i.e., cares supremely for truth, righteousness, humanity; not at all for himself, his pocket, his position, his life. None but such can effectively preach Christ. This repetition of the thought in ver. 16 is not for mere poetical effect, as Carr (Camb. G. T.), following Jebb (Sacred Literature, p. 195), seems to think.

Vv. 21-23. False discipleship. From false teachers the discourse naturally passes to spurious disciples. Luke's version contains the less of this passage (Luke vi. 46). Something of the kind was to be expected in the teaching on the hill. What more likely than that the Master, who had spoken such weighty truths, should say to His hearers: "In vain ye call me Master, unless ye do the things which I say"? As it stands here the logion has probably, as Weiss suggests (Matt. Evang., p. 210), undergone expansion and modification, so as to give to the title "Lord," originally = ἀρχηγός, Teacher, the full sense it bore when applied to Christ by the Apostolic Church, and to make the warning refer to false prophets of the Apostolic age using Christ's name and authority in support of anti-Christian tendencies, such as anti-nomianism (ἀνομίαν, ver. 23).—Ver. 21. ὁ λόγος, ὁ ποιῶν: Of all, whether disciples or teachers, the principle holds good without exception that not saying "Lord" but doing God's will is the condition of approval and admittance into the kingdom. Saying "Lord" includes taking Jesus for Master, and listening to His teaching with appreciation and admiration; everything short of carrying out His teaching in life. In connection with such lofty thoughts as the Beatitudes, the precept to love enemies and the admonition against care, there is a great temptation to substitute sentimental or aesthetic admiration for heroic conduct.—τῷ θελήματι τοῦ πατρὸς μου. Christ's sense of His position as Master or Lord was free from egotism. He was simply the Son and Servant of the Father, whose will He and all who follow Him must obey; my Father here for the first time.—Ver. 22. ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, the great dread judgment day of Jehovah expected by all Jews, with me as the witness and the grave reference.—τῷ σῷ οὖσαν: thrice repeated, the main ground of hope. Past achievements, prophecysings, exorcisms, miracles are recited; but the chief point insisted on is: all was done in Thy name, honouring Thee, as the source of wisdom and power.—Ver 23. τῶν. When they make this protestation, the Judge will make a counter-protestation.—διαλογίζεται αὐτῶς, I will own to them. Bengel's comment is: aperit, Magna potestas huic dicit. But there is a certain apologetic tone in the expression, "I will confess" ("profecto," A.V. and R.V.), as if to say: I ought to know men who can say so much for themselves, but I do not.—生活质量
EYAGGELION

εὐαγγελιόν "Good News" or "Evangelical".

In sense of beat against...

1 B omits τούτων, which is bracketed by W.H. It seems needed, and may have fallen out by homoeote.

2 ΝΒΖ have ὀμοιωθῆται for ὀμοιοοῦν τοῦτον. So W.H.

3 τῶν before τὴν εὐαγγελίαν in ΝΒΖΣ, so giving the pronoun due emphasis—his house.

4 τὸ εὐαγγέλιον is so used by L. & S., as grammarians call it; note also the rhythm of the sentence in which the war of the elements is described: down came the rain, down rushed the rivers, blew the winds; sudden, fell, terrible. — πρὸς θέασιν, they fell upon that house; rain on roof, river on foundation, wind on walls.

And what happened? καὶ οὐκ ἔφθασεν. The elements fell on it, but it did not fall.—τῆς ἐπίδημος γὰρ: for a good reason, it was founded on the rock. The builder had seen to that.

Vv. 26-27. μορφή, Jesus seems here to offend against His own teaching, v. 22, but He speaks not in passion or contempt, but in deep sadness, and with humane intent to prevent such folly.
Wherein lay the second builder’s folly? Not in deliberately selecting a bad foundation, but in taking no thought of foundation; in beginning to build at haphazard and anywhere; on loose sand (ἀμμός) near the bed of a mountain torrent. His fault was not an error in judgment, but inconsiderateness. It is not, as is commonly supposed, a question of two foundations, but of looking to, and neglecting to look to, the foundation. In the natural sphere no man in his senses commits such a mistake. But utterly improbable cases have to be supposed in parables to illustrate human folly in religion.—Ver. 27. καὶ ... ἄνως: exactly the same phrases as in ver. 25, to describe the oncome of the storm.—προσέκοψαν: a different word for the assault on the house—struck upon it with immediate fatal effect. It was not built to stand such rough handling. The builder had not thought of such an eventuality.—ἐγείρεν, καὶ ἦν ἡ πτώσις αὐτῆς μεγάλη: not necessarily implying that it was a large building, or that the destruction was of large dimensions, like the collapse of a great castle, but that the ruin was complete. The fool’s house went down like a house of cards, not one stone or brick left on another.

Allegorising interpretation of the rain, rivers and winds, and of the foundations, is to be avoided, but it is pertinent to ask, what defects of character in the sphere of religion are pointed at in this impressive parabolic logion? What kind of religion is it that deserves to be so characterised? The foolish type is a religion of imitation and without forethought. Children play at building houses, because they have seen their seniors doing it. There are people who play at religion, not realising what religion is for, but following fashion, doing as others do, and to be seen of others (Matt. vi. 1). Children build houses on the sea sand below high-tide mark, not thinking of the tide which will in a few hours roll in and sweep away their houselet. There are men who have religion for to-day, and think not of the trial to-morrow may bring.

Ver. 28. Concluding statement as to the impression made by the discourse. A similar statement occurs in Mk. i. 22, 27, whence it may have been transferred by Matthew. It may be assumed that so unique a teacher as Jesus made a profound impression the very first time He spoke in public, and that the people would express their feelings of surprise and admiration at once. The words Mark puts into the mouth of the audience in the synagogue of Capernaum are to the life (vide comments there). They saw, and said that Christ’s way of speaking was new, not like that of the scribes to which they had been accustomed. Both evangelists make the point of difference consist in “authority”.

Ver. 29. ἦν ἡ ἀνασκέψεως: Fritzsche supplies, after ἔργων, τοῦ διδάσκειν, and renders, He taught as one having a right to teach, because He could do it well, “scire et perire,” a master of the art. The thought lies deeper. It is an ethical, not an artistic or aesthetic contrast that is intended. The scribes spake by authority, resting all they said on traditions of what had been said before. Jesus spake with authority, out of His own soul, with direct intuition of truth; and, therefore, to the answering soul of His hearers. The people could not quite explain the difference, but that was what they obscurely felt.

Chapters VIII., IX. The Healing Ministry of Jesus. These two chapters consist mainly of miracle narratives,
VIII. 1. KATABANTI δε αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τοῦ βουλ. ἢκολούθησαν αὐτῷ a Ch. x. 8;
δύο λόγους: 2. καὶ ἰδοῦ, ἠλπίς ἤλθεν προσευκέναι αὐτῷ, λέγων,
"Κύριε, ἐὰν θλίψῃ, δύνασαι με καθαρίσαι." 3. Καὶ ἐκ τούτων τῇ
χερσίν, ἤτατο αὐτοῦ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, λέγων, "Θαλασσαί, καθαρίσθητι.") kal
vii. 14, 17. c with τὰ χεριά often in Sept. and frequently in the Gospels (Ch. xii. 13, 49, etc.).

1 For καταβαίνειν δε αὐτῶν (the reading of Ν al. adopted by Tisch.) Ν b BC have καταβαίνει τοις αὐτοῖς. Z has the gen. also (κατὰ κατ. αὐτοῦ). The dative is a grammatical "improvement".

2 For ἐλαφον (in CKL, etc.) ὩΒΑΣ have προσευκέναι. The προσ has probably fallen out through homoeot. (καταβαίνει).

3 ΝΒΖ omit οἱ ἱησοῦς, which Τ. R. often introduces.

the greater number being reports of healing acts performed by Jesus, nine in all, being the second part of the programme sketched in chap. iv. 23-25. These wonderful works are not to be regarded, after the manner of the older apologists, as evidential signs appended to the teaching on the hill to invest it with the authority of an act teaching needed no external credentials; it spoke for itself then as now. These histories are an integral part of the self-revelation of Jesus by word and deed; they are demonstrations not merely of His power, but above all, of His Spirit. Therein lies their chief permanent interest, which is entirely independent of all disputes as to the strictly miraculous character of the events. This collection is not arranged in chronological order. The connection is topical, not temporal.

CHAPTER VIII. 1-4. The leper (Mk. i. 40-45; Lk. v. 12-16). This is the first individual act of healing reported in this Gospel, chap. iv. 23-24 containing only a general notice. It is a very remarkable one. No theory of moral therapeutics will avail here to eliminate the miraculous element. Leprosy is not a disease of the nerves, amenable to emotional treatment, but of the skin and the flesh, covering the body with unsightly sores. The story occurs in all three Synoptics, and, as belonging to the triple tradition, is one of the best attested. Matthew's version is the shortest and simplest here as often, his concern being rather to report the main fact and what Christ said, than to give pictorial details. Possibly he gives it as he found it in the Apostolic Document both in form and in position, immediately after Sermon on Mount, so placed, conceivably, to illustrate Christ's respectful attitude towards the law as stated in v. 17 (cf. viii. 4 and vide Weiss, Matt. Evan., p. 227).

Ver. 1. καταβαίνειν αὐτῶν (for the reading vide above). Jesus descended from the hill towards Capernaum (ver. 5), but we must beware of supposing that the immediately following events all happened there, or at any one place or time. Mark seems to connect the cure of the leper with the preaching tour in Galilee (l. 40), and that of the palsied man with Christ's return therefrom (l. 1). Jesus had ascended the hill to escape the pressure of human need. He descends, in Matt.'s narrative, to encounter it again—ἀλλ' ἦλθεν, large crowds gather about and follow Him. —δῆμος, the sign mark of the Apostolic Document according to Weiss; its lively formula for introducing a narrative. —προσεύκειν, prostrated himself to the ground, in the abject manner of salutation suitable from an inferior to one deemed much superior, and also to one who had a great favour to ask. —Κύριε: not implying in the leper a higher idea than that of Master or Rabbi.—δν θάλασσαί: the leper's doubt is not about the power, for he probably knows what marvellous things have been happening of late in and around Capernaum, but about the will, a doubt natural in one suffering from a loathsome disease. Besides, men more easily believe in miraculous power than in miraculous love. θάλασσαί, present subjunctive, not aorist, which would express something that might happen at a future time (vide Winer, § xlii., 2, b).—καθαρίσαί—of course the man means to cleanse by healing, not merely to pronounce clean. This has an important bearing on the meaning of the word in next ver. —ἐφαίνετο, touched him, not to show that He was not under the law, and that to the pure nothing is unclean (Chrys., Hom. xav.), but to evince His willingness and sympathy. The stretching out of the hand does not mean that, in touching, He might be as far off as
possible to avoid defilement and infection (Weiss-Meyer). It was action suited to the word.—οἶμαι, "I will" pronounced in firm, cordial tone, carefully recorded by all the evangelists. ἐκαθαρίζω, naturally in the sense of the man's request. But that would imply a real miracle, therefore naturalistic interpreters, like Paulus and Keim, are forced to take the word in the sense of pronouncing clean, the mere opinion of a shrewd observer. The narrative of Matthew barely leaves room for this hypothesis. The other evangelists so express themselves as to exclude it.—ἐκαθαρίζω: forthwith the leprosy disappeared as if by magic. The man was and looked perfectly well.

Ver. 4. ἐπα, see to it! Look you!—imperative in mood and tone (side Mark's graphic account). Christ feared the man would be content with being well without being officially pronounced clean—physically healed, though not socially restored. Hence μηθεὶς ἐτύχῃς, ἄλλα ἔτυχας, etc.: speak of it to nobody, but go at once and show thyself (προστάξεις), to the priest who has charge of such matters. What was the purpose of this order? Many good commentators, including Grot., Beng. and Wetstein, say it was to prevent the priests hearing of the cure before the man came (lingering on the road to tell his tale), and in spite, declaring that he was not clean. The truth is, Jesus desired the benefit to be complete, socially, which depended on the priest, as well as physically. If the man did not go at once, he would not go at all.—τὸ δὲ πρῶτον, side Lev. xiv. 10, 21; all things to be done according to the law; no laxity encouraged, though the official religion was little worth of respect (cf. Matt. v. 19).—ἐλεγχὼς μὲν, as a certificate to the public (ἀπόιος) from the constituted authority that the leper was clean. The direction shows Christ's confidence in the reality of the cure. The whole story is a picture of character. The touch reveals sympathy; the accompanying word, "I will, be clean," prompt, cordial, laconic, immense energy and vitality; the final order, reverence for existing institutions, fearlessness, humane solicitude for the sufferer's future well-being in every sense.

Vv. 5-13. The centurion's son or servant (Lk. vii. 1-10). Placed by both Matthew and Luke after Sermon on Mount, by the latter immediately after.

—Ver. 5. ἐσελήνωσα, exist participle with another finite verb, pointing to a completed action. He had entered Capernaum when the following event happened. Observe the genitive absolute—say with a dative of the same subject, ἐτύχει, following ἐκαθαρίζων. ἐκαθαρίζων, a Centurion (ver. 10), probably an officer in the army of Herod Antipas.—Ver. 6. Κύριος again, not necessarily expressing any advanced idea of Christ's person.—παῖς may mean either son or servant. Luke has δοῦλος, and from the harmonistic point of view this settles the matter. But many, including Bleek and Weiss (Meyer), insist that παῖς here means son.—βεβλήται, perf. pointing to a chronic condition; bed-ridden in the house, therefore not with the centurion. —παραλυτικος, a disease of the nerves, therefore emotional treatment might be thought of, hadn't the son only been present. But he could not even be brought on a stretcher as in another case (Matt. ix. 1) because not only παραλυτικος, but διέσχεω βεβλητόρευεις, not an ordinary feature of paralysis.

—Ver. 7. This is generally taken as an offer on Christ's part to go to the house. Fritzsche finds it in a question, arranging the words (T. R.) thus: καί, λέγει ὁ δ. Ἰ., Ἐγώ δὲν θέρατον ἠτόν; and rendering: "And," saith Jesus to him, "shall I go and heal him?" = is that
what you wish? The following verse then contains the centurion’s reply. This is, to say the least, ingenious.—Ver. 8, ἱκανός, the Baptist’s word, chap. iii. 11, but the construction different in the two places, there with infinitive, here with ἵνα: I am not fit in order that. This is an instance illustrating the extension of the use of ἵνα in later Greek, which culminated in its superseding the infinitive altogether in modern Greek. On the N. T. use of ἵνα, vide Burton, M. and T., §§ 191-222. Was it because he was a Gentile by birth, and also perhaps a heathen in religion, that he had this feeling of unworthiness, or was it a purely personal trait? If he was not only a Gentile but a Pagan, Christ’s readiness to go to the house would stand in remarkable contrast to His conduct in the case of the Syro-Phoenician woman. But Lk. vii. 5.—ἐλεῖν λόγῳ, speak (and heal) with a word. A bare word just where they stand, he thinks, will suffice.—Ver. 9, καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ: he argues from his own experience not with an air of self-importance, on the contrary making light of his position as a commander.—καὶ ἰσχορηγὸς τῶν ἰσχορηγῶν, spoken in modesty. He means: also, though a very humble person in the army, under the authority of more important officers, still have a command over a body of men who do explicitly as I bid them. Fritzsche rightly suggests that διεσχόμενος τῶν ἰσχορηγῶν does not express a single idea = “a man under authority”. He represents himself as a man with authority, though in a modest way. A comma might with advantage be placed after ἰσχορηγὸς. The centurion thinks Jesus can order about disease as he orders his soldiers—say to fever, palsy, leprosy, go, and it will go. His soldiers go, his slaves do (Carr, C. G. T.).

Ver. 10. In ver. 13 we are told that Jesus did not disappoint the centurion’s expectation. But the interest of the cure is eclipsed for the evangelist by the interest of the Healer’s admiration, certainly a remarkable instance of a noteworthy characteristic of Jesus: His delight in signal manifestations of faith. Faith, His great watchword, as it was St. Paul’s. This value set on faith was not a mere idiosyncrasy, but the result of insight into its nobleness and spiritual virtue.—καὶ εἰρήνη: Christ did not conceal His admiration; or His sadness when He reflected that such faith as this Gentile had shown was a rare thing in Israel.—Ἀμὴν: He speaks solemnly, not without emotion.—ὡς ὢδέλλα: This is more significant than the reading of T. R., assimilated to Lk. vii. 9. The ὢδέλλα implies that Israel was the home of faith, and conveys the meaning not even there. But ὡς ὢδέλλα means not even in a single instance, and implies that faith in notable degree is at a discount among the elect people. Such a sentiment at so early a period is noteworthy as showing how far Jesus was from cherishing extravagant hopes of setting up a theocratic kingdom of righteousness and godliness in Israel.

Vv. 11-12. This logion is given by Luke (xiii. 28-29) in a different connection, and it may not be in its historical
place here. But its import is in thorough harmony with the preceding reflection on the spiritual state of Israel. One who said the one thing was prepared to say the other. At whatever time said it would give offence. It is one of the heavy burdens of the prophet that he cannot be a mere patriot, or say complimentary things about his nation or his Church. 

1 Authorities are much divided between the reading οὐδὲν εἰς τὴν ὁλίγον Πέτρου, ἢ δὲ τὴν πεπήραν (T.R.), which is found in ΖΕΓΕΓΕΧ ἤ τοις (Tisch.), and τῷ άνω τοιάδε τινῶν των εἰς τὴν ἑαυτόν εἰς τὸν λόγον, found in B, old Latin verss., Syr. Cur., Egypt. verss., and several curatives (W.H.). The former has probably come in from Lk. vii. 9.

2 ΜΒ omit καλ. Vide below;

3 ΜΒ omit αὐτοῦ, also superfluous.

4 απὸ τὴς ὥρας εἴη τοῦ μέγα.
 imply a serious attack, but *side* Luke iv. 38.—Ver. 15. *ψυχή*. He touched her hand; here to cure, in Mark to raise her up.—*ψυχή*, Bcs.; she rose up at once and continued to serve at the meal; all present but Jesus only referred to here (*αὐτός*, plural in Mark, but inapposite here). Not only the fever but the weakness causes her to leave her. "Ordinarily a long time is required for recovery, but then all things happened at once" (Chrst., Hom. xxvii.). Not a great miracle or interesting for anything said; but it happened at an early time and in the disciple circle; Peter the informant; and it showed Christ's *sympathy* (ver. 17).

Vv. 16-17. *Events of that Sabbath evening* (Mark i. 32-34; Luke iv. 40, 41). A general statement, which, after iv. 23 ἕν, might have been dispensed with; but it is in the source (Mark) in the same context, and it gives our evangelist a welcome opportunity of quoting a proper reference to Christ's healing work. Ver. 16. *ὤφθη γενομένη*: vague indication of time on any day, but especially a Sabbath day. There were two evenings, an early and a late (Ex. xxx. 8). Which of them was it; before or after sunset? Mark is more exact.—Σαμωνικον, *πολλοὺς*: why a crowd just then, and why especially demoniacs brought to be healed? For explanation we must go to Mark. The preaching of Jesus in the synagogue that Sabbath day, and the cure of a *demoniac* (Mark i. 21-28), had created a great sensation, and the result is a crowd gathered at the door of Peter's house at sunset, when the Sabbath ended, with their sick, especially with demoniacs.—Ver. 17. Prophetic citation, apposite, felicitous; setting Christ's healing ministry in a true light; giving prominence not to the thaumaturgic but to the sympathetic aspect; from the Hebrew original, the Sept. making the text (Is. lili. 4) refer to sin. The Hebrew refers to sicknesses and pains. It is useless to discuss the precise meaning of *λάβειν* and *βάλειν*: took and bore, or took and bore away; subjective or objective? The evangelist would note, not merely that Jesus actually did remove diseases, but that He was minded to do so; such was His bent.

Vv. 18-34. *Excursion to the eastern shore with its incidents* (Mark iv. 35—v. 20; Luke viii. 22-39). These narratives make a large leap forward in the history. As our evangelist is giving a collection of healing incidents, the introduction of vv. 18-22, *disciple interviews*, and even of vv. 23-27, a *nature* miracle, needs an explanation. The readiest is that he found these associated with the Gadara incident, his main concern, in his source or sources, the whole group in the Apostolic Document (so Weiss). Besides, as the evangelist did not appear to make himself the slave of his plan, it was natural to give together incidents that possibly (?) happened on the same eventful journey, though Luke (ix. 57-62) gives the disciple interviews in a different connection.

Ver. 18. *Ἰδον... περὶ αὐτὸν*. The evangelist makes a desire to escape from the crowd the motive of the journey. This desire is still more apparent in Mark, but the crowd and the time are different. The multitude from which Jesus escapes, in Mark's narrative, is that gathered on the shore to hear the parable-discourse from a boat on the lake.—*καλέσαντι ἀπελθεῖν*. Grotius thinks this elliptical for: *καλέσαντι πάντα τρομάζωσιν* ἄν. Beza renders: *indict prophetinem* = He ordered departure. τούτος μαθητής is understood, not men.
KATA MATHAION
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1 Lk. ix. 28: αὐτῷ, " Diaφοράκε, ἀκολουθήσοι σοι, ὅτου ἐὰν ἀπέρχῃ." 20. Kail
xiv. 32
2 Lk. ix. 28. ἄγη αὐτῷ δ ἰησοῦς, " Αἱ ἄλλωσιν " ἠμελεύς ἧχως, καὶ τα
1 Lk. ix. 28.
4 Ch. xin. 8. πετειά ρ τοῦ ὀφραυοῦ " κατασκηνώσεσιν ἡ δ ἡ ὑδά τοῦ ἄνθρωπον οὗ
1 Lk. viii.
5 (with Ἰξεί, τοῦ τῆς ἑκατέρυν θείης.) 21. Ἐνερεῖ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ
1 inf.
6 Cor. xvi. εἰσέλθων " Ἰρίτη, " ἐπιτρέπον μοι προῶν ἀπελθεῖν καὶ ἡθαι τῶν
8 (absol.) πατήσας μου." 22. ἢ δ ἰησοῦς εἰσέλθων " αὔτῷ, " ἀκολουθήθη μοι,
1 Ch. xiv.
9 Lk. ix. 39; xvi. 22.

1 Νξο omit αὐτῷ, which here as often elsewhere occurs in T. R., where it is not
required.
2 On the authority of Ν, Tisch. omits ἰησοῦς found in BCLΔ al.
3 λέγετι in Ν Β."
καὶ ἐφεσ τοὺς νεκροὺς γλαύκας τοὺς ἐστών νεκροὺς." 23. Καὶ ὅπως ἡμεῖς ἂν ὑποκύπτο ἐφὶ τὸ πλοῖον, ἡκαλύπθησαν αὐτὸς οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ.

24. καὶ ἦλθο, "συμπληρῶν μὲν γένετο ἐν τῇ θάλασσῃ, ὅτε τὸ πλοῖον καλύπτετο ὡς τῶν κυμάτων αὐτὸς δὲ ἐκάθευθε. 25. καὶ προσελθόντες οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἠγειραν αὐτῶν, λέγοντες:

1 το omitted in ΝΒΕ 33.

οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτῶν wanting in ΝΒ; added for clearness, but not needed.

ἴητρεφον μοι: he wished, before setting out from Capernaum, on the journey to the eastern side of the lake, to attend to an urgent domestic duty; in fact to bury his father. In that climate burial had to take place on the day of death. Permission would have involved very little delay of the voyage, unless, with Chrysostom, we include under ἄφας all that goes along with death and burial, arranging family affairs, distribution of inheritance, etc. There would not probably be much trouble of that sort in the case of one belonging to the Jesus-circle.—Ver. 22, ἀλεθεύει μοι: the reply is a stern refusal, and the reason apparently hard and unfeeling—ἄφες τοὺς νεκροὺς . . . νεκροὺς: word for word the same in Luke (v. 60), an unforgettable, mystic, hard saying. The dead must be taken in two senses = let the spiritually dead, not yet alive to the claims of the kingdom, bury the naturally dead. Fritzsche objects, and finds in the saying the paradox: "let the dead bury each other the best way they can," which, as Weiss says, is not a paradox, but nonsense. Another eccentric idea of some commentators is that the first verb refers to the vestibule, the corpse-bearers who carried out the bodies of the poor at night, in Hebrew phrase, the men of the dead. Take it as we will, it seems a hard, heartless saying, difficult to reconcile with Christ's denunciation of the Corban casuistry, by which humanitarian and filial piety were sacrificed on the altar of religion (Matt. xv. 3-6). But, doubtless, Jesus knew to whom He was speaking. The saying can be understood and justified; but it can also very easily be misunderstood and abused, and woe to the man who does so. From these two examples we see that Jesus had a startling way of speaking, which would create reflection, and also give rise to remark. Vide on Lk. ix. 57-62, where three cases are given, the above two included.

Vv. 23-27. Storm on the lake (Mk. iv. 35-41, Lk. viii. 22-23). Ver. 23, ἐμβάτην αὐτῷ might be called a dative absolute; if taken as dative after ἡκαλύπθησαν, the αὐτῷ after this verb is superfluous. This short sentence is overcharged with pronouns (αὐτός after μαθηταί). —τὸ πλοῖον (το omitted in Lk.), the ship in readiness in accordance with previous instructions (ver. 18). Ver. 24, ἦλθον indicates sudden oncom—συμπληρῶν ἐν τ. ὑ., literally an earthquake of the sea, the waters stirred to their depths by the winds referred to in vv. 26, 27; λαθωκ in Mark and Luke = hurricane.—ὁστε, here with infinitive, used also with finite moods (e.g., Gal. ii. 13). In the one case ὡστε indicates aim or tendency, in the other it asserts actual result (vide Goodwin, p. 221, also Baumlten, Schulgrammatik, §§ 593, 594). Klotz, Devar., ii. p. 772, gives as the equivalent of ὡστε, with infinitive, ita ut; with indicative, itaque or quare.—καλύπτεται, was covered, hidden, the waves rising high above the boat, breaking on it, and gradually filling it with water (cf. Mark and Luke).—αὐτός ἐδιδασκόντων: dramatic contrast = but He was sleeping (imperfect), the storm notwithstanding. Like a general in time of war Jesus slept when He could. He had fallen asleep before the storm came on, probably shortly after they had started (Lk. viii. 23, πλοῦτον αὐτών αἰφνιδίως: while they sailed He went off to sleep), soothed by the gliding motion. It was the sleep of one worn out in a long life, involving constant strain on body and mind. The mental tension is apparent in the words spoken to the two disciples (vv. 20-22). Words like these are not spoken in cold blood, or without waste of nervous power. Richard Baxter describes Cromwell as "of such vivacity, hiliarity, and alacrity as another man hath when he hath drunken a cup too much" (Reliquiae Baxt.). "Drunken, but not with wine," with a great epoch-making enthusiasm. The storm did not wake the sleeper. A tempest, the sublime
in nature, is a lullaby to a great spirit. The Fathers viewed the sleep and the storm theologically, both arranged for beforehand, to give time for cowardice to show itself (Chrys., Hom. xxviii.), to let the disciples know their weakness and to accustom them to trials (Theophyl.). A docetic Christ, an unreal man, a theatrical affair!—Ver. 25. προσέλθοντες: one of our evangelist's favourite words.—αὐγιαρ: they would not have waked Him if they could have helped it. They were genuinely terrified, though experienced sailors accustomed to rough weather.—Κύριε, σώσον... ἀπολλύμεθα: laconic speech, verbs unconnected, utterance of fear-stricken men. Luke's ἐπιστάτα, ἐπιστάτα is equally descriptive. Who could tell exactly what they said? All three evangelists report differently.—Ver. 26. ἐδεικτέναι, ἀληθεύων. He chides them first, then the winds, the chiding meant to calm fear. Cowards, men of little faith! harsh in tone but kindly meant; expressive really of personal fearlessness, to gain ascendency over panic-stricken spirits (cf. Luke).—τὰ ὑπερβολῆς: He had uttered the previous words as He lay, then with a sudden impulse He rose and spoke imperial words to the elements: animos disciplorum prius, deinde mare composuit (Bengel).—ἀνήρ, θάλασσα: He rebuked both. It would have been enough if the winds were caused the commotion in the water. But the speech was impassioned and poetic, not scientific.—γάληνη μεγάλη: antithetic to σεισμὸς μέγας, ver. 24.—Ver. 27, ol ἑνήρων: who? Naturally one would say the disciples with Jesus in the boat, called men to suit the tragic situation. But many think others are referred to, men unacquainted with Jesus: “quiibus nondum innotuerat Christus” (Calvin); either with the disciples in the boat, and referred to alone (Jerome, Meyer) or jointly (De Wette, Bleek), or who afterwards heard the story (Hilary, Euthy., Fritzsche: “hominum, quotquot hujus portentior nuntiurn acceperant,” and Weiss). Holtzmann (H. C.) says they might be the men in the other ships mentioned in Mk. iv. 36, but in reality the expression may simply point to the contrast between the disciples as men and the divine power displayed.—φωτισθή οὖν... ὡς, what manner of person? The more classic form is οὐκοδόμητος = from what land? where born? possibly from πῶς and ὡς, with a euphonic δ (Passow). φωτισθήναι, in later use, = is of what sort? vide Lobeck, Phryn., p. 56.—This story of the triple tradition is a genuine reminiscence of disciple life. There was a storm, Jesus slept, the disciples awoke Him in terror. He rebuked the winds and waves, and they withstood subsided. The only escape of naturalism from a miracle of power or Providence (Weiss, Leben Jesu) is to deny the causal sequence between Christ's word and the ensuing calm and suggest coincidence. The storm sudden in its rise, equally sudden in its lull.

Vv. 28-34. The demoniacs of Gadara (Mk. v. 1-20, Lk. viii. 26-39). This narrative raises puzzling questions of all sorts, among them a geographical or topological one, as to the scene of the occurrence. The variations in the readings in the three synoptical gospels reflect the perplexities of the scribes. The place in the text causes the demoniacs to have distinct names. It is called the territory of the Gadarenes, the Gerasenes, and the Gergesenes. The reading in Mk. v. 3 in B, and adopted by W. H., is Γεραισσών, and, since the discovery by Thomson (Land and Book, ii. 374) of a place called Geresa or Kena, near the eastern shore of the lake, there has been a growing consensus of opinion in favour of Gerasa (not to be confounded with Gerasa in Gilead, twenty miles east of the Jordan) as the true name of the scene of the story. A place near the sea seems to be demanded by the circumstances, and Gadara on the Hieromax
28. Kai ἠδονής ἀδιός 1 εἰς τὸ πέραν εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν Γερασενῶν,2 οὗ ὅπως ὁ δύο διαμαρτυρώμενος ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν ἔχεμενοι: 3 Χαλκωτοὶ λίαν, ὡστε μὴ ἤλυσαν τινα παραλείπειν διὰ τῆς ὁδοῦ ἑκείνης. 29. καὶ Ἰδοῦ, ἐκραυγάς, λέγοντες, "οὐ τὴν ἤλιον καὶ σοῦ, ἤσυχο, ὡς τοῦ δημοσίου ἐκείνου," πόροι ὁ. Μk. i. 24.

1 Dat. again by way of grammatical correction for the gen. abs. found in N·BC and adopted by Tisch., W.H., etc.
2 So in Ν·C·L·A·L al., Memph. vers., Origen. Γαβριήλ in Ν·B·C·Δ·E·A·L al., adopted by Tisch., Treg., W.H., Weiss. Vide below.
3 ἤσυχος is wanting in Ν·B·C·L·. Comes in from Mk. Modern editors omit.

was too far distant. The true reading in Matthew (v. 28) nevertheless is Γαβριήλ. He probably follows Mark as his guide, but the village Gerasa being obscure and Gadara well known, he prefers to define the locality by a general reference to the latter. The name Gergesa was a suggestion of Origen's made incidentally in his Commentary on John, in connection with the place named in chap. i. 28, Bethara or Bethany, to illustrate the confusion in the gospel in connection with names. His words are: Γεραια, δή χιλεία γεὶς αἱ Γεραιαστικαί, πολὺς ὄρεα, περὶ τὴν νῦν καλονυμίαν Τιβερίαδος λίμνην, περὶ ἧν κρημνοὶ παρακείμενοι τῇ λίμνῃ, δή χιλεία γεὶς αἱ Δεκαπόλεις την χώραν ὧδε τῶν βασιλέων καταβαλέσθαντας (in Ev. Ioan., T. vi. c. 24). Prof. G. A. Smith, Historical Geography, p. 459, note, pronounces Gerasa "impossible." But he means Gerasa in Decapolis, thirty-six miles away. He accepts Khera, which he identifies with Gergesa, as the scene of the incident, stating that it is the only place on the east coast where the steep hills come down to the shore.

Ver. 28. δόον, δόο, in Mark and Luke one. According to some, e.g., Holtzmann (H. C.), the two includes the case reported in Mk. i. 23-27, Lk. iv. 31-37, omitted by Matthew. Weiss' hypothesis is that the two is an inference from the plurality of demons spoken of in his source (vide Matt.-Evan., p. 239). The harmonists disposed of the difficulty by the remark that there might be two though only one is spoken of in the other accounts, perhaps because he was the more violent of the two (so Augustine and Calvin).—ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν, the precipitous hills on the eastern shore are a limestone formation full of caves, which were doubtless used for burying the dead. There the demons made their congenial home.—χαλκωτοὶ λίαν, fierce exceedingly; ἧσυχος, one of our evangelist's favourite words. These demoniacs were what one would call dangerous madmen; that, whatever more; no light matter to cure them, say by "moral therapies"—ὁ δὲ ψυχεῖ, again ὡστε with infinitive (with ὡς for negative). The point is not that nobody passed that way, but that the presence of the madmen tended to make it a place to be shunned as dangerous. Nobody cared to go near them. Christ came near their lair by accident, but He would not have been scared though He had known of their presence.

Ver. 29. Ἰδοῦ, ἐκραυγάς: sudden, startling, unearthly cry, fitted to shock weak nerves. But not the cry of men about to make an assault. The madmen, whom all feared and shunned, were subdued by the aspect of the stranger who had arrived in the neighbourhood. To be taken as a fact, however strange and mysterious, partly explained by the fact that Jesus was not afraid of them any more than He had been of the storm. They felt His power in the very look of His eye. τῇ ἤλιον καὶ σοῦ: an appropriate speech even in the mouth of one demoniac, for he speaks in the name of the legion of devils (Mk. v. 8) by which he conceives himself possessed. Identifying himself with the demons, he shrinks from the new comer with an instinctive feeling that He is a foe.—οitlement που ἐγνος τ. Θ. in the Capernaum Synagogue case; strange, almost incredible divination. Yet "insanity is much nearer the kingdom of God than worldly-mindedness." There was, doubtless, something in the whole aspect and manner of Jesus which was fitted to produce almost instantaneously a deep, spiritual impression to which child-like, simple, ingenuous souls like the Galilean fishermen, sinful, yet honest-hearted men like those who met at Matthew's feast,
readily surrendered themselves. Men with shattered reason also felt the spell, while the wise and the strong-minded too often used their intellect, under the bias of passion or prejudice, to resist the force of truth. In this way we may account for the prompt recognition of Jesus by the Gadarene demoniac. All that is necessary to explain it is the Messianic hope prevalent in Gadara as elsewhere, and the sight of Jesus acting on an impressionable spirit” (Bruce, The Miraculous Element in the Gospels p. 187).—φόρ καίρου: before the appointed time of judgment. The article wanting here before και, as in other phrases in N. T., e.g., ἐν καιρῷ, Matt. xxiv. 45.—βασανισθαι, to torment with pain, in Hades, described as a place of torment in Lk. xvi. 28, cf. ver. 23.

Ver. 30. μακρὰν: the Vulgate renders non longe, as if it had stood in the Greek before μακ. But there are no variants here in Mark and Luke, &c, which gives rise to an apparent discrepancy. Only apparent, many contend, because both expressions are relative and elastic: at a distance, yet within view; there, in that neighbourhood, but not quite at hand. Elasser refers to Lk. xv. 20: μακρὰν, “et tamen in conspectu ut, Luc. xv. 20: "Ετι δε αὐτοῦ μακρὰν ἀνέχοντος, εἶθεν αὐτὸν ἀ πατήρ". On ἐκεῖ he remarks: “docet in ea regione et viciniauisse, nec distantiam describit". Weiss against Meyer denies the relativity of μακρὰν, and takes it as meaning “a long way off," while visible. —βοσκοῦντες: far removed from ἤν, and not to be joined with it as if the feeding were the main point, and not rather the existence of the herd there. The ill attested reading βοσκοῦμεν brings out the meaning better. A herd of swine which were feeding in the hill pastures. The swine, doubtless, belonged to Gentiles, who abounded in Peraea.—Ver. 31. δημίου; unusual designation, commonly δαμόνα. —παρέκκλησιν: the request was made by the possessed in the name of the demons.—ἀντωνιλόν: the reading of the T. R. (ἐντρωτός ἀνελθεὶς) taken from Luke expresses, in a milder form, Christ’s share of responsibility in a transaction of supposed doubtful character. The demoniac would have no scruple on that score. His request was: if you are to cast us out, send us not to hell, but into the swine.—ἐναγέη: Christ’s laconic reply, usually taken to mean: go into the swine, but not necessarily meaning more than "begone". So Weiss, who holds that Jesus had no intention of expressing acquiescence in the demoniac’s request. (Matt. Evan. and Weiss-Meyer, “Hinweg mit euch.”)

—Ver. 32. ὁ δὲ . . . κοιρῶν: the entrance of the demons into the swine could not, of course, be a matter of observation, but only of inference from what followed.—ὁδοί, introducing a sudden, startling event—ἐγένετο πάνω ἡ δαμαί: the mad downrush of the herd over the precipice into the lake. Assuming the full responsibility of Jesus for the catastrophe, expositors have busied themselves in inventing apologies. Euthy. gives four reasons for the transaction, the fourth being that only thereby could it be conclusively shown that the devils had left the demoniacs. Rosenmüller suggests that two men are worth more than ever so many swine. The lowest depth of bathe in this line was touched by Wetstein when he suggested that, by cutting up the drowned swine, salting the meat or making smoke-dried hams (fum. ens ferum), and selling them to Gen-
33. or δὲ βάσκοντες ἐφυγον, καὶ ἀπελθόντες εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἀπῆγγελαν αὐτῶν, καὶ τὰ τῶν δαιμονιζόμενων. 34. καὶ ἵδοι, πάσα ἡ πόλις ἐξελέφαν εἰς συνάντησιν τοῦ Βασιλέως καὶ ἰδόντες αὐτῶν, παρεκάλεσαν εὐπνεῷ καὶ μεταβαίνοντες ἀπὸ τῶν ὀρίων αὐτῶν.

1 For συνάντησιν (CLXX) Β B 1, 33, have συνάντησιν (Tisch., W.H.), a preferable word. Vide below.
2 For τῷ (B) Υ C have τῷ, adopted by Tisch. and put in margin by W.C.
3 For ἔως B has ἕως.

tiles who did not object to eat suffocated animals, the owners would escape loss. But the learned commentator might be jesting, for he throws out the suggestion for the benefit of men whom he describes as neither Jews, Gentiles, nor Christians. Vv. 33-34. The sequel. ἐφυγον: the swineherds fled. No wonder, in view of such a disaster. If the demonsiacs, in the final paroxysm before return to sanity, had anything to do with bringing it about, the superstitious terror with which they were regarded would add to the panic.—ἀνάγγελον: they reported what had happened to their masters and to everybody they met in the town.—πάντα, what had befallen the swine.—καὶ τὰ τῶν δαιμονιζόμενων: they could not now know the whole truth about the demonsiacs. The reference must be to some visible connection between the behaviour of the madmen and the destruction of the herd. They told the story from their own point of view, not after interviewing Jesus and His company.—Ver. 34. ἔπαθαν ἡ πόλις: an exaggeration of course, cf. accounts in Mark and Luke.—εἰς συνάντησιν... Ι., to a meeting with Jesus. The noun occurs again in Matt. xxv. 1, and John xii. 13; in Matt. xxv. 6 ἀνάγγελον is used instead of εἰς ἄναγγελον. The two nouns are little used in Greek authors. The change from one to the other in Matt. xxv. 6 implies a slight difference in meaning; ἀνάγγελον = accidental chance, or stealthy meeting; ἀνάγγελον: an open designed meeting. The stealthy character of the meeting implied in ἐπάθανε is well illustrated in ἐπηρεάσαν, ver. 28, of this narrative. The statement that the whole city went out to meet Jesus implies a report laying the blame of the occurrence on Him. But Matthew’s account is very summary, and must be supplemented by the statements in Mark and Luke, from which it appears that some came from the town to inquire into the matter, “to see what had happened,” and that in the course of their inquiries they met Jesus and learned what they had not known before, the change that had come over the demonsiac. It was on their giving in their report to their fellow-townsmen, connecting the cure with the catastrophe, that the action reported in ver. 34 took place.—Ver. 34. παρεκάλεσαν: same word as in ver. 31 in reference to the demonsiac. They did not order or drive Him out. They were afraid of this strange man, who could do such wonderful things; and, with all due respect, they would rather He would withdraw from their neighbourhood. This would be an oft-told tale, in which different versions were sure to arise, wherein fact and explanation of fact would get mixed up together. The very variations in the synoptical accounts witness to its substantial historicity. The apologists’ task is easy here, as distinct from that of the harmonist, which is difficult. The essential outline of the story is this. A demonsiac, alias a madman, comes from the tombs in the limestone caves to meet Jesus, exhibiting in behaviour and conversation a double consciousness. Asked his name, he calls himself Legion. In the name of the “Legion” he begs that the demons may enter the swine. Jesus orders the demons to leave their victim. Shortly after a herd of swine feeding on the hills rushed down the steep into the sea and were drowned. Tradition connected the rush of the swine with the demons leaving their former victim and entering into them. But, as already remarked, the causal connection could not be a matter of observation but only of inference. The rush might, as Weiss suggests, be caused by the man, in his final paroxysm, chasing them. But that also is matter of conjecture. The
real cause of the catastrophe is a mystery. Rosenmüller suggests that at a hot season of the year one in a herd of swine might undergo a morbid seizure, begin to run wildly about, and be followed successively by the whole flock. He mentions an occurrence of the kind at Erfurt, recent when he wrote. Lutteroth, no rationalist, suggests "vertigo," permitted by Jesus to befoul the swine, that the demoniac might have in their behaviour a sensible sign of deliverance, and so be rid of his fixed idea (vide his Essai D'Interp., 3ème Partie, p. 27, note). On the nature of demoniacal possession, vide my Miraculous Element in the Gospels, pp. 172-190; vide also notes on Mark.

CHAPTER IX. THE HEALING MINISTRY CONTINUED. Vv. 1-8. The palsied man (Mark ii. 1-12; Luke vii. 17-23). Ver. 1. ἄρας: Jesus complied with the request of the men of Gerasa, who had intimated so plainly that they did not want any more of His company. Whatever His purpose in crossing over to the Eastern shore may have been, it was frustrated by an event which in some respects was an unexpected disaster. Was it rest only or a new sphere of work He was seeking there? Vide notes on Mark.—ἐλθὼν ὑπὸ τούτων: entering the boat which had been moored to the shore Jesus returned with His disciples to His own city, to distinguish it from Gerasa, the city that shut its gates against Him; so named here only. When precisely the following incident happened cannot be ascertained. Luke's indication of time is the vaguest possible; 'on one of the days' Matthew and Mark give it in different sequence, but their narratives have this in common, that they make the incident occur on arrival in Capernaum after an excursion; in either case the first mentioned, though not the same in both. Vide notes on Mark.

Ver. 2. καὶ ἱδον: usual formula for introducing an important incident.—προσέφερων, the imperfect, implying a process, the details of which, extremely interesting, the evangelist does not give. By comparison with Mark and Luke the narrative is meagre, and defective even for the purpose of bringing out the features to which the evangelist attaches importance, e.g., the value set by Jesus on the faith evinced. His eye is fixed on the one outstanding novel feature, the word of Jesus in ver. 6. In view of it he is careful, while omitting much, to mention that the invalid in this instance was brought to Jesus, ἐν κλίνῃ βεβηλημένῃ, lying on a couch. To the same cause also it is due that a second case of paralysis cured finds a place in this collection, though the two cases have different features: in the one physical torments, in the other mental depression.—πάρειν αὐτὸν, the faith of the man who had brought the sick man to Him. The common assumption that the latter is included in the αὐτῶν is based on dogmatic grounds.—ἀφέναι, τίθηναι: with swift sure diagnosis Jesus sees in the man not faith but deep depression, associated probably with sad memories of misconduct, and uttering first a kindly hope-inspiring word, such as a physician might address to a patient: cheer up, child! He deals first with the disease of the soul. —ἀφέναι: Jesus declares the forgiveness of his sins, not with the authority of an exceptional person, but with sympathy and insight, as the interpreter of God's will and the law of the universe. That law is that past error need not be a doom; that we may take pardon for granted; forgive ourselves, and start anew. The law holds, Jesus believed, both in the physical and in the moral sphere. In combining pardon with healing of bodily disease in this case, He was virtually announcing a general law. "Who forgiveth all thine iniquities, who health all thy diseases," Ps. civ. 3.
1. For ἐδώ (MCD, Tisch.) BM have εἰδως. The tendency of the scribes would be to use the same word as in ver. 2. W. H. has εἰδως in text but bracketed, ἐδώ in margin.

2. MCD omit ὄρατον.

3. σω in MBCDL.

4. εἰκόνες MBCDL.

5. εἰκόνες in B and D with κειμ.; the more forcible word.

Ver. 3. τινὸς τῷ γραμματέων: some scribes present on this occasion. Ominous fact duly introduced by ἔρχομαι; its significance still more distinctly recognised by Luke, who gives it prominent mention at the beginning of his narrative (ver. 17). Sure sign of the extent, depth, and quality of Christ’s influence.—προσέρχεσθαι: of course; the prophet always is a scandalous, irreverent blasphemer from the conventional point of view. The scribes regarded forgiveness purely under the aspect of prerogative, and in self-defence Jesus must meet them on their own ground. His answer covers the whole case. There is more than prerogative in the matter; there is the right, duty, privilege, and power of every man to promote faith in pardon by hearty prayer and the law of the moral world. This is dealt with first.—Ver. 4. ἐνθυμομενος: Jesus intuitively read their thoughts as He read the mental state of the sick man.—οὐδὲν ὑπερτερον: elliptical for οὐδὲν ἄνθρωπον αὐτοῦ understood = in order that what may happen, do you, etc. (e.g., Bährlein, Schol. Gram., § 606, and Goodwin’s Syn., § 331).—Ver. 5. εἰκονοτέρων (from εἴς and καθός, whence εἰκόνος; in N.T. (Gospels) only the comparative neuter is found, as here). The question as to ability, δύναμις, is first disposed of; which is easier.—εἰς: they are both alike easy to say; the vital matter is saying with effect. Saying here stands for doing. And to do the one thing was to do the other. To heal was to forgive. It is implied that it is easier to forgive than to make a palsied man strong. Christ means that the one is ordinary, the other extraordinary; the one is within the power of any man, the other belongs only to the exceptional man; there is no assumption in declaring pardon, there is pretension in saying “arise and walk.”—Ver. 6. ἐπὶ μᾶς ἐξέβλητα: transition to the other aspect, that of ἔγωγες, the point raised by the scribes when they looked a charge of blasphemy.—οὕτως δὲ ἡ ἱλαρία: these two phrases point at supposed disabilities for forgiving. “Forgiveness takes place in heaven, and is the exclusive prerogative of God,” was the thesis of the scribes. “It may be exercised even on earth, and by the Son of Man,” is the counter thesis of Christ. Therefore “Son of Man” must be a title not of dignity but of humiliation. Here = one whom ye think lightly of; even He can forgive.—τοῦτο λέγει: Jesus stops short in His speech to the scribes and turns to the sick man, saying: ἔσεσθαι, etc., also in ver. 6, intransitive. The reading ἔσεσθαι in T.R., ver. 6, is a correction of style, the use of the active intransitively being condemned by grammarians. Hence this various reading always occurs. (Vide Suidas, n.s., and Buttman, Gramm., p. 55.)—πᾶσαν ἁλίσκον, a light piece of furniture, easily portable. ἔσεσθαι: all three actions, arising, lifting, walking, conclusive evidence of restored power.—Ver.
150 KATA ΜΑΥΘΑΙΟΝ

8. Ἰδοὺς δὲ οἱ δύο ὄρασι παρείμασαν; καὶ ἔδεσαν τῷ Θεῷ, τῷ ἴδιτα
(with ἴδιτα).

9. Καὶ ἐκατέβαν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ εἰκεῖν, εἶχαν διαφοράντων καθήμενον ἐπὶ
tὸ τελώνιον, Ματθαίου λεγόμενου, καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ, "Ἀκολούθει
μοι." Καὶ ἀνατάσα ἥραλον ἀποθέτησεν ἀπὸ τοῦ τελώνιου, τοῦ τελώνιου, πολλοὶ τελώνιον καὶ ἄμαρτολοι (Hebrew

1 ἐφοβήθησαν in \$BD (Tisch., W.H.) θεαμάσαν (CL A al.) gives a commonplace idea more to the taste of the scribes.
2 ἀνακαμπέσαν εὖν in \$NC, as in text in most MSS.
4 καὶ omitted in \$ND.

7. Said, done; a convincing argumentum ad hominem. Who would dispute the right to forgive to one who could do that, or persist in the charge of blasphemy against Him? At least those who do will get little sympathy from the mass of spectators.—Ver. 8. Ἰδοὺς οἱ δύο ὄρασι. The people are free from the petty jealousies and pedantic theories of the professional class; broad facts settle the matter for them. They probably had no scruples about the forgiving, but if they had the miracle would put an end to them: the manifest authority and power a witness of the non-apparent (ποιεῖται τὴν φανερὰν [ἴδιτα] τεκμή-
rhoντος ἐξ ἀποφασιν. Euthy.).—ἐφοβήθησαν, they feared: may point to a change of mind on the part of some who at first were influenced by the disappointing mood of the scribes. The solemn frown of those who pass for saints and wise men is a formidable thing, making many cowards. But now a new fear takes the place of the old, perhaps not without a touch of superstition.

Vv. 9-13. The publican feast (Mk. ii. 13-17; Lk. v. 27-32). The point of interest for the evangelist in this narrative is not the call of the publican disciple, but the feast which followed, a feast of publicans and "sinners" at which Jesus was present proclaiming by action what He formerly proclaimed by word: a sinful past no doom. The story, though not a miracle-history, finds a place here because it follows the last in Mark, in which Gospel the incident of the palsied man forms the first of a group serving one aim—to show the beginnings of the conflict between Jesus and the religious leaders. The same remark applies to the next section.

Ver. 9. ἐκατέβαν εἰκεῖν: passing along from the scene of the last incident, Jesus arrives at the custom-house of Capernaum (τελώνιον).—ἐλοῦς . . . Ματ-
thaiou λεγ.: there He saw a man named Matthew. (On the identity of Matthew with Levi in Mark and Luke, wide Mark.) Capernaum being near the boundary and on the caravans road between Egypt and Damascus, Matthew would be a busy man, but, doubtless, Christ and he have met before.—Ἀκολο-
ύθει μοι: Jesus acted on His own plans, but the recent encounter with the scribes would not be without influence on this new departure—the call of a publican. It was a kind of defiance to the party who cherished hard thoughts not only about pardon but about those who needed pardon. An impolite step the worldly-wise would say; sure to create prejudice. But those who are too anxious to conciliate the prejudices of the present do nothing for the future.—

ἀνατάσα ἥραλον: prompt compliance, probably with some astonishment at the invitation.

Ver. 10. καὶ ἐγένετο, etc. The narrative of this incident in all three Syn-
optists is condensed, and the situation not clear. What house is meant (ἤτι 
τας), and why so many (καὶ;)? "There were many," Mark remarks, emphatically (ii. 15), and the οἶνος here implies that something important took place. Luke infers (for we need not suppose independent information) that it is a feast (δεκαλῆς), and, doubtless, he is right. But given by whom? Levi, according to Luke. It may have been so, but not necessarily as the prime mover; possibly, nay, probably, as the agent of his new Master. Our thoughts have been too much biased by the assumption that the call of Matthew in
this section is the main thing, and the feast an accompanying incident, a farwell feast of Matthew’s in which Jesus passively partook. The truth, probably, is that the call was a preliminary to the feast, the first step in the working out of a plan. Jesus aims at a mission among the reprobated classes, and His first step is the call of Matthew to discipleship, and His second the gathering together, through him, of a large number of these classes to a social entertainment; the place of meeting being, possibly, not a private house, whether Christ’s or Matthew’s, but a public hall. If Matthew’s house or Simon’s (in which Jesus probably had His home, side Mark) was large enough to have a quadrangular court, the gathering might be there, where, according to Faber, Archaiologie der Hebräer, p. 408, meetings of various sorts were held. In any case it was a great affair—scores, possibly hundreds, present, too large for a room in a house, a convenicle meeting, so to speak; a meeting with such people in the Synagogue not being possible. For further remark, side Mark.—τελέων: publicans, naturally, if Matthew was the host, but why ἀπαρτί;? He was a respectable man; are the ἀπαρτί simply the τελέοι as viewed from the outside, so named in anticipation of the Pharisaic description of the party? If Jesus was the inviter, they might be a distinct class, and worse, very real sinners, for His aim was a mission among the social Pariahs.

Ver. 11. Ἰδόντες οἱ Φαρ. Here was a good chance for the critics, really a scandalous affair!—τοῖς μαθηταῖς. They spoke to the disciples, possibly, as Euthy.

Zig. suggests, to alienate them from the Master, possibly lacking courage to attack Him face to face.

Ver. 12. ο δὲ ἦν εἰπών: to whom? Were the fault-finders present to hear?—οἱ χρηστοί, etc.: something similar can be cited from classic authors, side instances in Grotius, Elsner, and Wetstein. The originality lies in the application—the physician goes where he is needed, therefore, I am here among the people you contemptuously designate publicans and sinners. The first instalment, this, of Christ’s noble apology for associating with the reprobates—a great word.

Ver. 13. πορευθέντες μάθετε: a common expression among the Rabbis, but they never sent men to learn the particular lesson that God prefers mercy to sacrifice.—καὶ οὐ, does not imply that sacrifice is of no account.—Εἰλος (Εἰλος in T. R., a correction by the scribes), accusative neuter. Masculine nouns of 2nd declension are often neuter 3rd in N. T. and Sept.—ὁ λόγος: Jesus speaks as one having a mission.—ἀμαρτωλος: and it is to the sinful, in pursuance of the principle embodied in the prophetic mission of mercy. The words ἐχθρώντες, ver. 12, and δικαιοντες, ver. 13, naturally suggest the Pharisees as the class meant. Weiss, always nervously afraid of allegorising in connection with parabolic utterances, protests, contending that it is indifferent to the sense of the parable whether there be any “whole” or righteous. But the point is blunt if there be no allusion. καλόντων here has the sense of calling to a feast.

Ver. 14-17. The fast-question (Mk. ii. 18-22; Lk. v. 33-39).—Τότε Our evangelist makes a temporal connection
out of what in Mark is merely topical, another of the group of incidents showing Jesus in conflict with current opinion and practice. Where it happened cannot be determined, but it is brought in appositely after the feast of the publicans, serving with it to illustrate the free unconventional life of the Jesus-circle.—προσέρχονταί...οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου. The interrogants here are John's disciples; in Mark, unknown persons about John's disciples with the Pharisees; in Luke, who treats this incident as a continuation of the last, the fault-finders are the same as before (οἱ δὲ). Mark probably gives the true state of the case. Some persons unknown, at some time or other, when other religious people were fasting, and the Jesus-circle were observed not to be fasting, came and remarked on the dissidence.—ἄριτος: the interrogants wanted to know the reason. But the important thing for us is the fact, that Jesus and His disciples did not conform to the common custom of religious people, including the disciples of the Baptist. It is the first instance of an extensive breach with existing religious usage.—οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου: the broad patent fact: if they did any fasting it was not apparent.

Vv. 15, 16. The question drew from Jesus three pregnant parabolic sayings: bright, genial, felicitous promptness; the first a happy apology for His disciples, the other two the statement of a general principle.—οὐκ ἔσοντος νυμφαῖος. The mere suggestion of this name for the disciples explains all. Paranymphs, friends of the bridechamber, companions of the bridegroom, who act for him and in his interest, and bring the bride to him. How can they be sad (οὐδὲναναι παθοῦντες)? The point to note is that the figure was appropriate. The life of Jesus and His disciples was like a wedding feast—they the principal actors. The disciples took their tone from the Master, so that the ultimate fact was the quality of the personal piety of Jesus. Therein lay the reason of the difference commented on. It was not irreligion, as in the case of the careless; it was a different type of religion with a Father-God, a kingdom of grace open to all, hope for the worse, and spiritual spontaneity.—ἡσυχίας ἣμερας. While the Bridegroom is with them life will be a wedding feast; when He is taken from them it will make a great difference; then (τότε) they will grieve, and therefore fast: a hidden allusion to the tragic end foreseen by Jesus of this happy free life, the penalty of breaking with custom.

Vv. 16, 17. The substitution of νυμφαῖν for πενθεῖν, in the close of ver. 15, implicitly suggested a principle which is now explicitly stated in parabolic form: the great law of congraduity: practice must conform to mood; the spirit must determine the form. These sayings, apparently simple, are somewhat abstruse. They must have been over the head of the average Christian of the apostolic age, and Luke's version shows that they were diversely interpreted. Common to both is the idea that it is bootless to mix heterogeneous things, old and new in religion. This cuts two ways. It defends the old as well as the new; the fasting of John's disciples as well as the non-fasting of Christ's. Jesus did not concern Himself about Pharisaic practice, but He was concerned to defend His own disciples without disparagement of John, and also to prevent John's way and the respect in which he was justly held from creating a prejudice against Himself. The double application of the principle was therefore present to His mind.—Ver. 16, οἴδατε...παθοῦντες. No
17. 

18. The reading is in confusion here. B has after ἔρχων ἐσχαίδιον, probably the true reading out of which all variants arose (τὰς for εἰς; εἰς om.; ἐλθὼν for ὑποσ.; εἰς ἐλθὼν, ἐλθὼν).

1 For the future, in most MSS., ἩΒ have συκῇναναία (Tisch., W.H.).

2 All uncials have ἐμφατοὶ.

The truth as above indicated lies between.

Vv. 18-26. The daughter of Jairus, with interlude (Mk. v. 21-43; Lk. viii. 40-56). Given by Matthew in immediate connection with the discourse on fasting, but by Mark, and Luke following him, in connection with the return from the eastern shore, after the story of the demoniac. Ver. 18. Ἐδώ... λέγων: exactly the same formula as in vii. 2.— ἐρχομεν, an important person, a ruler of the synagogue, according to Mark.—ἀλέ: peculiar here, but taken from Mark where it is intelligible, the suppliant being there described as one of the rulers of the synagogue. The word puzzled the scribes, and gave rise to great variation in the text.— ἐρτὶ ἐφακοῦσαν: This statement of Matthew, compared with those of Mark and Luke, which make the father say his daughter was dying,
has created work for the harmonists. The patristic view (Chrys., Theoph., Euthy.), that the statement was an inference from the condition in which he left her, or a natural exaggeration, has been adopted by many. Probably it is an inaccuracy of the evangelist’s due to abbreviation. The girl was dead when Jesus arrived; that was all he cared about. The ruler thought Jesus could do anything short of raising from the dead, save even in articulo mortis. But our evangelist gives him credit for more faith; that Jesus can bring back from the dead, at least when death has just taken place.—δέοντας, not remain living, but revive, come to life again (Fritzsche).—Ver. 19. ἀγρευθέντος apparently refers back to ver. 10, implying close sequence—feasting, fasting, dying; such is life indeed.

Vv. 20-22. The story is suspended at this point by an interlude.—Ver. 20, καὶ ἰδοὺ, a new applicant for help appears on the scene, on the way to Jairus’ house.—γυνὴ . . . ἡ γυνὴ, a woman who had suffered for twelve years from some kind of bloody flux.—διακορίσθη: realistic feature; from womanly shame or the morbid shrinking of chronic ill-health, or out of regard to the law concerning uncleanness (Lev. xv.).—κραστέους, Hebrew כרכות (Num. xv. 38), fringes at the four corners of the outer garment to remind of the commandments. In dress Jesus was not nonconformist. His mantle, ἱμάτιον, had its κράσπεδα like other people’s.—ψάρι, touched one of the tassels; the least possible degree of contact enough to ensure a cure, without notice; faith, superstitition and cunning combined. Ver. 21. ἐλέγει γὰρ ἐν λαιμῷ: such was her little private scheme. Ver. 22, καὶ οἱ στραφεὶς καὶ ὡς. Matthew’s narrative here is simple as compared with that of Mark and Luke, probably a transcript from Apostolic Document, concerned mainly about the words of Jesus. So far as our evangelist is concerned the turning round of Jesus might be an accident, or due to consciousness of a nervous jerk instinctively understood to mean something.—θάρσει, θυγατέρ, again as in ix. 2, a terse, cordial sympathetic address; there child to a man, here daughter to a mature woman.—πιστις, no notice taken of the superstition or the cunning, only of the good side; mark the rhythm: ἡ πιστις σου σταυρωθή, again in Lk. vii. 50, where, with πιστεύεις εἰς ἑαυτήν, it forms a couplet.—σχίζω, perfect, not future, to convey a feeling of confidence = you are a saved woman.—καὶ ἔσωθέν, and so she was from that hour. A true story in the main, say Strauss and Keim, strictly a case of faith-cure.

Vv. 23-26. The narrative returns to the case of Jairus’ daughter. Ver. 23, ἐδόθη . . . καὶ οἱ, circumstantial participle leading up to what Jesus said, the main fact.—καὶ ἀληθὰς, etc.: the girl was only just dead, yet already a crowd had gathered about the house, brought together by various motives, sympathy, money, desire to share in the meat and drink going at such a time (so Lightfoot, Hor. Heb., ut erdent et bibere), and of course making a confused din.—θερομουθονος, the part. = a relative with finite verb = the crowd which was making a din. The crowd, besides the αληθὰς, tibicines, flute-players, would include some hired mourning women (Jerem. ix. 17), praefice, whose duty it was to sing nenia in praise of the dead. Mourning, like everything else, had been reduced to system, two flutes and one mourning woman at the burial of a wife incumbent on the poorest man (Lightfoot, Hor. Heb.). The practice in Greece and Rome was similar, proofs in Grotius, Elsner, Wetstein. Vide also Marquardt, Handbuch der Röm. Allertherimer, vol. vii., p. 341, where it is stated that by the twelve Tables the number of tibicines was limited to ten, and that before the Punic war, at least, praefice were employed.—
Ver. 24. ἀναχαίραται, retire! Hired mourning distasteful to Jesus, who gladly avails Himself of this opportunity of dismissing them.—οὐ γὰρ ἀπεθανεῖ, no need of you yet, for the maid (κοράσιον, dim. for κόρη, but = puella in late Greek) is not dead. A welcome word to naturalistic commentators, giving a plausible basis for the hypothesis of an apparent death or swoon (Schleierm., Keim, etc.), not to be taken prosaically as meant to deny death. Yet Carr (C. G. T.) thinks it open to question whether it ought not to be taken literally, and doubtful whether κοράσιον is ever used in a metaphorical sense in the N. T. or elsewhere. The derisive laughter of the crowd (κατεγέλαω) is good evidence to the contrary.—ἐξεβλήθη: not to be pressed as implying physical force, non ni et manus, sed nosse iussuque (Fritzsche), a tone and manner not to be resisted, the house therefore soon cleared of the noisy crowd.—Ver. 26. ἐξῆλθεν ἡ φ., against the wish of Jesus, who did not desire raising the dead to be regarded as a part of His ordinary work. Perhaps that was why He said: "she sleepeth" (Weiss, L. J., Marcus-Evang.).—τὴν γυνὴν ἔκειν: Weiss thinks the expression implies that the evangelist is a stranger to Palestine (Weiss-Meyer).

Vv. 27-31. Two blind men.—This miracle-narrative and the next are comparatively colourless and uninteresting. They bring under notice two new types of disease, blindness and possession accompanied with dummness. The interest in both cases, however, lies not so much in the cures as in the words spoken.—Ver. 27. τυφλοί, blindness common from limestone dust in the air and changing temperature.—vide Δ., Messianic appellation, first time addressed to Jesus, a point of interest for the evangelist; not welcome to Jesus, who feared the awakening of false expectations. Therefore He took no notice of them on the way to His house, whither He retired after the last incident.—Ver. 28. ἠλάλοντες εἰς τὸ προσήλθον: they follow, and Jesus at last takes notice of them, asking if they have faith in His power. His previous conduct might throw doubt on His willingness, but that is dispelled by speaking to them.—val, a prompt glad yes is their answer. Ver. 30.—ἐγείρθησαν, a Hebraism. The Jews thought of blind eyes as shut, and of seeing eyes as open.—ἐγείρθησαν, sternly enjoined (vide Mk. i. 43). The paraphrase of Euthy. Zig gives a vivid idea of the meaning, "looked severely, contracting His eyebrows, and shaking His head at them, as they are wont to do who wish to make sure that secrets will be kept".—Ver. 31. ἐν δὲ τ. γ. κ. (vide remarks on ver. 26).
Vv. 32-34. The dumb demoniac (Lk. xi. 14). A slight narrative, very meagre in comparison with the story of the Gerasene demoniac, the interest centring in the conflicting comments of spectators which probably secured for it a place in the Logia of Matthew. Ver. 32. Αὐτῶν ἐξερχόμενοι: while the two blind men are going out they bring another sufferer to the great Healer; an incessant stream of applicants for aid flowing towards His door.—κωπῆς: dumbness the apparent symptom. The word literally means blunt, and in Homer (Il., ii. 390) is applied to a weapon. In N. T. it is used with reference to the senses and faculties, here the faculty of speech (ver. 33, ἀλαλοῦν), in xi. 5, that of hearing.—δαιμονιζόμενον, the inferred cause. It was known that the dumbness was not due to any physical defect. Speech seemed to be prevented by some foreign spiritual power; the mental disease, possibly, melancholy.—Ver. 33. ἄλαλον: that cured, speech followed.—ἐθαμάσατε: the crowd present wondered, hearing one speak whom they had so long known to be dumb.—οὖν ὄντα ἐφώνει, etc.: thus they expressed their surprise; the like was never seen in Israel. ἐφώνει is impersonal, the reference being to the change in the man; the manner of expression is colloquial, and it is idle to discuss the precise meaning of οὖν, and what nominative is to be supplied to ἐφώνει. It is more to the purpose to inquire why this seemingly minor miracle should make so great an impression. Perhaps we should not isolate it, but take it along with the other marvels that followed in quick succession as joint causes of admiration. The people were worked up into a high measure of astonishment which, at last, found vent in these words. So in effect Euth., also Rosenmüller ("tot signa, tam admirabilia, tam celeriter, neque contactu tantum, sed et verbo, et in omni morborum genere").—Ver. 34. οἱ Φαρ. Πληγοί. The multitude admired, but the Pharisees said. They are watching closely the words and acts of Jesus and forming their theories. They have got one for the cure of demoniacs.—ἐν τῷ ἄρχωτι τοῦ δαιμονίου ἐκβάλλει τὰ δαιμόνια."—35. ΚΑῚ τῷ περιήγην ἃ ἰησοῦς τὰς πόλεις πάσας καὶ τὰς κώμας, ἐδειδάχθης ἐν ταῖς συναγωνίαις αὐτῶν, καὶ κηρύσσως τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας, καὶ θεραπευόν τὰς πάθαν ὑπὸν καὶ πᾶσαν μαλακίαν ἐν

1 ΝΒ omit οὖν των. 2 ΝΒCD omit οὐ. 3 ΝΒCD omit οὐ.
32–38. **ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ**


1 *καλλιεργημένοι* (T. R.) is a very weakly-supported reading, having only one important uncial, L, on its side. **NDBCΔΔ** have καλλιεργημένου, doubtless the true reading.

2 The variation here is simply a matter of spelling: έπ. in **NBLCL** (Tisch., W.H.), ώρα (T. R.) ΓΔ ώρα Δ.

part of their religious guides—the shepherds by profession without the shepherd heart, the spiritual husbandmen without an eye for the whitening fields and skill to handle the sickle. The Pharisaic comments on the Capernaum mission festival (ix. 11) were sufficient to justify the adverse judgment. Their question on that occasion meant much, and would not be forgotten by Jesus.—έσυκλησίων, ἔρμηνεων, graphic words, clear as to general import, though variously understood as to their precise meaning. The former may mean "layed" (from καλέων, Holtz., H. C.), or "hunted" and tired out (Weiss-Meyer), the practical sense is "exhausted by long, aimless wandering, foot-sore and fledge-torn." The other points to the natural sequel—lying down, scattered about (βίωμι), here one, there another, on the hill side, just where they found themselves unable to go a step further. A flock can get into such a condition only when it has no shepherd to care for it and guide it to the pastures.

Vv. 37, 38. θερισμός: a new figure coming in abruptly in the narrative, but not necessarily so close together in Christ’s mind. The one figure suits the mood of passive sympathy: the other, that of the harvest, suits the mood of active purpose to help. It would not be long in the case of Jesus before the one mood passed into the other. He could not be a mere pitying spectator. He must set on foot a mission of help. The Capernaum feast was the first stage; the mission of the twelve the second. The word "harvest" implies spiritual susceptibility. Weiss protests against this inference as allegorising interpretation of a parabolic saying which simply points to the want of suitable labourers

(vide L. I., ii. 119). So also Schanz maintains, against Euth., that not susceptibility but need is pointed to. But, as against Weiss, it is pertinent to ask: what suggested the figure of a harvest if not possibilities of gain to the kingdom of God, given sympathetic workers? This hopeful judgment as to the people of the land, contrasted with Pharisaic despair and contempt, was characteristic of Jesus (vide my Kingdom of God, chap. v.).—ἔργαται διάλογο: professional labourers, men busying themselves with inculcation of moral and religious observances, abundant; but powerless to win the people because without sympathy, hope, and creditable acceptable Gospel. Their attempts, if any, only make bad worse—sub leges onere megrotam plebem, Hilary). "Few"—as yet only one expert, but He is training others, and He has faith in prayer for better men and times.—Ver. 38. διείσθη: the first step in all reform—deep, devout desire out of a profound sense of need. The time sick and out of joint—God mend it!—διώνυμον ἐκβάλη, etc. The prayer, expressed in terms of the parabolic figure, really points to the ushering in of a new era of grace and humanity—Christian as opposed to Pharisaic, legal, Rabbinical. In the old time men thought it enough to care for themselves even in religion; in the new time, the impulse and fashion would be to care for others. ἐκβάλη, a strong word (cf. Mk. iv. 20, ἄνωτόντας), even allowing for the weakened force in later Greek, implying Divine sympathy with the urgent need. Men must be raised up who can help the time. Christ had thorough faith in a benignant Providence. Luke gives this **lógoς** in connection with the mission of the seventy (v. 2).
CHAPTER X. THE GALILEAN MISSION.

The beginnings of the mission to the neglected "lost" sheep of Israel may be found in the Capernaum feast (ix. 10). As time went on Jesus felt increasingly the pressure of the problem and the need for extended effort. Matthew's call was connected with the first stage of the movement, and that disciple was Christ's agent in bringing together the gathering of publicans and sinners. He is now about to employ all the intimate disciples He has collected about Him and through them to spread the movement all over Galilee. They will be a poor substitute for Himself, yet not wholly useless like the scribes, for they have heard His teaching on the hill and imbibed somewhat of His spirit of love.

Vv. 1-15. The Twelve: their names, mission, and relative instructions (Mk. iii. 14-19, vi. 7-13, Lk. ix. 1-6).

Ver. 1. προσκαλεσάμενος: this does not refer to the call to become disciples, but to a call to men already disciples to enter on a special mission.—τῶν διδάσκαλων, the Twelve. The article implies that a body of intimate disciples, twelve in number, already existed. The evangelist purposely had Mk. iii. 14 in view. He may also reflect in his language the feeling of the apostolic age to which the Twelve were familiar and famous. Hitherto we have made the acquaintance of five of the number (iv. 18-22, ix. 9). Their calls are specially reported to illustrate how the body of twelve grew.—διδάσκαλος, authority, not to preach, as we might have expected, but to heal. The prominence given to healing in this mission may surprise and disappoint, and even tempt to entertain the suspicion that the exalted ideas concerning the Twelve of after years have been read into the narrative. This element is certainly least prominent in Mark. Yet to some extent it must have had a place in the mission. The people in Galilee had all heard of Jesus and His work, and it was no use sending the Twelve unless they could carry with them something of His power.—πνευμάτων a, genitive objective, as in John xvii. 3, Rom. ix. 21. ἰδίως ἐκ . . . καὶ θεραπεύων, dependent also on διδάσκαλος (cf. 1 Cor. ix. 5).—οὖν with infinitive indicating tendency of the power. τὰ πνεύματα, etc., echo of iv. 23.

Ver. 2. τῶν δὲ διδάσκαλων: etc., the evangelist finds here a convenient place for giving the names of the Twelve, called here for the first and last time ἀπόστολοι, with reference at once to the immediate minor mission (from ἀπόστολοι, side v. 5) and to the later great one. One half of them are for us mere names, and of one or two even the names are doubtful, utterly obscure, yet, doubtless, in their time and sphere faithful witnesses. They are arranged in pairs, as if following the hint of Mark that they were sent out by two and two, each pair connected with a κατά (so in Luke, not in Mark).—πρῶτος: at the head of the list stands Peter, first not only numerically (Meyer) but in importance, a sure matter of fact, though priestly pretensions based on it are to be disregarded. He is first in all the lists.—δυτικός, Πέτρος: a fact already stated (iv. 18), here repeated probably because the evangelist had his eye on Mark's list (iii. 16) or possibly to distinguish this Simon from another in the list (No. 11).—Ver. 3. Βαρθολομαῖος, the 6th, one of the doubtful names, commonly identified with Nathanael (John i. 46).—Ματθαίος ὁ Τελονής, one of four in the list with epitheta: Peter the first, Simon the Zealot, Judas the Traitor, Matthew the Publican; surely not without reason, except as echoing ix. 9 (Meyer). Matthew stands second in his pair here, before Thomas in Mark and Luke. Position and epithet agree, indicative, Euthy suggests, of modesty and self-abasement.—Ver. 4. Ἰησοῦς ὁ Καναναῖος: Luke gives τὸν καλ. Ζηλωτὴς = the zealot, possibly a piece of in-
formation based on an independent reliable source, or his interpretation of the Hebrew word יָשָׁב. The form 

The form קָנָנָויס seems to be based on the idea that the word referred to a place. Jerome took it to mean "of Cana," "de vico Chana Galilaeae," יָסָבָא עֵּ֛קָרִיִּים: last in all the lists, as Peter is first. The epithet is generally taken as denoting the place to which he belonged: the man of Issachar (Grotius); but most render: the man of Kerioth (in Judah, Joshua xv. 24, Jer. xlviii, 41); in that case the one non-Galilean disciple. The ending, ἠπή, is Greek; in Mark the Hebrew ending, מ, is given.

Ver. 5-15. Instructions to the missionaries. Ver. 5. Τοῦτον τούς & πάντας: These, the Twelve, Jesus sent forth, under the injunctions following (παραγγειλαίων).—ἐν δὲ δόθην αὐτοῖς ἰδίᾳ ἐπικαριότητα. This prohibition occurs in Matthew only, but there is no reason to doubt its authenticity except indeed that it went without saying. The very prohibition implies a consciousness that one day the Gospel would go the way of the Gentiles just as Mt. v. 17 implies consciousness that fulfilling, in the speaker's sense, would involve annulling.—δένον ἰδίᾳ, the way towards (Meyer), the genitive being a genitive of motion (Fritzsche, Kühner, § 414, 4), or a way within or of, parallel to πᾶν Σαμαριταίαν in next clause.—ἐν πάντες Ἀποκ., not even in Samaria should they carry on their mission. The prohibition is total. πᾶν does not refer to the chief city (Erasmus, Annot., metrepolis) or to the towns as distinct from the rural parts through which at least they might pass (Grotius). It means any considerable centre of population. The towns and villages are thought of as the natural sphere of work (ver. 11). The reason of the double prohibition is not given, but doubtless it lay in the grounds of policy which led Christ to confine His own work to Israel, and also in the crude religious state of the disciples.—Ver. 6. ἀπολλοῦσα, "the lost sheep,""Lost" in His vocabulary meant "neglected" (ix. 36), in danger also of course, but not finally and hopelessly given over to perdition, savable if much needing salvation. The term is ethical in import, and implies that the mission had moral and religious improvement mainly in view, not mere physical benefit through healing agency; teaching rather than miraculous acts.—Ver. 7. περιεύξεται, as ye go, keep preaching; participle and finite verb, both present. Preaching first in the Master's thoughts, it is the evangelist's (ver. 1).—ἡγεμόνια οἱ ἁγίασθαι, the theme is, of course, the kingdom longed for by all, constantly on the lips of Jesus. The message is: It has come nigh to you and is here. Very general, but much more, it may be taken for granted, was said. The apostles could as yet make no intelligent theoretic statement concerning the Kingdom, but they could tell not a little about the King, the Master who sent them, the chief object of interest doubtless for all receptive souls. It was a house mission (not in synagogue) on which they were sent (ver. 12). They were to live as guests in selected dwellings, two in one, and two in another, for a time, and their preaching would take the form of familiar conversation on what they had seen and
heard Jesus do and say. They would talk by the hour, healing acts would be very occasional, one or two in a village.

Ver. 8. νεκρον ἀγιασμα. This clause is wanting in several Codds., including L, so often associated with B in good readings. It is, however, too well attested to be omitted. It must either have found a place in the autograph, or it must have crept in as a gloss at a very early period. The evangelist's aim seems to be to represent Christ as empowering the disciples to do the works He is reported to have done Himself in chaps. viii., ix. That purpose demands the inclusion of raising the dead as the crowning miracle of the group (raising of daughter of Jairus). Yet it is hard to believe that Jesus would give power to the disciples to do, as an ordinary part of their mission, what He Himself did only on one or two exceptional occasions. The alternatives seem to be either an early gloss introduced into the text, or an inaccuracy on the part of the evangelist. Meyer takes the former view, Weiss apparently the latter. We cannot take the phrase in a spiritual sense, the other clauses all pointing to physical miracles. This clause is not in the accounts of Mark and Luke. The seventy on their return (Luke x. 17) make no mention of raising the dead.

Ver. 9. μὴ κτήσασθε: Vulgate: nolite possidere. But the prohibition is directed not merely against possessing, but against acquiring (κτέσασθε, perfect = possess). The question is as to the scope of the prohibition. Does it refer merely to the way, or also to the mission? In one case it will mean: do not anxiously procure extensive provision for your journey (Meyer); in the other it will mean, more comprehensively: do not procure for the way, or during the mission, the things named. In other words, it will be an injunction to begin and carry on the mission without reward. Though the reference seems to be chiefly to the starting point, it must be in reality to their conduct during the mission. There was no need to say: do not obtain gold before starting, for that was practically impossible. There was need to say: do not take gold or silver from those whom you benefit, for it was likely to be offered, and acceptance of gifts would be morally prejudicial. That, therefore, is what Jesus prohibits, true to His habit of insisting on the supreme value of motive. So Jerome (condemnatio avariitiae), Chrys., Hilary, etc. So also Weiss, Holtz. (H.C.), while concurring in this interpretation, thinks the prohibition suits better the conduct of the Christ-merchants in the Didache than the circumstances of the disciples. — χρυσόν, ἀργυρόν, χαλκόν: an anticylimax, not gold, not silver, not even a copper. — εἰς τὰς ζώνας, in your girdles, used for this purpose as well as for gathering up the loose mantle, or in purses suspended from the girdle. "It was usual for travellers to carry purses (φαρακλία) suspended from their girdles, in which they carried the pence" (Eutych.).

—Ver. 10. τήραν, a wallet for holding provisions, slung over the shoulder (Judith xiii. 10, τήραν τῶν βρωμάτων). — δὲ χιτώνας: not even two under-garments, shirts; one would say very necessary for comfort and cleanliness in a hot climate, and for travellers along dusty roads. In Mark the prohibition seems to be against wearing two at the same time (vi. 8); here against carrying a spare one for a change. Possibly we ought not to take these instructions too literally, but in their spirit. — ἰδρώματα: this does not mean that they were to go barefooted, but either without a spare pair, or without more substantial covering for the feet (shoes) than the light sandals they usually wore — mere soles to keep the feet off the hard road. Lightfoot (Hor. Hbr.) distinguishes between the two thus: "usus delicatoris fuerunt calcei, durioris atque utilioris sandalia". He states that there were sandals, whose soles were of wood, and upper part of leather, the two joined by nails, and that they were sometimes made of rushes or the bark of palms.


-ἀδιδέων: not even a staff! That can hardly be meant. Even from the romantic or picturesque point of view the procession of pilgrim missionaries would not be complete without a staff each in their hand. If not at least, it was no luxury. Mark allows the staff, creating trouble for the harmonists. Grotius suggests: no second staff besides the one in hand! Glassius, quoted by Fritzsche in scorn, suggests a staff shod with iron (scipio) for defence. Ebrard, with approval of Godet, thinks of two different turns given to the

Aramaic original תושז = either "if you take one staff it is enough," or "if, etc., it is too much." Really the discrepancy is not worth all this trouble. Practically the two versions come to the same thing: take only a staff, take not even a staff; the latter is a little more hyperbolical than the former. Without even a staff, is the 

πλεον ἀλτα of austere simplicity and self-denial. Men who carry out the spirit of these precepts will not labour in vain. Their life will preach the kingdom better than their words, which may be feeble and helpless. "Nothing," says Euthy., "creates admiration so much as a simple, contented life." (πλος ἀπαντηματι καλ ἀπαντημα — a maxim universally recognised. A labourer of the type described is not only worthy but sure of his meat; need have no concern about that. This is one of the few sayings of our Lord referred to by St. Paul (1 Cor. ix. 14), whose conduct as an apostle well illustrates the spirit of the instructions to the Twelve.

Vv. 12-15. δείξανε (δε ἑδίκος, from ἑδίκος, true; to inquire as to the truth of a matter). A host to be carefully sought out in each place: not to stay with the first who offers. —ἐξεις points to personal moral worth, the deciding consideration to be goodness, not wealth (worth so much). The host to be a man generally respected, that no prejudice be created against the mission (ne praedicationis dignitas suscipientis infamia deturpetur, Jerome). —μᾶλλον: having once secured a host, abide with him, shift not about seeking better quarters and fare, hurting the feelings of the host, and damaging your character, as self-seeking men.— Ver. 12. τῆς οἰκίας, the house selected after due inquiry. —ἀρετεσθατε, salute it, not as a matter of formal courtesy, but with a serious mind, saying: "peace be with you," thinking the while of what peace the kingdom can bring.— Ver. 13. ἐὰν μὴ τῇ δ. δέξῃ: after all pains have been taken, a mistake may be made; therefore the worthiness of the house is spoken of as uncertain (ἐίδη, in an emphatic position, so μὴ, in next clause). —ἀλλὰ ἣ ἡ ἐρήμη . . . ἐν τοῖς ἑωρατηθοῖς. The meaning is: the word of peace will not be spoken in vain; it will bless the speaker if not those addressed. It is always good to wish peace and good for others, however the wish may be received. There is a tacit warning against being provoked by churlish treatment. Ver. 14. ἐὰν μὴ βέβαια: Christ contemplates an unfavourable result of the mission in the host's house, or in the town or village generally. The construction of the sentence is an appositional, beginning one way, ending another: rhetorical in effect, and suitable to emotional speech; cf. Lk. xxi. 6: "these things ye see—days will come in which not one stone will be left upon another" (more Winer, § 63, on such constructions). —ἐξετάζων: when an unrepentive attitude has once been decidedly taken up, there is nothing for it but to go away. Such a crisis severely tests the temper and spirit of promoters of good causes.—ἐκτινάζει τῷ κοινῷ εὐνομοῖς: a symbolic act practised by the Pharisees on passing from heathen to Jewish soil, the former being regarded as unclean.
Easy to perform, not easy to perform in a right spirit; too apt to be the outcome of irritation, disappointment, and wounded vanity—they did not appreciate me, I abandon them to their fate. Christ meant the act to symbolise the responsibility of the inhabitants for the result=leave the place, feeling that you have done your duty, not in anger but in sadness. The act, if performed, would be a last word of warning (as μαρτυρίαν αδύνατον, Mark and Luke). Grotius and Bleek understand it as meaning: "we have nothing more to do with you".—Ver. 15. γὰρ Σ. καὶ Γ.: Sodom and Gomorrah, a byword for great iniquity and awful doom (Is. i. 9), γῆ, land for people.—ἀνεκτόρευον: yet the punishment of these wicked cities, tragic though it was, or the punishment still in store, more endurable than that of city or village which rejects the message of the kingdom. This may seem an exaggeration, the utterance of passion rather than of sober judgment, and a dangerous thing to say to raw disciples and apprentice missionaries. But the principle involved is plain: the greater the privilege rejected the greater the criminality. The utterance reveals the high value Jesus set on the good tidings He commissioned the Twelve to preach.

Vv. 16-39. Prophetic picture of future apostolic tribulations. An interpolation of our evangelist after his manner of grouping logia of kindred import. The greater part of the material is given in other connections in Mark, and especially in Luke. No feeling of delicacy should prevent even the preacher from taking this view, as it destroys all sense of the natural reality of the Galilean mission to suppose that this passage formed part of Christ's instructions to the Twelve in connection therewith. Reading into the early event the thoughts and experiences of a later time was inevitable, but to get a true picture of the life of Jesus and His disciples, we must keep the two as distinct as possible. There may be a doubt as to ver. 16. It stands at the beginning of the instructions to the Seventy in Luke (x. 2), which, according to Weiss (Math. Evang., p. 263), are really the instructions to the Twelve in their most original form. But it is hard to believe that Jesus took and expressed so pessimistic a view of the Galilean villagers to whom He was sending the Twelve, as is implied in the phrase, "sheep among wolves," though He evidently did include occasional un-receptivity among the possible experiences of the mission. He may indeed have said something of the kind with an understood reference to the hostility of Pharisaic religiousists, but as it stands unqualified, it seems to bear a colouring imported from a later period.

Ver. 16. ἔκακον, something important is going to be said.—εἰκός, emphatic. Jesus is conscious that connection with Him will be a source not only of power, but of trouble to the Twelve.—ἐν μεταφράσει: not to wolves (πρὸς λύκους, Chrys.). They were not sent for that purpose, which would be a mission to destruction, but on an errand of which that would be an incident. ἐν is used here as often, especially in later Greek writers, with a verb of motion to indicate a subsequent chronic state, "the result of a love of conciseness" (Winer, § 50, 4, a).—εἰκός. . . ἐπιστέασαι. The serpent, the accepted emblem of wisdom (Gen. iii. 1; Ps. lvi. 5)—wary, sharp-sighted (Grotius); the dove of simplicity (Hos. vii. 11, "silly dove," ἄεις, Sept.).—ἀνέκτορευον (καὶ, κεράν-γυμνον), unmixed with evil, purely good. The ideal resulting from the combination is a prudent simplicity; difficult to realise. The proverb seems to have been current among the Jews. "God says: 'with me the Israelites are simple as the dove, but against the heathen cunning as the serpent." (Wünsche, Beiträge).—Ver. 17. τῶν ἀνίσθικων: Weiss, regarding ver. 17 as the beginning of an interpolation, takes τῶν generically =the whole race of men conceived of as on the whole hostile to the truth.
18. καὶ ἐτι ἁγιοίμας δὲ καὶ βασιλείς ἠδύνασθε ἵνα ἐνεκερ ἐμοὶ, εἰς τὸν τίτρον αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῖς ἀδένεσιν. 19. ὅταν δὲ παραδόθωνι ἐμῶς, μὴ μερισθῆναι πῦρ ὑπὸ τὴν καταστροφὴν. 20. τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ πατρὸς ὤμοι τὸ λαλοῦν ἐν ὕμι, καὶ τὸν πατὴρ τὰς ἑκάστροφοις αὐτοῦ. 21. καὶ ἔστωθε μοι ὁ ἐνακριβῶς ὁ τῶν ὄρων μου ἐν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ αὐτοῦ, ὑπάρχων καὶ τῆς ἱστορίας αὐτοῦ. 22. καὶ ὁ ἦσαν ὁ σωτὴρ σας ὁ ἐν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἑαυτοῦ, πρὸς τοὺς ἐμοὶ ἐμοῖς εἰς τὸν τίτρον αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ τοῦ ἔθους, καὶ τῇ ἀνθρώπου ἀνθρώπων αὐτοῦ.

1 ΜΒ have παραδόθων (Tisch., W.H.).
2 ΝΒ have λαλήσας = what ye ought to speak. The fut. ind. (T. R.) = what ye will speak. The former is to be preferred. DL omit the whole clause from δοθῆναι to λαλήσας, an error of similar ending.
ndirectly intimated, that there will be an end, that religious animosities will not last for ever. Even persecutors and guillotineers get weary of their savage work. On τὰ τάξεως Beza remarks: declarat neque momentaneam neque perpetuum hanc conditionem fore. —οὕτωσις συνήθεσιν, κα, emphatic, he and no other, shall be saved, in the day of final award (James i. 22, “shall receive the crown of life”); also, for the word is pregnant, shall be saved from moral shipwreck. How many characters go miserably down through cowardice and lack of moral fibre in the day of trial!

Ver. 23. δειν βλέπει: the thought takes a new comforting turn, much needed to reconcile disciples to the grim prospect. With courage and loyalty effort for self-preservation is quite compatible. Therefore, when they persecute here flee there.—ἐν τῇ πόλις ταύτη, in this city, pointing to it, this standing for one.—φεύγετε, flee, very unheroic apparently, but the bravest soldier, especially an old campaigner, will avail himself of cover when he can.

εἰς τὴν ἑτέραν: the reading of ΝΒ is to be preferred to ἀλλὰν of the T.R., the idea being: flee not merely to another city numerically distinct, but to a city presumably different in spirit (side vi. 24 and xi. 16), where you may hope to receive better treatment. Thus the flight, from being a mere measure of self-preservation, is raised to the dignity of a policy of prudence in the interest of the cause. Why throw away life here among a hostile people when you may do good work elsewhere? —Αἀπογραφα: reason for the advice solemnly given; an important declaration, and a perplexing one for interpreters.—οὐ μὴ, have no fear lest, ye will certainly not, have finished.—τήλευτα. In what sense? “gone over” (A.V.) in their evangelising tour, or done the work of evangelising thoroughly? (ad fidic et evangelicæ virtutis perfectionem—Hilary). The former is the more natural interpretation. And yet the connection of thought seems to demand a mental reference to the quality of the work done. Why tarry at one place as if you were under obligation to convert the whole population to the kingdom? The thing cannot be done. The two views may be combined thus: ye shall not have gone through the towns of Israel evangelising them in even a superficial way, much less in a thorough-going manner. Weiss takes the word τῆλε as referring not to mission work but to flight = ye shall not have used all the cities as places of refuge, i.e., there will always be some place to flee to. This is beneath the dignity of the situation, especially in view of what follows.—τασάλη ὥσπερ τ. θ. Here again is the peculiar title Son of Man: impersonal, but used presumably as a synonym for “I”. What does it mean in this connection? And what is the coming referred to? The latter question can be best answered at a later stage. It has been suggested that the title Son of Man is here used by Christ in opposition to the title Son of David. The meaning of ver. 23 on that view is this: do not think it necessary to tarry at all hazards in one place. Your work anywhere and everywhere must be very imperfect. Even success will mean failure, for as soon as they have received the tidings of the kingdom they will attach wrong ideas to it, thinking of it as a national kingdom and of me as the “Son of David”. No thorough work can be done till the Son of Man has come, i.e., till a universal Gospel for humanity has begun to be preached (Lutteroth). This is a fresh suggestion, not to be despised, on so obscure a subject. We are only feeling our way as to the meaning of some of Christ’s sayings. Meantime, all that we can be sure of is that Christ points to some event not far off that will put a period to the apostolic mission.

Vv. 24, 25 point to another source of consolation—companionship with the Master in tribulation. A hard lot, but mine as well as yours; you would not expect to be better off than the Master.
and Lord.—Ver. 25. Ἀρκετῷν, not as in vi. 34 a neuter adjective used as a noun, but a predicate qualifying the clause ἰδον γένοιται, etc., as a noun to verb et alio understood. Τοι γένοιται instead of the infinitive; διὸ δικαίους instead of τού δικαιοῦ dependent like τού μαθητῆς on Ἀρκετῷν, by attraction of the nearer word γένοιται (vide Winer, § 66, 3).—οἰκοδομοῦντα (-οι, B.) points to a more intimate relation between Jesus and the Twelve, that of a head of a house to a family, implying greater honour for the latter, and suggesting an added motive for patient endurance of the common lot.—οἰκοδομούντα is a late form. Earlier writers said ἀλαφάς θεωρεῖται, Loh., Philm., p. 373. —ἐπειδὴ: an opprobrious epithet; exact form of the word and meaning of the name have given more trouble to commentators than it is all worth. Consult Meyer ad loc., Weiss (Meyer) remarks that the name of the Prince of the demons is not yet sufficiently explained. A question of interest is: did the enemies of Jesus call Him Beelzebul (or Beelzebub), or did they merely reproach Him with connection with Beelzebub? Weiss, taking ver. 25 b as an explanatory gloss of the evangelist, has followed. xi. 24, adopts the latter view; De Wette and Meyer the former. The reading of Codex B, ὀικοδομοῦντα, favours the second alternative. The dative requires the verb ἐπικαλέσαν to be taken in the sense of to cast up to one. Assuming that the evangelist reports words of Jesus instead of giving a comment of his own, they may quite well contain the information that, among the contemptuous epithets applied to Jesus by His enemies, was this name. It may have been a spiteful pun upon the name, master of the house. —καὶ ἴδον μᾶλλον implies that still worse names will be applied to the Twelve. Dictis respondet eventus, remarks Grotius, citing in proof the epithets γένοιται, impostores, applied to the apostles and Christians by Celsus and Ulpian, and the words of Tacitus: conscriptos in odio humani generis, and the general use of δίκαιος as a synonym for Christians.—οἰκείοις (again in ver. 36), those belonging to a household or family (from οἶκος, whence also the more common οἰκία bearing a similar meaning).—Vv. 25, 26. μὴ ὥν ὁ ποιμήν ἑταίρες, “fear not,” and again “fear not” in ver. 28, and yet again, 31, says Jesus, knowing well what temptation there would be to fear. οὐν connects with vv. 24, 25; fear not the inevitable for all connected with me as you are, take it calmly. γάρ supplies a reason for fearlessness arising out of their vocation. It is involved in the apostolic calling that those who exercise it should attract public attention. Therefore, fear not what cannot be avoided if you would be of any use. Fear suits not an apostle any more than a soldier or a mariner, who both take coolly the risks of their calling.—κακαλομένος, ἐπικαλέσσιται: κρυπτῶν, γινομένη: the two pairs of words embody a contrast between Master and disciples as to relative publicity. —As movements develop they come more under the public eye. Christ’s teaching and conduct were not wholly covered and hidden. There was enough publicity to ensure ample criticism and hostility. But, relatively, His ministry was obscure compared to that of the apostles in after years to which the address looks forward. Therefore, more not less, tribulation to be looked for. The futures ἐπικαλ. γινομεν, with the relative virtually express intention; cf. Mk. iv. 22, where Iva occurs; the hidden is hidden in order to be revealed. That is the law of the case to which apostles must reconcile themselves.—Ver. 27. σκότως, the darkness of the initial stage; the begin-
nings of great epoch-making movements always obscure. — the light of publicity when causes begin to make a noise in the wide world. — a phrase current among Greeks for confidential communications. For such communications to disciples used the term

 whisper, may be understood = what ye here spoken into the ear. — an object on the roofs; not a likely platform from our western point of view, but the flat-roofed houses of the East are in view. — a house in classics means house; in Sept. and N. T., the flat roof of a house; in modern Greek, terrace. Vide Kennedy, Sources of N. T. Greek, p. 121. — proclaim with loud voice, suitable to your commanding position, wide audience, and great theme.

Vv. 28-31. New antidote to fear drawn from a greater fear, and from the paternal providence of God. also one of several ways in which the Greeks connected this verb with its object. — all is that all the persecutor in such an injury, not injure the soul, but the more he assails the physical side the safer the spiritual. — the small, scattered, casual. Who is that? God, say most commentators. Not so, I believe. Would Christ present God under this aspect in such close connection with the Father who cares even for the sparrows? What is to be greatly feared is not the final condemnation, but that which leads to it — temptation to forsake the cause of God out of regard to self-interest or self-preservation. Shortly the counsel is: fear not the persecutor, but the tempter, not the man who kills you for your fidelity, but the man who wants to buy you off, and the devil whose agent he is. — Ver. 29. small birds in general, sparrows in particular. — a small coin, Latin as, of a drachma = about 6d. The smallness of the price makes it probable that sparrows are meant (Fritzsche). We are apt to wonder that sparrows a price at all. — αὐτοὶ are like a Hebraism, but found also in Greek writers, cannot be called either a Graecism or a Hebraism; in every case the writer aims at greater emphasis than would be conveyed by oumis, which properly means the same thing, but had become weakened by usage (Winer, § 29). — οὐκ ἔνας γῆς. Chrys. paraphrases: ἔνας γῆς (Hom. 34), whence Bengel conjectured that the primitive reading was not γῆς but πάντως, the first syllable of a little used word falling out. But Wetstein and Fritzsche have pointed out that ouκ does not suit that reading. The idea is that not a single sparrow dies from any cause on wing or perch, and falls dead to the earth. — ἄνω τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν, Origen (c. Celsum, i. 9) remarks: "nothing useful among men comes into existence without God." (καίνα). Christ expresses a more absolute faith in Providence. "the meanest creature passes not out of existence unobserved of your Father." — Ver. 30. emphatic position: your hairs. — of little value all together, can be lost without detriment to life or health. — every, one without exception. — counted, counted. Men count only valuable things, gold pieces, sheep, etc. Note the perfect participle. They have been counted once for all, and their number noted; one hair cannot go amiss observed. — Ver. 31. a comparison between men and birds as to value: ye of more worth than many
sparrows; one hair of your head as much worth to God as one sparrow. "It is a litotes to say that there is a great difference between many sparrows and a human being" (Holtz., H.C.). There is really no comparison between them. It was by such simple comparisons that Jesus insinuated His doctrine of the absolute worth of man.

Vv. 32, 33. *Solem reference to the final judgment.* ὄψιν points back to ver. 27, containing injunction to make open proclamation of the truth.—ἐκείνοι: nominative absolute at the head of the sentence.—ἐν ὑμοί, ἐν αὐτῷ: observe these phrases after the verb in ver. 32 compared with the use of the accusative με, αὐτόν in the following verse: "confess in me," "deny me," "confess in him," "deny him." Chrysostom’s comment is: we confess by the grace of Christ, we deny destitute of grace. Origen (Cremer, Catenae, i. p. 80) interprets the varying construction as indicating that the profit of the faithful disciple lies in fellowship with Christ and the loss of the unfaithful in the lack of such fellowship. (ἔραν εἰ, εἰ μὴ τὸ πλήθος ἐλεημονοῦσας, ἐξ ἕνας ἐν σωτηρίᾳ βλέπωμεν, ἐκ τοῦ, "καίγειν ἐν αὐτῷ" ἐξωλογεῖτο τὸ δὲ κακόν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, εἰ καὶ τοῦ μὴ συνεργάζεται τῇ ἀρχῆς τὸ "ἐν ὑμίλι", ἢ τὸ "ἐν αὐτῷ").

Vv. 34-39. The whole foregoing discourse, by its announcements and conclusions, implies that dread experiences are in store for the apostles of the faith. To the inexperienced the question might naturally suggest itself, why? Can the new religion not propagate itself quietly and peaceably? Jesus meets the question of the surprised disciple with a decided negative.—Ver. 34. μὴ γνωμήλεγεν, do not imagine, as you are very likely to do (cf. v. 17).—ἀλλὰ βαλεῖν: the use of the infinitive to express aim is common in Matt., but Christ has here in view result rather than purpose, which are not carefully distinguished in Scripture. For ἀλλὰ βαλεῖν Luke has δοθέω, possibly with a feeling that the former word does not suit εἰρήνη. It is used specially with reference to μάχαιραν. The aorist points to a sudden single action. Christ came to bring peace on earth, but not in an immediate magical way; peace at last through war (Weiss, Matt. Evangel.).—μάχαιραν: Luke substitutes διόμερον.

The connecting link may be that the sword divides in two (Heb. iv. 12). Grotius says that by the word there should be understood: "non bellum sed dissidium".—Ver. 35. Description of the discord.—διάδοται, to divide in two (διὰ δοσιμοῦ), to separate in feeling and interest, here only in N.T.; verifies the truth of Grotius' comment as to the "sword".—ἀνάβρων κατὰ τὸν πάτραν αὐτοῦ. In this and the following clauses it is the *young* that are set against the old. "In all statements of thought the change begins from the young" (Carr, Cambridge Gr. T.).—νύμφην, a young wife, here as opposed to πνευματία, a daughter-in-law.—Ver. 36. ἐξακρόν: the predicate standing first for emphasis; enimvis, not friends as one would expect, the members of one's family (οικίας, as in ver. 25). The passage reproduces freely Micah vii. 6.—Ver. 37. Such a state of matters imposes the necessity of making a very painful choice between relatives and truth.—φιλῶν: this verb denotes natural affection as distinct from ἀγαπᾶω, which
pointa to love of an ethical kind. The distinction corresponds to that between 
amare and diligere. Vide Trench, Syno-
yms, and Cremer, s. v., άγαπέων.— 
μου άξιος. The Master is peremptory; 
absolutely demands preference of His 
cause to all claims of earthly relations.
—Ver. 38. ο πτατων. There is here no 
necessary allusion to the death of Jesus 
Himself by crucifixion, though one 
possessing such insight into the course 
of events, as this whole discourse indica-
cates, must have known quite well 
when He uttered the words what 
awaited Himself, the worst possible pro-
able if not certain. The reference is to 
the custom of the condemned person 
carrying his own cross. Death by cruci-
fixion, though not practised among the 
Jews, would be familiar to them through 
Roman custom. Vide Grotius for Greek 
and Roman phrases, containing figura-
tive allusions to the cross. This sentence 
and the next will occur again in this 
ευρέω ... άπόλογων, άπόλογοι ... 
εύρηκα: crucifixion, death ignominious, 
as a criminal—horrible; but horrible 
though not in sense as it means salvation. The fundamental 
paradox is one of Christ's great, deep, yet 
ever true words. It turns on a double 
sense of the term ψυχή as denoting now 
the lower now the higher life. Every 
wise man understands and acts on the 
maxim, "dying to live".
Vv. 40-42. The following sentences 
might have been spoken in connection 
with the early Galilean mission, and are 
accordingly regarded by Weiss as the 
conclusion of the instructions then given. 
Luke gives their gist (x. 16) at the close 
of the instructions to the seventy. After 
uttering many awful stern sayings, Jesus 
takes care to make the last cheering. 
He promises great rewards to those 
who receive the missionaries, thereby 
"opening the houses of the whole world 
to them," Chrysos.—Ver. 40. έμε δέχωται: 
first the principle is laid down that to 
receive the messenger is to receive the 
Master who sent him (Matt. xxv. 40), as 
to receive the Master is to receive God. 
—Ver. 41. Then in two distinct forms 
the law is stated that to befriend the repre-
sentative of Christ and God ensures the 
reward belonging to that representa-
tive.—εις δομα μαθητου, δομη λέγω άμι,
οδ έμη άπολογη τον 
μονον εις δομα μαθητου, άμη λέγω άμι,
οδ έμη άπολογη τον
XI. 1. Καὶ ἐγένετο δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν διανάσω τοῖς διδάσκαλοις αὐτῶν, *μετέβη ἐκείνην τοῦ διδάσκαλον καὶ κηρύσσειν εἰς τ. Ch. xii. 9; τοὺς πάλαιν αὐτῶν.

2. Ὅ Δὲ ἠκούσας ἐκείνης εἶναι τά ἀργα τοῦ Ἀκαν εἰς τ. Χριστοῦ, πέμψας διὸ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτῶν, ἐπεν αὐτῷ, ἢ. 114-118.—Ver. 1. 2. την ἔκβολον διανάσων. The participle here with a verb signifying to cease as often with verbs signifying to begin, continue, persevere, etc., vide Goodwin, § 879. ἀκανθόν, from that place, the place where the mission was given to the Twelve. Where that we do not know; probably in some place of retirement (dans la retraite, Lutteroth.).—καὶ ἦν αὐτῶν: the pronoun does not refer to the disciples (μαθηταίς) as Fritzsche thinks, but to the people of Galilee. While He sent out the Twelve to preach, He continued preaching Himself, only avoiding the places they visited, “giving room to them and time to do their work, for, with Him present and healing, no one would have cared to go near them,” Chrysos., Hom. 36.

Vv. 2-6. Message from the Baptist (Lk. vii. 18-23). Ver. 2. διευθυνθέντι (from διέγοντος, διέγοντος, a bond), in prison in the fortress of Machærus by the Dead Sea (Joseph., Antiq., i. 8, 5, 2), a fact already alluded to in iv. 12. By this time he has been a prisoner a good while, long enough to develop a prison mood.—ἀκούοντας: not so close a prisoner but that friends and followers can get access to him (cf. Matt. xxv. 36, 43).—τά ἔργα τοῦ Χριστοῦ: this the subject in which the Baptist is chiefly interested. What is Jesus doing? But the evangelist does not say the works of Jesus, but of the Christ, i.e., of the man who was believed to be the Christ, the works which were supposed to point Him out as the Christ. In what spirit reported, whether simply as news, with sympathy or with jealousy, not indicated.—πρότεινον: the news set John on musing, and led to a message of inquiry—διὰ τ. μαθητῶν αὐτῶν, by his
The texts show some unimportant variations in ref. to the καί in this and the following clauses. In the best MSS. there is a καί before κεφάλαιον.

disciples, possibly the same men who brought the news. There would be constant coming and going between Galilee and Machaerus. The construction is Hebraistic = sent by the hand of...—Ver. 3. ἀλλ' αὐτοῖς, said to Jesus by them, of course.—Συν el: the question a grave one and emphatically expressed: Thou, art Thou ἀρχήμενος? Art Thou He whom I spoke of as the One coming after me when I was baptising in the Jordan (iii. 11)? It is a question whether Jesus be indeed the Christ. Lutteroth, basing on the hypothesis that for popular Jewish opinion the Christ and the coming One (a prophet like Moses) were different persons, interprets the question thus: “Art Thou, Jesus, whom I know to be the Christ, also the coming Prophet, or must we expect another to fill that rôle?”—ἡ ἀρχήμενος, not ἀλλ' αὐτοῖς, which would have been more appropriate on Lutteroth’s view—a numerically distinct person. He suggests a different kind of person.—προσδοκῶμεν: may be present indicative (for future) as Beza and Fritzsche take it, or present subjunctive deliberative = ought we to look? (Meyer-Weiss, Holtz., H.C.), the latter preferable. What was the animus or psychological genesis of the question? Doubt in John’s own mind, or doubt, bred of envy or jealousy, in the minds of his disciples, or not doubt on Baptist’s part, but rather incipient faith? Alternative (2), universal with the fathers (except Tertullian, vide de projection, 8, de bapt., 10); (3) common among modern commentators; (4) favoured by Keim, Weisszäcker, and Holtz., H.C.: “beginning Disposition zum Glauben an Jesu Messianität.” The view of the fathers is based on a sense of decorum and implicit reliance on the exact historical value of the statements in fourth Gospel; No. (3), the budding faith hypothesis, is based on too sceptical a view as to the historic value of even the Synoptical accounts of John’s early relations with Jesus; No. (1) has everything in its favour. The effect of confinement on John’s prophetic temper, the general tenor of this chapter which obviously aims at exhibiting the moral isolation of Jesus, above all the wide difference between the two men, all make for it. Jesus, it had now become evident, was a very different sort of Messiah from what the Baptist had predicted and desiderated (vide remarks on chap. iii. 11-15). Where were the axe and fan and the holy wind and fire of judgment? Too much patience, tolerance, gentleness, sympathy, geniality, mild wisdom in this Christ for his taste.

VV. 4-6. Answer of Jesus. Ver. 4. ἀναγγέλεσθαι ἕμα: go back and report to John for his satisfaction.—καὶ καὶ βίωσεν, what you are seeing and hearing, not so much at the moment, though Luke gives it that turn (vii. 21), but habitually. They were not to tell their master anything new, but just what they had told him before. The one new element is that the facts are stated in terms fitted to recall prophetic oracles (Isaiah xxxv. 5, kai 1), while, in part, a historic recital of recent miracles (Matt. viii., ix.). Probably the precise words of Jesus are not exactly reproduced, but the sense is obvious: Tell John your story over again and remind him of those prophetic texts. Let him study the two together and draw his own conclusion. It was a virtual invitation to John to revise his Messianic idea in hope he would discover that after all love was the chief Messianic charism.

—Ver. 5. ἀναβλέποντος: used also in classics (ix., x.), recovery of sight. ἄφωνον, here taken to mean deaf, though in ix. 32, 33, it means dumb, showing that the prophecy, Isaiah xxxv. 5, is in the speaker’s thoughts. ἄφωνον: vague word, might mean literal poor (De W.) or spiritual poor, or the whole people in its national misery (Weiss, Matt. Evan.), best defined by such a text as ix. 36, and such facts as that reported in ix. 10-13.—εὐαγγέλισται: might be middle = the poor preach, and so taken by Euthey. Zig (also as an alternative by Theophy.), for “what can be poorer than fishing (ὁλυστικὸς)?” The poor in that case =
the Twelve sent out to preach the kingdom. That, too, was characteristic of the movement, though not the characteristic intended, which is that the poor, the socially insignificant and neglected, are evangelised (passive, as in Heb. iv. 2).—Ver. 6. μακάρως (vide v. 3), possessed of rare felicity. The word implies that those who, on some ground or other, did not stumble over Jesus were very few. Even John not among them! On ἡμέρα ἡμῶν wide ad. v. 29. ἐν ἡμέρᾳ, in anything relating to my public ministry, as appearing inconsistent with my Messianic vocation.

Vv. 7-15. Judgment of Jesus concerning the Baptist (Lk. vii. 24-30). Characteristically magnanimous, while letting it be seen that He is aware of John's limits and defects. Ver. 7. τούτων ἐκ πορευόμενων: while John's messengers were in the act of going, Jesus began at once, without any delay, to make a statement which He deemed necessary to prevent injurious inferences from the message of the Baptist, or the construction He had put on it as implying doubt regarding Himself.—τοῖς δικαίοις: the interrogation had taken place in presence of many. Jesus was always in a crowd, except when He took special steps to escape. The spectators had watched with interest what Jesus would say about the famous man. Therefore, more must be said; a careful opinion expressed.—τί ἔξηλθεν . . . αὐθεντός: it might be taken for granted that most of them had beenthere. The catechetical method of stating His opinion of John lively and impressive to such an audience. They had gone to see as well as hear and be baptised, curiosity plays a great part in popular religious movements.—κάλαμον. Plenty of reeds to be seen. —What a vast space of time lies between the days of the Baptist and us! How have the times changed! Yet the stream flows in the old bed. Still gently blows the wind among the sighing reeds. —Purrer, Wanderungen, 185. Many commentators (Grot., Wet., Fritzsche, De W.) insist on taking καλ. literally = did ye go, etc., to see a reed, or the reeds on the Jordan banks shaken by the wind? This is flat and prosaic. Manifestly the individualised reed is a figure of an inconsistent, weak man; just enough in John's present attitude to suggest such a thought, though not to justify it.—Ver. 8. ἄλλα assumes the negative answer to the previous question and elegantly connects with it the following "No; well then, did you, etc.?"—ἐν μακάριοις, neuter, ἱδίατοι not necessary, in precious garments of any material, silk, woollen, linen; the fine garments suggestive of refinement, luxury, effeminacy. —ἰδοὺ ἂν τ. μ. φορέως: ἰδοὺ points to a well-known truth, serving the same purpose as ὅδε here; those accustomed to wear, φορ., frequentative, as distinct from φέροντες, which would mean bearing without reference to habit.—οἰκεῖος τ. βασιλεύς, in palaces which courtiers frequent. Jesus knows their flexible, superfine ways well; how different from those of the
rude, clad and mannered, uncompromising Baptist! — Ver. 9. ἀλλὰ τι ἔδει: one more question, shorter, abrupt, needing to be supplemented by another (Weiss-Meyer) — why then, seriously, went ye out! ἐν τῷ προφήτῃ Ἠσαίαν — to see a Prophet? — val, yes! right at last; a prophet, indeed, with all that one expects in a prophet — vigorous moral conviction, integrity, strength of will, fearless zeal for truth and righteousness; utterly free from the feebleness and time-serving of those who bend like reeds to every breath of wind, or bow obsequiously before greatness. — καὶ περισσότερον π. a prophet and more, something above the typical prophet (vide on v. 47). The clause introduced by ναί, ἡ λέγειν ὡς shows, expresses Christ’s own opinion, not the people’s (Weiss). — Ver. 10. οὖν . . . γέραντα. The περισσότερον verified and explained by a prophetic citation. The oracle is taken from Malachi iii., altered so as to make the Messianic reference apparent — μου changed into σου. By applying the oracle to John, Jesus identifies him with the messenger whom God was to send to prepare Messiah’s way. This is his distinction, περισσότερον, as compared with other prophets. But, after all, this is an external distinction, an accident, so to speak. Some prophet must be the forerunner, if Messiah is to come at all, the last in the series who foretells His coming, and John happens to be that one — a matter of good fortune rather than of merit. Something more is needed to justify the περισσότερον, and make it a proper subject for eulogy. That is forthcoming in the sequel. — Ver. xi. ἢ ἀλήθεία ἡ γενεσία ἐστι. First Christ expresses His personal conviction in solemn terms. What follows refers to John’s intrinsic worth, not to his historic position as the forerunner. The latter rests on the prophetic citation. Christ’s aim now is to say that the Baptist’s character is equal to his position; that he is fit to be the forerunner. For Christ being the forerunner is no matter of luck. God will see that the right man occupies the position; nay, none but the right man can successfully per-
form the part. — ἀλήθεια γέγραμεν, there hath not arisen; passive with middle sense, but the arising non sine numine, “surrexit divinitus, quomodo existunt veri Prophetae,” Elsen; cf. Mt. xxiv. 11, Lk. vii. 16, vide also Judges ii. 18, iii. 9, — ἐν γενεσίᾳ γενναίῳ — among mankind, a solemn way of expressing the idea. The meaning, however, is not that John is the greatest man that ever lived. The comparison moves within the sphere of Hebrew prophecy, and practically means: John the greatest of all the prophets. A bold judgment, easily accepted by the populace, who always think the dead greater than the living. Christ expresses Himself strongly because He means to say something that might appear disparaging. But He is in earnest in His high estimate, only it is not to be understood as asserting John’s superiority in all respects, e.g., in authorship. The point of view is capacity to render effective service to the Kingdom of God. — δὲ μικρότερος. Chrysostom took this as referring to Jesus, and, connecting ἐν τῇ β. τ. ὁφ. with μικρότερος, brought out the sense: He who is the less in age and fame is greater than John in the Kingdom of Heaven. The opinion might be disregarded as an exegetical curiosity, had it not been adopted by so many, not only among the ancients (Hilar., Ambr., Theophy., Euthy.), but also in his contemporaries (Erasmus, Luth., Fritzsche). In the abstract it is a possible interpretation, and it expresses a true idea, but not one Jesus was likely to utter then. No doubt John’s inquiry had raised the question of Christ’s standing, and might seem to call for comparison between questioner and questioned. But Christ’s main concern was not to get the people to think highly of Himself, but to have high thoughts of the kingdom. What He says, therefore, is that any one in the kingdom, though of comparatively little account, is greater than John. Even the least is: for though μικρότερος, even with the article, does not necessarily mean μικρότατος (so Bengel), it amounts to that. The affirmative holds even in case of the highest degree of inferiority. The implication is that John was not in the kingdom as a historical movement (a
simple matter of fact), and the point of comparison is the dominant spirit. The moral sternness of John was his greatness and also his weakness. It made him doubt Jesus, kept him aloof from the kingdom, and placed him below any one who in the least degree understood Christ's gracious spirit, e.g., one of the Twelve called in x. 42 "these little ones".

Ver. 12. The statement just commented on had to be made in the interest of truth and the Kingdom of God, but having made it Jesus reverts with pleasure to a tone of eulogy. This verse has created much diversity of opinion, which it would take long to recount. I find in it two thoughts: one expressed, the other implied. (1) There has been a powerful movement since John's time towards the Kingdom of God. (2) The movement derived its initial impetus from John. The latter thought is latent in ἐνδὲ τῶν ήμῶν ἰδιαίτερα. The movement dates from John; he has the credit of starting it. This thought is essential to the connection. It is the ultimate justification of their προσφέρον (ver. 9). The apostle Paul added as one argument for his apostleship called in question by Judaists success, which in his view was not an accident but God-given, and due to fitness for the work (a Cor. ii. 14, iii. 1-18).—So Christ here in effect proves John's fitness for the position of forerunner by the success of his ministry. He had actually made the kingdom come. That was the true basis of his title to the honourable appellation of the "way"; without that it had been an empty title, though based on any number of prophecies. That success proved fitness, adequate endowment with moral force, and power to impress and move men. This being seen to be Christ's meaning, there is no room for doubt as to the animus of the words ἰδιαίτερα, ἰδιακόνοις. They contain a favourable, benignant estimate of the movement going on, not an unfavourable, as, among others, Weiss thinks, taking the words to point to a premature attempt to bring in the kingdom by a false way as a political creation (Weiss-Meyer). Of course there were many defects, obvious, glaring, in the movement, as there always are. Jesus knew them well, but He was not in the mood just then to remark on them, but rather, taking a broad, generous view, to point to the movement as a whole as convincing proof of John's moral force and high prophetic endowment. The two words ἰδιαίτερα, ἰδιακόνοις, signalise the vigour of the movement. The kingdom was being seized, captured by a storming party. The verb might be middle ν. and is so taken by Beng., "ipse vi quasi obtrudit," true to fact, but the passive is demanded by the noun following. The kingdom is forcefully taken (ἰδιαίτερα κρατίνης, Hesychius) by the ἰδιακόνοις. There is probably a tacit reference to the kind of people who were storming the kingdom, from the point of view, not so much of Jesus, as of those who deemed themselves the rightful citizens of the kingdom. "Publicans and sinners" (ix. 9-12), the ignorant (xi. 23). What a rabble thought Scribes and Pharisees. Cause of profound satisfaction to Jesus (ver. 25).

Vv. 13-15. Conclusion of speech about John. Ver. 13. The thought here is hinted rather than fully expressed. It has been suggested that the sense would become clearer if vv. 12 and 13 were made to change places (Maldonatus). This inversion might be justified by reference to Lk. xvi. 16, where the two thoughts are given in the inverse order. Wendt (L. J. 1, 75) on this and other grounds arranges the verses 13, 14, 12. But even as they stand the words can be made to yield a fitting sense, harmonising with the general aim, the eulogy of John. The surface idea is that the whole O. T., prophets of course, and even the law in its predictive aspects (by symbolic rites and foreshadowing institutions) pointed forward to a Kingdom of God. The kingdom coming—the burden of O. T. revelation. But what then? To what end make this observation? To explain the impatience of the stormers: their determination to have at last by all means, and in some form, what had so long been foretold? (Weiss).

No; but to define by contrast John's...
el ἀλήθεια διδάσκαλος, αὐτὸς ἐστὶν ἡλίας ὁ μῖλλων ἔρχεσθαι. 15. ἐκ ἧς ἐστα ἄκουειν, ἀκουέτω. 16. Τίν δὲ δρομὸν τὴν γένεσιν ταῦτα; ὁμιλεῖ ἄτοι παράροισις ἐν ἄγοραις καθημένος, καὶ προσψωποῦ, τοῖς οὖσιν αὐτῶν, καὶ λέγοντας, 17. ἐξάλισμεν ἥμι, καὶ ὄλος ἐρχόμεθα. ὕπηρξαμεν ὄμων, καὶ ὄδη ἐρχόμεθα. 18. ἐν καλυπτῷ πάσην τὴν γένεσιν τοῦ ἐρχόμεθα.

1 BD omit ἀκουέτω, which has come in from Mk. and Lk. where the addition of this word to the phrase is usual.

2 παράς in all uncials.

3 καθημένουs before εν in ΝΒCDL, etc., with ταῦτα before ἀγοραῖς in ΝΒΖ.

4 ΝΒΔΖ have προσψωποῦντα ... λέγοντας, and for οὕτοις ΒCDLAX al. have στερεοῦς.

5 ΝΒΔΖ omit ἔνως, which may have been added to assimilate with first clause.

position. Observe ἠμῶς l. goes not with the subject, but with the verb. Prophets (and even law) till John prophesied. The suggestion is that he is not a mere con- tinuator of the prophetic line, one more repeating the message: the kingdom will come. His function is peculiar and exceptional. What is it? Ver. 14 explains. He is the Elijah of Malachi, herald of the Great Day, usherer in of the kingdom, the man who says not merely "the kingdom will come," but "the kingdom is here"; says it, and makes good the saying, bringing about a great movement of repentance.—εἰς ἀλήθεια ἐγίνετο: the identification of John with Elijah to be taken cum grano, not as a prosaic statement of fact. Here, as always, Christ idealises, seizes the essential truth. John was all the Elijah that would ever come, worthy to represent him in spirit, and performing the function assigned to Elijah redux in prophecy. Some of the Fathers distinguished two advents of Elijah, one in spirit in the Baptist, another literally at the second coming of Christ. Servile exegesis of the letter. διδάσκαλος has no expressed object: the object is the statement following. Lutteroth supplies "him" = the Baptist. In the νοστὸς Weiss finds a tacit allusion to the im- penitence of the people: Ye are not willing because ye know that Elijah's coming means a summons to repentance. —Ver. 15. A proverbial form of speech often used by Jesus after important utterances, here for the first time in Matt. The truth demanding attentive and intelligent ears (ears worth having; taking in the words and their import) is that John is Elijah. It implies much—that the kingdom is here and the king, and that the kingdom is moral not political.
18. *Hlēa γαρ ἵσων τις μὴν ἐσθῖν μήτη πίνων, καὶ λέγουσιν,  
Δαιμόνιον ἢμι. 19. ἢδον ὁ ὄψις τοῦ ἀδρικοῦ ἐσθίου καὶ πίνων,  
καὶ λέγουσιν, Ἡσύς, ἀδρετός  ὁ φίλος καὶ οἰονόμος, τελωνεύς ὑμῖν 1 Ῥκ. vii. 34.  
φίλος καὶ ἀμαρτωλόν, καὶ εὐθαυσῆ ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ τῶν τέκνων ᾿Ιουλίας 1 Ῥκ. vii. 34.

1 ΝΒ have epw, which Tisch. and W.H. adopt. Though supported by a great  
array of MSS. (including CDL) τέκνων may be suspected of assimilation to the reading in Lk.

Jesus as reported in ver. 19. Who can they have been but the men who asked:  
Why does He eat with publicans and sinners (ix. 11)? These vile calumnies  
are what have come out of that feast, in the same sanctimonious circle. Luke  
evidently understood the Pharisees and lawyers (φιλοσυνή) to be the class referred  
to, guided probably by his own impression as to the import of the passage  
(vide Lk. vii. 30). — παρείσαγον . . . ἄγοραι: Jesus likens the Pharisaic  
γενέσθαι to children in the market-place playing at marriages and funerals, as He  
had doubtless often seen them in Nazareth. The play, as is apt to happen, has  
ended in a quarrel. — προσφ. τοῖς ἀνθρώποις . . . μέγανοι. There are two parties,  
the musicians and the rest who are expected to dance or mourn according to  
the tune, and they are at cross purposes, the moods not agreeing: ἄγοραι, the  
best attested reading, may point to this discrepancy in temper = a set differently  
inclined. — ἀληθηματικος: the flute in this  
case used for merriment, not, as in x. 23, to express grief. — ἄρρυθμος: we have  
expressed grief by singing funeral dirges, like the mourning women hired for the  
purpose (vide ad ix. 23). — ἀλογγάνητος: and  
ye have not beat your breasts in re-  
 sponsive sorrow. This is the parable  
to which Jesus adds a commentary.  
Without the aid of the latter the general  
import is plain. The γενέσθαι animadverted  
on are like children, not in a good but  
in a bad sense; not child-like but childish.  
They play at religion; with all their  
seeming earnestness in reality triflers.  
They are also fickle, fastidious, given to  
peevish fault-finding, easily offended.  
These are recognisable features of the  
Pharisees. They were great zealots and  
precisians, yet not in earnest, rather  
haters of earnestness, as seen in different  
ways in John and Jesus. They were hard  
to please: equally dissatisfied with John  
and with Jesus; satisfied with nothing  
but their own artificial formalism.  
They were the only men in Israel of  
whom these things could be said with  
emphasis, and it may be taken for  
granted that Christ’s animadversions  
were elicited by pronounced instances of  
the type.— Ver. 18. The commentary on  
the parable showing that it was the  
reception given to John and Himself that  
suggested it. — μὴν ἔσθη, μὴν πίνω: eat-  
ing and drinking the two parts of diet;  
not eating nor drinking = remarkably  
abstemious, ascetic, that his religious  
habit; μήτη not ὁδός, to express not  
merely the fact, but the opinion about  
John. Vide notes on chap. v. 34. — δαι-  
μόνιον ἢμι: is possessed, mad, with  
the madness of a gloomy austerity.  
The Pharisee could wear gloomy airs in  
fasting (vi. 16), but that was acting.  
The Baptist was in earnest with his morose,  
severely abstinent life. Play for them,  
grim reality for him; and they disliked it  
and shrank from it as something weird.  
None but Pharisees would dare to say  
such a thing about a man like John.  
They are always so sure, and so ready to  
judge. Ordinary people would respect  
the ascetic of the wilderness, though they  
did not imitate him.— Ver. 19. ὁ ὄψις τ.  
a.: obviously Jesus here refers to Him-  
selves in third person where we might have  
expected the first. Again the now famil-  
iar title, defining itself as we go along by  
varied use, pointing Jesus out as an ex-  
ceptional person, while avoiding all con-  
ventional terms to define the exceptional  
element.— ὡσὶν καὶ πίνων: the “Son  
of Man” is one who eats and drinks, i.e.,  
non-ascetic and social, one of the marks  
interpretative of the title = human, frater-  
nal. — καὶ λέγουσι, and they say: what?  
One is curious to know. Surely this  
genial, friendly type of manhood will  
please! — οὐδ' ὅλη σκανδαλίσθη σαν-  
crimoniousness points its finger at Him  
and utters gross, outrageous calumnies.—  
φύγε, ἀλογγάνητος, φίλος, an enter  
with emphasis = a glutton (a word of late  
Greek, Lob., Phryn., 434), a wine-bibber  
and, worse than either, for φίλος is used  
in a sinister sense and implies that Jesus  
was the comrade of the worst characters,  
and like them in conduct. A malicious  
nick-name at first, it is now a name of  
honour: the sinner’s lover. The Son of
Man takes these calumnies as a thing of course and goes on His gracious way. It is not necessary to reflect these characteristics of Jesus and John back into the parable, and to identify them with the piping and wailing children. Yet the parable is so constructed as to exhibit them very clearly in their distinctive peculiarities by representing the children not merely employed in play and quarrelling over their games, which would have sufficed as a picture of the religious Jews, but as playing at marriages and funerals, the former symbolising the joy of the Jesus-circle, the latter the sadness of the Baptist-circle (vide my Parabole Teaching of Christ, p. 420).—καλ ἅγια ἡμέρα, etc. This sentence wears a gnomic or proverbial aspect ("verba proverbium redolere videntur," Kuinoel, similarly, Rosenmüller), and the aorist of ἤλθεν may be taken as an instance of the gnomic aorist, expressive of what is usual; a law in the moral sphere, as elsewhere the aorist is employed to express the usual course in the natural sphere, e.g., in James i. 17. Weiss-Meyer strongly denies that there are any instances of such use of the aorist in the N. T. (On this aorist vide Goodwin, Syntax, p. 53, and Bäumlein, § 523, where it is called the aorist of experience, "der Erfahrungswahrheit").—ἐς, in, in view of (vide Buttman's Gram., p. 232, on ἐς in N. T.).—ἔφυγεν: the reading of ΝΒ, and likely to be the true one just because ὦκων is the reading in Luke. It is an appeal to results, to fruitt (vii. 20), to the future. Historical in form, the statement is in reality a prophecy. Resch, indeed (Agrapha, p. 142), takes ἤλθεν as the (erroneous) translation of the Hebrew prophetic future used in the Aramaic original = now we are condemned, but wait a while. The καλ at the beginning of the clause is not "but." It states a fact as much a matter of course as is the condemnation of the unwise. Wisdom, condemned by the foolish, is always, of course, justified in the long run by her works or by her children.

Vv. 20-24. Reflections by Jesus on the reception given to Him by the towns of Galilee (Lk. x. 13-15). Ver. 20. τότε, then, cannot be pressed. Luke gives the following words in instructions to the Seventy. The real historical occasion is unknown. It may be a reminiscence from the preaching tour in the synagogues of Galilee (Mt. iv. 23). The reflections were made after Jesus had visited many towns and wrought many wonderful works (δυνάμεις).—οτε μετανόησαν: this the general fact; no deep, permanent change of mind and heart. Christ appearing among them a nine days' wonder, then forgotten by the majority preoccupied with material interests.—Ver. 21. Χαριζεται, Βηθσαϊδα: the former not again mentioned in Gospels, the latter seldom (vide Mk. vi. 45, viiii. 22; Lk. ix. 10), yet scenes of important evangelical incidents, probably connected with the synagogue ministry in Galilee (iv. 23). The Gospels are brief records of a ministry crowded with events. These two towns may be named along with Capernaum because all three were in view where Christ stood when He
uttered the reproachful words, say on the top of the hill above Capernaum: Bethesda on the eastern shore of Jordan, just above where it falls into the lake; Chorazin on the western side on the road to Tyre from Capernaum (Furrer, Wanderungen, p. 370). They may also have been prosperous business centres selected to represent the commercial side of Jewish national life. Hence the reference to Tyre and Sidon, often the subject of prophetic animadversion, yet not so blameworthy in their imitipeniae as the cities which had seen Christ's works.—έν σακκάω καὶ στολή: in black sackcloth, and with ashes on the head, or sitting in ashes like Job (iii. 8).—Ver. 22. πῶς: contracted from πώς = moreover, for the rest, to put the matter shortly; not adversative here, though sometimes so used.—Ver. 23. The diversity in the reading μὴ or ἢ ἢσος, etc., does not affect the sense. In the one case the words addressed to Capernaum contain a statement of fact by Jesus; in the other a reference to a feeling prevailing in Capernaum in regard to the facts. The fact implied in either case is distinction on some ground, probably because Capernaum more than all other places was favoured by Christ's presence and activity. But there may, as some think (Grotius, Rosen., De Wette, etc.), be a reference to trade prosperity. "Floreat C. piscatui mercatur, et quae alia esse solent commoda ad mare sitatum urbum" (Grot.). The reference to Tyre and Sidon, trade centres, makes this not an idle suggestion. And it is not unimportant to keep this aspect in mind, as Capernaum with the other two cities then become representatives of the trading spirit, and show us by sample how that spirit received the Gospel of the kingdom. Capernaum illustrated the common characteristic most signally. Most prosperous, most privileged spiritually, and—most unsurpithetic, the population being taken as a whole. Worldliness as unresponsive as counterfeit piety represented by Pharisaism, though not so offensive in temper and language. No calumny, but simply invincible indiffererice.—ὁς ὁδόροις, ὁς ἔρημοι: proverbial expressions for the greatest exaltation and deepest degradation. The reference in the latter phrase is not to the future world, but to the judgment day of Israel in which Capernaum would be involved. The prophetic eye of Jesus sees Capernaum in ruins as it afterwards saw the beautiful temple demolished (chap. xxiv. 2).

Vv. 25-27. Jesus worshipping (Lk. x. 21, 22). It is usual to call this golden utterance a prayer, but it is at once prayer, praise, and self-communing in a devout spirit. The occasion is unknown. Matthew gives it in close connection with the complaint against the cities (ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καρπῷ), but Luke sets it in still closer connection (ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ ὄρᾳ) with the return of the Seventy. According to some modern critics, it had no occasion at all in the life of our Lord, but is simply a composition of Luke's, and borrowed from him by the author of Matthew: a hymn in which the Pauline mission to the heathen as the victory of Christ over Satan's dominion in the world is celebrated, and given in connection with the imaginary mission of the Seventy (vide Pfeiderer, Urchristenthum, p. 445). But Luke's preface justifies the belief that he had here, as throughout, a tradition oral or written to go on, and the probability is that it was taken both by him and by Matthew from a common document. Wendt (L. J., pp. 90, 91) gives it as an extract from the book of Logia, and supposes that it followed a report of the return of the disciples (the Twelve) from their mission.

Ver. 25. ἀπόκριθης, answering, not necessarily, to anything said, but to some environment provocative of such thoughts.—ἐξομολογομαί σοι ( = ἑαυτός ὑμῖν, Gen. xxix. 35, etc.). In iii. 6 this compound means to make full con-
fession (of sin). Here it = to make frank acknowledgment of a situation in a spirit partly of resignation, partly of thanksgiving. — ἐκφώσεις. The fact stated is referred to the causality of God, the religious point of view; but it happens according to laws which can be ascertained. — ταύτα: the exact reference unknown, but the statement holds with reference to Christ's whole teaching and healing ministry, and the revelation of the kingdom they contained. — ἐφώθεν καὶ εἰς ἑαυτόν. The reference is doubtless to the Rabbis and scribes, the accepted custodians of the wisdom of Israel. Cf. ἐφώθεν καὶ ἐπιστήμων in Deut. iv. 6 applied to Israel. The rendering " wise and prudent " in A. V. is misleading; " wise and understanding " in R. V. is better. — νηρήσαν (fr. νηρός and ἄνθρωπος, non-speaking) means those who were as ignorant of scribe-lore as babes (cf. John vii. 49 and Heb. v. 13). Their ignorance was their salvation, as thereby they escaped the mental preoccupation with preconceived ideas on moral and religious subjects, which made the scribes inaccessible to Christ's influence (vide my Parabole Teaching, pp. 333, 334). Jesus gives thanks with all His heart for the receptivity of the babes, not in the same sense or to the same extent for the non-receptive attitude of the wise (with De Wette and Fritzsche) and understanding, as Meyer and Weiss). No distinction indeed is expressed, but it goes without saying, and the next clause implies it. — Ver. 26. — νομίζω reasserts with solemn emphasis what might appear doubtful, νομίζω, that Jesus was content with the state of matters (vide Kloster, D VECTOR, i. 140). Cf. ver. 9. — σοφία: nominative for vocative. — ἡπί, because, introducing the reason for this contentment. — ἐφώθεν, as the actual facts stand, emphatic (" sic maxime non aliter," Fritzsche). — ἐφώθεια, a pleasure, an occasion of pleasure; hence a purpose, a state of matters embodying the Divine Will, a Hellenistic word, as is also the verb ἐφώθειν (cf. i Cor. i. 21, where the whole thought is similar). Christ resigns Himself to God's will. But His tranquillity is due likewise to insight into the law by which new Divine movements find support among the ἁθοι rather than among the σοφοί. — Ver. 27. — πάντα, all things necessary for the realisation of the kingdom (Holtz., H. C.). The πάντα need not be restricted to the hiding and revealing functions (Weiss, Nösgen). Hiding, indeed, was no function of Christ's. He was always and only a revealer. For the present Jesus has only a few babies, but the future is His: Christianity the coming religion. — παραθέθη, aorist, were given. We might have expected the future. It may be another instance of the aorist used for the Hebrew prophetic future (vide ad ver. 19). In Mt. xxviii. 18 ἔβαθεν again to express the same thought. The reference probably is to the eternal purpose of God: on the use of the aorist in N. T., vide note on this passage in Camb. G. T. — ἔφησεν, thoroughly knows. — τὸν θᾶν ... πατήρ. Christ's comfort amid the widespread unbelief and misunderstanding in reference to Himself is that His Father knows Him perfectly. No one else does, not even John. He is utterly alone in the world. Son here has a Godward reference, naturally arising out of the situation. The Son of Man is called an evil liver. He lifts up His heart to heaven and speaks against the Father. He was to me, His Son. The thought in the first clause is connected with this one thus: the future is mine, and for the present my comfort is in the Father's knowledge of me. — οἰδά τὸν πατέρα ... ὅ τι: a reflection naturally suggested by the foregoing statement. It is ignorance of the Father that creates misconception of the Son. Conventional, moral and religious ideas lead to misjudgment of one who by all He says and does is revealing God as He truly is and wills. The men who know least about God are those supposed to know most, and who have been most ready to judge Him, the " wise and understanding. " Hence the additional reflection, καὶ οὐ βουλήσαι τὸ ν. ἀποκαλύψαι. — Jesus
here asserts His importance as the revealer of God, saying in effect: “The wise despise me, but they cannot do without me. Through me alone can they attain that knowledge of God which they profess to desire above all things.” This was there and then the simple historic fact. Jesus was the one person in Israel who truly conceived God. The use of βουλήσασθαι is noticeable; not to whomsoever He reveals Him, but to whomsoever He is pleased to reveal Him. The emphasis seems to lie on the inclination, whereas in Mt. i. 19 ἔθνος appears to express the wish, and βουλήθη rather the deliberate purpose.

Jesus meets the haughty contempt of the “wise” with a dignified assertion that His influence is such that whether they are to know God or not. On the distinction between βουλήσασθαι and ἔθνος, vide Cremer, Wörterbuch, s. v. βουλήσασθαι. According to him the former represents the direction of the will, the latter the will active (Affect. Trieb). Hence βουλήσασθαι can always stand for ἔθνος, but not vice verād.

Vv. 28-30. The gracious invitation. Full of O. T. reminiscences, remarks Holtz., H.C., citing Isaiah xiv. 3; xxviii. 12; lv. 1-5; Jer. vi. 16; xxxii. 2, 25, and especially Sirach vi. 24, 25, 28, 29; li. 23-37. De Wette had long before referred to the last-mentioned passage, and Pfeiderer has recently (Ueich. 513) made it the basis of the assertion that this beautiful logion is a composition out of Sirach by the evangelist. The passage in Sirach is as follows: ἀγγέλεσθαι πρὸς μένειν τοῖς νόμισμαῖς, ἐνεργεῖται ἐν τούτοις, καὶ ἕναψατο ἐν αὐτῇ καὶ ἔλαβε, κατέσυνε άντιούς ἄνω ψυχοῖς. οὐκ ὅπεσθε ἐν τῇ ἀλήθειᾳ, ἡ γὰρ τῆς ἀλήθείας ἡ ἑαυτοῖς. οὐκ ἐπειδὴ ἐπὶ σαρκὶ ἔκλειψε, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπὶ σοφίᾳ, καὶ ἔκλειψε ὀφθαλμοῖς τῆς σοφίας. ἀγαπήσατε τὸν Κόσμον καὶ ἐξαναστήσατε τῶν ὑμῶν ἐναρκτίῳ.
it is not compatible with the humility of Jesus that He should so speak of Himself (Seat of Authority, p. 583). Why should He not do as another Jesus had done before Him: speak in the name of wisdom, and appropriate her attributes? (Ver. 28. Δέητε: vide ad iv. 19, again authoritative but kindly.—κατατμίζεις καλ
tοφόρτωσιντονο, the fatigued and burdened. This is to be taken metaphorically. The kind of people Jesus expects to become “disciples indeed” are men who have sought long, earnestly, but in vain, for the 
sumnum bonum, the knowledge of God. There is no burden so heavy as that of truth sought and not found. Scholars of the Rabbis, like Saul of Tarsus, knew it well. In coming thence to Christ’s school they would find rest by passing from letter to spirit, from form to reality, from hearsay to certainty, from traditions of the past to the present voice of God.—κατατμίζεις καλ
emphatic, with side glance at the reputed “wise” who do not give rest (with Meyer against Weiss).—Ver. 29. Λόγος: current phrase to express the relation of a disciple to a master. The Rabbis spoke of the “yoke of the law”. Jesus uses their phrases while drawing men away from their influence.—μάθετε αὐτῷ ἄμωμον: not merely learn from my example (Buttmann, Gram., 324; om, that is, from the case of), but, more comprehensively, not only learn from me: take me as your Master in religion. The thing to be learned is not merely a moral lesson, humility, but the whole truth about God and righteousness. But the mood of Master and scholar must correspond, He must as they have become by sorrowful experience. Hence διό ἐστι πράξας . . τῷ καρδίᾳ: not that, but for I am, etc. What connection is there between this spirit and knowledge of God? This: a proud man cannot know God. God knoweth the proud afar off (Ps. cxxxviii. 6), and they know God afar off. God giveth the grace of intimate knowledge of Himself to the lowly.—ἀνάπαυσιν: rest, such as comes through finding the true God, or through satisfaction of desire, of the hunger of the soul.—Ver. 30. χρηστότερον, kindly to wear. Christ’s doctrine fits and satisfies our whole spiritual nature—reason, heart, conscience, “the sweet reasonableness of Christ”.—φορτίον, the burden of obligation.—διάφορον: in one respect Christ’s burden is the heaviest of all because His moral ideal is the highest. But just on that account it is light. Lofty, noble ideals inspire and attract; vulgar ideals are oppressive. Christ’s commandment is difficult, but not like that of the Rabbis, grievous. (Vide With Open Face.)

CHAPTER XII. CONFLICTS WITH THE PHARISEES. This chapter delineates the growing alienation between Jesus and the Pharisees and scribes. The note of time (ἐν ἑκάστῳ τῷ καρπῷ, ver. 1) points back to the situation in which the prayer xi. 25-30 was uttered (vide ver. 25, where the same expression is used). All the incidents recorded reveal the captious mood of Israel’s “saints and sages”. They have now formed a thoroughly bad opinion of Jesus and His company. They regard Him as immoral in life (xi. 19); irreligious, capable even of blasphemy (assuming the divine prerogative of forgiving sin, ix. 3); an ally of Satan even in His beneficence (xii. 24). He can do nothing right. The smallest, most innocent action is an offence.

Vv. 1-8. Plucking ears of corn on the Sabbath (Mk. ii. 23-28; Lk. vi. 1-5). Sabbath observance was one of the leading causes of conflict between Jesus and the guardians of religion and morality. This is the first of several encounters reported by the evangelist. According to Weiss he follows Mark, but with sayings taken directly from the Apostolic Source.

Vv. 1, 2. σωτέρων: dative plural, as if from σωτέρων, other cases (genitive, singular and plural, dative, singular, accusative, plural) are formed from σωτέρων (vide ver. 2).—διὰ τῶν σαράπων might mean through fields adapted for growing grain, but the context requires fields actually sown; fields of corn.—εὐλαβεῖσθαι: for the form vide iv. 2. This word supplies the motive for the action, which Mark leaves vague.—
XII. 8. 'EN ἐκείνῃ τῇ καιρῷ ἐπορεύθη δ' ἤθος τοῖς σάββασιν ἀπερείσκεται καὶ ἢρματον ἀπὸ διὰ τῶν ἀποριῶν: οἱ δὲ μαθητὰς ἀστίοι ἐπηκίνησαν, καὶ ἢρματον ἐν παραλλ. τοῖς πάθεσι καὶ ἐστὶν. 2. οἱ δὲ Φαρισαῖοι ἔδωκες ἐν παραλλ. αὐτῷ, “Ἰδοὺ, οἱ μαθηταὶ σου πουκοῦν, ὅταν ξαίρεσιν σαββάτου αὐτῶν.”

3. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, “Οὐκ ἐνέγραψεν τοῖς ἔτοιμοι Δαβίδ, ὅταν ἐπικίνησαν αὐτὸν καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ; 4. τὸς εἰσήλθεν εἰς τὸν θρόνον τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ τούς ἄρτους τῆς προβεφύλους ἐσάψεν;” ὁ δὲ εἶπεν ᾧν αὐτῷ, ὅταν τοῖς μετ' αὐτοῦ, εἰ μὴ τοῖς εἰρετοῖς μόνοις; 5. ἢ οὐκ ἐνέγραψεν ἐν τῷ νόμῳ, ὧν τοῖς σάββασιν οἱ ἱερεῖς ἐν τῇ λεπτῇ τοῦ σάββατον .openapiοληύος, καὶ ἄναμφετέρου εἰσὶν;”

The αὐτος (LZ) comes from Mk. (ii. 25); it is omitted in ΜΒΔΔΔ d.

The reading of T. R. (ἐφαγον οὐ) is from Mk.

5 οἷον, perhaps emphasis should be laid on this word. No sooner had they begun to pluck ears than fault was found. Pharisaees on the lookout for offences. So Carr, Camb. G. T.—Ver. 2. οὐκ ἔδωκεν πάντα σάββατον. The emphasis here lies on the last word. To help oneself when hungry with the hand was humbly allowed in the Deuteronomic law (Deut. xxiii. 25), only to use the sickle was forbidden as involving waste. But according to the scribes what was lawful on other days was unlawful on Sabbath, because plucking ears was reaping. “Metens Sabbato vel tantium, reus est” (Lightfoot rendering a passage from the Talmud). Luke adds ἐφαγον, rubbing with the hands. He took the offence to be threshing. Microscopic offence in either case, proving prima facie malice in the fault-finders. But honest objection is not inconceivable to one who remembers the interdict placed by old Scottish piety on the use of the razor on Sabbath. We must be just even to Pharisaees.

Vv. 3-8. Christ’s defence. It is twofold. (1) He shields disciples by examples: David and the priests; to both the fault-finders would defer (vv. 3-5); (2) He indicates the principles involved in the examples (vv. 6-8). The case of David was apposite because (a) it was a case of eating, (b) it probably happened on Sabbath, (c) it concerned not only David but, as in the present instance, followers; therefore αὐτῶν, ver. 3, carefully added. (b) does not form an element in the defence, but it helps to account for the reference to David’s conduct. In that view Jesus must have regarded the act of David as a Sabbatical incident, and that it was may not unnaturally be inferred from 1 Sam. xxvi. 6. Vide Lightfoot, ad loc.—This was probably also the current opinion. The same remark applies to the attendants of David. From the history one might gather that David was really alone, and only pretended to have companions. But if, as is probable, it was usually assumed that he was accompanied, Jesus would be justified in proceeding on that assumption, whatever the fact was (vide Schanz, ad loc.).—Ver. 4. εἰσήλθεν, ἐφαγεν, he entered, they ate. Mark has ἐφαγεν. Weiss explains the harsh change of subject by combination of apostolic source with Mark. The two verbs point to two offences against the law: entering a holy place, eating holy bread. The sin of the disciples was against a holy time. But the principle involved was the same = ceremonial rules may be overruled by higher considerations.—οὐκ ἔδωκεν οὐκ ἐν Mark and Luke agreeing with ἐμπίπτειν, and here also in T. R., but doubtless the true reading; again presenting a problem in comparative exegesis (vide Weiss-Meyer). ὅ ought to mean “which thing it was not lawful to do,” but it may be rendered “which kind of bread,” etc.—εἰς ὅ περ, except, absolutely unlawful, except in case of priests.—Ver. 5. This reference to the priests naturally leads on to the second instance taken from their systematic breach of the technical Sabbath law in the discharge of sacerdotal duty.—οὐκ ἔδωκεν, have ye not read? not of course the statement following, but directions on which such a construction could be put, as in Numb. xxviii. 9, concerning the burnt offering of two lambs. They had
read often enough, but had not understood. As Euthy. Zig. remarks, Jesus reproaches them for their vain labour, as not understanding what they read (μη ἐγνωσόμενοι διὰ τοῦ καταθλιπτικοῦ του νόμου, etc.).—μη 
θελοντες, profane, on the Pharisaic view of the Sabbath law, as an absolute prohibition of work. Perhaps the Pharisees themselves used this word as a technical term, applicable even to permissible Sabbath labour. So Schanz after Schöttgen.

Vv. 6-8. The principles involved. The facts stated raise questions as to the reasons. The Pharisees were men of rules, not accustomed to go back on principles. The passion for minutiae killed reflection. The reasons have been already hinted in the statement of the cases: διὰ τοῦ δικαιοσύνης, ver. 3; διὰ τοῦ ἕργου, ver. 5: hunger, the temple; human needs, higher claims. These are referred to in inverse order in vv. 6-7.—Ver. 6. ἔγω δὲ ὄν: solemn affirmation, with a certain tone in the voice.—τοῦ ἑργοῦ: as if they had not thought of the matter before, the claim of the temple to outrace the Sabbath law would be admitted by the Pharisees. Therefore, Jesus could base on it an argument a fortiori. The Sabbath must give way to the temple and its higher interest, and therefore something higher still. What was that something? Christ Himself, according to the almost unanimous opinion of interpreters, ancient and modern; whence doubtless the μισθόν of T. R. But Jesus might be thinking rather of the kingdom than of the king; a greater interest is involved here, that of the kingdom of God. Fritzsche takes μισθόν as = teaching men, and curing them of vice then going on. It may be asked: How did the interest come in? The disciples were following Jesus, but what was He about? What created the urgency? Whence came it that the disciples needed to pluck ears of standing corn? We do not know. That is one of the many lacunae in the evangelic history. But it may be assumed that there was something urgent going on in connection with Christ’s ministry, whereby He and His companions were overtaken by extreme hunger, so that they were fain to eat unprepared food (ἀκατέργαστον σίτον, Euthy. Zig. on ver. 7).—Ver. 7. The principle of human need stated in terms of a favourite prophetic oracle (ix. 13).—ἐι δὲ ἐγνώσοιτε ... οὐκ ἄν καταθλιπτατε: the form of expression, a past indicative in protasis, with a past indicative with ἦν in apodosis, implies that the supposition is contrary to fact (Burton, N. T. Moods and Tenses, § 248). The Pharisees did not know what the oracle meant; hence on a previous occasion Jesus bade them go and learn (ix. 13). If their pedantry blinded them to distinctions of higher and lower in institutions, or rather made them reckon the least the greatest command, minutiae testing obedience, it still more deadened their hearts to the claims of mercy and humanity. Of course this idolatry went on from bad to worse. For the Jews of later, templeless time, the law was greater than the temple (Holtz, in H. C., quoting Weber).—ἀνατυφών: doubly guiltless: as David was through imperious hunger, as the priests were when subordinating Sabbath, to temple, requirements.—Ver. 8. This weighty lesson taken along with that in Mark ii. 27 = the Sabbath for man, not man for the Sabbath. The question is: Does it merely state a fact, or does it also contain the rationale of the fact? That depends on the sense we give to the title Son of Man. As a technical name = Messiah, it simply asserts the authority of Him who bears it to determine how the Sabbath is to be observed in the Kingdom of God. As a name of humility, making no obtrusive exceptional claims, like Son of David or Messiah, it suggests a reason for the lordship in sympathy with the ethical principle embodied in the prophetic oracle. The title does not indeed mean mankind, or any man, homo quivis, as Grotius and Kuinoel
9. καὶ μεταβὰς ἐκεῖθεν, ἠλθεν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν αὐτῶν. 10. ἦν τὸν χειρὰ ἐκλωμένην καὶ ἐπηρέασον παραλλ. καὶ ἐπηρέασον. 

John v. 3. καὶ ἐπηρέασον, λέγοντες, "Εἰ ἐξεταῖς τοὺς σάββατος παραπόνει;" ινα κατηγορήσωσιν αὐτὸν. 

11. ο crisis εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Τίς ἐσται ἐξ ὀρίων ἀνθρώπων, διέ ἐξερεύνατο ἐν, καὶ ἐὰν ἐπικύρωο τούτο τοῦ σάββατον

1 ΝΒΣ οίκοτι τήν ταν. The text of Mt. as in T. R. has been influenced by that in Mk. (iii. 3).

2 So in BC (W. H.), παραπόνει in ΝDL (Tisch.).

3 αὐτί is omitted in CLXX, and bracketed in W. H. This is found in ΧΒΔ rel.

think. It points to Jesus, but to Him not as an exceptional man ("der einzigartig," Weiss), but as the representative man, maintaining solidarity with humanity, standing for the human interest, as the Pharisees stood for the supposed divine, the real divine interest being identical with the human. The radical antithesis between Jesus and the Pharisees lay in their respective ideas of God. It is interesting to find a glimpse of the true sense of this logion in Chrysostom: περὶ αὐτοῦ λέγων. Ο ο Μάρκος καὶ περὶ τὴν κοινὴν φύσιν αὐτοῦ τότε ἔργαις φησίν. Hom. xxxiv. —κύριος, not to the effect of abrogation but of interpretation and restoration to true use. The weekly rest is a beneficent institution, God’s holiday to weary men, and the Kingdom of Heaven, whose royal law is love, has no interest in its abolition.

Vv. 9-14. A Sabbath cure (Mt. iii. 1-6; Lk. vi. 6-11): not necessarily happening immediately after. Matthew and Luke follow Mark’s order, which is topical, not historical; another instance of collision as to Sabbath observance.—Ver. 9. καὶ μεταβὰς . . . αὐτῶν. The εἰρήκας may be taken in two ways. First, that our evangelist takes the order as one of close temporal sequence (Mark says simply “into a synagogue,” iii. 1). In that case the αὐτῶν would refer to the fault-finding Pharisees of the previous narrative, piqued by Christ’s defence and bent on further mischief (vide Weiss-Meyer). The narrative comes in happily here as illustrating the scope of the principle of humanity laid down in connection with the previous incident.—Ver. 10. καὶ ἔφυγο, here, as in vii. 2, ix. 2, introducing a lively manner the story.—ἐν δὲ, a dry hand, possibly a familiar expression in Hebrew pathology (De Wette); useless, therefore a serious enough affliction for a working man (a mason, according to Hebrew Gospel, Jerome ad loc.), especially if it was the right hand, as Luke states. But the cure was not urgent for a day, could stand over; therefore a good test case as between rival conceptions of Sabbath law.—ἐπηρέασον. The Pharisees asked a question suggested by the case, as if eager to provoke Jesus and put Him to the proof. Mark says they observed Him, waiting for Him to take the initiative. The former alternative suits the hypothesis of immediate temporal sequence.—εἰ ἐφαινεται, etc. After λέγοντες we expect, according to classic usage, a direct question without εἰ. The εἰ is in its place in Mark (ver. 2), and the influence of his text may be suspected (Weiss) as explaining the incorrectness in Matthew. But εἰ in direct questions is not unusual in N. T. (Mt. xix. 3; Lk. xiii. 23, xxii. 49), vide Winer, § 57, 2, and Meyer ad loc. In Mark’s account Christ, not the Pharisees, puts the question.

Vv. 11, 12. Christ’s reply, by two home-thrusting questions and an irresistible conclusion.—τίς . . . ἐπηρέασον. One is tempted here, as in vii. 9, to put emphasis on ἐπηρέασον: who of you not dead to the feelings of a man? Such questions as this and that in Lk. xv. 4 go to the root of the matter. Humanity was what was lacking in the Pharisaic character.—πρᾶξιν αὐτοῖς: one sheep answering to the one working hand, whence perhaps Luke’s ἄνθρωπος (vi. 6),—καὶ ἄνθρωπος. The case supposed might quite well happen; hence in the protasis ἄνθρωπος with subjunctive, and in the apodosis the future (Burton, N. T. Moods and Tenses, § 250). A solitary sheep might fall into a ditch on a Sabbath, and that is what its owner would do if he were an ordinary average human being, vis., lift it out at once. What would the Pharisee do? It is easy to see what he would be tempted to do if the one sheep were his own. But would he have allowed such action as a general rule? One would
infer so from the fact that Jesus argued on such questions ex concesso. In that case the theory and practice of contemporary Pharisees must have been milder than in the Talmudic period, when the rule was: if there be no danger, leave the animal in the ditch till the morrow (vide Buxtorf, Syn. Jud., c. xvi.). Grotius suggests that later Jewish law was made stricter out of hatred to Christians.—Ver. 12. οὐ ψων οὐν διαφέρει, etc. This is another of those simple yet far-reaching utterances by which Christ suggested rather than formulated His doctrine of the infinite worth of man. By how much does a human being differ from a sheep? That is the question which Christian civilisation has not even yet adequately answered. This illustration from common life is not in Mark and Luke. Luke has something similar in the Sabbath cure, reported in xiv. 1-6. Some critics think that Matthew combines the two incidents, drawing from his two sources Mark and the Logia.—Στομα, therefore, and so introducing here rather an independent sentence than a dependent clause expressive of result.—καλός τουλίπ: in effect, to do good = εὖ τοιμίν, i.e., in the present case to heal, ἰατρέω, though in Acts x. 33, 1 Cor. vii. 37, the phrase seems to mean to do the morally right, in which sense Meyer and Weiss take it here also. Elsner, and after him Fritzschae, take it as = præclariss. ager, pointing to the ensuing miracle. By this brief prophetic utterance, Jesus sweeps away legal pedantries and casuistries, and goes straight to the heart of the matter. Beneficent action never unseasonable, of the essence of the Kingdom of God; therefore as permissible and incumbent on Sabbath as on other days. Spoken out of the depths of His religious consciousness, and a direct corollary from His benignant conception of God (vide Holtz., H. C., p. 91). Vv. 13, 14. The issue: the hand cured, and Pharisaic ill-will deepened. Ver. 13. τὸν λέγον. He heals by a word: sine contactu sola voce, quod ne speciem quidem violat Sabbath habere poterat (Grotius).—ἲησοῦν συν τ. χ. Brief authoritative word, possessing both physical and moral power, conveying life to the withered member, and inspiring awe in spectators.—καὶ Δέιν. καὶ ἄνεκατ. The double καὶ signifies the quick result ("celeritatem miraculi," Elsner). Grotius takes the second verb as a participle rendering: he stretched out his restored hand, assuming that not till restored could the hand be stretched out. The healing and the outstretching may be conceived of as contemporaneous.

—τινὸς ὑπὲρ ἡ ἀλλα: the evangelist adds this to ἄνεκατ. to indicate the completeness. We should have expected this addition rather from Luke, who ever aims at making prominent the greatness of the miracle, as well as its benevolence. —Ver. 14. μεταμορφοῦτος: oversight for the moment, the Pharisaic witnesses of the miracle soon recovered themselves, and went out of the synagogue with hostile intent.—συμβολὴν ἱλασθεν, consulted together = συμβολευσάντες.—καὶ οὖν, against Him. Hitherto they had been content with finding fault; now it is come to plotting against His life—a tribute to His power.—δοκεῖ, etc.: this clause indicates generally the object of their plotting, viz., that it concerned the life of the obnoxious one. They consulted not how to compass the end, but simply agreed together that it was an end to be steadily kept in view. The murderous will has come to birth, the way will follow in due course. Such is the evil fruit of Sabbath controversies.
Ye σώμα τοῦ μαθητή, ἡμεῖς δὲ τὰ δοκίμασαν τοῦ ἱλαστροῦ τοῦ θανάτου. Οἱ δὲ ἁπατώσεις τοῦ κόσμου ἐπηρεάσθησαν τὰ δράματα τῆς ἡμέρας. Καὶ δὲ τὰς ἀναφορὰς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν τῶν ἔργων τῆς ἀληθείας. Καὶ εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν τῶν ἀληθείας, εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν τῶν ἀναφοράς τῶν ἀληθείας.

Verse 15-21. Jesus retires; prophetic portraiture of His character. Verses 15 and 16 are abridged from Mk. iii. 7-12, which contains an account of an extensive healing ministry. The sequel of the Sabbath encounter is very vague. The one fact outstanding and noteworthy is the withdrawal of Jesus, conscious of having given deep offence, but anxious to avoid tragic consequences for the present. It is to that fact mainly that the evangelist attaches his fair picture of Jesus, in prophetic language. It is happily brought in here, where it gains by the contrast between the real Jesus and Jesus as conceived by the Pharisees, a misconception deserving to die. It is not necessary to suppose that the historical basis of the picture is to be found exclusively in vv. 15, 16, all the more that the statement they contain is but a meagre reproduction of Mk. iii. 7-12, omitting some valuable material, e.g., the demoniac cry: "Thou art the Son of God." The historical features answering to the prophetic outline in the evangelist’s mind may be taken from the whole story of Christ’s public life as hitherto told, from the baptism onwards. Luke gives his picture of Jesus at the beginning (iv. 16-30) as a frontispiece, Matthew places his at the end of a considerable section of the story, at a critical turning point in the history, and he means the reader to look back over the whole for verification. Thus for the evangelist ver. 18 may point back to the baptism (iii. 13-17), when the voice from heaven called Jesus God’s beloved Son; ver. 19 to the teaching on the hill (vii.), when the voice of Jesus was heard not in the street but on the mountain top, remote from the crowd below; ver. 20 to the healing ministry among the sick, physically bruised reeds, poor suffering creatures in whom the flame of life burnt low; ver. 21 to such significant incidents as that of the centurion of Capernaum (viii. 5-13). Broad interpretation here seems best. Some features, e.g., the reference to judgment, ver. 20, second clause, are not to be pressed.

The quotation is a very free reproduction from the Hebrew, with occasional side glances at the Sept. It has been suggested that the evangelist drew neither from the Hebrew nor from the Sept., but from a Chaldee Targum in use in his time (Lutteroth). It is certainly curious that he should have omitted Is. xiiii. 4, "He shall not fall nor be discouraged," etc., a most important additional feature in the picture = Messiah shall not only not break the bruised reed, but He shall not be Himself a bruised reed, but shall bravely stand for truth and right till they at length triumph. Admirable historic materials to illustrate that prophetic trait are ready to our hand in Christ’s encounters with the Pharisees (ix. 1-17, xii. 1-13). Either Matthew has followed a Targum, or been misled by the similarity of Is. xiiii. 3 and 4, or he means ver. 20 to bear a double reference, and read: He shall neither break nor be a bruised reed, nor allow to be quenched either in others or in Himself the feeble flame: a strong, brave, buoyant, ever-victorious hero, helper of the weak, Him.

\[1\] MB omit σέλος, which is inconsistent with καννὰς. \[2\] NBCD have ἐνα. \[3\] MB have simply ἐν. \[4\] Most uncials omit ἐν, which is found in D it. vg.
self a stranger to weakness. — ἡρέτης (ver. 18), an Ionic form in use in Hellenistic Greek, here only in N. T., often in Sept. = ἁράμωμα. Hesychius under ἡρέτητα and ἡράτητα gives as equivalents ἡγάγω, ἠγάγω, ἠμένω, ἠασθήνη, ἠατισθήνη. — κραυγάται (ver. 19), late form for κραυγάς. Phrynicus, p. 337, condemns as illiterate use of κραυγάται instead of κραυγάς. On the words ὡς εἴπη κρ. Priceus remarks: "Sentio clavorem intelligi qui nota est animi commoti et effervescensis". He cites examples from Seneca, Plutarch, Xenophon, etc.— ἄκοντα is late for ἀκούσται. Verbs expressing organic acts or states have middle forms in the future (side Rutherford, New Phrynicus, pp. 138, 376-412).—ὑπερ π. ver. 20, followed by subjective, with ἄν as in classics, in a clause introduced by ὡς referring to a future contingency. — τῷ ὑπέρατε, ver. 21, dative after ἐλπιοῦν; in Sept., Is. xliii. 4, with ἐν. This construction here only in N. T.

Vv. 22-37. Demonic healed and Pharisaic calumnies repelled (Μk. iii. 19-30; Lk. xi. 14-23 — cf. Mt. ix. 32-34). The healing of a blind and dumb demoniac has its place here not for its own sake, as a miracle, but simply as the introduction to another conflict between Jesus and the Pharisees. It is a story of wicked calumny repelled. The transition from the fair picture of the true Jesus to this hideous Pharisaic caricature is highly dramatic in its effect.

Vv. 22, 23. τυφλὸς καὶ κωφὸς, blind as well as dumb. The demoniac in ix. 32 dumb only. But dumbness here also is the main feature; hence in last clause κωφὸς only, and λαλῶν before βλέπων.— ἠφεται with infinitive, expressing here not merely tendency but result.—Ver. 23. ἡσυχασθητον: not implying anything exceptionally remarkable in the cure; a standing phrase (in Mark at least) for the impression made on the people. They never got to be familiar with Christ's wonderful works, so as to take them as matters of course. — μήτι implies a negative answer: they can hardly believe what the fact seems to suggest — can this possibly be, etc.? Not much capacity for faith in the average Israelite, yet honest-hearted compared with the Pharisees. — τῶν ἄσθενων: a popular title for the Messiah.

Ver. 24. Οἵ ἐκ φαρισαίων. They of course have a very different opinion. In Mark these were men come down from Jerusalem, to watch, not to lay hold of Jesus, Galilee not being under the direct jurisdiction of the Sanhedrin then (βαρύν on Mark).—Οὕτως οὐκ ἔκβαλεν, etc.: theory enunciated for second time, unless ix. 34 be an anticipation by the evangelist, or a spurious reading. What diversity of opinion! Christ's healing ministry, according to Mark, thought Him "beside Himself"—mad, Messiah, in league with Beelzebub! Herod had yet another theory: the marvellous healer was John redivivus, and endowed with the powers of the other world. All this implies that the healing ministry was a great fact—ουκ ἢ παντὶ: the negative way of putting it stronger than the positive. The Pharisees had to add οὐκ ἢ. They would gladly have said: "He does not cast out devils at all". But the fact was undeniable; therefore they had to invent a theory to neutralise its significance.—ἀρχετός, without article, might mean, as prince, therefore able to communicate such power. So Meyer, Weiss, et al. But the article may be omitted after Βεελζεβούλα as after βασιλεὺς, or on account of the following genitive.
So Schanz. Whether the Pharisees believed this theory may be doubted. It was enough that it was plausible. To reason with such men is vain. Yet Jesus did reason for the benefit of disciples. 

Ver. 25-30. The theory shown to be absurd.—Ver. 25. ἐλέει τὸν ἱδρυμένον. Jesus not only heard their words, but knew their thoughts, the malicious feelings which prompted their words, and strove so to present the case as to convict them of bad faith and dishonesty.—ὡς ἡσαλία, etc.: statement of an axiom widely exemplified in human affairs: division fatal to stability in kingdoms and cities. —ὅσοι τις ἐπιτίθενται: 1st future passive with an intransitive sense, vide Winer, § 38, 1.—Ver. 26 applies the axiom to Satan. ἐξ αὐτός τὰς ἔργας. Satan casting out Satan means self-contradiction; ἐστὶν ἐστι, self-division results. Against the argument it might be objected: Kingdoms and cities do become divided against themselves, regardless of fatal consequences, why not also Satan? Why should not that happen to Satan’s kingdom which has happened even to the Christian Church? Jesus seems to have credited Satan with more astuteness than is possessed by states, cities, and churches. Satan may be a fool, but he is not a fool. Then it has to be considered that communities commit follies which individuals avoid. Men war against each other to their common undoing, who would be wiser in their own affairs. One Satan might cast out another, but no Satan will cast out himself. And that is the case put by Jesus. Some, e.g., de Wette and Fritzsch, take ἐθάνατος τὸν ἱδρυμένον to mean one Satan casting out another. But that is not Christ’s meaning. He so puts the case as to make the absurdity evident. Ex ἐπιθέσις. He had a right to put it so; for the theory was that Satan directly empowered and enabled Him to deliver men from his (Satan’s) power.—Ver 27. To the previous convincing argument Jesus adds an argumentum ad hominem, based on the exorcism then practised among the Jews, with which it would appear the Pharisees found no fault.—οἱ ὁμοίας, not of course Christ’s disciples (so most of the Fathers), for the Pharisaic prejudice against Him would extend to them, but men belonging to the same school or religious type, like-minded. By referring to their performances Jesus put the Pharisees in a dilemma. Either they must condemn both forms of possession or explain why they made a difference. What they would have said we do not know, but it is not difficult to suggest reasons. The Jewish exorcists operated in conventional fashion by use of herbs and magical formulae, and the results were probably insignificant. The practice was sanctioned by custom, and harmless. But in casting out devils, as in all other things, Jesus was original, and His method was too effective. His power, manifest to all, was His offence.—σπάσατε. Jesus now makes the fellow-religionists of the Pharisees their judge. On a future occasion He will make John the Baptist their judge (xxi. 21-27). Such home-thrusts were very inconvenient. 

Ver. 28. The alternative: If not by Satan then by the Spirit of God, with an inevitable inference as to the worker and His work.—ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ. Luke has ἐκ θεοῦ ὁ. The former seems more in keeping with the connection of thought as defending the ethical character of Christ’s work assailed by the Pharisees. If, indeed, the spirit of God were regarded from the charismatic point of view, as the source of miraculous gifts, the two expressions would be synonymous. But there is reason to believe that by the time our Gospel was written the Pauline conception of the Holy Spirit’s influence as chiefly ethical and immanent, as distinct from that of the primitive apostolic church, in which it was charismatic and transcendent, had gained currency (vide my St. Paul’s
Conception of Christianity, chap. xiii.). A trace of the new Pauline view may be found in Mt. x. 20: "It is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father speaking in you". The influence is within, and the product is not unintelligible utterance, like that of the speaker with tongues (1 Cor. xii., xiv.), but wise, sincere apology for the faith. But why then did Luke not adopt this Pauline phrase? Because one of his main aims was to bring out the miraculousness of Christ's healing works; that they were done by the very finger of God (Exod. viii. 13).—διαφωνίας. Pritzsche takes this word strictly as signifying not merely: the kingdom of God has come nigh you (-yyyyπαν μ. σ. τ. σευδ., Lk. x. 9); but: has come nigh sooner than you expected. The more general sense, however, seems most suitable, as it is the usual sense in the N. T. The point at issue was: do the events in question mean Satan's kingdom come or God's kingdom come? It must be one or other; make up your minds which.—Ver. 29. To help them to decide Jesus throws out yet another parabolic line of thought.—ὁ, if all that I have said does not convince you consider this. The parable seems based on Is. xlix. 24, 25, and like all Christ's parabolic utterances appeals to common sense. The theme is, spoiling the spoiler, and the argument that the enterprise implies _hostile purpose_ and success in it _superior power_. The application is: the demoniac is a captive of Satan; in seeking to cure him I show myself Satan's enemy; in actually curing him I show myself Satan's master.—τοῦ λέγεται: the article is either generic, or individualising after the manner of parabolic speech. Proverbs and parables assume acquaintance with their characters.—σπουδάζω, household furniture (Gen. xxxxi. 37); ἄρρητος, seize (Judges xxi. 22).—διαφωνεῖν, make a clean sweep of all that is in the house, the owner, bound hand and foot, being utterly helpless. The use of this compound verb points to the thoroughness of the cures wrought on demoniacs, as in the case of the demoniac of Gadara: quiet, clothed, sane (Mk. v. 15).—Ver. 30. One begins at this point to have the feeling that here, as elsewhere, our evangelist groups sayings of kindred character instead of exactly reproducing Christ's words as spoken to the Pharisees. The connection is obscure, and the interpretations therefore conflicting. On first view one would say that the adage seems more appropriate in reference to lukewarm disciples or undecided hearers than to the Pharisees, who made no pretence of being on Christ's side. Some accordingly (e.g., Bleek, after Elwert and Ullmann) have so understood it. Others, including Grotius, Wetstein, De Wette, take the ἐννέα of the adage to be Satan, and render: he who, like myself, is not with Satan is against him. Kypke, Obscr. Sac., says: "Prima persona positâ est servatore pro quacunque alio, pro- verbaliter, hoc sensu: qui socius cives domini, cum alio gerentis non est, est pro adversario censeri solit. Cum igitur ego me re ipsa adversarium Satanae esse ostenderim, nulla specie socius ejus potero vocari." This certainly brings the saying into line with the previous train of thought, but if Jesus had meant to say that He surely would have expressed Himself differently. The Fathers (Hilary, Jerome, Chrys.) took the ἐννέα to be Jesus and the δὲ μὴ ἄνω to be Satan. So understood the adage contains a fourth concluding argument against the notion of a league between Jesus and Satan. Most modern interpreters refer the δὲ μ. σ. to the Pharisees. Schanz, however, understands the saying as referring to the undecided among the people. The only serious objection to this view is that it makes the saying irrelevant to the situation.—συνάρπασται: late for the earlier συζητᾶν, side Lob., Phryn., p. 218. As to the metaphor of gathering and scattering, its natural basis is not apparent. But in all cases, when one man scatters what another gathers their aims and interests are utterly diverse. Satan is the arch-waster, Christ the collector, Saviour.

Vv. 31, 32. Jesus changes His tone from argument to solemn warning. Ver.
31. *Di touth,* which seems to be simply an echo of τ. av. in the previous clause.

D has ὅσον, as in T. R.

For οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται found in most uncials B has οὐ μὴ ἀφεθῇ, which W. H. place in the margin.

31. *Di touth* connects not merely with preceding verse, but with the whole foregoing argument. Mark more impressively introduces the blasphemy-logic with a solemn ἄριστον λέγω ἀρκετά. — ἄριστον ἀμαρτία, etc. A broad preliminary declaration of the pardonoableness of human sin of all sorts, and especially of sins of the tongue, worthy and characteristic of Jesus, and making what follows more impressive.— Ἱερὰ τ. Π. βλασφημίᾳ ἀφεθήσεται: pointed, emphatic exception. Evidently the Spirit here is taken ethnically. He represents the moral ideal, the absolutely good and holy. Blasphemy against the Spirit so conceived unpardonable—that is our Lord's deliberate judgment. — βλασφημία, injurious speech (from βλάπτω and φημί), in such a case will mean speaking of the holy One as if He were unholy, or, in the abstract, calling good evil, not by misunderstanding but through antipathy to the good. — Ver. 32. So serious a statement needs to be carefully guarded against misapprehension; therefore Jesus adds an explanation: — ἄρα κατὰ τ. ὁ. τ. ἀνθρώπων. Jesus distinguishes between a word against the Son of Man and a word against the Holy Ghost. The reference in the former is to Himself, presumably, though Mark at the corresponding place has "the sons of men," and no special mention of a particular son of man. Christ gives the Pharisees to understand that the grave-men of their offence is not that they have spoken evil of Him. Jesus had no exceptional sensitiveness as to personal offences. Nor did He mean to suggest that offences of the kind against Him were more serious or less easily pardonable than such offences against other men, say, the prophets or the Baptist. Many interpreters, indeed, think otherwise, and represent blasphemy against the Son of Man as the higher limit of the forgiveable. A grave mistake, I humbly think. Jesus was as liable to honest misunderstanding as other good men, in some respects more liable than any, because of the exceptional originality of His character and conduct. All new things are liable to be misunderstood and decried, and the best for a while to be treated as the worst. Jesus knew this, and allowed for it. Men might therefore honestly misunderstand Him, and be in no danger of the sin against the Holy Ghost (e.g., Saul of Tarsus). On the other hand, men might dishonestly calumniate any ordinary good man, and be very near the unpardonable sin. It is not the man that makes the difference, but the source of the blasphemy. If the source be ignorance, misconception, ill-informed prejudice, blasphemy against the Son of Man will be equally pardonable with other sins. If the source be malice, rooted dislike of the good, selfish preference of wrong, because of the advantage it brings, to the right which is the better. If men good seek to establish, then the sin is not against the man but against the cause, and the Divine Spirit who inspires him, and though the agent be but a humble, imperfect man, the sinner is perilously near the unpardonable one. Jesus wished the Pharisees to understand that, in His judgment, that was their position.— ὅρθα, οὕτωs analyse the negation of pardon, conceived as affecting both worlds, into its parts for sake of emphasis (side on V. 34-36). Dogmatic inferences, based on the double negation, to possible pardon after death, are precarious. Lightfoot (Hor. Heb.) explains the double negation by reference to the Jewish legal doctrine that, in contrast to other sins, profaning the name of God
33. "He poured out to the deaf men, and to the blind men, to the dumb, and to the lame: and to the dumb he opened mouth; 34. whereby the scripture of Isaiah is fulfilled, saying, Beside those that were written, concerning him: save the blind and the dumb shall receive knowledge; 35. that the deaf may hear, and the dumb speak again; 36. that they may see, and not perceive; and that they may understand, and not understand; lest they should turn, and be healed.

25. The scripture concerning the Gentiles is fulfilled, when we preach that Christ is the righteousness of God: 26. And is written, The king shall see and fear, and the kings of the earth shall tremble before the Lord. 27. For he shall come down from heaven with stern looks, with strength and with much anger, to consume the iniquity of the earth, and to destroy the adversaries thereof. 28. He shall come down, and shall tread upon the mountain of confusion, and upon the hilly height of activity; and the mountains shall be consumed under him. 29. He shall consume the horns of the oxen, and shall burn the places where the fire is kindled. 30. He shall make his enemies his footstool, and he shall trample them under foot: he shall tread upon the neck of them that are lifted up, and he shall bring them down to the earth.
38. A sign asked and refused, with relative discourse (Lk. xi. 16, 20-35). Both Matt.’s and Luke’s reports convey the impression that the demand for a sign, and the enunciation of the Satanic theory as to Christ’s cures of demoniacs, were synchronous. If they were the demand was impudent, hypocritical, insulting. Think of the men who could so speak of Christ’s healing ministry wanting a sign that would satisfy them as to His Messianic claims! —Ver. 38. ΣΗΜΕΙΟΝ: what kind of a sign? They thought the cure of demoniacs a sign from heaven. Elsewhere we read of their asking a sign from heaven (xvi. 1). From what quarter was the sign now asked to come from? Perhaps those who made the demand had no idea; neither knew nor cared. Their question really meant: these signs won’t do; if you want us to believe in you you must do something else than cast out devils. The apparent respect and earnestness of the request are feigned: “teacher, we desire from you (emphatic position) to see a sign”. It reminds one of the mock homage of the soldiers at the Passion (xvi. 27, 32). —Ver. 39. γενναγεννα—μοιχαλλις, unfaithful to God as a wife to a husband, apt description of men professing godliness but ungodly in heart. —Weston, hankers after, as in vi. 32; characteristic men that have no light within crave external evidence, which given would be of no service to them. Therefore: oδ θυσσαμένα: it will not be given either by Jesus or by any one else. He declines, knowing it to be vain. No sign will convince them: why give one?—αλ μη, etc.; except the sign of Jonah the prophet, which was no sign in their sense. What is referred to? But for what follows we should have said: the preaching of repentance by Jonah to the Ninevites. So Lk. xi. 30 seems to take it. Jonah preached repentance to the men of Nineveh as the only way of escape from judgment. Jesus points to that historic instance and says: Beware! Jonah was not the only prophetic preacher of repentance; but, as Nineveh is held up as a reproach to the persons addressed, to single him out was fitting. —Ver. 40 gives an entirely different turn to the reference. The verse cannot be challenged on critical grounds. If it is an interpolation it must have become an accepted part of the text before the date of our earliest copies. If it be genuine then Jesus points to His resurrection as the appropriate sign for an unbelieving generation, saying in effect: you will continue to disbelieve in spite of all I can say or do, and at last you will put me to death. But I will rise again, a sign for your confusion if not for your conversion. For opposite views on this interpretation of the sign of Jonah, vide Meyer ad loc. and Holtzmann in H.C.—Ver. 41. Application of the reference in ver. 39. The men of Nineveh are cited in condemnation of the Jewish contemporaries of Jesus. Cf. similar use of historic parallels in xi. 20-24.—πλειόν ἰνωά, more than Jonah, cf. ver. 6; refers either to Jesus personally as compared with Jonah, or to His ministry as compared with Jonah’s. In the latter case the meaning is: there is far more in what is now going on around you to shut you up to repentance than in anything Jonah said to the men of Nineveh (so Grotius).—Ver. 41. ΚΑΣΩΝΤΕΣ ινός is next pressed into the service of putting unbelievers to shame. The form ΚΑΣΩΝΤΕΣ was condemned by Phryn., but Elsner cites instances from Demosthenes and other
good writers. J. Alberti also (Observ. Philol.) cites an instance from Athenaeus, lib. xiii. 595: βασιλεύς ἄτης Βαβυλώνος. The reference is to the story in 1 Kings x. and 2 Chron. ix. concerning the Queen of Sheba visiting Solomon.— In the parable of the worker and master. Elamor quotes in illustration the exhortation of Isocrates not to grudge to go a long way to hear those who profess to teach anything useful.—πλοῖον Σμύρνη, again a claim of superiority for the present over the great persons and things of the past. On the apparent egotism of these comparisons, vide my Apologetics, p. 367; and remember that Jesus claimed superiority not merely for Himself and His work, but even for the least in the Kingdom of Heaven (xi. 11).

Vv. 43-45. A comparison. Cf. Lk. xi. 24-26. Formerly Jesus had likened the evil race of Pharisian religions to children playing in the market-place (xi. 16-19). Now He uses expelled demons to depict their spiritual condition. The similitude moves in the region of popular opinion, and gives a glimpse into the supersitions of the time. We gather from it, first, that the effects of the arts of exorcists were temporary; and, second, the popular theory to explain the facts: the demon returned because he could not find a comfortable home anywhere else. On this vide Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. The parable was naturally suggested by the cure of the demoniac (ver. 22).—Ver. 43. δι' ἄνωθεν τῶν : the haunts of demons, as popularly conceived, were places uninhabited by men, deserts and graveyards. The demon in Tobias viii. 3 flies to the uppermost parts of Egypt; and in Baruch iv. 35 a land desolated by fire is to become tenanted by demons.—Διέρχεται ἵππον: the spirit keeps moving on in quest of a resting place; like a human being he feels ill at ease in the monotonous waste of sand.—οὐκ εὑρίσκει: in Luke εὑρίσκετον. The change from participle to finite verb is expressive. The failure to find a resting place was an important fact, as on it depended the resolve to return to the former abode.—Ver. 44. σκολοπάτων &c. καὶ καὶ καὶ = untenantcd and ready for a tenant, inviting by its clean, ornamented condition. The epithets simply describe in lively pictorial manner the risk of repossession. But naturally commentators seek spiritual equivalents for them. Ornamented how? With grace, say some (Hilary, Chrys., Gedei), with sins, others (Orig., Jer., Euthy., Weiss, etc.). The ornamentation must be to the taste of the tenant. And what is that? Neither for sin nor for grace, but for sin counterfeiting grace; a form of godliness without the power; sanctity which is but a mask for iniquity. The house is decorated reputedly for God's occupancy, really for the devil's.—σωφρόμενον: σωφρύν is condemned by Phryn.: "when you hear one say σωφρύν, bid him say παρεκάρσον".—Ver. 45. άτροποι πανεμορφοί, etc. This feature is introduced to make the picture answer to the moral condition of the Pharisees as conceived by Jesus. The parable here passes out of the region of popular imagination and natural probability into a region of deeper psychological insight. Why should the demon want associates in occupancy of the house? Why not rather have it all to himself as before?—οὕτως ἄτροποι, etc. Ethical application. The general truth implied is: moral and religious reform may be, has been, succeeded by deeper degeneracy. The question naturally suggests itself: what is the historical range of the application? It has been answered variously. From the lawgiving till the present time (Hil., Jer.); from the exile till now (Chrys., Grotius, etc.); from the Baptist till now (Weiss, etc.). Christ gives no hint of
43-50. **ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ**

1 κακοσμημένον. 45. τότε πορεύεται καὶ παραλαμβάνει μεθ' αὐτοῦ. Lk. xi. 25.  Ch. xix. 29 (of tomb).  
46. Ἔτι δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν τῷ ἀπότομῳ, ἵνα ἐπιτάχθη ἐν ἑαυτῷ, καὶ ἐπεστίλαξεν τις ἐν αὐτῷ, καὶ γίνεται τὸ ἕγγραφον τοῦ ἄνθρωπον ἐκείνου χειρόν τῶν ἐν Ch. xvii. πρῶτων. αὐτός ἦν οὖν καὶ τῇ γενεᾷ παύτη τῇ πονηρᾷ." 46. "Εἰς δὲ ἐν αὐτῷ λαλοῦντος τοῖς δόλοις, ἵνα δήμος καὶ οἱ ἄνδροι αὐτοῦ εἰστήκεισαν ἔχων ἢ ζητοῦντες αὕτη λαλήσαι. 47. εἰτί δὲ τε τις αὕτη, "Εἰδον, ἡ μήτηρ σου καὶ οἱ ἄνδροι σου ἔστηκαν, ἢ ζητοῦντες σου λαλήσαι." 48. Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν τῷ ἀπότομῳ, "Τις ἦσαν καὶ μήτηρ μου; καὶ τίνες εἰσὶν οἱ ἄνδροι μου;" 49. καὶ ἐκτίναξε τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ ἐπεν, ἵνα δοκήσατε ἕναν ἀδελφόν μου καὶ ἐπιθυμήσατε αὐτόν κατὰ κακίαν. 50. δοσιν γὰρ ἐν τοιχῷ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρὸς μου τοῦ ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς, αὐτὸς μου ἄδελφος καὶ ἐδοξη καὶ μήτηρ ἦσαν."  

1 ΝΒ omit ἐς (Tisch., W.H.).  
2 The whole of ver. 47 is wanting in ΝΒΛ and is omitted by W. H. Tisch. puts it within brackets. It is an explanatory gloss.  
3 λεγοντι in ΝΒΔΖ.  
4 ΝΒΔΣ omit ἐναν τό (Tisch.). BC retain it (W. H. within brackets),  

what period was in His thoughts, unless we find one in the epithet μεγάλης (ver. 39), which recalls prophetic charges of unfaithfulness to her Divine Husband against Israel, and points to the exile as the crisis at which she seriously repented of that sin. It is not at all likely that Christ's view was limited to the period dating from John's ministry. Moral laws need large spaces of time for adequate exemplification. The most instructive exemplification of the degeneracy described is supplied by the period from Ezra till Christ's time. With Ezra ended material idolatry. But from that period dates the reign of legalism, which issued in Rabbinism, a more subtle and pernicious idolatry of the letter, the more deadly that it wore the fair aspect of zeal for God and righteousness.  

Vv. 46-50. The relatives of Jesus (Mk. iii. 31-35; Lk. viii. 19-21). Matthew and Mark place this incident in connection with the discourse occasioned by Pharisaic calumny. Luke gives it in a quite different connection. The position assigned it by Matthew and Mark is at least fitting, and through it one can understand the motive. Not vanity: a desire to make a parade of their influence over their famous relative on the part of mother and brethren (Chrys., Theophy., etc.), but solicitude on His account and a desire to extricate Him from trouble. This incident should be viewed in connection with the statement in Mk. iii. 21 that friends thought Jesus beside Himself. They wished to rescue Him from Himself and from men whose ill-will He had, imprudently, they probably thought, provoked.—Ver. 46. ἄδειφοι, brothers in the natural sense, sons of Mary by Joseph? Presumably, but an unwelcome hypothesis to many on theological grounds.—εἴρημεν, pluperfect, but with sense of imperfect (Fritzsche). They had been standing by while Jesus was speaking.—ἴας, on the outskirts of the crowd, or outside the house into which Jesus entered (Mk. iii. 19).—Ver. 47 (wanting in ΝΒΛ) states what is implied in ver. 48 (τῷ λέγοντι), that some one reported to Jesus the presence of His relatives.—Ver. 48. τις ἦσαν καὶ μήτηρ μου. One might have expected Jesus, out of delicacy, to have spoken only of His brethren, leaving the bearing of the question on His mother to be inferred. But the mention of her gave increased emphasis to the truth proclaimed. The question repels a well-meant but ignorant interference of natural affection with the sovereign claims of duty. It reveals a highly strung spirit easily to be mistaken for a morbid enthusiasm.—Ver. 49. δεικνύει τ. χειρα: an eloquent gesture, making the words following, for those present, superfluous.—Ἰδοὺ, etc. There
are idealists, promoters of pet schemes, and religious devotees whom it would cost no effort to speak thus; not an admirable class of people. It did cost Jesus an effort, for He possessed a warm heart and unblighted natural affections. But He sacrificed natural affection on the altar of duty, as He finally sacrificed His life.—Ver. 50.

Definition of spiritual kinship. The highest bond possible founded on spiritual affinity.—ὅτε ἵνα ἐν κωφίᾳ: a general present supposition expressed by the subjunctive with ἵνα followed by present indicatives.—τὸ ἔλλειμα τοῦ πατρὸς. ὡς τῇ ἐκφάνσῃ: this probably comes nearest to Christ's actual words. In such a solemn utterance He was likely to mention His Father, whose supreme claims His filial heart ever owned. Mark has "the will of God"; Luke "those who hear and do the word of God"; obviously secondarily.

CHAPTER XIII. JESUS TEACHING IN PARABLES. The transition from the sultry, sombre atmosphere of chap. xii. into the calm, clear air of Christ's parabolic wisdom would be as welcome to the evangelist as it is to us. Yet even here we do not altogether escape the shadow of unbelief or spiritual insusceptibility. Ver. 1. He having good seed wasted, bad seed sown among good, fish of all sorts caught in the net. The adoption of the parabolic method of teaching, indeed, had its origin in part in disappointing experiences; truths misapprehended, actions misunderstood, compelling the Teacher to fall back on natural analogies for explanation and self-defence. All the synoptists recognise the importance of this type of teaching by their formal manner of introducing the first of the group of seven parables contained in Matthew's collection. Cf. Mt. xiii. 3; Mk. iv. 2; Lk. viii. 4. Matthew's way of massing matter of the same kind most effectually impresses us with the significance of this feature in Christ's teaching ministry. That Jesus spoke all the seven parables grouped together in this chapter at one time is not certain or even likely. In the corresponding section Mark gives only two of the seven (Sower and Mustard Seed). Luke has the Sower only. The Sower, the Tares, and the Drag net may have formed a single discourse, as very closely connected in structure and import. Perhaps we should rather say had a place in the discourse from the boat, which seems to have been a review of the past ministry of Jesus, expressing chiefly disappointment with the result. Much besides parables would be spoken, the parables being employed to point the moral: much seed, little fruit, and yet a beginning made destined to grow; the situation to be viewed with patience and hope. Just how many of the parables reported by the evangelists were spoken then it is impossible to determine.

V. 1-9. The Parable of the Sower (Mk. iv. 1-9; Lk. viii. 4-8).—Ver. 1. ἧδεν ἡμᾶς ἀκούσαντες: The parable stands in the same connection in Mark (not in Luke), but not as following in immediate temporal sequence. No stress should be laid on Matthew's phrase "on that day".—ὁλῷῳ τῆς οἰκίας: the house in which Jesus is supposed to have been when His parables were spoken. He, though Matthew makes no mention of it (vide Mk. iii. 19).—ἐκάθισεν: as at the teaching on the hill (v. 1), suggestive of lengthened discourse. The Teacher sat, the hearers stood.—Ver. 2. δύο λόγους γονάτιστοι, great numbers of people in all the accounts, compelling the Teacher to withdraw from the shore into the sea, and, sitting in a boat, to address the people standing on the margin. Much interest, popularity of the Teacher still great, and even growing; yet He has formed a very sober estimate of its value, as the parable following shows.—Ver. 3. τοιούτως ἐπανέβαλεν: this method of teaching was not peculiar to Jesus—it was common among Easterns—but His use of it was unique in felicity and in the
The importance of the lessons conveyed. Abstract *a priori* definitions of the word serve little purpose; we learn best what a parable is, in the mouth of Jesus, by studying the parables He spoke. Thence we gather that to speak in parables means to use the familiar in nature or in human life (in the form of a narrative or otherwise) to embody unfamiliar truths of the spiritual world.

**Vv. 3-9. The Parable.**—**Ver. 3.** ἰδεῖν: either a generic, or the Sower of my story.—τοῦ ἰδείαν: the infinitive of purpose with the genitive of article, very frequent in N. T. and in late Greek.—**Ver. 4.** παρὰ τὴν ὑδῶν: not the highway, of which there were few, but the footpath, of which there were many through or between the fields.—**Ver. 5.** ἐν τῇ περασθεὶς, upon shallow ground, where the rock of the surface (εἴχε γῆς τῆς πολλῆς).—**Ver. 6.** ἐπαυσάτειθεν, it was scorched (by the sun) (cf. Rev. xvi. 8), which had made it spring earliest: promptly quickened, soon killed.—**Ver. 7.** ἐν τῇ ἀκάδασι. Fritzsche prefers the reading ἵσα because the seed fell not on thorns already sprung up, but on ground full of thorns seeds or roots. But the latter idea, which is the true one, can be expressed also by ἵσα.—ἀνφιβάλων: the thorns sprang up as well as the corn, and growing more vigorously gained the upper hand.—ἀνφίβησαν. Euthy. Zig finds this idea in ἀνφιβάλων, for which he gives as synonym ἀνερχόμενος.—**Ver. 8.** καλλύν, genuinely good land free from all the faults of the other three: soft, deep, clean.—ἐθιόπων, yielded. In other texts (iii. 8, 10; vii. 17) οὕτως is used.—ἐκατόν, ἔθικον, τριάκοντα: all satisfactory; 30 good, 60 better, 100 best (Gen. xxvi. 12).—**Ver. 9.** ἐξαρχεὶν ἀκ. ἀκ. An invitation to think of the hidden meaning, or rather a hint that there was such a meaning. The description of the land in which the sower carried on his operations would present no difficulties to the hearers: the beaten paths, the rocky spots, the thorny patches were all familiar features of the fields in Palestine, and the fate of the seed in each case was in accordance with common experience. But why paint the picture? What is the moral of the story? That Jesus left them to find out.

**Vv. 10-17. The disciples ask an explanation.** There is some difficulty in forming a clear idea of this interlude. Who asked? The Twelve only, or they and others with them, as Mark states (iv. 10)? And when? Immediately after the parable was spoken, or, as was more likely, after the teaching of the day was over? The one certain point is that an explanation was asked and given.—**Ver. 10.** διαίτησαν σε παραβολὰς: Matthew makes the question refer to the method of teaching, Mark and Luke to the meaning of the parables spoken. The two questions were closely connected,
and both doubtless in the minds of the disciples. A more serious difficulty arises in connection with Christ's answer to their question, which seems to say that He adopted the parabolic method in order to hide the truths of the kingdom from unspiritual minds. Nothing is more certain than that Jesus neither did nor could adopt any such policy, and if

the evangelists ascribed it to Him then we should have no alternative but to agree with those who, like Holtzmann (H. C.) and Jülicher (Die Gleichnisse des Jesus, pp. 131, 149), cites also his Einleitung in das N. T., p. 228), maintain that the evangelists have mistaken His meaning, reading intention in the light of result. It is much better to impute a mistake to them than an inhuman purpose to Christ.

Ver. 11. τὰ μυθήματα: the word, as here used, might suggest the idea of a mysterious esoteric doctrine concerning the Kingdom of God to be taught only to a privileged inner circle. But the term in the N. T. means truths once hidden now revealed, made generally known, and in their own nature perfectly intelligible. So, e.g., in Eph. iii. 9, Col. i. 26. Jesus desired to make the truths of the kingdom of God known to all; by parables if they could not be understood otherwise. His aim was to enlighten, not to mystify—Ver. 12. This moral apothegm is given only in Matt. It contains a great truth, whether spoken or not on this occasion. For the construction, vide at x. 14.—προφητεύοντος: again in Mt. xxv. 29, where the saying is repeated. This use of the passive in a neuter sense belongs to late Greek.—Ver. 13. διὰ τοῦτο δέν. Mark and Luke have ἀνασκόπησε, the former assigning a reason, the latter ascribing a purpose. In Matt. Jesus says: I speak in parables because seeing they do not see, etc.; which ought naturally to mean: they are dull of apprehension, therefore I do my best to enlighten them.—Vv. 14, 15. The prophetic citation, given by Matthew only, may be due to him, though put into the mouth of Jesus. It is conceivable, however, that Jesus might use Isaiah's words in Isaiah's spirit, i.e., ironically, expressing the bitter feeling of one conscious that his best efforts to teach his countrymen would often end in failure, and in his bitterness representing himself as sent to stop ears and blind eyes. Such utterances are not to be taken as deliberate dogmatic teaching. If, as some allege, the evangelists so took them, they failed to understand the mind of the Master. The quotation exactly follows the Sept. The verb καταγράφω (ver. 15, ἐκάρμασα) is condemned by Phryn. as barbarous, the right word being κατάγανθαι.—Vv. 16, 17. In Mk. (iv 13) Jesus reproaches the disciples for their ignorance; here He congratulates them on their faculty of seeing and hearing (spiritually).—ἀλήθεια: in emphatic position, suggesting contrast between disciples and the multitude.—μακάριος, vide on chap. v. 3.—διὰ θητ., because, not for what, they see.—ἀλήθεια γάρ λέγω: introducing an important statement.—προφητεύοντος, sain
combination as in x. 41. The felicity now consists in the things seen and heard. The perceiving senses and the things to be perceived imply each other, neither by themselves yield enjoyment. This passage is given by Lk. (x. 23, 24) in a more suitable connection (report on their mission by the Seventy). Here it creates an exaggerated impression as to the extent of the new departure. The parabolic teaching of Jesus, as exemplified in the Sower and other parables here collected, was not an absolutely new feature. He had always been speaking more or less in parables (“Fishers of Men,” iv. 19; “Salt of the Earth,” “City on a Hill,” v. 13, 14; “Two Builders,” vii. 24-27; “Whole need not a Physician,” ix. 12; “New Garment and New Wine,” ix. 16, 17, etc.). Some of the parables in this connection, the Treasure and the Pearl, e.g., may be gems preserved from some otherwise forgotten synonyme discourses, say those delivered in the preaching tour through Galilee.

Ver. 18-23. Interpretation of the Sower (Mk. iv. 14-20; Lk. viii. 11-15). Ver. 18. ὕπειρα, emphatic, ye privileged ones.—οὕνεκα referring to the happiness on which they have been congratulated.—Ver. 16. ἄκοντατε τ. π.: not, hear it over again, but, what it means.—στιχαρπος, aorist, of the man who sowed in the story just told.—Ver. 19. πάντα ἄκοντος, in the case of any one who hears, “for the classical ἄκοντα τ. π.” (Camb. G. T.). It may be a case of interrupted construction, the sentence beginning with the intention to make the genitive dependent on an ἐκ τῆς καρδίας before ἄκοντα (so Weiss).—τὸν λόγον τῆς βασιλείας: the Sower, unlike the other parables in this chapter, contains no hint that it concerns the kingdom. But in Christ’s discourses that almost went without saying.—μη συνείστος: “not taking it in,” a phrase which combines the physical fact of the parable with the figurative sense.—ὁ πονηρός, the evil one, Satan, represented by the innocent birds of the parable. What a different use of the emblem from that in vi. 26—ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ: we should hardly say of truth not understood that it had been sown in the heart. But heart is used in Scripture in a wide sense, as the seat of intellect as well as of feeling. The word in the case supposed is in the mind, as the seed is in the ground: on it, if not in it; in it as words, if not as truth.—οὖντες ὄστιν, etc., this is he sown, etc., said of the man, not of the seed. Sign and thing signified identified, of “this is my body.” Properly, the seed sown, etc., represents the case of such a man. So throughout the interpretation.—Ver. 20. μετὰ χαρᾶς λ.: this is the new feature in the second type added to the hearing of the first; hearing and receiving with joy characteristic of quick emotional shallow natures, but not of them only. Deep earnest natures also have joy in truth found, but with a difference.—οὐκ ἔχει: instead of the participle ἔχειν under the influence of Mk.’s text (Weiss).—προσκύνησις, temporary, cf. 2 Cor. iv. 18.—Ver. 22. ἄκοντως, hearing alone predicated of the third type, but receiving both intellectually and emotionally implied; everything necessary present except purity of heart, singleness of mind. Hearing is to be taken here in a pregnant sense as distinct from the hearing that is no hearing (ver. 13).—μετὰ τ. α. ἐκώστα τ. π.: together = worldliness. Lust for money and care go together and between them spoil many an earnest religious nature. —ἀκαρπος may refer either to the man.
(Meyer) or to the word (λόγον just before; Bengel, Weiss); sense the same. There is fruit in this case; the crop does not wither in the blade; it reaches the green ear, but it never ripens.—Ver. 23. 

οίκους καὶ συνεξέλθει. The specific feature of the fourth and alone satisfactory type is not brought out either in Mt. or in Mk. but only in Lk. by his happy phrase: ἐν κάθει καλὴ καὶ δικαιο. The third type understands (Mt.) and receives into the heart (Mk.), but the fourth in addition receives into a clean, i.e., a “good and honest,” heart.—δὴ δὴ: δὴ occurs here for the first time in Mt., and only a few times altogether in the N. T., but always with marked expressiveness. According to Passow and Bauml (Grammatik, § 669, and Untersuchungen über G. Partikeln, p. 98), connected with δῆλος in origin and meaning, and signifying that the thing stated is clear, specially important, natural in the given circumstances.—As δὴ here = who, observe, or of course. Given such conditions, fruitfulness certainly results.—καρποφόρη, bringeth forth fruit such as is desired: ripe, useful.—δὴ in last clause may be pointed either δὲ μὲν, δὲ δὲ (T. R.) or δὲ δὲ, δὲ δὲ (W. H.). In the former case the meaning is: this man brings forth too fold, that man, etc.; in the latter, δὲ is accusative neuter after ποιήσει, and refers to the fruit. Opinion very much divided, sense the same.

This interpretation of the Sower raises two questions: Was it needed? Does it really explain the parable? which is in effect to ask: Does it proceed from Jesus? As to the former: could not even the general hearer, not to speak of the Twelve, understand the parable well enough? True, no hint that it related to the kingdom was given, but, as already remarked, that might go without saying. Jesus had all along been using similitudes explaining His meaning rather than needing explanation. Then parabolic speech was common even in Rabbinical circles, a source at once of entertainment and of light to hearers. In Mt.'s report the disciples do not even ask an explanation, so that that given comes on us as a surprise (Holtz. in H. C.). Christ's audience might at least carry away the general impression that He was dissatisfied with the result of His ministry, in many cases in which His teaching seemed to Him like seed cast on unproductive places. It might require further reflection, more than the majority were capable of, to comprehend the reasons of failure. Self-knowledge and observation of character were needed for this. As to the inferences given, it has been objected (Weiss, Jülicher, etc.) that it is allegorical in method, and that, while going into details as to the various persons and things mentioned in the parable and their import, it fails to give the one main lesson which it, like every parable, is designed to teach; in short, that we cannot see the wood for the trees. As to this it may be remarked: (1) There is a tangible difference between allegory and parable. Allegory and interpretation answer to each other part by part; parable and interpretation answer to each other as wholes. (a) Christ's parables are for the most part not allegories. (3) It does not follow that none of them can be. Why should the use of allegory be interdicted to Him?
May the Sower not be an exception? That it is has been ably argued by Feine in *Jahrücher für Prot. Theologie*, 1888, *q. v.* (4) The exclusion of so-called allegorical interpretation may be carried to a pedantic extreme in connection with all the parables, as it is, indeed, in my opinion, especially by Weiss. Thus we are told that in the saying “the whole need not a physician,” Jesus did not mean to suggest that He was a physician but only to buttress the special claims of a class on His attention. But the question may be asked in every case: What was the genesis of the parable? How did it grow in Christ’s mind? The Sower, *e.g.*? Was it not built up of likenesses spontaneously suggesting themselves now and then; of Himself to a sower; and of various classes of hearers to different kinds of soil? In that case the “allegorical” interpretation is simply an analysis of the parable into its genetic elements, which, on that view, have more than the merely descriptive value assigned to them by Weiss. (5) As to missing the main lesson amid details: is it not rather given, Eastern fashion, through the details: the preaching of the kingdom not always successful, failure due to the spiritual condition of hearers? That is how we Westerns, in our abstract general way, put it. The Orientals conveyed the general through concrete particulars. Jesus did not give an abstract definition of the Fatherhood of God. He defined it by the connections in which He used the title Father. That Jesus talked to His disciples about the various sorts of hearers, their spiritual state, and what they resembled, I think intrinsically likely. It is another question whether His interpretation has been exactly reproduced by any of the Synoptists.

*Vv. 24-30. The Tares.* This parable has some elements in common with that in Mk. iv. 26-29, whence the notion of many critics that one of the two has been formed from the other. As to which is the original, opinion is much divided. *Vide Holtz., H. C.* Both, I should say.

The resemblance is superficial, the lesson entirely different. The Sower describes past experiences; the Tares is prophetical of a future state of things. But may it not be a creation of apostolic times put into the mouth of Jesus? No, because (1) it is too original and wise, and (2) there were beginnings of the evil described even in Christ’s lifetime. Think of a Judas among the Twelve, whom Jesus treated on the principle laid down in the parable, letting him remain among the disciples till the last crisis. It may have been his presence among the Twelve that suggested the parable.

*Vv. 24-25.* The sower cast his seed on the land. — *καλόν* good, genuine, without mixture of other seeds.—*Ver. 25.* ἐν τῷ καθεύδειν = during the night.— δ. δ. ἐκρης, his enemy. Weiss (Matt. Evang., 347) thinks this feature no part of the original parable, but introduced to correspond with the interpretation (ver. 30), or by the hearers needed to account for the appearance of the “tares,” which might grow then as now from seed lying dormant in the ground. Christ’s parables usually comply with the requirements of natural probability, but sometimes they have to depart from them to make the parable answer to the spiritual fact; *e.g.*, when all the invited are represented as refusing to come to the feast (Lk. xiv. 16-24). The appearance of the “tares” might be made a preternatural phenomenon out of regard to the perfect purity of the seed, and the great abundance of bad men in a holy society. A few scattered stalks might spring up in a natural way, but whence so many? — ἐκστρατισάνειν, deliberately sowed over the wheat seed as thickly as if no other seed were there.
**KATA MATHEION**

1 Mk. iv. 26. στα ἔλλειπον τοῦ σπόρου, καὶ καρπὸν ἐποίησεν, τότε ἐφάνη 

2 Heb. ii. 17. καὶ τὰ ζυζάνα. 27. προσελάβατο τοὺς δοῦλους τοῦ ὁλοκληρώτου 

3 εἰπὼν αὐτῷ, ἂν γὰρ, καὶ καλῶν σπόρων ἐτειχίσας ἐν τῷ οὐράρχῳ, 

4 πόθεν οὖν ἔχει τὰ ζυζάνα; 28. οὐ γὰρ αὐτῶς, ἐξηρᾶτο ἄρρημα 

5 τοῦτο ἐποίησεν, οὐ δὲ δοῦλοι εἰπὼν αὐτῷ, ἐκλέσεις οὖν ἐπελάβατο 

6 συλλέξωμεν αὐτά; 29. οὐ γὰρ ἐφί, οὐ μέχρι ταῦτα συλλέγοντες τα 

7 ξυζάνα, ἐπειδὴ ἔχει αὐτῶς τοῖς ζυζάνοις. 30. ἂν ἄρα συνανάλογη 

8 οὕτως καὶ καλῶν καὶ καλῶν σπόρων ἐτειχίσας ἐν τῷ οὐράρχῳ, 

9 καὶ ἐν τῷ οὐράρχῳ, καὶ θερμοί τοῖς θερμοίς, καὶ πρῶτο τὰς ζυζάνας, καὶ ἴσης ἄρτα 

10 ἐξερράζοντο τοὺς κατακαίνοντας αὐτὰ τοῖς ζυζάνοις, ἢ γὰρ ἄρτα τοῖς πρῶτοις, 

11 οὖν ζυζάνα, καὶ ἐπειδὴ ἔχει αὐτῶς τοῖς ζυζάνοις. 30. ἂν ἄρα συνανάλογη 

12 καὶ καλῶν καὶ καλῶν σπόρων ἐτειχίσας ἐν τῷ οὐράρχῳ, 

13 καὶ ἐν τῷ οὐράρχῳ, καὶ θερμοί τοῖς θερμοίς, καὶ πρῶτο τὰς ζυζάνας, καὶ ἴσης ἄρτα. 

14 εἰς τὴν ἀποθήκην μου." 

---

1 The art. το Ν in T.R. (H.LX) is wanting in ΝΒCD al.

2 B omits δοῦλοι (W.H.) and BC have αὐτοῦ λεγοντος for αὐτὸν αὐτῷ (T.R.).

3 ΝΔ have λεγ. αὐτῷ (Tisch.).

4 φην εἰς ΝΒ.

5 BD have ἔνα, which W.H. adopt, putting ἔνα and μένα in margin.

6 τοῦ (in ΝΝΤ) is omitted in most uncials.

7 ΝΕ omitted in ΝΧΑ and bracketed in W.H.

8 B has συναγάγετε (W.H. with συναγάγετε in margin).

—ζυζάνα = bastard wheat, darnel, *lofium temulatum*, common in Palestine (Furrer, *Wanderungen*, p. 293), perhaps a Semitic word. Another name for the plant in Greek is ἀλσά (Suidas, Lex.).—Ver. 26. 

—σφον, ἐπίθετον, not distinguishable in the blade, not till it reached the ear, then easily so by the form, the ear branching out with pickles on each twig (Koetsveld, *De Getijde*, p. 25).—Ver. 27. σφον καὶ σφον, ἐπίθετα τοὺς ἐν παιδίων, ἐπίθετα τοὺς τοὺς τοὺς τοὺς τοὺς τοὺς τοὺς τοὺς τοὺς τοὺς τοὺς τοὺς τοὺς τοὺς τοὺς τοὺς τοὺς τοὺς τοὐς τοὺς τοisnan:

—το ΝΔ is wanting in ΝΒCD al.

2 B omits δοῦλοι (W.H.) and BC have αὐτοῦ λεγοντος for αὐτὸν αὐτῷ (T.R.).

3 BD have ἔνα, which W.H. adopt, putting ἔνα and μένα in margin.

4 τοῦ (in ΝΝΤ) is omitted in most uncials.

5 ΝΕ omitted in ΝΧΑ and bracketed in W.H.

6 B has συναγάγετε (W.H. with συναγάγετε in margin).

---

The art. το Ν in T.R. (H.LX) is wanting in ΝΒCD al.

B BD have ἔνα, which W.H. adopt, putting ἔνα and μένα in margin.

τοῦ (in ΝΝΤ) is omitted in most uncials.

Ε omitted in ΝΧΑ and bracketed in W.H.

B has συναγάγετε (W.H. with συναγάγετε in margin).
in the synagogue and to the people used more or less the parabolic method. To this extent it may be literally true that "without a parable He spake not unto them" (ver. 34).

Ver. 31. συνάπτεις: from σύναπτω, late for συναπτω in Attic, which Phryn. recommends to be used instead (Lobeck, 288).—Ver. 32. θεός, neuter, by attraction of σωφρόνες, instead of δειν in agreement with κόκκινος, masculine. —μοιράτωρ, not less perhaps than all the seeds in the world. An American correspondent sent me a sample of the seeds of the cotton tree, which he thinks Christ would have made the basis of His parable had He been familiar with it. —μοιράτωρ των λαχανίων, greater than (all) the herbs. The comparison implies that it too is an herb. There would be no point in the statement that a plant of the nature of a tree grew to be greater than all garden herbs. This excludes the mustard tree, called Salvadora Persica, to which some have thought the parable refers.—δαφνός, not in nature but in size; an excusable exaggeration in a popular discourse. Koetsveld remarks on the greatly increased growth attained by a plant springing from a single seed with plenty of room all round it (De Geijl, p. 50).—ὅταν here indicates at once tendency and result, large enough to make that possible, and it actually happened. The birds haunted the plant like a tree or shrub. Mark refers only to the possibility (iv. 32).—κατασκευῆς (cf. κατασκευής, viii. 20), not nidulati, to make nests (Erasmus), but to "lodge," as in A. V. The mustard plant is after all of humble size, and gives a very modest idea of the growth of the kingdom. But it serves admirably to express the thought of a growth beyond expectation. Who would expect so tiny a seed to produce such a large herb, a monster in the garden?—Ver. 33. ὀφειλε ... ἡμῖν, like in respect of pervasive influence. In Rabbinical theology leaven was used as an emblem of evil desire (Weber, p. 221). Jesus had the courage to use it as an emblem of the best thing in the world, the Kingdom of God coming into the heart of the individual and the community.—αὐτοῖς, hid by the process of kneading.—ἐκείνη ὡς ἐκομμένη; ἡ ἐκομμένη with the indicative, referring to an actual past occurrence.

Both these parables show how thoroughly Jesus was aware that great things grow from minute beginnings. How different His idea of the coming of the kingdom from the current one of a glorious, mighty empire coming suddenly, full grown! Instead of that a mustard seed, a little leaven!

Vv. 34, 35 contain a reflection more suitable for the close of the collection of parables in this chapter, brought in here apparently because the evangelist has
under his eye Mark’s narrative, in which a similar reflection is attached to the parable of the mustard seed (iv. 33-34).—Ver. 34. χειρὶ παραβολῆς, etc.: if this remark apply to Christ’s popular preaching generally, then the parables reported, like the healing narratives, are only a small selection from a large number, a fragrant posy culled from the flower garden of Christ’s parabolic wisdom.—έλθαμεν: imperfect, pointing to a regular practice, not merely to a single occasion.—Ver. 35. Prophetic citation from Ps. lxviii. 2, suggested by παραβολῆς in Sept., second clause, free translation from Hebrew.—ἐρέθισαν in Sept. for òβρυζεν in Ps. xix. 2, etc. (not in lxviii. 2), a poetic word in Ionic form, bearing strong, coarse meaning; used in softened sense in Hellenistic Greek. Chief value of this citation: a sign that the parabolic teaching of Jesus, like His healing ministry, was sufficiently outstanding to call for recognition in this way. Vv. 36-43. Interpretation of the Tares. Not in Apostolic Document; style that of evangelist; misses the point of the parable—so Weiss (Matt.-Evang., p. 351). But if there was any private talk between Jesus and the Twelve as to the meaning of His parables, this one was sure to be the subject of conversation. It is more abstruse than the Sower, its lesson deeper, the fact it points to more mysterious. The interpretation given may of course be very freely reproduced.—Ver. 36. φράσων (διασφάσων ΝΒ) again in xv. 15: observe the unceremonious style of the request, indicative of intimate familiar relations. Hesychius gives as equivalents for φράσων, διευκρινούσα, σημαίνω, λέγω, etc.—διασφάσω. In Deut. i. 5 = make clear, a stronger expression.—Ver. 37. οὐ παρέλαβον: identified here with the Son of man (not so in interpretation of Sower).—οι κόσμοι, the wide world; universalism.—Ver. 38. σκέφτομαι, not the word this time, but the children of the kingdom.—εἰς τὴν ζωὴν τῶν μείζων, the end of the world; phrase peculiar to this Gospel.—τοποθετήσω εἰς τὴν ἑώρακαν ζωὴννομος, the end of the world; phrase peculiar to this Gospel.—τοποθετήσω εἰς τὴν ἑώρακαν ζωὴνπροσφυγέων ΝΒ have διασφάσησον. φράσων probably comes from xv. 15.  

Transcribed from a page of a document containing text in Greek, with annotations and translations in English. The text appears to be a biblical passage, likely from the Gospel of Matthew, discussing the parable of the mustard seed and other parables. The annotations provide commentary on the text, discussing its context and interpretation. The document is part of a larger collection, possibly a commentary or study on the New Testament.
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βραγμός τῶν ὀβώντων.  43. τότε οἱ δίκαιοι ἐκλάμψασιν ὡς ὁ ἡλιός ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῶν. Ο ἡλιός δέν ἑαυτοῦ ἀκούεται.

44. "Πάλιν ὁμοία ὡς ἡ βασιλεία τῶν ὀφραίων θησαυρὸς ekphrasménon ἐν τῇ ἀγρῷ, δι' ἐν δοῦν ἀνθρώποις ἐχρύψει, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς καράς αὐτῶν ὑπάγει, καὶ πάντα δοῦ ἢ λεί πωλεῖ, καὶ ἀγοράζει τῶν ἄγρων ἑκείνων.

45. "Πάλιν ὁμοία ὡς ἡ βασιλεία τῶν ὀφραίων ἀνθρώπος έκφρασε ημβολούς καὶ λαῦμα μαργαρίτας. 46. δι' ἐν δοῦν ἀνθρώποις ἐχρυψει, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς καράς αὐτῶν ὑπάγει, καὶ πάντα δοῦ ἢ λεί πωλεῖ, καὶ ἀγοράζει τῶν ἄγρων ἑκείνων.


1 ΝΒ omit ἐκχοών.
8 BD omit πωλεῖ.
* πωλεῖ before πάντα in ΝΒ. B gives πωλεῖ the same position but omits πάντα. So W.H. with πάντα in margin.
3 ΝΒ omit. W.H. relegate to margin.
* ευφρά το in ΝΒDL verss. (Tisch., W.H.).

here, because the gnashing of teeth is caused by cold, not by fire (Holtz., H. C.); appropriate in viii. 12, where the doom is rejection into the outer darkness.—Ver. 43. ἐκλάμψασιν: vide Dan. xii. 2, which seems to be in view; an expressive word suggestive of the sun emerging from behind a cloud. The mixture of good and evil men in this world hides the characters of both.

Vv. 44-53. Three other parables: the Treasure, the Pearl, the Net. Ver. 36 would seem to imply that the evangelist took these as spoken only to disciples in the house. But as the Net is closely connected in meaning with the Tares, it is more probable that these parables also are extracts from popular discourses of Jesus, which, like all the others, would gain greatly if seen in their original setting. The Treasure and the Pearl would have their fitting place in a discourse on the kingdom of God as the highest good (Mt. vi. 33).

—Ver. 44. ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ: the article may be generic, indicating the field as the locality, as distinct from other places where treasures were deposited.—ἐχρύψει, he hid once more what some one had previously hidden; the occurrence common, the occasions various.—καράς αὐτῶν, in his joy rather than through joy over it, as many take the genitive, though both are admissible. The joy natural in a poor peasant; not less so the cunning procedure it inspired; ethically questionable, but parables are not responsible for the morality of their characters.—ὑπάγει, πωλεῖ, etc., four historic presents one after the other, in sympathy with the finder, and with lively effect.—πάντα δοῦ all required for the purpose, yet the all might not amount to much: the field minus the treasure of no great value. Worth while, the treasure being a pure gain. The point of the parable is that the kingdom of heaven outweighs in value all else, and that the man who understands this will with pleasure part with all. It helps to show the reasonableness of the sacrifice for the kingdom Jesus demanded.

Ver. 45. ἡμβολοῦς ζ. κ. μ. A pearl merchant who went to the pearl fisheries to purchase from the divers, of course selecting the best; a connoisseur in valuables.—Ver. 46. πολλὰς: precious because exceptionally large, well-shaped, and pure; such rare, but met with now and then.—ἀκβολοῦν: he is taken by surprise, has not as much with him as will purchase it on the spot, sees it is worth his whole stock, agrees to buy and promises to return with the price.—τέπνακα, ἡφάσσαι, a perfect with an aorist. Not to be disposed of by saying that the former is an "aoristic" perfect (Burton, § 88).—τέπνακα points to a momentous step, taken once for all and having lasting effects. A great venture, a risky speculation. The treasure in the field was a sure gain for the finder, but it remained to be seen what the pearl merchant would get for his one pearl. After the sale of his stock the purchase of the one pearl was a matter of course. In the former of
these two parables the Kingdom of Heaven appears as the object of a glad though accidental finding of a sure possession; in the latter as the object of systematic quest and venturesome faith. The difference between seekers and finders must not be exaggerated. The pearl merchant was also a finder. No one would set out on a journey to seek one unique pearl (Koetsveld). The spiritual class he represents are seekers after God and wisdom, finders of the Kingdom of God, of a good beyond their hope. Such seekers, however, are on the sure way to find. 

Vv. 47-50. The Net. οὐ παράθεται γίνοντας σωμ.: a matter of course, not intended but inevitable; large movements influence all sorts of people.—Ver. 48. καθιστάτων συνάπλεξαν: equally a matter of course; a thing to be done deliberately, of which the sitting attitude is an emblem. There is a time for everything; the time for sorting is at the end of the fishing.—συσπάσας, vide on vii. 17. Vv. 49, 50 contain the interpretation in much the same terms as in 41, 42.

Vv. 51, 52. Conclusion of the parabola collection.—Ver. 52 contains an important logion of Jesus preserved by Matthew only, and connected by him with the parabolic teaching of Jesus. In this connection καὶ η ἐκβάλλει of course points to the use of the old familiar facts of nature to illustrate newly revealed truths of the kingdom. But we should not bind ourselves too strictly to this connection, keeping in mind Matthew's habit of grouping; all the more that, as Wendt has pointed out (Die Lehre Jesu, ii. 349), the idea expressed by γραμματεύεις does not get justice. It naturally points to acquaintance with the O. T., and combined with μαθητεύεις μ. o. b. teaches that that knowledge may be usefully united with discipleship in the lore of the kingdom. In Wendt's words: "One remains in possession of the old, recognised as of permanent value, yet is not restricted to it, but along with it possesses a precious new element".—μαθητεύεις is here used transitively as in xxvii. 19, Acts xiv. 21.—ἐκβάλλει points to free distribution of treasures by the householder. He gives out new or old according to the nature of the article. The mere scribe, Rabbinical in spirit, produces only the old and stale. The disciple of the kingdom, like the Master, is always fresh-minded, yet knows how to value all old spiritual treasures of Holy Writ or Christian tradition.

Vv. 53-58. Visit to Nazareth (Mk. vi. 1-6, cf. Lk. iv. 16-30). In Mk. this is the next section after the parables, deducting what had previously been reported in Mt. (chaps. viii. and ix.), a pretty sure sign that our evangelist has Mk. under his eye. We can here see how he handles his source—substantial reproduction of the contents, no slavish copying of style, editorial discretion in reporting certain details. No attempt should be made to connect with the foregoing passage, except perhaps by
the general category of prevalent un-  
receptivity to which also the following  
narrative (xiv. 1-12) may be relegated.—  
Ver. 53. μετέρησαν: in classics to transfer  
something from one place to another.  
Hellenistic, intransitive = to remove one-  
self; one of Matthew's words (xiv. 1).—  
Ver. 54. παραβίας, in classics father-  
land. Here and in parallels evidently =  
native town, home. Vida ver. 56 and  
Lk. iv. 16.—συναγωνία, singular, not  
plural, as in Vulgate. One syn. index  
of size of town (Grotius).—Σοφία, with  
infinitive: tendency and actual result.  
They were astonished and said: πόθεν  
... δυνάμεις, wisdom and marvellous  
works; of the latter they had heard,  
of the former they had had a sample.  
When that is the question; not from  
schools, the parentage, family,  
social environment, or mere surround-  
ings and circumstances of any kind.—  
Ver. 55. ὁ τ. πέντεν άλογο: Mk. has  
ὁ τέκτων, which our evangelist avoids;  
the son of the carpenter, one only in the  
town, well known to all.—Μαρία,  
Ιάκωβος, etc., names given of mother  
and brothers, to show how well they  
know the whole family. And this other  
man just come back is simply another of  
the family whose name happens to be  
Jesus. Why should He be so different?  
It is an absurdity, an offence, not to be  
commonplace. The irritation of the  
Nazareans is satisfactory evidence of the  
extraordinary in Jesus.—Ver. 57. Proverb,  
not Jewish merely, but common property  
of mankind; examples from Greek and  
Roman authors in Pniceaus and Wetstein,  
including one from Pindar about fame  
fading at the family hearth (Olymp. Ode,  
xii. 3).—Ver. 58. Here also editorial  
discretion is at work. Mark states that  
Jesus was not able to work miracles in  
Nazareth, and that He marvelled at their  
unbelief. Matthew changes this into a  
statement that He did few miracles there  
because of their unbelief, and passes  
over the marvelling in silence.  

CHAPTER XIV. DEATH OF THE  
BAPTIST: COMMENCEMENT OF A NEW  
DIVISION OF THE EVANGELIC HISTORY.  
Vv. 1-12. Death of the Baptist (Mk.  
vi. 14-29, Lk. ix. 7-9). This section  
might with advantage have been given  
as a short chapter by itself, and a new  
start made with the feeding of the  
thousands which forms the first of a  
series of narratives together giving the  
story of the later Galilean ministry (xiv.  
13—xx. 16). In this section (1-12)  
Matthew still has his eye on Mark, the  
story of the fate of the Baptist being  
there the next after the section in  
reference to mother and brethren,  
excepting the mission of the Twelve  
(Mk. vi. 7-13) already related in Mt. (x.  
5-15). Indeed from this point onwards  
Matthew follows Mark's order. In the  
 foregoing part of this Gospel the  
parallelism between it and Mark has  
been disturbed by the desire of the  
evangelist to draw largely on his other  
source, the Logia, and introduce teaching  
materials bearing on all the topics  
suggested in his introductory sketch of  
Christ's early Galilean ministry: Didache,  
chap. v.-vii.; apostolic mission (iv. 18-
theory begotten of remorse; odd enough, but better than Pharisaic one begotten of malevolence; both witnessing to the extraordinary in Christ's career. —δια τοῦτο: the living John did no miracles, but no saying what a dead one redivivus can do?—ἐνεργοῦσιν, not: he does the mighty works, but: the powers (ἐνεργεῖα) work in him, the powers of the invisible world, vast and vague in the king's imagination.

Ver. 3. γὰρ implies that the following story is introduced to make the king's theory intelligible. "Risen" implies previous death, and how that came about must be told to show the psychological genesis of the theory. It is the superstitious idea of a man who has murder on his conscience.—κρατῆσαι, etc.: fact referred to already in iv. 12, xi. 2; here the reason given. Of course Herod seized, bound, and imprisoned John through his agents.—διὰ Ἰωάννης: a woman here, as so often, the cause of the tragedy.—γυναῖκα ἤδ.: vide on Mk.

Ver. 4. ἤλεγ γὰρ ὃ ἴ. The progressive imperfect, with force of a pluperfect. John had been saying just before he was apprehended (Burton, Moods and Tenses, § 29).—οὐκ ἐξετάν: doubly unlawful; as adultery, and as marriage within prohibited degrees (Lev. xviii. 16, xx. 21).—Ver. 5. θαλαπ.: cf. l. 19. Mark gives a fuller statement as to Herod's feelings towards John. No injustice is done Herod here by ascribing to him a wish to get rid of John. There are always mixed feelings in such cases. Compare the relations of Alcibiades to Socrates as described by Plato (Ζωικ. ψωτ.):—ἰφοβίθη τ. θ.: that for one
thing; also feared God and his conscience a little, not enough. It is well when lawless men in power fear anything. — δὲ ... ἐξῆγεν: they took John to be, regarded him as, a prophet. ἐξῆγεν does not by itself mean to hold in high esteem (in pretio habere, Kypke). The point is that John for the people passed for a prophet, belonged to a class commanding religious respect (so Fritzsche, Meyer, etc.). Vide xxxi. 46.

Ver. 6. γενεσίως γενομένως: one expects the genitive absolute as in T.R., which just on that account is to be suspected. The date of time. But cf. Mk. vi. 21, where we have γενομένως and γενεσίως occurring together, and vide Weiss, Mk.-Evang., p. 221, on the literary connection between the two texts. Most commentators take γενεσίως as referring to Herod's birthday. Some, e.g., Grotius, think of the anniversary of the accession to the throne = birthday of his reign. In classic Greek it means a feast in honour of the dead on their birthday, γενέθλιον being the word for a birthday feast, vide Lobeck, Phryn., 103. Loesner, Observ. ad N. T. c. Phil. Alex., cites instances from Phil. of the use of both words in the sense of a birthday feast. — ἤ δὲ γενεσίως τ. Ἰωάννου: Salome by name. — ἐν τῷ μέσῳ, implies a festive assembly, as fully described in Mk. — Ver. 7. ἐμφάλλοντος, confessed by oath; obligation to keep a promise previously given. Cf. Mk. vi. 23, where the fact is more fully stated. The account in Matt. seems throughout secondary. — Ver. 8. προβιβασοῦσα: not “before instructed,” as in A. V., but “brought to this point”; urged on. It should require a good deal of “educating” to bring a young girl to make such a grim request. But she had learnt her lesson well, and asked the Baptist's head, as if she had been asking a favourite dish (δἐ περὶ τὸν κύριον ἐδόματο διαλειμομένη, Chrys., Hom. xlviii.). Kypke cites two instances of the rare use of the word in the sense of instruction. — δὲ here and now, on the spot. ἰδὼν χυτός in Mk. That was an essential part of the request. No time must be left for repentance. If not done at once under the influence of wine and the momentary gratification given by the voluptuous dance, it might never be done at all. This implies that the feast was at Machaerus, where there was a palace as well as a fortress. — Ver. 9. λυπηθεῖς: participle used concessively, though grieved he granted the request; the grief quite compatible with the truculent wish in ver. 5. — βασιλεῖς: only by courtesy. — ἐπικεφαλίζω, plural, singular in ver. 7; spoken in passion, more like profane swearing than deliberate utterance once for all of a solemn oath. — Ver. 10. ἐπικεφαλίζω: expressive word, all too clear in meaning, though not found in Attic usage, or apparently
much used at all; a plebeian word according to Salmesius, cited by Kypke, who gives instances from late authors.—Ver. 12. προδότης; not expressly said "there and then," but all points to immediate production of the head on a platter in the banqueting hall before the guests; gruesome sight!—διῆξαν, δέχονται: what a nerve the girl must have had! her mother's nature in her; the dancing and the cool acceptance of the horrible gift well matched.—σαρώτα: not to be taken strictly: a young unmarried woman, say, of twenty (Holtz., H. C.).

The dancing of a mere girl would have been no entertainment to the sensual revellers. The treat lay in the indecency. —Ver. 12. στόμα: carcase, used absolutely in this sense only in late writers. Earlier writers would say στομα νεκρού. Lobeck, Phryn., 375.

Vv. 13-21. *Jesus retires; feeding of thousands* (Mk. vi. 30-44; Lk. ix. 10-17).

—Ver. 13. ἀκόνοσα, having heard of the fate of John from John's disciples (ver. 12). ξεκίνη: withdraw from where He was when the report reached Him; locality not indicated. Mark connects the retirement with the return of the Twelve from their mission, and the report they gave, and assigns as motive rest for the missionaries. The two events might synchronise, and escape from Herod's dangerous neighbourhood might be a joint motive for retirement. But against this is the speedy return (ver. 34).—ἐν πλω: naturally suggests a place near the sea as starting-point. But it may be rather intended to indicate in what direction they were going—to the eastern side of the lake.—εἰς τ. καιρ' Ιησοῦ. These phrases have certainly more point in Mk. as referring to a multitude from which they wished to escape.—οἱ γλασ: no previous mention of the crowds, and no hint that Jesus wished to get away from them; looks like a digest of a fuller narrative, such as that in Mk.—πετάξα (or πεταλ), on foot, but not implying that all literally walked; there were sick among them who could not. The contrast is between going by sea and going by land. Cf. Acts xx. 13.

Classical instances in philological commentaries (Wetstein, Kypke, Elsner, etc.).—Ver. 14. ἔξελθων, in this place, naturally means going forth from His retreat, in Mk. (vi. 34) going out of the ship, the crowd having arrived on the spot before Him. To escape from the people always difficult, now apparently more than ever. Evidently a time of special excitement, popularity at its height, though according to Fourth Gospel about to undergo a speedy decline.—ἐπιλαγχητής: deponent passive, pitied; Hellenistic, and based on the Hebrew idea of the bowels as the seat of compassion; used by Symmachus in translation of Deut. xiii. 9.—ἐπιλαγχητής: Mark gives prominence to the element of instruction; healing alone mentioned here.

Vv. 15-21. *The feeding.* —Ver. 15. ἔφαγα γενομένης: might mean as in viii. 16, but from the nature of the case must mean afternoon from 3 to 6, the first of the "two evenings".—ἐρημός, comparatively uninhabited, no towns near.—ἡ ἡμέρα ἡ ἐπαρχία, the meaning not clear. Mk. has: ἡ ἡμέρα ἡ παρειπή = already the hour is advanced. Various suggestions have been made: eating time (Grot.), healing and teaching time (Fritzsche), daytime (Meyer) is past. Weiss, with most probability, takes ἡμέρα
a'tois thetai phagein." 17. Oi de lagenon aut'ha, "Ouki eixeien o'de
el m' st' atrotos kai th idia." 18. Oi de elpe, "Thretai mo
atrotos o'de." 19. Kai keleu'sa tode thelou's anaklyhe'the eite tode
char'tous,2 kai 2 la benign tode st' atrotos kai tode th idia,
analh'sas eis to o'de'na, = ellogh'sen kai = kalasas dieke tois
Ch xvi. 19. ma'rai tode atrotos, oj de mabai tode thelou's. 20. kai exe
pantes, kai exeosth'he'san kai he'ran to perusooion tois klasmatai,
dede'kei koi'nous plh'reis. 21. oj de apostol'sen he'san andres eite
pepantios'lymai, xhros gynai'kion kai pai'diai. 22. Kai edos
24 elpe'san o' he'sous 4 tode ma'rai tode aut'5 eis to plh'ou,
kai 6 prode'gein aut'ous eis to perai, eis oj apo'th'ise tode thelou's.
23. kai apo'th'ise tode thelou's, asth eis to de'ros kai' idia.

1 de autovs ou 2 in XBZ. 8 NBC have ep tow char'ton; D the sing.
also, but accus.
2 BLAS omit kai. 4 o l. wanting in XBCDAE.
3 Most uncials omit, but BXX retain autov.
4 B and several cursives (1, 33, 124) omit to. W.H. place in margin.

= time for sending them away to get
food.— andh'os: though late for the
purpose, not too late; dismiss them forth-
with.— Ver. 18. oth exe'len fge'nov
anaple'sin, etc.: even if, as some think,
what happened was that under the
moral influence of Jesus the people
present generously made the provisio,
they had brought with them available
for the company at large, the character of
Jesus appears here in a commanding
light. No situation appears to Him
desperate, no crisis unmanageable.
No need to go. Give ye them to eat,
resources will be forthcoming (cf. Exod.
xiv. 15). And they were, how we cannot
tell. The story is a fact supported by
these were all four evangelists, not
a baseless legend, or a religious allegory.
— Ver. 17. pente' atrotos k. 8. ly.
A very modest supply even for the
disciple circle. They seem, under the
influence of Jesus, to have been a care-free
company, letting to-morrow look after itself.
"Learn the philosophy of the Twelve,
and how they despaired food. Being
twelve they had only so much, and they
readily gave up these" (Chrysos., H.
xix.). Five loaves and two fishes, all
that was known to be in that vast
gathering.— Ver. 18. fere'me, etc.: 
Christ's imperial way in critical situa-
tions often arrests attention. "Stretch
forth thine hand" (xii. 13). "Bring
them hither to me."— Ver. 19. kala'sin,
la'ben, analh'sin, participles without
copula all leading up to ello'gh'sen, the
central chief action: rapid, condensed
narrative, briefly, simply, recounting an
amazing event.— ello'gh'sen with accusa-
tive (atrotos) understood. He blessed
the loaves and fishes.— kai kalasas
dieke, then dividing them gave them
to the disciples, who in turn gave to the
multitude.— tis ligo' kai tis elo'gh'sen
adv'n kal kai plh'nous atrotos, Origen.
— Ver. 20. dide'kei koi'nous plh.'la is in appos.
with to perusooioin t. k. They took
the surplus of the broken pieces to the
extent of twelve baskets.— koi'nous,
answering to the Rabbinical 2
basket of considerable size ("ein grosses
Behaletttniss, Wunsche). Each of the
Twelve had one. The word recalls the
well-known line of Juvenal (Sat. iii. 14):
"Judaeas, quorum copinus soeneumque
suppellex," on which and its bearing on
this place vide Schottgen (Hor. Tal.) and
Elsner.— Ver. 21. pepantios'lymai, 5000
men, not counting women and children.
This helps us to attach some definite
meaning to the elastic words, 2
delta, so frequently occurring in the
Gospels. Doubtless this was an excep-
tionally great gathering, yet the inference
seems legitimate that 2 delta meant
hundreds, and 2 polw delta thousands.
Vv. 22-36. The return voyage (Mk.
v. 45-56).— Ver. 22. fega'nas a
strong word needing an explanation not
here given, supplied in John vi. 15. Of
course there was no physical compulsion,
but there must have been urgency on
Christ's part, and unwillingness on the part
of disciples. Fritzsche objects to special
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proseudoxai. Ὠψίας δὲ γενομένης, μόνος ἦν ἐκεῖ. 24. τὸ δὲ

(there of the men, here of the ship) τῆς νυκτὸς ἀνήλθε 2 πρὸς αὐτὸς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, 3 περιταξάν ἐπὶ τῆς

βασανίζουσιν ὄπω τῶν κυμάτων ἢ γὰρ ἐναντίος ἡ ἀμφότερος. 25. ἡ τετάρτη ἡ φωλιὰ

καὶ ἴδιστες αὐτῶν οἱ μαθηταὶ ἐπὶ τῇ θάλασσῃ 6

περιπατεῖν ἐπὶ τῇ θάλασσῃ, λέγοντες, "Ὅταν ὁ βάρσος ἔστιν.

καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ φόβου ἔκραξαν. 27. εὐθείας 7 ἢ ἐλάχιστον αὐτοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς 8 λέγων, "᾽Ὑπερτερεῖ ἐγώ ἐμμ, μὴ φοβεῖσθε." 28. Ἀποκρι-

θέα ποτε ἢ ἂνταὶ ὁ Πέτρος ἔπε τῇ κῆρυτί, εἶ ὤ τοι, κηλευόν ὑμᾶς πρὸς τὸ ἐλθεῖν ἐπὶ τὰ βάτατα. 29. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν, "Εὐθεία." Καὶ καταβάς

ἀπὸ τοῦ πλοίου ὁ Πέτρος περιπατήσας ἐπὶ τὰ βάτατα, ἐλθεῖν ἐπὶ T.R.

1 For μεσον . . . τῆς γῆς αὐτοῖς, αὐτοῦ ἤ ἐκεί, ὁ B. some vers. and minuss. have here σταθεῖς τολμᾶν εἰς τῆς γῆς αὐτοῖς, which W. H. adopt, putting the reading of T. R. in margin. It is

the undisputed reading in Mk. 2 ἐλθὼν in NBD vers. 3 Omit o l. NBD. 4 ἘΒΑΘ several cursive have the accus. here. 5 o e ὁ μαθητας a. in BD.

6 τῆς θάλασσῃς in NBD. 7 εὑρέθη in NBD here as always in Mk., whence it may have come. In Mk. this is a standing variation. It need not be again referred to.

8 o l. before αὐτοὺς in B, omitted in NBD, bracketed in W. H. 9 The order of words varies here. W. H., after B, have αὐτοῖς. ὁ Π. εἰπεν α. 10 Ὁ NBDCAÉ many cursive have ἐλθεῖν προς στ. 11 Art. omitted in NBD.

emphasis, and renders: "actus fuit discipulis, ut navem conscenderent." — ὅσως ὁ ἄνθρωπος, subjunctive, here used where optative would be used in classic Greek. Cf. xviii. 30, and vide Burton, § 324.—Ver. 23. ἀφέθη εἰς τὸ δρόμον. After dismissing the crowd Jesus retired into the mountainous country back from the shore, glad to be alone—καί ἔδιε, even to be rid of the Twelve for a season.

—Procemjzσαι: "Good for prayer the mountain, and the night, and the soli-

tude (μόνωσις), affording quiet, freedom from distraction (ὡς ἄνεργον, and calm)" (Euthy. Zig.) —δύσεις ὁμ. refers, of course, to a later hour than in ver. 15. —Ver. 24. μᾶκαρ, an adjective agreeing with πλοῖον (Winer, § 54, 6), signifies not merely in the middle strictly, but any appreciable distance from shore. Pricaeus gives examples of such use. But the reading of B, probably to be preferred, implies that the boat was many stadii (25 or 30, John vi. 19 = 3 to 4 miles) from the eastern shore.—ὅπω τῶν πυριτῶν: not in Mk., and goes without saying; when there are winds there will be waves.—ἀναφέρει ὁ ἄμμος: what wind? From what quarter blowing?

What was the starting-point, and the

destination? Holtz. (H. C.) suggests that the voyage was either from Bethsaida to the mouth of the upper Jordan to the north-western shore, or from the south end of the plain el-Batia towards Bethsaida, at the north end, citing Furrer in support of the second alternative, vide in Mk.—Ver. 25. τετάρτης φυλ. 3 to 6, in the early morning, πρω. τ. θ.: the readings in this and the next verse vary between genitive and accusative. The sense is much the same. The evangelist means to represent Jesus as really walking on the sea, not on the land above the sea level (Paulus, Schenkel). Holtz. (H. C.) regarding it as a legend, refers to O. T. texts in which God walks on the sea.—Ver. 26. φάντασια: a little touch of

sailor superstition natural in the circum-

stances; presupposes the impression that they saw something walking on the sea. —Ver. 27. Ἐλάχιστος, Jesus spoke; the words given (ὑπερτερεῖ, etc.), but the mere sound of His voice would be enough.

Vv. 28-32. Peter-episode, peculiar to Mt. The story is true to the character

Digitized by Google
of Peter.—Ver. 30. 

30. **bλέπων τὸν ἄνεμον** seeing the wind, that is, the effects of it. It is one thing to see a storm from the deck of a stout ship, another to see it in midst of the waves. **καταπτοντὶς θισίας** he walked at first, now he begins to sink; so at the final crisis, so at Antioch (Gal. ii. 11), so probably all through. A strange mixture of strength and weakness, bravery and cowardice; a man of generous impulses rather than of constant firm will.

"Peter walked on the water but feared the wind: such is human nature, often achieving great things, and at fault in little things." — (πολλάκις τὰ μεγάλα καταρθοῦσα, ἐν τοῖς ἐλάστοις ἐλθέται, Chrys., H. 1.).—Ver. 32. **διότατος** again in xxviii. 17, nowhere else in N. T., from δι', double, hence to be of two minds, to doubt (cf. δίσκονος, James i. 8).—

**ἀναβαστὼν αὐτῷ** Jesus and Peter.—

**ἐκπέπαυσεν** used in narrative of first seance of Mk., iv. 39 = exhausted itself (from κόπος).—Ver. 33. **οἷς ἐν τῷ πόλει** cf. οἷς ἄνθρωποι in vii. 27; presumably the disciples alone referred to.—

**δυσμᾶς** 34, a great advance on σωτηρία (vii. 27). The question it implies now settled: Son of God.

Vv. 34-36. **Safe arrival.**

**διαπεράσατος** having covered the distance between the place where Jesus joined them and the shore.—ἐν τῷ γῆς: they got to land; the general fact important after the storm.—*εἰς Γεννησαρῆτης* more definite indication of locality, yet not very definite; a district, not a town, the rich plain of Gennesaret, four miles long and two broad.—Ver. 35. **καὶ ἀκινητός** etc.: again popular excitement with its usual concomitants. The men of the place, when they recognised who had landed from the boat, sent round the word: Jesus has come! They bring their sick to Him to be healed.—Ver. 36. **παρεκάλουν** etc.: they have now unbounded confidence in Christ’s curative powers; think it enough to touch (μῶνον ἐφώνησεν) the hem of His mantle.—**διενώθησαν**: they are not disappointed; the touch brings a complete cure (ἐθάλάσσων) The expression, δοκεῖ ψάνετο, implies that all who were cured touched: that was the uniform means, Mk.’s expression, δοκεῖ ἐκ τῆς λαβάκεις that open.

**Chapter XV. Washing of Hands; Syrophænician Woman; Second Feeding.** The scene changes with dramatic effect from phenomenal popularity on the eastern shore, and in Gennesaret, to embittered ominous conflict with the jealous guardians of Jewish orthodoxy and orthopraxy. The relations between Jesus and the religious virtuosi are becoming more and more strained and the crisis cannot be far off. That becomes clear to Jesus now, if it was not before (xvi. 11).

Vv. 1-20. **Washing of hands** (Mk. vii. 1-23).—Ver. 1. **τῶν** connects naturally with immediately preceding narrative concerning the people of Gennesaret with unbounded faith in Jesus seeking healing by mere touch of His garment. Probably the one scene led to the other: growing popular enthusiasm deepening Pharisaic hostility.—**προσεύχονται (οἷς)** 31. If οἷς be omitted, the sense is that certain persons came to Jesus from Jerusalem. If it be retained, the sense is that certain persons belonging to Jerusalem came from it, the preposition εἰς being
changed into ἄδικα by attraction of the verb.—φαρ. καὶ γρ., usually named in inverse order, as in T.R. Our evangelist makes the whole party come from Jerusalem; Mk., with more probability, the scribes only. The guardians of tradition in the Capital have their evil eye on Jesus and co-operate with the provincial rigorists.—Ver. 2. διατόκοι μηθευς παραβας: no instance of offence specified in this case, as in ix. 10 and xii. 1. The zealots must have been making inquiries or playing the spy into the private habits of the disciple circle, seeking for grounds of fault-finding (cf. Mk. vii. 2).—παραβανουσι: strong word (Mk.'s milder), putting breach of Rabbinical rules on a level with breaking the greatest moral laws, as if the former were of equal importance with the latter. That they were was deliberately maintained by the scribes (vide Lightfoot).—τὴν παράδοσιν τ. π.: not merely the opinion, dogma, placitum, of the elders (Grotius), but opinion expressed ex cathedra, custom originated with authority by the ancients. The “rulers” here are not the living rulers of the people, but the past bearers of religious authority, the more remote the more venerable. The “tradition” was unwritten (ἐγγράφος διδασκαλία, Hesych.), the “law upon the lip” reaching back, like the written law (so it was pretended), to Moses. Baseless assertion, but believed; therefore to attack the παράδοσιν a Herculean, dangerous task. The assailants regard the act imputed as an unheard-of monstrous impiety. That is why they make a general charge before specifying the particular form under which the offence is committed, so giving the latter as serious an aspect as possible.—οὐ γὰρ νίκησαν, etc.: granting the fact it did not necessarily mean deliberate disregard of the tradition. It might be an occasional carelessness on the part of some of the disciples (τίμων, Mk. vii. 2) which even the offenders would not care to defend. A time-server might easily have evaded discussion by putting the matter on this ground. The Pharisees eagerly put the worst construction on the act, and Jesus was incapable of time-serving insincerity, thus conflict was inevitable.—νίκησαν, the proper word before meat, ἀνοικτονικίσαν, after, Elster, citing Athenaeus, lib. ix., cap. 18.—ἐρημώσαν, Hebrew idiom for taking food. The neglect charged was not that of ordinary cleanliness, but of the technical rules for securing ceremonial cleanness. These were innumerable and ridiculously minute. Lightfoot, referring to certain Rabbinical tracts, says: “lege, si vacat, et si per taeedium et nauseam potes”.

Vv. 3-6. Christ’s reply: consists of a counter charge and a prophetic citation (vv. 7-9) in the inverse order to that of Mk.—Ver. 3. καὶ γείας: the retort, if justifiable, the best defence possible of neglect charged = “we transgress the tradition because we want to keep the commands of God: choice lies between these; you make the wrong choice”. Grave issue raised; no compromise possible here.—δὲ γὰρ θέει: not rules made by the parties addressed (Weiss-Meyer), but the tradition which ye idolise, your precious paradosis.—Ver. 4. δὲ γὰρ θεός: counter charge substantiated. The question being the validity of the tradition and its value, its evil tendency might be illustrated at will in connection with any moral interest. It might have been illustrated directly in connection
with moral purity versus ceremonial. The actual selection characteristic of Jesus as humane, and felicitous as exceptionally clear.—τίμα 
... τελευτάτω 
... fifth commandment (Ex. xx. 12), with its penal sanction (Ex. xxii. 16).—Ver. 5 shows how that great law is compromised. 
... τίμη 
... ἡ λέγει; the emphatic antithesis of τίμη to θέλει, a pointed rebuke of their presumption. The scribes rival the Almighty in legislation. 
"Ye say": the words following give not the ἐπίσημα 
... of scribe-teaching or what they would acknowledge to be the drift of their teaching, but that drift as Jesus Himself understood it "This is what it comes to."—Διαφέρω "let it be a gift or offering devoted to God, to the temple, to religious purposes, i.e., a Corban (Mk. vii. 11); magic word releasing from obligation to show honour to parents in the practical way of contributing to their support. Of evil omen even when the "gift" was bond fide, as involving an artificial divorce between religion and morality; easily sliding into disingenuous pretext of vows to evade filial responsibilities; reaching the lowest depth of immorality when lawmakers and unfilial sons were in league for common pecuniary profit from the nefarious transaction. Were the faultfinders in this case chargeable with receiving a commission for trafficking in iniquitous legislation, letting sons off for a percentage on what they would have to give their parents? Origen, Jerome, Theophy., Lutteroth favour this view, but there is nothing in the text to justify it. Christ's charge is based on the practice specified even at its best: honest pleading of previous obligation to God as a ground for neglecting duty to parents. Lightfoot (Hor. Heb.) understands the law as meaning that the word Corban, even though profanely and heartlessly spoken, bound not to help parents, but did not bind really to give the property to sacred uses. "Ad dicanda sua in sacros usus per haec verba nullatenus tenet ab ad non juvandum patrem tenet au-tur indivisibiliter."—οὗ μὴ 
... he shall not honour = he is exempt from obligation to: such the rule in effect if not in words of the scribes in the case. The future here has the force of the imperative as often in the Sept. (vide Burton, M. and T., § 67). If the imperative meaning be denied, then οὗ μὴ 
... must be taken as a comment of Christ's. Ye say, "whosoever," etc.; in these circumstances of course he will not, etc. As the passage stands in T.R. the clause καὶ οὗ μὴ 
... belongs to the protasis, and the apodosis remains unexpressed = he shall be free, or guiltless, as in A. V.—Ver. 6. ἡκυρώσατο, ye invalidated, by making such a rule, the aorist pointing to the time when the rule was made. Or it may be a gnomic aorist: so ye are wont to, etc. The verb ἀκουράω belongs to later Greek, though Elsner calls the phrase "bene Graeca".—διὰ... ἰδίων: an account of your tradition, again to mark it as their idol, and as theirs alone, God having no part in it, though the Rabbis taught that it was given orally by God to Moses.—Ver. 7. ἡσυχασται: no thought of conciliation; open war at all hazards. "Actors," in their zeal for God, as illustrated in the case previously cited. God first, parents second, yet God not in all their thoughts—καὶ, appropriately, to the purpose. Isaiah might not be thinking of the Pharisees, but certainly the quotation is very felicitous in reference to them, exactly describing their religious character. Mt. follows Mk. in quoting;
neither follows closely the Sept. (Is. xxix. 13) Ver. 8. —BD and several cursive omis auth. —Instead of ὁ δὲ τωφλόν BDZ have τωφλόν ἐστιν ὁ δῆμος (W.H.). ฿ has the same inverted, ob. εἰς τῷ τῷ.

the ethical emphatically the law of God (τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ δίκαιον, ver. 3).—Ver. 11. Disciples sought impression made on Pharisees by the word spoken to the people. Not in Mark.—Ver. 12. ἐκκαθαριζόμενον: double offence—(1) appealing to the people at all; (2) uttering such a word revolutionary in character.—Ver. 13. ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς, etc.: the disciples were afraid, but Jesus was indignant, and took up high ground. ἰστελεχής, a plant, "not a wild flower but a cultivated plant" (Camb. G. T.), refers to the Rabbinical tradition; natural figure for doctrine, and so used both by Jesus and Greeks (vīde Schöttgen and Kypke). Kypke remarks: "pertinet hic parabola ἐπὶ τοῦ σωσίματος":—ὁ παῖς μου: the statement in the relative clause is really the main point, that the tradition in question was a thing with which God as Jesus conceived Him had nothing to do. This was the idea of God in the Corban tradition that His interest was antagonistic to that of humanity. In Christ's idea of God the two interests are coincident. This text should be set beside xii. 50, which might easily be misunderstood as teaching an opposite view.—ἐκκαθαρίζω: This is what will be, and what Jesus wishes and works for: uprooting, destruction, root and branch, no compromise, the thing wholly evil. The response of the traditionalists was crucifixion.—Ver. 14. ἐφεστὸς: the case hopeless, no reform possible; on the road to ruin. —ἐκκαθαρίζω: the reading in B is very laconic = blind men
are the leaders, the suggestion being: we know what happens in that case. The point is the inevitability of ruin. What follows expresses what has been already hinted.—το ἡμείς καὶ ταύτα, καὶ τὰ τῶν ἔθελεν ἵπτοντας τῆς καρδίας, καὶ εἰς τὸν ἐσθητοῦ ὄρμον τῶν κοινών, καὶ τὰ ἐκ τοῦ στόματος τῆς καρδίας ἐξερέται, καὶ τὰ κοινών τῶν ἀνθρώπων. 19. εἰ γὰρ τῆς καρδίας ἐξαρχωνται "δειλινομοί τοποίδας, ὁ φῶς, ὁ μουχᾶς, πορνείας, κλοπάς, ὁ φυλακτοριαίας, βλασφημίας. 20. ταύτα ἐστὶ τὰ κοινών τῶν ἀνθρώπων: τὸ δὲ ἀνίπτω τοῖς φαγεῖν ὀ κοινῶν τῶν ἀνθρώπων." 21. καὶ ἐξέλεξεν ἀνεχόμενον ᾧ ἦσαν ἀνεχόμενον εἰς τὴ μέρη Τίτου.

1. ΜΒΖ omit των τῶν ἢσσως and ΜΒΖ (D also omits l.).

2. see in BDZ.
grounds the presumption is in favour of the view that Jesus crossed the border into heathen territory. After that interview with sanctimonious Pharisees who thought the whole world outside Judea unclean, it would be a refreshment to Christ’s spirit to cross over the line and feel that He was still in God’s world, with blue sky overhead and the sea on thin hand and mountains on that, all showing the glory of their Maker. He would breathe a freer, less stifling atmosphere there.—Ver. 22. Χανααναία: the Phoenicians were descended from a colony of Canaanites, the original inhabitants of Palestine, Gen. x. 15 (vide Benziger, Heb. Arch., p. 63). Vide notes on Mk.—L. με, pity me, the mother’s heart speaks.—νῦν Δ. The title and the request imply some knowledge of Jesus. Whence got? Was she a proselyte? (De Wette.) Or had the fame of Jesus spread thus far, the report of a wonderful healer who passed among the Jews for a descendant of David? The latter every way likely, cf. Mt. iv. 24. There would be some intercourse between the borders, though doubtless also prejudices and enmities.—Ver. 23. οὐκέκρατησέν: a new style of behaviour on the part of Jesus. The rôle of indifference would cost Him an effort.—ηρετῶν (οὐ W. and H. as if contracted from ἡρετῆ), besought; in classics the verb means to inquire. In N. T. the two senses are combined after analogy of ἥξυ. The disciples were probably surprised at their Master’s unusual behaviour; a reason for it would not occur to them. They change places with the Master here, the larger-hearted appearing by comparison the narrow-hearted.—ἀπόλυσον, get rid of her by granting her request.—δύναται: they were moved not so much by pity as by dread of a sensation. There was far more sympathy (though hidden) in Christ’s heart than in theirs. Deep natures are often misjudged, and shallow men praised at their expense.—Ver. 24. οὐκ ἀπεστάλητος: Jesus is compelled to explain Himself, and His explanation is bond, not, and to be taken in earnest as meaning that He considered it His duty to restrict His ministry to Israel, to be a shepherd exclusively to the lost sheep of Israel (τὰ πρόβατα τ. Δ., cf. ix. 36), as He was wont to call them with affectionate pity. There was probably a mixture of feelings in Christ’s mind at this time; an aversion to recommence just then a healing ministry at all—a craving for rest and retirement; a disinclination to be drawn into a ministry among a heathen people, which would mar the unity of His career as a prophet of God to Israel (the drama of His life to serve its purpose must respect the limits of time and place); a secret inclination to do this woman a kindness if it could in any way be made exceptional; and last but not least, a feeling that her request was really not isolated but representative = the Gentile world in her inviting Him, a fugitive from His own land, to come over and help them, an omen of the transference of the kingdom from Jewish to Pagan soil.
27. Ἡ δὲ εἶπε, "Ναὶ, κύριε· καὶ γὰρ ἡ κυνάρια ἐσθίαι ἀπὸ τῶν ψιχίων τῶν πιπτόμων ἀπὸ τῆς τραπεζῆς τῶν κυρίων αὐτῶν." s Mk. vii. 28. Lk. xvi. 31.

28. Τότε ἀπεκρίθη δὲ ἦσον ἀρτί, "Ὡς γύναι, μεγάλη σου ἤ ποτες· γεννήθησον σοι ὁ δήλος." Καὶ ίδαθ εὐθανάτην αὐτῆς ἀπὸ τῆς ἡρας ἐκείνης.

29. Καὶ μεταβὰς ἐκεῖθεν δὲ ἦσον ἄλλο παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν τῆς Γαλαλαίας· καὶ ἀναβὰς εἰς τὸ ὅρος, ἔκάθισε εἰκεῖ. 30. καὶ προσῆλθον αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοί, ἔχοντες μεθ' αὐτῶν χωλούς, τυφλοὺς, κυψεῖς, καὶ ἐπέρασαν πολλούς, καὶ ὑπέφευγαν αὐτοῖς. 31. ὅπερ τῶν ὄχλων ἐσβαμάζει, βλέποντας κυψεῖς λαλοῦντας, κυψεῖς ὡμοίως, χωλοὺς περιπατοῦντας, καὶ τυφλοὺς βλέποντας· καὶ

1 B omits γεφ, which therefore WH. bracket. As Weiss suggests it may have fallen out per incuriam. It seems needed. Vide below.
2 The order in which these four words (χωλοῦς, etc.) are given varies. B has κυψεῖς before τυφλοῦς, which WH. adopt. The order of T.R. is supported only by late MSS.
3 avTov for tov l. in NBDL.
4 τὸν ὄχλον in NCCDA.
5 B has ekóntas.

Vv. 25-28. Entreaty renewed at close quarters with success.—Ver. 25. Ἡ δὲ ἐκάθευν, etc. Probably the mother read conflict and irresolution in Christ's face, and thence drew encouragement.—Ver. 26. οἷς ἐστὶν καλόν, etc. : seemingly a hard word, but not so hard as it seems. First, it is not a simple monosyllabic negative, leaving no room for parley, but an argument inviting further discussion. Next, it is playful, humorous, bantering in tone, a parable to be taken cum grano. Third, its harshest word, κυναρίως, contains a loophole. κυναρία does not compare Gentiles to the dogs without, in the street, but to the household dogs belonging to the family, which got their portion though not the children's.—Ver. 27. ναὶ, κύριε· καὶ γὰρ, etc. : eager assent, not dissent, with a gleam in the eye on perceiving the advantage given by the comparison. Yes, indeed, Lord, for even, etc. Kypke cites an instance from Xenophon of the combination ναὶ καὶ γὰρ in the same sense.—ψιχίως, dimin. from ψῆ, a bit, crumb, found only in N. T. (here and in Mk. xvi. 21), another diminutive answering to κυναρία = the little pet dogs, eat of the minute morsels. Curiously felicitous combination of ready wit, humility and faith: wit in seizing on the playful κυναρία and improving on it by adding ψιχίως, humility in being content with the smallest crumbs, faith in conceiving of the healing asked as only such a crumb for Jesus to give.—Ver. 28. Immediate compliance with her request with intense delight in her faith, which may have recalled to mind that of another Gentile (Mt. vii. 10).—ὁ γύναι: exclamation in a tone enriched by the harmonies of manifold emotions. What a refreshment to Christ's heart to pass from that dreary pestilential traditionalism to this utterance of a simple unsophisticated moral nature on Pagan soil. The transition from the one scene to the other unconsciously serves the purposes of consummate dramatic art.

Vv. 29-31. Return to the Sea of Galilee (Mk. vii. 31-37).—Ver. 29. παρὰ τ. θ. τ. Γαλ., to the neighbourhood of the Sea of Galilee; on which side? According to Mk., the eastern, approached by a circuitous journey through Sidon and Decapolis. Weiss contends that Mt. means the western shore. The truth seems to be that he leaves it vague. His account is a meagre colourless reproduction of Mk.'s. He takes no interest in the route but only in the incidents at the two termini. He takes Jesus north to the borders of Tyre to meet the woman of Canaan, and back to Galilee to feed the multitude a second time.—ἐς τὸ δρος, as in v. 1, and apparently for the same purpose: ἔκλειψε ε., sat down there to teach. This ascent of the hill bordering the lake is not in Mk.—Ver.
v Mk. viii. 2. έδόθαι τον θεον Ἰσραήλ. 32. ο θεός προσκαλεσάτων
τούς μαθητάς αυτοῦ ἔτειν, ὡς πληγεῖται ἐπὶ τὸν ἄγγλον, οπίσω
τοῦ θεού προσκαλεσάτων. καὶ θεοῦ ἐξελέγον τῇ φάντασίῃ. καὶ
καὶ οὖν ἔλεγεν τῇ φάντασίῃ. 

Mk. viii. 33. Καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ ὁ μαθητής αὐτοῦ, ἵδι."Πάσχεν ἡμῖν ἔν ἐρήμῳ
ἀρτον τοσοῦτον, δεῦτε χορτάσατε ἐξ ἰχθύων τοσοῦτον." 34. Καὶ λέγει
οὐ πάντως ἐξ ἠναστάσεως αὐτοῦ ἐξετάζεται; Οἱ δὲ εἶπον,""Εντάλκ
θαῦματος αὐτοὺς. 35. Καὶ ἐκλειστοὶ τοὺς ἰχθύους ἀποκρινθήσεται
τὸ "καλόν καὶ ἠλιθίαν." 36. Καὶ λαβὼν τοὺς ἐπτά ἄρτους καὶ τὸς ἰχθύαν,
viii. 6 ἵνα τὲν γῆν. 36. Καὶ λαβὼν τοὺς ἐπτά ἄρτους καὶ τὸς ἰχθύαν,
εὐχαριστήσετε ἐκλαίον, καὶ ἐδώκε ὁ μαθητής αὐτοῦ, οἱ δὲ
Lk. xi. 37 (ἐκείνης οὖν). Τοὺς ἐπτά καὶ τὸν ἰχθύαν. 36. Καὶ λαβὼν τοὺς ἐπτά

30. χαλεύνει, etc.: the people wanted healing, not teaching, and so brought
their sick and suffering to Jesus. — ἐρ-ρίφας: they threw them at His feet
either in care-free confidence, or in haste,
because of the greatness of the number.
Among those brought were certain classed
as κυλλόνης, which is usually interpreted
"bent," as with rheumatism. But in
xviii. 8 it seems to mean "mutilated".
Euthy. takes κυλλόνης = τὸ δίχρυα, and
Grotius argues for this sense, and infers
that among Christ's works of healing
were restorations of lost limbs, though
we do not read of such anywhere else.
On this view νεικεῖ, ver. 31, will mean
ἀρτίους, integros.—Ver. 31. ἀλοῦντας:
this and the following participles are used
substantively as objects in the accus.
ἀρτίους, the action denoted by the partic-
iple being that which was seen.—
ἐδόθαι τῷ Ș. 1. Ἰσραήλ. The expression
suggests a non-Israelite crowd and seems
to hint that after all for our evangelist
Jesus is on the east side and in heathen
territory. But it may point back to ver.
24, and mean the God who conferred
such favours on Israel as distinct from the
heathen (Weiss-Meyer).
Vv. 32-38. Second feeding (Mk. viii.
1-9).—Ver. 32. συλλαγγισμοί, with εἰς
as in Mk. viii. 2, with ἐπί in ix. 36, xiv.
24. In the first feeding Christ's com-
passion is moved by the sickness among
the multitude, here by their hunger.—
ἡμέρας τείχες: that this is the true reading
is guaranteed by the unusual construction,
the accusative being what one expects.

The reading of D adopted by Fritzsche,
which inserts εἶπον καὶ after ταῦτα, though
not to be accepted as the true reading,
may be viewed as a solution of the
problem presented by the true reading,
vide Winer, § 62, 2. — εὐαγγεῖος, fasting
(νη, ἱσθμίων similar to νησίων from νη,
ὐπερώτως), here and in parallel text in Mk.
only. The motive of the miracle is not the
distance from supplies but the ex-
husted condition of the people after
staying three days with Jesus with quite
inadequate provision of food. Mk. states
that some were far from home (viii. 3),
implying that most were not. But even
those whose homes were near might faint
(ἐκλυθῶσιν, Gal. vi. 9) by the way through
long fasting.—Ver. 33. θυσίας, ἑκτε
χερτάζεται. As the infinitive, the action denoted by the partic-
iple being that which was seen.—
ἐδόθαι τῷ Ș. 1. Ἰσραήλ. The expression
suggests a non-Israelite crowd and seems
to hint that after all for our evangelist
Jesus is on the east side and in heathen
territory. But it may point back to ver.
24, and mean the God who conferred
such favours on Israel as distinct from the
heathen (Weiss-Meyer).
Vv. 32-38. Second feeding (Mk. viii.
1-9).—Ver. 32. συλλαγγισμοί, with εἰς
as in Mk. viii. 2, with ἐπί in ix. 36, xiv.
24. In the first feeding Christ's com-
passion is moved by the sickness among
the multitude, here by their hunger.—
ἡμέρας τείχες: that this is the true reading
is guaranteed by the unusual construction,
the accusative being what one expects.

The reading of D adopted by Fritzsche,
which inserts εἶπον καὶ after ταῦτα, though
not to be accepted as the true reading,
may be viewed as a solution of the
problem presented by the true reading,
vide Winer, § 62, 2. — εὐαγγεῖος, fasting
(νη, ἱσθμίων similar to νησίων from νη,
ὐπερώτως), here and in parallel text in Mk.
only. The motive of the miracle is not the
distance from supplies but the ex-
husted condition of the people after
staying three days with Jesus with quite
inadequate provision of food. Mk. states
that some were far from home (viii. 3),
implying that most were not. But even
those whose homes were near might faint
(ἐκλυθῶσιν, Gal. vi. 9) by the way through
long fasting.—Ver. 33. θυσίας, ἑκτε
χερτάζεται. As the infinitive, the action denoted by the partic-
iple being that which was seen.—
ἐδόθαι τῷ Ș. 1. Ἰσραήλ. The expression
suggests a non-Israelite crowd and seems
to hint that after all for our evangelist
Jesus is on the east side and in heathen
territory. But it may point back to ver.
24, and mean the God who conferred
such favours on Israel as distinct from the
heathen (Weiss-Meyer).
Vv. 32-38. Second feeding (Mk. viii.
1-9).—Ver. 32. συλλαγγισμοί, with εἰς
as in Mk. viii. 2, with ἐπί in ix. 36, xiv.
24. In the first feeding Christ's com-
passion is moved by the sickness among
the multitude, here by their hunger.—
ἡμέρας τείχες: that this is the true reading
is guaranteed by the unusual construction,
the accusative being what one expects.

The reading of D adopted by Fritzsche,
which inserts εἶπον καὶ after ταῦτα, though
not to be accepted as the true reading,
may be viewed as a solution of the
problem presented by the true reading,
vide Winer, § 62, 2. — εὐαγγεῖος, fasting
(νη, ἱσθμίων similar to νησίων from νη,
ὐπερώτως), here and in parallel text in Mk.
only. The motive of the miracle is not the
distance from supplies but the ex-
husted condition of the people after
staying three days with Jesus with quite
inadequate provision of food. Mk. states
that some were far from home (viii. 3),
implying that most were not. But even
those whose homes were near might faint
(ἐκλυθῶσιν, Gal. vi. 9) by the way through
long fasting.—Ver. 33. θυσίας, ἑκτε
χερτάζεται. As the infinitive, the action denoted by the partic-
iple being that which was seen.—
ἐδόθαι τῷ Ș. 1. Ἰσραήλ. The expression
suggests a non-Israelite crowd and seems
to hint that after all for our evangelist
Jesus is on the east side and in heathen
territory. But it may point back to ver.
24, and mean the God who conferred
such favours on Israel as distinct from the
heathen (Weiss-Meyer).
Vv. 32-38. Second feeding (Mk. viii.
1-9).—Ver. 32. συλλαγγισμοί, with εἰς
as in Mk. viii. 2, with ἐπί in ix. 36, xiv.
24. In the first feeding Christ's com-
passion is moved by the sickness among
the multitude, here by their hunger.—
ἡμέρας τείχες: that this is the true reading
is guaranteed by the unusual construction,
the accusative being what one expects.
32-39. XVI. i. ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ

37. Καὶ ἔφαγον πάντες, καὶ ἔχορτάσθησαν·
καὶ ἦραν τὸ περισσότερον τῶν πλασμάτων, ἕτερον ὁστράκοις πλείρες.
38. οἱ δὲ δύο δύος τίτρις τετρακείμενοι ἄδρες, χωρίς γυναικῶν καὶ
παιδιών.

39. Καὶ ἀπολύσας τὸν δίχλον ἐνεβή εἰς τὸ πλαίον, καὶ ἠλθεν εἰς
τὰ δῶρα Μαγδαλᾶ.  

XVI. i. Καὶ προσελθόντες οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ Σαδδουκαίοι παρέ-
ζησαν εἰπώτης ἵστατον εἰς τοῦ ὁμοῦ ἐπεξείδειαν αὐτοῖς.

1 τούτω δίχλον in NBD al.  
2 Μαγδαλ. in NBD, adopted in Tisch., W.H., etc., and doubtless the true
reading. Ἔγινε ἐν Μαγδαλ. is a known substituted for an unknown.
3 εὐρύτερον in Ἐδ. (Tisch. and W.H. marg.).

defines στρεφεῖ: τὸ τῶν πυρῶν ἄγγος = wheat-basket; perhaps connected with
στρεφω, suggesting a basket made of
rope-net; probably larger than κόψινος,
for longer journeys (Grotius). Or does
the different kind of basket point to
different nationality? Gentiles? Hilary
contends for Gentile recipients of the
second blessing, with whom Westcott
(Characteristics of Gospel Miracles, p.
23) agrees.—Ver. 39. Μαγδαλ.: the
true reading, place wholly unknown,
whence probably the variants.

CHAPTER XVI. SIGN SEEKERS:
Cæsarea Philippi. Again a dramat-
cally impressive juxtaposition of events.
First an ominous encounter with ill-
affected men professedly in quest of a
sign, then in a place of retreat a first
announcement in startlingly plain terms
of an approaching tragic crisis.

Vv. 1-12. Demand for a sign (Mk.
viii. 11-21).—Ver. 1. προσελθό
τε: one of Mt.'s oft-recurring descriptive
words.—φαρ. καὶ Ζακᾶ, a new combina-
tion, with sinister purpose, of classes of
the community not accustomed to act
together; wide apart, indeed, in social
position and religious tendency, but
made allies πρὸ τοῦ, by common dislike
to the movement identified with Jesus.
Already scribes by themselves had asked
a sign (xii. 38). Now they are joined by
a party representing the priestly and
governing classes among whom the
"Sadducees" were to be found (Well-
hauen, Die Pharisiäer und die Sadduceäer).
Mk. mentions only the Pharisees (ver.
11), but he makes Jesus refer to the
leaven of Herod in the subsequent con-
versation with the disciples, whence
might legitimately be inferred the
presence of representatives of that
leaven. These Mt. calls "Sadducees,"
probably the better-known name, and
practically identical with the Herod
leaven. The "Herodians" were, I
imagine, people for whom Herod the
Great was a hero, a kind of Messiah,
all the Messiah they cared for or believed
in, one who could help worldly-minded
Israelites to be proud of their country
(wide Grotius on Mt. xvi. 6). It was
among Sadducees that such hero-
worshippers were likely to be found.—
ἐπεξείδειαν: here like the simple verb
(xv. 23) = requested, with infinitive,
ἐπεξείδειαν, completing the object of
desire.—σμηνοῦν ἐκ τοῦ ὁμοῦ: before
(xii. 38) only a sign. Now a sign from
heaven. What might that be? Chrys.
(Hom. liii.) suggests: to stop the course
of the sun, to bridle the moon, to
produce thunder, or to change the air,
or something of that sort. These sug-
gestions will do as well as any. Probably
the interrogators had no definite idea
what they wanted, beyond desiring to
embarrass or nonplus Christ.

Vv. 2-4. Reply of Jesus.—Vv. 2 and
3, though not in B and bracketed by W.
H., may be regarded as part of the text.
Somewhat similar is Lk. xii. 54-56. On
some occasion Jesus must have con-
trasted the shrewd observation of His
contemporaries in the natural sphere
with their spiritual obtuseness.—Ver 2.
εὔδος, fine weather! (εὖ, Δίου genitive of
Ζεύς).—σφραγὶς γὰρ ὅτι: that the sign
was a ruddy sky in the evening (σφραγὶς
in Lev. xiii. 19, 24).—Ver. 3. χοῦνα, a
storm to-day; sign the same, a ruddy
sky in the morning. —σφραγὶς, late but
expressive = triste coelum. No special
meteorological skill indicated thereby, only
the average power of observation based
on experience, which is common to man-
kinds. Lightfoot credits the Jews with
special interest in such observations, and Christ was willing to give them full
credit for skill in that sphere. His complaint was that they showed no such
skill in the ethical sphere; they could not discern the signs of the times (Τῶν
καιρῶν: the reference being, of course, chiefly to their own time). Neither
Pharisees nor Sadducees had any idea that the end of the Jewish state was so
near. They said ἐδίδα when they should have said χειμῶν. They mistook the
time of day; thought it was the eve of a good time coming when it was the
morning of the judgment day. For a historical parallel, vide Carlyle’s French
Vv. 5-12. The one important thing in this section is the reflection of Jesus
on what had just taken place. The historical setting is not clear. Jesus left
the sign seekers after giving them their answer. The disciples cross the lake;
in which direction? With or without their Master? They forget to take
toast. When? On setting out or after arrival at the other side? Ἀπελθόντες εἰς
τ. ἡμ. ver. 5, naturally suggests the latter, but, as Grotius remarks, the verb
ἀπελθοῦν in the Gospels sometimes means ίσον not νειστον (vide, e.g., Lk. xv.
20). Suffice it to say that either in the boat or after arrival at the opposite side
Jesus uttered a memorable word.—Ver. 6. ὤρατε καὶ προσέχετε: an abrupt,
urgent admonition to look out for, in order to take heed of, a phenomenon of
very sinister import; in Scottish idiom “see and beware of”. More impressive
still in Mk.: ὄρατε, βλέπετε, a duality
giving emphasis to the command (Ἀναβλέποντες, ἵματον εἰς Θανάτον
τῆς παραγγελίας, Euthy.).—ἔξωμεν: leaven, here conceived as an evil
influence, working, however, after the same manners as the leaven in the parable (xiii.
33). It is a spirit, a σείσεστι, insinuating itself everywhere, and spreading
more and more in society, which Jesus instinctively shrank from in horror, and
from which He wished to guard His disciples.—τῶν παρ. καὶ Σαδ.: one
leaven, of two parties viewed as one, hence no article before Σαδ. Two
leaven separately named in Mk., but even there juxtaposition in the warning
implies affinity. The leaven of Pharisaism is made thoroughly known to us in the
Gospels by detailed characterisation. Sadducism very seldom appears on the
stage, and few words of Jesus concerning it are recorded; yet enough to indicate
its character as secular or “worldly”. The two classes, antagonistic at many
points of belief and practice, would be at one in dislike of single-hearted
devotion to truth and righteousness, whether in the Baptist (iii. 7) or in
Jesus. This common action in reference to either might not be a matter of
arrangement, and each might come with its own characteristic mood: the
Pharisee with bitter animosity, the Sadducee with good-natured scepticism
and in quest of amusement, as when they propounded the riddle about the
woman married to seven brothers. Both moods revealed utter lack of appreciation,
no friendship to be looked for in either quarter, both to be dreaded.—Ver. 7. ἶνα
λαμβάνετε: either each man in his own
mind (Weiss), or among themselves, apart from the Master (Meyer).—diēgōnōtōatos may be recitative or = "because", He gives this warning because, etc.; sense the same. They take the Master to mean; don't buy bread from persons belonging to the obnoxious sects! or rather perhaps: don't take your directions as to the leaven to be used in baking from that quarter. Vide Light-foot ad loc. Stupid mistake, yet pardonable when we remember the abruptness of the warning and the wide gulf between Master and disciples: He a prophet with prescient eye, seeing the forces of evil at work and what they were leading to; they very commonplace persons lacking insight and foresight. Note the solitariness of Christ.—Ver. 8. diēgōnōtōatos: always thinking about bread, bread instead of the kingdom and its fortunes, with which alone the Master was occupied.—Vv. 9, 10. And with so little excuse in view of quite recent experiences, of which the vivid details are given as if to heighten the reproach.—Ver. 11. προσέξετε, etc.: warning repeated without further explanation, as the meaning would now be seen. Ver. 12. συνῆθεων, they now understood, at least to the extent of seeing that it was a question not of loaves but of something spiritual. One could wish that they had understood that from the first, and that they had asked the Master to explain more precisely the nature of the evil influences for their and our benefit. Thereby we might have had in a sentence a photograph of Sadducæism, e.g.—διδαχή, "doctrine": that was in a general way the import of the ἔση. But if Jesus had explained Himself He would have had more to say. The dogmas and opinions of the two parties in question were not the worst of them, but the spirit of their life: their dislike of real godliness.

Vv. 13-28. At Cæsarea Philippi (Mk. viii. 27—ix. 1; Lk. ix. 18-27). The crossing of the lake (ver. 5) proved to be the prelude to a second long excursion northwards, similar to that mentioned in xv. 21; like it following close on an encounter with ill-affected persons, and originating in a kindred mood and motive. For those who regard the two feedings as duplicate accounts of the same event these two excursions are of course one. "The idea of two journeys on which Jesus oversteps the boundaries of Galilee is only the result of the assumption of a twofold feeding. The two journeys are, in truth, only parts of one great journey, on which Jesus, coming out of heathen territory, first touches again the soil of the holy land, in the neighbourhood of Cæsarea Philippi." Weiss, Leben Jesu, ii. 256. Be this as it may, this visit to that region was an eventful one, marking a crisis or turning-point in the career of Jesus. We are at the beginning of the fifth act in the tragic drama: the shadow of the cross now falls across the path. Practically the ministry in Galilee is ended, and Jesus is here to collect His thoughts and to devote Himself to the disciplining of His disciples. Place and time invite to reflection and forecast, and afford leisure for a calm survey of the whole situation. Note that at this point Lk. again joins his fellow-evangelists in his narrative. We have missed him from xiv. 23 onwards (vide notes on Lk.).

Ver. 13. ἔλθον: here again this verb...
may mean not arriving at, but setting out for, or on the way: _untermwegs_, Schanz. So Grotius: _cum profisciscetur, non cum venisset_. Fritzsche dissents and renders: _postquam semelaret_. Mk. has ἐν τῷ δοξῷ to indicate where the conversation began. On the whole both expressions are elastic, and leave us free to locate the ensuing scene at any point on the road to Caesarea Philippi, say at the spot where the city and its surroundings came into view.—Kαταραίνεις τ. φ.: a notable city, romantically situated at the foot of the Lebanon range, near the main sources of the Jordan, in a limestone cave, in the province of Gaulonitis, ruled over by the Tetrarch Philip, enlarged and beautified by him with the Herodian passion for building, and furnished with a new name (Panaea before, changed into Caesarea of Philip to distinguish from Caesarea on the sea). A place of exceedingly beautiful, picturesque surroundings, with which few spots in the holy land can be compared. What a rush of many waters; what a wealth and variety of vegetation!—Furrer, _Wanderungen_, 414. _Vide_ also the description in Stanley's _Sinai and Palestine_, and in Professor G. A. Smith's _Historical Geography of the Holy Land_.—τίνα λέγων, etc.: with this grand natural scene possibly or even probably (why else name it?) in view, Jesus asked His disciples a significant question meant to lead on to important disclosures. The question is variously reported by the synoptists, and it is not easy to decide between the forms. It would seem simpler and more natural to ask, "whom do, etc., that I am?" (μα εἶδας, Mk. and Lk.). But, on the other hand, at a solemn moment Jesus might prefer to speak impersonally, and ask: "whom . . . that the Son of Man is?" (Mt.). That title, as hitherto employed by Him, would not prejudice the question. It had served rather to keep the question who He was, how His vocation was to be defined, in suspense till men had learned to attach new senses to old words. It is intrinsically unlikely that He would combine the two forms of the question, and ask: "whom, etc., that I, the Son of Man, am?" as in the T. R. That consideration does not settle what Mt. wrote, but it is satisfactory that the best MSS. leave out the μ. The question shows that Jesus had been thinking of His past ministry and its results, and it may be taken for granted that He had formed His own estimate, and did not need to learn from the Twelve how He stood. He had come to the conclusion that He was practically without reliable following outside the disciple circle, and that conviction is the key to all that follows in this memorable scene. How the influential classes, the Pharisees, and the priests and political men—Sadducees, were affected was apparent. Nothing but hostility was to be looked for there. With the common people on the other hand He had to the last been popular. They liked His preaching, and they took eager advantage of His healing ministry. But had they got a definite faith about Him, as well as a kindly feeling towards Him; an idea well-rooted, likely to be lasting, epoch-making, the starting-point of a new religious movement? He did not believe they had, and He expected to have that impression confirmed by the answer of the Twelve, as indeed it was.

Ver. 14. _Reply of disciples_: the general effect being: opinions of the people, favourable but crude, without religious definiteness and depth, with no promise of future outcome.—_ἀδείω, Ἡλίαν, ἠρείποι_. Historic characters, recent or more ancient, _redivivi_—that the utmost possible: unable to rise to the idea of a wholly new departure, or a greater than any character in past history; conservatism natural to the common mind. All three personages whose return might be expected; the Baptist to continue his work cut short by Herod, Elijah to prepare the way and day of the Lord (Mal. iv. 5), Jeremiah to bring back the ark, etc., which (2 Maccab. ii. 1-12) he had hid in a cave. Jeremiah is classed with the other well-known prophets (§ 5 να τ. π.), and the supporters of that hypothesis are called ἠρείποι, as if to distinguish them not merely numeri-
cally (Διόλος) but generically: a lower type who did not connect Jesus with Messiah in any way, even as forerunner, but simply thought of Him as one in whom the old prophetic charism had been revived.

Vv. 15, 16. *New question and answer.* — Ver. 15. ἤξασθε ἃδικά, and you? might have stood alone, perhaps did originally. Jesus invites the Twelve to give Him their own view. The first question was really only introductory to this. Jesus desires to make sure that He, otherwise without reliable following, has in His disciples at least the nucleus of a community with a definite religious conviction as to the meaning of His ministry and mission. — Ver. 16. Σιμών Πέτρος: now as always spokesman for the Twelve. There may be deeper natures among them (John?), but he is the most energetic and outspoken, though withal emotional rather than intellectual, strong, as passionate character is, rather than with the strength of thought, or of a will steadily controlled by a firm grasp of great principles: not a rock in the sense in which St. Paul was one.—οὐ εἶ ἀλλ' ὁ τῶν Ἐβραίων: “Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God,” in Mk. simply “Thou art the Christ,” in Lk. “the Christ of God”. One’s first thought is that Mk. gives the original form of the reply; and yet in view of Peter’s vehement temperament one cannot be perfectly sure of that. The form in Mt. certainly answers best to the reply of Jesus, vide on ver. 17. In any case the emphasis lies on the which is common to the three reports: the affirmation of the Christhood of Jesus. That was what differentiated the disciples from the favourably disposed multitude. The latter said in effect: at most a forerunner of Messiah, probably not even that, only a prophet worthy to be named alongside of the well-known prophets of Israel. The Twelve through Peter said: not merely a prophet or a forerunner of the Messiah, but the Messiah Himself. The remainder of the reply in Mt., whether spoken by Peter, or added by the evan-
gelist (to correspond, as it were, to Son of Man in ver. 13), is simply expansion or epexegeesis. If spoken by Peter it serves to show that he spoke with emotion, and with a sense of the gravity of the declaration. The precise theological value of the added clause cannot be determined.

Vv. 17-19. *Sollemn address of Jesus to Peter*, peculiar to Mt., and of doubtful authenticity in the view of many modern critics, including Wendt (*Die Lehre Jesu*, i., p. 181), either an addendum by the evangelist or introduced at a later date by a reviser. This question cannot be fully discussed here. It must suffice to say that psychological reasons are in favour of something of the kind having been said by Jesus. It was a great critical moment in His career, at which His spirit was doubtless in a state of high tension. The firm tone of conviction in Peter’s reply would give Him a thrill of satisfaction demanding expression. One feels that there is a hiatus in the narratives of Mk. and Lk.; no comment on the part of Jesus, as if Peter had delivered himself of a mere trite commonplace. We may be sure the fact was not so. The terms in which Jesus speaks of Peter are characteristic — warm, generous, unstinted. The style is not that of an ecclesiastical editor laying the foundation for Church power, and prelatic pretensions, but of a noble-minded Master eulogising in impassioned terms a loyal disciple. Even the reference to the “Church” is not unseasonable. What more natural than that Jesus, conscious that His labours, outside the disciple circle, have been fruitless, so far as permanent result is concerned, should fix His hopes on that circle, and look on it as the nucleus of a new regenerate Israel, having for its raison d’être that it accepts Him as the Christ? And the name for the new Israel, ἡ Χριστιανία, in His mouth is not an anachronism. It is an old familiar name for the congregation of Israel, found in Deut. (xviii. 26; xxiii. 3) and Psalms (xxii. 36), both books well known to
Jesus.—Ver. 17. **μακάριος**: weighty word chosen to express a rare and high condition, virtue, or experience ("hoc vocabulo non solum beata, sed etiam rara simul conditio significatur," Beng.). It implies satisfaction with the quality of Peter’s faith. Jesus was not easily satisfied as to that. He wanted no man to call Him Christ under a misapprehension; hence the prohibition in ver. 20. He congratulated Peter not merely on believing Him to be the Messiah, but on having an essentially right conception of what the title meant.—**Σβαρτάντα**: full designation, name, and patronymic, suiting the emotional state of the speaker, and the solemn character of the utterance, echo of an Aramaic source, or of the Aramaic dialect used then, if not always, by Jesus.—**φανερώθη** καί **αλήθεια**: synonym in current Jewish speech for "man". "Infinitt frequentiát hanc formulam loquendi adhibent Scriptores Judaici, eaque homines Deo opponunt." Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. Vide ver. 23. There is a tacit contrast between Peter’s faith, and the opinions of the people just recited, as to source. Flesh and blood was the source of these opinions, and the fact is a clue to the meaning of the phrase. The contrast between the two sources of inspiration is not the very general abstract one between creaturely weakness and Divine power (Wendt, *Die Begriffe Fleisch und Geist*, p. 60). "Flesh and blood" covers all that can contribute to the formation of religious opinion of little intrinsic value—tradition, custom, fashion, education, authority, regard to outward appearance. Hilary, and after him Luteroth, takes the reference to be to Christ’s flesh and blood, and finds in the words the idea: if you had looked to my flesh you would have called me Christ, the Son of David, but higher guidance has taught you to call me Son of God.—**ὁ γεννήτορ** **μου**: this is to be taken not in a merely ontological sense, but, ethically, so as to account for the quality of Peter’s faith. The true conception of Christhood was inseparable from the true conception of God. Jesus had been steadily working for the transformation of both ideas, and He counted on the two finding entrance into the mind together. No one could truly conceive the Christ who had not learned to think of God as the Father and as His Father. There were thus two revelations in one: of God as Father, and of Christ by the Father. Peter had become a Christian.

Ver. 18. **καίδα**: emphatic, something very important about to be said to Peter and about him.—**πέτρος, πέτρα**, a happy play of words. Both are appellatives to be translated "thou art a rock and on this rock," the two being represented by the same word in Aramaean (נַדְנָדָא). Elsewhere in the Gospels **πέτρος** is a proper name, and **πέτρα** only is used in the sense of rock (vii. 24). What follows is in form a promise to Peter as reward of his faith. It is as personal as the most zealous apostate of Papal supremacy could desire. Yet it is as remote as the poles from what they mean. It is a case of extremes meeting. Christ did not fight to death against one form of spiritual despotism to put another, if possible worse, in its room. Personal in form, the sense of this famous logion can be expressed in abstract terms without reference to Peter’s personality. And that sense, if Christ really spoke the word, must be simple, elementary, suitable to the initial stage; withal religious and ethical rather than ecclesiastical. The more ecclesiastical we make it the more we play into the hands of those who maintain that the passage is an interpolation. I find in it three ideas: (1) The **ἐκκλησία** is to consist of men confessing Jesus to be the Christ. This is the import of εἰσέλθετε. (2) Peter, believing that truth, is the foundation,
and the building is to be of a piece with the foundation. Observe the emphatic position of μέν. The έκκλησία is Christ's; confessing Him as Christ in Peter's sense and spirit = being Christian. (2) The new society is to be = the kingdom realised on earth. This is the import of ver. 19, clause 1. The keys are the symbol of this identity. They are the keys of the gate without, not of the doors within. Peter is the gate-keeper, not the αληθέων with a bunch of keys that open all doors in his hands (against Weiss).—κλειδάριος ἤργον τῷ εὐθύνῃ, Euthy. Observe it is not the keys of the church but of the kingdom. The meaning is: Peter-like faith in Jesus as the Christ admits into the Kingdom of Heaven. A society of men so believing = the kingdom realised. (3) In the new society the righteousness of the kingdom will find approximate embodiment. This is the import of ver. 19, second clause, Binding and loosing, in Rabbinical dialect, meant forbidding and permitting to be done. The judgment of the Rabbis was mostly wrong; the reverse of the righteousness of the kingdom. The judgment of the new society as to conduct would be in accordance with the truth of things, therefore valid in heaven. That is what Jesus meant to say. Note the perfect participles δεδουλεύων, λειμένων = shall be a thing bound or loosed once for all. The truth of all three statements is conditional on the Christ spirit continuing to rule in the new society. Only on that condition is the statement about the πόλει δόνων, ver. 18, clause 2, valid. What precisely the verbal meaning of the statement is—whether that the gates of Hades shall not prevail in conflict against it, as ordinarily understood; or merely that the gates, etc., shall not be stronger than it, without thought of a conflict (Weiss), is of minor moment; the point is that it is not an absolute promise. The έκκλησία will be strong, enduring, only so long as the faith in the Father and in Christ the Son, and the spirit of the Father and the Son, reign in it. When the Christ spirit is weak the Church will be weak, and neither creeds nor governments, nor keys, nor ecclesiastical dignities will be of much help to her.

Ver. 20. Βιοστελατόν (T. R.), "charged" (A. V.) not necessarily with any special emphasis = gravior interdicere, but = monuit (Loesner and Fritzsche). Cf. Heb. xi. 20, where a stronger sense seems required. For έπιτύμησιν in BD here and in Mk. Euthy, gives κατηφολίσατο = to make sure by injunction.—τοῖς μαθηταῖς: all the disciples are supposed to say amen to Peter's confession, thinking of God and of Jesus as he thought, though possibly not with equal emphasis of conviction.—ίνα . . . δ Χριστός: no desire to multiply hastily recruits for the new community, supreme regard to quality. Jesus wanted no man to call Him Christ till he knew what he was saying: no hearsay or echoed confession of any value in His eyes.—αὐτός, the same concerning whom current opinions have just been reported (ver. 14). It was hardly necessary to take pains to prevent the faith in His Messiah-ship from spreading prematurely in a crude form. Few would call such an one as Jesus Christ, save by the Holy Ghost. The one temptation thereto lay in the generous beneficence of Jesus.
Passion with relative conversation (Mk. viii. 31—ix. 1; Lk. ix. 22-27).—Ver. 21. ἀνφόρον Χριστοῦ (vide iv. 17) marks pointedly a new departure in the form of explicit intimation of an approaching final and fatal crisis. Time suitable. Disciples could now bear it, it could not be much longer delayed. Jesus could now face the crisis with composure, having been satisfied by Peter's confession that His labour was not going to be in vain. He then began to show, etc., for this was only the first of several communications of the same kind.—

Χριστὸς after ἡσυχασμός in ἩΒ is an intrinsically probable reading, as suiting the solemnity of the occasion and greatly enhancing the impressiveness of the announcement. Jesus, the Christ, to be crucified! But one would have expected the article before Χριστός. —παλάπαθη, the general fact.—ἄνδρας ἑαυτοῦ, the three constituent parts of the Sanhedrim—elders, priests, scribes.—ἀσκοπήθεν: one hard special fact, be killed.—

ἀγρεύθησα: this added to make the other fact not altogether intolerable.

Ver. 22. Peter here appears in a new character; a minute ago speaking under inspiration from heaven, now under inspiration from hell; or, as it were, quartered.—πέωθει, began to chide or admonish. He did not get far. As soon as his meaning became apparent he encountered prompt, abrupt, peremptory contradiction.—Διὸ οὐ: Elmer renders "sīs bono placidus animo," but most (Erasmus, Grotius, Kypke, Fritzsche, etc.) take it = absti! God avert it! Vehement utterance of a man confounded and horrified. Perfectly honest and in one sense thoroughly credible, but suggesting the question: Did Peter after all call Jesus Christ in the true sense? The answer must be: Yes, ethically. He understood what kind of man was fit to be a Christ. But he did not yet understand what kind of treatment such a man might expect from the world. A noble, benignant, really righteous man Messiah must be, said Peter; but why a man of sorrow he had yet to learn.—οὐ μὴ οὐκομήν, future of perfect assurance: it will not, cannot be.—Ver. 23. Χριστὸς οὖν ἠνθέλει, etc.; tremendous crushing reply of the Master, showing how much He felt the temptation; calm on the surface, deep down in the soul a very real struggle. Some of the Fathers (Origen, Jerome) strive to soften the severity of the utterance by taking Σατανᾶς as an appellative = ἀντιπάπτομα, adversarius, contrarius, and pointing out that in the Temptation in the wilderness Jesus says to Satan simply οὐκομήν = depart, but to Peter οὐ μὴ οὐκομήν = take thy place behind me and be follower, not leader. But these refinements only weaken the effect of a word which shows that Jesus recognises here His old enemy in a new and even more dangerous form. For none are more formidable instruments of temptation than well-meaning friends, who care more for our comfort than for our character.—σκόταπλεν: not "offensive to me," but "a temptation to me to offend," to do wrong; a virtual apology for using the strong word Σατανᾶς.—οὐ φρονείς τὰ, etc., indicates the point of temptation = non stias a Dei paribus (Wolf), or the opposite quaestiones rebus, etc. (Kypke), to be on God's side, or to study the Divine interest instead of the human. The important question is: What precisely are the two interests? They must be so conceived as not entirely to cancel the eulogium on Peter's faith, which was declared to be not of man but of God. Meyer's comment on τὰ τ. &.—concerned about having for Messiah a mere earthly hero and prince (so Weiss also)—is too wide. We must restrict the phrase to the instinct of self-preservation = save your life at all hazards. From Christ's point of view that was the import of Peter's suggestion; preference of natural life to duty = God's interest. Peter himself did not see that these were the alternatives; he thought
the two opposite interests compatible, and both attainable.

Vv. 24–28. General instruction on the subject of the two interests.—Ver. 24. ἐὰν τοιαῦτα μαθηταίς αὐτοῦ, "in calm, self-collected, didactic tone Jesus proceeds to give the disciples, in a body, a lesson arising out of the situation.—ἐἰ τις θέλει: wishes, no compulsion; οὐ βιάζομαι, Chrys., who remarks on the wisdom of Jesus in leaving every man free, and trusting to the attraction of the life: ἂν τις πράγματος ἢ μόνη ἑαυτῇ ἑξελέγξει, ἀπαρτισμὸν λατρείαν: here only, intimates that discipleship will call for self-denial, or self-subordination. Chrys. illustrates the meaning by considering what it is to deny another = not to assist him, bewail him or suffer on his account when he is in distress.—τῶν σταυρῶν looks like a trait introduced after Christ's passion. It need not be, however. Punishment by crucifixion was known to the Jews through the Romans, and it might be used by Jesus as the symbol of extreme torment and disgrace, even though He did not then know certainly that He Himself should meet death in that particular form. It became a common expression, but the phrase ἀπάντα τις ἄρα would sound harsh and startling when first used. Vide on Mt. x. 38.—Ver. 25. Vide x. 39. The Caesarea crisis was the most appropriate occasion for the first promulgation of this great ethical principle. It was Christ's first contribution towards unfolding the significance of His suffering, setting it forth as the result of a fidelity to righteousness incumbent on all.

Ver. 26. This and the following verses suggest aids to practice of the philosophy of dying to live. The statement in this verse is self-evident in the sphere of the lower life. It profits not to gain the whole world if you lose your life, for you cannot enjoy your possession; a life lost cannot be recovered at any price. Jesus wishes His disciples to understand that the same law obtains in the higher life: that the soul, the spiritual life, is incommensurable with any outward possession however great, and if forfeited the loss is irrevocable. This is one of the chief texts containing Christ's doctrine of the absolute worth of man as a moral subject. For the man who grasps it it is easy to be a hero and face any experience. To Jesus Christ it was a self-evident truth.—Ἐξίσωσι: not suffer any injury to, but forfeit. Grotius says that the verb in classics has only the dative after it = nuncitar morte, but Kypke and Eltener cite instances from Herod., Dion., P. Hal., Themis., etc., of its use with accusative.—ἀντιλαμβάνεται: something given in exchange. Cf. 1 Kings xx. 2. Job xxxi. 15 (Sept.), a price to buy back the life lower or higher; both impossible.—Ver. 27. μᾶλλον points to something near and certain; note the emphatic position.—ἐρχομαι ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ, the counterpart experience to the passion; stated objectively in reference to the Son of Man; the passion spoken of in the second person (ver. 21). In Mk. both are objectively put; but the disciples understood the reference to be personal (Mk. vii. 31.). This belongs to a third group of texts to be taken into account in an attempt
to fix the import of the title—those which refer to apocalyptic glory in terms drawn from Daniel vii. 13.—τὸν ἀποκάλυψιν: the Son of Man comes to make final awards. The reference to judgment comes in to brace up disciples to a heroic part. It is an aid to spirits not equal to this part in virtue of its intrinsic nobleness; yet not much of an aid to those to whom the heroic life is not in itself an attraction. The absolute worth of the true life is Christ's first and chiefline of argument; this is merely subsidiary.—Ver. 28. A *crux interpretum*, supposed by some to refer to the Transfiguration (Hilary, Chrys., Zephyr., Theogn., etc.); by others to the destruction of Jerusalem (Wetstein, etc.); by others again to the origins of the Church (Calvin, Grotius, etc.). The general meaning can be inferred with certainty from the purpose to furnish an additional incentive to fidelity. It is: Be of good courage, there will be ample compensation for trial soon; for some of you even before you die. This sense excludes the Transfiguration, which came too soon to be compensatory. The uncertainty comes in in connection with the form in which the general truth is stated. As to that, Christ's speech was controlled not merely by His own thoughts but by the hopes of the future entertained by His disciples. He had to promise the advent of the Son of Man in His Kingdom or of the Kingdom of God in power within a generation, whatever His own forecast as to the future might be. That might postulate a wider range of time than some of His words indicate, just as some of His utterances and His general spirit postulate a wide range in space for the Gospel (universalism) though He conceived of His own mission as limited to Israel. If the *logion* concerning the Church (ver. 18) be genuine, Jesus must have conceived a Christian era to be at least a possibility, for why trouble about founding a Church if the wind-up was to come in a few years? The words of Jesus about the future provide for two possible alternatives: for a near advent and for an indefinitely postponed advent. His promises naturally contemplate the former; much of His teaching about the kingdom easily fits into the latter.—

CHAPTER XVII. THE TRANSFIGURATION; THE EPILEPTIC BOY; THE TEMPLE TRIBUTE. Three impressive tableaux connected by proximity in time, a common preternatural aspect, and deep moral pathos.

Vv. 1-13. The Transfiguration (Mk. ix. 2-13, Lk. ix. 28-36).—Ver. 1. μηδέν ἡμέρας ἢ: This precise note of time looks like exact recollection of a strictly historical incident. Yet Holtzmann (H. C.) finds even in this a mythical element, based on Exodus xxiv. 16: the six days of Mt. and Mk. and the eight days of Lk., various expressions of the thought that between the confession of the one disciple and the experience of the three a *sacred week* intervened. Of these days we have no particulars, but on the principle that in preternatural experiences the subjective and the objective correspond, we may learn the psychological antecedents of the Transfiguration from the Transfiguration itself. The thoughts and talk of the company of Jesus were the prelude of the vision. A thing in itself intrinsically likely, for after thirty years solemn communications as those at Caesarea Philippi it was not to be expected that matters would go on in the Jesus-circle as if nothing had happened. In those days Jesus sought to explain from the O.T. the S3 of xvi. 27, showing from Moses, Prophets, and Psalms (Lk. xxiv. 44) the large place occupied by suffering in the experience of the righteous. This would be quite as helpful to disciples summoned to bear the cross as any of the thoughts in xvi. 25-28.—Πέμπε, ἵδον, ἵνα: Jesus takes Him the three disciples found most capable to understand and sympathise. So in Gethsemane. Such differences exist in all disciple-circles, and they cannot be ignored by the teacher.—ἀνάγκασον, leadeth up; in this sense not usual; of sacrifice in Jas. ii. 21 and in
1. οὐδὲ ΝΒΔ, which, the verb coming before the two nom., is legitimate. The T. R. is a grammatical correction of ancient revisers.

2. ΝΒ place μετ" αυτοπ after συναλλαγμένης.

3. πώπως in ΝΒC. Vide below.

4. άκουστε αυτον in ΝΒD.

Heb. vii. 27, xiii. 15.—δορς υψηλὸν: Tabor the traditional mountain, a tradition originating in fourth century with Cyril of Jerusalem and Jerome. Recent opinion favours Hermon. All depends on whether the six days were spent near Caesarea Philippi or in continuous journeying. Six days would take them far.

"The Mount of Transfiguration does not concern geography"—Holtz. (H. C.).—Ver. 2. μεταμορφώθηκεν, transfiguratus est, Vulgate; became altered in appearance. Such transformation in exalted states of mind is predicated of others, e.g., of Iamblichus (Eunapius in I. Vitt 22, cited by Elsner), and of Adam when naming the beasts (Fabricius, Cod. Pseud. V. T., p. 10),—αὐτῶν αὐτῶν, so as to be visible to them, vide vi. 1. Luke's narrative seems to imply that the three disciples were asleep at the beginning of the scene, but wakened up before its close.

—καὶ Λαμψ . . . φῶς: these words describe the aspect of the transformed person; face sun-bright, raiment pure white. Luke alone introduces a leading and remarkable feature in the scene: οὐδὲ αὐτῶν, there appeared to the three disciples, not necessarily an absolutely real, objective presence of Moses and Elias. All purposes would be served by an appearance in vision. Sufficient objectivity is guaranteed by the vision being enjoyed by all the three, which would have been improbable if purely subjective. Recognition of Moses and Elias was of course involved in the vision. For a realistic view of the occurrence the question arises, how was recognition possible? Euthy. Zig, says the disciples had read descriptions of famous men, including Moses and Elias, in old Hebrew books. Another suggestion is that Moses appeared with the law in his hand, and Elias in his fiery chariot.—συναλλαγμένης μ. α., conversing with Jesus, and, it goes without saying (Lk. does say it), on the theme uppermost in all minds, the main topic of recent conversations, the cross; the vision, in its dramatis personae and their talk, reflecting the state of mind of the seers.—Ver. 4. ἀποκρίθης ο. Π. Peter to the front again, but not greatly to his credit.—καλὸν αὐτίν, etc., either it is good for us to be here = the place is pleasant—so usually; or it is well that we are here—we the disciples to serve you and your visitants—Weiss and Holtzmann (H. C.). Pricaeus, in illustration of the former, cites Anacreon:

Παρὰ τὴν συνθή καθελα
Καθήκων καλὸν τὸ δώδεκαν.
Τίς αὖ οὖν δρῶν παρελθεί.
Καταγγέλ兮 τοιοῦτον.

—Ode 22.

This sense—amaenus est, in quo commòrétur, locus, Friztzcze—is certainly the more poetical, but not necessarily on that account the truer. Peter thought off the speaker, in view of the remark of Lk. omitted in Mt., that Peter did not know what he was saying.—πώπως, deliberative substantive with θέλειν preceding and without τοια; the singular—shall I make?—suits the forwardness of the man; it is his idea, and he will carry it out himself.—πρὸς σκήνη: material at hand, branches of trees, shrubs, etc. Why three? One better for persons in converse. The whole scheme a stupidity. Peter imagined that Moses and Elias had come to stay. Chrys. suggests that Peter here indirectly renew the policy of resistance to going up to Jerusalem (Hom. lvi.).

Vv. 5-8. νεφέλη φωτεινή, a luminous
cloud, still a cloud capable of casting a shadow, though a faint one ("non admodum atram," Fritzsche). Some, thinking a shadow incompatible with the light, render "cumpsavor tegebatur, circumdabat." Loesner cites passages from Philo in support of this meaning. — αὐτοῖς. Whom? the disciples? Jesus, Moses, and Elias? all the six? or the two celestial visitors alone? All these views have been held. The second the more probable, but impossible to be certain. —καὶ Ἰωάννης, again introducing a main feature: first the visitors, now the voice from heaven. Relation of the ear to the voice the same as that of the eye to the visitors. — αὐτοῖς: the voice spoken this time about Jesus; at the baptism to Him (Mk. i. 11), meant for the ear of the three disciples. The voice to be taken in connection with the previous spoken word and the coming passion. — Jesus God’s well-beloved as self-sacrificing. — ἀκούστη αὐτοῖς: to be taken in the same connection as hear Him when He speaks to you of the cross. Hunc audite, nempta solum, plena fide, perfectissimo obsequio, universi apostoli et pastores praestiterim, Elmer. — Ver. 6. καὶ ἀκούσατε, etc.: divine voices terrify poor mortals, especially when they echo and reinforce deep moving thoughts within. — Ver. 7. ἀφάνειος . . . ἄλλον: a touch and a word, human and kindly, from Jesus, restore strength and composure. — Ver. 8. And so ends the account of the more than human nature of the personages. — ἐφάρμοσας τ. ἀ., etc., raising their eyes they see no one but Jesus. Moses and Elias gone and Jesus in His familiar aspect; the dazzling brightness about face and garments vanished.

Vv. 9-13. Conversation while descending the hill. — Ver. 9. ἐμφανίσετε αὐτήν: injunction of secrecy. The reason of the injunction lies in the nature of the experience. Visions are for those who are prepared for them. It boots not to relate them to those who are not fit to receive them. Even the three were not partially fit; witness their terror (ver. 6). — τὸ ἱραμα, the vision, justifying the view above given of the experience held, among others, by Elmer, Herder, Bleek and Weiss. Herder has some fine remarks on the analogy between the experiences of Jesus at His baptism and on the Mount, six days after the announcement at Caesarea Philippi, and those of other men at the time of moral decisions in youth and in the near presence of death (vide his Vom Erlöser der Menschen, §§ 18, 19). — τῆς ὑστ. 66, followed by subjunctive without of the case (cf. xvi. 28) one of future contingency at a past time. The optative is used in classics (vide Burton, § 324). Not till the resurrection. It is not implied that Jesus was very desirous that they should then begin to speak, but only that they could then speak of the vision intelligently and intelligibly. Christ’s tone seems to have been that of one making light of the recent experience (as in Lk. x. 20). — Ver. 10. τῇ ὄψιν, etc.: does the ὄψιν refer to the prohibition in ver. 9 (Meyer), or to the appearance of Moses and Elias, still in the minds of the three disciples, and the lateness of their coming (Euthy., Weiss), or to the shortness of their stay? (Grotius, Fritzsche, Olsh., Bleek, etc.). Difficult to decide, owing to fragmentariness of report; but it is
most natural to take οὖν in connection with preceding verse, only not as referring to the prohibition of speech pro tem., but to the apparent slighting tone in which Jesus spoke. If the recent occurrence is not of vital importance, why then do the scribes say so? To lay the emphasis (with Weiss) on πρῶτον, as if the disciples were surprised that Moses and Elias had not come sooner, before the Christ, is a mistake. The advent would appear to them soon enough to satisfy the requirements of the scribes—just at the right time, after they had recognised in Jesus the Christ = Thou art the Christ we know, and lo! Elias is here to prepare the way for Thy public recognition and actual entry into Messianic power and glory. The sudden disappearance of the celestial beings would tend to deepen the disappointment created by the Master's chilling tone, so that there is some ground for finding in οὖν a reference to that also.—Ver. 11. ἐρχεται: present, as in ii. 4, praebent pro futuro, Raphel (Annotationes in S. S.), who cites instances in this enallage temporis from Xenophon. Wolf (Curae Phil.), referring to Raphel, prefers to find in the present here no note of time, but only of the order of coming as between Elias and Christ. It is a didactic, timeless present. So Weiss.—ἀποκαταστάσει πάντως. This word occurs in Sept Mal. iv. 5, for which stands in Lk. i. 17: ἀποκατάστασις; the reference is to restitution of right moral relations between fathers and children, etc. Raphel cites instances of similar use from Polyb. The function of Elias, as conceived by the scribes, was to lead Israel to the Great Repentance. Vide on this, Weber, Die Lehren des T., pp. 337-8.—Ver. 12. Μέν οὖν: Jesus finds the prophecy as to the advent of Elias fulfilled in John the Baptist, so still further reducing the significance of the late vision. The contrast between the mechanical literalism of the scribes and the free spiritual interpretation of Jesus comes out here. Our Lord expected no literal coming of Elijah, such as the Patriarch interpreters (Hilary, Chrys., Theophy., Eutby, etc.) supposed Him to refer to in ver. 11. The Baptist was all the Elijah He looked for.—οὖν ἐνε- γνώσατε: they did not recognise him as Elijah, especially those who professionally taught that Elijah must come, the scribes.—Δι’ ἐνεγνώσαν δὲ ἀπέφυ. etc. Far from recognising in him Elijah, and complying with his summons to repentance, they murdered him in resentment of the earnestness of his efforts towards a moral ἀποκατάστασις (Herod, as representing the Zeitgeist.).—ἐν ἀνόσῳ: literally, in him, not classical, but similar construction found in Gen. xi. 14, and elsewhere (Sept.).—οὕτως: Jesus reads His own fate in the Baptist's. How thoroughly He understood His time, and how free He was from illusions!—Ver. 13. τὸν ἐκεῖνον: the parallel drawn let the three disciples see who the Elijah was alluded to by their Master. What a disenchantment: not the glorified visitant of the night vision, but the beheaded preacher of the wilderness, the true Elijah!—Vv. 14-21. The epileptic boy (Mk. ix. 14-29; Lk. ix. 37-43).—Very brief report compared with Mk.—Ver. 14. Ἐλθόν τῶν: the avrμων of T. R. might easily be omitted as understood from the connection.—γυμνεῖν, literally, to fall upon the knees, in which sense it would naturally take the dative (T. R., αὐτῷ); here used actively with accusative = to beknee him (Schanz, Weiss).—Ver. 15. συνειδὼλευσα, he is moonstruck; the symptoms as described are those of epilepsy, which were supposed to become aggravated with the phases of
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Kata Mathaios

I.

with ος τος γονατισμόν αὐτῷ, καὶ λέγων, 15. "Κύριε, ἐλέησόν μου τὸν ὄλον, here (W. H.) and in δι ένεματεται καὶ κακόν πάοχει; 2. πολλάκις γάρ πίπτει εἰς τὸ

with τοῦρ, καὶ πολλάκις εἰς τὸ θωρ. 16. καὶ προσήγαγεν αὐτὸν τοὺς

μαθηταίς σου, καὶ οὐκ ἤκουσαν αὐτὸν θεραπεύσαι." 17. Ἀπο-

xxvii. 29.

Phil. ii. 15. κραδείς δὲ τὸ ἵππος εἶπεν, "Ζεγέλα ἄριστος καὶ ἰδεστραμμάτης,

(Δεντ, xxi. 5). οὐκός πάομαι μεθ' ὀμνίς; οὐκός πάος = ἀνθρώπως ὀμμίς; φησεν

ἐκ Μκ. ix. 19.

Lk. xxiv. 44. μου αὐτὸν ἀδείας. 18. καὶ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ τὸ ἵππος καὶ ἐξήλθεν

αὐτῷ τὸ δαμάσκον, καὶ ἐθηραπεύσεν ὁ παῖς ἀπὸ τῆς ὅρας κεινής.

iv. α. Col. iii. 13 (all) 19. Τότε προσελθόντες οἱ μαθηταὶ τῷ ἵππος καὶ ἦδαν εἶπον,

with gen. "Δια ήμείς οὖκ ἤκουσαν ἡμεῖς ἁμαλεῖν αὐτό;" 20. ο θ᾽ ἵππος 4

(accus. more common in classics). εἶπεν 6 αὐτοῖς, "Διὰ τὴν ἀπεστάλαν ὀμμίς. ἂμην γὰρ λέγω ὦμι,

1 αὐτοῦ in nearly all uncials. αὐτοῦ is a "mechanical repetition" (Weiss) of the

previous αὐτοῦ.

ης in ΝΕΛΖ; as the more usual word it is to be suspected. W.H. introduce

it with hesitation.

μηθ' ὄμοιον εἰρήμαι in ΝΒΔΖ.

4 ΝΒΔ omit ἴππος.

5 ΝΒΔ 33, etc., have λέγει.

6 ἀλευνοντεσταν in ΝΒ cursive, and adopted by most editors, though ἀλευνοντεσταν

in CD and other uncials as involving a severer reflection has much to recommend it.

The tendency would be to tone down.

the moon (cf. iv. 25).—κακός πάοχει

(φησί W. H. text), good Greek. Raphel (Annot.) gives examples from Poly. =
suffers badly.—Ver. 16. τοῦ μαθητάς: the nine left behind when Jesus and the

two ascended the Mount. The fame of Jesus and His disciples as healers had

reached the neighbourhood, wherever it was.—οὐκός ἤκουσαν: the case baffled

the men of the Galilean mission.—Ver. 17. θεγέλα: exclamation of impatience

and disappointment, as if of one weary in well-doing, or averse to such work

just then. Who are referred to we can only conjecture, and the guesses are

various. Probably more or less all present: parent, disciples, scribes (Mk. ix.

14). Jesus was far away in spirit from all, lonely, worn out, and longing for the

end, as the question following (ἐώς

πότε, etc.) shows. It is the utterance of a

fine-strung nature, weary of the dul-

ness, stupidity, spiritual insusceptibility (ἀνεχόμενος), not to speak of the moral

perversity (πειστραμμένος) all around Him. But we must be careful

to read into it peevishness or un-
graciousness. Jesus had not really grown tired of doing good, or lost patience with the bruised reed and

among tapers. The tone of His voice, gently reproachful, would show that.

Perhaps the complaint was spoken in an

undertone, just audible to those near, and

and then, aloud: φησεν μοι: bring him
to me, said to the crowd generally, therefore

plural.—Ver. 18. τὸ δαμάσκον: the

first intimation in the narrative that it is a
case of possession, and a hint as to

the genesis of the theory of possession.

Epilepsy presents to the eye the aspect of

the body being in the possession of a foreign will, and all diseases with which

the notion of demoniacal possession was

associated have this feature in common.

"Judeaeis usitatissimum erat morbos quosdam graviores, eos praeertim,

quibus vel distortum est corpus vel mens turbata et agitata phrenesi, malis

spiritibus attribuere." Lightfoot, Hor.

Heb., ad loc. The αὐτῷ after ἠπεί-

μησαν naturally refers to the demon.

This reference to an as yet unmentioned

subject Weiss explains by the influence

of Mk.

Ver. 19. καὶ ἦδαν: the disciples

have some private talk with the Master

as to what has just happened.—θεγέλα

οὐκ ἤκουσαν: the question implies

that the experience was exceptional; in

other words that on their Galilean

mission, and, perhaps, at other times,

they had possessed and exercised healing

to power.—Ver. 20. δὲ τὴν ἀλευνοντεσταν,

here only, and just on that account to be

preferred to ἀπεστάλαν (T. R.); a word

coinced to express the fact exactly: too

little faith for the occasion (cf. xiv. 31).
That was a part of the truth at least, and the part it became them to lay to heart.—μὴν, introducing, as usual, a weighty saying.—δὲν ἔχετε, if ye have, a present general supposition.—κόπκον σώασιν proverbial for a small quantity (xiii. 31), a minimum of faith. The purpose is to exalt the power of faith, not to inanitate that the disciples have not even the minimum. Schanz says they had no miracle faith ("fides miraculorum").—τῷ δὲ τοῦτῳ, the Mount of Transfiguration visible and pointed to. —μετέβαλε (μετέβη T. R.), a poetical form of imperative like ἔμβασιν in Rev. iv. 1. Vide Schmiedel's Winer, p. 115.—δὲν ἔχετε for ἔστειλεν ἐκείνου. —μεταβάλοντο: said, done. Jesus here in effect calls faith an "uprooter of mountains," a phrase current in the Jewish schools for a Rabbi distinguished by legal lore or personal excellence (Lightfoot, Hor. Heb., ad Mt. xxii. 21, Wünsche).—ἀναγνώρισεν used in the third person singular only in N. T. with dative = to be impossible; a reminiscence of Mk. ix. 23 (Weiss).—Ver. 21. Vide on Mk. ix. 29.

Vv. 22-23. Second announcement of the Passion (Mk. ix. 30, 31; Lk. ix. 44, 45).—Ver. 22. συντροφομένων αὐτῶν, while they were moving about a reunited band. —δὲ τῷ Γ.: they had got back to Galilee when the second announcement was made. Mk. states that though returned to familiar scenes Jesus did not wish to be recognised, that He might carry on undisturbed the instruction of the Twelve.—μελέτη, etc.: the great engrossing subject of instruction was the doctrine of the cross.—παραβίασαν: a new feature not in the first announcement. Grotius, in view of the words εἰς χειρας ἀνθρώπων, thinks the reference is to God the Father delivering up the Son. It is rather to recent revelations of disaffection within the disciple-circle. For if there were three disciples who showed some receptivity to the doctrine of the cross, there was one to whom it would be very unwelcome, and who doubtless had felt very uncomfortable since the Caesarea announcement.—ἰδροῦ contains a covert allusion to the part He is to play.—Ver. 23. ἀναγνώρισαν σφόδρα. they were all greatly distressed; but no one this time ventured to remonstrate or even to ask a question (Mk. ix. 32). The prediction of resurrection seems to have counted for nothing.

Vv. 24-27. The temple tax.—In Mt. only, but unmistakably a genuine historic reminiscence in the main. Even Holtzmann (H. C.) regards it as history, only half developed into legend.—Ver. 24. εἰς Καν.: home again after lengthened wandering with the satisfaction home gives even after the most exhilarating holiday excursions.—Ver. 24. προσήλθον εἷς, etc.: home-coming often means return to care. Here are the receivers of custom, as soon as they hear of the arrival, demanding tribute. From the Mount of Transfiguration to money demands which one is too poor to meet, what a descent! The experience has been often repeated in the lives of saints, sons of God, men of genius.—αἱ δύσαρεχμα: a δυσαρέχμα was a coin equal to two Attic drachmae, and to the Jewish half shekel.
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24. ἑλάθτων ἰδίᾳ αὐτῶν εἰς Κατερναοῦμι, προσήλθον αὐτῷ τὰ διδαχαμα λαμβάνοντες τῷ Πέτρῳ, καὶ εἶπον, "Ὁ διδάσκαλος ἡμῶν οὗ τελεῖ τὰ διδαχαμα;" 25. Λέγει, "Ναὶ." Καὶ διὰ ταὶ ἑλάθθαι εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, προσφέρανσιν αὐτῶν ἦς ἱππόδομος, λέγον, "Τί τοῦ δοκεῖς, Σίμων; οἱ βασιλείς τῆς γῆς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀλλῶν ἐλπίζουσιν; ἀπὸ τῶν υἱῶν αὐτῶν, ἢ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀλλοτρίων;"

1 ΝΔ omit τὰ here (Tisch.); BCL retain it (W.H.).
2 εὐσεβῶντα in Ν (τι D); εὐσεβῶν in B. Tisch. adopts the former; W.H. the latter, with εὐσεβῶν in margin.
3 B has τινες, which W.H. place in the margin.
4 For λέγω... Π. ΝBCL have εὐσεβῶς ἔγραφε (Tisch., W.H.). The T. R. is a grammatical correction. The adoption of εὐσεβῶς requires a comma before ἐὰς instead of a full stop as in T. R.

= about fifteen pence; payable annually by every Jew above twenty as a tribute to the temple. It was a tribute of the post-exilic time based on Exodus xxx. 13-16. After the destruction of the Temple the tax continued to be paid to the Capitol (Joseph. Bel. I. vii. 6, 7). The time of collection was in the month Adar (March).—τῷ Π. Peter evidently the principal man of the Jesus-circle for outsiders as well as internally.—ὁ τελεῖ. The receivers are feeling their way. Respect for the Master (διδάσκαλος) makes them go to the disciples for information, and possibly the question was simply a roundabout hint that the tax was overdue.—Ver. 25. υἱό: this prompt, confident answer may be either an inference from Christ's general bearing, as Peter understood it, or a statement of fact implying past payment.—εὐσεβῶντα ἐ. τ. ὅ. The meeting of the tax collectors with Peter had taken place outside; it had been noticed by Jesus, and the drift of the interview instinctively understood by Him.—προεξεχόμενον, anticipated him, here only in N. T. Peter meant to report, but Jesus spoke first, having something special to say, and a good reason for saying it. In other circumstances He would probably have taken no notice, but left Peter to manage the matter as he pleased. But the Master is aware of something that took place among His disciples on the way home, not yet mentioned by the evangelist but about to be (xviii. 1), and to be regarded as the key to the meaning of this incident. The story of what Jesus said to Peter about the temple dues is really the prelude to the discourse following on humility, and that discourse in turn reflects light on the prelude.—τῷ τοῦ δοκεῖ; phrase often found in Mt. (xviii. 12, xxi. 26, etc.) with lively colloquial effect: what think you?—τὴν ἡ θέσιν, customs or tribute; the former taxes on wares, the latter a tax on persons = indirect and direct taxation. The question refers specially to the latter.—ἀλλοτρίων, foreigners, in reference not to the nation, but to the royal family, who have the privilege of exemption.—Ver. 26. ἔργον on the force of this particle side at vii. 20. The γε lends emphasis to the exemption of the ἐρήμων. It virtually replies to Peter's υἱὸν: then you must admit, what your answer to the collectors seemed to deny, that the ch., i.e., NT., are free. The reply is a γε εἰς ἐσπίριτι. Christ's purpose is not seriously to argue for exemption, but to prepare the way for a moral lesson.

Ver. 27. θα μὴ συνέβλεψα, that we may not create misunderstanding as to our attitude by asking exemption or refusing to pay. Nögen, with a singular lack of exegetical insight, thinks the scandal of Jesus and His followers despise the temple, and disallow its claims. And the aim of Jesus was to fix Peter's attention on the fact that He was anxious to avoid giving offence thereby, and in that view abstained from insisting on personal claims. Over against the spirit of ambition, which has begun to show itself among His disciples, He
sets His own spirit of self-effacement and desire as far as possible to live peaceably with all men, even with those with whom He has no religious affinity. — τοποθετεῖ τὸ ὑπεράκοντον ἡμῶν. Generally the instruction given is: go and fish for the money needed to pay the tax.— ἄγωντος, a hook, not a net, because little would suffice: one or two fish at most.— πρῶτον ἤθελον: the very first fish that comes up will be enough, for a reason given in the following clause.— ἀναφέρεται στασία: the words point to something marvellous, a fish with a stater, the sum wanted, in its mouth. Paulus sought to eliminate the marvellous by rendering ἐφάνετο not “find” but “obtain,” i.e., by sale. Beyschlag (Das Leben Jesu, p. 304) suggests that the use of an ambiguous word created the impression that Jesus directed Peter to catch a fish with a coin in its mouth. Ewald (Geschichte Christus, p. 407) thinks Jesus spoke very much as reported, but from the fact that it is not stated that a fish with a coin in its mouth was actually found, he infers that the words were not meant seriously as a practical direction, but were a spirited proverbial utterance, based on rare examples of money found in fishes. Weiss is of opinion that a simple direction to go and fish for the means of payment was in the course of oral tradition changed into a form of language implying a miraculous element. This view appears to be right. The report in Mt. was derived from oral tradition (v.s.a Weiss, Das Leben Jesu, ii. 47, and my Miraculous Element in the Gospel, pp. 234-5). In any case the miracle, not being reported as having happened, cannot have been the important point for the evangelist. What he is chiefly concerned about is to report the behaviour of Jesus on the occasion, and the words He spoke revealing its motive.— ἀνωτάτου καὶ σοῦ: various questions occur to one here. Did the collectors expect Jesus only to pay (for Himself and His whole company), or did their question mean, does He also, even He, pay? And why pay only for Peter along with Himself? Were all the disciples not liable: Andrew, James and John there, in Capernaum, not less than Peter? Was the tax strictly collected, or for lack of power to enforce it had it become practically a voluntary contribution, paid by many, neglected by not a few? In that case it would be a surprise to many that Jesus, while so uncompromising on other matters, was so accommodating in regard to money questions. He would not conform to custom in fasting, Sabbath keeping, washing, etc., but He would pay the temple tax, though refusal would have had no more serious result than slightly to increase already existing ill-will. This view sets the generosity and nobility of Christ’s spirit in a clearer light.

CHAPTER XVIII. MORAL TRAINING OF THE DISCIPLES. In this and the next two chapters the centre of interest is the spiritual condition of the Twelve, and the necessity thereby imposed on their Master to subject them to a stern moral discipline. The day of Caesarea had inaugurated a spiritual crisis in the disciple-circle, which searched them through and through, and revealed in them all in one form or another, and in a greater or less degree, moral weakness: disloyalty to the Master (xvii. 22), vain ambition, jealousy, party spirit. The disloyal disciple seems to have taken to heart more than the others the gloomy side of the Master’s predicament after the announcement of the Passion; his more honest-hearted companions let their minds rest on the more pleasing side of the prophetic picture, the near approach of the kingdom in power and glory, so that while remaining true to the Master their hearts became fired with ambitious passions.

Vv. 1-14. Ambition rebuked (Mk. ix. 33-50; Lk. ix. 46-50, xv. 3-7, xvii. 1-4). — Ver. 1. ἐν τῷ ἡμερών: in that hour; the expression connects what follows very closely with the tax incident, and shows that the two things were intimately associated in the mind of the evangelist.
XVIII. I. 'EN ekhegei tē ēra prosothēlon oĩ maθhtai tī ιησου, leghontes, "Tīs ēra "meizōn oĩtēn ēn tī baiasleia tōn ὸpアウn;"
2. Kai prōskalestēmēs tī ιησούs 1 payidion ēntēsouν aútoν ēn òpアウv
aúton, 3. kai eite, "Aμην lágoi ómwn, éan μὴ ὀπραφήτε καὶ
γίνηθη ὡς τα παιδία, οὗ μὴ εἰσέλθητε ἐς την βασιλεία τῶν
ο浥wv, 4. ὡς τοις ὁν ὀμοφωνάντων ὡς τα παιδία τούτων,
oędziō oũτo μeizōν ἐν τη βασιλεία τῶν ὀ浥wv. 5. kai ἐδὲ ὅν
δι Ch. xxiv. ὑζεῖται παιδιόν τοιοῦτον ὑν ὁ ὀπτὶ τῆς θρόνου μου, ἐμὲ ὑζεῖνται ·

1 ΝΒΛ al. omit o. l.
2 τοποθετοῦσθαι in all uncials.
3 ὅν before παιδιόν in BDZ; τοιοῦτον in ΝΒΛΔ for the more usual τοιοῦτον in T. R. (ἐν παιδίον τοιοῦτον in Tisch. and W.H.).

τῆς ἐρα μείζων: who then is greater, etc.? The ēra may be taken as pointing back to the tax incident as suggesting the question, but not to it alone, rather to it as the last of a series of circumstances tending to force the question to the front: address to Peter at Caesarea Philippi; three disciples selected to be with the Master on the Hill of Transfiguration. From Mk. we learn that they had been discussing it on the way home.—ἦν τ. ἀστ. τ. σκ., in the Kingdom of Heaven; this is wanting in Mk., where the question is a purely personal one; who is the greater (among us, now, in your esteem)? In Mk. the question, though referring to the present, who is, etc., points to the future, and presents a more general aspect, but though it wears an abstract look it too is personal in reality = which of us now is the greater for you, and shall therefore have the higher place in the kingdom when it comes? It is not necessary to conceive every one of the Twelve-fancying it possible he might be the first man. The question for the majority may have been one as to the respective claims of the more prominent men, Peter, James, John, each of whom may have had his partisans in the little band.—Ver. 3. παίδια: the task of Jesus is not merely to communicate instruction but to rebuke and exorcise an evil spirit, therefore He does not trust to words alone, but for the greater impressiveness uses a child who happens to be present as a vehicle of instruction. The legendary spirit which dearly loves certainty in detail identified the child with Ignatius, as if that would make the lesson any the more valuable!—Ver. 3. ἐὰν μὴ ὀπραφήτε: unless ye turn round so as to go in an opposite direction. “Conversion” needed and demanded, even in the case of these men who have left all to follow Jesus! How many who pass for converted, regenerate persons have need to be converted over again, more radically! Chrys. remarks: "We are not able to reach even the faults of the Twelve; we ask not who is the greatest in the Kingdom of Heaven, but who is the greater in the Kingdom of Earth: the richer the more powerful” (Hom. Ivi.). The remark is not true to the spirit of Christ. In His eyes vanity and ambition in the sphere of religion were graver offences than the sins of the worldly. His tone at this time is markedly severe, as much so as when He denounced the vices of the Pharisees. It was indeed Pharisaism in the bud He had to deal with. Rech suggests that ὀπραφήτε here simply represents the idea of becoming again children, corresponding to the Hebrew idiom which uses בֵּית = πῶλον (Ausser-canonicische Parallelife zu Mt. and Mkh., p. 213).—ὡς τα παιδία, like the children, in unpretentiousness. A king’s child has no more thought of greatness than a beggar’s.—οὕ μὴ εἰσέλθητι, ye shall not enter the kingdom, not to speak of being great there. Just what He said to the Pharisees (side on chps. v. 17-20).—Ver. 4. ταυτίζων ἐν οὖν: the most difficult thing in the world for saint as for sinner. Raphel (Annot. in S.S.) distinguishes three forms of self-humiliation: in mind (Phil. ii. 3), by words, and by acts, giving classical examples of the latter two. It is easy to humble oneself by self-disparaging words, or by symbolic acts, as when the Egyptian monks wore hoods, like children’s caps (Elsner), but to be humble in spirit, and so child-like—ὁ μείζων. The really humble man is as great in the moral world as he is rare.
6. δε δι' αὐτὸν ἀνάθεσιν ἐν τοῖς ἐκκλησίαις ἡμῶν, συμφέρειν αὐτῷ, ἵνα κριμασθῇ μᾶλα ὑπὸ ἰδιοῦ ἐπὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ, καὶ καταποντισθῇ ἐν τῷ πελάγει τῆς θάλασσης. Ἐφ. χ. ν. 29.
7. Οὐδὲ τῷ κόσμῳ ἀπὸ τῶν σκάνδαλων· ἀνάγκη γερὸς ἄνωθεν ἅδειν ἑκατέρου, καὶ τὰ σκάνδαλα. 

For εὔετίς ΝΒΛΖ have ἐυετίς.
Omitted in BL (W.H.); found in ND (Tisch.).
εἴρεται wanting in ΝDPLΣ; found in B but not adopted by W.H. It looks like an echo of xxvi. 24, yet it answers well to the solemn tone of our Lord's utterance on this occasion.

Vv. 5-7.—Ver. 5. Δέξιται: the discourse passes at this point from being child-like to gracious treatment of a child and what it represents. ἐν ταῖς ἑλεόσωμοι τοιούτων: the real child present in the room passes into an ideal child, representing all that the spirit of ambition in its struggle for place and power is apt to trample under foot. So in effect the majority of commentators; a few, including Bengel, De Wette, Bleek, Weiss, hold that the reference is still to a real child. In favour of this view is Luke's version; "Whoso receiveth this child," etc. (ix. 48). But the clause εἰς τὸ ἐνέχειν μοι raises the child into the ideal sphere. The reception required does not mean natural kindness to children (though that also Christ valued), but esteeming them as fellow-disciples in spite of their insignificance. A child may be such a disciple, but it may also represent such disciples, and it is its representative function that is to be emphasised.—Ver. 6. σκάνδαλος: the opposite of receiving; treating harshly and contemptuously, so as to tempt to undo the work of God's grace, pride and selfish ambition of those who pass for eminent Christians make many infidels.

—ἐνα γ. μ. τ.: one of the large class of little ones; not merely child believers surely, but all of whom a child is the emblem, as regards social or ecclesiastical importance. Those who are caused to stumble are always little ones: "majores enim scandala non recipiunt," Jerome. One of them: "frequens unius in hoc capite mentio," Bengel. This is the one text in which Jesus speaks of Himself as the object of faith (vid. The Kingdom of God, p. 263).—συμφέρει. 

—ἐνα: vide on v. 29. Fritzsche finds here an instance of attraction similar to that in x. 25, καὶ ὁ δοῦλος, ὁς ἐλ. Χ. Χ. Instead of saying συμφέρει a. κριμα-

οῖναι... ἵνα καταποντισθῇ, the writer puts both verbs in the subjunctive after ἵνα—μᾶλα ὑπὸ ἰδιοῦ. The Greeks called the upper millstone δόντα the ass (ἡ ἀνώτερος λίθος, Hesychius), but they did not use the adjective ὑπὸ. The meaning therefore is a millstone driven by an ass, i.e., a large one, as distinct from smaller sized ones driven by the hand, commonly used in Hebrew houses in ancient times. "Let such a large stone be hung about the neck of the offender to make sure that he sink to the bottom to rise no more."—such is the thought of Jesus; strong in conception and expression, revealing intense abhorrence.—ἐκ τοῦ πελάγει τ. 8.: in the deep part of the sea. So Kypke, who gives examples; another significantly strong phrase. Both these expressions have been toned down by Luke.—καταποντισθῇ: drowning was not a form of capital punishment in use among the Jews. The idea may have been suggested by the word denoting the offence, σκάνδαλος. Bengel remarks: "apposita locutio in sermone de scandalo, nam ad lapsides ordine adfertur "let the man who puts a stone in the path of a brother have a stone hung about his neck," etc. Lightfoot suggests as the place of drowning the Dead Sea, in whose waters nothing would sink without a weight attached to it, and which to be drowned was a mark of execration.—Ver. 7. οὐδὲ τῷ κόσμῳ: woe to the world, an exclamation of pity at thought of the miseries that come upon mankind through ambitious passions. Some (Bleek, Weiss, etc.) take κόσμος in the sense of the ungodly world, as in later apostolic usage, and therefore as causing, not suffering from, the offences deplored. This interpretation is legitimate but not inevitable, and it seems better to take the word in the
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ΕΡΧΕΤΑΙ. 8. Εἰ δὲ ἡ χείρ σου ἡ δ' ποὺς σου σκανδάλιζε σε, ἐκκοψών αὐτά ἔφθασε ἄνδρος καὶ βαλε ἀπὸ σοῦ: καλόν σου ἐστὶν εἰσελθείν εἰς τὴν ζωὴν χωλὸν ἢ κυλλὸν, ἢ δύο χεῖρες ἢ δύο πόδες ἔχοντα βληθῆναι εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ αἰῶνον. 9. καὶ εἰ ὁ ωφάλμος σου σκανδάλιζε σε, ἐξελεγκθῆραι εἰς τὸν ἱερόν, καὶ εἰ στὸν ὁφαλμὸν σου, ἐπάθησαν τὰς μεταλλώμετρας τῶν ἕνωσιμῶν τούτων.

1 ἀντων ἐν ΝΒΔΛΣ. ἀντα γραμματικὴ κορrection.

2 κυλλὸν ἡ χωλὸν ἐν ΝΒ (Τισχ., Β.Μ.).

more general sense of humanity conceived of as grievously afflicted with "scandals" without reference to who is to blame. They are a great fact in the history of mankind, by whosoever caused.—έπειθε τ. σ.—εἰς τῆν ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς ρήματος. τῶν σκανδάλων: the scandals; a general category, and a black one.—ἀνεγέρση γραφ.: they are inevitable; a fatality as well as a fact, on the wide scale of the world; they cannot be prevented, only deplored. No shallow optimism in Christ's view of life.—μὴ ἔχω: adverative here, setting the woe that overtakes the cause of offences, over against that of those who suffer from them. Weiss contends that it is not adverative here any more than in xi. 23, but simply conducts from the general culpability of the world to the guilt of every particular cause of scandal, even when he does not belong to the world.

Vv. 8, 9. These verses are one of Mt.'s dualities, being found with some variations in the Sermon on the Mount (Mt. vii. 15-27). Repetition perhaps due to use of two sources, but in sympathy with the connection of thought in both places. Since the offender is the greater loser in the end, it is worth his while to take precautions against being an offender.—Ver. 8. χείρ, πόδας: mentioned together as instruments of violence.—καλὸν...ὑ: the positive for the comparative, or ὑ used in sense of magis quam. Raphel and Kypke cite instances of this use from classics. It may be an imitation of Hebrew usage, in which the comparative is expressed by the positive, followed by the preposition min. "A rare classical usage tends to become frequent in Hellenistic Greek if it be found to correspond to a common Hebrew idiom" (Carr, in Camb. N. T.).—κυλλὸν: with reference to hand, mutilated; wanting one or both hands.—χωλὸν: in a similar condition regarding the feet (cf. xi. 5; xv. 30).—Ver. 9. ωφαλμὸς, the eye, referred to as the means of expressing contempt; in chap. v. 29 as inciting to lust.—μονοφάλαμον, properly should mean having only one eye by nature, but here = wanting an eye, for which the more exact term is ἀμφίφαλαμος, vide Lobeck, Phryn., p. 130.

Vv. 10-14. Still the subject is the child as the ideal representative of the insignificant, apt to be despised by the ambitious. From this point onwards Mt. goes pretty much his own way, giving logia of Jesus in general sympathy with the preceding discourse, serving the purpose of moral discipline for disciples aspiring to places of distinction.—Ver. 10. ὅρατε µὴ καταφη: µὴ with the subj. in an object clause after a verb meaning to take heed; common N. T. usage; vide Matt. xxiv. 4; Acts xiii. 40, etc.—ὁδηγεῖ, one, again.—λέγω γραφ.: something solemn must be said.—ὁ δὲ γνωρίζεις, etc. In general abstract language, the truth Jesus solemnly declares is that God, His Father, takes a special interest in the little ones in all senses of the word. This truth is expressed in terms of the current Jewish belief in guardian angels. In the later books of O. T. (Daniel), there are guardian angels of nations; the extension of the privilege to individuals was a further development. Christ's words are not to be taken as a dogmatic endorsement of this post-exilian belief exemplified in the story of Tobit (chap. vi.). The same remark applies to the passages in which the law is spoken of as given through angelic mediation (Acts vii. 53; Gal. iii. 19; Heb. ii. 2). The λέγω γραφ. does not mean "this belief is true," but "the idea it embodies, God's special care for
the little, is true”. This is an important text for Christ’s doctrine of the Fatherhood. It teaches that, contrary to the spirit of the world, which values only the great, the Father-God cares specially for that which is apt to be despised.—

Vv. 12-14. Parable of straying sheep (Lk. xv. 4-7); may seem less appropriate here than in Lk., but has even here a good setting, amounting to a climax = God cares not only for the lowly and little morally erring. In both places the parable teaches the precious characteristically Christian doctrine of the worth of the individual at the worst to God.—Ver. 12. υ. δοκεῖ as in xvii. 25.—όντα γένεται τ. μαθήματα: if a man happen to have as large a number, yet, etc.—καὶ ὡς ἐν: only one wanderer, out of so many.—πορευθέντα ζητεῖ: does he not go and seek the one?—Ver. 13. καὶ . . . αὐτῷ: if it happen that he finds it.—In Lk. he searches till he finds it. —ἀπίστως λέγω: specially solemn, with a view to the application to the moral sphere of what is in the natural sphere is self-evident.—Ver. 14. application of the parable less emphatic than in Lk.—θαλάμῳ, a will, for an object of will.—μετροθεῖν τ. π. μ.: before the face of = for, etc.

Vv. 15-17. How to deal with an erring brother.—The transition here is easy from warning against giving, to counsel how to receive, offences. The terms are changed: μίσχος becomes ἀδελφός, giving offence not suiting the idea of the former, and for σωκεφαλίσαμεν we have the more general ἀμαρτάνειν.—Vv. 16 and 17 have something answering to them in Lk. xvii. 3, coming in there after the group of parables in chaps. xv. and xvi., in which that of the Shepherd has its place; whence Wendt recognises these verses as an authentic logion probably closely connected with the parable in the common source. Ver. 17 he regards as an addition by the evangelist or a later hand. Hofmann (H. C.) regards the whole section (15-17) as a piece of Church order in the form of a logion of the Lord.

Ver. 15. ἀμαρτήσῃ: apart from the doubtful ἐστιν following, the reference appears to be to private personal offences, not to sin against the Christian name, which every brother in the community has a right to challenge, especially those closely connected with the offender.

Yet perhaps we ought not too rigidly to draw a line between the two in an ideal community of love.—μεταφε ς κ. κ. μ.: the phrase implies that some one has the right and duty of taking the initiative. So far it is a personal affair to begin with. The simpler and more classical expression would be μονός μονόν.—ἀκούσῃ, hear, in the sense of
 submitting to admonition.—κατηφόρως: gained as a friend, as a fellow-member of the Kingdom of God, or as a man = saved him from moral ruin? All three alternatives find support. Is it necessary or possible to decide peremptorily between them?—Ver. 16. έάν μή κτ. A. After a first failure try again, with added influence.—παρέλαβε... έάν δέο. This bears a juridical aspect (Schanz), but it does not really pass out of the moral sphere: ethical influence alone contemplated; consensus in moral judgment carries weight with the conscience.

—έάν είτι ντόματος, etc.: reference to the legal provision in Deut. xix. 15 in a literary rather than in a legal spirit.—Ver. 17. έάν μή κτ. Try first a minimum of social pressure and publicity, and if that fail have recourse to the maximum.

—είτι τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ: speak to the "Church"—the brotherhood of believers in the Christ. This to be the widest limit for the ultimate sphere of moral influence, as ex hypothesi the judgment of the community will count for more to its members than that of all the world beyond.—έστω σοι, etc.: this failing, the offender puts himself outside the society, and there is nothing for it but to treat him as a heathen or a publican; which does not mean with indifference or abhorrence; but carefully avoiding fellowship with him in sin, and seeking his good only as one without. There is no reference in this passage to ecclesiastical discipline and Church censures. The older interpreters, in a theologico-polemical interest, were very anxious to find in it support for their developed ideas on these topics. The chief interest of historic exegesis is to divest it of an ecclesiastical aspect as much as possible, for only so can it suit the initial period, and be with any probability regarded as an utterance of Jesus. As such it may be accepted, when interpreted, as above. If, as we have tried to show, it was natural for Jesus to speak of a new community of faith at Caesarea, it was equally natural that He should return upon the idea in the Capernaum lesson on humility and kindred virtues, and refer to it as an instrument for promoting right feeling and conduct among professed disciples.—Ver. 18. Renewed promise of power to bind and loose, this time not to Peter alone, as in xvi. 19, but to all the Twelve, not qua apostles, with ecclesiastical authority, but qua disciples, with the ethical power of morally disciplined men. The Twelve for the moment are for Jesus = the ecclesia: they were the nucleus of it. The binding and loosing generically = exercising judgment on conduct; here specifically = treating sin as pardonable or the reverse—a particular exercise of the function of judging.

Vv. 19, 20. Promise of the power and presence of God to encourage concord.—Ver. 19. τέλειον... εἰς τοὺς ἀδικούς... introducing a new thought of parallel importance to the former, in ver. 18.

—έάν δέο: two; not the measure of Christ’s expectation of agreement among His disciples, but of the moral power that lies in the sincere consent of even two minds. It out weighs the nominal agreement of thousands who have no real bond of union.—συμφωνοῦσιν: agree, about what? not necessarily only the matters referred to in previous context, but anything concerning the Kingdom of God.—παρά τινς πράγματος: concerning every or any matter, offences committed by brethren included of course.—γενήσεται: it shall be; what absolute confidence in the laws of the moral world!—παρά τ. π. μ.: from my Father. The Father-God of Jesus is here defined as a lover of peace and
fraternal concord. In this verse we have a case of attraction, of the main subject into the conditional clause. Resolved the sentence would run: τάν παράκλησιν, οί δέν αὐτής, δὲν συμφωνήσαν, δὲν συμφωνήσαν οῇ αὐτής, γενήσαται αὐτής. — Ver. 20. τόδε η τριήμερος. Jesus deals in small numbers, not from modesty in His anticipations, but because they suit the present condition, and in jealousy for the moral quality of the new society.— συνεγγυμονέω εἰς, etc., not gathered to confess or worship my name, but gathered as believers in me. It is a synonym for the new society. The ecclesia is a body of men gathered together by a common relation to the name of the Christ: a Christian synagogue as yet consisting of the Twelve, or as many of them as were really one in heart,—ἐκαί ἐξήκοντα, etc.; there am I, now, with as many of you, my disciples, as are one in faith and brotherly love; not with any more even of you: far away from the man of ambitious, not to say traitorous, mind. There am I in reference to the future. His presence, if not certain, therefore expressed as a present fact, even with reference to a future time—a promise natural from One looking forward to an early death. Similar in import to Mt. xxviii. 20. For similar sayings of the Rabbis concerning the presence of the Divine Majesty, or the Shechinah, among two or three sitting in judgment or studying the law, vide Lightfoot and Schöttgen.

Vv. 21, 22. Peter’s question about forgiving.—The second of two interpellations in the course of Christ’s discourse (vide Mk. ix. 38-41; Lk. ix. 49, 50). Such words touch sensitive consciences, and the interruptions would be welcomed by Jesus as proof that He had not spoken in vain.—Ver. 21. ὑπάρχω, etc.: the question naturally arose out of the directions for dealing with an offending brother, which could only be carried out by one of placable disposition. Their presupposition is that a fault confessed is to be forgiven. But how far is this to go? In Lk. xvii. 3 the case is put of seven offences in a day, each in turn repented of and confessed. Is there not reason for doubting the sincerity of repentance in such a case? Or is this not at least the extreme limit? Such is Peter’s feeling.—ἀμαρτίζω, ἀφίζω: two futures instead of πρώτω, ἀμαρτίζω: Hebrew idiom instead of Greek.—ἐκ τῶν ἑπτάκεν: Peter meant to be generous, and he went considerably beyond the Rabbinical measure, which was three times (Amos i. 6): “ quicunque remissionem petit a proximo, ne ultra quam ter peiat,” Schöttgen.—Ver. 22. ἀδ; emphatic “no” to be connected with ἐκ τῶν ἑπτάκεν. Its force may be brought out by translating: no, I tell you, not till, etc.—ἀλλὰ ἧ δ. ἧ: Christ’s reply lifts the subject out of the legal sphere, where even Peter’s suggestion left it (seven times and no more—a hard rule), into the evangelic and may be rendered “times without number, infinite pliability. This alone decides between the two renderings of ἑβδομακοτάκεν ἐκτεινώ: seventy-seven times and seventy times seven, in favour of the latter as giving a number (490) practically equal to infinitude. Bengel leans to the former, and may be the termination καί as covering the whole number seventy-seven, and referring to Gen. iv. 24 as the probable source of the expression. Similarly some of the Fathers (Orig., Aug.), De Wette and Meyer. The majority adopt the opposite view, among whom may be named Grotius and Fritzsche, who cite the Syriac version in support. On either view there is inexactness in the expression. Seventy times seven requires the καί at both words. Seventy-seven times requires the καί at
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... the end of the second word rather than at end of first: either where kai eijo ... kai, or eijo ... ta etiktai.

Vv. 23-25. Parable of unmerciful servant.—Ver. 23. "Did you suggest that the aim of the parable is to justify the apparently unreasonable demand in ver. 22: unlimited forgiveness of injuries. All after, says Jesus, suppose ye comply with the demand, what do your remissions amount to compared to what has been remitted to you by God?—Διδωσαι βασιλείαν: a man, a king; king an afterthought demanded by the nature of the case. Only a great monarch can have such debtors, and opportunity to forgive such debts,—συναρέω λογον (found again in xxv. 10), to hold a reckoning.—δολάοι: all alike servants or slaves in relation to the king. So human distinctions are dwarfed into insignificance by the distance between all men and God.—Ver. 24. εἰς: one stood out above all the rest for the magnitude of his debt, who, therefore, becomes the subject of the story.—οὐκέτασας μη: a debtor of, or to the extent of, a thousand talents—an immense sum, say millions sterling; payment hopeless; that the point; exact calculations idle or pedantic. It may seem to violate natural probability that time was allowed to incur such a debt, which speaks to malversation for years. But the indulgence of an Eastern monarch must be taken into account, and the absence of system in the management of finance. As Koetsveld (De Gelijk., p. 286) remarks: "A regular control is not in the spirit of the Eastern. He trusts utterly when he does trust, and when he loses confidence it is for ever."—Ver. 25. πραδήσατε ... εἰς: the order is given that the debtor be sold, with all he had, including his wife and children; hard lines, but according to ancient law, in the view of which wife and children were simply property. Think of their fate in those barbarous times! But parables are not scrupulous on the score of morality.—καὶ ἀποδόθηναι: the proceeds of sale to be applied in payment of the debt.—Ver. 26. μακροθυμήω: a Hellenistic word, sometimes used in the sense of deferring anger (Prov. xix. 11 (Sept.), the corresponding adjective in Ps. lxxvi. 15; cf. 1 Cor. xiii. 4; 1 Thess. v. 14). That sense is suitable here, but the prominent idea is: give me time; wrath comes in at a later stage (ver. 34).—πάντα ἀποδώσαι: easy to promise; his plea: better wait and get all than take hasty measures and get only a part.—Ver. 27. συναρέωσθαι: touched with pity, not unmixed perhaps with contempt, and associated possibly with rapid reflection as to the best course, the king decides on a magnanimous policy.—Ἀπαντήσας, το δόλιον ἀφέναι: two benefits conferred; set free from imprisonment, debt absolutely cancelled, not merely time given for payment. A third benefit implied, continuance in office. The policy adopted in hope that it will ensure good behaviour in time to come (Ps. cxxx. 4); perfectly credible even in an Eastern monarch.

Vv. 28-34. The other side of the picture.—Ver. 28. ἐν τῷ συνδῆλον δ.: a fellow-slave though a humble one, which he should have remembered, but did not.
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ο κύριος τοῦ δούλου ἐκείνου ἑαυτὸν ἔστησεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ τὸ 7 ἄραιον ἀπέκληκεν γε here only αὐτῷ. 28. Ἐξελεύθην δὲ οἱ δούλῳ ἐκείνος 1 εὗρεν ἐν αὐτῷ τῶν συνδούλων αὐτοῦ, δὲ ὕπελευθήσατο ἐκατον δύναμιν, καὶ κρατήσας αὐτὸν ἐπηνευσε, εἶ λέγων, ὁ ἀπόδος μοι ὦ ἡ ὁ ὀφειλείς. 29. πεσὼν οὖν οἱ σύνδολοι αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν πόλον αὐτοῦ 4 παρεκάλεῖν αὐτόν, λέγων, ἐκατέργασαν ἐν ἑμοί, καὶ παρ’ ἕτος οἱ ἀποδόσις σοι. 30. δὲ οὖν ἔδειξεν, ἀλλὰ ἀπέλευθην ἔβαλεν αὐτὸν εἰς φυλακὴν, ἦς ὅτε ὅ ἀπόδοσ τὸ ὀφειλόμενον.

31. ἰδοὺντες δὲ 8 οἱ σύνδολοι αὐτοῦ τὰ γενόμενα ἐξυπηρέτησαν σοφρά:

1 B omits ἐκείνου here (W.H. in brackets) and ἐκεῖνος in ver. 28.
8 ΝΒΔΛ omit οἱ.
8 ΝΒΚΔ and other uncial have εἰ πάντα ἐπὶ (T. R.) only in minus., rejected by modern editors.
4 εἰς τι π. ἢ τοῦ omitted in ΝΒΚΔΛ and by modern editors.
6 So in ΝΒ and many uncial. CDL have εἰς ὅμα.
7 ἅτις is feebly attested and unsuitable to the case.
8 οἱ in ΝΒCL.

—ἐκατον δύναμιν: some fifty shillings; an utterly insignificant debt, which, coming out from the presence of a king, who had remitted so much to him, he should not even have remembered, far less been in the mood to exact.—κρατήσας αὐτὸν ἐπηνευσε: seizing, he choked, throttled him, after the brutal manner allowed by ancient custom, and even by Roman law. The act foretokens merciless treatment: no remission of debt to be looked for in this quarter.—ἀπόδος εἰ πάντα ὁ ὁ. In the εἰ πάντα some ingenious commentators (Fritzsch., e.g.) have discovered Greek urbanity! [4] Non sìne urbanitate Graeci a conditionis vinculo aptarunt, quod a nulla conditione suspenderat. Weis comes nearer the truth when he sees in it an expression of "merciless logic". He will have payment of whatever is due, were it only a penny.—Ver. 29. μακροθυμίαν, etc.: the identical words he used himself just a few minutes ago, reminding him surely of his position as a pardoned debtor, and moving him to like conduct.—Ver. 30. οὖν ἔδειξεν: no pity awakened by the words which echoed his own petition. "He would not." Is such conduct credible? Two remarks may be made on this. In parabolic narratives the improbable has sometimes to be resorted to to illustrate the unnatural behaviour of men in the spiritual sphere, e.g., in the parable of the least (Lk. xiv. 16-24) all refuse; how unlikely! But the action of the pardoned debtor is not so improbable as it seems. He acts on the instinct of a base nature, and also doubtless in accordance with long habits of harsh tyrannical behaviour towards men in his power. Every way a bad man: greedy, grasping in acquisition of wealth, prodigal in spending it, unscrupulous in using what is not his own. —Ver. 31. ἰδοὺντες οἱ σ. ἐνυπηρέτησαν: the other fellow-servants were greatly vexed or grieved. At what? the fate of the poor debtor? Why then not pay the debt? (Koestveld). Not sympathy so much as annoyance at the unbecoming conduct of the merciless one who had obtained mercy was the feeling.—Ver. 32. ἐνυπηρέτησαν: reported the facts (narraverunt, Vulg.), and so threw light on the character of the man (cf. Mt. xiii. 36, W. and H.).—-yyyy καὶ ἡ τοιοῦτοι τοῖς ὅσοι τῆς ὅσα to their own master, to whom therefore they might speak on a matter affecting his interest.—Ver. 32. ὁ πάροικος: the king could understand and overlook dishonesty in money matters, but not such inhumanity and villainy.—π. ὁ ὁ. 4: huge, uncountable.—ἦν παρεκάλεσας με, when you entreated me. In point of fact he had not, at least in words, asked remission but only time to pay. Ungenerous himself, he was incapable of conceiving, and therefore of appreciating such magnificent generosity.—Ver. 33. οὖν ἔδει; was it not your duty? an appeal to the sense of decency and gratitude.—καὶ οἱ Ἐληφάντα. There was condescension in putting the two cases together as parallel. Ten thousand acts of forgiveness such as the culprit was asked to
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XVIII. 32-35. KATA MATGAION

32. Τότε προσκαλεσμένος αὐτῶν ὁ κύριος αὐτῶι λέγει αὐτῷ, Δοῦλε

Rom. xii. πονηρῷ, πᾶς ὁ τῆς ὁφειλῆς ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς, ἐκεῖ παρεκκλησίς

Cor. vi. 3. μὲ 33. οὐκ ἔδει καὶ σὲ ἐλέησαι τῶν σύνθεσιν τούτων, ὁ δὲ καὶ ἔγνω σε ἡγέσας; 34. καὶ ἤργος αὐτοῦ παρεδόθη καὶ αὐτῷ τοῖς

hence only. βασανισταῖς, ἦσαν οὐκ ἕτοιμοι τῷ ὀφειλόμενον αὐτῷ. 35. Οὕτω καὶ ὁ πατὴρ μου ὁ ἐσπαράγως ποιήσει οὕτως, ἐὰν μὴ ἔκαστος τῷ θεαλήθῃ αὐτῶι ἀπὸ τῶν καρδίων ὃμιῶν τὰ παρατίθεμα αὐτῶι.

1 eauton in ÏBC. D has auton as in T. R. Vide below.

2 auton omitted in BD (W. H.).

3 opharon in ÏBDL. opharon is not found elsewhere in Mt.

4 το παρ. auton are wanting in ÏBDLε and most editors omit them.

perform would not have equalled in amount one act such as he had got the benefit of. The fact in the spiritual sphere corresponds to this.—Ver. 34. ἄργος: roused to just and extreme anger. —βασανισταῖς: not merely to the gaolers, but to the tormentors, with instructions not merely to keep him safe in prison till the debt was paid, but still more to make the life of the wretch as miserable as possible, by place of imprisonment, position of body, diet, bed, etc., if not by instruments of pain. The word, chosen to suit the king's mood, represents a subjective feeling rather than an objective fact.

Ver. 35. Application. —οὗτοι: so, mutatis mutandis, for feelings, motives, methods rise in the moral scale when we pass to the spiritual sphere. So in general, not in all details, on the same principle; merciless to the merciless. —ἐν πατρί μου: Jesus is not afraid to bring the Father in in such a connection. Rather He is here again defining the Father by differentiating the name, as One who above all things abhors mercilessness.—ἐσπαραγως: Christ is in full sympathy with the Father in this.—ἐλείμν: to you, my own chosen disciples.

—ἐκαστὸς: every man of you. —ἀπὸ τῶν καρδιῶν: from your hearts, no sham or lip pardon; real, unreserved, thorough-going, and in consequence again and again, times without number, because the heart inclines that way.

CHAPTER XIX. FAREWELL TO GALILEE. In Mt.'s narrative the journey of Jesus to the south, reported in ver. 1, marks the close of the Galilean ministry. Not so obviously so in Mk.'s (see notes there), though no hint is given of a return to Galilee. It is not perfectly clear whether the incidents reported are to be conceived as occurring at the southern end of the journey, or on the way within Galilee or without. The latter alternative is possible (vide Holtz., H. C., p. 214). The incidents bring under our notice a variety of interesting characters: Pharisees with captious questions, mothers with their children, a man in quest of the sumnum bonus, with words and acts of Jesus corresponding. But the disciplining of the Twelve still holds the central place of interest. Last chapter showed them at school in the house, this shows them at school on the way.

VV. 1, 2. Introductory, cf. Mk. x. 1.—Ver. 1. καὶ ἐγένετο ... λόγους τούτους: similar formulae after important groups of logia in xii. 25, xi. 1, xiii. 53.—μετέφερεν: also in xiii. 53, vide notes there; points to a change of scene worthy of note, as to Nazareth, which Jesus rarely visited, or to Judea, as here.—ἀπὸ τ. Γαλιλαίας. The visit to Nazareth was a movement within Galilee. This is a journey out of it not necessarily final, but so thought of to all appearance. "ἐξ ἀπ᾽ ἑαυτοῦ ... ἐκάλεσεν Ἰ. Ἰ. Ἰ. Ἰ.: indicates either the destination = to the coasts of Judea beyond the Jordan; or the end = the way = to the Judea territory by the way of Perea, i.e., along the eastern shore of Jordan. It is not likely that the writer would describe Southern Perea as a part of Judea, therefore the second alternative is to be preferred. Mk.'s statement is that Jesus went to the coasts of Judea and (eal, approved reading; instead of ἐκάλεσεν Ἰ. in T. R.) beyond Jordan. Weiss thinks that Mt.'s version arose from misunderstanding of Mk. But his understanding may have been a
XIX. 1—5. ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ

ΧΙΧ. 1. Καὶ ἔγραψε δὲ ὁ Ἰωάννης ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοῖς λόγοις τοῖς γεγραμμένοις,
μετίρετε ἀπ' τῆς Γαλιλαίας, καὶ ἠλθέν εἰς τὰ τριά τῆς ἱουδαίας Χ.λ. ι. 33.

Γέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου. 2. καὶ ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ ὁμολογούσις, καὶ Χ.λ. ι. 15.
ἐθεράπευσαν αὐτῶς ἀκέι. 3. καὶ προσήλθον ἀυτῷ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι
περιορισται αὐτῶν, καὶ λέγοντες αὐτῷ, "Εἰ ἔχετεν ἄνθρωπον
ἀπολύσας τὴν γυναίκα αὐτοῦ κατὰ τάσαν αἰτίαν;
καὶ ἐφεξῆς ἐτίθεν αὐτῶιν, "Οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε ὅτι τὸ παιός
ἀπό ἔρχεται καὶ Θείον ἐτίθησαν αὐτῶιν, 5. καὶ εἶπαν, "Εἰς τὸν
τοῦτον καταλείψας ἄνθρωπος τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα· καὶ
προσκαλύθησαν τῇ γυναικὶ αὐτῶ, καὶ ἠστοθεὶ ὁ δύο εἰς σάρκα

1 οἱ οἵτινες ἐξεσάραξαν in BCL al. 2 antw omitted in ΣBCL al. D has it.
3 BBL omit ἀνθρώπον. 4 ΣBDL omit αὐτοῖς.
5 κτήσεις in B, L, 22, 33, 124, sah. cop. (W.H.).
6 The simple καλλιεργηθηκαί in BD al. (modern editors). The compound (T. R.) is
true one, for Mk.'s statement may mean that Peræa was the first reached station
(Holtz., H. C.), implying a journey on the eastern side. The suggestion that the
writer of the first Gospel lived on the eastern side, and means by πέραν the
western side (Delitzsch and others), has met with little favour.—Ver. 2. ἠκολού-
θησαν: the crowds follow as if there had been no interruption, in Mt.; in
Mk., who knows of a time of hiding (ix. 30), they reassemble (x. 1).—ἐθερ-
άπευσαν e. d.: a healing ministry commences in the south; in Mk. a teaching
ministry (x. 1).

VV. 3-9. The marriage question (Mk. x.
3-9).—Ver. 3. Φ. περιορισται: Pharisees
again, tempting of course; could not ask
a question at Jesus without sinister motives;—the question in indirect form, vide on xii. 10.—ἐπολάβαις...
καὶ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν: the question is
differently formulated in the two
accounts, and the answer differently
arranged. In Mk. the question is abso-
lute = may a man put away his wife at
all? In Mt. relative = may, etc. . . .
for every reason? Under the latter form
the question was an attempt to draw
Jesus into an internal controversy of the
Jewish schools as to the meaning of
Deut. xxiv. 1, and put Him in the
dilemma of either having to choose the
unpopular side of the school of Shammai,
who interpreted τὴν γυναῖκα
strictly, or exposing Himself to a charge
of laxity by siding with the school of
Hillel. It was a petty scheme, but
characteristic. Whether the interrogants
knew what Jesus had taught on the sub-
ject of marriage and divorce in the
Sermon on the Mount is uncertain, but
in any case all scribes and Pharisees
knew by this time what to expect from
Him. For καὶ in the sense of profiter,
vide instances in Hermann's Viger, 632,
and Kypke.—Ver. 4. οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε:
The words quoted are to be found in Gen. i.
27, ii. 24.—ὁ κτήσας: the participle with
article used substantively = the Creator.
—ὁ πατήρ ἀρχικός goes along with what
follows, Christ's purpose being to em-
phasise the primitive state of things.
From the beginning God made man, male
and female; suited to each other, need-
ling each other.—Ἀρετὴν καὶ δόξαν: "one
male and one female, so that the one
should have the one; for He had
wished that the male should dismiss one
and marry another He would have made
more females at the first."—Euthy.—
Ver. 5. καὶ έστιν: God said, though the
words as they stand in Gen. may be a
continuation of Adam's reflections, or a
remark of the writer.—حة خیس: connected in
Gen. with the story of the woman made from the rib of the man,
here with the origin of sex. The sex
principle imperiously demands that all
other relations and ties, however inti-
mate and strong, shall yield to it. The
cohesion this force creates is the greatest
possible.—οἱ δόξαι: these words in the
Sept. have nothing answering to them
in the Hebrew, but they are true to the
spirit of the original.—ἐς σέρα καὶ πλατ: the
reference is primarily to the physical
fleshly unity. But flesh in Hebrew thought represents the entire man, and the ideal unity of marriage covers the whole nature. It is a unity of soul as well as of body: of sympathy, interest, purpose.—Ver. 5. οὐτοί with indicative, expressing actual result as Christ views the matter. They are no longer two, but one flesh, one spirit, one person.—VER. 6 γωνία: inference from God's will to man's duty. The creation out of sex, and the high doctrine as to the cohesion it produces between man and woman, laid down in Gen., interdict separation. Let the Divine Syzygy be held sacred! How small the Pharisaic disputants must have felt in presence of such holy teaching, which soars above the partisan views of contemporary controversialists into the serene region of ideal, universal, eternal truth!

Vv. 7-9. τι σεβ. etc.: such doctrine could not be directly gainsaid, but a difficulty might be raised by an appeal to the Mosaic and household drudgery about a bill of divorce (Deut. xxiv. 1). The Pharisees seem to have regarded Moses as a patron of the practice of putting away, rather than as one bent on mitigating its evil results. Jesus corrects this false impression.—Ver. 8. πρὸς τ., with reference to—σαλπροκαφάλας: a word found here and in several places in O. T. (Sept.), not in profane writers; points to a state of heart which cannot submit to the restraints of a high and holy law, literally uncircumcisedness of heart (Deut. x. 16; Jer. iv. 4).—ἐνεπηρείω, permitted, not enjoined. Moses is respectfully spoken of as one who would gladly have welcomed a better state of things; no blame imputed except to the people who compelled or welcomed such imperfect legislation ( yap twice in ver. 8).—ἀγία ἀρχής, etc.: the state of things which made the Mosaic rule necessary was a declension from the primitive ideal.—Ver. 9. vide notes on Mt. v. 31, 32. —Vv. 10-12. Subsequent conversation with the disciples.—Christ's doctrine on marriage not only separated Him toto caelo from Pharisaic opinions of all shades, but was too high even for the Twelve. It was indeed far in advance of all previous or contemporary theory and practice in Israel. Probably no one before Him had found as much in what is said on the subject in Gen. It was a new reading of old texts by one who brought to them a new view of man's worth, and still more of woman's. The Jews had very low views of women, and therefore of marriage. A wife was bought, regarded as property, used as a household drudge, and dismissed at a bill of divorce—vide Benzinghe, Heb. Arch., pp. 138-146.—Ver. 10. αἰρεία: a vague word. We should say: if such be the state of matters as between husband and wife, and that is doubtless what is meant. So interpreted, αἰρεία would = res, conditio. (So Groton.) Fritzsche regards the phrase ἀντί a τ. ἄ. μ. τ. γ. as in a negligent way expressing the idea: if the reason compelling a man to live with a wife be so stringent (no separation save for adultery). If we interpret αἰρεία in the light of ver. 3 (εἰρήνη w. αἰρεία) the word will not mean cause of separation. The sense is the same, but...
in any view the manner of expression is somewhat helpless, as was not unnatural in the unlearned. It gives both meanings = ατέρχοντας and ατέρχατος, with a preference for the former.—ατέρχοντας here = vir, maritus; instances of this use in Kypke, Palairet, etc.

Ver. 11. ὧν λέγων thus will mean: what you have said, the suggestion that the unmannered marriage is preferable.—χρωμόνειν = capere, receive, intellectually and morally, for in such a case the two are inseparable. One man can understand as a matter of theory the preferableness of celibacy under certain circumstances, unless he be capable morally of appreciating the force of the circumstances.—authenticate. χρωμόνειν: keeper of the bed-chamber in an Oriental harem (from τόντος, bed, and ἡ, a bedchamber, which could be entrusted only to such as were incapable of abusing their trust; hence one who has been emasculated. Jesus distinguishes three sorts, two physical and one ethical: (1) those born with a defect (ἐγνώρισμος ὀφθ.); (2) those made such by art (ἔννοις,παρακεφαλής ὀφθ. ἣν τῶν ἀνθρώπων); (3) those who make themselves eunuchs (ἐννοικεῖον ἄνδρον).—διὰ τὴν μ. τ. ὥστε, for the Kingdom of Heaven's sake. This explains the motive and the nature of ethical eunuchism. Here, as in xv. 17, Jesus touches on a delicate subject to teach His disciples a very important lesson. C. and c., that the claims of the Kingdom of God are paramount; that when necessary even the powerful impulses leading to marriage must be resisted out of regard to them.—διὸ ἐξομολογοῦμεν χρωμόνειν χρωμόνειν: by this final word Jesus recognises the severity of the demand as going beyond the capacity of all but a select number. We may take it also as an appeal to the spiritual intelligence of His followers = see that ye do not misconceive my meaning. Is not monasticism, based on vows of life-long celibacy, a vast baleful misconception, turning a military requirement to subordinate personal to imperial interests, as occasion demands, into an elaborate ascetic system?

Vv. 13-15. Children brought for a blessing (Mk. x. 13-16; Lk. xviii. 15-17).—Ver. 13. τότε: if the order of the narrative reflect the order of events, this invasion by the children was a happy coincidence after those words about the sacred and indissoluble tie of
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1 See in BCD; see in NDL.
2 NBDL place autous after χείρας (Tisch., W.H.). * NBD have auti auti.
3 NBDL Orig. Hil. omit ἄγαθος, which probably comes in from the parallel, to which, indeed, Mt.'s version has been assimilated throughout (ver. 17) in T. R.
4 σως in BD Orig. (W. H.).

marriage and the duty of subordinating even it to the claims of the kingdom.—
προσέγγισθαι, passive, by whom brought not said, the point of the story being how Jesus treated the children.—
ινα τ. χ. ἀνήκον, that He may lay His hands on them: the action being conceived of as present (Klose ad loc., p. 61);—προσέπτησθαι: the imposition of hands was a symbol of prayer and blessing, possibly in the minds of those who brought the children it was also a protection from evil spirits (Orig.).—προσέπτησθαι: the σως ought in strict grammar to mean the children, but it doubtless refers to those who brought them. The action of the disciples was not necessarily mere officiousness. It may have been a Galilean incident, mothers in large numbers bringing their little ones to get a parting blessing from the good, wise man who is leaving their country, unceremoniously crowding around Him, affectionately mobbing Him in a way that seemed to call for interference. This act of the mothers of Galilee revealed how much they thought of Jesus.—Ver. 14. ἀνήκον, μὴ καταλέγεται: visits of the children never understood; delightful to look on the living emblems of the true citizen of the Kingdom of God; pleased with them for what they were naturally, and for what they signified.—τοιούτως, of such, i.e., the child-like; repetition of an old lesson (xviii. 3).—Ver. 15. ἀνήκον ἐκεῖνον; He departed thence, no indication whence or whither. The results of this meeting are conceivable. Christians may have come out of that company. Mothers would not forget Him who blessed their children on the way to His cross, or fail to speak of the event to them when they were older.

Vv. 16-22.—A man in quest of the "sumnum bonum" (Mk. x. 17-22; Lk. xviii. 18-23).—A phenomenon as welcome to Jesus as the visit of the mothers with their children: a man not belonging to the class of self-satisfied religionists of whom He had had ample experience; with moral ingenuousness, an open mind, and a good, honest heart; a malcontent probably with the teaching and practice of the Rabbis and scribes coming to the anti-Rabbinical Teacher in hope of hearing from Him something more satisfying. The main interest of the story for us lies in the revelation it makes of Christ's method of dealing with inquirers, and in the subsequent conversation with the disciples.

Ver. 16. ἔδωκαν οἱ υἱοί...κοίμησεν τοὺς υἱούς αὐτῶν: a story worth telling.—ἐδώκα: one, singled out from the crowd by his approach towards Jesus, and, as the narrative shows, by his spiritual state.—Διαδόθη: this reading, which omits the epithet ἄγαθος, doubtless gives us the true text of Mt., but in all probability not a term in which the man addressed Jesus. Such a man was likely to accost Jesus courteously as "good Master," as Mk. and Lk. both report. The omission of the epithet eliminates from the story the basis for a very important and characteristic element; delighting to dealing with this inquirer contained in the question: "Why callest thou me good?" which means not "the epithet is not applicable to me, but to God only," but "do not make ascriptions of goodness a matter of mere courtesy or politeness." The case is parallel to the unwillingness of Jesus to be called Christ indiscriminately. He wished no man to give Him any title of honour till he knew what he was doing. He wished this man in particular to think carefully on what is good, and who, all the more that there were competing types of goodness to choose from, that of the Pharisees, and that exhibited in His own teaching.—τι ἄγαθον ποιοῦντοι: the ἄγαθον is omitted in the parallels,
“Τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν; οὐδεὶς ἀγαθός, εἰ μὴ εστί, δ ἔδει αὐτῷ. 18. Ἐγέρασιν τὸ ἔθιμον τῆς ἡμέρας, ἀντὶ τὸ ἔθιμον τῆς ἡμέρας.”

1. For the clause τι με λεγεις ... θεος in T. R., it is a version (including Syr. Cur. and Sin.) that has been read τι με ερωτας περι του ογαθουν; εις εστιν α ογαθος, which the R. V. and most modern editors adopt. Harmonic assimilation is probably responsible for the T. R.

2. N.B.C.D.L. place καθαρισμην after ζωην.

3. τιμη in BD. N.B.C.D. omit σου. ταυτα ταυτα in BD.

but it is implied; of course it was something good that would have to be done in order to obtain eternal life. What good shall I do? Fritzsche takes this as not = quid boni faciam? but = quid, quod bonum sit, faciam? that is, not = what particular good action shall, etc., but = what in the name of good, etc. This is probably right. The man wants to know what the good really is; . . . that by doing it he may attain eternal life. It was a natural question for a thoughtful man in those days when the teaching and practice of the religious guides made it the hardest thing possible to know what the good really was. It is a mistake to conceive of this man as asking what specially good thing he might do in the spirit of the type of Pharisee who was always asking, What is my duty and I will do it? (Schöttgen). Would Jesus have loved such a man, or would such a man have loved His presence so much?—N.B.C.D.L. place καθαρισμην after ζωην.

The Kingdom of God is the more common in the Synoptics, the other in the fourth Gospel. Ver. 17. τι με ερωτας, etc.: it seems as if Jesus thought the question superfluous (so Weiss and Meyer), but this was only a teacher’s way of leading on a pupil = of course there is only one answer to that: God is the one good being, and His revealed will shows us the good He would have us do. A familiar old truth, yet new as Christ meant it. How opposed to current teaching we know from Mt. xv. 4-9.—ει καθαρισμην, etc., but, to answer your question directly, if, etc.—τιμη (παραδειγματικα qu. τ. επα.): a vaguer direction then than it seems to us now. We now think only

of the Ten Words. Then there were many commands of God besides these; and many more still of the scriptures, hence most naturally the following question.—Ver. 18. τοιος; not = τιμη (Grotius), but what sort of commands: out of the multitude of commands divine and human, which do you mean? He had a shrewd guess doubtless, but wanted to be sure. Christ’s reply follows in this and subsequent verse, quoting in direct form prefaced with τοιος the sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth, and fifth commands of the Decalogue with that to love a neighbour as ourselves from Lev. xix. 18. This last Origen regarded as an interpolation, and Weiss thinks that the evangelist has introduced it from xxii. 39 as one that could not be left out. If it is omitted the list ends with the fifth, a significantly emphatic position, reminding us of Mt. xvi. 4, and giving to the whole list an antithetic reference to the teaching of the scribes. In sending the inquirer to the second table of the Decalogue as the sum of duty, Jesus gave an instruction anything but commonplace, though it seem so to us. He was proclaiming the supremacy of the ethical, a most important and least learned for the inquirer, the first being the necessity of using moral epithets carefully and sincerely. From the answer given to this second lesson it will appear whereabouts the inquirer is, a point Jesus desired to ascertain.

Vv. 20-22. ei παιδευθητος, the youth; whence known? from a special tradition (Meyer); an inference from the expression ει παιδευθητος μου in Mk. x. 20 (Weiss).— ἀπεστείλαμεν (-δοτον). Kypke and Eisner take pains to show that the use of this verb (and of τιμην, ver. 17) in the sense of obeying commands is good Greek. More
important is it to note the declaration the verb contains: all these I have kept from youth. To be taken as a simple fact, not stated in a self-righteous spirit (Weiss-Meyer), rather sadly as by one conscious that he has not thereby reached the desired goal, real rest in the highest good found. The exemplary life plus the dissatisfaction meant much: that he was not a morally commonplace man, but one with affinities for the noble and the heroic. No wonder Jesus felt interested in him, "loved him" (Mk. x. 21), and tried to win him completely. It may be assumed that the man appreciated the supreme importance of the ethical, and was not in sympathy with the tendency of the scribes to subordinate the moral to the ritual, the commands of God to the traditions of the elders.—

(21) τι ἐν δώτερα: the question interesting first of all as revealing a felt want: a good symptom; next as betraying perplexity: I am on the right road, according to your teaching; why then do I not arrive at the true godly life? The question, not in Mk., is implied in the tone of the previous statement, whether uttered or not.—Ver. 21. εἰ δὲ ἔθελος τέλειος εἶναι (on τέλειος vide v. 48): if you wish to reach your end, the true life and the rest it brings.—ἔσχας, etc.: go, sell off, distribute to the poor, and then come, follow me—such is the advice Christ gives: His final lesson for this inquirer. It is a subjective counsel relative to the individual. Jesus sees he is well-to-do, and divines where the evil lies. It is doubtful if he cares passionately, supremely for the true life; doubtful if he be τέλειος in the sense of single-mindedness. It is not a question of one more thing to do, but of the state of the heart, which the suggestion to sell off will test. The invitation to become a disciple is seriously meant. Jesus, who repelled some offering themselves, thinks so well of this man as to desire him for a disciple. He makes the proposal hope-filly. Why should so noble a man not be equal to the sacrifice? He makes it with the firm belief that in no other way can this man become happy. Noblesse oblige. The nobler the man the more imperative that the heroic element in him have full scope. A potential apostle, a possible Paul even, cannot be happy as a mere wealthy merchant or landowner. It is "a counsel of perfection," but not in the ascetic sense, as if poverty were the sure way to the higher Christian life; rather in the sense of the adage: of him to whom much is given shall much be required.—Ver. 22. ἀντίλθη: he would have to go away in any case, even if he meant to comply with the advice in order to carry it into effect. But he went away λυπούμενος, in genuine distress, because placed in a dilemma between peace and society, in no position, and forfeiting the joy of discipleship under an admired Master. What was the final issue? Did "the thorns of avarice defile the rich soil of his soul" (Euthy.,) and render him permanently unfruitful, or did he at last decide for the disciple life? At the worst see here the miscarriage of a really noble nature, and take care not to fall into the vulgar mistake of seeing in this man a Pharisee who came to tempt Jesus, and who in professing to have kept the commandments was simply a boastful liar. (So Jerome: "Non voto discendis sed tentantis interrogat . . . mentitur adolescens").

Vv. 23-27. Conversation ensuing (Mk. x. 23-27; Lk. xviii. 24-27).—Ver. 23.
27. Τότε ἀποκρίθησις ὁ Πέτρος εἶναι αὕτη, "Ἰδοὺ, ἡμῖν ἀφήκαμεν

1 τρηματος in ΒΒ. The majority of uncials have εἰσέλθειν (Τisch.), but BDX have ἔλθειν as in T. R. This reading requires εἰσέλθειν in the next clause (so in BD).

2 αὐτοῦ wanting in ΒΞCDLΖΔ. Though found in parall. (Lk.), from which it has probably been imported, the sentence is more impressive without it.

δέων, introduces as usual a solemn utterance.—πλούσιοι: the rich man is brought on the stage, not as an object of envy or admiration, which he is to the worldly-minded, but as an object of commiseration.—δυσκόλως εἰσέλθειν, etc.: because with difficulty shall he enter the Kingdom of Heaven. This is stated as a matter of observation, not without sympathy, and not with any intention to pronounce dogmatically on the case of the inquirer who had just departed, as if he were an absolutely lost soul. His case suggested the topic of wealth as a hindrance in the divine life.—δυσκόλως: the adjective δύσκολος means difficult to please as to food (δύσεια, δάκρων), hence morose; here used of things, occurs only in this saying in N. T.—Ver. 24. πάλιν ὅλος ἔλγυ: repetition with greater emphasis. The strange language of Jesus here reveals a keen sense of disappointment at the loss of so promising a man to the ranks of discipleship. He sees so clearly what he might be, were it not for that miserable money.—ἐκποτέτειον, etc.: a comparison to express the idea of the impossible. The figure of a camel going through a needle-eye savours of Eastern exaggeration. It has been remarked that the variation in the parallel accounts in respect to the words for a needle and its eye shows that no corresponding proverb existed in the Greek tongue (Camb. G. T.). The figure is to be taken as it stands, and not to be "civilised" (cide H. C.) by taking κάμπαλα (or κάμπλες, Suidas) = a cable, or the wicket of an Oriental house. It may be more legitimate to try to explain how so grotesque a figure could become current even in Palestine. Furrer suggests a camel driver leaning against his camel and trying to put a coarse thread through the eye of a needle with which he sews his sacks, and, failing, saying with comic exaggeration: I might put the camel through the eye easier than this thread (Tsch., für M. und R.).—τρεματος from τυπράμ, to pierce.—ραβίδος, a word disapproved by Phryn., who gives βαλίδων as the correct term. But since Lobeck's note, p. 90. It is noticeable that Christ's tone is much more severe in reference to wealth than to wedlock. Eunuchism for the kingdom is optional: possession of wealth on the other hand seems to be viewed as all but incompatible with citizenship in the kingdom.

Ver. 25. ἔξελθωσον αὐτόν: the severity of the Master's doctrine on wealth as on divorce (ver. 10) was more than the disciples could bear. It took their breath away, so to speak.—τί ἰματικά, etc.: it seemed to them to raise the question as to the possibility of salvation generally. The question may represent the cumulative effect of the austere teaching of the Master since the day of Caesarea. The imperfect tense of ἔξελθωσον may point to a continuous mood, culminating at that moment.—Ver. 26. ἐμπλήθοσ, etc.: practically this reflection amounted to saying that the previous remark was to be taken cum grano, as referring to tendency rather than to fact. He did not mean that it was as impossible for a rich man to be saved as for a camel to pass through a
needle-eye, but that the tendency of wealth was to act powerfully as an obstruc-
tive to the spiritual life.

Vv. 27-30. A reaction ( Mk. x. 27-31; Lk. xviii. 28-30).—Ver. 28. ἀνομὴ δὲ Π.: from depression the disciples, repre-
sented by Peter, pass to self-complacent buoynacy—their natural mood.—ἰδοὺ points to a fact deserving special notice in view of the recent incident.—ἀμήν, we, have done what that man failed to do: left all and followed Thee.—οἱ ἄρα, etc.: a question not given in Mk. and Lk., but implied in Peter’s remark and the tone in which it was uttered: what shall we do to us by way of recompense? Surely we shall attain what seems so hard for some to reach.—Ver. 28. ἀγνήν: introducing a solemn statement.—ὑμεῖς ὁ αὐτ.: not a nominative absolute (Palairet, Obser.), but being far from the verb, ἀγνήν is repeated (with καὶ) after καθιστηθεῖσα.—ἐν τ. παλαινσιοῖσιν to be taken with ἀγνήν following. This is a new word in the Gospel vocabu-
lary, and points to the general renewal —"re-novation (nova erit genesis cui praeerit Adamus it., Beng.)"—in the end of the days, which occupied a prominent place in Jewish apocalyptic hopes. The colouring in this verse is so strongly apocalyptic as to have suggested the hypothesis of interpolation (Weissstcker), or of a Jewish Christian source (Hilgenfeld). It is not in the parallels, but something similar occurs in Lk. xxii. 30. Commentators translate this promise, so strongly Jewish in form, into Christian ideas, according to their taste, reading into it what was not there for the disciples when it was spoken.—Ver. 29. General promise for all faithful ones.—

δελφοῖς, etc.: detailed specification of the things renounced for Christ.—πολλαπλασιάζοντας: shall receive manifoldly the things renounced, i.e., in the final order of things, in the new-born world, as nothing is said to the contrary. Mk. and Lk. make the compensation present.—καὶ ζωὴν αἰώνιον κηρυγμένην.: this higher boon, the summum bonum, over and above the compensation in kind. Here the latter comes first: in chap. vii. 33 the order is reversed.—Ver. 30. τὸ πολλὸν δὲ οὐστεῖς, etc., but many first ones shall be last, and last ones first. Fritzsche reverses the meaning = many being last shall be first, so making it accord with xx. 16. The words are so arranged as to suggest taking πολὺς, ἑκατεῖς, and ἑκατόν, πεντάκαι, as composite ideas, and rendering: many shall be first-lasts, and last-firsts = there shall be many reversals of position both ways. This aphorism admits of many applications. There are not only many in the same category but many categories: e.g., first in this world, last in the Kingdom of God (e.g., the wealthy inquirer and the Twelve); first in time, last in power and fame (the Twelve and Paul); first in privilege, last in Christian faith (Jews and Gentiles); first in seat and self-sacrifice, last in quality of service through vitiating influence of low motive (legal and evangelic piety). The aphorism is adapted to frequent use in various con-
nections, and may have been uttered on different occasions by Jesus (cf. Lk. xiii. 30: Jew and Gentile), and the sphere of its application can only be determined by the context. Here it is the last of those above indicated, not the first, as Weiss holds; also Holtzmann (H. C.),
though admitting that there may be reference also to the self-complacent mood of Peter. The ἀφεθήναι after ἀφεθῆναι implies that this is the reference. It does not introduce a new subject, but a contrasted view of the same subject. The connection of thought is: self-sacrifice such as yours, Peter, has a great reward, but beware of self-complacency, which may so vitiate the quality of service as to make one first in sacrifice last in the esteem of God.

Chapter XX. Parable of the Hours; Two Sons of Zebedeus; Blind Man at Jericho.

Vv. 1-16. Parable of the hours, peculiar to Mt., and, whatever its real connection as spoken by Jesus, to be interpreted in relation to its setting as here given, which is not impossible. The parable is brought in as illustrating the argument in v. 16. bποτιστήριον ἡμέραν = per diem, only a single day is contemplated in the parable.—Ver. 3. τίνι σε: the article τίνι before τίνι in T. R., omitted in W. H., is not necessary before an ordinal.—ἐστιν τις ἡμέρας: the market-place there as here, the place where masters and men met.—ἀργοῦ, (a and ἀργοῦ), not = idle in habit, but unemployed and looking for work.—Ver. 4. ικαλεῖται: he had got a fair number of workers in the morning, but he is pleased to have more for an urgent piece of work. The expression has reference to the Master's mood rather than to the men's knowledge of what had taken place at the first hour.—δὲ δὲν δικαιοῦν: no bargain this time, only a promise of fair equitable dealing, will be just at least, give in proportion to length of service; privately intends to do more, or at least is that way inclined; ἐκτοιγήσαντες ἑαυτοῖς: repetition of the action at sixth and ninth hours; more men still on similar footing.—Ver. 6. καὶ ἐγειρόμεθα: the καὶ marks this final procedure as noteworthy. We begin to wonder at this hiring, when we see it going on even at the last hour. Is the master a humorist hiring out of benevolence rather than from regard to the exigencies of the work? Some have thought so (Oldhausen, Goebel, Koetsveld), and there seems good ground for the suggestion, though even this unusual procedure may be made to appear probable by conceiving the master as anxious to finish the work on hand that day, in which case even an hour's work from a sufficient number of willing hands...
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The evening settlement.— Ver. 8. ἄριστος: a pregnant word, including not only the commencement of the process of paying but its progress. There is an ellipse, καὶ ο... λήψονται being understood before ἡμεῖς (Kypke). Grotius thinks this does not really mean beginning with the last comes, but with that regard to order of coming in, so that no one should be overlooked. He fails to see that the idiosyncrasy of the master is a leading point, indeed the key to the meaning of the parable. This beginning with the last is an eccentricity from an ordinary everyday-life point of view. The master chooses to do so: to begin with those who have no claims.—Ver. 9. ἄριστος: a denarius each; ἄριστος is distributive = "accipiebant singuli denaros." For this use of ἄριστος see Hermann’s Viper, p. 576.—Ver. 10. τὸ πρῶτον: the intermediates passed over, as non-essential to the didactic purpose, we arrive at the first, the men hired on a regular bargain in the morning.—ἐνδόμονεον: they had noticed the paying of the last first, and had curiously watched to see or hear what they got, and they come with great expectations: twelve hours’ work, therefore twelve times the sum given to the one-hour men.—καὶ ἄριστος: surprising! only a penny! What a strange, eccentric master! He had seen expectation in their faces, and anticipated with amusement their chagrin. The money was paid by the overseer, but he was standing by enjoying the scene.—Ver. 11. ἐγγείωσον: imperfect; the grumbling went on from man to man as they were being paid: to the overseer, but at (ἐνδόμονεον) the master, and so that he could overhear.—Ver. 12. Their grievous complaint.—καὶ ὡς, these, with a workman’s contempt for a shamm—worker.—ἐκδιπλωσακ. Some (Wetstein, Meyer, Goebel, etc.) render, spent = they put in their one hour: without doing any work to speak of. The verb
is used in this sense (e.g., Acts xv. 33), and one is strongly tempted to adopt this rendering as true to the contemptuous feeling of the twelve-hour men for the one-hour men. Kypke remarks against it that if ἐνοφήγη τότε had been meant in this sense = "commorati sunt," the word ἄνεγορος = τῷ ἀπερατοῖς would have been added. Perhaps the strongest reason against it is that the one-hour men had worked with such good will (that goes without saying) that even pre-ordiced fellow-workers could not ignore the fact. So we must take ἐνοφήγη = worked.—τῷ βεβευκτοῦ τῷ καλοτόῳ: these the points of their case: not that they had worked hard while the others had not, but that they had borne the burden of a whole day's work, and worked through the heat of the day, and now came to be paid, weary and sweat-stained. (Some take καλοτόῳ as referring to the sirocco or south-east wind; hot, dry and dust-laden. On the winds of Palestine, vidi Benzingier, Heb. Art. xxvii. 8.) One hour in the late afternoon, however hard the last comers worked, to that! And yet they are made equal (ἴσος)! Surely good ground for complaint! 

Vv. 13-15. The master's reply.—Ver. 13. ἤλθεν Ἰ. to one of them. It would have been undignified to make a speech in self-defence to the whole gang that would have been to take the matter too seriously. The master selects a man, and quietly speaks his mind to him.—φίλε, friend, comrade; familiar and kindly. Cf. Lk. xv. 31.—Ver. 14. ἄρον τοῦ ἄρον, take thine, thy stipulated denarius. It looks as if this particular worker had refused the penny, or was saucily handing it back.—ἠλθεν, I choose, it is my pleasure; emphatically spoken. Summa hujus verbi potestas, Beng.—τούτῳ τῇ ἴσῃ: one of the eleventh-hour men singled out and pointed to.—Ver. 15. οὐκ ἐξετάται right asserted to act as he chooses in the matter.—ἐν τούτῳ ἰσαίας: in matters within my own discretion—a truism; the question is: what belongs to that category? Fritzche and De Wette render: in my own affairs; Meyer: in the matter of my own property. —ἡ (W.H.) introduces an alternative mode of putting the case, which explains how the complainers and the master see the matter so differently, they seeing in it an injustice, he a legitimate exercise of his discretion.—ποινηθῇ, vide on vii. 22-24. —ἀγαθός, generous; doing more than justice demands. So Bengel. Cf. Rom. v. 7 for the distinction between δίκαιος and ἄγαθος.

Ver. 16. Christ here points the moral of the parable = xix. 30, the terms ἐσχάτου πρῶτοι changing places, the better to suit the story. The meaning is not: the last as the first, and the first as the last, all treated alike. True, all get the same sum; at least the last and first do, nothing being said of those between; but the point of the parable is not that the reward is the same. The denarius given to all is not the central feature of the story, but the will of the master, whose character from a commercial point of view is distinctly eccentric, and is so represented to make it serve the didactic purpose. The method of this master is commercially unworkable; combination of the two systems of legal contract and benevolence must lead to perpetual trouble. All must be dealt with on one footing. And that is what it will come to with a master of the type indicated. He will abolish contract, and engage all on the footing of generously rewarding generous service. The parable does not bring
17. Καὶ ἀναβαίνων ὁ ἰησοῦς εἰς ἱεροσόλυμα παρέλαβε τοὺς ἄδεικτα μαθητὰς καὶ ἔδωκεν τῷ Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, 18. "Ἰδοὺ, ἀναβαίνομεν εἰς ἱεροσόλυμα, καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδοθήσεται τοῖς ἁρχιερεῖσι καὶ γραμματεῖσι καὶ κατακρινόμενον αὐτὸν δοθήσεται. 19. καὶ παραδοθῶσιν αὐτὸν τοῖς ἰδίοις εἰς τὸ ἐμπαίζει καὶ μαστίγωσί καὶ σταυρώσει καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ αναστήσεται."

20. Τότε προσῆλθεν αὐτῷ ὁ μήτηρ τῶν ὦν Zεβεδαίου μετὰ τῶν

1 B begins this section thus: μελλὼν δὲ ἀναβαίνων ἐκ τῆς ἱεροσόλυμα παρέλαβε τοὺς ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ, which W.H. adopt and Tr. places on margin, Weiss approving, viewing the reading in T. R. as a reminiscence of Mk.

2 καὶ εἰς τὴν ὥραν in ΜBLZ (Tisch., W.H.).

3 εἰς σαβατόν in Ν (Tisch.). B omits (W.H. σαβατόν within brackets).

this out fully, as it gives the story only of a single day. It suggests rather than adequately illustrates its own moral, which is that God does not love a legal spirit. In the parable the men who worked on contract, and, as it came out at the end, in a legal temper, got their penny, but what awaits them in future is not to be employed at all. Work done in a legal spirit does not count in the Kingdom of God. In reward it is last, or even nowhere. This is the trend of the parable, and so viewed it has a manifest connection with Peter's self-complacent question. On this parable *vide my Parabolic Teaching of Christ.*

Vv. 17-19. Third prediction of the passion (Mk. x. 32-34; Lk. xviii. 31-34).—The first in xvi. 21 ; the second in xvii. 22. In the first it was stated generally that Jesus was about to die. Here the πώλεσα διακρίνεται. Here the πώλεσα are detailed. In the second mention was made of betrayal (παραδότων, xvii. 31) into the hands of men. Here the "men" resolve into priests, scribes, and Gentiles. —Ver. 17. ἀναβαίνων: going up from Peræa to the ridge on which the Holy City stood. The reading ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ may indicate that they are already on the west side of the Jordan, and about to commence the ascent (Weiss-Meyer). —εἰς ἱεροσόλυμα: face being now turned directly towards Jerusalem, thought naturally turns to what is going to happen there. —ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ is understood = on the right and left parts. *Vide Bos, Ellipsis Graecae,* p. 184, who cites an instance of the latter phrase from Diod. Sic. So this was all that came out of the discourse on child-like-ness (xviii. 3 ff.). But Jesus had also
spoken of thrones in the new Genesis, and that seems to have fired their imagination and stimulated their ambition. And "the gentle and humble" John was in this plot! Conventional ideas of apostolic character need revision.

Ver. 22. Jesus meets this bold petition as He met the scribe's offer of discipleship (viii. 19), aiming at disenchantedment by pointing out what it involved: throne and suffering going together. — ὁ ποτήριον: the cup, emblem of both good and evil fortune in Hebrew speech (Ps. xi. 6; xxiii. 5); here of suffering. — οὐκ ἔστω, we are able; the prompt, decided answer of the two brothers to whom Jesus had addressed His question. Had they then laid to heart what Jesus had said shortly before concerning His passion, and subsequent resurrection, and made up their minds to share His sufferings that they might so gain a high place in the kingdom? Had they already caught the martyr spirit? It is possible. But it is also possible that they spoke without thinking, like Peter on the hill.—Ver. 23. ὁ δὲ πᾶς π. π. πέσω, as for my cup, ye shall drink of it: predictive of the future fact, and also conferring a privilege = I have no objection to grant you companionship in my sufferings; that favour may be granted without risk of abuse. — τὸ δὲ καθίσμα, etc., but as for sitting on right and left hand, that is another affair. — ὃς δέν δοῦναι ἐὰν δοῦναι = is not a matter of mere personal favour: favouritism has no place here; it depends on fitness. That is the meaning of the last clause, οἷς ἠτοίμασται ὃ. τ. π. μ. = it is not an affair of arbitrary favour on the part of the father any more than on my part. Thrones are for those who are fit to sit on them, and prepared by moral trial and discipline to bear the honour worthily: τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν ἐρωμένων γενομένων λαμπρῶν.—Chrys., Hom. lxxv. The same Father illustrates by supposing an ἀγώνοθήματι to be asked by two athletes to assign to them the crowns of victory, and replying: "it is not mine to give, but they belong to those for whom they are prepared by struggle and sweat" (ἀπὸ τῶν πόλεων καὶ τῶν ἱστών). — Ver. 24-28. Commotion in the disciples-circle.—Ver. 24. οἱ δὲ οἱ δώδεκα. The Twelve were all on one moral level, not one superior to ambitious passion, or jealousy of it in another. Therefore the conduct of the two greatly provoked the ten.— Ἰησοῦς ὄρθριον Passow derives from ἑντός and ἑγαίμων, and gives as original sense to be in a state of violent excitement like new wine fermenting. The ten were "mad" at the two: pitiful exhibition in the circumstances, fitted to make Jesus doubt His choice of such men. But better were not to be found.—Ver. 25. ἔρημος ἦσσατο: Jesus had to call them to Him, therefore they had had
the decency not to quarrel in His presence. *Magistro non præsente*, Beng. —κατακριμασίαν: in the Sept. used in the sense of rule, Gen. i. 28, Ps. lxii. 8; here the connection requires the idea of "lording it over," the κατά having intensive force; so also in the ἀρχ. leg. *κατεδαφισμοί*, following = play the tyrant. —τῶν θεῶν: from these occasional references to the outside peoples we get the idea of the Pagan world; they seek material good (vi. 32), use repetition in prayer (vi. 7), are subject to despotic rule. —οἱ μεγάλοι, the grandees. —αὐτῶν after the two verbs in both cases refers to the θεῶν. Grotius takes the second as referring to the ἐργάζοντας, and finds in the passage this sense: the rulers, monarchs, lord over the people, and their grandees lord over them, the rulers, in turn; a picture certainly often true to life. Perhaps the intention is to suggest that the rule of the magnates is more oppressive than that of their royal masters, who sustain their authority. *Ipsi saepè dominis imperantiores*, Beng. —Ver. 26. ὅχι οὕτως ἦτοι δὲ ὧν. It is not so among you. The ὦτα of T.R. is probably conformed to the two following ὦτα, but it is true to the meaning. Jesus speaks of a state of matters He desires, but which does not yet exist. The present spirit of the Twelve is essentially secular and pagan. —μέγας, διάκονος: *greatness by service* the law of the Kingdom of God, whereby greatness becomes another thing, not self-asserted or arrogated, but freely conceded by others. —Ver. 27. πρῶτος may be a synonym for μέγας = μέγιστος (De W.) and δουλος for διάκονος; or in both cases increased emphasis may be intended, πρῶτος pointing to a higher place of dignity, δουλος to a lower depth of servitude. Burton (M. and T. in N.T., § 68) finds in the two ὦτα in vv. 26 and 27 probable instances of the third person future used imperatively. —Ver. 28. δισταρι, καὶ γινεται: note both phrases introducing reference to the *summitt e sumptum* (Bengel) in an emphatic way. —περ lends force to ὃς = as, observe. —δ. τ. ἄρθραν: an important instance of the use of the title. On the principle of defining by discriminating use it means: the man who makes no pretensions, asserts no claims. —οὐκ ἡδικεῖ points to the chief end of His mission, the general character of His public life: not that of a *Pretender* but that of a *Servant*. —δοῦναι τὴν ψυχήν, to give His life, to that extent does the service go. Cf. Phil. ii. 8: μεθ᾽ ὑμάς δοῦναι, there also in illustration of the humility of Christ. It is implied that in some way the death of the Son of Man will be serviceable to others. It enters into the life plan of the Great Servant.—λέγεται, a new term, another new term in the evangelical vocabulary, suggesting rather than solving a theological problem as to the significance of Christ's death, and admitting of great variety of interpretation, from the view of Origen and other Fathers, who regarded Christ's death as a payment to the *dilex* to ransom men from bondage to him, to that of Wendl, who finds in the word simply the idea that the example of Jesus in carrying the principle of service as far as to die tends by way of moral influence to deliver men's minds from spiritual bondage (Die Lehre Jesu, ii. 510-517). It is an interesting question, What clue can be found in Christ's own words, as hitherto reported, to the use by Him on this occasion of the term λέγεται, and to
29. KAI ἐκτροποιομένων αὐτῶν ἀπὸ Ἰεριχώ, ἡκολούθησαν αὐτῷ ἰχλος πολὺς. 30. καὶ ἦνοι, δύο τυφλοὶ καθήμενοι παρὰ τὴν ὑδάν, ἀκούσαντες ἃ ἦσαν παρέγι, ἐκρασάμενοι, λέγοντες, "Ἐλέησόν ἡμᾶς, κύριε, ἰδίοις Δαβίδ." 31. Οἱ δὲ ἰχλοὶ ἐκτριβήσαν αὐτῶν ἵνα "σωτηρίζων. οἱ δὲ μεῖζον ἐκρασάμενοι, λέγοντες, "Ἐλέησόν ἡμᾶς, κύριε, ἰδίοις Δαβίδ." 32. Καὶ εἶπες ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐφώνησεν αὐτούς, καὶ εἶπεν, "Τί θέλετε ποιήσω ὑμῖν?" 33. Ἀγομένοις αὐτῷ, "Κύριε, ἵνα ἀνοιχθῶν ἡμῖν οἱ ὀφθαλμοί." 34. Πλαγιοικοθεῖς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἰδίοις τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν ἄνοιξεν καὶ ἀπεστάλη ἄνθρωπος αὐτῶν οἱ ὀφθαλμοί, καὶ ἐκτριβήσαν αὐτοῖς. 35. ὁδόν ἑαυτὸς, with acc.). Lk. xiv. 12 (to invite). John xiii. 15 (to call by a name).

1 κυριε ἐλπισα πασιν in BLZ. ND omit κυριε (Tisch.). Same order in ver. 31 in NBDLZ.
2 καὶ in ΝCDLZ (Tisch., W.H. margin).
3 ἀνοικοθεῖς in NBDLZ.
4 οἱ οφθαλμοὶ in NBDLZ.
5 οἱ ἀνθρώποι in BDLZ. T. R. follows ΝCDN in using the more common word ὀφθαλμοὶ.
6 αὐτῶν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ wanting in NBDLZ and omitted by modern editors.

the sense in which He uses it? Wendt contends that this is the best method of getting at the meaning, and suggests as the most congenial text Mt. vi. 29–30. I agree with him as to method, but think a better clue may be found in Mt. xvii. 27, the word spoken by Jesus in reference to the Temple Tax. That word began the striking course of instruction on humility, as this word (xx. 29) ends it, and the end and the beginning touch in thought and language. The didrachmon was a λέπρον (Exodus xxx. 12), as the life of the Son of Man is represented to be. The tax was paid ἀντὶ ἰδίου καὶ σοῦ. The life is to be given ἀντὶ πολλῶν. Is it too much to suppose that the Capernaum incident was present to Christ's mind when He uttered this striking saying, and that in the earlier utterance we have the key to the psychological history of the term λέπρον? On this subject vide my book The Kingdom of God, pp. 238–241.

vv. 29–34. Blind men (man) at Jericho (Mk. x. 46–52, Lk. xviii. 35–43). The harmonic problems as to the locality of this incident (leaving Jericho Mt. and Mk., entering, Lk.) and the number of persons healed (one Mk. and Lk., two Mt.) may be left on one side, as also the modern critical attempts to account for the origin of the discrepancies. Those interested may consult for the former Keil and Nøsgen, for the latter Holtz, H.C., and Weiss-Meyer.—Ver. 29. ἀπὸ Ἰεριχώ from Jericho, an important town every way; "the key—the 'Chiavev'—of Palestine to any invader from this quarter" (Stanley, Sinai and Palestine, p. 305; the whole account there given should be read), situated in an oasis in the Judaean desert, caused by streams from the mountains above and springs in the valley; with a flourishing trade and fine buildings, Herod's palace included; two hours distant from the Jordan; from thence to the summit a steep climb through a rocky ravine, haunt of robbers.—δύλος πολὺς, a great crowd going to the feast in Jerusalem.—Ver. 30. ἀκούσαντες, etc. Luke explains that the blind man learnt that Jesus was passing in answer to inquiry suggested by the noise of a crowd. He knew who Jesus was; the fame of Jesus the Nazarene (Mk. and Lk.), the great Healer, had reached his ear.—οἶς Δ.: popular Messianic title (ix. 28, xv. 22).—Ver. 31. ἐκτριβήσαν: same word as in xix. 13, and denoting similar action to that of the disciples in reference to the children, due to similar motives. Officious reverence has played a large part in the history of the Church and of theology.—μεῖζον ἐκρασάμενοι, they cried out the more; of course, represion ever defeats itself; μεῖζον, adverb, here only.—Ver. 32. ἐφώνησεν might mean "addressed them" (Fritzsche), but "called them" seems to
XXI. 1. καὶ ὅτε ἔγυρσαν ἐκεῖ ἰεροσόλυμα, καὶ Ἴδον ἐκεῖ Βηθσαϊρ
πρὸς τὸ δρόμον τῶν ἄλαντῶν, τότε ἦσαν ἀπέστειλε δύο μαθητάς,
2. λέγων αὐτοῖς, "Πορευθήτε ἐκεῖ τὴν κόμην τὴν ἀπέστειλα ἡμῖν καὶ ἀπεθάνεσέ τινων δεδεμένης καὶ πώλησαν μετ’ αὐτῆς λασάνας ἀγάπης μοι.
3. καὶ ἔκακος ὁ δὲ ἵοι τις ὅμως ἐξῆκεν τι, ἔφερεν "Ὅτι δὲ Κύριος

suit the situation better; cf. the parallels.
—τις ὅλος, etc., what do you wish me to do for you? Not a superfluous question; they were beggars as well as blind; they might want alms (wide Mx. x. 46). Mt. says nothing about their being beggars, but the question of Jesus implies it.—Ver. 33. τις δοκούσαν οὐδὲν. They desire the greater benefit, opening of their eyes, which shows that the eyes of their mind were open as to Christ’s power and will.—δοκούσας, 2nd aorist subjunctive, for which the T. R. has the more common 1st aorist. —Ver. 34. στήλα γιγνόμενος. Note the frequent reference to Christ’s pity in this gospel (ix. 36, xiv. 14, xv. 34, and here).—τὸν δαμαστὶν, a synonym for ἰδρυκτον, as if with some regard to style in which the scribes might have been expected to appreciate, but have not, witness the threefold use of the same word in T. R.—δοκούσας, they followed Him, like the rest, without guide (sine kadego, Beng.), so showing at once that their eyes were opened and their hearts grateful.

Chapter XXI. Entry into Jerusalem, etc.—Vv. 1-11. The entry (Mk. xi. 1-11, Lk. xix. 29-44).—Ver. 1, δὲ ἔγγυρσαν ἡ λα, ὅταν, etc. The evangelist does not, like a modern tourist, make formal announcement of the arrival at a point near Jerusalem when the Holy City came first into view, but refers to the fact in a subordinate clause. The manner of entry is the more important matter for him.—ἐκεῖ Ἰσραήλ, to Bethphage, = the house of figs, mentioned here and in the synoptical parallels, nowhere else in O. or N. T., but from Talmudic sources appears to have been a better known and more important place than Bethany (Buxtorf, Talm. Lex., p. 1691). No trace of it now.—ἐκ τῆς Ὀλυμπος, to the Mount of Olives; the εἰς, in all the three phrases used to define the position, means near to, towards, not into.—τότε, then, introducing what for the evangelist is the main event. Bengel’s comment is: ventura mysterii plena inuitur. It is probably impossible to too much mystery into the incident following—Ver. 2. εἰς τὴν κόμην, that is, naturally, the one named, though if we take εἰς before Βηθσαϊρ as = into, it might be Bethany, on the other side of the valley. Some think the two villages were practically one (Porter, Handbook for Syria and Palestine, p. 180).—δὸν τῆς καὶ πώλησαν, a she-ass with her foal, the latter alone mentioned in parall.; both named here for a reason which will appear.—λασάνες ἄγαπης, loose and bring; without asking leave; as if they were their own.—Ver. 3. ἐκάκος, etc. Of course it was to be expected that the act would be challenged.—ἐπιτε, ye shall say, future with imperative force.—ὑπενικῶς, recitative, introducing in direct form the words of the Master.—ὁ Κύριος, the Lord or Master; not surely = Jehovah (Alford, G. T.), but rather to be taken in same sense as in Mt. viii. 25, or in ver. 30 of this chap.—αὐτῶν ἡμῖν δόθη, hath need of them; in what sense? Looking to the synop. narratives alone, one might naturally infer that the need was physical, due to the fatigue of a toilsome, tedious ascent. But according to the narrative in 4th Gospel the starting point of the day’s journey was Bethany (xii. 1, 12). The prophetic reference in ver. 4 suggests a wholly different view, εἰς, that the animals were needed to enable Jesus to enter Jerusalem in a manner conformable to prophetic requirements, and worthy of the Messianic King. One is conscious of a certain reluctance to accept this as the exclusive sense of the ἡμῖν. Luttreth suggests that Jesus did not wish to mix among the crowd of pilgrims on foot lest His arrival should be concealed and
1 NCDLZ omit oligon, which is found in BN. It is probably an echo of Ch. i. 22 (Weiss) (W. H. omit).

2 και ετη in NBLN. CD with many others omit the ετη as in T. R. (ετη ἐποτισιαν καὶ τῶν νῦν in Zech. ix. 9, Sept.).

3 συντεταβίν in BCD. 4 ετ αὐτῶν in NBDLZ. 5 NBD omit αὐτῶν.

The prophetic quotation, from Zech. ix. 9, prefaced by a phrase from Isaiah lix. ii., with some words omitted, and with some alteration in expression as compared with Sept.

Vv. 7-11. τὴν δύνα καὶ τῶν πῶλων: that both were brought is carefully specified in view of the prophetic oracle as understood by the evangelist to refer to two animals, not to one under two parallel names. ἐποτισιαν: the two disciples spread their upper garments on the two beasts, to make a seat for their Master. καὶ ἐπεκάθαρσεν εἰς αὐτὸν: if the second αὐτῶν be taken to have the same reference as the first the meaning will be that Jesus sat upon both beasts (alternately). But this would require the imperfect of the verb instead of the aorist. It seems best, with many ancient and modern interpreters, to refer the second αὐτῶν to the garments, though on this view there is a certain looseness in the expression, as, strictly speaking, Jesus would sit on only one of the mantles, if He rode only on one animal. Fritzsche, while taking the second as referring to ἔμαρτε, thinks the evangelist means to represent Jesus as riding on both alternately. — Ver. 8. ὁ δὲ πλακτὸς δύνας, etc., the most part of the crowd, follow the example of the two disciples, and spread their upper garments on the way, as it were to make a carpet for the object of their enthusiasm, after the manner of the peoples honouring their kings (vide Wetstein, ad loc.). ἔλατο δὲ ἐκποτήν: others, a small number comparatively, took to cutting down branches
of trees and scattering them about on the way. Had they no upper garments, or did they not care to use them in that way? The branches, if of any size, would not improve the road, neither indeed would the garments. Lightfoot, perceiving this—"hoc forsan equitantem prostermeret"—thinks they used garments and branches to make booths, as at the feast of tabernacles. It was well meant but embarrassing homage.—Ver. 9. δίχλων, the crowd divided into two, one in front, one in rear, Jesus between. —ζωγράφον: lip homage followed the carpeting of the way, in words borrowed from the Psalter (Ps. cxviii. 25, 26), and variously interpreted by commentators. —'Ωσανά τῷ υἱῷ Δ. Hosanna (we sing) to the son of David (Bengel). —ἐπονυμίας, etc. (and we say), "Blessed, etc.," repeating words from the Hallel used at the passover season.—'Ωσανά ἐν τοῖς φίλοις = may our Hosanna on earth be echoed and ratified in heaven! All this homage by deed and word speaks to a great enthusiasm, the outcome of the Galilean ministry; for the crowd consists of Galileans. Perhaps the incident at Jericho, the healing of the blind men, and the vociferated title Son of David with which they saluted the Healer, gave the keynote. A little matter moves a crowd when it happens at the right moment. The mood of a festive season was on them.—Ver. 10. ἕξεσθη: even Jerusalem, frozen with rigor mortis formalism and socially undemonstrative, was stirred by the popular enthusiasm as by a mighty wind or by an earthquake (σεισμὸς), and asked (ver. 11), τίς ὁ ὁσίος;—ὁ προφήτης, etc.: a circumstantial answer specifying name, locality, and vocation; not a low-pitched answer as Chrys. (and after him Schanz) thought (κυριακιδώς ἦν αὐτὸν ἡ γυναῖκα, καὶ ταύτῃ καὶ συνυπότητι, Hom. ixi.), as if they were ashamed of their recent outburst of enthusiasm. Rather spoken with pride = the man to whom we have accorded Messianic honours is a countryman of ours, Jesus, etc.—Vv. 12-17. Jesus visits the Temple (Mk. xi. 11, 15-19, Lk. xix. 45-48).—Ver. 12. εἰσήλθεν, etc. He entered the Temple. When? Nothing to show that it was not the same day (vide Mk.). —ἐξεβαιλείν. The fourth Gospel (ii. 14 f.) reports a similar clearing at the beginning of Christ's ministry. Two questions have been much discussed. Were there one or two acts of this kind? and if only one was it at the beginning or at the end as reported by the Synop.? However these questions may be decided it may be regarded as one of the historic certainties that Jesus did once at least and at some time sweep the Temple clear of the unholy traffic carried on there. The consent of the evangelists and the moral originality of the act vouch for the fact.—πάντας τοὺς πωλ. καὶ ἅγιον, the article not repeated after καὶ. Sellers and buyers bowed down on company. Kindred in occupation and spirit, to be cleared out wholesale.—τὰς προπετασματικὰς, etc.: these tables were in the court of the Gentiles, in the booths (tabernae) where all things needed for sacrifice were sold, and the money changers sat ready to give to all comers the dirhema for the temple tax in exchange for ordinary money at a small profit.—κολλυβιστῶν, from κολλύβος, a small coin, change money, hence ἀγίον; hence our word to denote those who traded in exchange, condemned by Phryn., p. 440, while approving κολλυβεία. Theophy.
9—17. 263EYAITEAION


1 τοῦτο in ΝBL (Tisch., W. H.).
2 τοὺς after παιδας as well as before in ΝBDLN.

saws: καλοβιστιτά εἰσιν οἱ παρ' ἡμῖν λεγόμενοι προσέχοντες: καλόβιστος γὰρ εἴδος εννυμέραντος εὐθανατός, διότι ἵνα μὴν εἰσέλθων τοῖς ἰδίοις ἢ τὰ ἄργυρα (side Hesychius and Suicer).—τὰς περιτεράς, doves, the poor man's offering. The traffic was necessary, and might have been innocent; but the trading spirit soon develops abuses which were doubtless rampant at that period, making passover time a Jewish "Holy Fair," a grotesque and offensive combination of religion with shady morality.—Ver. 13. γέροντες, it stands written, in Isaiah lvi. 7; from the Sept. but with omission of παιδας τοις ἱερεῖς, retained in Mk., and a peculiarly appropriate expression in the circumstances, the abuse condemned having for its scene the court of the Gentiles.—στήλαιον λῃτύων, a den of robbers, a strong expression borrowed from another prophet (Jer. vii. 11), pointing probably to the avarice and fraud of the traders (τὸ γὰρ φιλοπλουρὲς λῃτυρίδων πᾶσι ἐστίν, Theophy.), taking advantage of simple provincials. This act of Jesus has been justified by the supposed right of the zealot (Num. xxv. 6-13), which is an imaginary right: "ein unfundbar Artikel" (Holtz., H. C.), or by the re-forming energy besiting the Messiah (Meyer). It needed no other justification than the indignation of a noble soul at sight of shameless deeds. Jesus was the only person in Israel who could do such a thing. All others had got accustomed to the evil.

Vv. 14-17, peculiar to Mt.—Ver. 14. τῶν χιλιῶν καὶ τῶν χιλιῶν: that the blind and lame in the city should seek out Jesus is perfectly credible, though reported only by Mt. They would hear of the recent healing at Jericho, and of many other acts of healing, and desire to get a benefi-t for themselves.—Ver. 15. τὰ θυσία: here only in N.T., the wonderful things, a comprehensive phrase apparently chosen to include all the notable things done by Jesus (Meyer), among which may be reckoned not only the cures, and the cleansing of the temple, but the enthusiasm which He had awakened in the crowd, to the priests and scribes perhaps the most offensive feature of the situation.—τοὺς παιδας, etc.: the boys and girls of the city, true to the spirit of youth, caught up and echoed the cry of the pilgrim crowd and shouted in the temple precincts: "Hosanna, etc."—Ver. 16. ἀκοῦσαι, etc., the holy men attack the least objectionable phenomenon because they could do so safely; not the enthusiasm of the crowd, the Messianic homage, the act of zeal, all deeply offensive to them, but the innocent shout of children echoing the cry of seniors. They were forsooth unseemly in such a place! Hypocrites and cowards! No fault found with the desecration of the sacred precincts by an unhallowed traffic.—vad, yes, of course: cheery, hearty, yes, not without enjoyment of the ridiculous distress of the sanctimonious guardians of the temple.—οὐδὲ ἀνέγγειλας as in xix. 4: felicitous citation from Ps. viii. 3, not to be prosaically interpreted as if children in arms three or four years old, still being suckled according to the custom of Hebrew mothers, were among the shouting juniors. These prompt happy citations show how familiar Jesus was with the O. T.—Ver. 17. Βηθαβαίοις, Bethany, 15 stadia from Jerusalem (John xi. 18), resting place of Jesus in the Passion week—
true friends there (vide Stanley, S. and P.).—ἡμισίνη, passed the night; surely not in the open air, as Wetstein and Grotius think. At passover time quarters could not easily be got in the city, but the house of Martha and Mary would be open to Jesus (cf. Lk. xx. 57).

Vv. 18-22. The barren fig tree (Mk. xi. 12-14, 19-26).—The story of two morning journeys from Bethany to Jerusalem (vide Mk.) is here compressed into one.—Ver. 18. ἐπιλήψασθε, He felt hungry. The fact seems to favour the hypothesis of a bivouac under the sky overnight. Why should one be hungry leaving the hospitable friends? This was no difficulty for the Fathers who regarded the hunger as assumed (συγκαταστέαται παντώς, Euthy).—Ver. 19. συκὴν μὲν ἐξελέγεται:果实 near, came close to it, not climbed it (Fritzsche).—ὁ λεύκων ἐκ' αὐτῆς, came close to it, not climbed it (Fritzsche).—ὁ μήλον φύλλα, leaves only, no fruit. Jesus expected to find fruit. Perhaps judging from Galilean experience, where by the lake-shore the fig tree was ten months long (Joseph., Bell. J., i. 108. Vide Holtz., H. C.), but vide on Mk. xi. 13.—οὗ μυκῆς, etc.: according to some writers this was a prediction based on the observation that the tree was diseased, put in the form of a doom. So Bleek, and Furrer, who remarks: “Then said He, who knew nature and the human heart, ‘This tree will soon wither’; for a fig tree with full leaf in early spring without fruit is a diseased tree” (Wanderungen, p. 172).—καὶ ἡ παραχρῆμα, cf. Mk.’s account. —Ver. 20. οἱ μαθηταί, etc.: the disciples wondered at the immediate withering of the tree. Did they expect it to die, as a diseased tree, gradually?—Ver. 21 contains a thought similar to that in xvii. 20, q.v.—τὸ τῆς συκῆς, the matter of the fig tree, as if it were a small affair, not worth speaking about. The question of the disciples did not draw from Jesus explanations as to the motive of the mal- diction. The curving of the fig tree has always been regarded as of symbolic import, the tree being in Christ’s mind an emblem of the Jewish people, with a great show of religion and no fruit of real godliness. This hypothesis is very credible.

Vv. 23-27. Interrogation as to authority (Mk. xx. 27-33, Lk. xx. 18), wherewith suitably opens the inevitable final conflict between Jesus and the religious leaders of the people.—Ver. 23. ἐλθόντων αὐτῶν Ἰ. η. Λ: coming on the second day to the temple, the place of concourse, where He was sure to meet His foes, nothing loath to speak His mind to them.—διδάσκοντε: yet He came to teach, to do good, not merely to fight. —ἐν ποιπ. ἔσωσι, by what sort of authority? the question ever asked by the representa-
24. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Εὐρυτήρῳ ὁμᾶς κἀγὼ λόγον ἔα, δν ἐὰν ἐπιτέ μοι, κἀγὼ ὑμῖν ἔρω ἐν ποιήσῃ ἡμῖν ταῦτα ποιῶ. 25. τὸ βάπτισμα ἐν Ἰωάννῃ πόθεν ἦν; ἔδωκαν ὑμῖν, ἢ ἐὰν ἄνθρωπον;" Ὡς δὲ διελέγοντο τοῖς ἑκάστοις, λέγοντες, "Ἑλπίζω, ἔδωκαν ὑμῖν, ἔδωκαν ἐμεῖς ἔρω ἐν ποιήσῃ ἡμῖν ταῦτα ποιῶ. 26. δὲ ἔδωκαν ἐμεῖς ἐν ποιήσῃ ἔδωκαν ἀνθρώποι, φοβοῦμεθα τὸν ἥλιον· πάντες γὰρ ἔκρυσαν τὸν Ἰωάννην ἐν προφήτῃ."

27. Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐποίησεν τῷ Ἰησοῦς εἶπον, "Οὐκ ἐπιθύμητε." Ἔφη αὐτοῖς καὶ αὐτοῖς, "Οὐδὲ ἔδωκα τὸν λόγον ἐν ποιήσῃ ἡμῖν ταῦτα ποιῶ. 28. Τι δὲ ἡμῖν δοκεῖ; ἀνθρώπους εἶπε τέκνα δοκεῖ, καὶ ἐπορεύθην τῷ πρώτῳ εἶπε. Τέκνον, τις ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἔστι πρώτον εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν καὶ τοῖς ἑκάστοις ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ταῦτα ἐπανεισήχθησαν καὶ ἐπιλέγοντο τοῖς ἑκάστοις.

1 Some copies omit ὑμῖν. ΝΒCD have it.
2 to before ἦν in ΝΒCZ.
3 ἐν προφητῇ before εἶπον in ΝΒCLZ (so in modern editions).
4 So in ΝCDL al. ὑμῖν τέκνα in B (W.H. in margin).
5 καί is found in BCD and other uncials but wanting in ΝLZ. Tisch. omits and W.H. relegate to the margin.

tives of established order and custom at epoch-making initiators. So the Judaists interrogated St. Paul as to his right to be an apostle.—τοῦτα, vague (cf. xii, 25) and comprehensive. They have in view all the offences of which Jesus had been guilty, throughout His ministry—all well known to them—whatever He had done in the spirit of unconventional freedom which He had exhibited since His arrival in Jerusalem.—καὶ τίς: the second question is but an echo of the first: the quality of the authority (τοῖς) depends on its source.—τοῦτος, this authority, which you arrogate, and which so many unhappily acknowledge. It was a question as to the legitimacy of an undeniable influence. That spiritual power accredits itself was beyond the comprehension of the Judaists.—Ver. 24. Jesus replies by an embarrassing counter-question as to the ministry of the Baptist.

—λόγῳ ἔστι, hardly: one question for your many (Beng.) rather: a question, or thing, one and the same (cf. for ἐς in this sense Gen. xii. 25, 26; I Cor. iii. 8, xi. 5), an analogous question as we should say: one answer would do for theirs and for His.—Ver. 25. τὸ βάπτισμα τὸ τῆς, the baptism as representing John’s whole ministry.—ἐάν ὑμῖν, ὑμῖν ἂν, from heaven or from men? The antithesis is foreign to legitimist modes of thought, which would combine the two: from heaven but through men; if, not through men, not from heaven. The most gigantic and baleful instance of this fetish in modern times is the notion of church sacraments and orders depending on ordination. On the same principle St. Paul was no apostle, because his orders came to him “not from men nor by man,” Gal. i. 18." —ἐν ἀπατή, etc. The audible and formal answer of the scribes was οὐκ ἐπιθυμήτε (so W.H. in margin). All that goes before from ἐκακοῦ τοῦ προφητῆς is the reasoning on which it was based, either unspoken (παρ’ ὑμῖν καὶ ἐκακοῦ, Mt.) or spoken to each other (προφήτης, Mk. xi. 31); not likely to have been overheard, guessed rather from the puzzled expression on their faces.—οὐκ ἐπικακίστατο: the reference here may be to John’s witness to Jesus, or it may be general—why did ye not receive his message as a whole?—Ver. 26. ἐὰν ὑμῖν, etc.: the mode of expression here is awkward. Meyer finds in the sentence an ἀποφείασις: “if we say of men—we fear the people." What they mean is: we must not say of men, because we fear, etc. (cf. Mk.)—Ver. 27. σωτήρ ἔστι, etc.: Jesus was not afraid to answer their question, but He felt it was not worth while giving an answer to opportunists. —Vv. 28-32. Parable of the two sons, in Mt. only, introduced by the familiar formula, τι δὲ ὑμῖν δοκεῖ (xvii. 25, xviii. 12), and having for its aim to contrast the conduct of the Pharisees towards the Baptist with that of the publicans. And as the publicans are simply used as a foil to bring out more clearly the Pharisaic character, the main subject of remark, it is highly probable that the son who represents the Pharisee was mentioned first, and the son who represents the
publican second; the order in which they stand in B, and adopted by W. and H. The parable, therefore, should read thus: "A certain man had two sons. He said to one, Go work, etc. He replied, Yes, sir, and went not. To the other he said the same. He replied, I will not, and afterwards went."—Ver. 28. τὸ ἀμπελών: constant need of work in a vineyard, and of superintendence of workers.—Ver. 29. ἐγώ: laconic and emphatic as if eager to obey—κύριε, with all due politeness, and most filial recognition of paternal authority, the two words are our "Yes, sir".—Ver. 30. ὁ θεός, I will not, I am not inclined; rude, sulky, unmannerly, disobedient, and making no pretence to filial loyalty.—Ver. 31. To the question, Who did the will of the father? the answer, when the parable is arranged as above, must, of course, be τὸ ἐστόρος; the say-sayer, not the yea-sayer. It is a wonder any answer was given at all when the purport of the parable was so transparent.—ἀργὴ λέγω ὅ,: introducing here, as always, a very important assertion. The statement following would give deadly offence to the Pharisees.—τάλανα, ὅρνια, the publicans and the harlots, the two socially lowest classes. Jesus speaks here from definite knowledge, not only of what had happened in connection with the Baptist ministry, but of facts connected with His own. He has doubtless reminiscences of the "Capernaum mission" (chap. viii. 9-13) to go upon.—προάγοντο, go before, anticipate (προλαμβάνοντο, Euthy.), present tense: they are going before you now; last first, first last. Chrysostom, in Hom. lxvii., gives an interesting story of a courtesan of his time in illustration of this.—Ver. 32. εἰ ὁ δὲ διακινουσθῇ: not merely in the sense of being a good pious man with whose life no fault could be found (Meyer; the Fathers, Chrys., Euthy., Theophy.), but in the specific sense of following their own legal way. John was a conservative in religion not less than the Pharisees. He differed from them only by being thoroughly sincere and earnest. They could not, therefore, excuse themselves for not being sympathetic towards him on the ground of his being an innovator, as they could with plausibility in the case of Jesus. The meaning thus is: He cultivated legal piety like yourselves, yet, etc.—ὑμεῖς ὃ δὲ ἱδόντες, when ye saw how the sinful took John's summons to repent ye did not even late in the day follow their example and change your attitude. They were too proud to take an example from publicans and harlots.—τοῦ παντεύεισθαι, inf. of result with τοῦ.
of kindred import. The abrupt introduction betrays emotion. Jesus is aware that He has given mortal offence, and here shows His knowledge by forshadowing His own doom. The former parable has exposed the insincerity of the leaders of Israel, this exposes their open revolt against even divine authority. —ἀμπελῶνα: it is another vineyard parable. They were both probably exemplified, the one suggesting the other, the picture of non-doing calling up the companion picture of misdoing.—φαραγών & περίβλησις, etc.: detailed description of the pains taken by the landlord in the construction of the vineyard, based on Isaiah’s song of the vineyard (chap. v. 2), all with a view to fruitfulness, and to fruit of the best kind; for the owner, at least, is very much in earnest: a hedge to protect against wild beasts, a press and vat that the grapes may be squeezed and the juice preserved, a tower that the ripe fruit may not be stolen.—ἐξεδότο, let it out on hire; on what terms—whether for a rent in money or on the meterus system, produce divided between owner and workers—does not here appear. The latter seems to be implied in the parallels (Mk. xii. 2, ἀνὰ τῶν καρπῶν, Lk. xx. 10, ἀνὰ τοῦ καρποῦ)—ἀπεθάνησαν, went abroad, to leave them freedom, and also to give them time; for the newly planted vines would not bear fruit for two or three years. No unreasonableness in this landlord.—Ver. 34. καρπός: not merely the season of the year, but the time at which the new vines might be expected to bear.—τοῖς καρποῖς: the whole, apparently implying a money rent. The mode of tenure probably not thought of by this evangelist.—ἀδύτου should probably be referred to the owner, not to the vineyard = “his fruits,” as in A. V.—Ver. 35. λαβόντες ιγι, etc. The husbandmen treat the messengers in the most barbarous and truculent manner: beating, killing, stoning to death; highly improbable in the natural sphere, but another instance in which parables have to violate natural probability in order to describe truly men’s conduct in the spiritual sphere. On ἐβιάσαν Kyrke remarks: the verb ἐβιάζειν is so rare in profane writers that some have thought that for ἐβιάσαν should be read ἐβιώσαν, from βιῶσαν.—Ver. 36. πλείονας τ. χ., more than the first. Some take πλ. as referring to quality rather than number: better than the former (Bengel, Goebel, etc.), which is a legitimate but not likely rendering. The intention is to emphasise the number of persons sent (prophets).—διατόμως: no difference in the treatment; savage mood chronic.—Ver. 37. ἐβιάσαν, not afterwards merely, but finally, the last step was now to be taken, the mission of the son and heir; excuses conceivable hitherto: doubt as to credentials, a provoking manner in those sent, etc.; not yet conclusively proved that deliberate defiance is intended. The patient master will make that clear before taking further steps.—ἐβιάσασθαί (pass. for mid.), they will show respect to. It is assumed that they will have no difficulty in knowing him.—Ver. 38. ἢδονες: neither have they;
recognise at once the son and heir, and resolve forthwith on desperate courses, which are at once carried out. They eject the son, kill him, and seize the inheritance. The action of the parable is confined to a single season, the messengers following close on each other. But Jesus obviously has in His eye the whole history of Israel, from the settlement in Canaan till His own time, and sees in it God's care about fruit (a holy nation), the mission of the successive prophets to insist that fruit be forthcoming, and the persistent neglect and dialoquy of the people. Neglect, for there was no fruit to give to the messengers, though that does not come out in the parable. The picture is a very sombre one, but it is broadly true. Israel, on the whole, had not only not done God's will, but had badly treated those who urged her to do it. She killed her prophets (Mt. xxiii. 37).

Vv. 40-46. Application.—σταυρόν αὐτῶν; etc.: what would you expect the owner to do after such ongoings have been reported to him? Observe the subjunctive after σταυρόν compared with the indicative ἔγγαγον after ἰησοῦς, ver. 34. ἱησοῦς points to a definite time past, σταυρόν is indefinite (vide Hermann, Viger, p. 437).—Ver. 41. ἰησοῦς, they say: who? the men incriminated, though they could not but see through the thin veil of the allegory. In Mk. and Lk. the words appear to be put into Christ's mouth.—κακοὶ κακῶς ἀπολέσαν: a solemn fact classically expressed ("en Graeci sermonis peritiam in Matthaeo"—Raphael, Annot.) = He will badly destroy bad men.—σπέρμα, such as; he will give out the vineyard to husbandsmen of a different stamp.—τ. κ. ἐν τοῖς καρποῖς αὐτῶν; the fruits in their (the fruits') seasons, regularly year by year.—Ver. 42. ἰησοῦς ἀνέγαγεν, etc.: another of Christ's impromptu felicitous quotations; from Ps. cxviii. 22, 23 (Sept.). This quotation contains, in germ, another parable, in which the ejected and murdered heir of the former parable becomes the rejected stone of the builders of the theocratic edifice; only, however, to become eventually the accepted honoured stone of God. It is an apposite citation, because probably regarded as Messianic by those in whose hearing it was made (it was so regarded by the Rabbis—Schöttgen, ad loc.), and because it intimated to them that by killing Jesus they would not be done with Him.—Ver. 43. ἀποστέλλων, introducing the application of the oracle, and implying that the parties addressed are the builders = therefore.—ἡ βασιλεία τ. Θ.: the doom is forfeiture of privilege, the kingdom taken from them and given to others.—θράσος, to a nation; previously, as Paul calls it, a ἀνθρώπινος λαός (Rom. x. 19), the reference being, plainly, to the heathen world.—ποιοῦντι τ. κ. α.: cf. iii. 8, 10; vii. 17, bringing forth the fruits of it (the kingdom). The hope that the new nation will bring forth the fruit is the ground of the transference. God elects with a view to usefulness; a useless elect people has no prescriptive rights.—Ver. 44. This verse, bracketed by W.H., found in the same connection in Lk. (xx. 18), looks rather like an interpolation, yet it suits the situation, serving as a solemn warning to men meditating evil intentions against the Speaker.—ἐξεστῶ: he who falls on the stone, as if stumbling against it (Is. viii. 14).—συνάθροισθησον: shall be broken in pieces, like an earthen vessel falling on a rock. This compound is found only in late Greek authors.—οὗτος ἐν ὑμῖν ἐν τοῖς δικαιοµένων, on whom it shall fall, in judgment. The distinction is between men who believe not in the Christ through misunderstanding and those who reject Him through an evil heart of unbelief. Both suffer in
CHAPTER XXII. PARABLE OF THE WEDDING FEAST AND ENCOUNTERS WITH OPPONENTS.—Vv. 1-14. The royal wedding.—This parable is peculiar to Mt., and while in some respects very suitable to the situation, may not unreasonably be suspected to owe its place here to the evangelist’s habit of grouping kindred matter. The second part of the parable referring to the man without a wedding robe has no connection with the present situation, or with the Pharisees who are supposed to be addressed. Another question has been much discussed, viz., whether this parable was spoken by Jesus at all on any occasion, the idea of many critics being that it is a parable of Christ’s reconstructed by the evangelist or some other person, so as to make it cover the sin and fate of the Jews, the calling of the Gentiles, and the Divine demand for righteousness in all recipients of His grace. The resemblance between this parable and that of the Supper, in Lk. xiv. 16-24, is obvious. Assuming that Jesus uttered a parable of this type, the question arises: which of the two parables gives emphasis to what is peculiar, and bids us mark what it is that is judged? (The Parabolic Teaching of Christ, p. 453). The main objection rests on the assumption that Jesus uttered no parables of the allegorical type. On this, see remarks on the parable of the Soner, chap. xiii.

Ver. 1. ἐν παραβολῇ, the plural does not imply more than one parable, but merely indicates the style of address = parabolically.—Ver. 2. γάμους, a wedding feast; plural, because the festivities lasted for days, seven in Judges xiv. 17. The suggestion that the feast is connected with the handing over of the kingdom to the son (“quem pater succedere declarare volebat,” Kuinoel) is not to be despised. The marriage
and recognition of the son as heir to the throne might be combined, which would give to the occasion a political significance, and make appearance at the marriage a test of loyalty. Eastern monarchs had many sons by different wives, and heathen to the throne did not go by primogeniture, but by the pleasure of the sovereign, determined in many cases by affection for a favourite wife, as in the case of Solomon (Koetsveld, de Gelijk.)—Ver. 3. BÒgSovTco ceSovXov, to the apostles whose ministry gave to the same generation a second chance.—BÒgSovTco: the second set of messengers are instructed what to say; they are expected not merely to invite to but to commend the feast, to provoke desire.—BÒgSovTco, to arrest attention.—BÒgSovTco, the midday meal, as distinct from apuTTOVpov, which came later in the day (vide Lk. xiv. 12, where both are named = early dinner and supper). With the BÒgSovTco the festivities begin.—BÒgSovTco, perfect, I have in readiness.—BÒgSovTco, to provoke desire.—BÒgSovTco, to obtain, or oxen, and fed beasts: speak to a feast on a vast scale.—BÒgSovTco, slain, and therefore must be eaten without delay. The word is often used in connection with the slaying of sacrificial victims, and the idea of sacrifice may be in view here (Koetsveld).—BÒgSovTco, as John the Baptist and Jesus Himself, whose joint message to their generation was: the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand, feast time at length arrived.—BÒgSovTco, Israel in all her generations had been willing in a general way, quite intending to come; and the generation of John and Jesus were also willing in a general way, if it had only been the right son who was going to be married. How could they be expected to accept the obscure Nazarene for Bridegroom and Heir?—Ver. 4. BÒgSovTco BÒgSovTco refers to the apostles whose ministry gave to the same generation a second chance.—BÒgSovTco: the second set of messengers are instructed what to say; they are expected not merely to invite to but to commend the feast, to provoke desire.—BÒgSovTco, to arrest attention.—BÒgSovTco, the midday meal, as distinct from apuTTOVpov, which came later in the day (vide Lk. xiv. 12, where both are named = early dinner and supper). With the BÒgSovTco the festivities begin.—BÒgSovTco, perfect, I have in readiness.—BÒgSovTco, to provoke desire.—BÒgSovTco, as John the Baptist and Jesus Himself, whose joint message to their generation was: the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand, feast time at length arrived.—BÒgSovTco, Israel in all her generations had been willing in a general way, quite intending to come; and the generation of John and Jesus were also willing in a general way, if it had only been the right son who was going to be married. How could they be expected to accept the obscure Nazarene for Bridegroom and Heir?—Ver. 4. BÒgSovTco BÒgSovTco refers to the apostles whose ministry gave to the same generation a second chance.—BÒgSovTco: the second set of messengers are instructed what to say; they are expected not merely to invite to but to commend the feast, to provoke desire.—BÒgSovTco, to arrest attention.—BÒgSovTco, the midday meal, as distinct from apuTTOVpov, which came later in the day (vide Lk. xiv. 12, where both are named = early dinner and supper). With the BÒgSovTco the festivities begin.—BÒgSovTco, perfect, I have in readiness.—BÒgSovTco, to provoke desire.—BÒgSovTco, as John the Baptist and Jesus Himself, whose joint message to their generation was: the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand, feast time at length arrived.—BÒgSovTco, Israel in all her generations had been willing in a general way, quite intending to come; and the generation of John and Jesus were also willing in a general way, if it had only been the right son who was going to be married. How could they be expected to accept the obscure Nazarene for Bridegroom
which gave rise to the conduct specified. They treated the pressing invitations and glowing descriptions of the servants with indifference.—ότι μὲν, δεί δὲ: this one to his own (θέων for εὐνοόμα = προφητής for συμφ. his trading (μακραί here only in N. T. Cf. Lk. at this point).—Ver. 6. λαον, the rest, as if οἱ δὲ ἁμαρτάνοντες were only a part, the greater part, of the invited, while the expression by itself naturally covers the whole. Weiss finds in λαον a trace of patching: the parable originally referred to the people of Israel as a whole, but Mt. introduced a reference to the Synedrists and here has them especially in view as the λαον. Koetsveld remarks on the improbability of the story at this point: men at a distance—rulers of provinces—could not be invited in the morning with the expectation of their being present at the palace by midday. So far this makes for the hypothesis of remodelling by a second hand. But even in Christ’s acknowledged parables it is sometimes introduced to meet the requirements of the case; e.g., in Lk.’s version of the parable all refuse.—κρατήσαντες . . . ὦβ. καὶ ἀπέκτειναν: acts of open rebellion inevitably leading to war. This feature, according to Weiss, lies outside the picture. Not so, if the marriage feast was to be the occasion for recognising the son as heir. Then refusal to come meant withholding homage, rebellion in the bud, and acts of violence were but the next step.—Ver. 7. τὰ στρατεύματα: the plural appears surprising, but the meaning seems to be, the separate armies sent one after another, but forces. —ἀκάλεσεν, ἐνέπηρεν: the allegory here evidently refers to the destruction of Jerusalem; no argument against authenticity, if xxiv. 2 be a word of Jesus. Note that the destruction of Jerusalem is represented as taking place before the calling of those without = the Gentiles. This is not according to the historic fact. This makes for authenticity, as a later allegorist would have been likely to observe the historical order (v. A. Schanz).

Vv. 8-10. τούτο: after the second set of servants, as many as survived, had returned and reported their ill-success.—λέγει, he says to them.—τοίς, ready, and more.—Ver. 9. ἐτί τῶν διεξόδων, variously interpreted: at the crossing-places of the country roads (Fritzsche, De Wette, Meyer, Goebel), or at the places in the city whence the great roads leading into the country start (Kypee, Loesner, Kuinoel, Trench, Weiss). “According as we emphasise one or other prep. in the compound word, either: the places whence the roads run out, or Oriental roads passing into the city through gates” (Holtz, H. C.). The second view is the more likely: it was not only because, the time pressing, the place where new guests are to be found must be near at hand. In the open spaces of the city, strangers from the country as well as the lower population of the town could be met with; the foreign element = Gentiles, mainly in view.—Ver. 10. τονῖν τι καὶ ἄγαθον: not in the mood to make distinctions. τὸν gives τῶν. and ἄγαθος, together as one company = all they found, of all sorts, bad or good, the market-place swept clean.—ἐκκλησία, was filled; satisfactory after the trouble in getting guests at all.—γυμνῶν, the marriage dining-hall; in ix. 15 the bridechamber.
Though this feature has no connection with the polemic against the Sanhedrists, it does not follow, as even Weiss (Matthäus-Evang.) admits, that it was not an authentic part of a parable spoken by Jesus. It would form a suitable pendant to any parable of grace, as showing that, while the door of the kingdom is open to all, personal holiness cannot be dispensed with.—Ver. 11. ὁ δὲ ὄντας ὁ σωτήρ, we are not to suppose that the king came in to look out for offenders, but rather to show his countenance to his guests and make them welcome.—ἐνθρωπος, etc.: while he was going round among the guests smiling welcome and addressing here and there a gracious word, his eye lighted on a man without a wedding robe. Only one? More might have been expected in such a company, but one suffices to illustrate the principle. —οὐδὲ ὁ δὲ τοῦτος ὁ λεγόμενος, we have here an example of occasional departure from the rule that participles in the N. T. take μὴ as the negative in all relations.—Ver. 12. τίς ἐστι: the question might mean, By what way did you come in? this time, not ἐστὶ, as in ver. 11, implying blame. Euthymius includes the question as to how the man got in among the things not to be inquired into, διὰ τὴν αὐτονομίαν (freedom) τῆς παραβολῆς.—ὁ δὲ ἐφαμάθη, he was dumb, not so much from a sense of guilt as from confusion in presence of the great king finding fault, and from fear of punishment.—Ver. 13. τοῖς διακόνοις, the servants waiting on the guests, cf. Lk. xxii. 27, John ii. 5.—δόχος, ἐξέβλητε: disproportionate fuss, we are apt to think, about the rude act of an unmannier clown. Enough surely simply to turn him out, instead of binding him hand and foot as a criminal preparatory to some fearful doom. But matters of etiquette are seriously viewed at courts, especially in the East, and the king's temper is already ruffled by previous insults, which make him jealous for his honour. And the anger of the king serves the didactic aim of the parable, which is to enforce the lesson: sin not because grace abounds. After all the doom of the righteous, the king is not turned out of the festive chamber into the darkness of night outside.—καὶ ἦσαν, etc.: stock-phrase descriptive of the misery of one cast out into the darkness, possibly no part of the parable. On this expression Furzer remarks: "How weird and sightful, is the wanderer who has lost his way, the night, when clouds cover the heavens, and through the deep darkness the howling and teeth-grinding of hungry wolves strike the ear of the lonely one! Truly no figure could more impressively describe the anguish of the God-forsaken» (Wanderungen, p. 181).—Ver. 14. πόλλας γὰρ: if, as γάρ might suggest, the concluding aphorism referred exclusively to the fate of the unrobed guest, we should be obliged to conclude that the story did not supply a good illustration of its truth, only one
out of many guests called being rejected. But the gnome really expresses the didactic drift of the whole parable. From first to last many were called, but comparatively few took part in the feast, either from lack of will to be there or from coming thither irreverently.

Ver. 15. τότε ἀνεθελείς οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ὑμβασίαν ἡμῖν ὑμῖν ἐν λόγῳ. 16. καὶ ἀποκτάλωσαν αὐτῷ τοὺς μαθητάς αὐτῶν μετὰ τῶν Ἰησοῦν, λέγοντες, "Διδάσκαλε, ὦδαμνοί ἡμῖν ἄνθρωπος εἶ, καὶ τὴν βίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν ἄλληι διδασκαλίᾳ, καὶ οὐκ ἠλεήθης αὐτοῖς, οὐδὲ ὑμᾶς ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐς πρόσωπον αὐτῶν." 17. Ἰησοῦς δὲ λέγει αὐτοῖς, ὅτι ὁ ποιήσας τῶν ἑαυτοῦ τιμίων θαύματα, ἀποκλίνεται, καὶ ὁ ἐπιλεγμένος τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, ἐκ τῶν πυλῶν δεικνύεται ὡς διασκεδάζων τοὺς πρὸς τὸν ἱλαστήριον ἀνθρώπους.

1 λέγοντες in κατὰ Μᾶτθαίου in agreement with μαθητάς. The reading λέγοντες has CDAΣ al. in its favour, but modern editors prefer the other.
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associated with Sadducees in Mk. viii. 15; why so called is a matter of conjecture, and the guesses are many: soldiers of Herod (Jerome); courtiers of Herod (Fritzsche, following Syr. ver.); Jews belonging to the northern tetrarchies governed by members of the Herod family (Lutteroth) favourers of the Roman dominion (Orig., De W., etc.); sympathisers with the desire for a national kingdom so far gratified or stimulated by the rule of the Herod family. The last the most probable, and adopted by many: Weinstein, Meyer, Weiss, Keil, Schanz, etc. The best clue to the spirit of the party is their association with the Pharisees here. It presumably means sympathy with the Pharisees in the matter at issue; i.e., nationalism versus willing submission to a foreign yoke; only not religious or theocratic, as in case of Pharisees, but secular, as suited men of Sudaic proclivities. The object aimed at implies such sympathy. To succeed the snare must be hidden. Had the two parties been on opposite sides Jesus would have been put on His guard. The name of this party probably originated in a kashubian hero-worship for Herod the Great. Vide on xvi. 1—λέγοντες, etc., the snare set with much astuteness, and well baited with flattery, the bait coming first. —διδάσκαλος, teacher, an appropriate address from scholars in search of knowledge, or desiring the solution of a knotty question.—οὖν, we know, everybody knows. Even Pharisees understood so far the character of Jesus, as here appears; for their disciples say what they have been instructed to say. Therefore their infamous theory of a league with Beelzebub (xii. 24) was a sin against light; i.e., against the Holy Ghost. Pharisaic scholars might even feel a sentimental, half-sincere admiration for the character described, nature not yet dead in them as in their teachers. The points in the character specified are—
p here only 17. αὐτ一个月 ν ἡμέρα, τὸ τοῦ βοῶνα, ἐξεταὶ δοῦνα κήτους Καίσαρι, in N. T.
Heb. x. 1. Οἱ δὲ προσήνεγκαν αὐτῷ δηνάριον. 20. καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, “Τίνος ἡ Μκ. xil. 16.
Lk. xxiii. Τότε λέγει αὐτοῖς, “*Ἀπόδοτε οὖν τὰ Καίσαρος Καίσαρι, καὶ τὰ τοῦ
Rom. xil. 38. τοῦ θεοῦ τῷ θεῷ.” 22. Καὶ ἀκούσαντες θάραμαν καὶ ἀφύνετε αὐτὸν
in same ἀπήδουν.

1 εἰσνεπτον in LZ, and adopted by Tisch. and W.H., though εἰσεπτον is found in ΝΒC.
2 DLZ add εἰσεπτον after αὐτοῖς and W.H. put it in margin.
3 ΝΒ omit αὐτοῖς.

(1) sincerity—Δλανθεσσ; (2) fidelity, as a religious teacher—καὶ τὸ τῆς ἐλαθείας διάκονος; (3) fearlessness—οὐ μᾶλλον, etc.; (4) no respecter of persons—οὐ βλάστεις, etc. = will speak the truth to all and about all impartially. The compliment, besides being treacherous, was insulting, implying that Jesus was a simpleton who would give Himself away, and a vain man who could be flattered. But, in reality, they sinned in ignorance. Such men could not understand the character of Jesus thoroughly: e.g., His humility, His wisdom, and His superiority to partisan points of view.—Ver. 17. εἰσνεπτον εἰς τὴν σακείαν, the snare, a question as to the lawfulness in a religious point of view (ἐξεταί—fas est, Grotius) of paying tribute to Caesar. The question implies a possible antagonism between such payment and duty to God as theocratic Head of the nation. Vide Deut. xvii. 15. — ἢ οὖ; yes or no? they expect or desire a negative answer, and they demand a plain one—responsum rotundum, Bengel; for an obvious reason indicated by Lk. (xx. 20). They demanded more than they were ready to give, whatever their secret leanings; no fear of them playing a heroic part.

Vv. 18-22. Christ’s reply and its effect.—Ver. 18. Πονηρίαν, ὑποκρίται, wickedness, hypocrites; the former the evangelist’s word, the latter Christ’s, both thoroughly deserved. It was a wicked plot against His life veiled under apparently sincere compliments of young inquirers, and men of the world who posed as admirers of straightforwardness.—Ver. 19. τὸ νικηφορόν (Latin numismata, here only in N. T.) τοῦ καίσαρος, the current coin of the tribute, i.e., in which the tribute was paid, a roundabout name for a denarius (Mark).—Δηνάριον, a Roman coin, silver, in which metal tribute was paid (Pliny, N. H., 33, 3, 15; Marquardt, Rom. Alt., 3, 2, 147).—Ver. 20. ἡ σπείρα: the coin produced a bore an image; perhaps not necessarily, though Roman, as the Roman rulers were very considerate of Jewish prejudices in this as in other matters (Holzmann, H. C.), but at passover time there would be plenty of coins bearing Caesar’s image and inscription to be had even in the pockets of would-be zealots.—Ver. 21. ἀπόδοτα, the ordinary word for paying dues (Meyer), yet there is point in Chrysostom’s remark: οὐ γὰρ ἐστι τοῦτο δοῦνα, ἀλλὰ ἀποδοθέσθαι καὶ τοῦτο καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς σκέπος, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ἐπιγραφῆς θινυτταν (H. lxx.). The image and inscription showed that giving (ver. 17) tribute to Caesar was only giving back to him his own. This was an unanswerable argumentum ad hominem as addressed to men who had no scruple about using Caesar’s coin for ordinary purposes, but of course it did not settle the question. The previous question might be raised, Had Caesar a right to coin money for Palestine, i.e., to rule over it? The coin showed that he was ruler de facto, but not necessarily de jure, unless on the doctrine that might is right. The really important point in Christ’s answer is, not what is said but what is implied, viz., that national independence is not an ultimate good, nor the patriotism that fights for it an ultimate virtue. This doctrine Jesus held in common with the prophets. He virtually asserted it by distinguishing between the things of Caesar and the things of God. To have treated these as one, the latter category absorbing the former, would have been to say: The kingdom of God means the kingdom restored to Israel. By treating
23. "And when the scribes and Pharisees saw the great multitude, they were astonished at His teaching, for they spoke with authority. But the scribes and Pharisees, who were the leaders in the scribes and Pharisees, came to Him and said, 'Why do Your disciples violate the tradition of the elders? For they do not wash their hands when they eat bread.' And He answered and said to them, 'And why do you violate the commandment of God because of your tradition? For God said, 'Honor your father and your mother,' and '_You shall love your neighbor as yourself._' But you say, 'Whoever says to his father or mother, 'Whatever help you have from me.' And until seven years, therefore, (such is the implied thought) all had equal rights. Very clever puzzle, but not insuperably difficult even for Talmudists cherishing materialistic ideas of the resurrection life, who gave the first husband the prior claim (Schöttgen).

Vv. 23-33. Christ's answer.—One at first wonders that He deigned to answer such triflers; but He was willing meekly to instruct even the perverse, and He never forgot that there might be receptive earnest people within hearing. The Sadducees drew from Him one of His great words.—

Vv. 29-33. Christ's answer.—One at first wonders that He deigned to answer such triflers; but He was willing meekly to instruct even the perverse, and He never forgot that there might be receptive earnest people within hearing. The Sadducees drew from Him one of His great words.—
276 KATA MATHAIANON

30. πάντες, μη εἰλθέτες τάς γραφάς, μηδὲ τήν δόξαν τοῦ Θεοῦ. 31. εν γὰρ τῇ ἁπαστάσει οὐδὲ γαμοῦσιν, οὐδὲ εἰγαμβιοῦσιν, ἀλλ' ἐς ἄγγελον τοῦ Θεοῦ εῦ ὑπαινοῦς εἰς. 32. Ἐγὼ εἶμι ὁ Θεὸς Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ ὁ Θεὸς Ἰσραὴλ ἔστιν: 'Ο Θεὸς Ἰσραὴλ ἔρχεται 4 μαρτύρων, ἀλλά ἔρχεται'.

33. 34. ὁ δὲ Φαρισαῖος, ἀκούσας ὅτι δεῦτος σαββατοκυριακοῦ, 

35. καὶ ἔφριμεν αἱ ἀρχαί ἀνέφερμεν τὰ τοῦ ἄγγελον, καὶ ἐγῆμεν, 36. "Διδάσκαλε, ποιά ἀνθρώπινη μεγάλη 

1 γαμβιον τοῦ NBDL; the compound in many uncials.

2 NBL have τα before σαββατοκύριακα. ΔΑΣ omit.

3 ΝΔ (Tisch.) omit έ. W.H. in brackets.

4 The second θεος is wanting in NBDLA al. It has been added to make the meaning clear.

5 καί λέγω is probably a mechanical addition. It is wanting in NBL 33, Egypt. verse; found in ΔΑΣ. Tisch. and W.H. omit.

μὴ εἰλθέτες, etc.: doubly ignorant; of the Scriptures and of God's power, the latter form of ignorance being dealt with first.—

Ver. 30. εν γὰρ τῇ ἁπαστάσει might be rendered, with Fritzsche, in the resurrection life or state, though in strictness the phrase should be taken as in ver. 28.—οὐκ ἄγγελον, as angels, so far as marriage is concerned, not necessarily implying sexlessness as the Fathers supposed.—οὐ τοῦ ὑπαίτου refers to the resurrected dead (Weiss), not to angels (Meyer) = they live an angelic life in heaven; by the transforming power of God.—Ver. 31. Thus far of the mode, now of the fact of resurrection.—οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ γὰρ Θεὸς, with the article ὁ Θεὸς is subject, and the idea: God does not belong to the dead; without, it would be predicate = He is not a God of the dead. On second θεος vide critical notes. Vv. 34-40. The great commandments (Mk. xii. 34).—In a still more marked degree than in the case of the man in quest of eternal life, Mk.'s account presents the subject of this incident in a more favourable light than that of Mt. The difference must be allowed to stand. Mk.'s version is welcome as showing a good side even in the scribe or Pharisee world.—Ver. 34. ἀκούσαντες, hearing; not without pleasure, if also with annoyance, at the uniform success of Jesus.—

Ἐφίσμον: silenced, muzzled, from φιλεῖ, a muzzle (ver. 12, used in literal sense in Deut. xxv. 4).—Ver. 35. τῶν ἐν τῆς ἡλικίας: what sort of a commandment? it is a question not about an individual commandment, but about the qualities that determine greatness in the legal region. This was a question of the schools. The dis-
30—42. ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ

37. Ο δὲ ἤσος αὐτῷ αὕτη, ὡς ἀγαπήσεις κόριν τὸν θεν σου, ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ καρδίᾳ σου, καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ψυχῇ σου, καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ δύνασθεν σου. 38. αὕτη ἐστι πρώτη καὶ μεγάλη ἑτερολογία. 39. Συνεστάθη δὲ ὁμολογία αὕτη, ὡς ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου διὰ συνάφες. 40. ἐν τούτῳ γάρ τις δυοῦν ἑτερολογίας διὸς δύος καὶ ὁ προφήτης ἔφη: "κράματα." 5

41. Συνήγαγον δὲ τοὺς φαρισαίους, ἐπηρεάτων αὐτούς ὁ ἤσος, λέγων, 42. "Τί δὺ κεκατέρυγμα περὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ; τίνος υἱὸς ἐστιν?"

1 For ό θεος τοῦ πλατείας Σμύρνης, Egypt. verse, have ό θεος σου. So Trg., Tisch., W.H., Wc.
2 μεγάλη καὶ πρώτη in ΝΒΔΛΖ. The scribes would be apt to introduce the inverted order (as in T. R.) as the more natural.
3 ΝΒ omit Σε.
4 For ομολογία B has simply ομολογεῖν, which W.H. place in the margin. Perhaps it is the true reading.
5 In ΝΒΔΛΖ the verb comes before οὐ προφητεύας and is singular; doubtless the true reading.

A distinction between little and great was recognised (vide chap. v. 19), and the grounds of the distinction debated (vide Schöttgen, ad loc., who goes into the matter at length). Jesus had already made a contribution to the discussion by setting the ethical above the ritual (xv. 1-20, cf. xix. 18-22).—Ver. 37. ἀγαπήσεις, etc. Jesus replies by citing Deut. vi. 5, which inculcates supreme, devoted love to God, and pronouncing this the great (μεγάλη) and greatest, first (πρώτη) commandment. The clauses referring to heart, soul, and mind are to be taken cumulatively, as meaning love to the uttermost degree; with "all that is within us (ἐστὶ χωρὶς τῶν χωρίων Ps. clii. 1). This commandment is cited not merely as an individual precept, but as indicating the spirit that gives value to all obedience.—Ver. 39. ἡ συνεστία: a second commandment is added from Lev. xix. 18, enjoining loving a neighbour as ourselves. According to T. R., this second is declared like to the first (ὁμολογία αὕτη). The laconic reading of B (ἡ συνεστία) amounts to the same statement = the second is also a great, first commandment, being, though formally subordinate to the first, really the first in another form: love to God and love to man one. Euthy. Zig. suggests that Jesus added the second commandment in tacit rebuke of their lack of love to Himself.—Ver. 40. ὁ νόμος ἔφη: Jesus winds up by declaring that on these two hangs, is suspended, the whole law, also the prophets = the moral drift of the whole O. T. is love; no law or performance of law of any value save as love is the soul of it. So Jesus soar away far above the petty disputes of the schools about the relative worth of isolated precepts; teaching the organic unity of duty.

Vv. 41-46. Counter question of Jesus (Mk. xii. 35-37; Lk. xx. 41-44).—Not meant merely to puzzle or silence foes, or even to hint a mysterious doctrine as to the Speaker's person, but to make Pharisees and scribes, and Synedrists generally, revise their whole ideas of the Messiah and the Messianic kingdom, which had led them to reject Him.—Ver. 42. τί δὲ κεκατέρυγμα; what think you? first generally of the Christ (προφήτης τ. Χ.); second more particularly as to His descent (τίνος ἱδίος ἄτωτος).—τοῦ Δαβίδ, David's, the answer expected. Messiah must be David's son: that was the great idea of the scribes, carrying along with it hopes of royal dignity and a restored kingdom.—Ver. 43. ἐν οἷς τοιαύτη: etc. The question is meant to bring out another side of Messiah's relation to David, based on an admittedly Messianic oracle (Ps. cx. 1), and overlooked by the scribes. The object of the question is not, as some have supposed, to deny in toto the Sonship, but to hint doubt as to the importance attached to it. Think out the idea of Lordship and see where
it will lead you, said Jesus in effect. The scribes began at the wrong end: at the physical and material, and it landed them in secularitiy. If they had begun with Lordship it would have led them into the spiritual sphere, and made them ready to accept as Christ one greater than David in the spiritual order, though totally lacking the conventional grandeur of royal persons, only an unpretending Son of Man.

Chapter XXIII. The Great Anti-Pharisaical Discourse. This is one of the great discourses peculiar to the first Gospel. That some such words were spoken by Jesus in Jerusalem in the Passion week may be inferred from Mk. xxi. 38-40, Lk. xx. 45-47. The few sentences there reported look like a fragment, just enough to show that there must have been more—too meagre (gar su dürtlig, De W.) to have been all that Jesus said on such a large topic at such a solemn time. A weighty, deliberate, full, final statement, in the form of a dying testimony, was to be expected from One who had so often criticised the prevailing religious system in an occasional manner in His Galilean ministry—a summing up in the head-quarters of scribism of past prophetic censures uttered in the provinces. In such a final protest repetitions might be expected from (Nösgen). In any case, whether all the words here brought together were spoken at this time or not, the evangelist did well to collect them into one body, and he could not have introduced the collection at a more appropriate place.

Vv. 1-12. Introduction to the discourse.—Ver. 1. τοῦ ἐν λαῷ καὶ τ. μαθηταῖς: the discourse is about scribes and Pharisees, but the audience is conceived to consist of the disciples and the people. Meyer describes the situation thus: in the foreground Jesus and His disciples; a little further off the ἀγῶν; in the background the Pharisees.—Ver. 2. ἔτη τ. Μ. καθῆκε, on the seat of Moses, short for, on the seat of a teacher whose function it was to interpret the Mosaic Law. The Jews spoke of the teacher's seat as we speak of a professor's chair.—καθήκη, in effect, a gnomic aorist = solent sedere (Fritzsche), not a case of the aorist used as a perfect = have taken and now occupy, etc. (Erasmus). Burton (Syntax) sees in this and other aorists in N. T. a tendency towards use of aorist for perfect not yet realised: "rhetorical figure on the way to become grammatical idiom, but not yet become such," § 55.—οἱ Φα. Wendt (L. ᾿ Π., i., 186) thinks this an addition by the evangelist, the statement strictly applying only to the scribes.—Ver. 3. ἐλεημονικός, say, in the sense of enjoining: no need therefore of τηρεῖν as in T. R.—τοιούτου καὶ τηρεῖν: The natural order if the previous τηρεῖν be omitted. The diverse tenses are significant, the former pointing to detailed performance, the latter to habitual observance. Christ here recognises the legitimacy of the scribal function of interpretation in a broad way, which may appear too unqualified and incompatible with His teaching at other times (Mt. xv. 1-20) (so Holtz., H. C.). Allowance must be made for Christ's habit of unqualified statement, especially here when He is going to attack in an uncompromising manner the conduct of the Jewish doctors. He means: as teachers they have their place, but beware of following their example.—Ver. 4 illustrates the previous statement.—ἀπεστάλμοντο, etc., they bind together, like sheaves, heavy backloads of rules. Think, e.g., of the innumerable rules for Sabbath observance similar to that prohibiting rubbing ears of corn as work—threshing. —θεωρεῖται may be a
XXIII. i—6. EYAGTEION

XXIII. i. TOTE ἵππος ἔδειξε τοὺς ἕχλους καὶ τοῖς μαθηταῖς here only αὐτοῦ, λέγων, 2. "Εἰς τὴν Μωσέως καθήδραν ἐκθάνεις οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι. 3. πάντα οὖν διὰ τοῦ πάντων ὃν τις τῆς σέ εἴπειν, τοιοῦτοι καὶ ποιεῖτε; κατὰ δὲ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν μὴ ποιεῖτε. λέγων γὰρ καὶ οὐ ποιοῦν. 4. ἐξετάζομεν γὰρ ἐν τῇ ποιμαντικῇ καὶ διδασκαλίᾳ καὶ ἐπιτίθεμεν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄνθρωπον τῷ δακτύλῳ αὐτῶν οἱ θλιβοῦσι κυρία παρατιθέμενος αὐτά. 5. πάντα δὲ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν ποιοῦσι πρὸς τὸ θεᾶδθηναι τοῖς ἄνθρωποις. 6. ἐπλατύνομεν δὲ τὸ σαρκικὴ ἐν τῇς γενεσιον ἔργον καὶ μεγαλυτέρα τὰ κράτεια τῶν ἱεράτων αὐτῶν. 6. ἑαυτοὺς τῇ τῶν πρωτοκλήσεων ἐν τοῖς δέιπνοις, καὶ εἰς τὸ πρὸς τὸ θεᾶδθηναι τοῖς ἄνθρωποις.

Acts xxiv. 5 (to excite, metaph.). d s Cor. vi. 11, 13 (of the broadening or enlarging of the heart).

1] in ἩΛΔΑΣ; av in BD (Tisch., W.H. have ev).
2] ΝΒΔΛΖ omitt τῆρανν.
3] ΝΒΔΛΖ invert the order of the two verbs. D has τοιοῦτον, the rest toιοῦτοτ.
4] 6 in ΗΛΔΑΣ.
5] ΗΛ omit καὶ διδασκαλίᾳ (Tisch.). BDΔΑΣ have the words, which may have come in from Lk. (xi. 46), but may also be a genuine reading (W.H. in margin).
6] For τῷ δακτύλῳ ΝΒΔΛ read αὐτοῖς ὑμῖν τῷ δακτύλῳ. ὑπὲρ in ΝΒΔΛ, curs. vers.
7] ΝΒΔ omitt τῶν ἱεράτων αὐτῶν.

spurious reading imported from Lk. xi. 46, but it states a fact, and was doubtless used by Jesus on some occasion. It shows by the way that He had no thought of unqualified approval of the teaching of the scribes.—καὶ τῇ ὁμοίᾳ, on the shoulders, that they may feel the full weight, demanding punctual compliance.—αὐτὸ μὲν τῷ δακτύλῳ, etc., they are not willing to move or touch them with a finger; proverbial (Elsser) for will not take the smallest trouble to keep their own rules. A strong statement pointing to the subtle ways of evading strict rules invented by the scribes. "The picture is of the merciless camel or ass driver who makes up burdens not only heavy, but unwieldy and so difficult to carry, and then placing them on the animal's shoulders, stands by indifferent, raising no finger to lighten or even adjust the burden" (Carr, C. G. T.).

Vv. 5-7. The foregoing statement is of course to be taken cum grano. Teachers who absolutely disregarded their own laws would soon forfeit all respect. In point of fact they made a great show of zeal in doing. Jesus therefore goes on to tax them with acting from low motives.—Ver. 5, ἐρῶντα δι', etc., in so far as they comply with their rules they act with a view to be seen of men. This is a repetition of an old charge (Mt. vi.).—ἐπλατύνομεν γὰρ, etc.: illustrative instances drawn from the phylacteries and the tassels attached to the upper garment, the former being broadened, the latter lengthened to attract notice. The phylacteries (φυλακτηρία) were an admirable symbol at once of Pharisaic ostentation and Pharisaic make-believe. They were little boxes attached to the forehead and the left arm near the heart, containing pieces of parchment with certain texts written on them (Ex. xii. 1-10, 11-17; Deut. vi. 4-10; xi. 13-22) containing figurative injunctions to keep in memory God's laws and dealings, afterwards mechanically interpreted, whence these visible symbols of obedience on forehead and arm. The size of the phylacteries indexed the measure of zeal, and the wearing of large ones was apt to take the place of obedience. It was with the Pharisees as with Carlyle's advertising hatter, who sent a cart through the street with a huge hat in it instead of making good hats. For details on phylacteries and fringes consult works on Jewish antiquities.
The page contains a passage from the Greek New Testament, specifically from the Gospel of Matthew (KATA MATOAIION). The text is a section from chapter 23, which includes several verses discussing the teaching and authority of Jesus. The passage includes detailed notes and commentary, indicating it is part of a scholarly discussion on the text.

The page discusses themes such as the keeping of the law, religious ostentation, and the keeping of the Kerygma, with special attention to the role of the Twelve. It also touches on the concept of calling names, references to men and women, and the importance of authority and obedience.

The text is written in Greek and includes various scholarly references and notes, indicating it is intended for an audience familiar with New Testament scholarship. The page layout is typical of a scholarly publication with notes and marginal comments.
μένοι· διὰ τούτο λήφθη τις επιστούρον κρίμα. 14. Οδαί 2 ὅμών, γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοι, ὑποκρίται, δι' ἑλπίδα τῆς βασιλείας τῶν ὁρισμῶν ἐμποροῦν τῶν ἀνθρώπων· ὅμώς γὰρ οἴκεται ἐκείνους, οὐκέτι τὸς εἰσερχόμενος ὁμίλεται ἐνστείλειν. 15. Οδαί ὅμών, γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοι, ὑποκρίται, δι' ἑρμήνευσι τῆς ἀλαρείας καὶ τῆς παράγει τῷ ἀλάοιων καὶ τῶν γενόμενων διαλύτων ὅμών. 16. Οδαί ὅμώς, ὑπακούει τοῦ νῦν, οὕτως ὅτι· δε 8' ἐν ὑμῖν ὁμίλητε διὰ τοῦτο λήφθη τις επιστούρον κρίμα.

1 Ver. 13 omitted in ΝBDLZ, some cursive versions (including Syr. Sin.), Fathers, and by modern editors.

2 As must be supplied here if ver. 13 be omitted.
altar more than altar, throne of God in heaven more than heaven. Specialising indicated greater earnestness. Whether these forms of oath were actually used or current, and what precisely they meant, e.g., gold of the temple: was it ornament, utensil, or treasure? is immaterial. They may have been only hypothetical forms devised to illustrate an argument in the schools. — ὁδὲν ὀστὶν, ὅσειλε: the formulae for non-binding and binding oaths; it is nothing (the oath, viz.); he is indebted, bound to performance = ἄλλα, — Ver. 17. τὸ ἁγὸς μεῖζον: Jesus answers this question by asserting the opposite principle to that laid down by the Rabbis: the general includes and is more important than the particular, which He applies to all the three cases (vv. 17, 19, 22). This is the more logical position, but the main point of difference is moral. The tendency of the Rabbis was to enlarge the sphere of insincerity, idle, meaningless speech. Christ's aim was to inculcate absolute sincerity = always mean what you say; let none of your utterances be merely conventional generalities. Be as much in earnest when you say "by the temple" as when you say "by the gold of the temple"; rather be so truthful that you shall not need to say either. 

Vv. 23-24. The fourth were refers to tithe-paying (Lk. xi. 42). — ἀποθεωσασθεν: a Hellenistic word = ye pay tithes, as in Gen. xxviii. 22; to take tithes from in Heb. viii. 5, 6. — ἄρα ῥαπανον, ἀνθρωπον, κύπρον: garden herbs = mint (literally, sweet smelling), dill, also aromatic, cumin (Kümmer, German) with aromatic seeds. All marketable commodities, used as condiments, or for medicinal purposes, presumably all titheable, the point being not that the Pharisees were wilful in tithe-paying, but that they were extremely scrupulous. Vide articles in Smith's Dictionary of the Bible. The Talmud itself, however, in a sentence quoted by Lightfoot ("decimating oleum est a Rabinus") represents tithing of herbs as a refinement of the Rabbis. — τὰ ἐθνικά: either, the weightier, in the sense of xxii. 36 (Meyer), or the more difficult to do, in the sense of ver. 14 (Weiss after Fritzsche). The idea seems to be: they made a great show of zeal in doing what was easy, and shirked the serious and more arduous requirements of duty. — τὸ κρίνειν, righteous judgment, implying and = the love of righteousness, a passion for justice. — τὸ ἔλεος, neuter, after the fashion of later Greek, not τὸν ἔλεος, as in T. R.: mercy; sadly neglected by Pharisees, much insisted on by Jesus. — τὸ πίστιν, faith, in the sense of fidelity, true-heartedness. As a curiosity in the history of exegesis may be cited the use of this text by Schortinghuis, a Dutch Pietist of the eighteenth century, in support of the duty of judging the spiritual state of others (κρίνειν) ! Vide Ritschl, Geschichte des Pietismus, i., 329. — ὑπὲρ: the greater things last mentioned. — ὡς, it was your duty to do — ἐκείνα, and those things, the tithings, etc: this the secondary duty; its subordinate place might be brought out by rendering: "while not neglecting to pay tithes as scrupulously as you please". Bengel thinks ὑπὲρ and ἐκείνα here refer not to the order of the words but to the relative import-
23. "Odal òmín, γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοι, ὄτι ἡ πνευματική, ὅτι ἡ ἄποικος tó ἡδονόν καὶ τὸ δύναμαι, καὶ τὸ κύμινον, καὶ ἄφθατα, tó βαρέως τοῦ μόνον, τὴν κρίσιν καὶ τὸν ἔλεον
1. here only in N. T. (Amos vi. 6).
2. ἐ duelxontes tóν ἐκάνατα, τὴν ἐκ κάμηλος κατανύστατε.
24. ὁ δείκτης τιμλος, καὶ ἀκριβεῖ πρὸς τὸ ἐνδος τοῦ ποτηρίου καὶ τῆς παροφίδος, ἐξουθεν ἔχει μου, ὡμοίως ἐκ ἀφανῆς καὶ ἀκρασίας.
26. Φαρισαῖοι τυφλοί, καθάρισαν πρὸς τὸ ἐνδος τοῦ ποτηρίου καὶ τῆς παροφίδος, ὥστε γενναία καὶ τὸ ἐκτὸς αὐτῶν καθάρον.

1. το ἔλεος in ΝBDL. τον ἔλεον a grammatical correction.
2. καὶ the paroipidous is in ΝΒCLAX it., but is omitted by D, and may be a mechanical repetition from ver. 25 (Tisch. omits, W. H. bracket).
3. ανωτερ in BD and several cursives, the natural reading if καὶ the paroipidous be omitted.

ance of the things ("non pro serie verborum, sed pro ratione rerum"). On this view "these" means tithe-paying.—
Ver. 24. δυνάεστε (δι' and εἰς, Passow), a little used word, for which Hesychius gives as a synonym, διηθεν, to strain through.—καὶ τον καμήλα, τὴν κάμηλον, the gnat, the camel: article as usual in proverbial sayings. The proper object of the former part is olóvov: straining the wine so as to remove the unclean midge. Swallowing the camel is a monstrous supposition, but relevant, the camel being unclean, chewing the cud but not parting the hoof (Lev. xi. 4). The proverb clinches the lesson of the previous verse.

Vv. 25-26. Fifth wo., directed against externalism (Lk. xi. 39-41).—τῆς παροφίδος, the dish, on which viands were served. In classics it meant the meat, not the dish (τὸ διόν ὄψιν τὸ τέρναμνον, Phryn., p. 176). Rutherford (New Phryn., p. 255) remarks that our word "dish" has the same ambiguity. —δι' ἐκατον ἐχέμονιν ἔξι: within both cup and plate are full of, or from. ἔξι is either redundant or it points to the fulness as resulting from the things following: filled with wine and meat purchased by the wages of unrighteousness: luxuries acquired by plunder and licence. The verb γέμονω occurs again in ver. 27 without ἔξι, and this is in favour of the second view. But on the other hand in ver. 26 the vessels are conceived of as defined by ἀρταγιᾶ and ἀκρασία, therefore presumably as filled with them. Here as in vi. 22, 23, the physical and ethical are mixed in the figure.—Ver. 26. φαρισαῖοι τυφλοί: change from plural to singular with increased earnestness, and a certain friendliness of tone, as of one who would gladly induce the party addressed to mend his ways. —καθάρισαν: if ἔξι, ver. 35, is taken = by, then this verb will mean: see that the wine in the cup be no more the product of robbery and unbridled desire for other people's property (Weiss and Meyer). On the other view, that the cup is filled with these vices, the meaning will be, get rid of them. —ἐνα γένηται, etc., in order that the outside may become clean. The ethical cleanliness is conceived of as ensuring the ceremonial. Or, in other words, ethical purity gives all the cleanliness you need ("all things are clean unto you," Lk. xi. 41). Practically this amounts to treating ceremonial cleanliness as of little account. Christ's way of thinking and the Pharisaic were really incompatible.

Vv. 27-28. Sixth wo., referring to no special Pharisaic vice, but giving a graphic picture of their hypocrisy in
27. "Odate ὅμων, γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοι, ὑποκριταὶ, ὑπὸ παρατεταίρους ὄροις, ἐξηκομισθήκατε μὴ ἐμπεπνευσθήκατε τοὺς ὄρους τοῖς ἐστιν, ἐκ τῶν ἔθεσιν τῶν προφητῶν, καὶ καταλείψατε τὰ μηνύματα τῶν δικαίων, καὶ λάγετε.

30. Ἐπεὶ ἤμεν ἐν τοῖς ἡμέραις τῶν πατέρων ἦμων, ὥσπερ καὶ ἦμεν ἐν τῇ αἴματι τῶν προφητῶν. 31. Εἴπετε μαρτυρεῖτε τοῖς αὐτοῖς, ὅτι οὐκ ἠστὶν τῶν φωνευτικῶν τῶν προφητῶν. 32. καὶ ἦμεν πληρώσατε τὸ μέτρον τῶν πατέρων ὅμων. 33. δεῖξε, γενήματα

1 B have the simple ὄροις, which W.H. place in the margin.
2 ἄνωτεροι in both places in most uncial, including N BCDL.
3 αὐτῶν before κοινωνίας in BD (W.H.).

18 28. ἐξηκομισθήκατε, in B δικομισθήκατε, under either form an ἀφαίρεσις (from κοινωνία; dust, slaked lime), whitewashed, referring to the practice of whitewashing the sepulchres in the month Adar, before passover time, to make them conspicuous, inadvertent approach involving uncleanness. They would be wearing their fresh coat just then, so that the comparison was seasonable (vade Wetzstein, ad loc.).

32. ἐξηκομισθήκατε, ἐκομισθήκατε, again a contrast between without and within, which may have suggested the comparison.—ὄρατος, fair, without; the result but not the intention in the natural sphere, the aim in the spiritual, the Pharisees being concerned about appearance (chap. vi.).—ἀπαφάντων, etc., revolting contrast: without, quite an attractive feature in the landscape; within, only death-ridden loathsomeness.—Ver. 28. ἐπροσέγαγεν, etc.: the figure appears on both sides; the Pharisaic character apparently sainthood; really inwardly, full of godlessness and immorality (ἀνεξάρτητος), the result being gross systematic hypocrisy.

Vv. 29-33. Final μός (Lk. xi. 47-48), dealing with yet another phase of hypocrisy and a new form of the contrast between without and within; apparent zeal for the honour of deceased prophets, real affmity with their murderers.—Ver. 29. οἰκοδομεῖτο, may point to repair or extension of old buildings, or to new edifices, like some modern monuments, the outcome of dilettante hero-worship.—τάφους, προφητείας, probably synonyms, though there may have been monuments to the dead apart from burying places, to which the former word points.—προφητών and δικαίων are also practically synonymous, though the latter is a wider category.—καταλείψατε points to decoration as distinct from building operations. Führer (Wanderungen, p. 77) suggests that Jesus had in view the tomb of Zechariah, the prophet named in the sequel, in the valley of Jehoshaphat, which he describes as a lovely little temple with ornamental half and quarter pillars of the Ionic order.—λέγετε: they not merely thought, or said by deed, but actually so pointed the moral of their action, not trusting to others to draw the inference.—Ver. 30. ἡμεῖς, not in classics, ἡμῶν the usual form of sing. in N. T. being also rare; the imperfect, but must be translated in our tongue, "if we had been". For the imperfect used when we should use a pluperfect, vade Mt. xiv. 4, and consult Burton, § 29.—οὐ δὲ ἡμεῖς, the indicative with ὅτι, as usual in suppositions contrary to fact, vade Burton, § 248.—Ver. 31. ἴσως, with indicative expressing result therefore. —ἀφαίρεσις, to and against yourselves. Jesus reads more meaning into their words than they intended: "our fathers"; yes! they are your fathers, in spirit as well as in blood.—Ver. 32. καὶ, and, as ye have called yourselves their sons,
so show yourselves to be such indeed (Weiss). "περισσότερα". The reading περισσότερα is due to shrinking from the idea conveyed by the imperative. To the same cause is due the permissive (Grotius al.) or ironical (De W.) senses put upon the imperative. Christ means what He says: "Fill up the measure of your fathers; crown their misdeeds by killing the prophet God has sent to you. Do at last what has long been in your hearts. The hour is come."—Ver. 33. Awful ending to a terrific charge, indicating that the men who are predestined to superlative wickedness are appropriately doomed to the uttermost penalty.—συγκεκριμένον, ἵνα ὅσα προφητεύει, ἀληθή σταυρώσετε, καὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν μαστιγώσετε ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς ὑμῶν, καὶ διώξατε ἀπὸ τοὺς πόλεις εἰς τοὺς ἄγιους. Τῶν ἑδύμων ὑμῶν τῶν ἀλμόνων ἐχνιομένων ἐτέλεσεν τῆς γῆς, ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος Ἱησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὡς τοῦ αἵματος Ζωγραφίου, ὅταν ἐφονεύσατε μεταξὺ τοῦ νου καὶ τοῦ πυθαιμνηροῦ. 36. ἀλήθεια ὑμῶν, ἔχει ταύτα πάντα ἐτέλεσεν τῆν ἡμέραν.

1 ἩΒΔΑΣ 1, 13, 33, 69 al. omit καί, found in CDL.
2 εἰκονιζομένων in ἩΒΑΔΑΣ al., 1, 33 al.

so show yourselves to be such indeed (Weiss).—περισσότερα. The reading περισσότερα is due to shrinking from the idea conveyed by the imperative. To the same cause is due the permissive (Grotius al.) or ironical (De W.) senses put upon the imperative. Christ means what He says: "Fill up the measure of your fathers; crown their misdeeds by killing the prophet God has sent to you. Do at last what has long been in your hearts. The hour is come."—Ver. 33. Awful ending to a terrific charge, indicating that the men who are predestined to superlative wickedness are appropriately doomed to the uttermost penalty. —συγκεκριμένον, ἵνα ὅσα προφητεύει, ἀληθή σταυρώσετε, καὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν μαστιγώσετε ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς ὑμῶν, καὶ διώξατε ἀπὸ τοὺς πόλεις εἰς τοὺς ἄγιους. Τῶν ἑδύμων ὑμῶν τῶν ἀλμόνων ἐχνιομένων ἐτέλεσεν τῆς γῆς, ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος Ἱησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὡς τοῦ αἵματος Ζωγραφίου, ὅταν ἐφονεύσατε μεταξὺ τοῦ νου καὶ τοῦ πυθαιμνηροῦ. 36. ἀλήθεια ὑμῶν, ἔχει ταύτα πάντα ἐτέλεσεν τῆν ἡμέραν.

1 ἩΒΔΑΣ 1, 13, 33, 69 al. omit καί, found in CDL.
2 εἰκονιζομένων in ἩΒΑΔΑΣ al., 1, 33 al.
hoc dicitur uno hoc versus magna vi," Bengel.—ἀπό τ. ἀ., etc., from the blood of Abel, the first martyr, mentioned in the first book of the Hebrew Bible, to the blood of Zechariah, the prophet named in the last book (2 Chron. xxiv. 20-22).—υphere, the designation of the last but one of the minor prophets, applied here to the other Zechariah, by inadvertence either of the evangelist or of an early copyist.—δον θεονεσατω, whom ye (through your spiritual ancestors) slew; fact as stated in 2 Chron. xxiv. 21.—Ver. 36. ομηθη: solemn introduction of a statement terrible to think of: sins of countless generations accumulating for ages, and punished in a final representative generation; true, however terrible.

Vv. 37-39. Apostrophes to the Holy City (Lk. xili. 34).—Ειτα προς την πολιν ἀρκοτρεψη των λυγων. Chrys., H. lixiv. —Ver. 37. 'ιερουσαλημ, the Hebrew form of the name, exceptional in Mt., very appropriate to the solemn situation. Twice spoken; why? It is the fashion of one paying, bewailing, and greatly loving," Chrys. —ἀποκατισσου, λιθοβολουα: present participles, denoting habit and repute, now and always having so—killing, stoning.—προς αὑτην, to her, not to these, because the participles are in the nominative, whereas 'ιερουσαλημ is vocative: "exemplum compellationis per vocatium ad quam deinceps non amplius spectatur" (Fritzsche). Grotius regards the transition from second to third person as an Orientalism.—ποσιδυν, how often; on this word has been based the inference of frequent visits to Jerusalem not mentioned in the Synoptics. But the allusion may be to the whole history of Israel (so Orig., Hill., Jer.) and to the whole people, as the children of the metropolis, the Speaker still continuing to speak in the name of God, as in ver. 34, and including Himself among God's agents.—δον, a bird or fowl; after Plato, a hen; so here, the emblem of anxious love. θεριων τω λουων θεν τη εκγνα, Chrys. She gathers her chickens under her wings for protection against impending danger. This Jesus and all the prophets meant to do; a truth to be set over against the statement in vv. 34-35, which seems to suggest that God's aim was Israel's damnation.—τη νοστη (Attic, νοστη: form disapproved by Phryn. p. 200), her brood of young birds. Cf. Pa. lixiv. 28, where, as here, a pathetic use is made of the emblem.—οι θεονεσατω, ye would not, though I would (ἡθελησα). Man's consent necessary.—Ver. 38. ιδον, etc., solemn, sorrowful abandonment of the city to its fate.—δον θεον, spoken to the inhabitants of Israel.—δοικας αυ, your house, i.e., the city, not the temple; the people are conceived of as one family.—ομος, wanting in BL, and omitted by W. H., is not necessary to the sense. The sentence is, indeed, more impressive without it: "Behold your house is abandoned to your care: those who would have saved you giving you up further effort". What will happen left to be imagined; just what ομος expresses—desolation.—Ver. 39. ων αριν, from this moment, Christ's prophetic work
XXIV. i—3.

1. Καὶ ἐξελήφθη δὲ ἡ ἀρχὴ ἀπὸ τοῦ Ιέρου 1 καὶ σαρκί τοῦ Ἰησοῦ 2 προσήλθον ὁ μαθητής αὐτοῦ ἐκτείνεται αὐτῷ τὰς ἀκομοθέματα τοῦ Ἱεροῦ.
2. Ὁ ἀνήκε οὗτος δ᾽ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Οὐ βλέπετε πάντα ταῦτα 3; ἀλλὰ λέγει ὁ ὄρος, ὁ ὁ οὗ ἐζητοῖ ὅσιος ἀπὸ λίθου, ὃς ὁ μῆ 4 ἐκτείνεται." 5. καὶ ἦτο αὐτῷ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἑρῴ τῶν λαῶν, προσήλθον αὐτῷ ὁ μαθητής κατ᾽ ἱδίαν, λέγοντες, "Εἰπὲ ἦμιν, πάντα ταῦτα ἵνα ἔτη 6; καὶ τὸν ἐμφάνια τῆς σής 7 παροῦσια, καὶ τῆς 8 συντελείας.

1 ἐκτείνεται in ΝBDLAX (so modern editors).
2 For οὗτος ΝBDL al. versions have οὗτος without ἐκτείνεται.
3 ταῦτα ταῦτα in ΝBCLX al. D has the words in same order as T. R.
4 μὴ is wanting in ΝBCLX al.
5 τὸν omitted in ΝΒCL 1, 33 al.

done now: it remains only to die.—ους ἐκτείνεται: a future contingency on which it depends whether they shall ever see Him again (Weiss in Meyer). He will not trouble them any more till their mood change and they be ready to receive Him with a Messianic salutation.

The exquisite finish of this discourse, in the case of ordinary orators, would suggest premeditation and even writing. We have no means of knowing to what extent Jesus had considered beforehand what He was to say on this momentous occasion. The references to the whitened sepulchres and the tombs of the prophets show that the speech was in part at least an extempore utterance.

Chapter XXIV. The Apocalyptic Discourse. This chapter and its synoptical parallels (Mk., xiii., Lk. xxii.) present, in many respects, the most difficult problem in the evangelic records. Many questions may be, have been, asked concerning this discourse, on things to come. Which of the three versions comes nearest to what Jesus said? Did He say all that is here reported on this occasion, or have we in all the versions, more or less, a combination of words spoken at different times? Were the words here collected, all of them, or even the greater number of them, ever spoken by Jesus at any time? have the evangelists not worked up into the discourse a Jewish, or Jewish-Christian, apocalyptic, or given us a composition of their own, consisting of certain logia of the Master, as the nucleus, with additions, modifications, and comments in the light of subsequent events? Finally, what is the didactic significance of the discourse, what did Jesus mean to teach His disciples respecting the themes treated: the Ruin of the Holy City, the Coming of the Son of Man, and the End of the Age, and the connection between these things? A history of opinion on these topics cannot here be given; a confident attempt at answering the questions propounded I am not prepared to make; perhaps a final satisfactory solution of the problem is not attainable. I offer only a few general considerations which may, at least, help readers to assume a right attitude towards the problem, and to bring to the study of the discourse a sympathetic spirit.

1. The time was suitable for some such utterance. The situation was this: Jesus expecting death in a few days; convinced that the moral and religious condition of the Jewish people is hopelessly bad, and that it must ere long end in disaster and ruin; surrounded by friends who are to be, after the decease of their Master, the missionaries of a new faith in a troublous time, when an old world is going down and a new world is coming into being. Here surely is an occasion to provoke the prophetic mood! At such supreme prophetic utterances, apocalyptic forecasts, are inevitable. Here they are, whomever we have to thank for them. From whom are they more likely to have proceeded than from Him who had such clear insight into the moral forces at work, and into the spiritual phenomenology of the time?

2. The aim of any prophetic discourse Jesus might deliver at this crisis, like that of all true prophecy, would be ethical; not to foretell, like a soothsayer, but to forewarn and forewarn the representatives of a new faith, so that they might not lose their heads or their hearts in an evil perplexing time—not to gratify curiosity but to fortify against coming trial.
3. Prophetic utterance with such an aim would not need to be exact in statements as to dates and details, but only to be true as to the sequence and general character of events. From all we know of Hebrew prophecy it was to be expected that the prophesying of Jesus would possess only this latter kind of truth, instead of being like a "history of events before they come to pass". The version of the evangelic apocalypse that least resembles the description of prophecy now quoted from Butler's *Analogy* (part ii., chap. vii.) will come nearest to the original utterance. This consideration tells in favour of Mt. and Mk.

4. All prophetic or apocalyptic utterances have much in common; phraseology and imagery tending to become stereotyped. The prophetic literature of the O. T. had indeed provided a vocabulary, which by the Christian era had become normative for all speech concerning the future. Hence Jewish, Jewish-Christian, and Pauline utterances of this kind would in many particulars resemble one another, and it might be difficult to decide by mere internal evidence from what circle any particular utterance emanated. But it is not probable that the evangelists would introduce into a professed report of a discourse by Jesus a current apocalypse of known Jewish origin unless they had reason to believe that Jesus had adopted it, or endorsed its forecast of the future (Weiss, Schanz, *Untersuchungen über die Evang. Gesch.*, pp. 126, 551).

5. As we have seen reason to believe that in previous reports of our Lord's Discourses (e.g., of the *Sermon on the Mount* and of the Mission Discourse, chap. xi.) grouping of kindred material irrespective of historical occasion has taken place, so we cannot be surprised if traces of a similar procedure present themselves here. The remark applies especially to the latter part of the chapter, vv. 37-51, which contain logos given by Lk. in other connections (chaps. xii. and xvii.).

Vv. 1-3. *Introduction* (cf. Mk. xiii. 1-4; Lk. xxi. 5-7).—Ver. 1. *ἀπελθών*, going out from the temple, within whose presence and anti-Pharisaic manifesto had been spoken. The position assigned to *ἀπελθώ*, before the verb, *στοιχεῖον*, in the best MSS., suggests connection with *διὰ θλίψεως*. Some, however (Weiss, Schanz, etc.), insist that the words must be taken with *στοιχεῖον* to give to the latter a definite sense. In reality they go along with both, the full meaning being: going out from the temple. He was going away from it, when, etc.—στοιχεῖον: the imperfect, indicating an action in progress when something else happened. There is an emphasis on the idea of the verb. He was going away, like one who did not mean to return. Hence the action of the disciples next reported.—*ἐξάγοντο* etc. They came to the Master, going before in a deeply preoccupied mood, and tried to change the gloomy current of His thoughts by inviting Him to look back at the sacred structure; innocent, woman-like but vain attempt.—*ἐπάνω* etc. the whole group of buildings belonging to the holy house; magnificent, splendid, as described by Josephus (B. J., v., 5, 6), appearing to one approaching from a distance like a snow mountain (ὁ χώρος τῆς κληρονομίας) topped with golden pinnacles, which for forty years, in his Napoleonian passion for architecture, Herod the Great had been building to the glory of God and of himself.—Ver. 2. *διὰ αὐτοκίνητον*, but, adversatively. He answered, in a mood entirely different from theirs.—*ἐκ τῆς* etc. do you not see all these things? = you ask me to look at them, let me ask you in turn to take a good look at them.—*ταύρα* etc. these things, not buildings, implying indifference to the splendours admired by the disciples. —*οὐ* *μὴ* *διώκω*, etc.: not an exact description *ex eventu*, but a strong statement of coming destruction (by fire) in prophetically coloured language (Micah iii. 12; Jer. xxvi. 18). So Holtz., H.C.—Ver. 3. An interval of silence would naturally follow such a stern speech. This verse accordingly shows us Jesus with His disciples now on the other side of the Kidron, and sitting on the slope of Olivet, with face turned towards Jerusalem; Master and disciples sitting apart, and thinking their own thoughts. Satisfied that the Master means what He has said, and not daring to dispute His prophetic insight, they accept the
fate predicted for Jerusalem, and now desire to know the when and how.—κατ' άυτα looks like a borrow from Mk., where it refers to four of the disciples coming apart from the rest. It goes without saying that none but the Twelve were there.—τι το ομήριον τ. σ. π., etc. The questioners took for granted that all three things went together: destruction of temple, advent of Son of Man, end of the current age. Perhaps the association of the three helped them to accept the first as a fact. 

Weizensäcker (Untersuchungen, p. 54), note 1) suggests that the second and third questions are filled in by the evangelist to correspond with the answer. So also Weiss in Meyer. The main subject of interrogation is the predicted ruin: when will it happen, and how shall it be known when it is at hand, so as to be prepared for it? Cf. Mk. and Lk., where this alone is the subject of question.—πάροδος (literally presence, second presence) and κατά τάν άνάνυν are the technical terms of the apocalyptic age, for the second advent of Christ and the close of the present order of things, and they occur in Mk., only so far as the Gospels are concerned. Do not the ideas also belong to that age, and not the questions here put into the mouth of the Twelve too advanced for disciples?

Vv. 4-14. Signs presage of the end. (Mk. xiii. 19-22; Lk. xix. 18-40).—Ver 4. δεκατε: again (vide ver. 2), but here = see it, take heed. Cf. Heb. iii. 12.—πλάνοιος, lest any one deceive you; striking the practical ethical keynote of the whole discourse: its aim not to gratify curiosity, but to guard against deception and terror (ψιλήθει, ver. 6).—heads cool, hearts brave, in a tragic epoch.—Ver. 5. πολλών γὰρ ἀληθῶν ἀπέκρυπται, etc., the first omen the advent of pseudo-Messias. This first mentioned, quite naturally. Ruin of Jerusalem and the nation will come through revolt against Rome, and the deeper cause of revolt will be the Messianic hope as popularly understood. Volcanic outbreaks of Messianic fanaticism inevitable, all the more that they have rejected the true spiritual Christ. Josephus testifies that this was the chief incentive to war against Rome (B. J., vi. 54). The aim of the popular Messianic hope was independence, and all leaders of movements having that goal in view came in the name of "Christ," whether they formally assumed that name or not. It is doubtful if any did before the destruction of Jerusalem, but that does not falsify Christ's prediction, which is expressed in terms of an idea rather than in technical terms suggested by fact. It is not a vaticinium ex eventu; yet strictly true, if we understand by one coming in the name of Christ a leader of the fight for liberty (vindicem libertatis, Grotius).—οἷσιν πλανήτων. The political Christs, leaders of the war against Rome, deceived the bulk of the people. Jesus wished His followers to hold entirely aloof from the movement. To warn them against sympathising with it was by no means superfluous (vide Lk. xxiv. 21, Acts i. 6).—Ver. 6. Second sign: wars.—πολιορκία and ἀντιπόλεμον are the vague phrase suitable to the prophetic style, not ex eventu; well rendered in A. V. "wars and rumours of wars" = wars near and remote (Bengel, Meyer), or better: "actual and threatened" (Speaker's Com.). The reference is not to wars anywhere in the world, but to those in the Holy Land, arising, as they were sure sooner or later to do, out of Messianic fanaticisms. Christ speaks not out of foreknowledge of the actual facts as reported by contemporary historians and collected by modern commentators (Grotius, etc.), but by prophetic logic: given Messianic hopes misdirected, hence wars, hence ruin.—μελλήσατε, future of a verb, whose very meaning points to the future: ye will be about to hear, by-and-by, not for a while; often delusive times of peace before tragic times of war. Vid Carlyle's "French Revolution," book i.—δράτε, μὴ ἀπεξείθησθαι, see, be not scared
out of your wits (ὀρέων, originally = cry aloud; later use = to terrify, as if with a scream; here passive in neuter sense). This reference to coming wars of liberation was natural, and necessary if the aim was to fortify disciples against future events. Nevertheless at this point, in the opinion of many critics, begins the so-called "Jewish apocalyptic," which Mk. and after him Mt. and Lk. have interwoven with the genuine utterance of Jesus. The latter embraces all about false Christs and apostolic tribulations (4-5, 9-14, 22-23), the former all about war, flight, and the coming of the Son of Man with awful accompaniments (7-8, 15-22, 29-31). Vid. Wendt, L. J., i., p. 10 f., where the two series are given separately, from Mk., following in the main Weiffenbach. This critical analysis is ingenious but not convincing. Pseudo-Christs in the sense explained and wars of liberation went together in fact, and it was natural they should go together in prophetic thought. The political Messiahs divorced from the politics become mere ghosts, which nobody need fear.—Στὸ γὰρ γε. Their eventual coming is a divine necessity, let even that consideration act as a sedative; and for the rest remember that the beginning of the tragedy is not the end.—ἐλάχιστον τ. τ.: the end being the thing inquired about—the destruction of the temple and all that went along with it.—Ver. 7. Further development of the war-portent, possibly here the prophetic range of vision widens beyond the bounds of Palestine, yet not necessarily. In support of limiting the reference to Palestine Kypke quotes from Josephus words describing God's displeasure causing strife between people and people, city and city, and involving the nation in civil war (B. J., iv., 6).—ἀλμοι καὶ λαμοὶ, famines and pestilences, the usual accompaniments of war, every way likely to be named together as in T. R.—καὶ σεισμοὶ, and earthquakes, representing all sorts of unusual physical phenomena having no necessary connection with the political, but appealing to the imagination at such times, so heightening the gloom. Several such specified in commentaries (vide, e.g., Speaker's C., and Alford, from whom the particulars are quoted), but no stress should be laid on them.—κατὰ τὸν χρόνον: most take this as meaning not earthquakes passing from place to place (Meyer) but here and there, passim. Vide Elsner and Raphel, who cite classic examples. Grotius enumerates the places where they occurred.—Ver. 8. τὸν αὐτὸν: yet all these but a beginning of pains. It is not necessary to find here an allusion to the Rabbinical idea of the birth pangs of Messiah, but simply the use of a natural and frequent Biblical emblem for distress of any sort. As to the date of the Rabbinical idea vide Keil. The beginning: such an accumulation of horrors might well appear to the inexperienced the end, hence the remark to prevent panic.

Vv. 9-14. Third sign, drawn from apostolic experiences. This passage Weiss regards as an interpolation into the prophetic discourse by Matthew following Mark. It certainly resembles Mt. x. 17-22 (much less, however, than the corresponding passage in Mk.), and individual phrases may be interpolations: but something of the kind was to be expected here. The disciples were not to be mere spectators of the tragedy of the Jewish nation destroying itself. They were to be active the while, preaching the gospel of the kingdom, propagating the new faith, bringing in a new world. Jesus would have them go on with their work undistracted by false enthusiasms, or warlike terrors, and to this end assures them that they will have both to do and to suffer a great deal before the final crisis of Jerusalem comes. The ground of this prophetic forecast as to their experience is with God's will not allow the work He (Jesus) has inaugurated to perish. The gospel will be preached widely, with whatever tribulations to the preachers.—Ver. 9. θλίψις, from θλέω, originally pressure (στένωμα, Hesychius), in N. T. tropical, pressure from the evils of life, affliction. Again in ver. 29, in reference to the Jewish people. The apostles also are to have their θλίψις.—ἀποκατευθύνων ὑμᾶς, they will kill you. Lk. xxi. 16 has "some of you" (ἐκ ὑμῶν). Some qualification of the blunt statement is needed: such as: they will be in the mood to kill you (cf.
11. καὶ παλαιὸἐρωτεύεται ἀγγέλων, καὶ πλανήτεος πολλά λοὺσ.

12. καὶ διὰ τὸ ἐκπλήσσεται, ἐκ τῶν ἀνομίων ἐστὶν

13. δὲ καὶ ὅταν εἰς τότε, όθον δὲ ἀνυπόκτων τοῖς ἐθνεῖς

14. καὶ ἀνυπόκτως τοῦτο τὸ ζητεῖν τὸς Βασιλεῖας ἐν δόλῃ τῇ

οἰκομενῇ, εἰς τραυματιστοὶ τοῖς ἐθνικοῖς. καὶ τότε ἔσται τό

τέλος. 15. Ἡμεῖς δὲ τοῖς τοῦ βεβαιοῦσα τῆς ἡμερών, τὸ ἔθνος

Lk. xvi. 15. Rev. xvi. 4, 5; xxi. 27. m Mk. xiii. 14. Lk. xxii. 20.

John xvi. 2).—τῶν ἐθνῶν, not in Mark, universalising the statement = hated by all the nations, not Jews only.—Ver. 10. ἔσται καὶ ἀνυπόκτως: a natural sequel of apostolic tribulation, many weak Christians made to stumble (vide xiii. 21); this followed in turn by mutual treachery and hatred (καὶ ἀλλήλων, etc.).—Ver. 11. θεωρησόμεθα, false prophets. The connection requires that these should be within the Christian community (otherwise in ver. 24), giving false presentations of the faith with corrupt motives. A common feature in connection with new religious movements (vide on viii. 13).—Ver. 12. ἀναφέρει Weiss and Holtzmann (H. C.) take this in the specific sense of antinomianism, a libertine type of Christianity preached by the false prophets or apostles, the word in that sense of course to be credited to the evangelist. The word as used by Christ would naturally bear the general sense of godlessness or iniquity. We may wonder at the use of such a word in connection with nascent Christianity. It would require a considerable time to make room for such degeneracy. But the very point Jesus wishes to impress is that there will be room for that before the final crisis of Israel comes.—ψυχικά, etc., will cool the love of many. ψ. is an apx leg. and future passive of ψάω, to breathe. One of the sad features of a degenerate time is that even the good lose their favour.—ἀλλὰ οὖν, love of the world. But, here only in this sense in Synoptical Gospels, the distinctive virtue of the Christian, with a new name for a new thing.—Ver. 13. δὲ θρόμνου, he that endureth; the verb used absolutely without object. The noun θρόμνος is another of the great words of the N. T., Love and Patience, primary virtues of the Christian: doing good, bearing ill. The endurance called for is not merely in love (Fritzsche), but in the faith and life of a Christian in face of all the evils enumerated.—εἰς τέλος, to the end, i.e., of the ἀλήθεια, as long as there are trials to endure.—σωθησομαι, shall be saved in the sense of xvi. 25. The implied truth underlying this test is that there will be ample time for a full curriculum of trial testing character and siftimg the true from the false or temporary Christian.—Ver. 14 asserts the same thing with regard to the preaching of the gospel of the kingdom: time for preaching it in the whole world, to all nations, before the end. Assuming that the terminus is the same this statement seems inconsistent with that in x. 23. But the aim is different in the two cases. On the earlier occasion Jesus wished to ensure that all Israel should hear the gospel before the end came; therefore He emphasised the shortness of the time. Here He wishes to impress on the disciples that the end will not be for a good while, therefore He emphasises the amount of preaching that can be done. Just on this account we must not strain the phrases ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, τοῖς ἔθνεσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν. They simply mean: extensively even in the heathen world. But they have the merit of setting before the disciples a large programme to occupy their minds and keep them from thinking too much of the coming catastrophe.

Vv. 15-22. The end at last (Mk. xiii. 14-20, Lk. xxi. 20-24).—οὖν ὡς, when therefore, referring partly to the preceding mention of the end, partly to the effect of the whole preceding statement: "This I have said to prevent premature alarm, not, however, as if the end will never come; it will, therefore, etc."; the sequel pointing out the sign of the end now near, and what to do when it appears.—τὸ βεβαιοῦσα τῆς ἡμερών: this the awful portent; what? The phrase is taken from Daniel as expressly stated in following clause (τὸ ἡμερών, etc.), vide Dan. ix. 27, xi. 31, xii. 11. There and in 1 Macc. i. 54 it seems to refer to some outrage on Jewish religious feeling in connection with the temple (φιλοδοξίαν β. ἐπὶ τὸ θυσίατρον telephileov, the words in 1 Macc. i. 54, similarly in vi. 7). In a Jewish apoca-
lypse, which this passage is by some supposed to form a part of, it might be expected to bear a similar meaning, a technical sense for a stereotyped expression. Not so on the lips of Jesus, who was not the slave of phrases but their master, using them freely. Then as employed by Him it must point to some broad, easily recognisable fact, which His followers could at once see and regard as a signal for flight; a fact not merely shocking religious feeling but threatening life, which He would have no disciple sacrifice in a cause with which they could have no sympathy. Then finally, true to the prophetic as distinct from the apocalyptic style, it must point to something revealing prophetic insight rather than a miraculous foresight of some very special circumstance connected with the end. This consideration shuts out the statue of Titus or Caligula or Hadrian (Jerome), the erection of a heathen altar, the atrocities perpetrated in the temple by the Zealots, etc. Luke gives the clue (ver. 20). The horror is the Roman army, and the thing to be dreaded and fled from is not any religious outrage it may perpetrate, but the desolation it will inevitably bring. That is the emphatic word in the prophetic phrase.—εἰρημένως is genitive of apposition = the horror which consists in desolation of the land. The appearance of the Romans in Palestine would at once become known to all. And it would be the signal for flight, for it would mean the end near, inevitable and terrible.—ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ ἄγαλμα, one naturally thinks of the temple or the holy city and its environs, but a "holy place" in the prophetic style might mean the holy land. And Jesus can hardly have meant that disciples were to wait till the fatal hour had come.—ό δὲ γνώσης, etc.: this is most likely an interpolated remark of the evangelist bidding his readers note the correspondence between Christ's warning word and the fact. In Christ's own mouth it would imply too much stress laid on Daniel's words as a guide, which indeed they are not. In Mark there is no reference to Daniel, therefore the reference there must be to the gospel (on this verse consult Weiss-Meyer).

Ver. 16. οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ, those in Judea, who have no part in the struggle, with special reference to disciples of Jesus. There would naturally be some in the city, therefore the counsel to fly must refer to a point of time antecedent to the commencement of the siege.—ἐν τῇ βραχώ, to the mountains outside of Judea, i.e., east of the Jordan; general as befits prophetic speech. The actual place of refuge was Pella, as we learn from Eusebius, H. E., iii., 5, 3.—Vv. 17, 18 vividly express the urgency of the flight.—οἱ ἐν τῇ βραχώ, etc., the man on the house top must fly without stopping to get articles of value in the house down the outside stair and off.—τὴν δὲ σπιτίν, elliptical = the things in his house, from his house.—οἱ ἐν τῷ ἄγαλμα, let the man in the field, on hearing the fatal report, fly in his tunic, not returning home for his upper robe. "No man works in his mantle, the peasant leaves it at home, now as in Christ's time" (Furrer, Wanderungen, p. 217).—Vv. 19, 20 describe the pathos of the situation: woes to women with child, they cannot get rid of their burden; and to women nursing, they cannot abandon their children as men can their money or their clothes (ἠθνοῦσαν τῆς φωτείνης, Euthy. Cf. Chrys. and Theophy.). A touch this worthy of Jesus, sign mark of genuineness.—Ver. 20. προσεύχονται,
etc. (Ira μή with subjunctive instead of infinitive as often in N. T. after verbs of exhorting, etc.), pray that your flight be not in winter (ἐξελεύσομαι, genitive of time) or on the Sabbath (σαββάτῳ, dative of time). The Sabbatarianism of this sentence is a sure sign that it was not uttered by Jesus, but emanated from a Jewish source, say many, e.g.: Weissäcker (Untersuchungen, p. 124), Weissenbach (Wiederhufungsgedanke, i., p. 103) approving. But Jesus could feel even for Sabbattarians, if they were honest, as for those who, like John’s disciples, fasted.—Vv. 21, 22. The extremity of the distress.—Ver. 21 represents it as unparalleled before or after, in terms recalling those of Daniel xii. 1; ver. 22 as intolerable but for the shortness of the agony.—ἐκελορθείς (from κελόρθει, κόλορα, mutilated) literally to cut off, e.g., hands or feet, as in 2 Sam. iv. 12; here figuratively to cut short the time: nisi brevissati fuisseti (Vulgate). The aorist here, as in next clause (ζάροντα), is used proleptically, as if the future were past, in accordance with the genius of prophecy.—οὐκ ἔσω, etc.: the οὐκ must be joined to the verb, and the meaning is: all flesh would be not saved; joined to ζάροντα the sense would be not all flesh, i.e., only some, would be saved.—ζάροντα refers to escape from physical death; in ver. 13 the reference is to salvation in a higher sense. This is one of the reasons why this part of the discourse is regarded as not genuine. But surely Jesus cared for the safety both of body and soul (side x. 22, 30). The epistle of Barnabas (iv.) contains a passage about shortening of the days, ascribed to Enoch. Weissäcker (Untersuchungen, p. 135) presses this into the service of the Jewish apocryphal hypothesis.—διὰ δὲ τοῦ ἑλεκτροῦ: the use of this term is not foreign to the vocabulary of Jesus (side xxii. 14), yet it sounds strange to our ears as a designation for Christians. It occurs often in the Book of Enoch, especially in the Similitudes. The Book begins: “The words of the blessing of Enoch, where-with he blessed the elect and righteous who will be living in the day of tribulation when all the wicked and godless are removed” (side Charles, The Book of Enoch, p. 58). The idea attaching to the word here seems to be: those selected for deliverance in a time of general destruction the preserved. And the thought expressed in the clause is that the preserved are to be preservers. Out of regard to their intercessions away amid the mountains, the days of horror will be shortened. A thought worthy of Jesus.—Vv. 23-28. False Christ again (Ms. xiii. 21-23, Lk. xvii. 23, 24, 37).—Ver. 24. ψευδόχριστος, in the same sense as in ver. 5; there referred to as the cause of all the trouble, here as promising deliverance from the trouble they, or their like, have created. What would one not give for a Deliverer, a Messiah at such a dire crisis! The demand would create the supply, men offering themselves as Saviours from Rome’s power, with prophets (ψευδοπροφήται) preaching smooth things, and assuring a despairing people of deliverance at the last hour.—μὴ πιστεύσατε, says Jesus (ver. 23), do not believe them: no salvation possible; listen not, but flee.—καὶ δοκοῦντε, etc., and will give great signs and wonders. The words recall Deut. xiii. 1. Desperate situations require a full use of all possible powers of persuas-
sion: signs and wonders, or the pretence of them: easily accepted as such by a fanaticised multitude, and sometimes so clever and plausible as to tempt the wise to credence.—οὕτως, with infinitive to express tendency; often inclusive of result, but not here.—εἰς πανταχόν, if possible, the implication being that it is not. If it were the consequence would be fatal. The "select" (ῥητὸν ἀλέξανδρον)—selected by Providence for safety in the evil day—would be involved in the general calamity. Christians, at Israel's great crisis, were to be saved by unbelief in pseudo-messiahs and pseudo-prophets.

—Ver. 25. ἰδοὺ τῆς ἡμέρας, a likely place for a Christ to be (Moses, Israel's first deliverer).—καὶ μὴ ἄγεται, go not out (cf. xi. 7, 8, 9).—ἐν τοῖς παλαιοῖς (vide vi. 6), in the secret chambers, the plural indicating the kind of place, not any particular place. Both expressions—in the desert, in the secret recesses—point to non-visibility. The false prophets bid the people put their faith in a Messiah now, for the Great Unseen = "The hour is come, and the man is somewhere, out of view, not far away, take my word for it". Interpreters who seek for exact historical fulfilments point to Simon son of Gioras, and John of Giscala: the former the Messiah in the desert of Tekoa, gathering a confiding multitude about him; the latter the Messiah in the secret places, taking possession of the interior part of the temple with its belongings in the final struggle (vide Josephus, B. J., iv., 9, 5 and 7; v. 6, 1, and Lutteroth, ad loc.).—Ver. 27. ὅσπερ ὁ λεγόμενος . . . τῆς ἡμέρας, the coming of the true Messiah, identified with the Son of Man, compared to the lightning, to suggest a contrast between Him and the false Christs as to visibility, and enforce the counsel to pay no heed to those who say: He is here, or He is there.—Ver. 28. τῶν ἐχθρῶν, carcase, as in xiv. 12, q.v.—δετοί, eagles, doubtless the carrion vultures are meant. The reference of this proverbial saying, as old as the book of Job (xxxix. 30), in this place is not clear. In the best text it comes in without connecting particle, the γὰρ of T. R. being wanting. If we connect it with ver. 27 the idea will be that Messiah's judicial function will be as universal as His appearance (Meyer and Weiss). But does not ver. 28 as well as ver. 27 refer to what is said about the false Christs, and mean: heed not these pretended Saviours; Israel cannot be saved: she is dead and must become the prey of the vultures? (So Lutteroth.) In this view the Jewish people are the carcase and the Roman army the eagles.

Vv. 29-31. The coming of the Son of Man (Mk. xiii. 24-27, Lk. xxi. 25-28).—Thus far the eschatological discourse has been found to bear on the predicted tragic end of Jerusalem. At this point the ἀναφορὰ, which, according to the evangelist, was one of the subjects on which the disciples desired information, becomes the theme of discourse. What is said there: "They come, but you shall not see me, to teach you to regard it as a pendant to that revelation. Ver. 29. τιθέναι. Each evangelist expresses himself here in his own way,
26-31. 

ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ

η σελήνη οδ δώσει τό φέγγος αὐτῆς, καὶ αἱ αστερές πεσοῦνται ν Μκ. xiii. 

πᾶν τὸν ὀφθαλμόν, καὶ αἱ βωμάρες τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν σαλπηριστοῦν. Ἑι. 33 (Ἑ. 

καὶ τότε φαινομένος τὸ σημείον τοῦ ιῶτο τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν τῷ 

ἀνθρώπῳ, καὶ τότε κύονται πᾶσα αἱ φωλιά τῆς γῆς, καὶ δοκεῖ 

καὶ ὁ ἐν αὐτῷ ἄνθρωπος καὶ ὁ ἄγγελος τῆς γῆς, καὶ ὁ πάτερ 

τῆς γῆς καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τῆς γῆς, καὶ ὁ θεός τῆς γῆς καὶ ὁ πάτερ 

καὶ ὁ θεός τῆς γῆς καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τῆς γῆς. 33. καὶ ἀποστολοὶ πάσων 

ἀγγέλων αὐτοῦ μετὰ σαλπηριγγός φωνῆς μεγάλης, καὶ ἐπισωπέοντο τοὺς τοὺς ἐκ τῶν πεσόντων ἄγγελων, ἐκ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν.

1 ΝΔ have εκ (Tisch.). αὐτοί in BL.ΔΣ (W.H.). 2 NBL omit τοῦ. 

3 ΝΔ omit φωνη (Tisch., W.H. relegate to the margin). BD (καὶ φωνη) ΧΧ 

καὶ ἔχουν αὐτοί. 4 B 1, 13, 69 add τῶν after εῶς (W.H. insert, but bracketed).

Lk. most obviously adapting his words to suit the fact of a delayed parousia. Mt.'s word naturally means: immediately, following close on the events going before, the thisis of Jerusalem. One of the ways by which those to whom εἴδων is a stumbling block strive to evade the difficulty is to look on it as an inaccurate translation by the Greek Matthew of δανή, supposed to be in Hebrew original. So Schott, Comm. Ex. Dog.—δ ἔριος . . . σαλπηριστοῦν: a description in stock prophetic phrases (Is. xiii. 9, xxxix. 4, Joel iii. 15, etc.) of what seems to be a general collapse of the physical universe. Is that really what is meant? I doubt it. It seems to me that in true prophetic Oriental style the colossal imagery of the physical universe is used to describe the political and social consequences of the great Jewish catastrophe: national ruin, breaking up of religious institutions and social order. The physical stands for the social, the shaking of heaven for the shaking of earth (Haggai ii. 6); or in the prophetic imagination the two are indissolubly blended: stars, thrones, city walls, temples, effects religions tumbling down into one vast mass of ruin. If this be the meaning εἴδων is to be strictly taken.—φέγγος, applicable to both sun and moon, but oftener applied to the moon or stars; φῶς oftenest to the sun, but also to the moon. Vade Trench, Syn., p. 163.—Ver. 30. καὶ νῦν. Amid the general crash what longing would arise in Christian hearts for the presence of the Christ! To this longing the announcement introduced by these words "and then" responds.—τὸ σημείον τ. τ. τ. The question what is this sign has greatly perplexed commentators, who make becoming confessions of ignorance. "We must not be positive in conjecturing," Morrison. "What this shall be is to vain to conjecture," Cambridge. N. T. Is the reference not to Daniel vii. 13, "one like the Son of Man," and the meaning: the sign which is the Son of Man, τ. τ. τ. being genitive of appos. So Weiss after Storr and Wolf.—"σημείον ηῶν, similis est illis quibus profani passim utuntur quando diciunt μια Ἰσραήλου, i.e., "vis Herculis seu ipse Hercules," Wolf, Curae Phil.) Christ His own sign, like the lightning or the sun, self-evidencing.—καὶ τότε κύονται, etc.: a clause not in Mt. and obscure in meaning; why mourn? because they recognise in the Coming One their Judge? or because they see in Him one who had been despised and rejected of men, and penitently (taking the sin home to themselves) acknowledge His claims? ("believed on the world," 1 Tim. iii. 16).—ἐρχόμενον . . . σαλπηριστοῦν: description of the coming, here as in xvii. 27, xxvi. 64, in terms drawn from Daniel viii. 13.—Ver. 31. μετὰ σαλπηριγγός φῦμ., with a trumpet of mighty sound, another stock phrase of prophetic imagery (Is. xvii. 13).—καὶ ἐπισωπέοντο τοὺς ἐκ τῶν πεσόντων αὐτοῦ, and they (the angels or messengers) shall collect the elect (as in vv. 22, 24), showing that the advent is described in terms suited to the situation previously depicted. The Christ comes for the comfort of those preserved from the general ruin.—ἐκ τῶν τ. ἄνθρωπος: not merely from the mountains east of the Jordan, but from every quarter of the
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32. "And there shall be signs in sun, moon, and stars; and upon the earth distress of nations, in divers languages, tongues, and nations; 

x here and in Mk. xiii. 8.
y here and in Lk. xxiv. 33.

33. oth. and ver. 8; 17. 

34. whether.

35. "The Lord shall come to be in the eyes of all the nations, and shall be glorious among all nations; for the Lord shall be a great day of the Lord; and should be accounted as a day of vengeance, and the Lord shall return to seven hundred years.

36. "And there shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars; and upon the earth distress of nations, in divers languages, tongues, and nations; 

37. The Lord shall come to be in the eyes of all the nations, and shall be glorious among all nations; for the Lord shall be a great day of the Lord; and should be accounted as a day of vengeance, and the Lord shall return to seven hundred years.

38. The Lord shall come to be in the eyes of all the nations, and shall be glorious among all nations; for the Lord shall be a great day of the Lord; and should be accounted as a day of vengeance, and the Lord shall return to seven hundred years.

39. The Lord shall come to be in the eyes of all the nations, and shall be glorious among all nations; for the Lord shall be a great day of the Lord; and should be accounted as a day of vengeance, and the Lord shall return to seven hundred years.

40. The Lord shall come to be in the eyes of all the nations, and shall be glorious among all nations; for the Lord shall be a great day of the Lord; and should be accounted as a day of vengeance, and the Lord shall return to seven hundred years.

41. The Lord shall come to be in the eyes of all the nations, and shall be glorious among all nations; for the Lord shall be a great day of the Lord; and should be accounted as a day of vengeance, and the Lord shall return to seven hundred years.

42. The Lord shall come to be in the eyes of all the nations, and shall be glorious among all nations; for the Lord shall be a great day of the Lord; and should be accounted as a day of vengeance, and the Lord shall return to seven hundred years.

43. The Lord shall come to be in the eyes of all the nations, and shall be glorious among all nations; for the Lord shall be a great day of the Lord; and should be accounted as a day of vengeance, and the Lord shall return to seven hundred years.

44. The Lord shall come to be in the eyes of all the nations, and shall be glorious among all nations; for the Lord shall be a great day of the Lord; and should be accounted as a day of vengeance, and the Lord shall return to seven hundred years.

45. The Lord shall come to be in the eyes of all the nations, and shall be glorious among all nations; for the Lord shall be a great day of the Lord; and should be accounted as a day of vengeance, and the Lord shall return to seven hundred years.

46. The Lord shall come to be in the eyes of all the nations, and shall be glorious among all nations; for the Lord shall be a great day of the Lord; and should be accounted as a day of vengeance, and the Lord shall return to seven hundred years.

47. The Lord shall come to be in the eyes of all the nations, and shall be glorious among all nations; for the Lord shall be a great day of the Lord; and should be accounted as a day of vengeance, and the Lord shall return to seven hundred years.

48. The Lord shall come to be in the eyes of all the nations, and shall be glorious among all nations; for the Lord shall be a great day of the Lord; and should be accounted as a day of vengeance, and the Lord shall return to seven hundred years.

49. The Lord shall come to be in the eyes of all the nations, and shall be glorious among all nations; for the Lord shall be a great day of the Lord; and should be accounted as a day of vengeance, and the Lord shall return to seven hundred years.

50. The Lord shall come to be in the eyes of all the nations, and shall be glorious among all nations; for the Lord shall be a great day of the Lord; and should be accounted as a day of vengeance, and the Lord shall return to seven hundred years.

51. The Lord shall come to be in the eyes of all the nations, and shall be glorious among all nations; for the Lord shall be a great day of the Lord; and should be accounted as a day of vengeance, and the Lord shall return to seven hundred years.

52. The Lord shall come to be in the eyes of all the nations, and shall be glorious among all nations; for the Lord shall be a great day of the Lord; and should be accounted as a day of vengeance, and the Lord shall return to seven hundred years.

53. The Lord shall come to be in the eyes of all the nations, and shall be glorious among all nations; for the Lord shall be a great day of the Lord; and should be accounted as a day of vengeance, and the Lord shall return to seven hundred years.

54. The Lord shall come to be in the eyes of all the nations, and shall be glorious among all nations; for the Lord shall be a great day of the Lord; and should be accounted as a day of vengeance, and the Lord shall return to seven hundred years.

55. The Lord shall come to be in the eyes of all the nations, and shall be glorious among all nations; for the Lord shall be a great day of the Lord; and should be accounted as a day of vengeance, and the Lord shall return to seven hundred years.

56. The Lord shall come to be in the eyes of all the nations, and shall be glorious among all nations; for the Lord shall be a great day of the Lord; and should be accounted as a day of vengeance, and the Lord shall return to seven hundred years.

57. The Lord shall come to be in the eyes of all the nations, and shall be glorious among all nations; for the Lord shall be a great day of the Lord; and should be accounted as a day of vengeance, and the Lord shall return to seven hundred years.

58. The Lord shall come to be in the eyes of all the nations, and shall be glorious among all nations; for the Lord shall be a great day of the Lord; and should be accounted as a day of vengeance, and the Lord shall return to seven hundred years.

59. The Lord shall come to be in the eyes of all the nations, and shall be glorious among all nations; for the Lord shall be a great day of the Lord; and should be accounted as a day of vengeance, and the Lord shall return to seven hundred years.

60. The Lord shall come to be in the eyes of all the nations, and shall be glorious among all nations; for the Lord shall be a great day of the Lord; and should be accounted as a day of vengeance, and the Lord shall return to seven hundred years.

61. The Lord shall come to be in the eyes of all the nations, and shall be glorious among all nations; for the Lord shall be a great day of the Lord; and should be accounted as a day of vengeance, and the Lord shall return to seven hundred years.

62. The Lord shall come to be in the eyes of all the nations, and shall be glorious among all nations; for the Lord shall be a great day of the Lord; and should be accounted as a day of vengeance, and the Lord shall return to seven hundred years.

63. The Lord shall come to be in the eyes of all the nations, and shall be glorious among all nations; for the Lord shall be a great day of the Lord; and should be accounted as a day of vengeance, and the Lord shall return to seven hundred years.

64. The Lord shall come to be in the eyes of all the nations, and shall be glorious among all nations; for the Lord shall be a great day of the Lord; and should be accounted as a day of vengeance, and the Lord shall return to seven hundred years.

65. The Lord shall come to be in the eyes of all the nations, and shall be glorious among all nations; for the Lord shall be a great day of the Lord; and should be accounted as a day of vengeance, and the Lord shall return to seven hundred years.

66. The Lord shall come to be in the eyes of all the nations, and shall be glorious among all nations; for the Lord shall be a great day of the Lord; and should be accounted as a day of vengeance, and the Lord shall return to seven hundred years.

67. The Lord shall come to be in the eyes of all the nations, and shall be glorious among all nations; for the Lord shall be a great day of the Lord; and should be accounted as a day of vengeance, and the Lord shall return to seven hundred years.

68. The Lord shall come to be in the eyes of all the nations, and shall be glorious among all nations; for the Lord shall be a great day of the Lord; and should be accounted as a day of vengeance, and the Lord shall return to seven hundred years.

69. The Lord shall come to be in the eyes of all the nations, and shall be glorious among all nations; for the Lord shall be a great day of the Lord; and should be accounted as a day of vengeance, and the Lord shall return to seven hundred years.

70. The Lord shall come to be in the eyes of all the nations, and shall be glorious among all nations; for the Lord shall be a great day of the Lord; and should be accounted as a day of vengeance, and the Lord shall return to seven hundred years.

71. The Lord shall come to be in the eyes of all the nations, and shall be glorious among all nations; for the Lord shall be a great day of the Lord; and should be accounted as a day of vengeance, and the Lord shall return to seven hundred years.

72. The Lord shall come to be in the eyes of all the nations, and shall be glorious among all nations; for the Lord shall be a great day of the Lord; and should be accounted as a day of vengeance, and the Lord shall return to seven hundred years.

73. The Lord shall come to be in the eyes of all the nations, and shall be glorious among all nations; for the Lord shall be a great day of the Lord; and should be accounted as a day of vengeance, and the Lord shall return to seven hundred years.

74. The Lord shall come to be in the eyes of all the nations, and shall be glorious among all nations; for the Lord shall be a great day of the Lord; and should be accounted as a day of vengeance, and the Lord shall return to seven hundred years.

75. The Lord shall come to be in the eyes of all the nations, and shall be glorious among all nations; for the Lord shall be a great day of the Lord; and should be accounted as a day of vengeance, and the Lord shall return to seven hundred years.

76. The Lord shall come to be in the eyes of all the nations, and shall be glorious among all nations; for the Lord shall be a great day of the Lord; and should be accounted as a day of vengeance, and the Lord shall return to seven hundred years.

77. The Lord shall come to be in the eyes of all the nations, and shall be glorious among all nations; for the Lord shall be a great day of the Lord; and should be accounted as a day of vengeance, and the Lord shall return to seven hundred years.

78. The Lord shall come to be in the eyes of all the nations, and shall be glorious among all nations; for the Lord shall be a great day of the Lord; and should be accounted as a day of vengeance, and the Lord shall return to seven hundred years.

79. The Lord shall come to be in the eyes of all the nations, and shall be glorious among all nations; for the Lord shall be a great day of the Lord; and should be accounted as a day of vengeance, and the Lord shall return to seven hundred years.

80. The Lord shall come to be in the eyes of all the nations, and shall be glorious among all nations; for the Lord shall be a great day of the Lord; and should be accounted as a day of vengeance, and the Lord shall return to seven hundred years.
32—43. ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ

may not be so soon as even I think or you expect). His whole manner of speaking concerning the second advent seems to have two faces; providing on the other hand for the possibility of a Christian era, and on the other for an accelerated Parousia.

Vv. 37-42. Watch therefore (cf. Lk. xvii. 26-30, 34-36).—Ver. 37. αν ημερα τ. Ναη, the history of Noah used to illustrate the uncertainty of the Parousia.—Ver. 38. ηςαν with the following participles is not an instance of the periphrastic imperfect. It rather stands by itself, and the particles are descriptive predicates. Some charge these with sinister meaning: τραγουδηνεν, hinting at gluttony because often used of beasts, though also, in the sense of eating, of men (John vi. 58, 59). So Beza and Grotius: γαμιζοντες και γαμιζοντες, euphemistically pointing at sexual licences on both sides (Wolf, "omnia vagis libidinibus miscebarunt"). The idea rather seems to be that all things went on as usual, as if nothing were going to happen. In the N. T., and especially in the fourth Gospel, τραγον seems to be used simply as a synonym for δεινον. In like manner all distinction between δεινον and χορταζοναι (= to feed cattle in classics) has disappeared. Vide Mk. vii. 27, 28, and consult Kennedv, Sources of New Testament Greek, p. 83.—Ver. 39. αν ενρατησαν, they did not know, still, that the flood was coming till it was on them.—Ver. 40, 41 graphically illustrate the suddenness of the Parousia.—εις αυτους (ver. 40) instead of εις ορφεος, so μα μα in ver. 41. Of these idioms Herrmann in Viger (p. 6) remarks: "Sapiunt Ebraismum"—παραλαβεναι, εδέσθης, one is taken, one left. The reference may either be to the action of the angels, ver. 31 (Meyer), or to the judicial action of the Son of Man seizing some, leaving free others (Weiss-Meyer). The sentences are probably proverbial (Schott), and the terms may admit of diverse application. However applied, they point to opposite destinies. Δισσωμαι, grinding: δισσωμαι, late for δισσωμαι, condemned by Phryn., p. 151.—ειν τω μωλων (T. R.), in the mill house.—I. τ. μωλυ (W. H.), in or with the millstone. The reference is to a handmill, which required two men to work it when grinding was carried on for a considerable time—women's work (vide Robinson, i., 485; Furrer, Wand., p. 97; Benzinger, p. 85, where a figure is given).—Ver. 42. γινουκρατείν, watch, a frequently recurring exhortation, implying not merely an uncertain but a delayed Parousia, tempting to be off guard, and so making such repeated exhortations necessary.—αι δε ημερα, on what sort of a day, early or late; so again in ver. 43, at what sort of a watch, seasonable or unseasonable.

Vv. 43-51. Two parables: the Thief and the Two Servants, enforcing the lesson: Watch!—Ver. 43. γινουκρατείτε, observe, nota bene.—εν δεινον: supplementation contrary to fact, therefore verbs in prot. and apod. indicative.—εις τλατυς, admirably selected character. It is the thief's business to keep people in the dark as to the time of his coming, or as to his coming at all. οαι δεινοντες suggests the idea of a great man, but in reality it
is a poor peasant who is in view. He lives in a clay house, which can be dug through (sun-dried bricks), vide BioepiNenai in last clause. Yet he is the master in his humble dwelling (cf. on vi. 19).—Ver. 45. τίς, who, taken by Grotius, Kuinoel, Schott, etc. = of τις, si quis, supposing a case. But, as Fritsch points out, the article before ως. δοῦλος is inconsistent with this sense.—πιστός, φρόνιμος: two indispensable qualities in an upper servant, trusty and judicious.—θεραπείας (T. R.), service = body of servants, ὀκταείς (B., W. H.), household = domestics.—Ver. 46 answers the question by felicitations.—μακάριος, implying that the virtue described is rare (vide on chap. v. 3): a rare servant, who is not demoralised by delay, but keeps steadfastly doing his duty.—ἐὰν ἔτοιμον, this one among a thousand is fit to be put in charge of the whole of his master’s estate.—Ver. 48. The other side of the picture—ἐὰν δὲ ... δεῖκνοι: not the same individual, but a man placed in the same post (“cui edam provincia sit demandata,” Schott).—χριστόν (again in xxi. 8): the servant begins to reflect on the fact that his lord is late in coming, and is demoralised.—ἀπεικόνισε, he (now) begins to play the tyrant (τύπτωνν) and to indulge in excess (δεῦται καὶ πτών, etc.). Long delay is necessary to produce such complete demoralisation.—Ver. 50. ἔγειρε: the master comes at last, and of course he will come unexpectedly. The delay has been so long that the unworthy servant goes on his bad way as if the master would never come at all.—Ver. 51. διακοσμημένος, he will cut him in sunder as with a saw, an actual mode of punishment in ancient times, and many commentators think that this barbarous penalty is seriously meant here. But this can hardly be, especially as in the following clause the man is supposed to be still alive. The probable meaning is: will cut him in two (so to speak) with a whip = thrash him, the base slave, unmercifully. It is a strong word, selected in sympathy with the master’s rage. So Schott: “verberus multis eam castigavit.” Koetsveld, De Gelijk, p. 246, and Grimm (Thayer) but ith winesisacy. Beza and Grotius interpret: will divide him from the family = dismiss him.—μετὰ τῶν ἥρωστων, with the hypocrites, i.e., eye servants, who make a great show of zeal under the master’s eye, but are utterly negligent behind his back. In Lk. the corresponding phrase is τῶν ἀκτιστῶν, the unfaithful.
XXV. Three Eschatological Parables. These parables (especially the first and third) are appropriately introduced by Mt. at this place, whether actually uttered in immediate connection with the Olivet discourse, or during the Passion week, or otherwise. In his reproduction of the book of Logia, Wendt gives the group of parables incalculating constant preparedness for the Parusia, including the Waiting Servants (Lk. xxi. 35-38); the Thief (Mt. xxiv. 43, 44); Lk. xii. 39, 40); the Upper Servant (Mt. xxiv. 45-51; Lk. xii. 42, 48), and the Ten Virgins (Mt. xxv. 1-12; Lk. xiii. 23), a somewhat earlier place (L. J., i. pp. 118-122).

Vv. 1-13. Parable of the Ten Virgins, in Mt. only.—Ver. 1. τότε, then, connecting what follows in the evangelist's mind with the time referred to in the previous parable, i.e., with the Parusia. Δόειν παράδονα: ten virgins, not as the usual number—as to that no information is available—but as one coming readily to the mind of a Jew, as we might in a similar case say a dozen. αἶνειν, such as; αἱ might have been used, but the tendency in N. T. and late Greek is to prefer δοῦνα to δοῦνα. λαμπάδας αὐτῶν, their torches consisting of a wooden staff held in the hand, with a dish at the top, in which was a piece of cloth or rope dipped in oil or pitch (vide Lightfoot, Hor. Heb.). Rutherford (New Phrynicius, p. 131) says that λαμπάδας is here used in the sense of oil lamps, and that in the common dialect λαμπάδα became equivalent to λύχνος. — εἰς τὴν ἁμαρτίαν: vide at viii. 34.—τοῦ νυμφίου: the bridegroom, who is conceived of as coming with his party to the house of the bride, where the marriage feast is to take place, contrary to the usual though possibly not the invariable custom (Judges xiv. 10). The parable at this point seems to be adapted to the spiritual situation—the Son of Man coming again. Resch thinks καὶ τὴν νυμφία a true part of the original parable, without which it cannot be understood (Ausserseelioheische Paralleletexte zu Mt. und Lk., p. 300).—Ver. 2. πέντε μαραθνός, πέντε φόρμμα: equal numbers of both, not intended to represent the proportion in the spiritual sphere; foolish, wise, not bad and good, but imprudent and prudent, thoughtless and thoughtful. Even the "foolish" might be very attractive, lovable girls; perhaps might have been the favourites at the feast: for wisdom is apt to be cold; foolish first named in best MSS. and properly, for they play the chief rôle in the story, and are first characterised in the sequel.—Ver. 3. θηλασία: the statement about the foolish, indicating the nature or proof of their folly, is that they took their lamps but did not take oil. None? or only not a supply sufficient for an emergency—possible delay? Goebel (Die Parabeln Jesu) decides for
the former view. His idea of the whole situation is this: the virgins meet at the bride’s house, there wait the announcement of the bridegroom’s approach, then for the first time proceed to light their lamps, whereupon the foolish find that there is nothing in the dish except a dry wick, which goes out shortly after being lighted. In favour of this view he adds the consideration that the other alternative makes the wise too wise providing for a rare occurrence. Perhaps, but on the other hand Goebel’s view makes the foolish too foolish, and also irrelevantly foolish, for in the case supposed they would have been at fault even if the bridegroom had not married. But the very point of the parable is to illustrate the effect of delay. On the various ways of conceiving the situation, vide The Parabolic Teaching of Christ.—Ver. 4. *έν τοῖς ἄγγελοις: the wise took oil in the vessels, i.e., in vessels, with an extra supply, distinct from the cups at the top of the torches containing oil.—Ver. 5. *χρισίζοντος τ. ν.: no reason given for delay, a possibility in natural life, the point on which the spiritual lesson, be ready, hinges.—*εισελέγασαν, they nodded their heads, because a transient state, *ἐκείνην, and remained for some time in slumber, imperfect, because the state continuous. Carr (Camb. N. T.) cites Plato, *Apol. Socr., as illustrating the discriminating use of the two verbs in reference to the two stages of sleep.—*πάσας, all, in the circumstances perfectly natural and, everything being ready, perfectly harmless.—Ver. 6. *διότι *ὁ νυμφαῖς: at length at midnight a cry is raised by some one not asleep—*οἱ ἄνδρες *ἐκαίνενος, go forth to meeting: no words that can be dispensed with here either. Go forth whence I from the bride’s house (Goebel); from some inn, or private dwelling on the way, whither they have turned in on finding that the bridegroom tarried (Bleek, Meyer, Weissa). On this point Goebel’s view is to be preferred.—Ver. 7. *ἐκούσαν: trimmed, or proceeded to trim, for which the imperfect would have been more suitable. In the case of the five foolish it was an action attempted rather than performed, begun rather than completed.—Ver. 8. *σφάλλων: are going out, as in R. V.—Ver. 9. *μὴ πάντες: lest, implying, and giving a reason for, an unexpressed declination. Kypke renders, *perhaps, fortasse, citing examples from classics, also Loeser, giving examples from Philo. Elsner suggests that *δράτα or *βλαπτεῖν is understood before *μὴ πάντες. Schott, putting a comma after *μὴν, and omitting τάτοι after *τοιοῦτοι, translates thus: lest perchance there be not enough for us and you, go rather to them that sell, etc. ("ne forte oleum neque nobis neque vobis sufficit, abite potius," etc.).—*πορεύοντες, etc.: this seems a cold, ungenerous suggestion on the part of the wise, and apparently untrue to what was likely to occur among girls at such a time. Could the oil really be got at such a time of night? and, supposing it could, would going not throw them out of the festivities? Augustine says: "non consulentium sed irritantium ext ista responsio" (Serm. xc., iii., 8). More humanely, in the modern spirit, Koestel suggests that the marriage procession to music and song was very slow, and that there was a fair chance of overtaking it after the purchase (De Gelly, p. 220). Let us hope so; but I fear we must fall back on the fact that "sudden emergencies bring
into play a certain element of selfishness, and take the advice of the wise as simply a refusal to be burdened with their neighbours' affairs.

Ver. 10. ἄσωροι ἡμῶν, etc., the foolish took the advice and went to buy, and in so doing acted in character; foolish in that as in not having a good supply of oil. They should have gone on without oil, the great matter being to be in time. By reckoning this as a point in their folly we bring the foolish virgins into analogy with the foolish builder in chap. vii. 26. Vide notes there, and also The Parabolic Teaching of Christ, p. 505 f. Of course, on this view the oil has no significance in the spiritual sphere. It plays a great part in the history of interpretation. For Chrys. and Euthy., the lamp = virginity, and the oil = pity, and the moral is: continence without charity worthless; a good lesson. "Nothing," says the former, "is blinder than virginity without pity; thus the people are used to call the merciless dark (σκοτία σκοτίας)," Hom.lxxxviii.—δικλείσθη καὶ ὕδρα, the door was shut, because all the guests were supposed to be within; no hint given by the wise virgins that more were coming. This improbable in the natural sphere.—Ver. 11. κύριε, κύριε, etc., master, master, open to us; a last, urgent, desperate appeal, knocking having preceded (Lk. xiii. 25) without result. The fear that they are not going to be admitted has seized their hearts.—Ver. 12. οὐκ οἶδα ὑμᾶς, I do not know you, in the natural sphere not a judicial penalty for arriving too late, but an inference from the late arrival that those without cannot belong to the bridal party. The solemn tone, however (ἅμα λ. 6.), shows that the spiritual here invades the natural. Pricaeus refers to Lk. xi. 7 as helping to understand the temper of the speech from within = do not trouble me, the door is shut.—Ver. 13. The moral, γρηγορεῖτε, watch; not directed against sleep (ver. 5) but against lack of forethought. The reference of the parable to the Parusia, according to Weiss (Meyer), is imposed upon it by the evangelist.

Ver. 14-20. Parable of the Talents (cf. Lk. xix. 11-28), according to Weiss (M.-Ev., 535) and Wendt (L. J., i. 145) not a Parusia-parable originally, but spoken at some other time, and inculcating, like the parable of the unjust steward, skill and fidelity in the use of earthly goods.

—Ver. 14. γὰρ ἔστω: suggests a comparison between the parabolic history and the course of things in the kingdom, but the apodosis carrying out the comparison is omitted.—γὰρ implies that the point of comparison is in the view of the evangelist the same as in the preceding parable.—ἀποθημίων, about to go abroad.—καλάκατον, etc., called his own servants and delivered to them his means; not an unnatural or unusual proceeding introduced against probability for the sake of the moral lesson; rather the best thing he could do with his money in his absence, dividing it among carefully selected slaves, and leaving them to do their best with it. Investments could not then be made as now (vide Koetsveld, p. 254).—Ver. 15. τάντα, δύο, ἢ: the number of talents given in each case corresponded to the master's judgment of the capacity (δύναμις) of each man. All were supposed to be trustworthy and more or less capable. Even one talent represented a considerable sum, especially for that period when a denarius was a day's wage.

—καὶ ἀπεθάνατον, and then he went away. So ends the account of the master's action.—ἐπικοινωνεῖ should be connected with περιεβελθεί, whereby it gains
significance as indicating the temper of the servant. He lost no time in setting about plans for trading, with the talents entrusted to him (so Fritzsche, Weiss, Schanz, and Holtz., H. C.).—Ver. 16. εἰργάσατο εἰς αὐτοῖς, traded in or with them, used in classics also in this sense but without any preposition before the dative of the material.—Αλλα πέντε, other five, which speaks to a considerable period in the ordinary course of trade.—Ver. 17. ἰσοπάσων, in like manner; that absolutely the same proportion between capital and gain should be maintained in the two cases was not likely but possible, and the suppression is convenient for the application.—Ver. 18. ἔφυλεν ἐν, etc., dug up the silver of his master. Not dishonest—the master had not misjudged as to that—but indolent, unenterprising, timid. What he did was often done for safety. The master might have done it himself, but he wanted increase as well as safety. In Lk’s parable the same type of man buries his pound in a napkin. A talent was too large to be put up that way.

Ver. 19-23.—Ver. 19. τολὰμ χρόνον, the master returns after a long time, an important expression in a parable relating to the Parousia, as implying long delay.—συναφεῖς λόγοι, maketh a reckoning, as in xviii. 23.—Ver. 20. The first servant gives his report: bringing five and five, he presents them to his master, and says: ἰδε, as if inviting him to satisfy himself by counting.—Ver. 21. οὕτως ἐγὼ, excellently! εἰς ἐτών, to the years, not years, as in B.C.; but to the years, as in B.C., is the approved reading in Lk. xix. 17. Meyer takes it as an adverb, qualifying παντινός, but standing in so emphatic a position at the head of the sentence and so far from the word it is supposed to qualify it inevitably has the force of an interpolation—ἀγαθόν καὶ παντινός, devoted and faithful: two prime virtues in the circumstances. On the sense of ἀγαθόν, vide xx. 15.—ἐκ τ. σε καταστήσω, I will set thee over many things. The master means to make extensive use of the talents and energy of one who had shown himself so enthusiastic and trustworthy in a limited sphere.—ἐξολοθρεύει τ. χαράν τ. κ. σ. This clause seems to be exepgetical of the previous one, or to express the same idea under a different form. χαρά has often been taken as referring to a feast given on the occasion of the master’s return (so De Wette, Trench, etc.). Others (Reuss, Meyer, Weiss, Speaker’s Com.) take it more generally as denoting the master’s state of joy. Thus viewed, the word takes us into the spiritual sphere, the joy of the Lord having nothing in common with the affairs of the bank (Reuss, Hist. Ev.). Weiss thinks this second description of the reward pro-
ceeds from the evangelist interpreting the parable allegorically of Messiah's return. But we escape this inference if we take the phrase "the joy of thy lord" as=the joy of lordship (κερίλος γαύδι, Grotius, and Eisner after him). The faithful slave is to be rewarded by admission to fellowship in possession, partnership. Cf. μέτοχοι τοῦ χριστοῦ in Heb. iii. 14=sharers ("fellows") with Christ, not merely "partakers of Christ". — Ver. 23. Praise and recompense awarded to the second servant in identical terms: reward the same in recognition of equal devotion and fidelity with unequal ability a just law of the Kingdom of God, the second bearing on "Work and Wages" there. For the first, vide on xx. 1-16. Euthymius remarks with the perfect participle, instead of ἄλοιφος in ver. 20, because the one fact as to him is that he is the man who has received a talent of which he has made no use. (So Weiss in Meyer.)—ἐγών σε ἔδω for ἐγών δέν σε, by attraction.—σκληρός, "hard": grasping, ungenerous, taking all to himself, offering no inducements to his servants, as explained in the proverbial expressions following: θέρμα, etc., reaping where you do not sow, and gathering where (δουλεῖν instead of δουλόν, a word signifying in loco; vide Kypke for other examples) you did not scatter with the fan = appropriating everything produced on his land by the labour of his servants, without giving them any share —no inducement to work for such a curmudgeon of a master: all toil, no pay. Compare this with the real character as revealed in: "Enter thou into the joy of lordship".—Ver. 25. φοβηθεί, etc., fearing: loss of the talent by trade; he thought the one thing to make sure of, in the case of such a master, was that what he had got might be safe.—ἐν τῇ γῇ: the primitive meaning: security. Vide xiii. 44.—τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ σοῦ: see you have what belongs to you; no idea that the master was entitled not only to the talent, but to what it might earn.—Ver. 26. φονεύρεθε (vide on vi. 29).—"wicked" is too general a meaning: mean-spirited or grudging would suit the connection better.—φονεύρεθε is the fitting reply to σκληρός, and the opposite of ἄγαθος. You call me hard, I call you a churl: with no heart for your work, unlike your fellow-servant who put his whole heart into his work.—δοκιμηθεί, slothful; a poor creature altogether: suspicious, timid, heartless, spiritless, idle.—ζόης, etc.: a question, neither making an admission nor expressing surprise or anger, but leading up to a charge of inconsistency = if that was your idea of me, why then, etc.—Ver. 27. φύσιν, etc., you ought in that case to have cast my silver to the money-changers, or bankers. That could have been done without
trouble or risk, and with profit to the master.—έγα, apparently intended to be emphatic, suggesting a distribution of offices between servant and master = yours to put it into the bank, mine to take it out. So Field (Otium Nor.), who, following a hint of Chrys., translates: "And I should have gone (ἀλλιώ) to the bank and received back mine own (or demanded it) with interest".—συν τὸ ἰτέμα, literally, with offsetting: a figurative name for interest on money.—Ver. 28. ἄρατε, etc., take the one talent from the man who made no use of it, and give it to the man who will make most use of it.—Ver. 29. General principle on which the direction rests pointing to a law of life, hard but inexorable.—Ver. 30. ἀξιόπιον, useless. Palairet renders inunctionem; Küpke, improbem. Being useless, he was both injurious and unjust. The useless man does wrong all round, and there is no place for him either in this world or in the Kingdom of God. His place is in the outer darkness.

Difference of opinion prevails as to whether this parable refers to the use of material goods for the Kingdom of God, or to the use of spiritual gifts. It is not, perhaps, possible to decide in ignorance of the historical occasion of the parable, nor is it necessary, as the same law applies.

Vv. 31-46. The Judgment Programme.

—Much diversity of opinion has prevailed in reference to this remarkable passage; as to the subjects of the judgment, and the authenticity of this judgment programme as a professed logos of Jesus. Are the judged all mankind, Christian and non-Christian, or Christians only, or non-Christian peoples, including unbelieving Jews, or the Jewish people excluded? Even as early as Origen it was felt that there was room for doubt on such points. He says (Comm. in Ev. M.): "Utrum segregabuntur gentes omnes ab omnibus generationibus fuerint, illae tantum quae in consummatione fuerint derelictae, aut illae tantum quae crediderunt in Deum per Christianum, et ipsae utrum omnes, an non omnes, non satis est manifestum. Tamen quibusdam videtur de differentia eorum, quae crediderunt haec esse dicta." Recent opinion inclines to the view that the programme refers to heathen people only, and sets forth the principle on which they shall be judged. As to the authenticity of the logion critics hold widely discrepant views. Some regard it as a composition of the evangelist. So Pfleiderer, e.g., who sees in it simply the literary expression of a genial humane way of regarding the heathen on the part of the evangelist, an unknown Christian author of the second century, who had charity enough to accept Christlike love on the part of the heathen as an equivalent for Christian faith (Urchristenthum, p. 532). Holtzmann, H. C., also sees in it a second-hand composition, based on 4 Esdras vii. 33-35. Apoc. Bar, lxxiii. 22. Weiss, on the other hand, recognizes as basis an authentic logion of Jesus, setting forth love as the test of true discipleship, which has been worked over by the evangelist and altered into a judgment programme for heathendom. Wendt (L. 6, p. 186) thinks that the logion in its original form was such a programme. This seems to be the most probable opinion.
REFERENCES AND NOTES

Ver. 31. δός τις, the description following recalls xxiv. 30, to which the δός seems to refer.—Ver. 32. πάντα τὰ διδάσκει naturally suggests the heathen peoples as distinct from Jews, though the latter may be included, notwithstanding the fact that in one respect their judgment day had already come (xxiv. 15-22).—ἀπόρρητα: first a process of separation as in the interpretation of the parable of the tares (xii. 49).—τὰ πρόβατα ἀνά τῶν ἰδρύων, the sheep from the young goats. Sheep and goats, though feeding together under the care of the same shepherd, seem of their own accord to separate into two companies. Tristram and Furrer bear witness to this.—Ver. 33. καὶ στῆσεν, etc., the bare placing of the parties already judges, the good on the right, the evil on the left; sheep emblems of the former, goats of the latter. Why? No profit from goats, much from sheep; from their wool, milk, etc. Lyc. says Chrysa., Hom. Hes. —Lust and evil odour secure for the goat its unenviable emblematic significance say others: "id animal et libidinosum et odidum" (Grotius). Lange suggests stubbornness as the sinister quality. More important is the point made by Weiss that the very fact that a separation is necessary implies that all were one flock, i.e., that the judges in the view of Jesus are all professing Christians, disciples true or false.

Vv. 34-40. οἱ ἐκλέγοντες τὸ πατρὸς μου, my Father's blessed ones, the participle being in effect a substantive.—κληρονομίσατε, etc.: this clause Weiss regards as a proof that the parable originally referred to disciples, as for them only could the kingdom be said to be prepared from the foundation of the world. Wendt, holding the original reference to have been to the heathen, brackets the words from οἱ ἐκλέγοντες to κόσμου as of doubtful authenticity.—Ver. 35. ἐκπίστασα, εἰδίπτυον, εἶναι ἰδιήκεια, hungry, thirsty, a stranger. The claims created by these situations are universally recognised though often neglected; to respond to them is a duty of "common humanity".—συνηγάγετε μα, ye received me (into your house) (cf. Judges xix. 18).—οὐκ ἔστιν ἄνηπ συνήγαγον μα εἰς οἶκον. Meyer, Weiss, and others, with stricter adherence to the literal meaning of the word, render: ye gathered me into the bosom of your family; Fritzsche: ye admitted me to your table ("simul con-vivio adhibuisti").—Ver. 38. γινομα, ἤδεινη, ἐν φυλακῇ, deeper degrees of misery demanding higher degrees of charity; naked = ill clad, relief more costly than in case of hunger or thirst; sick, calling for sympathy prompting to visits of succour or consolation; in prison, a situation at once inscrutable and repulsive, demanding the highest measure of love in one who visits the prisoner, the temptation being strong to be ashamed of one viewed as a criminal, and to shrink from his cell, too often dark and loathsome.—ἐξέφυλλεν μα, this verb is often used in the O. T. and N. T. in the sense of gracious visitation on the part of God (for γὰρ in Sept.) (vide Lk. i. 78, and the noun ἐπιστομοφόρη in Lk. xix. 44).—Ver. 37. κύριος, not necessarily spoken by disciples supposed to know or believe in Jesus (Weisse). The title fits the judicial dignity of the person addressed by whomsoever used. In disclaiming the praise accorded those who call the Judge κύριος virtually deny personal acquaintance with Him.—Ver. 40. ἐφ' ἐνοῦ, in so far as = καὶ ἐνοῦ
39. ποτε δὲ σε εἴδομεν αδελφῆς, ή δὲ φυλακῇ, καὶ ἠλθομεν πρὸς ταῖς;
40. καὶ ἀποκριθείσα δὲ βασιλεὺς ἐρέι αὐτοῖς, Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐὰν δον ἐποίησατε ἐν τοῖς τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου καὶ τῶν ἀδελφῶν, ἡμῖν ἐποίησατε.

41. "Τότε ἐκαὶ τοῖς ἐξ ἐκκλησίας, Περεπεπέτει ἐκ πάντων, οἱ 2
καταραμένοι, εἰς τὸ πῦρ τοῦ αἰῶνος, τὸ θητοραμένον τὸ διαβάλει καὶ τοῖς ἀγγέλιοις αὐτοῦ. 42. ἐπείνασα γὰρ, καὶ οὐκ ἔδωκατε μοι φάγειν, ἐδίψατε, καὶ οὐκ ἐποίησατε με· 43. ξένοι ἡμῖν, καὶ οὐ συνήγαγετε με· γυμνοὶ, καὶ οὐ περιβάλλετε με· ἀφάνεια, καὶ ἐν φυλακῇ, καὶ οὐκ ἐποίησατε με. 44. Τότε ἀποκριθείσαται αὐτοὶ καὶ αὐτοί, λέγοντες, Κύριε, ποτὲ σε εἴδομεν πεινῶν, ή δυσφθή, ή

1 BD have συνεθευνοῦντα (Tisch., W.H.).
2 Β omits τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου, probably an error of similar ending.
3 NBL 33 omit oi, a significant omission. Vide below.
4 ante has only minus. to support it.

(Heb. vii. 20, used of time in Mt. ix. 15).—ἐν... διακρίνεται, the Judge's brethren spoken of as a body apart, not subjects, but rather instruments, of judgment. This makes for the non-Christian position of the judged. The brethren are the Christian poor and needy and suffering, in the first place, but ultimately and inferentially any suffering people anywhere. Christian sufferers represent Christ, and human sufferers represent Christians.—τῶν διακρίνεται seems to be in apposition with ἀδελφῶν, suggesting the idea that the brethren of the Son of Man are the insignificant of mankind, those likely to be overlooked, despised, neglected (cf. x. 42, xviii. 5).

Vv. 41-46. καταραμένοι, cursed, not the cursed (of wanting), and without τῶν πατρῶν μου. God has no cursed ones.—εἰς τὸ πῦρ, etc., the eternal fire is represented as prepared not for the condemned man, but for the devil and his angels. Wendt brackets the clause καταραμένοι... ἀγγέλων αὐτοῦ to suggest that as Jesus spoke it the passage ran: go away from me, for I was hungry, etc.—Vv. 42, 43, simply negative all the statements contained in vv. 35, 36.—Ver. 44 repeats in summary form the reply of the δικαίος, mutatis mutandis, rapidly enumerating the states of need, and disclaiming, with reference to all, neglect of service, οὐ διακρίνεται.

The use of this term in this place is one of the exegetical grounds rested on by those who advocate the "larger hope". Another is the strict meaning of αἴωνιος: age-long, not everlasting. From the combination results the phrase: age-long, pruning, or discipline, leaving room for the hope of ultimate salvation. But the doctrine of the future states must ultimately rest on deeper considerations than those supplied by verbal interpretation. Weiss (Mt.-Evang.) and Wendt (L. J.) regard ver. 46 as an interpolation by the evangelist.

The doctrine of this passage is that love is the essence of true religion and the ultimate test of character for all men Christian or non-Christian. All who truly love are implicit Christians. For such everywhere the kingdom is prepared. They are its true citizens and God is their Father. In calling those
who love the Father’s blessed ones Jesus made an important contribution to the doctrine of the Fatherhood, defining by discriminating use the title “Father”.

**CHAPTE! XXXVI-XXXVII. THE PASSION HISTORY.** These chapters give with exceptional fulness and minuteness of detail the story of Christ’s last sufferings and relative incidents. The story finds a place in all four Gospels (Mk. xiv., xv.; Lk. xxii., xxiii.; John xix., xx.). showing the intense interest felt by Christians of the apostolic age in all that related to the Passion of their Lord. Of the three strata of evangelic tradition relating respectively to what Jesus taught, what He did, and what He suffered, the last-named probably came first in origin. Men could wait for the words and deeds, but not for the awful tale of suffering. Even Holtzmann, who puts the teaching first, recognises the Passion drama as the nucleus of the tradition as to memorable facts and experiences. In the formation of the Passion chronicle the main facts would naturally come first; around this nucleus would gather gradually accretions of minor incidents, till by the time the written records began to be compiled the collection of memorabilia had assumed the form that bears in the Gospel of Mark; the historic truth on the solemn subject, at least as far as it could be ascertained. The passionless tone of the narrative in all four Gospels is remarkable; the story is told in subdued accent, in few simple words, as if the narrator had no interest in the matter save that of the historian: ἀνάθεσις ἀκατανόητα διηγομέναι, καὶ μόνης τῆς ἀκατάστασις φρονίμου. Euthy. Ziq. ad v. 67.

Chapter xxxvi. and parallels contain the anointing, the betrayal, the Holy Supper, the agony, the apprehension, the trial, the denial by Peter. Vv. 1-5. Introductory (Mk. xiv. 1, 2, Lk. xxii. 1, 2).—Vv. 1-2 contain a prediction by Jesus two days before Passover of His approaching death; vv. 3-5 a notice of a consultation by the authorities as to how they might compass His death. In the parallels the former item appears as a mere date for the latter, the prediction being eliminated.—Ver. 1. πάντας τ. λόγου τούτους, all these sayings, most naturally taken as referring to the contents of chaps. xxiv., xxx., though a backward glance at the whole of Christ’s teaching is conceivable. Yet in case of such a comprehensive retrov, 5-15, present, either used to describe vividly a future event (Burton, M. T., § 15) or to associate it with the feast day as a fixture (ὑπήρκειαν, “calendar day and divine decree of death fixed beyond recall”) (Holtz., H. C.,) or to imply that the betrayal process is already begun in the thought of the false-hearted disciple.—Ver. 3. τὸ, two days before Passover. συνήχθησαν points to a meeting of the Sanhedrim.—καὶ τ. ἀδὲν denotes the meeting place, either the palace of the high priest in accordance with the use of αὐτὸς in later Greek (Weiss), or the court around which the palatial buildings were ranged (Meyer) = atrium in Vulgate, followed by Calvin. In the latter case the meeting would be informal. In any case it was at the high priest’s quarters they met: where-—upon Chrys. remarks: "See the inexpressible corruption of Jewish affairs. Having lawless proceedings on hand they come to the high priest seeking authority where they should encounter hindrance” (Hom. lxxix.).—Καὶ τ. ἀδέν, Caiphas, surname, Joseph his name; seventeen years high priest (vide Joseph, Ant., 18, 2, 2; 4, 3).—Ver. 4. ἦν with subjunctive after a verb of effort or plan; in classic Greek often ἦν with future indicative (Burton, § 205).—δῆλον by,
5. Πληγον δέ, "Μή ἐν τῇ δορῇ, ἢ δὲ μὴ θέρμαις γίνεται ἐν τῇ λαῷ."

6. Τοῦ δὲ Ἰησοῦ γενόμενον ἐν Βηθανίᾳ ἐν οἷς εἶχες Σίμων τοῦ Ἰμαρτιοῦ. 7. προσήλθαν αὐτῷ γυνὴ ἀλάβαστρον μορφὸν ἔχουσα 2 (gender doubtful). 8. καὶ κατέχεν ἐκ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ ἂνακεφαλίζων, καὶ ἐμύστηκεν, "Εἰς τι ἠπάλαα αὐτὴ; 9. ἦδον τοῦτο τὸ μορφὸν πραβήναι

1 ἐκείνος κρατήσω, ἀλλὰ τίνος; προσενέχεσθαι τὸν ΝΑΒΔΛΔ (Τisch., W.H., Ws.). T.R. supported only by minus.
2 ἐκείνος. 3. ἐκείνος τοῦ ἄλαβαστρον μορφοῦ in ΝΑΒΔΛΔ 13, 33, 69, etc.
4 τοῦτον in ΝΑΔΛ (Tisch.) as in T.R. in ΒΓΔΞ (W.H.). τοῦτον probably comes from John xii. 3.
5 τοῦ τῆς κεφαλῆς in ΝΒΔ Δ 1, 13, 69 al. (Tisch., W.H.). 6 ΝΒΔΛΔ omit ἀντών. 7 ΝΑΒΔΛΔ omit τὸ μορφὸν (Tisch., W.H., Ws.).

Craft, a method characteristic of clerics; indigna consultatio (Bengel): cowardly and merciless.—Ver. 5. ἐκείνος δέ: δὲ points back to ver. 1, which fixes the passion in Passover time, while the Synedrists thought it prudent to keep off the holy season for reason given.—νῦν, etc., to avoid uproar apt to happen at Passover time, Josephus testa (B.J., i., 4, 3).

Vv. 6-13. Anointing in Bethany (Mk. xiv. 3-9; cf. John xii. 1-11). Six days before Passover in John; no time fixed in Mt. and Mk. Certainly within Passion week. The thing chiefly to be noted is the setting of this pathetic scene, between priestly plotting and false disciple espionage. “Hatred and baseness on either hand and true love in the midst” (Training of the Twelve).—Ver. 6. τοῦ δὲ Ἰησοῦ, etc.: indicates the scene, in Bethany, and in the house of Simon known as the leper (the one spoken of in viii. 2). The host of Lk. vii. 36 ff. was a Simon. On the other hand, the host of John xii. 1 f., or at least a prominent guest, was Lazarus, brother of Martha and Mary. This and other points of resemblance and difference raise the question: do all the four evangelists tell the same story in different ways? On this question endless diversity of opinion has prevailed. The probability is that there were two anointings, the one reported with variations by Mt., Mk., and John, the other by Lk.; and that the two got somewhat mixed in the tradition, so that the precise details of each cannot now be ascertained. Happily the ethical or religious import of the two beautiful stories is clear.—Ver. 7. ἀλάβαστρον, an “alabaster” (vase), the term, originally denoting the material, being transferred to the vessel made of it, like our word “glass” (Speaker’s Com.), in common use for preserving ointments (Pliny, N.H., iii., 3). An alabaster of nard (μορφὸν) was a present for a king. Among five precious articles sent by Cambyses to the King of Ethiopia was included a μορφὸν ἀλάβαστρον of gold (Herod., iii., 20). On this ointment and its source vide Tristram, Natural History of the Bible, p. 454 (quoted in notes on Mk.).—βαρντιοῦ (here only in N. T.), of great price; this noted to explain the sequel.—κεφαλῆς: she broke the vases and poured the contents on the head of Jesus, feet in John; both possible; must be combined, say the Harmonists.—Ver. 8. ἡγανάκτησεν, as in xx. 24. The disciple-circle experienced various annoyances from first to last: Syrophoenician woman, mothers and children, ambition of James and John, Mary of Bethany. The last the most singular of all. Probably all the disciples disapproved more or less. It was a seaman’s act, and they were men. She was a poet and they were somewhat prosaic.—ἀνάλαβε, waste, a precious thing thrown away. To how many things the term might be applied on similar grounds! The lives of the martyrs, e.g., εἰς βόνα? That is the question; not so easily answered as vulgar utilitarians think. Beside this criticism of Mary place Peter’s revolt against the death of Jesus (xvi. 22).—Ver. 9. ἄνωθεν, etc., to be given (the proceeds, subject easily understood) to the poor. How much better a use than
to waste it in the expression of a sentiment!—Ver. 10. γνωστα, perceiving though not hearing. We have many mean thoughts we would be ashamed to speak plainly out.—τι κόσμος παρέχετα, etc., why trouble ye the woman? a phrase not frequent in classic authors, though similar ones occur, and even this occasionally (vide Kyprke); found not only here but in Lk. xi. 7, xviii. 5. Gal. vi. 17, the last place worthy to be associated with this; St. Paul and the heroine of Bethany kindred spirits, liable to "troubles" from the same sort of people and for similar reasons.—καλόν, noble, heroic: a deed done under inspiration of uncalculating love.—Ver. 11 suggests a distinction between general ethical categories and duties arising out of special circumstances. Common men recognise the former. It takes a genius or a passionate lover to see and swiftly do the latter. Mary saw and did the rare thing, and so achieved an εφόνον καλόν.—είμι δέ οὐ πί, "a quasicholy litotes" (Meyer).—Ver. 12. πρὸς τὸ ἐντοφαίνετο, prepare for burial by embalming; so near is my death, though ye thought before, that of the woman's act, not her conscious purpose. The Syriac version introduces a quasi. She meant nothing but to show her love, quickened possibly by instinctive foreboding of ill. But an act done in that spirit was the best embalming of Christ's body, or rather of His act in dying, for the two acts were kindred. Hence naturally the solemn declaration following, an essential part of the story, of indubitable authenticity.—Ver. 13. τὸ στ. τοῦ σταυροῦ, this gospel, the gospel of my death of love.—ἐν δὲ τῇ κόπωμα: after δὲν ἦν might seem superfluous; not so, however: it serves to indicate the range of the "wheresoever": wide as the world, universality predicted for Christianity, and also for the heroine of the anointing. Chrysostom, illustrating Christ's words, remarks: Even those dwelling in the British Isles (Ἑπτανήκας νῆσοις) speak of the deed done in a house in Judæa by a harlot (Hom. lxxx. : Chrys. identifies the anointing here with that in Lk. vii.).

Ver. 14-16. Judas offers to betray Jesus (Mk. xiv. 10, 11, Lk. xxii. 3-6.).—Ver. 14. τότε, then, the roots of the betrayal go much further back than the Bethany scene—vide on xvii. 22, 23— but that scene would help to precipitate the fatal step. Death at last at hand, according to the Master's words. Then a base nature would feel uncomfortable in so unworldly company, and would be glad to escape to a more congenial atmosphere. Judas could not breathe freely amid the odours of the ointment and all it embodied.—εἰς τὰ ἐπτανήκας, one of the Twelve (Ⅰ).—Ver. 15. τὰ θέλημα, etc., what are ye willing to give me? Mary and Judas extreme opposites: she freely spending in love, he willing to sell his Master for money. What contrasts in the world and in the same small circle! The mercenary spirit of Judas's act, not so apparent in Mk. and Lk.—κάγια, etc.: καλ introducing a co-ordinate clause, instead of a subordinate clause, introduced by ὅτε or ἵνα; a colloquialism or a Hebraism: the traitor mean in style as in spirit.—ὑπερβολαὶ, they placed (in the balance) = weighed out. Many interpret: they agreed = συνεφόνεσθαίναι. So Theophy: "Not as many think, instead of ἐκπονοτάτηναν". This corresponds with Mk. and Lk., and the likelihood is that the money would not be paid till the work was done (Pitzschke). But Mt. has the prophecies ever in view, and uses here a prophetic word (Zech. xi. 12, ὑπερβολαὶ τὸν μιθὸν μου τρὶς ἄρην, Sept.), indifferent as to the time when
payment was made. Coined money was in use, but the shekels may have been weighed out in antique fashion by men careful to do an inquietious thing in the most orthodox way. Or there may have been no weighing in the case, but only the use of an ancient form of speech after the practice had become obsolete (Field, Ot. Nov.). The amount was about three or four pounds sterling, a small sum for such a service; too small thinks Meyer, who suggests that the real amount was not known, and that the sum was fixed in the tradition to suit prophecy.—Ver. 16. ebdevaoupolov (Mk. vi. 31), belongs to late Greek (Lobeck, Phryn., p. 125).

Vv. 17-19. Arrangements for Paschal Feast (Mk. xiv. 12-16, Lk. xxii. 7-13).—Ver. 17. ἔδαπφισεν τῷ ἵματι. The sacred season which began on the 14th Nisan and lasted for seven days, was two feasts rolled into one, the Feast of the Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread, and it was called by either name indifferently.—καί, where? A much more perplexing question is: when? Was it on the evening of the 13th, or the 14th (beginning of 14th), as the Fourth Gospel seems to say, or on the evening of the following day, as the synoptical accounts seem to imply, that Jesus kept the Paschal Feast? This is one of many harmonistic problems arising out of the Gospel narratives from this point onwards, on which an immense amount of learned labour has been spent. The discussions are irksome, and their results uncertain; and they are apt to take the attention off far more important matters: the essentials of the moving tale, common to all the evangelists. We must be content to remain in doubt as to many points.—ἀλλαὶ ἑπιμάχομαι, the deliberative subjunctive, without ἢν after ἄλλα.—Ver. 18. ἔσχατες, go ye into the city, i.e., Jerusalem.—πρὸς τὸν δείκτα, to such a one, evidently no sufficient direction. Mk. and Lk. are more explicit. Mt. here, as often, abbreviates. Doubtless a previous understanding had been come to between Jesus and an unknown friend in Jerusalem. Euthy. suggests that a roundabout direction was given to keep Judas in ignorance as to the rendezvous.—ὁ καιρὸς μου, my time (of death). Some (Grotius, Speaker's Com., Carr, Camb. N.T.) find in the words a reason for anticipating the time of the Paschal Feast, and so one of the indications, even in the Synoptics, that John's date of the Passion is the true one.—ποιεῖ τ. π., I make or keep (present, not future), a usual expression in such a concretion. Examples in Raphel.—μετὰ τ. μ.: making thirteen with the Master, a suitable number (justa foederalis, Grotius), between the prescribed limits of ten and twenty. The lamb had to be entirely consumed (Ex. xii. 4, 43). Did Jesus and the Twelve eat the Paschal lamb?—Vv. 20-25. The presence of a traitor announced (Mk. xiv. 18-21, Lk. xxii. 21-23).—Vv. 20, 21. ἄφησεν ὅ γ. It is evening, and the company are at supper, and during the meal (εἰσῆλθεν ὁ μ., ver. 21) Jesus made a startling announcement. At what stage is not indicated. Eissner suggests a late stage: “Cum fere comedissent; vergente ad finem coenæ,” because an early announcement would have killed appetite.—Ver. 21. ἀπαράδειγμα με, shall betray me. General announcement, without any clue to the individual, as in Mk. ver. 18.—Ver. 22.
αὐτῶν, 1 "Μήτι ἐγώ εἰμι, κύριε;” 23. ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν,
“Ο δὲ ἄμβλυς μετ’ ἑμῶν ἐν τῷ ἑλπίδω τῆς χειράς, 2 οὗτος με παρα-κλὲσεν ὑμᾶς. 24. ὁ μὲν οὖς τοῦ ἄνθρωπον ἐμῆν, καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν τῷ
περὶ αὐτῶν: οὐκ οὖς ἔσθε τὸ ἄνθρωπον ἑκεῖνον, δι’ οὖς ἔσθε τοῦ ἄνθρωπον
παραδίδουταί· καλὸν ἦν αὐτῷ, εἰ οὖς ἤγανηθή ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἑκεῖνος." 25. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ οὐδεὶς ἀπαντᾷ ἀπαντᾷ εἰς τινά,
“Μήτι ἐγώ εἰμι, Ραββί;” ᾿Αριστοκράτης, ""ο νόμον ὅτι ἀναπαύῃ,
τὸν ἑαυτοῦ ἐκεῖνον, ἐκεῖσε καὶ ὁ ἔξωθεν 2 τοῖς μαθηταῖς, καὶ 4 εἶπεν, "Αὔδηστε, φάγετε·

1 εἰς ἐκατὸν without αὐτῶν in ΝΒCLZ 33 (Tisch., W.H.).
2 τὴν χειρὰ before ἔν τῷ προβλῆμα in ΝΑBLZ.
3 ΝΒCDLZ omit τοῦ.
4 For ἔξω that τ. μ. καὶ εἰς ΝΒDLZ, cursives, have δεόν Τ. μ. εἰς.
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καὶ λαβὼν τὸ ἕνα ποτήριον, καὶ ἐκχυσάτο τὸ σῶμά μου. 27. ἦσαν αὐτοὶ, λέγων, “Πιεῖτε ὥσ τούτο πάντες. 28. καὶ ἤρθε ὁ άληθὸς άληθὸς μου, τὸ τῆς καυχήσεως, τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυσάτον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἀμαρτιῶν. 29. λέγω δὲ ὦμν, ὅτι οὐκ ἂμοι, ἀμοι, ἢ ὅπως τῆς ἡμέρας ἑκατέρα, όταν αὐτὸ πίνω μεθ᾽ ὦμν καυχὴν ἐν oundary.

τοῦτο ἔστι τὸ σῶμά μου.” 43(similar exp.)

1 ΝΒΛΖΣ omit το (Tisch., W.H., Ws.).
2 καὶ is in ΝΒΔ, but wanting in ΝΒΛΖ 1, 33. W.H. put it in brackets.
3 For μου, το τῆς καυχής ΝΒΛΖ have μον της, omitting καυχής. D has the same with καυχής.
4 ΝΒΔΣΣ omit στρ (Tisch., W.H., Ws.).
5 γεννατος in ΝΒΣΚΔΛ al. πλ.

to the disciples; the cake broken into as many morsels, either in the act of giving or before the distribution began.—λαβεῖ το φάγετε, take, eat.—λαβεῖ only in Mk. (W. and H.).—φάγετε probably an interpretative addition, true but unnecessary, by our evangelist.—τοῦτο ἕστι τὸ σῶμά μου, this is my body. The ἔστι is the copula of symbolic significance. Jesus at this sacred moment uses a beautifully simple, pathetic, and poetic symbol of His death. But this symbol has had the fate of all religious symbolism, which is to run into fetish worship; in view of which the question is raising itself in some thoughtful minds whether discontinuance, at least for a time, of the use of sacraments would not be a benefit to the religion of the spirit and more in harmony with the mind of Christ than the obligatory observance.—Ver. 27. ποτήριον, a cup, the article being omitted in best MSS. It is idle, and in spirit Rabbinical, to inquire which of the four cups drunk at the paschal feast. The evangelist had no interest in such a question.—ἐκχυσάτο: a different word from ἐχαρίσασθαι; a reference to the bread, but similar in import = having given thanks to God. Observe, Jesus was in the mood, and able, at that hour, to thank and praise, confident that good would come out of evil. In Gethsemane He was able only to submit.—λέγων, etc.: Mk.'s statement that all drank of the cup, Mt. turns into a direction by Jesus to do so, liturgical practice influencing the report here as in φάγετε. Jesus would use the fewest words possible at such an hour.—Ver. 28. το αἷμα μου: the very colour of the wine suggestive; hence called αἷμα στεφάλλης in Deut. xxxii. 14; my blood, pointing to the passion, like the breaking of the bread.—τῆς διαβήσεως (for the two gen. μον τ. 8. dependent on αἷμα, vide Winer, 30, 3, 3), the blood of me, of the covenant. The introduction of the idea appropriate to the circumstances: dying men make wills (διαβήσεως οἱ ἀποθνήκορες, Euthy.). The epithet καυχής in T. R. is superfluous, because involved in the idea. The covenant of course is new. It is Jeremiah's new covenant come at last. The blood of the covenant suggests an analogy between it and the covenant with Israel ratified by sacrifice (Ex. xxiv. 8).—το περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυσάτο: the shedding for many suggests sacrificial analogies; the present participle vividly conceives that which is about to happen as now happening; περὶ πολλῶν is an echo of ἄρτῳ πολλῶν in xx. 28.—εἰς ἄφεσιν ἀμαρτιῶν: not in Mk., and may be a comment on Christ's words, supplied by Mt.; but it is a true comment. For what else could the blood be shed according to Levitical analogies and even Jeremiah's new covenant, which blessings the complete forgiveness of sin?—Ver. 29 contains an express statement of the fact implied in the preceding actions, viz., that death is near. It is the last time I will drink paschal (τοῦτον τ. γ., etc.) wine with you. I am to die at this passover. The second half of the sentence is not to be taken prosaically. It is the thought of meeting again, brought in to brighten the gloom of the leave-taking (“so tritt zu dem Lebewohl ein Gedanke an das Wiedersehen,” Holz., H.C.). To disentangle figure from fact in this poetical utterance about the new.
wine is impossible. Hence such comments as those of Bengel and Meyer, to the effect that καιρος points to a new kind of wine (“novitatem dicit plane singularum,” Beng.), serve no purpose. They turn poetry into prose, and pathos into bathos.

The remarkable transaction narrated in vv. 26-29 was an acted parable proclaiming at once the fact and the epoch-making significance of the approaching passion. It sets in a striking light the personality of Jesus; His originality, His tenderness, His mastery of the situation, His consciousness of being through His life and His death the inaugurator of a new era.—Was Judas present? Who can tell? Lk.’s narrative seems to imply that he was. Mt. and Mk. give no sign. They cannot have regarded his absence as of vital importance.


With this participle, referring to the last act within the upper chamber—the singing of the paschal hymn (the Hallel, part 2, Ps. 115-118, or possibly a new song, Grotius)—we pass without, and after talk between Jesus and the disciples, arising out of the situation, arrive at the scene of another sacred memory of the passion eve. If, as is said (Lightfoot, Hor. Heb.), it was required of Jews that they should spend passover night in Jerusalem, the spirit of Jesus led Him elsewhere—towards the Mount of Olives, to the garden of the agony.—Ver. 31. τὸ δὲ τότε, then, on the way through the valley between the city and Olivet, the valley of Jehoshaphat (Kedron), suggestive of prophetic memories (Joel iii., Zech. xiii., xiv.), leading up, as well as the present situation, to the topic.—πάντες, all; one false-hearted, all without exception weak.—ἐν ἕμοι, in what is to befall me.—ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτοῦ, So near is the crisis, a matter of hours. The shadow of Gethsemane is beginning to fall on Christ’s own spirit, and He knows how it must fare with men unprepared for what is coming.—γεγέναται γὰρ: In Zech. xiii. 7, freely reproduced from the Hebrew. Ver. 32 predicts a brighter future to alleviate the gloom. The Shepherd will yet again go before His flock (προάγον, pastoris more, Grotius), leading them.—ἐὰν ἀλλαξάνων, the place of reunion. This verse is wanting in the Fayum Fragment, which Harnack regards as a sign of its great antiquity. Resch, Agrapha, p. 495.—Ver. 33. οἱ πάντες καθισμοῦσαντες, if, or although, all shall be offended; the future implies great probability of the case supposed; Peter is willing to concede the likelihood of the assertion in reference to all the rest.—γένομεν οὖν, I, never, vehemently spoken and truly, so far as he knows himself; sincere in feeling, but weaker than he is aware of.—Ver. 34. ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, repetition of statement in ver. 31, with added emphasis (ἀλλ' εἰς τῇ, and = never? this night I tell you.—γίνονται δὲ καθισμοί διαφοράς: more exact specification of the time to make the statement more impressive = before the dawn.—διέλθησα, poetic form for διέλθηντον. This fowl not mentioned in O. T.; probably introduced into Palestine after the exile, possibly from Babylon (Benzinger, p. 38, 94). Not allowed to be kept in Jerusalem according to Lightfoot, but this is contradicted by others (Schöttgen, Wünsche). In any case the prohibition would not apply to the Romans. Though no hens had been in Jerusalem, Jesus might have spoken the words to mark
the time of night.—προς, thrice, suggestive of denial in aggravated form; on which, not on the precise number of times, as an instance of miraculous prediction, stress should be laid.—Ver. 35.

Intensified protestation of fidelity—καλ· before δέ (ἀλλά) intensive, introducing an extreme case, death for the Master.—οὐ μὴ, making the predictive future emphatically negative I certainly will not.

—διώκωσι, similarly, weaker than Μκ.'s διώκω. Very improbable, thinks De Wette. But the disciples were placed in a delicate position by Peter's protestations, and would have to say something, however faint-hearted.

Vv. 36-46. The agony (so called from the word ἀγωνία in Lk. xxii. 44, a ἀγων λογικος.)—Ver. 36. χωρίον, a place in the sense of a property or farm = villa in Vulgate, ἀγορά in Hilary, Grundstück, Weiss's translation.—Γεωργίματι, probably = έλλειπον Γνά, an oil press.

Descriptions of the place now identified with it in Robinson's Researches, Furrer's Wanderungen, and Stanley's Sinai and Palestine. —καθώρα δεῦτε: Jesus arranges that a good distance shall be between Himself and the body of the disciples when He enters the valley of the shadow of death. He expects no help from them.—κακία, there pointing to the place visible in the moonlight.—Ver. 37. παραλυμοῖς: He takes the same three as at the transfiguration along with Him that they may be near enough to prevent a feeling of utter isolation.—δόματος, He began. This beginning refers to the appearance of distress; the inward beginning came earlier. He hid His feelings till He had reduced His following to three; then allowed them to appear to those who, He hoped, could bear the revelation and give Him a little sympathy.—διώκωσι, of uncertain derivation. Euthy. gives as its equivalent βαρβαριμα, to be dejected or heavy-hearted.—Ver. 38. τοιτ λέγει αὐτῷ: He confines to the three His state of mind without reserve, as if He wished it to be known. Cf. the use made in the epistle to the Hebrews of this frank manifestation of weakness as showing that Christ could not have usurped the priestly office, but rather simply submitted to be made a priest (chap. v. 7, 8).—παρέσυρον, overwhelmed with distress, "über und über traurig" (Weiss).—ἐκ ταυτάκις, mortally = death by anticipation, showing that it was the Passion with all its horrors vividly realised that was causing the distress. Hilary, true to his doctetic tendency, represents Christ as distressed on account of the three, fearing they might altogether lose their faith in God.—σοθε: the three stationed nearer the scene of agony to keep watch there.—Ver. 39. μικρῶν, a little space, presumably near enough for them to hear (cf. Lk. xxii. 41).—οὐκ ἐξέκοψαν, on His face, not on knees, summa demissio (Beng.).—πάτερ, Father! Weiss in Markus-Evang. seems to think that the one word Abba was all the three heard, the rest of the prayer being an
expansion and interpretation by the evangelist. But if they heard one word they could hear more. The prayer uttered in such a state of distress would be a loud outburst (cf. μετὰ κρανής λογοφρακτός, Heb. v. 7), at once, therefore before the disciples had time to fall asleep or even get drowsy.—τὸ ποτήριον τοῦ τε, this cup of death. —παρὰ, etc., howbeit not as I wish, but as Thou, expressively elliptical; no doubt spoken in a calmer tone, the subdued accent suggestive of a change of mood even if the very words did not distinctly reach the ear of the three.  

Grotius, from theological solicitudes, takes θάλαμος = ἁλόιμα, "vellem" ("more Hebraeorum, qui neque potentialem neque optativum modum habent"). — Ver. 40. ἐρχεται: not necessarily immediately after uttering the foregoing prayer. Jesus may have lain on the ground for a considerable time silent.—τὸ πέτρον: all three were asleep, but the reproach was most fittingly addressed to Peter, the would-be valiant and loyal disciple.—συνεντο: Euthy. puts a mark of interrogation after this word, whereby we get this sense: So? Is this what it has come to? You were not able to watch with me one hour! A spirited rendering in consonance with Mark's version. — Vv. 42-46. Further progress of the agony.—That Jesus had not yet reached final victory is apparent from His complaint against the disciples. He came craving, needing a sympathy He had not got. When the moment of triumph comes He will be independent of them. — Ver. 42. λέγων, saying; whereupon follow the words. Mark simply states that Jesus prayed to the same effect.—οὗ δύναται: οὐ not μή. He knows that it is not possible, yet the voice of nature says strongly: would that it were!—Ver. 43. καθεδώσεται: again I surprising, one would say incredible on first thoughts, but not on second. It was late and they were sad, and sadness is soporific.—Ver. 44. Jesus leaves them sleeping and goes away again for the final struggle, praying as before.—Ver. 45. καθεδώσεται λ. κ. ἀναπαύεσθαι, sleep now and rest, not ironical or reproachful; nor yet seriously meant, but concessive = ye may sleep and rest indefinitely so far as I am concerned; I need no longer your watchful interest. The Master's time of weakness is past; He is prepared to face the worst. — ἄρα: He expects the worst to begin forthwith; the cup, which He prayed might pass, to be put immediately into His hands.—παραδίδοτα, betray the first step, on the point of being taken.—ἀρπαγότατον, the Syndefrists, with whom Judas has been bargaining. — ἀγωνία, sudden change of mood, on signs of a hostile approach: arise, let us go; spoken as if by a general to his army. — ὁ παραδίδωτος, the traitor is seen to be coming. It is noticeable that throughout the narrative, in speaking of the action of Judas, the verb παραδίδωμι is used instead of παρέδωκα: the former expresses the idea of delivering to death,
47. ἐνι τῷ αὐτῷ λαλοῦντος, ἵδοι, ἵδοις εἴς τῶν δώδεκα ἤλθε, w here and καὶ μετ' αὐτοῦ ἄλογος πολὺς μετὰ μακρινῶν καὶ ἔξως, ἀντὶ τῶν in parallel, δριχλής γρόσων καὶ προεβτέρων τῷ λαῷ. 48. ὅ ἐν παραβιδοῦσιν αὐτὸν ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς σημαίνον, λέγων, “Ὅν ἐν φίλησον, αὐτός ἔστι κρατή-

sate αὐτὸν.” 49. καὶ εὐθέως, προσελήλυθεν τῷ ἵππῳ εἶναι, “Χαῖρε,

ῥαββῆ,” καὶ κατεδίδονεν αὐτόν. 50. ὅ ἐν ἵππων ἀκοῦν ἀὐτῷ,

“Εὐαίρε, ἐφ’ ἓ φ’ πάρει;” Τότε προσελήλυθεν ἐπὶ βαθὺς τὸ χείρας

the latter of delivering into the hands of those who sought His life (Euthy. on

ver. 21). The scene in the garden is intrinsically probable and without doubt historical. The temptation was to suppress rather than to invent in regard both to the behaviour of Jesus and to that of His disciples. It is not the creation of theology, though theology has made its own use of it. It is recorded simply because it was known to have happened.

Vv. 47-56. The apprehension (Mk. xiv. 43-52, Lk. xxii. 47-53).—ἐνι τῷ δώδεκα, as in ver. 14, repeated not for information, but as the literary reflection of the chronic horror of the apostolic church that such a thing should be possible. That it was not only possible but a fact is one of the almost undisputed certainties of the passion history. Even Brandt, who treats that history very sceptically, accepts it as fact (Die Evangelische Geschichte, p. 18).—μετ’ αὐτοῦ, etc.: the description of the company to whom Judas acted as guide is vague; δυναμικ. is elastic, and might mean scores, hundreds, thousands, according to the standard of comparison.—δύναμις does not suggest soldiery as its constituents, neither does the description of the arms borne—swords and staves. Lk. (xxii. 52, στρατηγοῦ τ. ἱρατοῦ) seems to have in his mind the temple police, consisting of priests and Levites with assistants, and was probably intrinsically probable, though Brandt (E. G., p. 4) scours it. The Jewish authorities would make arrangements to ensure their purpose; the temple police was at their command, and they would send a sufficiently large number to overpower the followers of their victim, however desperate their resis-

dance. —Ver. 48. Ὑπέθεκεν: the traitor, as he approached the place where he shrewdly guessed Jesus would be, gave (accidit, Vulg.), not had given. His plan was not cut and dry from the first. It flashed upon him as he drew near and began to think how he would meet his Master. The old charm of the Master

reasserts itself in his soul, and he feels he must salute Him affectionately. At the same instant it flashes upon him that the kiss which both smouldering love and cowardice compel may be utilised as a sign. Inconsistent motives? Yes, but such is human nature, especially in the Judas type: two-souled men, drawn opposite ways by the good and evil in them; betraying loved ones, then hanging themselves.—Ver. 48. αὐτὸς ἔστω, He and no other is the man.—Ver. 49. κατεδίδονεν, kissed Him heartily. In late Greek there was a tendency to use compounds with the force of the simple verb, and this has been supposed to be a case in point (De Wette). But coming after φίλησον, ver. 48, the compound verb is plainly used with intention. It occurs again in Lk. vii. 38, 45, xv. 20, obviously with intensive force. What a tremendous contrast between the woman in Simon’s house (Lk. vii.) and Judas! Both kissed Jesus fervently: with strong emotion; yet the one could have died for Him, the other betrays Him to death. Did Jesus remember the woman at that moment? —Ver. 50. ἐπέθεε: so might a master salute a disciple, and disciple or companion is, I think, the sense of the word here (so Elsner, Palairet, Wolf, Schanz, Carr, Camb. N. T.). It answers to ῥαββῆ in the salutation of Judas.—ἴρι δὲ πάρει, usually taken as a question: "ad quid venisti?" Vulg. Wherefore art thou come? A. V. “What? Are you come for me?” Winer: sacher. Against this is the grammatical objection that instead of δε should have been ηλί. Winer, § 24, 4, maintains that δε might be used instead of ἐστι in a direct question in late Greek. To get over the difficulty various suggestions have been made: Fritzsch. renders: friend, for what work you are come! taking δε = εἰσο. Others treat the sentence as elliptical, and supply words before or after: e.g., say for what you are come (Morison), or what you have come for, that do, R. V., Meyer, Weiss. The last is least satisfactory, for Judas had already done it, as Jesus instinctively
47—55.

ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ

ἐν τοῖς ἑσυχοῖς, καὶ ἔκρατησαν αὐτὸν. 51. Καὶ ἦδον, εἰς τῶν μετὰ ἑσυχοῖς, ἐκτένεις τὴν χειρά, ἀκέραιας τὴν μάχαιραν αὐτοῦ, καὶ
πατάς τοὺς δύον τοῦ ἐρχόμενου ἀφέλειν αὐτοῦ τὸ ᾗτον. 52. τότε λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ ἑσυχοὶ, "Ἀπόστρεψον τοὺς μάχαιραν τῶν ἑσυχοῖς, εἰς τῶν τόπων αὐτῆς: πάντες γὰρ οἱ λαβόντες μάχαιραν ἐν μαχαίρᾳ ἀπολούνται. 53. ἦς διότι οὐδὲν ἄρτος ἐρχόμενος, ἀρπάζεται τοῦτον τὸν ἱερέα μου, καὶ παρασκεύης μοι πλείως ἢ δακτιλιά λεγενῶς ἀγγέλων; 54. τὰς οὖν πληροῦσιν αὐτοῖς 
γενέσθαι;

55. 'Εν ἰκείμην τῇ ἁρπαγεῖ τῶν ἑσυχοὶ τοὺς ἁγίους, "Ως εἰπέ 
λατὴν ἰδίες μετὰ μαχαιρίων καὶ ἐξέβαλεν με; καθ' 

1 σου after τῶν μάχαιρας in ΝΒDL.
2 ἐρτὶ after παρασκεύης μοι in ΝΒDL 33 al. (Tisch., W.H.).
3 For πλείως η ΝΒDL have πλαίως. The reading in T. R. is a grammatical correction uncalled for, as the construction in πλαίως λεγενῶς is good Greek.

knew. Fritzschhe's suggestion is ingenious, and puts a worthy thought into Christ's mouth. Perhaps the best solution is to take the words as a question in effect, though not in form. Disciple, for which, or as which you are present? Comrade, and as a comrade here? So Judas pretended, and by the laconic phrase Jesus at once states and exposes the pretence, possibly pointing to the crowd behind in proof of the contrary. So in effect Beng.: "hoccine illud est cujus causa ad esse"; also Schanz. The point is that the Master gives the false disciple to understand that He does not believe in his paradox affection.

Vv. 51-54. Blood drawn.—Ἰδού, introducing a second scene connected with the apprehension (cf. ver. 47); the use of a weapon by one of Christ's disciples. A quite likely occurrence if any of them happened to have weapons in their hands, though we may wonder at that. It might be a large knife used in connection with the Paschal feast. Who used the weapon is not said by the Synop. Did they know? The article before μάχαιρα might suggest that the whole party were armed, each disciple having his sword. The fear that they might be explains the largeness of the band following Judas.—Ver. 52. Ἀπόστρεψον: Jesus could not encourage the use of arms by His disciples, and the order to sheathe the weapon He was sure to give. The accompanying word, containing a general legal maxim: draw the sword, perish with the sword (the subsequent history of the Jewish people a tragic exemplification of its truth), suitably enforces the order. Weiss thinks that this word recorded here was spoken by Jesus at some other time, if at all, for it appears to be only a free reproduction of Rev. xiii. 10 (Meyer, ed. Weiss). This and the next two verses are wanting in Mk. and Lk.—Ver. 53 gives another reason for not using the sword: if it were God's will that His Son should be rescued it could be done in a different way. The way suggested is described in military language, the verbs παρακαλίσω and παρασκεύασω being both used in classics in connection with military matters, and the word λεγενῶς suggesting the battalions of the Roman army.—δακτιλιά, twelve legions, one for each of the twelve disciples.—πλαίως, even more than that vast number, Divine resources boundless. The free play of imagination displayed in this conception of a great army of angels evinces the elasticity of Christ's spirit and His perfect self-possession at a critical moment.—Ver. 54. τὰς οὖν: refers to both forms of aid, that of the sword and that of angels (Grotius, Fritzschhe); rescue in any form inconsistent with the predicted destiny of Messiah to be a sufferer.—ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, etc., the purport of all prophetic scripture is that thus it should be: apprehension and all that is to follow.

Vv. 55, 56. Jesus complains of the manner of His apprehension.—By ἐν τῇ δρόμῳ connects with ἐκφάνησαν αὐτὸν in ver. 50. Having said what was necessary to the bellicose disciple, Jesus turns to the party who had come to arrest Him,
here called τοις ἐξολοθρεύσασιν. — ἦν ἐν αὐτῇ, etc.: the words may be taken either as a question or as a statement of fact. In either case Jesus complains that they have arrested Him as if He were a robber or other criminal. A robber as distinct from a thief (vide Trench, Synonyma) is one who uses violence to possess himself of others' property, and Christ's complaint is in the first place that they have treated Him as one who meant to offer resistance. But the reference to His past habit in the sequel seems to show that He has another complaint in His mind, viz., that they have regarded Him as one hiding from justice. The allusion is to the invasion of His privacy in the garden, and the implied suggestion that they have put a false construction on His presence there. They think He has been seeking escape from His fate when in fact He has been bracing Himself up for it! To what misconception the holiest and noblest actions are liable, and how humiliating to the heroic soul! It was thoroughly characteristic of Jesus that He should feel the humiliation, and that He should at once give expression to the feeling. This against Brandt (p. 6), who thinks this utterance in no respect appropriate to the situation.—καὶ ἦμεραν, etc.: Jesus asks in effect why they did not apprehend Him while, for several days in succession, He sat in the temple precincts teaching. To this it might be replied that that was easier said than done, in midst of a miscellaneous crowd containing not a few friends of the obnoxious teacher (so Brandt). But what Jesus is concerned to point out is, not the practicability of arrest in the temple, but that His behaviour had been fearless. How could they imagine that a man who spoke His mind so openly could sink away into hiding-places like an evil-doer? Brandt remarks that the complaint is addressed to the wrong persons; to the underlings rather than to the hierarchs. It is addressed to those who actually apprehended Jesus, whoever they were. Who composed that crowd it would not be easy in the dark to know.—Ver. 56. τούτῳ δὲ: a formula of the evangelist, introducing another reference by Jesus to the prophecies in these terms, ἢν προφητεύειν, etc. Jesus reconciles Himself to the indignity in the manner of His arrest, as to the arrest itself, and all that it involved, by the thought that it was in His "cup" as described by the prophets. The prophetic picture of Messiah's experience acted as a sedative to His spirit.—τότε, then, when the apprehension had been effected, and meekly submitted to by Jesus.—πάντες, Peter included.—ἐφώνον, fled, to save themselves, since their Master could not be saved. Thus that bitter drop in the cup: absolute loneliness.

Vv. 57-68. Before Caiphas (Mk. xiv. 53-65; Lk. xxii. 54, 66-71).—πρὸς Καίαφαν, to Caiphas, who sent them forth, and who expects their return with their victim.—δεικνύω: where, i.e., in the palace of Caiphas.—ὑπὲρ καλοῦ: scribes and presbyters, priests and presbyters in ver. 3. Mk. names all the three; doubtless true to the fact.—συνήθειαν, were assembled, waiting for the arrival of the party sent out to arrest Jesus. In Mk. the coming together of the Sanhedrim appears to be synchronous with the arrival of Jesus. This meeting happens when the world is asleep, and when
eager for damnatory evidence. Those who responded deserved to be stigmatised as false. None but base, mean creatures would have borne evidence in such a case.—56, only two had anything to say worth serious attention.—Ver. 61. οὖν ὑποτασσομένον, this person said: then follows a version of a word really spoken by Jesus, of a startling character, concerning destroying and rebuilding the temple. An inaccurate report of so remarkable a saying might easily go abroad, and the version given by the two witnesses seems to draw Jesus into explanations about the saying which will make it more damaging as evidence against Him. What about this pretentious word...
of yours; is it true that you said it, and what does it mean?—Ver. 63. ἔρωιάτα: Jesus seeing the drift of the questions gave the high priest no assistance, but continued silent.—ἐρωταίῳ (ἐρωταίῳ more common in classics). The high priest now takes a new line, seeing that there is no chance of conviction any other way. He puts Jesus on His oath as to the cardinal question of Messiahship.—ἐλευθερίαν ἐκ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, etc.: not two questions but one, Son of God being exegetical of the title Christ. If He was the one He was the other ipso facto.—Ver. 64. οὐ εἰρήνως: in current phrase = I am. Was Jesus morally bound to answer? Why not continue silent? First, the whole ministry of Jesus had made the question inevitable. Second, the high priest was the proper person to ask it. Third, it was an important opportunity for giving expression to His Messianic self-consciousness. Fourth, silence would, in the circumstances, have amounted to denial.—καὶ ἐν εἰρήνει not = "nevertheless but rather = "more: I have something more startling to tell you. What follows describes the future of the Son of Man in apocalyptic terms, and is meant to suggest the thought: "the time is coming when you and I shall change places; I then the Judge, you the prisoners at the bar". Vv. 65-68. τάτου: At last they have, or think they have, Him at their mercy. —διδυμῆς, etc.: a very imposing act as the expression of true emotion; in reality a theatrical action demanded by custom and performed in accordance with rule: length and locality of rent, the garments to be rent (the nearer; all of them, even if there were ten, said the Rabbinical rule: note the plural here, τὰ ἱματια), all fixed. A common custom among Eastern peoples. It was highly proper that holy men should seem shocked immeasurably by "blasphemy".—δῆλαφθήσεται: Was it blasphemy for a man to call Himself Messiah in a country where a Messiah was expected? Obviously not. It might be to call oneself Messiah falsely. But that was a point for careful and deliberate examination, not to be taken for granted. The judgment of the high priest and the obsequious vote of the Sanhedrin were manifestly premature. But it does not follow from this that the evangelist's account of the trial is unhistorical (Brandt, p. 62). The Sanhedrists, as reported, behave suo more.—Ver. 66. ἐν θανάτω: death the penalty of blasphemy, Lev. xxiv. 15, and of being a false prophet, Deut. xviii. 20. —Vv. 67-68: to judicial injustice succeed personal indignities: spitting in the face (ἐνθρονευσάς), smiting with the fist (ἀπεκλάδευσε) (ἐκαλάδον, originally to beat with rods). Euthy. Zig. distinguishes the two last words thus: καλαφισμὸς is a stroke on the neck with the hollow of the hand so as to make a noise, βαρσυμφ is a stroke on the face. The perpetrators of these outrages in Mk. are τινὲς and οἱ ξυπτρίας. The former word presumably pointing to some Sanhedrins. In Mt. the connection suggests Sanhedrins alone. Incredible that they should condescend to so unworthy proceedings, one is inclined to say. Yet it was night, there was intense dislike, and they might feel
they did God service by disgracing a pretender. Hence the invitation to the would-be christ to prophesy (προφητεύω) who smote him when he was struck behind the back or blindfolded (Mt. xiv. 63). Thus did they fill up the early hours of the morning on that miserable night. Sceptical critics, e.g., Brandt, p. 69, also Holtz, H. C., suggest that the colouring of this passage is drawn from O. T. texts, such as Micah iv. 14 (Sept. v. 1, A. V.), Is. l. 6, lii. 3-5, 1 Kings xxii. 24, and that probably the texts created the "facts". That of course is abstractly possible, but the statement of the evangelist is intrinsically probable; no one can be noted that not even in Mt. is there a "that it might be fulfilled".

Vv. 69-75. Peter's denial (Mt. xiv. 66-72, Lk. xxii. 54-62). The discrepancies of the four accounts here are perplexing but not surprising. It would be difficult for any one present in the confused throng gathered within the palace gate that night to tell exactly what happened. Peter himself, the hero of the tale, had probably only hazy recollections of some particulars, and might not always relate the incident in the same way. Harmonic efforts are wasted time that not away from the crowd in the court.—that night to tell exactly what happened. But on the whole it is best to take each version by itself, as one way of telling a story, which in the main is accepted even by writers like Brandt as one of the certainties of the Passion history.

Ver. 69. δὲ Πέτρος ἔδεικνυτο· δὲ Πέτρος ἔδεικνυτο. First denial, entailing others to follow.—Ver. 71. εἶναὶ τοῖς πολλοῖς, to or towards the gateway, away from the crowd in the court.—Ἀλλὰ (παραίτησιν), another saw him, and said, not to him, but to others there (not easy to escape!).—οὗτος, etc., this person, pointing to him, was, etc.—Ver. 72. μεθ' δρακον: second denial, more emphatic, with an oath, and more direct: I know not the man (ὡν ἐστιν).—Ver. 73. τοῖς ἀντίκρουσιν, loungers; seeing Peter's confusion, and amusing themselves by tormenting him. —Ἀλλὰ, beyond doubt, you, too, are one of them; of the notorious gang.—Ἡ λαλία: They had
heard him speak in his second denial, which so leads up to a third. Galilean speech was defective in pronouncing the gutturals, and making ψ = χ.—Ver. 74. κατεδαφίζων (here only καταναλ. in T. R., probably belonging to vulgar speech, Meyer), to call down curses on himself, sign of irritation and desperation; has lost self-control completely.

καὶ εἴδον: just after this passionate outburst a cock crew.—“Magna circumstantia,” Beng.—Ver. 75. καὶ πάρασχοι: The cock crowing caused a sudden revulsion of feeling, and flashed in on Peter’s mind the light of a vivid recollection: the word his Master had spoken. —πρὶν, etc., repeated as in ver. 34. ἰδεῖν, going out, neither in fear of apprehension (Chrys., Euthy.) nor from shame (Orig., Jer.), but that he might give free rein to penitent feeling. —τελαφόντας, wept loudly, as distinct from δεκατόν (John xi. 35), to shed tears.

Chapter XXVII. The Passion History Continued.—Vv. 1, 2. Morning meeting of the Sanhedrin (Mk. xv. 1, Lk. xxii. 66, xxiii. 1).—Ver. 1. συνβόλων Δαβίδ: this consultation took place at a meeting of Sanhedrin, which was probably only a continuation of the night meeting, though regarded as formally a second meeting, to keep right with the law which humanly required, at least, two sittings in a grave criminal case; the Sanhedrists in this, as in all things, careful to observe the letter, while sinning against the spirit of the law. Those who were present at the night meeting would scarcely have time to go home, as the hearing of many witnesses (xxvi. 59) would take hours. Absent members might be summoned to the morning meeting (Elsner), or might come, knowing that they were expected. —πάλιν points to a full meeting, as does also τοῦ λαοῦ after πρεσβύτεροι. The meeting was supremely important, though in one respect pro forma. The law or custom required a death sentence to be pronounced during day-time. Therefore, the vote of the night meeting had to be formally confirmed. Then they had to consider in what shape the case was to be put so as to ensure the consent of Pilate to the execution of their Pien- tence; a most vital matter.—ὅτε βανδάλως αὐτὸν, so that they might compass His death; the phrase seems meant to cover both aspects of the business on hand: the formal sentence of death, and the adoption of means for securing that it might be carried into effect. —δοθέω, with infinitive, here expresses tendency: that He should die the drift of all done. The result as yet remained uncertain.—Ver. 2. δίστασε: no mention of binding before in Mt. s narrative. If Jesus was bound at His apprehension the fetters must have been taken off during the trial.—ἀγγέλων, etc., they led Him away and delivered Him to Pontius Pilate. No mention at this point what they had resolved to say to Pilate. That comes out in Pilate’s questioning. Pilate was a very undesirable judge to come to with such a case, a poor representative of Roman authority; as described by Philo and Josephus, as destitute of fear of God or respect for justice, as the unjust judge of the parable; but, like him, accessible on the side of self-interest, as, no doubt, the Sanhedrists in this, as in all things, careful to observe the letter, while sinning against the spirit of the law. The more specific title was ἄρχοντος, procurator. The ordinary residence of procurators was Caesarea, on the sea coast, but it was their custom to be in Jerusalem at passover time, with a detachment of soldiers, to watch over the public peace. Vv. 3-10. The despair of Judas.—Peculiar to Matthew; interesting to the evangelist as a testimony even from the
false disciple to the innocence of Jesus, and the wickedness of His enemies, and as a curious instance of prophecy fulfilled.—Ver. 3. τότε connects the repentance of Judas with the leading of Jesus away to Pilate which he regarded as sealing his fate. What happened was but the natural result of the apprehension which he himself had brought about, and he doubtless had the natural issue in view at the moment of apprehension. But reaction had set in, partly as a matter of course in a "two-souled" man, partly at sight of the grim reality: his Master led to death by his assistance (ὅπερ κατεκρίθη).—μεταμεληθείς, regretting, wishing it were undone. —ἀντιτρητεία (ἀντιτρητεία W.H. as in Is. xxxviii. 8), returned the thirty pieces of silver, a sign in such a nature that the repentance as far as it went was very real. —μαρτυροι. I sinned, I did wrong.—παραδίδειν ἀ. ἀ. explains how. The sinning and the betraying are one, therefore the participles do not point to an act antecedent to that of the main verb.—αἷμα ἄδου, innocent blood, for the blood of an innocent person. So in Deut. xxvii. 25. Palairet cites examples to prove that Greek writers used αἷμα as = ἀνθρωπος.—τί πρὸς ἡμᾶς; that is not our concern.—σὺ δεῦ, look thou to that = "tu videris," a Latinism. The sentiment itself a Cainism. —"Ad modum Caini loquentur vera progenies Caini" (Grotius).—Ver. 5. ἐξ τῶν ναῶν, not in that part of the temple where the Sanhedrim met (Grotius), or in the temple at large, in a place accessible to laymen (Fritzsche, Bleek), or near the temple (Kypke), but in the holy place itself (Meyer, Weiss, Schnol, Carr, Morison); the act of a desperate man determined they should get the money, and perhaps hoping it might be a kind of atonement for his sin.—ἀντίγραφο, strangled himself; usually reconciled with Acts i. 18 by the supposition that the rope broke. The suggestion of Grotius that the verb points to death from griev ("non laqueo sed moestitiat") has met with little favour.—Ver. 6. κορβαν, the treasury, referred to by this name by Joseph. (B. J. ii. 9, 4).—τιμὴ αἵματος ἢνι: exclusion of blood money from the treasury, an extension of the law against the wages of harlotry (Deut. xxiii. 18).—Ver. 7. τὸν ἄγνων τ. κεραμέων, the field of the potter. The smallness of the price has suggested to some (Grotius, e.g.) that it was a field for potter's clay got cheap because worked out. But in that case it would naturally be called the field of the potters.—ἔψινι most take as referring to Jews from other lands dying at Jerusalem at passover time.—Ver. 8. ἄγνως αἵματος = acetidio, Acts i. 18, name otherwise explained there.—ἐν τῷ σήμαιρε: phrase frequent in O. T. history; sign of late date of Gospel, thinks De Wette.

Vv. 9, 10. Prophetic reference, τότε, as in ii. 17, not ἦν or ἦν. —διὰ ἱεραμοῦ, by Jeremiah, in reality by Zechariah (xi. 13), the reference to Jeremiah probably due to there being somewhat similar texts in that prophet (xviii. 2, 3, xxxii. 6-15) running in the evangelist's mind. A petty error. More serious is the question whether this is not a case of prophecy creating "facts," whether the whole story here told is not a legend growing out of the O. T. text.
quoted. So Brandt, who thinks the betrayal the only fact in the story of Judas, all the rest legendary (E. G., p. 11). The truth rather seems to be that facts, historical traditions, suggested texts which otherwise would never have been thought of. This may be inferred from the manipulation necessary to make the prophecy correspond to the facts: Ἐλαβόν, 1st person singular in Sept., 3rd person plural here = they took; the expression “the children of Israel” introduced with apparent intention to make the nation responsible for the betrayal; the substitution of the phrase “the field of the potter” for “the house of the Lord”. And after all the manipulation how different the circumstances in the two cases! In the one case it is the prophet himself, valued at a petty sum, who cast his price into the House of the Lord; in the other, it is the priests, who bought the life of the prophet of Nazareth for a small sum, who give the money for a potter’s field. The only real point of resemblance is the small value set upon a prophet in either case. It is a most unsatisfactory instance of prophetic fulfilment, almost as much so as that in Mt. ii. 23. But its very unsatisfactoriness makes for the historicity of the story. That the prophetic text, once associated with the story in the minds of believers, reacted on the manner of telling it, e.g., as to the weighing of the price (xxvi. 13), and the casting of the money into the holy place (xxvii. 5), is conceivable.

Vv. 11-26. Jesus before Pilate (Mk. xv. 2-15, Lk. xxiii. 2-7, 13-25).—Ver. 11. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς: §1 resumes an interrupted story (ver. 2).—ἢ ἐλ., etc.: Are Thou the King of the Jews? The question reveals the form in which the Sanhedrists presented their accusation. They had translated “Christ” into “King of the Jews” for Pilate’s benefit, so astutely giving a political aspect to what under the other name was only a question of religion, or, as a Roman would view it, superstition. A most unprincipled proceeding, for the confession of Jesus that He was the Christ no more inferred a political animus than their own Messianic expectations.—οὐκ ἀπεκρίθη: yes. One is hardly prepared for such a reply to an equivocal question, and there is a temptation to seek escape by taking the words interrogatively = dost thou say so? or evasively, with Theophy., = you say, I make no statement. Explanations such as are given in John xviii. 33-37 were certainly necessary.—Ver. 12. The accusations here referred to appear to have been made on the back of Pilate’s first question and Christ’s answer. Mark indicates that they were copious. Luke formulates the charge before Pilate begins to interrogate (xxii. 2). The purpose of their statements would be to substantiate the main charge that Jesus claimed to be King of the Jews in a sense hostile to Roman supremacy. What were the materials of proof? Possibly perverse construction of the healing ministry, of the consequent popularity, but the independent attitude towards Rabbinism, suggesting a defiant spirit generally.—οὐκ ἀπεκρίθη: (note use of 1st aorist middle instead of the more usual ἀπεκρίθη). Jesus made no reply to these plausible mendacities, defence vain in such a case.—Ver. 13. Pilate noting His silence directs His attention to what they have been saying.—Ver. 14. Καὶ οὐκ ἀπεκρίθη: still no reply, though no disrespect to the governor intended.—Ὅτι δὲ ἠθάμαζεν, etc., the governor was very much ( مواح, at the end, emphatic) astonished: at the silence, and at the man; the silence attracting
attention to the Silent One.—A new type of Jew this. The result of his observation is a favourable impression; how could it be otherwise? Pilate was evidently not alarmed by the charge brought against Jesus. Why? Apparently at first glance he saw that the man before him was not likely to be a pretender to royalty in any sense that he need trouble himself about. The verb in an emphatic position in ver. 11 suggests this = You the King of the Jews! Then there was nothing to bear out the pretension: no position, prestige, wealth, following; no troops, etc. (Grotius).

Vv. 15-18. Appeal to the people.—Pilate, not inexperienced in Jewish affairs, nor without insight into the ways of the ruling class, suspects that there are two sides to this matter. The very accusation suggests that the accused may be innocently popular, and the accusers jealous. An existing custom gives the opportunity of putting this to the test.—Ver. 15. κατὰ λαβὼν, at feast time (singularis fastis, Hermann, Viger, p. 633), not all feasts, but the passover meant.—εἷδεν, was accustomed; time and circumstances of the origin of this custom unknown; a custom likely to arise sooner or later, as it symbolised the nature of the passover as a passing over (Weiss-Meyer), and helped to make the governor’s presence at that season wear a gracious aspect; on that account probably originating under the Romans.—Ver. 16. ἐξῆς: they, the people (εὐλπ, ver 15).—ἀποκρισίμην: pointing not to the magnitude of his crime, but to the fact that for some reason or other he was an object of popular interest.—Βαραβᾶς, accusative of Βαραβᾶς = son of a father, or with double p, and retaining the v at the end, Bar-Rabban = son of a Rabbi. Jerome in his Commentary on Mt. mentions that in the Hebrew Gospel the word was interpreted filius magistri eorum. Origen mentions that in some MSS. this man bore the name Jesus, an identity of name which makes the contrast of character all the more striking. But the reading has little authority.—Ver. 17. τίνα ἔλεγες αὐτῶν ὁ Πλατών; Barabbān, he ἤτοι τῶν λεγόμενων Χριστόν;” 18. ἢ τις γὰρ ὁ ἦς κατὰ τὸ φθονὸν παρεδίωκεν αὐτῶν. 19. Καθημένος δὲ αὐτοῦ ἔπει τῷ βήματος, ἀπότειλε πρὸς αὐτὸν ἢ γινήτων, λέγουσα, “Μηθύν οὖ ν καὶ τῇ δικαίῳ ἑκεῖνῃ πολλὰ ἐμὴ γὰρ ἐπάθην σήμερον κατὰ ἄνω δὲ αὐτῶν.” 20. Οἱ δὲ ἀρματησάντες οἱ προσβάπτοντες οὖν διὰ τοὺς δυσχῶν, ἦν αὐτής ἦν τὸν Βαραβᾶν,

But the reading has little authority.—Ver. 17. τίνα ἔλεγες αὐτῶν ὁ Πλατών; Barabbān, he ἤτοι τῶν λεγόμενων Χριστόν;” 18. ἢ τις γὰρ ὁ ἦς κατὰ τὸ φθονὸν παρεδίωκεν αὐτῶν. 19. Καθημένος δὲ αὐτοῦ ἔπει τῷ βήματος, ἀπότειλε πρὸς αὐτὸν ἢ γινήτων, λέγουσα, “Μηθύν οὖ ν καὶ τῇ δικαίῳ ἑκεῖνῃ πολλὰ ἐμὴ γὰρ ἐπάθην σήμερον κατὰ ἄνω δὲ αὐτῶν.” 20. Οἱ δὲ ἀρματησάντες οἱ προσβάπτοντες οὖν διὰ τοὺς δυσχῶν, ἦν αὐτής ἦν τὸν Βαραβᾶν,
\[ \text{326 KATA MATHAION XXVII.} \]

\[ \text{τὸν δὲ Ἰησοῦν ἀπολέσωσιν. 21. ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν ἀτοίς, "Τίνα θέλετε ἀπὸ τῶν δυο ἀπολοίων ὃμίν;" ὁ δὲ εἶπεν, "Βαρραβᾶν." 22. Λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Πιλάτος, "Τί οὖν ποιήσει Ἰησοῦν τὸν λαγόμενον Χριστὸν;" "Λέγουσαν αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τῶν πάντων, "Σταυρωθῆναι."} \]

\[ \text{1 Μκ. κ. ἰδι. 23. Ὁ δὲ ἦμεν ἐφο, "Τι γὰρ κακὸν ἐποίησαν;" ὁ δὲ περι-} \]

\[ \text{έφῃ, "Ἐφο. ἦν ἡ πρεσβεία ἐν τῇ πόλει." 24. Ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ Πιλάτος, ex. ἐβαλεῖ-} \]

\[ \text{δυνατὸς ἡ πρεσβεία ἐν τῇ πόλει. Καὶ οὖν ἀπεκλείσθη ὁ Πιλάτος τὸν διδάσκαλον Ἰησοῦν, μὴ ἠλθόντως ἐκ τῆς πόλεως.} \]

\[ \text{1 \text{τὸν} \text{πρίν} \text{Βαρ. \text{in} ΝΒΜ 1, 33.} \text{2 \text{αὐτῷ} \text{ἐμεί} \text{in} \text{ΝΑΒΔΑΣ.} \text{3 \text{ΝΒ 33, 69 omit Ἐγγέλων.} \text{4 \text{καινοτόμος} \text{in} \text{BD (W.H. in text bracketed).} \text{5 \text{ΝΑΔΣ have καινοτόμος (Tisch.)}}} \text{6 BD omit τὸν διδάσκαλον, which probably has crept in from ver. 19.}} \]

\[ \text{Vv. 20-26. \text{Result of the appeal to the people.}—Ver. 20. \text{οi δὲ ἔφη, etc.: the Sanhedrists saw the danger, and set themselves to bias the popular judgment, not sure what might otherwise happen—} \]

\[ \text{with success, ἰπτέων. So when, after due interval, the governor put the} \]

\[ \text{question, the reply was (ver. 21) τὸν Βαρραβᾶν, and to the further question what} \]

\[ \text{then was to be done with Jesus: the unanimous (πάντες) reply was Ἀσταυρο-} \]

\[ \text{θήτω. Where were the men who had} \]

\[ \text{a few days ago shouted Hosanna? If there, how sickle; if absent, why? Or} \]

\[ \text{were they silent, cowed by the prevailing mood?—Ver. 23. \text{τί γὰρ κακὸν: ellipt-} \]

\[ \text{ical, implying unwillingness to carry out the} \]

\[ \text{popular will. (Fritzscbe, Grotius.) Some, Palairet, Raphael, etc., take γὰρ} \]

\[ \text{as redundant, the son of the Chief priests,} \]

\[ \text{they kept crying out more loudly. Cf. Mk., where the force of περιστούσισ comes out} \]

\[ \text{more distinctly.—Ver. 24. \text{ἐγίνεται ἄφθαρτος, that it was no use, but rather} \]

\[ \text{only provoked a more savage demand, as in the way of mobs. ἀφαίνεται, etc.: washed his hands, following a} \]

\[ \text{Jewish custom, the meaning of which} \]

\[ \text{all present fully understood, accompanying the action with verbal constructions of innocence. This also, with the grim} \]

\[ \text{reply of the people (ver. 25), peculiar to Mt.: a "traditional addition." (Weiss.)—Ver. 26. \text{τοῦτο ἀπενεργεῖται: Pilate, lacking} \]

\[ \text{the passion for justice, judges not} \]

\[ \text{according to the merits but according to policy. When he discovered that Jesus} \]

\[ \text{was not a popular favourite, in fact had no} \]

\[ \text{friends, he had no more interest in Him, but acted as the people wished, loosing} \]

\[ \text{Barabbas and delivering Jesus to be} \]

\[ \text{crucified, after having first subjected Him to scourging (ἐσμαχθῶς ἐσμαχθῆναι, a Latinism probably borrowed from Mk.). Such was the barbarous} \]

\[ \text{practice of the Romans. It is alluded to by Josephus (B. J., v. ii, 1) in these} \]

\[ \text{terms: μαστίγωται δὲ καὶ προσβασισμοὶ τοὺς διδάσκαλος, καὶ καταδίκα-} \]

\[ \text{σθημοὺς τοῦ δασετοῦ τῶν κάτω οἰκονομῶν ἀνετραυτοῦ τοῦ θέλοντος ἀνατρα-} \]

\[ \text{τραπετοῦ, Brandt thinks that the alleged custom of releasing a prisoner had no existence, and that the story in the Gospels arose out} \]

\[ \text{of an occurrence at a later time, the release of a prisoner the son of a Rabbi} \]

\[ \text{concerned in a tumult. The Christians} \]

\[ \text{say: they released the son of the Scribe, and crucified our Jesus, and at} \]

\[ \text{last the incident was read back into the story of the Passion (E. G., pp. 94-105).} \]

\[ \text{Vv. 27-31. \text{Jesus the sport of the} \}

\[ \text{soldiery (ΜΚ. xv. 16-20).—Ver. 27. \text{τῶν ὡς} \text{when Jesus had been sentenced to crucifi-} \]

\[ \text{cion.—ὁ στρατηγὸς ὁ δὲ, the soldiers} \]

\[ \text{of the governor, i.e., his bodyguard.} \]

\[ \text{στρατηγῶν, etc.: they conducted} \]

\[ \text{Jesus from the scene of judgment (without-} \]

\[ \text{out) to the στρατηγὸς, i.e., the official} \]

\[ \text{residence of the procurator, either Herod's} \]

\[ \text{palace, or more probably a palace connected} \]

\[ \text{with the fort Antonia, with barracks attached. The word has various} \]

\[ \text{meanings: a general's tent, a governor's} \]

\[ \text{residence, the barracks of the Praetorian} \]
27. TOTΕ oI strαταπότι ΤΟύ ΑΓΕΜΟΝΟΣ, παραλαβότες τον 'ΗΓΕΜΟΝΟΣ
εΙς τό πραυταρίοις, συνήγαγον ετ' αυτόν δλήν τήν σταυράν. 28. καὶ ο Μκ. ἁτ. 
ἐκδύσατες ἀυτόν, περιλήθασαν αὐτῷ χλαμύδα κοκίννην. 29. καὶ 
πλέξατες στέφανον ἐλακθάν, ἐπέθηκαν ἐπὶ τήν κεφαλήν αὐτοῦ, 
καὶ κλάμαν εἰς τήν δεξίαν αὐτοῦ καὶ γυναικεῖότας ἐμπροσθέν 
αὐτοῦ, ἐνέπαιζον αὐτῷ, λέγοντες, "Χαίρε, ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν 
Ιουδαίων." 30. καὶ ἐπιτύπατες εἰς αὐτόν, ἁλαβὸν τὸν κλάμαν, 
καὶ ἐπανέθηκαν εἰς τήν κεφαλήν αὐτοῦ. 31. καὶ ὅτε ἐνέπαιζαν αὐτῷ, 
ἐξεκένθησαν αὐτὸν τήν χλαμύδαν, καὶ ὑθύσαν αὐτὸν τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ 
καὶ ἀπήγαγον αὐτὸν εἰς τό σταυρόσα. 32. Ἐξερχόμενοι δὲ εὗρον

guard, the Praetorian guard itself.—συνήγαγον, etc.: gathered about Him 
(for sport) the whole στρατόπεδο, at most a 
cohort of 600, more probably a maniple 
of 200. ("στρατόπεδο, anything twisted 
round like a ball of thread, is a translation 
of 'manipulus'; a wisp of hay." 
Carr in Cam. N. T., ad loc.) A large 
number to assemble for such a purpose, 
but Roman soldiers at passover time 
would always be on the alert for serious 
work or sport, and here was no ordinary 
chance of both, a man sentenced to be 
executed by death for lack of the Jews. 
What more natural than to make 
sport of Him, and through Him to show 
their contempt for the Jewish people? 
(Holtzmann, H.C.)—Ver. 28. ἐκδύσατες 
(or ἐκδύσατος): taking off (or putting 
on) His clothes. If we adopt the former 
reading, the implied situation will be 
this: Jesus first stripped for scourging, 
thenn reclothed; then stripped again at 
the commencement of the mocking pro-
cess. If the latter, this: Jesus after 
scourging led naked to the praetorium, 
there clothed, all but His upper gar-
ment, instead of which they put on 
χλαμύδα κ. (Meyer).—χλαμύδα κοκίννην, a 
scarlet cloak, probably a soldier's sagum. 
Carr renders a soldier's scarf, and suggests 
that it may have been a worn-out scarf 
of Pilate's (Herod's, Elaner). The ridic-
ule would be more lifelike if it was 
really a fine article that might be, or had 
been, worn by a potentate—πλέξατε 
στέφανον, weaving out of thorns a crown; 
not, say Meyer and Weiss, hard and 
sharp, so as to cause great pain, but 
young, flexible, easily plaited, the aim 
being to ridicule not to inflict torture. 
Possibly, but the soldiers would not 
make a point of avoiding giving pain. 
They would take what came first to 
hand.—κλάμαν, a reed; apparently 
under the gov. of ἐπέθηκαν, but really 
the object of ἐθηκαν, understood.—γυναῖ-
κεῖας ἐμπροσθέν αὐτοῦ: after the investiture comes 
the homage, by lovely gesture and wor-
shipful salutation: χαίρε βασιλεύ τ. Ι. 
Hail, King of the Jews. A mockery of 
the nation in intention quite as much as 
of the particular victim. Loesner (Obs-
erver, ad N. T.) adduces from Philo. (in 
Placcum, 6) a historic parallel, in which 
the youth of Alexandria treat similarly a 
half-witted person, Karabas, the real 
design being to insult Herod Agrippa. 
Schanz and Holtzmann also refer to this 
incident.—Ver. 30. At this point rough 
sport turns into brutal treatment; the 
formal moment for execution of the sentence 
approaches.—ἐμπροσθέντες: spitting,sub-
stituted for kissing, the final act of 
homage, followed by striking with the 
mock sceptre (ἐτύπασαν ε. τ. κ.).—Ver. 
31. ἐξεκένθησαν, etc.: they took off the 
mock royal robe, and put on again 
His own garments (τὰ ἱμάτια, the upper 
garments, but why the plural?). No 
mention of the crown; left on according 
to some of the ancients, Origen, e.g.: 
"semel imposita et nunquam detracta.; 
and, according to the same Father, con-
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assumed by the head of Jesus ("consumptum a capite Iesu"). Taken off doubtless along with the rest, for there must be no mockery of Jesus or Jews before the public. Such proceedings only for the barracks (Holtz, H.C.).

Vv. 32-38. Crucifixion (Mk. xvi. 21-27; Lk. xxiii. 26, 35-38).—This part of the story begins with the closing words of ver. 31: "they led Him away to be crucified."—Ver. 32. ἔφερχομαι: going out (of the city) according to later Roman custom, and in harmony also with Jewish usage (Num. xv. 35; Kings xxii. 23, Acts vii. 58).—ἀνφ. Κυρ.: a man of Cyrene, in Libya, presumably recognisable as a stranger, with whom liberties might be taken.—ὑγράψαντος, compelled; a military requisition. Cf. at chap. v. 41.—οἱ ἄρη τ. σ. Jesus, carrying His cross according to the custom, has broken down under His burden. Gethsemane, betrayal, the ordeal of the past sleepless night, scourging, have made the flesh weak. No compassion for Him in finding a substitute; the cross must be carried, and the soldiers will not.—σταυρών: see on ver. 35.—Γολοθά: Weiss remarks on the double λεγόμενον—before the name, and in the following interpretation—and thinks it a sign that Mt. is copying from Mk. One wonders indeed why Mt., writing for Jews, should have used at all as κρανίων τότος, place of a skull (“Calvariae locus,” Vulg., whence “Calvary” in A. V.), of skulls rather, say many interpreters; a place of execution, skulls lying all about (Jerome started this view). Recent interpreters (including Schanz) more naturally take the word as pointing to the shape of the hill. The locality is quite uncertain.

Ver. 34. οἶνον μετὰ χολῆς μ., wine mingled with gall. Mk. has ἐπιρρυτισμένον αὐτόν, wine drugged with myrrh, a drink given by a merciful custom before execution to deaden the sense of pain. The wine would be the sour wine or posca used by Roman soldiers. In Mk. Jesus declines the drink, apparently without tasting, desiring to suffer with clear mind. In Mt. He tastes (γευσάμενος) and then declines, apparently because unpalatable, suggesting a different motive in the offerers, not mercy but cruelty; maltreatment in the very drink offered. To this view of the proceeding is ascribed the μετὰ χολῆς of Mt.’s text, not without the joint influence of Ps. lix. 22 (Meyer and Weiss). Harmonists strive to reconcile the two accounts by taking χολή as signifying in Hellenistic usage any bitter liquid (quamvis amaritum, Eissner), and therefore among other things myrrh. Prov. v. 4, Lament. iii. 15 (Sept.), in which χαῖρε stands for wormwood, ἰχθὺς, are cited in proof of this.

Against the idea that Mt.’s text has been altered from Mk.’s under the influence of Ps. lix. 22, is the retention of οἶνος (δῖος in Ps. and in T. R.) and the absence of any reference to the passage in the usual style—"that it might be fulfilled," etc.

Ver. 35. σταυρώσατε (from σταυ- ρόν, to drive stakes; in later Greek, and in N. T., to impale on a stake, σταυρός). All the evangelists touch lightly the fact of crucifixion, hurrying over the painful subject as quickly as possible; Mt., most of all, dispensing with it in a participial clause. Many questions on which there has been much discussion suggest themselves, e.g., as to the structure and form of the cross: did it consist of an upright beam (palus, stipes) and a cross beam (patibulum, antenna), or of the former only, the hands being nailed to the beam above the head? (so Fulda, Das Kreuz und die Kreuzigung, 1878). Was Christ’s cross a crux commissa (T) or a crux immissa (f)? Or is this distinction a purely imaginary one, as Fulda (p. 126) maintains against Justus Lip-
33—38

33. δὲ αὐτὸν, "διεμερίσατο τὰ ἱματιὰ αὐτοῦ, "βαλλόντες ἶκληρον Ἰνα: Lk. xi. 17, 18; xii. 24; xii. 55; xxii. 17. Acts ii. 32.

34. καὶ οὕτωσις ὁ σταυροῦμας, ἵνα διαφύλαξον τὸν κακὸν, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν κρίσιν μου ἐβαλον κλήρου. 35. καὶ οὕτωσις ὁ σταυροῦμας ἵνα διαφύλαξον τὸν κακὸν, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν κρίσιν μου ἐβαλον κλήρου. 36. καὶ οὕτωσις ὁ σταυροῦμας ἵνα διαφύλαξον τὸν κακὸν, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν κρίσιν μου ἐβαλον κλήρου.

38. Τότε σταυροῦματι σὺν αὐτῷ δύο λησταὶ, εἰς ἐκ δεξιῶν καὶ εἰς ἐκ εὐθώνων.

1 βαλλόντες in ἸΝΔ (W.H. in margin).

2 From ἰκληρον to end of ver. 35 is omitted in ἸΝΔΣΔΚ. It has probably come in from John xix. 24.

33. δὲ αὐτὸν, "διεμερίσατο τὰ ἱματιὰ αὐτοῦ, "βαλλόντες ἶκληρον Ἰνα: Lk. xi. 17, 18; xii. 24; xii. 55; xxii. 17. Acts ii. 32.

34. καὶ οὕτωσις ὁ σταυροῦμας, ἵνα διαφύλαξον τὸν κακὸν, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν κρίσιν μου ἐβαλον κλήρου.

35. καὶ οὕτωσις ὁ σταυροῦμας, ἵνα διαφύλαξον τὸν κακὸν, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν κρίσιν μου ἐβαλον κλήρου.

36. καὶ οὕτωσις ὁ σταυροῦμας, ἵνα διαφύλαξον τὸν κακὸν, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν κρίσιν μου ἐβαλον κλήρου.

38. Τότε σταυροῦματι σὺν αὐτῷ δύο λησταὶ, εἰς ἐκ δεξιῶν καὶ εἰς ἐκ εὐθώνων.

1 βαλλόντες in ἸΝΔ (W.H. in margin).

2 From ἰκληρον to end of ver. 35 is omitted in ἸΝΔΣΔΚ. It has probably come in from John xix. 24.

sium, till Fulda the great authority on the subject of crucifixion? The work of the more recent writer should certainly be consulted before coming to a final decision on the form of the cross or the method of crucifixion. Another question is, what did Jesus carry to the place of execution: the upright post or the cross beam? (the latter according to Marquhardt, Röm. Alter. vii. 1, 1). And how was His body fixed to the cross: were the feet, e.g., nailed as well as the hands, or only tied to the beam with a rope or with wands or left free? The passages cited from ancient authors bearing on the subject, Artemidorus, Plautus, Seneca, are diversely interpreted, and the practice does not seem to have been invariable. Crucifixion was at best a rude mode of executing justice, and, especially in time of war, seems to have been performed by soldiers in diverse fashions, according to their whim (ἄλλον ἄλλω χειρὶ πρὸς χειρὶν, Joseph., v. i, i; plates showing various forms in Fulda). Still there would be a normal mode, and in the case of Jesus, when only one or two were put to death, it would probably be followed. His cross has generally been supposed to have been a crux immissa, with the accusation on the point of the upright post above the cross beam, with a peg whereon to sit. Whether His feet were pierced with nails cannot be certainly determined. Paulus took the negative side in the interest of the hypothesis that Jesus did not really die on the cross; Meyer strongly maintains the contrary, vide ad loc. The fragment of the Gospel of Peter speaks of nails in the hands only: "then they drew the nails from the hands of the Lord". Fulda takes the same view, representing the hands as nailed, the feet as tied to the beam.—τὰ ἱπτάνα: the probability is that Jesus had been stript absolutely naked (γυμνὸς σταυροῦμας, Artemid., Oneirocritica, ii. 58). On the dividing of the garments vide John xix. 23 f. The prophetic reference in θελησθή in T. R. has little authority, and seems inserted from John xix. 24, by a scribe who thought it what the first evangelist should say. This is a second instance where a chance of prophetic citation is not taken advantage of.—Ver. 36: this statement about the executioners sitting down to watch Jesus takes the place of a statement as to the time of execution in Mk. The purpose apparently was to guard against a rescue. —Ver. 37: this fact is mentioned out of its proper place. It is probable that the placard with the accusation was fixed up before the cross was erected. As it stands in Mt.'s narrative, it looks like an after-thought of the soldiers as they sat keeping watch, their final jest at the expense of their victim and the nation to which He belonged. What the custom was as to this is not known. Of the various versions of the inscription Mk.'s is the shortest: The ΚΩΝΟ ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ; to this Mt. prefixes: This is Jesus.—Ver. 38: τοῦτο introduces the fact mentioned as an accomplishment of the crucifixion of Jesus, without indicating its precise place in the course of events. —σταυροῦμας, the historical present with lively effect; and passive, probably to imply that this act was performed by other soldiers. This very slight notice grows into a considerable incident in the hands of Luke.

Vv. 39-44. Taunts of spectators (Mk. xv. 29-32; Lk. xxiii. 35-37, 39). The last drop in Christ's bitter cup. To us it may seem incredible that even His worst enemies could be guilty of anything so brutal as to hurl taunts at one suffering the agonies of crucifixion. But men then felt very differently from us, thanks to the civilising influence of the
Christian faith, which has made the whole details of the Passion history so revolting to the Christian heart. These sneers at the great Sufferer are not invented fulfilsments of prophecy (Ps. xxii. 7, 8; so Brandt), but belong to the certainties of the tragic story as told by the synoptists.—Ver. 39. εἰς τῷ παρουσιαζομένῳ, the passers by: the place of crucifixion therefore near a road; going to or from the temple services (Speaker's Com.); or on work-day business, the 14th not the 14th of the month? (Fritzsche, De Wette).—κυνωνίζει τ. κ. α., shaking or nodding the head in the direction of the cross, as if to say: that is what it has come to.—Ver. 40. διὰ καταλύων (cf. ἐν θέασθαι, xxiii. 57), this and the other taunts seem to be echoes of words said to or about Jesus at the trial, of which a report has already gone abroad among the populace. Whether the saying about destroying the temple was otherwise known can only be a matter of conjecture.—εἰς τὸν ναὸν ο. ι.: Jesus had confessed Himself to be the Son of God at the trial (xxvi. 64).—κατάβαθσι: the God of this world and all men of the world have but one thought as to Sonship; of course it means exceptional privilege. What can a Son of God have to do with a cross?—Ver. 41. ἤνωσεν, etc.: one might have expected the dignitaries, priests, scribes, elders, to have left that low-minded work to the mob. But they condescend to their level, yet with a difference. They speak about the Sufferer, not to Him, and in a tone of affected seriousness and fairness.—Ver. 42. ἀλλοι ἔσωσεν, etc., He saved others, Himself He cannot save. Both facts; the former they can now afford to admit, and they do so all the more readily that it serves as a foil to the other fact, patent to everybody. —βασιλέως τ. Messianic King — the claim involved in the confession before the Sanhedrin, refuted by the cross, for who could believe that Messiah would be crucified?—κατέβασαν τ. ε. etc.: yet let Him come down now from the cross, and we will believe on Him at once. These pious scoffers profess their readiness to accept descent from the cross as the conclusive sign from heaven they had always been asking for.—Ver. 43. This looks like a mere echo of Ps. xxii. 9 (not a literal quote), but of the Sept., however, rather recalling Is. xxxvi. 5) rather than a word likely to be spoken by the Sanhedrists. What did they know about the personal piety of Jesus? Probably they were aware that He used to call God "Father," and that may be the basis of the statement, along with the confession of Sonship before the Sanhedrin: θεοῦ εἰμί, etc.—τότε, now is the time for testing the value of His trust, a plausible wicked sneer.—εἰς τὸν ναὸν ο. ι.: Fritzsche supplies ἤκολος after this phrase and renders: the same thing.
did the robbers, for they too reproached Him ("idem vero etiam latrones fecerunt, nempe ei conviciatis sunt"). It seems simpler to take άντιδ ατιν as one of two accusatives, depending on άνεντίην, ατιν following (the true reading) being the other. Vide Winer, § 32, 4.

Vv. 45-49. Darkness without and within (Mk. xv. 33-36, Lk. xxiii. 44-46). — Ver. 45. ιδέν χρόνος: three hours, according to Mark (ver. 25, cf. 33), after the crucifixion the darkness came on. This is the first reference in Matthew to a time of day. The definiteness of the statement in this respect seems to vouch for the historicity of the fact stated. Those who find in it legend or myth point to the Egyptian darkness, and prophetic texts such as Amos viii. 9, Joel ii. 20, etc. (none of which, however, are cited by the evangelist), as explaining the rise of the story. The cause of this darkness is unknown (vide notes on Mark). It could not, of course, be an eclipse of the sun at full moon. Origen saw this and explained the phenomenon by the hypothesis of dense masses of cloud hiding the sun. Others (Paulus, De Wette, etc.) have suggested a darkening such as is wont to precede an earthquake. To the evangelist the event probably appeared supernatural. — ἐκ τ. γῆς, Origen and many after him restrict the reference to Palestine. The fragment of the Gospel of Peter limits it to Τ. Ἰουδαίας (μαρτύρει τ. Ἰουδαίων). In the thought of the evangelist the expression had probably a wider though indefinite range of meaning, the whole earth (Weiss) or the whole Roman world (Grotius). — έστιν τ. άνεντίην: the end as exactly indicated as the beginning, another sign of historicity. The fact stated probably interested the evangelist as an emblem of the spiritual eclipse next to be related. — Ver. 46. άλλα, τ. άλλα, etc.: the opening words of Ps. xxi., but partly at least in Aramaic not in Hebrew, wholly so as they stand in Codex B (W.H.), but, l., l., etc., corresponding exactly to the version in Mark. — τ. άλλα, if the true reading in Matthew, seems to be an alteration made to suit what follows, whereby the utterance of Jesus becomes a mixture of Hebrew and Aramaic. It is not likely that Jesus would so express Himself. He would speak wholly either in Hebrew or in Aramaic, saying in the one case: "el eli lamah asavtani"; in the other: "eloi eloi lama savachtani". The form the utterance assumed in the earliest evangelistic report might be an important clue. This Resch finds in the reading of Codex D, which gives the words in Hebrew. Resch holds that D often preserves the readings of the Urevangelium, which, contrary to Weiss, he believes to have contained a Passion history in brief outline (Agrapha, p. 53). Brandt expresses a similar view (E. G., pp. 228-233). The probability is that Jesus spoke in Hebrew. It is no argument against this that the spectators might not understand what He said, for the utterance was not meant for the ears of men. The historicity of the occurrence has been called in question on the ground that one in a state of dire distress would not express his feelings in borrowed
phrases. The alternative is that the words were put into the mouth of Jesus by persons desirous that in this as in all other respects His experience should correspond to prophetic anticipations. But who would have the boldness to impute to Him a sentiment which seemed to justify the taunt: "Let Him deliver Him if He love Him"? Brandt's reply to this is: Jewish Christians who had not a high idea of Christ's Person (E. G., p. 245). That in some Christian circles the cry of desertion was an offence appears from the rendering of "eli eli" in Evang. Petri—καὶ ἐδοθή μοι ἡ σωτηρία μου ἡ σωτηρία μου = my strength, my strength. Its omission by Luke proves the same thing.—Ver. 47. τινὲς δὲ: not Roman soldiers, for they knew nothing about Elias; might be Hellenistic Jews who did not understand Hebrew or Aramaean (Grotius); more probably heartless persons who only affected to misunderstand. It was poor wit, and showed small capacity for turning to advantage the words spoken. How much more to the purpose to have said: Hear Him! He actually confesses that His God in Whom He trusted has forsaken Him.—Ver. 48. εἶδεν ἵνα, one of the bystanders, not one of the τινὲς, with some human pity, acting under the impression, how got not indicated, that the sufferer was afflicted with thirst.—δεντρον, sour wine, posca, the drink of Roman soldiers, with sponge and reed at hand, for use on such occasions.—Ver. 49. δὲ: either redundant coalescing with δομημερέ: let us see (cf. chap. vii. 4), age videmus, Grotius (vide also Burton, M. T., § 161), or meaning: hold, stop, don't give Him the drink, let us see whether Elias will come (ἐχειρισθαῖ, comes without fail) to help Him. The latter is the more probable. The λαός belongs to the scooping crew. The remainder of this verse about the spear thrust—another, final, act of mercy, though attested by important MSS., seems to be imported from John xix. 34. It is omitted in R. V. Vv. 50-56. Death and its accompaniments (Mk. xv. 37-44, Lk. xxiii. 46-49).—Ver. 50. πατήρ, pointing back to the cry in ver. 46. —πώς μεγάλη. The Fathers found in the loud cry a proof that Jesus died voluntarily, not from physical exhaustion. Some modern writers, on the contrary, regard the cry as the utterance of one dying of a ruptured heart (Dr. Stroud on The Physical Cause of Christ's Death; Hanna, The Last Day of Our Lord's Passion). Mt.'s narrative, like Mk.'s, gives the impression that the cry was inarticulate. Brandt recognises this cry as historical.—Ver. 51. καὶ θάνατον, introducing solemnly a series of preternatural accompaniments, all but the first peculiar to Mt.—τὸ καταπέμπεσα, the veil between the holy place and the most holy.—ἐσχήζει: this fact, the rending of the veil, is mentioned by all the Synoptists, though Lk. introduces it at an early point in the narrative. It might have happened, as a natural event, an accidental coincidence, though it is not so viewed by the evangelist. A symbolic fiction, according to Brandt. The legendary spirit took hold of this event, magnifying the miracle. In the Hebrew Gospel the rending of the veil is transformed into the fracture of the lintel of the temple: "Superliminare templi infintae magnitudinis fractum esse atque divisum" (Jerome, Com.).—καὶ ἡ γῆ, etc.: an earthquake, preceding and conditioning the greatest marvel of all, the opening of the graves and the resurrection of many saints (vv. 52 and 53). We seem here to be in the region of Christian legend. Certainly the legendary spirit laid hold of this feature with great eager-
ness, expanding and going into details, giving, e.g., the names of those who rose: Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, etc. (Vide Evang. Nicod., c. 17, and The Acts of Pilate in Thilo's Codex Apostrophus, N.T., p. 810).—Ver. 53. μετὰ τὴν ἑκατέραν αὐτοῖς, after the raising (active) of Jesus (by God), i.e., after Christ's own resurrection: not after the raising (of them) by Him, as if αὐτοῖς were genitive subjective. So Fritzsche, who, however, brackets the phrase as a doubtful reading. ἑρότικον occurs here only in N. T.—Ver. 54. ἐκατέργασας = κατεργάσας in Mk., the officer in charge of the detachment entrusted with the execution, not hitherto mentioned.—οἱ μετα αὐτοῖς, etc.: the whole military party make pious reflections in Mt.; in Mk., with more probability, the centurion only.—καὶ τὰ γινόμενα, and (generally) the things happening, the earthquake included. For a similar use of καὶ vide xxvi. 59.—οἱ θεοί: Lk. substitutes for this "a just man". In the centurion's mouth the words would mean more than that he was less than the average bear for a Christian = a hero, an extraordinary man. Yet Lk.'s rendering is to the point, because the Roman soldier is conceived as seeing in the events the anger of the gods at the treatment of an innocent man.—Ver. 55. γυναῖκες, women, bolder than men, love casting out fear. Lk. associates with them others called οἱ γυναῖκοι αὐτοῖς. His acquaintance, which might include the disciples. Though they fled panic-stricken they may have rallied and returned to see the end, either along with the women or mixed in the crowd, and so have become qualified afterwards for witnessing to what happened. It is no argument against this that no mention is made of them in the narratives. It is no part of the plan of the evangelists to indicate the sources of their information. The women are not mentioned for this purpose, but because they have a part to play in the sequel. If they had been introduced as witnesses it would not have been made so clear that they stood "afar off" (ἀπὸ μακρόθεν). In like manner that Peter followed his Master to the judgment hall is told, not that he may be available as a witness, but because there is a story of denial to relate about him.—πολλαὶ, many, a tribute to the impression made on feminine hearts by the Galilean ministry; for it was from Galilee they came, as the following clause states (aevina, etc., defining them as women who knew Him well, loved Him warmly, and served Him devotedly).—Ver. 56. ἐν αἷς: three out of the many named, with a reference to the sequel, or as the best known. Mary of Magdala (first mention in Mt.), Mary, the mother of the well-known pair of brothers, and the mother of the sons of Zebedee (Salome in Mk.).

Vv. 57-66. Burial (Mt. xiv. 42-47, Lk. xxiii. 50-55). ἡλθον, etc., there came (to the place of crucifixion, the centre of interest in the preceding narrative) a man (unknown to readers), rich (this fact put in the forefront by Mt.—εὐσεβῆνων βουλευτῆς in Mk. On εὐσεβῆνων Phrynichus remarks that the vulgar take it as = rich, or in good social position, while the ancients took it as applying to the noble or symmetrical. Mt. may be following vulgar usage, but also with an eye to Is. lxxx. 9: "with the rich in
His death”); from Arimathaea (Ramath-aim Zophim, 1 Sam. i. 1); the name Joseph, and the relation to Jesus that of a disciple (ἰατρός), which, if the correct reading, is an instance of the use of this verb in a neuter sense. Cf. xiii. 52, xxvii. 29, Acts xiv. 21.—Ver. 58. προσκόλλω: from the cross Joseph returns, and approaches Pilate to beg the body of Jesus for burial. In the case of the crucified such a request was necessary, but was generally granted (“Eorum in quos animadvertit corpora non alter sepeliuntur quam si fuerit petitum et permissum.” Ulpian. de Càdav. punct. in Justinian, Corpus Jur. Gr. xvi. 24. 1). The general practice was to leave the bodies to waste. The privilege of burial was sometimes granted for money.

There is nothing to show that Pilate condescended to such meanness, at least in the present instance, though Theophy, suggests that he did.—ἐκδίδων ἐκ τοῦ ἱματίου, he ordered it to be delivered.—Ver. 59. ἐντύλιξεν (little used, found in Aristophanes), wrapped.—συνόν καθαρρί, in clean, i.e., never before used linen.—συνόνδισις is of uncertain derivation and varying sense, being supplied to cloths of diverse material, but here generally understood as meaning linen cloth, wrapped in strips round the body as in the case of mummies in Egypt, the body being first washed (Acts ix. 37). As to this way of preparing dead bodies for burial we have no details in O. T. (Benzinger, p. 163).—Ver. 60. ἐν τῷ καινῷ ἀρχούμενῳ, in his own new tomb, recently prepared for himself. This not brought out in parallels.—ἐνατόμου (ὁ λόγος): the aorist for the pluperfect, as in ver. 55; he had hewn out of the rock = ἐν τῷ, ὕποπτος, the article pointing to the custom of making sepulchres in rock.—ἀλλον μέγαν: the usual mode of shutting the door of the tomb; the Jews called the stone goal, the roller.—ἀπήλθεν: the entombment over, Joseph went away; but the Dead One was not left alone.—Ver. 61. ἦν δὲ κει, etc., but, in contrast to Joseph, there was there Mary, the woman of Magdala, also the other Mary, sitting in front of the tomb.—τάφων here, as in xxiii. 27, 29, used of a place of burial, not of the act of burial. The word is peculiar to Mt. in the N. T.

Vv. 62-66. Precautions against theft of the body; peculiar to Mt., and among the less certain elements of the Passion history, owing its origin and presence in this Gospel apparently to the exigencies of the primitive Christian apologetic against Jewish unbelief, which, as we gather from ver. 64, must have sought to invalidate the faith in the resurrection of Jesus by the hypothesis of theft accounting for an empty grave. The transactions here recorded effectually dispose of that hypothesis by making theft impossible. Is the story true, or must we, with Meyer, relegate it to the category of unhistorical legend? Meyer finds largely on the impossibility of Christ predicting so distinctly as is here implied, even to His own disciples, His resurrection. That means that the priests and Pharisees could have had no such solicitude as is ascribed to them. All turns on that. If they had such fears, so originating, it would be quite natural to take precautions against a trick. I think it quite possible that even independently of the saying in chap. xii. 40, given as spoken to Pharisees, it had somehow reached their ears that Jesus had predicted His Passion, and in speaking of it was wont to connect with it the idea
59—66.

**EYAGGELION**

64. καλέσαντος οὖν ἀσφαλισθήναι τῶν τάφων ἡμῶν τῆς Λατιν. 

65. ἔφη δὲ ἀδέσποτος οἱ πιλάτος, ἡ διά τοῦ καιροῦ καὶ έσται Ἡ ἐσχάτη ἡ πλήρες Χριστός τῆς πρότης. 

66. Οἱ δὲ προευθύνετε ἂναλιστοῦν τῶν τάφων, σφραγίζωστε τὸν λίθον μετὰ τῆς κουστοδιαίας.

---

1. W. H. place it in margin.
2. οὐκ ἔγερσαν, found in CDL al. (W. H. omit). 
3. BL. and other uncialss omit δ (Tisch., W. H., in margin).

---

of rising again, and it was natural that at such a time they should not despise such reports.

Ver. 62. τῇ ἑαυτῆς, the next day, i.e., the Jewish Sabbath, curiously described as the day (ἐπίκειται) metὰ τὴν παρασκευὴν, the more important day defined by reference to the less important, suggesting that Mt. has his eye on Mk.'s narrative (εκ δεύτερου). So Weiss-Meyer. Ver. 63. ἐγέρσατο: contemptuous reference, as to one not worthy to be named, and far off, a thing of the past removed for ever by death.—ὁ πλάτων: a wanderer in the first place, then derivative, from the character of many wanderers, in N. T. a deceiver.—ἐγέρσατο, present for future, expressing strong confidence.—Ver. 64. ἔτοιμος τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμέρᾳ: the definite specification of time here and in ver. 63 may have been imported into the story in the course of the tradition.—ἡ ἐγέρσατο πλάνη, the last delusion = faith in the resurrection, belief in the Messiahship of Jesus being the first.—χείρ, worse, not so much in character as in consequences, more serious.—Ver. 65. ἔρχεται: probably imperative, not indicative = have your watch, the clock which thinks there is not likely to be much need for it, but has no objections to gratify their wish in a small matter. So most recent interpreters—Meyer, Weiss, Holtz, Weiszacker, Morison, Spk., Com., Alford. The Vulgate takes it as indicative = habitat, which Schanz follows. This rendering implies that Pilate wished them to be content with what they had already, either their own temple watch or soldiers already put at their disposal. Carr (Camb. N. T.) doubts the correctness of the modern interpretation on the ground that no clear example of the use of ἔρχεται in the sense of "to take" occurs in either classical or Hellenistic Greek.—κουστοδιαί, a guard, a Latinism, a natural word for the Roman Pilate to use. —ὑπάγετε ἄσφαλισθήτε, the three verbs: ἔλθατε, ἔταγε, ἀσφαλίσασθε, following each other without connecting particles form an asyndeton "indicating impatience on the part of Pilate" (Camb. N. T.).—δὲ ὀφθαλμέ, as ye know how.—Ver. 66. ᾿γείραστο, ἀναλιστόωπτο, is to be taken with the last clause. —μετὰ τῆς κουστοδιαίας, which points to the main means of securing the tomb against plunder. The participial clause.—σφραγίσαστε τὸν λίθον—i.e. a parenthesis pointing to an additional precaution, sealing the stone, with a thread over it and sealed to the tomb at either end. The worthy men did their best to prevent theft, and—the resurrection! 

**CHAPTER XXVIII. THE RESURRECTION AND THE GREAT COMMISSION.**

Vv. 1-10. The open grave (Mk. xvi. 1-8, Lk. xxiv. 1-11).—Ver. 1. οὐ δύναται, a curious and puzzling note of time, inconsistent with itself if translated "late on Sabbath, towards daybreak on the first day of the week," and on the assumption that the day is supposed to begin and end at sunset. That would give, as the time at which the events to be narrated happened, the afternoon of one day and the early morning of the next. Of course the two clauses are meant to coincide in meaning, and a way out of the difficulty must be sought. One is to take ὅσιος as = past, after the Sabbath, or late in comparison with the Sabbath, σαββατικῷ in clause 1 being in effect a genitive of comparison. So Rithy and Grotsius, who take σαββάτῳ as = the whole passover week, De Wette, Weiszäcker, etc. Another is to take ὅσιος as = not later than, but late on, and to assume that the day is conceived to begin and end with sunrise according to the civil mode of reckoning. So Kypke, Meyer, Weiss, Morison. Authorities are divided as to
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XXVIII. 1. "OYEE DE sabbatov, τῆς ἐντφωκσμος εἰς μίαν σαββατισμοpons, ἥλε Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνή, καὶ ἡ ἄλλη Μαρία, δεμφύλαζε τῶν τάφων. 2. Καὶ Ἰδοῦ, σωμάτως ἐγένετο μέγας ἐγγέλης γὰρ Κυρίου κάταβας εἰς ὅραμα, προσελθὼν ἐπεκάλυψε τὸν λίθον ἀπὸ τῆς θύρας. 3. Ἰδοῦ δὲ ἡ Ιδηα αὐτῶς ἐγέρθη, ἐκείνη ἐκ τῆς θύρας. 4. Ἀνακαθίσας δὲ ὁ ἐγγέλης εἶπε ταῖς γυναικίς, "Μὴ φοβεῖσθε ὑμεῖς· οἴδα γάρ ὅτι ἤσυχον τῶν ἐσταιρωμένων ζητείτη. 5. Οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ θάνατος· ἥγερθη γὰρ, καθὼς εἶπε. 6. Ἰδοῦ, ἤτει τῶν τούτων ἐνοίκουσαν

1 καὶ before προσελθὼν in ΝΒCL.
2 ΝΒD omit απὸ τῆς θύρας (so Τισχ. and W.H.).
3 ΝΒD have ὅσει here, and with these ΛΔ in end of ver. 4.
4 εγερθησαν in ΝΒCL.

Greek usage, Meyer and Weiss, e.g., contending that ἐνόικος always means lateness of the period specified, and still current. Holtzmann, H. C., remarks that only from the second clause do we learn that by the first is not meant the evening of the Sabbath, but the end of the night following, conceived as still belonging to the Sabbath.—τῆς ἐντφωκσμος, supply ἤματα or ἡμέρας—εἰς μίαν, σαββατισμος, towards day one of the week (Sabbath in first clause). ἦλθε, came, singular though more than one concerned, as in xxvii. 50, 51. Mary of Magdala, evidently the heroine among the women.—δεμφύλαζε τ. τ., to see the sepulchre; no word of anointing, that being excluded by the story of the watch. —Ver. 2. The particulars in this and the following two verses are peculiar to Mt.: first, an earthquake (εἰσαγόμενος), as in xxvii. 51; second, an angel descending from heaven; third, the angel rolling away the stone; fourth, the angel sitting on the stone as guard.—Ver. 3. Iδα (here only in N. T.; in Sept., Dan. i. 13, 15), the appearance, aspect (of the countenance of the angel). Vide Trench, Syn., p. 262, on μορφῇ, σχῆμα, Ιδα.—εἰς ὁστρακή (xxiv. 27), as lightning—brilliant, dazzling.—τὸ ἐνόικον αὐτοῦ, his raiment as distinct from his face—ὁ χιλ. white as snow (cf. Mt. xvii. 5).—Ver. 4. Ἐκ τοῦ: the keepers, through fear of the angel, were shaken as by an earthquake, and became as dead men—stupified, helpless, totally incapacitated for action by way of preventing what is assumed, though not directly stated, to have happened. The resurrection is not described.

Vv. 5-7. The angel speaks to the women.—μὴ φοβεῖσθε ὑμεῖς, fear not ye, with tacit reference to the guards.—οἴδα γάρ: γάρ gives a reason for the soothing tone of the address. The angel recognises them as friends of the crucified.—Ver. 6. οἴδας ὅτι, etc.: with what sublime simplicity and brevity is the amazing story told! "Versus hic incisa habet perquam apta" (Beng.). The last clause is better without the epithet ὁ χιλ., more in keeping with the rest. Bengel calls it gloriosa appellation, but, as Meyer remarks, just on that account it was more liable to be added than omitted.—Ver. 7. ταχὺ πορευθοῦντοι: introducing "quite in his own (the evangelist's) manner of expression" (Weiss) the command of the angel = go quickly and tell, etc.—προάγαγας: present; He is even now going before you into Galilee; in accordance with the prediction in xxvi. 32 the risen Shepherd is on His way to the pre-appointed rendezvous.—Ἰδοῦ, there shall ye see Him, and be able to satisfy yourselves that He is indeed risen. With this word ends the message to the disciples.—Ἰδοῦ ἐστών ἄνων, behold I said it to you = note what I say, and see if it do not come true. Mark has καθὼς ἐστών ἄνων = as He said to you, referring to the promise of Jesus, and forming part of the message to the disciples.

Vv. 8-10. Appearance of Jesus to the women on the way to deliver their message.—Ver. 8. ἀπελθοῦσα: the reading of T. R. (ἤξελ.) implies that they had been within the tomb, of which no mention is made in Matthew. They went away from, not out of, the tomb.—
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ξεκινά δ' Κύριος. 1 7. καὶ ταχὺ πορευεῖται ἑκάτες τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ, ὡς ἵγερθη ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν· καὶ ἰδοῦν, προδέχεται ὅρας εἰς τὴν Γαλαήαν· ἔκα τούτων ὄψεται. Ἰδοὺ, ἦτον ὄμων. 2 8. Καὶ ἔξελθοντες· 9 ταχὺ ἀπὸ τοῦ μνήμητι μετὰ φόβου καὶ κραίσας μεγάλης, ἔδραμον ἀπαγγελιὰς τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ. 9. ὡς δὲ ἐπορεύοντο ἀπαγγελιὰ τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, 8 καὶ ἰδοὺ, ὡς ἤησθος ἀπήγγεσαν 6 αὐτοῖς, λέγων, “Χαῖρετε.” Αἱ δὲ προσελθοῦσιν ἐκάτεραν αὐτοῦ τῶν τέσσας, καὶ προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ. 10. τότε λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· “Μη φοβεῖσθε· υπάγετε, ἀπαγγελία τοῖς ἄνθρωποις μου, ἵνα ἀπελθῶντες εἰς τὴν Γαλαήαν, κἀκεῖ με ὄρθοντα.”

1 ΝΒ 33 omit o κυριο (W.H. relegate to margin).
2 ἀπελθοῦσιν in ΝΒCL 33 (Tisch., W.H.).
3 From s 8. εἰπ. το αὐτόν is omitted in ΝΒD 33, 69 and many versions, and left out by modern editors. The passage may have fallen out by similar ending (αὐτῶν—αὐτόν).
4 ΝΒCDŁA omit α. ΝΒ have ὑπηνεήσεν.

ἀπὸ τ. μν., depending on ἀπελθοῦσιν, in Mark on οἰκγον.—κατὰ φόβον καὶ κραίς μεγάλας, with fear and great joy. This union of apparently opposite emotions is true to human nature. All powerful tides of gladness cause nervous thrills that feel like fear and trembling. Cf. Isaiah ix. 5 and Phil. ii. 12. The fear and trembling St. Paul speaks of is the result of an exhilarating consciousness of having a great solemn work in hand—a race to run, a prize to win.—Ver. 9. καὶ ἰδοὺ, and behold, another surprise (ver. 2). They are on the way to tell the disciples that they are to be favoured with a meeting in Galilee, and lo they are privileged to tell the One themselves.—ὑπηνεήσεν, cf. chap. viii. 34, xxv. 1-6.—ἐκάτεραν, etc., they took hold of His feet and cast themselves before Him; the gesture befitting the circumstances, an unlooked-for meeting with one who has been crucified and risen and is greatly changed. Impossible to resume the old familiar relations as if nothing had happened.—Ver. 10. μὴ φοβεῖσθε: kindly in word and tone, meant to remove the embarrassment visible in their manner.—ὑπάγετε, ἀπαγγειλάτε, another synedeton as in xxvii. 65. The instructions to the women simply repeat, in much the same words, those given by the angel (ver. 7), with the exception that the disciples are spoken of by the kindly name of “brethren”.

The similarity of vv. 9, 10 to John xx. 14-18 has been remarked on (vide Weiss, Meyer, on ver. 9). It has been lately commented on in connection with the theory of a “four-gospel Canon” prepared by the Presbyters of Asia Minor in the beginning of the second century. Vide Der Schluss des Marcus-Evangeliwm der Vier-Evangelien-Kanon und die Kleinasiatischen Presbyter, by Dr. Paul Rohrbach. Rohrbach’s idea is that when this Canon was prepared the editors altered more or less the statements of the Synoptists as to the visions of the Risen Christ so as to bring them somewhat into harmony with those of the fourth Gospel. For this purpose Mark’s original ending was cancelled and the present one, vv. 9-20, put in its place. The editorial procedure in the case of Matthew consisted in inserting vv. 9, 10 in the narrative, thus providing for at least one vision in Jerusalem, and making room for more, and so cancelling the impression otherwise produced that Jesus was seen only in Galilee. In support of the view that vv. 9-20 is an editorial addition at a later date Rohrbach adds the fact that the narrative has an appearance of continuity when they are omitted, and also that the instructions of Jesus to the women are a mere echo of those given by the angel.

Vv. 11-15. The guards and the priests.
—Ver. 11. πορευομένους ἔλα ἀ., while the women go on their errand, the guards, crestfallen, play their poor part. Some of them (τρεῖς) go into the city and report in their own way to the priests all that has happened.—Ver. 13. ἔργασα:
the holy men thoroughly understand the power of money; silver pieces, shekels are meant.—*Isaías* probably means here a considerable number, not a number sufficient to bribe the soldiers (Meyer and Weiss). They gave with a free hand. This sense of *Isaías* is frequent in the N. T. Vide, e.g., Mk. x. 46, of the crowd following Jesus at Jericho, and Acts xxvii. 9 (of time).—Ver. 13. *σημαίνετε*, introducing the lie they put into the mouths of the soldiers. The report to be set abroad assumes that there is a fact to be explained, the disappearance of the body. And it is implied that the statement to be given out as to that was known by the soldiers to be false: i.e., they were perfectly aware that they had not fallen asleep at their post and that no theft had taken place. The lie for which the priests paid so much money is suicidal; one half destroys the other. Sleeping sentinels could not know what happened.—Ver. 14. ἵππα ἀκούσαθι, eif to, εἰς τον ὀφθ. in, etc., as in A. V., or: if this come to a hearing, a trial, before, etc., as in R. V. margin. The latter is preferred by many modern commentators. The reading ἵππα τ. ἴ, suits the second sense best. Cf. 1 Cor. vi. 1, 1 Tim. v. 19.—*ἀλλαζέω*, emphatic, implying a great idea of their influence, on their part.—*τίλεον*, will persuade him; how not said, money conceivably in their minds. Kykpe renders: will appease; so also Loesner ("aliquam pacare vel precibus vel donis"), citing examples from Philo. The ordinary punishment for falling asleep on the watch was death. Could soldiers be persuaded by any amount of money to run such a risk? Of course they might take the money and go away laughing at the donors, meaning to tell their general the truth. Could the priests expect anything else? If not, could they propose the project seriously? The story has its difficulties.—*ἀμερίμνους*, free from grounds of anxiety; guaranteed against all possible unpleasant consequences. Bengel’s comment on this verse is: "Quam laboriosum bellum mendacii contra veritatem!"—Ver. 15. This verse states that the soldiers did as instructed, so originating a theft theory, which, according to our evangelist, was current in his day at the time he wrote in Jewish circles. Vv. 16-20. The meeting in Galilee, peculiar to Mt.—Ver. 16. οἱ ἐδεικνύειν τοὺς Χαρίλαους να, the eleven, not merely to discount Judas, but to indicate that what follows concerns the well-known Twelve (minus one), the future Apostles of the faith.—Ver. 18. ἐς τὰ ἄφος, a specific indication of the locality than any previously reported. Conjectures have been made as to the mountain meant, e.g., that on which the hill teaching was communicated. An interesting suggestion but unverifiable.—οἶ-, an adverb = ἀπεξ, used pregnant so as to include qua: whither Jesus had bid them go, and where He wished them to remain.—*ὑπάρχει: if this points to an instruction given expressly by Jesus, it is strange that the evangelist has not recorded it. It rather seems to presuppose an understanding based on experiences of the Galilean ministry as to the rendezvous.
The meeting place would be some familiar haunt, recalling many past associations and incidents, only imperfectly recorded in the Gospels. If there was such a retreat among the mountains often resorted to, it would doubtless be the scene of the hill teaching, as well as of other unrecorded disciple experiences. The disciples would need no express direction to go there. Instinct would guide them.—Ver. 17. A very meagre statement, the whole interest of the evangelist being absorbed by the words spoken by Jesus.—προσκενήσαν as in ver. 9, but the men less demonstrative than the women; no mention of seizing Jesus by the feet.—οὐ διείστησαν; but some doubted (cf. xiv. 31, in reference to Peter). This clause seems to qualify and limit the previous statement as to the worshiping, giving this sense: they worshipped, i.e., the most of them, for some were in doubt. So Meyer, who cites in support Klotz, *Ad loc.*, whose statement is to the effect that in passages of this kind containing a clause with οὐ without a μόν preceding, a universal affirmation is first made and then a division follows, which shows that a universal affirmation was not really intended (p. 358). Various methods have been adopted to get rid of the unwelcome conclusion that some of the eleven did not do homage, e.g., by taking ἀπεστάλησαν as a pluperfect (Fritzsche, Grotius), or by finding the doubters among the 500 mentioned by St. Paul (1 Cor. xiv. 6), or even by altering the text of οὐ into οὐδὲ (Beza). The whole narrative is so brief and vague as to lend support to the hypothesis that in the appearance of Jesus here recorded we have not one particular occurrence, but a general picture of the Christophanies, in which mingled conflicting feelings of reverent recognition and hesitation as to the identity of the person played their part. Such is the view of Keil, Steinmeyer, and Holtzmann (H. C.).

Vv. 18-20. The final commission.—Ver. 18. προσελθών, approaching; the speech of Jesus is majestic, but His bearing is friendly, meant to set them free from doubt and fear.—διέλαβον: this may seem a word not sufficiently dignified for the communication made. But it is often used, especially in Hebrews, in reference to divine revelations (vide, e.g., chap. i. 1).—ἔστω μόνον, there was given to me; the aorist as in xi. 27, the thought of which earlier text this utterance reiterates and amplifies. The reference may be to the resurrection, and the meaning that that event *ipso facto* placed Jesus in a position of power. Cf. Rom. i. 4.—ἔστω ἡ οὐκομοθετήσας, every form of authority; command of all means necessary for the advancement of the Kingdom of God.—ἐν οὐρανῷ: this points to a session on His celestial throne at the right hand of God. Jesus speaks as one already in heaven. There is no account of the ascension in Mt. It is conceived as involved in the resurrection.—ἐπὶ γῆς: upon earth, the whole earth. The two phrases together point to a universal cosmic dominion. But so far as earth is concerned, the dominion is only a matter of right or theory, to be worked out. Hence what follows.—Ver. 19. πορευθέντες οὖν: the οὖν omitted in many texts aptly expresses the connection. The commission to the Apostles arises out of the power claimed by all power has been given to me on earth, go ye therefore, and make the power a reality.—μακαριστάτες πάντα τὰ ἑνν: make disciples (act., cf. at xxvii. 57) of all the nations (cf. x. 5, "go not into the way of the Gentiles").—βαπτίζω —ἐνάρετε: baptism the condition of discipleship = make disciples by baptising; the sole condition, circumcision, and everything particularistic or Judaistic tacitly negatived. Christian baptism referred to here only in this Gospel.—αὐτοῖς refers to ἑνν, a constr. ad sensum, as in Acts xv. 17; Rom. ii. 14. In the anabaptist controversy αὐτοῖς was taken
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Ac. viii. 20. βαπτίζωτες αὐτοὺς ἐκ τοῦ βάπτισματος τοῦ Πάτρος καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος. 20. βαπτίζωτες αὐτοὺς τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ διὰ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος. 1 Cor. xiii. 2. τοῦ τιμήτου ὑμῶν· καὶ ἰδοὺ, ἐγὼ μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας (all with εἰς and accus.).

 Vide at Ch. xix. 17. Vide at Ch. xiii. 30.


2 The Αμήν is not found in ΝABD 1, 33, and is left out by modern editors.

by the opponents of infant baptism as referring to μαθήσις in μαθητεύω, and the verb was held to mean “teach”. For some references to this extinct controversy vide Wetstein, ad loc., and Hermann’s Viger, p. 61.—εἰς τὸ ὑμαρτίον into the name, i.e., as confessing the name which embodies the essence of the Christian creed.—τοῦ Πατρός, etc.: it is the name not of one but of three, forming a baptismal Trinity—Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. It is not said into the names of, etc., nor into the name of the Father, and the name of the Son, and the name of the Holy Ghost—whence might be deduced the idea of a Trinity constituting at the same time a Divine Unity. But this would probably be reading more into the words than was intended.—Ver. 20. βαπτίζωτες αὐτοὺς, teaching them, present participle, implying that Christian instruction is to be a continuous process, not subordinate to and preparing for baptism, but continuing after baptism with a view to enabling disciples to walk worthily of their vocation.—τηρεῖν: the teaching is with a view not to gnosis but to practice; the aim not orthodox opinion but right living.—πάντα δὲ ὑπὲρ τῆς ἁμαρτίας: the materials of instruction are to be Christ’s own teaching. This points to the desirability for the Church’s use of an oral or written tradition of Christ’s words: these to be the rule of faith and practice.—καὶ ἰδοὺ, introducing an important promise to the missionaries of the new universal religion to keep them in courage and good hope amid all difficulties.—ἔγγυο μὲθ' ὑμῶν, I the Risen, Exalted, All-powerful One, with you my apostles and representatives engaged in the heroic task of propagating the faith.—ἔξηλθαν, not will be, conveying the feeling of certainty, but also spoken from the eternal point of view, sub specie aeternitatis, for which distinctions of here and now, and then, and then, do not exist.

cf. John viii. 58, “before Abraham was I am”. In the Fourth Gospel the categories of the Absolute and the Eternal dominate throughout.—πάντας τὰς ἡμέρας, all the days, of which it is implied, there may be many; the vista of the future is lengthening.—ἐν τῇ συντέλεια τοῦ αἰώνος, until the close of the current age, when He is to come again; an event, however, not indispensable for the comfort of men who are to enjoy an uninterrupted spiritual presence. This great final word of Jesus is worthy of the Speaker and of the situation. Perhaps it is not to be taken as an exact report of what Jesus said to His disciples at a certain time and place. In it the real and the ideal seem to be blended; what Jesus said there and then with what the Church of the apostolic age had gradually come to regard as the will of their Risen Lord, with growing clearness as the years advanced, with perfect clearness after Israel’s crisis had come. We find here (1) a cosmic significance assigned to Christ (all power in heaven and on earth); (2) an absolutely universal destination of the Gospel; (3) baptism as the rite of admission to discipleship; (4) a rudimentary baptismal Trinity; (5) a spiritual presence of Christ similar to that spoken of in the Fourth Gospel. To this measure of Christian enlightenment the Apostolic Church, as represented by our evangelist, had attained when he wrote his Gospel, probably after the destruction of Jerusalem. Therein is summed up the Church’s confession of faith conceived as uttered by the lips of the Risen One. “Expressly not as words of Jesus walking on the earth, but as words of Him who appeared from heaven, the evangelist here presents in summary form what the Christian community had come to recognize as the will and the promise of their exalted Lord” (Weiss-Meyer).
I. THE BAPTISM OF JESUS.

BEGINNINGS OF THE GALILEAN MINISTRY.—Vv. 1-8. The appearance and ministry of the Baptist (Mt. iii. 1-12, Lk. iii. 1-18).—Ver. 1. ἀρχὴ, etc.: This verse may best be taken as the superscription of the whole Gospel, and as meaning: Here begins the Gospel concerning Jesus Christ the Son of God. So viewed it should be made to stand apart, ver. 2 beginning a new section as in the Greek Testament of W. and H. If we connect ver. 1 closely with vv. 2-4 it will contain the statement that the Gospel of Jesus Christ began with the ministry of the Baptist. On this view the connection of the sentences may be taken in two ways: either ver. 1 may be joined closely to ver. 2, the resulting sense being: the beginning of the Gospel (was) as it is written = was in accordance with the prophetic oracle predicting the introduction of Messiah by a forerunner, the story of the Baptist then following as the fulfillment of the prophecy; or vv. 2, 3 may be bracketed as a parenthesis, and ver. 1 connected with ver. 4, yielding this sense: the beginning of the Gospel was or became (ἐγένετο) John the Baptist. All three ways give a perfectly good meaning. In favour of the first view is the absence of the article before ἀρχή, against it has been alleged (Holtzmann, H. C.) that καθὼς in Matthew and Mark always connects with what goes before, never introduces a protasis as in Lk. vii. 31.—τοῦ ἐαγγελίου Ἰ. Χ., the good news concerning, not preached by, Ἰ. Χ. being genitive objective; not quite the evangelic record, but on its way to that final meaning of εὐαγγέλιον. “Christ” here appears as a proper name, as in Mt. i. 1.—ὑιός τ. Θεοῦ: this title, even if omitted, is implicit in the title Christ, but it is every way likely to have formed a part of the original text, as indicating the point of view in which Jesus is to be presented to readers of the Gospel. Without assuming any acquaintance on the part of the evangelist with the Gospel of the Infancy in Matthew and Luke we may say that this title takes the place of the opening chapters in these Gospels. It is all that Mark offers to gratify the curiosity to which these chapters owe their origin. Who is this remarkable Personage of whom you write? He is “the Son of God”. How much that was meant to convey cannot be certainly determined.

Vv. 2-4. καθὼς introduces a prophetic
citation as protasis to the historical statement about John in ver. 4 = in accordance with, etc., John appeared. The prothetic reference and the historical statement are given in inverse order in Matthew. — τοῦ τῆς ἡραλίας, in Isaiah, the actual quotation being from Isaiah and Malachi (ver. 2) conjointly. An inaccuracy doubtless, but not through an error of memory (Meyer and Weiss), but through indifference to greater exactness, the quotation from Isaiah being what chiefly occupied the mind. It is something analogous to attraction in grammar. It is Mark's only prothetic citation on his own account. — ἢ τῇ begins the quotation from Mal. iii. 1, given as in Mt. xi. 10, with μόνε, after προτοῦν and οὕτως, changed into οὕτω. — Ver. 3. Qux, with οὕτως and Ιακωβος, in Mt. iii. 3. — Ver. 4. ἀναφέρεται ἵνα: in accordance with, and in fulfilment of, these prothetic anticipations, appeared John. — ὁ βαπτιστής = the Baptist (substantive participle), that the function by which he was best known. — ὁς ἦσαν ἀμαρτών: this clause (in Luke, not in Matthew) may plausibly be represented as a Christianised version of John's baptism (Weiss), but of course John's preaching and baptism implied that if men really repented they would be forgiven (Holtz., H. C.). — Ver. 5-8. Ver. 5 describes the widespread character of the movement much as in Mt., only that Judea comes before Jerusalem, and the district of the Jordan is not mentioned. — Ver. 6 describes John's way of life as in Mt., ἐνθεμένος standing for εἰς τὸ ἐνθηματικόν, and εὐθανάσιον for ἐκ τῆς θανατού. — Ver. 7. καὶ ἐκρήσατο, introducing a special and very important part of his kerygma: inter alia he kept saying— anxious to prevent men from forming a wrong impression of his position. This is what makes mention of his ministry relevant in the evangelic record. — λόγω τῶν ἑμαρτημάτων, to loose the latchet of, instead of τῶν ἐν θάνατον. Βαστάζω; a stronger expression of subordination, practically the same idea. — Ver. 8. περιέβαλεν ἄγνωστον καὶ τῷ εἴρηται, whereby the view presented of Messiah's function becomes less judicial, more Christian. Mt.'s account here is truer to John's conception of the Messiah. Mk.'s was probably influenced by the destination of his Gospel for the Galilean reader. — Vv. 9-11. The baptism of Ἰησοῦς (Mt. iii. 13-17; Lk. iii. 21, 22). — Ver. 9. ὁ ἐκκαίνιως, τὸ ἔτος = in those days; an indefinite note of time = while John was carrying on his ministry of preaching and baptising. — οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, came with Jesus, with what feelings, as compared with Pharisees and Sadducees, vide notes on Mt.— ὥσπερ Μακαρίας ἣν, from Nasareth, presumably His home; of Galilee, to define the part of the country for outsiders; only Galilee mentioned in Mt. — ἐν τῷ ἐνθηματικῷ = with dative in ver. 5. The expression is pregnant, the idea of descending into the river being latent in εἰς—ὑπὸ ἱδρύμα, by John; no hesitation indicated; cf. remarks on three synoptical narratives on this point in Mt. It does
not even appear whether John had any suspicion that the visitor from Nazareth was ὁ λογόποτρος, of whom he had spoken. The manner in which the baptism of Jesus is reported is the first instance of the realism of this Gospel, facts about Jesus stated in a naked manner as compared, e.g., with Lk., who is influenced by religious decorum.

—Ver. 10. εὐθεία, straightway, a favourite word of Mk.'s, to be taken with ἐδείκτι as soon as He had ascended, etc., He saw. For similar usage in reference to εἴπατε εἰδε ἡμῖν, Viger, p. 772.—συγκεκάμψατο, being rent asunder, a sudden event; a stronger word than that used in Mt. and Lk. (ἀνακατέβησαν—ἐφαρμόσαν). The subject of ἐδείκτι is Jesus.—

ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ: this reading suggests the idea of a descent not merely upon but into Him, as if to take up its abode; henceforth the immanent spirit of Jesus.

Vv. 12, 13. The temptation (Mt. iv. 1-11; Lk. iv. 1-13).—Ver. 12. ἐκβάλλει: historic present, much used in Mt. with lively effect; introduces a new situation. The first thing the Spirit does (εὐθέως) is to drive Jesus into the wilderness, the expression not implying reluctance of Jesus to go into so wild a place (Weiss), but intense preoccupation of mind. Allowing for the weakening of the sense in Hellenistic usage (H. C.), it is a very strong word, and a second instance of Mk.'s realism: Jesus thrust out into the inhospitable desert by force of thought. De Wette says that the ethical significance of the temptation is lost in Mk.'s meagre narrative, and that it becomes a mere marvellous adventure. I demur to this. The one word ἐκβάλλει tells the whole story, speaks as far as may be the unpreachable. Mt. and Mk. have tried to tell us what happened, but have they given us more than a dim shadow of the truth?—Ver. 13. πειράζομαι, being tempted, presumably the whole time; doubtless the real truth. Two powers at work all through, the Spirit of God and the spirit of evil.—ἡ ὑποκρ. ὑπερῆς: not merely pictorial or intended to hint danger; meant rather to indicate the uninhabited nature of the place; no supplies obtainable there, hunger therefore a part of the experience.—οἱ ἄγγελοι: angels as opposed, not to devils (Schanz), but to human beings, of whom there were none.—διηκόνοι, ministered; in what way not said, but implying exhaustion. These few touches of Mk. suggest a vivid picture of a spiritual crisis: intense preoccupation, instinctive retreat into congenial grim solitudes, temptation, struggle, fierce and protracted, issuing
in weakness, calling for preternatural aid.

Vv. 14-20. The Galilean ministry begins (Mt. iv. 12-22; Lk. iv. 14).—Ver. 14. τὸ εὐαγγελίον τοῦ Θεοῦ, the Gospel of God, the good news sent by God to men through Jesus, a strong name for Christ's message.—Ver. 15. ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ: this defines more precisely the gospel Jesus preaches. It is the gospel of the Kingdom of God. But even this is vague. The kingdom may be differently conceived: as an awful thing or as a beneficent thing. The summons follows, throwing light on its nature.—μετανοεῖ καὶ πιστεύετε: “repent” echoes John’s preaching, and savours of awe, but “believe” is a new word, and presumably the watchword of the new ministry. And the name for the message to be believed settles the nature of the kingdom. Its coming is good news (ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ). For πιστεύειν see sive Gal. iii. 26, Eph. i. 13.—Ver. 16. ἀμφιβάλλοντες: just because different from Mt.’s expression, to which the T. R. assimilates Mk.’s, is likely to be the true reading, and is very expressive: casting about (their nets understood, here only).—Ver. 17. γενόσθαι: I will make you become, implying a gradual process of training; therefore the disciples called as early as possible.—Ver. 20. μετὰ μυστικῶν: they left their father with the hired assistants. This is taken by some as a merely pictorial trait, but others justly regard it as a touch of humanity. It comforted Mk. and probably his voucher Peter that the two brothers did not need to leave their father alone. He could do without them.

Vv. 21-28. First appearance in the synagogue; first impressions (Lk. iv. 31-37).—Ver. 21. εἰς παρεοικία: Jesus and the four newly acquired disciples enter or arrive at.—Καὶ, Capernaum; first mention. From Mk.’s narrative alone we should gather that Jesus arrived at Capernaum on His way northwards from the south—from the Jordan to Galilee, then along the shore of the lake to Capernaum.—εἰςδὲ: seems to imply arrival on Sabbath.—σαββάτῳ: dative plural as if from σάββατος; plural, after analogy of names for feast days (τὰ Ἀβγά, τὰ γενέσεις, τὰ εἴσοδια).—ιδίᾳ: Mt. in his general summary of the Galilean ministry applies both this word and κηρύσσω to Christ’s synagogue utterances. These, addressed to a
popular audience, would come more properly under the head of kerygma than of didache.—Ver. 22. ἧς ἐξηλπισοντο: they were amazed; a strong word, several times in Mk. (Mt. vii. 28).—ἐς ἐξουσίων ἐλθεῖν, etc.: a similar remark in Mt. vii. 29 (see notes there) appended to Sermon on Mount. Mk. gives no discourse, but only the impression made. "A poor substitute for the beautiful Sermon on the Mount" (Schanz). Doubtless, but let us be thankful for what we do get: a record of the impression made by Christ's very first appearance in the synagogue, witnessing to a striking individuality. Mk. omits much, and is in many ways a meagre Gospel, but it makes a distinctive contribution to the evangelistic history in showing by a few realistic touches (this one of them) the remarkable personality of Jesus.

Vv. 23-28. The demoniac.—Ver. 23. τῶν: almost = ὅσον, Matthew's word for introducing something important.—ἀτόμον, in their synagogue, i.e., the synagogue of the same men who had been surprised at Christ's preaching. They are to get a new surprise, though one would have been enough for one day. We also get a surprise, for nothing in Mark's narrative thus far has prepared us to expect such an event as is reported. In his general sketch of the Galilean ministry (iv. 23-25) Matthew combines the three features: preaching, teaching, and healing.—ἐν π. & = with an unclean spirit (Maldonatus, Holtz., H. C.), in the power of, possessed by, Meyer, Weiss, Keil, etc. An unclean spirit is Mark's standing name for what Matthew commonly calls δαιμόνιον or δαιμόνιον.—Ver. 24. τι ήμιν καὶ σοι, what to us and to Thee. The diseased man speaks for the demon in him, and the demon speaks for the fraternity as all having one interest. For the phrase used in a similar sense vide 1 Kings xvii. 18.—Ναζαρηνῶ: first certain intimation (cf. ver. 9) that Jesus belonged to Nazareth. The corresponding adjective in Matthew is Ναζαρηνός (ii. 23).—ἡλθες ἃ. ἢ. may be either a question or an assertion, the sense of the whole passage being: Thou art come to destroy us, for I know well who Thou art — the Holy One of God (Fritzsche).—The epithet, ἡγούμ. applied to Jesus is antithesis to ἀκαθάρτητι.—Ver. 25. θεματισθεῖτο: vide at Mt. xxii. 12.—Ver. 26. συνάρ-θεν, convulsing, throwing into a spasm. This reveals a characteristic of the malady under which the man suffered. He appears to have been an epileptic. The Gadarene demoniac was a madman. This was the final fit before recovery.—Ver. 27. ἡμαθίθησαι: another strong word peculiar to Mark = they were
astonished, i.e., at the sudden and complete recovery. They saw at a glance that the attack had not run its usual course.—"καθ’ως with the infinitive here expressing result.—συνήθεις, to seek together; in N. T. tropical = to inquire of one another, to discuss. The word occurs several times in Mark.—τῇ ξενίᾳ του Ἰησοῦ. The question refers to the whole appearance of Jesus in the synagogue that day. One surprise following close on another provoked wondering inquiry as to the whole phenomenon. The words following state the twofold ground of their astonishment: (1) διδαχή καὶ κατ’ ἀναστασία, a style of teaching new as to authoritativeness (entirely different from the familiar type of the scribes); (2) καὶ τοῖς πνεύμασι τοῖς ἀκαθάρτοις ἐντάσσεσθαι, etc., also He commandeth the unclean spirits so that they obey Him. Both equally looked for: the former a moral miracle, the latter a physical. The account reveals an imperial spirit exercising sway over the minds and bodies of men.—Ver. 28. ἄνωθεν, the report, as in Mt. xiv. 1, xxiv. 6.—ἐθέκας, expressive of the lightning speed with which rumour travels = πανταχοῦ in every direction.—αἷς ἄνω τ. π. τ. Ἰαλ., a vague phrase suggestive of a wide range of circulation, even beyond the boundaries of Galilee. But that can hardly be meant. Recent interpreters take it as meaning that the fame spread into the Galilean environment of Caesarea, along the lake north and south, and back into the hill country. Similarity at certain points in this incident to the story of the Gadarene demoniac, especially in the deprecatory speech (ver. 22; Mt. viii. 29), has suggested the hypothesis of borrowing on one side or other. Keim thinks this not a real history but an acted programme, like the change of water into wine in John ii., and like the preaching programme in Lk. iv. (L. J., ii. 105, 203), a mere duplicate of the Gadare story. Weiss thinks the words spoken by the demoniac (ver. 34) are borrowed from that story, and that Mark reproduces the features with which Peter was wont to describe such cases. The life-like reflections of the spectators (ver. 27) powerfully witness for the reality of the occurrence.

vv. 20-31. Cure of Peter’s mother-in-law (Mt. viii. 14, 15; Lk. iv. 38, 39).—ἐξελθόντες ἤλθον: even if the reading of B (participle and verb singular) be the true one, as it probably is just because the more difficult, the implied fact is that Jesus left this synagogue bemired by His disciples, probably all four, Simon and Andrew as well as James and John. Jesus came from the synagogue to the house of Simon and Andrew, with them, and with James and John.—Ver. 30. πυρέσσωσα (same word in Matthew), fevered, or feverish, doubtless a common occurrence in the damp, marshy flats by the lake.—ἀλύωνι αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, forthwith they tell Him about her, not necessarily as expecting Him to heal her, but to account for her absence, or as one naturally tells a friend of family troubles.—Ver. 31. ἐξελθέτες, etc. He took hold of her hand and so raised her up, the cure taking place simultaneously. In Matthew the touch (ἅφαρο) is the
34. κολλόνια, many; not all? In Matthew many are brought and all are healed.—ἐπιτύχει, allow, imperfect, as if from ἐπιτύχω with augment on preposition, again in xi. 16; prorsus barbara (Fritzsche).—ἐπιτυχεῖν αὐτόν, because they knew Him.

35. ἦλθεν αὐτὸς ἐξελθεῖν, καὶ ἀπίστησαν εἰς ἥρμαν τούτον, κάκει προσηγέστητο. 36. καὶ κατεβίβασαν αὐτὸν ἐδώ.

1 NBL omit αὐτῷ. 2 NBCCL 33 al. omit εὐθείας.

BD have εὐθείας, which being used transitively by the Greeks was likely to be corrected into εὐθεία by the ancient revisers.

For τὸ πόλις... ἡ ΝΒCDL 33 have τὴν ὅλη τῷ πόλις ἐπιστυχήσει (Tisch., W.H.).

6 συνάξα in ΝΒCDL (modern editions).

6 κατεβίβασαν in ΝΒ, which revisers would readily change into the plural.

7 NBL omit o.

means of cure. Holz. (H. C.) thinks Jesus took hold of her hand simply by way of greeting, and that the result was unexpected, Jesus thus discovering an unsuspected power.

Vv. 32-34. Cures on Sabbath evening (Mt. viii. 16, 17; Lk. iv. 40, 41).—Ver. 32. ὄψις, exact indication of time by two phrases, on the arrival of evening when the sun set; evening a vague phrase = late afternoon. It was Sabbath, and the people would wait till sunset when Sabbath closed. Hence the double note of time. So most recent commentators, also Victor Ant. in Cramer's Catena (ἐπείδη ἔγνυτον μὴ ἔξωθα τὴν θεραπείαν σαββάτου, τοῦτον χαῖρε τοῦ σαββάτου τὸ πέρα σάββατον). Matthew and Luke divide Mark's phrases between them. The first sufficed for Matthew because he says nothing of its being Sabbath. This instance of duality in expression in Mark has done service in connection with Griesbach's hypothesis that Mark is made up from Matthew and Luke.—κατακλύσεις, such as that it is ailing, peculiar to Mark.—τοὺς δαμασκινομένους: them specially, because of what happened in the synagogue.—Ver. 33. ἐδέχατο ἡ πόλις, a colloquial exaggeration.—πρὸς τὸ θύραν: the door of Peter's house. Meyer的思想 in the interval Jesus had gone to His own house, and that it was there the people gathered. But does Mark's gospel think of Jesus as having a residence in Capernaum? Weiss answers in the negative.—Ver. 34. πολλοὶ, many; not all? In Matthew many are brought and all are healed.—ὑπερβαίνει, allow, imperfect, as if from ὑπερβαίνω with augment on preposition, again in xi. 16; prorsus barbara (Fritzsche).—ἐπιτύχειν αὐτόν, because they knew Him. On the insight of demoniacs cf. at Mt. viii. 28 ff.

Vv. 35-39. Flight from Capernaum (Lk. iv. 42-44).—Ver. 35. πρῶτα, early, an elastic word, the last watch from three to six, defined more exactly by ἐννοία πᾶν = much in the night, at the beginning of the watch, or at the dark hour before dawn.—ἐννοία is the neuter plural of ἐννοια, nocturnal, used as an adverb (here only).—ἀναστὰς etc.: He rose up, went out of Capernaum, went away to a desert, solitary place, and there engaged in prayer. It was a kind of flight from Capernaum, the scene of those remarkable occurrences; "flight from the unexpected reality into which His ideal conception of His calling had brought Him," Holz., H. C. The real reason of the flight was doubtless a desire to preach in as many synagogues as possible before the hostility of the scribes, instinctively dreaded, had time to act obstructively. Jesus had a plan of a preaching tour in Galilee (vide ver. 38), and He felt He could not begin too soon. He left in the night, fearing opposition from the people.—Ver. 36. κατεβίβασαν: followed Him up; almost pursued Him as a fugitive; verb singular, though more than one followed,
Peter, the chief of them, being thought of mainly. A strong term like εξέβλησεν, ver. 12, all allowance made for weakened force in Hellenistic usage.—Ver. 37. πάντες Ἰησοῦν σε: all seek Thee, not merely all the people of Capernaum, but all the world: "nemo non te quiserit," Fritzsche; a colloquial exaggeration.—Ver. 38. δύναμιν: let us go, intrasitive; not so used in Greek authors.—κομπόστης: village towns; towns as to extent of population, villages as without walls (Kypke); ὄφηδος (Besz): here only in N. T., found in Strabo.—εἰρήνη: that there I may preach, no word of healing; because no part of His vocation (Klostermann); because subordinate to the preaching (Schanz).—ἐξέβλησεν: I came out from Capernaum, ver. 33). This may seem trivial (Keil), but it appears to be the real meaning, and it is so understood by Meyer, Weiss, Holtz., and even Schanz. The Fathers understood the words as meaning: "I am come from heaven". So Keil. In this clause Weiss finds evidence that in Mk.'s narrative Jesus has no home in Capernaum. He has visited it, done good in it, and now He wants to go elsewhere.—Ver. 39. ἔλθον (wide critical notes).—ἐλαυνεῖ (σῶμα) (Tisch., W. H.).

For the εἰρήνη, etc., and there cometh to Him, historic present as so often; where this happened not said, probably an incident of the preaching tour; "in one of the cities," says Lk. ἄν δὲ ἤκουσαν ὑμῶν: the leper has seen or heard enough of Christ's healing ministry to be sure as to the power. He doubts the will, naturally from the nature of the disease, especially if it be the first cure of the kind, or the first so far as the man knows.—Ver. 41. σπλαγχνισθείς, having compassion. Watch carefully
The order of the words varies in the MSS.

1. The order of the words varies in the MSS.

2. sar in ΝΒΛΔ.

3. pαραδεδεν in many uncials (Tisch., W.H.).

The portrait of Christ's personality in this Gospel, Mk.'s speciality.—Ver. 42. αὐτῷ, etc.: another instance of duality, the leprosy left him, and he or it was cleansed. Lk. has the former of the two phrases, Mt. the latter.—καθαρίζων is Hellenistic for καθαρίσων.—Ver. 43. ἔρημος, etc.: assuming a severe aspect, *vide* notes on the word at Mt. ix. 30, especially the quotation from Euthy. Zig.—ἐξέβαλεν αὐτῷ, thrust him out of the synagogue or the crowd. It is not quite certain that the incident happened in a synagogue, though the inference is natural from the connection with ver. 39. Lepers were not interdicted from entering the synagogue. These particulars are peculiar to Mk., and belong to his character sketching. He does not mean to impute real anger to Jesus, but only a masterful manner dictated by a desire that the benefit should be complete = away out of this, to the priest; do what the law requires, that you may be not only clean but recognised as such among the authorities, and so received by the people as a leper no longer.—Ver. 44. εἰς μαρτυρίον αὐτοῖς: for a testimony from priest to people, without which the leper would not be received as clean.—Ver. 45. What Jesus feared seems to have happened. The man went about telling of his cure, and neglecting the means necessary to obtain social recognition as cured.—τῶν λέγων: "the matter," A. V. Perhaps we should translate strictly the word, i.e., the word Jesus spoke: "I will, be thou clean." So Holtz, after Fritzsche. So also Euthy. Zig. ἐξέβαλεν αὐτῷ ὁ χριστός, δηλαδὴ τὸ ἑλέον, καθαρισθητικ, ὡς μὲν ἔχοντας γενόμενον.—εἰς πόλιν: the result was that Jesus could not enter openly into a city, a populous place, but was obliged to remain in retired spots. This cure and the popularity it caused may have co-operated to bring Christ's synagogue ministry to an abrupt termination by stirring up envy. Jesus was between two fires, and His order to the leper, go, show thyself, had a double reference: to the man's good and to the conciliation of the scribes and synagogue rulers.—καὶ ἡρῴοντο, etc.: and (still) they kept coming from all quarters. Popularity at its height. There is nothing corresponding to ver. 45 in Mt.

Chapter II. InCipient Conflict.

This chapter and the first six verses of the next report incidents which, though not represented as happening at the same time, have all one aim: to exhibit Jesus as becoming an object of disfavour to the religious classes, the scribes and Pharisees. Sooner or later, and soon rather than later, this was inevitable. Jesus and they were too entirely different in thought and ways for good will to prevail between them for any length of time. It would not be long before the new Prophet would attract their attention. The comments of the people in Capernaum synagogue, doubtless often repeated elsewhere, on the contrast between His style of teaching and that of the scribes, would soon reach their ears, and would not tend to promote a good understanding. That was one definite ground of offence, and others were sure to arise.

Vv. 1-12. The psalmed man (Mt. ix. 1-8; Lk. v. 17-26).—Ver. 1. The reading of ΝΒΛΔ (W.H.) with εἰσελθών for εἰσῆλθεν in T. R., and omitting καὶ before ἡκούσθη, gives a ruggedly anacoluthic construction ("and entering again into Capernaum after days it was heard that He was at home"), which the T. R. very neatly removes. The construction of the sentence, even as it stands in the critically approved text, may be made smoother by taking ἡκούσθη not im-
II. 1. καὶ πάλιν εἰσήλθεν εἰς Καπερναοῦμ, δι' ἡμερῶν καὶ ἡμέρα ὡς εἰς οἶκον ἕως οὗτος. 2. καὶ εἰσῆλθεν συνήχθησαν πολλοί, 3. καὶ εἰρήνη ἐργαζόμενος ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐργάτες. 4. καὶ ἤλθεν, καὶ ἤλθεν ἐγείρασαν τοὺς ἐργάτες. 5. ἔφτασεν χαλάζων τὸ κραββατόν, ἐφ᾽ ὑπὸ τοῦ παραλυτικοῦ κατέκειτο. 6. καὶ ἤπατε τὸ κραββατόν (to dig out the eyes), ἤπατε χαλάζων τὸ κραββατόν. 7. σῶμα in BDL. ἐφ᾽ (T.R.) is explanatory.

1. εἰσῆλθεν πάλιν in BDL; probably correct just because of the halting const. which the T.R. rectifies.
2. BDL omit καί; for the connection of the words vide below.
3. BDL have εἰς οἶκον (Tisch., W.H. in text). But εἰς οἶκον (Ca al.) is to be preferred as the more difficult.
4. BDL have φέροντες πρὸς αὐτὸν παραλυτικοῦ.
5. προσευκέας in BDL 33 (Tisch., W.H.).
6. Spelt κραββατόν in most uncials.
7. σῶμα in BDL. ἐφ᾽ (T.R.) is explanatory.

personally, but as referring to Jesus. He entering, etc., was heard of as being at home (Schanz and Holtzmann alternatively).—πάλιν, again, a second time, i. 21, mentioning the first. He has not been there apparently since He left it (i. 35) on the preaching tour in Galilee. —δι᾽ ἡμέραν: after days, cf. Gal. ii. 1; classical examples of this use of διὰ in Wetstein and Elsner. The expression suggests a short period, a few days, which seems too short for the time required for the preaching tour, even if it had been cut short by hostile influence, as is not improbable. The presence of scribes at this scene is very significant. They appear hostile in attitude on Christ's return to Capernaum. They had probably been active before it. Fritzsching translates: interjectis pluribus diebus. For a considerable time διὰ χρόνου would be the appropriate phrase. We get rid of the difficulty by connecting δι᾽ ἡμέραν with καὶ ἡμέρα (Kloster.), the resulting meaning being that days elapsed after the arrival in Capernaum before people found out that Jesus was there. He had been absent possibly for months, and probably returned quietly. —ἐν οἴκῳ or εἰς οἶκον (T. R.) = at home (in Peter's house presumably); εἰς οἶκον suggests the idea of entrance. —Ver. 2, συνήχθησαν πολλοί: with the extraordinary incidents of some weeks or months ago fresh in their memory, a great gathering of the townspeople was inevitable. —σῶμα, etc.: the gathering was phenomenal; not only the house filled, but the space round about the door crowded—no room for more people even then (μὴδε), not to speak of within. —τῶν λόγων: the phrase has a secondary sound, as if an echo of the speech of the apostolic church, but the meaning is plain. Jesus was preaching the gospel of the kingdom when the following incident happened. Preaching always first. —Ver. 3. Εἴρηντας: historic present with lively effect. The arrival creates a stir. —φέρουσας: this may mean more than the four who actually carried the sick man (ὑπὸ τοὺς ἐργάτας), friends accompanying. The bearers might be σηματοδότες (Schanz). —Ver. 4. The particulars in this verse not in Mt., who did not care how they found their way to Jesus; enough for him that they succeeded somewhere. —προσευκέας (T. R.): here only in N. T. to approach; προσευκέας (W.H.), to bring near (the sick man understood) to Him, Jesus. —ἀποστειράως τ. σ., removed the roof, to which they would get access by an outside stair either from the street or from the court. —ἐφ᾽ ὑπὸ, where He was: was that in an upper room (Lightfoot and Vitrina), or in a room in a storied house (Holtz., H. C.), or not in a room at all, but in the atrium or com- munium, the quadrangle of the house (Faber, Archdol., Jahn, Archdol.). In the last-mentioned case they would have to remove the parapet (battlement, Deut. xxii. 8) and let the man down into the open space. —ἐξορρότεναι: not something additional to but explanatory of ἀποστειράως = they unroofed by digging through the material—tiles, laths, and
5. iδὼν δὲ ὃ ἤσοισ τὴν πίστιν αὐτῶν λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ, "Τέκνο, ἀφέωνταί σοι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου." 6. Ἡσαν δὲ τινὲς τῶν γραμματέων ἐκεῖ καθήμενοι, καὶ διαλογίζομεν οὖν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν. 7. "Τι ὀφείλεις ἀμαρτίας τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ; τις δύναται ἀφεῖται ἁμαρτίαι, εἰ μὴ οἶς, ὁ Θεὸς?" 8. Καὶ εὐθέως ἐπιγνοῦν ὃ ἤσοισ τῇ πνεύματι αὐτῶν, διτ οὐσία διαλογίζονται οὖν αὐτοῖς, εἰς γὰρ αὐτοῖς, "Τί ταύτα διαλογίζοντες οὖν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν; 9. τι ἐστιν εὐποιώτερον, εἰπεῖν τῷ παραλυτικῷ, ἀφέωνται σοι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι,

1 καὶ Ἰωαν. τοῦ ΝΒCL. 2 Β 33 ἀφείται. ἀφαίτεται conforms to Lk. (v. 20), and is to be suspected. 3 For σοι as εἰς σοῦ (from Lk.) ΝΒCL have σοι καί εἰς. 4 οὖν in B (W.H. marg.). 5 In the T.R., οὖν οὖν λαλεί βλασφημία, we detect the hand of harmonising and prosaic revisers once more. The true reading is τί (Β, οὖν) οὖν οὖν λαλεί βλασφημία (ΝΒCL). Vide below. 6 B omits οὖν (W.H. in brackets). 7 λέγει in ΝΒCL 33. B omits αὐτοῦ (W.H. in brackets). 8 ἀφείται in ΝΒ. 9 σοι in ΝΒCL al.

plaster.—κραβάτταν: a small portable couch, for the poor, for travellers, and for sick people; condemned by Phryn., p. 62; σκιμμοῦ the correct word. Latin gratarius, which may have led Mk. to use the term in the text.—Ver. 5. τὴν πίστιν αὐτῶν, their faith, of that of the bearers, shown by their energetic action, the sick man not included (οὐ τὴν πίστιν τούτου παραλυτικοῦ ἄλλα τῶν κοιμώντων, Victor Ant., Cramer, Cat.)—τέκνον, child, without the cheering δώρου of Mt. Vv. 6-12. Thus far of the sick man, how he got to Jesus, and the sympathetic reception he met with. Now the scribes begin to play their part. They find their opportunity in the sympathetic word of Jesus: thy sins be forgiven thee; a word most suitable to the case, and which might have been spoken by any man.—τινὰς πράγματα: He makes of this simple fact a great affair: an assembly of Pharisees and lawyers from all quarters—Galilee, Judea, Jerusalem, hardly suitable to the initial stage of conflict.—ἐκεῖ καθήμενοι: sitting there. If the posture is to be pressed they must have been early on the spot, so as to get near to Jesus and hear and see Him distinctly.—ἐν τοῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν: they looked like men shocked and disapproving. The popularity of Jesus prevented free utterance of their thought. But any one could see they were displeased and why. It was that speech about forgiveness.—Ver. 7. τι ὀφείλεις ἀμαρτίας βλασφημεῖ.
II.

352

KATA MARKON

Instead of εγενετο συ τω ΝΒΛ 33 have simply γενεται (W.H.).

For καὶ οἱ Φ. ΒΔΛ have των Φαρισαίων, which doubtless the ancient scribes stumbled at as unusual.

For αὐτὸν αὐθαίρετα Β 33 have ὅτι σωθεί (W.H., R.G.T.), ΝΔΛ οτι σωθέ (Tisch.). The T.R. follows ΑΚΔΣ.

For τοὺς ἀμαρτωλοὺς καὶ ταλαντών in BDL 33, to be preferred just because unusual.

Omit τι ΒΛ 33 (W.H.).

ΝΒΔL omit καὶ πάνω, which the scribes would be ready to insert.

NABDLΔΣ al. vers. omit εἰς μετανοεῖν, which has been imported from Lk.

pains to prevent us from overlooking the πολλοί of the previous clause = for they, the publicans, and generally the people who passed for sinners, were many, and they had begun to follow Him. Some (Schanz, Weiss, etc.) think the reference is to the disciples (μαθηταίς), mentioned here for first time, therefore a statement that they were numerous (more, e.g., than four), quite apposite. But the stress of the story lies on the publicans, and Christ's relations with them. (So Holtz., H. C.) It was an interesting fact to the evangelist that this class of whom there was a large number in the neighbourhood, were beginning to show an interest in Jesus, and to follow Him about. To explain the number Elsner suggests that they may have gathered from various port towns along the shore. Jesus would not meet such people in the synagogue, as they seem to have been excluded from it (vide Lightfoot and Wünsche, ad Mt. xviii. 17). Hence the necessity for a special mission.—Ver. 16. ἔλεγον: the scribes advance from thinking (ii. 8) to speaking; not yet, however, to Jesus but about Him to His disciples. They note, with disapproval, His kindly relations with “sinners”. The publicans and other disreputables had also noted the fact. The story of the palsied man and the “blasphemous” word, “thy sins be forgiven thee,” had got abroad, making them prick up their ears, and awakening decided interest in these tabooed circles, in the “Blasphemer.”—Ver. 17. καλέσατι: to call, suggestive of invitations to a feast (Fritzsche, Meyer, Holtz.), and making for the hypothesis that Jesus, not Matthew, was the real host at the social gathering: the whole plan His, and Matthew only His agent; vide notes on Mt. He called to that particular feast as to the feast of the kingdom, the one a means to the other as the end.—δικαίων, ἀμαρτωλοῖς: Jesus preferred the company of the sinful to that of the righteous, and sought disciples from among them by preference. The terms are not ironic. They simply describe two classes of society in current language, and indicate with which of the two His sympathies lay.

Vv. 18-22. Fasting (Mt. ix. 14-17, Lk. v. 33-39).—Ver. 18. καλ., and, connection purely topical, another case of conflict.—ἤπειρον γνωστοῦντες, either: were wont to fast (Grotius, Fritzsche, Schanz, etc.), or, and this gives more point to the story: were fasting at that particular time (Meyer, Weiss, Holtz., H. C.).—εὐχόμεναι καὶ λέγ., they come and say, quite generally; they = people, or some representatives of John's disciples, and the Pharisees.—Ver. 19. μη δουλαται, etc.: the question answers
18. Кαὶ ἴσαν οἱ μαθηταὶ ἵωνου καὶ οἱ τῶν Φαρισαίων ἐνηστεοῦσιν καὶ ἔχονται καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ, "Διατι οἱ μαθηταὶ ἵωνου καὶ οἱ τῶν Φαρισαίων ἐνηστεοῦσιν, οἱ δὲ οἱ μαθηταὶ οὐδὲνεισπράξανται;" 19. Καὶ εἶναι αὐτοῖς ὁ ἴωνος, ὁ οὐ κατὰ τὸν ὄμοιον, ἀλλὰ ἐν μιᾷ ἑτέρῳ ἐν τῷ τῷ ὀμοίῳ ἐν καθαριᾷ ταῖς ἡμέραις. 20. Καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμέραν ἐκείνην ἦσαν ἕναν ὁμοίον, ἀλλὰ ἐν μιᾷ ἑτέρῳ, καὶ τὸ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐν καθαριᾷ ταῖς ἡμέραις. 21. Καὶ ἐδείξει ἑκάστῳ δόκησεν ἕναν ἕναν, ἕναν ἑτέρῳ, ἔξαιρε τὸ πλήρες αὐτοῦ τὸ καυσὸν τοῦ καυσοῦ, καὶ ἐξηράνει τὸ σχῆμα γινόμενο. 22. ἐν αὐτοῖς βάλλει οἶνον οὐκ ἔσοδος παλαιοῦ οὐκ ἔσοδος νέου, ἐν ἑνὶ μηνί, ἐν ἑνὶ μηνί, οἶνος ὁ οὖς τῶν ἄσκοπος, καὶ ὁ οὖς εἰκονιζεί οὐκ ἔσοδος αὐτοὶ ἐπολοῦνται. 23. Ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοῦς καυσοῦ βλητῶν." 24. 

1 For τῶν Φαρισαίων ὉABCD al. verss. have Ἐφεσιάων. 2 NBCL have μαθηταὶ after οἱ. 3 NBCL arrange thus: εἰσπράξαν τὸν τῶν μετ' αὐτών. 4 εν εὐκρινή τῇ ἡμέρᾳ in ὉABCDlaε, etc. 5 καὶ omit ὉABCL 33. 6 εν εὐκρινή τῇ ἡμέρᾳ in ὉABCDL. The dat. conforms to Mt. 7 εν αὐτοίς in ὉBLε. 8 ὅρησεν in ὉABCD 33. 9 NBCL 13, 69 al. omit οὖς. 10 BL (D in part) read οὖς οὖς αὐτοῖς καὶ οἱ οἱ. T.R. conforms to Mt. 11 NB omit βλητῶν (from Lk.). D and old Lat. verss. omit the whole clause.

classic Greek it means to make a road = viam sternere, δόν τοιοῦτοι meaning to make way = iter facere. If we assume that Mk. was acquainted with and observed this distinction, then the meaning would be: the disciples began to make a path by pulling up the stalks (τίλλοντες τοὺς στέχους), or perhaps by trampling under foot the stalks after first plucking off the ears. The ἤρθαν in that case will mean that they began to do that when they saw the path was not clear, and wished to make it more comfortable for their Master to walk on. But it is doubtful whether in Hellenistic Greek the classic distinction was observed, and Judges xvi. 8 (Sept.) supplies a phrase to make way for the ears. The ἤρθαν in that case will mean that they began to do that when they saw the path was not clear, and wished to make it more comfortable for their Master to walk on. But it is doubtful whether in Hellenistic Greek the classic distinction was observed, and Judges xvii. 8 (Sept.) supplies an instance of δόν τοιοῦτοι making way, as he journeyed. It would come natural to Mk. to use the phrase in the sense of iter facere. If we take the phrase in this sense, then we must, with Beza, find in the passage a formula in verborum collocatio, and translate as if it had run: δόν τοιοῦτοι τὰλακαὶ, “began, as they went, to pluck,” etc. (R. V.). The former view, however, is not to be summarily put aside because it ascribes to the disciples an apparently wanton proceeding. If there was a right of way by use and wont, they would be quite entitled to act so. The only difficulty is to understand how a customary path could have remained untrodden till the grain was ripe, or even in the ear. On this view side Meyer. Assuming that the disciples made a path for their Master by pulling up the grain, with which it was overgrown, or by trampling the straw after plucking the ears, what did they do with the latter? Mt. and Lk. both say or imply that the plucking was in order to eating by hungry men. Meyer holds that Mk. knows nothing of this hunger, and that the eating of the ears came into the tradition through the allusion to David eating the shewbread. But the stress Mk. lays on need and hunger (duality of expression, ver. 25) shows that his idea hunger was an element in the case of the disciples also.—Ver. 24. Λέγειν αὐτῷ. In this case they speak to Christ against His disciples; indirectly against Him.—οὐκ ἐπαινεῖν: the offence was not trampling the grain or straw, but plucking the ears; reaping on a small scale; rubbing = thrashing, in Lk.—χρείαν ἐξήκολο ἢ ἐπεσήκων: another example of Mk.’s duality, intelligible only if hunger was the point of the story. The verbs are singular, because David (αὐτῶς) is the hero, his followers in the background.—Ver. 26. ἐν
Chapter III. The Sabbath Question Continued. The Disciple-Circle.

Another Sabbath conflict completes the group of incidents (five in all) designed to illustrate the opposition of the scribes and Pharisees to Jesus. Then at v. 7 begins a new section of the history, extending to vi. 13, in which the disciples of Jesus are, speaking broadly, the centre of interest. First the people, then their religious heads, then the nucleus of the new society.

Vv. 1-6. The withered hand (Mt. xii. 9-14, Lk. vi. 6-11).—Ver. 1. *καλ.: connection simply topical, another instance of collision *in re* Sabbath observance.—*πάλιν*: as was His wont on Sabbath days (i. 21, 39).—*συναγωγή*: without the article (†B), into a synagogue, place not known.—*ἐχθρικόν*; dried up, the abiding result of injury by accident or disease, not congenital.—*νεκρόν τούτον*—*νοοῦν*; sed morbo aut vulnere; haec vis participii." Beng.—Ver. 2. *παρετήρησαν*, they were watching Him; who, goes without saying: the same parties, i.e., men of the same class, as those who figure in the last section. For this same belief, and no less eminently, in finding Jesus Himself at fault in *re* the Sabbath, instinctively perceiving that His thoughts on the subject must be wholly diverse from theirs.—Ver. 3. *ἐγέρει* *εἰς*; pregnant construction = arise and come forth into the midst. Then, the man standing up in presence of all, Jesus proceeds to catechise the would-be-fault-finders.

Ver. 4. *ἐγέρθη εἰς* *κακοποιήσας*, either: to do good or evil to one, or to do the morally good or evil. Recent commentators favour the latter as essential to the cogency of Christ's argument. But the former seems more consonant to
8. The fame of Jesus spreads notwithstanding (v. 7-12).—Vv. 7-12. The fame of Jesus spreads notwithstanding (v. 7, vide Mt. iv. 25, xii. 15 ff.; Lk. vi. 17-19).—Ver. 7. "Omit νευρατόν (v. 6) without av.; without with BCL. The position of the verb in the sentence varies.

Vv. 7-12. The fame of Jesus spreads notwithstanding (v. 7, vide Mt. iv. 25, xii. 15 ff.; Lk. vi. 17-19).—Ver. 7. "Omit νευρατόν (v. 6) without av.; without with BCL. The position of the verb in the sentence varies.

Vv. 7-12. The fame of Jesus spreads notwithstanding (v. 7, vide Mt. iv. 25, xii. 15 ff.; Lk. vi. 17-19).—Ver. 7. "Omit νευρατόν (v. 6) without av.; without with BCL. The position of the verb in the sentence varies.

Vv. 7-12. The fame of Jesus spreads notwithstanding (v. 7, vide Mt. iv. 25, xii. 15 ff.; Lk. vi. 17-19).—Ver. 7. "Omit νευρατόν (v. 6) without av.; without with BCL. The position of the verb in the sentence varies.
Shephelah, with the Negeb."—G. A. Smith, *Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, p. 239. Mentioned by Josephus (B. J., iii. 3-5) as a division of Judaea.—Ver. 9. έπαυσεν προσκαρτέρησε: a boat to be always in readiness, to get away from the crowds. Whether used or not not said; shows how great the crowd was.—Ver. 10. δοτε ἐπιπτέτεν: so that they knocked against Him; one of Mk.'s vivid touches. They hoped to obtain a cure by contact anyhow brought about, even by rude collision.—μαρτυρεῖ, from μαρτυρία, a scourge, hence tropically in Sept. and N. T., a providential scourge, a disease; again in v. 29, 34.—Ver. 11. έστο θάλ. In a relative clause like this, containing a past general supposition, classical Greek has the optative, Mk. has the imperative. Here we have the imperfect indicative with ἔσται (ἔσται). *Vide* Klotz., *ad Depar*, p. 600, and Burton, *M. and T.*, § 315. Other examples in chap. vi. 56, xi. 10.—προσκαρτέρησεν, fell before (ἐπιπτέτων, above, to fall against).—Συμ. 1: 14, v. 8.; again an instance of spiritual clairvoyance in demoniacs. *Vide* at Mt. viii. 29.—Ver. 12. This sentence is reproduced in Mt. xii. 16, but without special reference to demoniacs, whereby it loses much of its point. —Ver. 13-16. *Selection of the Twelve* (cf. Mt. x. 24, Lk. vi. 12-16).—Ver. 13. ἔσται ἐν ὑμῖν. He ascends to the hill; same expression as in Mt. v. 1; reference not to any particular hill, but to the hill country flanking the shore of the lake; might be used from whatever point below the ascent was made.—προσκαρτέρησεν, etc., He calls to Him those whom He Himself (αὐτός after the verb, emphatic) wished, whether by personal communication with each individual, or through disciples, not indicated. It was an invitation to leave the vast crowd and follow Him up the hill; addressed to a larger number than twelve, from whom the Twelve were afterwards selected.—ἀναβλέψαντες υ. ο.: they left the crowd and followed after Him.—Ver. 14. He is now on the hill top, surrounded by a body of disciples, perhaps some scores, picked out from the great mass of followers.—καὶ ἐν τούτῳ διδάσκει: and He made, constituted as a compact body, the Twelve. Here we have the imperfect indicative with ἔσται (ἔσται). *Vide* Klotz., *ad Depar*, p. 600, and Burton, *M. and T.*, § 315. Other examples in chap. vi. 56, xi. 10.—προσκαρτέρησεν, fell before (ἐπιπτέτων, above, to fall against).—Συμ. 1: 14, v. 8.; again an instance of spiritual clairvoyance in demoniacs. *Vide* at Mt. viii. 29.—Ver. 12. This sentence is reproduced in Mt. xii. 16, but without special reference to demoniacs, whereby it loses much of its point. —Ver. 13-16. *Selection of the Twelve* (cf. Mt. x. 24, Lk. vi. 12-16).—Ver. 13. ἐσται ἐν ὑμῖν. He ascends to the hill; same expression as in Mt. v. 1; reference not to any particular hill, but to the hill
appointed as the Twelve—the following persons, the twelve names mentioned being the object of ἐπιθυμεῖν, and τοὺς δὲ being in apposition.—Πέτρον is the first name, but it comes in very awkwardly as the object of the verb ἐπιθυμεῖν. We must take the grammar as it stands, content that we know, in spite of crude construction, what is meant. Fritzsche (after Beza, Erasmus, etc.) seeks to rectify the construction by prefixing, on slender critical authority, πρῶτον Σίμωνα, then brackets as a parenthesis καὶ ἐπιθυμεῖν ἐπὶ πρῶτον . . . Πέτρον = first Simon (and He gave to Simon the name Peter).—

Ver. 17. Βοοιργεῖς = θυνὶς ὀνόμαζεν as pronounced by Galileans; in Syrian = sons of thunder; of tumult, in Hebrew. Fact mentioned by Mk. only. Why the name was given is not known. It does not seem to have stuck to the two disciples, therefore not mentioned by other evangelists. It may have been an innocent pleasantry in a society of free, unrestrained fellowship, hitting off some peculiarity of the brothers. Mk. gives us here a momentary glimpse into the inner life of the Jesus-circle—Peter, whose new name did live, doubtless the voucher. The traditional interpretation makes the epithet a tribute to the eloquence of the two disciples (ὅδε τὸ μὲν ἀργοῦ καὶ διαστύνοντος ἡμῖν τηλεογογία τῆς θεολογίας τοῦ Βοοιργεῖα. Victor Ant.).—

Ver. 18. Mattathias. One wonders why Mk. did not here say: Levi, to whom He gave the name Matthew. Or did this disciple get his new name independently of Jesus? This list of names shows the importance of the act of selecting the Twelve. He gives the names, says Victor Ant., that you may not err as to the designations, lest any one should call himself an apostle τοὐῳ δὲ τινοῖς ἑσπερῶς ἀπόστολοι γεγονότοι. Ver. 19b-21. The friends of Jesus think Him out of His senses; peculiar to Mk. One of his realisms which Mt. and Lk. pass over in silence.—Ver. 19b. καὶ ἔρχεται εἷς οἶκος, and He cometh home (“nach Haus,” Weizs.) to house-life as distinct from hill-life (εἰς τὸ ὄζος, ver. 13). The formal manner in which this is stated suggests a sojourn on the hill of appreciable length, say, for some days. How occupied there? Probably in giving a course of instruction to the disciple-circle; say, that reproduced in the “Sermon on the Mount” = the “Teaching on the Hill,” vide introductory notes on Mt. v.—Ver. 20. The traditional arrangement by which clause b forms part of ver. 19 is fatal to a true conception of the connection of events. The Ῥ., by making it begin a new section, though not a new verse, helps intelligence, but it would be better still if it formed a new verse with a blank space left between. Some think that in the original form of Mk. the Sermon on the Mount came in here. It is certainly a suitable place for it. In accordance with the above suggestion the text would stand thus:—

Ver. 19. And Judas Iscariot, who also betrayed Him.——

Ver. 20. And He cometh home. Ver. 21. And the multitude cometh together again, etc.
persed, reassembles (implying lapses of an appreciable interval). Jesus had hoped they would go away to their homes in various parts of the country during His absence on the hill, but He was disappointed. They lingered on.—ἐστε, etc.: the crowding about the house and the demand for sight and succour of the Benefactor were so great that they (Jesus and His companions) could not find leisure not even (μὴδὲ) to take food, not to speak of rest, or giving instruction to disciples. Erasmus (Adnot.) thinks the reference is to the multitude, and the meaning that it was so large that there was not bread for all, not to speak of kitchen (obsonia).—Ver. 21 introduces a new scene into the lively drama. The statement is obscure partly owing to its brevity (Fritzsche), and it is made obscure by a pitiful which is not willing to accept the surface meaning (so Maldonatus—"hunc locum difficiliorum pietas facit"), which is that the friends of Jesus, having heard of what was going on—wonderful cures, great crowds, incessant activity—set out from where they were (ἐξ ἕλληνων) with the purpose of taking Him under their care (καταφέροντες αὐτόν), their impression, not concealed (ὁ λόγος, they had begun to say), being that He was in an unhealthy state of excitement bordering on insanity (ἐξέστη). Recent commentators, German and English, are in the main agreed that this is the true sense of ἐξέστη (cf. i. 12, v. 42, vi. 51).

Theophy (Theophy) is too strong, though the Jews apparently identified insanity with possession. Festus said of St. Paul: "Much learning doth make thee mad." The friends of Jesus thought that much beneficence had put Him into a state of enthusiasm dangerous to the health both of body and mind. Note: Christ’s healing ministry created a need for theories about it. Herod had his theories of Jesus (Mt. ii. 19. ‘meat friends’—μετὰ τῶν φίλων ὑδότων, and the Pharisees their: John redivivus, disordered mind, Satanic possession. That which called forth so many theories must have been a great fact.

Vv. 22-30. Pharisaic theory as to the cures of demoniacs wrought by Jesus (Mt. xii. 22-37. Lk. xv. 17-23.)—Ver. 22. ᾧ ἔρωμεν, ὧν ἀρνεῖτο, the scribes from Jerusalem. The local Pharisees who had taken the Herodians into their murderous counsels had probably also communicated with the Jerusalem authorities, using all possible means to compass their end. The representatives of the southern scribes had probably arrived on the scene about the same time as the friends of Jesus, although it is not inconceivable that Mk. introduces the narrative regarding them here because
of the resemblances and contrasts between their theory and that of the friends. Mt. sets the incident in different relations, yielding a contrast between Pharisaic ideas and those of the people respecting the cure of demoniacs by Jesus (xxii. 22 f.). — Βεελζεβολ. Ης ἅθη Beelzebul, implying that Beelzebul hath Him, using Him as his agent. The expression points to something more than an alliance, as in Mt., to possession, and that on a grand scale; a divine possession by a base deity, god of flies (Beelzebul) or god of dung (Beelzebul), still a god, a sort of Satanic incarnation; an involuntary compliment to the exceptional power and greatness of Jesus. — ἐν τῷ άρχων 4:1: the assumption that spirits are cast out by the aid of some other spirit stronger than those ejected. — Ver. 23. Προσκαλεσάμενος: Jesus, not overawed by the Jerusalem authorities, invites them to come within talking distance, that He may reason the matter with them. — έν παραβολάς, in figures; kingdom, house, plundering the house of a strong man. Next chapter concerning the parabolic teaching of Jesus casts its shadow on the page here. The gist of what Jesus said to the scribes in refutation of their theory is: granting that spirits are cast out by aid of another spirit, more is needed in the latter than superior strength. There must be qualitative difference—in nature and interest. The argument consists of a triple movement of thought. 1. The absurdity of the theory is broadly asserted. 2. The principle on which the theory is wrecked is set forth in concrete form. 3. The principle is applied to the case in hand. — ὡς δύναται, etc., how can Satan cast out Satan? It is not a question of power, but of motive, what interest can he have? A stronger spirit casting out a weaker one of the same kind? (so Fritzsche). — Vv. 24, 25 set forth the principle or rationales embodied in two illustrations. The theory in question is futile because it involves suicidal action, which is not gratuitously to be imputed to any rational agents, to a kingdom (ver. 24), to a house (ver. 25), and therefore not to Satan (ver. 26). — Ver. 27 by another figure shows the true state of the case. Jesus, not in league with Satan or Beelzebul, but overpowering him, and taking possession of his goods, human souls. The saying is given by Mk. much the same as in Mt. Vv. 28, 29. Jesus now changes His tone. Thus far He has reasoned with the scribes, now He solemnly warns to this effect. You do not believe your own theory; you know as well as I how absurd it is, and that I must be casting out devils by a very different spirit from
Beelzebub. You are therefore not merely mistaken theorists, you are men in a very perilous moral condition. Beware!—Ver. 28. áφην: solemn word, introducing a solemn speech uttered in a tone not to be forgotten.—πάντα ἀφεθήσατε, all things shall be forgiven; magnificently broad proclamation of the wideness of God’s mercy. The saying as reproduced in Lk. xii. 10 limits the reference to sins of speech. The original form, Weiss thinks (in Meyer), but this is very doubtful. It seems fitting that when an exception is being made to the pardonableness of sin, a broad declaration of the extent of pardon should be uttered.—τοῖς ὅλοις τ. Δ., to the sons of men; this expression not in Mt., but in its place a reference to blasphemy against the Son of Man. To suspect a literary connection between the two is natural. Which is the original form? Mk.’s? (Holtz., H. C., after Pfeiderer.) Mt.’s? (Weiss in Meyer.) The latter the more probable. Vide on ver. 30.—αἱ ἀμαρτίαι, sin at BL.: either in apposition with and explicative of πάντα, or τα ἀμαρτ., the subject which πάντα qualifies. The former construction yields this sense: all things shall be forgiven, etc., the sins and the blasphemies wherewithsoever they shall blaspheme. The last clause qualifying ἀμαρτηματαί (ἀμαρτ. ἀπό των BL.) which takes the place of πάντα in relation to ἀμαρτ.: is in favour of the latter rendering = all sins shall be forgiven, etc., and the blasphemies, etc.—Ver. 29. The great exception, blasphemy against the Holy Ghost.—τὸν αἵ̇ων: hath not forgiveness for ever.

Cf. the fuller expression in Mt.—ἀλλ’ ἁνευρέσῃ, but is guilty of. The negative is followed by a positive statement of similar import in Hebrew fashion.—ἀλοιπόν ἀμαρτηματος: of an eternal sin. As this is equivalent to "hath never forgiveness," we must conceive of the sin as eternal in its guilt, not in itself as a sin. The idea is that of an unpardonable sin, not of a sin eternally repeating itself. Yet this may be the ultimate ground of unpardonableness: unforgivable because never repented of. But this thought is not necessarily contained in the expression.—Ver. 30. ἤτι λέγων, etc., because they said: "He hath an unclean spirit," therefore He said this about blasphemy against the Holy Ghost—such is the connection. But what if they spoke under a misunderstanding like the friends, puzzled what to think about this strange man? That would be a sin against the Son of Man, and as such pardonable. The distinction between blasphemy against the Son of Man and blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, taken in Mt. xii. 31, is essential to the understanding of Christ’s thought. The mere saying, "He hath an unclean spirit," does not amount to the unpardonable sin. It becomes such when it is said by men who know that it is not true; then it means calling the Holy Spirit an unclean spirit. Jesus believed that the scribes were in that position, or near it.

Vv. 31-35. The relatives of Jesus (Mt. xii. 46-50, Lk. viii. 19-21).—Ver. 31. ἔρχονται, even without the ὅτι following in T. R., naturally points back
to ver. 31. The evangelist resumes the story about Christ's friends, interrupted by the encounter with the scribes (so Grotius, Bengel, Meyer, Weiss, Holtz.; Schanz and Keil dissent).—στάχτουσα, from στάχτη, a late form used in present only, from σταχτός, perfect of σταχτέα.—

Ver. 32. The crowd gathered around Jesus report the presence of His relatives. According to a reading in several MSS., these included sisters among those present. They might do so under a mistake, even though the sisters were not there. If the friends came to withdraw Jesus from public life, the sisters were not likely to accompany the party, though there would be no impropriety in their going along with their mother. They are not mentioned in ver. 31. On the other hand, διδασκάλη comes in appropriately in ver. 33 in recognition of female disciples, which may have suggested its introduction here.—Ver. 33. τίς μήτηρ, etc., who is my mother, and (who) my brothers? an apparently harsh question, but He knew what they had come for.—Ver. 34. περιβλέπουσος, as in ver. 5, there in anger, here with a benign smile. —όφθαλμοι: His eye swept the whole circle of His audience: a good Greek expression.—Ver. 35. δε, etc.: whoever shall do the will of God ("of my Father in heaven," Mt.), definition of true discipleship.—διδασκάλη, διδασκάλη, μήτηρ: without the article, because the nouns are used figuratively (Fritzsche). This saying and the mood it expressed would confirm the friends in the belief that Jesus was in a morbid state of mind.

Chapter IV. Parabolic Teaching. In common with Mt., Mk. recognises that teaching in parables became at a given date a special feature of Christ's didactic ministry. He gives, however, fewer samples of that type than the first evangelist. Two out of the seven in Mt., with one peculiar to himself, three in all; in this respect probably truer to the actual history of the particular day. Teaching in parables did not make an absolutely new beginning on the day on which the Parable of the Sower was spoken. Jesus doubtless used similitudes in all His synagogue discourses, of which a few samples may have been preserved in the Mustard Seed, the Treasure, and the Pearl.
serving as a sample.—ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ. In the teaching of that day He said inter alia what follows.—Ver. 3. ἀκούετε: hear! listen! a summons to attention natural for one addressing a great crowd from a boat quite compatible with ἤδωρ, which introduces the parable (against Weiss in Meyer). The parable is given here essentially as in Mt., with only slight variations: στέφοι( ver. 3) for στέφαινα( ver. 4) for δὲ μὲν, ἄλλο (νν. 5, 7) for ἄλλα. To the statement that the thorns choked the grain (συνε-μείζων αὐτὸς), Mk. adds (ver. 7) καὶ καρπὸν ὅκι δεῦκεν, an addition not superfluous in this case, as it would have been in the previous, because the grain in this case reaches the green ear. To be noted further is the expansion in ver. 8, in reference to the seed sown on good soil, Mt. says it yielded fruit (ἐδίδον καρπὸν), Mk. adds ἀναβάλλοντα καὶ ἀνεξάκουστον, καὶ ἐδέψεν, all three phrases referring to ἄλλα at the beginning of the verse. The participles taken along with ἐδίδον καρπὸν distinguish the result in the fourth case from those in the three preceding. The first did not spring up, being picked up by the birds, the second sprang up but did not grow, withered by the heat, the third sprouted and grew up but yielded no (ripe) fruit, choked by thorns (Grotius). —καὶ ἐδέψεν introduces a statement as to the quantity of fruit, the degrees being arranged in a climax, 30, 60, 100, instead of in an anti-climax, as in Mt., 100, 60, 30.—Ver. 9. καὶ έλεγεν: this phrase is wanting in Mt., and the summons to reflection is more pitifully expressed there = who hath ears let him hear. The summons implies that understanding is possible even for those without.

Vv. 10-12. Disciples ask an explanation of the parable (Mt. xiii. 10-17, Lk. viii. 9-10). Ver. 10. καὶ δέ μόνον (δὲ δὲν or γὰρ) ἠκούατο ἀλοιπόν, those about Him, not = οἱ παρ’ αὐτοῦ (iii. 21), nor = the Twelve, who are separately mentioned (σὺν τ. διδ.) ; an outer circle of disciples from which the Twelve were chosen.—τὰς παραβολὰς, the parables, spoken that day. They asked Him about them, as to their meaning. The plural, well attested, implies that the parables of the day had a common drift. To explain one was to explain all. They were a complaint of the comparative fruitlessness of past efforts.—Ver. 11. ἃς τοις, to you has been given, so as to be a permanent possession, the
mystery of the Kingdom of God. They have been initiated into the secret, so that for them it is a secret no longer, not by explanation of the parable (Weiss), but independently. This true of them so far as disciples; discipleship means initiation into the mystery. In reality, it was only partially, and by comparison with the people, true of the disciples.—γνώρισις in T. R. is superfluous. —τοιαύτης refers to the common crowd. —ἐν τοῖς παραβολαῖς: all things take place as set forth in parables. This implies that the use of parables had been a standing feature of Christ's popular kerygma, in synagogue and street.—Ver. 12 seems to state the aim of the parabolic method of teaching as being to keep the people in the dark, and prevent them from being converted and forgiven. This cannot really have been the aim of Jesus. Vide notes on the parable of the Sower in Mt., where the statement is softened somewhat.

Vv. 13-20. Explanation of the Sower (Mt. xiii. 18-23, Lk. viii. 11-15), prefaced by a gentle reproach that explanation should be needed.—Ver. 13. οὐκ οἶδατε . . . γνώρισιν: not one question = know ye not this parable? and how ye shall know all, etc. (so Meyer and Weiss), but two = know ye not this parable? and how shall ye, etc. (so most), the meaning being, not: if ye know not the simpler how shall ye know the more difficult? but rather implying that to understand the Sower was to understand all the parables spoken that day (πᾶσας τοῖς παραβολαῖς). They had all really one burden: the disappointing result of Christ's past ministry.—Ver. 14, in effect, states that the seed is the word.—Ver. 15. ἐπάρα τὴν ὀδόν: elliptical for, those in whose case the seed falls along the way = the "way side" men, and so in the other cases.—ἀπέθανεν for εἶς οὗς, Euthy. Zig.—Ver. 16. ὅτε ἦσαν would stand more naturally before ὀφθαλμοί = on the same method of interpretation.—συνεργοῦνται: this class are identified with the seed rather than with the soil, but the sense, though crudely expressed,
is plain. They are the "rocky ground" men.—Ver. 18. ἄλλοι ἐλείν, there are others; ἄλλοι, well attested (ους in T. R.), is significant. It fixes attention on the third type of hearers as calling for special notice. They are such as, lacking the thoughtlessness of the first and shallowness of the second class, and having some depth and earnestness, might be expected to be fruitful; a less common type and much more interesting.

Ver. 19 specifies the hindrances, the choking thorns—μήματα τ. σ., cares of life, in the case of thoughtful devout poor (Mt. vi. 25 f.).—ἀπάθει τ. πλ.], the deceitfulness of wealth in the case of the commercial class (Chorazin, Bethsaida, Capernaum: Mt. xi. 21-23. Vide notes there).—αἰ w. τ. λ. ἐπιθυμίας, the lusts for other things—sensual vices in the case of publicans and sinners (chap. ii. 13-17). Jesus had met with such cases in His past ministry.—Ver. 20. παραδείγματα, receive, answering to συνιστα in Mt. This does not adequately differentiate the fourth class from the third, who also take in the word, but not it alone. Lk. has supplied the defect.—ἐν might be either ἐν this one 30, that one 60, etc., or ἐν = in 30, and in 60, and in 100 = good, better, best, not inferior, respectable, admirable. The lowest degree is deemed satisfactory. On the originality of the interpretation and on the whole parable vide in Mt.

Vv. 21-25. Responsibilities of disciples (Mt. v. 15, x. 26, vii. 2; Lk. viii. 16-18).

True to His uniform teaching that privileges are to be used for the benefit of others, Jesus tells His disciples that if they have more insight than the multitude they must employ it for the common benefit. These sentences in Mk. represent the first special instruction of the disciples. Two of them, vv. 21, 24, are found in the Sermon on the Mount (Mt. v. 15, vii. 2). The whole of them come in appositely here, and were probably spoken at this time. (Cf. Lk. viii. 16-18, where they are partially given in the same connection.) In any case, their introduction in connection with the parables is important as showing that Mk. can hardly have seriously believed, what he certainly seems to say, that Jesus spoke parables to blind the people.—Ver. 21. μὴ ἔχεται, does the light come, for is it brought, in accordance with classic usage in reference to things without life; example in Kypre, e.g., οὐκ ἔχειν ἄλαθεν τράπεζαν γνῆσιαν. Findar, Pyth., iii, 28 = "non exspectavit donec adferretur mensa sponsalis".—6. τ. ἀλήθεια: not necessarily a table-couch (Meyer), might
be a bed, high enough to be in no danger of being set on fire. Vide on Mt. v. 15. The moral: let your light shine that others may know what ye know.—Ver. 22. Double statement of the law that the hidden is to be revealed; 1st, predictively; there is nothing hidden which shall not be revealed; 2nd, interpretatively, with reference to the purpose of the hider: nor did anything become concealed with any other view than that it should eventually come to manifestation. —ἀποκρύφων (ἀποκρύφως), here and in Lk. viii. 17, Col. ii. 3. —Ἀλλ': in effect = ἀπὸ μη αἰσθανόμενοι, but strictly ἀπὸ ἑνότω τοῦ ἔθνους is understood to be repeated after it = nothing becomes concealed absolutely, but it is concealed in order that, etc. This is universally true. Things are hid because they are precious, but precious things are meant to be used at some time and in some way. All depends on the time and the way, and it is there that diversity of action comes in. Christ's rule for that was: show your light when it will glorify God and benefit men; the world's rule is: when safe and beneficial to self.—Ver. 23. In ver. 9 a summons to those who have understood, or shall understand, the parable; here a summons to those who have understood, or shall understand, the parable, or the great theme of all the parables, to communicate their knowledge. Fritzsche, after Theophy. and Grot., thinks that in vv. 21, 22, Jesus exhorts His disciples to the culture of piety or virtue, not to the diffusion of their light, giving, as a reason, that the latter would be inconsistent with the professed aim of the parables to prevent enlightenment!—Ver. 24. Βάπτιστης, etc., take heed what you hear or how (πῶς, Lk.), see that ye hear to purpose.—ἐν ἡμῖν ἐκεῖνοι. It is not possible that the whole verse be quoted, even when the Lord speaks the whole thing. For the King James version is incorrect.
the fourth type of hearers the production of fruit is a gradual process demanding time. Put negatively it amounts to saying that Christ's ministry has as yet produced no fruit properly speaking at all, but only in some cases met with a soil that gives promise of fruit (the disciples). The parable reveals at once the discrimination and the patience of Jesus. He knew the difference between the blade that would wither and that which would issue in ripe grain, and He did not expect this result in any case per salium. A parable teaching this lesson was very reasonable after that of the Sower.—Ver. 27. καθεσθε. ... ἡμέρα, sleep and rise night and day, suggestive of the monotonous life of a man who has nothing particular to do beyond waiting patiently for the result of what he has already done (seed sown). The presents express a habit, while ἁλίμος, ver. 26, expresses an act, done once for all.—βλαστάω (the reading in BD, etc., as if from βλάσταω) may be either indicative or subjunctive, the former if we adopt the reading μηκένειαι (BD, etc.) = and the seed sprouts and lengthens.— étant ous elai, αὐτός, how knoweth not (nor careth) he, perfectly indifferent to the rationales of growth; the fact enough for him.—Ver. 28. αὐτομάτη (αὐτός and μαία, from absolute μαία, to desire eagerly), self-moving, spontaneously, without external aid, and also beyond external control; with a way and will, so to speak, of its own that must be respected and waited for. Classical examples in Wetstein, Kypke, Raphel, etc.—καρποφορεῖ, beareth fruit, intransitive. The following nouns, χάρτον, στάχυν, are not the object of the verb, but in apposition with καρπον (καρπον φέρει) or governed by φέρει, understood (φέρει, quod ex καρποφορεῖ petitionum, Fritzsche).—πληρός στός, this change to the nominative (the reading of BD) is a tribute to the importance of the final stage towards which the stages of blade and ear are but preparatory steps = then is the full ear. Full = ripe, perfect, hence the combination of the two words in such phrases as πλήρης καὶ τάδεια τάγαδα quoted by Kypke from Philo. The specification of the three stages shows that gradual growth is the point of the parable (Schanz).—Ver. 29. παραβολαὶ (παραβολῶ), when the fruit yields itself, or permits (by being ripe). The latter sense (for which classical usage can be cited) is preferred by most recent commentators.

Vv. 30-32. The Mustard Seed (Mt. xiii. 31-32, Lk. xiii. 18, 19).—Ver. 30. τῶν ... θημεῖ (vide above). This introductory question, especially as given in the text
of W.H., is very graphic = how shall we liken the Kingdom of God, or in (under) what parable shall we place it? The form of expression implies that something has been said before creating a need for figurative embodiment, something pointing to the insignificance of the beginnings of the Kingdom. The two previous parables satisfy this requirement = the word fruitful only in a few, and even in them only after a time. What is the best emblem of this state of things? — Ver. 31. ὡς κόκκον: ὡς stands for δρομούμενον = let us liken it to a grain, etc.; κόκκον would depend on δρομούμενον. — δέ τοις σταρῃ... καὶ τῶν σταρη: the construction of this passage as given in critical texts is very halting, offering a very tempting opportunity for emendation to the scribes who in the T. R. have given us a very smooth readable text (vide A. V.). Literally it runs thus: "which when it is sown upon the earth, being the least of all the seeds upon the earth, when it is sown, etc." etc. The R. V. improves this rugged sentence somewhat by substituting "yet" for "and" in last clause. It is hardly worth while attempting to construe the passage. Enough that we see what is meant. In the twice used δρομούμενον σταρῃ, the emphasis in the first instance lies on δρομούμενον, in the second on σταρῃ (Bengel, Meyer). By attending to this we get the sense: which being the least of all seeds when it is sown or at the time of sowing, yet when it is sown, after sowing, springs up, etc. — μακρότερον δὲ is nearer by attraction of σταρημάτων, though κόκκον going before is masculine. — Ver. 32. μεῖζον τ. τ. λαχάνων, the greatest of all the herbs, still only an herb; no word of a tree here as in Matthew and Luke, though comparatively tree-like in size, making great boughs (χάλικοι μεγάλους), great relatively to its kind, not to forest trees. Mark’s version here is evidently the more original.

Vv. 33, 34. Conclusion of the parable collection (Mt. xiii. 34, 35).— Ver. 33. τοιαύτας π. π., with such parables, many of them, He was speaking to them the word, implying that the three— sower; blade, ear and full corn; mustard seed—are given as samples of the utterances from the boat, all of one type, about seed representing the word, and expressing Christ’s feelings of disappointment yet of hope regarding His ministry. Many is to be taken cum grano.—καθὼς ἱδώνατο ἰδοὺν = as they were able to understand, as in 1 Cor. xiv. 2, implying that parables were employed to make truth plain (De Wette).— Ver. 34. χωρὶς παραβολῆς, etc., without a parable He was not wont to speak to the people, not merely that day, but at any time.— ἐπιλέους, etc., He was in the habit of interpreting all things (viz., the parables in private to His own disciples, the Two sands cf. ἐπιλέους, 2 Peter i. 20). This does not necessarily imply that the multitude understood nothing, but only that Jesus, by further talk, made the disciples understand better. Yet on the whole it must be admitted that in his account of Christ’s parabolic teaching Mark seems to vacillate between two opposite views of the function of parables, one that they were used to make spiritual truths plain to popular intelligence, the other that they were riddles, themselves very much needing explanation, and fitted, even intended, to hide truth. This second view might be suggested and fostered by the fact that some of the parables express recondite spiritual truths.

Vv. 35-41. Crossing the lake (Mt. vii. 18, 23-27, Lk. viii. 22-25).— ἐν ὁδῷ τ. ἡμέρας τ. ἡμέρας, on that day, the day of the parable
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IV. 36—41.

Δοθεὶν εἰς τὸ πέραν." 36. Καὶ ἀφέντες τὸν ὥχον, παραλαμ
θήσαντο αὐτῶν, δὲ ἦν ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ. "καὶ ἀλλὰ "δὲ 1 πλοίῳ δὲ ἦν
Mt. x. 18. John vi. 31. John i. 53. 
καὶ μετ' αὐτοῦ. 37. καὶ γίνεται λαλάσφ ἀνέμου μεγάλη. τὰ δὲ 4 κόματα
ἐπὶ τῷ πλοῖῳ, δότε ἀνέμος ἡ γεμίσθη. 38. καὶ ἦν
solely: in same sense. 
there only: in ABCDAI. ὅτι γεμίσθη τὸ πλοῖον εἰς τῇ πλοίῳ, ὅτε
καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ βάλλοντι, "Σιώπη, πεφίμωσον." καὶ ἐκάτωθεν ὁ ἄνεμος,
there. Mt. i. ἐγένετο γαλάζη μεγάλη. 40. καὶ ἐκέντε ἄνεμοι, "Τῇ ὑπερ
viii. ἐστιν ὁ ἄνεμος; τῶν οὐκ ἔχεται πάσην," 41. Καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν ἄνεμοι
καὶ Πλευρὸς πρὸς ἀλλήλους, "Τῇ ἄρᾳ ὁδὸς ἔστιν, ὅτι καὶ 
καὶ ἂν εἰμι καὶ τῇ βάλλει συναντηκόμοις 10 ἄνεμοι; /
1 ΝΒCL omitted: found in D; no other instance of καὶ ... δε in Mk.
2 πλοίον in ΝΑΒCDΛA. 8 μεγάλη γαλάζη in BDΛΑ.
καὶ τα for τα in ΝΒCDΛΑ. 
4 ὅτε γεμίσθη τὸ πλοῖον in ΝΒCDΛΑ: rugged style, but none the less 
likely to be true.
5 ἄνεμος ἄνεμος in ΝΒCL. 
6 ἐγένετο γαλάζη μεγάλη in BDΛΑ.
7 ὅτι in ΝΑΒΔΛΑ.
8 ἐπιστρεφόμενον in ΝΒΛΑ. 
9 ἐγένετο in ΝΒΔΛΑ (W.H.). 
10 νεκράνον in BL (W.H.). So ΝΚΔ, but with ἀντί after verb. Vide below.
discourse, the more to be noted that 
Mark does not usually trouble himself 
about temporal connection. — δοθεὶν, 
let us cross over, spoken to the Twelve, 
who are in the boat with Jesus.—Ver. 
36. This verse describes the manner in 
which Christ's wish was carried out—it 
was in effect a flight along the only line 
of retreat, the shore being besieged by 
the crowd = leaving (ἀφέντες, not 
dismissing) the crowd they carry Him off 
(as they reached the ship) as He was in 
the ship (καὶ ἦν — ὡς ἐγένο) sine apprehensu 
(Bengel) and sine morā; but there were 
also other boats with Him, i.e., with His 
boat. This last fact, peculiar to Mark, 
is added to show that even seawards 
escape was difficult. Some of the people 
had got into boats to be nearer the 
Speaker. The 31 after ἄλα, though 
doubtful, helps to bring out the sense. 
This is another of Mark's realisms.— 
Ver. 37. γίνεται λαλάσφ: cf. Jonah i. 
4, ἐγένετο πλῆθος μέγας. — ἐπιστρέφειν, 
were dashing (intransitive) against and 
into (ἐις) the ship.—γεμίσθη, so that the 
already (ἐπὶ) the ship was getting full. 
—Ver. 38. τὸ πρωσοκεφάλαιον, 
the pillow, a part of the ship, as indicated 
by the article (Bengel); no soft luxurious 
pillow, probably of wood (Theophy., 
Euthy.): "the leathern cushion of the 
steersman" (Macleay, Camb. N. T.); 
the low bench at the stern on which the 
steersman sometimes sits, and the captain 
sometimes rests his head to sleep (Van 
Lennep, Bible Lands, p. 62).—Ver. 39. 
Observe the poetic parallelism in this 
verse: wind and sea separately addressed, 
and the corresponding effects separately 
specified: lulled wind, calmèd sea. The 
evangelist realises the dramatic character 
of the situation.— σιώπη, πεφίμωσον, 
silence! hush! laconic, majestic, 
probably the very words. — ἀνέμοι, 
ceased, as if tired blowing, from κόμα (vide at 
Mt. xiv. 32).—Ver. 40. τῇ ὑπερ 
ΒΔΛΑ. — Ver. 41. ἐφοβήθησαν 
ἔφοβος μέγας, πρὸς άλλήλους, "Τῇ ἄρᾳ 
ὁδὸς ἔστιν, ὅτι καὶ ἂν εἰμι καὶ τῇ 
βάλλει συναντηκόμοις ἄνεμοι; /
One would have thought the disciples 
had been prepared by this time for any-
things. Matthew indeed has ἰδοὺ ἄνθρωποι, 
suggestive of other than disciples, as if 
such surprise in them were incongruous. 
But their emotional condition, arising 
out of the dangerous situation, must be 
taken into account. For the rest Jesus 
was always giving them surprises; His 
mind and character had so many sides. 
ὁμαλομαλός, singular, the wind and the 
sea thought of separately, each a wild 
lawless element, not given to obeying: 
even the wind, even the sea, obeys Him l
Chapter V. The Gerasene Demoniac. The Daughter of Jairus. The Woman with an Issue. This group of incidents is given in the same order in all three synoptists, but in Matthew not in immediate sequence. —Vv. 1-20. The Gerasene Demoniac (Mt. viii. 28-34. Lk. viii. 26-39). —Ver. 1. 
V. 1. KAI ἠλθὼν εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς βαλάσσης, εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν 
Γαδαρηνῶν. 
2. καὶ ἠσθένει αὐτῷ ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου, οἰδώς ἀντί-
ρησεν αὐτῷ ἐκ τῶν μυμηῶν ἀντρώπων ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ. 
3. ἐδοὺς ἀναιμίας εἰς τοὺς μυμηῖν ἅλλοις καὶ ἀλκόσει ὑπὲρ τῆς 
βεβαίας, καὶ διασπάζοντας ἀν' αὐτοῦ τὰς ἀλάσεις, καὶ τὰς 
συντρήθεις καὶ οἰδώς ἀναιμίας οἴνῳ διαμάσας. 
4. καὶ διαπανθότα 
καὶ ἠμέρας ἐν τοῖς δρεπεῖ καὶ ἐν τοῖς μνήμοσιν ἐν τοῖς δΡάζεν 
καὶ ἓνοικότα ἡσύχη λίθους. 
6. ἰδεν δὲ τὸν ἠημύον αὐτῷ 

1 θεραπευνὸς in ΒΒΔ it. vg. (Tisch., W.H.).
2 θεραπευνὸς αὐτῶν in ΒΒΔΛΑ (Tisch., W.H.).
3 υπηρέτησιν in ΒΒΔΛΑ. 
4 μνήματι in ΒΒΔΛΑ. 
5 οἴνῳ αὐτῶν in many uncials.
6 ω τοῖς μν. καὶ ω τοῖς οἴν. in the best copies.
7 ἵνα δέων in ΒΒΔΛΑ.
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μακρόθεν, ἐδράμε καὶ προσεκόμησεν αὐτῷ, 1 καὶ κράζεις φωνῇ
μεγάλῃ ἀκριβῇ, 2 "Τί ἐμοι καὶ σοί, ἵνα σὺ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ θεωτοῦ;
δεκίῳ σε τὸν θεοῦ, μὴ με βασανίσῃς." 3 Ἐλευθὺς γὰρ αὐτῷ,
"Εξαίλθη, τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀδάμαρτον ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου." 9. καὶ
ἐπηρεάτω αὐτῶν, "Τί σοι δόμῳ 8;" καὶ ἀπεκρίθη, λέγων, "Λέγειν
δύο μοι, 5 διὶ τὸλλοι ἑσεμέν." 10. καὶ παρεκάλει αὐτῶν πολλά,
ἐπὶ μὴ αὐτῶν ἀποστηλῆς 6 ἐξ τῆς κυρίας. 11. ἦν δὲ ἐκεί πρὸς τὰ
δρη 7 ἄγλυ ὕπνον μεγάλη βουσκομένη. 12. καὶ παρεκάλεσαν αὐτῶν
tάσεις 8 οἱ ἁγίοις 8 ἱερεῖς, "Πέμψων ἥμας εἰς τοὺς χοίρους, ἵνα
eἰς αὐτῶν εἰσελθῶμεν." 13. καὶ ἐπέτρεψεν αὐτοῖς εὐθὺς ἡ ἵνα 9
καὶ ἐξελάθη τὰ πνεῦμα τὰ ἀδάμαρτα συνήλθον εἰς τοὺς χοίρους,
καὶ ἠρέμησιν ἡ ἄγλυ κατὰ τὸν κρημνὸν εἰς τὴν δαλασίν 10 ἦσαν δὲ

\[\text{1 auton in } ΝΒCLΔ \text{ instead of the more usual autos of T.R.}
\[\text{2 λέγε in } ΝΒCLΔ.
\[\text{3 σοι in most uncialls. D has σοι ov. (so in Mk.).}
\[\text{4 καὶ λέγε auton Λεγον in } ΝΒCLΔ \text{ (Tisch., W.H.).}
\[\text{5 BD add estos.}
\[\text{6 auta auton, in BCΔ. D has autous.}
\[\text{7 τοi ov in all uncialls.}
\[\text{8 ωντει ov διαπ. omit } ΝΒCLΔ \text{ (Tisch., W.H.).}
\[\text{9 ΝΒCLΔ omit ωντιν ov 1.}
\[\text{10 ΝΒCDΛ omit ωντιν ov 8e.}

afa, a relative expression, a favourite pleonasm in Mk. (xiv. 54, xv. 40).—
προσεκόμησεν : worshipful attitude, as of one who feels already the charm or
spell of Him before whom he kneels; already there is a presentiment and com-
menacement of cure, though not yet wel-
come.—Ver. 7. π. θ. τοῦ ψυστον; Mt.
has τοῦ θεοῦ only. Luke gives the full
expression—"ος θεος Most High. Which is the original?—Weiss (Meyer)
says Mt.'s, Mk. adding τ. ψ. to prepare
for the appeal to One higher even than
Jesus, in δεκίῳ following. But why
should not the demoniac himself do that?
—δεκίῳ: in classics to make swear, in
N. T. (here and in Acts xix. 13) to adjoin
with double accusative; not good Greek
according to Phryn.: δεκίῳ the right
value—τι με βασανίσῃ: no πρὸ 
καρεύ as in Mt., the reference ap-
parently to the present torment of de-
omianiac or demon, or both; either shrin-
ing from cure felt to be impending.—
Ver. 8. Λέγειν γὰρ, for He was about
to say: not yet said, but evident from
Christ's manner and look that it was on
His tongue; the conative imperfect
(Weiss).—Ver. 9. τι σοι δόμῳ; instead
of saying at once what He had meant
to say, Jesus adopts a roundabout
method of dealing with the case, and
asks the demoniac his name, as if to
bring him into composure.—Λεγον: from
the Roman legion not a rare sight in
that region, emblem of irresistible
power and of a multitude organised into
unity; the name already naturalised into
Greek and Aramaean. The use of it by
the demoniac, like the immediate recog-
nition of Jesus as a God-like person,
reveals a sensitive, fine-strung mind
wrecked by insanity.—Ver. 10. παρεκά-
λα: he, Legion, in the name of the de-
moniac, beseeches earnestly (πολλὰ) that
He would not send them (autē) out of
the region (χώρα). Decapolis, beloved
by demons, suggests Grotius, because
full of Hellenising apostate Jews, testi-
Joseph. (A. j., xvii. 11.)—Ver. 11. ἀκαί,
there, near by. Cf. Mt. vii. 30.—πρὸς
τῷ ὄρει; on the mountain side.—Ver. 12.
πυραυνόν: send us into the swine; no
chance of permission to enter into men;
no expectation either of the ensuing
catastrophe.—Ver. 13. καὶ ἐπέτρεψεν:
permission not command to enter; in
Mt. not even that, simply a peremptory:
Depart! Vide notes there.—ἐξαίλθη:
an inference from the sequel; neither
exit nor entrance could be seen. There
was doubtless a coincidence between
the cure and the catastrophe.—ἐξ ἂν ἐδιχθὴν:
about 2000, an estimate of the herds
possibly exaggerated.—ἐντύγχανον (ἐν-
tygha, to choke), were drowned, used in this
sense in Joseph., A. J., x., 7, 5, regarding Jeremiah in the dungeon.

Vv. 14-20. Sequel of the story.—Ver. 14. ἐν τῇ πόλει, etc.: the herds of course ran in breathless panic-stricken haste to report the tragedy in the city and in the neighbouring farms (ἀγροὺς). —καὶ ἀνθρώπους, etc.: and the people in town and country as naturally went to see what had happened. Their road brings them straight to Jesus (ver. 15), and they see there a sight which astonishes them, the well-known and dreaded demoniac completely altered in manner and aspect: sitting (καθήμενον) quiet, not restless; clothed (ἐντυπωσιμένον here and in Lk. viii. 35), implying previous nakedness, which is expressly noted in Lk. (σώματι ἑαυτού), implying previous madness. For this sense of the verb vade 2 Cor. v. 13. Some take the second and third participle as subordinate to the first, but they may be viewed as co-ordinate, denoting three distinct, equally outstanding, characteristics: “sedentem, vestitum, sanam mentem, cum antea suis sine quiete, vestibus, rationibus usu” (Bengel) —all this had happened to the man who had had the Legion! (τόν ἐκα. τ. λεγενών) —ἐσγείχτω, perfect in sense of pluperfect. Burton, § 156.—ἐφοβηθησάντω: they were afraid, of the same man, as much as they had been of the insane, i.e., of the power which had produced the change.—Ver. 16. The eye-witnesses in further explanations to their employers now connect the two events together—the cure and the catastrophe—not representing the one as cause of the other, but simply as happening close to each other. The owners draw a natural inference: cure cause of catastrophe, and (ver. 17) request Jesus, as a dangerous person, to retire.—ἤρξατο, began to request, pointing to transition from vague awe in presence of a great change to desire to be rid of Him whom they believed to be the cause both of it and of the loss of their swine. Frisitsche takes ἤρξατο as meaning that Jesus did not need much pressure, but withdrew on the first hint of their wish.—Ver. 18. ἐμβαίνωντος, embarking, the same day? Jesus had probably intended staying some days on the eastern shore of the hill (iii. 13), to let the crowd disperse.—Τῶν μετα αὐτοῦ ἦν: an object clause after verb of exhorting with τῶν, and subjunctive instead of infinitive as often in N. T., that he might be with Him (recalling iii. 14). The man desired to become a regular disciple. Victor of Ant., Theophy., Grotius, and partly Schanz think his motive was fear lest the demons might return.—Ver. 19. Jesus refuses, and, contrary to His usual practice, bids the healed one go and spread the news, as a kind of missionary to Decapolis, as the Twelve were to Galilee. The first apostle of the heathen (Holtz. H. C.) after Volkmar). Jesus determined that those who would not have Himself should have His repre-
The daughter of Jairus and the woman with bloody issue (Mt. ix. 18-26, Lk. viii. 40-56).—Ver. 21. ἐν ἡλιόλουπος: the inescapable crowd, in no hurry to disperse, gathers again about Jesus, on His return to the western shore.—ἐν τῇ ἀνάπτυξιν: not merely for, but after Him, the great centre of attraction (cf. πρὸς αὐτόν, ii. 13, iv. 1).—περι τῷ θ., by the sea (here and there); how soon after the arrival the incident happened not indicated (cf. Mt. ix. 18 for sequence and situation), nor is the motive of the narrative. Weiss suggests that the Jairus story is given as another instance of unreceptivity, ver. 40 (Meyer).—Ver. 22. τῇ θ.: the expression implies a plurality of synagogues, each having its chief ruler. The reference is probably to Capernaum.—Ver. 23. ἰησοῦν ὑ.: an instance of Mk.'s love of diminutives, again in vii. 25.—ἰησοῦν ὑ.: is extremely ill, at death's door (in Mt. dead), stronger than κακῶς ἦς, a late Greek phrase (examples in Elissner, Wetstein, Kypke, etc.), disapproved by Phryn. (Loheor, p. 380).—ὑπὲρ ἀδικίας ἐπίθετο: either used as an imperative (cf. 1 Tim. i. 3, ἐν παραγεγραμμένῳ), or dependent on some verb understood, e.g., θεοφαίρεσαν (Palsaret), ἐπεί (Fritzsche); better παρακαλεῖ σε, the echo of παρακαλεῖς going before (Grotius. Similarly Euthy. Zig.).

Vv. 25-34. The woman with an issue.—Ver. 25. ἐν ἄκουσα: not merely to, but after Him, the great centre of attraction (cf. πρὸς αὐτόν, ii. 13, iv. 1).—περι τῷ θ., by the sea (here and there); how soon after the arrival the incident happened not indicated (cf. Mt. ix. 18 for sequence and situation), nor is the motive of the narrative. Weiss suggests that the Jairus story is given as another instance of unreceptivity, ver. 40 (Meyer).—Ver. 22. τῇ θ.: the expression implies a plurality of synagogues, each having its chief ruler. The reference is probably to Capernaum.—Ver. 23. ἰησοῦν ὑ.: an instance of Mk.'s love of diminutives, again in vii. 25.—ἰησοῦν ὑ.: is extremely ill, at death's door (in Mt. dead), stronger than κακῶς ἦς, a late Greek phrase (examples in Elissner, Wetstein, Kypke, etc.), disapproved by Phryn. (Loheor, p. 380).—ὑπὲρ ἀδικίας ἐπίθετο: either used as an imperative (cf. 1 Tim. i. 3, ἐν παραγεγραμμένῳ), or dependent on some verb understood, e.g., ἐπεί (Fritzsche); better παρακαλεῖ σε, the echo of παρακαλεῖς going before (Grotius. Similarly Euthy. Zig.).
of this long sentence (vv. 25, 26, 27) we may, with Fritzsche, connect this participle with γυνὴ, ver. 25, and treat all between as a parenthesis—a certain woman (whose case was, etc.) having heard, etc.—τὰ περὶ τ. ἡμ. The importance of the τὰ (ἡ BC Δ. W.H.) here is that with it the expression means not merely that the woman had heard of the return of Jesus from the east side, but that she had for the first time heard of Christ’s healing ministry in general. She must have been a stranger from a distance, e.g., from Caesarea Philippi, her home, according to Eusebius (Hist. Eccl., vii, 18), her house identifiable with a statue reproducing the gospel incident before the door; possibly a heathen, but more probably, from her behaviour, a Jewess—stealing a cure by touch when touch by one in her state was forbidden (ἡ γυνὴ ἐκ τῆς Ἰουδαίας). Perhaps this means no more than Lk.’s statement that the flux was stopped, but the expression seems chosen to signify a complete permanent cure—not merely the stream but the fountain dried.—ἐγὼ τ. σ.: she was conscious that the flow had ceased (ὑπὸ διὰ τοῦ σῶματος ὑπὲρ δαίμονον τοῦ στελεχοῦς, Euthy. Zig.).—Ver. 30. ἐπεννόησα τὴν . . . δύναμιν ἔδεισον, conscious of the going forth of the healing virtue; ἔδιδε is the substantive participle as object of the verb ἐπεννόησα. The statement as given by Mk. (and Lk.) implies that the cure was not wrought by the will of Jesus. But it may nevertheless have been so. Jesus may have felt the touch, divined its meaning, and consented to the effect. Vide on Mt., ad loc., τὸ μου ἡγεῖται τῶν ἰατρῶν: who touched me on my clothes? This verb here, as usual, takes genitive both of person and thing (Buttmann’s Grammar, N. T., p. 167).—Ver. 31. τὸν ἐπὶ συνθήκην, the crowd squeezing Thee, as in ver. 24. The simple verb in iii. 9. The compound implies a greater crowd, or a more eager pressure around Jesus. How exciting and terrifying that rude popularity for Him—Ver. 32. πρεσβύλλησε: Jesus, knowing well the difference between touch and touch, regardless of what the disciples had plausibly said, kept looking around in quest of the person who had touched Him meaningfully.—ἡ γυνὴ, conscious of being touched as a woman’s touch. Did Jesus know that, or is it the evangelist choosing the gender in accordance with the now known fact? (Meyer and Weiss). The former possible, without preternatural knowledge, through extreme sensitiveness.—Ver. 33. φοβ. καὶ πτωχ., fearing and trembling, the two states closely connected and often combined (2 Cor. vii. 15, Eph. vi. 5, Phil. ii. 12).—ἐξείλατα, etc., explains her emotion: she knew what had happened to her, and thought what a dreadful thing it would be to have the surreptitiously obtained
benefit recalled by an offended benefactor disapproving her secrecy and her bold disregard of the ceremonial law.—

πάνταν τὴν ἁλθίναν, the whole truth, which would include not only what she had just done, but her excuse for doing it—the pitiful tale of chronic misery. From that tale impressively told, heard by disciples, and not easily to be forgotten, the particulars in ver. 26 were in all probability derived.—Ver. 34. The woman had already heard the fame of Jesus (ver. 27). From what Jesus said to her she would for the first time get some idea of His exquisite sympathy, delicately expressed in the very first word: θεατέρια, daughter, to a mature woman, probably not much, if at all, younger than Himself! He speaks not as man to woman, but as father to child.

Note how vivid is Mark's story compared with the meagre colourless version of Mt. I a lively impressionable eyewitness, like Peter, evidently behind it.

Vv. 35-43. The story of Jairus' daughter resumed.—Ver. 35. ἡ πόρε ἡ ἀρχισυναγωγῆς, from the ruler of the synagogue, i.e., from his house, as in A.V. (ἀπὸ τῆς συναγωγῆς). The ruler is supposed to be with Jesus all the time.—Ver. 36. ἡ παρακώνων: might mean to disregard, as in Mt. xviii. 17 (with genitive). So Meyer; but here probably it means overhearing a word not spoken directly to Him. The two senses are quite compatible. Jesus might overhear what was said and disregard its import, i.e., act contrary to the implied suggestion that nothing could now be done in the case. The latter He certainly did.—

πάνταν, present, continue in a believing mood, even in presence of death.—

Ver. 37. συμπαθηθήσεται: here with ἀρχισυναγωγῆς; not with μετά, in xiv. 51, and Lk. xxiii. 49 with dative.—ὁ Πέτρος, etc., Peter, James, and John; earliest trace of preference within the disciple-circle. Not in Mt.

The woman had already heard the fame of Jesus (ver. 27). From what Jesus said to her she would for the first time get some idea of His exquisite sympathy, delicately expressed in the very first word: θεατέρια, daughter, to a mature woman, probably not much, if at all, younger than Himself! He speaks not as man to woman, but as father to child.

Note how vivid is Mark's story compared with the meagre colourless version of Mt. I a lively impressionable eyewitness, like Peter, evidently behind it.

Vv. 35-43. The story of Jairus' daughter resumed.—Ver. 35. ἡ πόρε ἡ ἀρχισυναγωγῆς, from the ruler of the synagogue, i.e., from his house, as in A.V. (ἀπὸ τῆς συναγωγῆς). The ruler is supposed to be with Jesus all the time.—Ver. 36. ἡ παρακώνων: might mean to disregard, as in Mt. xviii. 17 (with genitive). So Meyer; but here probably it means overhearing a word not spoken directly to Him. The two senses are quite compatible. Jesus might overhear what was said and disregard its import, i.e., act contrary to the implied suggestion that nothing could now be done in the case. The latter He certainly did.—

πάνταν, present, continue in a believing mood, even in presence of death.—

Ver. 37. συμπαθηθήσεται: here with μετά, in xiv. 51, and Lk. xxiii. 49 with dative.—ὁ Πέτρος, etc., Peter, James, and John; earliest trace of preference within the disciple-circle. Not in Mt.

The three chosen to be witnesses of a specially remarkable event. Perhaps the number of disciples was restricted to three not to crowd the house.—Ver. 38. θεραπεύει: what was going on within the house appealed to both eye and ear; here the scene is described from the spectacular side—a multitude of people seen making a confused din (θορμον), in which sounds of weeping and howling without restraint (τοιούτως) are distinguishable, and after θορμον is epehegetic, and ἀλαλάσσως and ἀλαλάσσως special features under it as a general. Flute playing (Mt. ix. 23) not referred to.—Ver. 40. κατεγελών: this the point of the story for the evangelist, thinks Weiss, hence related after the demoniacs—common link, the unbelief of
35-43. VI. 1-2.
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... the people. But surely in this case incredulity was very excusable!—τὸν πατέρα, etc.: father, mother, and the three disciples taken into the sick chamber, the former as parents, the latter as witnesses.—Ver. 42. Ταλίθα, maiden, raise! first instance in which the words of Jesus, as spoken in Aramaic, are given. Jesus may have been a bilingual, sometimes using Greek, sometimes Syriac. He would use the vernacular on a pathetic occasion like this. The word Ταλίθα, feminine of 

Chapter VI. At Nazareth. Mission of the Twelve. Herod and John. Feeding of the Thousands. Sea Incident. The first two of these various groups of narratives contained in this chapter (vv. 1-13) are regarded by some (Weiss, Schanz, etc.) as forming the conclusion of a division of the Gospel beginning at iii. 7, having for its general heading: The disciple-circle versus the un receptive multitude. Such analysis of the Gospels into distinct masses is useful provided it be not overdone.

Vv. 1-6a. Jesus at Nazareth (Mt. xiii. 53-58, cf. Lk. iv. 16-30).—Ver. 1. ξηλθέντες ακαίεν. It is not said, but it is very probable, that this was another of Christ's attempts to escape from the crowd into a scene of comparative quiet and rest (the hill, iii. 13, the eastern shore, v. 1, Nazareth, vi. 1). Mt. gives this incident at the close of the parable collection; Lk. at the beginning of the Galilean ministry. Mk.'s connection is the most historical, Lk.'s is obviously an anticipation. It is the same incident in all three Gospels.—πατρίδα: vide notes on Mt., ad loc.—οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ. Mt. omits this.—Ver. 2. ἤρετο διδάσκειν; etc.: Jesus did not go to Nazareth for the purpose of preaching, rather for rest; but that He should preach was inevit-
able; therefore, the Sabbath coming round, He appeared in the synagogue, and spoke.—τόθεν τούτων ριώτα: laconic; comprehensive, vague question, covering the discourse just heard and all that had been reported to them about their townsmen, with the one word ταῦτα: such speech, such wisdom (τὰς ἑαυτὰς), such powers (δυνάμεις, not wrought there), in such a well-known person (τοῦτον).—Ver. 3. ὅ τέκτων: avoided by Mt., who says the carpenter’s son: one of Mk.’s realisms. The ploughs and yokes of Justin M. (c. Trypho, 88) and the apocryphal Gospels pass beyond realism into vulgarity.—ἐσκανδαλίστης: what they had heard awakened admiration, but the external facts of the speaker’s connections and early history stifled incipient faith; vide notes on Mt.—Ver. 4. ἐν τοῖς συγγενεύσιν α., among his kinsmen. This omitted in Mt., ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ α., covering it.—Ver. 5. οὐκ ἔχθαντο, etc., He was not able to do any mighty work which is qualified by the added clause, that He placed His hands on a few ailing persons (ἀρρώστους); quite minor cures, not to be compared with those reported in the previous chapter. For this statement Mt. substitutes: He did not there many mighty works.—Ver. 6. ἔδραψαν, etc. Jesus marvelled at the faith of the centurion. Nazareth supplied the opposite ground for astonishment. There Jesus found an amount of stupid un receptivity for which His experience in Decapolis and elsewhere had not prepared Him. It was the ne plus ultra in that line. This wonder Mt. omits, merely noting the unbelief as cause of the non-performance of miracles. We are to conceive of it as bringing about this result, not by frustrating attempts at healing, but by frustrating Jesus an opportunity. The people of Nazareth were so consistently unbelieving that they would not even bring their sick to Him to be healed (Klostermann), and, as Euthy. Zieg. remarks, it was not fitting that Jesus should benefit them against their will (οὐκ ἔδει βιαλῶς εἰπε-γετεῖν αὐτοῖς).

Vv. 6b-13. Mission of the Twelve (Mt. x. 1-15, Lk. ix. 1-6).—Ver. 6b may either be connected with the foregoing narrative, when it will mean that Jesus, rejected by the Nazareans, made a teaching tour among the villages around (Fritzsche, Meyer), or it may be taken as an introduction to the following narrative = Jesus resumes the rôle of a wandering preacher in Galilee (i. 38, 39) and associates with Himself in the work His disciples (Schanz, Weiss, Klostermann, etc.). This brief statement in Mark: and He went round about the villages in a circle teaching, answers to Matt. ix. 35-38, where the motive of the mission of the Twelve is more fully explained.—Ver. 7. θεραπεύειν, etc.: Jesus calling to Him (προσκαλεῖται, vide iii. 13) the Twelve began at length to do what He had intended from the first (Weiss), vide, to send them forth as missionaries (ἐξοπτελεῖν).—δύο δύο, two (and) two, Hebraic for and or and δύο; two together, not one by one, a humane arrangement.—ἐβίβασεν, imperfect, as
specifying an accompaniment of the mission, not pointing to separate empowerment of each pair.—ἔψωσιν τ. π. τ. α., power over unclean spirits, alone mentioned by Mark, cf. Matthew and Luke.—Ver. 8. ἐὰν μὴ βάφησαι μένον: *side in Matthew, ἀδ loc.—* αἰχλόν: no mention of gold and silver, brass the only money the poor missionaries were likely to handle.—Ver. 9. ἄλλα ... ἑνδιάλεια, but shod with sandals,—μηδὲ ὑποδήματα, says Matthew, reconcilable either by distinguishing between sandals and shoes (side on Matthew), or by understanding μηδὲ before ὑποδήματα (Victor Ant.).—δὲν χειλές: In Mark the prohibition is not to wear (('@/δώσιτε) two tunics, in Matthew and Luke not to possess a spare one. The sentence in vv. 8, 9 presents a curious instance of varying construction: first ἵνα with the subjunctive after παραγαγήσεως (ver. 8), then ὑποδήματα, implying an infinitive with accusative (πορεύοντας understood), then finally there is a transition from indirect to direct narration in μὴ υποδημένος.—Ver. 10. ἐκείνος, there, in the house; thence, from the village.—Ver. 11. καὶ δὲ ἐὰν τ. ... ἔσων: another instance of inconsequent construction beginning with a relative clause and passing into a conditional one = and whatever place does not receive you, if (loud understood) they, its people, do not listen to you (so Schanz and Weiss in Meyer).—ὑποκάτω, the dust that is *under your feet, instead of ὑποκάτω in Matthew and Luke. The dust of their roads adhering to your feet, shake it off and leave it behind you. Vv. 12, 13 report the carrying out of the mission by the Twelve through preaching and healing.—ἵνα μετανοεῖτε: the burden of their preaching was, Repent. Luke has the more evangelic term, πίστευσεντες. The other aspect of their ministry is summed up in the expulsion of many demons, and the cure of many suffering from minor ailments, ἀρρώστως (cf. ver. 5). In Mark's account the powers of the Twelve appear much more restricted than in Matthew (cf. x. 8). The use of oil in healing (ἐλάιος) is to be noted. Some have regarded this as a mark of late date (Baur). Others (Weiss, Schanz) view it as a primitive
practice (vide James v. 14). Many conjectural opinions have been expressed as to the function or significance of the oil. According to Lightfoot and Schöttgen it was much used at the time by physicians.

The instructions to the Twelve present an interesting problem in criticism and comparative exegesis. It is not improbable that two versions of these existed and have been drawn upon by the synoptists, one in the Logia of Matthew, reproduced, Weiss thinks, substantially in Lk. x. (mission of Seventy), the other in Mt. x. vii. (Weiss) in Lk. x. 1-6. Matthew, according to the same critic, mixes the two. Similarly Holtzmann, who, however, differs from Weiss in thinking the two versions entirely independent. Weiss reconstructs the original version of the Logia thus:

1. Mt. ix. 38 = Lk. x. 2, prayer for labourers.
2. Lk. x. 3 = go forth, I send you as lambs among wolves.
3. Mt. x. 5, 6, go not to Samaria, but to Israel only.
4. Lk. x. 4-11, detailed instructions.

VV. 14-16. Herod and Jesus (Mt. xiv. 1, 2, Lk. ix. 7-9).—Ver. 14. ἥκονεν: Herod heard, what? Christ's name, τό ὄνομα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, (ἦν γὰρ ἣν, a parenthesis)? Or all that is stated in vv. 14, 15, court opinion about Jesus (from ἦν γὰρ ἣν to προφητάν, a parenthesis)? Both views have been held, but the simplest view is that Herod heard of the doings of the Twelve, though it is difficult to believe that the report of their mission was the first tidings he had received of the great work of Jesus, especially in view of the understanding between the Pharisees and Herodians mentioned in iii. 6. In the reports which reached Herod the Twelve were merged in their Master. He was the hero of the whole Galilean movement. Such is the import of the statement that His name had become known.—βασιλεύς: strictly, Herod was only a tetrarch (Matthew and Luke), but it was natural for Mark writing for the Roman world to use this title, as it was applied freely in Rome to all eastern rulers.—ἀλεγγοῦν, he said, i.e., Herod. ἄλεγγον, the reading of BD, and adopted by W.H., puts the saying into the mouth of the court people. Matthew has taken it the former way, Luke the latter. The theory that Jesus was John risen looks more like the creation of a troubled conscience than the suggestion of light-minded courtiers, unless indeed it was thrown out by them as a jest, and yet it appears to be the aim of the evangelist first to report the opinions of others and then to give the king's, emphatically endorsing one of the hypotheses.—ἀφεγγαίονται, is risen, and is now alive and active, the latter the point emphasised.—ἀφεγγαίονται ἐν δ.: vide notes on Matthew.

—Ἡλίας, Elias resedivius, with extraordinary power and mission.—Ver. 15. ἡ προφητία, etc., a prophet like one of the old prophets, not any of them resedivus. Luke understands it in the latter sense.

—Ver. 16. ἵνα πληρωθῇ: the accusative incorporated with the relative clause by
attraction both in position and in construction; vide Winer, § xxiv. 2, and Viger, p. 33. The king's statement is very emphatic = the man whom I beheaded, John, is risen (that is what it all means).

Vv. 17-20. Story of Herod and the Baptist (Mt. xiv. 3-12). Herod's endorsement of the theory that Jesus is John redivivus gives a convenient opportunity for reporting here post eventum the Baptist's fate. The report is given in acrostics which need not be translated as palaeographs (as in A. V. and R. V.).—Ver. 17. autòs yáp ὁ Ἰερ., for the same Herod, who made the speech just reported, etc.—τὴν γυναῖκα Φιλίππου; some have supposed that the mistake is here made of taking Herodias for the wife of Philip the tetrarch, who in reality was husband of her daughter Salome (so Holtz. in H. C.). Herodias had previously been the wife of a rich man in Jerusalem, step-brother of Herod Antipas, referred to by Josephus (Ant. i., xviii., 5, 4) by the name of Herod, the family name. He may, of course, have borne another name, such as Philip. Even if there be a slip it is a matter of small moment compared to the moral interest of the gruesome story.—Ver. 19. ἵνα ἦπε.; the murderous mood is very evident, and in her it would certainly be strongest and unchecked by any other feeling. In Herod, if the mood was there, it was accompanied by worthier impulses (side on Matthew).—ἀνέχετο, had a grudge (χάνειν understood, so Fritzche al.) against him (ἀσέβές, dative of disadvantage); or, kept in mind what John had said, treasured up against him, with fixed hate and purpose of revenge.—καὶ ὥστε ἤφθανεν, and was not able, to compass her end for a while.—Ver. 20 gives the reason.—φοβήτρια, feared, a mixture of reverence and superstitious dread towards the prophet and man of God.—συνετήρησε, not merely observed him (A. V.) —this too neutral and colourless—kept him safe (R. V.) from her fixed malice often manifested but not likely to have its way with him in ordinary circumstances. —ἀκόλουθος υπάλληλ implies frequent meetings between the Baptist and the king, either at Machaerus or at Tiberias.—ὑπάρχει, the true reading, not only on critical grounds (attested by LBL.), but also on psychological, corresponding exactly to the character of the man.—δύο γὰρ ἐπήρ—drawn two ways, by respect for goodness on the one hand, by evil passions on the other. He was at a loss what to do in the matter of his wife's well-known purpose, shiftless (ἀκατέργαστον to be without resources); half sympathised with her wish, yet could not be brought to the point.—ἤξυρεν α. ἦκουσεν, ever heard him with pleasure; every new hearing exercising the vindictive demon, even the slightest sympathy with it, for a time.

Vv. 21-29. The fatal day.—Ver. 21. εἰκάσαν, a day convenient for the long cherished purpose of Herodias; so regarded by her as well as by the evangelist. She had a chance then, if ever, and might hope that by wine, love, and the assistance of obsequious guests, her irresolute husband would at last be brought to the point (Grotius). The word occurs again in the N. T., Heb. iv. 16, εἰκάσαν ὁ βασιλεύς = seasonable succour.—μεγαστάσει (μεγαστάνος from μεγαστός), magnifies. A word belonging to Macedonian Greek, condemned by Phryn. (p. 196: μεγαστάτου the right expression), frequent in Sept. With these magnates, the civil authorities, are named the chief military men (χιλιάρχους) and the socially important persons of Galilee (φρώτους)—an imposing gathering on Herod's birthday.—Ver. 22. ἦραν, it, the dancing, pleased Herod.
KATA MATTHAIΩN


1 For αὐτής της ΝΒDLΔ have αὐτου (omitting της), adopted by W.H. contrary, Weiss thinks, to all history, all grammar, and the context (vide in Meyer).

2 For καὶ ἀρετ. ΝΒCLΔ 33 have ἀρετ.

3 o ὑ βασιλ. αὐτῆς in ΝΒCLΔ 33.

4 ΒΔ have o τι εἶναι, the most probable reading (W.H. text).

5 For τοῦ ΝΒΛΔ 33 have καὶ.

6 αὐτής μαίαν in ΝΒCDGLΔ 33.

7 βαπτίζοντος in ΝΒΛΔ.

8 αὐτάματον in ΒCLΔ.

9 αὐτότητις μοι in ΝΒCLΔ.

10 αὐτήν αὐτῆς in ΝΒCLΔ.

11 συνεκκυλλάτησα in ΝΒΑΒΛΔ al.

12 For o δὲ ΒCLΔ have καὶ.

and his guests.—τ. κορασίῳ, to the girl, as in v. 41-2, not necessarily a child; the word was used familiarly like the Scotch word “lassie”; disapproved by Phryn., p. 73.—αἰτήσον με . . . βρῶν: promise first, followed by oath after a little interval, during which the girl naturally hesitated what to ask.—Ver. 23. ἡμῖνως, genitive of ἡμῖνος, like ἄσεσις (τὰ, plural), a late form of the half, of my kingdom: mawkish amorous generosity.—Ver. 24. She goes out to ask advice of her mother, implying that she had not previously got instructions as Matthew's account suggests.—Ver. 25. συνακειμένοις, without delay and with quick step, as of one whose heart was in the business. There had been no reluctance then on the girl's part, no need for much educating to bring her to the point; vide remarks on τροποβαλλόντος in Mt. xiv. 8. Her mother's child.—ἐξαιτήτις (supply ἀποθες), on the spot, at once; request proffered with a cool pert impudence almost out-doing the mother.—Ver. 26. περιλύκων γενόμενος: a concessive clause, κατεκτημένος understood = and the king, though exceedingly sorry, yet, etc.—δρόμον: there might be more oaths than one (vide on Matthew), but the plural was sometimes used for a single oath. Schanz cites instances from Aeschylus and Xenophon.

—ἀδερθῇσιν αὐτῆς, to slight her, by treating the oath and promise as a joke; a late word, used, in reference to persons, in the sense of breaking faith with (here only). Kypke renders the word here: “non ut fidem illi datam fallere,” citing instances from Diod., Polyb., and Sept.

—Ver. 27. συνεκκυλλάτηρα = speculator in Latin, literally a watcher, a military official of the empire who acted partly as courier, partly as a police officer, partly as an executioner; illustrative citations in Wetstein. The word found its way into the Jewish language (here only).—Ver. 29 relates how the disciples of John buried the corpse of their master.—ἐν μνημείοις, in a tomb. The phrase recalls
to mind the burial of Jesus. Did the evangelist wish to suggest for the reflection of his readers a parallel between the fate of the Baptist and that of Christ? (So Klostermann.)

Vv. 30-33. Return of the Twelve (Mt. xiv. 13, Lk. ix. 10, 11).—Ver. 30 transfers us from the past date of the horrible deed just related to the time when the fame of Jesus and His disciples recalled the deed of guilt to Herod's mind.—συνάντησαν οἱ ἀντώντες πρὸς τὸν Ιησοῦν, the apostles (here only, and not in the technical sense of after days, but = the men sent out on the Galilean mission, the missionaries) gather to Jesus. Where? after how long? and what has Jesus been doing while? No answer is possible. These are gaps in the evangelistic history.—πάντα ὡς ἑκατέρον: suggests that they had great things to tell, though vv. 12, 13 create very moderate expectations. The repetition of δού before ἔδεασαν = how much they had taught ("quanta docuerant," Friztache), may surprise. The teaching element could not be extensive in the range of topics. Yet, if it took the form of personal narrative concerning Jesus, it might be copious enough, and really the principal feature of the mission. Vide notes on Mt., chap. x.—Ver. 31. ὡς ἡμῖν εἶπε, either: you yourselves, ἡμῖν ἡμῖν, without the crowd (Meyer, Schanz), or, better: you the same men who have been hard at work and need rest (Weiss in Meyer, Holtz., H. C.). This sympathy of Jesus with the Twelve reflects His own craving for rest which He often un成功ively strove to obtain.—ἀνασυνάσκησε, aorist, only a breathing space in a life of toil.—οἱ ἡμῖν, αὐτοῖς. Many coming and going: a constant stream of people on some errand; no sooner done with one party than another presented itself — no leisure. — ἀποκρύπτειν ἐκφάγον: no leisure (cf. εἰκασθεῖν, ver. 21), even to eat; imperfect, implying that it was not a solitary occurrence. What was the business on hand? Probably a political movement in Christ's favour with which the Twelve sympathised. Vide John vi. 15.—Ver. 32. τῇ πλατείᾳ. The boat which stood ready for service (iii. 9).—καὶ ἦσαν, privately, i.e., with Jesus only in the boat, and without other boats accompanying. As to the reason for this withdrawal into privacy cf. Mk.'s account with Mt.'s (xiv. 13), who connects with the report of John's death. Beyond doubt, Mk.'s is the correct account. The excursion was an attempt to escape from the crowd and from dangerous illusions; again without success.—Ver. 33 explains why.—ἐδοξοῦσιν, etc., they (the people) saw them departing.—εἰσήγαγον (or ἐγνώσαν, BD) is better without an object (ἀνασκάτως or ἀνασκάστως) = they knew, not who they were, but what they were after, where they were going, doubtless from the course they were steering. — ἔσχάζειν (from ἔσχατος, adjetive ἐσχάτος, understood), on foot, by land round the end of the lake.—συνήθραμμον, they ran together, excited and exciting, each town on the way contributing its rill to the growing stream of eager human beings; what a picture! The
αὐτῶν. \(\text{Ver. 34.} \) καὶ ἐξελθὼν εἶδεν ὁ ἠγορασμός 9 πολλὰ ὄχλαν, καὶ ἐσπλαγχνίσθη ἐν τοῖς ἀστοίς, 8 ὅτι ἦσαν ὑπὸ πρόβατα μὴ ἔχοντα ποιμνά - καὶ ἤρετο διδάσακις αὐτῶν τολμᾶ. \(\text{Ver. 35.} \) καὶ ἥξη ἄρας τολμήσεις γενομένης, προσελθόντες αὐτῷ 6 ὁ μαθητὴς αὐτῶν λέγοντι, "ΟΤΙ ἄρμῳ ἔστιν ἡ τότες, καὶ ἥξη ἄρας τολμή. \(\text{Ver. 36.} \) ἀπόλύσει αὐτῶν, ἵνα ἀπελθόντες εἰς τοὺς κύκλους ἄγροις καὶ κώμας, ἀγοράσαντες εὐτυχῶς ἄρτους 9 τῇ γὰρ φάγωσιν οὐκ ἔχουσιν." 5 \(\text{Ver. 37.} \) Ὅ τι ἀποκριθεὶς εἶναι αὐτῶν, "Δότε αὐτοῖς ὤμεις φαγεῖν." 10 Καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ, "Ἀπελθόντες ἀγοράζωμεν διακοσίων δηναρίων 6 ἄρτους, καὶ δῶμεν 7 αὐτοῖς φαγεῖν." 38. \(\text{Ver. 38.} \) Οὐ λέγει αὐτῶιν, "Πόσους ἄρτους ἔχετε; ὑπάγετε καὶ ἔβερε." 39. Καὶ ἐπετάξασιν αὐτοὺς ἀνακλίνας 9 πάντας συμπόσια ἀπὸ τῷ χειρῷ χέρτη. 40. καὶ ἀνέκατον προσαίλει προσαίλει, ἀνὰ 10 ἑκατόν καὶ ἀνὰ 10 πενήντα. 41. καὶ λαβὼν τῶν πάντων ἄρτους καὶ τῶν δύο ἵθασί, ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, εὐλόγησεν καὶ κατέκλασε τοὺς ἄρτους, καὶ ἄδιδον τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτῶν. 42. καὶ παραβιάζειν 12 αὐτοῖς καὶ τοῖς δύο ἵθασιν ἴμιμως πάντα. 42. καὶ ἐδόθην πάντες, καὶ ἕφοράθησαν. 43. καὶ ἤραν κλασμάτων διδάκοι κοφίνους πληρεῖς, 18

1 NBLA omit καὶ συνήλθον προς αὐτόν (Tisch., W.H.). 8 omit o l. ΝΑΒ αl. pl. ἀποτελέσθων in NBLA. 4 λεγόν τα ΝΒD.

5 For ἀποτελέσθων... νικήτας NBLA have simply τι φαγεῖν (Tisch., W.H.).

6 διακοσίων in NBLA. 7 δοσμένων in NBLA. συγκαταλείποντες in ΝΒ. συγκαταλείποντες LDA.

8 καὶ omit NBLD 33. 9 κατα NBD (Tisch., W.H.). 10 κατα NBD (Tisch., W.H.).

ultimate result, a congregation of 5000. This the climax of popularity, and, from the fourth Gospel we learn, its crisis (chap. vi.) — τρίτη διδασκαλία "outran" (A. V.), anticipated = ἐγένωσαν in classics.

Vv. 34-44. The feeding (Mt. xiv. 14-21, Lk. ix. 11-17).—Ver. 34. ἤρετο διδάσκαλος. He began to teach, constrained by pity (亚运ντικινομίη), though weary of toil and of popularity. To teach; Mt. says to heal. There could be few, if any, sick in a crowd that had come in such a hurry.—Ver. 35. ἄρας τολμήσεις, it being late in the day.—πολλὰς was extensively used by the Greeks in all sorts of connections, time included; examples in Kypke and Hermann's Vigor, p. 137 f. The phrase recurs in last clause of this verse (ἀράς τολμήσεις).—Ver. 37. διακοσίων ἄρτους, loaves of (purchaseable for) 200 denarii; the sum probably suggested by what the Twelve knew they were in possession of at the time = seven pounds in the purse of the Jesus-circle (Grotius, Holtz., H. C.).—Ver. 39. συγκαταλείποντες, Hebraistic for ἐγένωσαν (cf. δοσμένων, ver. 7) = in dining companies.—ἐκ τοῦ χειρὸς χέρτη, on the green grass; a reedy, marshy place near the mouth of the Jordan at the north end of the lake. Vide Stanley's description (Sinai and Palestine).—Ver. 40. προσαίλει προσαίλει = ἐγένωσαν, in garden flower plots, or squares, picturesque in fact and in description, bespeaking an eye-witness of an impressionable nature like Peter.—Ver. 43. καὶ ἤραν, etc., and they took up, as fragments (κλασμάτα, BL), the fillings (πληρομάτα) of twelve baskets,—καὶ ἀδό τῶν ἵθασιν, and of the fishes, either over and above what was in the twelve baskets (Fritzschbe), or some fragments of the fishes included in them (Meyer).—Ver. 44. πενήντα δικαιά 6. ἄρας, 5000 men: one loaf for 1000! Mt. adds: χρήσει γυναικῶν καὶ παιδιῶν, women and children not counted. Of these, in the circumstances, there would
34—51. ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ

καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἱερῶν. 44. καὶ ἦσαν οἱ φαγόντες τοὺς ἄρτους ὡσεὶ
πεντακοσίων ἄρθρων. 45. καὶ εἶδον ἥν ἤγκακε τοὺς μαθητὰς
αὐτοῦ ἐμβῆναι εἰς τὸ πλοῖον, καὶ προδέχετος εἰς τὸ πέραν πρὸς
Βηθsaidaν, ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἀπολογίαν τὸν ὄχλον. 46. καὶ ἂν ἀπολο
gίαν ἔθες αὐτοῖς, ἀπέλθον εἰς τὸ ὅρος προσεύξασθαι. 47. καὶ ὁ Ἰησ
γενομένης, ἢ τὸ πλοῖον ἐν μέσῳ τῆς βαλάνσης, καὶ αὐτὸς μόνος
ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. 48. καὶ εἶδεν ἂν αὐτοῖς βασιλεία τοῦ Ἰσραήλ
ἐν τῇ ἀλάτειν· ἢ γὰρ ὁ ἄνεμος ἐναντίος αὐτοῖς. 49. καὶ περὶ τετάρ
tην φυλακὴν τῆς νυκτὸς ἔρχεται πρὸς αὐτοὺς, περιπατῶν ἐπὶ τῆς
βαλάνσης· καὶ ἤθελεν παραλαβεῖν αὐτούς. 50. οἱ δὲ ἤδονες αὐτῶν
περιτατοῦντα ἐπὶ τῆς βαλάνσης, πνεοῦντας αὐτούς, καὶ ἀνέκραζαν· 51. πάντες γὰρ αὐτῶν εἶδον, καὶ ἐπαράχθησαν. καὶ
εἶδος ἀλάτης μετὰ αὐτῶν, καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, "Εἰρήνη· ἡγ
ἐμα, μη βοῦσθε." 52. καὶ ἠφίξεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ πλοῖον, καὶ
ἀκόσμην ὁ ἄνεμος, καὶ λίαι ἐν τῆς νύχτας· καὶ λίαι ἐν τῇ

1 ΝBDLA omit esse. 2 αἰνεῖς in ΝBDLA. αἰνεῖς is from Mt.
3 αἰνεῖς in ΝBDLA, which (D excepted) also omit καὶ before περί τετερη
φυλακῆς. αἰνεῖς is a simplification of the construction.
4 Tr. (εἰς τ. 8. περίν.) ΝBDLA 33.
5 αἰνεῖς in ΝBDLA 33 (Tisch., W.H.).
6 ο δὲ εὐνοῦς in ΝBDLA.
7 ΝBDLA omit εἰκερισσοῦ (W.H.). It suits the situation and may have fallen
out by oversight, or been omitted as superfluous, though really not so.

be few, therefore probably not referred to
by Mt.
Vv. 45-52. Another sea-anecdote (Mt.
xiv. 22-33). Luke drops out here and
does not join his brother evangelists till
we come to viii. 27.—Ver. 45. εἶδος: no
time to lose; it was getting late.—
ἡγάνακα, vide on Mt.—elai to τὸ πέραν:
we are apt to take this as a matter of
course as = to the other (western) side
of the lake, and consequently to assume
that πρὸς Βηθsaidaν points to a Beth-
saida there, distinct from Bethsaida
Julias (John i. 44). But the expression
eλα to π. w. may mean from the south end
of the plain El Betha, on the eastern
side, to the north end towards Bethsaida
Julias, the rendezvous for the night. In
that case the contrary wind which over-
took the disciples would be the prevailing
wind from the north-east, driving them
in an opposite direction away from
Bethsaida towards the western shore.
This is the view advocated by Farrer.
Vide Zeitschrift des Palästina-Vereins,
B. ii. (1879). Holtz., H. C., thinks that
either this view must be adopted or the
true reading in the clause referring to B. must be that represented in some Latin
copies: "trans fretum a Bedsaidam," C.
Veron.; "a Bethsaida," C. Monac.—Ver.
46. ἀντεπέχομεν, having dismissed
them, i.e., the multitude; late Greek
condemned by Phryn., p. 23 (ἐκφολον
πάνω).—Ver. 48. ἐν τῇ ἀλάτειν, in
propelling (the ship with oars).—περί τετ.
φυλ., about the fourth watch, between
three and six in the morning, towards
dawn.—ἐλατεῖν παραλαβεῖν. He wished to
pass them—"praeterire eos," Vul.; it ap-
ppeared so to them.—Ver. 50. Not quite
an instance of Mark’s habit of iteration:
explains how they came to think it was a
phantasm. All saw what looked like
Jesus, yet they could not believe it was
He, a real man, walking on the water;
therefore they took fright and rushed to
the conclusion: a spectre!—Ver. 51.
ἐλατεῖν, in iv. 39—λίαι ἐκ περισσοῦ,
very exceedingly, a double superlativel,
a most likely combination for Mark,
though ἐκ περισσοῦ is wanting in some
important MSS. and omitted in W.H.
Cf. ἐκ περισσου in Eph. iii. 20.—
Ver. 52 reflects on the astonishment of
the Twelve as blameworthy in view of
the recent feeding of the multitude. One might rather have expected a reference to the stilling of the storm in crossing to Decapolis. But that seems to have appeared a small matter compared with walking on the sea. The evangelist seems anxious to show how much the Twelve needed the instruction to which in the sequel Jesus gives Himself more and more.

Vv. 53-56. The landing (Mt. xiv. 34-36).—Ver. 53. προσωποθέτησαν (πρὸς ἄρματος ἀπὸ ἄρματος), they came to anchor, or landed on the beach; here only in N. T.—Ver. 55. ἐκ τοῦ κραββάτος, upon their beds, vide ii. 4.—παρελθών, to carry about from place to place. If they did not find Jesus at one place, they were not discouraged, but carried their sick to another place where He was likely to be. Their energy, not less than the word κραββάτος, recalls the story in ii. 1-12.—ὅπως ἤκουσαν ὅτι ἦταν, not: wherever He was = ἦταν ἦν, but: wherever they were told He was; ἦταν, present, from the point of view of those who gave the information in indirect discourse. Vide on this, Burton, M. and T., § 352.—Ver. 56. κόμαι, πόλεις, ἄργους: point probably to a wider sphere of activity than the plain of Gennesaret. This was practically the close of the healing ministry, in which the expectation and faith of the people were wound up to the highest pitch.

Chapter VII. Washing of Hands. Syrophoenician Woman. A Deaf-Mute Healed.—... xiv. 14).—Vv. 3-4, Ex-
VII. I. KAI συνάγονται πρός αὐτὸν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι, καὶ τιμῶν τῶν γραμματέων, ὁδώτες ἀπὸ ἱεροσόλυμον. 2. καὶ ἴδον τύχης τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ Κουκίας ἐφοίτησεν, τοῦτο ἔστιν ἄνιστος, ἐσθίοντος ἐδώκειν ἁρτοῦς ἐμέμησεν. 3. ὅτι ἦσαν Φαρισαῖοι καὶ πάντες οἱ ἱουδαῖοι, δύναται μὴ ὁ πυγμός νιώσαι τὰς χεῖρας, οὐ δὲ ἴδον τυχόντες τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων. 4. καὶ ἀπὸ ἀγορᾶς, ἐδώκει μὴ παρακλητεῖν. 5. ἔστιν οὖν τὸ εἰρημένον αὐτὸν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ γραμματέων, "Διότι οἱ μαθηταί σου οὐ περιπατοῦσι" κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, ἀλλὰ ἄνιστος ἐδοξίσει τὸν ἁρτόν." 6. Ὁ δὲ ἀπεκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Ὅτι καὶ ἐσθίοντες ἡμεῖς περὶ ὁμοίων τῶν ἐπικρίτων, ὡς γέγονε, ὁδὸς τοῖς χειλεῖσιν μὲ

1 οὐν εἰς πρὸς οὐκ ἐν ΝΒΔΑ 33 (W.H.).
2 τοὺς εἰς πρὸς οὐκ ἐν ΝΒΔΛΑΕ.
3 οὐκ ἐν ΝΒΔΑ. It was doubtless introduced to help the construction.
4 ΝΒ have παρακλητέω (W.H. text).
5 καὶ κλινῶν is omitted in ΝΒΔΑ (W.H. marg.), but found in D. It might fall out by similar ending, and was hardly likely to be added as a gloss.
6 οὐκ εἰς ΝΒΔΑ 33.
7 οὐ περὶ οἱ μάθηται εἰς ΝΒΔΑ (Tisch., W.H.).
8 κωνικοὶ in ΝΒΔ for αὐτοῖς, which seems an explanatory substitute.
9 Omitted in ΝΒΔΑ 33, also οὐν before καὶ.

Planatory statement about Jewish customs, not in Mt.—τὰντες οἱ λαοὶ.: the Pharisees, the thorough-going virtuosi in religion, were a limited number; but in this and other respects the Jews generally followed ancient custom. The expression reminds us of the Fourth Gospel in its manner of referring to the people of Israel—the Jews—as foreigners. Mark speaks from the Gentile point of view.—πυγμός, with the fist, the Vulgate has here crebros, answering to πυγμά, a reading found in Ν. Most recent interpreters interpret πυγμαῖς as meaning that they rubbed hard the palm of one hand with the other closed, so as to make sure that the part which touched food should be clean. (So Beza.) For other interpretations vide Lightfoot, Bengel, and Meyer.—Ver. 4. ἀπὸ ἀγορᾶς, from market (coming understood = ἀπὸ ἀγορᾶς in D), a common ellipsis, examples in Raphel, Kypke, and Bos, Ell. Gr., p. 98.—βαπτίζονται (ΜΒ), they sprinkle. The reading, βαπτίζονται (T.R.), may be interpreted either as dipping of the hands (mersionem manuum, Lightfoot; Wetzstein), or, bathing of the whole body. (Meyer. "The statement proceeds by way of climax: before eating they wash the hands always. When they come from market they take a bath before eating.")—ποτηρίων, ἐστίων, καλλίων: the evangelist explains how the Jews not only cleansed their own persons, but also all sorts of household utensils—altogether a serious business, that of preserving ceremonial purity. The two first articles, cups and jugs, would be of wood; earthen vessels when defiled had to be broken (Lev. xv. 12). The second word, ἔστιων, is a Latinism = sexus or sextarius, a Roman measure = 1/2 English pints; here used without reference to contents = uncus in Vulg. —καλλίων = vessels of brass. The καὶ κλινῶν, added in some MSS., will mean couches for meals on which diseased persons may have lain (lepers, etc.).—Ver. 5. At last we come to the point, the complaint of the jealous guardians of Jewish custom, as handed down from the elders (κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τοῦ π.), against the disciples of Jesus, and indirectly against Jesus Himself.—οὐκ εἰς παραλαβοῦν κατὰ: for this Mt. substitutes ἄντι παραλαβοῦν. Vv. 6-13. The reply of Jesus. It con-
VII. KATA MAPKON


1 γαρ omitted in ΣBLA.
2 All after ἀνάρων is omitted in ΣBLA, and is obviously a gloss taken from ver. 4.
3 Omit καὶ ΣBDL.
4 ΣBDL omit σου in both places.
5 σολων instead of σαλα (substituted for a word not understood) in ΣBDLAL, Vulg. Cop.
6 ἀκούσατε in BD and σουερε in BLA. The presents in T.R. are from Mt.

sists of a prophetic citation and a countercharge, given by Mt. in an inverted order. Commentators, according to their bias, differ as to which of the two versions is secondary.—Ver. 6. καλὸς: twice used in Mk. (ver. 9), here = appropriately, in ver. 9 = braverly, finely. The citation from Isaiah is given in identical terms in the two accounts.—Ver. 8. At this point Mk.'s account seems secondary as compared with Mt.'s. This verse contains Christ's comment on the prophetic oracle, then, ver. 9. He goes on to say the same thing over again.—Ver. 10. Μωυσῆς; God in Mt., the same thing in Jewish esteem.—Ver. 11. Κορβᾶν: Mk. gives first the Hebrew word, then its Greek equivalent.—Ver. 12. Here again the construction limps; it would have been in order if there had been no λέγειν after ἐκείνως at beginning of ver. 11 but ye, when a man says, etc., do not allow him, etc.—Ver. 13. ἐπεξηγήσατο, which ye have delivered. The receivers are also transmitters of the tradition, adding their quota to the weight of authority.—παράμοια τοιαῦτα πολλὰ; many such similar things, a rhetorically redundant phrase (such, similar) expressive of contempt. Cf. Col. ii. 21, Heb. ix. 10.

Vv. 14-16. The people taken into the discussion.—προσκαλεσάμενοι: the people must have retired a little into the background, out of respect for the Jerusalem magnates.—ἀκούσατε μου, etc., hear me all ye, and understand: a more pointed appeal than Mt.'s: hear and understand.—Ver. 15. This saying is called a parable in ver. 17, and Weiss contends that it must be taken strictly as such, i.e., as meaning that it is not foods going into the body through the mouth that defile ceremonially, but corrupt matters issuing from the body (as in leprosy). Holtmann, H. C., concurs. Schanz dissents on the ground that on this view the connection with unclean hands is done away with, and a quite foreign thought introduced. Mt., it is clear, has not so understood the saying (xv. 11), and while he also calls it a parable (ver. 15) he evidently means thereby an obscure, enigmatical saying, needing explanation. Why assume that Mk. means anything more? True, he makes Jesus say, not that which cometh
7—23. ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ

αὐτὸν κοινώσας. ἐὰν τὰ ἐκπορεύματα αὐτοῦ, ἢ ἐκάθεν ἢ σφήματα τὰ κοινωνία τῶν ἄνθρωπων. 16. ἦν οὗ θέα διὶ ἄκοιδος, ἄκουότερος. 17. Καὶ ἦν ἐνζήλοις εἰς οἴκον ἄνδρον τοῦ δύναμεν ἐντρωτών αὐτῶν οἱ πλησίωσαν καὶ μάθηται αὐτοῦ περὶ τῆς παραβολῆς. 18. καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, (τοῖς τοῖς ἄδεξ.)

"Ωστάρι καὶ ὅμειρος ἀσύμφοροι οὖσα; οὐκ εἶναι διὰ τὸ εἶναι τινὰ τὸ ἡμείς τοῖς ἤμεροις ἐκπορευόμενοι εἰς τὸν ἄνθρωπον οὐ δύναται αὐτὸν κοινώσασθαι; 19. διὰ οὗ εἰς εἰς αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν καρδίαν; ἔλθον εἰς τὴν κοιλίαν καὶ εἰς τὸν ἀφθαρσίαν ἐκπορεύεται, καθαρίζων τὰ τὰ βρόματα." 20. Ἐλεγε δὲ, "Ὅτι τὸ καὶ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐκπορευόμενον, ἢ πεπαθεμένον τοῦ καίρου τῶν ἄνθρωποι τὸ διαλογισμὸν ὧν κακῶν ἐκπορεύονται, μοιχείαν, πορνείαν, φόνου, 22. κλοπῆν, πλαστικὰ, οἰκήματα, ἀνάλογα, ἀδήλυμα, ἀθανάτον πνεύμα, μεταφορὰ, ἀνθρωποσκευή, ἀφορμὴν. 23. πάντα ταύτα τὰ πνευματικὰ ἐσωθεὶ ἐκπορεύεται, καὶ κοινώσασθαι τὸν ἄνθρωπον." 1

1 κοινωνία αὐτοῦ in ἩΒΔ (B το κοινωνα Α).
2 τὰ εἰς τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐκπορεύεται in ἩΒΔΔΑ 33, and εἰς καὶ αὐτὸν omitted in ἩΒΔΛ.
3 οἰκον ἄνδρον τοῦ δύναμεν omits a gloss.
4 τὴν παραβολήν for τὰ την ἐν ἩΒΔΔΑ 33.
5 καθαρίζον in ἩΒΔΔΑ al., Orig. (modern editions).
6 πορνεία, κλοπῆς, φόνου, μοιχείας in ἩΒΔΔ.

out of the mouth, but the things which come out of the man. But if He had meant the impure matters issuing from the body, would He not have said εἰς τοῦ σώματος, so as to make His meaning unmistakable? On the whole, the most probable view is that even in ver. 15 the thought of Jesus moves in the moral sphere, and that the meaning is: the only defilement worth serious consideration is that caused by the evil which comes out of the heart (ver. 21).

Vv. 17—23. Conversation with the disciples.—εἰς οἰκον ἄνδρον τοῦ δύναμεν = alone, apart from the crowd, at home, wherever the home, πρὸς τομ., might be. Whatever was said or done in public became habitually a subject of conversation between Jesus and the Twelve, and therefore of course this remarkable saying.—Ver. 18. Here, as in vi. 52, Mk. takes pains to make prominent the stupidity and consequent need of instruction of the Twelve.—δὲς καὶ ὡς ὡς ὢς .. .; are ye, too, so unintelligent as not to understand what I have said: that that which goeth into the man from without cannot defile?—Ver. 19. δὲν οὖν .. .; εἰς τὴν καρδίαν: this negative statement is not in Mt. The contrast makes the point clearer. The idea throughout is that ethical defilement is alone of importance, all other defilement, whether the subject of Mosaic ceremonial legislation or of scribe tradition, a trivial affair. Jesus here is a critic of Moses as well as of the scribes, and introduces a religious revolution.—καθαρίζεσθαι (not -σθαι) is accepted generally as the true reading, but how is it to be construed? as the nominative absolute referring to ἀφθαρσίαν, giving the sense: evacuation purges the body from all matter it cannot assimilate? So most recent commentators. Or ought we not to terminate the words of Jesus at ἐκπορεύεσθαι with a mark of interrogation, and take what follows as a comment of the evangelist? = ἐκπορεύονται, etc. etc.: this He said, purging all meats; making all meats clean, abolishing the ceremonial distinctions of the Levitical law. This view was adopted by Origen and Chrysostom, and is vigorously defended by Field, Oitum Nor., ad loc., and favoured by the Spk., Commentary. Weizsäcker adopts it in his translation: "So sprach er aller Speise rein."—Ver. 20. Πληγή δὲ: the use of this phrase here favours the view that καθαρίζεσθαι, etc., is an interpolated remark of the evangelist (Field).—Ver,
KATA MARKON

VII.

24. Kal ekteihen 1 anastas aptheleven eis tis mebriva 2 Touro kai Sidwos. 3 kal ekselewen eis thn 4 oixian, othenea thele gynai, kai 1.Lk.viii.47. ouk xurontoth 6 laoihein. 25. akousasa yap 6 gyni peri adou, 3 su. 26. pros tois padois adou. 3 pl. 6. 3 e. 27. eis tou. 4 eis othe. 1. 26. 5 3 eis tou. 6 eis othe. 1. 27. a fai. 3. 28. eis tou. 7. 27. 6 eis othe. 1. 27. 7 eis othe. 1. 27. 

1 ekteihen de in NBLA.

2 mebraia is an interpretative harmonising (Mt. xv. 22) substitute for oria in NBDLA (Tisch., W.H.).

3 DLALA omit kai T. (Tisch.), found in NBL (W.H. bracket).

4 Omit toin NBLA, etc.


6 allo evhen before akousasa instead of yap in NBLA 33.

7 eti sun me NBLA 33.

8 Xharaiothmasa in NBLA and many other uncialss = 33.

9 ekbale in NABDLAAL.

10 For o de tel. eisin NBLA 33 have kai elven.

21. An enumeration of the things which come out of the man, from the heart; first six plurals, potei, etc.; then six singulars, de, etc. (ver. 22).—Ver. 23. Concluding reflection: all these bad things come out from within and defile the man. Commonplace now, what a startling originality then!

Vv. 24-30. The Syrophenician woman (Mt. xi. 21-28).—Ekteihen de anastas points to a change from the comparatively stationary life by the shores of the lake to a period of wandering in unwonted scenes. Cf. x. 1, where anastas is used in reference to the final departure from Galilee to the south. The te, instead of the more usual kal, emphasises this change.—Eis ta othe T., not towards (Fritzsche), but into the borders of Tyre. There can be no doubt that in Mk's narrative Jesus crosses into heathen territory (cf. ver. 31). In view of the several unsuccessful attempts made by Jesus to escape from the crowd into quiet and leisure, so carefully indicated by Mk, this almost goes without saying. Failing within Jewish territory, He is forced to go without, in hope to get some uninterrupted leisure for confidential intercourse with the Twelve, rendered all the more urgent by scenes like that just considered, which too plainly show that His time will be short.—Eis eikaiou, into a house, considering Christ's desire for privacy, more likely to be that of a heathen stranger (Weiss) than that of a friend (Meyer, Keil).—Oddeia thele gynai. He wished no one to know (He was there); to know no one (Fritzsche), comes to the same thing: desires to be private, not weary of well-doing, but anxious to do other work hitherto much hindered.—Ouk xuronthei laoihein. He was not able to escape notice; not even here!—Ver. 25. eidothe: does not imply that the woman heard of Christ's arrival as soon as it happened, but that, after hearing, she lost no time in coming = as soon as she heard. Yet sorrow, like the demons, was quick to learn of His presence.—Thugatreni: another of Mk's diminutives.—Ver. 26. 'Ellins, Suro, Phoinikeou, a Greek in religion, a Syrian in tongue, a Phenician in race (Euthy, Sig.). The two last epithets combined into one (Surophi) would describe her as a Syrophenician as distinct from a Phenician of Carthage. Mk is careful to define the nationality and religion of the woman to throw light on the sequel.

—Ver. 27. Othes pouton, etc.: a milder word than that in Mt. (ver. 26): it is here a mere question of order: first Jews, then Gentiles, St. Paul's programme, Rom. i. 16. In Mt. we read, ous kai; it is not right, seemingly, to take the children's bread and to throw it to the dogs. Mk also has this word, but in a subordinate place, and simply as a reason for the prior claim of the children.
We note also that Mk., usually so full in his narratives compared with Mt., omits the intercession of the Twelve with Christ's reply (Mt. vv. 23, 24). Yet Mk.'s, "first the children," is really equivalent to "I am not sent," etc. The former implies: "your turn will come"; the latter: "to minister to you is not my vocation". This word, preserved in Mt., becomes less harsh when looked at in the light of Christ's desire for quiet, not mentioned in Mt. Jesus made the most of the fact that His commission was to Jews. It has been thought that, in comparison with Mt., Mk.'s report of Christ's words is secondary, adapted purposely to Gentile readers. Probably that is the case, but, on the other hand, he gives us a far clearer view of the extent and aim of the excursion to the North, concerning which Mt. has, and gives, no adequate conception.—Ver. 28. ἀπεκρίθη, aorist, hitherto imperfect. We come now to what Mk. deems the main point of the story, the woman's striking word.—ἐσκάτω τ. ἑτορ, the dogs under the table, waiting for morsels, a realistic touch.—τῶν φυλακῶν τ. πώς, not merely the crumbs which by chance fall from the table, but morsels surreptitiously dropt by the children("qui panem saepe prodigunt," Beng.) to their pets. Household dogs, part of the family, loved by the children; hard and fast line of separation impossible.—Ver. 29. ἰδιω τ. τ. λέγην, for this word, which showed the quick wit of the faith, which Mt. specifies as the reason of the exception made in her favour.—Ver. 30. ἐβεβλήμενον: the emphasis lies on this word rather than on παίδιον (Bengel), as expressing the condition in which the mother found her daughter: lying quietly ("in lecio molliter cubantem sine ulâ jactatione," Grotius).

It is probable that this interesting incident cannot be fully understood without taking into consideration circumstances not mentioned in the narratives, and which, therefore, it does not fail to the expositor to refer to. On this side my book, With Open Face, chap. vii.

Vv. 31-37. Cure of a deaf-mute, peculiar to Mk. Mt. has, instead, a renewal of the healing ministry on an extensive scale, the thing Jesus desired to avoid (av. 29-31).—Ver. 31. After the instructive episode Jesus continued His journey, going northwards through (διὰ, vide critical notes) Sidon, then making a circuit so as to arrive through Decapolis at the Sea of Galilee. The route is not more definitely indicated; perhaps it was along the highway over the Lebanese range to Damascus; it may conceivably have touched that ancient city, which, according to Pliny (H. N., v., 10), was included in Decapolis (vide Holtz., H. C., and Schürer, Div., ii., vol. i., p. 93).—Ver. 32. μεγάλη, speaking with difficulty; but here for...
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VII. 33—37.

Ino ἐπιθῇ αὐτῷ τὴν χείρα. 33. καὶ ἀπολαβόμενος αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ

Τ. 33. John 5:15 καὶ ἔβλεψεν τοὺς θανάτους αὐτοῦ ἐξ ἀπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ,

II. 33. v. 6. καὶ Πτερός ἦσαν τῆς γλώσσης αὐτοῦ, 34. καὶ ἀναβλήψας 

v. 12. ἐπὶ τὸν οὐρανόν, ἑστάθη, καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ, "Εφθάσας," ὥς ἔστην, "Διὰ 

v. 22. τῆς γλώσσης αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔδειξεν ὄρθον. 36. καὶ 

v. 26. ἐπιστελέευτο αὐτοῖς ἵνα μηδείς ἐπιστούν, καὶ ὅπως δὲ αὐτῶς, 

v. 30. ἐπιστελέευτο, μᾶλλον περισσότερον ἐκήρυσσον. 37. καὶ ἀπεκρίνετο 

v. 32. ὄν τός ἀξιολόγησαν, λέγοντες, "Καλῶς πάντα πετοῦσθε καὶ τοὺς 

v. 35. καὶ πᾶσαν αὐτοὺς, καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους λαλεῖν."

ἐφθάσας is omitted here in BDL 33 and inserted before εὐθύς in MBD; wanting here also in BD it. (W.H. omit both.

τοιοῦτοι (BDL 33. T.R. assimilates to ver. 34. ἀλλοιοτικὸν in BBL 33.

τοιοῦτοι omit τοιοῦτοι in MBL 33.

dumb. Cf. ἀλάλονος, ver. 37, used in Sept., Is. xxxv. 6, for ἄνὴρ, dumb, here only in N.T.—Ver. 33. ἀπολαβόμενος, etc., withdrawing him from the crowd apart. Many reasons have been assigned for this procedure. The true reason, doubtless, is that Jesus did not wish to be drawn into a new ministry of healing on a large scale (Weiss, Schanz).—ἐβάλα τοῦ δικτύου, etc.: one finger of the right hand into one ear, another of the left hand into the other, on account of the narrowness and depth of the hearing faculty, that He might touch it (ὡς τὸ στήθος καὶ βαθὺ τῆς ἄκος εἰς δικτύον τούτον, Euthy. Zyg.). Deafness is first dealt with; it was the primary evil. —πτερός, spitting; on what, the tongue of the dumb man as on the eyes of the blind (vss. 22-23). So Meyer. Or on His own finger, with which He then touched the tongue? So Weiss, Schanz, Kloster, Holtz. (H. C.), Keil. Mk. leaves us hear to our own conjectures, as also in reference to the import of these singular acts of Jesus. Probably they were meant to rouse interest and aid faith in the dull soul of the sufferer. (Vide Trench, Notes on the Miracles.)

Ver. 34. ἀναβλήψας, ἑστήκε: Jesus looked up in prayer, and sighed or groaned in sympathy. In this case a number of acts, bodily and mental, are specified. Were these peculiar to it, or do we here get a glimpse into Christ's modus operandi in many unrecorded cases? On the latter view one can understand the exhausting nature of the healing ministry. It meant a great mental strain.—ἐφθάσας, an Aramaic word = as Mk. explains, θανάσιμον; doubtless the word actually spoken = Be opened, in reference to the ears, though the loosing of the tongue was part of the result ensuing.—Ver. 35. αὐτῶς, literally, the hearings, here the instruments of hearing, the ears. So often in classics.—ἐλέει ὄρθος, he began to speak in a proper or ordinary manner, implying that in his dumb condition he had been able only to make maritculate sounds.—Ver. 36. μᾶλλον περισσότερον, a double comparative, forcibly rendered in A.V., "So much the more, a great deal". Cf. 2 Cor. vii. 13. This use of μᾶλλον to strengthen comparatives is found in classics, instances in Raphel, Annotation, ad loc., and Hermann's Viger, p. 710.—Ver. 37. ὑπερεκπέμπον, super-abundantly, a double superlative; here only.—καλῶς τ. τετείχε: He hath done all things well. This looks like a reflection on past as well as present; the story of the demoniacs, e.g. Observe the ποια, present, in next clause, referring to the cure just effected. It happened in Decapolis, and we seem to see the inhabitants of that region exhibiting a nobler mood than in chap. v. 17. Of course, there were no swine lost on this occasion. Their astonishment at the miracle may seem extravagant, but it must be remembered that they have had little experience of Christ's healing work; their own fault.
VII. I—6. *EYAIΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ*

VII. I. *EN ἕκεναις ταῖς ἡμέραις, παμπόλλου ἐκλίου ἄτος, καὶ μὴ ἔχοντων τί φένωσι, προσκαλεσάμενος δʼ ἠγούς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ λέγει αὐτοῖς, 2. «Σπλαγχνίζομαι εἰς τὸν ἐχλίου. ὡς ἡ ἡμέρᾳ τριῶν προσμόνωσι μοι, καὶ οὐκ ἔχουσι τί φένωσι. 3. καὶ δὲν ἀπολύσω αὐτοὺς νήστας εἰς οἰκον αὐτῶν, ἐκλυθήσονται εἰς τῇ ὁδῷ τῶν γὰρ αὐτῶν μακρόθεν ἤδησαν.» 4. καὶ ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ. «Πάντων τούτων διαφέρει τὰς ὁδὸς χορτάσαι ἄρτους ἐν ἐρήμως;» 5. καὶ ἐπηρέατα αὐτοὺς, «Πάντως ἔχετε ἄρτους;» 6. οἱ δὲ αὐτῶν, «Ἐπτά.» 7. καὶ παρήγγειλε τῷ ἄχλῳ ἀναπεσόντων ἐν τῇ γῆς καὶ λαβὼν τὸς ἐπτά ἄρτους, εὐφαρμότητα ἔκλασε καὶ ἄζειν τοὺς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, ένα παράδοει καὶ παρῆλθεν τῷ

1 παλίν πελλοῦν in ΝΒΔΛΑΣ 33. παμπόλλου is a conjectural emendation suggested by the fact of a great crowd, and perplexity caused by παλίν here as in vii. 14.
2 ΝΒΔΛΑΣ 33 it. vulg. cop. omit ἅγον, also ΝΒΔΛΑΣ omit αὐτοῦ after μαθητης.
3 μηρας = a grammatical correction for μηρας (ΝL, etc.), or μηρας τρισυ in B.
4 For τινες γερ... ἡσιν read καὶ τινες (ΝΒΔΑ) αὐτῶν εἰς μακρόθεν (ΝΒΔΛΑ), autn (ΒΔΑ).
5 οτι before τοῦεν in ΒΔΑ.
6 πρες in ΒΔΑ.
7 παραγγελείν in ΝΒΔΛΑ.
8 παραγγελείν in ΝΒCLΔ 33.

Chapter VIII. Second Feeding. Sign from Heaven. Cure at Bethsaida. Caesarea Philippi.—Vv. 1-10. Second feeding (Mt. xv. 32-39).—Ver. 1. en ekéinai tais hmeraias: a vague phrase, used only once again in this Gospel (i. 9, in reference to Jesus going from Nazareth to be baptised), indicating inability to assign to the following incident a precise historical place. Cf. Mt. iii. 1 for similar vague use of the expression. —παλίν πελλοῦν 6. 6. This well-attested reading is another indication of the evangelist's helplessness as to historical connection: there being again a great crowd. Why? where? not indicated, and we arc not entitled to assert that the scene of the event was Decapolis, and the occasion the healing of the deaf-mute. The story is in the air, and this is one of the facts that have to be reckoned with by defenders of the reality of the second feeding against those who maintain that it is only a literary duplicate of the first, due to the circumstance that the Petrine version of it differed in some particulars from that in the Logia of Matthew. On this subject I do not dogmatise, but I cannot pretend to be insensible to the difficulties connected with it.—ξελαν, a great crowd again. How often the crowd figures in the evangelic story! It is the one monotonous feature in narratives of thrilling interest.—Ver. 2. Vide on Mt. xv. 32. —Ver. 3. εκλυθήσονται, they will faint. This verb is used in N. T. in middle or passive in the sense of being faint or weary in body or mind (Gal. vi. 9, Heb. xii. 3).—καὶ τινες... εἰσιν, and some of them are from a distance, peculiar to Mark. The meaning is that such, even if in vigour at starting, would be exhausted before reaching their destination. But could they not get food by the way?—Ver. 4. παρένε, whence. This adverb was used by the Greeks, in speaking of food, in reference to the source of supply—παρένε φάγωμεν = "unde culum petiturum sitiis". Examples in Kypke, Raphael, Palaiet, —εἴπομεν, in a desert. The scene of the first feeding is a desert place also (chap. vi. 32). But in that case food was purchasable within a reasonable distance; not so here.—Ver. 6. Compare the meagre statement here with the picturesque description in vi. 38-40. The evangelist seems to lack interest in the twice-told tale. Ver. 7. Ιεβδομα: another of Mark's diminutives, but Matthew has it also (xv. 34), copied
probably from Mark. In these two places only.—Ver. 8. περισσεύματα κλασμάτων, the remainders of the broken pieces. Matthew uses the singular neuter, το περισσεύμα, in both feedings.—συνηδέσμα: in both accounts of second feeding, κοφίνονα in both accounts of first (κόφινα in Luke). On the difference in meaning, wide notes on Mt. xiv. 20.—Ver. 10. Here as in case of first feeding there is a crossing of the lake immediately after (ἐσθήσα, which has an obvious reason in first case). This time Jesus and the Twelve enter the boat together, at least in Mark’s narrative (μετά των μαθητῶν).—Δαλμανουθά, in Matthew Μαγαδασ; both alike unknown: another of the features in this narrative which give a handle to critical doubt. Some place it on the western shore in the plain of Gennesaret (Furrer, “On the site of Khan Minyeh lay once Dalmanutha,” Wanderungen, p. 369); others to the south-east of the lake near the junction of the Yarmuk with the Jordan (Delhemiyeh, Robinson, B. R., iii. 264). Weiss (in Meyer) adopts this view. Holtzmann (H. C.), while leaning to the former alternative, leaves the matter doubtful.

Vv. 11-12. Phariases seek a sign (Mt. xii. 1-4).—Ver. 11. ἔξηκον ὁ Φ., the Pharisees went out, from their seat in the Holy Land into the heathen Decapolis, otherwise carefully shunned, in their zeal against Jesus. So Weiss (in Meyer).—Ver. 12. άναστᾱναθα, fetching a deep sigh, here only in N. T.; probably from Mark. In these two places only.—Ver. 8. περισσεύματα κλασμάτων, the remainders of the broken pieces. Matthew uses the singular neuter, το περισσεύμα, in both feedings.—συνηδέσμα: in both accounts of second feeding, κοφίνονα in both accounts of first (κόφινα in Luke). On the difference in meaning, wide notes on Mt. xiv. 20.—Ver. 10. Here as in case of first feeding there is a crossing of the lake immediately after (ἐσθήσα, which has an obvious reason in first case). This time Jesus and the Twelve enter the boat together, at least in Mark’s narrative (μετά των μαθητῶν).—Δαλμανουθά, in Matthew Μαγαδασ; both alike unknown: another of the features in this narrative which give a handle to critical doubt. Some place it on the western shore in the plain of Gennesaret (Furrer, “On the site of Khan Minyeh lay once Dalmanutha,” Wanderungen, p. 369); others to the south-east of the lake near the junction of the Yarmuk with the Jordan (Delhemiyeh, Robinson, B. R., iii. 264). Weiss (in Meyer) adopts this view. Holtzmann (H. C.), while leaning to the former alternative, leaves the matter doubtful.

Vv. 11-12. Phariases seek a sign (Mt. xii. 1-4).—Ver. 11. ἔξηκον ὁ Φ., the Pharisees went out, from their seat in the Holy Land into the heathen Decapolis, otherwise carefully shunned, in their zeal against Jesus. So Weiss (in Meyer).—Ver. 12. άναστᾱναθα, fetching a deep sigh, here only in N. T.; probably from Mark. In these two places only.—Ver. 8. περισσεύματα κλασμάτων, the remainders of the broken pieces. Matthew uses the singular neuter, το περισσεύμα, in both feedings.—συνηδέσμα: in both accounts of second feeding, κοφίνονα in both accounts of first (κόφινα in Luke). On the difference in meaning, wide notes on Mt. xiv. 20.—Ver. 10. Here as in case of first feeding there is a crossing of the lake immediately after (ἐσθήσα, which has an obvious reason in first case). This time Jesus and the Twelve enter the boat together, at least in Mark’s narrative (μετά των μαθητῶν).—Δαλμανουθά, in Matthew Μαγαδασ; both alike unknown: another of the features in this narrative which give a handle to critical doubt. Some place it on the western shore in the plain of Gennesaret (Furrer, “On the site of Khan Minyeh lay once Dalmanutha,” Wanderungen, p. 369); others to the south-east of the lake near the junction of the Yarmuk with the Jordan (Delhemiyeh, Robinson, B. R., iii. 264). Weiss (in Meyer) adopts this view. Holtzmann (H. C.), while leaning to the former alternative, leaves the matter doubtful.

1 Omit λέγοντες (an explanatory word used) ΝBD.
3 B, L, B. 4 ΝΒCDLAX omit ετέ.
4 B, L, B. ΝΒCDLAX omit etά.
5 Klasmátωn plērēs in ΝΒCDLAX 33. 6 kai λέγοντες in ΝΒCDLAX.
6 Ερχονται in BCDLAX. The sing. (T.R.) is an adaptation to αὐτών.

Easymindedness as to food in the disciple-circle. Let to-morrow look after itself!—Ver. 15. ἄφεν τῆς ζωῆς, etc.: two leavens, one of Pharisees, another of Herod, yet placed together because morally akin and coincident in practical outcome. Vide notes on Mt. xvi. 16.—Ver. 16. πρὸς ἀλλήλους. Mt. has ἐν ἀνευμοῦ. The mind of Jesus was profoundly preoccupied with the ominous demand of the sign-seekers, and the disciples might talk quietly to each other unnoticed by Him.—Ver. 17. γνώνε: He does notice, however, and administers a sharp rebuke for their preoccupation with mere temporalities, as if there were nothing higher to be thought of than bread.—πεπορωμένης, in a hardened state; the word stands in an emphatic position. For the time the Twelve are wayside hearers, with hearts like a beaten path, into which the higher truths cannot sink so as to germinate.—Ver. 18 repeats in reference to the Twelve the hard saying uttered concerning the multitude on the day of the parables (iv. 12). In vv. 19, 20 Jesus puts the Twelve through their catechism in reference to the recent feedings, and then in ver. 21 (according to reading in B) asks in the tone of a disappointed Master: How do you not understand? If we may emphasise the imperfect tense of ἔλεγαν, He said this over and over again, half speaking to them, half to Himself; another of Mk.'s realistic features. All this shows how much the Twelve needed special instruction, and it is obviously Mk.'s aim to make this prominent. Desire for leisure to attend to their instruction is in his narrative the key to the excursions in the direction of Tyre and Sidon and to Caesarea Philippi.

Vv. 22-26. A blind man cured at Bethsaida, peculiar to Mk.—Ver. 22. Bēthsaidaîν. If there were two Bethsaidas, which of the two? If only one of course it was Bethsaida Julias. But against this has been cited the term κώμη twice applied to the town (vv. 23, 26), which, however, may be regarded as satisfactorily explained by the remark: it had been a village, and was first made a town by Philip, who enlarged and beautified it and called it Julias in honour of the daughter of Augustus (Joseph. B. J. ii., 9, 1, etc.). So Meyer and others.—Ver. 23. ἤπει τῆς κώμης, outside the village, for the same reason as in vii. 33, to avoid creating a run on Him for cures. Therefore Jesus becomes
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conductor of the blind man Himself, though he doubtless had one (Weiss-Meyer).—ἀπόλος, spitting, in this case certainly on the diseased parts. Spittle was regarded as a means of cure by the ancients. Holtzmann (H. C.) cites the story of Vespasian in Alexandria narrated by Tacitus (Hist. iv., 81). The prince was asked to sprinkle the eyes of a blind man "oris excremento."—εἶ τι βλέπει, do you, possibly, see anything? εἶ with a direct question, vide Winer, i. v., 2.—Ver. 24. ἀναβλέψας: the narrative contains three compounds of ἀναβλέψας (ἀνά, διά, ἐν); the first denotes looking up in the tentative manner of blind men, the second looking through (a mist as it were) so as to see clearly, the third looking into so as to see distinctly, as one sees the exact outlines of a near object (cf. Mk. xiv. 67).—ἐν δάφνα, as trees, so indistinct was vision as yet; yet not trees, but men because moving ("non arbores, quia ambulent," Bengel). He knew what a man is like, therefore he had once seen, not born blind.——Ver. 25. A second touch brings better vision, so that ἀναβλέψας, and he was now restored to full use of his eyes; the result being permanent perfect vision—ἀναβλέπων, imperfect.—ἀναβλέπων points to the first act of distinct seeing.—τηλαγωγῆς (τῆς αὐτῆς here only), shining from afar. He saw distant objects distinctly as if they were near; did not need to go near them to see them.—Ver. 26. εἶς οἶκον, home.—μηδὲ, etc., go not into the village; to avoid creating a sensation. It has been suggested that the gradual restoration of sight in this case was meant to symbolise the slowness of the Twelve in attaining spiritual insight. They got their eyes opened very gradually like the blind man of Bethsaida. So Klostermann.

Vv. 27-ix. 1. At Caesarea Philippi (Mt. xvi. 13-20, Lk. ix. 18-27).—Ver. 27, καὶ ἔξηλθεν: the καὶ connects very loosely with what goes before, but presumably ἔξηλθεν refers to Bethsaida. They leave it and go northwards towards Caesarea Philippi, up the Jordan valley, a distance of some twenty-five or thirty miles.—οἱ ἴδιοι: that Jesus is here expressly named is a hint that something very important is to be narrated, and the mention of the disciples along with Him indicates that it closely concerns them.—εἰς τὰς κάμψες Κ. τ. Φ., to the villages of Caesarea Philippi, not to Caesarea Philippi itself. Mt. has τὰ μέρη. Apparently they did not enter the city itself. Jesus seems to have avoided the towns in which the Herodian passion for ambitious architecture was displayed. Besides at this time He
desired solitude.—ἐν τῇ δόξῃ, on the way, probably when the city of Caesarea Philippi came into view. Vide on Mt. xvi. 13. But conversation leading up to the critical subject might begin as soon as they had got clear of Bethsaida. No time to be lost now that the Master had got the Twelve by themselves. Or was the Master, very silent on that journey, preparing His own mind for what was coming?—ἐμφάνεται, imperfect, because subordinate to the reply of the disciples, the main thing.—τίνα με, etc.: on the form of the question vide on Mt. xvi. 13. —Ver. 28. οἱ δὲ εἶναι αὐτοὶ λέγοντες, they said, saying, tautology, somewhat like the vulgar English idiom: He said, says he; fixing attention on what is said.—Ἰδούν τ. B.: the accusative depending on λέγοντες οἱ ἄνθρωποι σε εἶναι understood. This infinitive construction passes into direct speech in the last clause. Vide on εἶναι (I) τ. προφήτης. The opinions reported are much the same as in vi. 14, 15.—Ver. 29. ὅμως δὲ, etc.: a very pointed question given by all the Synoptists in the same terms. The reply, on the other hand, is different in each. Vide on Mt. xvi. 16.—ἀποκριθεὶς λέγω: we have here an aorist participate of identical action with a finite verb in the present tense. It usually goes with the aorist (cf. Mt. xvi. 17, ἀποκριθής εἶδεν).—Ver. 30. ἔπειτα ἦς He threatened them, spoke in a tone of menace, as if anticipating foolish talk—τώρα γὰρ—about Him, i.e., about His being the Christ, as in Mt. The prohibition might have a double reference: to the people, to prevent the spread of crude ideas as to the Messiahship of Jesus; to the disciples, that they might keep the new faith to themselves till it took deep root in their own souls. Recall Carlyle's counsel to young men: if thou hast an idea keep it to thyself, for as soon as thou hast spoken it it is dead to thee (Stump Orator in Latter Day Pamphlets). 

Ver. 31-33. First announcement of the Passion.—Ver. 31. καὶ: Mt. has the more emphatic ἀκριβῶς, indicating that then began an entirely new way of speaking as to the coming fate of Jesus.—διδάσκειν, to teach, more appropriate is Mt.'s word, δείκνυε, to show. It was a solemn intimation rather than instruction that was given; it must be; in all three evangelists. It points to the inevitability of the event, not to the rationale of it. On that subject Jesus gave in the first place no instruction.—πολλὰ παρειδοθέντα: where not indicated, as in Mt.—ἀποκριθῆσαν: an expressive word taken from Ps. cxvii. 22, fitly indicating the precise share of the religious authorities in the coming tragedy. Their part was solemnly to disapprove of the claimant to Messiahship. All else was the natural sequel of their act of rejection. —τῶν ἐρωτήματα, τῶν δὲ, τῶν γρ.: the article before each of the three classes named, saddling each with its separate responsibility.—Ver. 32. παρρησία: He spoke the word plainly, unmistakably. This remark was rendered almost necessary by the choice of the word διδάσκειν in ver. 31. Mt.'s δεικνύειν implies παρρησία. This word (from παρρησία) in ordinary Greek usage means frank, unreserved speech, as opposed to partial or total silence. Here,
προσλαβόμενος αυτών δ' Πέτρος ἔρρησε ἐπιτιμάν αὐτῷ. 33. δὲ ἐπιστραφεὶς, καὶ ἵδεν τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ, ἐπέτιμησε τῷ Πέτρῳ λέγων,8 "Ὑπαγε ὁπισώ μου, Σατανᾶ· ὅτι οὐ φρονεῖς τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀλλὰ τὰ τῶν ἄνθρωπων.

34. Καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τὸν ἄγιον σὺν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, εἰπὲν αὐτοῖς, 11 "Οστίς4 θέλει ὁπισώ μου ἔλθειν, ἀπαριθμησάθω ἐαυτόν, καὶ ἀράτω τὸν σταυρόν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀκολουθεῖτι τοῦ. 35. δὲ γὰρ δὲν θηλή τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σώσαι, ἀπολέσαι αὐτήν. δὲ δὲν ἀπολέσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἑνεκεν ἑμοῦ καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, οὕτως οὕτως ἀπολέσαι αὐτήν. 36. τι γὰρ ἀδελφήσει ἄνθρωπον, ἐὰν κερδήσῃ τὸν κόσμον δλον, καὶ ζημιώθη τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ; 37. η τί δοθήσει ἄνθρωπος9 ἀντάλλαγμα τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ; 38. δὲ ὁ Λκ ἣ τα 64 ἀδράμωσον ἡ ἐν ἡ ἑπαυχυνθῇ με καὶ τοῖς ἔμοις λέγων εἰς τῇ γενετῇ ταύτῃ τῇ μορφῇ καὶ ἁμαρτωλῷ, καὶ δόδοις τοῦ ἄνθρωπον ἑπαυχυνθῆσαι αὐτών, διόν ἐλθὴ εἰς τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων τῶν ἀγίων."

1 o Π. αὐτον in BL. 2 Omit τῷ ΝBDL. 3 καὶ λαγεῖ in ΝBCDΔ. 4 Omit τῷ ΝBDL. 5 ἀπολείπει in ΝBCDA al.; a mechanical conformation to the preceding ἀπολείπει, thinks Weiss. 6 αὐτοῦ (from Λκ.) omit ΝΑBCDLA verss. 7 ὁφέλει in ΝBL. 8 κηρύξῃ ἤζημιωθῇ come from Mt.; read κηρύξῃ ἤζημιωθῇ with ΝBL (Tisch., W.H.), of course omitting ειν. 9 η τα δισε αὐτ. is another conformation to Mt.; read τα γερ τοι α. with ΝΕ (Tisch., W.H.).

as in John xi. 14, xvi. 25, 29, it means plain speech as opposed to hints or veiled allusions, such as Jesus had previously given; as in Mk. ii. 20 (bridegroom taken away). In this sense St. Paul (2 Cor. iii. 12) claims παρρησία for the Christian ministry in contrast to the mystery connected with the legal dispensation as symbolised by the veil of Moses. The term was adopted into the Rabbinical vocabulary, and used to signify veiled speech as opposed to metaphorical or parabolic speech (Wünsche, Beitrag, ad loc.).—προσλαβόμενος δ' Π.: what Peter said is not given, Mk's aim being simply to show that Jesus had so spoken that misunderstanding of what He said was impossible. That the news should be unwelcome is regarded as a matter of course.—Ver. 33. ἐπιστραφεὶς: the compound instead of the simple verb in Mt., which Mk. does not use.—Ἰδὼν τ. μαθ.: the rebuke is administered for the benefit of all, not merely to put down Peter. This resistance to the cross must be grappled with at once and decisively. What Peter said, all felt. In Mk.'s report of the rebuke the words σκάνδαλον εἰς ἑμοῦ are omitted. On the saying τυλιγμενον εις ἑμοῦ. Ver. 33. ἄλλα, the crowd. Even here! A surprise; is it not a mistake? So appears to think Weiss, who (in Meyer) accounts for the reference to a crowd by supposing that the words of Mt. x. 38 are in his mind, which are given in Lk. xiv. 25 as spoken to a crowd, probably because they were so given in his source. Jesus certainly desired to be private at this time, and in the neighbourhood of Caesarea Philippi ought to have succeeded.—Ver. 35. τοῦ ἐγγυηλού: for my sake and the Gospel's, an addition of Mt.'s, possibly a gloss.—ἀπολέσῃ, instead of the more enigmatical ἐφήσει of Mt.—Ver. 38 reproduces the λογισμον in Mt. x. 33 concerning being ashamed in Jesus, which does not find a place here in Mt.'s version. In Mt.'s form it is the outward ostensible act of
IX. 1—4.

ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ

IX. 1. Καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς, "Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι εἰς τινὰς τῶν ἐότητων, οἵτινες μὴ γενόσυναι θανάτου, ἕως ἐν θῶσι τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐλθοῦσιν, ἐν δυνάμει.

2. Καὶ μεθ’ ἡμέρας ἐκ παραλαμβάνει ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὸν Πέτρον καὶ τὸν Ἰάκωβον καὶ τὴν Ἰωάννην, καὶ ἀναφέρει αὐτοῖς εἰς δρος ὅψηλν καὶ ἠδίκων μόνοις· καὶ μεταμορφώθηκε ἐξαρασσόν αὐτῶν, 3. καὶ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο ὁ παλαιός, λευκὰ λίαν ὡς χιόνι, ὥστε γναφεῖ ἐκ τῆς γῆς ὧν ἔρχεται. 4. καὶ ἔθηκεν αὐτοῖς Ἡλίας σὺν Μωσεί, καὶ ἦσαν συλλαβώντες τὸ ἱησοῦ. 5. καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς δ Ἰησοῦς λέγει τῷ ἤμερως, "Ῥαββί, καλὸν ἐστιν ἡμᾶς ἡδονὴ εἶναι· καὶ ποιήσωμεν σκηνὴς τρεῖς· καὶ μιᾶν, καὶ Μωσῆς μιᾶν, καὶ Ἡλίας·

1 οὐδὲ τὸν in BD; τὸν οὐδὲ a correction of style.
2 ἩΒCLA al. pl. have συνέργον as in T.R., which nevertheless is probably a correction of συνεργον in DL to suit the neut. pl. nom.
3 οὐκ εὐμετροῦσα is a gloss (Mt. xxviii. 3); not in ΗΒCLA.
4 οὕτως follows in ΗΒCLA, omitted as superfluous in T.R.
5 τρεις σκηνὰς in ΗΒCLA 33.

denial that is animadverted on; here the feeling of shame, which is its cause—ix. 1.—καὶ ἐλεγεν αὐτοῖς: with this phrase Mk. makes a new start, and turns the close of the Caesarea Philippi conversation into an introduction to the following narrative concerning the transfiguration, apparently suggesting that in the latter event the words found their fulfilment. This impression, if it existed, does not bind the interpreter.—ἄναψαν, introducing a solemn statement.—ἐπὶ Ἰς εὐμετροῦσα, etc.: the promised vision is differently described in the three accounts, as thus:—

Till they see: the Son of Man coming in His Kingdom (Mt.).

Till they see: the Kingdom of God come (ἐλημονεῖν) in power (Mk.).

Till they see: the Kingdom of God (Lk.).

CHAPTER IX. THE TRANSGRESSION.

THE EPILEPTIC. SECOND ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE PASSION. RETURN TO CAPEernaum AND CONVERSATION THERE.

Vv. 2-13. The transfiguration (Mt. xvii. 1-13, Lk. ix. 28-36).—Ver. 2. ἀναφέρει with accusative of person = to lead, a usage unknown to the Greeks. So in Mt.; Lk. avoids the expression.—ἐπὶ Ἰς εὐμετροῦσα, apart alone, a pleonasm, yet μόνον, in Mk. only, is not superfluous. It emphasizes the καὶ Ἰς εὐμετροῦσα, and expresses the passion for solitude. Strictly, it refers only to the three disciples as opposed to the nine, but it really reflects the feeling of Jesus. His desire to be alone with three select companions for a season.—Ver. 3. συνεργοῦσα, glittering; here only in N. T., common in classics; in Sept. of bright brass (Ezra viii. 27); "flashing sword" (R. V., Nahum iii. 3); sunshine on shields (1 Macc. vi. 39).—λευκὰ λίαν, white very. All the evangelists become descriptive. Mk., as was to be expected, goes beyond the two others.—οὐκ εὐμετροῦσα (T.R.) is a tempting addition, especially if Hermon was the scene, but it so adequately expresses the highest degree of whiteness, that alongside of it λίαν and the following words, etc., would have been superfluous.—γραφεῖς, a fuller, here only in N. T. (ἐγραφεῖς in ii. 21).—ἠξὶ τῆς γῆς, suggesting a contrast between what fuller on this earth can do in the way of whitening cloth, and the heaven-wrought brightness of Christ's garments (Schanz).—Ver. 4. Ἡλίας σὺν Ἰ.: Elijah first, not as the more important, but because of his special significance in connection with Messiah's advent, which was the subject of subsequent conversation (ver. 9 ff.).—Ver. 5. Ῥαββί, Rabbi: each evangelist has a different word here.—καλὸν, etc. On this side notes in Mt.—ποιήσωμεν: let us make, not let me make as in Mt. (vide notes there).—σὲ μιᾶν καὶ Μωσῆς, etc.: Moses now comes before Elijah.—Ver. 6. τῇ ἀποκριθεὶς, what he should answer—to the vision; he did not know
what else to make of it than that Moses and Elijah had come to stay. This is probably an apologetic remark added by the evangelist to the original narrative. Lk. reproduces it in a somewhat altered form. — ἐφοβοῦσα: they were frightened out of their wits (again in Heb. xii. 21); explains the stupidity of Peter. The fear created by the sudden preternatural sight made him talk nonsense. Mt. makes the fear follow the Divine voice.

—Ver. 7. καὶ ἐγένετο, before νεφέλη, and again before φωνή, in each place instead of Mt.'s θυόν; in both cases pointing to something remarkable: an overshadowing cloud, and a mysterious voice from the cloud. —Ver. 8. ἦλθεν, suddenly, a form belonging to late Greek = ἤκοιτος = ἤχος: neath, in the case of the Master puzzled and troubled the three disciples: resurrection—His own, and soon, in our time; but that implies death; whereof, indeed, He lately spoke to us, but not to Peter's resistance, sympathised with by his brethren, not yet overcome. They speak of it to one another, though not again to the Master. —Ver. 10. δὴ λέγουσιν, etc.: this may be taken as an indirect or suggested rather than expressed question, δὴ being recitative, as in ii. 10 = the Pharisees and scribes say, etc., how about that? (Weiss in Meyer), or, writing not δὴ but δὲ, (neuter of δοκίμως), as an instance of the use of this pronoun as an interrogative in a direct question (Meyer, Schanz, udi also Burton, ii. and T. § 349). De Wette takes δὲ = τί δὲ after Beza and Grotius (who calls it one of Mt.'s Hebraisms). —Ver. 12. The construction of this sentence also is somewhat puzzling. After Ἡλέας
comes μὲν in the best MSS., raising expectation of a δι in the apodosis, instead of which we have καὶ (τις γέγραμαι). Examples of such substitution occur in classic authors; concerning which Klottz, Devar., p. 659, remarks: when καὶ, τις, or the like are put for δι after μὲν, it is not properly a case of construction, but rather: "quaedam quasi legitima orationis νάκολουθία." Perhaps we are at a loss from merely reading the words instead of hearing them spoken with a pause between first and second half of sentence, thus: Elias, indeed, coming first, restoreth all things (so teach the scribes) —and how stands it written about the Son of Man? —that He should suffer many things and be set at nought! The aim is to awaken thought in the mind of the disciples by putting together things incongruous. All things to be restored in preparation for Messiah Himself to suffer and be set at nought: what then can the real function and fate of Elijah the restorer be? Who is Elijah? —ἐξουθενθή: this form, found in BD and adopted by W.H., is rare. The verb occurs in three forms—ἐξουθενθή, ἐξουθενθή (T.R.), ἐξουθενθή: the latter two in more common use. The word in any form is late Greek. Vide Grimm's Lexicon, and Lobeck, Phryn., p. 181 (from ἔξωθεν or ἐξωθή = to treat as nought).—

Ver. 13 contains Christ's own view of Elijah's coming, which differs both from that of the scribes and from that of the disciples, who found it realised in the vision on the hill.—καὶ δὲ γέγραμαι εἰς αὐτὸν: the reference is to the persecution of Elijah by Jezebel, the obvious intention being to suggest the identification of the expected prophet with the Baptist. All pointing to one conclusion —suffering the appointed lot of the faithful servants of God in this evil world: Elijah, John, Jesus. That, the lesson Jesus wished by all means to inculcate: the δι πολλὰ παθῶν, now, and henceforth, to the end. —

Vv. 14-29. The epileptic boy (Mt. xvii. 14-21, Lk. ix. 37-43). The story is told in Mark with much greater fullness than in the parallels.—Ver. 14. ἐκλόγον πολλῶν: the great crowd and the fact that the disciples at the foot of the hill, the nine, had been asked to heal the sufferer, are in favour of the view that the scene of the transfiguration was less remote than Hermon from the familiar theatre of the healing ministry of Jesus and His disciples.—γραμματεῖς συμποτοῦσιν τ. ἀ., scribes wrangling with them, the nine. This is peculiar to Mark, but the situation is easily conceivable: the disciples have tried to heal the boy and failed (ver. 18); the scribes, delighted with the failure, taunt them with it, and suggest by way of explanation the waning power of the Master, whose name they had vainly attempted to conjure with. The baffled nine make the best defence they can, or perhaps listen in silence.—Ver. 15. ἐξαναβηθησαν, were utterly amazed, used by Mark only in N. T., here, and in xiv. 33 and xvi. 5 in connections which demand a very strong sense. What was there in common in the three situations: the returned Master, the agony in the garden, and the appearance of the angel at the resurrection? A surprise; which, whether sorrowful or joyful, always gives a certain emotional shock. The Master
reappears, when He is not looked for, when He is needed, and when His name is being taken in vain, perhaps not without a certain sympathy on the part of the volatile crowd not accustomed hitherto to miscarriage of attempts at healing when the name of Jesus was invoked. In that case their feeling would be a compound of confusion and gladness—ashamed and yet delighted to see Him, both betrayed in their manner.—Ver. 16. ἔπιθετον αὐτοῖς, He asked them, i.e., the people who in numbers ran to meet Him. Jesus had noticed, as He drew near, that there was a dispute going on in which the disciples were concerned, and not knowing the composition of the crowd, He proceeds on the assumption that they had all a share in it = the crowd as a whole versus the nine.—Ver. 17. The father of the sick boy answers for the company, explaining the situation, laying the blame of course on the deplorable condition of his child.—φρέατε σοὶ, to thee, not aware that Jesus was absent.—πνεῦμα ἔλαλον, a dumb spirit; the boy dumb, and therefore by inference the spirit.—Ver. 18. ὅπως ἔη αὐτὸς καταλάβῃ, wherever it happens to seize him. The possession (ὑπνοία, ver. 17) is conceived of as intermittent; “the way of the spirit inferred from the characteristic phenomena of the disease” (The Miraculous Element in the Gospels, p. 181). Then follows a graphic description of the ensuing symptoms: spasms (ἐξείρησις, a late form of ἑγγραψις), foaming (ἀφρίζει from ἀφρίαν, he, the boy, foameth); grinding of the teeth (ἐριξάται στόματι), then the final stage of motionless stupor graphically described as withering (ἐξαίθνισαν), for which Euthy, gives an equivalent ἀναϊθνισθείτ, and Weizsacker “und wird starr”. Ver. 19. The complaint of Jesus, vide on Matthew.—Observe the ψάλε γὰρ instead of Matthew's μηθ γὰρ = how long shall I be in relations with you, have to do with you?—Ver. 20. Ἰδον may be taken as referring to the boy (Schanz), in which case we should have an anacoluthistic nominative for the accusative, the writer having in view to express his meaning in passives (ἐκλείποντα); or to the spirit (πνεῦμα) by a construction ad sensum = the spirit seeing Jesus made a last attack (Weiss in Meyer, et al.). This is most in keeping with the mode of conceiving the matter natural to the evangelist, a visible fact was a fresh fit, and the explanation, from the possession point of view, that the spirit, seeing Jesus, and knowing that his power was at an end, made a final assault.—Ver. 21. ἴνα: a particle of time, here as frequently in Luke and John = since, or when.—ἐκ τοῦ σπνοῦ, ἐκ redundant, similar to ἐπὶ μακρῶν (v. 6).—Ver. 22. ἐὰν τι δύνῃ, if Thou canst do anything (A. and R. Vv.), or better, if anyhow Thou canst help. The father speaks under the impression that the case, as he has just described it, is one of peculiar difficulty; therefore while the leper said
"if Thou will," he says "if Thou canst." With reference to the form διηγήσαι, Phryn. says that it is right after δια, but that at the beginning of a sentence διαναγαί must be used (p. 359).—Ver. 23. τὸ εἰ δίηγησαι, nominative absolute: as to the "if Thou canst"—πάντα διαναγαί, all, in antithesis to the τι of the father.—Ver. 24. κράξας: eager, fear-stricken cry; making the most of his little faith, to ensure the benefit, and adding a prayer for increase of faith (βοηθῶν, etc.) with the idea that it would help to make the cure complete. The father's love at least was above suspicion. Meyer and Weiss render "help me even if unbelieving," arguing that the other, more common rendering is at variance with the meaning of βοηθῶν in ver. 22.

Vv. 25-29. The cure.—ἐνσυννυστρίγισα (ἐν συννυστρίγισεν) indicates that the crowd was constantly increasing, so becoming a new crowd (διῆλος without art.); natural in the circumstances. Jesus seeing this proceeds to cure without further delay. The spirit is now described as unclean and, with reference to the boy's symptoms, both dumb and deaf—μηκότερος εἰσλάβας, enter not again. This was the essential point in a case of intermittent possession. The spirit went out at the end of each attack, but returned again.—Ver. 26 describes a final fit, apparently worse than the preceding. It was evidently an aggravated type of epilepsy, fit following on fit and producing utter exhaustion. Mark's elaborate description seems to embody the recollections of one on whom the case had made a great impression.—Ver. 28. εἷς οἶκος: into a house, when or whose not indicated, the one point of interest to the evangelist is that Jesus is now alone with His disciples.—Ver. 29. τοῦτο τὸ γένος ἐν οὐδείς δύναται εἰσελθεῖν, ei μὴ ἐν προσευχῇ καὶ νυστείᾳ.
remark: "The authorisation, however (for omitting καὶ νησ.), is not sufficient. But even if it were overwhelming, fasting would, in its essence, be implied" (Morison on Mark). What Jesus said doubtless was: "This kind can go out in (on the ground of) nothing except prayer," and His meaning that there was no hope of success except through a believing (of course faith is implied) appeal to the almighty power of God. It was a thought of the same kind as that in Mt. xix. 26 (Mk. x. 27): the impossible for man is possible for God. Of course in the view of Christ, prayer, faith (vide Mt. xvii. 20), both in healer and in healed, was needful in all cases, but He recognised that there were certain aggravated types of disease (the present, one of them) in which the sense of dependence and trust was very specially required. In the case of the epileptic boy this had been lacking both in the father in the kind of fasting and in the particular house in which Jesus was wont to stay.—Vv. 30-32. Second announcement of the Passion (Mt. xvii. 22, 23, Lk. ix. 43-45).—Ver. 30. καὶ ᾧδεν ἤξελθοντες, going forth from thence, i.e., from the scene of the last cure, wherever that was: it might be north or south of their destination (Capernaum)—Caesarea Philippi or Tabor.—παρωροφερέντα, they passed along without tarrying anywhere. Some take the παρὰ in the compound verb to mean, went along by-ways, to avoid publicity: "diverticulum ibant, non via regia," Grotius. It is certainly true that Jesus had become so well known in Galilee that it would be difficult for Him on the thoroughfares to escape recognition as He wished (δόξαι ἔθελεν ἵνα τις γνω).—Ver. 31. ἦδεσακε γὰρ, etc.: gives the reason for this wish. It was the reason for the whole of the recent wandering outside Galilee: the desire to instruct the Twelve, and especially to prepare them for the approaching crisis.—Ver. 32. ἔγγονα: they had heard the statement before, and had not forgotten the fact, and their Master had spoken too explicitly for them to be in any doubt as to His meaning. What they were ignorant of was the why, the δει. With all He had said, Jesus had not yet been able to make that plain. They will never know the mind in the Passion has become a fact accomplished.—δήμα, a solemn name for the utterance (vide Mt. iv. 4) = the oracular, prophetic, and withal weird, mysterious word of doom.—ἐφοβοῦτα, they feared to ask; they did not wish to understand, they would live on in hope that their Master was under a hallucination; true to human nature. —Vv. 33-50. The Twelve at school (Mt. xviii. 1-10, Lk. ix. 46-50, etc.).—Ver. 33. Καπερναοῦμα: home? This statement, more than anything else in Mk., gives the impression that Capernaum was a kind of home for Jesus.—Vv. 33-46, in the house, opposed to ἐν τῇ δήμῳ, but probably pointing to a particular house in which Jesus was wont to stay.—Vv. 47-50. διελογίζονται, what were ye discussing? Jesus did not always walk beside His disciples (vide x. 33). He went before,
34. Οἱ δὲ ἑσύχως πρὸς ἀλλήλους γὰρ "διαλέξθησαν ἐν τῇ δήγῃ, γε γε παρὰ τις μαίζων. 35. καὶ καθίσας "ἐφώνησα τοὺς διδάκτα, καὶ λέγειν αὐτοῖς, "Εἴ τις δεῖλεν πρῶτος εἶναι, ἐστὶν πάντων ἐσχατος, καὶ πάντων διδάκτοις." 36. Καὶ λαβὼν παῖδιν, ἐστησεν αὐτὸ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν. καὶ ἐναγκαλισμένος αὐτὸ, εἶπεν αὐτοῖς. 37. "Οὐ εἶ ὁ τῶν τοιούτων παιδίων δεξιάτ η εἰ τῷ ὄνομάτι μου, ἐμὲ δέχεται· καὶ δὴ εἶ ὁ τῶν τοιούτων παιδίων δεξιάτ η ἀλλὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων με." 38. Ἀπεκρίθη δὲ αὐτῷ ἡ ἀμάρα, λέγων, "Петербург, Καθολικαρχία, εἴπομεν ἃ ἐν τῷ ὄνοματι σου ἐκβάλλοντα δαιμόνια, δὲ οὐκ ἄκουσθεν ἡμῖν. καὶ ἐκβάλλονται αὐτῶν, ὅτι οὐκ ἄκουσθεν ἡμῖν." 39. Ο δὲ ἰησοῦς εἶπε, "Μὴ καλύπτεται αὐτὸν· ὅδε γὰρ ἐστιν δὲ ποιήσῃ δύναμιν ἐπὶ τῷ ὄνοματι μου, καὶ διενεργεῖται ταχύς κακολογησάμενοι με. 40. δὲ γὰρ

1 BDLΔ have αὐθ in both places, ΝC in the first place.
2 So in CDAΣ αὐθ. NBL have δέχεται (Tisch., W.H.).
3 For αὐθ. ὑπὲρ ΝΒΛ have ἐφί and omit λέγων.
4 With αὐθ prefixed in ΝΒΔΛΔΑ.
5 This clause ὡς ... ημῖν is omitted in ΝΒCLA, and treated as doubtful by modern editors. It may have been omitted to avoid redundancy (vide last clause, ἔτι οὐκ, etc.). But such redundancy is characteristic of Mk.
6 έκβαλλόμεν in ΝΒΔΛΔΑ, and ήκολοθρεῖ in ΝΒΔΛΔΑ.

thinking His deep thoughts, they followed thinking their vain thoughts. The Master had noticed that something unusual was going on, divined what it was, and now asks.—Ver. 34. ἵστατον, they kept silent, ashamed to tell.—Ver. 35. καὶ καθίσασα, etc.: every word here betokens a deliberate attempt to school the disciples in humility. The Master takes His seat (καθίσασα), calls His scholars with a magisterial tone (καθίσασα, for various sense in which used, vide references, Mt. xx. 32) — the Twelve (τῶν ἰδίων), called to an important vocation, and needing thorough discipline to be of service in it. — εἶ τινες θείαι, etc. the direct answer to the question under discussion: who the greatest? = greatness comes by humility (forγαρ), and service (διὰκάσατο).—Ver. 36. The child, produced at the outset in Mt., is now brought on the scene (λαβὼν), not, however, as a model (that in x. 15), but as an object of kind treatment.—έπιγαλοισμένος in Mk. only —taking it into His arms, to symbolise how all that the child represents should be treated.—Ver. 37. δέχεται in the first member of the sentence, δέχεται in the second; the former (aorist, subjective with ἐν), the more regular in a clause expressing future possibility. Winer, xiii. 39 (a). The second member of the sentence is not in the corresponding place in Mt., but is given in Mt. x. 40. Vv. 38-41. A reminiscence (Lk. ix. 49-50). Probably an incident of the Galilean mission, introduced without connecting particle, therefore (Weiss) connection purely topical; suggested (Holtz., H. C.) to the evangelist by the expression ἐν τῷ ὄνοματι μου in ver. 37, answering to ἐν τῷ ὄνοματι σου in ver. 38. ἐκβάλλοντα θ.: exorcists usually conjured with some name, Abraham, Solomon; this one used the name of Jesus, implying some measure of faith in His worth and power.—ἐκβάλλομεν, imperfect, taken by most as implying repeated interdictions, but it may be the conative imperfect = we tried to prevent him.—οὐχ ήκολοθρεῖ, he did not follow us: the reason for the prohibition. The aloofness of the exorcist is represented as still continuing in the words δὲ οὐκ ἄκουσθεν (T. R.).—Ver. 39. Jesus disallows the interdict for a reason that goes deeper than the purely external one of the disciples = not of our company? well, but with us at heart.—διενεργεῖται ταχύς: points to moral impossibility: use of Christ's name in exorcism incompatible with hostile or inappreciative thought and speech of Him.—ταχύ softens the assertion: not soon; he may do it, but
it will mean a change of mind, and dis- use of my name.—Ver. 40. The counter part truth to that in Mt. x. 30. Both truths, and easily harmonised. It is in both cases a question of tendency; a little sympathy inclines to grow to more, so also with a lack of sympathy. Vide on Mt. x. 30.—Ver. 41 = Mt. x. 42, but a later secondary form of the saying: ποτήριον ὅθος for π. ψυχρός, and δι Χριστοῦ ἐστι instead of ἐν ὑμν. μαθητῶν.

Vv. 42-48. After the episode of the exorcist the narrative returns to the discourse broken off at ver. 38. From receiving little children and all they represent, Jesus passes to speak of the sin of causing them to stumble.—Ver. 42. καλῶν, etc.: well for him; rather = better. Each evangelist has his own word here: Mt. συμφέρειν, Lk. (xvii. 2) λαυτολέγει; but Mk., according to the best attested reading, has the strong phrase μικρὸς ὄνομα in common with Mt. He is con tent, however, with the expression “in the sea,” instead of Mt.’s “in the deep part of the sea,” the faithful reproduction, probably, of what Jesus actually said.—Ver. 43. The offender of the little ones is still more an offender against himself, hence the discourse by an easy transition passes to counsels against such folly. In Mk.’s version these are given in a most particular way, hand, foot and eye being each used separately to illustrate the common admonition. In Mt. hand and foot are combined. In the third illustration ἐν τὴν ἤτη is replaced by ἐν τ. βασιλείᾳ τ. θ. The refrain: “where the worm, etc.,” is repeated in T. R. with solemn effect after each example, but the best MSS. have it only after the third, vv. 44, 46 being thus omitted (R. V.).
41—50.

ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ

σκόλησις αὐτῶν ὁλεθρεί, καὶ τὸ πῦρ ὁ σβήννυεται. 49. Πᾶς γὰρ
πυρὶ ἀλωθησότα, καὶ πᾶσα θυσία ἄλλο ἀλωθησότα. 50. καὶ τὸ
δάκρυ ἐκ τῆς ἀγάλματος γένεσθαι, ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ ἀρτὸς ἀρτοῦς;
ι. ἐάν ἔχετε ἑαυτοῖς δάκρυα, καὶ εἰρηνεύετε ἑαυτοῖς ἄλληλον.

1 This last clause is omitted in ΝBLΔ, many minusc. (Tisch., W.H., vide below).

αλα in ΝBLΔ.

Vv. 49-50. Salting inevitable and indispensable. These verses appear only in Mk. as part of this discourse. The logion in ver. 50 corresponds to Mt. v. 13, Lk. xiv. 34-35.—Ver. 49 is a crux interpretatum, and has given rise to great diversity of interpretation (vide Meyer, ad loc.). Three questions may be asked. (1) What is the correct form of the saying? (2) Was it spoken at this time by Jesus? (3) If it was, how is it to be connected with the previous context? As to (1) some important MSS. (NBLΔ and the new Syr. Sin.) omit the second half of the sentence, retaining only “every one shall be salted with fire”. D and some copies of the old Lat. omit the first part and retain the second. W. and H. retain only part 1. Weiss and Schanz think that the text must be taken in its entirety, and that part 2 fell out by homoeoteleuton, or was omitted because of its difficulty. Holtzmann, H. C., is inclined to favour the reading of D. It is difficult to decide between these alternatives, though I personally lean to the first of the three, not only because of the weighty textual testimony, but, as against D, on account of the startling character of the thought, salted with fire, its very boldness witnessing for its authenticity. As to (2) I think it highly probable that such thoughts as vv. 49-50 occur at some time by Jesus. The two thoughts, salting inevitable and salting indispensable, were thoroughly apposite to the situation: a master teaching men in danger of moral shipwreck through evil passion, and unless reformed sure to prove unfit for the work to which they were destined. I cannot therefore agree with Holtzmann (H. C.) that Mk., misled by the word ἐσπαρσε in ver. 48, has brought in here a logion spoken at some other time. As to (3) I see no necessity to regard ἐσπαρσε, ver. 49, as binding us down to a close exclusive connection with ver. 48, requiring us to interpret ver. 49 thus: everyone that does not cut off the offending member shall be salted by the fire of hell, itself quenchless, and not destroying its victim, as it is the nature of ordinary fire to do, but rather preserving him for eternal torment, like salt. Thus viewed, ver. 49b is a mere comment on the words ὥσπερ σβήνεται. The saying should rather be taken in connection with the whole course of thought in vv. 43-48, in which case it will bear this sense: “every one must be salted somehow, either with the unquenchable fire of gehenna, or with the fire of severe self-discipline. Wise is he who chooses the latter alternative.” If we ignore the connection with ver. 48, and restrict ἡ σκόλη to the disciple-circle, this alternative rendering will be avoided, and the idea will be: every man who is to come to any good, will, must, be salted with fire. In that case, however, it is difficult to account for the unusual combination of salt and fire, whose functions are so opposed. 49b is of quite subordinate importance, merely at best a parabolic aid to thought. Grotius and others divide the sacrifices into two classes answering to the two forms of salting: burnt offerings typifying those consumed in hell, peace offerings those preserved by self-discipline.—Ver. 50 sets forth the other great truth: salting in the form of self-discipline indispensable. καὶ τὸ ἄλογον ἐκ τῆς ἀγάλματος, an excellent thing is salt; a most reasonable truth, just then. What follows seems less so, as it stands in Mk.’s text. As spoken by Jesus, if we may assume that it was spoken on this occasion, it might come in quite naturally. The three thoughts in this verse: salt good, care must be taken that it lose not its virtue, have salt in yourselves, may be merely themes packed together in a single sentence, on which Jesus discoursed at length.—ἄλογον, ἀρ. λεγ. in N. T., used in later Greek; ἀμφαρσε in Mt. and Lk.— ἐχεῖν ἑαυτοῖς ἄλογα: have salt in yourselves. In the two former clauses disciples are thought of, as in Mt. v. 13, as themselves salt for the world. Here they are viewed as the subject of the salting process. They must be salted in order to be salt to the world, their
X. i. KAKEIGEN

1. ἁναστάς ἔρχεται εἰς τὰ δρα τῆς ὀιουδαίας, διὰ τοῦ 2 πέραν τοῦ ἱερᾶνου καὶ συμπορεύονται πάλιν ὣχοι πρὸς αὐτῶν καὶ ὡς εἰσήγουν πάλιν ἐδιδάσκειν αὐτοὺς.

2. Καὶ προσελθότες οἱ 3 φαραώοι ἐπηράτησαν αὐτῶν, ἐφεξῆς ἄθροι γυναῖκας ἀπολύεισαν, παρακολούων αὐτῶν.

3. ὄ ὁ ἄποκριθεὶς ἔπειν αὐτοῖς, "Τὸ ὁμιν ἄνεξικλητο ἦνως;" 4. ὁ ὁ ἔτερον, "Μωσῆς ἐπέτρεψε 4 βιβλίον ἄναστασιν γράφας, καὶ ἀπολύεια.

5. Καὶ ἄποκριθεὶς ὁ ἴσος ἔπειν 6 αὐτοῖς, "Πρὸς τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν διώκει ἄψευξιν ὃμιν τὴν

1 καί εκείνην ἐν ΝΒΣΔΑ.

2 καί instead of διὰ τοῦ in ΝΒCL; πέραν without καί in DA. The καί caused trouble to scribes, some omitted it after Mt., some substituted διὰ τοῦ as in T.R.

3 BDΛ omit φ (added here as usual), and ΝΒΣΔΛΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛΛΛΔΛLambda.

6 For καί . . . εἶνεν read with ΝΒΔΛΛΔΛΛΔΛΛΔΛΛΔΛΛΔΛΛΔΛΛΔΛΛΔΛΛΔΛΛΔΛΛΔΛΛΔΛΛΔΛΛΔΛΛΔΛΛΔΛΛΔΛΛΔΛΛΔΛΛΔΛΛΔΛΛΔΛΛΔΛΛΔΛLambda.

ulterior vocation. Meantime a more immediate effect of their being salted is pointed out in the closing words—σπηρεύεται ἐν ἀλληλοις: be at peace with one another; which they were not. The cause of dispeace was ambition. The salting would consist in getting rid of that evil spirit at whatever cost.

ἐπηράτησαν: a Pauline word, remarks Holtz. (H.C.) True, but why not also a word of Jesus? certainly very apposite to the occasion.

Note.—Salting of disciples imports suffering pain, but is not to be con- 

founded with the cross-bearing of faithful 

disciples (viii. 34). The former is the discipline of self-denial necessary to make a man a follower of Christ worthy of the name. The latter is the tribulation that comes on all who follow closely in the footsteps of Christ. The one is needful to make us holy, the other over- 

takes us when and because we are holy.

Chapter X. Marriage Question.

Little Children. Quest after Eternal Life. Two Sons of Zebreder. Bartimæus. Ver. 1. The departure from Galilee (Mt. xix. 1).—ἐκεῖνον ἁναστάς, as in vii. 24, q.v.; there, of a departure from Galilee which was followed by a return (ix. 33), here, of a final departure, so far as we know. Beza finds in the expression a Hebraism—to sit is to remain in a place, to rise is to depart from it. Kypke renders, et inde dissedens, and gives classic examples of the usage—ἐξαναστήσται τ. Ι. καὶ πέραν, etc., into the borders of Judæa and of Pææa; how reached not indicated. The reading of T. R. διὰ τοῦ πέραν τ. Ι. gives the route. Vide on Mt., ad loc., where the

καί (of ΝΒCL) is omitted.—συμπορεύσ 

ονται πάλιν, crowds again gather.— χοί, plural; here only, with reference to the different places passed through.— ὡς εἰσήγουν, as He was wont; remarked on, because the habit had been suspended for a season during which the whole attention of Jesus had been devoted to the Twelve. That continues to be the case mainly still. In every incident the Master has an eye to the lesson for the disciples. And the evangelist takes pains to make the lesson prominent. Possibly his incidents are selected and grouped with that in view: marriage, children, money, etc. (so Weiss in Meyer).—ἐδίδασκεν, He continued teaching, so also in vi. 34. In both places Mt. (xiv. 14, xix. 2) speaks of healing. Yet Mk.'s Gospel is a gospel of acts, Mt.'s of words. Each is careful to make prominent, in general notices, what he comparatively neglects in detail.

Vv. 2-12. The question of divorce (Mt. xix. 3-12).—ἀπολύσω: the question is put absolutely, the qualifying clause κατὰ πόλιν αὐτῶν in Mt. being omitted. Thus put the question presupposes knowledge of Christ's high doctrine as to marriage, and is an attempt to bring Him into collision with the Mosaic law, as absolutely interdicting what it allowed.

—Ver. 3. τι ὁμιν ἐνερετάω Μ.: here Jesus has in view not what Moses allowed in Deut. xxiv. 1, but what he in Genesis enjoined as the ideal state of things (Moses from the Jewish point of view author of the Pentateuch and all its legislation). They naturally supposed He had in view the former (ver. 4).—Ver. 5.
Both evangelists, while varying considerably in their reports, carefully preserve this important _logion_ as to legislation conditioned by the _sklerokardia_. — ταῦτα: at the end, with emphasis; _this_ particular command in contradiction to the great original one.—Ver. 6: "But from the beginning of the creation (it runs) 'male and female made He them,'" ἀρσεν καὶ ἀρσεν, etc., being a quotation from Sept. (Gen. i. 27), vv. 7, 8 being another (vide Gen. ii. 24), with Christ's comment in the last clause of ver. 8 and in ver. 9 appended. On the import of the words _vide_ in Mt., _ad loc._—Vv. 10-12 report as spoken to the Twelve in the house (as opposed to the way in which the Pharisees are supposed to have encountered Jesus) what in Mt.'s version appears as the last word to the interrogants (ver. 9). Two variations are noticeable: (1) the absence of the qualifying clause καὶ ἐξ ἐκείνης, and (2) the addition of a clause (ver. 12) stating the law in its bearing on the woman = if she put away her husband and marry another, she is an adulteress.

In the former case Mk. probably reports correctly what Christ said, in the latter he has added a gloss so as to make Christ's teaching a guide for his Gentile readers. Jewish women could not divorce their husbands. The ἐκείνη at the end of ver. 11 may mean either against, to the prejudice of, her (the first wife), or with her (the second). The former view is taken by the leading modern exegets, the latter by Victor Ant., Euthy., Theophy., and, among moderns, Ewald and Bleek.

Vv. 13-16. _Suffer the children_ (Mt. xix. 13-15, Lk. xviii. 15-17).—Ver. 13. _παιδία_ as in Mt. Lk. has βρέφα = infants carried in arms. Note the use of the compound _προσφέρων_; elsewhere the simple verb. The word is commonly used of sacrifices, and suggests here the idea of _dedication._—ἐγένετο, _touch_, merely, as if that alone were enough to bless; prayer mentioned in Mt.—Τοῖς _προσφέροντοι_ (T. R.), probably interprets the _ἀυτοῖς_ (W. H.) after _ἐπιτίθεν_.—Ver. 14. Ἰησοῦ γένετο, "was moved with indignation" (R. V.) is too strong,
KATA MARKON

15. ἐμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, δεῦρον μὴ δέσητε τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ ὡς παιδίον, ὡς μὴ εὐθυγραμμής εἰς αὐτόν. Θεὸς ἐστὶν ταῖς μερεσὶ τῶν χειρῶν ἡμῶν. Εἶπεν ἡ θυσία, αὐτὸν. 
16. Καὶ ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ ἐώς ὥραν, προσδραμὼν ἐκαίνε τοὺς πατέρας αὐτῶν ἐκπορευόμενον, "Διδάσκαλε ἄγαθε, τί ποιήσω ἵνα ζωὴν ἀληθῶς κληρονομήσω;" 17. ὃ δὲ ἤτοις εἶπεν αὐτῷ, "Τί μὲν λέγεις ἄγαθε; οὐδεὶς ἄγαθος, εἰ μὴ εἷς, ὁ Θεὸς. 18. τὰς ἐντολὰς ὅδε, μὴ μυμπεδοῦσθε, μὴ φονεῦσθε, μὴ κλέψθε, μὴ φυδομαρτυρήσθητε, μὴ ἀποστρατήσθητε, τίμα τὸν τατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα." Ο δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτῷ, "Διδάσκαλε, ταῦτα εἰς πάντα ἠμαθήκαμεν ἐν νεοτυγίῳ μού." Ο δὲ ἤτοις ἐμβλέψας ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῷ τοῦ ἔργου τῆς σοῦ καὶ τῆς ἡμέρας σαῖς. 19. "Ἔν σοι ἦν ὡσπερὶ ἀγαθόν, δει ξεῖς ποληνοῦ, καὶ δῶς τοῖς πτωχοῖς, καὶ ξεῖς ήθουρῶν ἐν

1 Instead of τίδα... ἴησον αυτῷ ἦν ταῦτα πάντα ἠμαθήκαμεν ἐν νεοτυγίῳ μού (Τίσχ., W. H.).
2 μὴ ἰδούσος πρὸς μὴ μοιχεύσασθε in BCD (W. H. text).
3 For ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν ἦν ταῦτα πάντα ἠμαθήκαμεν ἐν νεοτυγίῳ μού (Τίσχ., W. H. in brackets).

"was much displeased" (A. V.) is better, "was annoyed" is better still ("ward unwillig," Weizäcker).—μὴ κλέψθε, καὶ of T. R. before μὴ is much better left out: suffer them to come; do not hinder them; an expressive asyndeton. This saying is the main point in the story for the evangelist, hence the imperfects in ver. 13. It is another lesson for the still spiritually crude disciples.—Ver. 15 answers to Mt. xviii. 3. As Jesus gave several lessons on humility and kindred virtues, in Capernaum, here, and on the way to Jericho (x. 35 f.), it is not to be wondered at if the sayings spoken in the several lessons got somewhat mixed in the tradition. It does not greatly matter when they were uttered. The thing to be thankful for is their preservation.—Ver. 16. ἐναγκαλισμόν, as in ix. 36. Jesus took each child in His arms, one by one, and blessed it: καταφθάνειν imperfect. The process would last a while, but Jesus would not soon weary in such work. The compound verb καταφθάνειν (NBLCL, etc.), here only, has intensive force like καταφθάνω in Mt. xxvi. 49 (vide notes there and Maclear in C. G. T.).
Vv. 17-27. Quest after eternal life (Mt. xix. 16-30, Lk. xviii. 18-30).—Ver. 17. ἐκπορευομένου α. εἰς ὥραν: the incident to be related happens as Jesus is coming out from some house into the highway, at what precise point on the journey Mk. neither knows nor cares. The didactic significance of the story alone concerns him.—Διδάσκαλε ἄγαθε: that the epithet ἄγαθος was really used by the man is highly probable. Vide on Mt.—Ver. 18. τί μὲν λέγεις ἄγαθον: on the import of this question vide notes on Mt.—Ver. 19. The commandments of the second table enumerated are expressed by subjunctives with μὴ, instead of future indicatives with ἦν. While Mt. has the supernumerary, "love thy neighbour," Mk. has μὴ ἀποστρατήσῃς, which probably has in view the humane law in Deut. xxiv. 14, 15, against oppressing or withholding wages from a hired servant; a more specific form of the precept: love thy neighbour as thyself, and a most apposite reminder of duty as addressed to a wealthy man, doubtless an extensive employer of labour. It should be rung in the ears of all would-be Christians, in similar social position, in our time: defraud not, undercover not.—Ver. 21. ἢγάπησαν α.: on the import of the statement in reference to the man vide on Mt. Jesus loved this man. Grotius remarks: Jesus loved not virtues only, but seeds of virtues ("et semina virtutum"). Field (Olium Nor.) renders "caressed". Bengel takes ἐμβλέψας ἢγάπησαν as a ἐν διδοῦν, and renders, amāntr aspexit = lovingly regarded him—ἐν σοὶ ὡσπερὶ. In Mk. Jesus, not the inquirer, remarks on the


lack; in Mt. the reverse is the fact: the man is conscious of his defect, an important point in his spiritual condition.—δεόμενος, etc.: from the invitation to join the disciple band Weiss (Meyer) infers that the incident must have happened before the circle of the Twelve was complete. The last clause in T. R. about the cross is an obvious gloss by a scribe whose mind was dominated by stereotyped religious commonplaces.—Ver. 22. συνήθεσα: in Mt. xvi. 3, of the sky, here, of the face, λυπηθεὶς, following, referring to the mind: with sad face and heavy heart.

Vv. 23-27. The moral of the story given for the benefit of the disciples, πορεύεσθαις, etc.: from the invitation to join the disciple band Weiss (Meyer) infers that the incident must have happened before the circle of the Twelve. —τῶς ἐλήμωθεν, Euthy.—τῶς διωκότοι, with what difficulty! τὰ χρήματα, wealth collectively held by the rich class (Meyer).—Ver. 4. ἐθαμβοῦντο, were confounded.—πάλιν ἀποκρίθης prepares us for repetition with unmitigated severity, rather than toning down, which is what we have in T. R., through the added words, τοὺς πεποιθότας ἐπὶ τῶν χρήμασιν, suggesting an idea more worthy of a scribe than of Jesus; for it is not merely difficult but impossible for one trusting in riches to enter the Kingdom. Yet this is one of the places where the Sin. Syriac agrees with the T. R.—Ver. 25. In this proverbial saying the evangelists vary in expression in reference to the needle and the needle-eye, though one might have looked for stereotyped phraseology in a proverb. The fact points to different Greek renderings of a saying originally given in a Semitic tongue.—ποιμανταῖς, from προμανθηταίς, to rub through, so as to make a hole. According to Furrer, proverbs about the camel and the needle-eye, to express the impossible, are still current among the Arabs. E. g., "hypocrites go into paradise as easily as a camel through a needle-eye."—He asks of people that they conduct a camel through a needle-eye (Wanderungen, p. 339).—Ver. 26. The disciples, amazed, asked: καὶ τίς δύναται σωθῆναι τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, etc., in Mt. The καὶ resumes what has been said, and draws from it an inference meant to call its truth in question (Holz, H. C.) = who, in that case, can be saved?—Ver. 27. This saying is given diversely in the three parallels; most pithily in Mt., and perhaps nearest to the original. For the meaning vide on Mt.

Vv. 28-31. Peter's question (Mt. xix.
27-30. Lk. xviii. 28-30.—Ver. 28 introduces the episode without any connecting word such as τότε in Mt. Ἰδοὺ betrays self-consciousness, also the following ἤμεις. Yet, with all his self-consciousness, Peter, in Mk.'s account, has not courage to finish his question, stopping short with the statement of fact on which it is based: behold! we have left all and followed Thee?—ἀφήκαμεν, sorist, refers to an act done once for all, ἀκολούθηκαμεν, to an abiding condition. —Ver. 29. Jesus, seeing Peter's meaning, proceeds to give, first, a generous answer, then a word of warning. In the enumeration of persons and things forsaken, "wife" is omitted in important MSS. (W.H.). The omission is true to the delicate feeling of Jesus. It may have to be done, but He would rather not say it.—τῷ ἐξαγγελέων: a gloss to suit apostolic times and circumstances.—Ver. 30. νῦν: the present time the sphere of compensation; ἐκκαιονταπλασίων (Lk. viii. 8): the measure characteristically liberal; μετὰ διωγμόν: the natural qualification, seeing it is in this world that the moral compensation takes place, yet not diminishing the value of the compensation, rather enhancing it, as a relish; a foreshadowing this, perhaps a transcript, of apostolic experience.—Ver. 31. On this apothegm vide on Mt. —Vv. 32-34. Third Prediction of the Passion (Mt. xx. 17-10, Lk. xviii. 31-34).—Ver. 32. ἐλθόντας, to Jerusalem! The fact that they were at last on the march for the Holy City is mentioned to explain the mood and manner of Jesus.—προάγμα: Jesus in advance, all the rest following at a respectful distance.—ἐβαθυνάτω: the astonishment of the Twelve and the fear of others (οἱ ἰδολ. ἐβαθύνατο) were not due to the fact that Jesus had, against their wish, chosen to go to Jerusalem in spite of apprehended danger (Weisse). These feelings must have been awakened by the manner of Jesus, as of one labouring under strong emotion. Only so can we account for the fear of the crowd, who were not, like the Twelve, acquainted with Christ's forebodings of death. Memory and expectation were both active at that
35. Kai 4 prosporeioetai autô 4 ikakosai kai 4 isōntas os uliòxh. Zebedaiou, léontes, 4 "Δίδασκαλε, thlomei ena o én autísemen,4

ποίησις úmén." 36. O òde eixeun autídoi, "Tì 4blete poièsei ma 5

ðmín;" 37. O òde eixevn autî, "Dòs hémín, òna eis eke déthiou stou 6

eis éx oúmíous stou 7 kathísseun en tì ðóy h ñou." 38. O òde

ìsous eixeun autídoi, "Ókai odhate tì atitèthe. dúnase ne píon tì

pòthrom ó égí pínu, kai 8 tì báptisma ò égí batakíomai, batak-

íonthei;" 39. O òde eixevn autî, "Dunámeda." O òde ìsous

ìsoun autídoi, "Tò mén 9 pòthrom ó égí pínu, ðlóthe kai tì

báptisma ò égí batakíomai, batakíóthei; 40. tì òde kathíse eke

déthiou mou kai ìs oúmíous mou,10 òkai èstovn ìmán dovin, ìllì ìs

ítoímastai." 41. Kai òkai odhánte os òde ìrmánto ãyánakànes

1 éxípousíouos in first place, mústis. second, in ÑBCDLA.
2 metà tìs hímeta in ÑBCDLA.
3 ÑBCDLA add άνω. 4 ÑABCL add άνω.
5 For poièsei ma B has ma poièsei. CD correct by omitting me, ALA by
changing into infinitive with accusative as in T.R.
6 sou eke déthiou in ÑBCDLA.
7 ìs arísteron (without ñou) in BLA.
8 ìw mun wanting in ÑBCDLA. T.R. is a grammatical correction.
9 ñ for kai, and mou after ìmow. omitted, in ÑBDLÁ. Besides these ACZ al.
omit second mou.

moment, producing together a high-
strung state of mind: Peraea, John, 
baptism in the Jordan, at the beginning;
Jerusalem, the priests, the cross, at the
end! Filled with the varied feelings
excited by these sacred recollections and
tragic anticipations, He walks alone by
preference, step and gesture revealing
what is working within and inspiring
awe—“mutig und entschlossen,”
Schanz; with “majesty and heroism,”
Morison; “tantó animo tantáque
alacritate,” Elsner; “more intrepid,
ductis,” Grotius. This picture of Jesus
in advance on the way to Jerusalem is
one of Mk.’s realisms.—Ver. 33. δη ἱεροῦ, etc.: the third prediction has for
its specialties delivery to the Gentiles
(tois ìsaios), and an exact specification of the indignities to be endured: mock-
ing, spitting, scourging. Jesus had been
thinking of these things before He spoke
of them; hence the excitement of His
manner.
Vv. 35-45. The sons of Zebedee (Mt. 
xx. 20-28), showing the comic side of
the drama.—Ver. 35. In Mk., James
and John speak for themselves: Δδάσκαλε
καὶ, etc. In Mt. the mother speaks
for them.—Ver. 36. τι 
bllethei µe poièsei:
this reading of B is accredited by its very
grammatical peculiarity, two construc-
tions being confused together; an
accusative (me) followed, not as we expect
by the infinitive, poièse (T. R.), but by
the subj. delib., poièsem. —Ver. 38. to
baptisma: in Mk. there is a double
symbolism for the Passion, a cup and a
baptism; in Mt.’s true text only the
former. The cup is an Old Testament
emblem; the baptism not so obviously,
yet it may rest on Ps. xiii. 7. bxii. 2,
cxxiv. 4-5. The conception of Christian
baptism as baptism into death is Pauline
(Rom. vi.). —Ver. 40. ἥτοιμοται
stands alone in Mk. without the reference
to the Father, which is in Mt.—Ver. 42.
oi δοκούντες ἄρχειν, those who pass for,
are esteemed as, rulers: “quos gentes
habet et agnoscent” (Besa); “quì
perί τακάβου καί ιωάννου. 42. ὅ ἑ σε ἱεροῦς προσκαλεσάμενος αὐτοῦς ἔλεγε αὐτοῖς, "Οὕτως δὴ οἱ δοκούσας ἄρχει τῶν ἔθνων κατακυριεύσωσιν αὐτῶν· καὶ οἱ μεγάλοι αὐτῶν κατεσυνάψωσιν αὐτῶν. 43. οὖν οὖν δὲ ἐστιν ἐν ὑμῖν· ἀλλ' ἔσεσθαι ἐν δὲ καὶ τὴν γενεάν μεγάς ἐν ὑμῖν, ἔτει δικαιονῦ δικών. 44. καὶ δὲ ἐν δὲί ὑμῖν γενοῦται πρῶτος, ὡστε πάντων δοκοῖ. 45. καὶ γὰρ ὁ ὄνομος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὗτος ἢ λειμαρίζονται, ἀλλὰ διακοινοῦσι καί διοῦσιν, καί δοῦναι τῇ φυσικῇ αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν.

46. Καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς ἱερικό καί ἐκποιειμένον αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ ἱερικοῦ, καί τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ, καί δύσοις ἱκανοῦς, οὗτος Ἰωάννης Βαρθόμης ὁ τυφλὸς ἐκάθισεν παρὰ τὴν ὄψιν προσοπίτων. 47. καὶ ἔκαστος ἑτέρῳ ὁ ἱεροῦς ὁ Ναζωραῖος ἔστιν, ἦδοντα τὸ σώμα καὶ λέγειν, "Ο τύπος τῆς Ἰουδαίων. 48. Καί ἐπετίμησε αὐτῷ πολλοῖς, ἵνα σωτηρήσῃ· ὁ δὲ πολλῷ μᾶλλον ἐκπαλάτησεν, "Ξεῖ Δαβίδ, ἵλεσον με." 49. Καὶ στὰς ὁ ἱεροῦς εἶπεν αὐτῶν ψωφίζων καί φωνήσατε εἰς τοὺς τυφλοὺς, λέγοντες αὐτῷ, "Θάρσοι! ἔγειροι, Φωτείς σε." 50. Ο δὲ ἀποβαλὼν τὸ ἱμάτιον αὐτοῦ ἀναστὰς ἔλεγεν πρὸς τῶν ἱεροῦν·

1 καὶ προσκαλ. αὐτοὺς ο 1, in ὝΒCDLA. 2 estin in ὝΒCDLA Lat. vet. Vulg.
2 μεγας γεγ. in ὝΒCDLA, also γεγ. δικ. 3 estin εν ὝΒCDLA.
3 For nisi ... προσεμεθήναι ὝΒLΑ have ν νας τ. B. τυφλὸς προσεμεθήναι εκαθ.
4 τοπὸν τὸν οἶνον (Τισχ., W.H.).
5 Ναζωραῖος in ΒL. B places estin after ἵστους.
6 τις (for o. v.) in ὝΒCDLA.
7 φωνήσετε αὐτοῦ in ὝΒCDLA changed in T.R. into the more commonplace αὐτοῦ φωνήσησι.
8 εύπρεπος in ὝΒABCDΛA.
9 A tame substitute for αναστήσατος in ὝΒBDLA, so characteristic of Mk.

honorem habent imperandii" (Grotius). Some, e.g., Palaeis. regard δοκούσας as redundant, and take the phrase in Mk. as = Mt's of ἐστιν ἔρχονται. Kyrke resolves it into οἱ δὲ δύσοις τοιούτοι δοκούσας = "qui constituti sunt ut imperent".—Ver. 43. ἔστιν (W.H.), is: the "is" not of actual fact, but of the ideal state of things.—Ver. 45. Vide on Mt.

Vv. 46-52. Bartimaesus (Mt. xx. 29-34, Lk. xviii. 35-43).—Ver. 46. ἔρχονται, historical present for effect. οὗτος an important place, and of more interest to the narrator; the last stage on the journey before arriving at Jerusalem (Weiss in Meyer).—ἐκποιειμένον a.: Jesus mentioned apart as the principal person, or as still going before, the disciples and the crowd mentioned also, as they have their part to play in the sequel, παρειμένων understood.—δυσοι: not implying that the crowd was of very moderate dimensions, but = a large crowd, as we say colloquially "pretty good" when we mean "very good". This use of δυσοι probably belonged to the colloquial Greek of the period. Vide Kennedy, Sources of N. T. Greek, p. 79. —οὗτος T. B. Mk. knows the name, and gives both name, Bartimaesus, and interpretation, son of Timea.—Ver. 47. οὗτος Δαβίδ: this in all three narratives the popular name for Messiah.—Ver. 49. φωνήσατε, φωνοῦτες, φωτεῖ: no attempt to avoid monotony out of regard to style. It is the appropriate word all through, to call in a loud voice, audible at a distance, in the open air (vide ix. 35).—θάρσοι, ἔγειρε, φωτεῖ, courage, rise, He calls you; pithy, no superfluous words, just how they would speak.—Ver. 50. Graphic description of the beggar's eager response—mantle thrown off, jumping to his feet, he
EUAGGELION

42—52. XI. 1—3.

51. καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἔπειτα, ὁ κύριος ὁ πιστὸς δύο τῶν ἵματων, ἀποστάλατο δύο τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ, 2. καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Ὕπάγετε εἰς τὴν κάμην τὴν κατέναν ὁμών. καὶ εὐθὺς εἰσπορεύομεν εἰς αὐτήν εὐρήσωτε τοὺς δεδεμένους, ἐφ’ ὑμῖν οὖσαν ἀνθρώπων κακάθικε γάρ λύσαντες αὐτὸν ἐργάσατε. 3. καὶ ἦν τοῖς ὁμῶν εἰσέρχονταί τι ποιεῖτε τούτο; εἰσαίτε, ὡς ὁ κύριος

1. αὐτὸν ὁ λεγόντας in ΝΒCDΛΑ.
2. τί σου θελείς ποιήσω in ΝΒCLΔ, obviously preferable to the smooth reading in T.R.
3. καὶ εἰς in BLA Cop. (W.H.).
5. εἰσπορεύομεν is not used in Mk. The true form here is εἰσπερεύομαι as in ΝΒCDΔΣ.
6. D vet. Lat. Vulg. have simply καὶ εἰς θελον, which Tisch. adopts. The reading in T.R. is supported by ΝΑΒCLΔ al.
7. οὐκ εἰσείσω in BLA; after αὐτρακτον in Ν, before εἰσείσω in ΚΠΧ (W.H. order 1, Tisch. 2).
8. εὔκρινον in ΝΒCLΔ.
9. λύσαντες καὶ φερέτας in ΝΒCLΔ. The T.R. conforms to Lk.
10. Omit εἰς with ΒΔ vet. Lat.

comes, runs, to Jesus. Though blind he needs no guide (Lk. provides him with one); led by his ear.—Ver. 51. τι σου θελείς, etc.: what do you want: alms or sight? ἡ βασίλεια: more respectful than Rabbi (here and in John xx. 16).—ἐνα να ἀναβάλλω: sight, of course, who would think of asking an alms of One who could open blind eyes!

CHAPTER XI. ENTRY INTO JERUSALEM. OTHER INCIDENTS. Vv. 1—11.

The solemn entry (Mt. xx. 1—11; Lk. xix. 29—44).—Ver. 1. It is first stated generally that they approach Jerusalem, then Bethphage and Bethany are named to define more exactly the whereabouts. Both villages named; partly because close together, partly because, while Bethphage was the larger and better known place, and therefore might have stood alone as an indication of locality, Bethany was the place where the colt was to be got.—Ver. 2. κατέναν τοῦ, opposite you. This adverb (from κατά ἑκάστας) is not found in Greek authors, but occurs frequently in Sept.—ἐφ’ ὑμῖν εὕρεται σωτ. ἄν. καθαρων: this point, that the colt had never been used, would seem of vital importance afterhand, from the Christian point of view, and one cannot wonder that it took a sure place in the tradition, as evinced by the narrative in Mk. followed by Lk. But it is permissible to regard this as an expansion of what Jesus actually said. The idea underlying is that for sacred purposes only unused animals may be employed (Cf. Numb. xix. 3, 1 Sam. vii. 7).—λύσανε τὸ σῶμα, φέρετε: sorist and present; the former denoting a momentary act, the latter a process.—Ver. 3. δὲ κύριος α. χ. ἔχει: the Master hath need of him. Vide on this at Mt. xxi. 3.—καὶ εὐθὺς, etc.: and straightway He returneth him (the colt) again.—πάλιν, a well-attested reading, clearly implies this meaning, i.e., that Jesus bids His disciples promise the owner that He will return the colt without delay, after He has had His use of it. So without hesitation Weiss (in Meyer) and Holtzmann (H. C.) Meyer thinks this a paltry thing for Christ to say, and rejects πάλιν as an addition due to misunderstanding. Biased by
the same sense of decorum—"below the dignity of the occasion and of the Speaker"—the Speaker's Comm. cherishes doubt as to παῖλον, sheltering itself behind the facts that, while the MSS. which insert "again" are generally more remarkable for omissions than additions, yet in this instance they lack the support of ancient versions and early Fathers. I do not feel the force of the argument from decorum. It judges Christ's action by a conventional standard. Why should not Jesus instruct His disciples to say "it will be returned without delay" as an inducement to lend it? Dignity! How much will have to go if that is to be the test of historicity? There was not only dignity but humiliation in the manner of entering Jerusalem: the need for the colt, the use of it, the fact that it had to be borrowed all enter as elements in the lowly state of the Son of Man. On the whole subject vide notes on Mt. This is another of Mk.'s realisms, which Mt.'s version obliterates. Field (Otium Nor.), often bold in his interpretations, here succumbs to the decorum argument, and is biassed by it against the reading παῖλον contained in so many important MSS. (side above).—Ver. 8. στιβάδας (στιβάς from στιβᾶ, to tread, hence anything trodden, such as straw, reeds, leaves, etc.; here only in N. T.) ; "layers of branches," R. V., margin; or layers of branches (κλάδοιν, Mt.) obtained, as Mk. explains, by cutting from the fields (κατανεμεῖς εἰς τ. ἄγραν).—στιβάδας (στιβάδας, T. R.) is probably a corrupt form of στιβάς. Hesychius defines στιβᾶ as a bed of rods and green grass and leaves (καλα τέμνουν καὶ χλαμάν χόρταν στρώτες, καὶ φύλλαν).—Ver. 9. οἱ προάγοντες, those going before; pro-
bably people who had gone out from the city to meet the procession.—Ver. 11. elosthav, etc.: the procession now drops out of view and attention is fixed on the movements of Jesus. He enters Jerusalem, and especially the temple, and surveys all (περιβλεψάμονος πάντα) with keenly observant eye, on the outlook, like St. Paul at Athens, not for the picturesque, but for the moral and religious element. He noted the traffic going on within the sacred precincts, though He postponed action till the morrow. Holtzmann (H. C.) thinks that the περιβλεψάμονος πάντα implies that Jesus was a stranger to Jerusalem. But, as Fritzsche (265, 283) shows, Mk. cannot not have meant to suggest that, even if Jesus had never visited Jerusalem since the beginning of the public ministry.

Vv. 12-14. The fig tree on the way (Mt. xx. 18-19).—Ver. 12 tells how Jesus coming from Bethany, where He had passed the night with the Twelve, felt hunger. This is surprising, considering that He probably spent the night in the house of hospitable friends. Had the sights in the temple killed sleep and appetite, so that He left Bethany without taking any food?—Ver. 13. έλα, if in the circumstances; leaves there, creating expectation.—έσφρησα: future indicative; subjunctive, more regular.—διὰ γὰρ κακῶς, etc., for it was not the season of figs. This in Mk. only. The proper season was June for the first-ripened figs. One may wonder, then, how Jesus could have any expectations. But had He? Victor Ant. and Euthy, viewed the hunger as signified. It is more reasonable to suppose that the hope of finding figs on the tree was, if not signified, at least extremely faint. He might have a shrewd guess how the fact was, and yet go up to the tree as one who had a right to expect figs where there was a rich foliage, with intent to utilise it for a portable, if He could not find fruit on it. In those last days the prophetic mood was on Jesus in a high degree, and His action would be only very partially understood by the Twelve.—Ver. 14. πάντα: in the optative of wishing with μη (μηκέτι), as in classic Greek (Burton, M. T., § 476). The optative is comparatively rare in the N. T.—ξυκοφόροι: the disciples heard (what He said); they were not inobedient. His manner would arrest attention. The remark prepares for what is reported in ver. 20; hence the imperfect.

Vv. 15-19. Cleansing of the temple (Mt. xx. 12-17, Lk. xix. 45-48). The state of things Jesus saw in the temple yesterday has been in His mind ever since: through the night watches in Bethany; in the morning, killing appetite; on the way, the key to His enigmatical behaviour towards the fig tree.—Ver. 15. εἰς τοῦ λειψόν, into the temple, that is, the forecourt, the court of the Gentiles.—τὸν ιερόν καὶ τοὺς δ., the sellers and the
20. In ΝΒCLΔΑ.  Babylon, Jevamoth, in Lightfoot, ad loc.). — Ver. 17. Helvetica covers more than what He said just then, pointing to a course of teaching (cf. ver. 18 and Lk. xix. 47). Here again we note that while Mt. speaks of a healing ministry in the temple (xxi. 14) Mk. gives prominence to teaching. Yet Mt. gives a far fuller report of the words spoken by Jesus during the last week.—πάντα τοὺς ἡσυχαστές, to all the Gentiles, as in Is. lvi. 7, omitted in the parallel; very suitable in view of the fact that the traffic went on in the court of the Gentiles. A fore-shadowing of Christian universalism. — παρασκευή, ye have made it and it now is.—Ver. 18. φέος, the purpose to get rid of Jesus fixed, but the how puzzling because of the esteem in which He was held.—Ver. 19. óνημ (οῦν, T. R.) implies repetition of the action. We have here & with the indicative instead of the optative without αὐτῷ as in the classics. Field (Ot. Nor.) regards οὗμα δῆμ έγένετο as a solecism due probably to Mk. himself (as in iii. 11, οὗμεν θεῷς, and holds that the connection in Mk.‘s narrative is decidedly in favour of a single action instead of, as in Lk., a daily practice.

Vv. 20-25. The withered fig tree and relative conversation (Mk. xxvi. 20-22). — Ver. 20. παρασκευάζομαι, passing by the fig tree (on the way to Jerusalem next morning).—πρὸς : the position of this word after παρειμασία, instead of before as in T. R., is important. It gives it emphasis as suggesting that it was in the clear morning light that they noticed the state of the tree. It might have been in the same condition the previous evening, but it would be dark when they passed the spot.—Ver. 21. διαμαθόμεθα, remembering (what the Master had said the previous morning).—Δ Πέτρος:
κατηράσω δέχομαι." 22. Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ἤσοις λέγει ἀδιότως, ἢ ζήτησε πίστιν Θεοῦ. 23. ἄμην γὰρ λέγω ὅμως, ὅτι δέν ἐπὶ τῷ ἄγιοι τούτοις. Ἀρέθη, καὶ βλέψῃ εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, καὶ μὴ διακρίνῃ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ πιστεύῃ ὅτι δὲ λέγεις γίνεται· ἡμῖν αὐτῷ δὲ ἐὰν εἴης. 24. Σοὶ τούτῳ λέγω ὅμως, Πάντα δέ καὶ προσευχόμενοι ἀνέτειλο, πιστεύοντες ὅτι λαμβάνετε, καὶ ἐσται ὅμως. 25. Καὶ τότε οὕτως αὐτῷ δείχνετε ἀφίστης εἰς τοῦτον, ἵνα καὶ δὴ πατήρ ὅμως ἐν τοῖς ὁρανοῖς ἀφήνῃ τὰ παραπτώματα ὅμως. 26. εἰ δὲ ὅρις εἶ διέρεσε, ὥστε δὲ πατήρ ὅμως ἐν τοῖς ὁρανοῖς ἀφήνῃ τὰ παραπτώματα ὅμως." 27. ΚΑΙ ἔρχονται πάλιν εἰς ἱεροσόλυμα· καὶ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ πρεσβυτέρων αὐτοῦ, ἔρχονται πρὸς αὐτὸν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβυτέροι, 28. καὶ λέγουσαν αὐτῷ, "Ἐν ποιᾷ ἔξωθεν ταύτα ποιεῖς; καὶ τῆς σοὶ τῆς ἔξωθεν ταύτην ἔδωκεν." Ινα ταύτα

1 γαρ omitted in ΝΒΔ.
2 For πιστεύω οτι...οἰοι λαλεῖ (Tisch., W.H.).
3 Omit ὁ εἰς εἰς ἩΒΔΑΛΔ.
4 For οὐν ἀπροσευχημένοι ἩΒΔΑΛΔΑΛΔΑ, ἩΒΔΑΛΔ have οὐν προσευχημένοι καὶ (Tisch., W.H.).
5 ἔδεικται in ἩΒΔΑΛΔ. T.R. is a correction.
6 στήθηκεν in CDL (Tisch., W.H.), but B has στήθηκε.
7 Ver. 26 is omitted in ἩΒΔΑ (Tisch., W.H.). Weiss thinks it has fallen out by similar ending.
8 ἩΒΔΑΛΔ have εἰς ἑλέγουν. Εἰς λέγουσα conform to εἰροτείαται in ver. 27.
9 η in ἩΒΔΑ.
10 εἴδωκεν before τὸν εἰς τὸν ἩΒΔΑ.  

spokesman as usual; the disciples generally in Mt.—Ver. 22. ἢ ζήτησε πίστιν, have faith. The thoughts of Jesus here take a turn in a different direction to what we should have expected. We look for explanations as to the real meaning of an apparently unreasonable action, the curing of a fig tree. Instead, He turns aside to the subject of the faith necessary to perform miraculous actions. Can it be that the tradition is at fault here, connecting genuine words of the Master about faith and prayer with a comparatively unsuitable occasion? Certainly much of what is given here is found in other connections—ver. 23 in Mt. xvii. 20, Lk. xvii. 6; ver. 24 in Mt. vii. 7, Lk. xi. 9; ver. 25 in Mt. xviii. 35; of course in somewhat altered form. Mt. seems here to make room for some important words of our Lord, as if to compensate for neglect of the didache which he knew to be an important feature in His ministry, doing this, however, as Meyer remarks, by way of thoughtful redaction, not by mere random insertion.—τελεῖν Θεοῦ, faith in God, genitive objective as in Rom. iii. 22 and Heb. vi. 2 (βαπτισμὸν θεοῦ).—Ver. 24. ἔδεικται: this reading (ἩΒΔΑΛΔ) Frtschke pronounces absurd. But its very difficulty as compared with ἐλευθερευεται (T.R.) guarantees its genuineness. And it is not unintelligible if, with Meyer, we take the aorist as referring to the divine purpose, or even as the aorist of immediate consequence, as in John xv. 6 (βαπτίζω). So De Wette, wise Winer, sec. xi. 5 b.

Vv. 27-33. By what authority? (Mt. xxii. 23-27, Lk. xx. 1-8).—Ver. 27. πολύν, again, for the third time: on the day of arrival, on the day of the temple cleansing, and on this day, the event of which is the questioning as to authority.—αὐτῶν and τῶν before ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, while He is walking about, genitive absolute, instead of accusative governed by πολύ; probably simply descriptive (Schanz) and not implying anything offensive in manner—walking as if He were Lord of the place (Kloster); nor, on the other hand, meant
to convey the idea that Jesus was giving no fresh cause of offence, simply walking about (Weiss).— Ver. 28. ἵνα οὕτως: ἵνα with subjunctive after ἐξορθάζω instead of infinitive found in ii. 10, iii. 15.—Ver. 29. The grammatical structure of this sentence, compared with that in Mt. xxi. 24, is crude—and ἀποκριθητέ μοι instead of ἂν ἦν εἰσηγήθη μοι. It is colloquial grammar, the easy-going grammar of popular conversation.—ἵνα λέγων, vide at Mt. xxi. 24.—Ver. 30. ἀποκριθητέ μοι, answer me; spoken in the confident tone of one who knows they cannot and will not try.—Vv. 31-32 give their inward thoughts as divined by Jesus. Their spoken answer was a simple ὅπως οἴδαιμ (ver. 33).—Ver. 32. ἄλλα εἴπωμεν, ἃς ἀνθρώπους = but suppose we say, from men? ἤφθασεν τὸν εὐλογόνε. Here Mk. thinks for them instead of letting them think for themselves as in Mt. (ver. 26, φωτίζωμεν = they were afraid of the multitude.—αὐτοῖς γάρ, etc.: here again the construction is somewhat crude—ἰδονίαν by attraction, object of the verb ἐγνώκεν instead of the subject of ἦν, and δήτων by trajection separated from the verb it qualifies, ἔγνω, giving this sense: for all held John truly that he was a prophet = for all held that John was indeed a prophet.

CHAPTER XII. A PARABLE AND SUNDRY CAPTIOUS QUESTIONS.—Vv. 1-12. Parable of the wicked vinedressers (Mt. xxi. 33-46, Lk. xx. 9-19).—Ver. 1. ἐν παραβολαῖς: the plural may be used simply because there are more parables than one even in Mk., the main one and that of the Rejected Stone (vv. 10, 11), but it is more probably generic = in parabolic style (Meyer, Schanz, Holtz, H. C.). Jesus resumed (ὥστα) this style because the circumstances called forth the parabolic mode, that of one "whose heart is chilled, and whose spirit is saddened by a sense of loneliness, and who, retiring within himself, by a process of reflection, frames for his thoughts forms which half conceal, half reveal them"—The Parabolic Teaching of Christ, p. 20.—ἀμπελώνα: a vineyard, the theme suitably named first.—ἀμπελὼν is the usual word in Greek authors, but Kypke cites some instances of ἀμφελών in late authors.—ἰδονίαν (here only), the under vat of a wine press, into which the juices trampled out in the ἀμφέλω flowed.—ἐνδέκερον (W. H.), a defective form, as it is also from ἐνδέκα. Cf. ἐνδέκερον, Heb. xii. 16.—Ver. 2. ὦ καῦρ: at
the season of fruit, or at the time agreed on; the two practically coincident.—

οὐδὲν: a servant, one at a time, three in succession, then many grouped together, and finally the son. In Mt. first one set of servants are sent, then a larger number, then the son.—ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν: a part of the fruits, rent paid in kind, a share of the crop.—Ver. 4. ἑκατάλειον (al. T.R.) ὠνᾶν: ought to mean, summed up (ἑκατάλειον, Heb. viii. 1 = the crown of what has been spoken), but generally taken to mean “smote on the head” (“in capite vulneraverunt,” Vulg.). A “veritable solecism,” Meyer (“Μκ. confounded κεφάλαιῳ with κεφαλὴ”). Field says: “We can only conjecture that the evangelist adopted ἑκατάλειον, a known word in an unknown sense, in preference to ἑκατάλιον, of which both sound and sense were unknown.”—Ver. 5. τοὺς ἄλλους, many others. The construction is very loose. We naturally think of τολ. ἄλ. as depending on ἀπέτειλε = he sent many others, and possibly that was really what the evangelist had in his mind, though the following participles, ἄποκτεινοντος, suggest a verb, having for its subject the agents these participles refer to = they maltreated many others, beating some and killing some. So most recent writers. Vide Buxtorf, N. T. G., p. 293. Elsner suggests ἄποκτεινοντος after τολ. ἄλ. = and many others, sent, they either beat or slew.—Ver. 8. Mk. says: the son and heir they killed and cast out of the vineyard. Mt. and Lk. more naturally, as it seems: they cast out and killed. We must understand Mk. to mean cast out dead (Meyer, Weiss, Schanz), or with Grocius we must take καὶ ἐξεβάλον as = ἐκβληθέντα.—Ver. 11. πάρα κυρίου, etc., from or through the Lord it (the rejected stone) became this very thing (ἐντηρ. v. in., the head of the corner—κεφαλὴ γωνίας.—Ver. 12. καὶ ἐφεβή—.
12. Καὶ ἔλεγον αὐτῶν κρατῆσαι, καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν τὸν ὄχλον· ἐγνώσαν γὰρ ὅτι πρὸς αὐτῶν τὴν παραβολὴν ἔπει· καὶ αὐτοῖς αὐτῶν ἀπήλθον.

13. Καὶ ἀποστέλλουσι πρὸς αὐτῶν τινας τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ τῶν Ἰησούς, ἵνα αὐτῶν ἄφησιν πάντα· ἐγνώσαν γὰρ ὅτι αὐτοῖς, ἐγνώσαν γὰρ ἅπασαν τὴν παραβολὴν ἐπειδή· καὶ ἀφένεται αὐτῶν ἀπήλθον.

14. Οἱ δὲ ἀδότους λέγοντες αὐτῷ, "Διδάσκαλε, οἵματε ὅτι άλλης εἰς τὸν ὄχλον· ἐστιν κηνὸν Καίσαρος δόντα· ἢ οὖ; δόμεν, ἢ μὴ δόμεν;" 15. Οἱ δὲ εἰδοῦς αὐτῶν τὴν ὑπάρχοντα εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Τί με πειράζετε; φέρετε μοι δηνάριον, ἵνα δῶθη." 16. Οἱ δὲ ήρίγεναν. Καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, "Τίνος ἢ εἰκόνος αὐτῆς καὶ ἡ ἐπηργαθή;" Οἱ δὲ εἶπον αὐτῷ, "Καίσαρος." 17. Καὶ ἀποκρίθησαν αὐτῷ ἦν ήρίγενά εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Ἀπόκειται τά Καίσαρος καὶ τά τοῦ Θεοῦ τῷ Θεῷ." Καὶ θεώρησαν εἰς αὐτήν. 18. Καὶ ἔρχονται Ἀδαμούκαιοι πρὸς αὐτῶν, οἵτινες λέγουσιν

1 καὶ for with in ΝΒCDL. 33.
2 δοῦμεν before κηνον in ΝΒCL. For κηνον D has ἀπεκαθιστημένοι.
3 For καὶ erk. . . . αὐτοῖς B has simply δὲ κ. εἰπόν, BCL. For καίρος: οὐκ εἰρέδοτε K in ΝΒCL. T.R. conforms to Mt. 4 εἴθησαμαιν in ΝΒ. T.R. = Mt. 5

ἀφήνας: καὶ is to all intents adversative here, though grammarians deny that it is ever so used (vide Winer, sec. lili. 3 b) = they sought to lay hold of Him, but they feared the people. — ἐγνώσαν refers to the Synedrists (Weiss, Holtz.), not to the δύσλος (Meyer). It gives a reason at once for their desire to lay hold of Jesus, and for their fear of the people. They must be careful so to act as not to appear to take the parable to themselves, while they really did so.

Vv. 13-17. *Tribute to Caesar* (Mt. xxii. 15-22, Lk. xx. 20-26).—Ver. 13. *τοιαῦτα* : according to Mt. the representatives of the Pharisees were *disciples*, not masters; a cunning device in itself. * Vide* on Mt. xxii. 16.—ἀφετέρως (here only in N.T.), that they might *hunt or catch Him*, like a wild animal. Mt.'s expression, *παγιδεύσωσι*, equally graphic. Lk. avoids both.—λόγος: either, their question, or His reply; the one involves the other.—Ver. 14. The flattering speech is differently and more logically (Schanz) given in Mt. * Vide* notes there on the virtues specified.—ἐξεστατήκατον, etc.: the question now put, and in two forms in Mk. First, as in Mt, is it lawful, etc.; second, in the added words, δόμην ἢ μὴ δόμην; These have been distingushed as the theoretical and the practical form of the question respectively (Meyer, Weiss, Schanz), but there is no real difference. Yet it is not idle repetition. The second question gives urgency to the matter. They speak as men who press for an answer for their guidance (Holtz., H. C.).—Ver. 15. δηνάριον: instead of Mt.'s νόμισμα τοῦ κηνοῦ; as a matter of fact the denarius was the coin of the tribute.—Τοῦ δὲ, that I may see: as if He needed to study the matter, a touch of humour. The question was already settled by the existence of a coin with Caesar's image on it. This verb and the next, ἠρίγεναν, are without object; iaconic style.—Ver. 17. Christ's reply is given here very tersely = the things of Caesar render to Caesar, and those of God to God.—ἐξακολούθησαν: the compound, in place of Mt.'s simple verb, suggests the idea of excessive astonishment, though we must always allow for the tendency in late Greek to use compounds. Here only in N. T., occasionally in Sept.

Vv. 18-27. *The resurrection question* (Mt. xxii. 23-33, Lk. xx. 27-29).—Ver. 19. The case is awkwardly stated here as compared with Mt., though Lk. retains the awkwardness = if the brother of any
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ανθοτον μη είναι καὶ ἐπηρώτησαν 1 αὐτὸν, λέγοντες, 19. "Διδάσκαλε, Ἔργαις ἔγραψεν ἦμιν, ὅτι ἐὰν τόσον ἀδελφὸς ἀποθῆκε, καὶ καταλήκῃ γυναῖκα, καὶ τέκνα μὴ ἀφῇ, 2 ἵνα λάβῃ ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, 3 καὶ ἐξαναστήσῃ σπέρμα τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ. 20. ἐπὶ ἐδελφοὶ ἦσαν καὶ ὁ πρῶτος ἔλαβε γυναίκα, καὶ ἀποθήκησεν ὡς ἀδελφὸς σπέρμα· 21. καὶ ὁ δεύτερος ἐλάβεν αὐτήν, καὶ ἀπέθαναν, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἀδελφὸς ἀφῆκε σπέρμα · 22. καὶ ἐδάπαν ἄρτοι οἱ ἐν αὐτῷ, καὶ οἰκὸς αὕτης ἀπείπθαι καὶ ἡ γυνή. 23. ἐν τῇ οὐδ· ἐκακοῦσθε, ὅταν ἀναστῶσθε, τίνος αὐτῶν ἦστε γυνή; οἱ γὰρ ἐν τῇ ἐσχον αὐτήν γυναίκα." 24. Καὶ ἀποκρίθησις ὁ ἤθελος εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, 25. "Ὅδε ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν τὸν γράφα, μηδὲν τὸν δύναμιν τοῦ θεοῦ; 25. ὅταν γὰρ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῶσθαι, οὐκ αἰματοῦν, οὔτε γαμάζονται, όπλον γαμίζονται. 26. ἐν τῇ διδασά· ἐκακοῦσθε, οὐκ ἐγέρητες ἐν τῇ βίβλῳ, οὐκ οἱ βάτου, οὐκ εἰπεν αὐτῷ ὁ θεός, λέγειν, Ἔγώ ὁ θεὸς ᾿Αβραάμ, καὶ

1 επηρώτησαν in ΒΓΔΛΑ 33. T.R. = parall.
2 μὴ αὕτη τεκνον in ΒΛΔ.
3 Omit auton ΒΓΔΛΑ.
4 For καὶ οὔ τοι ... σπερμα ΒΓΔΛΑ 33 have μὴ καταλείπων σε.
5 For καὶ ἐδάπαν ... σπερμα ΒΓΔΛΑ 33 have καὶ οἴκος αὐτης σπερμα.
6 For σαχατῆ ... γυνη read with ΒΓΔΛΑ 33 σαχατην καὶ ἡ γυνη ἀπέθανεν.
7 Omit οὐ ΒΓΔΛΑ.
8 The oldest uncials omit οὖν αναστωσθω, which may, as Weiss suggests, have fallen out by similar ending (αναστώσατε) (Tisch. inserts, W.H. omit).
9 For καὶ ... αὐτοί read ἐφι αὐτοίς οἱ with ΒΓΔΛΑ 33.
10 γαμίζονται in ΒΓΔΛΑ (γαμίζοντι D).
11 τοι in ΥΑΒΔΛΑ 33. τοις in D (= Lk.).
12 τοις in ΒΓΔΛΑ. τοις in D, al.

one die, and leave a wife, and leave not children, let his (the brother's) brother take his wife and raise up seed to his brother. Mk. avoids the word ἐπηρώτησας (in Mt.). — Ver. 20: abrupt statement of the case, without connect ing particle, and ἐπὶ placed first for emphasis = seven brothers there were (in a case supposed, or pretendedly real, παρ' ὑμῖν, Mt.). — Ver. 23. τίνος αὐτῶν, etc., of which of them shall she be the wife? (γυνη, without the article, vide notes on Mt.). — Ver. 24. ἐδάπανας, do ye not err? not weaker but stronger than a positive assertion: "pro vehementi affirmatione," Grotius. — ἀπείπθαι usually refers to something going before, and it may do so here, pointing to their question as involving ignorant presuppositions regarding the future state, an ignorance due, in turn, to ignorance of Scripture teaching and the power of God. But it is more natural to connect it with the following clause, as in cases when the expression precedes ὅταν, ἐν τῇ, ἐκακοῦσθαι, etc., for μὴ δίδοτε is = δεικοῦσα. So De Wette and others, vide Winer, sec. xxiii. 5. — Ver. 26. ἐν τῇ βίβλῳ Μ.: a general reference to the Pentateuch, the following phrase, ἐν τῷ βάτῳ Μ.: a more definite reference to the exact place in the book, the section relating to the bush. “At the bush,” i.e., Ex. iii., similarly reference might be made to Ex. xv., by the title: “at the song of Moses.” — βάτος is masculine here according to the best reading; feminine in Lk. xx. 37. The feminine is Hellenistic, the masculine Attic. Vide Thayer's Grimm. The word occurs in Aristoi-
of the N. T.; possibly colloquial (Kennedy, Sources of N. T. G., p. 78).

Vv. 27-34. The great commandment (Mt. xxii. 34-40). The permanent value of this section lies in the answer of Jesus to the question put to Him, which is substantially the same in both Mt. and Mk. The accounts vary in regard to the motive of the questioner. In Mt. he comes to tempt, in Mk. in hope of getting confirmation in a new way of thinking on the subject, similar to that of the man in quest of eternal life—that which put the ethical above the ritual. No anxious attempt should be made to remove the discrepancy. — Ver. 28. προσελθὼν, ἄκουσας, εἶδος: the second and third of these three participles may be viewed as the ground of the first = one of the scribes, having heard them disputing, and being conscious that He (Jesus) answered them well, approached and asked Him, etc.— γόνα, what sort of; it is a question, not of an individual commandment, but of characteristic quality. The questioner, as conceived by Mk., probably had in view the distinction between ritual and ethical, or positive and moral. The prevalent tendency was to attach special importance to the positive, and to find the great matters of the law in circumcision, Sabbath-keeping, the rules respecting phylacteries, etc. (Lightfoot). The opposite tendency, to emphasise the ethical, was not unrepresented, especially in the school of Hillel, which taught that the love of our neighbour is the kernel of the law. The questioner, as he appears in Mk., seems to this side. — Ver. 29. ἄκουσε, Ἰσραήλ, etc.: this monothestic preface to the great commandment is not given by Mt. Possibly Mk. has added it by way of making the quotation complete, but more probably Jesus Himself quoted it to suggest that duty, like God, was one, in opposition to the prevailing habit of viewing duty as consisting in isolated precepts. Mt. compensates for the omission by preserving the reflection: "On these two commandments hangeth the whole law and the prophets." In Mk. the bond of unity is God; in Mt. love.— Ver. 30. Heart, soul, mind, strength (לְדוּשָׁהוֹ); in Mt.: heart, soul, mind; in Lk. (x. 27): heart, soul, strength, mind; in Deut. (vi. 4): heart, soul, strength (בְּשָׁרָיו); all varied ways of saying "to the uttermost degree" = "all that is within";

BD omit the article in these two places.

BD omit o, which has been introduced through θεός being taken as subject.

Omit θεός Ν·Α·Β·C·D·Α·

NBCLA K cop. omit ως συν. Vide below.

απεκρίθη αὐτοῖς in NBCLA 33.

ἐπιστάτη τῆς τάξεως in NBCLA. T. R. is a grammatical correction.

οικείος ο. l. in NBCLA 33.

For οτι . . . επιστήμης read with πόλια ὅπι̣ της επιστήμης επιτη.

Omit αὐτήν π. ev. (a gloss from ver. 28) with πόλια.

For καὶ . . . αὐτῇ BLA have simply διετέρω αὐτῇ (Tisch., W. H.).

phanes and in the N. T.; possibly colloquial (Kennedy, Sources of N. T. G., p. 78).
32. Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ γραμματέας, "Καλῶς, διδάσκαλε, ἐν ἀληθείᾳ εἶπας, ὅτι εἰς ἑαυτὸν Θεόν, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλος πλὴν αὐτοῦ. 33. καὶ τὸ ἀγαπάν ἄντων ἐξ ὀλίγης τῆς καρδίας, καὶ ἐξ ὀλίγης τῆς συνέσεως, καὶ ἐξ ὀλίγης τῆς ψυχῆς, καὶ ἐξ ὀλίγης τῆς λογίας, καὶ τὸ ἀγαπᾶν τῶν πλησίον ἔς λατών, πλεύζον ἐκ πάντων τῶν δικαίων ἀνθρώπων καὶ τῶν θυσίων."

34. Καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἠδὲν αὐτόν, ὅτι νοονύκτου ἀπεκρίθη, εἶπεν αὐτῷ, "Οὐ μακρὰν εἰ ᾧ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ. Καὶ ὁ δεῖς ὅκεντε ἐκλέξαι αὐτόν ἐπερυθήσατο.

35. Καὶ ἀποκρίθη δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἔλεγε, διδάσκαλεν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, "Πῶς λέγοντον οἱ γραμματεῖς, ὅτι ὁ Χριστὸς ὦς ἄρτι ἄνω στίς Άββᾶς; 36. αὕτως γὰρ Άββᾶς εἶχεν ἐν τῷ ἔνεστι τῷ Ἁγίῳ, Ἐξευάγερα τό Κόριον τῷ κυρίῳ μου, Κάθωσι ἐκ δεξιῶν μου, ὡς ἐν θῷ τῶν ἱεροποιῶν τῶν ποιῶν σου."

37. Αὕτως δὲν Άββᾶς λέγειν αὐτῶν κόριον· καὶ πάντως ὦς αὐτόν ἄντι; Καὶ ὁ πολὺς δόξας ἴδους αὐτῶν ἴδεις.

1 ΝΑΒΛΑomit Θεόν.
2 Περισσοτέρων in ΝΒΛΑ 33.
3 Άββᾶ before στίς in ΝΒΔΛ.
4 καθισών in B (Trg., W.H., marg.).

and with the full potency of that "all".— Ver. 32. καλῶς, ἐν ἀληθείᾳ: to be taken together = well indeed!—εἰς ἑαυτὸν: He is one (God understood, supplied in T.R.)—Ver. 33: the manner of loving God is stated by the scribe in yet another form of language: heart, understanding (συνέσεως), might.—περισσοτέρῳ στίς, etc., is more, far, than all the burnt offerings and the sacrifices (meat offerings) = the whole Levitical ritual. There is a ring of conviction in the words. The varied expression of the law of love to God (συνέσεως) also bears witness to sincerity and independent thought.—δικαίωματων (δικαίωμα, from δίκαιος, καλῶς), here and in Heb. x. 6, from Sept., for πλεύζει.— Ver. 34. νοονύκτου, intelligently, as one who had a mind (of his own), and really thought what he said, a refreshing thing to meet with at any time, and especially there and then. Here only in N.T. = νοονύκτων in classics.—οὐ μακρὰν, not far; near by insight into its nature (the ethical supreme), and in spirit—a sincere thinker.—οδήγεις εὐδοκεῖτε, etc.: questioning given up because seen to be vain, always ending either in the confusion or in the acquiescence of questioners (cf. Lk. xx. 40).— Vv. 35-37. David's Son and David's Lord (Mt. xxii. 41-46, Lk. xx. 41-44). On the aim and import of this counter-question see notes on Mt.—Ver. 35: ἀποκρίθη δὲ, διδάσκαλον ἐν τῇ δόξῃ. L.: these two participles describe the circumstances under which the question was asked—addressed to silenced and disheartened opponents, and forming a part of the public instruction Jesus had been giving in the temple; a large body of people present.—Ver. 36: αὕτως Α. Over against the dogma of the scribes, stated in ver. 35 as something well known (in Mt. Jesus asks for their opinion on the topic), is set the declaration of David himself, introduced without connecting particle. David, who ought to know better than the scribes.—ἐν τῷ τ. τ. ἀ.: especially when speaking, as they would all admit, by inspiration.—εἰς, etc.: the quotation as given in T.R. exactly reproduces the Sept. The omission of ἀποκρίθη before Κόριος in BD turns the latter into a proper name of God.—κάθωσι (καθισών in B) is a late or "popular" form of the
38. Καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοίς ἐν τῇ διδακῇ αὐτοῦ, "Βλέπετε ἀπὸ τῶν γραμματέων, τῶν θελόντων ἐν στολαῖς περιτατείναι, καὶ ἀσωματικῶς ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς, 39. καὶ πρωτοκαθαρίας ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς, καὶ πρωτοκλίσεις ἐν τοῖς δειπνοῖς. 40. Οἱ καταθλιπτείς τὰς οἰκίας τῶν χηρῶν, καὶ προφήταις μακρὰ προσευχόμενοι· οὕτω λήφθητι περιποιητέρον κρίμα.

41. Καὶ καθισαν ὁ ἤσυχος κατέναντί τοῦ γαζοφυλάκιον εἰσαρέτω

τῶν ἀχλασι βδέλλην χαλάν εἰς τὸ γαζοφυλάκιον. καὶ πολλοὶ

---

present imperatives of καθισαν.—Ver. 37. καὶ ὁ πολὺς ἀχλάς, etc.: this remark about the large crowd which had been witness to these encounters, as it stands in our N. T. at end of ver. 37, seems to refer merely to the closing scene of the conflict. Probably the evangelist meant the reflection to apply to the whole: the masses enjoyed Christ's victory over the classes, who one after the other measured their wits against His. The remark is true to the life. The people gladly hear one who speaks felicitiously, refutes easily, and escapes dexterously from the hands of designing men. (οἱ ἴδιοι διαλογισμοῦ, καὶ στρατέας αὐτούς ἀναρτέντων, καὶ ἦν ἀσυνήθη καὶ λατρεύοντες τῇ βασιλείᾳ—Euthy, Zyg.)

Vv. 38-40. Warning against the influence of the scribes (Lk. xx. 43-47). As if encouraged by the manifest sympathy of the crowd, Jesus proceeds to warn them against the baleful influence of their religious guides.—Ver. 38. ἐν τῇ διδακῇ αὐτοῦ: this expression alone suffices to show that what Mk. here gives is but a fragment of a larger discourse of the same type—an independent sentence. Here again the evangelist bears faithful witness to a great body of διδακῆς he does not record. Mt. xxiii. shows how much he omits at this point.—Ḥλεγεν: the imperfect here may be taken as suggesting that what follows is but a sample = He was saying things like this.—Βλέπετε ἀπὸ as in viii. 15.—θέλοντων, desiring, not so much claiming as their privilege (Meyer) as taking a childish pleasure in = φιλοτέθναι, Lk. xx. 40.—ἐν στολαῖς, in long robes, worn by persons of rank and distinction ("gravitatis index," Grotius), possibly worn specially long by the scribes that the tassels attached might trail on the ground.

So Wünsche, ad loc. Vide picture of Pharisee in his robes in Lund, Heiligthümer. — περιτατείναι: infinitive, depending on θελόντων followed by accusatives, ἀσωματικῶς, etc., depending on same word: oratio variata, vide Mt. xxiii. 6.—Ver. 40. οἱ καταθλιπτείς: this verse is probably still to be regarded as a continuation of the description of the scribes commencing with τῶν θελόντων, only the writer has lost the sense of the original construction, and instead of the genitive puts the nominative, so giving to what follows the force of an independent sentence (so Weiss). Grotius, Meyer, and Schanz take ver. 40 as a really independent sentence. Lk. set the precedent for this; for, apparently having Mk.'s text before him, he turns οἱ καταθλιπτείς into οἱ καταθλιπτείς. Holtzmann, H. C., is undecided between the two views. As to the sense, two facts are stated about the scribes: they devoured the houses, the property of widows, and they made long (μακρὰ, vide on Lk. xx. 47) prayers in the houses of, and presumably for, these widows.—προφήται: the real aim to get money, the long and superfluous prayers a blind to hide this aim. It is not necessary to suppose that the money-getting and the praying were connected by regular contract (so apparently Fritzsch, and Weiss in Meyer). For προφητείας cf. Phil. i. 18 and especially 1 Thess. ii. 5.—πότερ λήφθητι, etc.: this remark applies specially to the conduct just described: catching widows' substance with the bait of prayer, which Jesus characteristically pronounces exceptionally damnable in view of its sleek hypocrisy and low greed. The appending of this reflection favours the view that ver. 40 is after all an independent sentence. In it and the two preceding
we have a very slight yet vivid picture of Pharisaic piety in its vanity, avarice, and hypocrisy.

VV. 41-44. The widow’s offering (Lk. xxii. 1-4). This charming story comes in with dramatic effect, after the repulsive picture of the greedy praying scribe. The reference to the widows victimised by the hypocrites may have suggested it to the evangelist’s mind. It bears the unmistakable stamp of an authentic reminiscence, and one can imagine what comfort it would bring to the poor, who constituted the bulk of the early Gentile Church (Schanz).—Ver. 41. καθὼς: Jesus, a close and keen observer of all that went on (xi. 11), sits down at a spot convenient for noticing the people casting their contributions into the temple treasury.—γασφυσλαιον (γάσα, Persian, φυσλα = φυσοψλαιον, Hesychius). Commentators are agreed in thinking that the reference is to the treasury in the court of the women, consisting of thirteen brazen trumpet-shaped receptacles, each destined for its distinctive gifts, indicated by an inscription, so many for the temple tribute, and money gifts for sacrifices; others for incense, wood, etc.; all the gifts having reference to the service carried on. The gifts were people’s offerings, generally moderate in amount: “the Peter’s pence of the Jews” (Holtzmann, H. C.).—καλανθα may be meant for money in general, copper representing all sorts (Fritzsche, Grotius, etc.); but there seems to be no good reason why we should not take it strictly as denoting contributions in copper, the ordinary, if not exclusive, money gifts (Meyer; Holtzmann, H. C.).—καλανθα whoresons, etc., many rich were casting in much: Jesus was near enough to see that, also to notice exactly what the widow gave. Among the rich givers might be some of the praying scribes who had imposed on widows by their show of piety, suggesting reflections on where wealthy givers get the money they bestow for pious purposes. That is not a matter of indifference to the Kingdom of God, whatever it may be to beneficiaries.—Ver. 42. μια χ. π. one poverty-stricken widow. With what intense interest Jesus would watch her movements, after His eye fell on her! How much will she give?—λειτοπ, “two mites”; minute, of course, but two: she might have kept one of them (Bengel).—λειτοπ πεσον, so called from its smallness; smallest of brass coins—significant of deep poverty; two given, of a willing mind.—Ver. 43. η πτωχη emphatic—the poverty-stricken; manifest from her dress and wasted look.—Ver. 44.—εκ της ουσπυρς, from her state of want, cf. on Lk.—ουσπυρον, here and in Phil. iv. 11.—πάντα δον: this not visible to the eye; divined by the mind, but firmly believed to be true, as appears from the repetition of the statement in another form.—δολον των δον, her whole means of life. For the use of δον in this sense vide Lk. viii. 43, xv. 12, 30; similarly in classics.

Though it has nothing to do with strict exegesis, I am tempted to give here a prayer by that felicitous interpreter and devout monk, Euthymius Zigabenus, based on this beautiful Gospel story: “May my soul become a widow casting out the devil to which it is joined and subject, and casting into the treasury of God two lepta, the body and the mind; the one made light (λυτωκοθετα) by temperance, the other by humility”.

Chapter XIII. The Apocalyptic Discourse. This is the solitary instance in which the second evangelist has given at length a discourse of Jesus. The fulness with which the apocalyptic discourse is recorded is all the more striking, when contrasted with the very meagre reproduction of the anti-Pharisaic discourse (xii. 38-40). The exception made in its favour was doubtless due to
Mk.'s estimate of its interest and value for his first readers. Perhaps he was influenced in part by the fascinations of prediction. The real interest of the discourse and the key to its interpretation are to be found, as pointed out in the notes on the corresponding chapter in Mt., in its ethical aim—"to forewarn and forewarn the representatives of a new faith, so that they might not lose their hearts or their hearts in an evil perplexing time": notes on Mt. For a full exposition of the discourse in the light of this aim readers are referred to these notes.

Vv. 1-4. The introduction (Mt. xxiv. 1-3; Lk. xxi. 5-7).—Ver. 1. ἔν τε μαθητῶν, one of the disciples; the disciples generally in Mt.; who, not said, nor for what motive; probably to divert the Master from gloomy thoughts.—πάντας ἵππος, etc.; what stones and what buildings! the former remarkable for size, as described by Josephus (Antiq., xv., 11, 3); the latter for beauty. On πάντας vide at Mt. viii. 27.—Ver. 2. μέγας a question, do you see? to fix attention on an object concerning which a startling statement is to be made.—μεγάλας, great buildings, acknowledging the justness of the admiration and pointing to a feature which might seem incompatible with the statement following: that vast strong pile surely proof against destruction!—Ver. 3. to ὅς; implying previous motion towards, before sitting down on the Mount of Olives.—κατέναντι τ. τ., opposite the temple, with the admired buildings in full view; this graphic touch in Mk. only.

—ἐification (NBL), singular: Peter in view as the chief speaker, though accompanied by other three; imperfect, as subordinate to ἔγραψα in ver. 5 explaining the occasion of the discourse Jesus then began to deliver.—ὅ Πέτρος, etc.; the well-known three, and a fourth—Andrew; a selection found only here. Were these all the disciples with Jesus, all who went with Him to Bethany in the evenings, the rest remaining in Jerusalem? The two pairs of brothers were the first called to discipleship (Mt. i. 16-20). This reminiscence points to internal relations in the disciple-circle imperfectly known to us.—καὶ ἦλθαν, apart, i.e., from the rest of the disciples. Mt. has the same phrase, though he assumes all the disciples to be present, which is suggestive of literary dependence.—Ver. 4. The question of the four has exclusive reference to the predicted destruction of the sacred buildings. In Mt. three questions are mixed together: vide notes there.

Vv. 5-8. Signs prelusive of the end (Mt. xxiv. 4-8; Lk. xxii. 8-11). Jerusalem's judgment-day not to come till certain things have happened: advent of false Messiahs, rise of wars. —βλέπετε, take heed that no one deceive you; the ethical key-note struck at once; the aim of the whole discourse to help disciples to keep heads cool, and hearts brave in a perilous evil time (vide on Mt.).—Ver. 5. εἰμὶ ἐγώ, I am (He, the Christ). In what sense to be understood vide on Mt. The Messianic hope misconceived was the ruin of the Jewish people.—Ver. 7.
Λήγοντες, ὦτι ἐγὼ εἰμι· καὶ πολλοὺς πλαστοὺς. 7. ὅταν δὲ ἀκούσῃς πολλοὺς καὶ ακοδόμους, μὴ θροισθῇς· δει γὰρ 1 γενέσθαι ἥλιον τὸ τέλος. 8. Ἑγερθῆσαι γὰρ θέσος ἐπὶ θέσος, καὶ βασιλεία ἐπὶ βασιλείαν· καὶ 2 ἐσυνάνται σειραίς κατὰ τόπους, καὶ ἐσυνάντησαν λύμα καὶ παραξενεῖς. 8 ἀρχαὶ ἀδίνων ταύτα. 9. Βλέπετε δὲ ὅμιας ἐαυτοῖς. παραδώσωσι γὰρ ὅμας εἰς συνεβία, καὶ εἰς συναγωγὰς διαβάσοντες, καὶ εἰς ἡγεμόνας καὶ βασιλέων σταθοῦσα ἕκεκρα ἐμὸς, εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς. 10. καὶ εἰς πάντα τὰ θέσῃ διὰ πρῶτον 6 κηρυγγήμασι τὸ εὐαγγελιον. 11. ὅταν δὲ ἀγάπωσαν ὅμας παραδώσοντες, μὴ προμερμανήτες τι λαλήσατε, μὴ δὲ μελετᾶτε διὰ δὲ τῶν δοκὶ ὁμών ἐν δικείη τῇ ἁρπᾷ, τούτῳ λαλεῖτε· ὅ γαρ ἄπει ὅμιας οἱ λαλοῦσαι, ἄλλα τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ Ἁγιόν. 12. παραδώσετε δὲ 9 ἄδελφοις ἄδελφον εἰς ἀνάπτωσιν, καὶ παθῆ τέκνων.

1 ΝΒΔΛ sah. cop. omit γας. Vide below.
2 ΝΒDL omit the first καὶ and BL the second. Vide below.
3 ΝΒDL vet. Lat. vulg. cop. omit καὶ παρασκεύας (so Trg., Tisch., W.H.), but these words may have fallen out by similar ending (ἀρχαὶ, so Weiss).
4 ἄρχα in ΝΒΔΔ (Trg., Tisch., W.H.), which may be an assimilation to Mt. ἄρχα in ΑΕΓΧΓΖ α. (Weiss).
5 Omit γας BL cop.
6 πρῶτον δὲ in ΝΒΔ. ΛΔ = T.R.
7 καὶ οὖν γενοῦσαν in ΝΒΔL.
8 ΝΒDL omit μὴν μελετᾶτε.
9 καὶ παραδώσωσι in ΝΒDL.

πολλοὺς: first pseudo-Messiahs preaching national independence; then, naturally, as a second σημεῖον, μάρτις, actual or threatened (ἀκοδόμοι).—μὴ δροισθῆτε: good counsel, cheerful in tone, laconic in expression = be not scared; they must happen; but the end not yet. The disconnected style, no γὰρ after δὲ (ΝΒΒ), suits thee motional prophetic mood.—τὸ τέλος, the crisis of Jerusalem.—Ver. 8. ἐσυνάντησα σωμάτων, etc., there will be earthquakes in places; there will be famines. Here again the briefest reading without connecting particles (καὶ, καὶ) is to be preferred, as suiting the abrupt style congenial to the prophetic mood. The καὶ παρασκεύας after λαλῶν may have fallen out of ΝΒΔΔL by homoeoteleuton (ἄρχαὶ following immediately after), but after earthquakes and famines disturbances seems an anti-climax.

Ver. 9-13. Third sign, drawn from apostolic experiences (Mt. xxiv. 9-15, Lk. xxii. 12-19). On the hypothesis that this is an interpolation into the discourse, having no organic connection with it, wide on Mt. The contents of this section, especially in Mk.'s version, correspond closely to Mt. x. 17-22. But the question, in which of the two discourses the logion has the more historical setting, is not thereby settled. Some utterance of the sort was certainly germane to the present situation.—Ver. 9. Βλέπετε, etc.: not meant to strike a depressing note, but to suggest that the most interesting omens should be found in their own experiences as the Apostles of the faith, which, however full of tribulation, would yet be, on the whole, victorious.—παραδώσωσιν, etc.: the tribulations are not disguised, but the blunt statement only lends emphasis to the declaration in ver. 10 that, notwithstanding, the Gospel must (δὲ) and shall be proclaimed on a wide scale.—ἐν συναγωγῇ διαβάζοντες: the ele here is pregnant = you, delivered to the synagogues, shall be maltreated. Bengel renders: “in synagogas inter verbera agemini” = ye shall be driven into the synagogues with clubs. So Nösgen.—Ver. 11 gives counsel for Apostles placed at the bar of kings and rulers. They are not to be anxious beforehand (προμερμανήτας, here only in N.T.) even as to what they shall say, not to speak of what shall happen to them as the result of the trial. Their apologia will be given to them. They will not be the
real speakers (οὔ γὰρ ἢ τοίοι ὁμαδὶ οἱ λαλοῦντες), but the Holy Spirit. Lk. has "I" here: Christ = the Holy Ghost. This comforting word is wanting in Mt., and whether it was really spoken at this time must remain uncertain. Mt. describes with more detail the internal troubles of the Christian community—mutual treachery, false prophets (within, not without, like the false Messiahs of ver. 5), lawlessness, chilling of early enthusiasm—all implying the lapse of a considerable time, and all to happen before the end of Jerusalem. (Vv. 10-12.) For all this Mk. gives only the brief statement in ver. 12.—Ver. 13 answers in its first part to Mt. xxiv. 9b, and in its second to Mt. xxiv. 13.

Vv. 14-23. The Jewish catastrophe (Mt. xxiv. 15-25, Lk. xxii. 20-24).—Ver. 14. τὸ ββλημαντὶ τῇ. The horror is the Roman army, and it is a horror because of the desolation it brings. Vide on Mt. The reference to Daniel in T.R. is imported from Mt.—ἐφησκότα, the reading in the best texts, masculine, though referring to ββλημαντὶ, because the horror consists of soldiers (Schanz) or their general. (Cf. ἄντιχρον, 2 Thess. ii. 7.)—δόθων οὖ βδή, where it ought not, instead of ἐν τοῖς ἐγγύς in Mt.—a graceful circumlocution betraying the Jewish Christian writing for heathen Christians, abstaining from making claims that might be misunderstood for his native country by calling it the "holy land" (Schanz).—ὁ ἀναγνώσκων v. The reference here cannot be to Daniel, which is not mentioned in Mk., but either to the Gospel itself or to a separate document which it embodies—a Jewish or Jewish-Christian Apocalypse (vide on Mt.). The words may be taken as a direction to the reader in synagogue or church to explain further the meaning to hearers, it being a matter of vital practical concern. Vide Weizäcker, Das Apost. Zeit. p. 362.—Ver. 15. διώκων, he who is on the roof. Vide at Mt. x. 27. The main point to be noted in Mk.'s version of the directions for the crisis as compared with Mt.'s (q.v.) is the omission of the words μὴ σαββάτῳ, probably out of regard to Gentile readers.—Ver. 18. ἤν μὴ γένηται, that if it may not be; what not said, φυγῇ (T.R.) being omitted in best texts = the nameless horror which makes flight imperative, the awful crisis of Israel.—Ver. 19. ἐφοβηθαί γὰρ αἱ ἡμέραι, etc., for (not in those days, but) those days (themselves) shall be a tribulation. So we speak of...
“evil days,” and in Scotland of the
“killing times.”—οδα οδ γέφονων, etc.: a strong statement claiming for the crisis
of Israel a unique place of tragic distinction
in the whole calamitous experience
of the human race, past and to come.—
οδα οδ γέφονων, pleonastic, cf. 1 Cor. xv. 48,
2 Cor. x. 11.—Ver. 20. The merciful
shortening of the days, out of regard to the
elect, is here directly ascribed to
God. Mt. uses the passive construction,
where θέλειν as to the idea of shortening
and the reason.—τοις ἐκλεκτοῖς ὁδ
θέλειν, the elect whom He elected,
recalling “the creation which God
created” in ver. 19; but more than a
mere literary idiosyncrasy, emphasising
the fact that the elect are God’s elect,
whom He loves and will care for, and
whose intercessions for others He will
hear.—Ver. 22. ψευδόχριστον, ψεύδω-
προφήτην, false Christs, and false
prophets; again, as in ver. 6, here as
there without, not within, the Church;
political Messiahs, in ver. 6 spoken of as
the prime cause of all the calamities, here
as at the last hour promising deliverance
therefrom.—πρὸς τὸ δοσολαθύς, with a
view to mislead; the compound verb
occurs again in 1 Tim. vi. 10, in passive.
—Ver. 23. ἡμέρας οδ., etc., now you look
out! I have told you all things before-
hand; forewarned, forearmed.

Vv. 24-32. The coming of the Son of
Man (Mt. xxiv. 29-35, Lk. xxii. 32-33).
—Ver. 24. ἄλλα, opposes to the false
 Christs who are not to be believed in,
the coming of the true Christ.—καὶ ἡ
καιναῖς τὰ ἡμέρας, in those days, for
Mt.’s εὐθύς, a vaguer phrase, yet making
the paschas synchronise with the thilpis.
—Ver. 25. οἱ ἀντέχοντες, etc., the stars
shall be in process of falling (one after
the other)—δοσολαθυς, the signs instead
of δοσολαθυς in Mt.—τῶν δυνάμεων,
etc.; the powers in heaven = the powers
of heaven (Mt.) = the host of heaven
(Is. xxxiv. 4), a synonym for the stars.—
Ver. 26. τῶν διὰ τὸν: the Son of
Man, not the sign of, etc., as in Mt.
28. "Από δέ τῆς συμβ. μάθετε τὴν παραβολήν: ὅταν αὐτὴς ἤδη ὁ κλάδος ἄρα καὶ ἐν τῷ πελάτῃ, γινώσκετε ὅτι ἡ θέρες ἡ ἄρτι ἐστὶν. 29. οὕτω καὶ ὡμείον, ὅταν ταῦτα ἔγγυσε ζυγ. 30. Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὐκ ἂν παράλγη ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη γένεται, μέχρις ὅταν πάντα ταῦτα γένεται. 31. ὅ ὅμως καὶ ἡ γῆ παρελθεύσονται ὃ· οἱ δὲ λογίς μου οὐκ ὅμως παρέλθωσιν. 32. "Περὶ δέ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης καὶ τῆς ἡμέρας, ὡμείον γενέσθαι, οὐδὲ οἱ ἄγγελοι οἱ ὁ ὅμως ὅταν ὅτι οὐκ οἴδατε καὶ οὐ οἶδατε." 33. "Βλέπετε, ἀγρυπνείτε καὶ προσεύχεσθε, ὅπως οἴδατε γερά πάντα καὶ οικῆσθε ἐστίν. 34. ὅταν δὲ ἄνθρωπος ἀπόδημος ἀφεῖς τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ, καὶ δουλείας δοῦλον αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐξουσίαν, καὶ ἀκούση τὸ ἐργον τὸ ἐργανθήσεται ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῆς Αἰγίνας καὶ ἐν πάσης ἡλίθιος ἡμέρας. 35. Τοῦτοδὲ τὸ ἀνακοίνωσάν μετὰ τοῦ ἀνακοινώσας τοῦτο πρὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον αὕτην ἡμέραν καὶ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῆς Αἰγίνας. 36. Προεῖπεν δὲ καὶ ἀπέστημεν οἱ ἀνθρώποι πρὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον αὕτην καὶ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῆς Αἰγίνας. 37. Τοῦτοδὲ εἶδεν τὸ ἀνάθημα τοῦτο τῆς ἡμέρας καὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς Αἰγίνας. 38. Προεῖπεν δὲ καὶ ἀπέστημεν οἱ ἀνθρώποι πρὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον αὕτην καὶ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῆς Αἰγίνας. 

1 The order of the words varies in MSS. ΝABCDL have ηθη σ αλ ανας (W.H., Tisch., as in T.R.). 2 οῦτα ταύτα in ΝABCL. 3 ταύτα πατρα in ΝΒCLΔ. 4 παρελθοῦσαν in ΝΒΔ; sing. in ΛΔΣ (from Mt.); for μου παρέλθωσι (from Mt.) ΝΒΔL have παρελθοῦσαν a second time, and BL omit μου, which does not elsewhere occur in Mk. with μου and future indicative. 5 η in ΝΒCLΔ. ΝΔ have καί. 6 ΝΔL omit οι after μου. ΑΔ have it. B reads αγγελος (W.H. marg.). 7 ΒΔ omit καὶ προσεύχεσθε; a gloss. 8 ΝΒCLΔ omit καί, a connecting particle added by scribes. 9 Christ His own sign, vide on Mt.—Ver. 27. ἀνώτερον γενέσθαι, etc. (cf. expression in Mt.), from the extremity of the earth to the extremity of heaven. The earth is conceived as a flat surface, and the idea is—from one end of the earth to the other, where it touches the heavens. But they touch at both ends, so that Mt.'s expression is the more accurate. Either from one end of the earth to the other end of the earth, or from one end of the heavens to, etc.—Ver. 28. Parable of the fig tree, as in Mt.—ἀκοφην: this verb without accent might either be present subjunctive active of ἀκοφην = ἀκοφην = it puttheth forth its leaves; or 2nd aorist subjunctive intransitive = ἀκοφην, from ἀκοφην, later form of 2nd aorist indicative instead of ἀκοφην = the leaves shoot out. The former is preferred by most commentators. Vv. 32-37. Concluding exhortation (Mt. xxiv. 36).—Ver. 32. The words οὐδείς are an undoubted reading in Mk., and there can be little doubt they form a part of the true text in Mt. also. As to the import of the solemn declaration of nescience Jesus here makes, I need only refer to what has been said on the corresponding text in Mt. It is not a disclaimer of knowledge as to the precise day, month, or year of what it is certain will happen within the then present generation, but rather an intimation that all statements (that regarding the generation included) as to the time of the parousia must be taken in a qualified sense. Jesus had, I still feel, two ways of speaking on the subject, one for comfort (it will be soon), and one for caution (it may not be so soon as even I think or you expect).—Ver. 33. ἀγρυπνείτε: watch, be sleepless (or priv. and θέντο).—οὐκ εἰδατε, etc., ye know not the time or season (καιρός) of the parousia. If even the Son knows not, yet less His disciples; therefore let them watch.—Ver. 34. Enforcement of the exhortation to watch by a brief parable. At this point each of the synoptical evangelists goes his own way. In Mt. Jesus presses home the lesson by historical and prophetical pictures of the surprises brought by unexpected crises; in Lk. by general statements; in Mk. by a comparison which seems to be the germ of the parable in Mt. xxv. 14-30.—ἄνθρωπος ἀπόδημος (here only), a travelling man, cf. 2θ. ἄνθρωπος, a merchant man, in Mt. xiii. 45.—ἀφελείς, δοῦλη: these participles
specify the circumstances under which the command to the porter, the main point, was given; it was when the master was leaving, and when he gave to all his servants his parting instructions. - τον ἄρατον, his (the master's) authority, distributed among the servants when he could no longer exercise it himself.— τὸ ἁσαγεν, to each one his work, in apposition with ἁρατον. In the master's absence each man became his own master; put upon his honour, the seat of the ἀρατον, and prescribing careful performance of the ἁσαγεν entrusted to each. — καὶ τον ὄμον, also, among the rest, and very specially, to the porter (he gave instructions). The καὶ here is emphatic, as if it had been καὶ ἄρατον τό γραμμορρόδ, that he should watch: note that in this parable the function of watching becomes the business of one— the porter. Each servant has his appropriate task; the porter's is to watch. Yet in the moral sphere watching is the common duty of all, the temper in which all are to discharge their functions. All have to be porters, waiting at the gate, ready to open it to the returning master. Hence the closing exhortation in ver. 37. What I say to you, the four disciples (ver. 3), I say to all: watch. This had to be added, because it was not said or suggested by the parable; a defect which makes it doubtful whether we have here a lesson of Jesus in authentic form, and which may account for its omission by Lk.— Ver. 35. ἐστιν ἡ ἡμέρα, etc.: the night divided, Roman fashion, into four watches: 6-9, 9-12, 12-3, 3-6. Before the exile the Jews divided the night into three parts.— μακάριοι: μακάριοι: in Lk. xi. 5 on this word, found also in Acts xvi. 25, xx. 7.— ἀλεκτροφωνία, suddenly, here in Lk. ii. 13, and four times in Acts.— καθένως: this applies to all the servants, not merely to the porter; therefore all must watch as well as work. In the case of a master absent on a journey, the servants cannot know even the day, not to speak of the hour or watch of the night, as they could in the cases supposed in Lk. xii. 36, Mt. xxv. 1. Therefore they must keep awake not merely one night, but many nights, an incongruity which again suggests that we have not here an original utterance of Jesus, but a composite logion with elements borrowed from several parables.

CHAPTER XIV. THE PASSION HISTORY.—Vv. 1-2. Introduction (Mt. xxvi. 1-5, Lk. xxii. 1-3).— Ver. 1. ἦν δὲ τὴν μετέρατον: the first hint that the visit of Jesus to Jerusalem took place at passover season.— τὸ πάσχα καὶ τὰ ἐξομήνια: full name of the feast, which consisted of the passover proper beginning on the 14th Nisan, and the seven days of unleavened bread. Mt. and Lk. give each one only of the designations; Mt. the former, Lk. the latter. Mt.'s dual designation a manifest combination of Mt. and Lk., say the followers of Griesbach.— μετὰ δὲ ἡμέρας, indicates the point of time at which the Sanhedrins began seriously to consider how they could safely get rid of Jesus. Mt. turns this into an announcement by Jesus. Lk. generalises the precise note of time into a statement that the feast was approaching (ἐγενομένῳ).— ἦν δὲ ἡ ἡμέρα, in or with craft. ἦν = ἦν in Heb. Mt. has simply ἦν ἡ ἡμέρα, the dative instr.— Ver. 2. ἁσάρος ἅρις is a more difficult reading than ἦλε ὀ ἡ ἡμέρα of Mt., hence the correction in T.R. The ἅρις presupposes that the murder of Jesus during the feast was from the first regarded as out of the question, and the clause following partly makes that fact explicit, partly assigns a reason for it. They wanted to compass His death, but they were in a difficulty, for they felt and said to one another: it may not be on the feast, lest there be a popular disturbance.— μακάριοι: the fut. ind. instead of the more usual subjunctive after μακάριοι (cf. Col. ii. 8, Heb. iii. 12), implying the almost certain occurrence.
of a δέρματος, if an attempt were made on the life of Jesus during the feast. This shows how highly the Sanhedrists estimated the influence of Jesus.

The article is found in all the genders; το in GM cursives; τον in ΝΑΔΙΣ and many other uncials (Tisch.); τον in BCLA (Trg., W.H.).

The article is found in the Hebrew text (BCLD). The cardinal
number is here in the genitive of price after ἐπιθημαία.
In 1 Cor. xv. 6 ἰπάνα is followed by a dative depending on ἑφθη.—Ver. 6. ἐν ἐμοί, in me (cf. Mt. xvii. 12), for the more usual ἐν ἐμι (in Mt.), and imported into Mk. in T.R.—Ver. 7. καὶ ὅτι διὸ θάνατος, etc., and when ye wish ye can do them a kindness; a thought implied in the previous clause (the poor ye have always), and probably an expansion by Mk. (cf. Mt.), yet not superfluous: suggesting the thought that expenditure in one direction does not disqualify for beneficial acts in another. The willing-minded will always have enough for all purposes.—Ver. 8. δὲ ἔχεις (suppl. τούτων), what she had to do she did; the reference being not to the measure of her power (wealth) but to her opportunity: she did what lay to her hand, and could only be done then.—προδότης μους, she anticipated the anointing; the latter verb here only, the former in 1 Cor. xi. 21, Gal. vi. 1.—ἐνταφιασμόν: the noun answering to the verb in Mt., here and in John and in one place in the classics. —Ver. 9. τὰ δὲ δῶν τ. κ. for ἐν ό, etc., in Mt.; a constr. praeg., the idea of going to all parts of the world with the gospel being understood.
Vv. 10-11. Ἰδοὺ αὐτὸς ἦν ὁ Μάστερ (Mt. xxvii. 14-16, Lk. xxii. 3-6).—Ver. 11. ἐξαρίστηκαν, they rejoiced; when one of the twelve companions of Jesus unexpectedly turned up ready to deliver his Master into their hands. A most vivid feature omitted by Mt. in his summarising way. Well might they rejoice, as but for this windfall they might have been totally at a loss how to compass their end. —ἐπηγγέλσατο, they promised to pay, did not actually pay on the spot, as Mt.'s statement implies (δοτήσας, ver. 15).—ἐξελεύσετο, cf. ἐξελεύσον, ver. 1, in reference to the Sanhedrists. They were seeking means of getting rid of Jesus; Judas was now on the outlook for a chance of betraying Him into their hands. —ἀκαίρως here only in N. T., the
adjective and verb in Mk. vi. 21, 31, the noun in Mt. xxvi. 16.

Vv. 12-16. Arrangements for paschal feast (Mt. xxvi. 17-19, Lk. xxii. 7-13). Mk. is much more circumstantial in this section than Mt., his apparent aim being to explain how Judas did not find his opportunity at the paschal supper, the place of celebration being carefully concealed beforehand.—Ver. 12. τῇ... ἡμέρᾳ τ. Π. τάσχα ΄δνον: again a double note of time, the second clause indicating precisely that by the first day is meant the 14th Nisan. Schanz, following the Greek Fathers, takes πρῶτη in the first clause as πρῶτη· πρῶτη, yielding the same sense as πρὸ τ. δευ. τ. πάεχα in John xiii. 1.—τοῦ θείου; : the disciples would ask this question in good time, say in the forenoon of the 14th.—Ver. 13. θείου: more exact than Mt.; of course all the disciples would not be sent on such an errand. Lk. names the two.—ὑπάγετε, etc.: the instructions in Mk. are sufficient to guide the messengers. Mt.'s πρὸς τὸν διάν is manifestly too vague, and could not not have been spoken by Jesus.—ἐπωφελος: water-carrying was generally the occupation of women; hence a man performing the office would be more noticeable.—κεραμος (neuter of adjective κεράμος, earthen), an earthen pitcher, here and in Lk. xxii. 10.—Ver. 14. τὸ κατάλημα έμοι, my guest chamber. This έμοι of the best texts is interesting as suggesting a previous understanding between Jesus and the householder. It is not necessary to import the miraculous into the narrative.—Ver. 15. ἀνάγαινον (ἀνά, γαῖα = γη), a room above the earth, an upper room.—μέγα, large, enough for the company.—ἐστρώμενον, furnished with table-cushions.— месяцев, perhaps a synonym for ἐστρώμενον = furnished, all ready; possibly pointing to the removal of leaven (C.G.T.).

Vv. 17-21. The presence of a traitor announced (Mt. xxvi. 20-25, Lk. xxii. 21-23).—Ver. 17. ἔρχεται: after sunset He cometh to the place appointed for the feast, presumably after the two who had been sent to make arrangements had rejoined the company.—Ver. 18. οὐθέν μετ' ἐμοί: this clause, omitted in Mt., is designed to indicate, not the culprit, but the gravity of his offence = one of you, one who eats bread with me, a table companion.—Ver. 19. εἶς... κατά... εἶς, one by one = εἰς ἑαυτόν in Mt.: κατά is used adverbially, and hence is followed by εἰς instead of ὧν. For other instances of this usage of late Greek vide John viii. 9, Rom. xii. 5, and cf. Winer, § xxxvii. 3.—Ver. 20. To the anxious questioning of the disciples Mk.
12—45.

**ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ**

Kai ἄλλος, "Μή τι ἐγώ ἦν;" 20. Ο δὲ ἀποκρίθη 3 εἶπεν αὐτοῖς,

"Εἶς ἐκ τῶν δώδεκα, ὁ ἐμπαντόμοιος μετ' ἑμοῦ εἶς τὸ τροφόλιον."

21. ὁ μὲν ὑδὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὄψατο, καθὼς γέγραφατο περὶ αὐτοῦ. 4

οὐδὲ τῷ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἑκείνῳ, ἡμῖν οὖν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδόθησαν·

καὶ ἦν ὁ αὐτός, οὐ καθιστήθη ὁ ἀνθρώπος ἑκείνος."

22. Kai ἐνθιότων αὐτῶν, λαβὼν ὁ ἦτοις 5 ἐλογίσας ἐκλάσε, καὶ ἐδώκες αὐτοῖς, καὶ εἶπε, "Ἄδειτε, φάγετε. 8 τούτῳ ἄρτος

τὸ σῶμά μου." 23. Kai λαβὼν τὸ 9 ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας ἐδώκες

αὐτοῖς. 24. καὶ ἐπιστικὸν εἰς αὐτοῦ πάντες. 24. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Τούτῳ

ἐστι τὸ ἄρτον μου, τὸ τῆς καυνῆς διαθήκης, 10 τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκκυβερ

μένον. 25. ἀμὴν λέγω ὦμίν, ὅτι οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ πίω ἐκ τοῦ γεννήματος

tῆς ἄμυλου, ἦς τῆς θεμάτως ἑκείνης, ὅταν αὐτῷ πίνω καὶ ὑν ἐν τῇ

βαστίλεις τοῦ Θεοῦ." 3

1 καὶ ἄλλος μὴ τι εἰν (ADX al.) omitted in BCLPA, possibly by similar ending

(omit Tisch., W.H.).

2 Omitted in BBCDL; a mere mechanical expletive.

3 BBCL sah. cop. omit εκ (it comes from ver. 18).

4 BC have τὸ εὐθὺς. (W.H. brackets: τὸ).

5 στριατρισμοῦ εἰς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐδώκες αὐτοῖς, καὶ εἶπε, "Ἤδειτε, φάγετε. 8 τούτῳ ἄρτος τὸ σῶμά μου." 23. Kai λαβὼν τὸ 9 ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας ἐδώκες αὐτοῖς. 24. καὶ ἐπιστικὸν εἰς αὐτοῦ πάντες. 24. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Τούτῳ ἐστι τὸ ἄρτον μου, τὸ τῆς καυνῆς διαθήκης, 10 τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκκυβερμένον. 25. ἀμὴν λέγω ὦμίν, ὅτι οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ πίω ἐκ τοῦ γεννήματος τῆς ἄμυλου, ἦς τῆς θεμάτως ἑκείνης, ὅταν αὐτῷ πίνω καὶ ὑν ἐν τῇ βαστίλεις τοῦ Θεοῦ." 3

makes Jesus reply: one of the Twelve; he who dippeth with me in the dish. A repetition of the original declaration with variations: the Twelve for you, and dipping in the dish for eating; the former bringing out the gravity of the fact, the Twelve chosen to be Apostles of the faith, one of them the traitor of its Author; the latter narrowing the circle within which the traitor is to be found. Twelve ate with Jesus, only three or four would dip with Him.—ἐμπαντόμοιος, middle, dipping with his own hand: "haec vis medii verbi," Bengel.—Ver. 21. στριατρισμοῦ εἰς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐδώκες αὐτοῖς, καὶ εἶπε, "Ἤδειτε, φάγετε. 8 τούτῳ ἄρτος τὸ σῶμά μου." 23. Kai λαβὼν τὸ 9 ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας ἐδώκες αὐτοῖς. 24. καὶ ἐπιστικὸν εἰς αὐτοῦ πάντες. 24. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Τούτῳ ἐστι τὸ ἄρτον μου, τὸ τῆς καυνῆς διαθήκης, 10 τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκκυβερμένον. 25. ἀμὴν λέγω ὦμίν, ὅτι οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ πίω ἐκ τοῦ γεννήματος τῆς ἄμυλου, ἦς τῆς θεμάτως ἑκείνης, ὅταν αὐτῷ πίνω καὶ ὑν ἐν τῇ βαστίλεις τοῦ Θεοῦ." 3

Cf. Mk. ii. 20, "days will come, etc., and then shall they fast, in that day." Vv. 22-25. The Lord's Supper (Mt. xxvi. 26-29, Lk. xxii. 19-20), vide notes on Mt.'s account, to which Mk.'s closely corresponds.—Ver. 22. ἐσθίοντων αὐτῶν, while they were eating, as in ver. 18; a very general indication of time. This and the announcement of the betrayal are for Mt. and Mk. the two memorabilia of the paschal feast of Jesus with His disciples, and all they know is that they happened during feast-time.—লাদেস, take, without φάγετε, as in Mt.; the more laconic expression likely to be the original. "Take" implies "eat."—Ver. 23. καὶ ἐστιν, etc., and they drank of it, all. In Mt.'s account Jesus bids them drink, as He had previously bidden them eat. Mk.'s version strikes one as the more primitive; Mt.'s as influenced by liturgical usage.—Ver. 24. καὶ εἶπεν: while they drank the cup (not after they had drunk it, De Wette: nor before they began to drink, as Mt.'s narrative by itself would suggest), Jesus explained to them the symbolic import of
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32. Καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς χεριόν ὡς τὸ νόμον Γενεαρέην· καὶ λέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, "Καθίσατε ὅσε, ὅσο προσεύχεσθε." 33. Καὶ ἔρχεται εἰς χεριόν ὡς τὸ νόμον Γενεαρέην:

the cup. The important point in Mk.'s account of the words, as compared with Mt.'s, is the omission of the expression, εἰς ἑαυτοὺς ἠμαρτίαν.

Vv. 26-31. On the way to Gethsemane

(Mt. xxvi. 30-35, Lk. xxii. 39).—Ver. 26, exactly as in Mt. xxvi. 30, states that after singing the paschal hymn the company went forth towards the Mount of Olives.—Ver. 27. πάντες σκανδαλισθήσοντες, ye all shall be made to stumble; absolutely, without the addition of ἐν ἐμοί ἐν τῇ μυκῇ ταύτῃ imported into the text from Mt. in T.R. It was a startling announcement in broad general terms that the disciple-circle was about to experience a moral breakdown. The announcement was made not by way of reproach, but rather as a preface to a more cheering prophecy of an early reunion.—Ver. 28. Διὰ μᾶς, stronger than Μt.'s μ. δι' ἐμοί shall be offended, but (be of good cheer) after my resurrection I will go before you, as your Shepherd (προδέξα ὑμᾶς) into Galilaea.—Ver. 29. It is the former part of the Master's speech that lays hold of Peter's mind; hence he promptly proceeds to make protestations of fidelity.—ἐὰν καί, etc.: even if (as is likely) all the rest shall be offended (the future, because the case put is conceived to be probable), yet certainly (ἄλλα strongly opposing what follows to what goes before; vide Klotz, p. 93, on the force of διὰ in the apodosis of a conditional proposition) not I.—Ver. 30. To this over-confident ἄλλα ὀφθαλμον of the disciple, the Master returns a very pointed and peremptory reply: I tell thee that ἐκεῖνος (εἰς emphatic today) σήμερον, on this night (more precise indication of time), before the cock crow twice (still more precise indication of time), shall deny me, not once, but again and again and again (ὑπὲρ).—Ver. 31. ἔκρεισθε, abundantly in matter and manner, with vehemence and iteration; a διὰ λέγει, διὰ λέγει, kept saying: that he would not deny his Master even if he had to die for it.—σκοτεινὸς, a stronger word than Mt.'s ὀμολόγος, in the same way, and probably in the same words. But the words of the others were simply a faint echo of Peter's vehement and copious talk. They feebly said once (εἰςτον = εἰς τον what he said strongly again and again (διὰ λέγει).—Ver. 32-42. In Gethsemane

(Mt. xxvi. 36-46, Lk. xxii. 40-46).—Ver. 33. ἕρξετο, introduces the description of our Lord's awful experience in the garden.—ἐκεῖνος, to be amazed; in Mk. only, first in ix. 15, where see remarks on its meaning. Though Jesus had long...
known, and had often with realistic plainness spoken of, what was to befall Him, yet the vivid sense of what it all meant came upon His soul at this hour, as a sudden appalling revelation. The other two words used by Mk. to describe Christ's state of mind (ἀποκαλύφθης, "εὑρίσκεται") occur in Mt. also.—Ver. 35. ἐγένετο (in Mt. T.R. as in Mk.), imperfect: He fell again and again on the ground. It was a protracted desperate struggle.—καὶ προσηγχέτοι Ἰσα: Mk. first indicates the gist of Christ's prayers (=that if possible the hour might pass from Him), then reports what Jesus said (ver. 36). In the prayer of Jesus the experience dreaded is called the σῶρ, as in Mt. The Hour and the Cup—both alike solemn, suggestive names.—Ver. 36. Ἀββᾶ, ὁ πατήρ: in the parallels simply πατήρ. In the Apostolic Church the use of the double appellation among Gentile Christians was common (vide Rom. viii. 15, Gal. iv. 6), Ἀββᾶ having become a proper name and πατήρ being added as its interpretation = God our Father. Mk. imparts into the prayer of our Lord this apostolic usage. Jesus doubtless would use only one of the names, probably the Aramaic.—παρέσχε (cf. 1 Tim. ii. 1), remove this cup; equivalent to παρέλθῃ in ver. 35 (Lk. xxii. 42).—ἀλλ’ ὅφ., etc.: "but not what (ἰδίοις) I will, but what Thou"; elliptical but clear and expressive: γενέσθαι or γενέσθαι δὲ (not γενέσθαι which would demand μὴ before θέλω) is understood (vide Holtzmann, H. C., and Weiss in Meyer).—Ver. 37. τοῦ Πέτρου: to the disciple who had been so confident of his loyalty, but also from whom Jesus expected most in the way of sympathy.—Χειρ: the old, not the new, disciple, name; ominous.—Ver. 38. This exhortation to watch and pray is given in almost identical terms in Mt. and Mk. It looks like a secondary version of what our Lord actually said.—Ver. 39. Mk., like Mt., divides

1 B has τον before each name (W.H.). Many MSS. have the article only with Πέτρου.
2 μετ’ αὐντον in ΝΒCD.
3 CDΛΔ have προσῆλθων, but προσῆλθων, found in ΝΒ al., seems to be the word needed. προσήλθων is a frequent mistake of the scribes.
4 εἶπεν in ΝΒΛ (εἶπεν from Mt.).
5 τοῦτο εἰ. εμοῦ in ΝΑΒCLΔΣ al.
6 εἶπεν in ΝΒ (Tisch., W.H.). Weiss rejects the omission of εἰς before εἰς; a very frequent mistake in the old MSS.
7 For νποερτεψάς ... παλιν (ACΔ, Tisch.) ΝΒΛ have παλιν εἰςων αὐντον (W.H.). D the same, omitting παλιν.
8 αὐτον before οι φι. in ΝΒCDΛ, and καταβαρευμένοι in ΑΒΛΔ; καταβαρευμενοι in D.
9 αὐτο. before αὐτο ΝΑΒCDΛ.

10 hastov before each name (W.H.). Many MSS. have the article only with Πέτρου.
11 μετ’ αὐντον in ΝΒCD.
12 CDΛΔ have προσῆλθων, but προσῆλθων, found in ΝΒ al., seems to be the word needed. προσῆλθων is a frequent mistake of the scribes.
13 εἶπεν in ΝΒΛ (εἶπεν from Mt.).
14 τοῦτο εἰ. εμοῦ in ΝΑΒCLΔΣ al.
15 εἶπεν in ΝΒ (Tisch., W.H.). Weiss rejects the omission of εἰς before εἰς; a very frequent mistake in the old MSS.
16 For νποερτεψάς ... παλιν (ACΔ, Tisch.) ΝΒΛ have παλιν εἰςων αὐντον (W.H.). D the same, omitting παλιν.
17 αὐτον before οι φι. in ΝΒCDΛ, and καταβαρευμένοι in ΑΒΛΔ; καταβαρευμενοι in D.
18 αὐτο. before αὐτο ΝΑΒCDΛ.
41. Kai ἔρχεται τὸ τρίτον, καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, “Καθεύθετε τὸν λαιτὸν καὶ ἀναπαύεσθε. ἀνέχετε ἣλευν ἢ ὄρα. Ἰδοὺ, παραδίδοται ο ὦς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου εἰς τῶν χειρῶν τῶν ἀμαρτωλῶν. 42. ἐγείρεσθε, ἀνέμου ἦν Ἰδοὺ, ὁ παραδίδοος με ἔγγυτε.”

43. Καὶ εὐθὺς, ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ λαλοῦστος, παραγίνεται ἠοίδας, εἰς ἅ τῶν διδάκτα, καὶ μετ’ αὐτοῦ ὄχλος πολὺς μετὰ μαχαιρίων καὶ a. Ch. 1 τοῦ Ἰουλίου, παρὰ τῶν ἄρχων καὶ τῶν ἱερεῖων καὶ τῶν ἱερατικῶν καὶ τῶν προσβέτερων.

44. ἢ διδάκτα δὲ ὁ παραδίδοος αὐτὸν ὑσύμνων αὐτοῖς, λέγων, “Ὅν ἡ ἰλήνῳ, αὐτός ὁτι κρατήσατε αὐτὸν, καὶ ἀπαγάγετε ἄσφαλεος,”

45. Καὶ ἠλθὼν, εὐθὺς προσελήνω ἀυτῷ λέγει, “Ραββί, ραββί 5.”

the agony into three acts, but he reports the words spoken by Jesus in prayer only in the first. Mt. gives the prayer of Jesus in the second act, as well as in the first, generalising in the third, where he repeats the formula here used by Mk.: τὸν αὐτὸν λέγον εἰς τοῦ. — Ver. 40. καταβρανόμενοι, “their eyes were very heavy”; R. V., weighed down with irresistible sleep. — καταβρανόμενοι, here and occasionally in the Sept. = the more usual καταβαλόμενοι (from the simple verb βαλανόμενοι comes βεβαρμένου in T.R.). — καὶ ὥρα ἡμείων, etc.: this remark recalls the experience of the same three on the hill of transfiguration (cf. ix. 6). But in the earlier instance the reference is to the stupidity produced by sleep, here probably to shame on account of unseasonable sleep. They felt that they ought to have kept awake during their Master’s hour of trial, and knew not how to excuse themselves. — Ver. 41. ἀνέχετε, “it is enough,” A. V. = suffice in Vulgate; one of the puzzling words in Mk’s vocabulary to which many meanings have been given. Beza, in doubt as to Jerome’s interpretation, was satisfied at last by a quotation from Anacreon coming into his mind, in which the poet, giving instructions to a painter for the portrait of his mistress, concludes: ἀνέχετε, βλέπω γὰρ αὐτήν· τέχα, κυρέ, καὶ λαλήσομεν. = “Enough! the girl herself I view: so like, ’twill soon be speaking, too”. Elsner and Raphael follow Beza. Kurpke dissents and renders: ἀνέχετε, ἠλευνόν ὑμᾶς, as if it were ἠλευνέω καὶ ἠλεύν. Ἰδοὐ, = the hour (of my passion) is come and calls you and me away from this scene. Most modern commentators accept the rendering, “It is enough”. Vide an interesting note in Field’s Otium Nor. The meaning is: I have conquered in the struggle; I need your sympathy no longer; you may sleep now if you will.

Vv. 43-52. The apprehension (Mt. xxvi. 47-56, Lk. xxii. 47-53.) — Ver. 43. εὐθὺς, etc. (Ἰδοὺ in Mt.), straightway, even while He is speaking, appears Judas, who is carefully defined by surname and position as one of the Twelve. At what point of time the traitor left the company on his nefarious errand is not indicated. According to Weiss (in Meyer) the evangelist conceives of Judas as going with the rest to Gethsemane and stealing away from the nine, after the three had been taken apart, having now satisfied himself as to the Master’s whereabouts. — παρὰ τ. ἄρχ., etc.: παρὰ goes along with παραγίνεται, and implies that Judas and those with him had an official commission from the authorities, the details of which are carefully specified. — Ver. 44. διδάκτα: the pluperfect, but without augment, vide Winer, § xii. 9.—σύνονσις (neuter of adjective σύνονσιμός: σύν, σύμ: a sign previously agreed on (σύμοιρα in Mt.), a late word severely condemned by Phrynichus, p. 418, here only in N. T. In Sept. for Δ as an “ensign” (Is. v. 26). —ἄσφαλος may mean either: lead Him away with an easy mind (He will not attempt escape); or: lead, etc., cautiously, carefully. — He may slip out of your hands as He has done before (Lk. iv. 30). Judas was just the kind of man to have
a superstitious dread of Christ's preternatural power.—**Ver. 45. ἐδώκαν ἐνέδω προσέλθαν = arrived on the spot he without delay approaches Jesus; no hesitation, promptly and adroitly done.—*Παρρήσια: without Mt's χαίρε, and only once spoken (twice in T.R.), the fervour of false love finding expression in the kiss (καταφθάνατεν, vide notes on Mt.) rather than in words.

**Vv. 47-52. Attempt at rescue.—**Ver. 47. εἰς τ. ἁπάντα one of those standing by, i.e., one of the three, Peter according to the fourth gospel (xviii. 10).—**τὴν μάχη, the sword = his sword, as if each disciple was armed; vide on Mt.—*στάρειον = σταυρόν, T.R., diminutive of σταυρός; the use of diminutives for the members of the body was common in popular speech. Vide Lobeck, Phryn., p. 211.—**Ver. 48. On this and the following verse vide notes on Mt.—**Ver. 49. ίνα περισταθήσων αὐτῷ: this may be a case of ίνα with the subjunctive used as an imperative = let the Scriptures be fulfilled. Cf. 2 Cor. viii. 7, last clause, and consult Winer, § xliii. 5 d. —**Ver. 50. καὶ ἀφίησε, etc., and desiring Him fled **all (ὑπόπτες last, vide above): the nine with the three, the three not less than the nine— all alike panic-stricken.—**Ver. 51 introduces a little anecdote peculiar to Mk., the story of an unknown friend, not one of the Twelve, who had joined the company, and did not fly with the rest.—**συνεκλογηθεὶς αὐτός, was following Jesus; when He was being led away, and after the disciples had fled.—**περιβεβλημένος συνάντη αὐτὸν: this suggests that the youth, on hearing some sudden report, rose out of his bed and rushed out in his night-shirt, or, being absolutely naked, hurriedly threw about his body a loose cotton or linen sheet. The statement that on being laid hold of he cast off the garment favours the latter alternative.—**Ver. 52. γυμνὸς ἀκολόυθη, fled naked, in the literal sense, whereon Bengel remarks: "on a night not without a moon; fear conquers shame in great danger". (A few years ago a young wife chased a thief, who had been stealing her wedding presents, through the streets of Glasgow, in the early hours of the morning, in her night-gown; not without success. Her husband modestly stayed behind to put on his clothes.)—Who was this young man? Mk. the evangelist, say many, arguing: the story was of no interest to any one but the hero of it, therefore the hero was the teller of the tale. A good argument, unless a motive can be assigned for the insertion of the narrative other than
merely personal interest. Schanz suggests a desire to exhibit in a concrete instance the danger of the situation, and the forocrisy of the enemies of Jesus. On the whole one feels inclined to acquiesce in the judgment of Hahn, quoted by Holtz., H. C., that in this curious incident we have "the monogram of the painter (Mkr.) in a dark corner of the picture". Brandt, however (Die Ev. Gesch., p. 28), dissents from this view.

Vv. 53-65. Before Caiafas (Mt. xxvi. 57-68, Lk. xxii. 54, 66-71).—Ver. 53. συνήχεσθαι: α. πάντες, etc.: again all the three orders of the Sanhedrists are named, who have been summoned to meet about the time the party sent to apprehend Jesus might be expected to arrive.—Ver. 54. ο Πέτρος: the story of Peter's denial begins here, and, after being suspended by the account of the trial, is resumed at ver. 66.—εστὶν μακρόθεν, from afar (ἐστὶ redundant here as elsewhere), fearful, yet drawn on by love and curiosity.—τόν έσον εἰς: a redundant but expressive combination, suggesting the idea of one stealthily feeling his way into the court of the palace, venturing further and further in, and gaining courage with each step (vide Weiss, Mk. Evan., p. 470).—στρατηγὸν: nights cold even at Easter in Palestine; a fire in the court welcome in the early hours of morning, when something unusual was going on. "However hot it may be in the daytime, the nights in spring are almost always cold".—Purser, Wanderungen, p. 241.—πρὸς το φῶς, at the fire; here called light, because it was there to give light as well as heat. Elsner and Raphael cite instances of the use of φῶς for fire from Xenophon. Hesychius gives φῶς as one of its meanings.

Vv. 55-56. The trial and condemnation.—Ver. 55. μαρτυρίας: Mt. has ψυχομαρτυρίας, justly so characterised, because the Sanhedrists wanted evidence for a foregone conclusion: evidence that would justify a sentence of death.—Ver. 56. ημείς, equal, to the same effect, as the testimonies of true witnesses would, of course, be. Grotius takes the word as meaning, not equal to one another, but equal to the demands of weighty evidence and justifying condemnation. Elsner agrees, arguing from the use of the word again, in reference to the evidence about the temple logion of Jesus. These witnesses, he holds, are not represented as making conflicting statements, but simply as making statements not sufficiently weighty—not equal to the occasion. There is some force in this.—Ver. 57. τῶν, some, for which Mt. has the more definite δόξος, the smallest number necessary to establish a matter.—Ver. 58. κατά, etc.: Mk.'s version of the testimony borne by the witnesses differs in important respects from that of Mt.; viz., by the insertion of the words τὸν χειροποιητόν and ἄλλου χειροποιητόν. Mt.'s form doubtless comes nearest to what the witnesses actually said. Mk.'s puts into their mouths, to a certain extent, the sense in which he and his fellow-Christians understood Christ's saying, viz., as a prophecy that the material temple would be superseded by a spiritual temple = the community of believers in Jesus. If they had really spoken, as here reported, the falsehood would have lain rather in the animus of their statement than in its meaning: the animus of men who regarded it as impious to speak of the temple of God being destroyed, as contemptuous to
characterise it as hand-made, and as blasphemous to suggest that another could take its place.—Ver. 60. εἰς μέσιν: a graphic feature in Mk., suggesting that the high priest arose from his seat and advanced into the semi-circle of the council towards Jesus—the action of an irritated, baffled man.—οὖν ἀντικρίνει: on the high priest’s question vide notes on Mt.—Ver. 61. ἔπιστο λέγει πρὸς αὐτῷ, the Blessed One, here only, absolutely, as a name for God. Usually, an epithet attached to Κόρος (Wünsche, Beiträge).—Ver. 62. Ἐγώ εἰμι. On Christ’s reply to the high priest affirming the Messianic claim, vide notes on Mt.—Ver. 63. τῶν χειρῶν: his tunics, or undergarments, of which persons in good position wore two. —Ver. 64. τί ὄντιν φαίνεται, what appears to you to be the appropriate penalty of such blasphemous speech? = τί όντιν 8ομένι in Mt. Nösgen denies the equivalence, and renders Mk.’s peculiar phrase: what lies for you on the hand, what is now your duty? with appeal to Xenophon, Anab., v., 7, 3.—Ver. 65. τίνες: presumably Sanhedrists. —περικάλλτειν: Mt. says nothing of this, but he as well as Mk. represents them as asking Jesus to prophesy. Mt.’s version implies that Jesus was struck from behind, Mk.’s in front.—οἱ ὑπάρχοντες: following the example of their masters.—παριστάσατοι αὐτὸν ὅλος, received Him with slaps of the open hand: a phrase recalling the Latin, accipere aliquem verbis.

Vv. 66-72. Peter’s denial (Mt. xxvi. 69-75, Lk. xxii. 56-62).—Ver. 66. κατειλθείς ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ, below in the court, implying that the trial of Jesus had taken place in a chamber on a higher level.—ἐξεγράφη μᾶς, etc., cometh one of the maids of the high priest—a servant in his palace, on some errand that night when all things were out of their usual course. That a maid should be astir and on duty at that unsuitable hour was itself a sign that something extraordinary was going on.—Ver. 67. ὑπεξε: Peter, sitting at the fire, catches her eye, and she sees at once
that he is a stranger. Going closer to him, and looking sharply into his face in the dim fire-light ( libidoσα), she comes at once to her conclusion.— καὶ σὺ, etc., thou also went with the Nazarene—that Jesus; spoken in a contemptuous manner, a faithful echo of the tone of her superiors. The girl had probably seen Peter in Christ's company in the streets of Jerusalem, or in the temple during the last few days, and doubtless she had heard disparaging remarks about the Galilean prophet in the palace.— Ver. 68. ὁτινιδίκα, etc., I neither know nor understand, thou, what thou sayest.— οὐσιν-οὖν connect closely the two verbs as expressing inability to comprehend what she means. The unusual emphatic position of σὺ (σὺ γὰρ λέγεις, smoothed down into τι σὺ λέγεις in T.R.) admirably reflects affected astonishment.— ἐξῆλθεν: he slunk away from the fire into the forecourt— προαύλιον, here only in N. T.— καὶ ἀλήθεια ἐφώνησεν: these words, omitted in ΝΒΛ, are of very dubious authenticity. Weiss and Holtz- 
mann think they were inserted by copyists under the impression that the words of Jesus to Peter, ver. 30, meant that the cock was to crow twice in close succession, whereas the διὰ referred to the second time of cock-crowing; the beginning of the second watch after midnight. Schanz, while regarding this explanation of διὰ as unnatural, admits that it is difficult to understand how this first crow did not remind Peter of the Lord's warning word.— Ver. 69. ὁ παθιασθης: the article naturally suggests that it is the same maid, and probably but for harmonic interests there would have been no doubt on the subject. Yet the fact that Mt. makes it another obliges us to ask whether Mk.'s expression necessarily means the same person. Grotius, whom Rosenmüller follows, says η may here, as occasionally elsewhere = ἵπται. Of more weight is the suggestion that it means the maid on duty in that particular place, the fore- 
court (Schanz and Klostermann; the remarks of the latter specially worthy of notice). On first thoughts one might deem παλαις decisive as to identity, but (1) it is wanting in B, and (2) its most probable position is just before λέγεις, and the meaning, that Peter was a second time spoken to (or at) on the subject of his connection with Jesus, not that the same person spoke in both cases. On the whole a certain element of doubt remains, which cannot be eliminated by exegetical considerations. In favour of one maid is the consideration that two able to recognise Peter is more unlikely than one. Yet the two might be together when they saw Peter previously, or the one might point him out to the other that night. In Mt.'s narrative the standers-by seem also to have inde- 
pendent knowledge of Peter. In Mk. the maid gives them information. On the whole, Mk., as was to be expected, gives the clearer picture of the scene.— τοὶς παρεστῶσιν, to those standing by; pointing to Peter, and speaking so that he could hear.— Ver. 70. Now, it is the bystanders who persecute Peter with the charge of being a disciple.— ἄληθος: they are quite sure of it, for two reasons:
67-72.

EUAGGELION

62 αὐτῶν εἰ; καὶ γὰρ Γαλιλαίος εἰ, καὶ ἡ λαλίς σου ὄμοιεῖς." 1
71. Ο θὰ ἔριετο ανάθεσάζεις καὶ ομολέες,2 "Οτι σῶκ σίδα τῶν αὐτῶν τοῦτον, δο λέγεται." 72. Καὶ εἰς δεύτερον ἀλέκτωρ εὐφηγοῦσα. Καὶ ἀνεμοῖο διὰ πέτρος τοῦ ἰματας αὐτής εἶναι αὐτοῖς δὲ ἰματός, "Οτι πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φωνήσαι δίς, ἀπαρκής με τρίς." 3 καὶ ἐπιβάλλων 6 ἐκλάει.

1 καὶ η λαλ. σ. ὄμοιεῖς is imported from Mt.; omitted in ΝΒCDL (Tisch., W.H., Weiss).
2 ομολέεις in BL al. (ομολεις in Mt.).
3 καὶ followed by σῶκος in ΝBLD; omitted in ACINX, etc., which insert και αλεκ. εὐφηγοῦσα in ver. 68.
4 το ἰματας in ΝΑΒCLΔ, corrected into the more usual τῶν ἰματας in some copies.
5 B places δις before φωνήσαι, and ΝΒCLΔ have τρίς με ἀπαρκής instead of the order in T.R.
6 For επιβάλλων εκλάει D has ἰματας εκλάει, and is followed by Latin, Egyptian, and Syriac vers., including Syr. Sin.

(1) the maid’s confidence not specified but implied in the καὶ γὰρ, which introduces an additional reason; (2) Παλιλαίος εἰ = you are (by your speech) a Galilean. The addition in some MSS., καὶ ἡ λαλίς σ., etc., explanatory of the term Galilean, would be quite in Mk.’s manner, but the best authorities omit it.—Ver. 71. ἀναθέματεν: used absolutely, to call down curses on himself in case he was telling lies. Μt. has καταθάλε, which is probably a contraction from κατααθάλε. (in T.R.).—Ver. 72. σῳδός: omitted in the MSS. which insert a first cock-crow in ver. 68, as implying that this was the first crow at that hour, as in Μt.—ἐκ δεύτερου (omitted in Μt. because apparently implying a first cock-crow during the denial, which they omit) must be understood, Mk. as referring to the second time of cock-crowing (three in the morning), the first being at midnight.—ἐπιβάλλων: another puzzle in Mk.’s vocabulary; very variously interpreted. Most modern interpreters adopt the rendering in the A. V. and R. V., "when he thought thereon." (ἐπιβάλλων τῶν νοτῶν). Weizsäcker: "er bedachte es und weinte." Theophylact took ἐπιβάλλων = ἐπικαλυφέραμεν τὴν κεφαλήν, having covered his head (that he might weep unrestrainedly), a rendering which Frizsche and Field (Oἰτίαν Ναυν.) decidedly support. Field remarks: "it may have been a trivial or colloquial word, such as would have stirred the bile of a Phrynichus or a Thomas Magister, who would have inserted it in their Index Expurgatorius, with a caution: ἐπιβάλλων μὴ λέγε ἀλλὰ ἐγκαλυφέραμεν ἢ ἐπικαλυφέραμεν." Brandt (Dis Ev. Gesch., p. 31), adopting a suggestion by Holwerda, thinks the original word may have been ἐπιβάλλων = going out, or flinging himself out. Klostermann ingeniously suggests: "stopped suddenly in his course of denial, like a man, running headlong, knocking suddenly against an obstacle in his way". The choice seems to lie between the renderings: "thinking thereon" and "covering his head".

CHAPTER XV. THE PASSION HISTORY CONTINUED.—Vv. 1-5. Before Pilate (Μt. xxvii. 1-14, Λκ. xxiii. 1-10).—Ver. 1. εὐθύς, πρῶτο, without delay, quam primum, in the morning watch, which might mean any time between three and six, but probably signifies after sunrise. —ἀμβούλιον will mean either a consultation or the result, the resolution come to, according as we adopt the reading: ποιήσαστες (Τ.R. = ΒΔ) or ποιήσαστες (ΝCL).—καὶ δὴν τὸ συνέδριον: the καὶ simply identifies= even the whole Sanhedrin, and does not imply that, besides the three classes previously mentioned, some others were present (e.g., στρατηγοῦ τοῦ λεον: Λκ. xxii. 52). This added clause signifies that it was a very important meeting, as, in view of its aim, to prepare the case for Pilate, it obviously was. The Sanhedrists had accomplished nothing till they had got the matter put in such a form that they might hope to prevail with the procurator, with whom lay the jus gladii, to do their wicked will, and
of course that Jesus claimed to be the Christ would not serve that purpose. Vide notes on Mt.—παλάτων; without the article in best MSS. on this the first mention; with, in subsequent reference. Mk. does not think it necessary to say who or what Pilate was, not even mentioning, as Mt., that he was the governor. —Ver. 2. ὄν ἐς β. Pilate’s question reveals the secret of the morning meeting. The crafty Sanhedrists put a political construction on the confession of Jesus. The Christ, therefore a pretender to the throne of Israel. Vide on Mt.—Ver. 3. πολλά: either an adverb = much, or the accusative after κατηγοροῦν. As to the matter of these accusations vide on Mt.—Ver. 4. τώρα, answering to πολλά in ver. 3, might mean “how grave,” Thayer’s Grimm, but probably =how many, as in vi. 38, viii. 5, 19.—Ver. 5. δότε δαμακ. τ. π. Mt. adds λευκωτα. The governor had never seen a prisoner like this before. He does not believe Him to be a political pretender, but he sees that He is a remarkable man, and feels that he must proceed cautiously, groping his way amid the parties and passions of this strange people. Vide below.

Vv. 6-15. Jesus or Barabbas? (Mt. xxvii. 15-26, Lk. xxiii. 16-25).—Ver. 6. ἀπελέυ, imperfect = Mt.’s εἰσελθεῖσας ἀπολογίαν, pointing to a practice of the governor at passover season; on which vide on Mt.—οὐσὶν ἠπίστω, “whomsoever they desired.” A. V. The R. V. adopts the reading preferred by W. H., ὅσοι παραστῆτε, and translates “whom they asked of him.” It is difficult to decide between the two readings, as the ἡπ αραβᾶς might easily be changed into ἡπ, and vice versa. In favour of the R. V. is the fact that παρακατηγοῦντο ordinarily in N. T., as in the classics, means to refuse, and also that διακατηγοῦν very strongly emphasises the finality of the popular choice—they might ask the release of any one, no matter whom—such is the force of ἡπ; it would be granted. On these grounds Field (Otium Nor.) decides for the R. V.—Ver. 7. σταυροστάτον (σωτός, T. R.): this word (here only in N. T.) contains an interesting hint as to the nature of the offence committed by Barabba and his associates. They were no mere band of brigands (Ἀρματης: John xviii. 40), but men engaged in an insurrection, probably of a political character, rising out
of the restless desire of many for independence, and in connection with that

guilty of murder (φόνον,) at least some of them (οἵτινες), Barabbas included.—
tῇ στάσει: the article refers back to σταυρωμάτων = the insurrection implied in

there being insurrectionists. Mk.

therefore does not refer to the insurrection as known to his readers. Perhaps

he knew nothing about it himself, nor do we.—Ver. 8. ἀναβας, etc.: Mk.

assigns the initiative to the people. So Lk.; Mt. and John to Pilate. The
difference is not important to the course of the history. The custom existing, this

incident was bound to come about some-

how. Nor does it greatly affect the

question as to the attitude of Pilate. In
either case he was simply feeling his

way. The custom gave him a chance of

feeling the popular pulse, a most im-

portant point for a ruler of his opportu-
nist type.—καθὼς, here = that which.

—Ver. g. ὥθησε, etc.: Pilate makes the
tentative suggestion that the favoured

person should be Jesus; whom he de-
signates “King of the Jews,” to see

how the people would take a title which the Sanhedrins regarded as a mortal

offence.—Ver. 10. ἄλλας ἡμεῖς, it gradually
dawned upon him. Pilate would see the

animus of the Sanhedrins in their many

accusations (ver. 3), from which it would appear that Christ’s real offence was

His great influence with the people.

Hence the attempt to play off the one

party against the other: the people

against the priests.—Ver. 11. ἄνευσεν, the

aorist implies that the priests stirred

up the people with success, to the effect

that their request to Pilate was in favour

of Barabbas. One may wonder how they

so easily gained their purpose. But

Barabbas, as described by Mk., repre-

sented a popular passion, which was

stronger than any sympathy they might

have for so unworthy a character as

Jesus—the passion for political liberty.

The priests would know how to play on

that feeling. What unprincipled charac-

ters they were! They accuse Jesus to

Pilate of political ambition, and they re-

commend Barabbas to the people for

the same reason. But a “holy” end sancti-

fies the means! On the contrast between

Jesus and Barabbas vide Klostermann.

—Ver. 12. It is presupposed that the

people have intimated their preference

for Barabbas perhaps by the cry: not

Jesus, but Barabbas. Hence Pilate pro-
ceeds to ask: “what then, am I to do

with Him whom ye call (λέγετε) the

King of the Jews?” That whom ye call

was very astute. It ought to bring out

the real feeling of the people, as from

the next verse we learn that it did.—

Ver. 13. ἔδωκαν: they had intimated

their will already by a popular shout:

Barabbas, not Jesus; now they intamate

their feeling about Jesus by a second

shout with the unmistakable ring of re-

probation in it: Crucify Him! That

is what Pilate’s ἔλεγες has brought out.

It has been taken as an insult.

The sense is the same if, with B, we

omit ἔν. Pilate’s question then was: what

then shall I do, tell me, to the King

of the Jews? The sting lies in the


22. Kai phrouton auton epi Golgothas topon, kai esti mebemennou-

title.— Ver. 14. This final speech of Pilate presents a subtle combination of honesty and craft. He says what he really thinks: that Jesus is innocent, and he makes sure that the people really mean to stand to what they have said.

—perisostereos, beyond measure: the positive here is stronger than the comparative perisostereos (T.R.), and it is far better attested.—Ver. 15. Pilate was now quite sure what the people wished, and so, as an opportunist, he let them have their way.—tau ikanon polhsera: to satisfy (here only in N. T.) = satisfacere in Vulg., perhaps a Latinism (vide Grotius), but found in later Greek (vide Raphel and Elmer).—phragellassas: certainly a Latinism, from flagellare.

Vv. 16-20. Mocked by the soldiers (Mt. xxvii. 27-31).—Ver. 16. The soldiers in charge of the prisoner conduct Him into the barracks (eis tis adelh, kai esti praitorion = into the court, that is, the praetorium—Weizsacker), and call together their comrades to have some sport.—Eis ton tin stekara: "a popular exaggeration" (Sevin.); at most 200 men.—Ver. 17. evdousoun for evdousoun, T.R.: a rare word, not in classics, found in Sept. and Joseph. (and in Lk. vii. 27, xvi. 19), and because rare, the more probable reading.—porafoun, a purple garment, for M.'s chlamyda koxin = "scarlet robe".—aiadanhv s.: here and in John have 4. 

Vv. 21-25. The crucifixion (Mt. xxvii. 32-37, Lk. xxiii. 26, 33-38).—Ver. 21. aggerioseis: on this word vide on Mt. v. 41.—ap` agrou: this detail in Mk. and Lk. has been taken as an unintentional hint that the crucifixion took place a day earlier than the synoptical statements imply. Coming from the country, i.e., from his work. But even Holtzmann, H. C., disallows the inference: "as if nine in the morning were evening after work time, and eis agrou in Mk. xvi. 12 meant ploughing or reaping".—Alep, "Raph.: these names imply interest in the persons referred to within the circle of M.'s first readers, presumably well-known Christians. Rufus in Rom. xvi. 13? Alexander in Acts xix. 33?—Ver. 22. phroutov a.: they carry Him: "serunt, non modo ducunt," Bengel. It would appear that Jesus was so weak through the strain of the last few days, and the scourging,
4—32. ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ


1 μεθερμνημένον in VBL.
2 οὐκ ἐστιν in VBL.
3 VBLA omit τινιν.
4 For the participles BL have σταυρωντων αὐτον καλ.
5 For διεμερίζον (in minusc. only) read διεμερίζονται.
6 ΝΑΒΣ omits this verse, which is interpolated from Lk. xxii. 37.
7 οἰκοδομῶν before ΤΡ. in VBL. ev is wanting in D and other uncials (Tisch. omits, W. H. brackets).
8 For καταβας ΝΒΔΛΑ have καταβας.
9 οὐκ εἶναι omitted in ΝΒΔΛΑ.
10 ΝΒΔΛΑ omit τον before Ἰσραήλ.

that He was unable to walk, not to speak of carrying His cross. He had to be borne as the sick were borne to Him (Mk. i. 32).—Ver. 23. εἶδον: the conative imperfect = they tried to give, offered.—εἰσπνευσάμενον οἶνον, wine drugged with myrrh, here only in N. T. Cf. Mt.'s account.—οἶκος ἡλιᾶς: Mt. says Jesus tasted the drink. He would not take it because He knew that it was meant to stupefy.—Ver. 24. τις τι ἄρη, who should receive what; two questions pitilessly condensed into one, another example in Lk. xix. 15, vide Winer, § lxvi., 5, 3.—Ver. 25. ἄρτη τρίθη, the third hour = nine o'clock as we reckon; raising a harmonistic problem when compared with John xix. 14. Grotius comments: "id est, jam audita erat tuba horae tertiae, quod dici soletat donec canerat tuba horae sextae" (they called it the third hour till the sixth was sounded).—καὶ = when, Hebraistic, but also not without example in classics in similar connections: the fact stated connected with its time by a simple καὶ; instances in Meyer.—Ver. 26. ἐπιγραφή ἐπιγεγραμμένη: awkwardly expressed; Mt. and Lk. have phrases which look like corrections of style.—ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν ἱερατευμάτων: the simplest form of the inscription.

Vv. 29-32. Taints of spectators (Mt. xxvii. 39-44, Lk. xxiii. 35, 37, 39).—Ver. 29. οὖν = Latin, vah, expressing here ironical admiration: "admiringi vim cum ironia habet," Bengel. Raphael remarks that this word was not given in the Greek Lexicons, but that it is not therefore to be regarded as a Latinism peculiar to Mk., but rather as a word which had been adopted and used by the later Greeks, e.g., Arrian. Here only in N. T.—Ver. 30. καταβας (καλ καταβας, T. R.), etc., save Thyself, having descended, etc., or by descending = descend and so save Thyself.—Ver. 31. οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς: both in Mt. and in Mk. the priests lead in the unhallowed chuckling, scribes and elders (Mt.) being mentioned only subordinately (μετὰ, etc.).—πρὸς ἀλλήλους: a common fear gives place to a common sportiveness in this unholy brotherhood, now that the cause of their fear is removed.—Ver. 32. ἰησοῦς ὁ θεὸς that we may see (in the descent from the cross) an unmistakable sign from heaven of Messiahship, and so believe in Thee.—
Kai oĩ suneotonuphmuoi 1 auti' óneideis aotôn. 33. Genvoméni 5i 2
ôras étikes, skotos ἐγνέων ἐφ' ἠλιθν τήν γῆν, ἦς ὅρας ἐνάτης.
34. kai tē ὅρα tēn ènàtē 8 ἐβόησεν ὁ Ἱησοῦς φωνῇ μεγάλῃ, λέγων,4
"Ελατ, ἑλατ, λαμμά σαβαχθανί"; 5 ἐν ὅτι μεθερμηνεύωμεν,
"Ὁ Θεός μου, ὁ Θεός μου, εἰς τί με ἐγκαταλίπες;" 6 35. Kai tivn
tēn παραστήκην 7 ἀκοδαστῆς θλεγον, "Ἰδοῖ, Ἀλαί Φωνή." 36. Δραμὼν δὲ εἶς, καὶ 10
γεμίσας σπόγγον ὄξους, περιβείσ τη 11
καλάμων ἐπότιζαν αὐτῶν, λέγων, "Ἄφετε, ὦμην εἰ ἐρχεται Ἰλιας
καθελείν αὐτῶν." 37. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἀφεῖς φωνῆς μεγάλης ἐβάπτευσα. 38. καὶ τὸ
καταπάτημα τοῦ ναοῦ ἐσχισθῆ εἰς δύο, ἀπὸ δέος ὑπὲς κατώ.

1 σων after συνεταινμυον in ΝΒΛ. 4 και γεν. in ΝΒΔΛΑ.
2 την ενατη θα in ΝΒΔΛ. 5 Omit λεγων ΝΒΔΛ.
3 The spelling of the words λαμ. σαβ. varies much in the MSS.
4 με after εγκαταλιπε in ΝΒΛ. 6 B has στηρκοτων.
5 τις in ΝΒΛΔ. 7 τις in ΝΒΛΔ.
6 ΝΒΔΛ 33 omit τε (W.H. read Δραμον δε τε τε γεμ. σ. σ. περίλειψ καλ.).

οι συνεταινμυον, the co-crucified. Mk., like Mt., knows nothing of the
conversion of one of the robbers reported
by Lk. How different these fellow-
 sufferers in spirit from the co-crucified in
St. Paul's sense (Rom. vi. 6, Gal. ii.
20). 1
Vv. 33-36. Darkness without and
within (Mt. xxvii. 45-49, Lk. xxiii. 44-49).
—Ver. 33. γενομένης, ἐγνέων: another
awkwardness of style variously amended
in Mt. and Lk.—σκότος: on this dark-
ness vide on Mt. Furrer (Wanderungen,
p. 175-6) suggests as its cause a storm
of hot wind from the south-east, such as
sometimes comes in the last weeks of
spring. "The heavens are overcast with
a deep gray, the sun loses his bright-
ness, and at last disappears. Over the
darkened land rages the storm, so that
the country, in the morning like a flower-
carpet, in the evening appears a waste.
On the saddest day in human his-
tory swept such a storm at noon over
Jerusalem, adding to the terrors of the
crucifixion."—Ver. 34. ἠλατ, ἑλατ: the
Aramaic form of the words spoken by
Jesus, Mt. giving the Hebrew equiva-
 lent. On this cry of desertion vide re-
marks on the parallel place in Mt.—
ὁ Θεὸς μου, ὁ Θ. μ.: as in Sept. Mt.
gives the vocative.—εἰς τί, for what
end? τινι εἰς in Mt. and Sept.—Ver. 35.
Ἡλίας: the name of Elijah might be
suggested by either form of the name of
God—Eli or Eloi. Who the τινες were
that made the poor pun is doubtful,
most probably heartless fellow-country-
men who only affected to misunder-
stand.—Ver. 36. Δραμὼν δὲ: if the
wits were heartless mockers, then δὲ will
imply that this person who offered the
sufferer a sponge saturated with posca
(side Mt.) was a friendly person touched
by compassion. For the credit of human
nature one is very willing to be con-
vinced of this.—ἐπότιζαν might, like
ἐδίδον (ver. 23), be viewed as a conative
imperfect = offered Him a drink, but
John's narrative indicates that Jesus
accepted the drink (xix. 30).—Λέγων
refers to the man who brought the
drink. In Mt. it is others who speak
(xxvii. 49), and the sense of what was
said varies accordingly.—ὦμην in Mt.
naturally, though not necessarily, means:
stop, don't give Him the drink (side on
Mt.)—ὤμην in Lk. interpreted by the
man to the bystanders, means naturally:
allow me (to give Him the drink), the
idea being that thereby the life of the
sufferer would be prolonged, and so as
it were give time for Elijah to come
(ὤμην εἰ ἐρ. Ἡ.) to work an effectual
deliverance by taking Him down from
the cross (καθελείν αὐ).—ἐλ ἐρ.: εἰ with
the present indicative instead of the
more usual ἔλω with subjunctive in a
future supposition with probability (vide
Burton, M. and T. in N. T., § 251).
Vv. 37-41. Death and its accompa-
niments (Mt. xxvii. 50-56, Lk. xxiii.40-49).—
39. Ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ καντυρίνας ὁ παραστῆκας ἐξ ἐναντίας αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ὁ οὕτως πράξας ἐξέπνευσεν, εἰπών, "Ἀληθῶς ὁ διάθωκος οὗτος ὡς ἦν Θεός." 40. Νῦν δὲ καὶ γυναῖκες ἀπὸ μακρῶν θεωροῦσαν, ἐν ᾗς ἦν καὶ Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνή, καὶ Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Ἰακώβου τοῦ μικροῦ καὶ Ἡλεηθές μήτηρ, καὶ Σαλάμη, 41. αἱ καὶ ὅτε ἦν ἡ γαλλαρία, ἦκολουθοῦν αὐτῶ, καὶ διηκόνουν αὐτῶ, καὶ ἄλλαι πολλαὶ αἱ συνανάβασι αὐτῶ εἰς ἱεροσόλυμα.

42. Καὶ ἥδη ὀφθαλμοὶ γενομένης, εἰτέ ἦν παρασκευή, ὅ ὡσ προσβάτ-

1 ΝΒΔΛα cop. omitt πράξας, found in ACΔΣ al. rec.
2 The order of the words varies: πάντες οἱ αὐθ. in ΝΒΔΛΑ 33 (Tisch., W.H.); πάντες οἱ in AC al. (Tisch.). — πάντες οἱ in ΝΒΔΛΑ (W.H.).
3 ἢ (from Mt.) omitted in ΝΒΛ.
4 ΝΒΔΣ ΔΔΔΕΔΔΑ omitt τοῦ.
5 ΝΒΔΛ omitt τοῦ.
6 ΝΒ 33 omitt κα.; ΑΔΛΑ ΔΔΔΑ. Perhaps both omissions are due to similar ending.

Ver. 37. φωνὴ μεγάλη: a second great voice uttered by Jesus (vide ver. 34), the fact indicated in Mt. by the word ως. At this point would come in John's περιβολή (see, 30). — ἐξέπνευν, breathed out. His life, expired; aorist, the main fact, to which the incident of the drink (ἐνότερον, imperfect) is subordinate; used absolutely, here (and in Lk. xxiii. 46), as often in the classics. Bengel remarks: "spirare conductit corpori, expirare spiritui". — Ver. 38. The fact of the rending of the veil stated as in Mt., with omission of Mt.'s favourite δόθη, and the introduction of another of Mk.'s characteristic pleonasmata, δι' ἀνωθέν.— Ver. 39. καντύρινας, a Latinism = centurio, for which Mt. and Lk. give the Greek ἑκατόντυρχος.— ἐξ ἐναντίας (κατά), right opposite, Jesus, so that he could hear and see all distinctly. The thing that chiefly impressed him, according to Mk., was the manner of His death. —οὖν ἐξέπνευν = with a loud voice, as if life were still strong, and so much sooner than usual, as of one who, needing no Elijah to aid Him, could at will set Himself free from misery. This was a natural impression on the centurion's part, and patriotic interpreters endorse it as true and important. Victor Ant. says that the loud voice showed that Jesus died κατ' ὑποτασίαν, and theophany-like applies to the ἐξέπνευν the epithet δευτεροτίμων. But it may be questioned whether this view is in accord either with fact or with sound theology. What of the φωνή in ver. 22? And is there not something docetic in self-rescue from the pangs of the cross, instead of leaving the tragic experience to run its natural course? Mt.'s explanation of the wonder of the centurion, by the external events—earthquake, etc.—is, by comparison, secondary. Schanz characterises Mk.'s account as "sicherer psychologisch" (psychologically finer). — Ver. 40. On the faithful women who looked on from afar, vide on Mt. Mk. singles out for special mention the same three as Mt.: Mary of Magdala, Mary the mother of James and Joseph, and the mother of Zebedee's children. Mk. distinguishes James, the brother of Joseph, αὐτοῦ μικροῦ = either the little in stature (Meyer and Weiss), or the less in age, the younger (Schanz). Mk. refers to the mother of Zebedee's children by her own name, Salome. Neither evangelist mentions Mary, the mother of Jesus. — Ver. 41. This interesting reference to service rendered to Jesus in Galilee, given here by Mk. only, applies to the three named, hence the honourable mention of them. Mt. substitutes service on the way from Galilee to Jerusalem rendered by all—evidently a secondary account. — ἄλλαι πολλαὶ, others, many; also worthy of honour, but of an inferior order compared with the three. They made the journey from Galilee to Jerusalem with Jesus.

Vv. 42-47. Burial (Mt. xxvii. 57-66, Lk. xxiii. 50-56). — Ver. 42. ἤθη; omitted by Mt., but important, as indicating that the business Joseph had on hand—that of obtaining and using permission to take down and bury the body of Jesus—must
be gone about without delay. It was already the afternoon of the day before the Sabbath, προσβατων, called παρασκευή (here and in the parallels in this technical sense). It must, therefore, be done at once, or it could not be done till Sabbath was past.—Ver. 43. εὐχήματα: Mt. has πλῆθος; side there for remarks on the two epithets.—βούλευτα, a councillor, not in the provincial town, Arimathaea, which would have been mentioned, but in the grand council in Jerusalem.—καὶ αὐτὸς, not in contrast to the Sanhedrists generally (Weiss), but in company with the women previously named (Schanz); he, like them, was an expectant of the Kingdom of God.—τολμήσας: a graphic word, in Mk. only, giving a vivid idea of the situation. Objections to be feared on Pilate's part on score of time—dead so soon! possibly surly indifference to the decrees of burial in the case of a crucified person, risk of offence to the religious leaders in Jerusalem by sympathy shown to the obnoxious One, even in death. Therefore to be rendered: "taking courage, went in unto Pilate" (with Field, G. Nor., ad loc.).—Ver. 44. Omitted by Mt., whose narrative throughout is colourless compared with Mk.'s.—εἰ τέθηκε: εἰ = δότι, after a verb of wonder (side Burton, M. and T., § 277, and Winer, § IX., 6).—εἰ ἀνέθησαι: τέθηκε has reference to the present of the speaker, ἀνέθησαι to the moment of death.—τῆλα: opposed to δούλα, and not implying a considerable time before, but only bare priority to the present. Pilate's question to the centurion was, did He die before now? = is He actually dead?—Ver. 45. Satisfied on the point Pilate freely gives (ὁδοιοντα) the carcass (τούμα, ΝBDL; corrected from feelings of reverence into σώμα in many MSS.).—Ver. 46. ἀγοράσας, having purchased linen; therefore purchases could be made. This word, and the reason given for Joseph's haste (ver. 42), have, not without a show of reason, been regarded as unintentional evidence in favour of the Johannine Chronology of the Passion. So Meyer, Weiss, and Holtzmann.—καθαρίσας: καθαρίσας was the technical term for taking down from the cross. Proofs in Elner, Raphel, Kypke, and Loesner.—καθαρίσας: here only in N.T.—νῦν μὴ τούμα (νῦν μὴ, ΝB): no indication in Mk. as in Mt. that it was new, and Joseph's own.—Ver. 47. τεθεὶται: from the perfect Meyer and Weiss infer that the women were not present at the burial, but simply approached and took note where Jesus lay after burial. Schanz dissents, and refers to the καὶ before δότι in ver. 41 in some MSS., as proving that they had come to render the last office to Jesus.

The open grave (Mt. xxviii 1-10, Lk. xxiv. 1-12).—Ver. 1. Diaigneoménon tov sabbatón, the Sabbath being past; similar use of δίαγει in Acts xxv. 13, xxvii. 9, and in late Greek authors; examples in Elnner, Wetstein, Raphael, e.g., Διαγείομεν τέλει ετών δέκα, Polyb., Hist., ii., 19.—ήγορασαν ἐπὶ, purchased spices; wherewith, mingled with oil, more perfectly to anoint the body of the Lord Jesus. The aorist implies that this purchase was made on the first day of the week. Lk. (xxiii. 56) points to the previous Friday evening. Harmonists (Grotius, e.g.) reconcile by taking ήγόρασα as a superperfect. "After sunset there was a lively trade done among the Jews, because no purchase could be made on Sabbath" (Schanz).—Ver. 2. Εἶχαν πρὸς, very early in the morning, suggesting a time hardly consistent with the qualifying clause: ἀναστείλας τοῦ ἡλίου, when the sun was risen, which again does not harmonise with the "deep dawn" of Lk. and the "yet dark" of John. Mk.'s aim apparently is to emphasise the fact that what he is going to relate happened in broad daylight; Lk.'s to point out that the pious women were at their loving work as early on the Sunday morning as possible.—Ver. 3. ἔλεγον ὑπὲρ λευκῆς, as they went to the sepulchre, they kept saying to each other (ad invicem, Vulg., πρὸς ἄλληλας, Euthy.).—τί ἀποκλίσει; their only solicitude was about the stone at the sepulchre's mouth: no thought of the guards in Mk.'s account. The pious women thought not of angelic help. Men had rolled the stone forward and could roll it back, but it was beyond woman's strength.—Ver. 4. ἀναβλέψας, looking τῷ, as they approached the tomb; suggestive of heavy hearts and downcast eyes, on the way thither.—ἡ γὰρ μέγας φόβος: this clause seems out of place here, and it has been suggested that it should be inserted after μνημείου in ver. 3, as explaining the women's solicitude about the removal of the stone. As it stands, the clause explains how the women could see, even at a distance, that the stone had already been removed. It was a sufficiently large object. How the stone was rolled away is not said.

Vv. 5-8. The women enter into the tomb through the open door, and experience a greater surprise.—νεκταρίων, a young man. In Mt.'s account it is an angel, and his position is not within the tomb, as here, but sitting on the stone without. Lk. has τοὺς ἑαυτοὺς in shining apparel.—στολὴν λευκήν, in a white long robe, implying what is not said, that the youth is an angel. No such robe worn by young men on earth.—Ver. 6. ἡ ἐκαμβίεσθαι, "be not affrighted" (as they had been by the unexpected sight of a man, and wearing heavenly apparel); no οὕτως after the verb here, as in Mt. after φοβεῖσθαι, where there is an implied contrast between the women and the guards (vide on Mt.).—Ἰησοῦν, etc., Ἰησοῦς ye seek, the Nazarene, the crucified. Observe the objective, far-off style of description, befitting a visitor from
another world.—ἡγῷδης, etc. : note the abrupt disconnected style: risen, not here, see (ἦς) the place (empty) where they laid Him. The empty grave, the visible fact; resurrection, the inference: when, how, a mystery (ἀνηλάν, Euthy.).

—Ver. 7. ἀλλά, but; change in tone and topic; gazing longer into the empty grave would serve no purpose: there is something to be done—go, spread the news! Cf. John xiv. 31: But when you have ascended, and went to Peter in particular: why? to the disciple who denied his Master? so the older interpreters—to Peter, with all his faults, the most important man in the disciple band? so most recent interpreters: ut dum Apostolici coetus, Grotius.—ἔδησ, recit., introducing the very message of the angel. The message recalls the words of Jesus before His death (chap. xiv. 25).—ἐκεῖ, there, pointing to Galilee as the main scene of the reappearing of Jesus to His disciples, creating expectation of a narrative by the evangelist of an appearance there, which, however, is not forthcoming.—Ver. 8. ἐξαλλούσαν, going out—of the sepulchre into which they had entered (ver. 5).—ἐφυγοῦν, they fled, from the scene of such surprises. The angel's words are addressed to 'all the disciples'; the event altogether too much for them.—τρόμος καὶ ἀστορίας, trembling, caused by fear, and stupor, as of one out of his wits. —τρόμος = "tremor corporis" : ἀστορίαι = "stupor animi," Bengel.—οὐδὲν οὐδὲν ἦσον: an unqualified statement as it stands here, no "on the way," such as harmonists supply: "obvio scilicet," Grotius.—ἐφοβοῦτον γὰρ gives the reason of this reticence so unnatural in women: they were in a state of fear. When the fear went off, or events happened which made the disciples independent of their testimony, their mouths would doubtless be opened.

So ends the authentic Gospel of Mark, without any account of appearances of the risen Jesus in Galilee or anywhere else. The one thing it records is the empty grave, and an undelivered message sent through three women to the disciples, promising a reunion in Galilee. Strange that a story of such thrilling interest should terminate so abruptly and unsatisfactorily. Was there originally a continuation, unhappily lost, containing, e.g., an account of a meeting of the Risen One in Galilee with His followers? Or was the evangelist prevented by some unknown circumstances from carrying into effect an intention to bring his story to a suitable close? We cannot tell. All we know (for the light thrown on the question by criticism, represented, e.g., by Tischendorf, Nov. Test., G. Ed., viii., vol. i., pp. 403-407; Hahn, Gesch. des. N. Kanons, ii., p. 910 ff.; Westcott and Hort, Introduction, Appendix, pp. 29-51, approaches certainty) is that vv. 9-20 of Mk. xvi. in our N. T. are not to be taken as the fulfilment of any such intention by the author of the second Gospel. The external evidence strongly points this way. The section is wanting in ΗΒ and in Syr. Sin. Jerome states (Ep. cxx., quaest. 3) that it was wanting in nearly all Greek copies ("omnibus Graecis libris penes Eusebii") : Eusebius is to the same effect. The internal evidence of style confirms the impression made by the external: characteristic words of Mk. wanting, words not elsewhere found in the Gospel occurring (e.g., ἀνασκέπη, v. 11), the narrative a meagre, colourless summary, a composition based on the narratives of the other Gospels, signs ascribed to believers, some of which wear an apocryphal aspect (vide ver. 18). Some, in spite of such considerations, still regard these verses as an integral part of Mk.'s work, but for many the question of present interest is: what account is to be given of them, viewed as an indubitable addendum by another hand? Who wrote this conclusion, when, and with
what end in view? We wait for the final answers to these questions, but important contributions have recently been made towards a solution of the problem. In an Armenian codex of the Gospels, written in 986 A.D., the close of Mk. (vv. 9-20), separated by a space from what goes before to show that it is distinct, has written above it: "Of the Presbyter Aristion," as if to suggest that he is the author of what follows. (Vide Expositor, October, 1893. Aristion, the Author of the last Twelve Verses of Mark, by P. C. Conyebar, M.A.) More recently Dr. Rohrbach has taken up this fact into his interesting discussion on the subject already referred to (vide on Mt. xxviii. 9, 10), and appreciated its significance in connection with the preparation of a four-gospel Canon by certain Presbyters of Asia Minor in the early part of the second century. His hypothesis is that in preparing this Canon the Presbyters felt it necessary to bring the Gospels into accord, especially in reference to the resurrection, that in their preaching all might say the same thing on that vital topic. In performing this delicate task, the fourth Gospel was taken as the standard, and all the other Gospels were to a certain extent altered in their resurrection sections to bring them into line with its account. In Mt. and Lk. the change made was slight, simply the insertion in the former of two verses (xxviii. 9, 10), and in the latter of one (xxiv. 12). In Mk., on the other hand, it amounted to the removal of the original ending, and the substitution for it of a piece taken from a writing by Aristion the Presbyter, mentioned by Papias. The effect of the changes, if not their aim, was to take from Peter the honour of being the first to see the risen Lord, and from Galilee that of being the exclusive theatre of the Christophanies. It is supposed that the original ending of Mk. altogether ignored the Jerusalem appearances, and represented Jesus, in accordance with the statement of St. Paul (1 Cor. xv. 5), as showing Himself (in Galilee) first to Peter, then to the Twelve. The inference is based partly on Mk. xvi. 7, and partly on the relative section of the Gospel of Peter, which, following pretty closely Mk.'s account as far as ver. 8, goes on to tell how the Twelve found their way sad of heart to their old homes, and resumed their old occupations. In all this Rohrbach, a pupil of Harnack's, is simply working out a hint thrown out by his master in his Dogmengeschichte, vol. i., p. 346, 3 Ausg. It would be premature to accept the theory as proved, but it is certainly entitled to careful consideration, as tending to throw some light on an obscure chapter in the early history of the Gospels, and on the ending of the canonical Gospel of Mark in particular.

Vv. 9-20 may be divided into three parts corresponding more or less to sections in John, Luke, and Matthew, and not improbably based on these; vv. 9-11, answering to John xx. 14-18; vv. 12-14, answering to Lk. xxiv. 13-35; vv. 15-18, answering to Mt. xxviii. 19. Vv. 19, 20 wind up with a brief reference to the ascension and the subsequent apostolic activity of the disciples.

Vv. 9-11. ἀναστὰς δὲ πρὸς πρώτης αὐτὰρ τῆς Μαρίας τῇ Μαγδαληνῇ, ἀφ' ἑαυτῆς ἔκβαλεν ἄταλα δαίμονα. Io. ἀκούειν τῶν μετ' αὐτοῦ γεγομένων, πεθανοῦν καὶ κλαίουσιν. 11. κακεῖνοι ἀκούσαντες ὅτι ἦν καὶ ἠθάνην ὅτι αὐτὴς

1 παρ' ἑαυτῇ, in CDL. 33 (W.H.).
expression not elsewhere occurring in any of the Gospels.—Ver. 11. ἐπίστησαν, was seen. This verb, used again in ver. 14, is foreign to Mk., as is also ἀποκρινθεῖν, also twice used here (ἐπίστησαν, ver. 11; ἀποκρινθεῖ, ver. 16).

Vv. 12-14. καὶ ἐπὶ ταῦτα, afterwards (only here in Mk.); vaguely introducing a second appearance in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem.—διότι ἐξ αὐτῶν, to two of the friends of Jesus previously referred to, not of the Eleven. Cf. with Lk. xxiv. 13. It is not only the same fact, but the narrative here seems borrowed from Lk.—ἐν ἑτέρῳ μορφῇ, in a different form. Serving no purpose here, because the fact it accounts for, the non-recognition of Jesus by the two disciples (Lk. xxiv. 16), is not mentioned.—ἐλεγχόν: for εἰς κόμην in Lk. The use of φανερωθῆναι in the sense of being manifested to, in ver. 12, is peculiar to this section (again in ver. 14).—Ver. 14. ὄντερα, at a later time; vague indication, here only. It is difficult to identify this appearance with any one mentioned in the other Gospels. What follows in ver. 15, containing the final commission, seems to point to the farewell appearance in Galilee (Mt. xxviii. 16), but the ἀνακειμένος (ver. 14) takes us to the scene related in Lk. xxiv. 36-43, though more than the Eleven were present on that occasion. The suggestion has been made (Meyer, Weiss, etc.) that the account here blends together features taken from various appearances. The main points for the narrator are that Jesus did appear to the Eleven, and that He found them in an unbelieving mood.

Vv. 15-18. The Commission (Mt. xxviii. 18-20).—ἐκ τῶν κόσμων ἡμῶν, added to Mt.'s περιεβαίνετε, προσβαίνετε τ. ἐν: this more specific and evangelic phrase replaces Mt.'s μαθητεύσατε, καὶ ἔαρα καὶ πάση τῇ κόσμῳ gives more emphatic expression to the universal destination of the Gospel than Mt.'s πάντα καὶ ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ.—Ver. 16 is a poor equivalent for Mt.'s reference to baptism, insisting as it does, in an ecclesiastical spirit, on the necessity of baptism rather than on its significance as an expression of the Christian faith in God the Father, Son, and Spirit. Jesus may not have spoken as Mt. reports, but the words put into His mouth by the first evangelist are far more worthy of the Lord than those here ascribed to Him.——Ver. 17. Here also we find a great lapse from the high level of Mt.'s version of the farewell words of Jesus: signs, physical charisms, and thaumaturgic powers, taking the place of the spiritual presence of the exalted Lord. Casting out devils represents the evangelic miracles; speaking with tongues those of the apostolic age; taking up venomous serpents and drinking deadly poison.
19. ὁ μὲν οὖν Κύριος,1 μετὰ τὸ λαλῆσαι αὐτοῖς, ἀνελήφθη αἰς τῶν οἴκων, καὶ ἐκκόπτετο ἐκ θείων τοῦ Θεοῦ. 20. ἐκεῖνοι δὲ ἐξαλάβοντες ἐκήρυξαν πανταχοῦ, τοῦ Κυρίου συνεργοῦντος, καὶ τὸν λόγον βεβαιοῦντος διὰ τῶν εὐαγγελίουντων σημείων. Ἄμην.2

1 CLΔ have ἵστον after Κύριος (W.H. brackets).
2 Ἄμην is found in CLΔ among other uncialis (W.H. marg.).

seem to introduce us into the twilight of apocryphal story. Healing of the sick by laying on of hands brings us back to apostolic times. θανάσιμον is a δεικνύειν.

Vv. 19, 20. The story ends with a brief notice of the ascension of the Lord Jesus on the one hand (μὲν), and of the apostolic activity of the Eleven on the other (δὲ). Lk., who means to tell the story of the acts of the Apostles at length, contented himself with reporting that the Eleven returned from Bethany, his scene of parting, to Jerusalem, not with sadness but with joy, there to worship and wait.
Chapter I. The Early History. Vv. 1-4. The preface.—Ver. 1. ἐπειδήσις: three particles, ὅτι, ὧς, ἥπ, blended into one word, implying that the fact to be stated is well known (ἦν), important (ὡς), and important as a reason for the undertaking on hand (ὁτι = seeing, as is well known. Hahn thinks the word before us is merely a temporal not a causal particle, and that Luke means only to say that he is not the first to take such a task on hand. But why mention this unless because it entered somehow into his motives for writing? It might do so in various ways: as revealing a widespread impulse to preserve in writing the evangelic memorabilia, stimulating him to do the same; as meeting an extensive demand for such writings on the part of Christians, which appealed to him also; as showing by the number of such writings that no one of them adequately met the demand, or performed the task in a final manner, so that there was more than one attempt was not superfluous. Ἐπειδήσις, a good Greek word, occurs here only in N. T.—τολμᾶ: not an exaggeration, but to be taken strictly as implying extensive activity in the production of rudimentary "Gospels". The older exegetes understood the word as referring to heretical or apocryphal gospels, of course by way of censure. This view is abandoned by recent commentators, for whom the question of interest rather is: were Mt.'s Logia and Mk.'s Gospel among the earlier contributions which Lk. had in his eye? This question cannot be decided by exegesis, and answers vary according to the critical theories of those who discuss the topic. All that need be said here is that there is no apparent urgent reason for excluding Mt. and Mk. from the crowd of early essayists.—ἐπειδήσις, took in hand; here only in N. T. The word is a vox ambigua, and might or might not imply blame = attempted and did not succeed, or attempted and accomplished their task. It is not probable that emphatic blame is intended. On the other hand, it is not likely that ὅτι is a mere explicative, and that ὅτι, ἀνατάξασθαι is simply = ἀνατάξατο, as after Cassaubon, Palairet, Raphel, etc., maintained. The verb contains a gentle hint that in some respects finality had not yet been reached, which might be said with all due respect even of Mt.'s Logia and Mk.'s Gospel.—ἀνατάξασθαι δηλοῦν, to set forth in order a narrative; the expression points to a connected series of narratives arranged in some order (ταύτης), topical or chronological, rather than to isolated narratives, the meaning put on δηλοῦν by Schleiermacher. Both verb and noun occur here only in N. T. ἀπαλαφικός, ὁ προαλήτων indicates the subject of these narratives. The leading term in this phrase is περιηγοροφημένων, about the meaning of which interpreters are much divided. The radical idea of περιηγοροφήσεως (περιηγήσεως, ἐφόσον) is to bring or make full. The special sense will depend on the matter in reference to which the fulness takes place. It might be in the region of fact, in which case the word under consideration would mean "become a completed series," and the whole phrase "concerning events which now lie before us as a complete whole". This view is adopted by an increasing number of modern commentators (vide R. V.). Or the fulness may be in conviction, in which case the word would mean "most
surely believed " (A. V.). This sense of complete conviction occurs several times in N. T. (Rom. iv. 21, Heb. vi. 11, x. 22), but with reference to persons not to things. A very large number of interpreters, ancient and modern, take the word here in this sense ("bei uns beglaubigen," Weizsäcker). Holtz., H. C., gives both without deciding between them ("vollgeglaubten oder vollbrachten"). Neither meaning seems quite what is wanted. The first is too vague, and does not indicate what the subject-matter is. The second is explicit enough as to that = the matters which form the subject of Christian belief; but one hardly expects these matters to be represented as the subject of sure belief by one whose very aim in writing is to give further certainty concerning them (ἀπεικόνισε, ver. 4). What if the sphere of the fulness be knowledge, and the meaning of the clause: "concerning the things which have become widely known among us Christians"? Then it would be plain enough what was referred to. Then also the phrase would point out the natural effect of the many evangelic narratives—the universal diffusion of a fair acquaintance with the leading facts of Christ's life. But have we any instance of such use of the word?—πληροφορία is used in reference to understanding and knowledge in Col. ii. 2. Then in modern Greek πληροφορία means to inform, and as the word is mainly Hellenistic in usage, and may belong to the popular speech preserved throughout the centuries, τῶν περίλ. may mean, "those things of which information has been given" (Geldart, The Modern Greek Language, p. 180), or those things generally known among Christians as such.

Ver. 2. καθένας implies that the basis of these many written narratives was the παράδειγμα of the Apostles, which, by contrast, and by the usual meaning of the word, would be mainly though not necessarily exclusively oral (might include, e.g., the Logia of Mt.).—οἱ... τῶν λόγων describes the Apostles, the ultimate source of information, as men "who had become, or been made, eye-witnesses and ministers of the word". Both αὐτῶν, and ὑπ'... may be connected with τῶν λόγων, understood to mean the burden of apostolic preaching = the facts of Christ's earthly history. Eye-witnesses of the facts from the beginning (ἀπ' ἀρχῆς), therefore competent to state them with authority; servants of the word including the facts (= "all that Jesus began both to do and to teach"), whose very business it was to relate words and facts, and who therefore did it with some measure of fulness. Note that the ἡμῖν after παράδειγμα implies that Lk. belonged to the second generation (Meyer, Schanz). Hahn infers from the ἡμῖν in ver. 1 that Lk. was himself an eye-witness of Christ's public ministry, at least in its later stage.

Ver. 3. δὸ δὲ καλά: modestly introducing the writer's purpose. He puts himself on a level with the ἀποστόλοι, and makes no pretensions to superiority, except in so far as coming after them, and more comprehensive inquiries give him naturally an advantage which makes his work not superfluous.—παρουσιάζω...έμοι ἐν. π.: having followed (in my inquiries) all things from the beginning, i.e., not of the public life of Jesus (ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, ver. 2), but of His life in this world. The sequel shows that the starting point was the birth of John. This process of research was probably gone into antecedent to the formation of his plan, and one of the reasons for its adoption (Meyer, also Grimm: Das Prooemium des Lukasevangeliums in Fährblicher f. deutsche Theologie, 1871, p. 48. Likewise Calvin: omnibus exacte perestigatis), not merely undertaken after the plan had been formed (Hahn).

 Redemption, καθένας τ. yr. explain how he desired to carry out his plan: he wishes to be exact, and to write in an orderly manner (καθένας here only in N. T., ἐν. in earlier Greek). Chronological order aimed at (whether successfully or not) according to many (Meyer, Godet, Weiss, Hahn). Schanz maintains that the chronological aim applies only to the great turning points of the history, and not to all details; a very reasonable view. These two adverbs, άρκ., καθ., may imply a gentle criticism of the work of predecessors. Observe the historical spirit implied in all Lk. tells about his literary plan and methods: inquiry, accuracy, order, aimed at at least; vouchers desired for all statements. Lk. is no religious romancer, who will invent at will, and say anything that
suit his purpose. It is quite compatible with this historic spirit that Lk. should be influenced in his narrations by religious feelings of decorum and reverence, and by regard to the edification of his first readers. That his treatment of materials bearing on the characters of Jesus and the Apostles reveals many traces of such influence will become apparent in the course of the exposition.

4. The work is to be written for an individual who may perhaps have played the part of patrius librari, and paid the expenses of its production. The epithet κρατίστος may imply high official position (Acts xxiii. 26, xxvi. 25). On this see Grotius. Grimm thinks it expresses only love and friendship.

Vers. 4. Indicates the practical aim: to give certainty in regard to matters of Christian belief. Τοποθετεῖται εἰς μ. λόγων: an attraction, to be thus resolved: τοποθετεῖται εἰς μ. λόγων οδός κατηχήσεως. λόγων is best taken = matters (πραγμάτων, ver. 1); histories (Weiszäcker), not doctrines. Doubtless this is a Hebraistic sense, but that is no objection, for after all Lk. is a Hellenist and no pure Greek, and even in this preface, whose pure Greek has been so often praised, he is a Hellenist to a large extent. (So Hahn, Einleitung, p. 6.) The subject of instruction for young Christians in those early years was the teaching, the acts, and the experience of Jesus: their "catechism" historic not doctrinal. —κατηχήσεως: is this word used here in a technical sense = formally and systematically instructed, or in the general sense of "have been informed more or less correctly"? (So Kypke.) The former is more probable. The verb (from κατά, ἤχεω) is mainly Hellenistic in usage, rare in profane authors, not found in O. T. The N. T. usage, confined to Lk. and Paul, points to regular instruction (vide Rom. ii. 19).

This preface gives a lively picture of the intense, universal interest felt by the early Church in the story of the Lord Jesus: Apostles constantly telling what they had seen and heard; many of their hearers taking notes of what they said for the benefit of themselves and others: through these gospels acquaintance with the evangelical history circulating among believers, creating a thirst for more and yet more; imposing on such a man as Luke the task of preparing a Gospel as full, correct, and well arranged as possible through the use of all available means—previous writings or oral testimony of surviving eye-witnesses.

Vv. 5-25. The birth of the Baptist announced. From the long prefatory sentence, constructed according to the rules of Greek syntax, and with some pretensions to classic purity of style, we pass abruptly to the Protevangelium, the prelude to the birth of Christ, consisting of the remainder of this chapter, written in Greek which is Hebraistic in phrase and structure, and Jewish in its tone of piety. The evangelist here seems to have at command an Aramaic, Jewish-Christian source, which he, as a faithful collector of evangelical memorabilia, allows to speak for itself, with here and there an editorial touch.

Vv. 5-7. The parents of John. —ἐγένετο, there was, or there lived.—ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις, etc.: in the days, the reign, of Herod, king of Judæa. Herod died 730 a.C., and the Christian era begins with 733 a.C. This date is too late by three or four years.—ἐκ φασινων ᾗ Ἀβίαν: ἐφημερίς (a noun formed from ἐφημερίζομαι, daily, lasting for a day), not in profane authors, here and in ver. 8 in N. T., in Sept., in Chron. and Nehemiah, = (1) a service lasting for a day, or for days—a week; (2) a class of priests performing that service. The priests were divided into twenty-four classes, the organisation dating according to the tradition in Chronicles (1 Chron. xxiv.) from the time of David. The order of Abia was the eighth (1 Chron. xxiv. 10). Josephus (Ant., vii. 14, 7) uses ἐφημερίδα and παρθένα to denote a class. On the priesthood and the temple worship and the daily service, consult Schürer's History, Div. ii., vol. i., pp. 207-208.—γυνή: a daughter of Aaron; John descended
from priestly parents on both sides. —
Ver. 6. διακομή: an O. T. term, and expressing an O. T. idea of piety and goodness, as unfolded in the following clause, which is Hebrew in speech as in sentiment: walking in all the commandments and ordinances (equivalent terms, not to be distinguished, with Calvin, Bengel, and Godet, as moral and ceremonial) blameless (relatively to human judgment). —Ver. 7. καὶ ὥσπερ ηῇ, etc.: childless, a calamity from the Jewish point of view, and also a fact hard to reconcile with the character of the pair, for the Lord loveth the righteous, and, according to O. T. views, He showed His love by granting prosperity, and, among other blessings, children (Ps. cxviii.). —καθὼς: a good Attic word: in Lk.'s writings only in N. T. = seeing, insomuch as — προβασμένες in τ. ἑμ.: “advanced in days,” Hebraistic for the classic “advanced in age” (τὸν ἡλικίαν) or years (τοῖς ἥμεροις): childless, and now no hope of children.
Vv. 8-10. Hope preternaturally revived. —ἐν τῷ ἱερατείῳ: Zechariah was serving his week in due course, and it fell to his lot on a certain day to perform the very special service of burning incense in the holy place. A great occasion in a priest's life, as it might never come to him but once (priests said to be as many as 20,000 in our Lord's time). —The most memorable day in the life of Zechariah" (Farrar, C. G. T.). —Ver. 9. κατὰ τὸ ἤδος is to be connected with ἄγας : casting lots, the customary manner of settling who was to have the honour. —εὐθελίας, not with ἀγας. The meaning is that entering the sanctuary was the necessary preliminary to offering incense; in one sense a superfluous remark (Hahn), yet worth making in view of the sacredness of the place. A great affair to get entrance into the ναός. —Ver. 10. πλῆθος: there might be a crowd within the temple precincts at the hour of prayer any day of the week, not merely on Sabbath or on a feast day ("dies solennis, et fortasse sabbatum," Bengel).
interpreters; a very superficial criticism. True to human nature and to O. T. piety, and not unacceptable to God. That the prayer was for offspring appears from the angelic message, objective and subjective corresponding. — γεννήσει, shall bear; originally to beget. — ίωάννην: the name already mentioned to inspire faith in the reality of the promise: meaning, God is gracious.—Ver. 14. χαρά, ἀγαλλίασα, a joy, an exultation; joy in higher, highest degree; joy over a son late born, and such a son as he will turn out to be. — πολλαί: a joy not merely to parents as a child, but to many as a man.—Ver. 15. μέγας, a great man before the Lord; not merely in God’s sight = true greatness, but indicating the sphere or type of greatness: in the region of ethics and religion. — καὶ αὐνον, etc., points to the external badge of the moral and religious greatness: abstinence as a mark of consecration and separation—a devotee.—σίκερα = Υέρε (not Greek), strong drink, extracted from any kind of fruit but grapes (here only in N. T.).— Πνεύματος Αγίου: in opposition to wine and strong drink, as in Eph. v. 18. But the conception of the Holy Spirit, formed from the Johannine type of piety, is very different from that of St. Paul, or suggested by the life of our Lord.—Ver. 16 describes the function of the Baptist. — ἐπιστρέφει: repentance, conversion, his great aim and watchword.—Ver. 17. προσλευθαίτων εἰς αὐτό, not a reference to John’s function as forerunner of Messiah, but simply a description of his prophetic character. He shall go before God (and men) = δε, in his career, an Elijah in spirit and power, and function; described in terms recalling Malachi iv. 6. — Vv. 18-20. Zechariah doubts. The angel’s dazzling promise of a son, and even of a son with such a career, might be but a reflection of Zechariah’s own secret desire and hope; yet when his day-dream is objectified it seems too good and great to be true. This also is true to human nature, which alternates between high hope and deep despair, according as faith or sense has the upper hand.—Ver. 19. ἀποκριθείς: the very natural scepticism of Zechariah is treated as a fault.—Γάβριη: the naming of angels is characteristic of the later stage of Judaism (see Daniel viii. 16, x. 21).—Ver. 20. σιωπῶν καὶ μὴ λ., silent and not able to speak; a temporary dumbness the sign asked, a slight penalty; not arbitrary, however, rather the almost natural effect of his state of mind—a kind of prolonged stupefaction resulting from a promise too great to be believed, yet pointing to a boon passionately desired.—ἀνθή εἶν: a phrase of Lk. = ἴρα, because.
14—28. ἙΛΛΗΝΙΟΝ


26. Ἔν δὲ τῷ μνήμη τῆς ἑτήσια ἡμέρα ἐκείνη ἡ ἀγέλεος ἐρευνηθή ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς πάλιν τῆς Γαλιλαίας, ἦν ὁ ὅρος Ναζαρέτ, 27. πρὸς παρθένον μεμνημένην ἀνδρί, ἦν ὁ ὅρος ἰωσήφ, ἦν ὁ ὅρος Δαβίδ· καὶ τὸ ὅρος τῆς παρθένου Μαρίας. 28. καὶ εἰσελθὼν δὲ ἀγέλεος πρὸς αὐτήν εἶπε, "Χαίρε, κεχαριτωμένη! ὁ Κύριος μετά σοῦ,

1 αὐτοῦ after εὖ τῷ in BLE (W.H.). Order as in T.R. in ΝΙΑΔΑ al. (Tisch.).
2 ΝΙΔΛ 33 omit o (Tisch., W.H., text, o in marg.). ΒΔ have it. ΝΙΒDL 11 omit before εὗοιδος.
3 εὗοιδος in ΝΒΙ 1, 69.
4 BLE 1, 131, cop. omit o ἀγέλεος (W.H.).

Vv. 21-22. The people without.—προσβαίνω, waiting; they had to wait. The priest was an unusually long time within, something uncommon must have happened. The thought likely to occur was that God had slain the priest as unworthy. The Levitical religion a religion of distance from God and of fear. So viewed in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Illustrative quotations from Talmud in Wünsche, Beiträge, p. 413.—Ver. 22. δυστασία: from his dazed look they inferred that the priest had seen a vision (chap. xxiv. 23, 2 Cor. xii. 1).—Σαμωνία: making signs all he could do; he could not bless them, e.g., if that was part of his duty for the day, or explain his absence (here only).

Vv. 23-25. Returns home. The week of service over, Zechariah went back to his own house. λαυτωρίζω: in Biblical Greek used in reference to priestly service; elsewhere of public service rendered by a citizen at his own expense or of any sort of service.—Ver. 24. περικρυβεῖν: hid herself entirely (παρθένος) here only; παρθένος: a late form of 2nd aorist. Why, not said, nor whether her husband told her what had happened to him. μὴν πάντα, after which another remarkable event happened. Whether she appeared openly thereafter is not indicated. Possibly not (J. Weiss).—ἐφαίνοντο: here and in Acts iv. 29 = took care, the object being ἀγέλεον τὸ ἅν. μ. = to remove my reproach: keenly felt by a Jewish woman. ἐν is understood before αἰς (Bornemann, Scholia). Vv. 26-38. The announcement to Mary.—Ver. 26. Ναζαρέτ: the original home of Joseph and Mary, not merely the adopted home as we might infer from Mt. ii. 23.—Ver. 27. ἦν οἰκὸν Δ.: Mary, Joseph, or both? Impossible to be sure, though the repetition of παρθένου in next clause (instead of αὐτῆς) favours the reference to Joseph.—Ver. 28. χαίρε, κεχαριτωμένη: αὐτὲν plena gratid, Vulg., on which Farrar (C. G. T.) comments: "not grata plena, but grata cumulata"; much graced or favoured by God.—χαριτωμένη is Hellenistic, and is found, besides here, only in Eph. i. 6 in N. T.—ὁ Κύριος μετά σοῦ, the Lord (Jehovah) is or be with thee, ἐστὶ or ἐστώ understood; the two renderings come practically to the same thing.—Ver. 29. θεοπαράδεξη: assuming that ἰδεῖσα (T.R.) is no part of the true text, Godet thinks that Mary saw nothing,
and that it was only the word of the angel that disturbed her. It is certainly the latter that is specified as the cause of trouble. The salutation troubled her because she felt that it meant something important, the precise nature of which (τὸν ἐον) did not appear. And yet on the principle that in supernatural experiences the subjective and the objective correspond, she must have had a guess.—Ver. 31. ἦσανον: no interpretation of the name here as in Mt. i. 21; a common Jewish name, not necessarily implying Messianic functions. There may have been ordinary family reasons for its use.—Ver. 32 foreshadows the future of the child. μέγας, applied also to John, ver. 15. κληρονομεῖ, shall be called = shall be.—τὸν Θεὸν Λ. r. πατρὶ: the Messiah is here conceived in the spirit of Jewish expectation: a son of David, and destined to restore his kingdom.—Ver. 34: Mary’s perplexity, how a mother and yet a virgin! J. Weiss points out that this perplexity on the part of a betrothed woman is surprising. Why not assume, as a matter of course, that the announcement had reference to a child to be born as the fruit of marriage with the man to whom she was betrothed? “These words betray the standpoint of Lk., who knows what is coming (ver. 35).” J. Weiss in Meyer.—Ver. 35. Πνεῦμα Ἁγιον: without the article because a proper name = the well-known Holy Spirit, say some (Meyer, Farrar), but more probably because the purpose is not to indicate the person by whom, etc., but the kind of influence: σῶμα as opposed to flesh, holy in the sense of separation from all fleshly defilement (Hofmann, J. Weiss, Hahn).—δύναμις ἡ ψευτος: the power of the Most High, also without article, an equivalent for π. π., and more definite indication of the cause, the power of God. Note the use of ψευτος as the name of God in ver. 32, here, and in ver. 16. Feine (Vorkanonische Überlieferung des Lukas, p. 17) includes δ ἡ ψευτος, δ ἡ ψευτος (i. 49), δ ἡ ψευτος (ii. 29), δ κυρios (i. 6, 9, x, etc.), all designations of God, among the instances of a Hebraistic vocabulary characteristic of chaps. i. and ii. The first epithet recurs in vi. 35 in the expression “sons of the Highest,” applied to those who live heroically, where Mt. has “children of your Father in heaven.”—δυνατότης, δυνατος: two synonyms delicately selected to express the divine substitute for sexual intercourse. Observe the parallelism here: “sign of the exaltation of feeling. The language becomes a chant,” Godet. Some find poetry throughout these two first chapters of Lk. “These songs . . . doubtless represent reflection upon these events by Christian poets, who put in the mouths of the angels, the mothers and the fathers, the poems which they composed” (Briggs, The Messiah of the Gospels, p. 42. Even the address of Gabriel to Zechariah in the temple, i. 13-17, is, he thinks, such a poem).—τὸ γεννημένον ἄγιον, the holy thing—holy product of a holy agency—which is being, or about to be, generated = the embryo, therefore appropriately neuter.—μήθε Θεός, Son of God: not merely because holy, but because brought into...
being by the power of the Highest.— Ver. 36. καὶ ἵνα, introducing a reference to Elizabeth's case to help Mary's faith.— συννηγής, late form for συννηγή (T.R.), a blood relation, but of what degree not indicated, suggesting that Mary perhaps belonged to the tribe of Levi.— γῆρας: Ionic form of dative for γήρα (T.R.). Hellenistic Greek was an eclectic language, drawing from all dialects as from the poets, turning their poetic expressions to the uses of prose.— καλομένη: Elizabeth is described as one who is still being called barren, though six months gone in pregnancy, because people have had no means of knowing her state.— Ver. 37. ἀδυνατής: the verb means, in classic Greek, to be weak, of persons. In Sept. and N. T. (here and in Mt. xxvii. 20) it means to be impossible, of things. Commentators differ as to rendering: no word of God shall be weak, inoperative, or no thing, with, on the part of, God, shall be impossible.— βήμα = ἄνωθεν may be rendered either word or thing. The reading ἰδοὺ τῆς θεοῦ (BDL) seems to demand the former of the two translations. Field, Otium Nor., discusses this passage. Adopting the above reading, and adhering to the sense of ἀδυνατής, in reference to things, he translates: "for from God no word (or no thing) shall be impossible".

Some recent critics find in this section two different views of the birth of Jesus, one implying natural paternity, the other supernatural causality, the former being the view in the original document, the other introduced by the evangelist, the former Jewish in its tendency of thought, the latter heathen-Christian. The subject is discussed by Hillmann in Jahrb. für prot. Theol., 1891, and Usener, Religionsgesch. Untersuchungen, 1888. J. Weiss, in his ed. of Meyer, p. 303, note, seems inclined to favour this view, and to see in vv. 33-35 the one version, and in vv. 34, 35 the other, due to Lk. Against this view vide Feine, Volk. Überlief.

Vv. 39-45. Mary visits Elizabeth.— Ver. 39. ἤς τ. ἡ αὐτής in these (not those = ἵναις, A. V.) days = at the time of the angelic visit.— μετὰ συννηγής: no time lost, a most natural visit from one woman with a high hope, to another, a friend, in a similar state of mind.— ἐλαύνει (κόπος, again ver. 65): into the hill country, referring to the southern hill country of Judah, Benjamin and Ephraim. Galilee had a hill country too. The expression has been supposed to point to the origin of Lk.'s document in Judaea (Hillmann).— εἰς πόλιν Ιούδα, to a city of Judah, not particularly named. Reland (Palaestina) conjectures that we should read Ἰουθά, the name of a priestly city mentioned twice in Joshua (xxv. 55, xxii. 16).— Ver. 41. ἀνιστάμενος: commentators discuss the connection between the maternal excitement and the quickening of the child—which was cause and which effect. Let this and all other questions in reference to the movement denoted be passed over in respectful silence.— Ver. 42. ἀνεφάπτες: here only in N. T. The verb, with the following words, αὐθεντ}
KATA ΔΟΥΚΑΝ

"Εξεσάρτη, 42. καὶ ἀνεφώσας φωνὴ 1 μεγάλη, καὶ εἶδεν, "Εὐλογη-
μένη σὺ ἐν γυναιξί, καὶ εὐλογημένος ὁ καρπὸς τῆς κοιλίας σου.
43. καὶ πόθεν μοι τώτο, ἵνα ἐλθῇ ἡ μήτηρ τοῦ Κυρίου μου πρὸς
με; 44. ἵδο γὰρ, ὡς γένετο ἡ φωνὴ τοῦ ἄσπασμοῦ σου εἰς τὰ
ἐδώ τοῦ, ἐκφεύγαν ἐν αὐτῇ μεν ἀλλὸ τῷ βρέφες ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ μου.
1 cf. Heb. vil. ii.
45. καὶ μακαρία ἡ πιστεύσασα, δι' ἐσται 2 τελείως τοὺς λαλαλη-
μένους αὐτῇ παρὰ Κυρίῳ."

46. καὶ εἶπε Μαρία, " "Μεγαλάνθε ἡ ψυχὴ μου τῶν Κύριων,
47. καὶ ἤγιολάθη τὸ πνεῦμα μου ἐπὶ τῷ Θεῷ τῷ σωτῆρι μου;
48. δητ' ἔπεμπθεν ἐπὶ τὴν ταπείνωσιν τῆς δούλης αὐτοῦ. ἱδον
γὰρ, ἀπὸ τοῦ τῶν μακαρίου τοῦ παῖς αἱ γενεάι· 49. δητ' ἠτοίησι
μοι μεγαλεία 3 ὁ δυνάτος, καὶ δύναι τὸ ὅνομα αὐτοῦ· 50. καὶ τὸ
ἀλεον αὐτοῦ εἰς γενεάς γενεών 4 τοῖς φοβουμένοις αὐτῶν. 51. ἐποίη-
σες κράτος ἐν βραχίον ἀυτοῦ· διεσκόρπισεν ἑπερφάνους διανοία
καρδίας αὐτῶν. 52. καθελε δυνάτας ἀπὸ θρόνων, καὶ δύναι
πεινώνας. 53. πεινώνας ἐνήλπθην αὐτοῖς, καὶ πλουτώνας

1 μεγάλη in BLE (Tisch., W.H.).
2 ἁμαρτά in ΝΒ.
3 μεγάλα in ΝΒDL (Tisch., W.H.).
4 εἰς γενεάς καὶ γενεάς in BCLE (Tisch., W.H.).

megálē, point to an unrestrained utterance under the influence of irrepressible
feeling, thoroughly true to feminine nature: "blessed thou among women (a
Hebrew superlative), and blessed the fruit of thy womb," poetic parallelism
again, answering to the exalted state of
feeling. The reference to the Holy
Spirit (in ver. 41) implies that Elizabeth
spoke by prophetic inspiration.—Ver. 43.
ἐναλθ: subjunctive instead of ininf.
with art., the beginning of a tendency,
which ended in the substitution of αα
with the subjunctive for the infinitive in
modern Greek.—Ver. 44. γὰρ: implies
that from the movement of her child
Elizabeth inferred that the mother of
the Lord stood before her.—Ver. 45.
μακαρία, here, as elsewhere, points to
rare and high felicity connected with
heroic moods and achievements.—δητ',
because or that, which great conflict of
opinion among commentators. The
former sense would make δῆτι give the
reason for calling Mary blessed =
blessed because the things she hopes for
will surely come to pass. The latter
makes δῆτι indicate the object of faith =
blessed she who believes that what God
has said will come to pass, with possible allusion to her own husband's failure in
faith.

Vv. 46-56. Mary's song.—μεγαλονέ: m. malcat, Vulg., whence the ecclesiastical
name for this hymn, which has
close affinities with the song of Hanna
in 1 Sam. ii. 1-10; variously regarded by
critics: by some, e.g., Godet and Hahn,
as an extemporised utterance under in-
spiration by Mary, by others as a rem-
nant of old Jewish-Christian Hymnology
(J. Weiss, etc.), by others still as a purely
Jewish Psalm, lacking distinctively
Christian features (Hillmann). There
are certainly difficulties connected with
the first view, e.g., the conventional
phraseology and the presence of elements
which do not seem to fit the special
situation.—ψυχὴ, πνεῦμα: synonyms in
parallel clauses.—Ver. 48. This verse
and the two preceding form the first of
four strophes, into which the song natur-
ally divides. The first strophe expresses
simply the singer's gladness. The
second (vv. 49-50) states its cause. The
third (vv. 51-53) describes in gnomic
aorists the moral order of the world, for
the establishment of which God ever
works in His holy and wise Providence,
overturning the conventional order,
scattering the proud, upsetting the thrones,
and exalting them of low degree, filling
the hungry, and sending the rich away
empty. It is this third part of the hymn
which on first view seems least in keep-

ing with the occasion. And yet on a
large view this strophe exactly describes the constant tendency of Christ's influence in the world: to turn things upside down, reverse judgments, and alter positions. The last strophe (vv. 54, 55) sets forth the birth about to happen as a deed of divine grace to Israel.—Ver. 54. ἀντελάβομεν: laid hold of with a view to help, as in Isaiah xlix. 8, 9. Acts xx. 35, 1 Tim. vi. 2. Cf. ἐπαληθεύονται, Heb. ii. 10.—ἐμπιστεύομαι ἠλώνιον, καθὼς ἠλάλησον: what is about to happen is presented as fulfilling a promise made to the Fathers long, long ago, but not forgotten by God, to whom 1000 years, so far as remembering and being interested in promises are concerned, are as one day.—τῷ Ἀβραάμ καὶ τ. σ. α. The construction is a little doubtful, and has been differently understood. It is perhaps simplest to take εἰς, etc., as the dative of advantage = to remember mercy for the benefit of Abraham and his seed. The passage is an echo of Micah vii. 20.

Ver. 56. Mary returns to her home.—ἔμεινεν: the time of Mary's sojourn with her kinswoman is given as "about three months." This would bring her departure near to the time of Elizabeth's confinement. Did she remain till the event was over? That is left doubtful.

Vv. 57-66. Birth of John.—Ver. 57. ἠγέρθη, was fulfilled, the time for giving birth arrived in due course of nature.—Ver. 58. περιαύων, περί, οἴκεος, dwellers around, neighbours, here only in N. T., several times in Sept. Named first because nearest; some of the relatives would be farther away and would arrive later. This gathering of neighbours and kinsfolk (συγγενεῖς) presents a "gracious tableau of Israelite life," Godet.—πρὸς αὐτήν: a Hebraism = πρὸς αὐτήν.—συνέχαιρον αὐτῷ, they congratulated her: congratulabantur eis, Vulg.; or, better, they rejoiced with her (ver. 14).—Ver. 59. ἠδῶν, on the eighth, the legal day, they came, to circumcise the child; i. e., those who were concerned in the function—the person who performed the operation, and the relatives of the family.—ἐκάλουν may be the imperfect of repeated action = they took for granted by repeated expressions that the name was to be Zechariah, or the conative imperfect indicating a wish which was frustrated.—Ver. 60. ἰωάννη, Ἰωάννη; presumably the mother had learned this from the father, by writing on a tablet as on the present occasion. The older commentators (Meyer also) supposed a Divine revelation.—Ver. 61. συγγένεσις, kinsmanship. In Lk. only in N. T. Cf. Acts vii. 3, 14.—Ver. 62. ἐνενευόταν (here only in N. T.): they made signs, which seems to imply that Zechariah is supposed to be deaf as well as dumb. Various suggestions have been made to evade this conclusion; e. g., that men are very apt to treat a dumb person as if he were also deaf (Bengel, De Wette, Godet); that they communicated by signs instead of by
speech to spare the feelings of Elizabeth, whose judgment was being appealed from (Meyer); that a sign was all that was needed, Zechariah having heard all that was said (Blek, J. Weiss, Hahn).

-tó before the clause following—τί δὲν θέλοι, viewed as a substantive, is very appropriate in a case where the question was not spoken but signalled.—αὐτός: the optative with ἥδει, implies diverse possibilities; found in Lk.'s writings only in N. T.—Ver. 63. πινακίδιον (dim. from πίνακας), here only in N. T.: a little tablet probably covered with wax, used like a slate; πυγιλαμος in Vulg.—λέγων is used here, Hebrew fashion = to the effect.—ἐγέρθη λέγων: ἱππαλλυγο πρὸ γράφων λέγει (Pricacus) = he said by writing.—θαῦμασαν: they wondered, at this consent of the parents in giving a strange name, and felt there must be something under it—an omen.—Ver. 64. στόμα, πλάσμα: both connected with ἄρσην: each of them, the idea of opening is applicable only to the former—a case of συγματ. The return of speech a second marvel or rather a third: (1) a child of old parents; (2) the singular name; (3) the recovery of speech, much marked, and commented on among the denizens of the hill country of Judah (βιβλιαλάτρε).—φόβος, not terror, but religious awe in presence of the supernatural—characteristic of all simple people.—Ver. 66. τί ἄρα, etc.: what, in view of all these unusual circumstances, will this child come to? A most natural question. They felt sure all things portended an uncommon future for this child: "omnia principiiis inesse solent".—καὶ γὰρ, etc.: a reflection of the evangelist justifying the wistful questioning of the hill folk = they might well ask, for indeed the hand of the Lord was with him.

Vv. 67-79. The song of Zechariah, called from the first word of it in the Vulgate the Benedictus. It is usually divided into five strophes, but it is more obviously divisible into two main parts, vv. 67-75, vv. 76-79. (Briggs, The Messiah of the Gospels, calls these divisions strophes, thus recognising only two.) Hillmann (Fahrh. f. prot. Theol., 1891) regards the first part as a purely Jewish Psalm, having no reference to the birth of the Baptist; furnished with a preface, ver. 67, and an epilogue referring to the Baptist as the forerunner of Jesus by the evangelist. J. Weiss (in Meyer) seems to accept this conclusion, only suggesting that the second part (vv. 76-79) might be in the source used by Lk., appended to the Psalm by the Jewish-Christian redactor.

Ver. 67. ἐπεφθαίνων, prophesied, when? At the circumcision, one naturally assumes. Hahn, however, connects the prophesying with the immediately preceding words concerning the hand of the Lord being with the boy. That is, Zechariah prophesied when it began to appear that his son was to have a remarkable career.—Ver. 68. ἔπανοικίσατο, visited graciously (side on Mt. xxv. 36), occasionally used in Sept. in the sense of judicial visitation (Ps. lxxxix. 33). Note the use of the aorist here, which runs through vv. 68-75, in vv. 76-79
futures occur. The object of ἔκφρασιν is latent in τὸ λαῷ (ὁ λαὸς, cf. vii. 16; λαῶς applied to Israel as the chosen people, ἂνων to the other nations).—Ver. 69. κέρας σ. = βασιλέαν, because kings were anointed with a horn of oil, or = δύναμιν, because in their horn all horned animals have their power (Euthy. Zig.); a thoroughly Hebrew symbol.—ἐν ὀλίβῳ Δ., pointing to a descendant of David, who has wrought signal deliverance for Israel.—Ver. 70. ἄγιον: a predicate applied in reverence to the prophets, as to the apostles in Eph. iii. 5.—Ver. 71. σωτηρίαν, in apposition with κέρας σ., resuming and developing the thought interrupted by ver. 70, which is parenthetical.—ἐξήραν, τῶν μισοῦντων: not to be anxiously distinguished; poetic synonyma.—Ver. 72. ποιήσαι: in effect exegetical of salvation, though formally indicating the aim of the salvation.—ἐπετέλεσε τ. σ. in ver. 58, to make mercy with, for to show mercy to.—ἄγιας, holy, applied to another of Israel’s sacred inheritances: the covenant.—Ver. 73. δροκόν for δρόκον, depending on μνησθήσας, a case of inverse attraction, the noun by the relative (ὅς, object of ἐμοστὶς) instead of the relative by the noun. Cf. Lk. xx. 17. Examples from Greek authors in Bornemann, Scholia.—Ver. 75. δοθήσεται: the Godward, religious aspect of conduct (Eph. iv. 24).—διακωσμένων: the manward, ethical aspect.

Vv. 76-79. From the general thanksgiving for Divine mercy the song turns to the special cause of gladness afforded by the birth of John.—στ. πατράν: this address supposes the Baptist to be still a child, and all that is said of him is a prophetic forecast of the future, in literary form.—ψυχόν: once more, for God. In the circle which produced this hymn, and these early records, the idea of Divine transcendency characteristic of later Judaism seems to have prevailed.—Ver. 77. τὸ δοῦνα, the infinitive of purpose, to be connected with προσπορεύσῃ in ver. 76 = John will go before the Lord (Jehovah), with the view of giving the knowledge of salvation in the forgiveness of sins. This is a very general description of John’s ministry, hardly differentiating it from that of Christ. The knowledge of salvation in forgiveness is salvation = Christ’s gift.—Ver. 78. διὰ σωλήνας, etc., in account of, etc., indicating the fountain-head of salvation—the mercy of God, described in Hebrew phrase as the bowels of mercy of our God.—ἐπισκέψεις: the future (aorist in T.R.), though in few MSS. (VBL), is doubtless the true reading. In the second great strophe the verbs are all future, and describe what is to be.—ἀνάβηλλη: happily rendered “dawnspring” in A. V. The reference is undoubtedly to a light, star, or sun, not to a branch from Jesse’s stem, as it might be so far as usage in Sept. is concerned (vide Jer. xxiii. 5, Zechar. iii. 8, vi. 12), for its function is ἐπιφάνεια, to appear as a light to those in darkness (ἐπόθεσις).—σκέφτεται: vide on Mt. iv. 16.
The Benedictus is steeped in O. T. language; “an anthology from Psalms and Prophets,” Holtz, H. C.

Ver. 80. Conclusion: being a summary statement on John’s history from childhood to manhood.—πνεύματι: the growing strength of John’s spirit, the development of a remarkable moral individuality, the main point in the view of the evangelist.—ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις, in the desert places: not far to go from his home to find them; visits to them frequent in early boyhood; constant abode when youth had passed into manhood; love of solitude grown into a passion. Meet foster-mother for one who is to be the censor of his time. Essenes not far off, but no indication of contact, either outwardly or inwardly, with them.

Chapter II. The Birth and Boyhood of Jesus.—Vv. 1-5. Joseph and Mary go up to Bethlehem. In these verses Luke makes a historical statement, which one might have been inclined to regard as an illustration of the ἐκβίβασις (i. 1), at which he aimed, as well as of his desire, in the spirit of Pauline universalism, to connect the birth of Jesus with the general history of the world. In the former respect the experience of the exegete is very disappointing. The passage has given rise to a host of questions which have been discussed, with bewildering conflict of opinion, in an extensive critical and apologetic literature. The difficulty is not so much as to the meaning of the evangelist’s words, but rather as to their truth. As, however, the apologetic and the exegetical interests have been very much mixed up in the discussions, it may be well at the outset to indicate briefly the chief objections that have been taken to the passage on the score of historicity. On the face of it, Lk.’s statement is that the Roman Emperor at the time of Christ’s birth ordered a universal census, that this order was carried out by Quirinius, governor of Syria, and that the execution of it was the occasion of Joseph and Mary going to Bethlehem. To this it has been objected:

1. Apart from the Gospel, history knows nothing of a general imperial census in the time of Augustus.
2. There could have been no Roman census in Palestine during the time of Herod the Great, a rex socius.
3. Such a census at such a time could not have been carried out by Quirinius, for he was not governor in Syria then, nor till ten years later, when he did make a census which gave rise to a revolt under Judas of Galilee.
4. Under a Roman census it would not have been necessary for Joseph to go to Bethlehem, or for Mary to accompany him.—With these objections in our view we proceed with the exposition, noting their influence, as we go along, on the details of interpretation.

Ver. 1. ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἔκκαιναί: the days of Herod (i. 5), and of the events related in the previous chapter: the birth of John, etc.—δόγμα (δοκεῖ) = διδαχή, an opinion as of philosophers; here a decree, as in Acts xvii. 7.—ἀπογράφω (here and in Heb. xii. 23): the decree concerned enrolment or registration of the population (the verb might be either middle or passive—enrol itself, or be enrolled; the latter the more probable). For what purpose—taxation, or general statistical objects—not indicated, and not to be taken for granted as in the rendering “taxed” in A. V., but the former most probably intended. The hypothesis that the registration had reference to statistics meets objections i and 2, because Augustus did make or complete a descriptive oris terrarum of that sort, and such a census would give no offence to the Jews or their king.

Vide Hahn, ad loc. The Greek word for taxing is ἀπογράφω. —πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην: the whole habitable world, orbit terrarum = the Roman empire, not merely the provinces (Italy excluded), or Palestine, as has been suggested in an apologetic interest to get rid of the difficulties connected with a universal census. The usual meaning of the phrase, and the reference to Augustus as the source of the order, favour the larger sense. Augustus reigned from 30 B.C. to 14 A.D.

Ver. 2. This verse looks like a paren-
1 ἑν ἡ ἄπογραφὴ πρῶτη ἔγινεν ἡ ἀγαθομνήσθετο τῆς Συρίας Κυρηνίως.
3. καὶ ἀπορεύομαι πάντες ἀπογράφοι, ἐκατοστὶ εἰς τὴν ἱδίαν τῶν ἡλίους. 4. ἄνεβη δὲ καὶ ἱωτή ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλαήας, ἐκ τόπων Νααρέτ, εἰς τὴν Ίουδαίαν, εἰς τῶν Δαβίδ, ἔτης καλείται Βηθλεέμ, διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτῶν ἐν Οὐκ διὸ καὶ πατρίδος Δαβίδ, 5. ἀπογράφοι σὺν Μαραθῇ τῇ μεμνημονεύμακα καὶ παρακλητή γυναικείᾳ εἰς τοῦ γένους.

1 η omitted in ΝΒΔ 131; found in CLA (om. Tisch., W.H.).
2 ἑν ἄγεν before πρῶτη in ΝΔ Orig. lat. (Tisch.). An exegetical device to meet a difficulty, thinks J. Weiss. As in T.R. ABCDL (W.H.).
3 εκατοστὶ in ΝΣΒDLX (Tisch., W.H.).
4 έμφαστ in ΝΒCDLX.
5 Omit γυναικεία ΝΒCDLX 1, 131 (Tisch., W.H.).

... the theoretical explanation, and is actually bracketed in W.H. One could almost wish it had been omitted, or that there were reason to believe, as has been suggested by several writers, that it is a gloss that has found its way into the text, and that Lk. is not responsible for it—so much trouble has it given to commentators. Text and sense have alike been disputed.—ἀνθήθη has been taken as ἀνθήθη = ἀνθήθη = ἀνθήθη, the same, to make room for a distinction between the decree and its execution or completion ten years after by Quirinius, so meeting difficulty No. 3. This device is now generally discarded. πρῶτη has been taken as = πρῶτη, meaning: this census took place before Quirinius was governor, a possible but very improbable rendering, not to say that one fails to see the object of such a statement. The true text is ἄνθηθη ἀνθήθη πρῶτη ἔγινεν, and the meaning: that census took place as a first, when, etc. But why as a first? Because, reply many, there was a second, under the same Quirinius, ten years later, known to Lk. (Acts v. 37), distantly so, and which he was anxious his readers should not confound with this one (so Hahn and others).—ἡγεμονεύσωτος: this raises a question of fact. Was Quirinius governor then? He was, admittedly, governor of Syria ten years later, when he made the census referred to in Acts v. 37. Either there is a mistake here, or Quirinius was governor twice (so A. W. Zumpt, strenuously supported by Farrar, C. G. T., ad loc.), or at least present in Syria, at the time of Christ's birth, in some capacity, say as a commissioner in connection with the census.

Ver. 3. πάντες: not all throughout the world, but all in Palestine—the execution of the decree there being what the evangelist is interested in.—ἐκ τῆς ἱδίαν πόλιν (or ἑκατοστὶ π., W.H.). Does this mean to the city of his people, or to the city of his abode? If the former, what a stir in Palestine, or in the world if πάντες be taken widely! A regular "Völkerwanderung" (Holtzmann in H.C.). Sensible of this, some (Hahn, e.g.) take the reference to be to the place of residence (Wohnort not Stammort), implying that Bethlehem was for Lk. as for Mt. Joseph's home, and that they merely happened to have been living in Nazareth just before. But ver. 7 implies that Joseph and Mary had no house in Bethlehem. Feine quotes, with a certain amount of approval, the view of Schneller (Kennis du das Land) that Joseph was not a carpenter but a mason, and that Bethlehem was therefore his natural home, being the headquarters of that craft then as now. On this view, Joseph had simply been in Nazareth building a house, not at home, but away from home for a time as an artisan.

Vv. 4. 5. Joseph and Mary and Nazareth are here referred to, as if they had not been mentioned before (i. 26, 27), implying that Lk. is here using an independent document (Holtz., H.C.).—ἐκ τῆς Γαλαής, ἐπὶ τῶν πόλεων: used with classical accuracy: ἐπὶ = direction from, ἐκ from within (C. G. T.).—ἐς Οὐκ καὶ πατρίδος, "of the house and family," R. V.—οὗκος, πατρίδα, φυλή represent a series of widening circles.—ἀπογράφοις, to be enrolled. If Bethlehem was Joseph's home, he would have gone to Bethlehem sooner or later in any case. Because of the census he went just then (Hahn).—ἐς ὜μα, coming after ἀπογραφθῶ, naturally suggests that she had to be enrolled too. Was this necessary? Even if not, reasons might be suggested for
6. Ἔγενετο δὲ ἐν τῷ ἐναὶ αὐτῶν ἐκεῖ, ἐπέλθοντας αἱ Ἴμαρι τοῦ τεκεῖν αὐτὴν. 7. καὶ ἔτεκε τὸν ὑπὸ αὐτῆς τῶν πρωτότοκον, καὶ ἐσπαργάνωσεν αὐτόν, καὶ ἀνέκλινεν αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ φάτη· διότι ὅστις ἐν αὐτοῖς τότες ἐν τῇ καταλύματι.

8. Καὶ ποιμένες ἦσαν ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ τῇ αὐτῇ ἀγροκούστες καὶ φυλάσσοντες φυλακάς τῆς νυκτὸς ἐκ τῆς ποίμνης αὐτῶν. 9. καὶ Ἰωάννης ἐγγέλους Κυρίου ἐκπέμπτη αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἔδοξα Κυρίος περιλαμψεν αὐτῶν καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν φόβον μεγάλον. 10. καὶ ἔτεκεν αὐτοῖς ὁ ἄγγελος, "Μὴ φοβεῖσθε· ἱδοὺ γὰρ, οὐαγγελίζομαι ὅμως χάριν μεγάλην, ἣτε ἐσται παντὶ τῷ λαῷ· 11. ὅτι ἐκέχρη ὅμως σήμερον σωτήρ, δς ἔστιν Χριστὸς Κύριος, ἐν τῶλει λαβίδι. 12. καὶ τοῦτο ὅμως ἡμῖν τῷ σημείῳ· εὐρήστε βρέφος ἐσπαραγανόμενον, κείμενον ἐν τῇ φάτη· 13. Καὶ ἐξαίφνης ἐγενέτο εἰς τῇ ἁγγελίᾳ πλήθος

1 Omit τῇ MABDL. 2 το is omitted in BE 130 (W.H. relegate to margin).

For κείμενον τῇ φάτη ΝΔ 68 read simply τῇ φάτῃ (Tisch.). BLE 1, 33 al. have καὶ κείμενον (W.H.). Most MSS. omit τῇ before φάτῃ.

her going with her husband; her condition, the intention to settle there as their real home, she an heiress, etc.—ἐγκαθίσταται (here only in N. T.), preparing for what follows.

With reference to the foregoing statement, it is generally agreed that a census of some kind must have taken place. Meyer and Weiss, following Schlieirmacher and Olshausen, think that the event was something internal to Judaea, and concerned the revision of family genealogical registers, and that Luke was misled into transforming this petty transaction into an affair of world-historical significance. This is not satisfactory. It would be much more satisfactory if it should be shown that Luke’s historic framing of the birth of Jesus is strictly accurate. But most satisfactory of all is it to know that such a demonstration, however desirable, is not vital to faith.

Vv. 8-13. The shepherds and the angels.—Ver. 8. ποιμένες, shepherds, without article; no connection between them and the birthplace.—ἀγγέλους (ἀγγέλος, αὐτής, here only), bivouacking, passing the night in the open air; implying naturally a mild time of the year between March and November. In winter the flocks were in fold.—Ver. 9. ἐπίστηται, used elsewhere by Lk. in reference to angelic appearances, eighteen times in his writings in all = stood beside; one more than their number, suddenly.—περιλαμψεν: here and in Acts xxvi. 13, only, in N. T. = shone around.—ἐφοβήθησαν, they feared greatly; yet they were not utterly unprepared, their thoughts had been of a Divine gracious visitation—waiting for the consolation of Israel; subjective and objective corresponding.—Ver. 10. οὐαγγέλιζομαι, etc., I bring good news in the form of a great joy (cf. i. 19).—παρέτειν τῷ λαῷ, not merely to you, but to the whole people (of Israel, side i. 68).—Ver. 11. ἁγγελία: a word occurring (with σωτηρία) often in Lk. and in St. Paul, not often elsewhere in N. T.—Κῦριος: also often in Lk.’s Gospel, where the other evangelists use Jesus. The angel uses the dialect of the apostolic age.—Ver. 12. σημείον, the
sign just that which might, but for forewarning, have been a stumbling block: the Saviour and Lord lying in a crib, in a cattle stall, or cave! So Hahn, but Godet and Schanz take "sign" merely in the sense of means of identification.

Ver. 14. The angels' song.—If we regard the announcement of the angel to the shepherds (vv. 10-12) as a song, then we may view the gloria in excelsis as a refrain sung by a celestial choir (ζητοῦσι ζυγώμας οὐρανίου, ver. 13). With the reading εὐδοκίας, the refrain is in two lines:

1. “Glory to God in the highest.”
2. “And on earth peace among men, in whom He is well pleased.”

εἰρήνη in 2 answering to δῶξα in 1; ἐν γῇς to ἐν υἱοίσιοι; ἀνθρώποι to Θεός. With the reading εὐδοκίας (T.R.), it falls into three:
1. Glory to God in the highest.
2. And on earth peace (between man and man).
3. Good will (of God) among men.

ἐν υἱοίσιοι, in the highest places, proper abode of Him who is repeatedly in these early chapters called "the Highest". The thought in 1 echoes a sentiment in the Psalter of Solomon (18, 11), μέγας ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν καὶ ἐνδοξος ἐν υἱοίσιοι.—εὐδοκίας is a gen. of quality, limiting ἀνθρώποις—those men who are the objects of the Divine εὐδοκία. They may or may not be all men, but the intention is not to assert that God's good pleasure rests on all. J. Weiss in Meyer says = τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς.

Vv. 15-20. The shepherds go to Bethlehem.—Διδομένης δὲ, come! let us go. The force of δὲ, a highly emotional particle (the second time we have met with it, vide at Mt. xiii. 23), can hardly be expressed in English. The rendering in A. V. (and R. V.), "Let us now go," based on the assumption that δὲ has affinity with ἦδη, is very tame, giving no idea of the mental excitement of the shepherds, and the demonstrative energy with which they communicated to each other, comrade-fashion, the idea which had seized their minds. "The δὲ gives a pressing character to the invitation," Godet. Similarly Hahn = "agedum, wehlan, doch". Cf. δὲ in Acts xiii. 2. The δὲ in Διδομένην suggests the idea of passing through the fields.—ἐσσε (conjunction used as a preposition) may imply that it was a considerable distance to Bethlehem (Schanz).—ἡμεῖς, here = "thing" rather than "word".—Ver. 16. σπεύδοντες, hastening; movement answering to mood revealed by δὲ.—τὴν τίς Μαριάμ, etc., mother, father, child, recognised in this order, all united together in one group by τι. The position of the babe, in the manger, noted as corresponding to the angelic announcement; hence in ver. 17 the statement that the shepherds recognised the correspondence.—Vv. 18, 19. The shepherds of course told what they had seen in Bethlehem, and how they had been led to go there, and these verses state the effect produced by their story.
All wondered, but Mary thought on all the wonderful things that had happened to herself and to the shepherds; keeping them well in mind, and putting them together, so as to see what they all meant. The wonder of the many was a transient emotion (aorist); this recollecting and brooding of Mary was an abiding habit (aorist imperfect).

Vv. 21-24. Circumcision and presentation in the temple.—Ver. 21. ἵνα ἐπιστρέψων, as in i. 57, ii. 6, and again in ii. 22; in the first two places the reference is to the course of nature, in the second two to the course prescribed by the law.—τοῦ περιτέμνειν, the genitive not so much of purpose (Meyer, J. Weiss), but of more exact definition (Schanz; vide Burton, M. and T., § 400, on the use of τοῦ with infinitive to limit nouns).—καὶ ἐκλήθη: the καὶ may be taken as “also.”—He was circumcised (understood), and at the same time His name was called Jesus, or as introducing the apodosis: and = then (so Godet and Hahn). It might have been dispensed with (superfluit, Grocius).—Ver. 22. κατὰ τὸν νόμον Μ. The law relating to women after purification is contained in Leviticus xii.—ἀνήγαγον: at the close of these forty days of purification His parents took Jesus up to Jerusalem from Bethlehem. The Greek form of the name for Jerusalem, Ἰεροσόλυμα, occurs here and in a few other places in Lk. Ἰεροσόλυμα is the more common form.—παραστήσασα, a word used by Lk. and St. Paul (Rom. xii. 1), in the sense of dedication. This act was performed in accordance with the legal conception that the first-born belonged to God. His priestly servants before the institution of the Levitical order (Num. viii. 18, 19). J. Weiss suggests that the narrative is modelled on the story of the dedication of Samuel (1 Sam. i. 21-28).—Ver. 23. γέγραπται: the reference is to Ex. xiii. 2, and the statement implies that every first-born male child, as belonging to God, must be ransomed (Ex. xxiv. 19, Num. xviii. 15, 16).—Ver. 24. τοῦ δεοῦσα: parallel to παραστήσασα, indicating another of the purposes connected with the visit to Jerusalem. The mother went to offer her gift of thanksgiving after the days of purification were ended.—τοῦ εἰρήμονα, in Lev. xii., where alternative offerings are specified: a lamb, and a turtle dove or a young pigeon; and in case of the poor two turtle doves, or two young pigeons, the one for a burnt offering, the other for a sin offering. Mary brought the poor woman’s offering. The question has been asked, why any purification in this case? and the fact has been adduced in proof that the original docu-
25. Καὶ ἦδεν, ἦν ἄνθρωπος 1 ἐν ἑρωοταλῆμ, ὡς ὁμοία Συμεὼν,
καὶ ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος δίκαιος καὶ ἐελαφής, προσδεχόμενος παρὰ—ἐπὶ Ἀκτι 5:10
κλήσιν τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, καὶ Πνεῦμα "Ἄγιον ἦν" 2 ἐν αὐτῶν. 26. καὶ ἦν ἐπὶ 12:14
αὐτῷ κεχρηματισμένον ὅτι τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ Άγίου, μὴ ἢ ἰδεῖν ἀπὸ τῶν τιτ. 5:25
θάνατον πρὶν ἢ ἢ ἢ ἢ τῶν Ἰσραήλ Κυρίου. 27. Καὶ ἦλθεν ἐν τῷ
Πνεύματι εἰς τὸ οἰκόν· καὶ ἐν τῷ εἰσαγαγεῖν τοὺς γονεῖς τοῦ παιδίον
τούτου, τοῦ ποιήσαν αὐτόσι κατά το εὐθυμίων τοῦ νόμου περὶ αὐτοῦ, 28. καὶ αὐτὸσ ἔθεσαν αὐτό εἰς τὰς ἀδικίας αὐτοῦ, 4 καὶ εἰλαφήσεν
tὸν Θεόν, καὶ ἐστε, 29. "Πῶς ἀπολύεις τῶν δοῦλων σου, δοῦτοσα,
cατὰ τὸ βήμα σου, ἐν εἰρήνῃ 30. ὅτι εἶδον οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ μου τὸ

1 ἄνθρωπος before ἦν in ᾽ΝΒ (Tisch., W.H.). ἦν αὐς. in ADLΔ (not to be summarily rejected, J. Weiss).

2 ἦν before ἄγιον in ᾽ΝΒΔ a., c. T.R. = D.

3 πρὶν η in ᾽ΔΔΔ; πρὶν αὐτὰ in BF 36 (W.H. bracket πρὶν αὐτὰ); πρὶν η αὐτῶν in L 33 (Tisch.).

4 ᾽ΝΒΔ omit αὐτοῦ (Tisch., W.H.).

ment used by Lk. knew nothing of the virgin birth.—γονή, ver. 27, has been used for the same purpose (vide Hillmann, Jahrb. f. pr. Theol., 1891).

Vv. 25-28. Σίμων—Συμεὼν, introduced as a stranger (ἄνθρωπος ἦν). The legendary spirit which loves definite particulars about celebrities of Scripture has tried to fill up the blank. The father of Gamaliel the son of Hillel, one of the seventy translators of the Hebrew Bible, are among the suggestions. A bracketed passage in Euthy. Zig. says, in reference to the latter suggestion, that Simeon alone of the company objected to the rendering of Isaiah vii. 14: "Then shall the virgin son of his mother take upon him the name of a new king" (inscription on a tombstone in a soldiers' graveyard in Virginia), just and God-fearing, a saint of the O. T. type.—προσδεχόμενος περὰκλῆσιν τ. ὅτι: an earnest believer in the Messianic hope, and fervently desiring its early fulfilment. Its fulfilment would be Israel's consolation. The Messianic hope, the ideal of a good time coming, was the child of present sorrow—sin and misery prevalent, all things out of joint. The keynote of this view is struck in Is. xl. 1: "comfort ye"—παρακαλέστε. The Rabbis called Messiah the Comforter, Menahem. Cf. προσδεχόμενος περὶ αὐτῶν in ver. 38.—Ver. 26. ἄνθρωπος παρὰ—ἐπὶ Ἀκτι 5:10
κλήσιν τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, καὶ Πνεῦμα "Ἄγιον ἦν" 2 ἐν αὐτῶν. 26. καὶ ἦν ἐπὶ 12:14
αὐτῷ κεχρηματισμένον ὅτι τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ Άγίου, μὴ ἢ ἰδεῖν ἀπὸ τῶν τιτ. 5:25
θάνατον πρὶν ἢ ἢ ἢ τῶν Ἰσραήλ Κυρίου. 27. Καὶ ἦλθεν ἐν τῷ
Πνεύματι εἰς τὸ οἰκόν· καὶ ἐν τῷ εἰσαγαγεῖν τοὺς γονεῖς τοῦ παιδίον
τούτου, τοῦ ποιήσαν αὐτόσι κατά το εὐθυμίων τοῦ νόμου περὶ αὐτοῦ, 28. καὶ αὐτὸσ ἔθεσαν αὐτό εἰς τὰς ἀδικίας αὐτοῦ, 4 καὶ εἰλαφήσεν
tὸν Θεόν, καὶ ἐστε, 29. "Πῶς ἀπολύεις τῶν δοῦλων σου, δοῦτοσα,
cατὰ τὸ βήμα σου, ἐν εἰρήνῃ 30. ὅτι εἶδον οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ μου τὸ

1 ἄνθρωπος before ἦν in ᾽ΝΒ (Tisch., W.H.). ἦν αὐς. in ADLΔ (not to be summarily rejected, J. Weiss).

2 ἦν before ἄγιον in ᾽ΝΒΔ a., c. T.R. = D.

3 πρὶν η in ᾽ΔΔΔ; πρὶν αὐτὰ in BF 36 (W.H. bracket πρὶν αὐτὰ); πρὶν η αὐτῶν in L 33 (Tisch.).

4 ᾽ΝΒΔ omit αὐτοῦ (Tisch., W.H.).
... destined to be much spoken against (ἀντιλεγόμενον); this inevitable because of a mother's intense love. Mary's sorrow is compared vividly to a sword through her soul. It is a figure strong enough to cover the bitterest experiences of the Mater Dolorosa, but it does not necessarily imply prevision of the cross. There is therefore no reason, on this account at least, for the suggestion that Ver. 35 is an editorial addition to his source by the evangelist (J. Weiss).

1 For τοις... θαυμάστηκαν τότε οἱ ἀνθρώποι καὶ ἡ μήτηρ Θαυμ. with ΥBLD 1, 131. NL retain second anton. The substitution of ἱσόθεν for οἱ πατήρ explains itself.

8 οὐκ... προσέβαλεν τῷ πλήθει τῶν πολλῶν. The substitution of ἱσόθεν for οἱ πατήρ explains itself.
lived (De Wette, J. Weiss, Schanz, Hahn).—"Anna = Ἄννα, 1 Sam. i. 20 (Anna in Sept.) = grace. Of this woman some particulars are given, e.g., her father and her tribe, which makes the absence of such details in Simeon's case more noteworthy. The two placed side by side give an aspect of historicity to the narrative.—ἀντι (or ἀντί, the sense much the same) introduces some further details in a loosely constructed sentence, which looks like biographic notes, with verbs left out = she advanced in years, having lived with a husband, seven years from virginity, the same a widow till eighty-four years—all which may be regarded, if we will, as a parenthesis, followed by a relative clause containing a statement of more importance, describing her way of life = who departed not from the temple, serving (God) by fasts and prayers, night and day.—Ver. 37. ἄπω: either a widow for eighty-four years (Godet), or, as most think, a widow till the eighty-fourth year of her life. The former rendering would make her very old; married, say, at sixteen, seven years a wife, eighty-four years a widow = toy; not impossible, and borne out by the τελευκαν (ver. 36, advanced in days = many).—μεταβαλλεῖ: the fasting might be due to poverty, or on system, which would suggest a Judaistic type of piety. —πάντα ἢ: did she sleep within the temple precincts?—Ver. 38. The T.R. has yet another αὐτή here (the third), before αὐτή, which really seems wanted as nominative to the verb following, but which one can imagine scribes omitting to relieve the heaviness and monotony of the style.—ἀνθρωπολογεῖν (here only in N. T.): perhaps no stress should be laid on the preposition ἀνθρ., as the compound verb occurs in the sense of the simple verb in Sept. (Ps. lxxix. 13). The suggestion of an antiphony between Anna and Simeon (Godet; viciissim, Bengel) is tempting = began in turn to give thanks. The αὐτή may refer to spectators = began to praise God openly before all (Hahn). The subject of her praise of course was Jesus (περὶ αὐτοῦ), and its burden that He was the Saviour.—κανάλει points to an activity not confined to a single utterance; she spoke again and again on the theme to all receptive spirits. The omission of ἀνθρ. before ἐσπ. in Ἕβ, etc., gives us a peculiar designation for the circle to whom the prophetess addressed herself = those waiting for the redemption of Jerusalem (instead of Israel in ver. 25). Yet Isaiah xi. 2—"speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem"—makes such a turn of thought intelligible. And there might be discerning ones who knew that there was no place more needing redemption than that holy, unholy city.——

Vv. 39, 40. Return to Nazareth.—ὁλοκαυτών, their own city, certainly
KATA LOUKAN

41. Καὶ ἔπερε σήμερον οἱ γονεῖς αὐτῶν κατ' ἐτος εἰς ἱεροσόλυμα τῇ ὁρᾷ τοῦ πάσχα. 42. καὶ ὅτα ἐγένετο ἐν ἤλθεν δασκάλα, ἀναβάσσων αὐτῶν εἰς ἱεροσόλυμα 2 κατά τὸ θὸς τῆς ὁράσεως, 43. καὶ τελειωσάτων τὸ ἡμέρας, ἐν τῇ ὑποστρέφειν αὐτῶν, ὑπήκοον ἤπειρον 3 ἡμέρας ἐν ἱεροσόλυμα: καὶ οὐκ ἔγνω ἑωράσῃ καὶ η ἡμέρα 4 αὐτῶν. 44. ὡμώνυσε δὲ αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ συνοδείᾳ εἶναι, ἡλθον ἡμέρας ἄδων, καὶ ἀνέβησαν αὐτῶν ἐν τοῖς συνήγεισι καὶ ἐν τοῖς γνωρίσιοι. 45. καὶ μη ἐφόρτησε αὐτῶν, ὑποστρέφαν εἰς ἱεροσόλυμα ἤπειρον αὐτῶν. 46. καὶ ἐγένετο μὲν ἡμέρα τρέις, εὐρόν αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ ἱερᾷ, καθέλθοντον ἐν μέσῳ τῶν δασκάλων, καὶ ἀκούσαντα αὐτῶν, καὶ

suggesting that Nazareth, not Bethlehem, had been the true home of Joseph and Mary.—Ver. 40. ἠκρατήσαν καὶ ἐκρατά-σωσα, grew, and waxed strong, both in the reference to the physical nature.—πνεῦ-μα in T.R. is borrowed from i. 80; a healthy, vigorous child, an important thing to note in reference to Jesus.—πληροφορῶν: present participle, not = πλεον, Vulg., full, but in course of being filled with wisdom—mind as well as body subject to the law of growth.—χάρις: a great word of St. Paul’s, also more used by Lk. than by either of the other two synoptists (vide i. 52, iv. 22, vi. 32, 33, 34); here to be taken broadly = favour, good pleasure. The child Jesus dear to God, and the object of His paternal care. Vv. 41-52. When twelve years old. Lk. here relates one solitary, significant incident from the early years of Jesus, as if to say: from this, learn all. The one story shows the wish to collect anecdotes of those silent years. There would have been more had the evangelist had more to tell. The paucity of information favours the historicity of the tradition.—Ver. 41. καὶ ἔποιε: law—observing people, piously observant of the annual feasts, especially that of the passover.—Ver. 42. ἐν ἄλλω δασκάλ: this mention of the age of Jesus is meant to suggest, though it is not directly stated, that this year He went up to Jerusalem with His parents; ἀναβαίνουν includes Him. At twelve a Jewish boy became a son of the law, with the responsibility of a man, putting on the phylacteries which

reminded of the obligation to keep the law (vide Wünsche, Beiträge, ad loc.).—Ver. 43. τελειωσάτων τῇ. This naturally means that they stayed all the time of the feast, seven days. This was not absolutely incumbent; some went home after the first two days, but such people as Joseph and Mary would do their duty thoroughly.—ἀνέβησαν, tarried behind, not so much intentionally (Hahn) as by involuntary preoccupation—His nature rather than His will cause the effect (Acts xvii. 14).—Ver. 44. ἐν τῇ συνοδείᾳ, in the company journeying together (ἐν, ὄνομα only in N. T.), a journeying together, then those who so journey. A company would be made up of people from the same neighbourhood, well acquainted with one another.—ἡμέρα ὄνομα, a day’s journey. It is quite conceivable how they should have gone on so long without missing the boy, without much or any help on the part of the parents; not negligence, but human infirmity at worst.—συγγενεῖς, γνωρίσι: kinsfolk and acquaintances. Had there been less acquaintance and intimacy there had been less risk of losing the child. Friends take up each other’s attention, and members of the same family do not stick so close together, and the absence of one excites no surprise.—Ver. 45. ἀνεξαντίου-τες: the present participle, expressing the purpose of the journey back to Jerusalem, where (not on the road) the search took place (cf. Acts xi. 25). The ἀνά here (as in ἀνέβησαν, ver. 44) implies careful, anxious search.—Ver. 46. ἡμέρα τρέις, three days, measured from
the time they had last seen Him, not implying three days' search in Jerusalem. The place where they had lodged and the temple would be among the first places visited in the search. —ἐν τῇ ἱερᾶ: probably in a chamber in the temple court used for teaching and kindred purposes. Some think it was in a synagogue beside the temple. —Ver. 46. καθέξομενον, sitting; therefore, it has been inferred, as a teacher, not as a scholar, among (ἐν μάθω) the doctors, for scholars stood, teachers only sitting. An unwelcome conclusion, to which, happily, we are not shut up by the evidence, the posture rule on which it rests being more than doubtful (vide Vitringa, Synag., p. 167). —ἐπιστρέφων: nothing unusual, and nothing unbecoming a thoughtful boy. —Ver. 48. καθέξων refers to the parents. This astonishment points to some contrast between a previous quiet, reserved manner of Jesus and His present bearing; sudden flashing out of the inner life. —ἡ μήτηρ: the mother spoke naturally; a woman, and the mother's heart more keenly touched. This apart from the peculiar relation referred to in Bengel's major erat necessitudo matrix. —Ver. 49. ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς μου, in the things of my Father ("about my Father's business," A. V.); therefore in the place of house of my Father (R. V.); the former may be the verbal translation, but the latter is the real meaning Jesus wished to suggest. In this latter rendering patristic and modern interpreters in the main concur. Note the new name for God compared with the "Highest" and the "Despotes" in the foregoing narrative. The dawn of a new era is here. —Ver. 50. οὐ συνήκαν, they did not understand; no wonder! Even we do not yet fully understand. —Ver. 51. κατῆκα: He went down with them, gentle, affectionate, habitually obedient (ὑπακοὴν ὀφείλον), yet far away in thought, and solitary. —κατῆκα: she did not forget, though she did not understand. —Ver. 52. προέκοψε, steadily grew, used intransitively in later Greek. —ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ καὶ ἀλήθεια, in wisdom and (also as, the one the measure of the other) in stature, both growths alike real. Real in body, apparent in the mind: growth in manifestation of the wisdom within, complete from the first—such is the docetic gloss of ecclesiastical interpreters, making the childhood of Jesus a monstrum, and His humanity a phantom. —χάριτι γ. ὥ. καλ. ά., in favour with God and men: beloved of all; no division even among men while the new wisdom and the new religion lay a slumbering germ in the soul of the heaven-born boy. Chapter III. THE MINISTRY OF THE NEW ERA OPENS. Having related the beginnings of the lives of the two prophets of the new time (chapters i. and ii.), the evangelist now introduces us to the beginnings of their prophetic ministries, or rather to the ministry of
The spelling of this word varies in MSS. B has it as in T.R. Ἑν τοῖς πατραχοὺσιν, which Tisch. and W.H. adopt.

John as the prelude to the evangelic drama. In regard to the ministry of Jesus he gives us merely the date of its beginning (iii. 23), attaching thereto a genealogy of Jesus. Bengel has well expressed the significance of this chapter by the words: Hic quasi scena N. T. panditur.

Vv. 1-2. General historic setting of the beginnings. For Mt.'s vague "in those days" (iii. 1), which leaves us entirely in the dark at what date and age Jesus entered on His prophetic career, Lk. gives a group of dates connecting his theme with the general history of the world and of Palestine; the universalistic spirit here, as in ii. 1, 2, apparent. This spirit constitutes the permanent ethical interest of what may seem otherwise dry details: for ordinary readers of the Gospel little more than a collection of names, personal and geographical.

Worthy of note also, as against those who think Lk. was to a large extent a free inventor, is the indication here given of the historical spirit, the desire to know the real facts (i. 3). The historic data, six in all, define the date of John's ministry with reference to the reigning Roman emperor, and the civil and ecclesiastical rulers of Palestine.

Ver. 1. ἐν Φαραώ, etc., in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius as Caesar. This seems a very definite date, rendering all the other particulars, so far as fixing time is concerned, comparatively superfluous. But uncertainty comes in in connection with the question: is the fifteenth year to be reckoned from the death of Augustus (19 Aug., 27 B.C.), when Tiberius became sole emperor, or from the beginning of the regency of Tiberius, two years earlier? The former mode of calculation would give us 28 or 29 A.D. as the date of John's ministry and Christ's baptism, making Jesus then thirty-two years old; the latter, 26 A.D., making Jesus then thirty years old, agreeing with iii. 23. The former mode of dating would be more in accordance with the practice of Roman historians and Josephus; the latter lends itself to apologetic and harmonistic interests, and therefore is preferred by many (e.g., Farrar and Hahn).—Πιλάτου. Pilate was governor of the Roman province of Judæa from 26 A.D. to 36 A.D., the fifth in the series of governors. His proper title was Εὐσκεκροτημένος (hence the reading of D: Ἠσσεκροτημένος π. π.); usually Ἡρῴδης in Gospels. He owes his place here in the historic framework to the part he played in the last scenes of our Lord's life. Along with his name are named next two joint rulers of other parts of Palestine, belonging to the Herod family; brought in, though of no great importance for dating purposes, because they, too, figure occasionally in the Gospel story.—τετραρχεὺς, acting as tetrarch. The verb means primarily: ruling over a fourth part, then by an easy transition acting as a tributary prince.—Γαλαάς: about twenty-five miles long and broad, divided into lower (southern) Galilee and upper (northern). With Galilee was joined for purposes of government Perea.—Ἡρῴδου, Herod Antipas, murderer of the Baptist, and having secular authority over Jesus as his subject.—Φαλίτου, Herod Philip, brother of Antipas, whose name reappears in the new name of Paneas, rebuilt or adorned by him, Caesarea Philippi in Ebenezer, modern El-Lejah, the kingdom of Og in ancient times, was a basaltic region south of Damascus, and east of Golan. It is probable that only a fragment of Ituraea belonged to Philip, the region around
Panæas. On the other hand, according to Josephus, his territories embraced more than the regions named by Lk.: Batanæa, Auranitis, Gaulonitis, and some parts about Jannia (various places in Ant. and B. J.).—Awawaw, etc. This last item in Lk.'s dating apparatus is the most perplexing, whether regard be had to relevancy or to accuracy. To what end this reference to a non-Jewish prince, and this outlying territory between the Lebanon ranges? What concern has it with the evangelic history, or of what use is it for indicating the place of the latter in the world's history? By way of answer to this question, Farrar (C. G. T.) suggests that the district of Abilene (Abila the capital) is probably mentioned here "because it subsequently formed part of the Jewish territory, having been assigned by Caligula to his favourite, Herod Agrippa I., in A.D. 36". As to the accuracy: it so happens that there was a Lysanias, who ruled over Chalchia and Abilene sixty years before the time of which Lk. writes, who probably bore the title tetrarch. Does Lk., misled by the title, think of that Lysanias as a contemporary of Herod Antipas and Herod Philip, or was there another of the name really their contemporary, whom the evangelist has in his view? Certain inscriptions can be produced that make the latter hypothesis probable. Schürer (The Jewish People, Div. I., vol. ii., appendix 1, on the History of Chalchis, Ituraea, and Abilene, p. 338) has no doubt on the point, and says: "the evangelist, Lk., is thoroughly correct when he assumes that in the fifteenth year of Tiberias there was a Lysanias tetrarch of Abilene ".

Ver. 2. ἀρχιερέως "Ἀννα καὶ Καίθα, under the high priesthood of Anna and Caiaphas. The use of the singular ἀρχιερέως in connection with two names is peculiar, whence doubtless the correction into the easier ἀρχιερέως (T. R.); and the combination of two men as holding the office at the same time, is likewise somewhat puzzling. As Caiaphas was the actual high priest at the time, one would have expected his name to have stood, if not alone, at least first = under Caiaphas, the actual high priest, and the ex-high priest, Anna, still an influential senior. One can only suppose that among the caste of high priests past and present (there had been three between Anna and Caiaphas) Anna was so outstanding that it came natural to name him first. Anna had been deposed arbitrarily by the Roman governor, and this may have increased his influence among his own people. His period of office was A.D. 7-14, that of Caiaphas A.D. 17-35.—ἔγνωτο δὲ ἡμα, etc., came the word of God to John; this the great spiritual event, so carefully dated, after the manner of the O. T. in narrating the beginning of the career of a Hebrew prophet (vide, e.g., Jer. 1. 1). But the date is common to the ministry of John and that of Jesus, who is supposed to have begun His work shortly after the Baptist.—ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ. From next verse it may be gathered that the desert here means the whole valley of the Jordan, El-Ghor.

Vv. 3-6. John's ministry.—Ver. 3. ἦν ἐξ οἱ πέντε. In Mt. and Mk. the people come from all quarters to John. Here John goes to the people in an itinerant ministry. The latter may apply to the early stage of his ministry. He might move about till he had attracted attention, then settle at a place convenient for baptism, and trust to the impression produced to draw the people to him.—κηρύσσων, etc.: here Lk. follows Mk. verbatim, and like him, as distinct from Mt., connects John's baptism with the forgiveness of sins, so making it in effect Christian.—Ver. 4. βιβλίων λόγων: Lk. has his own way of
trîbous aîtô. 5. pása φάραγγι λαπρώθηται, kal tavn dros kal
e Ch. xxiii. 6. wovas ταπεινωθήσεται; kai εστιν τα σκολια εις εδείων, kai al
τραχεία εις δόξαν λείας. 6. kai ἐφετεῖ τάσα σάρξ τῷ σωτηρίῳ
tou Theou.' 7. 'Ελεγεν οὖν τοῖς ἐκπορευόμενοις δήλως βαπτισθήναι ὑπ᾽ αὐτοῦ. "Γεννήματα ἐχθρίων, τίς ὑπέδειξαν ὑμῖν φυγεῖν ἀπὸ τῆς
μελλουσάς θρίγης; 8. πολίστατε οὖν καρποῦς δέξιους τῆς μετανοίας
cal. Μή ἁρέσηδε λέγειν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, Πατέρα ἔχομεν τῶν Ἀβραάμ.
λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, ὅτι δύναται ὁ Θεὸς ἐκ τῶν λίθων τούτων ἔγειραι
tέκνα τῷ Ἀβραάμ. 9. Ἰδὴ δὲ καὶ ἡ ἀξίη πρὸς τὴν ἐπίθεσιν τῶν
ἀνδρῶν καίτε: πᾶν οὖν ἄνδραν μή ποιοῦ τοιοῦτον καλῶν ἐπεκτεῖ
tαι καὶ εἰς τὸ πῶρ βάλλεται." 10. Καὶ ἐπιρρήτων αὐτὸν οὐ δήλοι, λέγοντες, "Τί οὖν ποιήσωμεν?";
ΠΙ. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ λέγει 4 αὐτοῖς, "Τῷ ἔχον δύο χιτώνας μεταδότω

1 εὐθείας in BDE. T.R. = ΝCLΔ many vers.
αἵμας καρπους in B. Orig. (W.H. marg.). Most uncials as in T.R. (Tisch.).
τοιχύσαμεν in most uncials (Tisch., W.H.).
ελεγεν in ΝΒCL 1, 33, 69 al.

introducing the prophetic citation ("in the
book of the words"), as he also
follows his own course as to the words
quoted. Whereas Mt. and Mk. are con-
tent to cite just so much as suffices to
set forth the general idea of preparing
the way of the Lord, Lk. quotes in con-
tinuation the words which describe
pictorially the process of preparation
(ver. 5), also those which describe the
grand result: all mankind experiencing
the saving grace of God (ver. 6). The
universalistic bias appears here again.—
Ver. 5. φάραγγι, a ravine, here only in
N. T.—εἰς εὐθείας, the crooked places
shall be (become) straight (ways, δόξας,
understood)—ἀλ τραχεία (δόξας),
the rough ways shall become smooth.

Vv. 7-9. John's preaching (cf. Mt.
iii. 7-10).—Lk. gives no account of
John's aspect and mode of life, leaving
that to be inferred from i. 80. On the
other hand he enters into more detail in
regard to the drift of his preaching.
These verses contain Lk.'s version of
the Baptist's censure of his time.—Ver.
7. ἐκπορευομένοις δήλως: what Mt.
represents as addressed specially to the
Pharisees and Sadducees, Lk. less appro-
priately gives as spoken to the general
crowd. Note that here, as in the other
synoptists, the crowd comes to John,
though in ver. 3 John goes to them.—
γεννήματα ἐχθρίων: on this figure vide
Mt. Lk.'s report of the Baptist's severe
words corresponds closely to Mt.'s,
suggesting the use of a common source,
if not of Mt. himself. The points of
variation are unimportant.—Ver. 8.
καρποῦς: instead of καρπῶν, perhaps
to answer to the various types of reform
specified in the sequel.—ἀργυρίῳ instead
of δόξας (vide on Mt.), on which Ben-
gel's comment is: "omnis excusationis
etiam conatum praecidit". While the
words they are forbidden to say are the
same in both accounts, perhaps the
raising up children to Abraham has a
wider range of meaning for the Pauline
Lk. than for Mt.: sons from even the
Pagan world.

Vv. 10-14. Class counsels, peculiar to
Lk. Two samples of John's counsels to
classes are here given, prefaced by a
counsel applicable to all classes. The
classes selected to illustrate the Baptist's
social preaching are the much tempted
ones: publicans and soldiers.—Ver. 10.
ἐπιρρήτων, imperfect. Such questions
would be frequent, naturally suggested
by the general exhortations to repentance.
The preacher would probably give
special illustrative counsels without
being asked. Those here reported are
meant to be characteristic.—τοιχύσαμεν:
subj. delib.—Ver. 11. δόξοι: two, one
to spare, not necessarily two on the
person, one enough; severely simple
ideas of life. The χιτών was the under
garment, vide on Mt. v. 40.—βρώσαμεν:
the plural should perhaps not be
emphasised as if implying variety and
5—16. ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ

τῷ μὴ ἔχοντι· καὶ ὁ ἔχων βράμματα δόμισθη δοτικῶν·

12. Ἡλίαν δὲ καὶ τελώνα βαπτισθήναι, καὶ εἶπον πρὸς αὐτόν, "Ἀδείασκε, τί θείον·" 15. πρὸς αὐτοῦ, "Ὑπέδη διασείς, μηδὲ ἐςκοφαντηθήτης· καὶ ο ἐν πλάχειοι αὐτοῦ, ἀρκεθέν τοις ὀφωνίοις ὦρων·" 16. ἀπεκρίνατο δ ἵωνης ἀπασι λέγων, "Εγὼ μὲν ἔτασι βαπτίζω ὄμος· ἐρχέσθη δ ἰσχυρότερος μου, οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανός λύσαι τον ἱμάτῳ τῶν ὑποθημάτων αὐτοῦ· αὐτὸς ὄμος βαπτίσει ἐν Πνεύματι

1 Again ποιησμοὺς in most uncials; also in ver. 14.
2 τι ποίησις in ΝΒCLE 1, 69.
3 αὐτοῦ for πρὸς αὐτοῦ in BDLE 33 (W.H.).
4 ΝΒΛ have λέγων απασι ο 1. (Tisch., W.H.).

abundance (τῶν περιστεραῖον, Grotius). The counsel is: let him that hath food give to him that hath none, so inculcating a generous, humane spirit. Here the teaching of John, as reported by Lk., touches that of Jesus, and is evangelical not legal in spirit.—Ver. 13. μὴδὲ πλῆθος παρά: this mode of expression comparison (usual in mod. Grk.) is common to Lk. and the Ep. to Heb. (i. 4, etc.), and has been used in support of the view that Lk. wrote Heb. “Non improbabilis videtur mihi eorum opinio qui Lucae eam Ep. adjudicavit,” Priceus. —πράσονε, make in a sinister sense, exact, εἰσίγει, Beza. Kypke quotes Julius Pollux on the vices of the publicans, one being περιστεραῖς, nimum exigens, and remarks that this word could not be better explained than by the phrase in Lk., πράσονε τῷ Πίλατῳ. —Ver. 14. στρατεύομενοι, "soldiers on service", R. V. margin. So also Farrar. But Field disputes this rendering. “The advice seems rather to point to soldiers at home, mixing among their fellow-citizens, than to those who were on the march in an enemy’s country” (Ot. Nor.). Schürer, whom J. Weiss follows, thinks they would be heathen.—διασείς: the verb (here only) means literally to shake much, here = to extort money by intimidation = concerto in law, Latin. This military vice would be practised on the poor. —ἐςκοφαντηθήτης: literally to inform on those who exported figs from Athens; here = to obtain money by acting as informers (against the rich).— ὀφωνίους (ὀφων, ὀφωνίας): a late Greek word, primarily anything eaten with bread, specially fish, "kitchen"; salary paid in kind; then generally wages. Vide Rom. vi. 23, where the idea is the “kitchen,” the best thing sin has to give is death.

Vv. 15-17. Art thou the Christ? (Mt. iii. 11, 12, Mk. i. 7, 8).—Ver. 15. στρατοκώντων: in Mt. and Mk. John introduces the subject of the Messiah of his own accord: in Lk. in answer to popular expectation and conjecture; an intrinsically probable account, vide on Mt.—μῆπως, etc., whether perhaps he might not himself be the Christ; expresses very happily the popular state of mind.—Ver. 16. ἄσως: might suggest frequent replies to various parties, uniform in tenor; but against this is the aorist ἀπεκρίνατο, which suggests a single answer given once for all, to a full assembly, a formal solemn public declaration. On the Baptist’s statement in this and the following verse, vide on Mt.—ἐν Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ καὶ πνεύματι: against the idea of many commentators that the Holy Spirit and fire represent opposite effects on opposite classes—saving and punitive—Godet and Hahn press the omission of ἐν before πνεύματι, and take Ἁγίῳ and πνεύμα to be kindred = the emblem of the Spirit as a purifier. They are right as to the affinity but not as to the function. The function in both cases is judicial. John refers to the Holy Wind and Fire of Judgment.
It is, however, not impossible that Lk. read an evangelic sense into John's words.

Vv. 18-20. Close of the Baptist's ministry and life. Lk. gives here all he means to say about John, condensing into a single sentence the full narratives of Mt. and Mk. as to his end.—Ver. 18. πολλά μὲν οὖν καὶ ἑτέρα "many things, too, different from these" (Farrar, who refers to John i. 29, 34, iii. 27-30, as illustrating the kind of utterances meant). The εὐθυγελίστη following seems to justify emphasising ἑτέρα, as pointing to a more evangelic type of utterance than those about the αξε and the fan, and the wrath to come. But it may be questioned whether by such a representation the real John of history is not to a certain extent a consciously idealised and Christianised—μὲν οὖν: the οὖν may be taken as summarising and concluding the narrative about John and μὲν as answering to δὲ in ver. 19 = John was carrying on a useful evangelic ministry, but it was cut short; or μὲν οὖν may be taken as one word, emphasising πολλά καὶ ἑτέρα, and preparing for transition to what follows (Hahn).—Ver. 19. Ἡρώδης: the tetrarch named in ver. 1.—περὶ πάντων, implying that John's rebuke was not confined to the sin with Herodias. Probably not, but it was what John said on that score that cost him his head.—Ver. 20. ἐκεῖνος, added this also to all his misdeeds, and above all the crowning iniquity, and yet Lk. forbears to mention the damning sin of Herod, the beheading of the Baptist, contenting himself with noting the imprisonment. He either assumes knowledge of the horrid tale, or shrinks from it as too gruesome.—κατὰ λαυρις: instead of the infinitive; the paratactic style savours of Hebrew, and suggests a Hebrew source (Godet).

Vv. 21-22. The baptism of Jesus (Mt. iii. 13-17, Mk. i. 9-11).—ἐν τῷ βαπτιστήριῳ: the wording ought to imply that the bulk of the people had already been baptised before Jesus appeared on the scene, i.e., that John's ministry was drawing to its close (so De Wette; but vide Burton, M. and T., p. 51, § 109, on the effect of δὲ).—καὶ ἡ βαπτιστικὴ ὁριστικὸς: so Lk. refers to the baptised πρὸς Ἰησοῦν, in a participial clause, his aim not to report the fact, but what happened after it. On the different ways in which the synoptists deal with this incident, vide on Mt.—προσενεκρομένων: peculiar to Lk., who makes Jesus pray at all crises of His career; here specially noteworthy in connection with the theophany following: Jesus in a state of mind answering to the preternatural phenomena; subjective and objective corresponding.—σωματικὴ εἰδή, in bodily form, peculiar to Lk., and transforming a vision into an external event.—Δῦ καί: the voice, as in Mk., addressed to Jesus, and in the same terms.
The age of Jesus when He began His ministry, and His genealogy.

Ver. 23. "ος ἦν πεντασήμων," etc., and He, Jesus, was about thirty years of age when He began. The evangelist's aim throughout is to state the age at which Jesus commenced His public career. The spelling of many of the names in this genealogy varies in the MSS. As these variations are of little importance I let the names stand as in T.R. without remark, referring the curious to W.H. or Tisch.

Vv. 23-38. The age of Jesus when He began His ministry, and His genealogy.

Ver. 23. καὶ ἀνέστη, etc., and He, Jesus, was thirty years of age when He began. The evangelist's aim throughout is to state the age at which Jesus commenced His public career. Jesus stood before Pharaoh, and David began to reign are facts, but of no significance (vide Farrar in C. G. T.). God's prophets appear when they get the inward call, and that may come at any time, at twenty, thirty, or forty. Inspiration is not bound by rule, custom, or tradition.

Vv. 24-33. From Joseph back to David. Compared with the corresponding section of Mt.'s genealogy these differences are apparent: (1) in both sub-divisions of the section (David to captivity, captivity to Christ) there are considerably more names (20, 14), a fact intelligible enough in genealogies through different lines; (2) they start from different sons of David (Nathan,
Salomon); (3) they come together at the captivity in Shealtiel and Zerubbabel; (4) after running in separate streams from that point onwards they meet again in Joseph, who in the one is the son of Eli, in the other the son of Jacob. The puzzle is to understand how two genealogical streams so distinct in their entire course should meet at these two points. The earlier coincidence is accounted for by harmonists by the hypothesis of adoption (Jeconiah adopts Shealtiel, Shealtiel adopts Zerubbabel), the later by the hypothesis of a Levirate marriage. *Vide Excursus ii. in Farrar's work on Luke (C. G. T.).* These solutions satisfy some. Others maintain that they do not meet the difficulties, and that we must be content to see in the two catalogues genealogical attempts which cannot be harmonised, or at least have not yet been.

**Vv. 32-34a. From David back to Abraham.** The lists of Mt. and Lk. in this part correspond, both being taken, as far as Pharez, from Ruth iv. 18-22.

**Vv. 34b-38. From Abraham to Adam.** Peculiar to Lk., taken from Gen. xi. 22-26, v. 7-32, as given in the Sept., whence Canaan in ver. 36 (instead of יִצְוֹל in Gen. xi. 12, in Heb.). It is probable that this part of the genealogy has been added by Lk., and that his interest in it is twofold: (1) *universalisation:* revealed by running back the genealogy of Jesus to Adam, the father of the human race; (2) the desire to give emphasis to the Divine origin of Jesus, revealed by the final link in the chain: Adam (son) of God. Adam's sonship is conceived of as something unique, inasmuch as, like Jesus, he owed his being, not to a human parent, but to the immediate causality of God. By this extension of the genealogy beyond Abraham, and even beyond Adam up to God, the evangelist has deprived it of all vital significance for the original purpose of such tables: to vindicate the Messianic claims of Jesus by showing Him to be the son of David. The Davidic sonship, it is true, remains, but it cannot be vital to the Messiahship of One who is, in the sense of the Gospel, Son of God. It becomes like the moon when the sun is shining. Lk. was probably aware of this.

This genealogy contains none of those features (references to women, etc.) which lend ethical interest to Mt.'s.

**CHAPTER IV. The Temptation and Beginnings of the Ministry.**

**Vv. 1-13. The Temptation.** (Mt. iv. 1-11, Mk. i. 12-13). Lk.'s account of the temptation resembles Mt.'s so closely as to suggest a common source. Yet there are points of difference of which a not improbable explanation is editorial solicitude to prevent wrong impressions, and ensure edification in connection with perusal of a narrative relating to a delicate subject: the temptation of the Holy Jesus by the unholy adversary. This solicitude might of course have stamped itself on the source Lk. uses, but it seems preferable to ascribe it to himself.

**Ver. 1.** &i; introducing a new theme, closely connected, however, with the baptism, so appears from ἐστιν τοῦ ἀφανείας, the genealogy being treated as a parenthesis.—οὕτως ἑν ὕπερ ἀναίρεσις Α., full of the Spirit, who descended upon Him at the Jordan, and conceived of as abiding on Him and in Him. This phrase is adopted by Lk. to exclude the possibility of evil thoughts in Jesus: no room for them; first example of such editorial solicitude.—οὕτως ἑν ὄρασις τ. ἡμ. Hahn takes this as meaning that Jesus left the Jordan with the intention of returning immediately to Galilee, so that His retirement into the desert was the result of a change of purpose brought about by the influence of the Spirit.
The words do not in themselves convey this sense, and the idea is intrinsically unlikely. Retirement for reflection after the baptism was likely to be the first impulse of Jesus. Vide on Mt.—ψάρνα imperfect, implying a continuous process. —καὶ τῷ Πν., in the spirit, suggesting voluntary movement, and excluding the idea of compulsory action of the Spirit on an unwilling subject that might be suggested by the phrases of Mt. and Mk. Vide notes there.—ἐν τῇ ἑβ.: this reading is more suitable to the continued movement implied in Ψάρνα than εἰς τὴν ἑβ. of T.R.—Ver. 2. ημέρας τεσσ.: this is to be taken along with Ψάρνα. Jesus wandered about in the desert all that time; the wandering the external index of the absorbing meditation within (Gospe).—μετ' ἑαυτοῦ: Lk. refers to the temptation participially, as a mere incident of that forty days' experience, in marked contrast to Mt., who represents temptation as the aim of the retirement (συναντηθεί). again guarding against wrong impressions, yet at the same time true to the fact. The present tense of the participle implies that temptation, though incidental, was continuous, going on with increasing intensity all the time.—όθεν θάνατος ὁδηγεῖ implies absolute abstinence, suggestive of intense preoccupation. There was nothing there to eat, but also no inclination on the part of Jesus.

Vv. 3-4. First temptation.—τῷ λίθῳ τ.: possibly the stone bore a certain resemblance to a loaf. Vide Farrar's note (C. G. T.), in which reference is made to Stanley's account (Sinai and Palestine, p. 154) of "Elijah's melons" found on Mount Carmel, as a sample of the crystallisations found in limestone formations.—Ver. 4. καὶ ἀπεκρίθη, etc.: the answer of Jesus as given by Lk., according to the reading of NBL, was limited to the first part of the oracle: man shall not live by bread only; naturally suggesting a contrast between physical bread and the higher food of the soul on which Jesus had been feeding (J. Weiss in Meyer).

Vv. 5-8. Second temptation. Mt.'s third.—καὶ ἀναγαγὼν, without the added εἰς ὅρας Ψ. of T.R., is an expression Lk. might very well use to obviate the objection: where is the mountain so high that from its summit you could see the whole earth? He might prefer to leave the matter vague = taking Him up who knows how high!—τῆς οἰκουμένης: for Mt.'s τοῦ κόσμου, as in ii. 1.—ἐν στίγμῃ χ., in a point or moment of time (στίγμη from στιγμα, to prick, whence στίγμη, Gal. vi. 17, here only in N. T.).—Ver. 6. ἠκούσας, authority. Vide Acts i. 7, 8, where this word and δόμαι occur, the one signifying authority, the other spiritual power. —δηλοι, etc.: this clause, not in Mt., is probably another instance of Lk.'s editorial solicitude; added to guard against the notion of a rival God with independent possessions and power.
From the Jewish point of view, it is true, Satan might quite well say this (J. Weiss-Meyer).—Ver. 7. emphatic; Satan hopes that Jesus has been dazzled by the splendid prospect and promise: Thou—all Things (fut. subj. of pārāv).—Ver. 8. fut. subj. fut. is no part of the true text, imported from Mt.; suitable there, not here, as there is another tempt. to follow. 

Vv. 9-13. Third temptation. Mt.'s second.—Inpovwov, instead of Mt.'s διὰ τὸν θάλαν, added by Lk., helping to bring out the situation, suggesting the plunge down from the giddy height.—Vv. 10 and 11 give Satan's quotation much as in Mt., with νῦν διαφοράς συν added from the Psalm.—Ver. 12 gives Christ's reply exactly as in Mt. The nature of this reply probably explains the inversion of the order of the second and third temptations in Lk. The evangelist judged it fitting that this should be the last word, construing it as an interdict against tempting Jesus the Lord. Lk.'s version of the temptation is characterised throughout by careful restriction of the devil's power (vide vv. 1 and 6). The inversion of the last two temptations is due to the same cause. The old idea of Schleiermacher that the way to Jerusalem lay over the mountains is paltry. It is to be noted that Mt.'s connecting particles (τοῖς, πάντας) imply sequence more than Lk.'s (καλ', ίδια). On the general import of the temptation vide on Mt.—Ver. 13. πάντα πάντα καίρου: every kind of temptation.—Ver. 14. Return to Galilee (cf. Mk. i. 14, 28, 39).—Ver. 14. ἑξετρέφεσθαι, as in ver. 1, frequently used by Lk.—Ver. 15. ἑδίδασκεν: summary reference to Christ's preaching ministry in the Galilean synagogues.—αὐτῶν refers to Galilaeans, ver. 14, and means the
Galileans; construction *ad sensum.*—

**Σοφερόνως:** equally summary statement of the result—general admiration. Lk. is hurrying on to the following story, which, though not the first incident in the Galilean ministry (vv. 14 and 15 imply the contrary), is the first he wishes to narrate in detail. He wishes it to serve as the frontispiece of his Gospel, as if to say: *ex primo discp omnia.* The historic interest in exact sequence is here subordinated to the religious interest in impressive presentation; quite legitimate, due warning being given.

Vv. 16-30. *Jesus in Nazareth* (Mt. xiii. 53-58, Mk. vi. 1-6a). Though Lk. uses an editorial discretion in the placing of this beautiful story, there need be no suspicion as to the historicity of its main features (visit of Jesus to His native town, which had a secure place in the common tradition, would be sure to interest Lk. and create desire for further information, which might readily be obtained from surviving Nazareans, who had been present, even from the brethren of Jesus. We may therefore seek in this frontispiece (*Programmatische,* J. Weiss) authentic reminiscences of a synagogue address of Jesus.

Vv. 16-21. *κατὰ τὸ ἐλεοῦς:* the reference most probably is, not to the custom of Jesus as a boy during His private life, but to what He had been doing since He began His ministry. He used the synagogue as one of His chief opportunities. (So J. Weiss and Hahn against Bengel, Meyer, Godet, etc.) That Jesus attended the synagogue as a boy and youth goes without saying.—

**ἐντοίχος,** stood up, the usual attitude in reading ("both sitting and standing were allowed at the reading of the Book of Esther," Schürer, Div. II., vol. ii., p. 79); either as requested by the president or of His own accord, as a now well-known teacher.—Ver. 17, *Ἡράλοις:* the second lesson, *Haphtaroth,* was from the prophets; the first, *Parashah,* from the Law, which was foremost in Rabbinical esteem. Not so in the mind of Jesus. The prophets had the first place in His thoughts, though without prejudice to the Law. No more congenial book than Isaiah (second part especially) could have been placed in His hand. Within the Law He seems to have specially loved Deuteronomy, prophetic in spirit (vide the temptation).—*ἐπε τοῖς:* by choice or in due course, uncertain which; does not greatly matter. The choice would be characteristic, the order of the day providential as giving Jesus just the text He would delight to speak from.

The Law was read continuously, the prophets by free selection (Holtz., H. C.).—Vv. 18, 19 contain the text, Isaiah lxi. 1, 2, free reproduction of the Sept., which freely reproduces the Hebrew, which probably was first read, then turned into Aramaean, then preached on by Jesus, that day. It may have been read from an Aramaean version. Most notable in the quotation is the point at which it stops. In Isaiah after the "acceptable year" comes the "day of vengeance." The clause referring to
the latter is omitted.— ἀνωπολήσας τε-θραυσμόνον ἐν ἀφόσι (ver. 19) is import.(by Lk. probably) from Lk. viii.6, the aim being to make the text in all respects a programme for the ministry of Jesus. Along with that, in the mind of the evangelist, goes the translation of all the categories named—poor, broken-hearted, captives, blind, bruised—from the political to the spiritual sphere. Legitimately, for that was involved in the declaration that the prophecy was fulfilled in Jesus.—Ver. 20. πτυχέω, folding, ἄνωπολήσας in ver. 17 (T.R.) = unfolding.— ὑπερήφανος, the officer of the synagogue; cf. the use of the word in Acts xiii. 5.— ἀνώπολήσας, looking attentively (ἀνωπολήσας, intent, from a and τείνω), often in Acts, vide, e.g., xiii. 9.— Ver. 21. ἢπατο: we may take what follows either as the gist of the discourses, or the first words of the opening sentence (Grotius, Bengel, Meyer, Farrar). Such a direct arresting announcement would be true to the manner of Jesus.

Acts 22-30. The sequel.—Ver. 22. ἠματί-τέρων, a, bore witness to Him, not ἶδων εἴδων in ver. 15; the confession was extorted from them by Christ’s undeniable power.—θαυμάζων, not, admired, but, were surprised at (Hahn).— λόγος τῆς χάριτος, words of grace. Most take χάριτος here not in the Pauline sense, but as denoting attractiveness in speech (German, Anmuth), suavisitas sermonis (Kypke, with examples from Greek authors, while admitting that χάριτος may be an objective genitive, “ sermo de rebus suavibus et laetis ”). In view of the text on which Jesus preached, and the fact that the Nazareth incident occupies the place of a frontispiece in the Gospel, the religious Pauline sense of χάρις is probably the right one = words about the grace of God whereby the prophetic oracle read was fulfilled. J. Weiss (in Meyer), while taking χάρις = grace of manner, admits that Lk. may have meant it in the other sense, as in Acts iv. 3, xx. 24. Words of grace, about grace: such was Christ’s speech, then and always—that is Lk. ‘s idea.—ὁδαί, ὡδε, etc.: this fact, familiarity, neutralised the effect of all, grace of manner and the gracious message. Cf. Mt. xiii. 55, Mk. vi. 3.—Ver. 23. πάντως, doubtless, of course— παραβολὴν = Hebrew mashal, including proverbs as well as what we call “ parables ”. A proverb in this case.—λαοῦ, etc.: the very meaning is plain, the point of the parable not so plain, though what follows seems to indicate it distinctly enough = do here, among us, what you have, as we hear, done in Capernaum. This would not exactly amount to a physician healing himself. We must be content with the general idea: every sensible benefactor begins in his immediate surroundings. There is probably a touch of scepticism in the words we will not believe the reports of your great deeds, unless you do such things here (Hahn). For similar proverbs in other tongues, vide Grotius and Wetstein. The reference to things done in Capernuam implies an antecedent ministry there.—Ver. 24. Ἀμὴν: solemnly in-
producing another proverb given in Mt. and Mk. (xiii. 57, vi. 4) in slightly varied form.—Σερης (vidis ver. 19, also Acts x. 35), acceptable, a Pauline word (2 Cor. vi. 2, Phil. iv. 18).—Ver. 25. This verse begins, like ver. 24, with a solemn asser- 

veration. It contains the proper answer to ver. 23. It has been suggested (J. Weiss) that vv. 22 and 24 have been in-

terpolated from Mk. vi. 1-6 in the source Lk. here used.—ἐς τρία μ. ἐξ, three years and six months. The reference is to 1 Kings xvii. 1, xviii. 1, where three years are mentioned. The recurrence of the same number, three and a half years, in James v. 17 seems to point to a traditional estimate of the period of drought, three and a half, the half of seven, the number symbolic of misfortunes (Daniel xii. 7).—Ver. 26. Σαρεπτα, a village lying between Tyre and Sidon = modern Surafend.—Ver. 27, ἡ Σαρεπτα. Naaman and the widow of Sarepta both Gentiles; these references savouring of universalism were welcome to Lk., but there is no reason to suspect that he put them into Christ's mouth. Jesus might have so spoken (vide Mt. viii. 11).—Vv. 28-29. Unsympathetic from the first, the Nazareans, stung by these O. T. references, become indignant. Pagans, not to speak of Capernaum people, better than we: away with Him! out of the synagogue, nay, out of the town (ἐκ τῆς πόλεως).—ἐκ τοῦ ὄρους τ. δ., etc., to the eyebrow (supercilium, here only in N. T.) of the hill on which the city was built, implying an elevated point but not necessarily the highest ridge. Kypke remarks: "non summum montis cacumen, sed minor aliquis tumulus sive clivus intelligitur, qui cum monte cohaeret, metaphora a supercilii Occu-

lorum desumta, quae in fronte quidem eminente, ipso tamen vertice inferiore sunt". Nazareth now lies in a cup, built close up to the hill surrounding. Perhaps then it went further up.—ἐκτενοτέρων τ. ΒΔ (Tisch., W.H.) with infinitive indicating intention and tendency, happily not result.—Ver. 30. αὐτὸς ὁ δὲ, but He, emphatic, suggesting a contrast: they infuriated, He calm and self-possessed.—Βηθανια: no miracle intended, but only the marvel of the power always exerted by a tranquil spirit and firm will over human passions.

Vv. 31-37. In Capernaum; the de-

moniac (Mt. i. 21-28).—κατηγήθη οὖν Κ. He went down from Nazareth, not from heaven, as suggested in Marcion's Gospel, which began here: "Anno quintodecimo principatus Tiberiani Deum descendisse in civitatem Galilaeae Capharnaum," Tertull. c. Marc. iv. 7.—πόλιν τ. Γ.: circumstantially described
καὶ ἔζησαν αὐτοὺς ἐν τοῖς σάββασιν. ἂν 32. καὶ ἔξεπλήσσοντο ἐν τῇ διδαγῇ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἐν ἰδίωσιν ἦν ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ. ἂν 33. καὶ ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ ἦν ἄνθρωπος ζῶν πνεύμα δαιμόνιον ἀκαθάρτου, καὶ ἀνέκριτος φωνὴ μεγάλη. ἂν 34. λέγων. 1 "Εα, τί ήμῖν καὶ σοί, ἵσοι Ναζαρηνή; ἥδες ἀπολέονται ἡμᾶς; ὁδὴ σὲ τὸς εἶ, ὁ δόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ." ἂν 35. καὶ ἔπειτήσαν αὐτῷ ὁ ήσος, λέγων, "Φιλάθητι, καὶ ἔξελθε ἐξ αὐτοῦ." καὶ ρίψαν αὐτὸν τὸ δαιμόνιον εἰς τὸ μέσον ἔξηλθον ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, μηδὲν βλάψαν αὐτὸν. ἂν 36. καὶ ἔγνωτο ὁ θάμβος ἐπὶ πάντας, καὶ συνεκάλουσαν πρὸς ἄλληλους, λέγοντες, "Τίς ἐν τῷ λόγῳ οὗτος, ὅτι ἐν ἰδίωσιν καὶ δυνάμει ἐπιτάσσεται τοὺς ἀκαθάρτους πνεύμασιν, καὶ ἔξηλθον;" ἂν 37. καὶ ἔπεσεν ὁ ήσος περὶ αὐτοῦ εἰς πάντα τῶν τῆς περιχώρου.

38. Ἀναστὰς δὲ ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς, εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Σίμωνος. ἂν 39. πενθηρὰ δὲ τοῦ Σίμωνος ἦν συνεχομὴν πυρετὸς μεγάλη, καὶ ἦρωτεν αὐτῶν περὶ αὐτῆς. ἂν 39. καὶ ἐπέστατο ἐκάτω αὐτῆς, ἐπείτησαν τῷ πυρετῷ, καὶ ἀφῆκεν αὐτὴν· παρεχρῆμα δὲ ἀναστᾶσα διηκόνει αὐτοῖς.

40. Δύνατος δὲ τοῦ ἦλου, πάντες δοκοί εἰχον ἀσθενοῦτας νησίους

1 Omit λέγων ΝΒΛΕ cop. Orig.
2 ἂν in ΝΒΚΔΛΕ 33 al.
3 ἂν in ΝΒΚΔΛΕ minusc.
4 Omit ἡ ΝΒΛΕ.
With sunset the Sabbath closed. ὅνων to the place where He was.

Vv. 42-44. Withdrawal from Capernaum (Mk. i. 35-39).—γενεσις ἡμέρας, when it was day, i.e., when people were up and could see Jesus’ movements, and accordingly followed Him. In Mk. Jesus departed very early before dawn, while all would be in bed; a kind of flight.—οἱ δύο; in Mk. Simon and those with him, other disciples. But of disciples Lk. as yet knows nothing.—

The Call of Peter. The Leper. The Palsied Man. The Call of Levi. Fastino.—

Chapter V. The Call of Peter.
The position of Jesus in speaking to the crowd was on the margin of the lake; called by Lk. alone

Ver. 2. Ἀνάβη: two boats standing by the lake, not necessarily drawn upon shore, but close to land, so that one on shore could enter them. They had just come in from the fishing, and were without occupants, their owners having come on shore to clean their nets.

Ver. 3. Ἐβασία: this action of Jesus would be noticed of course, and would bring the owner to His side. It was Simon's boat, the man whose mother-in-law, in Lk.'s narrative, had been healed of fever. Ἐθαναγαγείν, to put out to sea, here and in Mk. 3.18 only;

—Δύο ἄνω τοῦ λίμνης. The position of Jesus in speaking to the crowd was on the margin of the lake; called by Lk. alone.

Ver. 2. Ἀνάβη: two boats standing by the lake, not necessarily drawn upon shore, but close to land, so that one on shore could enter them. They had just come in from the fishing, and were without occupants, their owners having come on shore to clean their nets.

Ver. 3. Ἐβασία: this action of Jesus would be noticed of course, and would bring the owner to His side. It was Simon's boat, the man whose mother-in-law, in Lk.'s narrative, had been healed of fever. Ἐθαναγαγείν, to put out to sea, here and in Mk. 3.18 only;

—Δύο ἄνω τοῦ λίμνης. The position of Jesus in speaking to the crowd was on the margin of the lake; called by Lk. alone.

Ver. 2. Ἀνάβη: two boats standing by the lake, not necessarily drawn upon shore, but close to land, so that one on shore could enter them. They had just come in from the fishing, and were without occupants, their owners having come on shore to clean their nets.

Ver. 3. Ἐβασία: this action of Jesus would be noticed of course, and would bring the owner to His side. It was Simon's boat, the man whose mother-in-law, in Lk.'s narrative, had been healed of fever. Ἐθαναγαγείν, to put out to sea, here and in Mk. 3.18 only;

—Δύο ἄνω τοῦ λίμνης. The position of Jesus in speaking to the crowd was on the margin of the lake; called by Lk. alone.

Ver. 2. Ἀνάβη: two boats standing by the lake, not necessarily drawn upon shore, but close to land, so that one on shore could enter them. They had just come in from the fishing, and were without occupants, their owners having come on shore to clean their nets.

Ver. 3. Ἐβασία: this action of Jesus would be noticed of course, and would bring the owner to His side. It was Simon's boat, the man whose mother-in-law, in Lk.'s narrative, had been healed of fever. Ἐθαναγαγείν, to put out to sea, here and in Mk. 3.18 only;

—Δύο ἄνω τοῦ λίμνης. The position of Jesus in speaking to the crowd was on the margin of the lake; called by Lk. alone.

Ver. 2. Ἀνάβη: two boats standing by the lake, not necessarily drawn upon shore, but close to land, so that one on shore could enter them. They had just come in from the fishing, and were without occupants, their owners having come on shore to clean their nets.

Ver. 3. Ἐβασία: this action of Jesus would be noticed of course, and would bring the owner to His side. It was Simon's boat, the man whose mother-in-law, in Lk.'s narrative, had been healed of fever. Ἐθαναγαγείν, to put out to sea, here and in Mk. 3.18 only;

—Δύο ἄνω τοῦ λίμνης. The position of Jesus in speaking to the crowd was on the margin of the lake; called by Lk. alone.
I—II. 

CYRUS OF Aponia. 

6. Ka to tov poioiasten, sunaexiasan
Ikeiou plhous 2 pollo. Diergynvto de to diktyon 8 aotwn. 7. ka
katankevno tois mevkhous eis tov epev plhous, tov elvouc eis
euxlathd aitois 4 kai ekhous, kai ekplhovn amvofa eis to plhous,
Dote bivthkevno aito. 8. Iov de Synwv Pteros prsptc eis tois
gnwn tov 'IposW, lewv, "Ezelekei ano emoi, dii anh' amartelous
eil, Kropi." 9. Thmbos gav perimych ev tois kai ptastas tois
syn aito, evi to wgrv ton Ikeiou 6 sunelvov. 10. Iamvvo de kai
Iakwvov kai Iwvnnv, uio de Zevedaiou, oI ehsan kouwv n tov Synwv.
Kai ejne pro tov Synwv l' IposW, "Mh fopou' avo tov avv
amvofov tov Iwvov." II. Ka katanagostes eis to plhous evi tov
vri, afwtes anyana, xmolodhsan aito.

1 ev Synwv in bBL. 2 plhous Ikeiou in NABCL. T.R. = D.
3 bBL have diergynynv, and bBDL ev Synwv (Tisch., W.H., adopt both).
4 Omit tois bBDL.
5 we in BD instead of e (in bCL).
6 T R. = D.

used actively = for taking, in the second, passively = for a take. But the latter
sense might suit both places. If so
used here the word implies a promise
(Hahn).—Ver. 5. evntspo: Lk.'s
name for Jesus as Master, six times; a
Greek term for Gentile readers instead
of Rabbi = (1) Master, then (2) Teacher,
"qui enim magistri doctriniae erant, ii
magistri simul vitae esse solabant,"
Kypke.—h to wv mwn, at Thy word
or bidding. Success was doubly im-
probable: it was day, and in deep
water; fish were got at night, and near
shore. The order, contrary to prob-
ability, tempts to symbolic interpreta-
tion: the deep sea the Gentile world;
Peter's indirect objection symbol of his
reluctance to enter on the Gentile
mission, overcome by a special reve-
6. diergynynv, began to break, or were
on the point of breaking; the sym-
bolic theory = the threatened rupture of
unity though the success of the Gentile
mission (Acts xv.).—Ver. 7. katankevno,
they made signs, beckoned, here only in
N. T. (katankevno, i. 62); too far to speak
perhaps, but fishers would be accustomed
to communicate by signs to preserve
needful stillness (Schanz).—euxlathd aito:
this verb with dative occurs in
Phil. iv. 3 = to help one...Dote, with
infinitive = tendency here, not result.—
Bvthkevno, to sink in the deep (Bvthos),
here only in O. or N. T. in reference to
a ship; in 2 Tim. vi. 9 in reference to
rich men.

Vv. 8-11. Sequel of the miracle.—
Ver. 8. Pteros: here for first time
introduced without explanation, pre-
sumably in connection with the great
crisis in his history.—anh' amartelous:
a natural exclamation especially for an
impulsive nature in the circumstances.
But the utterance, though real, might
have been passed over in the tradition.
Why so carefully recorded by Lk.? Per-
haps because it was a fitting thing
for any man to say on becoming a dis-
ciple of the Holy Jesus—the sin of the
disciple a foil to the holiness of the
Master. Also to supply a justification
for the statement in ver. 32, "I came
to not call," etc. In this connection sin
is ascribed to all the apostles when
called, in very exaggerated terms in Ep.
Barnab., v. 9 (Bvthos wtr pavan
amartelous avmvotepo).—Ver. 10.
'Idwvov kai Ivvnv, dependent on
fwarov, fear encompassed them,
not less than Peter and the rest.
In this connection sin is ascribed
to no person except Peter alone.
He alone, so far as appears, is to
become a fisher of men, but the other
two are named, presumably, because
meant to be included, and in matter of
fact they as well as Simon abandon all
and follow Jesus (ver. 11).—Bvthos: the
verb means to take alive, then generally
to take; here and in 2 Tim. ii. 26. The
analytic form (Bvthos) implies per-
manent occupation = thou shalt be a
taker.—Ver. 11. katanagostes eis...

17. KAI ἐγένετο ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἁμαρτίων· καὶ ἤκουσαν αὐτὸς ἱερεῖς καὶ ἦσαν καθήμενοι Φαρισαῖοι καὶ νομοδιδάσκαλοι, οἳ ἦσαν ἐξελιθθέντες ἐκ πάσης κόμης τῆς Γαλιλαίας καὶ Ἰουδαίας καὶ Ἰερουσαλήμ· καὶ δύομις Κυρίου ἦν εἰς τὸ ἱδατεῖν αὐτούς. 18. καὶ ἤκουσαν ἄνδρες φύρνετε εἰς κλίσις ἀνθρώπων δὲ ἦν παραλειμένος, καὶ ἔβηκον

drawing up their ships on land; that work done for ever. Chiefly in Lk. and Acts.

Vv. 12-16. The leper (Mt. viii. 1-4, Mk. i. 40-41).—Ver. 12. εἰς μιᾷ τ. π. in Lk. vii. 1, one of the cities or towns of Galilee in which Jesus had been preaching (Mk. i. 39 Lk. iv. 44).—καὶ ἤκουσαν, after καὶ ἐγένετο, very Hebraistic. πλήρης λέπρας, full of leprosy (λεπρός in parallels). Note here again the desire to magnify the miracle—ἐὰν θλίψῃ, etc., the man's words the same in all three narratives. His doubt was as to the will not the power to heal.—Ver. 13. ἤφατο: this also in all three—a cardinal point; the touch the practical proof of the will and the sympathy. No shrinking from the loathsome disease.—ᾧ λέπρα ἀπῆλθεν: Lk. takes one of Mk.'s two phrases, Mt. the other. Lk. takes the one which most clearly implies a cure; ἱκανεύσατε (Mt.) might conceivably mean: became technically clean.—Ver. 14. ἄλλα, etc.: here the optio indirecta passes into or. directa as in Acts i. 4, xiv. 22, etc.—τῷ ἱερείῳ, to the priest; not necessarily in Jerusalem, but to the priest in the province whose business it was to attend to such duties (Hahn).—Ver. 15. ἄκοις, to hear, but not the word as in ver. 1, rather to hear about the wonderful Healer and to get healing for themselves (θεραπεύωνθαλα).—Ver. 16. To retirement mentioned in Mk. Lk. adds prayer (προσευχόμενον); frequent reference to this in Lk. Vv. 17-26. The paralytic (Mt. ix. 1-8, Mk. ii. 1-12).—Ver. 17. εἰς μιᾷ τῶν ἁμαρτίων, a phrase as vague as a note of time as that in ver. 12 as a note of place.—καὶ ἤκουσαν, etc., and He was teaching; the Hebraistic paratactic construction so common in Lk. Note καὶ ἦσαν καὶ καὶ δύομις Κ. ήτοι, following. νομοδιδάσκαλοι, teachers of the law, Lk.'s equivalent for γραμματεῖοι. The Pharisees and lawyers appear here for the first time in Lk., and they appear in force—a large gathering from every village of Galilee, from Judea, and from Jerusalem. Jesus had preached in the synagogues of Galilee where the scribes might have an opportunity of hearing Him. But this extensive gathering of these classes at this time is not accounted for fully in Lk. Not till later does such a gathering occur in Mk. (iii. 22).—αὐτῶν, the reading in ΝΒΛ gives quite a good sense; it is accusative before ἱδατεῖν = the power of the Lord (God) was present to the effect or intent that He (Jesus) should heal.—Ver. 18. παραλειμένος, instead of παραλυτικὸς

1 ἤκουσα δὲ in ΝΒC cop.

8 ἔτοι in ΝΒCDL 33 al.

in the parallels, the former more in use among physicians, and the more classical. —Πήγασσ. imperfect, implying difficulty in finding access, due, one might think, to the great numbers of Pharisees and lawyers present, no mention having as yet been made of any others. But the ἀγάπας comes in in next verse.—Ver. 19. ποιάς (διὰ ποιάς ἄδεη), by what way. —οἱ τῆς κληρονομίας. dim. of ἀνάγκη (ver. 18, here only in N. T.). Lk. avoids Mk.'s κραββατος, though apparently following him as to the substance of the story.—Ver. 20. ἠθέτητε, man, instead of Mk.'s more kindly τέκνον and Mt.'s still more sympathetic θάρρος τέκνον; because (suggests J. Weiss) it was not deemed fitting that such a sinner should be addressed as son or child! This from Lk., the evangelist of grace! The substitution, from whatever reason proceeding, is certainly not an improvement. Possibly Lk. had a version of the story before him which used that word. Doubtless Jesus employed the kindlier expression.—Ver. 21. διαλογιζόμεναι: Lk. omits the qualifying phrases ἐν δαυτῷ, ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις of Mt. and Mk., leaving it doubtful whether they spoke out or merely thought.—λέγοντες does not settle the point, as it merely indicates to what effect they reasoned.—Ver. 22. The expression "in your hearts" coming in here suggests that Lk. may have omitted it in ver. 21 merely to avoid repetition.—Ver. 24. εὐρίσκει καὶ ἀραὶ . . . τοπερίου: by introducing the participle ἀραί Lk. improves the style as compared with Mk., but weakens the force of the utterance, "arise, take up thy bed and go". The same remark applies to the words of the scribes, ver. 21, "who is this that speaketh blasphemies?" compared with, "why doth this person speak thus?" He blasphemes. Lk.'s is secondary, the style of an editor working over a rugged, graphic, realistic text.—Ver. 25. παρασχέμα (ἐκεῖ τὸ χρῆμα), on the spot, instantly; in Lk. only, magnifying the miracle.—Ver. 26. ἔσωσιν might be taken out of Mk.'s ἔσωσται.—παράβολα. Each evangelist expresses the comments of the people in different terms. All three may be right, and not one of them may give the ipsissima
27. Καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἔξηλθε, καὶ ἐθέδαστο τελῶνην, ἵνα μάτι λευκόν, καθήμενον ἐπὶ τὸ τελῶνην, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, "Ἄκολουθε μοι." 28. Καὶ καταλαμψεν ἄπαντα, ἀναστὰς ἡκολουθήσει 1 αὐτῷ. 29. Καὶ ἐποίησε δοξὴν μεγάλην ὡς λευκόν αὐτῷ ἐν τῇ οὐκείᾳ αὐτοῦ. καὶ ἤξεις τελῶνην πολὺς, καὶ ἄλλων οἵ ήσαν μετ’ αὐτῶν κατακείμενοι.

30. καὶ ἐγόγγυζον οἱ γραμματεῖς αὐτῶν καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ἐπὶ τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ, λέγοντες, "Διάτι μετὰ τελῶνων καὶ ἀμαρτωλῶν ἠσθέται καὶ πίνετε;"

31. Καὶ ἀποκρίθησεν ὁ Χριστός εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς, "Ὅτι χρείαν έχουσιν οἱ διαίηνοις ίασμοι, ἀλλὰ οἱ κακῶς έχουσιν.

32. οὖν ἐξῆλθα καλῶς δικαίους, ἀλλὰ ἀμαρτωλοῦς εἰς

---

1. ἡκολουθήσει in BDŁE 69, a.
2. ἅπαν before τελ. in ABCLΔΕ 33 al.
3. οἱ Φαρ. καὶ οἱ γρ. αὐτῶν in ABCLΔΕ al.
4. T.R. = ND.

Lk.'s version is: We have seen unexpected things to-day. Here only in N.T.

27-32. Call of Levi (Mt. ix. 9-13, Mk. ii. 13-17).—Ver. 27. ἐθέδαστο, instead of ἐλθονεν. Hahn, appealing to John i. 14, iv. 35, xi. 45, assigns to it the meaning, to look with interest, to let the eye rest on with complacency. But it is doubtful whether in later usage it meant more than to look in order to observe. If the view stated in Mt. on the so-called Matthew's feast (g.v.) be correct, Jesus was on the lookout for a man to assist Him in the Capernaum mission to the publicans.—ἐπὶ τὸ τελῶνην, at "the tolbothe," Wyclif. The tolls collected by Levi may have been either on highway traffic, or on the traffic across the lake. Mk.'s ἄραγων (ver. 14) coming after the reference to the sea (ver. 13) points to the latter.—Ver. 28. καταλαμψεν ἄπαντα, leaving all behind, in Lk. only; a specialty of the sinecistically inclined evangelist, thinks J. Weiss (in Meyer). But it merely predicates of Levi what all three evangelists predicate of Peter and his comrades.—Ver. 29. δοξὴν (from δέχομαι here and in xiv. 13), a reception, a feast, in Sept. for πολλὸν (Gen. xxvi. 30, Esther i. 3). That Mt. made a feast is directly stated only by Lk., perhaps as an inference from the phrases in Mk. which imply it: κατακείμενοι, συναντάντα, (verse 15), ἠσθέται καὶ πίνει (verse 16). That it was a great feast is inferred from πολλὸν in reference to the number present.

The presence of the evangelists force us to conceive of the gathering as exceeding the dimensions of a private entertainment—a congregation rather, in the court, to eat and to hear the gospel of the kingdom. Possibly none of the evangelists realised the full significance of the meeting, though Lk. by the expression δύσα τολὴν shows that he conceived of it as very large.—ἀλλῶν stands for ἀμαρτωλῶν, which Lk. does not care to use when speaking for himself of the class, preferring the vague word "others". They were probably a very nondescript class, the "submerged tenth" of Capernaum.—Ver. 30. οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ γραμ. αὐτῶν, the Pharisees, and the scribes connected with them, the professional men of the party. They were not of course guests, but they might if they chose look in: no privacy on such occasions in the East; or they might watch the strange company as they dispersed.—ἠσθέται καὶ πίνετε: addressed to the disciples. In the parallels the question refers to the conduct of Jesus though put to the disciples.—Ver.31. ἡκολουθήσει is to be understood in a festive sense = I came to call sinners to the feast of the Kingdom, as I have called to this feast the "sinners" of Capernaum.

Vv. 33-39. Fasting (Mt. ix. 14-17, Mk. ii. 18-22).—Ver. 33. οἱ δὲ connects what follows with what went before as a continuation of the same story. Not so in Mk.; connection there simply topical.
The supposed speakers are the Pharisees and scribes (ver. 30). In Mk. Phar. and John’s disciples. In Mt. the latter only. If the Pharisees and scribes were the spokesmen, their putting John’s disciples first in stating the common practice would be a matter of policy = John held in respect by Jesus, why then differ even from him?—προσόντα (neuter plural, from προσόντος, dense), frequently.—διαμορφώτει, make prayers, on system; added to complete the picture of an ascetic life; cf. ii. 37; referred to again in xi. 1; probably the question really concerned only fasting, hence omitted in the description of the life of the Jesus-circle even in Lk.—ἀρδευον πίνουν, eat and drink; on the days when we fast, making no distinction of days.—Ver. 34. μη δύνασθε ... τὸν οἶκον, can ye make them fast? In Mt. and Mk., can they fast? Lk.’s form of the question points to the futility of prescriptions in the circumstances. The Master could not make His disciples fast even if He wished.—Ver. 35. καὶ ἔτοι: Mt. and Mk. place the καὶ before τὸν in the next clause. Lk.’s arrangement throws more emphasis on ἰμάρα: there will come days, and when, etc. The καὶ may be explicative (= et quidem, Bornemann), or it may introduce the apodosis.—ἐὰν ἀπαράθη, the subjunctive with ἐὰν in a relative clause referring to a probable future event.

Vv. 36-39. Relative parabolic Logia.—

Notes: an editorial introduction to the parabolic sayings. The first of these, as given by Lk., varies in form from the version in the parallels, suggests somewhat different ideas, and is in itself by no means clear. Much depends on whether we omit or retain σχίζειν in the first clause. If, with ΝΒΔΛ, we retain it, the case put is: a piece cut out of a new garment to patch an old one, the evil results being: the new spoiled, and the old patched with the new piece presenting an incongruous appearance (οὗ συμφωνεῖν). If, with AC, etc., we omit σχίζειν, the case put may be: a new piece not cut out of a new garment, but a remnant (Hahn) used to patch an old, this new piece making a rent in the old garment; τὸ καὶνὸν in second clause not object of, but nominative to, σχίζειν, and the contrast between the new patch and old garment presenting a grotesque appearance. The objection to this latter view is that there is no reason in the case supposed why the new patch should make a rent. In Mt. and Mk. the patch is made with unfulfilled cloth, which will contract. But the remnant of cloth with which a new garment is made would not be unfulfilled, and it would not contract. The sole evil in that case would be a piebald appearance. On the whole it seems best to retain σχίζειν, and to render τὸ καὶνὸν σχίζειν, he (the man who does so foolish a thing) will rend the new. Kypke suggests as an alternative rendering: the new is rent, taking σχίζειν intrinsically, and in that use he cites an instance from the Testament of the twelve patriarchs. The sense on this rendering remains the same.—Ver. 37. The tradition of the second logion seems to have come down to Lk.’s time without variation; at all events he gives
Chapter VI. Sabbath Conflicts.
The Apostles. The Sermon on the Mount.—Vv. 1-5. The ears of corn (Mt. xii. 1-8, Mk. ii. 23-28).—ινα σαιβατον: Mk. makes no attempt to locate this incident in his history beyond indicating that it happened on Sabbath. Mt. uses a phrase which naturally suggests a temporal sequence, but to which in view of what goes before one can attach no definite meaning. Lk. on the other hand would seem to be aiming at very great precision if the adjective qualifying σαιβατον, δευτερουμενω, were genuine. But it is omitted in the important group ΝΒΛ, and in other good documents, and this fact, combined with the extreme unlikelihood of Lk.'s using a word to which it is now, and must always have been, impossible to attach any definite sense, makes it highly probable that this word is a temporal gloss, which found its way, like many others, into the text. How the gloss arose, and what it meant for its author or authors, it is really not worth while trying to conjecture, though such attempts have been made. Vide Tischendorf, N. T., ex. viii., for the good that they did not wish even to taste any other, and could therefore make no comparisons. (Hence χρηστότερος preferable to χρηστότερος in T. R.) This saying is every way worthy of Christ, and it was probably one of Lk.'s finds in his pious quest for traditions of the Personal Ministry.

With reference to the foregoing parabolic words, drawn from vegetation and wine, Hahn truly remarks that they would be naturally suggested through association of ideas by the figure of a wedding feast going before. Bengel hints at the same thought: "parabola om a veste, a vino; inprimis opportunam convivio".
VI. 1. ἘΓΕΝΕΤΟ δὲ ἐν σαββάτῳ δευτερνυμίῳ διαπορεύεσθαι αὐτὸν διὰ τῶν ἑπτάκοσμ τούτοις ἐπὶ τοὺς ἑκατὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ τοὺς στάχυς, καὶ ἡσυχασάτων ταῖς κεραίαις. 2. τινὶς δὲ τῶν ἤλεγχων ἐπὶ τῶν αὐτοῖς, "Τί ποιεῖται ὁ οἶκός ἦσετε ποιεῖν ἐν τοῖς σαββάσις;" 3. καὶ ἀποκρίθηκεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ τὸ Ἰησοῦς, "Οὐδὲ τούτῳ ἄνγγειλεν, τὸ ἐποίησαν Δαβίδ, ὁπότε ἦπεικατέργασεν αὐτός καὶ οἰ μετ' αὐτοῦ ὄντες;" 4. ὡς ἐσθήθην εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προσευχῆς ἔδαρε, καὶ ἔφαγεν, καὶ ἄρακε καὶ τοὺς μετ' αὐτοῦ, ὁδὲ ἔκαθεν φαγεῖν εἰ μὴ μόνος τοὺς ἰερεῖς;" 5. καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς, "Ὅτι κύριός ἐστιν ὁ οἶος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ τοῦ σαββάτου." 11

1 ΝΒΛ 33 al. omit δευτερνυμίῳ. Vide below.
2 ΝΒΛ al. omit τοῦ (from parall.).
3 καὶ ἔπεα τῶν στάχυς in BCL (W.H.; Tisch. = T.R. with Ν).
4 Omit autōs ΝΒCL minusc. a, c, e, cop.
5 B omits τοὺς, and ΝΒBL omit τοῦ (W.H. omit both).
6 οὖν in ΝΒCDL minusc. (W.H.; Tisch. has οὖν with less weighty witnesses, vide below).
7 Omit οὖν with ΝBDL 33 al. (W.H.).
8 B omits ὡς (W.H. in brackets), D also, reading ἐσθήθην.
9 For ἐδάρει καὶ BCLX 33 have ἐδάρει, and BL omit καὶ after ἐδάρει.
10 ΝΒ 1, 132 aeth. omit οὖν (W.H.).
11 τοῦ σαββάτου without καί, before o v. r. αὐτ. in ΝΒ cop. aeth. (W.H.). DL = T.R. (Tisch.).

Mt.'s οὐκ = not even; have ye so little understood the spirit of the O. T.? (De Wette). The word might be analysed into οὐ, σὲ, when it will mean: but have ye not then read this? So Hofmann, Nösgen, Hahn.—ἐπίκες, here only in Ν. T., if even here, for many good MSS. have διὰ (W.H.).—Ver. 4. Lk. contents himself with the essential fact: hunger, overriding a positive law concerning the shewbread. No reference to the high priest, as in Mk., and no additional instance of the Sabbath law superseded by higher interests, as in Mt. (xii. 5). The controversy no longer lives for him, and his accounts are apt to be colourless and secondary.—Ver. 5. καὶ ἔλεγεν: in Lk. this important logion about the Son of Man's Lordship over the Sabbath is simply an external annex to what goes before = καὶ ἔλεγεν, and He said: instead of arising out of and crowning the argument, as in Mt., and partly in Mk., though the latter uses the same phrase in introducing the logion peculiar to him about the Sabbath being made for man. If Lk. had Mk. before him, how could he omit so important a word? Perhaps because it involved a controversial antithesis not easily intelligible to Gentiles, and because the Lordship of the Son of Man covered all in his view. How did he and his readers understand that Lordship?

Vv. 6-11. The withered hand (Mt. xii. 9-14, Mk. iii. 1-6).—Ver. 6. ἐν ἑτερῷ σαββάτῳ: simply intended to indicate that the following incident, like the one going before, happened on a Sabbath. Observe Lk. uses here, as in vi. 1, 5, the singular for the Sabbath.—τὴν συν.: the article here might point to a particular synagogue, as in Mt., or be generic.—διδάσκων, present, еσθήθην; orist: the entering an act, the preaching continuous. He was preaching when the following happened.—καὶ ἔλεγεν: by comparison with Mt. and Mk. Lk. is here paratactic and Hebraistic in construction. But Palairet, against Grotius emphasizing the Hebraism, cites from Aelian, Hist. Anim. (lib. xii., c. 24): ἐν τῇ θελάτῳ τῇ ἐφροδρίᾳ νυνί: καὶ ἔσχατον ἄτροφος φεύγει.—ἀδεια...

1 Omits καὶ ΝΒΛ min. 2 τοῦτο εἰς ΝΒΛ 33 al. (Tisch., W.H.). 3 παρατεθήκατο in ΑΒDL 33 al. (Tisch., W.H.). 4 ὑπάρχειν in ΝΑDL (Tisch., W.H., text). 5 T.R. = B (W.H. marg.). 6 κατηγορεῖν αὐτὸν in ΝΒ (D γορρησαί). 7 ἔπειν δὲ τὸ αὐτήν in ΝΒΛ 33 (Tisch., W.H.). 8 ἔγινε in very many uncials. 9 For o in ΝΒΛ 33 al. have καὶ ἔγινε. 10 εἴπερ in ΝΒΛ 33 al. have ἔπειν. 11 ΝΒDL have καὶ οὐκ, and τῷ σαββάτῳ for τοὺς σαββάτους. 12 αὐτῶ in B and many other uncials. T.R. = ΝDL 33. 13 Omit οὕτω BLA 33. 14 ἀποκατεστάθη in ADL al. πλ., but B has αὐτῶ. 15 Omit γνώσασθαι . . . ἀλλὰ (from Mt.) with ΝΒΛ. 16 ποιήσαται in BLA 33 al. πλ. (Tisch., W.H.).

defined under the right hand. This particular peculiarity to Lk., with the Hebrew style, proves, some think (Godet, Hahn), a source distinct from Mt. or Mk. Not necessarily. It may be an inference by Lk., added to magnify the beneficence of the miracle. The right hand the working hand, the privation great, the cure the more valuable.—Ver. 7. παρατεθήκατο, they kept watching, in a sly, furtive manner, ex obliquus et occultus, Bengel on Mk.—ἐξ ὄλυμπος, whether He is going to heal, if that is to be the way of it.—Ver. 8. ἀπείκονισά: a participle might have been expected here = ἦν ἔχων ἤκον τῶν σεισμῶν, etc.: this command was necessary to bring the matter under the notice of the audience present, who as yet knew nothing of the thoughts of the Pharisees, and possibly were not aware that the man with the withered hand was present.—Ver. 9. ἀγαθοποιήσατο, κακοποιήσατο: on the meaning of these words and the issue raised vide on Mk.—Ver. 10. περιβλεψάμονας. Lk. borrows this word from Mk., but omits all reference to the emotions he ascribes to Jesus: anger mixed with pity. He looks round merely waiting for an answer to His pointed question. None being forthcoming, He proceeds to heal: "qui tacet, consentit," Bornemann.—Ver. 11. ἀνοίας: they were filled with senseless anger. They were "mad" at Jesus, because He had broken the Sabbath, as they conceived it, in a way that would make Him popular: humanity and preternatural power combined.—τῇ ἐν ποιήσαι: ἐν with the optative in an indirect question, in Lk. only, following classic usage. This combination of occasional classicism with frequent Hebraism is curious. It is noticeable that Lk. does not impute murderous intentions to the opponents of Jesus at this stage, nor combination with politicians to effect truculent designs (vide Mk. iii. 6).
12. Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις, ἐξῆλθεν ὁ ἄγιος ἄγιος προσευχῆς τοῦ θεοῦ· καὶ ἦν διανυκτερεύων ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ τοῦ θεοῦ. 13. καὶ ἦν ἐγένετο ἡμέρα, προσεύχητο τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκλεξάρενος ἀπὸ αὐτῶν δώδεκα, οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὄνομασε. 14. Σίμων δὲ καὶ ὄνομασε Πέτρον, καὶ Ἀνδρέαν τὸν ἄδελφον αὐτοῦ, Ἰακώβου 2 καὶ Ἰωάννην, Φιλίππου καὶ Βαρθολομαίου, 15. Ματθαίου καὶ Θημάν, Ἰακώβου τοῦ τίτου 3 καὶ Σίμων τοῦ καλούμενου Ζηλωτῆς, 16. Ιούδαν Ἰακώβου, καὶ Ἰούδαν Ἰσκαριώτην, δς καὶ ἐγένετο προδότης. 17. καὶ καταβὰς μετ’ αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ τόπῳ πεδίου, καὶ δύνατος ἕκαστος αὐτοῦ καὶ πλῆθος τούτῳ τοῦ λαοῦ ἀπὸ

1 ἐξῆλθεν αὐτὸν in ΝΒDL. 2 ΝΒDL have καὶ before λαβὼν, and there is MS. authority for καὶ before every name (Tisch., W.H.; καὶ in brackets before λαβ. Αλφ., omitted there only in B, probably by oversight). 3 ΝΒDL 33. 4 Omit καὶ ΝΒL. 5 δύνατος τούτων in ΝΒL.

Vv. 12-19. On the hill (Mt. iv. 24-25, x. 2-4; Mk. iii. 7-19).—Ver. 12. ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις: a vague expression, but suggestive of some connection with foregoing encounters. ἐξῆλθεν, went out; whence not indicated, probably from a town (Capernaum?) into the solitude of the mountains.—ἐλθειν, to pray, not in Mk.; might be taken for granted. But Lk. makes a point of exhibiting Jesus as a devotional Model, often praying, and especially at critical times in His life. The present is viewed as a very special crisis, hence what follows.—διανυκτερεύων, etc., He was spending the whole night in prayer to God; διανυκτερεύων occurs here only in N. T. —τοῦ θεοῦ is genitive objective: prayer of which God is the object; but ἐξῆλθεν, was taken as = a place for prayer in the margin. Ver. 13. we should get the poetical idea of the προσευχή of God—the mountains!—Ver. 13. τῶς μαθητῶν, the disciples, of whom a considerable number have gathered about Jesus, and who have followed Him to the hill.—ἀποστόλους, Apostles, used by Lk. in the later sense, here and elsewhere. The word is more frequent in his Gospel than in Mt. and Mk. (six times in Lk., once in Mt., twice in Mk.).—Ver. 14. Σίμων: here follows the list much the same as in Mt. and Mk. Lk., though he has already called Simon Peter (v. 8), here mentions that Jesus gave him the name. In the third group of four Judas Jacob takes the place of Thaddaeus in Mt. and Leobbaeus in Mt. and Simon the Kanite is called Simon the Zealot. Of Judas Iscariot it is noted that he became a traitor, “turned traitor” (Field, Ot. Nor.).—προδότης has no article, and therefore should not be rendered the traitor as in A. V. and R. V. When the verb is used it is always περιπλέκων.—Ver. 17. καθαρέα, descending, with the Twelve, suggesting descent to the foot of the hills, the plain below. Yet the expression τῶν πεδίων is peculiar; hardly what we should expect if the reference were to the plain beside the lake. But Lk. suggests that was to be high enough to offer a suggestive of a flat space lower down the hill.—πεδίων, here only in N. T. The descent takes place in order to the delivery of a discourse which, with the choice of the Apostles, constitutes the occasion with reference to which Jesus had spent the night in prayer. The audience consists of three classes separately named (1) the Twelve, (2) the company of disciples described as an δύνατος τούτων, (3) a multitude (πλῆθος) gathered from a wide area. This is the same multitude from which in Mk. 8, the company that followed him, his disciples with Him, to get rest, and presumably to devote some leisure time to their instruction. Of this desire to escape from the crowd, so apparent in Mk., there is no trace in Lk. In indicating the sources of this great human stream Lk. omits Galilee as superfluous, mentions Judaea and
Jerusalem, passing over Idumaea and Peraea (Mk. iii. 8), and winds up with Tyre and Sidon, defining the territory there whence people came by the expression τῆς παραλίου (χώρας understood), the sea-coast. The people come from all these places to hear Jesus (ἀκούσαι αὐτοῦ) in the first place, as if in expectation of a great discourse, and also to be healed. The eagerness to get healing even by touch, of which Mk. gives so graphic a picture (iii. 10), is faintly indicated by ἔχοντο (ἔχοντας, T. R.).—Ver. 19. Σώματα may be nominative both to ἐξήρθησαν and to λέγοντα (A. V. and R. V.), or we may render: “power went forth from Him and He healed all”.

Vv. 20-49. The Sermon (Mt. v.-vii.). That it is the same sermon as Mt. reports in chapters v.-vii. may be regarded as beyond discussion. How, while the same, they came to be so different, is a question not quite easy to answer. There probably was addition to the original utterance in the case of Mt., and there was almost certainly selection involving omission in the case of Lk.'s version, either on his part or on the part of those who prepared the text he used. Retouching of expression in the parts common to both reports is, of course, also very conceivable. As it stands in Lk. the great utterance has much more the character of a popular discourse than the more lengthy, elaborate version of Mt. In Mt. it is didache, in Lk. kerygma—a discourse delivered to a great congregation gathered for the purpose, with the Apostles and disciples in the front benches so to speak, a discourse exemplifying the "words of grace" (iv. 22) Jesus was wont to speak, the controversial antithesis (Mt. v. 17-48) eliminated, and only the evangelic passages retained; a sermon serving at once as a model for "Apostles" and as a gospel for the million.

Vv. 20-26. First part of the discourse: Beatitudes and Woes (Mt. v. 1-12).—Ver. 20. ἔφαρσα τ. ὁμιλήματος. In Lk. the Preacher lifts up His eyes upon His audience (τ. μαθητας, who are themselves a crowd), in Mt. He opens His mouth; both expressions introducing a solemn set discourse. Lk.'s phrase suggests a benignant look, answering to the nature of the utterance.—μαθητας: Lk. has only four Beatitudes, of which the poor, the hungry, the weeping, the persecuted are the objects; the sorrows not the activities of the children of the kingdom the theme.—πτωχοι, πιστωτες, κλαίοντες are to be taken literally as describing the social condition of those addressed. They are characteristics of those who are supposed to be children of the kingdom, not (as in Mt.) conditions of entrance. The description corresponds to the state of the early Church. It is as if Jesus were addressing a church meeting and saying: Blessed are ye, my brethren, though poor, etc., for in the Kingdom of God, and its blessings, present and prospective, ye have ample compensation. Note the use of the second person. In Mt. Jesus speaks didactically in the third person. Christ's words are adapted to present circumstances, but it is not necessary to suppose that the adaptation proceeds from an ebionitic circle, ascetic in spirit and believing poverty to be in itself a passport to the kingdom, and riches the way to perdition.

Vv. 22, 23. In the corresponding passage in Mt. there is first an objective didactic statement about the persecuted,
then an expansion in the second person. Here all is in the second person, and the terms employed are such as suited the experience of the early Christians, especially those belonging to the Jewish Church, suffering, at the hands of their unbelieving countrymen, wrong in the various forms indicated—hatred, separation, calumny, ejection. Άφορίσουσιν may point either to separation in daily life (Keil, Hahn) or to excommunication from the synagogue (so most commentaries) = the Talmudic הָרְאָפָה. In the former case one naturally finds the culminating evil of excommunication in the last clause—ארקדאיאον τοις ανθρώποις. In the latter case this clause will rather point to the vile calumnies afterwards heaped upon the excommunicated. "Absentium nomen, ut improborum hominum, differre rumoribus," Grotius.—Ver. 23. σκαρπήσατε, leap for joy; the word occurs in I. 41, 44, and this and other terms found in the sermon have led some to infer that Lk. uses as his source a version of the discourse emanating from a Jewish-Christian circle. Vide the list of words in J. Weiss, Meyer, note, p. 387. Vide also Feine, Vörk. Überlief. Ver. 24-26. πληρ., but, used here adversatively, a favourite word with Lk., suggesting therefore the hypothesis that he is responsible for the "woes" following, peculiar to his version of the sermon. —ἀπέχετε, ye have in full; riches and nothing besides your reward (cf. Mt. vi 2).—Ver. 25. ἐμπεπλημνωμένοι, the sated, a class as distinct in character as the βασιλείαν of Mt. v. 10, on whom side remarks there. Readers can picture the sated class for themselves.—Ver. 26. This woe is addressed, not to the rich and full without, but to the disciples within, and points out to them that to be free from the evils enumerated in ver. 22 is not a matter of congratulation, but rather a curse, as indicative of a disloyalty to the faith and the Master, which makes them rank with false prophets. —Vv. 27-35. The law of love (Mt. v. 38-48).—Ver. 27. άνόητοι λέγω: Lk. here uses the phrase with which Mt. introduces each dictum of Jesus in opposition to the dicta of the scribes. But of the many dicta of the Lord reported in Mt. he has preserved only one, that relating to the duty of loving (Mt. v. 44). The injunction to love enemies is much weakened in force by omission of the antithesis: love neighbours and hate enemies. As if to compensate Lk. gives the precept twice, (1) as a general head under which to collect sayings culled from the section of the discourse omitted (Mt. v. 17-42), (2) as a protest against limiting love to those who love us (ver. 35, cf. ver. 32).—τούς ἄνθρωπον, to you who hear; a phrase by which the discourse is brought back to the actual audience from the rich and the false disciples apostrophised in the preceding verses. It is an editorial phrase.—
μένως δέμιον, καὶ προσώπησθε ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀπηρεαζότων ὀμάς.

29. τῷ πῦρτοι ἐστὶν ἐκ τῆς σιαγώνα, πάροσχε καὶ τὴν ἄλλην; καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀδροντος τοῦ ἀδρονοντος καὶ τοῦ χιτώνα τῆς καλύπτης.

30. παντὶ δὲ τῇ ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰωνίου σε, δίδου καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀδρονοντος τὸ σά, μὴ ἀποκτεί. 31. καὶ καθὼς ὠφελείτε ἵνα ποιῶν ὀμίλου ὅσοι οἱ ἀθρόπωτοι, καὶ ὄμεις ποιήτε αὐτοῖς ὀμόλους. 32. καὶ ἐὰν ἀγαπάτε τοὺς ἀγαπαίτω τὰς ὀμᾶς, ποῖα ὄμην χάρις ἐστί; καὶ γὰρ οἱ ἀμπροι τοὺς ἀγαποῦντες αὐτοὺς ἀγαπώντες. 33. καὶ ἐὰν ἀγαθοποιητε τοὺς ἀγαθοποιοῦσας ὀμᾶς, ποῖα ὄμην χάρις ἐστί; καὶ γὰρ οἱ ἀμπροι τοῦ αὐτὸν ἀγαποῦντες. 34. καὶ ἐὰν διαλείπητε7 παρ’ ἔνα ἀπολάβαι, ποῖα ὄμην χάρις ἐστί; καὶ γὰρ οἱ ἀμπροι ἀμπροι διαλείποντες, ἵνα ἀπολάβων τὸ ἵσαι. 35. πλὴν ἀγαπάτε τοὺς ἄχρονους ὀμόν, καὶ ἀγαθοποιείτε, καὶ διαλείπετε μηδὲν. 10 ἀπελπιστώτες καὶ

1 ὑπαίτια in ΝΒΔΕ vet. Lat. 6. ὑπαίτια is a correction to classical usage.
2 Ομιτ καὶ ΝΒΔΕ al. ὑπαίτια in ΝΒΕ.
3 Ομιτ δὲ το ΝΒ. ὑπαίτια in ΝΒΕ (Tisch., W.H.), in brackets).
4 Ομιτ γὰρ ΝΒ. ὑπαίτια in ΝΒΕ (Tisch., W.H.).
5 λαβεῖν in ΝΒΕ.
6 ΝΒΕ omit γαρ, and many uncials omit so.
7 10 μηδέν is the best attested reading (ΝΒΔΑ al., W.H. in brackets); μηδέν in ΝΕΠ (Tisch.).

καλὸς ποιήτης, etc.: Lk., in contrast with Mt. (true text), enlarges here, as if to say: you must love in every conceivable case, even in connection with the most aggravated evil treatment. In the clause enjoining prayer for such as have done wrong Lk. substitutes ἀπεραζόντως (ver. 28) for Mt.’s διωκότως = those who insult you, the people it is hardest to pray for. Persecution may be very fierce, at the prompting of conscience, yet respectful.—Ver. 29 = Mt. v. 39, 40 with some changes: τῶν ὁμοίων for βασίλειαν, ἀναφέρειν for ἀπεραζόντως; ἀπεραζόντως suggests the idea of robbery instead of legal proceedings pointed at by Mt.’s κρατάναι; ἰμάτιον and χειρὰν change places, naturally, as the robber takes first the upper garment; for Mt.’s ἄφες Lk. puts μην καλύπτῃ = withhold not (for the construction τῶν ἐκ τῶν καλύπτων, which Bornemann thought unexamined, vide Gen. xxiii. 6, Sept.).—Ver. 30. Lk. passes over Mt.’s instance of compulsory service (v. 41), perhaps because it would require explanation, or was not a practical grievance for his readers, and goes on to the duty of generous giving, which is to be carried the length of cheerfully resigning what is taken from us by force.—Ver. 31. Lk. brings in here the law of reciprocity (Mt. vii. 12), hardly in its proper place, as the change from singular to plural shows, but in sympathy with what goes before, though not quite in line, and therefore inserted at this point as the best place to be found for the golden rule. It seems to be meant as a general heading for the particular hypothetical cases following = you would like men to love you, therefore love them whether they love you or not, etc.—Ver. 32. χάρις, here and in the following verses stands for Mt.’s μισθὸς, as if to avoid a word of legal sound and substitute an evangelical term instead. Yet Lk. retains μισθὸς in ver. 23.—χάρις probably means not “thanks,” from men but favour from God. It is a Pauline word, and apparently as such in favour with Lk. Vide on iv. 22.—ἀμπροι here and in vv. 33, 34 for τελείων and ἄθροι in Mt., a natural alteration, but much weakening the point; manifestly secondary.—Ver. 33. For Mt.’s salvation Lk. substitutes doing good (ἀγαθοποιοῦσας).—Ver. 34. This example is robbed of its point if it be supposed that Lk. had an ascetic bias. If a man despises money there is no merit in lending without expecting repayment.—Ver. 35. πλὴν, but, in
opposition to all these hypothetical cases.—μεθὲ ἀπάλλιωσιται, “hoping for nothing again,” A. V., is the meaning the context requires, and accepted by most interpreters, though the verb in later Greek means to despair, hence the rendering “never despairing” in R. V. The reading μηδένα ἀπειρεῖ, would mean: causing no one to despair by refusing aid.—ἀδελφοὶ ὑψίστοι, sons of the Highest, a much inferior name to that in Mt. In Lk. to be sons of the Highest is the reward of noble, generous action; in Mt. to be like the Father in heaven is set before disciples as an object of ambition.—χρηστός, kind; by generalising Lk. misses the pathos of Mt.’s concrete statement (ver. 45), which is doubtless nearer the original.

Vv. 36-38. Mercifulness inculcated.

God the pattern.—Ver. 36 corresponds to Mt. v. 48, which fitly closes the promulgation of the great law of love = to be there with perion, as thy Father in heaven is perfect (side notes there). Lk. alters the precept both in its expression (οἰκτηρίων as τελειακός), and in its setting, making it begin a new train of thought instead of winding up the previous one = be compassionate (οὐν omitted, NABDL, etc.) as, etc.: the precepts following being particulars under that general.—γίνεσθαι, imperative, for the future in Mt.—οἰκτηρίων: a legitimate substitution, as the perfection inculcated referred to loving enemies, and giving opportunity for setting forth the doctrine of God’s free grace.—καθὼς for Mt.’s ὅσοι, common in Lk. (twenty-eight times), witnessing to editorial revision.—ὁ πατὴρ ὦ: without ὁ θεός, which is implied in the epithet “the Highest” (ver. 35).—Ver. 37. In these special precepts it is implied throughout that God acts as we are exhorted to act. There is a picture of the gracious spirit of God.—καλός, connecting the following precept as a special with a general. No καλός in Mt. vii. 1, where begins a new division of the sermon. In Mt. the judging condemned is referred to as a characteristic Pharisaic vice. Here it is conceived of as internal to the disciple-circle, as in James iv. 12.—ἀπολέσας, set free, as a debtor (Mt. xviii. 27), a prisoner, or an offender (τῷ ἀμαρταια ἀπολούων, 2 Macc. xii. 49).—Ver. 38. δίδοτε: this form of mercy is suggested by Mt. vii. 2, ἐν ὑμῖν μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε: giving, implying a constant habit, and therefore a generous nature.—μέτρων καλῶν, good, generous measure; these words and those which follow apply to man’s giving as well as to the recompense with which the generous giver shall be rewarded.—ἐκεῖνος, expressed down, shaken, and overflowing; graphic exegesis of good measure, all the terms applicable to dry goods, e.g., grain. Bengel takes the first as referring to dry (in aridis), the second to soft (in mollibus), the third to liquids (in liquidis).—κόλπον: probably the loose bosom of the upper robe gathered in at the waist, useful for carrying things (De Wette, Holtz., H. C., al.). It is implied that God gives so, e.g., “plenteous redemption” (Ps. cxvii. 7).

Vv. 39-45. Proverbial lore.—Ver. 39. οὗτος ὦ: the Speaker is represented here as making a new beginning, the connection of thought not being apparent.
Grotius says plainly that there is no connection, and that Lk. has deemed it fitting to introduce here a λόγος that must have been spoken at another time. Mt. has a similar thought to that in ver. 39, not in the sermon but in xv. 14—

τοῦ φίλου τού φιλον: viewing the sermon as an ideal address to a church, this adage may apply to Christians trying to guide brethren in the true way (James v. 19), and mean that they themselves must know the truth.—Ver. 40. The connection here also is obscure; the adage might be taken as directed against the conceit of scholars presuming to criticise their teachers, which is checked by the reminder that the utmost height that can be reached by the fully equipped (κατηρησμένος, a Pauline word, 1 Cor. i. 10, cf. 2 Tim. iii. 17, ἐφρησμένος) scholar is to be on a level with his teacher.—Ver. 41 introduces a thought which in Mt. stands in immediate connection with that in ver. 37 (Mt. vii. 1, 2, 3). If the view of ver. 40, above suggested, is correct, then this and the next verses may also be understood as referring still to the relations between teacher and taught in the Church, rather than to the vices of the Pharisees, which in Lk.'s version of the sermon are very much left out of account. Censoriousness is apt to be a fault of young converts, and doubtless it was rife enough in the apostolic age. On the parable of the mote and the beam video on Mt. vii. 3-5.—Ver. 40. οὗ βλέπων: this is one of the few instances in N. T. of participles negatived by εἰ. The ἐν such cases may = ἡ, which in classical Greek has the force of a condition, εἰ being used only to state a fact (video Burton, § 485).—Vv. 43-45. In Mt. these parabolic sayings are connected with a warning against false prophets (Mt. vii. 15-19). Here the connection is not obvious, though the thread is probably to be found in the word ἐπικρίνατα, applied to one who by his censoriousness claims to be saintly, yet in reality is a greater sinner than those he blames. This combination of saint and sinner is declared to be impossible by means of these adages.—Ver. 44. For τριβάλον in Mt., Lk. puts βάτος = thorn bush, rubus, and for συλλέγουσιν applied to both thorns and thistles in Mt., Lk. uses in connection with βάτον τρυγόνων the
46. "Τί δὲ με καλεῖτε, Κώρε, Κώρε, καὶ οδ ποιεῖτε ἡ λέγω; 47. καὶ ἐρχόμενοι πρὸς με καὶ αἰκώνιν μου τῶν λόγων καὶ ποιῶν αὐτούς, ἐποδείξοντες διὰ τῶν ἐστίν ὁμοίων. 48. δρομός ἐστίν αὐρωπία σκοποῦσαι τοις οἰκοδομοῦντι οἰκίαν, δι' ἐκαθαρία καὶ ἐθελομενον τήν τῶν πάντων εἰς τήν οἰκίαν ἡ προσέφερον ὁ ποταμός ἡ πρότερον ἐπί τῦν πάντων τῆς οἰκίας ἐκείνης, καὶ οὐκ ἰσχύομεν σαλασσών αὐτὴν. 49. ὁ δὲ αἰκώνας καὶ μὴ ποιήσας ὁμοίων ἐστὶν αὐρωπία σκοποῦσαι τοις οἰκοδομοῦντι οἰκίαν ἐπί τὴν γῆν χερις θεμελίου. 50. ὁ προσέφερον ὁ ποταμός, καὶ ἐθελομεν ἐπέσε, καὶ γένετο τὸ βῆμα τῆς οἰκίας ἐκείνης μέγα.

VII. 1. ἘΞΕΙΣ 46 ἐπιλήψεται πάντα τὰ βήματα αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰς ἁκόνας τοῦ λαοῦ, ἐσθιθήνες εἰς Καπαρναούμ. 2. Ἐκαθορίσκοι δὲ

proper word for grape-gathering.—Ver. 45. θραυσμοῦ τῆς καρδίας: either, the treasure which is in the heart, or the treasure which the heart is (Hahn). In either case the sense is: as is the heart, so is the utterance.

Ver. 46, introducing the epilogue, rather than winding up the previous train of thought, answers to Mt. vii. 21-23; here direct address (and person), there didactic (3rd person); here a pointed question, and paratactic structure as of an orator, in lively manner, applying his sermon, there a general statement as to what is necessary to admission into the Kingdom of Heaven—of τὰς ἡ λέγες, etc.

Vv. 24-27. The epilogue (Mt. vii. 24-27).—Ver. 47. πᾶς ἐρχόμενος, etc.: the style of address here corresponds to the idea of the discourse suggested by Lk.'s presentation throughout, the historical Sermon on the Mount converted into an ideal sermon in a church = every one that cometh to me by becoming a Christian, and heareth my words generally, not these words in particular.—Ver. 48. ἐσκάψας καὶ ἔδιδας, dug, and kept deepening. A Hebraism, say Grotius and others = dug deeply. But Raphel produces an example from Xenophon of the same construction: σφηκάζει τα καὶ ἄλκησεν γιὰ τα σφηκάζει (de Oeconomici, cap. xx.),—πλημμύρῃς (from πύρακλης, ἐπ. λεγ. in N. T.), a flood, "the sudden rush of a spate," Farrar (C. G. T.); "Hochwasser," Weizsäcker.—προσέφερθεν, broke against, here and in ver. 49 only, in N. T.—Ver. 49. χείρις θεμελίου, without a foundation; an important editorial comment. The foolish builder did not make a mistake in choosing a foundation. His folly lay in not thinking of a foundation, but building at haphazard on the surface. Vide notes on Mt. for the characteristics of the two builders.—τὰ βήματα (πτώσας in Mt.), the collapse, here only in N. T. This noun is used to answer to the verb προσέφερθεν.

The impression produced by the foregoing study is that Lk's version of the Sermon on the Mount, while faithfully reproducing at least a part of our Lord's teaching on the hill, gives us that teaching, not in its original setting, but readapted so as to serve the practical purposes of Christian instruction, either by Lk. or by some one before him.

Chapter VII. Caphernaum. The Widows Son at Nain. The Baptist. In the House of Simon.—Vv. 1-10. The Centurion of Caphernaum. The Widow's Son at Nain. The Baptist. In the House of Simon.—Vv. 1-10. The Centurion of Caphernaum (Mt. viii. 5-13).—Ver. 1. ἐλε ἡ τὰς ἁκόνας, into the ears = ἐλε ἦ τὰ da in Sept. (Gen. xx. 8, l. 4, Ex. x. 2). To show that it is not a Hebraism, Kypke cites from Dion. Hal.: ἐλε τῆς ἁκόνων τῶν παρών ἡ ἁκόνων.—ἐσθιθήνες, entered, not returned to, Caphernaum.—Ver. 2. δὲ ήν αὐτῷ ἄντων, who was deaf to him; though a slave, indicating that he
was a humane master. Lk. has also in view, according to his wont, to enhance the value of the benefit conferred: the life of a valued servant saved.—Ver. 3, ἀκούσας: reports of previous acts of healing had reached him.—ἀκέφαλος: there is no mention of this fact or of the second deputation (in ver. 6) in Mt.'s version. Lk. is evidently drawing from another source, oral or written.—προσβεβληθοῦσα τῶν ἱουδαίων, elders of the Jews; the reference is probably to elders of the city rather than to rulers of the synagogue. From the designation "of the Jews" it may be inferred that the centurion was a Pagan, probably in the service of Antipas.—διασώσθη, bring safely through the disease which threatened life.—Ver. 4, σταυροῦ, earnestly; though he was a Pagan, they Jews, for reason given.—ἐξομ. ὧν ἀντί, for ἐξόμοιον ὧν ἄντι. παρέθη: the 2nd person singular, future, middle, in a relative clause expressing purpose instead of the more usual subjunctive (vīde Burton, § 318).—Ver. 5, ἄγαμος γὰρ, etc., he loveth our race; a Philo-Jewish Pagan, whose affection for the people among whom he lived took the form of building a synagogue. Quite a credible fact, which could easily be ascertained. Herod built the temple. Vīde Lightfoot on this.—Ver. 6, ἐνοπλισμένοιν, no part of the Gentiles, nothing but Gentiles. For Jesus, as in the case of the Syrophoenician woman.—οἱ μακρὰ, not far, i.e., quite near. Lk. often uses the negative with adjectives and adverbs to express strongly the positive. Hahn accumulates instances chiefly from Acts.—θήλων: these also would naturally be Jews.—λαοὺς ἐλαύ οὐν ἦν: here we have λαοὺς, followed by οὐν with subjunctive. In iii. 16 it is followed by the infinitive.—Ver. 7, εὐλογεῖ, speak, i.e., command, with a word.—Ver. 8, καὶ γὰρ ἦν: here follows the great word of the centurion reported by Lk. much as in Mt. But it seems a word more suitable to be spoken in ἴδιαν ἑν· ή ὑπεράρκη, and speak this word himself. On its import vide at Mt. viii. 9—παρασύνημος: present, implying a constant state of subordination.

Comparing the two accounts of this incident, it may be noted that Lk.'s makes the action of the centurion consistent throughout, as inspired by diiferent humility. In Mt. he has the courage to ask Jesus directly, yet he is too humble to let Jesus come to his house. In Lk. he uses intercessors, who show a geniality welcome to the ironic evangelist. Without suggesting intention, it may be remarked that this story embodies the main features of the kindred incident of the
Syrophcenician woman, not reported by Lk. The excessive humility of the centurion = "we Gentile dogs". The intercession of the elders = that of the disciples. The friendliness of the elders is an admonition to Judaists = this is the attitude you ought to take up towards Gentiles. All the lessons of the "Syrophcenician woman" are thus taught, while the one unwelcome feature of Christ's refusal or unwillingness to help, which might seem to justify the Judaists, is eliminated. How far such considerations had an influence in moulding the tradition followed by Lk. It is impossible to say. Suffice it to point out that the narrative, as it stands, does double duty, and shows us:—
1. Gentile humility and faith.
2. Jewish friendliness.
3. Christ's prompt succour, and admiration of great faith.

Vv. 11-13. The son of the widow of Nain. In Lk. only.—ἐν τῷ ἐξῆς (καὶρῆς), in the following time, thereafter; vague. —ἐν τῷ ἁμ. would mean: on the following day (ἡμέρᾳ, understood), i.e., the day after the healing of the centurion's servant in Capernaum. Hofmann defends this reading on the negative ground that no usage of style on the part of Lk. is against it, and that it better suits the circumstances. "We see Jesus on the way towards the city of Nain on the north-western slope of the little Hermon, a day's journey from Capernaum. It is expressly noted that His disciples, and, as leavas is well attested, in considerable numbers, not merely the Twelve, were with Him, and many people besides: a surrounding the same on the hill where He had addressed His disciples. Those of the audience who had come from Judaea are on their way home." The point must be left doubtful. W. and H. have ἐν τῷ ἁμ. and omit leavas. —Naas: there is still a little hamlet of the same name (vide Robinson, Palestine, ill. 355, 361). Eusebius and Jerome speak of the town as not far from Endor. Some have thought the reference is to a Nain in Southern Palestine, mentioned by Josephus. But Lk. would hardly take his readers so far from the usual scene of Christ's ministry without warning. —Ver. 14. καὶ ἦσαν, and Io 1. The καὶ introduces the apodosis, but is really superfluous; very Hebrew (Godet). —ἐξερχόντα, was being carried out (here only in N. T.). ἐκβαίνετο used in the classics (Acts v. 6). Loesner cites examples of the use of this verb in the same sense, from Philo. —μονογενής, χήρα: these words supply the pathos of the situation, depict the woe of the widowed mother, and by implication emphasize the benevolence of the miracle, always a matter of interest for Lk. —Ver. 13. ὁ Κύριος, the Lord, first time this title has been used for Jesus in the narrative. Lk. frequently introduces it where the other synoptists have "Jesus". The heavenly Christ, Lord of the Church, is in his mind, and perhaps he employs the title here because it is a case of raising from the dead. The "Lord" is Himself the risen One. —ἐπελεγμένη: express mention of sympathy, pity, as the
14. And the people asked, "Is this the voice of a prophet?"
15. Then Elisha came down to him, crying, "See! There is a place where they are digging the earth, where they have spread out the burial cloths of the dead."
16. Then they said, "Tell us, prophecy of the Lord, what will you have us do?"
17. And Elisha answered, "As the Lord lives, who has created the heavens and the earth, there will never be a child without a place of burial."
18. And Elisha said, "Prepare a great number of men to bury the dead, for they will not have enough burial cloths for them."
19. And the people said, "But there are many more than there are bones in the burial vaults."
20. And Elisha said, "What are you saying, 'Bury the dead?' But rather, 'Bury the living.'"
21. And Elisha said, "As the Lord lives, who has created the heavens and the earth, there will never be a child without a place of burial."

Motive of the miracle. Cf. Mk. i. 41.—

mē klēia, cease weeping, a hint of what was coming, but of course not understood by the widow.—Ver. 14. soroû, the bier (here only in N. T.), probably an open coffin, originally an urn for keeping the bones of the dead.—προφητής, those who carried the coffin stood, taking the touch of Jesus as a sign that He wished this.—Ver. 15. ἀνέκτησαν, set up: the ἀνά is implied even if the reading ἀνὰσαν be adopted; to sit was to sit up for one who had been previously lying; sitting up showed life returned, speaking, full possession of his senses; the reality and greatness of the miracle thus asserted.—Ver. 16. φῶς: the awn natural to all, and especially simple people, in presence of the preternatural.—προφητής μέγας, a great prophet, like Elisha, who had wrought a similar miracle at Shunem, near by (2 Kings iv.).—Εὐαγγελία, visited graciously, as in i. 68, 78.—Ver. 17. ὁ λόγος οὗτος, this story. Lk. says it went out, it would spread like wildfire far and wide.—ἐν δύνῃ τῆς Ιουδαίας, in all Judæa. Some (Meyer, Bleek, J. Weiss, Holtzmann) think Judæa means here not the province but the whole of Palestine. But Lk. is looking forward to the next incident (message from John); therefore, while the story would of course spread in all directions, north and south, he lays stress on the southward stream of rumour (carried by the Judaean part of Christ's audience, vi. 17) through which it would reach the Baptist at Machaerus.—πρὸς τῷ περιτόμον, the district surrounding Judæa, Perææ, i.e., where John the Baptist was in prison.—Vv. 18-35. The Baptist's message (Mt. xi. 2-19).—Ver. 18. ἄργυγγελον: John's disciples report to him. Lk. assumes that his readers will remember what he has stated in iii. 20, and does not repeat it. But the reporting of the disciples tacitly implies that the master is dependent on them for information, i.e., is in prison.—περὶ πάντων τῶν τούτων: the works of Jesus as in Mt., but τούτων refers specially to the two last reported (centurion's servant, widow's son).—Ver. 19. διὸ, two; more explicit than Mt., who has διὰ τοῦ μαθητήν. The διὸ may be an editorial change made on the document, from which both drew.—πρὸς τὸν κύριον (Ἰησοῦν, T. R.): a second instance of the use of the title 'Lord' in Lk.'s narrative.—ἐὰν εἴ, etc.: question as in Mk., with the doubtful variation, ἄλλον for ἄνευ.—Ver. 20. On their arrival the men are made to repeat the question.—Ver. 21. Lk. makes Jesus reply not merely by word, as in Mt. (xi.
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wise alters and tones down the remarkable statement about John, omitting the solemn "γενέσεως," and inserting, according to an intrinsically probable reading, though omitted in the best MSS. (and in W.H.), "προφήτης," so limiting the wide sweep of the statement. Lk.'s version is secondary. Mt.'s is more like what Jesus speaking strongly would say. Even if He meant: a greater prophet than John there is not among the sons of women, He would say it thus: among those born of women there hath not arisen a greater than John, as if he were the greatest man that ever lived. - 33. As omitted in uncials, found in minusc.; a marginal direction inctionaries.
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following a late tradition, think Meyer and Schanz. More probably they are
explanatory editorial touches by Lk., as if to say; John did eat and drink, but
not bread and wine.—For ἔληλυθαν Lk. substitutes in vv. 33 and 34 ἔληλυθαν =
is come. Thus the two prophets have
taken their place once for all in the page
of history: the one as an ascetic, the
other as avoiding peculiarity—influenc-
ing men not by the method of isolation
but by the method of sympathy. The
malignant caricature of this genial
character in ver. 34—glutton, drunkard,
comrade of publicans and sinners—
originated doubtless in the Capernaum
mission.—Ver. 35. καί, etc., and wisdom
is wont to be justified by all her
children; by all who are themselves
wise, not foolish and unreasonable like
the “generation” described. On this
adage wide notes on Mt. xi. 19. Born-
emann thinks that this verse is part of
what the Samaritan woman had spoken in irony = their conduct shown
to be folly by results; what converts
they made: the refuse of the population!—
Vv. 36-50. The sinful woman. This
section, peculiar to Lk., one of the
golden evangelic incidents we owe to
him, is introduced here with much tact,
as it serves to illustrate how Jesus came
to be called the friend of publicans and
sinners, and to be calumniated as such,
and at the same time to show the true
nature of the relations He sustained to
these classes. It serves further to
exhibit Jesus as One whose genial,
gracious spirit could bridge gulls of
social cleavage, and make Him the
friend, not of one class only, but of all
classes, the friend of man, not merely of
the degraded. Lk. would not have his
readers imagine that Jesus dined only
with such people as He met in Levi’s
house. In Lk.’s pages Jesus dines with
Pharisees also, here and on two other
occasions. This is a distinctive feature
in his portrayal of Jesus, characteristic
of his irenic cosmopolitan disposition.
It has often been maintained that this
narrative is simply the story of Mary of
Bethany remodelled so as to teach new
lessons. But, as will appear, there are
original features in it which, even in the
judgment of Holtzmann (H. C.), make it
probable that two incidents of the kind
occurred.—Vv. 36-39. The situation.—τι τῶν Φ.;
when or who not indicated, probably not
known, but of no consequence to the
story; the point to be noted that one
of the Pharisaic class was the inviter.—
τοῦ Φαρισαίου: the class indicated a
second time to make prominent the
fact that Jesus did not hesitate to accept
the invitation. Euthy. Zig remarks: He
did not refuse that He might not give
excuse for saying that He ate with
publicans and sinners and avoided the
Pharisees (βαλονσόμενος).—Ver. 37.
γυνη, etc., a woman who was in the
city, a sinner. This arrangement of the
words (ἡ γυνὴ ἐν τῇ πόλει, W.H.)
represents her as a notorious character;
how sinning indicated by expressive
silence: a harlot. In what city? Various
conjectures. Why not Capernaum? She
a guest and hearer on occasion of the
feast in Levi’s house, and this what came
of it! Place the two dinners side by
side for an effective contrast.—ἐνυγνώσα,
KATA LOYKAN

VII.

b here only ἐν τῇ ὁλίγῃ τοῦ Φαρισαίου. 

κομίσασα ἄλλαστρον μέρος, 38. καὶ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κομισασάς τοῦ πόδαν αὐτοῦ δύον ὅπως 1 κλαίουσα, ἦραντο βρέχειν τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ τοὺς δάκρυσιν, 2 καὶ ταῖς θρισὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτῆς ἐξέμασκε, καὶ κατεφίλει τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἦλειφε τῷ μῦρῷ.

39. Ἡδὼ δὲ τοῦ Φαρισαίου δὲ καλός αὐτῶν εἶπεν ἐν διατυπωτι, "Οὕτως, εἰ ᾐν προφήτης, ἐγίνοντος ἐν τῷ καὶ ποιητῇ ἡ γνωστή, ἢτε ἀντέται αὐτῶν ὁ δὲ ἀμαρτωλός ἄρτος."

40. Καὶ ἀποκρίθης δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπε πρὸς αὐτῶν, "Σῆμων, ἢς σοι ἀντί εἶπεν." Ο δὲ φησὶ, "Διδάσκαλε, εἰπέ." 41. "Διός χρησιμολογεῖται ἡ σοὶ διακήρυξις τούτων. ὃ εἰς ψυχὲς δημόρα πεντάκοσια, δὲ ἔτερος πεντήκοντα. 42. μὴ ἔχωνες δὲ αὐτῶν ἀποδοθήκη, ἀμφοτέρους ἐχαρίσατο. τίς ὁν μὲν αὐτῶν εἰπέ, 6 πλεῖον αὐτῶν ἀγάπησε τίς;"

2 omit before παρα τ. τ. in BBDLXA 1, 33 (Tisch., W.H.).

1 omit before ηδὼ in BBDL 33, a very credible emphasis on the tears.

2 ΕΣ have προφ. (W.H. in brackets).

3 With φησιν in BBDLE 1 (Tisch., W.H.).

4 Omit οὖν BBDLE.

5 αὐτὸν in BBDLE.

7 having learned, either by accident, or by inquiry, or by both combined.— ἐν τῇ ὁλίγῃ τ. Φ.: the Pharisee again, nota bene! A formidable place for one like her to go to, but what will love not dare? — Ver. 38. στῶν σπιτῶν, standing behind, at His feet. The guests reclined on couches with their feet turned outwards, a posture learned by the Jews from their various masters: Persians, Greeks, Romans. In delicacy Jesus would not look round or take any notice, but let her do what she would.— κλαιον: excitement, tumultuous emotions, would make a burst of weeping inevitable.— ἐρόστρα applies formally to βρέχειν, generally to all the descriptive verbs following. She did not wet Christ’s feet with tears of set purpose; the act was involuntary.— βρέχειν, to moisten, as rain moistens the ground: her tears fell like a thunder shower on Christ’s feet. Cf. Mt. τ. 45.— ἐξίσωσε, she continued wiping. Might have been infinitive depending on ἐρόστρα, but more forcible as an imperfect. Of late use in this sense. To have her hair flowing would be deemed immodest. Extremes met in that act.— κατεφίλει, kissed fervently, again and again. Ἰδας also kissed fervently. Vide Mt. xxvi. 29 and remarks there.— ἐλαφεία: this was the one act she had come of set purpose to do; all the rest was done impulsively under the rush of feeling.— Ver. 30. Ἰ Φαρισαῖος, for the fourth time; this time he is most appropriately so designated because he is to act in character.— εἰπέ: their presence implies previous relations, of what sort need not be asked: not a prophet, but no thought of impurity; simply ignorant like a common man.— ἐγίνοντες ἐν, indicative with ἐν, as usual in a supposition contrary to fact.— τὰ καὶ τοὺς ἄντικα. who and what sort of a woman; known to everybody and known for evil.— ἐπέτρεπε: touch of a man however slight by such a woman impossible without evil desire arising in her. So judged the Pharisee; any other theory of her action inconceivable to him.

Vv. 40-50. Host and guest.— ἀποκριθεὶς, answering, to his thought written on his face.— Σῆμων: the Pharisee now is called by his own name as in friendly intercourse. The whole dialogue on Christ’s part presents an exquisite combination of outspoken criticism with courtesy.— ἐν τῷ καὶ ποιητῇ: comis prafatio, Bengel.— Διδάσκαλε: Simon’s reply equally frank and pleasant.— Ver. 41. The parable of the two debtors, an original feature in the story.— χρησιμολογεῖτα: here and in xvi. 5, only in N.T.— ἐπετρέπτω (here only in N.T.): might mean a usurer, but his behaviour in the story makes it more suitable to think of him simply as a creditor. — ἦς εἰς ψυχὲς: even the larger sum was a petty debt,
whereby Simon would be thrown off his guard: no suspicion of a personal reference. — Ver. 42. ἐχάριστα: a warmer word than ἀφίναι, welcome to Lk, as containing the idea of grace. — ἀφρός ἐκριναι, like the πᾶν ἄρβυς of Socrates, but without his irony.— Vv. 44-46. στραφὲς: Jesus looks at the woman now for the first time, and asks His host to look at her, the despised one, that he may learn a lesson from her, by a contrast to be drawn between her behaviour and his own in application of the parable. A sharply marked antithesis runs through the description.— ἰδιωρ — διάκρινην; φύλημα — καταφυλάσσα; ἵλαμ (common oil), μέρος (precious ointment); κεφαλὴν — πόδας. There is a kind of poetic rhythm in the words, as is apt to be the case when men speak under deep emotion. — Ver. 47. νεμένων, wherefore, introducing Christ's theory of the woman's extraordinary behaviour as opposed to Simon's ungenerous suspicions.— λέγω σοι, I tell you, with emphasis; what Jesus firmly believes and what Simon very much needs to be told. — ἀφιέναι (Doric perf. pas.) αἰ ἄμαρταί αὕτης, forgiven are her sins; i.e., it is a case, not of a courtean acting in character, as you have been thinking, but of a penitent who has come through to me the knowledge that even such as she can be forgiven. That is the meaning of this extraordinary demonstration of passionate affection.— αἱ πολλαί, the many, a sort of afterthought: many sins, a great sinner, you think, and so I also can see from her behaviour in this chamber, which manifests intense love, whence I infer that she is conscious of much forgiveness and of much need to be forgiven.— διε γὰρ ἐπέφυγεν πολὺ: διε introduces the ground of the assertion implied in πολλαί; many sins inferred from much love; the underlying principle: much forgiven, much love, which is here applied backwards, because Simon, while believing in the woman's great sin, did not believe in her penitence. The foregoing interpretation is now adopted by most commentators. The old dispute between Protestants and Catholics, based on this text, as to the ground of pardon is now pretty much out of date. — ἡ δὲ ἀλήγοι, etc.: this is the other side of the truth, as it applied to Simon: little (conscious)
sin, little love. The doctrine here enunciated is another very original element in this story. It and the words in Lk. v. 31 and Lk. xv. 7 form together a complete apology for Christ's relations with the sinful.—Ver. 49. ἀλλὰ ἡ ἀλήθεια: direct assurance of forgiveness, for confirmation of her faith tried by an unsympathetic surrounding of frowning Pharisees.—Ver. 49. τίς σὺν ᾧ: again the stupid cavil about usurpation of the power to pardon (v. 21).—Ver. 50. Concerned only about the welfare of the heroine of the story, Jesus takes no notice of this, but bids her farewell with "thy faith hath saved thee, go into peace". J. Weiss (Meyer) thinks ver. 49 may be an addition by Lk. to the story as given in his source.

Chapter VIII. The Sower and other Incidents.—Vv. 1-3. Ministering women; peculiar to Lk., and one of the interesting fruits of his industrious search for additional memorabilia of Jesus, giving us a glimpse into the way in which Jesus and His disciples were supported. —Vv. 4-8. Parable of the sower (Mt. xiii. 1-9, Mk. iv. 1-9).—Ver. 4. ὑπέλθων: Lk. like the two other evangelists, provides for the parable discourse a large audience, but he makes no mention of preaching from a boat, which has been forestalled in a previous incident (chap. v. 3).—καὶ τῶν κατὰ πόλεις, etc.: this clause simply explains how the crowd was made up, by contingents from the various towns. This would have been clearer if the καὶ had been left out; yet it is not superfluous, as it gives an enhanced idea of the size of the crowd.
people from every city gathering to Him.— διὰ παραβολῆς: Lk. gives only a single parable in this place.—Ver. 5. τῶν σωτέρων αὐτῷ: an editorial addition, that could be dispensed with.—δὲ μὲν, one part, δὲ neuter, replied to by καὶ ἔτερον = ἔτερον ἐτά in ver. 6.—Ver. 6. φωνή, 2nd aorist participle, neuter, from φώνη (Alex. form), the Attic 2nd aorist being φωνή— λειμάδα (λειμάδε), moisture, here only in N. T.—Ver. 7. ἐν μέσῳ τῇ ἁ. Μt. has ἔδωκεν. Mk. εἶπεν. Lk.'s expression suggests that the thorns are already above ground.—Ver. 8. ἐκπονταπλασίων, an hundredfold. Lk. has only one degree of fruitfulness, the highest, possibly because when two is possible δύο is not ununctuous, but an important lesson is missed by the omission. The version in Mt. and Mk., is doubtless the original. It was characteristic of Jesus, while demanding the undivided heart, to allow for diversity in the measure of fruitfulness. Therein appeared His "sweet reasonableness." This omission seems to justify the opinion of Meyer that Lk.'s version of the parable is secondary. Weiss on the contrary thinks it comes nearest to the original.

Vv. 9-10. Conversation concerning the parable (Mt. xiii. 10-17, Mk. iv. 10-12).—Ver. 9. τὰς ἑπτὰ, what this parable might be. The question in Lk. refers not to the parabolic method, as if they had never heard a parable before, but to the sense or aim of this particular parable. It simply prepares for the interpretation following.—Ver. 10. The contrast between the disciples and others, as here put, is that in the case of the former the mysteries of the kingdom are given to be known, in that of the latter the mysteries are given, but only in parables, therefore so as to remain unknown. The sense is the same in Mt. and Mk., but the mode of expression is somewhat different.—τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς, a milder phrase than the ἓκαστοι τοῖς ἔξις of Mk., cf. ἔκκλημα in chap. v. 29.—ἐφ' ἑκάστην, etc. : this sombre saying is also characteristically toned down by abbreviation, as compared with Mt. and Mk., as if it contained an unwelcome idea. Vide notes on Mt.

Vv. 11-15. Interpretation of the parable (Mt. xiii. 18-23, Mk. iv. 13-20).—Ver. 12. ἐκαθοριστείτω: this is not a sufficient definition of the wayside hearers; all the classes described heard. The next clause, beginning with ὥστε, must be included in the definition = the wayside men are persons in whose case, so soon as they have heard, cometh, etc.—δὲ διάβολος: each gospel has a different name for the evil one; ὁ ποιητής, Mt., ὁ σετανᾶς, Mk.—ἐνα μὴ πιστεύσατε σωθήσεσθε, lest believing they should be saved; peculiar to Lk., and in expression an echo of St. Paul.
and the apostolic age.—Ver. 13. metà χαράς: common to the three reports, a familiar and important feature of this type—emotional religion.—πρὸς καὶ τὸν πιστεύοντα, believe for a season, instead of Mt.'s and Mk.'s, he (they) is (are) temporary.—ἐν καὶ τὸ πιστεύον; a more comprehensive expression than that common to Mt. and Mk., which points only to outward trial, tribulation, or persecution. The season of temptation may include inward trial by deadness of feeling, doubt, etc. (Schanz).—Ver. 14. τὸ δὲ. There is a change here from the plural masculine to the neuter singular: from "those who" to "that which".—πορευμένων: the use of this word, which seems superfluous (Grotius), is probably due to Lk. having under his eye Mk.'s account, in which εἰσερχόμενοι comes in at this point. Kypke observes: "εἰ ὑπὸ μαθητῶν καὶ τοῦ τ. β.) occupative penetrati" = they being taken possession of, etc., the passive form of Mk.'s "cares, etc., entering in and taking possession". This seems as good an explanation as can be thought of.—Bornemann takes ὑπὸ = μετὰ or σῶν, and renders, they go or live amid cares, etc., and are checked.—οἱ τελεσφοροῦσι, they do not bring to maturity (here only in N. T.). Examples of this use in Wetstein and Kypke from Strabo, Philo, Josephus, etc. Hesychius explains τελεσφορὸς thus: ὁ τελεσφορὸς καθ' ὄρους τῶν καρπῶν, ἢ ὁ τελεσφόρος αὐτοῦ φέρει.—Ver. 15. οἱ καὶ τὰ πιστεύοντα καὶ ἄγαθος, in a noble and generous heart, an important contribution by Lk. to the explanation of the conditions of fruitfulness. The former epithet points to a lofty aim or ideal, the latter to enthusiastic whole-hearted devotion to the ideal, the two constituting a heroic character. The phrase was familiar to the Greeks, and Lk. may have been acquainted with their use of it to describe a man comme il faut, but he brings to the conception of the καὶ ἀγαθος new moral elements.—ἐν ὑπομονῇ, in patience, as opposed to πρὸς καὶ τὸν πιστεύον; and, it might be added, ἐν ἀγαθωσίᾳ as opposed to the thorny-ground hearers. ἦν, again in xxii. 19, often in Epistles.

Vv. 16-18. Those who have light must let it shine (Mt. v. 15, x. 26, Mk. iv. 21-25). Lk. here seems to follow Mk., who brings in at the same point the parable of the lamp, setting forth the duty of those who are initiated into the mysteries of the kingdom to diffuse their light. A most important complement to the doctrine set forth in ver. 10, that parables were meant to veil the mysteries of the kingdom.—Ver. 16. ἥσαν: καὶ ἑσάντα. ἕσαν is the more classical word.—σκείήν: any hollow vessel instead of the more definite but less familiar μάδαν in Mt. and Mk.—κλίνειν, bed or couch, as in Mt. and Mk. Nobody puts the lamp under a vessel or a couch, as a rule; it may be done occasionally when the light, which burns night and day in an eastern cottage, for any reason needs to be obscured for a while.—ἐναὶ ὡς εἰσερχόμενοι, etc., that those entering in may see the light. The light is rather for...
the benefit of those who are within (τοὺς ἐν τῇ ἡλία, Mt. v. 15), the inmates. Is Lk. thinking of the Gentiles coming into the church?—Ver. 17. γεννησάται: predictive = nothing hidden which shall not some day be revealed.—γνωσθῇ, ὄνη (SBL), the fut. ind. passes into aor. subj., with ὅς μη ἕν τῷ = nothing hidden which is not bound to become known (Meyer).—Ver. 18 enforces the duty thence arising, to be careful hearers; hearing so as really to know; shortcoming here will disqualify for giving light. Jesus has inculcated the duty of placing the light so that it may illuminate; He now inculcates the prior duty of being lights.—δ ὡς εἰς ἑκείνη: the δικαίος may be an editorial explanatory comment to remove the apparent contradiction between μὴ ἔχεις and δ ἔχεις (Weiss, Mk-evang., p. 157).

Vv. 19-21. *Mother and brethren* (Mt. xii. 46-50, Mk. iii. 31-35). Given in a different connection from that in Mt. and Mk. The connection here seems purely topical: the visit of the friends of Jesus gives Him occasion to indicate who are they who represent the good, fruitful soil (ver. 21).—Ver. 19. διὰ τῶν ἐκλογῶν: a crowd seems unsuitable here (though not in Mt. and Mk.), for just before, Jesus has been conversing with His disciples in private.—Ver. 21. Lk. omits the graphic touches—looking around, and stretching out His hands towards His disciples, concerned only to report the memorable word.—οἱ τῶν λόγων τοῦ Θεοῦ, those hearing and doing the word of God. The expression here is somewhat conventional and secondary as compared with Mt. and Mk. Cf. chap. vi. 47, and λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ, viii. 11.

Vv. 22-25. *The tempest on the lake* (Mt. viii. 23-27, Mk. iv. 35-41). The voyage across the lake took place, according to Mk., on the day of the parables; it was an escape from the crowd, a very real and credible account. The whole situation in Lk. is different: no preaching from a boat, no escape when the preaching was over. It simply happened on one of the days (ἐν μὶ τῶν ἡμερῶν).—Ver. 22.
26. KAI κατέχλησαν εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν Γαδαρηνῶν, ἢ τὸι εἰσὶν ἀντιπέραν τῆς Γαλιλαίας. 27. ἐξελθοῦσι δὲ αὐτῷ ἐκ τῆς γῆς, ὑπήρχον οὖν αὐτῷ ἁμρ τῆς πόλεως, ὃς ἦσε ἁμαρτία ἐκ χρόνων ἵκανή, καὶ ἤματον οὐκ ἐνεπιδείκτηκεν, καὶ ἐν οἷς οὐκ ἤματεν, ἀλλ᾽ ἐν τοῖς μημάσαν. 28. Βάπτισεν δὲ τὸν Ἰησοῦν, καὶ ἀνακράζει, προσέπεσον αὐτῷ, καὶ φησὶν μεγάλη εἶπεν, "Τί ἐμοί καὶ σοι, Ἰησοῦ, οἷά τίνος ἐστιν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὄψιν; διὸμαί σου, μὴ με

1 διεγράφει in NBL 13, 33 al. (Tisch., W.H.).
2 NBLX 1 al. omit αὐτῷ.
3 So in ARGDAP al. syr. verss. (including Sin.). Γερασηνῶν in NBLXE minusc. 6 memph., etc. (Tisch.). Γερασηνῶν in BC*D vet. Lat. vulg.; the most probable reading (W.H.).
4 αὐτῶν in most uncials.
5 οὗτος is τοῖς αὐτῶν in most uncials.
6 B has τοῦ αὐτῆς. D, while retaining αὐτῆς, omits τοῦ.
7 For καὶ χρόνων ... ενεπιδείκτηκεν NBL 1, 33, 131, 157 cop. al. have καὶ χρόνῳ ἵκανον οὐκ ενεπιδείκτηκα ἡματόν (Tisch., W.H.). The true text is doubtful here, though I have assumed below that that adopted by Tisch. and W.H. is to be preferred.
8 omit καὶ NBDLX 33 al.
9 Omit τοῦ θεοῦ ΔΕ 1 (W.H. in brackets).

λίμνης: no need for this addition in Mk., or even in Mt., where Jesus is represented as in Capernaum. Lk. does not tell us where Jesus was at the time.

Ver. 23. ἠπνοιῶν: went off to sleep, fatigued with heat and speaking; the storm implies sultry conditions; ἠπνοιῶν means both to awake = ἠπνοίησαν, and to go to sleep = καθῆλθεν; vide Lobeck, ad Phryn., p. 224.

κατῆλθεν, came down, from the hills — συνεκαταλαμβάνοντα, they (i.e., the boat) were getting full and in danger. Seamen would naturally say, "we were getting full," when they meant the boat.

Examples of such usage in Kyrke. — Ver. 24. ἀπωτάτα: Lk.'s word for master, answering to διδάσκαλος. Mk., and κυρίος, Mt.—οὐκ ἐξελθεῖν τοῦ θάνατος, the surge of the water. — Ver. 25. τούτῳ, etc., where is your faith? a mild rebuke compared with Mt. and Mk. Note: Lk. ever spares the Twelve.

Vv. 26-39. The demoniac of Gerasa (Mt. viii. 28, 34, Mk. v. 1-20). —Ver. 26. κατέχλησαν εἰς τὴν χώραν, "they sailed down from the deep sea to the land, put in," Grimm; appulfert ad regionem, Raphel, who gives numerous examples of the use of this verb (here only in N. T.) in Greek authors.—τ. Γερασηνῶν, the Gerasenes, inhabitants of the town of Gerasa (Kerna, Thomson, Land and Book), near the eastern shore of the lake, a little south of the mouth of Wadi Semach (Rob Roy on the 'fordan, chap. xxiii.). — ἄνηρ ἁμρ, etc.: this clause answers to Mk.'s εἰς τὸ τέφρων τ. 6. By the relative clause Lk. avoids the double εἰς (J. Weise in Meyer).—Αὐτὲς τ. Γαλ., opposite Galilee, a vague indication; an editorial note for the benefit of readers little acquainted with the country.—Ver. 27. ἄνηρ ἐκ τῆς πόλεως, a man of, or from, the city; he did not come
out of the city to meet Jesus.—ἐξίσως 

8αὐμα, having demons, a plurality with reference to ver. 30.—οὐκ ἐνθεσθέντα, etc.: the description begun here is completed in ver. 29. Mk. gives it all at once (v. 2-3). Lk. seems to follow Mk. but freely—unひとつて, abode among the tombs, the two facts first mentioned.—

Ver. 29. παραγγέλειν γὰρ: the command caused the cry of fear, and the fear is explained in the clause following, introduced by a second γὰρ.—πολλοὶ 

χρόνοι, answers to πολλὰ 

χρόνια in Mk. v. 4; therefore presumably used in the sense, oftentimes, frequently. So Erasmus and Grotius, and most recent commentators. Meyer and others take it = during a long time. Schanz combines the two senses. The disease was of an intermittent character, there were paroxysms of acute mania, and intervals of comparative quiet and rationality. When the paroxysms came on, the demon (one in ver. 29) was supposed to seize him (συνερτάσαι). Then he had to be bound in chains and fetters, and kept under guard (φυλασσόμενος, cf. A. V. and R. V. here), but all to no purpose, the demoniac force bursting the bonds and driving the poor victim into the deserts. The madman feared the return of an attack, hence his alarmed cry.—Ver. 30. διεἰσήλθαν, etc.: Lk. gives this explanation of the name Legion; in Mk. the demoniac gives it.—

Ver. 31. εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον, into the abyss (of Tartarus) instead of Mk. 's ἔξω 

τῆς χώρας, out of Decapolis.—Ver. 32. χορ. ἱματίων: for a large number, often in Lk.; his equivalent for Mk.'s 2000.

Vv. 34-39. The sequel. Lk. tells the second part of the story very much as it is given in Mk., with slight stylistic variations. In ver. 26 he substitutes the expression πώς ἐλθόθα ἡ βασμοθέσεις, how the demoniac was said, for Mk.'s "how it happened to the demoniac, and concerning the swine," suggesting the
idea that the destruction of the swine was a part of the cure. They had to be drowned that he might be restored to sanity.—Ver. 37. Lk. is very careful to involve the whole population in the request that Jesus would leave the country—the whole multitude of the district of Gerasa, town and country, citizens and farmers. And he gives as the reason, 6τι φόβον μεγάλον συνείχοντο, they were possessed with a great fear, panic-stricken.—Ver. 38. έθανε, the reading of BL. The healed man’s request, though not granted, would gratify Jesus, as a contrast to the unanimous petition of the Gerasenes that He would leave the place.—Ver. 39. έποιήθη: it was good for the man that he should return to his home and people, and tell them what had befallen him through the mercy of God (δοκεῖ έποίηθην και Θεός). It was good for the people also. They needed a missionary greatly.—καθ’ ἐλεύθερον τά πόλις, over the whole city. Mk. says in Decapolis.

Ver. 40. On the western side (Mk. v. 21). Lk. still follows Mk. closely, mentioning the cordial welcome given Jesus on His arrival on the Galilean shore, and proceeding to narrate the incidents of the woman with a flux, and Jairus’ daughter.—Δήλος, the crowd. This crowd is unexplained by Lk., who says nothing of a crowd when he introduces his narrative of the voyage to the eastern shore (ver. 22). In Mk. the presence of a crowd is easily accounted for: Jesus had suddenly left the great congregation to which He had spoken in parables, and as His stay on the eastern side was cut short, when He returned to the western shore the crowd had hardly dispersed, or at least could reassemble on short notice. Mk. does not say the crowd, but a great crowd.—ἀνεδέλται implies a cordial reception. Cf. Acts xv. 4. Raphel gives examples of this sense from Greek authors. Euthy, took it in this sense, giving as the reason for the welcome: οἱ εὐεργετικοί καὶ σωτῆρα.—προσοδικεῖτε: the parables, not to speak of recent healings, account for the expectation.

Vv. 41-42. The story of Jairus’ daughter begins (Mk. ix. 18, 19, Mk. v. 21-24).—Δήλος τής συμαγγυγῆς instead of Δρυσυμαγγυγος (Mk.), as more intelligible to Gentile readers. But after having explained its meaning by the use of this phrase he employs the other in ver. 49.
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αὐτὸν εἰσελθέντα, εἰς τὸν ὅλον αὐτὸν· 42. ἔτι θυγάτηρ μονογενῆς ἦν αὐτῷ ὡς έτῶν δώδεκα, καὶ αὐτῇ ἀπέστησεν. Ἐν δὲ τῷ ὀπάσῳ αὐτὸν οἱ δύο δύο συνενόην αὐτόν. 43. Καὶ γυνὴ ὁδόν ἐν χούσαν αἵματος ἐπὶ ὅλον δώδεκα, ἡς εἰς ἑαυτὰς προσαναλάλοσα ἔδω τὸν βίον ὡς ιώνας δύο· 44. προσελθοῦσα ὑπέθεσεν, ἥσυχα τοῦ κράτοις τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ, καὶ παραχρῆμα ὑπῆρε τῷ μύρῳ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτῆς. 45. καὶ εἶπεν ἡ ἰησοῦς, "Τις τὸ αἵματος μου." 46. Ἀρνομένων δὲ πάντων, εἶπεν ὁ Πέτρος καὶ οἱ μη ἀνίηθεν, "Εἰπτάτα, οἱ δύο δύο συνένοησι σε καὶ ἀποδόθησιν, καὶ λέγεις, Τις τὸ αἵματος μου." 47. "Ἡσυχαῖος μοι τίς· ἐγὼ γὰρ ἄγνων δύναμιν ἐξελάβοντας ἀπ' ἐμοί." 48. Ἡ δὲ ἰησοῦς εἶπεν, "Θάνατε, ἑβαθμίτης, ἡ μέσης αὐτοῦ σοῦ ἑσωκί σε· πορεύου εἰς εἰρήνην." 

1 From εἰς ἑαυτὰς to βίον omitted in BD (W.H.); may be a gloss from Mk.
2 in ΝΒΕ.
3 In some minusc. and verss. omit οἱ μη. αὐτοῦ (W.H.).
4 Omit καὶ λέγεις . . . μοι ΝΒL minusc. verss. (Tisch., W.H.); comes from Mk.
5 συνενόησι in ΝΒL 33.
6 eπονεμένων in ΝΒL 33.
7 ΝΒDLXE omitted.
8 in most uncials; BKL have θαυμάστη (W.H.).

— Ver. 42. μονογενῆς (as in vii. 12): peculiar to Lk. The name of the father, his rank, and the girl's age (all lacking in Mt.). Lk. has in common with Mk. This feature he adds after his wont to enhance the benevolence of Jesus.— ἀπέστησεν, was dying. Mk.'s phrase, ἐνίκητο ἡμῖν, is avoided as not good Greek. In Mt. she is already dead.— συνενόησι, were suddocing Him; a very strong expression. Mk.'s word is sufficiently strong (συνενόησιν, thronged), and if there was to be exaggeration we should hardly have expected it from Lk. But he uses the word to make Christ's quick perception of the special touch from behind (ver. 43) the more marvellous.

Vv. 43-48. **The woman with an issue** (Mt. ix. 20-22, Mk. v. 25-34).—Ver. 43. ἑβαθμίτης: indicating the terminus a quo. Mk. uses the accusative of duration.— προσαναλάλοσα (here only in N. T.), having expended in addition: to lose of health was added so as to gain it back.— ὅλως, means of life, as in xv. 12, 30, xxi. 4.—οὐκ ἰώνας, etc., was not able to get healing from any (physician), a milder way of putting it than Mk.'s.—Ver. 44. κράτοις, the tassel hanging over the shoulder; this feature not in Mk., a curious omission in so graphic a writer.— παραχρῆμα: Lk.'s equivalent for εἰσελθέντα.— ὑπῆρε, the flow of blood (ῥύος) stopped. ἱστάμεναι, the technical term for this experience.—Ver. 45. ὁ Πέτρος: Mk. says "the disciples," but one would speak for the rest, and Lk. naturally makes Peter the spokesman.—κυριακοῖς, hem thee in.—ἀποδέχονται, squeeze, like grapes (Joseph., Ant., ii., v. 2).— Ver. 46. ἄγνων δύο: Lk. puts into the mouth of Jesus what in Mk. is a remark of the narrator. Vide notes on this incident in Mt. and Mk.

Vv. 49-56. **Previous narrative resumed** (Mt. ix. 23-26, Mk. v. 35-43).—Ver. 49. τίς: one messenger, several in Mk.; one enough for the purpose.—παρὰ τῷ ἐρχόμενον, from the ruler = belonging to his house. Vide Mk. iii. 21: οἱ παρὰ αὐτοῦ. Mk. has ἔδω here.—Ver. 50. ἐκατονθα: Mk. has παρακολουθεῖ, the message being spoken not to Jesus but to Jairus: He overheard it.—μόνον παρακολουθεῖ, etc., only
believe and she shall be saved—Paulinism in the physical sphere.—Ver. 51. In B and other MSS. the usual order of the three disciples—Peter, James, John—is changed into Peter, John, James.—Ver. 53. eldeTtS $tia $tia6eanv: Lk. is careful to add this remark to exclude the idea that it was not a case of real death; his aim here, as always, to magnify the power as well as the benevolence of Jesus.—Ver. 55. to $veta6a, her spirit returned = $Y56$ in Acts xx. 10.—$vaygëv: the order to give the resuscitated child food is not peculiar to Lk., but he places it in a more prominent position than Mk. to show that as she had been really dead she was now really alive and well; needing food and able to take it. Godet remarks on the calmness with which Jesus gave the order after such a stupendous event. “As simply as a physician feels the pulse of a patient He regulates her diet for the day.”

CHAPTER IX. THE CLOSE OF THE GALILEAN MINISTRY. SETTING THE FACE TOWARDS JERUSALEM.—VV. 1-50 contain sundry particulars which together form the closing scenes of the Galilean ministry: the mission of the Twelve, the feeding of the thousands, the conversation on the Christ and the cross, the transfiguration, the epileptic boy, the conversation on “who is the greatest.” At ver. 51 begins the long division of the Gospel, extending to xviii. 14, which forms the chief peculiarity of Lk., sometimes called the Great Interpolation or Insertion, purporting to be the narrative of a journey southwards towards Jerusalem through Samaria, therefore sometimes designated the Samaritan ministry (Baur and the Tübingen school), but in reality consisting for the most part of a miscellaneous collection of didactic pieces. At xviii. 15 Lk. rejoins the company of his brother evangelists, not to leave them again till the tragic end.

VV. 1-6. The mission of the Twelve (Mt. x. 1, 5-15, Mk. vi. 7-13).—Ver. 1. συγκαταστάσεως δι: the δι turns attention to a new subject, and the part συγκα. implies that it is a matter of
IX. 1. ΣΥΓΚΛΕΣΙΜΕΝΟΣ δὲ τοὺς διάδεκα μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ, ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς δύναμιν καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ διὰμόρια, καὶ εὐσκόπους θεραπεύειν. 2. καὶ ἀπόστειλεν αὐτοῖς κηρύσσειν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἐδόθη τοὺς διὰβεβαιῶσας. 3. καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς, Ἔρθατε εἰς τὴν δῶν· μὴ τε βαύβουν, μὴτε πήραι, μὴτε ἀριστον, μὴτε ἀργόνων, μὴτε νεκρῶν διὸ καὶ ἔκτισιν ἔξοι. 4. καὶ εἴς ἐν εἰς οἶκον εἰσέλθησεν, ἐκεῖ μένετε, καὶ ἐκεῖθεν ἐξέρχεσθαι. 5. καὶ δόσιν ἐν τῇ βεβαιωθεὶ ὁμοίως, ἐξερχόμενοι ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως ἐκείνης καὶ τῶν κοινωνίων ἀπὸ τῶν ποιῶν ὅμων ἀποτελέσατε, εἰς παράδοτον κατὰ τὰς κόμως, εὐαγγελιζόμενοι καὶ θεραπεύοντες πανταχοῦ.

1 Many uncial (BD, etc.) omit μαθ. αὐτοῦ. Some texts (N克莱 al.) have ἀποστολοῦ.
2 E syn. cur. and sin. omit τοὺς αὐθ. (Τisch., W.H.).
3 ἔβαβυν in ΝΒCDLξε 1, 33, 69 al.
4 Οmit αὐτο_holder ΝΒCLE; found in D.
5 δεχθείτε in ΝΑΒCLE. Τ.Ρ. = D al.
6 Οmit καί ΝΒCDLξε 1, 33 verse.
7 Αποστελεῖτε in ΝΒ 1, 131, 157 (Τisch., W.H.). Τ.Ρ. = parallels (αιτ.).

importance: calling together the Twelve, out of the larger company of disciples that usually followed Jesus, including the women mentioned in viii. 1-3.— δύναμιν καὶ εξουσίαν, power and right; power implies right. The man that can cast out devils and heal disease is entitled to do so, nay bound. This principle found an important application in St. Paul’s claim to be an apostle, which really rested on fitness, insight. I understand Christianity, therefore I am entitled to be an apostle of it. Lk. alone has both words to express unlimited authority (Hahn). Mt. and Mk. have εξουσίαν.—εἰς πάντα, etc., over all the demons, and (also power and authority) to heal diseases, the latter a subordinate function; thoroughly to quell the demons (πάντας emphatic) the main thing. Hence the Seventy on their return speak of that alone (x. 17).—Ver. 2. This might have been viewed as an incidental mention of preaching as another subordinate function, but for the reference to healing (λάθησα), which suggests that this verse is another way of stating the objects of the mission, perhaps taken from another source.—Ver. 3. The instructions in this and the next two verses follow pretty closely the version in Mk.—μὴ ἔρθητε εἰς τὴν δῶν: as in Mk., but in direct speech, while Mk.’s is indirect (ινα μ. ἀσκεῖται).—μὴ τε βαύβουν: Lk. interprets the prohibition more severely than Mk. Not a staff (Mk. except a staff only).—ἀργόριον, silver, for Mk.’s χαλκόν: silver the common metal for coinage among the Greeks, copper among the Romans.—διὸ καὶ ἐκεῖθεν ἐξέρχεσθαι, there remain, thence depart, both adverbs referring to ὀλίγαν. —Ver. 5. By omitting the δικοῦνων ὄμων of Mk. Lk. gives the impression that non-receiving refers to the missionaries not as preachers but as guest = If they will not take you into the house you select, do not try another house, leave the place (so Hahn). This would be rather summary action, and contrary to the spirit of the incident (ix. 52-56).—Ver. 6. Brief statement, as in Mk., as
to the execution of the mission, but wanting his reference to the use of oil in healing.

Hahn states that this mission was purely pedagogic, for the benefit of the Twelve, not of the people. This is a mere unfounded assertion. The training of the Twelve by no means appears a prominent aim of Jesus in the pages of Lk.; much less so than in Mt. and Mk.

Vv. 7-9. Herod's interest in Jesus (Mt. xiv. 1-2, Mk. vi. 14-16).—ο ἱεραρχὴς τῶν ἰεραρχῶν ἡμῶν, which seems inconsistent with retirement; hence the introduction of τὸν ἐρημόν = the desert of the city (Tisch., W. H., follow BL, etc.).

For εἰς τὴν καλούμενήν Νο. BL X 33 sah. cop. have εἰς πόλην καλούμενην, which seems inconsistent with retirement; hence the introduction of τὸν ἐρημόν = the desert of the city (Tisch., W. H., follow BL, etc.).

5. οὐ δὲ ἡμῖν γνώτες ἐκκολοθήσασθαι αὐτῷ καὶ δεξιάμενος αὐτός, ἐδέκτης αὐτός πέρι τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ τοὺς χρείαν ἔχοντας θεραπείας λάτο.

1. Omit υπ αὐτον ΝΒCDE 59 al.

2. γνωρίζει in ΝΒCŒE al.

3. τό in ΝΒCLΔΕ 1, 13, 33.

4. For καὶ εἰς τὸν ΝΒCDE 1, 33 al. have εἰς τὸν Βε, and ΝCD al. ΒΙ. omit ο in BL.

5. ΝΒCŒE omit εἰς.

6. For εἰς τὴν καλούμενην Νο. BL X 33 sah. cop. have εἰς πόλην καλούμενην, which seems inconsistent with retirement; hence the introduction of τὸν ἐρημόν = the desert of the city (Tisch., W. H., follow BL, etc.).

7. αὐτοῖς in ΝΒDLX 33 al.
7—18. ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ


18. ΚΑΙ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτῶν προσελήνην καταμόνας, συνήκαν αὐτὸ ὁ μαθηταί· καὶ ἐπηρρίησαν αὐτοῖς, λέγων, "Τίνα

1 πορευθῆνες ἐν ΝΔΒΕΔ τῆς al.
2 φαγεῖν ὑμῖν in B (Tisch., W.H. text), also with other MSS. ἀρτοῦ before ψηλώς, and χῆπος before διός.
3 ωσι before αὐτοῦ in ΝΔΒΕΔΕ 33 (W.H.).
4 καταλίμπαν in ΝΔΒΕΔ τῆς i, 33, 59 al.
5 παραδέων in ΝΔΒΕΔ τῆς i, T.R. = DL al.

in a participial clause, but in an independent sentence, as bringing an unwelcome close to the beneficent labours of Jesus. He went on teaching and healing, but (8) the day, etc.—καταλύσας: the disciples in Lk. are solicitous about the lodging as well as the feeding of the people.—ἐποιμίσθωσιν, provisos, here only in N. T., but often in classics, e.g., with reference to the provisioning of an army (commeatus).—Ver. 13. πλεῖον ὁ: on the construction, vide Winer, § 58, 4 obs. i.—εἰ μὴ: . . . ἀγοράζωμεν, unless perhaps we are to buy, etc.; εἰ with subjunctive is one of the forms of protasis in N. T. to express a future supposition with some probability, e. t. takes also present and future indicative. Vide Burton, M. and T., § 252. That Lk. did not regard this proposal as, if possible, very feasible, appears from his mentioning the number present at this stage—ver. 14. Hence also he does not think it worth while to mention the amount of money for its disposal (200 denarii, Mk. vi. 37).—κλίσις, dining parties, answering to Mk.'s συμφέρεια. Mk.'s προσαλι, describing the appearance to the eye, like flower beds, with their gay garments, red, blue, yellow. Lk. omits.—Ver. 16. εὐλάβησαν αὐτοῖς. He blessed them (the loaves), and by the blessing made them sufficient for the wants of all. In Mt. and Mk. εὐλάβησαν has no object. This is the only trait added by Lk. to enhance the greatness of the miracle, unless the position of πάντας after ἐχορτάσθησαν be another— they ate and were filled, all; not merely a matter of each getting a morsel.

Vv. 18-27. The Christ and the cross (Mt. xvi. 13-28, Mk. viii. 27-ix. 1). At this point occurs a great gap in Lk.'s narrative as compared with those of Mt. and Mk., all between Mt. xiv. 22 and xvi. 12 and between Mk. vi. 45 and viii. 27 being omitted. Various explanations of the omission have been suggested: accident (Meyer, Godet), not in the copy of Mk. used by Lk. (Reuss), mistake of the eye, passing from the second feeding as it were the first (Beyschlag). These and other explanations imply that the omission was unintentional. But against this hypothesis is the fact that the edges of the opposite sides of the gap are brought together in Lk.'s
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με λέγοντιν οἱ ὁχλοὶ εἶναι;

19. Οἱ δὲ ἀποκριθέντες εἶπον, "Ἰδοὺν τὴν Ἐβραϊκὴν ἀλλοι δὲ, Ἡλιαί. ἀλλοι δὲ, δεί προφήτης τῶν ἀρχαίων ἄντιστα."

20. Ἐπεὶ δὲ αὐτοῖς, "Ὑμεῖς δὲ τίνα μὲ λέγετε εἶναι;" Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Πέτρος εἶπε, "Τὸν Χριστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ."

21. Οἱ δὲ ἐπιτιμήσας αὐτοὺς παρῆγγελε μηδὲν εἰπέν. 4 ποιών, 22. εἶπον, "Ὅτι δὲ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πολλα παθεῖν, καὶ ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι ἀπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ ἀρχιερέων καὶ γραμματέων, καὶ ἀποκαθάσθη, καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐγερθήναι." 6

23. Ἑλευθεραί δὲ πρὸς πάντας, "Εἰ τις θαλείν ὑπὸν αὐτῶν, ἀπαρνήσασθαι ἑαυτῶν, καὶ ἀράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτὸν καθ' ἡμέραν, 3

1 1.08. εὐλ. in ἩΒΛΕ ε. 131 sah. cop.
2 πέτρος ἐν αὐτο. in ἩΒΛΕ ε. 1 sah. cop.
3 λέγειν in ἩΜΑΒΧΕΔΛΕ al. pl.
4 So in most uncials. ACD minusc. have ἀναστήσει (W.H. marg.).
5 αὐξηθῆλας in ἩΜΑΒΧΕΔΛΕ al. The important authorities are divided between ἀπαρνήσασθαι and the simple ἀρνεῖν. (W.H. former in margin, latter in text.)

narrative at ix. 18: Jesus alone praying, as in Mt. xiv. 23, Mk. vi. 45-46, yet the disciples are with Him though alone (κατὰ μόνας συνήγονα α. οἷς μιθρῖτοι), and He proceeds to interrogate them. This raises the question as to the motives for intentional omission, which may have been such as these: avoidance of duplicates with no new lesson (second feeding), anti-Pharisaic matter much restricted throughout (ceremonial washing), Jewish particularism not suitable in a Gentile Gospel, not even the appearance of it (Syrophenician woman).—κατὰ μόνας, the scene remains unchanged in Lk.—that of the feeding of the 5000. No trace in this Gospel of Caesarea Philippi, or indeed of the great northerly journey (or journeys) so prominently raised in Mk., the aim of which was to get away from crowds, and obtain leisure for intercourse with the Twelve in view of the approaching fatal crisis. This omission can hardly be without intention. Whether Lk. knew Mk.’s Gospel or not, so careful and interested an inquirer can hardly have been ignorant of that northern excursion. He may have omitted it because it was not rich in incident, in favour of the Samaritan journey about which he had much to tell. But the very raison d’être of the journey was the hope that it might be a quiet one, giving leisure for intercourse with the Twelve. But this private fellowship of Jesus with His disciples with a view to their instruction is just one of the things to which justice is not done in this Gospel. Their need of instruction is not emphasised. From Lk.’s narrative one would never guess the critical importance of the conversation at Caesarea Philippi, as regards either Peter’s confession or the announcement by Jesus of the coming passion.—Ver. 20. τὸν Χριστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ: even the form of the confession, as here given, hides its significance. Peter speaks the language of the apostolic age, the Christ of God, a commonplace of the Christian faith. Mk.’s Thou art the Christ, laconic, emphatic, is original by comparison, and Mt.’s form still more sounds like the utterance of a fresh, strong conviction, a new revelation flashed into the soul of Peter.

Vv. 21-27. The cross and cross-bearing.—Ver. 22. εἶπον introduces reference to the coming sufferings of Jesus in a quite incidental way as a reason why the disciples should keep silence as to the Messiahship of their Master, just confessed. The truth is that the conversation as to the Christ was a mere prelude to a very formal, solemn, and plain-spoken announcement on a painful theme, to which hitherto Jesus had alluded only in veiled mystic language. Cf. the accounts in Mt. and Mk. (xvi. 21, viii. 31).—ὃ ἔθνες δὲ πρὸς πάντας: with this formula Lk. smoothly passes from Christ’s statement concerning His own Passion to the kindred topic of cross-bearing as the law of
discipleship. The discourse on that theme is reproduced in much the same terms as in the parallel accounts. But it loses greatly in point by the omission of the Master's rebuke to Peter for his opposition to the Passion. That rebuke gives to the discourse this meaning: you object to my suffering? I tell you not only must I suffer; it is the inevitable lot of all who have due regard to the Divine interest in this world. Thus the first lesson Jesus taught the Twelve on the significance of His death was that it was the result of moral fidelity, and that as such it was but an instance of a universal law of the moral order of the world, the great doctrine, the ethical aspect of the Passion, is not made clear in Lk.—καθ' ἡμέραν, daily, in Lk. only, a true exegetical addition, yet restricting the sense, directing attention to the commonplace trials of ordinary Christian life, rather than to the great tribulations at crises in a heroic career, in which the law of cross-bearing receives its signal illustration. This addition makes it probable that πάντας refers not only to the disciples, but to a larger audience: the law applies not to leaders only but to all followers of Jesus.—Ver. 25. εἰς τοὺς ἀπολόγους ἤ ἡμέρας = losing, or receiving in vain [Field, Ot. Nor.]. The idea expressed by the second participle seems to be that even though it does not come to absolute loss, yet if gaining the world involve damage to the self, the moral personality—taint, lowering of the tone, vulgarising of the soul—we lose much more than we gain.

—Ver. 26. ἐν τῇ δίδυμῃ, etc., in the glory of Father, Son, and holy angels, a sort of trinitarian formula.—Ver. 27. ἡμέρας = ἡμέρα in parallelas.—αὐτῷ, here = δίς in parallelas.—τὴν βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ, the Kingdom of God, a simplified expression compared with those in Mt. and Mk., perhaps due to the late period at which Lk. wrote, probably understood by him as referring to the original of the church at Pentecost.

VV. 28-29. The transfiguration (Mt. xviii. 1-13, Mk. ix. 2-13).—Ver. 28. τῶν δὲ λόγων τῶν ἡμέρας: the words about the Passion and cross-bearing.—ὁ δὲ ἡμέρας ἐκτέτλειν: no real discrepancy between Lk. and the other evangelists (after six days).—Πέτρον, etc., Peter, John and James, same order as in viii. 51 (BC, etc.).—ὁ λόγος: the mountain contiguous to the scene of the feeding, according to the sequence of Lk.'s narrative.—προσευχήθατο: prayer again (cf. ver. 18). In Lk.'s delineation of the character of Jesus prayer occupies a prominent place.—Ver. 29. ἐν τῷ προσευχῆσθαι, while praying, and as the result of the exercise. —Προσευχήθαι different self; a real objective change, not merely to the view of the three disciples. Lk. omits ἤσυχον αὐτῶν.—λειτούργει may be viewed as an
adverb in function, qualifying ἧσαντες (De Wette), but there is no reason why it should not be co-ordinate with ἦσαν, as being omitted = white, glistering. — ἧσαντες; in N. T. here only, flashing like lightning.—Ver. 31. ἐν δόξῃ: this is peculiar to Lk.—Δεικνύω, were speaking about. Kypke thinks more is meant: speaking with praise (cum laude aliquid commemorare). One could have accepted this sense had Peter's opposition been reported.—τὴν ἐξοδίαν, decease, death; so in 2 Peter i. 15. Other words for death are ἀσβεστος (Heb. xiii. 7), δειμφρα (Acts xx. 29), ἀναρριπθεί (2 Tim. iv. 6). Perhaps the exodus here spoken of should be taken comprehensively as including death, resurrection and ascension. (So Kypke, also Godet.) τὴν πληρωθείν in that case will mean "pass through all the stages". But against this wide sense is ἐν τῇ ἐφορονταλήμ. — Ver. 32. ὑπερηφάνειν: this particular, in Lk. only, implies that it was a night scene; so also the expression τὸ ἐν τῇ ἐνυπνία, ver. 37. The celestial visitants are supposed to arrive while the disciples are asleep. They fell asleep while their Master prayed, as at Gethsemane. — διαγγελοῦσαντες, having thoroughly wakened up, so as to be able to see distinctly what passed (here only in N. T.).—Ver. 33. While the two celestial were departing Peter made his proposal, to prevent them from going.—μὴ εἰδώς, etc., not knowing what he said; an apology for a proposal to keep the two celestial from returning to heaven.—Ver. 34. It is not clear who were enveloped by the cloud. If the reading άκοινοι before εἰσέλθωσιν were retained it would imply that the three disciples were outside; αὐτῶν, the reading of B, etc., implies that all were within.—Ver. 35. ἀκολούθουν, the reading of ΝΒΛ is to be preferred, because ἀκολούθησα, T. R., is confirmed to that in the parallels; here only in N. T.—Ver. 36. ἀνίστησαν, they were silent: "in those days," it is added, implying that afterwards (after the resurrection) they spoke of the experience. Lk. does not mention the injunction of Jesus to keep silence, nor the conversation on the way down the hill about Elijah and John the Baptist. — Ver. 37-43. The epileptic boy (Mt. xvii. 14-21, Mk. ix. 14-29).—Ver. 38. ἑβδόμας, to look with pity, as in i. 48. — μονογενής, only son, as in vii. 12, viii. 42, to bring out the benevolence of
the miracle.—Ver. 39. krάţei, he (the boy) crieth.—σωράσατον, he (the demon) teareth him.—Ver. 42. προσερχομένου αὐτοῦ, while the boy was approaching Jesus, in accordance with His request that he be brought to Him, the demon made a final assault on his victim, rendering and convulsing him.—Ver. 43. ἐκ τῆς μεγαλεύτητος τοῦ Θεοῦ, the people were astonished at the majesty of God, revealed in the power that could work such a cure. In Acts ii. 23 God is represented as working miracles through Jesus. So the matter is conceived here. But Lk. thinks of the majesty of God as immanent in Jesus.

Vv. 42-45. Second prediction of the Passion (Mt. xxi. 22-23, Mk. ix. 30-32).—πάντων θαυμαζόντων, etc., while all were wondering at all the things which He did. The reference is to the cure of the epileptic, which led the multitude to see in Jesus the bearer of the majesty or greatness of the Almighty.—ἐλεύθερα. Jesus spoke a second time of His approaching death, in connection with this prevailing wonder, and His aim was to keep the disciples from being misled by it. The setting in Mt. and Mk. is different. There Jesus speaks of His passion, while He with the Twelve is wandering about in Galilee, endeavouring, according to Mk., to remain unnoticed, and He speaks of it simply because it is the engrossing theme with which His mind is constantly preoccupied. Here, on the other hand, the second announcement is elicited by an external occasion, the admiration of the people.—Ver. 44. μέλλει παραβαίνειν, is about to be betrayed. Lk. gives the specialty of the second prediction as in the parallels. Where he fails in comparison with Mt. and Mk. is in grasping the psychological situation,
the emotional state of Christ’s mind. Cf. remarks on Mk., ad loc. Lk.’s Christ is comparatively passionless.

46. Who then, they might be the greatest (Mt. xviii. 1-5, Mk. ix. 33-41).—Ver. 46. διαλογισμοῦ, now there entered in among them (the Twelve) a thought. Lk.’s way of introducing this subject seems to show a desire, by way of sparing the future Apostles, to make as little of it as possible. It is merely a thought of the heart (τὰς καρδίας, ver. 47), not a dispute as in Mk., and inferentially also in Mt. It came into their minds, how or why does not appear. Mk.’s narrative leads us to connect the dispute with Christ’s foreboding references to His Passion. While they walked along the way (ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ), the Master thinking always, and speaking often, of His death, they, realising that a crisis of some sort was approaching but not knowing its nature, discussed the question τί ποιήσων; so supplying the comic side of the tragic drama,—τὸ τέκνον, etc., as he might be the greater of them, or, who might be greater than they. αὐτῶν may be taken either partitively, or as a genitive of comparison. It is ordinarily taken in the former sense, whereby Lk.’s account is brought into line with the parallels; but Weiss (Mk.-Ev.Eng., and J. Weis in Meyer) contends for the latter. His idea is that the Twelve, in Lk.’s view, were all conscious of their common importance as disciples of Jesus, and wondered if anybody could be greater than they all were. He connects the “thought” of the Twelve with the exorcist incident (ver. 49) as evincing a similar self-importance. This view cannot be negated on purely exegetical grounds.—Ver. 47. ἐκεῖνος beside Himself, note εὐθέως, as in ... construction from good authors {vide p. 353}.

48. τοῦ τὸ παιδίον, this particular child—not such a child, or what such a child represents, the little and insignificant—as in Mt. and Mk. Yet Lk.’s expression practically means that this child, for example,—βίβλοι: in Lk. the receiving of the little child is placed first in the discourse of Jesus, whereas in Mk. the general maxim that the man who is willing to be last is first, comes first. This position favours the view that not internal rivalry but a common self-exaltation in relation to those without is the vice in the view of Lk. Jesus says in effect: Be not high-minded; an appreciative attitude towards those you are prone to despise is what I and my Father value.—ἐν πάσιν ὄνομ: this phrase, on the other hand, seems to point to internal rivalries. There had been a question about them, and Lk. makes greater and less, to which the Master’s answer was: the least one is the great one. Lk.’s version of this important discourse is, as De Wette remarks, inferior in point and clearness to Mt.’s.—Ver. 49. ἐκκόλουθοι (T. R.), acrion, instead of Mk.’s imperfect; the former implies successful repression, the latter an attempt at it. Vide notes on Mk., ad loc. —μεθ’ ἡμῶν: Phrynichus objects to this construction after ἐκκόλουθοι, and says it should be followed by the dative. But Lobeck gives examples of the former construction from good authors {vide p. 353}.
Chapter ix., as Farrar remarks (C. G. T.), should have ended here, as with ver. 52 begins an entirely distinct, large, and very important division of Lk.'s Gospel. 

Vv. 51-56. "Looking southward. Samaritan intolerance."—Ver. 51 forms the introduction to the great division, ix. 51—xviii. 31. It makes all that follows up to the terminus ad quem stand under the solemn heading: the beginning of the end. From this time forth Jesus has the close of His earthly career in view. His face is fixedly set towards Jerusalem and—heaven. This conception of Jesus, as from this point onwards looking forward to the final crisis, suggests various reflections.

1. The reference to the last act of the drama comes in at a very early place in Lk.'s history.

2. The part of the story lying behind us does not adequately account for the mood of Jesus. We do not see why He should be thinking so earnestly of a final crisis of a tragic character, or even why there should be such a crisis at all. That the religious guides of Israel more or less disapproved of His ways has appeared, but it has not been shown that their hostility was of a deadly character. The dinner in Simon's house speaks to relations more or less friendly, and the omission of the sharp encounter in reference to hand-washing, and of the ominous demand for a sign from heaven, greatly tends to obscure the forces that were working towards a tragic end, and had the cross for their natural outcome. It does not seem to have entered into Lk.'s plan to exhibit Christ's death as the natural result of the opinions, practices, prejudices and passions prevalent in the religious world. He contemplated the event on the Godward, theological side, or perhaps it would be more correct to say on the side of fulfilment of O. T. prophecy. The necessity of Christ's death, the δεί (ix. 22) = the demand of O. T. Scripture for fulfilment, vide xxiv. 20.

3. In the long narrative contained in the next eight chapters, Jesus does not seem to be constantly thinking of the end. In Mk. and Mt. it is otherwise. From the period at which Jesus began to speak plainly of His death He appears constantly preoccupied with the subject. His whole manner and behaviour are those of one walking under the shadow of the cross. This representation is true to life. In Lk., on the other hand, while the face of Jesus is set towards Jerusalem, His mind seems often to be thinking of other things, and the reader of the story forgets about the cross as he peruses its deeply interesting pages.

συμπληρωθέντα, etc., when the days of His assumption were in course of accomplishment, implying the approach of the closing scenes of Christ's earthly experience; here and in Acts ii. 3, only, of time; in viii. 23 in the literal sense.—ἀναλήψας α. His assumption into heaven, as in Acts i. 2. The substantive in this sense is a δείκ. λα. in N. T. It occurs in the Test., xii. Patr. The verb occurs in a similar sense in various places in the Sept. The assumption into heaven includes the crucifixion in Lk.'s conception, just as the glorification of Jesus includes the Passion in the Johannine conception. "Instabat adhuc passio, crux, moris, sepulcrum; sed per haec omnia ad metam propeexit Jesus, cujus sensum imitatur stylius evangeliastae," Bengel. The ἀναλήψις was an act of God.—ἀντίρρησεν, He made His face firm (from στηρίγμα, akin to στήρεσ, Thayer's Grimm), as if to meet something formidable and unwelcome, the cross rather than what lay beyond, here in view. Hahn, who does not believe that Lk. is here referring to Christ's final journey to Jerusalem, tones down the force of this word so as to make it
express in Oriental fashion the idea of Jesus addressing Himself to a journey not specially momentous.

Vv. 52-56. Samaritan intolerance.—
esis cóymnη Samartianótēn: this indicates an intention to go southward through Samaritan territory. Not an unusual thing. Josephus (Antiq., xx., vi.) states that it was the custom for Galileans going to Jerusalem to the feasts to pass through Samaria.—προμοίασα αυτού, to prepare for Him, i.e., to find lodgings for the night.—ὅτε in view of the sequel can only express tendency or intention. —οὐκ ἔδειξα αυτῷ: the aorist, implying that they at once rejected Him;—Farrar (C. G. T.).—ὅτα introduces the reason: Christ's face was, looked like, going to Jerusalem. In view of what Josephus states, this hardly accounts for the inhospitable treatment. Perhaps the manner of the messengers had something to do with it. Had Jesus gone Himself the result might have been different. Perhaps He was making an experiment to see how His followers and the Samaritans would get on together. In that case the result would make Him change His plan, and turn aside from Samaria into Perea. If so then Baur's idea of a Samaritan ministry is a misnomer.—Ver. 54. ἰδάκμος καὶ ἰδαμάς: their outburst of temper, revealed in their truculent proposal, probably indicated the attitude of the whole company. In that case journeying through Samaria was hopeless.—καταβήναι, infinitive, instead of ἦν with subjunctive as often after εἰτα.—Ver. 55. στραφές: an imposing gesture, as in vii. 9. 44.—Ver. 56. οἱ ἰδίαι κόμην, to another village, probably in Galilee; both in the borderland.

Vv. 57-62. New disciples.—ἐν τῇ ἀδικίᾳ: the indication of time is not precise. It does not mean, on the way to the other village, mentioned just before (Meyer), but on the way to Jerusalem (ver. 51),
Grotius thinks the connection is purely topical. "Visum est Lucae connectere τὰ ἡμερήσια." The first two of the three cases are reported by Mt. (viii. 19-22) — τοῖς: Mt. (viii. 19) designates this certain one a scribe. — ἐκλησία implies a departure from a place. It would be a leaving of home for the disciple. — Ver. 58. This remarkable saying is given in identical terms by Mt. and Lk. Vide on Mt. Vv. 59, 60. The second case (Mt. viii. 21-22). — ἀκολούθησα μου. Jesus takes the initiative in this case. That He should not have done so in the first is intelligible if the aspirant was a scribe. Jesus did not look for satisfactory discipleship from that quarter. — οὐδὲ, but thou, emphatic, implying that the man addressed is not among the dead, but one who appreciates the claims of the kingdom. — διἀγγελλε, keep proclamation on every side the Kingdom of God; that thy sole business is to declare everything else, even burying parents, must be sacrificed; seek first the kingdom.

Vv. 61, 62. The third case, peculiar to Lk., and setting forth a distinct type. — ἀκολουθήσομαι: I will follow Thee, implying that he also has been asked to do so, and that he is ready, but on a condition. — ἐπίτρεψαν μοι: this is a type of man who always wants to do something, in which he is himself specially interested first (πρῶτον), before he addresses himself to the main duty to which he is called. — ἐπιστρέφεται: in this case it is to bid good-bye to friends, a sentimental business; that also characteristic. — τοίς εἰς τὸν οἰκὸν μου. The verb ἵσθαι, is used in later Greek both with the dative of a person to denote "to take leave of," and with the dative of a thing = to leave off. In the latter sense it is the only one suitable to the character (sentimental) and to the request, as property could be renounced on the spot; though this reason is not so conclusive, as some legal steps might be necessary to denude oneself of property.

— Ver. 62. ὁδεῖς ἐπιστάλλον, etc.: the necessity of self-concentration inculcated in proverbial language borrowed from their agricultural life. Wetstein cites from Hesiod, "Ἐργ., ver. 443, the well-known lines: ἰδεῖν ἀνάλαβε δαινοῦ, Μηθεῖ παταλῶν μεθ' ὀμφάλισα, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ ἐργα θημών ἔχων. The ambition to make a straight furrow has been common to ploughmen in all ages and countries, and it needs, like the highest calling, steady intention and a forward-cast eye. Furrer compliments the Palestine fellah on his skill in drawing a long straight furrow (Wanderungen, p. 149). His plough is a very inferior article to that used in this country. — ἐδώρες, well fitted, apt; here and in chap. xiv. 35, Heb. vi. 7. — The first case is that of inconsiderate impulse, the second that of conflicting duties, the third that of a divided mind. The incidents are related by Lk., not so much possibly for their psychological interest as to show how Jesus came to have so many disciples as chap. x. 1-16 implies, and yet how particular He was.
Chapter X. The Seventy. The Good Samaritan. Martha and Mary.—Vv. 1-12. The Seventy sent forth, peculiar to Lk. Many questions have been raised as to this narrative, e.g., as to its historicity, as to the connection between the instructions to the new missionaries and those to the Twelve, and as to the time and place of their election, and the sphere of their mission. On these points only the briefest hints can be given here. As to the first, the saying about the paucity of labourers, found also in Mt. (ix. 38), implies that Jesus was constantly on the outlook for competent assistants, and that He would use such as were available. The cases mentioned in the closing section of last chapter confirm this inference. Whether He would send them out simultaneously in large numbers, twelve, or seventy, or piecemeal, one or more pairs now, and another small group then, is a matter on which it is precarious to dogmatise, as is done by W. Grimm when he says (Das Præmissum des Lucas-Evang.) the Seventy should not send out twelve all at once, but two and two now and then, and besides the Twelve others of the second order, and that these piecemeal missions consolidated in the tradition into two large ones of twelve and seventy. As to the instructions: there would be such in every instance, and they would be substantially the same whether given once, twice, or twenty times, summed up in a few compact sentences, so racy and memorable as to be easily preserving even by oral tradition. It is, however, quite probable that versions of these instructions were to be found in documents, say in Mk. and in Mt.'s Logia; and Lk., as Weiss suggests, may have taken the instructions to the Twelve from the former, and those to the Seventy from the latter. Finally, as to time, place, and sphere, nothing certain can be determined, and there is room for various conjectures. Hahn, e.g., suggests, as the place of the appointment, Jerusalem; the time, the feast of tabernacles, mentioned in John viii. 2; and the sphere of the mission, the towns and villages of Judaea or southern Palestine. There was certainly need for a mission there. The mission of the Twelve was in Galilee. Ver. 1. μετὰ ταύτα, after what has been narrated in ix. 51-62, but not necessarily implying close sequence.—ἀνδρείαν (ἀνδρικός). The verb means (1) to lift up so as to show, cf. the noun in Lk. i. 80; (2) to proclaim as elected, cf. Acts i. 24; (3) to elect, appoint, as here = designavit, Vulgate.—ὁ Κύριος, the Lord, Jesus, here, as often in Lk., applied to Him in narrative.—πρῶτος, others, the reference being not to ἀνδρείαν, ix. 52 (Meyer), but to τοὺς διδάσκαλους, ix. 1 = others besides the Twelve. —ἀποστέλλω (ἀποστῆλον): preliminary statement as to the need of men fit to take part in the work of preaching the kingdom, as in Mt. ix. 38, vide notes there; a true
logion of Jesus, whenever spoken.—Ver. 3. θάνατος, go, whither? Mt.'s version of the instructions to the Twelve says: not to Samaria, but to the lost sheep of Israel only; this omitted by Lk. with the one word, "go," retained. —ὡς ἄρνας, etc., as λάμδα among wolves; sheep (πρόβατα) in Mt. x. 16; pathetic hint as to the helplessness of the agents and the risks they run; not imaginary, as the recent experience at the Samaritan village shows.—Ver. 4. βαλάντιον, a purse, in Lk. only, in N. T.; often in classics, spelt there, as in MSS. of N. T., variously with one or two λας.—μιθέως ἀναπάυσθη: salute no one, to be taken in the spirit rather than in the letter; be for him: be exclusively intent on your business: "negotio quod imposui vobis incumbere, praeternotabis vel brevissimis obstaculis et moramentis," Priscian. Weiss (Mt.-Evangel.) thinks the prohibition is directed against carrying on their mission on the way. It was to be exclusively a house-mission (side Mt. x. 12, where ψυχάσασθε occurs).—Ver. 5. πρῶτον λέγετε: the first word to be spoken, peace, speech on the things of the kingdom to be prepared for by courteous, kindly salutations. A sympathetic heart is the best guide in pastoral visitation. The first word should not be: how is it with your soul?—Ver. 6. ἀποκαθιστάτησαι (NB), a form of the 2nd fut. ind. passive, probably belonging to the spoken Greek of the period. Again in Rev. xiv. 13.—ἀνακάμψει: in any case the good wish will not be lost. If there be no "son of peace" in the house to receive it, it will come back with a blessing to the man who uttered it.—Ver. 7. ἐν αὐτῷ τῇ οἰκίᾳ: verbally distinct from ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ, etc., but really meaning the same thing = "in that same house," R. V.—τὰ παραπτωματα: not a repetition. It means, be contented with your fare: contenti este quamvis frugalis apparatu, Bengel. Holtz. (H. C.) thinks Lk. has in view heathen houses, and that the meaning is: put aside Jewish scruples. —Ver. 9. The functions of the missionaries briefly indicated = heal the sick, and announce that the kingdom is at their doors (ἡγιάζετε).—Vv. 10, 11. Direction how to act in case of churlish treatment.—ἐξελθόντες εἰς τὰς πλατείας ἄκοντες. Lk. expresses the action so as to make it vivid for Gentile readers to

1 εἰσελθεῖτε in N BCDLE 1, 13, 69.
2 μεν is found only in minusc. B places exci before η (W.H. text).
3 B have επανακαθιστησαι, to be preferred as the razer form.
4 BD have εσοδοντες (Tisch., W.H.). οστε omitted in N BDLX E.
5 οδι is wanting in N BCD E 1, 33 al.
6 After ὄντω Ν B D have eiς τους τοδος, adopted by modern editors.
whom the symbolic significance of the act was not familiar = go out of the inhospitable houses into the streets, and then solemnly wipe off the dust that has been taken up by your feet since you entered the town; wiping off (ἀφοίμασεν) is more expressive than shaking off (ἐκτινάξατε), Mt. x. 14, Lk. ix. 5, it means more thorough work, removing every speck of dust.—πάνα, for the rest. The solemn symbolic act is to wind up with the equally solemn declaration that the Kingdom of God has come to them with its blessings, and that it is their own fault if it has come in vain.

Vv. 13-16. Woe to thee, Chorazin (Mt. xi. 21-24).—While the terms in which the woes on the cities of Galilee are reproached are not common to Mt. and Lk., the connections in which they are given are different. In Mt. the connection is very general. The woes simply find a place in a collection of moral criticisms by Jesus on His time: on John, on the Pharisees, and on the Galilean towns. Here they form part of Christ's address to the Seventy, when sending them forth on their mission. Whether they properly come in here has been disputed. Wendt (L. J., p. 89) thinks they do, inasmuch as they indicate that the punishment for rejecting the disciples will be the same as that of the cities which were un receptive to the ministry of the Master. J. Weiss (in Meyer), on the other hand, thinks the woes have been inserted here from a purely external point of view, noting in proof the close connection between ver. 12 and ver. 16. It is impossible to be quite sure when the words were spoken, but also impossible to doubt that they were spoken by Jesus, probably towards or after the close of His Galilean ministry.—καθημένοι, after στοιχεῖον, is an addition of Lk.'s, explanatory or pictorial.—Ver. 16 = Mt. x. 40, 41, only Mt. emphasises and expands the positive side, while Lk. with the positive presents, and with special emphasis, the negative (οἱ ἁδετοί ὄρμος, etc.).

Vv. 17-20. Return of the Seventy. No such report of the doings of the Twelve, and of their Master's congratulations, is given in any of the Gospels (cf. Mt. xvi. 30, 31). It seems as if Lk. attached more importance to the later mission, as Baur accused him of doing under the influence of the tendency (Pauline universalism). But probably this report was one of the fruits of his careful research for memorabilia of Jesus: "a highly valuable tradition arising on Jewish-Christian soil, and just on account of its strangeness trustworthy." (J. Weiss in Meyer). Similarly Feine, and Resch, Agrapha, p. 414, note.—Ver. 17 καὶ τὰ δασὺνα, even the demons, subject to our power; more than they had expected or been promised, hence their exultation (μετὰ χαρᾶς).—Ver. 18 ἔθεσαν: their report was no news to.
Jesus. While they were working He saw Satan falling. There has been much discussion as to what is meant by this fall, and why it is referred to. It has been identified with the fall of the angels at the beginning of the world, with the Incarnation, with the temptation of Jesus, in both of which Satan sustained defeat. The Fathers adopted the first of these alternatives, and found the motive of the reference in a desire to warn the disciples. The devil fell through pride; take care you fall not from the same cause (ver. 20).—διὰ ἀπατής, like lighting; the precise point of the comparison has been variously conceived: momentary brightness, quick, sudden movement, inevitability of the descent—down it must come to the earth, etc.—παρειρόμενος, aorist, after the imperfect (ἀναπλωθείς), fallen, a fact accomplished. Pricaeus refers to Acts xix. 20 as a historical exemplification of the fall—Satan’s kingdom destroyed by the rapid spread of Christianity.—Ver. 19 reminds one of Mk. xvi. 18.—τοῦ ἐχθροῦ, the enemy, Satan.

—οὖθεν, may be either nominative or accusative = either, “nothing shall in any wise hurt you,” R. V., or “in no respect shall he (the enemy) hurt you”.

—Ver. 20. θλήν has adverbial force here = yet, nevertheless. The joy of the Seventy was in danger of becoming overjoy, running into self-importance; hence the warning word, which is best understood in the light of St. Paul’s doctrine of the Holy Spirit, which laid much more stress on the ethical than on the charismatical results of His influence = rejoice not so much in possessing remarkable spiritual gifts as in being spiritual men. This text may be put beside Mt. vii. 21-23 as bearing on the separability of gifts and graces (χαρακτήρας and γένος).

—Vv. 21-24. The exultation of Jesus (Mt. xi. 25-27).—The setting in Mt. gives to this great devotional utterance of Jesus a tone of resignation in connection with the apparent failure of His ministry.

Here, connected with the fall of Satan, it has a tone of triumph (θαλάσσατο),—ἐν τούτοις μετὰ τοῦ ἀγίου: it was an inspired utterance, “a kind of glosolaly,” J. Weiss (Meyer).—Ver. 21 is almost verbatim, as in Mt. xi. 25, only that Lk. has ἀπελευθέρωσις for Mt.’s ἐλευθέρωσις.—Ver.
22. This part of the devotional utterance, setting forth Christ's faith in the purpose of His Father and the intimate fellowship subsisting between Father and Son, appears in some texts of Lk. as a declaration made to the disciples (στραφεὶ πρὸς τ. μ. α., T. R.). The gesture implies that a solemn statement is to be made.—Τίς ἐστιν δ' ὁ υἱός, δ' πατήρ: to know who the Son or the Father is = knowing the Son and the Father. The idea in Lk. is the same as in Mt., though the expression is different.—Ver. 23. στραφεὶ: a second impressive gesture, if that in ver. 22 be retained, implying that Jesus now more directly addresses the disciples. But the first στραφεὶ is altogether doubtful. —ἀνω: the word, spoken κατ' ἑπάνω to the disciples, should accordingly = Mt. xiii. 16. there referring to the happiness conferred on the disciples in being privileged to hear their Master's parabolic teaching.—βασιλεία: in place of Mt.'s δικαίωμα, which expresses an idea more intelligible to Jews than to Gentiles.

Vv. 25-37. The lawyer's question, and the parable of the good Samaritan. Many critics (even Weiss, Mk.-Evang., p. 400) think that Lk. or his source has got the theme of this section from Mt. xxii. 35 ff., Mk. xii. 28 ff., and simply enriched it with the parable of the good Samaritan, peculiar to him. Leaving this critical question on one side, it may be remarked that this story seems to be introduced on the principle of contrast, the νομικὸς representing the σοφὸς καὶ νομικός, to whom the things of the kingdom are hidden as opposed to the νομικός, to whom they are revealed, i.e., the disciples whom Jesus had just congratulated on their felicity. Similarly in the case of the anecdote of the woman in Simon's house, vii. 26, vide notes there. J. Weiss remarks that this story and the following one about Martha and Mary form a pair, setting forth in the sense of the Epistle of James (ii. 8, 13, 14) the two main requirements of Christianity, love to one's neighbour and faith (vide in Meyer, ad loc.).—Ver. 25. ἀνωτέρω, stood up; from this expression and the present tense of ἀνωτάτωρ, how readest thou now? it has been conjectured that the scene may have been a synaegogue.—τί πούσατας: the νομικός, literally = Mt. xiii. 18, is professedly in quest of eternal life.—Ver. 26. τὰ γεράνα, τῶν ἀναγνώσεων, how stands it written? how readest thou? double question with a certain empréssent.—Ver. 27. Lk. here puts into the mouth of the lawyer an answer combining as co-ordinate the religious and the ethical, which in the later incident reported in Mt. xxii. 34-40, Mk. xii. 28-34, is ascribed to Jesus. The unity of these interests is, as Holtz. (H. C.) remarks, the achievement and characteristic of Christianity, and one may legitimately doubt whether a man belonging to the clerical class in our Lord's time had attained such insight. Divorce of religion from morality was a cardinal vice of the righteousness of the time, and we
see it exemplified in the following parable: priest and Levite religious but inhuman. In Lk.'s time the conception of religion and morality as one and inseparable had become a Christian commonplace, and he might have been unable to realise that there was a time when men thought otherwise, and so without any sense of incongruity made the lawyer answer as he does. But, on the other hand, it has to be borne in mind that even in our Lord's time there were some in the legal schools who emphasised the ethical, and Mk. makes the scribe (xii. 32, 33) one of this type.—

Ver. 29. See it exemplified in the following parable: priest and Levite religious but inhuman. In Lk.'s time the conception of religion and morality as one and inseparable had become a Christian commonplace, and he might have been unable to realise that there was a time when men thought otherwise, and so without any sense of incongruity made the lawyer answer as he does. But, on the other hand, it has to be borne in mind that even in our Lord's time there were some in the legal schools who emphasised the ethical, and Mk. makes the scribe (xii. 32, 33) one of this type.—

Ver. 31. Distracted, half dead, semimorto recinto, Vulgate, here only in N. T.; he will soon be whole dead unless some one come to his help; cannot help himself or move from the spot.—Ver. 32. Distracted, half dead, semimorto recinto, Vulgate, here only in N. T.; he will soon be whole dead unless some one come to his help; cannot help himself or move from the spot. But the phrase has its full meaning independently of this inference, vide above.—

Ver. 33. Distracted, half dead, semimorto recinto, Vulgate, here only in N. T.; he will soon be whole dead unless some one come to his help; cannot help himself or move from the spot. But the phrase has its full meaning independently of this inference, vide above.—
sumably longer than from Jerusalem to Jericho, fully equipped for a long journey (Hahn), and so in possession of means for help, if he have the will.—ἐπαληγχύσθη: both technical terms in medicine.—Δαιμον και ὁ λογος: not separately, but mixed; in use among Greeks and Romans as well as Jews (Weinstein).—κτήσις = κτήμα from κτάμαι, generally a property, and specially a domestic animal: one's beast.—πανδοχειον (in classics πανδοκεῖον), a place for receiving all comers, an inn having a host, not merely a khan or caravanserai like κατάλυμα in ii. 7.—Ver. 35. ἐκβαλω, casting out (of his girdle or purse).—δύο δην., two "pence," small sum, but enough for the present; will pay whatever more is needed; known in the inn, and known as a trustworthy man to the innkeeper (τῷ πανδοκεῖον).—δὴ δὲ, etc.: the speech of a man who in turn trusts the host, and has no fear of being overcharged in the bill for the wounded man.—ἐγὼ: with a slight emphasis which means: you know me.—ἀναφέρ-χεσθαι: he expects to return to the place on his business, a regular customer at that inn. This verb, as well as προσβάσιμον, is used here only in N. T.—Ver. 36. Application of the story.—γεγονότα: which of the three seems to you to have become neighbour by neighbourly action? neighbour is who neighbour does.—Ver. 37. ὁ πῶς Ῥησ. etc. If the lawyer was captious to begin with he is captious no longer. He might have been, for his question had not been directly (though very radically) answered. But the moral pathos of the "parable" has appealed to his better nature, and he quibbles no longer. But the prejudice of his class tacitly finds expression by avoidance of the word " Samaritan," and the use instead of the phrase ἡ πώς Ῥησ. τὸ θαυμάσω τὸ Ἰησοῦν ἐν αὐτῷ. Yet perhaps we do him injustice here, for the phrase really expresses the essence of neighbourhood, and so indicates not only Ῥησ. is neighbour but why. For the same phrase εἶδε i. 48, 72. This story teaches the whole doctrine of neighbourhood: first and directly, what it is to be a neighbour, vis., to give succour when and where needed; next, indirectly but by obvious consequence, who is a neighbour, vis., any one who needs help and whom I
have opportunity and power to help, no matter what his rank, race, or religion may be: neighbourhood coextensive with humanity.

Vv. 38-42. Martha and Mary.—Ver. 38. ἐν τῇ πορείᾳ, in continuation of the wandering whose beginning is noted at ix. 32; when, where, not indicated.—ἐὰς καὶ καὶ τίνα: either not known, or the name deemed of no importance. When it is stated that He (ἀυτός) (Jesus) came to this village it is not implied that He was alone, though no mention is made of disciples in the narrative.—Μάρθα = mistress, feminine of Ἰησοῦ.—Ver. 39. Μαριά, socially subordinate (inferrible from the manner of reference), though the spiritual heroine of the tale.—ἡ καλ.: the force of the καλ. is not clear, and has been variously explained. Grotius regards it as simply an otiose addition to the relative. Bornemann takes it = adeo = to such an extent did Mary disregard the customary duty of women, that of serving guests, "quem morem adeo non observat M. ut docentis Jesu suscipiat". Perhaps it has something of the force of ἐς = to; observe serving to counterbalance the social subordination of Mary; the less important person in the house, the more important in the Kingdom of God.—παρακαθισθείσα, first aorist passive participle, from παρακαθίζω, late Greek form = sitting at the feet of Jesus. Posture noted as significant of a receptive mind and devoted spirit.—τοῦ Κυρίου, the Lord, once more for Κυρίος in narrative (Ἱησοῦ in T. R.).—ἡμεῖς τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ, continued hearing His word, a conventional expression as in viii. 21.—Ver. 40. καὶ Μάρθα, but Martha, as if πᾶρ had gone before where καὶ = Mary on the one hand sat, etc., Martha on the other, etc.—πέριστάσατο, was distracted, over-occupied, as if the visit had been unexpected, and the guests numerous. In use from Xenophon down. In Polybius with τῇ διανοίᾳ added. Holtzmann (H. C.) points out the correspondence between the contrasted picture of the two sisters and the antithesis between the married and unmarried woman in 1 Cor. vii. 34, 35. The married woman caring for the world like Martha (μεριμνών, ver. 41); the unmarried virgin: ἐντάσσεται τῷ κυρίῳ ἄπριπτάστως.—ἔπαθάσατο, coming up to and placing herself beside Jesus and Mary; in no placid mood, looking on her sister as simply an idle woman. A bustling worthy housewife will speak her mind in such a case, even though a Jesus be present and come in for a share of the blame.—συνηπτάσθητι, bid her take a hand
XI.

1. Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ἐλθόντι αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ προσευχῆς, ἵνα προσευχήσητε, ἵνα τὰς μαθητὰς αὐτῶν πρὸς αὐτόν. "Κύριε, δίδαξον ἡμᾶς προσευχῆς, καθὼς καὶ Ἰωάννης δίδαξε τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ." 2. Ἡμῖν δὲ αὐτοῖς, "Όταν προσευχήσῃτε, λέγετε, Πάτερ ἡμῶν ἐν τοῖς ὄρασιν, ἀγιασθήτω τὸ ἄνομα σου. Ἡμεῖς δὲ ἔστω ἡ βασιλεία σου γεννηθῇ τὸ βασιλεία σου, ὡς ἐν ὀδραν, καὶ ἐπὶ

along with me in the work (cf. Rom. viii. 26).— Ver. 41. δοκεῖν (from δόξην, an uproar; τυράννος T. R., from τυράννος, similar in meaning, neither form again in N. T.), thou art bustled, gently spoken and with a touch of pity. —παρὰ σοὶ: a great day in that house. Every effort made to entertain Jesus worthily of Him and to the credit of the house.— Ver. 42. διὰμνώμον ἔδωκεν χρῆμα καὶ ἐνέδωκε. With this reading the sense is: there is need of few things (material); then, with a pause—or rather of one thing (spiritual). Thus Jesus passes, as was His wont, easily and swiftly from the natural to the spiritual. The notion that it was beneath the dignity of Jesus to refer to dishes, even as a stepping stone to higher things, is the child of conventional reverence.—τὴν ἀγαθὴν μερίδα, the good portion, conceived of as a share in a banquet (Gen. xlili. 34). Mary, having chosen this good portion, may not be blamed (γάρ), and cannot be deprived of it, shall not with my sanction, in deference to the demands of a lower vocation.

Chapter XI. Lesson on Prayer.

Discourses in Self-Defence.— Vv.1-13 contain a lesson on prayer, consisting of two parts: first, a form of prayer suggesting the chief objects of desire (vv. 1-4); second, an argument enforcing perseverance in prayer (vv. 5-13). Whether the whole was spoken at one time or not cannot be ascertained; all one can say is that the instructions are thoroughly coherent and congruous, and might very well have formed a single lesson.

Vv. 1-4. The Lord's Prayer with a historical introduction (Mt. vi. 7-15).— ἐν τῷ προσεύχοντα: neither the place nor the time of this incident is indicated with even approximate exactness. It is simply stated that it happened when Jesus was at a certain place, and when He was praying (προσευχήμαν). Why the narrative comes in here does not clearly appear. I have suggested elsewhere (The Parab. Teaching of Christ, Preface to the Third Edition) that the parable of the Good Samaritan, the story of Martha and Mary and the Lesson on Prayer form together a group having for their common heading: "at school with Jesus," exhibiting under three types the scholar's burden, the Teacher's meekness, and the rest-bringing lesson, so giving us Lk.'s equivalent for Mt.'s gracious invitation (chap. xi. 28-30). I am now inclined to think that Schola Christi might be the heading not merely for these three sections but for the whole division from ix. 51 to xviii. 14, the contents being largely didactic.—τις τ. μάθ.: a later disciple, Meyer thinks, who had not heard the Teaching on the Hill, and who got for answer to his request a repetition of the Lord's Prayer, given by Mt. as part of the Sermon on the Mount. This conjecture must go for what it is worth.—καθὼς καὶ Ἰωάννης: the fact here stated is not otherwise known: no trace of a Johannine liturgy; but the statement in itself is very credible: prayer like fasting reduced to system in the Baptist's circle.—Ver. 2. αὐτός, say, but not implying obligation to repeat regularly the ipissima verba. The divergence of Lk.'s form from that of Mt., as given in critical editions of the N. T., is sufficient evidence that the Apostolic Church did not so understand their Lord's will, and use the prayer bearing His name as a formula. Interpreters are not agreed as to which of the two forms is the more original. For my own part I have little doubt that Lk.'s is secondary and abbreviated from the fuller form of Mt. The very name for God—Father—without any added epithet is sufficient proof of this; for Jesus was wont to address God in fuller terms (vide x. 21), and was not likely to give His disciples a form beginning so abruptly. Lk.'s form as it stands in W. II. is as follows:
This petition, γενέτηρα... ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, omitted in BL 1, 22 vulg. syr. sin.

αἵρεσιν in Ν:ABCD. T.R. as in Ν* L.

αλλὰ... τορποῦ omitted in ΝBL 1, 22 al. pl. vulg. syr. sin. These abbreviations in Lk.'s version of the Lord's Prayer are accepted by most modern editors and scholars.

Φιλον αὐτοῦ in ΝΒCLX 33 al.

Father! Hallowed be Thy name.
Come Thy kingdom.
The bread of each day give us daily.
And forgive our sins, for we also forgive every one owing us.
And bring us not into temptation.

The third petition: Thy will be done, etc., and the second half of the sixth: but deliver us from evil, are wanting.—Ver. 3. τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν, daily, for Mt.'s σήμερον, this day, is an alteration corresponding to the καθ' ἡμέραν in the Logion concerning cross-bearing (ix. 23).—Σῶμα, for ζῶος, is a change necessitated by the other.—Ver. 4. ἀμαρτιάς: for Mt. ἁμαρτίας, but it is noticeable that the idea of sins is not introduced into the second clause. Lk. avoids making our forgiving and God's parallel: we forgive debts, God sins. Whether the debts are viewed as moral or as material is not indicated, possibly both.—On the whole, ζωὴ Mt.

Vv. 5-8. The selfish neighbour. This parable and that of the unjust judge (xviii. 1-8) form a couple teaching the same lesson with reference to distinct spheres of life or experience: that men ought always to pray, and not grow faint-hearted when the answer to prayer is long delayed. They imply that we have to wait for the fulfilment of spiritual desires, and they teach that it is worth our while to wait: fulfilments will come, God is good to them that wait upon Him.

Ver. 5. ἐλεήσω: the story is not called a parable, as the similar one in chap. xviii. is, but it is one. God's ways in the spiritual world are illustrated by men's ways in everyday life.—τὰ ἐξ ἡμῶν, etc.: the whole parable, vv. 5-8, is really one long sentence in which accordingly the construction comes to grief, beginning interrogatively (as far as φίλον, ver. 5, or παρακλήσεως αὐτής, ver. 6) and continuing conditionally, the apodosis beginning with λέγω ὑμῖν, ver. 8, and taking the form of an independent sentence.—μουσώνυμον, at midnight, a poetic word in classic Greek, a prose word in late Greek. Phryn. says: μουσώνυμον πωλητήν, ὁ πωλητήν. In hot climates travelling was largely done during night, therefore the hour was seasonable from the traveller's point of view, while unseasonable from the point of view of people at home. This is a feature in the felicity of the parable.—χρησις, 1st aorist active imperative, from χρῆσις, here only in N. T., to lend.—Ver. 6. οὐκ ἔχω: this does not necessarily imply poverty: bread for the day was baked every morning. It is rather to be wondered at that a man with a family of children (ver. 7) had any over.—Ver. 7. μη μοι, etc.: similar phrase in xviii. 5. Cf. Mt. xxvi. 10, Mk. xiv. 6. Here = don't bother me!—διαλεκτάς, has been barred for the night, a thing done and not to be undone for a trifling cause.—


1. In many MSS. (Tisch.), the word may have come from Mt. (so Tisch.). For the second αὐτῶν (ver. 10) BD have αὐταί (W.H. marg.).
2. From ἀγαθοῦ to έι καί is omitted in B verses. Orig. (W.H. text).
4. ΝBL 1, 13, 33 omit εἰ, and with CD al. have αὐταί. BL also omit μη before εἰ.
5. Or in ΝBLCDLA. 7 and καί αὐτόν ην omit ΝBL al. verses.

The moral of the story (cf. Mt. vii. 7-11).—καὶ ὲμῖν, etc., and I (the same speaker as in ver. 8) say to you, with equal confidence. What Jesus says is in brief: you also will get what you want from God, as certainly as the man in the tale got what he wanted; therefore pray on, imitating his ἀνάθεσις. The selfish neighbour represents God as He seems, and persistent prayer looks like a shameless disregard of His apparent indifference.—Vv. 9, 10 correspond almost exactly with Mt. vii. 7, 8. Vide notes there.—Ver. 11. τίνα δύνατε: δι' οὗ introduces a new parabolic saying: which of you, as a father, shall his son ask? etc. In the T.R. Lk. gives three examples of possible requests—Mt.'s two: a loaf, and a fish, and a third, an egg. Cod. B omits the first (W.H. put it on the margin).—φῶν, σκορπίων: in the two first instances there is resemblance between the thing asked and supposed to be given: loaf and stone, fish and serpent: in Lk.'s third instance also, the σκορπίων being a little round lobster-like animal, lurking in stone walls, with a sting in its tail. The gift of things similar but so different would be cruel mockery of which almost no father would be capable. Hens were not known in ancient Israel. Probably the Jews brought them from Babylon, after which eggs would form part of ordinary food (Benigeri, Heb. Arch., p. 94).—Ver. 13. τοῦ δὲ οὗ ὑπάρχον, this epithet is attached to ἡμῖν here though not in the Lord's Prayer.—Αὐτῷ ἡ εὐαγγελία is Mt.'s ἡ εὐαγγελία. The Holy Spirit is mentioned here as the summum donum, and the supreme object of desire for all true disciples. In some forms of the Lord's Prayer (Marcion, Greg. Nys.) a petition for the gift of the Holy Spirit took the place of the first or second petition.

The reproduction of these passages here is very summary; the reference to Israel, Mt. ix. 33, and the question "is not this the Son of David?" xii. 38, e.g., being omitted. Then, further, it is noticeable that the references to the Pharisees and scribes, as the authors of the malignant theory as to Christ's cure of demoniacs and the persons who demanded a sign, are eliminated, the vague terms τινες (ver. 15) and ἔκτεινοι (ver. 16) being substituted. The historical situation in which Jesus spoke is wiped out, the writer caring only for what he said.

Vv. 17-23. The Beelzebub theory (Mt. xii. 25-30, Mk. iii. 23-27).—Ver. 17. διαμορφωθηκέναι. Lk. has a preference for compounds; μετασχηματισθηκέναι in Mt.—καὶ οἶκος ἐφ᾽ οἷον πίναι, and house falls against house, one tumbling house knocking down its neighbour, a graphic picture of what happens when a kingdom is divided against itself. In Mt. kingdom and city are two co-ordinate illustrations of the principle. In Mk. a house takes the place of Mt.'s city. In Lk. the house is simply a feature in the picture of a kingdom ruined by self-division. Some (e.g., Bornemann and Hahn) render Lk.'s phrase: house upon house, one house after another falls. Others, in a harmonistic interest, interpret: a house being divided (διαμορφωθῆσθαι understood) against itself (ἐν οἴκοις = ἐν οἷοι ντῇ αὐτῷ) falls.—Ver. 20. ἐν διατηρήσει Θεοῦ: instead of Mt.'s ἐν πνεύματι Θεοῦ, which is doubtless the original expression, being more appropriate to the connection of thought. Lk.'s expression emphasises the immediateness of the Divine action through Jesus, in accordance with his habit of giving prominence to the miraculousness of Christ's healing acts. But the question was not as to the fact, but as to the moral quality of the miracle. The phrase recalls Ex. viii. 9.—ἐθάνατον: φθάσων in classics means to anticipate, in later Greek to reach, the idea of priority being dropped out.—Ver. 21. Ἠργάζεται: introducing the parable of the strong man subdued by a stronger, symbolising the true state of the case as between Beelzebub and Jesus, probably more original in Lk. than in Mt. (xii. 29).—καθάρισμαν, fully armed, here only in N.T.—ἀλλήλην, court, whose entrance is guarded, according to some; house, castle, or palace according to others (οἰκέα in Mt.).—Ver. 22. παροικίαν, panoply, a Pauline word (Eph. vi. 11, 13).—διάβλητον, distributes the spoils among his friends with the generosity and the display of victory, referring probably to the extensive scale of Christ's healing ministry among demoniacs.—Ver. 23 = Mt. xii. 30.

Vv. 24-26. The parable of the unclean spirit cast out and returning: given by Mt. in connection with the demand for a
KATA LOYKAN

1. "Otan το ἀκάθαρτον πνεύμα ἐξῆλθη ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀθρόπτον, ἤδειχται ὦ ἀνθρώπων τῶν, ἦτοι τῶν ἀνάπαυσιν. καὶ μὴ ἐσφάγεν λέγει. 25. καὶ ὦ ἐφήσεως. συγαφεράτως καὶ κακοσυμμένως. 26. τότε πορεύεται καὶ παραλαμβάνει ἐντὸς ἑτέρα πνεύματα πονηρότερα ἑαυτῷ, καὶ εἰσελθόντα κατακλύει ἑκατέρῳ καὶ γίνεται τὸ ἄγχατα τοῦ ἀθρόπτον ἀκίνητον τόν πρώτων."


1. BLX 33 add τοια, which implies that καί μὴ ευρίσκων is to be joined to αὐτοκατανεμεῖν (W.H. marg.).
2. BCL al. vers. insert σχολαζοῦτα, which may come in from Mt. (W.H. brackets).
3. τῶν after εἰς τοὺς in ΝΒΛΕ 13, 69 al.; a most appropriate position of emphasis.
4. λόγων before γυνὴ in ΝΒΛ. A credible order, but apt to be altered by scribes into the smoother in T.R.
5. μειοῦμεν in ΝΑΒΔΛΣε; μειοῦμεν in CDX al. There seems no reason why either should be changed into the other. The latter is found in Rom. ix. 20, v. 18.
6. Ομίλιον in ΝΑΒΔΛΣε. T.R. from Mt.

1. sign (xii. 43 ff.). Lk.'s version differs from Mt.'s chiefly in minute literary variations. Two omissions are noticeable: (1) the epithet σχολαζοῦτα in the description of the deserted house (a probable omission, the word bracketed in W. and H.), (2) the closing phrase of Mt.'s version: οὗτος δοθεῖ καὶ τῇ γενέσει τ. τ. πονηρῷ. On the import of the parable side on Mt., ad loc.

Vv. 27-28. The woman in the crowd. In Lk. only, though reminding one of Mt. xii. 46-50, Mk. iii. 32-35. It reports an honest matron's blessing on the, to her probably unknown, mother of Jesus, who in this case, as in an earlier instance (viii. 19-21), treats the felicity of natural motherhood as entirely subordinate to that of discipleship.—Ver. 27. κοιλία, μακριν.: "Μιλείς bene sentit sed muliebritatem loquitur." (Bengel).—Ver. 28. μειοῦμεν might be confirmatory (utique) or corrective (imo vero), or a little of both; the tone of voice would show which of the two the speaker meant to be the more prominent. Correction probably was uppermost in Christ's thoughts. Under the appearance of approval the woman was taught that she was mistaken in thinking that merely to be the mother of an illustrious son constituted felicity (Schanz). Viger, Ed. Hermann, p. 541, quotes this text as illustrating the use of μειοῦμεν in the sense of imo vero, rendering: "Quin imo, vel imo vero, beati qui audiunt verbum Dei". Its position at the beginning of the sentence is contrary to Attic use: "repetitur apud solos Scriptores Maceneos," Sturs. De Dial. Mac. el Alex., p. 203.—ὐπὸ τῶν λόγων τ. Θ., those who hear and keep the word of God, the truly blessed. Cf. "His word" in x. 39; an established phrase.

Vv. 29-32. The sign of Jonah (Mt. xii. 38-42).—T. 6. ἦπειρικοβιῶν, the crowds thronging to Him. The heading for the following discourse has been anticipated in ver. 16; ἔτοις περιβάλλουσιν, instead of Mt.'s scribes and Pharisees, asking a sign. In Lk.'s narrative Jesus answers their question in presence of a gathering crowd supposed to be referred to in the expression ἢ γενά αὐτήν.
μη τὸ σημεῖον ἵνα τοῦ προφήτου. 1 30. καθὼς γὰρ ἐγένετο ἵνα τούς σημεῖον τοὺς Νινευταῖς, 2 οὕτως ἦσαν καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ. 31. Βασιλεύσα νῦν ἐγερθήσεται ἐν τῇ κρίσει μετὰ τῶν ἄνδρων τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης, καὶ κατακρινεῖ αὐτούς· ὡς ἄλλως ἐκ τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς ἀκούσα τὴν σοφίαν Σολομῶντος, καὶ ἵδον, πλείον Σολομῶντος δόθη. 32. ἄνδρες Νινευταῖς ἀναστήσονται ἐν τῇ κρίσει μετὰ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης, καὶ κατακρινοῦσιν αὐτήν· ὡς μετενόησαν εἰς τὸ κήρυγμα ἱσταν καὶ ἵδον, πλείον ἵνα δόθη. 33. " Οὐδεὶς δι' ἥν ἔχετε εἰς κρυπτὸν 5 τίθην, οὐδὲ ὑπὸ τῶν μόδιων, ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ φωτιᾷ, ἵνα οἱ ἑσπερευόμενοι τὸ φῶς 6 βλέπωντων. 34. ὅ λόγος τοῦ σώματος ἦστιν ὁ ὀφθαλμός 7· ὡς νῦν 8 ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου οἴκος γ', καὶ ἕλον τὸ σῶμα σου φωτεινὸν ἦστιν· ἐπὰν δὲ ποιμὴν γ', καὶ τὸ σῶμα σου σκοτεινόν. 35. σκόπει

1 Omit v. τροφ. (from Mt.) with ΝΒΔΛΕ codd. vet. Lat.
2 ἢ γενεὰς αὐτής, etc., this generation is an evil generation; said in reference to the crowd supposed to sympathise with and share the religious characteristics of their leaders. The epithet μαγικὰς (Mt. xii. 39) is omitted as liable to be misunderstood by non-Hebrew readers. —Ver. 30. The sign of Jonah is not further explained as in Mt. (xii. 40), and it might seem that the meaning intended was that Jonah, as a prophet and through his preaching, was a sign to the Ninevites, and that in like manner so was Jesus to His generation. But in reference to Jesus Lk. does not say "is" but "shall be," ὡς, as if something else than Christ's ministry, something future in His experience, was the sign. Something is obscurely hinted at which is not further explained, as if to say: wait and you will get your sign.—Vv. 31, 32 = Mt. xii. 41, 22, only that the men of Nineveh and the Queen of Sheba change places. Mt.'s order seems the more natural, the discourse so passing from the sign of Jonah to the Ninevites, who had the benefit of it.

Vv. 33-36 contain parabolic utterances concerning the placing of a light, and the conditions under which the eye sees the light.—Ver. 33 repeats vii. 16 in slightly varied language, and vv. 34-36 reproduce what Mt. gives in his version of the Sermon on the Mount (vi. 22, 23). The connection with what goes before is not apparent.—Ver. 33. κρυπτὴν, a hidden place: crypt, vault, cellar, or press, to put a lamp in which is to make it useless. —Ver. 34. ὁ λόγος, etc., the lamp of the body is thine eye. This thought in connection with the foregoing one might lead us to expect some remark on the proper placing of the body's lamp, but the discourse proceeds to speak of the single (ὁ λόγος) and the evil (ὁ ὀφθαλμός) eye. The connection lies in the effects of these qualities. The single eye, like a properly placed lamp, gives light; the evil eye, like a lamp under a bushel, leaves one in darkness. On these attributes of the eye vide remarks on Mt. vi. 22, 23.—Ver. 35. A counsel to take care lest the light in us become darkness, answering to that suggested in the parable: see that the lamp be properly placed.—Ver. 36. This verse is very puzzling both critically and exegetically. As it stands in T.R. (and in W.H.) it appears tautological (De Wette), a fault which some have tried to surmount by punctuation, and some by properly placed emphasis—on ἕλον in the protasis and on φωτεινὸν in the apodosis, giving this sense: if thy body be wholly lighted, having no part dark,
then will it be lighted indeed, as when the lamp with its lightning illumines thee (so Meyer). Even thus the saying seems unsatisfactory, and hardly such as Lk., not to say our Lord, could have been responsible for. The critical question thus forces itself upon us: is this really what Lk. wrote? Westcott and Hort think the passage contains "a primitive corruption," an opinion which J. Weiss (in Meyer, p. 476, note) endorses, making at the same time an attempt to restore the true text. Such attempts are purely conjectural. The verse is omitted in D, some Latin cods., and in Syr. Cur. The new Syr. Sin. has it in a form which Mrs. Lewis thus renders: "Therefore also thy body, when there is in it no lamp that hath shone, is dark, thus while thy lamp is shining, it gives light to thee"—a sentence as dark as a lampless body.

Vv. 37-54. In the house of a Pharisee; criticism of the religion of Pharisees and scribes (Mt. xxiii.). This section contains a selection of the hard sayings of Jesus on the "righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees," given with much greater fulness in Matt. But the anti-Pharisaic discourse, the severity of the attack being further mitigated by the words being thrown into the form of table talk. This is the second time Jesus appears as a guest in a Pharisee's house in this gospel, speaking His mind with all due freedom but without breach of the courtesies of life. The effect and probable aim of these representations is to show that if it ultimately came to an open rupture between Jesus and the Pharisees it was their fault, not His.—Ver. 37. ἐν τῇ καλέσα, while He was speaking, as if it had been ἐν τῇ λαλίᾳ. ἐν goes most naturally with the present infinitive, but Lk., who uses ἐν with infinitive much more frequently than any other N.T. writer, has ἐν with the aorist nine times. Vide Burton (M. and T., § 109), who remarks in reference to such cases: "The preposition does not seem necessarily to denote exact co-occurrence (of time), but in no case expresses antecedence. In 1 Cor. xi. 21 and Heb. iii. 12 the action of the infinitive cannot be antecedent to that of the principal verb."—ἀπώλησις: the meal was breakfast rather than dinner.—Ver. 38. ἐθαύμασαν: the cause of wonder was that Jesus did not wash (ἐξαφάνισθη) before eating. We have here Lk.'s equivalent for the incident in Mt. xv. 1 ff., Mk. vii. 1 ff., omitted by him. But the secondary character of Lk.'s narrative appears from this, that the ensuing discourse does not, as in Mt. and Mk., keep to the point in hand—neglect of ritual ablutions, but expatiates on Pharisaic vice generally.—Ver. 39. ὁ Κύριος, once more this title in narrative.—ἐσύ: variously taken as igitur or esse, or as a strictly temporal particle = now = "a silent contrast with a better πᾶς" (Meyer). Hahn affirms that ἐσύ at the beginning of a sentence can mean nothing else than "now." But Raphel, in support of the second of the above senses ("admirationem quantam declarat"), quotes from Arrian ἐσύ δύνας την ἐκάθισμα καὶ ἄλογον, καὶ αὐτὸ ἐκαθήμενον (Epict., lib. iii., cap. 25, 1). Bengel cites 2 Kings vii. 6, Sept., where ἐσύ in the first position is the equivalent for τῇ ἐσύ (vide Sweet's edition). Lo! ecce! seems best to suit the situation, which demands a lively emotional word. Godet happily renders: "Vous voilà bien! Je vous prends sur le fait."—ἐσύσασθε for Mt.'s παραφθέοις (xxiii. 23).—ἐν τῷ ἐσύσασθε ὑμῶν, your inside, instead of the inside of the dishes in Mt. The idea is that the food they take
into their bodies is the product of plunder and
crack and wickedness (πουρίας = ἀγαπαῖας,
Mt.).—Ver. 40. ἰδρόνες, stupid men! not so strong a word as μωροῖ (Mt. xxiii. 17)—ἀνὴρ ἰδρόνες, etc.; either a
question or an assertion. As an assertion = he that makes the outside (as it
should be) does not thereby also make the
inside: it is one thing to cleanse the
outside, another, etc. On this view
πουρίας has a pregnant sense = purgare,
which Kypke and others (Borremann
dissenting) claim for it in this place. As
a question the reference will be to God,
and the sense: did not the Maker of the
world make the inside of things as well
as the outside? Why therefore lay so
exclusive stress on the latter? The
outside and inside are variously taken as
body and spirit (Theophy., Euthy., etc.),
vessel and contents (Wolf, Hofmann),
vessel and human spirit (Bengel).—Ver.
41. πλὴν, rather (instead of devoting
such attention to the outside).—τὰ ἐνότα,
etc., give, as aims, the things
within the dishes. Others render as if
the phrase were κατὰ τὰ ἐνότα: according
to your ability (Priscianus, Grotius, etc.).
VV. 42-44. To this criticism of the
externalism of the Pharisees, the only
thing strictly relevant to the situation as
described, are appended three of Mt.'s
"woes" directed against their will-
worship in tithing (Mt. xxiii. 23), their
love of prominence (Mt. xxiii. 6, not
formally put as a "woe"), and their
hypocrisy (Mt. xxiii. 27).—πήγαρον, rue,
instead of Mt.'s ἀγαπαῖας, anise, here only
in N.T.—πάν ἁγασε, every herb,
general statement, instead of Mt.'s
third sample, κύμοιν.—τὴν ἁγασὴν τ. θ.,
the love of God, instead of Mt.'s
mercy and faith.—Ver. 43. Pharisaic
ostentation is very gently dealt with
here compared with the vivid picture in
Mt. xxiii. 5-7, partly out of regard to
the restraint imposed by the supposed
situation. Jesus a guest, partly because
some of the details (phyllactories, e.g.)
lacked interest for Gentile readers.
—Ver. 44. This "woe" is evidently
adapted for Gentile use. In Mt. the
sepulchres are made conspicuous by
white-washing to warn passers-by, and
the point is the contrast between the
fair exterior and the inner foulness.
Here the graves become invisible (ἐκλήθη,
in this sense here only in N.T.; cf. 1 Cor.
xiv. 8) and the risk is that of being in
the presence of what is offensive without
knowing. Farrar (C. G. T.) suggests
that the reference may be to Tiberias,
which was built on the site of an old
cemetery.
VV. 45-52. Castigation of the scribes
present; severe, but justified by the
invitation of the Pharisees, a
professional man, the Pharisees being
laymen; the two classes kindred in
spirit, hence the lawyer who speaks felt
hit.—Ver. 46. Jesus fearlessly proceeds
to say what He thinks of the class.—
καὶ ὑμῖν, yes l to you lawyers also woes.
Three are specified: heavy burdens (Mt.
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προφητῶν, οἱ 1 πατέρες ὄμων ἀπέκτειναν αὐτοῦ. 48. ἦδα
μαρτυρεῖτε καὶ συνεδοκείτε τοὺς ἵρους τῶν πατέρων ὄμων. 49. διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡ σοφία τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶνεν, Ἀποστελεῖ εἰς αὐτοὺς

προφητας καὶ ἀποστόλους, καὶ εἴ αὐτῶν ἀποκεφαλίσθη καὶ ἐκδιδά-

σουσιν. 50. Ιν ἐκείσης τὸ αἷμα πάντων τῶν προφητῶν τὸ

eκομόμενον ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου ἀπὸ τῆς γνώσεως ταύτης. 51. ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος Ἀβελ ἡς τοῦ αἵματος Ζαχαρίου τοῦ

ἀπολομένου μεταξὺ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου καὶ τοῦ οἶκου — καὶ λέγω ὄμων, ἐκείνης ἦταν ἀπὸ τῆς γνώσεως ταύτης. 52. Οὔτε ὁμὶς τοῖς νομικοῖς, διὸ ἄρα τῇ γνώσει τῆς γνώσεως αὐτοῦ ὁδὸν ἐλέησεν, καὶ τοὺς ἐσοφρυμένους ἐκκλίνατο. 53. Ἀγνοοτοὶ δὲ αὐτοῦ ταύτα πρὸς αὐτῶν, ἦρεται οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαραώ-ηκεν, καὶ ἀποστολίζοντες αὐτὸν, περὶ πλείονων, 54. ἀνεφροποίησεν αὐτὸν, καὶ ἤξυρον ταῖς τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ, ἵνα κατηγορη-

σώσων αὐτοῦ. 8

1 For os ἐν ΝC have καὶ os (Tisch.). Vide below.
2 For μαρτυρεῖτε (ACDX al. pl.) ᾿ΝBL aeth. Orig. have μαρτυρεῖν εἰς τα.
3 ἹΒDL codd. vet. Lat. om. αὐτῶν τα μνήματα. Vide below.
4 διασώσαντι in ᾿ΝBLX al. (W.H.). ἴνα ἔκκλημα in B 33, 69 (W.H. text).
5 For λέγοντος ἐν το̃ς αὐτοὺς found in the Western type of text, ἹΒDLX 33 have κακειθεν ἐξελθόντος αὐτοῦ: two quite distinct prefaces to the new section.
6 Tisch., W.H., prefer that of B (2) to that of D (1).
7 ἹBL 1, 118, 131 al. om. καὶ ἤξυρον (Tisch., W.H.). ἹXX omit also αὐτῶν after ἀνεφροποίησεν (Tisch.).
8 ἹBL cop. aeth. om. ἐνα ἐν ... αὐτοῦ (a gloss imitating Mt. xii. 10).

xxiii. 3), tombs of the prophets (Mt. xxiii. 29-31), key of knowledge (Mt. xxiii. 14).
— ὕποψεῖτε (with two accusatives only in N.T.), ye lade men with unbearable burdens.— ἡ σοφία τοῦ Θ. : vide note 3 above. Tomb-building in honour of dead prophets and killing of living prophets have one root: stupid superstitious reverence for the established order.—Ver. 49. ἐκείνη της γνώσεως, the key which is knowledge (genitive of apposition) admitting to the Kingdom of God. Many take it = the key to knowledge.

Ver. 53. The foregoing discourse, though toned down as compared with Mt., was more than the hearers could stand. The result is a more hostile attitude towards the free-spoken Prophet than the classes concerned have yet shown, at least in the narrative of Lk. They began οἱ ἰδίαι, to be sorely nettled at Him (cf. Mk. vi. 19). Buthy.
gives as equivalents ἐγχοτίν, ὄργεσθαι. The Vulgate has graviter insistere, to press hard, which A.V. and R.V. follow. Field (Ot. Nor.) decides for the former sense = the scribes and Pharisees began to be very angry.—ἀκοινωνίας: Grimm gives three meanings—
to speak from memory (ἀπὸ στόματος); to repeat to a pupil that he may commit to memory; to ply with questions so as to entice to offhand answers. In this third sense the word must be taken here as it is by Theophy. (and by Euthy.: ἀκοινωνίας αὐτοχειρίς καὶ ἀντισυνετοτοῦ ἀποκρίσεις ἀριθμητῶν δολερῶν = to seek offhand ill-considered answers to crafty questions).—Ver. 54 really gives the key to the meaning of ἀποκρισίας (here only in N.T.).

CHAPTER XII. MISCELLANEOUS DISCOURSES.—Vv. 1-12. Exhortation to fearless utterance, addressed to the disciples (cf. Mt. x. 17-33).—ἐν οἷς, in these circumstances, i.e., while the assaults of the Pharisees and scribes on Jesus were going on (xi. 53).—μπάρας: a hyperbolic expression for an "innocent" pointing, if the words are to be taken in earnest, to the largest crowd mentioned anywhere in the Gospels. Yet this immense gathering is not accounted for: it does not appear where or why it collected, but the ἐν οἷς suggests that the people had been drawn together by the encounter between Jesus and His foes.—πρῶτον from its position naturally qualifies προσέχετε, implying that hypocrisy was the first topic of discourse (Meyer). But it may also be taken with πρῶτον, as implying that, while Jesus meant to speak to the crowd, He addressed Himself in the first place to His disciples (Schanz, J. Weiss, Holtzmann). Bornemann points out that while Mt. places πρῶτον after imperatives, Lk. places it also before, as in ix. 61, x. v.—ἀρνήσασθαι τῇ ᾧμης τῷ Φ.; this is the logion reported in Mt. xvi. 6 and Mk. viii. 15, connected there with the demand for a sign; here to be viewed in the light of the discourse in the Pharisees' house (xi. 37 f.). In the two first Gospels the warning expresses rather Christ's sense of the deadly character of the Pharisaic leaven; here it is a didactic utterance for the guidance of disciples as witnesses of the truth.—πρὸς την ἄνθρωπον: not in Mt. and Mk.; might be taken as an explanatory gloss, but probably to be viewed as part of the logion. Hypocrisy, the leading Pharisaic vice = wearing a mask of sanctity to hide an evil heart; but from what follows apparently here to be taken in a wider sense so as to include dissimulation, hiding conviction from fear of man as in Gal. ii. 13 (so J. Weiss in Meyer). In Lk.'s reports our Lord's sayings assume a form adapted to the circumstances of the writer's time. Hypocrisy in the sense of Gal. ii. 13 was the temptation of the apostolic age, when truth could not be spoken and acted without risk.—Ver. 2 = Mt. x. 26, there connected with a counsel not to fear men addressed to persons whose vocation imposes the obligation to speak out. Here = dissimulation, concealment of your faith, is vain; the truth will out sooner or later.—Ver. 3. ἀνθρώπων, either = quare, inferring the particular case following from the general statement going before, or = because, assigning a reason for that statement. This verse = Mt. x. 27, but altered. In Mt. it is Christ who speaks in the darkness, and whispers in the ear; in Lk. it is His disciples. In the one representation the whispering stage has its place in the history of the kingdom; in the latter it is conceived as illegitimate and tule.
5. ὃς μὲν τίνα φοβήθητε· φοβήθητε τὸν μετὰ τῷ ἀποκτείναι ἐξουσίαν ἔχοντα· ἐμβάλεις εἰς τὴν γένναν· εἰ, λέγω ὅμως, τούτοι φοβήθητε. 6. Οὐχὶ πάντα στροφῇ πολλὰς στροφές διαφέρει: καὶ εἰ σὺ ἀντικύλος ἐστιν ἐκπλησσόμενος ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ· 7. ἀλλὰ καὶ αἱ τρίχες τῆς κεφαλῆς ὅμως σάμας ἀφθηρωνήσαν· μὴ δὲ ὑμῖν φοβεῖτε· πολλὰς στροφές διαφέρειτε. 8. Λέγω δὲ ὅμως,

1 εὖντα ἔξωσιν in NBDL, etc., verse.
8 For τολείνται (a cor., as usual, neut. pl. nom.) NB 13, 69, 346 have τολείνται.
3 BLR 157 codd. vet. Lat. omit omv.
3 So in NL al. pl. (Tisch.). BDA al. have ὀμολογεῖται (W.H.).
6 κοσμοφοροῦν in NBLRX 1, 33 al.
8 μεμνημένη in NBLQRX 1, 13, 33, 69. D and codd. vet. Lat. syr. cur., etc., omit η τι after τις (W.H. brackets).

What you whisper will become known to all, therefore whisper not but speak from the housetop.— Ver. 4. λέγω δὲ, introducing a very important statement, not a mere phrase of Lk.'s to help out the connection of thought (Wa., Mt.-Evang., 279).—τοὺς φίλους μου, not a mere conventional designation for an audience, but spoken with emphasis to distinguish disciples from hostile Pharisees = my comrades, companions in tribulation.—μὴ φοβῆσθε, etc., down to end of ver. 5 = Mt. x. 28, with variations. For Mt.'s distinction between body and soul Lk. has one between now and hereafter (μετὰ τῶν). The positive side of the counsel is introduced not with a simple "fear," but with the more emphatic "I will show ye whom ye shall fear". Then at the end, to give still more emphasis, comes: "Yes, I say unto you, fear him". Who is the unnamed object of fear? Surely he who tempts to unfaithfulness, the god of this world!—Ver. 6. πέντε, five, for two farthings, two for one in Mt. (x. 29); one into the bargain when you buy a larger number. They hardly have a price at all!—ἐκπλησσόμενον, forgotten, for Mt.'s "falls not to the ground without"; the former more general and secondary, but the meaning plainer.— Ver. 7. ἀφθηρωνήσαν· they remain numbered, once for all; number never forgotten, one would be missed.

Vv. 8-12. Another solemn declaration introduced by a λέγω δὲ = Mt. x. 32, 33.—ἐμπροσθεν τῶν ἀγγέλων τ. Θ.: in place of Mt.'s "before my Father in heaven". In ver. 6 "God" takes the place of "your Father" in Mt. It seem as if the Christian circle to which Lk. belonged did not fully realise the significance of Christ's chosen designation for God.—Ver. 10. τὰς δὲ ἐριές, etc.: the true historical setting of the logion concerning blasphemy is doubtless that in Mt. (xii. 31), and Mk. (iii. 28), where it appears as a solemn warning to the men who broached the theory of Beelzebub-derived power to cast out devils. Here it is a word of encouragement to disciples (apostles) to this effect: blaspheming the Holy Spirit speaking through you will be in God's sight an unpardonable sin, far more heinous than that of prejudiced Pharisees speaking evil against me, the Son of Man, now.—
13. If he in the dative in the dative, ἀμείβομαι, μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ ἀμείβομαι.
14. Οὐ γὰρ ἀκούειν ἀκούειν, ἀλλὰ ἀκούειν ἄκουεῖν ἀκούειν ἄκουεῖν.
15. Οὐ γὰρ ἀκούειν ἀκούειν, ἀλλὰ ἀκούειν ἄκουεῖν ἄκουεῖν ἄκουεῖν.
16. Οὐ γὰρ ἀκούειν ἀκούειν, ἀλλὰ ἀκούειν ἄκουεῖν ἄκουεῖν ἄκουεῖν.
17. Οὐ γὰρ ἀκούειν ἀκούειν, ἀλλὰ ἀκούειν ἄκουεῖν ἄκουεῖν ἄκουεῖν.
18. Οὐ γὰρ ἀκούειν ἀκούειν, ἀλλὰ ἀκούειν ἄκουεῖν ἄκουεῖν ἄκουεῖν.
19. Οὐ γὰρ ἀκούειν ἀκούειν, ἀλλὰ ἀκούειν ἄκουεῖν ἄκουεῖν ἄκουεῖν.
20. Οὐ γὰρ ἀκούειν ἀκούειν, ἀλλὰ ἀκούειν ἄκουεῖν ἄκουεῖν ἄκουεῖν.

Ver. 11. ἀπὸ τῶν ἱπποτῶν, τῶν ἱπποτῶν: a general reference to heathen tribunals in place of Mt.'s συνεδρία (x. 17). "Synagogues," representing Jewish tribunals, retained.—Ver. 12. ἀπὸ τῶν ἱπποτῶν, τῶν ἱπποτῶν: their utterances always inspired by the Holy Ghost (hence to contradict their word blasphemy), and specially when they are on their defence.

Vv. 13-21. An interlude leading to a change of theme, in Lk. only.—Ver. 13. τῶν ἱπποτῶν: the crowd now comes to the front, and becomes the audience for at least a few moments.—ἀλλὰ here takes after it the infinitive, instead of the subjunctive.—μετασχηματίζοντας, to divide, presumably according to law, one-third to the younger, two-thirds to the elder (Deut. xxi. 17). The references to tribunals in ver. 11 may have suggested this application to Jesus.—Ver. 14. Ἀφεῖναί, man discouraging, no sympathy with the object (cf. Rom. ii. 1, ix. 20).—καταφέρω, a judge, deciding the right or equity of the case; μερίστως, an arbiter carrying out the judgment (here only in N.T.). The application was the less blameworthy that appeals to Rabbis for such purposes seem to have been not frequent (Schanz).—Ver. 15: the moral pointed = beware of covetousness!—οὐκ ἐν τῷ περισσῶσιν, etc.: the expression here is peculiar and the meaning somewhat obscure, but apparently the idea is: not in the abundance enjoyed by any man is (consists) his life—not in (of) his possessions. Two ways of saying the same thing, the second a kind of afterthought. If life, true life, meant possessions, then the more the better, but it means something far higher.

Vv. 16-21. Parable of the rich fool, simply a story embodying in concrete form the principle just enunciated: teaching the lesson of Ps. xlix., and containing apparent echoes of Sirach xi. 17-19.—Ver. 16. ἐφέρετο, bare well; late and rare (here only in N.T.). Kypke gives examples from Josephus and Hippocrates.—χώρα, estate, farm = ἄγροι (ix. 12), so in John iv. 35.—Ver. 18. τῶν σιτῶν (or τῶν γενήματα): may refer to the fruits (καρπος, ver. 17) of the season, τὰ ἄγαθα to the accumulated
22. Εἴπε δὲ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ, Ἔδειξά τοι τὸν ἑαυτοῦ φάγην, μὴ μεριμνᾶτε τῇ ψυχῇ ὑμῶν, 1 τὴν φάγην· μηδὲ τὸ σῶμα, τὶ ἐνδύσησθε. 23. καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ πληθύνει ἐστὶ τής τροφῆς, καὶ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ ἐνδύματος. 24. Κατανοίγατε τοὺς κόρακας, ὅτι οὐκ ὄρεισσον, οὐδὲ τρίβουσιν· οἰς οὖν ὅτι ταμεῖον οὐδὲ ἀποθήκη, καὶ οἱ θεοὶ τρέφειν αὐτοὺς· τὸν μᾶλλον ὄμεις διαφέρετε τῶν πετεινῶν; 25. τί δὲ δὲ ὄμεις μεριμνῶν δύναται προσεῖναι ἐπὶ τὴν ἠλικίαν αὐτοῦ πῆχυν ἕνα, 4 26. εἶ δὲ ὄντε καὶ ὄλοχον δύνασθε, τὶ περὶ τῶν λοιπῶν μεριμνᾶτε; 27. Κατανοίγατε τὰ κρίνα, πῶς αὐξάνει· οὐδὲ κοτός, οὐδὲ ἡθεί· 6 λέγω ὧν, οὐδὲ σωλήνα ἐν πόσῇ τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ περιβαλλότο ο ἐν τούτων. 28. εἶ δὲ τὸν χόρτον ἐν τῷ ἄργῳ σήμερον ὄτα, καὶ αὐτὸν εἰς κλίβανον βαλλόμενον, οἱ θεοὶ οὕτως αμφίλευσι, τὸν μᾶλλον ὄμεις, ἀληθιστι; 29. Καὶ ὅμεις μὴ ἰητείτε τῆς φάγης,

1 Omit ὡς ἐν ΝABDLQ al. 8 η γαρ in ΝBDLX (Trg., W.H.).
2 o, ouδε in B (W.H. text). ouε, ouε in ΝDLQ c (Tisch., W.H., marg.).
4 ouδε in ΝBLQ 1, 33 al.
5 For τῶν ἀνθρώπων . . . τοῖς D a synt. cur. sin. have τοῖς εὑρεῖτε εὑρεῖτε εὑρεῖτε (Tisch., W.H., marg.; “worth considering,” J. Weiss).
6 ΝBL have εν αὐρω τον χορ. εντα σήμερον (Tisch., W.H.).
7 η αμφίλευσι (-αμει B) in BDL.

possessions of bygone years.—Ver. 19. ἄνωτα, etc., rest, eat, drink, be jolly: an epicurean asyndeton.—Ver. 20. εἴπε δὲ a., but God said to him, through conscience at the death hour (Euthy.).—ἀμωτοίον, they ask thy life = thy life is asked.—τῶν χρησι, whose? Not thing at all events.—Ver. 21. οἱ θεοὶ θλικοῦν, rich with treasure laid up with God. Other interpretations are: rich in a way that pleases God, or rich in honor and Dei, for the advancement of God’s glory. The last sense implies that the riches are literal, the first implies that they are spiritual.

Ver. 22-31. Dissipatives against earthy care (Mt. vi. 25-33). The disciples again become the audience.—Ver. 23. ψυχὴ and υπὸ are to be taken in the physical sense, the suggestion being that God has given us these the greater things, and therefore may be expected to give us food for the one and raiment for the other, the smaller things.—Ver. 24. κόρακας, the ravens, individualising, forMt.’s πετεινα.—οἱ θεοὶ δὲ τὰ πτερύγα ὑμῶν in Mt.—Ver. 25. θλιχοῦν: the application of this epithet to the act of adding a cubit to the height of life at first appears conclusive evidence that for Lk. at least θλιχα must mean length of life: as to add a cubit to one’s stature is so great a thing that no one thinks of attempting it (Hahn, similarly Holtzmann, H. C.). But adding to one’s stature a cubit or an inch is of minimum importance as compared with lengthening our days. Yet it must be owned that Lk.’s ἡθεῖα puts us off the track of the idea intended, if we take ἠθεία = stature. The point is, we cannot do what God has done for all mature persons: added a cubit at least to the stature of their childhood, and this is the greater thing, not the least, greater than giving us the means of life now that we have reached maturity. Vide notes on Mt.—Ver. 29. μεταμισθισθεὶς: a δικ. λεγ. in N.T. and variously rendered. The meaning that best suits the connection of thought is that which finds in the word the figure of a boat tempest-tossed, but that which is best supported by usage points rather to high-mindedness, vain thoughts. The Vulgate renders solites in sublimi tolli = lift not yourselves up to lofty claims (Meyer); do not be ambitious, be content with humble things, a perfectly congruous counsel. Still the rendering: be not as
32—35.
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τί πίστευτε καὶ μὴ μετεωρίζεσθε. 30. τάστα σῶς πάντα τὰ ἑυθὺμ
τοῦ κόσμου ἐπιτίθετε. 31. πληρωθείτε τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ τάστα πάντα
προσεθέσθητε ὑμῖν. 32. μὴ φοβοῦ, τὸ μικρὸν ποιμνὸν. ὡς ἐσπόδοκεν δ θεὶ ποιμνὸν δοῦναι ὑμῖν τὴν βασιλείαν. 33. Πιθήκατε τὰ ἀπόρκοτα ὑμῖν, καὶ δότε ἀληθοσκόπην. τοιοῦτα διαφανεῖς ἐβαλάντα μὴ παλαιομακανά, θησαυρὸν ἄνελκατον ἐν τοῖς οὐδαμοῖς, ὅπως κλέπτης οὐκ ἐγγίζει, οὐδὲ σής διαφθείρει. 34. δοῦν ὑμῖν ὅτι ὃ ἐστιν ὁ θησαυρὸς ὑμῶν, ἐκεῖ καὶ ἡ καρδία ὑμῶν ἔσται. 35. Ἑστῶσαν

καὶ ἐν ΝΒΛ. 3 For εὐθύμετα (a cor., neut. pl. nom.) ΝΒΛΤ 13, 33, 69 al. have εὐθυμητωσαν. 4 αὐτὸν for τ. θ. in ΝΒDL. 4 Omit πάντα ΝΒΛ al. vers. (from Mt.).

tempest-tossed vessels, vexed with care, is a finer thought and more what we expect. Hahn renders: do not gaze with strained vision heavenwards, anxiously looking for help. Pricaeus: "ex futuro suspendi." Theophylact gives a paraphrase which in a way combines the two senses. He defines meteorismus ad distractionem (περιστασάμον), and a restless movement of the mind, thinking now of one thing now of another, leaping from this to that, and always fancying higher things (ὅτι τὰ ψυχικά ἔνα γαμαλίμανον).—Ver. 30. τ. δ. τοῦ κόσμου, the nations of the world; this addition is peculiar to Lk., the expression here only in N.T., but frequent with the Rabbis (Lightfoot, ad loc.); meaning with them the peoples of the outside world as distinct from the Jews; here probably all (Jews included) but Christians. On the thought vide on Mt.—Ver. 31. πιστ., much rather (Schanz, Hahn).—ἐπιτίθετε, etc.: In his version of this great word of Jesus Lk. omits ἐπιτίθετε, so that it takes this simple and absolute form: seek His (the Father's) kingdom: very probably the original form. As temporal things are added (προσεθέσθητε) they do not need to be sought. Mt.'s final word about not caring for to-morrow Lk. omits, either deeming it superfluous, or giving what follows as a substitute.

Vv. 32-34. *The little flock, in Lk. only.* —τομᾶν (contracted from τομάνων), a flock (of sheep), a familiar designation of the body of believers in the apostolic age (Acts 20. 28; 1 Pet. v. 3); μικρὸν adds pathos. That Jesus applied this name to His disciples is very credible, though it may be that in the sense of the source from which Lk. drew, the little flock is the Jewish-Christian Church of Palestine subject to persecution from their unbelieving countrymen (J. Weiss in Meyer). The counsel "fear not" is Mt.'s "take no thought for to-morrow," but the "to-morrow" refers not to temporal but to spiritual things; hence the declaration following. Paraphrased = Fear not future want of food and raiment, still less loss of the kingdom, the object of your desire. Your Father will certainly give it.—Ver. 33 counsels a heroic mood for which apprehension as to future temporal want has become an impossibility, such want being now viewed as a means of ensuring the one object of desire, eternal riches.—παρασκευάζετε, etc.: the special counsel to the man in quest of eternal life generalised (cf. xviii. 22).—βαλάντια, purses: continens pro contento (De Wette).—παλαιομακανά; in Heb. viii. 13 applied to the Sinaitic covenant. Covenants, religions, wax old as well as purses.—ἀνακλητον, unfulfilling. Cf. ἐκλείπ. xvi. 9, in reference to death: "vox rara, sed paris elegantiae sum altera ἀνακλῆτη, quam adhibet auctor libri Sapient., vii. 4. viii. 18, ubi habes θησαυρὸς ἀνακλῆτη et πλοῦτος ἀνακλῆτη," Wolf. There is poetry in this verse, but also some think ascription, turning the poetry of Jesus into ecclesiasticall prose. I prefer to believe that even Lk. sees in the words not a mechanical rule, but a law for the spirit.—Ver. 34 = Mt. vi. 21, with σον turned into ὑμών.

Vv. 35-38. *Loins girt, lamps burning.* Connection with what goes before is not apparent, but there is a latent affinity which makes the introduction of this logion here by Lk. or his source in-
οἵων αἱ δοφύες περιεξομέναι, καὶ οἱ λόγοι καὶ μονακτίς. 36. καὶ οἱ λόγοι αἰώνιοι ἀνθρώπους προσδεχομένους τὸν κύριον ἐκπύρωσεν, ψωπό ἀναλύεται ἐκ τῶν γάμων, ἵνα, ἐλθόντος καὶ κρούσαντος, εὐθαίρετος ἀνέφερεν αὐτῷ. 37. μακάριοι οἱ δούλοι ἐκεῖνοι, οὐς ἔλθων ὁ κύριος κατεργάσατο γρηγορόταται. ἀμὴν λέγω ὅμως, ὅτι περιερχότατον καὶ ἀνεκδοτεί αὐτοὺς, καὶ παρελθόν διακοσμήσει αὐτοῖς. 38. καὶ τῶν ἐκδηγεῖν ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ φυλακῇ, καὶ ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ φυλακῇ ἐλθότος, καὶ ἐφές οὖν, μακάριοι εἰσίν οἱ δούλοι ἐκεῖνοι. 39. τούτῳ δέ γινώσκετε, ὅτι εἰ γένη ὁ ὀλοκληρώσας τοὺς ἄρους καὶ κλέστης ἐρχεται, ἔφυγήσων ἐν, καὶ εἰς ἐν. ἀφήκε διοργανήσας τῶν ὀλοκλήρωσεν. 40. καὶ ὁμοίως ὅπως γίνεται ξένοις· ὅτι ἡ ἀρχή ἀδυνάτη, δι’ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχεται. 41. Εἰπε τῷ δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ Πέτρος, "Κώρη, πρὸς ἡμᾶς τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην λέγεις, ἢ καὶ πρὸς πάντας;

e 1 ἀναλύετα in Ῥ Β Δ Λ and many others (Tisch., W.H.).
* For the words καὶ οὖν... ὑπὲρ τοῦ δικείου Monday 33, 131 have καὶ ἐν τῇ δικαιοσ. καὶ ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ, fil. εὐθ. καὶ εὐθ. τοῦ συν. (Tisch., Trg., W.H.).
καὶ τῶν δούλων οὐσίας Χριστοῦ 33 (Tisch., W.H.).
* For the words καὶ οὖν... ὑπὲρ τοῦ δικείου Monday 33, 131 have καὶ ἐν τῇ δικαιοσ. καὶ ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ, fil. εὐθ. καὶ εὐθ. τοῦ συν. (Tisch., Trg., W.H.).
* Omit συν. in Ῥ (Tisch.).
* Diakriptai in Ῥ Β Δ Λ 33 (Tisch., W.H.).
* Omit αὐτῶν (in Ῥ = Tisch.) BDL 33 (W.H.).
tellible. The kingdom the summum bonum; all to be sacrificed for it; its coming (or the King's) to be eagerly waited for.—Vv. 35, 36 contain the germ of the parable of the Ten Virgins (Mt. xxv. 1 f.). So De Wette, J. Weiss, Holtzmann, Schanz, etc.—δοφύες περιεξομέναι, loins gift, for service.—λόγοι κωμικοὶ, lamps burning, for reception of the master expected to return during the night. In the spiritual sphere the loins gift point to a noble purpose in life, and the burning lamp to the spirit of hope.—Ver. 36. ἀναλύεται, when (πᾶτε = ὑπὲρ) he shall return; the figure is taken from sailors making the return voyage to the port whence they had sailed. Beza (vide Phil. i. 23, 2 Tim. iv. 6).—ἐλθόντος καὶ κρούσαντος: the participles in the genitive absolute, though the subject to which they refer, αὐτῷ, is in the dative.—Ver. 37. μακαρίως: here as always implying rare felicity the reward of heroic virtue.Δὲ γὰρ: the Hebrew word retained here contrary to custom, introducing a startling thought, the inversion of the relation of master and servants, lord and slaves, through joy over their fidelity. For the other side of the picture vide Lk. xvii. 7-10.—διακριπταί αὐτοῖς: the master, in genial mood, turns servant to his own slaves; makes them sit down, throws off his caftan, girds his undergarments, and helps them to portions of the marriage feast he has brought home with him, as a father might do for his children (De Wette, Koetsveld, p. 244). There is not necessarily an allusion either to the last supper (xxii. 27) or to the Roman Saturnalia (Grotius, Holtzmann, H. C.).—Ver. 38. ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ, etc., second and third watches named as the times at which men are most apt to be overtaken with sleep (Hahn), the night being probably supposed to consist of four watches, and the first omitted as too early, and the last as too late for the return.
Vv. 39-40. The thief (Mt. xxiv. 43, 44). A new figure is now employed to give pictorial embodiment to the counsel: be ever ready. The master returning from a wedding is replaced by a thief whose study it is to come to the house he means to plunder at an unexpected time. This logion is reproduced by Lk. substantially as in Mt. with only slight stylistic variations.
Vv. 41-46. A question by Peter and a reply (Mt. xxiv. 45-51). Some look on Peter's question as a literary device of
42. Et ο Κύριος, "Τίς ἄρα ἔστιν ὁ πιστὸς οἰκονόμος καὶ φρόνιμος, ὃς καταστήσει ὁ κύριος ἐπὶ τῆς θεραπείας αὐτοῦ, τοῦ διδάσκαν ἐν καρδίᾳ τῷ ὑστομέτρῳ; 43. μακάριος ὁ δοῦλος ἐκεῖνος, ὃς ἰδεῖν ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ εὑρήσει ποιῶντα αὐτόν. 44. ἄληθες λέγω ἰδίν, ὅτι ἐπὶ πάντα τοῖς ὑπάρχονσιν αὐτοῦ καταστήσει αὐτόν. 45. ἕκαστος ὁ δοῦλος ἐκεῖνος ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ, ἔρχεται ὁ κύριος μοι ἄρχοντας καὶ ἀρχιτείται πάντων τοῖς παιδίσκοις καὶ ταῖς κοινωνίαις, ἵνα γνωρίζωμεν τὰ καὶ πίναις καὶ μεθύσκεσθαι. 46. ἦκαστος ὁ κύριος τοῦ δούλου ἐκεῖνος ἐν ἡμέρες ἑαυτοῦ, καὶ ἐν ἁρπῇ ἑαυτοῦ, καὶ διηκόμεθα αὐτόν, καὶ τὸ μέρος αὐτοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἐπίστων δίστασιν. 47. Ἐκεῖνος δὲ ὁ δοῦλος ὁ γνώσει τὸ θέλημα τοῦ κυρίου ἑαυτοῦ, καὶ μὴ ἐπουδάσοις μηδὲ ἐποίησά πρὸς τὸ θέλημα τοῦ κυρίου ἑαυτοῦ.

the evangelist either to connect his material (Weiss in Meyer; x. 29, xi. 45 cited as similar instances), or to give what follows a special relation to the Apostles and to Peter as their head (Holtzmann, H. C., the passage thus becoming in his view a substitute for Mt. xvi. 18, 19).—Ver. 41. Peter's question reminds us of Mk. xii. 37: "What I say unto you, I say unto all, watch."—Ver. 42. ἡ ἄρα, the Lord, in narrative.—τίς ἄρα, etc.: in Mt. this is connected immediately with the thought in ver. 40, so that Peter's interpellation appears as an interruption of a continuous discourse. Some variations from Mt.'s text are noticeable in Lk.'s version, e.g., ὡς κανονιστήριον (future) for κανονιστήριον (aorist), δικαιοσύνης for δικαιοσύνης, ὑστομέτρῳ for τροφῇ. These changes, according to Weiss and Holtzmann (H. C.), are due to the parable being connected with the Apostles, and one can see some plausibility in the hypothesis so far as the first two variations are concerned. The question: who then, etc., is supposed to answer itself: who but each of you apostles, who especially but you Peter?—Ver. 43. ὑστομέτρῳ, the due portion of food; a word of late Greek. Phryn. p. 383, forbids the use of ὑστομέτρῳ, and enjoins separation of the compound into its elements: ὑστών, μετρόν. The noun occurs here only; the verb in Gen. xlvi. 12 and occasionally in late Greek authors.—Ver. 44. ἄληθες here, as usual, for ἰδίν (ver. 37 an exception).—Ver. 45. ἕκαστος: introducing supposition of an abuse of power, conceived possible even in the case of an apostle, of a Peter. Let no proud ecclesiastic therefore say, Is thy servant a dog?—ἐρχομένων: a delayed ἐρχομένων, a prominent thought in our Lord's later utterances. The delay may possibly be long enough to allow time for the utter demoralization of even the higher officials. Vide on Mt.—τοῖς παιδίσκοις, etc., the men- and maidservants, instead of συνδοῦλοις in Mt.—διηκόμεθα: the retention of this strong word by Lk., who seems to have it for one of his aims to soften harsh expressions, is noticeable, especially when he understands it as referring to the Apostles, and even to Peter. It makes for the hypothesis that the word means not to cut into two as with a saw, but either to lash unmercifully, to cut to pieces in popular parlance, or to separate from the household establishment (Geza, Grotius, etc.)—μετὰ τῶν ἐπίστων points to degradation from the confidential position of οἰκονόμος to a place among the unfaithful; dismissed, or imprisoned, or set to drudging service. 

Vv. 47, 48. Degrees of guilt and punishment, in Lk. only, and serving as an apology for the severity of the punishment as described in ver. 46. That punishment presupposes anger. The statement now made is to the effect: penalty inflicted not as passion dictates
but as principle demands.—οὗτος ὁ γνών, etc.: describes the case of a servant who knows the master's will but does not do it (μὴ νοήσας), nay, does not even intend or try to do it (μὴ ἐπιμένας), deliberately, audaciously negligent.—διστηται πολλάς (πληγάς): many stripes justly his portion.—Ver. 48. ὃ ἐδὲ μὴ γνών: the opposite case is that of one who does not know. What he would do if he did know is another question; but it is not to be gratuitously supposed that he would neglect his duty utterly, like the other, though he does commit minor faults. He is a lower servant in the house to whom the master gave no particular instructions on leaving, therefore without special sense of responsibility during his absence, and apt like the average servant to take liberties when the master is away from home.—ἐπιστὶ ὃ ἐδοξήθη, etc.: a general maxim further explaining the principle regulating penalty or responsibility (cf. Mt. xxv. 15 ff.).—Ver. 49-53. Not peace but division (Mt. x. 34-36). This section is introduced by no connecting particle. Yet there is a certain affinity of thought. Strict fidelity demanded under penalties, but fidelity not easy; times of fierce trial and conflict awaiting you. I forewarn you, that ye may be forearmed.—Ver. 49. ἤφη: the fire of a new faith, or religion, a burning enthusiasm in believers, creating fierce antagonism in unbelievers; deplorable but inevitable.—βοῶν, used by Mt. in reference to peace and war, where Lk. has διδόων.—τί δὲ τίνα, etc., how much I wish it were already kindled; τί = ὁσίος and τί after ἡλέω to express the object of the wish, as in Sirach xxiii. 14 (δειλίσας ἐλπις ἐγενήθης, you will wish you had not been born).—Ver. 50. Βασιλεία: before the fire can be effectually kindled there must come for the kindler His own baptism of blood, of which therefore Jesus naturally speaks here with emotion.—τὰς συνέχειας, how am I pressed on every side, either with fervent desire (Euthy., Theophr., De Wette, Schanz, etc.), or with fear, shrinking from the cup (Meyer, J. Weiss, Holtzmann, Hahn).—Ver. 51. διαμερισμῶν: instead of Μτ.'s μάχαιρα, an abstract prosaic term for a concrete pictorial one; exactly descriptive of the fact, however, and avoiding possible misapprehension as to Christ's aim = Jesus not a patron of war.—Ver. 52. τρεῖς ἐν τῷ δυναμ, etc.: three against two and two against three; five in all, not six though three pairs are mentioned, mother and mother-in-law (μητὴρ and παύρα) being the same person. This way of putting it is doubtless due to Lk. —ἐν with dative = contra, only here in N.T.; κατὰ with genitive in Mt.—Ver. 54-59. A final word to the crowd (cf. Mt. xvi. 2 L., v. 25 L.).—τοῖς δύσκολοι: in Mt. Jesus speaks to the Pharisees and Sadducees, in reply to their demand for a sign, which gives a more definite occasion. But the words might quite appropriately have been addressed to the people at large. The weather-skill ascribed to the audience is such as any one might possess, and all Jews needed
54. ἕλεγε δὲ καὶ τοὺς δύσλους, "Ὅταν ἴδητε τὴν ἀφελὴν ἀνεφλικτικοὺς ἀντὶ ἰδίων, εὐθέως λέγετε, ὅταν πάντων ἀπὸ τούτων γίνεται ἀδίκως. 55. καὶ διὰ τὸν κόλπον πνεύματος, λέγετε, ὡς οἱ καίσαν ἔσται καὶ γίνεται. 56. ὁποιαὶ τὰ τὸ πρῶτον τῆς γῆς καὶ τοῦ ὀφραντοῦ ὀδηγεῖται δοκιμαζόμενοι - τὸν καὶ κατανυστήσατε; 57. τὸ δὲ καὶ ἰδίων οὐ κρίνεται τὸ δίκαιον; 58. ὡς γὰρ ὅπως οἱ ἀντίκειται τῷ ἀντικειμένῳ τὸν ἐκ τῆς ἀνωτάτου ἀναπλάσθων ἀπὸ τοῦ κρίτην, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ κρίτην κατανυστήσεται σφυγμόν καὶ τὸ δίκαιον καὶ τὸ ἀδίκον ἐπὶ ἀποδίδεται."

1 Omit τὴν ΝΑΒΛΔΑ I, 33, 69 al.
2 om in ΝΑΒΛ 64.
3 om after λέγεται in ΝΑΒΛ, etc.
4 For δοκιμαζόμενοι (ADALPMA) ΝΑΒΛ 33 verss. have omi δοκιμαζόμενοι (W.H.).
5 παραδώσουν in ΝΒΔ minusc. (L = T.R.). The same authorities have βαλει for βάλλει.
6 Omit om ΝΑΒΛ I Orig.

the warning. The precise circumstances in which this logion was spoken are uncertain.—ἐν διαφορέσ, in the west, the region of the setting sun, and of the Mediterranean. A cloud rising up from that quarter meant, of course, rain (I Kings xviii. 44, 45).—Ver. 55. καίσαν, the sirocco, a hot wind from the desert, blighting vegetation (Jas. i. 11), equally a matter of course.—Ver. 56. ὑποκριταί seems too strong a term to apply to the people, and more appropriate to a Pharisaic or professional audience (Mt. xvi. 3). Raphael, after Erasmus Schmidt, translates heroi, weather prophets, citing a passage from Lucian in support of this sense. This is certainly one meaning of the word (vide Passow), but, as Hahn remarks, the usage of the N.T. does not support it here.—Ver. 57. ἰδίων, from or of yourselves (sauf sponte, Palaiaret); without needing any one to tell you the right; implying that the persons addressed were destitute of the average moral insight (cf. Lk. xxii. 30).—Ver. 58. ὡς γὰρ: introducing a legal scene from natural life to illustrate a similar situation in the moral world. It is implied that if they had the necessary moral discernment they would see that a judgment day was at hand, and understand that the duty of the hour was to come to terms with their adversary by timely repentance. That is how they would act if it were an ordinary case of debtor and creditor.—Οἱ ἐργασίαι (phrase here only): usually interpreted give diligence, give thine endeavour = da operam, a Latinism. Theophylact renders it: give interest (of the sum owed); Hoffmann, offer work, labour, in place of money.—κατασφηρίζεται (here only in N.T.), lest he drop thee to the judge, stronger than Mt.'s παραδώσε (v. 25), realistic and not exaggerated.—τὸ πράκτορον, the man whose business it was to collect the debts after the judge had decreed payment, or to put the debtor in prison till the debt was paid. Kypke defines πράκτορος: "exactores qui multas violatorum legum a jure irrogatas exigunt," citing an instance of its use from Demosthenes.—Ver. 59. λέγων, the half of the κοβράντα (Mt.'s word), making the necessity of full payment in order to release from prison still more emphatic.

Chapter XIII. Judgment to Come. This chapter continues the sombre judicial strain of xii. 54-59. Beginning with a general reference to the impending doom of Israel, as foreshadowed by a reported tragedy which had befallen certain individuals, it ends with a specific prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem similar to that which closes the great anti-Pharisaic discourse in Mt. xxiii. The dramatic effect of the prediction there is entirely lost in Lk.'s narrative, which in subsequent chapters continues
its report of the teaching of Christ as if the end were still a great way off.

Vv. 1-5. The Galilean tragedy, peculiar to Lk., as is the greater part of what follows, on to xviii. 14.—Ver. 1. τον γαλ., etc.: The introduction to the gruesome story naturally implies a temporal connection between what follows and what goes before: i.e., some present when Jesus spoke as reported in xii. 54-59 took occasion to tell Him this piece of recent news, recalled to their minds by what He had said about judgment and how to avert it. There is no good reason to suppose that the connection is merely topical, and that the preface is simply a literary device of Lk. —τον γαλ.: the article implies that the story was current.—ἐν τούτῳ αὐτ., etc.: So the story was told among the horrified people: the blood of the poor Galilean victims ruthlessly shed by Pilate while they were in the very act of offering the sacrifice. Perfectly credible in those times under such a ruler, and in reference to such victims, Galileans, free in spirit, restive under the Roman yoke. Similar incidents in Josephus, though not this precise occurrence.—Ver. 2. ἀποκρίθησις: Jesus answered to an implied question. Those who told the story expected Him to make some remarks on it; not such doubtless as He did make.—δοκεῖν, think ye; probably that was just what they did think. The fate of the Galileans awakened superstitious horror prone to impute to the victims special criminality.—παρὰ πάντως τ. Γ., in comparison with all Galileans. To make the point more vivid the victims are compared with men of their own province, disposition, and temptations.—ἔγνωντο, became, were shown to be. —παρέδωΚας, have suffered, an irrevocable fact.—Ver. 3. ἐστι, an emphatic “no,” followed by a solemn “I say to you.” The prophetic mood is on the speaker. He reads in the fate of the few the coming doom of the whole nation.—ἀποκρίθησις, the reading in T.R., is stronger = in the same way. Jesus expresses Himself with greater intensity as He proceeds = ye shall perish likewise; nay, in the same way (ver. 5. ἀποκρίθησις), your towers and temples falling about your ears.—Ver. 4. Jesus refers to another tragic occurrence, suggesting that He was acquainted with both. His ears were open to all current news, and His mind prompt to point the moral. The fact stated, otherwise unknown to us.—ἀποκρίθησις, word changed, in meaning the same as ἀμαρτωλοί, moral debtors paying their debt in that dismal way. The utterances of Jesus on this occasion of a general question: how far may lot be viewed as an index of character? which was not then before His mind. He assumed that the sufferers in the two catastrophes were sinners and even great sinners, so acquiescing in the popular view, because He wanted to point a lesson for the whole nation which He regarded as fast ripening for judgment. From the saying in the Teaching on the Hill concerning the Father in Heaven giving sunshine and rain to evil and good alike, it is evident that He had risen not only above popular current opinion, but even above the O.T. view as to the connection between physical and moral good and evil. That saying implies that there is a large sphere of Divine action within which moral distinctions among men are overlooked, that good may come to bad.
men and evil to good men. To our Lord it would not have appeared impossible that some of the best men in Israel might be involved in the two calamities here mentioned.

Nv. 6-9. Parable of the barren fig tree, peculiar to Lk., probably extemporised to embody the moral of the preceding narratives; takes the place in Lk. of the cursing of the fig tree in Mt. and Mk.—Ver. 6. Συκήν ἐξέθη ταῖς: a fig tree, quite appropriate and common in corners of a vineyard, yet not the main plant in such a place; selected rather than a vine to represent Israel, by way of protest against assumed inalienable privilege. "Periah," Jesus had said once and again (vv. 3 and 5). Some believers might think: What l the Lord's elect people perish? Yes, replies Jesus in effect, like a barren fig tree cast out of a vineyard, where at best it has but a subordinate place.—Ver. 7. ἄμμελευργῶν, the vine-dresser (ἀμμελεσιον, ἀμμελεσιον) here only in N.T.—190, lo! as of one who has a right to complain.—τρία έτη, three years, reckoned not from the planting of the tree (it is three years after planting that it begins to bear fruit), but from the time that it might have been expected in ordinary course to yield a crop of figs. Three years is not a long period, but enough to determine whether it is going to be fruit-bearing, the one thing it is there for. In the spiritual sphere in national life that cannot be determined so soon. It may take as many thousand years.—ἔρχομαι, I keep coming, the progressive present. The master comes not merely once a year, but again and again within the year, at the seasons when fruit may be found on a fig tree (Hahn). Cf. δουλεώς in xv. 29.—ἔρχομαι ἐξέθη σε, I do not find it. I come and come and am always disappointed. Hence the impatient ἐκκοφων, cut it out (from the root).—καί τι καλ.: kal points to a second ground of complaint. Besides bearing no fruit it occupies space which might be more profitably filled.—καταργεί (here and in Paul's epistles), renders useless; Vulgate, occupat, practically if not verbally the right rendering. A barren fig tree renders the land useless by occupying valuable space.—Ver. 8. τοῦτο τά ἐτα, one year more; he has not courage to propose a longer time to an impatient owner.—κόπτει (neuter plural from adjective κόπτειον), dung stuffs. A natural proposal, but sometimes fertility is better promoted by starving, cutting roots, so preventing a tree from running to wood.—Ver. 9. ἐκ τοῦ μελλον: if it bear the coming year—well (ἐκ ἐξομεν understood).—ἐκκοφως, if not, thou shalt cut it down—thou, not I. It depends on the master, though the vine-dresser tacitly recognises that the decision will be just. He sympathises with the master's desire for fruit. Of course when the barren tree is removed another will be planted in its place. The parable points to the truth taught in ver. 29.
Vv. 10-17. Cure in a synagogue on a Sabbath day, peculiar to Lk.—Ver. 10. ἐν τούτω στέβαστον: may mean on Sabbaths (Hahn, who refers to the discriminating use of singular and plural in Lk.) and imply a course of instruction in a particular synagogue for weeks.—Ver. 11. πνεύμα ἀσθενείας: the Jews saw the action of a foreign power in every form of disease which presented the aspect of the sufferer's will being overmastered. In this case the woman was bent and could not straighten herself when she tried.—συγκύστωνα, bent together, here only in N.T.—ἐν τοῖς παντελεῖς goes with ἀνακυψάεις, and implies either that she could not carry her head, or body at all, or entirely. The former is more in keeping with the idea of bondage to a foreign spirit (Schanz). Similar use of the phrase in Heb. vii. 25.—Ver. 12. προσεφώνησεν: Jesus, ever prompt to sympathise, called her to Him when His eye lit upon the bent figure.—ἀπολάλευσα: perfect for future, the thing as good as done; spoken to cheer the downcast woman while she approaches. The cure was consummated by touch when she came up to Jesus (ver. 13), whereupon the eighteen years' sufferer burst into praise: ἀπέβαλε τὸν Θεόν. A lifelike moving scene.—Ver. 14. But religious propriety in the person of the ruler of the synagogue is once more shocked: it is a Sabbath cure.

—ἐλεγε τῷ δόλῳ: He spoke to the audience at Jesus—plausibly enough; yet, as so often in cases of religious zeal, from mixed motives. Christ's power and the woman's praise annoyed him.—Ver. 15. ὄπωρκρατα: plural less personal than the singular (T.R.), yet severe enough, though directed against the class. The case put was doubtless according to the prevailing custom and so stated as to make the work done dominant (λιγώ, less, that one bit of work: ἀνάγων, leading the animal loosed to the water, that another, vide Bengel).—ποιεῖς, gives him drink, at least to the extent of drawing water from the well, if not of carrying it head or body, mouth (the former allowed, the latter disallowed in the Talmud, vide Lightfoot and Wünsche).—Ver. 16. The case of the woman described so as to suggest a parallel and contrast: a daughter of Abraham versus an ox or ass; bound by Satan, not merely by a chain round the neck; for eighteen years, not for a few hours. The contrast the basis of a strong a fortiori argument. The reply is thoroughly in the spirit of Jesus, and the whole incident, though peculiar to Lk., is a credible reminiscence of His ministry; whether placed in its true historical setting is a matter of minor moment.—Ver. 17. The religious leaders and the people behave according to their character; the former ashamed, not as
Vv. 22-30. Are there few that be saved? This section is a mosaic of words found dispersed in the pages of Mt.: the strait gate (ver. 24) in Mt. vii. 14; the pleading for admission (vv. 28, 29) recalls Mt. vii. 21-23; the exclusion from the kingdom (vv. 28, 29) reproduces Mt. viii. 11, 12; the apothegm in ver. 30 = Mt. xix. 30, xx. 16. The parabolic word concerning the master of the house (ver. 25) seems to be an echo from the parable of the ten virgins. The question as to the number of the saved introducing the group need not be an artificial heading furnished by Lk. or the compiler of his source.

Ver. 22 is a historical notice serving to recall the general situation indicated in ix. 51. So again in xvii. 11. "Luke gives us to understand that it is always the same journey which goes on with incidents analogous to those of the preceding cycle," Godet. Hahn, however, maintains that here begins a new division of the history and a new journey to Jerusalem, yet not the final one. This division extends from this point to xvii. 10, and contains (1) words of Jesus on the way to Jerusalem (xiii. 22-35), (2) words spoken probably in Jerusalem (xiv. 1-24), (3) words spoken after the return to Galilee.—διδάσκειν, teaching; the main occupation of Jesus as He went from village to village. The long section from ix. 51 to xvii. 14 is chiefly didactic in contents, though an occasional healing is recorded.—καλ ὁ πόρ. τω, the καλ is exepexegetic = and at the same time; His pace set towards Jerusalem as He taught.
Vv. 23-24. αἱ ἄλλα αὐτὸν; αἰτία, not to the question merely but to all present, as the reply was of general concern.—Ver. 24. ἀρέσθηται εἰς... the narrower door (πύλη, gate, in Mt.)... 23. The Kingdom of Heaven is here conceived of as a house.—πολλαί; the idea is that many shall desire admission and shall not obtain it. The reason in the parable is... as if it meant something less than ἀρέσθησα (Godet). All strive, but success is for the strongest who can push the weaker aside. So in the parable. In the interpretation the one point to be insisted on is: be in dead earnest.

Vv. 25-27. Here begins a new parable and a new sentence, though some (Beza, Lachmann, W. and H.) connect with what goes before, putting a comma after ἐπὶ τὴν πόρυν. Against this is not only the change from the third person to the second (ἀρέσθηται), but the fact that the cause of exclusion is different: not the narrowness of the door, but coming too late. The case put now is that of the master of a house who is giving an entertainment. He waits for a certain time to receive his guests. At length, deeming that all are, or ought to be, present, he rises and shuts the door, after which no one can be admitted. Some, however, come later, knock at the door, and are refused admission. The moral of this parable is distinct; of the former parable it was: be in earnest; of this it is: be not too late.—καὶ ἀρέσθηται: both verbs depend on ἀρέσθηται: ye begin to stand without and to knock. Some take ἀρέσθηται as σταυροῦντας: it is better to take it as denoting a first stage in the action of those arriving late. At first they expect that the door will be opened soon as a matter of course, and that they have nothing to do but to step in. By and by they find it will be necessary to knock, and finally, being refused admission even when the door is opened, they are fain to plead (ver. 26).—καὶ ἀρέσθησα: the καὶ here has the force of θέλων: the sense would have been clearer had it been omitted. Here properly begins the apodosis of the sentence and the close of the parable proper = then he answering will say: I do not know you.—ποιεῖν ὑπῆρξεν: these added words rather weaken than strengthen the laconic ὥσπερ ὁ ἴδε ὑμᾶς of Mt. xxv. 12 = you must be strangers, not of those invited.—Ver. 26. This verse is viewed by many as the apodosis of a long sentence beginning with ἀρέσθησα (ver. 25), and the emotional character of the passage, in which parable and moral are blended, goes far to justify them. But it is better on the whole to find here a new start.—καὶ ἀρέσθησα, before thee, either, as thy guests or hosts (Cæpernaum feast, dinners in the houses of Pharisees), i.e., with thee; or, under thine eye—

1 λεγονολογίαι in ΝΒΛ.
2 ὑπαράστηκα in ΝΒDL 1, 131 Orig.
3 B has ἀρέσθησα (Tisch., W.H., text), but ΝΒDLT and many more have ἀρέσθησα (W.H. marg.).
volving a claim simply of neighbourhood. The former is the more likely, because it puts the case more strongly in their favour.—Ver. 27. οὐχ οἴδα, etc.: the same answer, iteration cum emphasi (Bengel).—ἀπέστροφη, etc.: nearly as in Mt. vii. 23. This answer goes entirely out of the parable into the moral sphere. In the parable exclusion is due to arriving too late; in the spiritual sphere to character.—ἀδικίας, Mt. has ἀνομίαν, lawlessness. Against the tendency-criticism Schanz remarks: "ἀρμίλα in Mt. is Jewish-Christian but not anti-Pauline, ἀδικία Pauline but not anti-Jewish".

Vv. 28-30. Concluding reflections.—Ver. 28. ἦταν, there; then, according to Euthy. Zig. (τότε, ἐν ἦταν τῇ καραφ). Kuinoel also takes it as an advert of time in accordance with Hebraistic usage, and Bornemann cites instances from Greek authors of the same use of adverbs of place as adverbs of time. But there is not only verbally correct, but graphic: there, outside the door of the house where patriarchs and prophets feast, shall he excluded weep and gnash their teeth, all the more because they think they have a right, as belonging to the chosen race, to be within.—Ver. 29 points to an aggravation of the misery of the outcasts: men coming from every quarter of the globe to join the festive company and finding admission. The shut door and the too late arrival are now out of view, and for the private house of the parable is substituted the Kingdom of God which it represents. It is needless to ask whether Mt. or Lk. has given this saying in its true place. Perhaps neither has. The important point is their joint testimony to the saying as a true utterance of Jesus.—Ver. 30. The same remark applies to this saying. As it stands here it refers to Jews as the first who become last, and to Gentiles as the last who become first, and the distinction between first and last is not one of degree, but absolute—within and without.

Vv. 31-33. Warning against Herod by Pharisees, peculiar to Lk., but Mk. (iii. 6, viii. 15) has prepared us for combined action of court and religious coteries against Jesus similar to that against Amos (vii. 10-13), both alike eager to be rid of Him as endangering their power.—Ver. 31. ἕξελθη: xvii. 11 shows that Lk. did not attach critical importance to this incident as a cause of Christ's final departure from Galilee.—ὁλεὶ ἐν ἀνδροτητών: was this a lie, an inference, a message sent by Herod in order to intimidate, or a fact which had somehow come to the knowledge of the reporters? It is impossible to ascertain. The answer of Jesus seems to imply that He regarded the Pharisees as messengers, and also innocent tools of the crafty king. But He answers according to the ex facie character of the message, that of friends warning against a foe, while probably having His own thoughts as to where the craft and the enmity lay. The one thing certain is that there was low cunning somewhere. The king was using the Pharisees, or the Pharisees the king, or perhaps they were both playing the same game. Possibly the evangelist viewed the Pharisees as friends.—Ver. 32. τὴν ἀλλήλων ταύτην, this fox; the fox revealed in this business, ostensibly the
32. Кай εἶτεν αὐτῷ, "Πορευόμενες ἐξῆκατε τῇ διάτηκῃ 
ταύτῃ, ἱδοὺ, ἐκβάλλει δαμόνα καὶ ἱάσεις ἐπιτελέων 4 σήματον καὶ 
αὐρίον, καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ τελεσάμαι. 33. πλὴν δὲι με σήματον καὶ 
αὐρίον καὶ τῇ ἰχνηλή πορευόμεναι· ὧτι οὐκ ἠθέτηται προφήτης 
ἀπολοθήκην ἢ' εἰρωνείαν. 34. 'Ιερουσαλήμ, 'Ιερουσαλήμ, ἡ ἀποκτείνουσα τοὺς προφήτας, καὶ λιθοβολούσα τοὺς ἀπεσταλμένους 
πρὸς αὐτὴν, ποσάκεις ἐθέλησα ἐπισυνάξε τὰ τέκνα σου, ἐν τῶν 
δρόνης τὴν έαυτῆς ρουσίν ὑπὸ τὰς πτέρυγας, καὶ οὐκ ἔθελήσατε. 
35. ἱδοὺ, ἀφέται μιν 4 δὲ εἰκός ὁμών ἐρμος 2. ἁμὴν δὲ λέγω ὅμων, 
δι' ὅτι μὴ με ἔθετε ἐς δὲ ἕξιν, δι' ἔτει εἴπητε, Ἐδοξημένου ὁ 
ἐφχασμένος εἰς σώματι Κυρίου." 

1 συντελεύτω in ΝBL 33, 124 (Tisch., W.H.).
2 ΝΑΒΚΛ al. verss. omit ἐρμος, found in DXA 33 al.
3 λεγε Γν (for εμφάνες δε λεγην in minusc.) in BDX al. (W.H. with δε in brackets).
4 Simply λεγε in ΝL (Tisch.).
5 Omit στι ΝBLD (W.H.).
6 For με έθετε ΝΒ have έθετε με; for εως αν ΒDL have εως; ΝBL omit έη 
στι, which may be conformed to Mt.

king, but in a roundabout way the 
would-be friends may be hit (Euthy. 
Zig.). The quality denoted by the name 
is doubtless cunning, though there is no 
clear instance of the use of the fox as the 
type of cunning in the Scriptures else-
where.—σήματον, etc.: this note of time 
is not to be taken strictly. Jesus is in 
the prophetic mood and speaks in 
the third day symbolise a short time.— 
τελεσάμαι as to form may be either 
middle or passive. If middle it will 
mean: finish my healing (and teaching) 
ministry in Herod's territory (Galilee 
it seems). This meaning suits the 
connection, but against it is the fact that 
the verb is never used in a middle sense 
in N.T., and very rarely in classics. 
Taken passively it will mean: I am 
performed by a martyr's death (Heb. xi. 
40, xii. 23). Commentators are much 
divided between these meanings.—Ver. 
33. πλὴν, for the rest, or, on the other 
hand, introducing the other side of the 
case = I must work still for a little space, 
yet I must keep moving on southwards, 
as the proper place for a prophet to die 
is Jerusalem, not Galilee. The second 
ote of time (ἐπιτελέων) coincides with 
the first: work and moving southwards 
go hand in hand.—οὐκ ἠθέτηται, it is not 
fitting (here only in N.T., cf. xvii. 1). 
John was murdered in Machaerus, but 
that was an offence against the fitness of 
things. The reply of Jesus is full of 
dignity and pathos. In effect He says: 
I am not to be driven out of Galilee by 
threats. I will work till the hour comes. 
Nevertheless keep your minds easy, 
princes and Pharisees! I must soon 
endure a prophet's fate, and not here. 
I go to meet it in the proper place, 
though not in fear of you. 
Vv. 34, 35. Apostrophe to Jerusalem 
(Mt. xxiii. 37, 38), suitably introduced 
here as in sympathy with the preceding 
utterance, though not likely to have 
been spoken at this time and place, as 
indeed it is not alleged to have been. 
It is given nearly as in Mt — τῷ ναῷν 
(for τον ναόν in Mt.) = a nest (nidum 
suum Vulgate), hence the young in the 
nest. Vide remarks on Mt., ad loc. 

Chapter XIV. Table Talk and a 
Concio Ad Populum.—Vv. i-24 contain 
digests of sayings of Jesus at the table of 
a Pharisee, this being the third instance 
in this Gospel of such friendly inter-
course between Him and members of the 
Pharisaic party. The remaining part of 
the chapter consists of solemn words on 
self-sacrifice and on counting the cost 
represented as addressed to the people. 
Vv. 1-6. The drooping man healed, 
with relative conversation, in Lk. only 
(cf. Mt. xii. 9-14).—Ver. 1. τῷ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, 
ecc.: the indication of place and time is 
very vague so as to lend plausibility to 
the suggestion that the introduction is
extracted from the parabolas speeches, vv. 7-24 (Holtzmann, H. C.). — ἀρχώτων τ. Φ., the house is described as that of one of the rulers of the Pharisees, an inexact expression, as the Pharisees as such had no rulers, being all on a level. Omitting the article before Φαρ. (as in B) we might take this word as in apposition and render: one of the rulers, Pharisees; rulers meaning the Sanhedrists, and Pharisees denoting their religious tendency (so Grothus, who therefore thinks the scene was in Jerusalem). — σαββάτῳ φαγῶν ἄρτον: feasting on Sabbath was common among the Jews, ex pietate et religione (Lightfoot), but the dishes were cold, cooked the day before. — καὶ, introducing the apodosis, and the main point of the observation of Jesus by those present at the meal (ἄρτον). Altogether a strange situation: Jesus the guest of a great man among the Pharisees, as if held in honour, yet there to be watched rather than treated as a friend; simple-hearted geniality on one side, insincerity on the other.

Vv. 2-6. ὑβριστικὸς (ὑβρωμ).: here only in N.T., a solitary instance of this disease among the healing acts of Jesus. No conceivable reason for its being mentioned except that it was a fact. — ἐπιρροθέν αὐτοῦ, before Him, so that He could not fail to see him; how there — as guest, as brought by the Pharisees to tempt Jesus, come there of his own motion in hope to be cured, though not asking out of reverence for the Sabbath and in fear of its strict guardians (Euthy. Zig.) — not indicated. — Ver. 3. ἀποκριθεῖν: Jesus addresses Himself to the double situation; on the one hand a sick man dumbly appealing for help, on the other the jealous religionists aware of His free habit and expecting eccentric speech and action open to censure. — ἔστην, etc.: first He asks a question as to the legality of Sabbath healing in a tone which amounts to an affirmative assertion, allowed to pass uncontradicted (ἓν ἤκουσαν); then He proceeds to answer His own question by healing the man (ver. 4), and finally He offers an apology for the act. — Ver. 5. τῶν ἐμάν, etc.: an awkward Hebraistic construction for τῶν ἐμάν, etc. — ὡς ὁ βοῦς, a son or (even) an ox, in either case, certainly in the former, natural instinct would be too strong for artificial Sabbath rules. — φρέαρ, a well, or cistern, an illustration as apt to the nature of the malady as that of the ox loosened from the stall in xiii. 15 (Godei). — ἀπελθὼς, at once, unhesitatingly, without thought of Sabbath rules. The emphasis lies on this word. — Ver. 6. οὐκ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀναποκριθῆσαι (again in Rom. ix. 20); silenced but of course not convinced. The difference in the way of thinking too great to be overcome in a moment.

Luke has three Sabbath cures. The present one has no very distinctive features. The accumulation may point to a desire to help weak Christians to
Acts iii. 5. J. "Eβέκλειστος ου προς αυτούς, δεκαπεντατρίτης τότε τό αυτού προτεταμετοχα τας, λεγών προς αυτούς, 8. "Οταν εκλεγης ἀπὸ τινος εἰς γάμον, μὴ κατακλεθής εἰς τὴν πρωτοκλίσιαν· μὴ πάντας ἐντυμοτρόφος σοι ἡ κελεύσας ἃντειν αυτοῦ, 9. καὶ ἐκδοθή ὁ σκότος καὶ αὐτὸν καλῶν ὑπὲρ σοι, Διὸ τοῦτο τότε· καὶ τότε ἐδέχαται αὐτοῖς τὸν δεσπότα τῶν κατέχειν. 10. ἔλη οὖν τὴν κελεύσας, προειδοειδες ἀνάτομον 1 εἰς τὸν δεσπότα τότε· Αφι, οὖν ἔλη ὁ δεσπότα τῶν κατέχειν τοις σε ὑπὲρ τῶν πατέρων τῶν σοι. 11. διὸ τὰς ὁμοιότατα πάνω σοι, ὃς ἐν τοῖς πατέροις τῶν σοι. 12. ἔλη οὖν τῷ κατέχουσιν αὐτοῦ, "Οταν τοις ἀριστοτέρις ἢ δεδεμένοις, μὴ φωνεῖς τοὺς φίλους σου, μηδὲ τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς σου, μηδὲ τοὺς συγγενεῖς σου, μηδὲ γείτονας πλούσωσος· μὴ πάντας καὶ αὐτοῖς σε ἐν τοῖς σε ὑπὲρ τῶν πατέρων σοι. 12. ἔλη οὖν τῷ κατέχουσιν αὐτοῦ, "Οταν τοις ἀριστοτέρις ἢ δεδεμένοις, μὴ φωνεῖς τοὺς φίλους σου, μηδὲ τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς σου, μηδὲ τοὺς συγγενεῖς σου, μηδὲ γείτονας πλούσωσος· μὴ πάντας καὶ αὐτοῖς σε ἐν τοῖς σε ὑπὲρ τῶν πατέρων σοι.

1 enestos in א B al. 2 erei in אBLX minusc. 3 wawons after enestos in אABLX verse.

get above their scruples by an appeal to the Master (Schanz). In the first and second cases the principle of Christ's defence is indicated: it is lawful to do good (vi. 9); you may do for a man, a forti or, what it is lawful to do for a beast (xiii. 15). In the present case it is not indicated. It may be: you may do for another what you all do for your own son or ox (Meyer, J. Weiss); or if need is a valid plea in any case, it is valid in all cases (Schanz).

Vv. 7-11. Take the lowest seat. Here begins the table talk of Jesus, consisting of three discourses. The first addressed to the guests in general is really a parable teaching the lesson of humility pointed in ver. 11. "Through the medium of a counsel of prudence relating to ordinary social life He communicates a lesson of true wisdom concerning the higher sphere of religion" (The Parabolic Teaching of Christ).—Ver. 7. ἐνέκλεισεν, observing. Euthy. renders: μεμψασθέντος, blaming, in itself a legitimate meaning but not compatible with τότε. The practice observed—choosing the chief places—was characteristic of Pharisees (Mt. xxiii. 6), but it is a vice to which all are prone.—Ver. 8. γάμοι, a marriage feast, here representing all great social functions at which ambition for distinction is called into play.—ἀντιμέτρος σωφρονίστης, this does not necessarily denote one of known superior social standing, but may mean simply one held in more honour by the host (Hahn).—Ver. 9. ἐκδόθη τὸ κελευθεροποιηθέν τῶν, etc.: the guests are supposed to have taken their places before the host comes in.—δεκαπεντατρίτης: the shame would be most acutely felt at the beginning of the movement from the highest to the lowest place (Meyer).—τό δεσπότα τότε, the lowest place just vacated by the honoured guest, who is humble in spirit though highly esteemed, who therefore in his own person exemplifies the honour and glory of being called up by the host from the lowest to the highest place.—Ver. 10. προσανέβηθη ἀνώτερον: "go up higher," A.V. and R.V.; better "come up higher," which gives effect to the προσανέβηθη. The master invites the host to come towards himself. So Field (Ot. Nor.).—Ver. 11: the moral of the parable: a great law of the Kingdom of God dear to the heart of the Pauline evangelist, recurring in xviii. 14.

Vv. 12-14. A word to the host, also parabolic in character in so far as it gives general counsel under a concrete particular form (Hahn), but not parabolic in the strict sense of teaching spiritual truth by natural examples.—Ver. 12. φασιν used for καλέσω in Hellenistic Greek (Farrar, C. G. T.), denoting formal ceremonious invitation as on a great occasion (Hahn).—τῶν φίλων, etc.: four classes likely to be asked on ordinary social grounds are named personal intimates, brethren, relations (these two form one category), and rich neighbours. The epithet πλούσωσος belongs to the last class alone. Friends and relatives are called because they are such. Mere neighbours are called
only because they are rich, or, more generally, socially important.—μὴ γὰρ, lest, presenting return invitations (ἀντικαλέσωσι, here only in N.T.) as an object of dread, a fear unknown to the world. (Hic metus mundo ignotus, Bengel.)—Ver. 13. δοχήν, the same word used by Lk. in reference to the feast in Levi's house, which was a gathering of the sort here recommended by Jesus.—μακάριος, here and always denoting rare virtue and felicity = the pleasure of doing a kindness not to be repaid, except at the resurrection of the just, or by the joy that every really beneficent action brings now.—τῶν δικαίων: in specifying the righteous as the subjects of the resurrection the Speaker has no intention of indicating an opinion as to the unrighteous: whether they rise at all, or when.

Vv. 15-24. The great feast (cf. Mt. xxii. 1-14), very naturally introduced by the pious reflection of a guest whose religious sentiment had been touched by the allusion to the resurrection-felicity of the just. Like many other pious observations of the conventional type it did not amount to much, and was no guarantee of genuine godliness in the speaker. The parable expresses this truth in concrete form, setting forth that many care less for the Kingdom of God and its blessings than they seem to care, and teaching that these will be offered to those who do care indeed.

Vv. 16-20. ἐκάλεσαν: it was a great feast and many were asked, with a long invitation.—Ver. 17. ἐπιτυχοντος κεκλημένος: a second invitation according to Eastern custom still prevailing (Rosenmüller, Morgenland, v. 199; Thomson, Land and Book, vol. i. chap. ix.).—Ver. 18. ἀνὸς μίᾶς (supply γνώμης, ψυχῆς, ἔρας, or some such word implying with one mind, or at one time, or in the same manner, here only in Greek literature), with one consent.—παραγείονται: not to refuse, but in courteous terms to excuse themselves.—ὁ πρῶτος, the first; of three, simply samples, by no means exhausting the list of possible excuses.—ἀγράφω γνώρασα: a respectable excuse, by no means justifying absence, but excellently exemplifying preoccupation, the state of mind common to all. A man who has purchased a farm is for a while very much taken up with it and makes himself very busy about it; everything else for the moment secondary.—ἐκὼ ἀνέγειν: no fewer than three Latinisms have been found in this sentence; this, the use of ἐκὼ in the sense of ego, and εἴπε με παραψήφισον (Grotius). But parallels can be found in Greek authors for the first. Kypke cites an instance of
the second from Josephus. The third, if not a Latinism (Meyer and J. Weiss say no, Schanz and Hahn yes), is at least exactly = excusatum me habeo.—

—Ver. 19. ἔτερος, another: his excuse is also highly respectable, though nothing more than a decent excuse; the preoccupation very real, though the apology lame. Five yoke of oxen a very important purchase in the owner’s eyes.—Ver. 20. γνώσασθαι εὐγήμα: most presentable excuse of all, therefore offered sans phrase; preoccupation this time intense, and surely pardonable? In the natural sphere these are likely forms of preoccupation, but not necessarily either the only, or even the chief in the spiritual sphere, or those which kept the lawyers and Pharisees from accepting the teaching of Jesus. Their prepossessions were religious and theological.

Not only these three but all decline to come. In the natural sphere this is highly improbable and unexampled. Jesus as a parable artist, had to make improbable suppositions to exemplify the fact in the spiritual sphere, which in this instance was that the bulk of the Jewish people were indifferent to the Kingdom as He presented it. On the other hand, in the parables spoken in justification of His own conduct, the case put has the highest measure of probability. Vide, e.g., those in next chapter.

Vv. 21-24. The sequel.—Ver. 21. The servant has done his duty and returns to make his strange report.—ἀργοσθάλη, enraged; no wonder. ἐξέλθε ταχέως, go out quickly; no time to be lost, as all things are ready; but the thing chiefly to be noted is how the word answers to the master’s mood.—πλατείας καὶ ρώμας, broad streets and narrow lanes (Mt. vi. 2, q. v.): all sorts of people to be met with there and many of them: invitation to be broadcast, no one to be shunned however poor or unsightly: the poor, maimed, blind, and halt rather to be preferred, therefore expressly named—such is the master’s mood in his disgust at the behaviour of the well-to-do, propertied, happy classes—a violent but natural reaction.—Ver. 22. ἐν τῶν ἑαυτῶν ἔρει, yet there is room, places for more; many more, else the servant would hardly think it worth while to mention the fact, though he quite understands that the master wants the banqueting hall filled, were it only to show that he can do without those saucy recusants. Room after such a widespread miscellaneous invitation speaks to a feast on a grand scale, worthy emblem of the magnificence of Divine grace.—Ver. 23. ὅσον καὶ φρειμοῦ, “highways and hedges”; the main roads and the footpaths running between them, on the one side the broad streets and hedges (Hahn); these, in the country, answering to the streets and lanes in the town. The people to be found there are not necessarily lower down socially than those called within the city, perhaps not so low, but they are without, representing in the interpretation the Gentiles.—ἀνάγκασον, compel; reflects in the first place the urgent desire of the master to have an absolutely full house, in the second the feeling that pressure will be needed to overcome the incredulity of country people as to the invitation to them being meant seriously. They would be apt to laugh in the servant’s face.—ἐκ γεμιοῦ: the house must be full, no excuse to be taken; but for a curious reason.—Ver. 24. ἔτι οὖν, etc.: to keep out the
first invited in case they should change their minds. Of course this is spoken by the master, and is no comment of Jesus, though we read ψυχή where we expect σώς, the application to the hearers of the parable intruding itself at this one point. The reason of the master for wishing his house filled is not a high one. But the ethics of parables belong to this world. They must not be transferred into the spiritual sphere.

Vv. 25-35. *Concio ad populum.* Jesus now appears on the way, and followed by "many multitudes" (δύος πολλοί, ver. 25) to whom He speaks. Thus sayings which in Mt. and Mk. form part of disciple-instruction (διδάσκη) assume the character of popular preaching, as in the case of the Sermon on the Mount (in Lk.), though the subject is the conditions of discipleship.

Vv. 26-27. *The requirements of true discipleship* (Mt. x. 37-39).—Ver. 26. ἔρχεται πρός με, cometh to me, with a view to close and permanent discipleship.—ματι: a stronger word than that used in Mt., where it is a question of loving less; surprising in Lk., whose general habit is to confine sayings. But the logion is presented in different lights in the two Gospels. In Mt. it is a question of being a disciple *worthy* of the Master (δύος); in Lk. of being an *effective* disciple (οὐ δύναται). Love of friends makes discipleship difficult or impossible; on the other hand, hatred makes it easy. It is easy to be devoted to a master or cause when you hate all rival masters or interests. Therefore "hates" is the appropriate word here, but the practical meaning is *love less*, which in experience signifies: hating other objects of affection in so far as they present themselves as hindrances to the supreme love of the Master.—τὴν γυναῖκα, (not in Mt.); to be most "hated" just because most loved, and exercising the most entangling influence.—οὐ τε καὶ, and moreover. The τε (BL) binds all the particulars named into one bundle of *renunciation*.—ψυχή: life, oneself, most loved of all, therefore forming the climax, and also determining the sense of ματι. The disciple is to hate friends as he can hate himself—"secundum eam partem, secundum quam se ipsum odisse debet, a Christo aversam" (Bengel). This last item in the list of things to be hated represents the idea contained in Mt. x. 39.—Ver. 27 = Mt. x. 38, with the idea of ability substituted for the idea of worth.

Vv. 28-33. *Parables illustrating the need of counting the cost,* peculiar to Lk., but intrinsically probable as sayings of Jesus, and thoroughly germane to the foregoing discourse. The connection is: It is a serious thing to be a disciple, therefore consider well before you begin—the renunciations required, the cross to be borne—as you would, if wise, consider before building a tower or engaging in battle.—Ver. 28. *Μάρτυς*; the word parable, the participle, "if he wish"; with the article it would = who wishes.—πύργον, a tower; need not be magnified into a grand house with a tower. Doubtless, as Bengel remarks, Christianity is a great and arduous affair, and is fitly compared *cum rebus magnis et arduis.* But the greatness of the undertaking is sufficiently represented by the second parable: the first emblem may be allowed to be less ambitious and more within the reach of ordinary mortals. A tower of observation in a vineyard (Mt. xxv. 33) or for refuge in danger, or for ornament in a garden may be thought of.
the attitude appropriate to deliberate, leisurely consideration.—Διάφορος, the cost, here only in N.T.—εἰ δὲ ἔχεις ἑαυτόν, if he has what is necessary for (τὰ δύονα understood).—ἀναρτησμὸν is for completion, here only in N.T. and in Dion. Halic.; condemned by Phryn., p. 447. Cf. ξηραστησαμένος in 2 Tim. iii. 17.—Ver. 29. ἀναβαλλεῖν, to mock; an unfinished tower is specially ridiculous: height is essential.—οὕτως, etc., this man, contemptuously; "this" stands for a proper name. "Vulgo ponunt N. N.," Bengel. Jesus here appeals with characteristic tact to one of the most sensitive feelings of human nature—shrinkings from ridicule. Who would care to be spoken of all his days as the man who commenced a tower and could not finish it?

Vv. 31-33. The king going to fight. This is the affair of the few, a parable to be laid to heart by men aspiring to, or capable of, a grand career.—συμβαλλεῖν εἰς τάλαμον, to encounter in war (R.V.), or perhaps better "to fight a battle" (Field, Ot. Nor.). πάλαμον is so rendered in 1 Cor. xiv. 8, Rev. ix. 9, in A.V. (altered in R.V. into "war"). In Homer the idea of battle prevails, but in later writers that of war.—ἐν δέκα, in, with, in the position of one who has only 10,000 soldiers at command.—μετὰ ἔκαστον to beat 20,000 with 10,000 is possible, but it is an unlikely event: the chances are against the king with the smaller force, and the case manifestly calls for deliberation. The implied truth is that the disciple engages in a very unequal conflict. Cf. St. Paul, "we wrestle against principalities," etc., Eph. vi. 12. A reference in this parable to the relations between Herod Antipas (the "fox") and Aretas, his father-in-law, is possible (Holtzmann, H. C.).—Ver. 33 gives the application of the parable. Hofmann, Keil, and Hahn divide the sentence into two, putting a full stop after ἀνωτέρως and rendering: "So then every one of you! (do the same thing, i.e., consider). He who does not renounce all he hath is not able to be a disciple of mine." This is very effective; it may have been what Jesus actually said; but it is hardly how Lk. reports His words. Had he meant the sentence to be read so he would have put ψάλε after δὲ. He runs the two supposed sentences into one, and so the counsel
to deliberate is left out or latent in the requirement of renunciation, which is the reason for deliberation.

Vv. 34-35. The saying concerning salt (Mt. v. 13, Mk. ix. 50). This logion may have been repeatedly uttered by Jesus, but it does not seem to be so appropriate here as in its place in Mk. In this place the salt appears to denote disciples and the idea to be: genuine disciples are an excellent thing, valuable as salt to a corrupt world, but spurious disciples are as utterly worthless as salt which has lost its savour.—Ver. 35. οδε ος γην οδε ος ουκ εκπαινη, neither for land nor for dung (is it fit, εδειχθην as in ix. 62). The idea seems to be: the spurious disciple is not only false, earth, nor manure.—ουκ is emphatic = out they cast it, as worthless, good for nothing, mere refuse, a waste substance.

Chapter XV. Parables teaching the joy of finding things lost. Nothing is gained by insisting anxiously on historical connection here. The introduction of these beautiful parables of grace at this point is a matter of tact rather than of temporal sequence, so far as the conscious motive of the evangelist is concerned. They are brought in as a set-off to the severe discourse in the closing section of the previous chapter, in which Jesus seems to assume a repellant attitude towards those who desired to follow Him. Here, in happy contrast, He appears as One who graciously received the sinful, regardless of unfavourable comments. The parables of the Lost Sheep, the Lost Coin, and the Lost Son are here given as a self-defence of Jesus against Pharisaic faultfinding. Whether they were first spoken in that connection, or uttered in that connection alone, cannot be determined. So far as their main drift is concerned they might have been spoken to any audience; to critical Pharisees, to disciples (the first is given in Mt. xviii. 12-14 as spoken to the Twelve), to synagogue audiences, or to a gathering of publicans and sinners like that in Capernaum (Lk. v. 29-32); controversial, didactic, or evangelic, as the case might be. Quite possibly the original setting of these parables was a synagogue discourse, or better still the address to the Capernaum gathering. That they are all three authentic utterances of Jesus need not be doubted. The first has synoptical attestation, being found in Mt. also; the second has value only as a supplement to the first, and was hardly worth inventing as an independent parable; the third is too good to have been an invention by Lk. or any other person, and can only have proceeded from the great Master. Wendt (L. J.) accepts all three as authentic, and taken from the Logia of Mt.

Vv. 1, 2. Historic introduction.—των ευαγγελισμων: either in the act of approaching Jesus at a given time (Meyer), or were in the habit of doing so. The position of αυτω before ευαγγελισμων in NAB favours the latter (Schanz). On the other hand, it is not improbable that the reference is to the Capernaum gathering. We may have here, in fact, another version of that story taken from the Logia, the occasion slightly described, the words spoken carefully reported. In that case we may take των following somewhat strictly, and not as a mere exaggeration of the evangelist's. There were many at the feast. The aim was to have all the outcasts of the town present (side on Mt. ix. 9-13). True, they came to feast according to the other report, whereas here stress is laid on the hearing (δουλεψαν). The festive feature is referred to in the complaint of the Pharisees (verses 16, ver. 7). Of course there would be hearing as well as eating, and probably what the guests heard was just these same parables in slightly different form. In that case they served first as a gospel and then as an apologia.—Ver. 1. διηγηθησαν: the 2a conveys the idea of a general pervasive murmuring. This is probably not an instance illustrating Hermann's remark (ad Viger., p. 856) that this preposition in compound verbs often adds the notion of striving (διαπινειν, certe bibendo).—ος τε Φι: the τε (NBL) binds Pharisees and scribes together as one: as close a corporation as "publicans and sinners" (equivalent to "sinners" in their conception, αμαρτωλοις, ver. 2). Note the order:
Pharisees and scribes; usually the other way. Pharisees answers to sinners, scribes to publicans; the two extremes in character and calling: the holiest and unholiest; the most reputable and the most despicable occupations. And Jesus preferred the base group—\textit{προσέκρητε}, receives. admits to His presence; instead of repelling with involuntary loathing.—καλ\textit{ συνεθεία:} not only admits but \textit{also eats with them.} That was the main surprise and offence, and therefore just the thing done, because the thing which, while offending the Pharisees, would certainly gain the “sinners.” Jesus did what the reputedly good would not do, so winning their trust.

Vv. 3-7. \textit{The first parable} (cf. Mt. xviii. 12-14).—\textit{Ver. 3.} \textit{τὴν παραβολὴν, ταύτην:} the phrase covers the second parable (\textit{Lust Coin}) as well as the first. The two are regarded as virtually one, the second a duplicate with slight variations.—\textit{Ver. 4.} \textit{ἐν τῷ ὄμοιῳ, what man of you}. Even the Pharisees and scribes would so act in temporal affairs. Every human being knows the joy of finding things lost. The innocent lose the scent of simple universal truths.—\textit{καὶ κατὰ πᾶς:} a \textit{hundred} a considerable number, making \textit{one} by comparison insignificant. The owner, one would say, can afford to lose a single erring sheep. Yet not so judges the owner himself, \textit{any owner. Losing only one} (\textit{ἐν τῷ ὄμοιῳ}) he takes immediate steps to recover it.—\textit{ἐν τῷ ἐρήμῳ,} in the untilled, untenced pasture land; but of course not so as to run the risk of losing the whole flock; it is left under the care of an assistant, the master taking the more arduous task to himself.—\textit{ἐις αὐτῷ} indicates not only direction but aim: goeth after in order to find.

(Schanz: Kypke remarks that \textit{ἐις} with verbs of going or sending often indicates \textit{“scopum itionis”} and is usually prefixed to the thing sought. Similarly Priceaus.—\textit{ἐκαίνετε:} the search not perfunctory, but thorough; goes on till the lost one be found, if that be possible.—\textit{Ver. 5.} \textit{ἐπικυρίαν etc.,} he places the found one on his shoulders; not in affection merely or in the exuberance of his joy, but from necessity. He must carry the sheep. It cannot walk, can only \textit{"stand where it stands and lie where it lies"} (Koetsveld). This feature, probable in natural life, is true to the spiritual. Such was the condition of the mass of Jews in Christ’s time (Mt. ix. 36, cf. \textit{“when we were without strength,”} Rom. v. 6).—\textit{χαῖρες:} the carrying necessary, but not done with a grudge, rather gladly; not merely for love of the beast, but in joy that a thing lost has been \textit{found}, making the burden, in spite of the long way, light. He is a very poor shepherd that does not bear the sheep that stands still, unable to walk (vide Zech. xi. 16, margin).—\textit{Ver. 6.} \textit{σὺν γυναικὶ:} that she is not the formal invitation of neighbours to sympatheise, but the confident expectation that they will. That they do is taken for granted. Sympathy from neighbours and friends of the same occupation, fellow-shepherds, a matter of course in such a case. This trait hit the Pharisees, and may have been added to the original parable for their special benefit.—\textit{Ver. 7.} \textit{ἐν τῷ ὄμοιῳ, in heaven, that is, in the heart of God.} Heaven is a synonym for God in vv. 18 and 21.—\textit{ἡ = more than, as if ἡδονή had preceded, so often in N.T. and in Sept. = Hebrew הָג.} The comparison in the moral sphere is bold,
but the principle holds true there as in
the natural sphere, even if the ninety-nine
be truly righteous men needing no
repentance. It is rational to have
peculiar joy over a sinner repen-
ting, therefore God has it, therefore Christ
might have it. This saying is the third
great word of Christ's apology for loving
the sinful. For the other two vide on
Mt. ix. 9-13 and Lk. vii. 36-50.
Vv. 8-10. The second parable, a penda-
tant to the first, spoken possibly to the
Capernaum gathering to bring the ex-
perience of joy found in things lost home
to the poorest present. As spoken to
Pharisees it is intended to exemplify the
principle by a lost object as insigni-
ficant in value as a publican or a sinner
was in their esteem. A sheep, though
one of a hundred, was a comparatively
precious object. A drachma was a piece
of money of inconsiderable value, yet of
value to a poor woman who owned only
ten drachmas in all; its finding therefore
a source of keen joy to her.—Ver. 8.
κατέλαβα λαμπρότερον λαμπρότε�
reprove your cynicism and melt your hearts? Yet such things are happening among these publicans and sinners you despise, every day.

Vv. 11-13. The case put. ὁδὸς ὑλῶς: two sons of different dispositions here as in Mt. xxi. 28-31, but there is no further connection between the two parables. There is no reason for regarding Lk.'s parable as an allegorical expansion of Mt.'s Two Sons (Holtzmann in H. C.).— Ver. 12. ὁ νεώτερος, the younger, with a certain fitness made to play the foolish part. The position of an elder son presents more motives to steadiness—τὸ ἐνώπιόν μερός, the portion belonging to, the verb occurs in this sense in late authors (here only in N.T.). The portion of the younger when there were two sons would be one third, the right of the first-born being two portions (Deut. xxi. 17).—ἀνέβαλεν: the father compiles, not as bound, but he must do it in the parable that the story may go on.—βλέπων ὡς ἦν, as in Mk. xii. 44, Lk. viii. 43.— Ver. 13. μετ' ὁ πολλὰς ἡμέρας: to be joined to ἀπεθανόντων: he went away as soon as possible, when he had had time to realize his property, in haste to escape into wild liberty or licence.—παρὰ δὲν ὁ παπάς ἔδωκεν: the farther away the better.—ἀκούστων (a pr. and σώζω, here only in N.T.), insalvably; the process of reckless waste, free rein given to every passion, must go on till nothing is left. This is what undisciplined freedom comes to.

Vv. 14-19. The crisis: recklessness leads to misery and misery prompts reflection.—Ver. 14. λυπῶς, a famine, an accident fitting into the moral history of the prodigal; not a violent supposition; such correspondences between the physical and moral worlds do occur, and there is a Providence in them.—ἐν οἴκῳ: the most probable reading if only because λυπῶς is feminine only in Doric and late Greek usage.—ὑποτεθείη: the result of wastefulness and prevalent dearth combined is dire want. What is to be done? Return home? Not yet; that the last shift.—Ver. 15. ἐκκαλῆθη, he attached himself (pass. with mid. sense). The citizen of the far country did not well his name, it is no time for employing superfluous hands, but he suffered the wretch to have his way in good-natured pity.—βόσκειν χορὀν: the lowest occupation, a poor-paid pagan drudge; the position of the publicans glanced at.—Ver. 16. ἐκκαλίσκεις, etc., he was fain to fill his belly with the horn-shaped pods of the carob-tree. The point is that he was so poorly fed by his new master (who felt the pinch of hard times, and on whom he had small claim) that to get a good meal of anything, even swine's food, was a treat. yeōsai τ. κ., though realistic, is redeemed from vulgarity by the dire distress of the quondam voluptuary. Anything to fill the aching void within!—οὐδέποτε ἐδίδω, no one was giving him: this his experience from day to day and week...
to week. Giving what? Not the pods, as many think, those he would take without leave, but anything better. His master gave him little—famine rations, and no other kind soul made up for the lack. Neither food nor love abounded in that country. So there was nothing for it but to swine’s food or semi-starvation—or home!—Ver. 17. εἰς διανόησιν ἐλθὼν = either, realising the situation; or, coming to his true self, his sane mind (for the use of this phrase vide Kypke, Observ.). Perhaps both ideas are intended. He at last understood there was no hope for him there, and, reduced to despair, the human, the filial, the thought of home and loved ones. The expression—περισσυνωται = passive, with gen. of the thing; here only in N.T. are provided to exceed, have more given them than they can use.—Ver. 18. ἀναστάς = a bright hope gives energy to the starving man; home! Said, done, but the motive is not high. It is simply the last resource of a desperate man. He will go home and confess his fault, and so, he hopes, get at least a hireling’s fare. Well to be brought out of that land, under home influences, by any motive. It is in the right direction. Yet though bread is as yet the supreme consideration, for instants of true ethical repentance appear in the premeditated speech:—Πάεις: some sense of the claims that long-disused word implies—ἡμαρτων, I erred; perception that the whole past has been a mistake and folly—ἐλα τῶν ὀφεινδων, against heaven, God—κατεφύλασθαι, in thy sight, in thy judgment (Hahn)—he knows quite well what his father must think of his conduct; what a fool he must think him (Ps. lxxxii. 22)—οὐκέτι εἰμί, etc. (ver. 19), fully conscious that he has forfeited all filial claims. The omission of καλ suits the emotional mood.

Vv. 20-24. Return and reception.—ὁδεῖς, etc., he came to his father; no details about the journey, the fact simply stated, the interest now centring in the action of the father, exemplifying the joy of a parent in finding a lost son, which is carefully and expertly described in four graphic touches—ἐλθὼν: first recognition at a distance, impelling a habit of looking for the lost one (Göbel, Schanz, etc.), at least a vision sharpened by love—ἐπιλαμβανομένης: instantly pity awakened by the woful plight of the returning one manifest in feeble step, ragged raiment possibly also visible, ἀπευθυνα, running, in the excitement and impatience of love, regardless of Eastern dignity and the pace safe for advancing years—κατεφύλασθαι: kissing fervently and frequently the son folded in his arms (cf. Mt. xxvi. 45, Lk. vii. 38, 43). All signs these of a love ready to do anything to recover the lost, to search for him to the world’s end, if that had been sitting or likely to gain the end.—Ver. 21. The son repeats his premeditated speech, with or without the last clause; probably with it, as part of a well-conned lesson, repeated half mechanically, yet not inso-$

---

1 So in ΝDL, etc. (Tisch.). περισσυνωται in ABP i, 94 (W.H.).
2 After λυμ ΝBL have εἰς.
3 ο οιοι before αυτω in BL i, 131 al.
4 και omitted here also in ΝABDL, etc.
5 ΝBD add σωθεν με η εν των μισθων σου (W.H. brackets). Vide below.
6 ΝBLX prefix the expressive ταχυ (D ταχεω) and omit the before στολην.
here, three mata eis tois todois 23. kai envekantes 1 twn modxou tiv sutevtoin times. thevatai, kai fagontes ephravthmven 24. dite ouostos d' uidos mou necros he, kai anevson kai apollobos he, kai epherei. Kali hraxato ephraiosetha. 25. 'Hn x d' uidos autov d' proxebrerov ev agroph.

here only kai de erxhmenos eγγυσε τη οικη, ήκουσε 1 συμφωνιας kai 2 xerovn in N.T.

here only 26. kai proskalestemenos eva twn paidev anov, 8 eπυνθανον τι 4 etai taute. 27. d' he eipan autov. 'Oti d' abdelos sou hekei kai edusen d' otho sou tivn modxon tivn sutevton, d' uginontai autov analeven.

28. 'Aργισθη σε, kai oük xheleven eisalevov. d' ody, 

1 ferein in NBLRX more suitable to emotional speech.

2 For kai ep. rny NBL have rny ep. without kai

3 Omit avtov all uncial.

4 ti av in B al. (W.H.).

5 For o ouv NABDLRX 1, 33 al. have o de.

cerely—as if to say: I don't deserve this, I came expecting at most a hireling's treatment in food and otherwise, I should be ashamed to be anything higher.—Ver. 22. σουλοντα: their presence conceivable, the father's running and the meeting noticed and reported by some one, so soon drawing a crowd to the spot, or to meet the two on the way to the house. To them the father gives directions which are his response to the son's proposed self-degradation. He shall not be their fellow, they shall serve him by acts symbolic of reinstatement in sonship.—ταχο, quick! a most probable reading (NBL), and a most natural exclamation; obliterate the traces of a wretched past as soon as possible; off with these rags! fetch robes worthy of my son, dressed in his best as on a gala day.—πενεγαστη, bring from the house—στολὴν τ. πρωτην, the first robe, not in time, formerly worn (Theophyl.), but in quality; cf. the second chariots, Gen. xli. 43 (currus secundus, Bengel).—δακτυλιον (here only in N.T.): no epithet attached, golden, e.g. (Woff, golden ring for sons, iron ring for slaves); that it would be a ring of distinction goes without saying.—κραδαμα, shoes; needed—he is barefoot and footsore; and worn by sons, not by slaves. Robe, ring, shoes: all symbols of filial state.—Ver. 23. των μοδοχών των σιτευτων: always one fattening for high-tides; could not be used on a better occasion.—Ver. 24: reason for making this a festive day.

στος, etc.: the father formally calls him his son, partly by way of recognition, and partly to introduce him to the attendants in case they might not know him.—νεκωσ, dead, ethically? or as good as dead? the latter more probable in a speech to slaves.—απολλω, lost; his whereabouts unknown, one reason among others why there was no search, as in the case of the shepherd and the coin.

Vv. 25-32. The elder son, who plays the ignoble part of wet blanket on this glad day, and represents the Pharisees in their chilling attitude towards the mission in behalf of the publicans and sinners.—Ver. 25. 4 αγρό, on the farm; of course there every day, doing his duty, a most correct, exemplary man, only in his wisdom and virtue so cold and merciless towards men of another sort. Being at his work he is ignorant of what has happened: the arrival and what followed.

—ερχόμενος, coming home after the day's work is over, when the erriment is in full swing, with song and dance filling the air.—Ver. 26. τι 4 εις ταυτα, not contemptuous, "what all this was about" (Farrar, C. C. G. T.), but with the pullelair of a man in the dark and surprised = what does this mean?—Ver. 27. In simple language the servant briefly explains the situation, showing in his words neither sympathy nor, still less, the reverse, as Hofmann thinks.—ἐξακοινωνη, in good health: home again, and well, that is the whole case as he knows it; no thought in his mind of a tragic career culminating in repentance, or if he has any suspicion he keeps it to himself; thoroughly true to nature this.—Ver. 28. ἀργισθη he was angry, a very slight description of his state of mind into which various bad feelings would enter. disgust, chagrin that all this merit had been going on for hours and they had not thought it worth while to let him know—an impolitic oversight; a sense of wrong and general unfair treat-
ment of which this particular neglect was not a specimen.—ό δὲ πατήρ, etc.: the father goes out and presses him to come in, very properly; but why not send for him at once that he might stop working on the farm and join in the feasting and dancing on that glad day? Did they all fear he would spoil the sport and act accordingly? The elder son has got a chance to complain, and he makes the most of it in his bitter speech to his father.—Ver. 29. ἐριφον, a kid, not to speak of the fatted calf.—μετὰ τῶν φίλων μου: he would have been content if there had been any room made for the festive element in his life, with a modest meeting with his own friends, not to speak of a grand family demonstration like this. But no, there was nothing but work and drudgery for him.—Ver. 30. οὕτως: contemptuous, this precious son of yours.—μετὰ τῶν πορνῶν: hard, merciless judgment; they were all of them in the coarsest way. How did he know? He did not know; had no information, jumped at conclusions. That the manner of his kind, who shirk work and go away to enjoy themselves.—Vv. 31, 32. The father answers meekly, apologetically, as if conscious that the elder son had some right to complain, and content to justify himself for celebrating the younger son’s return with a feast; not a word of retaliation. This is natural in the story, and it also fits well into the aim of the parable, which is to illustrate the joy of finding the lost. It would serve no purpose in that connection to disparage the object of the lesser joy. There is peculiar joy over one sinner repenting even though the ninety-nine be truly righteous, and over a prodigal returned even though the elder brother be a most exemplary, blameless, dutiful son.

Chapter XVI. Two Additional Parables on the Right Use of Wealth. These two parables, the unjust steward and Dives, bear such a foreign aspect when compared with the general body of Christ’s teaching as to give rise to a doubt whether they have any claim to a place in an authentic record of His sayings. One at first wonders at finding them in such company, forming with the preceding three a group of five. Yet Luke had evidently no sense of their incongruity, for he passes from the three to the two as if they were of kindred import (λέγει δὲ καλί). Doubtless they appealed to His social bias by the sympathy they betray for the poor (cf. vi. 20, xi. 41), which has gained for them a place among the so-called Ebionitic sections of Luke’s Gospel (vide Holtzmann in H. C.). In favour of the authenticity of the first of the two parables is its apparently low ethical tone which has been such a stumbling-block to commentators. Who but Jesus would have had the courage to extract a lesson of wisdom from conduct like that of the unrighteous steward? The literary grace of the second claims for it the same origin and author.

Vv. 1-7. The parable of the unjust steward.—Ver. 1. λέγει δὲ καλί: the same formula of transition as in xiv. 12. The καλ means not with
1 "ΕΛΕΓΕ δὲ καὶ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ, ἢς άνθρωπὸς τις ἐν πλούσιος, δεῖ αὐξεῖν οἰκονόμῳ καὶ οὗτος διεβλήθη αὐτῷ ὡς διασκορπίσαι τὰ ἑρμήνια αὐτοῦ. 2. καὶ φωνὴς αὐτῶν εἶχεν αὐτῷ, Τί τούτο ἐκ τῆς περὶ σοῦ; ἀπὸ δὲ τὸν λόγον τῆς οἰκονομίας σου· οὐ δὲ γὰρ δυνηθή ἢ ἐπὶ οἰκονομίας. 3. Εἶπε δὲ ἐν εὐαγγ. ὁ οἰκονόμως, Τί ποιήσας, ὅτι ὁ κύριος μου ἀπεστάλη τὴν οἰκονομίαν ἐπὶ τὸν οἰκονόμον σου; σκάπτων οὐκ ἴσως, ἐποίησαν αὐτοῖς ἀξίων. 4. ἐφευρέτην τί ποιήσας, ἢ ὧν, ὅταν μεταστάθη τῆς οἰκονομίας, βέβαιον; μὲ εἰς τοὺς οἰκονομοὺς αὐτῶν. 5. Καὶ προκαλεσάμενος ἐν ἐκαστῷ τῶν χρεωφέλετῶν τοῦ κυρίου εὐαγγ. ἔλεγε τῷ πρώτῳ, ἴσον ὧν ἐφείλετο τῷ πρώτῳ. 6. ἔλεγεν δὲ τῷ πρώτῳ, ἴσον ὧν ἐφείλετο τῷ πρώτῳ.

1 Omit αὐτὸν ὥστοι. 2 So in L and many others; ὥστοι ἐχεθ' in BDPR. 3 NBD 1, 69 al. have ἔκαστος after μεταστάθη. 4 εὐαγγ. in ὥστοι. 5 αὐτὸν in DL.
1. The steward’s master acquainted with his new misconduct. The steward in his final statement, of course, put as fair a face as possible on matters, presenting what looked like a true account, so as to make it appear he was being unjustly dismissed, or even to induce the master to cancel his purpose to dismiss. And those who had got the benefit of his sharp practice were not likely to tell upon him. The master therefore may be supposed to be in the dark; it is the speaker of the parable who is in the secret. He praises the steward of iniquity, not for his iniquity (so Schleiermacher), but for his prudence in spite of iniquity. His unrighteousness is not glossed over, on the contrary it is strongly asserted: hence the phrase τον ο. της δικαιας, which is stronger than τ. ο. των δικαιων. Yet however bad he still acted wisely for himself in providing friends against the evil day. What follows—διηκολολοι, etc.—applies the moral to the disciples = go ye and do likewise, with an implied hint that in this respect they are apt to come short. The counsel would be immoral if in the spiritual sphere it were impossible to imitate the steward’s prudence while keeping clear of his iniquity. In other words, it must be possible to make friends against the evil day by unobjectionable actions. The mere fact that the lesson of prudence is drawn from the life of an unprincipled man is no difficulty to any one who understands the nature of parabolic instruction. The comparison between men of the world and the “sons of light” explains and apologises for the procedure. If you want to know what prudent attention to self-interest means it is to men of the world you must look. Of course they show their wisdom so more, in relation to men of their own kind, and in reference to worldly matters

1 For καὶ ΝΑΒΛΡ al. have ὁ δι.
2 τα χρεματα in ΝΑΒΔΛΡ 1 (Tisch., W.H.).
3 Omit καὶ ΒΛΡ 13, 69 al. (Tisch., W.H.).
4 Again τα χρεματα in ΝΑΒΔΛΡ.
Show ye your wisdom in your way and in reference to your peculiar generation (ἐς τ. γενέαν, etc., applicable to both parties) with equal zeal.

Ver. 9. ἀγαθόν: the use of the emphatic pronoun seems to involve that here begins the comment of Jesus on the parable, ver. 8 being spoken by the master and a part of the parable. But J. Weiss (in Meyer) views this verse as a second application put into the mouth of Jesus, but not spoken by Him, having for its author the compiler from whom Lk. borrowed (Feine’s Vork. Lukas). He finds in vv. 8-13 three distinct applications, one by Jesus, ver. 8; one by the compiler of precanonical Lk., ver. 9; and one by Lk. himself, vv. 10-13. This analysis is plausible, and tempting as superseding the difficult problem of finding a connection between these sentences, viewed as the utterance of one Speaker, the Author of the parable. Ver. 9 explicitly states what the compiler had suggested, that the prudence is to be shown in the way of making friends.—φίλους: the friends are not named, but the next parable throws light on that point. They are the poor, the Lazaruses whom Dives did not make friends of—to his loss. The counsel is to use wealth in doing kindness to the poor, and the implied doctrine that doing so will be to our eternal benefit. Both counsel and doctrine are held to apply even when wealth has been ill-gotten. Friends of value for the eternal world can be gained even by the mammon of unrighteousness. The more ill-gotten the more need to be redeemed by beneficent use; only care must be taken not to continue to get money by unrighteousness in order to have where-with to do charitable deeds, a not uncommon form of counterfeit philanthropy, which will not count in the Kingdom of Heaven. The name for wealth here is very repulsive, seeming almost to imply that wealth per se is evil, though that Jesus did not teach.—ἀγαθόν, when it (wealth) fails, as it must at death. The other reading, ἐκλήση (T.R.), means “when ye die,” so used in Gen. xxv. 8.—ἀγαθῖνος σημαίνει, eternal tents, a poetic paradox = Paradise, the poor ye treated kindly there to welcome you! Believing it to be impossible that Jesus could give advice practically suggesting the doing of evil that good might come, Bornemann conjectures that an ὅς has fallen out before ποιήσατε (fut.), giving as the real counsel: do not make, etc.

Vv. 10-13. These verses contain not so much an explanation of the parable as correction of the parable. They may have been added by Lk. (so J. Weiss in Meyer, and Holtzmann, H. C.) to prevent misunderstanding, offence, or abuse, so serving the same purpose as the addition “unto repentance” to the saying, “I came not to call,” etc. (v. 32); another instance of editorial solicitude on the part of an evangelist ever careful to guard the character and teaching of Jesus against misunderstanding. So viewed, their drift is: “the steward was dishonest in money matters; do not infer that it does not matter whether you
be honest or not in that sphere. It is very necessary to be faithful even there. For faithful in little faithful in much, unfaithful in little unfaithful in much. He who is untrustworthy in connection with worldly goods is unworthy of being entrusted with the true riches; the unjust administrator of another's property will not deserve confidence as an administrator even of his own. In the parable the steward tried to serve two masters, his lord and his lord's creditors, and by so doing promoted his own interest. But the thing cannot be done, as even his case shows." This corrective, if not spoken by Jesus, is not contrary to His teaching. (Ver. 10 echoes Mt. xxv. 21, Lk. xix. 17; ver. 13 reproduces verbally the *logion* in Mt. vi. 24.) Yet as it stands here it waters down the parable, and weakens the point of its teaching. Note the epithets applied to money: the *little* or least, the *unjust*, and, by implication, the *fleeting, that which belongs to another*. Spiritual riches are the "much," the "true"... in the Johannine sense = the ideal as opposed to the vulgar shadowy reality, "our own"... Vv. 14-18 form a "somewhat heavily built bridge" (H. C.) between the two parables, which set forth the right and the wrong use of riches.—Ver. 14. *φιλάργυρου*: an interesting and very credible bit of information concerning the Pharisees (2 Tim. iii. 2).—*ξύμεικτον* (καὶ μείκτηρ, the nose), turned up the nose at, in contempt, again in xxv. 6.—Ver. 15. *εὐκοπεῖν* κ. k. c.: cf. the statements in Sermon on Mount (Mt. vi.) and in Mt. xxiii. 5.—Ver., etc.: a strong statement, but broadly true; conventional moral judgments are very often the reverse of the real truth: the conventionally high, estimable, really the low; the conventionally base the truly noble.—Ver. 16 = Mt. xi. 12 and 13, inverted, introduced here in view of ver. 31.—Ver. 17 = Mt. v. 18, substantially. Ver. 18 = Mt. v. 32. Its bearing here is very obscure, and its introduction in a connection to which it does not seem to belong is chiefly interesting as vouching for the genuineness of the *logion*. J. Weiss suggests that its relevancy and point would have been more apparent had it come in after ver. 13. On the critical question raised by this verse, vides J. Weiss in Meyer.

Vv. 19-31. Parable of the rich man and Lazarus. This story is hardly a parable in the sense of illustrating by an incident from natural life a truth in the spiritual sphere. Both story and moral belong to the same sphere. What is the moral? If Jesus spoke, or the evangelist reported, this story as the complement of the parable of the unfaithful servant, then for Speaker or reporter the moral is: see what comes of neglecting to make friends of the poor by a beneficent use of wealth. Looking to the end of this second "parable," ver. 31, and connecting that with ver. 17, we get as the lesson: the law and the prophets a sufficient guide to a godly life. Taking the first part of the story as the main thing (vv. 19-26), and connecting it with the reflection in ver. 15 about that which is lofty among men, the resulting aim will be to exemplify by an impressive imaginary example the reversal of positions in this and the next world: the happy here the damned there, and vice versa. In that case the parable simply pictorially sets forth the fact of reversal, not its ground. If with
some (Weizsäcker, Holtzmann, Feine, J. Weiss) we cut the story into two, an original part spoken by Jesus and an addition by a later hand, it will have two morals, the one just indicated, and another connecting eternal perdition with the neglect of the law and prophets by a worldly unbelieving Judaism, and eternal salvation with the pious observance of the law by the poor members of the Jewish-Christian Church. On this view vide J. Weiss in Meyer.

Ver. 19. ἄνθρωπος δέ, etc.: either there was a certain rich man, or a certain man was rich, or there was a certain man—rich, this the first fact about him. —καὶ introduces the second, instead of δὲ, after the Hebrew manner.—πορφύρα καὶ δόξον: his clothing of the costliest: “purple without, Egyptian byssus underneath” (Farrar in C. G. T.).—λαμπρός (from λάμπω), splendidly, characterising his style of living; life a daily feast; here only in N.T.—Ver. 20. Ἀδάμπος gives the impression of a story from real life, whereas the poor man is introduced for convenience in telling the tale. He has to be referred to in the sequel (ver. 24). No symbolic meaning should be attached to the name.—πρὸς τὸν πυλόν αὐτοῦ: Lazarus is brought into relation with the rich man. This favours the view that the moral is the folly of neglecting beneficence. If the story were meant to illustrate merely the reversals of lot, why not describe Lazarus' situation in this world without reference to the rich man? Is he placed at his door simply that he may know him in the next world? —ἄλκατέρα: covered with ulcers, therefore needing to be carried to the rich man's gate; supposed to be a leper, hence the words lazaretto, lazar, etc.—Ver. 21. ἄνθρωπον, desiring, perhaps not intended to suggest that his desire was not gratified. Suppose morsels did come to him from the rich man's table, not meant for him specially, but for the hungry without, including the wild street dogs, would that exhaust the duty of Dives to his poor brother? But the trait is introduced to depict the poor man's extreme misery rather than the rich man's sin.—καὶ: no ellipse implied such as that supplied by the Vulgate: et nemo illi dabit. Bornemann supplies: “not only was he filled with the crumbs,” etc., but also, etc. (οὐ μόνον ἐξορτάσθη ἀπὸ τῶν ψυχῶν—πλουσίων, ἀλλὰ, etc.).—ἀλλὰ simply introduces a new feature, and heightens the picture of misery (so Schanz) = he was dependent on casual scraps for his food, and moreover, etc.—ἐπέλειψον, licked (here only in N.T.); was this an aggravation or a mitigation? Opinion is much divided. Or is the point that dogs were his companions, now licking his sores (for the poor man), now scrambling with him for the morsels thrown out? The scramble was as much a fact as the licking. Furrer speaks of witnessing dogs and lepers waiting together for the refuse (Wanderungen, p. 40).—Ver. 22. The end comes to the two men.—ἀπεθανεῖται: the poor man dies, and is carried by angels into the bosom of Abraham; the man, body and soul (so Meyer), but of course this is poetry. What really happened to the carcasse is passed over in delicate reserve.—ἔγαρ: of course Dives was buried with all due pomp, his funeral worth mentioning. (“It is not said that the poor man was buried because of the meanness of poor men's burial, but it is
said expressly of the rich man, διὰ τὸ πολυτέλεια τῆς τῶν πλούσιων τοιχῆς. (Euthy. Zig.)

Vv. 23-26. In the other world.—Ἐν τῷ εἶδ.: from the O.T. point of view Hades means simply the state of the dead. Thus both the dead men would be in Hades. But here Hades seems hell, the place of torment, and of course Lazarus is not there, but in Paradise.—καθαρά: Paradise dimly visible, yet within speaking distance; this is not dogmatic teaching but popular description; so throughout.—ἐν τοῖς καλύτεροι: plural here (cf. ver. 22); so often in classics.—Ver. 24. Πάτερ Ἄτο: the rich man, like Lazarus, is a Jew, and probably, as a son of Abraham, very much surprised that he should find himself in such a place (Mt. iii. 8, 9), and still hoping that the patriarch can do something for him.—καθαρίσθητι (καθαρίσατε, here only in N.T.): surely that small service will not be refused! If the flames cannot be put out, may the pain they cause not be mitigated by a cooling drop of water on the tip of the tongue?—a pathetic request.—Ver. 25. τέκνον: answering to Πάτερ, introducing in a kindly paternal tone a speech holding out no hope, all the less that it is so softly and quietly spoken.—τὰ διάβασμα σου, τὰ κακά: you got your good things—what you desired, and thought you had a right to—Lazarus got the ills, not what he desired or deserved, but the ills to be met with on earth, of which he had a very full share (no αὐτός after κακά).—νῦν δὲ, but now, the now of time and of logic: the reversal of lot in the state after death a hard fact, and equitable. The ultimate ground of the reversal, character, is not referred to; it is a mere question of fairness or poetic justice.—Ver. 26. The additional reason in this verse is supplementary to the first, as if to buttress its weakness. For the tormented man might reply: surely it is pressing the principle of equity too far to refuse me the petty comfort I ask. Will cooling my tongue increase beyond what is equitable the sum of my good things? Abraham’s reply to this anticipated objection is in effect: we might not grudge you this small solace if it were in our power to bring it to you, but unfortunately that is impossible.—ἐν (ἐν, T.R.) τῶι τοὺσ, in all those regions: the cleft runs from end to end, too wide to be crossed; you cannot outflank it and go round from Paradise to the place of torment. With ἐν the phrase means, “in addition to what I have said”—χάσμα μέγα, a cleft or ravine (here only in N.T.), vast in depth, breadth, and length; an effectual barrier to intercommunication. The Rabbis conceived of the two divisions of Hades as separated only by a wall, a palm breadth or a finger breadth (vide Weber, Lehre des Talmud, p. 326 f.).—διάτεκνοι implies that the cleft is there for the purpose of preventing transit either way; location fixed and final.
ΚΑΤΑ ΛΟΥΚΑΝ
XVI. 27—31.

ἐκεῖθεν πρὸς ἡμᾶς διατερῶν. 27. Εἶπε δὲ, Ἐρέτα ὦν σε, πάτερ, ἵνα πέμψῃ αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ πατρὸς μου. 28. ἦκε γὰρ πόντα ἀδέλφους ὅπως διαμαρτύρηται αὐτοῖς, ἵνα μὴ καὶ αὐτοὶ ἠλθόντες εἰς τὸν τόπον τούτον τῆς βασιλείας. 29. λέγει αὐτῷ Ἄβραμ, Ἐχοῦσα ἰωάννη καὶ τῶν προφητῶν· ἄκουσάωντες αὐτῶν. 30. Οἱ δὲ εἶπαν, Ὠχί, πάτερ Ἄβραμ· ἀλλὰ ἐὰν τὰς ἄνω νεκρῶν παρευθέντες πρὸς αὐτούς, μετανοήσωμεν. 31. Εἶπε δὲ αὐτῷ, Εἰ ἰωάννη καὶ τῶν προφητῶν οὐκ ἀκοοῦσιν, ὡδὲ, ἐὰν τὰς ἄνω νεκρῶν μετανοήσωσιν, πεσθήσονται.

1 For ὁμιλ. (εἰ...) Tisch.) ABD 69 al. have σε σου (W.H.).
2 Many authorities (ABDL, etc.) add de after λέγει, and NBL omit αὐτῷ. D has εἶπαν.

Vv. 27—31. Dives intercedes for his brethren.—Ver. 27. ἄν ὃν ὁ θεός δέχῃ καὶ σῶσαι τὸν ἁρπαγόν—πάτερ, the father of the Hebrews. Possibility of transit from Paradise to earth is assumed. That this is desired reveals humane feeling. No attempt to show that Dives is utterly bad. Is such a man a proper subject for final damnation?—Ver. 28. ἀδέλφοι, brothers, in the literal sense. Why force on it an allegorical sense by finding in it a reference to the Pharisees or to the Jewish people, brethren in the sense of fellow-countrymen? Five is a random number, true to natural probability; a large enough family to make interest in their eternal well-being on the part of a deceased member very intelligible. ἀνεψιστήμηται, urgently testify to, telling them how it looks beyond, how it fares with their brother, with the solemn impressiveness of one who has seen.—Ver. 29. Ἰωάννη, etc.: cf. xviii. 20, where Jesus refers the ruler to the commandments of Moses, or the law, and the prophets = the O.T., the appointed, regular means of grace.—Ver. 30. ὡχὶ, a decided negative = nay! that is not enough; so he knew from his own experience; the Scriptures very good doubtless, but men are accustomed to them.—ἐκατὰ νεκρῶν: something unusual, the preaching of a dead man returned to life, that might do.—Ver. 31. εἶπε δὲ: Abraham does not plead impossibility as in reference to the first request; he simply declares his unbelief in the utility of the plan for converting the five. The denizens of Paradise set little value on the unusual as a means of grace. Abraham does not say that a short-lived sensation could not be produced; he does say that they would not be persuaded (πεσθήσονται), i.e., to repent (Hahn). By taking πεσθήσονται as meaning something less than μετανοήσονται, and emphasising the difference between ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάσεως and ἐκ νεκρῶν παρευθέντων (ver. 30), Trench (Notes on the Parables) makes this point: "A far mightier miracle than you demand would be ineffectual for producing a far lighter effect." It is doubtful if the contrast be legitimate in either case: certainly not as between "repent" and "be persuaded". In the other case there may be the difference between an apparition and a resurrected man. It may be noted that the resurrection of Christ and of Christians is spoken of as ἐκ νεκρῶν (vide Lk. xx. 35), while the general resurrection is ἡ ἀνάστασις τῶν νεκρῶν (e.g., 1 Cor. xv. 42).

CHAPTER XVII. A COLLECTION OF SAYINGS, INCLUDING THE PARABLE OF EXTRACT SERVICE. This chapter gives the impression of being a group of fragments with little connection in place, contents, or topic, and nothing is gained for exegesis by ingenious attempts at logical or topical concatenation. If we view the group of parables in chaps. xv., xvi. as a mass which has grown around the parable of the Lost Sheep as its nucleus, and reflect that that parable with the sayings in xvii. 1—4 is found in Mt. xviii., we may with some measure of confidence draw the inference that the discourse on humility at Capernaum was the original locus of at least these elements of Luke's narrative. That they are mixed up with so much matter foreign to Mt.'s record speaks to extensive transformation of the tradition of our Lord's words by the time it reached Lk.'s hands (vide Weizsäcker, Untersuchungen, p. 177).
XVII. 1. Eipe de pros tois mathetais, "Anoiketon dioti tou mη
dilein taka khala 2. odis de 3. de to erchetai. 2. luostelai aytou,
ei moulos oikides 4. periketai peri tou trachei ointou, kai eripptai
eis tin thelassan, h iha skaphalioi ena twn mikroin touton. 3.
proesxete aiwtois, en de amartei eis se 5. o adelphos sou,
eptiymenon aytou 4. kai en metanofsi, afves aytou, kai en
entakis tis enmeras amartei 7 eis se, kai entakis tis enmeras
epistrophi epi se 9. logon, Metanov, afhseis aytou."
5. Kai eisoi oi apoptoloi tη Kuris, "Prōsebhes hmin πistov."

1 ΝABDL al. verss. add auton.
2 For µη eis se (conformed to Mt.) ΝBLX c have ta se. µη elab. tou is
omitted in minusc.
3 Omit de ΝABDL al.
4 For µu. oikides, the true reading in Mt. and Mk., read λaθos µulikes with ΝABDL
5 των µeirop. touton se in ΝBL (Tisch., W.H.).
6 ean amartei without se and eis se in ΝBL (Tisch., W.H.). DX 33 omit se,
and A 1, 42, 131, etc., omit eis se.
8 Omit tis enmeras in ΝABDL al.
9 proes se in ΝABDL al. se chiefly in minusc.

Vv. 1-4. Concerning offences and forgiving of offences (cf. Mt. xviii. 6, 7; 21, 22).—Anoiketon: here only in N.T. and hardly found in classics; with dioti = oikides (xiii. 33), it is not possible.—
tou mη dilein: the infinitive with the genitive article may depend on anoiketon viewed as a substantive = an impossibility of offences not coming exists (Meyer, J. Weiss), or it may be the subject to dioti, aiwto, being the predicate that offences should not come is impossible (Schanz; Burton, M. and T., inclines to the same view, vide § 409).—Ver. 2. λuostelai (Now, vloso), it profits or pays; here only in N.T. = συµfureis in Mt. xviii. 6.—λaθos µulikes, a millstone, not a great millstone, one driven by an ass (μoulos oikides, T.R.), as in Mt.; the vehement emphasis of Christ's words is toned down in Lk. here as often elsewhere. The realistic expression of Mt. is doubtless truer to the actual utterance of Jesus, who would speak of the offences created by ambition with passionate abhorrence.—πeriketai = perf. pass. of περιτυμηση in sense = has been placed; with eripptai, another perfect, suggesting the idea of an action already complete—the miscreant with a stone round his neck thrown into the sea.—eis tin thelassa—

Vv. 1-4. Concerning offences and forgiving of offences (cf. Mt. xviii. 6, 7; 21, 22).—Anoiketon: here only in N.T. and hardly found in classics; with dioti = oikides (xiii. 33), it is not possible.—
tou mη dilein: the infinitive with the genitive article may depend on anoiketon viewed as a substantive = an impossibility of offences not coming exists (Meyer, J. Weiss), or it may be the subject to dioti, aiwto, being the predicate that offences should not come is impossible (Schanz; Burton, M. and T., inclines to the same view, vide § 409).—Ver. 2. λuostelai (Now, vloso), it profits or pays; here only in N.T. = συµfureis in Mt. xviii. 6.—λaθos µulikes, a millstone, not a great millstone, one driven by an ass (μoulos oikides, T.R.), as in Mt.; the vehement emphasis of Christ's words is toned down in Lk. here as often elsewhere. The realistic expression of Mt. is doubtless truer to the actual utterance of Jesus, who would speak of the offences created by ambition with passionate abhorrence.—πeriketai = perf. pass. of περιτυμηση in sense = has been placed; with eripptai, another perfect, suggesting the idea of an action already complete—the miscreant with a stone round his neck thrown into the sea.—eis tin thelassa—

The power of faith (cf. Mt. xvii. 20).—oì apostoloi instead of mathetai. Ver. 1. την κυρια: these titles for Jesus and the Twelve betray a narrative having no connection with what goes before and secondary in its character.—προσβες hmin πιστον, add faith to us. This sounds more like a stereotyped petition in church prayers than a request actually made by the Twelve. How much more life-like the occasion for the utterance supplied by Mt.: "Why could not we cast him out?"—Ver. 6. el ἔχει.
KATA LOUKAN

6. Elia 32 3 Kúropo, "El ἔχετε πίστιν, δε κόκκον συνάπεσιν, ἄλεγεται ἐν τῇ συκαμίνῃ ταύτῃ, ἐκρυβόηθη, καὶ φυσεθήτη ἐν τῇ βαλάνῳ· καὶ ἐπικοῦσαν ἐν ὑμῖν. 7. Τῇ 32 ἐν ὑμῖν δούλῳ ἔχων

I. Cor. ix. 6 ὅποια ἤτα θαυμάζοντα, δε ἐνσεθήκετε ἐκ τοῦ ἀγγείου ἐξεῖ, ἐξεῖ ἐν τῇ καθισμῇ τοῦ Κοκκόπου τούτου, καὶ ἐπικοῦσαν σου ἔλαβεν. 8. Ἑβδομάδαν ἐν τῇ καθισμῇ τοῦ Κοκκόπου τούτου, καὶ ἐπικοῦσαν σου ἔλαβεν. 9. Μὴ χάριν ἔχει τῇ δούλῳ ἐκείνῃ, ὅτι ὤποις τὰ διαταξόμενα αὐτὸς ὦ δοκεῖ. 10. οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς, ὅταν πονηρεῖτε ἄνα τὰ διαταξόμενα ὑμῖν, λέγετε, ὦ δούλῳ ἐκείνῳ ἄρει, καὶ ὅτι ἐφειλομένοι ποιήσατε πεποίηκατε.

II. ΚΑΙ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ παρεδοθείναι αὐτῶν εἰς Ἀρωσαλῆμ, καὶ

2. ΝΒΔΛΔΧ al. verss. add ἀναφορά.
4. Εἰς Εἰς W.H.
5. ΝΒΔΛΧ al. omit o ὑπὸ W.H.
6. ΝΒΔΛΧ 1, 32, 118, 131 al. verss. omit τον Tisch.
7. ΝΒΔΛΧ al. verss. οὗτος Tisch., Trg., text, R.V., W.H.

ἐκ with pres. in protasis, the imperf. in apodosis with ἀν. Possession of faith already sufficient to work miracles is here admitted. In Mt. the emphasis lies on the want of such faith. Another instance of Lk.'s desire to spare the Twelve.— συκαμίνῃ, here only in N.T. = συκο- μορφή, xii. 4, the fig mulberry tree (vide there). A tree here, a mountain in Mt.; and the miraculous feat is not rooting it out of the earth but replanting it in the sea — a natural impossibility. Fructose cites a classic parallel: τὸ σὺλλαγος πρὸτερον οὖσα ἐκεῖνον.

Vv. 7-10. The parable of extra service, in Luke only. For this name and the view of the parable implied in it see my Parabolic Teaching of Christ. It is there placed among the theotactic parables as teaching a truth about the Kingdom of God, viz., that it makes exacting demands on its servants which can only be met by a heroic temper. "Christ's purpose is not to teach in what spirit God deals with His servants, but to teach rather in what spirit we should serve God."—Ver. 7. οἴκους: to be connected not with ἐδοθήναι but with παρεδόθην. οὐ = he does not say: Go at once and get your supper.—Ver. 8. ἀλλ' ὥστε: ἀο VOC impl. the negation of the previous supposition.—ὡς φάγων, etc., "till I have eaten," etc., A.V.; or, "while I eat and drink."—Ver. 9. μὴ ἔχει χάριν, he does not thank him, does he? the service taken as a matter of course, all in the day's work.—Ver. 10. ὡς, so, in the Kingdom of God: extremes meet. The service of the Kingdom is as unlike that of a slave to his owner as possible in spirit; but it is like in the heavy demands it makes, which we have to take as a matter of course.—διαταχόμενα, commanded. In point of fact it is not commands but demands we have to deal with, arising out of special emergencies. — δοῦλος ἄρει: the words express the truth in terms of the parabolic representation which treats of a slave and his owner. But the idea is: the hardest demands of the Kingdom are to be met in a spirit of patience and humility, a thing possible only for men who are as remote as possible from a slavish spirit: heroic, generous, working in the spirit of free self-devotion. Such men are not unprofitable servants in God's sight; rather He accounts them "good and faithful," Mt. xxv. 21. Syr. Sin. reads simply "we are servants".

Vv. 11-19. The ten lepers.—Ver. 11. ἐκ τοῦ: the note of time seems to take us back to ix. 51. No possibility of introducing historic sequence into the section of Lk. lying between ix. 51 and xviii. 15.—ἀετός. He without emphasis; not He, as opposed to other pilgrims taking another route, directly through Samaria (so Meyer and Godet).—βία μετοργ. = βία μετοργ. (T.R.), μετοργ. being used adverbially as in Philip. ii. 15 = through between the two provinces
named, on the confines of both, which explains the mixture of Jews and Samaritans in the crowd of lepers.—Ver. 12. ἐκεῖ λεπροί: *ein, a large number, the disease common. Rosemüller (das A. and N. Morgenland) cites from Dampier a similar experience: lepers begging alms from voyagers on the river Camboga, when they approached their village, crying to them from afar. They could not heal them, but they gave them a little rice.—Ver. 13. ἡρεμία: this word is peculiar to Lk., which suggests editorial revision of the story.—ἀλέννοιν: a very indefinite request compared with that of the leper in v. 12 f., whose remarkable words are given in identical terms by all the synoptists. The interest was not so great as ἡρεμία: the same direction as in the first leper narrative, but without reason annexed.—λεπροί: plural, either to the priests of their respective nationalities (Kuinoel, J. Weiss, etc.) or to the priests of the respective districts to which they belonged (Hahn).—ἐν τῷ ἑπεμένει, etc., on the way to the priests they were healed. Did they show themselves to the priests? That does not appear. The story is defective at this point ("negligently told," Schleiermacher), either because the narrator did not know or because he took no interest in that aspect of the case. The priests might not be far off.—Ver. 15. δοξάζων τ. Θ.: general statement, exact words not known, so also in report of thanksgiving to Jesus.—Ver. 16. Ἑαμαρείτης: this, with the comment of Jesus, the point of interest for Lk.—Ver. 17. ἐχθρία (ἐχθρία), T.R.): asking a question and implying an affirmative answer. Yet the fact of asking the question implies a certain measure of doubt. No direct information as to what happened had reached Jesus presumably, and He naturally desires explanation of the non-appearance of all but one. Were not all the ten (οἱ δέκα, now a familiar number) healed, that you come back alone?—ποῦ: emphatic position: the nine—where expressing the suspicion that not lack of healing but lack of gratitude was the matter with the nine.—Ver. 18. οὐκ εὐθείας, etc., best taken as another question (so R.V.).—ἀλλογενής, here only in N.T. and in Sept. = ἀλλόφυλος and ἀλλοθνής in classics, an alien. Once more the Jew suffers by comparison with those without in respect of genuine religious feeling—faith, gratitude. It is not indeed said that all the rest were Jews. What is certain is that the one man who came back was not a Jew.—Ver. 19. ἄναστάς πορεύοντο: that might be all that Jesus said (so in B), as it was the man’s gratitude, natural feeling of thankfulness, not his faith, that was in evidence. But Lk., feeling that
20. Ἐπερωτήθησις δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν φαρισαίων, πότε ἐρχεται η ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἔδειξεν, "Οὐκ ἐρχεται η ἐκκλησία τοῦ εἰκότως Θεοῦ μετά τοῦ παρατηρήσεως· 21. οὐδὲ ἔρχονται, ιδοὺ οὗτος, η, ιδοὺ ἐν N.T.

Β. Ἐπει δὲ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς, "(LogLevel τῇ μέρᾳ σα, διὰ ἐπιθυμήσετε μιᾶν

1 The second ιδοὺ in D and many other texts is omitted in BBL 157.

it was an abrupt conclusion, might add ἵνα τίσιν σ. σ. σ. to round off the sentence, which may therefore be the true reading.

Vv. 20-37. Concerning the coming of the Kingdom and the advent of the Son of Man. In this section the words of Jesus are distributed between Pharisees and disciples, possibly according to the evangelist's impression as to the audience they suited. Weissenbach (Wieder- kunfgedanken Jesu, p. 217) suggests that the words in vv. 20, 21 were originally addressed to disciples who did not yet fully understand the inward spiritual character of the Kingdom of God. I am inclined to attach some weight to this suggestion. I am sure at any rate that it is not helpful to a true understanding of Christ's sayings to lay much stress on Lk.'s historical introductions to them.

Vv. 20, 21. μετὰ παρατηρήσεως: there is considerable diversity of opinion in the interpretation of this important expression. The prevailing view is that Jesus meant thereby to deny a coming that could be observed with the eye ("not with observation"). The older interpretation "not with pomp" (μετὰ παρατηρήσεως ἄνθρωπίας) is the gloss of Euthy. Zig.) is closely related to this view, because such pomp alone would make the kingdom visible to the vulgar eye. J. Weiss (Meyer) contends that it is not visibility but predictability that is negated. Παρατηρήσεως, he remarks, "is used of the observation of the heavenly bodies, from whose movements one can calculate when an expected phenomenon will appear. In a similar way the apocalypticists sought to determine by signs the moment when the kingdom should come. That was what the Pharisees expected of Jesus with their πότε ἐρχεται. And it is just this that Jesus declines. The Kingdom of God comes not so that one can fix its appearing by observation beforehand." The assumption is that when it does come the kingdom will be visible. It does not seem possible by mere verbal interpreta-

tion to decide between the two views. Each interpreter will be influenced by his idea of the general drift of Christ's teaching concerning the nature of the kingdom. My own sympathies are with those who find in Christ's words a denial of vulgar or physical visibility. —Ver. 21. οὐδὲ ἔρχον, nor will they say; there will be nothing to give occasion for saying: non erit quod dicatur, Grotius.—οὗτος, εἰς, here, there, implying a visible object that can be located.— ἐν τῇ μέρᾳ σα, within you, in your spirit. This rendering best corresponds with the non-visibility of the kingdom. The thought would be a very appropriate one in discourse to disciples. Not so in discourse to Pharisees. To them it would be most natural to say "among you" = look around and see my works: devils cast out (Lk. xi. 20), and learn that the kingdom is already here (ἐφησαν τῇ μέρᾳ σα). Kindred to this rendering is that of Tertullian (c. Marcionem, L. iv., 35): in your power, accessible to you: in manu, in potestate vestra. The idea "among you" would be more clearly expressed by ἐν τῇ μέρᾳ σα, γραφ. Cf. John i. 26. μίσος τ. σταυρ. etc., one stands among you whom ye know not—cited by Euthy. to illustrate the meaning of our passage. Field (Ot. Nor.) contends that there is no clear instance of ἐν τῇ μέρᾳ in the sense of "among," and cites as an example of its use in the sense of "within " Ps. ciii. 1, πάντα τῇ ἐν τῇ μέρᾳ νου.

Vv. 22-25. The coming of the Son of Man (Mt. xxxv. 26-28).—πρὸ τ. μαθητῶν: so in Mt., but at a later time and at Jerusalem; which connection is the more original cannot be decided.—λειτούργεται ἡμῖν, there will come days (of tribulation), ominous hint like that in v. 35.—μίας τ. ἁ. etc., one of the days of the Son of Man; not past days in the time of discipleship, but days to come. Tribulation will make them long for the advent, which will put an end to their sorrows. One of the days: why not the first, the beginning of the Messianic period? Hahn actually takes μίας as = first, Hebraistic fashion, as in
Mt. xxviii. 1, Mk. xvi. 2.—οὐκ ἰδεῖν, ye shall not see, not necessarily an absolute statement, but meaning: the vision will be deferred till your heart gets sick; so laying you open to temptation through false delight to the times encouraging delusive hope.—Ver. 23. ἐκεῖ, ἃ ὁ εἰδὼλος introducing a new comparison = similarly, as it was in the days, etc.—so shall it be in the days of, etc. (ver. 30). Bornemann ingeniously connects ὁ εἰδὼλος with ἀπαντάς going before, and, treating it as a Latinism, renders perdidit omnes pariter.—ὁ εἰδώλος, etc.: again a series of unconnected verbs, and a larger, six, and all in the imperfect tense. This second comparison, taken from Lot’s history, is not given in Mt. The suddenness of the catastrophe makes it very apposite.—Ver. 29. ἢ βρέξῃ (βρέχω): an old poetic word used in late Greek for σπέυρας, to rain. ἢ βρέχῃ is the modern Greek for rain (vide Mt. v. 45).—Ver. 30. κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ, etc., the apodosis of the long sentence beginning ver. 28.

Vv. 26-30. The advent will be a surprise (Mt. xxiv. 37-41).—Ver. 27. ὅταν, etc.: note the four verbs without connecting particles, a graphic asyndeton; and note the imperfect tense: those things going on up to the very hour of the advent, as it was in the days of Noah, or in the fateful day of Pompeii. —Ver. 28. ὁ εἰδώλος: introducing a new comparison = similarly, as it was in the days, etc.—so shall it be in the days of, etc. (ver. 30). Bornemann ingeniously connects ὁ εἰδώλος with ἀπαντάς going before, and, treating it as a Latinism, renders perdidit omnes pariter.—ὁ εἰδώλος, etc.: again a series of unconnected verbs, and a larger, six, and all in the imperfect tense. This second comparison, taken from Lot’s history, is not given in Mt. The suddenness of the catastrophe makes it very apposite.—Ver. 29. ἢ βρέξῃ (βρέχω): an old poetic word used in late Greek for σπέυρας, to rain. ἢ βρέχῃ is the modern Greek for rain (vide Mt. v. 45).—Ver. 30. κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ, etc., the apodosis of the long sentence beginning ver. 28.

Vv. 31-34. Sause qui peut (Mt. xxiv. 17, 18; Mk. xiii. 15, 16). The saying in ver. 31 is connected in Mk. and Mt. with the crisis of Jerusalem, to which in this discourse in Lk. there is no allusion.
The connection in Mt. and Mk. seems the more appropriate, as a literal flight was then necessary.—Ver. 32. In Mt. and Mk., being inappropriate to the flight they had in view. No fear of looking back when an invading army was at the gates. Lk. has in view the spiritual application, as is shown by the next ver., which reproduces in somewhat altered form the word spoken at Caesarea Philippi concerning losing and saving life (ix. 24).—The unjust judge, in Lk. only.—Ver. 1. The story is a parable in so far as it teaches by an incident in natural life the power of perseverance with reference to the spiritual life.—ποις, in reference to, indicating the subject or aim of the parable—δε (so Kypke, with examples).—tentatively: not continuously, but persistently in spite of temptation to cease praying through delayed answer = keep praying, notwithstanding delay. The whole reason d'être of the parable is the existence of such delay. Some fail to see this and think that the difference between God and the judge is that He does not delay. It is not so. God is like the judge in this, only His delay has not the same cause or motive. The judge represents God as He appears in Providence to tried faith—σωζόμενος: a Pauline word (Gal. vi. 9; 2 Thess. iii. 13, etc.). This introduction to the parable is probably due to Lk., who, it will be observed, takes care to make the lesson of general
application, though the δι᾽ after ἔνεγα and the concluding reflection in ver. 8 imply that the special subject of prayer contemplated both by Lk. and by our Lord was the advent referred to in the previous context.

Vv. 2-5. The parable.—τὸν Ἐθνὸς, etc.: a proverbial description for a thoroughly unprincipled man (examples from classics in Wetstein).—κοίτης, having respect for, with accusative, as in late Greek; in earlier writers with genitive.—Ver. 3. χήρα, a widow, such a suppliant tests a man's character. Her weakness appeals to a generous, noble nature, and is taken advantage of by an ignoble.—ἐρχεται, presumably used in a frequentative sense = venitilabat (Grotius), though not necessarily meaning more than "began to come," with possibility of recurrence.—ἐκδικήσωμεν μ. give me redress or satisfaction. "Avenge me" is too strong.—Ver. 4. ἐν χρόνον, for a considerable time. Per multum tempus (Vulgate) may be too strong, but it is in the right direction. The scope of the parable and the use of the word χρόνον in a pregnant sense implying τολάσι (vide examples in Kypke) demand a time sufficient to test the temper of the parties.—ἐν λαυρίῳ, within himself. The characters in Lk.'s parables are given to talking to themselves (Prodigal, Unjust Steward).—Ver. 5. Βιά γε, etc.: similar expression in xi. 8. The parable before us is a companion to that of the Selfish Neighbour. The two should be studied together—vide The Parabols Teaching of Christ.—κόσμον: the power of the petitioner in both parables lies in their ability and determination to disturb the comfort of those they address. The neighbour and the judge are both selfish, care only for their own ease, and it is that very quality that gives the suppliants their opportunity. They can annoy the reluctant into granting their requests—success certain.—ἐς τέλος: interpreters differ as to the meaning of this phrase, and whether it should be connected with ἐρχομένων or with ὑποτασίας. The two ways of rendering the last clause of ver. 5 are: lest coming continually, she weary me to death, or lest coming and coming, she at last give me black eyes; of course meant in a humorous sense. The latter rendering does more justice to the humour of the situation, but the other seems more in harmony with the scope of the parable, which is to enforce persistence in prayer—continual coming. The present tense in participle and verb also seems to demand the first rendering: it points to a process in the coming and in its effect on the judge, the two keeping pace with each other. As she keeps coming, he gets more and more bored. If a final act, the use of sīstis (seriously or humorously meant) were pointed at by ὑποτασίας, the aorist would have been more suitable. (So Field in Ot. Nor.). The philological commentators differ in regard to the sense of ἐστε τέλος, some taking it = perpetuo, indecimento (Grotius, Kypke); others = tándem (Palairet); others = omnino (Raphel); all citing examples.

Vv. 6-8. The moral.—κρίνω τ. δικίας, cf. ἄκοντος τ. &c. xvi. 8.—Ver. 7. ὁ μ. ποιήσῃ, etc., will not God avenge, etc., the question implying strongly that
He will, but the emphasis is rendered necessary by appearances to the contrary, which strongly try men’s faith in His good will—long delays in answering prayer which wear the aspect of indifference. His elect: standing in a close relation, so named to support the previous assertion. But in the dark hour of trial it is difficult to extract comfort from the title. Then the doubt arises: is the idea of election not a delusion? What are we to the far-off Deity? from these words down to the end of the sentence (έναυτος) is a single clause meant to define the situation of “the elect.” They are persons who keep crying to God day and night, while He seems to pay no heed to them, but delays action in their case, and in their interest. The words down to καλής describe the need of Divine interference; those which follow describe the experience which tempts to doubt whether succour will be forthcoming.

μακροθυμεῖ: this verb means to be slow, leisurely, unpulsive in temper, whether in punishing or in succouring, or in any other form of action. Instances of the use of the verb in the first-mentioned occur in 2 Maccab. vi. 14 (cited by Pricaeus) and Sirach xxvi. 22 (οὗ μὴ βραβεύσῃ οὐδὲ μὴ μακροθυμήσῃ ἐν αὐτοῖς, frequently quoted). In James v. 7 it is applied to the husbandman waiting for harvest. Here it is applied to God’s leisureliness in coming to the help of tried saints. The construction καλ ἀνεκτάω is of the Hebraistic type.—Ver. 8. ἐν τάξει, quickly, quite compatible with delay; quickly when the hour comes = suddenly. ἐκλή, yeit; in spite of the alleged speed, the time will seem so long that, etc. —ἀπαφε, so to be taken (not ἀπαφή), as bearing a major force of reasoning, and interrogative. The two words are one in essence, but ἀπαφε has more emphasis in utterance, and therefore the first syllable is lengthened, and it stands at the beginning of a sentence, here before ἐκλήθη: cf. Gal. ii. 17. On the two particles vide Klotz in Dev., p. 180.—πιστίν: not absolutely, but in reference to the second coming, hope deferred making the heart sick.

Vv. 9-14. The Pharisees and the publican.—Ver. 9. πρὸς τινας, with reference to certain persons; who not indicated, of what sort definitely described. This introduction is doubtless an editorial heading extracted from the story. It is true, but not necessarily the whole truth. The story may have been spoken to publicans to encourage them to hope in God’s mercy—at the Capernaum gathering, e.g.—παραβολή: it is not really a parable, but simply an imaginary incident within the sphere to which its moral belongs.—Ver. 11. συνήθεις, having taken his stand; sedent loco solito (Bengel); “a sign less of confidence
than of self-importance" (J. Weiss in Meyer). Probably both qualities are aimed at—πρός αὐτὸν: whether these words should be taken with στάθη or with προσπέχετε is disputed. If the position of ταῦτα before πρός ἐν Ἐμ be accepted, there is no room for doubt. Hahn contends that the proper meaning of πρός ἐν προσπέχετε is "prayed to himself," and that there is no instance of the use of πρός ἐν in the sense of "with himself": Godet takes the phrase as = to himself, and regards the so-called prayer as simply self-congratulation in God's presence.—οἶκος τ. ἁ. not necessarily all mankind, rather all the Jewish world outside his coterie = am haarets.—ἀπραγμοὶ, etc.: these hard words recall the elder brother's μετὰ πορνῶν (xv. 30).—ἡ καὶ, or even, the publican pointed at as the ne plus ultra of depravity; the best foil to Pharisaic exemplariness.—Ver. 12. τις τ. σ., twice in the week: voluntary fasts on Mondays and Thursdays, ultra-legal in his zeal.—ἀποδεικτικοὶ (κύρως. W. and H.) = διακριτοὶ in Greek writers: tithing a typical instance of Pharisaic strictness.—πάντα, all, great and small, even garden herbs, again ultra-legal.—πτώμα, all I get (R.V.).—Ver. 13. ἡ ταῦτα: the demeanour of the publican is drawn in vivid contrast to that of the Pharisee; he stands aloof, not in pride but in acute consciousness of demerit, does not dare to lift his eyes towards the object of prayer, beats upon his breast in pungent grief for sin.—τὸ ἁμαρτέω: the sinner; he thinks of himself only and of himself as the sinner, well known as such, the one fact worth mentioning about him, as one might speak about the drunkard of the village. Koetsveld remarks: "The publican might see his own picture in the prodigal son; no doubt many a son out of a good house took to a publican's trade as a last resort"—Ver. 14. διδακτικοὶ, justified (here only in Gospels), a Pauline word, but not necessarily used in a Pauline sense = pardoned.—παρ' ἐκείνον (ἡ ἐκείνος, T.R.), in comparison with that one (the Pharisee). The reading ἐν παρ' ἐκείνον (QX) would have to be taken as a question—or was that one justified? The publican was the justified man; you would not say the other one was?—ἐκεῖνος: it introduces a moral maxim which we have met with already at xiv. 11. It stands here as the ethical basis of "justification". It is a universal law of the moral world, true both of God and of men, that self-exaltation provokes in others condemnation, and self-humiliation gentle judgment.

CHAPTER XVIII. 15-43. SOME SYNOPSIS TICAL INCIDENTS OF THE LATER TIME. Lk., who has for some time followed his own way, now joins the company of his brother evangelists. Schleiermacher held that the document Lk. has been using did not stop at xviii. 14, but went on to the end of chapter xix. Vv. 15-17. The little ones brought to Jesus (Mt. xix. 13-15, Mk. x. 13-16).—τὰ βρέφη: for παιδία in parallels = infants, sucklings, often in Lk.'s writings; the καὶ preceding naturally means "even," suggesting the notion of great popularity or great crowding, and perhaps hinting an apology for the Twelve. The article before βρέφη means the in-
fant some of those who brought them = their

infants.—Ver. 16. προσκαλεσάμενον, called, speaking to those who carried the infants. Lk. omits the annoyance of Jesus at the conduct of the Twelve, noted by Mk. Decorum controls his presentation not only of Jesus but of the Twelve. He always spares them (Schanz).—τῶν τωυτῶν, of such; does this mean that children belong to the kingdom, or only that the childlike do so? Bengel, De Wette and Schanz take the former view, J. Weiss and Hahn the latter. Schanz says: "τωυτῶν with the article means not similarity but likeness with respect to something going before or following after. Therefore the children as such are recognised by Jesus as worthy of the kingdom."—Ver. 17, as in Mk. x. 15. With this reflection Lk. ends, his interest being mainly in the didactic element.

Vv. 18-23. The young ruler (Mt. xix. 16-22, Mk. x. 17-22). From a didactic point of view this narrative is closely connected with the two preceding. The three set forth conditions of entrance into the Kingdom of God—self-abasement, childlikeness, and single-mindedness.—Ver. 18. ἀρχηγός, a ruler; this definite statement in Lk. only.—τί ποιήσας instead of τί ποιήσας.—Ver. 20. μὴ μοιχεύσῃς: the Seventh Com., first in Lk., the Sixth in Mt. and Mk. (W. H.). Mk.'s μὴ διαστερήσῃς and Mt.'s διαστερήσεις τ. πλησίον σου, etc., are not found in Lk.—Ver. 21. ἐν σοὶ λείπει: ἐν σοι οὐκ ἔχεις in Mk. λείπει
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that the man was a self-complacent Pharisee. I am glad to find Hahn decidedly repudiating this view (vide notes on Mt. and Mk.). Vide Mt. Vv. 24-30. Ensuing conversation (Mt. xix. 23-30, Mk. x. 23-31).—Ver. 24. εἰσοδορείσθαι: present, not future, as in parallels, indicating not what will happen but what is apt to happen from the nature of riches.—Ver. 25. τηρήματος βελόνης: each evangelist has his own expression here.—τρίζαμα from τρίζω, τίτημι (or τισώ), to pierce, bore through; hence τρήσαμεν, penetrating, clear; βελόνη, the point of a spear.—Ver. 26. οἱ δεκαόυστοι, those hearing, a quite general reference to the company present. In Mt. and Mk. the words are addressed to the disciples.—καὶ τῆς 8. σ.: as in Mk., vide notes there.—Ver. 27. τὰ δεδώτα, etc. Mk. and Mt. have first a particular then a general statement. Lk. gives the general truth only: the impossibilities for men possible for God. —Ver. 28. Peter’s remark about leaving all, as in Mk., without the question, what shall we have? appended to it in Mt.—Ver. 29. γυναῖκα: as in xiv. 26, not in parallels.—γονεῖς: parents, for father and mother in parallels; the latter more impressive.—Ver. 30. πολλαπλασιάσοντας, as in Mt. Mk. has the more definite ἐκατοπλασίασον. The reading ἐπτασίως (D, W. H., margin), though little supported, has intrinsic probability as toning down an apparent exaggeration (hundred fold I say seven fold). Cf. ἐπτάσις in xviii. 4. Vv. 31-34. Third prediction of the Passion (Mt. xx. 17-19, Mk. x. 32-34). Vide notes on the account in Mk., which is exceptionally realistic.—Ver. 31. τελεσθήσεται, shall be fulfilled. With this verb is to be connected τὸ νῦν τ. α. (not with γεγραμμένα). The sense is not “shall be fulfilled by the Son of Man”. So Bornemann (Scholia), “a dei filio perfectum, i.e., satisfiit pro-
phetarum vaticiniis a dei filio. Nor is it necessary to insert ἔν before v. 3, 6, 7. The meaning is: all things shall happen to the Son of Man as written in the prophets. —τελείωθαι stands for γίνεσθαι, being used because of the prophetic reference (in Lk. only). So Priceus: "τελείωθαι hic esse quod Marc. xi. 23, 24 εἶπεν, quod 1 Cor. iv. 5 γίνεσθαι, quod 1 Pet. v. 9 ἐκπλείωθαι." In all these places the verb is followed by the dative. —Vv. 32, 33. The details of the Passion are the same as in Mk., except that no mention is made of the Jewish rulers, and that other particulars are given in a somewhat different order. —Ver. 34. This is peculiar to Lk. A similar statement in ix. 45 with the same curious repetition. "An emphatic prolixity" is Meyer's comment. J. Weiss (Meyer) from the facts that this verse repeats ix. 45 and that Lk. avoids repetition infers that the words must have been in his source. I rather think that we have here an effort on Lk.'s part to compensate by a general statement about the ignorance of the Twelve for the instructive narrative about the two sons of Zebedee which comes in at this point in Mt. and Mk., and which Lk. omits, doubtless by way of sparing the disciples an exposure. The iteration (same thing said three times) is in Lk.'s manner (Acts xiv. 8), but it is significant here. The aim is by repetition of a general statement to convey the impression made by the concrete story—an utter impossibility. No wonder Lk. labours in expression, in view of that humiliating proof of ignorance and moral weakness! But the attempt to express the inexpressible is interesting as showing that Lk. must have had the sons of Zebedee incident in his mind though he does not choose to record it. The omission of this incident carries along with it the omission of the second and most important saying of our Lord concerning the significance of His death. Lk.'s gospel contains hardly any basis for a doctrine on that subject (cf. Mt. xx. 28, Mk. x. 45).

Vv. 35-43. The blind man at Jericho (Mt. xx. 29-34, Mk. x. 46-52). —τυφλὸς τιν: the blind man is not named, from which J. Weiss (Meyer) infers that the name cannot have been in Lk.'s source. A very precious inference. Lk. deviates from the tradition in the parallels as to the place of the incident: connecting it with the entrance into Jericho instead of the exit from the town. —ὑπαιτίων as in xvi. 3.—Ver. 36. ἄκουσας: in Lk. what he hears is the multitude passing through, which he has here seen if he had not been blind. In the parallels what is heard is that it was Jesus around whom the multitude had gathered, which even a seeing man might have had to learn by the ear. Lk. is careful to bring out the fact of blindness. —βιωμαιρεῖν is an instance of a participle serving as the object of a verb. What was heard was the passing of the crowd. —εἰς ἐν τῇ, the optative without ἐν in an indirect question makes the question definite (cf. iii. 15, viii. 9, xvi. 26). —Ver. 37. Ναζαρηνός: the usual form in Lk., an exception in iv. —Ver. 38. ἔριξαν: aorist, he cried out once. —Ver. 39. οἱ προδόται, those in front, nearest him.
He would hear the sound of the crowd before it came up to him; when it was close to him he would make inquiry to find out whether or not a strong man or perfect, kept shouting louder than before.—Ver. 40. ἔρχεται, to be led to Him; Lk. again careful to bring out the fact of blindness, all the more noticeable when his narrative is compared with parallels. The omission of the interesting particular in Mk., vv. 49, 50, has been remarked on (Hahn) as proving that Lk. did not know Mk. Again a precarious inference. It is Lk.'s habit to magnify the miracle, therefore he tells the story so as to bring out that it was a case of total blindness, which does not clearly appear in Mk., side ver. 50.—Ver. 41. Κύριε: in Mk. Παραβίαν.—Ver. 43. αἰνῶν, praise, a poetical word in Greek writers = (1) a saying, (2) a word of praise, frequent in Sept. ἔδοξαν αἰνῶν, instead of αἰνίων, is Hellenistic.

Chapter XIX. Zacchæus. Parable of the Pounds. Entry into Jerusalem.—Vv. 1-10. The story of Zacchæus, in Lk. only, apparently derived from an Aramaic source—note the abundant use of καλός to connect clauses—but bearing traces of editorial revision in the style (καθότι, ver. 9).—Ver. 1. διήρχετο: the incident occurred when Jesus was passing through Jericho, precisely where, not indicated. —συκώμονας, called by name, as in i. 61; a Hebraism, συκώματα superfluous.—Zac., ἄρχων, πλοῦσιος: name, occupation, social standing. Zacchæus = the pure one, but not so intended; chief publican; probably a head man or overseer over the local collectors of taxes, of whom there might be a goodly number in Jericho, with its balsam trade, and traffic from the eastern to the western side of Jordan.—Ver. 3. ἰδονίζει: imperfect, implying continuous effort, for a while unsuccessful, because of (ἀπε) the crowd, too dense to penetrate, and not to be seen over by him, being short of stature (ἡλικία as in Mt. vi. 27).—ἴδειν τὸν 'Ιησοῦν τῷ ἵδειν τὸν ἵδειν οὐδὲν ὑπέδεικνυτον, to see who Jesus is = de facie cognoscente (Kuinoel); "fama notum vulte nostrae cupidat" (Grotius).—Ver. 4. ἔλθε τοῦ ἰμαρσοῦν, in front of the crowd, to make sure; stationed at any point opposite the crowd he might miss his chance.—συκομοραίαν, a fig mulberry tree, as many think = συκώμανας in xvii. 6; but why then not use the same word in both places, the only two places in N.T. where they occur, both used by the same writer? To this it has been replied: "Although it may be admitted that the sycamine is properly and in Lk. xxvii. 6 the mulberry, and the sycamore the fig mulberry, or sycamore fig, yet the latter is the tree generally referred to in the O.T. and called by the Sept. sycamine, as 1 Kings x. 27, 1 Chron. xxvii. 28, Ps. lxxviii. 47, Am. vii. 14.
Dioscorides expressly says Συκόμορον, ἕνοις δὲ καὶ τότε συκάμοιν λέγοντες, lib. i., cap. 180 "(Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, s. v. Sycamore). This is in effect to say that through the influence of the Sept. and following common usage Lk. used the two words indifferently as synonyms.—ἐκείνης: supply διδοῦ, cf. v. 19.—Ver. 5. Ζακχαῖος: Jesus knows his name, how not indicated.—σπευδάτω, etc., uttered in cordial tone as if He were speaking to a familiar friend whom He is glad to see and with whom He means to stay that day. What a delightful surprise that salutation, and how irresistible its friendly frankness, ver. 6 shows.

—Ver. 7. ἀπαντάτω: general muttered dissent (not even the Twelve excepted), which Jesus anticipated and disregarded. Note His courage, and how much prejudice the uncommon in conduct has to reckon with.—ἀμαρτῆλος: no reason to think with some ancient and modern commentators that Zacchaeus was a Gentile, a son of Abraham only in a spiritual sense. They thought him unfit to be Christ's host because he was a "sinner" (Grotius). A sinner of course because a publican, a great sinner because a chief publican.—Ver. 8. σταθείς: like the Pharisees (xviii. 11) but in a different spirit—in self-defence, not self-laudation. J. Weiss thinks the word indicates the solemn attitude of a man about to make a vow (Meyer).—μ. τ. ὑπαρχόντων, the half of my goods, earnings, not of my income (οἱ πρόσωποι) as Godet suggests.—διδοὺμεν, διατιθέμενοι: presents, probably expressing not past habit but purpose for the future. This is the regenerating effect of that generous, brave word of Jesus. It has made a new man of him. Yet the desire to see Jesus, of whom he had heard as the publicans' friend, shows that the germ of the new man was there before. A "sinner" doubtless in the way indicated, as the εἶμι mildly admits, but by no means, even in the past, a type of the hard, heartless, unscrupulous publican.—τετραπλῶν, four fold, as in cases of theft (Exodus xxii. 1, four or five fold).—Ver. 9. πρὸς αὐτόν, to him or with reference to him; probably both; the words meant for the ears of Zacchaeus and all who might be there to hear, or perhaps spoken half as a soliloquy.—καθότι, inasmuch as; a word of Lk.'s; in his writings only in N.T.—εἶδος Ἀ., a son of Abraham in the natural sense, a Jew; a protest against popular prejudice, for which a publican was as a heathen. The more radical reason, unexpressed, but present doubtless to the mind of Jesus, was: because he also is a son of man, a human being.—Ver. 10. A great key-word to Christ's idea of His own mission—a Saviour.—τὸ ἀντλώλος, the lost, a pathetic name for the objects of Christ's quest; its shades of meaning to be learned from the parables in Lk. xv.: lost as a sheep, a coin, a foolish son may be lost. Here the term points
II. ΑΚΟΥΩΝ ηδον ταῦτα, προσθεὶς ἔτει παραβολήν,
διὰ τὸ δύος αὐτῶν εἶναι ἤπειροσωλήν, καὶ δοκεῖν αὐτοῖς ὅτι παρα-
χρήμα μελέτῃ ἤ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐναραϊνεθαν. 12. εἶπεν οὖν,
"Ἀνθρώπως τίς εὐγένεις ἐπορεύθη εἰς χώραν μακρὰν, λάβει ἑαυτῷ ἑαυτῷ
βασιλείαν, καὶ υποτρέψας. 13. καλέσας δὲ δέκα δουλῶν ἑαυτοῦ,
ἐδωκεν αὐτοῖς δέκα ἡμᾶς, καὶ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτοὺς, Πραγματεύσαθε ὑμῖν.

15. εἶναι I. αὐτοῦ in ἩΕΠίl 157.

to the social degradation and isolation of
the publicans. They were social lepers.
With reference to the conduct of Jesus
in this case Euthy. Zig. remarks: "It
is necessary to despine the little scandal
when a great salvation comes to any one
and not to lose the great on account of the
little." (καὶ ἐκ τοῦ μικρὸν σκάνδαλον
cataphorein, ἐνα μεγάλη σωτηρία τιν
προσγίνεται, καὶ μη διὰ τοῦ μικρὸν
ἀντίλαλον (sic) τοῦ μέγαν). The significance
of Christ choosing a publican for His
host in a town where many priests dwell
has been remarked on. Art. "Publican"
in Smith's Dictionary of the Bible.
Vv. 11-27. Parable of the pounds, or of
the nobleman who goes to find a kingdom
(cf. Mt. xxv. 14-30). Into the vexed
question of the connection between this
parable and that of the talents in Mt. I
cannot here go. That there is a resemblance
between them is obvious, and the
hypothesis that the one has grown out of
the other in the course of tradition can-
not be treated as a mere impertinence.
Yet that they are two distinct parables in
their main features, both spoken by Jesus,
is not improbable. They serve different
purposes, and their respective details suit
their respective purposes, and the kindred
features may only show that Jesus did
not solicitiously avoid repeating Himself.
The parable before us suits the situation
as described by Luke, in so far as it cor-
rects mistaken expectations with regard
to the advent of the Kingdom. It is a
prophetic sketch in parabolic form of the
real future before them, the fortunes of
the King and the various attitudes of
men towards him. It is more allied to
allegory than most of the parables, and
on this ground, according to J. Weiss (in
Meyer), it cannot have proceeded from
Jesus. One fails to see why Jesus might
not occasionally use allegory as a vehicle
of truth as well as other teachers.

Ver. 11. The introduction.—ταύτα
naturally suggests the words spoken to
Zacchaeus by Jesus about salvation, as
what was heard.—προσθεὶς ἔτει imitates
the Hebrew construction = He added
and said, cf. Gen. xxxviii. 5. προσθεὶς
ἔτεικν.—ἐγγὺς: about fifteen miles off.—
παραχρῆμα: a natural expectation for
friends of Jesus to entertain, and for all,
friends and foes, to impute to Him, and a
good occasion for uttering a parable to
correct false impressions; comparable in
this respect with the parable of the Sup-
per in Lk. xiv.—saying in effect, "not so
soon as you think, nor will all be as well
affected to the king and his kingdom as
you may suppose."

Vv. 12-27. The parable.—γενόμενος, well-
born, noble; of such rank and social
position that he might legitimately aspire
to a kingdom. The Herod family might
quite well be in view. Herod the Great
and his son Archelaus had actually gone
from Jericho on this errand, and Arch-
elaus had had the experience described
in ver. 14. Since the time of Clericus and
Wolf, who first suggested it, the idea that
the Herod family was in Christ's mind
has been very generally accepted. Schanz
thinks Jesus would not have selected so
bad a man as Archelaus to represent Him.
Yet He selected a selfish neighbour
as an unjust judge to represent God as He
appears, and an unjust steward to teach
prudence!—ἐς χώραν μακρὰν: implying
lapse of time; Rome, in the case of Arche-
laus.—ὑποτρέψας: the desired kingdom
is in the land of his birth; Palestine in
the case of Archelaus.—Ver. 13. δέκα,
a considerable number, pointing to
an extensive household establishment.
—δέκα μῆνες, ten pounds, not to each but
among them (ver. 16). A Greek pound
= about £3 or £4; a Hebrew = nearly
double; in either case a small sum
compared with the amounts in Mt. xxv.
The purpose in the two parables is entirely
different. In the Talents the master di-
vides his whole means among his servants
to be traded with, as the best way of
disposing of them during his absence.
In the Pounds he simply gives a moderate
sum, the same to all, with a view to test
fidelity and capacity, as he desires to
have tested men for higher service when the time comes. The amount may suit the master's finances, and though small it may just on that account the better test character and business talent.—προγραμματεύω, trade with, here only in the Scriptures, found in Plutarch.—ἐρχομαι: with ἐν (T.R.) = until I come back, with ἐν ὑμῖν (W.H.) = while I go (to the far country); perhaps it is used pregnantly to include going and returning.—Ver. 14. πολεμεῖς = συμπολεμεῖς, fellow-citizens of the aspirant to kingship while a private citizen (as in Gen. xxiii. 11, Sept., Heb. viii. 11, W.H.).—μησος, hated habitually, showing something far wrong in him, or in them.—προσβεβλα: this actually happened in the case of Archelaus, on just grounds; this, however, is no proof that he cannot have been in Christ's mind. The point is, hated just or unjust, in the case both of Archelaus and of Jesus very real.—οὐ δῆλον, we don't wish, an emphatic nolens, stronger than δῆλον τοῦτον ὑμῖν, etc.

Vv. 15 ff. After the return,—ἐν τῷ ἐπανδίδῃ: ἐν with the aorist infinitive, usually with present, but frequently with aorist in Lk. = on his return, he takes action at once (vide Burton, M. and T., § 109).—ἐπεφώνησα = commanded (jussit, Vulgate) to be called; ἐπεὶ with infinitive, instead of ἐπεί with subjunctive, as in some places, e.g., Mt. iv. 3.—τί διετέρω: (T. R.) is two questions in one: who had gained anything and what—τί διετεραπευσάτω (W.H.), what they had gained.—Ver. 16. ἡ μή σου, thy pound, modestly, as if he had no hand or merit in the gain (Grotius).—Δέν: a considerable increase, implying proportional length of time, the kingdom not near.—Ver. 17. ἐγὼ without ποιεῖ, as in Mt., but ποιεῖ in next clause = noble, devoted.—ἐν ἐλαχίστῃ, in a very little. ἐς δόλῳ in Mt.—ἀπὸ δὲ πέλας, over ten cities, or a Decapolis (Holtzmann, H. C.). This is what the king has had in view all along—to get capable and trusty governors. A new king needs to take special pains about this. The trial of character through trade is not unsuitable, as governors would have much to do with the provincial revenues.—Ver. 18. πέντε, five, half as much, implying less capacity, diligence, conscientiousness, or luck which, however, is not taken into account.—Ver. 19. καὶ σὺ: this man also deemed trustworthy, but of less capacity, therefore appointed to a governorship, but of less extent. Also, note, there is no praise. He was honest, but might have done better. The new king is thankful to have honesty even with respectable, though not admirable administrative qualities.
14—28.

The useless servant. If in any part the parable has borrowed from the parable in Mt., it is here. The story might well have wound up with a statement as to what was to be done with the disaffected.—Ver. 27. Yet this feature is not inapropos, for there were likely to be three classes of people to be dealt with by the king: the honest and capable, the incapable and useless, and the disaffected. The chief objection to the part referring to the second class is that it gives the parable a too didactic aspect, aiming at theoretic exhaustiveness rather than insisting on the main points: how the king will deal with his friends and how with his foes.—Ver. 20. In συνεδρίᾳ, in a handkerchief: έν τῇ γῇ in Mt.—Ver. 21. αὐτῷ τοῦ λεγόμενος (here only in N.T.), harsh in flavour, then in disposition.—αὐτές, etc., you lift what you did not deposit, and reap what you did not sow; accusing the master of an exorbitant demand for profit. He despaired of pleasing him in that respect, therefore did nothing—a pretext of course.—Ver. 23. ἐγὼ ἔδωκα = τοῖς τάξιν εἰς ἕκαστάν τινί in Mt.—Πράγμα = ἔκαστάν ἐν Μτ.—Ver. 24. άρα, etc.: the pound given to him that had ten could only have the significance of a present, and a petty one, for he was no longer to be a trader but a ruler, therefore not an important illustration of the principle stated in ver. 26, a sign that in this section of the parable Lk. is secondary. —Ver. 25. Possibly an utterance from the crowd interested in the parable, the “Lord” being Jesus, or an addition by Lk., or not genuine (wanting in D).—Ver. 26. Deprivation the only penalty here, no casting out into outer darkness as in Mt.; merciless severity reserved for the enemies of the king.—Ver. 27. Πλήθυς, for the rest, winding up the transactions at the commencement of the king’s reign.—κατασφεβάτε: barbarous, but true to Eastern life; the new king cannot afford to let them live. In the spiritual sphere the slaying will be done by the moral order of the world (destruction of the Jewish state), King Jesus weeping over their fate. Motive must not be transferred from the parable to the application.

Ver. 28. On the way to Jerusalem. The Jericho incidents disposed of, the next centre of interest is the Holy City. Lk. connects the two parts of his narrative by a brief notice of the ascent from the smaller city at the foot of the pass to the larger and more famous at the top. —εἰς ταύτα refers naturally to the
parable. As a note of time the expression is sufficiently vague, for we do not know when or where the parable was spoken, nor how much time intervened between its utterance and the commencement of the ascent. It is simply one of Lk.'s formulae of transition.—ἐκατέργασεν = ἐστί ἐκατεργάσειν, not before them, but forwards: *iter sum* continuabilis, Kypr. —ἀναβαλον, going up. A constant ascent, steep and rugged.

Vv. 29-38. The triumphal entry into Jerusalem (Mt. xx. 1-11, Mk. xi. 1-11).—Βηθσαγη. Following Lightfoot and Renan, Godet regards this as the name not of a village but of a suburban district included for passover purposes in the holy city, pilgrims to the feast finding quarters in it. The reference to the two places Bethphage and Bethany is obscure and confusing.—θλιών, commentators dispute whether the word should be accentuated thus, making it the genitive plural of θλις, or θλιων, making it nominative singular of a name for the place = Olivetum, olive grove. W. and H. print it with the circumflex accent, and Field (Of. Nor.) and Hahn take the same view.—Vv. 31-34. The sending of two disciples for the colt is related as in Mt. and Mk., but with a little more of Greek in the style. The remark about the owners sending it (Mt.) or Jesus returning it (Mk.) is omitted. On the other hand, Lk. alone states that the two disciples found matters as the Master had said (ver. 32). In ver. 33 οἱ κύριοι suggests a plurality of owners.—Ver. 35. ἐκπρίστηκεν: the participle is used to relieve the monotony of the paratactic construction (καλ, καλ, καλ in Mt. and Mk.); the word occurs here only and in 1 Pet. v. 7, q.v.—ἐπεβίβασαν, helped to mount, as in Lk. x. 34. Acts xxiii. 24; a technical term, possibly used here to add pomp to the scene.—Ver. 36. τὰ ιμάτια, their garments, but no mention of branches in Lk., possibly from a feeling that they would be an encumbrance.—Ver. 37. ἔγγραφος: Lk. is thinking of Jerusalem = when He was nearing the city. The next clause, ἐπὶ τῇ καταβάσει, is added to define more precisely the point reached = at the descent of the mount. They had got over the ridge to the western slope.—καταβασιν, here only in N.T.—ἀπάν τὸ πλῆθος: Mt. and Mk. divide the crowd into those going before and those following.—διώκοντας: this reference to miracles as the occasion of praise is peculiar to Lk. That Galilean pilgrims should remember gratefully the healing ministry at that moment was very natural. Yet Lk.'s explanation of the popular enthusiasm, while true, may be far from exhaustive.—Ver. 38. A free reproduction of the popular acclaim as reported by Mt. and Mk., not without

1 Omit έν τοις ΝΒΛ minusc. (found in D al.).
2 Μέγεθος in ΝΒDL 13, 69.
3 Omit έν τοις ΝΒDL minusc.
4 Λέγουσι in ΝΒDLA 1, 13, etc.
5 So in ΝΔL. B has here εὐαγγελισμένα.

*Xryuvinfr$BDLB 1, 3, 69.*

*BDL 157 prefix καλ.*

*οτί before ο κυπ. in ΝΑΒDL al. pi.*

*BDL 157 prefix καλ.*
29—43.

**EUAGGELION**

φωνή μεγάλη περὶ πασῶν ὁ εἶδος δυνάμεως. 38. λέγοντες,

"Εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος βασιλεὺς ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου· εἰρήνη ἐν οὖραν," 39. καὶ τίνες τῶν Φαρισαίων ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄχλου ἐπὶ τοῦ πρὸς αὐτὸν, "Διδάσκαλε, ἐπιτίμησον τοὺς μαθητάς σου." 40. καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Λέγω ὅμως, ὅτι, ἐὰν οὐκ ἔσωσθήσων, οἱ λίθοι κεκράβονται." 41. καὶ ὃς ἤγγισεν, ἰδεῖν τὴν πόλιν, ἐκλαυσάν ἐπὶ αὐτῇ, λέγων, 42. "Ὅτι εἶ ἄγνωστοι καὶ σοὶ, καὶ γε ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ σου ταύτη, τὰ πρὸς εἰρήνην σου· τῶν δὲ ἐκροῆς ἀπὸ ὀφθαλμῶν σου. 43. δὴ ἧσουν ἡμέραι ἐκεῖ σε, καὶ περιβάλλοντες σου ἐξήρανσαν σου, καὶ περικυκλώσασιν

1 παντών in BD, perhaps the true reading; πασῶν a correction to agree with δυνάμεως.

8 εν συν. εἰπ. in ΝBL Orig. (Tisch., W.H.).

8 ΝBL omit adhos.

4 σωματίσωσιν in ΝABL R al.

For this form, common in Sept. ΝBL Orig. have θαισσωσιν.

6 εν αὐτῷ in ΝABL, etc.

καὶ σὺ καὶ γε is probably a confusable reading; some western texts have the one, some the other. ΝBL (with D) omit καὶ γε and read εἰς εὐγένειαν τῆς ημ. ταύτης (σου omitted) καὶ συ, and omit σου after εἰρήνην.

5 So in B (W.H. marg.) παριβάλλοντες in ΝCL 33 (Tisch., W.H., text).

variations even between them. The Hebrew Hosanna is omitted and translated into equivalents which recall the gloria in excelsis (Lk. ii. 14), "already become a church hymn" (Holtz., H. C.).

Lk.'s version runs:

Blessed is He that cometh, the King, in the name of the Lord!

In heaven peace,

And glory in the highest.

In comparison with Mt. and Mk. this version seems secondary.

Vv. 39-44. Pharisees murmur and Jesus weeps, peculiar to Lk.—ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄχλου, from within the crowd, or on account of the crowd and what they had been saying, as in ver. 3. Loesner cites from Philo instances of the use of ἅδε in this sense (but in reference to ver. 3).—Ver. 40. ἓναι σωματίσωσιν: ἓναι with future indicative instead of subjunctive as in classic Greek, one of the divergent ways in which the N.T. expresses a future supposition with some probability (vide Burton, *M. and T.*, §§ 250-256).—οἱ λίθοι κραξοῦσιν, the stones will cry out; possibly there is a reference to Hab. ii. 11, but the expression is proverbial (instances in Pniceus, Wetstein, etc.) = the impossible will happen rather than the Messianic kingdom fail of recognition. Some, e.g., Stier and Nösgen, find in the words a reference to the destruction of the temple and the witness it bore to Jesus = if I receive not witness from the Jewish people the scattered stones of the ruined temple will witness for me. An attractive idea, not refuted by Hahn's objection that if it had been in view we should have had ἐν τοῖς οὖσι σωματίσωσιν. instead of ἓναι, etc. ἓναι with future may express a future supposition with some probability.

Vv. 41-44. Jesus weeps at sight of the city and laments its doom.—ὁς = when, as in many places in Lk.—ἐκλαυσάν τε·, He wept aloud, like Peter (Mk. xiv. 72).—δικαίωσαι = to shed tears silently; for a group of synonyms with their distinctive meanings vide under κλαίω in Thayer's *Grimm*.—Ver. 42. εἶ ἤγνως: εἶ with the aorist indicative in a supposition contrary to fact, the apodosis being omitted by an impressive apophasis. —ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τής, in this (late) day, not too late yet. —καὶ σὺ, thou too, as well as my disciples: their insight will save them, but not you and the nation; you must know for yourselves. —καὶ γε (T.R.) the combination καὶ σὺ καὶ γε (vide critical notes) is suspicious. Coming before ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, etc., as in T.R., it will mean: even at this late hour. —τὰ πρὸς εἰρήνην, the things tending to thy peace = thy salvation.—τῶν οὐκ, but now as things stand; the day of grace there-
fore is already past,—ἀπεισάθη; judicial blindness has set in, the penalty of a long course of moral perversity.—Ver. 43. ἐστι, for, because, introducing a prophetic picture of coming ruin, either to explain the εἰ ἐρυθεῖς = what you would have escaped had you but known; or to substantiate the assertion of judicial blindness = no hope of your seeing now: your fate sealed; judgment days will surely come (ἐξουσιοῦν ἡμέραι). Then follows an awful picture of these judgment days in a series of clauses connected by a fivefold καὶ, the first being = when. The description recalls Isaiah xxix. 3 so closely that the use of such definite phrases before the event is quite conceivable, although many critics think the prophecy so certainly εὐερήν as to use it for fixing the date of the Gospel.—χώρας, a palisade (here only in N.T.). Titus did erect a palisaded mound around Jerusalem, and, after it was destroyed by the Jews in a sortie, he built a wall.—Ver. 44. ὁδαφισθῇς: this verb (here only in N.T., Sept. several times) has both σε and τὰ τέκνα σοι, for its objects and must have a meaning assigned to it suitable to each: (1) to raise to the ground—in reference to the city, (2) to dash to the ground—in reference to the children or population of the city. Here only in N.T., frequent in Sept.—τὸν καίρον τῆς ἐνεργικῆς σοι, the season of thy gracious visitation.—ἐνεργικῆς and its corresponding verb have this meaning in N.T. In Sept. it is a non medius and is used with reference to visitations both in mercy and in judgment. —Vv. 45-48. Jesus in the temple (Mt. xxii. 12-17, Mk. xi. 15-19). We have here two tableaux: Jesus reforming temple abuses (45-46), and Jesus teaching in the temple to the delight of the people and the chagrin of their religious and social superiors. Of the former we have but a slight and colourless presentation from Lk., whose editorial solicitudes, now well known to us, here come into play. The story as told by Mt. and Mk. shows passion (of the true Divine prophetic type) and action bordering on violence. This disappears from Lk.'s page in favour of a decorous but neutral picture. J. Weiss thinks it incredible that Lk. should have given us so inadequate a statement had he had such an account as that in Mk. before him (Meyer, eighth edition, note, p. 584). It is perfectly intelligible, once we understand Lk.'s method of handling his material. Equally groundless, for the same reason, is the inference of Hahn from the omissions of Lk. between vv. 44 and 45 (Mt. xxii. 10, 11, Mk. xi. 11-14) that he cannot have known either Mt. or Mk. —Ver. 45. τοὺς πωλοῦντας, the sellers, no mention of the buyers in the true text (W.H. after ℶΒΔ).—Ver. 46. καὶ ἐστα: the καὶ, a well-attested reading, does not occur in the text quoted (Is. lvii. 7). The
XX. 1. KAI ἔγενετο ἐν μία τῶν ἡμερῶν ἑκείνης, 1 διδάσκοντος αὐτοῦ τόν λαόν ἐν τῇ ἱερᾶ καὶ εὐαγγελιζόμενον, ἐπέστησαν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς σὺν τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις, 2. καὶ εἶπον πρὸς αὐτοὺς, λέγοντες, 2 "Εἰπε 3 ἥμιν, ἐν ποιεῖ έξουσία τούτων ποιεῖς, ή τίς ἐστίν ὁ δοῦς σοι τὴν έξουσίαν τούτην?" 3. Ἀποκρίθησαν δὲ εἶπον πρὸς αὐτοὺς, "Ἐρωτήσαμεν ἡμᾶς κἂν ἦν 4 λόγον, καὶ εἴπατε μοι· 4. Τὸ βάπτισμα 5 ἦλθεν εἰς ὁδόν ἣν, ἢ εἰς ἄνθρωπον; 5. Οἱ δὲ συνελογίσαντο 6 πρὸς αὐτούς, λέγοντες, "Οὐ έἰπες ἡμῖν, ἢς ἦν ἐπιμεν, ἢς ὁ ὁδόν, ἢς σὺ, Διαίτη σοὶ 7 οὐκ ἐπιστεύσατε αὐτῷ; 6. ἦν δὲ εἰπεῖς, ἢς ἀνθρώπων, τοις δὲ λαΐς 8 καταλαβάζει ἡμᾶς· 9 πεπεσμένος

words πᾶσιν τοῖς άθεσιν, which do occur, are strangely omitted by Lk., the Gentile evangelist, perhaps to sharpen the contrast between the ideal—a house of prayer, and the reality—a den of robbers, i.e., of dishonest traders, or it may be because the temple was now in ruins. The last part of the saying is from Jerem. vii. 11.

Vv. 47-48. τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν, daily, as in xi. 3.—ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ γραμματεῖς, priests and scribes, Sadducees and Pharisees, lax and strict, united against the Man who had nothing in common with either.—καὶ οἱ προτότοι: added as a kind of afterthought—a socially important people who, though laymen, agreed with the professionals in their dislike of Jesus.—Ver. 48. τὸ τι ποιήσοντων, "the what to do;" the will to kill there, but the way dark (cf. i. 62, xxii. 24).—δὲ λαὸς, the people, the common mass, with their inconvenient liking for a true, outspoken, brave, heroic man.—ἐξερχόμενος αὖ, hung upon Him (hearing), an expressive phrase, and classical; examples in Westein and Pricaeus and in Loesner from Philo. From the Latins they cite:

Pendentque iterum narrantis ab ore.—
Virg., Aen., v. 79.
Narrantibus conjux pened ab ore viri.—
Ovid., Her., i, 30.

Pricaeus suggests that the metaphor is taken from iron and the magnet.

CHAPTER XX. IN THE TEMPLE. PREACHING, CONFLICTS, AND PARABLE OF THE VINEDRESSERS.—Vv. 1-8. By what authority? (Mt. xx. 23-27, Mk. xi. 27-33.)—ἐν μία τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, on one of the days, referred to in xix. 47; vague note of time.—εὐαγγελιζόμενον: Lk. wishes his readers to understand that Jesus was not engaged in heated controversy all the time, that His main occupation during these last days was preaching the good news, speaking "words of grace" there as in Galilee and in Samaria.—ἐπιστήμων, came upon, with perhaps a suggestion of suddenness (examples in Loesner from Philo), and even of hostility (adorti sunt, Erasmus, Annot.), In xxi. 34 Lk. uses a separate word along with the verb to express the idea of suddenness.—Ver. 2. εἶπον ἥμιν: peculiar to Lk., makes the question pointed.—τῶν ought to refer to the preaching, not to the cleansing of the temple, which in Lk. is very slightly noticed.—τὸ δότων, etc.: a direct question introduced by ή, not dependent on εἶπον, not altogether distinct from the first question; an alternative form putting it more specifically and more pointedly than in parallels —who is it that gives, who can it be? Authority everything for the interrogators. Every Rabbi had his diploma, every priest his ordination (Farrar).—Ver. 3. λόγον: without the έν of the parallels. Vide notes there.—Ver. 5. συνελογίσαντο:
γάρ ἐστιν ἰδιαίτερα προφητὴν εἶναι." 7. Καὶ ἀπεκρίθησαν μὴ εἰδέναι
πόλεμῳ. 8. καὶ ὁ Παρισιώτης εἶξεν αὐτοῖς, "Οδὸν ἐγὼ λέγω ὅτι ἐν ποιῇ
θεοῦ ταύτα τούτα πῶς.
9. Ἡράτως δὲ πρὸς τὸν λαὸν λέγεις τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην—
"Ἀποκαλύπτος τις ἐφώτισεν ἀμπελώνα, καὶ ἔβδομος 2 αὐτῶν γεννηθῆς,
καὶ ἀπεθάνετος κρόνος ἰκανοῦς. 10. καὶ ἐν 3 καρφὶ ἀπάοτειλε πρὸς
τῶν γεωργῶν δοῦλον, ἵνα ἀπὸ τοῦ καρποῦ τοῦ ἀμπελώνος δώσῃ 4
αὐτῷ· οἱ δὲ γεωργοὶ διήραντες αὐτῶν ἐξαπέστειλαν 5 κενὸν. 11. καὶ
προσέθετο πέμψαι ἄτερον 6 δοῦλον· οἱ δὲ ἀκάιεινοι διήραντες καὶ
ἀπόμεινες ἐξαπέστειλαν κενὸν. 12. καὶ προσέθετο πέμψαι τρίτον 7·
οἱ δὲ καὶ τούτον "τραυμάτισαν ἐξβάλον· 13. ἔκει δὲ ὁ κύριος
τοῦ ἀμπελώνου, τῇ πόλει; πέμψει τὸν υἱόν μου τῷ ἀνάγκην·

1 NBDCL omit τι, and BBL have εὐφόρ. εὐφτ. as. in T.R. C has ἐφτ. εὐφτ. εὐφτ. εὐφτ. εὐφτ. εὐφτ. εὐφτ. εὐφτ. εὐφτ.
2 ἕβδομος in NBL = parall. Tisch. and W.H. both adopt it, but Trg. retains ἔβδομος found in D.
3 Ομίλος οὗ NBL 33.
4 ἔφωτισεν in NABLMQ (Tisch., W.H.). CD have διήραντες.
5 ἐξαπέστειλαν αὐτῶν in NBL.
6 κατεργάσατο in NBL.
7 τριτον πέμψαι in NBL.

for the more usual διήραντες; here only in N.T.—φρονοῦν may be connected either with this verb or with διήραντες.
—Ver. 6. καταλθάνειν: in the parallels it is indicated generally that they feared the people; here it is explained why or what they feared: viz., that the people wouldstone them; to be taken cum grano.
The verb is a ἐπίδημος; synonyms are καταλθάνειν (Joseph.), καταλθαβάλειν (Ex. xvi. 4). —κατεργάσατο points to a
fixed permanent conviction, this the force of the perfect participle.—Ver. 7. μὴ εἰδέναι, the answer is given in dependent form = ὅσιον ἔσθομεν in parallels.
—Ver. 9-19. The parable of the wicked scribes (Mt. xx. 33-46, Mk. xxi. 1-12). Between the last section and this, comes in Mt., the parable of the Two Sons.
—Ver. 9. ἐβαθμίζω: this word is less appropriate here than in Mk., where it means: made a beginning in teaching by parables by uttering this particular parable. Here it may signify turning to the people again after disposing of the question of the Pharisees concerning authority.—ἐφώτισεν ἀμπελώνα: Lk. contents himself with this general statement, omitting the details given in parallels, which explain what planting a vineyard involves.—χρόνους λειτουργήσεως; literally, "for long times," peculiar to Lk. here; similar phrases are of frequent occurrence in his writings. The "long times" cover the whole period of Israel's history. The absenteeism of God during these long ages represents the free scope given in providence to the will of man in the exercise of his moral responsibility.—Ver. 10. τὸ ᾲραμαῖον means the fruit season each year; many such seasons at which God sent demanding fruit.—ἐν δόζοις: ἐν with the future in a pure final clause; similar constructions occur in classic Greek, but with δῶροι, not with ἐναι.—διήραντες: the gradation in indignities is well marked in Lk.—beating, beating, beating with shameful handling (ἀτριμίζαστες), ejection with woundings (τραυματίσαστες ἐξβάλον), culminating in murder in the case of the son. In the parallels killing comes in sooner, which is true to the historical fact.—Ver. 12. προσέθετο πέμψαι, he added to send, a Hebraism, as in xix. 11. —Ver. 13. τῇ πόλει: deliberative sub-
junctive, serving to make the step next taken appear something extraordinary. In Mt. it appears simply as the next (final) step in common course. In Mk. the son is the only person left to send. He had yet one, a beloved son, "beloved" added to bring out the significance of
sending him. In Lk, the reference to
the son has a theological colour: τὸν
υἱὸν μον τὸν ἀγαπητὸν.—Ἰσως: more
than "perhaps" or "it may be" (A.V.,
R.V.), and less than "without doubt"
("aine dubio," Wolf). It expresses
what may naturally and reasonably
be expected — τὰ γαρ (Hesychius), or
οἷς (Bormann) = I should think
(they will reverence him). Here only
in N.T.—Ver. 15. εἰκόνισεν ἀπεκτειναν,
casting out they killed him, inven-
ting the order of the actions in Mk.;
perhaps with prospective reference (on
Lk’s part) to the crucifixion, when Jesus
was led outside the city and crucified
"without the gate".—Ver. 16. μὴ
γενέσθαι: here only in the Gospels,
frequent in St. Paul’s Epistles ("a Pauline
phrase," Holtzmann, H. C.). Sturz
(De Dialecto Mac. et Alex.) reckons it an
Alexandrine usage, because found in the
sense of depreciation only in Sept., N.T.,
and late Greek writers. Raphael cites an
example from Herodotus. This μὴ
γενέσθαι is put by Lk. into the mouth of
the people, as unable to contemplate the
doom pronounced on the husbandmen
as described by Jesus. In Mt. (xx. 41)
the people themselves pronounce the
doom. The sentiment thus strongly
expressed prepares the way for the reference
to the "rejected stone".
Vv. 17-19.—ἐμβλήθης, looking in-
tently, to give impressiveness to what
He is going to say in reply.—τί οὖν,
etc., what then is (means) this Scripture? the
οὖν implying that the words point to the
very doom they deprecate. Yet the
oracle does not directly indicate the fate
of the builders, but rather the unex-
pected turn in the fortunes of the re-
jected and despised Stone. In Mt. and
Mk. the citation is introduced, without
any binding connection with what im-
mediately goes before, to state a fact
concerning the future of the "Son"
lying outside the parable. They give
the citation in full. Lk. omits the last
clause: πάρα πως, etc.—Ver. 18
points out the bearing of the turn in the
fortunes of the "Stone" on the fate of
those who rejected Him. The thought
is based on Daniel ii. 35. It is not in
Mk., and it is a doubtful reading in Mt.
It may have been a comment on the
oracle from the Psalter suggested to
believing minds by the tragic fate of the
Jews. They first stumbled on the stone,
then the stone fell on them with crushing
judicial effect.—Ver. 19 states the effect
of the parabolic discourse of Jesus on the
men whom it satirised. They desired to
apprehend the obnoxious Speaker on the
spot.—ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἡρῴ, καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν,
etc.: the καὶ here, as in Mk., is in effect
= but; vide notes on Mk.—ἐγνώσαν,
they, that is the Pharisees, and scribes
knew.—τὸ αὖτον = with reference
to themselves.
20. Καὶ παρατηρήσαντες ἄπετείλαν ἐγκαθέτουσιν ὑποκριτικοῦς, ὑποκριτικοῦς

21. καὶ ἐπηρώθησαν αὐτοῖς, λέγοντες, "Διδάσκαλε, ὅταν ὁ δρόμος λεγεῖς

καὶ ὑποκριτικοῦς, καὶ ὁ λαμβάνεις πρόσωπον, ἀλλ' ἐν ἀληθείᾳ τῆς


1 For eis τὸ ΝΒCDL have wos (Tisch., W.H.).

2 καθαρισμόντες: used absolutely = watching, not Him, but their opportunity; so Grotius and Field (Ot. Nor.); watching with close cunning observation (accurate et insidiosa observare, Kypke).

3 ἄνακαθήσεται; some derive from ἀν and καθάπερ = sitters down, lying in wait (subscorere, Grotius), others from κατατάσσω. The most probable derivation is from καθαμία, to place in ambush (so Kypke, Schanz, etc.).

4 πειρατεῖς: from πειράσσειν, to test, prove, as in the mind of Lk. Here only in N.T. = "spies" (A.V., R.V.), "Aufpasser" (Weizäcker). — ἡποκριτικοῦς: ὑποκριτικοῦς, being to pass themselves off as; that was the trick they had been put up to. — δικαίων, honest men, sincerely anxious to know and do their duty. They might pose as such with the better chance of success if they were as Mt. states "disciples"; scholars of the scribes = ingenious young men. — ἐν αὐτοῦ λόγον: that they might lay hold either of a word of His, or of Him by a word (eum in sermo, Vulgate), or of Him, i.e., of a word spoken by Him; all three alternatives find support.— διδάσκαλος (ἐν τῷ Τ. R.), indicating aim and tendency.— ταὐτὰ καὶ τὰ ἐφετέρα τὸν, therefore, connecting to τοῖς θεοῦν. So construed the clause will mean "to the rule and especially to the authority of the governor," rule being general, and authority a more special definition of it. Some take ἀρχηγός as referring to the Sanhedrim. The probability is that both refer to Pilate. On the aim thus said to be in view Grotius remarks: "When disputes about religion do not suffice to oppress the innocent, matters relating to the state are wont to be taken up."— Ver. 21. ἄρχηγος, rightly, as in vii. 43, pointing not to sincerity in speech (λέγεις) and teaching (διδάσκαλος) but to sound judgment = you always say the right thing; the second clause points to impartiality = you say the same thing to all; the third to sincerity = you say what you think. They describe an ideal from which their own masters were as remote as possible.

Ver. 22. The question.— φῶνον = κῆνον, a Latinism, in the parallels.— Ver. 23. πανουργίαν, craft, cunning, as in 2 Cor. iv. 2, which possibly the evangelist had in his eye. Each synoptist has his own word here (πανουργίαν Mt., ὑποκρισίαν Mk.) as if trying to describe the indescribable.— Ver. 24. Lk. reports more briefly than Mt. and Mk., not thinking it necessary to state that the denarius asked for was handed to Jesus.

Ver. 25. τοῦτον, therefore, connecting
27. Προσελθόντες δὲ τινες των Σαδδουκαίων, οἱ ἀρτιλόγοιτες ἀνάστασιν μὴ εἶναι, ἐπηρώθησαν αὐτὸν. 28. λέγοντες, “Διδάσκαλε, ἡμῶν ἤγραφεν ἡμῖν, ἂν τινος ἄδελφος ἀποθάνῃ ἐκὼν γυναῖκα, καὶ οὗτος ἀτεκνὸς ἀποθάνῃ, ἵνα λαβῇ ὁ ἄδελφος αὐτοῦ τὴν γυναίκα, καὶ ἐξαναστήσῃ σπέρμα τῷ ἄδελφῳ αὐτοῦ. 29. ἐπὶ αὐτῷ ἄδελφοι ἦσαν καὶ ὁ πρῶτος λαβὼν γυναῖκα ἀπέθανεν ἀτεκνὸς. 30. καὶ ἢλαβεν ὁ δεύτερος τὴν γυναίκα, καὶ οὗτος ἀπέθανεν ἀτεκνὸς. 31. καὶ ὁ τρίτος ἠλαβεν αὐτὴν· ὁ δεύτερος δὲ καὶ οἱ ἐπὶ αὐτῷ κατέλιπον τέκνα, καὶ ἀπέθανον. 32. ἔστερον δὲ πάντων ἀπέθανεν καὶ ἡ γυνή. 33. ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ ἀναστάσει, τίνος αὐτῶν γίνεται γυνή; οἱ γὰρ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐσχον αὐτὴν γυναίκα.” 34. Καὶ ἀποκρίθησις ἐκείνη αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, “Οἱ οὐλο τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦτον γαμοῦσιν καὶ ἐκγαμίσκονται. 35. οἱ δὲ καταξιωθέντες τοῦ αἰῶνος ἑκείνου πυχεῖν καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τῆς ἐκ νεκρῶν ὡς γαμοῦσιν ὡς ἐκγαμίσκονται. 36. οὐτε γὰρ

1 ἩΒΔΚΛΙ, 33 al. vers. have οἱ λεγομένης, which may be a conformation to paral. Tisch. and W.H. adopt this reading.
2 For ἀποθάνῃ ἩΒΔΚΛΠ I, 33 al. have ἡ (Tisch., W.H.).
3 For καὶ ἠλαβεν ἌΛΒΠ have simply καὶ οἱ δεύτερος (Tisch., W.H.).
4 Omit δὲ πάντων and place ἀπέθανεν after γυνή ἩΒΔΚΛ minusc.
5 For ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ ἀναστάσει ἩΒΔΚΛ have η γυνή οὖν ἐν τῇ ἀναστ., γυνὴ thus occurring twice (Tisch., W.H.).
6 Omit ἀποκρίθησις ἩΒΔΚΛ.
7 γαμισκονται in ἩΒΔΚΛ 33.
8 γαμισκονται in ἩΔΚΛΟΨΙΑ I, 33 al. (Tisch., W.H., text). B has γαμισκονται (W.H. marg.).

the dictum following with the fact stated before that the denarius bore Caesar’s image, and implying that by the dictum Jesus pronounced in favour of paying tribute to the Roman ruler.—Ver. 26. The reply of Jesus, baffling in itself, was doubly so, because it had made a favourable impression on the people. Therefore the questioners deemed it best to make no attempt at criticism in presence of the people (διανοοῦν τοῦ λαοῦ).

Vv. 27-39. The resurrection question. Sadducees speak (Mt. xxii. 23-33, Mk. xii. 18-27).—οἱ ἀρτιλόγοιτες in strict grammar ought to refer to τινες, but doubtless it is meant to refer to the whole party. It is a case of a nominative in loose apposition with a genitive—"outside the construction of the sentence—interposed as a pendent word, so to speak." Winer, G. N. T., p. 668.—μὴ εἶναι: literally denying that there is not a resurrection, the meaning being really the reverse. After verbs of denying the Greeks repeat the negation. The reading λέγοντες, though well attested, looks like a grammatical correction.—Ver. 28. ἀτεκνὸς: here only in N.T. = μὴ ἐχὼν τ. in Mt. and μὴ ἀφῇ τ. in Mk.—Ver. 29. οὖν, therefore, carrying on the narrative (frequent in John) and implying that the law of Moses cited gave rise to the curious case stated and the difficulty connected with it.—Ver. 31. οὐ κατέλιπον τ. κ. ἀπέθανον, did not leave children and died, for dying leaving no children. The emphasis is on the childlessness, therefore it is mentioned first. That the seven died in course of time was a matter of course, but that seven in succession should have no children was marvellous.—Ver. 34. In giving Christ’s answer Lk. omits the charge of ignorance against the questioners found in Mt. and Mk.—γαμισκονται = γαμισκονται in parallels, here only in N.T.—Ver. 35. οἱ ἐκ καταξιωθέντες, etc., those deemed worthy to attain that world. The thought could have been expressed without τυχεῖν, for which accordingly there is no equivalent in the Vulgate: “qui digni habebuntur seculo illo,” on which account Præceus thinks it should be left out of the Greek text. But the
The sentiment in some measure echoes Rom. xiv. 7, 8.—Ver. 39. καλοὶ ἔθεα, Thou hast spoken well; complimentary, but insincere, or only half sincere. They are glad to have the Sadducees put down, but not glad that Ἰησοῦς triumphed.—Ver. 40. οὐδὲν γὰρ: the γὰρ, if the true reading, must mean: The scribes could do nothing but flatter (ver. 39), for they were so conscious of His power that they dared no longer ask captious questions.

**Vv. 41-44. The counter question (Mt. xxii. 41-46, Mk. xii. 35-37).** Lk. who had given something similar at an earlier stage (x. 25-37), omits the question of the scribe concerning the great commandment, which comes in at this point in Mt. (xxii. 34-40) and Mk. (xii. 28-34), retaining only its conclusion (in Mk.), which he appends to the previous narrative (ver. 40).—Ver. 41. πρὸς αὐτούς, to them, i.e., the representatives of the scribes mentioned in ver. 39. In Mt. the Pharisees are addressed, in Mk. the audience is the people, and the question is about the scribes as interpreters. Ἡ λέγων, how do they say? (not λέγειν). The controversial character of the question is not made clear in Lk.—Ver. 42. ἐν βίβλῳ ᾑ, in the book of Psalms, in place of ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τ. ᾑ (in the Holy Spirit, Mk.), which one might have expected Lk. to retain if he found it in his source. But he probably names the place in O.T. whence the quotation is taken for the information of his readers. That what
was written in the Psalms, was spoken by the Holy Spirit, was axiomatic for him.—ουτος ἦν, as in the Psalms, for οὐκ οὖν in Mt. and Mk. according to the approved readings. Lk. seems to have turned the passage up (Holtzmann, H. C.). Vv. 45-47. Warning against the scribes (Mk. xii. 38-40).—Either a mere fragment of the larger whole in Mt. xxiii., or the original nucleus around which Mt. has gathered much kindred matter—the former more likely.—Ver. 46. φιλούντων: while following Mk. in the main, Lk. improves the construction here by introducing this participle before διστασμούς, which in Mk. depends on διέγραψαν.—Ver. 47. Another improvement is the change of οἱ κατασκευάτες (Mk. xii. 40) into οἱ κατασκευασμένα—vide notes on Mk.—μακρὰ, at length, an adverb. Bengel (in Mt.) suggests μακρὰ to agree with προφατεί ("ex orationibus sucere magnam prōfātw, prae-textum comendendi domus viduarum"). Eisler adopts the same view.

Chapter XXI. The Widow’s Offering. The Apocalyptic Discourse.—Vv. 1-4. The widow’s offering (Mk. xii. 41-44), unfortunately placed at the beginning of this chapter, which should have been devoted wholly to Christ’s solemn discourse concerning the future. Yet this mal-arrangement corresponds to the manner in which Lk. introduces that discourse, by comparison with Mt. and Mk., markedly unemphatic.—Ver. 1. ἀναβλήψας, looking up, giving the impression of a casual, momentary glance taken by one who had been previously pre-occupied with very different matters. Mk’s narrative conveys the idea of deliberate, interested observation by one who took a position convenient for the purpose, and continued observing (καθώς κατέλαβε, θεόρη).—τὰ δόματα, instead of Mk’s χελέων. Lk. has in view only the rich; Mk., in the first place, the multitude.—πλουτισμός: the whole clause from τοὺς μακρὰ ἔλεγεν ἦν, saw those casting in, etc., or πλ. may be in apposition with τοὺς βαλλόντας = saw those casting in, etc., being rich men (so Hahn and Farrar). The former (A.V., Wz.) is to be preferred.—Ver. 2. πεντηκοσιά, needy, from πένθος or πένα; a poetic word rarely used, here only in N.T. ἄηδης, Mk.’s word, is stronger = reduced to beggary.—δύο λέπτα. Lk. does not think it necessary to explain
what the coin was or what the contribution amounted to. Mk. states its value in Roman coinage (κοσμάτων).

The narrator is concerned alone about the saying—λόγος, for Mk.'s Hebrew אֱמִית, as nearly always. —πως: Lk. does not avoid this word: the use of the other term in his preliminary narrative is a matter of style. πως implies that the widow might have been expected to beg rather than to be giving to the temple treasury.—Ver. 4. πώσας συνειδ, all these, referring to the rich and pointing to them.—στεφάναμα: practically = Mk.'s στεφάνες, preferred possibly because in use in St. Paul's epistles: not so good a word as στεφάνες to denote the state of poverty out of which she gave. Lk.'s expression strictly means that she gave out of a deficit, a minus quantity ("ex quo quod deest illi," Vulg.), a strong but intelligible way of putting it.—τ. Βλαν, her living, as in xv. 12, 30 = means of subsistence. Lk. combines Mk.'s two phrases into one.

The Apocalyptic Discourse (vv. 5-38).—Vv. 5-7. Introduction to the discourse (Mt. xxiv. 1-3, Mk. xiii. 1-4).—καὶ των λεγόντων, and some remarking. A most unemphatic transition, as if what follows were simply a continuation of discourse in the temple on one of many topics on which Jesus spoke. No indication that it was disciples (any of the Twelve) who asked the question, or that the conversation took place outside. Cf. the narrative in Mk. The inference that Lk. cannot have known Mk.'s narrative (Godet) is inadmissible. Lk. omits many things he knew. His interest is obviously in the didactic matter only, and perhaps we have here another instance of his "sparing the Twelve". He may not have cared to show them filled with thoughtless admiration for a building (and a system) which was doomed to judicial destruction.—λόγος καλός, beautiful stones: marble, huge; vide Joseph., B. J., v. 5. 2.—καὶ στέφανα, and votive or sacred gifts, in Lk. only; the reference implies that the spectators are within the building. These gifts were many and costly, from the great ones of the earth: a table from Ptolemy, a chain from Agrippa, a golden vine from Herod the Great. The temple was famous for its wealth. Tacitus writes: "illic immense opulentiae templum," Hist., vi. 8.—καὶ στέφανα: perfect, expressing the permanent result of past acts of skilful men and beneficent patrons—a highly ornamented edifice, the admiration of the world, but marked for destruction by the moral order of the universe.—Ver. 6. ταῦτα κ. Σομε. Some (Grotius, Priceus) take ταῦτα = τούτος: of these things which ye see a stone shall not be left. Most, however, take it as a nominative absolute = as for these things which ye see (vide Winer, § lxxxii. 2 d). This suits better the emotional mood.—διασώστε σοι: cf. v. 35, where a similar ominous allusion to coming evil does not occur.—Ver. 7. θεώσαθε, Master, suggesting its correlate, disciples, but not necessarily implying that the question proceeded from the Twelve; rather the contrary, for they would not be so formal in their manner of speaking to Jesus (cf. Mt. and Mk.).—καὶ οὐθεν ἡδονά, etc.: the question refers exclusively to the predicted destruction of the temple= when, and what the sign? So in Mk. Cf. Mt. Vv. 8-11. Signs presulusive of the end (Mt. xxiv. 4-8, Mk. xiii. 5-11).—βλέπετε, etc., take heed that ye be not deceived. This the keynote—not to tell when, but to protect disciples from delusions and terrors.—καὶ τῷ στίχῳ, in my name, i.e., calling themselves Christs. Vide at Mt. on these false Messiahs.—ὁ καιρὸς ἡγείμεν ἡγείμεν: the καιρός should naturally mean Jerusalem's latal day.—Ver. 9.
lying under Lk.'s eye mentions the signs in the heaven at a later stage, ver. 24. Or it may be Lk.'s equivalent for "there things are the beginning of birth pangs" (Mt. ver. 8, Mk. ver. 9), a Hebrew idea which he avoids.—απαγορεύοντες: a technical term in Athenian legal language.—Ver. 13. άποθεοτείται, it will turn out; as in Phil. i. 19.—μή εἰς μαρτύριον, for a testimony to you = to your credit or honour; = εἰς μαρτυρίου δόξαν, Theophy. So also Bleek. J. Weiss (Meyer), following Baur and Hilgenfeld, renders: it will result in your martyrdom. This meaning is kindred to that of Theophy., but can hardly be intended here (Schanz). The idea belongs to a later time, and the sense is scarcely consistent with ver. 18.—Ver. 14. θέτε σον: not = consider, as in i. 66, but = resolve, as in Acts v. 4 ("settle it in your hearts," A.V.).—μη προμελέτητα (here only in N.T.), not to study beforehand, with the inf. ; not to be taken in the letter, as a rule, but in the spirit, therefore = Mk.'s προμελετήσατε which counsels abstinence from anxious thought beforehand.—Ver. 15. έγώ, I, emphatic, the exalted Lord, instead of "the Holy Spirit" in Mk. and "the Spirit of the Father" in Mt. x. 20. The sub titution bears witness to the inspiring effect of the thought of the Lord Jesus ruling in heaven on the minds of Christians enduring tribulation, at the time when Lk. wrote.—στόμα, a mouth = utterance.—σιφών: the wisest thing to say in the actual situation.—αὐτωτήρα εἰς στόμα, and αὐταρκείαν to σφιών = "They will not be able to
1. οδέστησαίναι τάκτες οι ἀντικείμενοι ὅμων. 16. παραδοθῆσαί τε καὶ ὅπως γονέων καὶ ἀδελφῶν καὶ συγγενῶν καὶ φίλων, καὶ βανατο- 
σουσιν ὅμων. 17. καὶ ἐσοδέο μοιούμενοι ὅπως τάκτες διὰ τὸ ὄνομά 
μου. 18. καὶ βρίζε ἐκ τῆς κεφαλῆς ὅμων ὁ μὴ ἀπολητή. 19. ἐν 
τῇ ὀπομνή ὅμων κτίσασθε τὰς ψυχὰς ὅμων. 20. Ὑπὸ δὲ ἔδη 
κυκλομάζην ὑπὸ στρατοπεδῶν τὴν ἱερουσαλήμ, τότε γνώτε ὅτι 
ἡγεμόνι ἡ ἐρήμωσις ἀυτῆς. 21. τότε οἱ ἐν τῇ θωδαίᾳ. ἐφεγίνουσα 
eis τὰ δρα. καὶ οἱ ἐν μέσῳ ἀυτῆς ἐκχωρίσασθαν καὶ οἱ ἐν τοῖς 
χώραις μὴ ἐίσαρξισθοῦσαν εἰς αὐτήν. 22. ὅτι ἱμάρα ἐκδικήσεις 
ἀυτάς εἰσιν, τού πληρωθήναι πάντα τὰ γεγομάμενα. 23. οὐαὶ δέ 
ταῖς ἐν γαστρὶ ἐκχωρίσασας καὶ ταῖς θηλαζοῦσαις ἐν ἐκκενίσι ταῖς 
ἱμάραις. ἓσται γὰρ ἀνάγκη μεγάλη ἐκ τῆς γῆς, καὶ ἀρχὴ ἐν 
τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ. 24. καὶ πεσόνται στόματα μαχαίρας, καὶ ἀκινδυ- 
νοθησόνται εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη καὶ ἱερουσαλήμ ἓσται πατομάτη.

1 ἀντικείμενοι οἱ ἀντικείμενοι εἰς ΝΒΛ 13, 69 al. (Tisch., W.H.).
2 κτίσασθε in AB minusc. (W.H.). T.R. = ΝDLRX, etc. (Tisch.).
3 Ομοιόμενοι οἱ πάντων, continued (pres. part.) by all; dismal prospect! Yet—Ver. 18, ὅπως, etc., a hair of your head shall not perish = Mt. x. 30, where it is said: “your hairs are all numbered.” What! even in the case of those who die? Yes, Jesus would have His apostles live in this faith whatever beside! an optimistic creed, necessary to a heroic life.—Ver. 19, κτίσ- 
σας ὁ κτίσασθε, ye shall win, or win ye; sense the same. Similar various readings in Rom. v. 1, ἱομίων or ἱομένων.
4 Τὸ παράδοθον, in course of being surrounded; pres. part., but not necessarily implying that for the author of this version of Christ’s words the process is actually going on (J. Weiss—Meyer). Jesus might have so spoken conceiving Himself as present—στρατοπεδῶν, camps, or armies, here only in N.T. This takes the place in Lk. of the ἰδέαν γαμα in the parallels, avoided as at once foreign and mysterious.—ὑπὸ ἐρήμωσις a., her desolation, including the ruin of the temple, the subject of inquiry: when besieging armies appear you know what to look for.—Ver. 21. τότε, then, momentous hour, time for prompt action.—ἐφεγίνουσα, flee! The counsel is for the three classes: (1) those in Judea at some distance from Jerusa- 
elle, (2) those who happen to be in Jerusalem (ἐν μέσῳ αὐτής) when the armies appear, (3) those in the fields or farms round about Jerusalem (ἐν ταῖς χώραις) who might be tempted to take refuge within the city from the invaders, thinking themselves safe within its walls, and who are therefore counselled not to enter. The corresponding counsel in the parallels, vv. 17, 18 in Mt., 15, 16 in Mk., vividly sets forth the necessity of immediate flight.—Ver. 22: peculiar to Lk., and setting forth Jerusalem’s fate as the fulfillment (πληρωθήναι, for the more usual πληρω- 
θήναι, here only in N.T.) of prophecy.—Ver. 23, οὐαὶ, etc.: as in parallels as far as ἱμάραις; then follow words peculiar to Lk. concerning the ἀνάγκη and ἀρχή. The use of the former word in the sense of distress is mainly Hellenistic; here and in St. Paul’s epistles. The latter
16—28. ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ

25. Καὶ ἔσται σημεία ἐν ξύλῳ καὶ σέληνι καὶ ἄστροις, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς συνοχὴ ἐθνῶν ἐν τῷ Κορ. Ι. 4. ἀνορίᾳ, ἡχοῦσι 26. ἀποφυγόντων ἄνθρωπων there only πως ἀπὸ φόβου καὶ προσωπικὰς τῶν ἐπιχειρήμων τῆς οἰκουμένης αἴ γὰρ δυνάμεις τῶν φάραγκων σαλεύσονται. 27. καὶ τότε ὄφειται τῶν ὀφείλον· ἀπὸ ἄθρωτου ἐρχόμενον καὶ καθήκονται ἔσχατη τις.

28. ἂρχομένων δὲ τούτων γίνεται, ἀνακόψει καὶ ἐπάρατε τὸς κεφάλας ὅμως· διὸ ἔγγεις ἡ ἀπαλύτρωσις ὅμως." e here only in Gospels.

1 αἵρετον in ΝBCLDR al. pl. B inserts after πληρωθῶς καὶ συνται (W.H. in brackets).
2 The singular with a plural neuter nominative as usual in T.R.; συνται in ΝBD.
3 ἤχον in ΝΑΒCLMRX al. (Tisch., W.H.). ἤχον (D, etc.) an exegetical change.

word expresses the same idea as that in ἦχον (W.H.) according as it is derived from ἤχος (neuter like θλός, νίκος, etc., in N.T.) or from ἤχος.—Ver. 26. ἐναπόκεισται: literally, dying. probably meant tropically = ὑπερείπε. Mt. xxviii. 4.—ἀπὸ φόβου καὶ προσωπικά, from fear and expectation, instead of fearful expectation as in Heb. x. 27 (φοβερὰ ἐκδοχῆς) προσωπικὰ here and in Acts xii. 11.—Ver. 27. ἐν νεφέλῃ, in a cloud, sing., instead of the plural in parallels, making the conception more literal.—Ver. 28: instead of the graphic picture of the angels gathering the elect in Mt. and Mk., Lk. has a general statement that when these signs, terrible to the whole of redemption for believers is at hand. They may look up and raise their heads. Cf. i Thess. i. 5-10, Jas. v. 7.
29. And he spoke to the people in parable, saying, ‘Watch out for the fig tree and all the trees.
30. When you see a fig tree shoot out leaves, you know that summer is near.
31. So also, when you see these things happening, you know that the kingdom of God is near.
32. Be on your guard, therefore, for you do not know when this will happen, whether in the next week or the next year.
33. Be prepared, therefore, for it is as though a man (who does not know whether it is in the next week or the next year) goes away to leave his property to his servants, saying to them, ‘Each of you as his master teaches him.
34. If anyone is able to make a good return, let him receive more, and if not, he will be not be able to make even what he has.
35. ‘Whoever therefore has earned will receive more, and whoever has not earned will lose even what he has.’

Vv. 29-33. Parable of the Fig Tree.

Ver. 29. στάθηκα: added by Lk., generalising as in xii. 23: ‘take up his cross daily’. The lesson is taught by all the trees, but parabolic style demands special reference to one particular tree.—προβάλλων, put forth (their leaves, τα φύλλα understood). Similar phrases in Greek authors.—βλάπτωντας, etc., when ye look (as who does not when spring returns) ye know of yourselves, need no one to tell you.—Ver. 31. η βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, explaining the elliptical but not obscure words in Mt. and Mk.: ‘(it) is near,’ i.e., the coming of the Son of man. For Lk. that is one with the coming of the Kingdom, which now is (ver. 31).—Ver. 32. οὐκ ἐπέτρεπεν: Lk. adds, ‘as when the Son of man is to be revealed in his glory’ (ver. 31).—Ver. 33: with slight change as in parallels, even to the retention of ἀμέν usually replaced by ἀλληλούς. Presumably ἐγείρας means for Lk., as it must have done for the Twelve to whom the words were spoken, the generation to which Jesus Himself belonged. Hahn holds that ἀγείρας refers to the generation within whose time the events mentioned in ver. 25, 26 shall happen (so also Klostermann).

Vv. 34-36. General exhortation to watchfulness, peculiar to Lk.; each evangelist having his own epilogue.—ἐαυτόν καὶ μηδέ: this seems to be a phrase similar to ἕχοις καὶ σάλιον—sound and wave for sounding wave (ver. 25) = in headache (from yesterday’s intoxication) and drunkenness, for: in drunkenness which causes headache and stupidity. Pricaeus denies that κρασάλη (here only in N.T.) means yesterday’s debauch (χθεσιν μάθη), and takes it = ἀθησία, gluttony. That is what we expect certainly. The warning he understands figuratively. So also Bleek.—μεριμνάς βιωτικάς, cares of life, ‘what shall we eat, drink?’ etc. (xii. 22).—Ver. 35. ἐστὶν ταγία, as a snare, joined to the foregoing clause in R.V., ‘(and that day come upon you suddenly as a snare’). Field objects that the verb following ἐκπαιδεύεσθαι does not seem sufficiently strong to stand alone, especially when the same word occurs in ver. 26.—Ver. 36. ἐστιν ταγία, a double connection. The figure of a snare, while expressive, is less apposite than that of a thief (xii. 39).—καθήμενος κ. ε. π. etc., sitting on the face of the earth; the language here has a Hebrew colouring.—Ver. 36. ἐστιν ταγία καιρῆς, in every season.—κατασχούσεται,
that ye may have power, "prevail" (R.V.)—καταξειθήσεται (T.R.), "may be accounted worthy" (A.V.), also gives a very good meaning, even in some respects preferable.—στοιχεῖα, to stand—in the judgment (so, many), or to be presented to, placed before. So most recent commentators. Either gives a good sense (Bleck).

Vv. 37-38. Concluding notice as to how Jesus spent His last days.—Ver. 37. ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ διδάσκων, teaching in the temple. The statement covers all that is related in chapters xx., xxii., including the Apocalyptic discourse of Jesus made the most of His short time for the spiritual instruction of the people.—πολὺ, lodged, imperfect, because done night after night. Some (e.g., Godet and Farrar) think Jesus with the Twelve slept in the open air. The word might mean this, though in Mt. xxi. 17 it appears to mean passed the night in a house in Bethany.—εἰς τ. β.: the use of εἰς is probably due to the influence of ἐξερχόμενοι. But Tobit xiv. 10 has a similar construction: μνασέως ἀλοιποθετεί εἰς τὸ οἴκον, came and dwelt in the house. early, or sought Him eagerly (Meyer). ὁρισθεῖσαι, the Greek form, always is used literally or temporarily.—ὁρισθεῖσαι, its Hellenistic equivalent, seems sometimes to be used tropically, as in Ps. lxxviii. 34 ("early," R.V., "earnestly" in margin), Sirach iv. 26, vi. 36. The one meaning easily runs into the other: he who rises early to learn is in earnest. Earliness in the people implies earliness in Jesus, and corresponding devotion to the work.

CHAPTER XXII. THE PASSION HISTORY. The Passion history, as told by Lk., varies considerably from the narratives of Mt. and Mk., by omissions, additions, etc. J. Weiss (Meyer), following Feine, thinks that Lk. used as his main source for this part of his Gospel not Mk., but the precanonical Lk., whose existence Feine has endeavoured to prove. Lk.'s narrative at some points resembles that of the Fourth Gospel.

Vv. 1-2. Introductory (Mt. xxvi. 1-5, Mk. xiv. 1-2).—γυναῖκα, drew near, for the more definite note of time in parallels.—ἤ ορθή, etc.: the Feast of Unleavened Bread and the Passover are treated as one. Mk. distinguishes them. Lk. writes for Gentiles; hence his "called" the passover (ἠ λεγομένη).—Ver. 2. ὁ θάνατος, the how, that was the puzzle, that Jesus should be put out of the way by death (ἀνέλευσον αὐτὸν); somehow was a settled matter. Cf. xix. 48 (τὸ τέλος, etc.).—ἀφοβοῦτο γὰρ τ. θ. : their fear of the people explains why the how was so perplexing a matter. The popularity of Jesus was very embarrassing.

Vv. 3-5. Ὅδωρα (Mt. xxvi. 14-16, Mk. xiv. 10, 11). At this point in Mt. (xxvi. 6-13) and Mk. (xiv. 3-9) comes in the anointing at Bethany omitted by Lk.—ἐλυθέραν Σαμαραίας, Satan entered into Judas. Lk. alone of the synoptists thus explains the conduct of Judas. Cf. John xiii. 2. Lk.'s statement is stronger even than John's, suggesting a literal possession. Only so could he account for such behaviour on the part of a disciple towards such a Master. It was a natural view for a devout evangelist in the Apostolic Age, but, taken literally, it would be fatal to the moral significance of the act of the traitor, which, while presenting a difficult psychological problem, doubtless proceeded from conscious motives.—ἐκ τοῦ ἅρματος, of the number, but how far from the spirit which became that privileged body!—Ver. 4. στρατηγοῖς: a military term which might suggest the captains of Roman soldiers, but doubtless pointing
to the heads of the temple watches (Levites) who kept order during the feast. They would be necessary to the carrying out of Judas’ plan. The Levites had to perform garrison duty for the temple (side Numbers viii. 24, 25). In Acts iv. 2 we read of one στρατηγὸς τῆς Λ. who was doubtless the head of the whole body of temple police.—τὸ πῶς: a second reference to the perplexing λόγος.—Ver. 5. ἔχαρησαν, they were glad, emphatically; and how piously they would remark on the providential character of this unexpected means of getting out of the difficulty as to the πῶς!—Ver. 6. ἐξωμολόγησαν, he agreed, spopondit, for which the Greeks used the simple verb. The active of ἐξομ. occurs here only in N.T.—ἐπερ ἦλθον, without a crowd, the thing above all to be avoided. ἐπερ is a poetic word in Greek authors; here and in ver. 35 only in N.T.

Vv. 7-13. Preparation for the paschal feast (Mt. xxvi. 17-19, Mk. xiv. 12-16).—Ver. 7. ἦλθα, arrived. A considerable number of commentators (Euthy. Zigm. Godet, Schanz, J. Weiss (Meyer)) render, approached (ἐπηλθον, Euthy.), holding that Lk. with John makes Jesus anticipate the feast by a day, so finding here one of the points in which the third Gospel is in touch with the fourth.—Ver. 8. ἀκέχοντες: in Lk. Jesus takes the initiative; in Mt. and Mk. the disciples introduce the subject. Various reasons have been suggested for this change. Lk. simply states the fact as it was (Schanz). He thought it unsuitable that Jesus should seem to need reminding (Meyer, seventh edition). The change of day, from 14th to 13th Nisan, required Jesus to take the initiative (J. Weiss, Meyer, eighth edition).—Πέτρων καὶ Ι.: the two disciples sent out not named in parallels.—Ver. 11. οἷκαι κατηφορτώτης τῆς οἰκίας: a pleonasm = the house-master of the house. Bornemann cites from Greek authors similar redundancies, οἰκοφόρος θεωρόν, αἰτελός αἰτελῶν, αἰτολός αἰτελῶν, συρμένα συμμετοχαί, and from Sept., to ἑκδολία τῶν βοῶν (Deut. vii. 13). In the remainder of ver. 11 and in vv. 12, 13 Lk. follows Mk. closely.

Vv. 14-18. Prelude to the Lord’s Supper (Mt. xxvi. 20, Mk. xiv. 17).—Ver. 14. οἱ ἀπόστολοι, the apostles, for disciples in parallels. This designation for the Twelve, the initiative ascribed to Jesus (ver. 8), and the desire of Jesus spoken of in next ver. all fit into each other and indicate a wish on the part of the evangelist to invest what he here
narrates with great significance. He seems to write with the practice of the Apostolic Church in view in reference to the Holy Communion. — Ver. 15. ἐπὶ τοῦ με πασχάν: the last passover He will eat with them is looked forward to with solemn, tender feeling. — Ver. 16. λέγω γὰρ: the words of Jesus here reported answer to words given in Mt. and Mk. at a later stage, i.e., at the close of their narrative of the institution of the Supper. At this point Lk.'s narrative follows a divergent course. — Ver. 17. ἰδεύματος, having received from the hand of another (different from λαβὼν, ver. 19), handed to Him that He might drink. — ἐξαριστησάς, this solemn act gives to the handing round of the cup here mentioned the character of a prelude to the Holy Supper: ("quaedam quasi prolusio S. Coenae," Beng. in reference to vv. 15-18). If the reading of D and some Old Latin codd. which makes ver. 19 stop at σῳμά μου and omits ver. 20 be the true text (vide critical notes above), then Lk.'s account of the institution really begins in ver. 17, and what happened according to it was this: Jesus first sent round the cup, saying: take this and divide it among yourselves, then took bread, broke it, and gave it to the disciples, saying: this is my body. In this version two things are to be noted: first, the inversion of the actions; second, the omission of all reference to the blood in connection with the wine. The existence of such a reading as that of D and the Old Latin version raises questions, not only as to Lk.'s text, but as to church practice in the Apostolic age and afterwards; or, assum-

1 Omits ὑβεκα ΝΒΔ (Tisch., W.H.). LX omits αὐτοῦ. 
2 ΝABL omit αὐτοῦ (W.H.), found in D al. (Tisch.).
3 ΝABL omit αὐτοῦ (W.H.), found in D al. (Tisch.).
4 For τοῦ αὐτοῦ ΝΒΛ minusc. have αὐτό.
5 D al. have αὐτοῦ = T.R.
6 Οmit στὶ BCDGL al. (W.H.), found in ΝΧΓΔ al. (Tisch.).
7 T.R.
8 After τοῦ ΝΒΚΛΜΠ al. have αὕτον τού νῦν. DG 1 have the phrase, but before ον μή.
9 So in DX al. (Tisch.). ΝΒΛ have οὐ (W.H.).
10 From τοῦ νῦν, ver. 19, to the end of ver. 20, found in nearly all Greek codd. and verss., is omitted in D a f g i; b e syrr. cur. sin. more or less rearrange the matter referring to the Supper. — Syr. cur. has ver. 19 before vv. 17, 18. Syr. sin. has this order: 19, 20 a, 17, 20 b, 18 ("And He took bread and gave thanks over it and brake, and gave unto them, saying, This is my body which I give for you: thus do in remembrance of me. And after they had supped He took the cup and gave thanks over it, and said, Take this, share it among yourselves. This is my blood, the new Testament. For I say unto you that henceforth I will not drink of this fruit, until the Kingdom of God shall come," Mrs. Lewis).
ing as a possibility that Lk. wrote as D represents, have we here another instance of editorial discretion—shrinking from imputing to Jesus the idea of drinking His blood? If with D we omit all that follows σῶμα μου, then it results that Lk. has left out all the words of our Lord setting forth the significance of His death uttered (1) at Caesarea Philippi; (2) on the occasion of the request of Zebedee’s sons; (3) the anointing at Bethany; (4) the institution of the Supper. (2) and (3) are omitted altogether, and (1) is so reported as to make the lesson non-apparent.

Vv. 19-20. The Supper.—Ver. 19. τὸ σῶμα μου, my body, broken like the bread, implying blood-shedding, though that is passed over in silence if the reading of D be accepted. Note that in Acts ii. 46 the communion of the faithful is called breaking bread.—τὸ ὑμ. ἐδόμενον: what follows from these words to the end of ver. 20 resembles closely St. Paul’s account in 1 Cor. xi. 23-25. This resemblance is one of the arguments of W. and H. against the genuineness of Lk.——Ver. 20. On the whole subject consult J. Weiss (Meyer, eighth edition) and Wendt, L. T., i., 173, both of whom adopt the reading of D.

Vv. 21-23. The traitor (Mt. xxvi. 21-25, Mk. xiv. 18-21), placed after the Supper, instead of before, as in parallels.—κληρονομεῖ: making a transition to an incident presenting a strong moral contrast to the preceding.—ὁ χιλ. the hand, graphic and tragic; the hand which is to perform such opposite acts, now touching the Master’s on the table, ere long to be the instrument of betrayal.—Ver. 22, ἢ χιλ. adversative, nevertheless; the Son of Man destined to go (to death), but that does not relieve the instrument of his responsibility.—Ver. 23. πρὸς ἑαυτοῦ, to one another, or among themselves, without speaking to the Master; otherwise in parallels.—τοῦτο: in an emphatic position = this horrible deed.

Vv. 24-30. Strife among the disciples. Cf. on chap. ix. 46.—Ver. 24. ἐφορεύεται, a contention, here only in N.T. The juxtaposition of this strife among the eleven with the announcement of the traitor gives it by comparison the aspect of a pardonable iniquity in otherwise loyal men, and it is so treated by Jesus.—τὸ τῆς α., etc., as to the who of them, etc. The topic of the earlier dispute (ix. 46) might be: who outside their circle was greater than they all, but here it certainly is: which of them is greater than his fellow. It is usual to connect this incident with the feet-washing in John xiii. —οὐκείοις, seems, looks like, makes the impression of being (Bleek and Hahn).—Vv. 25, 26: borrowed from the incident of the two sons of Zebedee (Mt. xx. 25, 26, Mk. x. 42, 43), which Lk. omits and somewhat alters in expression.—Ver. 25. Only in N.T., either titular, like our “your highness,” e.g., Ptolemy Euergetes (so, many), or = benefactor.—Ver. 26. ὧμις δὲ, etc., but ye not so, elliptical, ὑπέρθεν or περίστερα understood.—ὁ νεότερος, the younger, “who in Eastern families fulfils menial duties, Acts v. 6” (Farrar).—ὁ ἱερομάχος, the leader or chief, the name of those in office in the Church in Heb. xiii. 7, also in the epistle of Clement; therefore viewed by some as a note of a late date, but without sufficient reason.—Ver. 27 addsuce the example of Jesus to enforce the principle stated in ver. 26. He, the admittedly greater, had assumed the position.
of the less by becoming the serving man, δ ὅπως διακονῶν, instead of the guest at table (δ ἰδίως). In what way Jesus had played the part of serving man Lk. does not indicate. The handing round of the cup might be viewed as service. By omitting the incident of the sons of Zebedee Lk. missed the supreme illustration of service through death (Mt. xx. 28, Mk. x. 45).—Ver. 28. ὥστε δ', but ye, the δ' making transition from words of correction to a more congenial style of address—οἱ διαμεμενηκότες, who have continued all through; the perfect participle, pointing them out as in possession of a permanent character, a body of thoroughly tried, faithful men.—καὶ ὑπερασπίσατε, in my temptations, pointing to all past experiences fitted to try faith and patience, which were of daily occurrence: temptations even to the Master, but still more to the disciples (in view of their spiritual weakness) to lose confidence in, and attachment to, One so peculiar, so isolated, and so much disliked and opposed by the people of repute and influence.—Ver. 29. Διαβίβασα (Διατίθημα), middle only in N.T.), “appoint,” make a disposition of. The corresponding noun is διαθήκη. In Heb. ix. 17 we find δ διαθήκην, a testator, and the verb may be used here in the sense of bequeathing, though that sense is inapplicable to God’s gift of a kingdom to Jesus referred to in next clause.—Ver. 30. καθήσοσθε, ye shall sit, the judicial function the main thing, the feasting a subordinate feature; hence stated in an independent proposition (καθήσοσθε not dependent on ἵνα). — Σωτήρ, twelve tribes, and τελευτήσει rule over them, the defection of Judas not taken into account. The promise is given in that respect as if spoken on another occasion (Mt. xix. 28). This generous eulogy of the disciples for their fidelity has the effect of minimising the fault mentioned just before. Lk. was aware of the fact. It is another instance of his “sparing of the Twelve”.

Vv. 31-34. Peter’s weakness foretold. With John (xiii. 36-38) Lk. places this incident in the supper chamber. In Mt. and Mk. it occurs on the way to Gethsemane (Mt. xxvii. 31-35, Mk. xiv. 37-31). It is introduced more abruptly here than in any of the other accounts. The εἰναὶ δ' ὁ Κύριος of the T.R. is a natural attempt to mitigate the abruptness, but the passage is more effective without it. From generous praise and bright promises Jesus passes suddenly, with perhaps a slight pause and marked change of tone, to the moral weakness of His much-loved companions and of Peter in particular.—Ver. 31. Σίμων, Σίμων: one can imagine, though not easily describe, how this was said—with much affection and just enough of distress in the tone to make it solemn.—οἱ Σατανᾶς. The reference to Satan naturally reminds us of the trial of Job, and most commentators assume that the case of Job is in the view of Jesus or the evangelist. The coming fall of Peter could not be set in a more advantageous light than by being paralleled with the experience of the famous man of Uz, with a good record behind him and fame before him, the two connected by a dark but profitable time of trial.—ἐξητήσατο, not merely “desired to have” (A.V.) but, obtained by asking (R.V., margin). Careful Greek writers used θεωρέω—to demand for punishment, and ἐξητήσασθαι as to beg off, deprecari. Later writers somewhat disregarded this distinction. The aorist implies success in the demand. It is an instance of the “Resultative Aorist”
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XXII.

1. καλιτιν ἐν ΝΒΔΛΤ al.
3. οὐ without μή in ΝΒΛΤX.
4. For πρίν η ΝΒΛΤ 69 al. have εἰος (D εἰος στον).
5. For αὐτν... με ΝΒΛΤ 13, 131 al. have με αὐταρκῆς εἰδέναι (W.H.).
7. For οὖν ΝΒΛΤ have δέ. ΝΠ Δ have ο διενέργειν.

(vide on this and other senses of the aorist, Burton, M. and T., § 35). Field (Ot. Nor.) cites from Wetstein instances of such use and renders ἐγγε. ὅ. periphraphically “Satan hath procured you to be given up to him”—ὑπεκα, you, the whole of you (though not emphatic); therefore, Simon, look to yourself, and to the whole brotherhood of which you are the leading man. Bengel remarks: “Totus sane hic sermo Domini praesupponit P. esse primum apostolorum, quo stante aut excidente ceteri aut minus aut magis periclitarentur”—σωτάρεια: a δ. λεγ., but of certain meaning. Hesychius gives as equivalent κοινωθεῖα, from κοινωνία, a sieve. Ethy. Zig. is copious in synonyms = ὑποβοίοι, κοινωθεῖα, ταρταρεῖα. He adds, “what we call κοινωνία is by some called σωτάρεια,” and he thus describes the function of the sieve: ἐν ὃ δ' οὕτως τεθεία κακίας μεταφράζουσα ταραττώσει. Sifting points to the result of the process anticipated by Jesus. Satan aimed at ruin.—Ver. 32. ἐγώ δὲ ἔδειξαν, but I have prayed: I working against Satan, and successfully.—ὑπ' μὴ ἔκλητη ἡ π. σ., that thy faith may not (utterly) fail or die (xvi. 9), though it prove weak or inadequate for the moment. Job's faith underwent eclipse. He did not curse God, but for the time he lost faith in the reality of a Divine government in human affairs. So Peter never ceased to love Jesus, but he was overpowered by fear and the instinct of self-preservation.—ἔσταρρέσας, having returned (to thy true self). Cf. στραφῆτε in Mt. xviii. 3. The word "converted," as bearing a technical sense, should be allowed to fall into desuetude in this connection. Many regard ἀντισταρακος as a Hebraism = vicissim: do thou in turn strengthen by prayer and otherwise thy brethren as I have strengthened thee. So, e.g., Grotius: "Da operam ne in fide deficient, nempe pro iis orans, sicut ego pro te oro". Ingenious but doubtful.—στραφεῖον: later form for στραφόν: for the sense vide Acts xiv. 22 and 1 Pet. v. 10.—Ver. 33. ἐπ' ἕφυλακνι καὶ εἰς ἰδανον: more definite reference to the dangers ahead than in any of the parallels.—Ver. 34. στραφεῖον, to-day, as in Mk., but without the more definite τῶν τῆς νυκτὸς—μή ἐλάβειν: ὁ μὴ after a verb of denial as often in Greek authors, e.g., τὸν τάμ' ἀπαραθήκηται μὴ χρώναι ἡμῖν, Eurip., Hippol., l. 1256. Vv. 35-38. Coming danger, peculiar to Lk. There is danger ahead physically as well as morally. Jesus turns now to the physical side. What He says about a sword is not to be taken literally. It is a vivid way of intimating that the supreme crisis is at hand = the enemy approaches, prepare!—Ver. 35. ητα ἀντίσταλα: the reference is to ix. 3, or rather, so far as language is concerned, to x. 4, which relates to the mission of the seventy.—διέρκεσθαι as in ver. 6.—Ver. 36. ἀλλὰ νῦν, but now, suggesting an emphatic contrast between past and present,
large knives? The latter suggestion, made by Chrysostom and adopted by
Euthym., is called "curious" by Alford, but regarded by Field (Ot. Nor.) as
"probable."—καὶ, enough! i.e., for
One who did not mean to fight. It is a
pregnant word = "for the end I have in
view more than enough; but also enough
of misunderstanding, disenchantment,
speech, teaching, and life generally."
Holtzmann, H. C.
Vv. 39-40. Gethsemane (Mt. xxvi. 36-
46, Mk. xiv. 32-42). Lk.'s narrative here
falls far short of the vivid realism of the
parallels. Mt. and Mk. allow the
infirmity of the great High Priest of human-
ity so graphically described in the Epistle
to the Hebrews to appear in its appalling
naked truth. Lk. throws a veil over it,
so giving an account well adapted doubt-
less to the spiritual condition of first
readers, but not so well serving the deep-
est permanent needs of the Church. This
statement goes on the assumption that
vv. 43, 44 are not part of the genuine
text, for in these, especially in ver. 44,
the language is even more realistic than
that of Mk., and is thus out of harmony
with the subdued nature of Lk.'s narra-
tive in general. This want of keeping
with the otherwise colourless picture of
the scene, which is in accord with Lk.'s
uniform mode of handling the emphatic
words, acts and experiences of Jesus, is,
in my view, one of the strongest argu-
ments against the genuineness of vv. 43,
44.
Ver. 39. Ἠδέλθω: no mention of the
hymn sung before going out (Mt. ver. 20,
Mk. ver. 26). Lk. makes prominent the
outgoing of Jesus. The parallels speak
in the plural of the whole company.—
kατὰ τὸ ἱδος: for the form vide ii. 42,
and for the fact xxi. 37 and John xviii. 2.
This is another point of contact between
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these two Gospels. The reference to the habit of Jesus deprives this visit of special significance.—ἐξολοθρεύων: the disciples followed, no talk by the way of their coming breakdown, as in Mt. ver. 31, and Mk. ver. 27.

Vv. 40-46. ἐν τῷ τοίχῳ, at the place, of usual resort, not the place of this memorable scene, for it is not Lk.'s purpose to make it specially prominent. Cf. John xviii. 2, τῶν τοίχων previously described as a κύπεσα across the brook Kidron.—παρευρέσθη: Jesus bids the disciples pray against temptation. In Mt. and Mk. He bids them sit down while He prays. Their concern is to be wholly for themselves.—Ver. 41. ἀναπάλησθη, He withdrew, accessit. Some insist on the literal sense, and render, "tore Himself away" = "avulsus est," Vulg., implying that Jesus was acting under strong feeling. But did Lk. wish to make that prominent? The verb does not necessarily mean more than "withdrew," and many of the philological commentators (Wolf, Raphel, Priceus, Palairop, etc.) take it in that sense, citing late Greek authors in support.—ἄναπαλήσω, from them (all); no mention of three taken along with Him, a very important feature as an index of the state of mind of Jesus. The Master in His hour of weakness looked to the three for sympathy and moral support; vide Mt. xxxvi. 40. But it did not enter into Lk.'s plan to make that apparent.—λίθῳ βόλη, a stone's cast, not too distant to be overheard. θολή is the accusative of measure. —δεις τὰ γόνατα: the usual attitude in prayer was standing; the kneeling posture implied special urgency ("in genus orantem quotas res major urgetat," Grot.), but not so decidedly as falling at full length on the ground, the attitude pointed at in the parallels.—Ver. 42. πάτηρ, Father! the keynote, a prayer of faith however dire the distress.—ἰππάλακτο, etc., with the reading παρευρέσθη the sense is simple: if Thou wilt, take away. With παρευρέσθη or παρευρέσθη we have a sentence unfinished: "apodosis suppressed by sorrow" (Winer, p. 750), or an infinitive for an imperative (Bengel, etc.). The use of ἐπάστασιν in the sense of "remove" is somewhat unusual. Hesychius gives as synonyms verbs of the opposite meaning: παραδείσω, παραθέλειν. The τῆς ἐρυθροῦ leaves no doubt what is meant. In Lk.'s narrative there is only a single act of prayer. The whole account is mitigated as compared with that in Mt. and Mk. Jesus goes to the accustomed place, craves no sympathy from the three, kneels, utters a single prayer, then returns to the Twelve. With this picture the statement in vv. 43, 44 is entirely out of harmony.—Ver. 44. ἄγωνα, in an agony (of fear), or simply in "a great fear". So Field (Ot. Nor.), who has an important note on the word ἄγων, with examples to show that fear is the radical meaning of the word. Loesner supports the same view with examples from Philo. Here only in N.T.
From this word comes the name "The Agony in the Garden." — Θραμμοί, clots (of blood), here only in N.T.

Vv. 45, 46. Return of Jesus to His disciples. — ἄνω τῆς προσευχῆς: rising up from the prayer, seems to continue the narrative from ver. 41.— ἀνῶ τῆς λύπης, asleep from grief, apolectic; Hebraistic construction, therefore not added by Lk., but got from a Jewish-Christian document, says J. Weiss (in Meyer). Doubtless Lk.'s, added out of delicate feeling for the disciples, and with truth to nature, for grief does induce sleep ("moestitias somnum affect."). — Wolf.

Ver. 48. ἀναστάτες πρόσεγγισθε: Jesus rose up from prayer. He bids His disciples rise up to prayer, as if suggesting that prayer would help them against sleep. — ἰδαν, etc.: again a warning against temptation, but no word of reproach to Peter or the rest, as in parallels.

Vv. 47-53. The apprehension (Mt. xxvi. 47-56, Mk. xiv. 43-52).— Ver. 47. ἐγέρθης αὐτῷ, to kiss Him; that the traitor's purpose, its execution left to be inferred, also that it was the preconcerted signal pointing out who was to be apprehended. — Ver. 48. διὰ τῶν υἱῶν τῶν ἁγίων, the place of, and explains, the enigmatical ἧς ὁ πάροικος of Mt. The simple φίλημα, unlike καταφιλέω, implies no fervour. — Ver. 49. οἱ περὶ αὐτῶν, those about Him, i.e., the disciples, though the word is avoided. — τὸ ἵσσωμεν, what was about to happen, i.e., the apprehension. The disciples, anticipating the action of the representatives of authority, ask directions, and one of them (ver. 50) not waiting for an answer, strikes out. In the parallels the apprehension takes place first. — Ver. 50. ἐκ τοῖς, etc., a certain one of them, thus vaguely referred to in all the synoptists. John names Peter. — τὸ δεξίον, the right ear; so in Fourth Gospel. Cf. the right hand in vi. 6. — Ver. 51. ἔσται ὡς τούτων: an elliptical colloquial phrase, whose meaning might be made clear by intonation or gesture. It might be spoken either to the captors = leave me free until I have healed the wounded man, or to the disciples = let them apprehend me, or: no more use of weapons. For the various interpretations put upon the words, vide Hahn. Perhaps the most likely rendering is: "cease, it is enough," desinit, satēs est, as if it had stood, ἐστιν τούτων ἱκανόν ἔτος, the disciples being addressed. — Ver. 52. δραχμεῖα, etc.: Lk. alone represents the authorities as present with the δχλος—priests, captains of the temple and elders—some of them might be, though it is
καὶ ἀκούσαντες ἔξερεν ὅτι ἦλθην. 53. καὶ ἔκρυψαν ἥριστος μου μεθ' ὁμών ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, οὐκ ἔκατεν με τὸν Χῖρα ἐκimum. ἀλλ' ἂν ἦρεν ὅτι ἦτοι, ἢ ἦρεν, καὶ ἦν καθὼς οἱ σκότοις.

54. ΣΥΛΛΑΒΟΝΤΕΣ δὲ αὐτὸν ἤγαγον, καὶ ἐστήσαντο αὐτὸν ἐς εἰς τὸ θέατρον τῶν ἄρχεων τοῖς ἀρχετεύοις. ὡς Πέτρος ἠκολούθει μακρὸν. 55. ἀφάντων δὲ πῦρ ἐν μέσῳ τῆς ἀνθιδ, καὶ συγκαθισάσών τε αὐτὸν ἐκάθητο ὁ Πέτρος ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν. 56. ἤδονα δὲ αὐτὸν παυσάκη τις καθήμενος πρὸς τὸ φῶς, καὶ ἂν ἀναίρεσαν αὐτὸν, εἰσήνε, "Καὶ ἀδρά σὺν αὐτῷ ἔστω," 57. ὡς ἦν ἄριστο χαιρετάν. τί λέγων, "Γίνον, οὐκ οἴδας αὐτὸν." 58. καὶ μετὰ βραχίονι ξύπνοι ἔδων αὐτῶν ἑθῆ, "Καὶ σοὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐστιν," ὡς Πέτρος εἶπεν, ἀφανές, οὐκ εἶμι. 59. εἰς ἄλλης εἰς τοὺς ἀδράς μᾶς, ἄλλος τις ἔδιωκησε, ἐλέγων, "Ἐν ἀληθείᾳ καὶ ὁ δότος μετ' αὐτῶν ἦν καὶ ἠγγέλλακτός ἦτοι." 60. εἰς Ἀλαμποῦς ἐν Ὁδικτ. etc. (W.H.).

not likely. Farrar remarks: "these venerable persons had kept safely in the background till all possible danger was over"—ἐς τῆς λυτρώσεως. Lk. gives the reproachful words of Jesus nearly as in the parallels.—Ver. 53. ἄλλη αὐτή ἡ θεία, etc.: the leading words in this elliptical sentence are τοῦ σκότους, which qualify both ἔνα καὶ ἐκάθησαν. Two things are said: your hour is an hour of darkness, and your power is a power of darkness. There is an allusion to the time they had chosen for the apprehension, night, not day, but the physical darkness is for Jesus only an emblem of moral darkness. He says in effect: why should I complicate a man captured as a robber in the dark by men whose whole nature and ways are dark and false?

Vv. 54-62. Peter’s fall (Mt. xxvi. 57, 58, 69-75, Mk. xiv. 53, 54, 66-72).—Lk. tells the sad story of Peter’s fall without interruption, and in as gentle a manner as possible, the cursing omitted, and the three acts of denial forming an anti-climax instead of a climax, as in parallels.—Ver. 54. ὁ δὲ Ἰωάννης ἠκολούθει, Peter followed. What the rest did is passed over in silence; flight left to be inferred.—Ver. 55. τιμωρήθησαν, more strongly than ἀφάντων (T.R.) suggests the idea of a well-kindled fire giving a good blaze, supplying light as well as heat. Who kindled it did not need to be said. It was kindled in the open court of the high priest’s house, and was large enough for the attendants to sit around it in the chilly spring night (ἐγυγκαθισάτων).—μάσος αὐτῶν. Peter sat among them. Was that an acted denial, or was he simply seeking warmth, and taking his risk?—Ver. 56. ἀντίθεσα (a intensive, and τείνω), fixing the eyes on, with dative here, sometimes with ἐλέους, accusative, frequently used by Lk., especially in Acts. ὅτι, the maid makes the remark not to but about Peter in Lk. = this one also was with Him, of whom they were all talking.—Ver. 57. οὐκ εἶδε α. γ.: a direct denial = I do not know Him, woman, not to speak of being a follower.—Ver. 58. μετὰ βοῶ, shortly after (here only in N.T.), while the mood of fear is still on him, no time to recover himself.—ἔτερος, another of the attendants, a man.—ἐξ αὐτῶν, of the notorious band, conceived possibly as a set of desperadoes.—ἀνθρώπου, οὐκ εἰμι, man, I am not, with more emphasis and some irritation = denial of disciple-ship. In one sense a stronger form of denial, but in another a weaker. Peter
might have known Jesus without being a disciple. To deny all knowledge was the strongest form of denial. Besides it was less cowardly to deny to a man than to a woman.—Ver. 59. μετά τοῦ χρόνου ἀπῆδε, at the distance of an hour; the verb here used of time, in xxiv. 51 and Acts xxvii. 28 of place. This interval of an hour is peculiar to Lk. Peter in the course of that time would begin to think that no further annoyance was to be looked for.—Δευτέρῳ δὲ ἐπήδε, these expressions imply that the previous denials had partly served their purpose for a time, and put the attendants off the idea that Peter was of the company of Jesus. After watching Peter, and listening to his speech, a third gains confidence in his position = I am sure he is after all one of them, for, etc.—Ver. 60. Ἀναρρενήσας, etc., man, I don’t know what you are saying—under shelter of the epithet Γαλατείας, pretending ignorance of what the man said—an evasion rather than a denial, with no cursing and protesting accompanying. A monstrous minimising of the offence, if Lk. had Mk.’s account before him, thinks J. Weiss; therefore he infers he had not, but drew from a Jewish-Christian source with a milder account. What if he had both before him, and preferred the milder?—ἀφύγησεν ἀλεξ., immediately after the cock crew; but in Lk.’s account the reaction is not brought about thereby. In the parallels, in which Peter appears worked up to a paroxysm, a reaction might be looked for at any moment on the slightest occasion, the crowing of the cock recalling Christ’s words abundantly sufficient. But in Lk. there is no paroxysm, therefore more is needed to bring about reaction, and more accordingly is mentioned.—Ver. 61. ἀπεφαίησαν, etc., the Lord, turning, looked at Peter; that look, not the cock crowing, recalled the prophetic word of Jesus, and brought about the penitent reaction.—ὑπειμανθηθη, remembered, was reminded, passive here only in N.T.—Ver. 62 exactly as in Mt.
Vv. 63-65. Indignities (Mt. xxvi. 67-68, Mk. xiv. 65). In Mt. and Mk. these come after the trial during the night which Lk. omits. In his narrative the hours of early morning spent by Jesus in the palace of the high priest are filled up by the denial of Peter and the outrages of the men who had taken Jesus into custody (οἱ συνέχοντες αὐτὸν).—Ver. 63. ἔνειασαν, mocked, in place of the more brutal spitting in parallels.—Δεροτές, smiting (the whole body), instead of the more special and insulting slapping in the face (κολαφίζειν).—Ver. 64. περικαλύφαντες, covering (the face understood, τὸ πρόσωπον in Mk.)—προφήτησαν, τέ, etc.: Lk. here follows Mt., not Mk., who has simply the verb

2 αὐτων in ῬΔΔΤ al. 3 εἰτων in ῬBLT. 4 Omit καὶ ῬBLT.
5 ῬBLT omit μη ἡ ἀπολύσει (Tisch., W.H.).
6 τον δὲ in ῬΔΔΔΤX. 7 εχομαι μαρ. χριστι in BLT (Tisch., W.H.).

προφ. without the question following.—
Ver. 65. ησπρα τολλα, many other shameful words, filling up the time, which Lk. would rather not report particularly, even if he knew them.

Vv. 66-71. Morning trial, the proceedings of which, as reported by Lk., correspond to those of the night meeting reported by Mt. and Mk. (Mt. xxvi. 59-66, Mk. xiv. 55-64), only much abridged. No mention of the attempt to get, through witnesses, matter for an accusation, or of the testimony concerning the word about destroying the temple. The Messiah question is alone noticed. Perhaps Lk. omitted the former because of their futility, though they were important as revealing the animus of the judges.—Ver. 66. εἰς τῷ συνεδρίῳ, to the council chamber, in which the Sanhedrim met. The defenders, introducing the proceedings, in a very generalising way. Cf. the graphic account of the high priest rising up to interrogate Jesus, after the first attempt to incriminate Him had failed, in parallels (Mt. xxvi. 52 f., Mk. xiv. 60 f.)—εἰ σὺ εἶ Χ. εἰσέλθῃς: either, art Thou the Christ? tell us, or tell us whether Thou be the Christ. Christ simpliciter without any epithet as in parallels (Son of God, Son of the Blessed).—Vv. 67, 68. Jesus first answers evasively, saying in effect: it is vain to give an answer to such people. In parallels He replies with a direct "yes" ("thou sayest," Mt.; "I am," Mk.).—Ver. 69. What Jesus now says amounts to an affirmative answer.—Δό τούτων ἄρα, etc.: Jesus points to a speedy change of position from humiliation to exaltation, without reference to what they will see, or to a second coming.—Ver. 70. πάντες, all, eagerly grasping at the handle offered by Christ's words.—δό τούτων. This is supposed to be involved in the exalted place at the right hand.—ἀγω εἶμι, the direct answer at last.—Ver. 71. μαρτυρίας: instead of μαρτυρων, no mention having been previously made of witnesses.

J. Weiss (in Meyer, eighth edition) finds in this section clear evidence of the use of a Jewish-Christian source from the correspondence between the account it gives of the questions put to Jesus and His replies and the Jewish-Christian ideas regarding the Messiahship. These he conceives to have been as follows: In His earthly state Jesus was not Messiah or Son of Man; only a claimant to these honours. He becomes the Son of God by the act of exaltation (cf. Acts ii. 36, "God hath made Him both Lord and Christ"). He was God's Son in the earthly state because He was conscious of God's peculiar love and of a Messianic commission. So here: Jesus is to become (ἐστα) Messianic Son of Man with glory and power (δύναμις and δόξας); He is Son of God (ἐγώ εἴμι). On this view Sonship is lower than Christship. Was that Lk.'s idea? On the contrary, he evidently treats the Christ question as one of subordinate importance on which it was hardly worth debating. The wider, larger question was that as to Sonship, which, once settled, settled also the narrower question. If Son, then Christ and more; not only the Jewish Messiah, but Saviour of the world. The
XXIII. 1—6.

EUAGGELION
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XXIII. 1. KAI evanastan apay to plēbos autōn, ἡγαγεν ἂν autōn epi ton Pilatos. 2. ἤρεμων tē kathgorein autōn, lēgonente, "Toōtōn eurōmen diasteftonta tō Íthos, kai kalwonta Kaisarís fórōs. 3. Xristón basilea einaí." 3. 'O de Pilatos épérōtنتεν autōn, lēgon, "Se eĩ ó basileus tōn 'Ioudaíwn;" 4. 'O de ἀποκριθεί στι τιτήρεις kai tòu chllous, "Odhéne euríkex autōn en tē diapōn touτή." 5. 'O de èpístoxos, lēgonente, "Onti ãνασελ τὶν λαὸν, didaskōn a here only in N.T. (kas. in Ch. iii. 14.) 6. Pilatos de åkousa Gαλλαίas ἐπέρωτησεν eĩ ἂν ἀνθρωπος
tον na in uncials, ἡγαγεν in minusc. 1 Add ënνo to ënνo ΝΒDLT, etc. 2 fórōs K. in ΝΒLT, which also have καὶ before lēgoneta. 3 So in ΝΑDL (Tisch.), auton in GBT. 4 ἀμαρτησεν in ΝΒRT. T. R. = DL, etc. 5 καὶ before ἀρέμανος in ΝΒLT, not in D, etc., probably omitted because difficult. 6 Omit Gαλ. ΝΒLT. 8 B and a few others omit ο (W.H. parentheses).

account of the trial runs on the same lines as the genealogy, in which Davideic descent is dwarfed into insignificance by Divine descent (ἐδε...τοῦ θεοῦ).

CHAPTER XXIII. THE PASSION HISTORY CONTINUED.—Vv. 1-5. Before Pilate (Mt. xxvii. 1, 2, 11-14, Mk. xv. 1-5). At the morning meeting of the Sanhedrin (in Mt. and Mk.) it had doubtless been resolved to put the confession of Jesus that He was the Christ into a shape fit to be laid before Pilate, i.e., to give it a political character, and charge Him with aspiring to be a king. To this charge Lk. adds other two, meant to give this aspiration a sinister cast. And since the Avaos, the whole number. The Jewish authorities go to Pilate in full strength to make as imposing an appearance as possible and create the impression that something serious was on hand.—ἡγαγεν: nothing is said about leading Jesus bound, as in Mt. and Mk.—Ver. 2. diasteftonta, perverting, causing disaffection and disloyalty to Rome.—καλέσαντα, doing His best to prevent (people from paying tribute to Caesar); false, and they probably knew it to be so, but it was a serviceable lie.—βαιζειν: in apposition with Χριστόν = saying that He was Christ—a King/-Ver. 3. σου ἔτι, etc.: Pilate's question exactly as in Mt. and Mk.—σου λέγεις: this reply needs some such explanation as is given in John; vide notes on Mt.—Ver. 4. ἄφτων, blameworthy, punishable (neuter of ἄφτως) = aitia. Pilate arrived at his conclusion very swiftly. A glance sufficed to satisfy him that Jesus was no dangerous character. Probably he thought him a man with a fixed idea.—Ver. 5. ἐπίσχον (here only in N.T.), they kept insisting, used absolutely = "invincilcencant," Vulg. = ἀνασελ, stirs up, a stronger word than διαστέφειν.—διδάςων, teaching, the instrument of excitement. Jesus did, in fact, produce a great impression on the people by His teaching, and one not favourable to the Pharisees, but He did not set Himself to stir up the people even against them.—καθ δῆμος τ. Ἰ.: κατὰ with the genitive of place as in iv. 14 = in the whole of Judaea. This, considering the purpose, should mean Judaea strictly, Pilate's province, and so taken it bears witness to more work done by Jesus in the south than is recorded in the Synoptists. But the testimony is of little value. The accusers said what suited their purpose, true or false.—καὶ ἀφαινον: the καὶ is a difficult reading, and just on that account probably correct. It gives the impression of an unfinished sentence, something left out = and beginning from Galilee He has spread His mischievous doctrine over the land even to this holy city. The
words from καὶ to γολολογεῖσαι are omitted in some MSS., and it is not inconceivable that they are an early gloss to explain ver. 6 (so Weiss in Meyer).

Vv. 6-12. Before Herod, peculiar to Lk.—Ver. 7. ἀνέπτυχθην, reminded Him = remissi, sent Him to, not the higher (Meyer), but the proper tribunal: a Galilean, to the tetrarch of Galilee; a technical term.—ἐν Ἰεροσ. Herod would be in Jerusalem to keep the Passover, though that is not stated.—Ver. 8. ἐξῆρα σταυρόν, was much pleased, "exceeding glad" (A.V. and R.V.) is too grave a phrase to express the feeling of this worthless man, who simply expected from the meeting with Jesus a "new amusement" (Schanz), such as might be got from a conjurer who could perform some clever tricks (τοις σημείοις).—Ver. 9. ἐν λόγοις λαοῦ καὶ λαοῖς: suggesting the idea of a desultory conversation, in which the king introduced topic after topic in a random, incoherent manner, showing no serious interest in any of his questions.—οὐδὲν ἀνέπτυχθη, answered nothing, which would greatly astonish and pique this kingling, accustomed to courtier-servility. The fact that Jesus said nothing, and that nothing of importance came out of the appearance before Herod, may explain its omission by the other evangelists.—Ver. 10. ἤρχεται ἐραξερεῖς, etc., priests and scribes, there too, having followed Jesus, afraid that the case might take an unfavourable turn in their absence.—ἐντύλλεται, eagerly (Acts xviii. 28).—Ver. 11. ἡζωονήσας: on this verb and kindred forms, vide at Mk. ix. 12. Herod, feeling slighted by Jesus, slights Him in turn, inciting his bodyguards (τοῖς στρατεύμασιν, which cannot here mean armies) to mock Him, and having Him invested with a costly robe, probably a cast-off royal mantle of his own, and so sending Him back a mocking king to Pilate, a man to be laughed at, not to be feared or punished.—ἐμπλήθη λαμπράν, a splendid robe; of what colour, purple or white, commentators vainly inquire.—ἀνέπτυχθη, "sent Him again" (A.V.), or "back" (R.V.). The verb may mean here, as in ver. 7, sent Him to Pilate as the proper person to try the case. The two magnates compliment each other, and shirk unpleasant work by sending Jesus bither and thither from tribunal to tribunal, the plaything and sport of unprincipled men.—Ver. 12. ἐγένετο φίλος: that the one positive result of the transaction—two rulers, previously on bad terms, reconciled, at least for the time. Sending Jesus to Herod was a politic act on Pilate's part. It might have ended the case so far as he was concerned; it pleased a jealous prince, and it gave him a free hand in dealing with the matter: nothing to fear in that quarter.
stites πρὸς ἀλλήλους (for πρὸς αὐτοὺς).

—δττς after προσηθήκαν might have been omitted, as in Acts viii. 9, but it serves to convey the idea of continued bad relations.

Vv. 13-16. Pilate proposes to release Jesus.—Ver. 14. ἀποστάφυντα, turning away (the people from their allegiance). In Acts iii. 26, of turning men from their iniquities.—ἀνάκριναι, having made an inquiry in your presence. In John, Pilate’s inquiry is private. “He says this,” remarks Pricaeus, “lest they should think he was setting Jesus free by favour or intrigue” (gratia aut ambitum). ἀνάκριναι is used absolutely here as in Acts xxiv. 8.

—Ver. 15. αὐτῷ: some have taken this as referring to Herod = Herod did nothing in the case, implying that it was of a serious, capital nature. Most take it as referring to Jesus = behold, the result of sending to Herod is that in his judgment nothing has been done deserving death by the accused.—αὐτῷ instead of τῷ αὐτῷ; vide on this construction Winer, § xxxi., 10.—Ver. 16. παθεῖναι: doubtless used here in the Hellenistic sense of chastise, scourge—a mild name for an ugly thing. The policy of the proposal Euthy, thus explains: “a moderate flagellation (μεταξύ μαστῶν) to mitigate their wrath, that thinking they had gained their point they might cease from further madness”. A weak, futile policy. “Hic coept iniustum concedere” (Bengel). Fanaticism grows by concession (Schanz).

Vv. 17-25. Pilate finally succumbs (Mt. xvii. 15-26, Mk. xv. 6-14).—Ver. 17, which states that Pilate was under a necessity (why, not explained) to release one (prisoner) at feast time, is almost certainly imported from the parables by a later hand, though it fills up an obvious hiatus in Lk.’s meagre narrative.—Ver. 18. παραπληθεῖ: adverb, from παραπληθέσθη (here only in N.T.)—in the whole-mob style, giving a vivid idea of the overpowering shout raised.—αἷς τοῦτον, take away this one, i.e., to the cross.—ἀνέλθων, release; if ye will release some one (ver. 16, ἀνέλθων) let it be Barabbas. Lk. makes this demand the final act of the people. In the parallels (vide there) it is suggested to them by Pilate (Mt.), and urged on them by the priests. In Lk.’s narrative the behaviour of the people is set in a dark light, while both Pilate and the priests are treated with comparative mildness. In view of Israel’s awful doom, Lk. says in effect: the people have suffered for their own sin.—Ver. 19. δέττες seems to be δὲ here, following the growing usage of later Greek (Schanz, vide Buttman, Gram., p. 115).—διὰ στόχων... καὶ φόνον = διὰ φόνον ἐν στόχων πεποιημένον, Pricaeus.—ὑν βληθές: instead of ἐμβηθής, the analytic form is unusual
21. Οί δὲ ἐπεφώνων, λέγοντες, "Σταυρώσων, σταυρώσων" αὐτόν." 22. Ο δὲ τρίτον εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς, "Τί γὰρ κακὸν ἐποίησεν αὐτὸς; οὐδὲν αὐτὸν θανάτου εὗρον ἐν αὐτῷ· παιδεύσας οὖν αὐτὸν ἀπολύσωμεν." 23. Οἱ δὲ ἐπέκεισαν φωναὶ μεγάλαια, αἰτοῦμεν αὐτὸν σταυρωθῆναι· καὶ κατίσχον αἱ φωναὶ αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν ἁρχιερέων. 24. Ο δὲ Πῶλος ἐπέκρινεν γενέσθαι τὸ αίτημα αὐτῶν· 25. ἀπέστησε δὲ αὐτοῖς τὸν διὰ στάσιν καὶ φόνον βεβλημένον εἰς τὴν ἕμφαλην, ἐν ἧτοιποῖ τὸν δὲ Ἱησοῦν παρέδωκε τῷ θελήματι αὐτῶν.

26. Καὶ δὲ ἀπῆγαγον ἀντιλαβόμενοι Σιμώνος τινὸς Κυρηναίου τοῦ ἐρχόμενον ἀπ' ἄγρου, ἐπέθηκαν αὐτῷ τὸν σταυρόν, φέρειν ὀπισθώς τοῦ Ἱησοῦ. 27. Ἡ κολοῦθει δὲ αὐτῷ πολλὸς πλῆθος τοῦ λαοῦ,

1 σταυρόν, σταυρόν in ν ΒΔ. Τ.Ρ. = A L X, etc.
2 ἔποιησεν, ἔποιησε in ΝBL (Tisch., W. H.).
3 For ε φ NLBL have και.
4 Omit αντών Ν Α Β Δ Χ etc
5 Omit τὴν Ν ΒΔ 69 al.
6 ἀπῆγαγον in B (W. H. marg.).
7 Σιμώνιν τινα Κ—ον ερχ—ον in Ν Β Δ Λ Χ 13, 33 al. (Tisch., W. H.).

with the aorist (here only in N. T.), hence probably the reading of T. R., βεβλημένος. Ver. 20. ταλίν, again, a second time. Lk. carefully enumerates the friendly attempts of Pilate, hence τρίτον in ver. 22. The first is in ver. 16. Ver. 21. ἐπεφώνουν, shouted (δοξάζει, Hesych.), in Lk. only, and in reference to the people (Acts xii. 22). σταυρόν (active, not middle = σταυ-

22. τρίτον: third and final attempt, showing some measure of earnestness on Pilate's part.—.FloatTensor: the φόνο answers to the hostile mood of the people: = I cannot respond to your demand for, etc.; the "why, what evil," etc., of the R. V. is a happy rendering. In this final appeal, Pilate states most distinctly his opinion that Jesus is innocent. — Ver. 23. ἐπέκρινεν, "they were instant," A. V. The verb is used absolutely.—κατίσχον, were overpowering; "ecce gens ingenium!" Pricaeus. — Ver. 24. ἐπέκρινεν, decided, gave judgment; here only in N. T. and in 2 Maccab. iv. 47, 3 Maccab. iv. 2. It was not a condemnation but simply a sentence to death under pressure.—αἰτήμα, desire, here and in Phil. iv. 6 in this sense.— Ver. 25. τὸν διὰ σ.: the repetition of this description, instead of giving the name, is very expressive.—τῷ θελήματι α., to their will. Weak man and wicked people!

Vv. 26-32. On the way to the cross (Mt. xxvii. 31-34, Mk. xvi. 21). — Ver. 26. ἀπῆγαγον: who led Jesus away is not indicated. It might seem it was the mob, to whose will Jesus had just been delivered. But Lk. does not mean that. He simply continues the story, as in Mk., omitting the mockery of the soldiers (Mk. xv. 16-20), who, that brutal sport ended, led Him out (ἐξέγοναν, Mk. xv. 20). Lk. omits also the scourging, which even Mt. and Mk. hurry over (φραγελλώθη). ἐπιλαβόμενοι: a Greek word substituted for the foreign technical ἄγγελιον in the parallels (usually takes the genitive in the Gospel, here also in T. R., accusative in W. and H.'s text, also in Acts xvii. 19, xviii. 17). — ὀπισθώς τοῦ Ἱησοῦ does not mean that Simon helped Jesus to bear the cross, carrying the end behind Jesus. They laid the whole cross on him.

V. 27 f. This incident of the women following in the crowd is peculiar to Lk. — καὶ γυναῖκας, and of women; they are the part of the crowd in which the story is interested. They were mainly women of Jerusalem (ver. 28). — ἀ συνεπέρα, etc.: they indulged in demonstrative grief by gesture and voice (ἡθονῶν), contrary to rule it would appear ("non planxerunt eductum ad supplicium, sed interius luxerunt in corde, Lighfoot on Mt. xxvii. 31), but great grief heeds not rules.—Ver. 28. ἐν ἔκρισι, ἐκ τύχης are brought close together to emphasise the
καὶ γινακῶν, αϊ καὶ ἐκόπτοντο καὶ ἔθρηνον αὐτῶν. 28. στραφεῖς ἔνας ἄυτάς οὔ ήγος εἶναι, "θυγατέρες ἦτορουσάλμη, μὴ κλαίετε ἐν' ἔμε, πλὴν ἐφ' ἑαυτᾶς κλαίετε καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν. 29. δι' ἐνδ. ἔρχονται ἡμέραι ἐν αἰς ἔροις, Μακάρια αἱ στείραι, καὶ κοιλίαι, αἱ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν, καὶ μαστοὶ οὐκ ἤθλισαν. 30. τότε ἄρεσται λέγειν τοῖς ἄρεσται, Πέσετε ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ τοῖς βουνοῖς, σκύλοι Καλύφατε ἡμᾶς. 31. δι' ἐν τοῖς ἕχοις ἔξω ταῦτα ποιοῦσιν, ἐν δὲ ἡερατές τὸ γήρω τί γένηται; 32. Ἰησοῦ δὲ καὶ ἔτεροι, δύο κακοῦργοι σύν εὐεργ. αὐτῷ ἔμαρτιν. 33. Καὶ δι' ἀπήλθον ἐπὶ τὸν τόπον τῶν κακο试点工作 Κρανίων, ἐκεῖ ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτῶν, καὶ τοὺς κακοῦργους, δι' ἐν' ἐκ βεβίων, ἐν δὲ ἢρωτοὺς. 34. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἔλεγε, "Πάπερ, ἀφεῖς αὐτῶν· οὐ γὰρ οἴδας τί ποιοῦσιν." 

contrast = weep not for me, but for yourselves weep, hinting at the tragedies of Jerusalem's fatal day. At such times the greatest joy, that of motherhood, is turned into the greatest misery (Holtzmann, H. C.). The mothers have ever the worst of it (J. Weiss in Meyer).—Ver. 29. μακάρια, etc.: blessed the women that have no children, barren, or unmarried: nobody to care for but themselves. The reflection implies keen sympathy with human feeling.—Ver. 30. τοῖς ἄρεσται, τοῖς βουνοῖς: the reference is to Palestine, a land of mountains and hills, and the prayer of the miserable that they might be lifted up and bury them under its ruins (quoted from Hosea x. 8).—Ver. 31. The sense of this proverbial phrase is obscure, but the connection demands this general idea: what is happening to me now is nothing to what is going to happen to this people. The green tree represents innocence, the dry tree guilt, ripe for the fire of judgment. Vide Ezekiel xx. 47, xxi. 3. Pictaesus cites as a parallel from Catullus: "quid facient crines quum sero talia cedant?" The Rabbinical proverb, "si duo fuerint ligna arida et unum viride, arida illud lignum viride exurunt," does not seem to bear the same meaning: "in ligno viride, in the wet tree; in ligno humido, Grotius. χλωρίν = lignum viride, in Ezekiel.—Ver. 32. ἐκεῖοι δύο κακοῦργοι, other two malefactors, as if Jesus was one also. But this is not meant. It is a negligent construction, common to all languages, and not liable to be misunderstood." remarks Field (Ot. Not.), who gives an example from the Communion service. "If he require further comfort or counsel let him come to me, or to some other discreet and learned minister of God's word." If κακοῦργοι were meant to include Jesus it would be used in reference to what we thought, διαστικός (Kypke) = pro tali habitus in reference to Jesus (Kuinoel). On this use of ἐκεῖοι and ἅλλοι, vide Winer, p. 665.

Vv. 33-38. Crucifixion (Mt. xxvii. 33-38, Mk. xvi. 24-27).—κρανίον, a skull, for the Hebrew Γολγοθᾶ in Mt. and MK.—Ver. 34. Πάπερ, etc.: a prayer altogether true to the spirit of Jesus, therefore, though reported by Lk. alone, intrinsically credible. It is with sincere regret that one is compelled, by its omission in important MSS., to regard its genuineness as subject to a certain amount of doubt. In favour of it is its
conformity with the whole aim of Lk. in his Gospel, which is to exhibit the graciousness of Jesus.—διαμαρτυρομένοι, etc., and parting His garments they cast lots = they divided His garments by casting lots.—Ver. 35. θεωρήσαν: the people are now mere spectators. Have they begun to rue already when they see what their demand has come to? Observe the words θεωράν and θεωρήσαντες in ver. 48. When they had gazed long enough it came to decided poignant regret. Fickle mob!—οἱ ἄρχοντες: they alone, the rulers of the people, mock and sneer. The σῶν αὐτῶν (T.R.) is a badly attested reading and clearly contrary to the spirit of the narrative.—ὁ ἀλεττός, the Elect One, and to come to this? Incredible? Not thus all the truest sons and elect of God have fared in this evil world.—Ver. 36. οἱ στρατιώται, the soldiers; first mention of them, whether there as executioners or as keeping order does not appear in Lk.'s narrative. They too mock in their own rough way, offering the sufferer vinegar by way of grim joke (Meyer). So Lk. understands the matter. Note how he buries over these brutalities. Cf. Mt. and Mk.—Ver. 37. The taunt put into the mouth of the soldiers is a pointless echo of the sneers of the rulers. The crucified one might be a King, yet be unable to save Himself. The Christ, elect of God, might be conceived endowed with supernatural power.—Ver. 38. ἐκ' αὐτῷ, over Him, i.e., above His head; or in reference to Him (Bleek). The ἐπιγραφή is viewed by Lk. as also an insult, crowning the others (ἦν δὲ καὶ), to which answers its form as in W. and H.: ἀ βασιλεύει τ. ἱ. ἄνθρωπος = the King of the Jews this (crucified person).—Vv. 39-43. The penitent malefactor, peculiar to Lk. and congenial to the spirit of the Gospel of the sinful.—Ver. 39. ἐδιαιρήσατο: the wretched man caught up the taunt of the rulers and, half in coarse contempt, half by way of petition, repeated it, with καὶ ἡμᾶς added, which redeemed the utterance from being a gratuitous insult.—Ver. 40. οὐδὲ φοβή συ τ. θ.: οὐδὲ may be connected with, and the emphasis may fall on, either φοβή, συ, or θέν = (1) dost thou not even fear God, not to speak of any higher religious feeling? (2) dost not even thou, in contrast to these mockers of misery, fear, etc.? (3) dost thou not fear God, at least, if thou hast no regard for men? The position of οὐδὲ just before φοβή tests the scale in favour of (1).—Ver. 41. ἄτονον (α. pr. and τότος): primarily out of place, unfitting, absurd, often in Plato; in later usage bearing a moral sense—wrong, wicked (ἅπαξ; ἄτονος =
41. Θεον, δι ιν τω αυτω κριναι ει; 41. και ημας μην δικαιοσ. αξια γην εν επραβεν αποκλαμπόμαν. ουτος δε ουδεν αντωνε επραβεν.
42. Και δην μεν εις ιερου αυτω "Μηνουτι μου, κυριε," διαν αληθις εν τη βασιλεια τω σου." 43. Και είπεν αυτω "ηνουσου; μην λεγω σου, ο σήμερον μετ' έμοι έστω εν τω παραδεισω." 44. "Ην δε οι δέ ωρα έκτις και σκοτος εγένετο ψη έδη των γινών, δες δρας έναντις. 45. και εκποτίζεθη δ ελλος και δοξίζεθη το κατάτευγμα του ναον μεσων· 46. και ανατρεψας πρωι μεγαλη δ ηνουσου είπεν, "πιστε εξειρησαι παραδεισωμα τω πνευμα μου." 47. Και ταύτα εισενέκτως.

42. After crucifixion (Mt. xxvii. 45-56, Mk. xv. 33-41).—Ver. 44. υπερ την γην: though Lk. writes for Gentiles this phrase need not mean more than over the whole land of Israel.

43. The reading of BL, εις την β'. σω, might point to an immediate entering into the Kingdom of Heaven, the prayer meaning: may I go there to be with Thee when I die!—Ver. 43. ομηρον: to be connected with what follows, not with λέγω = οδος, as opposed to a boon expected at some future time (which makes for the reading εις την β'. in ver. 42). Or the point may be: this very day, not to-morrow or the next day, as implying speedy release by death, instead of a slow lingering process of dying, as often in cases of crucifixion.—ιη ρα παραδεισων, in paradise; either the division of Hades in which the blessed dwell, which would make for the descensus ad inferos, or heaven; vide at xvi. 23, and cf. 2 Cor. xii. 4, where it is a synonym for heaven, and Rev. ii. 7, where it denotes the perfected Kingdom of God, the ideal state of bliss realised. The use of "paradise" in this sense is analogous to the various representations in Hebrews of the perfect future drawn from the primeval condition of man: lordship in the world to come, deliverance from the fear of death, a Sabbathism (Heb. ii. 14; iv. 9). The use of the term παραδεισως by St. Paul makes its use by our Lord credible.

Vv. 44-49. After crucifixion (Mt. xxvii. 45-56, Mk. xv. 33-41).—Ver. 44. ψη έδη των γινών: though Lk. writes for Gentiles this phrase need not mean more than over the whole land of Israel.

45. του ηλιου εκποτίζεθαι: this phrase (a well-attested reading as against the T.R. εκποτίζεθη δ η;) ought to mean the sun being eclipsed, an impossibility when the moon is full. If all that was meant was the sun's light totally failing, darkened, e.g., by a sand storm, the natural expression would be εκποτίζεθαι.

Ver. 46. ψη ρα μεγαλη: this expression is used in Mt. and Mk. in connection with the "My God, My God," which Lk. omits. In its place comes the "Father, into Thy hands.

Neither he personally, or his source, or his first readers, could not bear the thought of it.—παραδεισομαι τ. τ. τ. p.: an echo of Psalm xxxxi. 6, and to be understood in a similar sense, as an expression
of trust in God in extremis. Various shades of meaning have been put on the words, among which is that Jesus died by a free act of will, handing over His soul to God as a deposit to be kept safe (Grotius, Bengel, Hahn, etc.).—Ver. 47. δὲ δεατονάρκης, the centurion, in command of the soldiers named in ver. 36.—δίκαιος, righteous, innocent; in the parallels he confesses that Jesus is a Son of God. Lk. is careful to accumulate testimonies to Christ’s innocence: first the robber, then the centurion, then the multitude (ver. 48) bears witness.—Ver. 48. θεωρέω, sight, here only (3 Macc. v. 24).—τὰ γενόμενα, the things that had happened; comprehensively, including the crucifixion and all its accompaniments. They had looked on and listened, and the result was regret that they had had anything to do with bringing such a fate on such a man.—τούτων τις, beating their breasts. Lk. has in mind Zechariah’s “they shall look on me whom they have pierced and mourn” (xii. 10).—ἐπτευτρέφον, kept going away, in little groups, sad-hearted.—Ver. 49. ἐκ γνωστῶν, His acquaintances. Galileans mostly, who stood till the end, but far away. Mt. and Mk. do not mention this. No word of the eleven.—καὶ γυναίκες: warm-hearted Galileans they too, and women, therefore bolder where the heart was concerned; nearer presumably, therefore “seeing” predicted of them specially (δρώσας). The men stood at a safe distance, the women cared more for seeing than for safety. 

Vv. 50-56. The burial (Mt. xxvii. 57-61, Mk. xv. 42-47).—Ver. 50. καὶ ίδοι: introducing the bright side of the tragic picture, a welcome relief after the harrowing incidents previously related: the Victim of injustice honourably buried by a good man, who is described with greater fullness of detail than in Mt. and Mk.—ἀνήρ ἀγαθός καὶ δίκαιος, a man generous or noble and just. Instead of the epithets σωτηρίας (Mk. xv. 43) and πλούσιος (Mt. xxvii. 57), indicative of social position, Lk. employs words descriptive of moral character, leaving βουλευτής to serve the former purpose. ἀγαθός has reference to the generous act he is going to perform, δίκαιος to his past conduct in connection with the trial of Jesus; hence the statement following: ὠφελεῖ οὐκ ἦν, etc., which forms a kind of parenthesis in the long sentence.—Ver. 51. οὐκ ἦν συγκαταταξεῖσας, was not a consenting party, here only in N. T. Alford thinks the meaning is that he absented himself from the meeting. Let us hope it means more than that: present at the meeting, and dissenting from its proceedings.—τ. βουλὴ καὶ τ. πράξεις, their counsel and their subsequent action in carrying that counsel into effect.—ἐπηρεασθέντες, etc.: this describes his religious character. Thus we have first social position, then ethical character, generous and just:
finally religious character, one who was waiting for the Kingdom of God.—Ver. 53. λαξεύτω, cut out of stone, here only, and in Deut. iv. 49.—οὐκ ὁδότων, an accumulation of negatives to emphasise the honour done to Jesus by depositing His body in a previously unused tomb.

—Ver. 54. ἀναπτύχθη, was about to dawn, illuucesebat, Vulgate. The evening is meant, and the word seems inappropriate. Lk. may have used it as if he had been speaking of a natural day (as in Mt. xxviii. 1) by a kind of inadvertence, or it may have been used with reference to the candles lit in honour of the day, or following the Jewish custom of calling the night light justified by the text, Ps. cxlviii. 3, "Praise Him, all ye stars of light" (vide Lightfoot, Hor. Heb.). Or it may be a touch of poetry, likening the rising of the moon to a dawn. So Exercit. anti-Baronianae, p. 416.—Ver. 55. ἀπέγνω, possibly = αἰ, but possibly meant to suggest the idea of distinction: Galilean women, and such in character as you would expect them to be: leal-hearted, passionately devoted to their dead. Friend.—ὄνατα, spices, dry.—μύρα, ointments, liquid.—Ver. 56. κατὰ τὴν ἐντολήν: they respected the Sabbath law as commonly understood. The purchase of spices and ointments is viewed by some as a proof that the day of Christ's crucifixion was an ordinary working day.

Chapter XXIV. The Resurrection. In this narrative Lk. diverges widely from Mt. and Mk. both as to the appearances of the Risen Christ he reports and as to the scene of these. Specially noticeable is the limitation of the Christophanies to the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, Galilee being left out of account.

Vv. 1-11. The women at the tomb (Mt. xxviii. 1-8, Mk. xvi. 1-8).—Ver. 1. τῇ δὲ μή αὐτῇ καὶ τῇ λήμνῳ ἀποκεκλεισμένῳ ἀπὸ τοῦ μυθείου, 3. καὶ τῇ Πεντεκοστῇ ὁ Κυρίων ἀνάγεται καὶ κατεύθυνῃ τοὺς διάκονους ἵνα προσήρχονται τοῖς μαθηταῖς καὶ ἔδωκαν αὐτοῖς ἡμίπαθες δυνάμεις. 4-5. καὶ ἐν ἐκείνης τῇ Πεντεκοστῇ ἦκαν ἀνάγεσις, καὶ ἔθηκεν δύναμιν ἀναστήσεως, καὶ ἔδωκαν αὐτοῖς ἡμίπαθες δυνάμεις. 6. καὶ ἐν τῇ Πεντεκοστῇ ἦκαν ἀνάγεσις, καὶ ἔδωκαν αὐτοῖς ἡμίπαθες δυνάμεις. 7. καὶ τῇ Πεντεκοστῇ ἦκαν ἀνάγεσις, καὶ ἔδωκαν αὐτοῖς ἡμίπαθες δυνάμεις. 8. καὶ τῇ Πεντεκοστῇ ἦκαν ἀνάγεσις, καὶ ἔδωκαν αὐτοῖς ἡμίπαθες δυνάμεις.
angelic raiment (ἐν ἐνθύμησι ἀστραπτούσι).—Ver. 5. ἐφοβόμενοι, fear-stricken, from ἐφοβοῦσθαι, chiefly in later writers, for ἐν ἐφοβεῖ εἶναι. Vide Hermann, ad Viger., p. 607.—τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, the living one, simply pointing to the fact that Jesus was risen: no longer among the dead.—μετὰ τῶν νεκρῶν, among the dead. The use of μετά in the sense of among, with the genitive, is common in Greek authors, as in Pindar's line (Pythia, v., 127): μέσαν ρέναι ἀνθρώπων. Wolf mentions certain scholars who suggested that μετά τῶν νεκρῶν should be rendered "with the things for the dead," i.e., the spices and mortuary. But of this sense no example has been cited.—Ver. 6. μητοχήσθητε, etc.: the reference is to what Jesus told the disciples in the neighbourhood of Caesarea Philippi (ix.). There is no indication elsewhere that women were present on that occasion.—ὅτι: not merely "that," but "how," in what terms.—ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ: this reference to Galilee suggests that Lk. was aware of another reference to Galilee as the place of rendezvous for the meeting between the disciples and their risen Master (Mt. xxviii. 32, Mk. xiv. 28, to which there is nothing corresponding in Lk.).—Ver. 7. τὸν ἄνθρωπον τ. θ. a. standing before ἐμαυτῷ δὲ may be taken as an accusative of reference = saying as to the Son of Man that, etc.—ἀνθρώπων ἀμαρτητοίν, sinless men, not necessarily Gentiles only (Meyer, J. Weiss, etc.), but men generally (Hahn). Jesus actually expressed Himself in much more definite terms.—Ver. 9. ἀνέγγισται, etc.: cf. the statement in Mk. xvi. 8, according to which the women said nothing to any person.—Ver. 10: here for the first time Lk. gives names, adding to two of those named by Mk. (xv. 47, xvi. 1) Joanna, mentioned in viii. 3. Mary Magdalene is here called the Magdalene Mary.—καὶ αὐτῇ ἐκάθισεν, etc., also the other women with them. The emphasis must lie on the persons named as those who took the chief hand in informing the Apostles.—ὑμνοις describes the other
women as, in a subordinate way, joint-informants. The ατέω before δειγμα in T. R. makes the construction easier, and just on that account may be regarded as a correction by the scribes.—Ver. 11. αδήλωτα: plural with a neuter pl. nom. (τα ρήματα), denoting things without life, as in John xix. 31, because the "words," reports, are thought of in their separate-ness (vide Winer, § lvi., 3 a).—Αδήλωτα: here only in N.T. = idle talk, not to be taken seriously.

Ver. 12. Peter runs to the sepulchre. This verse, omitted in D and some copies of the old Latin version, is regarded by some as an interpolation. For Rohrbach’s theory vide notes on the appendix to Mark’s Gospel (xvi. 9-20).—ἀναστατικά, rising up, suggesting prompt action, like the man; as if after all he at last thought there might be something in the women’s story.—παρακώπωσις may mean: stooping down so as to look in, but in many passages in which the verb is used the idea of stooping is not suggested, but rather that of taking a stolen hasty glance with outstretched neck. Kypke gives as its meaning in profane writers exterto capite prospicere (examples there). Field (Of. Nor.) quotes with approval these words of Casaubon against Baronius (p. 693): "Male etiam probat humilitatem sepulchri ex eo quod dicitur Joannes se inclinasse; nam Graeca veritas habet παρακώπωσιν, quod sive de fenestra sumatur sive de janua, nullam inclinationem corporis designat, qualem sibi finxit B., sed protensionem collis potius cum modica corporis incurvatione".—μόνα, alone, without the body.—πρός τον τάφον (or αὐτόν): most connect this with ἐκατέρθην = went away to his home, as in John xx. 10 (πρὸς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ διαγώνῃ, Euthy. Zig.). The Vulgate connects with θαυμάζων = secum mirans, and is followed by not a few, including Theophyl. and Grotius; Wolf also, who lays stress on the fact that the ancient versions except the Coptic so render.—θαυμάζων, wondering; for, remarks Euthy., he knew that the body had not been carried off, for then the clothes would have been carried off also.

Vv. 13-35. On the way to Emmaus: in Lk. only, and one of the most beautiful and felicitous narratives in his Gospel, taken, according to J. Weiss (in Meyer), from Feine’s precanonical Luke. Feine, after Holtmann, remarks on the affinities in style and religious tone between it and Lk. i. and ii.

Vv. 13 ff. δόος αὐτῶν, two of them. The reference ought naturally to be to the last-named subject, the Apostles (ver. 10); yet they were evidently not Apostles. Hence it is inferred that the reference is to τοὺς λοιποὺς in ver. 9. Feine (also J. Weiss) thinks the story had been originally given in a different connection.

—Εμμανουὴλ: now generally identified with Kalonieh, the Emmaus of Josephus, B. J., vii. 6, 6, lying to the north-west of Jerusalem (vide Schürer, Div. I., vol. ii., p. 253, note 138, and Furrer, Wanderungen, pp. 168-9).—Ver. 15. συνεξηνέναι. This word, added to ὁμιλεῖν to describe the converse of the two disciples, suggests lively discussion, perhaps accompanied by some heat. One might be sceptical, the other more inclined to believe the story of the resurrection.—Ver. 16. ἐκατέρθησαν, their eyes were held, from
recognising Him (here only in this sense). Instances of the use of the verb in this sense in reference to the bodily organs are given by Kypke. It is not necessary, with Meyer, to suppose any special Divine action or purpose to prevent knowledge of Jesus.—Ver. 17. *αυτοποιηθεν*; an expressive word (here only in N.T.), confirming the impression of animated and even heated conversation made by *συνηθεν*. It points to an exchange of words, not simply, but with a certain measure of excitement. As Pricaeus expresses it: "servidius aliquanto et commotius, ut fieri amat ubi de rebus novis miraque disserentia nullamque expediendi nos viam invenientes, altercamur". The question of the stranger quietly put to the two wayfarers is not without a touch of kindly humour.—καλ *ευθαναισαν*, *συνεξωσαν*: this well-attested reading gives a good graphic sense = "they stood still, looking sad" (R.V.). A natural attitude during the first moments of surprise at the interruption of their talk by an unknown person, and in a puzzling tone.—Ver. 18. *αποκριθες ου*: at last after recovering from surprise one of them, Cleopas, finds his tongue, and explains fully the subject of their conversation.—*ευθανασαν*, etc.: he begins by expressing his surprise that the stranger should need to be told. What could they be talking about but the one supreme topic of the hour? The verb *παροιμισθη* might mean: live near, and the point of the question be: dost thou live near Jerusalem (in the neighbourhood of Emmaus, a few miles distant), and not know, etc. So Grotius, Rosenmüller, Bleek, etc. The usual meaning of the verb in Sept. and N.T. (Heb. xi. 9) is to sojourn as a stranger, and most take it in that sense here = art thou a stranger sojourning in Jerusalem (at passover season), and therefore ignorant? The *μονος* implies isolation over and above being a stranger. There were many strangers in Jerusalem at passover season; the two friends might be among them; but even visitors from Galilee and other places knew all about what had happened = do you live alone, having no communication with others—a stranger in Jerusalem so as to be the only man who does not know? (μονος qualifies ου as well as παροιμισθη).—Ver. 19. *νοια*, what sort of things? with an affected indifference, the feigning of love—οι ηλικοι: both speak now, distributing the story between them.—*αναρ προφητης*, a prophetic man, a high estimate, but not the highest.—*αναρ* may be viewed as redundant—"eleganter abutat." Kypke.—Ver. 20. *διωκες* ης, and how! *διωκες* here = *φοβες*, used adverbially with the indicative, here
only in N. T. The ἐκ connects what follows with what goes before as together constituting one complete tragic story: the best of men treated as the worst by the self-styled good.—καὶ ἑσταυρωμένοις: this confirms the idea suggested in the previous narrative of the crucifixion that Lk. regarded that deed as the crime of the Jewish people, and even as executed by them.—Ver. 21. ἤμειν δὲ, but ἔστιν, on the other hand, as opposed to the priests and rulers.—Ἄπαντες, were hoping; the hope dead or in abeyance now. But how wide asunder these disappointed ones from the rulers, ethically, in that they could regard such an one as Jesus as the Redeemer of Israel! ἀντιπαύσαι is to be taken in the sense of τις, τινὲς.—

**Ver. 22.** ἀλλὰ καὶ γ. τ.: introducing another hope-inspiring phase of the story.—ἐξετάσατε ἃ, astonished us.—ἀρθρινές: ἀρθρινός is a late form for ἀρθρωμένος, and condemned by Phryn.; the adjective instead of the adverb = early ones, a common classical usage.—Ver. 23. μὴ ἐφοροῦσα, etc.: that part of the women's story—the body gone—is accepted as a fact; their explanation of the fact is regarded as doubtful, as appears from the cautious manner of expression.—λέγοντες, etc., they came saying that they had also seen a vision of angels who say. Yet the use of the present indicative, λέγοντες, in reporting what the angels said, shows a wish to believe the report.—Ver. 24. τινες τῶν σωσάμενων: a general reference to the Apostles, though the phrase covers all the lovers of Jesus. The τινες were Peter and John (John xx. 3).—αὐτῶν δὲ ἐστιν, but Him they saw not, as surely, think the two friends, they ought to have done had He really been alive from the dead.

**Ver. 25 f.** Jesus speaks.—ἀνήγορος, "fools" (A. V.) is too strong, "foolish men" (R. V.) is better. Jesus speaks not so much to reproach as by way of encouragement. As used by Paul in Gal. iii. 1 the word is harder. "Stupid" might be a good colloquial equivalent for it here.—πιστεύειν ἐπὶ τ.: ἐπὶ with dative of person after πιστεύειν is common, with dative of the thing only here.—Ver. 26. ἐδει: here as always in Lk. pointing to the necessity that O. T. prophecy should be fulfilled. Accordingly Jesus is represented in the next verse as going on to show that prophecy demanded the course of experience described: first the passion, then entrance into glory.—καὶ εἰρήνα: the passion is past, the entering into glory is still to come, therefore it seems unfit to make εἰρήνη dependent with
27. Kαι ἄρακεμος ἀκτὶ Μωσέως καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν προφητῶν, διηρμηνευόντων 1 αὐτοίς ἐν πᾶσιν ταῖς γραφαῖς· τὰ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ. 28. Καὶ ἤγγισαν εἰς τὴν κοίμην οὖν ἐπορεύοντο· καὶ ἀυτῶς προσπενειτο 2 πορρητά τοῦ συνεδρίου ἁπάντα τοῖς συνεδρίοις, μεν ἐκείνον μὲν ἔκφρασαν σπάνιον· ἀλλὰ τοῖς δὲ ἄλλοις· "Μείναν μεθ' ἡμῶν, ὅτι πρὸς ἄπειρον ἐστὶν· καὶ καλλικρινὴν ἡ ἡμέρα." 3 Καὶ ἠσθίσα

1 διηρμηνευσαν in BL (Tisch., W.H. text). D has τόν αὐτόν. before αὐτοῖς with ἐν BL (Tisch., W.H. text).

2 προστενειτο in ΝΑΒDL 1; for πορρητά (in ΝΔL) AB 382 have πορρητάς (W.H.).

3 τότε before τὸ εἰς in Ν BL 1, 33 al.

4 So in ΝΑΛΧ 1, 31. BD omit εἰς τὸ εἰς (W.H.). For καλλικρινὴς D has καλλικρινὴς (W.H. marg.).

... οὕτω καὶ κατοικημένη ἦν ἐν ἡμῖν, 4 δὲ διδάχει ἡμῖν ἐν τῇ...


Typical of the experience of the whole early Church when it got the key to the sufferings of Jesus (Holtmann, H. C.). Their doubt and its removal was common to them with many, and that is why the story is told so carefully by Lk.—δὲ δὲλᾶσθη, ἡ δυνάμειν (without καλ.), as He spoke, as He opened, etc.; first the general then the more specific form of the fact.—Ver. 33. ἀπῆλθε τῷ ὅρα: no time lost, meal perhaps left half finished, no fear of a night journey; the eleven must be told at once what has happened. “They ran the whole way from overjoy” (καὶ παρακείμενοι), Buthy. Zig.—Ver. 34. λέγεται: the apostolic company have their story to tell: a risen Lord seen by one of their number. The two from Emmaus would not be sorry that they had been forestalled. It would be a welcome confirmation of their own experience. On the other hand, the company in Jerusalem would be glad to hear their tale for the same reason. So they told it circumstantially (τὰ ἐν τῇ δῆμῳ, ver. 35).

Vv. 36-43. *Jesus appears to the eleven* (cf. Mk. xvi. 14, John xx. 19-23).—Ver. 36. ἦσθη ἐν μέσῳ ἡ. suggests an appearance as sudden as the departure from the two brethren.—Ver. 37. πνεῦμα, a spirit, i.e., a form recognisable as that of Jesus, but of Jesus not risen but come from the world of the dead disembodied or only with an apparent body; therefore they were terrified at the sight, notwithstanding what they had heard.—Ver. 38. τι νεκρομάνσιον ὠφελεῖ; why are ye disturbed? or about what are ye disturbed? taking τι as object of τεταράπ. (Schanz).—Ver. 39. τὰς χειρὰς μοι, etc.: Jesus shows His hands and feet with the wounds to satisfy them of His identity (ὅτι έχει εἰμὶ αὐτός). Then He bids them touch Him (ψηλαφήσατε με) to satisfy themselves of His substantiality.—Ver. 40. see with the mind; with the eye in case of the preceding ἴδε. —Ver. 41: either *that*, or *because*.—Ver. 40. Very nearly John xx. 20 and possibly an interpolation. It seems superfluous after ver. 39.—Ver. 41. ἐπὶ τῷ ἴδιῳ τῆς χαρᾶς, a psychological touch quite in Lk.’s manner. *Cf.* xxii. 45: there asleep from grief, here unbelievers from joy. Hahn takes χαρᾶ objectively.

—τι βρῶσιμον, anything eatable, here
only in N.T.—Ver. 42. ἀπὸ μελισσῶν κηρίου, of a bee-comb. The adjective μελισσός occurs nowhere else. κηρίου is the diminutive of κηρύς. The words are probably a gloss.—Ver. 43. That Jesus ate is carefully stated. The materiality thus evinced seems inconsistent with the pneumatic nature of Christ’s body as suggested by sudden appearing and departure, and with the immortal form of embodied life generally. Hahn suggests that the materiality was assumed by Jesus for the moment to satisfy the disciples that He had a body, and that He was risen. Euthy. Zig. expresses a similar view, stating that Jesus ate and digested supernaturally (στηρίζω), and that what He did to help the faith of the disciples was exceptional in reference to the immortal condition of the body, which can have nothing to do with wounds of food (ἀκολούθων ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνατέλλων τοῦ ἐκτελεσθέντος κηρίου, ἢ βρώσαν προστίθηται). Vv. 44-49. Parting words.—ἐστε δὲ αὐτοῖς: it is at this point, if anywhere, that room must be made for an extended period of occasional intercourse between Jesus and His disciples such as Acts i. 3 speaks of. It is conceivable that what follows refers to another occasion. But Lk. takes no pains to point that out. His narrative reads as if he were still relating the incidents of the same meeting. In his Gospel the post-resurrection scenes seem all to fall within a single day, that of the resurrection—οὕσα ἐλήλογον, etc., these are the words. With Euthy. Zig. we naturally ask: which? (οὗτοι; ψωλοί; and there he leaves it). Have we here the concluding fragment of a longer discourse not given by Lk., possibly the end of a document containing a report of the words of Jesus generally (so J. Weiss in Meyer)? As they stand in Lk.’s narrative the sense must be: these events (death and resurrection) fulfil the words I spoke to you before my death. If that be the meaning the mode of expression is peculiar.—ἐν τ. ν. Μοριας, etc.: Moses, Prophets, Psalms, a unity (no article before προφητείαν or ψαλμοῖς) = the whole O.T. canon. So most. Or, these three parts of the O.T. the main sources of the Messianic proof (Meyer, Hahn, etc.). The latter the more likely.—Ver. 45 points to detailed exposition of Messianic texts, generally referred to in ver. 44, as in the case of the two brethren.—Ver. 46 gives the conclusion of the expository discourse in Christ’s own words (καὶ ἐρῶ τῆς διδασκαλίας).
43—53.

ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ

μάρτυρες τοῦτων. 49. καὶ ἱδοὺ, ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω ἐκ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας τοῦ κατρός μου ἐγείραι· ὅμως ἐκαθήκατε ἐν τῇ πύλῃ ἱεροσαλήμ, εἰς ἐὰν ἐλώσθητε δύναμιν ἐξ ὕψους. 50. Ἐξῆγαγεν δὲ αὐτοῖς ἔξω ἔξω εἰς Ἰησοῦν. Καὶ ἀπέραν τὸν ἱερότα τῆς χειρᾶς αὐτοῦ, εὐλόγησαν αὐτοῖς. 51. καὶ ἔγειτο ἐν τῇ ἱεροσαλήμ ἀυτῶν αὐτοῖς, διὸντι ἀπ' αὐτῶν, καὶ ἀνεῴθεν εἰς τὸν ωραρίον. 52. καὶ αὐτοὶ προσευχήσαντες αὐτοῖς, ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς ἱεροσαλήμ μετὰ χαρᾶς μεγάλης. 53. καὶ ἦσαν διαπάντος ἐν τῇ θεῷ, αἰνοῦτες καὶ εὐλογοῦντες τῷ Θεῷ. Ἀμήν.

1 καὶ ἤδων ᾑδων in ABC al. (W.H.); omit ἤδων ΝΔL (Tisch.). ΝοBLXΔ 33 have ἐκαθήκατε (Tisch., W.H.).

2 Omit ιπ. ΝΒCDL codd. vet. Lat.

3 Omit ιπ. ΝΒCL 1, 33.

4 For ιπ. ΝΒCDL 1, 33 have ἐξ.


7 ἐλώσθητε only in D a b e ff* (Tisch.). ΝΒC*L have euλογούντες only (W.H. text).

8 Ἀμήν is wanting in ΝC*DL 1, 33 al.

and do this—beginning at Jerusalem.—Ver. 48. μάρτυρες τινα, the witnessing function refers mainly to the resurrection, not exclusively as i. 2 shows.—Ver. 49. τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τινα, the promise is the Spirit spoken of in prophetic oracles (Is. xlv. i., Joel ii. 28, etc.)—καθήκατε, sit still, patiently but with high hope.—ἐξω: without ἐκ, because the power is expected to come without fail.—ἐνδούσατε: till ye be invested, a natural figure, and no mere Hebraism. Cf. Rom. xiii. 14, Gal. iii. 27. There may be a reference to warlike armour (ἐνδούσατε, Euthy. Zieg.).

Vv. 50-53. Farewell (cf. Mk. xvi. 19, 20, Acts i. 9-12).—Ver. 50. ἔξηγαγεν: does this imply that Jesus walked through the streets of Jerusalem towards Bethany visible to all? Assuming that it does, some (e.g., Holtz. in H. C.) find here a contradiction of the statement in Acts x. 42 that Jesus was manifested after His resurrection only to chosen witnesses.—ἐξω: the best MSS. leave this out, and it seems superfluous after ἔξηγαγεν; but such repetitions of the preposition are by no means uncommon in Greek (examples in Bornemann).—ἐν τῷ πνεύματι (ἐν τ. Τ.Ρ.): this reading adopted by the revisers they render: "until they were over against," which brings the indication of place into harmony with that in Acts i. 12. Possibly harmonistic considerations influenced transcription, leading, e.g., to the adoption of πνεύματι instead of ἐκ (in ACX, etc.). Bethany lay on the eastern slope of Olivet, about a mile beyond the summit.—Ver. 51. διόντι, parted; taken by itself the verb might point merely to a temporary separation, but even apart from the next clause, referring to the ascension, it is evidently meant to denote a final leave-taking.—καὶ ἀνεῴθεν, etc.: the absence of this clause from Ν and some old Latin codd. may justify suspicion of a gloss, meant to bring the Gospel statement into line with Acts. But on the other hand, that the author of both books should make a distinct statement concerning the final departure of Jesus from the world in the one as well as in the other was to be expected.—Ver. 52. μετὰ χαρᾶς μεγάλης, with great joy, the joy of men convinced that their Lord was risen and gone up to glory, and that great events were impending in connection with the promise of the Spirit.—Ver. 53. διὰ παντὸς (χρόνον understood), continually, i.e., at the hours of worship when the temple was open. By frequenting the temple the disciples remained faithful to the programme "beginning at Jerusalem". To the Jew first, and with the Jew as far and as long as possible: such was Lk.'s habitual attitude; manifest throughout in the Gospel and in Acts.
THE GOSPEL

ACCORDING TO

JOHN
INTRODUCTION.

AUTHORSHIP. The importance of ascertaining the authorship of the Fourth Gospel can hardly be exaggerated. In no other Gospel have we the direct testimony of an eye-witness. Luke expressly informs us that his information, although carefully sifted, is at second hand. If in Mark we have the reminiscences of the Apostle Peter, these are related not by himself but by his companion and interpreter John Mark. In the first Gospel we probably have in a more or less original form the collection of our Lord's sayings which Papias tells us was made by Matthew; but certainly the original work of Matthew did not exactly coincide with our present Gospel, and to what extent alteration has been made upon it, it is not easy to say. But the Fourth Gospel professes to be the work of an eye-witness, and of an eye-witness who enjoyed an intimacy with our Lord allowed to none besides. If this claim be true, and if the Gospel be indeed the work of the Apostle John, then we have not only the narrative of one who saw and was a part of what he records, but we have a picture of our Lord by one who knew Him better than any one else did.

On examination the contents of this Gospel are found to be of such a character as to make it imperative that we should know whether we can trust its statements or not. The author of the Gospel not only expresses his own belief in our Lord's divinity, but he puts words into the mouth of Jesus which even on close scrutiny seem to many to form an explicit claim to pre-existence and thus to imply a claim to divinity. If these claims and statements merely reflect the belief and opinion of the third or fourth generation and not the very mind of Christ Himself, then they are important mainly as historical evidence of a growing tradition and not as giving us the firm basis on which the Church may build. But if an apostle was responsible for the Gospel, then the probability is that the utterances which are referred to Christ nearly, if not absolutely, represent His very words, and that the doctrinal position of the author himself is not one we can lightly set aside. For, although apostolic author-
ship does not guarantee absolute accuracy in detail, and although we
cannot determine the relation of the record to the words actually
spoken by Jesus until we have ascertained the object and point of
view of the writer, yet apostolic authorship not only fixes the date
within certain limits, but also determines to a considerable extent
the probable spirit, attitude, means, and object of the writer.

Critics who find themselves unable to admit apostolic authorship
lay stress upon the value of the Gospel as exhibiting the faith of the
Church in the early part of the second century and the grounds on
which that faith rested. Thus Weizsäcker declares that the debates
regarding the divinity of Christ are a mere reflex of the time in
which the evangelist lived—a time when, according to Pliny,
Christians were accustomed to sing hymns to Christ as God and
were creating a fuller dogma of His divinity. The Johannine Christ
occupies no relation to the Law, because for the Church of the
evangelist's day the Law was no longer of present interest as it had
been in a former generation. The strife exhibited in the Gospel did
not belong to the life of Christ, but is a strife of the Epigoni.

Holtzmann is of the same opinion. The Gospel has value as a
mirror of the times in which the writer lived and of the experiences
through which the Church had reached that period; but when we
proceed to use the Gospel as a record of our Lord's life we must
bear in mind that the author meant to portray the image of Christ
as that image lived in his own soul and in the Church for which he
wrote; and as, in his view, it should live in the Church of all times
as the image of the Godhead. Oscar Holtzmann (Das Johannes-
evangelium, 1887, p. 137) believes that the writer sought to write a
life of Jesus which should be in keeping with the thought of his
time; and with this object he used the material furnished by the
Synoptists and by the oral tradition of his day, correcting and
amplifying to suit his purpose.

Schürer (Vorträge d. theol. Konferenz zu Giessen, 1889, Über d.
gegenwärtigen Stand d. Johanneischen Frage) maintains that the
worth of the fourth Gospel lies, not in its historical narrative, but in
its expression of the conviction that in Jesus Christ God revealed
Himself. This is the essence of Christianity; and this is the funda-
mental thought of the Gospel. Nowhere in the New Testament is
it presented with such clearness, with such ardent faith, with such
victorious confidence. Accordingly, though this Gospel as a source
of history must take a lower place than the synoptic Gospels, it
must always have its worth as a witness of the Christian faith.

Doubtless the Gospel has a value, whoever is its author, and
whatever its date. But if it is not historically reliable and if the
utterances attributed to our Lord were not really uttered by Him
but are merely the creation of the writer and ascribed to the
Founder of the Church to account for and justify some of its
developments, plainly its value is widely different from that which
attaches to a reliable record of the words and actions of Jesus.
The faith and life of the Church of the second century is not
normative; and if in this Gospel all that we have is a reflex of that
life given in terms of the life of Christ, we have, no doubt, a very
interesting document, but not a document on which we can build
our knowledge of our Lord. Nay, professing, as this record does, to
be historically reliable, the Church has been throughout its history
gravely in error regarding the claims of its Founder, and this error
lies at the door of the author of the Gospel. It is of the first
importance, therefore, that we ascertain whether the writer had the
means of being historically trustworthy, whether he was an eye-
witnees or was entirely dependent on others for his information.

1. External evidence in favour of Johannine authorship. In
examining the Christian literature of the second century with a view
to ascertain the belief of the Church regarding the authorship of
the Fourth Gospel, it must be borne in mind that there are many
instances in which the classical writers of antiquity were not quoted
for some centuries after their works were published. The character
and position of the New Testament writings, however, made it likely
that they would at once and frequently be referred to. But although
the second century was prolific of Christian writings, their extant
remains are unfortunately scanty. We might have expected definite
information from the exegetical writings of Papias and Basileides,
and possibly some allusions in the histories of Hegesippus, but of
these and other important documents only the names and a few
extracts survive. It is also to be borne in mind that the mode of
quotation in vogue at that time was different from our own. Books
were not so plentiful, and they were more cumbersome. Accordingly
there was more quotation from memory and little of the exactness
which in our day is considered desirable. It was a common practice
with early writers to weave Scriptural language into their own text
without pausing to say whence these allusions were derived. The
consequence is that while such allusions may seem to one reader to
carry evidence that the writer is making use of such and such a
book of Scripture, it is always open to a more sceptical reader to
say that the inexactness of the allusion is rather a proof that the
book of Scripture had not been seen, and that some traditional
saying was the source of the quotation. And even where explicit quotations occur, no light may be thrown on the authorship of the book quoted, except in so far as they indicate the date of its composition.

It is not questioned that in the last quarter of the second century the Fourth Gospel was accepted by the Church as the work of the Apostle John, and was recognised as canonical. This is a fact not questioned, but its importance may easily be underrated and its significance missed. Opponents of the Johannine authorship have declared it to be "totally unnecessary to account" for this remarkable consent of opinion. But the very fact that a Gospel so obviously different from the synoptic Gospels should have been unanimously received as Apostolic is a weighty testimony. Its significance has been admirably summarised by Archdeacon Watkins (Bampton Lectures, p. 47): "It is not that the Fourth Gospel was known and read as the work of St. John in the year a.d. 190 or 180 or 170; but that it was known and read through all the extent of Christendom, in churches varying in origin and language and history, in Lyons and Rome, in Carthage and Alexandria, in Athens and Corinth, in Ephesus and Sardis and Hierapolis, in Antioch and Edessa; that the witness is of Churches to a sacred book which was read in their services, and about which there could be no mistake, and of individuals who had sacrificed the greatest good of temporal life, and were ready to sacrifice life itself as a witness to its truth; that these individual witnesses were men of culture and rich mental endowment, with full access to materials for judgment, and full power to exercise that judgment; that their witness was given in the face of hostile heathenism and opposing heresy, which demanded caution in argument and reserve in statement; and that this witness is clear, definite, unquestioned."

To this universal consent the sole exceptions were Marcion and the Alogi, and possibly Gaius. During the decade a.d. 160-170 there existed in Asia Minor some persons who discovered in the Gospel traces of Gnostic and Montanistic teaching. They held their place in the Christian Church, but discarded the Johannine writings and ascribed them to Cerinthus. Epiphanius gives them the name of "Αλογοι [unreasonable, irrational] because they did not accept the Logos proclaimed by John." Harnack justly maintains that this is

1 See Rendel Harris' Hermas in Arcadia and other Essays, 1896.
2 Epiphan., Haeres., 51, 3, defines this heresy as ἀνομολλογον Ἰωάννου τῆς βίβλου. Τέτω σύν τὸν λόγον αὐτὸ δεικνύει τὸν παρὰ Ἰωάννου κατηγορούν, "Αλογοι ἀληθησόμεναι. See Harnack, Das N. Test. um d. Jahr 200, pp. 58-70;
"of the highest significance" for the history of the Canon; but it has little or no significance for the criticism of the Gospel, because the rejection of the Gospel proceeded wholly on dogmatic grounds. Its ascription to Cerinthus, an impossible author, betrays the recklessness of the judgment pronounced; while the naming of a contemporary and fellow-townsmen of the Apostle may be accepted as an indication of the true date of the Gospel. Some of the scholars who are best informed regarding the second century, such as Hilgenfeld and Salmon, are inclined to believe that no such sect as the Alogi ever existed, although one or two individuals may have held the opinions identified with that nickname. If they existed, their rejection of the writings of John demonstrates that previous to their time these writings had been accepted as Apostolic and authoritative.1 Marcion's neglect of the Johannine books is equally unimportant for the criticism of the Gospel.

In the writings of Irenaeus, who was born, according to Lipsius, about A.D. 130, and whose great work against Gnosticism may be dated between 180-185, the Fourth Gospel is referred to the Apostle John and is regarded as canonical. In a well-known passage (Contra Haer., III., xi., 8) this representative writer even argues that in the nature of things there can be neither more nor fewer than four Gospels, as there are four zones of the world in which we live, and four principal winds. In accordance with this natural fourfoldness the Word who designs all things has given us the Gospel under four aspects but united and unified by one Spirit. Additional importance has been given to this statement by the suggestion of Dr. Taylor of Cambridge that Irenaeus borrowed this idea from Hermas. This writer, who belongs to a much earlier period than Irenaeus, in speaking of the Church says: "Whereas thou sawest her seated on a couch, the position is a firm one; for the couch has four feet and standeth firmly, for the world too is upheld by means

Watkins' B. L., p. 123; Salmon's Introd., p. 229; Sanday's B. L., p. 64; and cf. Irenaeus, Haer., III., xi., 9.

1 Dr. Plummer, after discussing the rejection of the Gospel by Marcion and the Alogi, proceeds: "All this tends to show that if the Fourth Gospel was rejected in certain quarters for a time, this tells little or nothing against its genuineness. Indeed it may fairly be said to tell the other way; for it shows that the universal recognition of the Gospel, which we find existing from A.D. 170 onwards, was no mere blind enthusiasm, but a victory of truth over baseless, though not unnatural, suspicion. Moreover, the fact that these overwary Christians assigned the Gospel to Cerinthus is evidence that the Gospel was in their opinion written by a contemporary of St. John. To concede this is to concede the whole question" (Cambridge Greek Test.; Gospel acc. to St. John, p. 24).
of four elements".1 If we could accept Dr. Taylor's view and believe that the four Gospels are here alluded to, we should have the earliest testimony to our four canonical Gospels; but it may so reasonably be doubted whether the reference is to four Gospels that the passage cannot be appealed to without hesitation.

But it is the connection of Irenaeus with Polycarp which has always been considered the significant element in his testimony. Eusebius (H. E., v., 20) has preserved a letter written by Irenaeus to Florinus, in which he reminds him how they had together listened to Polycarp in their youth: "I distinctly remember the incidents of that time better than events of recent occurrence; for the lessons received in childhood, growing with the growth of the soul, become identified with it; so that I can describe the very place in which the blessed Polycarp used to sit when he discoursed, and hisgoings out and his comings in, and his manner of life and his personal appearance, and the discourses which he held before the people; and how he would describe his intercourse with John and with the rest who had seen the Lord, and how he would relate their words. And what were the accounts he had heard from them about the Lord, and about His miracles, and about His teaching, how Polycarp, as having received them from eye-witnesses of the life of the Word [τῆς ζωῆς τοῦ Α不良信息], used to give an account harmonising on all points with the Scriptures."2 The Scripture in which "the life of the Word" can be traced is the Fourth Gospel. Polycarp does not refer his hearers to that Gospel, because having himself been a pupil of John, he preferred to relate what he had heard from him. But Irenaeus recognised that Polycarp's oral tradition was in harmony with the Gospel. Besides, John lived to the times of Trajan, whose reign began in A.D. 98, while Polycarp was born not later than A.D. 70, and was put to death in 156, so that the first thirty years of his life coincided with the last years of John's, and the last thirty years with the youth of Irenaeus. This being so, can it fairly be said to be likely that after such intimacy with Polycarp as Irenaeus claims, he should not know whether John had written a Gospel or not? Is it conceivable that a young man of an intelligent and inquiring turn of mind should have been in daily communication with a pupil of the Apostle's, and should never have discovered the origin of the most remarkable document of primitive Christianity?

But Irenaeus is not the earliest writer who ascribes the Fourth

1 See Taylor's Hermas and the Four Gospels. Cambridge, 1892.
2 This argument is put in an interesting and conclusive form by Dr. Dale in his Living Christ and the Four Gospels, pp. 149-151, 281-284.
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Gospel to the Apostle John. This distinction belongs to Theophilus of Antioch. His treatise, *Ad Autolycum*, was probably of an earlier date than Irenaeus' great work, and in this treatise, speaking of inspired men, he says: "one of whom, John, says, In the beginning was the Word".

The date of the Muratorian Canon is so much debated that it cannot be cited as a witness anterior to Irenaeus. But it records an interesting tradition of the origin of the Gospel. "The fourth of the Gospels is by the disciple John. He was urged by his fellow disciples and bishops and said, 'Fast with me this day and for three days and whatever shall be revealed to any of us let us relate it'. The same night it was revealed to the Apostle Andrew that John should write the whole in his own name, and that all the rest should revise it." Whatever may be thought of this tradition, it is at all events evidence that for some considerable time prior to the publication of the Muratorian Canon the Fourth Gospel had been accepted as the work of John.

The esteem in which the Fourth Gospel was held about the middle of the second century is evinced by the place it holds in the *Diatessaron* of Tatian. This harmony of the four Gospels opens with a portion of the Fourth Gospel. What may reasonably be gathered from the existence of such a work is fairly stated by Harnack in his article on Tatian in the *Encyc. Brit.*: "We learn from the *Diatessaron* that about A.D. 160 our four Gospels had already taken a place of prominence in the Church, and that no others had done so; that in particular the Fourth Gospel had already taken a fixed place alongside of the three synoptics". But this is too modest an inference. Prof. Sanday has shown that the text used in the composition of the *Diatessaron* does not represent the original autograph of the Gospel, nor a first copy of it, but that several copyings must have intervened between the original and Tatian's text; that in fact this text was derived "from a copy that is already very corrupt, a copy perhaps farther removed (if every aberration is taken into account) from the original text than the text which was committed to print in the sixteenth century. This is a fact of the very highest significance, and it is one that the negative critics in Germany have, to the best of my belief, entirely overlooked." The date of the Gospel is thus pushed back considerably.

With the writings of Tatian's master, Justin, we pass from the second into the first half of the second century. Dr. Hort places his

1 See also Harris' *Preliminary Study, etc.*, p. 56.
martyrdom in the year a.d. 149, and his writings may, with Lightfoot, be dated in the fifth decade of the century. That he made use of the Fourth Gospel, although hotly contested a few years ago, is now, since the investigations of Drummond and Abbot, scarcely denied. And indeed several passages in Justin's writings are indisputable echoes of the Gospel. In the Dialogue with Trypho (c. 105) he expressly states that his knowledge of Jesus as the only begotten of the Father and as the Logos was derived from the Gospels, that is, from the Fourth Gospel, for none of the synoptics speak of the Logos. In his First Apology (c. 63) he says of the Jews: "They are justly upbraided by Christ Himself as knowing neither the Father nor the Son". In the same Apology (c. 61), in explaining baptism, he says: "For Christ also said, Except ye be born again ye shall in no wise enter into the Kingdom of Heaven". Other passages have a similar bearing.

In the Apostolic Fathers we find no express references to the Fourth Gospel, but there are not wanting echoes which indicate a familiarity with its teaching. Thus in the epistles of Ignatius written in the year a.d. 110 while the writer was on his way to martyrdom, are found such expressions as "the Spirit . . . knoweth whence it cometh and whither it goeth," an obvious reminiscence of our Lord's conversation with Nicodemus. And when we find Ignatius speaking of Jesus as "the door of the Father," "the Shepherd," "the Son who is His Word," the probability is that these expressions were derived from the Gospel.

Polycarp's one epistle dates from the same year a.d. 110. It is a brief letter, and no reference to the Fourth Gospel occurs in it. But he quotes from the First Epistle of John, and as no one doubts that the Gospel and the Epistle are from the same hand, it can at any rate be concluded that the writer of the Gospel "flourished before Polycarp wrote".

Papias of Hierapolis, although not usually numbered among the Apostolic Fathers, was a contemporary of Polycarp, and his life overlapped that of the Apostle John by about twenty-five years. He wrote the earliest known commentary, entitled An Exposition of our Lord's Oracles. Most unfortunately this book is lost, and among the many rich discoveries which modern research is making none could be more valuable than the discovery of this work of Papias. The fact remains that he did write it, and therefore had some written material to proceed upon. And significant allusion is

---

1 See Abbot's Critical Essays; Purves, Test. of Justin; Norton, Genuineness of the Gospels.
made to this work in an old Latin argument prefixed to the Gospel in a MS. of the ninth century, which says: "The Gospel of John was revealed and given to the churches by John while he still remained in the body, as one named Papias of Hierapolis, a beloved disciple of John, related in his five books of expositions".

The testimony of heretics is equally decisive. From the decade A.D. 160-170 we receive a significant witness in the commentary on the Gospel of John by Heracleon, a pupil or companion of Valentinus,\(^1\) (γνώριμον is Origen's word). Mr. Brooke, who edited the extant portions of this commentary for Armitage Robinson's *Texts and Studies*, arrives at the conclusion that it must be dated shortly after the death of Valentinus, that is to say, not much later than A.D. 160. "The rise of commentaries shows an advanced stage in the history of the text of the Fourth Gospel" (Lightfoot, *Bibl. Essays*, p. 111). And the reason for Heracleon's choosing this Gospel as the subject of a commentary is that Valentinus and his school borrowed from it much of their phraseology, and hoped by putting their own interpretation on it to gain currency for their views. We have, then, this remarkable circumstance that shortly after the middle of the second century the Fourth Gospel occupied such a position of authority in the Church that the Gnostics considered it of importance to secure its voice in favour of their views. No wonder that even Volkmar should exclaim: "Ah! Great God! if between A.D. 125 and 155 a commentary was composed on John's Gospel such as that of which Origen has preserved considerable extracts, what yet remains to be discussed? It is very certain that it is all over with the critical thesis of the composition of the Fourth Gospel in the middle of the second century."\(^2\)

But there is evidence that even an earlier Gnostic teacher made use of this Gospel. Hippolytus (*Philos.*, vii., 22), in giving an account of the opinions of Basileides, who flourished at Alexandria about the year A.D. 125, quotes him in the following terms: "This," says he (i.e., Basileides), "is that which is said in the Gospels, 'That was the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world'". The words are cited precisely as they stand in the Fourth Gospel, and as they are not words of Jesus, which might have been handed down through some other channel, but words of the evangelist himself, they prove that the Gospel existed before the year A.D. 125. The attempt to evade this conclusion by the suggestion that

---

\(^1\) Valentinus himself used "integro instrumento," the whole N.T. as Tertullian received it. *Tert.*, *Præscr.*, 38.

Hippolytus is quoting the followers of Basileides rather than himself has been finally disposed of by Matthew Arnold (God and the Bible, 268-9). But even Basileides was not the earliest Gnostic who used this Gospel. Hippolytus gives an account of the previously existing sects, the Naasseni and Peratae, which proves that they made large use of this Gospel. Already in the earliest years of the second century the Fourth Gospel was an authoritative document.

What must necessarily be inferred from this use of the Gospel by the Gnostics of the second century? The conclusion drawn by Ezra Abbot is as follows: "It was then generally received both by Gnostics and their opponents between the years A.D. 120 and 130. What follows? It follows that the Gnostics of that date received it because they could not help it. They would not have admitted the authority of a book, which could be reconciled with their doctrines only by the most forced interpretation, if they could have destroyed its authority by denying its genuineness. Its genuineness could then be easily ascertained. Ephesus was one of the principal cities of the Eastern world, the centre of extensive commerce, the metropolis of Asia Minor. Hundreds, if not thousands, of people were living who had known the Apostle John. The question whether he, the beloved disciple, had committed to writing his recollections of his Master’s life and teaching, was one of the greatest interest. The fact of the reception of the Fourth Gospel as his work at so early a date, by parties so violently opposed to each other, proves that the evidence of its genuineness was decisive." 1

The Clementine Homilies and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, which respectively represent the Ebionite and Nazarene branches of Judaistic Christianity, betray familiarity, if not with the Fourth Gospel, certainly with its teaching and phraseology.

In the face of this external evidence, it has been found impossible to maintain the late date which was ascribed to the Gospel by several eminent critics of the last generation. There can be no doubt that the Gospel existed in the earliest years of the second century, and that it was even then esteemed authoritative. That the Apostle John was its author, is nowhere explicitly stated before the middle of the century; but that this was from the first believed, may legitimately be inferred both from the esteem in which it was held, and from the fact that no other name was ever connected with the Gospel until the impossible Cerinthian authorship was suggested by the insignificant and biased sect of the Alogi. Schürer, indeed, says

1 Critical Essays, p. 92.
that "the utmost one can admit in an unprejudiced way, is that the external evidence is evenly balanced pro and con, and leads to no decision. Perhaps, however, it would be truer to say it is more unfavourable than favourable to the authenticity." Such a conclusion can only excite astonishment.

2. Internal evidence of Johannine authorship. The internal evidence has usually been grouped under four heads, showing respectively that the author was (1) a Jew, (2) a Palestinian, (3) an eye-witness, (4) the Apostle John.

(1) That the writer was a Jew is proved by his Hebraistic style, by his knowledge of Hebrew and Aramaic, and by his familiarity with Jewish traditions, ideas, modes of thought, expectations, customs. Although written in Greek which is neither awkward nor ungrammatical, the Gospel uses a small number of words and only such as are familiar in ordinary conversation. The vocabulary is much more limited than that of the well-educated Paul, and the style reveals none of the nicety found in the Epistle to the Hebrews. One chief distinction between Hebrew and Greek style is that the Greek writer by means of multitudinous particles exhibits with precision the course of thought by which each clause is connected with that which goes before it: the Hebrew writer contents himself with laying thought alongside of thought and leaving it to the reader to discover the connection. The most casual reader of the Fourth Gospel speedily finds that the difficulty of understanding it is the difficulty of perceiving the sequence of the clauses. Any one accustomed to a Greek style would on reading the Fourth Gospel conclude that its author was not familiar with Greek literature.

It would also naturally be concluded that the writer was a Jew from his inserting translations of Aramaic names, as in i. 38, i. 41, i. 42, ix. 7, xix. 13, xix. 17, xx. 21; and especially from his familiarity with Jewish customs, ideas, and institutions. Thus he knows that it is a Jewish custom to sit under the fig tree, i. 49; to have water-pots for purposes of purification, ii. 6; to embalm the dead, xix. 40; to wash the feet before meals, xiii. 4. He is familiar with Jewish ideas, as that it is wrong for a Rabbi to speak with a woman, iv. 27; that disease is the result of sin, ix. 2; that Elias was to come before the Messiah, i. 21; that it defiles a Jew to enter a Gentile dwelling, xviii. 29. So intimate an acquaintance with the Jewish Messianic ideas as is shown in chap. vii. cannot easily be ascribed to any but a Jew. Jewish institutions are also well known: Levites and priests

are distinguished, i. 19; the composition and action of the Sanhedrim is well understood; the less frequented feasts (ἐγκαίνια, x. 22) are known. He is also aware of the chief point in dispute between Jews and Samaritans, iv. 20; the length of time the Temple has been in building, ii. 21; that synagogue and temple are the favourite resort for teachers, xviii. 20.1

Two objections, however, have been raised. 1st. It is said that the author throughout his Gospels betrays a marked antipathy to the Jews. He uses the name as a recognised designation of the enemies of Jesus; "the Jews" sought to kill Him; "no man spake openly of Him for fear of 'the Jews'". They are spoken of as "the children of the devil". This objection, however, is baseless. In the synoptic Gospels Jesus, Himself a Jew, is represented as pronouncing invectives against the leaders of the people quite as strong as any to be found in the Fourth Gospel. In John all the apostles are Jews, and it is in this Gospel the great saying is preserved that "salvation is of the Jews". 2nd. Matthew Arnold and the author of Supernatural Religion have maintained that the Jews and their usages are spoken of in this Gospel as if they belonged to a race different from the writer's. "The water-pots at Cana are set 'after the manner of purifying of the Jews'; . . . 'now the Jews' passover was nigh at hand'. . . . It seems almost impossible to think that a Jew born and bred—a man like the Apostle John—could ever have come to speak so. . . . A Jew talking of the Jews' passover and of a dispute of some of John's disciples with a Jew about purifying. It is like an Englishman writing of the Derby as the English people's Derby, or talking of a dispute between some of Mr. Cobden's disciples and an Englishman about free trade. An Englishman would never speak so." An Englishman who had for many years been resident abroad and who was writing for foreigners would use precisely such forms of expression.

(2) The author was a Palestinian. A Jew of the dispersion, a Hellenist, would probably betray himself, not only by writing a freer Greek style, but by showing a less intimate knowledge of the localities of the Holy Land, and by using the LXX., and not the original Hebrew, in quoting from the Old Testament. In regard to the evidence afforded by a knowledge of localities, Professor Ramsay lays down the following: "It is impossible for any one to invent a tale, whose scene lies in a foreign land, without betraying in slight

1 The best statement of this part of the evidence will be found in Oscar Holtzmann's Υοκαμ., pp. 188-191.

2 God and the Bible, p. 251.
details his ignorance of the scenery and circumstances amid which the event is described as taking place. Unless the writer studiously avoids details, and confines himself to names and generalities, he is certain to commit numerous errors. Even the most laborious and minute study of the circumstances of the country, in which he is to lay his scene, will not preserve him from such errors. He must live long, and observe carefully in the country, if he wishes to invent a tale which will not betray his ignorance in numberless details. Allusions of French or German authors to English life supply the readiest illustration of this principle.” Now the author of the Fourth Gospel betrays that intimate acquaintance with the localities of Palestine, which could only be possessed by a resident. He describes Bethany as “nigh unto Jerusalem, about fifteen furlongs off”. Who, but one who had often walked it, would be likely to let that exact indication drop from his pen? It is the unconscious gratuitousness of full knowledge. In chap. vi. he has before his mind’s eye the movements round the Sea of Galilee, which he describes. He is familiar with the Temple, with its porches and cloisters, and he knows the side of the building which people chose in cold weather. He passes from Jerusalem to the villages around, crossing brooks, and visiting gardens without once stumbling in his topographical details. This sure sign of a resident he constantly betrays, he adds to the name of a town the additional specification by which it might be distinguished from others of the same name: “Bethany beyond Jordan,” “Aenon near to Salim,” “Bethsaida the city of Andrew and Peter,” and so forth.

In a matter of this kind few are more qualified to judge than Bishop Lightfoot, who spent so much of his own life in archæological research. Here is his judgment: “Let us place ourselves in the position of one who wrote at the middle of the second century, after the later Roman invasion had swept off the scanty gleanings of the past which had been spared from the earlier. Let us ask how a romancer so situated is to make himself acquainted with the incidents, the localities, the buildings, the institutions, the modes of thought and feeling which belonged to this past age, and (as we may almost say) this bygone people. Let it be granted that here and there he must stumble upon a historical fact, that in one or two particulars he might reproduce a national characteristic. More than this would be beyond his reach. For, it will be borne in mind, he would be placed at a great disadvantage, compared with a modern writer; he would have to reconstruct history without these various appliances, maps and plates, chronological tables, books of travel,
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by which the author of a historical novel is so largely assisted in the present day" (Expositor, Jan., 1890, p. 13).

A few years ago the writer's ignorance of the localities he mentioned was insisted upon. But since the Palestinian Survey the tables are turned. It is now admitted that competent knowledge of the localities is shown. Schürer, e.g., says: "Among serious difficulties we need no longer reckon at the present day the supposed ignorance of Palestinian and Jewish matters from which Bretschneider and Baur inferred that the author was neither a Palestinian nor in any sense a Jew. The geographical errors and ignorance of things Jewish have more and more shrunk to a minimum." The argument now is, "admitting that the writer shows local knowledge, this does not prove that he was a native of Palestine. He may have derived his knowledge from books, or from occasional residence in the country." Professor Sanday has been at pains to show that any knowledge which could have been derived from such geographers as Pomponius Mela, Ptolemy, or Strabo, was of the scantiest possible description. Holtzmann, though strongly opposed to the Johannine authorship, admits that the topographical knowledge indicates that the author had visited the holy places, but not that he was a Palestinian. He had then been a resident in Palestine, knew the places he spoke about, and so far was not romancing.

One distinction of the Jew of the dispersion was his use of the LXX., instead of the Hebrew Bible. What Old Testament then does the writer of the Fourth Gospel use? He is found to depart from the LXX., and to use language more closely representing the Hebrew. Until a very few years ago, this was accepted as proof that he read the Hebrew, and used it. But recently there has been a growing conviction that during the Apostolic Age other versions of the Old Testament, or of some books and portions of it, were extant in Greek. And it is argued that John might have used some of these. But when it is found that in some of his quotations his language is closer to the original than that of the LXX., or than the versions of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, it is certainly reasonable to conclude that he used the Hebrew, and translated for himself, and was, therefore, a native Palestinian.¹

(3) There is reason to believe that the author was an eye-witness of the events he relates. In the first place, the writer claims to be an eye-witness. This is surely of some account. The expression

¹ See this handled with his usual fairness by Professor Sanday, Expositor, March, 1892.
"we beheld His glory" (i. 14) need not be pressed, although considering the analogous statement of 1 John i. 1, it may very well be maintained that the writer had with his bodily eyes seen the manifestation of His Lord's glory. But in xix. 35 we have an explicit claim: "He that saw it bare record, and his record is true, and he knoweth that he saith true, that ye might believe". The words "he knoweth that he saith true" could hardly have been inserted by any other hand than that of the eye-witness himself. In xxi. 24 we read: "This is the disciple which testifieth of these things, and wrote these things". Whether this note was added by the writer himself, or by another hand, certainly the intention is to identify the writer with an eye-witness and participator of the events recorded. We are thus confronted with the alternative: either an eye-witness wrote this Gospel, or a forger whose genius for truth and for lying are alike inexplicable. As Renan says (Vie, xxvii.): "L'auteur y parle toujours comme témoin oculaire; il veut se faire passer pour l'Apôtre Jean. Si donc cet ouvrage n'est pas réellement de l'apôtre, il faut admettre une supercherie que l'auteur s'avouait à lui-même."

This claim is abundantly confirmed by the character of the Gospel. For we find in it such a multitude of detail as gratuitously invites the detection of error. Not only are individuals named, and so described that we seem to know them, but frequently there are added specifications of time and place which obviously are the involuntary superfluity of information which flows almost unconsciously from a full memory. Such details are: the hour at which Jesus sat on the well, the number and size of the water-pots at the marriage at Cana, the weight and value of the ointment, the number of fish at the last cast, the hour at which the nobleman's son began to amend, the hour at which Jesus took the two inquirers into His own lodging.

Circumstantiality can, no doubt, be given to a narrative by a Defoe or a Swift. But among the Jews the writing of fiction was not cultivated; and besides, the circumstantial detail of this Gospel does not belong to the world of imagination, but attaches to real objects and events, and can in many instances be verified. If in these instances the detail is found to be accurate, the presumption is that accuracy characterises those also which cannot so easily be checked; and that, therefore, the circumstantiality is due to the fact that the writer was an eye-witness of what he records.

(4) This Palestinian Jew who was himself an eye-witness of the ministry of Jesus was the Apostle John. In xxi. 24 the writer of the Gospel is identified with the disciple whom Jesus loved. This disciple
was certainly one of the seven named in xxi. 2, who appear as the actors in the scene there recorded. Of these seven there were three who frequently appear in the other Gospels as the intimates of Jesus. These are Peter, James, and John. But Peter cannot have been the disciple in question, for in this chapter Peter and that disciple are spoken of separately. Neither can James be the person meant, for his early death precludes the idea of his being the author of the Gospel. It remains that John was the disciple whom Jesus loved,¹ the author of the Fourth Gospel. And however we interpret the intention of John in using this circumlocution to designate himself, it must not be overlooked that its employment is evidence of the Johannine authorship. In the other Gospels John is frequently spoken of by name. In this Gospel John is not once named, although from no Gospel do we gather such vivid descriptions of the Apostles. Certainly it is a most natural and sufficient explanation of this fact to suppose that John was the author of the Gospel.

Objections. But to this conclusion many critics demur. Since Bretschneider it has been continually asserted that this does not exhaust the internal evidence, and that there is that in the Fourth Gospel which makes it impossible to refer it to the Apostle John. There are evidences of dependence on the synoptists, inconsistent with the hypothesis that it was written by an Apostle who himself had been an eye-witness; of a universalism inconsistent with the fact that the Apostle John was a pillar of the Jewish Christian Church; and of a philosophical colouring which does not favour the idea that the author was a Galilean fisherman.²

The two latter objections are not formidable. Schürer shows with considerable force that up to the time of the Apostolic convention in Jerusalem John was a Jewish Christian and an upholder of the law, whereas the author of this Gospel knows the law only as the law of the Jews. Is it likely, he asks, that one who during the first twenty years of his ministry maintained the law would in his latter years so entirely repudiate it? "If during this long period the influence of the preaching of Jesus had not made John a liberal, was such a transformation probable at a still later time?" That such a transformation was very probable will be the answer of those who consider that between the earlier and the later period the Jewish

¹ “There is no trace that in Christian antiquity this title ever suggested any one but John” (Ezra Abbot, Critical Essays, p. 73).

² For a brief but conclusive answer to these objections, see Dale’s Living Christ and the Four Gospels, 149-152.
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economy had come to an end and that John had become the successor of Paul in a thoroughly Greek city.

The traces of philosophical colouring have been exaggerated and misinterpreted. In the Platonic dialogues the circumstances, the speakers, and their utterances are all either created by the writer or employed to proclaim his own philosophy. To suppose that the Gospel was composed in some analogous manner is to misconceive it. No doubt in Ephesus John was brought into contact with forms of thought and with speculations which were little heard of in Palestine. And in so far as the ideas then prevalent were true, an intelligent Christian mind would necessarily bring them into relation with the manifestation of God in Christ. This process would bring to the surface much of the significance both of the life and teaching of Jesus which hitherto had been unnoticed and unused. The process is apparent in the epistles of Paul as well as in the Fourth Gospel. The idea of the Logos was a Jewish-Alexandrian idea, and that the author sought to attach his Gospel to this idea is unquestionable, but it is a very long and insecure step from this to conclude that he was himself trained in the Hellenistic philosophy of Alexandria. The Logos idea is not essential to the Fourth Gospel; it is rather the Sonship idea that is essential. But the term and the idea of the Logos are used by the author to introduce his subject to the Greek readers. As Harnack says: "The prologue is not the key to the understanding of the Gospel, but is rather intended to prepare the Hellenistic reader for its perusal".1 After the introduction the Logos is never again referred to. The philosophy one finds in the Gospel is not the metaphysics of the schools, but the insight of the contemplative, brooding spirit which finds in Christ the solvent of all problems.

The originality of the author of the Fourth Gospel has recently been vigorously assailed.2 It has been shown that, in certain passages, he is dependent for his phraseology on the Synoptic Gospels; and it has been urged that an Apostle and eye-witness would not thus derive from others an account of what he had himself seen. As a general rule it is of course true that an eye-witness would depend on his own reminiscences; but, presumably, no one denies that John knew and used the Synoptic Gospels; and that phrases which occur in them should have remained in his memory is not surprising. Even in the passages where these borrowings occur,

2 See especially Oscar Holtzmann, Johannevangel., p. 6 ff.
there are divergences so considerable as to indicate an original witness. For, to interpret these divergences, as Oscar Holtzmann does, as misunderstandings of his sources, is rather, if it may without offence be said, a misunderstanding of John. It may rather be said that, in several instances, we find additions and corrections which are requisite for the understanding of the Synoptists. From the first three Gospels the reader might gather that our Lord's ministry extended over only one year; the Fourth Gospel definitely mentions three Passovers (ii. 13; vi. 4; xiii. 1), with a possible fourth (v. 1). The probabilities here are certainly in favour of the representation of the Fourth Gospel, and it may be shown that even in the Synoptic narratives a longer ministry is implied than that which they expressly mention. Again, the ministry in Jerusalem, as recounted in the Fourth Gospel, alone enables us to understand the lament which finds a place in the Synoptics, "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, how often," etc. The call of those who afterwards became Apostles, the arrival in Galilee of scribes from Jerusalem to watch Jesus, and other incidents recorded by the Synoptists, only become fully intelligible when read in the light of the narrative given in the Fourth Gospel. Evidently the author of this Gospel had, at least on some points, access to more accurate and complete information than that which was accessible to the other evangelists.

The independence of the Fourth Gospel is further shown by its omission of such remarkable scenes as the Temptation, the Transfiguration, the Agony in the Garden, and by its introduction of places and persons unnamed in the other Gospels; as, Aenon, Salim, Sychar, Bethany beyond Jordan, Nicodemus, Nathanael, the Samarian woman, the man born blind, the dead Lazarus, Annas. The most natural way to account for this is to suppose that we have here the additional information which an Apostle would necessarily possess. The alternatives are that we must refer it to the creative imagination of the writer, or to the tradition of our Lord's life which had been handed down irrespective of the Synoptic Gospels, the "Johanneisches vor Johannes". But why deny this tradition to the Apostle John? In whom could it find a more suitable repository? Unquestionably there underlies this Gospel a full and significant tradition, but there seems no good reason for allotting the tradition to one source and the Gospel to another. Much more probable is the account of Eusebius, who tells us "that John, having spent all

1 H. E., iii., 24: Ἰωάννης γεγονὼς τῶν πάντων χρόνων ἀργαίς κακριμένων παραγμάτων τέλος καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν γραφὴν ἑλθεῖν.
his life in proclaiming the Gospel orally, at the last committed it to writing”.

Suspicion has been cast on the historicity of the Fourth Gospel by the omission from the others of all reference to the raising of Lazarus. As related by John, this event was not only remarkable in itself, but materially contributed to the catastrophe. It is difficult to suppose that so surprising an event should not be known to the Synoptists. It is true John omits incidents as remarkable; but he knew that they were already related. It is possible that at the first, while the life of Lazarus was still in danger from the authorities, reference to the miracle may have been judged unadvisable, especially as similar raisings from the dead had been recorded. Probably, however, Professor Sanday’s solution is right: “Considering that the Synoptists knew nothing of events in Jerusalem before the last Passover, we cannot be surprised that they should omit an event which is placed at Bethany”.  

But that which has driven many open-minded critics to a disbelief in the Apostolic authorship of the Gospel is the character of the conversations and addresses which are here attributed to our Lord. Some pronounce these discourses to be entirely fictitious, ascribed to Jesus for the sake of illustrating and enforcing opinions of the author. Others suppose that a small modicum of historical truth is to be found in them; while critics who are branded as “Apologists” almost entirely eliminate from the discourses ascribed to our Lord any subjective element contributed by the Evangelist. Is there then any test we can apply to this record, any criterion by which these discourses may be judged? The reports in the Synoptic Gospels at once suggest themselves as the required criterion. Doubts there may be regarding the very words ascribed to our Lord in this or that passage of the Synoptists, doubts there must be, whether we are to follow Matthew or Luke, when these two differ; but practically there is no doubt at all, even among extreme critics, that we may gather from those Gospels a clear idea both of the form and of the substance of our Lord’s teaching.

Now it is not to be denied that the comparison of the Fourth Gospel with the first three is a little disconcerting. For it is obvious that in the Fourth Gospel the discourses occupy a different position, and differ also both in style and in matter from those recorded in the Synoptical Gospels. They occupy a different position, bulking much more largely in proportion to the narrative. Indeed, the

1 Authorship of Fourth Gospel, p. 185.
narrative portion of the Gospel of John may be said to exist for the sake of the verbal teaching. The miracles which in the first three Gospels appear as the beneficent acts of our Lord without ulterior motive, seem in the Fourth Gospel to exist for the sake of the teaching they embody, and the discussions they give rise to. Similarly, the persons introduced, such as Nicodemus, are viewed chiefly as instrumental in eliciting from Jesus certain sayings, and are themselves forgotten in the conversation they have suggested.

In form the teachings recorded in John conspicuously differ from those recorded by the other evangelists. They present our Lord as using three forms of teaching, brief, pregnant apophthegms, parables, and prolonged ethical addresses. In John, it is alleged, the parable has disappeared, the pointed sayings suitable to a popular teacher have also disappeared, and in their place we have prolonged discussions, self-defensive explanations, and stern invectives. As Renan says: "This fashion of preaching and demonstrating without ceasing, this everlasting argumentation, this artificial get-up, these long discussions following each miracle, these discourses, stiff and awkward, whose tone is so often false and unequal, are intolerable to a man of taste alongside the delicious sentences of the synoptists".

Even more marked is the difference in the substance of the discourses. From the synoptists we receive the impression that Jesus was a genial ethical teacher who spent His days among the common people exhorting them to unworldliness, to a disregard of wealth, to the humble and patient service of God in love to their fellow-men, exposing the hollowness of much that passed for religion, and seeking to inspire all men with firmer trust in God as their Father. In the Gospel of John His own claims are the prominent subject. He is the subject matter taught as well as the teacher. The Kingdom of God no longer holds the place it held in the synoptists: it is the Messiah rather than the Messianic kingdom that is pressed upon the people.

Again it has been urged that the style ascribed to our Lord in this Gospel is so like the style of John himself as to be indistinguishable; so that it is not always possible to say where the words of Jesus end and the words of John begin (see chap. xii. 44, iii. 18-21). This difficulty may, however, be put aside, and that for more reasons than one. The words of Jesus are translated from the vernacular Aramaic in which He probably uttered them, and it was impossible they should not be coloured by the style of the translator. Besides, there are obvious differences between the style of John and that of Jesus. For example, the Epistle of John is singularly abstract and devoid of
illustration. James abounds in figure, and so does Paul; but in John's epistles not a single simile or metaphor occurs. Is it credible that their writer was the author of the richly figurative teachings in the tenth and fifteenth chapters of the Gospel [the sheepfold and the vine]?

But turning to the real differences which exist between the reports of the first three and the Fourth Gospel, several thoughts occur which at least take off the edge of the criticism and show us that on a point of this kind it is easy to be hasty and extreme. For, in the first place, it is to be considered that if John had had nothing new to tell, no fresh aspect of Christ or His teaching to present, he would not have written at all. No doubt each of the synoptists goes over ground already traversed by his fellow-synoptist, but it has yet to be proved that they knew one another's work. John did know of their Gospels, and the very fact that he added a fourth prepares us to expect that it will be different; not only in omitting scenes from the life of Christ with which already the previous Gospels had made men familiar, but by presenting some new aspect of Christ's person and teaching. That there was another aspect essential to the completeness of the figure was, as the present Bishop of Derry has pointed out, also to be surmised. The synoptists enable us to conceive how Jesus addressed the peasantry and how He dealt with the scribes of Capernaum; but, after all, was it not also of the utmost importance to know how He was received by the authorities of Jerusalem and how He met their difficulties about His claims? Had there been no record of those defences of His position, must we not still have supposed them and supplied them in imagination?

That we have here, then, a different aspect of Christ's teaching need not surprise us, but is it not even inconsistent with that already given by the synoptists? The universal Christian consciousness has long since answered that question. The faith which has found its resting-place in the Christ of the synoptists is not unsettled or perplexed by anything it finds in John. They are not two Christs but one which the four Gospels depict: diverse as the profile and front face, but one another's complement rather than contradiction. A critical examination of the Gospels reaches the same conclusion. For while the self-assertiveness of Christ is more apparent in the Fourth Gospel, it is implicit in them all. Can any claim be greater than that which our Lord urges in the Sermon on the Mount to be the supreme lawgiver and judge of men? Or than that which is implied in His assertion that He only knows the Father and that only through Him can others know Him; or can we conceive any
clearer confidence in His mission than that which He implies when He invites all men to come to Him and trust themselves with Him, or when He forgives sin, and proclaims Himself the Messiah, God's representative on earth?

Can we then claim that all that is reported in this Gospel as uttered by our Lord was actually spoken as it stands? This is not claimed. Even the most conservative critics allow that John must necessarily have condensed conversations and discourses. The truth probably is that we have the actual words of the most striking sayings, because these, once heard, could not be forgotten. And this plainly applies especially to the sayings regarding Himself which were most likely to astonish or even shock and startle the hearers. These at once and for ever fixed themselves in the mind. In the longer discussions and addresses we have the substance but cannot at each point be sure that the very words are given. No doubt in the last resort we must trust John. But whom could we more reasonably trust? He was the person of all others who entered most fully into sympathy with Christ and understood Him best, the person to whom our Lord could most freely open His mind. So that although, as Godet says, we have here "the extracted essence of a savoury fruit," we may be confident that this essence perfectly preserves the flavour and peculiarity of the fruit.

Neither ought it to be forgotten that there occur in the Gospel passages which strikingly illustrate the desire of the author to preserve the very words of our Lord. In chap. xii. 33, e.g., we find an interpretation given of the saying recorded in verse 32. This is unintelligible on the hypothesis that the author was himself composing the discourses which he attributes to Christ. Any author who is expressing his own ideas, and writing freely out of his own mind, even although he is using another person as his mouthpiece, will at once deliver his meaning. To suppose that John first put his own words in the mouth of Jesus, and then interpreted them, is to suppose an elaborateness of contrivance which would reduce the Gospel to a common forgery. Cf. vii. 39.

While, then, it cannot be affirmed that the internal evidence uniformly points to the Johannine authorship, neither can it be said that it is decisively against it. There are difficulties on either alternative. But when to the internal evidence the weight of external attestation is added, by far the most probable conclusion is that the Fourth Gospel is the work of the Apostle John, and that it is historically trustworthy.

Between the affirmation and denial of the Johannine authorship
there has been interposed a third suggestion. The Gospel may have been (1) partly or (2) indirectly the work of the Apostle: parts of it may be from the hand of John, while the remainder is the work of an unknown editor; or, the whole may be from the school of John, but not directly from his own hand. The most distinguished advocate of the former of these two suggestions is Dr. Wendt, whose theory is that the Apostle John made a collection of our Lord’s discourses, which was used by some unknown editor as the basis or nucleus of a Gospel. This theory ruthlessly sacrifices many of the most valuable and characteristic portions of the Gospel, such as the scene between the Baptist and the deputation, the examination before Annas (or Caiaphas), and many of those historical touches which lend life to the narrative. But the fatal objection to this theory is the solidarity of the Gospel. Holtzmann does not accept the Fourth Gospel as Johannine, but he says: “All attempts to draw a clearly distinguishable line of demarcation, whether it be between earlier and later strata, or between genuine and not genuine, historical and unhistorical elements, must always be wrecked against the solid and compact unity which the work presents, both in regard to language and in regard to matter. Apart from the interpolations indicated by the history of the text (v. 4, vii. 53, viii. 11), and from the last chapter added by way of supplement, the work is both in form and substance, both in arrangement and in range of ideas, an organic whole without omissions or interpolations, the ‘seamless coat,’ which cannot be parted or torn, but only by a happy cast allotted to its rightful owner.” Certainly, if this Gospel is not from one hand, then there is no possibility of proving unity of authorship by unity of design and execution.

The second alternative, that the Gospel proceeded rather from the circle of John’s disciples than from his own hand, has more in its favour and has enlisted great names in its support. Thus Renan says (Vie de J., xxv.): “Can it indeed be John who has written in Greek these abstract metaphysical discourses, which find no analogy either in the Synoptists or in the Talmud? This is a heavy tax on faith, and for myself I dare not say I am convinced that the Fourth Gospel was entirely from the pen of an old Galilean fisherman; but that the Gospel as a whole proceeded, towards the close of the first century, from the great school of Asia Minor whose centre was John.” “One is sometimes tempted to believe that some precious notes made by the Apostle were employed by his disciples.”

The other . . . literary critic of our own day, Matthew Arnold, held the same opinion regarding the origin of the Gospel. In God
and the Bible, 256-7, he writes: “In his old age St. John at Ephesus has 'logia,' sayings of the Lord, and has incidents in the Lord's story which have not been published in any of the written accounts that were beginning at that time to be handed about. The elders of Ephesus, whom tradition afterwards makes into apostles, fellows of St. John, move him to bestow his treasure on the world. He gives his materials, and the presbytery of Ephesus provides a redaction for them and publishes them. The redaction with its unity of tone, its flowingness and connectedness, is by one single hand; the hand of a man of literary talent, a Greek Christian, whom the Church of Ephesus found proper for such a task. A man of literary talent, a man of soul also, a theologian. A theological lecturer perhaps, as in the Fourth Gospel he so often shows himself, a theological lecturer, an earlier and a nameless Origen, who in this one short composition produced a work outweighing all the folios of all the Fathers, but was content that his name should be written in the Book of Life.” Schürer and Weizsäcker¹ are both advocates of this theory.

That this is an inviting theory is not to be denied. But, after all, little is gained by it; and there are grave objections to it. The Jew and the eye-witness appear on every page; so that the utmost that can be allowed is that some younger man may in quite a subordinate function have collaborated with the Apostle. That the Gospel was composed after the Apostle's death, mainly from reminiscences of his teaching, is a hypothesis which seems at once needless and inadequate.

Object of the Gospel. The object of the writer reflects some light on the nature of his work. In xx. 31 it is said: “these things are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life in His name.” The writer has no intention of composing a full biography of Jesus. He means to select from His life such material as will most readily convince men that He is the Christ, the Son of God. If not a dogmatic treatise [a "lehrschrift"], it is at any rate a history with a dogmatic purpose. This is always a dangerous form of literature, tempting the author to exaggeration, concealment, misrepresentation. But that this temptation invariably overcomes an author is of course not the case. A certain limitation, however, nay, a certain amount of distortion, do necessarily attach to a biography which aims at presenting only one aspect of its subject—distortion, not in what is actually presented, but in the implication that this is the whole. Where only a part of

¹ Apost. Zeit., 531-538.
the life is given and certain aspects of the character are exclusively
depicted, there is a want of perspective and so far a misleading
element. But this gives us no ground for affirming that the actual
statements of the book are erroneous or unhistorical.

The circumstance that John wrote a Gospel with the express
purpose of proving that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of God,
implies that he considered that this truth needed confirmation; that
in the Christian circle in which he moved there was some more or
less pronounced tendency towards a denial of the Messiahship or
Divinity of Jesus. Whether the teaching of Cerinthus was or was
not the immediate occasion of the publication of the Gospel, it is a
happy circumstance that the author did not confine himself to what
was controversial, or throw his work into a polemic and doctrinal
form, but built up a positive exhibition of the Person and claims of
our Lord as stated by Himself.

The object in view, therefore, reflects light on the historicity of
the contents of the Gospel. The writer professes to produce certain
facts which have powerfully influenced the minds of men and have
produced faith. If these pretended facts were fictions, then the
writer is dishonest and beneath contempt. He wishes to produce
the conviction that Jesus is the Messiah, and to accomplish his
purpose invents incidents and manipulates utterances of Jesus. A
writer of romance who merely wishes to please, even a preacher
whose aim is edification, might claim a certain latitude or negligence
of accuracy, but a writer whose object it is to prove a certain pro-
position stands on a very different platform, and can only be pro-
nounced fraudulent if he invents his evidence.

Method and Plan of the Gospel. The method adopted by the
writer to convince men that Jesus is the Christ is the simplest
possible. He does not expect that men will believe this on his mere
word. He sets himself to reproduce those salient features in the
life of Jesus which chiefly manifested His Messianic dignity and
function. He believes that what convinced himself will convince
others. One by one he cites his witnesses, never garbling their
testimony nor concealing the adverse testimony, but showing with
as exact truthfulness how unbelief grew and hardened into opposition,
as he tells how faith grew till it culminated in the supreme con-
fusion of Thomas, "My Lord and my God". The plan of the
Gospel is therefore also the simplest. Apart from the Prologue
(i. 1-18), and the Epilogue (chap. xxii.), the work falls into two nearly
equal parts, i. 19-xii. and xiii.-xx. In the former part the evangelist
relates with a singular felicity of selection the scenes in which
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Jesus made those self-revelations which it was essential the world should see. These culminate in the raising of Lazarus related in chap. xi. The twelfth chapter therefore holds a place by itself, and in it three incidents are related which are intended to show that the previously related manifestations of Jesus had sufficed to make Him known (1) to His intimates (xii. 1-11), (2) to the people generally (12-19), and (3) even to the Gentile world (20-36). Jesus may therefore now close His self-revelation. And the completeness of the work He has done is revealed not only in this widely extended impression and well-grounded faith, but also in the maturity of unbelief which now hardens into hatred and resolves to compass His death. Between the first and second part of the Gospel there is interposed a paragraph (xii. 37-50), in which it is pointed out that the rejection of Jesus by the Jews, who had been trained to receive the Messiah, had been predicted and reflects no suspicion on the sufficiency of the preceding manifestations. In the second part of the Gospel the glory of Christ is manifested (1) in His revealing Himself as the permanent source of life and joy to His disciples (xiii.-xvii.), and (2) in His triumph over death (xviii.-xx.).

The Gospel, therefore, falls into these parts:

I. Part First. 1. Manifestation of Christ’s glory as the Joy, Life, Light, Nourishment, Saviour of Men: or as the Son of God among men, i. 19-xi.
   2. Summary of results, xii. 1-35.
   Pause in the Gospel for review of Christ’s teaching and its consequences, xii. 36-56.

II. Part Second. 1. Jesus declares Himself to be the permanent source of life and joy to His disciples, xiii.-xvii.
   2. His victory over death, xviii.-xx.

The Epilogue, xxi.

LITERATURE.

A vast literature has grown up around the Fourth Gospel. A full list of critical treatises on the Authorship, published between 1792 and 1875, is given by Dr. Caspar Gregory in an appendix to the translation of Luthardt’s St. John, the Author of the Fourth Gospel. To this list may now be added Thoma, Die Genesis d. Joh. Evang., 1882; Jacobsen, Untersuchungen über d. Joh. Evang., 1884; Oscar Holtzmann, Das Joh. evangelium, 1887. The Introductions of H. Holtzmann, Weiss, Salmon, and Gloag may also be consulted. The fullest history of the criticism of the Gospel is to be found in Watkins’ Bampton Lectures for 1890.

Full lists of commentaries are given in the second volume of the translation of Meyer on John, and in Luthardt. The most valuable are the following:
INTRODUCTION

HERACLEON. The Fragments of Heracleon have been collected out of Origen's Commentary on John, and edited for Armitage Robinson's Texts and Studies by A. E. Brooke, M.A.

ORIGEN. Commentary on St. John's Gospel; originally only extending to the thirteenth chapter, and even of this original much has been lost. The best edition is that of A. E. Brooke, M.A., Cambridge University Press, 1896. Portions of this Commentary are translated in the additional volume of Clark's Ante-Nicene Library.


THEOPHYLACT and EUTHYMius (see p. 58) both wrote on this Gospel. The commentary of the latter is especially excellent.

Among post-reformation works, the Paraphrases of Erasmus, the Commentary of Calvin, and the Annotationes Majores of Beza are to be recommended. The Annotationes of Melanchthon are frequently irrelevant. Besides the collections of illustrative passages mentioned on pp. 58, 59, and the commentaries of Grotius, Bengel, and others which cover the whole New Testament, there may be named the following which deal especially with this Gospel: Lampe, Com. Analytico-Exegeticus, 3 vols., 4to, Amstel., 1724, an inexhaustible mine. More recent commentaries are those of Lücke, 1820-24; Tholuck, 1827 [translated in Clark's F. T. Lib., 1860]; Meyer, 1834 [translated 1875], edited by Weiss, 1893; Luthardt, 1852-3 [translated in Clark's F. T. Lib., 1875], Alford, 1849; 4th edition, 1859; Godet, 1864-5 [translated in Clark's F. T. L., 1876-7], Westcott, 1882; Reith, in Clark's Hand-books for Bible-classes; Whitelaw, 1888; Reynolds, in Pulpit Com., 1888; Watkins, in Ellicott's Com., n. d.; Holtzmann, in Hand-commentar, 1890; Plummer, in Cambridge Greek Testament, 1893. In Oscar Holtzmann's Das Johannesevangelium untersucht und erklärt, 1887, there are a hundred pages of commentary.
TO KATA IΩANNΗH

AGION ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ.1

I. I. * "Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος, καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, καὶ ἐν Γέν. I. 1.
* Θεός ἦν ὁ λόγος. 2. ὁ δόΣ ἦν ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν. 3. * Πάντα ἐν


1 κατὰ Ιωάννην in A B E F G; κατὰ Ιωάννην in B; εὐαγγελιον κατα Ιωάννην in

ACEFG; T.R. in minusc.

CHAPTER I.—Vv. 1-18. The prologue. The first eighteen verses contain a preface, or as it is usually called, the prologue to the Gospel. In this prologue the writer identifies the person, Jesus Christ, whom he is about to introduce on the field of history, with the Logos. He first describes the Logos in His relation to God and to the world, and then presents in abstract the history of His reception among men, which he is about to give in detail. That the Eternal Divine Word, in whom was the life of all things, became flesh and was manifested among men; that some ignored while others recognised Him; that some received while others rejected Him—that is what John means to exhibit in detail in his Gospel, and this is what he summarily states in this prologue.

The prologue may be divided thus: Vv. 1-5. The Logos described; vv. 6-13. The historic manifestation of the Logos and its results in evoking faith and unbelief; vv. 14-18. This manifestation more precisely defined as incarnation, with another aspect of its results. Cf. Westcott's suggestive division; and especially Falconer in Expositor, 1867.

Vv. 1-5. The Logos described. The first five verses describe the pre-existence, the nature, the creative power of the Logos, who in the succeeding verses is spoken of as entering the world, becoming man, and revealing the Father; and this description is given in order that we may at once grasp a continuous history which runs out of an unmeasured past, and the identity of the person who is the subject of that history.

Ver. 1. In the first verse three things are stated regarding the Logos, the subject ὁ λόγος being repeated for impressiveness. Westcott remarks that these three clauses answer to the three great moments of the Incarnation declared in ver. 14. He who was (ἡ) in the beginning, became (ἐγένετο) in time; He who was with God, tabernacled among men; He who was God, became flesh.

(1) ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος. ἐν ἀρχῇ is here used relatively to creation, as in Gen. i. 1 and Prov. viii. 23. ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸ τοῦ τῆς ἡμερᾶς παλαιότατος; cf. i John i. 1. Consequently even in the time of Theophylact it was argued that this clause only asserts that the Logos was older than Adam. But this is to overlook the ἡ. The Logos did not then begin to be, but at that point at which all else began to be He already was. In the beginning place it where you may, the Word already existed. In other words, the Logos is before time, eternal. Cf. Col. i. 18 (the article is absent because ἐν ἀρχῇ is virtually an adverbal expression)—ὁ λόγος. The term Logos appears as early as Heraclitus to denote the principle which maintains order in the world (see passages in Ritter and Preller). Among the Stoics the word was similarly used, as the equivalent of the anima mundi (cf. Virgil, Æn., vi., 724). Marcus Aurelius (iv. 14-21) uses
Almost all ante-Nicene Fathers join the reading of the Greek text with AC*DG*L. Chrysostom declares this reading heretical and argues against it. T.R. is found in C*EG*HK vet. Lat. Brixianus.

The term καιροτητικός λόγος to express the generative principle or creative force in nature. The term was familiar to Greek philosophy. In Hebrew thought there was a need for a term to express God, not in His absolute being, but in His manifestation and active connection with the world. In the O. T. “the Angel of the Lord” and “the wisdom of God” are used for this purpose. In the Apocryphal books and the Targums “the word of Jehovah” is similarly used. These two streams of thought were combined by Philo, who has a fairly full and explicit doctrine of the Logos as the expression of God or God in expression (see Drummond’s Philo; Siegfried’s Philo; Reville, Doctrine du Logos; Bigg’s Baptist Lec.; Hatch’s Hübbert Lec.). The word being thus already in use and aiding thoughtful men in their efforts to conceive God’s connection with the world, John takes it and uses it to denote the Revealer of the incomprehensible and invisible God. Irrespective of all speculations which had gathered around the term, John now proceeds to make known the true nature of the Logos. (Cf. The Primal Will, or Universal Reason of the Babus; Sell’s Faith of Islam, 146.)

(1) If the Word was thus in the beginning, what relation did He hold to God? Was He identical or opposed? δέ λόγος ήν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν. πρὸς implies not merely existence alongside of but personal intercourse. It means more than συνεδρ. and is regularly employed in expressing the presence of one person with another. Thus in classical Greek, τήν πρὸς Σωματίαν συνεδρ. and in N. T. Mk. vi. 3, Mt. xiii. 56, Mk. ix. 19, Gal. i. 18, 2 John 12. This preposition implies intercourse and therefore separate personality. As Chrysostom says: “Not in God but with God, as person with person, eternally.”

(2) The Word is distinguishable from God and yet Θεός ήν δέ λόγος, the Word was God, of Divine nature; not “a God,” which to a Jewish ear would have been abominable; nor yet identical with all that can be called God, for then the article would have been inserted (cf. 1 John iii. 4). “The Christian doctrine of the Trinity was perhaps before anything else an effort to express how Jesus Christ was God (Θεός) and yet in another sense was not God (δὲ Θεός), that is to say, was not the whole Godhead.” Consult Du Bose’s Ecumenical Councils, p. 70-73. Luther says “the Word was God” is against Arius: “the Word was with God” against Sabellius.

Ver. 2. ὁ Θεός ήν ἐν αρχῇ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν. Not a mere repetition of what has been said in ver. 1. There John has said that the Word was in the beginning and also that He was with God: here he indicates that these two characteristics existed contemporaneously. “He was in the beginning with God.” He wishes also to emphasise this in view of what he is about to tell. In the beginning He was with God, afterwards, in time, He came to be with man. His pristiner condition must first be grasped, if the grace of what succeeds is to be understood.

Ver. 3. Ημέρας δι’ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο. The connection is obvious: the Word was with God in the beginning, but not as an idle, ineffectual existence, which only then for the first time put forth energy when He came into the world. On the contrary, He was the source of all activity and life. “All things were made by Him, and without Him was not even one thing made which was made.”

The double sentence, positive and negative, is characteristic of John and lends emphasis to the statement.—τὸ πάντα, “grande verbum quo mundus, i.e., universitas rerum factarum denotatur” (Bengel). The more accurate expression for “all things” taken as a whole and not severally is τὸ πάντα (Col. i. 16) or τὸ πάν; and, as the negative clause of this verse indicates,
created things are here looked at in their variety and multiplicity. Cf. Marcus Aurelius, iv. 23, 6 φονέα, εκ σου πάντα, εν σι πάντα, εις σι πάντα.—δι' αυτοῦ. The Word was the Agent in creation. But it is to be observed that the same preposition is used of God in the same connection in Rom. xi. 36, δι' ευ αυτοῦ καὶ δι' αυτοῦ καὶ εις αυτον τά πάντα; and in Col. i. 6 the same writer uses the same prepositions not of the Father but of the Son when he says: τα πάντα δι' αυτοῦ καὶ εις αυτον εκτιμαν. In 1 Cor. viii. 6 Paul distinguishes between the Father as the primal source of all things and the Son as the actual Creator. (In Greek philosophy the problem was to ascertain by whom, what, and in view of what the world was made; μόνον τοίς, μόνον τούς, πρός δι'. And Lücke quotes a significant sentence from Philo (De Cherub., 35): εὐρήκεις αὐτόν μήν αὐτοῦ (τοῦ κόσμου) τὸν θεόν, ὃς οὐ γέγονεν· ὅλην ἐν τὰ τέσσαρα στοιχεῖα, ἐκ ὧν συνεκράτη· ἐργανόν ὃ λόγον θεοῦ δι' οὗ κατεκυκλώθη.)

Ver. 4. In αὐτῷ σά ἦν. “In Him was life”; that power which creates life and maintains all else in existence was in the Logos. To limit “life” here to any particular form of life is rendered impossible by ver. 3. In John ὄν is generally eternal or spiritual life, but here it is more comprehensive. In the Logos was life, and it is of this life all things have partaken and by it they exist. Cf. Philo’s designation of the Logos as παγχ ζωῆς.—καὶ ἡ ζωή ἦν τὸ φῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, “and the life was the light of men”’; the life which was the beginning of existence to all things was especially the life of man (Lücke). It was not the Logos directly but the life which was in the Logos which was the light of men. O. Holtzmann thinks this only means that as men received life from the Logos they might be expected in the gift to recognise the Giver. Godet says: “The Logos is light; but it is through the mediation of life that He must become so always; this is precisely the relation which the Gospel restores. We recover through the new creation in Jesus Christ an inner light which springs up from the life.” Stevens says: “The Word represents the self-manifesting quality of the Divine life. This heavenly light shines in the darkness of the world’s ignorance and sin.” The words seem to mean that the life which appears in the variety, harmony, and progress of inanimate nature, and in the wonderfully manifold yet related forms of animate existence, appears in man as “light,” intellectual and moral light, reason and conscience. To the Logos men may address the words of Ps. xxxvi. 9, παρε σοι ἐν παγχ ζωῆς, εν τῷ φως σοι ὁ δύναμις φῶς.—Ver. 5. καὶ τὸ φῶς ἐν τῇ σκοτιᾳ φαίνει, “and the light shineth in the darkness.” Three interpretations are possible. The words may refer to the incarnate, or to the pre-incarnate experience of the Logos, or to both. Holtzmann and Weiss both consider the clause refers to the incarnate condition (cf. 1 John ii. 8). De Wette refers it to the pre-incarnate operation of the Logos in the O.T. prophets. Meyer and others interpret φαίνει as meaning “present, i.e., uninterruptedly from the beginning until now”. The use of the aorist κατάλαβεν seems to make the first interpretation impossible; while the second is obviously too restricted. What “shining” is meant? This also must not be limited to O.T. prophecy or revelation but to the light of conscience and reason (cf. ver. 3). In τῷ σκοτίᾳ, in the darkness which existed wherever the light of the Logos was not admitted. Darkness, σκοτίας or σκοτία, was the expression naturally used by secular Greek writers to describe the world’s condition. Thus Lucian: ἐν σκοτίᾳ πλαγίων πάντων ἑλκυμένων. Cf. Lucretius: “Qualibus in tenebris vitae, quantisque periculis, Deditur hoc sevi quocunque est ”.

Kal ἡ σκοτία αὐτὸ οὐ κατάλαβεν. The A. V. renders this “and the darkness comprehended it not”; the R. V. has “apprehended” and in the margin “overcame”. The Greek interpreters understood the clause to mean that the darkness did not conquer the light. Thus Theophylact says: ἡ σκοτία . . . ἑιμαλὰ τὸ φῶς, ἀλλ' ἐρώσιμακαταλάβατον καὶ ἐλημένου. Some modern interpreters,
and especially Westcott, adopt this rendering. "The whole phrase is indeed a startling paradox. The light does not banish the darkness: the darkness does not overpower the light." This rendering is supposed to find support in chap. xii. 35, where Christ says, "Walk while ye have the light," etc. The word "katalebąs;" and katalebávav is the word commonly used to denote day or night overtaking any one (see Wetstein). But the radical meaning is "to seize," "to take possession of," "to lay hold of"; so in Rom. ix. 30, 1 Cor. ix. 24, Phil. iii. 12. It is also used of mental perception, as in the Phaedrus, p. 250, D. See also Polybius, iii. 32, 4, and viii. 4, 6, òπογλος καταλήβειν, difficult to understand. This sense is more congruous in this passage; especially when we compare ver. 10 (δό κόσμος αὐτόν οὐκ ἔγνω) and ver. 11 (οἶδα αὐτόν ὥσπερ παρέλαβον).

Vv. 6-13. The historic manifestation of the Logos and its results.—Ver. 6. In this verse John passes to the historical; and like the other evangelists begins with the Baptist. So Theodore Moschus: μετ' εἰς τὴν ἐνεργάναν τοῦ θεοῦ, τίνα δὲ εὑρίσκας ἐκέχειν ἢ τά κατὰ τὸν Ἰωάννην;—ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, "not there was (chap. iii. 3), but denoting the appearing, the historical manifestation," Meyer. Cf. Lk. i. 5. The testimony of John is introduced not only as a historical note but in order to bring out the aggravated blindness of those who rejected Christ. This man was ἀναστάλκτον παρεκκλησίας. Holtzmann says "an historical appearance is characterised as Godsent." It might rather be said that an historical appearance sent to fulfil a definite Divine purpose is so characterised. There is no designation our Lord more frequently applies to Himself. In the prayer of chap. xvii. some equivalent occurs six times. And in the epistle to the Hebrews He is called "the Apostle of our confession." No distinguishing title is added to the common name "John." Westcott says: "If the writer of the Gospel were himself the other John of the Gospel history, it is perfectly natural that he should think of the Baptist, apart from himself, as John only". Watkins says: "The writer stood to him in the relation of disciple to teacher. To him he was the John." Afterwards the disciple became the John.—Ver. 7.
philosophical researches (see Justin's Dial., ii., etc., and Clement, passim).—
κόσμον has been variously construed, with ἄνθρωπον, with τὸ φῶς, or with άν. (1) The first construction is favoured by Chrysostom, Euthymius, the Vulgate, and A. V., "that was the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world"; or with Meyer, "the true light which lighteneth every man coming into the world was present" (ἰν = adata). To the objection that ἐξωuch...
κόσμον is thus redundant, Meyer replies that there is such a thing as a solemn redundancy, and that we have here an "epic fulness of words". But the "epic fulness" is here out of place, especially viewing Rev. 10. Besides, in this Gospel, "coming into the world" is not used of human birth, but of appearance in one's place among men. And still further ἐρχόμενον of this verse is obviously in contrast with the ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ὅν of the next, and the subject of both clauses must be the same. (2) The second construction, with τὸ φῶς, was advocated by Grotius ("valde mihi se probat expositio quae apud Cyrillum et Augustinum exatut, ut hoc ἐρχόμενον referatur ad τὸ φῶς"). cf. iii. 19, xii. 46, xviii. 27, and has been adopted by Godet, who renders thus: "(That light) was the true light which lighteth every man, by coming (itself) into the world". If this were John's meaning, it is difficult to see why he did not insert ὅτι as in the second verse or ὅτι. (3) The third construction, with ὅν, has much to recommend it, and has been adopted by Westcott, Holtzmann, and others. The R. V. margin renders as if ὅν ἐρχόμενον were the periphrastic imperfect commonly used in N. T., "the true light which enlightenth every man was coming into the world", i.e., at the time when the Baptist was witnessing, the true light was dawning on the world. Westcott, however, thinks it best to take it "more literally and yet more generally as describing a coming which was progressive, slowly accomplished, combined with a permanent being, so that both the verb (was) and the participle (coming) have their full force and do not form a periphrasis for an imperfect". And he translates: "There was the light, the true light which lighteth every man; that light was, and yet more, that light was coming into the world".—Ver. 10. ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ...ὖς ἐγένετο. Vv. 10 and
11 briefly summarise what happened when the Logos, the Light, came into the world. John has said: "The Light was coming into the world"; take now a further step, ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἦν, and let us see what happened. Primarily rejection. The simplicity of the statement, the thrice repeated κόσμος, and the connecting of the clauses by a mere καί, deepens the pathos. The Logos is the subject, as is shown by both the second and the third clause.

Westcott thinks that the action of the Light which has been comprehensively viewed in ver. 9 is in vv. 10, 11 divided into two parts. "The first part (ver. 10) gathers up the facts and issues of the manifestation of the Light as immanent. The second part (ver. 11) contains an account of the special personal manifestation of the Light to a chosen race." That is possible; only the obvious advance from the ἐρχόμενον of ver. 9 to the ὅν of ver. 10 is thus obscured. Certainly Westcott goes too far when he says: "It is impossible to refer these words simply to the historical presence of the Word in Jesus as witnessed to by the Baptist".

Ver. 11. ἐλετὸς τὰς ἑδραν, "He came to His own". In the world of men was an inner circle which John calls τὰ ἑδραν, His own home. (For the meaning of τὰ ἑδραν cf. xii. 27, xvi. 32, Acts xxi. 5, 3 Macr. iv. 27-29, Esther v. 10, Polybius Hist., ii. 57, 5.) Perhaps in this place "His own property" might give the sense as accurately. Israel is certainly signified; the people and all their institutions existed only for Him. (See Exod. xix. 5, Deut. vii. 6, "The Lord thy God hath chosen thee to be a special people, a peculiarity unto Himself"; also Mt. xxi. 33)—οἱ ἑδραν, those of His own home (His intimates, cf. xiii. 1), those who belonged to Him, ἀπότων ὧν παρέλαβον "gave Him no reception". The word is used of welcoming to a home, as in xiv. 3, πάλιν ἐρχόμενος καὶ παρέλαβον ὃς προέρχετο. Even those whose whole history had been a training to know and receive Him rejected Him. It is not said of "His own" that they did not "know" Him, but that they did
not receive Him. And in the parable of the Wicked Husbandmen our Lord represents them as killing the heir not in ignorance but because they knew him. —Ver. 12. But not all rejected Him. 

——δεκα αυτοις, to them (resuming δεκα by a common construction) He gave διψαναλ, not equivalent to διψαμε, the inward capacity, nor just equivalent to saying that He made them sons of God, but He gave them title, warrant, or authorisation, carrying with it all needed powers. Cf. v. 27, x. 18, xix. 10, Lk. ix. i, Mk. vi. 7, where ἐξουσία includes and implies διψαμε. —τέκνα θεοῦ γενοῦσα, to become children of God.

Weiss (Bibl. Theol., § 150) says: "To those who accept Him by faith Christ has given not sonship itself, but the power to become sons of God; the last and highest realisation of this ideal, a realisation for the present fathomless, lies only in the future consummation". Rather, with Stevens, "to believe and to be begotten of God are two inseparable aspects of the same event or process" (John, Theol., p. 251). John uses τέκνα rather than the Pauline υἱὸς τ. θ., because Paul's view of sonship was governed by the Roman legal process of adopting a son who was not one's own child: while John's view is mystical and physical, the begotten of a child by the communication of the very life of God (1 John, passim). This distinction underlies the characteristic use of υἱὸς by the one writer and τέκνα by the other (cf. Westcott, Epistles of St. John, p. 123). By the reception of Christ as the Incarnate Logos we are enabled to recognise God as our Father and to come into the closest possible relation to Him. Those who thus receive Him are further identified as τοις πιστεύων αὐτῷ τῷ δόμῳ αὐτοῦ, "those who believe (believers, present participle) in His name".—πιστεύων αὐτῷ τῷ τινα is the favourite construction with John, and emphasises the object on which the faith rests. Here that object is τῷ δόμῳ αὐτοῦ, the sum of all characteristic qualities which attach to the bearer of the name: "quique qui credente esse eum id ipsum, quod nomen declarat" (Holtzmann). It is impossible to identify this "name" with the Logos, because Jesus never proclaimed Himself under this name. Other definite names, such as Son of God or Messiah, can here only be proleptic, and it is probably better to leave it indefinite, and understand it in a general sense of those who believed in the self-manifestation of Christ, and were characterised by that belief. —Ver. 13. οὐκ ἐκ ἀλμάτων ... γεννήθησαν. This first mention of τέκνα θεοῦ suggests the need of further defining how these children of God are produced. The εκ denotes the source of the relationship. First he negatives certain ordinary causes of birth, not so much because they could be supposed in connection with children of God (although thoughts of hereditary rights might arise in Jewish minds) as for the sake of emphasising by contrast the true source. —οὐκ ἐκ ἀλμάτων; that is, not by ordinary physical generation. ἀλμα was commonly used to denote descent; Acts xvii. 26, Ody. iv. 621, ἀλματος εἰς ἀγένεια. This is rather a Greek than a Hebrew expression. The plural ἀλμάτων has given rise to many conjectural explanations; and the idea currently received is that it suggests the constituent parts of which the blood is composed (Godet; Meyer). Westcott says: "The use of the plural appears to emphasise the idea of the element out of which in various measures the body is formed". Both explanations are doubtful. The plural is used very commonly in the Sept., 2 Sam. xvi. 8, ἄνθρωπον ἄλματος σω' ; Ps. xcv. 9, μετὰ ἀνθρώπων ἄλματων; 2 Chron. xxiv. 25, etc.; and especially where much slaughter or grievous murder is spoken of. Cf. Eurip., Iph. in Taur., 73. It occurs in connection with descent in Eurip., Ion., 693, ἄλλων ἀνθρώπων ἄλματος (Lücke). The reason of John's preference for the plural in this place is not obvious; he may perhaps have wished to indicate that all family
histories and pedigrees were here of no account, no matter how many illustrious ancestors a man could reckon, no matter what bloods united to produce him.—οὐδὲ... ἀνθρόπος. The combination of these clauses by οὐδὲ... οὔτε and not by οὔτε... οὔτε excludes all interpretations which understand these two clauses as subdivisions of the foregoing. οὐδὲ adds negation to negation: οὐδὲ divides a single negation into parts (see Winer, p. 613). "Nor of the will of the flesh," i.e., not as the result of sexual instinct; "nor of the will of a man," i.e., not the product of human purpose ("Fortschritt von Stoff zum Naturzweck und zum persönlichen Thun," Holtzmann). Cf. Delitzsch, Bibl. Psych., p. 290, note E. Tr.—καὶ ἐν θοὺς ἐνεγκάθηθεν. The source of regeneration positively stated. Human will is repudiated as the source of the new birth, but as in physical birth the life of the child is at once manifested, so in spiritual birth the human will first manifests regeneration. In spiritual as in physical birth the origination is from without, not from ourselves; but just because our spiritual birth is spiritual the will must take its part in it. Nothing is spiritual into which the will does not enter.

Vv. 14-18. The manifestation of the Logos defined as Incarnation.—Ver. 14, καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο, "and the Word became flesh." This is not a mere repetition. John has told us that the Logos came into the world, but now he emphasizes the actual mode of His coming and the character of the revelation thus made. "He is carrying forward the discourse" (Meyer) and now introducing the chief statement (Luthardt). It is this great statement to which the whole prologue has been directed; and accordingly he names again the great Being to whom he at first introduced us but whom he has not named since the first verse. As forcibly as possible does he put the contrast between the prior and the subsequent conditions, ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο; he does not even say ἀνθρώπως but σὰρξ. He wishes both to emphasize the interval crossed, λόγος, σὰρξ; and to direct attention to the visibility of the manifestation. Cf. 1 Tim. iii. 16, ἐκαθαρσία ἐν σαρκὶ; 1 John iv. 2, ἐν σαρκὶ ἀληθοῦς; also Heb. ii. 14. "Flesh expresses here human nature as a whole regarded under the aspect of its present corporeal embodiment, including of necessity the 'soul' (xii. 27) and the 'spirit' (xi. 33, xiii. 21) as belonging to the totality of man" (Westcott). The copula is ἐγένετο, and what precisely this word covers has been the problem of theology ever since the Gospel was written. The Logos did not become flesh in the sense that He was turned into flesh or ceased to be what He was before; as a boy who becomes a man ceases to be a boy. By his use of the word ἐκαθαρσία in connection with the incarnation Paul intimates that something was left behind when human nature was assumed; but in any case this was not the Divine essence nor the personality. The virtue of the incarnation clearly consists in this, that the very Logos became man. The Logos, retaining His personal identity, "became "man (so as to live as man. —καὶ ἐκαθαρσία ἐν ἡμῖν, "and tabernacled among us"; not only appeared in the flesh for a brief space, manifesting Himself as a Being apart from men and superior to human conditions, but dwelt among us ("non tantum momento uno apparuisse, sed versatam esse inter homines," Calvin). The "tent," σκηνή, suggests no doubt temporary occupation, but not more temporary than human life. Cf. 2 Cor. v. 1, 2 Pet. i. 13. And both in classical and N.T. Greek σκηνῶν had taken the meaning "dwell," whether for a long or a short time. Cf. Rev. vii. 15, xii. 12, and Raphel, Annot. in loc. From the use of the word in Xenophon to denote living together and eating together Brentius would interpret in a fuller sense: "Filius ille Dei carme induitus, inter nos homines vivit, nobiscum locutus est, nobiscum convivatus est." But the association in John's mind was of course not military, but was rather with the Divine tabernacle in the wilderness, when Jehovah pitched His tent among the shifting tents of His people, and shared even in their thirty-eight years of punishment.
Whether there is an allusion to the Shekinah has been doubted, but it is probable. The Shekinah meant the token of God's presence and glory, and among the later Jews at all events it was supposed to be present not only in the temple but with individuals. See Schoettgen in loc. and Weber, Die Lehren des Talmud, § 39. What the tabernacle had been, the dwelling of God in the midst of the people, the humanity of the Logos now was,—kal ἀναθαρσία τῆς ἁγίας ἁγίων, we, among whom He lived, beheld by our own personal observation the glory of the incarnate Logos. "Beheld," neither, on the one hand, only by spiritual contemplation (Baur), nor, on the other, merely with the bodily eye, by which the glory could not be seen. This "beholding," John treasured as the wealth and joy of his life. The glory they saw was not like the cloud or dazzling light in which God had manifested His glory in the ancient tabernacle. It was now a true ethical glory, a glory of personality and character, manifesting itself in human conditions. It is described as something unique, δύσιν ὑπὲρ μονογενός παρὰ πατρός, "a glory as of an only begotten from a father,"—ὅς introduces an illustrative comparison, as is indicated by the anarthrous μονογενός. Holtzmann expands this. The impression which the glory made was of so specific a character that it could be taken for nothing less than such a glory as an only son has from a father, that is, as the only one of its kind; for besides the μονογενής a father has no other sons." But the expression is no doubt suggested, by the immediately preceding statement that as many as received Christ were born of God. The glory of the Incarnate Logos, however, is unique, that of an only begotten. In the connection, therefore, the application of the relation of Father and Son to God and Christ is close at hand and obvious, although not explicitly made. "The thought centres in the abstract relation of Father and Son, though in the actual connection this abstract relation passes necessarily into the relation of the Son to the Father." Westcott.—παρὰ πατρός more naturally follows δύσιν than μονογενός. The glory proceeds from the Father and dwells in the only begotten wholly, if there were no other children required to reflect some rays of the Divine glory. Accordingly He is πληρής. With what is πληρής to be construed? Erasmus thinks with ἀναθαρσία following. Codex Bezæ reads πλήρης and joins it to δύσιν. Many interpreters hold it to be one of those slight irregularities such as occur in Mk. xii. 40 and Phil. iii. 19 and in the Apoc., and would unite it either with ἀναθαρσία or μονογενός. But (pace Weiss) there is no good reason why we should not accept it as it stands and construe it in agreement with the nominative to ἀναθαρσίας.—χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας. His glory consisted in the moral qualities that appeared in Him. What these qualities were will appear more readily from ver. 17.—Ver. 15. ἡ ἀναθαρσία μαρτυρεῖ . . . πρῶτος μοι ἦν. At first sight this verse seems an irrelevant interpolation thrust in between the ἀναθαρσία of ver. 14 and the πληρήμα of ver. 16. Euthymius gives the connection: εἰ καὶ μὴ ἐγὼ, φησὶ δοκεῖ τινι πάνω ἐξιστοροῦν-τος, ἀλλὰ πρὸ ἢ ἐμοῦ ὁ ἡ ἀναθαρσία μαρτυρεῖ περὶ τῆς ἑστήκτος αὐτοῦ. ἡ ἀναθαρσία ἐγῶν σὺ τὸ δόμα μέγα καὶ περιβάλλον παρὰ πάνω ἡ γῆ. "John testifies and cries, saying ouτός ἦν ὁ ἐμφαν. This was He of whom I said τῇ πάνω μοῦ ἐρχόμενος," etc. This testimony was given to Andrew and John, ver. 30; but when the previous "saying" occurred we do not know, unless it be referred to the answer to the authorities, ver. 27. The meaning of the testimony will be considered in the next section of the Gospel, which is entitled "The Testimony of John."—Ver. 16. δύτι ἐπὶ τοῦ πληρώματος . . . χάριτος, "because out of His fulness have we all received." The δύτι does not continue the Baptist's testimony, but refers to πληρώμα in ver. 14. In Col. ii. 9 Paul says that in Christ dwelleth all the πληρώμα of the Godhead, meaning to repudiate the
Instead of the reading of the T.R., ο μονογενὴς θεός, several modern editors read μονογενὴς θεός. For the T.R. the authorities are ACX and some other uncials; of versions the old Latin and the Vulgate, Curetonian Syriac, Armenian and Ethiopic; almost all the cursive and the great body of the Fathers—all the Latin Fathers after the fourth century. For μονογενὴς θεός the uncialss NBC*L and cursive 33; the Peshito and Harklean Syriac in margin, and the Memphitic; and of the Greek Fathers Clement of Alexandria, Valentinus in Irenaeus, Epiphanius, Basil, etc. These authorities and the text they witness to have been discussed by the late Dr. Hort in his Two Dissertations, and by Ezra Abbot in his Critical Essays, pp. 241-285. The MS. authority favours the reading θεός; while the versions and the Fathers weigh rather in the opposite scale. Internal evidence is on the whole in favour of the T.R. The reading θεος is rejected by Scrivener, Wordsworth, McLellan, Tischendorf, Meyer, Godet, Lücke, Holtzmann, and Weissäcker. It should be noted, as brought out by Ezra Abbot, that the Arians were quite willing to call the Son ο μονογενὴς θεός, because in their view this appellation happily distinguished Him from the Father who alone was God in the highest sense, unbegotten, uncaused, and without beginning.

Gnostic idea that this pleroma was distributed among many subordinate beings or ζώα. But what John has here in view is that the fulness of grace in Christ was communicable to men. By ὸμεὶς πάντες he indicates himself and all other Christians. He had himself experienced the reality of that grace with which Christ was filled and its inexhaustible character. For he adds καὶ χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος, "grace upon grace". Bera suggests the rendering: ("ut quidam vir eruditus explicat," he says): "Gratiam supra gratiam; pro quo elegerant dixeris, gratiam gratia cumulatum," but he does not himself adopt it. It is, however, adopted by almost all modern interpreters: so that ever and anon fresh grace appears over and above that already received. This rendering, as Meyer points out, is linguistically justified by Theognis, Sent., 344, ἀντὶ ἄνων ἄνω, sorrows upon sorrows; and it receives remarkable illustration from the passage quoted by Wetstein from Philo, De Poster. Cain., where, speaking of grace, he says that God does not allow men to be sated with one grace, but gives ἄρας ἄνων καὶ ἄνων ἄνω, (the first) καὶ τρίτας ἄνω των δευτέρων καὶ τῶν ἄνω ἄνω των (the first) καὶ τρίτας ἄνω των δευτέρων καὶ τῶν ἄνω των δευτέρων. Harnack (Hist. of Dogma, i., 76, E. Tr.) asks: "Where in the history of mankind can we find anything resembling this, that men who had eaten and drunk with their Master should glorify Him, not only as the Revealer of God, but as the Prince of Life, as the Redeemer and Judge of the world, as the living power of its existence, and that a choir of Jews and Gentiles, Greeks and barbarians, wise and foolish, should along with them immediately confess that out of the fulness of this one man they have received grace for grace?" —Ver. 17. ἦτα νομος . . . ἔγνεντο. What is the connection? His statement that the Incarnate Logos was the inexhaustible supply of grace might seem to disparage Moses and the previous manifestations of God. He therefore explains. And he seems to have in view the same distinction between the old and the new that is so frequently emerging in the Pauline writings. Through Moses, here taken as representing the pre-Christian dispensation, was given the law, which made great demands but gave nothing, which was a true revelation of God's will, and so far was good, but brought men no ability to become like God. But through Jesus Christ (here for the first time named in the Gospel, because we are now fully on the ground of history) came grace and truth. In contrast to the inexorable demands of a law that brought no spiritual life, Jesus Christ brought "grace," the unearned favour of God. The Law said: Do this and live; Christ says: God gives you life, accept it. "Truth" also was brought by Christ.—ἀλήθεια here means "reality" as opposed to the symbolism of the Law (cf. iv. 23). In the Law was a shadow of good things to come: in Christ we have the good things themselves. Several good critics
find a contrast between Ἰδοθεο and ἐγένετο; the law being "given" for a special purpose, "grace and truth" "coming" in the natural course and as the issue of all that had gone before.—Ver. 18. θεον οδηγεῖ άπρακτα... ἐγένετο. This statement, "God no one has ever seen," is probably suggested by the words ἵνα ἴδῃ τοὺς Χριστούς. The reality and the grace of God we have seen through Jesus Christ, but why not directly? Because God, the Divine essence, the Godhead, no one has ever seen. No man has had immediate knowledge of God: if we have knowledge of God it is through Christ.

A further description is given of the Only Begotten intended to disclose His qualification for revealing the Father in the words δὲ ἐν ηλι τῶν κόλπων τοῦ πατρὸς. Meyer supposes that John is now expressing himself from his own present standing point, and is conceiving of Christ as in His state of exaltation, as having returned to the bosom of the Father. But in this case the description would not be relevant. John adds this designation to ground the revealing work which Christ accomplished while on earth (ἐγένετο), 40, referring to that work, to prove His qualification for it. It must therefore include His condition previous to incarnation. δὲ ἐν is therefore a timeless present and ἐν is used, as in Mk. xiii. 16, Acts viii. 40, etc., for ἐν τῶν κόλπων, whether taken from friends reciting at a feast or from a father's embrace, denotes perfect intimacy. Thus qualified, ἐκεῖνος ἐγένετο "He" emphatic, He thus equipped, "has interpreted " what? See viii. 32; or simply, as implied in the preceding negative clause, "God". The Scholiast on Soph., 411., 320, says, ἐγένετο εἰς θελα, ᾗ ὑπερήφανος ἐν τοῖς τυχότοις, Weist.-Ver. 19. With this verse begins the Gospel proper or historical narrative of the manifestation of the glory of the Incarnate Logos.

Vv. 19-42. The witness of John and its result.—Vv. 19-28. The witness of John to the deputation from Jerusalem, entitled αὐτῇ ἀστιν... Λευκίας. The witness or testimony of John is placed first, not only because it was that which influenced the evangelist himself, nor only because chronologically it came first, but because the Baptist was commissioned to be the herald of the Messiah. The Baptist's testimony was of supreme value because of (1) his appointment to this function of identifying the Messiah, (2) his knowledge of Jesus, (3) his own holiness, (4) his disinterestedness.—ἀυτῶν, this which follows, is the testimony given on a special occasion διὰ ἀντίς... Λευκίας, "when the Jews sent to him from Jerusalem priests and Levites".—Ἰουδαίοι... Ἰσραηλίτων, originally designating the tribes of Judah and Benjamin which formed the separate kingdom of Judah, but after the exile denoting all Israelites. In this Gospel it is used with a hostile implication as the designation of the "entire theocratic community as summed up in its official heads and as historically fixed in an attitude of hostility to Christ" (Whitelaw). Here "the Jews" probably indicates the Sanhedrin, composed of priests, presbyters, and scribes.—Ἰσραήλ καὶ Λευκίας, the higher and lower order of temple officials (Holtzmann). Why were not scribes sent? Possibly because John's father was himself a priest. The priests were for the most part Sadducees, but John tells us this deputation was strong in Pharisees (ver. 24). Lampe says: "Custodibus Tempii incumbebat, Dominum Tempi, cuius adventum expectabant, nostri... They were sent ἐν ἰουδαίοις αὐτῶν, "that they might interrogate him," not captiously but for the sake of information. Lk. tells us (iii. 15) that the people were on the tiptoe of expectation, and were discussing whether John were not the Christ; so it was time the Sanhedrin should make the inquiry. "The judgment of the case of a false prophet is specially named in the Mishna as belonging to the council of the Seventy One" (Watkins). "This incident gives a deep insight into the extraordinary religious life of the Jews—their unusual combination of conservatism with progressive thought" (Reynolds' John the Baptist, p. 365).—Σὺ τίς εἶ. "Who art thou?" Not, what is your name, or birth, but, what personage do you claim to be,
what place in the community do you aspire to?—with an implied reference to a possible claim on John’s part to be the Christ. This appears from John’s answer, ὄρατον καὶ κρύφθηναι καὶ ὄρατον γένοιτο. Schoettgen says the form of the sentence is “judaeo more,” citing “Jethro confessus, et non mentitus est.” Cf. Rom. ix. 1 and I Tim. ii. 7. The iteration serves here to bring out the earnestness, almost horror, with which John disclaimed the ascription to him of such an honour. His high conception of the office emphasises his acknowledgment of Jesus. 6—9, here, as commonly, “recitative,” serving the purpose of our inverted commas or marks of quotation. 17 ὅ σφος ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστός, the reading adopted by Tisch. and W.H., bringing the emphasis on the “I.” “I am not the Christ,” but another is. The T.R. ὅ σφος ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστός, by bringing the ὅσο and ὁ Χριστός together, accentuates the incongruity and the Baptist’s surprise at being mistaken for the Christ. This straightforward denial evokes another question (ver. 21). τί σφος, which Weiss renders, “What then art thou?” Better “what then?” “what then is the case?” quid ergo, quid irrigit—“ὅλας ἐστὶν; If not the Christ Himself, the next possibility was that he was the forerunner of the Messiah, according to Mal. iv. 5, “Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord.” Among the Fathers there seems to have been a belief that Elias would appear before the second Advent. Thus Tertullian (De anima, 50) says: “Translatus est Enoch et Elias, nec mors eorum reperta est, dilata scilicet. Caeterum moritur reservantur, ut Antichristum sanguine suo extinguant.” Other references in Lampe.] But to this question also John answers ὃ σφος ἐστιν, because the Jews expected Elias in person, so that although our Lord spoke of the Baptist as Elias (Mt. xvii. 10—13), John could not admit that identity without misleading them. If people need to question a great spiritual personality, replies in their own language will often mislead them. Another alternative presented itself: ὁ προφήτης ἐστίν; “art thou the prophet?” vis., the prophet promised in Deut. xviii. 15, “The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet from the midst of thee, like unto me.” Allusion is made to this prophet in four places in this Gospel, the present verse and ver. 25 of this chapter; also in vi. 14 and vii. 40. That the Jews did not see in this prophet the Messiah would appear from the present verse, and also from vii. 40: “Some said, Of a truth this is the prophet; others said, This is the Christ.” The Jews looked for “a faithful prophet” (1 Macc. xiv. 43) who was to terminate the prophetic period and usher in the Messianic reign. But after Peter, as recorded in Acts iii. 22, applied the prophecy of Deut. to Christ, the Christian Church adopted this interpretation. The use of the prophecy by Christ Himself justified this. But the different interpretations thus introduced gave rise to some confusion, and as Lightfoot points out, none but a Jew contemporaneous with Christ could so clearly have held the distinction between the two interpretations. (See Deane’s Pseudepigrapha, p. 121; Wendt’s Teaching of Jesus, E. Tr., i., 67; and on the relation of “the prophet” to Jeremiah, see Weber, p. 339.) To this question also John answered “No;” “quia Prophetis omnis erat praestantiam” (Lampe). This negation is explained by the affirmation of ver. 23. Thus baffled in all their suggestions the deputies ask John to give them some positive account of himself, that they might not go back to those who sent them without having accomplished the object of their mission. To this second τί εστίν; τί λέγεις περι σεαυτοῦ; (ver. 23) he replies in words made familiar by the Synoptists, ἐγώ φωνη βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ὅρμῃ . . . ὁ προφήτης; John applies to himself the words of Is. xl. 3, blending the two clauses ἐγώ φωνη βοῶντος and τί λέγεις περὶ σεαυτοῦ into one. εὐθύνατε τὴν ὅσον Κυρίον . . . εἰς ζημίαν.
KATA IOANNHN

24. Kai el 1 ἀπεσταλμένοι ἦσαν ἐκ τῶν Φαρισαίων.  25. καὶ ἠρώτησαν αὐτὸν, καὶ εἶπον αὐτῷ, "Τί οὖν βαπτίζεις; εἶ σοὶ οὖκ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς, οὗτε ἡλίας, οὗτε ὁ προφήτης;"

1 Mt. iii. 11.  26. Ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς ὁ Ιωάννης λέγων, "Εγὼ βαπτίζω ἐν υἱῶτες: μέσος δὲ ὑμῶν ἤστηκεν, οὐ δὲ ὑμεῖς οὐκ ὤδησατε.  27. αὐτὸς ἄτιν ό ὁ πόνοι μου ἐρχόμενοι, δεὶμπροσέκουν μοι γέγονεν; οὐ δὲ γεώ οὐκ εἰμι ἐξός ἵνα λύσω αὐτὸ τὸν ἱμάτιον τοῦ υπόθηματος."  28. Ταῦτα ἐν ἤθελαν ἀρθράφα ἐγένετο πέραν τοῦ ἱρώδαν, ὅπου ἦν Ἰωάννης βαπτίζων.

1 T.R. in ΝευΑ*BC*, etc.; without article in Ν*ABC*.
2 T.R. in ACX, etc.; στείχει in BL, adopted by W.H.R.
3 βῆθανι in Ν*ABC*EFG, etc., adopted by Tr.T.W.H.R.

δύναν Κυρίου. By appropriating this prophetic description John identifies himself as the immediate precursor of the Messiah; and probably also hints that he himself is no personage worthy that inquiry should terminate on him, but only a voice. [Heracleon neatly graduates revelation, saying that the Saviour is δ λέγων, John is φωνή, the whole prophetic order φωνή, a mere noise; for which he is with some justice rebuked by Origen.] "The desert," a pathless, fruitless waste fitly symbolises the spiritual condition of the Messiah's people. For the coming of their King preparation must be made, especially by such repentance as John preached. "If Israel repent but for one day, the Messiah will come." Cf. Weber, p. 334.—Ver. 21. καὶ ἀπεσταλμένοι ἦσαν ἐκ τῶν Φαρισαίων. This gives us the meaning "And they had been sent from," which is not so congruous with the context as "And they who were sent were of the Pharisees;" because apparently this clause was inserted to explain the following question (ver. 25): τί οὖν βαπτίζεις . . . ὁ προφήτης; Founding on Zech. xiii. 1. "In that day there shall be a fountain opened for sin and for uncleanness," and on Ezek. xxxvi. 25, "then will I sprinkle clean water upon you," they expected a general purification before the coming of the Messiah. Hence their question. If John was not the Messiah, nor the prophet, nor Elias in close connection with the Messiah, why did he baptise? Lightfoot (Hor. Heb., p. 965) quotes from Kiddushin "Elias venit ad immundos distinguendum et ad purificandum." See also Ammonius and Besa quoted in Lampe. In reply to this objection of the Pharisees (ver. 26) John says: ἐγὼ βαπτίζω . . . τοῦ υπόθηματος. "I for my part baptise with water." the emphatic "I" leading us to expect mention of another with whom a contrast is drawn. This contrast is further signified by the mention of the element of the baptism, ἐν υἱῶτες: a merely symbolic element, but also the element by baptism in which preparation for the Messiah was to be made. And John's administration of this precursory baptism is justified by the fact that he immediately states, μέσος ὑμῶν στήκει ὁ ἐξός σὺν ὤδησε. Had they been aware of this presence (ἔσωθας emphatic) as John was aware of it, they could not have challenged the baptism of John, because it was the divinely appointed preparation for the Messiah's advent. This scarcely amounts to what Lampe calls it, "nova exprobratio ignorantiae Pharisaeorum" (Is. xlii. 19, xxix. 14), because as yet they had had no opportunity of knowing the Christ.—μέσος ὑμῶν. There is no reason why the words should not be taken strictly. So Euthymius, ἦν γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς ἀμα- μελμένος τότε τῷ λαῷ.—ὅπισώ μου ἐρχόμενοι, denoting the immediate arrival of the Messiah and John's close connection with Him. He is further described relatively to John as inconceivably exalted above him, οὐ δὲ εἴμι . . . ὑπόθηματος. The grammatical form admitting both the relative and pers. pronoun is Hebraistic. ἐξέων ἵνα also stands instead of the classical construction with the infinitive. Talmudists quote the saying: "Every service which a servant will perform for his master, a disciple will do for his Rabbi, except loosing his sandal thong."—Ver. 28. ταῦτα ἐν βῆθανίᾳ . . . βαπτίζων. The place is mentioned on account of the importance of the testimony thus borne to Jesus, and because the evangelist himself in all probability was present and it was natural to him to name it. But where was it? There is no doubt that
29. The reading Bethania is to be preferred. The addition πέραν τοῦ Ἱερᾶνου confirms this reading; as the existence of Bethany near Jerusalem rendered the distinguishing designation necessary. Bethany = Βηθανία meaning "boat-house," and Bethabara having the same meaning [ῥειμα] a ferry boat is it not possible that the same place may have been called by both names indifferently? Henderson (Palestine, p. 154) suggests that possibly the explanation of the doubtful reading is that the place referred to is Bethacatha which led over into Bethania, that is, Bashan. Similarly Conder (Handbook, p. 320) says Bethania beyond Jordan is evidently the province of Batanae, and the ford Abdrat now discovered leads into Batanae. At this place "John was, baptising," rather than "John was baptising".

Vv. 29-34. The witness of John based on the sign at the baptism of Jesus.—

Ver. 29. τὸ ἔσω γεύμαν τοῦ Ἱερᾶνου, the first instance of John's accurate definition of time. Cf. 35, 43, ii. 1. The deputation had withdrawn, but the usual crowd attracted by John would be present. "The inquiries made from Jerusalem would naturally create fresh expectation among John's disciples. At this crisis," etc. (Westcott).—βλέπει τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐξελθόντα καὶ πρόειλθαι αὐτόν. Jesus had quite recently returned from the retirement in the wilderness, and naturally sought John's company. Around John He is more likely to find receptive spirits than elsewhere. And it gave His herald an opportunity to proclaim Him, ῥῆτορα του αἴων θεοῦ ἢ αἴων τὴν ἡμεραν καὶ τὴν κόσμον. The article indicates that a person who could thus be designated had been expected; or it may merely be introductory to the further definition of the succeeding clause.—τοῦ θεοῦ, provided by God; cf. "bread of God," vi. 33; also Rom. viii. 32. It is impossible to suppose with the author of Eccle Homo that by this title "the lamb of God" the Baptist merely meant to designate Jesus as a man "full of gentleness who could patiently bear the ills to which He would be subjected" (cf. Aristoph., Pax, 935). The second clause forbids this interpretation. He is a lamb αἰων τὴν ἡμεραν, and there is only one way in which a lamb can take away sin, and that is by sacrifice. The expression might suggest the picture of the suffering servant of the Lord in Is. liii. "led as a lamb to the slaughter," but unless the Baptist had previously been speaking of this part of Scripture, it is doubtful whether those who heard him speak would think of it. In Isaiah it is as a symbol of patient endurance the lamb is introduced; here it is as the symbol of sacrifice. It is needless to discuss whether the paschal lamb or the lamb of daily sacrifice was in the Baptist's thoughts. He used "the lamb" as the symbol of sacrifice in general. Here, he says, is the reality of which all animal sacrifice was the symbol.—αἰων, the present participle, indicating the chief characteristic of the lamb. αἰων has three meanings: (1) to raise or lift up, John viii. 59, ἑράν λίθοις; (2) to bear or carry, Mt. xvi. 24, ἀρατῷ τὸν σταυρόν αὐτοῦ; (3) to remove or take away, John xx. 1, of the stone ἐρασμὸν from the sepulchre; and 1 John iii. 5, ἐκ τῆς ἁμαρτίας, that He might take away sins. In the LXX φέρειν, not αἴων, is regularly used to express the "bearing" of sin (see Leviticus, passim). In 1 Sam. xxv. 25 Saul beseeches Samuel in the words ἄρον τὸ ἡμερον τοῦ κόσμου, which obviously means "remove" (not "bear") my sin. So in 1 Sam. xxv. 28. But a lamb can remove sin only by sacrificially bearing it, so that here αἴων includes and implies φέρειν.—τοῦ κόσμου, cf. 1 John ii. 2, ἀντίκειται λαμπερὸν ἐστὶν . . . περὶ ἑλθον τοῦ κόσμου, and especially Philo's assertion cited by Wetstein that some sacrifices were ὀτι τον ἀναστος ἀνθρωπων γένους.

In this verse Holtzmann finds two marks of late date. (1) The Baptist was markedly a man of his own people, whose eye never ranged beyond a Jewish horizon; yet here he is represented as from the first perceiving that the work of Jesus was valid for all men. And (2) the allusion to the sacrificial efficacy of Christ's death could not have been made till after that event. Strauss stated this difficulty with his usual lucidity. "So foreign to the current opinion at least was this notion of the Messiah that the disciples of Jesus, during the whole
period of their intercourse with Him, could not reconcile themselves to it; and when His death had actually taken place their trust in Him as the Messiah was utterly confounded." Yet Strauss himself admits that "a penetrating mind like that of the Baptist might, even before the death of Jesus, gather from the O.T. phrases and types the notion of a suffering Messiah, and that his obscure hints on the subject might not be comprehended by his disciples and contemporaries". The solution is probably to be found in the intercourse of John with Jesus, and especially after His return from the Temptation. These men must have talked long and earnestly on the work of the Messiah; and even though after his imprisonment John seems to have had other thoughts about the Messiah, that is not inconsistent with his making this statement under the direct influence of Jesus. We must also consider that John's own relation to the Messianic King must have greatly stimulated his thought; and his desire to respond to the cravings he stirred in the people must have led him to consider what the Messiah must be and do.

Ver. 30. οὐτός ... πρῶτός μου ἦν. Pointing to Jesus he identifies Him with the person of whom he had previously said αὐτός μού, etc. Cf. ver. 15. "After me comes a man who is before me because He was before me." The AV. "which is before me" is preferable though not so literal as the R.V. "which is become before me". The words mean: "Subsequent to me in point of time comes a man who has gained a place in advance of me, because He was eternally prior to me."—αὐτός μού ἡχοῦται refers rather to space than to time, "after me," but with the notion of immediacy, close behind, following upon. As certainly, ζυγοφυλάξεσθαι μου γέγονεν refers to position or dignity; He has come to be in front of me, or ahead of me. So used sometimes in classic writers; as ἐπιτροπὴ τοῦ δικαίου, preferred before justice. Dem., 1297, 26.

1 ὑπὲρ in ΝΒΣ, Origen. Cp. 2 Thess. ii. 7, and 2 Cor. i. 8. This use common in late Greek prose. Cp. Holden's note in Plutarch, Demosth., p. 181.
“Have you ever seen it rain without clouds?”). In what sense did the Baptist “see” the Spirit descending? Origen distinctly declared that these words  ὁ ὄρφανον τὸ ἄγγελον οὐκ ἔχειν ἄνθρωπον. 33.  ἔδωκεν ἀνέμοις ἀνατισμένοις, ἔδωκεν ἀνέμοις. 34.  ἀνέμοις ἀνέμοις ἀνατισμένοις, ἀνατισμένοις. In what sense did the Baptist “see” the Spirit descending? Origen distinctly declared that these words do not necessarily involve that an actual dove was visible. It was not the dove which was to be the sign; but, as the Baptist affirms in ver. 33, the descent and abiding of the Spirit. John was scarcely the type of man who would be determined in an important course of action by the appearance of a bird. What he saw was the Spirit descending. This he can best have seen in the de-maanour of Jesus, in His lowliness and sympathy and holiness, all of which came to their perfect bloom at and in His baptism. It was the possession of this spirit by Jesus that convinced John that He could baptise with the Holy Spirit. That this conviction came to him at the baptism of Christ with a clearness and firmness which authenticated it as divine is guaranteed by the words of this verse. It was as plain to him that Jesus was possessed by the Spirit as if he had seen the Spirit in a visible shape alighting upon Him. To a mind absorbed in this one idea it may have actually seemed as if he saw it with his bodily eyes. Ambrose, De Sacram., i., 5, “The Spirit had at first imparted to the Baptist, sed in specie columnae descendit de coelo.” The dove was in the East a sacred bird, and the brooding dove was symbolic of the quickening warmth of nature. In Jewish writings the Spirit hovering over the primeval waters is expressly compared to a dove: “Spiritus Dei ferebatur super aquas, sicut columba, quae fertur super pullos suos nec tangit illos.” Cf. also Noah’s dove as symbol of the new creation. (See Suicer, τ.τ., περιστεράω, and Strauss, i., 362.) Such a symbol of the Spirit would scarcely have been imagined by the Baptist, who was all for stern and violent methods.—Ver. 33. ἐδώκεν ὈΧΘΩΝ ἐδώκεν ὈΧΘΩΝ. Because of the importance of the identification of the Messiah the Baptist reiterates that his proclamation of Jesus was not a private idea for which he alone was responsible. On the contrary, He who had sent him to baptise had given him this sign by which to recognise the Christ. ἐδώκεν ὈΧΘΩΝ . . . ὈΧΘΩΝ. Lk. (iii. 16) adds καί ἔσχατον, which occasions the well-known utterance in Ecce Homo: “Baptism means cleansing, and fire means warmth. How can warmth cleanse? The answer is that moral warmth does cleanse. No heart is pure that is not passionate; no virtue is safe that is not enthusiastic. And such an enthusiastic virtue Christ was to introduce.” In affirming that the Christ baptises with the Holy Spirit, and that this is what distinguishes the Christ, the Baptist steps on to ground where his affirmations can be tested by experience. This is the fundamental article of the Christian creed. Has Christ power to make men holy? History gives the answer. The essence of the Holy Spirit is communication: Jesus being the Christ, the anointed with the Spirit, must communicate it.—Ver. 34. ἀνέμοις . . . ἀνέμοις. “And I have seen and have testified that this is the Son of God.” The Synoptists tell us that a voice was heard at the baptism declaring “this is my beloved Son”; and in the Temptation Satan uses the title. Nathanael at the very beginning of the ministry, and the demon, a little later, use the same designation. This was in a rigidly monotheistic community and in a community in which the same title had been applied to the king, to designate a certain alliance and close relation between the human representative and the Divine Sovereign. Whether the Baptist in his peculiar circumstances had begun to suspect that a fuller meaning attached to the title, we do not know. Unquestionably the Baptist must have found his ideas of the Messianic office expanding under the influence of intercourse with Jesus, and must more than ever have seen that this was a unique title setting Jesus apart from all other men. The basis of the application of the title to the Messiah is to be found in 2 Sam. vii. 14, “I will be to him a Father
and he will be to me a Son". In the second and eighty-ninth Psalms the term is seen passing into a Messianic sense, and that it should appear in the N.T. as a title of the Messiah is inevitable.

Vv. 35-52. *Witness of John to two of his disciples and first self-manifestation of Jesus as the Christ.* Bengel entitles the section, vv. 35-52, "primae origines Ecclesiae Christianae"; but from the evangelist's point of view it is rather the blending of the witness of John with the self-manifestation of Jesus. His kingly lordship over men He reveals (1) by making Himself accessible to inquirers: Andrew and John; (2) by giving a new name, implying a new character: Simon becomes Peter; (3) by summoning men to follow Him: Philip; (4) by interpreting and satisfying men's deepest desires and aspirations: Nathanael.—Ver. 35. ὁ ἐνεσίρθος ... ἀντὶ δύο. On the morrow John was again standing (υστῆκεν, pluperfect with force of imperfect) and two of his disciples. (Holtzmann uses this close riveting of day to day as an argument against the historicity of this part of the Gospel. He says that no room is left for the temptation between the baptism and the marriage in Cana. But these repeated "mornings" take us back, not to the baptism, which is nowhere in this Gospel directly narrated, but to the Baptist's conversation with the deputation from Jerusalem, in which it is implied that already the baptism of Jesus was past; how long past this Gospel does not state, but, quite as easily as not, six weeks may be inserted between the baptism of Jesus and the deputation.)—πάλιν looks back to ver. 29. Then no results followed John's testimony: now results follow. Two of his disciples stood with him, Andrew (ver. 41) and probably John.—Ver. 36. The Baptist, ἐμβλέψας τῷ ἵππου, having gazed at, or contemplated (see Mt. vi. 26, ἐμβλέπετε ἐν τῇ περαντίᾳ, and especially Mk. xiv. 67, καὶ ὤψαντο τὸν πέτρον ... ἐμβλέψασθαι) Jesus as He walked, evidently not towards John as on the previous day, but away from him. —λέγει ἵνα ὁ ἄρνης τοῦ θεοῦ without the added clause of ver. 29.—Ver. 37. καὶ ἠκούσαν ... τῷ ἵππου. "And the two disciples heard him speaking"—possibly implying that the day before they had not heard him—"and they followed Jesus"; the Baptist does not bid them follow, but they feel that attraction which so often since has been felt.—Ver. 38. ὁ δὲ ἵππος, καὶ Ἠμεροβιβάσματα ἄνωτος ἀκολουθοῦντας, λέγει ἄνωτος, 39. "Τί ζητεῖτε?"

1 For the two forms εἰστήκεν and ὦστήκεν see Veitch.
versation with Jesus during the remainder of the day [but Grotius gives the sense as "ibidem pernoctarunt, quia jam serum erat"], a day so memorable to John that he recalls the very hour when they first approached Jesus, four o'clock in the afternoon. It seems that at this time throughout the Graeco-Roman world one system of reckoning the hours prevailed. There is indisputable evidence that while the Romans calculated their civil day, by which leases and contracts were dated, as extending from midnight to midnight, the hours of each day were reckoned from sunrise to sunset. Thus on the Roman sun-dials noon is marked VI. (see Becker's Gallus, p. 319). Martian's description of the manner in which each hour was spelt (Ep. iv., 8) leads to the same conclusion; and for proof that no different method was followed in the provinces, see Prof. Ramsay's paper "On the Sixth Hour" in the Expositor, 1893. Cf. also paper by Mr. Cross in Classical Review, June, 1891.—Ver. 41. Ἠν Ἀνδρέας . . . Ζήμων. One of the two who thus first followed Christ was Simon, whose name was much in his own name as being the brother of Simon.—Πέτρου is here proleptic. We are left to infer that the other disciple was the evangelist.—Ver. 42. εὑρίσκεις οὖτος πρῶτος. If with T. R. and Tischendorf we read πρῶτον, the meaning is that Andrew, before John, found his brother; if with W. H. we read πρῶτον the meaning is that before Andrew did anything else, and perhaps especially before the other men afterwards named were called, he first of all finds his own brother. Reading πρῶτον, we cannot gather that John went in search also of his brother, and as there is no mention of him at this time the probability is that he was not at hand. πρῶτον is the note of warning that this was but the beginning of a series of calls.—εὑρίσκεις τὸν Μεσσιᾶν. "We have found," perhaps, as Weiss suggests, with reference to the expectations produced by the Baptist's teaching. The result of their conversation with Jesus is summed up in these words. They were now convinced that He was the Christ. In Jewish lips "we have found the Messiah" was the most comprehensive of all Eurekas. That John gives the actual words, though he has immediately to translate one of them for his Greek readers, is not without significance in regard to his accuracy in reporting.—Ver. 43. καὶ ἤγαγεν αὐτὸν πρὸς τὸν Ἱσοῦν. He was not content to allow his report to work in his brother's mind, but induced him there and then, though probably on the following day, as now it must have been late, to go to Jesus.—εὑρίσκεις . . . Πέτρος. Jesus may have known Simon previously, or may have been told his name by Andrew. "Thou art Simon, Jonah's son, or better, John's son. Thou shalt be called Kephas." This name is in his own name as being the brother of Simon.—Πέτρου is here proleptic. We are left to infer that the other disciple was the evangelist.—Ver. 42. εὑρίσκεις οὖτος πρῶτος. If with T. R. and Tischendorf we read πρῶτον, the meaning is that Andrew, before John, found his brother; if with W. H. we read πρῶτον the meaning is that before Andrew did anything else, and perhaps especially before the other men afterwards named were called, he first of all finds his own brother. Reading πρῶτον, we cannot gather that John went in search also of his brother, and as there is no mention of him at this time the probability is that
him receive a character fitting them to be of service.

Vv. 44-52. Further manifestations of Jesus as Messiah.—Vv. 44. Ὁ ἐπήριον . . . Γαλιλαῖον. “The day following He would go forth,” that is, from the other side of Jordan, into Galilee, probably to His own home.—καὶ ἐφώτισεν Φιλίππον, “and He finds,” “lights upon,” Philip (cf. vi. 5, xii. 21, xiv. 3). To him He utters the summons, ἀκολούθει μοι, which can hardly have the simple sense, “accompany me,” but must be taken as the ordinary call to discipleship (Lk. ix. 59, Mt. xix. 21, etc.).

Ver. 45. Ἡ δὲ Φιλίππος . . . Πέτρος. This is inserted to explain how Jesus happened to meet Philip: he was going home also; and to explain how Philip’s mind had been prepared by conversation with Andrew and Peter. The exact position of Bethsaida is doubtful. There was a town or village of this name (Fisher-Home) on the east bank of Jordan, slightly above its fall into the Sea of Galilee. This place was rebuilt by Philip and named Julias, in honour of the daughter of Augustus. Many good authorities think that this was the only Bethsaida (see Dr. G. A. Smith’s Hist. Geog. of Palestine, p. 457). Others, however, are of opinion that the manner in which Bethsaida, here and in xii. 21, is named with an added note of distinction, “the city of Andrew,” “of Galilee,” requires us to postulate two Bethsaldas. This is further confirmed by the movements recorded in vi. 16-22. Cf. Mk. vi. 45. Those who accept two Bethsaldas locate the one which is here mentioned either opposite Bethsaida Julia and as a kind of suburb of it or farther south at Ain Tabigha (see Rob Roy on the Jordan, 348-393).—Ver. 46. ἐφώτισεν . . . Ναζαρηνός. Philip in turn finds Nathanael, probably on the road from the Bethany ford homewards. Nathanael is probably the same person as is spoken of in the Synoptical Gospels as Bartholomew, i.e., Bar Tolmai, son of Puamisy. This is usually inferred from the following: (1) Both here and in chap. xxi. 2 he is classed with apostles; (2) in the lists of apostles given in the Synoptical Gospels Bartholomew is coupled with Philip; (3) while Nathanael is never mentioned by the Synoptists, Bartholomew is not mentioned by John. The two names might quite well belong to one man. Bartholomew being a patronymic. Nathanael means “God’s gift,” Theodore, or, like Augustine’s son, Adeodatus. Philip announces the discovery in the words ἐφώτισεν . . . Ναζαρηνός. On which Calvin remarks: “Quam tenuius fuerit modulus fidei in Philippo hinc patet, quod de Christo quatuor verba profari nequit, quin duos crassos errores permiscat.” Facit illum filium Joseph, et patriam Nazareth falsa illi assignat.” This is too stringent. He draws the conclusion that where there is a sincere purpose to do good and to proclaim Christ, success will follow even where there is error. Nazareth lies due west from the south end of the Sea of Galilee, and about midway between it and the Mediterranean.—Ver. 47. Philip’s announcement is received with incredulity.—ἐκ Ναζαρηνοῦ δύναται τα ἄγαθα εἶναι; “Can anything good be from Nazareth?” Cf. vii. 52. “It is difficult to believe that Nazareth could produce the Messiah (cf. Is. lii. 2, “a root out of a dry ground”). From this remark of Nathanael’s light is reflected on the obscurity and unobtrusiveness of the youth of Jesus. Though living a few miles off, Nathanael never heard of Him. To this incredulity Philip wisely replies, ἵππον καὶ τὸν; as
Bengel says, "optimum remedium contra opiniones praeconestas". And Nathanael shows himself to be willing to have his preconceptions overcome. He goes with Philip.—Ver. 48. εἶδεν ... δύος ὦν ἐστιν. The honesty shown in his coming to Jesus is indicated as his characteristic. He had given proof that he was a good man. In Gen. xxvii. 35 Isaac says to Esau, "Thy brother has come and metá δύον πλαβα τὴν εἰσοδον σου". And it was by throwing off this guile and finding in God his dependence that Jacob became Israel. So that in declaring Nathanael to be a guileless Israelite, Jesus declares him to be one who does not seek to win blessing by earthly means but by prayer and trust in God.—Ver. 49. The significance of this utterance is further shown by what follows. Naturally Nathanael is surprised by this explicit testimony from one with whom he has had no acquaintance and who has not-withstanding truly described him, and he asks, πώσιν μὲ γνώσεις; "how do you know me?" perhaps imagining that some common friend had told Jesus about him. But Jesus ascribes it to an angel τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπεφώνωσεν δύος ὄντα τῇ συκῇ εἶδον σε, I saw thee under the fig tree before Philip called thee (not, I saw thee somewhere else before Philip called thee when you were under the fig tree). "Under the fig tree" is obviously significant. Such trees were planted by the wayside (Mt. xxii. 19), and the large thick leaf afforded shade. It was the favourite garden tree of the Jews, so that "sitting under one's fig tree" meant being at home (Micah iv. 4, Zech. iii. 10). The tree formed a natural arbour affording shade and privacy. Thus Schöttgen quotes that it is related of Rabbi Jose and his disciples, "solebam summo manu surgere et sedere et studere sub ficu". And Lightfoot (Hor. Heb., in loc.) says that Nathanael was "aut orans, aut legens, aut meditans, aut aliquid religiosum praestans, in secessu sub aliqua ficu et extra conspectum hominum". But evidently Nathanael understood that Jesus had not only seen him when he thought he was unobserved, but had penetrated his thought in retirement, and understood and sympathised with his prayer under the fig tree, for the impression made upon him by this knowledge of Jesus is profound.—Ver. 50. Ραββί, he exclaims, σὺ ὦ ὄνος τοῦ θεοῦ, σὺ βασιλεὺς σὺ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ. Nathanael had been praying for the manifestation of the Messiah: now he exclaims θ' ηοι art He. That Nathanael used both expressions, Son of God, and King of Israel, we may well believe, for he found both in the second Psalm. And it is probable that he used both as identifying Jesus with the Messiah (see chap. xi. 27, xii. 13-15). It is not likely that he would pass from a higher designation to a lower; more probable that by the second title he means more closely to define the former. Thou art the Son of God, fulfilling the ideal of sonship and actually realising all that prophecy has uttered regarding the Son of God. Thou art the ideal, long-expected King of Israel, in whom God's reign and kingdom are realised on earth. "The words are an echo of the testimony of the Baptist. Nothing can be more natural than to suppose that the language of John had created strange questionings in the hearts of some whom it had reached, and that it was with such thoughts Nathanael was busied when the Lord 'saw' him. If this were so, the confession of Nathanael may be an answer to his own doubts" (Westcott).—Ver. 51. ἀπεκρίθη ... ἐδειν. In accordance with the habit of this evangelist, who calls attention to the moving cause of faith in this or that individual, the source of Nathanael's faith is indicated with some surprise that it should have proved sufficient: and with the announcement that his nascent
faith will find more to feed upon: μείζων τούτων δῆπ—Ver. 52. These things are described in the words δύοθεν... ἀνθρώπων, introduced by the emphatic ἄμην, ἂμην λέγην ὁμιν, used in this double form twenty-five times in this Gospel (always single in Synop.,) and well rendered "verily, verily". Christ as the Faithful and True Witness is Himself called the Amen in Rev. iii. 14. The words αὐτοὶ ἔρται are omitted by recent editors. The announcement describes the result of the incarnation of Christ as a bringing together of heaven and earth, a true mediation between God and man, an opening of what is most divine for the satisfaction of human need. It is made in terms of Jacob's dream (Gen. xxviii. 10 ff.). In his dream Jacob saw a ladder fixed on earth with its top in heaven, οἱ ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ ἄνβαινον καὶ κατβαίνοντες αὐτῷ. What Jacob had dreamt was in Christ realised. The Son of Man, the Messiah or actual representative of God on earth, brings God to man and makes earth a Bethel, and the gate of heaven. What Nathanael under his fig tree had been longing for and unconsciously preparing, an open communication with heaven, a ladder reaching from the deepest abyss of an earth submerged in sin to the highest heaven of purity, Jesus tells him is actually achieved in His person. The Son of Man is the designation by which Jesus commonly indicates that He is the Messiah, while at the same time He suggests that His kingdom is not founded by earthly power or force, but by what is especially human, sympathy, reason, self-sacrifice.

CHAPTER II.—Vv. 1-11. The marriage at Cana. The first manifestation of Christ's glory to His disciples.—Ver. 1. As usual John specifies time and place and circumstance. The time was τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ. The Greeks reckoned στίχοι, ἄφρον, τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ. So Lk. xiii. 32, ἰδώσεις εὐτελεῖ σήμερον καὶ αὔριον, καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ τελειώματι. The third day' was therefore what we call "the day after to-morrow". From what point is this third day calculated? From l. 41 or l. 44? Probably the latter. Naturally one refers this exact specification of time to the circumstance that the writer was present. The place was ἐν Κανέ τῆς Γαλαής, "of Galilee" to distinguish it from another Cana, as in all countries the same name is borne by more than one place (Newcastle; Tarbet; Cleveland, Ohio, and Cleveland, N.Y.; Freiburg). This other Cana, however, was not the Cana of Josh. xix. 28 in the tribe of Asher (Weiss, Holtzmann); but more probably Cana in Judaea (cf. Henderson's Palestine, p. 152; Josephus, Antiq., xiii., 13, 1.; and Lightfoot's Disq. Chorog. Τοποτ. praemissae). Opinion is now in favour of identifying "Cana" with Kebr Kâna, five miles north-east of Nazareth on the road to the Sea of Galilee. Robinson (Researches, iii., 108 and ii., 346) identified it with Khurbet Kâna, three hours north of Nazareth, because ruins there were pointed out to him as bearing the name Kâna el Jelil. Cana of Galilee. Dr. Zeller, however, who resided at Nazareth, declares that Khurbet Kâna is not known to the natives as Kâna el Jelil. Major Conder (Test Work, i., 153), although not decided in favour of its identification, still maintains that the alteration in the form of the name can be accounted for, and that its position is in its favour (Henderson's Palestine, 151-3).—γάμος ἤγγενετο, a marriage took place. Jewish marriage customs are fully described in Trumbull's Studies in Oriental Social Life... καὶ ἡ μήτηρ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἔκει. This is noticed to account for the invitation given to Jesus and His disciples. Joseph is not mentioned, probably because already dead. Certainly he was dead before the crucifixion.—Ver. 2. Κσκηθήθη δὲ καὶ ἡ Ἰησοῦς καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν
And both Jesus was invited and His disciples to the marriage. To translate ἕλθεν as a pluperfect "had been invited" is grammatically possible, but it is impossible that the disciples should have been previously invited, because their existence as disciples was not known. They were invited when they appeared. The collective title of μαθηται αὐτοῦ is anticipatory as yet it could not be in use. The singular verb (καλέθη) with a plural nominative is too common to justify Holtzmann's inference that it indicates, what of course was the fact, that the disciples were asked only in consequence of Jesus being asked. Cf. Lk. ii. 33. In this instance Jesus "came unto His own" and His own received Him, at any rate as a friend. Ver. 3. Through this unexpected addition to the number of guests the wine began to fail, ὑπερχρεωτος οἶνον. ὄστερω, from ὄστερον, signifies "to be late," and hence "to come short of," "to lack," and also "to be awanting." Cf. Mt. xix. 20, ἦν ὅστερα; and Mk. x. 21, ἐν σοὶ ὄστερα. Here the meaning is "the wine having failed," "given out." Consequently λέγει ἡ μητέρ τοῦ ἵππου πρὸς αὐτὸν, ὁ οἶνος ἐστάλη. In the Judgment of Gideon he ordered them to leave "velum discedas, ut ceteri item discendant, antequam penuria pateat." Calvin suggests " fieri potest, ut [mater] tale remedium [miraculum] non expectans eum adnuminerit, ut pia aliqua exhortatione convivis taedium eximereat, ac simul levaret pudorem sponsae." Lampe says: "Obscurum est." Lüke thinks Jesus had given proof of His miracle-working previously. The Greek commentators and Godet suppose that when she saw Him recognised as Messiah the time for extraordinary manifestation of power had arrived. The words show that she was on terms of intimacy with the family of the bridegroom, that she knew of the failure of the wine and wished to relieve the embarrassment. She naturally turns to her oldest son, who had always in past emergencies proved helpful in counsel and practical aid. But from the words of Jesus in reply, "Mine hour is not yet come," it certainly would seem as if she had suggested that He should use Messianic powers for the relief of the wedding guests. Ver. 4. His complete reply is, τί ἐμοί καὶ σοί, γυναῖ; οὐσίων ἐκείνοι τῇ δρα μου. Then what a term of respect, not equivalent to our "woman!" See chap. xix. 26, xx. 13, Lk. xiii. 12. In the Greek tragedians it is constantly used in addressing queens and persons of distinction. Augustus addresses Cleopatra as γυναι (Dio, quoted by Wetstein). Calvin goes too far when he says that this term of address was used to correct the superstitious adoration of the Virgin which was to arise. But while there is neither harshness nor disrespect, there is distance in the expression. Wetstein hits the point when he says: "Non poterat dicere: quid mihi tecum est, mater?"—τί ἐμοί καὶ σοί represents the Hebrew יְהֹוָה יְשֹׁרְדָה (Judges xi. 12), and means: What have we in common? Trench gives the sense: "Let me alone; what is there common to thee and me; we stand in this matter on altogether different grounds." Or, as Holtzmann gives it, Our points of view and interests are wholly diverse; why do you mingle them?—οὐσίων ἐκείνοι τῇ δρα μου, not as Bengel, "discendendi hora," but, mine hour for bringing relief. This implies that He too had observed the failure of the wine and was waiting a fitting opportunity to interfere. That the same formula is more than once used by Jesus of His death (see chap. vii. 36, viii. 20) merely indicates that it could be used of any critical time. Euthymius says it here means "the hour of miracle working." Wetstein quotes from R. Sira "non quavis hora fit miraculum." Especially true is this of the first miracle of the Messiah, which would commit Him to a life of publicity ending in an ignominious death. That Mary found hope in the οὐσίων is obvious from ver. 5. She did not find His reply wholly refusal.
She therefore says to the servants (ver. 5), δὲ τὴν λέγει δρόμων ποιήσατε. The ἀδελφον, or servants waiting at table, might not otherwise have obeyed an unimportant guest. His orders might perhaps be of an unusual kind.—Ver. 6. There were there, hard by or in the feast-room, there were ὀδηγίας λίθων ἡς ἀλήθειαν, "six stone water jars standing". Stone was believed to preserve the purity and coolness of the water. [According to Plutarch, Tih. Gracchus, these jars were sometimes used for drawing lots, wooden tablets being put in the jars and shaken.] Similar stone jars are still used in Cana and elsewhere. They were ἀληθὲς, i.e.: "in purely classical Greek καὶ in the recognised passive perfect of ἔθμα" (Holden, Plutarch’s Themist., p. 121).—κατὰ τὸν καθάρισμα τῶν ἱουδαλων. For the washing of hands and vessels. Cf. Mk. vii.

"Abluenti quidem ritum habebant ex Lege Dei, sed ut mundus semper nimius est in rebus externis, Judaei praescriptâ a Deo simplicitate non contenti continuis asperonibus ludebant: atque ut ambiviens est superstitos, non dubium est quin hoc etiam pompae serviret, quemadmodum hodie in Papatu videmus, quæscunque ad Dei cultum pertinent dicuntur, sed herem ostentationem esse composita," Calvin. The number and size are given that the dimensions of the miracle may appear. There were six ἰχθύσων ἧς ἀληθηγάς δόθη η τρία, "holding two or three firkins each".—δὲ δὲ δὲ δὲ δὲ ἐποίησαν τὰς ἀληθέιας τῶν ἱουδαλων. According the Vulgate translates "capientes singulæs metretas binae". The Attic ἀληθῆς held about nine gallons, so that averaging the jars at twenty gallons the six would together contain 120 gallons. The English translation has firkin, that is, vierkin, the fourth of a barrel, a barrel being thirty imperial gallons. It is difficult to assign any reason for giving the number and capacity of these jars, except that the writer wished to convey the idea that their entire contents were changed into wine. This prodigality would bring the miracle into closer resemblance to the gifts of nature. Also it would furnish proof, after the marriage was over, that the transformation had been actual. The wedding guests had not dreamt it. There was the wine. It was no mesmeric trick. Holtzmann, in a superior manner, smiles at the prosaic interpreters who strive to reduce the statement to matter of fact.—Ver. 7. The first order Jesus gives to the diakonos is one they may unhesitatingly obey.—γεμίσατε τὰς ὀδηγίας ἡς ἀλήθειαν, "Fill the water jars with water," the water being specified in view of what was to follow.—καὶ ἐγέμισαν ἄλλας ἄλλας ἄλλας ἄλλας, "and they filled them up to the brim". The corresponding expression καὶ τὰς ἐρμοὺς ἐγεμίσαν, as found in Mt. xxvii. 51. τὰς ἐρμοὺς and τὰς ἐρμοὺς are also found in N.T. to indicate more particularly the terminus ad quem. In this usage ἄλλας is not perceptibly different from a preposition. "Up to the brim" is specified not so much to indicate the abundant supply as to suggest that no room was left for anything to the water. The servants did all their part thoroughly, and left no apparent room for Jesus to work. Thus they became instrumental to the working of a miracle. —Ver. 8. The second order might stagger them more. Ἀπόκηρεν νῦν καὶ φέρετε τῷ ἄρχετερολόγῳ. The ἄρχετερολόγος was originally the person who had charge of the triclinium or triple couch set round a dining table: "praefectus cui instruendi ornandique triclinii cura incumbit"; a butler or head waiter whose duty it was to arrange the table and taste the food and wine. Petron. Arb. 22, "Jam et Tricliniarches exceperunt lucernis occidentibus oleum infuderat". But apparently the person indicated in this verse is rather the συμποσιάρχης or συμποσιάρχης, the chairman elected by the company from among the guests, sometimes by lot. Cf. Horace’s "Arbiter bibendi," Od., ii., 7. The requirements in such an official are described in Ecl. xxxii. 1; Plato, Laws, p. 640; see also Reid’s edition of Cicero, De Senect., p. 131. In general he regulated the course of the feast and the conduct of the guests. [Holtzmann and Weiss both retain the proper meaning of
Westcott suggests that the ἀντλήσατα νῦν may refer to drawing from the well, and that "the change in the water was determined by its destination for use at the feast". That which remained water when kept for a ceremonial use became wine when borne in faith to minister to the needs, even to the superfluous requirements of life," a suggestive interpretation, but it evacuates of all significance the clause "they filled them up to the brim". The servants obeyed, possibly encouraged by seeing that they had poured in as water flowed out as wine; although if the words in the end of the ninth verse are to be taken strictly, it was still water when drawn from the water jars. But some refer the οὐ γνωρίζειν to drawing from the well. It is, however, more natural to refer it to the ἀντλήσατα νῦν of the eighth verse. Besides, drawing water from the well would be the business rather of the women than of the διάκονοι.—Ver. 9. The architriklinos, then, when he had tasted the water which had now become wine, and did not know whence it had been procured, and was therefore impartially judging it merely as wine among wines, φωνεῖ τῶν νυμφῶν, "calls the bridegroom," or simply "addresses the bridegroom," and says to him πώς ἀρθρώσως ... The usage referred to by the διώκσις, the mixture of all the heeltaps with which the harder heads dosed the drunken at the end of a debauch.—δεῖν καθαρθῆσθαι, "when men have drunk freely," R.V. The Vulgate more accurately has "cum inebrati fuerint." And if the word does not definitely mean "when men are intoxicated," it at least must indicate a condition in which they are unfit to discriminate between good wine and bad. The company then present was not in that condition, because they were able to appreciate the good wine; but the words of the architriklinos unquestionably imply that a good deal had already been drunk. The ἐστιν ἔρτε involves this. The significance of the remark consists in the certificate thus given to the quality of the wine. Bengel felicitously says: "Ignorantia architriclini comprobavit bonitatem vini; scientia ministrorum veritatem miraculi." Judging it by its natural taste and comparing it with the wine supplied by the host, the architriklinos pronounces this fresh supply better. What Christ introduces into the world will stand comparison with what is already in it. Christian grace must manifest itself not in sanctimonious and unpractical displays, but must stand comparison with the rough natural virtues, the courage, generosity, and force which are called for in the practical affairs of life.—Ver. 11. No answer of the bridegroom is recorded, nor any detail of the impression made, but John notes the incident as "the beginning of signs".—ἀρχαῖας εὐφορίας ἄρχουν, deleting the article with Tisch. and W.H., and rendering "This as a beginning of signs did Jesus," from which it can scarcely be gathered that no insight mentioned in the first chapter was considered by John to be supernatural. It is characteristic of this Gospel that the miracles are viewed as signs, or object lessons. The feeding of the five thousand presents Jesus as the bread of God; the strengthening of the impotent man exhibits Him as the giver of spiritual life; and so forth. So that when John here says that by this sign John 4:14 hearken to us, ἐφανέρωσε τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, we are prompted to ask what particular aspect of His glory was manifested here. What was there in it to elicit the faith and reverence of the disciples? (1) He appears as King in physical nature. He can use it for the furtherance of His purposes and man's good. He is, as declared in the Prologue, that One in whom is life. (2) A hint is given of the ends for which this creative power is to be used. It is, that human joy may be full. These disciples of the Baptist perceive a new kind of power in their new Master, whose goodness irradiates the natural joys and domestic incidents of human life. (3) When John recorded this miracle he saw how fitly it stood as the first, rehearsing as it did the entire...
work of Christ, who came that human happiness might not untimely close in shame. Wine had become the symbol of that blood which brought reconciliation and renewal. Seeing this sign and the glory manifested in it, Testimony (i. 36) directs those who were ready to welcome Christ to Him. Personal intercourse converts followers into disciples (ii. 2). A manifestation of power, as a sign of divine grace, converts discipleship into personal faith” (Westcott). “Credosursum amplius” (Bengel). The different grades, kinds, and types of faith alluded to in this Gospel are a study. Sanday remarks on the unlikelihood of a forger making such constant allusion to the disciples. That they believed would seem a truism. If they had not, they would not have been disciples. It would have been more to the point to tell us the effect on the guests, and a forger would hardly have failed to do so. But John writes from the disciples’ point of view. Not happy are the attempts to interpret this seeming miracle as a cleverly prepared wedding jest and gift (Paulus); or as a parable (Weisse), or as a hastened natural process (Augustine, Olahausen). Holtzmann finds here an artistic Lehredichtung, an allegory rich in suggestion. Water represents all that is mere symbol as contrasted with spirit and reality. The period of symbolism is epitomised by the water baptism of John: this was to find its realisation in Jesus. The jars which had served for the outward washings of Judaism were by Jesus filled with heart-strengthening wine. The O.T. gift of water from the rock is superseded by the gift of wine. Wine becomes the symbol of the spiritual life and joy of the new kingdom. With this central idea the details of the incident agree: the helplessness of the old economy, “they have no wine”; the mother of the Messiah is the O.T. community; and so forth. The historical truth consists simply in the joyful character ascribed to the beginning of Christ’s ministry. (1) Against all these attempts it is the obvious intention of John to relate a miracle, a surprising and extraordinary manifestation of power. (2) Where allegory exists he directs attention to it; as in this chapter, ver. 21; also in chapters x., xv., etc. (3) That the incident can be allegorised is no proof that it is only allegory and not history. All incidents and histories may be allegorised. The life and death of Caesar have been interpreted as a sun myth. Few, if any, incidents in the life of Jesus give us an equal impression of the width of His nature and its imperturbable serenity. He was at this juncture fresh from the most disturbing personal conflict, His work awaited Him, a work full of intense strife, hazard, and pain; yet in a mind occupied with these things the marriage joy of a country couple finds a fit place.

Ver. 12. From Nazareth to Capernaum and thence to Jerusalem. At ver. 12, as Calvin says, “transit Evangelista ad novam historiam”. This new section runs to the end of the fourth chapter, and gives an account of the first great series of public manifestations on the part of Christ (1) in Jerusalem, (2) in Judea, (3) in Samaria, (4) in Galilee. These are introduced by the note of time, metà toúto, commonly used by John when he wishes merely to denote sequence without definitely marking the length of the interval. The interval in the present case was probably long enough at any rate to allow of the Nazareth family returning home, although this is not in the text. The motive for a fresh movement was probably the desire of the fishermen to return home. Accordingly Kaqorh eli Kapharwv, down from the higher lands about Nazareth to the lake side, 680 feet below sea level. His destination was Kapharwv, the site of which is probably to be found at Khan Minye (Minia), at the north end of the plain of Gennesareth, where the great road to Damascus leaves the lake coast and strikes north. [The most valuable comparison of the two competing sites,
Tell Hum and Khan Minyeh, will be found in the Rob Roy on the Jordan. Mr. Macgregor spent several days sounding along the shore, measuring distances, comparing notes, and making careful examination, and concluded in favour of Khan Minyeh. Tell Hum was thought to represent Kefr Nahum (Nahumston); which, when it ceased to be a town and became a heap of ruins, might have been called Tell Nahum, and hence Tell Hum. Authoritative opinion is, however, decidedly in favour of Khan Minyeh.] With Jesus there went to Capernaum ἢ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ ἄδελφοι αὐτοῦ καὶ ἄδελφοι αὐτοῦ. From the manner in which His brothers are here mentioned along with His mother the natural inference is that they were of the same father and probably of the same mother. At Capernaum no long stay was made; the reason being given in ver. 13, ἢγγεία ἢν τὸ πάσχα τῶν Ἰουδαίων, the Passover was approaching, here called "of the Jews," either for the sake of Gentile readers or because the Christian Easter was sometimes called πάσχα, and John wished to distinguish it.—καὶ ἄνθρωποι, the disciples also went, as appears from ver. 17. "Went_UP" because Jerusalem was the capital, and because of its height (2500 feet) above sea level. On these movements Prof. Sanday (Fourth Gospel, p. 53) makes the remark: "If it is all an artificial composition with a dogmatic object, why should the author carry his readers thus to Capernaum—for nothing? The apparent aimlessness of this statement seems to show that it came directly from a fresh and vivid recollection and not from any floating tradition."—Ver. 14. On reaching Jerusalem Jesus as a devout Jew visited the Temple καὶ εὗρεν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, that is, in the outer court of the Temple, the court of the Gentiles,—τοὺς πολυτύτας βασάνη καὶ ἄνθρωποι καὶ περιπτέρας, cattle and sheep and doves, the sacrificial animals. It was of course a great convenience to the worshippers to be able to procure on the spot all requisites for sacrifice. Some of them might not know what sacrifice was required for their particular offence, and though the priest at their own home might inform them, still the officiating examiner in the Temple might reject the animal they brought as unfit; and probably would, if it was his interest to have the worshippers buying on the spot. That enormous overcharges were sometimes made is shown by Edersheim, who relates that on one occasion Simeon, the grandson of Hillel, interfered and brought down the price of a pair of doves from a gold denar, 15s. 3d., to half a silver denar, or 4d. This Temple tyranny and monopoly and these exorbitant charges naturally tended to make the Temple worship hateful to the people; and besides, the old charm of sacrifice, the free offering by a penitent of what he knew and cherished, the animal that he valued because he had watched it from birth, and had tested its value in the farm work—all this was abolished by this "convenient" abuse. That the abuse was habitual is shown by John Lightfoot, who quotes: "Veniens quadam die Bava Ben Buta in atrium, vacuum pecoribus illud repetit," as an extraordinary thing. It was not the presence of oxen and sheep which was offensive, for such animals must pass into the Temple with their usual accompaniments. But it was an aggravation to have these standing all day in the Temple, and to have the haggling and chaffering of a cattle market mingling with the sounds of prayer. But especially was it offensive to make the Temple service a hardship and an offence to the people of God. Not only were there those who provided sacrificial animals but also τοὺς κεραμείας, money changers seated, at their tables, for a regular day's business—not a mere accidental or occasional furnishing with change of some poor man who had hitherto not been able to procure it. —κέρμα is a small coin, from κέρμα, to cut short.—Τὰ κέρματα used collectively in the next verse would be in Attic τὰ κέρματα. —κεραμεύτης is one who gives small change, a money changer (such as may be seen sitting on the open street at a table in Naples or elsewhere). In the
fifteenth verse they are called καλλυμβωταλ, from καλλυμβος, a small coin, this again from καλλυμβο, docked, snipped short. Maimonides, quoted by Lücke, says the καλλυμβος was the small coin given to the money changer for exchanging a shekel into two half-shekels. The receiver of the change “dat ipsi aliquid superabundans,” gives the changer something over and above, and this aliquid superabundans vocatur collybus. In fact the word was transliterated, and in the Hebrew characters was read “kolbon”. This kolbon was about 2d., which was pretty high for providing the sacred half-shekel, which could alone be received into the Temple treasury and which every Jew had to pay. It was not only on the exchange of foreign money brought up to Palestine by Jews of the dispersion these money changers must have made a good percentage; but especially by exchanging the ordinary currency of Galilee and Judaea into the sacred half-shekel, which was the poll-tax or Temple tribute exacted from every Jew. This tax was either paid a week or two before Passover in the provinces or at the Passover in the Temple itself. To Jesus the usage seemed an intolerable abuse. καὶ τοῦτος φραγίλλων ἐκ σχοινίων. φραγίλλων is the Latin flagellum. Many commentators represent the matter as if Jesus made a whip of the litter; but John does not say ἐκ σχοινίων, “of rushes,” but ἐκ σχοινίων, of ropes made of rushes. In the account of Paul’s shipwreck (Acts xxvii. 32) σχοινία are the ropes which held the boat to the ship; so that it is impossible on this ground to say with Dr. Whitelaw that “the whip could only have been designed as a symbol of His authority”. It is quite probable it was not used; as Bengel says: “neque dicitur hominibus ictum inflixiae; terrorem perfectum.”—πάντας ἰεβαλέν. Holtzmann and Weiss consider that the following clause is epegegetic of the πάντας, as, grammatically, it is; and that πάντας therefore refers to the sheep and oxen, not to the men. In the Synoptical Gospels πάντας ἰεβαλέν certainly refers to the men, and as the masculine is here retained it is difficult to refer it to the πρόβατα. After driving out the oxen and their owners, ἵππα τὰ κέρα καὶ τὰ τραχία ἀντιτρέφον, or as W. H. read ἀντιτρέψειν.—τραχία were specifically “bankers’ tables,” hence τραχίς, bankers, so that we might translate “counters”. These He overturned, and poured the coin on the ground. We cannot evacuate of forcible meaning these plain terms. It was a scene of violence: the traders trying to protect their property, cattle rushing hither and thither, men shouting and cursing, the money changers trying to hold their tables as Jesus went from one to another upsetting them. It was indeed so violent a scene that the disciples felt somewhat scandalised until they remembered, then and there, not afterwards, that it was written: ὁ ζηλος τοῦ οἶκου σου καταφάγεται μα, words which are found in the sixty-ninth Psalm, the aorist of the LXX being changed into the future. In ordinary Greek ἄσθια has for its future ἄφωμαι, but in Hellenistic Greek it has φάγωμαι for its future. See Gen. iii. 3. Lk. xvi. 8. The disciples saw in their Master’s act a consuming zeal for God’s house. It was this zeal which always governed Christ. He could not stand by and wash His hands of other men’s sins. It was this which brought Him to this world and to the cross. He had to interfere. It might have been expected that the words of Malachi would rather have been suggested to them, “The Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to His temple; but who may abide the day of His coming? For He shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver”. Their interpretation of His act was suggested by His words: μὴ τοιεῖτε τοῦ οἶκου τοῦ πατρός μου οἶκος ἐμοίρων. At His first visit to the Temple He had called it His Father’s house. There was an appropriation from which others are excluded. He does not say “your Father’s house” nor “our Father’s,” but “my Father’s”. In this word and in His action His Messiahship was implied, but directly the act and even the word were no more than a reforming prophet might have felt to be suitable. Weiss (Life of Jesus, ii. 6) says: “He felt Himself to be the Son of Him who in a unique way had consecrated this place for His temple, and He exercised the authority of a Son against the turmoil which defiled His Father’s house. Those
who looked deeper must ultimately have seen that the Messiah alone had a right to feel Himself in this sense the Chosen of Jehovah. As yet, however, there were no such observers. The followers by whom He was already surrounded did not require to deduce His Messiahship from this: they knew He was the Messiah." Make not my Father's house a den of thieves;" which seems to be a combination of Is. lvi. 7, "Mine house shall be called a house of prayer for all people," and Jer. xvii. 11, "Is this house which is called by my name become a den of robbers in your eyes?" In the oikos εγκρατησων there may be a reminiscence of Zech. xiv. 21.

At ver. 18 the cleft begins to open between faith and unbelief. In the act in which the disciples had seen the fulfillment of a Messianic Psalm, the Jews see only an unauthorized interference and assumption of authority. Characteristically they ask for a sign.—ολ' ουδαίως, as frequent in John, means "the Jewish authorities"; and ἀπεκρίθησαν is used as elsewhere of a reply to what has been suggested or affirmed not by word but by deed.—οἱ σώματος διανύσας ἡμῖν, διὰ τὰ ἔργα ποιεῖν δὲν is used similarly in ix. 17 = εἰς ἔκτοὺς διήτης. The blindness of the Jews is enough to put external evidence for ever out of repute. They never will see the sign in the thing itself. The fact that Jesus by one blow accomplished a much needed reform of an abuse over which devout men must often have sighed and which perhaps ingenuous Levites had striven to keep within limits, the fact that this unknown youth had done what none of the constituted authorities had been able to do, was surely itself the greatest σώματος. Might they not rather have said: Here is one who treats things radically, who does not leave grievances to mend themselves but effectively puts His hand to the work? But this blindness is characteristic. They never see that Jesus Himself is the great sign, but are always craving for some extraneous testimony. This Gospel throughout is an exhibition of the comparative value of external and internal evidence. To their request Jesus could not answer, "I am the Messiah." He wished that to be the people's discovery from their knowledge of Him. He therefore answers (ver. 19), Αῦχατε τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον, saying that it was meant to be enigmatical. Jesus spoke in parables when He wished to be understood by the spiritual and to baffle the hostile. Those who cross-question Him and treat Him as a subject to be investigated find no satisfaction. John tells us (ver. 21) that here He spoke of the "temple of His body." Bengel suggests that He may have indicated this, "adhibito nutu gestu"; others suggest that He may have given such an emphasis to τοῦτον as to suggest what He intended; but this is excluded by ver. 22, which informs us that it was only after the resurrection that the disciples themselves understood what was meant. Those who heard considered it an idle challenge which He knew could not be put to the proof. He knew they would not destroy their unfinished Temple. His words then had but one meaning for Himself; another for those who heard. For Himself they meant: 'Destroy this body of mine in which dwells the Father and I will raise it in three days'. He said this, knowing they would not now understand Him, but that this would be the great sign of His authority. Paul refers the resurrection of Christ to the Father or to the Spirit: John here, as in x. 17, 18, refers it directly to Christ Himself.

Holtzmann suggests, as had previously been suggested by others, that "to do anything in three days" merely meant to do it quickly. Reference is made to Hos. vi. 2, Mt. xiii. 40. This may be. Holtzmann further maintains that such an announcement as Jesus is here represented as making was impossible at so early a period of the ministry, that it must have been uttered on some other occasion and have been inserted here to suit John's purpose. The origin of the expression he finds in the Pauline-Alexandrian conception of the body as the temple of God. If this was believed
of ordinary men much more must that body be the temple in which dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily (Col. ii. 9). That the saying itself was historical is put beyond doubt by its quotation at the trial of Jesus, Mk. xiv. 58; cf. xv. 29. There were those who had heard Him say that He would destroy the Temple; which gives this saying with just the kind of misunderstanding and perversion one would expect. But if the saying itself is historical, can Jesus have meant anything else by it than John tells us He meant? That He considered His body the Temple of God goes without saying. It is indeed extremely unlikely that Jesus should at the very beginning of His ministry have spoken of His death and resurrection openly. Hence even Weiss seems to think that the words meant: Destroy this Temple, as you are doing by allowing such abuses in it, prohibit me from those reforms on the Temple which can alone save it, and eventually this Temple must be completely destroyed, its purpose gone, and its services extinct. But I will in its place raise a spiritual temple, the living Church. But if already Jesus had thought out the Messianic career, then He already was sure both that He would die and that He would rise again. Being in perfect fellowship with the living God He knew that He must be hated of men, and He knew that He could never fall from that fellowship but must conquer death. At no time then after His baptism and temptation could it be impossible to Him to speak covertly as here of His death and resurrection. On this point see Schwartzkopff, Die Weissagungen Christi.

Ver. 20. The Jews naturally saw no reference to His own body or to its resurrection, and replied to the letter of His words, ἐνεπράκτωσα... The Temple was begun to be rebuilt in the eighteenth year of Herod's reign, that is the autumn of 734-735. In Jewish reckoning the beginning of a year was reckoned one year. Thus forty-six years might bring us to the autumn of 779 and the Passover of 780, I.e., 27 A.D. would be regarded as forty-six years from the rebuilding; and this is Edersehlm's calculation. But several accurate chronologists think the following year is meant. The Synoptical Gospels insert a similar incident at the close of Christ's ministry, and there alone. Harmonists accordingly understand that the Temple was twice cleansed by Him. "Bis ergo Christus templum... purgavit" (Calvin). It is easy to find reasons for such action either at the beginning or at the close of the ministry. On the whole it seems more appropriate at the beginning. The Messiah might be expected to manifest Himself at the Temple.

The next paragraph extends from ii. 23 to iii. 21, and contains (1) a brief description of the general result of Christ's manifestation in Jerusalem (ii. 23-25), and (2) a longer description of an instance of the kind of faith and inquiry which were produced by this manifestation and of the manner in which Christ met it.—Ver. 23. Time, place, and circumstance are again given, ὅπως ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἦν ἐν τῷ ἱεροσόλυμω στὸ τέμενος ἐν τῷ ἔρχοντα... The last clause is added with a reference to ver. 13. Then the feast was near, now it had arrived. We are to hear what happened while Jesus resided in Jerusalem during the feast...οἱ κωπότως ενεπεστάλαν... The miracle they saw... ἔσωροντος αὐτοῦ τὰ σημεῖα καὶ ἔτολε, seeing day by day the signs He was doing, and of which John relates none. This faith, resting on miracles, is in this Gospel never commended as the highest kind of faith,
although it is by no means despised. It is what Luther calls "milk faith" and may grow into something more trustworthy. Accordingly, although Jesus had at once committed Himself to the men who were attracted without miracle by His personality and the testimony of the Baptist, He knew all men, and He knew 

from among them it was not the name Jesus, as Holtzmann remarks, shows the article inserted because reference is made to the individual with whom Jesus had on each occasion to do. This seems quite unnecessary. Αὐτός is here, as in A.V., "man," the ordinary generic use of the article. The reason for this again is given in the closing words, "For He Himself knew what was in man,

knew human nature, the motives, governing ideas, and ways of man. This knowledge was not supernatural. Westcott has an important note on this point, in which he points out that John describes the knowledge of Jesus "both as relative, acquired (γνώσις) and absolute, possessed (εἰδίκευσις). Each constitutes a higher degree of the kind of knowledge found among men. Reynolds says: "There are many other indications of this thought mystery, which the evangelists appear to regard as proofs of divine power; so that I think the real significance of the passage is an ascrip-

tion to Jesus of Divine power. The supernatural in mind, the superhuman mental processes of Jesus, are part of the proof we have that though He was man He created the irresistible impression that He was more than man."

CHAPTER III. Vv. 1-21. A specimen is given of the kind of beliefs produced in the Jews of Jerusalem and of the manner in which Jesus dealt with it. — Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ἄνθρωπος, the Syriac adds "there," i.e., at Jerusalem. άνθρωπος is simply equivalent to τόν, and does not point back to the άνθρωπος of the preceding verse. He is described as ὁ θεος οὐρανών, that we may the better understand what follows. He belonged to that party which with all its bigotry contained a salt of true patriotism and could rear such cultured and high-toned men as Gamaliel and Paul. It is a mistake to suppose that all who belong to a mischievous party in a Church are themselves mischievous: it is also a mistake to ascribe without inquiry the goodness of individuals to the influence of their party. — Νικόδημος ἤτρων αὐτής. Many Jews had now Greek names. Lightfoot quotes from the Talmud passages which show that a certain Bonai surnamed Nicodemus was a disciple of Jesus, and that he lived through the destruction of Jerusalem, but lost in it all his wealth. He is, however, very doubtful whether this is the Nicodemus of this passage. He is further described as ἄρχων τῶν ἱερείων, a member of the Sanhedrin. See vii. 50, where he appears in the Sanhedrin. Lk. xiv. 1 speaks of one τῶν ἄρχων τῶν Φαρισαίων. See also Lk. xviii. 18, viii. 41; Mt. ix. 18.—Ver. 2. οὔτως ἦλθε πρῶτος αὐτός. The pronoun instead of the name Jesus, as Holtzmann remarks, shows the close connection with the closing verses of the last chapter. Nicodemus came to the fountain head, dissatisfied with the way in which his colleagues were dealing with Jesus, and
resolved to judge for himself. Nothing could be more hopeful than such a state of mind. When a man says, I will see for myself what Jesus is; not influenced by what other men say; before I sleep I will settle this matter, the result is fairly certain to be good. See chap. vii. 50, xix. 39. He came wreed, certainly with the purpose of secrecy, and yet for a man in his position to come at all was much. No timidity is shown in vii. 50. In xix. 39 John still identifies him as "he that came to Jesus by night," but adds "at the first" in contrast to the courage he afterwards showed. Similarly, as Grotius tells us, Euclid of Megara visited Socrates by night when Athens was in session, the Megarians. Modestly and as if not presuming to speak as an individual but as representing a party however small (ii. 32), he says, "Parnell oivamen dti atv theo elenveis didesvoulos, "Rabbi, we know that Thou art come from God as a teacher." We need not see in the words anything either patronising or flattering, but merely the natural first utterance of a man wishing to show the state of his mind. He was convinced that Jesus was a divinely commissioned teacher. He came to hear what He had to teach. His teaching, in the judgment of Nicodemus, was divinely authenticated by the miracles; but to Nicodemus at any rate the teaching was that for which the miracles existed. They were σημεία, and though not recorded, they must have been of a kind to strike a thoughtful mind. The emphatic pronoun, as if other miracles might not have been so convincing. At the same time the reply of Jesus shows that behind this cautious designation of "teacher" there lay in the mind of Nicodemus a suspicion that this might be the Messiah. Nicodemus may have taken to heart the Baptist's proclamation. Grotius supposes the conversation is abridged, and that Nicodemus had intimated that he wished to learn something about the kingdom which formed the subject of our Lord's teaching. "Responsum tacite innitit, quod adjectum a Nicodemo fuerat, nemo, velle se scire, quandoquidem Jesus Regni coelestis inter docendum mentionem saepe faceret, quae ratio esset co perveniendi." But with the introduction to this incident (ii. 23-25) in our mind, it seems gratuitous to suppose that part of the conversation is here omitted. Jesus speaks to the intention and mental attitude of His interlocutor rather than to his words. He saw that Nicodemus was conceiving it as a possible thing that these miracles might be the signs of the kingdom; and in this visit of Nicodemus He sees what may be construed into an overture from the Pharisaic party. And so He cuts Nicodemus remorselessly short. As when the Pharisees (Lk. xvii. 20) demand of Him when the Kingdom of God should come, He replied: The Kingdom of God cometh not with observation, not with signs which the natural eye can see. By its coming it comes within you; so here in strikingly similar language He says, έσται το τιν εν τη δαιμονει του θεου. This allusion to the kingdom, which is not a favourite idea of John's, is one of the incidental marks of his historical trustworthy. —Δωματίον is sometimes local = εν εικονίαν from above; sometimes temporal = έν ἀρχής, de novo. The former meaning is advocated here by Baur, Lücke, Meyer, and others. But the use of παλαιογραφία and the difficulty stated by Nicodemus in ver. 4 rather indicate that the Syriac and Vulgate [nisi quis renatus fuerit], Augustine, Calvin, and among many others Weiss are right in adopting the temporal meaning and rendering with R.V. "new". [Wetstein, in proof of this meaning, quotes from Artemidorus, who tells of one & ευς ως; the emphatic pronoun, as if other miracles might not have been so convincing. At the same time the reply of Jesus shows that behind this cautious designation of "teacher" there lay in the mind of Nicodemus a suspicion that this might be the Messiah. Nicodemus may have taken to heart the Baptist's proclamation. Grotius supposes the conversation is abridged, and that Nicodemus had intimated that he wished to learn something about the kingdom which formed the subject of our Lord's teaching. "Responsum tacite innitit, quod adjectum a Nicodemo fuerat, nemo, velle se scire, quandoquidem Jesus Regni coelestis inter docendum mentionem saepe faceret, quae ratio esset co perveniendi." But
such expressions as ίδειν δύνατον (Lk. ii. 26, Heb. xi. 5), διαθεσθαι (Acts ii. 27), θύμαις ἰδανάται (1 Pet. iii. 10), understand that “participation” is meant. So Calvin, “videre regnum Dei idem valet ac ingredi in regnum Dei,” and Grotius, “participem fieri.” Confirmation of this view is at first sight given by the ἐσωτηρίων of ver. 5. But it is of “signs” Nicodemus has been speaking, of observing the kingdom coming; and Christ says: To see the kingdom you must be spiritual, born anew, for the signs are spiritual. In this language there should have been nothing to stumble Nicodemus. All Jerusalem was ringing with reports about Jesus’ preaching, the essence of which was “ye must be born again.” To be children of Abraham is nothing. There is nothing moral, nothing spiritual, nothing of the will, nothing related to the Kingdom of God in being children of Abraham. As regards your fleshly birth you are as passive as stones and as truly outside the kingdom. In fact John had communicated the whole nation, and expressly told them that they must submit to baptism, like Gentile proselytes, if they were to be prepared for the Messiah’s reign. The language may not mean a puzzled Nicodemus. Had our Lord said: “Every Gentile must be born again,” he would have understood. It is the idea that staggered him. His bewilderment he utters in the words:—Ver. 4. πῶς δύναις ἀνθρώπως γεννηθῆναι γῆρων ἢ; μὴ χρωσθῆναι μεν ἐπὶ ἔκτισθην, οὐ τενασάς καὶ εἰς τὸν βάπτισμον καὶ πνεύματος, οὐ δύναις ἐσωτηρίζεσθαι τίνα. To remove as far as possible the difficulty of Nicodemus as to the σώος of the second birth our Lord declares that the two great factors in it are “water” and “spirit.” Calvin thinks this is a σῶς ὁ δὲ σῶς, and that the two names cover one reality. “Spiritum et aquam pro eodem posuit.” “Aqua nihil aliud est quam interior Spiritus sancti purgatio et vegetatio.” And he defends this by a reference to the Baptist’s announcement that the Messiah would baptise with the spirit and fire. Grotius takes the same line, but cautiously adds: “Si quis tamen malit ista decernere, ut aqua significet mal lugum, spiritus vero impetum ad optimam quaeque agni, inveniet quo hanc sententiam siue.” Lk. (vii. 30) tells us that the Pharisees, to whom belonged Nicodemus, were not baptised of John; their reason being that to submit to the same rite as Gentiles and acknowledge the insufficiency of their Jewish birth was a humiliation they could not suffer. To receive the Spirit from the Messiah was no humiliation; on the contrary, it was a glorious privilege. But to go down into Jordan before a wondering crowd and own their need of cleansing and new birth was too much. Therefore to this Pharisee our Lord declares that an honest dying to the past is as needful as new life for the future. To be born of the Spirit involves a dying to the past, and therefore it is only the Spirit that is spoken of in the subsequent verses; but it is essential that our past be reckoned as new life in order to cleanse and forgive. These two factors, water and spirit, are not strictly co-ordinate. Water is not an actual spiritual agency in the second birth; it is only a symbol. But in every true second birth there is a negative as well as a positive side, a renunciation of the past as well as a new life created. The same idea is found in Titus iii. 3-5. “We were [of the flesh] but He saved us by the bath of regeneration and the renewal of the Holy Ghost.” The same combination is found in Ezek. xxxvi. 25-27. “Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness and from all your idols.
will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you." The water, then, is considered as that which cleanses from sin: the Spirit as the principle of the new life.—Ver. 6. The necessity of the new birth is further exhibited by a comparison of the first and second birth: τὸ γεγεννημένον ἐκ τῆς σαρκός, σάρξ ἄνωτερός καὶ τὸ γεγεννημένον ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος, πνεῦμα ἄνωτερός. The neuter is used because the speaker wishes to make His statement altogether general (Ver. 5), whatever is born. “The law is laid down in Aristotle (Eth. Maj., i., 10), “Every nature generates its own substance,” flesh, flesh; spirit, spirit.—Ver. 7. Therefore it was no cause for wonder that a new birth was required for entrance into the spiritual kingdom. The argument implies that natural birth produces only σάρξ, not spirit. By his natural birth man is an animal, with a nature fitting him to live in the material world in which he finds himself and with capacities for spiritual life in a spiritual world. These capacities may or may not be developed. If they are developed, the Spirit of God is the Agent, and the change wrought by their development may fitly be called a new birth, because it gives a man entrance into a new world and imparts new life to live in it (cf. the second birth of many insects).—Ver. 8. τὸ πνεῦμα διὸν ὑλᾶς πνεῖ. Two renderings of these words are possible: "The wind bloweth where it listeth," as in A.V.; "The Spirit breatheth where He will," as in margin of R.V. By the one rendering a comparison is instituted between the unseen but powerful operation of the Spirit in regeneration and the invisible but mighty power of the wind. You hear the voice of the wind but cannot see where it comes from nor where it goes to. So in the new birth the Spirit moves and works unseen. Similarly Socrates (Xen., Mem., iv. 3) says: The thunder as it comes and goes is not seen: the winds also are invisible though their effects are manifest; the soul of man is itself unseen, therefore despise not the unseen but honour God. In favour of the other rendering it may be urged that there is nothing to warn us that we are now to understand that by the word πνεῦμα "wind" is meant. It occurs about 370 times in the N.T., and never means "wind" except once in a quotation from the O.T. The Vulgate renders "Spiritus ubi vult spirat," and if we could not only say "expire," "inspire," but also "spire," the best translation might be "the Spirit spires". As this cannot be, we may render: "The Spirit breathes where He will," that is to say, there is no limitation of His power to certain individuals, classes, races. Cf. v. 21, δ υός oρθόλογος. The thought here is similar: there need be no despair regarding the second birth: the Spirit breathes where He will. So Bengal, "Spiritus, propriis, nam huic, non vento voluntas et vox est."—καὶ τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ ἀκούει, the Spirit makes Himself audible in articulate and intelligible sounds. The breathing of the Spirit is like man's breath, not mere air, but articulated and significant voice. The Spirit works intelligible results. He does not roar like the wind and toss men in unavailing contortions as the wind tosses the trees. It is a voice and the result is full of reason, in harmony with human nature, transforming it to higher life. But for all this, οὐκ ὑόες πεπέφυται καὶ υἱὸς υἱοθετημένος εἰκὸς νομίσῃς, you cannot observe and regulate the Spirit's approach and departure.—οὕτως δὲ τῶν διὰ τὸ γεγεννημένον ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος, thus it is in the case of every one who is born of the Spirit. You cannot see the process of regeneration; the process is secret and invisible, the results are apparent.—Ver. 9. This explanation did not satisfy Nicodemus. He falls back upon his bewilderment, πῶς δύναται τάντα γενέσθαι. This question sprang from Jesus to a fuller explanation, which is reported in vv. 10-15.—Ver. 10. He opens with an exclamation of surprise, ἐστι δὲ διδάσκαλος τοῦ Ἰσραήλ καὶ τάντα σοι γενέσθαι; perhaps there is more of
8-13. **ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΩΝ**

tauta genvanai;" 10. 'Apekrifbhs de 'Ierous kai eipen autph, "Elo ei 1 Rom. ii. 20. 11. 2bidhakalos tou 'Ierous, kai tauta o2 gyvouskeis; 11. amhn amh; amhn leioj sou, dti 2 otdmaven alydogmen, kai 2 dprakamven marturopmen. kai thn martupian hymov o2 laumhnte. 12. ei taw 2 etgyna o2 hymov amhn, kai o2 otipeteste, tois, dhn eiph 2 hymov taw 2 etgyna, otipeteste; 13. kai 2 otdh evaibhenv eis tin ouranov, eli mh 2 ek tou ouranov 2 katafias, 2 uile tov anthrwpou 2 ev taw ouranov. 1

1 o 2 ev taw ouaran is found in AYDA vet. Lat. vulg. syr., but is omitted in NBL 33 memph. Cyr.-Alex.

sadness than either of indignation or irony in the words. Is this the state of matters I have to confront? If the teacher is so obtuse what must the taught be? The presence of the article is usually taken as indicating that Nicodemus was recognised as a great teacher, perhaps held the official position of Chakam in the Sanhedrim. But Westcott is right: "the definite article marks the official relation of Nicodemus to the people generally". It is used to bring out sharply, not the relation to other teachers, but the relation he held to the people. "Art thou the teacher of Israel and knowest not these things?" Bad enough for an Israelite to be blind to such things, but how much worse for one who teaches! But should a teacher of Israel have known these things? Westcott overleaps the difficulty by saying that gyvouskeis refers to the knowledge of perception, and that Jesus is surprised that Nicodemus should not have been able during this conversation to apprehend what was said.—Ver. 11. amhn, amhn... o2 laumhnte. From this point dialogue ceases, and we have now an unbroken utterance of Jesus. It starts with a certification of the truth of what Nicodemus had professed himself unable to understand.—2 otdmaven alydogmen. Many of the plural in the last clause becomes a plural in laumhnte in the first clause. Or there may be an indefinite identification of Himself with all who had apprehended the nature of the new birth—the Baptist and the best of his disciples. Jesus does not wish to represent Himself as alone able to testify of such matters. Weiss' view is peculiar. He thinks that the contents of the marturopmen consist of what John and Jesus saw at the Baptism, when the Spirit's descent indicated Jesus as the Baptister with the Spirit.—Ver. 12. el taw etgyna... evwvovenv. The reference of taw etgyna is fixed by the o2 hymov. They are such things as Jesus had been speaking of: things verified in human, earthly experience, the necessity of a spiritual birth and the results of it. Regeneration was a change made in this earthly life. The kingdom of regenerate men was to be established on earth, as apprehensible in certain of its aspects as the kingdom Nicodemus was proposing to found. The evwvovenv are matters not open to human observation, matters wholly in the unseen, the nature and purposes of God. Of the remarkable parallel in Wisd. ix. 16.—Ver. 13. kai otdh evaibhenv... katafias. The connection is: You have not believed earthly things, much less will you believe those which are heavenly; for not only are they in their own nature more difficult to understand, but there is none to testify of them save only that One who came down out of heaven. The sentence may be paraphrased thus: No one has come up to heaven and by dwelling there gained a knowledge of the heavenly things: One only has dwelt there and is able to communicate that knowledge—He, viz., who has come down from heaven. "Presence in heaven" is considered to be the ground and qualification for communicating trustworthy information regarding "heavenly things". Direct knowledge and personal experience of heavenly things alone justify authoritative declarations about them; as in earthly things one may expect to be believed if he can say, "we speak that we do know and testify that we have seen". But this "presence in heaven" Jesus declares to be the qualification exclusively of one
person. This person He describes as “He that came down out of heaven,” adding as a further description “the Son of Man” [who is in heaven]. This description identifies this person as Jesus Himself. He claims therefore to have a unique qualification for the declaration of truth about heavenly things, and this qualification consists in this, that He and He alone has had direct perception of heavenly things. He has been in heaven. By “heaven” it is not a locality that is indicated, but that condition which is described in the prologue as πρὸς τὸν Θεόν. And when He speaks of coming down out of heaven He can only mean manifesting Himself to those who are on that lower level from which they had not been able to ascend to the knowledge of heavenly things. In short, we have here the basis in Christ’s own words of the statement in the prologue that the Word was in the beginning with God, and became flesh to be a light to men. Why is οὗτος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου introduced? It identifies the person spoken of, and it suggests that He who alone had the knowledge of heavenly things now wore human nature, was accessible, and was there for the purpose of communicating this knowledge. The words added in the T.R., ὅν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, affirm that although He had come out of heaven He was still in it, and they show that a condition of being, not a locality, was meant by “heaven”.—Ver. 14. If the Son of Man alone has this knowledge, how is it to be disseminated and become a light to all men? This is an elevation in the words, καὶ καθὼς Μωϋσῆς... τοῦ ἀνθρώπου [modern editors read Μωυσῆς; so also in LXX]. The emphatic word is ὁσίως. When Moses made the brazen serpent, he did not secrete it in his tent and admit a few selected persons to view it, but ὁσίως ὁ στὰν δέιξας, gave it an elevation at which all might see it. So must the Son of Man, the bearer of heavenly light and healing, ἀνεφάρη, that all may see Him. The “lifting up” of the Son of Man is interpreted in xii. 33 to mean His lifting up on the cross. It was this which drew human observation and human homage. The cross is the throne of Christ. In the phrase ἐκ ζητόμενος the aorist is used in accordance with Greek usage by which an aorist infinitive is employed to express the action of the verb even though future after verbs signifying to hope, to expect, to promise, and such like. Thus Ἰρ. in Λευ. 463, οἱ ματίν ὑπὲρ τῆς κρισίν, where Markland needlessly changes the aorist into the future. Nicodemus could not see the significance with which these words were filled by the crucifixion. What would be suggested to him by the comparison of the Messiah with the brazen serpent might be something like this: The Son of Man is to be lifted up. Yes, but not on a throne in Herod’s palace. He was to be conspicuous, but as the brazen serpent had been conspicuous, hanging on a pole for the healing of the people. His elevation was certain, but it was an elevation by no mere official appointment, or popular recognition, or hereditary right, but by placing the depths of human degradation in truest self-sacrifice. There is no royal road to human excellence, and Jesus reached the height He attained by no blare of heralds’ trumpets or flaunting of banners or popular acclaim, but by being subjected to the keenest tests by which character can be searched, by passing through the ordeal of human life in this world, and by being found the best, the one only perfectly faithful servant of God and man.—Ver. 15. The words ἡ δύναμις ἂν ἄλλη of the T.R. are omitted by Tisch., W.H., and R.V. Further, the same editors replace the words εἰς ἄνθροπον by εἰς ἄνθρωπον, and the R.V. translates “that whosoever believeth may in Him have eternal life,” in accordance with Johannine usage, which does not support the rendering “believeth in Him”. This is the object to be accomplished by the “elevation” of the Son of Man, viz., that whoever, Jew or Gentile, believes that there is life in Him that is thus exalted, may have life eternal.—Ver. 16. Several conservative theologians,
Neander, Tholuck, Westcott, are of opinion that the words of Jesus end with ver. 15, and that from vv. 16-21 we have an addition by the evangelist. There is much to be said in favour of this idea. The thoughts of these verses are explanatory rather than progressive. Vv. 16 and 17 repeat the object of Christ's mission, which has already been stated. Vv. 18 and 19 declare the historic results in faith and unbelief, results which at the date of the conversation were not conspicuous. Vv. 20 and 21 exhibit the causes of faith and unbelief. The tenses also forbid us to refer the passage directly to Jesus. In His lips the present would have been more natural. To John looking back on the finished story aorists and perfects are natural. Also, the designation "only begotten son" is not one of the names by which Jesus designates Himself, but it is used by the evangelist, i. 18 and 1 John iv. 9. — θεὸς γάρ ἐγένετο ... ζωλον θεόν. The love of God for the world of men is the source of Christ's mission with all its blessings. It was this which prompted Him to "give," that is, to give not solely to the death of the cross alluded to in ver. 14, but to all that the world required for salvation, His only begotten Son. "The change from the aorist (απέστησα) to the present (έγένετο) is to be noted, the utter ruin being spoken of as an act, the possession of life eternal as an enduring experience." (Meyer, Weiss, Holtzmann).—Ver. 17. ού γάρ ἀπέστειλεν ... δι' αὐτοῦ. For whatever the result of Christ's coming has been, in revealing a love of sin and bringing heavier judgment on men, this was not God's purpose in sending His Son. The Jewish idea was that the Messiah would come "to judge," i.e., to condemn the world.—κρίνειν καὶ κατακρίνειν, though originally distinct, are in the N.T. sometimes identical in meaning, the result of judgment so commonly being condemnation; cf. κρίμα. But although the result is judgment, the bringing to light a distinction among men and the resulting condemnation of many, yet the object was οῦ σωθὰ δ κόσμος. John repeats his favourite word κόσμος three times in this verse that there may be no possibility of missing his point, that so far as God's purpose was concerned, it was one of unmixed love, that all men might be saved. The emphasis was probably due to the ordinary Messianic expectation which limited and misrepresented the love of God. Westcott remarks on this verse: "The sad realities of present experience cannot change the truth thus made known, however little we may be able to understand in what way it will be accomplished." It might on similar grounds be argued that because God wills that all men be holy in this life, all men are holy.—Ver. 18. δ' θεόν ... τοῦ θεοῦ. Expansion of previous verse. God sent His Son not to judge but to save; and whose accepts the Son and His revelation is not judged. It is no longer "every Jew," nor "every one chosen by God," but every one that believeth. All here is spiritual. Although judgment was not the object it is the necessary result of Christ's presence in the world. But it is a judgment very different from that which the Jews expected. It is determined by the attitude towards Christ, and this again, as afterwards shown, is determined by the moral condition of the individual.—δ' θεοῦ κερται, "he that believeth not is already judged": not only is left under the curse of his own evil actions; but, as the next clause shows, lies under the condemnation of not believing.—κερται, he is already judged: it is not some future assize he doubtfully awaits and which may or may not convict. He is judged, and on a ground which to John seems to indicate monstrous depravity, ἐν αὐτῷ ... τοῦ θεοῦ. Not to perceive the glory of this august Being whom John so adored, not to receive the revelation made by the Only Begotten, is proof not merely of human infirmity and passion, but of wickedness chosen and preferred in presence of revealed goodness.—Ver. 19. This is further explained in the following, αὕτη ... τοῦ φῶς. The ground of the con-
demnation lies precisely in this, that since the coming of Christ and His exhibition of human life in the light of the holiness and love of the Father, human sin is no longer the result of ignorance, but of deliberate choice and preference. Nothing can be done for a man who says, "Evil, be thou my good".

The reason of this preference of darkness and rejection of Christ is that the life is evil, ἤ γὰρ τὸν φαῦλον ἀυτὸν τὰ ἔργα. Ver. 20. The principle is explained in this verse. Underlying the action of men towards Christ during His historical manifestation was a general law: a law which operates wherever men are similarly invited to walk in the light. The law which governs the acceptance or refusal of light is given in the words τὰς ἑβαθρεὶς οὐκ ἔχει τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ. "Evil, be thou poor." The Vulgate, "pale," "ugly," or "wretched," is the vulgar, "to be common sort." In Polybius, φαῦλος πλοῖον, πολιτείας φαῦλος, badly constructed; φαῦλος ἡγεμόνα, a foolish general, and in xvii. 15, 15 it is opposed to deliberate wickedness. Dull, senseless viciousness seems to be denoted. Here and in ver. 29 πράσας ἡμεν expresses the reiterative putting forth of activity, is to pass ὑποτιθεν the actual production of what is aimed at. Hence there is a slight hint of the busy fruitlessness of vice. Paul, as well as John, uses πράσας, in certain passages, of evil actions. The person thus defined μονὶ τὰ φῶς, "hates the light," is with Paul ἐρεῖται πρὸς τὸ φῶς, and does not bring himself within its radiance, does not seek to use it for his own enlightenment: ἢ μὴ ἐλεγχῇ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ, "lest his works be convicted" and so put to shame. According to John there is moral obliquity at the root of all refusal of Christ. Obviously there is, if Christ be considered simply as "light." To refuse the ideal he presents is to prefer darkness.—Ver. 21. ἢ διὰ τοῦτον... "On the other hand, he who does the truth..." This is one of John's comprehensive phrases which perhaps lose by definition. "To do the truth" is at any rate to live up to what one knows; to live an honest, conscientious life. John implies that men of this type are to be found where the light of Christ has not dawned; but when it dawns they hail it with joy. He that doeth the truth comes to the light that his deeds may be manifested, ἢ δὲ τῶν ἐγερμάτων. Is ἢ δὲ the expressive of a fact or declarative of a reason? Must we translate "manifested, that they are," etc., or "manifested, because they are," etc.? The R.V. has "that," in the text, and "because" in the margin. Gogodt and Westcott prefer the former; Lücke, Meyer, Weiss and Weisszäcker the latter. It is not easy to decide between the two. On the whole, the latter interpretation is to be preferred. This clause gives the reason of the willingness shown by the man to have his deeds made manifest; and thus it balances the clause ἤ γὰρ τὸν φαῦλον ἀυτὸν τὰ ἔργα, which gives the reason for evil doers shunning the light. He who does the truth is not afraid of the light, but rather seeks increased light because his deeds have been done ἐν φως; that is, he has not been separated from God by them, but has done what he has done because he conceived that to be the will of God. Where such light as exists has been conscientiously used, more is sought, and welcomed when it comes. "Plato was breathing a Miltonic "Come, let us sleep and die," a magnet attracting to itself, running hither and thither, with his poor flickering Taper, agonizing to get forthe, and holding himself in readiness to make a spring forward the moment a door should open. But it never did. "Not manie wise are called." He had clomb a Hill in the Darke, and stood calling to his companions below, "Come on, come on, this way lies the East: I am avised we shall see the sun rise anon." But they never did. What a Christian he would have made. Ah! he is one now. He and Socrates, the veil long removed from their eyes, are sitting at Jesus' feet. Sancte Socrates, ora pro nobis." (Erasmus to More in Sir T. More's Household.) Holtzmam quotes from Haurath: "As a magnet attracts the metal while the dead stone lies unmoved: so are the children of God drawn
by the Logos and come to the Light". Cf. chap. xviii. 37.

Vv. 22-36. **The ministry of Jesus in Judaea after He left Jerusalem.** This falls into three parts: (1) a brief account of the movements and success of Jesus and the Baptist which provoked a comparison between them, 22-28; (2) the Baptist's acceptance of the contrast and final testimony to Jesus, 27-30; (3) the expansion by the evangelist of the Baptist's words, 31-36. — Ver. 22. ìμετά ταύτα, subsequent to the ministry in Jerusalem, Jesus and His disciples came *εἰς τὴν ἱουδαΐαν γῆν, "into the Judaean country," the rural parts in contradistinction to the metropolis. "Nam quum ex Judaeis metropoli exiret Jesus, non poterat simpliciter dici profiscisci in Judaeam; ... malumus ergo territum convertere quam terram," Beza. So in Josh. viii. 1 (Codex Ambrosianus), "I have given into thy hand the King of Gai καὶ τὴν πόλιν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν γῆν αὐτοῦ". Cf. also John xi. 54. — καὶ εἶκεν διέτριβεν, "and there He spent some time with them"; whether weeks or months depends on the interpretation of iv. 35. — καὶ ἡ ἄνωθεν, that is, His disciples baptised, iv. 2. — Ver. 23. ἢ δὲ καὶ ... ἥκει. And John also was baptising, although he had said that he was about to baptise in order that the Messiah might be identified; which had already been done. But John saw that men might still be prepared for the reception of the Messiah by his preaching and baptism. Hence, however, the questioning which arose, ver. 25. The locality is described as Ἀλπῶν ἐγγύς τοῦ Σαλέη. "The Salim of this place is no doubt the Salem of Genesis xxxii. 18, and some seven miles north is 'Alînîn [= Springs], at the head of the Wady Fâ'ârâh, which is the great highway up from the Damieh ford for those coming from the east by the way of Peniel and Succoth" (Henderson's *Palestine*, p. 154). The reason for choosing this locality was διὰ τοῦτα πολλα τὴν ἤκει, "because many waters were there," or much water; and therefore even in summer baptism by immersion could be continued. It is not the people's refreshment," that is in view. Why mention this any more than where they got their food? — καὶ παραγινομένον, the indefinite third plural, as frequently in N.T. and regularly in English, "they continued coming". — Ver. 24. οὖν γὰρ ... ἔ μετα τοῦ ἰωάννη, "for not yet had John been cast into prison"; a clause inserted for the sake of those who might have gathered from the synoptic narrative that John was cast into prison immediately after the temptation of Jesus, Mk. i. 14, Mt. iv. 12. John having been present with Jesus through all this period can give the sequence of the events with chronological precision. — Ver. 25. ἐγένετο οὖν ἦττοις ... There arose therefore—that is, in consequence of the proximity of these two baptisms—on the part of John's disciples [iv. cf. Herod. v. 21 and Euseb. Daum. Hal. viii. p. 556] a questioning, or discussion, of whether a Jew about purifying, that is, generally, including the relation of those two baptisms to one another, and to the Jewish washings, and the significance of each. The trend of the discussion may be gathered from the complaint to the Baptist, ver. 26. As the discussion was begun by the disciples of John, it would seem as if they had challenged the Jew for seeking baptism from Jesus. For their complaint is (ver. 26) "Ραββί ... πρὸς αὐτὸν." That Jesus should baptise as well as John they could not understand. Really, the difficulty was that Jesus should have allowed John to go on baptising, and that John should not himself have professed discipleship of Jesus. But so long as John saw that men were
led by his preaching to accept the Messiah he might well believe that he served Christ better than by following in His train.—Ver. 27. His answer sufficiently shows that it was not rivalry that prompted him to continue his baptism.—οὐ δὲναὶ...οὗτοι. The general sense is obvious (cf. Ps. lxv. 6, 7, cxvii. 1; Jas. i. 17; 1 Cor. iii. 7), but did John mean to apply the principle directly to himself or to Jesus? Wetstein prefers the former: “non possum mihi arrogare et rapere, quae Deus non dedit”; So Calvin, Bess ("quid consimilis age conditioni aliquid adhucesse?"). Bengel ("quomodo adeo audet, inquit, homines ad me adstringere?"); and Lücke. But, as Weiss points out, it is a justification of Jesus which the question of the disciples demands, and this is given in John's statement that His popularity is God's gift. But John avails himself of the opportunity to explain the relation he himself holds to Jesus.—Ver. 28. αὐτός ὁ με.. ἐκείνου. John's disciples should have been prepared for what they now see happening. He had emphatically declared that he was not the Christ, but only His forerunner (i. 19-27, 30).—Ver. 29. ἐξουσίως τὴν γρηγορίαν... The bride is the familiar O.T. figure expressive of the people in their close relation to God (Is. liv. 5, Hos. ii. 18, Ps. xliv.). This figure passes over into the apostolic age (cf. Mk. xiv. 2, Eph. v. 32, Jas. iv. 4).—ἐξουσίως he that has and holds as a wife. Cf. Mk. vi. 18, Is. liv. 1. lxxii. 5.—γυμνὸς ἐστὶν, it is the bridegroom, and no one else, who marries the bride and to whom she belongs. There is only one in whom the people of God can find their permanent joy and rest: one who is the perennial spring of their happiness and life.—ὅτι ὁ φίλος τοῦ γυμνοῦ, the friend, par excellence, the groomsmen, παραγόντος, γυμνὸς, or in Hebrew Shoabben, who was employed to stand at the hand of the bride and to arrange the marriage. For the standing and duties of the Shadchan and Shoabben see Abraham's Jewish Life in the Middle Ages, pp. 170, 180. The similar function of the Hindu go-between or ghatak is fully described in The City of Sunshine. The peculiar and intense gratification [καρπὸς καρπῶν, intensely rejoiced, see especially Lücke, who renders "durch und durch"; Weizsäcker, "freut sich hoch"; R.V., "rejoiceeth greatly"] of this functionary was to see that his delicate task was crowned with success; and of this he was assured when he stood and heard the bridegroom directly welcoming his bride ["voice of bridegroom" as symbol of joy, Jer. vii. 34, xvi. 1].—ἐξουσίως he that has and holds as a wife. This is the joy which John claims for himself, the joy of the bridegroom's friend, who arranges the marriage, and this joy is attained in Christ's welcoming to Himself the people whom John has prepared for Him and directed to Him. Cf. 2 Cor. xi. 2, where Paul uses similar language. It is not John's regret that men are attracted to Jesus: rather it is the fulfilment of his work and hope. This was the God-appointed order.—Ver. 30. ἐξουσίως ἢς ἐστὶν, it is for Him to go on growing and for me to be ever getting less, and adds, "the language seems to be solar". In the Church Calendar, no doubt, John the Baptist's day is Midsummer Day, while our Lord's "natalitia" is midwinter. Mk. xxv. 4, 5, shows an solar considerations of the day's increase after Christmas and decrease after 24th June. Rather John is the morning star "fidelis Lucifer" whose light is eclipsed in that of the rising sun (cf. Bernard's "Lucet ergo Johannes, tanto verius quosto minus appetit lucere," and Euthymiou, ἐπικίνδυνος ὡς ἠλέους ἀναταλικός ἔσσωρφος). If the style of the following verses is any clue to their authorship we must ascribe them to the evangelist. Besides, some of the expressions are out of place in the Baptist's lips: For the standing and duties of the Shadchan and Shoabben could scarcely have been said at the very time when crowds were
flocking to Him. The precise point in the Baptist's language to which the evangelist attaches this commentary or expansion ["theirs erkirkende, theirs erweiterndc Reflexion," Lücke] is his affirmation of the Messiah's superiority to himself. To this John adds (ver. 31): He is superior not only to the Baptist but to all, ἐπάνω πάντων ἐστιν, the reason being that He comes from above, ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν; which is the equivalent of ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ in the latter part of the verse. These expressions are contrasted with ἐκ τῆς γῆς, the ordinary earthly origin of men, and they refer Christ's origin to a higher and unique source: unique because the result of this origin is that He is supreme over all, ἐπάνω πάντων. His origin is superior to that of all, therefore His supremacy is universal (cf. ver. 13). The results of origin, whether earthly or heavenly, are traced out in a twofold direction: in the kind of life lived and in the words spoken. On the one hand ἐκ τῆς γῆς ... ἑαυτοῦ. The first ἐκ expresses origin: the second moral connection, as in xviii. 37, xv. 13: he whose origin is earthly is an earthly person, his life rises no higher than its source, his interests and associations are of earth. Another result is given in the words ἐκ τῆς γῆς λαλεῖ, from the earth his ideas and his utterance of them spring. A man's talk and teaching cannot rise above their source. So far as experimental knowledge goes he is circumscribed by his origin. In contrast to persons of earthly origin stands ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐρχόμενος; ἐρχεῖσθαι is added that not only his origin but his transition to his present condition may be indicated. His origin in like manner determines both his moral relationships and his teaching. The one is given in ἐπάνω πάντων ἐστὶ. He lives in a higher region than all others and is not limited by earthly conditions.—Ver. 32. The result is ἐρώσασθαι ... οὐκ εἶπεν τιμῆς τούτης. Seeing and hearing are equivalent to having direct knowledge. The man who is of earth may be trusted when he speaks of earth: he who is from heaven testifies to that of which he has had experimental knowledge (cf. ver. 13), and might therefore expect to be listened to, but the μαρτυρίαν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ λαμβάνειν. The καί which connects the clauses implies the meaning "and yet". This statement could not have been made when crowds were thronging to Jesus' baptism. They are the reflection of the evangelist, who sees how sporadically the testimony of Christ has been received. Yet it has not been universally rejected: ἐκ λαβὼν ... ἀληθῆς ἐστιν. He who received His testimony sealed that God is true. ἐρχεῖσθαι means to stamp with approval, to endorse, to give confirmation. Wetstein quotes from Aristides, Platonice, p. 18: Ἀλυκης ἡμαρτυρεῖ γένεσιν ... καὶ τὴν τούτα μαρτυρίαν ἄντεπτιπραγίσεται. But he who believes Christ not only confirms or approves Christ's truthfulness, but God's. ἐν γὰρ ἀπετεκνήθη ... λαλεῖ. For Christ is God's ambassador and speaks God's words. This is a thought which pervades this Gospel, see viii. 26, 28; xv. 5, etc. "He that sent me," or "the Father that sent me," is a phrase occurring over twenty times in the Gospel and is characteristic of the aspect of Christ presented in it, as revealing the Father.—Ver. 34. The reason assigned for the truth and trustworthiness of Christ's words is scarcely the reason we expect: οὐ γὰρ ... Πνεῦμα. John has told us that Christ is to be believed because His
testifies of what He hath seen and heard: now, because the Spirit is given without measure to Him. The meaning of the clause is contested. The omission of ὁ θεός does not materially affect the sense, for ὁ θεός would naturally be supplied as the nominative to διδόμενος from τοῦ θεοῦ of the preceding clause. There are four interpretations. (1) Augustine, Calvin, Lücke, Alford, suppose the clause means that God, instead of giving occasional and limited supplies of the Spirit as had been given to the prophets, gives to Christ the fullness of the Spirit. (2) Meyer thinks that the primary reference is not to Christ but that the statement is general, that God gives the Spirit freely and abundantly, and does not divide it to Christ. (3) Westcott, following Cyril, makes Christ the subject and understands the clause as meaning that He proves His Messiahship by giving the Spirit without measure. (4) Godet makes τὸ πνεῦμα the subject, not the object, and supposes the meaning to be that the Spirit gives to Christ the words of God without measure. The words of ver. 35 seem to weigh in favour of the rendering of A.V.: “God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto Him.” The R.V. is ambiguous. ἐκ μέτρου, out of a measure, or, by measure, that is, sparingly. So ἐκ μέτρου in Ezek. iv. xi. Wetstein quotes: “R. Achan dixit: etiam Spiritus S. non habitavit super Prophetas nisi mensura quadam: quidam enim librum unum, quidam duos vaticiniorum ediderunt.” The Spirit was given to Jesus not in the restricted and occasional manner in which it had been given to the O.T. prophets, but wholly, fully, constantly. It was by this Spirit His human nature was enlightened and guided to speak things divine; and this Spirit, interposed as it were between the Logos and the human nature of Christ, was as little cumbrous in its operation or perceptible in consciousness as our breath which is interposed between the thinking mind and the words which utter it.—Ver. 35. ὁ πατέρας ἀλλ' ἀυτῶν. These absolute expressions, “the Father,” “the Son,” are more naturally referred to the evangelist than to the Baptist. This absolute use of “the Son” as a designation of Christ certainly suggests, if it does not prove, the proper Divinity of Christ. It is the favourite designation in this Gospel. The love of the Father for the Son is the reason for His giving to Him the Spirit: nay, it accounts for His committing all things to His hand; πάντα διδόμενα ἐν τῇ χεριν αὐτοῦ, that is, to possess and to rule. “Facit hic amor, quo Filium amplexus nos quoque in eo amplexetur, ut per illius manum nobis bona sua omnia communicet” —Calvin. But Calvin does not make the mistake of supposing that the words signify “by means of His hand”; cf. Beza. God has made Christ His plenipotentiary for this world and has done so because of His love. It was a boon then to Christ to come into this world and win it to Himself. There is no history of movement, or life of God so glorious as the history of God incarnate.—Ver. 36. ὁ πατέρας . . . ἀυτῶν. Christ has been represented as Sovereign, commissioned with supreme powers, especially for the purpose of saving men and restoring them to God. Hence “he that believeth on the Son hath eternal life.” He who through the Son finds and accepts the Father has life in this very vision and fellowship of the Supreme; cf. xvii. 3. But “he that refuses to be persuaded,” lit. “he that disobeyeth.” Beza points out that in the N.T. there is a twofold ἀνάθεα, one of the intellect, dissenting from truth presented, as here and in Acts xiv. 2; the other of the will and life, see Rom. xi. 30. But will enters into the former as well as the latter. ἡ δραστήσει τοῦ θεοῦ, the wrath of God denotes “the fixed determination of which it had been constituted, not given to the O.T. prophets, but wholly, fully, constantly. It was by this Spirit His human nature was enlightened and guided to speak things divine; and this Spirit, interposed as it were between the Logos and the human nature of Christ, was as little cumbrous in its operation or perceptible in consciousness as our breath which is interposed between the thinking mind and the words which utter it. —Ver. 35. ὁ πατέρας . . . αὐτῶν. These absolute expressions, “the Father,” “the Son,” are more naturally referred to the evangelist than to the Baptist. This absolute use of “the Son” as a designation of Christ certainly suggests, if it does not prove, the proper Divinity of Christ. It is the favourite designation in this Gospel. The love of the Father for the Son is the reason for His giving to Him the Spirit: nay, it accounts for His committing all things to His hand; πάντα διδόμενα ἐν τῇ χεριν αὐτοῦ, that is, to possess and to rule. “Facit hic amor, quo Filium amplexus nos quoque in eo amplexetur, ut per illius manum nobis bona sua omnia communicet” —Calvin. But Calvin does not make the mistake of supposing that the words signify “by means of His hand”; cf. Beza. God has made Christ His plenipotentiary for this world and has done so because of His love. It was a boon then to Christ to come into this world and win it to Himself. There is no history of movement, or life of God so glorious as the history of God incarnate.—Ver. 36. ὁ πατέρας . . . ἀυτῶν. Christ has been represented as Sovereign, commissioned with supreme powers, especially for the purpose of saving men and restoring them to God. Hence “he that believeth on the Son hath eternal life.” He who through the Son finds and accepts the Father has life in this very vision and fellowship of the Supreme; cf. xvii. 3. But “he that refuses to be persuaded,” lit. “he that disobeyeth.” Beza points out that in the N.T. there is a twofold ἀνάθεα, one of the intellect, dissenting from truth presented, as here and in Acts xiv. 2; the other of the will and life, see Rom. xi. 30. But will enters into the former as well as the latter. ἡ δραστήσει τοῦ θεοῦ, the wrath of God denotes “the fixed determination of which it had been constituted, not given to the O.T. prophets, but wholly, fully, constantly. It was by this Spirit His human nature was enlightened and guided to speak things divine; and this Spirit, interposed as it were between the Logos and the human nature of Christ, was as little cumbrous in its operation or perceptible in consciousness as our breath which is interposed between the thinking mind and the words which utter it. —Ver. 35. ὁ πατέρας . . . αὐτῶν. These absolute expressions, “the Father,” “the Son,” are more naturally referred to the evangelist than to the Baptist. This absolute use of “the Son” as a designation of Christ certainly suggests, if it does not prove, the proper Divinity of Christ. It is the favourite designation in this Gospel. The love of the Father for the Son is the reason for His giving to Him the Spirit: nay, it accounts for His committing all things to His hand; πάντα διδόμενα ἐν τῇ χεριν αὐτοῦ, that is, to possess and to rule. “Facit hic amor, quo Filium amplexus nos quoque in eo amplexetur, ut per illius manum nobis bona sua omnia communicet” —Calvin. But Calvin does not make the mistake of supposing that the words signify “by means of His hand”; cf. Beza. God has made Christ His plenipotentiary for this world and has done so because of His love. It was a boon then to Christ to come into this world and win it to Himself. There is no history of movement, or life of God so glorious as the history of God incarnate.—Ver. 36. ὁ πατέρας . . . ἀυτῶν. Christ has been represented as Sovereign, commissioned with supreme powers, especially for the purpose of saving men and restoring them to God. Hence “he that believeth on the Son hath eternal life.” He who through the Son finds and accepts the Father has life in this very vision and fellowship of the Supreme; cf. xvii. 3. But “he that refuses to be persuaded,” lit. “he that disobeyeth.” Beza points out that in the N.T. there is a twofold ἀνάθεα, one of the intellect, dissenting from truth presented, as here and in Acts xiv. 2; the other of the will and life, see Rom. xi. 30. But will enters into the former as well as the latter. ἡ δραστήσει τοῦ θεοῦ, the wrath of God denotes “the fixed determination of which it had been constituted, not given to the O.T. prophets, but wholly, fully, constantly. It was by this Spirit His human nature was enlightened and guided to speak things divine; and this Spirit, interposed as it were between the Logos and the human nature of Christ, was as little cumbrous in its operation or perceptible in consciousness as our breath which is interposed between the thinking mind and the words which utter it. —Ver. 35. ὁ πατέρας . . . αὐτῶν. These absolute expressions, “the Father,” “the Son,” are more naturally referred to the evangelist than to the Baptist. This absolute use of “the Son” as a designation of Christ certainly suggests, if it
Jesus leaves Salim and the south for Galilee, and is received by the Samaritans on His way.

Vv. 1-4 account for His being in Samaria; 5-26 relate His conversation with a Samaritan woman; 27-38 His consequent conversation with His own disciples; 39-42 the impression He made upon the Samaritans.

The circumstances which brought our Lord into Samaria seem to be related as much for the sake of maintaining the continuity of the history and of exhibiting the motives which guided His movements as for the sake of introducing the incident at Sychar.

The first verse gives the cause of His leaving Judaea, to wit, a threatened or possible collision with the Pharisees, who resented His baptising.

Jesus is making and baptising more disciples than John; the knowledge that comes by information is meant. The Pharisees had heard, the aorist here, as frequently elsewhere, representing the English pluperfect. What they had heard is given in direct narration under an introductory οὖν, and hence not the pronoun but Ἰησοῦς appears as subject: "Jesus is making and baptising more disciples than John". The verb "to be" being here used in the wider sense and not involving permanent separation from their employments.

The Pharisees had resented John's baptising, much more that of Jesus, because more popular. Here John inserts a clause corrective of one impression which this statement would make: καλωσύνη... ἀδελφοί, καλωσύνη is slightly stronger than "although," rather "although indeed". Hoogeveen (De Particulis, p. 322) renders "qualquam re vera"; see also Paley, Greek Particles, pp. 67-8. τοι is the old form of τις, "hereby," "truly," "in fact." The clause is inserted to remind us, as Bengel says, that "baptizare actio ministralis (cf. Paul's refusal to baptize). Johannes minister suæ manu baptizavit, discipuli ejus, ut videtur, nemenim; at Christus baptizat spirito sancto." So too Nonnus, who says that the king did not baptise with water. "By leaving the baptism of water to the apostles. He rendered the rite independent of His personal presence, and so provided for the maintenance of it in His Church after His departure," Godet. On this coming to the ears of Jesus, δόθηκε... ἀδελφοί, He forsook or abandoned Judaea. The verb is used of neglecting or dismissing from thought, hence of forgiving sin; but there is here no ethical sense in the word, and it may be translated "left," καὶ ἀνήλθε πάλιν, "again" in reference to the visit to Galilee already narrated. Jesus feared a collision with the Pharisees at this early stage, because it could only mar His work. He refuses to be hurried, and remains master of the situation throughout. He therefore retired to Galilee, where He thought He would be hidden. Cfr. ver. 44. — Ver. 4.
of Augustus. The territory of Samaria in the time of Christ was included in the tetrarchy of Archelaus and was under the procurator Pontius Pilate. Herod Antipas' domain marched with it north and east.—Ver. 5. ἕρχεται οὖν ἐκ τῆς Ἰακώβ. "So He comes to a city of Samaria called Sychar.

The strength of the case for 'Askar, west of Salim and near Shechem, the modern Nablus, is identified with 'Askar, west of Salim and near Shechem, the modern Nablus. The territory claimed by the Samaritans.--Ver. 6. ἐν τῇ Ἰακώβ ἦν ἀμύντις. "There were appointed or stationed, which Jacob gave to Joseph his son; according to Gen. xxxvi. 22, where Jacob says, "I have given thee one portion (Shechem) above thy brethren"; cf. Gen. xxxiii. 19. Shechem in Hebrew means "the shoulder," and some have fancied that the shoulder being the priest's portion, the word came to denote any allotment. Gesenius, however, is of opinion that the word was transferred to a portion of land, on account of the shape resembling the back across the shoulders.—Ver. 6. ἔν τῇ Ἰακώβ ἦν ἀμύντις. Both παραλλήλως and φλασκ are used in this context; the former meaning the spring or well of water, the latter the dug and built pit or well. In ver. 11 φλασκ is necessarily used. Whether in this verse δ εν τῇ Ἰακώβ is to be rendered "at," keeping παραλλήλως in its strict sense, or "on," as if for φλασκ is doubted; but the former is certainly the more natural rendering; cf. Aristoph., Frogs, 191, where εν τῇ Ἰακώβ with accus. gives rise to misunderstanding of sitting "on" an oar instead of "at it. The difficulty is: Why should a woman have come so far, passing good sources of water supply? Most probably the reason is that this well was Jacob's, and special care was taken to attach to it; or because in the heat of summer the other wells and streams were dry. The real difficulty is: Why was there a well there at all, in the neighbourhood of streams? Possibly Jacob may have dug it that he might have no quarrelling with his neighbours about water-rights. As a stranger with a precarious tenure he might find this necessary. Travellers agree in accepting as Jacob's well here mentioned the Ain-Jakub, or Bir-Jakub, some twenty minutes east of Nablus.—δ εν τῇ Ἰακώβ ἦν ἀμύντις. It was "about midday" (Theophylact's attention to this as a mark of accuracy), the sixth hour, that is, midday (the Jews dined on Sabbath at the sixth hour, see Josephus, Vita) (see on c. i. 40); and they had probably been walking for several hours, and accordingly Jesus was tired, exhausted, and in the habit of returning to the inn for food and rest. Jesus was sitting, tired as He was, and was sitting thus, tired as He was (οὖν, in the condition in which He was, that is, tired as He was). Elsewhere it only indicates consequence (nihil aliud quam consequentiam significat) and should be omitted in translating. So Kypke, who cites instructive instances, concludes: "solemnem est Graecis, praecedente participio, voculum οὖν πλασών apostatico ponere." But in all his instances οὖν precedes the verb, at the well (cf. Josephus, Ant., vi. 1: εὐφράτους... ἐκ τοῦ Ἱερουσαλήμ). As to the hour, two circumstances confirm the opinion that it was midday.
First, that apparently there was no intention of halting here for the night, as there would have been had it been evening. And, second, while it is truly urged that evening is the common time for drawing water, it is obvious that only one woman had come at this time, and accordingly the probability is it was not evening. See also Josephus, Ant., ii. 11, 1, where he describes Moses sitting at the well at midnight weared with his journey, and the women coming to water their flocks.—Ver. 7. Ἰδεῖς ὅπως ὄνειρον ἔσεσθε: apparently this clause is prepared for by the preceding. "There comes a woman of Samaria," that is, a Samaritan woman, not, of course, "from the city Samaria," which is two hours distant from the well, ἀνέθηται ἐν κόσμῳ, infinitive and aorist, both classical: cf. Rebecca in Gen. xxiv. 11, etc., having her ἱδρὺς on her shoulder or on her head, ἄγγις ἐν τῇ κέφαλῇ ἴχνους, Herod., v. 12; and Ovid's "Pontirum summa fictilia urna coma." [Elsner] Ἰδεῖς is the hold of a ship where the bilge settles: ἱδρὺς, to bale a ship and dry it out. To her Jesus says, Λῶς μοι πιαίνειν, the usual formula: cf. δέκα πιαίνει, Pherecrates, Frag., 67, and Aristoph., Pax, 49.—Ver. 8. οὗτος ἵνα μαθῆται ... ἀγοράσωτε. This gives the reason for the request. Had the disciples been present they would have made the comment on the relations already subsisting between the disciples and the Lord. Probably the five first called were still with Him. That the disciples had gone to buy in Sichar shows either that the law allowed trading with Samaritans, or that Jesus and His disciples ignored the law. But the woman is surprised at the request of Jesus.—Ver. 9. ὅπως οὗτος λεγειν ἔναντι σου, ἄνοιξεν. How did she know He was a Jew? Probably there were slight differences in dress, feature and accent. Ederesheim says "the fringes on the Tallith of the Samaritans are blue, while those worn by the Jews are white." He also proposes the mistake of some commentators regarding the words uttered by Jesus: "Τενέι λίθοθαυμάσι." The reason of the woman's surprise is given by the Evangelist in the words οὗτος λέγειν λεγειν, συνεργάται, "For Jesus have no dealings with Samaritans." Συνεργάσιος literally signifies "to use together with," so that the sense here might be that the woman was surprised that Jesus should use the same vessel she used; rather it has the secondary meaning "to have intercourse" or "dealing with;" similarly to the Latin uxor, see Hor., Ep. i. xii. 22, "utere Pompeio Grospho," and xvii. 13, "regibus uti," to make a friend of, or be on terms of intimacy with." The classical phrase is οὖν ἐκτὸς ἐπιστροφαί, Eurip., Helena, 440. The later tradition said: "Samaritans panem comedere aut vinum bibere prohibidum est." Of course the hostile feeling ran back to the days of Nehemiah. And see Ecclus. i. 25, 26. "With two nations is my soul vexed, and the third is no nation: they that sit upon Mount Seir and the Philistines, and that foolish people that dwelleth in Sichem." For the origin of the Samaritans see 2 Kings xvii., and cf. Farrar's Life of Christ in loc. Tristram, Land of Israel, 134.—Ver. 10. Ἀπεκρίθη ἐν τῷ ἱδρυμένῳ. "If thou knewest," the pathos of the situation strikes Jesus. The woman stands on the brink of her greatest possibilities, but is utterly unconscious of them. Two things she did not know: (1) ἤδη διαπέφαγεν τοῦ θεοῦ, the free gift of God. This is explained in the last words of the verse to be "living water"; but in its first occurrence it is indefinite: "If thou knewest the freeness of God's giving, and that to each of His children He has a purpose of good," But in God's direction the woman cherished no hope. (2) She did not know τίς ἐστιν ὁ λέγειν σοι, Δῶς μοι πιαίνειν. So long as she thought Him an ordinary Jew she could expect nothing from Him. Had she known that Jesus
was the bearer of God's free gift to men, she would have asked of Him. She addresses Him with καρή, perhaps fancying from His saying, "If you had known who it is that says to you," that He was some great person in disguise. But her answer breathes incredulity: οὔτε ἄντλησα χεῖς. She began her sentence meaning to say, "You neither have a bucket, nor is the well shallow enough for you to reach the water without one," but she alters its construction and puts the second statement first. The depth of the well is variously given. Conder found it 75 feet. She is mystified. μή σοi μείζων . . . θρέματα αὐτοῦ. Jesus had spoken as if independently of the well He could procure living water: but even Jacob (claimed by the Samaritans as their father, and whose bones lay in their midst), great as he was, used this well—θρέματα. "What is nourished." Kypke adduces several instances in which it is used of "domestica". Plato, Laws, 953 E, uses it of "nurslings of the Nile," the Egyptians. But Wetstein adduces many instances of its use in the sense of "cattle". Theophylact thinks this points to the abundant supply of water.—Vv. 13, 14. Jesus in reply, though He does not quite break through the veil of figure, leads her on to think of a more satisfying gift than even Jacob had given in this well. He contrasts the water of the well with the water He can give; and the two characteristic qualities of His living water are suggested by this contrast. The water of Jacob's well had two defects: it quenched thirst only for a time, and it lay outside the town a weary distance, and subject to various accidents. Christ offers water which will quench thirst lastingly, and which will be "in" the person drinking, ἐν αὐτῷ παγεί θέρατος ἀλλοιμένου εἰς μᾶν  ἀλώνιον. For this figure put to another though similar use, see Marcus Aurelius, vii. 59, and viii. 51, with Gataker's notes. The living water lastingly quenches human cravings and is with in the man, inseparable from him, and always energetically and alread thirsty. Vv. 15, 16. To this request Jesus replies "Υπαγε, φῶνησον τὸν ἄνδρα σου, καὶ
continued still." Jesus, reading this thought, bids her bring the man for whom she draws water. The gift is for him also. But this meaning is too obscure. Meyer thinks the request was not seriously intended; but this detracts from the simplicity of Christ. The natural interpretation is that in response to her request Jesus gives her now the first draught of the living water by causing her to face her guilty life and bring it to Him. He cannot give the water before thirst for it is awakened. The sure method of awaking the thirst is to make her acknowledge herself a sinful woman (cf. Alford).—Ver. 17. The woman shrinks from exposure and replies οὐκ ἔχω ἄνδρα, "I have no husband." A literal truth, but scarcely honest in intention. Jesus at once veils her deceit, καλῶς εἶπες, etc., and disposes of her equivocation by emphasising the ἄνδρα. Thou hast well said, I have no husband.—πέτυ τὸ γῆρ... ἀφηκές. He whom thou now hast is not my husband: in this [so far] you said what is true." In Malachi's time facility for divorce was producing disastrous consequences, and probably many women, not only in Samaria but among the poorer Jews, had a similar history to relate. The stringency with which our Lord speaks on this subject suggests that matters were fast approaching the condition in which they now are in Mohammedan countries. Lane tells us that "there are certainly not many persons in Cairo who have not divorced one wife if they have been long married," and that there are many who have in the course of ten years married twenty or thirty or more wives (cf. Lecky's European Morals for the state of matters in the Roman world). Jerome, Ep. ad Ageruck, 123, mentions a Roman woman who had had twenty-two husbands. Serious attention need scarcely be given to the fancy of "the critical school" that the woman with her five husbands is intended as an allegorical representation of Samaria with the [seven] gods of the five nations who peopled the country. See 2 Kings xvii. 24-31. Consistently the man with whom the woman now lived would represent Jehovah. Holtzmann, shrinking from this, suggests Simon Magus. Heracleon discovered in the husband that was not a husband the woman's guardian angel or Pleroma (Bigg's Neoplatonism, 150).—Ver. 19. The woman at once recognises this knowledge of her life as evidence of a supernatural endowment.—Κύριε θεωρῶ δι' ἡμῶν προφήτης ἔι ὑμῖν. Cf. ver. 29 and ii. 24. θεωρῶ is used in its post-classical sense. It is not unnatural that the woman finding herself in the presence of a prophet should seek His solution of the standing problem of Samaritan religion. His answer would shed further light on his prophetic endowment, and would also determine whether He had any light "and hope to give to a Samaritan" (Josephus (Antiq., xiii. 3, 4) narrates that a disputation on this point before Ptolemy Philometor resulted in the death according to contract of the two Samaritan advocates, they not being able to prove their position.—Ver. 20. οἱ πατέρες... δεῖ προσκυνεῖν. Our fathers worshipped in this mountain, Gerizim, at whose base we are standing, etc. On Gerizim were proclaimed the blessings recorded Deut. xxviii. Sanballat erected on it a rival temple (but see the Bible Dict. and Josephus) which was raised by John Hyrcanus, b.c. 129. A broad flat surface of rock on the top of Gerizim is still held sacred by the few Samaritans who now represent the old race and customs. Especially consult G. A. Smith's Hist. Geog., p. 334, who shows that Shechem is the natural centre of Palestine, and adds: "It was
by this natural capital of the Holy Land, from which the outgoings to the world are so many and so open, that the religion of Israel rose once for all above every geographical limit, and the charter of universal worship was given. In *Ierosolýmós* may either mean that the place of worship, the temple, is in Jerusalem, or that Jerusalem is itself the place—more probably the latter.—Ver. 21. Γέναι, πάντεσπον μοι... τῷ πατρί. One of the greatest announcements ever made by our Lord; and made to one sinful woman, cf. xx. 16.—ἔρχεται ἢ ἔρα a time is coming; in ver. 23 καὶ νῦν ἐστιν is added. A great religious revolution has arrived. Localism in worship is abolished, ὅσα ἐν τῷ δρα τούτῳ, etc., "neither in this mountain nor in Jerusalem," exclusively or preferentially, "shall ye worship the Father." What determines this "hour"? The manifestation of God in Christ, and the principle announced in ver. 24 and implied in τῷ πατρί, for God being absolutely "the Father," all men in all places must have access to Him, and being of a like nature to man's He can only receive a spiritual worship. Cf. Acts xvii. 29.—Ver. 22. ὅμεις προσκυνεῖτε δό κε οἴδατε. The distinction between Jewish and Samaritan worship lies not in the difference of place, but of the object of worship. To the former personal to the object of worship. "You do not know the object of your worship;" suggested by the τῷ πατρί of the preceding clause. Cf. Acts xvii. 23. ἤμεις προσκυνοῦμεν δό οἴδαμεν. The Jews worshipped a God who had made Himself known to them in their history by His gracious and saving dealings with them. That it is this knowledge which is meant appears in the following clause: δια τῆς σωτηρίας ἐκ τῶν ἱεραίων ἐστιν, that is to say, God has manifested Himself as Saviour to the Jews, and through them to all. "A powerful repudiation of the theory which makes the author of this Gospel a Gentile of the second century with a Gnostic antipathy to Judaism and Jews," Reynolds.—Ver. 23. There is this great distinction between Jew and Samaritan, καὶ ἔρχεται ἢ ἔρα. Both the Samaritans, but notwithstanding that it is to the Jews God has especially revealed Himself as Saviour, the hour has now come when the ideal worshippers, whether Jew or Samaritan, shall worship the one universal Father in spirit, not in either Gerizim or Jerusalem, and in truth, not in the symbols of Samaritan or Jewish worship, ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ. Two defects of all previous worship are aimed at; all that was local and all that was symbolic is to be left behind. Worship is to be (1) ἐν πνεύματι (on ἐν here, see Winer, 528), in the heart, not in this place or that. The essential thing is, not that the right place be approached, but that the right spirit enter into worship. And (2) it is to be ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, in correspondence with reality, both as regards the object and the manner of worship. The Samaritans had not known the object of their worship: the Jews had employed symbolism in worship. Both these defects were now to be removed. καὶ γάρ ἢ πατήρ... ἢ σοτηρία ἢ ἐστίν. καὶ γάρ is not merely equivalent to γάρ, but must be rendered "For of a truth". The characteristics of the ideal worshipers have been declared; and now, in confirmation, Jesus adds, "For of a truth the Father seeks such for His worshippers."—Ver. 24. The reason of all this is found in the determining statement τω ὕπομένῃ ὁ θεός, God is Spirit. Cf. God is Light; God is Love. The predication involves much; that God is personal, and much else. But primarily it here indicates that God is not corporeal, and therefore needs no temple. Rarely is the fundamental fact of God's spirituality carried to all its conclusions. Cf. James i. 27; Rom. xii. 1.—Ver. 25. This
great statement rather overwhelms and bewilders the woman. *λυγγίασας πρὸς τὸ τῶν ῥήματος ἔφος, Εὐθύμιος, after Chrysostom. Somewhat helplessly she appeals to the final authority, ὁδὸν δὲν Μεσονίας ... πάντα. The Samaritan expectation of a Messiah was based on their knowledge of Deut. xviii., and other allusions in the Pentateuch, and on their familiarity with Jewish ideas. He was known as Hashab or Hathab, the Converter, or as El Muhdy, the Guide. For the sources of information, see Westcott's Introd. to Gospels, chap. ii., note 2. "It appears from Josephus (Ant., xviii. 4, 1) that in the later years of the procuratorship of Pilate, there was an actual rising of the Samaritans, who assembled on Mount Gerizim, under the influence of these Messianic expectations. Who can say that they may not have been originally set in motion by the event recorded in the Fourth Gospel?" Sunday. It was His prophetic endowment which this woman especially believed in, "He will tell us all"; and for Him she was willing to wait.—Ver. 26. The woman's despairing bewilderment is at once dissipated by the announcement ἐγὼ εἰμι, δ λαλῶν σοι. "I that speak to thee am He." This declaration He was free to make among a people with whom He could not be used for political ends. "I think, too, there will be felt to be something not only very beautiful, but very characteristic of our Lord, in His declaring Himself with greater plainness of speech than He had Himself hitherto done even to the Twelve, to this dark-minded and sin-stained woman, whose spiritual nature was just awakening to life under His presence and His words" (Stanton, Jewish and Christian Messiah, p. 275).—Ver. 27. But just at this critical juncture, ἐν τοῖς, "on this," came His disciples καὶ διαφανέως. The imperfect better suits the sense; "they were wondering": the cause of wonder being δι' ἑαυτῆς γυναικῶς ἔδειξεν, "that He was speaking with a woman"; this being forbidden to Rabbis. "Samuel dicit non salutant feminam omnino." "The wise have said, Each time that the man prolongs converse with the woman [that is, his own wife] he causes evil to himself, and desists from words of Thorah and in the end inherits Gehinnom" (Taylor, Piros Aboth, p. 29; see also Schoettgen in loc.). But although the disciples wondered οὐδὲν μένοι εἶναι, "no one, however, said," τι ζητεῖτε, "what are you seeking?" nor even the more general question τι λαλεῖς μετ' αὐτῆς, "why are you talking with her?" Their silence was due to reverence. They had already learned that He had reasons for His actions which might not lie on the surface.—Ver. 28. ἄφηκεν οὖν ... η γυνή. "The woman accordingly," that is, because of the interruption, "left her pitcher," forgetting the object of her coming, in the greater discovery she had made; and also unconsciously showing that she meant to return.—καὶ ἀπῆλθεν ... ἀρχιερεῖς; and went to the city and said to the men, easily accessible because lounging in groups at the hottest hour of the day, "Come, see a man who told me all I ever did". The woman's absorption in the thought of the prophet's endowment causes her to forget the shame of the declaration which had convinced her. She does not positively affirm that He is the Christ, but μήτι αὐτὸς ἐστιν ἐπὶ Χριστοῦ; This is what grammarians call the "tentative" use of μήτι. The A.V. "Is not this the Christ?" is not so correct as R.V. "Can this be the Christ?" The Syriac has "Is not this perhaps the Christ?" The Vulgate has "Nam quid ipse est Christus?" In some passages of the N.T. (Mt. vii. 16, Acts x. 47) μήτι is used in questions which expect a more decided and exclusive negative than the simple μη, "certainly not," "not at all". But here and in Mt. xii. 23 mere doubt expresses itself, doubt with rather a leaning to an affirmative answer (cf. Hoogeveen, Doctrina Partic., under μήτι; and Pope's Lexicon, where it is rendered "ob etwā"). The Greek commentators unite in lauding the skill with which the woman excites the curiosity of the men and leads without seeming to
lead. [Euthymius says: τὸ δὲ μήτε οὖσα ἢ Χριστὸς ἢ ἄνθρωπος ἢ Χριστὸς ἢ ἄνθρωπος ἢ Χριστὸς ἢ ἄνθρωπος. But in His conversation with the woman His fatigue and hunger had disappeared, and He replies (ver. 32) ἐγὼ βρῶμαι... οὐκ οἴδατε. John does not distinguish between βρῶμαι and βρῶμαι, eating and the thing eaten. cf. ver. 34: Paul uses both words in their proper sense, 1 Cor. viii. 4, vi. 13. Weiss and others, strangely enough, maintain that βρῶμαι has here its proper meaning "an eating." The pronouns are emphatic: ἐγὼ ἐτέρτιον οὖσα ἢ Χριστὸς ἢ ἄνθρωπος ἢ Χριστὸς ἢ ἄνθρωπος. Surely no one can have brought Him anything to eat? Winer, p. 642, adds "especially here in Samaria." Perhaps evidence that Jesus had such an appearance as would not forbid any one offering Him food. But we must keep in view the easier manners of Oriental life.—Ver. 34. Jesus answers their question though not put to Him: Ἐρωταὶ ἐγὼ... τὸ ἔργον. Westcott thinks the immediate use of ἔρωτα can be discerned here; "the exact form of the expression emphasises the end and not the process, not the doing and finishing, but that I may do and finish." Lucke acknowledges that it is not always easy to distinguish between the construction of ἔρωτα or τοῦτο with ἔρωτα and with ἔτι, but that here it is possible to discriminate; and translates "Meine Speise besteht in dem Bestreben," etc. It is much better to take it as the Greek commentators and Holtmann and Weiss take it, as equivalent to τὸ ποιήμα. See especially 3 John 4. "Sometimes, beyond doubt, ἔτι is used where the final element in the sense is very much weakened—sometimes where it is hard to deny that it has altogether vanished," Simcox, Grammar, 177.] The idea that mental or spiritual excitement acts as a physical stimulant is common. Cf. Plato's λόγων ἐπιστήμης, Tim., 27 B; Thucydides, i. 70, represents the Corinthian ambassadors as saying of the Athenians μήτε ὑπέρθεν ἀλλο τῇ ἡγεμονίᾳ ἢ τῷ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ πρόβαλε. See also Soph., Electra, 363, and the quotations in Wetstein; also Browning's Fra Lippo Lippi, "to find its [the world's] meaning is my meat and drink." Jesus does not say that His meat is to bring living water to parched souls, but "to do the will of God and to finish His work." First, because throughout it is His aim to make Himself a transparency through which the Father may be seen; and second, because the will of God is the ultimate stability by fellowship with which all human charity and active compassion are continually renewed.—Ver. 35. ὅφει ὢν ἔργα, etc. These words may either mean "Are you not saying?" or "Do you not say?" that is, they may either refer to an expression just used by the disciples, or to a common proverb; if the former, then the disciples had probably been speaking of the dearness of the provisions they had bought, and congratulating themselves that harvest would lower them. Or sitting by the well and looking round, some of them
may have casually remarked that they were four months from harvest. In this case the time of year would be determined. Harvest beginning in April, it would now be December. But the phrase ὁ δὲ χείρῳ μαθὼν is not the natural introduction to a reference to some present remark of the disciples; whereas it is the natural introduction to the citation of a proverb (Matt. xvi. 2). That it is a proverb is also favoured by the metrical form ἠτὶ τετράμεθύνην ἐστι καὶ ὁ θερισμὸς ἐρχεται. No trace of such a proverb has been found, but that some such saying should be current was inevitable, the waiting of the husbandman being typical of so much of human life. (Wetstein quotes from Ovid (Heroid., xvii. 263), “adhuc tua messia in herba est,” and many other parallels.) If this was a proverbial expression to give encouragement to the sower, we cannot infer from its use here that the time of harvest that year would be December. Our Lord quotes it for the sake of the contrast between the ordinary relation of harvest to seed-time, and that which they can recognise by lifting their eyes.—ἐπέφερεν τοὺς ὀφθαλ- μοὺς ἐμων... Your harvest is already here. What the disciples see when they lift their eyes from their food is the crowd of Samaritans ripe for the kingdom and now approaching them. In Samaria a long time might have been expected to elapse between sowing and reaping; but no.—Ἀνέκαλεν ἀλλὰ... the fields are already ripe to life eternal. (Neuser Wetstein illustrates from Ovid, “maturis albescit messis aristas!”)—Ver. 36. καὶ ὁ θερισμὸς... W.H. close ver. 35 with θερισμὸν and begin 36 ἢν δὲ θερισμὸν. Already, and not after four months waiting, the harvester has his reward and gathers fruit to life eternal. The reaper has not to wait, but even now and in one and the same action finds his reward (cf. 1 Cor. ix. 17) and gathers the great product of this world which nourishes not merely through one winter till next year’s crop is gathered but to life eternal.—Τον δὲ στείρων ὁμοίχα χείρῃ καὶ ὁ θερισμὸς, “that sower and reaper may rejoice at one and the same time”. Here among the Samaritans this extraordinary spectacle was seen, Jesus the Sower and the disciples the reapers working almost simultaneously. So quickly had the crop sprung that the reapers trod on the heels of the Sower.—Ver. 37. ἐν γὰρ τούτῳ. For this, i.e., in the circumstances explained in the following verse, namely, that I have sent you to reap what others sowed, is the saying verified, “one soweth and another reapeth”.—ὁ λόγος, “the saying”; cf. i Tim. i. 15, iii. 1, etc.—Δλασὶως without the article is the mediate and scarcely expresses that the saying receives in the present circumstances its ideal fulfilment, rather that the saying is shown to be genuine; the saying is ἄλλος ἐστίν δὲ στείρων καὶ ἄλλος δὲ θερισμῶν, various forms of which are given by Wetstein; as, ἄλλος μὲν στείρων, ἄλλος δὲ ἀνεφίληται, “sic vos non vos”; cf. Job xxxii. 8; Micah vi. 15; Deut. vi. 11. [“It was objected to Pompey that he came upon the victories of Lucullus and gathered those laurels which were due to the fortune and valour of another,” Plutarch.—Ver. 38. The exemplification in our Lord’s mind is given in ver. 38, where the pronouns ἵνα and ὑμᾶς are emphatic. “I sent you to reap.” When? Holtzmann thinks the past tenses can only be explained as spoken by the glorified Lord looking back on His call of the twelve as Apostles. That is, the words were not spoken as John relates. But may not the reference be to the baptising of many by the disciples in the preceding months? This would be quite a natural and obvious reference. The work in Judæa which justifies the preterites was now alluded to, because now again the same division of labour is apparent. The Samaritans come not because of anything the disciples had said while making purchases in the town, but because of their Master’s
talk with the woman.—Vv. 39-42 briefly sum up the results of the Lord’s visit.—Vv. 39. Out of Sychar many of the Samaritans believed on Him. This faith was the result of the woman’s testimony, διὰ τὸν λόγον τῆς γυναικὸς, her testimony being, ὡς καὶ πᾶντα δῶσαν ἑαυτήν. —Ver. 40. Their faith showed itself in an invitation to Him to remain with them; in compliance with which invitation, impressive as coming from Samaritans, He remained two days.—Ver. 41. The result was that πολλὰ πλεῖον, a far larger number than had believed owing to the woman’s report now believed διὰ τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ, on account of what they heard from Jesus Himself. This is a faith approved by John, because based not on miracles but on the word of Christ.—ὡσαύτως... καὶ οὕτως. No longer do we believe on account of your talk [λαλίαν, not λόγον], for we ourselves have heard and know. This could only be said by those who went out first from the city, not by those many more who afterwards believed. They felt that their faith was now firmer and surer, more worthy to be called faith. This mature belief expressed itself in the confession οὗτος τῶν ἄνθρωπων ὁ σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου ὁ Χριστός. The title “Saviour of the World” was of course prompted by the teaching of Jesus Himself during His two days’ residence. To suppose, with several interpreters, that it is put into the mouth of the Samaritans by the evangelist is to suppose that during these two days Jesus did not disclose to them that He was the Saviour of the World. [“It probably belongs not to the Samaritans but to the evangelist. At the same time it is possible that such an epithet might be employed by them merely as synonymous with ‘Messiah’” —Sanday.] Doubt has been cast on the historicity of this narrative by Baur, who thinks the woman is a type of susceptible heathendom; and by Strauss, who thinks it was invented for the purpose of showing that Jesus personally taught not only in Galilee, Judea, and Perea, but also in Samaria. “How natural the tendency to perfect the agency of Jesus, by representing Him to have sown the heavenly seed in Samaria, thus extending His Ministry through all parts of Palestine; to limit the glory of the apostles and other teachers to that of being the mere reapers of the harvest in Samaria; and to put this distinction, on a suitable occasion, into the mouth of Jesus!” Holtzmann’s idea of this section of the Gospel is similar. The fictitious character of the narrative seems to be mainly based on its great significance for the life of Christ. As if the actual events of His life were not significant. Stress too is laid on the circumstance that among simple peoples all striking incidents, conversations, recognitions, take place at wells. In other words, wells are common meeting-places, therefore this meeting at a well cannot have taken place.

Vv. 43-54. Jesus passes into Galilee and there heals the son of a nobleman.—Ver. 43. Μετὰ δὲ τὰς δύο ἡμέρας. “And after the two days,” see ver. 40.—ἐξῆλθεν ἐκεῖνον, “He departed thence,” i.e., from Sychar.—ἐπὶ τὴν Γαλιλαίαν, “into Galilee,” carrying out the intention which had brought Him to Sychar, iv. 3.—Ver. 44. The reason for His proceeding to Galilee is given in ver. 44.—οὗτος γὰρ ὁ Ἰησοῦς Ἰησοῦς, “for Jesus Himself testified.” The evangelist would not have presumed to apply to Jesus the proverbial expression, προφήτης... οὐκ εἶπεν, but Jesus Himself used it. The saying embodies a common observation. Montaigne complained that
in his own country he had to purchase publishers; while elsewhere publishers purchased him. The difficulty lies in the present application of the saying. If Galilee was His "fatherland," how can He use this proverb as a reason for His going there? To escape the difficulty Cyril, followed by Calvin, Grotius, and many more, says Nazareth was His πατρίς, and here [ἀναγενναῖον τινὲς τὴν ἑπολογίαν τῆς παραβολῆς] he assigns the reason for His passing by Nazareth. πατρίς can be used of a town as in Philo's Leg. ad Caïum, Agrippa says ἀντὶ ὧν ἔστι Παραβόλη πατρίς (Kypke). See also Achilles Tat., 22: Lk. iv. 23. But the objection is that Lk. tells us He did go to Nazareth. Origene says Judea was the πατρίς τῶν προφητῶν; and Lücke, Westcott, Reith, and others believe that Judea is here meant; and that Jesus, by citing the proverb, gives the reason for His rejection in Jerusalem. But this is out of place, as He had long since left Jerusalem. Meyer thinks the meaning is that Jesus left Galilee in order to substantiate His Messianic claim in Jerusalem, and this having been accomplished, He returns with His credentials to His own country. This agrees with ver. 45, "having seen the miracles which He did in Galilee," and Weiss interprets the words as meaning that Jesus leaves Samaria, where honour had come unbidden, in order to evoke faith and honour where as yet He had none: thus continuing the hard work of sowing and leaving to the disciples the glad harvesting. This is ingenious; but the obvious interpretation is that which finds in the statement (vv. 43, 44) a resumption of the narrative of vv. 1-3, which had been interrupted by the account of the Lord's experience in Samaria. That narrative had assigned as the reason for our Lord's leaving Judea and making for Galilee, His own over-popularity, which threatened a collision with the Pharisees. To avoid this He goes to Galilee, where, as He Himself said, there was little risk of His being too highly honoured.—Ver. 45. Neither is υἱὸν of ver. 45 inconsistent with this interpretation. It merely continues the narration: "when, then, He came into Galilee." The immediate result of His coming was not what He anticipated, and therefore ἤλθεν is thrust into the emphatic place, "a welcome was accorded to Him by the Galileans." And this unexpected result is accounted for by the fact stated, πάντα ἐσφακτεῖ... εἰς τὴν ἡράτης... they had been at the Passover at Jerusalem, and had seen all He had done there. "They received Him... on account of His fame in Jerusalem, the metropolis, which set them the fashion in their estimate of men and things" (Alford). According to John's usual method of distinguishing various kinds of faith, this note is inserted to warn the reader that the reception was after all not deeply grounded, and to prepare, for the statement of ver. 48. [�δὼν, and even ἤτείθη, may be rendered by pluperfecta.]—Ver. 46. ἤλθεν οὖν ὁ ἤρων... May we conclude from the circumstance that no mention is made of the disciples until vi. 3, "that they had remained in Samaria, and had gone home"? πάλιν ἔλθειν means "to return"; here with a reference to ii. 1. The further definition of Καρά, ἐποίησις τὸ ἀνδρόν οἶνον, is to identify the place, to prepare for ver. 54, and to remind us He had friends there. Westcott and Holtmann suppose the family of Jesus was now resident at Cana. That we have no reason to suppose. From the period of the ministry in Galilee now beginning, the Synoptists give many details: John gives but one. ὅ τι βασιλικός: Euthymius gives the meanings of βασιλικός thus: βασιλικὸς ἄληγεν, ἢ υἱὸς γένους βασιλικοῦ, ἢ υἱὸς ἡμῶν τε κεκηρυγμένος ἢ υἱὸς σωτῆρος, ἢ υἱὸς ἐκτελεῖται βασιλικὸς, ἢ υἱὸς υἱοθετήτα βασιλικὸς. Kypke gives examples of its use by writers of the period to denote soldiers or servants of a king, or persons of royal blood, or of rank and dignity, and thinks it here means "vir nobilis, clarus, in dignitate quadam constitutus." Lampé thinks it may imply that this man was both in the royal service and of royal blood. Lightfoot suggests that this may
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47. othos akousas that 1hsoys hem en tis ioudaia
eis thn galiilaian, apelle prois auton, kai hromata auton Iva kataphi

1 a Mac. vii. kai Iadthetai auton ton uion. 1hmele gar apothenion. 48. eten

u vi. 30. oth de 1hsoys prois auton, "Ean th symia kai htereta idete, oth

mi hpesteute." 49. legei prois auton d basuliado, "Kurye, katarphthi prin apothenion to paiidion mou." 50. legei auton d

1hsoys, "Poreioi o uios sou wu." Kapp episthsean o anerwtoi

tu logw f eiven auton o 1hsoys, kai eporeuteto. 51. 1hmi o auton

With acc. katathavontos, oio douloia auton aptethn 1 auton, kai aptesseian

laevotes, "Otan o paios sou wu." 52. "Epistheto oth par auton

tu dran ev fi koumpteteron evne kai eiven auton, "Otan th

1 numpthun (always used in John, xi. 20, 30; xii. 18) found in wBCDKL.

have been Chuza, Herod's chamberlain. Most probably he was an officer of
Herod's court, civil or military. His prominent characterastic at this time is
given in the words, oth de uios yphienei en Kapharanaio. The place is named beause
critical to the understanding of what follows.—Ver. 47. Having heard
1hsoys hemei, "that Jesus has come into Galilee," he traces Him to Kana,
and begs Him not simply to heal his son, but pointedly Iva kataphi, to go to Capernaum for the purpose. He considered
the presence of Jesus to be necessary
["non putat verbo curare posse," Melanchthon] (contrast the centurion of Matt.
vi.); and, being a person of standing,
did not scruple to trouble Jesus. Jesus
neither refuses nor grants the request at once, but utters the reflection: Ver. 48.
Ean th symia . . . pisteushte. Not
as a prophet uttering truth, but as a
m in Gnostics. He is put in His own
country; Samaria had received Him
without Him, as a Prophet. To seek
for a sign, says Melanchthon, "est velle
certificari alio modo quam per verbum," terata here only in John,
though frequent in Acts. Faith rooted in
"marvels" Jesus put in an inferior
place. But the father in his urgent
anxiety can only repeat his request (ver. 49)
kataphi prin apoTHENION TO PAIDION
muvo. "Duplex imbexilias rogantis, quasi
Dominus nessece haberet adesse, nec pos-
set aequa resuscitare mortuum " (Bengel).
But Jesus, unable to prolong his misery,
says parevou o uios sou wu. He did not

he with him. His cures are independent of
material media and even of His pres-
ence.—Ver. 50. And now the man be-
lieved tu logw [or de] eiven auton o
1hsoys. His first immature faith has
grown into something better. The
evident sincerity of Jesus quickens a
higher faith. On Christ's word he
departs home, believing he will find his
son healed.—Ver. 51. And while already
on his way down [1hmi showing that he
did not remain with Christ until from
some other source he heard that his son
was healed], his servants met him and
gave him the reward of his faith.—d paios
sou wu, an echo, as Weiss remarks, of
the words of Jesus, ver. 50. The ser-
voeans seeing the improvement in the
boy and not ascribing it to miracle, set
out to save their master from bringing
Jesus to Capernaum.—Ver. 52. epistheto
ou . . . koumpteteron evne. "Amenem
verbum, de convallentia, puerro praes-
sertim"—Bengel. Theophylact explains
by ev ti euvali kai evrwsteteron metiTHEN DEV PAIS: Euthymius by TO
bouteron, to koumpteteron, as we speak of
a sick person being "easier," "lighter".
The best illustration is Raphael's from
Epictetus that a little patient not be too much uplifted if the
physician says to him koumptes evneis, you are
doing well. The servants name the
seventh hour, i.e., 1 p.m. of the previous
day, as the time when the fever left him.
[Accus. of time when, rare; Winer ex-
plains as if it meant the approximate
time with a pera or xoiv understand;
Acts x. 3; Rev. iii. 3.] And this the
father recognised as the time at which
Jesus had said "Thy son liveth." The
distance between Cana and Capernaum
is about twenty-five miles, so that it
would appear as if the father had need-
lessly delayed on the road. But he may
have had business for Herod or for him-
self on the road, or the beast he rode
may have been unequal to the double
journey. At any rate it seems illegitimate to say with Weiss that “yesterday” means before sundown; or to ascribe the father’s delay to the confidence he had in Jesus’ word. The discovery of the coincidence in point of time produces a higher degree of faith, ἐπιστεύεται αὐτός καὶ ἥσαν αὐτοῦ δή. The cure brings into prominence this distinctive peculiarity of a miracle that it consists of a marvel which is coincident with an express announcement of it.—Ver. 54. τοῦτο πάλιν ἐκ δεύτερου a common pleonasm, “again a second”; cf. xxi. 16. In Mt. xxvi. 42, πάλιν ἐκ δεύτερου; and Acts x. 15. By this note John connects this miracle with that at the wedding, ii. 1-10, of which he said (ii. 11) ταύτην ἑκατέραν ἄρχην τῶν σημείων ἡ Ἰςοῦς. It does not mean that this was the second miracle after this return to Galilee, although the words might bear that interpretation. Why this note? Bengel thinks that attention is called to the fact that John relates three miracles wrought in Galilee and three in Judæa. Alford supposes that John wishes to note that as the former miracle had called forth the faith of the disciples, so this elicited faith from a wider circle.

Not only Strauss, Baur, and Keim but also Weiss and Sanday suppose that this is the same healing miracle recorded in Mt. vii. 5-13. But the differences are too great. In the one it is a Gentile centurion whose servant is paralysed; in the other it is the son of a (probably Jewish) court official who is at the point of death from fever. In the one the centurion insists that Jesus shall not come under his roof; in the other the suppllicant beseeches Him to do so. The half-faith of the father is blamed; the extraordinary faith of the centurion is lauded.

Chapters v.-xi. depict the growth of the unbelief of the Jews. In this part of the Gospel three Judaean miracles and one in Galilee are related in full, and the impulse given by each to the hatred of the Jews is pointed out. These miracles are the healing of the impotent man (chap. v.), the miraculous feeding (chap. vi.), the cure of the man blind (chap. ix.), and the raising of Lazarus (chap. xi.). This section of the Gospel may be divided thus:—

1. Chaps. v. and vi., Christ manifests Himself as the Life first in Judæa, then in Galilee, but is rejected in both places. 2. Chaps. vii. to x. 21. He attends the Feast of Tabernacles and manifests Himself by word and deed but is threatened both by the mob and by the authorities. 3. Chaps. x. 22 to xi., Jesus withdraws from Jerusalem but returns to raise Lazarus, in consequence of which the authorities finally determine to slay Him.

CHAPTER V. Jesus in Jerusalem manifests Himself as the Life by communicating strength to an impotent man.

—Ver. 1. μετὰ ταύτα, “after this”; how long after does not concern the narrative.—ἡν εὐρθή τῶν ιουδαίων. See critical note. Even if the article were the true reading, this would not, as Lücke has shown, determine the feast to be the Passover. Rather it would be Tabernacles, see W. H. ii. 76. We are thrown upon general considerations and that these yield a very uncertain result is shown by the variety of opinion expressed by commentators. The feasts we have to choose from are: Purim in March, Passover in April, Pentecost in May, Tabernacles in October, Dedication in December. It is chiefly between Purim and Passover that opinion is divided, because some feast in spring is supposed to be indicated by iv. 35. Against Passover it is urged that in chap. vi. another Passover is mentioned; but this is by no means decisive, as John elsewhere passes over equally long intervals of time. Lampe, Lightfoot, Grotius, Whitelaw, and Wordsworth argue for Passover; Tischendorf, Meyer,
Godet, Farrar, Weiss, and others strongly favour Purim; while Lücke seems to prove that no sure conclusion can be reached. [For a full and fair presentation of opinions and data see Andrew's *Life of our Lord*, p. 189 sqq.] The feast, whatever it was, is mentioned here to account for Jesus being again in Jerusalem.—

Ver. 2. ἔστι δὲ ἐν τούτῳ ἱεροσόλυμαι. From the use of the present tense Bengel concludes that this was written before the destruction of Jerusalem [*Scipio Johannes ante vastationem urbis*]. But quite probably John considered the pool one of the permanent features of the city. Its position is more precisely defined in the words ἐν τῇ προβατικῇ, rendered in A.V. "by the sheep market" and in R.V. "by the sheep gate." Others read κολυμβήθρα, and render "by the sheep-pool a pool"; Weiss, adopting this reading, supplies οἶκα or some such word: "there is by the sheep-pool a building." But this does some violence to the sentence; and as the "sheep gate" is mentioned in Neh. iii. 32, xii. 39, the reading, construction, and rendering of R.V. are to be preferred.—ἡ ἐπιλεγομένη Ἐβραϊστή Βηθσεδᾶ. The pool has recently been identified. M. Clermont-Ganneau pointed out that its site should not be far from the church of St. Anne, and in 1888 Herr Shick found in that locality two sister pools, one fifty-five and the other sixty feet long. The former was arched in by five arches, while five corresponding porches ran alongside the pool. By the crusaders a church had been built over this pool, with a crypt framed in imitation of the five porches and with an opening in the floor to get down to the water. That they regarded this pool as that mentioned here is shown by their having represented on the wall of the crypt the angel troubling the water. [Herr Shick’s papers are contained in the *Palestine Quarterly*, 1888, pp. 115-134, and 1890, p. 19. See also St. Clair’s *Buried Cities*, Henderson’s *Palestine*, p. 180.] The pool had five porches. Bovet describes the bath of Ichab near Tiberias: "The hall in which the spring is found is surrounded by several porticoes in which we see a multitude of people crowded one upon another, lying stretched out in blankets, with lamentable expressions of misery and suffering." Here lay πλῆθος τῶν ἀσθενοῦντων, and these were of three kinds, τυφλῶν, χωλῶν, ἔφηβων.—Ver. 3. ἐκδεχομένων μόνον: See critical note.—Ver. 5. ἔστι δὲ ταῦτα ἢ δόμων ... ἀσθενῶν. "And there was a certain man there who had spent thirty-eight years in his infirmity." ἡμᾶς cf. v. 6 and viii. 57; and Achil. Tat., 24. How long he had lain by the water is not said. To find in the man’s thirty-eight years’ imbecility a symbol of Israel’s thirty-eight years in the wilderness is itself an imbecility.—Ver. 6. Jesus when He saw the man lying and had ascertained (γνωσάς, having learned from his man or his friends) that already he had passed a long time (in that infirmity) says: θέλεις ἄρης γενέσθαι; "Do you wish to become whole
(healthy)?” This question was put to attract the man’s attention and awaken hope. But the man is hopeless: it is not a question of will, he says, but of opportunity. His very weakness enabled others to anticipate him; εν δέ ἔρχομαι έγώ, “while I am coming,” he could, then, move a little, but not quickly enough. At each bubbling up of the water, apparently only one could be healed. The ἄλογον τό έρων καταβαίνω was a great aggravation of his case.—Ver. 8. The impotent man having declared his helplessness, Jesus says to him, "Εγείρε, a command to be obeyed on the moment by faith in Him who gave it. Cf. vi. 63, and Augustine’s “Da quod jubes, et jube quod vis.” Ἀρνον τόν κράββατον σου, “take up your pallet”, ἀπό τοῦ κράββατον is the Latin grābatus, and is late Greek; see Rutherford’s New Phryn., 137; and McLellan’s Greek Test., p. 106, for references and anecdote. He was commanded to take up his bed that he might recognise that the cure was permanent. No doubt many of the cures at the pool were merely temporary. περιπέτατο “walk,” ability was given not merely to rise, but to walk. The cures wrought by Christ are perfect, and do not only give some relief.—Ver. 9. καὶ εἴσθανον . . . Immediately on Christ’s word he became strong, and took up his bed and walked: ἧς aorist of one act, περιπέτατο imperfect of continued action. Ver. 10 should begin with the words ἵνα δὲ σάββατον, as this is the starting-point for what follows.—Ver. 10. “It was a Sabbath on that day,” the Jews there-
Though the healed man had failed to keep hold of Jesus, Jesus does not lose hold of him, but εὑρίσκει αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ ἱερᾷ, "finds him," as if He had been looking out for him, cf. i. 44, 46, "in the temple," where He may have gone to give God thanks. Jesus says to him ἵνα γέγονα ... γενήσαι. μηκέτι ἀμέτρητα, present imperative, "continue no longer in sin," χείρον. There is then some worse consequence of sin than thirty-eight years' misery and uselessness. Apparently Jesus feared that health of body might only lead the man to further sin. His physical weakness was seemingly the result of sin, cf. Mark ii. 5-10. Jesus is not satisfied with giving him physical health. Oscar Holtzmann observes that we have here the two leading Pauline ideas, that the Saviour frees from many O.T. precepts, and yet that His emancipation is a call to strive against sin (Yohan., p. 60).—Ver. 15. ἀνήλθεν δὲ ἄνθρωπος, "The man went off and reported to the Jews that the person who healed him was Jesus." He had asked His name, and perhaps did not consider that in proclaiming it he was endangering his benefactor.—Ver. 16. The consequence however was that the Jews persecuted Jesus, "εἰδικὼς, not in the technical sense; but, as the imperfect also suggests, they began from this point to meditate hostile action; cf. Mark iii. 6. καὶ ἔηθους αὐτὸν ἀποκτείνας, on the ground that He was a Sabbath-breaker, and therefore worthy of death; οὐκ ἐτύπωσε τὴν σαββάτου. The plural and the imperfect show that the cure of the impotent man was not the only case they had in view. Their allies in the provinces had made them acquainted with similar cases. It would almost seem as if He was in the habit of thus signalising the Sabbath.—Ver. 17. In some informal way these accusations were brought to the ears of Jesus, and His defence was: ὁ πατὴρ μου … ἀργόλογοι. "My Father until now works, and I work," as if the work of the Father had not come to an end on the seventh day, but continued until the present hour. Nay, as if the characteristic of the Father were just this, that He works. Philo perceived the same truth; πάντεστα σοφοὶ τοίνυν οὐθὲ ἀλλ' εὐσεβείς θειὸς τὸ καλὸν πνεῦμα καὶ χθόνος τὸ πνεῦμα, οὕτω καὶ θεοῦ τοῦ πνεύματος. God never stops working, for as it is the property of fire to burn and of snow to be cold so of God to work (De allegor., ii. See Schoetgen in loc.). Jesus means them to apprehend that there is no Sabbath, such as they suppose, with God, and that this healing of the impotent was God's work. The Father does not rest from doing good on the Sabbath day, and I as the Father's hand also do good on the Sabbath. In charging Him with breaking the Sabbath (ver. 18), it was God they charged with breaking it. But this exasperated them the more "because He not only was annulling (Δικαίωμα, 'laws, as having binding force, are likened to bonds, hence Δικαίωμα is to annul, subvert, deprive of authority," Thayer) the Sabbath, but also said that God was His own Father, making Himself equal to God." The Jews found in ὁ πατὴρ μου (ver. 17) and the implication in καὶ γὰρ ἔργά οις a claim to some peculiar and exclusive (ὁις) sonship on the part of Jesus; that He claimed to be Son of God not in the sense in which other men are, but in a sense which involved equality with God. Starting from this, Jesus took occasion to unfold His relation to the Father so far as it concerned men to know it.
The passage 19-30 divides itself thus: vv. 19, 20 exhibit the ground of the Son's activity and love for the Son; vv. 21-23, the works given by the Father to the Son are, generally, life-giving and judging; vv. 24-27, these works in the spiritual sphere; vv. 28-29, in the physical sphere; and ver. 30, reaffirmation of unity with the Father.—Ver. 19. The fundamental proposition is οὐ δύναται δ ὄλες τοις ἀνθρώποις, "The Son can do nothing of Himself." This is not, as sometimes has been supposed, a general statement true of all sons, but is spoken directly of Jesus. Δύναται is moral not physical ability—though here the one implies the other; but cf. ver. 26. So perfect is the Son's sympathy with the Father that He can only do what He sees the Father doing. He does nothing at His own instance. That is to say, in healing the impotent man He felt sure He was doing what the Father wished done and gave Him power to do.—Δ ἢ ἄρσεν . . . τοις, as Holtzmann observes, the force of the repetition lies in ἀρσέν, *pariter,* "in like manner."—Ver. 20. And the Son is enabled to see what the Father does, because He loves the Son and shows Him all that He Himself does. The Father is not passive in the matter, merely allowing Jesus to discover what He can of the Father's will; but the Father *συνέκρινε*, shows Him, inwardly and in response to His own readiness to perceive, not mechanically but spiritually, all that He does; τοις apparently without limitation, for τοις is habitual present as φέρει in previous clause, and cannot be restricted to the things God was then doing in the case of the impotent man. Besides, a merely human sonship scarcely satisfies the absolute δ ἄρσεν and δ ὄλες of this passage.—καὶ μετοίκω ... ταὐμάζουν, the Father through the Son will do greater works than the healing of the impotent man; cf. xiv. 13; "that ye may marvel"; this seems an inadequate motive, but ver. 23 explains it. In the following passage, spiritual quickening is meant in vv. 21-27, while in vv. 28, 29, it is the bodily resurrection that is in view.—Ver. 21. ἦν πάθη ἔξερεν τοῖς καιροῖς καὶ ζωοτείς, "that ye may marvel"; this is one of the "greater works" which the Father shows to the Son. The Jews believed in the power of God to give life and to raise the dead; see Deut. xxxiii. 39; 1 Sam. ii. 6; Isa. xxvi. 19. In our Lord's time there was in use the following prayer: "Thou, O Lord, art mighty for ever; Thou quickenest the dead; Thou art strong to save: Thou sustainest the living by Thy mercy; Thou quickenest the dead by Thy great compassion; Thou makest good Thy faithfulness to them that sleep in the dust; Thou art faithful to quicken the dead." "There is therefore no need to ask, what quickening of the dead is here meant? What was meant was that the power which they all believed to be in God was likewise in the Son. He quickens ὅσοι βίαι, i.e., no matter how dead the person is; even though he has lain as long useless as the impotent man. The question of the human will is not touched here, but it may be remarked that the will of the impotent man was consulted as the prime requisite of the cure.—Ver. 22. But not only does the Son quicken whom He will, but He also judges: ὅσοι γὰρ . . . ζωή. "For not even does the Father judge any one, but has given all judgment to the Son." "For since He knows Himself to be the sole mediator of true life for men, He can also declare that all those who will not partake through Him of this blissful life, just therein experience judgment whereby they sink into death." Wendt, ii. 211; and cf. ver. 27. οὐδεν γὰρ introduces the fresh statement, that He judges, not only as the reason for what goes before, but on its own account also, as an additional fact to be noticed. It would seem an astonishing thing that
even "judgment," the allotting of men to their eternal destinies, should be handed over to the Son. But so it is: and without exception, the κρίσιν πάσης "all judgment," of all men and without appeal.—Ver. 23. This extreme prerogative is given to the Son for the purpose of committing judgment to the Son; that even those supremely and inalienably Divine prerogatives of giving life and judging may be seen to be in Him, and that thus Deity may be honoured in and through Him. The great peril threatening the Jews was that they should deny honour to the Son, and thereby incur the guilt of refusing honour to the Father. In denouncing Him for breaking the Sabbath they were really dishonouring the Father. η τιμίως... αὐτῶν. μὴ τιμίως a supposed case, therefore μὴ: of actual negation. To dishonour the Father's messenger is to dishonour the Father. Having explained the relation of His work to the Father's, and having declared that life-giving and judging are His prerogatives, Jesus now, in vv. 24-30, more definitely shows how these powers are to be exercised in the spiritual regeneration, and in the resurrection and final judgment. The voice of Jesus gives life eternal. ἀμὴν, ἀμὴν, however incredible what I now say may seem.—Ver. 24. ὁ τῶν λόγων μου ἀκούων; it was through His word Jesus conveyed life to the impotent man, because that brought Him into spiritual connection with the man. And it is through His claims, His teaching, His offers, He brings Himself into connection with all. It is a general truth not confined to the impotent man. But to hear is not enough: καὶ πιστεύσῃ τῇ περὶ ἐμείς, belief on Him that sent Jesus must accompany hearing. Not simply belief on Jesus but on God. The word of Jesus must be recognised as a Divine message, a word with power to fulfill it. In this case, by the very hearing and believing, ἦσαν ἑδραμόντες. As the impotent man had, in his believing, physical life, so whoever believes in Christ's word as God's message receives the life of God into his spirit. Faith has also a negative result; εἰς κρίσιν oye ἐρχεται, "all judgment." of all men without appeal.—Ver. 25. ἀμὴν, ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, διότι "ἀπροσδιορισμένοι" τῆς φωτός...

1 ακούσταιν in ADG; ακούσταιν in B, adopted by T.Tr.W.H.R. So in ver. 28.
Modern editors read ήσοντας with ΜBDL 1, 22, 33.

death hear but not all give ear (Weiss). δοκούσαντες in the former clause means hearing with the outward ear, δοκούσαντες hearing with faith. The question, how can the spiritually dead hear and believe? is the question, how could the impotent man rise in response to Christ's word? Perhaps psychologically inexplicable, it is, happily, soluble in practice. — Ver. 26. The 26th verse partly explains the apparent impossibility. — δοστή γέραν... ἐκεῖν ἐν δόξῃ. The particles mark the fact of the gift and not the degrees of it' (Westcott). As the Father has in Himself, and therefore at His own command, life which He can impart as He will: so by His gift the Son has in Himself life which He can communicate directly to whom He will. — ἐν δόξῃ (similarly used Mk. iv. 17, John iv. 14, etc.) excludes dependence for life on anything external to self. From this it follows that what is so possessed is possessed with uninter rupted fulness, and can at will be imparted. — ἐκεῖνος, 'the tense carries us back beyond time,' says Westcott. This is more than doubtful; although several interpreters suppose the eternal generation of the Son is in view. That is precluded both by the word "gave" (which "denotat id quod non per naturalem generationem, sed per benevolam Patris voluntatem est concessum," Mt. xxvii. 18 Lk. i. 32; John iii. 34, vi. 37, Lamps) and by the context, especially by the last clause of ver. 27. The opinions of the Fathers and Reformers are cited in Lamp. See further Stevens, John. Theol., p. 60. — Ver. 27. Not only has the Father given to the Son the great prerogative, but καὶ ἡσοντας... ἀνθρώπου τοῦ... κρίνων ποιής, like judicium facere, and out do judgment, is used by Demosthenes, Xenophon, Polybius, etc., in the sense "to judge," "to act as judge." This climax of authority [although καὶ is omitted before ἡσοντας by recent editors on good authority] is based upon the fact ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπου τῷ... [Strangely enough, Chrysostom ascribes this punctuation to Paul of Samosata, and declares it to be an inconsequence. He himself begins ver. 28 with this clause, and reads "marvel not at this, that He is the Son of Man."]. The absence of the article condemns all interpretations which render these words "the Son of Man" and understands that Jesus claims the prerogative of judgment as the Messiah. Where "the Son of Man" means the Messiah the articles regularly appear. Besides, direct allusion to the Messianic functions would here be out of place. The words must be rendered "because He is a son of man," that is, a man. How is this a reason for His being Judge of men? Various explanations are given: the Judge must be visible since the judgment is to take place with human publicity (Luther, Maldonatus, Witsius), because as man the Son carries out the whole work of redemption (Meyer, etc.), because men should be judged by the lowest and most loving of men (Stier), because the Judge must share the nature of those who are brought before Him (Westcott), because only as man could Jesus enter into the sphere in which the judicial office moves or have the compassion which a judge of men should possess (Baur), because the judgment of humanity is to be a homage rendered to the holiness of God, a true act of adoration, a worship; and therefore the act must go forth from the bosom of humanity itself (Godet). But undoubtedly Beyrich is right when he says: "The eternal love condemns no one because he is a sinner; as such it does not at all condemn; it leaves it to men to judge themselves, through rejection of the Saviour who is presented to them. The Son of Man is the judge of the world, just because He presents the eternal life, the kingdom of heaven to all, and urges all to the eternal decision, and thus urges those who continue unbelieving to a continuing self-judgment" (Neuest. Theol., i. 290). By His appearing in human form as God's messenger, and by His offer of life eternal, He necessarily judges men. As His offer of life to the impotent man tested him and showed whether he would abide in death or pass out of life: so are all men judged precisely by that appearance among them in human form which stumbles them and tempts them to think His claims absurd, and which yet as the em-
bodied love and life of God necessarily judges men. Therefore μὴ θανάτευτε τούτο.—Ver. 28. And another reason for restraining surprise is ἵνα ἔρχεται ἄρα, etc. It has been proposed to render this as if δὲ were explanatory of τούτο, do not wonder at this, that an hour is coming. But (1) τούτο usually, though not invariably, refers to what precedes; and (2) when John says "Do not wonder that" so and so, he uses μὴ θανάτευτε δὲ without τούτο; and (3) the ordinary rendering suits the passage better: Marvel not at this [that my voice gives life] because a time is coming when there will result from my voice that which if not really greater will strike you more sensibly. The bodily resurrection may be said to be greater than the spiritual as its consummation, completion, and exhibition in results. Besides, the Jews of our Lord's time looked upon the resurrection as the grand demonstration of God's power. But here the οἷς τοῖς μνημείοις shows that the surprise is to be occasioned by the fact that even the physically dead shall hear.—πάντες ... κρίνεται. That the resurrection is alluded to is shown by the change from κρίνεται of ver. 25 to οἷς τοῖς μνημείοις. Some take κρίνεται as a temporary act, which from its opposition to ζωῆς must here be equivalent to κατακρίνεται. If it is asked with regard to the righteous, With what body do they come? much more may it be asked of the condemned. The entrance into life and into condemnation are determined by conduct; how the conduct is determined is not here stated. For the expressions defining the two types of conduct see on chap. iii. 20, 21. That the present reception of life is the assurance of resurrection is put strikingly by Paul in 2 Cor. v. 5. The fact that some shall rise to condemnation discloses that even those who have not the Spirit of God in them have some kind of continuous life which maintains them in existence with their personal identity intact from the time of death to the time of resurrection. Also, that the long period spent by some between these two points has not been utilised for bringing them into fellowship with Christ is apparent. In what state they rise or to what condition they go, we are not here told. Beyond the fact of their condemnation their future is left in darkness, and was therefore probably meant to be left in darkness.—Ver. 30. This judgment claimed by Jesus is, however, engaged in, not in any spirit of self-exaltation or human arbitrariness, nor can it err, because it is merely as the executor of the Father's will He judges.—οὐ δέναιμαι ... οὐδέν. The first statement of the verse is a return upon ver. 19, "The Son can do nothing of Himself"; but now it is specially applied to the work of judgment.—καθὼς ἀκούσει κρίνεται. As He said of His giving life, that He was merely the Agent of God, doing what He saw the Father do: so now He speaks what He hears from the Father. His judgment He knows to be just, because He is conscious that He has no personal bias, but seeks only to carry out the will of the Father. In vv. 31-40 Jesus substantiates these great claims by his conduct, as shown in the foregoing verses. He refers to the μαρτυρία borne by John the Baptist, by the works given Him by the Father, and by the Father in Scripture.—Ver. 31. "Εὰν εὖ γὰρ μαρτυρῆται ... ἀδικήσῃ. Jesus anticipates the objection, that these great claims were made solely on His own authority [ἐγὼ τοὺς ἱουδαίους ἐστήθη μένοις ἀντίθετα, Euthym.]. The Jewish law is given by Wetstein, "Testibus de se ipsis non credunt," or "Homo non est fide dignus de se ipso," and cf. Deut. xix. 15. The same law prevailed among the Greeks, μαρτυρία τοῦ ἰδιού, ἐκείνου ᾧ ἔδωκεν αὐτὸν εὐωδι (Demosth., De Cor., 2), and among the Romans, "more majorum comparatum est, ut in minimis
28—35. "ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ

εμαυτοῦ, ἢ μαρτυρία μου οὐκ ἐστὶν ἀληθῆς. 32. ἔλλος ἐστὶν ὁ ζ. ἐκτὸς ἀληθῆς, καὶ οἶδα ὅτι ἀληθῆς ἐστὶν ἡ μαρτυρία ἡ μαρτυρεῖ περὶ ἑμοῦ.

33. "Ὑμεῖς ἀπεστάληκα πρὸς Ἰωάννην, καὶ μεμαρτύρηκε τῇ ἐκτῇ ἀληθείᾳ. 34. εἶδε δὲ οὐ πάρα ἀνθρώπῳ τὴν μαρτυρίαν λαμβάνων· καὶ εἰς ἐκείνην ἀλλὰ τούτο λέγω ἵνα ὑμεῖς σωθῆτε. 35. ἐκείνος ἦν ὁ λόγος ὁ πόρισεν ὁ καὶ ὁ διάκονος καὶ ὁ φαίνων, ὑμεῖς δὲ ἰδοὺ ἐπιλαμβάνετε ἡγεῖσθε ἑαυτούς πρὸς Ἰωάννην, sent, by the deputation mentioned chap. i., to John; which they would not have done had they not thought him trustworthily (Euthymius). The perfect is used, indicating that the result has been continued; as the perfect μαρτυρήσατε indicates that "the testimony preserves its value notwithstanding the disappearance of the witness."—τῇ ἀληθείᾳ to the truth, especially of the Messianic dignity of Jesus.—Ver. 34. εἶδε δὲ οὐ ... but for my part I do not depend upon a man's testimony. In what sense is this to be taken? In iii. 11 λαμβάνων τὴν μαρτυρίαν means "to credit testimony," but this sense does not satisfy the present use. Grotius says, "Hic λαμβάνων est requiro, ut infra 41, 44, ubi in opposito membro ponitur ζητέων ut idem valens". So too Lücke. Godet and Westcott prefer to emphasize the article, "the testimony," "the only real, infallible, unexceptionable testimony," I do not accept from man. The sense is: You sent to John and he testified to the truth; but the testimony which I for my part accept and rely upon is not that of a man. The testimony which confirms Him in the consciousness that He is God's messenger is not a human but a Divine testimony.—ἀλλὰ τὸ αὐτὸ λέγω but this I say, that is, this regarding the truth of John's testimony I now mention ἵνα ὑμεῖς σωθῆτε, for your sakes, not for my own, that even on a man's testimony you may be induced to believe.—Ver. 35. ἐκείνος δὲ τῶν λόγων ὁ καὶ διάκονος καὶ φαίνων, "He was (suggesting that now the Baptist was dead) the lamp that burneth and shineth"—δὲ λόγων; for the difference between λόγους a lamp and λαμπάτα a torch, see Trench, Synonyms, p. 154, and cf. λαμπαδί-δρομα the Athenian torch-race. The article "simply marks the familiar piece of household furniture" (Westcott). "The article simply converts the image into a definition" (Godet). "The article points him out as the definite light which

rebuses homines amplissimi testimony de sua re non dicentur" (Cicero, pro Roscio, 36, Wetstein). Grotius says: "Romani dicunt neminem idoneum testem esse in re sua". But how can Jesus say that if His witness stands alone it is not true? Chrysostom says He speaks not absolutely but with reference to their suspicion [πρὸς τὴν ἐννέαν φήμαν]. And on occasion He can maintain that His testimony of Himself is true, chap. viii. 13, where He says "Though I witness of myself my witness is true," and demands that He be considered one of the two witnesses required. Here the point of view is different, and He means: Were I standing alone, unauthenticated by the Father, my claims would not be worthy of credit. But ἔλλος ἐστὶν ὁ μαρτυρεῖ περὶ ἑμοῦ (on the definite predicate with indefinite subject vide Winer, p. 136).

"It is another that beareth witness of me," namely, the Father [σημαίνει τὸν ἐν τοῖς ἑδραίοις ἐστιν δεδομὲν καὶ πατέρα, Cyril, Melanchthon, and the best modern interpreters, Holtzmann, Weiss, Westcott). Grotius, following Chrysostom and Euthymius, says "faciliorem est ut de Johanne sumamus, quia de eo sunt quae proxime sequuntur". Against this is (1) the disclaimer of John's testimony, ver. 34: and especially the accentuated opposition of υμεῖς, ver. 33, and εἶδα, ver. 34. For other reasons, see Lücke. Of this witness Jesus says οἶδα ὅτι ... ἱμῶν. Why this addition? Is it an overflow of satisfaction in the unassailable position this testimony gives Him? Rather it is the offset to thesupposition made in ver. 31, "my witness is not true". [Cyril's interpretation is inexact, but suggestive: μανονογιλο τοῦτο διάδοσιν, διὰ Θεοῦ δὲ ἀληθῶς, οἴδα, φησίν, ἑφανερωκατανόην δὲ οἶδα ὁ Πατὴρ ὅτι περὶ ἑμοῦ.]—Ver. 33. Before exhibiting the Father's testimony Jesus meets them on their own ground: υμεῖς, γε yourselves, ἀπεστάλνακα πρὸς...
could have shown them the way to salvation, ver. 34 " (Weiss). Others find a reference to Ps. cxiii. 17, ηγείμασα λόγον τον Χριστόν σου. Grotius and Lücke think the reference is to Exclus. xlvii. 1, καὶ ἀνάγοντα διὰ προφητὴς ὀς πάντα καὶ δὲ λόγον ἀντίκειται. In the medieval Latin Hymns the Baptist is " non Lux iste, sed lucerna." [Cicero, pro Milone, 21, and elsewhere, calls certain illustrious citizens "lumina," but with a somewhat different significance.] — διὰ καύσμαν, "burning and shining are not two different properties," Meyer; a lamp must burn if it is to shine.—ψηφείς δὲ θεβάζομαι ἄγαλμισθήναι πρὸς ὑμᾶν ἐν τῷ φωτὶ αὐτοῦ; the expression seems intended to suggest the thoughtless and brief play of insects in the sunshine or round a lamp. ["Wie die Mücken im Sonnen-schein spielen," Haurath in Holtzmann.] Like children following in a bridal procession, dancing in the torchlight: the type of sentimental religionists reveling in their own emotions.—Ver. 36. ἦν δὲ " was one of the most important of ver. 33, ἦν τὴν μαρτυρίαν μείζον, "have the witness which is greater," i.e., of greater weight as evidence than that of John,—τὰ γὰρ ἔργα . . . ἀπεστάλη, "the works which the Father θέωκε [or as modern editors read ἔδωκε] to Him" comprise all that He was commissioned to do, but with a more special reference to His miracles. Lücke well says, "He who looked at the miracles as separate and individual displays of supernatural power and did not view the entire manifestation of Christ in its solidarity, was bound to find the miracles without significance and the latter incomprehensible". The ἔργα are cited as evidence, chaps. x. 25, 38, and xiv. 11; evidence as here to the fact that the Father had sent Him.—Ver. 37. But over and above the evidence of the works καὶ δὲ τέμνεις με παρῆρε, αὐτὸς μαρτυρήσει, "And the Father who sent me has Himself also testified". Where and how this testimony of the Father's separate from the works has been given, is explained, ver. 38 and 40. But, first, Jesus states how it has not been given: οὐκ ἔχεις αὐτὸν . . . ἀπεστάλη. It is not by coming into your midst in a visible form and speaking as I speak that the Father has testified. "His voice you have never heard: His form you have never seen." It is not by sensible sights and sounds the Father has given His testimony. [This interpretation is however ignored by most: by Meyer, who thinks the reference is to their insensibility to the revelation of God in Scripture; by Westcott, who says "the Jews by their disbelief of Christ failed to hear and see Him"; by Godet, who finds "a declaration of man's natural impotence to rise to the immediate and personal knowledge of God". Reference to the baptism is put out of the question by νυώνα. The reference to the ἐγέρσαι is only form of prophetic revelation (Weiss) is too remote.—Ver. 38. καὶ τὸν λόγον . . . you have not heard His voice— as you have heard mine (ver. 23)—and His word which you have heard, and which has been coming to you through all these centuries, you do not admit to an abiding and influential place within you. —τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ is God's revelation, which the Jews were conscious they had received; but though the word of God had come to them, they did not have it "abiding in" them; cf. 1 John iii. 15; a phrase which in John denotes permanent possession and abiding influence. God's message does no good until it inwardly possesses those to whom it comes. The proof that the Jews had not thus received it is: οὐτὶ δὲ ἀπεστάλην . . . "whom God
hath sent, Him ye believe not." Had the revelation or word of God in law and prophets possessed them, they would inevitably have recognised Jesus as from the same source, and as the consummation of the message, the fulfilment of the promise. Not that the Jews held their Scriptures in no esteem, no, (ver. 39), ἐρευνάτε τὰς γραφάς; the indicative is to be preferred, "Ye search the Scriptures"; the reason being ὅτι ὁ υἱός ὁ μακάριος ἐν αὐτοῖς ἦν ἀληθῶς ἢς, "because you suppose that in them you have life eternal"—already it is hinted, by the emphatic ὁ υἱός implicitly opposed to a contracted ἰδιώς, and by the emphatic ἐν αὐτοῖς suggesting another source, that eternal life was not to be had in the Scriptures, but in something else. But it is of no small importance the Scriptures themselves into which you search testify. καὶ Καὶ where "They testify that in me is life eternal; and yet you will not come to me that you may have life."—Ver. 40. καὶ ὁ ἔχετε. The true function of Scripture is expressed in the words, ὁ υἱός ὁ μακάριος ἐν αὐτοῖς; they do not give life, as the Jews thought; they lead to the life-giver. God speaks in Scripture with a definite purpose in view, to testify to Christ; if Scripture does that, it does all. But to set it on a level with Christ is to do both it, Him, and ourselves grave injustice.

This closes the description of the threefold witness to Christ, and in vv. 41-47, He exposes the source of their unbelief. This exposure is introduced by a disclaimer on His part of any chagrin at the want of homage and acceptance He received.—Ver. 41. Δέον παρὰ ἄνθρωπον ὁ λαμβάνω, not "glory from men I am not receiving," not quite "glory from men I do not seek," but rather, that which is in my judgment glory, I do not receive from men: not what men yield me is my glory. Ambition is not my motive in making these claims.—Ver. 42. ἄνθρωπος ἐν αὐτοῖς; but I know you, etc.; that is, I know why you do not receive me; the reason is that you have not the love of God in yourselves, and therefore cannot appreciate or understand one who acts in concert with God; if therefore they did offer Him homage, it could not be God in Him they worshipped (Holtzmann). [The motive of Jesus in making His claims is a subject inviting inquiry and full of significance.]—Ver. 43. ἕνα διαίλθεν οὕτως; It is just because I have come in the Father's name that you do not receive me. Not really loving God, they could not appreciate and accept Jesus who came in God's name, that is, who truly represented God. But ἄνθρωπος ἐν αὐτοῖς λήψάτε, "if another come in his own name," and thereby seeking only such glory as the Jews could give, him ye will receive; cf. Matt. xxiv. 5, 23, 24. "He did not say, 'If I had come in my own name,' because the thing was so inconceivable." Mason, Conditions of our Lord's Life, etc., p. 90. Possibly Jesus had here in view Antichrist (see Bousset's Antichrist, 133); but neither Bar Cochba nor any other definite Pseudo-Christ. Schudt mentions sixty-four.—Ver. 44. The Jewish inability to believe arose from their earthly ambition: πώς δύνασθε ἀπὸ ἑαυτῶν. The root of their unbelief was their earthly idea of
glory, what they could win or bestow. This incapacitated them from seeing the glory of Christ, which was divine and heavenly, which men could not give or remove. The glory was contrasted with that μόνων Θεοῦ from the only God, the only source, arbiter, and dispenser of praise. Seeking credit as religious men from one another, they necessarily habituated themselves to current ideas, and blotted out Divine glory from their mind.—Ver. 45. μὴ δοξάζετε . . . These words bear in them the mark of truth. They spring from Jesus' own consciousness of His intimacy with the Father. To suppose that the Jews feared He would accuse them, is to suppose that they believed Him to have influence with God. Chiefly in view is the fact that Moses will accusation them. They thought they were defending Moses' law in accusing Christ for Sabbath-breaking: but, on the contrary, they were themselves open to the accusation of Moses; else ἵνα διώχησηται, in Vulgate “Moses in quo vos speratis”—Ver. 46. They will be accused by Moses because their unbelief in Christ convicts them of unbelief in Moses, εἰ γὰρ . . . ὑμεῖς. Had they believed the revelation made by Moses and understood it, they would necessarily have believed in Christ. “Disbelief in me is disbelief in him, in the record of the promises to the patriarchs, in the types of the deliverance from Egypt, in the symbolic institutions of the Law, in the promise of a prophet like unto Moses; not for it was of me (the order is emphatic) he wrote,”—Westcott. —Ver. 47. The converse is true, and true with an a fortiori conveyed by the contrast between γράμματα and δόξα. If the writings you have had before you for your study all your life, and which you have heard read in the Synagogues Sabbath after Sabbath, have not produced faith in you, and enabled you to see God and appreciate His glory, how shall ye believe the once heard words of one whose coming was prepared for, and His identification made easy by all that Moses wrote?

CHAPTER VI. Jesus miraculously furnishes a meal for 5000 men with women and children, and thus manifests Himself as the Bread from heaven. This provokes the crisis in Galilee.—Vv. 1-13. The miracle narrated.—Ver. 1. μετὰ τοῦ, John's indefinite note of time. The interval between chap. v. and chap. vi. depends on the feast alluded to, v. 1. If it was Purim, only a month had elapsed; if it was Passover, a year. In any case Jesus had left Jerusalem, the reason being that the Jews sought to slay Him (vii. 1).—ἀνεξέλθεν δὲ ἡμών, “Jesus departed,” but whence? Evidently from Capernaum and the neighbourhood; cf. Mt. xiv. 13, Mk. vi. 30, Lk. ix. 10.—εἰσῆλθεν . . . Τιβερίας, “to the other side of the Sea of Galilee, of Tiberias”. In xxi. 1 it is called simply τῆς Τιβερίας. The second title may here be a gloss, either by the evangelist himself or by a later hand, to distinguish the lake from Merom, or possibly because the latter name was more familiar to some of John's readers than the former. [Pausanias, v. 7, 3, calls it Λάμην Τιβερία.] Grotius, followed by Meyer, says: “Proprius denotat lacus partem quae ab adstant oppido, ut fieri solet, nomen habet proprium”. Consequently he thinks of Jesus as crossing the Jordan below the lake. This is groundless. The town Tiberias was only built by Herod about the year 20 A.D. (Smith's Hist. Geog., 448). The exact locality where the following scene is laid seems to have been at the northeastern corner of the lake, not far from Bethsaida Julia.—καὶ ἡμολογήθη . . . ἀδειναύτων. “A great crowd followed Him,” out of Galilee into Galanitias, the reason being ὅτι ἤλθον [plural although ἡμολογεῖ is singular], “because they had seen the miracles which He was doing [imperfect of continuous action] on the sick”.—ἄνθρωπος with genitive denotes the object towards which action is directed, ἐν ὀικίᾳ, homewards, etc. Meyer, Weiss (and Holtzmann) take it as meaning “among”.—ἀνέξαντες δὲ εἰς τὸ δρόμον ἐν ἡμῶν, “and Jesus went up,” from the
level of the Jordan and the lake, to the higher ground on the hill; καὶ ικε... αὐτοῦ, “and there sat down with His disciples,” having apparently left the crowd behind, for the sitting down with the disciples indicated that rest and peace were expected.—Ver. 4. But another crowd was to be accounted for, as ver. 4 intimates, ἦν δὲ ἀγνώρ. ... ἱουδαίων, “now the Passover, the Jewish feast, was at hand.” [Grotius says: “Hoc ideo interjicit, ut intelligatur tempus fuisse opportunum ad eliciendam multitudinem, et quo melius cohaeret quod de herba sequitur.”] Gobet’s account of the insertion of this clause, that it was meant to show that the nearness of the Passover suggested to Jesus the idea “we will keep a Passover here,” is plainly out of the question.—ἐπάρασ ... Ἰησοῦς therefore (or better, “accordingly”); οὗν connects what He saw with the foregoing statement).—Ver. 5. τὸλς ἐκλογὴ ἐρχεται, not the same crowd as was mentioned in ver. 2, else the article would have been inserted, but a Passover caravan coming from some other direction, and probably guided to Jesus’ retirement by some of those who had followed in the first crowd. Seeing the crowd approaching, He initiates the idea of giving them a meal. The synoptic account is different.—λέγει γρ. τοῦ Φιλίππου. Why to Philip? The question was put to Philip whether he happened at the moment to be nearest to Jesus (Alford); nor, as Bengel suggests, because he had charge of the commissariat, “forteasse Philippus rem alimentarium curabat inter discipulos”; nor “because he knew the country best”; nor only, as Euthymius says, ἤν τὴν ἀφορισμὸν ὄμολογοσίαν ἀκριβέστερον καταμένῃ τοῦ μέλλοντος γεννήσαι βασιλέα τὸ μέγαθε; but Cyril is right who finds the explanation in the character of Philip and in the word πειράζων of ver. 6 [γεμνάζων εἰς πίστιν τοῦ μαθητῆν]. Philip was apparently a matter-of-fact person (xiv. 8), a quick reckoner and good man of business, and therefore perhaps more ready to rely on his own shrewd calculations than on unseen resources. This weakness Jesus gives him an opportunity of conquering, by putting the question πῶς ἐγνώρισμεν ἄρτους; “Whence are we to buy bread?” [lit. loaves]. πῶς may either mean “from what village,” or “from what pecuniary resources.” Cf. πῶς γὰρ ἤκουσαν βιοτά; Soph., Philoct., 1159.—Ver. 7. Philip swiftly calculating declares it impossible to provide bread for so vast a multitude, Διακασιών ... λαβή. “Two hundred denarii worth of loaves are not enough for them that each should receive a little.” “Denarius” means containing ten; and originally the denarius contained ten asses. The as was originally an ingot of copper, aex, weighing one lb.; but long before imperial times it had been reduced to one ounce, and the denarius was reckoned as equal to sixteen asses or four stateres, and taking the Roman gold piece like our sovereign as the standard, the denarius was equivalent to about 9½d., which at that time was the ordinary wage of a working man; sufficient therefore to support a family for a day. If half was spent in food, the reckoning the family at five persons, one denarius would feed ten persons, and 200 would provide a day’s rations for 2000; but as Philip’s calculation is on the basis of food for a whole day, but only for one meagre meal, a short ration (ἐβραξό ἤν), it is approximately accurate. There were between five and ten thousand mouths. See Expositor, Jan., 1890.—Ver. 8. With the same matter-of-factness as Philip εἷς ... Πέτρου, “one of His disciples, Andrew, the brother of Simon Peter,” a description apparently inserted in forget-
fulness that it has already been given, i. 41, supplementing Philip's judgment, cf. xii. 22, λέγει αὐτῷ, "says to Him" (the dative still holds its place after λέγει, and has not quite given way, as in modern Greek, to πρὸς with accusative, cf. ver. 5). Ἐστι παῖδρόν ἐν δὲν. "There is here one little boy." [Ἐν is rejected by modern editors. May it not have been rejected because unnecessary? At the same time it must be borne in mind that although in Mt. (viii. 19 and xxvi. 66) έίς is used as an indefinite article—as in German, French, etc.—it is not so used in John. The Vulgate has "est puer unus hic". Meyer thinks it is inserted to bring out the meagerness of the resources, "but one small boy"].—Ver. 9. ἐξαρκῇ ... δόφαρα. The Synoptic account speaks of these provisions as already belonging to the disciples.—κρῆσιν, the cheapest kind of bread; see Ezek. xiii. 19, and the extraordinary profusion of illustrations in Wetstein, among which occurs one from the Talmud: "Jochanan dixit, hordeum faciam mirexundum ei: nuncia equis et asinis"; and from Livy, "Cohortibus, quae signa amiserant, hordeum dixissent".—καὶ δύο δόφαρα, in Mt. xiv. 17, ἰεροῦ, see also John xxi. 10. —δύορον is whatever is eaten with bread as seasoning or "kitchen," hence, re-eminently, fish. So Athenaeus, cited by Wetstein. In Numbers xi. 22 we have τοῦ δόφου τῆς θαλάσσης.—ἀλλὰ ταῦτα τί έστιν εἰς τοσοῦτον; exhibiting the helplessness of the disciples and inadequacy of the means, as the background on which the greatness of the miracle may be seen.—Ver. 10. The moral ground for the miracle being thus prepared Jesus at once says, τούτοις τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἀνεπηρεῖν. [For the form of speech cf. Soph., Philoct., 925, κλέιν ... μα... τιμί.] This order was given for two reasons: (1) that there might be no unseemly crowding round Him and crushing out of the weaker; and (2) that they might understand they were to have a full meal, not a mere bite they could take in their hand in passing. Obedience to this request tested the faith of the crowd. They trusted Jesus.— ἦν δὲ χόρτος τόλμην ἐν τῷ τόπῳ, "Now there was much grass in the place," contrasting with the corn-lands and olive-yards of the opposite shore, where the large crowd could not easily have found a place to lie down. Mark rather brings out the contrast between the colours of the dresses and the green grass (vi. 39): ἐντάεμι αὐτοῖς ἀνένειμα τάπας συμ-νόμια συντόνω ἐν τῷ χλωρῷ χόρτῳ. καὶ ἄνεργον προσεῖλε προσαίλει, like beds of flowers.—ἀνέπηρεν [better ἀνεπηρεῖν] οὖν οἱ ἄνθρωποι ... the men reclined, not counting women and children (ὥσπερ γυναῖκις καὶ παιδίων, Mt. xiv. 21), in number about five thousand; the women, though not specified, would take their places with the men. Some of the children might recline from His Own hand.—Ver. 11. Facing the vast and hungry crowd Jesus took up and gave thanks for the slender provision, ἐλαβεί δὲ [better ἐλαβεί οὖν] τοὺς ἄρτους, the loaves already mentioned, καὶ κύκλῳ ἑλέβων [Phrynichus says εὐχαριστεῖν οὖν τοὺς δεσμοὺς κυκλῳ ἑλέβως; and Rutherford says Polybius is the first writer who uses the word in the sense of "give thanks"]). Pagans, by libation, or by throwing a handful on the household altar, gave thanks before a meal; Jews pronounced a blessing, ἀνάγνωσμα or ἔλεος. (Luke xiv. 30, Mt. xiv. 19, and especially 1 Tim. iv. 4. See also Grotius' note on Mt. xxvi. 27.) Having given thanks Jesus dīδωκε ... τοῖς ἀνακειμένοις. The words added from the Synoptists give a fuller account
of what actually happened. But curiosity as to the precise stage at which the multiplication occurred, or whether it could distinctly be seen, is not satisfied. They all received ὄφρας ἱδέας, not the ἡ ραχής τι of Philip; and even this did not exhaust the supply; for (ver. 12) ὅποσ ἐνεκτήσανσα, when no one could eat any, there were seen to be κλάσματα περισσεύματα, pieces broken off but not used. These Jesus directs the disciples to gather ἵνα μὴ τι ἀπόληται, "that nothing be lost". The Father's bounty must not be wasted. Infinite resource does not justify waste. Euthymius ingeniously supposes the order to have been given ἵνα μὴ δέξῃ φαντασία τις τὸ γενόμενον; but of course those who had eaten already knew that the provision was substantial and real.—Ver. 13. Συνήγαγον ὅπως . . ἐβραίωσαν, the superabundance, the broken pieces of the five loaves which were in excess of the requirements, & ἐπερεπεννυόντως, filled δεδεκα κοφίνους, that is to say, far exceeded the original five loaves.—κοφίνος [French, Coffin, petit panier d'osier; cf. our "coffin" and "coffer"], a large wicker basket or hamper used in many countries by gardeners for carrying fruit, vegetables, manure, soil; and identified with the Jew by Juvenal (iii. 14), "Judaes quorum cophinum foemunque supelix". (See further Mayor's note on the line, and Sot., vi. 541.) This gives colour to the idea that each of the apostles may have carried such a basket, which would account for the twelve. But why they should have had the baskets with nothing to carry in them does not appear.

Vv. 14-25. The immediate impression made by the miracle and the consequent movements of Jesus and the crowd.—Ver. 14. The conclusion drawn from the miracle by those who had witnessed it, was that this was "the beginning of that reign of earthly abundance, which the prophets were thought to have foretold". See Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. 552. This at once found expression in the words οὗτος ὁ θεὸς . . . κόσμῳ. "This is indeed," or "of a truth," as if the subject had been previously debated by them, or as if some had told them He was "the prophet who should come into the world," δ ἐρχόμενος, used of the Messiah by the Baptist (Matt. xi. 3) without further specification; but John adds his favourite expression ἐν τοῖς κόσμοι. That the people meant the Messiah (cf. Deut. xviii. 14-19) is shown by the action they were prepared to take. —Ver. 15. For Jesus perceived that they were on the point of coming and calling Him off to make Him king. ἀρπάζων, to snatch suddenly and forcibly (derived from the swoop of the falcon, the ἀρφίον, hence the Harpies). This scene throws light on the use of ἀρπάζων in Matt. xi. 12. Their purpose was to make Him king. Their own numbers and their knowledge of the general discontent would encourage them. But Jesus ἀνεξήγητο πάλιν εἰς τὸ δρόμον αὐτῶν μόνον, "wished again (cf. ver. 3) to the mountain," from which He may have come down some distance to meet the
crowd. Now He detached Himself even from His disciples. [ἐν χιλιάδεσι μηδὲν νοέσθαι τούτου, Origen.] The Synoptic account is supplementary. The disciples remained behind with fragments of the crowd, but, when it became late, they went down to the sea, and having got on board a (not "the") boat, they were coming across to Capernaum [Mark says Jesus told them to go to Bethsaida, but that is quite consistent, as they may have meant to land at the one place and walk to the other] on the other side, and it had already become dark, and Jesus had not, or "not yet," come to them, and the sea was rising owing to a strong wind blowing.—Ver. 19. ὤλπακτος οὖν ὃς σταθεῖς εἰκοσιτέτο ἡ πτερίδα. The Vulgate renders "cum remigassent ergo," and modern Greek ἔκπαιδηλάγησαν, rightly; see Aristoph., Frogs, 195; and other passages in Elsner. The stadium was about 194 (Rich gives 202) yards, so that the disciples would go to a mile. The disciples had rowed about three miles. [The best discussion of the direction they were taking is in the Rob Roy on the Jordan, p. 374.] θεώρουσι τῶν ἤσησύν περιπατοῦντα ἐν τῇ βαλάνσῃ "they see Jesus walking on the sea." It has been suggested that this may only mean that Jesus was walking "by" the sea, ἐν τῷ being used in this sense in xxi. 1. But that ἐν can mean "on" the sea is of course not questioned [see Lucian's Vera Historia, where this incident is burlesqued; also Job ix. 8, where, to signalise the power of God, He is spoken of as ὁ πεπάσμας ἐν τῇ βαλάνσῃ]. Besides, why should the disciples have been afraid had they merely seen Jesus walking on the shore? They manifested their fear in some way, and He says to them, 'Εγώ εἰμί, I am He, or It is I."—Ver. 20. Hearing this, ἔξωσαν ἐν λαβεῖν αὐτόν εἰς τὸ πλοῖον, by which Lücke, Holtzmann, Weiss, Thayer, and others suppose it is meant, that they merely wished to take Him into the boat, but did not actually do so. The imperfect tense favours this sense; and so do the expressions ἔσθαλον πιάσας αὐτόν, xii. 44; and ἧσαν αὕτου ἐνέστη, xvi. 19; whereas two of the passages cited against this meaning by Alford are in the aerist, a tense which denotes accomplished purpose. On the other hand, the imperfect may here be used to express a continuous state of feeling, and accordingly the A.V., following the Geneva Bible, against Wiclif and Tindale, rendered "they willingly received Him". So Grotius "non quod non reciperint, sed quod cupide admodum". So, too, Sânday: "The stress is really on the willingness of the disciples, Bthé̂sáleth by which rather than eight would pack to the shore? They manifested their fear in
action. The observations they made are described under ἵδε, which never finds its verb, but is resumed in οὖν ἐδειν of ver. 24; and their consequent action is described in the main verbs of the sentence ἐνέβησαν (ver. 24) καὶ ἠλώσαν. With the unconscious but accurate observation of a fishing population in such matters, the crowd had noticed that there was only one boat lying on the beach at that point, and further that the disciples had gone away in it and had not taken Jesus with them. But in the morning, having presumably passed the night in the open air, and having gathered at the lake-side below the scene of the miracle, they found that neither Jesus nor His disciples were there. Apparently they expected that the disciples would have returned for Jesus, and that they might find both Him and them on the shore. Disappointed in this expectation, and concluding that Jesus had returned by land as He had come, or had left in one of the Tiberias boats, they themselves entered the boats from Tiberias, which had been driven ashore by the gale of the previous night, and crossed to Capernaum. This account of the movements and motives of the crowd seems to give each expression its proper force. The fact parenthetically introduced, ver. 23, that boats from Tiberias had put in on the east shore, is an incidental confirmation of the truth that a gale had been blowing the night before. What portion of the belated crowd went back to Capernaum in these Tiberias boats we do not know.—ὡρύντες· οὖν πέραν τῆς βαλάσσης, having found Him on the other side of the lake, that is, on the Capernaum side, εἶπον ... γέγονεν, "they said to Him, Rabbi, when camest thou hither?" "Quæstio de tempore includit questionem de modo" (Bengel). For this use cf. γέγονας cf. ver. 19; and Cebes, Tabula, πρὸς τὸν λατρεύν γινόμας, and Lucian, Asinus, οὐκ ἐδειν τῆς πλοῖως ἑγερθομαιν (Kypke). They came seeking Him, but were surprised to find Him. To their question Jesus makes no direct reply. He does not tell them of His walking on the water.

In vv. 26-65 we have the conversation arising out of the miracle. The first break in it is at ver. 41. From ver. 26-40 Jesus explains that He is the Bread of Life.—Ver. 26. Αἀρην ... ἐχορσήσθην. In this pursuing crowd Jesus sees no evidence of faith or spiritual hunger, but only of carnal- and misunderstanding. Ye follow me συν δε ἐβαθεν σημεία, "not because you saw signs," not because in the feeding of the 5000 and other miracles you saw the Kingdom of God and glimpses of a spiritual world, ἀλλ' δει φέσητε εἰς τῶν ἐρτῶν καὶ ἐχορσήσθην, but because you received a physical satisfaction. This gave the measure of their Messianic expectation. He was the true Messiah who could maintain them in life without toil. Sense clamours and spirit has no hunger.—ἐχορσήσθην, from χέρτος, means "to give fodder to animals," and was used of men only "as a depreciatory term." In later Greek it is used freely of satisfying men; see Kennedy's Sources of N.T. Greek, p. 80; Lightfoot on Phil. iv. 12.—Ver. 27. ἐργάσθη ... ἐν τῷ δώσειν. "Work not for the meat which perisheth." ἐργάσηται means "I earn by working," "I acquire," see passages cited by Thayer in voc. The food which He had given them the evening before He called βρῶσιν ἀναλωμένην: they were already hungry again, and had toiled after Him for miles to get another meal. Rather must they seek τὴν βρῶσιν ... αὐτῶν, the food which abides εἰς τὴν αἰώνιαν, that is, which is not consumed in the eating but rather grows as it is enjoyed. Cf. iv. 14. This food δὲ ἐστά τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐμῖν δώσει. He does not call Himself "the Prophet,"
as they had called Him yesterday, because this would have excited false expectations; but in calling Himself the Son of Man He suggests His sympathy with all human wants and at the same time indicates to the initiated that He claims the Messiahship. The guarantee is given in the words τοῦτον γὰρ ... ἀδέης, "For Him hath the Father, God, sealed." By giving the Son the miracle of the previous day and other signs to do, the Father has sealed or authenticated Him as the Giver of that which nourishes life everlasting. [For the idea, approved by Delitzsch, that the seal refers to the stamping of loaves with the name of the maker, see O. T. Student, Sept., 1883, and Expositor, 1883. Elsner with more reason cites passages showing that a person ordering a banquet gave his seal to the slave or steward commissioned to provide it: and thus that Christ here declares "se a Patre constitutum esse ad suppedandum Ecclesiae salutarem cibum." The various meanings of the word are given by Suicer.] Some at least of the crowd are impressed; and conscious that their toil was, as Jesus said, commonly misdirected, they ask Him (ver. 28) τι ποιοῦμεν [better, ποιῶμεν] ἵνα ἐργαζόμεθα τὸ ἐργά τοῦ Θεοῦ; that is, how can we so labour as to satisfy God? What precisely is it that God waits for us to do, and will be satisfied with our doing? To which Jesus, always ready to meet the sincere inquirer, gives the explicit answer (ver. 29) τοῦτο ἐστι ... ἐκίνον. If God has sent a messenger it is because there is need of such interposition, and the first duty must be to listen believingly to this messenger. To this demand that they should accept Him as God's ambassador they reply (ver. 30) τι ἐστὶν ποιῶμεν ... "Judaicus proprium erat signa quærebar," 1 Cor. i. 22, Lampe. Grotius and Lücke think this asking for a sign could not have proceeded from those who saw the miracle of the previous day. But Lampe rightly argues that they were the same people, and that they did not consider either the miracle of the previous day or the ordinary cures wrought by Jesus to be sufficient evidence of His present claim.—Ver. 31. This is proved by the suggestion added in ver. 31. τι παρέχετε ... φαγεῖν; they demanded that He as Messiah should make good His claim by outdoing Moses. Schoetgen and Lightfoot quote from Rabbinical literature a relevant and significant saying; "Qualis fuit redivo primus (Moses) talis erit redemptor ultimus (Messias). Redemptor prior descendere fecit pro iis Manna, sicut et Redemptor posterior descendere faciet Manna, sicut scriptum est," Ps. lxiii. 16. See other instructive passages in Lightfoot. According to this expectation that the Messiah would feed His people supernaturally the crowd now insinuate that though Jesus had given them bread He had not fulfilled the expectation and given them bread from heaven. (For the expression "bread of
heaven" see Exod. xiv. 4 and Ps. lxxviii. 23, 24. To this challenge to fulfil Messianic expectation by showing Himself greater than Moses Jesus replies (ver. 32), ο θεός μου συνιστά το πάντα. A double denial; not Moses, but "my Father" is the giver, and although the manna was in a sense "bread from heaven" it was not "the true bread from heaven," τον εδραμένον τον αἰωνα ο θεός. This is My Father who is now giving you; συνιστά το πάντα. —Ver. 33. Moses therefore could not give this bread, since it comes down out of heaven. It is characterised by two attributes: (1) it is ο θεός συνιστά το πάντα, that which cometh down out of heaven—not, as Godet renders, "He who cometh down from heaven"; at least the request of ver. 34 shows that those who heard the words did not take them in this sense; (2) the other characteristic of the bread of God is that it giveth life to the world; a fuller life-giving power than that of the manna is implied; and it is of universal application and not merely to their fathers. Hearing this description of "the bread of God" the crowd exclaim (ver. 34) Κύριε, σωστος δέσμη τού θεού τῶν δασών. precisely as the woman of Samaria had exclaimed Κύριε, σωστος, when Jesus had disclosed to her the properties of the living water. And as in her case the direct request brought the conversation to a crisis, so here it elicits the central declaration of all His exposition of the bearing of the miracle: "Εγώ εσμήν ο θεός τῆς ζωῆς. (It is not impossible that some of them may have had a glimmering of what He meant and uttered their request with some tincture of spiritual desire; for among the Rabbis there was a saying, "In seculo venturo neque edunt neque bibunt, sed justi sedent cum coronis suis in capitis et alunt splendore majestatis divinae."). "I am the bread of life," "I am the living bread" (ver. 51, in a somewhat different sense), "I am the bread which came down from heaven" (ver. 42), or, "the true bread from heaven" —all these designations our Lord uses, and that the people may quite understand what is meant, He adds δραμένον το πάντα. The repetition of the required action δραμένον, and δραμένων, and of the result of δ ες συνιστά το πάντα, is for clearness and emphasis, not for addition to the meaning. The "believing" explains the "coming"; and the "quenching of thirst" more explicitly conveys the meaning of "never hungering," that all innocent and righteous cravings and aspirations shall be gratified. The "coming" was not that physical approach which they had adopted in pursuing Him to Capernaum, but such a coming as might equally well be called "believing," a spiritual approach, implying the conviction that He was what He claimed to be, the medium through which God comes to man, and man to God. —Ver. 36. But although God and this perfect satisfaction were brought so near them, they did not believe: ἀλλ' εἰπὼν ... πιστεύετε. Beza, Grotius, Bengel, Godet, Weiss, etc., understand that εἰπὼν refers to ver. 26. Euthymius, preferably, says εἰπὼν τούτῳ ἔρχομαι μν, μη γραφήναι δι'. Lampe gives the alternatives without determining. Undoubtedly, although the reference may not be directly to ver. 26, the εὑρέσκετε means seeing Jesus in the exercise of His Messianic functions, doing the works given Him by the Father to do. But seeing is not in this case believing. It was found very possible to be in His company and to eat the provision He miraculously provided, and yet disbelieve. Is so, what could produce belief? Might not His entire manifestation fail to accomplish its purpose? —Ver. 37. Νο; for πάντα διδάσκοντες ... σημείων. "Everything which the Father gives"; the neuter is used as being more universal than the masculine and including everything.
which the Father determines to save from the world's wreck, viewed as a totality. Cf. ver. 39, ἀναστήσον ἀυτόν: and the collective neuter, as in Thucyd., iii. 16, τὸ ἐπίστων for τῶν ἐπίστων. Lampe thinks the neuter is used, “quia has personae spectantes at roast peculium, haereditas, merces, genus, semen, sacerdotium, sanctuarium Domini”. What is meant by δίδωσιν? It is an act on God's part prior to the “coming” on man's part; the coming is the result of the giving. Calvinistic interpreters have therefore identified the giving with election. “Dominii verbum perinde valet ac si dixisset Christus, quos elegit Pater, eos regenerat”—Calvin. “Patrem dare filio est eligere”—Melanchthon; and similarly Beza and Lampe. On the other hand, Reynolds represents a number of interpreters when he says, “It is the present activity of the Father's grace that is meant, not a foregone conclusion”. This identifies the Father's “giving” with His “drawing,” ver. 44. It would rather seem to be that which determines the drawing, the assigning to Jesus of certain individuals who shall form His kingdom. This perhaps involves election but is not identical with it. Cf. xvii. 6. Euthymius replies, from a Semi-Pelagian point of view, to the objections which arise from an Augustinian interpretation of the words. The purpose of the verse is to impart assurance that Christ’s work will not fail. καὶ τῶν ἐξήχυμον . . . ἑως. Grotius thinks the “casting out” refers to the School of Christ; Lücke thinks the kingdom is referred to. It is scarcely necessary to think of anything more than Christ's presence or fellowship. This strong asseveration εἰ μὴ ἥξαλα, and concentrated Gospel which has brought hope to so many, is here grounded on the will of the Father.—Vv. 38, 39. δτι καταβεβληκα . . . ημέρα. Everywhere Jesus forestalls the idea that He is speaking for Himself, and is uttering merely human judgments, or is in any way regulated in His action by what is arbitrary: it is the Supreme Will He represents. And this will requires Him to protect and preserve all that He is committed to Him. ἵνα πᾶς δ' θεωρῶν τὸν υἱόν καὶ ἤτοι αὐτῷ, ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἁλών, καὶ αναστῆσον αὐτόν ἐγώ, τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς ἱμάρας. 41. Ἑγγύτευξαν οὖν οἱ Ιουδαῖοι περὶ αὐτοῦ, διότι

1 τατρός omitted in B·ABCD, etc.
2 All authorities read γερ. "tou τεμπιστού με in AEGH; tou τατρός μου in NBBCD.

V. 41-51. In this paragraph we are first told how the Jews were staggered by our Lord's affirming He had come down from heaven; second, how Jesus explains that in order to understand and receive Him they must be
taught of God; and third, how He reiterates His claim to be the Bread of Life, adding now the explanation that it is His flesh which He will give for the life of the world.—Ver. 43. “Εὐγγεγγυέον... ἀναφορά. “The Jews,” not as we might expect, “the Galileans,” probably because John identifies this unbelieving crowd with the characteristically unbelieving Jews. εὐγγεγγυέον in Exod. xvi. 7-9, 1 Cor. x. 10, etc., has a note of malevolence, but in John vii. 32 no such note. “Murmur” thus corresponds to the ground of their murmuring was His asserting Ἐγώ εἰμι... ἀναφορά. Cf. ver. 33, ὁ καταβάτων, and ver. 38, καταβατικα. Lücke says: “When John makes the descent from heaven the essential, inherent predicate of the bread, he uses the present: when the descent from heaven is regarded as a definite fact in the manifestation of Christ, the aorist.” They not merely could not understand how this could be true, but they considered that they had evidence to the contrary (ver. 42), καὶ ἔλεγον, ὅτι... καταβατικα; the emphatic ἡμῖν more clearly discloses their thought. We ourselves know where He comes from. The road from heaven, they argued, could not be through human birth. This was one of the real difficulties of the contemporaries of Jesus. The Messiah was to come “in the clouds,” suddenly to appear; but Jesus had quietly grown up among them. From this passage an argument against the miraculous birth of our Lord has been drawn. The murmurers represent the current belief that He had a father and mother, and in His reply Jesus does not repudiate His father. But He could not be expected to enter into explanations before a promiscuous crowd. As Euthymius says: He passes by His miraculous birth, “lest in removing one stumbling block He interpose another”. To explain is hopeless.—Ver. 43. Therefore He merely says Ἔγὼ γεγενέων μετ' ἀλλήλων. That was not the way to light. Nor could He expect to convince all of them, for οδοιποι... ἀλλήλων αὐτὸν, “no one can come to me unless the Father who hath sent me draw him”. ἀλλήλων has the same latitude of meaning as “draw”. It is used of towing a ship, dragging a cart, or pulling on a rope to set sails. But it is also used, xii. 32, of a gentle but powerful moral attraction; “if I be lifted up, all men will draw, etc.” Here, however, it is an inward disposing of the soul to come to Christ, and is the equivalent of the Divine teaching of ver. 45. And what is affirmed is that without this action of God on the individual no one can come to Christ. In order to apprehend the significance of Christ and to give ourselves to Him we must be individually and inwardly aided by God. [Augustine says: “Si trahitur, ait aliquis, invitus venit. Si invitus venit, non credit, si non credit, nec venit. Non enim ad Christum ambulando currisimus, sed credendo, nec motu corporis, sed voluntate cordis accedimus. Noli te cogitare invitum trahi: trahitur animus et amore.”] And Calvin says: “Quantum ad trahendi modum spectat, non est ille quidem violentus qui hominem cogat externo impulso, sed tamen efficax est motus Spiritus Sancti, qui homines ex nolentibus et invitatis reddit voluntarios". All that Calvin objects to is that men should be said “proprio motu” to yield themselves to the Divine drawing. Cf. a powerful passage from Luther’s De libero Arbitrio quoted in Lampe; or as Beza concisely puts it: “Verum quidem est, neminem credere invitum, quum Fides sit assensus. Sed volumus quia datum est nobis ut velimus.” —Ver. 45. In confirmation of His assertion in ver. 44, Jesus, as is His wont, cites Scripture: ἕστιν γεγεγομένον ἐν τοῖς προφηταίσιν, that is, it is written in that part of Scripture known as “the Prophets”. The passage cited is Is. liv. 13, where, in describing Messianic times, the prophet says, “Their
children shall all be taught of God;” εὐρηται τὰς τινὰς ἱδιαίτερὰς τοῦ Θεοῦ, and what this being taught of God means. He more fully explains in the words πᾶς οὖν ... μαθων, “every one who has heard from the Father and has learned comes to me.” Both the hearing and the learning refer to an inward spiritual process. The outward teaching of Scripture and of Christ Himself was enjoyed by all the people He was addressing; but they did not come to Him. It is therefore an inward and individual illumination by the special operation of God that enables men to come to Christ. Whether these verses teach “irresistible grace” may be doubted. That they teach the doctrine which Augustine asserted against Pelagius, viz., that power to use grace must itself be given by God, is undeniable. That is affirmed in the statement that no one can come to Christ unless the Father draw him. But whether it is also true that every one whom God teaches comes is not here stated; the καὶ μάθων introduces a doubtful element. [Vegetius quotes from Thibius the words, Ἐρωτεύσου τούτων τοῦ μόνου ἀντώνως.]—Ver. 46. Lest His hearers should suppose that in Messianic times direct knowledge of God was to be communicated, He adds, οὐχ ὅτι τὸν πατέρα τις ἔφακεν, it is not by direct vision men are to learn of God. One alone has direct perception of the Father, ὁ ἐν παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ, He whose origin is Divine; not ὁ ἄνεστιν παρὰ Θεοῦ, a designation which belonged to all prophets, but He whose Being is directly derived from God. Similarly, in vii. 29, we find Jesus saying ἐγὼ οἶδα ὅτι τὰ ἐπ' αὐτοῦ εἰμὶ καὶ ἀνεστίν, where the source of the mission and the source of the being are separately mentioned. To refer this exclusive vision of the Father to any earthly experience seems out of the question. No one who was not more than man could thus separate himself from all men. See i. 18. Having thus explained that they could not believe in Him without having first been taught of God, He returns (ver. 47) to the affirmation of ver. 40, ἀνωθεν ... ἔσται. Their unbelief does not alter the fact, nor weaken His assurance of the fact. This consciousness of Messiahship was so identified with His spiritual experience and existence that nothing could shake it. But now He adds two significant confirmations of His claim.—Vv. 49, 50. οἱ πατέρες ... μὴ ἀποθάνων. “Your fathers ate the manna in the desert and died: this is the bread which comes down out of heaven, that a man may eat of it and not die.” In other words: The manna which was given to your fathers to maintain them in physical, earthly life, could not assert its power against death, and maintain them continually in life. Your fathers died physically. The bread which comes down from heaven does not give physical life; it is not sent for that purpose, but it is given to maintain, it maintains in continuance and precludes death. Taken in connection with the context, the words interpret themselves. Godet however says: “Jesus, both here and elsewhere, certainly denies even physical death in the case of the believer. Cf. viii. 51. That which properly constitutes death, in what we call by this name, is the total cessation of moral and physical existence. Now this fact does not take place in the case of the believer at the moment when his friends see him die.” This seems to misrepresent the fact of death for the sake of misrepresenting the present passage.—Ver. 51. In ver. 51 Jesus adds two fresh terms in explanation of the living bread, which, however, through
their want of apprehension, increased their difficulty. The first is ἐγὼ ἐμι... ὥστε. In giving this explanation He slightly alters the designation of Himself as the Bread: He now claims to be not "the bread of life," but ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ἐαυτοῦ, "the living bread." Geddes says: "The manna, as not itself living, could never impart life. But Jesus, because He Himself lives, can give life." That is correct, but is not the full meaning. ὁ δὲ λέγει... καί πρῶτα ἡ σάρκα μου δεσμών... and as "living water" is water running from a fountain in perpetual stream, and not a measured quantity in a tank, so "living bread" is bread which renews itself in proportion to all needs like the bread of the miracle. The second fresh intimation now made is ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ἐγὼ δεσμών ἡ σάρκα μου ἐκ τοῦ... This intimation is linked to the foregoing by a double conjunction καὶ ὁ ἄρτος ὁ... "and besides" indicating, according to classical usage, a new aspect or expansion of what has been said. The new intimation is at first sight an apparent limitation: instead of "I am the bread," He now says "My flesh is the bread". Accordingly some interpreters suppose that by "flesh" the whole manifestation of Christ in human nature is meant. cf. ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγέρθη. Thus Westcott says: "The life of the world in the highest sense springs from the Incarnation and Resurrection of Christ. By His Incarnation and Resurrection the ruin and death which sin brought in are overcome. The thought here is of support and growth, and not of Atonement." To this there are two objections. (1) If σάρξ is equivalent to the whole manifestation of Christ in the flesh, this is not a new statement, but a repetition of what has already been said. And (2) the δεσμός compels us to think of a giving yet future. Besides, the turn taken by the con-

... 55-57, seems to point rather to the atoning sacrifice of Christ. [So Euthymius: τῆς σταυροῦντος αὐτοῦ προστασίας... τῷ δὲ ἐγὼ δεσμόν τὸ ἔνθισμόν ἐμβαίνει τοῦ τουτοῦτον πᾶσαν. So too Cyril: 'Ἀποθεοῦσας, φίλην, ὑπὸ πάντων, ἵνα πάντας ὠφθησίσας δὲ ἐμαυτοῦ, καὶ ἀντλήσας τὴν ἐπάνω σαρκὸς τῆς ἐννοιμαζόμενης. Bengel says: 'Tota haec de carne et sanguine Jesu Christi oratio passionem spectat'. Bexa even finds in δεσμὸν the sense "offeram Patri in ara crucis."] The giving of His flesh, a still future giving which is spoken of as a definite act, is, then, most naturally referred to the death on the cross. This was to be ἑκάτη τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ὥστε, "for the sake of the life of the world". ἑκάτη when used in connection with sacrifice tends to glide into ἐκτιν; see the Alcestis of Eurip. passim and Lampe's note on this verse. Here, however, the idea of substi-
tution is not present. It is only hinted that somehow the death of Christ is needed for the world's life. This state-
ment, however, only bewilders the crowd; and the next paragraph, vv. 52-59, gives expression to and deals with this bewildement.—Ver. 52. Ἐμαχόστε... The further explanations sprang from a fresh question put not directly to Jesus, but to one or other of the crowd. They differed in their judgment of Him. Some impatiently denounced Him as insane: others suggesting that there was truth in His words. The discussion all tended to the question τῶν ἀναλυτέων... ἡμᾶς. He had only spoken of "giving" His flesh for the life of the world: but they not unreason-

ably concluded that if so, it must be eaten. Their mistake lay in thinking of a physical eating.—Vv. 53, 54. ἦσθε... ημᾶς. Instead of explaining the mode Jesus merely reiterates the statement. The reason of this is that
their attention was thus more likely to be fixed on the necessity of using Him as the living bread. The difficulty of the statement disappears when it is perceived that the figure of speech is not to be found in the words "flesh" and "blood," but in the words "eating" and "drinking." The actual flesh and blood, the human life of Christ, was given for men; and men eat His flesh and drink His blood, when they use for their own advantage His sacrifice, when they assimilate to their own being all the virtue that was in Him, and that was manifested for their sakes. As Locke points out, the σαρξ καὶ αἷμα form together one conception and are equivalent to the μοι of ver. 57. If αἷμα stood alone it might refer especially to the death of Christ, but taken along with σαρξ it is more natural to refer the double expression to the whole manifestation of Christ; and the "eating and drinking" can only mean the complete acceptance of Him and union with Him as thus manifested. [τρώγων, originally the munching of herbivorous animals, was latterly applied to ordinary human eating.—Vv. 55, 56. This is further shown in vv. 55, 56. η γαρ σαρξ μου ἀληθής [better ἀληθῆς] ὁτι βρῶσις, "For my flesh is a genuine food and my blood is a genuine drink"; with an implied contrast to those things with which men ordinarily endeavour to satisfy themselves. The satisfying, genuine character of Christ as the bread consists especially in this, that ὁ τρώγων . . . ἐν ἐμοὶ μένει καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ. He becomes as truly assimilated to the life of the individual as the nourishing elements in food enter into the substance of the body. The believer abides in Christ as finding his life in Him (Gal. ii. 20); and Christ abides in the believer, continually imparting to him what constitutes spiritual life. For in Christ man reaches the source of all life in the Father (ver. 57), καθὼς ἀπέστειλε μοι ὁ ζων πατήρ . . . δι' αἵματος, The living Father has sent Christ forth as the bearer of life. He lives ἐν τῶν πατέρας, not equivalent to ἐν τοῖς πατέρας through or by means of the Father, but "because of," or "by reason of the Father." The Father is the cause of my life; I live because the Father lives. [Besa quotes from the Plutus of Aristoph., 470, the declaration of Penia that μόνον ἄγαθον ἄματών εὐσεβῶν αἵνεκεν ἦν ἤματος, ἀν ζωὴ ἐντὸς τῆς ζωῆς,] The Father is the absolute source of life; the Son is the bearer of that life to the world; cf. v. 26, where the same dependence of the Son on the Father for life is expressed. The second member of the comparison, introduced by καὶ (see Winer, p. 548; and the Nic. Ethics, passim), is not, as Chrys. and Euthymius suggest, καὶ ἐν ζωῇ, but καὶ ὁ τρώγων με, κακέως ἀπομαται (better ἀπομαται) δι' αἵματος. (For the form of the sentence cf. x. 14.) Every one that eateth Christ will by that connection partake of life in God.—Ver. 59. ὁτὲ ἐτών . . . ἀληθῆ. These characteristics, now mentioned, identify this bread from heaven as something of a different and superior nature to the manna.—Ver. 59. With his usual exact specification of time and place John adds τῇ . . . τῇ Καπαναίᾳ. Lampe says: "Colligi etiam inde postes, quod haec accidierint in Sabbato"; but the synagogue was available for teaching on other days, and it is not likely that on a Sabbath so many persons would have followed Him across the lake.—Vv. 60-71. The crisis in Galilea.—Ver. 60. Πολλοὶ οὖν . . . ἀκούον; many of His disciples [i.e., of the larger and more loosely attached circle of His followers, as distinct from the Twelve, ver.
67) having heard the foregoing utterances, said Ξελαρός άστιν άοτο το δῶγος. Ξκληρός is rather "hard to receive," than "hard to understand." Abraham found the command to cast out Ἡγαρ Ξκληρός, Gen. xxi. 11. Euripides opposes σκληρός, διστασιφή, distasteful, uncompromising truths to μαθακά προφήτη, flattering falsehoods (Frag., 75, Weilstein). The δῶγος referred to was especially, ver. 58, αύτος άστιν άπότε παρὰ τοῦ σκληρού καταβας as is proved by vv. 61, 62. But this must be taken together with His statement in ver. 51, that He would give His flesh, and the development of this idea in vv. 53, 54, τίς δάναι αύτοπο ἄκοαί; "who can listen to Him?"—Ver. 61. This apparently was said out of the hearing of Jesus, for ver. 61 says εἰδον ὃ Ἰησοῦς ἐν αὐτῷ, "Jesus knowing in Himself," that is, perceiving that they were murmuring, He intuitively understood what it was they were stumbling at, and said τῶν υἱῶν γ. . . πρώτον; "Does this saying stumble you? If then ye see the Son of Man ascending where He was before——" What are we to supply? Either, Will you not be much more scandalised? Or, Will you not then be convinced? According to the former, the sense would be: If now you say, how can this Man give us His flesh to eat? much more will you then say so when His flesh wholly disappears. But the second interpretation gives the better sense: You will find it easier to believe I came down from heaven, when you see me returning thither. Cf. iii. 13; xiii. 3. You will then recognise also in what sense I said that you must eat my flesh. τὸ ψηφία ἔστι τὸ ἱεροσολυμ. ή σαράντα ὄχλοις ὑδάν. It was therefore the spirit animating the flesh in His giving of it which profited; not the external sacrifice of His body, but the spirit which prompted it was efficacious. The acceptance of God's judgment of sin, the devotedness to man and perfect harmony with God, shown in the cross, is what brings life to the world; and it is this Spirit men are invited to partake of. It is therefore not a fleshy but a spiritual transaction of which I have been speaking to you. [Bengel excellently: "Non sola Deitas Christi, nec solus Spiritus sanctus significatur, sed universaliter Spiritus, cui contradistinctur caro "] τά ρήματα . . . ἐστιν. His entire discourse at Capernaum, and whatever other sayings He had uttered, were spirit and life. It was through what He said that He made Himself known and offered Himself to them. To those who believed His words, spirit and life came in their believing. By believing they were brought into contact with the life in Him.—Ver. 64. But τίνος οὐ πιστεύωσιν, and therefore do not receive the life. This Jesus said ήσιν γὰρ . . . αὐτῶν, for Jesus knew from the first who they were that believed not, and who it was who should betray Him. "Hoc ideo addidit Evangelista, ne quis putet temere judicasse Christum de suis auditoribus," Calvin. Euthymius says it illustrates His forbearance. ἢ ἄρχητι, from the beginning of His connection with individuals. Weiss supposes it means from the beginning of their not believing. He gave utterance to this knowledge in ver. 26. He even knew who it was who should betray Him. This is said in anticipation of vv. 70, 71. This declaration raises the question, Why then did Jesus call Judas to the Apostolate? Holtzmann indeed supposes that this intimation is purely apologetic and intended to show that Jesus was not deceived in appointing Judas. It is unnecessary to increase the difficulty by supposing the ἢ ἄρχητι to refer to the time previous to his call. Jesus saw in Judas qualities fitting him to be an Apostle; but seeing him among the others He recognised that he was an
unfaithful man. To suppose that He called him in the clear knowledge that he would betray Him is to introduce an unintelligible or artificial element into the action of Christ. [Neither Calvin nor Beza makes any remark on the clause. Bruce, Training of the Twelve; and Reith, in loc., should be consulted.] Jesus already recognised in what manner His death would be compassed: by treachery. The fact stated in ver. 64, that some of His own disciples could yet not believe in Him, illustrates the truth of what He had said, ver. 44, that no one can come to Him except the Father draw him.—Ver. 65. He therefore points this out, διὰ τοῦτο ... πατρὸς μου. All that brings men to Christ is the Father's gift.—Ver. 66. ἐκ τοῦτον, "on this"; neither exclusively "from this time" ἐκ τοῦτον (Euthymius), "from this moment onwards" (Lücke), nor exclusively "on this account," but a combination of both. Cf. xix. 12. Here the time is in the foreground, as is shown by the οὐκ ἤτε following. Lampe has: "Qui ab illo tempore Iesum descrebat, clare indicabant, quod propter hunc sermonem istud fecerat," or "he that had despised him in the beginning . . . perieπάτων." Many of those who had up to this time been following Him and listening to His teaching, returned now to their former ways and no longer accompanied Jesus. [ἐπίστων δὲ οὐκ ἦν μοι, καὶ τῶν πρώτων βίων αὐτῶν, εἰς δὲ πάλιν ἴνα συνεπεργασάτω, Euthymius.] εἰς τὰ ἐπίστων occurs xviii. 6, xx. 14; also Mk. xiii. 16. But the most instructive occurrence is in Ps. xiv. 18, οὐκ ἠπόστωτος εἰς τὰ ἐπίστων ἡ καρδία ἡμῶν, where the literal sense passes into the spiritual meaning, apostasy, abandonment of God.—Ver. 67. This giving up of their adherence to Christ was probably manifested in an immediate and physical withdrawal from His presence. For He turned to the Twelve with the words: μὴ καὶ ἡμεῖς ἔλθετε ὑπάγεις; "Scriebat id non facturos," Lampe, who adds six reasons for the question, of which the most important are: "ut confessionem illam egregiam et eret, qua se genuinos discipulos Jesu esse mos probatur erant"; and "ut edoceret, se nonnisi voluntarios discipulos quaerere." Probably also that they might be confirmed in their faith by the expression of it, and that He might be gladdened.—Ver. 68. Simon Peter answered in name of all, Κύριε . . . ἥμνοι. He gives a threefold reason why they remained faithful while others left. (1) πρὸς τίνα ἀπελευσόμεθα; "To whom shall we go away?" implying that they must attach themselves to some one as a teacher and mediator in divine things. They cannot imagine that any one should be to them what already Jesus had been. (2) Especially are they bound to Him, because He has words of eternal life, ἰδίατα ζωῆς αἰωνίου ἥμεις. They had experienced that His words were spiritual and eternal. In them He had given them a new life which was quickened by His words, a life they recognised as the true, highest, eternal life. To have received eternal life from Christ makes it impossible to abandon Him. (3) καὶ ἡμεῖς (ver. 69), "we for our part," whatever others think. ἠγέωμαι καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν "have believed and know," cf. 1 John iv. 16, ἡμεῖς ἠγέωμαι καὶ πεπεπτυκάμεν, which shows we cannot press the order [cf. Augustine's "credimus ut intelligamus"] but must accept the double expression as a strong assurance of conviction: we have believed and we know by experience ἡμεῖς ἐοὶ εἰ . . .
The expression is not Johannine; but the idea of the Messiah as consecrated or set apart is found in x. 36, by "περιπατεῖτε δ' ἵππους μετὰ ταύτα ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ." Peter's confession here is equivalent to his confession at Caesarea Philippi, recorded in the Synoptic Gospels.—Ver. 70. ἀνεκριβή... ὡς εἰσέπε. This reply of Jesus to Peter's warm-hearted confession at first sight seems chilling. Peter had claimed for himself and the rest a perfect loyalty; but this confidence of Peter's carried in it a danger, and must be abated. Also it was well that the conscience of Judas should be pricked. Therefore Jesus says: Even in this carefully selected circle of men, individually chosen by himself from the mass, there is not the perfect loyalty you boast.—ἐξ οὗ μίαν εἰς διάβολος ἐστὶν. Even of you one is a devil. Lücke, referring to Esth. vii. 4 and viii. 1, where Haman is called ἄγιος, as being "the slanderer," or "the enemy," suggests that a similar meaning may be appropriate here. But Jesus calls Peter "Satan" and may much more call Judas "a devil." Besides in the present connection "traitor" is quite a startling word as "devil."—Ver. 71. Using the knowledge brought by subsequent events John explains that Judas was meant, ἔλεγε δὲ τῶν ιουδαίων Σιμώνος ἰσκαριώτην [better "ἰσκαριώτην," which shows that the father of Judas was also known as Iscariot]. Ἐλεγε with the alternative meaning "He spoke of," is classical, and see Mk. xiv. 71. The word "Iscariot" is generally supposed to be equivalent to ἰσκαριώτης, Ish Keriyoth, a man of Kerioth in the tribe of Judah (Jos. xvi. 25). Cf. Ishthob, a man of Tob (Joseph. Ant., vii. 6, 1, quoted in Smith's Dict.). The name Judas now needs no added surname.

**Chapter VII.** At the Feast.—Vv. 1-13. The circumstances of His visit to Jerusalem.—Vv. 14-36. He teaches, and discussions regarding Him are evoked.—V. 37-end. His manifestation on the last day of the Feast, and the consequent action of the Sanhedrim.—Ver. 1. Having described the crisis in Galilee the evangelist proceeds to describe the various opinions and discussions held regarding Jesus in Jerusalem. See Sunday, p. 144. In chap. vi., a Passover was said to be at hand; but Jesus did not go to it, but continued to go about teaching in Galilee, περιπατεῖτε δ' ἵππους μετὰ ταύτα ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ. Although appropriate to a single school, περιπατεῖτε denoted generally the going about of a teacher with his disciples; hence, "to dispute," or "to discourse," περιπατοῦσα in Aristoph., Frogs, 907 and 918, means "a philosophical discussion or argumentation". John assigns a reason for Jesus remaining in Galilee; this, according to Holtzmann and Weiss, proves that he considered the Judaean ministry the rule, the Galilean the exception. But the assigning of a reason may be accounted for by the unlikelihood of Jesus remaining in Galilee after what was recorded in chap. vi. His reason for remaining in Galilee, even after His rejection there, was the active hostility of the Jews, εξίσου αὐτῶν ἵππος ἰουδαίων ἰσκαριώτην. See ver. 18. Things were not yet ripe for His exposing Himself to the hostility of the authorities.—Ver. 2. But occasion arose for His abandoning His purpose to remain in Galilee. ἐλευθεροτητικά. In Hebrew יְהֹוָה בֵּית (Lev. xxiii. 34), the Feast of Succoth, or Booths, in Greek σκηνοτήτις, the fixing of tents; so called because in this Feast the Jews commemorated how their fathers had dwelt in tents, and been fed and cared for as if in a settled condition. It was one of the great Feasts, and as it fell in October and Jesus had not attended the previous Passover, it might seem desirable that He should go up to Jerusalem now.—Ver. 3. The desirability of doing so is urged by His brothers ἔλεγον... τῷ κόσμῳ. The reason they
advanced was "that Thy disciples also may see Thy works which Thou doest". And if καὶ οἱ μαθηταί σου seems to imply that since the Feeding of the Five Thousand in May and Jesus had been living in comparative retirement, perhaps at Nazareth. At Jerusalem, all who were attached to Him would be found at the Feast; and the brothers recognise that He would then have an opportunity of putting His claims to the proof. "No one," they say, "who seeks public recognition confines his activities to a hidden and private corner," εἰς ταραπησίαν, as in xi. 54, means "openly" or "in public," and is in direct contrast to εἰς κρύπτην. Having laid down the general law, they then apply it to Him, "if (or not even expressing doubt) Thou doest these things, show Thyself to the world". Lücke, following Euthymius, thinks doubt is implied in καὶ; but this implies an ignorance on the part of the brothers which is inconceivable.—Ver. 5. It is indeed added εἰς τοὺς ἅγια ἁ γάρ ... "But when His brothers had gone up, then He also went up to the Feast, not openly, but, as it were, in secret." That is to say, He went up, but not at His brothers' instigation, nor with the publicity they had recommended. [Of course if we read in ver. 8 εἶναι σὺν ἄνθρωπω a change
of mind must be supposed, although not the "inconstancy" alleged by Porphyry.

Vv. 11-13. Disappointment at Jesus' non-appearance.—Ver. 11. Of evil... and... "the Jews," possibly, as usual in John, the authorities (so Meyer, Weiss, etc.), and thus in contrast to the δηλοῦ of ver. 12; but ver. 15 rather indicates that the term is used more generally. They looked for Him, expecting that He would appear at least at this third feast. They asked... καὶ... ἐκεῖνοι; which Luther, Meyer, etc., think contemptuous; but εκεῖνοι cannot thus be pressed. Cf. 1 John passim.—Ver. 12. Among the masses (ἐν τοῖς δηλοῖς) there was... τολὴν regarding Him; not "murmuring," as R.V., but rather "whispering," suppressed discussion in low tones, in corners, and among friends; "halbaute Mittheilung entgegengesetzter Ansichten" (Holzmann), "viel im Volke über ihn herumgeredet" (Weissäcker). Specimens of this talk are given: οἱ μὲν... δηλοῦ. "Some said, He is a good man," ἀγάλης, pure in motive and seeking to do good. "But others said, No: but He misleads the multitude" (Mt. xxviii. 53. Lk. xxiii. 5), that is, seeks to ingratiate Himself with people to serve His own ends.—Οἴδατε... ἱουδαίων. "No one, however, talked openly about Him, for fear of the Jews." Until the Jews, the authorities, gave their decision, neither party dared to utter its opinion openly.

Vv. 14-36. The teaching of Jesus at the Feast of Tabernacles. [Spitta supposes that the original place of paragraph vv. 15-24 was at the end of chap. v.] So far as reported this teaching is found in three short statements: (1) in justification of His authority as a teacher; (2) in assertion of His Divine origin; and (3) of His approaching departure. This threefold teaching elicited expressions of opinion from three parties: (1) from "the Jews" (15-24); (2) from inhabitants of Jerusalem (25-31); (3) from the officers sent to apprehend Him (32-36).—Ver. 14. "Hith to the feast of... μετάσχες. "But when it was now mid-feast," i.e., the fourth day. μετάσχες is commonly used in this sense: ημέρα μετάσχες, midday: ἄρος μετάσχου, midsummer.—ἀνάβη... ἠδιασκέ. "Jesus went up to the temple and taught"; see xviii. 20; He did not go to Jerusalem to conclude Himself and worship in private, nor did He go to proclaim Himself explicitly as Messiah. He went and taught. His teaching astonished the Jews, and they asked... τῶν οὗτοι γράμματα οἴδα μὴ μεμαθηκός. It is not His wisdom that astonishes them, for even uneducated men are often wise; but His learning or knowledge. γράμματα (Acts xxvi. 24) "included the whole circle of rabbinical training, the sacred Scriptures, and the comments and traditions which were afterwards elaborated into the Mishna and Gemara" (Plumptre, Christ and Chrestodom). But it cannot be supposed that Jesus made Himself acquainted with these comments. His skill in interpreting Scripture and His knowledge of it is what is referred to. What the scribes considered their prerogative, He, without their teaching, excelled them in.—Ver. 16. But though not received from them, it was a derived teaching. He is not self-taught. "H ἡμέρα διδαχῇ... μή. The teaching which I give has not its source in my knowledge but in Him that sent me. "Der Autodidakit in Wahrheit ein Theodidak ist," Holtzmann. The truest self-renunciation is the highest claim. That this claim was true He proceeds to show (1) from the conviction of every one who desired to do God's will, ver. 17; and (2) from His own character, ver. 18.—Ver. 17. ἰἀν τις... λαλ. "If any
man willeth to do His will, he shall know concerning the teaching, whether it is of God (or from God) or I speak from myself.' As Jesus everywhere asserts (v. 46, xviii. 37), he who thirsts for God will recognise Him as God's messenger; he who hungers for righteousness is filled in Jesus; he who is of the truth hears His voice. The teaching of Jesus is recognised as Divine by those whose purpose and desire it is to be in harmony with God.—Ver. 18. There are also two different kinds of teachers: the one ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ λαλῶν, speaks his own mind, teaches his own ideas, does not represent God and reveal His mind; because he τὴν δόξαν τὴν Ἰδιὰν ἄγνηκεν, "seeks his own glory," which of course cannot be reached by representing himself to be merely the herald of another's glory. The other style of teacher is described in the words ὁ δὲ ἑαυτῷ τὸν νόμον... ἐφην. Plainly He who seeks the glory of Him whose ambassador He is, has no interest in falsifying matters to advance His own interests. If His aim is to advance the glory of Him who has sent Him, He will truthfully deliver His message; ἄλληδε ἔστιν, καὶ ἄλληθρον... and injustice, dishonesty, is not in Him. The rejection of this general principle to Jesus was obvious.—Ver. 19. ὁ δὲ Ἰωάννης... ἐπιτοκεῖται. The connection is not obvious, but seems to be this: You reject my teaching, but that is not surprising, for you reject Moses' also (cf. v. 39, 43-47). "Did not Moses give you the law?" or, "Hath not Moses given you the law?" [the point of interrogation should be after the first νόμον; none after the second]. "Yet none of you keeps it. If you did you would not seek to kill me." Was there not a former revelation of God which should have prevented you from thus violently rejecting my teaching?—Ver. 20. This, some of the crowd think mere raving. He is a monomaniac labouring under a hallucination that people wish to kill Him.—Δαιμόνιον... ἀποκτείνει; This question, repudiating the idea that any one seeks to slay Him, needs no answer and gets none.—Ver. 21. Jesus prefers to expose the unjustifiable character of the hostility which pursued Him (ver. 16). Referring to the miracle wrought at Bethesda, and which gave occasion to this hostility, He says ἐν ἔργον... σαββάτω. One single work I did and ye all marvel [are horrified or scandalised]; for this same object, of imparting health, Moses gave you circumcision, an ordinance that continues through all the generations and regularly sets aside the Sabbath law. If circumcision is performed, lest the law of Moses be broken, are ye angry at me for making a man every whit whole [or rather, for making an entire or whole man healthy] on the Sabbath day? The argument is obvious; and its force is brought out by the antithetical form of the sentence: the ἐν ἔργον of the healing of the impotent man is contrasted with the continuous ordinance of circumcision, and so the aorist is used of the one, the perfect of the other. ["praeputium est vitium in corpore "] Weinstein quotes from a Rabbi a singularly analogous argument: "Si circumciscio, quae fit in uno membrorum 248 hominis, pellit Sabbatum, quanto magis verum est, conservationem vitae Sabbatum pellere?" The parenthesis in ver. 22, ἐδώ σφας... παρεῖναι, is apparently thrown in for accuracy's sake, lest some captious persons should divert
22. "Did not Moses... against the Sabbath law?"

23. "I say to you.../Ezra vii. 28, xiii. 32.

24. "And they did...from David's line...in the clouds."/Cf. 4 Ezra vii. 28, xiii. 32.
Messiah, 279 ff. Different sections of the community may have had different expectations. The surmisings of the Jerusalemites came to the ears of Jesus, and stirred Him to further and more emphatic statements, "Exarchen oin en ti leipw. From the repetition of the words "in the Temple," Westcott gathers that a break occurred between this scene and the last; but this idea seems to be precluded by the continuity of the conversation. Jesus takes up the words of the doubters, Καὶ οἶδατε ... Some interpreters think there is a touch of irony in the first clauses; thus Weissacher translates: "So? mich kennet ihr und wisset wo ichh her bin? Und doch bin ich," etc. Similarly Lücke and Godet. But this is unnecessary. Jesus concedes their ability to identify Him as the carpenter of Nazareth. This knowledge they had; but whether they had not was of far greater importance. To know my native place and to be able to recognise me as Jesus is not enough; for I am not come at my own prompting. To deduce from your knowledge of my origin that I am a self-constituted prophet and therefore not the Messiah, is to mistake; for I am not come of myself. To know me apart from Him that sent me is empty knowledge. He that sent me has a real existence, and is not a fancy of mine. You indeed do not know Him; but I know Him because from Him I have my being and He has sent me. Weiss rightly observes that δι' (ver. 29) does not include κάκεινος με ἀπέστειλεν under its government. Jesus knew the Father because He was from Him; but His being sent was the result, not the cause, of His knowledge. These statements exasperated the Jews, (ver. 30) Exarchen oin en autôn πιάσας. They sought to seize or apprehend Him. πιάμεν, Doric and Hellenistic for πιάμεν, "I press": in later Greek "I catch" (xxi. 3), "I arrest," ver. 32, etc. But oidele ἐπέβαλεν "no one laid hands [or, 'his hand,' R.V.] upon Him, for His hour was not yet come": the immediate cause being that they were not all of one mind, and feared resistance on the part of some of the people.—Ver. 31. For, πολλοὶ ... Here as usual alongside of the hostility evoked by the deeds and words of Jesus faith also was evoked; faith which suggested covertly that He might be the Messiah, ὁ Χριστὸς ἦν ἐν εἰρήνη, "When the Christ comes will He do more signs than this man has done?" Nv. 32-36, The Sanhedrin takes action. The Pharisees, perceiving that many of the people were coming under the influence of Jesus, determined to put a stop to His teaching, and persuaded the Sanhedrin [ὁ ἄρχων καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι] to send officers to apprehend Him.—Ver. 32. Εἶδεν οὖν αὐτοῖς [αὐτοῖς omitted by modern editors] ἑνὶ μικρὸν χρόνον ... τῆς ἐπιστολῆς ἡμῶν. Seeing the servants of the Sanhedrin [οῦν], Jesus said to the crowd: "Yet a little while am I with you, and then I go to Him that sent me." The "little while" is prompted by the actively hostile step taken by the Sanhedrin. The utterance was a word of warning. Ἴδαμεν does not convey any sense of secrecy, as has been alleged. [It has been supposed that τὸν τῆς ἐπιστολής]
28—37. **ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ** 767

34. "Εξῆθεστέ με, καὶ οδυ εὑρήσετε—καὶ διαν εἰμὶ ἡ Ὕπολοικα ἡμῶν. ἐγὼ, ὑμεῖς ὁ δύνασθε ἐλθεῖν." 35. Εἰπών οὖν οἱ οἰουδαίοι πρὸς ἐμαυτοὺς, "Ποῦ οὖν οὗτος μέλλει πορεύεσθαι, ὅτι ημῖν οὗτος εὑρήσουμεν αὐτὸν;" μὴ εἶς τὴν διαστοράν τῶν Ἐλλήνων μέλλει πορεύεσθαι, Δεντ. xxi. 26. καὶ διδάσκανεν τοὺς Ἐλλήνας: 36. τὸς οὖτος οὐκ ἔλεγον ἐν εἰπε, Ζητήσατε με, καὶ οδυ εὑρήσετε—καὶ, "Ὅτι εἰμὶ ἐγὼ, ὑμεῖς οὐ δύνασθε ἐλθεῖν;"

37. "Εν δὲ τῇ ἑσχατῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἡ μεγάλη τῆς ἐρτησίας εἰστήκει ἡ Χ. xix. 31. ἱσούσιος, καὶ ἄκραβε λέγων, "Εάν τις διώκῃ, ἔρχεσθω πρὸς με καὶ ποιεῖν..."

37. "Εν δὲ τῇ ἑσχατῇ ἡμέρᾳ... The saying has impressed itself on their memory, though they find it unintelligible. How they could not go where He could, they could not fathom. Cf. Peter's "Lord, why can I not follow Thee now?" and the whole conversation, chap. xiii. 33—xiv. 31. No one comes to the Father but through me."

Vv. 37—44. Jesus proclaims His ability to quench human thirst with living water. —Ver. 37. "Εν δὲ τῇ ἑσχατῇ ἡμέρᾳ... This exact specification of time is given that we may understand the significance of the words uttered by Jesus. The Feast of Tabernacles lasted for seven days (Lev. xxiii. 34, Neh. viii. 18), and on the eighth day was "an holy convocation," on which the people celebrated their entrance into the holy land, abandoning their booths, and returning to their ordinary dwellings. On each of the seven feast days water was drawn in a golden pitcher from the pool of Siloam, and carried in procession to the Temple, in commemoration of the water from the rock with which their fathers in the desert had been provided. On the eighth day, which commenced this ceremony, they entered into "a land of springs of water," this ceremony was discontinued. But the deeper spirits must have viewed with some misgiving all this ritual, feeling still in themselves a thirst which none of these symbolic forms quenched, and wondering whether the vision of Ezekiel would be realised, and a river broad and deep would issue from the Lord's house. Filled with these misgivings they suddenly hear a voice, clear and assured, "Εάν τις διώκῃ, ἔρχεσθω πρὸς με καὶ ποιεῖν..." that is, whatever natural wants and innocent cravings and spiritual aspirations men have, Christ undertakes to satisfy them every one. To this general invitation are added words so enigmatical that John finds it necessary...
to explain their reference.—Ver. 38. á τιτείσθω... ζητοῦσι. [The nominative absolute is common.] No Scripture gives the words verbatim. Is. lviii. 11 has: "The Lord shall satisfy thy soul in drought: and thou shalt be like a watered garden, and like a spring of water whose waters do not fail." The words seem to intimate that the believer shall not only have his own thirst quenched, but shall be a source of new streams for the good of others (O. Holtzmann). A remarkably analogous saying is quoted by Schottigen from the Talmud: "Quando homo se convertit ad Dominum suum, tanquam fons aquas vivas impeturat, et fluenta ejus egeriduintur ad omnia generis homines et ad omnes tribus". At the same time it is not easy to see the relevancy of the saying if this meaning be attached to it, and the saying of John iv. 14 is so similar that it seems preferable to understand it in the same sense, of the inseparableness and inwardness of the living water. Those who advocate the other meaning can certainly find confirmation for their view in the explanation added by John.—Ver. 39. τοῦτο... ἤθελασθή, for these words apparently refer to Pentecost, the initial outpouring of the Spirit, when it once for all became manifest that the Spirit’s presence did not turn men’s thoughts in upon themselves, and their own spiritual anxieties and prospects, but prompted them to communicate to all men the blessings they had received. From the little group in the upper room “rivers” did flow to all. But the appended clause, οὕτω γὰρ ἐν Πνεύμα “Ἀγίων, is difficult. The best attested reading (see critical note) gives the meaning: “The Spirit was not yet, because Jesus was not yet ὁ Ἐσχατον, not ὁ Ἐσχατον glorified.” ἤθελασθή with John signifies the entire process of glorification, beginning with and including His death (see chap. xii. 23, 32, 33); but especially indicating His recognition by the Father as exalted Messiah (see chap. xvii. 5, 31). Until He thus became Lord the Spirit was not given; and the thought of the Spirit’s cost was recognised as the grand proof and sign that He had reached the position of supremacy in the moral universe. (See especially Acts ii. 32, 33.) The Spirit could not be given before in His fulness, because until Christ no man could receive Him in His fulness. Christ was the lens in whom all the scattered rays were gathered. And it is always and only by accepting Christ as perfect humanity, and by finding in Him our norm and ideal, that we receive the Spirit. It is by the work of the Spirit on the human nature of Christ that we are made aware of the fulness and beauty of that work. It is there we see what the Spirit of God can make of man, and apprehend His grace and power and intimate affinity to man.—Ver. 40. The immediate results of this declaration were twofold. In some faith was elicited: many of the crowd said: "This is of a truth the prophet;" others, going a step further, said: "This is the Christ." On the relation of "the prophet" to "the Christ," see on i. 21.—Ver. 41. But others, either honestly perplexed, or hostile to Christ, and glad to find Scripture on their side, objected, μὴ γὰρ ἐν τῇ Γαλαλαίᾳ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἔρχεται; "But does the Christ come out of Galilee?" [Hoogeven explains the γάρ by resolving the sentence into a double statement: "Others said this is not the Christ: for Christ will not come out of Galilee." The γάρ assigns the reason for the denial
already hinted in the ΔΔλιος δι' introducing a contrary opinion to that already expressed.) They knew that Jesus was a Galilean, and this clashed with their idea that the Christ was to be born of the seed of David and in Bethlehem; an idea founded on Micah v. 2; Isa. xi. 1; Jer. xxiii. 5. Bethlehem is here called the κόμη δαβίδ [or Δαβίδ, which gives the same pronunciation], because there David spent his youth; 1 Sam. xvi. 1, 4, etc.—Vv. 43, 44. Σχολή γ. χ. Χείρας. On this verse Calvin has the following pertinent remark: "quaequecumque dissidia emergunt quum praedicatur Evangelium, eorum causa et semen prius in hominibus latebant; sed tunc demum quasi ex somno experegacti se movere incipient, qualiter vapores aliunde quam a sole procreantur, quamvis nonnisi exoriente sole emergant". To this divided state of opinion He owed His immunity on this occasion. —Vv. 45-52. Anger of the Sanhedrim on receiving the report of their officers.—Ver. 45. ἐὰν οὖν... αὐτῶν. It now appears that the οὖν of the preceding clause applies even to the officers sent by the Sanhedrin. They returned empty-handed πρὸς τοὺς ἄρχοντας καὶ Ἐφηβοὺς, that is, as the single article shows, to the Sanhedrin, or at any rate to these parties acting together and officially. What the motive of their visit was ought to be known, if they were met as a court. They [ἐκεῖνος regularly refers to the more remote noun; but here, although in the order of the sentence the ἐκεῖνος are more remote, they are nearer in the writer's mind, and he uses ἐκεῖνος of the priests and Pharisees] at once demand the reason of the failure, Διατί οὖν ἠγάπησεν αὐτὸν; "Why have ye not brought Him?" Apparently they were sitting in expectation of immediately questioning Him. —Ver. 46. The servants frankly reply: οὖν οὖν... ἀνθρώπου. The testimony is positive, because the officers of a court are apt to be entirely mechanical and leave all responsibility for their actions with their superiors. Also it is remarkable that the same result should have found place with them all; for in view of the divided state of public feeling, probably five or six at least would be sent.—Ver. 47. But their apology only rouses the indignation of those who had sent them, μὴ καὶ ὦμης πεπλάνητε; Are ye also, of whom better things might have been expected, deluded?—μὴ τις... Ἐφηβοὺς? What right have the subordinates to have a mind of their own? Wait till some of the constituted authorities or of the recognised leaders of religious opinion give you the cue. Here the secret of their hostility is out. Jesus appealed to the people and did not depend for recognition on the influential classes. Pover was slipping through their fingers.—Δὴ ὦ δαχλος... εἶπα, "But this mob [these masses] that knows not the law are cursed." This Pharisaitic scorn of the mob [or "am-haaretz," which is here represented by δαχλος] appears in Rabbinic literature. Dr. Taylor [Sayings of the Jewish Fathers, p. 44] quotes Hillel as saying: "No boor is a sin-fearer; nor is the vulgar pious." To the Am-haaretz are opposed the disciples of the learned in the law; and Schoettgen defines the Am-haaretz as "omnes illi qui studiis sacrosanctis et literarum operam non dederant". The designation, therefore, ὦ μὴ γυνώσκων τοῦ νόμου, was usual. That it was prompted here by the popular recognition as Messiah of one who came out of Galilee, in apparent contradiction of the law and of the opinion of the Pharisees, is also probable. People so ignorant as thus to blunder ἐπικατάρατοι εἶπα.—Ver. 50. To this strong expression one of their own number (and therefore to their great surprise), Nicodemus, the same person who had visited Jesus under cover of night, takes exception and makes a protest. [Tisch. deletes
the clause ολαν αὐτοῦ, and no doubt it has quite the appearance of a gloss. At the same time it is John's manner thus to identify persons named. And at xix. 39 the similar clause is not deleted. This was a bold step. For he must have known it was useless; and he might have persuaded himself to evade all risk by silence. His remonstrance is based on their implied claim to know the law: μη δ νόμου . . . ποιήσατε; their own action is suspiciously like a violation of the law. "Does our law pass judgment on the suspected person before it first hears him and knows what he is guilty of doing?" For the law regarding trials see Deut. i. 16 and Stapfer's "Palestine," p. 108, on the administration of justice. The construction is simple; "the law" which the Sanhedrin administered is the nominative throughout.—Ver. 52. This remonstrance is exasperatingly true, and turns the bitterness of the Pharisaic party on Nicodemus, μὴ καλ . . . ἡγησέρθη. "Art thou also, as well as Jesus, from Galilee, and thus disposed to befriend your countryman?" Cf. Mk. xiv. 70. By this they betray that their own hostility was a merely personal matter, and not founded on careful examination. "Search and see, because (or 'that') out of Galilee there arises no prophet." That is, as Westcott interprets, "Galilee is not the true country of the prophets: we cannot look for Messiah to come from thence." They overlooked the circumstance that one or two exceptions to this rule existed.

CHAPTER VIII.—Ver. 1. καὶ ἐκκόστος . . . The position of these words almost necessitates the understanding that the members of the Sanhedrin are referred to. But in this case the contrast conveyed in the next clause, ἰησοῦς δὲ ἐκκόστος, is pointless,—αὐτῷ τῶν Ἰδιώτων, to the Mount of Olives. Cf. Mt. xxiv. 3, xxvi. 30; Mk. xiii. 3. Lodging probably in the house of
Lazarus, He returned to the city before dawn (ver. 2). ἀφ' ὧν ᾔδραμα τάλαν παρεγένετο εἰς τὸ ἱερόν. Plato, Protag., 310 A, reckons ἀφ' ὧν a part of the night.—καὶ τάς ὅ λαος ἁγιασμοῦ, i.e., those designated δὲ ἔχομαι in the preceding chapter.—καὶ καθισμα, and He sat down and began to teach them. But this quiet and profitable hour was broken in upon.—Ver. 3. ἄγωνει δὲ οἱ γραμματεῖς . . . κατελήψανεν. The scribes and the Pharisees, who in the synoptics regularly appear as the enemies of Jesus, bring to Him a woman taken in adultery. In itself an unlawful thing to do, for they had a court in which the woman might have been tried. Obviously it was to find occasion against Him that they brought her; see ver. 6. They knew He was prone to forgive sinners.—καὶ στῆναν τὰ . . . τι λέγεις; "And having set her in the midst," were she could be well seen by all; a needless and shameless preliminary, "they say to Him, Teacher," appealing to Him with an appearance of deference, "this woman here has been apprehended in adultery in the very act." εἴτε αὐτοφόρος is the better reading. Originally meaning "caught in the act of theft", (φθορά), it came to mean generally "caught in the act," red-hand. But also, as the instances cited by Kyrke show, it frequently meant "on incontrovertible evidence," "manifestly": Thus in Xen., Symm., iii. 13, εἴτε αὐτοφόρος ἐλεμαθείς πλακωμένος ἐν, I am evidently convicted of being the richest. See also Wetstein and Eisner.—Ver. 5. εἴ τις τῇ γυνῇ . . . λιθοβολίσθη. In Lev. xx. 10 and Deut. xxii. 22 death is fixed as the penalty of adultery; but "stoning" as the form of death is only specified when a betrothed virgin is violated, Deut. xxii. 23, 24. And the Rabbis held that where death simply was spoken of, stranguing was meant ["omnis mora dicta in Lege simpliciter non est nisi strangulatio"]. It is supposed therefore that by τόσοι τοιαύτας the accusers refer to the special class to which this woman belonged. The words themselves do not suggest that; and it is better to suppose that these lawyers who had brought the woman understood "stoning" when "death" without further specification was mentioned. See further in Lightfoot and Holtzmann. —καὶ εἶναί τι λέγεις; "What then sayest Thou?" as if it were possible He might give a decision differing from that of the law.—Ver. 6. τοῦτο δὲ . . . αὐτοῦ. "And this they said tempting Him," hoping that His habitual pity would lead Him to exonerate the woman. ("Si Legi subscripteret, videri poterat sibi quodammodo dissimilis," Calvin. προσέθηκες δὴ ἓν σῴζεσαι αὐτής, καὶ λοιπὸς ἔξωσεν κατηγορίαν κατ' αὐτοῦ ὑπὲρ παρανόμως φείδομένου τῇ ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου λιθοβολίας, Euthymius.) The dilemma supposed by Meyer is not to be thought of. See Holtzmann. Their plot was unsuccessful; Jesus, as He sat (ver. 2), κάτω κύψας . . . γῆν, "bent down and began to write with His finger on the ground," intimating that their question would not be answered; perhaps also some measure of that embarrassment on account of "shame of the deed itself and the brazen harshness of the prosecutors" which is overstated in Ecce Homo, p. 104. The scraping or drawing figures on the ground with a stick or the finger has been in many countries a common
expression of deliberate silence or embarrassment. [Eiicp elioa mpaKaias pouiv o m η cteowtties ipovlptwv προς τον δικαιοσύνην οντού το ανώτερο της άκαρα και άνάμαρτης, Euthymius.] Interesting passages are cited by Wetstein and Kypke, in one of which Euripides is cited as saying: την σωτηρία τοις σοφοῖς ἀνόμωμοι εἶναι.

—Ver. 7. The scribes, however, did not accept the silence of Jesus as an answer, but "went on asking Him". For this use of ἔμμαχος with a participle cf. Acts xii. 16, ἐμματισμένος κρόων; and see Buttman's N.T. Gram., 237, 14. And at length Jesus lifting His head, straightening Himself, said to them: Ο άναμάρτητος . . . βαλέτω, "let the faultless one among you first cast the stone at her", άναμάρτητος only here in N.T. In Sept. Deut. xxxii. 19, η μη συναπασχήλος ο αμαρτωλός τον αναμάρτητον. It can scarcely have been used on this occasion generally of all sin, but with reference to the sin regarding which there was present question, or at any rate to sins of the same kind, sins of unchastity. They are summoned to judge themselves rather than the woman.

—Ver. 8. Having shot this arrow Jesus again stooped and continued writing on the ground, intimating that so far as He was concerned the matter was closed. —Ver. 9. oI δὲ . . . ἰσχατόν. "And they when they heard it went out one by one, beginning from the elders until the last." [The words which truly describe the motive of this departure, καὶ οὗ τῆς συνεδρίας Λεγομένος, are deleted by Tr.W.H.R.] πρεσβυτέρων refers not to the elders by office but by age. They naturally took the lead, and the younger men deferentially allowed them to pass and then followed. Thus

κατελεύθη μόνος . . . βοῶν. Jesus was left sitting and the woman standing before Him. But only those would retire who had been concerned in the accusation: the disciples and those who had previously been listening to Him would remain.—Ver. 10. ἀνακύψας . . . Jesus, lifting His head and seeing that the woman was left alone, says to her: Η γυνή . . . κατέκρινε; "Woman," nominative for vocative, as frequently, but see critical note, "where are they? Did no man condemn thee?" That is, has no one shown himself ready to begin the stoning?—Ver. 11. And she said: "No one, Lord".—Eis . . . ἀμάρτανε. "Neither do I condemn thee," that is, do not adjudge thee to stoning. That He did condemn her sin was shown in His words μηρέτη ἀμάρτανε. Therefore Augustine says: "Ergo et Dominus damnavit, sed peccatum, non hominem".

Vv. 12-20. Jesus proclaims Himself the Light of the World.—Ver. 12. έδειξεν δὲ οὖν. "Again therefore Jesus spake to them"; "again" refers us back to vii. 37. Lücke and others suppose that the conversation now reported took place on some day after the feast: but there is no reason why it should not have been on the same day as that recorded in chap. vii. The place, as we read in ver. 20, was ἐν τῷ γαστροφυλακίῳ, "in the Treasury," which probably was identical with the colonnade round the "Court of the Women," or γυναικείῳ, "in which the receptacles for charitable contributions, the so-called Shopharoth or trumpets, were placed" (Edersheim, Life of Christ, ii. 165). Edersheim supposes that here the Pharisees would alone venture to speak. This seems
scarcely consistent with the narrative. The announcement made by Jesus was, 'Eywfl|uto ... those who believe in Christ have not a chart but a guide; not a map in which they can pick out their own route, but a light going on before, which they must implicitly follow. Thus ov|M|ircpLiran^rffiiv i-jjoxoria,"shall not walk in the dark"; cf. Mt.iv.16. The Messiah was expected to scatter the darkness of the Gentiles, "Lux est nomen Messiae" (Lightfoot). άλλο âexi)0ivi)inBDL 33; αληθης in Ν.

veritas in ΒΦΓΚΛ; Τ.Ρ. in ΔΕΗΜ.

12. Πελαν ουν δ' Ηρσουι οτοις διάλοηε λέγων, "Εγώ είμαι το φως του κόσμου· έφολουθών έμοι, ού μη περιπατήσει 1 ἐν τῇ σκότῳ, ἄλλ' εἴη το φώς τῆς ζωῆς." 13. Είπον ουν αὐτῷ οἱ Φαρισαίοι, "Σοι περί σαμωτοῦ μαρτυρεῖς· ή μαρτυρία σου οὐκ έστιν αλήθης." 14. Απεκρίθη Ηρσουι καὶ εἶθεν αὐτοῖς, "Καί έγώ μαρτυρῶ περί σαμωτοῦ, αλήθης έστιν ή μαρτυρία μου· δι' οὗ άϋδεν ήλθον, και ποι άπαγω· άρεις δε οὐκ ούδατε πόθεν έρχομαι, και ποι άπαγω· 15. άρεις "κατά τήν σάρκα κρίνετε· έγώ οὐ κρίνω ούδαν. 16. o o Con. άl και εάν κρίνω δε έγώ, ή κρίσις ή έμη αλήθης 2 έστιν· δι' άπών οὐκ εάν κρίνω δε έγώ, ή κρίσις ή έμη αλήθης 2 έστιν· δι' άπών οὐκ εάν κρίνω δε έγώ, ή κρίσις ή έμη αλήθης 2 έστιν· δι' άπών οὐκ εάν κρίνω δε έγώ, ή κρίσις ή έμη αλήθης 2 έστιν· δι' άπών οὐκ εάν κρίνω δε έγώ, ή κρίσις ή έμη αλήθης 2 έστιν· δι' άπών οὐκ εάν κρίνω δε έγώ, ή κρίσις ή έμη αλήθης 2 έστιν· δι' άπών οὐκ εάν κρί

1 περιτατηθη in ΒΦΓΚΛ; T.R. in DEΗΜ.
2 αληθης in BDL 33; αληθης in Ν.

The difference between και εί and εί και is clearly stated by Hermann on Viger, 822; Klotz on Devarius, 519; and is for the most part observed in N.T. On the law regulating testimony, which was meant merely for courts of law, see ver. 31. The expressed έγώ indicates that He is an exception to the rule; the reason being because He knows whence He comes and whither He goes, δι' οὗ άπώ ... ύπάγω. He knows His origin and therefore the rule mentioned has no application to Him.—πόθεν ήλθον cannot of course be restricted to His earthly origin. He knows He is from God, so ύπάγω refers to His going to God. Cf. xiii. 3. Moreover, He is compelled to witness to Himself, because He has not a chart but a guide; not a map in which they can pick out their own route, but a light going on before, which they must implicitly follow. Thus ov|M|ircpLiran^rffiiv i-jjoxoria,"shall not walk in the dark"; cf. Mt.iv.16. The Messiah was expected to scatter the darkness of the Gentiles, "Lux est nomen Messiae" (Lightfoot). άλλο âexi)0ivi)inBDL 33; αληθης in Ν.
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The analogous δ' ἄρεις τῆς ζωῆς, το έθερ τ. έκ. show that the light of life means the light which is needful to maintain spiritual life.—Ver. 13. To this the Pharisees, seeing only self-assertion, reply: Σο ... αλήθης. A formal objection; cf. v. 31. But the attempt to apply it here only shows how far the Pharisees were from even conceiving the conditions of a true revelation. They were still in the region of pedantic rules and external tests.—Ver. 14. Jesus replies: καί ... άπένευ. "even if I witness of Myself, My witness is true". The reason being because He knows whence He comes and whither He goes, δι' οὗ άπώ ... ύπάγω. He knows His origin and therefore the rule mentioned has no application to Him.—πόθεν ήλθον cannot of course be restricted to His earthly origin. He knows He is from God, so ύπάγω refers to His going to God. Cf. xiii. 3. Moreover, He is compelled to witness to Himself, because He has not a chart but a guide; not a map in which they can pick out their own route, but a light going on before, which they must implicitly follow. Thus ov|M|ircpLiran^rffiiv i-jjoxoria,"shall not walk in the dark"; cf. Mt.iv.16. The Messiah was expected to scatter the darkness of the Gentiles, "Lux est nomen Messiae" (Lightfoot). άλλο âexi)0ivi)inBDL 33; αληθης in Ν.
eimai, all' ege kal o pempas me pathe. 17. kai en tis ymou sti tis
emetera ylprhante, oti duo avraphw kai maureia alsi eistin.
18. ege eimai o maureio perpi eamai, kai maureie perpi hymo o
pempas me pathe." 19. "Elege oon aotio, "Pou osetin o pathe
sou;" 'Apkrihih o Iepsoz, "Oute ege oibaste, oute toon pathe
mou. eimai ybaste, kai toon pathe mou ybaste av." 20. Tausta ta
emata alhrian o Iepsoz eis tis 'agion hikan, bibwnes eis tis
ieron kai oideis epivseti aotio, oti oon ellynei o dora aotio.
21. Epive oon paliv aotio o Iepsoz, "Ege ypagn, kai hetiaste
me, kai en tis emartia hymo apotheoseis. 13 epive ege ypagn, omeis
o dounsete elheiv." 22. "Elege oon ou ioudaios, "Mphi apokteni
eunton, oti legi, "Otopo ege ypagn, omeis o dounsete elheiv;"
or prejudiced, because I am not alone, but I am inseparably united to the
Father who sent me." Cf. v. 30, "as I hear I judge". In Pirque Aboth, iv. 12,
R. Ishmael is cited: "He used to say, judge not alone, for none may judge alone
save One." — Ver. 17; kai en tis ymou ... pathe. He returns from "judging"
to "witnessing," and He maintains that His witness (ver. 18) satisfies the Mosaic
law (Deut. xvii. 6, xix. 15) because what He witnesses of Himself is confirmed by
the Father that sent Him. The nature of this witness was given fully at v. 37-
47. Yge eimai o maureio ... Field maintains the A.V. "I am one that
beareth witness," against the R.V. "I am He that beareth witness"; ege eimai
being equivalent to "There is I" or "It is I." Misled perhaps by the Lord's
use of avraphw (ver. 17), the Pharisees ask (ver. 19): Pou eteri o pathe sou;
"Paterem Christi carnaliter acceperunt" (Augustine), therefore they ask where He
is that they may ascertain what He has to say regarding Jesus; as if they said:
"It is all very well alleging that you have a second witness in your Father;
but where is He?" The idea of Cyril that it was a coarse allusion to His birth
is out of the question, and Cyril himself does not press it. Jesus replies: Oute ... 
ybaste av [or av ybaste]. They ought to have known who He meant by
His Father and where He was; and their hopeless ignorance Jesus can only
deplor. They professed to know Jesus, but had they known Him they would
necessarily have known the Father in whom He lived and whom He repre-
sented. Their ignorance of the Father proves their ignorance of Jesus.—Tausta ...
lerpi. On yagoph, see ver. 12. Euthymi, as usual, hits the nail on the head:

"Tausta" ta parhrafia tis. En parhrafia ghar ton topon, deiknwn ton
tarhrian tov didaskalou. "But no one apprehended Him, because not yet was
His hour come." His immortality was all the more remarkable on account of the
proximity to the chamber where the Sanhedrin held its sittings, in the south-
east corner of the Court of the Priests. See Edersheim's Life of Christ, ii. 165,
note.

Vv. 21-30. Further conversation with the Jews, in which Jesus warns them
that He will not be long with them, and that unless they believe they will die
in their sins. They will know that His witness is true after they have crucified
Him.—Ver. 21. Epive oon paliv. On another occasion, but whether the same
day (Origen) or not we do not know, although, as Luke points out, the
aporia favours Origen's view, Jesus said: 'Ege ypagn ... elheiv. This
repeats vii. 34, with the addition "and ye shall die in your sin"; i.e., undelivered
by the Messiah, in the bondage of sin and reaping its fruit. He adds the
reason why they should not find Jesus (cf. vii. 34): 5topou ... elheiv. He goes
to His Father and thither they cannot come, if they do not believe in Him.—
Ver. 22. As before, so now, the Jews fail to understand Him, and ask: Mphi ...
elheiv; "Will He kill Himself, etc.?" They gathered from the tarhra
that the departure He spoke of was His own action, and thought that perhaps
He meant to put Himself by death beyond their reach. Many interpreters,
even Westcott and Holtzmann, suppose that the hell of suicides is meant by the
place where they could not come. This is refuted by Edersheim (ii. 170, note);
and, besides, the meaning obviously is,
23. Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Ὑμεῖς ἐκ τῶν κάτω ἐστε, ἓν ἐκ τῶν ἁνω εἶμι· ὑμεῖς ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου ἐστε, ἓν ὅπειρα ἐμι ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου.

24. ἐπεφώνον ὦν ὄμων ὦν ἀποθανεῖσθαι ἐν ταῖς ἄμαρτίαις ὄμων· δὲν γὰρ μὴ πιστεύσετε ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμί, ἀποθανεῖσθαι ἐν ταῖς ἄμαρτίαις ὄμων."

25. Ἐλεγον ὦν ὄμων, "Σὺ τίς εἶ;" Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὢν ἤσοχος, "Τὴν ἀρχὴν δὲ τί καὶ λαλὼ ὄμων. 26. πολλὰ ἤχῳ περὶ τινὸς ὑμῶν λαλεῖν καὶ κρίνειν· ἀλλ' ὁ πάθος με ἀλήθεις ἔστι, κάγω ὑμᾶς ἧμων καὶ ἀνεγείρω·

1 W.H. read σοι as one word and place point of interrogation at the end of the clause.

that as they had no intention of dying, His supposed death would put Him beyond their reach.—Ver. 23. But disregarding the interruption, and wishing more clearly to show why they could not follow Him, what constituted the real separation in destiny between Him and them, He says: ὅμως... τούτον, "You belong to the things below, I to the things above; you are of this world, I am not of this world."
The two clauses balance and interpret one another: "things below" being equivalent to "this world". It was because this gulf naturally separated them from Him and His destiny and because their destiny was that of the world that He had warned them.—Ver. 24. εἶπον ὦν... ὄμων. "Therefore said I unto you, ye shall die in your sins." The emphatic word is now ἀποθανεῖσθαι (cf. ver. 12); the destruction is itself put in the foreground (Meyer, Holtzmann). "For unless ye believe that I am He, ye shall, etc." What they were required to believe is not explicitly stated (see their question, ver. 15), it is δὲ εἶπεν ὦν... "that I am," which Westcott supposes has the pregnant meaning "that I am, that in me is the spring of life and light and strength"; but this scarcely suits the context. Meyer supposes that He means, "I am the Messiah." But surely it must refer directly to what He has just declared Himself to be, "I am not of this world but of the things above" ["nämlich der ἀνωθεν Stammende; die allentscheidende Persönlichkeit," Holtzmann]. This belief was necessary because only by attaching themselves to His teaching and person could they be delivered from their identification with this world.—Ver. 25. This only adds bewildenment to their mind, and they, not "pervit and contumuously" (Meyer, Weiss, Holtzmann), but with some shade of impatience, ask: Μ若您 εἰς; "Who art Thou?" To this Jesus replies: τὴν ἀρχήν δὲ τί καὶ λαλὼ ὄμων. These words are rendered in A.V. "Even the same that I said unto you from the beginning"; and in R.V. "Even that which I have also spoken unto you from the beginning". The Greek Fathers understood τὴν ἀρχήν as equivalent to δόξα, a meaning it frequently bears; and they interpret the clause as an exclamation, "That I should even speak to you at all!" [δόξα, δὲ τί καὶ λαλὼ ὄμων, περίτιτον ἑστιν. ἀνάξιοι γὰρ ἐστε παντὸς λόγον, ὡς περιστασία, Euthymius.] With this Field compares Achilles Tatius, vi. 20, οὐκ ἄγαντί τέ δι τοι καὶ λαλὼν: Art thou not content that I even condescend to speak to thee? In support of this rendering Holtzmann quotes from Clem., Hom. vii. 11, εἰ μὴ παρακολουθήσας σὲς λέγων, τί καὶ τὴν ἀρχήν διαλέγομαι; He even supposes that this is an echo of John, so that we have here an indication of the earliest interpretation of the words. This meaning does no violence to the words, but it is slightly at discord with the spirit of the next clause and of Jesus generally (although cf. Mk. ix. 19). Another rendering, advocated at great length by Raphael (Annot., i. 637), puts a comma after τὴν ἀρχήν and another after ὄμων, and connects τὴν ἀρχήν with πολλὰ ἤχῳ; "omnia, quia et loquor vobis, multa habeo de vobis loqui"; Raphael's note is chiefly valuable for the collection of instances of the use of τὴν ἀρχήν. A third interpretation is that suggested by the A.V., and which finds a remarkable analogue in Plautus, Capit. III. iv. 91, "Quis igitur ille est? Quem dudum dixi a principio tibi" (Elser). But this would require λέγων, not λαλὼν. There remains a fourth possible interpretation, that of Melanchthon, who renders "plane ilium verbum sum quod loquor vobiscum". So Luther (see Meyer); and Winer translates "I am"
altogether that which in my words I represent myself as being". To this Meyer and Moulton (see his note on Winer) object that τὴν ἀρχήν only means "omnino" "prorsus" when the sentence is negative. Eisner, however, admitting that the use is rare, gives several examples where it is used "sine addita negativa". The words, then, may be taken as meaning "I am nothing else than what I am saying to you: I am a Voice; my Person is my teaching".—Ver. 26. πολλὰ ἔχω ... "many things have I to speak and to judge about you," some of which are uttered in the latter part of this chapter.—ἀλλ' ὁ πέμψας ... But—however hard for you to receive—these things are what are given me to say by Him that sent me, and therefore I must speak them; and not to you only but to the world ἐξ ἀντέχων.—Ver. 27. His hearers did not identify "Him that sent me" with "the Father": ὅταν ἐγγραφαὶ ... θεοῦ.—Ver. 28. Therefore (οὕτω) Jesus said to them, "Ὅταν ... εἶμι," when ye have lifted up the Son of Man, then shall ye know that I am He". ὑψωτερὲς has the double reference of elevation on the cross and elevation to the Messianic throne, cf. iii. 14. The people were thus to elevate Him and then they would recognise Him, Acts ii. 37, etc. —ἐξ ἕως ἐλιμ "that I am He," i.e., "the Son of Man". What follows is not dependent on ὅταν (against Meyer, Holtzmann, Westcott); the καὶ ἐκ ἐμαυτοῦ begins a new statement, as the present, ἐνώπιον shows. The sequence of thought is: ye shall know that I am Messiah: and indeed I now act as such, for of myself I do nothing, but as my Father has taught me, so I speak. This is the present proof that He was Messiah.—Ver. 29. καὶ ὁ πέμψας ... πάντων. His fidelity to the purpose of the Father that sent Him secured His perpetual presence with Him. By His entire self-abnegation and freedom from self-will He gave room to the Spirit of the Father. Or, as Westcott supposes, the 6th clause may give the evidence or sign of the preceding rather than its cause; and the meaning may be that the result of the Father's presence is seen in the perfect correspondence of the conduct of the Son with the will of the Father.—Ver. 30. ταῦτα ... αὐτῶν. "As He spake these things many believed on Him," not only believed what He said, but accepted Him as the Messenger of God. The statement closes one paragraph and prepares for the next, in which it is shown what this faith amounted to (Holtzmann).

Vv. 31-50. Discussion between Jesus and the Jews regarding their paternity.

—Ver. 31. To those who have just been described as believing on Him Jesus went on to say, ἔνας ἡμῖν ... ἡμᾶς. "If you"—ἡμῖν emphasised in distinction from those who had not believed—"abide in my word"—not content with making this first step towards faith and obedience—"then"—but not till then—"are ye really my disciples."—Ver. 32. καὶ γνώσεσθε ... ἦμες. By abiding in Christ's word, making it the rule of their life and accepting Him as their Guide and Teacher, they would come to that knowledge of the truth which only experimental testing of it can bring; and the truth regarding their relation to Him and to God would turn all service and all life into liberty. Freedom, a condition of absolute liberty from all outward constraint, is only attained when man attains fellowship with God (who is absolutely free) in the truth; when that prompts man to action which prompts God. [Cf. the striking parallel in Epictetus, iv. 7. εἰ μὲν οὖσαν ἰδὼν ἔχεις ἥλιον τοῦ θεοῦ, γνωκαί αὐτοῦ τὰς ἑσπέρας, οἶκει τοῖς οὐδέσι δούλοι.([Correction made to: holmzmann])
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33. 'Apekríthasaí aútò, "'Σπέρμα Ἀβραὰμ ἵσμαιν, καὶ ὀδεῖι 8-ε-ε τν. 37, 32. 'O de duókamén póstote pòs sou lýgeis, ὁτι ὑλεὔβεροι γενίσθησθε; " d Gen. xv. 26.

34. 'Apekríthà aútòs ὁ Ἑρωδός, "'Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι ἢ γὰρ εἰς δυότατα ἡμῶν ἣν ἐγὼ ἐν τῆς ἁμαρτίας. 35. ὁ δὲ διὸς ἐν τ. 15. ἓος μὲνει ἓν τῆς ἁμαρτίας. 1ον ὁ ἀνά καὶ τύν χαῖρεν τοὺς ἕλευβεροι ἐξεβούρησεν. iv. 22.

35. ὅτα ὃ τύν σπέρμα Ἀβραὰμ ἔστε ἀλλὰ ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ ἀνακτησών, γ. v. 44. ὅτι δὲ λέγος δ ἐμὸς οὐ χαίρεσ ὑμῖν. 38. εἰς δὲ ἡπακα πάρα τῆς δν. 19; κιλ. πατρι μαου, λαλῶ καὶ ὑμεῖς οὖν δ ἐσφάγατε πάρα τῷ πατρί. 48. ὑμῖν, τοιείτε. 39. 'Apekríthasai καὶ εἶπον αὐτῷ, "Ὁ πατὴρ

1 ου omitted in BCL. 2 a ηκουσαν with ΒΕΒΚΛ I. 33.
2 τον παταρος without υμων in T. Tr. W. H. R.

γεννησα με δώστας], — Ver. 33. But this announcement, instead of seeming to the Jews the culmination of all bliss, provokes even in the πεντευκάθες (ver. 37. a blind, and cropping criticism: Σπέρμα . . . γενίσθησθε; we are the seed of Abraham, called by God to rule all peoples, and to none have we ever been slaves. "The episodes of Egyptian, Babylonian, Syrian, and Roman conquests were treated as mere transitory accidents, not touching the real life of the people, who had never accepted the dominion of their conquerors or coalesced with them," Westcott. Sayings such as "All Israel are the children of kings" were current among the people. How then could emancipation be spoken of as yet to be given them? — Ver. 34. The answer is: ἀμὴν . . . ἁμαρτίας [ἡ ἁμαρτία] is bracketed by W. H. ]. The liberty meant is inward, radical, and individual. "Every one who lives a life of sin is a slave." Cf. Rom. vi. 16, 20; 2 Pet. ii. 19; Xen. Mem., iv. 11. 3. It is equally true that a man's probus sit liber," and the Stoic saying "solum sapiens est liber." The relations subsisting in την ὅλην in the house of God, the Theocracy to which they boasted to belong, must be determined by what is spiritual, by likeness to the Head of the house; "this servitude would lead to national rejection." Edersheim. It behoves them therefore to remember this result of the generally recognised principle that sin masters the sinner and makes him a slave (ver. 35), via., "that the slave does not abide in the house," does not permanently inherit the promises to Abraham, and the blessedness of fellowship with God; it is the Son who abides for ever. Cf. Heb. iii. 6. The slave has no permanent footing in the house: he may be dismissed or sold. The transition which Paul himself had made from the servile to the filial position coloured his view of the Gospel, Gal. iv. 1-7; but here it is not the servile attitude towards God but slavery to sin that is in view. From this slavery only the Son emancipates, ἐδών... δεσμός. This implies that they were all born slaves and needed emancipation, and that only One, Himself the Son, could give them true liberty. —ἐν τω θεώ ὑλεῦβεροι in contrast to the liberty they boasted of in ver. 33. How the Son emancipates is shown in Gal. iv. 1-7. The superficial character of the liberty they enjoyed by their birth as Jews is further emphasised in ver. 37. — Ver. 37. ὅδε . . . ὑμῖν. "I know that you are Abraham's seed; it is your moral descent which is in question, and your conduct shows that my word, which gives true liberty (vv. 31, 32), does not find place in you." — οὖ χαίρετε ἐν ὑμῖν. The Greek Fathers all understand these words in the sense of A.V., "hath no place in you". Cyril has διὰ την ἑνοικήσαν ἐν ὑμῖν ἁμαρτίαν ἐπαλαθήτω καὶ τὸν διστηρ οὐκ ἔσωσαν, etc. So Euthymius and Theophylact. Beza renders "non habet locum," citing a passage from Aristotle, which Meyer disallows, because in it the verb is used impersonally. But Field has found another instance in Alciphron, Epist., iii. 7, in which χαϊρετι is used in the sense of "locum habere" (Olium Norvici, p. 67). The common meaning of χαϊρετι, "to advance," is also quite relevant and indeed not materially different. It is frequently used for prosperous, successful progress. See Aristoph., Pax, 694, and other passages
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In Kyrke; and cf. 2 Thess. iii. 1, ένα δέ λόγον τρέχει. "My word meets with obstacles and is not allowed its full influence in you."—Ver. 38. "And yet the word of Christ justly claimed acceptance, for it was derived from immediate knowledge of God," Westcott.—έγώ δέ [or ἐγώ, as recent editors read] ... φωνή. "What I have seen with my Father I speak; and what ye have seen with your father ye do." He makes the statement almost as if it were a necessary principle that sons should adopt their fathers' thoughts. The ένω might be rendered "and so"; it was because Jesus uttered what He had learned by direct intercourse with His Father that the Jews sought to slay Him. See vv. 16-19. The διάλογος (cp. iii. 31, 32) might seem to indicate the knowledge He had in His pre-existent state, but the next clause forbids this.—φωνή, but it is to balance λάβα, must be indicative.—Ver. 39. To this ambiguous but ominous utterance the Jews reply: Ο θεὸς ἡμῶν Ἁβραὰμ ἐστίν, thereby meaning to clear themselves of the suspicion of having learned anything evil from their father. To which Jesus retorts: Εἰ τεκνα ... εὑρετεία δέ. "If ye were Abraham's children ye would do the works of Abraham"; according to the law of ver. 38. If their origin could be wholly traced to Abraham, then their conduct would resemble his.—καί μέν ... εὑρετείαν. "But now—as the fact really is—you seek to kill me; and this has not only the guilt of an ordinary murder, but your hostility is roused against me because I have spoken to you the truth I heard from God. It is murder based upon hostility to God. This is very different from the conduct of Abraham."—ἀγαλματίων seems to be used simply as we might use "person"—a person who: certainly, as Lamphe says, it is used "sine praecipudio deitatis". Beltz thinks it anticipates ἀγαλματικοῖς in ver. 44, and Westcott says it stands in contrast with of God ... and at the same time suggests the idea of human sympathy, which He might claim from them (a man), as opposed to the murderous spirit of the power of evil".—Ver. 41. θρίαμβος ... ψυχῶν. You do not do the works of Abraham: you do the works of your father. And yet (ver. 37) He had acknowledged them to be the children of Abraham. The only possible conclusion was that besides Abraham some other father had been concerned in producing them. This idea they repudiate with indignation: Ημεῖς ... Θεοί. "We were not born of fornication: we have one father, God"; not "Abraham," as might have been expected, but "God": i.e., they claim to be the children of the promise, within the Theocracy, children of God's house (ver. 35)—Ver. 43. But this claim Jesus explodes by the same argument: Εἰ δέ θεὸς ... ἀπείπηλα. Were God your Father you would love me, for I am from God.—ἐξελέησον εἰ τοῦ Θεοῦ expresses "the proceeding forth from that essential pre-human fellowship with God, which was His as the Son of God, and which took place through the incarnation," Meyer. The meaning of the expression is fixed by that with which it is contrasted in xiii. 3, xvi. 28. ήκι is
44. ὑμεῖς ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ διαβόλου ἔστε, καὶ τὰς ἐκθωμίας τοῦ ἔστε ἡμῶν ἀληθεία διασκέδαστε. ἦσαν τὸν αὐθεντικόν ἄρχον ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας τῆς ἐπιστήμης τοῦ ἀποκάλυψεν, ὅτι οὐκ ἐστίν ἡ ἀληθεία ἐν ἀληθείᾳ. 

45. ἦσαν λαλὴ τὸ φεῦγος, ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων ἱλατὶ. ὅτι ὁ φασίν ἄρχον καὶ δὲν τήν ἀληθείαν λέγω, οὐ πιστεύετε μοι.

added, as ἀληθεία ἐκ τῶν ἱδίων in xvi. 26, almost in the sense in which it is used in the Dramatists, announcing the arrival of one of the "personae" on the stage, "I am come from such and such a place and here I am". The coming itself was the result of God's action rather than of His own: ἀληθεία ἐκ τῶν ἱδίων. This is His constant argument, that as He came forth from God and was sent by Him, they must have welcomed Him had they been God's children. Their misunderstanding had a moral root.—πεπιθανόν... ἐμοί. They did not recognise His speech as Divine, because they were unable to receive the message He brought. "In λαληὶ (= loquī) the fact of uttering human language is the prominent notion; in λέγων (= dicere) it is the words uttered, and that these are correlative to reasonable thoughts within the breast of the utterer" (Trench, Synonymus, 271). All His individual expressions and the very language He used were misunderstood, because there was in them a moral incapacity to receive the truth He delivered.

Ver. 44. This was the result and evidence of their unbelief: ὑμεῖς... [τοῦ πατρὸς is read by all recent editors]. "Ye are of the father who is the devil." The translation, "of the father of the devil," i.e., the (Gnostic) God of the Jews, is, as Meyer says, thoroughly un-Johannine. Perhaps a slight pause before the culmination would emphasise them and show that this had been in His mind throughout the conversation. Being of this parentage they deliberately purport [ἐθέλετε] and not merely unintentionally are betrayed into the fulness of his desires. Their origin is determined by the fact that "from the first the devil was a slayer". To what does ὁ δὲ... φρήσιν refer? Since the beginning of the human race, or since men first were killed; not since the devil's beginning. Cyril and some others think it is the first murder, that of Abel, that is in view (cf. I John iii. 15), but far more probably it is the introduction of death through the first sin (Wisd. ii. 23, 24). So almost all recent commentators. Some think both references are admissible (see Lucke).—καὶ ὁ τῆς ἀληθείας ὁδός ἐστε, "and stands not in the truth". R.V. has "and stood not"; so the Vulgate "et in veritate non stetit". W.H. adopt the same translation, reading ὁδός ἐστε, the imperfect of ὁδός, I stand; but good reasons against this reading are given by Thayer s.v. ὁδός is the usual perfect of ὁδόμην with the sense of a present. The reference therefore is not to the fall of the angels, but to the constant attitude of the devil; ὁδός ἐμοί, Euthymius. "The truth is not the domain in which he has his footing." Meyer, Weiss. He does not adhere to the truth and lives in falsehood. The reason being, ἵνα... ἀφίκῃ, "because truth is not in him". There is not in him any craving for the truth. He is not true to what he knows. His nature is so false that ἔστω μὴ λάληται ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων λαληὶ, "whenever he speaks what is false, he speaks of his own".

"But the article may mean 'the lie that is natural to him,' 'his lie'" (Plummer).—ἐκ τῶν ἱδίων means that he speaks out of that which is characteristically and peculiarly his (cf. Mt. xii. 34); "because he is his character and description—'a liar and his father,' i.e., he is himself a liar and the father of all liars. This is added to reflect light on the first statement of this verse. So Holtzmann and most recent interpreters. But Weiss rightly defends the reference of ἀφίκῃ to φεῦγος as in A.V. Westcott proposes to translate: "Whenever a man speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own, for his father also is a liar". Paley renders: "When (one) utters... he is speaking from his own, because he is a liar, and (so is) his father". Westcott's translation makes excellent sense and suits the context and gives a good meaning to the ἱδίων, but, as he himself owns, the omission of the subject ἐστὶ ν λαλὴ is certainly harsh; it may be said, impossible.—Ver. 45, ἔστω μὴ... φρήσιν. "But I"—in contrast to the devil—"because I speak the truth you do not believe me." Had I spoken falsehood you would have believed me, because it is your nature to live in what is false (cf. Euthymius).—Ver. 46.
... ἀμαρτίας; Alford, who represents a number of interpreters, says: "The question is an appeal to His sinlessness of life, as evident to them all, as a pledge for His truthfulness of word". Calvin is better: "Haec defensio ad circumstauntiam loci restringi debet, ac si quicquam sibi posse obici negaret, quominus fidus esset Dei minister". Similarly Bengel.—el bi... µια; "If I speak truth, why do you not believe me?" It follows from their inability to convict Him of sin, that He speaks what is true: if so, why do they not believe Him?—Ver. 47. He is believed by those who have another moral parentage, ἀν... ἐστίν. "He that is of God listens to the words of God," implying that the words He spoke were God's words. Their not listening proved that they were not of God. At this point the Jews break in: ὡς... εἰδεν; "Say we not well that You art a Samaritan and hast a demon?" "In the language in which they spoke, what is rendered into Greek by 'Samaritan' would have been either Cuthi, which, while literally meaning a Samaritan, is almost as often used in the sense of 'heretic,' or else Shomroni. The latter word deserves special attention. Literally, it also means 'Samaritan'; but the name Shomron is also sometimes used as the equivalent of Ashmedai, the prince of the demons. According to the Kabbalists, Shomron was the father of Ashmedai, and hence the same as Sammael or Satan. That this was a widespread Jewish belief appears from the circumstance that in the Koran Israel is said to have been seduced into idolatry by Shomron, while in Jewish tradition this is attributed to Sammael. If therefore the term applied by the Jews to Jesus was Shomron—and not Cuthi, 'heretic'—it would literally mean 'Child of the Devil,'" Edersheim. The ordinary interpretation of "Samaritan" yields, however, quite a relevant meaning. To His refusal to own their true Abrahamic ancestry they retort that He is no pure Jew, a Samaritan.—Ver. 49. Βασάνων εὑς, possessed, or crazed. Cf. x. 20. To this Jesus replies: Ἑγὼ... αἰώνα. The ἕω is emphatic in contrast to the expressed ἔως of the last clause; "I am not out of my mind, but all I do and say springs from my desire to honour my Father, while you for your part and on this very account dishonour me". This dishonour does not stir His resentment, because (ver. 50) ἕω... μοι, "I am not seeking my own glory". Cf. v. 41. Nevertheless His pass is not to be carelessly slighted and turned into reproach (Ps. iv. 2) for ἐστίν ὁ ἔως καὶ κρίνων, "there is who seeketh it and judgeth" (vv. 22, 23).—Ver. 51. Therefore the emphasis in the next verse, precisely as in ver. 44 of chap. v., is on "my word".—ὁ... αἰώνα, "if any one keeps my word, he shall never see death". For τὴν... see xiv. 15-23, xv. 10-20, xvii. 6. I John and Rev. passim; it is exactly equivalent to "keep". ὑπέρ... εἰς... occurs only here. It is probably stronger than the commoner ὑπὲρ... εἰς... (Lk. ii. 26, Heb. xi. 5), "expressing fixed contemplation and full acquaintance" (Plummer); although in John this fuller meaning is sometimes not apparent.—Ver. 52. This
confirms the Jews in their opinion that He is not in His right mind, Nōv ἑρεμάρειν . . . they seem to have now got proof of what they had suspected; "antea cum dubitatione aliquâ locuti erant," Bengel. Their proof is that whereas Jesus says that those who keep His word shall never die, Abraham died and the prophets; therefore Jesus would seem to be making Himself greater than those most highly revered personages.—Ver. 53. What did He expect them to take Him for?—τίνα σεαυτον ὑποκάινον? For the μὴ σὺ μείζων cf. iv. 12.—Ver. 54. To their question Jesus, as usual, gives no categorical answer, but replies first by repelling the insinuation contained in their question and then by showing that He was greater than Abraham (see Plummer).—"Ἐὰν ἐγὼ δοξάζω. "If I shall have glorified myself, my glory is nothing; my Father is He who glorifieth me." He cannot get them to understand that it is not self-adoration on His part which prompts His claims, but fulfilment of His Father's commission. This "Father" of whom He speaks and who thus glorifies Him is the same δὲ ὃμισε λέγετε δὲ . . . "of whom you say that He is your God". His witness therefore you ought to receive; and the reason why you do not is this, ὅτι ἐγώ κατεκάωντο αὐτῶν, ἔγνω δὲ οἰδαμένων, "you have not learned to know Him, but I know Him". The former verb denotes knowledge acquired, by teaching or by observation; in contrast to the latter, which denotes direct and essential knowledge.—καὶ ἐὰν ἔσώθη . . . τῆς. So far from the affirmations of Jesus regarding His connection with the Father being false, He would be false, a liar and like them, were He to deny that He enjoyed direct knowledge of God. "But, on the contrary, I know Him and all I do, even that which offends you, is the fulfilment of His commission, the keeping of His word."—Ver. 56. And as regards the connection they claim with Abraham, this reflects discredit on their present attitude towards Jesus; for ἄρα γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν, "Abraham in whose parentage you glory," ἡγαλλιᾶστο ἵνα ἴδη τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ἑμῆν καὶ εἴδε καὶ ἐχάρη."—Ver. 57. Eἴτε οὖν οἱ οὖν διαστάλης πρὸς αὐτῶν, "Πενθῆκοντα ἔτη ἔστω:
"Fifty years" may be used as a round number, sufficiently exact for their purpose and with no intention to determine the age of Jesus. But Lightfoot (Hor. Hdb., 1046) thinks the saying is ruled by the age when Levites retired, see Num. iv. 3, 39: "Tu non adhuc pervenisti ad vulgarem annum superannuationis, et tune vi diisti Abrahamum?" Irenaeus (ii. 22, 5) records that the Gospel (presumably this passage) and the Presbyter of Asia Minor who had known John, testified that Jesus taught till He was forty or fifty. This idea is upheld by E. v. Bunsen (Hidden Wisdom of Christ), and even Keim is of opinion that Jesus may have lived to His fortieth year.—Ver. 58. The misunderstanding of His words elicits from Jesus the statement: ἔχεις ἀνάμνησιν, Δαυίδ ἡμών. "Before Abraham was born I am." "Antequam Abraham fieter, Ego sum," Vulgate. Plummer aptly compares Ps. xc. 2, πρὸ τοῦ ἄγιου γεννήθηνα ... σε ἐμ. Before Abraham came into existence I am, eternally existent. No stronger affirmation of pre-existence occurs, and Byschkagl's subtle attempt to evade the meaning is unsuccessful.—Ver. 59. What the Jews thought of the assertion appeared in their action: ἦραν ... αὐτῶν. Believing that He was speaking sheer blasphemy and claiming equality with the Deity they sought to stone Him. For this purpose there was material ready to hand even in the Temple court, for, as Lightfoot reminds us, the building was still going on. "A stoning in the temple is mentioned by Josephus, Ant. xvii. 9, 3," Meyer.—Τρίτον ἐκ τῆς καταγωγῆς καὶ ἐξῆλθεν. "But Jesus went out unperceived"; on this usage vide Winer, and cf. Thayer. Why it should be supposed that there is anything miraculous or doctic in this (Holtzmann and others) does not appear. Many in the crowd would favour the escape of Jesus. The remaining words of the chapter are omitted by recent editors.

**Chapter IX. 1—X. 22. The healing of a man born blind and the discussions arising out of this miracle.**

Vv. 1-7. The cure narrated.—Ver. 1. Ἐπεί παραδόχων "And as He passed by," possibly, as Lightfoot and Holtzmann suppose, on the occasion just mentioned (viii. 59), and as He passed the gate of the Temple where beggars congregated; but the definite mention that it was a Sabbath (ver. 14) rather indicates that it was not the same day. See on x. 22.—ἐπείθεν ... γέννηθε. "He saw a man blind from birth; an aggravation which plays a prominent part in what follows. And first of all it so impresses the disciples that they ask τίς ... γέννηθε. Their question implies a belief, repudiated by Jesus here and in Lk. xiii. 1-5, that each particular sickness or sorrow was traceable to some particular sin; see Job passim and Weber's Lehren d. Talmud, p. 235. Their question seems also to imply that they supposed even a natural defect might be the punishment of the individual's own sin. This has received different explanations: (1) that the pre-existence of souls had been deduced from Wisd. viii. 20, "being good, I came into a body undeveloped"; (2) that metempsychosis was held by some Jews (so Calvin, Beza, and see Lightfoot, p. 1048); or (3) that the unpunished were selected from the best in body and soul. xxv. 26, Lk. i. 41-44; or (4) that the punishment was anticipatory of the sin; or (5) that the question was one of sheer bewilderment, putting all conceivable possibilities, but without attaching any very definite meaning to the one branch of the alternative. A combination of the two last seems to fit the mental attitude of the disciples. The alternative that the man suffered for his parents' sin was an idea which would naturally suggest itself. See Exod. xx. 5, etc.—ἐπείθεν γέννηθε; ἡ γεννήθης expresses result, not purpose; and the form of expression is the product of false analogy, arising from
imitation of a construction which really expresses purpose" (Burton, Moods, 215, 219).—Ver. 3. Both alternatives are rejected by Jesus, OVT... αὐτῶ. And another solution is suggested, ἵνα... κατὶ. Evil furthers the work of God in the world. It is in conquering and abolishing evil He is manifested. The question for us is not where suffering has come from, but what we are to do with it. Ver. 4. The law which is binding on all men Jesus enunciates.—ἐὰν... ἔργασθαι. Work, active measures to remove suffering, are more incumbent on men than resentful speculation as to the source of suffering. As to God's connection with evil, the practical man need only concern himself with this, that God seeks to abolish it. The time for doing so is limited, it is ἡ ἡμέρα... ἔτην. So long as it is day" that is, as the next clause shows, so long as life lasts. [On ἡμέρα in N.T. see Burton, Moods, 321-330.].—ἔργασθαι νῦν, suggested by the threats (vii. 59, etc.) and by the presence of the blind man.—Ver. 5. ἤ... κόσμων. We should have expected ἡμέρα and not ἐτῶν, and the Vulgate renders "quamdiu." But the "when" seems to be used to suggest a time when He should not be in the world: "when I am in the world, I am the Light of the World," as He immediately illustrated by the cure of the blind man.—Ver. 6. Τάτα αὐτῶν, i.e., "in this connection," ἐπειδὴ... χαμαί... "He spat on the ground and made clay of the spittle," "quaia aqua ad manum non erat," says Grotius; but that spittle was considered efficacious Lightfoot proves by an amusing anecdote and Wetstein by several citations. Tacitus (Hist., iv. 81) relates that the blind man who sought a cure from Vespasian begged "ut... oculorum orbes dignarctur respergere oris excremento." Probably the idea was that the saliva was of the very substance of the person. Taylor (Prim. Culture, ii. 400) is of opinion the Roman Catholic priest's touching with his spittle the ears and nostrils of the infant at baptism is a survival of the custom in Pagan Rome in accordance with which the nurse touched with spittle the lips and forehead of the week-old child. Virtue was also attributed to clay in diseases of the eye. A physician of the time of Caracalla prescribes "turgentes oculos vili circumline coeno." That Jesus supposed some virtue lay in the application of the clay is contradicted by the fact that in other cases of blindness He did not use it. See Mk. x. 46. But if He applied the clay to encourage the man to believe, as is the likely solution, the question of accommodation arises (see Lücke). The whole process of which the man was the subject was apparently intended to deepen his faith. —Ver. 7. The application of the clay was not enough. Jesus further said: "Ὑπάγε... ἀπεσταλμένος. Elsner shows that "wash into," νίψατε, is not an uncommon construction. But ver. 11, which gives the same command in a different form, shows that the man understood that εἶς followed ὑπάγε and not νίψατε. The pool of Siloam, supplied from the Virgin's fountain (Is. viii. 6), lay at the south-east corner of Jerusalem in the Kidron Valley. On the opposite side of the valley lies a village Silwan.

1 Considerable variety of reading occurs in this clause; W.H.R. adopt alou elenon Oucx, all the omis of prov estin.

2 ηπεκχηθησαν read by Tr.Ti.W.H.R. with [ABCDEF].

8 representing the old name. The name is here interpreted as meaning "Sent" [ἡρλή, missus; not [ἡρλ, missio sc. aquarium, Meyer]. The word ἀνεκτυμένος is so frequently used by Jesus of Himself that, notwithstanding what Meyer says, we naturally apply it here also to Himself, as if the noiseless Stream which their fathers had despised (Is. vii. 6) and which they could trace to its source, was a fit type of Him whom the Jews rejected because they knew His origin and because he had no external force. His influence consisted in this, that He was ἀνεκτυμένος. The blind man obeyed and received his sight. Cf. Elisha and Naaman. From the succeeding γείτονες several interpreters conclude that ἦλθε means "came" home. Needlessly.

Vv. 8-12. The people discuss the man's identity.—Ver. 8. Οἱ οὖν γείτονες . . . προσατίτων. "The neighbours, then," who might or might not be at that time near the man's home, "and those who formerly used to see him, that he was blind" [but προσατίτων is read instead of τυφλὸς by recent editors], "said, Is not this he that sits and begs?"—Ver. 9. "Others" but evidently of the same description "said, This is he." Besides those who were doubtful and those who were certain of his identity there was a third opinion uttered: "He is like him." Naturally the opened eyes would alter his appearance. The doubts as to his identity were scattered by the man's decisive Ἐγώ ἐμι.—Ver. 10. This being ascertained the next question was, ἡρλ ἄνεκτυμαν σου οἱ ὀφθαλμοί? In reply the cured man relates his experience. He had ascertained Jesus' name from some bystander; and it is noticeable that he speaks of Him as one not widely known: ἀνεκτυμένος λεγόμενος ἡγουσίας ἀνέβλεψα, "I recovered sight." The man, who now saw for the first time, "uses the ordinary language of men, though in strictness it was not applicable to his own case," Watkins.

Vv. 13-34. The man is examined by the Pharisees, who eventually communicate him.—Ver. 13. "Ἀγωνισον . . . τυφλόν. "They," some of the neighbours and others already mentioned, "bring him who had formerly been blind to the Pharisees, not to the Sanhedrin, but to an informal but apparently authoritative (ver. 34) group of Pharisees, who were members of the court.—Ver. 14. The reason of this action was that the cure had been wrought on a Sabbath. ["Prohibitum erat sputum oculo illinere Sabbatio, sub notione aliquis medicinali," Lightfoot.]—Ver. 15. πάλιν . . . ἀνέβλεψεν. πάλιν looks back to the same question put by the people, ver. 10; the καὶ serving the same purpose. Their first question admits the man's original blindness. The man's reply is simple and straightforward.—Ver. 16. And then the Pharisees introduce their charge and its implication, Ὄντως . . .
8—23. 

The miracle is not a work of God, rather affirmed, but it cannot be a work of God, for it has been done on Sabbath. Cf. iii. 2 and v. 16. Some of their party, however, inclined to a different conclusion, 

"And there are many blind, and lame, and sick, and shorn, who are brought to thee, and they do not recover."

How can such a work be done at all, whether on Sabbath or any other day, by a sinner? This breach of the Sabbath law must admit of explanation. It cannot arise from opposition to God.—καὶ σχίσμα ἤ ἐν αὐτοῖς, as before among the people, vii. 43, so now among the authorities a pronounced and permanent clef was apparent.—Ver. 17. Differing among themselves, they refer the question to the man, ἦτα τῇ λέγειν . . . "You, what do you say about Him, on account of His opening your eyes?" The question is not one of fact, but of inference from the fact; the δι τι means "in that," "inasmuch as," and the Vulgate simply renders "Tu quid dices de illo, qui aperuit oculos tuos?" Promptly the man replies, προφήτης ἦταν.—Ver. 18. It now appears that their previous admission of the fact of the miracle was disingenuous and that they suspected fraudulent collusion between Jesus and the man; Οὐκ ἐπιτετελοῦσαν, "they did not believe" his account (ver. 19), ἦταν . . . ἔπηκεν; "until they summoned his parents."—Ver. 20. To them they put virtually three questions:

Is this your son? Was he born blind? (for though you say this of him, υμεῖς emphatic, we do not believe it). How does he now see? The first two questions they unhesitatingly answer: This is our son who was born blind. This answer explodes the idea of collusion.—Ver. 22. The third question they have not the means of answering, or as ver. 22 indicates, they shammed ignorance to save themselves; and refer the examiners to the man himself.—ὅλικαι ἔγει, his parents are no longer responsible for him. Examples of the Greek phrase are given by Kypke and Wetstein from Plato, Aristophanes, and Demosthenes,ἀὐτὸς πέρυ αὐτοῦ [better ἐν αὐτοῖς] ἔλεγον.—Ver. 22. Τινὸς . . . ἐρωτήσατο. The reluctance of the parents to answer brings out the circumstance that already the members of the Sanhedrin had come to an understanding with one another that any one who acknowledged Jesus as the Messiah should be excommunicated, ἀποστεγάως γίνεται. Of excommunication there were three degrees: the first lasted for thirty days; then followed "a second admonition," and if impenitent the culprit was punished for thirty days more; and if still impenitent he was laid under the Cherem or ban, which was of indefinite duration, and which entirely cut him off from intercourse with others. He was treated.
as if he were a leper. This, to persons so poor as the parents of this beggar, would mean ruin and death (see Ebersheim, Life of Christ, ii. 183-4).—Ver. 24. Baffled by the parents the Pharisees turn again, i.e. denierov, a second time to the man and say: ὅσον δὲ ἔδει τῇ θείᾳ . . . ἄνωθεν. They no longer deny the miracle, but bid the man ascribe the glory of it to the right quarter; to God: not to Jesus, because they can assure him on knowledge of their own, ἡμεῖς οἴδαμεν, that He is a sinner.—Ver. 25. But they find in the man a kind of independence and obstinacy they are not used to. Εἰ ἀμαρτωλὸς . . . βλέπων. He does not question their knowledge, and he draws no express inference from what has happened, but of one thing he is sure, that he was blind and that now he sees.—Ver. 26. Thwarted by the man's boldness and perceiving that it was hopeless to deny the fact, they return to the question of the means used. Τὸ ἐνώπιον σοι; At this the man loses patience. Their crafty and silly attempt to lead him into some inconsistent statement seems to him despicable, and he breaks out (ver. 27): Εἴπον . . . γεννήθη. No more galling gibe could have been hurled at them than this man's "Are you also wishing to become His disciples?"—Ver. 28. It serves its purpose of exasperating them and bringing them to the direct expression of their feelings. Ἐλοιδώρησαν . . . ἄστιν. "They reviled him." On ἐκεῖνον Bengel has: "Hoc vocabulo removent Jesum a sece."—Ver. 29. We know that Moses was a prophet, commissioned by God to speak for Him (for ἐλλαχίστατα see Heb. i. 1); and if this man is commissioned He must show proof of His being sent from God, and not leave us in ignorance of His origin.—Ver. 30. This, in the face of the miracle, seems to the man a surprising statement: Ἐν γὰρ τούτῳ εὐαγγελιστὶ ἄστιν, ὅτι ἡμεῖς οὐκ οἴδατε πόθεν ἄστιν. 31. οἴδαμεν δὲ ὅτι ἀμαρτωλῶν ὁ θεός οὐκ ἀκοίνει· ἀλλ' ἐὰν τις ἀποκαθιστήσῃ τὸ πάθος, καὶ τὸ θλήμα αὐτοῦ πόθεν ἄστιν; 32. ἐκ τοῦ αὐτῶν οὐκ ἡκούσθη, ὅτι ἠρνεῖτο τρ. Lk. 70, etc. τῆς ὑφόλου τυφλοῦ γεγεννημένου. 33. εἰ μὴ ἦν ὄντος παρὰ
Ver. 34. *EvafMorUut. . .f{«. “Insinsthouwastwhollyborn,and dostthou teachus?” They refer his blindness to sin, and reproach him with his calamity. Sin, they say, was branded on the whole man; he was manifestly a reprobat. Yet we, the pure and godly, are to be taught by such a man!—*ζξηβαλον αυτων εις, “they cast him out,” not merely from the chamber, but from communion. This is implied both in ver. 35 and all that Jesus says of the shepherds in the following paragraph.

Ver. 35-X. 21. The good and the hireling shepherds.—Ver. 35. *Heouwew. . . The action of the Pharisees threw the man on the compassion of Jesus: “He heard that they had cast him out,” and He knew the reason; therefore, ευρων αυτων, “when He found him,” as He wished and sought to do, His first question was: Σω. . . Θεοι! Perhaps a slight emphasis lies in the Σω. “Dost thou believe in the Messiah?”—Ver. 36. The man’s answer shows that he was willing to believe in the Messiah if he could identify Him; and having already declared Jesus to be a prophet, he believed that He could tell him who the Messiah was. It may be taken for granted that although he had not seen Jesus since recovering his sight, he knew somehow that he was speaking to the person who had healed him; and was perhaps almost prepared for the great announcement (ver. 37): Καλ ήρα-

EYAGGELION

Σω, ουκ ήδύνατο πνευμ οδεν.

34. *Εκκριθήσαν καὶ εἶπον αὐτῷ, “*Εν ἀμαρτίαις σὺ ἐγενήθης ὁ λος, καὶ σὺ διδάσκας ἡμᾶς;” — Ps. ii. 5. εις τοῦ Θεοῦ 1;”

36. Απεκρίθη ἐκεῖνος καὶ εἶπε, “Τίς ἐστιν κύριε, ἵνα πιστεύσω εἰς αὐτὸν;”

37. Εἶπε δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ ἱσοῦς, “Καὶ ἐράκας αὐτῷ, καὶ ὁ λαλῶν μετὰ σου, ἐκεῖνος ἐστιν.” 38. ὁ δὲ εἰς τοὺς ἐφή, “Πιστεύω, κύριε.”

39. καὶ προσεκόμησεν αὐτῷ. καὶ εἶπεν ὁ ἱσοῦς, “Εἰς κρίμα ἔγιν εἰς τὸν κόσμον τούτων ἢδον, ἵνα οἱ μὴ βλέποντες βλέπωσιν, καὶ οἱ βλέποντες τυφλοί γίνονται.”

40. Καὶ ἠκούσαν ἐκ τῶν Φαρισαίων ταύτα οἱ δικεῖς μετ’ αὐτῶν, καὶ εἶπον αὐτῷ, “Μὴ καὶ ἡμεῖς τυφλοί ἴσοιμεν;”

41. Εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ ἱσοῦς, “Εἰ τυφλοὶ ἦτε, οὐκ άν ἐξῆτε ἀμαρτίαν. νῦν δὲ λέγετε, Ὄτι εἰς ἔθνη, ἐλπίδωμεν ὁ δὲ ἀμαρτία υἱῶν μένει.

proved their truth by saying with indignant contempt: μὴ καὶ ἡμεῖς τύφλοι ἐσμέν; To which Jesus, taking them on their own ground, replies: Καὶ τύφλοι ἔστε, οὐκ ἦσαν ἐπίκριτοι ὑμῶν. If ye were ignorant, as this blind man was, aware of your darkness and anxious to be rid of it, your ignorance would excuse you: but now by all your words and actions you proclaim that you are satisfied with the light you have, therefore you cannot receive that fuller light which I bring and which is deliverance from sin, and must therefore remain under its bondage. Cf. viii. 21.

Chapter X.—Vv. 1-21. The Good Shepherd and the hirelings. This paragraph is a continuation of the conversation which arose out of the healing of the blind man. Instead of being introduced by any fresh note of time, it is ushered in by ἀμὴν ἀμὴν, which is never found in this Gospel at the commencement of a discourse. The subject also is directly connected with the miracle and its consequences. Jesus explains to the excommunicated man who it is that has power to give entrance to the true fold or to exclude from it. As usual, the terms and tenor of the teaching are interpreted by the incident which gave rise to it.—Ver. 1. ἀμὴν... Αποροῖς. The αἴμα, or sheepfold, into which the sheep were gathered for safety every night, is described as being very similar to folds in some parts of our own country; a walled, unroofed enclosure. The θῆρα, however, is not as with us a hurdle or gate, but a solid door heavily barred and capable of resisting attack. This door is watched by a θυρωρός [door-guard, for root “or” vide Spratt’s Thucy., iii. p. 132], who in the morning opened to the shepherd. He who does not appeal to the θυρωρός but climbs up over the wall by some other way (lit. from some other direction: ἀλαξιοῦν, which is used in later Greek for the Attic ἀλλαξεῖ) is κλέπτης καὶ λῃστής, a “thief” who uses fraud and a “robber” who is prepared to use violence. That is to say, his method of entrance, being illegitimate, declares that he has no right to the sheep.—Ver. 2. On the other hand, ἐὰν ἐισερχόμενοι... προβατών, “but he that entereth by the door is the shepherd of the sheep”. The shepherd is known by his using the legitimate mode of entrance. What that is, He does not here explicitly state. The shepherd is further recognised by his treatment of the sheep, τὰ πρόβατα καλὰ [better φωτεῖν] καὶ δωμά, “his own sheep he calls by name”. Τὰ πρόβατα he perhaps as distinguished from others in the same fold; perhaps merely a strong possessive. As we have names for horses, dogs, cows, so the Eastern shepherds for their sheep.

[“Many of the sheep have particular names,” Van Lennep, Bible Lands, i. 185. It was also a Greek custom to name sheep, and Wetstein quotes from Longus, ὁ δὲ ἄγων ἐκάλεσε τινὸς αὐτὸς δωματίου...—διαν... αὐτῶν. When he has put all his own out of the fold, they follow him, because they know his voice: the shepherd walking in front as is still the custom in the East. This method cannot be adopted by strangers “because the sheep know not the voice of strangers”.

“There is a story of a Scotch traveller who changed clothes with a Jerusalem shepherd and tried to lead the sheep; but the shepherd followed the shepherd’s voice and not his clothes.” Plummer.

So that the shepherd’s claim is justified not only by his method of entrance but by his knowledge of the names of the sheep and by their knowledge of him and confidence in him. The different methods are illustrated in Andrews and Laud, the former saying...
"Our guiding must be mild and gentle, else it is not duxisti, but fraxisti, drawing and driving and no leading"; the latter, of whom it was said that he "would never convince an opponent if he could suppress him". See Ottley's Andrews, 159.—Ver. 6. The application of the parable was sufficiently obvious; but 

"ταύτην... αὐτῶς. παρομία [παρά, ὁμός, out of the way or wayside] seems more properly to denote "a proverb"; and the Book of Proverbs is named in the Sept. αἱ παρομίαι or παρομίαι Σαλωμόντος; and Aristotle, Rhetor., 3, 11, defines παρομία as μεταφοραί αὐτ' εἴδοσιν εἰς εἴδος. But παρομίαι and παραβολή came to be convertible terms, both meaning a longer or shorter utterance whose meaning did not lie on the surface or proverbial sayings: the former term is never found in the Synoptic Gospels, the latter never found in John. [Further see Hatch, Essays in Bibl. Greek, p. 64; and Abbot's Essays, p. 82.] This parable the Pharisees did not understand. They might have understood it, for the terms used were familiar O.T. terms; see Ezek. xxxiv., Ps. lxxx. But as it had been spoken for their instruction as well as for the encouragement of the man whom they had cast out of the fold, (ver. 7) εἰκὼν οὖν πάλιν, Jesus therefore began afresh and explained it to them. —Γάρ 

"εἰμὶ ἡ θύρα τῶν προβάτων, I, and no other, am the door of the sheep. (Cf. the Persian reformer who proclaimed himself the "Báb," the gate of life.) Through me alone can the sheep find access to the fold. Primarily uttered for the excommunicated man, these words conveyed the assurance that instead of being outcast by his attachment to Jesus he had gained admittance to the fellowship of God and all good men. Not the Pharisees but Jesus could admit to or reject from the fold of God. —Ver. 8. In contrast to Jesus, πάντες... ἄρισται, "all who came before me," i.e., all who came before me, claiming to be what I am and to give to the sheep what I give. The prophets pointed forward to Him and did not arrogate to themselves His functions. Only those could be called "thieves and robbers" who had come before the Shepherd came, as if in the night and without His authority. It must have been evident that the hierarchical party was meant. [The inexactness of contrasting the "door" rather than the Shepherd with the "thieves and robbers" who came before Jesus, only emphasizes the fact that the reality was more prominent than the figure in the mind of the speaker.] Those, however, who had tried to assume the functions of the Shepherd had failed; because 

"ἐξουσιον ἀυτῶν τὰ πρόβατα, the people of God had not listened to them. They no doubt assumed authority over the people of God and compelled obedience, but the true children of God did not find in their voice that which attracted and led them to pasture. —Ver. 9. 

"γάρ... εἰρήσει. With emphasis He reiterates: "I am the door: through me, and none else, if a man enter he shall be saved, and shall go in and out and find pasture". Meyer and others supply "any shepherd" as the nominative to εἰσόδιον, which may agree better with the form of the parabole saying, but not so well with the substance. Jesus is the Door of the sheep, not of the shepherd; and the blessings promised, σωθήσεται, κ. τ. λ., are proper to the sheep. These blessings are three: deliverance from peril, liberty, and sustenance. For the phraseology see the remarkable passage Num. xxvii. 15-21, which Holtzmans misapplies, neglecting the twenty-first verse. To "go out and in" is the common O.T. expression to denote the free activity of daily life, Jer. xxvii. 4, Ps. cxxi. 8, Deut. xxviii. 6.—Ver. 10. The tenth verse introduces a new contrast, between the good
shepherd and the thieves and hirelings.

— ἀλάτων . . . ἀπολογ. The thief has but one reason for his coming to the fold: he comes to steal and kill and destroy; to aggrandize himself at the expense of himself. The θάνατος in Acts x. 13, Mt. xxi. 4; cf. Deut. xxii. 1. With quite other intent has Christ come: ἵνα ἀλάτον . . . ἵνας, that instead of being killed and perish- ing the sheep "may have life and may have abundance". This may mean abundance of life, but more probably abundance of all that sustains life. "To have a surplus." The repetition of ἵνας gives the second point a more independent position than it would have had if καὶ had alone been used. Cf. ver. 18; Xen. Anab., vii. 6, 31, means "to have a surplus." In these verses Jesus designates Himself "the Good Shepherd" and emphasizes two features by which a good shepherd can be known: (1) his giving his life for the sheep, and (2) the reciprocal knowledge of the sheep and the shepherd. These two features are both introduced by the statement (ver. 11) ἵνα ἔλθῃ ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλὸς, "the good shepherd": "good" probably in the sense in which we speak of a "good" painter or a "good" architect; one who excels at his business. The definite article claims this as a description applicable to Himself alone. Cf. Ps. xxiii., Is. xi. 11, Ezek. xxxiv., etc.

For other descriptions of the ideal shepherd, see Plato's Republic, p. 345, and the remarkable passage in the Politicus, 271-275, and Columella (in Wetstein), "Magister autem pecoris aecer, durus, strenuus, laboris patientissimus, alacer atque audax esse debet; et qui per rupes, per solitudines atque vepres facile vadat"—ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλὸς, the good shepherd, whoever he is, ἵνα ὄψην . . . ἵνας, "lays down his life for the sheep". θάνατος in the ὄψην is not a classical phrase, but in Hippocrates occurs a similar expression, Μακάδων γάρ τινι ὄψην καθάπερ εἰς τῇ Τράβδῳ, Kypke. Pones spiritum occurs in Latin. Of the meaning there is no doubt. Cf. xiii. 37.— ὡς τῶν ἀποικίων, "for the good of the shepherd," that is, when the welfare of the sheep demands the sacrifice of life, that is freely made. Here it is evident Jesus describes "the good shepherd" as revealed in Himself.

Ver. 12. ὁ μυστήριος ὁδ [ὁδ is omitted by recent editors] . . . ἀρνητῶν. In contrast to the good shepherd stands now not the robber but a man in some respects better, a hireling or hired hand (Mark i. 20), not a shepherd whose instincts would prompt him to defend the sheep, and not the owner to whom the sheep belong. So long as there is no danger he does his duty by the sheep for the sake of his wages, but when he sees the wolf coming he abandons the sheep and flees. "The wolf" includes all that threatens the sheep. In Xen., Mem., ii. 7, 14, the dog says to the sheep: ἵνα γὰρ εἰπὼς καὶ ἵνα ἀλάτας σῶμαν, διὸ ἐντὸς ἐς ἀντίθεσι κλάματοι, μὴν ὀμαθήναι ἀρνητῶν, καὶ ὁ λύκος . . . ἐκπετραθεί, and the wolf carries them off and scatters them"—cf. Mt. ix. 36; a general description careless of detail. Bengel says "lacerat quasi potest, ceteras dispergit"—Ver. 13. ὁ δ' ἀγωνισμὸς φόνος, not, as in ver. 12, ὁ μισός, δὲ, "because the antithesis of the hireling was there first brought forward and greater emphasis was secured by that position". Meyer. Klotz, p. 378, says that δὲ is placed after more words than one "ubi quae praeposita particularum verba sunt aut aptius inter se conjuncta sunt aut ita amplexa, ut summum pondus in ea sententia obstante". He flees ὅτι μισοῦσι ὁτι, his nature is
betrayed by his conduct. He does not care for the sheep but for himself. He took the position of guardian of the sheep for his own sake, not for theirs; and the presence of the wolf brings out that it is himself, not the sheep, he cares for.—Ver. 14. The second mark of the good shepherd is introduced by a repetition of the announcement: ἐγὼ ... καλὸς. And this second mark is not stated in general terms applicable to all good shepherds, but directly of Himself: ἐγὼ εἰμι ... καὶ γνῶσομαι τὰ ἔμα. The existence of this knowledge is the proof that He is the Shepherd. The shepherd's claim is authenticated by his knowledge of the marks and ways of the sheep, and by his knowledge of him as shown in its coming to his voice and submission to his hand. Augustine says: "They sometimes do not know themselves, but the shepherd knows them".—Ver. 15. This reciprocal knowledge is so sure and profound that it can only be compared to the mutual knowledge of the Father and the Son: καὶ ἀμαρτανόμενοι πάντες ... καλὸς. He then applies to Himself what had been stated in general of all good shepherds in ver. 11; and ver. 16 might suitably have begun with the words "And my life I lay down for the sheep." This statement is, however, prompted by His reference to His knowledge of the Father. He knows it is the Father's will that He should lay down His life. See vv. 17 and 18.—Ver. 16. But the mention of His death suggests to Him the wide extent of its consequences. Ἀλλὰ προῆκεν εἰκών, "other sheep I have"; not that they are already believers in Him, but "His" by the Father's design and gift. Cf. xvii. 7 and Acts xviii. 10. They are only negatively described: δὲ ὅσα δέον ἐκ τῆς ἀλλήλης ταύτης; "this fold" is evidently that which contained the Jews who already had received Him as their Shepherd; and the other sheep which are not "of" (ἐκ, as frequently in John, "belonging to"; not as Meyer renders) this fold are the Gentiles.—καῦμαι ποιμήν "those also I must bring and they shall listen to my voice, and they shall so amalgamate with the Jewish disciples that there shall be one flock, one shepherd." The listening to Christ's voice brings the sheep to Him, and this being what constitutes the flock, the flock must be one as He is one. But nothing is said of unity of organisation. There may be various folds, though one flock.—μὴ ποιμάνῃ ἐκ ποιμήν, the alliteration cannot be quite reproduced in English. For the emphasis gained by omitting καὶ cf. Eurip., Orestes, 1244, τρισοτεῖοι φίλοι γιὰ τὸ ἐὰν γίνεται, δική με. The A.V. wrongly translated "one fold," following the Vulgate, which renders both αὐτῇ and ποιμήν by "ovile" ([}' qua voce non grex ipse sed ovium stabulum declaratur; quod unum vix unquam fuit, et non modo falsa, sed etiam utile im- pudenter Romae collocatur". Beza]. This is corrected in R.V. The old Latin versions had "unus grex"; see Wordsworth's and White's Vulg.—Ver. 17. At this point the exposition of the functions of the good shepherd terminates; but as a note or appendix Jesus adds διὰ τοῦτο, "on this account," i.e., because I lay down my life for the sheep (ver. 15 and following clause) does my Father love me. The expressed ἐγὼ serves to bring out the spontaneity of the surrender. And this free sacrifice or death is justified by the object, ἵνα πάλιν λαβῶ σῶμα. He dies, not to remain in death and so leave the sheep defenceless, but to live again, to resume life in pursuance of the object for which He had given it. The freedom of the sacrifice is proved by His taking
His life again. He was not compelled to die.—Ver. 18. οὐδεὶς αἷρε αὕτην ἀπ’ ἑαυτοῦ. He did not succumb to the machinations of His foes. To the last He was free to choose another exit from life; Mt. xxvi. 53. He gave His life freely, perceiving that this was the Father's will: ἐξετάζει τις μονῇ. Others have only power to choose the time or method of their death, and not always that: Jesus had power absolutely to lay down His life or to retain it. Others have no power at all to resume their life after they had laid it down. He has. This freedom, as Weiss remarks, does not clash with the instrumentality of the Jews in taking His life, nor with the power of God in raising Him again.—ταύτην τὴν ἐντολὴν. This commandment "thus to dispose of His life and to resume it He has received from the Father. In this as in all else He is fulfilling the will and purpose of God.

Vv. 19-21. The result of this discourse briefly described.—Ver. 19. As usual, diverse judgments were elicited, and once more a division of opinion appeared, Σχέμα σοι πάλιν ἐγένετο ... Many thought Him possessed and mad, as in Mk. iii. 21; cf. οὗ μᾶς ὑποθέτει of Paul, Acts xxvi. 24. Others took the more sensible view. These words they had heard were not the wild exclamations and ravings they usually heard from demoniacs; and His acts, such as opening the blind man's eyes, were not within the compass of a demon.

V. 22-39. Sayings of Jesus at the Feast of Dedication.—Ver. 22. Ἐγένετο δὲ τὰ ἑγκαινία τοῖς ἱεροσόλυμοις, καὶ χείμων. This reading would connect this paragraph with the foregoing, and the interval of two months between the Feast of Tabernacles and Dedication would be placed between chs. viii. and ix. It has been suggested that Τὰ ἑγκαινία may here mean the Dedication of Solomon's Temple, which coincided with the Feast of Tabernacles. This is not likely. The reading of T.R. is strongly authenticated, being found in ΝΔ and most other uncial, vulg., Goth. syr., etc.

His life again. He was not compelled to die.—Ver. 18. οὐδεὶς ᾧρε ἀὑτὴν ἀπ’ ἑαυτοῦ. He did not succumb to the machinations of His foes. To the last He was free to choose another exit from life; Mt. xxvi. 53. He gave His life freely, perceiving that this was the Father's will: ἐξετάζει τις μονῇ. Others have only power to choose the time or method of their death, and not always that: Jesus had power absolutely to lay down His life or to retain it. Others have no power at all to resume their life after they had laid it down. He has. This freedom, as Weiss remarks, does not clash with the instrumentality of the Jews in taking His life, nor with the power of God in raising Him again.—ταύτην τὴν ἐντολὴν. This commandment "thus to dispose of His life and to resume it He has received from the Father. In this as in all else He is fulfilling the will and purpose of God.

Vv. 19-21. The result of this discourse briefly described.—Ver. 19. As usual, diverse judgments were elicited, and once more a division of opinion appeared, Σχέμα σοι πάλιν ἐγένετο ... Many thought Him possessed and mad, as in Mk. iii. 21; cf. οὗ μᾶς ὑποθέτει of Paul, Acts xxvi. 24. Others took the more sensible view. These words they had heard were not the wild exclamations and ravings they usually heard from demoniacs; and His acts, such as opening the blind man's eyes, were not within the compass of a demon.

V. 22-39. Sayings of Jesus at the Feast of Dedication.—Ver. 22. Ἐγένετο δὲ τὰ ἑγκαινία τοῖς ἱεροσόλυμοις, καὶ χείμων. This reading would connect this paragraph with the foregoing, and the interval of two months between the Feast of Tabernacles and Dedication would be placed between chs. viii. and ix. It has been suggested that Τὰ ἑγκαινία may here mean the Dedication of Solomon's Temple, which coincided with the Feast of Tabernacles. This is not likely. The reading of T.R. is strongly authenticated, being found in ΝΔ and most other uncial, vulg., Goth. syr., etc.
character of their demand: “Εως πότε τὴν ψυχήν ἡμῶν ἀφεῖς?” Beza renders ἀφεῖς by “suspendis, i.e., anxiam et suspensa tamens.” For which Elnser blames him and prefers “why do you kill us with delay?” But αἰμω occurs not infrequently in the sense of “disturb”. Soph., Oed. Tyr., 914, αἴρεται θυμὸν Οἰδίπους, Oedipus excites his soul; Eurip., Hecuba, 69, τι ποτὲ αἴρομαι ἐννοιόν σου διάφωνος; cf. Virgil, Aeneid, iv, 9, “qua me suspensa insomnia terrerit”? “Why do you keep us in suspense?” is a legitimate translation. “If Thou art the Christ tell us plainly,” —παραστολήν, in so many words, devoid of all ambiguity; cf. xvi. 29. This request has a show of reasonableness and honesty, as if they only needed to hear from Himself that He was the Christ. But it is never honest to ask for further explanation after enough has been given. Nothing more surely evinces unwillingness to believe. Besides, there was always the difficulty that, if He categorically said He was the Christ, they would understand Him to mean the Christ of their expectation.—Ver. 25. Therefore He replies: “I told you and ye believe not. The works which I do in my Father’s name, these witness concerning me.” These works tell you what I am. They are works done in my Father’s name, that is, wholly as His representative. These show what kind of Christ He sends you and that I am He.—Ver. 26. “But you on your part do not believe,” — the reason being that you are not of the number of my sheep. Had you been of my sheep you must have believed; because my sheep have these two characteristics, (ver. 27) they hear my voice and they follow me; (ver. 28) and these characteristics meet a twofold response in me, “I know them,” and “I give them life eternal”, κἀγὼ ἐκ τῶν προβατῶν τῶν ἐμῶν, καθὼς ἔπον ὁμία. Ver. 27. τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἐμὰ τῆς φωτὸς μου ἀκοίμησε, κἀγὼ γινώσκω αὐτὸν, καὶ ἀκολουθοῦσιν μου. 28. κἀγὼ ἔχων ἀλώνιον δίδωμι αὐτοῖς—καὶ οὐ μὴ ἀπόλυσαι εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, καὶ οὐχ ἀρπάσει τις αὐτὰ ἐκ τῆς χειρός μου. 29. τὸ πατήρ μου δὲ δεδωκὼς μοι, μετόχων 1 πάντων ἔστιν· καὶ οὐδεὶς δύναται ἀρπάσει ἐκ τῆς χειρός τοῦ πατρὸς μου. 30. ἐγὼ ἔμω—

1 Instead of ος and μετόχων of T.R. εἰς and μετόχων are read by Tr.Ti.W.H. following [for ος] ΝBL and [for μετόχων] AB and versions. This reading seems exegetically impossible. See Weiss. It gives a sense irrelevant to the passage. “That which my Father has given me is greater than all.” Very possibly μετόχων was originally read, cp. Mt. xii. 6, and ος may have been changed into εἰς through a misunderstanding of μετόχων.
he denies that the words carry this sense: "Abusis sunt hoc loco veterum ut probarent Christum esse Patri filiou hominum. Neque enim Christus de unitate substantiae disputat, sed de consensu quem cum Patre habet: quicquid scilicet geritur a Christo Patris virtute confirmatum iri." An ambassador whose demands were contested might quite naturally say: "et my sovereign are one"; not meaning thereby to claim royal dignity, but only to assert that what he did his sovereign did, that his signature carried his sovereign's guarantee, and that his pledges would be fulfilled by all the resources of his sovereign. So here, as God's representative, Jesus introduces the Father's power as the final guarantee, and claims that in this respect He and the Father are one. Whether this does not involve metaphysical unity is another question. Cf. Tertullian, adv. Praxeum, 28; Hippolytus, c. Noetum, 7, διό προσωπεῖς διδασκέις, δύναμις δι' μιᾶς.—Ver. 31. Εβδόματαν οὖν... αὐτοῖς. In chap. viii. 59, ἥραν λίθους, so now once more, πᾶλιν, they lifted stones to stone Him.—Ver. 32. Jesus anticipating them says: Πολλὰ... μὲ; "Many excellent works have I shown you from my Father; for what work among these do ye stone me?" Which of them deserves stoning? (Holzmann). As it could only be a work differing in character from the καλὰ ἔργα which deserved stoning, πᾶσος is used, although in later Greek its distinctive meaning was vanishing. Wetstein quotes from Dionys. Halicarn., viii. 29, an apposite passage in which Coriolanus says: οὐ με ἄτυχον πολλὰς καὶ καλὰ ἔργα, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔμειναν προστὶκαν... αὐτόμονοι ἔξεσαν ἐκ τῆς πατρίδος. —Ver. 33. The irony is as much in the situation as in the words. The answer is honest enough, blind as it is: Περὶ... Θεόν. "For a praiseworthy work we do not stone Thee, but for blasphemy, and because Thou being a man makest Thyself God." For πεπληροφορία in this sense cf. Acts xxvi. 7. The καὶ δὲ does not introduce a second charge, but more specifically defines the blasphemy. On the question whether it was blasphemy to claim to be the Christ see Deut. xviii. 20. Lev. xxiv. 10, 17, and Trefry's Eternal Sonship. It was blasphemy for a man to claim to be God. And it is noteworthy that Jesus never manifests indignation when charged with making Himself God; yet were He a mere man no one could view this sin with stronger abhorrence.—Ver. 34. On this occasion He merely shows that even a man could without blasphemy call himself "Son of God"; because their own judges had been called "gods".—Οὐκ... γεγραμμένον... οὖν ὄντων.... "Is it not written in your law, I said 'Ye are Gods'?" In Ps. Ixxv. 5-8, the judges of Israel are rebuked for abusing their office; and God is represented as saying: "I said, 'Ye are gods, and all of you are children of the Most High'." "The law" is here used of the whole O.T. as in xii. 34, xv. 23, Rom. iii. 10, 1 Cor. xiv. 19. In ver. 35. If καὶ δὲ is the nominative to ἀπέσταλεν it [that δὲ νόμος is the nominative to ἀπέσταλεν is proved by the two following clauses, although at first sight it might be more natural to suppose the nearer and more emphatic ἐν supplied the nominative] called them gods, to whom the word of God came," that is, who were thus addressed by God at their consecration to their office and by this word lifted up to a new dignity—"and that they were so called is certain because Scripture cannot be denied or put aside—then do you, shutting your eyes to your own Scriptures, declare Him whom the Father consecrated and sent into the world to be a blasphemer because He said, I am God's Son?"
The a fortiori element in the argument lies in this, that the judges were made "gods" by the coming to them of God's commission, which found them engaged otherwise and itself raised them to their new rank, whereas Jesus was set apart by the Father and sent into the world for the sole object of representing the Father. If the former might be legitimately called "gods," the latter may well claim to be God's Son. The idea of the purpose for which Christ was sent into the world is indicated in the emphatic use of ὁ πατὴρ; and this is still further accentuated in ver. 37.—Vv. 37, 38. εἶναι τις... ἔπεμψαν. "If I do not the works of my Father, do not believe me: but if I do them, even though you do not believe me, believe the works." That is, if you do not credit my statements, accept the testimony of the deeds I do. And this, not to give me the glory but "that ye may know and believe [cf. vi. 60] that the Father is in me, and I in the Father" [for αὐτῷ read τῷ πατρί].—Ver. 39. Ἰησοῦν... ἀναστασίν. His words so far convinced them that they wished to kill him; but they sought to arrest him. The πάλιν refers to vii. 30, 44. But He escaped out of their hand, and departed again beyond Jordan to the place where John at first was baptising, i.e., Bethany. Cf. i. 28, also iv. 1. Holtzmann considers that the πάλιν is intended to differentiate the earlier from the later ministry of the Baptist. It might rather seem to point to the beginning of the ministry of Jesus, especially as following πάλιν.—καὶ ἔμεινεν ἐκεῖ, "and He remained there" until xi. 7, that is, for a little more than three months.—Ver. 41. There He was still busy; for πολλοὶ ἔλαβαν πρὸς αὐτὸν, "many came to Him and said," that is, giving this as their reason for coming, that "although John himself had done no miracle, all he had said of Jesus was found to be true." The reference to John is evidently suggested by the locality, and probably means that the "many" alluded to as coming to Jesus belonged to the district and had been impressed by John. The correspondence between what they had heard from the Baptist and what they saw in Jesus, as well as the intrinsic evidence of the works He did, engendered belief in Him (ver. 42) Καὶ ἔστωσαν πολλοὶ ἐκεῖ εἰς αὐτῶν.

1 For περιστεραί BLX, cursives and versions read γυναῖκας, "that ye may attain to knowledge and permanently know". The T.R. is read in ΝΑ.
Recent editors read Μαρία instead of Μαρία, but, as Meyer remarks, the genitive presupposes the form Μαρία, and while in some versions Μαρία is well supported, in others it is poorly authenticated. Generally T.R. is supported by ΝΑΔ, Μαρία by BC.

been narrated by John (see xii. 3), but it was this which distinguished her at the time John was writing; cf. Mt. xxvi. 13.—Ver. 3. The sisters were so intimate with Jesus that they naturally turn to Him in their anxiety, and send Him a notice of the illness, which is only a slightly veiled request that He would come to their relief: "Lord, behold, he whom Thou loves is ill". "Sufficat ut noveris. Non enim amas et deseras," Augustine.—Ver. 4. Ακούσας δὲ ὄνησον εἰπεν, "And Jesus when He heard said," i.e., to His disciples. It was not the reply sent to the sisters. "This illness is not to death," πρὸς θάνατον, death is not the end towards which it is making. But that Jesus knew that death had already taken place (ver. 6 and ver. 17) or was imminent is evident from the following clause, but He knew from what He would do (vi. 6) and that death was not to be the final result of this illness. The illness and death were ἐνῷ τῆς Θέου τοῦ Θεοῦ, for the sake of glorifying God (cf. ix. 3), "gloriae divinae illustrandae causa," Winer, p. 479. This is further explained in the clause "that the Son of God may be glorified by means of it," i.e., by means of this illness; cf. xiii. 31. "In two ways; because the miracle (1) would lead many to believe that He was the Messiah; (2) would bring about His death. Δόξασθαι is a frequent expression of this Gospel for Christ's death regarded as the mode of His return to glory (vii. 39, xii. 16, xii. 31), and this glorification of the Son involves the glory of the Father (v. 23, x. 30-38)." Plummer, Bengel.—Ver. 5. Ηγιάσας δὲ ὄνησον . . . It is quite true that φανεροί denotes the more passionate love, and ἀγαπᾶν the more reasoning; but it is doubtful whether this distinction is observed in this Gospel. Passages proving the distinction are given by Wetstein.—Ver. 6. Jesus loved the family, ὅσον ἤκουσαν . . . τότε μὲν ἤμενεν. We expect another consequence: "Jesus loved them, therefore He immediately went to Bethany". But the consequence indicated in ὅσον is found in λέγω, ver. 7, and the whole sentence should read: "When, therefore, He had heard that he was ill, for the present indeed [τότε μὲν = tum quidem], He remained for two days while He was; then after this He says to His disciples, Let us go into Judaea again". The μαν after τότε suggests a δὲ after ἠκούσα and unites the two clauses. For the dropping of δὲ after ἠκούσα or its absorption see Winer, 720; and for the pleonastic συνωτὸς μετὰ τοῦτο and for ἄγιαν in the sense "let us go" see Kypke, who gives instances of both from post-Macedonian authors. Jesus remained two days inactive, not to test the faith of the sisters, which Holtzmann justly characterizes as "grausam"; but, as Godet, Holtzmann, and Weiss agree, because He awaited the prompting of the Father, cf. ii. 4, vii. 1-10.—Ver. 8. The announcement of His intention is received with astonishment: "Ῥαββί . . . ἄρα. "Rabbi, the men of Judaea were but now seeking to stone
They, and goest Thou thither again?" "They think of the danger to Him, and are not without thought of the danger to themselves (ver. 16)." Watkins. The νῦν shows that they had not been long in Peræa. To this remonstrance Jesus replies, as in ix. 4, that while His day, appointed to Him by the Father, continued, He must work, and nothing could hinder Him.—Ver. 9. οὐκ... ἡμέρας, i.e., each man's day, or term of work, is a defined quantity. [τὰ δὲ θυσίαι μᾶρτις ἡμέρας πάντα τῶν ἡρωίων ἔµαθον Ἰησοῦς, Ἑροδ., ii. 109; and see Rawlinson's Appendix to his Translation].—ἐὰν τις... βλέπῃ. So long as this day lasts, a man may go confidently forward to the duties that call him; or προσκόπτων 'he does not stumble,' he can walk erect and straight on amid dangers, cf. Mt. iv. 6, "because he sees the light of the world"; as the sun makes all causes of stumbling manifest and saves the walker from them, so the knowledge of God's will, which is man's moral light, guides him; and to follow it is his only safety.—Ver. 10. On the other hand, ἐὰν δὲ τις... ἐν αὐτῷ, if a man prolongs his day beyond God's appointment, he stumbles about in darkness, having lost his sole guide, the will of God. His prolonged life is no longer a day but mere night.—Ver. 11. Ταῦτα... ἠτόντον. "These things speak He, and after this," how long after we do not know; but ver. 15, "let us go to him," indicates that the two days here intervened. There is, however, difficulty introduced by this supposition. He now makes the definite announcement: "Our friend Lazarus is fallen asleep, but I go to awake him."—κεκοιμημένον τοῦ συμμαθητικοῦ μου ᾿Αδάμ, θεμάς; "A friend lies dead, brother, do you think of him?"—Ver. 12. But I say unto you, "Ver. 13. "Ver. 14. On the morning of the third day He said, "Ver. 15. The disciples misunderstood Him, and said: "K海口... σωθήσεται. "Lord, if he sleeps, he will recover," implying that in this case they need not take the dangerous step of returning to Judæa [cf. Achilles Tatius, iv. οὖν γὰρ πάντως νομοθέτης φάρακον]. How He knows that Lazarus sleeps they do not inquire, accustomed as they are to His exercise of gifts they do not understand. σωθήσεται, cf. Mk. v. 28, 34, vi. 56, etc. Their misunderstanding was favoured by His having said (ver. 4) that the illness was "not to death"; naturally when Jesus spoke of Lazarus sleeping they understood Him to speak (ver. 13) ποτὲ τοῦ κοιμήσεως τοῦ ἔτοιμον, "of the koi'mhseis of sleep."—Ver. 14. τότε ὄνων. "At this point, accordingly, Jesus told them plainly," παραρρησίᾳ "without figure or ambiguity," "expressly in so many words," cf. x. 24, removing all possibility of misunderstanding. "Lazarus is dead," but instead of grieving (ver. 15) καὶ χαιρείτην ὑμῖν, "I am glad for your sakes," although grudging the pain to Lazarus and his sisters, ὅτι οὐκ ἔδει ἡμῖν, "that I was not there," implying that had He been there Lazarus would not have died. This gives us a glimpse into the habitual and absolute confidence of Jesus in the
presence with Him of an almighty power, that ye may believe," go on to firmer faith. "Faith can neither be stationary nor complete. "He who is a Christian is no Christian," Luther." Westcott.—Ver. 16. "When the only Θεομόρφος τό Νεκρόν Θεός is the transliteration and Δόξα the translation of ὈΝᾶς, a twin. He is the pessimist among the disciples, and now takes the gloomy, and, as it proved, the correct view of the result of this return to Judaea, but his affectionate loyalty forbids the thought of their allowing Jesus to go alone. "To his mind there is nothing left for Jesus but to die. But now comes the remarkable thing. He is willing to take Jesus at the lowest, uncrowned, unseated, disrobed, he loves Him still." Matheson. If Thomas is still and obstinate in his incredulity, he is also stiff and obstinate in his affection and allegiance. "In him the twins, unbelief and faith, were contending with one another for mastery, as Esau and Jacob in Rebecca's womb." Trench. οὐχὶ ἐπιμένειν μετ' αὐτοῦ, i.e., with Jesus. The expression is well illustrated by Wetstein.

Vv. 17-44. The raising of Lazarus.—Ver. 17. "Ἐλάχιστον οὖν ἵνα Ἰησοῦς εὕρῃ. "When, then, Jesus came, He found," implying that He did not know before, but learned from some in Bethany, ἐπέστη πάνωπρος ἡμᾶς ἢ ἡμῖν ἤν τῷ μνημείῳ "that he had been four days already in the tomb." Raphel and Wetstein give instances of this construction, and see v. 5. According to Jewish custom burial took place on the day of death, so that, allowing somewhat more than one day for the journey from the one Bethany to the other, it seems probable that Lazarus died about the time the messenger reached Jesus. At ver. 39 the time which had elapsed since death is mentioned for a different reason. Here it seems to be introduced to account for ver. 19; as also is the statement ἵνα ἦν Βηθανίαν [cf. deleted by Tisch. and W.H.] ἐγγύς τῶν ἱεροσολύμων, ὡς ἀπὸ σταδίων δεκατένα, within easy walking distance of Jerusalem, about fifteen furlongs off. The form is a Latinism, used in later Greek instead of ὡς σταδίων δεκατένα ἐκ τῶν ἱεροσολύμων; cf. xii. 1, xxi. 8, Rev. xiv. 20. The nearness of Bethany accounts for the fact that πολλοὶ . . . αὐτῶν, "many of the Jews had come out to Martha and Mary". Of visits of condolence we have a specimen in Job. "Deep mourning was to last for seven days, of which the first three were those of 'weeping'. During these seven days it was, among other things, forbidden to wash, to anoint oneself, to put on shoes, to study, or to engage in any business. After that followed a lighter mourning of thirty days." Edersheim, Jewish Social Life, an interesting chapter on In Death and after Death. Cf. Gen. i. 3; Num. xx. 29; i Sam. xxviii. 13. Specimens of the manifestations of grief in various heathen countries and of the things said of the θανάτων θανάτων are given by Lucian in his tract Concerning Grief.—Ver. 20. ή σὺν Μάρθα . . . Μανᾶτον. Martha as the elder sister and mistress of the house (Lk. x. 38-40) goes out to meet Jesus, while Mary remained seated in the house. "After the body is carried out of the house all chairs and couches are reversed, and the mourners sit on the ground on a low stool." Edersheim, loc. cit. On
sitting as an attitude of grief see Doughty, 
_Analctic Sacra_, on Ezek. viii. 14.—Ver. 21. 
Martha's first words to Jesus, Κύριε ... ἔστησεν, "hadst Thou been here my brother had not died," are "not a reproach but a lament," Meyer. Mary uses the same words (ver. 32), suggesting that this had been the burden of their talk with one another; and even, as Bengel says, _before_ the death "utinam adesset Dominus Jesus."—Ver. 22. 
But Martha not only believed that Jesus could have prevented her brother's death but also that even now He could recall him from the grave: καὶ νῦν ἀδέλφος ... 
"Even now I know that what thing soever you ask of God, God will give you." _Cf._ ix. 31. Jesus referred all His works to the Father, and spoke as if only faith were required for the working of the greatest miracles. See Mt. xiv. 31, xvii. 20. On the use of αὐτῷ and ἐρωτάω see Ezra Abbott's _Critical Essays_, in which Trench's misleading account of their difference is exposed.—Ver. 23. 
λέγει ... συν. "Thy brother shall rise again." "The whole history of the raising of Lazarus is a parable of life through death."—Ver. 24. "Here, then, at the beginning the key-note is struck." Westcott. Whether the words were meant or not to convey only the general truth of resurrection, and that death is not the final state, Martha did not find in them any assurance of the speedy restoration of Lazarus.—Ver. 24. "I know," she says, "that he will rise again, in the resurrection at the last day." On the terms used see v. 28, vi. 39, 40, 54. 
Belief in the resurrection had been promoted through Dan. xii. 2, and, as Holtzmann remarks, Martha must have heard more than enough about it during the last four days, and fears perhaps that even Jesus is offering the merely conventional consolation. To one who yearns for immediate re-union the "last day" seems invisible. It was small consolation for Martha to know that her brother would lie for ages in the tomb, no more to exchange one word or look till the last day.—Ver. 25. Nor does this faith satisfy Jesus, who at once replaces it by another in the words, 'Εγώ εἰμι ἡ ἀνάστασις καὶ ἡ ζωή. Resurrection and life are not future only, but present in His person; she is to trust not in a vague remote event but in His living person whom she knew, loved, and trusted. Apart from Him there was neither resurrection nor life. He carried with Him and possessed there and then as He spoke with her all the force that went to produce life and resurrection. Therefore ἡ παράβολα ἐίναι ἄλλων (ver. 26), "He that believeth on me, even though he die, shall live; and every one who liveth and believeth on me shall never die". Belief in Him or acceptance of Him as the source of true spiritual life, brings the man into vital union with Him, so that he lives with the life of Christ and possesses a life over which death has no power.—Ver. 27. 
Martha believed this, as implicitly included in her belief in Jesus as the Messiah, Ναὶ, Κύριε ... ἐρχόμενος. Resurrection and life were both Messianic gifts, but it is doubtful whether Martha fully understood what our Lord had said. Rather she falls back on what she did understand and believe. She will not claim to believe more than she is sure of; but if His statement is only an elaboration of His Messianic function, then she can truly say: Ναὶ, Κύριε—
I have come to believe, I have reached the belief.—Ver. 28. καὶ τοῦτα ἐπιστύλωσεν ἀπόλυτα, "and when she had said this," and when some further conversation had taken place (cf. ἠκούσεις), "she went and called Mary her sister, secretly saying to her: The Teacher is here and asks for you". The secrecy was due not so much to the presence of Jesus' enemies as to Martha's desire that Mary should meet Jesus alone, unaccompanied even by friends. For the same purpose Jesus remained in the place where He had met Martha.—Ver. 29. On the delivery of His message Mary springs up from her attitude of broken-hearted grief and comes to meet Him.—Ver. 31. But she was not allowed to go alone: οὐ εὖ... άκούει. The Jews who were with her in the house comforting her interpreted her sudden movement as one of those urgent demands of grief which already, no doubt, they had seen yield to, and in sincere sympathy (ver. 33) followed her. —Ver. 32. Consequently when she reaches Jesus she has only time to fall at His feet and exclaim, in Martha's words, Κύριε... ἄσσιλβους. The sight of Jesus, ἠκούσα αὐτόν, produced a more vehement demonstration of grief than in Martha. Cf. Cicero, in Verrem, v. 39. "Mihi obviam venit et... mihi ad pedes misera jacuit, quasi ego excitare filium ejus ab inferis possem." Wetstein. —Ver. 33. ἤκούσα αὐτὸν... αὐτὸν. "Jesus, then, when He saw her weeping ἠκόλουθον is stronger than ἠκούσαν and might be rendered 'wailing'. It is joined with ἀκούσαν, Mk. v. 38; ἠδόκουσαν, Jas. v. 1; θερμηθήκην, Mk. v. 39; παύσατε, Mk. xvi. 10. Cf. Webster's Synonyms} and the Jews who accompanied her wailing, ἐνεργότερον τῷ πνεύματι, "was indignant in spirit". The word ἐνεργότερον occurs again in ver. 38 and in three other passages of the N.T., Mt. ix. 30, Mk. l. 43, and xiv. 5. In those passages it is used in its original sense of the expression of feeling, and might be rendered "sternly charged"; and it is in each case followed by an object in the dative. In Mt. ix. 30 Jesus sternly charged or with strong feeling charged the healed blind man not to make Him known. In Mk. i. 43 the leper is similarly charged. In Mk. xiv. 5 the bystanders express strong feeling [of indigation, ἔναντικάτους] against Mary for her apparent extravagance. In all three passages it is used of the expression of strong feeling; but no indignation entered into its meaning in the former two passages. Here in John it is not feeling expressed, but τῇ πνεύματι, inwardly felt; and with only such expression as betrayed to observers that He was moved (cf. Mk. viii. 12, ἀνοιακάτους τῷ πνεύματι), for τῇ πνεύματι cannot be the object, for this does not give a good sense and it is contradicted by τοῖς ἑορταῖς εἰς αὐτῷ of ver. 38. It would seem, then, to mean “strongly moved in spirit”. This meaning quite agrees with the accompanying clause, καὶ ἁρπαγμὸν ἰσχύος, "and disturbed Himself"; precisely as we speak of a man “distressing himself,” or “troubling
himself,” or “making himself anxious”. To say that the active with the reflexive pronoun indicates that this was a voluntary act on Christ’s part is to introduce a jarring note of Doketism. His sympathy with the weeping sister and the wailing crowd, caused this deep emotion. To refer His strong feeling to His indignation at the “hypocritical” lamentations of the crowd is a groundless and unjust fancy contradicted by His own “weeping” (ver. 34) and by the remark of the Jews (ver. 35).—Ver. 34. His intense feeling prompts Him to end the scene, and He asks, Ποίοι θυμάστε αὐτὸν; He asks because He did not know. They reply, but probably with no expectation of what was to happen, ἔρχεσθαι καὶ θέλει. As He went ἔδαφωσεν, “He shed tears”. To assert that such tears could only be theatrical because He knew that shortly Lazarus would live, is to show profound ignorance of human nature. And it also shows ignorance of the true sympathy requisite for miracle. “It is not with a heart of stone that the dead are raised.”—Ver. 36. These tears evoked a very natural exclamation: “Τι θύμος ἔδαφεν αὐτὸν, “see how He loved him.”—Ver. 37. But this again suggested to the more thoughtful and wary the question, ὅποι ... ἀπέστη. The tears of Jesus, which manifest His love for Lazarus, puzzle them. For if He opened the eyes of a blind man, He was able to prevent the death of His friend. The question with ὅποι expects an affirmative answer. Euthymius and the Greek interpreters in general think the question was ironical and scoffing. Thus Cyril, Ποίοι μὲν λέγεις; οὖν θεαμάστεγεν; But there is nothing in the words to justify this.—Ver. 38. Ἰησοῦς οὖν πάλιν ἐβρομιμένος. “Jesus, then, being again deeply moved,”—Quia non accedit Christus ad sepulcrum tanquam otiosus spectator, sed athleta qui se ad certamen instruit, non mirum est si iterum fremat.” Calvin. To refer the renewed emotion to the sayings of the Jews just reported is to take for granted that Jesus heard them, which is most unlikely. The tomb ἰησοῦ οὖν ... αὐτῷ, “was a cave,” either natural, as that which Abraham bought, Gen. xxviii. 9, or artificial, hewn out of the rock, as our Lord’s, Mt. xxvii. 60.—Ἄλως ἐπέκειτο ἐπὶ αὐτῷ, “a stone lay upon it,” i.e., on its mouth to prevent wild animals from entering. The supposed tomb of Lazarus is still shown and is described by several travellers.—Ver. 39. The detail, that Jesus said, “Ἀρατε τὸν λίθον,” is mentioned because it was an unexpected step and quickened inquiry as to what was to follow, but also because it gave rise to practical Martha’s quick objection, φθορὰ ὅμη. (“He employed natural means to remove natural obstructions, that His Divine power might come face to face with the supernatural element. He puts forth supernatural power to do just that which no less power could accomplish, but all the rest He bids men do in the ordinary way.” Laidlay, Miracles, 350.)—Phil. 36. shows that Lazarus had not been embalmed or even wrapped in spiced grave-clothes; which, some suppose, sheds light on xii. 3. The fact is mentioned, however, to show how little Martha expected what Jesus was going to do; evidently she supposed He wished to take a last look at His friend, and she [ἡ ἀναλήψεως τοῦ τετσαληκέςτου] the sister of the deceased, and therefore jealous of any exposure, interposes, knowing what He would see,—τεταρτάς γὰρ ἐστι, “for he is four days [dead].” Herodotus, ii. 89, tells us that the women of men of rank were not at death given to the embalmers at once, ἀλλ' ἐκεῖν τριτάται ἡ τεταρτάς γίνεται. Lightfoot quotes a remarkable tradition of Ben Kaphra:
40. And Jesus said to them, “Did you ever see anyone rise again from the dead? 41. The Son of Man is also going to rise. 42. For if we knew what time of day he was coming, we would wake up and be ready. 43. But we know that the Son of Man will rise from the dead. 44. He told them, ‘The hour is coming when I will be glorified. 45. The Father will give Me glory, because I am going to do what my Father has commanded Me. 46. But I do not seek glory. My Father gives glory to Me. 47. I will be glorified because of the Father, who sent Me. 48. He who believes in Me will have life forever. He who does not believe will be condemned. 49. From now on, I am no longer speaking to you in figures of speech. 50. I tell you the truth. He who has seen Me has seen the Father. 51. He who sees Me sees the Father. He who does not see Me does not see the Father. 52. The Father has put His seal on Me. 53. And I tell you the truth: All who believe in Me will never be condemned. 54. They will see the Son of Man coming in the glory of his Father, with the angels.”

The clause ... is obviously a gloss and is not found in ΝBC*DL 33.

"Grief reaches its height on the third day. For three days the spirit hovers about the tomb, if perchance it may return to the body. But when it sees the fashion of the countenance changed, it retires and abandons the body."—Ver. 40. But Martha's incredulity is mildly rebuked, Οὐκ ἐπίνω σοι ... Θεοῦ. "Did I not say to you, that if you believed, you would see the glory of God?" recalling rather what He had said (ver. 4) to the disciples than what He had said to Martha (vv. 23-26); but the conversation is, as already noted, abridged.—Ver. 41. Accordingly, notwithstanding her remonstrance, and because it was now perceived that Jesus had some end in view that was hidden from them, they lifted the stone, ἤραν τὸν λίθον.—"Ο δὲ Ἰησοῦς ... ἀνεστάλαγ. "But Jesus lifted up His eyes and said, Father, I thank Thee that Thou hast heard me; No pomp of incantation, no wrestling in prayer even; but simple words of thanksgiving, as if already Lazarus was restored. [Origen thinks that the spirit of Lazarus had already returned.] Ἄρτῳ εὐχὴν παραστήσωμεν, ἵσταται σήμερον τὴν Ἀδηραν ψυχὴν εἰσελθοῦσαν εἰς τὸ σῶμα.] The prayer which He thanks the Father for hearing had been during the two days in Peraea. And the thanksgiving was more likely to impress the crowd now than in the excitement following the resurrection of Lazarus. Therefore He thanks the Father because it was essential that the miracle should be referred to its real source, and that all should recognise that it was the Father who had sent this power among men.—Ver. 43. Having thus turned the faith of the bystanders to the Father, ψυχὴ magnificē ἑκατέρου, "He cried with a great voice," "that all might hear its authoritativeness" (Euthymius). "Talis vox opposita est omni magico murmuri, quale incantatores in suis praestigia adhibere solent." Lampe. More probably, as Lampe also suggests, it was the natural utterance of His confidence, and of the authority He felt. κρανγαζέω is an old word, see Plato, Rep., 607 B, but is principally used in late Greek (Rutherford's New Phys., 425).—Ἀλαζάρης δεύρο ἤρε. "Lazarus, come forth," or as Weiss renders, "hier hera," "huc foras;" "hither, out;" but on the whole the E.V. is best. Sometimes an imperative is added to δέυρο, as χωρέ τού δέυρο (Paley's Com. Frag., p. 16).—"And out came the dead man," δευτέρων ... περιεβίβαστο, "bound feet and hands with grave-bands," κεφαλάς, apparently the linen bandages with which the corpse was swathed. Opinions are fully given in Lampe. "And his face was bound about with a napkin." Cf. xx. 7. "The trait marks an eye-witness," Westcott.—λέγει ... ὑπάγων. "Jesus says to them, 'Loose him and let him go away.'" He did not require support, and he could not refish the gaze of the throng in his present condition.—Ver. 45. The consequences of the miracle.—Ver. 45. Πολλοὶ οὖν ... αὐτῶν. "Many therefore of the Jews, viz., those who had come to Mary and seen what Jesus did, believed on Him." That is to say, all the Jews who thus
came and saw believed.—Ver. 46. But of this number [it may be “of the Jews” generally, and not of those who had been at Bethany] some went away to the Pharisees and told them, His recognised enemies, what He had done. Whether they did so in good faith or not does not appear.—Ver. 47. The Pharisees at once acted on the information, συνεδρίαν... συνεδρίου. The chief priests, who were Sadducees, and the Pharisees, their natural foes, but who together composed the supreme authority, “called together a meeting of the Sanhedrim”. The keynote of the meeting was struck in the words τί ποιοῦμεν; “What are we doing?” i.e., why are we doing nothing? The indicative, not the deliberative subjunctive. The reason for shaking off this inertia is σὺ... ποιεῖ. The miracles are not denied, but their probable consequence is indicated.—Ver. 48. ἥν ἀφεῖν... θρόνον. “If we let Him thus alone,” i.e., if we do no more to put an end to His miracles than we are doing, “all will believe on Him; and the Romans will come and take away both our place and our nation”. ηπόλιων emphatic. The idea of the reign of Caiaphas and the consequent accession of adherents to Jesus made it probable that the people as a whole would attach themselves to Him as Messiah; and the consequence of the Jews choosing a king of their own would certainly be that the Romans would come and exterminate them.—τῶν τῶνων one would naturally render “our land” as co-ordinate with τῶν θησαυρῶν [“Land und Leute,” Luther], and probably this is the meaning; although in 2 Макк. v. 19 in a very similar connection ὁ τῶνων means the Temple: οὐ διὰ τῶν τῶνων τῶν θησαυρῶν, ἀλλὰ διὰ τῶν ἵππων τῶν τῶνων ὁ Κέρας ἠξέχρητε. Others, with less warrant, think the holy city is meant.—Ver. 49. Εἰς τὰς εἰς αὐτῶν Καΐαφᾶς. “But a certain one of them, Caiaphas.”

Winer (p. 146) says that εἰς does not destroy the arithmetical force of εἰς. This may be so: but the use of εἰς in similar forms is a peculiarity of later Greek. Caiaphas (Mt. xxvi. 3) is a surname = Kephas, added to the original name of this High Priest, Joseph. He held office from A.D. 18 to 36, when he was deposed by Vitellius.—ἀρχιερεὺς ἡν τοῦ ἐμποτοῦ ἐκείνου, εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, “Ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἰδατε οἰδέν;”

1 λογιζομαι in WABDL 1, 22. T.R. poorly authenticated.

2 ηπόλιων in BDLM. ηπόλιων in AEGHP.
this man with His eclat and popular following, instead of endangering us and bringing suspicion on our loyalty, is exactly the person we may use to exhibit our fidelity to the empire? Sacrifice Jesus, and you will not only rid yourselves of a troublesome person, but will show a watchful zeal for the supremacy of Rome, which will gratify you with the imperial authorities."—Ver. 51.

Tojto de $i$ lantou oYK eiven... profeftewen. $i$s lauTo, "at his own instigation," is contrasted with "at the instigation of God" implied in profeftewen [Kypke gives interesting examples of the use of $i$s lauTo in classical writers]. "None but a Jew would be likely to know of the old Jewish belief that the high priest by means of the Urim and Thummim was the mouth-piece of the Divine oracle." Plummer. Caiphas, he prophesied "that Jesus was to die for the nation, and not for the nation only, but that also the children of God who were scattered in various places should be gathered into one." $i$s is rendered "because" by Weiss and others. Jesus was to die filp to ybros, although not in Caiphas' sense; and His death had the wider object of bringing into one whole, of truer solidarity than the nation, all God's children wherever at present scattered. C.f. x. 16, Eph. ii. 14. The expression to tèvev oTov tov theos is used proleptically of the Gentiles who were destined to become God's children. So Euthymius. For the phrase $i$s $i$s $i$s $i$s $i$s, cf. Meyer refers to Plato, Philbo, 378, C, and Eurip., Orestes, 1640.—Ver. 53. This utterance of Caiphas brought sudden light to the members of the Sanhedrim, and so influenced their perplexed mind that $i$s $i$s $i$s $i$s $i$s $i$s $i$s $i$s $i$s $i$s $i$s $i$s $i$s. This was the crisis: what hitherto they had desired (v. 16, 18, vii. 32, x. 39) they now determined in council. —Ver. 55. He prophesied "that Jesus was to die for the nation, and not for the nation only, but that also the children of God who were scattered in various places should be gathered into one".
the Passover of the Jews was at hand, and many went up to Jerusalem out of the country before the Passover to purify themselves." Cf. xviii. 28. Num. ix. 10, 2 Chron. xxx. 17. Some purifications required a week, others consisted only of shaving the head and washing the clothes. See Lightfoot in loc.—Ver. 56. ἔτη... ἐτοῖς; Jesus was one main topic of conversation among those who stood about in groups in the Temple when their purifications had been got through; and the chief point discussed was whether He would appear at this feast. Cf. vii. 10-13.—Ver. 57. There was room for difference of opinion, for Ἀδδακεινων... αὐτῷ, "the Sanhedrim had issued instructions that if any knew where He was He should intimate this, that they might arrest Him".

CHAPTER XII.—VV. 1-11. "Jesus embalmed in the love of His intimates."—Ver. 1. Ὁ οὖν Ἰησοῦς... Ὑβαβίαζαν, οὗν takes us back to v. 55; the Passover being at hand, Jesus therefore came to Bethany.—πρὸ... ἡμέραν τοῦ πάσχα, not, as Vulgate, "ante sex dies Paschae," but with Beza "sex ante Pascha diebus". So Amos i. 1, πρὸ δοῦ ἐτῶν τοῦ σεβοῦ, Josephus, Antiq., xv. 14, πρὸ ματί ἡμέρας τῆς δορτής. Other examples in Kypke; cf. x. 18, xxi. 8, and see Vierck's Sermo Gracæus, p. 81. Six days before the Passover probably means the Sabbath before His death. According to John Jesus died on Friday, and six days before that would be a Sabbath. But it is difficult to ascertain with exactness what day is intended. Bethany is now described as the place ὅπου ἦν Λαξάρος ἤτηθικός. This description is given to explain what follows.—Ver. 2. ἤπιοισάν... αὐτῷ, "παρακαλεῖται is the indefinite plural: "they made Him" a supper; ἔτην, originally any meal, came to be used invariably of the evening meal.—καὶ ἡ Μάρθα διηκότη, "and Martha waited at table," which was her peculiar province (Lk. x. 40).—ὅς ὢν Λαξάρος... αὐτῷ. This is mentioned, not to show that Lazarus was still alive and well, but because the feast was not in his house but in that of Simon the leper (Mk. xiv. 3, Mt. xxvi. 6). That was the same feast as that mentioned by the Synoptists is apparent; the only discrepancy of any consequence being that the Synoptists seem to place the feast only two days before the Passover. But they introduce the feast parenthetically to present the immediate motive of Judas' action, and accordingly disregard strict chronology.—Ver. 3. Ἡ οὖν Μαρία... The third member of the Bethanyedion appears also in character, λαβοῦσα ἅρπαν μύρων νάρδου πυτικῆς πολυτίμου, ἄλτρα (Lat. libra), the unit of weight in the Roman empire, slightly over eleven ounces avoidupos. ἔμφων (from ἔμφως) to trickle, or from ἦμφαι, myth, the juice of the Arabian myrtle) is any unguent, more costly and luxurious than the ordinary θαλαττ. Cf. Lk. vii. 46, and Trench, Synonyms. νάρδου, "the head or spike of a fragrant East Indian plant belonging to the genus Valeriana, which yields a juice of delicious odour which the ancients used in the preparation of a most precious ointment". Thayer.

πυτικῆς is sometimes derived from
With e here only.
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etwv Kal iktowv eik tis symehs toou murov. 4. legei oon eis ek twn mabhvow autwv, "toos symavou 13. symhenvwv qeiskasth, o melao auton

MM vi. 5. para2eSovna. 5. "Dias tauto to to movov oon etvath toimwv

xi. 93. xiii. 90. thevparoiv, kai efthi pivkhoi;" 6. Eite 6 tauto, oon oti "peri twn pivkwn eimel autwv, alla oti alephs 8, kai to yelwskovov

pieste, and rendered "genuine," γνησιος, doikemos. Thus Euthymius, Δερανω και kastepswmamatiwv eis kadoxwv, un-adulterated and guaranteed pure. But piovo is the common form; cf. θημαλλων πιστων τικνων, Theopomp. in Com. Frag. Some suppose it indicates the name of the place where the nard was obtained. Thus Augustine: "Quod sit 'pistici,' locum aequum credere debemus, unde hoc erat un-guementum pretiosum". Similarly some modern scholars derive it from Opis (sc. Opistike), a Babylonian town. In the Classical Review (July, 1890) Mr. Bennett suggests that it should be written πιστοσ, and that it refers to the Piscata Terebinthus, which grows in Cyprus, Chios, and Palestine, and yields a turpentine in such inconsiderable quantities as to be very costly. The word is most fully discussed by Fritzsche on Mk. xiv. 3, who argues at great length and with much learning for the meaning "drinkable". He quotes Athenaeus in proof that some ointments were drunk, mixed with wine. Πιστως is the word commonly used for "potable," as in Aesch., Prom. Vinct., 480, where Prometheus says man had no defence against disease ου τηρεσωμον, ων χριστων, ουτο πιστω. And Fritzsche holds that while πιστως means "qui bibi potest," πιστικος means "qui facile bibi potest". The weight and nature of the ointment are specified to give the nard an air of nobleness; see ver. 5. —δηλvqv tov πιθανω του ισμω, Mt. and Mk. say "the head," which was the more natural but less significant, and in the circumstances less convenient, mode of disposing of the ointment,— καν θηρεσω . . . αυτω, "and wiped His feet with her hair". Holtzmann thinks this an infelicitous combination of Mk. xiv. 3 and Lk. vii. 38; infelicitous because the anointing of the feet which was appropriate in the humbled penitent was not so in Mary's case; and the drying with her hair which was suitable where tears had fallen was unsuitable where anointing had taken place, for the unguent should have been allowed to remain. This, however, is infelicitous criticism. In Aristoph., Wasps, 607, the daughter anoints her father's feet: ὁ θηρεσω ... το τι ου τηρεσω; and if, as Fritzsche supposes, the ointment was liquid, there is nothing inappropriate but the reverse in the wiping with the hair. — η δι αικα τηρεσω εις την δομη του μυρος, at once attracting attention and betraying the costliness of the offering. —Ver. 4. Hence the ον in ver. 4. "legei oon eis ... pivkhoi;" "one" of His disciples. Matthew (xxvi. 8) leaves all the disciples under the reproach, which John transfers to Judas alone. On the designation of Judas see vi. 71. Western writing, however, has this habit of using one word to express or shade another. Fritzsche himself, in his comment on τηρεσω, says "Judas expressed what others felt". But this is contradicted by the motive which John ascribes to Judas, ver. 6.—Dias . . . thevparoiv. Three hundred denarii would equal a day labourer's wage for one year. —Ver. 6. Eite 6 tauto . . . θηρεσω. "This he said, not because he cared for the poor, but because he was a thief." Before John could make this accusation, he must have had proof; how or when we do not know. But the next clauses, being in the imperfect, imply that his pilfering was habitual.—την πιστηκοσμοιν, "the bag," better "the purse," or "box," "loculos habens," Vulgate. In the form πιστηκοσμοιν (which Phrynichus declares to be the proper form, see Rutherford, p. 151) the word occurs in the Bacahe of Lysiippus to denote a case for holding the various instrumental utensils (γυασατα, κομματα). Hence it came to be used of any box, chest, or coffeer. In Sept. it occurs in 2 Sam. vi. 11 (Codd. A, 247, and Aquila) of the Ark of the Lord; in 2 Chron. xxvii, 8 of the chest for collections in the Temple. This chest had a hole in the lid, and the people cast in (νbblalov, cf. τη βαλλομενa here) their contributions. (Further see Hatch, Essays in Biblical Greek, p. 42, and Field's Otium Norvici, 68.)—τη βαλλομενa θηρεσω. The R.V. renders "took away what was put therein." Certainly, to say that Judas had the money box and carried what was put therein is flat and tautological. And that θηρεσω can bear the sense of "take.
away" or "make away with" is beyond dispute. The passages cited by Kypke and Field (Soph., Philol., 1105; Josephus, Antiq., ix. 2; Diog., Lael., iv. 59) prove that it was used of "taking away by stealth" or "purloining"; and cf. the use of ἑρευν in Eur., Hec., 792. Liddell and Scott aptly compare the Scotia use of "life" in "cattle-lifting" and so forth. Mary found a prompt champion in Jesus: ἀφεῖς αὐτήν, "let her alone", R.V. renders: "Suffer her to keep it against the day of my burying"; and in margin: "Let her alone: it was that she might keep it". This Westcott understands as meaning "suffer her to keep it—this was her purpose, and let it not be disturbed—for my preparation for burial". But, however we understand it, there is a palpable absurdity in our Lord's requesting that which had already been poured out to be kept for His burial. On the other hand, if the reading of A adopted in T.R. τετῆρηκεν was the original reading, it might naturally be altered owing to the scribe's inability to perceive how this day of anointing could be called the day of His ἁρματαιομενος, and how the ointment could be said to have been kept till that day (cf. Field, Oeum Norv., p. 69). τετῆρηκεν is opposed to ἑρευν (ver. 3); she had not sold, but kept it; and she kept it, perhaps unconsciously, against the day of His entombment or preparation for burial. ἁρματαιομενος is rather the preparation for burial than the actual interment. Vide especially Kypke on Mk. xiv. 8. This anointing was His true embalming. Mary's love was representative of the love of His intimate friends in whose loyal affection He was embalmed so that His memory could never die. The significance of the incident lies precisely in this, that Mary's action is the evidence that Jesus may now die, having already found an enduring place for Himself in the regard of His friends. It is possible that Mary herself, enlightened by her love, had a presentiment that this was the last tribute she could ever pay her Lord.—Ver. 8. As for Judas' suggestion, He disposes of it, τοῦτο πτωχοῦτο... ξέτει. "For the poor ye have always with you," and every day, therefore, have opportunities of considering and relieving them, "but me ye have not always," and therefore this apparent extravagance, being occasional only, finds justification. Occasional lavish expenditure on friends is justified by continuous expenditure on the real necessities of the poor.—Ver. 9. ἔγνω οὖν δόχλος πολὺς ἐκ τῶν ἱουδαίων. "A great crowd of the Jews"; δόχλος is generally used by John in contrast to the Jewish authorities, and R.V. renders "the common people". When they knew that Jesus was in Bethany they went out from Jerusalem to see Him and Lazarus: an easily accessible and undoubted sensation. The result was that many of the Jews, on identifying Lazarus, believed on Jesus. Accordingly ἱστηκέντως... ἀπτέθησαν. The high priests, being Sadducees, could not bear to have in their neighbourhood a living witness to the possibility of living through death, and a powerful testimony to the power of Jesus. And so, to prevent the people believing on Jesus, they made the monstrous proposal to put Lazarus,
an entirely innocent person, to death. In Mary John has shown faith and devotion at their ripest: in this devilish proposal the obduracy of unbelief is exhibited in its extreme form.

Vv. 12-15. *The triumphal entry into Jerusalem.*—Ver. 12. *The entrance,* i.e., probably on Sunday, called Palm Sunday in the Church year [κυριακή τῶν βασιλέων, dominica palmarum, or, in ramis palmarum]. Four days before the Passover the Jews were required to select a lamb for the feast.—δέχοντο πολὺς ὁ λόγος εἰς τὴν ὄρθριν, and therefore not Jerusalemites, ἀκούοντες ... λαβον τὰ βασιλεία τῶν φωνῶν "took the fountains of the palms," the palms which every one knew as growing on the road from Jerusalem to Bethany. The βαλαν (from Κοπτίκ βας) were recognised as symbols of victory or rejoicing. *Cf.* 1 Macc. xiii. 51, μετὰ αὐλοῦτας καὶ βαλαν. So Pausanias (viii. 48), άσιδὴ τῆν δεξίαν οὔτε καὶ ταύτα τὰ χρυσάνθια ὀλίβανον φωνεῖ. *Cf.* Hor., Odes, I. i. 5, "palma nobilis." This demonstration was evidently the result of recent events, especially, as stated in 18, of the raising of Lazarus.—Ver. 13. εἰς ἑκάστην αὐτήν. "Substantives derived from verbs which govern a dative are sometimes followed by this case, instead of the ordinary genitive." Winer, 264. They left no doubt as to the meaning of the demonstration, ἔκαψεν ὡς αὐτοὶ ... Ἰσραήλ. These words are taken from Ps. cxviii. 25, 26; written as the Dedication Psalm of the second Temple. ὡς αὐτοὶ is the Hebrew נַפְלֵיהָם, "save now". The words were originally addressed to approaching worshippers; here they designate the Messiah; but that no mistake might be possible as to the present reference, the people add, ὁ βασιλεύς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ.—Ver. 14. Jesus being thus hailed as king by the people, εὐφόρων ... δοῦν, i.e., He accepted the homage and declared Himself self-king by adopting the prediction of Zech. ix. 9 (ver. 15). "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion (χαίρε σφόδρα instead of μη φοβοῦ), proclaim it aloud, O daughter of Jerusalem; behold the king is coming to thee, just and saving, He is meek and riding on a beast of burden and a young foal!" The significance of the "as" is shown in what follows: "He shall destroy the chariots out of Ephraim and the horse out of Jerusalem, and the war-bow shall be utterly destroyed: and there shall be abundance and peace." By riding into Jerusalem as king but on an ass, not on a war horse, He continued to claim to be Messiah but ruling by spiritual force for spiritual ends.—Ver. 16. The significance of His action was not at that time perceived by the disciples: τότε ... πρῶτον, but when Jesus had been glorified, then they perceived that this had been written concerning Him and that the people had made this demonstration in His favour, καὶ τούτα ἐθνικῶν αὐτῆς.—Ver. 17. In verses 17 and 18 this demonstration is carelessly traced to the raising of Lazarus: "the crowd which was with Him when He summoned Lazarus from the tomb, and raised him from the dead, testified [that He had done so], and on this account the crowd went out to meet Him, because they had heard this testimony." The demonstration is thus rendered intelligible. In the Synoptists it is not accounted for. He is represented as
18. Did He enter the city with the pilgrims, and no reason is assigned for the sudden outburst of feeling. See Mk. xi. 1, etc. — Ver. 19. The effect on the Pharisees is, as usual, recorded by John; they said one to another, "Thou seest these things, and yet seest not. "Do you see how helpless you are? The world is gone after Him." For οὐδὲν see 4 Macc. xvii. 14 and French "tout le monde". For ἐπίσων αὐτοῦ see 2 Sam. xv. 13.

20. "And the people stoned Philip. ""The hour is come that the Son of Man should be glorified." Directly the glorification of the Son of Man or Messiah consisted in His being acknowledged by men; and this earnest inquiry of the Greeks was the evidence that His claims were being considered beyond the circle of the Jewish people.—Ver. 24. But second to the thought of His enronment as Messiah comes the thought of the way to it: ἄλλα ... φέρει, "except the grain of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abides itself alone; but if it die, it bears much fruit." The seed that is planted dies, but its full and proper development by being sown in the ground and dying. It is this process, apparently destructive, and which calls for faith in the sower, which disengages the forces of the seed and allows it to multiply itself. To preserve the seed from this burial in the ground is to prevent it from attaining its best development and use. The law of the seed is the law of human life.—Ver. 25. ὃ φέρει ... αὐτῷ, he that so prizeth his life [φιλῆσθαι] is used in the classics of excessive love of life. See Kypke] that he cannot let it out of his own hand or give it up to good ends checks its growth, and it withers and dies; whereas he who treats his life as if he hated it, giving it up freely to the needs of other men, shall
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τοι κόσμῳ τούτῳ, εἰς ἣν ἀλῶνον φιλάθης αὐτήν. 26. ἐὰν ἔμοι
ἐκ τῆς διακοφῆς, ἐμοὶ ἀκολουθεῖτω· καὶ σὺ ἐμέ ἐγώ, ἐκεῖ καὶ ὁ
διάκονος ὁ ἐμός ἔσται· καὶ εἰς τὸν εἶμοι διακοφὴ, τιμήσει αὐτὸν ὁ
πατὴρ.

122. Gen. xii. 27. "Νῦν ἡ ψυχή μου τεταρτακτική καὶ τί έίπε; πατέρα, σώσον
οὐκ ἔμοι ἐκ τῆς δρας ταύτης. ἀλλὰ διὰ τούτο ἤλθον εἰς τὴν δρας ταύτης.

28. πατέρα, δοῦσαι σοι τὸ δῶμα."  "Ἡλέκοιν φωνή ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ,
"Καὶ ἐδόξασα, καὶ τάλιν δοξάσω." 29. ὁ δὲ λόγος ὁ ἐστῶς καὶ
ἀκούσας ἔλεγεν βορυνθή γεγονόν. ἀλλοί ἔλεγον, "Ἀγγέλος αὐτῆς
λαλήσειν." 30. 'Απεκρίθη δὲ Ἡσυχὸς καὶ εἶπεν, "Οδί δέ ἐμε αὐτῆς
ἡ φωνή γέγονεν, ἀλλὰ δέ δίδασκες.

31. νῦν κρίνει ἐκτι τοῦ κόσμου

keep it to life eternal. φιλάθης, "shall guard," suggested by the apparent lack of
guarding and preserving in the μισοῖς. He has not guarded it from the claims
made upon it in this world, but thus has
guarded it to life eternal.—Ver. 26. This
law is applicable not to Jesus only, but
to all: ἐν ἑμοί . . . ἀκολουθεῖτω. The
badge of His servants is that they adopt
His method and aim and truly follow
Him. The result of following necessarily
is that ξυνω . . . δεται, "where I am,
as my eternal state, there shall also my
servant be", διάκονος is especially a
servant in attendance, at table or else-
where; a δοῦλος may serve at a distance:
hence the appropriateness of διάκονος
in this verse. The office of διάκονος
may seem a humble and painful one, but
ἐν τις [omit καὶ] . . . πατήρ, to be
valued or honoured by the Father
crowns life.—Ver. 27. The distinct and near
prospect of the cross as the path to
glory which these Greeks called up in
His thoughts prompts Him to exclaim:
Νῦν ἡ ψυχή μου τεταρτακτική, "Now is
my soul troubled". ψυχή is, as Weiss
remarks, synonymous with πνεῦμα, see
xii. 21. A conflict of emotions disturbs
His serenity. "Concurrebat horribilis mor-
tis et ardor obedientiae." Bengel, καὶ
τε έίπε; "And what shall I say?" This
clause certainly suggests that the next
should also be interrogative, "Shall I
say, Father, save me from this hour? But
for this cause (or, with this object)
came I to this hour." That is, if He
should now pray to be delivered from
death this would be to stultify all He had
up to this time been doing; for without
His death His life would be fruitless.
He would still be a seed preserved and
not sown.—Ver. 28. Therefore He prays:
Πάτερ δοῦσαι σοι τὸ δῶμα. "Father,
glorify Thy name." Complete that
manifestation of Thy holiness and love
which through me Thou art making; com-
plete it even at the cost of my
agoniz.—"Ἡλέκοιν φωνή . . . δοξάσω.
"There came, therefore, a voice out of
heaven: I have both glorified it and will
again glorify it." However Jesus might
see in the coming days to be tossed on
the sea of human passions, the Father
was steadily guiding all to the highest
end. The assurance that His death
would glorify God was, of course, that
which served Jesus for its endurance.
He was not throwing His life away.—
Ver. 29. οὐ δὲ δοῦλος . . . λαλάτησεν.
The mass of the people which was stand-
ing by and heard the voice did not
recognise it as a voice, but said it
thundered. Others caught, if not the
words, yet enough to perceive it was
articulate speech, and said that an angel
had spoken to Him.—Ver. 30. 'Απεκρίθη
dὲ Ἡσυχὸς. In hearing these con-
ceptions, explained to them that not on
His account but on theirs this voice had
been uttered. It was of immense
importance that the disciples, and the
people generally, should understand that
the sudden transition from the throne
offered by the triumphal acclamation of
the previous day to the cross, was not a
defeat but a fulfilment of the Divine
purpose. The voice furnished them
against the coming trial.—Ver. 31. It
was a trial not so much of Him as of
the world: νῦν λαμβάνει σοῦ τὸν κόσμον
τούτου. In the events of the next few
days the world was to be judged by its
treatment of Jesus. Cf. iii. 18, v. 27.
Calvin, adopting the fuller meaning
given to the Hebrew word "judge," thinks
that the restoration of the world to its
legitimate rule and order is signified.
A fuller explanation follows in the
clauses, νῦν δὲ ἐρχοντας . . . ἡμετέρον.
Two rulers are represented here as contending for supremacy, the ruler who is spoken of as in possession and Jesus. The latter, in possession, Satan, shall be ejected from his dominion by the cross, but Jesus by the cross shall acquire an irresistibly attractive power. Si quis roget, quomodo dejectus in morte Christi fuerit Satan, qui assidue bellare non desinit, respondet ejectionem hanc non restringit ad exiguum aliquod tempus, sed describit insinuendum illum mortem Christi effectum qui quotidie apparat. Calvin. The Τοῦτος is a general expression looking to the ultimate issue of the contention between the rival rulers.
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32. τότε ἐὰν ὁ υἱός τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκβληθῆσθαι εἴη: 32. e. xiv. 30; xvi. 11.
33. Τοῦτο δὲ ἐλεγεν, "σημαίνειν τοὺς θανάτους ἥμαλληκέντας." 34. xlii. 14, vili. 11.
34. ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ ὁ διάκονος, "Ἡμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν ἐκ τοῦ νόμου, ὅτι ἐξακολούθησιν.
35. Χριστὸς "μὴ μὴν εἴη τὸν αἶλανον καὶ τῶν ὑπὸ λέγεις, ὧν δὲ οὐφωβηθήναι εἰς τοῦτο ἐν ἀνάθεμα;
36. ἐστε ὁ θεός αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Επεί μικρὸν χρόνον τὸ φῶς μεθ' ὦν 1 ἔστιν προστάτησεν ὁ θεός ἐκεῖνον, ἵνα μὴ σκοτία ἴμας εἴη καταλάβῃ καὶ ὁ πρωτότοκος ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ οὐκ ὑπεραγεῖν. b: 1 Thess. 36. ἐστε ὁ θεός ἐκεῖνος, πρώτευετε ἐπὶ τὸ φῶς, ἵνα ὑπό τοῦ πρωτοτάκτου γεγονέτοι. f: 1 Thess. 36. ἐστε ὁ θεός αὐτοῖς, ἀπελθὼν ἑκρύθη ἀπ' αὐτῶν.

1 For 33 read 33, translating "walk as ye have the light". So in ver. 36. 33 is supported by 33 and several versions, and gives the better sense. Two rulers are represented here as contending for supremacy, the ruler who is spoken of as in possession and Jesus. The latter, in possession, Satan, shall be ejected from his dominion by the cross, but Jesus by the cross shall acquire an irresistibly attractive power. Si quis roget, quomodo dejectus in morte Christi fuerit Satan, qui assidue bellare non desinit, respondet ejectionem hanc non restringit ad exiguum aliquod tempus, sed describit insinuendum illum mortem Christi effectum qui quotidie apparat. Calvin. The Τοῦτος is a general expression looking to the ultimate issue of the contention between the rival rulers. Τοῦτον Hellenistic for Attic Τοῦτον.—Ver. 32. ἐρωσθείς ἐκ τῆς γῆς is explained as indicating or hinting, σημαίνειν, "by what death He was to die," i.e., that He was to be raised on the cross. "Σημαίνειν notat alicquid futurum vaticinando cum ambiguitate quadam atque obscuritate innuere." Kypke. So Plutarch says of the Oracle, "οὕτω λέγει οὕτω κρύπτει ἄλλα σημαίνειν."—Ver. 34. The crowd apparently understood the allusion to His death, for they objected: Ἡμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν . . . ἀνάθεμα; "we have heard out of the law," i.e., out of Scripture (cf. x. 34, xv. 25, and Schechter, Studies in Judaism, p. 15; "under the word Torah were comprised not only the Law, but also the contributions of later times expressing either the thoughts or the emotions of holy and sincere men"), "that the Christ abides for ever"; this impression was derived from Ps. cx. 4, Is. ix. 7, Ezek. xxxvii. 25, Dan. vii. 14. A different belief was also current. Their belief regarding the Messiah seemed to contradict His allusion to death that it occurred to them that after all "the Son of Man" might not be identical with "the Messiah" as they had been supposing. So they ask, τίς ἀκούειν ὡς ὁ ἄνθρωπος; This among other passages shows that the "Son of Man" was a title suggestive of Messiahship, but not quite definitive in its meaning and not quite identical with "Messiah".—Ver. 35. ἐστε ὁ θεός αὐτοῖς. In replying Jesus vouchsafes no direct solution of their difficulty. It is as if He said: Do not entangle yourselves in sophistries. Do not seek such logical proofs of Messiahship. Allow the light of truth and righteousness to enter your conscience and your life. "Yet a little while is the light with you." "Walk while ye have the light, lest darkness overtake you" (cf. 1 Thess. v. 4), that is, lest Jesus, the light of the world, be withdrawn.—καὶ οἱ πρώτοις . . . ὑπάγει, cf. xi. 10.—Ver. 36. In ver. 36 it becomes evident that under τὸ φῶς He refers to Himself. He urges them to yield to that light in Him which penetrates the conscience. Then they will become vitae φωτείς, see 1 The. v. 5, "children of light," not "of the Light." The expression is the ordinary form used by the Hebrews to indicate
close connection; see Mt. viii. 12, ix. 15, Mk. iii. 17, Lk. xvi. 8, etc. To be 

vulgar φωτιές is to be such as find their 

truest life in the truth, recognising and 

delighting in all that Christ reveals.

"These words Jesus spoke and departed 

and was hidden from them." His warn- 

ing that the Light would not always be 

available for them was at once followed 

by its removal. Where He was hidden 

is not said.

Vv. 37-43. In the verses which follow, 

37-43, John accounts for the unbelief of the 

Jews. This fact that the very people 

who had been appointed to accept the 

Messiah had rejected Jesus needed ex- 

planation. This explanation is suitably 
given at the close of that part of the 

Gospel which has described His mani- 

festation.—Ver. 37. Τοσοῦτα ... αὐτῶν. 

The difficulty to be solved is first stated.

"Although He had done so many signs 

before them, yet they did not believe on 

Him." A larger number of miracles is 

implied than is narrated, vii. 31, xi. 47, 

xxi. 25. The quality of the miracles is 

also alluded to once and again, iii. 2, ix. 32. 

They had not been done "in a corner," 

but ἐπηρεάσθη αὐτῶν, cf. ἐνώπιός 

των. Yet belief had not resulted. The cause 

of this unbelief was that the prediction of 

Isa. liii. 1 had to be fulfilled. Certainly 

this mode of statement conveys the im- 

pression that it was not the future event 

which caused the prediction but the pre- 

diction which caused the event. The 

form of expression might in some cases 

be retained although the natural order 

was perceived. The purpose of God 

was always in the foreground of the 

Jewish mind. The prophecy of Isaiah 

was relevant; the "arm of the Lord" 

signifying the power manifested in the 

miracles, and τῷ ἅγιῳ referring to the 

teaching of Jesus. In the time of Jesus 

as in that of Isaiah the significance of 

Divine teaching and Divine action was 

hidden from the multitude.—Ver. 39. 

Διὰ τούτῳ seems to have a double 

reference, first to what precedes, second 

to the διὰ following, cf. viii. 47.—οὐκ 

ἐξηκόνωσαν, "they were not able," irre- 

spective of will; their inability arose 

from the fulfilment in them of Isaiah's 

words, vi. 10 (ver. 40), Τετύφλωκεν ... 

αὐτοῖς. Τετύφλωκεν refers to the 

blinding of the organ for perceiving 

spiritual truth, ἐντύφλωμα (from πύρως, a 

callus) to the hardening of the sensibility 
to religious and moral impressions. 

This process prevented them from seeing 

the significance of the miracles and under- 

standing with the heart the teaching of 

Jesus. By abuse of light, nature pro- 
duces callousness; and what nature 

does God does.—Ver. 42. The prophecy 
of prophecy is given in the words Ταῦτα ... αὐτοῖς. "The Targum renders 

the original words of Isaiah 'I saw the 

Lord' by 'I saw the Lord's glory'. 

St. John states the truth to which this 

expression points, and identifies the 

Divine Person seen by Isaiah with 

Christ," Westcott. This involves that 
Theophanies of the O.T. were mediated 

by the pre-existent Logos.—Ver. 42. 

Although unbelief was so commonly the 

result of Christ's manifestation, ἐξαρτός 

μένετος, cf. Herodot. i. 189, "neverthe- 

less, however, even of the rulers many 

believed on Him, but on account of the 

Pharisees they did not confess Him
you, etc. apostolos your 5° AION. 43. ἡγαγησαν γὰρ τὴν οἰκ. 22. δοξαν τῶν ἀνθρώπων μᾶλλον ἀπερχθερ τὴν δοξαν τοῦ Θεου. p.Mac. xiv.

44. ἵσατος δὲ ἔφαξε καὶ εἶπεν, "Ο πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ, ὁ πιστεύει εἰς ἐμὲ, ἀλλ' εἰς τὸν πέμψαντά με. 45. καὶ ὁ θεωρῶν ἐμὲ, θεωρεῖ τὸν Θεοῦ; τὸν πέμψαντά με. 46. εἰς νῦν εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἑλθείς, ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ, ἐν τῇ σκοτει νῃ μὴ μείνῃ. 47. καὶ εὰν τίς τούτων ἀκούση τῶν μημάτων καὶ μὴ πιστεύῃ ἑτερον, ἴνα σώσῃ τὸν κόσμον. γὰρ ἠλθον ἵνα κρίνῃ τὸν κόσμον, ἀλλ' ἵνα σώση τὸν κόσμον. 48. δὲ ἄβετον ἐμὲ καὶ μὴ λαμβάνων τὰ μὴ ματά μου, ἥξει τὸν κρίσιν. Them. αὐτὸν, ὁ λέγων δὲ ἡλίσθη, ἐκείνος κρίνει αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ σκοτείᾳ. 49. ἡμέρα. 49. ὁτι ἐγὼ ἐξ ἐμαυτοῦ οὐκ ἐλαίλησα: ἀλλ' ὁ πέμπας με ἐν τῇ 39 τῷ πατέρι, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔστηλεν ἑνκε, τί εἶπεν καὶ τί λαλήσω. 50. καὶ ὅτα ὅτι η ἐντολή αὐτοῦ ἕως αἰώνιος ἐτών. τα ὄν λαλῶ ἑγώ, καθὼς ἐφηκέ μοι ὁ πατέρι, ὅτων λαλῶ."

1 φιλάθλη in ΜΑΒΔΚΛΠ 33 and most versions. See Mt. xix. 20, Lk. xi. 28.

(ὁμολογεῖν, imperfect, their fear to confess Him was continued) lest they should be put out of the synagogue. The inherent truth of the teaching of Jesus compelled response even in those least likely to be influenced. Westcott says: "This complete intellectual faith (so to speak) is really the climax of unbelief. The conviction found no expression in life." This is true of the bulk of those referred to (see ver. 43), but cannot apply to all (see vii. 30, xix. 38, 39). For ἔφασανγεῖν see ix. 22, xvi. 2.- ὡς ἡλίσθησαν. Θεόν. As in v. 44 an excessive craving for the glory which men can bestow is noted as the cause of unbelief.

Vv. 44-50. A summary of the teaching of Jesus regarding the nature and consequences of faith and unbelief.—Ver. 44. Ἰσαακ δὲ ἔφαξε, "but Jesus cried aloud, that the summary of the teaching that He made the following statement at some particular time, but as ver. 36 has informed us, He had already withdrawn from public teaching. It is therefore natural to suppose that we have here the evangelist's reminiscences of what Jesus had publicly uttered at a previous time.—Ο πιστεύων με. This sums up the constant teaching of Jesus that He appeared solely as the ambassador of the Father (see v. 23, 30, 43, vii. 16, viii. 42); and that therefore to believe on Him was to believe on the Father.—Ver. 45. Here He adds καὶ ὁ θεωρῶν ἐμὲ θεωρεῖ τὸν πέμψαντά με: "he who beholds me, beholds Him that sent me"; so xiv. 9; cf. vi. 40. Jesus was the perfect transparency through whom the Father was seen: the image in whom all the Father was represented.—Ver. 46. ἐγὼ φῶς ἐμαυτοῦ. "I am come into the world as light," and in the connection, especially as light upon God and His relation to men. The purpose of His coming was to deliver men from their native darkness: ἡλίσθησαν. As in v. 44 an excessive craving for the glory which men can bestow is noted as the cause of unbelief. "Wisdom and most versions. See Mt. xix. 20, Lk. xi. 28.
The main action is expressed in ἡγιασματία of the fourth verse; but to set his reader in the right point of view for perceiving the significance of this action the Evangelist points out three particulars regarding the mind and feeling of Jesus, and two external circumstances. (i) ἔστω δὲ ... ἀντίθετο, "Jesus, knowing that the hour had come that He should pass (for the construction ἦν see xili. 33) ἐπροεξείαί εἰς τὸν κόσμον which described His future condition, and it suggests the difficulties they are left to cope with and the duties they must do. They are to represent Him in the world: and this appeals to Him, He loved them," ἐστιν ὡς, which is translated "in the highest degree" by Chrys., Euthymius, Cyril., Cyp. Alex. [τελειοτάτην ἀγάπην], Godet, Weiss; but Godet is wrong in saying that ἐστιν ἄμως never means "unto the end," see Mt. x. 22. Melanchthon renders "perduravit done," to persist through all the sufferings and to all the issues to which His love brought Him. The statement is the suitable introduction to all that now looms in view. His love remained steadfast, and was now the ruling motive. The statement is further illustrated by the disappointing state of the disciples. [Weinstein quotes from Eurip., Troad., 1051, ουκ ἔστω ἐρωτηματικῶς διατείναι εἰς τὸν κόσμον; and from the Anthol., τούτος ἐστιν ἄγαπη μηχανητος τὸν κόσμον ἀγαποῦντας, and cf. Shakespeare's Sonnets, cxi., "Love... bears it out even to the edge of doom."] (ii) καὶ ἐπειποθηκαν γνωσμόν,
"supper having arrived," "supper having been served," cf. γενόμενον σαββάτου, the Sabbath having come, πρῶτα γενόμενα, Mt. xxvi. 1, morning having dawned. In x. 22 the phrase ἐγένετο τὰ ἐγκαινία means "the Dedication had arrived". So here the meaning is "supper having come," and not "supper being ended," or "while supper was proceeding." If we read γενόμενον the meaning is substantially the same, "supper arriving," "at supper time". This also is essential to the understanding of the incident. Feet-washing, pleasant and customary before a meal, would have been disagreeable and out of place in the course of it. [The custom is abundantly illustrated by Weststein, Doughty and others. See especially Becker's Charii. The feet, either bare, or sandalled, or with shoes, were liable to be heated by the fine dust of the roads, and it was expected that the host would furnish means of washing them, see Lk. vii. 44. When our Lord and His disciples supped together, this office would be discharged by the youngest, or by the disciples in turn; but this evening the disciples had been disputing which of them was the greatest, Lk. xxii. 24, and consequently no one could stoop to do this menial office for the rest. (3) τὸ διάβαλον... παραδός [or παραδοῦ]. "the devil having now put into the heart," etc. For the expression βεβληκότος ἐς τὴν καρδίαν see especially Pindar, Olymp., xiii. 16, πολλὰ ὅ υ εἰς καρδίας ἄνθρωπος δίδωσιν ἡμῖν κ. ο. xiv. 3, 5. See also Steph. Synt., frequent in Homer. It is perhaps rather stronger than "suggest," "the devil having already put in the heart"; the idea had been entertained, if we cannot say that the purpose was already formed. His presence was another disturbing element in the feast. But had Jesus unmasked him before such fiery spirits as John and Peter, Judas would never have left that room alive. Peter's sword would have made a surer work than with Malchus. Judas therefore is included in the feet-washing. "Jesus at the feet of the traitor, what a picture, what lessons for us" (As-ti).—Ver. 3. (1) ἐδώ... χείρως, this consciousness on the part of Jesus is mentioned to bring out the condescension of the action to be related. (5) So too is the accompanying consciousness, ὅτι ἐν τοῖς ὑδάταις... ὑπάνως. It was not in forgetfulness of His true dignity but because conscious that He was supreme and God's ambassador that He did what He did. ["All things," says Melanchthon, "condere testamentum promissum in Scripturis"; "omnia, adeoque peccatum et mortem".]—Ver. 4. This person, and in this mood and in these circumstances, on the brink of His own passion, is free to attend to the wants of unworthy men, and ἐγένετο... διεσώμανος. "He rises," having reclined at the table in expectation that one or other of the disciples would do the feet-washing.—καὶ τίθητι τὰ ἱμάτια, "and lays aside His garments," i.e., His Tallith, appearing in His χιτῶν, similar to our "in His shirt sleeves." τίθημι is similarly used in τίθημι τὴν ψυχήν, x. 5, etc. [See also Kypke on Lk. xix. 21.].—καὶ λαβὼν λείτουν διεσώμαν εἱματον, "and having taken a linteum," a towel or long linen cloth. "He girt Himself," tying the towel round Him. Cf. ἐγκυμοσύνης, 1 Pet. v. 5. The middle διεσώμαστο is used in xxi. 7; the expression here more emphatically indicates that He was the sole Agent. The condescension is understood in the light of what Suetonius tells of Caligula (Cal. 26), that he was fond of making some of the senators wait at his table "sucinctos linteos," that is, in the guise of waiters.—Ver. 5. συνηγήσατε... κατὰ τὴν ἱματίαν. Each step in the following scene is imprinted on the mind of John. "Next He pours water into the basin," the basin which the landlord had furnished as part of the necessary arrangements. [κατὰ τὴν ἱματίαν is only found here; but ποδονυμίας is not so rare; see Plut., Phocian, 20, where ποδονυμίας filled with wine were provided for the guests.].—καὶ ἔφεξε... νίττες... "nihil ministerii omittit" (Grotius). [Plutarch says of Favorius that he did for Pompey what Herophilus did for Alexander: "He began"] to wash the feet of the disciples; "began,"
perhaps because, as Meyer suggests, the washing was interrupted, but this is not certain.—Ver. 6. ἠργῶν ὑπον, apparently in the order in which they happened to be sitting, and having first washed some of the other disciples. He comes to Simon Peter, who draws up his feet out of reach and exclaims, Κύριε, ἐὰν μὴ νίψης τοῦ ἐναντίων εἰς τὸν ἀλώνιον. The πάντως μου are brought together for the sake of the contrast.—Ver. 7. This was a right impulse and honourable to Peter; and therefore Jesus treats it tenderly. ὃ ἐγὼ ποιῶ... μετὰ ταύτα, "what I am doing thou dost not at present comprehend, but thou shalt learn as soon as I am finished". The pronouns are emphatic, that Peter may understand that Jesus may have much to do which the disciple cannot comprehend. The first requisite in a disciple or follower is absolute trust in the wisdom of his Master. μετὰ ταύτα refers to the immediate future; see ver. 12, where the explanation of the action is given. [οὐκ ἔσεσθαι ὥστε, Euthymius.—Ver. 8. Peter, however, cannot accept the disciple's attitude, but persists, ὃ ἐγὼ νίψης μου τοῦ ποδας ἐν τῶν ἀλώνων, "never shalt Thou wash my feet". The ἐν τῶν ἀλώνων was prompted by the μετὰ ταύτα. No future explanation can make this possible. Peter's humility is true enough to allow him to see the incongruity of Jesus washing his feet; not deep enough to make him conscious of the incongruity of his thus opposing and dictating to his Master. To this characteristic utterance Jesus, waiting with the basin, replies, ἐὰν μὴ νίψῃ σε... ἐν ἐμοί. Superficially these words might mean that unless Peter allowed Jesus to wash him, he could not sit at table with Him. But evidently Peter found in them a deeper significance, and understood them as meaning: Unless I wash you, you are outcast from my fellowship and cease to share in my kingdom and destiny. Here the symbolic significance of the eating together and of the washing begins dimly to appear. That Peter saw that this deeper meaning was intended appears from the eagerness of his answer.—Ver. 9. Κύριε... κεφάλην. A moment ago he told his Master He was doing too much: now he tells Him He is doing too little. Self-will gives place slowly. Yet this was the unmistakable expression of devotion. If washing is any requirement for fellowship with Thee, wash me wholly. ["Non pedes solum, quis soli ministri vident; sed manus et caput, quod conviviae adspicient."] Wetstein.) He is still in error.—Ver. 10. ὁ ἀληθινῶν... δόξα. "He that has been in the bath has no need to wash save his feet, but is all clean." His feet may be soiled by walking from the public bath to the supper chamber, and it is enough that they be washed. "Ad convivium vocati solebant prins in balneo lavari; in domo vero convivatoris non nisi pedes, quibus in via pulvis aut sordes adhaesperant, a servis abluebantur, ne lecti, super quibus accumebant, macularentur." Wetstein. He supports the statement by many references. The added clause discloses that a spiritual sense underlies the symbol: ὄμως καθαροὶ ὄστε, ἄλλη εἰς ἀκαθάρτητα, ye are clean, but not all."

All had been washed; the feet of Judas were as clean as those of Peter. But Judas was not clean.—Ver. 11. That Judas was meant is at once said in ver. 11. ἤδη... ἐστε. Jesus thus shows that He distinguishes between the offence of the rest and the sin of Judas. All that they required was to have the soil of
their present evil temper and jealousy removed: they were true in heart, they had been in the bath and had only contracted a slight stain. But Judas was not in the bath; he had no genuine and habitual loyalty to Christ.—Ver. 12. *Ὅταν, when, then, He had washed their feet and taken His garments (cf. τίθηνι τά ἱμάτια of ver. 4) and reclined again He said to them: Know ye what I have done to you?* Do you perceive the meaning of this action? By washing their feet He had washed their heart. By stooping to this menial service He had made them all ashamed of declining it. By this simple action He had turned a company of wrangling, angry, jealous men into a company of humbled and united disciples.—Ver. 13. *ὅμως φωνεῖται με, you call me,* in addressing me (φωνεῖν, not καλέων), ὁ διδάσκαλος καὶ ὁ Κύριος, “Teacher” and “Lord”; the nominative titles, see Winer, 226. Perhaps “Rabbi” would convey better the respect involved in διδάσκαλος. καὶ καλέως λέγεται, ἐμί γάρ. Jesus, humble and self-suppressing as He was, clearly recognised His own dignity and on occasion asserted it. Here the point of the lesson lay in His consciousness of being their Lord.—Ver. 14. Hence the a fortiori argument: *εἰ δέν ἔγνω Ἰησοῦς ... πάδοις, “if I then, Lord and Teacher, washed your feet, ye also ought (ἀπέκτεινον denoting moral obligation) to wash one another’s feet”.* It is not the act itself, but its moral essence, which after His example He enjoins upon them to exercise.” Meyer. This has sometimes been considered a command enjoining the literal washing of the feet of poor saints: and was practised in England until 1731 by the Lord High Almoner, and is still practised by the Pope on Maundy Thursday (Dies Mandati), the day before Good Friday. See also Church’s *Anselm*, p. 49. The ancient practice is discussed in Augustine’s *Letters*, 55, to Januarius, c. 33. It at once took its place as symbolic of all kindly care of fellow-Christians, see 1 Tim. v. 10.—Ver. 15. υπόθεσαμα ... ὕποθεσαμα is condemned by Phrynichus, who recommends the Attic παράδειγμα. See Rutherford’s interesting note, *New Phryn.*, p. 62. The purpose, Ἰνα, of His action was that they might act in the same humble, loving spirit, in all their conduct to one another.—Ver. 16. And as confirmatory of this example and in rebuke of their pride, He adds: *οὐκ ἐστιν δοῦλος ... αὐτῶν.* In Mt. x. 24 a similar saying occurs; cf. also Lk. vi. 40, and Lk. xxii. 37. The slave whose function it is to serve is not “greater,” μεῖζον, than his lord, who may expect to receive service, and therefore the slave may well stoop to the offices which the lord himself discharges and count on no exemptions the lord does not claim.—Ver. 17. These are obvious first principles in Christian discipleship, but the mere knowledge of them is not enough: *εἰ ταῦτα οἴδατε, μακάριοι ἢττε δὲν ποιήσατε αὐτά. ταῦτα refers to what Jesus had just declared to be the significance of His action. *εἰ οἴδατε, “if ye know,” as you do know: δὲν ποιήσατε, a supposition, “The knowing is objectively granted,
the doing subjectively conditioned." Meyer. On the double protasis see Burton, 268. 
medi” Calvin) He hastens to add: ἀμὴν ... περὶ αὐτῶν με. Two elements in the company had prevented Jesus from freely uttering His last counsels to the Twelve. (1) They had manifested dissension which would prevent them from acting together when He was gone, and a temper which would prevent them from receiving His words. And (2) there was among them a traitor. The first element of discord had been removed by the feet-washing. He now proceeds to eliminate the second. But to have at once named the traitor would have been fatal. Peter and the rest would have taken steps to defeat, if not to put an end to Judas. Therefore (see the doing subjectively conditioned. 19. "Επί ἀρχύ λέγω ὑμῖν πρὸ τοῦ γεγονότος ἡμάς, ἵνα ἐπιτύπωστε ἵνα 
mechanism (as the knowledge resulting from the announcement rather than the announcement itself were dictating the expression). "I tell you before it happens, that when it has happened you may know that I am He," i.e., the Messiah in whom these predictions were destined to be fulfilled.—Ver. 20. But lest this announcement should weaken their confidence in one another and in their own call to the Apostolate ("probable est voluisse Christum offendiulo 
mediē"). Calvin) He hastens to add: 21. "Ταῦτα εἰτών ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἔταραξάθη τὸ πνεύματι, καὶ ἐμαρτύρθη 
with Himself and with God. 
Vv. 21-30. Judas is eliminated from the company.—Ver. 21. Ταῦτα εἰτών ... παραδοσαί με. Two elements in 
with the feet of the first at his back; while the third occupied the same posture relatively to the second (see the engraving in Becker's Charities, 327, and Lightfoot, p. 1095, who says that this second arrangement prevailed in Palestine in the time of Christ). John
was lying, then, next to Jesus, his position being inside of that of Jesus. To him Peter voices, "beckons" (cf. καὶ δεῖν μὲν τῷ ἑώρω κεφαλῆς, Od., xvi. 283), taking the initiative as usual, but not himself asking, perhaps because he had made so many mistakes that evening already, perhaps because a private matter might better be transacted in a whisper from John.—Ver. 25. That disciple, ἦν, when thus appealed to, ἀνέπαφος ἐκ τοῦ στόχου τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, "having learnt back towards the breast of Jesus" so as to speak more directly to Him and to be heard only by Him. On the difference between ἀναπαράστας and ἀνεπαφός see Origen in Evang. Jo., ii. 16, and see BCP. But even in answer to John's question, τίς ἦν, Jesus does not name Judas, but merely gives a sign by which John may recognise the traitor: ἢν, "he it is for whom I shall dip the sop and give it him". Some argue from the insertion of the article τό ἔρμων that this was the sop made up of a morsel of lamb, a small piece of unleavened bread, and dipped in the bitter sauce, which was given by the head of the house to each guest as a regular part of the Passover; and that therefore John as well as the Synoptists considered this to be the Paschal Supper. But not only is the article doubtful, see W.H., but it is an ordinary Oriental custom for the host to offer such a tid-bit to any favoured guest; and we are rather entitled to see in the act the last appeal to Judas' better feeling. The very mark Jesus chooses to single him out is one which on ordinary occasions was a mark of distinctive favour. At any rate he is thus all the more effectually screened from the others.—Ver. 27. But instead of moving Judas to compunction μετὰ τὸ φῶς, τότε εἰσῆλθεν εἰς ἐκεῖνον ὁ Σατάνας. μετὰ "after," not "with," "non cum offulsa," Bengel and Cyril, who also says, οὗ γὰρ καὶ σῶμαυλον ἔχει τὸν σατανᾶς, ἄλλη δέλθη τῇ καρδίᾳ δεσπότην. On ἐκεῖνον Bengel also has: "Jam remoto notat Judam". Morally he is already far removed from that company. But what was it that thus finally determined Judas? Perhaps the very revulsion of feeling caused by taking the sop from Jesus: perhaps the accompanying words, "Ὥστε, τοῖς ἡγομένων τάξιν, "what thou doest, do quickly". τάξιν: "at Attic writers διανόω (ἀναρχέω) was the only comparative, and τάξιν the only superlative". Rutherfurd, New Phryn., p. 150. The idea in the comparative is "with augmented speed," see Donaldson's Greek Gram., p. 390.—Ver. 28. Τὸῦτο . . . ἀφίη. All heard the command given to Judas, but none of them knew its object, not even John; for although he was now aware that Judas was the traitor he did not connect the command "Do it quickly" with the actual work of betrayal.—Ver. 29. τις
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xiii.

31. ἀγένε ἰπτοὺς, Ἰνν' ἐδοξάσθη ἡ ὑδίς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἐδοξάσθη ἐν αὐτῷ, καὶ ὁ

k Freq. in 1 θεός ὁ θεός ὁ θεός ἐν αὐτῷ, καὶ ἡ ἄγαν ποιεῖ ἄγαν, καὶ I

10. ἐν τῷ πάντοτε διαφωτισμῷ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων, ἵνα καὶ ὁ ἄγαν ἀλλήλουs., καὶ ὁ ἄγαν ἀλλήλουs.

35. καὶ τοῦτο γίνεσται πάντας ἵνα ἢ ἄγαν μεθίστατο ὁ ἄγαν τήν ἄγαν.

καὶ τοῦτο γίνεσται πάντας ἵνα ἢ ἄγαν μεθίστατο ὁ ἄγαν τήν ἄγαν.

This clause omitted in ἱëBC°DL (and by W.H.R.); found in ἱẽACΓ and

many versions.

γράμμα θεοῦ. Some supposed that Judas being treasurer of the company had been sent to buy what they needed for the feast, or to give something to the poor.

That it was possible at so late an hour to make purchases appears from Mt. xxv. 9-11 (Holtzmann).—Ver. 30. Judas on his part, having accepted the sop, ἐξήλθεν εὔθεα, the eúthē answering to τάχων, ver. 27; he went out immediately, taking the purse with him no doubt, ἵνα δὲ νύ, "and it was night". The sudden darkness succeeding sunset in the East suddenly fell on the room, impressing John's sensitive spirit and adding to the perturbation of the company. The note of time may however only result from John's desire to keep his narrative exact.

Ver. 31—XIV. 31 comprise one continuous conversation, introduced by Jesus' announcement (vv. 31-35) of His speedy departure.—Ver. 31. οὗτος οὖν ἐξῆλθεν. As soon as Judas had gone out, the spirit of Jesus rose, and with a note of triumph He explains the situation to the disciples. Two points He emphasises: His work is done, and He must leave them. The former He announces in the words Νῦν ἐδοξάσθη ἡ ὑδίς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἐδοξάσθη ἐν αὐτῷ. "This 'now' with which the Lord turns to the faithful eleven, expresses at once the feeling of deliverance from the traitor's presence and His free acceptance of the issues of the traitor's work." Westcott. ἐδοξάσθης the aorist is used because the traitor is considered to have "as it were already completed his deed". Winer, p. 346. The Son of Man is "glorified" by accomplishing the work of His life by being accepted as the manifestation of God, and by being acknowledged by the Father as having revealed Him; see xvii. 1, 4, 5, xii. 23, xi. 4. Cf. Milligan's Ascension of our Lord, p. 79.—Ver. 32.

Necessarily therefore when He is glorified
fore the kind rather than the degree of love is indicated in the clause καθὼς ἡ πίστις ἡ τ. l.—Ver. 35. And this Christian love is to be the sole sufficient evidence of the individual's Christianity: ἐκ τούτου (emphatic) γνώστεται... ἀλληλεία. Cf. Acts iv. 32, 1 John iii. 10; also Tertull., Apol., 39, "vide, inquit, ut inimicem se diligant"; Clem. Alex., Strom., ii. 9; Min. Felix, Octavius, 9.—Ver. 36. On this announcement of Jesus that He was shortly to leave them follow four characteristic utterances of the disciples. First as usual, ἀλλάζειν Σίμων Πέτρος, Κύριε ποῦ ἐλάχιστας ἐρωτεύεται; "Lord, where are you going?" referring to ver. 33. The Vulgate renders "Domine, quo vadis?" the words which the legend ascribes to Peter when withdrawing from persecution in Rome he met Jesus entering the city. Jesus does not needlessly excite them by plainly telling them of His death, for He has much to say to them which He wishes them to listen to undisturbed. He assures Peter that though he cannot now accompany his Master, he will afterwards follow, and so rejoin Him; cf. xxii. 19.—Ver. 37. This does not satisfy Peter. He sees it is some dangerous enterprise Jesus is undertaking, and he feels his courage discredited by the refusal to be allowed to accompany Him. Κύριε δισκωρία... ὅρασιν. "Putane aula itineris molestia me terreret?" Grotius. "In the zeal of love he mistakes the measure of his moral strength." Meyer. Mt. and Mk. represent all the disciples as making the same declaration (Mt. xxvi. 33, Mk. xiv. 31); which made it all the more necessary to expose its unconscious hollowness, painful as it must have been to Jesus to do so. Τὴν ψυχὴν σου... τρία. "Wilt thou lay down...? So far from that, you will deny me thrice before the morning." os μὴ ἄλλαται φωνῇς. "Cockcrow" was used among the Jews as a designation of time (Lightfoot on Mt. xxvi. 34); cf. Mk. xiii. 33, where the night is divided into ὄψις, ὤρα, ἥμισυ, ἀληθοφοβία, τριά. At the equinox cock-crow would be between 2 and 4 A.M. See Greswell's Dissert., iii. 216. This was incomprehensible; how the night could bring circumstances so appalling as to tempt any of them, and compel the hardest to deny Jesus, they could not conceive.—Chapter XIV. Ver. 1. But as they sat astounded and perplexed, He continues, Μὴ ἀπαγορεύσῃ ὁμοίως ἡ καρδία. Let not your heart be tossed and agitated like water driven by winds; cf. Liddell and S. and Thayer. He not only commands them to dismiss their agitation, but gives them reason: πιστεύετε... πιστεύετε. "Trust God, yea, trust me." Trust Him who overrules all events, He will bring you through this crisis for which you feel yourselves incompetent; or if in your present circumstances that faith is too difficult, trust me whom you see and know and whose word you cannot doubt. It is legitimate to construe the first πιστεύετε as an indicative, and the second as imperative; but this gives scarcely so appropriate a sense.—Ver. 2. As an encouragement to this trust, He adds, ἐν τῇ ὁλιγῇ... ὄντων. He is going home to His Father's house, but had there been room in it only for Himself He would necessarily have told them that this was the case, because the very reason of His going was to prepare a place for them. ὥστε assigns the reason for the necessity of explanation: the reason being that His purpose or plan
for His future would require to be entirely altered had there been no room for them in His Father’s house. “My Father’s house” is used in ii. 16 of the Temple: here of the immediate presence of the Father and of that condition in which His love and protection are uninterrupted and directly experienced. This is most naturally thought of as a place, but with the corrective that “it is not in heaven one finds God, but in God one finds heaven”. Cf. Godet. In this house, as in a great palace, cf. Iliad, vi. 242, μοινα τοιλαλ εστων, μοινη (μένειν), only here and in ver. 23, means a place to abide in, and was used of a station on a journey, a resting place, quarters for the night, and in later ecclesiastical Greek a monastery. See Soph., Lexicon. “Mansions” reproduces the Vulgate “mansions”. See further Wright’s Bible Word-Book. el 81 μη . . . “were it not so, I would have told you,” “admissem vos bibis spem inanem,” Erotrius. Had there been no such place and no possibility of preparing it, He necessarily would have told them, because the very purpose of His leaving them was to prepare a place for them. ἐστομάσασα τότον, a figure derived from the custom of sending forward one of a party to secure quarters and provide all requisites. Cf. the Alectus, line 363: ἄλλ’ οὖν ἐκείνῳ προσδέκα μ’, ἡταν δὲν, καὶ δι’ ἑτοιμαζ’ ὡς συντοκιστοῦσα μοι. What was involved in the preparation here spoken of is detailed in Hebrews. Cf. Selby’s Ministry of the Lord, 275. —Ver. 3. Neither will He prepare a place and leave them to find their own way to it.—καὶ ἐὰν πορεύθη . . . πάντα. “I go”; that is, the commencement of this work as their forerunner was the pledge of its completion. And its completion is effected by His coming again and receiving them to Himself, or “to His own home,” ἐπὶ ἐμαυτόν. Cf. xx. 10.—πάντα ἐρχομαι καὶ παραλαμβάνω, “I come again and will receive”. The present is used in ἐρχομαι as if the coming were so certain as to be already begun, cf. v. 25. For παραλαμβάνω see Cant. viii. 5. The promise is fulfilled in the death of the Christian, and it has changed the aspect of death. The personal second coming of Christ is not a frequent theme in this Gospel. The ultimate object of His departure and return is not that one will see Him, καὶ ὠρίζει ζήτειν. Cf. 1 Thess. iv. 17, 2 Cor. v. 8, Phil. i. 23. The object of Christ’s departure is permanent reunion and the blessedness of the Christian.

Vv. 4-7. A second interruption occasioned by Thomas.—Ver. 4. καὶ δεῦρο ἐνωπίων ὀδηγεῖ τὴν ὀδόν. The ἐνωπίων is emphatic: the disciples knew the direction in which He was going.—Ver. 5. But this statement bewilders the despondent Thomas, who gloomily interjects: Κύριε . . . εἰσέρχεται; Thomas’s difficulty is that not knowing the goal they cannot know the way. In the reply of Jesus both the goal and the way are disclosed.—Ver. 6. ἔγω εἰμι . . . ἤμω. “I am the way and the truth and the life: no one comes to the Father save through me.” I do not merely point out the way and teach the truth and bestow life, but I am the way and the truth and the life. Cf. 1 Cor. xii. 3, where it is added that by attachment to me one necessarily is in the way and possesses the truth and the life. “The way” here referred to is the way to the Father. He is the goal of all human aspiration: and there is but one way to the Father, “no one comes”, etc.—καὶ ἀληθεία, “and the truth,” primarily about God and the way to God, and to Him, but also as furnishing us with all knowledge which we now require for life. Thomas craved knowledge sufficient to guide him in the present crisis. Jesus says: You have it in me.—καὶ ἡ ζωή, “and the life”; the death which casts its shadow over the eleven and Himself is itself to be swallowed up in life. Those who
are one with Jesus cannot die. They are possessed of the source of life. Further see Hort's The Way, etc., and Bernard's Central Teaching. — οἴδας ἐρχέσθαι, "no one comes to the Father save through me" as the way, the truth, the life. It is not "through believing certain propositions regarding me" nor "through some special kind of faith," but "through me".— Ver. 7. He is the essential knowledge, εἰ γνώσθητι μὲν... Some press the distinction between γνώσθητι and ἴδεται, "the first representing a knowledge acquired and progressive; the second a knowledge perceptive and immediate ". But this discrimination is here inappropriate. The clause explains the foregoing. The Father is in Jesus, and to know Him is to know the Father. They had unconsciously been coming to the Father and living in Him. Now they were to do so consciously: ἐν' ἑρήν γινώσκετε... αὐτόν. The repeated αὐτόν brings out the point, that it was the Father that was henceforth to be recognised by them when they saw and thought of Jesus: "ye know Him and have seen Him".

Vv. 8-14. A third interruption by Philip; to which Jesus replies, appending to His answer a promise which springs out of what He had said to Philip.— Ver. 8. Λέγει... Ἰησοῦς. Philip, seizing upon the ἑδρακάτε αὐτόν of ver. 7, utters the universal human craving to see God, to have the same indubitable direct knowledge of Him as we have of one another. Perhaps Philip supposed some appearance visible to the eye would be granted. Always there persists the feeling that more might be done to make God known than has been done.— Ver. 9. Jesus corrects the error, and guides the craving to its true satisfaction. Τοσοῦτον χρόνον... πατέρα... may be a gloss for the dative which is found in (BCL). The manifestation which Philip craves had been made, and made continuously for some considerable time; for so long that it was matter of surprise and regret to Jesus that Philip needed still to be taught that he who saw Jesus saw the Father. It is implied that not to see the Father in Jesus was not to know Him.— Ver. 10. ἐν πίστει... ἀπίστη... This unbelief was involved in Philip's question, but when the question of the mutual indwelling of the Father and Jesus was thus directly put to him, he would have no doubt as to the answer. Cf. x. 38. The fact of the union is indubitable; the mode is inexplicable; some of the results are indicated in the words: τὰ βήματα... τὰ ἔργα. See vii. 16-18 and ν. 19. The mutual indwelling is such that everything Jesus says or does is the Father's saying or doing. This was so obvious that Jesus could appeal to the works He did in case His assertion was disbelieved.— Ver. xi. πιστεύετε μοι... πιστεύτε. "Believe me," i.e., my assertion, not my manifestation, "or if you find that difficult, believe on account of the works themselves". The mention of His works and the evidence they afford that He is in the Father suggests to Him a ground of comfort for His disciples in view of His departure. And from this point onwards in this chapter it is to the comforting of the disciples our Lord addresses Him.
First, in vv. 12-14; second, in vv. 15-17; third, in vv. 18-21. The mention of the Paraclete in connection with this third item of encouragement gives rise to a fourth interruption, this time by Judas, vv. 22-24; and at ver. 25 Jesus resumes His explanation of the Paraclete's function, and closes with several considerations calculated to remove their fears.—Ver. 12. ἐμὴν ... τοῦθεν. The first encouragement is the assurance that through Christ's absence the disciples would be enabled to do greater works than Jesus Himself had done. These "greater" works were the spiritual effects accomplished by the disciples, especially the great novel fact of conversion. See this developed in Parker's The Paraclete. Such works were to be possible διὰ ... τοῦδέως. It was by founding a spiritual religion and altering men's views of the spiritual world Christ enabled His followers to do these greater works. Here this is explained on the plane of the disciples' thoughts and in this form: "I go to my Father, the source of all power, and whatever you ask in my name I will do it."—Ver. 13. τοῦτο ... τοῦτο. The name of a person can only be used when we seek to enforce his will and further his interests. This gives the condition of successful prayer: it must be for the furtherance of Christ's kingdom. For the end of all is ἵνα δοξασθῇ διὰ την τῆς ὑλῆς, that is, that the fulfilment of God's purpose in sending forth His Son may be manifest in Christ's people and in their beneficent work in the world.—Ver. 14. In ver. 14 the promise is repeated, as Euthymius says, for confirmation: τῷ αὐτῷ λεγεὶ βαπτισμόν μελετῆσαι τὸν λόγον. Perhaps, too, additional significance is given to His agency by introducing τῷ. Cf. Bengel and Meyer.

vv. 15-17. The second encouragement: the promise of another Paraclete.—Ver. 15. ἄν ... τοῦτο. The fulfilment of the promise He is about to give depends upon their condition of heart and life. This therefore He announces as the preamble to the promise. On their side there would be a constant endeavour to carry out His instructions: on His side καθὼς ἐρωτήσατε. .. During His ministry Jesus has said little of the Spirit. Now on the eve of His departure He directs attention to this "alter ego". He designates Him ἄλλον παρακλήτων, implying that Jesus Himself was a Paraclete. See John ii. 1. παρακλήτων is literally advocatus, called to one's aid, especially in a court of justice. [Cf. παραμετάτης in Arist., Theist., 359; Eccles., 9.] See especially Hatch, Essays in Bibli. Greek, p. 82, and Westcott's "Additional Note". "Comforter" in A.V. is used in its original sense of "strengthener" (con, fortis); as in Wislifa's version of Phil. iv. 13. "I may do all things in him that comforteth me" (see Wright's Bible Word-Book). This Paraclete should remain with them for ever, and He is specifically designated (ver. 17) τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, cf. xvi. 13, 14; He would enable them to understand the new truths which were battling with their old conceptions, and to readjust their beliefs round a new centre. He would explain the departure of Christ, and the principles of the new economy under which they were henceforth to live. This spirit was to be peculiarly
18. οὐκ ἄφησον ὑμᾶς ὅρατον ὀρθοφονοῦν· ἑρῴζων πρὸς ὑμᾶς. 19. ἔτι ὑμᾶς ἤξεχεὶ τὸ κόσμος με· οὐκ ἔτι θεωρεῖ· ὄμορεις δὲ θεωρεῖτε με· ὅτι ἐγὼ ἦλθον, καὶ ὑμεῖς ἤσεθεθεῖσθε. 20. ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ γνώσεθεν ὑμεῖς ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐν τῇ πατρί μου, καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐν ἐμοί, κἀγὼ ἐν ὑμῖν. 21. ὁ Ξων τὰς ἐντολὰς μου καὶ τηρῶν αὐτὰς, ἐκάνεις ἄστιν ὁ ἄγατος με· ὅ δὲ ἄγατοποι, ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς μου· καὶ ἐγώ

their's, δὲ κόσμος στὸ δύναται λαβεῖν, the characteristically worldly cannot receive that which can only be apprehended by spiritually prepared persons. It has been proposed to render λαβεῖν, "seize" or "apprehend," as if a contrast to the world's apprehension and dismissal of Jesus were intended. But λαμβάνειν τὸ τεκίλαμα is regularly used in N.T. to express "receiving the Spirit," Gal. iii. 2; I Cor. ii. 12. The world cannot receive the Spirit ὅτι το θεωρεῖν αὐτόν. . . . Outward sense cannot apprehend the invisible Spirit; and the world has no personal experience of His presence and power; but ye, ὑμεῖς, have this experimental knowledge, "because He is even now abiding with you (has already begun His ministry); or, rather, has this for His characteristic that He remains with you, making you the object of His work), and shall be within you." With the entire statement cf. I Cor. ii. 8-14.

Vv. 18-21. The third encouragement: that Jesus Himself will come to them and make Himself known to them.—Ver. 18. Great as was the promise of this other helper, this spirit of truth, it did not seem to compensate for the departure of Jesus. "Another," any other, was unable to fill the blank; it was Himself they craved. Therefore He goes on, οὐκ ἄφησον ὑμᾶς ὅραν ὀρθοφονοῦν· ἑρῴζων πρὸς ὑμᾶς, "I will not abandon you as orphans," ὅραην (orbus) "bereaved," used of fathers bereft of children (I Thess. ii. 17, Dionys. Hal., i.); as well as of children bereft of parents. See Elsner, πατρίς προσαναγγέλει τὸ βήμα, Euthymius. Cf. Ps. ix. 14, ὅραην ὤν ἤρετο δεσμὸς. Wetstein quotes Rabbi Akiba as lamenting the death of Rabbi Eleazar, "Vae mihi . . . quia totam hanc generationem reliquisti orphanam". The utter helplessness of the disciples without their Master is indicated. ἑρῴζων πρὸς ὑμᾶς. From the absence of ἐγὼ it may be gathered that Jesus means to point out not so much that it is He who is coming through the spirit to them, as that His apparent departure is really a nearer approach.—Ver. 19. In a short time, ἔτι μικρὸν, the world would no longer see Him, but His disciples would be conscious of His presence, ὑμεῖς δὲ θεωρεῖτε με, present for immediate future. His presence would be manifested in their new life which they would trace to Him, ὅτι ἐγὼ ἦλθον, καὶ ὑμεῖς ἤσεθεθεῖσθε. This is confirmed by Paul's "No longer I, but Christ liveth in me", Gal. ii. 20. The grand evidence of Christ's continued life and presence is the Christian life of the disciple.—Ver. 20. ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ. "in that day," which does not mean Pentecost, but the new Christian era which was to be characterised by these experiences. Cf. Holtzmann. The sense of a new life produced by Christ would compel the conviction ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρί . . . "that I am in the Father" in vital union with the source of all life, "and that you are in me," vitally connected with me so as to receive that life that I live, "and I in you," filling you with all the fulness that is in myself, living out my own life in and through you, and finding in you room for the output of all I am.—Ver. 21. The conditions on which depended the manifestation of the departed Christ are then exhibited, ὁ Ξων . . . ἐμαυτόν. The love to which Christ promises a manifestation of Himself is not an idle sentiment or shallow fancy, but a principle prompting obedience, ὁ Ξων τὰς ἐντολὰς μου, cf. 1 John ii. 7, iv. 21, 2 John 5; it means more than "hearing," and is yet not equivalent to τηρῶν; it seems to point to the permanent possession of the commandments in consciousness. This finds its appropriate expression in τηρῶν αὐτὰς—"keeping them," observing them in the life. This is the expression and proof of love, and this love finds its response and reward in the love of the Father and of the Son, and in the manifestation of the Son to the individual. The appropriateness of introducing the Father and His love appears in ver. 24. The love of Christ is that which prompts the manifestation. ἐμαυτόν, the word is used by Moses in Exodus xxxiii. 13. Reynolds says: "This remarkable word implies that the scene or place of the higher manifestation


...will be in (φ) the consciousness of the soul.” The word however is currently used for outward manifestation; although here the manifestation alluded to is inward. Cf. Judas’ words. The nature of the manifestation has already been explained, ver. 19.

VV. 22-24. A fourth interruption, by Judas.—Ver. 22. All that Jesus has said has borne more and more clearly in upon the mind of the disciples the disappointing conviction that the manifestation referred to is not to be on the expected Messianic lines. Accordingly Judas, not Iscariot, but Thaddaeus or Lebbaeus (Mt. x. 3; Lk. vi. 16), says: τι γέγονεν κ. τ. λ. “What has happened that,” etc.? or, “What has occurred to determine you,” etc.? Kypke quotes from Arrian apposite instances of the use of this expression. Judas expresses, no doubt, the thought of the rest. Was there to be no such public manifestation of Jesus as Messiah, as would convince the world?—Ver. 23. To this Jesus replies έαν τις...πατήσεις. The answer explains that the manifestation, being spiritual, must be individual and to the spiritually prepared. It contemplates not a public discovery of power, but a sort of domestic visitation of love.” Bernard. προς αυτον ευλογημεν, “to him we will come”; Jesus without scruple unites Himself with the Father. μοινι...πατήσεις, a classical expression, see Thuc., i. 131, μοινι...πατήσεις. “We will make our abode with him, will be daily his guests, yea, house and table companions.” Luther in Meyer. μοινι is here used in a sense different from that of ver. 2, where it means a place to abide in.—Ver. 24. The necessity of love as a condition of this manifested presence is further emphasised by stating the converse, δ μη...πατήσεις. The κόσμος of ver. 22 is here more closely defined by δ μη...διανοησης. See Holtzmann.

VV. 25-31. The conversation closed by a beseech of peace. The genuineness of this report of the last words of Jesus is guaranteed by the frequency with which He seems to be on the point of breaking off. The constant resumption, the adding of things that occur on the moment, these are the inimitable touch of nature. At this point the close seems imminent.—Ver. 25. Ταυτα λαληθη ομιν...πατρε. 26. δ ει τα...κλητος... ψηλων. The Paraclete is now identified with το πνευμα το εγων, and His connection with Christ is further guaranteed by the clause δ...διανοησης; “whence the Father will send in my name,” that is, as representing me and promoting my interests. And this He will accomplish by teaching: εκεινος “He,” and no longer the κλητος. “He will teach you all things,” σάντα ειν το ταυτα (ver. 25) with which Christ had to be satisfied; but σάντα must itself be limited by the needs and capacities of the disciples.—και σεφομησης... “and will bring to your remembrance all that I said to you,” that is, the teaching of the Spirit should so connect itself with the teaching of Christ as to revive the memory of forgotten words of His, and give them a new meaning. Cf. especially xvi. 12-14.—Ver. 27. αρπαγην...ψηλων... ψηλων, “peace I bequeath to you.” The usual farewell was given with the word
"peace". And Jesus uses the familiar word, but instead of uttering a mere wish He turns it into a bequest, intimating His power not only to wish but to give peace in the further description εἰρήνην τὴν ἐμὴν δίδωμι ψυχήν, "my peace I give unto you" ; the peace which He had attained by means of all the disturbance and opposition He had encountered. Leaving them His work, His view of life, His Spirit, He necessarily left them His peace.—οὐ καθὼς ὁ κόσμος δίδωσιν, ἐμὸν δίδωμι ψυχήν, "not as the world gives I give to you". This is referred by Grotius to the difference between the empty form of salutation and Christ's gift of peace. ("Mundus, i.e., major pars hominum, salutare impertit sono vocis, nihil saepe de re cogitans; et si cogitet, tamen id alteri nihil prodest.") So too Holtmann and Bernard. Meyer considers this "quite out of relation to the profound seriousness of the moment," and understands the allusion to be to the treasures, honours, pleasures which the world gives. There is no reason why the primary reference should not be to the salutation, with a secondary reference to the wider contrast. This gift of peace, if accepted, would secure them against perturbation, and so Jesus returns to the exhortation of ver. 1, μὴ ταπασεσθε... "Observing that the opening sentence of the discourse is here repeated and fortified, we understand that all enclosed within these limits is to be taken as a whole in itself, and that the intervening words compose a divine antidote to that troubling and desolation of heart which the Lord's departure would suggest." Bernard. He now adds a word, μὴ δὲ καθαρίζω, which carries some reproach in it. Theophrastus (Char., xxvii.) defines καθαρίζω as ὑποτελείς τῆς ψυχῆς ἔμφθορος, a shrinking of the soul through fear. With this must be taken Aristotle's description, Nic. Eth., iii. 6, 7, δὸς δὲ τῇ φοβίας τευχελλῶν δείλας. It may be rendered "neither let your heart timidly shrink".

—Ver. 28. On the contrary quite other feelings should possess them: joy in sympathy with Him in His glorification and in expectation of the results of His going to the Father: ηὐκοσία... υἱοί των πατέρων. "If ye loved me," an almost playful way of reproaching their sadness. There was no doubt of their love, but it was an unintelligent love. They failed to consider the great joy that awaited Him in His going to the Father. This going to the Father was cause for rejoicing, ὅποτι ὁ πατήρ μου, because the Father is greater than I"; and can therefore fulfil all the loving purposes of Christ to His disciples. "The life which He has begun with them and for them will be raised to a higher level." They had seen the life He had lived and were disturbed because it was coming to an end; but it was coming to an end because absorbed in the greater life He would have with the Father. The theological import of the words is discussed by Westcott, who cites patristic opinions and refers to Bull and Pearson. In all that Jesus did, it was the Father's will He carried out, and with powers communicated by the Father; the Father is the Originator and End of all His work in the world. Throughout the ministry of Jesus the Father is represented as "greater" than the Son. That it should require to be explicitly affirmed, as here, is the strongest evidence that He was Divine.—Ver. 29. καὶ νῦν... πως... τιμήσετε... "I have told you now before it came to pass," i.e., He has told them of His departure, that they might not be terrified or depressed by its occurrence, but might recognise it as foretold by Him as the consummation of His work and so might have their faith increased.
Chapter XV.—Vv. 1-17. The relation between Jesus and His disciples represented by the relation of the vine and its branches.—Ver. 1. Ἐγέρα ἐμί ἢ ἄμπελος ἢ ἀληθής, καὶ ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ γεωργὸς ἡττε. 2. τῶν κληρῶν ἐν ἑμοὶ μὴ φέρων καρπῶν, ἀμετάξατο· καὶ τῶν τὸ καρπὸν φέρων, καθαίρει αὐτὸ, ἵνα πλείονα καρπῶν φέρη.

Cf. xiii. 10.—Ver. 30. οὐκ ἦν... ὕπνον. "I will no longer speak much with you"; "temporis angustiae abripiunt verba," Grotius.—ἐρχεται... ὀδόν. "The ruler of this world" is Satan, see xii. 31. He "comes" in the treachery of Judas (xili. 27) and all that followed. But this coming was without avail, because ζωὴ ὢν ἐρχεται ὀδῷν, "in me he hath nothing," nothing he can call his own, nothing he can claim as his, and which he can use for his purposes. He is ruler of the world, but in Christ has no possessions or rule. A notable assertion of sinlessness.—Ver. 31. Jesus goes to death not crushed by the machinations of Satan, "but that the world may know that I love the Father, as he hath commanded me," oὐχ ἐποτίζω, "thus do," applies to His whole life, which was throughout ruled by regard to the Father's commandment, but in the foreground of His thought at present is His departure from the disciples, His death.—ἐγείρεσθε, ἐγείρεσθε, "arise, let us go hence," similar to the summons in Mt. xxvi. 46, but the idea of referring so common an expression to a reminiscence of the Synoptic passage is absurd. On the movement made in consequence of the summons, see on xiv. 1.

In chapters xv. and xvi. Jesus (1) explains the relation He holds to those who continue His work, xv. 1-17; (2) the attitude the world will assume to His followers, xv. 18-25; (3) the conquest of the world by the Spirit, 26-xvi. 11; and (4) adds some last words, encouragements and warnings, xvi. 12-33. In this last conversation, which extends from chap. xiii. to chap. xvi. inclusive, the closing words of chap. xiv., ἐγείρεσθε ἐγείρεσθε ἐγείρεσθε, form the best marked division. At this point Jesus and His disciples rose from table. Whether the conversation was continued in the house or after they left it may be doubtful; but probabilities are certainly much in favour of the former alternative. A party of twelve could not conveniently talk together on the street. In xviii. 1 we read that when Jesus had uttered the prayer recorded in xvii. ἧξαν ὅταν τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ πείραν τοῦ χειμάρρου τῶν Κέβρων. This, however, may refer to their leaving the city, not the house.

Bengel thinks they may have paused in the courtyard of the house.

Chapter XV.—Vv. 1-17. The relation between Jesus and His disciples represented by the relation of the vine and its branches.—Ver. 1. Ἐγέρα ἐμί ἢ ἄμπελος ἢ ἀληθής, "I am the true vine." ἀληθής suggests a contrast to other vines to which this title could not be applied: but not to a vine trailing across the window of the room where they were, nor to the golden vine on the Temple gate, nor to the vines on the slopes of Olivet; but to Israel, the stock which God had planted to bring forth fruit to Him, see Ps. lxxx. 1. v., Jer. ii. 21. ἔγειραι οὖν τοὺς καρποφόρους τῶν ἀληθῶν. The vine of Israel as a symbol of the Messiah, see Delitzsch in Expositor, third series, iii., p. 68, and in his Iris, pp. 180-190, E. Tr. On the Maccabean coinage Israel was represented by a vine. It was the present situation which here suggested the figure. As Jesus rose to depart the disciples crowd round Him with anxiety on every face. Their helplessness and trouble appeal to Him, and He encourages them by reminding them that, although left to do His work in the world, they would still be united to Him as truly as the branches to the vine. He and His together are the true Vine of God. καὶ ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ γεωργὸς ἡττε, "and my Father is the vine-dresser". What is now happening is the Father's doing, and, therefore, tends to the well-being and fruitfulness of the vine. "Pater qui cum diliget me, certe servabit totum fruticum," Melanchthon.—Ver. 2. The function of the vine-dresser is at once described: ἐγείραν τὴν ἑκάστην... φέρον. κλήρων, or more fully as in Xen. Oncos. xii. 8, κλήρα ἀμπελών. is the shoot of the vine which is annually put forth. It is from κλάδος, "I break," as also is κλάδος, but Wetstein quotes Pollux to show that κλάδος was appropriated to the shoots of the olive, while κλήρα signified a vine-shoot. Of these shoots there are two kinds, the fruitful, which the vine-dresser αἰφέει: "Inutilesque falcis ramos amputans," Hor. Epod., ii. 13; the fruitful, which He καθαίρει ["suavis rhythmus," Bengel]. The full meaning of αἰφέει is described in ver. 6: καθαίρει here denotes
especially the pruning requisite for concentrating the vigour of the tree on the one object, that it may continually surpass itself, and yield richer and richer results. The vine-dresser spares no pains and no material on his plants, but all for the sake of fruit. 

Cicero, De Senec., xv. 53.)
The use of καθαριομ was probably determined by the καθαριο of ver. 3.—Ver. 3. ἡδὲ ὑµᾶς καθαρίως ἔστω: “Already ye are clean.” καθαρίο here means “in a condition fit to bear fruit”; in xiii. 10, 11, it is suggested by the feet-washing, and means “free from inward stain”. It is similarly used even in classical writers. 

καθαρίον ὑµᾶς ὑµῖν, “on account of the word which I have spoken unto you”. For διὰ in this sense as indicating the source, see vi. 67. The word which Jesus had spoken to them, i.e., the whole revelation He had made, had brought spiritual life, and, therefore, cleansing. But this condition they must strive to maintain, μείνετε ἐν ὑµῖν, κάγω ἐν ὑµῖν. μένε must be understood after κάγω. Maintain your belief in me, your attachment to me, your derivation of hope, aim, and motive from me: and I will abide in you, filling you with all the life you need to represent me on earth. All the divine energy you know to be in me will now pass through you.—Ver. 4. It is in and through you I live henceforth. καθώς τὸ κλῆμα... μείνετε (or μένετε); illustrating by the figure the necessity of the foregoing injunction. A branch that falls to the ground, and no longer abides in the vine as a living part of it, cannot bear fruit, so neither can ye except ye abide in me. That is, ye cannot bear the fruit my Father, the vine-dresser, looks for, and by which He will be glorified, ver. 8.—Ver. 5. ἦσα... κλήματα—“I am the Vine, ye are the branches,” together forming one tree and possessed by one common life. The stock does not bear fruit, but only the branches; the branches cannot live without the stock. Therefore it follows ὑμεῖς... οἴδετε. The one thing needful for fruit-bearing is that we abide in Christ, and He in us; that the branch adhere to the vine, and the life of the vine flow into the branch. χωρίς ὑµῶν, “in separation from me”. See Eph. ii. 12. Grotius gives the equivalent “secessim,” “separatim,” κατὰ µονάχα, κατὰ αὐτῶ, οὐ δόκησαν ποιεῖν οἴδετε, “ye cannot do anything,” absolutely nothing according to i. 3, 4; but here the meaning is, “ye cannot do anything which is glorifying to God, anything which can be called fruit-bearing,” ver. 8.—Ver. 6. ὑμεῖς... μέν, “if any one shall have abided in me”. ἥλθη... ἔπραπτεν, the gnomic aorist, cf. 1 Peter i. 24; and see Burton, M. and T., 43, and Grotius: “Hi aoristi sine designacione temporis signifi- cant quid fieri solet, pro quo et præsems saepe usurpatur”. The work undergone by the fruitless branch is described in these six verbs, ἄρει ver. 2, ἠλθη, ἔπραπτεν, συνάγουσιν, βάλλουσιν, κατείσαι, and each detail is thus given for the sake of emphasising the inevitability and the completeness of the destruction. ἠλθη ἦσα ὑμῖν τὸ κλῆμα, “is cast out,” i.e., from the vineyard, as the next words show; here this means hopeless rejection. The result is ἔπραπτεν, the natural capacity for fruit-bearing is destroyed. The figure derived from the treatment of the fruitless branch is continued in συνάγουσιν... κατείσαι, cf. Mt. xiii. 49, 50; and 41, 42. On κατείσαι, Euthymius remarks οὐ μὴν κατακαιόνται “but are not consumed”. And in Exod. iii. 2, the bush κατείσαι, but οὐ κατακαίεται “burns, but was not consumed”. 

But this only shows that without the
miraculous interposition it would have been consumed.—Ver. 7. From the fate of those who do not abide in Him, Jesus turns to the results of faithful adherence—καὶ ἐγκατέστη ὅμως. The expression is altered from that of vv. 3 and 5, instead of “and I in you,” we now have “and my words abide in you”; it is by means of His teaching and His commandments that Christ abides in His people, and by His word they are fitted for fruit-bearing, ver. 5. Not that His words are a substitute for His personal presence, but its medium. But His presence is not to energise in them as if they were machines; they are to consider the exigencies that arise, and, giving play to judgment and conscience, are to ask for appropriate manifestations of grace: δὲ ἐὰν θέλητε αὐτῆσθαι, “ask what ye will”. Petitions thus prompted by the indwelling word of Christ will necessarily be answered: καὶ γενήσεται ὅμως.—Ver. 8. Further assurance of an answer is given in the fact that the γεννησθαι is glorified in the fruit-bearing branches: ἐν τούτων, “in this pre-eminently,” i.e., in your bearing much fruit, cf. vi. 29, 30, 40. So, rightly, Weiss and Holtzmann. For construction on see Burton on Subject, Pre- dictate and Appositive clauses introduced by οὖν.—ἐδοξάζῃ δὲ πατὴρ μου, Ἰησοῦς, etc. ἐδοξάζῃ, proleptic; cf. xiii. 31. The Father is glorified in everything which demonstrates that through Christ His grace reaches and governs men.—καὶ γενήσεται ἐστὶν ὁμοιασθαι, “and ye shall become my disciples”. The ἐστὶν ἁμαρτάνει seems to mean: This is the relation you will hold to me, viz., that of discipleship. “A Christian never ‘is,’ but always ‘is becoming’ a Christian. And it is by his fruitfulness that he indicates his claim to the name.” Westcott. Vv. 9-17. The disciples are urged to fulfil Christ’s purposes in the world, and are assured that if they abide in the love of Christ they will receive all they need for fruit-bearing.—Ver. 9. Καὶ ἐγκαταστάσει ὅμως . . . ἐόμως. Love is the true bond which gives unity to the moral world, and inspires discipleship. All that Christ experiences is the result of the Father’s love; that all the disciples are called to be and to do is the outcome of Christ’s love. This love of Christ was to be retained as their possession by their conforming themselves to it: μειναῖοι ἐν τῷ ἀγάπῃ τῷ ἐμῷ, “abide in my love,” no longer “abide in me,” but specifically “in my love”. Abide in it, for there is a possibility of your falling away from its enjoyment and possession.—Ver. 10. That possibility is defeated, ἐὰν τὰς ἐντολὰς μονὰς τηρήσετε. To encourage them in keeping His commandments He reminds them that He also has been subject to the same conditions, and by keeping the Father’s commandments has remained in His love.—Ver. 11. The great joy of His life had been found in the consciousness of the Father’s love and in the keeping of His commandments: this joy He desires that they may inherit, ταῦτα λελάλκα ὅμως ἐνα ἡ χαρὰ ἡ λάλησεν ὅμως μειναίοι, “my joy,” i.e., the joy I have enjoyed, the joy which I habitually feel in accomplishing the Father’s will. This joy is not an incommunicable monopoly. —καὶ ἡ χαρὰ ὅμως πληρωθῇ, “and your joy be full,” which it could not be until they, like Him, had the spring of full joy in the consciousness of His love, and perfect obedience to Him; standing in
the same relation to Him as He to the Father.—Ver. 12. And that they might know definitely what His commandment (ver. 10) is, He said, αὐτῷ... ὑμῖν. "This is my commandment, that ye love one another as I have loved you." Perhaps they expected minute, detailed instructions such as they had received when first sent out (Matt. x.). Instead of this, love was to be their sufficient guide. καὶ ἀγάπην ἔχεσθε.—His love was at once the source and the measure of theirs. In His love for them they were to find the spring of love to one another, and were to become transparencies through which His love would shine.—Ver. 13. And that they might not underrate the measure of this exemplary love, He says, μείζονα ταύτης ἄγαπην... αὐτῷ. Ταύτης is explained by ἵνα... αὐτῷ as in ver. 8; and does not directly mean "than this which I have shown and still show," as understood by Westcott and White-law. It is a general statement, the application of which is suggested in ver. 14. Self-sacrifice is the high water mark of love. Friends can demand nothing more: there is no more that love can do to exhibit devotedness to friends, cf. Rom. v. 8, 10.—Ver. 14. Then comes the application: ὑμῖν... ὑμῖν. "Ye are my friends, if ye do what I command you." You may expect of me this greatest demonstration of love, and therefore every minor demonstration of it which your circumstances may require, "if ye do," etc. This condition was added not to chill and daunt, but to encourage: when you find how much suffering the completion of my work entails upon you, assure yourselves of my love. It is copartnery in work that will give you assurance that you are my friends.—Ver. 15. "Friends" who may expect all the good offices of their Friend, not "slaves," is the character in which alone you can carry on my work: ὑμῖν ὑμᾶς λέγω δούλους... ὑμῖν. The designation "slave" is no longer (οὖσα) appropriate, cf. xiii. 16 and Jas. i. 1, Phil. i. 1, etc. It is not appropriate, because ὅθος οὐκ οἶδε τι ποιεῖ αὐτῷ ὁ κύριος: ὑμᾶς δὲ εἴρηκα δούλους, ὅτι πάντα ἢ ήκουσα καὶ πάρο τοῦ πατρὸς μου, ἐγνώρισα ὑμῖν. k. xiii. 26, etc. Other remarkable passages on God's calling the Israelites "friends" are also cited by him in loc. For the peculiar use of εἴρηκα, cf. x. 35 and 1 Cor. xii. 3; and for parallels in the classics, see Rose's Parkhurst's Lexicon. δόθη... ήκουσα παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς μου, ἐγνώρισα ὑμῖν. Jesus had opened to them the mind of the Father in sending Him to the world, and as this purpose of the Father had commended itself to Jesus, and fired Him with the desire to fulfil it, so does He expect that the disciples will intelligently enter into His purposes, make them their own, and spend themselves on their fulfilment.—Ver. 16. ὑμῖν... ὑμῖν. This is added to encourage them in taking up and prosecuting the work of Jesus. Euthymius says it is ἄλλη τεκμηρίων τοῦ ἵδικην ἀυτοῦ δολον ἐκνητόν; but it is more. They are invited to depend on His will, not on their own. They had not discovered Him, and attached themselves to Him, as likely to suit their purposes. "It is not ye who chose me," But "I chose you," as a king selects his officers, to fulfil my purposes. καὶ θηκα ὑμᾶς, "and I set (or, appointed) you," cf. x. 28, Acts xx. 28, etc., see Con-
cordance. The purpose of the appointment is ἵνα ὑμεῖς ὠφελήσητε, "that you may go away from me on your various missions, and thus (resuming the original figure of the vine and branches) καρπων, ποιμενί, may bear fruit in my stead, and supplied by my life. Or to express this purpose in a manner which reveals the source of their power to bear fruit, ἵνα δὲ νὴν αὐτήμαστα . . . ὦν, see ver. 7, and xiv. 13.—Ver. 17. ταῦτα ἐνταλματος ἡμῖν. "These things" which I have now spoken "I enjoin upon you," ἵνα ἀγαπήσητε ἀλλήλων, "in order that ye may love one another".

Vv. 18-25. The relation of the disciples to the world.—Ver. 18. Εἰ δὲ κόσμος . . . μακροχρόνους. "If the world hates you," as it does (indicative),"the world"is contrasted with "one another" of ver. 17, with the disciples who were to love. γινώσκετε, "ye know, or, if it be taken as an imperative, "know ye," that it has hated me, πρῶτον ὑμᾶς, "before you," and, as in l. 15 where also the superlative is found, not only "before" in point of time, but as the norm or prototype.—Ver. 19. εἰ δὲ . . . ἐφελθέν, "If ye were of the world, the world would love [that which is] its own"; not always the case, but generally. διὸ δὲ . . . κόσμος, "but because ye are not of the world," do not belong to it, and are not morally identified with it, "but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hates you". So that the hatred of the world, instead of being depressing, should be exhilarating, as being an evidence and guarantee that they have been chosen by Christ.—Ver. 20. μημοιουσατο τοῦ λόγου . . . ἀυτῶν. μημοιουσατο (from μημοιούμενον, mindful), "be mindful of," sometimes used pregnantly, as in 1 Thess. i. 3; Gal. ii. 10; "the words which I said to you," vis., in xiii. 16, and Mt. x. 24, 25. The outcome of the principle is seen in 2 Tim. ii. 11, and 1 Peter iv. 13. That He should speak of them as "servants" so shortly after calling them "friends," shows how natural and appropriate both designations are, how truly service characterises His friends, and how He must at all times be looked upon as Supreme Lord. εἰ δέ ἐλθήσω . . . τηρήσουσιν. "If they persecuted me, you also will they persecute; if they kept my word, yours too will they keep." In so far as they are identified with Him, their experience will be identical with His. The attitude of the world does not alter. Bengel takes ἐτηρησων in a hostile sense, "infinens modis observare," referring to Mt. xxvii. 36, but in John ὁ λόγος ἐτηρεως is regularly used of "observing" in the sense of "practising," see viii. 51, ix. 16, xiv. 23; 1 John ii. 3, 4, 5, etc.; Apoc. i. 3, iii. 8, etc.—Ver. 21. ἄλλα. "But" be not dismayed at persecution, for "all these things they will do to you for my name's sake." ταῦτα τὰ ταύτα seems to involve that details had been given (cf. Mt. x. 16 ff.) which were omitted by the reporter; or that xvi. 2 had been already uttered; or that John, writing when the persecutions of the Christians were well known, uses "all these things" from his own point of view. διὰ τὸ δομα μον. The efficacy of this consolation appears everywhere in the Apostolic age; Acts v. 41; Phil. i. 29, and cf. Ramsay's Church in the Roman Empire. The "name" of Christ was hateful to the world, διὰ τοῦ οὐκ οἴδατο τὸν σέματα μον. They did not believe He was sent, because they did not know the sender. Had they known God, they would have recognised Christ as sent by Him. Cf. vii. 23, v. 38, εἰ μὴ ἡλέθω . . . ἀυτῶν.—Ver. 22. "If I had not come and spoken to them," as the revealer of the Father, "they would not have sin," they would still be ignorant of the Father, but would not have incurred the guilt which attaches to ignorance maintained in the presence of light. ἐξείν ἐμπρος ἐστίν Ἰωάννης, see ver. 24;
18—27.  

Ye files per iη της ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν. 23. ὁ ἐμὲ μην, καὶ τὸν πατέρα μου, μοι. 24. εἰ τὰ ἐργὰ μὴ ἐποίησαν ἐν αὐτῶν, ᾧ δόθηκεν ἀλλος παππάκα τῇ διὸ, καὶ μεμιζ—ς xiv. 9. καὶ ἐμὲ καὶ τὸν πατέρα μου: 25. ἀλλ’ ἵνα πληρωθῇ ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀμαρτίας ἐν τῷ ὔμοι αὐτῶν, ἵνα ἐμοι ἔμαθήναι με δωρεάν.' 26. i. xiv. 4. ὁταν ἔλθῃ ὁ παράκλητος, ὃν ἔγω πέμψαμεν ἀμφὶ παρὰ τοῦ πατρός, εἰς ἐν αὐτῷ τον πνεύμα τῆς ἀληθείας, το παρὰ τοῦ πατρός ἐκπορευέται, εἰκόνος τῆς ἀρχῆς εἰς ἑαυτόν, μαρτυρήσῃ περὶ ἐμοῦ, 27. καὶ ὡς μαρτυρεῖται, ὅτι ἀν ἄρχης εἰς τιμήν μετ’ ἐμοὶ ἔστω.

1 εἰς τινα in ΝΒ; εἰς in AD

xix. 11; i. John i. 8. τὸ δὲ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ἐξοστρεφάλην περὶ τῆς ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν. "But now," as I have come, "they have no excuse for," etc., πρόσωπον, e. Ps. cxii. 4: "Incline not my heart προσώπου αὐτῶν ἐν ἀμαρτίας."—Ver. 23. In hating me, they hate my Father whom I represent, ὁ ἐμὲ μην... δόθηκεν. In hating and persecuting me, it is God they hate.—Ver. 24. εἰ τὰ ἐργὰ... ἐποίησαν. This repeats in a slightly varied form the statement of ver. 22. He had not only come and spoken, but had done works which none other had done, cf. iii. 2; ix. 32; vii. 31. The miracles wrought by Christ were themselves of a kind fitted to produce faith. In them men were meant to see God, v. 17, 19, 20. So that He could say, τὸν δὲ καὶ ὑπάρχας... μοι. This is their guilt, that they have both seen and hated both me and my Father. This does not imply that they had been conscious of seeing the Father in Christ, but only that in point of fact they had done so. Cf. xiv. 9; i. 18.—Ver. 25. This almost incredible blindness and obduracy is accounted for, as in xii. 37, by the purpose of God disclosed in O.T. Scripture. "Their law" is here, as in x. 34, etc., used of O.T. Scripture as a whole, as אבות is inserted, as ἀμαρτήσας in viii. 17, to suggest that the very Scripture in which they had prided themselves would condemn them; see also v. 45, v. 39. The words ἐμοί οὖν με δωρεάν do not occur in O.T.; but similar expressions are found in Ps. xxxiv. 19, 20 μηκοῦς με δωρεάν, and ev. iii. 8 ἐπολεύμαζαν με δωρεάν. Entirely gratuitous was their hatred and rejection of Christ, so that they were inexcusable.

Ver. 26—xvi. 11. The conquest of the world by the Spirit.—Ver. 26. But the work of the Apostles was not to be wholly fruitless, nor was their experience to be wholly comprised in fruitless persecution. ὁταν δὲ ἔλθῃ... περὶ ἐμοῦ. The Spirit of Truth will witness concerning me. The Spirit is here designated, as in xiv. 16, "the Paraclete," and the Spirit of Truth. There, and in xiv. 26, it is the Father who is to give and send Him in Christ's name: here it is ὁ γὰρ πέμψαμεν... παρὰ τοῦ πατρός, as if the Spirit were not only dwelling with the Father, but could only be sent out from the Father as the source of the sending. This is still further emphasised in the added clause, δὲ παρὰ τοῦ πατρός ἐκπορευέται. To define the mode of being of the Spirit, or His essential relation to the Father, would have been quite out of place in the circumstances. These words must be understood of the mission of the Spirit. What the disciples needed to know was that He came out from the Father, and of this they are here assured. εἰκόνος μαρτυρεῖται περὶ ἐμοῦ, "He," that person thus elaborately described, who is truth and who comes out from Him who sent me, "will witness concerning me."—Ver. 27. καὶ ὡς μαρτυρεῖται, "and do ye also witness," or, if indicative, "and ye are also witness". Most prefer the indicative. "The disciples were already the witnesses which they were to be in the future." Mey. This agrees with the ἡσυχαστά following. They were able to act as witnesses ἐν τῶν ἀρχῶν μετ’ ἐμοὶ ἔστω, "because from the beginning," of the Messianic activity, "ye are with me," The present, ἡσυχαστά, is natural as Jesus is looking at their entire fellowship with Him, and that was still continuing. Cf. Mk. iii. 14, ἐκοίμησα διδάσκαλον, ἦν ὅσι μητέρα ἄντων; also Acts ii. 21, iv. 13.—CHAP. XVI. VER. 1. Τέωνα λεπάλασα ὄμως. I have warned you of persecution, and have told you of the encouragements you will have, ἧν μὴ σκανδαλίζητε, "that ye be not
staggered," or stumbled, i.e., that the troubles that fall upon you may not induce you to apostatise. See Thayer and Parkhurst, and Wetstein on Mt. v. 29. Cf. also Mt. xi. 6.—Ver. 2. ἀνοσούν-
αγόνοι τοιούτου ὄμοι. For the word ἀνοσούν. see ix. 22, xii. 42; "they will put you out of their synagogues," they will make you outcasts from their syna-
gogues. ἀλλ' "yes," or "yea more"
used in this sense Rom. vii. 7, 2 Cor. vii. 11, where it occurs six times. Cf. Acts
xii. 2.—ἔρχεται . . . ἔρχεται ἃ 
τα. Cf. xii. 23, ἅλλων ἢ ἃ ἃ τα... and Burton, Moods and Tenses, 216, on the complementary limitation by ἃ τα of nouns signifying set time, etc. And for
πάσας ἀνοσούν, the aorist indicating those "who once do the act the single
doing of which is the mark of the class," see Burton, 124, cf. 148.—δέθη λατρείαν
προσφέρειν, "may think that he offers sacrificial service". Λατρεία is used in
Exod. xii. 25, etc., of the Passover; apparently used in a more general sense in
I Macc. ii. 19, 22; and defined by Suicer "quicquid fit in honorem et
cultum Dei," and by Théophylact as ἑθαρροτον ἐργον, a work well pleasing
to God. Cf. Rom. xii. 1. Meyer and others quote the "Babian" or "Hebrew" 
fanaticism, "Omnis effusandis sanguinum improborum aequalis est illi qui sacri-
ficium facit."—Ver. 3. This fanatical blindness is traced to its source, as in
xv. 21, to their ignorance of God and of
Christ: καὶ ταῦτα . . . ἰδίων. And He
forewarns them that they might not be taken unawares.—Ver. 4. ἄλλα ταῦτα
. . . ὀμοί. This repeats ver. 1, but He
now adds an explanation of His silence up to this time regarding their future:
ταῦτα δὲ ὀμοί . . . ἰδίων. Ἐὰν ἀρχής ἦν ἀρχήν:
of xv. 27, Holtzmann. If there is
a difference, Ἐἀρχή indicates rather
the point of time (cf. its only other occurrence, vi. 64) while ἀρχή indicates continuity. The fact of the silence has been disputed: but no
definite and full intimations have hitherto
been given of the future experience of the Apostles, as representing an absent
Lord. The reason of His silence was
ὅτι μὲν ὄμοι ἦμαν, "because I was with
you". While He was with them they
leaned upon Him and could not apprehend
a time of weakness and of persecution. See Mt. ix. 15.—Ver. 5. νῦν δὲ,
"but now," in contrast to ἦν ἀρχήν, ἦπάνας; "I go away," in contrast to μὲν ὄμοιν ἦμαν, πρὸς . . . μα, "to Him that sent
me," as one who has discharged the duty
committed to Him. καὶ οὔτως ἐν ὄμοιν . . . ὀπέπει, "and no one of you asks me,
Where are you going?" They were so absorbed in the thought of His
departure and its consequences of bereave-
mament to themselves that they had failed
to ascertain clearly where He was going.
ἀλλ' ὅτι . . . καρδίαι. The consequence
of their absorption in one aspect of the
crisis which He had been explaining to
them was that grief had filled their heart
to the exclusion of every other feeling.
Cf. xiv. 28.—Ver. 7. ἄλλα ἐργα . . . ἀναγινώ
σθαι, "convict the world". Reprove," reprobare, to reprove or refute, as in Henry VI., iii., l. 49, "Reprove my
allegation if you can," is no longer used in this sense. The verb ἀνέδειξε expresses the idea of pressing home a conviction. The object of this work of the Spirit is "the world" as opposed to Christ; and the subjects regarding which (περὶ) the convictions are to be wrought are "sin, righteousness and judgment". Regarding these three great spiritual facts, new ideas are to be borne in upon the human mind by the spirit.—Ver. 9. In detail, new convictions περὶ ἀμαρτίας are to be wrought, ὥστε στὶς πιστεύοντος ἐν ἐμέ. Each of the three clauses introduced by διὰ is in apposition with the foregoing substantive, and is explanatory of the ground of the conviction, "Concerning sin, because they do not believe on me". Unbelief will be apprehended to be sin. The world sins "because" it does not believe in Christ, i.e., the world sins inasmuch as it is unbelieving, cf. iii. 18, 19, 36; xv. 22. περὶ δικαιοσύνης διὰ . . . "And concerning righteousness, because I go to my Father and ye see me no longer." The world will see in the exaltation of Christ proof of His righteousness [δικαιούνται γὰρ γνώρισεν τὸ παρείσονσι πρὸς τὸν θεόν καὶ συνε- ναί αὐτῷ, Εὐθυμίους] and will accordingly cherish new convictions regarding righteousness. The difference ὥστε ἐν ἐμέ is added to exhibit more clearly that it was a spiritual and heavenly life He entered upon in going to the Father; and possibly to remind them that the invisibility which they lamented was the evidence of His victory.—Ver. 11. περὶ δὲ κρίσεως, "and concerning judgment (between sin and righteousness, and between Christ and the prince of this world, xii. 31, xiv. 30), because the ruler of this world has been judged," or "is judged". The distinction between sin and righteousness was, under the Spirit's teaching, to become absolute. In the crucifixion of Christ the influences which move worldly men—δὲ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου—were finally condemned. The fact that worldliness, blindness to the spiritually excellent, led to that treatment of Christ, is its condemnation. The world, the prince of it, is "judged". To adhere to it rather than to Christ is to cling to a doomed cause, a sinking ship.

Vv. 12-15. The Spirit will complete the teaching of Jesus.—Ver. 12. "Ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ πάση ἐν ἸΗΣΟΥΝ, possibly originating in the common occurrence of ἀνέδειξε with dative in Sept., see Ps. xxv. 5.
So only could He glorify Christ. Not by taking the Church beyond Christ, but by fully exhibiting the fulness of Christ, does He fulfill His mission.—Ver. 15. There is no need that the Spirit go beyond Christ and no possibility He should do so, because we shall hear the Father and shall know all things whatsoever the Father has are mine,” cf. xvii. 10 and xiii. 3; 1 Cor. xv. 24-28; Heb. ii. 8. The Messianic reign involved that Christ should be truly supreme and have all things said at His disposal. So that when He said that the Spirit would take of that which was His, that was equivalent to saying that the Spirit had the unlimited fulness of the Godhead to draw upon.

Vv. 16-22. "The sorrow occasioned by Christ's departure turned into joy at His return."—Ver. 16. "Meanwhile He shall glorify me." The Spirit's fulness of promise is found in every action and word of the Apostles. Under the Spirit's guidance they lived wholly for Christ: the dispensation of the Spirit was the Christian dispensation. This is further explained in "et in toto erou λήφεται..." because He shall take of that which is mine, and declare it unto you." The Spirit draws from no other source of information or inspiration. It is always "out of that which is Christ's" He furnishes the Church.

λαλήσει...φων, "for He shall not speak from Himself, but whatever He shall have heard He will speak, and the things that are coming He will announce to you". This is the guarantee of the truth of the Spirit's teaching, as of Christ's, vii. 17, xiv. 10. What the Father tells Him, He will utter. Particularly, "καὶ ἐρχόμενα ἀναγγέλλων ἡμῖν," "the things that are coming He will declare to you". "καὶ ἐρχόμενα" means "the things that are now coming," not "the things which at any future stage of the Church's history may come". It might include the events of the succeeding day, but in this case ἀναγγέλλω could not be used; for although these events might require to be explained, they did not need to be "announced". The promise must therefore refer to the main features of the new Christian dispensation. The Spirit would guide them in that new economy in which they would no longer have the visible example and help and counsel of their Master. It is not a promise that they should be able to predict the future. ["Maxime huc spectat apocalypsis, scripta per Johannem." Bengel.] In enabling them to adapt themselves to the new economy the centre and norm would be Christ.—Ver. 14. "ἐκείνως ἐμὲ δέχεσθαι," "He will glorify me". The fulfilment of this promise is found in every action and word of the Apostles. Under the Spirit's guidance they lived wholly for Christ: the dispensation of the Spirit was the Christian dispensation. This is further explained in "et in toto erou λήφεται..." because He shall take of that which is mine, and declare it unto you." The Spirit draws from no other source of information or inspiration. It is always "out of that which is Christ's" He furnishes the Church.
μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ. A pause is implied; during which some of the disciples (τοὺς understood, as in vii. 40; see Simcox, Gram. of N.T., p. 64) expressed to one another their bewilderment. They were alarmed, but could not attach their alarm to any definite object of dread.—Ver. 19. Jesus, perceiving their embarrassment, and that they wished to interrogate Him—στις ἀκούεις αὐτὸν ἄρωμα—said to them: Περὶ τοῦτον ... "Are you inquiring among yourselves—μετὰ ἄλληλοιν, not as in ver. 17, πρὸς ἄλληλον, "about this that I said," etc.? —Ver. 20. ἀμήν ... δει κλαίσετε ὑμεῖς; δει κλαίσετε ὑμεῖς: ye shall weep and lament": δει κλαίσετε ὑμεῖς is commonly used of lamentation for the dead, as in Jer. xxii. 10, μη κλαίσετε τὸν τεθνηκότα, μηδὲ δει κλαίσετε αὐτὸν; 2 Sam. i. 17; Mt. xi. 17; Lk. vii. 32. Here it is weeping and lamentation for the dead that is meant. δὲ κόσμος χαρῆται, but while you mourn, the world shall rejoice, as achieving its purpose in it: the world’s enemy. υμεῖς δὲ λυπηθήσεσθε, "and ye shall be sorrow-stricken, but your sorrow shall become joy". Cf. ἀκροβολοῦσα εἰς χαράν, Esth. ix. 22, and especially xx. 20, ἔχαρησαν οἱ μαθηταὶ ἰδόντες τὸν Κύριον.—Ver. 21. He adds an illustration of the manner in which anxiety and dread pass into joy: ἡ γυνὴ ... “the woman,” the article is generic, cf. δὲ θεόλογος, xv. 15, Meyer, δὲν τίκτηρ, “when she brings forth,” λύπην ... αὐτής, “hath sorrow because her hour”—the critical or appointed time of her delivery—"is come". The woman in travail is the common figure for terror-stricken anguish in O.T.: Ps. xlviii. 6; Jer. iv. 31; vi. 24, etc. δὲ γεννησάτο τὸ παιδίον ... "but when the child is born, she no longer remembers the distress, for the joy that a man is born into the world": "The comparison, so far as explicitly used by our Lord in ver. 22, extends only to the sudden replacement of sorrow with joy in both cases. But a comparison of Is. lxvi. 7-9, Hos. xiii. 13, and other O.T. passages, in which the resurrection of a new Israel is likened to a difficult and painful birth, warrants the extension of the metaphor to the actual birth of the N.T. church in the resurrection of Christ. Cf. Holtzmann.—Ver. 22. καὶ ὑμεῖς ... υμῶν, "and you accordingly," in keeping with this natural arrangement conspicuous in the woman’s case, "have at present sorrow". This is the time when the results are hidden and only the pain felt: "but I will see you again and your heart shall rejoice and your joy no one takes from you". This joy was felt in the renewed vision of their Lord at the Resurrection. "All turns on the Resurrection without the experiences of that time there would have been no beholding Christ in the Spirit." Bernard.

Vv. 23-28. Future accessibility of the Father.—Ver. 23. καὶ ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, "and in that day" of the Resurrection and the dispensation it introduces, see xiv. 20, in contrast to this present time when you wish to ask me questions, ver. 19, "ye shall not put any questions to me". Cf. xxi. 12. He was no longer the familiar friend and visible teacher to whom at any moment they might turn. But though this accustomed intercourse terminated, it was only that they might learn a more direct communion with the
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ektein tis hmera emi oik ewrhtseste othein. 'Armpn amypn l eyw emi, 
geta en aithte e to patre en tis doymati mou, boste emi.1

p ii. 10. Mt. 24. 3 de to brei oik eymate othein en tis doymati mou. 4 aiteite, kal
21. 12.
q Mt. vii. 7. lyeose, ena h xara emi, tis penlbrahim. 25. taute en "papromia"
ii. 7-10.
ria, lella lamiai dmi: alli ekrtei evoi 5. eti oik eti en papromia
ver. 29.
Eccles. xlii. 17. Cp. Hatch, 26. en ekeini tis hmera en tis doymati mou aithte e:
Prov. 1. 
alhres dmi, alli "parfisi peri to patre apagagel" dmi.
6. 60.

1 v. 25.
"patei filei emi, eti omiai emi epafelhke, kal penoitekate eti
u. 24.

1 Doesi evoi before en to omerati mou in ABC*. LX. T. R. in AC'D, it. vulg. Cp.
xiv. 13, 14.

2 For the anaygelifo of EGH anaygelifo is read in ABC*D, while N reads
anaygelifo.

Father: amypn . . . boste orin. The
connection is somewhat obscure. The
words may either be taken in connection
with those immediately preceding, in
which case they intimate that the infor-
mation they can no longer get from a
present Christ they will receive from the
Father: or they may begin a distinct
paragraph and introduce a fresh subject,
the certainty of prayer being heard.—
Ver. 24. evap ari oik eymate othein en t.
... "Until now ye have asked nothing
in my name." They had not yet realised
that it was through Christ and on the
lines of His work all God’s activity
among man and all man’s prayer to
God were to proceed.—aiteite . . .
penlbrahim, "ask and ye shall receive,
that your joy may be full," or "fulfilled," or
"completed". The joy they were to
experience on seeing their Lord
again, ver. 22, was to be completed by
their continued experience of the
efficacy of His name in prayer. Prayer
must have been rather hindered by
the visible presence of a sufficient
helper, but henceforth it was to be the
medium of communication between the
disciples and the source of spiritual
power.—Ver. 25. Another great change
would characterise the economy into
which they were passing. Instead of
dark figurative utterances which only
dimly revealed things spiritual, direct
and intelligible disclosures regarding the
Father would be made to the disciples:
taute en papromia . . . omiai. par-
omia. See x. 6; "dark sayings" or
"riddles" expresses what is here meant.
It is opposed to parfisi, open, plain,
easily intelligible, meant to be under-
stood. He does not refer to particular
utterances, such as xv. 1, xvi. 21, etc.,
but to the reserved character of the
whole evening’s conversation, and of all
His previous teaching. “The promise
is that the reserve imposed by a yet un-
finished history, by a manifestation in
the flesh, by the incapacity of the hearers,
and by their gradual education, will then
be succeeded by clear, full, unrestricted
information, fitted to create in those who
receive it that ‘full assurance of under-
standing’ which contributes so largely to
the ‘full assurance of faith’.” Bernard.
pari tou patre, the Father is the
central theme of Christ’s teaching, both
while on earth and above.—Ver. 26. en
ektein tis hmera. “In that day,” in
which I shall tell you plainly of the
Father (ver. 25, ekrtei emi), “ye shall
ask in my name” ; this is the natural
consequence of their increased knowl-
dge of the Father. kal omiai . . . EU
kinoi. “And I do not say to you that I will ask
the Father concerning you”—pari, al-
most equivalent to σφη, here and in
Matt. xxvi. 28; x John iv. 10, “in re-
lation to,” almost “in behalf of”—(ver. 26)
“for the Father Himself loves you, be-
cause ye have loved me, and have
believed that I came forth from God”.
The intention of the statement is to
convey fuller assurance that their prayers
will be answered. The Father’s love
needs no prompting. Yet the interces-
sion of Christ, so emphatically present-
ed in the Epistle to the Hebrews and in
Rom. viii. 34, is not ignored. Jesus says:
“I do not base the expectation of answer
solely on my intercession, but on the Fa-
ther’s love, a love which itself is quick-
ened and evoked by your love for me”.
“I do not say that I will ask” means
“I do not press this,” “I do not bring
this forward as the sole reason why you
**EUAGGELION**

24—33.

gω *(pará tov θεοῦ*) 28. ἐξῆλθον *(pará tov patrâs,* 2 ν See cit. καὶ ἡλιθα αἰς τὸν κόσμον· πάλιν *(afými tov kósmou, kai wiv. 3. πορεύμαθα πρὸς τὸν πατέρα."

29. Ἀγοῦσιν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτῷ, "ἳδε νῦν παρρησία λαλεῖς, καὶ παροιμίαι οὐδεμιᾶ ἔγινες. 30. νῦν οἴδαμεν ὅτι οἶδας πάντα, καὶ οὐ χρείαν ἔχαις ἵνα σε ἐρωτᾷ. "ἐν τούτῳ πιστεύεις ὅτι ἀπὸ Θεοῦ ἐξῆλθας." 31. Ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Ἀρτί πιστεύετε; 32. ἵδον, ἔρχεται ἡρα καὶ νῦν ἄλληθρος, ἵνα σκοπήσῃ θέτε ἑκατος εἰς τὰ δίκα, καὶ ἐμὸν ἄφητε· καὶ ὅσα εἰμί β. 12. καὶ γινώσκει· 33. τάτα λελάληκα ὑμῖν, ἵνα διαλυθήσηται. ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ Ἱλίσκω ἔφεσε· ἀλλὰ θαυμαστεῖ, ἐγὼ ἡ πενθίμα τῶν κόσμων."

1 παροσ is read by W.H.R. following Ν=BC*D. θεοῦ is found in Ν*AC* it vulg.
2 T.R. in ΝAC*, ek in BC*L 33. ek follows ἐξῆλθον in viii. 42; ἔκτε in ver. 30, xiii. 3, xvi. 30; ἄναρσ in ver. 27 and in xvii. 8. ek conveys the idea of origin, ἄναρσ of starting point, ἔκτε of the agency of the sender.
3 ev with ΝBCD nowhere else in John with λαλεῖν, but in Ep. μετὰ is used in Acts.
4 νῦν deleted by Tr. T. W. H. R. following ΝABC*D*L 33.
5 ἐγείρει in ΝΑΒCL, etc.

may expect to be heard ". The mediation of Christ has here its incidence at an earlier stage than in the Apostolic statements. The love of God is represented as intensified towards those who have accepted Christ as the revealer of the Father.—Ver. 28, ἐξῆλθον ... ἀναρσ. "I came forth from the Father and am come into the world; again (reversing the process) I leave the world and go to the Father." There is a sense in which any man can use these words, but it is a loose not an exact sense. The latter member of the sentence — "I leave the world and go to the Father"—gives us the interpretation of the former—"I came forth," etc. For to say "I leave the world" is not the same as to say "I go to the Father"; this second expression describes a state of existence which is entered upon when existence in this world is done. And to say "I came forth from the Father" is not the same as to say "I am come into the world"; it describes a state of existence antecedent to that which began by coming into the world.

Vv. 29-33. Last words.—Ver. 29. The Lord's last utterance, vv. 25-28, the disciples find much more explicit than his previous words: ἰδε νῦν παρρησία λαλεῖς, "Behold, now at length Thou speakest plainly," explicitly, καὶ παροιμίαι οὐδεμιὰ ἔγινες, and utterest no obscure saying," ver. 25. Almost universally νῦν, in vv. 29, 30, is understood to denote the present time in contrast to the future promised in ver. 25. As if the disciples meant: "Already Thou speakest plainly; we do not need to wait for that future time." It seems simpler to take it as signifying a contrast to the past time in which He had spoken in dark sayings.—Ver. 30. νῦν οἴδαμεν ... ἥρμον. The reference is to ver. 19, where they manifested dissatisfaction with the obscurity of His utterances. Here in ver. 30 two things are stated, that Jesus has perfect knowledge, οἴδαμεν πάντα, and that He knows how to communicate it, γινώσκει δὲ όνεις τις σὺ ἠρμον. Convinced that He possessed these qualifications, they felt constrained to accept Him as a teacher come from God, ἐν τούτῳ ("herein," or "by this," ἐν τούτῳ in modern Greek version) πιστεύεις δὲ ἀπὸ Θεοῦ ἐξῆλθας, cf. iii. 2.—Ver. 31. To this enthusiastic confession Jesus makes the sobering and pathetic reply: Ἀρτί πιστεύετε; Do ye now believe that I am God's Representative? Is this your present attitude? ἰδε, ἔρχεται ἡρα καὶ νῦν ἄλληθρος, "Behold, the hour is coming and is come," so imminent is it that the perfect may be used. ἵνα σκοπήσῃ ... ἐφαίνει. Cf. 1 Mac. vi. 54.
Chapter XVII.—Vv. 1-26. The closing prayer of Jesus ("precatio summis sacerdotis," Chytraeus). Vv. 1-5, with reference to Himself; vv. 6-19, for His disciples; vv. 20-26, for all who should afterwards believe on Him.—Ver. 1. Τά τετάρτην... καὶ ἐτέρα. The connection of διάλεγον with ἐτέρα by καὶ shows that the prayer followed immediately upon the discourse, and was, therefore, uttered in the hearing of the disciples. ὑπείρα... ὄφραν, so Χρον. xxi. 16. ἡρα τ. βαφ. Ps. cxxi. 1, and cxviii. 1. From ὄφραν it cannot be argued that they were in the open air.

“For the Auge des Geistes ist der freie Himmel überall.” Lücke. “The eye of one who prays is on all occasions raised toward heaven.” Meyer. Πάτερ, θλίψεως ἢ ἡμέρα, “Father,” the simplest and most intimate form of address, cf. xii. 41, xii. 27. “The hour is come,” i.e., the hour appointed for the glorification of the Son; cf. ii. 4, xii. 23. That this hour is meant is shown by the petition which follows: δοξαίον σου τὸν υἱὸν, “glorify Thy Son”: σου, in position of emphasis. This glorification embraced His death, resurrection, and session at God’s right hand, as accredited Mediator, cf. vii. 39, xii. 16, 23. But this glorification itself had an object, θανάτου αὐτῷ ἰσοτάξων... αἰώνιον. Only by Him being glorified could the Son give this eternal life, and so fulfill the commission with which He was entrusted. ἰσοτάξων ἰσοτάξων is explained in ver. 27, and the verses preceding: 1 Cor. i. 2. οἰκονομία σαρκός represents ποιμέν, Gen. vi. 12, Is. xi. 6, etc., and denotes the human race as possessed.
of a frail, terrestrial existence, lacking ζωὴν αἰωνίαν. Ίνα πάντα δὴ διδώκας αὐτῷ, the neuter, as in vi. 39, resolved into the individuals in αὐτῶν; and on the nominative absolute, see Buttman's N.T. Gram., 379; and Kypke in loc.—Ver. 3. αὐτὴ δὲ ἡ αἰώνιος ἡ ζωὴ Ἰνα ... On Ἰνα in this construction, see Burton, 213, and cf. xv. 8; ἵνα in iii. 19 is not quite equivalent. In Is. xxxvii. 20 God is designated ὁ Θεὸς μόνος, and in Exod. xxxiv. 6 ὁ Δεσπότης; cf. 2 Thess. i. 10. He is the only true God in contrast to many that are "called gods," 1 Cor. viii. 5, 6. But cf. especially I John v. 20. It was by making known to them this God, and thus glorifying the Father, that Christ "gave men eternal life." The life He gave consisted in and was maintained by this knowledge. But to the knowledge of the Father, the knowledge of "Him whom Thou didst send, Jesus Christ," was necessary, i. 18, iv. 6. As in i. 17, so here, Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν is the double name which became common in Apostolic times, and not (as Meyer and others) "an appellative predicate," "Jesus the Messiah." Whether Jesus' naming of Himself as a third person can be accounted for by the solemnity of the occasion ("der eriereiche Gebetstil," Lücke), or is to be ascribed to John, is much debated. Westcott seems justified in saying that "the use of the name 'Jesus Christ' by the Lord Himself at this time is in the highest degree unlikely. ... It is no derogation from the truthfulness of the record that St. John has thus given parenthetically, and in conventional language (so to speak), the substance of what the Lord said at greater length."—Ver. 4. ἔγετοصةτατοικτα. This is a fresh ground for the petition of ver. 1 renewed in ver. 5: "glorify Thou me." The ground is "I have glorified Thee on the earth; having finished (perfectly accomplished, cf. τεθεὶσαι of the cross) the work which Thou gavest me to do." But it is not the idea of reward that is prominent here, although that idea is found in Phil. ii. 6-11; Heb. ii. 9-11; v. 4-10; the immediate thought here is of the necessary progress which the hour demanded. There remained no longer any reason for His continuance on earth. He did not desire, and did not need, any prolongation of life below. Beyschlag's objection (N.T. Theol., i. 254) is therefore baseless, as also is Grotius' "ostendit, non iniquum se pere ter".—Ver. 5. καὶ πάντα διδαχθήσον. ... σοι. The precise character of the glorification He looks for is here presented. It is παρὰ σεαυτῷ, and it is a restoration to the glory He had enjoyed in ὁ παρὰ σοῦ εἶναι. By παρὰ σεαυτῷ it is rendered impossible to understand παρὰ σοι of an "ideal" pre-existence; because these two expressions are here equivalents, and Christ cannot be supposed to have prayed for an "ideal" glory when He asked that God would glorify Him παρὰ σεαυτῷ. "There is, consequently, here, as in vi. 52, viii. 58, a continuity of the consciousness of the historical Christ with the Logos." Tholuck. On this verse Beyschlag remarks (i. 254): "The possibility of such a position was first won by Jesus through His life and death on earth, so that, in point of fact, it forms the divine reward of that life and death; how then could He have possessed it realiter before the world was?" But the representation given by Paul in Phil. ii. is open to the same objection. Christ is represented as leaving a glory He originally enjoyed and returning to it when His work on earth was done and as the result of that work. The humanity was now to share in and to be in some way the organ of that divine glory; and this it could not be until it had been perfected by the experience of a human life. Wendt (Teaching of Jesus, ii. 169) says: "Ae-
cording to the mode of speech and conception prevalent in the N.T., a heavenly good, and so also a heavenly glory, can be conceived and spoken of as existing with God, and belonging to a person, not because this person already exists, and is invested with glory, but because the glory of God is in some way deposited and preserved for this person in heaven. The passages, however, on which he depends for this principle do not sustain it. Such expressions as i. 14, ii. 11, which indicate that already while on earth a divine glory was manifest in Christ, in no degree contradict but rather confirm such statements as the present.

Vv. 6-19. Prayer for the disciples.—Ver. 6. Ἐφανερώσα σοι τὸ δύναμα τούτων νους δεικνύως μοι ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου, σοὶ ζησέω, καὶ ἐμοὶ αὐτοίς δεικνύως καὶ τὸν λόγον σου διεπήρησα. 7. νῦν γίνειν ὅτι πάντα διὰ δεικνύως μοι, παρά σοι ὅστιν. 8. οὕτως καὶ αὐτοίς καὶ τοῖς πληθον, καὶ ἠκούσαν ἀληθῶς, ὅτι παρὰ σοῦ ἐξήλθον, καὶ ἐπιτεύχθησαν ὅτι σὺ με ἀπέστειλας. 9. ἐγὼ περί αὐτῶν ἐρωτεύομαι: οὖν περί τοῦ κόσμου ἐρωτεύομαι, ἄλλα περί ὑμᾶς δεικνύως μοι, σοὶ εἰσι. 10. καὶ τὰ ἐμα πάντα σα ἐστι, καὶ τὰ σα ἐμα καὶ δεικνύως των ἐμα.
ciples. In them it had been manifested that Christ was the messenger of God and had the words of eternal life.—Ver. 11. καὶ οὐκ έτι εἰμὶ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ. The circumstances necessitating the prayer are now stated. Jesus is no longer in the world, already He has bid farewell to it, but the disciples remain in it, exposed without His accustomed counsel and defence. ψάρτε ἡγίας. “Holy Father”; this unique designation is suggested by the Divine attribute which would naturally assert itself in defending from the world’s corruptions those who were exposed to them. τῷ οὖν κρίτῳ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ σου διδάσκας μοι, “preserve them in [the knowledge of] Thy name, which Thou gavest me”. ὅ is attracted into active by διδάσκας. This was the fundamental petition. The retention of the knowledge which Christ had imparted to them of the Father would effect οὐκ ένι ἐν καθὼς ἡμεῖς. Without harmony among themselves, so that they should exist as a manifest unity differentiated from the world, their witness would fail; xv. 8, 12. καθὼς ἡμεῖς is explained by xv. 9, 10.—Ver. 12. The protection now asked had been afforded by Christ so long as He was with the disciples. διὸ ημῖν μετ’ αὐτῶν, ἐγὼ ἔτηρον . . . “when I was with them, I kept them in Thy name which Thou hast given me; and I guarded them, and not one of them perished, but the son of perdition, that the Scripture might be fulfilled”. On the detail of educative care spent on the disciples, and covered by έτηρον, see Bernard, Central Teaching, p. 370. διὸ υἱὸς τῆς άπωλείας, cf. 2 Thess. ii. 3, in accordance with the usual Hebrew usage, the person identified with perdition, closely associated with it. Cf. Is. liii. 4; xxiii. 2; Mt. xxiii. 15. Raphael quotes from Herod- otus, viii., εἴκοσι úλων, with the remark, “nec Graecis plane ignorat esse locundí modus”. The Scripture referred to is Ps. xii. 10, as in xiii. 18.—Ver. 13. As He Himself goes to the Father, He utters this petition aloud, and while yet with the disciples—ταῦτα λαλῶ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ—that they might recognize that the power of God was engaged for their protection, and might thus have repeated and perfected in themselves the same joy with which Christ had overcome all the trials and fears of life. Cf. xv. 11, xvi. 24.—Ver. 14. ὡθεί διδάσκα . . . κόσμον. Additional reason for soliciting in behalf of the disciples the protection of the Father consists in this, that the world hates them because they have received the revelation of God in Christ, and are thereby separated from the world as their Teacher was not of the world. Cf. ver. 6.—Ver. 15. The simplest escape from the anger of the world was removal from it, but for this He would not ask: οὐκ ἐρωτε ἡμῖν ἡμῖν κρίτην αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ. They had a work to do which involved that they should be in the world. It also involved the fulfilment of the petition, ἢ τὴν ημᾶς αὐτῶν ἐκ τοῦ παρευρίσκομαι. Luther, Calvin, etc., take ποιεῖτο as neuter; recent interpreters in general consider it to be masculine, “from the evil one,” as in 1 John ii. 13, iv. 4, v. 18; cf. Mt. vi,
13. "The evil one" as the prince of this world and "a murderer from the beginning" (viii. 44) was the instigator of persecution.—Ver. 16. For τοῖς ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου ὁ διά τοῦ ἀνθρώπου—Ver. 17. But besides this negative qualification for representing Christ, they must possess also a positive equipment, ἀγάπην ἀντίθετον ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, which is implied in τίς ἐφθανές τῷ Πέτρῳ. τοῦ προφήτου. Ecclus. xlv. 4. "Consecrate them by thy truth." ἀγάπη is to render sacred, to set apart from profane uses; as in Exod. xiii 1, ἀγάπην ἔφθασεν πρὸς τῶν πρωτάστων; Exod. xx. 8, ἀγ. ἡμέραν; Exod. xxxvi. 37, ἀγάπης ἄνω τοῦ προφήτου μοι ἐν τῷ ἐνακτητῷ; Mt. xxiii. 17; Hebr. ix. 13. In x. 36 it is used of the Father's setting apart of Christ to His mission. Here it is similarly used of the setting apart or consecration of the disciples as Christ's representatives. Meyer includes their "equipment with Divine illumination, power, courage, joyfulness, love, inspiration, etc., for their official activity". Wetstein's definition is good; "Sanctificare est aligum eligere ad certum munus obeundum, eumque praeparare atque idoneum reddere." "The truth," as the element in which they now lived, was to be the efficient instrument of their consecration, cf. xiv. 16, xvi. 7-13; the truth specifically which became theirs through the revelation of the Father, ὁ λόγος ὁ σῶς ἀληθείᾳ ἐστιν, the word which is Thine, ver. 14, but here emphatically distinguished as being the Word of the Father and no other. The article is absent before ἀληθεία, as in iv. 24, because ἀληθεία is abstract. "Thy word is" not only "true" but "truth"—Ver. 18. καθὼς ἐστὶν ἀντίθετον... "As Thou didst send me into the world, I also sent them into the world." καθὼς seems to imply "in prosecution of the same purpose and therefore with similar equipment", εἰς τὸν κόσμον is not otiose, but suggests that as Christ's presence in the world was necessary for the fulfilment of God's purpose, so the sphere of the disciples' work is also "the world," cf. v. 15. ἀντίθετον, aorist, because already they had served as apostles, see iv. 38 and Mark iii. 14.—Ver. 19. The crowning plea is that it was for this end, their consecration, Jesus consecrated Himself: καὶ ἔθεσεν αὐτοῖς, and in their behalf, that they may be consecrated in truth, do I consecrate myself". "Ἀγάπη ἐν τῷ παρεκκλήσει τῷ ἑαυτοῦ can only be understood of Christ's self-consecration to His sacrificial death." Tholuck. ἐγὼ ἔκκοψομαι ἐν ἀληθείᾳ. Euthymius; so Meyer, Reynolds and others. This however is needlessly to limit the reference and to introduce an idea somewhat alien to this context and to x. 36. Calvin is right: "Porro sanctificatio haec quamvis ad totam Christi vitam pertineat, in sacris cultura tamen non maxime illustris futat". Ἰν... The object of Christ's consecration to His work was the severance of His disciples from the world and their inspiration with the same spirit of self-sacrifice and devotedness to sacred uses. ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, understood by the Greek commentators as "real" in contrast to what is symbolic, cf. iv. 23. Thus Euthymius, Ἰνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ὅσο τελευταίον ἐν ἀληθείᾳ θυσία, ἢ γὰρ νομικὴ θυσία τύπου ἢ ἄλλη θυσία... Discernit a sanctificatio. Melanchthon. Similarly Godet. Meyer renders "truly" and remarks: "As contrasted with every other ἀγάπης in human relations, that wrought through the Paraclete is the true consecration". But is it possible to neglect the reference to ἀληθεία ver. 19? As Lücke points out, John (3 John 3, 4) does not always distinguish between ἀληθεία and ἡ ἀληθεία. The object of Christ's consecration was to bring the truth by and in which the disciples might be consecrated—Ver. 20. Prayer for future believers. —Ver. 20. Ο ὁ πρεσβυτρὶς ἐκ ἐρωτοποιάτων... The consecration of the disciples and His sending them forth natu-
rally suggests the enlargement of the Church and of His care.—Ver. 21. For those who through their preaching believe on Him He prays that they may be one. Naturally the extension of the Church imperils its unity, the ενότητα τοῦ πνεύματος, Eph. iv. 3. "This unity is infinitely more than mere unanimity, since it rests upon unity of spirit and life." Tholuck. This unity of all believers finds its ideal in the unity of the Father and the Son: καθὼς σὺ, πάτερ κ. τ. λ., and not only its ideal but its unifying principle and element, εν ημίν. This unity of all believers is to result in the universal belief in Christ's mission, Ιησοῦς Κυρίου . . . ἀποστείλας.—Ver. 22. That the unity of believers in the Father and the Son might be perfect, it was needful that even the glory which Christ possessed by the Father's gift (ver. 5) should be given to Him in the measure of their capacity, v. 22; Tim. ii. 12, Rev. iii. 21.—Ver. 23. Τοῦτον of ver. 22 becomes in ver. 23 οὗ τετελειωμένον εἰς ἐννυ, "that they may be perfected into one". They are perfected by being wrought to a Divine unity. The work of Christ is accomplished when men are one by Christ dwelling in them. God is in Him, He is in each believer, and thus a true and final unity is formed. One result is the conviction wrought in the world, διὰ σοῦ με ἀποστείλας . . . ἡγάπησας. The mission of Christ and its results prove not only the Father's love of the Son but His love for men.—Ver. 24. Πάτερ, δικαιο, καὶ ὁ κόσμος σε αὐτός, ἐγώ δέ σε ἅγνωναν γίνωςατοί τὸ δόμα σου, καὶ γνωρίσω· ἦν οἱ ἡγάπησε, ἦν ἡγάπησες με, ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐγώ, κἀγὼ ἐν αὐτοῖς."
XVIII. 1. TAYTA eivwv δ' ἤσους ἐξήλθεν σὺν τοῖς μαθηταῖς autoi πέραν τοῦ χειμάρρου τῶν Καθών, ἵππω ὅν κῆπος, εἰς ὁν εἰσῆλθεν αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ μαθηταί αὐτῶς. 2. ἤθει δὲ καὶ Ιούδας, ὁ παραδίδωσιν αὐτῶν, τῶν τῶν · ὅτι πολλακῖς ἡ ἤσους ἐκεί μετά τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτῶν. 3. ὅ ὁν Ιούδας λαβὼν τὴν στειρᾶν, καὶ d vii. ἐκ τῶν ἄρχων καὶ Φαρισαίων ἀπετέρας, ἔρχεται ἐκεί μετὰ

1 τῶν Καθών in Μ-ΒCLXV, Orig. Chrys. Cytr.-Alex. Tr. W. H. R. [ep. 2 Sam. xv. 23]. τοῦ Καθόν in Δ Θ. τοῦ Καθόν in A(S)Δ, vet. lat. vulg. Meyer, Weiss, Holtzmann, who understand it as Συλβίον, a name frequently given to streams. “If the original reading was τοῦ Καθόν it is easy to understand how each of the two corruptions came to be substituted for it by copyists knowing only Greek.” Sanday.

ing δ', but to the second καλ, the effect being something like: “While the world knew Thee not, though I knew Thee, these on their part knew” . . . Similarly Westcott; “it serves to coordinate the two main clauses. . . . The force of it is as if we were to say: Two facts are equally true; it is true that the world knew Thee not; it is true that these knew that Thou didst send me.” May the καὶ not be intended to connect this clause with the preceding δ', . . . κυριακον, and to mark the contrast between the love that was in God before the foundation of the world and the world’s ignorance of Him, and especially of His love? But “I knew Thee and these knew,” etc. They did not know God directly as Christ did, but they knew they could accept Him as the Revealer of God. And to them who were willing to receive my message, because they knew I was sent by Thee, I made known Thy name and will make it more manifest by sending the Spirit of truth (Westcott). The end in view in this manifestation of Christ was that the love with which the Father had loved the Son might rest on the disciples. ἵνα δὲ γαίρην ἤγαγον μὲ. The construction is found in Eph. ii. 4, and is frequent in the classics; ἐκρίσει δὲ ἐκ τῆς Ὀλυμπίας, τῇ νίκῃ δὲ ἐκ τῆς Ἀριστοκράτου, Arrian.—See Kypke, κάμφων κατ' αὐτός. This is the end and crown of all. That He should desire this intimate communion with men, and should seek above all else to live in and through His disciples, is surprising proof of His love.

Chapter XVIII.—Friedrich Spitta (Zur Geschichte und Literatur des Urchristentums, i. 157 ff.) believes that the second section of this chapter has been accidentally dislocated, and that its original order was as follows: (1) 12, 13, Jesus is brought to Annas; (2) 19-23, He is examined before the high priest; (3) 24, 14, He is passed on to Caiaphas; (4) 15-18, 25-27, the triple denial of Peter; (5) 28, Jesus is sent to the Praetorium.

But this arrangement also has its difficulties. It requires us to suppose that Caiaphas had come to the house of Annas and conducted the examination recorded in 19-23, and that when it is said that Annas sent the prisoner to Caiaphas, after this examination, it is only meant that he sent Him to the house or palace of Caiaphas where the Sanhedrim sat.

Vv. 1-12. The arrest of Jesus.—Ver. 1. Having finished His prayer and His discourse, Jesus ἤλθεν, "went out" from the city, as is suggested by πέραν τοῦ χειμάρρου, "to the other side of the torrent," cf. vi. 1. χειμάρρος sc. χειμάρρος τοῦ ἄρθρου, a stream that flows in winter, a torrent; of Jabok, Gen. xxiv. 25; of the Kephron, "the Kidron," described in Henderson’s Palestine, 90. ἕπει τὴν κῆπον "where was a garden," in Mark xiv. 32, described as χαρα (a country place, or estate), and called Γαθεναγη. The owner was probably a friend of Jesus. Into this garden He went with His disciples.—Ver. 2. ἦ να δὲ καὶ Καθὼς. “And Judas also knew the place, because Jesus and His disciples had frequently assembled there” on previous visits to Jerusalem, Lk. xxi. 37. This is inserted to account for what follows, and to remind the reader of the voluntariness of the surrender. There was no attempt to escape or hide.—Ver. 3. ὅτι ἦνοικα Λαμπύν τὴν στειρᾶν καὶ . . . ὑπερετάτω κατείσις (Scria, anything rolled up or folded together), a Roman cohort (Polyb., xi. 23, 1) or tenth
part of a legion, and therefore containing about 600 men. The cohort denotes the garrison of the castle Antonia, which, during the Passover, was available to assist the Sanhedrin in maintaining order. Part of it was now used in case "the servants of the Sanhedrin," &c. to whom the apostle, should not prove sufficient. A considerable body of troops would obviate the risk of a popular rising, vii. 32-49, xii. 42; especially Mk. xiv. 2. They were furnished with φωνή καὶ λαμπαδίων καὶ ἰππῶν. φωνή was a link or torch, consisting of strips of resinous wood tied together, and in late Greek was used for λυγυρός, a lantern; λαμπάς was the open torch. See Rutherford's New Phryn., p. 131, and Wetstein. Both open lights and lanterns were in use in the Roman army, and would be at hand. "The soldiers rushed out of their tents with lanterns and torches." Dion. Hal., xi. 5. It was new moon, but it might be cloudy, and it would certainly be shady in the garden.—Ver. 4. Jesus, then, not with the boldness of ignorance, but with a visible act, "all that was coming upon Him," cf. Lk. xiv. 31, ἐρχόμενον ἐν αὐτόν, "went out" from the garden, or more probably, ver. 26, from the group of disciples, "and says, Whom seek ye?" to concentrate attention on Himself and prevent a general attack.—Ver. 5. Ἰησοῦς τῶν Ναζαρηνῶν "Jesus the Nazarene," cf. Acts xxiv. 5. Ναζαρηνός occurs Mk. xiv. 67, etc. ἐγώ εἰμι, "I am He." He had already been identified by Judas' kiss, Mt. xxvi. 47, but Jesus wished to declare Himself as one who did not fear identification. That the kiss was superfluous is, however, no proof that it was not given. Ἐπιτίθεμε δὲ καὶ Ιουδασσὸς τὸ παραδίδοντα αὐτῶν μετ' αὐτῶν. 6. Ὁς οὖν εἶσαι αὐτῶν, "Οτι ἐγώ εἰμι," ἀπῆλθον 8 iv. 26; viii. εἰς τὰ άρτιάν, καὶ ἔπεσον 1 2 χαμαί. 7. τὰλακνὶν αὐτῶν ἐπηρώθη g vi. 66; xx. τον, "Τίνα ἔστησεν;" Οἱ δὲ ἔπεσον, "Τίνος τῶν Ναζαρηνῶν." 8. Ἀπεκρίθη δ' Ἰησοῦς, "Εἶπον ὃμι, ἃ ἐγώ εἰμι. εἰ οὖν ἐμὲ ἔστησεν, ἐφεστηκαί τούτους υπάνειν." 9. ὁν πληρωθῇ δ' ὁ λόγος δυνατὸς τοῦ τίτων, καὶ ἔπεσεν, "Οτι ὁς δεδουλῶς μοι, ὁδ' ἀπόλεσα ἐξ αὐτῶν οὐδένα." xxi. 44; xii. 7. Acts v. 38, etc. xii. 16. "Τίνα ἔστησεν "Οτι ἐγώ εἰμι "Τίνος τῶν Ναζαρηνῶν." xii. 16. "Τίνα ἔστησεν "Οτι ἐγώ εἰμι "Τίνος τῶν Ναζαρηνῶν." xii. 16. "Τίνα ἔστησεν "Οτι ἐγώ εἰμι "Τίνος τῶν Ναζαρηνῶν." xii. 16. "Τίνα ἔστησεν "Οτι ἐγώ εἰμι "Τίνος τῶν Ναζαρηνῶν." xii. 16. "Τίνα ἔστησεν "Οτι ἐγώ εἰμι "Τίνα ἔστησεν "Οτι ἐγώ εἰμι "Τίνα ἔστησεν "Οτι ἐγώ εἰμι "Τίνα ἔστησεν "Οτι ἐγώ εἰμι "Τίνα ἔστησεν "Οτι ἐγώ εἰμι "Τίνα ἔστησεν "Οτι ἐγώ εἰμι "Τίνα ἔστησεν "Οτι ἐγώ εἰμι 
possible, as only the Sanhedrin officials would enter the garden, leaving the soldiers outside. ή μαχαίριν, ’having a sword,’ "pro more peregrinantium in iis locis," Grotius, and cf. Thucyd., i. 6; Luke xxii. 36. He struck τον τοῦ αρχιερέως δοῦλον. "the high priest's servant." The δοῦλος are distinguished from the ἐνθρεία, ver. 18. John, being acquainted with the high priest's household, both identified the man and knew his name, which was a common one, see Wetstein, and cf. Neh. x. 41; also, Porphyry, Life of Plutinus, 17. "In my native dialect I (Porphyry) was called Malchus, which is interpreted, king." ἀπέκεισαι αὐτοῦ τὸ ἄτομον τὸ δεξιόν. In Mark xiv. 47 ἀπέκειτο τὸ ἄτομον. τὸ δεξιόν indicates eye-witness or subsequent intimate knowledge. Peter meant, no doubt, to cleave the head.—Ver. 11. Peter's action, however, was not commended. βλέψα... θέλην. "Res evanglica non agitur ejusmodi praesi-diis." Erasmus. θέλην, a receptacle; sometimes ἐβοήθησα; usually κολέος. τὸ ποτῆριον... αὐτόν. For the figure of the cup, see Ezek. xxiii. 31-34; Mt. xx. 22, and xxvi. 29. Shall I refuse the lot appointed me by the Father?—Ver. 12. ἦν οὖν στείρα... αὐτόν. The Roman soldiers, ἡ στείρα, under the orders of their Chiliarch (Tribune, Colonel), abetted the officers of the Sanhedrin, ἐνθρεία τῶν ἱερουσαλημ, in the apprehension of Jesus. As a matter of course and following the universal practice θέσαν αὐτόν, "they bound Him," with His hands shackled behind His back.

Vv. 13-24. Examination before Annas.—Ver. 13. καὶ ἀπήγαγον αὐτὸν, "and they led Him to Annas first," ἤρθεν refers to the subsequent examinations, vv. 24, 28. The reason for taking Him to Annas first was that he was father-in-law of the actual high priest, Caiaphas, and was a man of commanding influence. He had himself been high priest from a.d. 7-14, while five of his sons occupied the office in succession. Caiaphas held office till 37 a.d. On ἀρχιερέως τοῦ ἱερουσαλημ see xi. 49.—Ver. 14. The attitude Caiaphas was likely to assume towards the prisoner is indicated by his identification with the person who uttered the principle, xi. 50, δι᾽ αυτοῦ... ἀπολογήθη.—Ver. 15. Ἡκολουθεῖ... μαθητής. "There followed Jesus Simon Peter"—with whom the narrative is now concerned—"and another disciple," in all probability John. He is mentioned to explain how Peter found access to the high priest's residence. "That disciple was known to the high priest," i.e., probably to Caiaphas, and accordingly went in with Jesus καὶ τὴν ἀλήθη τοῦ ἀρχιερέως, "into the palace (or court) of the high priest«. ἀλήθη, originally the court or quadrangle round which the house was built, was used of the residence itself. Apparently, and very naturally, Annas had apartments in this official residence now occupied by Caiaphas.—Ver. 16. Peter, not being known to the household, was excluded and stood outside at the door, πρὸς τῇ θύρᾳ δὲν, cf. xx. 11. John, missing him, spoke to the doorkeeper and introduced
him. τῇ ἰσχαρίου, female doorkeepers appear 2 Sam. iv. 6, Acts. xii. 13, and see Wetstein.—Ver. 19. Naturally she concluded from John's introducing him that Peter was also a disciple, and as a mere innocent and purposeless remark says: Μὴ καὶ σῦ...; τούτου; "Are you also one of this man's disciples?" He says, οὐκ εἰμί, "I am not."—Ver. 18. Eleuthereus... ἄφωθόμονος. The household servants and the Sanhedrim servitors had made a fire in the open court of the house and were standing round it warming themselves. Peter, unabashed by his lie, joined himself to this group and stood in the light of the fire. Ver. 19. Jerusalem, lying 2500 feet above sea-level, is cold at night in spring.—Ver. 19. Οὐκ ἄρχιερες ἤρωτησε...; "The high priest then interrogated Jesus about His disciples and about His teaching," apparently wishing to bring out on what terms He made disciples, whether as a simple Rabbi or as Messiah. But Jesus answered: Ἐγὼ παρρησίᾳ ἤλεγχα... οὐδὲν. The high priest's question was useless. Jesus had nothing to tell which He had not publicly and frequently proclaimed. Similarly Socrates replied to his judges (Plato, Apol. 33). "If any one says that he has ever learned or heard anything from me in private which the world has not heard, be assured he says what is not true," παρρησίᾳ "without reserve," rickhardis- los, Holtzmann, τῷ κόσμῳ, "to everybody," to all who cared to hear; cf. Socrates' ἡμεῖς. "I always taught in synagogue and in the temple"; the article dropped as we drop it in the phrase "in church"; "where," i.e., in both synagogue and temple, πάντες "all the Jews assemble."—Ver. 21. "Why do you interrogate me? Ask those who have heard, what I said to them." Similarly Socrates appeals to his disciples. The οὖν might be construed as if Jesus looked towards some who were present.—Ver. 22. Τάυτα... ἄρχιερες... ἧμεν. The older meaning of ἤμεν was "to strike with a rod" sc. ἐμβιάζει; but in later Greek it meant "to give a blow on the cheek with the open hand". This is put beyond doubt by Field, Otium Norv., p. 71; cf. Rutherford's New Phryn., p. 257. R.V. marg. "with a rod" is not an improvement on R.V. text.—Ver. 23. The calmness and reasonableness of Jesus' retort to this blow impressed it on the memory of John, whose own blood would boil when he saw his Master struck by a servant.—Ver. 24. As nothing was to be gained by continuing the examination, Jesus is handed on to Caiaphas, Ἀπείπευσεν... ἄρχιερες. Ver. 25 resumes the narrative inter-
ruptured at vv. 18-19, and resumes by repeating the statement that Simon Peter was standing and warming himself. While he did so the servants and officers, ver. 18, who were round the fire said, "My Lord;", etc., "a detail which marks an exact knowledge of the household (ver. 15)," Westcott.—Ver. 27. Παλαιν οὖν... ἐδορσάμενοι... A cock crew, the dawn approaching, and the warning of xiii. 38 was fulfilled. See on xiii. 38.

Vv. 28—xix. 16. *Jesus before Pilate.*—Ver. 28. "Ἀρνηται, "They lead," i.e., the Sanhedrists who had assembled lead: in Luke xxiii. 1, ἀρνηται ἑαυτῶν τῷ πλῆθος αὐτῶν. ἀνέτυμνε τῷ Καὶφᾶ. Field prefers translating "from the house of Caiphas," cf. Mark v. 35; Acts xvi. 40. πρατήριον, praetorium, lit. "the general's tent"; here probably the governor's quarters in Antonia, but possibly the magnificent palace of Herod used by the Roman governor while in Jerusalem; see especially Keim, *Jesus of Nazareth*, vi. 79 E. Tr. ἦν δὲ πρωτα καὶ αὐτοί οἰκεῖ·δόν. . . . "It was early morning (the fourth watch, from 3 to 6 a.m., see Mark xxii. 35; see on xiii. 38) and they themselves entered not into the palace that they might not be defiled but might eat the passover." The dawnning of the day seems to have reminded them of its sacred character. To enter a house from which all leaven had not been removed was pollution. Probably too the mere entrance into the house of a Gentile was the gnat these men strangled at. The plain inference from the word is that the Paschal Supper was yet to be eaten. But see Edersheim's *Life of Jesus*, ii. 566.—Ver. 29. ἐξῆλθεν οὖν δ. Πιλάτος... The examination began therefore in the open air in front of the building; cf. xix. 13. Pilate opened the case with the formal inquiry, *Τίνα κατηγορίαν κ. τ. λ.;* To this reasonable demand the Sanhedrists evasively and insolently reply (ver. 30): "Had He not been a κακοσύνος we should not have delivered Him to you."

It appears therefore that having already condemned Him to death (see Mt. xxvi. 66, ἐνοχα...
They handed Him over—παρεδόθη—unto Pilate, not to have their judgment revised, but to have their decision confirmed and the punishment executed. So the power of life and death, the jus gladii, was reserved to the governor. See Arnold's Roman Prov. Administration, pp. 55, 57; and Josephus, Bell. jūd., ii. 8, 1, who states that when the territory of Archelaus passed to the provincial governor, Coponius, the power of inflicting capital punishment was given to him, in the form of a special dispensation, to the Sosthenes εἰς τὴν Ἀρχαλαοῦν ἐξοντις. See also Stapffer's Palestine, p. 100. By being thus handed over to the Roman magistrate it came about that Jesus was crucified, a form of capital punishment which the Jews never inflicted even when they had power; and thus the word of Jesus was fulfilled which He spake intimating that He would die by crucifixion, xii. 32, 33.

Vv. 33-37. *Jesus examined by Pilate in private.*—Ver. 33. Pilate, being thus compelled to undertake the case, withdraws within the Praetorium to conduct it apart from their prejudices and clamours. He calls Jesus and says to Him, ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῶν ἱудαίων; How did Pilate know that this was the κατηγορία against Jesus? John omits the information given in Lk. xxiii. a that the Sanhedrists definitely laid this accusation. And the answer of Jesus implies that He had not heard this accusation made in Pilate's presence. The probability therefore is that Pilate had privately obtained information regarding the prisoner. There is some contempt as well as surprise in Pilate's Σὺ. "Art Thou," whose appearance so belies it, "the king of the Jews?"—Ver. 34. Jesus answers by asking: ἂν ἑαυτῷ σὺ τὸν λόγον λέγεις. ... Pilate's reply, "Am I a Jew?" precludes all interpretations, however inviting (see especially Alford and Oscar Holtzmann), but the simple one: "Do you make this inquiry from any serious personal interest and with any keen apprehension of the blessings attached to the Kingdom of God, or are you merely echoing a formal charge brought against me by others?"—Ver. 35. To this Pilate at some heat and contempt replies: Μετά τοῦ ἱνώμενον εἶμι; "Am I a Jew?" How can you suppose that I have any personal interest in such a matter?—τὸ ἱνώμενον τῷ σωτῇ ἔμοι. "Your own nation and the chief priests handed you over to me;" It is their charge I repeat, "what hast Thou done?" He scouts the idea that he should take any interest in the Jewish Messiah, and returns to the practical point, "what have you done?"—Ver. 36. But Jesus accepts the allegation of the Jews and proceeds to explain in what sense He is king: ἡ βασιλεία ἐγὼ κ. τ. λ. My kingdom is not of a worldly nature, nor is it established by worldly means. Had it been so, my servants would have striven to prevent my being surrendered to the Jews. But as things are, νῦν, since it is indisputable that no armed resistance or rescue has been attempted, it is put beyond question that my kingdom is not from hence. "The substitution of 'hence' for 'of this world' in the last...
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clause appears to define the idea of the world by an immediate reference to the representatives of it close at hand.” Westcott. Perhaps this rather limits the reference. Jesus uses ἀντέχειν as one who has other worlds than this in view. —Ver. 37. Pilate understands only so far as to interrupt with Ὀδόνως . . . σῶ; “So then you are a king?” On Ὀδόνως see Klotz’s Devarius, p. 173. To which Jesus replies with the explicit statement: ἵνα λέγω . . . ἐγώ. “Thou sayest.” This, says Schoettgen (Mt. xxvi. 25), is “solonnis adfirmantium apud Iudaos formula”; so that ἵνα must be rendered with R.V. marg. “because” I am a king. Erasmus, Westcott, Plummer, and others render, “Thou sayest that I am a king,” neither definitely accepting nor rejecting the title. But this interpretation seems impossible in the face of the simple εἰ λέγω of the synoptists, Mt. xxvii. 11, Mark xv. 2, Luke xxiii. 3. We must then render, “Thou art right, for a king I am.” In what sense a king, He explains: ἐγὼ εἰς τούτο γεγένημαι κ. τ. λ. “For this end have I been born, and for this end am I come into the world;” the latter expression, by being added to the former, certainly seems to suggest a prior state. Cf. i. 9. The end is expressed in ἰνα μαρτυρῆσον τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, “that I might witness to the truth,” especially regarding God and His relation to men. The consequence is that every one who belongs to the truth (moral affinity expressed by ἐκ) obeys Him, ἀκοίνοι in a pregnant sense, cf. x. 8-16. They become His subjects, and form His kingdom, a kingdom of truth. For which Pilate has only impatient scorn; τί ἦστιν ἀληθεία;— “Tush, what is Aletheia? It was a kingdom which could not injure the empire. What have I to do with provinces that can yield no tribute, and threaten no armed rebellion? Vv. 38-40. Pilate declares the result of his examination.—Ver. 38. Pilate waited for no reply to his question, but τούτῳ ὁδιμένων πάλιν ἦξις. The noting of each movement of Pilate suggests the eye-witness, and brings out his vacillation. “Ἐνα ὁδιμέναι αἰτίαν . . . “I for my part find no fault, or ground of accusation in Him.” Naturally, therefore, Pilate will acquit and dismiss Him; but no. He attempts a compromise: ὅτι δὲ συνήθεια ὅμιλον, “You have a custom,” of which we have no information elsewhere; although Josephus (Antiq., xx. 9, 3) relates that at a passover Albinus released some robbers. Analogies in other countries have been produced. This custom Pilate fancies they will allow him to follow in favour of Jesus. ἔπικλεος βουλευομαι ἡσυχαίας: ἄνευ λόγων, aorist subjunctive; cf. Mt. xiii. 28, θέλεις συλλέξεις; Lk. ix. 54, θέλεις εἰπόμενος; βουλευομαι κολασεῖς; βουλευομαι εἰπώ, etc., commonly occur in Aristophanes and other classical writers. Ἐκαθοράσας . . . ἡ τοῦτον, ἀλλὰ τῶν Ἴδων. In Mt. xxvii. 16, Oregen read ἰησοῦν τῶν Βαρ., but added “in multis exemplaribus non continetur.” He found a mystery in the circumstance that both prisoners were called “Jesus, the Son of the Father”: Barabbas is designated λῃστής, or, as Luke (xxiii. 19) more definitely says, he had been imprisoned for sedition in the city and for murder. John does not bring out the irony of the Jews’ choice, which freed
the real and crucified the pretended mover of sedition.

CHAPTER XIX.—Vv. 1-6. Pilate, after scourging Jesus, again pronounces Him guiltless.—Ver. 1. Τότε οὖν ... ἡμα
tιγγως. Keim (vi. 99) thinks that Pilate at this point pronounced his "condemno" and "ibis in crucem." and that the scourging was preparatory to the crucifixion. This might seem to be warranted by Mark's very condensed account, xv. 15. Φρεγαλλώτας ἦν σταυρωθή (according to the Roman law by which, according to Jerome, it was decreed "ut qui crucihigetur, prius flagellis verbarearetur"); so Josephus, B. Ζ., v. 11, and Philo, ii. 528). But according to John the scourging was meant as a compromise by Pilate; as in Lk. xxiii. 22: "what evil hath He done? I found in Him nothing worthy of death; I will therefore scourge Him and let Him go." Neither, then, as part of the capital punishment, nor in order to elicit the truth (quaestio per tormenta); but in the ill-judged hope that this minor punishment might satisfy the popular demand, and so ordered the scourging. The victim of this severe punishment was bound in a stooping attitude to a low column (column of the Flagellation, now shown in Church of Holy Sepulchre) and beaten with rods or scourged with whips, the thongs of which were weighted with lead, and studded with sharp-pointed pieces of bone, so that frightful laceration followed each stroke. Death frequently resulted. καὶ οἱ στρατιώται ... ἔσχησαν, and the soldiers plaited a crown of thorns" in mockery of the claim to royalty (for a similar instance, see Keim, vi. 121). Of the suggestions regarding the particular species of thorn, it may be said with Bynaeus (De Morte Christi, iii. 145) "nemo attulit aliquid certi." Ἰμάτιον πορφυρών, "a purple robe," probably a small scarlet military cloak, or some cast-off sagum, or paludamentum, worn by officers and subject kings.—Ver. 3. καὶ ήρωτόν πρὸς αὐτόν, "and they went on, coming to Him," imperfect of continued action; "and hailing Him king," χαίρε κ. ρ. λ., as they were accustomed to shout "Ave, Caesar." At the same moment they struck Him on the face with their hands.—Ver. 4. Pilate, judging that this will content the Jews, brings Jesus out that they may see Him and η συνωτε ... νόμισμα, that Pilate may have another opportunity of pronouncing Him guiltless.—Ver. 5. Still wearing (φορών) the mocking symbols of royalty, an object of derision and pity, Jesus is led out, and the judge pointing to Him says, "Iδε ὁ ἄνθρωπος, Ecce Homo, "Lo! the man," as if inviting inspection of the pitiable figure, and convincing them how ridiculous it was to try to fix a charge of treason on so contemptible a person. δ ἄνθρωπος is used contemptuously, as in Plutarch, Them., xvi. 2, "the fellow," "the creature." Other instances in Holden's note in Plut., Them. The result is unexpected.—Ver. 6. Instead of allowing him to release the prisoner, "the chief priests and their officers," not "the people," who were perhaps moved with pity (Lücke), "roared" (ἐκραύγασαν) "Crucify, crucify"; "To the cross." To this demand Pilate, "in angry sarcasm" (Reynolds), but perhaps rather merely wishing strongly to assert, for the third time, that he...
for his part would not condemn Jesus to death, "If He is to be crucified, it is you who must do it," retorts, Ἄβερα... αἱρήσει, "Take ye Him and crucify Him, for I find no fault in Him."—Ver. 7. The Jews are as determined that Pilate shall condemn Jesus as he is resolved not to condemn Him, and to his declaration of the prisoner's innocence they reply, Ἡμεῖς νῦν ξομολογήσαμεν... ἐκπειράσαμεν. He may have committed no wrong of which your Roman law takes cognisance, but "we have a law (Lev. xxiv. 16), and according to our law He ought to die, because He made Himself God's Son". For the construction see v. 18. The occasion they refer to is His profession to the Sanhedrin recorded in Mk. xiv. 62. ὡς ἦσας here means more than "Messiah," for the claim to be Messiah was not apparently punishable with death (see Treffry's Eternal Sonship), and, moreover, such a claim would not have produced in Pilate the state of mind suggested by (ver. 8) μᾶλλον ἐφοβήθη, wording that already indulged in with the governor's hesitation to condemn an innocent man there was an element of awe inspired by the prisoner's bearing and words. The words also imply that this awe was now deepened, and found utterance in the blustering interrogatory (ver. 9), Πλὴν μὲν οὐ... "Whence art Thou?" What is meant by your claim to be of Divine origin? To this question Jesus ἀπάντησεν οὖν ἔδειξέν αὐτῷ, "did not give him an answer". Pilate had no right to prolong the case; because already he had three times over pronounced Jesus innocent. He needed no new material, but only to act on what he had. Jesus recognises this and declines to be a party to his vacillation. Besides, the charge on which He was being tried was, that He had claimed to be King of the Jews. This charge had been answered. Legal procedure was degenerating into an unregulated wrangle. Jesus therefore declines to answer,—Ver. 10. At this silence Pilate is indignant; Ἠμῶν οὖν λαλήσας; "To me do you not speak?" It is intelligible that you should not count it worth your while to answer the charges of that yelling mob; but do you not know that I have power to crucify you and have power to release you?—Ver. 11. Jesus answered, Ὁδέ εἴχες ἐξουσίαν ὑπενθύμιζες κατ' ἑμοί, "from above," i.e., from God. Pilate must be reminded that the power he vaunts is not inherently his, but is given to him for God's purposes. From this it follows, οὗτος ὑπʼ ὑμᾶς, that οὗτος... μὲν σας, "he that delivered me unto thee," to wit, Caiphas (although the designation being that which is constantly used of Judas it has not unnaturally been referred to him), μελλόνα ἀμαρτίαν ἔχει... "bent greater sin," not than you, Pilate (as understood by most interpreters), but than others in certain occasions it would have been. Had Pilate been a mere irresponsible executioner their sin would have been sufficiently heinous; but in using the official representative of God's truth and justice to fulfil their own wicked and unjust designs, they involve themselves in a darker criminality. So Wettein: "Comparatur ergo, nisi fallor, peccatum Judaeorum cum suis circumstantiis, cum eodem peccato sine ipsis circumstantiis: hoc Judaeos aggressat, eosque atrociorsis delicii reos agit, quod non per tumultum sed praeclaram, idque specie juris, me quæruntur de medio tollere."—Ver. 12. In consequence of
this and from this point, ἐκ τοῦτον, as in vi. 66, “upon this,” with a causal as well as a temporal reference, ἔγειται ὁ Πιλάτος ἀπολύοντας αὐτόν, Pilate sought (ineffectually, imperfect) to set Him free. Vi. 12a-10. New assault upon Pilate and his final surrender.—Ver. 12. οἱ ἱουδαῖοι, “but the Jews,” a new turn was at this point given to the case by the cunning of the Sanhedrists, who cried out, ἔκραζον λέγοντες Ἐὰν... Καίσαράς φιλοῦσαν τοῦ Καίσαρας. Wetstein says: “Legati, praesides, praefecti, consiliarii, amici Caesaris dicebantur,” but it is not in this titular sense the expression is here used. The meaning is: Thou dost not show thyself friendly to Caesar. The reason being that every one who makes himself a king, ἀντίλεγε τῷ Καίσαρι, “speaks against Caesar”, Euthymius, Field, Thayer, etc., prefer “settheth himself against Caesar,” “resisteth his authority”. And as Jesus made Himself a king, Pilate would aid and abet Him by pronouncing Him innocent. This was a threat Pilate could not despise. Tiberius was at that time procurator, and could condemn Judaea to the error of majestas... atrociissime exercuit.” Suetonius, Tib., 58. Treason was the makeweight in all accusations. Tacitus, Annals, iii. 38.—Ver. 13. Pilate therefore, when he heard this, brought Jesus out, καὶ ἐκδόθην ἐκ τοῦ βήματος. In the Gospel according to Peter, ἐκδόθη is understood transitively: καὶ ἐκδόθη αὐτὸν ἐκ τῆς θρόνου κρίνει δικαίως κρίνει, basileu τοῦ Ἰσραήλ. Similarly in Justin, I. Apol., i. 35. This rendering presents a strikingly dramatic scene, and admirably suits the “behold your king,” of ver. 14. (See Expositor for 1893, p. 290 ff., and Robinson and James’ Gospel according to Peter, p. 18.) But it is extremely unlikely that Pilate should thus have degraded his seat of justice, and much more natural to suppose that ἐκδόθην is used intransitively, as in xii. 14, etc. (Joseph., Bell. Jud., ii. 9, 3, ὁ Πιλάτος καθίσας ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος), and that Pilate’s taking his seat is mentioned to indicate that his mind was now made up and that he was now to pronounce his final judgment. The βήμα was the suggestum or tribunal, the raised platform (Livy, xxxi. 29; Tac., Hist., iv. 25) or seat (Suet., Aug., 44) on which the magistrate sat to administer justice. See 2 Macc. xiii. 26.—ἐς τῶν λεγόμενων λιθοστρώτων, “at a place called Lithostrotos,” i.e., lit. Stone pavement, or Tesselated pavement (of which see reproductions in Rich’s Antic.). Cf. 2 Chron. vii. 3, Joseph., Bell. Jud., vi. 1, 1. Pliny (xxxvi. 13) defines Lithostrota as mosaics, “parvulis certe crustulis,” and says they were a luxury introduced in the time of Sulla and found in the provinces rather than in Rome (see Krebs in loc.). The space in front of the praetorium where the βήμα stood was thus paved and therefore currently known as “Lithostrotos” : ἔβασαν τῷ Γαβραθῳ, “but in Hebrew,” i.e., in the popular Aramaic, “Gabbatha,” which is not a translation of Lithostrotos, but a name given to the same place from its being raised, from άνθις, a ridge or elevation. The tribunal was raised as a symbol of authority and in order that the judge might see and be seen (see Lücke).—Ver. 14. ἤν ὁ παρακεκατοκτητὴς τοῦ πάσχα, “now it was the preparation of the Passover”, παρακεκατοκτητής was the usual appellation of Friday, the day of preparation for the weekly Sabbath. Here the addition τοῦ πάσχα shows that it is used of the day preceding the Passover. This day was, as it happened, a Friday, but it is the relation to the feast, not to the ordinary Sabbath, that is here indicated. Cf. ver. 42. ἄρα ἦν ὁ μεσόν χρόνον, “It was about the sixth hour,” i.e., about 12 o’clock. But Mark
(xv. 25) says: "It was the third hour and they crucified Him". The various methods of reconciling the statements are given in Andrew's Life of Our Lord, p. 545 ff. Meyer leaves it unsolved, "and the preference must be given to the disciple who stood under the cross". But if the crucifixion took place midway between nine and twelve o'clock, it was quite natural that one observer should refer it to the former, while another referred it to the latter hour. The height of the sun in the sky was the index of the time of day; and while it was easy to know whether it was before or after midday, or whether the sun was more or less than half-way between the zenith and the horizon, finer distinctions of time were not recognisable without consulting the sun-dials, which were not everywhere at hand. Cf. the interesting passages from rabbinical literature in Wetstein, and Professor Ramsay's article in the Expositor, 1893, vol. vii., p. 216. The latter writer found the same conditions in Turkish villages, and "cannot feel anything serious" in the discrepancy between John and Mark. "The Apostles had no means of avoiding the difficulty as to whether it was the third or the sixth hour when the sun was near mid-heaven, and they cared very little about the point." καὶ λέγει ... ὑμῖν, "and he says to the Jews: Behold your king!" words uttered apparently in sarcasm and rage. If he still wished to free Jesus, his bitterness was impolitic.—Ver. 15. They at once shouted, "Ἄρον, ἄρον, σταύρωσον αὐτόν." To this Pilate could offer only the feeble opposition of more sarcasm, Τῶν βασιλέων ὑμῶν σταύρωσον; where, of course, the emphasis is on the first words, John with his artistic perception exhibits their final rejection of Christ in the form in which it appeared as a reckless renunciation of all their national liberties and hopes: Οὐκ ἔχομεν βασιλέα εἰς χάριν πάσης. Even yet Pilate will take no active part, but hands Jesus over to the Sanhedrists with the requisite authorisation; παρέδωκεν, used in a semi-technical sense, cf. Plut., Dem., xiv. 4, and the passages cited in Holden's note. Vv. 17-30. The crucifixion.—Ver. 17. The Jewish authorities on their part "received" Jesus, καὶ ἀνήγαγον ... βασιλέα ... Γολgota. "And carrying the cross for Himself, He went out to the place called Kranion (of a skull), which in Hebrew is called Golgotha." The condemned man carried at least part of the cross, and sometimes the whole. ἀπὸ μὲν σταυρῷ προσηλούθη τρόπον αὐτὸν βασιλέα, Artemid., Onser., ii. 56. Other passages in Keim, vi. 124. Since Tertullian (adv. Jud., 10) a type of this has been found in Isaac's carrying the wood for the sacrifice. ἔξελθεν, it was usual both in Jewish and Roman communities to execute criminals outside the city. In Athens the gate through which they passed to the place of punishment was called χαρφέεα θύρα. Cf. Bynaeus, De Morte Christi, 120; Pearson, On the Cross (Art. iv.); Heb. xiii. 12; Lev. xxiv. 14. The place of execution at Jerusalem was a small knoll just beyond the northern wall, which, from its bare top and two hollow caves in its face, bears a rough resemblance to a skull, and was therefore called κρανίων, Calvania, Skull. "Golgotha" is the Aramaic form of Gulgolet, which is found in 2 Kings ix. 35. It is described in Conder's Handbook, p. 355; Henderson's Palestine, pp. 163, 164.—Ver. 18. Στον ... ἢσσαν. All information regarding the cross has been collected by Lipsius in his treatise
19. "Εγράφε δὲ καὶ τίτλον ὁ Πιλάτος, καὶ ἐθηκεν ἐπὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ·
ἐν δὲ γεγραμμένον, "Ἡρῴδης ὁ Ναζαρηνεὶς ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων."
20. Τούτου οὖν τὸν τίτλον πολλοί ἀνέγραψαν τῶν Ἰουδαίων, διὰ
τὸ γὰρ ἦν τῆς πόλεως ὁ τόπος, ὅπου ἐσταυρώθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς· καὶ xvi. 19 τεκ.
ὴν γεγραμμένον ἔβρασατι, Ἑλληνιστὶ, Ῥωμαίοτι. 21. Ἐπεζ οὖν τὸ
τοῦ Πιλάτου οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς τῶν Ἰουδαίων, "Μὴ γράφε, ὁ βασιλεὺς
τῶν Ἰουδαίων· ἀλλ' ὁ ἐκεῖνος εἶπε, Βασιλεὺς εἰμὶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων."
22. Ἀπεκρίθη δὲ Πιλάτος, "ὤ ζος γέγραφα, γέγραφα." 23. Οἱ οὖν γεν. xiii. λοιπόν,
στρατιώται, δε ἐσταύρωσαν τὸν Ἰησοῦν, ἀλλ' ἔβαψαν τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ,
καὶ ἐποίησαν τέσσαρα μέρη, ἕκαστον στρατιώτης μέρος, καὶ τὸν
χιτώνα. 24. εἶτα οὖν ὁρὸς ἀρραβὼν, ἐκ τῶν ἀφαιτῶν ἔλος, "Μὴ ἐχθρίσσων αὐτὸν, ἀλλ' ἔλαχιστον 8
περί αὐτοῦ, τίνος ἄρει. Ἰνα ἐγχειρήσατο τὰ ἱμάτια μου ἑαυτοῦ,
καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ἑμισθίον μου ἐδόθην, καὶ ἐδόθην, καὶ ἐδόθην ἐφ' ἑαυτὸν κλῆρον."
Οἱ μὲν οὖν στρατιώται ταῦτα ἐποίησαν: 25. ἐιστήκασαν δὲ παρὰ
τοῦ σταυροῦ τὸν Ἰησοῦν καὶ ἐμπήραν τὰς μητρίας.

De Cruce, Antwerp, 1595; Amstel., 1670; and in vol. ii. of his collected works,
published at Lugduni, 1613. With Jesus were crucified "other two," in Mt. xxvii.
35, called "robbers," probably of the same class as Barabbas. Jesus was
crucified between them; possibly, to identify Him with the worst criminals.
"The whole of humanity was represented there: the sinless Saviour, the
saved penitent, the condemned impeni-
tent." Plummer.—Ver. 19. "Ἐγράφα δὲ
καὶ τίτλον ὁ Πιλάτος. "And Pilate
wrote a "title," also, and set it on the
cross." The "title," αὐτία, was a board
whitened with gypsum (σαύρις, λεύκωμα)
such as were commonly used for public
notices. Pilate himself, meaning to
insult the Jews, ordered the precise
terms of the inscription, καὶ τίτλον, a"title also," in addition to all the
other insults he had heaped on them
during the trial.—Ver. 20. This title
was read by "many of the Jews," because
the place of crucifixion was close to
the city, and lay in the road of
any coming in from the north; also it
was written in three languages so
that every one could read it, whether Jew or
Gentile.—Ver. 21. Naturally the chief
priests remonstrated and begged Pilate
so to alter the inscription as to remove
the impression that the claim of Jesus
was admitted.—Ver. 22. But Pilate, "by
can obstinate and stubborn" (Philo,
589), peremptorily refused to make
any alteration. δ γέγραφα γέγραφα.—
Ver. 23. "The soldiers, then, when
they had crucified Jesus, took His gar-
mements" — the executioner's perquisite
(Apuleius has the comparison "naked
as a new-born babe or as the cruci-
fied") — and as there were four soldiers,
tητράδιον, Acts xii. 4, they divided the
clothes into four parts. This was the
more easily done because the usual dress
dress, of a Jew consisted of five parts, the
head,
the shoes, the chiton, the outer
garment, and the girdle. The chitων
remained after the four other articles
were distributed. They could not divide
it into four without spoiling it, and so
they cast lots for it. It was seamless,
ἀρραβών, unsewed, and woven in one
piece from top to bottom.—Ver. 24.
The soldiers therefore said, Μὴ ἐχθρίσσων
αὐτὸν ἀλλ' ἔλαχιστον ὁ λογός, "let us not divid
but cast lots." λαγχάνει is, properly,
not "to cast lots," but "to obtain by
lot." See Field, Otium Nov., 72. In
this John sees a fulfilment of Ps. xxii.
18, the LXX. version of which is here
quoted verbatim.—Ver. 25. This part
of the scene is closed (that another
may be introduced) with the common
formula, οι μὲν οὖν στρατιώται ταῦτα
ἐποίησαν. ("Graeci . . . saepissime
hujusmodi conclusionis utuntur.
Raphel in loc.) οι μὲν . . . ἐιστήκασαν
84 . . . The soldiers for their part acted
as has been related, but there were others
beside the cross who were very differently
afected. η μητρ... Μαγδαλη. It is doubtful whether it is meant that three or that four women were standing by the cross; for Μαρία η τού Κληρατα may either be a further designation of η δελαφη της μητρος αυτος, or it may name the first member of a second pair of women. That four women are intended may be argued from the extreme improbability that in one family two sisters should bear the same name, Mary. The Synoptists do not name the mother of Jesus among those who were present, but Matthew (xxvii. 56) and Mark (xv. 40) name Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James, and Salome the mother of John. Two of these three are mentioned by John here, and it is natural to infer that the unnamed woman (η δελαφη κ. τ. λ.) is the third, Salome, unnamed possibly because of this writer's shyness in naming himself or those connected with him. But the fact that Luke (xxiv. 10) names Joanna as the third woman reflects some uncertainty on this argument. If Salome was Mary's sister, then Jesus and John were cousins, and the commendation of Mary to John's care is in part explained. η τού Κληρατα may mean the mother, daughter, sister, or wife of Klopas; probably the last. According to Mt. xxvii. 56, Mk. xv. 40, Lk. xxiv. 10, the Mary here mentioned was the mother of James and Joses. But in Mt. x. 3 we learn that James was the son of Alphaeus. Hence it is inferred that Klopas and Alphaeus are two slightly varying forms of the same name η δελαφη κ. τ. λ.—Ver. 26.

John's interest in naming the women is not obvious except in the case of the first. ησου... η μητρη σου. Jesus when He saw His mother, and the disciple whom He loved standing beside her (the relevancy of the designation, τον μαθητην δε ηγομην, is here obvious, and the most convincing proof of its truth and significance is now given), says to His mother, "Woman, behold thy son"; i.e., turning His eyes towards John, There is your son. Me you are losing, so far as the filial relation goes, but John will in this respect take my place.—Ver. 27. And this trust He commits to John in the simple words, Ιησου... η μητρη σου, although his natural mother, Salome, was also standing there. [Cf. the bequest of Eudamidas: "I leave to Artemes the care of nourishing and providing for my mother in her old age," Lucian's Τοσαρις.] John at once accepted the charge, "from that hour (which cannot be taken so stringently as to imply that they did not wait at the cross to see the end) the disciple took her to his own home"; εις τα ζεια, see i. xi. 32. The circumstances of the Nazareth home which made this a possible and desirable arrangement are not known. That Mary should find a home with her sister and her son is in itself intelligible, and this close intimacy of the two persons whose hearts had been most truly the home of Jesus must have helped to cherish and vivify all reminiscences of His character and words.—Ver. 28.

Μετα του τον... Δημη. "After this, Jesus knowing that all things are now finished, that the scripture might be completely fulfilled, saith, I thirst." Jesus did not feel thirsty and proclaim it with the intention of fulfilling scripture—which would be a spurious fulfilment—but in His complaint and the response to it, John sees a fulfilment of Ps. lxix. 22, εις την διψαν μου επητησαν με δεος. Only when all else had been attended to (εις τα ζεια κ. τ. λ.) was He free to attend to His own physical sensations.—Ver. 29. Σκευος... Ιουστυ—"There was set a vessel full of vinegar"; the mention of the vessel betrays the eye-witness. "The Synoptists do not mention the σκευος, but John had stood beside it." Plummer. δεος, the vinegar used by soldiers. [Upian says: "vinum atque acetum milites nostri solent pericipe, uno die vinum, alio die acetum", Keim, vi. 182.] Here it seems to have been provided for the crucified, for as Weiss and Plummer
observe, there were a sponge and a hyssop-reed also at hand. οἷς, i.e., the soldiers, but cf. Mk. xv. 36; πληγισμένοι. They filled a sponge, because a cup was impracticable, and put it round a stalk of hyssop, and thus applied the restorative to His mouth. The plant called "hyssopus" has not been identified. All that was requisite was a reed (cf. περίπλοιος καλάμως, Mt. xxvii. 48, Mk. xv. 36) of two or three feet long, as the crucified was only slightly elevated.—Ver. 39. 

30. ὅτε οὖν ἐπὶ τὸ δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ, εἶπε, "Τετέλεσθαι..." καὶ κλίνας τὴν κεφαλὴν, παρέδωκε τὸ πνεῦμα.

31. Οἱ οὖν ήσυχαίοι, ἵνα ἡ μείζη ἐπὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ τὰ σώματα ἐν τῷ σαββάτῳ, ἔπαι παρασκευὴν ἵν' ἦν γὰρ ἡ μεγάλη ἡ ἡμέρα εἰκόνιαν. vii. 37. Is. τοῦ σαββάτου ἠρώτησαν τὸν Παλάτων, ἵνα παρέδωκαν αὐτοῦ τὰ ἵνα ἐκκλήσαι καὶ ἀρθέωσιν. 32. ἠδόνος οὖν οἱ στρατιώται, καὶ τοῦ μὲν πρῶτον κατάδαν τὰ σκέλη καὶ τοῦ ἄλλου τοῦ συσταυρωθέντος αὐτοῦ. 33. ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν ἁγιοὺς ἁλαθότες, δός εἶδον αὐτῶν ἡδή τιθενόμενο, οὐ κατάδαν αὐτῶν τὰ σκέλη. 34. ἀλλ' εἰς τῶν στρατιώτων λέγει.

(Life of Christ, p. 473) has an interesting note on cruurifragium; and cf. the Gospel according to Peter on σκελετοποιία, with the note by the author of Supernat. Religion.—Ver. 32. The two robbers were thus despatched. οἷς ἐπὶ τῶν θεοὺς ἁλαθότες, but when the soldiers who were carrying out Pilate's orders came to Jesus and saw that He was already dead, they refrained from breaking His legs.—Ver. 34. But one of the soldiers λέγει αὐτοῦ τὴν πλευρὰν θνητος, "pierced His side with a spear"; but Field prefers "pricked His side," to keep up the distinction between θνητος (the milder word) and ἀκτινοφόροι (ver. 37). He favours the idea of Loesner that the soldier's intention was to ascertain whether Jesus was really dead, and he cites a very apt parallel from Plutarch's Cimon, 37. But ἀκτινοφόροι occurs in Homer (II., v. 579), where death followed, and as the wound inflicted by this spear thrust seems to have been a hand-breadth wide (xx. 25) it may be presumed the soldier meant to make sure that Jesus was dead by giving Him a thrust which itself would have been fatal, and which for the speed of death of Jesus. The symbol he uses for the hand-breadth was sometimes referred to as such when the head was struck in cases where the custom was to leave the body the flesh and blood of preying. To secure speedy death the cruurifragium, breaking of the legs with a heavy mallet or bar, was sometimes resorted to: as without such means the crucified might in some cases linger for thirty-six hours. Neander
cance of the blood and water so abundantly insisted on by the Fathers (see Burton, B. L., 167-72, and Westcott's additional note) is not within John's horizon.—Ver. 35. When he goes on to testify, ὅ ἐστιν καὶ ὅ ἀπὸ Ἀρμα-θαίας, ὅς μαθήτης τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, κεκρυμμένος ἢ διὰ τῶν φόδων τῶν οὐναϊων, ἢ δὲ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ: καὶ ἔκτρεψεν ὁ Πιλάτος.

Ver. 36. Here only in N.T. ἤδεικνύειν δὲ καὶ ἢδεικνύειν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. 39. ἤδεικνύειν δὲ καὶ Νακώδημος.

Eccles. xxxviii. 8. ὅ ἐλθὼν πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν νικτὸς τ' ἐπὶ πρῶτον, φέρων μέγα σώματος.
Thus Jesus by being lifted up is already drawing men unto Him. These Jewish aristocrats first confess Him in the hour of His deepest degradation. — Plummer. Nicodemus is identified as ὁ ἄλλος ... τῷ πρῶτῳ, “he who came to Jesus by night at the first”; iii. 1, in contrast to the boldness of his coming now. φέρων μίμημα ... ἀκότην. μίμημα, a “confection” or “compound,” cf. Ecclus. xxxviii. 8. σφόντας καὶ ἄλογα, “of myrrh and aloes.” Myrrh was similarly used by the Egyptians, see Herod., ii. 83. Cf. Ps. xiv. 9. ὄνειρα ἄλτρα ἀκότην. The ἄλτρα (libra) was rather over eleven ounces avoirdupois. The enormous quantity has been accounted for as a rich man’s expression of devotion, or as required if the entire body and all the wrappings were to be smeared with it, and if the grave itself was to be filled with unguents as in 2 Chron. xvi. 14. — Ver. 40. ἄλαβον ... ἐσταφάδειαν. They wrapped the body in strips of linen along with the aromatic preparations (2 Chron. xvi. 14, ἄρωμάτων), as is the custom (οὕς θὸς ὕπυρε, 1 Macc. x. 86) with the body having other customs) to prepare for burial.— Ver. 41. ἐσταφάδειαν, see Gen. l. 1-3. ἦν ποταὶ τῷ τόπῳ, “There was in the place,” i.e., in that neighbourhood, κῆπως, a garden, which, according to Mt. xxvii. 60, must have belonged to Joseph. μνημείων καϊμών, a tomb, rock-carved according to Synoptists, which had hitherto been unused, and which was therefore fresh and clean.— Ver. 42. “There, accordingly, on account of the preparation of the Jews, because the tomb was at hand, they laid Jesus.” The Friday was so nearly at an end that they had not time to go to any distance, and therefore availed themselves of the neighbouring tomb as a provisional, if not permanent, resting-place.

CHAPTER XX.—The resurrection and subsequent manifestations.—Vv. 1-10. The empty tomb.—Ver. 1. Τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑβδόμῃ. And on the first day of the week”. Mk. (xvi. 2) and Lk. (xxiv. 1) have the same expression. Mt. (xxviii. 1) has ὥσπερ ἐκ σάββατων, τῇ ἐπιφωνήσει εἰς μιᾶς σάββατος. [In the suspected ninth verse of Mk. xvi. πρῶτον appears instead of μιᾷ.] — Μαρία η Μαγδάλη ἔρχεται, Mary of Magdala, now Meijdel, a fishing village north of Tiberias; she is further described in Mk. xvi. 9 as παρ' ἑκατέρων ἐκάθεν τῇ δαμάσκις (cf. Lk. viii. 2), which lends significance both to her being at the tomb and to her being the first to see the Lord. She alone of the three women present is here named, because she alone is required in John’s account. The time is more exactly described as πρῶτον, σκοτίας ἐτί οὖσαν. Mk. (xvi. 2) has οὖν ἐκεῖ πρῶτον, but adds ἀντεῖλέπτος τοῦ θάλασσα, apparently having chiefly in view, not the first arrival of the waving but the sudden appearance of Jesus to Mary. Luke’s ἐρωτοῦν βαθέως agrees with John’s expression. Phrynichus defines βρόχος as the time before the day began while a lamp was still needed. [Cf. Plato’s Crito at the beginning, and Roger’s note on Aristoph., Wasps, 215.] The darkness is noticed by John to account for her seeing nothing of what Peter and John afterwards saw. She could not, however, fail to see τὸν λίθον ἐρμηνόν ἐκ τοῦ μνημείου; the slab closing the sepulchre had been removed. Seeing this she naturally concluded that the tomb had been violated, possibly that
the authorities for purposes of their own had removed the body.—Ver. 2. ἐγκατέστησεν οὖν ἀπό τοῦ σώματος. She therefore runs, disregarding unseemliness, and comes to those who would be most interested, and without preface, breathless and anxious, exclaims: ἄνω... "they have removed the Lord from the tomb, and we know not where they have laid Him". Evidently she had no idea that a resurrection had taken place. The plural ὀδαμοί may naturally be accepted as confirming Mark’s account that she was not alone.—Ver. 3. At once the two men ἠξίλησαν... καὶ ἤρχοντα, singular and plural imperfectly, sorist and imperfect, the one referring to the passing beyond the city wall, the other to the whole course from the house to the tomb.—Ver. 4. ἦρχον δὲ οἱ δύο ὄμοι, "and the two ran together"; equally eager; but ὁ ἄλλος μαθητὴς πρὸ τοῦ τοῦ Πέτρου, "the other disciple ran on before more quickly than Peter"; probably John was the younger man. [Lampe suggests two other reasons: either Peter’s steps were slower "ob conscientiam culpae," or "beaste via Ioanni magis nectat."] Confer whereby John ἦσαν πρῶτοι... "came first to the tomb."—Ver. 5. καὶ παρακύψας... The R.V. renders παρακύψας by "stooping and looking in," A.V. has merely "stooping down"; the Vulgate "cum se inclinasset," Weizsäcker "beugte sich vor." Field (Olumb Nortoc, on Luke xxiv. 12) prefers "looking in," although, he says, "peep in" would more accurately define the word παρακύπτειν. He quotes Casaubon’s note that the word implies "pro-tensionem colli cum modica corporis incurvatione." See also Kypke on Luke xxiv. 12, and Lid., and Scott Lex. ὄμοιον are the strips of linen used for swathing the dead; the cerecloths. ὄμοιον is frequent in Homer (II., 3, 141; 18, 505) to denote the fine material of women’s dress; in Lucian and Herodian of salls; in Acts x. 11 of a sheet. σουδάριον is the word used by Luke (xxiii. 53); so Herodotus, ii. 86. ὁ μέτοιχος ἐισῆλθεν, "he did not however enter," withheld by dread of pollution, according to Wetzstein; by terror, according to Meyer. It is enough to suppose that it did not occur to John to enter the tomb, or that he was withheld by a feeling of reverence or delicacy.—Ver. 6. Peter is not so withheld. He enters καὶ θεωρεῖ τὰ ὀδύνια... τότε, θεωρεῖ is probably used here in its stricter sense of seeing so as to draw conclusions.—Ver. 7. What he saw was significant; the linen wrappings lying, and the napkin which had been on His head not lying with the linen cloths, but separately folded up in a place by itself. The first circumstance was evidence that the body had not been hastily snatched away for burial elsewhere. Had the authorities or any one else taken the body, they would have taken it as it was. The second circumstance gave them even stronger proof that there had been no hurry. The napkin was neatly folded and laid into one place, the linens being in another. They felt in the tomb as if they were in a chamber set apart by the owner of the self of one set of garments to assume another. [Euthymius is here interesting and realistic.] σουδάριο, sudarium, from sudio, I sweat.—Ver. 8. On Peter reporting what he saw τότε ὀν... ἐκλύθησαν, "then entered accordingly the other disciple also, who had first arrived at the tomb, and he saw and believed". Standing and gazing at the folded napkin, John saw the truth. Jesus has Himself risen, and disencumbered Himself of these wrappings. Cf. xi. 44. It was enough for John; ἐκλύθησαν. He visited no other tomb; he questioned no one.—Ver. 9. The emptied and orderly grave convinced him, οὐδὲν γὰρ ἔθεσαν... ἄνωθεν;) it was not an expectation founded on
scripture which prompted belief in the resurrection; but only those matter-of-fact observations, the empty grave and the folded napkin.—Ver. 10. Satisfied in their own minds ἀνὴρθον οὖν... οἱ μαθηταί. πρὸς ἐαυτούς οὗτος οὖν οὗτος... home; “chez eux,” Segond’s French version; οἷς τὰ ἔκθες, modern Greek. Kyrike gives examples of a phrase which he says is “tria profanis”.

VV. 11-18.—Jesus reveals Himself to Mary.—Ver. 11. Μαρία δὲ εἶδον... ἡμέρα. Hitherto John has told us simply what he himself saw; now he reports what Mary told him, see ver. 18. She had come to the tomb after the men, but could not share in their belief. She remained outside the tomb helplessly and hopelessly weeping. She herself had told the disciples that the tomb was empty, and she had seen them come out of it; but again ἵνα νῦν ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον “she peered into the tomb”: an inimitably natural touch. She could not believe her Lord was gone. καὶ ἦθεν... Ἰησοῦ. This, says Holtzmann, is a mere reminiscence of Luke xxiv. 4. But even the description of the angels differs. They were “seated one at the head and one at the feet where the body of Jesus lay”; sitting, says Bengel, “quasi opera quapiamperfector, et expectantes aliquem, quem doce rent”. Lampe has little help to give here; and Lücke is justified in saying that neither the believing nor the critical inquirer can lift the veil that hangs over this appearance of angels. In Mary’s case it was wholly without result; for no sooner does she answer the angels’ question than she turns away, probably hearing a footprint behind her.—Ver. 14. ἐστράφη ἐπὶ τὰ ὦτα... “And she sees Jesus standing and did not know that it was Jesus”; not merely because her eyes were dim with tears, but because He was altered in appearance; as Mark (xiv. 12) says, ἐν ἔκθες μαρφή. So little was her ultimate recognition of Jesus the result of her expectation or her own fancy embodied.—Ver. 15. λέγει... Ἰησοῦς; That she was searching for some one she had lost was obvious from her tears and demeanour. But not even the voice of Jesus sounds familiar. Ἐκείνη... ὥρα. She supposed Him to be the gardener (or garden-keeper) not because He had on the gardener’s clothes—for probably He wore merely the short drawers in which He had been crucified (see Hug and Lücke)—nor because He held the spade as represented in some pictures, but because no one else was likely to be there at that early hour and to question her as to her reason for being there. Her answer shows that she thought it possible that it had been found inconvenient to have the body of Jesus in that tomb and that it had been removed to some other place of sepulture. In this case she will gladly relieve them of the encumbrance. It is none to her.—Ver. 16. λέγει... Διδάσκαλε. His uttering her name, Μαρία, revealed that He was a friend who knew her; and there was also that in the tone which made her instantly turn fully round to search Him with her gaze. Surprise, recognition,
relief, joy, utter themselves in her exclamation, "Pa Bushowv!, which Buxtorf renders "Domine mi;" but probably the pronominal suffix had ceased to have significance, as in "Monsieur," etc. Lampe quotes the saying: "Majus est Rabbi quam Rabbi, et majus est Rabban quam Rabbi," cf. Mk. x. 51. With the exclamation Mary made a forward movement as if to embrace Him. But this is forbidden.—Ver. 17. Μύ μον απτων, "noli me tangere," not because it was indecorous (Lk. vii. 38); nor because she wished to assure herself by touch that the appearance was real, a test which He did not prevent His disciples from applying; nor because her embrace would disturb the process of glorification through which His body was passing; nor, following Kypke's note, can we suppose that Jesus forbids Mary to worship Him [although K. proves that αντενθηα is used of that clinging to the knees or feet which was adopted by suppliants], because He accepts Thomas' worship even before His ascension; but, as He Himself says, ουκ εγρ αναβηκτη οταν της σωτηρεως. "for I have not yet ascended to my Father," implying that this was not His permanent return to visible fellowship with His disciples. Mary, by her eagerness to seize and hold Him, showed that she considered that the μεγερ, the "little time," of xvi. 16, was past, and that now He had returned to be for ever with them. Jesus checks her with the assurance that much had yet to happen before that. His disciples must at once be disabused of that misapprehension. Therefore, ως εορτου . . . ὡς , "Go to my brothers [adelphous mou, here for the first time; in anticipation of the latter part of the sentence, cf. Mk. iii. 35] and tell them, I ascend to my Father and your Father, and my God and your God." He thus forms a relationship which bound Him to them more closely than His bodily presence. His place by right is with God. But His love binds Him as certainly to His people on earth as His rights carry Him to God. The form of the expression is dictated by His desire to give them assurance. They had no doubt God was His God and Father. He teaches them that, if so, He is their God and Father. Ερχεσθαι . . . απτη, Mary carries forthwith the Lord's message to the disciples, cf. Mk. xvi. 10; Mt. xxviii. 10; Lk. xxiv. 10.

Vv. 19-20. Manifestations of the risen Lord to the disciples, first without Thomas, then with Thomas.—Ver. 19. The time of the manifestation is defined, it was τη ἡμερα . . . σαββατων "on that day, the first of the week," and during the evening, ουσιν ουν δηλος, which agrees with Luke's account, from which we learn that when Jesus and the two disciples reached Emmaus, two hours from Jerusalem, the day was declining. The evening was chosen, probably because then the disciples could be found together. The circumstance that the doors were shut seemed to John significant regarding the properties of the risen body of Jesus. των θυρων κεκλειμνων, "the doors having been shut," i.e., securely fastened so that no one could enter, because the precaution was taken δια της σωτηρεως. So soon had the disciples begun to experience the risks they ran by being associated with Jesus. Calvin supposes Jesus opened the doors miraculously; but that is not suggested in the words. Rather it is indicated that His glorified body was not subject to the conditions of the natural, earthly body, but passed where it would. Suddenly ουσιν ουν δηλος (cf. Lk. xxiv. 36). "Phasis notat se in publico omnium conspicu sibere," Kypke. Not only as the ordinary salutation, but to calm their perturbation at this sudden
17—26. **ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΩΝ**

21. εἶπεν οὖν αὐτοῖς ὅ τι ησύχος πάλιν, «Τι θεία ὡς καθὼς αὐτοτάκει μὲν ὁ πατήρ, καθὼς πέμπω ὁ υἱὸς.» *Ἰων. vi. 23.*

22. Καὶ τοῦτο εἶπον αὐτοῖς ἐφεύρετο καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, «Αὐτὸς εἶμι Πνεῦμα ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ μόνον εἰς τὸ λαὸν, τὸν τύπον τῶν ἥλων, καὶ βαλὼν τὸν δικαστήριον τούτο πρὸς τὸν θάνατον τῶν ἥλων, καὶ βαλὼν τὴν χειρὰς μου εἰς τὴν πλευρὰν αὐτοῦ, οὐ μὴ πιστεύσινεν.»

23. καὶ τοιούτῳ ἀφῆτε τὰς ἀμαρτίας, ἀφεῖται αὐτοῖς ὅ τι ησύχος. *Gen. ii. 7.*

24. Άγιος δὲ, εἰς τὸν δίδακα διὰ τὴν ἔνδομον Ἀδίμωνος, οὐκ ἦν μετὰ αὐτῶν ὅτε ἦλθεν ὁ ἱησούς. *Gen. iii. 16.*

25. εἶπεν οὖν αὐτοῖς ἀλλοι μαθηταί, «Εὐπρόκειται τὸν κύριον.»


1 ἀφεῖται with ἀφεῖται.

2 τπνων in its first occurrence in this verse is rendered in the Vulgate by "fixuram," which may mean "the spot where the nail was fixed"; "figuram," "fissuram," and "locum" are also read. See Wordsworth and White in loc. τπνων is read by Tisch. instead of τπνων in its second occurrence on the authority of A only, some old Lat. and Syr. versions.

apparition (cf. Lk. xxiv. 37), He greets them with Τι θεία ὡς καθὼς, and to assure them of His identity δέχεται ὁ ἄνθρωπος... αὐτοῦ. — Ver. 20. His body, therefore, however changed in its substance, retained its characteristic marks. The fear of the disciples was replaced by joy, ἔχομεν τοις... Κύριον. In this joy the promise of xvi. 22 is fulfilled (Weiss).—Ver. 21. When they recognised Him and composed themselves, He naturally repeated His greeting, ἔχομεν τοις, but now adds, καθὼς... ὡς. «As the Father hath sent me, so send I you.» In these words (cf. xvii. 18) He gives them their commission as His representatives. And in confirmation of it, (ver. 22) τοῦτο ἐδώκω... Ἀγιος, «He breathed on them, ἐφεύρετο;» the same word is used in Gen. ii. 7 to describe the distinction between Adam's "living soul," breathed in him by God, and the life principle of the other animals. The breathing upon them was meant to convey the impression that His own very Spirit was imparted to them.—Ver. 23. The authority of the Apostles is completed in the words: ἔν τινω... ἀφεῖται. «Whosoever sines ye forgive, they are forgiven to them: whosoever ye retain, they are retained.» The meaning of ἀφεῖται is determined by the opposed ἐφεύρετο [the better reading]. The announcement is unexpected. Yet if they were to represent Him, they must be empowered to continue a function which He constantly exercised and set in the forefront of His ministry. They must be able in His name to pronounce forgiveness, and to threaten doom. This indeed formed the main substance of their ministry, and it was by receiving His Spirit they were fitted for it. The burden was laid upon them of determining who should be forgiven, and who held by their sin. Cf. Acts iii. 26, v. 4.—Ver. 24. Άγιος... ἀφεῖται... αὐτοῖς. a twin, from δίνω to be double; of which Διάμος from δίνω is the Greek equivalent. εἰς ἕν τῶν δίδακτων... one of the twelve, the familiar designation still used of the eleven, ὁ ἵν... was not with them when Jesus came," why, we do not know.—Ver. 25. The rest accordingly, when first they met him, possibly the same evening, said, ἐφεύρεσαν... τὸν Κύριον; which he heard with incredulity, not because he could mistrust them, but because he concluded they had been the victims of some hallucination. Nothing would satisfy him but the testimony of his own senses: «Εἰς ἕν... τιτυπέσαν.» The test proposed by Thomas shows that he had witnessed the crucifixion and that the death and its circumstances had deeply impressed him. To him resurrection seemed a dream. But he still associated with those who believed in it.—Ver. 26. Καὶ μεθ ἠμάρα... αὐτῶν. μεθ ἠμάρα διὰ τὸ πάλιν. Probably he had been with
them every day during the interval, but as Bengel remarks, "interjectis diebus nulla fuerat apparitio". On the first day of the second week the disciples were "again," as on the previous Sunday, "within," in the same convenient place of meeting, and now Thomas is with them. As on the previous occasion (ver. 19), the doors were shut and Jesus suddenly appeared among them and greeted them with the customary salutation.— Ver. 27. Εἶπεν...πιστῶ. He does not need to be informed of Thomas’ incredulity: although it is quite possible that, as Lücke supposes, the others had mentioned it to Him. Still, this is not in the text. Cf. Weiss, who also quotes Bengel’s characteristic note: "Si Pharisaeeus ita dixisset, Nisi videro, etc., nil impretrasset; sed discipulo pridem probo nil non datur". Weiss supposes the hands were seen (ὑδη), the side only touched under the clothes. Some suppose that as the feet are not mentioned in this passage, they had not been nailed but only bound to the cross. See Lücke’s interesting note. καὶ μὴ γίνον ἐπιστο ἀλλά πιστῶ, "Incredulitas aliquid habet de voluntario".— Ver. 28. Grotius, following Tertullian, Ambrose, Cyril and others, is of opinion that Thomas availed himself of the offered test: surely it is psychologically more probable that the test he had insisted on as alone sufficient is now repudiated, and that he at once exclaims, Ο γόριος μου καὶ ο Θεὸς μου. His faith returns with a rebound and utters itself in a confession in which the gospel culminates. The words are not a mere exclamation of surprise. That is forbidden by εἶπεν αὐτῷ; they mean "Thou art my Lord and my God". The repeated pronoun lends emphasis. In Pliny’s letter to Trajan (I.II. A.D.) he describes the Christians as singing hymns to Christ as God. Our Lord does not reject Thomas’ confession; but (ver. 29) reminds him that there is a higher faith than that which springs from visual evidence: Ὅτι ἐπιστῶ μὲν...καὶ πιστεύομεν. Jesus would have been better pleased with a faith which did not require the evidence of sense: a faith founded on the perception that God was in Christ, and therefore He could not die; a faith in His Messiahship which argued that He must live to carry on the work of His Kingdom. The saying is cited as another instance of the care with which the various origins and kinds of faith are distinguished in this gospel.

Vv. 30-31. First conclusion of the gospel—Ver. 30. πολλὰ μὲν οὖν... τοῦτο. That this was the original or intended conclusion of the gospel is shown by the use of the words "in this book," which indicate that the writer was now looking back on it as a whole (Holtzmann). Perhaps τοῦτο is emphatic, contrasted with the Synoptic gospels in which so many other signs were recorded. The expression πολλὰ μὲν οὖν καὶ ἀλλὰ is necessarily of frequent occurrence and is illustrated by Kypke. Beza says these particles in the usage of John "proprie conclusionibus adhibentur." "Many other signs therefore" (R.V.) is not an improvement on A.V. "And many other signs truly." "Many other signs indeed did Jesus" is sufficient. Why ἐπιστῶ...μεν...καὶ πιστεύομεν?"
XXI. Meta taute *de faenorwos dakovn paling prois tis fides tois b 35; id. 11. maqhtos epi tis theladosis tis Tiberiadas: *de faenorwos de otopos. 2. 3.
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fulness, xix. 35; and the use of the plural 
instead of the singular is not decisive.]

Ver. 1. Meta taute. John's usual 
indefinite note of time, de faenorwos 
dakovn, cf. vii. 4, xiii. 4, 12; Mark xvi. 12; 
"but these have been written these, vis., which have been included in this 
book, tiv . . . autou, with an object, and this object has determined their 
selection; 'that ye may believe that 
Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God'. 
The use of the 2nd pers. suggests that 
the writer had in view some special class. But his object was of universal signifi-
cance. See the Introduction.

CHAPTER XXI.—Supplementary chap-
ter in which Jesus again manifests Himself after the resurrection.

[There is no reason why this chapter should be ascribed to a different hand. 
The style is the same as that of the 
gospel, and although the gospel closed 
at the end of chap. xx., this supplementary 
chapter must have become an integral 
part of the gospel at a very early period. 
No trace exists of a gospel without it. 
It is by no means so certain that ver. 25 
is Johannine. It seems an inflated ver-

tion of xx. 30. The twenty-fourth verse is 
also rejected by several critics on the 
ground of eidoi. This may be valid 
as an objection; but it is in the manner 
of the Apostle to testify to his own truth-
fulness, xix. 35; and the use of the plural 
instead of the singular is not decisive.]

Ver. 1. Meta taute. John's usual 
indefinite note of time, de faenorwos 
dakovn, cf. vii. 4, xiii. 4, 12; Mark xvi. 12; 
"but these have been written these, vis., which have been included in this 
book, tiv . . . autou, with an object, and this object has determined their 
selection; 'that ye may believe that 
Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God'. 
The use of the 2nd pers. suggests that 
the writer had in view some special class. But his object was of universal signifi-
cance. See the Introduction.

CHAPTER XXI.—Supplementary chap-
ter in which Jesus again manifests Himself after the resurrection.

[There is no reason why this chapter should be ascribed to a different hand. 
The style is the same as that of the 
gospel, and although the gospel closed 
at the end of chap. xx., this supplementary 
chapter must have become an integral 
part of the gospel at a very early period. 
No trace exists of a gospel without it. 
It is by no means so certain that ver. 25 
is Johannine. It seems an inflated ver-

tion of xx. 30. The twenty-fourth verse is 
also rejected by several critics on the 
ground of eidoi. This may be valid 
as an objection; but it is in the manner 
of the Apostle to testify to his own truth-
fulness, xix. 35; and the use of the plural 
instead of the singular is not decisive.]

Ver. 1. Meta taute. John's usual 
indefinite note of time, de faenorwos 
dakovn, cf. vii. 4, xiii. 4, 12; Mark xvi. 12; 
"but these have been written these, vis., which have been included in this 
book, tiv . . . autou, with an object, and this object has determined their 
selection; 'that ye may believe that 
Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God'. 
The use of the 2nd pers. suggests that 
the writer had in view some special class. But his object was of universal signifi-
cance. See the Introduction.

CHAPTER XXI.—Supplementary chap-
ter in which Jesus again manifests Himself after the resurrection.

[There is no reason why this chapter should be ascribed to a different hand. 
The style is the same as that of the 
gospel, and although the gospel closed 
at the end of chap. xx., this supplementary 
chapter must have become an integral 
part of the gospel at a very early period. 
No trace exists of a gospel without it. 
It is by no means so certain that ver. 25 
is Johannine. It seems an inflated ver-

tion of xx. 30. The twenty-fourth verse is 
also rejected by several critics on the 
ground of eidoi. This may be valid 
as an objection; but it is in the manner 
of the Apostle to testify to his own truth-
fulness, xix. 35; and the use of the plural 
instead of the singular is not decisive.]

Ver. 1. Meta taute. John's usual 
indefinite note of time, de faenorwos 
dakovn, cf. vii. 4, xiii. 4, 12; Mark xvi. 12; 
"but these have been written these, vis., which have been included in this 
book, tiv . . . autou, with an object, and this object has determined their 
selection; 'that ye may believe that 
Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God'. 
The use of the 2nd pers. suggests that 
the writer had in view some special class. But his object was of universal signifi-
cance. See the Introduction.
disciples. Yes, when He openly addresses them; but here He uses the word any stranger might use, and the rendering "children" retained even in R.V. is wrong. It should be "lads"; παιδίον being the common term of address to men at work, see Aristophanes, Cl. 137, Fr. 33; Euthymius, ἓφος γάρ τοὺς ἑργατικοὺς οὕτως ὁμαίζει. Jesus appeared as an intending purchaser and cries, μετὰ προσφέροντος ἔχετε. "Have you taken any fish?" (R.V.: "have ye anything to eat?" misapprehends both the words and the situation). προσφέροντος, as its composition shows, means anything eaten as seasoning or "kitchen" to bread; being the Hellenistic word used instead of the Attic ὄφουν or προσφέρυμα. Atheneaeus and Plutarch both tell us that fish was so commonly used in this way that προσφέροντος came to mean "fish". ἔχετε has its quasi-technical sense, "have ye caught?"

For this sense, see Aristophanes, Cl. 705 (723, 731), where Socrates asks Strepisades under the blanket, ἔχετε τι; on which the Scholiast remarks, χαράζως τὸ ἔχεις τι, τῇ τῶν ἐργατῶν λέγει χρώμενον; τὸ γάρ ἄλλων ἦ ἐρωτα- γενέως οὕτως φασί, ἔχεις τι; saying that the words of Jesus are: "Lads, have ye caught no fish?" ἔκριθησαν αὐτῷ: "Οὐ," "They answered Him, 'No,'" without any Κύριε or Δίκαιακαλε.—Ver. 6. "Ο θεὸς καὶ εὕρητεν. "Cast your net on the right side of the boat, and you will find." They supposed the stranger had been making observations from the shore, had seen a shoal or some sign of fish, and unwilling to come in empty, ἔβαλον οὖν ἔλεγον. "They cast therefore, and were no longer (as they had been before) able to draw it [ἐλέγον, not ἔλεγον, see Veitch's Irreg. Verbs, seems here to be used as we use 'draw' in connection with a net, meaning to draw over the side of the boat so as to secure the fish. Contrast σύρετες in ver. 8] for the multitude of fishes"; ἔδω often means "on account of" in Dionysius Hal., Plutarch, and even in Thucydides and Sophocles as shown by Kypke.—Ver. 7. This sudden change of fortune John at once traced to its only possible source, Ο Κύριος ὁτι. "Vita quaeta citius observat res divinas quam actas." Bengel. "Σήμερον... ἀδελασάντα... ἐλέγετε... The different temperaments of the two Apostles as here exhibited have constantly been remarked upon; as by Euthymius, "John had the keener insight; Peter the greater ardour". Peter τῶν ἐπενθήτων ἐπεδίσετο. Some writers identify the ἐπενθήτης with the inner garment or χίτων, others suppose it was the outer garment or ἱμάτιον. And the reason assigned, ἢ γὰρ γυμνὸς, they say, is that he had only the χίτων. That one who was thus half-dressed might be called γυμνὸς is well known (see Aristoph., Cl. 480); but it was not the outer garment round which the belt was girt, but the inner. And besides, Peter must often have appeared before Jesus in their boat expeditions without his upper garment. And to put it on his Tithlish when about to plunge into the sea was out of the question. He was rowing, then, with as little on as possible, probably only a sublacum or loin-clot, and now picks up his ἐπενθήτης, a garment worn by fishers (Theophylact), and girds it on, and casts himself into the sea.—Ver. 8. The rest came in the little boat, οὖν ἦσαν... ἔλεγον. Bengel correctly explains the γάρ, "Celeriter hi quoque venire poterant". They were not far from the land, ἀλλ' ἂν ἦν ἀπ' τῶν πιστών διακοσιῶν, "about one hundred yards". πιστών, says Phrynichus, is διενεκής ἀντίκροι; we must use the form πιστῶν. Observe the unconscious exactness of the eye-witness. For the Hellenistic-con-
struction with ἀπό, cf. xi. 18. The others came συντροπεις... ἔργην, "hauling the net of the fishes," or "netful of the fishes"; genitive of contents, like δέντα ὄνων, a cup of wine. It is needless, with Lücke, to complete the construction with μαχστ, cf. ver. 11.—Ver. 9. Ὁ σὺν... ἄρτον. "When, then, they got out upon the land, they see a fire (or heap) of coals laid and fish laid thereon, and bread"; or, possibly, "a fish" and "a loaf," but see ver. 13. For ἀναχριστ., see xviii. 18. The disciples were evidently surprised at this preparation.—Ver. 10. But miracle is not gratuitously wrought; indeed, Weiss maintains there is neither miracle nor the appearance of one in this preparation. Accordingly Jesus says, ἔνεγκε... νῦν. And in compliance ἀνασκήνω. Simon Peter went on board and drew the net on shore full of large fishes, 153, and though there were so many the net was not torn." Mysteries have been found in this number. In Hebrew characters Simon Iona is equivalent to 118 + 35, i.e., 153. Some of the Fathers understood that 100 meant the Gentiles, 50 the Jews, 3 the Trinity. Jerome cites the authority of naturalists to prove that there were exactly 153 species of fish, and he concludes that the universality of the Gospel take was thus indicated. Calvin, with his usual robust sense, says: "quantum ad piscium numerum spectat, non est sublime aliquid in eo quaeerendum mysterium." Peter never landed a haul of fish without counting them, and John, fisherman as he was, could never forget the number of his largest takes. The number is given, because it was large, and because they were all surprised that the net stood the strain. The only significance our Lord recognises in the fish is that they were food for hungry men.—Ver. 12. λέγει... ἀνασκήνωτε, Jesus takes the place of host and says, "Come, breakfast," make your morning meal. ὁδοιας... Κύριε ἔστω, not one of the disciples ventured to interrogate Him; ἔνεγκε... νῦν is "to examine by questioning". Each man felt convinced it was the Lord, and a new reverence prevented them from questioning Him.—Ver. 13. When they had gathered round the fire, ἔρχεται... ὑμῶν. "Jesus approaches and takes the bread and gives to them, and the fish" (used here collectively) "in like manner." Evidently there was something solemn and significant in His manner, indicating that they were to consider Him as the Person who supplied all their wants. If they were to be free from care as His Apostles, they must trust Him to make provision for them, as He had this morning done.—Ver. 14. A note is added, perhaps indicating no more than John's orderliness of mind, explaining that this was the third manifestation given by Jesus to His disciples after rising from the dead. For the form of expression, τοῦτο ὑπὸ τρίτον, see 2 Cor. xiii. 1.

Vv. 15-18. Jesus evokes from Peter a confession of love, and commissions him as shepherd of His sheep.—Ver. 15.

"Ὅν ὅσον ἐροτηθης, "when, then, they had broken their fast," a note of time essential to the conversation following. Peter had manifested the most ardent affection, by abandoning on the instant the net of fish for which he had been toiling all night, and by springing into the sea to greet his Lord. But was not that a mere impulsive demonstration,
870 KATA IOANNHN

15. "Ote oiv ariosthsw, legi tiv Similar Petrov ev kiprond, 21.1a. ""Similar Iowv,1 agapte me plievov toitwv;" Legi autv, "Nai
b. kivr eiv ovdas oti filw sv. Legi autv, "Biske tiv Arivia
muov." 16. Legi autv paliv deyterov, "Similar Iowv, agapte me;"
Lega autv, "Nai kivr eiv ovdas oti filw sv." Legi autv,
1 Better leown with NBC*DL. So in 16, 17.
2 probeta in BC; probeta in NAD. Some have thought there was a climax,
arvav, probeta, probeta. "Passe agriculv neos, passe agnus meos, passe
oviculas meas."

"the wholesome madness of an hour"? Therefore He lets Peter settle down, He
lets him breakfast and then takes him at the coolest hour of the day, and, at last
breaking silence, says, Similar Iowv [better, 'leomev] agapte me plievov [better, plieov]
toivn; "Simon, son of John, love thou me more than these?" So far as
grammar goes, this may either mean
"Lovest thou me more than the other
disciples love me?" or "Lovest thou
me more than this boat and net and
your old life?" It may either refer
to Peter's saying, "Though all should
forsake Thee, yet will not I," or to
his sudden abandonment of the boat
and fishing gear. If the former were
intended, the second personal pronoun
would almost necessarily be expressed;
but, as the words stand, the contrast is not
between "you" and "these," but be-
tween "me" and "these". Besides,
would the characteristic tact and delicacy
of Jesus have allowed Him to put a
question involving a comparison of Peter
with his fellow-disciples? The latter
interpretation, although branded by
Lucke as "eine geistlose lacherliche
Frase," commends itself. Difference
of opinion also exists about the use of
agapte and philv, most interpreters
believing that by the former a love based
on esteem or judgment is indicated, by
the latter the affection of the heart.
The Vulgate distinguishes by using
"diligie" and "amo". Trench (Syno-
nyms, 38) uses this distinction for the
interpretation of this passage, and main-
tains that Peter in his reply intentionally
changes the colder agapte into the
warmer philv. It is very doubtful
whether this is justifiable. The two
words are used interchangeably to ex-
press the love of Jesus for John, see xii.
23, and xx. 2; also for His love for
Lazarus, xi. 3, 5, 36. And that the
distinction cannot be maintained at any
rate in this conversation is obvious from
ver. 17; for if the words differed in
meaning, it could not be said that
"Peter was grieved because Jesus a third
time said, philev me;" because
Jesus had not used these words three
times. The words seem interchanged for
euphony, as in Aelian, Var. Hist., ix. 1,
where Hiero is said to have lived with
his three brothers, πανε σφόδρα
agapthev autous kal eiv oiv autov
philhev eiv to mepoi. In Peter's answer there is
no sense of any discrepancy between the
kind of love demanded and the love felt.
It comes with a vaia, Kivv. Why need
He ask? oiv ovdas... In this appeal to
Christ's own knowledge there is probably,
as Weiss suggests, a consciousness of
his own liability to be deceived, as shown
in his recent experience.—Ver. 16. To
this confession, the Lord responds,
Biske tiv Arivia muov, "Feed my lambs,"
showing that Jesus could again trust him
and could leave in his hands those
whom He loved. "Lambs" is used
instead of "sheep" to bring out more
strongly the appeal to care, and the
consequent complete confidence shown
in Peter. legi... muov. The second
inquiry is intended to drive Peter back
from mere customary or lip-profession to
the deep-lying affections of his spirit.
But now no comparison is introduced
into the question, which might be par-
aphrased: "Are you sure that love and
nothing but love is the bond between
you and me?" This test Peter
stands. He replies as before; and
again is entrusted with the work in
which His Lord is chiefly interested,
Poleivn tiv probeta muov. No different
function is intended by poleivne: it re-
peats in another form the commission
already given.—Ver. 17. But to him
who had uttered a threefold denial, op-
portunity is given of a threefold confes-
sion, although Peter at first resented the
reiterated inquiry: 'Ελυπήθη . . . He was grieved because doubt was implied, and he knew he had given cause for doubt. His reply is therefore more earnest than before, Κύριε . . . Φιλέ με. He is so conscious of deep and abiding love that he can appeal to the Lord’s omniscience. The στὸ πάντα οἶδας [or πάντα σὺ οἶδας with recent editors] reflects a strong light on the belief which had sprung up in the disciples from their observation of our Lord. And again he is commissioned, or commanded to manifest his love in the feeding of Christ’s sheep. The one qualification for this is love to Christ. It is not for want of time no other questions are asked. There was time to put this one question three times over; and it was put because love is the one essential for the ministry to which Peter and the rest are called.—Ver. 18. To this command our Lord unexpectedly adds a reflection and warning emphasised by the usual ἄμην ἅμα λέγω σοί. It had been with a touch of misanthropy in Peter’s heart, and probably there is a latent reference to this, but in the first instance it is a summons to Peter to accompany Jesus as He retires from the rest. This is clear from what follows.—Ver. 20. 'Επιστραφεῖν . . . σα. Peter had already followed Jesus some distance, but hearing steps behind him he turns and sees John following. The elaborate description of John in this verse is, perhaps almost unconsciously, introduced to justify his following without invitation. ‘On the word ἀνέφερεν . . . σα. Peter had already followed Jesus some distance, but hearing steps behind him he turns and sees John following. The elaborate description of John in this verse is, perhaps almost unconsciously, introduced to justify his following without invitation. ‘On the word ἀνέφερεν . . . σα. Peter had already followed Jesus some distance, but hearing steps behind him he turns and sees John following. The elaborate description of John in this verse is, perhaps almost unconsciously, introduced to justify his following without invitation. On the word ἀνέφερεν, see Origen, in Ἰωαν., ii. 151 (Brooke’s edition).—Ver. 21. Peter, however, seeks an explanation, Κύριε
23. "Εξήλθαν οὖν ὁ λόγος οὗτος εἰς τοὺς ἅδελφους, "Ὁτι ὁ μάθητής ὃς ἀποθνῄσκεται, καὶ ὁ ὁκείων αὐτῷ ἢ Ἰησοῦς, ὃς ὁκεί ἄν τῶν ἑαυτῶν, ἢ Ἰησοῦς, ὃς ὁκεί ἁπατήσει. 24. ΟΥΣΙΣ ἵνα ὁ μάθητής ὁ μαρτυρεῖν περὶ τούτων, καὶ γράφῃς ταῦτα· καὶ οὖθαν διὸ ἀληθῆ ὅτι ἦν ὁ μαρτυρεῖν αὐτὸς. 25. ἦτο ἀλλὰ πολλὰ ὡς ἐποίησαν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ἄτιμα ἦν γραφήναι ἐν τῇ ICLE 

1 Tisch. omits this verse with Ν. For σος of ACDE a is read in ἹΒC* X. For χρηστον of ACDE χρηστον is found in ἹΒC* X. Αρμ. is omitted in ἹABCD 1, 33.

... τι, "Lord, and this man, what of him?"—Ver. 22. To which Jesus replies with a shade of rebuke, Ἐκ ... τοις. Peter, in seeking even to know the future of another disciple, was stepping beyond his province, τι πρὸς σου; τοῦ ἀκολουθεῖ μοι. Your business is to follow me, not to intermeddle with others. Cf. A Kempis' description of the man who "neglects his duty, musing on all that other men are bound to do". De Imit. Christi, ii. 3. Over-anxiety about any part of Christ's Church is to forget that there is a chief Shepherd who arranges for all. This part of the conversation might not have been recorded, but for a misunderstanding which arose out of it. —Ver. 23. Ἐφάλαν ... πρὸς σου; "There went forth this saying among the brethren, that that disciple should not die". John himself, however, has no such belief, because he remembers with exactness the hypothetical form of the Lord's words, Ἐκ ... τοις μὲν ... Another instance of the precision with which John recalled some, at least, of the words of Jesus.

In ver. 24, the writer of the gospel is identified with the disciple whom Jesus loved, and a certificate of his truth is added. The whole verse has a strong resemblance to xix. 35, and it seems impossible to say with certainty whether they were or were not written by the evangelist himself. The οὖθαν might seem to imply that several united in this certificate. But who in John's old age were there, who could so certify the truth of the gospel? They could have no personal, direct knowledge of the facts; and could merely affirm the habitual truthfulness of John. Cf. too the χρηστος of ver. 25 where a return to the singular is made; but this may be because in the former clause the writer speaks in the name of several others, while in the latter he speaks in his own name. Who these others were, disciples, Ephesian presbyters, friends, Apostles, it is vain to conjecture. τοῦτων and ταύτα refer to the whole gospel, including chap. xxi. Besides the things narrated δοτι δι ... Αρμ. The verse re-affirms the statement of xx. 30, adding a hyperbolical estimate of the space required to recount all that Jesus did, if each detail were separately told, ἢν γράφηται καθ' οὖ. 