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EXCURSUS TO THE GOSPEL. 552
The present Commentary may in many respects claim to be considered as new in its design and construction, and as an attempt to supply a need which has been long and seriously felt by meditative readers of God's Holy Word.

We have at present no Commentary of the New Testament which addresses itself especially to that large and increasing class of cultivated English readers who, believing the Holy Scriptures to be what an ancient writer has defined them to be—"the true sayings of the Holy Ghost"—and knowing and feeling them to be living and abiding words, desire to realise them, and to be able intelligently to apply them to their daily wants and to the general context of life around them. This class largely includes those who are unable to read the Holy Scriptures in their original languages, and to whom the many valuable commentaries, based on the original text, which this country and Germany now freely supply, are unavailing and inaccessible. And yet, even if they could read them, they would hardly find in them all they want. They might find lucid explanations of difficulties, well-chosen historical illustrations, judicial discussion of disputed interpretations, candid investigation of real or supposed discrepancies; still there would be something yet wanting which, after all, they would feel was that which they most needed, and for which, even amid all this influence of exegetical detail, they were to some extent looking in vain. This something, this lacking element, even in commentaries of this higher class, it is the especial object and design of our present Commentary at any rate to attempt to supply; and it may briefly be defined to be this—the setting forth of the inner life of Scripture, and that, too, not without reference to the hopes, fears, needs, aspirations, and distinctive characteristics of the restless age in which we are now living.

No class feels more sensibly the need of this vital element in the interpretation of Holy Scripture than the large and intelligent body of thoughtful men and women to which we are especially addressing ourselves. They feel the storm and stress of intellectual difficulties; they realise, often vividly and acutely, the trials to which the childlike faith of early days is now being increasingly subjected; they see old landmarks disappearing, old truths undergoing modification and change, and, in their deepening anxiety, they turn, with the true instinct of the Christian soul, to that which they inwardly feel changes not—the enduring and abiding Word of God. They turn to it; and it speaks to them, for it is a living Word; but its consolations are often only imperfectly appreciated, its truths far from fully realised, its promises very inadequately recognised to be the true moving principles of a pure, chivalrous, self-denying, and holy life. They need the sympathetic interpreter. They need one to guide them, who has thought as they think, who feels as they feel—one who, from no mere ecclesiastical standpoint, or the supposed vantage-ground of some half-selfish theological adjustment, but simply from the reverent, loving, and prayerful study of the Book of Life, sets forth to them its ever fresh truths, its ever new aspects, its ever pertinent and timely consolations. Such is the commentator and such the commentary that is now more than ever needed by the earnest general reader in these closing years of a progressive and eventful century.

That these high aims have been realised in this present volume is more than any editor, however hopeful, and however confident in the ability of those with whom he is working, could by any means with propriety assert. Yet this may be said—that the attempt has been made with the full recognition, not only of the importance of the work, but of the peculiar aspects it must necessarily assume, and also
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of the general spiritual characteristics of those for whom it is chiefly designed—thoughtful English
readers, who desire to understand the written Word, feel its power, realise its message, estimate its
difficulties, and recognise its living adaptation to all the complex relations and problems of modern
religious life. If the New Testament is truly what we believe it to be, it must have a message to every
age and generation; this message, especially as concerns our own times, is what we are now endeavou­
ing to set forth fully, candidly, and unreservedly, to the Christian reader.

It would be too much to say that this has never been attempted before. Works like those of Bengel
may remind us that men to whom the Holy Spirit has vouchsafed a singular interpretative faculty, and,
with it, that almost greater gift of bringing its results home alike to the heart and to the perceptions of
the reader—works such as these, as marvellous in the fruitful brevity of their comments as profound in
their spiritual power, may well remind us that He who inspired the Word has never left Himself without
clear and faithful interpreters of it. This we fully believe and recognise; still we may also express our
belief that it is more particularly in our own times that the need for such an attempt as the present has
distinctly emerged, and so that anything novel which it may involve is due to the circumstances of the
case, and to the plain fact that, as the needs are new, so that which attempts to meet the needs must have
some elements which are new also. Thus far our work may be considered to occupy new ground, and
in many respects to be considered a new Commentary: new, because it includes new elements; new,
because it meets new needs.

But what are these new needs? What is it that has really called into existence such attempts as
this present Commentary may in some degree represent? The answer is not far to seek. Modern
criticism has made it in many minds doubtful whether Scripture is what it declares itself to be—living
and enduring, not only a record of salvation, but a bearer of it to the soul; not only, as the early writers
commonly regarded it, a source of illumination to the mind, but a life-influencing and life-modifying
power, as fresh and as potent now as when its words were first heard in the Christian Church. Modern
criticism has declared all such views to be dreams and enthusiasms, perhaps harmless, but certainly
illusory; enthusiasms which may be regarded by the calm student of history as either the not unnatural
results of traditional reverence, or the sequences of that great movement in the religious
life of Western
Europe that transferred infallibility from a Church to a Book, and invested with supernatural attributes
the documents of an early Christianity which, it is asserted, itself never so regarded them. And these
chilling doubts have crept into the souls of thousands. The early love and reverence for the blessed
Book, and especially for the New Testament, has become silently transmuted into a calm and cold
acceptance of it as the record of a wondrous era in this poor world's changing history; as a group of
documents setting forth a morality purer than the mind of man had ever realised; as the sad, strange
story of a blessed life, half real, half ideal, to which eighteen centuries have tendered their irrepressible
homage; as this, and perhaps as all this, and yet as nothing beyond it—history, and nothing more.
Many and many a weary soul, and those not the least noble among us, are at this very hour feeling all
this, and feeling it too with the sad inward consciousness that the soul remains unsatisfied; that the dew
of early belief has dried up, and that nothing has ever supplied its place; and that if only it were possible
that that dew could rise again all yet might be well: that the lost might yet be found, and a hope in
something higher than the mere development of our humanity might again take its leading place among
the lights and forces of the soul. Many a one would give half a life if only it could be made certain that
the New Testament might be completely accepted as true, and that its words once more might be heard
as the voice of God speaking through the lips and with the utterance of mortal man.

These are some of the needs of the present time, and it is to meet them, and to show that God's
word is really what it claims to be; that it is truth—vivid, fresh, and enduring truth; that it is light, and
not light only—but life, life speaking to life—to show this, and to meet these needs is one of the chief
purposes of our present Commentary. It is under these aspects that it may lay claim to the title of a
new Commentary—new, as thus meeting new needs; new, as seeking to supply guidance amid newly developing difficulties and perplexities.

But this—as, indeed, we have already implied—is very far from being our only purpose. There are, thank God, thousands and tens of thousands to whom this Book of Life is what it ever was, and who perhaps feel themselves more potently drawn to it than ever. Numbers of quiet and godly souls there now are, weary with the controversies of the times, who are turning now, as men turned in stirring days gone by, to the Holy Scriptures, and are making them their ultimate Book of appeal—ultimate whether in regard of the homely needs of daily Christian life, or of those blessed hopes and promises that bring nearer the unfolding future. And these too are seeking for a Commentary that may really meet and sympathise with their aspirations—a Commentary that may help them to realise the blessed story, to see things as with modern, and yet as with reverential and believing eyes, and to hear with the ears of to-day the message, the great life-giving message, that is now just as pertinent and applicable to all the varying circumstances of modern life as it was when to listening disciples and thronging multitudes it was declared that God's kingdom was nigh at hand. Everything that thus brings back the past and places it, as it were, among the realities of the present, is what the modern religious mind is now consciously or unconsciously seeking. Its chief care is to make its own what it knows was designed to be its own; and it welcomes readily and gladly any or every form of interpretation that seems to have this purpose or object in view.

It is for these—for this large and increasing class of really earnest readers of God's Holy Word—that this Commentary has been more especially composed. Though, as has been already said, the deep needs of those who have not yet realised the Book to be what it is have ever been present to our minds; and though every effort has been made indirectly to set forth that greatest of all evidential arguments, the deep life of the written Word, to each truth-seeking and unbiassed reader; yet our chief thought has been for those who desire more fully to realise that which, by the mercy of God, they have never been tempted to doubt. How many there are who are now earnestly seeking for that which we are here endeavouring to present to them! The student of Holy Scripture, the Christian father of the family where God's Word is loved and reverenced, the upgrowing children, the teacher in the Sunday-school or the instructor of the Bible-class, and, last and chief of all, that large class of English readers who feel themselves more and more drawn to God's Word by the very restlessness of the times in which they are living. All these, and such as these, are now earnestly craving to have Scripture brought home to their hearts, and that too not merely by interpretation of difficulties, but by meditative comments—comments of our time and age, comments that help to make the Book not only better understood, not only more reverenced, but more and more loved, more and more felt to be life to the inner soul as well as light to the appreciative mind.

These, then, are the two broad classes of readers—those who doubt the full authority of Scripture, but who would rejoice to have those doubts dissipated, and that much larger class that (by God's blessing) doubt not, but desire more fully to realise and to understand: these are the two classes who have been ever present to the thoughts of the writers of this Commentary, and for whom especially they have undertaken this work. May the favour and grace of God the Holy Ghost rest upon it, and bless it both to the writers and to the readers.

Thus far our thoughts have been directed to our readers. Let a few words be added in reference to the writers who are associated together in this responsible work. They are men of different minds and of different modes of individual thought, but all have one common purpose—all are animated by one common feeling of love and reverence for God's Holy Word, all have for it that sympathy which shows itself most clearly and most truly when it tries to impart that feeling to others, and to share with them a common love. Free and candid thoughts will be found in these pages; difficulties will not be passed over; if they cannot, as yet, be explained, the avowal will be made with all Christian simplicity, and the
direction in which the solution appears to lie, pointed out by way of suggestion and reasonable inference—suggestion and inference, but nothing more. No attempt will be made merely to rehabilitate what may have the sanction of honoured names or ancient authority; still less merely to reproduce some current and conventional explanation, which is not only felt to be what it is by every intelligent reader, but is even distinctly harmful and repellent to the reverential searcher. The truth is very dear to the writers of this Commentary, and their reverence for it is too great to allow them ever to set forth as truth any explanations in which they themselves have not the fullest and completest confidence. Yet let no one for a moment suppose that in these pages he will find traces of unfixed opinions or of fluctuating and half-persuaded sentiments as to the real nature of God's Holy Word. No: each one of our little company knows in Whom and in What he has trusted—knows and believes that truth, heavenly truth, is present in every verse, even though he may not be able to see it in its clearness, or set it forth in its fulness; and knows it, too, by that best and truest of all teachings—the silent witness of Scripture to the inward soul, deepened by life's experiences—that testimonia animae, which bears the conviction no arguments can supply, no merely outward reasoning can do more than passingly substantiate. Candour, and candid seeking after truth, the reader will find; and with it that sympathy of spirit in difficulties which alone makes the writer and the reader truly to be at one. This, we humbly believe, each one who may read these pages will find legibly traced on them; but on the one great truth that Holy Scripture alike is God's Word and contains God's Word, there will be found no hesitancy or fluctuation. Let this be called an assumption at the very outset which perfect impartiality ought never to make—let it be called prejudice, inherited bias, or bear whatever other name our own unstable age may think fit to apply to it; such, at any rate, is the conviction of the writers of this Commentary, and such the general attitude of mind under which they have addressed themselves to their responsible work.

And now, lastly, a few comments on the details of this work, as regards both the matter and manner of interpretation.

In the first place, the Authorised version is that on which the Commentary is formed; and this for obvious reasons. This is a work for general readers, to whom the Authorised version will for years to come be the form in which God's Word is presented to them. As such it stands as our text, and as that which the notes are designed to illustrate. But while it rightly occupies that place, care has been taken never to fail to indicate whenever and wheresoever there is sound reason for believing that the words do not reflect the true text or the true meaning of the original. Mere minutiae of textual criticism are not enumerated; mere shades of interpretation which leave the real meaning substantially the same are not specified. The reader, however, may in all cases feel confident that nothing in this department of the work is passed over which it is proper for the faithful student of Holy Scripture to have presented to his consideration. The notes will remind him that there is real need for a revision of our Authorised version, perhaps more even in its textual than in its grammatical aspects; but at the same time he will not fail to observe how comparatively few the passages are in which the true meaning of the original is entirely obscured. There are many in which its full meaning is very inadequately expressed; but, by the overruling mercy and providence of God, distinctly erroneous forms of words appear very rarely either in the text or in the translation.

The Notes, as already has been to some extent implied, are designed for earnest searchers and earnest readers who have either no knowledge of the original language, or only such a knowledge as may be at best but a precarious guide. Hence the references in the Notes are in all cases to works accessible by means of translation to English readers. Such references are not numerous, but, wherever they appear, they will be found to direct the reader to illustrative matter, which will much help his true appreciation of the passage under consideration. The effect, not only on the general power of rightly apprehending the meaning of a passage, but on the memory, and, if we may so speak, on the spiritual interest in the inspired words under consideration, will be found greatly enhanced by an attention to a well-chosen
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reference, and by an honest perusal of the source of illustration, or of further information to which the reader may be directed. References, whether to Scripture or to works that illustrate it, are of the greatest and most real importance. If thoughtfully and conscientiously made, and as thoughtfully and conscientiously referred to by the reader, they are of lasting profit. But the choice must be well considered and well tested, and the number of references carefully limited. Full confidence must exist in this matter between the commentator and his reader; and such confidence we trust and believe will be found to arise between the writers and readers of this Commentary.

But the broad purpose of the Notes—not only to explain and to illustrate, but to bring home to the heart of the reader the sacred text to which the Notes are appended—has never been lost sight of or merged in mere exegetical detail. On the one hand all real or seeming difficulties have been candidly set forth, and the inferences which may be thought to flow from them discussed and analysed. Nothing has been kept back from the reader. The truth, so far as a knowledge of it has been vouchsafed to the interpreter, has been stated fully and unreservedly; and where difficulty yet remains, no attempt has been made to hide it by any of the plausibilities of a mere conventional or traditional exegesis. If that which lies before us is God's word, revealed to man through the instrumentality of man, then difficulties there must be; yet difficulties of such a nature as, if rightly and reverently discussed, will, in the sequel, only still more clearly and convincingly display the blessed fulness of the manifold and multiform wisdom of God. On the other hand, where the meaning is plain, and the inferences from it presumably certain, there, with equal freedom and unreserve, these inferences have been drawn, and the results—results often in contrast with the current superficial estimates of a mere popular theology—laid seriously before the reader. Our work is for the thoughtful and earnest, for those who seek truth and love truth, for those who desire to be guided by God's Word, and to realise its message in days of doubt and transition; and to withhold from such what would seem to be the full counsel of God, would be to miss the first great duty of a conscientious interpreter. Such, in broad and general terms, is the prevailing aspect of the notes and exegesis of this Commentary.

Two useful supplements to these Notes will be found in the case of the sacred books here commented upon. In the first place, an Introduction is prefixed to each portion of Scripture; in which everything that is judged to be likely to illustrate the scope, circumstances, or general details of the inspired writing, is placed succinctly—but yet, it is hoped, with no want of completeness—before the general reader. In the second place, wherever it may have seemed necessary, an Excursus has been appended to the Notes, for the benefit of the student who might desire a fuller and more technical treatment of the subject than would be consistent with the general scope of the Commentary. By this means the many points which require a separate consideration will be found so far critically, as well as fully, discussed, as to leave no reader, to whatever class he may belong, uninformed in regard of the last and best results, in each particular, of modern interpretation.

To the whole work an Introduction is prefixed, from which it is hoped that both the general and the critical reader will derive trustworthy information both as to the literary history of the sacred documents, and the deeply interesting story of the noble English version which is the text of this Commentary. Such information will be found useful to the reader at every step of his progress. He will practically see and realise that the outward elements of God's inspired Word have had a great and even mysterious history, and that if we may humbly see His blessed inspiration in the written words, no less clearly may we trace His providence in the outward manner in which those words have come down to us. No really faithful student of God's Holy Word will do well to pass over this portion of the work. No reader, however moderately versed in knowledge of this kind, will fail to derive from these pages information which he will readily comprehend, and at once find to interest him still more deeply in the sacred words which form the subject of the providential history.

One brief and closing paragraph may allude to the work of the Editor, and, if I may here speak in
the first person, the aspects under which I have regarded the responsible office, and the manner in which I have endeavoured to perform the duties allotted to me. My care has simply been to help each writer, where it might seem necessary, to set forth his own views with clearness and cogency. Without perfect independence on the part of the writers—and such writers, let me add, as we have had the good fortune to secure for this Commentary—no good results could be looked for, no realisation of our great and common objects could ever be attained. Where it has seemed necessary, I have used an Editor's freedom in suggesting partial reconsideration; but I have deemed it right to leave the writer wholly free to maintain that line of interpretation which, after such reconsideration, he still felt it his duty to take. All I have asked is that he should make it plain that it was a view for which he was individually responsible. Where I have simply differed from the writer in points on which interpreters of different minds have differed and will differ to the end, there I have in no way sought to indicate my own opinion, feeling sure that the writer had considered this opinion (for I lay claim to no originality) among those which had passed in review before him. Each writer, in a word, is responsible for his own commentary and his own interpretations. It has been my care only to see, by close and careful reading, that the writer did not fail, from any oversight, to set forth these interpretations fully and clearly. To express here any opinion on what is now submitted to the reader would be indecorous and unusual; yet this I must ask leave to say—that I can wish no better wish to any reader, than that he may derive the same interest and advantage that I have derived from the perusal of this volume of our Commentary.

I return now to the company and brotherhood of those with whom I am associated, and with them pray to our merciful God and Father that this our work may be blessed by His divine favour, and that His heavenly truth may be brought more and more home to the hearts of the readers of His Holy Word. We have striven, at a critical time in the history of religious opinion, to show forth the fulness of that Word, its light and its life; and we now commend these results of our labours to all who love Him of whom the Scriptures speak from the beginning to the end—Jesus Christ, our Lord, our Saviour, our King, and our God; to Whom, with the Father and the eternal Spirit, be all honour and glory, for the ages of eternity.

C. J. GLOUCESTER AND BRISTOL.
INTRODUCTION.

I. THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

I. The language in which we commonly speak of the volume which all Christians accept as being, in some sense, their rule of faith and life, presents many terms more or less technical in character, each of which has a distinct history of its own, not without interest. The whole volume for us is the Bible, or more fully, the Holy Bible, containing the Old and New Testaments. Sometimes we use the Scripture, or the Scriptures, or the Holy Scriptures, as a synonym for the Bible. With these we sometimes find, bound up in the same volume, "the books called Apocrypha," which are distinguished in the Sixth of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England from the "Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament." It is desirable that the student of the New Testament should know, at least in outline, something as to the meaning and history of each of these terms.

II. Of all the words so used, Scripture, or the Scriptures, is that which stands highest, as far as the claims of antiquity and authority affect our estimate. It had come to be used by the Jews before our Lord's time as contrasting—as the Moslem now contrasts, in reference to the Koran—those who had a written rule, or book, as the rule of faith and life, with those who had not. The books that had been written in "sundry times and divers manners" (see Note to Heb. i. 1, for the true meaning of the words), and which, after various processes of sifting, editing, and revising, were then received as authoritative, were known as "the Writings," "the Scriptures," as in Matt. xxi. 42, Luke xxiv. 27, John viii. 39, sometimes with the addition of the term "holy," or "sacred" (2 Tim. iii. 5.) It was because they studied this literature (grammata), that the interpreters of the Law were known as "scribes" (grammatai). When these books were quoted, it was enough to say, "It is written" (e.g., Matt. iv. 6; xxii. 13; xxvi. 24), or, with more emphasis, "the Scripture saith" (e.g., Rom. iv. 7; ix. 17), or to cite this or that "Scripture" (Mark xii. 10).

It may be noted, however, that the later terminology of the Jews in their classification of the Sacred Books differed from this. They applied the term "Writings" (Ketubin), or "Holy Writings" (from which we get the Hebrew Mikra ("what is read or recited"), a word which has the interest of being connected with the Koran, or sacred book, of Islam.

III. The Greek word for Bible (Biblion) occurs in our version as "book," in 2 Tim. iv. 13, Rev. x. 3, v. 1, but not apparently with any specially distinctive sense. It is just possible that in the first of these passages St. Paul may refer to what he elsewhere calls the Scriptures. (See Note on 2 Tim. iv. 13.) This sense, however, did not begin to attach to the word by itself till the twelfth or thirteenth century. Greek writers indeed, talked, as was natural, of the sacred or holy "books" on which their faith rested; and, as in the Council of Laodicea, drew up catalogues of such books, or spoke of the whole universe as a book, or "bible," in which men might read the wisdom and love of the Creator. It was natural, as the word came to be used, like other Greek terms, in the Western churches, that transcribers, or binders, of the "sacred books" should label them as Biblia Sacra. As the centuries passed on, however, men forgot the origin of the word, and took Biblia, not for a neuter plural, as it really was, but for a feminine singular; and so we get the origin of the "Holy Bible," betraying itself in most European languages, as, e.g., in La Bible, La Bibbia, die Bibel, by the feminine form of the noun. We are able to fix, within comparatively narrow limits, the date of the introduction of the word so used into our English language. It was unknown to our Saxon fathers. They used ge-wriht, the "Writing," or following Jerome's felicitous phrase, Bibliothèque, the "library" or collection of books. "Bible" came into use through the Norman conquest and the prevalence of French. Chaucer uses it in his earlier poems (House of Fame, Book iii., l. 244) as applicable to any book. In the Prologue to the Canterbury Tales, l. 437, his latest work, it stands as "the Bible," with its new distinctive honours. Wycliffe's translation of what was headed as the Holy Bible, and the frequent use of the term in the Preface to this translation, probably gained for it a wide acceptance, and all idea of its plural meaning having dropped out of sight, the definite article acquired a new significance, and it was received, as ninety-nine readers out of a hundred receive it now, as the Bible, the Book above all other books.

IV. The history of the terms the Old and the New Testament leads us into a region of yet higher interest. They have their starting point in the memorable distinction drawn between the Covenant that had been made with Israel through Moses, and the New Covenant, with its better promises, which was proclaimed for the future, in Jer. xxxi. 31. That promise received a fresh significance, and was stamped for ever in the minds of the followers of Christ, by the words...
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which were spoken on the night of the Last Supper, when He told the Apostles that it was ratified by His own blood. (See Note on Matt. xxvi. 28, where Covenant, and not "Testament," is the right rendering.) The stress laid on the distinction between the two Cov­enant—in the Epistle to the Hebrews (chap. vii. x.) was, as it were, the natural development of that thought; and the repetition of the words of institution, as we find them in 1 Cor. xi. 25, at every celebration of the Supper of the Lord, secured for it a universal acceptance in all the churches. For a time, the essential outlines of the New Covenant—the terms, as it were, of the New Contract—were conveyed chiefly or exclusively by the oral teaching of the Apostles and their immediate followers. But soon the New Covenant, like the Old, gathered round it a literature of its own. Without anticipating what will have to be said hereafter as to the history of individual books, it lies on the surface that within sixty or seventy years after the Death and Resurrection of the Lord Jesus, there were written records of His words and deeds. Epistles purporting to be written by His Apostles and disciples, revelations of the future of His kingdom. In course of time, but probably not till the fourth century, the books so received came naturally enough to be known as the Books of the New Covenant (diathekē), as distinguished from those of the Old; and so in the Council of Laodicea, in A.D. 320, we have lists of the books which were recognised as belonging to each (Can. 50). The Greek word for Covenant was never naturalised, however, in the Latin of the Western and African churches, and the two latter words, but state that the last was the more generally accepted term. As such, it passed first into the early Latin versions of the Scriptures, and then into St. Jerome's Vulgate, and so became familiar throughout the whole of Latin Christendom. If we confine its meaning to its strict legal sense of "will," it must be admitted to be a less accurate rendering than ἱερός of the general sense of the Greek diathēkē (Heb. ix. 16—"in the person of Christ, He made a testament, a "deed;" and testamentum, a "will.") The earlier Latin writers, such as Tertullian (adv. Marcion, vi. 1), use both the two latter words, but state that the last was the more generally accepted term. As such, it passed first into the early Latin versions of the Scriptures, and then into St. Jerome's Vulgate, and so became familiar throughout the whole of Latin Christendom. If we confine its meaning to its strict legal sense of "will," it must be admitted to be a less accurate rendering than ἱερός of the general sense of the Greek diathēkē (Heb. ix. 16—"in the person of Christ, He made a testament, a "deed;" and testamentum, a "will.") The earlier Latin writers, such as Tertullian (adv. Marcion, vi. 1), use both the two latter words, but state that the last was the more generally accepted term. As such, it passed first into the early Latin versions of the Scriptures, and then into St. Jerome's Vulgate, and so became familiar throughout the whole of Latin Christendom.

V. In the Sixth of the Thirty-Nine Articles of the English Church, we find the phrase CANONICAL SCRIPTURES, and that term also has a noteworthy history of its own. We start from the Greek word ἱερός, connected with "canā, " canālis, "channus," "canal, " "cannon"—all the words implying the idea of straightness—and find its primary meaning to be that of a "reed," or rather (for that belongs to the earlier form, kanē), of a rod; then of a rod used as a carpenter's rule; thence, by a natural use of metaphors, it was employed, chiefly by Alexandrian critics and grammarians, for a "rule" in ethics, or rhetoric, or grammar. So the great writers of Greece were referred to as being the Canon or standard of accuracy. In the LXX. version of the Old Testament, the word is found only once, in Mic. vii. 10. The passage is very obscure, but it is apparently used in the sense of a column or bar of some sort, as it is also in Judith xiii. 8. The figurative sense had become dominant in the time of the New Testament, and so we find St. Paul using it in Gal. vi. 16, Phil. iii. 16, for a "rule" of faith and life, and in 2 Cor. x. 13, 16, for one which marked out a man's appointed line of work. So Councils made Canons, or Rules, for the churches. So those who were bound by the rules of cathedrals and collegiate churches were called Canonicæ, or Canons. So the fixed invariable part of the Roman liturgy was known as the Canon of the Mass.

At even an earlier period than that to which these later illustrations refer, the word had come into use as belonging to the language of theology. Clement of Alexandria speaks of the Canon of the Church being found in the agreement of the Law and the Prophets with the traditional teaching of the New Covenant (Strom. vi., p. 676). Chrysostom and other commentators find the Canon, or Rule, of Faith in Scripture. Tertullian, obviously Latinising the same word, speaks of the doctrine which the Church had received from the Apostles or embodied in a creed, as the regulæ fidei. Alexandria appears in this, as in other instances, to have been the main source of ecclesiastical terminology. In Origen we find the next application of the word, and he speaks (in books of which we have only the Latin version) of the Scripture Canonicæ, libri regulares. Origen's gloss of ἱεροῖς is obscured, but his gloss of ἱεροῖς is understood by some of the more scholarly Protestant theologians, such as Beza, as part of their terminology. So in the writings of the French Reformed Church, the New Testament appears as La Nouvelle Alliance. Luther, with a certain characteristic love for time-honoured words, used Testament throughout, and though some recent German writers have used Band, it does not seem likely to gain general acceptance. In the history of the English versions we find Wycliffe, as was natural in a translation from the Vulgate, using "Testa­ment" uniformly. Tyndale, in spite of his usual ten­dency to change the familiar terms of Latin theology, was probably in part influenced by Luther's example, and retained "Testament" throughout. He was followed in the other English translations till we come to that known as the Geneva version, where it is replaced by "Covenant" in most passages, still re­taining, so to speak, its place of honour in Matt. xxvi. 28, Luke xxiii. 20, and Heb. ix. 16, and it has thus secured a position from which it will not be easy to dislodge it.

In strict accuracy, we ought to speak, as the title-page of our Bible does, of the Books of the New Testament, but the natural tendency of popular speech to economy of utterance leads men to speak of the "New Testament" as including the books.
THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Scripture (1 Tim. v. 18). There were Epistles that were cited in the same way (2 Pet. iii. 15). There were many references to the Gospels, and to the teaching of Christ (Luke i. 2). The "memoirs" of the Apostles were read publicly in Christian assemblies, and these were known as Gospels (Justin, Apol. c. 66). Besides these books, which are now in the Canon, we find a Gospel of the Hebrews, and of St. Peter, a Revelation bearing the name of the same Apostle, an Epistle to the Laodiceans, and so on. It was obvious that men would want some standard by which to discern the genuine from the spurious, and as lists of the Old Testament had been drawn up even earlier, the scholars of the Church, by Melito of Sardis (A.D. 190) and others, so, as we have seen, the Church of Alexandria, the centre of the criticism of early Christendom, supplied the thing, as it had supplied the word. The process by which such a list was drawn up must be left, in part, to imagination, but it is not difficult to picture to ourselves, with little risk of error, what it must almost necessarily have been. A man of culture and great industry, imbued with the critical habits of his time, such, e.g., as was Origen, finds a multitude of books before him professing to have come down from the time of the Apostles. He takes them one by one, and examines the claims of each. Has it been read in church at all, and if so, where, and in how many churches? Has it been quoted by earlier writers? Has it been one of a group assigned to the same writer, with the same characteristics of style as the other books so assigned? Whence has it come? Who can report its history? It is obvious that the answer to these questions was to be found in a process of essentially personal inquiry, of the exercise of private judgment, of the critical reason working upon history. And so, to take the earliest instance of such a list which we can connect with a name, we find Origen giving one which includes the four Gospels by name, the Epistles of St. Paul (the names of the Epistles, however, are not given, nor even the total number of them), the two Epistles of St. Peter, the second being noted as open to question, the Revelation, and one "acknowledged" Epistle by St. John. Elsewhere he mentions the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the traditions which assigned it to St. Paul, St. Luke, and Clement of Rome respectively. Another, without a name, but commonly known as the Muratorian Canon, from that of the scholar who first found it among the MSS of the Ambrosian Library at Milan, is assigned, on internal grounds, to a period about A.D. 170. The former divides the books into two classes, the one those which are generally recognised, and the other those that were still open to question (Antilegomena); and the latter list includes 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, Jude, and the Apocalypse. This may be taken, though not exhaustive, as a sufficient account of the evidence supplied by individual writers, and as they include representatives of Alexandria, Palestine, Syria, Asia Minor, and Rome, it may fairly be considered as embodying the general consent of the Christian Church in the fourth century.

These individual testimonies were confirmed about the same period by the authority of two local Councils of the Church. That held at Laodicea in A.D. 380, gives a list of the "Books of the Old Testament," that ought to be read, agreeing with the Hebrew Canon, except that it inserts Baruch and the Epistle of Jeremiah, and in its catalogue of the "Books of the New Testament," gives a complete list of those now received, without noting, as Eusebius notes, any difference between them, with the one exception that it makes no mention of the Apocalypse, and that it assigns the Epistle to the Hebrews to St. Paul. That known as the third Council of Carthage (A.D. 397), enumerates among the "Canonical Scriptures of the Old Testament," Tobias (= Tobit), Judith, and the two books of Maccabees, and in its list of those of the New, includes, without any exception, all the books that are now recognised, and does so on the ground that this was what had been received from "the Fathers."

The history of this growth of the Canon of the New Testament is in many ways instructive. It has often thrown in the teeth of those who urge the right of private judgment as against the authority of the Church of Rome, or of the Church in her Councils gene-

eral, that they have not understood what was meant by that rule of procedure by which the books were finally recognised and made part of the Scriptures themselves, and especially for that of the Scriptures of the New Testament, but that authority. The facts that have been stated exhibit a process which leads naturally and necessarily to the very opposite conclusion. What we have traced is the exercise, at every stage, of private judgment, of criticism working upon history; and it is not till this has done its work that Councils step in to recognise and accept the results that have been thus obtained. And when this is done, be it observed, it is not by any Ecumenical or General Council, nor by the Church which claims to have been founded by St. Peter, nor by the Bishop who claims to be his successor, but by two Synods, in comparatively remote provinces, who confine themselves to testifying what they actually found. Other men had laboured, and they entered into their labours. The authority of the Church, so far as it was asserted, rested upon the evidence of free inquiry and private judgment. How far later inquiry may have modified the results of the earlier, throwing doubt on what was then accepted as certain, or establishing the genuineness of what was then looked upon as doubtful, compensating for its remoteness by its
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wider range and manifold materials, by its skill in following up hints and tracing coincidences designed or unintended. Thus is a question which in the Jerome on individual books of the New Testament will be best discussed in the Introduction to each of those Books.

VII. Side by side with the Books as belonging to the Old or New Testament thus recognised as Canonical, there were those which had been weighed in the balance and found wanting. These were known either as being simply "uncanonical" or "uncanonical," as not being in the list which formed the standard of acceptance. Such as continued, from their having formed part of the generally accepted Greek version of the Old, to be read in churches or quoted by devout scholars, were described by a term which had already become conspicuous as applied to the Wisdom of the Son of Sirach, the book Ecclesiasticus, and were known as "ecclesiastical," and these included all, or nearly all, the books which we commonly know as the APOCRYPHA. Later writers, especially among the more liberal or critical Roman Catholic writers since the Council of Trent, have invented and applied the term Deuterocanonical to those books, as recognising that they do not stand on the same level as those included in the older Canons of Laodicea and Carthage. The Council itself (Sess. 4), however, had the courage of its convictions, and setting aside the authority of earlier councils, and of the great Father to whom it owed its Vulgate, drew no such distinction. It added to the Canon of Scripture, not, indeed, all the books that we know as the Apocrypha, but the greater part of them: Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, the additions to Esther and Daniel, and the two books of Maccabees. It declared that all these books were to be received with the same reverence as the other sacred writings. It placed the traditions of the Church on the same level with the sacred books thus defined. It pronounced its anathema on all who did not accept its Canon of Scripture, or despised its traditions. It deliberately proclaimed to all men that this was the foundation of its faith.

The history of the word APOCRYPHA exhibits a curious instance of a change from honour to dishonour. Primarily it simply meant "hidden" or "secret." In this sense we find it in Luke viii. 17; Col. ii. 13; Ecles. xxiii. 19. It was used accordingly by teachers who claimed a higher exoteric wisdom which they embodied in secret, i.e., in this sense, apocryphal, writings. These, however, ever attained to the respectable position of the Infancy of Jesus, of Nicodemus, of Matthew, of James; spurious Acts of Philip, of Andrew, of Matthew, of Thomas, of Pilate, of Bartholomew, of John; spurious Epistles of St. Paul to the Laodiceans and to Seneca; spurious Revelations of St. Peter. None of these, however, ever attained to the respectable position occupied by most of the Apocrypha of the Old Testament. They met a vulgar curiosity as to the unrecorded facts of the childhood of Jesus, as to the authorship of the New Testament, as to the circumstances of the history they contain, or by their pseudonymous authorship, obviously claim attention as belonging to the Old Testament, and are therefore rightly classed among its Apocrypha. The New Testament, however, was not without an apocryphal literature of its own—authentic Gospels, the Infancy of Jesus, of Nicodemus, of Matthew, of James; spurious Acts of Philip, of Andrew, of Matthew, of Thomas, of Pilate, of Bartholomew, of John; spurious Epistles of St. Paul to the Laodiceans and to Seneca; spurious Revelations of St. Peter. None of these, however, ever attained to the respectable position occupied by most of the Apocrypha of the Old Testament. They met a vulgar curiosity as to the unrecorded facts of the childhood of Jesus, as to the work that He had done behind the veil in the Descent into Hades. They were read more or less widely, and formed the nucleus of a popular Christian mythology which has left its traces in literature and art. The legends as to the childhood of the Virgin, her betrothal to Joseph when his rod alone budded, and those of all her other suitors remained as they had been before; as to her physical virginity, that remained unaltered after the birth of the Infancy of Child; the fact that the Magi brought the same as that which the Queen of Sheba had brought to Solomon; that the wood of the Cross had been grown in Paradise as the tree of life; that Calvary was named from the skull of Adam, and that it received the first drops of the blood by which
the children of Adam were redeemed; the release of the souls of the Patriarchs from the limbo (limbus, the "outer fringe") of Hades into Paradise—all these had their origin in the Apocryphal Gospels; and their appearance in the art of the Renaissance period, as, e.g., in the paintings of Raffaele and others, is a proof of the hold they had taken upon the imagination—one can hardly say, the mind—of Christendom. But from first to last, happily, they were not received by a single teacher with the slightest claim to authority, nor in any list of books that ought to be read by Christians publicly or privately. Here and there, as we have seen, books that we now receive were for a time questioned. Here and there, other books might be quoted as Scripture, or bound up with the sacred volume, as the Epistle of Clement is with the Alexandrian MS, or the "Shepherd" of Hermas with the Sinaitic; but none of these spurious Gospels, Acts, or Epistles were ever raised for a moment to the level of the Canonical Scriptures. They remained in the worst sense of the word as Apocrypha. The Canon of the New Testament has never varied since the Council of Carthage. If we have to receive the statement that there was "never any doubt in the Church" about any one of these books with some slight modification, it is yet true that that doubt was never embodied in the decrees of any Synod, and extended no further than the hesitation of individual critics.

THE TEXT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

I. Introductory.—We might have expected, had we been framing the history of a Revealed Religion according to our wishes or a priori assumptions, that, so far as it depended on written records, those records would be preserved through successive ages as an authentic standard of appeal. Facts are, however, against all such theories of what ought to have been. Not a single autograph original of any book is known to exist now, nor does any writer of the second or third century say that he had seen such an original. Failing this, we might have fallen back on the notion that each transcriber of the books would be guided by a supernatural guidance against the usual chances of transcription; that each translator would be taught how to convey the meaning of the original without error in the language of his version. Here also we have to accept facts as we find them. There has been no such perpetual miracle as this theory would require, extending, as it does extend when pushed to its logical conclusions, to the infallibility of every compositor in a printer’s office who had to set the type in any language. Manuscripts vary, versions differ, printed Bibles are not always free from error. Here also we trace the law in things spiritual which we recognise in things natural.

Pater ipse colendi
Haud faciendum esse viam voluit.
"The Father from whose gifts all good things flow,
No easy path hath oped His truth to know."

Here also the absence of any immunity from error has tried men’s faith and roused them to labour, and labour has received its reward. Accepting probability as the only attainable result, the probability which they have actually attained is scarcely distinguishable from certainty. Experience shows that, had they begun with postulating infallibility somewhere, and accepting its supposed results, inquiry would have ceased, criticism would have slumbered, and errors would have crept in and multiplied without restraint.

II. The Process of Transcription.—Dealing, then, with facts, we have to realise to ourselves in what way copies of the books of the New Testament were multiplied. It is obvious that prior to the invention of printing, two methods of such multiplication were possible. A man might place a MS before him, and copy it with his own hand, or he might dictate it to one or more writers. The former was probably the natural process when Christians were few and poor, when it was a labour of love to transcribe a Gospel or an Epistle for a friend or a Church. The latter became natural, in its turn, when the books were in sufficient demand to be sold by booksellers, or when Christian societies were sufficiently organised, as, e.g., in monasteries, to adopt the methods of the trade. Each process had its own special forms of liability to error. Any one who has corrected a proof-sheet will be able to take a measure of what they are in the former. Any one who has had experience of the results of a dictation lesson can judge what they are in the latter. We may assume that in most cases, where the work was done systematically, there would be a process for correcting the errors of transcription, analogous to that of correcting the errors of the press now. MSS. of the New Testament, as a matter of fact, often bear traces of such correction by one or more hands.

III. The Sources of Variation.—Experience shows that in such a process as that described, various readings, more or less of the nature of errors, may arise in many different ways. In some cases they may be entirely involuntary. The eye may mistake what it reads, or pass over a word, or, misled by two lines that end with the same word or syllable, omit even a whole line (as in the omission in many MSS. of "He that acknowledgeth the Son hath the Father also," in 1 John ii. 23), or, where contractions are employed, freely as they were by most Greek writers, might omit or insert the mark that indicated contraction. Thus in the famous passage of 1 Tim. iii. 16, the two renderings, "God was manifested in the flesh," and "Who was manifested," represent respectively the readings ö2 (i.e., God) and ö2 (5r, Who). Or the ear might mistake the sound of vowels, and so we find Christos for Chrestos (= "gracious") in 1 Pet. ii. 3, or Hetairoi (= "companions") for Heteroi (= "others") in Matt. xvi. 16, or Kamilon (= "a rope") for Komelon (= "a camel") in Luke viii. 25. In not a few cases, however, the element of will came in, and the variation was made deliberately as an improvement on what the transcriber had before him. Taste, grammatical accuracy, the desire to confirm a doctrine, or to point a moral, or to soften down a hard saying, or avoid a misconstruction, or bring about a closer agreement between one book and another in passages where they were more or less parallel, all these might come into play, according to the temperament and character of the transcribers. Thus, e.g., one set of MSS. gives in Luke xv. 16, would fain have filled his belly; and another, aiming apparently at greater refinement, would have been satisfied, or filled. Some, as has been said, give "God was manifested in the flesh," in
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1 Tim. iii. 16, and some "Who was manifested." So, we find "the only begotten Son" and "the only begotten God" in John i. 18. Some in Acts xx. 28 give "the Church of God," which He hath purchased with His own blood; and some, "the Church of Christ," or "the Church of the Lord." 1 John v. 7, which speaks of "Jesus sat under record in heaven," and which is not found in any Greek MS. earlier than the thirteenth century, is manifestly an interpolation of this nature. So some give and some omit the italicised words in the following passages:—

"Whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause."
Matt. v. 22.

"Thy Father which seeth in secret shall reward thee openly;" Matt. vi. 4, 6.

"When men speak all manner of evil against you falsely." Matt. v. 11.

"This kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting." Mark ix. 29.

"That ye may give yourselves to fasting and prayer." 1 Cor. vii. 5.

Or the alteration might be made to avoid a difficulty, as when we find "I go not yet up to this feast" for "I go not up," in John vii. 8, or "Joseph and His mother" for "His father and His mother," in Luke ii. 38; or to make one Gospel correspond with another, as when we find "Why callest thou Me good?" for "Why askest thou concerning that which is good?" in Matt. xix. 17; or to bring the Gospel into closer accord with liturgical usage, as when the doxology was inserted in the Lord's Prayer, in Matt. vi. 13, or the full confession of faith, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, put into the mouth of the Ethiopian eunuch, in Acts viii. 37; or to insert introductory words, "the Lord said," "Jesus said unto His disciples," in some of the Gospels in our Prayer Book; or mere grammatical accuracy might lead the transcriber to reject forms which the grammarians pronounced inaccurate. The last class, however, affecting form only, does not come under the notice of the student of a translation, nor need it be much dwelt on even by those who study the original.

IV. Canons of Criticism.—Men who gave themselves to the work of classifying phenomena such as these, soon found that they had a sufficient basis for the results of an induction. It was easy to note the causes of error, and to frame canons, or rules, by which, in addition to the weight of evidence drawn from the number or antiquity of MSS. and the like, to judge of the authority of this or that reading. Thus, (1) that the same holds good of the more determined by their style of writing. Down to the easier or more complete, while no such motive was in addition to the weight of evidence drawn from the causes of error, and to frame canons, or rules, by which, (2) that the same holds good of the more number or antiquity of MSS. and the like, to judge of the results of an induction. Thus, (3), of one that agrees less closely not resting, as these do, on antecedent probability, but (3), of one that agrees less closely not resting, as these do, on antecedent probability, but

for Westminister. This contains the whole of the Greek version of the Old Testament, as well as the New, and the Shepherd of Hermas, an allegorical book more or less of the Pilgrim's Progress type, ascribed to the second century. It represents the early text that was received at Alexandria.

A. The Alexandrian, containing the Old and New Testaments, a Greek Evening Hymn, a Psalm ascribed to David after the slaughter of Goliath, some Psalms ascribed to Solomon, and the Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians. It is mutilated in parts of St. Matthew and St. John. It represents the text received at Constantinople.

B. The Vatican, containing the Old and New Testaments. This agrees generally with Σ, as representing the Alexandrian text of the fourth century.

C. The Codex Ephraem; contains portions of most of the Old and New Testaments, 2 Thess. and 2 John having disappeared in the process of cutting up and re-making. It agrees generally with Σ and B, but has been corrected at Constantinople, and so gives later readings in the margin.

V. Manuscripts.—The extant MSS. of the New Testament are classed roughly in two great divisions, determined by their style of writing. Down to the ninth or tenth century the common usage was to write in capital letters, which, as having been originally of a bold and large type, like those which we use for the title-page of a folio-Bible, were spoken of as litterae uncialis ("letters an inch big"). The word is thus applied by St. Jerome, and from this use of it the whole class of MSS. so written are known as Uncials. Somewhat later a smaller running-hand came to be employed, and the later MSS. are accordingly known as Cursives. They begin to appear in the tenth century, and extend to the sixteenth. The invention of printing did away with the demand for copies multiplied by transcription, and with the exception of one or two conspicuous instances of spurious MSS. of parts of the New Testament palmed off upon the unwary as genuine antiquities, none are extant of a later date. Experts in such matters acquire the power of judging, by the style of writing, or the material employed, of the date of a MS. belonging to either class, and in their judgment there are no extant MSS. of any part of the New Testament earlier than the fourth century. Most critics, however, are agreed in assigning a date as early as A.D. 350 to the two known respectively as the Sinaitic, as having been discovered by Tischendorf in the monastery of St. Catherine, on Mount Sinai, and the Vatican, so named as being the great treasure of the library of the Papal palace. Two others, the Alexandrian—sent by Cyril Lucaris, Patriarch of Constantinople, to Charles I., as a precious Codex, or MS., that had been brought from Alexandria—and the Codex Bezae, so called because it was given by Theodore Beza, the French Reformer, to the University of Cambridge in 1592, belongs probably to the latter part of the fifth or the beginning of the sixth century. Others—some complete, and some existing only in fragments, either as originals or as palimpsests—came later, in the seventh or eighth, or even as low as the eleventh century.

As a matter of convenience, to avoid the constant repetition of the names of these and other MSS., a notation has been adopted by which letters of the alphabet stand for them, as follows:—

N (Aleph) for the Sinaitic. This contains the whole of the Greek version of the Old Testament, as well as the New, and the Shepherd of Hermas, an allegorical book more or less of the Pilgrim's Progress type, ascribed to the second century. It represents the early text that was received at Alexandria.

* This way of using up old MSS., by partially effacing what had first been written with pumice stone, and then writing what was thought of more importance, was a common practice in monasteries. The words of many ancient authors have probably fallen a sacrifice to this economy. MSS. so used are known as palimpsests, literally, "re-scraped."
D. The Codex Boze; contains the Gospels and Acts only, with a Latin version. The presence of the latter shows a Western origin, and the Greek seems to have been copied by an ill instructed scribe. The Greek text is peculiar, and has more interpolations than any other MS. The Latin represents the version that preceded the Vulgate.

L. The Paris Codex, containing the Gospels only, and with several gaps. It agrees generally with R and B.

The MSS. that come between D and L, and others, are not of sufficient importance to claim mention here. It is not thought necessary to give in this place any detailed account of the cursive MSS. It is, of course, possible, as some have urged, that they may represent a text more ancient than that of any uncial; but it is clearly against common sense and the laws of evidence to accept a bare possibility on one side against a strong probability on the other, and all that can be allowed in this case is that where they may come in and help, so far as they can be shown to give an independent testimony, to turn the scale in favour of this or that reading. MSS. that are manifestly copied from the same original, or come from the same school of transcribers, are obviously not independent, and their value is proportionately diminished.

The following Table of New Testament MSS., from Dr. Scrivener's Introduction, p. 225, will show the range of materials with which criticism has to deal, and the relative proportions of the two classes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Uncial</th>
<th>Cursive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gospels</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts and Catholic Epistles</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul's Epistles</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revelation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelistaria (Service Books) containing Gospels for the year</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for do.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>127</td>
<td>1,463</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many of these, however, are imperfect, some containing only a few chapters or even verses.

VI. Versions.—Over and above MSS. of the actual text of the Greek Testament, we have an important subsidiary help in the form of the translations which was made as soon as the Canon was more or less complete, into this or that language. If we know when a translation was made, we can infer, in most cases with very little room for doubt, what Greek text it was made from; and so can, in some cases, arrive at that which represents an earlier text than any existing MS. Of these versions the most important are:

1. The Syriac, commonly known as the "Peshitto," i.e., the "simple" or "accurate" version, made in the second century. Later Syriac versions were made in the fifth and sixth centuries.

2. The early Latin version, before Jerome, commonly known as the Italian version. Most of the MSS. belong to the fourth, fifth, or sixth centuries.

3. Jerome's Latin version, known as the Vulgate (i.e., made in the common or vulgar tongue), represents, of course, the Greek text received in the churches of Palestine, perhaps also in that of Rome, in the fourth century. It is the most ancient MSS. of this version are of the sixth century.

4. The Gothic, made by Ulfilas, the Apostle of the Goths, when they settled on the Danube in the fourth century.

5. The Ethiopic, in the fourth century.

6. The Armenian, in the fifth century.

VII. Quotations in the Fathers.—One other element of evidence, often of considerable importance, comes to the help of the textual critic. The early writers of the Christian Church, of whom we speak commonly as the Fathers, read Scripture, studied it sometimes very carefully, and almost in the modern spirit of critical accuracy, lived in it, and quoted it perpetually in their writings. In some cases, of course, they might quote from memory, subject to the risks incident to such quotations; but as soon as they felt that they were writing for educated men, in the presence of adversaries who would easily fasten upon a blunder or misquotation, they would naturally strive after accuracy, and verify their quotations as they proceeded. The Greek Fathers occupy obviously the first place as giving the words of the text of the Greek Testament, and of these the most important are—Clement of Rome (cir. A.D. 91—101), Justin Martyr (A.D. 140—164), Clement of Alexandria (ob. A.D. 230), Origen (ob. A.D. 254), Irenæus, where we have the Greek text of his works (ob. A.D. 200), Athanasius (ob. A.D. 373), Eusebius (ob. A.D. 339), Chrysostom (ob. A.D. 407). The earlier writers are obviously of more authority than the later. That of Origen, on account of his indefatigable labours, and the critical character of his mind, stands as the highest authority of all. Alone, or almost alone, among the early Fathers, he notes, again and again, the various readings which he found even then existing, as for example "Gadarenes" and "Gerasenes" in Matt. viii. 28; "Bethabara," "Bethany" in John i. 28; "Barabbas" alone, and "Jesus Barabbas," in Matt. xxvii. 17. Of the Latin Fathers, Tertullian (ob. A.D. 240), Cyprian (ob. A.D. 257), Ambrose (ob. A.D. 397), Augustine (ob. A.D. 430), Jerome (ob. A.D. 420), are the most important, as giving in their quotations the text of the earlier Latin versions, and so enabling us to judge upon what Greek text they had been based.

VIII. Results.—As a rule it is found that the lines of evidence from these classes of materials tend to converge. The oldest MSS., the oldest versions, the quotations from the earlier Fathers present, though not a universal, yet a general agreement. Where differences arise the judgment of one editor may differ from that of another, as to the weight of conflicting witnesses or internal probability; but as correcting the text upon which the Authorised version was based, there is now something like a consensus of editors on most important passages. It has not been thought desirable in this Commentary to bring the evidence in detail before the reader in each individual case; but, as a rule, the readings which are named as "better" than those of our printed Bibles, are such as are supported by convergent evidence as above described, and adopted by one or more of the most eminent scholars in New Testament criticism.

IX. Printed Text of the Greek Testament.—It may seem strange at first that the Hebrew text of the Old Testament should have been printed for European use, at Soncino, in 1482, thirty-three years before the Greek text of the New. In the one case, however, we must remember that the Jews had a large Jewish population in almost every great city in Germany, Italy, and France, wanting copies for their synagogues and for
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private use. In the other, the Latin of the Vulgate satisfied ecclesiastics, and as yet there was not a sufficient number of Greek students even in the Universities of Europe to create a demand for books in that language. During the last quarter of the fifteenth century, however, the knowledge of Greek spread rapidly. When Constantinople was taken by the Turks, refugees fled to Italy and other parts of Western Europe, bringing with them Greek MSS. and offering themselves as instructors. In 1481 a Greek Psalter was printed at Milan, and in a reprint at Venice in 1486 the hymns of Zacharias and the Virgin were added as an appendix, being the first portions of the New Testament, almost the whole of which the new art was applied. In 1504 the first six chapters of St. John were appended tentatively to an edition of the poems of Gregory of Nazianzus, published at Venice. About the same time (1502) under Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain, the great Cardinal Ximenes, who had founded a University at Alcala, began a grand work on a princely scale. It was by far the noblest task to which the art of printing had as yet been applied. It was to give the Hebrew of the Old Testament, with the Chaldee Targum, or Paraphrase, and the LXX., or Greek version, and the Vulgate. Hebrew and Greek lexicons were appended, and something like a dictionary of proper names. MSS. were borrowed from several quarters, chiefly from the Vatican Library at Rome. The work went on slowly; and was not completed till 1517, four months before the Cardinal's death; nor published till 1522, after it had received the approval of Leo X. in 1520. The edition is commonly known as the Complutensian from Complutum, the Latin name of Alcala. Meantime Erasmus, the head of the Humanists, or Greek scholars of Germany, had been employed in 1515 by Froben, the head of an enterprising publishing house at Basle, to bring out a Greek Testament, which was to get the start of the Complutensian. The work was done hurriedly in less than a year, and the book appeared in February, 1516. But little care had been taken in collecting MSS., and in some cases we find somewhat bold conjectural interpolations. The omission of 1 John v. 7 was, however, a sign that a spirit of honest criticism was at work. Erasmus had not found it in any Greek MS., and therefore he would not insert it. A second edition appeared in 1519, and in 1522 a third, in which, through fear of giving offence, he had restored the disputed text on the strength of a single MS. of the thirteenth century, now in the library of Trinity College, Dublin, and known as the Codex Montfortianus. Later editions followed in 1527 and 1535.

Paris, however, soon took the lead in meeting the demand, now rapidly increasing, partly through the labours of Erasmus, and partly through the theological excitement of the time, for copies of the Greek Testament. After an edition by Simon de Colines (Colinesus), in 1543, of no great importance, the foremost place was taken by Robert Etienne (or Stephanus), and maintained afterwards by his son Henry. His first edition, based upon collections of MSS. in the Royal Library at Paris with the Complutensian text, appeared in 1546; another in 1549. A third, in 1550, was on a larger scale, and gave for the first time—the marking an epoch in the progress of textual criticism—a systematic collection of various-readings to the number of 2,194. A fourth edition, published in 1557 at Geneva, and therefore intended primarily, we may believe, for the use of the pastors and students of the Reformed Church there, is remarkable as giving for the first time the present division into verses. The work of Henri Estienne, guided in 1556 by Beza, and the text, as revised by him (not very critically), was printed in successive editions in 1563, 1576, 1582, and 1588. The name of the great Reformer stamped the work with a sanction which most Protestant students recognised. The editions were widely circulated in England, where as yet no Greek Testament had issued from the press; and this and the earlier text of Etienne were probably in the hands of the translators of the Authorised version.

The house of Elzevir, at Leyden, famous for the beauty of type and the "diamond" editions which we now associate with the name, took up the work at the beginning of the seventeenth century, and a Greek Testament, almost the whole of which the new art was applied. In 1624, and another in 1633. Both were based, as far as the text was concerned, upon the later editions of Etienne and Beza, and in the Preface to the latter, the editor assured the reader that he could now rely on having an undisputed text (textum ab omnibus receptum). The boast was not without foundation, and it tended, for a time at least, to secure its own fulfilment. Most English editions in the seventeenth century reproduced it typographically, and the Textus receptus, though no critic now receives it as a whole, still keeps its ground as a standard of comparison.

We measure the value of MSS., for the most part, by the extent to which they differ from or agree with it.

The spirit that craves for accuracy as an element of truth, was, however, still active in England, as elsewhere. The arrival of the Alexandrian MS. (see above) attracted the notice of scholars. They began to feel the importance of various-readings as offering a fresh point of view, and in Bishop Walton's famous Polyglot Bible, the Syriac, Arabic, Persian, and Ethopic versions were printed side by side with the text of Etienne, and various-readings were given, though not very fully, from the Alexandrian, the Cambridge, and fourteen other MSS. The work of collecting and comparing these and other materials was carried on for thirty years with unremitting industry by Dr. John Mill, Professor of Divinity at Oxford, and in 1706 the labours of his life were crowned, just before his death, by the publication of an edition of the Greek Testament in two folio volumes, which, while practically retaining the text of Etienne—i.e., the Textus receptus, contained a far larger mass of materials, and a more thorough examination of their relative value than had ever been before attempted. The Prolegomena extended over 180 pages; the various-readings were reckoned at 30,000. The shallow scepticism of the Free-thinkers of the time assumed that all grounds for certainty as to the contents of the New Testament writings had vanished. Timid and prejudiced theologians took up the cry that textual criticism was dangerous. It found, however, a sufficiently able apologist in Richard Bentley, Master of Trinity College, Cambridge. He urged with great power and success, in a pamphlet published under the pseudonym of Philaleutherus Lipsiacus, in 1714, that truth has no need to fear truth; that if the existence of the various-readings is compatible with the Christian faith, the knowledge of their existence cannot be fatal to it; that it was with the New Testament, as with other ancient books, a help and not a hindrance, to have to edit from many MSS., and not from one only, which might chance to be defective; that every fresh discovery of variations was, therefore, a step to certainty; and that the result had been to fix the range of possible uncertainty within such narrow limits that no single fact or doctrine of the religion of Christ was imperilled by it. Bentley himself aspired to take a high place among the workers whom he thus defended, and, in 1716, sketched out a plan...
for printing a revised Greek text, on principles which
presented a singular approximation to those that have
since been acted on by Lachmann and Tregelles. He
believed that it was possible to ascertain from the uncial
MSS., the early versions, and the early Fathers, what
text was received in the fifth century, and was prepared
to reject all later variations. Acting on those prin-
ciples, he proposed to use the materials which Mill's
indescribable labours had collected.

Bentley was, however, involved in personal troubles
and disputes which hindered the accomplishment of his
purpose, and for a long series of years the work was
left to be carried on by the scholars of Germany, while
English students were content to accept, with scarcely
any inquiry, the text which was known as Mill's, but
which practically hardly differed at all from the Textus
receptus. Among the former the most conspicuous was
Bengel (1734), whose essentially devout Commentary
bore witness that criticism did not necessarily lead to
scepticism, that he was a verbal critic mainly because
he believed in verbal inspiration. He was followed
by Griesbach (1774–1806), Scholz (1830–36), and by
Lachmann (1831), who avowedly looked on himself as
Bentley's disciple, working on his lines, and completing
the work which he had left unfinished. The list cul-
inates in Tischendorf, the labours of whose life in
collating and publishing, often in fac simile, MSS.
of the highest value (among others the Codex
Ephraim) were crowned by the discovery, in 1859,
of the Sinaitic MS. Two countrymen of our own—
Dr. J. R. Tregelles (d. 1876), and the Rev. Dr.
Scrivener—may claim a high place in the list of those
who, with unshaken faith, have consecrated their lives
to the work of bringing the printed text of the Greek
Testament to the greatest possible accuracy. Alford and
Wordsworth, in their editions of the Greek Testament,
though not professing to do more than use the materials
collected by others, have yet done much to bring
forth the work of students and the results of textual
criticism. In Dr. Tregelles's Introduction to the New
Testament, Dr. Scrivener's Introduction to New Testa-
ment Criticism, and Mr. Hammond's Outlines of New
Testament Criticism, in the Clarendon Press Series, the
student who wishes to go more fully into the subject
will find ample information. Of these Lachmann and
Tregelles are, perhaps, the boldest in setting aside the
Textus receptus in deference to the authority of the
unical MSS. and the early Fathers; Scrivener and
Wordsworth, and more recently Mr. Macallan, in main-
taining the probability that the cursive MSS., upon
which the Textus receptus was mainly based, though
themselves of late date, may represent an ancient text
of higher authority than that of the oldest existing
uncials.

III.—THE ENGLISH VERSIONS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

I. The Earlier Versions.—Wherever men have
believed in earnest that they had the ground-work of
their faith in God mainly or wholly in a written record,
it is natural that they should desire, if their religion
has any life and energy, to have that book in the speech
to which they were born, and in which they think.
The religious life of our early English, or Anglo-Saxon,
forefathers, after their conversion by Augustine, was a
deep and earnest life; and as soon as schools and
monasteries gave the power to study the Scriptures in
the Latin of the Vulgate translation, portions of them
were translated into Anglo-Saxon. There were
versions of the Psalms in the eighth century. Bede,
as in the well-known narrative of his scholar Cuthbert,
died (A.D. 735) in the act of finishing the last chapter
of St. John's Gospel. Alfred prefixed a translation of
the Ten Commandments, and some other portions of
Exodus, to his Code of Laws (A.D. 901). The
Homilies of Ælfric (ob. A.D. 1095) must have made
many passages of Scripture familiar to lay as well as
clerical readers. In the tenth century the four Gospels
were translated; a little later, the Pentateuch, and
other portions of the Old Testament. Most of these
were made of necessity from the Vulgate, without
reference to the originals. Hebrew was utterly un-
known, and the knowledge of Greek, which Theodore
of Tarsus (ob. A.D. 690) brought with him to the See
of Canterbury, did not spread. Here and there only, as
in the case of Bede, who spent his life in the Monastery
of Jarrow, founded by Benedict Biscop, do we find any
traces of it, and even in him it hardly goes beyond the
explanation here and there of a few isolated terms.
There are no signs that he had studied a single chapter
of a Gospel in the Greek. It was natural, when the
Norman rule, introducing a higher culture through the
medium of two languages, one of which was dead, and
the other foreign, represened the spontaneous develop-
mment of that which it had found in existence, that these
versions should drop into disuse, and be forgotten.
At the best they were but tentative steps to a goal
which was never reached.

II. Wycliffe.—The stirrings of spiritual and intel-
lectual life in the thirteenth century, mainly under the
influence of the Franciscan and Dominican Orders in
the Universities of Europe, led, in the first instance, to
the development of a logical and metaphysical system
of theology, of which the works of the great schoolmen,
Peter Lombard (ob. A.D. 1164) and Thomas Aquinas
(ob. A.D. 1274), furnish the most complete examples.
This was, for the most part, subservient to the great
dream of a spiritual universal monarchy on the part
of the Bishop of Rome, which found its most pro-
minent representatives in Innocent III. (ob. A.D. 1216)
and Boniface VIII. (ob. A.D. 1303). The teaching of
Scripture was still formally the basis of that of the
schoolmen, but it was Scripture as found in the
Vulgate and commented on by the Fathers; and,
practically, the comments and glosses of the doctors
took the place of the text. Against this, whenever
men found themselves on any ground, political or
theological, opposed to Rome, there was, in due course,
a natural reaction. Roger Bacon (ob. A.D. 1292), who
certainly knew some Greek and a little Hebrew, is
loud in his complaints of the corrupt state of the
current text of the Vulgate, and of its defects as a
translation. Devotional minds turned then, as always,
to the Psalms, as giving utterance at once to the
passionate complaints and the fervent hopes of men in
dark and troublous times; and three English versions
of them belong to the first half of the fourteenth
century. It was significant, as an indication of what
was ripening for the future, that the first book of the
New Testament to be translated into English should
have been the Revelation of St. John. The evils of the time were great. Men's minds were agitated by wild communitic dreams of a new social order, and by the false revelation of a so-called Everlasting Gospel, ascribed to the Abbot Joachim of Calabria (ob. A.D. 1262). It seemed to John Wycliffe, in A.D. 1356, that men would find the guidance which they needed in the Apocalypse, and with this accordingly he began. He soon found, however, the wider plan of making the whole Bible accessible to his countrymen. It seemed to him, as John of Gaunt put it in a speech before the King's Council, a shameful thing that other nations, French, Gascons, and the Bohemians, who, in the person of the wife of Richard II. had supplied England with a queen, should have the Scriptures in their own tongue, and that Englishmen should not. The next step accordingly was a translation of the Gospels with a commentary; and by 1380 there was a complete English New Testament. A version of the Old Testament was begun by Nicholas de Hereford, and carried on to the middle of the book of Baruch, which then stood after Jeremiah, when, as is seen in the original MS. in the Bodleian Library at Oxford, his work was interrupted, probably by an ecclesiastical prosecution, which first summoned him to London, and then drove him into exile. Wycliffe, or some other-worker, finished it before his death, in 1384. A few years afterwards it was carefully revised throughout by another disciple, John Purvey, whose text is that commonly printed (as in Forshall and Madden's edition) as Wycliffe's version.

There is much that is touching in the history of the work thus accomplished, as Purvey describes it in his Preface. It was hard to get at the true text of the Vulgate; harder often to understand it. He felt that it was a task that required the consecration of all powers, "to live a clean life, and be full devout in prayer;" but he laboured on in the belief that his toil would not be fruitless. "By this manner, with good living and great travail, men may come to clear and true understanding of Holy Writ, seem it never so hard at the beginning." A work so begun and completed could hardly fail of success. It met a great want, and in spite of all the difficulty and cost of multiplying books by hand, and the active measures taken by Archbishop Arundel, under Henry V. (ob. A.D. 1413), not fewer than 170 copies of the whole, or part, of one or other of the versions, most of them of the Revised text, are still extant. The greater part appear to have been made between 1420 and 1450; nearly half of them being of a portable size, as if men desired to have them in daily use. The book was clearly in great demand, and though the "Lollardie," with which it was identified, was suppressed by the strong arm of persecution, it doubtless helped to keep alive the spirit of religious freedom.

Wycliffe's version did not profess to have been made from the original, and it had, therefore, against it all the chances of error that belong to the translation of a translation. Thus, to confine ourselves to a few instances from the New Testament, the "Pontifex" which stands for High Priest in Heb. ix. 11, 25, and elsewhere, is rendered by "Bishop"; the "knowledge of salvation," in Luke i. 77, appears, as from the scientia salutis of the Vulgate, transformed into the "science of health"; for "repent," in Matt. iii. 2, we have "do ye penance"; for "mystery," in Eph. v. 32, "sacrament." The "villages" of the Gospels are turned into "castles" (Luke x. 38); the "soldiers" into "knights"; "pearls" into "margaritas"; "unlearned men," into "idiots."
of the Orations of Isocrates as a proof of his competency. He was met with delays and rebuffs, and found that he was not likely to gain help from him or any other prelate. He was forced to the conclusion that, "not only was there no room in my Lord of London's palace to translate the New Testament, but also there was no place to do it in all England."

He accordingly went abroad, first to Hamburg, and then, with the permission of St. Matthew and St. Mark with marginal notes; thence to Cologne, where his work was interrupted by one of Luther's bitterest opponents, Coormus; thence, with his sheets, to Worms; and from its presses came two editions—one in octavo, the other in quarto—in 1525. They appeared without his name. Six thousand copies were struck off. They soon found their way to London's palace to translate the New Testament, but from its presses came two editions—one in octavo, the other in quarto—in 1525. They appeared without his name. Six thousand copies were struck off. They soon found their way to

The labours of Tyndale as a translator of the New Testament were important, not only because he prepared the way as a pioneer for those who were to follow him, but because, to a great extent, he left a mark upon the work which endures to this day. The feeling that his task was to make a Bible for the English people kept him from the use of pedantic "inkhorn" terms belonging to the vocabulary of scholars, and varying with their manner of spelling, and gave him an almost instinctive tact in choosing the phrases and turn of speech, which happily have not yet disappeared, and we may add, are not likely to disappear, in any process of revision. And this, we must remember, required at the time a courage which we cannot easily estimate. The dominant feeling of ecclesiastics was against translating the Bible at all. Those who did not openly oppose it, such as Gardiner and those who acted with him, surrounded their consent with reservations of all kinds. The dignity of Scripture was to be secured by keeping its language as distinct as possible from that of the common people. Time-honoured and ecclesiastical words, on which the Church had, as it were, stamped its seal, were to be used as largely as possible. Tyndale's leading idea was precisely the opposite of this. He felt that the scholastic theology of the time had so surrounded the language of Christ and His Apostles with new associations, that their meaning, or what has been called their connotation, was practically altered for the worse; and it seemed to him that the time was come for laying the axe to the root of the tree by the exclusion of the terms which had thus been spoiled for common use. And at first the work was done with a thoroughness in which subsequent revisers have not had the courage to follow him. "Congregation" uniformly instead of "church," "favour" often instead of "grace," "mystery" instead of "sacrament," "oversee" instead of "bishop," "penitence" instead of "penance," "elder" instead of "priest," "love" instead of "charity," "acknowledge" instead of "confess." It was just this feature in Tyndale's work that roused the keenest indignation on the part of the Bishops of the English Church, and even of scholars like Sir Thomas More; and made Ridley (the uncle of the martyr) say of it, not untruly if we wish to picture to ourselves what might have been the result had Tyndale acted as the "prelates and learned men" would have had him act, we may see it in the Rhemish New Testament. If we ask what shape his translation might have taken had he been only a scholar and a critic, we may find the answer in the fragments of a translation left by Sir John Cheke, the great scholar—

"Who first taught Cambridge and King Edward Greek."

The first process would have given us "azymes" for "unleavened bread"; "evacuated from Christ" (Gal. v. 4); "contemplating confusion" (Acts iii. 4); "sicer," for "strong drink" (Luke i. 15); "replenished with fear" (Luke v. 26); "the specious gate of the Temple" (Acts iii. 2); "a greater host" (Hob. xi. 4); "contemplating confusion" (Hob. xii. 2); the "congregations" instead of "the faithful" who had suffered in his cause, Tyndale presented her with a copy (now in the British Museum) printed upon vellum, and illuminated. The inscription Anna Regina Anglie, in faded red letters, may still be traced on the gilded edges. So far, Tyndale lived to see of the travail of his soul; but his work was nearly over. The energy of the Reformers to undermine the Church was driven down under the persecuting edicts of Charles V., and in October, 1536, he suffered at the stake at Vilvorde, near Brussels, breathing the prayer of longing hope, as seeing far off the Pisgah vision of a good land on which he was not himself to enter, "Lord, open the King of England's eyes." So passed to his rest the truest and noblest worker in the English Reformation.
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"gainbirth" for "regeneration," and the like. Instead of such monstrosities, we have a version which represents as accurate a scholarship as was possible under the then conditions of culture, and the faithfulness of one who felt that what he was dealing with contained God's message to mankind, and never consciously tampered with its meaning. Two testimonies to its value may well close this brief account of it. One is from the pen of the most eminent of modern English historians. "The peculiar genius—if such a word may be permitted—which breathes through it, the mingled tenderness and simplicity, the Saxon simplicity, the preternatural grandeur, unequalled, unapproached, in the attempted improvements of modern scholars—all are here—and bear the impress of the mind of one man, William Tyndale" (Froude, History of England, iii. p. 84). The other comes from one who seems to have felt keenly the change which he found when he had to quote the phrases of the Rhemish version, almost, as it were, to think in it, instead of those with which his youth and manhood had been familiar, and after which he now sighs with the vain wish that, being what it is, it was with Rome and not against her. "It was surely a most lucky accident for the young religion that, while the English language was coming to the birth with its special attributes of nerve, simplicity, and vigour, at its very first breathings Protestantism was at hand to form it upon its own theological patois, and to educate it as the mouth-piece of its tradition. So, however, it was to be; and soon, "As in this bad world below,Holiest things find vilest using," the new religion employed the new language for its purposes, in a great undertaking—the translation of its own Bible; a work which, by the purity of its diction and the strength and harmony of its style, has deservedly become the very model of good English, and the standard of the language to all future times" (J. H. Newman, Lectures on the Present Position of Catholics, p. 66).

IV. Tyndale's successors.—In this, as in the history of most great enterprises, it was true that "one soweth, and another reapeth." Other men, with less heroism and less genius, entered into the labours of the martyr of Vilvorde. The limits of this Introduction exclude a full account of the work of his successors. It will be enough to note briefly the stages of the great undertaking. As it was, a copy was ordered to be set up in every church. Other men, with his chief authorities; but he was less consistent than Tyndale, and deliberately defends his inconsistency, in not excluding the words that had become associated with scholastic definitions. He uses, e.g., "penance," as well as "repentance," "priest" as well as "elder," "charity" as well as "love." "Congregation," however, keeps its ground as against "church." Reprints of this version appeared in 1536 and 1537, and even in 1550 and 1553. Among smaller facts connected with this version we may note that the Latin Biblia, and not Bible, appears on the title-page; that the Hebrew letters forming the name of Jehovah are also there; and that the alphabetic elegies of the Book of Lamentations have the Hebrew letters attached to the respective verses to prevent no notes, no chapter headings, nor division into verses.

(2) Matthew's Bible appeared in 1537, and is memorable as having been dedicated to Henry VIII. and his Queen, Jane Seymour, and set forth "with the kine's most gracions license." Who was Matthew was, by whom the book purports to be translated, no one knows. There was no scholar of repute of that name; and though his name is attached to the dedication, the exhortation to the study of Scripture has the initials J. R. as a signature. Possibly, Thomas Matthew, as some have supposed, a simple aliquote assumed by John Rogers, afterwards the proto-martyr of the Marian persecution, in order that the name of one who was known to have been a friend of Tyndale's might not appear with an undue prominence on the title-page. Possibly he was a layman, who made his translation, with the consent of the king, for the cost of printing. The book was printed in large folio. Through Coverdale's influence, which was then in the ascendant, backed by Cranmer's—partly also, we may conjecture, through Matthew's name appearing as the translator instead of Rogers's—the king's license was obtained without difficulty. The publishers (Grafton and Whitchurch) were bold enough to ask for a monopoly for five years; to suggest that "every curate" (i.e., parish priest) should be compelled to buy one copy, and every abbey six. As a literary work, Rogers's translation is of a composite character. The Pentateuch and New Testament are reprinted from Tyndale, the Books of the Old Testament, from Ezra to Malachi, from Coverdale. From Joshua to 2 Chronicles we have a new translation. The most noticeable feature of the book was found in the marginal notes, which made a kind of running commentary on the text, and which were, for the most part, of a strong Lutheran character. It is scarcely conceivable that the king could have read, with any care, the book to which he thus gave his sanction. As it was, a copy was ordered to be set up in every parish church, and Matthew's Bible was the first Authorised version.

(3) It was, perhaps, in part, owing to the antagonism which Rogers's notes roused, that it was scarcely published before another version was begun under Coverdale's authority. Coverdale was called on to undertake the task of revision, and he and Bonner (names strangely joined) were for a time acting as a joint committee, representing the king on his throne, giving the Verbum Dei to Cromwell and Cranmer, while they in their turn distribute it to clergy and laity. It appeared with a preface by Cranmer in 1540, and a copy of it was ordered to be set up in every church. Other editions followed, two in the same year, and three in 1541. In the third and fifth of these two new names appear on the title-page (the first two editions having
been issued without the name of any translator) as having revised the work—Tunstal, then Bishop of Durham, and Heath, Bishop of Rochester. The impulse which Tyndale had given had told even on the man to whom he had applied, an influence that at once Cordovale and his career, and as by the strange irony of history, he who had been foremost in condemning Tyndale’s version as dangerous, full of errors, and heretical, was now found giving the sanction of his name to a translation which was, at least, largely based on that version. It is significant that under this editorship even the marginal “hands” of Cordovale’s unfulfilled intentions disappear, and the Bishops were thus committed to what twenty years before they had shrunken from and denounced, the policy of giving to the English people a Bible in their own tongue without note or comment. It was well that all this was done when it was. Cromwell’s fall, in July, 1540, was followed by a time of reaction, in which Gardiner and Bonner gained the ascendancy. They did not, however, venture to recall the step that had thus been taken, and the Great Bible, chained to its desk in every church, and allowed, for some years, at least, to be read out of service-time to any who chose to listen, did a work which not even the king’s proclamations against discussing its teaching, nor Bonner’s threats to withdraw the Bibles unless the discussions were suppressed, were able to undo. It remained the Authorised version, recognised in the Liturgical Reforms under Edward VI., and from it accordingly were taken the Psalms, which appeared in the Prayer Books of that reign, and have kept their place through all revisions to the present day. The version, as a whole, was based upon Cordovale and Tyndale, with alterations made more or less under the influence of the Latin versions of Erasmus for the New Testament, and the Vulgate for the Old. All readers of the English Prayer Book Psalms have accordingly the means of comparing this translation with that of the Authorised version; and, probably, the general impression is in favour of the Prayer Book version as being, though less accurate, more rhythmical and harmonious in its turns of phraseology; often with a felicitous ring in its cadences, that seems, even when the Psalms are read, to carry with it a music of its own. A certain ostentation of learning is seen in the appearance of the Hebrew names of books, such, e.g., as Bereshith (Genesis), Velle Shemoth (Exodus). On the other hand, by what was obviously the hasty substitution of what was thought a more respectful term than Apocrypha, which the editors of the Great Bible had deliberately said to be “called Hagiographa” (i.e., “sacred writings”), because they were read in secret and apart.*

(4) Nearly contemporaneous with the Great Bible—issuing from the press, indeed, before it—another translation was published in London (1539), by Richard Taverner, who had been a student at Cardinal College, afterwards Christ Church, at Oxford. It affords the attraction of the running commentary on the text, which the editors of the Great Bible had deliberately omitted, and on this ground found the acceptance which is indicated by two editions, folio and quart, of the whole Bible, and two, quarto and octavo, of the New Testament, in the same year, followed by a subsequent reprint. It never occupied, however, any position of authority, nor had it any traceable influence on subsequent versions. It deserves to be noted, however—as if each translation was to have something specially memorable connected with it—as an instance of a layman’s right to translate, publish, comment on, the Sacred Books. The work which Taverner had done in this way was so far recognised, that in the reign of Edward VI. he received a special license to preach, and performed his office with an almost ostentatious disregard of conventional rules of costume, preaching, not in the dress of his university degree, but in velvet hat, damask gown, gold chain, and sword.

(5) The Geneva Bible. The last six years of the reign of Henry VIII. were conspicuously a time of reaction, but it kept, as has been said, within limits. The old horror of Tyndale’s name revived, and all books bearing his name were ordered to be destroyed. The notes in all editions that had them—i.e., Matthew’s and Taverner’s—were to be erased. No women, except those of noble and gentle birth, no men below what we should call the upper middle-class, were to read the Bible, publicly or privately, to others, or by themselves. Coverdale’s New Testament was proscribed, as well as Tyndale’s, and this involved in most instances the destruction of the whole Bible that bore his name. Gardiner proposed that a translation should be made by the Bishops (Tunstal and Heath now disavowing the work of revision, for which the title-page of the Great Bible made them responsible), and urged the retention in the original Latin of every ecclesiastical or theological term, and even of others, such as orienx, tyrannus, in which he seemed to see a peculiar and untranslatable force. That project happily fell through. The matter was discussed in Convocation, and referred to the universities, but nothing more was done. The Great Bible kept its position as the Authorised translation.

Under Edward VI. the attention of Cranmer and the other reforming bishops was occupied with the more urgent work of liturgical reformation, and though many reprints of both Bibles and New Testaments issued from the press, and were eagerly purchased, nothing was done towards a new revision, beyond the appointment of two foreign reformers, Fagius and Bucer, to professorships at Cambridge, with a view to their undertaking such a work. The former was to take the Old Testament, the latter the New. They were to write notes on dark and obscure places, and reconcile those that seemed repugnant to each other. Their work was hindered by illness, and the accession of Mary, in 1553, put a stop to this or any like enterprise.

The work was, however, done for England, though not in England, and in 1557, the last year of Mary’s reign, a New Testament, with copious notes, was printed at Geneva, with an introductory epistle by Calvin. The work appeared anonymously, but it was probably by Whittingham, one of the English refugees, who had married Calvin’s sister. For the first time in the history of the English Bible the chapters were divided into verses, after the manner with which we are familiar, and so the facility of reference and verifying quotations was enormously increased. The example of such a division had been set, as stated above (Introduction on the Text of the New Testament), in the Greek Testament published by Stephens (or Etienne) in 1551; but there the verses were only noted in the margin, as is done, for example, in the Oxford reprint of Mill’s Greek Testament. It was also the first translation printed in Roman type, and so presenting a clearer and easier page to the reader. The work was
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carried on by Whittingham, Coverdale, and others, after the accession of Elizabeth, for two years, and the whole Bible was published in 1560. Of all English versions before that of 1611, it was by far the most popular. Size, price, type, notes, division into verses, made it for more than half a century the household Bible of the English people. In most of the editions after 1578 it was accompanied by a useful Bible Dictionary. It was found in every family. It was the text-book of every student. It came in opportunistically to fill up the gap which had been caused by the wholesale destruction of Bibles in the latter years of Henry VIII., and during the whole reign of Mary. It was only slowly displaced by that which we now know as the Authorised version—several editions being printed after 1611—and from one point of view it may be questioned whether there was not loss as well as gain in the displacement. The presence of notes, even if they were, like those of the Geneva Bible, somewhat over-dogmatic and controversial in their tone, was yet at once an incentive and a help to a thoughtful study of Scripture. The reader could find some answer—often a clear and intelligent answer—to the questions that perplexed him, and was not tempted, as a Bible without note or comment tempts men, to a mechanical and perfunctory perusal. For good or for evil, and it is believed that the former greatly predominated, it was the Geneva version that gave birth to the great Puritan titles. The Geneva Bible was that which now attaches to it, of the Bishops' Bible. It was published, like most of the Bibles intended for use in church, in a stately folio. It has no dedication, but a portrait of Elizabeth appears on the engraved title-page, and others of Leicester and Burleigh appear, with strange, almost ludicrous, inappropriateness, before the Book of Joshua and the Psalms. It does not appear to have distinctly received the queen's sanction, but a vote of Convocation ordered copies to be bought by every archbishop and bishop, and placed in his hall or dining-room, for the convenience of strangers, by all cathedrals, and, as far as possible, for all churches. Fresh issues, more or less revised, appeared in 1572 and 1578. The Bishops' Bible is memorable, as to a certain extent fulfilling Coverdale's intention, which had been adjourned sine die by the successive editors of the Great Bible, and, for the first and last time, there was thus a quasi-authorised commentary on the whole Bible. It aimed, too, more than most previous versions, at reproducing the exact spelling of Hebrew names, as, e.g., in giving Izhak for Isaac, and affixing the final η to names like Hezekiah, Josiah, and the like. It classified the books both of the Old and New Testament as legal, historical, sapiential, and prophetic. Passages were marked to be omitted when the chapters were read as the lessons for the day. In the edition of 1572 there was, for the first time, a map of Palestine, with degrees of latitude and longitude; and elaborate genealogical tables were prefixed to it. The judgment of most scholars is unfavourable to this version in the Old Testament, but the New shows considerable scholarship, carrying on its work of revision at each successive issue.

(7) The Rheims Version of the New Testament, followed by the Douay Version of the Old, was intended partly to refute the charge that the Church of Rome was opposed altogether to the work of translation; partly to show that she had scholars who were not afraid to challenge comparison with those of the Reformed Churches. It appeared at Rheims in 1582, and had copious notes, mostly of a controversial character. It was just such a version as Gardiner would have welcomed, based avowedly on the Vulgate as more authoritative than the Greek, and on the text of the Vulgate that had been stamped by Clement VIII. with Papal sanction. It was thought, therefore, possible, all technical and theological terms, such as depositum (I Tim. vi. 20), exinanited (Phil. ii. 7), penance, chalice, priest (for "elder"), host (for "sacrifice"), advent (for "coming"), co-inquisition (2 Pet. ii. 13), peregrination (1 Pet. i. 17), propice, azymes, and the like. (See III., p. xi., for other examples.) In many cases, but naturally more in the Old Testament than the New, they were content to rest in a rendering which had simply no meaning at all. Two specimens may be sufficient to show to what extent stones we thus offered to English Catholics instead of bread.

Eph. vi. 12. Our wrestling is . . . against princes and potentates, against the rectors of the world of this darkness, against the spirituals of wickedness in the celestial.
the Rhemish Testament in place of those which were found in the Bishops’ Bible or the Geneva version. Among these we may note, “charity” for “love” in I Cor. xiii., “church” for “congregation” in Matt. xvi. 18, xviii. 17.

V. The Authorised Version. The position of the Church of England on the accession of James I., in 1603, in relation to the translations of Scripture then current, presented two conflicting currents of feeling. On the one hand, the Bishops’ Bible occupied the position of authority. On the other, that of Geneva had its stronger hold on the affections of the English people, and to a large extent, of the English clergy also. The Puritan party wished to dislodge the Bishops’ Bible from its pre-eminence, and to make way for one more after the pattern of Geneva. The king and the court divines disliked the bolder tone of many of the notes of the latter version. Some few, perhaps, of the school afterwards developed by Laud and Montagu on the one side, by Falkland and Chillingworth on the other, fretted under the yoke of the Calvinistic dogmatism which pervaded both. Accordingly, when the Puritan petition, known, from the supposed number of signatures, as “millenary,” led to the Hampton Court Conference, the campaign was opened by Dr. Reynolds, Bishop of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, who, urging some special faults in the Bishops’ Bible (the passages selected, Gal. iv. 25, Psa. cv. 28, cxi. 30, were, it must be said, singularly unimportant) pleaded for a new revision. Bancroft, Bishop of London, made the somewhat pessi-mistious answer, “that if every man’s humour were to be followed, there would be no end of translating.” The king, however, interposed. He saw in the task of revision just the kind of work which met his tastes as a scholar. He saw in it also an opportunity for getting rid of the obnoxious Geneva Commentary. It was settled then and there, Bancroft withdrawing his opposition on this concession, that the forthcoming version should be issued without note or comment. Fifty-four scholars were selected (only forty-seven, however, are named), probably by the bishops who had most influence with the king, and arranged in six groups, to each of which a given portion of the Bible was assigned. Comparatively few of the names on this list have now any special interest for the general English reader. Of those who are still remembered, we may name Andrewes, afterwards Bishop of Winchester, Abbot, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury; Overall, the author of the latter part of the Church Catechism; Saravia, the friend of Hooker; Sir Henry Savile, famous as the editor of Chrysostom; Reynolds, who had, as we have seen, been the first to urge revision. The king recommended the translators to the patronage of the bishops, and invited cathedrals to contribute to the expenses of the work. As far as can be traced, the labour was, from first to last, like that of the present revisers of the Authorised version, a labour of love, without payment, or hope of payment, beyond the occasional hospitality of this or that college, which might, perhaps, offer free quarters to a company that included one of its own members. After nearly three years of labour the new Bible appeared in 1611. It bore, as our Bibles still bear, on its title-page, the claim to be “newly translated out of the original tongue; and with the former translations diligently compared and revised,” and to be “appointed to be read in churches.” The latter announcement, confirmed as it has been by general acceptance, has led to the title of “Authorised version,” which has since commonly attached to it. Singularly enough, however, there is nothing, as has been said above, but the printer’s title-page as the warrant for this assumption of authority. A fresh revision was talked of under the Long Parliament in 1653, and a committee of scholars appointed in 1656. They met at the house of Lord Keeper Whitelock, and the list included the names of Walton, the editor of the great Polyglot Bible, and Cudworth, the famous metaphysician, but nothing came of the Conference. The principles on which the translators were to act were definitely laid down for them in fifteen rules, probably drawn up under Bancroft’s direction: (1) The Bishops’ Bible was to be taken as a basis, and altered as little as possible. (2) Names of prophets and others were to be retained in their common form. This was directed against the plan which had been adopted in the Bishops’ Bible. (3) The old ecclesiastical words were to be kept. “Church” was to be used instead of “congregation.” This was against Tyndale and the versions that had followed him, with special reference to the Genevan. (4) Weight was to be given, where a word had different senses, to the authority of the ancient Fathers. (5) The received division of chapters was to be altered not at all, or as little as might be. (6) There were to be no marginal notes, except such as were purely verbal, alternative renderings, and the like. (7) Marginal references should be given at discretion. The next six rules prescribed the details of the work: the revision by one company of the work of another, and the like. The 14th pointed to Tyndale’s translation, Matthew’s, Coverdale’s, Whitechurch’s (the Great Bible), and the Geneva version, as to be followed where it was thought desirable.

In their preface, written by Dr. Miles Smith—a far more interesting document than the dedication which we find in all our Bibles—some further rules of action are stated as having guided them. They contrast their careful work, extending through three years or more, with the seventy-two days of the legend of the Septuagint. They speak respectfully of previous English versions. They profess to have consulted both ancient and modern translations: Chaldee, Hebrew, Syrian, Greek, Latin, Spanish, French (probably the Geneva version), Italian (probably Diosiatri), Dutch (certainly Luther’s). They defend their practice of varying the renderings of Hebrew or Greek words, partly on the legitimate ground that one English word will not always express the different meanings of the same word in the original, partly on the somewhat fantastic plea of fairness, that as many English words as possible might have the honour of being admitted to the sacred volume. A careful comparison shows that in the New Testament their chief standards of comparison were Beza’s, the German, and even the Rhemish version, from the last of which, as stated above, they adopted many words and phrases, and with which the direction to retain the old ecclesiastical terms at times brought them into close agreement. The general acceptance which the Authorised version met with, both from scholars and the great mass of readers, may fairly be admitted as evidence that the work was done carefully and well. The revisers were never satisfied, as those of Rheims or Douay sometimes were, with an absolutely unmeaning translation. They avoided archaisms to the
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best of their power, and with equal care avoided the "ink-horn terms" of a pedantic scholarship. They followed the earlier English versions in the majestic simplicity which, as a rule, had characterised them from Tyndale onwards, and aimed, not unsuccessfully, at greater accuracy. Where they failed, it was chiefly through the circumstances under which they worked. In one respect, their deliberate choice of a wrong method, in seeking to vary the renderings of Greek or Hebrew words as much, instead of as little, as possible, has involved them in many mistakes, leading to a false emphasis or a false antithesis, hindering the English reader from seeing how one passage throws light upon another, and making the use of an English concordance of little or no value as a help to interpretation. For other defects they were, perhaps, less responsible. The text of the New Testament was as yet in an unsettled state, and Stephens's (or Etienne's) edition, which they took as their standard, was based on the later, not the earlier MSS. They had learnt Greek through Latin, and were thus led (1) through the comparative incompleteness of the Latin conjugation, to confound tenses of the Greek verbs, imperfect, aorist, perfect, pluperfect, which were really distinct; (2) through the absence of a Latin definite article, to pass over the force of the Greek article, or to exaggerate it into a demonstrative pronoun; (3) through the imperfect analysis of the use of the Greek prepositions to give not unfrequently a sense, when the proposition is used with one case, which rightly belongs to it only when it is used with another. (4) The two centuries and a half which have passed since have naturally rendered some words obsolete or obsolescent, have lowered or altered the meanings of others, and have enlarged the range of the English vocabulary so as to take in words which would be as legitimately at the disposal of the revisers now as any, which were then in use, were at the command of the revisers of 1611. Mr. Aldis Wright's Bible Word-Book, and the papers by Canon Venables in the Bible Educator, on "Bible Words," may be consulted as authorities on the subjects of which they treat.

A few of the minor, but not unimportant, details of the Authorised version still remain to be noticed.

(1) The two editions printed in 1611 were both in the Old English black letter. Roman type was used in the reprint of 1612. (2) All the editions contained the Apocrypha till 1632. (3) Printers, or the editors employed by printers, have from time to time modified, though without authority, the spelling of the edition of 1611, so as to keep pace with the real or supposed improvements of later usage. (4) The careful use of italics to indicate the use of words which, though not expressed in the original, were yet essential to the meaning, was, from the outset, a special characteristic of the Authorised version. This, too, has, from time to time, been modified by successive editors. The text printed in the present volume represents, in this respect, that of 1611, but the Cambridge edition of 1635 is said, in this respect, to be more carefully edited. (5) The marginal readings and references of the edition of 1611 have in like manner been largely added to or varied by subsequent editors, notably by Dr. Paris in the Cambridge edition of 1672, and Dr. Blayney, who superintended the Oxford edition of 1769. Useful as these are as suggesting possible alternative translations or the comparison of really parallel passages, they cannot be regarded as having the slightest claim to authority, properly so called. Some few corrections of the version itself were also made by these or other editors, on their own responsibility, as, e.g., "about" for "above" in 2 Cor. xii. 12, "unto me" for "under me" in Ps. xviii. 47. Mistakes in printing have made some editions memorable—"vinegar" for "vineyard" in Matt. xxi. 23; "not" omitted from the Seventh Commandment, in 1632; "righteousness" for "unrighteousness" (Rom. vi. 13), in 1653. (6) The marginal dates of the common English Bibles, which first appear in Bishop Lloyd's Bible in 1701, are so, also, it should be noted, though often helpful, altogether without authority. They represent, as now printed, the chronology adopted by Archbishop Ussher, and are, like all such systems, open to correction, as research brings to light fuller or more authentic materials, or criticism corrects the conclusions of earlier scholars. In some cases, as, e.g., in assigning A.D. 60 to the Epistle of St. James, A.D. 96 to the Revelation of St. John, A.D. 58 to the Epistle to the Galatians, the dates assigned assume theories which many recent scholars have rejected. (7) The chapter-headings of our printed Bibles have remained with but little alteration, but they, too, will call for a careful revision. That the right of revision has been exercised, however, appears from the changes that have taken place in the heading of Ps. xxix. from the form which it presented in 1611, "The Psalmist exhorteth to praise God . . . for that power which He hath given to the Church to bind the consciences of men," to its present text, which omits the last six words. In many instances the headings assume, somewhat too decisively, the character of a commentary, rather than a summary. Thus, while Pss. xvi., xxii., and lix. are dealt with in their primary historical aspect, Pss. ii., xlv., xlvii., lix., and cx. are referred explicitly to "Christ's kingdom." "The Church" appears as the subject of Pss. lxxvi., lxxx., and lxxxvii., where it would have been historically truer to say Israel. Ps. cix. is referred to Judas as the object of its imprecations. The Song of Solomon receives throughout an elaborate allegorical interpretation. Isa. lxxii. is referred specifically to "the scandal of the Cross," Isa. lix. to "the praise of Christ," Mic. vii. to "the birth of Christ," and so on. Luke vii. assumes the identity of the "woman that was a sinner" with Mary Magdalene. In Acts vi. the Apostles are said to "appoint the office of deaconship to seven chosen men." In Acts xx. Paul is said to "celebrate the Lord's Supper." Apart altogether from the question whether the interpretation in these and other like cases is or is not correct, it is clear that the headings go beyond the function which properly belongs to them, and trench upon the work of the commentator, which the revisers of 1611 deliberately renounced. That there was an element of loss in that renunciation has been already stated, but we may well believe that on the whole it has been well that we have the Bible in its completeness, without the addition of any comments reflecting the passing ecclesiastical or Calvinistic dogmatism characteristic of the early part of the seventeenth century, which would in all probability have been clothed, sooner or later, by popular and clerical feeling, with a fictitious authority, or even been invested by legal decisions, or Acts of Parliament, with a real one. It is well, in the long-run, that every commentary on the whole or any part of Scripture should be submitted freely to the right and the duty of private judgment.
THE ORIGIN OF THE FIRST THREE GOSPELS.

IV.—THE ORIGIN OF THE FIRST THREE GOSPELS.

I. It is, of course, an important question whether we have in the four Gospels received by the Church as canonical, the evidence of contemporary writers—two of them claiming to be eye-witnesses—or writings of a generation, or two generations, later, the after-growth of the second century, fathered upon authors whose names belonged to the first. The question when the Gospels were written is, it may be admitted, one which cannot be answered precisely within a decade or so of years; nor would it be right to overstate the argument by asserting that we have any evidence external to the New Testament of the existence of the Gospels in their present form earlier than Papias (ob. A.D. 170), who names St. Matthew and St. Mark, and Irenæus (A.D. 130—200) and Tertullian (A.D. 160—240), who name all four. The existence in A.D. 170 of a harmonised narrative of the Gospel history by Tatian, known as the Diatessaron (i.e., the Gospel as stated by the Fourth), and the mention of St. Luke in the MS. in the Ambrosian Library at Milan, known from the name of its first editor as the Muratorian Fragment (A.D. 150—200), point to the conclusion that four Gospels bearing the same names as those now received, and presumably, till proof is given of the contrary, identical with them, were composed and read publicly as authoritative documents in the middle of the second century. And, obviously, they occupied at that time a position of acknowledged superiory to all other like documents. Men invent reasons, more or less fantastic, such as those which Irenæus gives (Contr. Hæres. iii. 11)—the analogy of the four elements, or the four winds—why there should be neither more nor less than four. It is scarcely too much to say that this reputation could hardly have been gained in less than half a century from the time when they first came to be generally known; and so we are led to the conclusion that they must have been in existence at a date not later than A.D. 100—130.

II. An examination of the earliest Christian writings outside the canon of the New Testament is to some extent disappointing. There are very few references to the Gospel narratives in the Apostolic and primitive church books that bear the name of Clement or Ignatius or Barnabas. They assume the broad outlines of the Gospel history, the Crucifixion and Resurrection of Jesus as the Christ. They contain echoes and fragmentary citations from the Sermon on the Mount, and other portions of our Lord's ethical teaching which had most impressed themselves on the mind and conscience of His disciples; but it must be admitted that we could not infer from them that the writers had in their hands the Lord's ethical teaching which had most impressed themselves on the mind and conscience of His disciples; but it must be admitted that we could not infer from them that the writers had in their hands the four Gospels as we have them. We may go further, and say that it is antecedently probable that their knowledge was more or less traditional, and that the general acceptance of the Gospels, and therefore, so far as their writings are concerned, even the existence of the Gospels, may have been of later date. On the other hand, it must be remembered that these letters are, in the strictest sense of the word, occasional, and not systematic. They are directed, each of them, to a special purpose, under circumstances that did not naturally lead the writers to speak of the facts of the Gospel record—even of those of which, on any assumption, they must have had, at least, a traditional knowledge.

III. When we come to the writings of Justin Martyr (A.D. 103—167), the case is altered. He, as having passed into the Church of Christ from the schools of philosophy, was a man of wider culture than any Christian writer since St. Paul. The circumstances of his life led him into controversy with Jews who questioned the claim of Jesus to be the Christ, and in his argument with them, his references to the acts and words of Christ are numerous and often of great length. It is true that he does not cite any Gospel by name, but mentions them generally as "the memoirs" or "records" that are "known as Gospels," and are read in the weekly meetings of the churches (Apol. i. 66), and that where he quotes from those "memoirs" it is at times with such considerable variations of detail as regards their facts, and of expression as regards their teaching, that it has been urged by some writers—notably by the unknown author of "Supernatural Religion"—that he probably had in his hands some book other than any of the four which we now acknowledge. Against this it may be pleaded, however, that the habits of the age, and the special circumstances of Christian writers, were unfavourable to accurate quotation. The Jewish Scriptures, in their Greek form, were collected into a volume, and could be bought at Alexandria, or perhaps in any great city, for a trifle; and then have vanished like a meteor. But if it did exist, then it would simply follow that we have, in the unknown Gospel supposed to be quoted by Justin, a fifth independent witness confirming, at least in substance, the records of the other four.

IV. There are, however, writings which even the most sceptical critics allow to be earlier than the Epistles of Clement and Ignatius. The Epistles of the New Testament are—excluding for the present the so-called Antilegomena (2 Pet. ii. and iii., John, Jude)—documents of an antiquity that may well be called primitive. They did not come together into a volume till perhaps the middle of the second century, or later. The letters of each writer may be cited accordingly, as giving a perfectly independent testimony. Let us ask, therefore, what evidence they supply as to the existence, either of the first three Gospels, or of a common narrative, written or oral, which they embody, each with variations of its own. For the present we limit the
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inquiry to these three. The fourth Gospel stands apart from them in a distinct position of its own, and the evidence in favour of its having come from the Apostle whose name it bears will be found in the Introduction to it.

Take, then, (1) the Epistle of St. James. Its contents point to its being, perhaps, the very earliest document in the New Testament. The absence of any reference to the controversy between the Jewish teachers and the followers of St. Paul, leads naturally to the conclusion that it was written before that controversy—prior, i.e., to the Council of Jerusalem of Acts xv. There is absolutely no ground for thinking, as men have thought, that he writes either against St. Paul's doctrine, that a man is justified by faith, or against the perversion of that doctrine by St. Paul's followers. The dead faith which he condemns is not a faith in Christ, as having atoned for sin, but the mere confession of the primary article of Jewish monotheism—"Thou believest that there is one God " (Jas. ii. 19). Taking the Epistle of St. James, therefore, as the earliest witness, what do we find there? Not, we must freely admit, any reference to the Gospel narrative; but, on the other hand, a mind whose thoughts and mode of teaching had been manifestly formed on the model of the Sermon on the Mount. He, too, teaches by beatitudes (Jas. i. 12); Matt. v. 10, 11, and the one beatitude is an echo of the other. To him, also, God is emphatically the giver of all good things (Jas. i. 17; Matt. vii. 11). He, too, dwells on the danger of hearing without doing (Jas. i. 22; Matt. vii. 24). To him the grass withering before the scorching sun and the hot wind of the desert, is the type of all that is most fleeting in fortune or in character (Jas. i. 10; Matt. vi. 30; xiii. 6). He, too, connects the name of our Lord Jesus Christ with that freedom from "respect of persons," which even the scribes acknowledged to be a leading feature in His character, and which, therefore, He would condemn in those who professed to be His disciples (Jas. ii. 1; Matt. xxii. 16). He shares His Master's implied condemnation of the "gorg eous raiment " of those whom the world honours (Jas. ii. 2; Matt. vi. 8). To him, as to Christ, to keep the law, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself," is the condition of entering into life (Jas. ii. 8; Matt. xix. 19; xxii. 40), and that law, as having been thus confirmed by the great King, is for him the royal, the kingly law. He re-states the law that the merciful, and they alone, will obtain mercy (Jas. ii. 13; Matt. v. 7; vii. 1). He warns men against the risks of claiming without authority the function of teachers, and forgetting that we all need the guidance of the one divine Teacher (Jas. iii. 1; Matt. xxiii. 8). The same familiar illustration of the tree and its fruits is used by him to set forth the relation of character and act (Jas. iii. 12; Matt. vii. 16). To clothe the naked and to feed the hungry are with him, as with the Christ, elements of the perfect life (Jas. ii. 15; Matt. xxvi. 35, 36). He has the same word of stern reproof for those who "dwell on the Mount of Olives," and who "follow their Lord's example for His sake" (1 Pet. ii. 23; Matt. xvi. 24). He has the same word of stern reproof for those who "deny Christ" and are "adversaries of Christ" (Matt. xxv. 13; vii. 21). He has the same word of stern reproof for those who have the "precious stones" of which the builders rejected (1 Pet. ii. 4, 7; Mark xii. 38). He has the same word of stern reproof for those who are "peacemakers" and not "confessors" (Matt. v. 9). He has the same word of stern reproof for those who are "adversaries of Christ" and are "adversaries of Christ" (Matt. xxv. 13; vii. 21). He has the same word of stern reproof for those who are "adversaries of Christ" and are "adversaries of Christ" (Matt. xxv. 13; vii. 21).
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of sins (1 Pet. iv. 8; John xxi. 15—17). Revelings do but bring to his memory yet another beatitude which he had heard from his Lord's lips (1 Pet. iv. 18; Matt. v. 12). He remembers how his Lord had commended His spirit to the Father (1 Pet. iv. 19; Luke xxii. 46). He writes, as being himself a witness of the sufferings of Christ (1 Pet. v. 1). He has learnt to see in Him the chief Shepherd, under whom he himself and all other pastors are called to serve (1 Pet. v. 4; John x. 14). His call to others to be "sober and watchful," because their adversary, the devil, was "like a roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour," speaks of the experience of one who had been told that Satan desired to have him that he might "sift him as wheat" (1 Pet. v. 8; Luke xxii. 31).

The doubts which have from time to time been raised as to the Second Epistle of St. Peter, prevent my laying much stress on the evidence which it supplies in this matter. My own belief is that the scale turns in favour of its genuineness. In any case, it is as early as any document later than the New Testament writings. Looking to it, then, we note the recognition of the distinction between calling and election, which Peter had himself specially been taught (2 Pet. i. 10; Matt. xx. 16). The writer remembers how the Lord Jesus had shown him that the putting off of his "tabernacle" should be quick and sudden (2 Pet. i. 14; John xxi. 18). He uses of his own "decease" the self-same word which had been used of that of Christ (2 Pet. i. 12; Luke ix. 31). The vision of the brightness of the Transfiguration, and the voice from the excellent glory, are still living in his memory (2 Pet. i. 17, 18; Mark viii. 2—7). In this, as in the former Epistle, he has been taught to see lessons connected with the coming of Christ, which did not lie on the surface, in the history of Noah and the Flood, to which our Lord had directed men's attention (1 Pet. iii. 20, 21; 2 Pet. iii. 5—7; Matt. xxiv. 37). Here also, then, we have documents, one of which, at least, is acknowledged as belonging, without the shadow of a doubt, to the Apostolic age, and which abound in allusive references to what we find recorded in the Gospels. In this case it is, of course, more than probable that the writer spoke from personal recollection, and that we may have here the testimony, not of one who had read the Gospels, but of one from whom the information which they embody had been imparted, at least, derived. And, assuming the Second Epistle to be by him, we have here, but a faint intimation of his intention to provide that information should be embodied for those for whom he wrote in some permanent form (2 Pet. i. 15). For the evidence which leads to the conclusion that the Second Gospel grew out of that intention, see Introduction to St. Mark.

V. We pass to the Epistle to the Hebrews, which, whether we assume, as seems to me most probable, the authorship of Apollos, or that of St. Paul, or one of his fellow-labourers, Barnabas, or Luke, or Clement, belongs also to the Apostolic age. The writer of that Epistle acknowledges the fact of the Ascension (Heb. i. 3; xii. 2). He distinguishes himself (Heb. ii. 3, 4), just as St. Luke does, from those who had actually heard the word of salvation from the lips of the Lord Himself, but he has heard from them of the Temptation and the Passion of the Christ (Heb. ii. 18), of His perfect sinlessness (Heb. iv. 15), of His tolerant sympathy for all forms of ignorance and error (Heb. v. 2), of the prayers and supplications, the strong crying and tears, of the garden and the cross (Heb. v. 7). The Messianic prophecy of Ps. cx., to which prominence had been given by our Lord's question in Matt. xxii. 42, becomes the centre of his argument. He knows, as one who had traced the descent from David, as given by St. Matthew and St. Luke, that our Lord had sprung out of Judah (Heb. xi. 10). The New Covenant, of which Christ had spoken as being ratified by his blood, fills the next great place in his argument (Heb. viii. 8—13; xiii. 24; Luke xxi. 20). He finds a mystical meaning in the fact that the scene of that blood-shedding was outside the gate of Jerusalem (Heb. xii. 12; John xix. 20). To him, as to St. Peter, the name of Jesus, on which he most loves to dwell, is that He is, as He described Himself, the Great Shepherd of the sheep (Heb. xiii. 20; John x. 14).

VI. We pass, as next in order, to the Epistles of St. Paul, taking them, as is obviously more natural in such an inquiry, in their chronological sequence. It is not without significance that the earliest of these, the First Epistle to the Thessalonians, opens with a reference to a Gospel of which St. Paul speaks as his (1 Thess. i. 5; ii. 2). It is, of course, true that he uses that word in its wider sense, not as a book, but as a message of glad tidings; but then he had resided at Thessalonica, not in a speculative doctrine, but in the record of what the Lord Jesus had done, and suffered, and taught, and how He had been raised from the dead (1 Cor. xi. 23; xx. 3, 3), and so the facts of the case suggest the conclusion that the name was given at a later stage—later, but how soon we cannot say—to the book, because the book so called embodied the substance of what had previously been taught orally. He knows that those whose faith in God exposes them to persecution are, in this respect, followers of the Lord, reproducing the pattern of His sufferings (1 Thess. i. 6). He warns men of a "wrath to come," such as the Baptist had proclaimed (1 Thess. i. 10; Luke iii. 7), and assumes the Resurrection, the Ascension, the Second Coming from Heaven (1 Thess. i. 19; iii. 13), as ideas already familiar. The key-note of his preaching, as of that of the gospel, is that men have been called to a kingdom of which Christ is the Head (1 Thess. ii. 12; Luke iv. 43). In words which reproduce the very accents of our Lord's teaching, he tells men that "the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night" (1 Thess. v. 2; Luke xii. 39). For him also the times of trouble that are to precede that coming are as the travail-pangs of the world's new birth (1 Thess. v. 3; Matt. xxiv. 8). The echoes of the voice of calls must not to sleep, but must to wake and be sober." It was ringing in his ears, as they had done in those of St. Peter (1 Thess. v. 6; Luke xxi. 34—36). In the Second Epistle the coming of the Son of Man is painted more fully, as Christ Himself had painted it. He is to come with "the sound of a trumpet, and with angels of His might" (2 Thess. i. 7; Matt. xxiv. 31; xxv. 31; Luke xxi. 27), and the sentence which He will then pass on the unpenitent is characterised as "eternal" (2 Thess. i. 9; Matt. xxv. 46). He, too, has learnt, though as with a fresh revelation of details, that the day of the Lord is not, as men dreamt, at hand, that the end is not "by and by" (2 Thess. ii. 2; Luke xxi. 9). He appeals to a body of traditions—i.e., of oral teaching, which certainly included portions of the Gospel history and of the teaching of Christ (2 Thess. ii. 15; 1 Cor. xi. 23; xx. 1, 2).

The Epistles to the Church of Corinth present the same general features as to the Coming of Christ, the revelation of Jesus Christ from Heaven, the Resurrection, and the Judgment (1 Cor. xv. 20—28). Their greater fulness naturally presents more points of contact with the Gospel history on which they
rest. We meet with the names of Cephas (which we find in that form in John i. 43, and not elsewhere in the Gospels) and of the brethren of the Lord as familiar to that Church (1 Cor. xiii. 10; iii. 22-23, v. 5). The command which Christ had given to His disciples to baptise all nations is known and acted on (1 Cor. i. 14). The story of the Cross is the theme of the Apostle's preaching (1 Cor. i. 18). Christ is to him the impersonation of the Divine Wisdom (1 Cor. i. 30; Luke ii. 40, 52; xii. 49). He employs the imagery, which Christ had employed, of the Wise Builder who erects his fabric on a firm foundation (1 Cor. iii. 10; iv. 30). He knows the lessons taught by the parable of the Steward (1 Cor. iv. 2; Luke xii. 42), and by that of the Unprofitable Servant (1 Cor. iv. 7; Luke xvii. 10). The rule of the Sermon on the Mount for those who suffer persecution is his rule also (1 Cor. iv. 13, 18; Luke vi. 27, 28). He illustrates the spread of spiritual influence for good or evil by the same image that gives its distinctive character to the Gospel itself (1 Cor. iv. 15; Luke xiii. 30), and connects this with the sacrifice of Christ as the true Passover, on the day of that Feast (1 Cor. v. 7; Luke xxii. 15). He has received the thought that the saints shall judge the world (1 Cor. v. 2; Matt. xix. 28), and on that ground urges men to submit now to injustice (1 Cor. vi. 6, 7; Luke vii. 29, 30). His thoughts of the holiness of marriage rest on the same grounds as those of Jesus (1 Cor. vi. 18; Matt. xix. 5, 9); and he, too, has learnt to see in man's body a temple of the Eternal Spirit (1 Cor. vi. 20; John ii. 21). Outward freedom and slavery are looked on by him as nothing compared with the true freedom of the spirit (1 Cor. vii. 22, 23; John viii. 36). He regards the life of the unmarried, when the choice is made for the Kingdom of Heaven's sake, as higher than that of the married (1 Cor. vii. 32; Matt. xix. 12). The special danger of over-anxiety about earthly things is to him known by the same word that our Lord had used (1 Cor. vii. 32-34; Luke x. 49). The very adverb which he employs to express freedom from it, is taken from St. Luke's account of Martha as "cumbered" by the concerns of many (1 Cor. vii. 33; Luke xi. 49). He uses the same unusual word for persistent "wearying" that St. Luke had used (1 Cor. ix. 24-27; Luke xvii. 5). The narrative of the Last Supper, with all the symbolic significance of its words and acts, with all the associations of the events that came before and after it, is assumed as part of the elementary knowledge (1 Cor. v. 5; Gal. i. 14; Luke x. 27). He refers the to external facts are, however, not wanting. The names of James, Cephas, and John are mentioned as already familiar to his Galatian converts (Gal. ii. 9). He echoes the very syllables of the prayer of Gethsemane (Gal. iv. 6; Rom. viii. 16; Mark xiv. 36). He mentions the birth of Christ ("made of a woman") in a way which at least suggests an acquaintance with St. Luke's account of the Incarnation (Gal. iv. 4; Luke i. 31). He sums up all duties of man to man in the self-same law which Christ had solemnly affirmed (Gal. v. 16; Rom. xiii. 9; Luke x. 27). His list of the works of the flesh reads like an echo of our Lord's list of "the things that defile a man" (Gal. v. 19-21; Mark vii. 21, 22).

In the Epistle to the Romans we have comparatively few of these references, but the great facts of the birth from the seed of David (Rom. i. 3), and the Resurrection and Ascension of Christ are assumed throughout (Rom. viii. 34; Eph. i. 20). The command to meet cursing with blessing is repeated (Rom. xii. 14; Luke vi. 28), as also that of paying tribute to whom tribute is due (Rom. xiii. 7; Luke xvii. 10, 11). He looks forward to external facts are, however, not wanting. The names of James, Cephas, and John are mentioned as already familiar to his Galatian converts (Gal. ii. 9). He echoes the very syllables of the prayer of Gethsemane (Gal. iv. 6; Rom. viii. 16; Mark xiv. 36). He mentions the birth of Christ ("made of a woman") in a way which at least suggests an acquaintance with St. Luke's account of the Incarnation (Gal. iv. 4; Luke i. 31). He sums up all duties of man to man in the self-same law which Christ had solemnly affirmed (Gal. v. 16; Rom. xiii. 9; Luke x. 27). His list of the works of the flesh reads like an echo of our Lord's list of "the things that defile a man" (Gal. v. 19-21; Mark vii. 21, 22).

The Epistles of the First Imprisonment—i.e., Philippians, Ephesians, Colossians—speak of Christ as "the beloved" of the Father (Eph. i. 6; Luke xiv. 35). As already in the First Epistles and Epistles of the First Imprisonment, they have the same influence, in the sense of bringing together, as Christ had joined them, and in close connection with the Wisdom of God as sending them (Eph. iii. 5, 10; iv. 11; Luke x. 49). The parable of the Bridegroom and the Bride is recognised and developed (Eph. v. 25; Matt. xxii. 1; xxv. 1; Luke xiv. 16), and our Lord's citation from Gen. ii. 24 re-cited (Eph. v. 31; Mark x. 7). The writer knows
that there is no respect of persons with the Lord Jesus (Eph. vi. 9; Col. iii. 23; Matt. xxii. 16). He takes up and expands the thought of the "whole armour," the "panoply" of God, which is mightier than the "pano­ply of evil" (Eph. vi. 13; Luke xi. 23). He sees that the true redemption or deliverance of men is found in the forgiveness of sins (Col. i. 14; Luke i. 77; iii. 3). He expresses the perfect law of the believer's life in saying that all personal or corporate acts should be done in the name of the Lord Jesus (Col. iii. 17; 1 Cor. v. 4; Matt. xviii. 20). That Name is above every name, because He who bore it, having been in the form of God, hasenoahed Himself of that glory, and had come to be in the likeness of man, and even in His manhood had humbled Himself still further, and become obedient unto death, even the death of the cross (Phil. ii. 6—9; Luke i. 32; ii. 51).

The Pastoral Epistles—1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus—carry on the evidence. It is with him one of the faithful sayings, which are as the axioms of Christian doctrine, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners (1 Tim. v. 18; Luke vii. 50). He adds, "He gave Himself a ransom for all men" (1 Tim. ii. 6; Matt. xx. 28). The earliest type of the Church's creed includes the Incarna­tion, the Visions of Angels, the Ascension, as they are recorded by St. Luke (1 Tim. iii. 16; Luke xxii. 43; xxiv. 4, 51; Acts i. 10). He lays down as the rule of discipline for the trial of offenders, that which, though previously acknowledged, had yet, in a specially solemn manner, been re-affirmed by Christ (1 Tim. v. 19; Matt. xviii. 16). He dwells on the good confession which Jesus Christ had witnessed before Pontius Pilate (1 Tim. vi. 13; Luke xxiii. 3). He speaks of the far-off judgment in Christ's own words, as simply "that day" (2 Tim. i. 18; Matt. vii. 22). He refers once more to his own gospel as witnessing both to the Resurrection of Christ and His descent from David (2 Tim. ii. 8). He states again, almost in the very words of Christ, the law of retribution according to which He will deny hereafter those who deny Him now, and will cause those who endure to be sharers in His kingdom (2 Tim. ii. 12; Luke xi. 26). Baptism is for him the washing of a new birth, and that by the working of the Spirit (Tit. iii. 5; John iii. 5). What has been said of the Second Epistle of St. Peter holds good of this last group of the Epistles that bear St. Paul's name. If they are not actually by him, they are yet unquestionably documents that carry the name of the apostle to us in the close of the First Century or the very beginning of the Second.

The examples that have thus been collected are, it is believed, sufficient to show that the Epistles of the New Testament abound in references, not only to the great facts and doctrines of the Faith, but to the acts and teaching of Christ as recorded in the Gospels. And it must be remembered that there was nothing in the circumstances of the case to lead the writers to use less than these incidental and allusive references. They were writing, not the Commentaries or the Sermons which belonged to a later age, but Epistles called for the most authoritative and internal—what may be added on behalf of each of them, and show that they represent what was the current teaching of the Apostles' age. It is probable enough, looking to the literary activity of that time in all cities of the empire, that there were, as St. Luke says (chap. i. 1), and as Papias implies (see Introduction to St. Matthew), many writers who undertook the task of embodying these floating traditions in writing. If out of these only three have survived, it is a natural inference that they were recognised as the most accurate or the most authoritative.

VIII. And it is at least a presumption in favour of the Gospels with which we are now dealing that they are ascribed to persons whose names were not of themselves clothed with any very high authority. A later writer, compiling a Gospel for Jewish Christians, would hardly have been likely to select the publican St. Matthew, the object of scorn and hatred alike to his own countrymen and to the Gentiles, instead of St. Peter in the.recyclerview according to a document on the Apostles, whose help St. Paul had rejected because he had shown himself wavering and faint-hearted (Acts xiii. 13; xv. 38); or the physician whose name just occurs incidentally in the salutations of three of St. Paul's later Epistles (Col. iv. 14; Phil. xiv. 26; 2 Tim. iv. 11). And yet, when we know the names, and track out the history of the men, we see that in each case they explain many of the phenomena of the books to which they are severally attached, and furnish many coincidences that are both interesting and evidential.

In the case of one Gospel, that of St. Luke, there is besides this, as the Notes on it will show, so close an agreement between its vocabulary and that of St. Paul, that it is scarcely possible to come to any other conclusion than that the one writer was intimately acquainted with the other. It may be added that whether from the sceptical point of view, or that of those who accept the first three Gospels as a real record of our Lord's words, there is primum facie evidence that they took their present form before the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 72. The warnings of the great prediction of Matt. xxiii., Mark xiii., Luke xxi., as to "the abomination of desolation," and "Jerusalem compassed with armies," the counsel that men should "flee to the mountains," are ascribed to persons whose names were not of themselves clothed with any very high authority. A later writer, compiling a Gospel for Jewish Christians, would hardly have been likely to select the publican St. Matthew, the object of scorn and hatred alike to his own countrymen and to the Gentiles, instead of St. Peter in the.recyclerview according to a document on the Apostles, whose help St. Paul had rejected because he had shown himself wavering and faint-hearted (Acts xiii. 13; xv. 38); or the physician whose name just occurs incidentally in the salutations of three of St. Paul's later Epistles (Col. iv. 14; Phil. xiv. 26; 2 Tim. iv. 11). And yet, when we know the names, and track out the history of the men, we see that in each case they explain many of the phenomena of the books to which they are severally attached, and furnish many coincidences that are both interesting and evidential.

In the case of one Gospel, that of St. Luke, there is besides this, as the Notes on it will show, so close an agreement between its vocabulary and that of St. Paul, that it is scarcely possible to come to any other conclusion than that the one writer was intimately acquainted with the other. It may be added that whether from the sceptical point of view, or that of those who accept the first three Gospels as a real record of our Lord's words, there is primum facie evidence that they took their present form before the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 72. The warnings of the great prediction of Matt. xxiii., Mark xiii., Luke xxi., as to "the abomination of desolation," and "Jerusalem compassed with armies," the counsel that men should "flee to the mountains," are ascribed to persons whose names were not of themselves clothed with any very high authority. A later writer, compiling a Gospel for Jewish Christians, would hardly have been likely to select the publican St. Matthew, the object of scorn and hatred alike to his own countrymen and to the Gentiles, instead of St. Peter in the.recyclerview according to a document on the Apostles, whose help St. Paul had rejected because he had shown himself wavering and faint-hearted (Acts xiii. 13; xv. 38); or the physician whose name just occurs incidentally in the salutations of three of St. Paul's later Epistles (Col. iv. 14; Phil. xiv. 26; 2 Tim. iv. 11). And yet, when we know the names, and track out the history of the men, we see that in each case they explain many of the phenomena of the books to which they are severally attached, and furnish many coincidences that are both interesting and evidential.

In the case of one Gospel, that of St. Luke, there is besides this, as the Notes on it will show, so close an agreement between its vocabulary and that of St. Paul, that it is scarcely possible to come to any other conclusion than that the one writer was intimately acquainted with the other. It may be added that whether from the sceptical point of view, or that of those who accept the first three Gospels as a real record of our Lord's words, there is primum facie evidence that they took their present form before the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 72. The warnings of the great prediction of Matt. xxiii., Mark xiii., Luke xxi., as to "the abomination of desolation," and "Jerusalem compassed with armies," the counsel that men should "flee to the mountains," are ascribed to persons whose names were not of themselves clothed with any very high authority. A later writer, compiling a Gospel for Jewish Christians, would hardly have been likely to select the publican St. Matthew, the object of scorn and hatred alike to his own countrymen and to the Gentiles, instead of St. Peter in theropdown according to a document on the Apostles, whose help St. Paul had rejected because he had shown himself wavering and faint-hearted (Acts xiii. 13; xv. 38); or the physician whose name just occurs incidentally in the salutations of three of St. Paul's later Epistles (Col. iv. 14; Phil. xiv. 26; 2 Tim. iv. 11). And yet, when we know the names, and track out the history of the men, we see that in each case they explain many of the phenomena of the books to which they are severally attached, and furnish many coincidences that are both interesting and evidential.
obviously undesigned, with the Epistles of St. Paul, in
regard to facts, as soon, e.g., in Paley's *Horae Pauliniae*,
and yet more in respect of style and phraseology, as
above stated, makes it all but certain that the two
were written contemporaneously. The fact that the last
incident recorded in the Acts is St. Paul's arrival at
Rome, makes it, *prima facie*, probable that the book
was written shortly after the expiration of the two
years of his sojourn there, with the mention of which
the book concludes—i.e., about A.D. 65. But if so,
then the Gospel to which it is a sequel could not have
well been later, and thus the former conclusion gains
an additional confirmation.

The elements of agreement and of difference in
the first three Gospels fall in, it is obvious, with the
view thus given of their origin and history. It is
scarcely probable, though we are not justified in
assuming it to be impossible, that any notes of our
Lord's discourses or parables, or shorter sayings, were
taken at the time, or that records of His miracles were
then and there reduced to writing. But in the East,
as elsewhere, the memory of men is often active and
retentive in proportion to the absence of written aid.
Men recite long poems or discourses which they
have learnt orally, or get into the way of repeating
long narratives with comparatively slight variations.
And so, when the Church was enlarged, first in Pales-
tine and afterwards at Antioch and the other churches
of the Gentiles, new converts would be instructed
freely in the words and acts of the Master from whom
they took the name of Christians. As the church
spread beyond the limits of Judaea, as it came to
include converts of a higher culture, as it spread to
countries where those who had been eye-witnesses were
few and far between, there would naturally be a demand
for documents which should preserve what had first
been communicated by oral tradition only, and that
demand was certain in its turn to create the supply.
It was natural that each of the three great sections of
the Church—that of the Hebrew section of the cir-
cumcision, represented by James the Bishop of Jeru-
salem; that of Hellenistic Judaism mingling with the
Gentiles, as represented by St. Peter; that of the more
purely Gentile churches that had been founded by St.
Paul—should have, each of them, in the Gospels of
St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke respectively, that
which satisfied its wants. Each of those Gospels, as
will be seen, had its distinctive features—St. Matthew
conspicuous for the fullest report of discourses, St.
Mark for graphic and vivid detail, St. Luke for a
wider range of topic and of teaching, as the work
of one who had more the training of a skilled his-
torian, and who, though not an eye-witness, based his
record upon fuller and more directly personal inquiries.
For the circumstances which led to the composition
of the fourth Gospel, and the position which it occu-
pied in relation to the Three, see *Introduction to
St. John*.  

XI. The difference in tone and phraseology between
the Gospels and the Epistles may fairly be urged as
evidence of the earlier date, if not of the books
themselves, yet of the teaching which they embody.
(1) Throughout the Gospels the term by which our
Lord most commonly describes Himself is the "Son
of Man," and it occurs not less than eighty-four
times in all. It expressed at once our Lord's
fellowship with our humanity, and His specially
Messianic character as fulfilled prophecy. vii. 13. The faith of the disciples after the Resur-
rection and Ascension naturally fastened, however,
on the higher truth that the Lord Jesus was the
Christ, the Son of God; and the term so familiar to us
in the records of the Gospels is not found in one solitary
passage through the whole body of the Epistles, and
the only examples of its use outside the Gospels are in
the Apocryphal Gospels—e.g., the Pilate and the Descent
into Hades. (2) Hardly less striking is the contrast between the
two groups of books as regards the use of another
term—that of the Church, or Ecclesia—as describing
the society of Christ's disciples. In the Acts and
Epistles it meets us at every turn, 112 times in all.
In the Gospels we find it in two passages only, Matt.
xxvi. 18, xviii. 17. Here also we may point to the fact
as a proof that the reports of our Lord's teaching as
preserved in the Gospels were entirely unaffected by
the influence of the thought and teaching of the
Apostles. The writers of the Gospels
must have been collected while the words and acts of
Jesus were yet fresh in the memories of those who
saw and heard them.  

**INTRODUCTION.**
sayings, reported as having been among the sayings of the Lord Jesus:

(1) Quoted by St. Paul in Acts xx. 35, "It is more blessed to give than to receive."

(2) An addition to Luke vi. 4, in Codex D, "And on the same day Jesus saw a man working at his craft on the Sabbath-day, and He said unto him, 'Man, if thou knowest that thou doest, then art thou blessed; but if thou knowest not, then art thou accursed, and art a transgressor of the Law.'" There seems no reason why we should not receive the saying as authentic. Its teaching is in harmony with our Lord's reported words and acts, and it brings out with a marvellous force the distinction between the conscious transgression of a law recognised as still binding, and the assertion of a higher law as superseding the lower.

(3) Quoted by Origen (in Johann. xix.), "Be ye trustworthy money-changers." The word is the same as that used in the parable of the Talents (Matt. xxv. 27), and may well have been suggested by it. The saying appears to imply a two-fold parable. The disciples of Christ were to be as the money-changers (a) in their skill to distinguish the counterfeit coin from the true—to know, as it were, the ring of what was stamped with the King's image and superscription from that which was alloyed and devalued; and (b) in the activity with which they laboured, and the wisdom which guided their labours so that their Lord, at His coming, might receive His own with usury.

(4) An addition to Codex D, to Matt. xx. 28, "But ye seek (or, perhaps, taking the verb as in the imperative, seek ye) to increase from little, and from greater to be less."

(5) From the Epistle of Barnabas, c. 4, "Let us resist all iniquity, and hold it in abhorrence."

(6) From the same, c. 7, "They who wish to see Me, and to lay hold on My kingdom, must receive Me by affliction and suffering."

(7) From the Gospel of the Hebrews, quoted by Clement of Alexandria (Strom. ii. 9, § 45), "He that wonders [i.e., apparently, with the wonder of reverence] shall reign, and he that reigns shall be made to rest."

(8) From Clement of Alexandria (Strom. ii. 9, § 45), "Wonder thou at the things that are before thee."

Both this and the preceding passage are quoted by Clement to show that in the teaching of Christ, as in that of Plato, wonder is at once the beginning and the end of knowledge.

(9) From the Ebionite Gospel, quoted by Epiphanius (Hier. xxx. 16), "I came to abolish sacrifices, and unless ye cease from sacrificing, the wrath (of God) will not cease from you."

(10) Quoted by Clement of Alexandria (Strom. iv. 6, § 34) and Origen (de Oratione, c. 2), "Ask great things, and small shall be added to you: ask heavenly things, and there shall be added unto you earthly things."

(11) Quoted by Justin (Dial. c. Tryph. c. 47), and Clement of Alexandria (Quis divae, c. 40), "In the things wherein I find you, in them will I judge you."

(12) From Origen (Comm. in Jer. iii. p. 778), "He who is nigh unto Me is nigh unto the fire: he who is far from Me is far from the kingdom." Ignatius (ad Smyrn. c. 4) has a like saying, but not as a quotation. "To be near the sword is to be near God."

(13) The Pseudo-Clement of Rome (Ep. ii. 3), "If ye kept not that which was little, who will give you that which is great?"

(14) From the same (as before), "Keep the flesh pure, and the seal without stain." (The "seal" probably refers to Baptism as the sign of the Covenant.)

(15) From Clement of Alexandria, as a quotation from the Gospel according to the Egyptians (Strom. iii. 13, § 92), and the Pseudo-Clement of Rome (Ep. ii. 12), Salome, it is said, asked our Lord when His kingdom should come, and the things which He had spoken be accomplished; and He answered, "When the two shall be one, and that which is without as that which is within, and the male with the female, neither male nor female."

Another like saying is given by the Pseudo-Linus, "Unless ye make the left as the right, and the right as the left, and that which is above as that which is below, and that which is behind as that which is before, ye know not the kingdom of God." In the first of these we may trace a feeling analogous to that expressed by St. Paul in Gal. iii. 28; 1 Cor. vii. 29.

(16) Origen (in Matt. xiii. 2), "For them that are infirm was I infirm, and for them that hunger did I hunger, and for them that thirst did I thirst."

(17) Jerome (in Eph. v. 3), "Never be ye joyful, unless when ye have seen your brother (dwelling) in love."

(18) Ignatius (ad Smyrn. c. 3). Our Lord, after His Resurrection, said to Peter, "Take hold, handle Me, and see that I am not a bodiless demon." This is obviously a reproduction of Luke xxiv. 39—the peculiarity being the use of the word "demon" for "spirit."

(19) The Clementine Homilies, xii. 29, "Good must needs come, but blessed is He through whom it comes."

(20) Clement of Alexandria (Strom. v. 10, § 64), "My mystery is for Me, and for the sons of My house."

The Clementine Homilies (xix. 20) gives another version, "Keep My mysteries for Me, and for the sons of My house."

(21) Eusebius (Theophania, iv. 13), "I will choose these things to Myself. Very excellent are those whom My Father that is in Heaven hath given Me."

(22) Papas (quoted according to Irenæus, v. 33, 3), "The Lord speaks of His kingdom. The days will come in which vines shall spring up, each having ten thousand stocks, and on each stock ten thousand branches, and on each branch ten thousand shoots, and on each shoot ten thousand bunches, and on each bunch ten thousand grapes, and each grape when pressed shall give five-and-twenty measures of wine. And when any saint shall have laid hold on one bunch, another shall cry, 'I am a better bunch, take me through me bless the Lord.'" This is followed by a like statement as to the productiveness of ears of corn, and then by a question from Judas the traitor, who asks, "How shall such products come from the Lord?" and who receives the answer, "They shall see who come to Me in these times."

The above extracts are taken from Dr. W. Westcott's Introduction to the Gospels, App. C. In some of them, as has been said above, there is no internal difficulty in receiving the words as they stand, as not unworthy of the Teacher to whom they are ascribed. In others, as notably in (15) and (22), whatever nucleus of truth there was at first has been encrusted over with mystic or fantastic imaginations. None, of course, can claim any authority, but some, pre-eminently, perhaps, (2), (3), and (19), are at least suggestive enough to be fruitful in deep thoughts and salutary warnings.
INTRODUCTION.

V.—THE HARMONY OF THE GOSPELS.

I. The Christian Church found itself, as we have seen, in the middle of the second century, in possession of four Canonical Gospels, and of these alone, as authentic records of the words and events of Jesus. Each was obviously but a fragmentary memoir. They were almost as obviously, though, in part, derived from common sources, independent of each other. It was natural, as soon as they came to be read and studied by men with anything like the culture of historians, that they should wish to combine what they found separate, and to contruct, as far as might be, a continuous narrative. So, as we have seen, Tatian, of the Syrian Church, compiled his Diatessaron (circa A.D. 170), a book which, though now altogether lost, was once so popular that Theodoret (H. i. 20) states in the fifth century that he had found not fewer than 200 copies in the churches of his own diocese; and about half a century later, a like work was undertaken by Ammonius of Alexandria. The historical mode of study fell, however, for many centuries into disuse, and it was not till the revival of learning in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries that attempts, more or less elaborate, were made, first by Gerson, the famous Chancellor of the University of Paris (Ob. A.D. 1429), to whom some have attributed the authorship of the De Imitatione Christi, and Osiander, the friend of Luther (A.D. 1551), to place all the facts recorded in the four Gospels in their order of chronological sequence. Since that time Harmonies have multiplied, and while, on the one hand, they have often helped the student to see facts in their right relation to each other, they have, on the other, it may be feared, tended to perplex him by their divergent methods and consequently discordant conclusions.

II. It may be admitted that the four Gospels do not lend themselves very readily to this process. That of St. John, which is most precise in its notes of time, as connecting well nigh every incident which it records with a Jewish feast, is the one which stands most apart, with only here and there a connecting-link, from the other three, confining itself almost exclusively to their Lord's ministry in Galilee. The two which have so much in common, St. Matthew and St. Mark, that the one has been thought, though wrongly, to be but an abridgment of the other, differ so much in their arrangement of the facts which they record (see Notes on Matt. viii. and ix.) that it is clear that either one or both must have been led to adopt an order which was not that of actual sequence. St. Luke, though aiming, more than the others, at chronological exactness (Luke i. 3), was dependent on the reports of others. Probably the very mode in which facts and sayings were for several years transmitted orally and separately, made it often difficult to assign to each event its proper place in the series. The assumption, on which some have started, that the order in each Gospel must be accepted as free from the possibility of error in the order of its incidents, has led to an artificial and arbitrary multiplication of similar events, such as would at once be dismissed as untenable in dealing with any other histories. Men have found in the Gospels three blind men at Jericho, and two anointings at Bethany. The counter-assumption that no two events, no two discourses in the Gospels could be like each other and yet distinct, has led to equally arbitrary and fantastic rearrangements of the facts. Men have assumed the identity of the feeding of the Five and of the Four Thousand; of the anointing which St. Luke records in chap. vii., in the house of Simon the Pharisee, with that which the other Gospels record as taking place in the house of Simon the leper (Matt. xxvi. 6-13; Mark xiv. 3-9; John xii. 1—11); of the cleansing of the Temple in John ii., at the commencement of our Lord's ministry, with that which the other Gospels relate as occurring at its close (Matt. xxi. 12—17; Mark xi. 15—19; Luke xix. 45—48).

III. Admitting, however, these elements of difficulty and uncertainty, it yet remains true that they are more than balanced by the advantage of being able to connect one Gospel with another, and to read the narratives of the first three in their right relation to those of the fourth. If difficulties present themselves, so also do coincidences, often of great significance and interest. It is believed, therefore, that it will be a gain for the readers of this Volume to have, ready at hand for reference, such a harmonised table of its contents. That which follows is based, though not without variations here and there, made in the exercise of an independent judgment, on the arrangement of the Synopsis Evangelica of the great German scholar, Tischendorf, as that in its turn was based upon a like work of Wieseler's. It has been thought expedient, as generally in the Notes of this Commentary, to give results rather than to discuss the views which have been maintained on each point that has been thought open to discussion by this or that writer. It is not pretended that what is now presented is throughout free from uncertainty, and where the uncertainty exists it will be indicated in the usual way, by a note of interrogation (?).

IV. It will be expedient, however, to state briefly what are the chief data for the harmony that follows, both in relation (A) to external history, and (B) to the internal arrangement of the Gospel narrative that follows:—

A.—(1) Luke iii. 1 fixes the beginning of John the Baptist's ministry in the fifteenth year of Tiberius. This may be reckoned, either from the death of Augustus (A.U.C. 757), or from A.U.C. 765, when he associated Tiberius with himself as sharing the imperial power. The latter calculation is the one generally adopted. As our Lord is stated to have been at that time "about thirty years of age," this would place His birth in A.U.C. 762 or 760. (2) The narrative of Matt. ii. 1 shows the birth of Jesus to have preceded the death of Herod the Great, which took place shortly before the Passover of A.U.C. 760 or B.C. 4. (3) John ii. 20 fixes the first Passover in our Lord's ministry as forty-six years from the beginning of Herod's work of reconstruction, on which he entered in A.U.C. 734—i.e., in A.U.C. 750; and this agrees with St. Luke's statement as to His age at the commencement of His ministry.

Under (B) the chief points are those which are common to all four Gospels. (1) The baptism of Jesus; (2) the imprisonment of the Baptist; (3) the feeding of the Five Thousand; (4) the last entry into Jerusalem, followed by the Crucifixion. In addition to these, as notes of time peculiar to the Gospels that contain them, we note (1) St. Luke's second-first Sabbath (see Note on Luke vi. 1), which, however, is for us too obscure to be of much service as a landmark, and the successive feasts mentioned by St. John, sc., (2) the Passover of chap. ii. 13; (3) the unnamed Feast of chap. v. 1; (4) the Passover of chap. x. 4, coinciding with the feeding of the Five Thousand, and...
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Therefore important in its bearing on the other Gospels; (5) the Feast of Tabernacles in chap. vii. 2; (6) the Feast of the Dedication in chap. x. 22; and, lastly, (7) the final Passover (chap. xii. 1), in common with the other three. The last-mentioned Feast, however, while it serves, on the one hand, to connect the history with that of the other Gospels, introduces a new difficulty. It cannot be questioned that the impression naturally left by Matt. xxi. 17—19, Mark xiv. 12—16, Luke xxii. 7—13, is that of the meal which our Lord partook with the disciples was the actual Passover. It can, as little be questioned as that the impression naturally left by John xiii. 1, 29, xviii. 28, is that the Passover was eaten by the Jews on the evening after the Crucifixion. The question is hardly important except as bearing upon the trustworthiness or authority of the Gospel narratives, and a discussion of the various solutions of the problem will be found in the Notes on the passages of St. John above referred to. The view which commends itself to the present writer, as most probable, is that which assumes our Lord and the disciples to have eaten the actual Passover at the same hour as the majority of the Jews were eating it, and that the priests and others who took part in the proceedings against our Lord postponed their Passover, under the pressure of circumstances, till the afternoon, not the evening, of Friday (John xvii. 28). That Friday, it may be noted, was the Preparation, not for the Passover as in history since the Christian era; and it was accorded to the present writer, as most probable, that which assumes our Lord and the disciples to have eaten the actual Passover at the same hour as the majority of the Jews were eating it, and that the priests and others who took part in the proceedings against our Lord postponed their Passover, under the pressure of circumstances, till the afternoon, not the evening, of Friday (John xvii. 28). That Friday, it may be noted, was the Preparation, not for the Passover as St. John uses the Roman reckoning, and the Three the Jewish; so that their "early in the morning," and his "about 6 A.M." came to the same thing. (See, however, Note on John iv. 6.)

V. A word ought, perhaps, to be said in explanation of the fact that we place the birth of Jesus, not as might have been expected, in A.D. 1, but in B.C. 4. The mode of reckoning by the "year of our Lord," was first introduced by Dionysius the Little, a monk of Rome, in his Cyclus Paschalis, a treatise on the computation of Easter, in the first half of the sixth century. Up to that time the received computation of events through the western portion of Christendom had been from the supposed foundation of Rome (B.C. 754), and events were marked accordingly as happening in this or that year, Anno Urbis Condita, or by the initial letters A.D. or B.C. In the East some historians continued to reckon from the era of Seleucus, which dated from the accession of Seleucus Nicator to the monarchy of Syria, in B.C. 312. The new computation was naturally received by Christendom (it first appears as a date for historical events in Italy in the sixth century), and adopted, without adequate inquiry, till the sixteenth century. A more careful examination of the dates presented by the Gospel history, and, in particular, by the fact that the birth of Christ preceded the death of herod, showed that Dionysius had made a mistake of four years, or perhaps more, in his calculations. The received reckoning had, however, taken too firm a root to be disturbed by re-dating all events in history since the Christian era; and it was accordingly thought simpler to accept it, and to rectify the error, as far as the Gospel history was concerned, by fixing the birth of Christ at its true date, B.C. 4.

VI.—CHRONOLOGICAL HARMONY OF THE GOSPELS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B.C.</th>
<th>A.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Birth of John the Baptist, June (?) October (?); birth of Jesus, December (?).</td>
<td>15. Preaching of John the Baptist, January (?); or in the previous Autumn (?), (Matt. iii. 1—12; Mark i. 1—8; Luke iii. 1—18).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Census under Quirinus, or Cyrenius; birth of Jesus, January (?); April (?); Presentation in the Temple; Flight into Egypt, March; death of Herod, just before the Passover; return of Joseph and Mary to Nazareth (?), (Matt. ii. 19—23).</td>
<td>16. Baptism of Jesus (Matt. iii. 13—17; Mark i. 9—11; Luke iii. 21, 22).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Augustus assigns Judaea to Archelaus, Galilee to Antipas; birth of Apollonius of Tyana (?).</td>
<td>17. The Temptation in the wilderness (Matt. iv. 1—11; Mark i. 12—13; Luke iv. 13—18; John i. 19—34).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Birth of John the Apostle (?).</td>
<td>18. Call of Peter, Andrew, John, Philip, and Nathanael (John i. 35—51).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Birth of Seneca (?).</td>
<td>19. The marriage at Cana (John ii. 1—11).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Death of Hillel; deposition of Archelaus; Judaea a Roman province.</td>
<td>21. Tiberias built by Antipas; death of Livy and Ovid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>23. Death of Joseph (?).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>25. Preaching of John the Baptist, January (?), or in the previous Autumn (?), (Matt. iii. 1—12; Mark i. 1—8; Luke iii. 1—18).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>— Baptism of Jesus (Matt. iii. 13—17; Mark i. 9—11; Luke iii. 21, 22).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>— The Temptation in the wilderness (Matt. iv. 1—11; Mark i. 12—13; Luke iv. 13—18; John i. 19—34).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>— Call of Peter, Andrew, John, Philip, and Nathanael (John i. 35—51).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Death of Augustus; Tiberius, Emperor.</td>
<td>— The marriage at Cana (John ii. 1—11).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— Passover in Jerusalem (John ii. 13—25); Nicodemus (John iii. 1—21); Jesus baptises in Judaea (John iii. 22—36); John the Baptist imprisoned (Matt. xiv. 3—6; Mark vi. 17—29; Luke iii. 19—20); Jesus returns through Samaria (John iv. 1—42) into Galilee (Matt. iv. 12; Mark i. 14; Luke iv. 14).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A.D. 26. Jesus again at Cana; healing of the son of the king's officer of Capernaum (John iv. 43–54).
   — The first sermon at Nazareth; DAY OF ATONE-
   MENT (?); October (?); settlement at Caperna-
   um (Luke iv. 16–30).

27. FEAST OF PASSOVER, March (?); PENTECOST,
   May, A.D. 26 (?); TABERNACLES, October,
   A.D. 26 (?); or, PURIM, February, A.D. 27 (?),
   most probably the last, at Jerusalem; the cripple
   at Bethesda (John v. 1–9).
   — Jesus begins His public ministry in Galilee (Matt.
   iv. 17; Mark i. 14, 15).
   — Call of Peter, Andrew, James, and John (Matt.
   iv. 18–22; Mark i. 16–20; Luke v. 1–11, ?).
   — Miracles at Capernaum (Matt. viii. 14–17; Mark
   i. 29–34; Luke iv. 31–41).
   — Mission-journey through Galilee, including Chor-
   azin (?), Bethsaida (?), &c. (Matt. iv. 23; Mark
   — Leper healed (Matt. viii. 1–4; Mark i. 40–45;
   — Capernaum: paralytic healed (Mark ii. 1–8; Mark
   ii. 1–12; Luke v. 18–26).
   9–17; Mark ii. 13–22; Luke v. 27, 28).
   — Near Capernaum: second-first Sabbath, March (?),
   April (?), (Matt. xii. 1–5; Mark ii. 23–28; Luke
   vi. 1–5).
   — Capernaum: the withered hand healed on the Sab-
   bath (Matt. xii. 9–13; Mark iii. 1–6; Luke vi.
   6–11).
   — Choice of the Twelve Apostles (Matt. x. 2–4;
   — The Sermons on the Mount (Matt. v., vi., vii.)
   and on the Plain (Luke vi. 26–63).
   — Capernaum: centurion's servant healed (Matt.
   — Nain: widow's son raised to life (Luke xi. 11–17).
   — Messengers sent by John the Baptist (Matt. xii.
   — House of Simon the Pharisee; the woman that
   was a sinner (Luke vii. 36–50).
   — Journey through Palestine, followed by devout
   — The charge of doing evil by devils by Beelzebub
   (Matt. xii. 22–37; Mark iii. 32–39; Luke xi. 14–26).
   — Visit of the Mother and Brethren of Jesus (Matt.
   xii. 46–50; Mark iii. 31–35; Luke viii. 19–21).
   — The first teaching by parables (Matt. xiii. 1–53;
   Mark iv. 1–34; Luke vii. 4–18; xiii. 18–21).
   — The Sea of Galilee: the tempest calmed (Matt.
   vi. 23–27; Mark iv. 35–41; Luke viii. 22–25).
   — The Gadarene demoniac (Matt. viii. 26–34; Mark
   — The daughter of Jairus raised to life (Matt. xii.
   18–26; Mark v. 22–43; Luke vii. 40–56).
   — Nazareth; second discourse in the synagogue (Matt.
   xii. 53–58; Mark vi. 1–6).
   — Renewed journey through Galilee (Matt. ix. 35–
   39; Mark vi. 5).
   — Mission of the Twelve Apostles (Matt. x. 1–42;
   Mark vi. 7–13; Luke vi. 1–6).
   — Execution of John the Baptist, March (?), (Matt.
   xiv. 6–12; Mark vi. 21–29).
   — Herod the Tetrarch hears of Jesus (Matt. xiv.
   1, 2; Mark vi. 14–16; Luke vi. 7–9).
   — Return of the Twelve to Bethsaida; feeding of
   the Five Thousand; PASSOVER (Matt. xiv. 13–21;
   Mark vi. 30–44; Luke ix. 10–17; John vi.
   1–14).

A.D. 27. Sea of Galilee: Jesus walks on the waters (Matt.
   xv. 22–33; Mark vi. 45–52; John vi. 15–21).
   — Gennesaret: works of healing (Matt. xiv. 34–36;
   Mark vi. 53–56).
   — Capernaum: SABBATH AFTER PASSOVER; dis-
   course on the Bread of Life (John vi. 22–65).
   — Pharisees from Jerusalem charge the disciples with
   eating with unwashed hands (Matt. xvi. 1–20;
   Mark vii. 1–23).
   — Coasts of Tyre and Sidon: daughter of Syro-
   Phoenician woman healed (Matt. xv. 21–28;
   Mark vii. 25–30).
   — Deaf and dumb (Matt. xv. 29–31; Mark vii.
   31–37).
   — Feeding of the Four Thousand (Matt. xv. 32–33;
   Mark vii. 1–9).
   — Pharisees and Sadducees demand a sign from
   heaven (Matt. xvi. 1–4; Mark vi. 10–12).
   — Bethsaida: blind man healed (Mark vii. 22–26).
   — Caesarea Philippi: Peter's confession (Matt.
   xvi. 13–28; Mark viii. 27–ix. 1; Luke ix.
   18–27; John vi. 66–71, ?).
   — Hermon (?); Tabor (?); the Transfiguration (Matt.
   xvii. 1–13; Mark ii. 2–13; Luke x. 28–36).
   — Base of Hermon (?); demoniac healed (Matt.
   — The Passion foretold (Matt. xvii. 22, 23; Mark
   ix. 30–32; Luke ix. 43–45).
   — Capernaum (?); payment of didrachma, or Temple-
   rate, April (?), May (?), (Matt. xvii. 24–27).
   — Rivalry of disciples, and consequent teaching
   (Matt. xvii. 1–35; Mark iii. 33–50; Luke
   x. 46–50).
   — Journey through Samaria; new disciples; Jeru-
   salem: FEAST OF TABERNACLES, October
   1–53).
   — Jerusalem: the woman taken in adultery (John
   vii. 53–viii. 11).
   — Jerusalem: discourse in Temple; blind man healed
   at Siloam (John viii. 21–59; John x. 1–41).
   — Jerusalem: the Good Shepherd (John x. 1–18).
   — Bethany: Jesus in the house of Martha (Luke x.
   38–42).
   — Disciples taught to pray (Luke xi. 1–13).
   — Two blind men healed (Matt. ix. 27–31).
   — Demoniac healed; subsequent teaching (Matt. ix.
   — Perea (?); Galilee (?); teaching on various occasions
   — Jerusalem: FEAST OF DEDICATION, December
   20–27 (John x. 22–39).

28. January. Jesus on the east side of Jordan (John
   x. 40–42).
   — Jesus begins to prepare for the journey to Jeru-
   salem; message from Herod (Luke xii. 22–35).
   — East side of Jordan: teaching, including parables
   of the Lost Sheep, the Lost Piece of Money,
   Prodigal Son, Unjust Steward, the Rich Man and
   Lazarus, &c. (Luke x. 1–16; xii. 10).
   — Progress towards Jerusalem (Matt. xix. 1; Mark x.
   1; Luke xvii. 11).
   — The ten lepers; teaching, including parables of
   Unjust Judge, Pharisee and Publican (Luke
   xvii. 12–xviii. 14).
   — Teaching as to divorce and infants (Matt. xix.
   3–15; Mark x. 2–16; Luke xviii. 15–17, infants only).
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A.D.
28. Dialogue with the rich young ruler (?), (Matt. xix. 16—30; Mark x. 17—31; Luke xviii. 18—30).
—— Parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard (Matt. xx. 1—16).
—— Bethany; raising of Lazarus (John i. 1—46).
—— Ephraim; retirement of Jesus (John xi. 47—54).
—— Request of the sons of Zebedee (Matt. xx. 20—28; Mark x. 35—45).
—— Jericho; two blind men healed (Matt. xx. 29—34; Mark x. 46—52; Luke xviii. 35—43).
—— Jericho; Jesus in the house of Zacchaeus (Luke ix. 1—10).
—— Parable of the Pounds (Luke xix. 11—28).
—— Nazareth; a young man with Jesus; EVENING OF SABBATH BEFORE THE PASSOVER.
—— Bethany and Jerusalem; FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK; kingly Entry into the city (Matt. xxi. 1—11; Mark xi. 1—11; Luke xix. 29—44; John xii. 12—19).
—— SECOND DAY OF THE WEEK: Bethany and Jerusalem; the barren fig-tree (Matt. xxi. 18—22; Mark xi. 12—14, 20—25).
—— Cleansing of the Temple (Matt. xxi. 12—17; Mark xi. 15—19; Luke xix. 45—48).
—— Parables; discussions with Pharisees, Herodians, Sadducees, and lawyers (Matt. xxi. 23—xxii. 46; Mark xi. 27; xii. 40; Luke xx. 1—44).
—— The last discourse against the Pharisees (Matt. xxiii. 1—39; Mark xii. 38—40; Luke xx. 45—47).
—— The widow’s mite (Mark xii. 41—44; Luke xx. 1—4).
—— The Greeks in Jerusalem (?); the voice from heaven (John xii. 20—36).
—— Prophetic discourse of the destruction of Jerusalem and of the second Advent (Matt. xxiv. 1—42; Mark xiii. 1—37; Luke xi. 5—36).
—— The parables of the Wise and Foolish Virgins, the Talents, the Sheep and the Goats (Matt. xxv. 1—46).
—— THIRD DAY OF THE WEEK: passed by Jesus in Bethany and Gethsemane (?), Jerusalem (?); compact of Judas with the chief priests (Matt. xxvi. 1—5, 14—16; Mark xiv. 1, 2, 10, 11; Luke xxii. 1—6).

28. FOURTH DAY OF THE WEEK: nothing recorded; Bethany (?), Gethsemane (?), Jerusalem (?).
—— FIFTH DAY OF THE WEEK: Peter and John sent from Bethany to Jerusalem; THE PASSOVER SUPPER; the Feast of the New Covenant; dialogue and discourses.
—— Gethsemane (Matt. xxvi. 17—46; Mark xiv. 12—42; Luke xxii. 7—46; John xiii. 1—xvii. 26).
—— SIXTH DAY OF THE WEEK: 3 A.M., Jesus taken in Gethsemane; brought before Annas; Peter’s denial (Matt. xxvi. 47—75; Mark xiii. 43—72; Luke xxii. 47—62; John xvi. 2—18).
—— 6 A.M. The trial before Caiaphas and the Sanhedrin; their second meeting; Jesus sent to Pilate; suicide of Judas.
—— Jesus before Pilate, Herod, and Pilate again; the people demand release of Barabbas; Jesus led to Golgotha (Matt. xxvi. 55—xxvii. 34; Mark xiv. 55—xxvii. 23; Luke xxii. 63—xxiii. 33; John xviii. 19—xxix. 17).
—— Noon to 3 P.M. Darkness over the land; death of Jesus (Matt. xxvii. 45—56; Mark xv. 29—41; Luke xxiii. 44—46; John xix. 28—30).
—— 6 P.M. Embalmment and entombment by Joseph of Arimathaea, Nicodemus, and devout women; priests apply for a guard over the sepulchre (Matt. xxvii. 57—66; Mark xv. 42—47; Luke xxiii. 50—56; John xix. 38—42).
—— SABBATH: disciples and women rest (Luke xxiii. 56).
—— FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK: the Resurrection (see Notes on Matt. xxviii. for the order of the manifestations), (Matt. xxviii. 1—20; Mark xvi. 1—20; Luke xxiv. 1—43; John xx. 1—xxi. 25).
—— TEN DAYS BEFORE PENTECOST (?): the Ascension (Mark xvi. 19, 20; Luke xxiv. 44—53).
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INTRODUCTION

TO

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. MATTHEW.

I. The Author.—The facts presented by the New Testament records are few and simple. In Mark ii. 14, Luke v. 27, we find Levi, the son of Alphaeus, sitting at the receipt of custom (better, perhaps, at the custom-house) in Capernaum. He is identified by Matt. ix. 9 with the “man that was called Matthew.” The second name may have been given by our Lord, as Peter was given to Simon, or taken by him of his own accord. Its meaning, as “God-given,” like Theodorus, Theodoretus, Dorotheus, Adeodatus, made it a suitable name for one to take for whom old things had passed away, and all things had become new, and who thanked God for that unspeakable gift; and its historical associations with the name of the great Matthew, the father of the Maccabean heroes, made it—as we see in the case of Matthias, another form of the name (see Note on Acts i. 23)—one of the names which, like Judas and Simon, had become popular with all true patriots. In the lists of the Apostles, his name is always found in the second group of four, with Thomas, James (or Jacob) the son of Alphaeus, and Judas the son (or brother) of James (see Notes on Matt. x. 3). If, as seems probable, we recognise in Mark ii. 14 the same Alphaeus as in Mark iii. 18, we have another instance, in addition to the sons of Jona and of Zebedee, of two, or possibly three, brothers called to act together as Apostles. A probable conjecture leads us a step further. The name of Matthew is coupled, in all the lists in the Gospels, with that of Thomas—sometimes one, sometimes the other name taking precedence—and as Thomas, or Didymus (John xi. 16, xxi. 2), signifies “Twin,” there is, primâ facie, good ground for the inference that he was so known as the twin-brother of Matthew. The Alphaeus who is named as the father of the second James in the lists of the Apostles, is commonly identified with the Cephas of John xix. 25, where the Authorised version wrongly gives Cleophas. This cannot, however, be regarded as certain, and there are serious considerations against it. Mary, the wife of Cleophas, is described (Mark xv. 40) as the mother of James the less and Joseph. But the union of these two names (as in Mark vi. 3) suggests that the Evangelist speaks of the brethren of our Lord, and therefore, not of James the Apostle. Either, therefore, Cleophas and Alphaeus are not different forms of the same name, or, if they are, the two forms were used for the sake of clearness, to distinguish the father of the three or four Apostles from the father, on this assumption, of the four “brethren” of our Lord.

Assuming these facts, the circumstances of the call of Matthew gain a fresh interest. The brothers of the Evangelist may have been already among the disciples who had acknowledged Jesus as the Christ, or at least as a great Prophet. Matthew may have seen and heard Him as He taught in the synagogue of Capernaum. The event which immediately preceded his call, had been the healing of the man sick of the palsy, and the proclamation that the Son of Man had power on earth to forgive sins (Matt. ix. 1—8; Mark ii. 1—12; Luke iii. 17—26). We are led to believe, by the readiness with which he obeyed the call of Jesus, that the good seed had already been sown. But He was a publican. He had chosen for himself a calling more lucrative than that of the fisherman or the peasant, but one which brought with it an evil repute and a sense of degradation. The Pharisees shrank from his touch. His companions were “publicans and sinners” like himself. Could he any longer claim to be a “son of Abraham”? (Luke xix. 9.) Would the new Teacher deign to receive him, or even speak to him? To one in such a state of feeling, the command, “Follow Me,” would be in itself a gospel. Regardless, apparently, of its being one of the traditional fast-days, which the Pharisees were observing with their usual strictness (see Note on Matt. ix. 14), he called together his friends and neighbours, mostly of the same calling as himself, and gave them a farewell feast, that they too might hear “the words of grace,” in which his soul had found the starting-point of a new life (Matt. ix. 10; Mark ii. 15; Luke v. 29). Of the rest of his life, we know but very little. Called now to be a disciple, he, with his brothers, was chosen afterwards, much, we may believe, to his own astonishment, to be one of the Twelve who were the special envoys of the anointed King. The union of his name with that of Thomas suggests the inference that the two twins were joined together in the work of proclaiming the gospel. He is with the other disciples in the upper chamber after the Ascension, and on the day of Pentecost (Acts i. 13; ii. 1). From that date, as far as the New Testament is concerned, he disappears from view. A comparatively late tradition (Euseb. Hist. iii. 24; Clem. Alex. Strom. vi.) represents him as having preached for fifteen years in Judea, and ultimately died a martyr’s death in Parthia or Ethiopia (Socrates, Hist. i. 19). Clement of Alexandria, however, speaks of his dying a natural death. The fact that Thomas also is reported to have founded churches in Parthia and Ethiopia (Euseb. Hist. iii. 1) is, at least, in harmony with the thought that then, as before, during their Lord’s ministry on earth, they had been fellow-workers together to the end. An independent tradition that Pantænus, the great Alexandrian Missionary, had found the Gospel of St. Matthew among the Indians (Euseb. Hist. v. 10) points in the same direction. His asceticism led him to a purely vegetarian diet (Clem. Alex. Pedag. ii. 1, § 16). A characteristic saying is ascribed to him by Clement of Alexandria (Strom. vii. 13)—“If the neighbour of an elect man sin, the elect man himself
II. The Authorship and Sources of the Gospel.—As has been said above (Introduction to the First Three Gospels), the very obscurity of St. Matthew's name and the odium attached to his calling, made it antecedently improbable that a later pseudonymous writer would have chosen him as the Apostle on whom to affix a book which he wished to invest with a counterfeit authority. On the other hand, assuming his authorship as a hypothesis calling for examination, there are many coincidences which at least, render it probable. His occupation as a publican must have involved a certain clerical culture which would make him, as it were, the scholar of the company of the Twelve, acquainted, as his calling required him to be, with Greek as well as Aramaic, familiar with pen and paper. The, or as a later date, as growing out of that culture, he must have acquired that familiarity with the writings of the Old Testament which makes his Gospel almost a manual of Messianic prophecy. * The external evidence begins, as we have seen, with Papias (A.D. 170), who states that Matthew compiled a record of the oracles or sayings of the Lord Jesus (Euseb. Hist. iii. 39). As the work of Papias is known to us only by a few fragmentary quotations, we have, of course, no adequate data for proving the identity of the book which he names with what we now know as the Gospel according to Matthew. But the account which he gives of it shows a precise agreement with the prominence given in that Gospel more than in any other to our Lord's discourses; and it is, to say the least, a strained hypothesis, hardly likely to suggest itself except for the sake of a foregone conclusion, to assume the existence of a vanished Gospel bearing Matthew's name, and afterwards superseded by the work of a pseudonymous writer. Papias, it may be added, is described by Eusebius (Hist. iii. 39) as having been a hearer of St. John and a friend of Polycarp. He describes himself as caring less for what he found in books—thus implying the existence of many narratives such as St. Luke speaks of (chap. i. 1)—than from what he gathered by personal inquiry from the elders who remembered the Apostles, and who could thus repeat what the Lord Jesus had taught. To him the divine voice, still abiding with the Church, was the most precious of all records, and upon these he based what appears to have been the first Commentary on the Gospel-history and the words of Jesus. He names Aristotle and John the Presbyter as his two chief informants. Eusebius, while admitting his indubitable authority in collecting the fragments of apostolic tradition, looks on him as wanting in discernment, and mingling with what was authentic matter that which was strange and legendary. Among these fragments he seems to have included the narrative of the woman taken in adultery ( "a woman accused before the Lord of many sins," Euseb. Hist. iii. 39), which, though found at present in St. John, bears every mark of having been inserted in that Gospel after it had left the hands of its writer. (See Notes on John viii. 1—11.)

III. The Aim and Characteristics of the Gospel.—There was a widely-diffused tradition, as early as the second century, that the Gospel of St. Matthew had been written primarily for Hebrew Christians. By many it was believed that it had been written originally in the Hebrew or Aramaic of the time, and that we have only a version of it. So Papias writes that Matthew composed his Gospel in the Hebrew tongue, and that each interpreted it as he could (Euseb. Hist. iii. 39); and the statement is repeated by Irenæus (Hist. ii. 1), who adds, that it was written while St. Peter and St. Paul were preaching the Gospel at Rome, i.e., circ. A.D. 63—65, and by Jerome (Prof. in Matt.). There is, however, no evidence of the actual existence of such a Hebrew Gospel, and the Greek text now received bears no marks of being a translation. The belief that it was, in the intention of the writer, meant for readers who were of the stock of Abraham, receives, at any rate, abundant confirmation from its internal character. It presents, as we have already seen, numerous parallelisms with the Epistle which James, the brother of the Lord, addressed to the Twelve Tribes scattered abroad (p. xviii.). It begins with a genealogy—a "book of the generations" of the Christ (Matt. i. 1)—after the manner of the old Hebrew histories (Gen. v. 1; x. 1; xxxvi. 1; Ruth 8). It is contented to trace the descent of the Christ from Abraham through David and the kingly line (See Note on Luke iii. 23). It dwells, as has been said, with far greater fulness than any other Gospel, on the Messianic prophecies, direct or typical, of the Old Testament. It does not explain Jewish customs, as St. Mark and St. Luke do. (Comp. Matt. xv. 1, 2, with Mark vii. 3, 4.) It sets forth more fully than they do the contrast between the royal law, the perfect law of freedom (Jas. i. 25; ii. 12), and the corrupt traditions and casuistry of the scribes (Matt. v., vi., xxiii.). It presents, as we have already seen, a distinctively Hebrew formula of "the kingdom of heaven,"* where the other Evangelists speak of "the kingdom of God." It records the rending of the veil of the Temple, the earthquake and the signs that followed it, which, at the time, could hardly have had any special significance except for Jews (Matt. xxvii. 51—53). It reports and refutes the explanation which the Jewish priests gave at the time he wrote, of the marvel of the emptied sepulchre (Matt. xxviii. 11—15). It dwells more than the others do on the aspect of the future kingdom which represents the Apostles as sitting on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel (Matt. xxv. 28). Such features were naturally to be looked for in a Gospel intended for Israelites. We may add that they were also natural in the Gospel of the publican. For with the emotions of him who was called from the receipt of custom, would be the joy that he too was now, at last, recognised as a child of Abraham. To him it would be a welcome task to contrast the higher and purer doctrine of the Lord who had called him, with that of the Pharisees who had scorned and thrust him out. We may, perhaps, even trace the influence of his experience as a collector of customs, in the care with which he brings together his Master's warnings against the vain and rash swearing, * The phrase occurs thirty-two times in St. Matthew, and nowhere else in the New Testament.

---

*In St. Matthew's Gospel there are no less than eleven direct citations from the Old Testament, not including those reported as spoken by our Lord. In St. Mark there are two, of which one is doubtful; in St. Luke three; in St. John nine. It is, on any view, striking, that this reference to the teaching of the earlier Scriptures should characterise the Gospels of the two Apostles rather than those of the two Evangelists who wrote specially for Gentiles.
and the false distinctions as to the validity of different oaths (Matt. v. 34—37; xxiii. 16—22) which, common as they were in all times and places, were sure to be loudest and least trustworthy in disputes between the publican and the payers of an ad valorem duty.

There was, however, another aspect of the publican character. The work of St. Matthew had brought him into contact with those who were known as the “sinners of the Gentiles” (Gal. ii. 15). He had called them to share his joy in the first glow of his conversion (Matt. ix. 10). The new consciousness of being indeed one of a chosen and peculiar people passed, not, as with the Pharisees, into the stiffness of a national exclusive pride, but, as a like consciousness as did afterwards in St. Paul, into the sense of universal brotherhood. And so he is careful to record that visit of the Magi in whom Christendom has rightly seen the first-fruits of the calling of the Gentiles (Matt. ii. 1—12). He dwells, if not exclusively, yet emphatically, on the far-off prospect of men coming from east and west, and north and south, and sitting down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob (Matt. viii. 11). He records the parable which represents the servants of the great King as sent forth to gather guests for the marriage feast from the “by-ways” of the Gentile world (Matt. xxii. 10). He sets forth the law of compassionate judgment, which shall make the doom of Tyre and Sidon more tolerable than that of Chorazin and Bethsaida (Matt. xi. 21—24), and take as its standard, when all the Gentiles are gathered round the throne of the Judge, not the specific truths revealed in Christ, but the great laws of kindness which are stamped everywhere, even when neglected and transgressed, upon the hearts and consciences of those who have known no other revelation. (See Notes on Matt. xxv. 31—40.)

Lastly, it is in St. Matthew that we find recorded the full commission, anticipating the gospel as St. Paul afterwards preached it, which bade the disciples not to circumcise, but to baptise—to baptise, not converts from Israel only, but “all the Gentiles,” the outraging people of the world, of every race and speech. (See Notes on Matt. xxviii. 19.) It follows from what has now been said that the chief aspect in which the form of the Son of Man is presented to us in St. Matthew’s Gospel is that of the King who fulfilled the hopes of Israel—a King, not receiving, even in unconscious infancy, tokens of His sovereignty, and in manhood giving proof of that sovereignty by His power over nature, and men, and the forces of the unseen world. Seen from this point of view, each portion of the Gospel is part of the great portraiture of the ideal King. The Sermon on the Mount, while it is, in part, the voice of the true Teacher, the true Rabbi, as contrasted with those who were unworthy of that title, is yet also the proclamation by the King, who speaks, not as the scribes, but as one having authority, of His royal Law (Jas. ii. 8), of the conditions of His kingdom (Matt. vii. 29). The parables of chaps. xiii. and xxv. are brought together with a fulness and profusion found in no other Gospel, because they bring before us, each of them, some special aspect of that kingdom. If he alone of the Evangelists mentions, as coming from our Lord’s lips, the word for the Christian society (Ecclesia) which, when the Gospels were written, was in universal use, we may see in the care that he took to record those few words as bearing witness to the true relation of that society to its King and Lord, his sense of the reality of the kingdom. Christ had built that Church on Himself as the Eternal Rock, and the gates of hell should not prevail against it (Matt. xvi. 18). Where it was, there He would be, even to the end of the world (Matt. xxviii. 20). The play of fancy which led the men of a later age to connect the four Gospels with the four cherubic symbols may have had much in it that was arbitrary and capricious, but it was not altogether wrong when, with a uniform consent, it identified the Gospel of St. Matthew with the form that had the face of a man (Ezek. i. 10; Rev. iv. 7). Assuming the cherubic forms to represent primarily the great manifestations of Divine wisdom (see Note below) as seen in nature, that “face of a man” testified to the seers who looked on it that there was a Will and a Purpose which men could partly comprehend as working after the manner of their own. Interpreted by the fuller revelation of God in Christ, it taught them that the Son of Man, who had been made a little lower than the angels, was crowned with glory and honour, sitting on the right hand of the Ancient of days (Dan. vii. 9), Lord and King over the world of nature and the world of men, and yet delighting above all in the presence that flowed from the midst of babes and sucklings (Ps. viii. 2; Matt. xxi. 16).

EXCURSUS ON THE CHERUBIC

SYMBOLISM OF THE GOSPELS.

It will, perhaps, convey information which will be welcome to many readers, if I lay before them a brief survey of the mystical symbolism above referred to. I do not pretend that it helps us much in the interpretation of the Gospels. I do not believe that the cherubic forms were primarily typical of anything but the divine attributes of majesty and strength as seen in the forms of animal creation. A like symbolism meets us, it will be remembered, obviously with that meaning, in the winged bulls and lions, the men with wings and heads of eagles, that are seen in the monuments of Assyria, with which the prophet who spent his exile on the banks of Chebar could not fail to have been familiar. But the history of such symbolism, if it lies outside the limits of the work of the interpreter, has yet a special interest of its own, and has exercised so wide an influence on Christian art and poetry, that the reader of the Gospels should hardly remain ignorant of its several stages. The first description that meets us is that in Ezek. i. 10. Here they are described, not as “cherubim,” but as “living creatures.” “As for the likeness of their faces, they four had the face of a man, and the face of a lion, on the right side: and they four had the face of an ox on the left side: they four also had the face of an eagle.” They had each four faces and four wings, and they shone “like burning coals of fire,” and like “the appearance of lamps.” There were wheels with them, and “the spirit of the living creatures was in the wheels,” and they moved altogether, and above them was a sapphire throne, and round it the brightness of the rainbow, and on the throne the “appearance of a man.” In chap. x. the prophet has another vision, seen as in the courts of the Temple, but there is a suggestive change in the description: “The first
face was the face of a cherub" (this taking the place of the ox), "and the second face was the face of a man, and the third the face of a lion, and the fourth the face of an eagle;" and he adds, what is in every way significant, that he then recognised, what he had apparently not perceived before, the identity of the vision at Chebar with the cherubim of the Temple (Ezek. x. 20, 21). The symbols remained mysterious, uninterpreted, unnoticed, till the visions of the Apocalypse, in which St. John brought together things new and old from all previous Apocalypses. We find in his symbolic picture of the unseen world the same mysterious forms. "In the midst of the throne, and round about the throne, were four beasts" (better, four living creatures, as in Ezekiel), "full of eyes before and behind; and the first beast was like a lion, and the second beast like a calf, and the third beast had a face of a man, and the fourth beast was like a flying eagle." It was natural that this reproduction of the symbolic imagery should attract the attention of Christian writers, and equally natural that they should endeavour to find a meaning for it that came within the horizon of their own associations. And when the Church found itself in possession of the four Gospels, and of those alone, as recognised authentic records of the life and teaching of its Lord, when men were finding in them a mystic correspondence with the four elements and the four winds and the four rivers of Paradise, it was natural that the number of the living creatures also should seem to them to have been intended to answer to that of the four precious and sacred books. It is significant, however, of the somewhat arbitrary character of the symbolism that its application has not been uniform. The earlier writers, beginning with Irenaeus (iii. 11), assign the lion, as the emblem of kingly majesty, to St. John; the calf, as signifying sacrificial or priestly attributes, to St. Luke; the man, as presenting the humanity of Christ, to St. Matthew; the eagle, as answering to the prophetic announcement with which his Gospel opens, to St. Mark; and this is reproduced by Juveneus, a Latin poet, circ. A.D. 334. The Pseudo-Athanasius (Synopsis Script.) assigns the man to St. Matthew, the calf to St. Mark, the lion to St. John, the eagle to St. James; and without assigning reasons. In Sedulius, a Latin poet of the fifth century, what has since been the received distribution of the symbols makes its first appearance. It was quickly accepted, as having a greater measure of fitness than the earlier interpretations, was adopted by Augustine (De Consens. Evang. i. 6) and Jerome (Proem. in Matt.), appears in the early mosaics of the basilicas at Rome and Ravenna, and has since been current, to the entire exclusion of the earlier view. It finds, perhaps, its noblest expression in the Latin hymn of Adam of St. Victor, in the twelfth century. It will be well, it is believed, to give this both in the original and in a translation. The whole hymn may be found in Archbishop Trench's Latin Poetry, p. 67.

ST. MATTHEW.

Supra colos dum consecidunt
Summi Patris comprehendit
Natum ante saecula;
Pollens subeunt neutrae molis
Inteetur jubar solis
Joannes in aqua.

Est leonis rugiens
Marco vultus, resurrectus
Quo clarit potestiat
Voco Patris excitatus,
Sangit Christus, laureatus
Immortali gloria.

Os humanum est Mathaei,
In humana formis Dei
Dictantis prosapia;
Cujus genus sic context
Quod a stirpe David exit
Per carnis materiam.

Ritus bovis Lucae datur
In qua forma figuratur
Novae Christi hostia ;
Aracudis manusuetus
Hic maculatur, sicut vetus
Transit observanda.

Paradisi hic fluenta
Nova fluent sacramenta
Quae descendunt collium ;
His quadrigis deportatur
Mundo Deus, sublimatur
Leta arca vectibus.

See, far above the starry height,
Beholding, with unclouded sight,
The brightness of the sun,
Still gazing on the vision clear
Of Christ, the Eternal Son.

To Mark belongs the lion's form,
With voice loud-roaring as the storm,
His risen Lord to own;
Cried by the Father from the grave,
As victor crowned, and strong to save,
We see Him on His throne.

The face of man is Matthew's share,
Who shows the Son of Man doth bear
Man's form with might divine,
And see all else is vain.

To Luke the ox belongs, for he,
More clearly than the rest, doth see
Christ as the victim slain;
Upon the cross, as altar true,
The bleeding, spotless Lamb we view,
In David's kingly line.

So from their source in Paradise
The four mysterious rivers rise,
And life to earth is given:
On these four wheels and staves, behold,
God and His ark are onward rolled,
High above earth in Heaven.
THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. MATTHEW.

CHAPTER I.—(1) The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham. (2) Abraham begat Isaac; and Isaac begat Jacob; and Jacob begat Judas and his brethren; (3) and Judas begat Phares and Zara of Thamar; and Phares begat Esrom; and Esrom begat Aram; (4) and Aram begat Aminadab; and Aminadab begat Naasson; and Naasson begat Salmon; (5) and Salmon begat Booz of Rachab; and Booz begat Obed of Ruth:

(1) The book of the generation.—The opening words of the Gospel show that it is written by a Jew for Jewish readers. They are an essentially Hebrew formula (as in Gen. v. 1), and were applied chiefly though not exclusively (Gen. xxxvii. 2) to genealogies such as that which follows here.

The omission of the names of Ishmael and Esau is explained by the fact, that they were not only not in the line of succession, but were outside the covenant with Abraham—"In Isaac shall thy seed be called" (Gen. xxi. 12); and Esau had forfeited both the birthright and the blessing. The brethren of Judah are named, on the other hand, because all who were descended from them had an equal interest in the Messiah.

(2) Thamar.—The occurrence of the names of women in genealogies was the exception rather than the rule among the Jews; but there are instances enough in the Old Testament (e.g., Keturah, Gen. xxv. 1; the wives of Esau, Gen. xxxvi. 10; Timna, Gen. xxxvi. 22; Mehetabel, Gen. xxxvi. 39; Azubah, the wife of Caleb, 1 Chron. ii. 18; Acsah, his daughter, 1 Chron. ii. 49; and many others) to make the insertion of such names here quite natural, even without assuming any distinct purpose. It was enough that the women were historically notable. In the case of Thamar there were precedents enough for such an honourable mention. In the days of Ruth she was as much the heroine of the tribe of Judah as Rachel and Leah were of all Israel, and her name came into the formula of nuptial benediction (Ruth iv. 12). It appears also in the genealogies of 1 Chron. ii. 24, it would bear from the language of the Talmud as if the Jews looked on her strange and to us revolting history with quite other feelings. To them she was as one who, at the risk of shame, and, it might be, death, had preserved the line of Judah from destruction, and "therefore was counted worthy to be the mother of kings and prophets." The mention of Thara, though not in the line of succession, follows the precedent of 1 Chron. ii. 47.

(3) Naasson, or Nahshon, the brother of Elishaba the wife of Aaron, was, at the time of the Exodus, the "prince (or captain) of the children" of Judah (Num. i. 7; ii. 3; 1 Chron. ii. 10). A Jewish legend made him the first to enter the waters of the Red Sea.

(5) Rachab.—The Old Testament records are silent as to the marriage of Salmon with the harlot of Jericho. When they were compiled it was probably thought of as a blot rather than a glory; but the fact may have been preserved in the traditions of the house of David. It has been conjectured that Salmon may have been one of the two unnamed spies whose lives were saved by Rahab, when he was doing the work which Caleb had done before him. The mention of Rahab in Jas. ii. 25, Heb. xi. 31, shows that her fame had risen at the time when St. Matthew wrote. The Talmud legends, curiously enough, reckon eight prophets among her descendants, including Jeremiah and Baruch, but not any of the line of David. Assuming the connection between St. Matthew and St. James, which has been shown in the Introduction to this Gospel to be probable, the mention of Rahab by both takes its place as an interesting coincidence.

Booz.—The succession is the same as in Ruth iv. 21. The new fact of Salmon's marriage explains some of the features of that history—the readiness with which the sons of Naomi marry two women of the Moabites; the absence of any repugnance to such a union on the part of Boaz; perhaps the reference to Tamar in the benediction of Ruth iv. 12. Salmon would seem to have been the first of the house to have had land at Bethlehem (1 Chron. ii. 54), and to have gained this in part through his adoption into the family of Caleb.
The Genealogy

and Obed begat Jesse; (6) and Jesse begat David the king; and David begat Solomon of her that had been the wife of Urias; (7) and Solomon begat Roboam; and Roboam begat Abia; and Abia begat Asa; (8) and Asa begat Josaphat; and Josaphat begat Joram; and Joram begat Ozias; (9) and Ozias begat Joatham; and Joatham begat Achaz; and Achaz begat Ezekias; (10) and Ezekias begat Manasses; and Manasses begat Amon; and Amon begat Josias; (11) and Josias begat Jechonias and his brethren, about the time they were carried away to Babylon; (12) and after they were brought to Babylon, Jechonias begat Salathiel; and Salathiel begat Zorobabel; (13) and Zorobabel begat Abiud; and Abiud begat Azor; (14) and Azor begat Sadoc; and Sadoc begat Achim; and Achim begat Eliud; (15) and Eliud begat Eleazar; and Eleazar begat Mattan; and Mattan begat Jacob; (16) and Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ.

(17) So all the generations from Abraham to David are fourteen generations; and from David until the carrying away into Babylon are fourteen generations; and from the carrying away into Babylon unto Christ are fourteen generations.

(18) Now the birth of Jesus was on this wise: When as his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they

---

(6) The wife of Urias.—Once again we have the mention of a woman who at least played a memorable part in the history of Israel. As this is the last of such names in the genealogy, it may be well to deal with the question whether any special purpose can be traced in the selection, beyond that of noting points of interest. Nothing can carry us beyond probable conjectures; but, within those limits, it is at least suggestive that all the names are those of women who, either as of heathen origin (Bathsheba, like her husband, was probably a Hitite), or by personal guilt, were as those whom the strict judgment of the Pharisees excluded from his fellowship. St. Matthew may have meant men to draw the inference that, as these women were not excluded from the honour of being in the Messiah’s line of ancestry, so others like them would not be shut out from fellowship with His kingdom.

(9) Ozias.—Ozias is, of course, the Uziah of the Old Testament. Three names are omitted between Joram and this king—viz., Ahaziah, Joash, Amaziah. Apparently the motive for the omission was simply the desire of bringing the names in each period into taking the dates supplied by the received chronology of the Old Testament. B.C. 1996-1085.

(11) Jechonias and his brethren.—Here again there is a missing link in the name of Eliakim, or Jehoiakim, the son of Josiah (2 Kings xxiii. 24). Jechonias was therefore the grandson of Josiah. The alternative reading mentioned in the margin rests on very slight authority, and was obviously the insertion of some later scribe, to meet the difficulty. The word “brethren” was probably meant to include Mattaniah or Zedekiah, the last king of Judah, who was the son of Josiah, and therefore uncle to Jechonias.

(13) Jechonias begat Salathiel.—We come here into a cluster of genealogical difficulties. (1) The natural impression left by Jer. xxii. 30 is that Coniah (or Jechonias) died childless, or, at least, left no descendants who came to rule as Zerubbabel did; (2) In the genealogy given by St. Luke (iii. 27), Salathiel is named as the son of Neri; (3) In 1 Chron. iii. 17—19, Salathiel is the son of Assir, the son of Jeconiah, and Zerubbabel the son of Pedaiah, the brother of Salathiel. It is not easy to see our way through these difficulties; but the most probable solution is that Assir was the only son of Jeconiah, and died without issue before his father; that the line of Solomon thus came to an end, and that the descendants of Nathan, another son of David, took their place in the succession, and were reckoned, as by adoption, as the sons of the last survivor of the other line. The practice is, it may be noted, analogous to that which prevails among Indian princes, and in other Eastern nations. (Comp. Note on Luke iii. 23—38.)

(15) The arrangement into three triads of fourteen generations each was obviously in the nature of a memoria technica. The periods embraced by the three groups were, it may be noted, of very unequal length; and the actual omission of names in one of them, makes it possible that the others may have been treated in the same way. (1) From the birth of Abraham to the birth of David, taking the dates supplied by the received chronology of the Old Testament. B.C. 1996-1085. (2) From the birth of David to the Captivity. B.C. 1085-588. (3) From the Captivity to the birth of Jesus. B.C. 588-4.
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The Birth of Jesus Christ.

came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost. (19) Then Joseph her husband, being a just man, and not willing to make her a publick example, was minded to put her away privately. (20) But while he thought on these things, behold, the angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a dream, saying, Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife: for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost. (21) And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name JESUS: for he shall save his people from their sins.

history must fix a beginning more or less arbitrary, he found his starting-point in those facts which took a foremost place in what bore upon the fulfilment of Messianic prophecy. It has been said that the impression left by his narrative is so far misleading, that it suggests the idea that there was no earlier connection with Nazareth than that which we find in ii. 23. It must, however, be remembered that even St. Luke's narrative tells us nothing as to the original home of Joseph, and that one who himself belonged to Bethlehem, a being of the house and lineage of David, might, without any improbability, be betrothed to a maiden of Nazareth, probably of the same lineage. Of the earlier life of Mary the Canonical Gospels tell us nothing, and the Apocryphal Gospels (though they have furnished the groundwork of the treatment of the subject by Christian art—see Notes on Luke i. 27) are too legendary to be relied on. The omission of any mention of her parents suggests the idea of orphanhood, possibly under the guardianship of Joseph. The non-appearance of Joseph in the records of our Lord's ministry, makes it probable that he died in the interval between the visit to the Temple of Luke ii. 42 and the preaching of the Baptist, and that he was older than Mary. Both were poor; Joseph worked as a carpenter (Matt. xiii. 55), Mary offered the cheaper sacrifice of "two young pigeons" (Luke ii. 24). They had no house at Bethlehem (Luke ii. 7). Mary was related to Elizabeth, the wife of Zechariah the priest (Luke i. 36). Both were within the circle of those who cherished Messianic expectations, and to whom, therefore, the announcement that these expectations were to be fulfilled would come as the answer to their hopes and prayers.

Was espoused to Joseph.—Betrothal, among the Jews, was a formal ceremony, the usual symbolic act being from priestly times, the gift of a ring and other jewels (Gen. xxiv. 53). The interval between betrothal and marriage was of uncertain length, but among the Jews of our Lord's time was commonly for a whole year in the case of maidens. During that time the bride-elect remained in her own home, and did not see the bridegroom till he came to fetch her to his own house. All communications in the meantime were conducted through "the friend of the bridegroom" (John iii. 29).

Of the Holy Ghost.—To Joseph and those who heard the new report from him, prior to the more precise truths revealed by our Lord's teaching, the words would at least suggest a divine creative energy, quickening supernaturally the germ of life, as in Gen. i. 2, Ps. cv. 90. (19) Joseph her husband.—The word was applied with strict accuracy from the moment of betrothal onwards.

Being a just man . . . . —The glimpse given us into the character of Joseph is one of singular tenderness and beauty. To him, conscious of being of the house of David, and cherishing Messianic hopes, what he heard would seem to come as blighting those hopes. He dared not, as a "righteous" man, take to himself one who seemed thus to have sinned. But love and pity alike hindered him from pressing the law, which made death by stoning the punishment of such a sin (Deut. xxii. 21), or even from publicly breaking off the marriage on the ground of the apparent guilt. There remained the alternative, which the growing frequency of divorce made easy, of availing himself of a "writ of divorcement," which did not necessarily specify the ground of repudiation, except in vague language implying dispersal of the Mat. (16). The name "would" be settled quietly without exposure. The "bill of divorcement" was as necessary for the betrothed as for those who were fully man and wife.

(20) While he thought on these things.—The words imply a conflict, a perplexity; and the words of the angel came as the solution of his doubts.

In a dream.—From the Jewish point of view, dreams were the received channels of divine communications to the aged, open visions in the state of ecstasy to the young (Joel ii. 28). This, at least, falls in with what has been inferred as to Joseph's age.

Joseph, thou son of David.—The latter words were, in the highest degree, significant. His character as the heir of Messianic hopes, which was indeed at the root of his fears, was fully recognised. That which he was bid to do would not be inconsistent with that character, and would bring about the fulfilment of those hopes.

Thy wife.—Here again stress is laid on the fact that Mary was already entitled to that name, and had done nothing to forfeit it.

Conceived.—Better, perhaps, begotten.

(21) Thou shalt call his name Jesus.—There is nothing strange in this being to Joseph the first knowledge of the name, which St. Luke tells us (Luke i. 31) had been previously imparted to Mary. The customs of the Jews were, as we have seen, against any communications between the bride and bridegroom during the period of betrothal, and the facts of the case (including Mary's visit to Elizabeth) would make it more improbable than ever.

The name Jesus was one full of meaning, but it was not as yet a specially sacred name. In its Old Testament form of Jehoshua (Num. xiii. 16), Joshua, (Num. xiv. 17) it meant "Jehovah is salvation;" and the change of the name of the captain of Israel from Hoshea, which did not include the divine name, to the form which gave this full significance (Num. xiii. 16) had made it the expression of the deepest faith of the people. After the return from Babylon it received a new prominence in connection with the high priest Joshua, the son of Josedeek (Hagg. i. 1; Zech. iii. 1), and appears in its Greek form in Jesus the father, and again in the son, of Sirach. In the New Testament itself we find it borne by others (see Note on verse 1). It had not been directly associated, however, with Messianic hopes, and the infatuation that it was to be the name of the Christ gave a new character to men's thoughts of the kingdom. Not conquest, but "salvation"—deliverance, not from
human enemies only or chiefly, nor from the penalties of sin, but from the sins themselves. As spoken by the angel to the dreamer it was the answer to prayers and hopes, going beyond the hope, and purifying it from earthly thoughts. As recorded by the Evangelist it was a witness that he had been taught the true nature of the kingdom of the Christ.

All this was done.—The Evangelist pauses in his narrative to introduce his own comment. He saw in what he relates that which answered to the apparent meaning of prophetic words. He could not possibly regard the agreement as a chance coincidence; and, as chance was excluded, there was no alternative but purpose. The prophecy and the event entered both of them into a divine plan.

Behold, a virgin shall be with child.—It is not so easy for us, as it seemed to St. Matthew, to trace in Isaiah's words the meaning which he assigns to them. As we read them in a literal translation from the Hebrew, the words of Isa. vii. 14 run thus:—“Behold, the maiden conceives and bears a son, and calls his name Immanuel.” If we read these words in connection with the facts recorded in that chapter—the alliance of the kings of Syria and Israel against Judah, Isaiah's promise of deliverance, and his offer of a sign in attestation of his promise, the hypocritical refusal of that offer by Ahaz, who preferred resting on his plan of an alliance with Assyria—their natural meaning seems to be this:—The prophet either points to some maiden of marriageable years, or speaks as if he saw one in his vision of the future, and says that the sign shall be that she shall conceive and bear a son (the fulfilment of this prediction constituting the sign, without assuming a supernatural conception), and that she should give to that son a name which would embody the true hope of Israel—“God is with us.” The early years of that child should be nourished, not on the ordinary food of a civilised and settled population, but on the clotted milk and wild honey, which were (as we see in the case of the Baptist) the food of the dwellers in the wilderness, and which appear in verses 21, 22, as part of the picture of the desolation to which the country would be reduced by the Assyrian invasion. But in spite of that misery, even before the child should attain to the age at which he could refuse the evil and choose the good, the land of those whom Ahaz and his people were then dreading should be “forsaken of both her kings.” So understood, all is natural and coherent. It must be added, however, that this child was associated by Isaiah with no common hopes. The land of Israel was to be his land (viii. 8). It is hardly possible not to connect his name with “the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father,” and with “Rod and Branch of the Stem of Jesse that was to grow up and present the picture of an ideal king (xi. 1—9). All that we speak of as the Messianic hopes of the prophet clustered round the child Immanuel. Those hopes were, as we know, not fulfilled as he had expected. They remained for a later generation to feed on with yearning desire. But, so far as we know, they did not suggest to any Jewish interpreter the thought of a birth altogether supernatural. That thought did not enter into the popular expectations of the Messiah. It was indeed foreign to the prevailing feeling of the Jews as to the holiness of marriage and all that it involved, and would have commended itself to none but a small section of the more austere Essenes. St. Matthew, however, having to record the facts of our Lord's birth, and reading Isaiah with a mind full of the new truths which rested on the Incarnation, could not fail to be struck with the correspondence between the facts and the words which he here quotes, and which in the Greek translation were even more emphatic than in the Hebrew, and saw in them a prophecy that had at last been fulfilled. He does not say whether he looked on it as a conscious or unconscious prophecy. He was sure that the coincidence was not casual.

The view thus given deals, it is believed fairly, with both parts of the problem. If to some extent it modifies what till lately was the current view as to the meaning of Isaiah's prediction, it meets by anticipation the objection that the narrative was a mythical outgrowth of the prophecy as popularly received. It would be truer to say that it was the facts narrated that first gave occasion to this interpretation of the prophecy. St. Luke, who narrates the facts with far greater fulness than St. Matthew, does so without any reference to the words of the prophet.

Emmanuel.—As spoken by Isaiah, the name, like that of The Lord our Righteousness, applied by Jeremiah not only to the future Christ (Jer. xxiii. 6), but to Jerusalem (xxiii. 16), did not necessarily mean more than that “God was with His people,” protecting, guiding, ruling them. The Church of Christ has, however, rightly followed the Evangelist in seeing in it the witness to a Presence more direct, personal, immediate than any that had been known before. It was more than a watchword and a hope—more than a “nomen et omen”—and had become a divine reality.

Took unto him his wife.—These few words cover a great deal. They imply the formal ratification of the betrothal before witnesses; the benediction by a priest; the marriage-feast; the removal from the house that had hitherto been her home to that of Joseph. They imply also that what had seemed evidence of guilt among the neighbours of that home, brought with it to Joseph's mind no ground for blame. To them, if they were not told the history, and it is not probable that they were, it must have been deemed an act of exceptional mercy and forbearance. The reverence implied in what the next verse records must have roused their wonder.

Till she had brought forth her first-born son.—The word "firstborn" is not found in the best MSS. The questions which meet us here, unprofitable as they are, cannot be altogether passed over. What bearing have these words on the widespread belief of Christendom in the perpetual maidenhood of Mary? On what grounds does that belief itself rest?
CHAPTER II.—(1) Now when Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judaea in the days of Herod the king, behold, there came wise men from the east to Jeru-
salem, (2) saying, Where is he that is born King of the Jews? for we have seen his star in the east, and are come to worship him.

(1) Nothing can be inferred directly from St. Matthew’s phrase “till she had brought forth” as to what followed after the birth. The writer’s purpose is obviously to emphasise the absence of all that might interfere with the absolutely supernatural character of the birth itself. (2) Nothing can be inferred with certainty from the mention of our Lord’s “brethren” in xii. 46 (see Note there), and elsewhere. They may have been children of Joseph by a former marriage, or by what was known as a levirate marriage with the widow of a deceased brother, under the law of Deut. xxv. 5, Matt. xxii. 24, or children by adoption, or cousins included under the general name of brethren.

(3) The fact that the mother of our Lord found a home with the beloved disciple (John xix. 27) and not with any of the “brethren” points, as far as it goes, to their not being her own children, but it does not go far enough to warrant any positive assertion. Scripture therefore supplies no data for any decision on either side, nor does any tradition that can really be called primitive. The reverence for virginity as compared with marriage in the patristic and medival Church made the “ever-virgin” to be one of the received titles of the mother of the Lord. The reaction of natural feeling against that reverence led men in earlier and later times to assert the opposite. Every commentator is inclined consciously or unconsciously by his leanings in this or that direction. And so the matter must rest.

II.

(1) In the days of Herod the king.—The death of Herod took place in the year of Rome A.U.C. 750, just before the Passover. This year coincided with what in our common chronology would be B.C. 4—so that we have to recognise the fact that our common reckoning is erroneous, and to fix B.C. 5 or 4 as the date of the Nativity.

No facts recorded either in St. Matthew or St. Luke throw much light on the season of the birth of Christ. The flocks and shepherds in the open field indicate spring rather than winter. The received day, December 25th, was not kept as a festival in the East till the parent diameter of the moon. The last hypothesis of Herod’s time, that the journey from any part of such stars gathered round the births of Alexander the Great and Mithridates as well as Herod, might not seem to those who watched the heavens as the precursor of a great king. Any star (as Kepler conjectured) natural—the conjunction of the planets Jupiter and Saturn appearing as a single star of special brightness—or supernatural; visible to all beholders, or to the Magi only? Astrology is against the first view, by showing that the planets at their nearest were divided by the apparent diameter of the moon. The last hypothesis introduces a fresh miracle without a shadow of authority from Scripture. We must be content to remain in ignorance. We know too little of the astrology of that period to determine what star might or might not seem to those who watched the heavens as the precursor of a great king. Any star (as e.g., that which was connected with the birth of Caesar) might, under given rules of art, acquire a new significance. Stories, not necessarily legends, of the appearances of such stars gathered round the births of Alexander the Great and Mithridates led Cicero to say “the language of Balaam as to ‘the Star that was to rise out of Jacob’ (Num. xxiv. 17) implied the existence of such an association of thoughts then, and tended to perpetuate it. As late as the reign of Hadrian, the rebel chief who headed the insurrection of the Jews took the name of Bar-cochab, the “Son of a Star.” Without building too much on uncertain data, we may, however, at least believe that the “wise men” were Gentiles. They do not ask for “our king,” but for the King of the Jews; and yet, though Gentiles, they were sharers in the Messianic hopes of the Jews. They came to worship,
When Herod the king had heard these things, he was troubled, and all Jerusalem with him. (4) And when he had gathered all the chief priests and scribes of the people together, he demanded of them where Christ should be born. (5) And they said unto him, In Bethlehem of Judæa: for thus it is written by the prophet, (6) And thou Bethlehem, in the land of Juda, art not the least among the princes of Juda: for out of thee shall come a Governor, that shall rule my people Israel.

The chief priests and scribes.—The chief priests were probably the heads of the twenty-four courses into which the sons of Aaron were divided (2 Chron. xxiii. 8; Luke i. 5), but the term may have included those who had, though only for a time, held the office of high priest. The “scribes” were the interpreters of the Law, casuists and collectors of the traditions of the Elders, for the most part Pharisees. By the time the Magi arrived in Jerusalem, all these were elements of suspicion. The excitement naturally spread throughout the city.

The meeting thus convened was not necessarily a formal meeting of the Sanhedrim or Great Council, and may have been only as a Committee of Notables called together for a special purpose. With a characteristic subtlety, as if trying to gauge the strength of their Messianic hopes, Herod acts as if he himself shared them, and asks where the Christ, the expected Messiah, the “anointed” of the Lord (Ps. ii. 2; xlv. 7; lxxix. 20) was to be born.

In Bethlehem of Judæa.—The words of the people in John vii. 42 show the same belief thirty years later. The Targum, or Jewish paraphrase, of Micah v. 2, inserts the very words, “Out of thee the Messiah shall come.”

Then Herod, when he had privately called the wise men, enquired of them diligently what time the star appeared. And he sent them to Bethlehem, and said, Go and search diligently for the young child; and when ye have found him, bring me word again, that I may come and worship him also. (9) When they had heard the king, they departed; and, lo, the star, which they saw in the east, went before them, till it came and stood over where the young child was. (10) When they saw the star, they rejoiced with exceeding great joy.

And thou Bethlehem . . . —The Evangelist is not quoting the prophecy of Micah himself, but recording it as it was quoted by the scribes. This in part explains the fact that he does not give either the version of the LXX., or a more accurate rendering of the Hebrew, but a free paraphrase. As the Targum, just referred to, belongs to this period, it is perfectly possible that the writer of it may have been one of the Council. At any rate, his Messianic reference of the passage was likely to be dominant. The chief difference for the English reader to note is, that the Hebrew gives “thou art little among the thousands (i.e., as in Judg. vi. 15, the families or clans) of Judah;” the version given by St. Matthew, “thou art not the least among the princes.” The prophet contrasts the outward insignificance with the spiritual greatness. The paraphrase sees the outward transfigured by the glory of the spiritual. So again the simpler “out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel” is paraphrased into “out of thee shall come a Governor that shall rule (e.g., feed, as a shepherd) my people Israel.” The fact that the scribes stopped, and did not go on to the words that told of the Ruler as one “whose going forth have been of old, from everlasting;” may have arisen either from an unwillingness to bring that aspect of the expected Christ before the mind of Herod, or, possibly, from an equal unwillingness to face it themselves.

When he had privily called.—True to his nature to the last—himself probably a believer in astrology, and haunted by fears of what the star portended—the king’s next measure is to ascertain the limits of his danger. The English “what time the star appeared” is not quite accurate. Literally, the time of the star that was appearing—i.e., at what time the star, which was still visible (ver. 9), had first appeared.

Enquired of them diligently.—Better, ascertained exactly.

Bethlehem was but a short six miles from Jerusalem. “Diligently,” better, as before, exactly. So far as the mission became known, it would impress the people with the belief that he too shared their hopes, and was ready to pay his homage to the new-born King.

Which they saw . . . .—The words would seem to imply that the star was in the evening; and, as they started, saw the star in the direction of Bethlehem. In popular language it served to guide them, and so led them on. We need not suppose that they found the child whom they sought in the “manger” described by St. Luke. There had been time for the crowds that had been gathered by the census to disperse, and Joseph
and Mary may have found a house in which they could lodge. The expectations that connected Bethlehem with the coming of the Christ might naturally lead them to remain there at least for a season.

(11) Opened their treasures.—The word points to caskets, or chests, which they had brought with them. **Gold, and frankincense, and myrrh.** These were natural enough as the traditional gifts of homage to a ruler. Compare the gifts sent by Jacob to Joseph (Gen. xxxv. 15), and Ps. lxxii. 15, for the myrrh and spices; Ps. cxlv. 15, for the gold; Isa. lx. 6, for gold and incense. The patristic interpretation of the gifts as significant—the gold, of kingly power; the incense, of Divinity; the myrrh, of death and embalmment—interesting as it is, cannot be assumed to have been definitely present to the mind of the Evangelist. It is noticeable that there is here no mention of Joseph. Looking to his prominence in St. Matthew's narrative, we must assume that his absence on the night of their arrival was accidental.

(12) Being warned of God.—Following the order of events in our minds, it seems probable that after their homage on the evening of their arrival, they retired, possibly to the "inn" of Bethlehem, and were then, in their sleep, warned not to return to Jerusalem the following day, but to make their way to the fords of Jordan, and so to escape from the tyrant's jealous pursuit. So ends all that we know of the visit of the Magi. St. Matthew, writing for Hebrews, recorded it apparently as testifying to the kingly character of Jesus. Christendom, however, has rightly seen in it a yet deeper significance, and the "wise men" have been regarded as the first-fruits of the outlying heathen world, the earnest of the future ingathering. Among all the festivals that enter into the Christmas cycle, none has made so deep an impression on Christian feeling, poetry, and art as the Epiphany, or "Manifestation of Christ to the Gentiles." The arrangement which places that festival at an interval of twelve days only from the Nativity is purely arbitrary.

We need not ignore the fact that the narrative has been treated by many critics as purely mythical. Those who so regard it, however, with hardly an exception, extend their theory to every supernatural element in the Gospel history; and so this is but a fragmentary issue, part of a far wider question, with which this is not the place to deal. The very least that can be said is that there are no special notes of a legendary character in this narrative which could warrant our regarding it as less trustworthy than the rest of the Gospel. Why St. Matthew only records this fact, and St. Luke only the visit of the shepherds, is a question which we may ask, but cannot answer. The two narratives are, at any rate, in no way whatever irreconcilable.

(13) The angel.—Better, an angel. The interval of time between the departure of the Magi and Joseph's dream is not specified. Probably it was very short. As with the Magi, the dream may have come as an echo of his waking thoughts, an answer to the perplexities with which their visit and the other wonders of the time had filled his spirit.

Flee into Egypt. —The nearness of Egypt had always made it a natural asylum for refugees from Palestine. So Jeroboam had found shelter there (1 Kings xi. 40), and at a later date, Johanan the son of Kareah and his companions had fled thither from the face of Nebuchadnezzar (Jer. xliii. 7). The number of Jews who were settled in Alexandria and other cities of Egypt had probably made the step still more common during the tyranny of Herod's later years.

(14) He took the young child and his mother. —The form adopted here, as in the preceding verse, is significantly reverential. In a narrative of common life the natural expression would have been "his wife and the young child."

And departed into Egypt. —The brevity with which this is told is, to a certain extent, an argument for the non-mythical character of the narrative of which it forms a part. The legends of the Apocryphal Gospels, embodied in many forms of poetry and art, show how easily, in later times, the fabulous element crystallised round the Gospel nucleus of fact. The idols of Egypt bowed or fell down before the divine child; a well sprang up under the palm-tree that gave the traveller shelter. They were attacked by robbers, and owed their preservation to the pity of Dismas, one of the band, who was afterwards the penitent thief of the crucifixion. How far the journey extended we cannot tell. It would have been enough for Joseph's object to pass the so-called River of Egypt, which separated that country from the region under Herod's sovereignty.

(15) Until the death of Herod. —The uncertainty which hangs over the exact date of the Nativity hinders us from arriving at any precise statement as to the interval thus described. As the death of Herod took place a little before the Passover, B.C. 4 (according to the common but erroneous reckoning), it could not have been more than a few months, even if we fix the Nativity in the previous year.

Out of Egypt have I called my son. —As the words stand in Hos. xi. 1, "When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt," they refer, beyond the shadow of a doubt, to the history of Israel, as being in a special sense, among all the nations of the world, the chosen son of Jehovah (Exod. iv. 22, 23). It is hard to imagine any reader of the prophecy not seeing that this was what we should call the meaning. But the train of thought which leads the Evangelist to apply it to the Christ has a distinct method of its own. A coincidence in what seems an accessory, a mere circumstance of the story, carries his mind on to some deeper analogies. In the days of the
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until the death of Herod: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Out of Egypt have I called my son.  

(16) Then Herod, when he saw that he was mocked of the wise men, was exceeding wroth, and sent forth, and slew all the children that were in Bethlehem, and in all the coasts thereof, from two years old and under, according to the time which he had diligently enquired of the wise men. (17) Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jerome the prophet, saying, (18) In Rama was there a voice heard, lamentation, and weeping, and great mourning, Rachel weeping for her children, and would not be comforted, because they are not.

(19) But when Herod was dead, behold, an angel of the Lord appeareth in a dream to Joseph in Egypt, (20) saying, Arise, and take the young child and his mother, and go into the land of Israel: for they are dead which sought the young child's life. (21) And he arose, and took the young child and his mother, and came into the land of Israel.

(22) But when he heard that Archelaus did reign in Judea in the room of his father, he being warned of God in a dream, resolved to depart into another country. (23) And when he was about to go forth into Galilee, he passed through the coasts of Phœnicia and Caesarea, and by the coast of Samaria, unto Galilee.

Exodus, Israel was the one representative instance of the Fatherhood of God manifested in protecting and delivering His people. Now there was a higher representative in the person of the only begotten Son. As the words "Out of Egypt did I call my Son" (he translated from the Hebrew instead of reproducing the Greek) in the LXX. (to which the memory of what more natural than that mere context and historical meaning should be left unnoticed, and that he should note with wonder what a fulfilment they had found in the circumstances he had just narrated. Here, as before, the very seeming strain put upon the literal meaning of the words is presumptive evidence that the writer had before him the fact to which it had been adapted, rather than that the narrative was constructed, as some have thought, to support the strained interpretation of the prophecy.

(19) The fact of the slaughter of the infants of Bethlehem is not mentioned by Josephus, or by any other writer, and has on that ground been called in question. It is admitted, however, on all hands, that it was an act every way in harmony with Herod's character. Tormented as it had been in the time of Jeremiah, and the imagery which best embodied his feelings of sorrow for his people was that of Rachel, as the great "mother in Israel," seeing, as from the "high place" of her sepulchre (this is the meaning of the name Ramah), the shame and death of her children at the other Ramah, a few miles further to the north, and weeping for her bereavement. Historically, as we find from Jer. xvi. 1, this was the place to which the prisoners were dragged, that Nebuzaradan might assign "such as were for death" to death, others to exile, and others again to remain as bondsmen in the land. That picture, St. Matthew felt, had been reproduced once again. The tomb of Rachel was as familiar to the people of Bethlehem (it stands but one mile to the north of the town) as it had been in the time of Jeremiah, and the imagery was therefore as natural in the one case as the other. The Ramah of Jeremiah was about seven or eight miles further north, on the borders of Benjamin, but it has been thought by some geographers that the name was given to some locality nearer the tomb of Rachel.

(20) They are dead.—The use of the plural is noticeable, as Herod alone had been named. Possibly, however, others may have been implicated in the scheme; or the turn of the phrase may have been suggested to the reporter of the dream by the parallel language of Exod. iv. 19, in reference to Moses.

Archelaus.—Strictly speaking, this prince, who, under his father's will (made just before his death), governed Judea, Samaria, and Idumea, was never recognised as a king by the Roman Emperor, but received the inferior title of Tetrarch. Antipas had Galilee and Perea, Philip the region of Trachonitis. Popularly, however, the higher title was still used of him as we find it in xiv. 9 of the Tetrarch Antipas. The character of Archelaus was as cruel and treacherous as that of his father, and within a few months after his accession, he sent in his horsemen to disperse a multitude, and slew not less than 3,000 men. The temper of Antipas on the other hand was as yet looked on as milder. This, and possibly his absence from Galilee on a visit to Rome, may well have led Joseph to turn to that region as offering a prospect of greater safety (Jos. Ant. xvii. 2, 5, 6, 8, 9). Nine years later the oppression of Archelaus became so intolerable that both Jews and
father Herod, he was afraid to go thither: notwithstanding, being warned of God in a dream, he turned aside into the parts of Galilee: (22) and he came and dwelt in a city called Nazareth: that it might be fulfilled which
Samaritans complained of him to the Emperor, and he was deposed and banished to Gaul.
(23) He shall be called a Nazarene.—For an account of Nazareth, see Note on Luke i. 26. Here it will be enough to deal with St. Matthew’s reference to the name as in itself the fulfilment of a prophetic thought. He does not, as before, cite the words of any one prophet by name, but says generally that what he quotes had been spoken by or through the prophets. No such words are to be found in the Old Testament. It is not likely that the Evangelist would have quoted from any apocryphal prophecy, nor is there any trace of the existence of such a prophecy. The true explanation is to be found in the impression made on his mind by the verbal coincidence of fact with prediction. He had heard men speak with scorn of “the Nazarene,” and yet the very syllables of that word had also fallen on his ears in one of the most glorious of the prophecies admitted to be Messianic—”There shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a Netzer (Branch) shall grow out of his roots (Isa. xi. 1). So he found in the word of scorn the nomen et omen of glory. The town of Nazareth probably took its name from this meaning of the word, as pointing, like our -hurst and -holt, to the trees and shrubs for which it was conspicuous. The general reference to the prophets is explained by the fact that the same thought is expressed in Jer. xxiii. 5; xxxiii. 15; Zech. iii. 8; vi. 12, though there the Hebrew word is Zemach, and not Netzer. A like train of thought is found in the language of Tertullian and other early Christian writers to their heathen opponents—”You call us Christians,” they say, “worshippers of Christos, but you pronounce the words Christiani and Chrestos, i.e., you give us a name which in your own language (Greek) means ‘good,’ and so you unconsciously bear testimony to the life we really lead.” This seems the only tenable explanation of the passage. It is hardly likely that the Evangelist should have referred to the scorn with which Nazareth was regarded. Any reference to the Nazarite vow is out of the question, (1) because the two words are spelt differently, both in Greek and Hebrew, and (2) because our Lord’s life represented quite a different aspect of holiness from that of which the Nazarite vow was the expression. That vow, as seen pre-eminent in the Baptist, represented the consecration which consists in separation from the world. The life of Christ manifested the higher form of consecration which is found in being in the world, but not of it, mingling with the men and women who compose it, in order to purify and save.

We find:

III.

(1) John the Baptist.—For the birth and early life of the forerunner of the Christ, see Notes on Luke i. The manner in which he is mentioned here shows that his name was already well known to all readers of the Gospel. So, in like manner, Josephus names him as popularly known by the same title (Ant. xviii. 5, § 2), and describes his work as that of a preacher of repentance in nearly the same terms as St. Matthew. The symbolism of abolution as the outward sign of inward purification was, of course, derived from the Mosaic ritual. It was ordered for the consecration of the priests (Ex. xxix. 4; Lev. viii. 6), for the purification of the leper and other unclean persons (Lev. xiv. 8; xv. 31, 32). It had received a fresh prominence from the language of Isa. i. 16, of Ezek. xxxvi. 25, of Zech. xiii. 1, and probably (though the date of the practice cannot be fixed with certainty) from its being used on the admission of proselytes, male or female, from heathenism. The question asked by the priests and Levites in John i. 25 implies that it was expected as one of the signs of the coming of the Messiah, probably as one of the result of the prophecies just referred to. That which distinguished the baptism of John from all previous forms of the same symbolism was, that it was not for those only who were affected by a special uncleanness, nor for the heathen only, but for all. All were alike unclean, and needed purification, and their coming to the baptism was in itself a confession that they were so. The baptism was, as the name implies, an immersion, and commonly, though not necessarily, in running water. The abrupt way in which the narrative is introduced “in those days,” after an interval of thirty years from the close of chap. ii., may be explained as referring to the well-known period of the commencement of John’s ministry; or it may loosely refer to chap. i. 23, and imply that time had gone on with no change in the general circumstances. (Comp. Ex. ii. 11. See Excurius on the intervening History in the Notes on this Gospel.)

Came.—Literally, with the vividness of the historic present, cometh.

Preaching.—Here, as everywhere in the New Testament, the word implies proclaiming after the manner of a herald.

In the wilderness of Judea.—The name is commonly applied to the thinly populated region in the southern valley of the Jordan, and so was equivalent to “the country about Jordan” of Luke iii. 1, including even part of the district east of the river. In this region John had grown up (Luke i. 80).

(2) Repent.—Etymologically, the word “repent,” which has as its root-meaning the sense of pain, is hardly adequate as a rendering for the Greek word, which implies change of mind and purpose. In the Greek version of the Old Testament, the word is used of divine rather than human repentance, i.e., of a change of purpose implying pity and regret (1 Sam. xiv. 22; Jer. iv. 28; xvii. 8). In Wisd. v. 3; Esclus. xvii. 24; xlviii. 15, it includes the sorrow out of which the change comes.

The kingdom of heaven.—The phrase is used by St. Matthew about thirty times, and by him only among the New Testament writers. In the Greek the form is plural, “the kingdom of the heavens,” probably as an equivalent for the Hebrew word, which was dual in its form. The name, as descriptive of the kingdom of the Messiah, had its origin in the vision of Dan. vii. 13, where the kingdom of “one like the Son of Man” is contrasted with those of earthly rulers. To Gentile readers—to whom the term would convey the thought of the visible firmament, not of the invisible
Repent ye: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand. (3) For this is he that was spoken of by the prophet Esaias, saying, The voice of one crying in the wilderness; Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight. (4) And the same John had his raiment of camel’s hair, and a leathern girdle about his loins; and his meat was locusts and wild honey. (5) Then went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judæa, and all the region round about Jordan, (6) and were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins. (7) But when he saw many of the Pharisees and Sadducees come to his dwelling-place of God—the term might have been misleading, and therefore in the Gospels intended for them “the kingdom of God” (which occurs sometimes in St. Matthew also, vi. 15; xii. 28) is used instead of it. It is probable that both terms were used interchangeably by the Baptist and our Lord, and the systematic change is suggestive as showing that the writers of the Gospels did not feel themselves bound to a purely literal report or rendering of their words.

Is at hand.—Better, has come nigh. (3) This is he.—The words are those of the Evangelist, not of the Baptist, though the latter also used them to describe his own office (John i. 23). In each case the reference shows how strongly the great second prophet of Israel had impressed itself on the minds of men. To the Baptist, brooding over the sins of his people, and the long-expected consolation of Israel, there had come “the word of the Lord” (Luke iii. 2), bidding him identify himself with that “voice of one crying in the wilderness.”

Historically, the connection of the opening chapters of this part of Isaiah with the protests against idolatry (xl. 18—24; xli. 7; xlv. 9—20), and with the name of Cyrus (xlv. 1), shows that the prophet blended his glorious visions of the ideal polity of the future with the return of the exiles from Babylon. The return came, and the ideal was not realised. The kingdom of heaven seemed still far off. Now, the Baptist came to proclaim its nearness.

Prepare ye the way of the Lord.—The imagery is drawn from the great strategic works of the conquerors of the East. They sent a herald before the army, to call the people of the countries through which they marched to prepare for their approach. A “king’s highway” had to be carried through the open land of the wilderness, valleys filled up, and hills levelled (the words used are, of course, poetical in their greatness), winding bye-paths straightened, for the march of the great army. Interpreted in its spiritual application, the wilderness was the world lying in evil, and the making low the mountains and hills was the bringing down of spiritual pride. When the poor in spirit were received into the kingdom of heaven, the valleys were exalted; when soldier and publican renounced their special sins, the rough places were made plain and the crooked straight.

It is probable that the stress thus laid upon “the way of the Lord,” in the first stage of the Gospel, led to the peculiar use of the term “the way” by St. Luke, to denote what we should call the “religion” of the Apostolic Church (Acts ix. 2; xviii. 25, 26; xix. 9, 23; xxii. 4; xiv. 14, 22).

(4) His raiment of camel’s hair.—The dress was probably deliberately adopted by the Baptist as reviving by introducing Greek worship and Greek customs, was and are still used by the poor in Palestine and Syria. They are commonly salted and dried, and may be cooked in various ways, pounded, or fried in butter, and they taste like shrimps. It is needless, when the facts are so clear, to go out of the way to seek the food of the Baptist in the sweet pods of the so-called locust-tree (Ceratonia Siliqua), with which it has been sometimes identified. The wild honey was that found in the hollows of trees (as in the history of Jonathan, 1 Sam. xiv. 25), or in the “rocks” (Deut. xiii. 13; Ps. lxxxii. 16). Stress is laid on the simplicity of the Baptist’s fare, requiring no skill or appliances, the food of the poorest wanderer in the wilderness, presenting a marked contrast to the luxury of the dwellers in towns. The life of Barnabas, the hermit-master of Josephus, who lived only on herbs and water (Life, c. 2) presented analogous though not identical features. (5) All the region round about Jordan.—This would include the whole length of the river-valley, and would therefore take in parts of Perea, Samaria, Galilee, and Gaulonitis.

(6) Were baptized.—The Greek tense implies continual succession. Crowd after crowd passed on, and still they came confessing their sins—i.e., as the position of the word implies, in the closest possible connection with the act of immersion. The Greek word (sometimes used for “confessing” in the sense of “praising” as in Luke xiv. 8), always implies public utterance, and included, as the plural of the noun seems to show, a specific mention of, at least, the more grievous individual sins.

(7) Pharisees and Sadducees.—It is desirable to give, once for all, a sufficient account of these two sects to explain their relation to each other and to the teaching of our Lord. (1) The Pharisees. Singularly enough, the name appears for the first time in the Gospel history. Josephus, who tells us most about them, being presumably later, if not than the Gospels in their present form, yet, at all events, than the materials from which they are derived. We cannot say, therefore, when the name came first into use. They are first mentioned by the Jewish historian as opposing the government of the priest-ruler of the Asmonæan house, John Hyrcanus (Ant. xiii. 5). The meaning of the name is clear enough. The Pharisees were the “separated” ones, and the meaning may help us to trace the history. The attempt of Antiochus Epiphanes (as related in the two Books of Maccabees) to blot out the distinctness of Jewish life by introducing Greek worship and Greek customs, was met with a heroic resistance by priests and people. The “ mingling” or “not mingling” with the heathen in marriage or in social life became a test of religious character (2 Macc. xiv. 3, 38). The faithful became known as Assiduous, i.e., Chasidim or saints (1 Macc. xiv. 3).
baptism, he said unto them, O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come? (9) Bring forth therefore fruits meet for repentance; and think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father: for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham. (10) And now also the axe is laid unto the root of the trees: therefore every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire. (11) I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance: but he carried away for a time by the enthusiasm of the people, or sought to guide the movement by controlling it, or to enlist the new teacher on this side or that. Anyhow, there was no repentance, and no confession, and so the Baptist met them with a stern reproof.

Q generation of vipers.—Better, brood, or offspring, of vipers. Our Lord takes up the same term, and applies it to them at the close of his ministry (Matt. xxiii. 39).

Who hath warned.—Better, who taught you? Who had shown them the way without repentance by which they sought to escape? He had given them no such guidance, and they must have gained that notion from some other teacher.

The wrath to come.—This is spoken of as something definite and known, the thought resting probably on the pictures of the great day of the Lord in Mal. iii. and iv.

(8) Fruits (better, fruit) meet for repentance.

The English version is ambiguous and not happy, suggesting the thought of the "fruit" as preparing the way for repentance. The thought is, however, "by coming to the baptism you profess repentance; bring forth, therefore, fruit worthy of repentance—i.e., of a changed heart and will."

(9) We have Abraham to (better, as) our father.—The boast seems to have been common, as in John viii. 33—39, and was connected with the belief that this alone, or taken together with the confession of the creed of Israel "the Lord our God is one Lord" (Deut. vi. 4), would be enough to ensure for every Jew an admission into Paradise. The "bosom" of Abraham was wide enough to receive all his children. "We have Abraham as our father" was to the Jew all and more than that "civis Romanus sum" was to the Romans.

Of these stones.—The words were obviously dramatised by gesture, pointing to the pebbles on the banks of the Jordan. In their spiritual application, they are remarkable as containing the germs of all the teaching of our Lord, and of St. Paul, and of St. John, as to the calling of the Gentiles, and the universality of God's kingdom.

(10) Now.—Rather, already. The present of an act no longer future.

The axe is laid unto the root of the trees.—The symbolism which saw in "trees" the representatives of human characters, of nations, and institutions, had been recognised in Isaiah's parable of the vine (v. 1—7), in Jeremiah's of the vine and the olive (ii. 21; xi. 16), and the Baptist's application of it was but a natural extension. Judgments that were only partial or corrective were as the pruning of the branches (John xv. 2). Now the axe was laid to the root, and the alternative was preservation or destruction. For the unfruitful tree there was the doom of fire.

(11) With water unto repentance.—The "I" is emphasized, as also the baptism with water, as contrasted with that which was to follow. The result of John's baptism, even for those who received it faithfully,
that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire: (12) whose fan is in his hand, and he will throughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into the garner; but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire.

(13) Then cometh Jesus from Galilee unto Jordan unto John, to be baptized of him. (14) But John forbad him, saying, I have need to be baptized of thee, and not thou of me.

It seems right briefly to direct the reader's thoughts here to what is recorded of the Baptist's ministry in the other Gospels; the questions of the priests and Levites (John i. 19—25); the counsels given to publicans, soldiers, and others (Luke iii. 10—14); the presence, among the crowd, of Galileans, some of whom were afterwards Apostles (John i. 35—42). A curious legendary addition, found in the Apocryphal Gospel according to the Hebrews, is worth noting, as preparing the way for what follows: "Behold, the mother of the Lord and his brethren said unto Him, 'John the Baptist baptiseth for the remission of sins; let us go that we may be baptised by him.' But He said unto them, 'In what have I sinned that I should go and be baptised by him? unless, perhaps, even that which I have thus spoken be a sin of ignorance.'" This was obviously an attempt to explain the difficulty of the Sinless One seeking a baptism of repentance. It was, of course, probable enough that the household of Nazareth, cherishing, as they did, hopes of the kingdom of heaven, should be drawn with other Galileans to the Baptist's preaching.

(15) Then cometh Jesus.—We are brought here face to face with the question which the legend just quoted sought to answer, and cannot altogether turn aside from: Why did the Lord Jesus come to the baptism of John? The Sinless One had no sin to confess, no need of repentance. We cannot even ascribe to Him that consciousness of evil which weighs upon the hearts of the saints of God almost in exact proportion to their holiness; yet we must believe that His righteousness was essentially human, and therefore capable of increase, even as He increased in wisdom and stature. Holy as He was at every stage of life in proportion to its capacities, there yet rose before Him height upon height of holiness as yet unattained, and after which we may say with reverence He "hungered and thirsted." And for that attainment the baptism, which to others was a stepping-stone out of the slough of despair, might well seem a means, if not a condition. It was meet that He should fill up the full measure of righteousness in all its forms by accepting a divine ordinance, even, perhaps, because it seemed to place Him in fellowship with sinners.

(16) John forbade him. —Better, sought to hinder Him. Here again we have a question which we cannot fully answer. Did John plus forbid Him, as knowing Him to be the Christ? If so, how did that knowledge come? Had they known each other before, in youth or manhood? Or did a special inspiration reveal the character of Him who now drew near? The narrative of St. Matthew seems to imply such knowledge. On the other hand, the words of the Baptist in John i. 33 not only imply, but assert that he did not know Him till after the wonders of the Baptist. Probably, therefore, the sequence of facts was this: The Lord Jesus came to be baptised, as others did, though not, it would seem, with others. He confessed no sins. Look and tone, and words and silence alike spoke of a sinless and stainless life, such as even in approximate instances impresses us with something like awe in presence of the majesty of holiness. Recognising that holiness, the
The Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him: (12) And lo a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.

CHAPTER IV.—(1) Then was Jesus led up of the spirit into the wilderness
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comest thou to me? (15) And Jesus answering said unto him, Suffer it to be so now: for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness. Then he suffered him. (16) And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water: and, lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw

Baptist spake as he did, „I have need to be baptised of Thee, to sit at Thy feet, learning lessons of purity and change of heart from Thee.”

(15) Suffer it to be so now.—The “now” is emphatic, at the present time, in contrast with what was to follow. Hereafter, John should be the receiver and not the giver, but as yet there was a fitness in each retaining his position (the words “it becometh us” refer to both not to the speaker only). The word and the thought are the same as those of Heb. ii. 10. Even He had to pass through the normal stages of growth, and so an outward ordinance was even for Him the appointed way to the fulness of spiritual power. He was in His place receiving that rite. John was doing his proper work in administering it.

(16) The heavens were opened.—The narrative implies (1) that our Lord and the Baptist were either alone, or that they alone saw what is recorded. “The heavens were opened to him” as they were to Stephen (Acts vii. 56). The Baptist bears record that he too beheld the Spirit descending (John i. 33, 34), but there is not the slightest ground for supposing that there was any manifestation to others. So in the vision near Damascus, St. Paul only heard the words and saw the form of Him who spake them (Acts ix. 7; xii. 9). That which they did see, served, as did the tongues of fire on the day of Pentecost, as an attestation to the consciousness of each, of the reality of the gift imparted, and of its essential character. That descent of the Spirit, “as it were a dove,” as St. Luke adds (iii. 22), “in bodily form,” taught the Baptist, as it teaches us, that the gift of supernatural power and wisdom brought with it also the perfection of the tenderness, the purity, the gentleness of which the dove was the acknowledged symbol. To be “harmless as doves” was the command the Lord gave to His disciples (Matt. x. 16), and when they read this record, they were taught as we are, “of what manner of spirit” they were meant to be.

(17) A voice from heaven.—The words were heard, so far as the record goes, as the sign was seen, by our Lord and the Baptist only. It was a testimony to them, and not to the multitude. The precise force of the latter clause, in whom I was well pleased, points (to speak after the manner of men) rather to a definite divine act or thought, than to a continued ever-present acceptance. He who stood there was the beloved Son, in whom, “in the beginning,” the Father was well-pleased. To the Baptist this came as the answer to all questionings. This was none other than the King to whom had been spoken the words, “Thou art my Son” (Mark iv. 17), neither to the Father, for Isaac was to Abraham (the very term “beloved son” is used in the Greek of Gen. xxii. 2, where the English version has “only”), upon whom the mind of the Father rested with infinite content. And we may venture to believe that the “voice” came as an attestation also to the human consciousness of the Son of Man. There had been before, as in Luke ii. 49, the sense that God was His Father. Now, with an intensity before unfelt, and followed, as the sequel shows, with entire change in life and action, there is, in His human soul, the conviction that He is “the Son, the beloved.”

Here, as before, it is instructive to note the legendary accretions that have gathered round the simple narrative of the Gospels. Justin (Dial. c. Tryph. p. 319) adds that “a fire was kindled in Jordan.” An Ebionite Gospel added to the words from heaven, “Who art thou, Lord?” and further adds, “a great light shone around the place, and John saw it, and said, ‘Who art thou, Lord?’ and again a voice from heaven, saying, ‘This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.’ And then John fell down, and said, I beseech Thee, O Lord, baptise Thou me.” But He forbade him, saying, “Suffer it, for thus it is meet that all things should be accomplished.”

More important and more difficult is the question, What change was actually wrought in our Lord’s human nature by this descent of the Spirit? The words of the Baptist, “He giveth not the Spirit by measure unto Him” (John iii. 34) imply the bestowal of a real gift. The words that follow here, “He was led by the spirit” (iv. 1), “The spirit driveth Him” (Mark i. 12), show, in part, the nature of the change. We may venture to think even there of new gifts, new powers, a new intuition (comp. John iii. 11), a new constraint, as it were, bringing the human will that was before in harmony with the divine into a fuller consciousness of that harmony, and into more intense activity; above all, a new intensity of prayer, uttering itself in Him, as afterwards in His people, in the cry, “Abba, Father” (Mark xiv. 36; Rom. viii. 15; Gal. iv. 6). There also we may think of the Spirit as “making intercession with groanings that cannot be uttered.”

IV.

(1) The narrative of the Temptation is confessedly one of the most mysterious in the Gospel records. In one respect it stands almost, if not altogether, alone. It could not have come, directly or indirectly, from an eye-witness. We are compelled to look on it either as a mythical after-growth; as a supernatural revelation of facts that could not otherwise be known; or, lastly, as having had its source in our Lord’s own report of what He had passed through. The first of these views is natural enough with those who apply the same theory to all that is marvellous and supernatural in our Lord’s life. As a theory generally applicable, however, to the interpretation of the Gospels, that view has not been adopted in this Commentary, and there are certainly no reasons why, rejecting it elsewhere, we should accept it here. Had it been based upon the narrative of the temptation of the first Adam, in Gen. iii., we should have expected the recurrence of the same symbolism, of the serpent and the trees. Nothing else in the Old Testament, nothing in the popular expectations of the Christ, could have suggested anything of the kind. The ideal Christ of those expectations would have been a great and mighty king,
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The Temptation

in the Wilderness

to be tempted of the devil. (2) And when he had fasted forty days and forty

showing forth his wisdom and glory, as did the historical son of David; not a sufferer tried and tempted. The forms of the Temptation, still more the answers to them, it will be seen, are distinct, and a genuine record of them, just conceivable in the work of some consummate artist, but utterly unlike the imagery, beautiful or grand, which enters into most myths. Here, therefore, the narrative will be dealt with as the record of an actual experience. To assume that this record was miraculously revealed to St. Matthew and St. Luke is, however, to introduce an hypothesis which cannot be proved, and which is, at least, not in harmony with their general character as writers. They are, one by his own statement, the other by inference from the structure and contents of his Gospel, distinctly compilers from many different sources, with all the incidental variations to which such a process is liable. There is no reason to look on this narrative as an exception to the general rule. The very difference in the order of the temptations is, as far as it goes, against the idea of a supernatural revelation. There remains, then, the conclusion that we have here that which originated in some communication from our Lord's own lips to one of His disciples, His own record of the experience of those forty days. So taken, it will be seen that all is coherent, and in some sense (marvellous as the whole is), natural, throwing light on our Lord's past life, explaining much that followed in His teaching.

Led up of the spirit.—Each narrator expresses the same fact in slightly different language. St. Luke (iv. 1), "Jesus, full of the Holy Spirit, was led in the wilderness." St. Mark (i. 12), more vividly, "Immediately the Spirit driveth Him into the wilderness." What is meant by such language? The answer is found in the analogous instances of communication with our Lord's own record of the experience of His disciples, His own record of the experience of those forty days. So taken, it will be seen that all is coherent, and in some sense (marvellous as the whole is), natural, throwing light on our Lord's past life, explaining much that followed in His teaching.

The forms of the Temptation, still more the answers to them, just conceivable in the work of some consummate artist, but utterly unlike the imagery, beautiful or grand, which enters into most myths. Here, therefore, the narrative will be dealt with as the record of an actual experience. To assume that this record was miraculously revealed to St. Matthew and St. Luke is, however, to introduce an hypothesis which cannot be proved, and which is, at least, not in harmony with their general character as writers. They are, one by his own statement, the other by inference from the structure and contents of his Gospel, distinctly compilers from many different sources, with all the incidental variations to which such a process is liable. There is no reason to look on this narrative as an exception to the general rule. The very difference in the order of the temptations is, as far as it goes, against the idea of a supernatural revelation. There remains, then, the conclusion that we have here that which originated in some communication from our Lord's own lips to one of His disciples, His own record of the experience of those forty days. So taken, it will be seen that all is coherent, and in some sense (marvellous as the whole is), natural, throwing light on our Lord's past life, explaining much that followed in His teaching.

Forty days and forty nights.—Here we have an obvious parallelism with the fasts of Moses (Ex. xxxiv. 28) and Elijah (1 Kings xix. 8), and we may well think of it as deliberately planned. Prolonged fasts of nearly the same extent have been recorded in later times. The effect of such a fast on any human organism, and therefore on our Lord's real humanity, would be to interrupt the ordinary continuity of life, and quicken all perceptions of the spiritual world into a new intensity. It may be noted that St. Luke describes the Temptation as continuing through the whole period, so that what is recorded was but the crowning conflict, gathering into one the struggles by which it had been preluded. The one feature peculiar to St. Mark (who omits the specific history of the temptations), that our Lord "was with the wild beasts" (i. 13), suggests that their presence, their yells of hunger, their raving fierceness, their wild glaring eyes, had left, as it were, an ineffable and ineffaceable impression of horror, in addition to the terrors and loneliness of the wilderness as such.

He was afterward an hungred.—The words imply a partial return to the common life of sensation. The cravings of the body at last made themselves felt,
and in them, together with the memory of the divine witness that had been borne forty days before, the Tempter found the starting-point of his first attack. Of that attack there may well have been preludes during the previous time of trial. Now it came more distinctly.

(3) When the tempter came.—Nothing in the narrative suggests the idea of a bodily presence visible to the eye of sense, and all attempts so to realise it, whether as Milton has done in *Paradise Regained,* or as by rationalistic commentators, who held that the Tempter was, or assumed the shape of, a scribe or priest, are unsanctioned, and diminish our sense of the reality and mystery of the Temptation. The narrative is not the less real and true because it lies altogether in the spiritual region of man’s life.

If thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread.

(4) It is written.—The words of all the three answers to the Tempter come from two chapters of Deuteronomy, one of which (Deut. vi.) supplied one of the passages (vi. 4—9) for the phylacteries worn by devout Jews. The fact is every way suggestive. A prominence was thus given to that portion of the book, which made it an essential part of the education of every Israelite. The words which our Lord now uses had, we must believe, been familiar to Him from His childhood, and He would have rising to a dizzy height of 400 cubits above it (Jos. Ant. xv. 11, 5). Our Lord’s earlier visits to Jerusalem must have made the scene familiar to Him. In past years He may have looked down from that parapet on the dark gorge beneath. Now a new thought is brought before Him. Shall He test the attestation that He was the beloved Son by throwing himself headlong down the pinnacle? Was there not a seeming warrant for such a trial, the crucial experiment of Sonship? Had not the Psalmist declared of the chosen One of God that His angels should bear Him up? This seems a far truer view than that of the point of the temptation lay in the suggestion that He should work a sign or wonder by throwing Himself, in the presence of the people, from the parapet that overlooked the court of the worshippers, and so obtain power and popularity? Tempting as the Tempter shows that the suggestion tended, not to vain glory, but to distrust simulating reliance. It is a somewhat curious coincidence that James the Just, the brother of the Lord, is said to have been thrown down from “the pinnacle of the Temple” into one of its courts (Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 23).

(5) If thou be the Son of God.—In this case, as before, the temptation starts from the attestation
written, He shall give his angels charge concerning thee: and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone." (7) Jesus said unto Him, It is written again, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God. (8) Again, the devil taketh him up into an exceeding high mountain, and sheweth him all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them; (9) and saith unto him, All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me. (10) Then saith Jesus unto him, Get thee hence, Satan: for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve," (11) Then the devil leaveth him, and, behold, angels came and ministered unto him.
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of the world, and the glory of them; (9) and saith unto him, All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me. (10) Then saith Jesus unto him, Get thee hence, Satan: for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve," (11) Then the devil leaveth him, and, behold, angels came and ministered unto him.

The character of Jesus as the Son of God. With this there is now joined an appeal to familiar and sacred words, and the subtility of the Tempter lay in his perversion of their true meaning. Here, too, the words throw light on the previous spiritual life of the Son of Man. As in all analogous temptations (and the history would have but little significance or interest for us if it were not analogous to many human experiences) the words which were presented to the soul, with their true meaning obscured and perverted, must have been precisely those that had before been most precious. We can think of Him as having fed on those words, found in them the stay and comfort of His life, without ever dreaming (if one may venture so to speak) of putting them to the test by devices of His own imagining.

In their hands.—Better, on. The angelic hands are thought of as sustaining and up-bearing.

(7) It is written again.—The words are, as already stated, from the chapter that contains one of the passages written on the phylacteries, that were probably used by our Lord Himself. As the words stand in Deut. vi, 16, their general meaning is specialised by an historical reference, “Ye shall not tempt the Lord thy God, as ye tempted Him in Massah.” In the history thus referred to, the sin of the people had been that they questioned the presence of God with them until they saw a supernatural proof of it. They asked, “Is Jehovah among us, or not?” and that question sprang from unbelief. To have demanded a like proof of His Father’s care now would have identified the Son of Man with a like spirit of distrust, and the history of that temptation was therefore a sufficient answer to this. Here, too, a light is thrown on the future teaching of the Christ. The lessons of the wilderness taught Him (the word may seem bold, but it is justified by Heb. v. 8) to commit Himself absolutely to His Father’s will. We find almost an echo of what is recorded here in the words which tell us that He forsook the world, its Herods and its Cæsars, seemed to have attained their eminence by trampling the laws of God under foot, and accepting Evil as the Lord and Master of the world. In part, the claim is allowed by our Lord’s language and that of his Apostles. Satan is “the prince of this world” (John xii. 31; xiv. 30). His hosts are “the world-rulers” of darkness” (Eph. vi. 12). In this case the temptation is no longer addressed to the sense of Sonship, but to the love of power. To be a King like other kings, mighty to deliver His people from their oppressors, and achieve the glory which the prophets had predicted for the Christ,—this was possible for Him if only He would go beyond the self-imposed limits of accepting whatsoever His Father ordered for Him.

Wilt fall down and worship me.—The latter word properly expresses, as apparently throughout the New Testament, the homage offered to a king rather than the adoration due to God.

(10) Get thee hence, Satan.—Once more the answer to the Tempter was found in the words of the Tephillim and the lessons of childhood. No evidence of power could change the eternal laws of duty. There came to the Son of Man the old command, “Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God,” as an oracle from heaven, and this, rather than an attempt to refute the claim of power could change the eternal laws of duty. There came to the Son of Man the old command, “Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God,” as an oracle from heaven, and this, rather than an attempt to refute the claim of power, law and statues, which were probably used by our Lord Himself. As the words stand in Deut. vi, 16, their general meaning is specialised by an historical reference, “Ye shall not tempt the Lord thy God, as ye tempted Him in Massah.” In the history thus referred to, the sin of the people had been that they questioned the presence of God with them until they saw a supernatural proof of it. They asked, “Is Jehovah among us, or not?” and that question sprang from unbelief. To have demanded a like proof of His Father’s care now would have identified the Son of Man with a like spirit of distrust, and the history of that temptation was therefore a sufficient answer to this. Here, too, a light is thrown on the future teaching of the Christ. The lessons of the wilderness taught Him (the word may seem bold, but it is justified by Heb. v. 8) to commit Himself absolutely to His Father’s will. We find almost an echo of what is recorded here in the words which tell us that He forsook the world, its Herods and its Cæsars, seemed to have attained their eminence by trampling the laws of God under foot, and accepting Evil as the Lord and Master of the world. In part, the claim is allowed by our Lord’s language and that of his Apostles. Satan is “the prince of this world” (John xii. 31; xiv. 30). His hosts are “the world-rulers” of darkness” (Eph. vi. 12). In this case the temptation is no longer addressed to the sense of Sonship, but to the love of power. To be a King like other kings, mighty to deliver His people from their oppressors, and achieve the glory which the prophets had predicted for the Christ,—this was possible for Him if only He would go beyond the self-imposed limits of accepting whatsoever His Father ordered for Him.

(11) Angels came and ministered unto him.—The tenses of the two verbs differ, the latter implying continued or repeated ministrations. Here also we are
the region of the spiritual life, and must be content to
leave the nature of the ministration undefined, instead
of sensualising it as poets and artists have done. What
is instructive is, that the help of their service, the con-
trast between the calm and beauty of their presence and
that of the wild beasts and of the Tempter, comes as
the reward of the abnegation which refused to make
their ministry the subject of an experimental test. In
this case, also, we find strange coincidences. The fact
recorded by St. Matthew explains the words recorded
by St. John (i. 51) as uttered but a few days later, and
which speak of "the angels of God ascending and
descending on the Son of Man." The words with which
St. Luke ends his record of the Temptation may well be
noticed here: "And having finished every temptation,
the devil departed from him, till a certain interval:
the conflict was not yet ended, and was from time to time renewed—now in the passionate
prayer of the disciple (Matt. xvi. 22), now in the open enmity of the prince of this world (John xii. 31; xiv. 30).

(12) Between the 11th and 12th verses there is a
great break, and it is well to remember what passed in
the interval: (1) the return to the Baptist, and the call
of the six disciples (John i. 29—51); (2) the marriage
at Cana, and the visit to Capernaum (John ii. 1—12);
(3) the cleansing of the Temple; the interview with
Nicodemus, and the last testimony of the Baptist
(John ii. 13 to iii. 36). At this stage comes in the im-
prisonment of John (mentioned here, but not narrated
until xiv. 3—5) and the consequent journey through
Samaria to Galilee (John iv. 1—42). The verse now
before us may be noted as implying a ministry in
Judaea, which for some reason the writer does not
narrate.

(13) Leaving Nazareth.—The form of the name in
the older MSS. is Nazara. St. Matthew records the bare
fact. St. Luke (iv. 16—30) connects it with His
rejection by the men of the very place, where He had
been brought up, and their attempt upon His life. St. John
(ii. 12) states a fact which implies (1) that Capernaum
had not been before the home of the mother of our
Lord and of His brethren, and (2) that there were ties
of some kind drawing them thither for a temporary
visit. The reasons for the choice of that city lie, some
of them, on the surface.

(1) The exact site of Capernaum has long been one of
the vexed questions of the topography of Palestine, but
the researches of the Palestine Exploration Society have
identified it with the modern village of Tell-Him, where
their excavations have disinterred the remains of an
ancient building of the Roman period, which is sup-
pposed to have been the synagogue of the city; possibly,
therefore, the very synagogue, built by the
believing centurion (Luke vii. 5), in which our Lord
worshipped and taught (John vi. 59). Its position on
the shore of the lake, as a town with a garrison
and a custom-house, made it the natural centre of the
fishing-trade of the Lake of Galilee. As such, it
fell in with the habits of the four first-called disciples,
who, though two of them were of Bethsaida, were
already partly domiciled there. (2) It was within an
easy day's journey of Nazareth, and so admitted either
of another visit thither, as if to see whether those who
dwelt there were more capable of faith than they had
shown themselves at first (Matt. xiii. 54), or, as in Matt.
xxii. 40—50, of visits from His mother, and His brethren,
when they were anxious to restrain Him from teaching
that seemed to them perilous. (3) Even the presence of
the "publicans and sinners"—the latter term including
Gentiles, the class of those who had flocked to the
preaching of John, and were to be found in the half-
Romanised city, and were not to be found in the more
secluded villages—may have been one of the elements
which led to the decisive choice. (4.) Lastly, St. John's
narrative supplies another link. The healing of the
son of one of the Tetrarch's officers at Capernaum (John
iii. 1—54) had secured there a certain degree of pro-
tection and of influence.

The chronology of John v. 1 is uncertain (see Notes
there), but at some time before, or shortly after, this
migration to Capernaum, we must place the visit to
Jerusalem, and the miracle at Bethsaida, which St. John
there records.

(14) The light in which the fact of the migration pre-
sented itself to St. Matthew was, as with other facts,
that it agreed with what had been spoken by a prophet.
The abode of Nazareth had thus fulfilled one prediction,
that at Capernaum fulfilled another.

(15), (16) The citation is remarkable as the only re-
ference in the New Testament to what seems to us
the most wonderful and majestic of all Messianic pro-
phesies; and still more remarkable as dwelling, not on
the words so familiar to us, "Unto us a Child is born,
unto us a Son is given", but on the merely
local imagery which is a prelude to that great utterance,
and on that, in a version which is neither a true
rendering of the Hebrew, nor a correct citation from
the received Greek version. We have to recognise
the fact that the Evangelist did not study prophecy as
we study it. Books were scarce, and the publican of
Capernaum, though his occupation implied some clerkly
knowledge, probably had few, and heard rather than
read the Scriptures which he quotes. What strikes a
man who learns in this way is the coincidence of single
words and phrases with familiar facts. He speaks
not of what has been written, but of what has been
spoken. He is not careful about the context. When
St. Matthew looked back on the change that had come
over Capernaum in the arrival of the prophet of Naz-
areth—a change extending to his own life—these words
seemed the only adequate description of it. Here was
the very scene of which Isaiah had spoken (xxvii. 9)
and in which the spirit of God was to be seen in the
country of Zebulon and of Naphthalim. To him and to
others who had been in the darkness of spiritual
ignorance, neglected and uncaref for, as sheep gone
astray in the dark valley of death, there had sprung up
a marvellous Light. Unconsciously he adds his testi-
mony to that of St. John, that the presence of Jesus
was felt to be that of the "true Light" that "lighteth
every man" (John i. 9).
(17) From that time Jesus began to preach, and to say, Repent: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand. And he saith unto them, Follow me, and I will make you fishers of men. And they straightway left their nets, and followed him. (21) And going on from thence, he saw other two brethren, James the son of Zebedee, and John his brother, in a ship with Zebedee their father, mending their nets; and he called them. (22) And they immediately left the ship and their father, and followed him.

(18) And Jesus, walking by the sea of Galilee, saw two brethren, Simon called Peter, and Andrew his brother, casting a net into the sea: for they were fishers. And he saith unto them, Follow me, and I will make you fishers of men.

(23) Mending their nets.—On the assumption that the facts in St. Luke preceded what we read here, the "mending" might seem the natural consequence of the "breaking" there described, and be noted as an undesigned coincidence. It must be remembered, however, (1) that the "mending" as well as "washing" followed naturally even on a night of unsuccessful fishing, and (2) that the Greek of St. Luke does not say that the nets actually broke, but that they were on the point of breaking, and were beginning to do so. (22) Left the ship and their father.—St. Mark adds, "with the hired servants," a fact of interest as showing that the sons of Zebedee were probably, in some measure, of better means and higher social standing than those of Jonas. The absence of the name of the latter suggests the inference that he was no longer living. The sacrifice of the disciples seems, perhaps, small as compared with others in the history of saints; yet to leave all, to give up the life of home, and its regular occupations, requires, in any case, an effort more or less heroic; and beyond it there lay the future, as yet undiscerned, with all its possible trials and sufferings, to which, by that one act, they pledged themselves. (Comp. xix. 27.)

(25) Preaching the gospel of the kingdom.—As far as regards St. Matthew this is the first occurrence of the phrase. It tells of a vast amount of unrecorded teaching, varying in form, yet essentially the same—a call to repentance—the good news of a kingdom of heaven not far off—the witness, by act for the most part rather than words, that He was Himself the Head of that kingdom.
Miracles of Healing. ST. MATTHEW, V. The Sermon on the Mount.

all manner of disease among the people. (24) And his fame went throughout all Syria: and they brought unto him all sick people that were taken with divers diseases and torments, and those which were possessed with devils, and those which were lunatick, and those that had the palsy; and he healed them. (25) And there followed him great multitudes of people from Galilee, and from Decapolis, and from Jerusalem, and from Judæa, and from beyond Jordan.

CHAPTER V.—(1) And seeing the multitudes, he went up into a mountain: and when he was set, his disciples came

Healing all manner of sickness.—In the Greek, as in the English, sickness implies a less serious form of suffering than “disease,” as the “torments” of the next verse imply, in their turn, something more acute. St. Matthew’s first mention of our Lord’s miracles cannot be read without interest. It will be seen that they are referred to, not directly as evidence of a supernatural mission, but almost, so to speak, as the natural accompaniment of the work; evidence of power only or chiefly, but of the love, tenderness, pity, which were the true marks or “notes” of the kingdom of heaven. Restoration to outward health was at once the pledge that the Son of Man had not come to destroy men’s lives, but to save them, and often, we cannot doubt, served to strengthen that faith in the love of the Father, some degree of which was all but invariably required as an antecedent condition of the miracle (Matt. xii. 50).

(24) Throughout all Syria.—The word is probably used popularly, rather than with the definite significance of the Roman province with which St. Luke uses it in ii. 2. Our Lord’s ministry, with the one exception of the journey to the coasts of Tyre and Sidon (Matt. xv. 21), was confined to what is commonly known as Palestine. Traces of the wider fame are, however, found, in the mention of hearers from Idumæa, and Tyre, and Sidon among the crowds that followed Him (Mark iii. 8); in the faith of the Syro-Phrenician woman in His power to found its way. More than any other part of that record that appear in St. John. How far that contrast really

Possessed with devils . . . . lunatick.—The phenomenon of what is called possession, and the theories to which the phenomena have been referred, will best be discussed in dealing with the great representative instance of the Gadarene demonsiac (Matt. viii. 28). Here it will be enough to notice (1) that the word rendered “devil” is not the same as that used for the Tempter in iv. 1, but “demon” in the sense of an evil spirit, (2) that the possessed with demons are at once grouped with the “lunaticks,” both exhibiting forms of mental disease, and (3) that the term is applied, in the Greek, as in the Latin and our own, “moon-struck madness”—the belief that the moon exercised a disturbing influence on the brain (a coup de lune being dreaded by Eastern travellers almost as much as a coup de soleil); and that the intensity of the disturbance varied, when the disease had once set in, with the moon’s changes.

Those that had the palsy.—Here the word (literally, the paralytic) points, not to a view of the cause of the disease, but to its conspicuous phenomena—the want of muscular power to control motion, and the consequent “looseness,” in popular phraseology, of limbs or head.

(25) Decapolis.—The district so named was formed by the Romans on their first conquest of Syria, B.C. 63, and, speaking roughly, included a tract of country east and south-east of the Sea of Galilee. The ten cities from which the region took its name are given by Pliny (v. 15)—though with the reservation that the list was given differently by others—as Scythopolis, Hippos, Gadara, Pella, Philadelphia, Geræa, Dion, Canathus, Damascus, and Raphana. Of these Gadara (Matt. vii. 25; Mark v. 1; Luke vii. 22), and in some MSS. of the first named passage, Geræa, are the only two that occur in the Gospels. Damascus is prominent in the Acts, but the statement of Josephus (B. J. iii. § 7), that Scythopolis was the largest of the ten towns, makes it almost certain that he did not include Damascus in the list.

V.

(1) What is known as the Sermon on the Mount is obviously placed by St. Matthew (who appears in the earliest traditions connected with his name as a collector of our Lord’s “Oracles” or discourses) in the fore­front of his record of His work, as a great pattern-discourse, that which more than any other represented the teaching with which He began His work. Few will fail to recognise the fitness of its position, and the influence which it has exercised wherever the Gospel record has found its way. More than any other part of that record did it impress itself on the minds of men in the first age of the Church, and more often is it quoted by the writers of that period—St. James, and Barnabas, and Clement of Rome, and Ignatius, and Polycarp. More than any other portion, in recent time, has it attracted the admiring reverence even of many who did not look on the Preacher of the Sermon as the faith of Christendom looks on Him. Not unfrequently its teaching, as being purely ethical, has been contrasted with the more dogmatic character of the discourses that appear in St. John. How far that contrast really exists will appear as we interpret it. Two preliminary questions, however, present themselves: (1) Have we here the actual verbatim report of one single discourse? (2) Is that discourse the same as that which we find in Luke vi. 20—49, and which, for the sake of distinctness, we may call the Sermon on the Plain? Following the method hitherto adopted in dealing with problems which rise from the comparison of one Gospel with another, the latter inquiry will be postponed till we have to meet it in writing on St. Luke’s Gospel. Here it will be enough to state the conclusion which seems to be most probable, that the two discourses are quite distinct, and that each has traceably a purpose and method of its own. The other question calls for discussion now.

At first sight there is much that favours the belief that the Sermon on the Mount is, as it were, a pattern discourse, framed out of the fragments of many like discourses. Not only is there a large element common to it and to the Sermon on the Plain, but we find many
The Sermon on the Mount. ST. MATTHEW, V. The Beatitudes.

unto him: (2) and he opened his mouth, and taught them, saying, (3) Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. (4) Blessed are they

other portions of it scattered here and there in other parts of St. Luke’s Gospel. Thus we have:—

(1) Matt. v. 13 ... Luke xiv. 34
(2) v. 17 ... xvi. 17
(3) v. 25, 26 ... xii. 58
(4) v. 25, 26 ... xiii. 38, 41
(5) vi. 9–13 ... xii. 2–4
(6) vi. 19–21 ... xii. 33, 34
(7) vi. 23–26 ... xiii. 34–36
(8) vi. 21 ... xvi. 13
(9) vi. 25 ... xii. 23
(10) vi. 34 ... xii. 31
(11) vii. 7–11 ... xii. 9–13
(12) vii. 22, 23 ... xiii. 27

In most of these passages St. Luke reports what served as the starting-point of the teaching. It comes as the answer to a question, as the rebuke of a special fault. We might be led to think that the two Evangelists, coming across a collection more or less complete of our Lord’s words (I use the term as taking in a wider range than discourses), had used them each after his manner: St. Matthew by seeking to dovetail them as much as he could into a continuous whole; St. Luke by trying, as far as possible, to trace them to their sources, and connect them with individual facts. This line of thought is, however, traversed by other facts that lead to an opposite conclusion. In chapters v. and vi. of the Sermon on the Mount there is strong evidence of a systematic plan, and therefore of unity. The Beatitudes and the verses that immediately follow (v. 2–16) set forth the conditions of blessedness, the ideal life of the kingdom of heaven. Then comes the contrast between the righteousness required for it and that which passed current among the scribes and Pharisees; and this is carried (1) through their way of dealing with the Commandments (v. 17–48), and (2) through the three great elements of the religious life—almsgiving, prayer, and fasting (vi. 1–18). This is followed by warnings against the love of money, and the cares which it brings with it, as fatal to the religious life in all its forms (vi. 19–34). In the precepts of chapter vii. there is less traceable sequence, but its absence is as natural on the supposition of missing links in the chain, as on that of pearls threaded on a string, or a tesselated mosaic made up of fragments. The Sermon, as it stands, might have been spoken in thirty or forty minutes. There is no reason to think that this was the necessary or even customary limit of our Lord’s discourses. Assume a discourse somewhat longer than this, heard by a multitude, with no one taking notes at the time, but many trying, it may be some years afterwards, to put on record what they remembered; and then think of the writer of a Gospel coming to collect, with the aid of the Spirit (John xiv. 26), the disjecta membra which all held so precious; comparing, if he himself had heard it, what others had written, or could tell him with what he recalled; placing together what he thus found with a visible order, where the lines had been left broad and deep; with an order more or less latent, where the trains of thought had been too subtle to catch the attention of the hearers—and we have a process of which the natural outcome is what we find here. On these grounds, then, we may reasonably believe that we have substantially the report of a single discourse, possibly with a few additions from other similar discourses,—the first great prophetic utterance, the first full proclamation of “the perfect law of liberty” (Jas. i. 25), the first systematic protest against the traditions of Pharisees and scribes—that protest in which we find the groundwork of holiness, and the life of Jesus translating itself into speech. That it was not more than this; that it did not reveal doctrines which, from our Lord’s own teaching and that of His apostles, we rightly hold to be essential to the true faith of Christians; that it is therefore wrongly made, as some would fain make it, the limit of theology—is explained by the fact that our Lord spake the word as men were able to hear it; that this was the beginning, not the end, of the training of His disciples; that the facts on which the fuller doctrines rested as yet were not. And so He was content to begin with “earthly things,” not “heavenly” (John iii. 12), and to look forward to the coming of the Comforter to complete what He had thus begun. Those who would follow His method, must begin as He began; and the Sermon on the Mount, both in its negative and positive elements, is therefore the eternal inheritance of the Church of Christ, at all ages “the milk for babes,” even though those of full age may be capable of receiving the food of higher truths.

(3) Blessed.—The word differs from that used in Matt. xxiii. 39, xxv. 34, as expressing a permanent state of felicity, rather than the passive reception of a blessing bestowed by another.

The poor in spirit.—The limitation, as in “the pure in heart,” points to the region of life in which the poverty is found. In Luke vi. 20 there is no such qualifying clause, and there the words speak of outward poverty, as in itself a less perilous and therefore happier state than that of riches. Here the blessedness is that of those who, whatever their outward state may be, are in their inward life as those who feel that they have nothing of their own, must be receivers before they give, must be dependent on another’s bounty, and be, as it were, the “bedesmen” of the great King. To that temper of mind belongs the “kingdom of heaven,” the eternal realities, in this life and the life to come, of that society of which Christ is the Head. Things are sometimes best understood by their contraries, and we may point to the description of the church of Laodicea as showing us the opposite type of character, thinking itself “rich” in the spiritual life, when it is really as “the pauper,” destitute of the true riches, blind and naked.

(4) They that mourn.—The verb is commonly coupled with weeping (Mark xvi. 10; Luke vi. 25; Jas. iv. 9; Rev. xviii. 15–19). Here, as before, there is an implied, though not an expressed, limitation. The “mourning” is not the sorrow of the world that worketh “death” (2 Cor. vii. 10) for failure, suffering, and the consequences of sin, but the sorrow which flows out in the tears that cleanse, the mourning over sin itself and the stain which it has left upon the soul.

They shall be comforted.—The pronoun is emphatic. The promise implies the special comfort (including counsel) which the mourner needs; “comforted” he shall be with the sense of pardon and peace, of restored purity and freedom. We cannot separate the promise from the word which Christendom has chosen (we need not now discuss its accuracy) to express the work of the Holy Ghost, the Comforter, still less from the yearning expectation that then prevailed among such of our Lord’s hearers as were looking for the “consolation”—i.e., the “comfort”—of Israel (Luke ii. 25).
that mourn: for they shall be comforted.
(8) Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth.
(9) Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled.
(10) Blessed are the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy.
(11) Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God.
(12) Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called children of God.
(13) Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.
(14) Blessed are ye, when men shall revile others that it has almost monopolised the name. No single form of evil spreads its taint more deeply than that which "lets in contagion to the inward parts."

Shall see God.—Does the promise find its fulfilment only in the beatific vision of the saints in glory, seeing God as He is (1 John iii. 2), knowing even as also we are known (1 Cor. xiii. 12)? Doubtless there, and there only, will be the full fruition which now we wait for; but "purity of heart," so far as it exists, brings with it the power of seeing more than others see, still more than the "pure in heart" who is therefore tranquil and untroubled, as in part determining the popular use of the word, and in part also explaining the beatitude.

They shall inherit the earth.—The words may be allusive to the "kingdom of the saints of the Most High" in that prophecy of Daniel (vii. 27) which had done so much to fashion the Messianic expectations of the time. They have, however, a wider and continuous fulfilment. The influence of the meek and self-controlled is in the long-run greater than that of the impulsive and passionate. Their serenity helps (2 Cor. iii. 18).

The meek.—The word so rendered was probably used by St. Matthew in its popular meaning, without any reference to the definition which ethical writers had given of it, but it may be worth while to recall Aristotle's account of it (Eth. Nicom. v. 5) as the character of one who has the passion of resentment under control, and who is therefore tranquil and untroubled, as in part determining the popular use of the word, and in part also explaining the beatitude.

Which do hunger and thirst.—We seem in this to hear the lesson which our Lord had learned from the recent experience of the wilderness. The craving of bodily hunger has become a parable of that higher yearning after righteousness, that thirsting after God, even as the heart desireth the water-brooks, which is certain, in the end, to gain its full fruition. Desires after earthly goods are frustrated, or end in satiety and weariness. To this only belongs the promise that they who thus "hunger and thirst" shall assuredly be filled. The same thoughts meet us again in the Gospel of the children of God.—Better, sons of God. The English version slightly obscures the connection between the promise and the character of Him who had been declared to be the Son of God in the truest and highest sense. Not in the ways which the Tempter had suggested, but in the work of "making peace" between God and man, between Jew and Gentile, even at the price of shedding His own blood (Col. i. 20), was the witness of sonship to be found, and those who were sharers in that work should, according to their capacity, "be called"—i.e., be, and be recognised as, sharers in that sonship.

Persecuted for righteousness' sake.—Here again is a profound significance in the order. The work of the peacemakers is not a light and easy work. Often, as of old, when we "labour for peace," we "make them ready for battle" (Ps. cxxxiv. 4); but not the less is the blessing sure to follow. Amid seeming failure or seeming success, those who are persecuted, not for opinions, but for right conduct, the true martyrs and confessors of righteousness, attain their reward at last. There is something suggestive in the fact that the last promise is the same as the first. We end, as we began, with "the kingdom of heaven;" but the path by so described in that sense was not that which was the ideal of the Pharisees, outward and ceremonial; nor, again, was it limited, as the common language of Christians too often limits it, to the absence of one special form of sensual sin; but it excluded every element of baseness—the impurity of hate or greed of gain, no less than that of lust. Not without cause, however, has the evil of the latter sin so overshadowed the
The Salt of the Earth.

You, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake. (12) Rejoice, and be exceeding glad: for great is your reward in heaven: for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you.

(13) Ye are the salt of the earth: but if the salt have lost his savour, whereunto shall it be salted? It is thenceforth good for nothing, but to be cast out, and to be trodden under foot of men. (14) Ye are the light of the world. A city that is set on an hill cannot be hid. (15) Neither do men light a candle, and put it under a bushel: but on a candlestick: and it showing itself in gibes and nicknames; (2) persecution generally; (3) deliberate calumnies, such as those of the four orgies and Thysteanean banquets, which were spread against the believers in Christ in the first two centuries.

Falsely.—The word is absent from the best MSS., and was probably added as a safeguard against the thought that a man might claim the reward of the persecuted, even if really guilty of the crimes laid against him.

For my sake.—Here, again, there is a more emphatic personal directness. For the abstract “righteousness” we have “for my sake.” He forewarns His disciples that they must expect persecution if they follow Him. Either name will be the signal and occasion of it (Acta xiv. 22; 2 Tim. iii. 12).

(12) Rejoice, and be exceeding glad.—The second word implies a glorious and exulting joy. The same combination is found, possibly as an actual echo of the light of the world. A city that is set on an hill cannot be hid. (10) Neither do men light a candle, and put it under a bushel: but on a candlestick: and it

with shall it be salted? It is thenceforth good for nothing, but to be cast out, and to be trodden under foot of men. (14) Ye are the light of the world. A city that is set on an hill cannot be hid. (15) Neither do men light a candle, and put it under a bushel: but on a candlestick: and it
giveth light unto all that are in the house. (16) Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven.

common meaning of the word. The candles of the seven-branched candlestick of the Temple were undoubtedly lamps supplied with oil, and so probably were the "candles" of household use. The word is not the same, however, as that used for the "lamps" of the Wise and Foolish Virgins (Matt. xxv. 1), and was applied apparently to the cheaper vessels of the poor rather than to those of the wealthy. Wiclif translates it "lantern."

The image was drawn from objects familiar to all the hearers, and the presence of the article in the Greek, "under the bushel," "on hie candlestick or lamp-stand," implies the familiarity. Each cottage had one such article of furniture. The "bushel" was a Latin measure, nearly the same as the English peck. It adds to the interest of the illustration to remember that as commonly used as these must often have been turned out from the carpenter's shop at Nazareth for the use of its neighbours. It should also be remembered that the self-same word had been applied a short time before by our Lord to the Baptist (John v. 35). His disciples were in this way to continue the Baptist's work.

(16) Let your light so shine.-The English form of the sentence is somewhat misleading, or at least ambiguous. It is not simply, Let your light so shine that men may glorify; but, "Thus, like the lamp on its stand, let your light shine..." The motive to publicity is, however, the direct opposite of the temper that led the Pharisee to his ostentatious prayers and almsgiving; not "to be seen of men," and win their praise, but to win men, through our use of the light which we know to be not our own, to glorify the Giver of the light. We have at least a partial fulfilment of the command in the impression made on the heathen world by the new life of the Church when they confessed, in spite of all prejudices, "See how these Christians love one another."

Your Father which is in heaven.-The name was in common use among devout Jews, but its first occurrence in our Lord's teaching deserves to be noted. The thought of God as a Father was that which was to inspire men not only when engaged in prayer (Matt. vi. 9), but in the activity of obedience. (See Note on vi. 9.)

(17) Here a new section of the discourse begins, and is carried on to the end of the chapter. From the ideal picture of the life of the society which He came to found, our Lord passes to a protest against the current teaching of the scribes, sometimes adhering to the latter and neglecting the spirit, sometimes overriding even the letter by unauthorised traditions—lowering the standard of righteousness to the level of men's practices, instead of raising their practices to the standard which God had fixed.

Think not that I am come.-The words imply that men had begun so to think. The Teacher who came preaching repentance, but also promising for-giveness, was supposed to be what in later times has even augmented force, in reference to His own words (18) For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one

popularly equivalent to the whole of the Old Testament, though a strict classification required the addition of the Hagiographa, or "holy writings," i.e., the poetical and miscellaneous books.

I am not come.-Better, I came not. The words might be naturally used by any teacher conscious of a mission, but they gain a new meaning when we remember that He who so spake was emphatically "He that should come," that "He came into the world" not in the same sense as other men, but in a manner absolutely His own.

Not...to destroy, but to fulfil.-Explained by the immediate context, the words would seem to point chiefly to our Lord's work as a teacher. He came to fill up what was lacking, to develop hints and germ of truth, to turn rules into principles. Interpreted on a wider scale, He came "to fulfill the Law and prophets," as He came "to fulfill all righteousness" (iii. 15) by a perfect obedience to its precepts, to fulfill whatever in it was typical of Himself and His work by presenting the realities. The further thought that He came to fulfill what are called the Messianic prophecies hardly comes within the range of the words. No one could dream for a moment that the Christ could do anything else, and throughout the whole discourse there is no reference to those predictions. The prophets are named, partly in conformity with usage, partly in their character as ethical teachers, expounding and spiritualising the Law, and preparing the way for a further and fuller development.

It may be noted as a singular instance of the boldness of some of the early heretics, that Marcion, who rejected the Old Testament altogether, maintained that these words had been altered by the Judaisers of the apostolic age, and that the true reading was, "Think ye that I came to fulfill the Law or the prophets? I came not to fulfill, but to destroy." (18) Verily.-The first occurrence in the Gospel of the word so common in our Lord's teaching seems the right place for dwelling on its meaning. It is the familiar Amen of the Church's worship—the word which had been used in the same way in that of the wilderness (Num. v. 22; Dent. xxvii. 15) and of the Temple (Ps. xli. 13; lxxii. 19, et al.). Coming from the Hebrew root for "fixed, steadfast, true," it was used for solemn affirmation or solemn prayer. "So is it," or "so be it," for the most part, the Greek LXX. translates it; but in 1 Chron. xvi. 36, and Neh. v. 13, it appears in its Hebrew form. From the worship of the synagogue it passed into that of the Christian Church, and by the time the Gospels were written had become so familiar that it was used without hesitation by all the Evangelists, sometimes singly, sometimes (uniformly in St. John) with the emphasis of reduplication.

Till heaven and earth pass.-The formula was probably one in common use by our Lord to express the unchangeableness of the divine word. It was afterwards used, we must remember, by our Lord, with every augmented force. He came to "fulfill the Law and pro-

One jot or one tittle.-"The "jot" is the Greek iota (ι), the Hebrew yod (י), the smallest of all the letters of
tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. (19) Whosoever there-
fore shall break one of these least com-
mandments,* and shall teach men so, he
shall be called the least in the kingdom

the alphabet. The “tittle” was one of the smaller strokes, or
twists of other letters, * e.g., as distinguished
γ (D) from γ (R), or ζ (K) from ζ (B). Jewish Rabbis
used to caution their scholars against so writing as to
cause one letter to be mistaken for another, and to
give examples of passages from the Law in which such
a mistake would turn a divine truth into nonsense or
blasphemy. The γ within its turn was equally important.

It distinguished Joshua from Hoshea, Sarah from
Sarah. The Jews had indeed a strange legend that its
insertion in the former name was given as a compensa-
tion for its exclusion from the latter. The meaning
is obvious enough," Nothing truly belonging to the
Law, however seemingly trivial, shall drift away and be
forgotten until it has done all that it was meant
to do.

Till all be fulfilled.—Literally, *Till all things
have come to pass. The words in the English version
suggest an identity with the “fulfil” of verse 17, which
is not found in the Greek. The same formula is used
in the Greek of Matt. xxiv. 34. The “all things” in
either cases are the great facts of our Lord's life, death,
resurrection, and the establishment of the kingdom of
God. So taken, we find that the words do not assert,
as at first they seem to do, an perpetual obligation
even of the details of the Law, but the limit up to which
the obligation was to last; and they are therefore not
inconsistent with the words which speak of the system
of the Law as a whole as “decaying and waxing old,
and ready to vanish away” (Heb. viii. 13). The two
“untils have each of them their significance. Each
“jot” or “tittle” must first complete its work; then,
and not till then, will it pass away.

(19) Shall break one of these least command-
ments.—The words seem at first to imply that even
the ceremonial law was to be binding in its full extent
upon Christ's disciples. The usage of the time, how-
ever, confined the word to the moral laws of God (as in
Ecclus. xxxii. 23, 24), and throughout the New Testa-
ment it is never used in any other sense, with the
possible exception of Heb. vii. 5, 16 (comp. especially
Rom. xiii. 9; 1 Cor. vii. 19). And the context, which
proceeds at once to deal with moral laws and does
not touch on ceremonial, is in accordance with this
meaning. The “least commandments,” then, are those
which seemed trivial, yet were really great—the con-
trol of thoughts, desires, words, as compared with the
apparently greater commands that dealt with acts.
The reference to “teaching,” shows that our
Lord was speaking to His disciples, as the future
instructors of mankind, and the obvious import of
His words is that they were to raise, not lower, the
standard of righteousness which had been recognised
previously.

Shall be called the least in the kingdom of
heaven.—The consequence of tampering with the
great laws of duty, or the least laws, which are practi-
cally great, is described in terms at once severe and
gentle; gentle, because the sentence, where the guilt
is not wilful, or is repented of, is not one of absolute
exclusion from the kingdom; severe in so far as being
the “least” in that kingdom, the object of pity or

sorrow to others, involved a severe humiliation to those
who aimed at being the highest. To that condemna-
tion many in every age of the Church have been liable,
the Antinomian fanatic and the Jesuit casuist standing
so far on the same footing.

Whosoever shall do and teach.—Here again
the teaching work of the disciples is prominent. The
combination is in this case even more significant
than in the other. Not right doing only, still less right
Teaching only, but both together, made up the ideal
of the preacher's work.

Great.—Not “greatest.” The avoidance of the
latter word, interpreted by the later teaching of xviii. 4, would seem to have been deliberate. Men
might aim at a positive standard of the greatness of the
true teacher and the true work, but the conscious
aim at being “greatest” was self-frustrating. That
honour belonged to him only who was all unconscious
that he had any claim to it.

(20) Shall exceed.—Better, Shall abound more
than.

Scribes and Pharisees.—Here, for the first
time, the scribes are mentioned in our Lord's teach-
ing. The frequent combination of the two words
(thirteen times in the first three Gospels) implies
that for the most part they were of the school of the
Pharisees, just as the “chief priests” were, for the
most part, of that of the Sadducees. Where “scribes and
chief priests” are united, it is with a different
import, as the two chief divisions of the Sanhedrim,
or Great Council. The New Testament use of the word
differs from the Old. There the scribe is simply the
man who writes, the secretary or registrar of the king's
edicts and official documents (2 Sam. viii. 17; xx. 25;
2 Kings xviii. 18). After the return of Babylon, as
in the case of Ezra (Ezra vii. 6, 12), it was used first
of the transcribers and editors of the sacred books,
and then, by a natural transition, of their interpreters;
and this is the dominant sense of the word in the New
Testament. As interpreters they were much occupied
with the traditional comments of previous teachers,
and these as descending more into particulars, and so
affording a better basis for a casuistic system, had
come to usurp the rightful place of the Law. As
far as the three Gospels are concerned this is the
first direct protest of our Lord against their teaching.
St. John's record, however, shows that the conflict
had begun already in Jerusalem (John v. 10), and
that the Sabbath question was prominent in it.

Ye shall in no case enter . . .—The
“kingdom of heaven” is here neither what we speak
of as the visible Church—for there the evil and the
good grow together till the harvest—nor yet the
Church triumphant in the far future. It stands here
rather for the ideal and invisible Church on earth—
that which answers to its name, that to which belong
the blessings and the promises. Into that Church none
enter who are content with an outward conventional
standard of righteousness. All who strive after a high
standard, sooner or later, in spite of wanderings and
mistakes, find their way into it (Matt. xxv. 34;
John vii. 17).
of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven.

(21) Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment:

(22) but I say unto you, That whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment: and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council: but whosoever

depend for their full force on popular association, and raca, like words of kindred meaning among ourselves, was in common use as expressing not anger only but insolent contempt. The temper condemned is that in which anger has so far gained the mastery that we no longer recognise a "brother" in the man who has offended us, but look on him with malignant scorn.

The council.—Offences of this kind are placed by our Lord on the same level as those which came before the great court of the Sanhedrin. That word, though it looks like Hebrew, is really only a transliterated form of the Greek word for council. The council consisted of seventy or seventy-two members, with a president and vice-president, and was made up of the heads of the twenty-four courses of the priests, with forty-six or forty-eight (how chosen it is not known) from the "elders" and "scribes." Like the Areopagus at Athens, it took cognisance—as in the case of our Lord (Matt. xxvi. 65) and Stephen (Acts vi. 12)—of blasphemy and other like offences, and its peculiar prerogative was that it could order death by stoning. The point of our Lord’s teaching was, therefore, that to scorn God’s image is the true completion of the Law and the Prophets, that it could order death by stoning. The point of our Lord’s teaching was, therefore, that to scorn God’s image

in danger of the judgment; (22) but I say unto you, That whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment: and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council: but whosoever

depend for their full force on popular association, and raca, like words of kindred meaning among ourselves, was in common use as expressing not anger only but insolent contempt. The temper condemned is that in which anger has so far gained the mastery that we no longer recognise a “brother” in the man who has offended us, but look on him with malignant scorn.

The council.—Offences of this kind are placed by our Lord on the same level as those which came before the great court of the Sanhedrin. That word, though it looks like Hebrew, is really only a transliterated form of the Greek word for council. The council consisted of seventy or seventy-two members, with a president and vice-president, and was made up of the heads of the twenty-four courses of the priests, with forty-six or forty-eight (how chosen it is not known) from the “elders” and “scribes.” Like the Areopagus at Athens, it took cognisance—as in the case of our Lord (Matt. xxvi. 65) and Stephen (Acts vi. 12)—of blasphemy and other like offences, and its peculiar prerogative was that it could order death by stoning. The point of our Lord’s teaching was, therefore, that to scorn God’s image in man is to do dishonour to God Himself. We cannot truly “fear God” unless we also “honour all men” (1 Pet. ii. 17). The reverence for humanity as such must extend even to the man who has most provoked us. In the unseen eternal world the want of that reverence has its own appropriate punishment.

Thou fool.—The Greek word so rendered agrees accidentally in its consonants with the Hebrew word translated “rebel” (m’re) in Num. xx. 10, and hence it has been thought by some that we have here, as with raca, a common Hebrew term of opprobrium. There is no evidence, however; that the word was thus used, and it is more probable that the Greek is a translation of some word which, like the “fool” of the Old Testament, implied, as in Ps. xiv. 1, utter godlessness as well as lack of intellectual wisdom. With that meaning it embodied the temper, not like that represented by raca, of petulant contempt, but of fixed and settled hatred. That it was the temper and not the utterance of the merob syllables which our Lord condemned is seen in that He Himself used the word of the scribes and Pharisees (Matt. xxiii. 17, 19), and St. Paul of the sceptical Greek materialist (1 Cor. xv. 36). The self-same word might spring from a righteous indignation or from malignant hatred.

Of hell fire.—Literally, of the Gehenna of fire. Great confusion has arisen here and elsewhere from the use of the same English word for two Greek words of very different meanings: (1) Ἡ εἰδωλία, answering to the Sheol (also for the most part translated “hell”) of the Old Testament, the unseen world, the region of the dead, without any reference to their blessedness or misery; (2) γεηenna, which had come to represent among the later Jews (not in the time of any Old Testament writer) the place of future punishment. The history of the word is worth studying. Originally, it was the Greek form of Ge-hinnom (the Valley of Hinnom, sometimes of the “son” or the “children” of Hinnom), and was applied to a narrow gorge on the south of Jerusalem (Josh. xv. 8).
shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire. (22) Therefore if thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath ought against thee; (24) leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift. (25) Agree

There Solomon erected a high place for Molech (1 Kings xi. 7). There the fires of that god had received their bloody offerings of infant sacrifice under Ahaz and Manasseh (2 Kings xvi. 3; 2 Chron. xxviii. 3; xxxii. 6). Josiah, in his great work of reformation, defiled it, probably by casting the bones of the dead and other filth upon it (2 Kings xxiii. 10-14); and the Jews on their return from captivity showed their abhorrence of the idolatry of their fathers by making it, as it were, the place where they cast out all the refuse of the city, properly, it must have been foul to look upon and small, and thus it became, before our Lord's time, a parable of the final state of those in whom all has become vile and refuse. The thought first appears in the Targum or Paraphrase of Isa. xxxiii. 14 (“Gehenna is the eternal fire”). It is often said that fires which were kept burning to consume the solid refuse added to the horror of the scene; but of this, though it is suggested by this passage and Mark ix. 48, there is no adequate evidence. Here the analogy of the previous clauses suggests also the thought that the bodies of great criminals were sometimes deprived of burial rites, and cast out into the Valley of Hinном; but of this, too, there is no evidence, though it is in itself probable enough. In any case, the meaning of the clause is obvious. Our passing words, expressing states of feeling, and not the overt act of murder only, are subject to the judgment of the Eternal Judge, and may bring us into a guilt and a penalty like that of the vilest criminals.

If thou bring thy gift to the altar.—Literally, If thou shouldest be offering. Our Lord was speaking to Jews as such, and paints, therefore, as it were, a scene in the Jewish Temple. The worshipper is about to offer a “gift” (the most generic term seems intentionally used to represent any kind of offering), and stands at the altar with the priest waiting to do his work. That is the right time for recollection and self-scrutiny. The worshipper is to ask himself, not whether he has a ground of complaint against any one, but whether any one has cause of complaint against him. This, and not the other, is the right question at such a moment—has he injured his neighbour by act, or spoken bitter words of him?

Leave there thy gift.—The words describe an act which would appear to men as a breach of liturgical propriety. To leave the gift and the priest, the act of sacrifice unfinished, would be strange and startling, yet that, our Lord teaches, were better than to sacrifice with the sense of a wrong unconfessed and unatoned for, and à fortiori, better than the deeper evil of not being ready to forgive. The Talmud gives a curious recollection of a complaint against him. Do the words point to a terminable or to an endless punishment? In the frame-work of the similitude such a sentence would not involve perpetual imprisonment, if only the condemned could get together the money wherewith to pay his debt or fine; and we might infer, as Romanist divines have inferred, that such a payment, to be followed by liberation, was possible in the divine judgment. But in practice, unless the man had friends or property, the sentence would, for the most part, involve a life-long punishment. And the question may well be asked, when we turn to the realities shadowed forth in the parable, Can a man pay the “uttermost farthing” in that unseen world? Does he pay by enduring for a given time a given measure of suffering, bodily or spiritual? Can he there find others to pay it for him? Do not the words “till thou hast paid” exclude the thought of their intervention as availing to stay the
full action of the great law of retribution? These questions must, for the most part, be so answered as to diminish the force of the first hasty inference. If hope is not shut out altogether, it is because we cannot absolutely answer the first question in the negative. There may be a suffering that works repentance, and the repentance may lead to peace and pardon—there may be, but that is the very utmost that can be said. It is noticeable that the word “prison” is that used in 1 Pet. iii. 19, where the “spirits in prison” are, almost beyond a doubt, represented as the objects of a dispensation that proclaimed even there the good news of salvation. But the whole tone of the passage is that of one who seeks to deepen the sense of danger, not to make light of it, to make men feel that they cannot pay their debt, though God may forgive it freely, accepting faith in Him in lieu of payment.

It is noticeable that the word “prison” is that used in verse 19, where the “spirits in prison” are, almost beyond a doubt, represented as the objects of a dispensation that proclaimed even there the good news of salvation. But the whole tone of the passage is that of one who seeks to deepen the sense of danger, not to make light of it, to make men feel that they cannot pay their debt, though God may forgive it freely, accepting faith in Him in lieu of payment.

It is noticeable that the word “prison” is that used in verse 19, where the “spirits in prison” are, almost beyond a doubt, represented as the objects of a dispensation that proclaimed even there the good news of salvation. But the whole tone of the passage is that of one who seeks to deepen the sense of danger, not to make light of it, to make men feel that they cannot pay their debt, though God may forgive it freely, accepting faith in Him in lieu of payment.

It is noticeable that the word “prison” is that used in verse 19, where the “spirits in prison” are, almost beyond a doubt, represented as the objects of a dispensation that proclaimed even there the good news of salvation. But the whole tone of the passage is that of one who seeks to deepen the sense of danger, not to make light of it, to make men feel that they cannot pay their debt, though God may forgive it freely, accepting faith in Him in lieu of payment.
The Law of Divorce.

ST. MATTHEW, V.

her a writing of divorcement: (32) but I say unto you, That whatsoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery: and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery.

in this matter the laxer view—"If she go not as thou wouldest have her, cut her off from thy flesh, and give her a bill of divorce, and let her go" (Eccles. xxv. 26). It is noteworthy that our Lord, whose teaching, especially as regards the Sabbath question, might have been, for the most part, claimed by the school of Hillel, on this matter of divorce stamps the impress of His approval on the teaching of his rival.

(32) Saving for the cause of fornication.—The most generic term seems intentionally used to include ante-nuptial as well as post-nuptial sin, possibly, indeed, with reference to the former only, seeing that did not include ante-nuptial as well as post-nuptial sin, possibly, the letter of the Law as taught by the Rabbis, who, leaving the wife, and à fortiori the husband, at liberty to marry again; for otherwise she could not have incurred the guilt of adultery by a second marriage: but it asserts that in such a case, when divorce was obtained on any other ground than the specific sin which violated the essence of the marriage contract, man's law (even that of Moses) was at variance with the true eternal law of God.

Whosoever shall marry her that is divorced.

The Greek is less definite, and may be rendered either "a woman who has been put away," or better, "her when she has been put away." Those who take the former construction, infer from it the absolute unlawfulness of marriage with a divorced woman under any circumstances whatever; some holding that the husband is under the same restrictions, i.e., that the vinculum matrimonii is absolutely indissoluble; while others teach that in the excepted case, both the husband and the wife gain the right to contract a second marriage. The Romish Church, in theory, takes the former view, the Greek and most Reformed Churches the latter; while some codes of law, like that now recognised in England, go back to the looser interpretation of Deut. xxiv. 1, and allow the divorce à vinculo for many lesser causes than incontinence. Of these contending views, that which is intermediate between the two extremes seems to be most in harmony with the true meaning of our Lord's words. The words "put away" would necessarily convey to His Jewish hearers the idea of an entire dissolution of the marriage union, leaving both parties free to contract a fresh marriage; and if it were not so, then the case in which He specially permits that dissolution would stand on the same level as the former. The injured husband would still be bound to the wife who had broken the vow which was of the essence of the marriage-contract. But if he was free to marry again, then the guilt of adultery could not possibly attach to her subsequent marriage with another. The context, therefore, requires us to restrict that guilt to the case of a wife divorced for other reasons. The injured husband would still be bound to the unfaithful wife. This, then, seems the true law of divorce for the Church of Christ as such to recognise. The question how far national legislation may permit divorce for other causes, such as cruelty or desertion, seems to stand on a different footing, and must be discussed on different grounds. In proportion as the "hardness of heart" which made the wider license the least of two evils prevails now, it may be not only expedient, but right and necessary, though it implies a standard of morals lower than the law of Christ, to meet it, as it was met of old, by a like reluctant permission.

(33) By them of old time.—Read, to them of old time, as before. Here, again, the reference is to the letter of the Law as taught by the Rabbis, who did not go beyond it to its wider spirit. To them the Third Commandment was simply a prohibition of perjury, as the Sixth was of murder, or the Seventh of adultery. They did not see that the holy name (Lev. xix. 12) might be profaned in many ways, even when it was not uttered; and they expressly or tacitly allowed (See Philo, De Special. Legg.) many forms of oath in which it was not named, as with the view of guarding it from desecration. Lastly, out of the many forms thus sanctioned (as here and in xxiii. 16—23) they selected some as binding, and others as not binding, and thus by a casuistry at once subtle, irrational, and dishonest, tampered with men's sense of truthfulness.

(34) Swear not at all.—Not a few interpreters, and even whole Christian communities, as e.g. the Society of Friends, see in these words, and in Jas. v. 12, a formal prohibition of all oaths, either promissory or evidential, and look on the general practice of Christians, and the formal teaching of the Church of England in her Articles (Art. XXXIX.), as simply an acquiescence in evil. The first impression made by the words is indeed so strongly in their favour that the scruples of such men ought to be dealt with (as English legislation has at last dealt with them) with great tenderness. Their conclusion is, however, it is believed, mistaken: (1) Because, were it true, then in this instance our Lord would be directly repealing part of the moral law given by Moses, instead of completing and expanding it, as in the case of the Sixth and Seventh Commandments. He would be destroying, not fulfilling. (2) Because our Lord himself answered, when He had before been silent, to a solemn formal adjuration (Matt. xxvi. 63, 64), and St. Paul repeatedly uses such forms of attestation (Rom. i. 9; 1 Cor. xv. 31; 2 Cor. i. 23; Gal. i. 20; Phil. i. 8). (3) Because the context shows that the sin which our Lord condemned was the light use of oaths in common speech, and with no real thought as to their meaning. Such oaths practically involved irreverence, and were therefore inconsistent with the fear of God. The real purpose of an oath is to intensify that fear by bringing the thought of God's presence home to men at the very time they take them, and they are therefore rightly used when they attain that end. Practically, it must be admitted that the needless multiplication of oaths, both evidential and promissory, on trivial occasions, has tended, and still tends, to weaken awe and impair men's reverence for truth, and we may rejoice when their number is diminished. In an ideal Christian society no oaths would be needed, for every word would
thron e: (35) nor by the earth; for it is his footstool: neither by Jerusalem; for it is the city of the great King. (36) Neither shalt thou swear by thy head, because thou canst not make one hair white or black. (37) But let your communication be, Yea, yea; Nay, nay; for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil.

be spoken as by those who knew that the Eternal Judge was hearing them. (34-35) Neither by heaven; ... nor by the earth; ... neither by Jerusalem.—Other formulae of oaths meet us in Matt. xxiii. 16—22; Jas. v. 12. It is not easy at first to understand the thought that underlies such modes of speech. When men swear by God, or the name of Jehovah, there is an implied appeal to the Speech and Name of God, and not to His person. The form, “So help me God!” to assist and bless us according to the measure of our truthfulness, or to punish us if we speak falsely. But to swear by a thing that has no power or life seems almost unintelligible, unless the thing invoked be regarded as endowed in idea with a mysterious holiness and a power to bless and curse. Once in use, it was natural that men under a system like that of Israel, or, we may add, of Christendom, of pre-eminence, but, as in 1 Cor. v. 13, the human Supreme Ruler. We invoke Him (as in the English in their popular casuistry made the rule one not of judicial action only, but of private retaliation; and it was thus made the sanction of the vindictive temper that forgives nothing. (38) Resist not evil.—The Greek, as before in verse 37, may be either masculine or neuter, and followed as it is by “whosoever,” the former seems preferable; only here it is not “the evil one,” with the emphasis of “pre-eminence,” but, as in 1 Cor. v. 13, the human evil-doer. Of that mightier “evil one” we are emphatically told that it is our duty to resist him (Jas. iv. 7).

Shall smite.—The word was used of blows with the hand or with a stick, and for such blows fines from a shekel upwards were imposed by Jewish courts. Turn to him the other also.—We all quote Yea, yea.—St. James reproduces the precept in v. 12 of his Epistle, but the phrase is found in the Talmud, and was probably proverbial. In all common speech a man’s words should be as good as his oaths. Yea should mean yea, and No should mean no, even though there be no oath to strengthen it. Cometh of evil.—The Greek may (as in the Lord’s Prayer, “Deliver us from evil”) be either neuter, “from evil in the abstract,” or masculine, “from the evil one.” With some hesitation, and guided chiefly by Matt. xiii. 19—38, I accept the latter as the more probable. These devices of fantastic oaths come not from Him who is the Truth, but from him who “when he speaketh a lie, speaketh of his own” (John viii. 44). (38) Ye have heard that it hath been said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth: (39) but I say unto you, That ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. (40) And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also.
And whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain. Give him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away. Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbour; and hate thine enemy.

Gives the same counsel to the believers at Corinth: “Why do ye not rather suffer yourselves to be defrauded? (1 Cor. vi. 7). Here also, of course, the precept, absolutely binding, as far as self-interest is concerned, may be traversed by higher considerations.

The influence of Rome is shown by the use of the Latin word (slightly altered) for the mille passuum, the thousand paces which made up a Roman mile—about 142 yards short of an English statute mile. It is interesting to note a like illustration of the temper that yields to compulsion of this kind, rather than struggle or resist, in the teaching of the Stoic Epictetus—“Should there be a forced service, and a soldier shall lay hold on thee, let him work his will; do not resist or murmur.”

GIVE TO HIM THAT ASKETH.—Here again our Lord teaches us by the method of a seeming paradox, and enforces a principle binding upon every one in the form of a rule which in its letter is binding upon no man. Were we to give to all men what they ask, we should in many cases be cursing, not blessing, them with our gifts. Not so does our Father give us what we ask in prayer; not so did Christ grant the prayers of His disciples. That which the words really teach as “Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.”

And credit alike were Israelites (Exod. xxi. 25; Lev. xxv. 37; Deut. xxiii. 19, 20). From our modern point of view that law cannot be regarded as in harmony with the present order of society, nor consistent with our modern views of financial justice. It is not the less true, however, that in the education of a family or nation, such a prohibition may be a necessary and useful discipline. We should look with scorn on boys who lent on interest to their brothers or their schoolfellows, and the ideal of the Law of Moses was that of treating all Israelites as brothers brought under the discipline of the schoolmaster. As it with a prescient insight into the besetting temptation of the race, the lawgiver forbade a practice which would be a useful discipline of the schoolmaster. As it with a prescient insight into the besetting temptation of the race, the lawgiver forbade a practice which would be a useful discipline of the schoolmaster. As if with a prescient insight into the besetting temptation of the race, the lawgiver forbade a practice which would be a useful discipline of the schoolmaster. As if with a prescient insight into the besetting temptation of the race, the lawgiver forbade a practice which would be a useful discipline of the schoolmaster. As if with a prescient insight into the besetting temptation of the race, the lawgiver forbade a practice which would be a useful discipline of the schoolmaster. As if with a prescient insight into the besetting temptation of the race, the lawgiver forbade a practice which would be a useful discipline of the schoolmaster. As if with a prescient insight into the besetting temptation of the race, the lawgiver forbade a practice which would be a useful discipline of the schoolmaster. As if with a prescient insight into the besetting temptation of the race, the lawgiver forbade a practice which would be a useful discipline of the schoolmaster. As if with a prescient insight into the besetting temptation of the race, the lawgiver forbade a practice which would be a useful discipline of the schoolmaster.

Whosoever shall compel thee to give any thing that would borrow of thee turn not thou away. The force of the precept depends on its connection with the Jewish Law, which forbade not only what we call usury, i.e., excessive interest, but all interest on loans where debtor
maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust. (46) For if ye love them which love you, what reward have ye? do not even the publicans the same? (47) And if ye salute your brethren only, what do ye more than others? do not even the publicans so?

**ST. MATTHEW, VI.**

**The Law of Almsgiving.**

(48) Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect.

**CHAPTER VI.—**(1) Take heed that ye do not your alms before men, to be seen of them: otherwise ye have no reward of your Father which is in heaven. (2) Therefore when thou doest thine alms...
alms, do not sound a trumpet before thee, as the hypocrites do in the synagogues and in the streets, that they may have glory of men. Verily I say unto you, They have their reward. (3) But when thou dost alms, let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth: (4) that thine alms may be in secret; and thy Father which seeth in secret himself shall reward thee openly.

Again we have a principle rather than a rule. Publicity may be a duty, especially in public work. But this—gifts for schools, hospitals, and the like—is hardly contemplated in the word “alms,” which refers rather to acts of mercy, to cases of individual suffering. Ostentation in those acts is what our Lord especially condemns.

Thy Father which seeth in secret.—The attribute which we call the Omniscience of God is commonly dwelt on as calculated to inspire a just fear of the All-seeing One. He sees, we say, the evil deeds that are done in secret. Here it is brought before us as an encouragement and ground of hope. Do we feel isolated, not understood, not appreciated? He sees in secret and will reward.

Shall reward thee openly.—A curious instance of an early attempt to improve on our Lord’s teaching. The adverb “openly” is not found in the best MSS., and is now omitted by most editors. It would seem either as if a false rhetorical taste desired a more complete antithesis, or that the craving for public acknowledgment in the presence of men and angels asserted itself even here, and led men to add to the words of the Divine Teacher. It need hardly be said that the addition weakens and lowers the force of the truth asserted. It is not necessarily in this way, “openly,” that God rewards His servants, nor do the words point only to the reward of the last great day. The reward is at once immediate, and, it may be, secret—the hidden manna, the joy with which a stranger doth not intermeddle, and which no man taketh from us.

Standing in the synagogues.—The Jewish custom, more or less prevalent throughout the East, and for a time retained at certain seasons in the Christian Church, was to pray standing, with outstretched, uplifted hands, and there was nothing in the attitude as such that made it an act of ostentation; nor would there have been any ostentation in thus joining in the common prayer of the congregation assembled in the synagoue. What our Lord’s words point to, was the custom of going into the synagogue, as men go now into the churches of Latin Christendom, to offer private devotion (as, e.g., in the parable of the Pharisee and the publican), and of doing this so as to attract notice, the worshipper standing apart, as if absorbed in prayer, while secretly glancing round to watch the impression which he might be making on others who were looking on.

In the corners of the streets.—Not the same word as in verse 3, but the broad, open places of the city. There, too, the Pharisees might be seen, reciting their appointed prayers—probably the well-known eighteen acts of devotion which were appointed for the use of devout Israelites—and with the tallith or veil of prayer over their heads.

Enter into thy closet.—Literally, the store-closet of thy house. The principle, as before, is embodied in a rule which startles, and which cannot
secret shall reward thee openly. (7) But when ye pray, use not vain repetitions, as the heathen do: for they think that they shall be heard for their much speaking. (8) Be not ye therefore like unto them: for your Father knoweth what things ye have need of, before ye ask him. (9) After this manner therefore when ye pray, say, Our Father, which art in heaven, Hallowed be Thy name; Thy kingdom come; Thy will be done on earth, as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen. Amen.
fore pray ye: Our Father which art in heaven," Hallowed be thy name. | \n\nwith which they were thus familiar. But it was a word pregnant with a future. Time and the teaching of the Spirit were to develop what was now in germ. That it had its ground in the union with the Eternal Son, which makes us also some of God; that it was a name that might be used, not by Israelites only, but by every child of man; that of all the names of God that express His being and character, it was the fullest and the truest—this was to be learnt as men were guided into all the truth. Like all such names, it had its inner and its outer circles of application. It was true of all men, true of all members of the Church of Christ, true of those who were led by the Spirit, in different degrees; but all true theology rests on the assumption that the ever-widening circles have the same centre, and that that centre is the Love of the Father.

The words "Our Father" are not a form excluding the use of the more personal "My Father" in solitary prayer, but they are a perpetual witness that even then we should remember that our right to use that name is no particular privilege of ours, but is shared by every member of the greatest family of God.

Which art in heaven.—The phrase, familiar as it is, has a history of special interest. (1.) In the earlier books of the Old Testament the words "Jehovah is God in heaven above and in earth beneath" (Deut. iv. 39; Josh. ii. 11) express His universal presence; and this was embodied also in the name of the "Most High God, the Possessor of heaven and earth," of the earliest patriarchal faith (Gen. xiv. 22). Later on, men began to be more conscious of the infinite distance between themselves and God, and represented the contrast by the thought that He was in heaven and they on earth (Eccles. v. 2); and this thought became a liturgical formula in the great dedication prayer of Solomon, "Hear thou in heaven thy dwelling-place!" (1 Kings viii. 32, 34, et cetera; 2 Chron. vi. 21, et cetera). And so, emancipated from over-close identification with the visible firmament, the phrase became current as symbolising the world visible and invisible, which is alike the dwelling-place of God, uttering in the language of poetry that which we vainly attempt to express in the language of metaphysics by such terms as the Infinite, the Absolute, the Unconditioned. (2.) We ought not to forget that the words supply at once (as in the phrase, "God of heaven," in Ex. i. 2; Dan. ii. 18, 19) a link and a contrast between the heathen and the Jew, the Aryan and Semitic races. Each alike found in the visible heaven the symbol of the invisible forces of the universe of an unseen world; but the one first identified his heaven (the Varuna of the Vedic hymns, the Ournos of the Greeks) with that world, and then personified each several force in it, the Pantheism of the thinker becoming the Polytheism of the worshipper; whilst to the other heaven was never more than the dwelling-place of God in His undivided unity.

Hallowed be thy name.—The first expression of thought in the pattern prayer is not the utterance of our wants and wishes, but that the Name of God—that which sums up all our thoughts of God—should be "hallowed," be to us and all men as a consecrated name, not lightly used in trivial speech, or rash assertion, or bitterness of debate, but the object of awe and love and adoration. The words "Jehovah, hallowed be His name," were familiar enough to all Israelites, and are found in many of their prayers, but here the position of the petition gives a new meaning to it, and makes it the key to all that follows. Still more striking is the fact, that this supplies a link between the teaching of the first three Gospels and that of the fourth. Thus the Lord Jesus taught His disciples to pray—thus, in John xii. 28, He prayed Himself, "Father, glorify Thy name,"

(10) Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven.

Thy will be done. —The prayer has often been, even in the lips of Christians, hardly more than the "acceptance of the inevitable." Like the Stoic, we have submitted to a destiny; like the Moslem, we have resigned to the Absolute; whilst to the other heaven was never more than the dwelling-place of God in His undivided unity.

Hallowed be thy name. —The thought is true of the order of the visible heaven, where law reigns supreme, with no "variableness or shadow of turning." But seeing that the obedience contemplated is that of the will, it is better, perhaps, to think of the words as pointing to the unseen hosts of heaven, the ministering angels, and the spirits of just men made perfect. That all wills on earth should be brought into the same
entire conformity with the divine will as theirs, is what we are taught to pray for.

(11) Give us this day our daily bread. - A strange obscurity hangs over the words that are so familiar to us. The word translated "daily" is found nowhere else, with the one exception of the parallel passage in Luke xi. 3, and so far as we can judge must have been coined for the purpose, as the best equivalent for the unknown Aramaic word which our Lord actually used. We are accordingly thrown partly on its possible derivation partly on what seems (compatibly with its derivation) most in harmony with the spirit of our Lord's teaching. The form of the word (see Note in Excursus) admits of the meanings, (1) bread sufficient for the day now coming; (2) sufficient for the morrow; (3) sufficient for existence; (4) over and above material substance—or, as the Vulgate renders it, panis super-substantialis. Of these, (1) and (2) are the most commonly received, and the idea conveyed by them is expressed in the rendering "daily bread." So taken, it is a simple petition, like the prayer of Agur in Prov. xxx. 8, for "food convenient for us;" and as such, has been uttered by a thousand child-like hearts, and has borne its witness alike against over-anxiety and far-reaching desires for outward prosperity. It is not without some hesitation, in face of so general a concurrence of authority, that I find myself constrained to say that the last meaning seems to me the truer. Let us remember (1) the words with which our Lord had answered the Tempter, "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God" (Matt. iv. 4); (2) His application of those words in " I have meat to eat that ye know not of" (John iv. 32); (3) His own use of bread as the symbol of that which sustains the spiritual life (John vi. 27—58); (4) the warnings in verses 25—31 not only against anxiety about what we shall eat and drink, but against seeking these things instead of seeking simply the kingdom of God and His righteousness—and we can scarcely fail, I think, to see that He meant His disciples, in this pattern Prayer, to seek for the nourishment of the higher and not the lower life. So taken, the petition, instead of being a contrast to the rest of the Prayer, is in perfect harmony with it, and the whole raises us to the region of thought in which we leave all that concerns our earthly life in the hands of our Father, without asking Him even for the supply of its simplest wants, seeking only that He would sustain and perfect the higher life of our spirit. So when we ask for "daily bread," we mean not common food, but the "Bread from heaven, which giveth life unto the world." So the reality of which the Eucharistic bread is the symbol is the Lord's gracious answer to the prayer He has taught us.

(12) Forgive us our debts. - Duty—i.e., that which we owe, or ought to do—and debts are, it may be noted, only different forms of the same word. A duty unfilled is a debt unpaid. Primarily, therefore, the words "our debts" represent sins of omission, and "trespasses" the transgression of a law, sins of commission. The distinction, however, though convenient, is more or less technical. Every transgression implies the non-fulfilment of duty in a more aggravated form, and the memory of both presents itself to the awakened conscience under the character of an over-accumulating debt. Even the sins against our neighbour are, in this sense, debts which we have incurred to God; and as the past cannot be undone, they are debts which we can never pay. For us, therefore, the one helpful prayer is, "Forgive the debt," and the gospel of our Lord proclaimed was, that the Father was ready to forgive. The confession of the debt was enough to ensure its remission, and then there was to come the willing service of a grateful love instead of the vain attempt, which Pharisaism encouraged, to score up an account of good works, as part payment, and therefore as a set-off, reducing the amount of debt. The parables of the Two Debtors (Luke vii. 41) and of the Unforgiving Creditor whose own debt had been forgiven (Matt. xviii. 23—35) were but expansions of the thought which we find in its germ in this clause of the Lord's Prayer.

In striking contrast with that clause is the claim of merit which insinuates itself so readily into the hearts of those who worship without the consciousness that they need forgiveness, and which uttered itself in the daring prayer attributed to Apollonius of Tyana, "Give me that which is my due—pay me, ye gods, the debts ye owe to me."

As we forgive our debts.—The better reading gives, We have forgiven, as a completed act before we begin to pray. In the very act of prayer we are taught to remind ourselves of the conditions of forgiveness. Even here, in the region of the free grace of God, there is a law of retribution. The temper that does not forgive cannot be forgiven, because it is ipso facto a proof that we do not realise the amount of the debt we owe. We forget the ten thousand talents as we exact the hundred pence, and in the act of exacting we bring back that burden of the greater debt upon ourselves.

Up to this point, in the petitions of the Lord's Prayer, we may think of the Man Christ Jesus as having not only taught the Prayer, but Himself used it. During the years of youth and manhood it may well have been thus far the embodiment of the outpourings of His soul in communion with His Father. Even the prayer, "Give us this day our daily bread," whether we take it in its higher or its lower meaning, would be the fit utterance of His sense of dependence as the Son of Man. Can we think the same of the prayer, "Forgive us our debts?" It is, of course, opposed to the whole teaching of Scripture to believe that there dwelt on His human spirit the memory of a single transgression. In the fullest sense of the word He was without sin, the Just One, needing no repentance. And yet the analogy of those of His saints and servants who have followed most closely in the footsteps of His holiness may lead us to think it possible that even these words also may have had a meaning in which He could use them. In proportion as men attain holiness and cease to transgress, they gain a clearer perception of the infinite holiness of God, and seek to be made partakers of it. They would fain pray and praise and work for Him evermore, but though the spirit is willing, the flesh is weak. They are weary and faint, and they become more intensely conscious of the limits of their human powers as contrasted with the limitless range of their desires. In this sense, therefore, and strictly in reference to the limitations of the true, yet absolutely sinless, humanity which He vouchsafed to assume, it is just conceivable that He too Himself may have used this prayer. And we must remember also that He prayed as the Brother of mankind, as the repre-
Pattern Prayer.

**ST. MATTHEW, VI.**

Lord's Prayer: Pattern and True Fast.

*Forgive our debts.* (13) And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen. (14) For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you: a (15) but if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses.

*Lead us not into temptation.*—The Greek word includes the two thoughts which are represented in English by "trials," i.e., sufferings which test or try, and "temptations," allurements on the side of pleasure which tend to lead us into evil. Of these the former is the dominant meaning in the language of the New Testament, and is that which we must think here. (Comp. Matt. xxvi. 39.) We are taught not to think of the temptation in which lust meets opportunity as that into which God leads us (Jas. i. 13, 14); there is therefore something that shocks us in the thought of asking Him not to lead us into it. But trials of another kind, persecution, spiritual conflicts, agony of body or of spirit, these may come to us as a test or as a discipline. Should we shrink from these? An ideal stoicism, a perfected faith, would say, "No, let us accept them, and leave the issue in our Father's hands." But those who are conscious of their weakness cannot shake off the thought that they might fail in the conflict, and the cry of that conscious weakness is therefore, "Lead us not into such trials," even as our Lord prayed, "If it be possible, let this cup pass away from me." (Matt. xxvi. 39.) And the answer to the prayer may come either directly in actual exemption from the trial, or in "the way to escape" (1 Cor. x. 13), or in strength to bear it. It is hardly possible to read the prayer without thinking of the recent experience of "temptation" through which our Lord had passed. The memory of that trial in all its terrible aspects was still present with Him, and in His tender love for His disciples He bade them pray that they might not be led into anything so awful.

*Deliver us from evil.*—The Greek word includes the two thoughts which are represented in English by "sorrows," i.e., sufferings which test or try, and "soul-temptations," allurements on the side of pleasure which test or try that which is for our eternal welfare. Of these the former is the dominant meaning in the language of the New Testament, and is that which we must think here. (Comp. Matt. xxi. 37; xxvi. 39.) We are taught not to think of the temptation in which lust meets opportunity as that into which God leads us (Jas. i. 13, 14); there is therefore something that shocks us in the thought of asking Him not to lead us into it. But trials of another kind, persecution, spiritual conflicts, agony of body or of spirit, these may come to us as a test or as a discipline. Should we shrink from these? An ideal stoicism, a perfected faith, would say, "No, let us accept them, and leave the issue in our Father's hands." But those who are conscious of their weakness cannot shake off the thought that they might fail in the conflict, and the cry of that conscious weakness is therefore, "Lead us not into such trials," even as our Lord prayed, "If it be possible, let this cup pass away from me." (Matt. xxvi. 39.) And the answer to the prayer may come either directly in actual exemption from the trial, or in "the way to escape" (1 Cor. x. 13), or in strength to bear it. It is hardly possible to read the prayer without thinking of the recent experience of "temptation" through which our Lord had passed. The memory of that trial in all its terrible aspects was still present with Him, and in His tender love for His disciples He bade them pray that they might not be led into anything so awful.

*Deliver us from evil.*—The Greek word includes the two thoughts which are represented in English by "sorrows," i.e., sufferings which test or try, and "soul-temptations," allurements on the side of pleasure which test or try that which is for our eternal welfare. Of these the former is the dominant meaning in the language of the New Testament, and is that which we must think here. (Comp. Matt. xxi. 37; xxvi. 39.) We are taught not to think of the temptation in which lust meets opportunity as that into which God leads us (Jas. i. 13, 14); there is therefore something that shocks us in the thought of asking Him not to lead us into it. But trials of another kind, persecution, spiritual conflicts, agony of body or of spirit, these may come to us as a test or as a discipline. Should we shrink from these? An ideal stoicism, a perfected faith, would say, "No, let us accept them, and leave the issue in our Father's hands." But those who are conscious of their weakness cannot shake off the thought that they might fail in the conflict, and the cry of that conscious weakness is therefore, "Lead us not into such trials," even as our Lord prayed, "If it be possible, let this cup pass away from me." (Matt. xxvi. 39.) And the answer to the prayer may come either directly in actual exemption from the trial, or in "the way to escape" (1 Cor. x. 13), or in strength to bear it. It is hardly possible to read the prayer without thinking of the recent experience of "temptation" through which our Lord had passed. The memory of that trial in all its terrible aspects was still present with Him, and in His tender love for His disciples He bade them pray that they might not be led into anything so awful.

*Deliver us from evil.*—The Greek word includes the two thoughts which are represented in English by "sorrows," i.e., sufferings which test or try, and "soul-temptations," allurements on the side of pleasure which test or try that which is for our eternal welfare. Of these the former is the dominant meaning in the language of the New Testament, and is that which we must think here. (Comp. Matt. xxi. 37; xxvi. 39.) We are taught not to think of the temptation in which lust meets opportunity as that into which God leads us (Jas. i. 13, 14); there is therefore something that shocks us in the thought of asking Him not to lead us into it. But trials of another kind, persecution, spiritual conflicts, agony of body or of spirit, these may come to us as a test or as a discipline. Should we shrink from these? An ideal stoicism, a perfected faith, would say, "No, let us accept them, and leave the issue in our Father's hands." But those who are conscious of their weakness cannot shake off the thought that they might fail in the conflict, and the cry of that conscious weakness is therefore, "Lead us not into such trials," even as our Lord prayed, "If it be possible, let this cup pass away from me." (Matt. xxvi. 39.) And the answer to the prayer may come either directly in actual exemption from the trial, or in "the way to escape" (1 Cor. x. 13), or in strength to bear it. It is hardly possible to read the prayer without thinking of the recent experience of "temptation" through which our Lord had passed. The memory of that trial in all its terrible aspects was still present with Him, and in His tender love for His disciples He bade them pray that they might not be led into anything so awful.
ST. MATTHEW, VI. The Two Masters, God and Mammon.

The True Treasures.

thou, when thou fastest, anoint thine head, and wash thy face; (18) that thou appear not unto men to fast, but unto thy Father which is in secret: and thy Father, which seeth in secret, shall reward thee openly.

(19) Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal: (20) but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through nor steal: (21) for where your treasure is, there will your heart be also. (22) The light of the body is the eye: if therefore thine eye looked on as unsuitable for a time of mourning. The disciples of Christ were to hide their contrition and dimly-then the whole life also is shrouded in gloom. If that is the case with the higher life, what will be the state of the region of life which is in itself naturally dark—the region of appetites and passions, which needs the presence of the light to keep them at all in check! “If the light that is in thee be darkness, the darkness how great is that darkness!”

(23) If thine eye be evil. (24) No man can serve two masters: (25) 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. (26) Therefore I say unto you, Take no thought for your life, (27) 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—

if it discerns not singly but doubly, and therefore dimly—then the whole life also is shrouded in gloom. If that is the case with the higher life, what will be the state of the lower? If the light is darkened, what will be the state of the region of life which is in itself naturally dark—the region of appetites and passions, which needs the presence of the light to keep them at all in check! “If the light that is in thee be darkness, the darkness how great will it be?”

(28) Lay not up for yourselves treasures. (29) Literally, with a force which the English lacks, treasure not up your treasures. Where moth and rust doth corrupt. (30) The first word points to one form of Eastern wealth, the costly garments of rich material, often embroidered with gold and silver. (Comp. “Your garments are moth-eaten” in Jas. v. 2.) The second word is not so much the specific “rust” of metals, as the decay which eats into and corrodes all the perishable goods of earth.

(31) Treasures in heaven. Those, as in the parallel passage of Luke xii. 36, are the good works, or rather the character formed by them, which follow us into the unseen world (Rev. xiv. 13), and are subject to no process of decay. So men are “rich in good works” (1 Tim. vi. 18). “Rich in faith” (Jas. ii. 5), are made partakers of the “unspeakable riches of Christ and His glory” (Eph. iii. 8, 16).

(32) Where your treasure is. The words imply the truth, afterwards more definitely asserted, that it is impossible to “serve God and mammon.” (verse 24.) Men may try to persuade themselves that they will have a treasure on earth and a treasure in heaven also, but in the long-run, one or the other will assert its claim to be the treasure, and will claim the no longer divided allegiance of the heart.

(33) The light of the body. Literally, the lamp of the body. So in Prov. xx. 27, “The spirit of man is the candle (or ‘lamp’) of the Lord”—that which, under the name of “ conscience, “the moral sense,” the “ inner man” discerns spiritual realities, distinguishes right from wrong, gives the light by which we see our way. If this is “ single,” if it discerns clearly, all is well. The “ whole body, ” the life of the man in all its complex variety, will be illumined by that light. The connection with what precedes lies on the surface. Singleness of intention will preserve us from the shame of having a double treasure, and therefore a divided heart.

(34) If thine eye be evil. If the spiritual faculty, whose proper work it is to give light, be itself diseased
The Lesson of the Birds.

ST. MATTHEW, VI.

The Lesson of the Lilies.

The fowls 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? (28) Behold the fowls of the air, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin: (29) and yet I say unto you, That even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these. (30) Wherefore, if God so clothe the grass of the field, which to day is, and to morrow is cast into the oven, shall he not much more add to the length of life which God has appointed for us. Of the two meanings, however, the last best satisfies the teaching of the context. Men are not anxious about adding to their stature. They are often anxious about prolonging their life. Admit the thought that our days are but "as a span long" (Ps. xxxix. 5), and then the addition of a cubit becomes a natural metaphor. It is to be noted that in the parallel passage in St. Luke (xii. 26) this appears as "that which is least," and which yet lies beyond our power.
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clothe you, O ye of little faith? (31) Therefore take no thought, saying, What shall we eat? or, What shall we drink? or, Wherewithal shall we be clothed? (32) (For after all these things do the Gentiles seek:) for your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things. (33) But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you. (34) Take therefore no thought for the morrow: for the morrow shall take thought for the things of itself. Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof.

ST. MATTHEW, VII.

CHAPTER VII.—(1) Judge not, that ye be not judged.—The words point to a tendency inherent in human nature, and are therefore universally applicable; but they had, we must remember, a special bearing on the Jews. They, as really in the van of the religious progress of mankind, took on themselves to judge other nations. All true teachers of Israel, even though they represented different aspects of the truth, felt the danger, and warned their countrymen against it. St. Paul (Rom. ii. 3; 1 Cor. iv. 5) and St. James (iv. 11) alike, in this matter, echo the teaching of their Master. And the temptation still continues. In proportion as any nation, any church, any society, any individual man rises above the common forms of evil that surround them, they are disposed to sit in judgment on those who are still in the evil.

The question, how far we can obey the precept, is not without its difficulties. Must we not, even as a matter of duty, be judging others every day of our lives? The juryman giving his verdict, the master who discharges a dishonest servant, the bishop who puts in force the discipline of the Church—are these acting against our Lord's commands? And if not, where are we to draw the line? The answer to these questions is not found in the distinctions of a formal casuistry. We have rather to remember that our Lord here, as elsewhere, gives principles rather than rules, and embodies the principle in a rule which, because it cannot be kept in the letter, forces us back upon the spirit. What is forbidden is the censorious judging
ye be not judged.* (2) For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged: and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again. (3) And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother’s eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye? (4) Or how wilt thou say to thy brother, Let me pull out the mote out of thine eye; and, behold, a beam is in thine own eye? (5) Thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam out of thine own eye; and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother’s eye. (6) Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine, lest they trample them under their feet, and turn again and rend you. (7) Ask, and it shall be given you;"
seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you: (8) for every one that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened. (9) Or what man is there of you, whom if his son ask bread, will he give him a stone? (10) Or if he ask a fish, will he give him a serpent? (11) If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask him? (12) Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them; for this is the law and the prophets.

Here, once more, the words are absolute and unqualified, and yet are clearly limited by implied conditions. It is assumed (1) that we ask for good gifts—for “bread” and not for a “stone,” for a “fish” and not for a “serpent;” and (2) that we ask, as Christ has taught us, in His name and according to His spirit. Otherwise we may ask and receive not, because we ask amiss.

The three words imply distinct degrees of intensity. There is the “asking” in the spoken words of prayer, the “seeking” in the efforts and labours which are acted prayers, the “knocking” at the gate with the urgent importunity which claims admission into our Father’s house.

(9) Or what man is there of you.—The meaning of the illustrations is obvious enough, yet their homeliness is noticeable as addressed to the peasants of Galilee, who found in fish and bread, as in the miracles of the Five thousand and the Four thousand, the staple of their daily food.

(10) If ye then, being evil.—The words at once recognise the fact of man’s depravity, and assert that it is not total. In the midst of all our evil there is still that element of natural and pure affection which makes the fatherhood of men a fit parable of the Fatherhood of God. We mount from our love to His, abstracting from our thoughts the evil of which we cannot but be conscious.

Give good things to them that ask him.—The context shows that the “good things” are spiritual and not temporal gifts, the wisdom and insight which we all need, or rather (as in the parallel passage of Luke xi. 13) the one gift of the Holy Spirit, which, in its sevenfold divinity, includes them all.

(12) Therefore . . . whatsoever.—The sequence of thought requires, perhaps, some explanation. God gives His good things in answer to our wishes, if only what we wish for is really for our good. It is man’s highest blessedness to be like God, to “be perfect as our Father in heaven is perfect,” and therefore in this respect too he must strive to resemble Him. The ground thus taken gives a new character to that which otherwise had already become almost one of the “common-places” of Jewish and heathen ethics. Perhaps the most interesting illustration of the former is the well-known story of the Gentile inquirer who went to Shammai, the great scribe, and asked to be taught the law in a few brief words, while he stood on one foot. The Rabbi turned away in anger. The questioner then went to Hillel, and made the same demand; and the sage turned and said, “Whatever thou wouldest that men should not do to thee, that do not thou to them. All our law is summed up in this.” And so the Gentile became a proselyte. A like negative rule is quoted by Gibbon (Decl. and Fall, c. liv., note 2) from Isocrates, not without a sneer, as if it anticipated the teaching of the Christ. The nearest approach to our Lord’s rule is, however, found in the saying ascribed to Aristotle, who, when asked how we should act towards our friends, replied, “As we would they should act to us” (Diog. Laert., v. 1, § 21). All these, however, though we may welcome them as instances of the testimonium animae naturalitier Christi (as Tertullian calls it), are yet wanting in the completeness of our Lord’s precept, and still more do they fall below it in regard of the ground on which the precept rests, and the power given to perform it. Yet even here, too, there is, of necessity, an implied limitation. We cannot comply with all men’s desires, nor ought we to wish that they should comply with ours, for these desires may be foolish and frivolous, or may involve the indulgence of lust or passion. The rule is only safe when our own will has been first purified, so that we wish only from others that which is really good. Reciprocity in evil or in folly is obviously altogether alien from the mind of Christ.

(13) Enter ye in at the strait gate.—The figure was possibly suggested by some town actually in sight. Safed, the “city set on a hill,” or some other, with the narrow pathway leading to the yet narrower gate, the “needle’s eye” of the city, through which the traveller entered. Such, at any rate, was the picture which the words presented. A like image had been used before, with a singular coincidence of language, in the allegory known as the Tablet of Cebes, the Disciple of Socrates: “Seest thou not a certain small door, and a pathway before the door, in no way crowded, but few, very few, go in there?” This is the way that leads to true discipleship (c. 16). The meaning of the parable here lies on the surface. The way and the gate are alike the way of obedience and holiness, and the gate is to be reached not without pain and effort; but only through it can we enter into the city of God, the heavenly Jerusalem. A deeper significance is, however, suggested even by our Lord’s own teaching. He Himself is the “way” (John xiv. 6), or with a slight variation of the imagery, He is the “door,” or gate, by which His sheep enter into the fold (John x. 7). Only we must remember that His being thus the “way” and the “gate” does not mean that we can find, in union with Him, a substitute for holiness, but indicates simply how we are to attain to it.

That leadeth to destruction.—The question, which has been much discussed lately, whether this word “destruction” in the English version of our Lord’s life—what is popularly called annihilation—or prolonged existence in endless suffering, is one which can hardly be settled by mere reference to lexicons. So far as they go, the word implies, not annihilation, but waste (Matt. xxvi. 8; Mark xiv. 4), perdiction, i.e., the loss of all that makes existence precious. I question whether a single passage can be adduced in which it means, in relation to material things, more than the breaking up
many there be which go in thereat:  
(14) Because1 strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it.  
(15) Beware of false prophets, which come unto you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves.  
(16) Ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?  
(17) Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit.  
(18) A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit.  
(19) Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire.  
(20) Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them.  
(21) Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven;  
(22) But he that doeth the will of my Father, which is in heaven, the same shall enter in.  
(23) Enter ye in at the strait gate: for wide is the gate, and broad is the way, which leadeth to the destruction of many, and many there be which go in thereat:
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of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven. (22) Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name have done wonderful works? (23) And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity.

Therefore whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock: and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell not: for it was founded upon a rock. (26) And every one that heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, which built his house upon the sand: (27) and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell: and great was the

These sayings of mine.—The reference to what has gone before tends, so far as it goes, to the conclusion that we have in these chapters a continuous discourse, and not a compilation of fragments. On the assumption that the Sermon on the Plain was different from that on the Mount, the recurrence of the same image there makes it probable that this or some similar parable was not an uncommon close to our Lord’s discourses.

I will liken him unto a wise man.—The surrounding scenery may, in this as in other instances, have suggested the illustration. As in all hilly countries, the streams of Galilee rush down the torrent-beds during the winter and early spring, sweep all before them, overflow their banks, and leave beds of alluvial deposit on either side. When summer comes their waters fail (comp. Jer. xv. 18; Job vi. 15), and what had seemed a goodly river is then a tract covered with debris of stones and sand. A stranger coming to build might be attracted by the ready-prepared level surface of the sand. It would be easier to build there instead of working upon the hard and rugged rock. But the people of the land would know and mock the folly of such a builder, and he would pass (our Lord’s words may possibly refer to something that had actually occurred) into a by-word of reproach. On such a house the winter torrent had swept down in its fury, and the storms had raged, and then the fair fabric, on which time and money had been expended, had given way, and fallen into a heap of ruins. Interpreting the parable in the connection in which our Lord has placed it, it is clear that the house is the general fabric of an outwardly religious life. “The rock” can be nothing else than the firm foundation of repentance and obedience, the assent of the will and affections as well as of the lips. The “sand” answers to the shifting, uncertain feelings which are with some men (the “foolish” ones of the parable) the only ground on which they act—love of praise, respect for custom, and the like. The “wind,” the “rain,” the “floods” hardly admit, unless by an unreal minuteness, of individual interpretation, but represent collectively the violence of persecution, of suffering, of temptations from without, beneath which all but the life which rests on the true foundation necessarily gives way.

Such is obviously the primary meaning of the parable here, but, like most other parables, it has other meanings, which, though secondary, are yet suggestive and instructive, and are not unsanctioned by the analogy of our Lord’s teaching. (1.) Already He had bestowed upon one of His disciples the name of Cephas, Peter, the Rock, and in so doing had at least indicated the type of character represented by the “rock” upon which the wise man built. When He afterwards said,
fall of it. (28) And it came to pass, when Jesus had ended these sayings, the people were astonished at his doctrine:

(29) for he taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes.

"Upon this rock will I build my Church," He was speaking in the character of a wise Master-builder who saw in fervent faith and unhesitating obedience the ground-work on which the Christian society, which He designated as His kingdom, was to rest. (2.) Personal experience and the teaching of the Spirit led men to the thought that there must be a yet deeper foundation, a rock below the rock even of obedience and holiness; and they found in Christ Himself that Rock and that Foundation (1 Cor. iii. 10, 11). Only in personal union with Him could they find the stability of will without which even their firmest purposes would be as the shifting sand. (30) When Jesus had ended these sayings.—The words again point to the conclusion that the Evangelist believed that he had been recording one continuous discourse.

The people were astonished at his doctrine.—Better, at his teaching; with greater prominence given, as the words that follow show, to its manner than to its substance. (30) He taught them.—The Greek implies continuity, He was teaching.

As one having authority, and not as the scribes.—Some instances have been already pointed out: the "I say unto you," which is contrasted with what had been said "to them of old time"; the assumption that He, the speaker, was the Head of the divine kingdom and the Judge of quick and dead. More striking still is the entire absence of any reference by the words again point to the conclusion that the Evangelist believed that he had been recording one continuous discourse.

Better, at his teaching; with greater prominence given, as the words that follow show, to its manner than to its substance.

A comparison such as this, especially if we take into account the narratives which in St. Mark and St. Luke come between those which St. Matthew makes to follow close one upon another, and the apparent notes of succession in each case, is enough to show, once for all, the difficulty of harmonising the Gospel narratives with any certainty. Three conclusions may fairly be received as all but certain. (1.) The independence of each record. It is scarcely conceivable that St. Mark or St. Luke would have departed so widely from St. Matthew's order had they had his Gospel before them. (2.) The derivation of all three from earlier records, written or oral, each embracing some few acts or discourses of our Lord. (3.) The absence of any direct evidence as to the order of these events, so that each writer was often left to his own discretion, or to some internal principle of grouping.

In dealing with such cases, therefore, while the parallel narratives in the other Gospels will be noticed, so far as they make the record here more vivid and complete, there will seldom be any attempt to discuss elaborately the order in which they stand.

(3.) A leper.—The discussion of leprosy, as to its nature, symptoms, and causes, would be at once long and difficult. The word, which is Greek and not Hebrew in its origin, has probably been used with varying extent of meaning, sometimes including leucoderma, or even cancer. Even in its narrower meaning, as used by Hippocrates, leprosy was subdivided into three kinds: (1) the mealy, (2) the white, (3) the black, according to the appearance presented by the portions of diseased flesh. Confining ourselves to the Biblical form of the disease, we note (1) its probable origin in the squaeryl and wretchedness of the Egyptian bondage. It was the "boch, or plague of Egypt" (Deut. xxviii. 27). In the Egyptian legends of the Exodus, indeed, the Israelites were said to have been expelled because they were lepers. (2) Its main features were the appearance of a bright spot on the flesh, whiter than the rest, spreading, inflaming, cracking; an ichorous humour oozing from the cracks; the skin becoming hard, scaly, "as if it had been snowed upon" (Ex. iv. 6; 2 Kings v. 27). One so affected was regarded as unclean; his touch brought defilement (Lev. xiii. 3, 11, 15). He was looked upon as smitten with a divine plague, and cases like those of Miriam and Gehazi gave strength to the belief. He had to live apart from his fellows, to wear on his brow the outward sign of separation, to cry out the words of warning, "Unclean, unclean" (Lev. xiii. 45). The idea which lay at the bottom of this separation seems to have been one of abhorrence rather than precaution. The disease was loathsome, and there is no evidence that it was contagious, or even believed to be contagious. At the stage in which it reached its height, and the whole body was covered with the botch and scabs, the man was, by a strange contrast, declared to be ceremonially clean (Lev. xiii. 13). And in this stage, therefore, the leper might return to his kindred, and take his place among the worshippers of the synagogue. In the case now before us, the man would appear to have been as yet in the intermediate stage. St. Luke describes him, however, as "full of leprosy." Worshipped him,—i.e., as in St. Mark, "falling on
canst make me clean.  (3) And Jesus put forth his hand, and touched him, saying, I will; be thou clean. And immediately his leprosy was cleansed.  (4) And Jesus saith unto him, See thou tell no man; but go thy way, shew thyself to the priest, and offer the gift that Moses commanded, for a testimony unto them."  (5) And when Jesus was entered into Capernaum, there came unto him a centurion, beseeching him, (6) and saying, Lord, my servant lieth at home sick of the palsy, grievously tormented.

The Healing of the Leper.

ST. MATTHEW, VIII.

his knees," or in St. Luke, "falling on his face," in the highest form of Eastern homage. The act gave to the word "Lord" the emphasis of one, at least, of its higher meanings.

If thou wilt, thou canst make me clean.—The words imply either that he had seen or heard of our Lord's works of healing, or that His words had impressed him with the belief that the Teacher must have a power extending to acts also. There does not appear to have been any previous case of leprosy miraculously cleansed. The words of the man involve a singular mingling of faith and distrust. He believes in the power, he does not as yet believe in the will. Can it stoop to one so foul as he? If he shared the common feeling that leprosy was the punishment of sin, he might ask himself, Will He pity and relieve one so sinful?

(3) Jesus put forth his hand, and touched him.—The act was itself a proof at once of the will and the power to heal. He did not fear becoming unclean by that contact, and was therefore not subject to the law that forbade the touch. And He met the one element of doubt in the sufferer's mind by the words—yet more, perhaps, the tone or look that told of pity—"I will; be thou clean." St. Mark adds, "Had compassion on him."

Immediately his leprosy was cleansed.—We may venture to picture the process to our minds: the skin cleansed, the sores closed, the diseased whiteness giving way to the tints and tones of health.

(4) See thou tell no man.—St. Mark adds, with his usual vividness, "strictly charged," or vehemently urged him, and "forthwith sent him away." The reasons of the command are not given, but are not far to seek. (1.) The offering of the gift was an act of obedience to the Law (Lev. xiv. 10, 21, 22), and was therefore the right thing for the man to do. In this way also our Lord showed that He had not come to destroy the Law, but to fulfil. (2.) It was the appointed test of the reality and completeness of the cleansing work. (3.) It was better for the man's own spiritual life to cherish his gratitude than to waste it in many words.

So much lies on the surface. But as the treatment of leprosy in the Mosaic code was clearly symbolical rather than sanitary, and dealt with the disease as the special type of sin in its most malignant form, so in the healing of the leper we may fairly see the symbol of our Lord's power to purify and save from sin, and in His touching the leper, the close fellowship into which He entered with our unclean nature, that through His touch it might be made clean. The miracle, like most other miracles, was also a parable in act.

(5) In St. Luke the narrative follows immediately upon the Sermon on the Plain; in St. Matthew (the healing of the leper intervening), upon the Sermon on the Mount. The juxtaposition in both cases seems to imply a connection between the teaching and the act that had fixed itself on men's minds. The act was, indeed, chiefly memorable for the teaching to which it led. A comparison of the two narratives suggests the thought that St. Matthew records the miracle more with reference to the associated teaching. St. Luke after more close inquiry into the details and circumstances. Here, e.g., the centurion is said to have come to our Lord himself; but from St. Luke's report we learn that he never came at all in person, but sent first the elders of the Jews, and then his friends.

A centurion.—The presence of a centurion (a word originally meaning the commander of a hundred soldiers, but, like most words of the kind, afterwards used with a greater latitude of meaning) implied that of a garrison stationed at Capernaum to preserve order. So we find a centurion with his soldiers at Cæsarea (Acts x. 1). At Jerusalem, it would appear, it was thought necessary to station a Chilarch, or "chief captain" of a thousand soldiers (Acts xxvi. 31); and the same words meet us as connected with the birthday feast of the Tetrarch Antipas (Mark vi. 21). Here, as in the case of Cornelius, the faith and the life of Judaism (seen, we may well believe, to more advantage in the villages of Galilee than amid the factions of Jerusalem) had made a deep impression on the soldier's mind. He found a purity, reverence, simplicity, and nobleness of life which he had not found elsewhere; and so he "loved the nation" (Luke vii. 5), and built anew the synagogue of the town. It is probable, as has been already said, that among the ruins of Tel-Hum, identified as Capernaum, we have the remains of the very fabric thus erected. And he, in like manner, had made a favourable impression upon the Jews of that city. They felt his love for them, were ready to go on his errand, to support his prayer with all earnestness, to attest his worth. To one whose work had been, like that of St. Luke, to preach the gospel to the Gentiles, all these incidents would be precious, as early tokens of that breaking-down of barriers, that brotherhood of mankind in Christ, of which the Apostle who was his companion was the great preacher.

(6) My servant.—The Greek word might mean either "servant" or "boy." The former meaning is the more common, and is fixed as the meaning here by St. Luke's use of the word which means strictly "slave." He is described as paralysed, but the words "grievously tormented" point to more acute suffering than is common in that form of disease, and imply either something like rheumatic fever, or tetanus, or the special kind of paralysis which benumbs the muscles only, and affects the nerves of sensation with sharp pain. A like case of paralysis with agonising pain is found in 1 Macc. ix. 55, 56. The fact that this suffering touched his master's heart with pity was itself a sign of something exceptionally good in the centurion's character. It was not thus, for the most part, that the wealthy Romans dealt with their slaves when they were sick. St. Luke does not state the nature of the disease, perhaps as not having been able to satisfy himself as to its precise nature, but simply describes the slave as "ill, and at the point to die," and adds that he was "dear" (literally, "precious") to his master. His narra-
The Centurion's Faith.

(7) And Jesus saith unto him, I will come and heal him. (6) The report had obviously been submitted to him by some of the elders of the synagogue or even by some who had merely heard the report, and he wished to see and judge for himself. He was a man of influence and authority, and as such he had the right to demand the healing he was seeking. Moreover, he was a Gentile, and as such he was not entitled to the same privileges as the Israelites. He had asked to be admitted into the company of the Israelites who sought our Lord's healing work, and now he had a right to expect the same treatment as they. He had come to see our Lord and to judge for himself whether or not he was worthy to be admitted into the circle of his followers. He had come to see if he was worthy to be healed by our Lord. He had come to see if he was worthy to be admitted into the company of the Israelites who sought our Lord's healing work.

(8) Lord, I am not worthy.—In St. Luke's account, the friends deliver the message as beginning with “Trouble not thyself,” the word being a colloquial one, which starting from the idea of flaying, or mangling, passed into that of “worrying,” “vexing,” and the like. The sense of unworthiness implied at once the consciousness of his own sins, and the recognition of the surpassing holiness and majesty of the Teacher he addressed.

Speak the word only.—This was the special proof of the speaker's faith. He had risen above the thought of a magic influence, operating by touch or charm, to that of a delegated power depending only on the will of the centurion.
out into outer darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth. (13) And Jesus said unto the centurion, Go thy way; and as thou hast believed, so be it done unto thee. And his servant was healed in the selfsame hour. (14) And when Jesus was come into Peter’s house, he saw his wife’s mother laid, and sick of a fever." (15) And he touched her hand, and the fever left her: and she arose, and ministered unto them.

and otherwise, that it included more than the life after death. We may accordingly rightly look for like “springing and germinating accomplishments” of the words now before us. Men came “from the east and west,” when the Gentiles were admitted into the Church of Christ. The children of the kingdom were left in the “outer darkness” when they were self-excluded from fellowship with that Church and its work among the nations. The outbursts of envy and rage recorded in the Acts (v. 33; xiii. 45) illustrate this aspect of “the weeping and gnashing of teeth.”

As thou didst believe.—The words were, of course, sent as a message. Better, As thou didst believe—referring to his one great act of faith. (14) And when Jesus was come into Peter’s house.—St. Mark (i. 29) and St. Luke (iv. 38) relate more specifically that it was on the Sabbath, and that our Lord had previously taught in the synagogue and healed a demiac. The sons of Zebedee and of Jona had all been present, and when the service was over they came to the house in which Peter apparently (though born in Bethsaida, John i. 44) had settled on his marriage.

His wife’s mother.—The fact of St. Peter’s marriage has not unnaturally been almost unduly prominent in the Protestant argument against the enforced celibacy of the clergy. “Here,” it has been said, “is the Apostle from whom the Bishop of Rome claims succession, married when called to his office, and never separated from his wife, and yet Rome declares the marriage of priests to be unlawful, and stigmatises it as worse than concubinage.” Telling as it may sound, however, it is after all only an argumentum ad hominem. Had the case been otherwise, we should not have admitted that the celibacy of the chief of the Churches was a ground for compelling all bishops, elders, and deacons of the Church to follow his example. And all that can be urged, as the case stands, is that there is an inconsistency in accepting these facts, and yet treating marriage as incompatible with the sacred office of the ministry. The Church of Rome might answer, that experience, or the teaching of the Spirit, or the moral authority of the saints and Fathers of the Church, outweighed the inference from St. Peter’s example, and the question must be discussed on wider ethical and social, as well as Scriptural, grounds. In that argument, it is believed, those who advocate Christian liberty (1 Cor. ix. 5) as most in harmony with the mind of Christ are not likely to get the worst of it.

Sick of a fever.—St. Luke, with a kind of medical precision, adds, “with a great fever,” and that they (Peter, John, and the others) asked Him about her, as if consulting about a case of which they almost despaired.

(15) She arose, and ministered unto them.—The fact is stated as showing the completeness of the work of healing. The “great fever” had not left behind it its usual sequel of weakness and exhaustion.

When the even was come.—Or, as St. Luke has it, “While the sun was setting.” There were two reasons why the time should be thus specified. (1) It was natural that the sick should be brought into the cool of the evening, rather than in the scorching heat of the afternoon; and (2) it was the Sabbath, and the feeling which made the Pharisees question the lawfulness of a man’s carrying the bed on which he had been lying (John v. 10), would probably have deterred the friends of the sick from bringing them as long as it lasted. But with sunset the Sabbath came to a close, and then they would feel themselves free to act. The prominence given to “those that were possessed with devils,” both by St. Matthew and St. Mark, shows that it was the work of the Sabbath morning that had most impressed itself on their minds.

Himself took our infirmities.—The citation is interesting as showing St. Matthew’s way of dealing with Messianic prophecies. We see in Isa. liii. throughout a picture of our Lord’s spiritual work of redemption, and the words quoted are almost the cardinal text for the special view of the atonement, which sees in the sufferings of Christ the freely accepted penalty that was due for the transgressions of mankind. The Evangelist, with the memory of that evening present to his mind, saw them fulfilled in this removal of the “infirmities” and “sicknesses” that oppressed the bodies of men. It was not merely that He came, as one of boundless wealth, who might scatter alms broadcast, but that He Himself “took” and “bore” the sufferings which He removed. He suffered with those He saw suffer. The power to heal was intimately connected with the intensity of His sympathy, and so was followed (as analogous works of love are followed in those who are most Christ-like in their lives) by weariness and physical exhaustion. What is related by St. Mark and St. Luke of our Lord’s seeking out the refuge of solitude at the earliest dawn of the day that followed, is entirely in harmony with the view thus suggested.

To depart unto the other side—i.e., the eastern shore of the Sea of Galilee. Here, too, though less conspicuously than in the other Gospels, there is indicated the yearning for a time of rest and retirement. (19) A certain scribe came.—The facts that follow are placed by St. Luke, as we have seen, in quite another stage of our Lord’s ministry. The fact that it was a scribe that came is striking, as showing that the impression made by our Lord’s teaching was not
him, Master, I will follow thee whithersoever thou goest. (20) And Jesus saith unto him, The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head. (21) And another of his disciples said unto him, Lord, suffer me first to go and bury my father. (22) But Jesus said unto him, Follow me; and let the dead bury their dead.

confined to the “common people” that “heard him gladly.” As Nicodemus had already come confessing that He was a “Teacher come from God,” so in Galilee there was one whom the Sermon on the Mount, or some like discourse, had led to volunteer at least the show of discipleship. (20) The foxes have holes.—Our Lord’s answer seems to indicate that it was hardly more than the show. The scribe had not counted the cost, and, like the young ruler that had great possessions, needed to be taught. To follow the Son of Man was not to be the adherent of a new sect or party, or the servant of a king marching onward to an earthly throne, but to share in poverty, privation, homelessness.

Nests.—The word is sufficient for popular use, but, strictly speaking, the “nest” belongs only to the brooding season of a bird’s life, and the Greek word has the wider meaning of “shelter.” The Son of man.—The passage is remarkable as the first in this Gospel in which the name occurs which St. Mark, twenty-six in St. Luke, and twelve times in St. John. It had thus been used. The “Son of Man” became one of the titles of the expected Christ. The Targum or Paraphrase of the Psalms (probably earlier than our Lord’s ministry) explains even such a passage as Ps. lxxx. 17 (“the son of man whom thou madest strong for thine own self”) as referring to the Christ. So when the crowd at Jerusalem are questioning in their hearts whether Jesus was the Christ, they are not startled at this application of the name, and their question, “Who is this Son of Man?” is the utterance of their wonder that things so unlike what they expected of the Christ should be predicted of One who claimed the title (John xii. 34). It was accordingly, with these ideas attached to it—involving at once fellowship with the lowest of the heirs of our humanity, and yet also participation in the eternal glory of the highest—that our Lord claimed the title, and used it with such marvellous frequency. We might almost say that it serves as the chief connecting-link between the teaching of the first three Gospels and the fourth. It appears thirty-two times in St. Matthew, fourteen in St. Mark, twenty-six in St. Luke, and twelve times in St. John. It is remarkable that it never passed into the current language of the Apostolic Church, nor into the theological or liturgical phraseology of Christendom. It is not used in any one of the Epistles. Outside the Gospels it is found only in the exclamation of Stephen (Acts vii. 55), with a manifest reference to Dan. vii. 13, and possibly in the visions of the Apocalypse (Rev. i. 13; xiv. 14). The minds of believers loved to dwell on the glory of the risen Christ, and apparently looked on this as belonging rather to the time of His humiliation. Its absence from the other books of the New Testament, and its presence in the Gospels is, at all events, an indication that the latter were not the after-growth of a later age.

Suffer me first to go and bury my father.—A curious tradition, preserved by Clement of Alexandria, says that the disciple who came with this request was Philip. Nothing in the Gospel history, however, suggests this. Philip had been called before, and had obeyed the call (John i. 43). All that we can say is that it may have been so, and that he may at this stage of his spiritual growth have shrunk from the fresh activity of actual service in the work of evangelising. The form of the petition may mean either (1) that his father was then actually dead, and that the disciple asked leave to remain and pay the last honours to his remains, or (2) that he asked to remain with his father till his death. The latter seems by far the most probable. In the East burial followed so immediately on death that the former would hardly have involved more than the delay of a few hours. In the latter case the request was, in fact, a plea for indefinite postponement. This at least fits in best with the apparent severity of our Lord’s answer.

(22) Let the dead bury their dead.—The point of the half-epigrammatic, half-proverbial saying, lies in the contrast between the two meanings of the word “dead.” “Let those who have no spiritual life linger in the circle of outward routine duties, and sacrifice the highest spiritual possibilities of their nature to their fulfilment. Those who are really living will do the work to which their Master calls them, and leave the
And when he was entered into a ship, his disciples followed him. And, behold, there arose a great tempest in the sea, insomuch that the ship was covered with the waves: but he was asleep. And his disciples came to him, and awoke him, saying, Lord, save us: we perish. And he saith unto them, Why are ye fearful, O ye of little faith? Then he arose, and rebuked the winds and the sea; and there was a great calm. But the men marvelled, saying, What manner of man is this, that even the winds and the sea obey him!

And when he was come to the other side into the country of the Gergesenes, there met him two possessed with devils, coming out of the tombs, exceeding fierce, so that no man might lower conventional duties to be done or left undone as the events of their life shall order. Something there was, we may be sure, in the inward state of the disciple which called for the sternness of the rebuke. He had been called to a living work: he was resting in a dead one.

The two narratives that follow are brought together in all three Gospels; but St. Mark and St. Luke place them, as we have seen, after the parables which St. Matthew gives in chapter xii.

Entered into a ship. The better MSS. give, as often elsewhere, "the ship," or boat—i.e., one which, belonging possibly to Peter or the sons of Zebedee, was always ready at their Master's service. St. Mark adds that "they took Him, even as He was, in the boat," the words indicating apparently extreme exhaustion from the fatigue of teaching. This, we learn, was followed by immediate sleep as He lay in the stern on the boat's cushion as a pillow.

There arose a great tempest. Storms such as that here described are of common occurrence in all inland seas. The wind sweeps through the narrow mountain valleys, and the sea, which a few minutes before was smooth as glass, is at once rough with the white crests of the foaming waves. The ship was on the point of sinking, as the waves dashed over it while it was in the trough between them. It was beginning to be filled with water, and still He slept.

Lord, save us: we perish. As given by St. Mark the words indicate even more of the impatience of panic: "Master, carest Thou not that we perish?" They began to think that He was indifferent to their safety, and believing, it may be, that He Himself had a charmed life, they were half angry at that indifference.

Why are ye fearful, O ye of little faith? St. Luke puts the question more strongly: "Where is your faith?" as though it had all drifted away under the pressure of their fears. Yet the word "of little faith" was singularly appropriate. They had not altogether lost their trust in Him, but they had not learnt the lesson of the centurion's faith, and were only at ease when they heard His voice, and saw that He was watching over them.

Rebuked the winds and the sea. This seems to have been almost, so to say, our Lord's formula in working miracles. The fever (Luke iv. 39), the frenzy of the demoniac (Mark ix. 25), the tempest, are all treated as if they were hostile and rebellious forces that needed to be restrained. St. Mark, with his usual vividness, gives the very words of the rebuke: "Peace, be still!" literally, be dumb, be muzzled, as though the howling wind was a maniac to be gagged and bound.

There was a great calm. As with the fever in verse 15, so here, the work was at once instantaneous and complete. There was no after-swell such as is commonly seen for hours after a storm.

The men marvelled. This use of so vague a term as "men," as applied to the disciples, is so exceptional as to suggest the thought that there were others in the boat with them. The marvel was not without a "great fear" (Mark iv. 41). The Presence among them was mightier even than they had thought, and the elements, which seemed far more removed from human control than leprosy or fever, were yet subject to His sovereignty.

The spiritual application of the miracle lies so near the surface that it has almost become one of the common-places of sermons and hymns. And yet there is a profound fitness in it which never ceases to be fresh. The boat is the Church of Christ, and it sails across the ocean of the world's history to the "other side" of the life beyond the grave. The wind is the blast of persecution, and the Lord of the Church seems as though He were asleep, and heard not the cry of the sufferers, and the disciples are faint-hearted and afraid. And then He hears their prayer, and the storm of the persecution ceases, and there is a great calm, during which the Church goes on its way, and men learn to feel that it carries more than Caesar and his fortunes.

The country of the Gergesenes. The exact determination of the locality presents many difficulties. In all the three Gospels we find various readings, of which the best supported are Gadarenes in St. Matthew, and Gerasenes in St. Mark and St. Luke. "Gergesenes" is, however, found in some MSS. of high authority, and the variations are obviously of very early date. The main facts as to the three regions thus indicated are as follows:

(1.) Gadara was a city east of the Sea of Galilee, about sixteen miles from Tiberias. It is identified with the modern Um Keis, the ruins of which are more than two miles in circumference, and stand at the north-west extremity of the mountains of Gilead, near the south-east corner of the Lake. The tombs of the city, chambers in the limestone rock often more than twenty feet square, are its most conspicuous feature, and are, indeed, the sole abode of its present inhabitants. Under the Roman occupation it was important enough to have two amphitheatres and a long colonnaded street.

(2.) Gerasa was a city in the Gilead district, twenty miles east of the Jordan, described sometimes as belonging to Coele-Syria, sometimes to Arabia. It also has ruins which indicate the former splendour of the city. Of these two, it is clear that Gadara fits in better with all the circumstances of the narrative; and if "Gerasenes" is more than the mistake of a transcriber, it could only be because the name was used vaguely for the whole Gilead district. The reading "Gadarenes" in that case would probably come from some one better acquainted with the position of the two cities.
The Gergesene Demoniacs.

ST. MATTHEW, VIII.

The Herd of Swine.

pass by that way. (29) And, behold, they cried out, saying, What have we to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of God? art thou come hither to torment

us before the time? (30) And there was a good way off from them an herd of many swine feeding. (31) So the devils besought him, saying, If thou cast us

(3.) There was no city named Gergesa, but the name Gergesenes was probably connected with the older Girgasites, one of the Canaanite races that occupied the country before the invasion of Israel (Gen. x. 19; xv. 21; Josh. iii. 10; xxiv. 11; et al.). Apparently, however, from the last passage referred to, they were on the western side of the Jordan. It is, on the whole, more likely that the reading was a mistake, than that the old tribe still remained with its old name; but it is possible that the name of Gerasa may represent an altered form of Girgasim.

Two possessed with devils.—St. Mark and St. Luke speak of "one" only. A like difference meets us in St. Matthew's "two blind men" at Jericho (Matt. xx. 39) as compared with the "one" of the other Gospels. The natural explanation is that, in each case, one was more prominent than the other in speech or act, and so was remembered and specified, while the other was either forgotten or left unnoticed. The difference, as far as it goes, is obviously in favour of the independence of St. Matthew's narrative. The "tombs," in the neighbourhood of Gadara, hewn out in the rock, have been already mentioned. To dwell in such tombs was, to the ordinary Jew, a thing from which he shrank with abhorrence, as bringing pollution, and to choose such an abode was therefore a sign of insanity.

St. Luke adds that he wore no clothes (i.e., strictly, no outer garment; the word does not imply actual nakedness). St. Mark (whose account is the fullest of the three) notices that he had often been bound with fetters and chains, and that, with the abnormal strength often found in mania, he had set himself free from them. The insanity was so homicidal that "none could pass by that way," so suicidal that he was ever cutting himself with stones, howling day and night in the wildness of his paroxysms.

For a full discussion of the subject of demoniacal possession, one of the Canaanite races that occupied the country before the invasion of Israel, must have entered into each of the two thousand and two (or is it three?) demons, each with a personality of his own, and to calculate accordingly the number that the man was familiar with. The question would recall to the man's mind that he once had a human name, with all its memories of human fellowship. It was a stage, even in spite of the paroxysm that followed, in the process of recovery, in so far as it helped to disentangle him from the confusion between himself and the demons which caused his misery. But, at first, the question seems only to increase the evil: "My name is Legion, for we are six thousand demons, each with a human name, with all its memories of human fellowship. It was a stage, even in spite of the paroxysm that followed, in the process of recovery, in so far as it helped to disentangle him from the confusion between himself and the demons which caused his misery.

At this stage, too, they add, our Lord asked the question, "What is thy name?" The most terrible phenomenon of possession, as of many forms of insanity, was the divided consciousness which appears in this case. Now the demon speaks, and now the man. The question would recall to the man's mind that he once had a human name, with all its memories of human fellowship. It was a stage, even in spite of the paroxysm that followed, in the process of recovery, in so far as it helped to disentangle him from the confusion between himself and the demons which caused his misery.

So the devils besought him.—As St. Mark gives the words, "that He should not send them out of the country," or district, in which they were; as in St. Luke's report, "that He would not command them to go out into the deep," i.e., the abyss, the "bottomless pit" of Rev. x. 1, 2, 11. The words of the man are as those of the demons with whom he identifies himself. He shrinks from the thought of being sent to desolate places, "seeking rest, and finding none" (Matt. xii. 43), or being compelled to flee, like Asmodeus, into "the utmost parts of Egypt" (Tobit viii. 3), or, worst fate of all, to be sent into the "abyss," which was the ultimate doom of evil. And so he, as one with them, suggests another alternative: "If Thou cast us out, send us into
The Lord had had compassion on him—this was better for him than the work of a more avowedly kindred in his own house, the quiet witness borne there. Retirement, renewed fellowship with his unclean spirits, and therefore shrank from his presence among them. Not so with the demoniac himself. He felt, with a faith which was real, though weak, as if he were only safe while close to his Deliverer. He followed Him to the boat, and as He was in the act of embarking (Mark v. 18), prayed that he might be with Him. But this was not the discipline which was needed for his spiritual health. Retirement, renewed fellowship with his kindred in his own house, the quiet witness borne there that the Lord had had compassion on him—this was better for him than the work of a more avowed discipleship. And so he went his way “proclaiming,” or “preaching,” what Jesus had done for him—a true evangelist to a people whose panic terror showed that they were as yet in darkness and the shadow of death.

IX.

(1) Here, again, the order of the facts narrated varies so much in the three Gospels that the labours of the harmonist are baffled.

ST. MATTHEW. ST. MARK. ST. LUKE.

(1.) The Paralytic, ii. 1-12. v. 18-26.
(2.) The call of Matthew, &c., v. 17. v. 27-39.
(3.) Jairus, and the woman with an issue of blood, v. 21-43. viii. 41-56.
(4.) The two blind, 27-31.
(5.) The dumb, 32—34.

It will be seen that (1) and (2) are grouped together in all three, as are the two events in (3), but beyond this we cannot trace any systematic order, and the apparent notes of sequence are so far misleading. In this case, St. Matthew makes the return to Capernaum follow the healing of the Gadarene demoniacs. St. Mark and St. Luke place it after that of the leper, but as if they were uncertain as to its exact position, “after certain days,” or “on one of the days.”

Ship.—Better, boat.

Into his own city.—St. Mark states definitely Capernaum, which had become His “own city” since His departure from Nazareth (Matt. iv. 13). That city, though the home of His childhood, is never so described.

(2) Behold, they brought him.—From the other Gospels we learn:—(1) That He was teaching (Luke v. 17) in a house (apparently, from what follows, from the upper room of a house), while the people stood listening in the courtyard. (2) That the courtyard was crowded, so that even the gateway leading into the street was filled (Mark ii. 2). (3) That among the hearers were Pharisees and Doctors of the Law, who had come, not only from “every village of Galilee and Judaea,” but also “from Jerusalem.” The last fact is important as one of the few traces in the first three Gospels of an unrecorded ministry in Jerusalem, and, as will be seen, throws light on much that follows. They had apparently come to see how the new Teacher, who had so startled them at Jerusalem, was carrying on His work in Galilee, and, as far as they could, to hinder it.

(4) That “the power of the Lord was present to heal them” (Luke v. 17), i.e., that as He taught, the sick were brought to Him, and, either by word or touch, were cured.

A man sick of the palsy.—St. Matthew and St.
lying on a bed: and Jesus seeing their
faith said unto the sick of the palsy; Son, be of good cheer; thy sins be forgiven thee. (3) And, behold, certain of the
scribes said within themselves, This man blaspheth. (4) And Jesus knowing
their thoughts said, Wherefore think ye evil in your hearts? (5) For

whether is easier, to say, Thy sins be forgiven thee; or to say, Arise, and
walk? (6) But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to
delve sins, (then saith he to the sick of the palsy,) Arise, take up thy bed, and
and go unto thine house. (7) And he arose, and departed to his house.

Mark use the popular term "paralytic;" St. Luke, with perhaps more technical
precision, the participle of the verb, "who was paralysed." The man was
borne on a couch (St. Mark uses the Greek form of the Latin gravatam, the bed or mattress of the poor) carried by four bearers (Mark ii. 3). They sought
to bring him through the door, but were hindered by the crowd; and then going outside the house, they got upon the roof, removed part of the roof (the light structure of Eastern houses made the work comparatively easy), let him down with ropes through the opening into the midst of the crowd, just in front of the
Teacher (Mark ii. 4; Luke v. 19). This persistency implied faith in His power to heal on the part both of the sick man and the bearers.

Son, be of good cheer.—Better, child. The word implies, perhaps (as in Luke ii. 48), comparative youth, or, it may be, a fatherly tone of love and pity
on the part of the speaker. Here, as elsewhere, pity is the starting-point of our Lord's work of healing, and He looked with infinite tenderness on the object of these
expression of the sufferer, who had lost heart and hope.

Thy sins be forgiven thee.—The English is to modern ears ambiguous, and suggests the thought of a prayer or wish. The Greek is, however, either the present or the perfect passive of the indicative, "Thy sins are" or "have been forgiven thee." The words were addressed, we must believe, to the secret yearnings of the sufferer. Sickness had made him conscious of the burden of his sins, perhaps had come (as such forms of nervous exhaustion often do come) as the direct consequence of his sin. The Healer saw that the disease of the soul must first be removed, and that then would come the time for restoring strength to the body.

This man blaspheth.—The words were but an echo of the charge that had been brought at Jerusalem, that He made Himself equal with God (John v. 18), and may well have come from some of the same objectors. St. Mark and St. Luke give the grounds of their accusation: "What is this that this Man
thus speaketh? Who can forgive sins but One, that is, God?" Speaking abstractedly, they were affirming one of the first principles of all true religions belief. All sins are offences against God, and therefore, though men may forgive trespasses as far as they themselves are concerned, the ultimate act of forgiveness belongs to God only; and for a mere man, as such, to claim the right of forgiving thus absolutely, was to claim a divine attribute, and therefore to blaspheme—i.e., to utter words as disparaging as open profaneness to the majesty of God. What they forgot to take into account was the possibility (1) that God might so far delegate His power to His chosen servants that they, on sufficient evidence of that delegation, might rightly declare sins to be forgiven; or (2) that the Teacher might Himself be one with God, and so share in His perfections and prerogatives. On either of these suppositions the charge of blasphemy was fully answered, and the sin of the scribes lay in their ignoring the fact that He had given sufficient proof of the former, if not of the latter also.

Knowing their thoughts.—The better MSS. give "seeing," as with an immediate act of intuition. St. Mark adds his usual "immediately," and both he and St. Luke use the word which implies fulness of knowledge.

Wherefore think ye evil?—Literally, evil things. The thoughts were evil because, in face of the mighty works and the divine wisdom of the Teacher, they were assuming that He had wantonly spoken words that involved the most extreme of all forms of sin against the God in whose name He taught.

Whether is easier, . . . ?—The form of the question implies what we call an argument a fortiori. It was easier to say, "Thy sins are forgiven thee," for those words could not be put to any outward test, and only the consciousness of the sinner could attest their power. It was a bolder and a harder thing to risk the utterance of words which challenged an immediate and visible fulfilment; and yet He was content to utter such words, without fear of the result. Measured in their true relation to each other, the spiritual wonder was, of course, the greater; but here, as so often elsewhere, He puts Himself, as it were, on the level of those who hear Him, and vouchsafes to speak to them according to their thoughts.

That ye may know that the Son of man hath power.—Better, authority, as in John v. 27. The two passages are so closely parallel that we can hardly be wrong in thinking that the words now spoken were meant to recall those which some, at least, of those who listened had heard before. This view, at any rate, brings out the fulness of their meaning. As they stand here, they seem to include both the two hypotheses mentioned in the Note on verse 3. The Father had given Him authority to "forgive sins" and to "execute judgment" because He was the Son of Man, the representative of mankind, and as such was exercising a delegated power. But then, that discourse in John v. showed that He also spoke of Himself as the Son of God as well as the Son of Man (John v. 25), and as such claimed an honour equal to that which was rightly paid to the Father (John v. 23). Ultimately, therefore, our Lord's answer rests on the higher, and not the lower, of the two grounds on which the objectors might have been met.

Arise, take up thy bed.—As St. Mark gives the words we have the very syllables that had been spoken to the "impotent man" at Bethesda (John v. 8), and in any case words identical in meaning; and the natural inference is that our Lord meant to recall what the scribes from Jerusalem had then seen and heard.

He arose, and departed to his house.—St. Mark adds his usual "immediately"; St. Luke, that he went "glorifying God." We can picture to ourselves the exultant joy of the soul freed from the
burden of its sins, and rejoicing in the new vitality of the body.

(8) They marvelled.—The better reading, adopted by most editors, gives they were afraid. This agrees better with St. Mark’s “they were amazed, and glorified God,” and St. Luke’s “they were filled with fear.” St. Mark gives the words they uttered, “We never saw it after this fashion;” St. Luke, “We saw strange things to-day.”

Which had given such power unto men.—It was natural that this should be the impression made on the great body of the hearers. They rested in the thought of a delegated authority, a “power given to was the pariah of Palestine, and no decent person would associate with him. The term “sinners” may be explained and drink . . . (Luke v. 30) as such, without passing on to the deeper truth of the union of the manhood with God.

(9) As Jesus passed forth from thence.—All three Gospels agree, as has been noticed, in the sequence of the two events. And the sequence was probably, in part at least, one of cause and effect. The sympathy and power shown in healing the paralytic impressed itself on the mind of one who, as a publican, felt that he too had sins that needed to be forgiven.

A man, named Matthew.—St. Mark and St. Luke give the name as Levi, the former adds that he was the “son of Alphæus.” The difference may be explained by assuming that in his case, as in that of “Simon who is called (or named) Peter” (Matt. x. 2), a new name was given that practically superseded the old. The meaning of Matthew—which, like Theodore, Dorotheus, and the like, means “the gift of God,” or, more strictly, “the gift of Jehovah”—makes a change of this kind itself probable. If he were the son of Alphæus, he would be (assuming identity of person and of name) the brother of the James whose name appears with his own in the second group of four in the lists of the Twelve Apostles.

Sitting at the receipt of custom.—Literally, at the custom-house, the douane of the lake. The customs levied there were probably of the nature of an octroi on the fish, fruit, and other produce that made up the exports and imports of Capernaum.

And he saith unto him, Follow me.—St. Mark (i. 13) makes the call follow close upon an unrecorded discourse addressed to the whole multitude of Capernaum. In the nature of the case it was probable that there had been, as in the analogous call of the sons of Jona and Zebedee, a preparation of some kind. A brother had been converted, his own heart had been touched, he had felt (see Note on iv. 13) the presence of the new Teacher as light in the shadow of death.

He arose, and followed him.—St. Luke adds, “he left all.” There was not much to leave—his desk at the custom, his stipend or his percentage; but it was his all, and no man can leave more than that.

(10) As Jesus sat at meat in the house.—The Greek runs, as he sat at meat. The insertion of the name Jesus in this part of the sentence injures the sense. What seems to have been meant is, that while Matthew sat (i.e., reclined after Roman fashion), many publicans and sinners came and reclined with Jesus and His disciples. On the assumption of St. Matthew’s authorship of the Gospel, there is a noticeable humility in his omission of the fact that he had made “a great feast” (Luke v. 29). It was apparently a farewell feast to old friends and neighbours before he entered on his new calling. They were naturally mostly of his own class, or on a yet lower level. The publican was the pariah of Palestine, and no decent person would associate with him. The term “sinners,” may have included Gentiles, but does not necessarily designate them. So far as the context goes, as in verse 13, the term is used in its simple and natural sense.

(11) When the Pharisees saw it.—“Scribes of the Pharisees” (Mark ii. 16). These were probably those who had been present at the healing of the paralytic, the scribes who had come from Jerusalem. They, of course, would not enter the publican’s house, but they stood outside and watched the mingled guests with wonder, and asked their two-fold question, “Why do ye eat and drink . . . (Luke v. 30)?” “Why doth thy Master . . . ?”

(12) They that be whole.—Literally, They that are strong. St. Luke gives, with a more professional precision, “They that are in health.” That speaking from the thoughts and standpoint of those addressed (which in another than our Lord we might term grave irony), which enters so largely into our Lord’s teaching, appears here in its most transparent form. Those of whom He speaks were, we know, suffering from the worst form of spiritual disease, but in their own estimation they were without spot or taint, and as such, therefore, He speaks to them. On their own showing, they ought not to object to His carrying on that work where there was most need of it. The proverb cited by Him in Luke iv. 23 shows that it was not the first time that He had referred to His own work as that of the Great Physician.

(13) Go ye and learn.—The words of Hos. vi. 6—cited once again by our Lord in reference to the Sabbath (Matt. xii. 7)—asserted the superiority of ethical to ceremonial law. To do homage with formal contact with sinners would have been a formal sacrifice, such as Pharisees delighted to offer, and from which they took their very name; but the claims of “mercy” were higher, and bade Him mingle with them. It was the very purpose of His coming, not to call “righteous men” (again with studied reference to their own estimate of themselves), but “sinners,” and to call them, not to continue as they were, but, as St. Luke adds (the words are wanting in the best MSS.) here
Then came to him the disciples of John, saying, Why do we and the Pharisees fast oft, but thy disciples fast not? (23) And Jesus said unto them, Can the children of the bridechamber mourn, as long as the bridegroom is with them? but the days will come, when the bridegroom shall be taken from them, and then shall they fast. (24) No man putteth a piece of new cloth1 unto an old garment, for that which is put in to fill it up taketh from the garment, and them? but the days will come, when the bridegroom shall be taken from them, and then shall they fast. (25) No man putteth a piece of new cloth1 unto an old garment, for that which is put in to fill it up taketh from the garment, and

and also in St. Mark), “to repentance.” We may, perhaps, infer further, that when the scribes were told to consider what the prophet’s words meant, there was also some reference to the context of those words. They would find their own likeness in the words, “Your goodness is as a morning cloud; and they have transgressed the covenant; there have they dealt treacherously against me” (Hos. vi. 4, 7).

(14) The disciples of John.—The passage is interesting as showing (1) that the followers of the Baptist continued during our Lord’s ministry to form a separate body (as in Matt. xi. 2; xiv. 12); and (2) that they obeyed rules which he had given them, more or less after the pattern of those of the Pharisees. They had their own days of fasting (the context makes it probable that the feast in Matthew’s house was held on one of them), their own forms of prayer (Luke xi. 1). They, it would seem, acting with the Pharisees, and perhaps influenced by them, were perplexed at conduct so unlike that of the master they revered, and came therefore with their question. But they were, at least, not hypocrites, and they are answered therefore without the sternness which had marked the reply to their companions.

(15) Can the children of the bridechamber mourn?—The words were full of meaning in themselves, but they only gain their full significance when we connect them with the teaching of the Baptist recorded in John iii. 29. He had pointed to Jesus as “the Bridegroom.” He had taught them that the coming of that Bridegroom was the fulfilling of his joy. Would he have withdrawn from the outward expression of that joy? The children of the bridechamber—i.e., the guests invited to the wedding. The words implied, startling as that thought would be to them, that the feast in Matthew’s house was, in fact, a wedding-feast. His disciples were at once the guests of that feast individually; and collectively they were the new Israel, the new congregation or church. (16) Then shall they fast.—The words can hardly be radically barbarous, or heathen, or worldly, and the true expression of the feelings that belonged to it. So the Christian Church has always felt; so it was, as the New Testament records, in the lives of at least two great apostles, St. Peter (Acts x. 10) and St. Paul (2 Cor. xi. 27). So far as it goes, however, the principle here asserted is in favour of fasts at special seasons of sorrow, rather than of frequent and fixed fasts as a discipline, or meritorious act. In fixing her days of fasting, the Church of England, partly guided perhaps by earlier usage, has at least connected them with the seasons and days that call specially to meditation on the sterner, sadder side of truth.

The children of the bridechamber—i.e., the guests invited to the wedding. The words implied, startling as that thought would be to them, that the feast in Matthew’s house was, in fact, a wedding-feast. His disciples were at once the guests of that feast individually; and collectively they were the new Israel, the new congregation or church. (16) Then shall they fast.—The words can hardly be radically barbarous, or heathen, or worldly, and the true expression of the feelings that belonged to it. So the Christian Church has always felt; so it was, as the New Testament records, in the lives of at least two great apostles, St. Peter (Acts x. 10) and St. Paul (2 Cor. xi. 27). So far as it goes, however, the principle here asserted is in favour of fasts at special seasons of sorrow, rather than of frequent and fixed fasts as a discipline, or meritorious act. In fixing her days of fasting, the Church of England, partly guided perhaps by earlier usage, has at least connected them with the seasons and days that call specially to meditation on the sterner, sadder side of truth.

The children of the bridechamber—i.e., the guests invited to the wedding. The words implied, startling as that thought would be to them, that the feast in Matthew’s house was, in fact, a wedding-feast. His disciples were at once the guests of that feast individually; and collectively they were the new Israel, the new congregation or church. (16) Then shall they fast.—The words can hardly be radically barbarous, or heathen, or worldly, and the true expression of the feelings that belonged to it. So the Christian Church has always felt; so it was, as the New Testament records, in the lives of at least two great apostles, St. Peter (Acts x. 10) and St. Paul (2 Cor. xi. 27). So far as it goes, however, the principle here asserted is in favour of fasts at special seasons of sorrow, rather than of frequent and fixed fasts as a discipline, or meritorious act. In fixing her days of fasting, the Church of England, partly guided perhaps by earlier usage, has at least connected them with the seasons and days that call specially to meditation on the sterner, sadder side of truth.

The children of the bridechamber—i.e., the guests invited to the wedding. The words implied, startling as that thought would be to them, that the feast in Matthew’s house was, in fact, a wedding-feast. His disciples were at once the guests of that feast individually; and collectively they were the new Israel, the new congregation or church. (16) Then shall they fast.—The words can hardly be radically barbarous, or heathen, or worldly, and the true expression of the feelings that belonged to it. So the Christian Church has always felt; so it was, as the New Testament records, in the lives of at least two great apostles, St. Peter (Acts x. 10) and St. Paul (2 Cor. xi. 27). So far as it goes, however, the principle here asserted is in favour of fasts at special seasons of sorrow, rather than of frequent and fixed fasts as a discipline, or meritorious act. In fixing her days of fasting, the Church of England, partly guided perhaps by earlier usage, has at least connected them with the seasons and days that call specially to meditation on the sterner, sadder side of truth.
the rent is made worse. (17) Neither do men put new wine into old bottles: else the bottles break, and the wine runneth out, and the bottles perish: but they put new wine into new bottles, and both are preserved.

(18) While he spake these things unto them, behold, there came a certain ruler, and worshipped him, saying, My daughter is even now dead: but come and lay thy hand upon her, and she shall live. (19) And Jesus arose, and followed him, and so did his disciples.

(20) And, behold, a woman, which was diseased with an issue of blood twelve years, came behind him, and touched the hem of his garment: (21) for she said within herself, If I may but touch his garment, I shall be whole. (22) But Jesus turned him about, and when he saw her, he said, Daughter, be of good comfort; thy faith hath made thee

(17) Neither do men put new wine into old bottles.—The bottles are those made of hides partly tanned, and retaining, to a great extent, the form of the living animals. These, as they grew dry with age, became very liable to crack, and were unable to resist the pressure of the fermenting liquor. If the mistake were made, the bottles were marred, and the wine split. When we interpret the parable, we see at once that the “new wine” represents the inner, as the garment did the outer, aspect of Christian life, the new energies and gifts of the Spirit, which, as on the day of Pentecost, were likened to new wine (Acts ii. 10). In dealing with men, our Lord did not bestow these gifts suddenly, even on His own disciples, any more than He imposed rules of life for which men were not ready. As the action of organised churches has too often reproduced the mistake of sewing the patch of new cloth on the old garment, so in the action of enthusiastic or mystic sects, in the history of Montanism, Quakerism in its earlier stages, the growth of the so-called Catholic and Apostolic Church, which had its origin in the history of Edward Irving, we have that of pouring new wine into old bottles. The teaching of our Lord points in both instances to gradual training, speaking the truth as men are able to bear it; reserving many truths because they “cannot bear them now.”


(18) While he spake these things.—The sequence seems so clear as, at first, hardly to admit of doubt; and yet it is no less clear that St. Mark and St. Luke represent what is told as following close upon our Lord’s return to the western side of the lake after the healing of the Gadarene, and place many events between it and the call of Levi. Assuming St. Matthew’s own connection with the Gospel, we may justly, in this case, give greater weight to his order than to the arrangement of the other two, who derived the account from others.

A certain ruler.—St. Mark and St. Luke give the name Jairus, and state that he was “a ruler of the synagogue,” probably an elder, or one of the Parnasim or “pastors.” The fact is interesting as suggesting a coincidence between this narrative and that of the centurion’s servant. As a ruler of the synagogue, Jairus would probably have been among the leaders of the Jews who came as a deputation to our Lord, and would thus have been impressed with His power to heal in cases which seemed hopeless.

My daughter is even now dead.—St. Luke adds, as one who had inquired into details, that she was the ruler’s only child, was twelve years old, and that she “lay a-dying;” agreeing with St. Mark’s “is at the point of death,” literally, in extremis, “at the last gasp;” and both add that the crowd that followed “thronged” and “pressed” our Lord as He went.

(20) Behold, a woman.—The “issue of blood” was probably of the kind that brought with it ceremonial uncleanliness (Lev. xv. 26), and this accounts for the sense of shame which made her shrink from applying to the Healer openly, and from confessing afterwards what she had done. It is significant that the period of her sufferings coincided with the age of the ruler’s daughter. His sorrow was sudden after twelve years of joyful hope; hers had brought with it, through twelve long years, the sickness of hope deferred. St. Mark and St. Luke add (though in the latter some MSS. omit the words) that she “had spent all her substance on physicians, and was nothing bettered, but rather grew worse;” and the former states (what is, of course, obvious) that she came because she had “heard of the things concerning Jesus.”

Touched the hem of his garment.—The incidental notice is interesting as making up, together with Matt. xiv. 36, John xix. 23, all that we know as to our Lord’s outward garb. There was first, nearest the body, the coat or tunic (πόρτα) without seam, woven from the top throughout; then, over that, the garment or cloak (κλήρον), flowing loosely after the manner of the East; and this had its “border or fringe,” probably of a bright blue mingled with white, that on which the scribes and Pharisees laid stress as being in accord-ance with the Law (Num. xix. 36), and which they wore, therefore, of an ostentatious width (Matt. xi. 23). Later tradition defined the very number of the threads or tassels of the fringe, so that they might represent the 613 precepts of the Law.

(21) She said within herself.—The words indicate a faith real but not strong. She believed, as the leper did, in the power to heal, but did not trust the love, and shrank from the thought lest the Healer should shrink from her. And she thought not of a will that would thus have been impressed with His power to the paralytic. What each needed, she the most of the two, was the courage, the enthusiasm of faith.

Thy faith hath made thee whole.—Literally, thy faith hath saved thee. The rendering of the Authorised version is not wrong, and yet it represents but part of the full meaning of the word. Her faith had
from the “hem of the garment,” even through outward and of supplication, and the other of these were shown in his own day, in the early part of charged the parents that they should not make it statues in bronze — one of herself in the attitude life was dependent, after the supernatural work had saved her, in and the “virtue” which it seeks goes forth even words, of which St. Mark gives the Aramaic form, erect and stretching forth His hand ordinances (for thus we interpret the miracle, which 

There may be imperfect knowledge, false shame, im- her even out of that sleep. And then, with the heart. 

Christ, the Healer both of the souls and bodies of men, recognises even the germ, and answers the longing desire many forms of death to be mistaken as to its outward signs. And then He entered, with the five, as before, into the chamber of death, where the body was laid out for the burial, and grasped her hands, and uttered the words, of which St. Mark gives the Aramaic form, 

There is not dead, but sleepeth.” To Him the death, though originally the panting breath of vehement emotion, is real, was yet but as a sleep, for He, as afterwards in the case of Lazarus (John xi. 11), had come to awaken her even out of that sleep. And then, with the heart.

And when Jesus came into the ruler’s house, and saw the ministers and the people making a noise, he said unto them, Give place: for the maid is not dead, but sleepeath. And they laughed him to scorn. But when the people were put forth, he went in, and took her by the hand, and the maid arose. And the fame hereof went abroad into all that land.

saved her, in the higher as well as in the lower sense. The teaching of the narrative lies almost on the surface. There may be imperfect knowledge, false shame, imperfect trust, and yet faith. In the germ of faith and unspoken prayer, which again by the 

The Ruler of the Synagogue’s Daughter. ST. MATTHEW, IX.

Two Blind Men receive Sight.

And when Jesus came into the house, the blind men came to him: and Jesus saith unto them, Believe ye that I am able to do this? They said unto him, Yea, Lord.

Then touched he their eyes, saying, According to your faith be it unto you.

And their eyes were opened; and Jesus straitly charged them, saying, See
that no man know it. (31) But they, when they were departed, spread abroad his fame in all that country.

(32) As they went out, behold, they brought to him a dumb man possessed with a devil. (33) And when the devil was cast out, the dumb spake: and the multitudes marvelled, saying, It was never so seen in Israel. (34) But the Pharisees said, He casteth out devils through the prince of the devils. (35) And Jesus went about all the cities and villages, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing every sickness and every disease among the people.

(36) But when he saw the multitudes, he was moved with compassion on them, because they fainted, and were scattered abroad, as sheep having no shepherd. (37) Then saith he unto his disciples, The harvest truly is plenteous, but the

one of the strongest used by the New Testament writers (Mark i. 43; xiv. 5; John xi. 33, 38) to express repugnance, displeasure, or the command that implies annoyance. It is as if our Lord saw the garrulous joy on the point of uttering itself, and sought by every means in His power to restrain it. The reasons may be sought, as elsewhere, either (1) in its being good for the spiritual life of the men themselves that they should show forth their praise of God, not with their lips but in their lives; (2) in the shrinking from mere notoriety, from the gaze of crowds drawn together to gaze on signs and wonders, and ready to make the Wonder-Worker a king because He wrought them, which St. Matthew, at a later stage, notes as characteristic of our Lord's ministry (xii. 16-21).

(31) They...spread abroad his fame.—As in other cases, so in this, the command was not obeyed. The question has been raised, whether zeal which thus showed itself was or was not praiseworthy; and, curiously enough, has been answered by most patristic and Roman Catholic commentators in the affirmative, some even maintaining that the command was not meant seriously; and by most Protestant commentators in the negative. There can be no doubt that the latter take that which is ethnically the truer view. "To obey is better than sacrifice," better even than unrestrained emotion, better certainly than garrulous excitement.

(32) A dumb man possessed with a devil.—This narrative is also given by St. Matthew only. Referring to the Note in the Exegetical on viii. 28 for the general question as to "possession," it may be noted here that the phenomena presented in this case were those of catalepsy, or of insanity showing itself in obstinate and sullen silence. The dumbness was a spiritual disease, not the result of congenital malformation. The work of healing restored the man to sanity rather than removed a bodily imperfection. Comp. the analogous phenomena in Matt. xii. 22, Luke xi. 14. The latter agrees so closely with this that but for the fact of St. Matthew's connecting our Lord's answer to the accusation of the Pharisees with the second of these miracles, we might have supposed the two identical.

(33) The verse is obviously intended to stand in contrast with that which follows. The "multitudes" gave free expression to their natural wonder, which, though it did not actually amount to faith, was yet one step towards it. The Pharisees stood aloof, not denying the facts, but having their own solution of them.

(34) Through the prince of the devils.—In xii. 24—the charge reappears, with the addition of the name of "Beelzebub," as the prince of the devils; and, together with our Lord's answer to it, will be better discussed in the Notes on those verses. Here

it will be enough to note the coincidence with x. 25, which shows that the accusation had been brought before the mission of the Twelve, related in the following chapter.

(35) And Jesus went about.—The verse is all but identical with iv. 23, and may be described as recording our Lord's second mission - circuit in Galilee, in which He was accompanied probably by His disciples, whom, however, He had not as yet invested with a delegated authority as His "apostles" or representatives. It is manifestly the beginning of the section which contains the great discourse of chap. x., and was intended to lead up to it.

Every sickness and every disease—i.e., every variety or type, rather than every individual case. The work of healing was, we must believe, dependent, as before, on the faith of those who came seeking to be healed. The "many" is used as a test term, the former is in the Greek stronger, and, though the relative significance of the English words is not sharply defined, it would, perhaps, be better to invert the renderings.

(36) He was moved with compassion.—The words that follow are so vivid and emphatic that we may well believe them to have had their starting-point in our Lord's own expression of His feelings. We find Him using the identical words in xv. 32, and Matthew v. 3, meaning literally "flayed," and thence figuratively "tormented, worried, vexed." They were not merely as sheep that have grown weary and faint, hungry, looking up and yet not fed, but were as those that have been harassed by the wolf—the prey of thieves and robbers. (Comp. John x. 8-12.)

(37) Then saith he unto his disciples.—Nowhere in the whole Gospel record is there a more vivid or more touching instance of the reality of our Lord's human emotions. It is not enough for Him to feel compassion Himself. He craves the sympathy of His companions and disciples, and needs even their fellowship in prayer. A great want lies before Him, and He sees that they are the right agents to meet it, if only they will pray to be made so; or, to put the case more clearly, if only they will pray that the work may be done, whether they themselves are or are not the doers of it.

The harvest truly is plenteous.—This is the first occurrence in the record of the first three Gospels of the figure which was afterwards to be expanded in the two parables of the Sower and the Tares, and to
The Labourers and the Harvest. ST. MATTHEW, X. The Mission of the Twelve

labourers are few; (38) pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that he will send forth labourers into his harvest.

CHAPTER X.—(1) And when he had called unto him his twelve disciples, a he gave them power against unclean spirits, to cast them out, and to heal all manner of sickness and all manner of disease.

(2) Now the names of the twelve apostles are these: The first, Simon, who is called Peter, and Andrew his brother;

joined with the other three as called to listen to the great prophetic discourse on the Mount of Olives (Mark xiii. 3). All the four appear to have come from Bethsaida, on the western shore of the Sea of Galilee.

(4.) The name of Philip is always first in the second group, and he, too, came from Bethsaida. Next, in the three Gospel lists, comes that of Bartholomew. The name, like Barjona and Bartholomew, was obviously a patronymic, and it was at least probable that he had some other name. The absence of any mention of Bartholomew in St. John's Gospel, or of Nathansel (John i. 45) in the other three, has led most modern commentators to the conclusion that they were two names for the same person; and the juxtaposition of the two names in their lists agrees with the fact that it was Philip who brought him to know Jesus as the Christ (John i. 45). On this assumption, Bartholomew was of Cana, the son of Laodamas, brother of Philip (John xxi. 2). The name of Matthew stands before that of Thomas in Mark and Luke; after it in the Gospel which bears his own name. On the change of name from Levi, and his description as the son of Alpheaus, see Notes on ix. 9. As the name of Thomas, or Didymus, means "twin," there seems some ground for believing, from the way in which the two names are grouped together, that here too we have another pair of brothers called to the service of their Master. Eusebius (H. E. i. 13), in his account of the conversion of Abgarus of Edessa, speaks of this Apostle as "Judas who is also Thomas," and this suggests the reason why the cognomen of "the Twin" prevailed over the name which was already borne by two out of the company of the Twelve.

(5.) The third group always begins with "James the son of Alpheaus;" and this description suggests some interesting inferences:—(1) That he too was a brother of Matthew (there are no grounds for assuming two persons of the name of Alpheaus), and probably, therefore, of Thomas also. (2.) That if the Clopas (not Cleopas) of John xix. 25, was, as is generally believed, only the less Graecised form of the name Alpheaus, then his mother Mary may have been the sister of Mary the mother of the Lord (see Notes on John xix. 25). (3) This Mary, in her turn, is identified, on comparing John xix. 25 with Mark xv. 40, with the mother of James the Less (literally, the Little) and of Joses. The term probably pointed, not to subordinate position, but, as in the case of Zacchaeus, to short stature, and appears to have been an epithet (Luke xix. 3) distinguishing him from the James of the first list. The Greek form in both cases was Καθομα—Jacob of the Old Testament—which has passed, like Joannes, through many changes, till it appears in its present clipped and curtailed shape. (4.) On the assumption that the James and Joses of Mark xv. 40 are two of the "brethren of the Lord" of Matt. xiii. 55, this James might, perhaps, be identified with the James "the brother of the Lord" of Gal. i. 19 and Acts xv. 13, the writer of the Epistle. The balance of evidence is, however, decidedly against this view. (Comp. Note on Matt. xiii. 55.) The next name appears in three different forms:
James the son of Zebedee, and John his brother; (3) Philip, and Bartholomew; Thomas, and Matthew the publican; James the son of Alphaeus, and Lebbeus, whose surname was Thaddseus; (4) Simon the Canaanite, and Judas Iscariot, who also betrayed him. (6) These twelve Jesus sent forth, and commanded them, saying, Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not: (7) but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. (7) And as ye go, preach, saying, The kingdom of heaven is at hand. (8) Heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, cast out devils: freely ye have received, freely give. (9) Provide neither gold, nor silver, nor brass in your ...
but if it be not worthy, let your peace return to you. (14) And whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear your words, when ye depart out of that house or city, shake off the dust of your feet. (15) Verily I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrha in the day of judgment, than for that city.

In your purses.—Literally, in your girdles—the twisted folds of which were, and are, habitually used in the East instead of the “purse” of the West.

(10) *Scrip.*—The practical obscurantism of the word in modern English makes it necessary to remind readers of the New Testament that the “scrip” or wallet was a small basket carried on the back, or by a strap hanging from one shoulder, containing the food of the traveller. So David carried in his scrip the smooth stones from the brook (1 Sam. xvii. 40). Such a basket was looked on as the necessary equipment even of the poorest traveller, yet the apostles went to without it. St. Mark adds, what was implied in this, “no bread.”

Neither two coats.—Commonly, the poorer Eastern traveller carried with him the flowing plaid-like outer garment (the modern *abba*), with one “coat” or tunic next the skin, and one clean one as a change. That simplest of all the comforts of life they were in this work of theirs to dispense with.

Neither shoes, nor yet staves.—The apparent contradiction between these words and St. Mark’s “nothing except a staff only,” “be shod with sandals,” is explained by what has been said above. They were to have none of the reserved comforts of common travellers, no second staff in case the first should break, no second pair of shoes in which to rest the worn and weary feet. The “sandals” were the shoes of the peasant class.

Experience (and, we may add, the Spirit that teaches by experience) has led the Christian Church at large to look on these commands as binding only during the mission on which the Twelve were actually sent. It is impossible not to admire the noble enthusiasm of poverty which showed itself in the literal adoption of such rules by the followers of Francis of Assisi, and, to some extent, by those of Wiclif; but the history of the Mendicant Orders, and other like fraternities, forms part of that teaching of history which has led men to feel that in the long-run the beggar’s life will bring of a heathen land brought defilement with it, added to the tendency to go from one house to another according to the advantages which were offered to the guest.

(12) *When ye come into an house.*—The English indefinite article is misleading. We must read “into the house,” i.e., the dwelling of the man who had been reported as worthy. The salutation, as the words that follow imply, was the familiar, “Peace be with thee—Peace be to this house” (Luke x. 5).

(13) If the house be worthy.—The doubt implied in the “if” seems at first somewhat inconsistent with the supposition that they only went into the house after having ascertained the worthiness of the occupant. It must be remembered, however, that the missionaries entered each city or village as strangers, and that in such a case even the most careful inquiry might not always be successful.

Let your peace come upon it—i.e., the peace implied in the formula of salutation. The imperative is not so much a command addressed to them as the proclamation of an edict from the King in whose name they went. Their greeting was not to be a mere ceremonious form. It would be as a real prayer wherever the conditions of peace were fulfilled on the other side. At the worst, the prayer for peace would bring a blessing on him who prayed.

(14) * Shake off the dust of your feet.*—The act was a familiar symbol of the sense of indignation, as in the case of St. Paul (Acts xiii. 51) at Antioch in Pisidia. The Jewish maxim, that even the very dust of a heathen land brought defilement with it, added to its significance. It was a protest in act, declaring (as our Lord declares in words) that the city or house which did not receive the messengers of the Christ was below the level even of the Gentiles.

For the land of Sodom and Gomorrha.—The thought implied in the previous verse is now expressly asserted. The cities that stood out, in the history of the world, as most conspicuous for their infamy, were yet less guilty (as sinning less against light and knowledge) than those who rejected the messengers of the King. The same comparison reappears with the addition of Tyre and Sidon in Matt. xi. 21.

In the day of judgment.—The phrase, like the Old Testament “day of the Lord,” is wider in its range than the thoughts we commonly connect with it, and includes the earlier and more earthly judgments, as well as that which is the great consummation of them all.
Behold, I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves: be ye therefore wise as serpents, and harmless as doves. But beware of men: for they will deliver you up to the authorities, and they will scourge you in their synagogues; and ye shall be brought before governors and kings for my sake, for a testimony against them and the Gentiles. But when they deliver you up, take no thought how or what ye shall speak: for it shall be given you in that same hour what ye shall speak. (19) Ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake: but he that endureth to the end shall be saved. (16) I send you forth.—The nominative pronoun is emphatic, “It is I who send,” and that not so much as an assurance of protection, but, as the words that follow show, as reminding them of their responsibility as His delegates. As sheep in the midst of wolves.—Nothing can be more striking than the union of this clear foresight of conflict and suffering with the full assurance of victory and sovereignty. The position of the disciples would be as sheep surrounded by a flock of hungry and raging wolves, the wolf being here, as elsewhere in the New Testament, the symbol of the persecutor. Wise as serpents.—The idea of the serpent as symbolising wisdom, seems to have entered into the early parables of most Eastern nations. We find it in Egyptian temples, in the twined serpents of the Rod of Asclepius and of Hermes, in the serpent-worship of the Turanian races, in the history in Gen. iii. of the serpent that was “more subtle than any beast of the field.” For the most part it appears in Scripture as representing an evil wisdom to be fought with and overcome. Here we learn that even the serpent’s sinuous craft presents something which we may well learn to reproduce. When St. Paul “caught men with guile” (2 Cor. xii. 16), becoming “all things to all men” (1 Cor. ix. 22), he was acting in the spirit of his Master’s counsels. Harmless as doves.—Better, simple, sincere—i.e., “guileless.” The Greek indicates more than simple harmlessness—a character in which there is no alloy of baser motives. Once again truth appears in the form of paradox. The disciples are to be at once supremely guileful and absolutely guileless. Our Lord’s reference to this symbolon gains a fresh significance when we remember that He had seen the heavens opened, and the Spirit of God descending “like a dove” upon Himself (Matt. iii. 16). In and by that Spirit the two qualities that seem so contradictory are reconciled. (17) To the councils.—The plural shows that our Lord referred, not to the Great Council or Sanhedrin at Jerusalem, but to the lesser councils connected with provincial synagogues that had power to judge and punish persons accused of offences against religion. They will scourge you in their synagogues.—The words imply the actual infliction of the punishment within the walls of the building. To us this appears something like desecration, but there is no reason for thinking that it did so to the Jews, and St. Paul’s language in Acts xxii. 19, xxvi. 11, seems to place the fact beyond the shadow of a doubt. The sera in the Apostolic preachings in 2 Cor. xi. 24, were probably thus and there inflicted. (18) Ye shall be brought before governors and kings.—The words are significant as looking forward (if we assume the unity of the discourse) to that future work among the Gentiles upon which the Twelve were told that they were not as yet to enter. “Rulers” stands always in the New Testament for the governors (proconsuls, procurators, and others) of the Roman Empire. “Kings” at least includes, even if it does not primarily indicate, the emperors themselves. Against them.—Rather, unto them. The word is simply the dative of the person to whom we address our testimony, not involving necessarily any hostile or even reproving purpose. (19) Take no thought.—In the same sense as in Matt. vi. 25, “Do not at that moment be over-anxious.” The words indicate an almost tender sympathy with the feelings of Galilean disciples, “unlearned and ignorant men,” standing before those who were counted so much their superiors in power and knowledge. The words that follow contain a two-fold promise: not only what they should say, but how, in what form and phrase, to say it, should be given them in that hour. The courage of Peter and John before the Sanhedrin is at once the earliest and the most striking instance of the fulfilment of the promise (Acts iv. 13). (20) It is not ye that speak.—The words are strong. Human thoughts and purposes seem as if utterly suppressed, and the inspiring agency alone is recognised. It would be obviously beside the drift of our Lord’s discourse to make this promise of special aid in moments of special danger the groundwork of a theory of inspiration as affecting the written records of the work of the disciples. The brother.—The nouns are in the Greek without the article, “brother shall deliver up brother,” and are thus, perhaps, more forcible as statements of what should happen often. Our English idiom, however, allows the use of the article with nearly the same meaning. The words reproduce almost verbally the prophecy of Mic. vii. 6, and are there followed by the prophet’s expression of his faith, “Therefore I will look unto the Lord; I will wait for the God of my salvation,” answering to the “endurance” of which our Lord speaks in the next verse. (21) Hated of all men for my name’s sake.—Here, as before, the words sketch out the history of the persecution with a precision which marks and attests the divine foreknowledge. From the days of Stephen to that of the last martyr under Diocletian it was always as a Christian and for the name of Christ that men thus suffered. Would they but renounce that, all would have gone smoothly with them. As Tertullian said of the sufferers of his day, “We are tortured when we confess our guilt, we are set free if we deny it, for the battle is about a Name” (Apol. c. 2). (Comp. 1 Pet. iv. 16.) He that endureth to the end—i.e., endures, as
But when they persecute you in this city, flee ye into another: verily I say unto you, Ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come. The disciple is not above his master, nor the servant above his lord. It is enough for the disciple that he be as his master, and the servant as his lord. If they have called the master of the house Beelzebub, how much more shall they call them of his household? Fear them not therefore: for there is nothing covered, that shall not be revealed; and hid, that shall not be known. What I tell you in darkness, that speak ye in light:

the context shows, in the confession of the name of Christ as long as the trial lasts, or to the end of his own life. Such a one should receive "salvation" in its highest sense, the full participation in the blessedness of the kingdom of the Christ.

When they persecute you. The counsel is noteworthy as suggesting at least one form of the wisdom of the serpent. Men were not to imagine that they were "enduring to the end" when, in the eagerness of their zeal, they coursed martydrom; but were rather to avoid danger instead of courting it, and to utilise all opportunities for the continuance of their work. The effect of the command thus given may be traced in all the great persecutions under the Roman Empire, both Jewish and Cyprian furnishing, perhaps, the most conspicuous examples.

Till the Son of man be come.—The thought of another Coming than that of the days of His humiliation and of His work as a Prophet and a Healer, which had been implied before (Matt. vii. 21-23), is now explicitly unfolded. The Son of Man should come, as Daniel had seen Him come (Dan. vii. 13), in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory, to complete the triumph of His Kingdom. It is more difficult to understand the connection of the words with the preceding limit of time, "Ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel." The natural result of such a promise was to lead the disciples to look forward to that coming as certain to be within the range of their own lifetime, and was the ground of the general expectation of its nearness which, beyond all doubt, pervaded the minds of the Apostles. Explanations have been given which point to the destruction of Jerusalem as being so far "a day of the Lord" as to justify its being taken as a type of the final Advent, and they receive at least a certain measure of support from the way in which the two events are brought into close connection in the great prophetic discourse of chap. xxiv., Mark xiii., Luke xxi. But the question meets us, and cannot be evaded. Were the two events thus brought together with a knowledge of the long interval by which they were in fact to be divided from each other, and if so, why was that knowledge kept from the disciples? Some reasons for that reticence lie on the surface. That sudden widening of the horizon of their vision would have been one of the things which they were not able to bear (John xvi. 12). In this, as in all else, their training as individual men was necessarily gradual, and the education of the Church which they founded be carried on, like that of mankind at large, through a long succession of centuries. The whole question will call for a fuller discussion in the Notes on chap. xxiv. In the meantime it will be enough humbly to express my own personal conviction that what seems the boldest solution is also the truest and most reverential. The human thoughts of the Son of Man may not have travelled in this matter to the farthest bound of the mysterious horizon. He Himself told them of that day and that hour, that its time was known neither to the angels of heaven, nor even to the Son, but to the Father only (Mark xiii. 32).

The disciple is not above his master.—The proverb was probably a common one, and is used by our Lord (as in Luke vi. 40; John xiii. 16; xv. 20) with more than one application. Here the thought is, "Be not amazed or cast down at these prophecies of evil days; in all your sufferings you will but be following in My footsteps; what they have said and done with Me, they will say and do with you also."

It is enough.—Here also we note a tone of grave and tender sympathy, not without the gentle play of feeling which the words seem to betoken. To be as their Master in anything, even in shame and suffering, might well be enough for any scholar.

Beelzebub.—The Greek gives the form Beel-zebul. Its history illustrates some interesting phases of Jewish thought. (1.) It appears in the form Baal-zebub, the "Lord of flies" (probably as sending or averting the swarms of flies or locusts that are one of the plagues of the East), as the name of a god worshipped by the Philistines at Ekron, and consulted as an oracle (2 Kings i. 2) in cases of disease. (2.) Later Jews, identifying all heathen deities with evil spirits, saw in the god of their nearest and most hated neighbours the chief or prince of those "demons," and in their scorn transformed the name into Baal-szebel, which would mean "Lord of dung," or Baal-szel, "Lord of the dwelling"—i.e., of the house of the evil spirits who are the enemies of God. Our Lord's connection of the name with "the master of the house" seems to point to the latter meaning as that present to our Lord's thoughts. The reference is clearly made to the charge that had already been implied in Matt. ix. 34. We do not indeed find the name of Beel-zebub there, nor indeed do we meet with the direct application of that name to our Lord anywhere in the Gospel history; but there was obviously but a single step, easily taken, between the language they had actually used and that which is here reported of them.

Fear them not therefore: for the words that bid them banish fear look backward and forward. Why should they be afraid when they were only suffering what their Master Himself had suffered, and when they could look forward to the open publicity of His triumph? In that day the veil that now conceals the truth shall be drawn away; the unknown sufferers for the truth shall receive the crown of martyrdom; the undetected cowardice that shrinks from confessing the name of our Lord shall be rewarded. What I tell you in darkness.—The words point to our Lord's method of teaching, as well as to the fact of its being esoteric, and disclosed only to the chosen few, and to them only as they were "able to bear it" (John xvi. 12). Parables, and dark sayings, and whispered hints, and many-sided proverbs, were among the forms by which He led them on to truth. They, in their work as teachers, were not to shrink through any fear of man from giving publicity to what
The Fear of Man and of God.

ST. MATTHEW, X. Not Peace, but a Sword.

and what ye hear in the ear, that preach ye upon the housetops. (28) And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell. (29) Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? and one of them shall not fall on the ground without your Father. (30) But the very hairs of your head are all numbered. (31) Fear ye not therefore, ye are of more value than many sparrows. (32) Whosoever shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven. (33) But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven. (34) Think not that I came to send peace on earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword.

For I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law.

ever therefore shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven. (33) But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven. (34) Think not that I came to send peace on earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword. (35) For I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law.

they had thus learnt. To “proclaim on the housetops”—the flat roofs of which were often actually used by criers and heralds for their announcements—is, of course, a natural figure for the fullest boldness and freedom in their preaching.

(28) Are not able to kill the soul.—Here our Lord uses what we may call the popular dichotomy of man’s nature, and the word “souls” includes all that truly lives and thinks and wills in man, and is therefore equivalent to the “soul and spirit” of the more scientific trichotomy of St. Paul’s Epistles (1 Thess. v. 23).

Fear him which is able .—Few words have given rise to interpretations more strangely contrasted than these. Not a few of the most devout and thoughtful commentators, unwilling to admit that our Lord ever presented the Father to men in the character of a destroyer, have urged that the meaning may be thus paraphrased: “Fear not men, but fear the Spirit of Evil, the great Adversary, who, if you yield to his temptations, has power to lead you captive at his will, to destroy alike your outward and your inward life, either in the Gehenna of torture or in that of hatred and remorse.” Plausible as it seems, however, this interpretation is not, it is believed, the true one. (1) We nowhere taught in Scripture to fear the devil, but rather to resist and defy him (Eph. vi. 11; Jas. iv. 7); and (2) it is a sufficient answer to the feeling which has prompted the other explanation to say that we are not told to think of God as in any case willing to destroy, but only as having the power to inflict that destruction where all offers of mercy and all calls to righteousness have been rejected. In addition to this, it must be remembered that St. James uses language almost identical (“There is one Lawgiver, who is able to save and to destroy,” Jas. iv. 12) where there cannot be a shadow of doubt as to the meaning.

(29) Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing?—The coin mentioned here is not the same as the such.

The coin mentioned here is not the same as the such.

1 It is of no value half a denarius for a thing in the original text. The word denarius is thus translated in the ninth and tenth parts of the Roman penny. 2 Tim. ii. 22.

(30) The very hairs of your head.—The apparent hyperbole of the figure is but the natural expression of this final sovereignty, and (2) in extending the scope of the discourse beyond the apostles themselves to all who should receive their witness.

(31) Whosoever shall deny me.—As with all other eternal laws, the blessing on those who fulfil the conditions to which it is attached has its counterpart of woe on those who do not fulfil them. To deny Christ on earth by word or deed, to live as if His work were nothing to us, must lead to His denying us in the last great day.

(32) Shall confess me.—Literally, make his confession in and for me; and so in the corresponding clause. The promise points forward to the great day when the Son of Man shall be enthroned in His kingdom, and then before His Father and before the angels of God (Luke xii. 8) shall acknowledge His faithful servants. The words are remarkable (1) in their (calm assertion of this final sovereignty, and (2) in extending the scope of the discourse beyond the apostles themselves to all who should receive their witness.

(33) Whosoever shall deny me.—As with all other eternal laws, the blessing on those who fulfil the conditions to which it is attached has its counterpart of woe on those who do not fulfil them. To deny Christ on earth by word or deed, to live as if His work were nothing to us, must lead to His denying us in the last great day.

(34) Think not that I am come to send peace.—Truth appears again in the form of seeming paradox. Christ is “our peace” (Eph. ii. 14), and came to be the one great Peacemaker; and yet the foreseen consequences of His work involved strife and division, and such a consequence, freely accepted for the sake of the greater good that lies beyond it, involves, in fact, a purpose. The words are the natural expression of such a thought; and yet we can hardly fail to connect them with those which, in the earliest dawn of His infancy, revealed to the mother of the Christ that “a sword should pass through her own soul also” (Luke ii. 35).

The words are partly, as the marginal reference shows, an echo of Mic. vii. 6, but the selection of the special relationships as typical instances suggests the thought of some personal application. Had Zebedee looked with displeasure on the calling of his two sons? or was there variance between the daughter-in-law and the mother-in-law in the household of Peter? Were the brethren of the Lord, who as yet believed not, as the foes of a man’s own household?
ST. MATTHEW, XI.

The Cup of Cold Water.

XI.-And it came to pass, when Jesus had made an end of commanding his twelve disciples, he departed thence to teach and to preach in their cities. (2) Now when John had heard in the prison the works of Christ,

...
he sent two of his disciples, (3) and said unto him, Art thou he that should come, or do we look for another? (4) Jesus answered and said unto them, Go and shew John again those things which ye do hear and see: (5) the blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, and the poor have the gospel preached to them. (6) And blessed is he, whosoever shall not be offended in me.

(3) Art thou he that should come?—There are no adequate grounds for assuming, as some have done, that the Baptist sent the disciples only to remove their doubts. The question comes from him; the answer is sent to him. No difficulty in conceiving how the doubt which the question seems to imply could enter into the mind of the Baptist after the testimony which he had borne and that which he had heard, can warrant us in doing violence to what seems to be the plain meaning of the history. And the meaning of the question is not far to seek. The nicknames of deferred hope turns the full assurance of faith into something like despair. So of old Jerusalem had complained, in the bitterness of his spirit, that Jehovah had deceived him (Jer. xx. 7). So now the Baptist, as week after week passed without the appearance of the kingdom as he expected it to appear, felt as if the King was deserting the forerunner and herald of His kingdom. The very wonders of which he heard made the feeling more grievous, for they seemed to give proof of the power, and to leave him to the conclusion that the will was wanting. And so he sends his disciples with the question, which is one of impatience rather than doubt, “Art Thou the coming One of whom the prophets spoke” (Ps. xlv. 7; cxviii. 26; Mal. iii. 1)? but if so, why tarry the wheels of Thy chariot? Are we still to look for another and a different Christ?

(4) Go and shew John again.—There is no Greek adverb answering to the last word. St. Luke (vii. 21) adds that “in that same hour Jesus cured many of their infirmities and plagues, and of evil spirits,” and they were therefore to carry back their report as eye-witnesses.

(5) The blind receive their sight.—Apparently no facts were stated which might not have already come to the ears of the Baptist. At least one instance of each class of miracle has already been recorded by St. Matthew, the blind (ix. 27), the lame (ix. 6), the leper (viii. 2), the dead (ix. 25). The raising of the widow’s son at Nain, which in St. Luke follows closely upon the healing of the centurion’s servant, must also have preceded what is here narrated. What the Baptist needed was, not the knowledge of fresh facts, but a different way of looking at those he already knew. Where these works were done, there were tokens that the coming One had indeed come. But above all signs and wonders, there was another spiritual note of the kingdom, which our Lord reserves as the last and greatest: Poor men have the good news proclaimed to them. They are invited to the kingdom, and told of peace and pardon. It is as though our Lord knew that the Baptist, whose heart was with the poor, would feel that One who thus united power and tenderness could be none other than the expected King.

(6) Blessed is he.—The words at once confirm the view that the question which the messengers had brought came from the Baptist himself, and show how tenderly our Lord dealt with the impatience which it implied. A warning was needed, but it was given in the form of a beatitude which it was still open to him to claim and make his own. Not to find a stumbling-block in the answer is sent to him. No difficulty in conceiving how he might be led to think with undue harshness, perhaps even with contempt, of one who had so far failed in steadfastness. As if to meet that risk, Jesus turns, before the messengers were out of hearing, to bear His testimony to the work and character of John. But a little while before, almost as his last public utterance, the forerunner had borne his witness to the King (John iii. 33—36), and now He, in His turn, recognises to the full all the greatness of the work which that forerunner had accomplished.

(7) As they departed.—There was an obvious risk that those who heard the question of the Baptist, and our Lord’s answer, might be led to think with undue harshness, perhaps even with contempt, of one who had failed in steadfastness. As if to meet that risk, Jesus turns, before the messengers were out of hearing, to bear His testimony to the work and character of John. But a little while before, almost as his last public utterance, the forerunner had borne his witness to the King (John iii. 33—36), and now He, in His turn, recognises to the full all the greatness of the work which that forerunner had accomplished.

(8) A man clothed in soft raiment?—Had they seen, then, one who shared in the luxury, and courted the favour of princes? No, not so, again. They that wear soft clothing, or, as in St. Luke’s report, “they that are gorgeously appareled, and live delicately,” are in kings’ houses. The words had a more pointed reference than at first sight appears. Jewish historians (Jost, Gesch. d. Judenth.) record how in the early days of Herod the Great a section of the scribes had attached themselves to his policy and party, and in doing so had laid aside the sombre garments of their order, and had appeared in the gorgeous raiment worn by Herod’s other courtiers. The Herodians of the Gospel history were obviously the successors of these men in policy, and probably also in habits and demeanour; and the reference to “kings’ houses” admits of no other application than to the palace of Antipas. We may trace, with very little hesitation, a vindictive retaliation for these very words in the “gorgeous robe” with which Herod arrayed Him in mockery when the Tetrarch and the Christ stood for one brief hour face to face with each other (Luke x. 11).

(9) What went ye out for to see? A prophet?—The words again throw the hearers back upon the
Our Lord's Testimony to the Baptist. ST. MATTHEW, XI. The Children sitting in the Markets.

out for to see? A prophet? yea, I say unto you, and more than a prophet. (10) For this is he, of whom it is written, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee. (11) Verily I say unto you, Among them that are born of women there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist: notwithstanding he that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he. (12) And from the impressions made on them when they first saw and heard the Baptist. They then went out to see a prophet, and they were not disappointed. Nothing that they had seen or heard since was to lead them to think less worthy of him now. He was indeed a prophet, taught by the Spirit of Jehovah, predicting the glory of the kingdom; but he was also something more than this—a worker in the fulfilment of what he thus proclaimed.

(10) There hath not risen a greater.—The greatness of men is measured by a divine not a human standard. The prophet, who was more than a prophet, the herald or the forerunner of the kingdom, was greater in his work, his holiness, his intuition of the truth, than the far-off patriarchs, than David or Solomon, and, à fortiori, than the conquerors and the destroyers, such as Alexander, Pompey, Herod, on whom the world bestowed the title of "the great" ones.

(11) He that hath ears to hear.—The Greek gives the comparative, not the superlative—he whose relative position in the kingdom of heaven is less than that of John. Very many commentators have thought, strangely enough, that our Lord referred in these words to Himself. He in the eyes of men was esteemed less than the Baptist, and yet was really greater. But this is surely not the meaning of the words. (1) It would be but a poor truism to have declared that the King was greater than the herald; and (2) there is no example of our Lord’s so speaking which meets us here for the first time, is one which interpreters have cherished the belief that Elijah will appear in person before the second Advent of the Lord. The true meaning of the words of Malachi had, however, been suggested in the words of the angel in Luke i. 17, “He shall go before Him in the spirit and power of Elias;” and is here distinctly confirmed. The words “if ye will (i.e., be willing to) receive it” imply the consciousness that our Lord was setting aside a popular and strongly-fixed belief: “If you are willing and able to receive the truth that John was in very deed doing the work of Elijah, you need look for no other in the future.”

(12) This is Elias.—The words of Malachi (iv. 5) had led men to expect the reappearance of the great Tishbite in person as the immediate precursor of the Christ. It was the teaching of the scribes then (Matt. xvii. 10; John i. 21); it has lingered as a tradition rather than the legislative aspect of previous revelation. They did their work pointing to the kingdom of heaven in the far-off future of the latter days, but John saw it close at hand, and proclaimed its actual appearance.

The kingdom of heaven suffereth violence.—The Greek verb may be either in the middle voice, “forces its way violently,” or passive, as in the English version, but there is little doubt that the latter is the right rendering. The words describe the eager rush of the crowds of Galilee and Judaea, first to the preaching of the Baptist, and then to that of Jesus. It was, as it were, a city attacked on all sides by those who were eager to take possession of it.

The violent take it by force.—The Greek noun is without the article, “men who are violent or use force.” The meaning is determined by the preceding clause. The “violent are men of eager, impetuous zeal, who grasp the kingdom of heaven—i.e., its peace, and pardon, and blessedness—with as much eagerness as men would snatch and carry off as their own the spoil of a conquered city. Their new life is, in the prophet’s language, “given them as a prey” (Jer. xxi. 9; xlv. 5). There is no thought of hostile purpose in the words.

(13) All the prophets and the law.—The usual order is inverted, because stress is laid on the prophetic rather than the legislative aspect of previous revelation. They did their work pointing to the kingdom of heaven in the far-off future of the latter days, but John saw it close at hand, and proclaimed its actual appearance.

(14) He that hath ears to hear, let him close at hand, and proclaimed its actual appearance.
their fellows, (17) and saying, We have piped unto you, and ye have not danced; we have mourned unto you, and ye have not lamented. (18) For John came neither eating nor drinking, and they say, He hath a devil. (19) The Son of man came eating and drinking, and they say, Behold a man gluttonous, and a wine-bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners. But wisdom is justified of her children. (20) Then began he to upbraid the others to dance; they beat their breasts in lamentation, and expect others to weep. They complain if common to both Evangelists in Matt. x. and Luke x., but it does not in all with our Lord's language, which specifically identifies the children who invite the others (this rather than "their fellows") is the true reading with the "generation" which He condemns. The verses that follow, giving the language in which the same generation vented its anger and scorn against the two forms of holiness, agree better with the interpretation here adopted.

(19) He hath a devil.—The phrase was a common one, asserting at once the fact of insanity, and ascribing it to demoniacal possession as its cause. (Comp. John viii. 20; viii. 48.) This was the explanation which the scribes gave of John's austerities. The locusts and wild honey were to them the diet of a madman.

(20) Eating and drinking.—i.e., as in the feast in Matthew's house, or at the marriage-feast of Cana, sharing in the common life of the people. The words point almost specifically to the two instances just named, and the very form and phrase recall the question which The Pharisees had asked of the disciples, "Why do ye eat and drink with publicans and sinners?" (Luke v. 30.)

Wisdom is justified of her children.—Literally, was justified. This is our Lord's answer for Himself and the Baptist to the contradictory calumnies of the Jews. Men might accuse wisdom, true heavenly wisdom, on this ground or that, but she would be, or rather (the tense implying a generalised fact) is evermore, justified, acknowledged as righteous, alike in her severer or more joyous forms, by all who are indeed her children, i.e., by all who seek and love her as the mother of their peace and joy. Like so many other laws of the Bible, this passage was applicable at any and every time to any and every people. The evil world rejects all who seek to overcome its evil, some on one pretext, some on another; but true seekers after wisdom will welcome holiness in whatever form it may appear, cheerful or ascetic, Protestant or Romish, Puritan or liberal, so long as it is real and true.

Then began he to upbraid.—The rebuke is inserted by St. Luke in our Lord's charge to the Seventy (x. 13—15). As in the case of the passages common to both Evangelists in Matt. x. and Luke x., we need not assume that the former has compiled a discourse from fragments collected separately. It is far more natural and probable to believe that our Lord in this case, as in others, used at different times the same, or nearly the same, forms of speech.

(21) Woe unto thee, Chorazin! woe unto thee, Bethsaida!—It is singular enough that no miracles are recorded in the Gospels as wrought at either of these cities. The latter was indeed nigh unto the scene of the feeding of the five thousand, but that comes later on in the Gospel narrative. The former is only known to us through this passage and the parallel words of Luke x. 12—16. We may at least infer from the absence of any such record the genuineness of the words reported and the truthful aim of the Evangelists. The words were not an after-thought dovetailed into the narrative. The narrative was not expanded or modified in order to explain the words. In St. Luke the "woes" are connected with the mission of the Seventy. They may well have been uttered, as has been said above, more than once.

The position of Chorazin is described by Jerome as being on the shore of the lake, about two miles from Capernaum. The Bethsaida here spoken of was probably that on the western shore of the Sea of Galilee. The name in Aramaic signifies "House of Fish;" and it was therefore, we may believe, on the shore, and not far from the two cities with which it is here grouped.

Tyre and Sidon.—The two cities are chosen as being, next to Sodom and Gomorrah (chap. x. 15, and verse 24), the great representative instances of the evil of the heathen world, and of the utter overthrow to which that evil was destined (Ezek. xxvii., xxviii.). Over and above their immediate import the words are full of meaning as throwing light on the ultimate law of God's dealings with the heathen world. Men are judged not only according to what they have done, but according to what they might or would have done under other circumstances and conditions of life. In other words, they are judged according to their opportunities. The whole teaching of St. Paul in Rom. ii., all the wider hopes of later times as to the future of mankind,are but the development of the truth partly declared and partly suggested here.

(22) And thou, Capernaum.—This city had already witnessed more of our Lord's recorded wonders than any other. That of the nobleman's son (John iv. 46—54), of the demoniac (Mark i. 21—28), the man sick of the palsy (Matt. ix. 1—8), of Peter's wife's mother and the many works that followed (Matt. viii. 1—14), of the woman with the issue of blood, and of Jairus's daughter (Matt. xii. 21—28), of the centurion's
exalted unto heaven, shalt be brought down to hell: for if the mighty works, which have been done in thee, had been done in Sodom, it would have remained until this day. (24) But I say unto you, That it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment, than for thee.

(25) At that time Jesus answered and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes. (26) Even so, Father: for so it seemed good in thy sight. (27) All things are delivered unto me of my Father; and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, but the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him.

(28) Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you (ST. MATTHEW, XI. Thanking of the Son of Man.

The Guilt of Capernaum.

servant (Matt. viii. 5—13), had all been wrought there, besides the unrecorded "signs" implied in Luke iv. 23. In this sense, and not in any outward prosperity, had Capernaum been "exalted unto heaven." All this, however, had been in vain, and therefore the sentence was passed on it that it should be "brought down to hell," i.e., to Hades, the grave, not Gehenna. The words point, as the next verse shows, to the ultimate abasement of the guilty city in the day of judgment, but the words have had an almost literal fulfilment. A few ruins conjecturally identified mark the site of noteworthy that in this exceptional instance we find, besides the

Chorazin and Bethsaida. In the record of St. Matthew and St. Luke, turns of thought and (Mark vi. 30; Luke ix. 10). Their presence, it may be above the reach of the other reporters of his Master's teaching.

(25) Answered and said.—The phrase is more or less a Hebraism, implying that the words rose out of some unrecorded occasion. St. Luke connects them (x. 17—24) with the return of the Seventy; but as their mission is not recorded by St. Matthew, it seems reasonable to connect them, as here recorded, with the return of the Twelve, and their report of their work (Mark vi. 30; Luke ix. 10). Their presence, it may be noted, is implied in the narrative with which the next chapter opens. The words, however, were probably repeated as analogous occasions called for them.

I thank thee.—Literally, I confess unto Thee.—i.e., "acknowledge with praise and thanksgiving." The abruptness with which the words come in points to the fragmentary character of the record which St. Matthew incorporates with his Gospel. The context in St. Luke implies a reference to the truths of the formal denial of the Sonship of the Lord by the Pharisees, wise in their conceit, seeking men's praise the ineffable mystery of His being and His work but the

sincerity of the knowledge that requires above all things of God but He whose relation to Him had been from eternity one of Sonship. To those only who knew God in Christ was the Fatherhood of which Jews and Gentiles had had partial glimpses revealed in all its completeness.

To whomsoever the Son will reveal him.—The Greek implies full and complete knowledge, and in that sense it was true that no one knew the Son as such in all the ineffable mystery of His being and His work but the Father; that no one fully entered into the Fatherhood of God but He whose relation to Him had been from eternity one of Sonship. To those only who knew God in Christ was the Fatherhood of which Jews and Gentiles had had partial glimpses revealed in all its completeness.

The Guilt of Capernaum.

The Guilt of Capernaum.

The Guilt of Capernaum.

The Guilt of Capernaum.

The Guilt of Capernaum.
CHAPTER XII.—(1) At that time Jesus went on the sabbath day through the corn; and his disciples were an hecho, and began to pluck the ears of corn, and to eat. (2) But when the Pharisees saw it, they said unto him, Behold, thy disciples do that which is not lawful to do upon the sabbath day. (3) But he said unto them, Have ye not read what David did, (4) when he was an hungry, and they that were with him; (5) how he entered into the house of God, and did eat the shewbread, which was not lawful for him to eat, neither for them which were with him, but only for the priests? (6) Or have ye not read in the law, how that on the sabbath days the priests in the temple profane the sabbath, and are blameless? (7) But I say unto you, That in this permitted by the Law as far as the rights of property were concerned (Deut. xxiii. 25), but it was against the Pharisees’ interpretation of the law of the Sabbath. To pluck the ears was to reap, to rub the husks from the grain, and to thresh; and the new Teacher was therefore, they thought, tacitly sanctioning a distinct breach of the holiness of the day of rest.

(5) When the Pharisees saw it,—In the position in which the narrative stands in the other two Gospels, the Pharisees would appear as belonging to the company that had come down from Jerusalem to watch and accuse the new Teacher (Luke v. 17). He claimed the power to forgive sins, He ate and drank with publicans and sinners. Now they found that He was teaching men to dishonour the Sabbath, as He had already taught them in Jerusalem (John v. 10, 16).

(3) Have ye not read . . . ?—The question was an appeal to the Pharisees on the ground where they thought themselves strongest. For them it was an argument à fortiori. Would they accuse David of sacrilege and Sabbath-breaking because he, in a case of urgent need, set at nought the two-fold law of ordinances? If they shrank from that, was it not inconsistent to condemn the disciples of Jesus for a far lighter transgression?

(4) How he entered into the house of God.—Strictly speaking, it was in the tabernacle at Nob, where Ahimelech (possibly assisted by Ahiah, Mark ii. 26) was ministering as high priest (1 Sam. xxi. 6). The shewbread, or ‘bread of oblation,’ consisted of twelve loaves, in two rows of six each, which were offered every Sabbath day (Ex. xxv. 30; xl. 23; Lev. xxiv. 5–9), the loaves of the previous week being then removed and reserved for the exclusive use of the priests. The necessity of the case, however, was in this instance allowed to override the ceremonial ordinance, and our Lord teaches men through that single instance to see the general principle that when positive commands and necessities involving the good of man come into collision, the latter, not the former, must prevail.

(5) The priests in the temple profane the sabbath.—The work of the priests, as described, e.g., in Num. xxviii. 9, viz., slaying victims, placing the shewbread, involved an amount of labour which, in work of any other kind, would have broken the Sabbath rest; yet no one blamed the priests, for they were serving in the Temple of Jehovah.

(6) In this place is one greater than the temple.—Better, Here is something greater than the Temple. The Greek adjective is neuter in the better MSS. and the word “here” we may think of as accompanied (like the “destroy this temple” of John ii. 19) by a gesture which interpreted the words. The passage

The Easy Yoke of Christ.
**The Lord of the Sabbath.**

**ST. MATTHEW, XII. The Man with a Withered Hand.**

place is one greater than the temple. (7) But if ye had known what this meaneth, I will have mercy, and not sacrifice, ye would not have condemned the guiltless. (8) For the Son of man is Lord even of the sabbath day. (9) And when he was departed thence, he went into their synagogue: (10) And, behold, there was a man which had his hand withered. And they asked him, saying, Is it lawful to heal on the sabbath days? that they might accuse him. (11) And he said unto them, What man shall there be among you, that shall have one sheep, and if it fall into a pit on the sabbath day, will he not lay hold on it, and lift it out? (12) How much then is a man better than a sheep? Wherefore it is lawful to do well on the sabbath days. (13) Then saith he to the man, Stretch forth thine hand. And he stretched it forth; and it was restored whole, like as the other. (14) Then the Pharisees went out, and held a council against him, how they thus referred to furnishes obviously the true explanation of our Lord's assertion of His greatness here, and spoken, as it probably was, to scribes from Jerusalem, may have been intended to remind them of it. The body of the Son of Man was the truest, highest temple of God, and the disciples who ministered to Him were entitled to at least the same privilege as the priests in the Temple at Jerusalem. The range of the words is, however, wider than this their first and highest application. We are taught to think of the bodies of other sons of men as being also, in their measure, temples of God (1 Cor. vi. 19), and so there follows the conclusion that all works of love done for the bodies or the souls of men as little interfere with the holiness of a day of rest as did the ministrations of the priests as they laboured to weariness in the ritual of the Temple. Inasmuch as the disciples were not at the time engaged in any direct service to their Master, but were simply satisfying the cravings of their own hunger, their act, strictly speaking, came under the general rather than the special application of the words. Man, as such, to those who take a true measure of his worth, is greater than any material temple.

(7) **I will have mercy, and not sacrifice.**—Yet a third argument follows from the Old Testament (Hos. vi. 6). The teachers or interpreters of the Law had failed to catch the meaning of the simplest utterances of the prophets. "Mercy and not sacrifice," moral and not positive duties, these made up the true life of religion, and were alone acceptable to God. It was because they had inverted the right relation of the two that they had, in this instance, condemned those whom our Lord now declares to have been in this respect absolutely guiltless.

(9) **For the Son of man.**—The words contain the ground for the authoritative judgment of the previous verse. They assert that this also came within the limits of His jurisdiction as the Messiah, just as the power to forgive sins had been claimed by Him under the same title. In both instances, however, the choice of the title is significant. What is done is done by Him as the representative of humanity, acting, as it were, in its name, and claiming for it as such what He thus seems at first to claim for Himself as a special and absolute prerogative.

(10) **There was a man which had his hand withered.**—Two facts are implied: (1) That the Pharisees expected our Lord to heal the man thus afflicted. They knew that commonly the more sign of suffering of this kind called out His sympathy, and that the sympathy passed into act. (2) That they had resolved, if He did so heal, to make it the ground of a definite accusation before the local tribunal, the " judgment " of Matt. v. 21. The casuistry of the Rabbis allowed the healing art to be practised on the Sabbath in cases of life and death, but the " withered hand," a permanent infirmity, obviously did not come under that category. (11, 12) **Will he not lay hold on it?**—As the reasoning takes the form of an argumentum ad hominem, it is clear that the act was regarded as a lawful one, even by the more rigid scribes. The Talmud discusses the question, but does not decide it. Some casuists solved the problem by a compromise. The sheep was not to be pulled out of the pit till the Sabbath was over, but in the meantime it was lawful to supply it with fodder. In St. Mark and St. Luke the question is given in another form, and without the illustration, which we find in St. Luke, in another connection, in xiv. 5. Jesus bids the man with the withered hand stand up in the midst, and then puts the question, "Is it lawful to do good on the Sabbath day or to do evil, to save life or to destroy it?" The alternative thus presented as a dilemma was a practical answer to their casuistry. They would have said, "Leave the man as he is till the Sabbath is over;" and our Lord's answer is that in that case good would have been left undone, and that not to do good when it lies in our power is practically to do evil.

(13) **Then saith he to the man.**—St. Mark, with his usual vividness, adds the look and gesture and feeling which accompanied the words, "looking round about on them with anger, being grieved at the hardness of their hearts."

It was restored whole—i.e., as the tense implies, in the act of stretching the hand forth. The man's ready obedience to the command, which if he had not believed in the power of Jesus would have seemed an idle mockery, was, ipso facto, a proof that he had "faith to be healed."

(14) **Held a council against him.**—If, as seems probable, these Pharisees included those who had come from Jerusalem, the deliberation was of more importance in its bearing on our Lord's future work than if it had been a mere meeting of the local members of the party. It is significant that St. Mark adds (iii. 6) that they called the Herodians into their councils. These latter have not yet been mentioned in the Gospel history, but they had probably been irritated by the market
Our Lord's fulfilment

ST. MATTHEW, XII.

of Isaiah's Prophecy.

might destroy him. 13) But when Jesus knew it, he withdrew himself from thence: and great multitudes followed him, and he healed them all; 16) and charged them that they should not make him known; 17) that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, 18) Behold my servant, whom I have chosen; my beloved, in whom my soul is well pleased: I will put my spirit upon him, and he shall show judgment to the Gentiles. 19) He shall not strive, nor cry; neither shall any man hear his voice in the streets. 20) A bruised reed shall he not break, and smoking flax shall he not quench, till he send forth judgment unto victory. 21) And in his name shall the Gentiles trust.

19) Then was brought unto him one possessed with a devil, blind, and dumb: and he healed him, insomuch that the king, as teaching, no less than as executing, righteousness. As yet, of course, the work of preaching the gospel to the Gentiles had not begun, but St. Matthew notes, as it were, by anticipation, the spirit of love and gentleness which, when he wrote his Gospel, had brought them also within the range of the judgments—i.e., of the life-giving truths—of the righteous Judge. It is one of the many instances in which his record, though obviously written for Jews, is yet emphatically a Gospel for the Gentiles.

19) He shall not strive, nor cry.—The words point to the pervading calmness which had impressed itself upon the mind of the Evangelist, and which stood out in marked contrast to the wrangling of Jewish scribes, the violence of Roman officers, yet more, it may be, to that of false prophets and leaders of revolt, such as Judas of Galilee had been. St. Matthew had probably known something of each of those types of character, and felt how different that of the Christ was from all of them.

20) A bruised reed shall he not break.—The prophet's words described a character of extremest gentleness. The "bruised reed" is the type of one broken by the weight of sorrow, or care, or sin. Such a one men in general disregard or trample on. The Christ did not so act, but sought rather to bind up and strengthen. The "smoking flax" is the wick of the lamp which has ceased to burn clearly, and the clouded flame of which seems to call for prompt extinction. Here (as afterwards, in chap. xxv. 1—8) we read a parable of the souls in which the light that should shine before men has grown dim. Base desires have clogged it; it is no longer fed with the true oil. For such the self-righteous Pharisee had no pity; he simply gave thanks that his own lamp was burning. But the Christ in His tenderness sought, if it were possible, to trim the lamp and to pour in the oil till the flame was bright again. We cannot help feeling, as we read the words, that the publican-apostle had found their fulfilment in his own personal experience of the profound tenderness of His Master.

Till he send forth judgment unto victory.—In the Hebrew, unto truth. The citation was apparently from memory. What is implied in both readings is, that this tender compassion was to characterise the whole work of the Christ until the time of final judgment should arrive, and truth should at last prevail.

22) And in his name shall the Gentiles trust.—Better, shall hope. The Hebrew gives "in his law," but St. Matthew follows the LXX.

22) The narrative that follows is again a stumbling-block in the way of harmonists. St. Luke (xi. 14) places it after the feeding of the five thousand; St. Mark (iii. 22) immediately after the mission of the Twelve. A like narrative has met us in chap. ix. 32, and it is probable enough that the charge was repeated as often as
Casting out Devils by Beelzebub. ST. MATTHEW, XII.

Can Satan cast out Satan? Is not this the son of David? But when the Pharisees heard it, they said, This fellow doth not cast out devils, but by Beelzebub, the prince of the devils. And Jesus knew their thoughts, and said unto them, Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation; and every city or house divided against itself shall not stand; and if Satan cast out Satan, he is divided against himself; how shall then his kingdom stand? And if I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your children cast them out? therefore they shall be your judges. But if I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, then the kingdom of God is come unto you. Or else how can one enter into a strong man's house, and spoil his goods, except he first bind the strong man; and then he will spoil his house. He that is not with me is against me.

Notes on chap. ix. 34; x. 25.) The words appear to have really cast out demons, and that not by Beelzebub. But when the Pharisees heard it, they said, This fellow doth not cast out devils, but by Beelzebub, the prince of the devils. And Jesus knew their thoughts, and said unto them, Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation; and every city or house divided against itself shall not stand;

the occasion presented itself, and as often answered in identical or like words. St. Mark states that the Pharisees who brought it were those who had come down from Jerusalem, and this falls in with all that we have seen of the activity of those emissaries of the party.

Possessed with a devil, blind, and dumb.—In chap. ix. 32, the man was simply dumb; here the phenomena of the suspension of conscious sensation and volition is even more complicated.

Is not this the son of David?—The people use (as the blind man had done in Matt. ix. 27) the most popular of all the synonyms of the Christ.

Beelzebub the prince of the devils.—(See Notes on chap. ix. 34; x. 25.) The words appear to have been whispered by the Pharisees among the people. They were not addressed to Jesus. The charge is significant as showing that the Pharisees admitted the reality of the work of healing which they had witnessed, and were driven to explain it by assuming demoniacal agency.

Jesus knew their thoughts.—The Searcher of Hearts saw the meaning of the whispers and the looks of real or affected horror, and now enters on a full answer to the charge. Of all the accusations brought against Him this was the one that caused the greatest pain of soul for the most indignant answer. He had restored peace and joy, freedom of reason and will, to those who had lost them, had been doing His Father's work on earth, and He was accused of being in league with the powers of evil. The work of healing was represented as the bait of the Tempter luring men to enter on a work which was self-destructive. Reason, upon men unawares.

Every kingdom divided against itself.—The answer assumes, as the teaching of the New Testament does from first to last, the existence of a kingdom of evil, compact and organised, with a distinct unity of purpose. The laws which govern the life of other kingdoms are applicable to that also. Its head and ruler was not likely to enter on a work which was self-destructive. Reason, calmness, peace, these were not his gifts to men.

If Satan cast out Satan.—In the Greek the name has the article in both places, as pointing to the one great adversary. It is not that one Satan casts out another, but that he, on the assumption of the Pharisees, casts out himself. Satan is not personally identified with the demon, the deaf or dumb spirit, that had possessed the man, but the language implies that where evil enters into the soul, Satan enters also. (Comp. John xiii. 27.) There is, as it were, a seeming ubiquity, a solidarité, in the power of evil, as there is admittedly in the sovereign power of good.

By whom do your children cast them out?—The "children" of the Pharisees are their disciples, and in this case, such as practised exorcism, like the sons of Sceva in Acts xix. 13. The belief in demoniacal possession had as its natural accompaniment the claim on the part of those who could control the disordered reason of the possessed person of power to cast out the demon. We need not assume that such power was always a pretence, or rested only on spells and incantations. Earnestness, prayer, fasting, faith—these are always mighty in intensifying the power of will, before which the frenzied soul bows in submission or yields in confidence, and these may well have been found among the better and truer Pharisees.

Our Lord's question, indeed, requires for its logical validity the admission that the "children" of the accusers did really cast out demons, and that not by Beelzebub.

By the Spirit of God.—In Luke xi. 19 the word describes a coming suddenly, unlooked for, sooner than men expected. The argument may be briefly formulated thus:—The word was confessedly superhuman, either from the power of Satan or that of God, but the former hypothesis was excluded by the reasoning of verses 25—27; the latter was therefore the only explanation. But if so, if Jesus gave proof that He was thus filled with the power of the Spirit to heal and save, then He was what He claimed to be, the Head of the divine kingdom. That kingdom had burst upon men unawares.

How can one enter into a strong man's house?—The parable implied in the question appears in a fuller form in Luke xi. 21, 22. Here it will be enough to note that the "strong man" is Satan. The "house" is the region which is subject to him—i.e., either the world at large, or the spirits of individual men; the "goods" or "instruments" (comp. the "armour" of Luke xi. 22) are the demons or subordinate powers of evil by which he maintains his dominion; the "binding of the strong man" is the check given to the tyranny of Satan by emancipating the possessed sufferers from their thraldom; the "spoil" of the house implies the final victory over him.

He that is not with me is against me.—The words seem at first at variance with the answer to
Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost.

Neither in this world, neither in the world to come. (33) Either make the tree good, and its fruit good; or else make the tree corrupt, and its fruit corrupt:

For the tree is known by its fruits.

(34) O generation of vipers. How can ye. being evil, speak good things? for out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh.

(35) A good man out of the good treasure, brings forth good things: and an evil man out of the evil treasure brings forth evil things.
of the evil treasure bringeth forth evil things. (38) But I say unto you, That every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment. (37) For by thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned.

(38) Then certain of the scribes and of the Pharisees answered, saying, Master, we would see a sign from thee. (39) But he answered and said unto them, An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given to it, but the sign of the prophet Jonas: (40) for as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale’s belly; so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth.

Justification by Words.

ST. MATTHEW, XII.

Sign of the Prophet Jonas.

(a) every idle word that men shall speak.—The teaching, though general in form, still looks back to the hard, bitter words of the Pharisees which had been the starting-point of the discourse. Our Lord does not speak, as we might have expected, of “every evil word,” but of “every idle—i.e., useless and purposeless—word,” the random utterances which, as being more spontaneous, betray character more than deliberate speech. Such an “idle word” had been the passing taunt, “He casteth out devils by Beelzebub.” It is not said, however, that for every such random speech a man shall be condemned, but that he shall give an account. It will enter into that great total which determines the divine estimate of his character, and, therefore, the issues of the great “day of judgment.”

(b) by thy words thou shalt be justified.—Stripped of the after-thoughts which have gathered round it in the later controversies of theologians, the word “justified” means, as its position here shows, the opposite of “condemned,” the being “acquitted” either on a special charge or on a general trial of character. In this sense we are able to understand (without entering into the labyrinth of logomachies in which commentators on the Epistles have too often entangled themselves) how it is that men are said to be justified by faith (Rom. iii. 28 et al.), justified by works (Jas. ii. 24), justified—as here—by words. All three—faith, works, words—are alike elements of a man’s character, making or showing what he is. Faith, implying trust and therefore love, justifies as the root-element of character; “words,” as its most spontaneous manifestation; works, as its more permanent results. Of the words and the works men can in some measure judge, and they are the tests by which a man should judge himself. The faith which lies deeper in the life is known only to God, and it is therefore by faith rather than by works that a man is justified before God, though his faith is not tested unless it moulds the character and therefore enables the man to pass the other tests also.

Master, we would see a sign from thee.—The order varies slightly from that in St. Luke, in which the demand for a sign follows on the parable of the unmerciful servant returning to his house. In both, however, the sequence of thought appears the same. The tone of authority, as of one who is the judge of all men, leads to the challenge—“Give us a sign by which you may convince us that you have a right thus to speak.”

(c) An evil and adulterous generation.—The true relation between Israel and Jehovah had been represented by the prophets as that of the wife to her husband (Jer. iii.; Ezek. xvi., xxiii.; Hos. i., ii.). The adulterous generation was therefore one that was unfaithful to its Lord—demanding a sign, instead of finding sufficient proofs of faithfulness and love in what He had already done.

There shall no sign be given to it.—The words seem at first to place our Lord’s miracles of healing outside the category of signs, and yet it was to these that He referred the messengers of the Baptist as proof that the Christ had Indeed come (Matt. xi. 5). They must, however, be interpreted by the context. One sign and only one, such as they demanded, should be given to those for whom the other notes of Messiah-ship were insufficient, and that should be the sign of the prophet Jonas.

(d) As Jonas was three days and three nights.—To understand the words rightly, we have to remember the prominence which our Lord gives to the history of Jonah, and to the repentance of the men of Nineveh, in this and in the parallel passage of Luke xi. 29, and in answer to another demand for a sign in Matt. xvi. 4. In the other passages “the sign of the prophet Jonas” appears with a vague mysteriousness, unexplained. Not a few critics have accordingly inferred from this difference that the explanation given by St. Matthew was an addition to the words actually spoken by our Lord, and that “the sign of the prophet Jonas” was sufficiently fulfilled by His preaching repentance to the wicked and adulterous generation as Jonah had done to the Ninevites. Against this view, however, it may be urged:—(1) That Jonah’s work as a preacher was not a “sign” in any sense, and that nothing in his history had this character, except the two narratives of the whale (Jonah i. 17) and the gourd (Jonah iv. 6—10). Any reference to the latter is, of course, out of the question; and it remains therefore, in any case, that we must look to the former as that to which our Lord alluded. (2) That the very difficulty presented by the prediction of “three days and three nights” as compared with the six-and-thirty hours (two nights and one day) of the actual history of the Resurrection, is against the probability of the verse having been inserted as a prophecy after the event. (3) That if we believe that our Lord had a distinct provision of His resurrection, and foretold it, this was early and sometimes in dark sayings—and of this the Gospels leave no room for doubt (xvi. 21; xxvi. 32; John
earth. (41) The men of Nineveh shall rise in judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: because they repented at the preaching of Jonas; and, behold, a greater than Jonas is here. (42) The queen of the south shall rise up in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: for she came from the uttermost parts of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and, behold, a greater than Solomon is here. (43) When the unclean spirit is gone out of a man, he walketh through dry places, seeking rest, and findeth none. (44) Then he saith, I will return into my house from whence I came out; and when he is come, he findeth it empty, swept, and garnished. (45) Then goeth he, and taketh with himself seven other spirits more wicked than himself, and they enter in and dwell there: and the last state of that man is worse than the first. Even so shall it be also unto this wicked generation.

ii. 19)—then the history of Jonah presented an analogy which it was natural that He should notice. It does not necessarily follow that this use of the history as a prophetic symbol of the Resurrection requires us to accept it in the very letter of its details. It was enough, for the purposes of the illustration, that it was familiar and generally accepted. The purely chronological difficulty is explained by the common mode of speech among the Jews, according to which, any part of a day, though it were but a single hour, was for legal purposes considered as a whole. An instance of this mode of speech is found in 1 Sam. xxx. 12, 13, and it is possible that in the history of Jonah itself the measurement of time is to be taken with the same laxity.

Some incidental facts are worth noticing: (1) that the word translated “whale” may stand vaguely for any kind of sea-monster; (2) that the heart of the earth,” standing parallel as it does to “the heart of the seas,” the “belly of hell”—i.e., Sheol and Hades—in Jonah ii. 2, 3, means more than the rock-hewn sepulchre, and implies the descent into Hades, the world of the dead, which was popularly believed to be far below the surface of the earth; (3) that the parable has left its mark on Christian art, partly in the constant use of Jonah as a type of our Lord’s resurrection, and partly in that of the Jews of a great whale-like monster as the symbol of Hades; (4) that the special character of the psalm in Jonah ii., corresponding as it does so closely (Jonah ii. 6) with Ps. xvi. 10, 11, may well be thought to have prompted our Lord’s reference to it.

(41) The men of Nineveh shall rise. The reasoning is parallel with that of the references to Tyre and Sidon, Sodom and Gomorrah in xi. 21-24, but with this difference, that there the reference was to what might have been, here to what actually had been. The repentance of the heathen, and their search after wisdom, with far poorer opportunities, would put to shame the slowness and unbelief of Israel. The word “rise” is used not of the mere fact of resurrection but of standing up as witnesses. (Comp. John xvi. 8.)

A greater than Jonas. No chapter contains more marvellous assertions of our Lord’s superhuman majesty. Greater than the Temple (verse 6), greater than Jonas, greater than Solomon: could this be rightly claimed by any man for himself who was not more than man?

(42) The queen of the south. Literally, a queen of the south, as before, men of Nineveh, the Greek having no article. Rhetorically, the absence of the article is in this case more emphatic than its presence.

(43) When the unclean spirit is gone out of a man, the same spirit cometh in abruptly, possibly because he, as elsewhere, we have a part and not the whole of a discourse, striking passages noted and put together, now in this order, now in that, while the links that joined them are missing. The inner connection of thought is, however, clear enough. How was it, it might be asked, that Israel had sunk to such a depth of evil? and the answer was found in the similitude which thus opens. The phenomena which furnish the comparison were probably familiar enough. So far as possession was identical in its phenomena, wholly or in part, with insanity, there might be sudden and violent relapses after intervals of calmness and apparent cure. The spirit of the man, under the influence of exorcisms, or prayers, or the sympathy of friends, might assert its freedom for a time, and then yield again to the oppressor. In the history of such a demoniac, which our Lord narrates in the language of the popular belief, He sees a parable of the history of the Jewish people.

Walketh through dry places. The description reflects the popular idea that the parched deserts of Syria and Arabia and Egypt were haunted by demons, who thence came to invade the bodies and the souls of men. So in the book of Tobit (viii. 3), the demon Asmodeus flees to the upper parts of Egypt. (44) Empty, swept, and garnished. The words have a two-fold symbolism, as representing (1) the state of the possessed man; (2) that of the nation of which he is made the type. The latter belongs to the interpretation of the parable as a whole. The former portrays the state of the man who has been delivered from the wildness of frenzy, but has been left to the routine of common life and conventional morality, with no higher spiritual influence to protect and guard him.

(45) Seven other spirits more wicked than himself. The number seven, as in the case of Mary Magdalene (Mark xvi. 9; Luke viii. 2), represents a greater intensity of possession, showing itself in more violent paroxysms of frenzy, and with less hope of restoration.

In applying the parable to the religious life of the Jewish people, we have to ask, (1) What answers to the first possession and the expulsion of the evil spirit? (2) What to the seven other spirits joined with the first, and yet more evil? (3) What is the last state, yet future at the time our Lord spoke, which was to be worse than the first? The answer to the first question lies on the surface of their history. Their besetting sin from the time of the Exodus to that of the Captivity had been idolatry and apostasy. The worship of other gods exercised a strange and horrible fascination over them, deprived them, as it were, of light, reason, and true freedom of will. They were enslaved and possessed. Then came the return from the Exile, when, not so much by the teaching of
While he yet talked to the people, behold, his mother and his brethren stood without, desiring to speak with him.

Then one said unto him, Behold, thy mother and thy brethren stand without, desiring to speak with thee. But he answered and said unto him that told him, Who is my mother? and who are my brethren? And he stretched forth his hand toward his brethren, saying, Behold, my brethren, and my mother!...
toward his disciples, and said, Behold my mother and my brethren! (50) For whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother.

CHAPTER XIII.—(1) The same day went Jesus out of the house, and sat by the sea side. (2) And great multitudes were gathered together unto him, so that he went into a ship, and sat; and the whole multitude stood on the shore. (3) And he spake many things unto them in parables, saying, Behold, a sower went forth to sow; (4) and when he sowed, some seeds fell by the way side, and the fowls came and devoured them.

we all acknowledge, that though natural relationships involve duties which may not be neglected, spiritual relationships, the sense of brotherhood in a great cause, of devotion to the same Master, are above them, and that when the two clash (as in the case supposed in x. 37), the latter must of right prevail.

The words have naturally occupied a prominent position in the controversial writings of Protestants against what has been judged by them to be the idolatrous worship of the Virgin Mother by the Church of Rome; and it is clear that they have a very direct bearing on it. They do exclude the thought that her intercession is more privileged than that of any other pure and saintly soul. Though spoken with no apparent reference to the abuses of later ages, the words are a protest, all the stronger because of the absence of such reference, against the excess of reverence which has passed into a cultus, and the idolatry of dressed-up dolls into which that cultus has developed.

(50) Whosoever shall do the will.—This is, then, what Christ recognises as the ground of a spiritual relationship. Not outward, but inward fellowship; not the mere fact of baptism, but that which baptism signifies; that doing the will of God, which is the essence of holiness—is this that which makes the disciple as dear to the heart of Christ as was the mother whom He loved so truly.

Sister, and mother.—The special mention of the sister suggests the thought that those who bore that name had joined the mother and the brethren in their attempt to interrupt the divine work.

XIII.

(1, 2) The same day... out of the house. —In St. Mark the parable of the Sower follows the appearance of the mother and the brethren, as in St. Matthew, but in St. Luke (vii. 4—15, 19—21) the order is inverted. In this case the order of the first Gospel seems preferable, as giving a more intelligible sequence of events. The malignant accusation of the Pharisees, the plots against His life, the absence of real support where He might most have looked for it, the opposition roused by the directness of His teaching—this led to His presenting that teaching in a form which was at once more attractive, less open to attack, better as an intellectual and spiritual training for His disciples, better also as a test of character, and therefore an education for the multitude.

That our Lord had been speaking in a house up to this point is implied in the "standing without" of xiii. 50. He now turns to the crowd that followed, and lest the pressure should interrupt or might occasion—as the feeling roused by the teaching that immediately preceded made probable enough—some hostile attack, He enters a boat, probably with a few of His disciples, puts a few yards of water between Himself and the crowd, and then begins to speak.

(3) He spake many things unto them in parables.—This is the first occurrence of the word in St. Matthew's Gospel, and it is clear from the question of the disciples in verse 10 that it was in some sense a new form of teaching to them. There had been illustrations and similitudes before, as in that of the houses built on the sand and on the rock in vii. 24—27, and that of the unclean spirit in xii. 43—45, but now for the first time He speaks to the multitude in a parable, without an explanation. The word, which has passed through its use in the Gospel into most modern European languages (parabola, parabole, parabel), means literally, a comparison. It had been employed by the Greek translators of the Old Testament for the Hebrew word mashal, which we commonly render by "proverb," and which, like the Greek parabole, has the sense of similitude. Of many, perhaps of most, Eastern proverbs it was true that they were condensed parables, just as many parables are expanded proverbs. (Comp. John xvi. 25, 26.) In the latter and New Testament use of the word, however, the parable takes the fuller form of a narrative embracing facts natural and probable in themselves, and in this respect differs from the fable which (as in those of Esop and Phaedrus, or that of the trees choosing a king in Judg. ix. 8—15) does not keep within the limits even of possibility. The mode of teaching by parables was familiar enough in the schools of the Rabbis, and the Talmud contains many of great beauty and interest. As used by them, however, they were regarded as belonging to those who were receiving a higher education, and the son of Sirach was expressing the current feeling of the schools when he said of the tillers of the soil and the herdsmen of flocks that they "were not found where parables were spoken" (Ecclus. xxxviii. 33). With what purpose our Lord now used this mode of instruction will appear in His answer to the question of the disciples. The prominence given in the first three Gospels to the parable that follows, shows how deep an impression it made on the minds of men, and so far justified the choice of this method of teaching by the divine Master.

(4) A sower.—Literally, the sower—the man whose form and work were so familiar, in the seed-time of the year, to the peasants of Galilee. The outward framework of the parable requires us to remember the features in which Eastern tillage differs from our own. The ground less perfectly cleared—the road passing across the field—the rock often cropping out, or lying under an inch or two of soil—the patch of good ground rewarding, by what might be called a lucky chance rather than skill of husbandry, the labour of the husbandman. (6) The way side—i.e., on the skirts of the broad path that crossed the field. Here the surface was level and smooth, the grain lay on the surface, the pigeons and other birds that followed the sower reaped an immediate harvest.
up: (5) some fell upon stony places, where they had not much earth: and
forthwith they sprung up, because they had no deepness of earth: (6) and when
the sun was up, they were scorched; and because they had no root, they
withered away. (7) And some fell among thorns; and the thorns sprung up, and
choked them. (8) But other fell into good ground, and brought forth fruit,
some an hundredfold, some sixtyfold, some thirtyfold. (9) Who hath ears to
hear, let him hear. (10) And the dis-
ciples came, and said unto him, Why
spakest thou unto them in parables? (11) He answered and said unto them,
Because it is given unto you to know
the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven,
but to them it is not given. (12) For
whosoever hath, to him shall be given,
and he shall have more abundance:
but whosoever hath not, from him shall
be taken away even that he hath. (13) Therefore speak I to them in parables:
because they seeing see not; and hearing they hear not, neither

(5) Stony places.—Either ground in which stones and pebbles were mingled with the soil, or, more probably, where a thin stratum of earth covered the solid rock. Here, of course, growth was rapid through the fertile layers of soil which were so copiously watered, but they were so shallow and so infertile that the root, after reaching a certain depth, could encounter no nutrition, and every day’s heat of the sun exposed the plant to the intense heat of the rock at once made the heat more intense, and deprived the plant of the conditions of resistance.

(7) Among thorns.—Literally, the thorns, so familiar to the husbandman. These were not visible at the time of sowing. The ground had been so far cleared, but the roots were left below the surface, and their growth and that of the grain went on simultaneously, and ended in the survival, not of the fittest, but of the strongest. The ears shot up, and did not die suddenly, as in the preceding case, but were slowly strangled till they died away.

(9) Into good ground.—Here also the Greek has the definite article, “the good ground.” The different results imply that even here there were different degrees of fertility. The hundredfold return was, perhaps, a somewhat uncommon increase, but the narrative of Isaac’s tillage in Gen. xxvi. 12 shows that it was not unheard of, and had probably helped to make it the standard of a more than usually prosperous harvest.

(10) Who hath ears to hear.—The formula had been used, as we have seen before (comp. Note on xi. 15). It was probably familiar in the schools of the Rabbis, when they were testing the ingenuity or progress of their scholars.

(11) The disciples came, and said unto him.—They, it would seem, were with our Lord in the boat. The parable was ended, and then followed a pause, during which, unheard by the multitude on the shore, came their question, and our Lord’s answer.

Why spakest thou unto them in parables?—The wonder of the disciples probably included many elements of surprise. Why in parables instead of, as before, the direct announcement of the kingdom of heaven, and the call to prepare for it by repentance? And why to them, when they were not students with intellect sharpened in Rabbinc schools, but plain peasants and fishermen, slow and dull of heart?

(11) It is given.—Better, it has been given, as by the special act of God.

To know the mysteries.—The Greek word, like “parable,” has passed into modern languages, and has suffered some change of meaning in the process. Strictly speaking, it does not mean, as we sometimes use it—when we speak, e.g., of the mystery of the

Trinity, a truth which none can understand—something “awfully obscure” (the definition given in Johnson’s Dictionary), but one which, kept a secret from others, has been revealed to the initiated. Interpreted by our Lord this teaching up to this time, the mysteries of the kingdom may be referred to the new birth of water and the Spirit (John iii. 5), the judgment to be exercised hereafter by the Son of Man (John v. 25), the power of the Son of Man to forgive sins (ix. 6), the new ideas (no other word will express the fact so well) which He had proclaimed as to the Sabbath (xii. 8), and fasting, and prayer, and alms (vi. 1-18). Those ideas had been proved occasions of offence, and therefore, for the present, the Teacher falls back upon a method of more exoteric instruction.

(12) Whosoever hath, to him shall be given.—The words have the ring of a proverb applicable, in its literal meaning, to the conditions of worldly prosperity. There fortune smiles on the fortunate, and nothing succeeds like success. Something like that law, our Lord tells His disciples, is to be found in the conditions of spiritual growth in wisdom. They had some elements of that wisdom, and therefore, using their knowledge rightly, could pass on to more. The people, including even scribes and Pharisees, were as those that had few or none, and not using even the little that they had, were in danger of losing even that. The faithless Jew was sinking down to the level of a superstitious heathen. The proverb accordingly teaches the same lesson as that which was afterwards developed in the parables of the Talents and the Pounds.

(13) Because they seeing see not.—As the words stand in St. Matthew, they might mean that our Lord adopted the method of parables as a condescension to their infirmities, feeding them, as babes in knowledge, with milk, and not with meat. In St. Mark and St. Luke the reason given assumes a penal character, “that seeing they might not see,” as though they were not only to be left in their ignorance, but to be plunged deeper in it. And this, it is obvious, is even here the true meaning, for only thus does this clause answer to the conclusion of the proverb of verse 12, “From him shall be taken away even that which he hath.” In one aspect, then, the parable was a veil hiding the truth from them, because they did not seek the truth, and this was the working of the divine law of retribution. But even here we may venture to trace beneath the penalty an element of mercy. The parable could, at all events, do men no harm. It could not rouse the fierce enmity that had been kindled by truth spoken in its plainness. And it might prepare the way, might set men thinking and questioning, and if so, that was at least one step towards the “having,” though it were but
do they understand. (14) And in them is fulfilled the prophecy of Esaias, which saith, By hearing ye shall hear; and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and shall not perceive: (15) for this people's heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed; lest at any time they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and should understand with their heart, and should be converted, and I should heal them. (16) But blessed are your eyes, for they see: and your ears, for they hear. (17) For verily I say unto you, That a very little, which might place them among those to whom more shall be given.

(14) In them is fulfilled.—The Greek verb expresses complete fulfillment; but the sense is that of a work still in progress. The prominence given to these words of Isaiah's in the New Testament is very noticeable. Our Lord quotes them here, and again in John xii. 40. St. Paul cites them in Acta xxviii. 26. The quotation is from the LXX. version. It is as though the words which sounded at the very opening of Isaiah's prophecy as the knell of the nation's life, dwelt on the minds of the Master and His disciples, and prepared them for the seeming fruitlessness and hopelessness of their work.

(15) Lest at any time they should see.—The words point to the obstinate, wilful ignorance which refuses to look on the truth, lest the look should lead to conviction, and conviction to conversion—the ignorance of those who love darkness rather than light because their deeds are evil (John iii. 19).

(16) Blessed are your eyes.—The words are spoken to the small company of disciples in the boat. They were not as the multitude. They might see but the light and foolish thoughts that are as the Tempter's words which sounded at the very opening of Isaiah's prophecy (vv. 16-21). He does not “understand” it (the fault which sounded at the very opening of Isaiah's prophecy (vv. 16-21). He does not “understand” it (the fault of the air” in their multitude should represent the connection with the clause in the Lord's Prayer, “Deliver us from evil,” or “the evil one” snatches it away even from his memory. At first it seems strange that “the birds of the air” in their multitude should represent the Tempter in his unity; and yet there is a terrible truth in the fact that everything which leads men to forget the truth is, in very deed, doing the work of the great enemy. On the other hand, the birds, in their rapid flight and their gathering flocks, may well represent the light and foolish thoughts that are as the Tempter's instruments. The “way-side” thus answers to the character, which is hardened by the wear and tear of experience has presented analogous phenomena.

The ethical sequence described runs thus: The man hears “the word of the kingdom,” a discourse, say, like the Sermon on the Mount, or that at Nazareth (Luke iv. 16-21). He does not “understand” it (the fault that heareth the word, and anon with joy receiveth it; (21) yet.

(18) Hear ye therefore the parable of the sower. (19) When any one heareth the word of the kingdom, and understandeth it not, then cometh the wicked one, and catcheth away that which was sown in his heart. This is he which received seed by the way side. (20) But he that received the seed into stony places, the same is he that heareth the word, and anon with joy receiveth it; (21) yet actually been our Lord's experience. The classes of hearers who had gathered round Him were represented, roughly and generally, by the four issues of the seed scattered by the sower, and all preachers of the truth, from that day to this, have felt that their own experience has presented analogous phenomena.

The ethical sequence described runs thus: The man hears “the word of the kingdom,” a discourse, say, like the Sermon on the Mount, or that at Nazareth (Luke iv. 16-21). He does not “understand” it (the fault that heareth the word, and anon with joy receiveth it; (21) yet actually been our Lord's experience. The classes of hearers who had gathered round Him were represented, roughly and generally, by the four issues of the seed scattered by the sower, and all preachers of the truth, from that day to this, have felt that their own experience has presented analogous phenomena.
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hath he not root in himself, but dureth for a while: for when tribulation or persecution ariseth because of the word, by and by he is offended. (22) He also that received seed among the thorns is he that heareth the word; and the care of this world, and the deceitfulness of riches, choke the word, and he becometh unfruitful. (23) But he that received seed into the good ground is he that heareth the word, and understandeth it; which also beareth fruit, and bringeth forth, some an hundredfold, some sixty, some thirty.

(24) Another parable put he forth unto them, saying, The kingdom of heaven is likened unto a man which sowed good seed in his field: (25) but while men slept, his enemy came and sowed tares among the wheat, and went his way. (26) But when the blade was sprung up, and brought forth fruit,

suffering; “tribulation,” the thousand petty annoyances to which every convert to the faith of Christ was exposed in the first age of the Church, and to which it may be added, even now most men and women who seek to be Christians in deed as well as in name are at some time or other in their lives exposed. The words explain the “time of temptation” in St. Luke’s report (Luke viii. 13).

The rapidity of the renegade matches that of the convert. Such a man finds a “stumbling-block” in the sufferings he is called to endure, and turns into a smoother path. (22) He also that received seed among the thorns.—See Note on verse 19. Here there is no over-rapid growth, and there is some depth of earth. The character is not one that wastes its strength in vague emotions, but has the capacity for sustained effort. The evil here is, that while there is strength of purpose, there is not unity of spirit. The man is double-minded, and would fain serve two masters. The “care of this world” (the word is the root of the verb “take no thought” in vi. 25), the deceitfulness of earthly riches—cheating the soul with its counterfeit shows of good—these choke the “word” in its inner life, and it becomes “unfruitful.” There may be some signs of fruitfulness, perhaps the “blade” and the “ear” of partial reformation and strivings after holiness, but there is no “full corn in the ear.” In St. Luke’s words, such men “prospered to full perfection” (Luke vi. 26). To the simpler root-forms of evil in St. Matthew, St. Mark adds “the lusts (or desires) about other things”—i.e., the things that are other than the true life—and St. Luke, “the pleasures of life” to which wealth ministers, and for the sake of which, therefore, men pursue it.

(23) He that heareth the word, and understandeth it.—The process is not merely an intellectual one. It takes it in, discerns its meaning. The phrases in the other Gospels express the same thing: “hear the word and receive it” (Mark), “in an honest and good heart” hear and retain it (Luke). Even here, however, there are different degrees of the holiness which is symbolised by “bearing fruit”—“some an hundredfold, some sixty, some thirty”—varying according to men’s capacities and opportunities.

It is allowable to fill up the outline-sketch of interpretation which thus formed the first lesson in this method in the great Master’s school. (1.) It may seem strange at first that the disciples were not told who in the work of the kingdom answered to “the Sower” of the parable. The interpretation is given in the parable of the Tares (“the Sower of the good seed is the Son of Man”), and, in part, it may be said that this was the one point on which the disciples were not likely to mis
then appeared the tares also. (27) So the servants of the householder and said unto him, Sir, didst not thou sow good seed in thy field? from whence then hath it tares? (28) He said unto them, An enemy hath done this. The servants said unto him, Wilt thou that we go and gather them up? (29) But he said, Nay; lest while ye gather up the tares, ye root up also the wheat with them. (30) Let both grow together until the harvest; and in the time of harvest I will say to the reapers, Gather ye together first the tares, and bind them in bundles to burn them: but gather the wheat into my barn.

Tares, known to botanists as the \textit{Lolium temulentum}, or darnel, grew up at first with stalk and blade like the wheat; and it was not till fructification began that the difference was easily detected. It adds to the point of the parable to remember that the seeds of the tares were not merely useless as food, but were positively noxious.

(29) But he said, Nay.—Prior to the interpretation the householder of the parable is clearly intended to be a pattern of patient wisdom. He knows that he can defeat the malice of his foe, but he will choose his own time and plan. While both wheat and tares were green, men might mistake between the two; or, in the act of rooting up the one, tear up the other. When harvest came, and the stalks were dry, and the difference of aspect greater, it would be comparatively easy to gather the tares and leave the wheat.

(31) The kingdom of heaven is like to a grain of mustard seed.—The two parables that follow are left without an explanation, as though to train the disciples in the art of interpreting for themselves. And, so far as we can judge, they seem to have been equal to the task. They ask for the meaning of the Tares, but we read of no question about these.

It is scarcely necessary to discuss at any length the botany of the parable. What we call mustard (\textit{Sinapis nigra}) does not grow in the East, any more than with us, into anything that can be called a tree. Probably, however, the name was used widely for any plant that had the pungent flavour of mustard, and botanists have suggested the \textit{Salvadora persica} as answering to the description. (See \textit{Bible Educator}, I. 119.)

The interpretation of the parable lies almost on the surface. Here again the sower is the Son of Man; but the seed in this case is not so much the “word,” as the Christian society, the Church, which forms, so to speak, the firstfruits of the word. As it then was, even as it was on the day of Pentecost, it was smaller than any sect or party in Palestine or Greece or Italy. It was sown in God’s field of the world, but it was to grow till it became greater than any sect or school, a tree among the trees of the forest, a kingdom among other kingdoms (comp. the imagery of Ezek. xxxi. 3; Dan. iv. 10), a great organised society; and the “birds of the air” (no longer, as before, the emblems of evil)—i.e., the systems of thought, institutions, and the like, of other races—were to find refuge under its protection. History has witnessed many fulfilments of the prophecy implied in the parable, and those who believe that the life of Christendom is an abiding life will look for yet more.

(32) The least of all seeds.—The description is, of course, popular, and need not be pressed with microscopic exactness.

The greatest among herbs.—More literally, \textit{greater than the herbs}—i.e., belonging to a higher order of vegetation.

(33) The kingdom of heaven is like unto leaven.—The parable sets forth the working of the Church of Christ on the world, but not in the same way that of the Mustard Seed. There the growth was outward, measured by the extension of the Church, dependent on its missionary efforts. Here the working is from within. The “leaven”—commonly, as in the Passover ritual, the symbol of malice and wickedness (1 Cor. v. 8)—causing an action in the flour with which it is mingled that is of the nature of decay and tends to actual putrefaction, here becomes, in the mode of teaching which does not confine itself within the limits of a traditional and conventional symbolism, the type of influence for good as well as evil. It can turn the flour into human food—this symbolism is traceable in the leavened loaves that were offered on the day of Pentecost (Lev. xxiii. 17)—can permeate the manners, feelings, and opinions of non-Christian societies until they become blessings and not curses to mankind. In the new feelings, gradually diffused, of Christendom as to slavery, prostitution, gladiatorial games—in the new reverence for childhood and womanhood, for poverty and sickness—we may trace the working of the leaven.

Descending to the details of the parable, it is at least open to us (as an application of it, if not as an interpretation) to see in the woman, as in the parable of the Lost Piece of Money (Luke xv. 8), the representative of the divine Wisdom as working in the history of the world, or of the Church of Christ as embodying that wisdom. The three measures of meal admit, in like manner, of many references, of which we cannot say with certainty that one is more likely to have been intended than another. The descendants of the three sons of Noah, or the Jew, the Greek, the Barbarian, as representing the whole race of mankind, or body, soul, and spirit, as the three parts of man’s nature, which the new truth is to permeate and purify, are all in this sense equally legitimate applications.

(34) Without a parable spake he not unto them.—The words are, of course, limited by the
he not unto them: (35) that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, saying, I will open my mouth in parables; I will utter things which have been kept secret from the foundation of the world. (36) Then Jesus sent the multitude away, and went into the house: and his disciples came unto him, saying, Declare unto us the parable of the tares of the field. (37) He answered and said unto them, He that soweth the good seed is the Son of man; (38) the field is the world; the good seed are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are the children of the wicked one; (39) the enemy that sowed them is the devil.

Chapter XIII.

Tares and Wheat Interpreted.

(35) I will open my mouth in parables.—The quotation illustrates, much in the same way as in vii. 17, xii. 17, St. Matthew's peculiar way of dealing with the prophetic language of the Old Testament. He found the word “parable” at the opening of a Psalm (Ps. lxxviii. 2). The Psalm itself was in no sense predictive, but simply an historical survey of God's dealings with Israel from the days of the Exodus to those of David. But the occurrence of the word was enough for him. Here was One whose form of teaching answered to that which the Psalmist had described, who might claim the Psalmist's words as His own; and excluding, as he did, the idea of chance from all such coincidences, he could use even here the familiar formula, “that it might be fulfilled.”

A remarkable various-reading gives, “by Eesias the prophet.” It is found in the Sinaitic MS., and had been used before the time of Jerome by a heathen writer (Porphyry) as a proof of St. Matthew's ignorance. Old as it is, however, there is no reason for receiving it as the original reading. The mistake was probably that of a transcriber, misled by the word “prophet,” and writing the name after the precedent of viii. 17, xii. 17. If the mistake had been St. Matthew's, it would stand on the same footing as the substitution of Jeremiah for Zechariah in xxvii. 9. The Psalm is assigned by the superscription to the authorship of Asaph.

(39) Declare unto us the parable of the tares of the field.—The question was asked privately, probably in the house of Peter, to which our Lord had retired with the disciples after the listening crowd upon the beach had been dismissed. It implies that the disciples had thought over the parable, and had found it harder to understand than those of the Mustard-seed and the Leaven.

(37) He that soweth the good seed is the Son of man.—Primarily, we must remember that the parable refers to the kingdom of heaven—i.e., to that new order of things which the Christ came to establish, and which is conveniently described as the Church which owns Him as its Lord. It offers, accordingly, an explanation of the presence of evil in that Church, and only by inference and analogy does it bear upon the wider problem of the origin of the evil in the world at large. That analogy, however, is not likely to mislead us. If the Son of Man has been “the Light that lighteth every man” (John i. 9), then He had been a sower of the good seed in the wider region of the world from the beginning, and then also all who followed after righteousness had been children of the kingdom.

(38) The tares are the children of the wicked one.—It was, perhaps, natural that theologians, who saw in heresy the greatest of all evils, should identify the tares with heretics. So far as heresy rises from the spirit of self-will, or antagonism to righteousness, we may admit that they are included in the class, but the true definition is that given in verse 41, “all things that offend, and them which do iniquity.”

Chapter XIII. continued.

(35) The solution of the difficulty is found, as the context to this occasion, but it is noticeable from this time forward that parables are the dominant element in His teaching to the multitude, and that the mysteries of the kingdom are reserved for the more esoteric instruction of the disciples.

Errors grow up and develop upon the beach had been dismissed. It is found harder to understand than those of the Mus-
The reapers are the angels.—What will be the actual work of the ministry of angels in the final judgment it is not easy to define, but their presence is implied in all our Lord's greater prophetic utterances about it (Matt. xxv. 31). That ministry had been brought prominently before men in the apocalyptic visions of the Book of Daniel, in which for the first time the name of the Son of Man is identified with the future Christ (vii. 13), and the Messianic kingdom itself brought into new distinctness in connection with Himself. Our Lord's teaching does but expand the hints of the "thousand times ten thousand" that ministered before the Ancient of Days when the books were opened (Dan. vii. 9, 10), and of Michael the prince as connected with the resurrection of "many that sleep in the dust of the earth" (Dan. xii. 1, 2).

43 His angels . . . his kingdom.—The vision of One who stood before men outwardly as the carpenter's son stretches forward to the far future, and sees that the angels of God and the kingdom are alike His.

All things that offend.—Literally, all stumbling-blocks; the word being explained by the clause that follows as including all that work iniquity. It lies in the nature of the case that the interpretation should recognise only the great broad divisions of good and evil, leaving the apportionment of rewards and punishments, according to the varying degrees of each, to be filled into the outline afterwards.

44 Into a furnace of fire.—Better, the furnace—i.e., that of Gehenna, in which there will be "the wailing and gnashing of teeth." (See Notes on viii. 12.)

45 Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun.—The imagery is so natural that we hardly need to look for any reference to older teaching, yet we can hardly help remembering the path of the just that "shineth more and more unto the perfect day" (Prov. iv. 18), and yet more, as connected more closely with the judgment to come, those that shall shine as the brightness of the firmament and as the stars for ever and ever" (Dan. xii. 3). Yet the promise here has one crowning and supreme blessing: the kingdom in which the righteous shall thus shine forth is the kingdom of their Father.

46 The kingdom of heaven is like unto treasure hid in a field.—Probably no parable in the whole series came more home to the imagination of the disciples than this. Every village had its story of the merchant man, seeking goodly pearls. Here again the illustration would commend itself to the thoughts of the fishermen of Galilee. The caprices of luxury in the Roman empire had given a prominence to pearls, as an article of commerce, which they had never had before, and have probably never had since. They, rather than emeralds and sapphires, were the typical instance of all costliest adornments (vii. 6; 1 Tim. ii. 9). The story of Cleopatra, the fact that the opening of a new pearl-market was one of the alleged motives which led the Emperor Claudius to invade Britain, are indications of the value that was then set on the "goodly pearls" of the parable. Such a merchant seeking them, either on the shores of the Mediterranean, or as brought by caravans to other traders from the Persian Gulf or the Indian Ocean, must have been a familiar presence to the fishermen of Capernaum. The parable in its spiritual bearing, has, of course, much that is common with the preceding. But there is this marked and suggestive difference. The "search" is presupposed. The man has been seeking the "goodly pearls" of

the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father. Who hath ears to hear, let him hear.

45 Again, the kingdom of heaven is like unto treasure hid in a field; the which when a man hath found, he hideth, and for joy thereof goeth and selleth all that he hath, and buyeth that field.

46 Again, the kingdom of heaven is like unto a merchant man, seeking...
goodly pearls: (46) who, when he had found one pearl of great price, went and sold all that he had, and bought it.

(47) Again, the kingdom of heaven is like unto a net, that was cast into the sea, and gathered of every kind: (48) which, when it was full, they drew to shore, and sat down, and gathered the good into vessels, but cast the bad away. (49) So shall it be at the end of the world: the angels shall come forth, and sever the wicked from among the just, (50) and shall cast them into the furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth. (51) Jesus saith unto them, Have ye understood all these things? They say unto him, Yea, Lord. (52) Then said he unto them, Therefore every scribe which is instructed unto the kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is an householder, which bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old.

(53) And it came to pass, that when Jesus had finished these parables, he departed thence. (54) And when he was
The narrative must be misplaced in its relation to other facts in one or other of the Gospels. A dislocation of some kind must indeed be admitted in any case, as St. Mark places it after the resurrection of Jairus's daughter, and makes that event follow the cure of the Gadarene demoniac, and places that on the next day after the first use of parables. We are compelled to admit, as before in the Notes on viii. 1, the almost entire absence of any trustworthy notes of chronological sequence, beyond the grouping, in some cases, of a few conspicuous facts. In comparing, however, St. Matthew and St. Mark with St. Luke, there seems no sufficient ground for hastily assuming identity. The third Gospel places the visit which it narrates, at the very beginning of our Lord's work, and as giving the reason of His removal to Capernaum. Here, there is no outburst of violent enmity such as we find there, but simple amazement. It seems, therefore, more probable that we have here a short account (short and imperfect, it may be, because our Lord went without His disciples) of another effort to bring the men of Nazareth to acknowledge Him, if not as the Christ, at least as a Prophet. The circumstances of the case in St. Matthew's record suggest another motive as, at least, possible. He had recently, as in xii. 48, when His mother and His brethren had come in their eager anxiety to interrupt His work, spoken in words that seemed to repel them to a distance from Him. What if this visit were meant to show that, though as a Prophet He could not brook that interruption, home affections were not dead in Him, that His heart still yearned over His brethren and His townsmen, and that He sought to raise them to a higher life? On comparing the account here with that in St. Luke, it would seem almost certain that there was now a less direct assertion of His claims as the Christ than there had been before—a proclamation of the laws of the kingdom rather than of His own position in it. And so the impression is one of wonder at His wisdom, not of anger or scorn at what He claims to be.

Is not this the carpenter's son?—In St. Mark, the question appears in the form, "Is not this the carpenter?" and it is, of course, in the nature of things probable that He both helped in the workshop the carpenter? and it is, therefore, shocked the conscience of all the stricter Jews. It involved Antipas in a war with the father of the wife whom he had divorced and dismissed, and it was probably in connection with this war that we read of soldiers on actual duty as coming under the teaching of the Baptist in Luke iii. 14. The prophetic spirit of the Baptist, the very spirit of Elijah in His dealings with Ahab and Jezebel, made him the spokesman of the general feeling, and so brought him within the range of the vindictive bitterness of the guilty queen.

Heard of the fame of Jesus.—The words do not necessarily imply that no tidings had reached him till now. Our Lord's ministry, however, had been at this time at the furthest not longer than a year, and possibly less, and Antipas, residing at Tiberias and surrounded

CHAPTER XIV.—At that time Herod the tetrarch heard of the fame of
by courtiers, might well be slow to hear of the works and teaching of the Prophet of Nazareth. Possibly, the nobleman of Capernaum (John iv. 46), or Mannaen the foster-brother of the tetrarch (Acts xiii. 1), or Chusa his steward (Luke viii. 3), may have been among his first informants, as "the servants" (the word is not that used for "slaves") to whom he now communicated his theory as to the reported wonders.

(2) This is John the Baptist.—In xvi. 14, Luke ix. 7—9, this is given as one of the three opinions that were floating among the people as to our Lord's character, the other two being, (1) that He was Elijah, and (2) that He was one of the old prophets who had risen again. The policy of the tetrarch connected him with the Sadducean priestly party rather than with the more popular and rigid Pharisees, and a comparison of xvi. 6 with Mark viii. 15 at least suggests the identity of the "leaven of Herod" with that of the Saducees. On this supposition, his acceptance of the first of the three rumours is very way remarkable. The superstitious terror of a conscience stained with guilt is stronger than his scepticism as a Sadducee, even though there mingled with it, as was probable enough, the wider unbelief of Roman epicureanism. To him was the new Prophet, working signs and wonders which John had never worked, was but the re-appearance of the man whom he had murdered. It was more than a spectacle from the unseen world, more than the metempsychosis of the soul of John into another body. It was nothing less than John himself.

(3) Put him in prison.—Josephus (Ant. xviii. 5, § 2) gives Machærmus, in Peræa, as the scene of the imprisonment and death of the Baptist.

(4) For John said unto him.—The Jewish historian (Ant. xviii. 5, § 2) states more generally that Antipas was afraid lest some popular outbreak should be the result of the preaching of the Baptist, working on the excitable peasantry of Galilee.

(5) He feared the multitude.—St. Mark, whose narrative is here most the fullest of the three, adds that Herod himself "feared John," knowing "him to be a just man and a holy," and was much perplexed—this, rather than "did many things" is the true reading—and heard him gladly (Mark vi. 20). There was yet a struggle of conscience against passion in the weak and wicked tetrarch, as there was in Ahab in his relations with Elijah. In Herodias, as in Jezebel, there was no hatred between two opinions, and no bitterness of her hate, thirsted for the blood of the prophet who had dared to rebuke her guilt.

(6) Herod's birthday.—Some critics have looked on the feast as one commemorating Herod's accession—his birth-day as a ruler; but there seems no reason for not accepting the word in its simple natural sense. Such feasts were common enough in the imperial life at Rome, and that of Herod's birthday had become proverbial even there (Persius, Sat. v., l. 180).

The daughter of Herodias danced before them.—Dances in filmy garments that but half concealed the form, commonly of an impure or voluptuous nature, were common enough both at Eastern and Roman banquets, the guests being simply spectators. But the dancers were for the most part women who made it their calling, like the nautch-girls of India; and it was a new thing, at which every decent Jew would shudder, for the daughter of a kingly house to come forth to dance in a place of public resort. Though there mingled with it, perhaps rather than "did many things" is the true reading—appeared in reckless disregard of all maiden modesty. And she, being before instructed of her mother, said, Give me here John Baptist's head in a charger. And the king was sorry: nevertheless for the oath's sake, and them which sat with him at meat,
The Burial of the Baptist.

ST. MATTHEW, XIV.

The Multitude in the Desert

he commanded it to be given her. (\textsuperscript{10}) And he sent, and beheaded John in the prison. (\textsuperscript{11}) And his head was brought in a charger, and given to the damsel: and she brought it to her mother. (\textsuperscript{12}) And his disciples came, and took up the body, and buried it, and went and told Jesus.

\textsuperscript{13} When Jesus heard of it,\textsuperscript{a} he departed thence by ship into a desert place apart: and when the people had heard thereof, they followed him on foot out of the cities. (\textsuperscript{14}) And Jesus went forth, and saw a great multitude, and was moved with compassion toward them, and he healed their sick.

\textsuperscript{15} And when it was evening,\textsuperscript{b} his disciples came to him, saying, This is a desert place, and the time is now past; send the multitude away, that they may assembled guests, if they should see him draw back from his plighted word. A false regard for public opinion, for what people will say or think of us in our own narrow circle, was in this, as in so many other instances, an incentive to guilt instead of a restraint.

(\textsuperscript{10}) He sent, and beheaded John in the prison. —Measured by the standard of earthly greatness, it seems almost like a paradox to say of one who had only been for a few short months a preacher of righteousness in the wilderness of Judaea, as men have said of the kings and conquerors of the world, “So passed from the earth one of the greatest of her sons;” and yet this, and nothing less than this, if we accept our Lord’s words, must be our estimate of the Baptist’s character. Intensity of purpose, dauntless courage, profound humility, self-denial carried to its highest point, a burning love that passed beyond the limits of race and nation, tenderness of sympathy for the toilers of the world, for the fallen and the outcast, all these were there; and what elements of moral greatness can go beyond them? And the consciousness of Christendom has recognised that greatness. Art and poetry have symbolised it in outward form, and the work of the Forerunner, the revivification of religious life which has brought the kingdom of heaven nearer to men’s hearts and hopes.

\textsuperscript{11} She brought it to her mother. —A glance at the after-history of those who were accomplices in the deed of blood will not be out of place. Shortly after the new society, for which John had prepared the way, had started upon its great career, when her brother, the young Agrippa, had obtained the title of king, through the favour of Caligula, Herodias, consistent in her ambition, stirred up her husband to seek the same honour. With this view she accompanied him to Rome; but they were followed by complaints from the oppressed Galileans, and the result was that he was deposed from his tetarchy, and banished to Lugdunum (the modern Lyons) in Gaul. Thither she accompanied him, faithful to his fallen fortunes, in spite of outcries from her brother to return to Judaea, and there they died (Jos. \textsuperscript{Ant.} xviii. 7, § 2). A tradition or legend relates that Salome’s death was retributive in its outward form. She fell upon the ice, and in the fall her head was severed from the body. Josephus, however, simply records the fact that she married first her great-uncle Philip, the Tetrarch of Trachonitis, and afterwards her first cousin, Aristobulus (Ant. xviii. 5, § 4).

\textsuperscript{12} His disciples came. —Among those who thus transferred their allegiance to their true Lord were, we must believe, the two whom John had sent to Him from his prison. ‘From this time they probably ceased in Judaea to be a distinct community, though, as the instances of Apollos (Acts xviii. 26) and the disciples at Ephesus (Acts xix. 3) show, they still maintained a separate existence in the more distant regions to which the influence of the Baptist had indirectly penetrated.

\textsuperscript{13} When Jesus heard of it. —We may, I think, reverently trace as the motives of this withdrawal, (1) the strong personal emotion which the death of one whom Jesus had known and loved could not fail to cause, and (2) the wish to avoid being the centre of the popular excitement which the death of John was likely to cause, and which we know, as a matter of fact (Jos. \textsuperscript{Ant.} xviii. 5, § 2), was so strong that men looked on all the subsequent troubles of Antipas and his wife as a retributive judgment for it. This was, indeed, sufficiently shown by the eagerness with which the people followed Him into His retirement. Two other circumstances, named by the other Evangelists, tended to increase the crowd that thronged around Him. (1) The Twelve had just returned from their missionary circuit (Mark vi. 30, 31; Luke ix. 10), and it was, indeed, partly to give them, too, an interval of repose that He thus withdrew from His public work; and (2) the Passover was coming on (John vi. 4), and all the roads of Galilee were thronged with companies of pilgrims hastening to keep the feast at Jerusalem.

\textsuperscript{14} Into a desert place. —St. Luke names this as a city called Bethsaida, i.e., one of the two towns bearing that name on the coast of the Sea of Galilee. The name (which signified House of Fish=Fish-town) was a natural one for villages so placed, and the topography of all countries, our own included, presents too many instances of two or more places bearing the same name, with some distinctive epithet, to make the fact at all strange here. In St. Mark’s account the disciples sail, after the feeding of the five thousand, to the other Bethsaida (Mark vi. 45); and as this appears in John vi. 17 to have been in the direction of Capernaum, the scene of the miracle must have been Bethsaida-Julias, on the north-east shore of the lake.

\textsuperscript{15} And Jesus went forth. —The words imply that our Lord, from the height to which He had withdrawn, saw the crowds drawing near, and then, instead of retiring still further, went forward, moved by the touch of pity which the sight of an eager and suffering multitude never failed to rouse in Him (ix. 36), to meet them and relieve their sufferings. St. Mark (vi. 34) adds that the source of His compassion was (as in Matt. ix. 36) that they were as sheep having no shepherd.

(\textsuperscript{a}) And when it was evening, his disciples came to him, saying, This is a desert place, and the time is now past; send the multitude away, that they may
go into the villages, and buy themselves victuals. (16) But Jesus said unto them, They need not depart; give ye them to eat. (17) And they say unto him, We have here but five loaves, and two fishes. (18) He said, Bring them hither to me. (19) And he commanded the multitude to sit down on the grass, and took the five loaves, and the two fishes, and

of the case, one of creative power, and does not admit, as some of the works of healing might seem to do, of being explained away as the result of strong faith or excited imagination on the part of those who were its objects. The only rationalisation explanation which has ever been offered—viz., that our Lord by his example, in offering the five loaves and the two fishes for the use of others than His own company of the Twelve, stirred the multitude to bring out the little store which, till then, each man in his selfish anxiety had kept concealed—is ludicrously inadequate. The narrative must be received or rejected as a whole: an if accepted, it is, as we have said, a proof of supernatural, if not absolutely of divine, power. (3.) No narrative of any other miracle offers so many marks of naturalness, both in the vividness of colouring with which it is told, and the coincidences, manifestly without design, which it presents to us. It is hardly possible to imagine four independent writers—indeed, even if two of them were derived from a common source—reproducing, in this way, a mere legend. (4.) The nature of this evidence will be seen in all its strength by combining the facts of the four records as we proceed. (5.) The miracle was important, as we see from John vi., on account of its dogmatic symbolism. It became the text of the dialogue at Capernaum in which (not to anticipate the Notes on the fourth Gospel) communion with the life of Christ was shadowed forth under the figure of eating the flesh of Him who is the true Bread from heaven.

His disciples came to him.—In St. John's narrative, Philip and Andrew are prominent as speakers, and our Lord puts to the former the question, "Whence shall we buy bread that these may eat?" As Philip and Andrew both belonged to one of the Bethsaidas, their local knowledge made the question natural. It was apparently after this private conversation that the main body of the disciples came to their Master beseeching Him to dismiss the multitude that they might buy food in the nearest villages. They were met by what must have seemed to them the marvellous calmness of the answer: "They need not depart, give ye them to eat." Philip's rough estimate having been passed on to the others, they answer that it would take two hundred pennyworth of bread (the Roman penny, as a coin, was worth 7½ d. of our money), but its value is better measured by its being the average day's wages of a soldier or labourer, xx. 2) to feed so great a number (Mark vi. 37; John vi. 7). Then Jesus asks them, "How many loaves have ye?" and Andrew (John vi. 8), as the spokesman of the others, replies that they have found a lad with five loaves (barley loaves, in St. John, the food of the poor) and two fishes.

He commanded the multitude to sit down on the grass. This, too, was done with a calm and orderly precision. They were to sit down in companies of fifty or a hundred each, and thus the number of those who were fed became a matter of easy calculation. St. Mark, with a vivid picturesque quality, describes them as presenting the appearance of so many beds of flowers in a well-ordered garden. The bright colours of Eastern dress probably made the resemblance more striking than it would be with a like multitude so arranged among ourselves.

Looking up to heaven, he blessed, and brake. —The act was natural and simple enough, the "saying grace" (St. John uses the word, "giving thanks") of the head of a Jewish household as he gathered his family around him for the daily meal. The ritual, if it were, common, was precisely of the form "May God, the ever-blessed One, bless what He has given us." Looking, however, to the teaching which followed the miracle, as in John vi., and to our Lord's subsequent use at the Last Supper of the same words and acts, with others which gave them a new and higher meaning, we can hardly be wrong in thinking that as He offered the earthly bread to the hungering crowd, through the agency of His Apostles, there was present to His mind the thought that hereafter He would, through the same instrumentality, impart to souls that hungered after righteousness the gift of communion with Himself, that thus they might feed on the true Bread that cometh down from heaven.

It lies in the nature of the case, as a miracle of the highest order, that the process of multiplication is inconceivable in its details. Did each loaf, in succession, supply a thousand with food, and then come to an end, its place taken by another? Was the structure of the fishes, bone and skin and head, reproduced in each portion that was given to the guests at that great feast? We know not, and the Evangelists did not care to ask or to record. It was enough for them that the multitude "did all eat, and were filled."

Twelve baskets full.—The basket here is the cophinus, a small basket carried in the hand, and often used by travellers to hold their food. So Juvenal (Sat. iii. 14) describes the Jews of Italy as travelling with "their cophinus and a wisp of hay," by way of pillow, as their only luggage. St. John records that the gathering was made by our Lord's express commands, "that nothing be lost." The marvellous display of creative power was not to supersede forethought, thrift, economy in the use of the gifts it had bestowed. It is probable, from the language of the disciples in Mark vi. 37, and from John xiii. 29, that they were in the habit of distributing the poor in the villages and towns in which they preached, and the fragments were, we may believe, reserved for that use.

Beside women and children.—St. Matthew is the only Evangelist who mentions their presence, but all the four use the word which emphasizes the fact that all the five thousand women and children came in many cases from considerable distances, the women and children were probably few in number.
were grouped together by themselves, and were not counted, so that the round number dwelt in men's minds without reference to them.

(22) Straightway Jesus constrained his disciples.—St. John narrates more fully the impression made by the miracle. It led those who witnessed it to the conclusion that “this was the Prophet that should come into the world.” They sought to seize Him and make Him king over them, and Jesus withdrew from His disciples, dismissed the multitude, and on the mountain height passed the night in prayer. The disciples at His bidding were crossing to the other side to Bethsaida (Mark vi. 45)—i.e., to the town of that name on the western shore of the lake near Capernaum (John vi. 17). It was, we may reverently say, as if in this unwonted stir of popular excitement—not against Him, but in His favour—this nearness to a path of earthly greatness instead of that which led onward to the cross, He saw something like a renewal of the temptation in the wilderness, needing special communion with His Father, that He might once again resist and overcome it. And once again, therefore, He desired to pass through the conflict alone, as afterwards in Gethsemane, with no human eye to witness the temptation or the victory.

(23) Tossed with waves.—Literally, vexed, or tormented.

(24) In the fourth watch of the night.—The Jews, since their conquest by Pompeius, had adopted the Roman division of the night into four watches, and this was accordingly between 3 A.M. and 6 A.M., in the dimness of the early dawn. St. John adds, as if from a personal reminiscence, and as guarding against explanations that would minimise the miracle (such as that our Lord was seen on the shore, or was swimming to the boat), that they were about twenty-five or thirty furlongs from the point from which they had started—i.e., as the lake was five miles wide, nearly three-fourths of the way across.

Walking on the sea.—Here, again, we have to choose between the simple acceptance of the supernatural fact as another instance of His sovereignty, or rejecting it as a legend. On the former supposition, we may see in it something like an anticipation (not unconnected, it may be, with the intensity of that crisis in His life) of that spiritual body of which we see another manifestation in the Transfiguration, and which became normal after the Resurrection, reaching its completeness in the wonder of the Ascension. We speculate almost involuntarily on the nature, and, as it were, process of the miracle, asking whether the ordinary laws that govern motion were broken or suspended, or counteracted by higher laws. No such questions would seem to have suggested themselves to the disciples. They, as yet not free from the popular superstitions of their countrymen, thought that it was “a spirit” (better, a phantom, or spectre) taking the familiar form, it might be, to lure them to their destruction, or as a token that some sudden mischance had deprived them of that loved Presence, and, therefore, in their vague terror, they were troubled, and cried out for fear.

(25) And Peter answered him and said, Lord, if it be thou, bid me come unto thee on the water. And he said, Come. And when Peter was come down out of the ship, he walked on the water, to go to Jesus. (26) But when
he saw the wind boisterous,1 he was afraid; and beginning to sink, he cried, saying, Lord, save me. (33) And immediately Jesus stretched forth his hand, and caught him, and said unto him, O thou of little faith, wherefore didst thou doubt? (32) And when they were come into the ship, the wind ceased. (33) Then they that were in the ship came and worshipped him, saying, Of a truth thou art the Son of God. (34) And when they were gone over, they came into the land of Gennesaret. (35) And when the men of that place had knowledge of him, they sent out into

gracious pity of his Lord helped the “little faith” with the firm sustaining grasp, not, indeed, without a word of loving reproof, and yet as unwilling even here to quench the smoking flax. (32) The wind ceased.—St. Mark adds that “they were above measure astonished” at the sudden hush. For the most part these mountain squalls died away gradually, and left the waves rough. Here the wind ceased in a moment, and ceased as their Lord entered the boat. And he gives a significant reason for their astonishment, “For they reflected not on the loaves, for their heart was hardened.” This was the later analysis which the disciples made of their feelings on that night. Had they understood all the divine creative energy which the miracle of the loaves involved, nothing afterwards, not even the walking on the waves, or the hushing of the storm, would have seemed startling to them. (33) They that were in the ship.—The peculiar description was apparently intended to distinguish them from Peter and the other disciples, and probably indicates that they were the crew of the boat, or some chance passengers, who had no previous knowledge of our Lord and of His works. They too were led, in that moment of wonder, to the confession that the Prophet of Nazareth was more than man, and in this, as far as the Gospel record goes, they anticipated the faith even of the foremost of the disciples. It is significant that Peter’s confession that He was “the Son of God,” or “the Holy One of God” (John vi. 69), follows shortly upon this. (34) They came into the land of Gennesaret.—The name, possibly a corruption of the older Chinneroth (Num. xxxiv. 11; Josh. xi. 2; xii. 3), belonged to the western shore of the lake to which it gave one of its titles, and included Capernaum, to which, as we learn from John vi. 17, 24, the disciples were steering. The region was one of singular fertility (the name has been explained as meaning the “Garden of Sharon”), and was then one of the most populous districts of Palestine. (35) And when the men of that place.—We have to remember, though not in this place to discuss, the fact that it was here, in the synagogue of Capernaum, that our Lord, meeting with those who had seen the miracle of the loaves, led them into that higher region of spiritual truth which the discourse of John vi. 22—65 brings before us. The manifestation of divine power in the works of healing coincided with the divine wisdom revealed in the new teaching. (36) That they might only touch the hem of his garment.—The wide-spread belief may be noted as the natural result of the miracle already recorded in ix. 20—22, and as the touch implied the faith which was the condition of receptivity, it was now also, as before, effective.

CHAPTER XV.—(1) Then came to Jesus scribes and Pharisees, which were of Jerusalem, saying, (2) Why do thy disciples transgress the tradition of the elders? for they wash not their hands when they eat bread. (3) But he answered and said unto them, Why do ye also transgress the commandment of
The Corban Tradition.  

ST. MATTHEW, XV.  

What it is that Defiles.

God by your tradition? (4) For God commanded, saying, Honour thy father and mother; a and, He that curseth father or mother, b let him die the death. (5) But ye say, Whosoever shall say to his father or his mother, It is a gift, c by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me; (6) and honour not his father or his mother, he shall be free. Thus have ye made the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition. (7) Ye hypocrites, well did Esaias prophesy of you, saying, (8) This people draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, d and honoureth me with their lips; but their heart is far from me. (9) But in vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men. (10) And he called the multitude, e and said unto them, Hear, and understand: (11) Not that which goeth into the mouth defileth a man; but that which cometh out of the mouth, this defileth a man. (12) Then came his disciples, and said

(1) aEx. 20. 13.  
(2) bLev. 19. 17; Deut. 5. 16. 
(3) cLev. 21. 17; Ex. 21. 17; Lev. 19. 17; Prov. 20. 9.  
(4) dIsa. 29. 13.  
(5) eMark 7. 11.  
(6) fMark 7. 14.  

By your tradition. — As before, for the sake of. They had inverted the right relation of the two, and made the tradition an end, and not a means. St. Mark (vii. 9) gives what we cannot describe otherwise than as a touch of grave and earnest irony, in the truest and best sense of that word, “Full well ye reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep your own traditions.”

(7) Ye hypocrites. — See Note on Matt. vii. 5.

(8) This people draweth nigh unto me. — The quotation is given substantially from the Greek version of Isaiah. We have already seen in xiii. 14 how the Pharisees were taught to see their own likeness in the language of the prophet. Now the mirror is held up once more, and they are seen to have been anticipated in that very substitution of human for divine ordinances for which our Lord reproves them.

(9) Teaching for doctrines the commandments of men. — Neither word is quite adequately rendered. The “doctrines” are not articles of faith, propositions to be believed, but precepts which were taught as binding. The “commandments” are single, special rules as contrasted with the divine “commandment,” which was exceedingly broad.

(10) He called the multitude, and said unto them. — The act was more startling and suggestive than appears on the surface. He did not appeal to the authority of great names or of a higher tribunal. He removed the case, as it were, to another court, which was more beyond the common people. His opponents did not recognise, and turned from the disputes and traditions of the schools to the unperturbed conscience of the common people.

(11) Not that which goeth into the mouth. — Up to this time the question had been debated indirectly. The scribes had been convicted of unfitness to speak with authority on moral questions. Now a great broad principle is asserted, which not only cut at the root of Pharisaism, but, in its ultimate tendency, swept away the whole Levitical system of ceremonial purity — the distinction between clean and unclean meats and the like. It went, as the amazement of the disciples showed, far beyond their grasp as yet. Even after the day of Pentecost, Peter still prided himself on the observance of the Law, which he thus summed and boasted that he had never “eaten anything common or unclean” (Acts x. 14). So slow were even those who had sat at the feet of Jesus to take in the thought that purity was inward and not outward, a spiritual and not a physical quality.

(12) Then came his disciples. — The sequence of events appears in Mark vii. 17. The Pharisees drew
The Blind Leaders of the Blind.

St. Matthew, XV.

The Evil Things from within.

unto him, knowest thou that the Pharisees were offended, after they heard this saying? (13) But he answered and said, Every plant, which my heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up. (14) Let them alone: they be blind leaders of the blind. And if the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch. (15) Then answered Peter and said unto him, Declare unto us this parable. (16) And Jesus said, Are ye also yet without understanding? (17) Do not ye yet understand, that whatsoever entereth at the mouth goeth into the belly, and is cast out into the draught? (18) But those things which proceed out of the mouth come forth from the heart; and they defile the man. (19) For out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies: these are the things which defile a man: but to eat with unwashed hands defileth not a man. (20) Then Jesus went thence, and back as in holy horror at the boldness with which the new Teacher set Himself, not only above their traditions, but above laws which they looked on as divine, and therefore permanent. The multitude heard in silence a teaching so unlike that with which they had been familiar from their youth. Even the disciples were half perplexed at the teaching itself, half afraid of what might be its immediate consequences. They came with their question, "Knowest thou not that the Pharisees were offended?" Had their Master calculated the consequences of thus attacking, not individual members or individual traditions of the party, but its fundamental principle, that which was, so to speak, its very raison d'etre?

(13) Every plant, which my heavenly Father hath not planted. — The disciples could hardly fail to connect the words with the parable which they had heard so lately. The system and the men that they had been taught to regard as pre-eminently religious were, after all, in their Master's judgment, as the tares and not as the wheat (xii. 37, 38). So far as they were a sect or party, His Father had not planted them. They, too, were left, according to the teaching of that parable, to grow until the harvest, but then these appetites were there before the food, and these appetites were there before the food, and their end was sure — they should be "rooted out." The words which proclaim their doom were, however, intentionally general in their form. In that divine judgment which works through the world's history, foreshadowing the issues of the last great day, that doom is written on every system, party, sect which originates in man's zeal, in narrowness, in self-will. It has not been planted by the Father, and therefore it is doomed to perish.

(14) They be blind leaders of the blind. — It would appear from Rom. ii. 19 that the phrase was one in common use to describe the ideal of the Rabbi's calling. Now they heard it in a new form, which told them that their state was the very reverse of that ideal. And that which was worst in it was that their blindness was self-chosen (xiii. 15), and that they were yet all unconscious of it, and boasted that they saw (see John iv. 41).

If the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch. — The proverb was probably a familiar one (it is given in St. Luke vi. 39 as part of the Sermon on the Plain), but, as now spoken, it had the character of a prophecy. We have but to read the Jewish historian's account of the years that preceded the destruction of Jerusalem to see what the "ditch" was towards which teachers and people were alike blindly hastening. Bitter sectarianism, and wild dreams, and baseless hopes, and maddened zeal, and rejection of the truth which alone had power to save them, this was the issue which both were preparing for themselves, and from which there was no escape.

(15) Declare unto us this parable. — The answer shows that Peter's question referred not to the proverb that immediately preceded, but to what seemed to him the strange, startling utterance of verse 11. It was significant that he could not as yet take in the thought that it was a truth to be received literally. To him it seemed a dark enigmatic saying, which required an explanation, like that which had been given of the parable of the Sower, to make its meaning clear.

(16) Are ye also yet without understanding? — The pronoun is emphatic: "Ye, My disciples, who have heard from My lips the spiritual nature of My kingdom, are ye too, like the Pharisees, still such backward scholars?"

(17) Is cast out into the draught. — The word is used in its old English meaning, as equivalent to drain, sewer, cesspool (see 2 Kings x. 27). St. Mark (vii. 19) adds the somewhat perplexing words, "purging all defilements," or, as we may trace a reference to those thin things which proceed out of the mouth, a teaching so unlike that with which they had been thought that it was a truth to be received literally. To him it seemed a dark enigmatic saying, which required an explanation, like that which had been given of the parable of the Sower, to make its meaning clear.

(19) Evil thoughts, . . . blasphemies. — The plural form points to the manifold variety of the forms of guilt under each several head. The order is in some measure an ascending one, beginning with the "thoughts," or rather trains of thought, which are the first suggestions of evil, and ending in the "blasphemies" or revilings which, directly or indirectly, have God and not man for their object. In this beginning and end we may trace a reference to those "evil surmises" which had led the Pharisees, as in xii. 24, to words which were blasphemy against the Son of Man, and came perilously near to the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit.

(31) Into the coasts of Tyre and Sidon. — St. Mark (vii. 31) says more definitely that our Lord passed, after the miracle, "through Sidon," and so we have the one recorded exception to that self-imposed law of His ministry which kept Him within the limits of the land of Israel. To the disciples it might seem that He was simply withdrawing from conflict with the excited hostility of His Pharisee opponents. We may see a relation between the two acts not unlike that which afterwards connected the vision of Peter at Joppa with his entry into the house of Cornelius at Caesarea. He was showing in act, as before in word (chap. xi. 21), that He regarded Tyre and Sidon as standing on the same level as Chorazin and Bethsaida. The dust of the heathen cities was not more defiling than that of Capernaum. The journey from Caper-
departed into the coasts of Tyre and Sidon. (22) And, behold, a woman of Canaan came out of the same coasts, and cried unto him, saying, Have mercy on me, O Lord, thou son of David; my daughter is grievously vexed with a devil. (23) But he answered her not a word. And his disciples came and besought him, saying, Send her away; for she crieth after us. (24) But he answered and said, I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel. (25) Then came she and worshipped him, saying, Lord, help me. (26) But he answered and said, It is not meet to take the children's bread, and to cast it away to dogs. (27) And I am not sent but unto the lost of the sons of Israel. (28) Then came she and said, Lord, even the dogs under the table eat of the children's dainties. (29) And he answered and said, It is not meet to take the children's bread, and to cast it unto the dogs. (30) But she came and worshipped him, saying, Lord, help me. (31) And the Lord answered and said, Woman, great is thy faith: be it unto thee even as thou wilt. (32) And he delivered her daughter forth of the evil spirit. (33) And they went into Capernaum: and straightway on the morrow Jesus went into the synagogues, and taught. (34) And they were astonished at his teaching: for he taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes. (35) And immediately his father and mother and brethren, and his sisters, and his kinsmen, and his disciples, were gathered together unto him. (36) And they were not able to go in because of the crowd. (37) And he gave them commandment to have something to eat: and they gave unto him fishes and herbs. (38) And he fed them, and they were filled, and he commanded theRemnant of the people to take up the broken pieces, which remained seven baskets. (39) And they did take up seven baskets full. (40) And he commanded his disciples that they should tell it not to any man. (41) And he said unto his disciples, The harvest is plenteous, but the labourers are few. (42) Pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that he send forth labourers into his harvest.
to dogs. (27) And she said, Truth, Lord: yet the dogs eat of the crumbs which fall from their masters’ table. (28) Then Jesus answered and said unto her, O woman, great is thy faith: be it unto thee even as thou wilt. And her daughter was made whole from that very hour. (29) And Jesus departed from thence, and came nigh unto the sea of Galilee; and went up into a mountain, and sat down there. (30) And great multitudes came unto him, having with them those that were blind, dumb, maimed, and many others, and cast them down at Jesus’ feet; and he healed them: (31) insomuch that the multitude wondered, when they saw the dumb to speak, the maimed to be whole, the lame to walk, and the blind to see: and they glorified the God of Israel.

(32) Then Jesus called his disciples unto him, and said, I have compassion on the multitude, because they continue with me now three days, and have nothing to eat: and I will not send

The Dogs eating the Crumbs.
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The Multitude Healed.

well believe that there was no intentional scorn in it, though it emphasized an actual distinction.

(27) Truth, Lord: yet the dogs eat of the crumbs. The insertion of the conjunction “for” in the Greek gives it a force which it is hard to reproduce in English, “Yet grant what I ask, for the dogs under the table...” The woman catches at the form which had softened the usual word of scorn, and presses the privilege which it implied. She did not ask that the “children” might be deprived of any fragment of their portion; but taking her place, contentedly, among the “dogs,” she could still claim Him as her Master, and ask for the “crumbs” of His mercy. The Talmud contains a story so singularly parallel to this that it is worth reproducing. “There was a famine in the land, and stores of corn were placed under the care of Rabbi Jethudah the Holy, to be distributed to those only who were skilled in the knowledge of the Law. And, behold, a man came, Jonathan, the son of Amram, and clamorously asked for his portion. The Rabbi asked of him whether he knew the condition, and had fulfilled it, and then the supplicant changed his tone, and said, ‘Nay, but feed me as a dog is fed, who eats of the crumbs of the feast,’ and the Rabbi hearkened to his words, and gave him of the corn.”

(30) O woman, great is thy faith. The answer of the woman changed the conditions of the problem, and therefore, we may reverently add, changed the purpose which depended on them. Here again, as in the case of the centurion, our Lord found a faith greater than He had met with in Israel. The woman was, in St. Paul’s words, a child of the faith, though not of the flesh, of Abraham (Rom. iv. 16), and as such was entitled to its privileges. She believed in the love of God her Father, in the pity even of the Prophet who had answered her with words of seeming harshness.

Be it unto thee even as thou wilt. —St. Mark adds, as spoken by our Lord, “Go thy way, the devil party travelling together, large enough, as in St. Paul’s anecdote from Damascus (Acts ix. 25), took and longer while in the other it was the κόφιον, or smaller basket, which a man carried in his hand. Lastly, our Lord’s words in xvi. 9, 10, distinctly recognise the two miracles, and connect the close of each with the word which was thus specially appropriate to it. Unless we adopt the incredible hypothesis that the one narrative was first so disguised that it lost the marks of its identity, and that the Evangelists, having combined the two, then invented our Lord’s words, with all their apparent freshness and adaptation to the special circumstances of the hour, they must be admitted to be decisive as proving that there had been two events, like in kind, to which He thus referred. It is significant that here, as so often before, the display
The Four Thousand Fed.

ST. MATTHEW, XVI. The Seven Baskets of Fragments.

them away fasting, lest they faint in the way. (33) And his disciples say unto him, Whence should we have so much bread in the wilderness, as to fill so great a multitude? (34) And Jesus saith unto them, How many loaves have ye? And they said, Seven, and a few little fishes. (35) And he commanded the multitude to sit down on the ground. (36) And he took the seven loaves and the fishes, and gave thanks, and brake them, and gave to his disciples, and the disciples to the multitude. (37) And they did all eat, and were filled: and they took up of the broken meat that was left seven baskets full. (38) And they did eat were four thousand men, beside women and children. (39) And he sent away the multitude, and took ship, and came into the coasts of Magdala.

CHAPTER XVI.—(1) The Pharisees also with the Sadducees came, and of miraculous power in its highest form originates not in answer to a challenge, or as being offered as a proof of a divine mission, but simply from compassion. Three days had passed, and still the crowds hung on His words and waited for His loving acts, and now they began to show signs of exhaustion that moved His sympathy.

(33) His disciples say unto him.—Here, on the assumption that we are dealing with a true record, a difficulty of another kind meets us. How was it, we ask, that the disciples, with the memory of the former miracle still fresh in their recollection, should answer as before with the same child-like perplexity? Why did they not at once assume that the same divine power could be put forth to meet a like want now? The answers to that question may, perhaps, be grouped as follows:—(1.) It is not easy for us to put ourselves in the position of men who witnessed, as they did, these workings of a supernatural might. We think of the Power as inherent, and therefore permanent. To them it might seem intermittent, a gift that came and went. Their daily necessities had been supplied, before and after the great event, in the common way of gift or purchase. The gathering of the fragments (Matt. xiv. 20; John vi. 12) seemed to imply that they were not to rely on the repetition of the wonder. (2.) The fact that three days had passed, and that hunger had been allowed to pass on to the borders of exhaustion, might well have led to think that the power was not to be exerted now. (3.) Our Lord's implied question—though, as before, He Himself "knew what He would do" (John vi. 6)—must have appeared to them to exclude the thought that He was about to make use again of that reserve of power which He had displayed before. They would seem to themselves to be simply following in His footsteps when they answered His question as on the level which He Himself thus appeared to choose.

(34) Seven, and a few little fishes.—The resemblance of the answer to that which had been given before is, at least, interesting as showing what was the provision habitually made by the travelling company of preachers for the supply of their daily wants. The few barley loaves and dried fishes, this was all their store, as they went from village to village, or passed days and nights on the hills of Galilee.

(35) He commanded the multitude to sit down on the ground.—Probably, with the same orderly precision as before, by hundreds and by fifties, the women and children, as we learn from verse 38, being in this instance also grouped together apart from the men.

(36) Seven baskets full.—The nature of the baskets has been explained above. As it is hardly likely that these could have been carried by the disciples on their journey, we must think of them as having been probably brought by some of the multitude to hold their provisions. The fact that the disciples were shortly afterwards (xvi. 7) again without provision, suggests the thought that the fragments themselves had been in their turn distributed to the poor of the villages in the district to which our Lord and the disciples now turned their courses.

(37) Into the coasts of Magdala.—The better MSS. give the reading Magadan. The narrative implies that it was on the western shore of the lake, and it is probably to be identified with the modern village of El Mejdel, about three miles above Tabarieh (Tiberias). The name would seem to be an altered form of the Hebrew Mejdel, a tower. On the assumption that "Mary, called Magdalene," derived her name from a town of that name, we may think of our Lord's visit as having been in some way connected with her presence. It is clear that the company of devout women who ministered to Him could hardly have followed Him in the more distant journey to the coasts of Tyre and Sidon, and it was natural, if they did not, that they should have returned for a time to their homes. St. Mark gives Dalmanutha as the place where our Lord disembarked. This has been identified with the modern Ain-al-Birideh, the "cold fountain," a glen which opens upon the lake about a mile from Magdala.

XVI. (1) The Pharisees also with the Sadducees came, and the presence of members of the latter sect, who do not elsewhere appear in our Lord's Galilean ministry, is noticeable. It is probably explained by St. Mark's version of the warning in verse 6, where "the leaven of Herod" appears as equivalent to "the leaven of the Sadducees" in St. Matthew's report. The Herodians were the Galilean Sadducees, and the union of the two hostile parties was the continuation of the alliance which had begun after our Lord's protest against the false reverence for the Sabbath, which was common to both the parties (Mark iii. 6).

That he would shew them a sign from heaven.—The signs and wonders that had been wrought on earth were not enough for the questioners. There might be collusion, or a power, like that implied in the charge of "casting out devils by Beelzebub," preternatural, but not divine. What they asked was a sign like Samuel's thunder from the clear blue sky (1 Sam. xii. 18), or Elijah's fire from heaven (1 Kings xviii. 38); or, possibly, following the train of thought suggested by the discourse at Capernaum, now definitely asking, what they hinted then (John vi. 30, 31), for bread, not multiplied on earth, but coming straight from heaven.
The Signs of the Heaven

ST. MATTHEW, XVI. and of the Times.

\( \text{tempting desired him that he would shew them a sign from heaven.} \) 

He answered and said unto them, When it is evening, ye say, \textit{It will be fair weather:} for the sky is red. \( \text{(3) And in the morning, \textit{It will be foul weather} to day: for the sky is red and lowering.} \)

\( \text{O ye hypocrites, ye can discern the face of the sky; but can ye not discern the signs of the times?} \)

\( \text{A wicked and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given unto it, but the sign of the prophet Jonas.} \) And he left them, and departed. \( \text{(5) And when his disciples were come to the other side, they had forgotten to take bread.} \)

\( \text{Then Jesus said unto them, Take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees.} \) And they reasoned among themselves, saying, \textit{It is because we have taken no bread.} 

\( \text{(6) Which when Jesus perceived, he said unto them, O ye of little faith, why reason ye among yourselves, because ye} \)

\( \text{Thy had forgotten. — Better, they forgot.} \) 

St. Mark, with his usual precision in detail, states that they had but \textit{“one loaf”} with them. Either the suddenness of their Lord’s departure had deprived them of their customary forethought, or, it may be, they were beginning to depend wrongly on the wonder-working power, as though it would be used, not as before, to supply the wants of the famished multitude, but as rendering that forethought needless for themselves.

\( \text{(7) Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees.} \) The form of the warning was obviously determined by the fact just narrated. The Master saw the perplexed looks and heard the self-reproaching or mutually acusing whispers of the disciples, and made them the text of a proverb which was a concentrated parable. As St. Mark gives the words, they stand, \textit{“Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees, and of the leaven of Herod,”} and this, if we have to make our choice, we may believe to have been the form in which they were actually spoken; St. Matthew, or the report which he followed, substituting for the less known Herodians the better known Sadducees. The language of the tetrarch, as has been shown (see Note on chap. xiv. 2), implies that Sadduceism had been the prevailing belief of his life, and the current of Jewish political, not to say religious, sympathies, naturally led the Sadducean priests, courting (as Caiphas did) the favour of the Roman rulers, to fraternise with the scribes who attached themselves to the party of the tetrarch. (Comp. Acts v. 17.)

\( \text{(8) Beware of the Pharisees.} \) The form of the warning was obviously determined by the fact just narrated. The Master saw the perplexed looks and heard the self-reproaching or mutually acusing whispers of the disciples, and made them the text of a proverb which was a concentrated parable. As St. Mark gives the words, they stand, \textit{“Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees, and of the leaven of Herod,”} and this, if we have to make our choice, we may believe to have been the form in which they were actually spoken; St. Matthew, or the report which he followed, substituting for the less known Herodians the better known Sadducees. The language of the tetrarch, as has been shown (see Note on chap. xiv. 2), implies that Sadduceism had been the prevailing belief of his life, and the current of Jewish political, not to say religious, sympathies, naturally led the Sadducean priests, courting (as Caiphas did) the favour of the Roman rulers, to fraternise with the scribes who attached themselves to the party of the tetrarch. (Comp. Acts v. 17.)

\( \text{(9) Beware of the Pharisees.} \) The form of the warning was obviously determined by the fact just narrated. The Master saw the perplexed looks and heard the self-reproaching or mutually acusing whispers of the disciples, and made them the text of a proverb which was a concentrated parable. As St. Mark gives the words, they stand, \textit{“Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees, and of the leaven of Herod,”} and this, if we have to make our choice, we may believe to have been the form in which they were actually spoken; St. Matthew, or the report which he followed, substituting for the less known Herodians the better known Sadducees. The language of the tetrarch, as has been shown (see Note on chap. xiv. 2), implies that Sadduceism had been the prevailing belief of his life, and the current of Jewish political, not to say religious, sympathies, naturally led the Sadducean priests, courting (as Caiphas did) the favour of the Roman rulers, to fraternise with the scribes who attached themselves to the party of the tetrarch. (Comp. Acts v. 17.)

\( \text{It is because we have taken no bread.} \) — There is a childish \textit{naïveté} in their self-questioning which testifies to the absolute originality and truthfulness of the record, and so to the genuineness of the question which follows, and which assumes the reality of the two previous miracles. The train of thought which connected the warning and the fact was probably hardly formulated even in their own minds. It may be that they imagined that as the Pharisees would not eat of bread that had been defiled by the touch of heathen or publican, so their Master forbade them, however great their need, to receive food at the hands of either of the sects that had combined against Him.

\( \text{(10) O ye of little faith.} \) — Our Lord reproves not the want of discernment which made them slow to receive the meaning of the similitude, but their want of faith. The discernment depended (in part, at least) on imaginative power, or acquired culture, for the lack of which they were not responsible. But their memory of the manner in which their wants had been twice supplied might at least have taught them that no such case of extreme necessity, such as they pictured to themselves, was likely to arise while He was with them, and therefore that their gross carnal interpre-
have brought no bread? (9) Do ye not yet understand, neither remember the five loaves of the five thousand, and how many baskets ye took up? (10) Neither the seven loaves of the four thousand, and how many baskets ye took up? (11) How is it that ye do not understand that I spake it not to you concerning bread, that ye should beware of the
tation of His words could not possibly be the true one. Memory in this case should have been an aid to faith, and faith, in its turn, would have quickened spiritual discernment.

(9, 10) How many baskets.—The distinction between the two kinds of baskets—the copthini and the spuriades—is, as before noticed (Note on Matt. xv. 32), strictly observed here.

(11) How is it that ye do not understand?—True to His method of education our Lord does not hint at the presupposition of the parable. But is, of course, content to suggest the train of thought which led to the interpretation. And the disciples, slow of heart as they were, followed the clue thus given. "Then understood they." Memory did at last quicken faith, and faith, in its turn, would have quickened the return of Christ.

The doctrine of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees.—Better, teaching; not so much the formulated dogmas of the sect as a general drift and tendency. The leaven was (as expressly stated in Luke xii. 1) "hypocrisy," the unreality of a life respectable, rigid, outwardly religious, even earnest in its zeal, and yet wanting in the humility and love which are of the essence of true holiness. That of the Sadducees and of Herod, was, we may believe (it is not specially defined), the more open form of worldliness and self-indulgence which allied themselves with their denial of Whom do men say that I the Son of man am? (14) And they

name of the city, Paneas, bore witness to this consecration. Herod the Great built a temple there in honour of Augustus (Jos. Ant. xv. 10, § 3), and his son Philip the tetrarch (to whose province it belonged) enlarged and embellished the city, and re-named it in honour of the emperor and to perpetuate his own memory. From Agrippa II. it received the name of Neronia, as a like compliment to the emperor to whom he owed his title; but the old local name survived these passing changes, and still exists in the modern Banias. With the journey through Sidon (Mark vii. 31), it was the northern limit of our Lord's wanderings; and belonging as it does to the same period of His ministry, His visit to it may be regarded, though not as an extension of His work beyond its self-imposed limits, as indicating something like a sympathy with the out-lying heathen who made up the bulk of its population—a sense of rest, it may be, in turning to them from the ceaseless strife and bitterness which He encountered at Capernaum and Jerusalem. How the days passed which were spent on the journey, what gracious words or acts of mercy marked His track, what communings with His Father were held in the solitude of the mountain-heights—are questions which we may dwell upon in reverential silence, but must be content to leave unanswered. The incident which follows is the one event of which we have any record.

Whom do men say that I the Son of man am?—The Greek emphasizes "men" by prefixing the article, so as to contrast the opinions of men, as such, with God's revelation. The question comes before us, as possibly it did to the disciples, with a sharp abruptness. We may believe, however, that it occupied a fitting place in the spiritual education through which our Lord was leading His disciples. It was a time of, at least, seeming failure and partial desertion. "From that time," St. John relates, speaking of what followed after the discourse at Capernaum, "many of His disciples went back, and walked no more with Him." (John vi. 66.) He had turned to the Twelve and asked, in tones of touching sadness, "Will ye also go away?" and had received from Peter, as the spokesman of the others, what was for the time a reassuring answer, "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life, and this has been coupled with the confession of faith which we now find repeated. But in the meantime there had been signs of wavering. He had had to rebuke them as being "of little faith" (verse 8). They had urged something like a policy of reticence in His conflict with the Pharisees (chap. xv. 12). One of the Twelve was cherishing in his soul the "devil-temper" of a betrayer (John vi. 70). It was time, if we may so speak, that they should be put to a critical test, and the alternative of faith or want of faith pressed home upon their consciences.

(14) And they said, Some say that thou art John the Baptist.—The passage is the greatest possible interest as one of the very few that indicate
the disciples had borne before he
appeared, and were impressed with wonder at His words and works, as having been before unknown to them.

(13) He saith unto them, But whom say ye that I am? (18) And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. (17) And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee.—Better, It was not flesh and blood that revealed it unto thee.—The words are used in their common Hebrew meaning (as in John i. 13; 1 Cor. xv. 50; Eph. vi. 12) for human nature, human agency, in all their manifold expressions, to which the Pharisees had given a place in their system of teaching. The great actors of the past were still in existence. They might, at any great national crisis, reappear to continue and complete their work. Each of the answers has a further special interest of its own.

(1.) The identification of our Lord with the Baptist has already met us as coming from the lips of the tetrarch Antipas, adopted, but not originated, by him as explaining our Lord’s mighty works (Matt. xiv. 2; Luke ix. 7). (2.) The belief that Elijah had appeared was of the same nature. He was expected as the forerunner of the Messiah (Mal. iv. 5). The imagination of the people had at first seen in the Baptist the reappearance of a prophet, but he, through the teaching of John, had disclaimed the character which was thus ascribed to him, and it was natural that the impression of the people should now turn to One who appeared to them as simply continuing his work. The character of our Lord’s recent miracles, corresponding as it did to that which was recorded as wrought by Elijah for the widow of Sarepta (1 Kings xvii. 14), had partly strengthened that impression. (3.) The name of Jeremiah introduces a new train of legendary thought. The impression made by that prophet on the minds of men had led to something like a mythical after-growth. It was said that the spirit of Jeremiah had passed into Zechariah (see Note on Matt. xxvii. 9), and on that assumption another reappearance might well seem probable. He, it was believed, had hidden the ark, and the tabernacle, and the altar of incense in a cave in “the mountain where Moses climbed up and saw the heritage of God”—i.e., in Nebo, or Pisgah (2 Macc. ii. 1—7)—and was expected to come and guide the people in the time “when God should gather His people together” to the place of concealment. He had appeared to Judas Maccabees in a vision as “a man with grey hairs, and exceeding glorious,” and as the guardian prophet of the people, praying for them and for the Holy City, had given him a golden sword as the gift of God (2 Macc. xv. 13—18). As the prophet who had foretold the new covenant and the coming of the Lord our Righteousness (Jer. xxiii. 6, xxxi. 31) he was identified, as thoroughly as Isaiah, with the Messianic expectations of the people. Something, we may add, there may have been in our Lord’s human aspect, as a Man of sorrows and acquainted with grief, which may have helped to suggest this identification with the prophet who was, above all others of the goodly company, a prophet of lamentations and tears and woe.

(4.) The last conjecture was more vague and undefined, and was probably the resource of those who were impressed with wonder at our Lord’s words and works, and yet could not bring themselves to acknowledge Him as what He claimed to be. All the four conjectures, it will be seen, fell far short of the recognition of the Christ.

Interpreted in connection with the vision of Dan. vii. 13, the words of the question, “Whom do men say that I, the Son of Man, am?” did, in fact, assume His claim to be the Christ. But it remained to be seen whether the disciples had risen to their Lord’s meaning in thus speaking of Himself, and would, on their part, adopt that interpretation. The report which they made of the belief of others shows how little, at this time (whatever may have been the case earlier or later), He was regarded as the Messiah by the mass of the people.

Whom say ye?—The pronoun is doubly emphasised in the Greek, “But ye—whom say ye . . . ?” The question is, as has been said, parallel in tone, though not in form, to that of John vi. 67. Had they still a distinct faith of their own? or were they, too, falling back into these popular surmises?

Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.—The variations in the other Gospels—St. Mark giving simply, “Thou art the Christ,” St. Luke, “Thou art the Son of God” —in this point of the question of literal inspiration, but do not affect the meaning; and the fullest of the three reports may be received without hesitation as the most authentic. The confession was made by Peter, partly, we may believe, as the representative of the others, partly, as the special promise that follows implies, from the personal fervour of his character. He believed himself, and had impressed his faith on them. His words have helped to suggest this identification with the in John i. 42) by the full utterance of the name which he had pronounced, not through popular rumours, not through the teaching of scribes, but by a revelation...
unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven. (18) And I say also unto thee,

from the Father. He was led, in the strictest sense of the words, through the veil of our Lord's human nature to recognise the divine. {1} Thou art Peter, and upon this rock . . . .

—It is not easy, in dealing with a text which for many centuries has been the subject-matter of endless controversies, to clear our minds of those "after-thoughts of theology" which have gathered round it, and, in part at least, overlaid its meaning. It is clear, however, that we can only reach the true meaning by putting those controversies aside, at all events till we have endeavoured to realise what thoughts the words at the time actually conveyed to those who heard them, and that when we have grasped that meaning it will be our best preparation for determining what bearing they have upon the later controversies of ancient or modern times. And (1) it would seem clear that the connection between Peter and the rock (the words in the Greek differ in gender, πέτρα and πέτρας, but were identical in the Aramaic, which our Lord probably used) was meant to be brought into special prominence. Now whether built is my Church, (2) or Christ Himself? Taking all the facts of the case, the balance seems to incline in favour of the latter view. (1) Christ and not Peter is the Rock in 1 Cor. x. 4, the Foundation in 1 Cor. iii. 11. (2) The poetry of the Old Testament associated the idea of the Rock with builders. (1) aJohn 1 · 42. That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the

(18) And I say also unto thee, (xviii. 17) in which it is found in the whole cycle of our Lord's recorded teaching. Its use was every way significant. Partly, doubtless, it came with the associations which it had in the Greek of the Old Testament, as used for the "assembly" or "congregation" of the Lord (Deut. xviii. 16; xxiii. 1; Ps. xxvi. 12); but partly also, as soon at least as the word came in its Greek form before Greek readers, it would bring with it the associations of Greek politics. The Ecclesia was the assembly of free citizens, to which belonged judicial and legislative power, and from which aliens and slaves were alike excluded. The mere use of the term was accordingly a momentous step in the education of the disciples. They had been looking for a kingdom with the King, as its visible Head, sitting on an earthly throne. They were told that it was to be realised in a society, like those which in earthly polities we call popular or democratic. He, the King, claimed that society as His own. He was its real Head and Founder; but, outwardly, it was to be what the word which He now chose described. And the Church He was to build. It might seem to incline in favour of the last view. (Comp. vii. 24.) and Death rides upon a pale horse, and Hades follows in the shadow-world of the dead, the unseen counterpart of the visible grave, all-absorbing, all-destructive, into whose gates or gates all things human pass, and from which issue all forces that destroy, is half-idealised, half-personified, as a power, or polity of death. The very phrase, "gates of the grave, or of Hades," meets us in Hezekiah's elegy (Isa. xxxviii. 10), and Wisd. xvi. 13. In Rev. vi. 8 the personification is carried still further, and Death rides upon a pale horse, and Hades follows after him, and both are in the end overthrown and cast into the lake of fire (Rev. xx. 14). And as the gates of the Eastern city were the scene at once of
The Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven. ST. MATTHEW, XVI. The Power to Bind and Loose.

And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven. (a John 20. 23.)


1. The palace of a great king implied the presence of a chief officer, as treasurer or chamberlain, or to use the term of Hillel, a "servant," or, as an "office," as "over the household." And of this, as in the case of Eblakia, the son of Hilkiah (Isa. xxii. 22), the key of the office, the key of the gates and of the treasure, was the recognised symbol. In the highest sense that key of the house of David belonged to Christ Himself as the King. It was He who opened and none could shut, who shut and none could open (Rev. iii. 7). But that power was now delegated to the servant whose very name, as an Apostle, marked him out as his Lord's representative, and the after-history of Peter's work, when through him God "opened the door of faith unto the Gentiles" (Acts xiv. 27; xv. 7), was the proof of his faithful discharge of the office thus assigned to him. (2.) With this there was another thought, which in the latter clause of the verse becomes the dominant one. The scribes of Israel were thought of as stewards of the treasures of divine wisdom (xiii. 52). When they were admitted to their office they received, as its symbol, the "key of knowledge" (Luke xi. 52), which was to admit them to the treasure-chambers of the house of the interpreter, the Beth-Midrash of the Rabbis. For this work the Christ had been training His disciples, and Peter's confession had shown that the training had so far done its work. He was qualified to be a "scribe instructed unto the kingdom of heaven, and to bring forth out of its treasures things new and old" (chap. xiii. 52); and now the "key" was given to him as the token of his admission to that office. It made him not a priest (that office lay altogether outside the range of the symbolism), but a teacher and interpreter. The words that follow as to "binding" and "loosing" were the formal confirmation of that symbol. Had the disciple of Christ not only to belong to the scribe's office and not the priest's, and express an entirely different thought from that of retaining and forgiving sins. That power was, it is true, afterwards bestowed on Peter and his brother-apostles (see Note on John xx. 23), but it is not in question here. As interpreted by the language which was familiar to the Jews (see Lightfoot, Hor. Hebr., on this verse), the words pointed primarily to legislative or interpretative functions, not to the judicial treatment of individual men. The school of Shammai, e.g., bound what it declared this or that act to be a transgression of the Sabbath law, or forbade divorce on any but the one ground of adultery; the school of Hillel loosed when it set men free from the obligations thus imposed. Here, too, the after-work of Peter was an illustration of the meaning of the words. When he resisted the attempt of the Judaisers to "put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples" (Acts xv. 10), he was loosing what was also loosed in heaven. When he proclaimed, as in his Epistle, the eternal laws of righteousness, and holiness, and love, he was binding those laws on the conscience of all who had faith in Christ, whatever the power thus bestowed on him was conferred afterward (xviii. 18) on the whole company of the Apostles, or, more probably, on the whole body of the disciples in their collective unity, and there with an implied extension to partially judicial functions (see Note on xviii. 18).

A few words will, it is believed, be sufficient to set the claims and the controversies which have had their rise upon the interpretation of this verse. It may be briefly noted (1) that it is at least doubtful (not to claim too much for the interpretation given above) whether the man Peter was the rock on which the Church was to be built; (2) that it is doubtful (though this is not the place to discuss the question) whether Peter was ever in any real sense Bishop of the Church of Rome, or in any way connected with its foundation; (3) that there is not a syllable pointing to the transmission of the power conferred on him to his successors in that supposed Episcopate; (4) as just stated, that the power was not given to him alone, but equally to all the disciples; (5) that the power of the keys, no less than that of "binding" and "loosing," was not sacerdotal, but belonged to the office of a scribe or teacher. As a matter of interpretation, the Roman argument from this verse stands on a level with that which sees the supremacy of the successors of St. Peter in the "two great lights" of Gen. i. 16, or the "two swords" of Luke xxi. 38. The claims of the Church of Rome rest, such as they are, on the greatness of her history, on her association with the imperial city, on the work done by her as the "light of the wide West" in ages of darkness, on the imposing aspect of her imagined unity; but to build them upon the promise to Peter is but the idolatry of fantastic dreams, fit only to find its place in that Limbo of vanities which contains, among other abortive or morbid growths, the monstrosities of interpretation.

Then charged he his disciples that they should tell no man.—We may venture to analyse what we may reverently call the motives of this reticence. Had the disciples gone about, not only as preachers of repentance, but sounding the watchword that the Christ had come, it might not have been difficult for them to gather round Him the homage of excited crowds. It
should tell no man that he was Jesus the Christ.

(21) From that time forth began Jesus to shew unto his disciples, how that he must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and be raised again the third day. (22) Then

was not such homage, however, that he sought, but that which had its root in a deeper faith. It tended to present a false aspect of His kingdom to the minds of men; it tended also to prevent the consummation to which He was now directing the thoughts of His disciples as the necessary condition of His entering on the glory of His kingdom. The zeal of the multitude to make him a king after their own fashion (John vi. 15) was what He deprecated and shunned.

(21) From that time forth began Jesus.—The prominence given to the prediction shows that it came upon the minds of the disciples as something altogether new. They had failed to understand the mysterious hints of the future which were given in, "Destroy this temple" (John ii. 19), in the Son of Man being "lifted up" (John iii. 14), in the sign of the prophet "Jonas" (xii. 39; xvi. 4). Now the veil is uplifted, and the order of events is plainly foretold—the entry into Jerusalem, the rejection, the condemnation, the death, the resurrection. It is obvious that if we accept the record as true the prediction is one which implies a foreknowledge that is at least supernatural, and is so far evidence of a divine mission, it is also of a divine nature in the speaker. And it may well be urged that in this case the incidents which surround the prediction—as, e.g., Peter's protest, and the rebuke addressed to him in such striking contrast with the previous promise—have a character of originality and unexpectedness which negatives the hypothesis of its being a prophecy after the event. On the other hand, the fact that the disciples did not take in the meaning of the prediction as to His rising from the dead may, in its turn, be pleaded in bar of the assumption that the prophecy lingered in men's minds, and suggested the belief in a mythical, in the absence of a real, fulfilment.

(22) Peter took him, and began to rebuke him.—It is obvious that the mind of the disciple dwelt on the former, not the latter part of the prediction. The death was plain and terrible to him, for he failed to grasp the idea of the resurrection. The remonstrance would perhaps have been natural at any time, but the contrast between this prediction and the tone of confidence and triumph in the previous promise doubles intensified its vehemence. Personal love for his Lord, his own desire to share in the glory which He was about to receive, was the causeless despondency, a dark view of the future, at variance alike with his own expectations and what seemed to him the meaning of His Master's previous words. The words that followed were, however, more than a prayer, "This shall not be unto thee," as though his power to bind and to loose extended even to the region of his Master's work and the means by which it was to be accomplished.

(23) He turned, and said to Peter.—St. Mark adds, significantly, "when He had turned about and looked on His disciples." They, we may believe, stood behind, watching the effect of the remonstrance which Peter had uttered as their spokesman, and therefore, the Lord reading their thoughts, the rebuke, though addressed to him, was so worded that they too might hear the voice of a divine in the speaker, and the rebuke would be to them as an offence unto them. He added, "Get thee behind me, Satan: thou art an offence unto me; for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but the things that be of men."
Then said Jesus unto his disciples, If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me. For whosoever will save his life shall lose it: and whosoever will lose his life for my sake shall find it. (25) For what is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul? (26) For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works. (27) Verily I say unto you, There be some standing here, which shall not taste of death... The immediate sequence of the vision of the Son of Man transfigured...
from the low estate in which He then lived and moved, into the "excellency of glory" which met the gaze of the three disciples, has led not a few interpreters to see in that vision the fulfilment of this prediction. A closer scrutiny of the words must, however, lead us to set aside that interpretation, except so far as the Transfiguration bore witness to what had till then been the latent possibilities of His greatness. To speak of something that was to take place within six days as to occur before some of those who heard the words should taste of death (comp. John viii. 52, Heb. ii. 9, for the form of the expression) would hardly have been natural; nor does the vision, as such, satisfy the meaning of the words "coming in His kingdom." The solution of the problem is to be found in the great prophecy of chap. xxiv. In a sense which was real, though partial, the judgment which fell upon the Jewish Church, the destruction of the Holy City and the Temple, was the outward march of the Church of Christ, as was the coming of the Son of Man in His kingdom.

His people felt that He was not far off from every one of them. He had come to them in "spirit and in power," and that advent was at once the earnest and the foreshadowing of the "great far-off event," the day and hour of which were hidden from the angels of God, and even from the Son of Man Himself (Mark xiii. 32). The words find their parallel in those that declared that "This generation shall not pass away till all be fulfilled" (xxiv. 34). That such words should have been recorded and published by the Evangelists is a proof either that they accepted that interpretation, if they wrote after the destruction of Jerusalem, or, if we assume that they were led by them to look for the "end of all things" as near at hand, that they wrote before the generation of those who then stood by had been "eye-witnesses of His majesty" (2 Pet. i. 16). To those who believe that our Lord's human nature was in very deed, sin only excepted, like unto ours, it will not seem over-bold to suggest that for Him too this might have been a time of conflict and of trial, a renewal of the Temptation in the wilderness (chap. xvi. 23), an anticipation of that of the agony of Gethsemane, and that even for Him, in his humanity, there might be in the excellent glory and in the voice from heaven the help and comfort which strengthened Him for the cross and passion. Following the narrative in its details, we may trace its several stages in some such sequence as follows:—After six days, spent apparently with their Lord in the mountain district near Cesarea Philippi, but not in the work of preaching or working miracles, the rest of the disciples are left at the foot of the mountain, and the three follow Him, as the evening closes, to its summit.

There, as afterwards in Gethsemane, He withdraws from them "about a stone's throw" (Luke xxii. 41), and they "watch with Him," and gaze on Him, as He, standing or kneeling (the first was, we must remember, the more common attitude of prayer, Luke xviii. 11), intercedes for them and for Israel, and,
And, behold, there appeared unto them Moses and Elias talking with him. Then answered Peter, and said unto Jesus, Lord, it is good for us to be here: if thou wilt, let us make here three tabernacles; one for thee, and one for Moses, and one for Elias. While he yet spake, a bright cloud overshadowed them: and behold a voice out of the cloud, which said, This is my beloved Son.

And one of the scribes said unto him, Master, thou hast said the words of eternal life. It is said by the way of tradition, and of the scribes, that man shall not die but have an immortal soul. Lord, now hast thou spoken the words of eternal life. Amen, amen, I say unto thee, now belovest thou the Father, and shewest me all things. Verily, verily, I say unto thee, he that heareth my words, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall come up into the presence of the Son of man.

When Jesus had spoken these words, he was parted from them, and carried up into heaven, and a cloud received him out of their sight. And they went into the mount, and waited for them as they promised, until they had been vested with white garments. And it came to pass, as they were in the way, that a man ran from the city, and came to them, and said, Lord, I pray thee, look upon my sins. Then they removed from thence, and came into the parts of Judea beyond Jordan. Then began Jesus to shew unto them himself that he must go up to Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and be raised again the third day. Then said the disciples, Rabbi, blessed art thou that teachest them of these things. Then said Jesus unto them, O men of Saba, how is it that ye believe not my words? For the Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are oppressed, to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord, and the day of vengeance of our God; to comfort all them that mourn; to give unto them that despised to lift up the humble, and to exalt the meek; to give unto them that mourn in Zion the former beauty of his image; to give unto them that have shed their blood for the word of God the land of the living. Then shall the wolf and the lamb feed together; and the lion shall eat straw like the ox; and the sucking child shall play over the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall take hold on the bow of the serpent; and the child shall bite the asp, and the little child shall put his hand on the cockatrice. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain: for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea. And in that day shall the root of Jesse be standing for an ensign of the people; upon it shall the nations trust.
my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye him. (6) And when the disciples heard it, they fell on their face, and were sore afraid. (7) And Jesus came and touched them, and said, Arise, and be not afraid. (8) And when they had lifted up their eyes, they saw no man, save Jesus only. (9) And as they came down from the mountain, Jesus charged them, saying, Tell the vision to no man, until the Son of man be risen again from the dead. (10) And his disciples asked him, saying, Why then say the scribes that Elias must first come? (11) And Jesus answered and said unto them, Elias truly shall come first, and restore all things. (12) But I say unto you, That Elias is come already, and they knew him not, but have done unto him all manner of things: as it is written of him.

(6) When the disciples heard it.—At this point St. Matthew's narrative is the fullest. The three disciples shrink in fear, like that of the Israelites at the brightness of Moses' face (Ex. xxxiv. 30), like that of the priests in the Temple who could not stand to minister because of the cloud (1 Kings viii. 11), and lie prostrate on the ground in speechless terror. They have seen the glory of the Lord: can they hear His voice and live?

(7) Jesus came and touched them.—Act and words were both expressive of an almost brotherly tenderness. The touch of the hand they had so often grasped—as, e.g., in xiv. 31—the familiar words that had been of so much service to them in the hour of danger (xiv. 27), recall these again to the realities of life. They need not fear the glory of the divine Presence, for He is with them still as its most perfect manifestation.

(8) They saw no man, save Jesus only.—The words, following as they do upon the “Be not afraid,” imply a marked contrast to Peter's rash thought of a dream-state in the beholders. It was not “good” for frail men such as they were to tarry long in the immediate glory of the Presence. It was a relief to see “Jesus only” with them, as they had been wont to see Him. So in our own lives, moments of spiritual ecstasy are few and far between, and it is good for us that it should be so, and that we should be left to carry the fragrance and power of their memory into the work of our common life, and the light of our common day.

It may not be amiss to say a few words as to the credibility of a narrative which is in itself so wonderful, and has been exposed so often to the attacks of a hostile criticism. And (1) it is obvious that what is commonly known as the rationalistic method of interpretation is altogether inapplicable here. The narrative of the Evangelists cannot by any artifice be reduced to a highly-coloured version of a natural phenomenon falling under known laws. If accepted at all, it must be accepted as belonging to the region of the supernatural. (2) The so-called mythical theory, which sees in such narratives the purely legendary after-growth of the dreaming fancies of a later age, is of course possible here, as it is possible wherever the arbitrary criticism which postulates the incredibility of the supernatural chooses to apply it; but it may, at least, be urged against its application in this instance that there was no ground in the Jewish expectations; the circumstance connected with it are such (e.g., its association with our Lord's sufferings, and the strange, abrupt utterance of Peter) as were hardly likely to suggest themselves either to the popular imagination or to that of an individual mind. (3) The position which it occupies both in our Lord's ministry and the spiritual training of the disciples, while, on the one hand, it raises the Transfiguration, though the raving of a mere marvel, is, it may be urged again, such as was not likely to occur to a simple lover of the marvellous. (4) Lastly, the language of John i. 14 and (though with less certainty, owing to the doubt which hangs over the genuineness of that Epistle) of 2 Peter i. 16, may surely be allowed some evidential weight, as being of the nature of allusive reference to a fact which the writers take for granted as generally known. Over and above St. Peter's direct reference, we note the recurrence of the words “decease,” “tabernacle,” as suggested by it (2 Pet. i. 13, 15).

(9) Tell the vision to no man.—The command obviously included even the rest of the Apostles within the range of its prohibition. For them in their lower stage of spiritual growth, the report of the vision at second hand would have been only sufficient to dispirit it or to pervert its meaning. Whatever reasons excluded them from being spectators were of still greater weight for the time against their hearing of what had been seen from others. The Greek word for “vision,” it may be noted, means simply “what they had seen,” and does not suggest, as the English word does, the thought of a dream-state in the beholders.

(10) His disciples asked him.—The context clearly implies that the question came not from the disciples at large, but from the three who had seen the vision, and were brooding over the appearance, and yet more, perhaps, the disappearance, of Elijah, as connected with the tradition of the scribes. If Elijah was to come and prepare the way, why had he thus come from the unseen world for a moment only?

(11) Elias truly shall first come.—Better, cometh. Our Lord's words are obviously enigmatic in their form, and, as such, admit of two very different interpretations. Taken literally, as they have been by very many both in earlier and later times, they seem to say that Elijah shall come in person before the yet future day of the Lord, the great second Advent of the Christ. So it has been argued the prophecy of Mal. iv. 5 shall yet have a literal fulfilment, and John the Baptist when he confessed that he was not Elijah (John i. 21) was rightly expecting his appearance. It would hardly be right to reject this interpretation merely on the ground of its literalism, or its improbability, or the resemblance which it has to the fantastic belief and practices, which have kept their ground even in modern Judaism, in connection with the expected appearance of the Tishbite, though these, so far as they go, must be thrown into the adverse scale. The words that follow in the next verse are, however, decisive against it or to pervert its meaning. Whatever reasons excluded them from being spectators were of still greater weight for the time against their hearing of what had been seen from others. The Greek word for “vision,” it may be noted, means simply “what they had seen,” and does not suggest, as the English word does, the thought of a dream-state in the beholders.

And restore all things.—Better, and shall restore. Leaving for the present the question who was to do the work, we turn to the nature of the work itself. Our Lord's language generalises the description given by Malachi. That work of “turning the hearts of the children to the fathers, and the hearts of the fathers to the children,” was but part of a wider restoration of things and persons. Old truths were to be re-proclaimed, and cleared from the after-growths of traditions. Men, as a race, were to be brought into their right relation to their God and Father. The
first come, and restore all things.

(12) But I say unto you, That Elias is come already, and they knew him not, but have done unto him whatsoever they listed. Likewise shall also the Son of man suffer of them. (13) Then the disciples understood that he spake unto them of John the Baptist.

words seem—at least as interpreted by Acts ii. 21 (where see Note); Rom. viii. 21; Eph. i. 22, 23; 1 Cor. xv. 28, and other like passages—to point forward to a “restitution of all things,” the bringing in of order where now there is disorder and confusion, which shall embrace not Israel only, or even mankind, but the whole universe of God, visible and invisible.

(14) And when they were come to the multitude, there came to him a certain man, kneeling down to him, and saying, (15) Lord, have mercy on my son: for he is lunatick, and sore vexed: for oftentimes he falleth into the fire, and oft into the water. (16) And I brought him to thy disciples, and they could not

Transfiguration. The magie power of the art of Raffaelle has brought into vivid juxtaposition the contrast between the scene of glory above and that of trouble and unrest below, but we must not allow the impression made by the picture to distort our thoughts of the history. The two scenes did not synchronise. The vision was at night, and the descent from the mountain would have carried those who made the journey some way at least into the day that followed.

There came to him a certain man.—St. Mark (ix. 14—16) narrates more fully that as our Lord and the disciples were coming to the disciples, they saw a crowd, and scribes disputing with them; that when the multitude saw this they were astonished, and running to Him, saluted Him; that He then asked, Why dispute ye with them? Why dispute ye with them? and that this drew forth the answer and the prayer which in St. Matthew’s record stands without any prelude.

(15) Lunatick.—See Note on iv. 24. The other Gospels add some further touches. The boy had a “dumb spirit.” When the spirit seized him it “tore him,” and he foamed at the mouth, and gnashed with his teeth. Slowly, and as with difficulty, the paroxysm passed off, and the sufferer was wasting away under the violence of the attacks. The phenomena described are, it need hardly be said, those of epilepsy complicated with insanity, a combination common in all countries, and likely to be aggravated where the “seizure,” which the very word epilepsy implies, was the work of a supernatural power. A prolonged melancholy, an inexpressible look of sadness, a sudden falling, and loss of consciousness, with or without convulsions, or passing into a tetanic stiffness, a periodical recurrence of the pangs, recurring often with the new or full moon (hence probably the description of the boy as “lunatick”), grinding the teeth, foaming at the mouth, are all noted by medical writers as symptoms of the disease. The names by which it was known in the earlier stages of medical science were all indicative of the same with which men looked on it. It was the “divine,” the “sacred” disease, as being a direct supernatural infliction. The Latin synonym, morbus comitialis, came from the fact that if a seizure of this kind occurred during the comitia, or assemblies of the Roman Republic, it was looked upon as of such evil omen that the meeting was at once broken up, and all business adjourned. Whether there was in this case something more than disease, viz., a distinct possession by a supernatural force, is a question which belongs to the general subject of the “demonias” of the Gospel records. (See Note on viii. 28.)

Here, at any rate, our Lord's words (verse 21) assume, even more emphatically than elsewhere, the reality of the possession. (See Mark ix. 25.)

(16) They could not cure him.—This, then, would seem to have been the subject-matter of debate. The scribes were taunting the disciples, who had probably trusted to their use of the wonted formula of their master's name, and were now wrangling in their own defence. Neither scribes nor disciples had thought of
The Demoniac Healed.

The words were obviously addressed both to the scribes and the disciples. Both had shown their want of the faith which utters itself in prayer to the Father; both were alike “perverse,” in finding in the misery brought before them only an occasion of wrangling and debate. The mystery with which these cases of possession were clothed, and the formulæ of exorcism were but as an idle charm, without the faith of which they were meant to be the expression.

How long shall I suffer you?—The words are significant as suggesting the thought that our Lord’s whole life was one long tolerance of the waywardness and perversity of men.

Bring him hither to me.—St. Mark, whose record is here by far the fullest, relates that at this moment: “The spirit tare him,” and that he “wallowed foaming,” in the paroxysm of a fresh convulsion; that our Lord then asked, “How long is it ago since this came unto him?” and was told that he had suffered from his childhood; that the father appealed, half-despairing, to our Lord’s pity, “If thou canst do anything, have compassion on that boy.” The question came obviously from the disciples who had been left below when our Lord went apart with Peter, James, and John, to the Mount of the Transfiguration.

How long shall I suffer you?—The words imply degrees in the intensity of the forms of evil ascribed to demons, and the apparent severity of our Lord’s words. They show conclusively that the disciples themselves came under the range of His rebuke to the “faithless and perverse generation.”

A grain of mustard seed,—The hyperbolical form of our Lord’s words, repeated afterwards in xxi. 21, is an example of a tendency to tone down the apparent severity of our Lord’s words. They show conclusively that the disciples themselves came under the range of His rebuke to the “faithless and perverse generation.”

Nothing shall be impossible unto you.—The words, absolute as they sound, are yet, ipse facto, conditional. Nothing that comes within the range of faith in the wisdom and love of God, and therefore of submission to His will, is beyond the range of prayer and fasting.

This kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting.—The words imply degrees in the intensity of the forms of evil ascribed to demons amounting to a generic difference. Some might yield before the energy of a human will, and the power of the divine Name, and the prayers even of a weak faith. Some, like that which comes before us here, required a greater intensity of the spiritual life, to be gained by the “prayer and fasting” of which our Lord speaks. The circumstances of the case render it probable that our Lord himself had vouchsafed to fulfill both the conditions. The disciples, we know, did not as yet fast (ix. 14, 15), and the facts imply that they had been weak and remiss in prayer. The words are noticeable fraction of the divine order, and therefore rightly seen in them the work, directly or indirectly, of the great antagonist of that order. All our Lord’s works of mercy are summed up by St. Peter in the words that “He went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil” (Acts x. 38), and on this supposition the particular phenomena of each case were logically ascribed to demoniac forces.

If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed,—The words imply degrees in the intensity of the forms of evil ascribed to demons, and the apparent severity of our Lord’s words. They show conclusively that the disciples themselves came under the range of His rebuke to the “faithless and perverse generation.”

ST. MATTHEW, XVII.

The Demonic Healed.

The words were obviously addressed both to the scribes and the disciples. Both had shown their want of the faith which utters itself in prayer to the Father; both were alike “perverse,” in finding in the misery brought before them only an occasion of wrangling and debate. The mystery with which these cases of possession were clothed, and the formulæ of exorcism were but as an idle charm, without the faith of which they were meant to be the expression.

How long shall I suffer you?—The words are significant as suggesting the thought that our Lord’s whole life was one long tolerance of the waywardness and perversity of men.

Bring him hither to me.—St. Mark, whose record is here by far the fullest, relates that at this moment: “The spirit tare him,” and that he “wallowed foaming,” in the paroxysm of a fresh convulsion; that our Lord then asked, “How long is it ago since this came unto him?” and was told that he had suffered from his childhood; that the father appealed, half-despairing, to our Lord’s pity, “If thou canst do anything, have compassion on that boy.” The question came obviously from the disciples who had been left below when our Lord went apart with Peter, James, and John, to the Mount of the Transfiguration.

How long shall I suffer you?—The words imply degrees in the intensity of the forms of evil ascribed to demons, and the apparent severity of our Lord’s words. They show conclusively that the disciples themselves came under the range of His rebuke to the “faithless and perverse generation.”

A grain of mustard seed,—The hyperbolical form of our Lord’s words, repeated afterwards in xxi. 21, is an example of a tendency to tone down the apparent severity of our Lord’s words. They show conclusively that the disciples themselves came under the range of His rebuke to the “faithless and perverse generation.”

Nothing shall be impossible unto you.—The words, absolute as they sound, are yet, ipse facto, conditional. Nothing that comes within the range of faith in the wisdom and love of God, and therefore of submission to His will, is beyond the range of prayer and fasting.

This kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting.—The words imply degrees in the intensity of the forms of evil ascribed to demons amounting to a generic difference. Some might yield before the energy of a human will, and the power of the divine Name, and the prayers even of a weak faith. Some, like that which comes before us here, required a greater intensity of the spiritual life, to be gained by the “prayer and fasting” of which our Lord speaks. The circumstances of the case render it probable that our Lord himself had vouchsafed to fulfill both the conditions. The disciples, we know, did not as yet fast (ix. 14, 15), and the facts imply that they had been weak and remiss in prayer. The words are noticeable fraction of the divine order, and therefore rightly seen in them the work, directly or indirectly, of the great antagonist of that order. All our Lord’s works of mercy are summed up by St. Peter in the words that “He went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil” (Acts x. 38), and on this supposition the particular phenomena of each case were logically ascribed to demoniac forces.

If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed,—The words imply degrees in the intensity of the forms of evil ascribed to demons, and the apparent severity of our Lord’s words. They show conclusively that the disciples themselves came under the range of His rebuke to the “faithless and perverse generation.”

we cast him out?—And Jesus said unto them, Because of your unbelief: For verily I say unto you, If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye shall say unto this mountain, Remove hence to yonder place; and it shall remove; and nothing shall be impossible unto you. (21) Howbeit this kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting.

The words were obviously addressed both to the scribes and the disciples. Both had shown their want of the faith which utters itself in prayer to the Father; both were alike “perverse,” in finding in the misery brought before them only an occasion of wrangling and debate. The mystery with which these cases of possession were clothed, and the formulæ of exorcism were but as an idle charm, without the faith of which they were meant to be the expression.

How long shall I suffer you?—The words are significant as suggesting the thought that our Lord’s whole life was one long tolerance of the waywardness and perversity of men.

Bring him hither to me.—St. Mark, whose record is here by far the fullest, relates that at this moment: “The spirit tare him,” and that he “wallowed foaming,” in the paroxysm of a fresh convulsion; that our Lord then asked, “How long is it ago since this came unto him?” and was told that he had suffered from his childhood; that the father appealed, half-despairing, to our Lord’s pity, “If thou canst do anything, have compassion on us, and help us;” and was told that it depended on his own faith, “If thou canst believe; all things are possible to him that believeth;” and then burst out into the cry of a faith struggling with his despair, “Lord, I believe; help Thou my unbelief;” and that faith, weak as it was, was accepted as sufficient.

Jesus rebuked the devil.—Better, demon, as elsewhere in these cases of possession.

The child was cured.—Better, the boy. Mark ix. 21 implies, as indeed the Greek does here, that the sufferer had passed beyond the age of childhood. St. Mark gives the words of the rebuke, “Thou dumb and deaf spirit, I command thee, come out from him, and enter no more into him.” This was followed by a great cry and another convulsion; then he fell down, “as it were, dead,” and many cried out, “He is dead.” Then Jesus took him by the hand, and raised him up, and the work of healing was accomplished. Calmness, and peace, and self-possession were seen instead of the convulsive agony. The spiritual power of the Healer had overcome the force, whether morbid or demoniac, which was the cause of his sufferings. Our Lord’s words, it need hardly be said, assume it to have been the latter; and those who deny the reality of the possession must, in their turn, assume either that He shared the belief of the people, or accepted it because they were not able to receive any other explanation of the mysterious sufferings which they had witnessed. Each hypothesis presents difficulties of its own, and we may well be content to confess our inability to solve them. (See Note on chap. viii. 28.) Speaking generally, the language of the New Testament seems to recognise, if not in all diseases, yet at least in all that disturb the moral equilibrium of man’s nature, an in-
And while they abode in Galilee, Jesus said unto them, The Son of man shall be betrayed into the hands of men: and they shall kill him, and the third day he shall be raised again. And they were exceeding sorry.

And when they were come to Capharnaum, they that received tribute as testifying to the real ground and motive for "fasting," and to the gain for the higher life to be obtained, when it was accompanied by true prayer, by looking out for another transgression of the law, and as testifying to the real ground and motive for plies that they half-thought that the Prophet of Nazareth had erred or would disclaim payment. They were looking out for another transgression of the law, and as soon as He entered Capharnaum (though He still held it in the same the Spirit (Acts xii. 2), are both connected with fasting. And St. Paul, besides the "hunger and thirst" that came upon him as the incidents of his mission-work, speaks of himself as "in fastings often" (2 Cor. xi. 23).

While they abode in Galilee.—Better, as they went to and fro. The journeyings were apparently, like that to the coasts of Tyre and Sidon (chap. xv. 21), unconnected with the work of His ministry. Our Lord was still, as before, taking His disciples apart by themselves, and training them by fuller disclosures of His coming passion. "He would not that any man should know" of their presence (Mark ix. 30), for at that crisis, as was shown only too plainly by what followed, their minds were in a state of feverish excitement, which needed to be controlled and calmed. St. Luke adds (ix. 44) the solemn words with which this second announcement of His death was impressed on their thoughts, "Let these sayings sink down into your ears" (literally, place these things). The substance of what they heard was the same as before, but its repetition gave it a new force, as showing that it was not a mere foreboding of disaster, passing away before (this is clearly implied), as every devout Israelite would pay. Both the application and the answer suggest the thought that our Lord was looked upon as domiciled in the house of Peter. The answer, however, was given without thought of the altered conditions of the case. He had not yet learnt to grasp the full meaning of the truth which he had himself so recently confessed.

They were exceeding sorry.—St. Mark (ix. 32) and St. Luke (ix. 45) add that "they understood not the saying; it was hid from them, that they should not perceive it;" and that "they were afraid to ask Him." Their sorrow was vague and dim, and they shrank from that which might make it more definite. St. Paul, besides the "hunger and thirst" that came upon him as the incidents of his mission-work, speaks of himself as "in fastings often" (2 Cor. xi. 23).

They that received tribute money.—The word for tribute here is didrachma, and differs from that of verse 25 and xxii. 17. The latter is the denarius, or Roman poll-tax; the former was the Temple-rate, paid by every male Israelite above the age of twenty (Ex. xxx. 13—16; 2 Chron. xxiv. 9). It was fixed at a half-shekel a head, and the shekel being reckoned as equal to four Attic drachmae, was known technically as the didrachma (Jos. Ant. iii. 8. 2). It was collected even from the Jews in foreign countries, was paid into the Corban, or treasury of the Temple, and was used to defray the expenses of its services. After the destruction of Jerusalem, Vespasian ordered that it should still be collected as before, and, as adding insult to injury, be paid to the fund for rebuilding the Temple of the Capitoline Jupiter (Jos. Wars, vii. 6, § 6). The three great festivals of the Jewish year were recognised as proper times for payment; and the relation of this narrative to John vii. makes it probable that the collectors were now calling in for the Feast of Tabernacles the payments that had not been made at the Passover or Pentecost previous. Their question im-

money came to Peter, and said, Doth not your master pay tribute? (25) He saith, Yes. And when he was come into the house, Jesus prevented him, saying, What thinkest thou, Simon? of whom do the kings of the earth take custom or tribute? of their own children, or of strangers? (26) Peter saith, etc. —The first word points to the duties on the export or import of goods, the octroi, in modern language, levied on provisions as they were brought in or out of towns; the second, as stated above, to the poll-tax paid into the Roman treasury, which followed on the taxing or registration of Luke ii. 2; Acts v. 37. Both were probably farmed by the capitalist publicans, and collected by the "publicans" of the Gospels, or other inland tax-collectors for the Romans. Of their own children, or of strangers? —The answer must be sought not from the Eastern rather than the European theory of taxation. To the Jews as to the Eastern nations, direct taxation was hateful as a sign of subjugation. It had roused them to revolt under Rehoboam (1 Kings xii. 4), and they had stoned the officer who was over the tribute. They had groaned under it when imposed by the Syrian kings (1 Macc. x. 29, 30; xi. 35). It was one of their grievances under Herod and his sons (Jos. Ant. xvi. 8, § 4). Judas of Galilee and his followers had headed an insurrection against it as imposed by the Romans (Acts v. 37). It was still (as we see in chap. xxii.) a moot point between the Pharisees and Herodians whether any Jew might lawfully pay it. Peter naturally answered our Lord's question at once from the popular Galilean view.
Then are the children free.—The words are commonly interpreted as simply reminding Peter of his confession, and pressing home its logical consequence that He, the Christ, as the Son of God, was not liable to the “tribute” which was the acknowledgment of His Father’s sovereignty. This was doubletess prominent in the answer, but its range is, it is believed, wider. (1) If this is the only meaning, then the Israelites who paid the rate are spoken of as “aliens” or “foreigners,” in direct opposition to the uniform language of Scripture as to their filial relation to Jehovah. (2) The plural used not only in this verse but in that one as well, as “children of the kingdom,” might have claimed exemption. No payment is made for the other disciples: most probably they had homes of their own, where the didrachma would be applied for, and were not living with Peter. We cannot ignore the many points of contrast which difference this narrative from that of our Lord’s miracles in general. (1) There is no actual record that a miracle was wrought at all. We expect the narrative to end with the words, “and he went and found as it had been said unto him,” but we do not find them. The story is told for the sake of the teaching, not of the wonder. Men have inferred that a miracle must have been wrought from a literal interpretation of the promise. (2) On this assumption the wonder stands alone by itself in its nature and surroundings. It does not originate in our Lord’s compassion, nor depend upon faith in the receiver, as in the miracles of healing, nor set forth a spiritual truth, like that of the withered fig-tree. It is so far distinct and peculiar. This would not in itself, perhaps, be of much, if any, weight against a direct statement of a fact, but it may be allowed to be of some significance in the exceptional and therefore conspicuous absence of such a statement. On these grounds some have been led to explain our Lord’s words as meaning, in figurative language, which the disciple would understand, that Peter was to catch the fish, and sell it for a stater. Most interpreters, however, have been content to take our Lord's words in their literal sense, and to believe that they were literally fulfilled. If we accept this view the narrative is well fitted in the well-known story of the ring of Polycrates, the tyrant of Samos (Herod. iii. 39-41).

CHAPTER XVIII. (1) At the same time came the disciples unto Jesus, ‘say-

Who is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven?—St. Mark records more fully that they had disputed about this in the way, that our Lord, knowing their thoughts (Luke x. 46), said, ‘Those who are least among you shall be the greatest. Those who were less distinguished looked on this preference, it may be, with jealousy, while, within the narrower circle, the ambition of the two sons of...
Zebadæus to sit on their Lord’s right hand and on His left in His kingdom (Matt. xx. 23), was ill-disposed to concede the primacy of Peter.

(2) Jesus called a little child unto him.—As the conversation was “in the house” (Mark ix. 33), and that house probably was Peter’s, the child may have been one of his. As in other like incidents (Matt. xix. 13; xxi. 15, 16), we may recognise in our Lord’s act a recognition of the special beauty of childhood, a tender love for the graceful thoughts which it shows when, as yet, the taint of egotism is undeveloped. St. Mark adds that He folded His arms round the child as in loving fondness, and, before He did so, uttered the warning words, “If any one wills to be first, he shall be last of all and servant of all.”

A late tradition of the Eastern Church identified the child with Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, taking the name which He gave Himself as passive, ἐκπέφασεν (Theophorus), “one who had been carried or borne by God.” Ignatius himself, however, uses it in its active sense, “one who carries God within him.”

(3) Except ye be converted.—The English word expresses the force of the Greek, but the “conversion” spoken of was not used in the definite, half-technical sense of later religious experiences. What was needed was that they should “turn” from their self-seeking ambition, and regain, in this respect, the relative blamelessness of children.

Ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven.—The force of the words as spoken to the Twelve can hardly be exaggerated. They were disputing about pre-eminence in the kingdom, and in that very dispute they were showing that they were not truly in it. It was essentially spiritual, and its first condition was abnegation of self. Even the chief of the Apostles was self-excluded when he gloriéd in his primacy. The words at least help us to understand the more mysterious language of John iii. 3, 5, as to the “new birth” of water and the Spirit, which one, at least, of the disputants must, in all likelihood, have heard.

(4) Whosoever therefore shall humble himself.—This, then, was the answer to the question “Who shall be the greatest.” The secret of true greatness lay in that unconsciousness of being great, which takes the lowest position as that which of right belongs to it. For a man to “humble himself” with the purpose of attaining greatness would frustrate itself, and reduce humility to an hypocrisy. The “pride that apes humility,” the false lowliness of Col. ii. 18, is even more hateful and contemptible than open self-assertion.

As this little child.—That which was to be the result of a deliberate act in the disciples was found in the child’s nature as it was. They were to make themselves lowly as he was lowly. The transition from the plural to the singular gives an almost dramatic vividness to the form of our Lord’s teaching. We see to see the child shrinking timidly, with blushing face and downcast eyes, from the notice thus drawn to him.

(5) And whoso shall receive one such little child in my name receiveth me.

(6) But whoso shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me, it was better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea.

(7) Woe unto the world because of offences! for it must needs be that offences come; but woe to that man by
The Offending Hand or Foot.  ST. MATTHEW, XVIII. The Sheep Lost on the Mountains.

whom the offence cometh. (8) Wherefore if thy hand or thy foot offend thee, cut them off, and cast them from thee: it is better for thee to enter into everlasting fire. (9) And if thine eye offend thee, pluck it out, and cast it from thee: it is better for thee to enter into life with one eye, rather than having two eyes to be cast into hell fire. (10) Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones; for I say unto you, That in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven. (11) For the Son of man is come to save that which was lost.

(8, 9) **If thy hand or thy foot offend thee.—** (See Notes on chap. v. 29, 30.) The disciples had heard the words before in the Sermon on the Mount, but their verbal reproduction, sharpened as by a special personal application addressed not to the multitude but to the Twelve, then in a new and solemn emphasis.

(10) **Take heed that ye despise not.**—The words remind us of what we are apt to forget in the wider range of the preceding verses. The child was still there, perhaps still folded in the arms of Jesus, still the object of His care, even while He spake of the wider offences that “must needs come” upon the world at large. Looking to the frequency with which our Lord’s words were addressed to the thoughts of His hearers, it seems likely that the faces of some at least of the disciples betrayed, as they looked on the child, some touch of half-contemptuous wonder, that called for this prompt rebuke. The words have, however, as interpreted by what follows, a wider range, and include among the “little ones,” the child-like as well as children—all, indeed, whom Christ came to save.

In heaven their angels.—The words distinctly recognise the belief in guardian angels, enshrined each with a definite and special work. That guardianship is asserted in general terms in Ps. xxxiv. 7, xci. 11, Heb. i. 14, and elsewhere. What is added to the general fact here is, that those who have the guardianship of the little ones assigned to them are among the most noble of the heavenly host, and are as the angels of the Presence, who, like Gabriel, stand before the face of God, and rejoice in the beatific vision (Luke i. 19). The words “I say unto you” clothe what follows with the character of a new truth, as they do the like utterances of Luke xv. 7, 10. Whatever difficulties may connect themselves with the whole range of questions connected with the ministry of angels, they lie outside the work of the interpreter. There can be no question that our Lord adopts as His own the belief in the reality of that ministry, and this at a time when the Sadducees, as a leading sect, were calling it in question (Acts xxiii. 8). The words are indirectly important as a witness to the fact that the Lord Jesus, while He proclaimed the universal Fatherhood of God as it had never been proclaimed before, also (almost, as it were, unconsciously, and when the assertion of the claim was not in view) claims a sonship nearer and higher than could have been claimed by any child of man.

(14) **For the Son of man is come.**—The words are wanting in many of the best MSS. Assuming their genuineness, two points call for special notice. (1.) The work of the Son of Man in saving that which was lost is given as the ground of the assertion of the special glory of the angels of the little ones. They are, in their ministry, sharers in His work, and that work is the highest expression of the will of the Eternal Father. To one at least of the disciples the words that he now heard must have recalled words that had been addressed to him in the most solemn crisis of his life, when he had been told that he should one day “see the heavens opened, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man” (John i. 51). In that ascent and descent they were not only doing homage to His glory, but helping Him in His work. (2.) The words seem chosen to exclude the thought that there was any special grace or sanctity in the child round whom our Lord had folded His arms. To Him the child’s claim was simply his need and his capacity for all that is implied in salvation. The words which He spake were as true of any “wastrel” child of the streets as of the offspring of the holiest parents.

(15) **If a man have an hundred sheep.**—The parable is repeated more fully in Luke xv. 4–6, and will best find its full explanation there. The fact that it reappears there is significant as to the prominence, in our Lord’s thoughts and teaching, of the whole cycle of imagery on which it rests. Here the opening words, “How think ye?” sharpen its personal application to the disciples, as an appeal to their own experience. Even in this shorter form the parable involves the claim on our Lord’s part to be the true Shepherd, and suggests the thought that the “ninety and nine” are (1) strictly, the unfallen creatures of God’s spiritual universe; and (2) relatively, those among men who are comparatively free from gross offences.

(13) **Rejoiceth more of that sheep.**—More literally, over it. (14) **Even so it is not the will.**—The form of the proposition has all the force that belongs to the rhetorical use of the negative. “It is not the will” suggests the thought that the will of the Father is the very opposite of that, and so the words are identical in their teaching with those of St. Paul, “He will have all men to be saved” (1 Tim. ii. 4). The continued presence of the child is again emphasised in “one of these little ones.”

(15) **Moreover if thy brother shall trespass.**—Better, and if thy brother shall sin. A twofold train of thought is traceable in what follows. (1.) The presence of “offences” implies sin, and the question
pass against thee,' go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone: if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. (10) But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. (17) And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the church: but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as an heathen or a publican.

arises how each man is to deal with those sins which affect himself personally. (2.) The dispute in which the teaching recorded in this chapter had originated implied that the unity of the society which was then represented by the Twelve, had for the time been broken. Each of the disciples thought himself, in some sense, aggrieved by others. Sharp words, it may be, had been spoken among them, and the breach had to be healed.

Go and tell him his fault.—The Greek is somewhat stronger, convict him of his fault, press it home on him in such a way as to reach his reason and his conscience. (Comp. John xvi. 8.) But this is to be done “between thee and him alone.” Angry words spoken in the presence of others would fail of that result. It is significant that the substance of the precept is taken from the passage in Leviticus (xix. 17, 18) which ends with “Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.”

Thou hast gained thy brother.—The words in part derive their force from the subtle use of a word in one sense which men associated commonly with another. “Gain” of some kind, aimed at, or wrongfully withheld, was commonly the origin of disputes and litigation. A man hoped to reap some profit by going to law. In the more excellent way which our Lord presents, he would by sacrificing the lower, attain the higher, and win for God (see 1 Cor. ix. 19, 1 Pet. iii. 1, for this aspect of the word) and for himself the brother with whom he had been at variance.

(16) Take with thee one or two more.—The principle of action is the same as before. The first point aimed at is the reformation of the offender without the scandal (here we may take the word both in its earlier and later sense) of publicity. If personal exposition failed, then the “one or two” were to be called in. (Comp. 1 Cor. vi. 5.) It is, of course, implied that they are not partisans, but disinterested representatives of what is likely to be the common estimate of the fault committed. If the end is attained through them, well; if not, then they are in reserve for the final stage as witnesses that every effort has been made in the spirit of a righteous friendship. As the previous verse implied a reference to Lev. xix. 17, so does this to Deut. xix. 15. This selection of all that was highest and most spiritual in the ethical teaching of the Law is one of the features of our Lord’s method, for the most part insufficiently recognised. (See John viii. 17.)

(17) If he shall neglect to hear them.—Better, refuse, the word implying something more than mere negligence.

Tell it unto the church.—Here, and here only in our Lord’s teaching after the promise to Peter (chap. xvi. 18), we have the word Ecclesia repeated. The passage takes its place among the most conspicuous instances of the power of a word. Theories of church authority, as exercised by the priesthood, or bishops, or councils, or the personal infallibility of the Bishop of Rome, have been built upon it. The last clause has been made the groundwork of the system of church discipline which loads the heretic with anathemas, excommunicates the evil-doer, places nations under an interdict. It can scarcely be doubted that the current thoughts and language of Englishmen as to ecclesiastical dis-
as an heathen man and a publican.

(20) Verily I say unto you, Whatever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.

(21) Then came Peter to him, and said, Lord, how oft shall my brother sin against me, and I forgive him? till seven times? (22) Jesus saith unto him, I say not unto thee, Until seven times: but, Until seventy times seven.

(23) Therefore is the kingdom of heaven likened unto a certain king, which would take account of his servants.

(24) And when he had begun to reckon, one was brought unto him, which owed him ten thousand talents.

(25) But as he had not to pay, his lord commanded him to be sold, and his wife, and children, and all that he had, and paid his debt.

The framework of the parable was necessarily secondarily and indirectly as punishing or pardoning. Therefore is the kingdom of heaven likened unto a certain king, which would take account of his servants. When the slave said, My lord, all is utterly finished; the king said, Take his girdle away from him, and divide his portion to the放入者. Therefore is the kingdom of heaven likened unto a certain king, which would take account of his servants. When the slave said, My lord, all is utterly finished; the king said, Take his girdle away from him, and divide his portion to the放入者.

The strength of the Christian society in its times was drawn from a few, as in the prayer of the sons of Zebedee, asking a sum thus described: Assuming the Greek "talent" to be an ounce of silver, the ounce of silver, which the self-same words in verse 15 had obviously told on the minds of the disciples, was the parable it has the interest, as regards its form, of being, in some sense, an advance on those of chapter xiii., and so the nature and extent of the former. The strength of the Christian society in its times was drawn from a few, as in the prayer of the sons of Zebedee, asking a sum thus described: Assuming the Greek "talent" to be an ounce of silver, the ounce of silver, which the self-same words in verse 15 had obviously told on the minds of the disciples, was the parable it has the interest, as regards its form, of being, in some sense, an advance on those of chapter xiii., and so the nature and extent of the former.
manded him to be sold, and his wife, and children, and all that he had, and payment to be made. (26) The servant therefore fell down, and worshipped him, saying, Lord, have patience with me, and I will pay thee all. (27) Then the lord of that servant was moved with compassion, and loosed him, and forgave him the debt. (28) But the same servant went out, and found one of his fellow-servants, which owed him an hundred pence; and he laid hands on him, and took him by the throat, saying, Pay me that thou owest. (29) And his fellow-servant fell down at his feet, and besought him, saying, Have patience with me, and I will pay thee all. (30) And he would not: but went and cast him into prison, till he should pay the debt. (31) So when his fellow-servants saw what was done, they were very sorry, and came and told unto their lord all that was done. (32) Then his lord, after that he had called him, said unto him, O thou wicked servant, I forgave thee all that debt, because thou
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Condition of Forgiveness.

ST. MATTHEW, XIX

CHAPTER XIX.—(1) And it came to pass, that when Jesus had finished these sayings, he departed from Galilee, and came into the coasts of Judea beyond Jordan; (2) and great multitudes followed him; and he healed them there.

(3) The Pharisees also came unto him, tempting him, and saying unto him, Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause? (4) And he answered

The Question as to Divorce.

(33) Even as I had pity on thee.—The comparison of the two acts, the implied assumption that the pity of the one act would be after the pattern of the other, was, we may believe, designed to lead the disciples to the true meaning of the prayer they had been taught to use, “Forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors.”

(34) Delivered him to the tormentors.—The words seem deliberately vague. We dare not say that the “tormentors” are avenging angels, or demons, though in the hell of mediæval poetry, and art these latter are almost exclusively represented as the instruments of punishment. More truly, we may see in them the symbols of whatever agencies God employs in the work of righteous retribution, the stings of remorse, the scorching of conscience, the scorn and reproach, of men, not excluding, of course, whatever elements of suffering lie behind the veil, in the life beyond the grave.

Till he should pay all that was due unto him.—As in chap. v. 26 (where see Note), the words suggest at once the possibility of a limit, and the difficulty, if not impossibility, of ever reaching it. How could the man in the hands of the tormentors obtain the means of paying the ten thousand talents? And the parable excludes the thought of the debt being, as it were, taken out in torments, a quantitative punishment being accepted as the discharge of what could not otherwise be paid. The imagery of the parable leaves us in silent awe, and we only find refuge from our questionings in the thought that “the things that are impossible with man are possible with God” (xix. 26).

(35) My heavenly Father.—The adjective is slightly different in form from that commonly used, suggesting rather the thought of the “Father in heaven.”

Do also unto you.—The words cut through the meshes of many theological systems by which men have deceived themselves. Men have trusted in the self-assurance of justification, in the absolving words of the priest, as though they were final and irreversible. The parable teaches that the debt may come back. If faith does not work by love, it ceases to justify. If the man bind himself once again to his old evil nature, the absolution is annulled. The characters of the discharge are traced (to use another similitude) as in sympathetic ink, and appear or disappear according to the greater or less glow of the faith and love of the pardoned debtor.

From your hearts.—A verbal, formal forgiveness does not satisfy the demands of the divine righteousness. God does not so forgive, neither should man.

Every one his brother their trespasses.—The two last words are not in some of the best MSS., and have probably been added to make the verse correspond with vi. 14, 15.

A.D. 33.

XIX.

(1) He departed from Galilee.—The verse covers a considerable interval of time which the materials supplied by St. Luke and St. John enable us to fill up. From the former we get the outlines of what has been called, as being “beyond Jordan,” our Lord’s Peræan ministry, from Luke ix. 51 to xviii. 30; from the latter, according to the arrangement of the best harmonists, His visit to Jerusalem at the Feast of Tabernacles (John vii. 2), and again at that of the Dedication (John x. 22). To keep these facts in mind will throw some light on the narrative that follows here. The journey from Galilee to Peræa appears from Luke xvii. 11 to have led our Lord through Samaria.

(2) Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause?—See Note on v. 32. So far as the teaching of the Sermon on the Mount had become known, it gave a sufficiently clear answer to the inquiry of the Pharisees. It is, however, quite conceivable that it had not reached the ears of those who now put the question, or, that if it had, they wished to test His consistency, and to see whether on this point He still held with the stricter rule of Shammai, and not with the laxer rule of Hillel. If the narrative of the woman taken in adultery in John viii. 1—11 be rightly placed (see Note on that passage), that might have given rise to doubts and rumours. Would He who dealt so pitifully with the adulteress have sanctioned divorce even in that case, or pronounced the marriage bond absolutely indissoluble? Or was His apparent tolerance of that offender indicative of a lower standard as to the obligations of marriage? In any case, they might hope to bring Him into conflict either with the stricter or the more popular school of casuists. An illustration of what has been stated in v. 32 may be found in the fact that the Jewish historian Josephus records how he had divorced two wives on grounds comparatively trivial (Life, c. 75, 76), and speaks incidentally in his history of “many causes of all kinds” as justifying separation (Ant. iv. 5, § 23). We do not know on what grounds Herod Antipas had divorced the daughter of Aretas, but it is probable enough that here, as afterwards, the Herodian party were working with the Pharisees. Here, in Peræa, they might count, either on the Teacher shrinking from expressing His convictions, or so uttering them as to provoke the tetrarch’s wrath, as the Baptist had done. In either case, a point would have been gained against Him.

(4) Have ye not read . . . ?—The answer to the question is found not in the words of a code of laws, but in the original facts of creation. That represented the idea of man and woman as created for a permanent relationship to each other, not as left to unite and separate as appetite or caprice might prompt.
and said unto them, Have ye not read, that he which made them at the beginning made them male and female; (5) and said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and they twain shall be one flesh? (6) Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder. (7) They say unto him, Why did Moses then command to give a writing of divorcement, and to put her away? (8) He saith unto them, Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so. (9) And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery.

(10) His disciples say unto him, If the followers of Hillel. But He proclaimed, with an authority greater than that of Moses, that his legislation on this point was a step backwards when compared with the primary law of nature, which had been “from the beginning,” and only so far a step forward because the people had fallen into a yet lower state, in which the observance of the higher law was practically impossible. But for the possibility of divorce the wife would have been the victim of the husband’s tyranny; and law, which has to deal with facts, was compelled to choose the least of two evils. Two important consequences, it will be obvious, flow from the reasoning thus enforced: (1) that the “hardness of heart” which made this concession necessary may be admitted as at least a partial explanation of whatever else in the Law of Moses strikes us as deviating from the standard of eternal righteousness embodied in the law of Christ—as, e.g., the tolerance of polygamy and slavery, and the severity of punishment for seeming trivial faults; (2) that the principle is one of wider application than the particular instance, and that where a nation calling itself Christian has sunk so low as to exhibit the “hardness of heart” of Jews or heathens, there also a concessive legislation may be forced upon the State even while the churches assert their witness of the higher truth.

(9) Whosoever shall put away his wife.—The questions to which the law thus proclaimed gives rise have been discussed in the Note on v. 32. One serious difference has, however, to be noticed. Where in the earlier form of the precept we read, “causeth her (the woman put away for any cause but adultery) to commit adultery,” we have here, more emphatically as bearing on the position of the husband in such a case, the statement that he by contracting another marriage “committeth adultery.” The utmost that the law of Christ allows in such a case is a divorce, a mensa et thoro, not a vinculo. The legislation which permits the complete divorce on other grounds, such as cruelty or desertion on either side, is justified, so far as it is justifiable at all, on the ground of the “hardness of heart” which makes such a concession necessary. It is interesting to compare St. Paul’s treatment of cases which the letter of this command did not cover, in 1 Cor. vii. 10—15.

(10) If the case of the man.—The words seem to indicate that the latter view of the school of Hillel was the more popular one even with those who, like the disciples, had been roused to some efforts after a righteousness higher than that of the scribes or Pharisees. They looked forward to the possible discomforts of marriage under the conditions which their Master had set before them, and drew the conclusion that they outweighed its advantages. Why entangle themselves
unto them, saying, save they whom it is given.
12 For there are some eunuchs, which were so born from their mother’s womb: and there are some eunuchs, which were made eunuchs of men: and there be

in a union which they were no longer able to dissolve, when they got tired of it, by the short and easy method of a bill of divorcement? It is instructive to remember all its blessings, for their work as pastors or evangelists. The Church of Rome and the founders of monastic orders were not wrong in their ideal of the highest form of life. Their mistake lay in enforcing that ideal as a rule on those who had not the power to realise it. The boldness (as it seems to us) of our Lord’s language seems intended to teach men that the work must be done as effectively as if, like Origen, they had obeyed the implied commandment in its letter. If the impulses still remain; if life is made miserable by the struggle with them; if they taint the soul by not being allowed to flow in their legitimate channel, the man is, ipso facto, disqualified for the loftier ideal. He has not made himself a eunuch for the kingdom of heaven’s sake, and he is therefore among those who “cannot receive the saying” that it “is not good to marry.” On such grounds the conduct of those who have married after pledging themselves, as priests of the Church of Rome, to vows of celibacy is amply justified. The vows were such as ought never to have been imposed, and men ought never to have taken, and therefore, like the tetrarch’s oath (xiv. 7—9), when they were distinctly found to clash with the higher law of Nature, and to narrow what God had left free, their obligatory power ceased. The case of the monk who enters deliberately into an order of which celibacy is a condition, may seem at first to stand on a different footing; but here, also, though celibacy may be unconditionally imposed, a condition of continuing to belong to an order, the vow of a lifelong celibacy must be held to have been such as men had no right either to impose or take, and therefore as binding only so long as a man chooses to continue a member of the society which requires it.

(11) All men cannot receive this saying.—As the words stand, “this saying” might refer either to the rule which our Lord had laid down on the subject of divorce, or to the comment of the disciples on What follows, however, determines the reference to the latter. Looking at marriage from a simply selfish point of view, and therefore with an entirely inadequate estimate of its duties on the one hand, and on the other of the temptations incident to the unmarried life when chosen on such grounds, they had come rashly to the conclusion that, if our Lord’s rule held good, it was not good, not expedient, to “marry.” He declares that judgment to be false. There were but few who were capable of acting safely on that conclusion. For those who were not so capable, and the next verse tells us who they were, marriage, with all its risks, was the truer, healthier, safer state. Alike in its brighter or sadder sides, in seeming success or seeming failure, it brought to men the discipline they needed.

(12) There are some eunuchs.—The words are singularly startling in their form, and bear upon them an unmistakable stamp of being a true report of teaching, in its depth and originality, went beyond the grasp of those who heard and reported it. What they teach is, that only those who are in some sense “eunuchs,” who are, i.e., without the impulses that lead men to marriage, either naturally, or by the mutation which then, as now, was common in the East, or who have conquered those impulses by the power of self-consecration to a higher life, can safely abstain from marriage. The celibacy of self-indulgence, or even of selfish prudence, tends but too fatally to impurity of heart or life. The man who thus makes himself as the eunuch, must do it “for the kingdom of heaven’s sake,” not, as too many have understood the words to mean, in order to win heaven for himself (that aim is not excluded, but it must not be the only or chief motive), but for the sake of all that the kingdom of heaven implies, in order to enlarge its range, and more effectually to bring the souls of men to receive it. Those who heard the words could hardly fail, as they thought over them, to look on their Master’s life as having been the great perfect example of what He thus taught as to the higher form of holiness. The motives which St. Paul states as determining his own choice of the celibate life (1 Cor. vii. 7), or the counsel which he gave to others (1 Cor. vii. 32—34), are identical with this teaching in their principle. They have influenced men in all ages of the Church, leading them to sacrifice the life of home, with all its blessings, for their work as pastors or evangelists. The Church of Rome and the founders of monastic orders were not wrong in their ideal of the highest form of life. Their mistake lay in enforcing that ideal as a rule on those who had not the power to realise it. The boldness (as it seems to us) of our Lord’s language seems intended to teach men that the work must be done as effectively as if, like Origen, they had obeyed the implied commandment in its letter. If the impulses still remain; if life is made miserable by the struggle with them; if they taint the soul by not being allowed to flow in their legitimate channel, the man is, ipso facto, disqualified for the loftier ideal. He has not made himself a eunuch for the kingdom of heaven’s sake, and he is therefore among those who “cannot receive the saying” that it “is not good to marry.” On such grounds the conduct of those who have married after pledging themselves, as priests of the Church of Rome, to vows of celibacy is amply justified. The vows were such as ought never to have been imposed, and men ought never to have taken, and therefore, like the tetrarch’s oath (xiv. 7—9), when they were distinctly found to clash with the higher law of Nature, and to narrow what God had left free, their obligatory power ceased. The case of the monk who enters deliberately into an order of which celibacy is a condition, may seem at first to stand on a different footing; but here, also, though celibacy may be unconditionally imposed, a condition of continuing to belong to an order, the vow of a lifelong celibacy must be held to have been such as men had no right either to impose or take, and therefore as binding only so long as a man chooses to continue a member of the society which requires it.

(13) Then were there brought unto him little children.—St. Luke (xviii. 15) uses a word which implies infancy. The fact that they were brought (we may assume by their mothers) indicates that there was something in our Lord’s look and manner that attracted them. He that is able to receive it, let him receive it. The motives of the disciples in rebuking those that brought them, may, in like manner, be connected with what they had just heard from their Master’s lips. What interest, they might have thought, could He have in these infants, when He had in those words appeared to claim for the “eunuch” life a special dignity and honour? What could the pressing claims of mothers and their children be to Him but a trouble and vexation, interfering with the higher life of meditation and of prayer?

(14) Suffer little children, and forbid them
said, Suffer little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me; for of such is the kingdom of heaven. (15) And he laid his hands on them, and departed thence.

(16) And, behold, one came and said unto him, Good Master, what good thing shall I do, that I may have eternal life? (17) And he said unto him, Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is, God: but if thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments.
The Way of Eternal Life.

ST. MATTHEW, XIX. The Way to Treasure in Heaven.

young man saith unto him, All these things have I kept from my youth up: what lack I yet? (21) Jesus said unto him, If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come and follow me. (22) But when

(20) All these things have I kept.—There is obviously a tone of impatient surprise in the questioner’s reply. He had come seeking some great thing to satisfy his lofty aspirations after eternal life. He found himself re-taught the lessons of childhood, sent more productive of true and permanent good; in the language of the schools, has heard debates as to which was the great commandment of the Law (xxii. 36). Which class of commandments is he to keep that he may win eternal life?

Thou shalt do no murder.—Our Lord’s answer was clearly determined by the method of which we have ventured to speak as calling up the thought of that of Socrates and another type of character. He would have pointed (as in xxv. 37) to the two great commandments, the love of God, and the love of man, on which hung all the Law and the Prophets. Here it was more in harmony with His loving purpose to leave out of sight altogether the commandments of the first table, that laying down an indispensable condition for all who aim to satisfy his lofty aspirations after eternal life. He saw that each true disciple must be prepared to follow Him in that path of glory. And this accounts for the way in which the path of glory.

(21) Jesus said unto him .—St. Mark (x. 21) "sad," Our Lord’s answer ness of his life. The discipline so far did its work. It made the man of his own spiritual state, his condition was not then understand all their significance. To the Teacher of law, through definite prohibitions of single acts of the Great Teacher. The holiness at which he aimed. Yet the sorrow, though naturally the only form of charity. A wider range of action is presented by the organisation of modern Christian societies, and the same sacrifice may be made in ways more productive of true and permanent good; in the foundation, e.g., of schools or hospitals, in the erection of churches, in the maintenance of home or foreign missions.

Treasure in heaven.—The parallelism with the Sermon on the Mount should not be forgotten. (v. 20). The “treasure” is the “eternal life” which the young ruler was seeking, the memory of good deeds, the character formed and perfected, the vision of the presence of God.

Come and follow me.—Here again St. Mark adds words that are pregnant with meaning. “Take up thy cross, and follow Me.” The questioner could not then understand all their significance. To the Teacher that cross was now coming, day by day, nearer, and He saw that each true disciple must be prepared to follow Him in that path of suffering, which was also the path of glory. “Via crucis, via lucis.”

(22) He went away sorrowful.—St. Mark adds “sad,” i.e., frowning, or as with a look that lowered. The word is the same as that used of the sky in xvi. 3. The discipline so far did its work. It made the man conscious of his weakness. He shrunk from the one test which would really have led him to the heights of holiness at which he aimed. Yet the sorrow, though it was a sign of the weakness of one whose heart was not yet whole with God, was not without an element of hope.
the young man heard that saying, he went away sorrowful: for he had great possessions.

(23) Then said Jesus unto his disciples, Verily I say unto you, That a rich man shall hardly enter into the kingdom of heaven. (24) And again I say unto you, It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God.

(25) When his disciples heard it, they were exceedingly amazed, saying, Who then can be saved? (26) But Jesus beheld them, and said unto them, With men this is impossible; but with God all things are possible.

(27) Then answered Peter and said unto him, Behold, we have forsaken all such comparisons, it states a general fact, the plied with their Master's commands. What were they admir. Their wider teaching is, course, that they must have seemed to the disciples to have rebuked the young ruler. His teaching, leads to the conclusion that a marginal note, added by some one who felt as the disciples felt, has here found its way into the text.

(28) Jesus beheld them.—We can surely conceive something of the expression of that look. He had gazed thus on the young ruler, and read his inner weakness. Now, in like manner, he reads that of the disciples; and the look, we may believe, tells wonder, sorrow, tenderness, anxiety. Those feelings utter themselves in the words that follow, partly in direct teaching, partly in symbolic promises, partly in a parable.

With men this is impossible.—General as the words are in their form, we cannot help feeling that they must have seemed to the disciples to have rebuked their hasty judgment, not only as to the conditions of salvation generally, but as to the individual case before them. He, the Teacher, would still hope, as against hope, for one in whom He had seen so much to love and to admire. Their wider teaching is, of course, that wealth, though bringing with it many temptations, may be so used, through God's grace, as to be a help, not a hindrance, in that deliverance from evil which is implied in the word "salvation."
The Promise of the Twelve Thrones. ST. MATTHEW, XIX. The Hundred-fold Reward of Sacrifice.

all, and followed thee; what shall we have therefore? (28) And Jesus said unto them, Verily I say unto you, That ye which have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging

though they had forsaken the earthly calling and the comforts of their home; and they were dwelling on what they had done, as in itself giving them a right to compensation.

(28) In the regeneration.—In the only other passage in the New Testament in which the word occurs, it is applied to baptism (Tit. iii. 5), as the instrument of the regeneration or new birth of the individual believer. Here, however, it clearly has a wider range. There is to be a "new birth" for mankind as well as for the individual. The sorrows through which the world was to pass were to be as the travail-pangs of that passage into a higher life. (See Note on xxiv. 8.) Beyond as them there lay, in the thoughts of the disciples, and, though after another pattern, in the mind of Christ, the times of the "restitution of all things" (Acts iii. 21), the coming of the victorious Christ in the glory of His kingdom. In that triumph the Twelve were to be sharers. Interpreted as they in their then stage of progress would necessarily interpret them, the words suggested the idea of a kingdom restored to Israel, in which they should be assessors of the divine King, not only or chiefly in the great work of judging every man according to his works, but as "judging," in the old sense of the word, the "twelve tribes of Israel," redressing wrongs, guiding, governing. As the words that the Son of Man should "sit on the throne of His glory" recalled the vision of Dan. vii. 14, so these assured them that they should be foremost among those of the "saints of the Most High," to whom, as in the same vision, had been given glory and dominion (Dan. vii. 27). The apocalyptic imagery in which the promise was clothed reappears in the vision of the four-and-twenty elders seated on their thrones in Rev. iv. 4, in the sealing of the hundred and forty-four thousand of all the tribes of Israel in Rev. vii. 4, and the interpretation of the words here is subject to the same conditions as that of those later visions. What approximations to a literal fulfilment there may be in the far-off future lies behind the veil. They receive at least an adequate fulfilment if we see in them the promise that, in the last triumphant stage of the redeeming work, the Apostles should still be recognised and had in honour, as guiding the faith and conduct of their countrymen; their names should be on the twelve foundations of the heavenly Jerusalem (Rev. xxi. 14); they should be sharers in the throne and glory of its King. The thought on which St. Paul dwells, that the "saints shall judge the world" (1 Cor. vi. 2), in like manner refers not only or chiefly to any share which the disciples of Christ shall have in the actual work of the final judgment, but to the assured triumph of the faith, the laws, the principles of action of which they were then the persecuted witnesses. We must not ignore the fact that, in at least one instance, the words, absolute as they were in their form, failed of their fulfilment. The guilt of Judas left one of the thrones vacant. The promise was given subject to the implied conditions of faithfulness and endurance lasting even to the end.

(29) Every one that hath forsaken.—While the

loyalty and faith of the Apostles were rewarded with a promise which satisfied their hopes then, and would bring with it, as they entered more deeply into its meaning, an ever-increasing satisfaction, their claim to a special privilege and reward was at least indirectly rebuked. Not for them only, but for all who had done or should hereafter do as they did, should there be a manifold reward, even within the limits of their earthly life, culminating hereafter in the full fruition of the "eternal life" of which they had heard so recently in the question of the young ruler.

For my name's sake.—The variations in the other Gospels, "for my sake and the gospel's." (Mark x. 29), "for the kingdom of God's sake," (Luke viii. 29), are significant, (1) as explanatory, (2) as showing that the substantial meaning of all three is the same. The act of forsaking home and wealth must not originate in a far-sighted calculation of reward; it must proceed from devotion to a Person and a cause, must tend to the furtherance of the gospel and the establishment of the divine Kingdom.

Shall receive an hundredfold.—The better MSS. have "manifold more," as in St. Luke. The received reading agrees with St. Mark. Here it is manifestly impossible to take the words literally, and this may well make us hesitate in expecting a literal fulfilment of the promise that precedes. We cannot look for the hundredfold of houses, or wives, or children. What is meant is, that the spirit of insight and self-sacrifice for the sake of God's kingdom multiplies and intensifies even the common joys of life. Relationships multiply on the ground of spiritual sympathies. New homes are opened to us. We find new friends. The common things of life—sky, and sea, and earth—are clothed with a new beauty to the cleansed eyes of those who have conquered self. St. Mark (x. 30) adds words which, if one may so speak, are so strange that they must have been actually spoken,—"with persecutions." We seem to hear the words spoken as a parenthesis, and in a tone of tender sadness, not, perhaps, altogether unmingled with a touch of the method which teaches new truths, by first meeting men's expectations, and then suddenly presenting that which is at variance with them. The thoughts of the disciples were travelling on to that "hundredfold," as though it meant that all things should be smooth and prosperous with them. They were flattering themselves in at least one instance, the words, absolute as they were in the individual case of which the disciples had made themselves the judges. They had seen one who stood high in his own estimate brought low by the test of the divine Teacher. They were flattering themselves that they, who had left all, and so could stand that test, were among the first in the hierarchy of the king-

(30) Many that are first shall be last.—The words point obviously not only to the general fact of the ultimate reversal of human judgments, but to the individual case of which the disciples had made themselves the judges. They had seen one who stood high in his own estimate brought low by the test of the divine Teacher. They were flattering themselves that they, who had left all, and so could stand that test, were among the first in the hierarchy of the king-
first shall be last; and the last shall be first.\(^a\)

CHAPTER XX.—(1) For the kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is an householder, which went out early in the morning to hire labourers into his vineyard. (2) And when he had agreed with the labourers for a penny\(^1\) a day, he sent them into his vineyard. (3) And he went out about the third hour, and saw others standing idle in the marketplace, (4) and said unto them; Go ye also into the vineyard, and whatsoever

is right I will give you. And they went their way. (5) Again he went out about the sixth and ninth hour, and did likewise. (6) And about the eleventh hour he went out, and found others standing idle, and saith unto them, Why stand ye here all the day idle? (7) They say unto him, Because no man hath hired us. He saith unto them, Go ye also into the vineyard; and whatsoever is right, that shall ye receive. (8) So when even was come, the lord of the vineyard saith unto his steward, Call the labourers, and give them their

dom. For them too, unless their spirit should become other than it was in its self-seeking and its self-complacency, there might be an unexpected change of position, and the first might become the last. The parable that follows was designed to bring that truth more vividly before them.

XX.

(1) For the kingdom.—The division of the chapter is here singularly unfortunate, as separating the parable both from the events which gave occasion to it and from the teaching which it illustrates. It is not too much to say that we can scarcely understand it at all unless we connect it with the history of the young ruler who had great possessions, and the claims which the disciples had made for themselves when they contrasted their readiness with his reluctance.

To hire labourers into his vineyard.—The framework of the parable brings before us a form of labour in some respects lower than that of the "servants," or "slaves,\(^b\) who formed part of the household, and had been bought or born to their position. The labourers here are the "hired servants" of Luke xv. 17, engaged for a time only, and paid by the day. Interpreting the parable, we may see in the householder our Lord Himself. It was indeed a title which He seems to have, as it were, delighted in, and which He applied directly to Himself in chaps. x. 25, xiii. 27, 52. And the "vineyard" is primarily, as in Isa. v. 1, the house of Israel, which the Anointed of the Lord had come to claim as His kingdom. The "early morning" answered accordingly to the beginning of our Lord's ministry; the "labourers" He then called were the disciples whom, at the outset of His Ministry, He had summoned to follow Him. He had promised them a reward. Though at the best they were unprofitable servants, He yet offered them wages, and the claims which the disciples had made for themselves when they contrasted their readiness with his reluctance.

(2) A penny a day.—Measured by its weight, the "penny"—i.e., the Roman denarius, then the common standard of value in Palestine—was, as nearly as possible, sevenscore-halfpenny of our coinage. Its real equivalent, however, is to be found in its purchasing power, and, as the average price of the unskilled labour of the tiller of the soil, it may fairly be reckoned as equal to about half-a-crown of our present currency. It was, that is, in itself, an adequate and just payment.

(3) About the third hour.—Reckoning the day after the Jewish mode, as beginning at 6 A.M., this would bring us to 8 A.M. The "market-place" of a town was the natural place in which the seekers for casual labour were to be found waiting for employment. In the meaning which underlies the parable we may see a reference to those who, like St. Matthew (ix. 9) and the disciples called in chap. viii. 19-22, were summoned after the Jewish mode, as beginning at 6 A.M., and yet there was still to be found waiting for employment.

(4) Whosoever is right.—The absence of a definite contract in hiring the labourers who did less than the day's work obviously involved an implicit trust in the equity of the householder. They did not stipulate for wages, or ask, as the disciples had asked, "What shall we have therefore?" The implied lesson thus suggested is, that a little work done, when God calls us, in the spirit of trust, is better than much done in the spirit of a hireling.

(5) About the eleventh hour.—The working day, which did not commonly extend beyond twelve hours (John xi. 9), was all but over, and yet there was still work to be done in the vineyard, all the more urgent because of the lateness of the hour. The labourers who had been first hired were not enough. Is there not an implied suggestion that they were not labouring as zealously as they might have done? They were working on their contract for the day's wages. Those who were called last of all had the joy of feeling that their day was not lost; and that joy and their faith in the justice of their employer gave a fresh energy to their toil.

(6) Because no man hath hired us.—This, again, is one of the salient points of the parable. The last-called labourers had not rejected any previous summons, and when called they obeyed with alacrity. They, too, came in full unquestioning faith.

(7) When even was come.—It was one of the humane rules of the Mosaic law that the day-labourer was to be paid by the day, and not made to wait for his wages (Deut. xxiv. 15). This law the householder keeps, and his doing so is a feature in his character.

Beginning from the last unto the first.—The order is not without its significance. It was a
hire, beginning from the last unto the first. (9) And when they came that were hired about the eleventh hour, they received every man a penny. (10) But when the first came, they supposed that they should have received more; and they likewise received every man a penny. (11) And when they had received it, they murmured against the goodman of the house, (12) saying, These last have wrought but one hour, and thou has made them equal unto us, which have borne the burden and heat of the day. (13) But he answered one of them, and said, Friend, I do thee no wrong: didst not thou agree with me for a penny? (14) Take that thine is, and go thy way: I will give unto this last, even as unto thee. (15) Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own? Is thine eye evil, because I am good? (16) So the last shall be
first, and the first last: for many be called, but few chosen. (17) And Jesus going up to Jerusalem took the twelve disciples apart in the way, and said unto them, (18) Behold, we go up to Jerusalem; and the Son of man shall be betrayed unto the chief priests and unto the scribes, and they shall condemn him to death, (19) and shall deliver him to the Gentiles to mock, and to scourge, and to crucify him; and the third day he shall rise again. (20) Then came to him the mother of Zebedee’s children with her sons, worshiping him, and desiring a certain

question whether we are to see in it the doctrine of an absolute equality in the blessedness of the life to come. There also there will be some first, some last, but the difference of degree will depend, not on the duration of service, nor even on the amount of work done, but on the temper and character of the worker. Looking to the incident which gave rise to the parable, we can scarcely help tracing a latent reference to the “young rulers” whom the disciples had hastily condemned, but in whom, and in 17, who “loved” him (Mark ix. 21), saw the possibility of a form of holiness higher than that which they were then displaying, if only he could overcome the temptation which kept him back when first called to work in his Master’s vineyard in his Master’s way. His judgment was even then reversing theirs.

For many be called, but few chosen.—The warning is repeated after the parable of the Wedding Feast (xxii. 14), and as it stands there in closer relation with the context, that will be the fitting place for dwelling on it. The better MSS., indeed, omit it here. If we accept it as the true reading, it adds something to the warning of the previous clause. The disciples had been summoned to work in the vineyard. The indulgence of the selfish, murmuring temper might hinder their “election” even to that work. Of one of the disciples, whose state may have been specially present to our Lord’s mind, this was, we know, only too fatally true. Judas had been “called,” but would not be among the “chosen” either for the higher work or for its ultimate reward.

Interpreting the parable as we have been led to interpret it, we cannot for a moment imagine that its drift was to teach the disciples that they would forfeit their place in the kingdom. A wider interpretation is, of course, possible, and has been and is held by some. It is the first-called labourers answer to the Jews, and those who came afterwards to converts in the successive stages of the conversion of the Gentiles. But this, though perhaps legitimate enough as an application of the parable, is clearly secondary and subordinate, and must not be allowed to obscure its primary intention.

(17) And Jesus going up to Jerusalem.—The narrative is not continuous, and in the interval between verses 16 and 17 we may probably place our Lord’s “abode beyond Jordan” (John x. 40), the raising of Lazarus, and the short sojourn in the city called Ephraim (John xi. 54). This would seem to have been followed by a return to Peræa, and then the journey to Jerusalem begins. The account in St. Mark adds some significant facts. “Jesus went” (literally, was going—implying continuance) “before them.” It was as though the burden of the work on which He was entering pressed heavily on His soul. The shadow of the cross had fallen on Him. He felt something of the conflict which reached its full intensity in Gethsemane, and therefore He needed solitude that He might prepare Himself for the sacrifice by communing with His Father; and instead of journeying with the disciples and holding “sweet converse” with them, went on silently in advance. This departure from His usual custom, and, it may be, the look and manner that accompanied it, impressed the disciples, as was natural, very painfully. “They were amazed, and as they followed, were afraid.” It was apparently as explaining what had thus perplexed them that He took the Twelve apart from the others that followed (including probably the Seventy and the company of devout women of Luke viii. 2) and told them of the nearness of His passion.

(19) Behold, we go up to Jerusalem.—The words repeat in substance what had been previously stated after the Transfiguration (xvii. 22), but with greater definiteness. Jerusalem is to be the scene of His suffering, and their present journey is to end in it, and “the chief priests and scribes” are to be the chief actors in it, and “the Gentiles” are to be their instruments in it. The mocking, the spitting (Mark x. 34), the scourging, the crucifixion, all these are new elements in the prediction, as if what had before been presented in dim outline to the disciples was now brought vividly, in every stage of its progress, before His mind and theirs.

(20) And the third day he shall rise again.—This, as before, came as a sequel of the prediction that seemed so terrible. The Master looked beyond the suffering to the victory over death, but the disciples could not enter into the meaning of the words that spoke of it. St. Luke, indeed (as if he had gathered from some of those who heard them what had been their state of feeling at the time), reports that “they understood none of these things, and this saying was hid from them, neither understood they the things that were spoken.” (Luke xix. 54.) All was to them as a bubble in a dream, which burst upon their Master’s soul which time, they imagined, would disperse.

(20) Then came to him the mother of Zebedee’s children.—The state of feeling described in the previous Note supplies the only explanation of a request so strange. The mother of James and John (we find on comparing xxvii. 56 and Mark xv. 40, that her name was Salome) was among those who “thought that the kingdom of God should immediately appear” (Luke xix. 11); and probably the words so recently spoken, which promised that the Twelve should sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel (xix. 38) had fastened on her thoughts, as on those of her sons, to the exclusion of those which spoke of suffering and death. And so, little mindful of the teaching of the parable they had just heard, they too expected that they should receive more than others, and sought (not, it may be, without some jealousy of Peter) that they might be nearest to their Lord in that “regeneration” which seemed to them so near. The mother came to ask for her sons what they shrank from asking for themselves, and did so with the act of homage (“worshiping Him”) which implied that she was speaking to a King.
thing of him. (21) And he said unto her, What wilt thou? She saith unto him, Grant that these my two sons may sit, the one on thy right hand, and the other on the left, in thy kingdom.

(22) But Jesus answered and said, Ye know not what ye ask. Are ye able to drink of the cup that I shall drink of, and to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with? They say unto him, We are able. (23) And she saith unto them, Ye shall drink indeed of my cup, and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with: but to sit on my right hand, and on my left, is not mine to give, but it shall be given to them for whom it is prepared of my Father. (24) And when the ten heard it, they were moved with indignation against the two brethren. (25) But Jesus called them unto him, and said, Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them. (26) But it shall not be so among you: but whosoever will be great among you, let him be as the young servant; and whosoever will be chief among you, let him be as the young servant.

(21) The one on thy right hand.—The favour which had already been bestowed might, in some degree, seem to warrant the petition. John was known emphatically as “the disciple whom Jesus loved” (John xiii. 23; xiv. 21; xx. 22), and if we may infer a general practice from that of the Last Supper (John xiii. 23), he sat near Him at their customary meals. James was one of the chosen three who had been witnesses of the Transfiguration (xvii. 1). Both had been marked out for special honours by the new name of the Sons of Thunder (Mark iii. 17). The mother might well think that she was but asking for her sons a continuance of what they had hitherto enjoyed. The sternness of our Lord’s words to Peter (Matt. xvi. 23) might almost justify the thought that his position had been forfeited.

(22) Ye know not what ye ask.—The words come to us as spoken in a tone of infinite tenderness and sadness. That nearness to Him in His glory could be obtained only by an equal nearness in suffering. Had they counted the cost of that nearness?

To drink of the cup that I shall drink of.—The words follow, “to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with,” are not found in many of the best MSS., and have probably been added to bring St. Matthew’s narrative into harmony with St. Mark’s. For the sake of completeness, however, they will be examined here. And (1) we have the question, How did the two disciples understand our Lord’s words? We are familiar with their meaning. Was it equally clear to them? As far as the cup is concerned, there can be little doubt that any reader of the Old Testament would at once recognise it as the symbol of a good or evil fortune. There was the “cup running over” of Ps. xxiii. 5, the “wine-cup of fury” of Jer. xxv. 15, the “cup of astonishment and desolation” of Ezek. xiii. 23. The meaning of the “baptism” was, perhaps, less obvious (see Note on verse 29, on our Lord’s use of the symbolism), yet here also there were the overwhelming “prudent waters” of Ps. cxxiv. 5, the “waves and billows” of Ps. xiii. 7. The very verb, “to baptize” (i.e., to plunge into the deep), was used by Josephus for the destruction of a city (Wars, iv. 3, § 3), by the LXX. for “terrifying” in Isa. xxi. 4. Our Lord Himself had already used it in dim mysterious reference to His coming passion (Luke xii. 50, where see Note). There was enough, then, to lead them to see in their Master’s words an intimation of some great suffering about to fall on Him, and this is, indeed, implied in the very form of their answer. “We are able,” they say, in the tone of those who have been challenged and accept the challenge. That their insight into the great mystery of the passion went but a little way as compared with their Master’s, lies, of course, in the very nature of the case. When the beloved disciple, in after years, taught by his own experience and by his brother’s testimony, there can be little doubt that any reader of (24) Against the two brethren.—Literally, concerning, or about. The context shows that it was not a righteous indignation, as against that which was unworthy of true followers of Jesus, but rather the jealousy of rivals, angry that the two brothers should have taken what seemed an unfair advantage of our Lord’s known affection for them and for their mother.

(25) Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles.—No words of reproof could more strongly point the contrast between the true and the false views of the Messiah’s kingdom. The popular Jewish expectations, shared by the disciples, were really heathen in their character, substituting might for right, and ambition for the true greatness of service.

Exercise dominion over them.—Better, as in 1 Pet. v. 3, lord it over them. It is not easy to find a like forcible rendering for the other word, but we must remember that it, too, implies a wrong exercise of authority, in the interest, not of the subjects, but of the rulers.

(26) Whosoever will be great.—Better, whosoever wisheth to be great. The man who was conscious,
The Ransom for Many.

ST. MATTHEW, XX.

The Two Blind Men at Jericho.

great among you, let him be your minister; (27) and whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant: (28) even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many. (29) And as they departed

The multitude rebuked them. — The silence of our Lord, the hushed reverence of the multitude, led
The Blind receive their Sight.

ST. MATTHEW, XXI. The Ass and the Colt at Bethphage.

baked them, because they should hold
their peace: but they cried the more,
saying, Have mercy on us, O Lord, thou
son of David. (32) And Jesus stood still,
and called them, and said, What will ye
that I shall do unto you? (33) They say unto him, Lord, that our eyes may
be opened. (34) So Jesus had compassion
on them, and touched their eyes: and immediately their eyes received
sight, and they followed him.

A.D. 22.

o Mark x. 11. 1

CHAPTER XXI.—(1) And when they
drew nigh unto Jerusalem, and were
come to Bethphage, unto the mount of
Olives, then sent Jesus two disciples,
saying unto them, Go into the vil­
lage over against you, and straightway
ye shall find an ass tied, and a colt
with her: loose them, and bring them
unto me. (2) And if any man say ought
unto you, ye shall say, The Lord hath
need of them; and straightway he will

men to look on the eager, clamorous supplication as intrusive. The entry of the Prophet about to claim His kingdom was not to be thus disturbed. But they were not to be silenced, and the litanies of Christendom for centuries have been modelled on the Elyseion ("Lord, have mercy upon us") which came from their lips. (32) Jesus stood still, and called—Or, as in St. Mark, " bade them be called," the message being given specially to Bartimaeus. St. Mark gives, with a graphic fulness, the very words of the message, "Be of good cheer, arise; He calleth thee," and adds that the blind man flung off his outer coat, or mantle, and leapt up and came to Jesus. All three Gospels give our Lord's question in the same, or nearly the same, words. He sought, as with the clear insight of sympathy, to know what was the special grief that weighed upon the man's spirit.

(33) Lord.—St. Mark (x. 51, in the Greek), after his manner, gives the Hebrew word, Rabboni (comp. John xx. 16), which Bartimaeus actually uttered. (34) So Jesus had compassion.—Literally, and Jesus. It was not His purpose to meet the popular demand for signs and wonders, but compassion drew on Him the work of power which otherwise He would have shrunk from here. And then the two followed Him, glorifying God. In St. Luke's narrative the incident is followed by the story of Zacchaeus and the parable of the Pounds. Possibly (see Note on verse 30) they preceded it.

XXI.

1) And when they drew nigh unto Jerusalem.

—Here again we have, as far as we can, to fill up a gap in St. Matthew's Gospel. We have to think of the journey up the narrow valley that leads from Jericho to Jerusalem. Our Lord, as before, was followed by the disciples, and they in their turn were followed by the crowds of pilgrims who were drawn to the Holy City either by the coming Passover or by wonder and curiosity to see what part the Prophet of Nazareth would take. Throughout the multitude, including the disciples, there was a fervour expectation that He would at last announce Himself as the Christ, and claim His kingdom (Luke xix. 11). They reach Bethany "six days before the Passover," probably, i.e., on the Friday afternoon (John xii. 1). They remain there for the Sabbath, probably in the house of Lazarus or Simon the leper (Matt. xxvi. 2; John xii. 2; and in that of the latter we have the history of the anointing, which St. Matthew relates, out of its chronological order, in xxvi. 6—13). The point of time with which the narrative, which now becomes more continuous, opens, may be fixed at the dawn of the first day of the week, the daybreak of Palm Sunday. Bethphage.—The village is named in Luke xix. 29, and in many MSS. of Mark xi. 1, in conjunction with Bethany, and before it, and from this it would seem probable that it lay on the road from Jericho, and was therefore to the east of Bethany. The traditional site, however, followed in most maps, makes it to the west of Bethany, and nearer the summit of the hill. The name signifies "the house of dates," and Gethsemane "the oil-press," the three obviously indicating local features giving distinctness to the three sites. All three were on the Mount of Olives. Bethany is identified with the modern El-Azariyeh, or Lazariyeh (the name attaching to its connection with the history of Lazarus), which lies about a mile below the summit on the eastern slope of the Mount of Olives, in a woody hollow planted with olives, almonds, pomegranates, and figs. The palms implied in the name of Bethany and in the history of the entry into Jerusalem (John xii. 13) have disappeared.

Two disciples.—The messengers are not named in any of the Gospels. The fact that Peter and John were sent on a like errand in Luke xxii. 8 makes it, perhaps, probable that they were employed in this instance.

(2) Go into the village over against you.—This may have been either Bethany or, on the assumption that it was nearer Jerusalem, Bethphage itself.

An ass tied, and a colt with her.—St. Mark and St. Luke name the "colt" only. St. John speaks of a "young" or "small" ass, using the diminutive of the usual name (δοκα). The colt was one on which "man had never sat" (Mark xi. 2; Luke xix. 39). The command clearly implies a deliberate fulfilment of the prophecy cited in verses 5 and 5. They were to claim the right to use the beasts as for the service of a King, not to hire or ask permission.

(3) The Lord hath need of them.—Simple as the words are, they admit of three very different interpretations. "The Lord" may be used either (1) in the highest sense as equivalent to Jehovah, as though the ass and the colt were claimed for His service; or (2) as referring to Christ in the special sense in which He was spoken of as "the Lord" by His disciples; or (3) as pointing to Him, but only in the language which all men would acknowledge, and without any special claim beyond that of being the Master whom the disciples owned as in a lower sense their Lord. Of these (3) is all but excluded by the facts of the case. The words involve a claim to more than common authority, and the claim is recognised at once. In favour of (2) we have the numerous instances in which the disciples and the evangelists not only address their Master as "Lord," but speak of Him as "the Lord" (xxviii. 6; Mark xvi. 19; Luke x. 1; xvii. 6; xviii. 6; John xi. 2; xiii. 13; xx. 13, 18, 20, 25; xxi. 7, 12). For (1), lastly, we have our Lord's use of the word as a synonym for
The King sitting on an Ass.

ST. MATTHEW, XXI. The Hosannas of the Multitude.

And the disciples went, and did as Jesus commanded them, and brought the ass, and the colt, and put on them their clothes, and they send them. (4) All this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, saying, (5) Tell ye the daughter of Sion, Behold, thy King cometh unto thee, meek, and sitting upon an ass, and a colt the foal of an ass. (6) And the disciples went, and did as Jesus commanded them, and brought the ass, and the colt, and put on them their clothes, and they took away the clothes of the ass. (7) They set him thereon. (8) And a very great multitude spread their garments in the way; others cut down branches from the trees, and strawed them in the way. (9) And the multitudes that went before, and that followed, cried, saying, Hosanna to the son of David: Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord; Hosanna in the highest. (10) And when he was come into Jerusalem, all the elders of the children of Israel came to him, and did unto him as it was written in the book of the prophets. (11) And when he had taken the colt, and sat upon it, the multitudes spread their garments in the way. (12) And as He was now drawing nigh to Bethphage and Bethany, at the mount of Olives, (13) The multitudes saw it, and said unto one another, Behold, this is the prophet of whom it is written in the prophet. (14) Jesus sent two of his disciples and said unto them, Go into the village over against you, and straightway ye shall find an ass tied, and a colt of an ass: set the colt upon, and bring hither the ass also, and set both upon. (15) And bring ye the beasts hither to the disciples. (16) And they went, and found as he had said unto them: (17) And they brought the ass and the colt, and set them upon, and brought Jesus thereon. (18) And as they went forth from Jericho, there was a great company of people, and they sent messengers before unto Jesus, saying, The king shall come to thee. (19) And Jesus answered and said, What will they? (20) And they forthwith sent messengers before him, saying, Tell the inhabitant of Jerusalem, Behold, the king cometh unto you, meek, and sitting upon an ass, and a colt the foal of an ass. (21) And the two disciples, when they had thus done, returned to the city, and told Jesus. (22) And as he came near unto Jerusalem, and approached to Bethphage and Bethany, at the mount of Olives, the chief priests and the scribes sought to lay hold on him; (23) And when Jesus sent them away, they departed, going into a city of Samaria, to prepare for his lodging. (24) And when they came nigh unto Jerusalem, unto Bethphage and Bethany, at the mount of Olives, the chief priests and the scribes said, Who is this? (25) But one of them, desiring to show himself a wise man, said unto them, Why are ye not come to meet him, as all the people do? (26) And they said, The people that were not come to meet him had no cause. (27) And another said, Perhaps he will come to save the kingdom. (28) And they said, What then? (29) He said, Who then shall tell him? (30) And they said, Behold, he is come to save our nation. (31) Then said they among themselves, What shall we do? (32) For they feared the multitude, because they were all of one mind. (33) And from that time they took counsel how they might put him to death. (34) And when he came near Jerusalem, unto Bethphage and Bethany, at the mount of Olives, he sent two of his disciples, (35) Saying, Go into the village over against you, and straightway ye shall find an ass tied, and a colt of an ass: set the colt upon. (36) And they went, and found as he had said unto them: (37) And they brought the ass, and put upon him their clothes. (38) And they set up the crosses over against him, and began to follow him. (39) And it came to pass, when he came nigh unto Bethany, to an olive tree, that belongeth to one of the disciples, he cast one of them into a basket of bread, and said unto them, Whence is it that ye have brought bread? (40) And they said, It is from the field of the measure. (41) And he said, Ye have brought it for a certain sum, and he said, Take it, and enjoy yourselves. (42) And when the disciples had done this, (43) They went, and brought the ass, and put upon him their clothes, and set upon him their garments, and spread their garments before him, and followed him. (44) And as they went forth, he called unto a certain disciple, and said unto him, Follow me, and I will make thee fishers of men. (45) And they immediately left all, and followed him.
the city was moved, saying, Who is this? (11) And the multitude said, This is Jesus the prophet of Nazareth of Galilee.

(12) And Jesus went into the temple of God, and cast out all them that sold and bought in the temple, and overthrew the tables of the moneychangers, and the seats of them that sold doves, (13) and said unto them, It is written, My house shall be called the house of

filled with pilgrims of many lands. To them this was a strange prelude to the usual order of the feast, and they asked what it meant. The answer fell short of the full meaning of the shouts of the people, but it conveyed the aspect of the character of Jesus which was most intelligible to strangers. He was “the Prophet of Nazareth of Galilee.”

(12) And Jesus went into the temple.—Here, again, there is a gap to be filled up from another Gospel. St. Mark (xi. 11) says definitely that on the day of His solemn entry He went into the Temple, “looked round about on all things there,”—i.e., on the scene of traffic and disorder described in this verse—and then, “the evening-tide being come” (or, “the hour being now late”), went back to Bethany, and did what is here narrated on the following day. So, with a like difference of order, St. Mark places the sentence on the barren fig-tree on the next morning, and before the cleansing of the Temple. (Comp. Note on verse 17.) St. John (ii. 13—25) records an act of like nature as occurring at the commencement of our Lord’s ministry, on the first visit to Jerusalem after His baptism. Critics who have started with the assumption that the repetition of such an act was impossible, have inferred accordingly that the narrative has been misplaced either by the Three or by St. John, some holding with the latter and some with the former, on grounds more or less arbitrary. From the purest human historical point of view, we may, I believe, accept both narratives as true. If Jesus of Nazareth had been only a patriot Jew, filled with an intense enthusiasm for the holiness of the Temple, what more likely than that He should commence His work with a protest against its desecration? If the evils against which He thus protested, after being suppressed for a time, reappeared in all their enormity, what more probable than that He should renew the protest at this stage of His work, backed as He now was by the equal enthusiasm of the people? What more natural, again, than that the second cleansing should revive the memory of the first, and call up with it the words which are recorded by St. John, and not by the Three, and which served as the basis of the charge that He had threatened to destroy the Temple (John ii. 20, 21; Matt. xxvi. 61; Mark xiv. 58). There is—it cannot be concealed—a real difficulty in the omission of the earlier cleansing by the Three, and in the absence of any reference to the latter cleansing by the Fourth; but the fact in either case is only one of many like facts incident to the structure of the Gospels. The Three knew nothing—or rather, they record nothing—as to our Lord’s ministry in Jerusalem prior to this last entry. The Fourth, writing a Gospel supplementary either to the Three or to the current oral teaching which they embodied, systematically passes over, with one or two notable exceptions, what they had recorded, and confines his work to reporting, with marvellous vividness and fulness, specially selected incidents.

Cast out them that sold and bought in the temple.—The apparent strangeness of the permission of what seems to us so manifest a desecration, was obviously not felt by the Jews as we feel it. Pilgrims came from all parts of the world to keep the Passover, and bought their sacrifices, sin-offerings, or thank-offerings, according to the circumstances of each case. They did not bring the victims with them. What plan, it might seem, could be more convenient than that they should find a market near as possible to the place where the sacrifice was to be offered? One of the courts of the Temple was therefore assigned for the purpose, and probably the priests found their profit in the arrangement by charging a fee or rent of some kind for the privilege of holding stalls. There is no trace of the practice prior to the Captivity, but the dispersion of the Jews afterwards naturally led men to feel the want of such accommodation more keenly. But this permission brought with it another as its inevitable sequel. The pilgrims brought with them the coinage of their own country—Syrian, Egyptian, Greek, as the case might be—and their money was either not current in Palestine, or, as being stamped with the symbols of heathen worship, could not be received into the Corban, or treasury of the Temple. For their convenience, therefore, money-changers were wanted, who, of course, made the usual agio, or profit, on each transaction. We must picture to ourselves, in addition to all the stir and bustle inseparable from such traffic, the wrangling and bitter words and reckless oaths which necessarily grew out of it with such a people as the Jews. The history of Christian churches has not been altogether without parallels that may help us to understand how such a desecration came to be permitted. Those who remember the state of the great cathedral of London, as painted in the literature of Elizabeth and James, when mules and horses laden with market produce, were led through St. Paul’s as a matter of every-day occurrence, and bargains were struck there, and burglaries planned, and servants hired, and profligate assignations made and kept, will feel that even Christian and Protestant England has hardly the right to cast a stone at the priests and people of Jerusalem.

And the seats of them that sold doves.—The Greek has the article—“the doves,” that were so familiar an object in the Temple courts. There is a characteristic feature in this incident as compared with the earlier cleansing. Then, as taking into account, apparently, the less glaringly offensive nature of the traffic, our Lord had simply bidden the dealers in doves depart, with their stalls and bird-cages (John ii. 16). Now, as if indignant at their return to the desecrating work which He had then forbidden, He places them also in the same condemnation as the others.

(15) It is written.—The words which our Lord quotes are a free combination of two prophetic utterances: one from Isaiah’s vision of the future glory of the Temple, as visited both by Jew and Gentile (Isa. li. 7); one from Jeremiah’s condemnation of evils like in nature, if not in form, to those against which our Lord protested (Jer. vii. 11).

A den of thieves.—The pictorial vividness of the words must not be passed over. Palestine was then swarming with bands of outlaw brigands, who, as David of old in Adullam (1 Sam. xxii. 1), haunted the lime-stone caverns of Judea. The wranglings of such a company over the booty they had carried off were
prayer;" but ye have made it a den of thieves." (14) And the blind and the lame came to him in the temple; and he healed them. (15) And when the chief priests and scribes saw the wonderful things that he did, and the children crying in the temple, and saying, Hosanna to the son of David; they were sore displeased, (16) and said unto him, Hearest thou what these say? And Jesus saith unto them, Yea; have ye never read, Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings thou hast perfect praise? (17) And he left them, and went out of the city into Bethany; and he lodged there. (18) Now in the morning as he returned into the city, he hungered. (19) And when he saw a fig tree in the way, he came to it, and found nothing thereon, but leaves only, and said unto it, Let no fruit grow on thee henceforward for ever. And presently the order and quiet of its courts

reproduced in the Temple, and mingled with the Hallelujahs of the Levites and the Hosannas of the crowds. We ask, as we read the narrative, how it was that the work of expulsion was done so effectively, and with so little resistance. The answer is found (1) in the personal greatness and intensity of will that showed itself in our Lord's look and word and tone; (2) in the presence of the crowd that had followed him from the Mount of Olives, and had probably filled the courts of the Temple; and (3) in the secret consciousness of the offenders that they were desecrating the Temple, and that the Prophet of Nazareth, in His zeal for the Father's house, was the witness of a divine truth.

(14) The blind and the lame. - These, as we see from Acts iii. 2, and probably from John ix. 1, thronged the approaches to the Temple, and asked alms of the worshippers. They now followed the great Healer into the Temple itself, and sought at His hands relief from their infirmities. If we were to accept the LXX. reading of the strange proverbial saying of 2 Sam. v. 8, "The blind and the lame shall not come into the house of the Lord," it would seem as if this were a departure from the usual regulations of the Temple; but the words in italics are not in the Hebrew. Most commentators give an entirely different meaning to the proverb, and there is no evidence from Jewish writers that the blind and the lame were ever, as a matter of fact, excluded from the Temple. All that we can legitimately infer from the two passages is the contrast between the hasty, passionate words of the conquering king, and the tender compassion of the Son of David, to whom the blind and the lame were objects, not of antipathy, but pity.

(15) The chief priests. - These, as commonly in the Gospels, were the heads of the twenty-four courses of the priesthood, as well as Annas and Caiaphas, who were designated by the title in its higher sense, the one as actually high priest, the other as president of the Sanhedrin. (See Note on Luke iii. 2.)

The children. - Literally, the boys, the noun being masculine. Taking the Jewish classification of ages, they would probably be from seven to fourteen years old, but in such a narrative as this the general phrase does not exclude younger children.

(16) Hearest thou what these say? - The priests and scribes had probably remained in the Temple, and had not heard the Hosannas which were raised on the Mount of Olives. The shouts of the children were therefore a surprise to them, and they turned to the Teacher and asked whether He accepted them in the sense in which they were addressed to Him. Had He really entered the Temple claiming to be the expected Christ? Did He approve this interruption of the order and quiet of its courts?

Have ye never read? - Better, did ye never read? The question was one which our Lord frequently asked in reasoning with the scribes who opposed Him (xii. 3, 5; xix. 4; xxi. 42; xxii. 31). It expressed very forcibly the estimate which He formed of their character and scribes who opposed Him.
The Might of Faith and Prayer. ST. MATTHEW, XXI.

The Question of the Scribes.

fig tree withered away. (20) And when the disciples saw it, they marvelled, saying, How soon is the fig tree withered away! (21) Jesus answered and said unto them, Verily I say unto you, If ye have faith, and doubt not, ye shall not only do this which is done to the fig tree, but also if ye shall say unto this mountain, Be thou removed, and be thou cast into the sea; it shall be done. (22) And all things whatsoever ye shall ask in prayer, believing, ye shall receive.

it was now with all but the single tree which attracted our Lord's notice. It was in full foliage, and being so far in advance of its fellows it might not unnaturally have been expected to have had, in the first week of April, the "first ripe fruit." (Hos. ix. 10), which usually was gathered in May. So, in Song Sol. ii. 13, the appearance of the "green figs" coincides with that of the flowers of spring, and the time of the singing of birds. The illustrations from the branches and leaves of the fig-tree in Luke xxi. 29, 30, suggest that the season was a somewhat forward one. On the special difficulty connected with St. Mark's statement, "the time of figs was not yet," see Note on Mark xi. 13.

Let no fruit grow on thee henceforward for ever.—From the lips of one of like passions with ourselves, the words might seem the utterance of impatient disappointment. Here they assume the character of a solemn judgment passed not so much on the tree as on that of which it became the representative. The Jews, in their show of the "leaves" of outward devotion, in the absence of the "fruits" of righteousness, were as that barren tree. But a few weeks before (Luke xiii. 6) He had taken the fig-tree to which "a man came seeking fruit and finding none," as a parable of the state of Israel. Then the sentence, "Cut it down," had been delayed, as in the hope of a possible amendment. Now, what He saw flashed upon Him in a moment (if we may so speak) as the parable embodied. The disappointment of the expectations which He had formed in His human craving for food was like the disappointment of the owner of the fig-tree in the parable. The sentence which He now passed on the tree, and its immediate fulfilment, were symbols of the sentence and the doom which were about to fall on the unrepentant and unbelieving people.

Presently.—The word is used in its older sense of"immediately." As with nearly all such words—"anon," "by and by," and the like—man's tendency to delay has lowered its meaning, and it now suggests the thought.

And when the disciples saw it.—Here again St. Mark's narrative (xi. 20, 21) seems at once the fullest and the most precise. As he relates the facts, the disciples did not perceive that the fig-tree was withered away till they passed by on the following morning. Peter then remembered what had been said the day before, and, as the spokesman of the rest, drew His Master's attention to the fact. The immediate withering may have been inferred from its completeness when seen, or its beginning may have been noticed by some at the time.

If ye have faith, and doubt not.—The promise, in its very form, excludes a literal fulfilment. The phrase to "remove mountains" (as in 1 Cor. xiii. 2) was a natural hyperbole for overcoming difficulties, and our Lord in pointing to "this mountain" as He had done before to Hermon (xxvii. 29)—did but give greater vividness to an illustration which the disciples would readily understand. A mere physical miracle, such as the removal of the mountain, could never be in itself the object of the prayer of a faith such as our Lord described. The hyperbole is used here, as elsewhere, to impress on men's mind the truth which lies beneath it.

All things whatsoever ye shall ask in prayer.—Here again there is the implied condition (as in vii. 7) that what is asked is in harmony with the laws and will of God. If it were not so it would not be asked in faith, and every true prayer involves the submission of what it asks to the divine judgment. The words suggest the thought, of which we have the full expression in John i. 42, that our Lord's miracles were less frequently wrought by an inherent supernatural "virtue"—though this, also, distinctly appears, e.g., in the history of the woman with the issue of blood (Luke viii. 46)—than by power received from the Father, and in answer to His own prayers.

The chief priests and the elders.—St. Matthew and St. Luke add "the scribes," thus including representatives of the three constituent elements of the Sanhedrin. The character of the teaching is further specified by St. Luke, "as He was teaching the gospel," proclaiming, i.e., the good news of the kingdom, the forgiveness of sins, and the law of righteousness.

By what authority?—The right to take the place of an instructor was, as a rule, conferred by the scribes, or their chief representative, on one who had studied "at the feet" of some great teacher, and had been solemnly admitted (the delivery of a key, as the symbol of the right to interpret, being the outward token) to that office. The question implied that those who asked it knew that the Prophet of Nazareth had not been so admitted. The second question gave point to the first. Could He name the Rabbi who had trained Him, or authorised Him to teach?

I also will ask you one thing.—The question is met by another question. As One who taught as "having authority, and not as the scribes" (vii. 29), He challenges their right to interrogate Him on the ground of precedent. Had they exercised that right in the case of the Baptist, and if so, with what result? If they had left his claim unquestioned, or if they had shrunk from confessing the result of their inquiry, they had virtually abdicated their office, and had no right, in logical consistency, to exercise it, as by fits and starts, in the case of another teacher.

They reasoned with themselves.—The self-
The Parable of the Two Sons.
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say, From heaven; he will say unto us, Why did ye not then believe him? (28) But if we shall say, Of men; we fear the people; for all hold John as a prophet. (27) And they answered Jesus, and said, We cannot tell. And he said unto them, Neither tell I you by what authority I do these things.

(28) But what think ye? A certain man had two sons; and he came to the first, and said, Son, go work to day in my vineyard. (29) He answered and said, I will not: but afterward he repented, and went. (30) And he came to the second, and said likewise. And he answered and said, I go, sir: and went not.

The flow of a public reverence which the death of John like an unconsciousness that they were described in the testimony which he had borne to the spiritual life in relation to his baptism (iii. 7); at another they said, "He came apparently from the lips of the very persons who were self-condemned by it, and so implied something like an unconsciousness that they were described in the person of the second son. They who gave God thanks and repented not afterward, that ye might believe him. (33) Hear another parable: There was a certain householder, which planted a vineyard, and hedged it round about, and digged a winepress in it, and built a tower at the entering in thereof. And he espoused one wife, a maid-virgin; and when she was an year old he caused her to drink wine, and she put off her husband. And she put off her husband, and was espoused to another man. The former husband听说, said, She is my wife. The second husband heard, and said, She is my wife. And they parted her not. (31) Whether of them twain did the will of his father? They say unto him, The first. Jesus saith unto them, Verily I say unto you, That the publicans and the harlots go into the kingdom of God before you. (29) For John came unto you in the way of righteousness, and ye believed him not: but the publicans and the harlots believed him: and ye, when ye had seen it, repented not afterward, that ye might believe him.

The publicans and the harlots.—The words are purposely general, as describing the action of classes; but we cannot help associating them with the personal instances of the publican who became an Apostle (ix. 9), and of Zacchaeus (Luke xix. 2-10), and of the woman that was a sinner (Luke vii. 37—50).

Go into the kingdom of God before you.—Which literally means, lead the way into. What follows shows that our Lord is stating not so much a law of God's government as a simple fact. The choice of the word is significant as implying that there was still time for scribes and Pharisees to follow in the rear. The door was not yet closed against them, though those who they despised had taken the place of honour and preceded them.

In the way of righteousness.—The term seems used in a half-technical sense, as expressing the aspect of righteousness which the Pharisees themselves recognised (vi. 1), and which included, as its three great elements, the almsgiving, fasting, and prayer, that were so conspicuous both in the life and in the teaching of the Baptist.

The publicans and the harlots believed him.

—The former class appear among the hearers of John in Luke iii. 12. The latter are not mentioned there, but it was natural they also should feel the impulse of the strong popular movement.

Repented not afterwards.—Better, did not even repent afterwards. The words are repeated from the parable (verse 29), and sharpen its application. In relation to the preaching of the Baptist, the scribes and Pharisees were like the first of the two sons in his defiant refusal; they were not like him in his subsequent repentance.

Which planted a vineyard.—The frequent recurrence of this imagery at this period of our Lord's ministry is significant. (Comp. chap. xx. 1; xxi. 24; Luke xiii. 6.) The parable that now meets us points in the very form of its opening to the great example...
a tower, and let it out to husbandmen, and went into a far country: and when the time of the fruit drew near, he sent his servants to the husbandmen, that they might receive the fruits of it. And the husbandmen took his servants, and beat one, and killed another, and stoned another. Again, he sent other servants more than the first: and they did unto them likewise. But last of all he sent unto them his son, saying, They will reverence my son. But when the husbandmen saw the son, they said among themselves, This is the heir; come, let us kill him, and let us seize on his inheritance. And they caught him, and cast him out of the vineyard, and slew him. When the lord therefore of the vineyard cometh, what will he do unto those husbandmen? They say unto him, He will miserably destroy those wicked men, and will let out his vineyard unto other husbandmen, which shall render him the fruits in their seasons. Jesus saith unto them, Did ye never read in the scriptures, The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner; this is the Lord's doing, and of the use of that image in Isa. v. 1. Taking the thought there suggested as the key to the parable, the vineyard is “the house of Israel;” the “fence” finds its counterpart in the institutions which made Israel a separate and peculiar people; the “wine-press” (better, wine-vat—i.e., the reservoir underneath the press), in the Temple, as that into which the “wine” of devotion, and thanksgiving, and charity was to flow; the “tower” (used in vineyards as a place of observation and defence against the attacks of plunderers; comp. Isa. i. 8), in Jerusalem and the outward polity connected with it. So, in like manner, the letting out to husbandmen and the going “to a far country” answers historically to face with One who knew the secrets of their hearts, already had Caiaphas given the counsel that one man should die for the people (John xii. 49), while among those who knew it, and did not protest, were many who believed on Him, and yet, through fear of the Pharisees, were not confessed disciples (John xii. 42). The words of the parable showed that they stood face to face with One who knew the secrets of their hearts, and had not received Himself as to the issue of the conflict in which He was now engaged.

Cast him out of the vineyard.—The minor touches of a parable are not always to be pressed in our interpretation of it; but we can hardly help seeing here a latent reference to the facts (1) that our Lord was delivered over to the judgment of the Gentiles; and (2) that He was crucified outside the Holy City, (John xix. 20; Heb. xiii. 12), which was, in a special sense, as the vineyard of the Lord of Hosts.

They say unto him . . .—The fact that the answer to the question came, not from the speaker, but from the hearers of the parable, is peculiar to St. Matthew. On the assumption that those who gave the answer were the scribes and Pharisees, we may see in it either a real unconscionableness that they were as the men on whom the punishment was to fall (see Note on verse 31), or, more probably, an affected horror, by which they sought to disguise the conviction that the parable was meant for them. They would not admit, in the presence of the multitude, that they winked at this intimation that their designs were known.

Those wicked men.—Better, those miserable men, the adjective being the same as the preceding adverb. Their answer, like the speech of Caiaphas in John x. 40—51, was an unconscious prophecy, in which were wrapped up at once the destruction of the Holy City, and the transfer of the privileges that had belonged to Israel to the Gentile Church, which was to grow into Catholic Christendom. The Lord of the vineyard would not be robbed of its fruits, and sooner or later would find faithful and true labourers.

Did ye never read . . . ?—The quotation is remarkable as being found (Ps. cviii. 22) in the immediate context of the verse which had supplied the “hosannas” shouts of the multitude on the preceding day. In the primary meaning of the Psalm, the illus-
it is marvellous in our eyes? Therefore say I unto you, The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof. And whosoever shall fall on this stone shall be broken: but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder. And when the chief priests and Pharisees had heard his parables, they perceived that he spake of them. But when they sought to lay hands on him, they feared the multitude, because they took him for a prophet.

CHAPTER XXII.—(1) And Jesus answered.—The word implies a connection of some kind with what has gone before. The parable was an answer, if not to spoken words, to the thoughts that were stirring in the minds of those who listened.

(2) Which made a marriage for his son.—The germ of the thought which forms the groundwork of the parable is found, in a passing allusion, in Luke xii. 36—"When he shall return from the wedding." Now circumstances were even more against them. The Prophet was surrounded by His own disciples, and by an admiring crowd. Open violence they did not dare to venture on, and they had to fall back upon the more crooked paths of stratagem and treachery.
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and they would not come. (4) Again, he sent forth other servants, saying, Tell them which are bidden, Behold, I have prepared my dinner: my oxen and my fatlings are killed, and all things are ready: come unto the marriage.

(5) But they made light of it, and went their ways, one to his farm, another to his merchandise: (6) and the remnant took his servants, and entreated them spitefully, and slew them. (7) But when the king heard thereof, he was wroth: and he sent forth his armies, and destroyed those murderers, and burned up their city. (6) Then saith he to his servants, The wedding is ready, but there ready, but they which were bidden were not worthy.

(9) Go ye therefore into the highways, and as many as ye shall find, bid to the marriage. (10) So those servants went out into the highways, and gathered together all as many as they found, both bad and good: and the wedding was furnished with guests.

(11) And when the king came in to see the guests, he saw there a man which had not on a wedding garment: (12) and he saith unto him, Friend, how camest thou in hither, not having a wedding garment? And he was speechless.

been “bidden” to the wedding. The proclamation of the kingdom was addressed to the Jews, who, as such, had all along been children of the kingdom.

(4) My dinner.—The Greek word points to a morning meal, as contrasted with the “supper,” or evening meal; but, like all such words (as, e.g., our own dinner), was applied, as time passed on, to meals at very different hours. In Homer it is used of food taken at sunrise; in later authors, of the repast of noon.

(5) They made light of it.—The words point to the temper of neglect which slighted the offer of the kingdom of God, and prefers the interest of this world. This was one form of neglect. Another ran parallel with it, and passed on into open antagonism.

(6) Entreated them spitefully.—The Greek word implies the wanton infliction of outrage. The parable at this stage looks forward as well as backward, and seems to include the sufferings of Christian preachers and martyrs as well as those of the prophets who were sent to Israel.

(7) He sent forth his armies.—As in other parables that shadow forth the judgment of the Son of Man, the words find an approximate fulfilment, first, in the destruction of Jerusalem, and afterwards, in all times of trouble that fall upon nations and churches as the punishment of unbelief and its consequent unrighteousness. The word “armies” suggests in its modern use, action on a larger scale than that indicated by the Greek. Better, troops.

(9) Into the highways.—Literally, the openings of the ways, the places where two or more roads met, and where, therefore, there was a greater probability of meeting way-farers. In the interpretation of the parable, we may see in this feature of it a prophecy of the calling of the Gentiles, and find an apt illustration of it in St. Paul’s words when he turned from the Jews of the Pisidian Antioch who counted themselves “unworthy of eternal life” (Acts xiii. 46) to the Gentiles who were willing to receive it.

(10) Both bad and good.—The words imply, as in the parable of the Drag-net (xiii. 47, 48), (1) the universality of the offer of the gospel, so that none were shut out through any previous sins; (2) that the assembly of the guests so gathered answers to the visible Church of Christ in which the evil are mingled with the good, waiting for the coming of the King “to see the guests.”

The wedding was furnished.—Some of the most ancient MSS. give “the bride-chamber was furnished,” but it looks like a gloss or explanatory note.

(11) To see the guests.—The verb conveys the idea of inspecting. The king came to see whether all the guests had fulfilled the implied condition of coming in suitable apparel. The framework of the parable probably pre-supposes the Oriental custom of providing garments for the guests who were invited to a royal feast. Wardrobes filled with many thousand garments formed part of the wealth of every Eastern prince (chap. vi. 19; Jas. v. 2), and it was part of his glory, as in the case of the assembly which Jehu held for the worshippers of Baal (2 Kings x. 22), to bring them out for use on state occasions. On this assumption, the act of the man who was found “not having a wedding garment” was one of wilful insult. He came in the “filthy rags” (Isa. lxiv. 6) of his old life, instead of putting on the “white linen” (Isa. lxiv. 2) of his new life, instead of putting on the “white linen” (Isa. lxiv. 2) of his new life. (12) Friend.—(See Note on xx. 13.) The question implies that the act was strange, unlooked-for, inexcusable.

Both bad and good.—The words imply, as in the parable of the Drag-net (xiii. 47, 48), (1) the universality of the offer of the gospel, so that none were shut out through any previous sins; (2) that the assembly of the guests so gathered answers to the
Many Called, but few Chosen.  

ST. MATTHEW, XXII.  

The Pharisees and Herodians.

(13) Then said the king to the servants,  
"Bind him hand and foot, and take him away, and cast him into outer darkness; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth." (14) For many are called, but few are chosen.

(15) Then went the Pharisees, and took counsel how they might entangle him in his talk. (16) And they sent out unto him their disciples with the Herodians, saying, Master, we know that thou art true, and teachest the way of God in truth, neither carest thou for any man; for thou regardest not the person of men. (17) Tell us therefore, What thinkest thou? Is it lawful to give tribute...?
give tribute unto Caesar, or not? (16) But Jesus perceived their wickedness, and said, Why tempt ye me, ye hypocrites? (19) Shew me the tribute money. And they brought unto him a penny. (20) And said, Why tempt ye me, knowing the scriptures, nor the power not, and in the nature of things could not, provide a direct answer. It what does prescribe is that all such questions should be approached in the manner which seeks to reconcile the two obligations, not in that which exaggerates and perpetuates their antagonism. Least of all does it sanction the identification of the claims of this or that form of ecclesiastical polity with the "things that are God's." (22) They marvelled.—We can picture to ourselves the surprise which the conspirators felt at thus finding themselves baffled where they thought success so certain. The Herodians could not charge the Teacher with wrongdoing in giving tribute to Caesar. The Pharisees found the duty of giving to God what belonged to Him pressed as strongly as they had ever pressed it. They had to change their tactics, and to fall back upon another plan of attack.

(23-29) The Sadducees.—(See Note on chap. iii. 7.) These, we must remember, consisted largely of the upper class of the priesthood (Acts v. 17). The form of their attack implies that they looked on our Lord as teaching the doctrine of the resurrection. They rested their denial on the ground that they found no mention of it in the Law, which they recognised as the only rule of faith. The case which they put, as far as the principle involved was concerned, need not have gone beyond any case of re-marriage without issue, but the questions pushed it to its extreme, as what seemed to them a reductio ad absurdum. Stress is laid on the childlessness of the woman in all the seven marriages in order to guard against the possible answer that she would be counted in the resurrection as the wife of him to whom she had borne issue. (29) Ye do err.—This is, it may be noted, the one occasion in the Gospel history in which our Lord comes into direct collision with the Sadducees. On the whole, while distinctly condemning and refuting their characteristic error, the tone in which He speaks is less stern than that in which He addresses the Pharisees. They were less characterised by hypocrisy, and that, as the pessina corruptio optimi, was that which called down His sternest reproof. The causes of their error were, He told them; two-fold: (1) an imperfect knowledge even of the Scriptures which they recognised; (2) imperfect conceptions of the divine attributes, and therefore an a priori limitation of the divine power. They could not conceive of any human fellowship in the life of the resurrection except such as reproduced the relations and conditions of this earthly life.

(18) Ye hypocrites.—The special form of the hypocrisy was that the questioners had come, not avowedly as disputants, but as "just men" (Luke xx. 20) perplexed in conscience and seeking guidance as from One whom they really honoured.

(19) Shew me the tribute money.—The parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard (xx. 2) indicates that the denarius was in common circulation. It was probably part of the fiscal regulation of the Roman government that the poll-tax should be paid in that coin only. In any case, wherever it passed current, it was a witness that the independence of the country had passed away, and that Caesar was in temporal things its real ruler.

(20) Render therefore unto Caesar.—As far as the immediate question was concerned, this was of course an answer in the affirmative. It recognised the principle that the acceptance of the emperor's coinage was an admission of his de facto sovereignty. But the words that followed raised the discussion into a higher region, and asserted implicitly that that admission did not interfere with the true spiritual freedom of the people, or with their religious duties. They might still "render to God the things that were His”—i.e. (1), the tithes, tribute, offerings which belonged to the polity and worship that were the appointed witnesses of His sovereignty, and (2) the faith, love, and obedience which were due to Him from every Israelite. The principle which the words involved was obviously wider in its range than the particular occasion to which it was thus applied. In all questions of real or seeming collision between secular authority and spiritual freedom, the former claims obedience as a de facto ordinance of God up to the limit where it encroaches on the rights of conscience, and prevents men from worshiping and serving Him. Loyal obedience in things indifferent on the part of the subject, a generous tolerance (such as the Roman empire at this time exercised towards the religion of Israel) on the part of the State, were the two correlative elements upon which social order and freedom depended. Questions might arise, as they have arisen in all ages of the Church, as to whether the limit has, or has not, been transgressed in this or that instance, and for these the principle does not apply.

(21) They say unto him, Why sayest thou that Caesar is Lord of the image and superscription? (22) Better, inscription. The coin brought would probably be a silver denarius of Tiberius, bearing on the face the head of another plan of Emperors. In value, these coins varied from 10½ to 11½ pence halfpenny. (23) And said unto him, Who is this image and superscription? (24) They say unto him, Caesar's. Then saith he unto them,Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's. (25) When they had heard these words, they marvelled, and left him, and went their way. (26) The same day came to him the Sadducees, which say that there is no resurrection; and asked him, saying, Master, Moses said, If a man die, having no children, his brother shall marry his wife, and raise up seed unto his brother. (27) Now there were with us seven brethren: and the first, when he had married a wife, deceased, and, having no issue, left his wife unto his brother: (28) likewise the second also, and the third, unto the seventh. (29) And last of all the woman died also. (30) Therefore in the resurrection whose wife shall she be of the seven? for they all had her. (31) Jesus answered and said unto them, Ye do err, not knowing the scriptures, nor the power
of God. (30) For in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven. (31) But as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, (32) I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? a God is not the God of the dead, but of the living. (33) And when the multitude heard this, they were astonished at his doctrine. (34) But when the Pharisees had heard that he had put the Sadducees to silence, they were gathered together. (35) Then one of them, which was a lawyer, asked him a question, tempting him, and saying, (36) Master, which is the great commandment in the law? (37) Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt hear their opponents refuted with what seemed to them a greater dexterity than that of their ablest scribes.

**ST. MATTHEW, XXII. Which is the Great Commandment?**

(30) They neither marry, nor are given in marriage.—In St. Luke's report (xx. 34, 35) our Lord emphasises the contrast in this respect between the children of this world and the children of the resurrection. His words teach absolutely the absence from the resurrection life of the definite relations on which marriage rests in this, and they suggest an answer to the yearning questions which rise up in our minds as we ponder on the things behind the veil. Will there, we ask, be no continuance there of the holiest of the technicalities that have left little or no trace behind us? Is there to be found to co-exist a pure and unimpaired affection. The contrast between the old relations and the new, and the memories of the past? The answer to all such questionings is found in dwelling on the "power of God." The old relations may subsist under new conditions. Things that are incompatible here may there be found to co-exist. The saintly wife of two saintly husbands may love both with an angelic, and therefore a pure and unimpaired affection. The contrast between our Lord's teaching and the sensual paradise of Maimon, or Swedenborg's dream of the marriage state perpetuated under its earthly conditions, is so obvious as hardly to call for notice.

(31) That which was spoken unto you by God.—In St. Mark and St. Luke we find the addition "at the bush," the words probably being a reference to the section of the Law containing Ex. iii., and known by that title. There are, it need scarcely be said, many passages scattered here and there through the Old Testament (such, e.g., as Job xix. 25, 26; Ps. xvi. 10, 11; Dan. xii. 2) in which the theme of immortality, and even of a resurrection, is expressed with greater clearness; but our Lord meets the Sadducees on their own ground, and quotes from the Law which they recognised as of supreme authority. The principle implied in the reasoning is, that the union of the divine Name with the kingdom of God was, at least, honest in his purpose, and "not far from the kingdom of God." (Mark xii. 34).

(32) Which is the great commandment...?—Literally, of what kind. The questioner asked as if it belonged to a class. Our Lord's answer is definite, "This is the first and great commandment." (33) Thou shalt love the Lord thy God.—In St. Mark's report (xii. 29) our Lord's answer begins with the Creed of Israel ("Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God, is one Lord") and the Ten Commandments (see Notes on chap. iv. 4, 7); and (2) that He does but repeat the answer that had been given before by the "certain lawyer" who stood up tempting Him, in Luke x. 25. In their ethical teaching the Pharisees had grasped the truth intellectually, though they did not realise it in
love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, a and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. (38) This is the first and great commandment. (39) And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. (40) On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.

(41) While the Pharisees were gathered together, c Jesus asked them, (42) saying, What think ye of Christ? whose son is he? They say unto him, The son of David. (43) He saith unto them, How then doth David in spirit call him Lord, saying, (44) The Lord said unto

my Lord,4 Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool? (45) If David then call him Lord, how is he his son? (46) And no man was able to answer him a word, neither durst any man from that day forth ask him any more questions.

CHAPTER XXIII.—(1) Then spake Jesus to the multitude, and to his disciples, (2) saying, The scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses’ seat: (3) all therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do; but do not ye after their works: for they say, and

their lives, and our Lord did not shrink, therefore, so far, from identifying His teaching with theirs. Truth was truth, even though it was held by the Pharisees and coupled with hypocrisy. (38) Thou shalt love thy neighbour.—The words were found, strangely enough, in the book which is, for the most part, pre-eminently ceremonial (Lev. xix. 18), and it is to the credit of the Pharisees, as ethical teachers, that they, too, had drawn the law, as our Lord now drew it, from its comparative obscurity, and gave it a place of dignity second only to that of the first and great commandment.

(40) All the law and the prophets.—The words are coupled, as in chaps. v. 17, vii. 12, to indicate the whole of the revelation of the divine will in the Old Testament. The two great commandments lay at the root of all. The rest did but expand and apply them; or, as in the ceremonial, set them forth symbolically; or, as in the law of slavery and divorce, confined their application within limits, which the hardness of men’s hearts made necessary. For the glowing assever of the scribe to our Lord’s teaching, and our Lord’s approval of it, see Notes on Mark xii. 32—34.

(41) While the Pharisees were gathered together.—St. Mark and St. Luke add here, as St. Matthew does in verse 46, that “no man dared ask Him any more questions.” They have recourse from this time forth to measures of another kind, and fall back upon treachery and false witness. It was now His turn to appear as the questioner, and to convict the Pharisees of resting on the mere surface even of the predictions which they quoted most frequently and most confidently as Messianic.

(42) The son of David.—Both question and answer gain a fresh significance from the fact that the name had been so recently uttered in the Hosannas of the multitude (chap. xxi. 9, 15). The Pharisees are ready at once with the traditional answer; but they have never asked themselves whether it conveyed the whole truth, whether it could be reconciled, and if so, how, with the language of predictions that were confessedly Messianic.

(43) Doth David in spirit call him Lord?—The words assume (1) that David was the writer of Psalm cx. ; (2) that in writing it, he was guided by a Spirit higher than his own; (3) that the subject of it was no earthly king of the house of David, but the far-off Christ. On this point there was an undisturbed consensus among the schools of Judah, as represented by the Targums and the Talmud. It was a received tradition that the Christ should sit on the right hand of Jehovah and Abraham on His left. Its application to the Christ is emphatically recognised by St. Peter (Acts ii. 34), and by St. Paul, though indirectly (Col. iii. 1). In the argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews, it occupies well-nigh the chief place of all (Heb. i. 3; v. 6). The only hypothesis on which any other meaning can be assigned to it is, that it was written, not by David, but of him. Here it will be enough to accept our Lord’s interpretation, and to track the sequence of thought in His question. The words represent the Lord (Jehovah) as speaking to David’s Lord (Adonai), as the true king, the anointed of Jehovah. But if so, what was the meaning of that lofty title? Must not He who bore it be something more than the son of David by mere natural descent? If the scribes had never even asked themselves that question, were they not self-convicted of incompetency as religious teachers?

(1) To the multitude.—Now, as in chap. xv. 10, but here more fully and emphatically, our Lord not only reproves the hypocrisy of the Pharisees, but warns the multitude against them. He appeals, as it were, to the unprejudiced consciences of the people, as against the perversions of their guides. In some points, as, e.g., in verses 16—21, it presents a striking parallel to the Sermon on the Mount (chap. v. 33—37). Our Lord closes His public teaching, as He began, by a protest against that false casuistry which had substituted the traditions of men for the commandments of God.

(2) The scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses’ seat.—The words were probably spoken of their collective action as represented in the Sanhedrin, rather than of their individual work as interpreters of the Law. As such, they claimed to be the authoritative exponents of the Law, and our Lord recognises (unless we suppose a latent protest in His words, like that which is veiled in the “full well ye reject” of Mark vii. 9) their official claim to reverence.

(3) All therefore whatsoever . . .—Followed, as the words are, by repeated protests against special and grave errors in the teaching of the Pharisees, it is obvious that they must be received with an implied limitation. So far as they really sit in Moses’ seat, and set forth His teaching—as, e.g., the scribe had done whose answer has been just recorded—they were to be followed with all obedience. That which was wanting was the life, without which even the highest maxims of morality became the common-places of rhetorical declamation. It was one thing to “draw fine pictures
better, prayed standing (chap. vi. 5), that men might see and wore them as they walked to and fro in the streets, or sees, in their ostentatious show of piety, made either of their fingers. (5) But all their works they do for to be seen of men; they make broad their phylacteries, and of virtue, and another to bring thought and word and deed into conformity with them.

(4) Heavy burdens.—The thought was involved in our Lord’s call to the “heavy laden,” in the words that spoke of His own “burden” as “light” (chap. xi. 28, 30). Here it finds distinct expression. That it appealed to the witness men’s hearts were bearing, secretly or openly, we see from St. Peter’s confession in Acts xv. 10.

They themselves will not move. . . . The rigorous precepts, the high-flown morality were for others, not themselves. Professing to guide, they neither helped nor sympathised with the troubles of those they taught. (Comp. Rom. ii. 17—23.)

(6) To be seen of men. —As with a clear insight into the root-evil of Pharisaism, and of all kinds of formalism in the religious life, our Lord fixes, as before in chap. vi. 1—18, on the love of man’s applause as that which vitiated the highest ethical teaching and the most rigorous outward holiness. The fact, which we learn from John xii. 42, 43, that many “among the chief rulers” were in their hearts convinced of His claims, and yet were afraid to confess Him, gives a special emphasis to the rebuke. They may have been among those who listened to it with the consciousness that He spake of them.

Phylacteries.—The Greek word (phylacterion) from which the English is derived signifies “safe-guard or preservative,” and was probably applied under the idea that the phylacteries were charms or amulets against the evil eye or the power of evil spirits. This was the common meaning of the word in later Greek, and it is hardly likely to have risen among the Hellenistic Jews to the higher sense which has sometimes been ascribed to it, of being a means to keep men in mind of the obligations of the Law. Singularly enough, it is not used by the LXX. translators for the “frontlets” of Ex. xiii. 2—16, Deut. vi. 8, xi. 8, and the only place in the Old Testament where it is found is for the “cushions” of Ezek. xii. 18. The Hebrew word in common use from our Lord’s time onward has been tephillin, or Prayers. The things so named were worn by well-nigh all Jews as soon as they became Children of the Law, i.e., at thirteen. They consisted of a small box containing the four passages in which frontlets are mentioned (Ex. xiii. 2—10, 11—16; Deut. vi. 4—9; xi. 13—22), written on four slips of vellum for the phylactery of the head, and on one for that of the arm. This is fastened by a loop to thin leather straps, which are twisted in the one case round the arm, with the box on the heart, in the other, round the head, with the box on the brow. They were worn commonly during the act of prayer (hence the Hebrew name), and by those who made a show of perpetual devotion and study of the Law, during the whole day. The Pharisees, in their ostentations show of piety, made either the box or the straps wider than the common size, and wore them as they walked to and fro in the streets, or prayed standing (chap. vi. 5), that men might see and admire them.

The borders of their garments.—The word is the same as the “hem” of the garment (chap. ix. 20) worn by our Lord. The practice rested on Num. xv. 37—41, which enjoined a “ribband” or “thread” of blue (the colour symbolic of heaven) to be put into the fringe or tassels of the outer cloak or plaid. The other threads were white, and the number of threads 013, as coinciding with the number of precepts in the Law, as counted by the scribes. The fringes in question were worn, as we see, by our Lord (see Notes on chap. ix. 20; xiv. 36), and probably by the disciples. It was reserved for the Pharisees to make them so conspicuous as to attract men’s notice.

The uppermost rooms.—Better, the first places, the word “room,” which had that meaning at the time when the English version was made, has now become identical with “chamber.” Strictly speaking, they would be the first places, nearest to the host, on the couches or ottomans (as we have learnt to call them from their modern Eastern use) on which the guests reclined, those being assigned (as in the case of “the disciple whom Jesus loved,” in John xiii. 23) to the most favoured guests.

The chief seats in the synagogues.—These were at the upper end of Jerusalem, the upper end of the synagogue (corresponding to the east end of most Christian churches), where was the ark, or chest that contained the Law. These were given, either by common consent or by the elders of the synagogue, to those who were most conspicuous for their devotion to the Law, and as such, were coveted as a mark of religious reputation.

Greetings in the markets.—The greetings referred to were more than the familiar “Peace with thee,” and involved the language of formal reverence (comp. Note on Luke x. 4) paid to those whom men delighted to honour.

Rabbi, Rabbi.—The title, which properly meant a “great” or “chief” one, as in Rab-Mag (“the chief priest,” Jer. xxxix. 3), Rabbasris (“the chief eunuch,” 2 Kings xviii. 17), had come to be applied, in the days of Hillel and Shammah, to the teachers or masters of the Law, and, as such, was given to the scribes who devoted themselves to that work. In Rabban (said to have been first given to Simeon, the son of Hillel) and Rabboni (John xx. 16) we have forms which were supposed to imply a yet greater degree of reverence.

Be not ye called Rabbi.—The teaching of our Lord was not without its foreshadowings in that of the better scribes, and a precept of Shemayah, the successor of Hillel, lays down the rule that “men should love the work, but hate the Rabbi-ship.”

One is your Master.—The word, as found in the better MSS., is used in its old sense as “teacher.” He was, as the disciples called Him, the Rabbi to whom they were to look for guidance. They were not to seek the title for themselves as a mark of honour. As they did their work as “teachers” (1 Cor. xii. 28; Eph. iv. 11), they were to remember who was teaching them. The received text of the Greek gives the word which means “guide,” as in verse 10.
Call no Man Master.
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Devouring Widows' Houses.

and all ye are brethren. (9) And call no man your father upon the earth: for one is your Father, 9 which is in heaven. (10) Neither be ye called masters: for one is your Master, even Christ. (11) But he that is greatest among you shall be your servant. (12) And whosoever shall exalt himself shall be abused; and he that shall humble himself shall be exalted.

(13) But woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye shut up the kingdom of heaven against men: for ye neither go in yourselves, neither suffer ye them that are entering to go in. (14) Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye devour widows' houses, 4 and for a pretence make long prayer: therefore ye shall receive the greater damnation. (15) Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye compass sea and land to

Even Christ.—The words are wanting in the best MSS., and have apparently crept into the text from a marginal explanatory note, completing the sense after the pattern of verse 10.

All ye are brethren.—The words would seem to come more naturally at the close of the next verse, and are so placed in some MSS. There is, however, a preponderance of authority in favour of this position, nor is the use of the name here without significance. The fact that men are disciples of the same Teacher constitutes in itself a bond of brotherhood.

Call no man your father.—This also, under its Hebrew form of Abba, was one of the titles in which the scribes delighted. In its true use it embodied the thought that the relation of scholars and teachers was filial on the one side, paternal on the other; but precisely because it expressed so noble an idea was it merely conventional use full of danger. The history of the ecclesiastical titles of Christendom offers to this respect a singular parallel to that of the titles of Judaism. In Abbot (derived from Abba=Father), in Papa and Pope (which have risen from their application to every priest, till they culminate in the Pontifex summus of the Church of Rome), in our “Father in God,” as applied to Bishops, we find examples of the use of like language, liable to the same abuse. It would, of course, be a slavish literalism to see in our Lord’s words an absolute prohibition of these and like words in ecclesiastical or civil life. What was meant was to warn men against so reckoning in any case, the fatherhood of men as to forget the Fatherhood of God. Even the teacher and apostle, who is a father to others, needs to remember that he is as a “little child” in the relation to God. (Comp. St. Paul’s claim in 1 Cor. iv. 15.)

(10) Neither be ye called masters.—The word is not the same as in verse 8, and signifies “guide,” or “leader,” the “director” of conscience rather than the teacher. (Comp. Rom. ii. 19.)

(11) He that is greatest among you.—Literally, the greater of you. The words admit of a two-fold meaning. Either (1), as in Mark ix. 35, they assert a law of retribution—the man who seeks to be greatest shall be the servant of all; or (2) they point out the other law, of which our Lord’s own life was the highest illustration—that he who is really greatest will show himself greatest in asserting it, but in a life of ministration. The latter interpretation seems to give on the whole the best meaning.

(12) Whosoever shall exalt himself.—The precept seems to have been one which our Lord desired specially to imprint on the hearts of the disciples. It had been spoken at least twice before, as in Luke xiv. 11, xviii. 14. The echoes of it in Jas. iv. 10, 1 Pet. v. 6, show that the impression had been made.

(13) Woe unto you.—We enter in these verses on the sternest words of condemnation that over came from our Lord’s lips; but it may be questioned whether our English “Woe unto you” does not exclude too entirely the element of sorrow, as well as indignation, of which the Greek interjection (as in Mark xiii. 17) is at least capable. Woe for you is, perhaps, a better rendering.

Hypocrites.—See Note on chap. vi. 2.

Ye shut up the kingdom . . . —The words reproduce what had been said before as to “the key of Knowledge” (Luke xi. 52), the symbol which was given to each scribe on his admission to his office. Our Lord’s charge against them is that the only use they made of the key was to lock the door. They did not enter into the inner meaning of Law or Prophets; they excluded (with a possible reference to their putting out of the synagogue those who believed in Jesus, John ix. 22; xii. 42) those who were so entering into the higher life and the higher teaching of the Kingdom. (Comp. Gal. iv. 17.)

(14) Ye devour widows’ houses.—The avarice thus described may have attained its end either (1) by using the advantages which they possessed, as the jurists and notaries of the time, to press unjust claims against wealthy widows, or to become their heirs, or (2) by leading devout women, under the show of piety, to bestow on them their estates or houses. To minister to the maintenance of a scribe was, they taught, the best use of wealth. The “long prayer” refers probably to the well-known Eighteen Prayers, which formed the standard of the Pharisee’s devotion. The whole verse, it may be noted, is wanting in many MSS., and may have been inserted here from Mark xii. 40 or Luke xx. 47.

(15) To make one proselyte.—The zeal of the earlier Pharisees had showed itself in a propagandism which reminds us rather of the spread of the religion of Mahomet than of that of Christ. John Hyrcanus, the last of the Maccabean priest-rulers, had offered the Idumeans the alternative of death, exile, or circumcission (Jos. Ant. xiii. 9, § 3). When the government of Rome rendered such measures impossible, they resorted to all the arts of persuasion, and exulted when they succeeded in enrolling a heathen convert as a member of their party. But the proselytes thus made were too often a scandal and proverb of reproach. The ties of duty and natural affection were ruthlessly snapped asunder. The popular Jewish feeling about them was like that of the popular Christian feeling about a converted Jew. Proselytes were regarded as the leprous
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Straining at a Gnat.

False Teaching as to Oaths.

make one proselyte, and when he is made, ye make him twofold more the child of hell than yourselves. (16) Woe unto you, ye blind guides, which say, Whosoever shall swear by the temple, it is nothing; but whosoever shall swear by the gold of the temple, he is a debtor! (17) Ye fools and blind: for whether is greater, the gift or the altar that sanctifieth the gift? (18) And, Whosoever shall swear by the altar, it is nothing; but whosoever sweareth by the gift that is upon it, he is guilty. (19) Ye fools and blind: for whether is greater, the altar, or the altar that sanctifieth the altar? (20) Whoso therefore shall swear by the altar, sweareth by it, and by all things thereon. (21) And whoso shall swear by the temple, sweareth by it, and by him that dwelleth therein. (22) And he that shall swear by heaven, sweareth by the throne of God, and by him that sitteth thereon.

(23) Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye pay tithe of mint and anise and cummin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith: these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone. (24) Ye blind guides, which strain at a gnat, and swallow a camel. (25) Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye make clean the outside of the cup and of the platter, but within they are full of extortion and excess. (26) Thou blind Pharisee, cleanse first that which is within the cup and platter, that the outside of them may be clean also. (27) Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye are like unto whitened sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men's bones, and of all unclean-

of Israel, hindering the coming of the Messiah. It became a proverb that no one should trust a proselyte, even to the twenty-fourth generation. Our Lord was, in part at least, expressing the judgment of the better the "infinitely little" He contrasts the three ethical whether is greater, the gold, or the temple that sanctifieth the gold? (18) And, Whosoever shall swear by the altar, it is nothing; but whosoever

The language of Deut. xii. 17 seems to recognize only corn, wine, and oil, among the produce of the earth, as subject to the law of tithes. The Pharisee, in his minute scrupuloscity (based, it may be, on the more general language of Lev. xxvii. 30), made a point of gathering the tenth sprig of every garden herb, and presenting it to the priest. So far as this was done at the bidding of an imperfectly illumined conscience our Lord does not blame it. It was not, like the teaching

as to oaths and the Corban, a direct perversion of the Law. What He did censure was the substitution of the lower for the higher. With the three examples of the "infinitely little" He contrasts the three ethical obligations that were infinitely great, "judgment, mercy, and faith." The word translated "mint" means literally the "sweet-smelling," the "fragrant."

The implied premise is that "uncleanness" in its ethical sense was altogether distinct from the outward uncleanness with which the Pharisees identified it. If the contents of the cup were pure in their source and in their use, they made the outside "clean," irrespective of any process of surface purification.

Contact with a sepulchre brought with it ceremonial uncleanness, and all burial-places were accordingly
Building the Tombs of the Prophets. ST. MATTHEW, XXIII. Filling up the Measure of Iniquity.

ness. (29) Even so ye also outwardly appear righteous unto men, but within ye are full of hypocrisy and iniquity. (29) Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! because ye build the tombs of the prophets, and garnish the sepulchres of the righteous, (30) and say, If we had been in the days of our fathers, we would not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets. (31) Wherefore ye be witn

did not understand, and therefore could not rightly honour, the life of a prophet or just man. They might have learnt something from the saying of a teacher of their own in the Jerusalem Talmud, that "there is no need to adorn the sepulchres of the righteous, for their words are their monuments." In somewhat of the same strain wrote the Roman historian: "As the faces of men are frail and perishable, so are the works of art that represent their faces; but the form of their character is eternal, and this we can retain in memory, and set forth to others, not by external matter and skill of art, but by our own character and acts" (Tacitus, Agricola, c. 46).

(30) If we had been in the days . . .—There is no necessity for assuming that the Pharisees did not mean what they said. It was simply an instance of the unconscious hypocrisy of which every generation has more or less been guilty, when it has condemned the wrong-doing of the past—its bigotry, or luxury, or greed—and then has yielded to the same sins itself.

(31) Ye be witnesses unto yourselves.—Their words were true in another sense than that in which they had spoken them. They were reproducing in their deeds the very lineaments of those fathers whom they condemned.

(32) Fill ye up then . . .—The English fails to give the pathetic abruptness of the original: And ye—fill ye up the measure of your fathers. The thought implied is that which we find in Gen. xv. 16, and of which the history of the world offers but too many illustrations. Each generation, as it passes, adds something to the ever-accumulating mass of evil. At last the penalty falls, as though the long-suffering of God had been waiting till the appointed limit had been reached, and the measure of iniquity was at last full.

(33) Ye generation of vipers.—Better, as in iii. 7, brood, or progeny of vipers. The word of rebuke which had come before from the lips of the Baptist, comes now, with even more intense keenness, from those of the Christ.

How can ye escape?—Better—to maintain the parallelism with the Baptist's words, which was, we can hardly doubt, designed—How should ye flee from?

(34) Behold, I send unto you prophets.—In the parallel passage of Luke xi. 49 these words are introduced by the statement, "Therefore said the wisdom of God," which has led some to see in them a quotation from some prophetic writing then current (see Note there). The words are, in any case, remarkable as including "scribes" no less than "prophets" among the ministers of the New Covenant. (See Note on chap. xiii. 52.)

Shall ye scourge in your synagogues.—See Note on chap. x. 17.
The blood of Zacharias son of Barachias.

—A very memorable martyrdom is recorded in 2 Chron. xxiv. 20—22, in which a prophet, named Zechariah, was stoned “in the court of the house of the Lord, at the commandment of the king.” That Zacharias was, however, the son of Jehoiada; and the only “Zechariah the son of Barachias” in the Old Testament, is the minor prophet whose writings occupy the last place but one among the prophetic books of the Old Testament. Of his death we know nothing, and it is not probable, had he been slain in the manner here described, that it would have passed unrecorded. The death of the son of Jehoiada, on the other hand, is not only recorded, as above in 2 Chron. xxiv., but had become the subject of popular legends. The blood of the prophet, it was said in the Talmud, would not dry up. It was still bubbling up when Nebuzaradan, the Chaldean commander (Jer. xxxix. 9) took the Temple. No sacrifices availed to stay it, not even the blood of thousands of slaughtered priests. Wild as the story is, it shows, as does the so-called tomb of Zacharias, the impression which that death had made on the minds of men, and explains why it was chosen by our Lord as a representative example. The substitution of Barachias for Jehoiada may be accounted for as the mistake of a transcriber, led by the association of the two names, like that of Jeremy for Zechariah in chap. xxvii. 9 (where see Note). In the Sinaitic MS., the words “son of Barachiah” are omitted, but this betrays the hand of a corrector cutting the knot of the difficulty. The assumptions (1) that Jehoiada may have borne Barachiah as a second name, (2) or that he may have had a son of that name, and been really the grandfather of the martyr, are obviously hypotheses invented for the occasion, without a shadow of evidence. Singularly enough, Josephus (Wars, iv. 5, § 4) recounts the murder of a “Zechariah, the son of Baruch,” i.e., Barachiah, as perpetrated in the Temple by the Zealots just before the destruction of Jerusalem. It is possible that this also may not have been without its weight in so linking the two names together in men’s minds as to mislead the memory as to the parentage of the older of his will to frustrate the love and pity, and therefore

unto Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets.—The words reproduce its atrocity, identify themselves with it; and so, what seems at first an arbitrary decree, visiting on the children the sins of the fathers, becomes in such cases a righteous judgment. If they repent, they cut off the terrible entail of sin and punishment; but if they harden themselves in their evil, they inherit the delayed punishment of their father’s sins as well as of their own.

Jerusalem, Jerusalem.—The lamentation had been uttered once before (Luke xiii. 34, 35), and must, we may believe, have been present to our Lord’s mind when He “beheld the city and wept over it” (Luke xiv. 41), as He hailed on the brow of Olivet.

It should be noted that the Hebrew form of Jerusalem (_UNIQUE (_text)) occurs here only in St. Matthew, as though the very syllables had impressed themselves on the minds of men.

Even as a hen gathereth her chickens.—The words are in the present tense, as embracing the past and even the future. As with a sad prescience our Lord speaks of the sufferings which were in store for His messengers, and of which the deaths of Stephen (Acts vii. 60) and of James (Acts xii. 2) were representative instances. That the persecution in each case took a wider range, was in the nature of the case inevitable. It is distinctly stated, indeed, that it did so in both instances (Acts viii. 1, xii. 1), and is implied in 1 Thess. ii. 14, 15, where the “prophets” who suffered are clearly Christian prophets, and probably in Jas. v. 10.

Ye would not.—No words could more emphatically state man’s fatal gift of freedom, as shown in the power of his will to frustrate the love and pity, and therefore the will, even of the Almighty.
Coming Destruction of the Temple. ST. MATTHEW, XXIV.

CHAPTER XXIV.—

(1) And Jesus went out, and departed from the temple; and his disciples came to him for to shew him the buildings of the temple.

(2) And Jesus said unto them, See ye not all these things? verily I say unto you, There shall not be left here one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down.

in a momentary burst of excitement, not with feigned Hosannas, but in spirit and in truth—would they look on Him as they looked now. There can be little doubt that our Lord points to the second Advent, and to the warnings would be needed; and this may, in part, account for the variations with which it then appeared.

(3) The disciples came unto him privately.—

From St. Mark we learn their names—"Peter, and James, and John, and Andrew;" i.e., the four in the point connected with the general pre-eminence of the first three.

The sign of thy coming.—Literally, of Thy presence. The passage is memorable as the first occurrence of the word ( synopsis, parousia), which was so prominent in the teaching of the Epistles (1 Thess. ii. 19; iii. 13; Jas. v. 7; 1 John ii. 28, et al.). They had brought themselves to accept the thought of His departure and return, though time and manner were as yet hidden from them.

The end of the world.—Literally, the end of the age. In the common language of the day, which had passed from the schools of the Rabbis into popular use, "this age," or "this world," meant the time up to the coming of the Messiah; the "age or world to come" (chap. xiii. 40; xix. 28; Heb. xi. 5; vi. 5), the glorious time which He was to inaugurate. The disciples had heard their Lord speak in parables of such a coming, and they naturally connected it in their thoughts with the close of the age or period in which they lived.

(4) Jesus answered and said unto them . . .

—The great discourse which follows is given with substantial agreement by St. Mark and St. Luke, the variations being such as were naturally incident to reports made from memory, and probably after an interval of many years. In all probability, the written record came, in the first instance, from the lips of St. Peter, and it will accordingly be instructive to compare its eschatology, or "teaching as to the last things," with that which we find in his discourses and epistles. St. Paul's reference to "the day of the Lord coming" as a thief in the night" (1 Thess. v. 2) suggests the inference that its substance had become known at a comparatively early date; but it was probably not published, i.e., not thrown as a document into circulation, among Christian Jews, till the time was near when its warnings would be needed; and this may, in part, account for the variations with which it then appeared.

(5) Many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ.—Better, the Christ. No direct fulfilments of this prediction are recorded, either in the New Testament, or by Josephus, or other historians. Bar-Cochba (the "son of the star"), who claimed to be the "Star" of the prophecy of Balaam (Num. xxiv. 17), is often named as a fulfilment; but he did not appear till A.D. 120—nearly 50 years after the destruction of Jerusalem. In the excited fanaticism of the time, however, it was likely enough that such pretenders should arise and disappear, after each had lived out his little day, and fill no place in history. The "many antichrists, i.e., rival Christs, of 1 John ii. 18, may point to such phenomena; possibly, also, the prophecy of 2 Thess. ii. 4. Theudas (the last rebel of that name —not the one named in Acts, v. 36, but by Josephus, Ant. xx. 5, or "the Egyptian" of Acts xxi. 38, may possibly have mingled Messianic claims with their pretensions, but there is no evidence of it.

(6) Ye shall hear . . .—Literally, ye shall be about to hear—a kind of double future, or possibly an
end is not yet. (7) For nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom: and there shall be famines, and pestilences, and earthquakes, in divers places. (8) All these are the beginning of sorrows. (9) Then shall they deliver you up to be afflicted, and shall kill you: and ye shall be hated of all nations for my name's sake. (10) And then shall many be offended, and shall betrayal one another, and shall hate one another. (11) And many false prophets shall arise, and shall deceive many. (12) And because iniquity shall abound, the love shall kill you: and ye shall be hated of all nations for my name's sake. (10) And then shall many be offended, and shall betray one another, and shall hate one another. (11) And many false prophets shall arise, and shall deceive many. (12) And because iniquity shall abound, the love

example of the transition between the older future tense and the use of an auxiliary verb.

Wars and rumours.—St. Luke adds “commotions.” The forty years that intervened before the destruction of Jerusalem were full of these in all directions; but we may probably think of the words as referring specially to wars, actual or threatened, that affected the Jews, such, e.g., as those of which we read under Caligula, Claudius, and Nero (Jos. Ant. xx. 1, 6). The title which the historian gave to his second book, “The Wars of the Jews,” is sufficiently suggestive. As the years passed on, the watchword, “Be not troubled,” must have kept the believers in Christ calm in the midst of agitation. They were not to think that the end was to follow at once upon the “visitation of God upon them” (Rom. viii. 38) “travailing in pain together” (Rom. viii. 22). The whole period was, indeed, marked by tumults of this kind.

Famines.—Of these we know that of which Agabus prophesied (Acts xi. 28), and which was felt severely, in the ninth year of Claudius, not only in Syria, but in Rome (Jos. Ant. xx. 2). Suetonius (Clu. c. 18) speaks of the reign of that emperor as marked by “continual scarcity.”

Pestilences.—The word is not found in the best MSS., and has probably been inserted from the parallel passage in Luke xxi. 11. It was, however, the inevitable attendant on famine, and the Greek words for the two (λύμος and λοιμός, χάριμος and λοιμός) were so like each other that the omission may possibly have been an error of transcription. A pestilence is recorded as sweeping off 30,000 persons at Rome (Sueton. Nero, 39; Tacitus, Ann. xvi. 13).

Earthquakes, in divers places.—Perhaps no period in the world’s history has ever been so marked by these convulsions as that which intervenes between the Crucifixion and the destruction of Jerusalem. Josephus records one in Judaea (Wars, iv. 4, § 5); Tacitus tells of them in Crete, Rome, Apamea, Pergamum, Campania (Ann. xii. 49; xiv. 27; xv. 22); Seneca (Ep. 91), in A.D. 58, speaks of them as extending their devastations over Asia (the proconsular province, not the continent), Achaea, Syria, and Macedonia.

The beginning of sorrows.—The words mean strictly, the commencement of troubles. The troubles through which the world passes are thought of as issuing in a “new birth”—the “regeneration” of chap. xix. 28. So St. Paul speaks of the whole creation as “travelling in pain together” (Rom. viii. 22). So a time of national suffering and perplexity is one in which “the children are come to the birth, and there is not strength to bring forth” (Isa. xxxvii. 3).
of many shall wax cold. (13) But he that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved. (14) And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come. (15) When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place, (whoso readeth, let him understand:) (16) then let them which be in Judea flee into the mountains: (17) let him which is on the housetop not come down to take anything out of his house: (18) neither let him which is in the field return back to take his clothes. (19) And woe unto them that are with child, and to them that give birth in that time. (20) The woe was here at once a higher and lower sense. Endurance to the end of life is in every case the condition of salvation, in the full meaning of the word. But the context rather leads us to see in the “end” the close of the period of which our Lord speaks, i.e., the destruction of Jerusalem; and so the words “shall be saved” at least include deliverance from the doom of those who were involved in that destruction. (14) Shall be preached in all the world.—The words may have been chosen by the trained and cunning which they would have for those who heard them, and they were certain to see in “all the world” (literally, the inhabited earth, as in Luke ii. 1; Acts xi. 28) neither more nor less than the Roman empire; and it was true, as a matter of fact, that there was hardly a province of the empire in which the faith of Christ had not been preached before the destruction of Jerusalem. Special attention should be given to the words, “a witness unto all the nations,” i.e., to all the Gentiles, as an implicit sanction of the work of which St. Paul was afterwards the great representative. So taken, the words prepare the way for the great mission of chap. xlviii. 19. (15) The abomination of desolation.—The words, as they stand in Dan. xii. 11, seem to refer to the desecration of the sanctuary by the mad attempt of Antiochus Epiphanes to stop the “daily sacrifice,” and to substitute an idolatrous worship in its place (2 Macc. iv. 9-19). What analogous desecration our Lord’s words point to, is a question that has received very different answers. We may at once narrow the range of choice by remembering (1) that it is before the destruction of the Temple, and therefore cannot be the presence of the plundering troops, or of the eagles of the legions in it; (2) that the “abomination” stands in the “Holy Place,” and therefore it cannot be identified with the appearance of the Roman eagles in the lines of the besieging legions under Cestius, A.D. 68. The answer is probably to be found in the faction-fights, the murders and outrages, the profane consecration of usurping priests, which the Jewish historian describes so fully (Jos. Wars, iv. 6, §§ 6-8). The Zealots had got possession of the Temple at an early stage in the siege, and profaned it by these and other like outrages; they made the Holy Place (in the very words of the historian) “a garrison and stronghold” of their tyrannous and lawless rule; while the better priests looked on from afar and wept tears of horror. The mysterious prediction of 2 Thess. ii. 4 may point, in the first instance, to some kindred “abomination.” The words “spoken of by Daniel the prophet” have been urged as absolutely decisive of the questions that have been raised as to the authorship of the book that bears the name of that prophet. This is not the place to discuss those questions, but it is well in all cases not to put upon words a strain which they will scarcely bear. It has been urged, with some degree of reasonableness, that a reference of this kind was necessarily made to the book as commonly received and known, and that critical questions of this kind, as in reference to David the writer of the Psalms, or Moses as the author of the books commonly ascribed to him, lay altogether outside the scope of our Lord’s teaching. The questions themselves had not been then raised, and were not present to the thoughts either of the hearers or the readers of his prophetic warnings. Whoso readeth, let him understand.—The words have at once a higher and lower sense. The book as commonly received and known, and that of the nations; and then shall the end come. (15) When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the temple, and therefore cannot be the presence of the Temple, and therefore cannot be identified with the appearance of the Roman eagles in the lines of the besieging legions under Cestius, A.D. 68, to Pella, a town on the northern boundary of Peræa. So Josephus (Wars, iv. 9, § 1; v. 10, § 1) more generally relates that many of the more conspicuous citizens fled from the city, as men abandon a sinking ship. The “mountains” may be named generally as a place of refuge, or may point, as interpreted by the event, to the Gilead range of hills on the east of Jordan. (17) Let him which is on the housetop.—The houses in the streets of Jerusalem were built in a continuous line, and with flat roofs, so that a man might pass from house to house without descending into the street until he came to some point near the wall or gate of the city, and so make his escape. At a moment of danger (in this case that arising from the factions within the city, rather than the invaders without), any delay might prove fatal. Men were to escape as though their life were “given them for a prey” (Jer. xlv. 5), without thinking of their goods or chattels. (19) Woe unto them.—Better, alas for them, or woe for them. The tone is that of pity rather than denunciation. The hardships of a hurried flight would press most heavily on those who were encumbered with infant children, or were expecting childbirth. The same tenderness of sympathy shows itself in the words spoken to the daughters of Jerusalem in Luke xxiii. 28, 29. Perhaps the words point to the darker horrors of the siege, when mothers were driven, in the frenzy of starvation, to feed on their infants’ flesh (Jos. Wars, vi. 3, § 4).
The Great Tribulation.
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The Carcass and the Eagles.

suck in those days! (20) But pray ye that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the sabbath day: (21) for then shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be. (22) And except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved: but for the elect's sake those days shall be shortened. (23) Then if any man shall say unto you, Behold, here is Christ, or there; believe it not. (24) For there shall arise false Christs, and false pro-

(20) Pray ye that your flight . . . —Rules were given for flight where the conditions lay within their own power. Other incidents which lay outside their will might lawfully be the subjects of their prayers. It is characteristic of St. Matthew, writing for Jews, that he alone records the words “nor on the Sabbath day.” Living as the Christians of Judea did in the strict observance of the Law, they would either be hindered by their own scruples from going beyond a Sabbath day’s journey (about one English mile), which would be insufficient to place them out of the reach of danger, or would find impediments—gates shut, and the like—from the Sabbath observance of others.

(21) Such as was not since the beginning . . . —The words come from Dan. xii. 1. One who reads the narrative of Josephus will hardly hesitate to adopt his language, “that all miseries that had been known from the beginning of the world fell short” of those of the siege of the Holy City (Wars, v. 13, §§ 4, 5). Other sieges may have witnessed, before and since, scenes of physical wretchedness equally appalling, but nothing that history records offers anything parallel to the alternations of fanatic hope and frenzied despair that attended the breaking up of the faith and polity of Israel.

(22) Should no flesh be saved.—The words are of course limited by the context to the scene of the events to which the prophecy refers. The warfare with foes outside the city, and the faction-fights and massacres within, would have caused an utter depopulation of the whole city.

For the elect's sake.—Those who, as believers in Jesus, were the “remnant” of the visible Israel, and therefore the true Israel of God. It was for the sake of the Christians of Judea, not for that of the rebellious Jews, that the war was not protracted, and that Titius, under the outward influences of Josephus and BorGH, tempered his conquests with compassion (Ant. xii. 3, § 2; Wars, vi. 9, § 3). The new prominence which the idea of an election gains in our Lord’s later teaching is every way remarkable. (Comp. chaps. xviii. 7; xx. 6). The “call” had been wide; in those who received and obeyed it He taught men to recognise the “elect” whom God had chosen. Subtle questions as to whether the choice rested on foreknowledge or was absolutely arbitrary lay, if we may reverently so speak, outside the scope of His teaching.

(23) Lo, here is Christ, or there.—Better, Lo, here is the Christ. The narrative of Josephus, while speaking of many “deceivers” claiming divine authority (Wars, ii. 13, § 4), is silent as to any pretenders to the character of the Messiah. It is scarcely conceivable, however, that this should not have been one of the results of the

phets, and shall shew great signs and wonders; insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect. (25) Behold, I have told you before. (26) Wherefore if they shall say unto you, Behold, he is in the desert; go not forth: behold, he is in the secret chambers; believe it not. (27) For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be. (28) For wheresoever the carcasse is, there will the eagles be gathered together.
29) Immediately after the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken: and then shall appear the sign of the Son of Man in heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven, and take no account of theer, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the moon shall not give her light, of those days shall the sun be darkened, and the words reproducible the imagery in which Isaiah had described the day of the Lord's judgment upon Babylon (Isa. xiii. 10), and may naturally receive the same symbolic interpretation. Our Lord speaks here in language as essentially apocalyptic as that of the Revelation of St. John (Rev. viii. 12), and it lies in the very nature of such language that it precludes a literal interpretation. Even the common speech of men describes a time of tribulation as one in which "the skies are dark" and "the sun of a nation's glory sets in gloom;" the language of Isaiah, of St. John, and of our Lord, is but the expansion and immediate disciples, though they were too conscious of their ignorance of "the times and the seasons" to fix the day or year, lived and died in the expectation that it was not far off, and that they might, by prayer and acts, hasten its coming (2 Pet. iii. 12). (See Note on verse 36.)

Shall the sun be darkened.—The words reproduce the imagery in which Isaiah had described the day of the Lord's judgment upon Babylon (Isa. xiii. 10), and may naturally receive the same symbolic interpretation. Our Lord speaks here in language as essentially apocalyptic as that of the Revelation of St. John (Rev. viii. 12), and it lies in the very nature of such language that it precludes a literal interpretation. Even the common speech of men describes a time of tribulation as one in which "the skies are dark" and "the sun of a nation's glory sets in gloom;" and the language of Isaiah, of St. John, and of our Lord, is but the expansion of that familiar parable. Sun, moon, and stars may represent, as many have thought, kingly power, and the spiritual influence of which the Church of Christ is the embodiment, and the illuminating power of those who "shine as lights in the world" (Phil. ii. 15), but even this interpretation is, it may be, over-precise and technical, and the words are better left in their dim and terrible vagueness.

The powers of the heavens.—These are, it will be noted, distinguished from the "stars," and may be taken as the apocalyptic expression for the laws or "forces" by which moon and stars are kept in their appointed courses. The phrase is found elsewhere only in the parallel passages in St. Mark and St. Luke.

30) Then shall appear the sign of the Son of man.—Can we picture to ourselves what this sign shall be? Is it distinct from the coming of the Son of Man which here is so closely united with it? Men have given wildly conjectural answers to these questions, and have dreamt of the cross as appearing in the sky (as if the vision of Constantine were to be reproduced in the last days), or the lightning flash that shall dazzle all men with its brightness, or of some visible manifestation which none can imagine till it shall come. The vision of Dan. vii. 13 supplies, it is believed, the true answer. The sign of the Son of Man is none other than the presence of the Son of Man Himself, coming in the clouds of heaven, in the ineffable glory of His majesty. And here, too, we must remember that we are still in the region of apocalyptic symbols. All such imagery falls short of the ultimate reality, and a "sign in heaven" is something more than a visible appearance in the sky.

Then shall all the tribes of the earth.—It lies in the nature of the case, that the "tribes" are those who have done evil, and who therefore dread the coming of the Judge. The words find their best comment in Rev. i. 7, where St. John combines them freely with the prediction of Zech. xii. 10, "They also which pierced Him," obviously including not only those who were sharers in the actual "piercing" of the crucified body of the Lord Jesus (John xix. 37), but all who in any age "crucify the Son of God afresh" (Heb. vi. 6).
The Parable of the Fig-tree.

ST. MATTHEW, XXIV.

Words that never pass away.

The Parable of the Fig-tree.

He shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other. (31) Now learn a parable of the fig tree; when his branch is yet tender, and putteth forth leaves, ye know that summer is nigh: so likewise ye, when ye shall see all these things, know that it is near, even at the doors. (32) Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled. Heaven and earth shall pass away; but my words shall not pass away. (33)

(31) He shall send his angels.—The words are memorable as the formal expansion of what had been, as it were, hinted before in the parables of the Tares (xiii. 41) and the Net (xiii. 49).

With a great sound of a trumpet.—The better MSS. omit “sound.” With a great trumpet. We know not, and cannot know, what reality will answer to this symbol, but it is interesting to note how deeply it impressed itself on the minds not only of the disciples who heard it, but of those who learnt it from them. When St. Paul speaks of the “trumpet” that shall “sound” (1 Cor. xiv. 52), of “the voice of the archangel and the trump of God” (1 Thess. iv. 16), we feel that he was reproducing what had been thus proclaimed, and that his eschatology, or doctrine of the last things, was based on a knowledge of the substance of the great prophetic discourse recorded in the Gospels.

They shall gather together his elect.—The “elect” are the same in idea, though not necessarily the same individuals, as those for whom the days were to be shortened in verse 22; and the work of the angels is that of gathering them, wherever they may be scattered, into one fold. As with so many of the pregnant germs of thought in this chapter, the work of the angels is expanded by the visions of the Apocalypse, when the seer beheld the angels come and seal the hundred and forty-four thousand in their foreheads Jehovah. (Comp. 1 Pet. i. 24, 25.) The whole history of Christendom witnesses to the fulfilment of the prophetic claim. Amid all its changes and confusions, its errors and its sins, the words of Christ have not passed away, but retain their pre-eminence as the last and fullest revelation of the Father.

(32) Now learn a parable of the fig tree.—As in so many other instances (comp. Notes on John viii. 13; x. 1), it was on the Mount of Olives, where then, as now, fig-trees were found as well as olives (chap. xxii. 19), and the season was that of early spring, when “the flowers appear on the earth,” and the “fig-tree putteth forth its green figs” (Song Sol. ii. 11-13). And what our Lord teaches is that as surely as the fresh green foliage of the fig-tree is a sign of summer, so shall the signs of which He speaks portend the coming of the Son of Man.

(33) So likewise ye.—The pronoun is emphatic. Ye whom I have chosen, who are therefore among the elect that shall be thus gathered. The words are spoken to the four Apostles as the representatives of the whole body of believers who should be living—first, at the destruction of Jerusalem, and afterwards at the end of the world. Of the four, St. John alone, so far as we know, survived the destruction of Jerusalem.

That it is near.—Better, that He is near, in accordance with Jas. v. 9.

This generation shall not pass . . .—The natural meaning of the words is, beyond question, that which takes “generation” in the ordinary sense (as in chap. i. 17, Acts xiii. 36, and elsewhere) for those who are living at any given period. So it was on “this generation” (chap. xxiii. 36) that the accumulated judgments were to fall. The desire to bring the words into more apparent harmony with history has led some interpreters to take “generation” in the sense of “race” or “people,” and so to see in the words a prophecy of the perpetuity of the existence of the Jews as a distinct people till the end of the world. But for this meaning there is not the shadow of authority; nor does it remove the difficulty which it was invented to explain. The words of chap. xvi. 28 state the same fact in language which does not admit of any such explanation.

Till all these things be fulfilled.—Better, till all these words be fulfilled. The words here necessarily imply more than the commencement of a process, the first unrolling of the scroll of the coming ages.
incidental to man's nature, even when untainted by evil and in fullest fellowship, through the Eternal Spirit, with the Father.

As the days of Noe were.—Here again we note an interesting coincidence with the Epistles of St. Peter, both of which seem, more than any other portions of the New Testament, with references to the history to which the mind of the writer had been directed by his Master's teaching. 1 Pet. iii. 20; 2 Pet. ii. 5; iii. 6. This is, perhaps, all the more noticeable from the fact that the report of the discourse in St. Mark does not give the reference, neither indeed does that in St. Luke, but substitutes for it a general warning-call to watchfulness and prayer. Possibly (though all such conjectures are more or less arbitrary) the two Evangelists who were writing for the Gentile Christians were led to omit the allusion to a history which was not so familiar to those whom they had in view as it was to the Hebrew readers of St. Matthew's Gospel.

So shall also the coming of the Son of man be.—The words justify the interpretation given above of verses 29, 30. If the "signs" of the Advent were to be phenomena visible to the eye of sense, there could not be this reckless apathy of nescience. If they are to be tokens, "signs of the times," which can be discerned only by the illumined insight of the faithful, the hardened unbelief on the one side, and the expectant watchfulness on the other, are the natural result of the power or the want of power to discern them.

The one shall be taken.—Literally, the present tense being used to express the certainty of the future, one is taken, and one is left. The form of the expression is somewhat obscure, and leaves it uncertain which of the two alternatives is the portion of the chosen one. Is the man who is "taken" received into fellowship with Christ, while the other is abandoned? or is he carried away as by the storm of judgment, while the other is set free? On the whole, the use of the Greek word in other passages (as, e.g., in chap. i. 20, 24; xii. 45; John i. 11; xiv. 3) is in favour of the former interpretation. What is taught in any case is that the day of judgment will be, as by an inevitable law, a day of separation, according to the diversity of character which may exist in the midst of the closest fellowship in outward life.

Two women shall be grinding at the mill.—The words bring before us the picture of the lowest form of female labour, in which one woman holds the lower stone of the small hand-mill of the East, while another turns the upper stone and grinds the corn. In Judg. xvi. 21, and Lam. v. 13, the employment appears as the crowning degradation of male captives taken in battle. It is probable that in this case, as in that of the fig-tree, the illustration may have been suggested by what was present to our Lord's view at the time. The Mount of Olives might well have presented to His gaze, even as He spoke, the two labourers in the field, the two women at the mill.

But know this.—The verses from 42 to 51 have nothing corresponding to them in the reports of the discourse given by St. Mark and St. Luke, but are found almost verbatim in another discourse reported by St. Luke xii. 42, et seq. Here, as elsewhere, we have to choose between the assumption of a repetition of the same words, or of a transfer of what was spoken on one occasion to another; and of the two, the former hypothesis seems the more probable. It may be noted, however, that the variations in the three reports of this discourse indicate a comparatively free treatment of it, the natural result, probably, of its having been often reproduced, wholly or in part, orally before it was committed to writing. On ordinary grounds of evidence, St. Mark's report, assuming his connection with St. Peter, would seem likely to come nearest to the very words spoken by our Lord.

The goodwoman of the house.—Better, as in chap. xx. 1., householder.

In what watch.—The night-watches were four in number, of three hours each. So in Luke xii. 38, we have "the second or the third watch" specified. The allusion to the "thief coming" would seem to have passed into the proverbial saying, that the day of the Lord would come "as a thief in the night," quoted by St. Paul in 1 Thess. v. 2.

In such an hour as ye think not.—The words are important as showing that even the signs which were to be as the budding of the fig-tree at the approach of summer were intended only to rouse the faithful to watchfulness, not to enable men to fix the times and the seasons which the Father hath set in His own power. The apparent destiny of failure which has attended on all attempts to go beyond this in the interpretation of the apocalyptic eschatology of Scripture might have been avoided had men been more careful to restrain here also their efforts after knowledge "within the limits of the knowable."
and wise servant, whom his lord hath made ruler over his household, to give them meat in due season? [46] Blessed is that servant, whom his lord when he cometh shall find so doing. [47] Verily I say unto you, That he shall make him ruler over all his goods. [48] But and if that evil servant shall say in his heart, My lord delayeth his coming; [49] and shall begin to smite his fellowservants, and to eat and drink with the drunken; [50] the lord of that servant shall come in a day when he looketh not for him, and in an hour that he is not aware of, [51] and shall cut him asunder, and appoint him his portion with the hypocrites: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.

CHAPTER XXV.—[1] Then shall the kingdom of heaven be likened unto ten virgins, which took their lamps,
and went forth to meet the bridegroom. (2) And five of them were wise, and five were foolish. (3) They that were foolish took their lamps, and took no oil with them: (4) but the wise took oil in their vessels with their lamps. (5) While the bridegroom tarried, they all slumbered and slept. (6) And at midnight there was a cry made, Be­hold, the bridegroom cometh; go ye out to meet him. (7) Then all those virgins arose, and trimmed their lamps. (8) And the foolish said unto the wise, Give us of your oil; for our lamps are gone out. (9) But the wise answered, saying, Not so; lest there be not enough for us and you: but go ye rather to them that sell, and buy for yourselves. (10) And while they went to buy, the bridegroom came; and they that were ready went in with him to the marriage; and the door was shut. (11) Afterward came also the other virgins, saying, Lord, Lord, open to us. (12) But he answered and said, Verily I say unto you, I know you not. (13) Watch therefore, for ye know neither the day nor the hour wherein the Son of man cometh. (14) For the kingdom of heaven is as a man travelling into a far country, who called his own servants, and delivered

(2) Five of them were wise.—The word is the same as in chap. xxiv. 45, were see Note.
(3) Took no oil with them.—In the interpretation of the parable, the lamp or torch is obviously the out­ward and visible sign of the inward and spiritual. The foolish were not only careless of the divine grace, or more definitely, the gift of the Holy Spirit, without which the torch first burns dimly and then expires. The foolish virgins neglected to seek that supply, either from the Great Giver, or through the human agencies by which He graciously imparts it.
(4) While the bridegroom tarried.—Strictly speaking, the time thus described includes the whole interval between our Lord’s Ascension and His final Advent; but looking to the law of “springing and germinant accomplishments,” which we have recognised as applicable to the whole subject, we may see in it that which answers to any period in the history of any church, or, indeed, in the life of any member of a church, in which things go smoothly and as after the routine of custom. At such a time even the wise and good are apt to slumber and the crisis, which is to them, if not to the world at large, as the bridegroom’s coming, takes them by surprise; but they have, what the foolish have not, the reserved force of steadfast faith and divine help to fall back upon. We may note that the “delay” in this case is followed by a less glaring form of evil than that in chap. xxiv. 48. Not reckless and brutal greed, but simple apathy and neglect is the hypothesis, had done, all would have been well. The mistake lay in their not having gone before. It is too tenderness in the way in which, in the original, the wise virgins give the reason that makes compliance with the request impossible, without directly uttering a refusal.
(5) Our lamps are gone out.—Better, as in the margin, are going out. They were not quite extinguished; the flax was still smoking.
(6) Not so.—The words, as the italics show, are not in the Greek. They are, perhaps, necessary to complete the sense in English; but there is a tone of regretful

For the kingdom of heaven is as a man travelling into a far country, who called his own servants, and delivered
unto them his goods. (15) And unto one he gave five talents, to another two, and to another one; to every man according to his several ability; and straightway took his journey. (16) Then he that had received the five talents went and traded with the same, and made them other five talents. (17) And likewise he that had received two, he also gained other two. (18) But he that had received one went and digged in the earth, and hid his lord's money.

that it will be well to deal with each separately, and to reserve a comparison of the two till both have been interpreted.

The outward framework of the parable lies in the Eastern way of dealing with property in the absence of or, the earth, and hid his lord's money. many things: enter thou into the joy of thy lord.-The words

ST. MATTHEW, XXV. Reward of the Faithful Servant.

| 18. After a long time the lord of those servants cometh, and reckoneth with them. (20) And so he that had received five talents came and brought other five talents, saying, Lord, thou deliveredst unto me five talents, behold, I have gained beside them five talents more. (21) His lord said unto him, Well done, thou good and faithful servant: thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things: enter thou into the joy

The word "ruler" is not in the Greek. Here again, as in chap. xxiv. 47, we have a glimpse given us into the future that lies behind the veil. So far as the parable brings before us prominently either the final judgment or that which follows upon each man's death, we see the reward of faithful work lies not in rest only, but in enlarged activity. The world to come is thus connected by a law of continuity with that in which we live; and those who have so used their "talents" as to turn many to righteousness, may find new spheres of action, beyond all our dreams, in that world in which the ties of brotherhood that have been formed on earth are not extinguished, but, so we may reverently believe, multiplied and strengthened.

Enter thou into the joy of thy lord.—The words are almost too strong for the framework of the parable.
of thy lord. (22) He also that had received two talents came and said, Lord, thou deliverdest unto me two talents: behold, I have gained two other talents beside them. (23) His lord said unto him, Well done, good and faithful servant; thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things: enter thou into the joy of thy lord. (24) Then he which had received the one talent came and said, Lord, I knew thee that thou art an hard man, reaping where thou hast not sown, and gathering where thou hast not strawed: (25) and I was afraid, and went and hid thy talent in the earth: lo, there thou hast that is thine. (26) His lord answered and said unto him, Thou wicked and slothful servant, thou knewest that I reap where I sowed not, and gather where I have not strawed: (27) thou oughtest therefore to have put my money to the exchangers, and then at my coming I should have received mine own with usury. (28) Take therefore the talent from him, and give it unto him which hath ten talents. (29) For unto every one that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance: but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which which is his, that it may be given unto them that have abundance. (30) Take therefore the talent from him, and give it unto him which hath ten talents. (31) For unto every one that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance: but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which which is his, that it may be given unto them that have abundance.

A human master would hardly use such language to his slaves. But here, as yet more in the parable that follows, the symbol breaks through the symbol, and we hear the voice of the divine Master speaking to his servants, and He bids them share His joy, for that joy also has its source (as He told them but a few hours later) in loyal and faithful service, in having “kept His Father’s commandments” (John xv. 10, 11).

(24) I knew thee that thou art an hard man.—The word “hard” points to stiffness of character—St. Luke’s “sustern,” to harshness and bitterness. Was the plea an after-thought, put forward as an excuse for what had been originally sloth pure and simple? On that view, the lesson taught is that neglect of loyal service leads before long to disloyal thoughts. But it may have been our Lord’s intention to represent the slothful servant as having all along cherished the thought which he now pleads in his defence. That had been at the root of his neglect. The eye sees only so far as it brings with it the power to see, and therefore he had never seen in his master either generous love or justice in rewarding. The proverb, “One soweth, another reapeth” (John iv. 37), taken on its darker and more worldly side, seemed to him the rule of his master’s conduct. So in the souls of men there springs up at times the thought that all the anomalies of earthly rule are found in that of God, that He too is arbitrary, vindictive, pitiless, like earthly kings; and that thought, as it kills love, so it paralyses the energy which depends on love. So, we may believe, following the thought already thrown out, the heart of the Traitor was full of envy and bitterness because he stood so low in the company of the Twelve, and thought hardly of his Master because He thus dealt with him and yet looked for faithful service.

(25) And I was afraid.—The words are those of the master piece below the false excuse, and reveal the faults which had eaten like a canker into the man’s heart and soul.

(27) Thou oughtest therefore to have put my money to the exchangers.—Literally, table or counter-keepers, just as bankers were originally those who sat at their banca, or bench. These were the bankers referred to in the Note on verse 14. In that case, if the servant had been honestly conscious of his own want of power, there would have been at least some interest allowed on the deposit.

Usury.—Better, interested; the word not necessarily implying, as usury does now, anything illegal or exorbitant. The question—What answers to this “giving to the exchangers” in the interpretation of the parable?—is, as has been said, analogous to that which asks the meaning of “them that sell” in the answer of our Lord. There was a corresponding activity in the Church in the time of our Lord, when men in the middle ages gave to a cathedral or a college, when they subscribe largely to a cathedral or a college, when they subscribe largely to hospitals or missions, doing this and that, as our modern charitable organisations. The giver will not lose his reward.

(28) Take therefore the talent from him.—The sentence passed on the slothful servant confirms the view which sees in the “talents” the external opportunities given to a man for the use of his abilities. The abilities themselves cannot be thus transferred; the opportunities can, and often are, even in the approximate working out of the law of retribution which we observe on earth. Here also men give to him that hath, and faithful work is rewarded by openings for work of a higher kind. So, assuming a law, if not of continuity, at least of analogy, to work behind the veil, we may see in our Lord’s words that one form of the penalty of the slothful will be to see work which might have been theirs to do, done by those who have been faithful while on earth.

(29) Unto every one that hath.—The meaning and practical working of the law thus stated have been sufficiently illustrated in the Note on verse 23. What is noteworthy here is the extreme generality with which the law is stated. Analogies of that kind are, it need even scarcely be said, to be found both in nature and in human society. Non-user tends to invalidate legal
he hath. (30) And cast ye the unprofitable servant into outer darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.

(31) When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: (32) and before him shall be gathered all nations: and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats: (33) and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left. (34) Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world: (35) for I was an hungred," and ye gave me meat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me in: (36) naked, and ye clothed me: I was sick, and ye visited me: I was in prison, and ye came unto me. (37) Then shall the righteous answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungry, and fed thee? or thirsty, and gave thee drink? (38) When saw we thee a stranger, and took thee in? or naked, and clothed thee? (39) Or when saw we thee sick, or in prison, and came unto thee? (40) And the King shall answer and say unto them, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, right. A muscle that is not exercised tends to degenerate and lose its power.

(33) Cast ye the unprofitable servant. . . — We have heard of the special punishment of sloth, but it is not complete without the solemn and emphatic recurrence of the "darkness" and "gnashing of teeth."

(31) When the Son of man shall come. — We commonly speak of the concluding portion of this chapter as the parable of the Sheep and the Goats, but it is obvious from its very beginning that it passes beyond the region of parable into that of divine realities, and that the sheep and goats form only a subordinate and parenthetic illustration. The form of the announcement is in part based, as indeed are all the subordinate and parenthetic illustration. The form of the announcement is in part based, as indeed are all the thoughts connected with the final Advent, upon the vision of Dan. vii. 13. The "throne of His glory" is that which He shares with the Shechinah.

Before him shall be gathered all nations. — Better, all the nations, or even better, perhaps, all the Gentiles. The word is that which, when used, as here, with the article, marks out, with scarcely an exception, the heathen nations of the world as distinguished from God's people Israel (as, e.g., in Rom. xv. 11, 12; Eph. ii. 11). The word, thus taken, serves as the key to the distinctive teaching that follows. We have had in this chapter, (1) in the Wise and Foolish Virgins, the law of judgment for all members of the Church of Christ; (2) in the Talents, that for all who hold any office or ministry in the Church: now we have (3) the law by which those shall be judged who have lived and died as heathens, not knowing the name of Christ, and knowing God only as revealed in Nature or in the law written in their hearts. Every stage in what follows confirms this interpretation.

As a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats. — Elsewhere the shepherd's work is the symbol of protective, self-sacrificing love, and, as such, our Lord had emphatically claimed for Himself the title of the Good Shepherd (John x. 14). Here we are reminded that even the shepherd has at times to execute the sentence of judgment which involves separation. The "right" hand and the "left" are used, according to the laws by what we might almost call a natural symbolism, as indicating respectively good and evil, acceptance and rejection.

(40) Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren. — The words are true, in different degrees of intensity, in proportion as the relationship is consciously recognised, of every member of the family of man. Of all it is true that He, the Lord, who took their flesh and blood, "is not ashamed to call them brethren" (Heb. ii. 11). We have here, in its highest and divinest form, that utterance of sympathy which we re admire even in one of like passions with ourselves. We find that He too "counts nothing human alien from Himself."
ye have done it unto me. (41) Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels: (42) for I was an hungry, and ye gave me no meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink: (43) I was a stranger, and ye took me not in: naked, and ye clothed me not: sick, and in prison, and ye visited me not.' (44) Then shall they also answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungry, or athirst, or a stranger, or naked, or sick, or in prison, and did not minister unto thee? (45) Then shall he answer them, saying, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to me. (46) And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal.

(41) Ye cursed.—The omission of the words "of My Father," which might have seemed necessary to complete the parallelism with verse 34, is everywhere significant. He is not the author of the curse. Those who have brought themselves under the curse by their own evil deeds He no longer acknowledges as His.

(44) When saw we thee...?—There is, as before, an unconsciousness of the greatness of the things that had been done for good or evil. Men thought that they were only neglecting their fellow-men, and were, it may be, thinking that they had wronged no man. It is significant that the sins here are, all of them, sins of omission. As in the case of the parable of the talents, the opportunities (here those that are common to all men, as those that attached to some officer or ministry in the Church) have simply not been used.

(46) Everlasting punishment...life eternal.—The two adjectives represent one and the same Greek word, a[script]nav, and we ought therefore to have the same word in both clauses in the English. Of the two words, hence used by ethical writers and in the Greek version of the Old Testament

4 Ps. 6. 8; ch. 7. 25.
5 Dan. 12. 2; John iii. 5.
CHAPTER XXVI.—(1) And it came to pass, when Jesus had finished all these sayings, he said unto his disciples, (2) Ye know that after two days is the feast of the passover, and the Son of man is betrayed to be crucified. (3) Then assembled together the chief priests, and the scribes, and the elders of the people, unto the palace of the high priest, who was called Caiaphas, (4) and consulted that they might take Jesus by subtlety, and kill him. (5) But they said, Not on the feast day, lest there be an uproar among the people. (6) Now when Jesus was in Bethany, in the house of Simon the leper,
(7) There came unto him a woman having an alabaster box of very precious ointment, and poured it on his head, as he sat at meat. (8) But when his disciples saw it, they had indignation, saying, To what purpose is this waste? (9) For this ointment might have been sold for much, and given to the poor. (10) When Jesus understood it, he said unto them, Why trouble ye the woman? for she reports that "some had indignation;", St. John (xii. 4), as knowing who had whispered the first word of blame, fixes the uncharitable judgment on "Judas Iscariot, Simon's son." The narrow, covetous soul of the Traitor could see nothing in the lavish gift but a "waste" (literally, perdition) that was matter for reproach. There is something almost terribly suggestive in the fact that our Lord repeats the self-same word when He describes Judas as a "son of perdition" (John xvii. 12). He had wasted that which was more precious than the ointment of spikenard. He wondered that his Master should accept such an offering. His indignation, partly real, partly affected, was perhaps honestly shared by some of his fellow-disciples, probably by those of the third group, with whom he came most into contact, and of whom we may well think as having a less glowing love, and narrower sympathies than the others.

(9) This ointment might have been sold for much.—St. Mark and St. John agree in giving the Traitor's computation. It might have been sold for three hundred denarii, a labourer's wages for nearly a whole year (chap. xx. 2), enough to feed a multitude of more than 7,500 men (John vi. 7). St. John adds the damning fact that the pretended zeal for the poor was the cloak for the irritation of disappointed greed. "He was a thief, and bare the bag." He was, i.e., the treasurer or bursar of the travelling company, received the offerings of the wealthier disciples, and disbursed them either on their necessary expenditure or in alms to the poor (see Notes on John xii. 6 and xiii. 29). This was the "one talent" given to him "according to his ability," and in dealing with it he proved fraudulent and faithless.

(10) Why trouble ye the woman?—The Greek is more emphatic, "Why are ye giving trouble?" St. Mark uses a word to describe their conduct which explains the verse. "They murmured against her," or better, They were bitterly reproaching her. One after another of the murmurers uttered his bitter remonstrances.

She hath wrought a good work upon me.—The Greek adjective implies something more than "good" —a noble, an honourable work. The Lord Jesus, in His sympathy with all human affections, recognises the love that is lavish in its personal devotion as noble and excellent in itself. After His departure, as the teaching of chap. xxv. 40 reminds us, the poor are His chosen representatives, and our offerings to Him are best made through them. How far the words sanction, as they are often urged as sanctifying, a lavish expenditure on the aesthetic element of worship, church architecture, ornamentation, and the like, is a question to which it may be well to find an answer. And the leading lines of thought are, (1) that if the motive be love, and not ostentation, He will recognise it, even if it is misdirected; (2) that so far as ostentation, or the wish to gratify our own taste and sense of beauty, enters into it, it is vitiated from the beginning; (3) that the wants of the poor have a prior claim before that gratification. On the other hand, we must remember (1) that the poor have spiritual wants as well as physical; (2) that all well-directed church-building and decoration minister to those wants, and, even in its accessories of...
hath wrought a good work upon me. (11) For ye have the poor always with you; but me ye have not always. (12) For in that she hath poured this ointment on my body, she did it for my burial. (13) Verily I say unto you, Wheresoever this gospel shall be preached in the whole world, there shall also this, that this woman hath done, be told for a memorial of her. (14) Then one of the twelve, called Judas Iscariot, went unto the chief priests, (15) and said unto them, What will ye give me, and I will deliver him unto you? And they covenanted with him for thirty pieces of silver. (16) And from that time he sought opportunity to betray him. (17) Now the first day of the feast of unleavened bread the disciples came to Jesus, (18) saying unto him, Where wilt thou that we prepare for thee to eat the passover? (19) And he said, Go into form and colour, give to the poor a joy which is in itself later stage of his guilt. Nor can we forget that, even life by making worship a delight. It is a work of used words which spoke of the "kingdom of God should immediately appear" John's narrative, as has been said, leaves any impression. Where wilt thou that we prepare for thee to eat the passover? Our slave (Zech. xi. 12); but the chief priests (Caiaphas and his fellows) saw through the sordid baseness of the man, and, as if scorning both his Master and himself, gauged their reward accordingly. St. John, as has been said, leaves primum facie a different impression. Where wilt thou that we prepare for thee to eat the passover?—Our Lord had passed each night since His entry at Bethany (probably in the house of Lazarus or Simon the leper), or in the garden of Gethsemane (John xviii. 1), but the Paschal lamb was to be slain and eaten in Jerusalem, and therefore special preparations were needed. Once before, and probably once only (John xii. 13), had the disciples kept that feast with Him in the Holy City. Were they expecting, as they asked the question, that this feast was to be the chosen and, as it might well seem, appropriate time for the victorious manifestation of the Kingdom? We learn from St. Luke (xxii. 7) that the two who were sent were Peter and John. To such a man.—The Greek word is that used when the writer knows, but does not care to mention, the name of the man referred to. St. Mark and St. Luke relate the sign that was given them. They were to meet a man "bearing a pitcher of water" and follow him, and were to see in the house into which he entered that in which they were to make their preparations. The master of the house was probably a disciple, but secretly, like many others, "for fear of the Jews" (John xii. 42), and this may explain the suppression of his name. He was, at any rate, one who would acknowledge the authority of the Master in whose name the disciples spoke. In the other two Gospels our Lord describes the large upper room furnished which the disciples would find on entering. The signal may have been agreed upon before, or may have been the result of a supernatural prescience. Scripture is silent, and either supposition is legitimate.

My time is at hand.—For the disciples, the "time" may have seemed the long-expected season of His manifesting Himself as King, and the memory of such
The last Passover.
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the city to such a man, and say unto him, The Master saith, My time is at hand; I will keep the passover at thy house with my disciples. (19) And the disciples did as Jesus had appointed them; and they made ready the passover. (20) Now when the even was come, a he sat down with the twelve. (21) And as they did eat, he said, Verily I say unto you, that one of you shall betray me. (22) And they were exceeding sorrowful, and began every one of them to say unto him, Lord, is it I? (23) And he answered and said, He that dipbeth his hand with me in the dish, the same shall betray me. (24) The Son of man goeth as it is written of him: but woe unto that man by whom the Son of man is betrayed! it had been good for that man if he had not been born. (25) Then Judas, which betrayed him, answered and said, Master, is it I? He said unto him, Thou hast said.

words as those of John vii. 8 ("My time is not yet full come") may have seemed to strengthen the impression. We read, as it were, between the lines, and see that it was the "time" of the suffering and death which were the conditions of His true glory (John xii. 23; xiii. 22).

(19) They made ready the passover.—It may be well to bring together the facts which these few words imply. The two disciples, after seeing that the room was "furnished," the tables arranged, probably in the form of a Roman triclinium, and the benches covered with cushions, would have to purchase the lamb, the unleavened bread, and the bitter herbs, together with the wine and the conserve of sweet fruits which later practice had added to the older ritual. The Paschal victim would have to be slain in the courts of the Temple by one of the officiating priests. The lamb so slain would then be roasted, the bitter herbs prepared, and the table set out, and then, as sunset drew near, all would be ready for the Master and His disciples, who formed, on this occasion, the household which were to partake of the Paschal Supper.

(20) He sat down with the twelve.—Reserving special Notes for the Gospels which contain the narratives, we may call to mind here the words of strong emotion with which the feast was opened (Luke xxii. 15), the dispute among the disciples, probably connected with the places which they were to occupy at the table (Luke xxii. 24), and our Lord's practical reproof of that dispute in washing His disciples' feet (John xiii. 1—11). Picturing the scene to ourselves, we may think of our Lord as reclining—not sitting—by His Master, St. Peter probably on the other side, and the others sitting in an order corresponding, more or less closely, with the three-fold division of the Twelve into groups of four. Upon the washing of the feet followed the teaching (John xiii. 12—20), and then came the "blessing" or "thanksgiving" which opened the meal. This went on in silence, while the countenance of the Master betrayed the deep emotion which troubled His spirit (John xiii. 21), and then the silence was broken by the awful words which are recorded in the next verse.

(21) One of you shall betray me.—The words would seem to have been intentionally vague, as if to rouse some of those who heard them to self-questioning. They had not, it is true, shared in the very guilt of the Traitor, but they had yielded to tendencies which they had in common with him, and which were dragging them down to his level. They had joined him in his murmuring (verse 8), they had been quarrelling, and were about to renew their quarrel, about precedence (Mark ix. 34, Luke xxii. 24). It was well that the abyss should be laid bare before their eyes, and that each should ask himself whether he were indeed on the point of falling into it.

(22) They were exceeding sorrowful.—St. John (xiii. 22) describes their perplexed and questioning glances at each other, the whisper of Peter to John, the reproof of that dispute in washing His disciples' feet. All that they could have been saying to each other was, "Thou hast said," but these words were, they have their bright as well as their dark side. According to the estimate which men commonly form, the words are true of all except those who depart this life in the fear and love of God. In His applying them to the case of the Traitor in its exceptional enormity, there is suggested the thought that for others, whose guilt was not like his, existence even in the penal suffering which their sins have brought on them may be better than never to have been at all.

(23) Then Judas, which betrayed him...—The words appear to have been spoken in the spirit of reckless defiance, which St. John indicates by saying that "after the sop Satan entered into him" (xii. 27). Did his Master (he calls Him by the wonted title of honour, Rabbi) indeed know his guilt? It would appear from St. John's narrative (xxi. 21) that the dread answer, "Thou hast said," was not heard by all. All that they did hear was the command, "What thou doest, do..."
And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. (27) And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; (28) for this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for
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sprinkled on the people had been to the outward
Israel. It was the true "blood of sprinkling" (Heb.
xii. 24), and Jesus was thus the "Mediator" of the
New Covenant as Moses had been of the Old (Gal. iii.
19). (3) That so far as this was, in fact or words, the
commandment that would last to the end of time; that
He had obtained a greater honour than Moses, and was
the Mediator of a better covenant (Heb iii. 3; viii. 6).

(29) I will not drink henceforth of
this fruit of the vine, until that day
when I drink it new with you in my
Very time when He had spoken of the guilt of the
Traitor and His own approaching death, the proof of
a divine prescience. He knew that His true work was
beginning and not ending; that He was giving a
commandment that would last to the end of time; that
He had obtained a greater honour than Moses, and
was the Mediator of a better covenant (Heb iii. 3; viii. 6).

(30) And when they
had sung an hymn,1 they went out into
the mount of Olives. (31) Then saith
Jesus unto them, All ye shall be offended

10r. Psalm.

father's kingdom. (30) And when they

They went out into the mount of Olives.—We
must think of the breaking up of the Paschal company;
of the fear and forebodings which pressed upon the
minds of all, as they left the chamber and made their
way, under the cold moonlight, through the streets of
Jerusalem, down to the valley of the Kidron and up
the western slope of Olivet. St. Luke records that
His disciples followed Him, some near, some, it may
be, afar off. The discourses reported in John xv., xvi.,
xvii., which must be assigned to this period in the
evening, seem to imply a halt from time to time, during
which the Master poured forth His heart to His dis-
ciples, or uttered intercessions for them. St. John,
who had "lain in His bosom" at the supper, would
naturally be nearest to Him now, and this may, in
part at least, explain how it was that so full a report
of all that was thus spoken appears in his Gospel,
and that only.

(31) All ye shall be offended because of me.—
We may think of the words as spoken at some early
stage of that evening walk. It corresponds in substance
with John xvi. 32, but seems to have been uttered more
abruptly.
The Shepherd smitten,

I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered.

Meaning, while others either did not hear them, or listened to them as above their reach, and asked their child-like questions (xvi. 18—19, 29—30). St. Luke records what we may look on as the germ of the great intercession, in our Lord's words to Peter, "I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not" (Luke xxii. 32).

A place called Gethsemane.—The word means "oil-press," and was obviously connected with the culture of the trees from which the Mount took its name. St. John's description implies that it was but a little way beyond the brook Kidron (xviii. 1), on the lower western slope of the Mount. There was a garden (or rather, orchard) there which was the wondrous resort of our Lord and the disciples when they sought retirement. The olive-trees now growing in the place shown as Gethsemane, venerable as their age is, can hardly have been those that then grew there, as Josephus expressly records that Titus ordered all the gardens in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem to be cut down, and the Tenth Legion was actually encamped on the Mount of Olives (Jos. Wars, v. 2, § 3). They probably represent the devotions of pilgrims of the fourth or some later century, who replenished the hollowed site.

Sit ye here, while I go and pray yonder.—Partly in compassion to the weakness and weariness of the disciples, partly from the sense of the need of solitude in the highest acts of communing with His Father, of all the four Evangelists places the fact of the praying for them; He now needs to pray for Himself. (35) He took with him Peter and the two sons of Zebedee.—The favoured three, as before at the Transfiguration, and in the death-chamber in the house of Jairus (xvii. 1; Mark v. 37), were chosen out of the chosen. Their professions of devotion justified, as it were, the belief that they, at least, could "watch and pray" with Him. The nearness and sympathy of friends were precious even when personal solitude was felt to be a necessity.

And began to be sorrowful and very heavy.—The Greek word for the latter verb occurs only here, in the parallel passage of Mark xiv. 33, and Phil. ii. 26, where it is translated "full of heaviness." Its primary meaning is thought by some philologists to have been that of "satiety," hence, "loathing" and "ill at ease." Others, however, find its root-thought in being "far from home," and so weary and perplexed. There is, it is obvious, a mysterious contrast between the calm, triumphant serenity which had shone in the look and tone of the Son of Man up to this point, and had reached its highest point in the prayer of John xvii., and the anguish and distress that were now apparent. The change has, however, its manifold analogies in the experience of those who are nearest to their Master in
sons of Zebedee, and began to be sorrowful and very heavy. (39) Then saith he unto them, My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death: tarry ye here, and watch with me. (38) And he went a little further, and fell on his face, and prayed, saying, O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me: nevertheless as I will, but as thou wilt. (40) And he cometh unto the disciples, and findeth them asleep, and saith unto Peter, What, could ye not watch with me one hour? (41) Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation: the spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak. (42) He went away again the second time, and prayed, saying, O my Father, if this cup may not pass away from me, except I drink it, thy will be done. (43) And he came and

sufferings and character. They, too, know how suddenly they may pass from confidence and joy as to a horror of great darkness. And in His sufferings we must remember there was an element absolutely unique. It was His to "tread the wine-press" alone (Isa. xi. 3). It was not only, as it might be with other martyrs, the natural and human suffering of man's nature from pain and death, but the pain of finding treachery and want of true devotion where there had been the promise of faithfulness. The intensity of His sympathy at that moment made the sufferings and sins of mankind His own, and the burden of those sins weighed upon His soul as greater than He could bear (Isa. lii. 4-6).

(39) Exceeding sorrowful, even unto death.—The infinite sadness of that hour leads the Master to compro mise, even with the three who were most of all His brothers. If they may not see, or fully hear, the throes of that agony, as though the pangs of death had already fallen on Him, it will be something to know that they are at least watching with Him, sharers in that awful vigil.

(38) He went a little farther.—St. Luke adds (xxii. 41) "about a stone's cast." The eight were left, we may believe, near the entrance of the garden; the three, "apart by themselves," further on; the Master, still further, by Himself. The three heard the words that came from His lips as with a half-consciousness which revived afterwards in memory, but they were then numbed and stupefied with weariness and sorrow. It was now near the dawning of the day, and their eyes had not closed in sleep for four-and-twenty hours.

If it be possible, let this cup pass from me.—We shrink instinctively from commenting on the utterances of that hour of agony. But, happily, words are given us where our own words fail. Thus it was, we are told, that "He learned obedience by the things that He suffered" (Heb. v. 8). He had spoken before to the very disciples who were now near Him of the "cup" which His Father had given Him to drink (xx. 28). Now the "cup" is brought to His lips, and His human will at once shrinks from it and accepts it. The prayer which He had taught His disciples to use, "Lead us not into temptation," is now His prayer, but it is subordinated to that other prayer, which is higher even than it, "Thy will be done." In the prayer "If it be possible" we recognise, as in Mark xiii. 32, the natural, necessary limits of our Lord's humanity. In one sense "with God all things are possible," but even the Divine Omnipotence works through self-imposed laws, in the spiritual as in the natural world, and there also ends cannot be obtained except through their appointed and therefore necessary means. God might have redeemed mankind, men have rashly said, without the sufferings and death of the Son of Man, but the higher laws of the Divine Government made such a course, if we may venture so to speak, morally impossible.

(40) He cometh unto the disciples.—Perhaps to both the groups—first of the three and then of the eight. All were alike sleeping—as St. Luke characteristically adds, "sleeping for sorrow."

What, could ye not watch . . . ?—Literally, Were ye thus unable to watch! St. Mark (xiv. 37) indicates that the sleepiness is subordinated to the prayer already spoken before to the very disciples who were now near the entrance of the garden; the three heard the words that revived afterwards in memory, but they were then numbed and stupefied with weariness and sorrow. It was now near the dawning of the day, and their eyes had not closed in sleep for four-and-twenty hours.

(41) Watch and pray.—The first word is eminently characteristic of our Lord's teaching at this period (xxiv. 42; xxv. 13). It became the watchword of the early disciples (1 Cor. xvi. 13; Col. iv. 2; 1 Thess. v. 6; 1 Pet. v. 8). It left its mark in the history of Christendom in the new names of Gregory, and Vigilius, or Vigilantius, "the watcher."

That ye enter not into temptation—i.e., as in the Lord's Prayer, to which our Lord manifestly recalls the minds of the disciples—the trial of coming danger and persecution. In their present weakness that trial might prove greater than they could bear, and therefore they were to watch and pray, in order that they might not pass by negligence into too close contact with its power.

The spirit indeed is willing.—Better, ready, or eager. There is a tenderness in the warning which is very noticeable. The Master recognises the element of good, their readiness to go with Him to prison or to death, in their higher nature. But the spirit and the flesh were contrary the one to the other (Gal. v. 17); and therefore they could not do the things that they would, without a higher strength than their own.

(42) If this cup may not pass away from me.—There is a slight change of tone perceptible in this prayer as compared with the first. It is, to speak after the manner of men, as though the conviction that it was not possible that the cup could pass away from Him had come with fuller clearness before His mind, and He was learning to accept it. He finds the answer to the former prayer in the continuance, not the removal, of the bitter agony that preyed on His spirit. It is probably at this stage of the trial that we are to place the sweat like "great drops of blood" and the vision of the angel of Luke xxii. 43, 44.

(43) He came and found them asleep again.—The motive of this return we may reverently believe to have been, as before, the craving for human sympathy in that hour of awful agony. He does not now rouse them or speak to them. He looks on them sorrowfully, and they meet His gaze with bewildered and stupefied astonishment. "They wist not what to answer Him" (Mark xiv. 40).
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found them asleep again: for their eyes were heavy. And he left them, and went away again, and prayed the third time, saying the same words. Then cometh he to his disciples, and saith unto them, Sleep on now, and take your rest: behold, the hour is at hand, and the Son of man is betrayed into the hands of sinners. Rise, let us be going: behold, he is at hand that doth betray me. And while he yet spake, lo, Judas, one of the twelve, came, and with him a great multitude with swords and staves, from the chief priests and elders of the people.

(44) Saying the same words.—The fact is suggestive, as indicating that there is a repetition in prayer which indicates not formalism, but intensity of feeling. Lower forms of sorrow may, as it were, play with grief and vary the forms of its expression, but the deepest and sharpest agony is content to fall back upon the iteration of the selfsame words.

(45) Sleep on now, and take your rest.—There is an obvious difficulty in these words, followed as they are so immediately by the “Rise, let us be going,” of the next verse. We might, at first, be inclined to see in them a shade of implied reproach. “Sleep on now, if sleep under such conditions is possible; make the most of the short interval that remains before the hour of the betrayal comes.” Something of this kind seems obviously implied, but the sudden change is, perhaps, best explained by the supposition that it was not till after these words had been spoken that the Traitor and his companions were seen actually approaching, and that it was this that led to the words seemingly so different in their purport, bidding the slumberers to rouse themselves from sleep. The past, which, as far as their trial of the disciple who struck the blow (Peter) and of the servant whom he attacked. The reticence of the first clause does not involve any suggestion of flight, intentional; but it is not easy to conjecture its motive.

(46) Rise, let us be going.—It is obvious that the latter clause does not involve any suggestion of flight, but rather a call to confront the danger.

(47) A great multitude with swords and staves.—St. John’s account (xviii. 3) is fuller. The multitude included (1) the band (not “a band,” as in the Authorised version), i.e., the cohort (the same word as in Acts. x. 1) of Roman soldiers sent by Pilate to prevent a tumult. These probably were armed with swords; (2) the officers of the chief-priests, probably the Levites or Nethinim, who were the guards of the Temple, armed with “staves” or “clubs.” He adds, also, what lay in the nature of seem, not as one of the officers of the Temple, but as his personal slave of Caiaphas. Three of the four Gospels in this instance, as in that of the woman taking the box of ointment, must have been obviously more familiar than the English has come to be for us. It was, we may believe, the disciples’ usual greeting.

(48) Whomsoever I shall kiss, that same is he: hold him fast.—And forthwith he came to Jesus, and said, Hail, master; and kissed him. And Jesus said unto him, Friend, wherefore art thou come? Then came they, and laid hands on Jesus, and took him. And behold, one of them which were with Jesus stretched out his hand, and drew his sword, and struck a servant of the high priest’s, and smote off his ear.

(50) Then said Jesus unto him, Put up again thy sword into his place: for all give touches that others had passed over, rather than to repeat what the oral or written teaching of the Church had already made familiar.

Hail, master.—Beter, Rabbi, both St. Matthew and St. Mark (xiv. 46) giving the Hebrew word. The Greek word for “hail” is somewhat more familiar than the English.

Friend, wherefore art thou come?—The word is the same as in Matt. xx. 13, xxii. 12; and “comrade,” and the old and not yet obsolete English “mate,” come nearer to its meaning. In classical Greek it was used by fellow-soldiers, or sailors, of each other. Socrates used it in conversing with his scholars (Plato, Repub. i. p. 334). It is probably immediately after the kiss had thus been given that we must insert the short dialogue between our Lord and the officers recorded in John xviii. 2–8.

(51) One of them which were with Jesus.—It is remarkable that, though all four Gospels record the fact, St. John alone (xviii. 10, 11) records the names both of the disciple who struck the blow (Peter) and of the servant whom he attacked. The reticence of the first clause does not involve any suggestion of flight, intentional; but it is not easy to conjecture its motive.

Drew his sword.—We learn from Luke xxii. 33 that there were but two swords in the whole company of the twelve. One of these naturally was in Peter’s possession, as being the foremost of the whole band.

A servant of the high priest’s.—St. John (xviii. 11) with the precision characteristic of his narrative, especially in this part of the Gospel history, gives the servant’s name as Malchus, and states that it was the right ear that was cut off. He came, it would seem, not as one of the officers of the Temple, but as the personal slave of Caiaphas. Three of the four Gospels use the diminutive form of the Greek for “ear.” St. Luke only (xxii. 50) giving the primitive word. It is doubtful, however, whether the former was used with any special significance. St. Luke also (xxii. 51) alone records the fact that our Lord touched and healed the wound thus made.

(52) All they that take the sword.—St. Matthew’s record is here the fullest. St. Mark reports none of the words; St. Luke (xxii. 51) gives only the calming utterance, “Suffer ye thus far;” St. John (xviii. 11) adds to the command to put the sword into its sheath the words, “The cup which My Father hath given Me, shall I not drink it?” A manifest echo of the
they that take the sword shall perish with the sword. (53) Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father, and he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels? (54) But how then shall the scriptures be fulfilled, that thus it must be? (55) In that same hour said Jesus to the multitudes, Are ye come out as against a thief with swords and staves for to take me? I sat daily with you teaching in the temple, and ye laid no hold on me. (56) But all this was done, that the scriptures of the prophets might be fulfilled. (57) Then all the disciples forsook him, and fled. (58) But Peter

The Capture of Jesus.
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implied that our Lord took the position of a teacher more or less recognised as such (comp. Note on Matt. v. 1), not that of one who was addressing the multitude without authority. (56) But all this was done.—Better, but all this has come to pass. The words, though they agree in form with those of i. 22, are, as we see from Mark xiv. 49, not a comment of the Evangelist’s, but our Lord’s own witness to the disciples and the multitude, that the treachery and violence of which He was the victim were all working out a divine purpose, and (as in verse 54) fulfilling the Scriptures in which that purpose had been shadowed forth.

Then all the disciples forsook him, and fled.—We read with a sorrowful surprise of this cowardly abandonment. Better things, we think, might have been expected of those who had professed their readiness to go with Him to prison and to death. Yet we must remember (1) the weariness and exhaustion which had overcome them, making the resolve and courage, to say the least, more difficult; and (2) that they had been told not to resist, and that flight might seem to them the only alternative to resistance. We have to fill up St. Matthew’s record with the strange episode of the “young man with a linen cloth cast about his naked body” of Mark xvi. 51, where see Note.

(57) To Caiaphas the high priest.—St. John alone, probably from the special facilities which he possessed as known to the high priest, records the preliminary examination before Annas (John xviii. 13, 19–24). It was obviously intended to draw from our Lord’s lips something that might serve as the basis of an accusation. Caiaphas, we must remember, had already committed himself to the policy of condemnation (John xi. 49, 50). The whole history that follows leaves the impression that the plans of the priests had been hastened by the treachery of Judas.

Where the scribes and the elders were assembled.—It was against the rules of Jewish law to hold a session of the Sanhedrin or Council for the trial of capital offences by night. Such an assembly on the night of the Paschal Supper must have been still more at variance with usage, and the fact that it was so held has, indeed, been urged as a proof that the Last Supper was not properly the Passover. The present gathering was therefore an informal one—probably a packed meeting of those who were parties to the plot, Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea, and probably not a few others, like the young “ruler” of Luke xviii. 18, not being summoned. When they had gone through their mock trial, and day was dawning (Luke xxii. 68), they transformed themselves into a formal court, and proceeded to pass judgment.

(56) Peter followed him afar off.—We find from St. John’s narrative, here much the fullest, that it was through him that Peter found admission. He
followed him afar off unto the high priest's palace, and went in, and sat with the servants, to see the end. (59) Now the chief priests, and elders, and all the council, sought false witness against Jesus, to put him to death; but found none: yea, though many false witnesses came, yet found they none. At the last came two false witnesses, (61) and said, This fellow said, I am able to destroy the temple of God, and to build it in three days. (62) And the high priest arose, and said unto him, Answerest thou nothing?

sat in the “court” with the servants (better, officers, as in John xviii. 18) and the slaves, who, in the chill of the early dawn, had lighted a charcoal fire. Female slaves who acted as gate-keepers were passing to and fro. The cold night air had told on the disciple, and on the disciples. What is it • • • To see the end.—There is something singularly suggestive in this account of Peter's motive. It was, we may believe, more than a vague curiosity. There was something of sorrowful anxiety, of reverential fear, of suspense, of uncertainty, and so all the natural instability of his character had free play, with nothing to control it.

Sought false witness.—The sense of the Greek verb implies a continued process of seeking. The attempt to draw the materials for condemnation from the lips of the accused had failed. The law of Moses required at least two witnesses (Deut. xvii. 6; xix. 15), and these, it is natural to believe, were examined independently of each other. The haste which marked all the proceedings of the trial had probably prevented previous concert, and the judges could not, for very shame, convict in the face of a glaring discrepancy, probably as to time and place, between the witnesses who thus offered themselves.

This fellow said, I am able to destroy the temple of God.—It is remarkable that the two Gospels which record the charge do not record the words in which it had its starting-point. Apparently, the second cleansing of the Temple (chap. xxi. 12) had revived the memory of the first, and brought back to men's minds the words that had then been spoken—"Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up" (John ii. 19). What was now reported was a sufficiently natural distortion of what had then been said. St. Mark adds that even then the witnesses did not agree. There were still discrepancies as to time, place, and the exact words, that did not fit in with the established rules of evidence.

Anewerest thou nothing?—A different punctuation gives, Anewerest Thou nothing to what these witness against Thee? as one question. The question implies a long-continued silence, while witness after witness were uttering their clumsy falsehoods, the effect of which is not easy to realise without a more than common exercise of what may be called dramatic imagination. Remember how a distinguished scholar who had seen the Ammergau Passion-mystery, that, as represented there, it came upon him with a force which he had never felt before. In the silence itself we may perhaps trace a deliberate fulfilment of the prophecy of Isa. liii. 7. In 1 Pet. ii. 23 we find a record of the impression which that fulfilment made on the disciples.

What is it • • • ?—The question was clearly put, as it had been before Annas (John. xviii. 19), with the intention of drawing out something that would ensure condemnation.

Adjure thee by the living God • • • .—The appeal was one of unusual solemnity. All else had failed to break through the silence, but this would surely rouse Him. Technically, the oath thus tendered of uncertain expectation, and so all the natural instability of his character had free play, with nothing to control it.

of which it is not easy to realise without a more than were bound to rend their clothes in twain when the judge. The judges in a Jewish trial for blasphemy were bound to rend their clothes in twain when the blasphemous words were uttered, and the clothes so torn were never afterwards to be mended (Acts xiv. 14) the same act appears, on the part of Paul and Barnabas, as the expression of an impulsive horror, as
The Spitting and Buffeting. ST. MATTHEW, XXVI.

Peter's Threefold Denial.

now ye have heard his blasphemy. (66) What think ye? They answered and said, He is guilty of death. (67) Then did they spit in his face, and buffeted him; and others smote him with the palms of their hands, (68) saying, Prophecy unto us, thou Christ, Who is he that smote thee? (69) Now Peter sat without in the palace; and a damsel came unto him, saying, Thou also wast with Jesus of Galilee. (70) But he denied before them all, saying, I know not what thou sayest. (71) And when he was gone out into the porch, another maid saw him, and said unto them that were there, This fellow was also with Jesus of Nazareth. (72) And again be denied with an oath, I do not know the man. (73) And after a while came unto him they that stood by, and said to Peter, Surely thou also art one of them; for thy speech bewrayeth thee. (74) Then began he to curse and to swear, saying, I know not the man. And immediately the cock crew. (75) And Peter remem-

it had done of old when Eliakim rent his clothes on hearing the blasphemies of Rab-shakeh (2 Kings xviii. 37). A comparison of the Greek word here and in Mark xiv. 63 shows that it included the tunic or under-garment as well as the cloak. (66) He is guilty of death.—In modern English the word “guilty” is almost always followed by the crime which a man has committed. In older use it was followed by the punishment which the man deserved. (Comp. Num. xxxv. 31.) The decision, as far as the meeting went, was unanimous. Sentence was passed. It remained, however, to carry the sentence into effect, and this, while the Roman governor was at Jerusalem, presented a difficulty which had to be met by proceedings of another kind. The Jews, or at least their rulers, who courted the favour of Rome, ostentatiously disclaimed the power of punishing capital offences (John xviii. 31).

(67) Then did they spit in his face.—We learn from St. Mark (xiv. 65) and St. Luke (xxii. 63) that these acts of outrage were perpetrated, not by the members of the Sanhedrin, but by the officers who had the accused in their custody, and who, it would seem, availed themselves of the interval between the two meetings of the council to indulge in this wanton cruelty. Here, also, they were unconsciously working out a complete correspondence with Isaiah’s picture of the righteous sufferer (Isa. i. 6). The word “buffeted” describes a blow with the clenched fist, as contrasted with one with the open palm.

(68) Prophecy unto us, thou Christ.—The words derived their point from the fact recorded by St. Mark (xiv. 65), that the officers had blindfolded their prisoner. Was He able, through His supernatural power, to identify those who smote Him? (69) Now Peter sat without in the palace.—Better, had sat down in the court. The word rendered “palace” here and in verse 58, is strictly the court-yard or quadrangle round which a house was built. It may well be to bring together the order of the Apostle’s three-repeated denials.

1. On his entry into the court-yard of the palace, in answer to the female slave who kept the door (John xviii. 17).

2. As he sat by the fire warming himself, in answer (a) to another damsel (Matt. xxvi. 69) and (b) other by-standers (John xviii. 25; Luke xxii. 58), including (c) the kinsman of Malchus (John xviii. 25).

3. About an hour later (Luke xxii. 59), after he had left the fire, in order to avoid the shortness of questions, and had gone out into the porch, or gateway leading out of the court-yard, in answer (a) to one of the damsels who had spoken before (Mark xiv. 69; Matt. xxvi. 71), and again (b) to other by-standers (Luke xxii. 59; Matt. xxvi. 13; Mark xiv. 20).

There were thus three distinct occasions, but as the hasty words of denial rose to his lips, it is probable that several persons heard them.

As far as we can analyse the impulse which led to the denial, it was probably shame not less than fear. The feeling which had shown itself in the cry, “Be it far from thee, Lord,” when he first heard of his Master’s coming passion (Matt. xvi. 22), came back upon him, and he shrank from the taunts and ridicule which were sure to fall upon the followers of One whom they had acknowledged as the Christ, and whose career was ending in apparent failure. It was against that feeling of shame that our Lord on that occasion had specially warned him (Mark viii. 38). The element of fear also was, however, probably strong in Peter’s nature. (Comp. Gal. ii. 12.)

(70) With an oath.—The downward step once taken, the disciple’s fall was fatally rapid. Forgetful of his Lord’s command forbidding any use of oaths in common speech (Matt. v. 34), he did not shrink from invoking the divine name, directly or indirectly, to attest his falsehood.

(71) Thy speech bewrayeth thee.—The Galilean patois was probably stronger when he spoke under the influence of strong excitement. It was said to have, as its chief feature, a confused thick utterance of the guttural letters of the Hebrew alphabet, so that they could not be distinguished from each other, and the change of Sh into Th. The half-detection which the remark implied, perhaps, also, some sense of shame at the provincialism attracting notice, led to the more vehement denial that followed.

(72) To curse and to swear.—We may infer from the two words that he used some common formula of execution, such as, e.g., “God do so to me and more also” (1 Kings xix. 2; xx. 10), as well as the oath-formula, “By Heaven,” or “By the Temple.”

Immediately the cock crow.—St. Mark alone records the first cock-crow. The Greek has no article; “a cock crow.” We find from Mark xiii. 35 that “cock-crowing” had become a familiar phrase, as with us, for the earliest hour of dawn.

(73) Peter remembered the word of Jesus.—St. Luke records (xxii. 61) that it was at this moment, probably as He was passing from the council chamber, knocked and buffeted by the officers, that “the Lord turned” and looked upon Peter.” That glance, full, we must believe, of tenderest pity and deepest sadness, as of one who was moved not by anger but by sorrow, recalled him to his better self, and the flood-gates of
bered the word of Jesus, which said unto him, Before the cock crow, thou shalt deny me thrice. And he went out, and wept bitterly.

CHAPTER XXVII.—(1) When the morning was come, all the chief priests and elders of the people took counsel against Jesus to put him to death; *(2) and when they had bound him, they led him away, and delivered him to Pontius Pilate the governor.

(3) Then Judas, which had betrayed him, when he saw that he was condemned, repented himself, and brought again the thirty pieces of silver to the chief priests and elders, *(4) saying, I have sinned in that I have betrayed the

After five days of obstinacy and a partial attempt to suppress the tumult, Pilate at last yielded (Jos. Ant. xvii. 3, §§ 1, 2; Wars, ii. 9, §§ 2–4). *(2) He had hung up in his palace at Jerusalem gilt shields inscribed with the names of heathen deities, and would not remove them till an express order came from Tiberius (Philo, Leg. ad Caium, c. 38). *(3) He had taken money from the Corban, or treasury of the Temple, for the construction of an aqueduct. This led to another tumult, which was suppressed by the slaughter not of the rioters only, but also of their spectators (Jos. Wars, ii. 9, § 4). *(4) Lastly, on some unknown occasion, he had slain some Galileans while they were in the very act of sacrificing (Luke xxi. 1), and this had probably caused the ill-feeling between him and the tetrarch Antipas mentioned in Luke xxi. 12. It is well to bear in mind these antecedents of the man, as notes of character, as we follow him through the series of vacillations which we now have to trace.

(5) Then Judas, which had betrayed him.—Better, the betrayer. The Greek participle is in the present tense. The narrative which follows is found only in St. Matthew, but another version of the same facts is given in Acts i. 18. Here, too, as in the case of Peter, we have to guess at motives. Had he looked for any other result than this? Was he hoping that his Lord, when forced to a decision, would assert His claim to the Governor, or collector of revenue, invested were no tears as there had been in Peter’s repentance. *(3) He had taken some Galileans while they were in the very act of sacrificing (Luke xxi. 1), and this had probably caused the ill-feeling between him and the tetrarch Antipas mentioned in Luke xxi. 12. It is well to bear in mind these antecedents of the man, as notes of character, as we follow him through the series of vacillations which we now have to trace.

Repepnted himself.—The Greek word is not that commonly used for “repentance,” as involving a change of mind and heart, but is rather “regret,” a simple change of feeling. The coins which he had once gazed on and clutched at eagerly were now hateful in his sight, and their touch like that of molten metal from the furnace. He must get rid of them somehow. There is something terribly suggestive in the fact that here there were no tears as there had been in Peter’s repentance.

(4) I have sinned in that I have betrayed.—More accurately, I sinned in betraying.

What is that to us?—We instinctively feel, as we read these words, that deep as was the guilt of Judas, that of those who thus mocked him was deeper still. Speaking after the manner of men, we may say that a word of sympathy and true counsel might have saved him even then. His confession was as the germ of repentance, but this repulse drove him back upon despair, and he had not the courage or the faith to turn to the great Absolver; and so his life closed as in a blackness of darkness; and if we ask the question, Is there any hope? we dare not answer. Possibly there mingled
The Suicide of Judas.
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innocent blood. And they said, What is that to us? see thou to that. (5) And he cast down the pieces of silver in the temple, and departed, and went and hanged himself. (6) And the chief priests took the silver pieces, and said, It is not lawful for to put them into the treasury, because it is the price of blood. (7) And they took counsel, and bought with them the potter's field, to bury strangers in. (8) Wherefore that field was called, The field of blood, unto this day. (9) Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremy the prophet, saying, And they took the thirty pieces of silver, the price of him that was valued, whom they of the children of Israel did value: 1 and gave

with his agony, as has been suggested by one at least of the great teachers of the Church (Origen, Hom. in Matt. xxxv.), some confused thought that in the world of the dead, behind the veil, he might meet his Lord and confess his guilt to Him.

(5) He cast down the pieces of silver in the temple.—The Greek word for "temple" is that which specially denotes (as in Matt. xxii. 16; xxvi. 61; John ii. 19), not the whole building, but the "sanctuary," which only the priests could enter. They had stood, it would seem, talking with Judas before the veil or curtain which screened it from the outer court, and he hurled or flung it into the Holy Place.

Hanged himself.—The word is the same as that used of Ahithophel, in the Greek version of 2 Sam. xvii. 23, and is a perfectly accurate rendering. Some difficulties present themselves on comparing this brief record with Acts i. 18, which will be best examined in the Notes on that passage. Briefly, it may be said here that the horrors there recorded may have been caused by the self-murderer's want of skill, or the trembling agony that could not tie the noose firm enough.

(6) It is not lawful for to put them into the treasury.—The Greek for the last word is the Corban, or sacred treasure-chest of the Temple, into which no foreign coins were admitted, and from which the Law (Deut. xxiii. 18) excluded the unclean offerings of the price of shame, which entered largely into the ritual of heathen nations. By parity of reasoning, the priests seem to have thought that the blood-money which was thus returned was excluded also.

(7) And they took counsel.—As before, they held a council.

The potter's field.—In Jer. xviii. 2 we read of the potter's house, as being outside the city, probably, from Jer. xix. 2, in the Valley of Hinom (Gehenna), on the south side of Jerusalem. It is probable that it had been worked out in course of time, and was now in the state of a disused quarry. It was necessary, now that Roman soldiers were often stationed in the city, and men of all nations came to it, to provide some burial-place for them; but no Jew would admit their bones into the sepulchre of his fathers. On the other hand, every devout Jew would shrink from the thought of burying his dead in the foul and hateful spot which had become the type of the unseen Gehenna. (See Notes on chap. v. 22.) There was, therefore, a subtle fitness of association in the policy which the priests adopted. The place was itself accursed; it was bought with accursed money; it was to be used for the burial of the accursed strangers.

(8) The field of blood.—St. Luke (Acts i. 19) gives the Aramaic form, Akeldama, but assigns the death of Judas in a field which he had bought as the origin of the name. It is possible that two spots may have been known by the same name for distinct reasons, and the fact that two places have been shown as the Field of Blood from the time of Jerome downwards, is, as far as it goes, in favour of this view. It is equally possible, on the other hand, that Judas may have gone, before or after the purchase, to the ground which, bought with his money, was, in some sense his own, and there ended his despair, dying literally in Gehenna, and buried, not in the grave of his fathers at Kerioth, but as an outcast, with none to mourn over him, in the cemetery of the aliens.

Unto this day.—The phrase suggests here, as in chap. xxviii. 15, an interval, more or less considerable, between the events and the record. (Comp. the Introduction as to the date of the Gospel.)

(9) Then was fulfilled.—Three questions present themselves, more or less difficult:—(1) The words cited are found in our present Old Testament, not in Jeremiah, but in Zech. xi. 13, and there is no trace of their ever having occupied any other place in the Hebrew Canon. How is this discrepancy to be explained? (a) Are we to assume an early error in transcription? Against this, there is the fact that MSS. and versions, with one or two exceptions, in which the correction is obviously of later date, give Jeremiah and not Zechariah. (b) May we fall back upon the Jewish notion that the spirit of Jeremiah had passed into Zechariah; or that Jeremiah, having, at one time, stood first in the Jewish order of the Prophets, was taken as representing the whole volume, as David was of the whole Book of Psalms? This is possible, but it hardly falls within the limits of probability that the writer of the Gospel would deliberately have thus given his quotation in a form sure to cause perplexity. (c) May we believe that the writer quoted from memory, and that recollecting the two conspicuous chapters ( xviii. and xix.) in which Jeremiah had spoken of the potter and his work, he was led to think that this also belonged to the same group of prophecies? I am free to confess that the last hypothesis seems to me the most natural and free from difficulty, unless it be the difficulty which is created by an arbitrary hypothesis as to the necessity of literal accuracy in an inspired writing. (2) There is the fact that the words given by St. Matthew neither represent the Greek version of Zech. xi. 13, nor the original Hebrew, but have the look of being a free quotation from memory adapted to the facts; and this, so far as it goes, is in favour of the last hypothesis. (3) It is hardly necessary to dwell on the fact that the words as they stand in Zechariah have an adequate historical meaning entirely independent of St. Matthew's application of them. This, as we have seen again and again (chaps. i. 23; ii. 15—18; iv. 15; viii. 17; xii. 18), was entirely compatible with the Evangelist's manner of dealing with prophecy. It was enough for him that the old words fitted into the facts, without asking, as we ask, whether they were originally meant to point to them. The combination in one verse, as he remembered it, of the thirty pieces of silver and the potter's field, was a coincidence that he could not pass over.

1 Or, whom they bought the children of Israel.
them for the potter's field, as the Lord appointed me. (11) And Jesus stood before the governor: and the governor asked him, saying, Art thou the King of the Jews? And Jesus said unto him, Thou sayest. (12) And when he was accused of the chief priests and elders, he answered nothing. (13) Then said Pilate unto him, Hearest thou not how many things they witness against thee? (14) And he answered him to never a word; insomuch that the governor marvelled greatly. (15) Now at that feast the governor was wont to release unto the people a prisoner, whom they would. (16) And they had then a notable prisoner, called Barabbas. (17) Therefore when they were gathered together, Pilate said unto them, Whom will ye that I release unto you? Barabbas, or Jesus which is called Christ? (18) For he knew that for envy they had delivered him.

(19) When he was set down on the judgment seat, his wife sent unto him, saying, Have thou nothing to do with that just man: for I have suffered many things this day in a dream because of him.

(11) And Jesus stood before the governor.—We may infer from the greater fulness with which St. John relates what passed between our Lord and Pilate, that here, too, his acquaintance with the high priest gave him access to knowledge which others did not possess. We learn from him (1) that in his first conversation with the accusers, Pilate endeavoured to throw the onus of judging upon them, and was met by the ostentatious disavowal of any power to execute judgment (John xviii. 28—32); (2) that the single question which St. Matthew records was followed by a conversation in which our Lord declared that, though He was a King, it was not after the manner of the kingdoms of the world (John xviii. 33—35). The impression thus made on the mind of the Governor explains the desire which he felt to effect, in some way or other, the release of the accused.

(12) He answered nothing.—Here, as before in chap. xxvi. 63, we have to realise the contrast between the vehement clamour of the accusers, the calm, imperceptible, patient silence of the accused, and the wonder of the judge at what was so different from anything that had previously come within the range of his experience.

(13) The governor was wont to release.—It is not known when the practice began, nor whether it was primarily a Jewish or a Roman one. The fact that the release of criminals was a common incident of a Latin lectisternium, or feast in honour of the gods, makes the latter the more probable. If introduced by Pilate (and this is the only recorded instance of the practice) it was, we may believe, a concession intended to conciliate those whom his previous severities had alienated. Before this stage of the proceedings we have to place (1) the second conference between Pilate and the priests after his dialogue with our Lord (Luke xxiii. 4, 5), and their definite charge of sedition, now urged for the first time; and (2) his attempt, catching at the word “Galilee” as the scene of our Lord’s work, to transfer the responsibility of judging to Herod (Luke xxiii. 6—12).

(16) A notable prisoner, called Barabbas.—There is considerable, though not quite decisive, evidence in favour of the reading which gives “Jesus Barabbas” as the name of the prisoner. The name Bar-abbas (¼ son of Abbas, or of “a father”), like Bar-therem and Bar-tholomew, was a patronymic, and it would be natural enough that the man who bore it should have another more personal name. We can easily understand (1) that the uncommonness of the name Jesus might lead to his being known to his comrades and to the multitude only or chiefly as Barabbas; and

(2) that the reverence which men felt in after years for the Name which is above every name, would lead them to blot out, if it were possible, the traces that it had once been borne by the robber-chief. Of Barabbas St. John (xviii. 40) tells us that he was a robber; St. Luke (xxii. 19) and St. Mark (xxv. 7) that he had taken a prominent part with some insurgents in the city, and that he, with them, had committed murder in the insurrection. The last recorded tumult of this kind was that mentioned above (Note on verse 2), as connected with Pilate’s appropriation of the Corban. It is so far probable that this was the tumult in which Barabbas had taken part; and the supposition that he did so has at least the merit of explaining how it was that he came to be the favourite hero both of the priests and people. As the term Abba (= father) was a customary term of honour, as applied to a Rabbi (Matt. xxiii. 9), it is possible that the sobriquet by which he was popularly known commemorated a fact in his family history of which he might naturally be proud. “Jesus, the Rabbi’s son” was a cry that found more favour than “Jesus the Nazarene.”

(37) Whom will ye that I release unto you?—This, we must remember, was all but the last attempt of Pilate to shift off from himself the dreaded burden of responsibility.

(17) He knew that for envy.—Pilate knew enough of the accusers to see through the hollowness of their pretended zeal for their own religion, or for the authority of the emperor. He found their real motive in “envy”—fear of the loss of influence and power, if the work of the new Teacher was to continue.

(19) The judgment seat.—The chair of judgment was placed upon a Mosaic pavement, and was indispensable to the official action of any provincial ruler. (Comp. Note on John xix. 13.)

His wife sent unto him.—Under the old regime of the Republic provincial governors were not allowed to take their wives with them; but the rule had been relaxed under the Empire, and Tacitus records (Ann. iii. 33, 34) a vain attempt to revive its strictness. Nothing more is known of the woman thus mentioned, but the Apocryphal Gospel of Nicodemus (ii. 1) gives her name as Procula, and states that she was a proselyte to Judaism. The latter fact is probably enough. About this time, both at Rome and in other cities, such, e.g., as Thessalonica and Berea (Acts xvii. 4, 12), Jews had gained considerable influence over women of the higher classes, and carried on an active work of proselytism.

With that just man.—The word is striking, as showing the impression which had been made on
It were to wash their hands over the sin-offering, and to camp, had come to be used, with a somewhat wide range of a saying, Let him be crucified. Whether of the twain will ye that I release unto you? They said, Barabbas. (29) Pilate saith unto them, What shall I do then with Jesus which is called Christ? They all say unto him, Let him be crucified. (25) And the governor said, Why, what evil hath he done? But they cried out the more, saying, Let him be crucified.

**ST. MATTHEW, XXVII.**

**Pilate Washes His Hands.**

Pilate’s wife by all she had seen or heard. As contrasted with priests and scribes, He was emphatically the “just,” the “righteous” One.

In a dream because of him.—Questions rise in our minds as to the nature of the dream. Was it, as some have thought, a divine warning intended to save her husband from the guilt into which he was on the point of plunging? Did it come from the Evil Spirit, as designed to hinder the completion of the atoning work? Was it simply the reflection of the day-thoughts of a sensitive and devout woman? We have no data for answering such questions, but the very absence of data makes it safer and more reverential to adopt the last view, as involving less of presumptuous conjecture in a region where we have not been called to enter. What the dream was like may be a subject for a poet’s or— as in a well-known picture by a living artist—for a painter’s imagination, but does not fall within the province of the interpreter.

The chief priests and elders.—Brief as the statement is it implies much; the members of the Sanhedrin standing before Pilate’s palace, mingling with the crowd, whispering—now to this man, now to that—praises of the robber, scoffs and slander against our Lord. We have to remember, however, that but a small fraction of the people were present; that some of the priests destined their prisoner. It was implied, indeed, in their fixed resolve to make the Roman governor the executioner of their sentence, as shown in the dialogue recorded by St. John (xviii. 31); but now the cry came from the multitude, as the result, we may believe, of the promptings described in verse 20. “Crucify Him!”—punish Him as the robber and the rebel are punished.

Why, what evil hath he done?—The question attested the judge’s conviction of the innocence of the accused, but it attested also the cowardice of the judge. He was startled at the passionate malignity of the cry of the multitude and the priests, but had not the courage to resist it. We find from Luke xxvii. 23, that he had recourse to the desperate expedient of suggesting a milder punishment—“I will chastise,” i.e., scourge, “Him, and let Him go;” but the suggestion itself showed his weakness, and therefore did but stimulate the crowd to persist in their demand for death.

He took water, and washed his hands.—The act belonged to an obvious and almost universal symbolism. So in Deut. xxi. 6 the elders of a city in which an undiscovered murder had been committed were to wash their hands over the sin-offering, and to say, “Our hands have not shed this blood, neither have our eyes seen it.” (Comp. also Ps. xxvi. 6.) Pilate probably chose it, partly as a relief to his own conscience, partly to appease his wife’s scruples, partly as a last appeal of the most vivid and dramatic kind to the feelings of the people and the priests. One of the popular poets of his own time and country might have taught him the nullity of such a formal abolution—

>“Ah nimium faciles, qui trisita crimina caedis
>Flumine toli posse putatis aqua.”

>Too easy souls who dream the crystal flood
>Can wash away the fearful guilt of blood.”

Ovid, Fast. ii. 43.

His blood be on us, and on our children.—The passionate hate of the people leads them, as if remembering the words of their own Law, to invert the prayer—which Pilate’s act had, it may be, brought to their remembrance— “Lay not innocent blood to Thy people of Israel’s charge” (Deut. xxv. 8), into a defiant imprecation. No more fearful prayer is recorded in the history of mankind; and a natural feeling has led men to see its fulfilment in the subsequent shame and misery that were for centuries the portion of the Jewish people. We have to remember, however, that but a fractional part of the people were present; that some at least of the rulers, such as Joseph of Arimathea, Nicodemus, and probably Gamaliel, had not consented to the deed of blood (Luke xxvi. 51), and that even in such a case as this it is still true that “the son shall not bear the iniquity of the father” (Ezek. xviii. 20), except so far as he consents to it, and reproduces it.

When he had scourged Jesus.—The word used by St. Matthew, derived from the Latin *flagellum*, shows that it was the Roman punishment with knotted thongs of leather (like the Russian “knout” or the English “cat”), not the Jewish beating with rods (2 Cor. xi. 24, 25). The pictures of the Stainies, so widely used throughout Latin Christendom, have made other nations more familiar with the nature of the punishment than most Englishmen are. The prisoner was stripped sometimes entirely, sometimes to the waist, and tied by the hands to a pillar, with his back bent, so as to receive the full force of the blows. The scourge was of stout leather weighted with lead or bones. Jewish law limited its penalty to forty stripes, reduced in practice to “forty stripes save one” (2 Cor. xi. 24; Deut. xxv. 3), but Roman practice knew no limit but that of the cruelty of the executioner or the physical endurance of the sufferer.

The common hall.—Literally, the Precentorium, a word which, applied originally to the tent of the praetor, or general, and so to the head-quarters of the camp, had come to be used, with a somewhat wide range
The Mocking of the Jews.

ST. MATTHEW, XXVII.

Simon of Cyrene.

gathered unto him the whole band of soldiers. (28) And they stripped him, and put on him a scarlet robe.

(29) And when they had platted a crown of thorns, they put it upon his head, and a reed in his right hand: and they bowed the knee before him, and mocked him, saying, Hail, King of the Jews! (30) And they spit upon him, and took the reed, and smote him on the head. (31) And after that they had mocked him, they took the robe off from him, and put his own raiment on him, and led him away to crucify him.

(32) And as they came out, they found a man of Cyrene, Simon by name: him they compelled to bear his cross. (33) And when they were come unto a place called Golgotha, that is to say, a place of a skull,
they cast lots. They parted my garments among them, and upon my vesture did...
The Taunts of the Priests.

ST. MATTHEW, XXVII.

Darkness over all the Land.

him, wagging their heads, and saying, Thou destroyest the temple, and buildest it in three days, save thyself. If thou be the Son of God, come down from the cross. Likewise also the chief priests mocking him, with the scribes and elders, said, He saved others; himself he cannot save. If he be the King of Israel, let him now come down from the cross, and we will believe him. He trusted in God; let him deliver him now, if he will have him: for he said, I am the Son of God. The thieves also, which were crucified with him, cast the same in his teeth. Now from the sixth hour there was darkness over all the land unto the ninth hour. And

John iv. 6) the Roman or modern mode of reckoning from midnight to noon. Looking to the facts of the case, it is probable that our Lord was taken to the high priest's palace about 3 A.M. (the "cock-crow" of Mark xiii. 35). Then came the first hearing before Annas (John xviii. 13), then the trial before Caiphas and the Sanhedrin, then the formal meeting that passed the sentence. This would fill up the time probably till 6 A.M., and three hours may be allowed for the trials before Pilate and Herod. After the trial was over there would naturally be an interval for the soldiers to take their early meal, and then the slow procession to Golgotha, delayed, we may well believe, by our Lord's falling, once or oftener, beneath the burden of the cross, and so we come to 9 A.M. for His arrival at the place of crucifixion.

Darkness over all the land.—Better so than the "earth" of the Authorised version of Luke xxiii. 44. The degree and nature of the darkness are not defined. The moon was at its full, and therefore there could be no eclipse. St. John does not name it, nor is it recorded by Josephus, Tacitus, or any contemporary writer. On the other hand, its appearance in records in many respects so independent of each other as those of the three Gospels places it, even as the common grounds of historical probability, on a sufficiently firm basis, and early Christian writers, such as Tertullian (Apol. c. 21) and Origen (c. Cels. ii. 33), appeal to it as attested by heathen writers. The narrative does not necessarily involve more than the indescribable yet most oppressive gloom which seems to shroud the whole sky as in mourning (comp. Amos viii. 9, 10), and which being a not uncommon phenomenon of earthquakes, may have been connected with that described in verse 51. It is an indirect confirmation of the statement that about this time there was an obvious change in the condition of the crowd. There is a pause and lull. The gibes and taunts cease, and the life of the Crucified One ends in a silence broken only by His own bitter cry.

Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani.—The cry is recorded only by St. Matthew and St. Mark. The very syllables or tones dwelt in the memory of those who heard and understood it, and its absence from St. John's narrative was probably due to the fact that he had before this taken the Virgin-Mother from the scene of the crucifixion as from that which was more than she could bear (John xix. 27). To the Roman soldiers, to many of the by-standers, Greeks or Hellenistic Jews, the words would be, as the sequel shows, unintelligible. We shrink instinctively from any over-curious analysis of the inner feelings in our Lord's humanity that answered to this utterance. Was it the natural fear of death? or the vicarious endurance of the wrath which was the penalty of the sins of the human race, for whom, and instead of whom, He suffered? Was there a momentary interruption of the conscious union between His human soul and the light of His Father's countenance? or, as seems implied in John xix. 28,
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about the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice, saying, Eli, Eli, lama sa-bachthani? that is to say, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me? (47) Some of them that stood there, when they heard that, said, This man calleth for Elias. (48) And straightway one of them ran, and took a sponge, and did He quote the words in order to direct the thoughts of men to the great Messianic prophecy which the Psalm contained? None of these answers is altogether satisfactory, and we may well be content to leave the mystery unfathomed, and to let our words be wary and few. We may remember (1) that both the spoken words of His enemies (verse 43) and the acts of the soldiers (verse 35) must have recalled the words of that Psalm; (2) that memory thus roused would pass on to the cry of misery with which the Psalm opened; (3) that our Lord as man was to taste death in all its bitterness for every man (Heb. ii. 9), and that He could not so have tasted it had His soul been throughout in full undisturbed enjoyment of the presence of the Father; (4) that the lives of the saints of God, in proportion to their likeness to the mind of Christ, have exhibited this strange union, or rather instantaneous succession, of the sense of abandonment and of intensest faith. The Psalmist himself, in this very Psalm, is one instance; Job (xix. 6–9, 23–26) and Jeremiah (xx. 7–9, 12, 13) may be named as others. Conceive this conflict—and the possibility of such a conflict is postulated in John xii. 27 and in the struggle of Gethsemane—and then, though we cannot understand, we may in part at least conceive, how it was possible for the Son of Man to feel for one moment that sense of abandonment, which is the last weapon of the Enemy. He tasted of despair as others had tasted, but in the very act of tasting, the words "My God? were as a protest against it, and by them He was delivered from it. It is remarkable, whatever be, perhaps, almost as natural an explanation. Is it not a natural way of putting the question to Our Lord in His suffering? Some of them that stood there, when they heard that, said, This man calleth for Elias. — There is no ground for looking on this as a wilful, derisory misinterpretation. The words may have been imperfectly understood, or some of those who listened may have been Hellenistic Jews. The dominant expectation of the coming of Elijah (see Notes on chap. xvi. 14; xvii. 10) would predispose men to fasten on the simplicity of sound, and the strange unearthly darkness would intensify the feeling that looked for a supernatural manifestation of His presence. (47) This man calleth for Elias. — There is no ground for looking on this as a wilful, derisory misinterpretation. The words may have been imperfectly understood, or some of those who listened may have been Hellenistic Jews. The dominant expectation of the coming of Elijah (see Notes on chap. xvi. 14; xvii. 10) would predispose men to fasten on the simplicity of sound, and the strange unearthly darkness would intensify the feeling that looked for a supernatural manifestation of His presence. (48) Took a sponge, and filled it with vinegar. — The "vinegar" was the sour wine, or wine and water, which was the common drink of the Roman soldiers, and which they at an earlier stage, and as in derision (Luke xxiii. 36), had offered to the Sufferer. The simplicity had probably instilled into a work to the jaw in which the soldiers had brought the drink that was to sustain them in their long day's work. Some one, whether soldier or Jew we know not, heard, not only the cry, "Eli, Eli, . . .," but the faint "I thirst," which St. John records as coming from the fevered lips (John xix. 28), and prompted by a rough pity, stretched out a cane, or stalk of hyssop (John xix. 29), with the sponge that had been dipped in the wine upon it, and bore it to the parched lips of the Sufferer. It was not now refused (John xix. 30). And gave him to drink. — The Greek verb is in the imperfect tense, as implying that while he was doing this, the others tried to interrupt him. (49) Let us see whether Elias will come. — Here again we have eager expectation rather than derision. Was the "great and dreadful day" (Mal. iv. 5) about to burst on them? Would the long-expected prophet at last appear? The sponge and vinegar would seem to minds thus on the stretch an unworthy interruption of the catastrophe of the great drama of which they were spectators. (50) When he had cried again with a loud voice—it is well to remember what the words were which immediately preceded the last death-cry; the "It is finished" of John xix. 30, the "Father, into Thy hands I commend My spirit" of Luke xxiii. 46, expressing as they did, the fulness of peace and trust, the sense of a completed work. It was seldom that crucifixion, as a punishment, ended so rapidly as it did here, and those who have discussed, what is hardly perhaps a fit subject for discussion, the physical causes of our Lord's death, have ascribed it accordingly, especially in connection with the fact recorded in John xix. 34, and with the "loud cry," indicating the pangs of an intolerable anguish, to a rupture of the vessels of the heart. Simple exhaustion as the consequence of the long vigil, the agony in the garden, the mocking and the scourging, would be, perhaps, almost as natural an explanation. Yielded up the ghost. — Better, yielded up His spirit. All four Evangelists agree in using this or some like expression, instead of the simpler form, "He died." It is as though they dwelt on the act as, in some sense, voluntary, and connected it with the words in which He had commended His spirit to the Father (Luke xxiii. 46). (51) The veil of the temple was rent in twain. — Better, the veil of the sanctuary, or, if we do not alter the word, we must remember that it is the veil that divided the Holy Place from the Holy of Holies that is here meant. The fact, which the high priests would naturally have wished to conceal, and which in the nature of the case could not have been seen by any but the sons of Aaron, may have been reported by the "great multitude of the priests" who "became obedient to the faith" (Acts vi. 7). The Evangelist's record of it is all the more significant, as he does not notice, and apparently, therefore, did not apprehend, the symbolic import of the fact. Yet of late we learn indirectly from the Epistle to the Hebrews. The priests had, as far as they had power, destroyed the true Temple (comp. John ii. 19); but in doing so they had robbed their own sanctuary of all that made it holy. The true veil, as that which shrouded the Divine Glory from the eyes of men, was His own flesh, and through that He had passed, as the Forerunner of all who trusted in Him, into the sanctuary.
bottom; and the earth did quake, and the rocks rent; and the graves were opened; and many bodies of the saints which slept arose, and came out of the graves after his resurrection, and went into the holy city, and appeared unto many. Now when the centurion, and they that were with him, watching Jesus, saw the earthquake, and those things that were done, they feared greatly, saying, Truly this was the Son of God. And many women were there beholding afar off, which followed Jesus from Galilee, ministering unto him: among which was Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of not made with hands, eternal in the heavens (Heb. x. 20, 21). All who fulfilled that condition might enter into that holiest place, but the visible sanctuary was now made common and unclean, and there too all might enter without profanation.

The earth did quake, and the rocks rent.—Jerusalem was, it will be remembered, situated in the zone of earthquakes, and one very memorable convulsion is recorded or alluded to in the Old Testament (Isa. xxiv. 19; Amos i. 1; Zech. xiv. 5). Here, though the shock startled men at the time, there was no wide-spread ruin such as would lead to its being chronicled by contemporary historians.

Many bodies of the saints which slept arose.—extreme conclusion, have explained it as meaning simply "firstfruits" of the victory over death (1 Cor. xv. 20), as it does, without any collateral testimony in any other language hardly less startling, which meets us in the group was obviously distinct from that of "the daughters of Jerusalem," of Luke xxii. 28, but was probably identical with that mentioned in Matt. xxv. 3, as accompanying our Lord in many of His journeyings. Mary Magdalene.—This is the first mention of the name in St. Matthew. The most natural explanation of it is that she came from the town of Magdala, or Magadan (the reading of the chief MSS.), not far from Tiberias, on the western side of the Sea of Galilee. The two prominent facts in her history prior to her connection with the Resurrection are, (1) that our Lord had cast "seven devils out of her" (Mark xvi. 9, Luke vii. 2), i.e., had freed her from some specially aggravated form

Many women were there beholding.—The group was obviously distinct from that of "the daughters of Jerusalem," of Luke xxiii. 25, but was probably identical with that mentioned in Matt. xxv. 3, as accompanying our Lord in many of His journeyings. Mary Magdalene.—This is the first mention of the name in St. Matthew. The most natural explanation of it is that she came from the town of Magdala, or Magadan (the reading of the chief MSS.), not far from Tiberias, on the western side of the Sea of Galilee. The two prominent facts in her history prior to her connection with the Resurrection are, (1) that our Lord had cast "seven devils out of her" (Mark xvi. 9, Luke vii. 2), i.e., had freed her from some specially aggravated form
James and Joses, and the mother of Zebedee's children. (67) When the even was come, there came a rich man of Arimathaea, named Joseph, who also himself was Jesus' disciple: (68) he went to Pilate, and begged the body of Jesus. Then Pilate commanded the body to be delivered. (59) And when Joseph had taken the body, he wrapped it in a clean linen cloth, (60) and laid it in his own new tomb, which he had hewn out in the rock: and he rolled a great stone to the door of the sepulchre, and departed. (62) And there was Mary of Zebedee, and possibly also from James the son of Alphæus, who may, however, have been identical with the wife of Clopas (possibly another form of Alphæus) mentioned in John xix. 25 as standing near the cross with the mother of the Lord. According to a natural construction of the words, described as her sister. In this case, the word “Little” would attach to the son of that sister. Whether the two names, which occur also in the list of the Twelve, a view which we may accept here, into which there is not the shadow of any evidence for either identification.

Mary the mother of James and Joses.—In St. Mark (xv. 40) she is described as the mother of “James the Less” (or, better, the Little) “and Joses,” the epithet distinguishing the former from James the son of Zebedee, and possibly also from James the son of Alphæus. She may, however, have been identical with the wife of Clopas (possibly another form of Alphæus) mentioned in John xix. 25 as standing near the cross with the mother of the Lord. According to a natural construction of the words, described as her sister. In this case, the word “Little” would attach to the son of that sister. Whether the two names, which occur also in the list of the Twelve, a view which we may accept here, into which there is not the shadow of any evidence for either identification.

The mother of Zebedee’s children.—St. Mark (xv. 40) gives her name as Salome, and she, and not the wife of Clopas, may, on a perfectly tenable construction of John xix. 25, have been identical with the sister of our Lord’s mother there mentioned. St. Luke notes the fact that with the women who were there whom he describes as “all His acquaintance,” i.e., friends and disciples of or at that time in Jerusalem (xxix. 49). The place so named was probably with the form Ramathaim, in the LXX. version it appears throughout as Ramathaim, in Josephus as Ramath, in 1 Mac. xi. 54 as Ramatham. It was a city of the Jews, in the narrower sense in which that word meant the people of Judæa (Luke xxiii. 51). The site is more or less conjectural, but if we identify the Ramah, or Ramatham, of 1 Sam. i. 1 with the modern Neby Samuel, about four miles north-west of Jerusalem, we have a position which sufficiently fits in with the circumstances of the history. Of Joseph we are told by St. Mark (xv. 43) that he was “an honourable counsellor,” i.e., a member of the Sanhedrin, and that he was looking for the king—of God; by St. Luke (xxiii. 50, 51), that he was “a good man, and a just” (see Note on Rom. v. 7 for the distinction between the two words); by St. John (xix. 38), that he was “a disciple, but secretly for fear of the Jews.” He was apparently a man of the same class and type of character as Nicodemus, not as a man, admiring Him as a teacher, half-believing in Him as the Christ, and yet, till now, shrinking from confessing Him before men.
Magdalene, and the other Mary, sitting over against the sepulchre.

(62) Now the next day, that followed the day of the preparation, the chief priests and Pharisees came together unto Pilate, (63) saying, Sir, we remember that that deceiver said, while he was yet alive, After three days I will rise again. (64) Command therefore that the sepulchre be made sure until the third day, lest his disciples come by night, and steal him away, and say unto the people, He is risen from the dead: so the last error shall be worse than the first. (65) Pilate said unto them, Ye have a watch: go your way, make it as sure as ye can. (66) So they went, and made the sepulchre sure, sealing the stone, and setting a watch.

CHAPTER XXVIII.—(1) In the end of the sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, came

(words imply that they remained by the cross while the body was taken down, and watched its entombment: then returning to the house where they lodged, they prepared their spices and ointment before the Sabbath began, for a more complete embalming, so that they might be ready by the earliest-hour of dawn on the first day of the week (Lk xxvii. 56).

(62) The next day, that followed the day of the preparation.—The narrative that follows is peculiar to St. Matthew, and, like the report of the rending of the veil of the Temple, may, perhaps, be traced to the converted priests of Acts vii. 7. This was, as we find from what follows, the Sabbath. The “preparation” (Paraskeue) was a technical term, not, as is sometimes said, in reference to preparing for the Passover, but, as in Mark xv. 42, to a preparation for the Sabbath (Jos. Ant. xvi. 6, § 2, is decisive on this point), and the use of the term here leaves the question whether the Last Supper or the Crucifixion coincided with the Passover, still an open question.

The “preparation” (Paraskeue) was a technical term, not, as is sometimes said, in reference to preparing for the Passover, but, as in Mark xv. 42, to a preparation for the Sabbath (Jos. Ant. xvi. 6, § 2, is decisive on this point), and the use of the term here leaves the question whether the Last Supper or the Crucifixion coincided with the Passover, still an open question.

(63) The next day, that followed the day of the preparation.—The narrative that follows is peculiar to St. Matthew, and, like the report of the rending of the veil of the Temple, may, perhaps, be traced to the converted priests of Acts vii. 7. This was, as we find from what follows, the Sabbath. The “preparation” (Paraskeue) was a technical term, not, as is sometimes said, in reference to preparing for the Passover, but, as in Mark xv. 42, to a preparation for the Sabbath (Jos. Ant. xvi. 6, § 2, is decisive on this point), and the use of the term here leaves the question whether the Last Supper or the Crucifixion coincided with the Passover, still an open question.

(64) Command therefore that the sepulchre be made sure until the third day, lest his disciples come by night, and steal him away, and say unto the people, He is risen from the dead: so the last error shall be worse than the first. (65) Pilate said unto them, Ye have a watch: go your way, make it as sure as ye can. (66) So they went, and made the sepulchre sure, sealing the stone, and setting a watch.

CHAPTER XXVIII.—(1) In the end of the sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, came

(words imply that they remained by the cross while the body was taken down, and watched its entombment: then returning to the house where they lodged, they prepared their spices and ointment before the Sabbath began, for a more complete embalming, so that they might be ready by the earliest-hour of dawn on the first day of the week (Lk xxvii. 56).

(62) The next day, that followed the day of the preparation.—The narrative that follows is peculiar to St. Matthew, and, like the report of the rending of the veil of the Temple, may, perhaps, be traced to the converted priests of Acts vii. 7. This was, as we find from what follows, the Sabbath. The “preparation” (Paraskeue) was a technical term, not, as is sometimes said, in reference to preparing for the Passover, but, as in Mark xv. 42, to a preparation for the Sabbath (Jos. Ant. xvi. 6, § 2, is decisive on this point), and the use of the term here leaves the question whether the Last Supper or the Crucifixion coincided with the Passover, still an open question.

The “preparation” (Paraskeue) was a technical term, not, as is sometimes said, in reference to preparing for the Passover, but, as in Mark xv. 42, to a preparation for the Sabbath (Jos. Ant. xvi. 6, § 2, is decisive on this point), and the use of the term here leaves the question whether the Last Supper or the Crucifixion coincided with the Passover, still an open question.
Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulchre. (2) And, behold, there was a great earthquake: for the angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled back the stone from the door, and sat upon it. (3) His countenance was like lightning, and his raiment white as snow: (4) and for fear of him the keepers did shake, and became as dead men. (5) And the angel answered and said unto the women, Fear not ye: for I know that ye seek Jesus, which was crucified. (6) He is not here: for he is risen, as he said. Come, see the place where the Lord lay. (7) And go quickly, and tell his disciples that he is risen from the dead; and, behold, he goeth before you into Galilee; there shall ye see him: lo, I have told you. (8) And they departed quickly from the sepulchre with fear and great joy; and did run to bring his disciples word. (9) And as they went to tell his dis-

The report in St. Mark (xvi. 6, 7) nearly coincides with this. St. Luke is somewhat fuller (xxiv. 5—7), introducing the question, "Why seek ye the living among the dead?" and a more detailed reference to our Lord's prophecies of His resurrection.

(7) **He goeth before you into Galilee.**—The words seem to point to a meeting in Galilee as the first appearance of the risen Lord to His disciples, and St. Matthew records no other. No adequate explanation can be given of the omission of what the other Gospels report, if we assume the whole Gospel to have been written by the Apostle Matthew. On the hypothesis that it is a "Gospel according to Matthew," representing the substance of his oral teaching, the absence of this or that fact which we should have expected him to record may have been due to some idiosyncrasy in the scribe, or, so to speak, editor of the Gospel. It is possible that if the disciples had believed the report brought by the women, the mountain in Galilee would have been the scene of the first meeting between them and their Master; but they did not believe, and required the evidence which He in His compassion gave them, in order to quicken their faith and lead them to obey the command thus given.

(8) **They departed quickly.**—It is natural that independent narratives, given long years afterwards, of what had passed in the agitation of "fear and great joy" should present seeming, or even real, discrepancies as well as coincidences. The discrepancies, such as they are, at any rate, show that the narratives were independent. The best solution of the questions presented by a comparison of the Gospel narrative at this stage is that Mary Magdalene ran eagerly to tell Peter and John, leaving the other Mary and Joanna (Luke xxiv. 10), and then followed in the rear of the two disciples (John xx. 2). Then when they had left, the Lord showed Himself first to her (John xx. 14), and then to the others (Matt. xxviii. 9), whom she had by that time rejoined, and they all hastened together to tell the rest of the disciples.

(9) **All hail.**—Literally, *rejoice*. The word was probably our Lord's wonted greeting to the company of devout women, and though used in homage, real or derivative, as in chap. xxvii. 29, John xix. 3, had not necessarily the solemnity which modern usage has attached to "hail." It was, we may believe, by that familiar word and tone that the other women at first recognised their Lord, as Mary Magdalene had done by His utterance of her own name.

**Held him by the feet.**—Better, *clothed His feet*. Mary Magdalene had, we must remember, already heard the words "Touch Me not" (John xx. 17), but, if we suppose her to have rejoined the other women,


by night, and stole him away while we slept. (14) And if this come to the governor’s ears, we will persuade him, and secure you. (15) So they took the money, and did as they were taught: and this saying is commonly reported among the Jews until this day.

(16) Then the eleven disciples went away into Galilee, into a mountain where Jesus had appointed them. (17) And when they saw him, they worshipped him: but some doubted. (18) And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.

passionate and rejoicing love carried her, as it carried the others, beyond the limits of reverential obedience.

Worshipped him.—The word does not necessarily imply a new form of homage. The prostration which it indicates had been practised before (chaps. viii. 2; ix. 18); though (it is right to add) by many persons not connected with the apostolic company, who came with definite petitions. It was the natural attitude of a suppliant servant before his master (chap. xviii. 26). It was, perhaps, not till later that the disciples were led to feel that the attitude was one that was due to God and to the Man Christ Jesus, and to no other of the sons of men (Acts x. 26) or angels (Rev. xxii. 9). (See Note on verse 17.)

(10) Go, tell my brethren.—The words are clearly used of those who were brethren by spiritual relationship, as in chap. xii. 49, and have their counterpart in John xx. 17, “I ascend to My Father and your Father.”

(11) Some of the watch.—This incident, like that of the appointment of the guard, is reported by St. Matthew only. As writing primarily for the Jews of Palestine, it was natural that he should take special notice of the rumour which hindered many of them from accepting the fact of the Resurrection, and trace it to its corrupt source. The object of the soldiers was, of course, to escape the penalty which they were likely to incur for seeming negligence, but their statement to the priests was at first a truthful one. They told “all the things that were done”—the earthquake, the opened and emptied sepulchre, perhaps also of the form in bright raiment that had filled them with speechless terror.

(12) When they were assembled.—Obviously the chief priests to whom the soldiers had told their tale. And had taken counsel.—Better, as before in xxvii. 1, 7, having held a council. It was a formal, though probably, as before, a packed, meeting of the Sanhedrim. They decided on the readiness of bribery and falsehood. The fact that the chief priests were Sadducees, and therefore specially interested in guarding against what would appear as a contradiction of their main dogmas, must not be forgotten, as in part determining their action. (Comp. Acts iv. 42.)

(13) His disciples came by night.—The story was on the face of it self-contradictory. How could they tell, if they had been asleep, who had stolen the body? And what could they know was that they had fallen asleep, and that when they awoke the sepulchre was open and empty.

(14) This saying is commonly reported.—The passage is interesting as the earliest indication of a counter-statement to the witness borne by the disciples, and as in part explaining the partial non-acceptance of their testimony. The phrase “until this day” suggests some considerable interval—say, at least, fifteen or twenty years—between the facts recorded and the composition of the narrative. (See Note on chap. xxvii. 8.) Justin Martyr mentions the report as current among the Jews of his time, the Jews having sent “chosen men” into all parts of the world to propagate it (Dial. c. Tryph. c. 108).

(15) Then the eleven disciples.—The writer passes over, for some reason which we cannot now discover, all the intermediate appearances, and passes on to once to that which connected itself with the mission and work of the Apostles, and through them of the universal Church.

Into a mountain.—Better, to the mountain. The words imply some more definite announcement than that of verses 7 and 10, and therefore, probably, some intermediate meeting. We may think of the mountain as being one that had been the scene of former meetings between the Master and His disciples. They had seen Him there before, in the body of His humiliation. They were now to see Him in the body of His glory. (Comp. Phil. iii. 21.)

(16) They worshipped him—i.e., fell prostrate at His feet. The act, as has been said, was not new in itself, but it seems certain that our Lord’s manifestations of His Presence after the Resurrection had made the faith of the disciples stronger and clearer (comp. John xx. 28), and so the act acquired a new significance.

Some doubted.—It seems hard at first to conceive how those who had been present in the upper chamber at Jerusalem (John xx. 19—26) could still feel doubt; but the narrative of John xxi. 4 throws some light upon it. There was something mysterious and supernatural in the manifestation of the glorified body—outlines, at first indistinct and scarcely recognised, and then the whole form seen as it had been seen in life. The more devoted and loving disciples were probably, here as before, the first to recognise their Lord. Others questioned whether it was a phantom (comp. Notes on chap. xiv. 26) or a reality.

(17) All power is given unto me. — Literally, all authority was given, the tense used being that in which men speak of something that occurred at a given point of time. We may possibly connect it with St. Paul’s use of the same tense in the Greek of Phil. ii. 6. The exaltation came, the authority was given, as at the moment of the Resurrection, and as the crown of His obedience unto death.
Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen.

(19) Teach all nations.—Better, make disciples of all the heathen. The Greek verb is the same as that which is rendered " instructed " in chap. xiii. 52, and is formed from the noun for "disciple." The words recognize the principle of a succession in the apostolic office. The disciples, having learnt fully what their Master, their Rabbi, had to teach them, were now to become in their turn, as scribes of the kingdom of heaven, the teachers of others. It is, to say the least, suggestive that in this solemn commission, stress should be laid on the teaching, rather than on what is known as the sacerdotal element, of the Christian ministry; but the inference that that element is altogether excluded requires to be balanced by a careful study of the words of John xv. 23, which seem at first sight to point in an opposite direction. (See Note on John xx. 23.)

The words rendered "all nations" are the same as those in chap. xxv. 32, and, as commonly used by the Jews, would point to the Gentile nations of the world, as distinguished from the people of Israel. They are therefore an emphatic expansion of the commission given in chap. x. 5. And it is every way interesting that this full declaration of the universality of the Gospel should be specially recorded in the Gospel written, as we see throughout, specially for Jews.

Baptizing them in the name of the Father. —We have to deal (1) with the form, (2) with the substance. As regards (1) we have to explain why, with this command so recently given, the baptisms recorded in the Acts (ii. 38; x. 43; xix. 5), and referred to in the Epistles (Rom. vi. 3; Gal. iii. 27), are in (or rather, into) "the name of the Lord Jesus," or of "Christ." What has been noted as to the true meaning of the word "nations" seems the best solution of the difficulty which thus presents itself. It was enough for converts from the house of Israel, already of the family of God, to be baptised into the name of Jesus as the Messiah, as the condition of their admission into the Church which He had founded. By that confession they gave a fresh life to doctrines which they had partially received before, and belief in the Father and the Spirit was virtually implied in their belief in Jesus as the incarnate Son. For the heathen the case stood otherwise. They had worshipped "gods many and lords many" (1 Cor. viii. 5), had been "without God in the world" (Eph. ii. 12), and so they had not known the Father. (2) There remains the question, What is meant by being baptised "into a name"? The answer is to be found in the fact so prominent in the Old Testament (e.g. Ex. iii. 14, 15), that the Name of God is a revelation of what He is. Baptism was to be no longer, as it had been in the hands of John as the forerunner, merely a symbol of repentance, but was the token that those who received it were brought into an altogether new relation to Him who was thus revealed to them. The union of the three names in one formula (as in the benediction of 2 Cor. xiii. 14) is in itself a proof at once of the distinctness and equality of the three Divine Persons. We cannot conceive of a command given to, and adopted by, the universal Church to baptise all its members in the name (not "the names") of God and a merely human prophet and an impersonal influence or power.

(20) All things whatsoever I have commanded you.—The words obviously point, in the first instance, to the teaching given by our Lord recorded in the Gospels—the new laws of life, exceeding broad and deep, of the Sermon on the Mount, the new commandment of Love for the inner life (John xiii. 34), the new outward ordinances of Baptism and the Supper of the Lord. But we may well believe that they went further than this, and that the words may cover much unrecorded teaching which they had heard in the darkness, and were to reproduce in light (chap. x. 27).

I am with you alway.—Literally, all the days, or, at all times; the words emphasising continuity more than the English adverb. The "days" that were coming might seem long and dark and dreary, but He, their Lord, would be with them, in each of those days, even to the far-off end.

Even unto the end of the world.—Literally, of the age. The phrase is the same as that in chaps. xiii. 39, 40, 49; xxiv. 13. In Heb. ix. 28 it is used of the time of the appearance of Christ in the flesh, as the beginning of the last age of the world. Like all such words, its meaning widens or contracts according to our point of view. Here the context determines its significance as stretching forward to the end of the age, or soon, which began with the first Advent of the Christ and shall last until the second.

We ask, as we close the Gospel, why it ends thus? why there should be no record of a fact so momentous as the Ascension? The question is one which we cannot fully answer. There is an obvious abruptness in the close of the book as a book. It may be that it was left unfinished. It may be that the fact of the Ascension entered into the elementary instruction of every catechumen, and was therefore taken for granted; or that it was thought of as implied in the promise of Christ's perpetual presence; or, lastly, that that promise seemed, in its grandeur and its blessedness, to be the consummation of all that Christ had come to accomplish, and therefore as the fitting close of the record of His life and work.
EXCURSUS ON NOTES TO ST. MATTHEW.

I.—ON THE HISTORY OF OUR LORD'S LIFE TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF HIS MINISTRY (Matt. iii.).

A brief review of the events that affected more or less directly the human life of the Christ will, it is believed, be helpful to most readers. Of the early childhood we have no record but the simple statement that “the Child grew, and waxed strong, being filled with wisdom: and the grace of God was upon Him” (Luke ii. 40). Outwardly, we must believe, it presented no startling features. There was the simple life of home, and in due course the lessons given in the synagogue, and the worship of the Sabbath, and the habits of a devout household. The annual pilgrimage of Joseph and Mary to keep the Passover at Jerusalem (Luke ii. 41) would be the one conspicuous break in the year’s routine of labour in the carpenter’s shop at Nazareth. At the age of twelve (A.D. 8) there was the first manifest unfolding of the higher life (see Luke ii. 40), but, so far as we know, it stood absolutely alone, and the growth was quiet and orderly as before. Only in the absolute sinlessness, in the absence of the faults of childhood, could that growth have differed from the growth of other children of the same time and place. He too was subject to His parents, and worked with Joseph as a carpenter. And in that home (the question who they were being still reserved) were also the “brothers” of the Lord—James, and Joseph, and Simon, and Judas (Matt. xiii. 55), and His sisters. The death of Joseph must have left Him, in the common course of things, as the head of the household, and we may believe that the other members of it, more and more, looked to Him for guidance, and depended upon Him for their support. It is at least probable that the yearly visits to Jerusalem were not interrupted, and that He who was made “under the Law,” gave the same proofs of His obedience to it as were given by every devout Israelite. Partly as claiming descent from David, partly from the devout habits of His own life and that of His reputed father, He must have been prominent in the small community of Nazareth, and probably exercised the function commonly assigned to devout laymen, of reading the Sabbath lessons in the synagogue (Luke iv. 16). Thus much we may venture to picture to ourselves of the outward life. Of the veil that shrouds the growth of the inward life we may hardly dare to lift a corner. Prayer to His Father in Heaven, in part (with the one necessary exception) after the manner of the prayer which He afterwards taught His disciples, the patient expectation that waited till His hour should come, gentle and loving care for His mother and His brethren, not without the power to reprove when reproach was necessary, delight in the solitude of the hills, the changing aspect of the skies, and the beauty of the flowers of the field, all these made up a life of harmony and noble holiness. But as it passed on, it hardly appeared likely to be more than this. The very tranquillity of its growth must have made His mother’s heart sink within her, as with the sickness of hope deferred. It was not till the preaching of the Baptist showed that His hour had come, that there was outwardly more than the life of a man of the peasant class, of blameless purity and intense devotion.

In the mean time events were passing round Him, which more or less affected those whom His ministerial work was afterwards to embrace. Archelaus, after the massacre referred to in the Note on chap. iii. 22, went to Rome to defend himself before the Emperor against the charge of cruelty, and to maintain his right to the kingdom against the claims of Antipas. Augustus, true to the balancing policy of Roman rule, made Antipas Tetrarch of Galilee, and Archelaus Ethnarch of Judaea. The latter ruled with as much cruelty as ever. Complaints again multiplied, and in A.D. 6 he was deposed and banished to Gaul, and Judaea, as a Roman province, was placed under the direct government of a Procurator. The immediate effect of this was to move the dormant fanaticism of a population who fondly flattered themselves that they had “never been in bondage to any man,” and when the census taken at the time of our Lord’s birth was followed by actual taxation (the “tribute” or poll-tax of Matt. xxii. 17), the discontent broke out in the revolt of Judas of Gamala, commonly known as “of Galilee” (Acts v. 37). That province furnished the greater part of his adherents, and they took as their watchword, “We have no master but God,” and refused to pay tribute. The insurrection was suppressed, Judas himself slain, and his followers dispersed; but the party was not extinct, and Josephus writing seventy years afterwards, in the time of Vespasian and Titus, enumerates it, together with Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes, among the four sects of the Jews (Ant. xviii. 1, § 3). The question put by the Pharisees and Herodians, “Is it lawful to give tribute to Caesar?” was one which must have been often discussed in Nazareth and the neighbouring villages from the time of our Lord’s childhood. The policy of the Tetrarch of Galilee led him, on the other hand, to court the favour of Rome. The new town of Tiberias (built A.D. 18), the new name, the Sea of Tiberias, which it gave to the Lake of Galilee, bore witness of Herod’s adulation of the Emperor who had succeeded Augustus in A.D. 14. Coming nearer to the time of the commencement of our Lord’s ministry we may note the Tetrarch’s divorce of his first wife, the daughter of Aretas; his incestuous and adulterous marriage with Herodias, the daughter of his brother Aristobulus, and the wife of his brother Philip; and the war with Aretas in which this act involved him. The government of Judaea, after the deposition of Archelaus, under five successive Procurators, presented no events of any striking importance, but in A.D. 25–26 we come to the more memorable name of Pontius Pilate. One of his first acts was to remove the Roman garrison from Cæsarea to Jerusalem, and the troops were accordingly stationned in the Tower of Antonius, which rose (as we see in Acts xxi. 34, 35) from the precincts of the Temple. They
brought with them the standards that bore the image of the Emperor, and this roused the population to a white heat of fury, to which Pilate at last yielded (Jos. Ant. xviii. 3, § 1). Other provocations, however, followed. Gilt shields bearing the names of heathen deities were suspended in the Procurator's palace at Jerusalem, and were only removed by a special order from Tiberius. The consecrated Corban, or treasure of the Temple, was employed for the construction of an aqueduct, and the riot that followed (probably the insurrection which made Barabbas the hero of the people) was only suppressed by Pilate's sending into the crowd soldiers in disguise, armed with concealed daggers, who massacred both rioters and unfriendly spectators (Jos. Wars, ii. 9, § 4). It is probable that the slaughter of the Galileans, whose blood Pilate mingled with their sacrifices (Luke xiii. 1), was connected with this outbreak. Such was the state of things when the voice of the Baptist was heard in the wilderness of Judaea. In the mean time the influence of Roman rule was seen in language, government, customs, in the employment of the publicans, in the centurions stationed with their troops at Capernaum, in the adoption of Roman manners at the feasts of the Tetrarch's Court, in the forced service to which the peasants of Galilee were subject, in the frequent use of the Roman punishment of scourging, in the crosses upon which rebels and robbers were exposed in shameful nakedness to die the most agonising of all forms of death.

II.—THE WORD "DAILY," IN MATT. VI. 11.

The word ἐρωτάω has been derived (1) from § ἱερά = the day that is coming on; and this meaning is favoured by the fact that Jerome says that the Hebrew Gospel current in his time gave the word mahor (= crassius) to-morrow's bread, and by the very early rendering, quotidianum, in the Latin versions. On the other hand, this meaning introduces a strange tautology into St. Luke's version of the prayer, "Give us this day—i.e., daily—our daily bread." (2) The other derivation connects it with οὖσα in some one or other of its many senses, and with οὕτι as signifying either "for" or "over"—the former force of the proposition suggesting the thought "for our existence or subsistence;" the latter, the superabundantia of Jerome, that is, "over or above our material substance." It is said, and with truth, that in classical Greek the form would have been not ἐρωτάω, but ἐρωτάω; but it is clear that that difficulty did not prevent a scholar like Jerome from accepting the derivation, and it was not likely that the Hellenistic Jew who first translated our Lord's discourses should be more accurate than Jerome in coining a word which seemed to him wanted to express our Lord's meaning. The derivation being then admissible, it remains to ask which of the two meanings of οὖσα and of οὐτι gives most force to the clause in which the word occurs, and for the reasons given above I am led to decide in favour of the latter. New words would hardly have been wanted for the meanings "daily" or "sufficient." When a word is coined, it may fairly be assumed that it was wanted to express a new thought, and the new thought here was that which our Lord afterwards developed in John vi., that the spirit of a man needs sustenance not less than his body, and that that sustenance is found in the "bread of God which cometh down from heaven." (John vi. 33). The student should, however, consult Dr. Lightfoot's admirable excursus on the word in his Hints on a Revised Version of the New Testament.

On the assumption that the Lord's Prayer included and spiritualised the highest thoughts that had previously been expressed separately by devout Israelites, we may note, as against the meaning of "bread for the morrow," the saying of Rabbi Eliass, that "He who has a crumb left in his scrip, and asks,—'What shall I eat to-morrow?' belongs to those of little faith." There is, it must be admitted, a difficulty in conjecturing what Aramaic word could have answered to this meaning of ἐρωτάω, and the fact that a word giving the other meaning is, as it were, ready to hand, and was actually found in the Hebrew Gospel in the fourth century, has some weight on the other side. That word may, however, itself have been not a translation of the original, but a re-translation of the Latin quotidianus; and the fact that Jerome, knowing of this, chose another rendering here, while he retained quotidianus in St. Luke xi. 3, shows that he was not satisfied with it, and at last, it may be, halted between two opinions.

III.—DEMONIAC POSSESSION (Matt. viii. 28).

As to the word, the Greek δαιμόν (the "knowing," or the "divider") appears in Homer as interchangeable with θεός (God). In the mythology of Hesiod (Works and Days, i. 108) we have the first downward step, and the δαιμόνες are the departed spirits of the men who lived in the first golden age of the world. They are the good genii of Greek religion, aveters of evil, guardians of mortal men. The next stage introduced the notion of the adjective derived from δαιμόνιος as something more impersonal, and τὸ δαιμόνιον was used by Plato as something "between God and man, by which the former communicates with the latter" (Symm., p. 202), and in this sense Socrates spoke of the inward oracle whose warning he obeyed, as his δαιμόνιον, and was accordingly accused of bringing in the worship of new δαιμόνια, whom the State had not recognised. The fears of men led them, however, to connect these unknown intermediate agents with evil as well as good. The δαιμόνιον of the Greek tragedians is the evil genius of a family, as in the case of that of Agamemnon. A man is said to be under its power when he is swayed by some uncontrollable, frenzied passion that hurries him into guilt and misery.

Such were the meanings that had gathered round the word when the Greek translators of the Old Testament entered on their task. They, as was natural, carefully avoided using it in any connection that would have identified it with the God of Israel. It appears in Ps. xc. 3, where the English version gives "destruction;" in Deut. xxxii. 17, and Ps. cvii. 37, where the
English version has "devils," and in this sense it accordingly passed into the language of the Hellenistic Jews, and so into that of the writers of the Gospels. So St. Paul speaks of the gods whom the heathen worshipped as Baalberen (1 Cor. x. 20).

(2.) As to the phenomena described, the belief of later Judaism ascribed to "demons," in the sense which the word has thus acquired, many of the more startling forms of bodily and mental suffering which the language of modern thought groups under the general head of "disease." Thus, in the history of Tobit, the daughter of Raguel is possessed by the evil spirit Asmodeus, and he slays her seven bridle-grooms (Tobit iii. 8). Or passing on to the Gospel records, we find demoniac agency the cause of dumbness (Matt. ix. 32), blindness (Matt. xii. 22), epilepsy (Mark ix. 17-27), or (as here, and Mark v. 1-5) insanity. To "have a devil" is interchangeable with "being mad" (John vii. 20; viii. 48; x. 20, and probably Matt. xi. 15). And this apparently was but part of a more general belief, which saw in all forms of disease the work, directly or indirectly, of Satan, as the great adversary of mankind. Our Lord went about "healing all that were oppressed of the devil" (Acts x. 38). "Satan had bound" for eighteen years the woman who was crippled by a spirit of infirmity (Luke xiii. 16). And these "demons" are described as "unclean spirits" (Matt. x. 3; xii. 43, et al.) acting under a "ruler" or "prince," who is popularly known by the name of Beelzebub, the old Philistine deity of Ekron, and whom our Lord identifies with Satan (Matt. xii. 24-26). The Talmud swarms with allusions to such demons as lurking in the air, in food, in clothing, and working their evil will on the bodies or the souls of men. St. Paul, though he refers only once to "demons," in this sense, and then apparently as the authors of false doctrines claiming divine authority, but coming really from "seducing spirits" (1 Tim. iv. 1), seems to see in some forms, at least, of bodily disease the permitted agency of Satan, as in the case of the chastisement inflicted on the incoherent Corinthian (1 Cor. v. 5; 2 Cor. ii. 11), his own "thorn in the flesh" (2 Cor. xii. 7), and possibly in other like hindrances to his work (1 Thess. ii. 18).

(3.) The belief bore its natural fruit among the Jews of our Lord's time. The work of the exorcist became a profession, as in the case of the sons of Sceva at Ephesus (Acts xix. 13). Charms and incantations were used, including the more sacred forms of the divine name. The Pharisæes appear to have claimed the power as one of the privileges belonging to their superior holiness (Matt. xii. 27). Josephus narrates that a herb grew at Machærus, the root of which had the power of expelling demons (whom he defines as the spirits of wicked men, and that he had himself beheld, in the presence of Væpsianus, a man possessed with a demon, cured by a ring containing a root of like properties. As a proof of the reality of the dispossession, a vessel of water was placed at a little distance from the man, which was overthrown by the unseen demon as he passed out from the man's nostrils (Wars, vii. 6, § 3; Ant. viii. 2, § 5). The belief as to the demons being "the souls of the dead," lingered in the Christian Church, was accepted by Justin, who, coming from Samaria, probably received it from the Jews (Apol. I., i., p. 65), and was recognised as at least a common belief by Chrysostom (De Luc. v., p. 728).

(4.) Our Lord's treatment of the cases of men thus "possessed with demons" stands out partly as accepting the prevailing belief in its highest aspects, partly as contrasted with it. He uses no spells or charms, but does the work of casting out as by His own divine authority, "with a word." He delegates to the Twelve the power to "cast out demons," as well as to cure diseases (Matt. x. 8); and when the Seventy return with the report that the devils (i.e., demons) were subject unto them in His name, He speaks of that result as a victory over Satan (Luke x. 17, 18). He makes the action of the demons the vehicle for a parable, in which first one and then eight demons are represented as possessing the same man (Matt. xii. 43-45). It may be noted that He nowhere speaks of them, in the language of the later current beliefs of Christendom, as identical with the "fallen angels," or as the souls of the dead, though they are evil spirits subject to the power of Satan.

(5.) It is obvious that many hard questions rise out of these facts. Does our Lord's indirect teaching stamp the popular belief with the seal of His authority? or did He, knowing it to be false, accommodate Himself to their belief, and speak in the only way men were able to understand of His own power to heal, teaching them as they were "able to hear it"? (Mark iv. 38). If we answer the former question in the affirmative, are we to believe that the fact of possession was peculiar to the time and country, and that the "demons" (either as the souls of the dead, or as evil angels) have since been restrained by the influence of Christendom or the power of Christ? or may we still trace their agency in the more obscure and startling phenomena of mental disease, in the delirium tremens of the drunkard, in the orgiastic frenzy of some Eastern religions, in homicidal or suicidal mania? And if we go as far as this, is it a true theory of disease in general to assign it, in all cases, to the permitted agency of Satan? and how can we reconcile that belief either with the temper which receives sickness as "God's visitation," or with that which seeks out its mechanical or chemical causes? Wise and good men have answered these questions very differently, and it may be that we have not the data for an absolutely certain and exhaustive answer. It is well to remember, on the one hand, that to speak of the phenomena of the Gospel possessions as mania, hysteria, or the like, is to give them a name, but not to assign a cause—that science, let it push its researches into mental disease ever so far, has to confess at last that it stands in the presence of unknown forces, more amenable often to spiritual influences than to any medical treatment; and on the other, that our Lord came to rescue men from the thraldom of frenzy and disease, and so to prepare them for the higher work of spiritual renovation, rather than rudely to sweep away the traditional belief of the people as to their source, or to proclaim a new psychological theory.
THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. MARK.
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THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. MARK.

I. The Writer.—There is but one person of the name of Mark, or Marcus, mentioned in the New Testament, and, in the absence of any evidence, it may reasonably be assumed that the Gospel which bears his name is ascribed to him as being, directly or indirectly, its author. The facts of his life as they are gathered from the New Testament may be briefly put together. He bore also the Hebrew name of John, i.e., Joannes, or Iohanan (Acts xii. 12, 25; xv. 37). The fact that he took a Latin and not a Greek surname suggests the probability of some point of contact with Jews or others connected with Rome. As was natural, when he entered on his work among the Gentiles the new name practically superseded the old, and in the Epistles (Col. iv. 10; 2 Tim. iv. 11; Phil. verse 24; 1 Pet. v. 13) he is spoken of as “Mark” only. He was sister’s son to Barnabas, and was therefore, on his mother’s side at least, of the tribe of Levi (Col. iv. 10; Acts iv. 36). His mother bore the name of Mary, or Miriam, and it may be inferred from the fact that her house served as a meeting-place for the disciples at Jerusalem (Acts xii. 12), that she, like her brother, was one of the prominent and wealthy members of the Apostolic Church. St. Peter speaks of him as his “son” (1 Pet. v. 13), and it is a natural inference from this that he was converted by that Apostle to the new faith, but whether this was during our Lord’s ministry in Pamphylia from the work to which they were sent, and returned home (Acts xiii. 13). We find him, however, again at Antioch, after the council at Jerusalem, and he had so far regained his uncle’s confidence that he was willing to take him once more as a companion in his missionary labours (Acts xv. 37—39). To that course, however, St. Paul would not agree, and the result was that the two friends who had so long been fellow-workers in the cause of Christ were divided after a sharp contention.

From this point onwards we get but few glimpses of the writer of the Gospel. He accompanied Barnabas (A.D. 52) in his work among the Jews and Gentiles of Cyprus (Acts xv. 39). About eight years later he was with St. Peter in the city on the banks of the Euphrates which still bore the old name of Babylon, and there must have met Silvanus, or Silas, who had taken his place as the companion and minister of St. Paul (see Note on 1 Pet. v. 12, 13). It is possible that this may have led to a renewal of the old intimacy between him and the Apostle of the Gentiles, and about four years later (A.D. 64) we find him with St. Paul at Rome, during the Apostle’s first imprisonment (Col. iv. 10; Phil. verse 24), and there, it may be noted, he must have met his brother Evangist, St. Luke (Col. iv. 14). He was then, however, on the point of returning to the Asiatic provinces, and contemplated a visit to Colossae (Col. iv. 10). Two years later (A.D. 66), accordingly, we find him at Ephesus with Timotheus, and the last mention of his name shows that St. Paul had forgotten his former want of steadfastness in the recollection of his recent services, and wished for his presence once again as being “profitable for ministering” (2 Tim. iv. 11).

To these facts, or legitimate inferences, we may now add the less certain traditions that have gathered round his name. Epiphanius (Contr. Haer.) makes him one of the Seventy whose mission St. Luke narrates (x. 1), and says that he was of those who turned back when they heard the hard saying of John vi. 60, 66. Eusebius (Hist. ii. 15; vi. 14) states, on the “authority of the ancient elders” and of Clement of Alexandria, that he was with St. Peter at Rome, acting as his “interpreter,” or secretary, and that he was sent on a mission from Rome to Egypt (Hist. ii. 16). There, according to Jerome (de Vir. illust. 8), he founded the Church of Alexandria, became bishop of that church, and suffered martyrdom at the hands of the people on the Feast of Serapis, in the fourteenth year of Nero, A.D. 68, about three years after the death of St. Peter and St. Paul. In A.D. 815 his body was said to have been taken to Venice, and the stately cathedral in the Piazza of St. Mark in that city was dedicated to his memory. Some recent commentators identify him conjecturally with “the young man with the linen cloth round his naked body” of Mark xiv. 51. (See Note on that passage.)

II. The Authorship of the Gospel.—St. Mark is named by Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis (cirec. a.d. 169), on the authority of a certain “John the Presbyter,” as writing down exactly, in his character as Peter’s interpreter, “whatever things he remembered, but not in the order in which Christ spoke or did them, for he was neither a follower nor hearer of the Lord’s, but was afterwards a follower of Peter.” The statement is probable enough in itself (Euseb. Hist. iii. 39), and receives some additional weight from the
fact that the city of which Papias was Bishop was in
the same district as Colosse, which Mark, as we have
seen, meant to visit (Col. iv. 10). In another passage,
above referred to, Eusebius (Hist. ii. 15; v. 8) speaks
of him as having been asked to write by the hearers
of St. Peter at Rome, and that the Apostle at first
acquiesced in, and afterwards sanctioned his doing so.
The same tradition appears (A.D. 160-225) in Tertullian
(Cont. Marc. iv. 5). It receives some confirmation from
the language of the second Epistle ascribed to St.
Peter. The Apostle there promises that he will
"endeavour" that those to whom he writes may have
these things (i.e., the facts and truths of the gospel)
in remembrance, that they might know that they had
not "followed cunningly-devised fables," but were
trusting those who had been eye-witnesses, at the
Transfiguration and elsewhere, of the majesty of
Christ (2 Pet. i. 15, 16). Such a promise seems
almost to pledge the Apostle to the composition of
some kind of record. Mark, we have seen, was with
him when he wrote his first Epistle, perhaps also
when he wrote the second, and it would be natural
that he should take down from his master's lips, or
write down afterwards from memory, what he had heard
from him. It may be added that the com-
paratively subordinate position occupied by St. Mark
in the New Testament records makes it improbable
that his name should have been chosen as the author
of a book which he did not really write. A pseudony-
rous writer would have been tempted to choose (let
us say) Peter himself, not Peter's attendant and
interlocutor.
The Gospel itself, we may add, supplies some internal
evidence in favour of this hypothesis:—(1.) It differs
from St. Matthew, with which to a great extent it runs
parallel in the facts narrated, in giving at every turn
graphic descriptive touches which suggest the thought
that they must have come in the first instance from an
eye-witness. These are noticed in detail in the Notes on
the Gospel, and here it will be enough to mention a few
of the more striking instances. Thus, e.g., we have (a)
the "very early in the morning, while it was yet night,"
of i. 35, as compared with "when it was day" in Luke
iv. 42; (b) there being no room, "not so much as about
the door," in ii. 2; (c) the "taking off the roof and
digging a hole in it" in ii. 4; (d) the "making a path
by plucking the ears of corn" in ii. 23; (e) the
"looking round with anger" in iii. 5; (f) the "taking
him, even as He was, into the ship," and the "lying
in the stern on the pillow" (iv. 36, 38); (g) the account
of the manner in which the Gadarene demoniac had
"burst asunder" his chains and "worn away" his
fetters (v. 4), and how he was "in the mountains crying
and cutting himself with stones" (v. 5); (h) the "green
grass," and the "sitting in ranks and companies by
hundreds and by fifties" (vi. 39, 40); (i) the "exceed-
ing white as snow so as no fuller on earth can whiten
them" (ix. 1); (j) the "thief beholding him, loved
him" of the young ruler (x. 21); (k) the "young
man with the linen cloth round his naked body" (xiv.
51); and many others of a like character. (2.) As
pointing to the same direction, we may note the in-
stances in which St. Mark, and he alone, reproduces
the very syllables which our Lord uttered in Aramaic.
Whether they were an exception to His usual mode
of speaking, or not, may be an unanswerable question;
but as connected with His works of healing they had the
character of words of power for those who heard them,
and so fixed themselves in their memories. So we have
the TALITHA CUMI of v. 41, the EPHPHATHA of vii.
34, the RABONI in the Greek of x. 51, the BOANERGES
of iii. 17, the ABBA of xiv. 36, the CORBAN of vii. 11,
and, though here in common with St. Matthew, the ELOI,
ELOI, LAMA SABACHTHANI of xv. 34. (3.) So, too, in a
few cases, St. Mark gives names where the other Gospels
do not give them: Levi is the son of Alpheus (ii. 14); the
ruler of the Synagogue, not named by St. Matthew,
is Jairus (v. 22); the blind beggar at Jericho is Barti-
maus, the son of Timaeus (x. 46); the mother of James
and John is Salome (xx. 40); Simon the Cyrenian is
the father of Alexander and Rufus (xx. 21). (4.) Some
have seen grounds for the inference thus suggested in
St. Mark's omission of the promise made to Peter in
Matt. xvi. 17-19, and of his "weeping bitterly" after
he had denied his Master, but the proof in this case
seems somewhat precarious.

III. The first readers of the Gospel.—The position
which St. Mark occupied in relation both to St. Paul
and St. Peter—his connection with the former being
resumed, as we have seen, after a long interval—would
make it probable that he would write with a special
eye to Gentile rather than Jewish readers; and of this
the Gospel itself supplies some internal evidence in the full
explanation of the customs of the Jews as to ablutions
and the like in vii. 3, 4, in the explanation of the word
Corban in vii. 11, perhaps, also, in his description of
"the river of Jordan" in i. 5. A closer study suggests
the thought, in full agreement with the tradition men-
tioned above, that he wrote with a special view to
Christians of the Roman Church. He alone describes
Simon the Cyrenian as the father of Alexander and
Rufus (xx. 21), as though that fact had a special interest
for his readers. There is but one Rufus mentioned
elsewhere in the New Testament, and he meets us in
Rom. xvi. 13 as one who was prominent enough in the
church of that city for St. Paul to send a special message
of remembrance to him; and it may be inferred, with
some likelihood, that the wife or widow of Simon of
Cyrene (having previously met St. Paul at Corinth, for
some personal knowledge is implied in the words "his
mother and mine") had settled with her two sons in
the imperial city, and had naturally gained a position
of some importance. The very name of Marcus indi-
cates, as has been said, some Latin affinities; and it is
noticeable, in this connection, that a larger number of
words Latin in their origin appear in his Gospel than
in any one of the others. Thus we have him giving the Latin centurio instead of the Greek tērōn (shell-boatarches) in xv. 39, 44, 45; the Latin specular
for "executioner" in vii. 27; grābatus for bed (this in
common with John v. 8, 9, 10) in ii. 4, 9, 11, 12; quadrans for "farting" in xii. 42; a verb formed from
the Latin flagellum for "scourging" (this in common with
Matt. xxvii. 28 in xv. 15; a noun formed from sextarius for "vessels" in vii. 4; Pecudum (this in common
with Matt. xxvii. 27 and John xviii. 28) in xiv. 16; the
devahris in vi. 37, xii. 15, xiv. 5 (this, however, is com-
mon to all four Gospels); the legio (found also in Matt.
xvi. 53, Luke viii. 30) in v. 9; censura (found also in

IV. The characteristics of the Gospel.—The dis-
inguishing features of St. Mark's Gospel are, it will be
seen, (1) vividness and fulness of detail in narrating
the events of the history; (2) expression sufficient in
dealing with our Lord's discourses. This may have
been owing partly to the object which he had in view,
writing, it may be, for the instruction of catechumens,
for whom he judged this method the most fitting, and
partly to the idiosyncrasies of his own character. What we have seen of his life and work would prepare us to accept the latter as, to a great extent, an adequate explanation. One who had been chiefly a "minister" or "attendant" (the latter word is the more common rendering of the Greek of Acts xiii. 5) on the two Apostles may well be supposed to have been chiefly distinguished for his activity in service, for the turn of mind which observes and notes particulars, rather than for that which belongs to the student, and delights to dwell on full and developed statements of the Truth. We may see in what he has left us accordingly, pre-eminently the Gospel of Service, that which presents our Lord to us as in the form of a servant, obedient even unto death (Phil. ii. 7, 8); and so far it forms the complement to that in which St. Matthew presents Him to us pre-eminently in His character as a King. Even the characteristic iteration of the ever-recurring "immediately," "anon," "presently," "forthwith," "by-and-by," "straightway"—all representing the self-same Greek word, occurring not less than 41 times—may not unreasonably be connected with his personal experience. That had been, we may believe, a word constantly on his lips in daily life, the law and standard of his own service, and he could not think of his Lord's work otherwise than as exhibiting the perfect fulfilment of that law, a work at once without haste and without pause. So, too, in another point in which he stands in singular contrast to St. Matthew, the almost entire absence of any reference, except in reporting what had been said by our Lord or others, to any prophecies of the Old Testament—there are but two such references in the whole Gospel (i. 2, 3; xv. 28), as rising out of his own reflection—may be explained in part, perhaps, by the fact that he was writing not for Jews, but for Gentiles, to whom those prophecies were not familiar, and also by the fact that his own life in its ceaseless round of humble service led him to be less than others a student of those prophecies. Assuming the genuineness of the latter of the two passages just referred to (it is absent from nearly all the best MSS.), we may, perhaps, trace the connection of thought. Words from that 53rd chapter of Isaiah had been quoted by the Apostle to whom he ministered (1 Pet. ii. 22, 23), at a time when he was with him, in special connection with the work of servants and the duty of obedience, and so his mind had been called to those words, but there does not appear to have been in him, as there was in St. Matthew, a deliberate purpose to trace the fulfilment of prophetic words in the circumstances of our Lord's life and work. He was content to paint the scenes that passed before his mind clearly and vividly, and to leave the teaching which the facts embodied to do its work on the minds of his readers.

V. Relation to St. Matthew and St. Luke.—The Gospels of St. Mark and St. Matthew have so much in common, sometimes with each other only, sometimes with St. Luke also, that it is clear that they must have drawn more or less from a common source. Nothing, however, can be more against the whole tenor of internal evidence than the hypothesis that St. Mark epitomised from St. Matthew, or that St. Matthew expanded from St. Mark. The narrative of the second Gospel is in almost every instance fuller than that of the first, and its brevity is obtained only by the absence of the discourses and parables which occupy so large a portion of the other. On account of these assumptions the perplexing variations in the order of events (see Note on Matt. viii. 1) are altogether inexplicable. What is, with our scanty data, the most probable explanation is, that the matter common to both represents the substance of the instruction given orally to disciples in the Church of Jerusalem and other Jewish-Christian communities coming, directly or indirectly, under the influence of St. Peter and St. James, as the Apostles of the Circumcision (Gal. ii. 9). The miracles that had most impressed themselves on the minds of the disciples, the simplest or most striking parables, the narratives of the Passion and Resurrection, would naturally make up the main bulk of that instruction. St. Matthew, the publican Apostle, and therefore conversant, as has been said before, with clerical culture, writing for his own people, closely connected with James the Bishop of Jerusalem (see Introduction to St. Matthew), would naturally be one exponent of that teaching. St. Mark, the disciple and "interpreter," or secretary, of St. Peter, would as naturally be another. That they wrote independently of each other is seen, not only in the details above noted, the addition of new facts, the graphic touches of description, but from variations which would be inexplicable on any other assumption; such, e.g., as Mark's "Dalmanutha" (viii. 10) for Matthew's Magdala (Matt. xv. 39), "Syro-Phenician woman" (vii. 26) for Canaanite (Matt. xv. 22), "Levi the son of Alphæus" (ii. 14) for Matthew (Matt. ix. 9). Short as the Gospel is, too, there is one parable in it (iv. 26—29), and one miracle (vii. 31—37), which are not found in St. Matthew. It is remarkable, moreover, that there are some incidents which St. Mark and St. Luke have in common, and which are not found in St. Matthew: that of the demoniac (chap. i. 23—27, Luke iv. 33—37; the journey through Galilee (i. 35—39), Luke iv. 42—44); the pursuit of the disciples (i. 36, 37, Luke iv. 42); the prayer of the demoniac (v. 18, Luke viii. 38); the complaint of John against one that cast out devils (ix. 38, Luke ix. 49); the women bringing spices to the sepulchre (xvi. 1, Luke xxiv. 1). Of these phenomena we find a natural and adequate explanation in the fact that the two Evangelists were, at least at one period of their lives, brought into contact with each other (Col. iv. 10, 14, Phil. iv. 24). It is probable, as has been said above, that neither wrote his Gospel in its present form until the two great Apostles whom they served had entered on their rest; but when they met each must have had the plan formed and the chief materials collected, and we may well think of them as comparing notes, and of the one, whose life had led to less culture, and whose temperament disposed him to record facts rather than parables or discourses, as profiting by his contact with the other, and while content to adhere to the scope and method which he had before marked out for himself, adding here and there what he learnt from his fellow-worker whose "praise was in the Gospel" (2 Cor. viii. 18). (See Introduction to St. Luke.)
CHAPTER I. — (1) The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God; (2) as it is written in the prophets, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee. (3) The voice of one crying in the wilderness; Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight. (4) John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins. (5) And there went out unto him all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem, and were all baptized of him in the river of Jordan, confessing their sins. (6) And John was clothed with camel’s hair, and with a girdle of a skin about his loins; and he did eat locusts and wild honey; (7) and preached, saying, There cometh one mightier than I after me, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to stoop down and unloose. (8) I indeed have baptized you with water: but he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost. (9) And it came to pass in those days, that Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee, and was baptized of John in Jordan. (10) And straightway coming up out of the water, he saw the heavens opened, and the spirits of angels ascending and descending upon him. (11) Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee. (12) Moreover John himself bare witness, saying, I saw the spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon him. (13) And I knew him not: but that he should be a witness to me in the Spirit and water. (14) I indeed baptized you with water: but he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost. Therefore came Jesus also to Jordan, to be baptized of John. (15) But John forbade him, saying, One ought not to go beyond what is assigned to him. But what doeth this? (16) And Jesus answering said unto him, Suffer it for now: for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness. (17) Then said John, He is able to baptize with the Holy Ghost and with fire. (18) I indeed baptized you with water: but he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire. (19) His衣服 was a camel’s hair: and his girdle a skin: and he did eat locusts and wild honey. (20) And there went out unto him all the land of Judea: and they of Jerusalem, and were all baptized of him in the river of Jordan, confessing their sins. (21) And John saw many of the Pharisees and Sadducees come unto his baptism: and said unto them, Beware lest ye be drawn into the snare of sinners. (22) For this was the baptism that John did: he said, He that comes after me is mightier than I: and in nothing I am worthy to be called his servant. (23) He himself swallowed up baptism: and we were baptized in the sign. (24) And John also was baptizing in the Jordan, and praying, and saying, Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do. (25) And when he saw the multitudes about him, he said, Vengeance is mine, and I will repay; and the time to_dy will speak for itself. (26) The law and the prophets were until John; and since that time the kingdom of heaven is power-fully at hand; and | triumphant in the heavens. (27) For as soon as John had heard these things, he said at once, He who is mightier than I is come, and is better than I. (28) I am not worthy to unloose the latchet of his shoes. (29) We are begotten by water and the Spirit; but he is begotten by the Father alone. (30) And the heavens were opened, and the spirits of angels were descending upon him. (31) And the Holy Ghost descended upon him from heaven as a dove, and a voice came from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. (32) And John himself bare witness, saying, I saw the spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon him. (33) And I knew him not: but that he should be a witness to me in the Spirit and water. (34) I indeed baptized you with water: but he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost. (35) John was in the wilderness where he was, and he said, I am not worthy to unloose the latchet of his shoes. (36) And he had no clothes to wear: but there was a camel’s hair garment upon his body, and a skin bound about his loins. (37) He ate locusts and honey: and when he was baptized, the heavens were opened, and he saw the spirits of angels ascending and descending upon him. (38) And thus was the beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God.
Spirit like a dove descending upon him:

(11) and there came a voice from heaven, saying, Thou art my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. (12) And immediately the Spirit driveth him into the wilderness. (13) And he was there in the wilderness forty days, tempted of Satan; and was with the wild beasts; and the angels ministered unto him.

(14) Now after that John was put in prison, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God, and saying, The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye, and believe the gospel.

(15) Now as he walked by the sea of Galilee, he saw Simon and Andrew his brother casting a net into the sea: for they were fishermen. (16) And Jesus said unto them, Come ye after me, and I will make you to become fishers of men.

(17) And straightway they forsook their nets, and followed him. (18) And when he had gone a little farther then, he

saw James the son of Zebedee, and John his brother, who also were in the ship mending their nets. (19) And straightway he called them: and they left their father Zebedee in the ship with the hired servants, and went after him.

(20) And they went into Capernaum; and straightway on the sabbath day he entered into the synagogue, and taught.

(21) And they were astonished at his doctrine: for he taught them as one that had authority, and not as the scribes. (22) And there was in their synagogue a man with an unclean spirit; and he cried out, saying, Let us alone; what have we to do with thee, thou Jesus of Nazareth? art thou come to destroy us? I know thee who thou art, the Holy One of God. (23) And Jesus rebuked him, saying, Hold thy peace, and come out of him. (24) And when the unclean spirit had torn him, and cried with a loud voice, he came out of him. (25) And they were all

elsewhere, being more boldly virid than that of the other Gospels. (See Notes on Matt. iii. 16, 17.)

(19) Immediately the spirit driveth him.—See Notes on Matt. iv. 1; but note also St. Mark's characteristic "immediately," and the stronger word "driveth him."

(20) And he was there in the wilderness.—See Notes on Matt. iv. 2—11. St. Mark compresses the history by omitting the several forms of the Temptation. Peculiar to him are (1) the use of "Satan" instead of "the devil;" (2) the statement that Jesus was "with the wild beasts." In our Lord's time these might include the panther, the bear, the wolf, the hyena, possibly the lion. The implied thought is partly that their presence added to the terrors of the Temptation, partly that in His being protected from them there was the fulfillment of the promise in the very Psalm which furnished the Tempter with his chief weapon, that the true child of God should trample under foot "the lion and the adder," the "young lion and the dragon" (Ps. xcv. 13).

(21) Now after that John was put in prison.—St. Mark agrees with St. Matthew in omitting all our Lord's early ministry in Galilee and Jerusalem, and takes the imprisonment of the Baptist as his starting-point. That imprisonment is assumed here to be known; but the facts connected with it are not related till chap. vi. 17—20.

(22) The time is fulfilled.—The words are not found in the parallel passages of the other Gospels, and are interesting as embodying the same thought as St. Paul's "in the fulness of time" (Gal. iv. 4; Eph. i. 10). So, too, St. Mark adds "believe the gospel" to the simple "repent" of St. Matthew, and gives "the kingdom of God" instead of "the kingdom of heaven."

(23) As he walked by the sea of Galilee.—See Notes on Matt. xiv. 18—22. St. Mark names Simon without the addition of Peter.

(24) With the hired servants.—Peculiar to this Gospel, and of some interest as throwing light on the relative social position of the sons of Zebedee.

(25) And they went into Capernaum.—Here St. Mark's narrative ceases to run parallel with that of St. Matthew, and agrees almost verbally with Luke iv. 31—37.

Straightway.—The frequent recurrence of this adverb, often disguised in the English version as "immediately," " anon," "by-and-by," should be noticed as we proceed. It occurs forty-one times in the Gospel; nine times in this first chapter.

(26) And they were astonished.—The verbal agreement with Matt. vii. 28 (where see Note) suggests the thought that St. Mark had heard or read that passage. For "doctrine" read teaching. Stress is laid, as in Matt. vii. 28, on the manner rather than the thing taught.

(27) An unclean spirit.—The phrase occurs in all the first three Gospels (not in St. John's), but with special frequency in this. As in most Eastern cities, in both ancient and modern times, madness had an immunity from restraint, and the demons seem to have mingled, if they chose, with the crowd of worshippers in the synagogue.

(28) What have we to do with thee?—The cry is identical with that of the Gadarene demonsiac (Matt. viii. 29). Here, as there, the possessed man has a preternatural intuition of our Lord's greatness.

The Holy One of God.—The name occurs, as applied to Christ, only here, in the parallel passage of Luke iv. 34, and in the better MSS. of John vi. 69. It probably had its origin in the Messianic application of "Thy Holy One" in Ps. xvi. 10. Its strict meaning is "the Holy One whom God owns as such," who has attained, i.e., the highest form of holiness.

(29) Hold thy peace.—Literally, be still, be gagged. The same verb is used in the calming of the winds and waves in chap. iv. 39.

(30) He came out of him.—St. Luke adds the fact "and hurt him not."

(31) What new doctrine is this?—A various-reading gives a different structure, "What thing is
amazed, insomuch that they questioned among themselves, saying, What thing is this? what new doctrine is this? for with authority commandeth he even the unclean spirits, and they do obey him. (29) And immediately his fame spread abroad throughout all the region round about Galilee. (28) And forthwith, when they were come out of the synagogue, they entered into the house of Simon and Andrew, with James and John. (30) But Simon’s wife’s mother lay sick of a fever, and anon they tell him of her. (31) And he came and took her by the hand, and lifted her up; and immediately the fever left her, and she ministered unto them. (32) And at even, when the sun did set, they brought unto him all that were diseased, and them that were possessed with devils. (33) And all the city was gathered together at the door. (34) And he healed many that were sick of divers diseases, and cast out many devils; and suffered not the devils to speak,1 because they knew him. (35) And in the morning, rising up a great while before day, he went out, and departed into a solitary place, and there prayed. (36) And Simon and they that were with him followed after him. (37) And when they had found him, they said unto him, All men seek for thee. (38) And he said unto them, Let us go into the next towns, that I may preach there also: for therefore came I forth. (39) And he preached in their synagogues throughout all Galilee, and cast out devils. (40) And there came a leper to him,2 beseeching him, and kneeling down to him, and saying unto him, If thou wilt, thou canst make me clean. (41) And Jesus, moved with compassion, put forth his hand, and touched him, and saith unto him, I will; be thou clean. (42) And as soon as he had spoken, immediately the leprosy departed from him, and he was cleansed. (43) And he straitly charged him, and forthwith sent him away; (44) and saith unto him, See thou say nothing to any man: but go thy way, shew thyself to the priest, and offer for thy cleansing those things which Moses commanded, for a testimony unto them. (45) But he went out, and began to publish it much, and to blaze abroad the matter, insomuch that Jesus could no more openly enter into the city, but was without in desert places: and they came to him from every quarter.

---

1 Or, to say that they knew him. 2 Luke 5:12.

---
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this? A new doctrine with power. He commandeth even the unclean spirits. . . . "Doctrine" is, as elsewhere, the teaching taken as a whole, including manner as well as substance.

(29) And forthwith.—Again we have St. Mark’s characteristic word, as in the “immediately” of verse 28, and in the “anon” of verse 30. (See Notes on Matt. viii. 14, 15.)

(32) And at even.—See Notes on Matt. viii. 16, 17. The special features in St. Mark are (1) the fuller description, in verse 33, that “all the city was gathered together at the door;” and (2) the omission of St. Matthew’s reference to the prophecy of Isa. lii. 4.

(34) And suffered not the devils to speak.—St. Luke (iv. 41) gives the reason of the prohibition more distinctly. The demons had cried out, ‘Thou art the Son of God.” They knew that He was the Christ.

(35) A great while before day.—Literally, very early, while it was yet night. The note of time is peculiar to St. Mark. Prayer seems to have been sought now, as at other times, after a day of extraordinary and exhausting labour.

(36) Simon and they that were with him.—This part of the narrative is given by St. Luke also, but not by St. Matthew. The definite statement who they were that followed after Him is, however, peculiar to St. Mark; while St. Luke alone gives their motive: “they stayed Him that He should not depart from them.” They would fain have kept Him at Capernaum, that He might teach them and heal their sick. This is to some extent, perhaps, implied in the words “All men seek for Thee.”

(38) Let us go into the next towns.—The word translated “towns” occurs here only. It is a compound word, “village cities,” and seems to have been coined to express the character of such places as Bethsaida, Chorazin, and others on the shore of the Sea of Galilee, which were more than “villages,” yet could hardly be classed as “cities.”

That I may preach there also.—St. Luke gives more fully “to publish the good news of the kingdom of God.” The word “preach” has here its full significance of “proclaiming,” doing a herald’s office.

For therefore came I forth.—In this form the words might refer simply to His leaving Capernaum; but the report in St. Luke, “for therefore was I sent,” connects them with His mission as a whole. In any case, however, the disciples in this stage of their progress, would hardly enter, as we enter, into the full meaning of that mission. To them His “coming forth,” even as being “sent,” would be as from His home at Nazareth, not as from the bosom of the Father.

(40) And he preached.—See Note on Matt. iv. 23. (41-45) And there came a leper.—See Notes on Matt. viii. 1-4. The miracle appears in St. Matthew as following closely on the Sermon on the Mount.

(43) He straitly charged him.—The word is the same as that in Matt. ix. 30 (where see Note).

(46) But he went out.—St. Mark alone describes the man himself as the agent in spreading the report of the miracle, and gives in more vivid terms than St. Luke the consequent pressure of the multitude, and the necessity for retirement into “desert places.”
CHAPTER II.—(1) And again he entered into Capernaum after some
days; and it was noised that he was in the house. (2) And straightway
many were gathered together, insomuch that there was no room to receive
them, no, not so much as about the door: and he preached the word unto them.
(3) And they come unto him, bringing one sick of the palsy, which was borne
of four, (4) And when they could not come nigh unto him for the press, they
uncovered the roof where he was: and when they had broken it up, they let
down the bed wherein the sick of the palsy lay. (5) When Jesus saw their
faith, he said unto the sick of the palsy, Son, thy sins be forgiven thee.
(6) But there were certain of the scribes seeing there, and reasoning in their
hearts, (7) Why doth this man thus speak blasphemies? who can forgive
sins but God only? (8) And immediately when Jesus perceived in his
spirit that they so reasoned within themselves, he said unto them, Why
reason ye these things in your hearts? (9) Whether is it easier to say to the
sick of the palsy, Thy sins be forgiven thee; or to say, Arise, and take up thy
bed, and walk? (10) But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power
on earth to forgive sins, (he saith to the sick of the palsy,) (11) I say unto thee,
Arise, and take up thy bed, and go thy way into thine house. (12) And imme-
diately he arose, took up the bed, and went forth before them all; insomuch
that they were all amazed, and glorified God, saying, We never saw it on this
fashion. (13) And he went forth again by the sea side; and all the multitude
resorted unto him, and he taught them. (14) And as he passed by, he saw
Levi the son of Alpheus sitting at the receipt of custom, and said unto him,
Follow me. And he arose and followed him. (15) And it came to pass, that, as
Jesus sat at meat in his house, many publicans and sinners sat also together
with Jesus and his disciples: for there were many, and they followed him.
(16) And when the scribes and Pharisees saw him eat with publicans and sinners,
they said unto his disciples, How is it that he eateth and drinketh with
publicans and sinners? (17) When Jesus heard it, he saith unto them, They that
are whole have no need of the physician, but they that are sick: I came not to
call the righteous, but sinners to repentance. (18) And the disciples of John
and of the Pharisees saw him eat with publicans and sinners, they said unto his disciples, How is it
that he eateth and drinketh with publicans and sinners? (19) And when the scribes
and Pharisees saw him eat with publicans and sinners, they said unto his disciples, How is it
that he eateth and drinketh with publicans and sinners? (20) And when the scribes
and Pharisees saw him eat with publicans and sinners, they said unto his disciples, How is it
that he eateth and drinketh with publicans and sinners? (21) And as he passed by, he saw
Levi the son of Alpheus sitting at the receipt of custom, and said unto him,
Follow me. And he arose and followed him. (15) And it came to pass, that, as
Jesus sat at meat in his house, many publicans and sinners sat also together
with Jesus and his disciples: for there were many, and they followed him.
(16) And when the scribes and Pharisees saw him eat with publicans and sinners,
they said unto his disciples, How is it that he eateth and drinketh with
publicans and sinners? (17) When Jesus heard it, he saith unto them, They that
are whole have no need of the physician, but they that are sick: I came not to
call the righteous, but sinners to repentance. (18) And the disciples of John
and of the Pharisees saw him eat with publicans and sinners, they said unto his disciples, How is it
that he eateth and drinketh with publicans and sinners? (19) And when the scribes
and Pharisees saw him eat with publicans and sinners, they said unto his disciples, How is it
that he eateth and drinketh with publicans and sinners? (20) And when the scribes
and Pharisees saw him eat with publicans and sinners, they said unto his disciples, How is it
that he eateth and drinketh with publicans and sinners? (21) And as he passed by, he saw
Levi the son of Alpheus sitting at the receipt of custom, and said unto him,
Follow me. And he arose and followed him. (15) And it came to pass, that, as
Jesus sat at meat in his house, many publicans and sinners sat also together
with Jesus and his disciples: for there were many, and they followed him.
(16) And when the scribes and Pharisees saw him eat with publicans and sinners,
they said unto his disciples, How is it that he eateth and drinketh with
publicans and sinners? (17) When Jesus heard it, he saith unto them, They that
are whole have no need of the physician, but they that are sick: I came not to
call the righteous, but sinners to repentance. (18) And the disciples of John
and of the Pharisees saw him eat with publicans and sinners, they said unto his disciples, How is it
that he eateth and drinketh with publicans and sinners? (19) And when the scribes
and Pharisees saw him eat with publicans and sinners, they said unto his disciples, How is it
that he eateth and drinketh with publicans and sinners? (20) And when the scribes
and Pharisees saw him eat with publicans and sinners, they said unto his disciples, How is it
that he eateth and drinketh with publicans and sinners? (21) And as he passed by, he saw
Levi the son of Alpheus sitting at the receipt of custom, and said unto him,
Follow me. And he arose and followed him. (15) And it came to pass, that, as
Jesus sat at meat in his house, many publicans and sinners sat also together
with Jesus and his disciples: for there were many, and they followed him.
taken away from them, and then shall they fast in those days. (21) No man also seweth a piece of new 1 cloth on an old garment: else the new piece that filled it up taketh away from the old, and the rent is made worse. (22) And no man putteth new wine into old bottles: else the new wine doth burst the bottles, and the wine is spilled, and the bottles will be marred: but new wine must be put into new bottles.

(23) And it came to pass, that he went through the corn fields on the sabbath day; 2 and his disciples began, as they went, to pluck the ears of corn. (24) And the Pharisees said unto him, Behold, why do they on the sabbath day that which is not lawful? (25) And he said unto them, Have ye never read what David did, when he had need, and was an hungered, he, and they that were with him? (26) How he went into the house of God in the days of Abiathar the high priest, and did eat the showbread, which is not lawful? to save life, or to do evil? to save life, or to kill? But they held their peace. (27) And when he had looked round about on them with anger, being grieved for the hardness 3 of their hearts, he saith unto the man, Stretch forth thy hand. And he stretched it out: and his hand was restored whole as the other. (28) And the sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath: therefore the Son of man is Lord also of the sabbath.

CHAPTER III.—(1) And he entered again into the synagogue; and there was a man there which had a withered hand. (2) And they watched him, whether he would heal him on the sabbath day; that they might accuse him. (3) And he saith unto the man which had the withered hand, Stand forth. (4) And he saith unto them, Is it lawful to do good on the sabbath days, or to do evil? to save life, or to kill? But they held their peace. (5) And when he had looked round about on them with anger, being grieved for the hardness of their hearts, he saith unto the man, Stretch forth thy hand. And he stretched it out: and his hand was restored whole as the other. (6) And the sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath: therefore the Son of man is Lord also of the sabbath.

(23–28) And it came to pass.—See Notes on Matt. xii. 1–8. As they went . . .—More literally, they began to make a path (or perhaps, to make their way), plucking the ears of corn.

(25) In the days of Abiathar the high priest.—St. Mark’s is the only record that gives the name of the high priest, and in so doing it creates a historical difficulty. In 1 Sam. xxii. 1, Ahimelech is named as exercising the high priest’s office in the Tabernacle at Nob. He is slain by Doeg, at the command of Saul, and his son Abiathar joins David at the cave of Nob (1 Sam. iv. 4), and being, as his flight showed, of David’s party, was the chief agent in allowing him to take the showbread.

III.

(1–6) A man there which had a withered hand.—See Notes on Matt. xii. 9–14. St. Mark omits the reference to the sheep fallen into a pit, and, on the other hand, gives more graphically our Lord’s “looking round” with an “anger” which yet had in it a touch as of pitying grief. The form of the Greek participle implies compassion as well as sorrow. St. Mark alone names (verse 6) the Herodians as joining with the Pharisees in their plot for His destruction. On the Herodians, see Notes on Matt. xi. 18, xxii. 16.

(7) And from Judea . . . and from Jerusalem.—The fact thus recorded is interesting as in some degree implying the ministry in Jerusalem and its neighbourhood, which the first three Gospels, for some reason or other, pass over.

(8) From Idumaea.—The only passage in the New Testament in which this country is named. It had acquired a considerably wider range than the Edom of the Old Testament, and included the whole country between the Arabah and the Mediterranean. It was at this time under the government of Aretas (2 Cor. xi. 32), the father of the wife whom Herod Antipas had divorced, and this had probably brought about a more frequent intercourse between its inhabitants and those of Galilee and Peræa.

They about Tyre and Sidon.—The fact is interesting in its connection with the history of the Syro-Phœnician woman (Matt. xv. 21; Mark vii. 24) as showing how it was that our Lord’s appearance in that region was welcomed as that of one whose fame had travelled thither before Him.

(9) That a small ship should wait on him.—The fact thus mentioned incidentally shows that in what is recorded in Matt. xii. 2 our Lord was but having recourse to a practice already familiar.
wait on him because of the multitude, lest they should throng him. (10) For he had healed many; insomuch that they pressed1 upon him for to touch him, as many as had plagues. (11) And unclean spirits, when they saw him, fell down before him, and cried, saying, Thou art the Son of God. (12) And he straitly charged them that they should not make him known. (13) And he goeth up into a mountain, and calleth unto him twelve, that they should be with him, and to have power to heal sicknesses, and to cast out devils: (14) and Simon he surnamed Peter; (15) and James the son of Zebedee, and John the brother of James; and he surnamed them Boanerges, which is, The sons of thunder: (16) and Andrew, and Philip, and Bartholomew, and Matthew, and Thomas, and James the son of Alpheus, and Thaddeus, and Simon the Canaanite, (17) and Judas Iscariot, who betrayed him: and they went into an house.2 (20) And the multitude cometh together again, so that they could not so much as eat bread. (21) And when his friends3 heard of it, they went out to lay hold on him: for they said, He is beside himself. (22) And the scribes which came down from Jerusalem said, He hath Beelzebub, and by the prince of the devils casteth he out devils. (23) And he called them unto him, and said unto them in parables, How can Satan cast out Satan? (24) And if a kingdom be divided against itself, that kingdom cannot stand. (25) And if a house be divided against itself, that house cannot stand. (26) And if Satan rise up against himself, and be divided, he cannot stand, but hath an end. (27) No man can enter into a strong man’s house, and spoil his goods, except he first bind the strong man; and then he will spoil his house. (28) Verily I say unto you, All sins shall be forgiven unto the sons of men, and blasphemies wherewith soever they shall blaspheme: (29) but he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath indignant shrinking from contact with the heretic Cerinthus, that which was in harmony with the spiritual being of the Seer, and with the name which his Lord had thus given him. (30) And Simon he surnamed.—Better, Canaanite, or, following many MSS., Cananean, i.e., the Aramaic equivalent of Zelotes. (31) And they went into an house.—It would be better to put a full stop after “betrayed Him,” and to make this the beginning of a new sentence. (32) So that they could not so much as eat bread.—The graphic touch, as if springing from actual reminiscence of that crowded scene, is eminently characteristic of St. Mark. (33) And when his friends . . .—Literally, those from Him,—i.e., from His home. As the “mother and the brethren” are mentioned later on in the chapter as coming to check His teaching, we must see in these some whom they had sent with the same object. To them the new course of action on which our Lord had entered seemed a sign of over-excitement, recklessly rushing into danger. We may, perhaps, see in the random word thus uttered that which gave occasion to the more malignant taunt of the scribes in the next verse. They were saying now, as they said afterwards (John x. 20), “He hath a devil, and is mad.” (34) He hath Beelzebub.—See Notes on Matt. xii. 24—32.

1 Or, some. 2 Or, marked. 3 Or, sibamens. 4 Matt. 9. 34. 5 Matt. 10. 1. 6 Matt. 13. 31.

(10) As many as had plagues.—Literally, scevagoes; the same word as in Acts xxii. 24, Heb. xi. 36.
(11) And unclean spirits.—The testimony which had been given in a single instance (i. 24) now became more or less general. But it came in a form which our Lord could not receive. The wild cry of the frenzied demoniac had no place in the evidence to equivalent of Zelotes. (See Note on John x. 20). We can scarcely fail to trace in the (29) In danger of eternal damnation.—Better, eternal judgment, the Greek word not necessarily carrying with it the thoughts that now attach to the
never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation: (30) because they said, He hath an unclean spirit.

(31) There came then his brethren and his mother, and, standing without, sent unto him, calling him. (32) And the multitude sat about him, and they said unto him, Behold, thy mother and thy brethren and thy brethren without seek for thee. (33) And he answered them, saying, Who is my mother, or my brethren? (34) And he looked round about on them which sat about him, and said, Behold my mother and my brethren! (35) For whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother, and my sister, and mother.

CHAPTER IV. — (1) And he began again to teach by the sea; and there was gathered unto him a great multitude, so that he entered into a ship, and sat in the sea; and the whole multitude was by the sea on the land. (2) And he taught them many things by parables, and said unto them in his doctrine, (3) Hearken; Behold, there went out a sower, (4) and it came to pass, as he sowed, some fell by the way side, and the fowls of the air came and devoured it up. (5) And some fell on stony ground, where it had not much earth; and immediately it sprang up, because it had no depth of earth: (6) but when the sun was up, it was scorched; and because it had no root, it withered away. (7) And some fell among thorns, and the thorns grew up, and choked it, and it yielded no fruit. (8) And other fell on good ground, and did yield fruit that sprang up and increased; and brought forth, some thirty, and some sixty, and some an hundred. (9) And he said unto them, He that hath ears to hear, let him hear. (10) And when he was alone, they that were about him with the twelve asked of him the parable. (11) And he said unto them, Unto you it is given to know the mystery of the kingdom of God: but unto them that are without, all these things are done in parables: (12) that seeing they may see, and not perceive; and hearing they may hear, and not understand; lest at any time they should be converted, and their sins should be forgiven them. (13) And he said unto them, Know ye not this parable? and how then will ye know all parables?

(14) The sower soweth the word. (15) And these are they by the way side, where the word is sown; but when
they have heard, Satan cometh immediately, and taketh away the word that was sown in their hearts. (16) And these are they likewise which are sown on stony ground; who, when they have heard the word, immediately receive it with gladness; (17) and have no root in themselves, and so endure but for a time; afterward, when affliction or persecution ariseth for the word's sake, immediately they are offended. (18) And these are they which are sown among thorns; such as hear the word, (19) and the cares of this world, and the deceitfulness of riches, and the lusts of other things entering in, choke the word, and it becometh unfruitful. (20) And these are they which are sown on good ground; such as hear the word, and receive it, and bring forth fruit, some thirtyfold, some sixty, and some an hundred. (21)

(21) Is a candle brought to be put under a bushel?—See Note on Matt. v. 15. St. Mark, it will be noted, omits all the other parables that follow in St. Matthew, and connects with that of the Sower sayings more or less proverbial, which in St. Matthew appear in a different context. Looking at our Lord's method of teaching by the repetition of proverbs under different aspects and on different occasions, it is not unlikely that this of the "candle" was actually spoken in the connection in which we find it here. Their knowledge of the meaning of the parable was not given them for themselves alone, but was to shine forth to others. We probably owe to the saying so uttered the record of this parable given in three out of the four Gospels.

(22) For there is nothing hid.—This also is found elsewhere (e.g., in Matt. x. 20). The Greek word here "secret" is interesting as being the same as that which we find in our word "Apocrypha." The term was, in the first instance, applied to books that were not publicly recognised in the Church as being of divine authority, and was then transferred to all books which, whether "spurious" or "secret," wanted that recognition.

(23) For he that hath.—See Note on Matt. xiii. 12.

(24) As if a man should cast seed into the ground.—What follows has the special interest of being the only parable peculiar to St. Mark, one therefore which had escaped the manifest eagerness of St. Matthew and St. Luke to gather up all that they could find of this form of our Lord's teaching. It runs to some extent parallel with the parable of the Sower, as though it had been given as another and easier lesson in the art of understanding parables; and if we assume a connection between St. Mark and St. Peter, it may be regarded as having in this way made a special impression on the mind of the Apostle. Like many other parables, it finds an interpretation in the analogous phenomena of the growth of the Kingdom (1) in the world at large, (2) in the heart of each individual. Speaking roughly, the Sower is, as before, either the Son of Man or the preacher of His word, and the ground falls under one or other of the heads just defined as being the proverbial parable, with, perhaps, a special reference to the good ground.

(25) And should sleep, and rise.—So it was in the world's history. Men knew not the greatness, which shall not be manifested; neither was any thing kept secret, but that it should come abroad. (26) If any man have ears to hear, let him hear. (24) And he said unto them, Take heed what ye hear: with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you: and unto you that hear shall more be given. (25) For he that hath, to him shall be given: and he that hath not, from him shall be taken even that which he hath.

(26) And he said, So is the kingdom of God, as if a man should cast seed into the ground; (27) and should sleep, and rise night and day, and the seed should spring and grow up, he knoweth not how. (26) For the earth bringeth forth fruit of herself; first the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in
First the blade, then the ear.—Following the same lines as before, we have (1) three stages in the growth of the Church of Christ in the field of the world, and (2) three like stages representing the influence of the new truth on thoughts, purposes, acts, in the individual soul.

(30) He puttheth in the sickle.—From one point of view, here again, the harvest is the end of the world (Matt. xiii. 39), and the putting in the sickle is the coming of Christ to judge. (Comp. the use of the same image in Rev. xiv. 14–18.) From the other, the harvest is the end of each man’s life, and the sickle is in the hands of the Angel of Death.

(30) With what comparison shall we compare it?—Literally, By what parable shall we set it forth? The question which introduces the parable is in St. Matthew, but not in St. Mark. It gives us the impression of a question asked, in order to put the minds of the hearers on the stretch, so that they might welcome the answer.

(31–32) It is like a grain of mustard seed.—See Notes on Matt. xiii. 31, 32. Slight variations in this report are (1) the “great branches,” and (2) the birds lodging “under the shadow of the tree.”

(33–34) And with many such parables.—See Notes on Matt. xiii. 34–35. St. Mark’s omission of the reference to Ps. lxxviii. 2, and his addition of “as they were able to hear it,” are, each of them, characteristic. It may be noted that the “many such parables” of St. Mark imply something like the series which we find in St. Matthew.

(34) He expounded. The word may be noted as being the verb from which is formed the noun “interpretation” in 3 Pet. i. 20, and so takes its place in the coincidences of phraseology which connect that Epistle with this Gospel. (See Introduction.)

(35–41) And the same day.—Better, in that day. See Notes on Matt. viii. 23–27. The connection of the events, as given by St. Mark, seems to be precise enough, but it differs widely from that in St. Matthew and St. Luke, and it must remain uncertain which was the actual order.

The other side.—The voyage was from Capernaum—from the west to the east side of the lake.

(39) They took him even as he was.—The phrase is peculiar to this Gospel, and seems to point to the impression made on the mind of St. Mark’s informant by the utter exhaustion that followed on the long day’s labours. St. John’s statement that our Lord, on His journey through Samaria, “being wearied, sat thus on the well” (John iv. 6), presents an interesting parallel.

(39) Beat into the ship, so that it was now full.—Better, were beating upon the ship, so that it was filling. Both verbs describe continuous action.

(39) Asleep on a pillow.—Better, on the pillow—the cushion commonly to be found in the boat’s stern.

Carest thou not that we perish?—St. Mark alone gives this touch of despairing expostulation, in which we trace the specific want of faith which was afterwards reproved.

(39) Peace, be still.—Literally, be still, be silenced. The latter word is the same as that used of the man who had not on a wedding garment, and was “speechless” (Matt. xxii. 12). Note the vividness with which St. Mark gives the very words addressed to the raging sea, as though it were a hostile power rising in rebellion against its true Lord.

The wind ceased.—Better, lulled.

V.


(1) The country of the Gadarenes.—The better MSS. give “Gerasenes,” some “Gergesenes.”

(2) A man with an unclean spirit.—The phrase, though not peculiar to St. Mark, is often used by him where the other Gospels have “possessed with demons, or devils.” St. Mark and St. Luke, it will be noticed, speak of one only; St. Matthew of two.
The Demoniacs of Gadara.

ST. MARK, V.

The Demoniacs and the Herd of Swine.

ship, immediately there met him out of the tombs a man with an unclean spirit,
(3) who had his dwelling among the tombs; and no man could bind him, no, not with chains: (4) because that he had been often bound with fetters and chains, and the chains had been plucked asunder by him, and the fetters broken in pieces: neither could any man tame him. (5) And always, night and day, he was in the mountains, and in the tombs, crying, and cutting himself with stones. (6) But when he saw Jesus afar off, he ran and worshipped him, (7) and cried with a loud voice, and said, What have I to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of the most high God? I adjure thee by God, that thou torment me not. (8) For he said unto him, Come out of the man, thou unclean spirit. (9) And he asked him, What is thy name? And he answered, saying, My name is Legion: for we are many. (10) And he besought him much that he would not send them away out of the country. (11) Now there was there nigh unto the mountains a great herd of swine feeding. (12) And all the devils besought him, saying, Send us into the swine, that we may enter into them. (13) And forthwith Jesus gave them leave. And the unclean spirits went out, and entered into the swine: and the herd ran violently down a steep place into the sea, (they were about two thousand;) and were choked in the sea. (14) And they that fed the swine fled, and told it in the city, and in the country. And they went out to see what it was that was done. (15) And they come to Jesus, and see him that was possessed with the devil, and had the legion, sitting, and clothed, and in his right mind: and they were afraid. (16) And they that saw it told them how it befall to him that was possessed with the devil, and also concerning the swine. (17) And they began to pray him to depart out of their coasts. (18) And...
when he was come into the ship, he that had been possessed with the devil prayed him that he might be with him.

(19) Howbeit Jesus suffered him not, but saith unto him, Go home to thy friends, and tell them how great things the Lord hath done for thee, and hath had compassion on thee. (20) And he departed, and began to publish in Decapolis how great things Jesus had done for him: and all men did marvel.

(21) And when Jesus was passed over again by ship unto the other side, much people gathered unto him: and he was nigh unto the sea. (22) And, behold, there cometh one of the rulers of the synagogue, Jairus by name; and when he saw him, he fell at his feet, (23) and besought him greatly, saying, My little daughter lieth at the point of death: I pray thee, come and lay thy hands on her, that she may be healed; and she shall live. (24) And Jesus went with him; and much people followed him, and thronged him. (25) And a certain woman, which had an issue of blood twelve years, (26) and had suffered many things of many physicians, and had spent all that she had, and was nothing bettered, but rather grew worse, (27) when she had heard of Jesus, came in the press behind, and touched his garment. (28) For she said, If I may touch but his clothes, I shall be whole.

(29) And straightway the fountain of her blood was dried up; and she felt in her body that she was healed of that plague.

(30) And Jesus, immediately knowing in himself that virtue had gone out of him, turned him about in the press, and said, Who touched my clothes? (31) And his disciples said unto him, Thou seest the multitude thronging thee, and sayest thou, Who touched me? (32) And he looked round about to see her that had done this thing.

(33) But the woman fearing and trembling, knowing what was done in her, came and fell down before him, and told him all the truth. (34) And he said unto her, Daughter, thy faith hath made thee whole; go in peace, and be whole of thy plague. (35) While he yet spake, there came from the ruler of the synagogue's house certain which said, Thy daughter is dead: why troublest thou the Master any further? (36) As soon as Jesus heard the word that was spoken, he saith unto the ruler of the synagogue, Be not afraid, only believe. (37) And he cometh to the house of the ruler of the synagogue, and seeth the tumult, and them that wailed and rent their garments. (38) And when he was come in, he saith unto them, Why make ye this ado, and wail greatly.

(39) And when he was entered in, he said unto them, Why make ye this ado, and wail greatly? for she is not dead, but sleepeth. And they笑了. (40) And he took her by the hand, and called, saying, Teacher, daughter, arise. (41) And her spirit came again, and she arose straightway. And he rebuked the fear. (42) And he charged them that she should not tell what was done. (43) But go thy way, tell my disciples, and tell my brethren, how these things are accomplished, and how great the grace was that was shewed me. (44) And he charged them strictly, and returned into Galilee.
weep? the damsel is not dead, but sleepeth. (46) And they laughed him to scorn. But when he had put them all out, he tooketh the father and the mother of the damsel, and them that were with him, and entereth in where the damsel was lying. (47) And he took the damsel by the hand, and said unto her, Talitha cumi; which is, being interpreted, Damsel, I say unto thee, arise. (48) And straightway the damsel arose, and walked; for she was of the age of twelve years. And they were astonished with a great astonishment. (49) And he charged them straitly that no man should know it; and commanded that something should be given her to eat.

CHAPTER VI. — (1) And he went out from thence, and came into his own country; and his disciples follow him. (2) And when the sabbath day was come, he began to teach in the synagogue: and many hearing these things? and what wise-
The Mission of the Twelve.

ST. MARK, VI.

The Tetrarch and the Baptist.

In him. (15) Others said, That it is Elias. And others said, That it is a prophet, or as one of the prophets. (16) But when Herod heard thereof, he said, It is John, whom I beheaded: he is risen from the dead. (17) For Herod himself had sent forth and laid hold upon John, and bound him in prison for Herodias' sake, his brother Philip's wife: for he had married her. (18) For John had said unto Herod, It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother's wife. (19) Therefore Herodias had a quarrel against him, and would have killed him; but she could not: (20) for Herod feared John, knowing that he was a just man and an holy, and ob-

house, there abide till ye depart from that place. (11) And whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear you, when ye depart thence, shake off the dust under your feet for a testimony against them. Verily I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrha in the day of judgment, than for that city. (12) And they went out, and preached that men should repent. (13) And they cast out many devils, and anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them. (14) And king Herod heard of him; (for his name was spread abroad;) and he said, That John the Baptist was risen from the dead, and therefore mighty works do shew forth themselves in him. (15) Others said, That it is Elias. And others said, That it is a prophet, or as one of the prophets. (16) But when Herod heard thereof, he said, It is John, whom I beheaded: he is risen from the dead. (17) For Herod himself had sent forth and laid hold upon John, and bound him in prison for Herodias' sake, his brother Philip's wife: for he had married her. (18) For John had said unto Herod, It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother's wife. (19) Therefore Herodias had a quarrel against him, and would have killed him; but she could not: (20) for Herod feared John, knowing that he was a just man and an holy, and ob-

(11) Whosoever shall not receive you.—The better MSS. give, "whatsoever place shall not receive you." (See Note on Matt. x. 14.)

(12) And preached that men should repent.—The work of the Apostles appears from this to have been a continuation of that of the Baptist. They announced the nearness of the kingdom of God, and repentance as the one adequate preparation for it, and baptism as the outward token of that repentance and the new life in which it was to issue (John iii. 5; iv. 2), but they did not as yet proclaim their Master as being Himself the Christ, and therefore the Head of that kingdom.

(13) Anointed with oil.—St. Mark is the only Evangelist who mentions this as the common practice of the disciples, but we learn from Jas. v. 17 that it was afterwards in use, at least, in the churches of Jerusalem and other Jewish communities. It was partly analogous to our Lord's treatment of the blind and deaf (vii. 33; viii. 23; John ix. 6), i.e., it was an outward sign showing the wish to heal, and therefore a help to faith; but as the use of oil was more distinctly that of an agent recognised as remedial in the popular therapeutics of the time, it had also the character of unifying (and devout minds have since so regarded it) the use of natural outward means of healing with prayer for the divine blessing. It need scarcely be said that it had not the slightest affinity with the mediæval so-called sacrament of extreme unction, which, though it may still retain, in theory, a partial secondary connection with the cure of the diseases of the body, is practically never administered till all hope of cure is abandoned. The development of the latter aspect of the usage was obviously the after-growth of a later time, when the miraculous gift of healing was withdrawn, and when it became necessary to devise a theory for the retention of the practice.

(14) That John the Baptist was risen from the dead.—See Notes on Matt. xiv. 1, 2. In addition an interesting illustration of what is stated as to Herod's belief may be given from the Roman poet Persius. He is describing in one of his satires (V. 180-188) the effect of superstitious fear in marring all the pleasures of the pride of luxurious pomp, and this is the illustration which he chooses:

"But when the feast of Herod's birthday comes, And through the window, smoke-besmeared, the lamps. Set in due order, wreaths of violets round, Pour out their oily fumes, and in the dish Of red-clay porcelain tall of tunny'swims, And the white flagon filled with wine, Thou mov'st thy lips, yet speak'st not, and in fear Thou keep'st the Sabbath of the circumcised, And then there rise dark spectres of the dead, And the cracked egg-shell bones of coming ill."

It is clear that a description so minute in its details must have been photographed, as it were, from some actual incident, and could not have been merely a general picture of the prevalence of Jewish superstition in Roman society. Commentators on the Roman poet have, however, failed to find any clue to the incident thus graphically related. Can we, starting from what the Gospels tell us as to the character of Antipas, picture to ourselves a scene that explains his strange mysterious hints? In A.D. 39 Herod Agrippa I., the nephew of the Tetrarch, obtained the title of king from the Emperor Caligula. Prompted by the ambition of Herodias, Antipas went with her to Rome, to seek, by lavish gifts and show of state, the same distinction. The emissaries of Agrippa, however, thwarted his schemes, and he was deposed and sent into exile at Lugdunum. May we not conjecture that the same superstitious terror which made him say that John the Baptist was risen from the dead followed him there also? "Herod's birthday" again comes round, and there is a great feast, and instead of the "lords, high captains, and chief estates of Galilee," senators and courtiers and philosophers are there, and, lo! there is a pause, and the Tetrarch rises in silent horror—as Macbeth at the apparition of Banquo's ghost—and he sees the dark form shaking its gory locks, and his lips move in speechless terror, and he "does many things on the coming Sabbath, and the thing becomes a by-word and a proverb in the upper circles of Roman society, and is noted in the schools of the Stoics as an illustration of what superstition can effect. The view thus stated is, of course, not more than a conjecture, but it at least explains phenomena. Persius died, at the age of twenty-eight or thirty, in A.D. 62, and may well therefore have heard the matter talked of in his boyhood.

(17) For Herod himself had sent forth.—See Notes on Matt. xiv. 3-12.

(19) Therefore Herodias had a quarrel.—Better, as in the margin, had a grudge, or spite, against him.

(20) For Herod feared John.—The full description of Herod's feelings towards the Baptist is peculiar to St. Mark.
served him; and when he heard him, he did many things, and heard him gladly. (21) And when a convenient day was come, that Herod on his birthday made a supper to his lords, high captains, and chief estates of Galilee; (22) and when the daughter of the said Herodias came in, and danced, and pleased Herod and them that sat with him, the king said unto the damsel, Ask of me whatsoever thou wilt, and I will give it thee. (23) And he sware unto her, Whatever thou shalt ask of me, I will give it thee, unto the half of my kingdom. (24) And she went forth, and said unto her mother, What shall I ask? And she said, The head of John the Baptist. (25) And immediately the king sent an executioner, and commanded his head to be brought: and he went and beheaded him in the prison, and brought his head in a charger, and gave it to the damsel: and the damsel gave it to her mother. (26) And when his disciples heard of it, they came and took up his corpse, and laid it in a tomb. (27) And the apostles gathered themselves together unto Jesus, and told him all things, both what they had done, and what they had taught. (28) And he said unto them, Come ye yourselves apart into a desert place, and rest a while: for there were many coming and going, and they had no leisure so much as to eat. (29) And they departed into a desert place by ship privately. (30) And the people saw them departing, and many knew him, and ran afoot thither out of all cities, and outwent them, and came together unto him. (31) And Jesus, when he came out, saw much people, and was moved with compassion toward them, because they were as sheep not having a shepherd: and he began to teach them many things. (32) And when the day was now far spent, his disciples came unto him, and said, This is a desert place, and now the time is far passed: (33) send them away, that they may go into the country round about, and into the villages, and buy themselves bread: for they have nothing to eat. (34) He answered and said unto them, Give ye them to eat. And they say unto him, Shall we go and buy two hundred
pennyworth of bread, and give them to eat? (30) He saith unto them, How many loaves have ye? go and see. And when they knew, they say, Five, and two fishes. (39) And he commanded them to make all sit down by companies upon the green grass. (40) And they sat down in ranks, by hundreds, and by fifties. (41) And when he had taken the five loaves and the two fishes, he looked up to heaven, and blessed, and brake them to his disciples to set before them; and the two fishes divided he among them all. (42) And they did all eat, and were filled. (48) And they took up twelve baskets full of the fragments, and of the fishes. (44) And they that did eat of the loaves were about five thousand men. (45) And straightway he constrained his disciples to get into the ship, and to go to the other side before unto Bethsaida, while he sent away the people. (46) And when he had sent them away, he departed into a mountain to pray. (47) And when even was come, the ship was in the midst of the sea, and he alone on the land. (48) And he saw them toiling in rowing; for the wind was contrary unto them; and about the fourth watch of the night he cometh unto them, walking upon the sea, and would have passed by them. (49) But when they saw him walking upon the sea, they supposed it had been a spirit, and cried out: (50) for they all saw him, and were troubled. And immediately he talked with them, and saith unto them, Be of good cheer: it is I; be not afraid. (53) And he went up unto them into the ship; and the wind ceased: and they were sore amazed in themselves beyond measure, and wondered. (52) For they considered not the miracle of the loaves: for their heart was hardened. (53) And when they had passed over, they came into the land of Gennesaret, and drew to the shore. (54) And when they were come out of the ship, straightway they knew him, and ran through that whole region round about, and began to carry about in beds those that were sick, where they heard he was. (56) And whithersoever he entered, into villages, or cities, or country, they laid the sick in the streets, and besought him that they might touch if it were but the border of his garment: and as many as touched him were made whole.

CHAPTER VII.—(1) Then came together unto him the Pharisees, and certain of the scribes, which came from Jerusalem. (2) And when they saw some of his disciples eat bread with defiled, that is to say, with unwashed,

By companies.—The Greek expresses the distributive force of the English by simple repetition, "companies and companies." The "green grass" may be noted as an example of St. Mark's vividness, and serves as an indirect note of time pointing to the same season as that specified by St. John, sc., a little before the Passover. (Comp. John vi. 10.)

In ranks.—The primary meaning of the Greek word is "a bed of flowers or herbs," and it comes in here effectively, with the same distributive reduplication as in the last verse, to paint the whole scene to the mind's eye.

Five thousand men.—St. Mark uses the word which excludes women and children.

Unto Bethsaida.—There is nothing in the text to warrant the marginal reading, "over against Bethsaida." It was probably suggested by some one who did not know that there were two Bethsidas, in order to avoid the seeming difficulty which presented itself from the statement in St. Luke, that the Five Thousand were fed at or near Bethsaida.

And when he had sent them away.—See Notes on Matt. xiv. 22—23.

For they considered not.—This is peculiar to St. Mark, and may fairly be received as representing St. Peter's recollection of what had been the mental state of the disciples at the time. They had not drawn from the miracle of the Loaves the conclusion which they might have drawn, that all natural forces were subject to their Master's sovereignty. The personal connection of the Evangelist with the Apostle may, perhaps, also account for his omission of the narrative which St. Matthew gives of his rashness and failing faith.

CHAPTER VII.—(1) Then came together unto him the Pharisees, and certain of the scribes, which came from Jerusalem. (2) And when they had passed over.—See Notes on Matt. xiv. 34—36.

Or country.—Better, as before in vi. 36, farms or hamlets. The three words form almost an exhaustive list of the various grades of aggregate human habitations.

In the streets.—Better, in the market-places. The border of his garment.—Better, the hem, or fringe. See Note on Matt. ix. 20.

Were made whole.—The Greek tense implies an event frequently recurring.
Eating Bread with Unwashen Hands.  ST. MARK, VII.  The Doctrine of Corban.

hands, they found fault.  (3) For the Pharisees, and all the Jews, except they wash their hands oft, eat not, holding the tradition of the elders.  (4) And when they come from the market except they wash, they eat not. And many other things there be, which they have received to hold, as the washing of cups, and pots, brusen vessels, and of tables.  (5) Then the Pharisees and scribes asked him, Why walk not thy disciples according to the tradition of the elders, but eat bread with unwashen hands?  (6) He answered and said unto them, Well hath Esaias prophesied of you hypocrites, as it is written, This people honoureth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me.  (7) Howbeit in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.  (9) For laying aside the commandment of God, ye hold the tradition of men, as the washing of pots and cups; and many other such like things ye do.  (8) And he said unto them, Full well ye reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep your own tradition.  (10) For Moses said, Honour thy father and thy mother; and, Whoso curseth father or mother, let him die the death: (11) but ye say, If a man shall say to his father or mother, It is Corban, that is to say, a gift, by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me; he shall be free.  (12) And ye suffer him no more to do ought for his father or his mother; (13) making the word of God of none effect through your tra­
The Greek Pride.—Better, from the people, his disciples asked him into his heart, but into the belly, and instrument with which the Law was made null and void. same terms, the truth of Acts x. 15, “What God hath
least of His parables (chap. iv. 9, Matt. xiii. 10). And it (22) Covetousness, wickedness.
when he was entered into the house
without a man, that entering into him
people
ears to hear, let him hear.
defile him;
defile the man.
condition, which ye have delivered: and
many such like things do ye.
(14) And when he had called all the people unto him,* he said unto them, Hearken unto me every one of you, and understand: (15) There is nothing from without a man, that entering into him can defile him: but the things which come out of him, those are they that defile the man. (16) If any man have ears to hear, let him hear. (17) And when he was entered into the house from the people, his disciples asked him concerning the parable. (18) And he saith unto them, Are ye so without understanding also? Do ye not perceive, that whatsoever thing from without entereth into the man, it cannot defile him; (19) because it entereth not into his heart, but into the belly, and goeth out into the draught, purging all

Through your tradition.—Here the structure of the sentence points to the “tradition” as being the instrument with which the Law was made null and void. In Matt. xv. 6 the meaning is slightly different (see Note there).

Many such like things.—Assuming the words “washing of cups and pots,” in verse 8, to be genuine, there is an emphatic scorn expressed in this iteration of the same formula.

If any man have ears to hear.—It was with this formula that our Lord had closed some at into the text.

Purging all meats.—This also is peculiar to St. Mark, and presents some difficulties. In the commonly received text, the participle is in the neuter nominative, agreeing with the nominative to the verb “goeth out.” But in this construction it is difficult to see in what sense that which goeth into the mouth—itself an article of food, with no special character—can be said to purge or cleanse all other forms of food. The better MSS., however, give the participle in the masculine. This has been explained by many as a grammatical anomaly, and the participle being treated as if it agreed (though in a different case) with the word “draught” or “cesspool,” the latter is said to cleanse all meats, as removing the excreta, or impure parts, from them, and leaving only that which nourishes the body. A far better construction, both as to grammar and meaning, is found by making the word “purging,” or better, cleansing, agree with the subject of the verb “He saith,” in verse 18.

* Or, Gentile.

Through your tradition.—Here the structure of the sentence points to the “tradition” as being the instrument with which the Law was made null and void. In Matt. xv. 6 the meaning is slightly different (see Note there).

Many such like things.—Assuming the words “washing of cups and pots,” in verse 8, to be genuine, there is an emphatic scorn expressed in this iteration of the same formula.

If any man have ears to hear.—It was with this formula that our Lord had closed some at into the text.

Purging all meats.—This also is peculiar to St. Mark, and presents some difficulties. In the commonly received text, the participle is in the neuter nominative, agreeing with the nominative to the verb “goeth out.” But in this construction it is difficult to see in what sense that which goeth into the mouth—itself an article of food, with no special character—can be said to purge or cleanse all other forms of food. The better MSS., however, give the participle in the masculine. This has been explained by many as a grammatical anomaly, and the participle being treated as if it agreed (though in a different case) with the word “draught” or “cesspool,” the latter is said to cleanse all meats, as removing the excreta, or impure parts, from them, and leaving only that which nourishes the body. A far better construction, both as to grammar and meaning, is found by making the word “purging,” or better, cleansing, agree with the subject of the verb “He saith,” in verse 18.

He saith this . . . and in so saying, cleanseth all meats.” So taken, the words anticipate, in almost the same forms, the truth of Acts x. 15, “What God hath cleansed, that call not thou common.” The construction is tenable grammatically, has the support of high authority both ancient and modern, and obviously gives a much better sense. It is a possible conjecture that the words “cleansing all meats” may have been, at first, a marginal note (like the addition in verse 16), attached to “He saith,” and have afterwards found their way into the text.

Covetousness, wickedness. —The Greek words for these are, like the preceding, in the plural, as pointing to the manifold forms in which the sins show themselves.

An evil eye.—As explained by Matt. xx. 15 (where see Note), the “evil eye” is that which looks askance on the good of others—i.e., envy in its most malignant form.

Pride.—Better, perhaps, haughtiness. This is the only passage in the New Testament where the word so translated occurs. The cognate adjective meets us in Rom. i. 30; 2 Tim. iii. 2.

Foolishness.—This, again, is a rare word in the New Testament, meeting us only in 2 Cor. xi. 17, 21. As interpreted by Prov. xiv. 18, xv. 21, it is the fanny which consists in the absence of fear of God, the infatuation of impiety.

And from thence he arose.—See Notes on Matt. xv. 21–28.

Tyre and Sidon.—The better MSS. omit the latter name here, and reserve it for verse 31, where see Note.

Entered into an house.—The fact is peculiar to St. Mark, and seems specified as an indication of our Lord’s wish to avoid publicity.

A Greek.—i.e., in the sense which the word had gained in Palestine, a Gentile, as in Rom. i. 16; ii. 9. 10. The modern use of “Frank” in the East for Europeans of every country, offers an analogous extension of the original meaning of a name.

Syro-Phcenician.—The word, which occurs in Juvæan (Sat. viii. 159), may be noted as an instance of
(27) But Jesus said unto her, Let the children first be filled: for it is not meet to take the children’s bread, and to cast it unto the dogs. (28) And she answered and said unto him, Yes, Lord: yet the dogs under the table eat of the children’s crumbs. (29) And he said unto her, For this saying go thy way; the devil is gone out of thy daughter. (30) And when she was come to her house, she found the devil gone out, and her daughter laid upon the bed.

(31) And again, departing from the coasts of Tyre and Sidon, he came unto the sea of Galilee, through the midst of the coasts of Decapolis. (32) And they bring unto him one that was deaf, and had an impediment in his speech; and they beseech him to put his hand upon him, (33) And he took him aside from the multitude, and put his fingers into his ears, and he spit, and touched his tongue; (34) and looking up to heaven, he sighed, and saith unto him, Ephphatha, that is, Be opened. (35) And straightway his ears were opened, and the string of his tongue was loosed, and he spake plain. (36) And he charged them that they should tell no man: but the more he charged them, so much the more a great deal they published it; (37) and were beyond measure astonished, saying, He hath done all things well: he maketh both the deaf to hear, and the dumb to speak.

CHAPTER VIII.—(1) In those days the multitude being very great, and having nothing to eat, Jesus called his disciples unto him, and saith unto them, (2) I have compassion on the multitude, because they have now been with me three days, and have nothing to eat: (3) and if I send them away fasting to their own homest...
houses, they will faint by the way: for divers of them came from far. (4) And his disciples answered him, From whence can a man satisfy these men with bread here in the wilderness? (5) And he asked them, How many loaves have ye? And they said, Seven. (6) And he commanded the people to sit down on the ground: and he took the seven loaves, and gave thanks, and brake, and gave to his disciples to set before them; and they did set them before the people. (7) And they had a few small fishes: and he blessed, and commanded to set them also before them. (8) So they did eat, and were filled: and they took up of the broken meat that was left seven baskets. (9) And they that had eaten were about four thousand: and he sent them away. (10) And straightway he entered into a ship with his disciples, and came into the parts of Dalmanutha. (11) And the Pharisees came forth, and began to question with him, seeking of him a sign from heaven, tempting him. (12) And he sighed deeply in his spirit, and saith, Why doth this generation seek after a sign? verily I say unto you, There shall no sign be given unto this generation. (13) And he left them, and entering into the ship again departed to the other side.

(14) Now the disciples had forgotten to take bread, neither had they in the ship with them more than one loaf. (15) And he charged them, saying, Take heed, beware of the leaven of the Pharisees, and of the leaven of Herod. (16) And they reasoned among themselves, saying, It is because we have no bread. (17) And when Jesus knew it, he saith unto them, Why reason ye, because ye have no bread? perceive ye not yet, neither understand? have ye your heart yet hardened? (18) Having eyes, see ye not? and having ears, hear ye not? and do ye not remember? (19) When I brake the five loaves among five thousand, how many baskets full of fragments took ye up? They say unto him, Twelve. (20) And when the seven among four thousand, how many baskets full of fragments took ye up? And they said, Seven. (21) And he said unto them, How is it that ye do not understand? (22) And he cometh to Bethsaida; and they bring a blind man unto him, and besought him to touch him. (23) And he took the blind man by the hand, and led him out of the town; and when he

(4) Satisfy.—The verb is the same as the “filled” of Mark vii. 27.

Here in the wilderness.—The word here, as in Matt. xv. 33, is not the one usually employed, and is abstract, not concrete, in its form, suggesting the idea, i.e., of “loneliness;” and through that, of a lonely place. It is used in a like sense in 2 Cor. xi. 26; Heb. xi. 38. Like many other abstract words, it seems to have tended to a concrete meaning; but there is always an appreciable shade of difference.

(6) To sit down.—The Greek word implies the usual Eastern position of reclining, rather than our sitting.

Broken meat.—Better, fragments.

Seven baskets.—See Note on Matt. xv. 37.

(10) He entered into a ship.—Better, the ship, or boat.

Dalmanutha.—St. Mark’s use of the word, instead of the Magdala or “Magdada” of St. Matthew, may be noted as an instance of his independence. It is mentioned by no other writer. On its probable site, see Note on Matt. xv. 39.

(11–12) And the Pharisees came forth.—See Notes on Matt. vii. 1–4. St. Mark, it may be noted, does not mention the presence of the Pharisees, and gives only part of our Lord’s answer. On the other hand, he characteristically describes the “sighing deeply in spirit” in verse 12, which St. Matthew does not give.

(12) There shall no sign be given.—We note the omission of “the sign of the prophet Jonas,” as given in Matt. xvi. 4.

(13–21) See Notes on Matt. xvi. 4–12.

(14) Now the disciples.—Better, and the disciples, in close connection with the preceding verse, and not as the beginning of a new section.

More than one loaf.—Another detail peculiar to St. Mark.

(15) He charged them.—The verb is in the imperfect tense, and implies that the command was more than once repeated. Hence they, too, “were reasoning;” more than once, what was the meaning of the precept on which so much stress was laid.

The leaven of Herod.—The words imply the presence among the questioners of verse 11 of others besides the Pharisees. On the connection between the “leaven of Herod” and that of “the Sadducees” in Matt. xvi. 6, see Note on that verse.

(17) Have ye your heart yet hardened?—The question is peculiar to St. Mark, as are also the two first questions in verse 18. The expression of indignant astonishment is characteristically more vivid and emphatic in St. Mark’s report.

(19–20) How many baskets . . . ?—The words for “baskets” are, as has been said, different in the two verses. (See Note on Matt. xv. 37.)

(23) And he cometh to Bethsaida.—This miracle also is recorded by St. Mark only. Judging by the localities named previously, Dalmanutha (verse 10), the passage across the lake (verse 13), and afterwards “the villages of Cæsarea Philippi” (verse 27), it is probable that this was the Bethsaida on the north-eastern shore of the Sea of Galilee.

(23) He took the blind man by the hand.—We note in the act the same considerate adaptation of
had spit on his eyes, and put his hands upon him, he asked him if he saw ought. (24) And he looked up, and said, I see men as trees, walking. (25) After that he put his hands again upon his eyes, and made him look up: and he was restored, and saw every man clearly. (26) And he sent him away to his house, saying, Neither go into the town, nor tell it to any in the town.

(27) And Jesus went out, and his disciples, into the towns of Cæsarea Philippi: and by the way he asked his disciples, saying unto them, Whom do men say that I am? (28) And they answered, John the Baptist: but some say Elias; and others, One of the prophets. (29) And he saith unto them, But whom say ye that I am? And Peter answereth and saith unto him, Thou art the Christ. (30) And he charged them that they should tell no

the method of healing to the man’s infirmities as in the case of the deaf man in chap. vii. 33. As far as the first three Gospels are concerned, these are the two instances of “spitting” here recorded, but it is one of the links that connect St. Mark with the fourth Gospel (John ix. 6).

If he saw ought.—The better MSS. give the very words, “Dost thou see ought?”

(34) I see men as trees, walking.—The better MSS. give two words expressing different forms of perception, “I behold men, for I see them walking as trees.” His sight was not yet clear, but he interpreted what it told him rightly. The naturalness of this description of the first impression of the restored sense strikes every reader. From the point of view which looks on our Lord’s miracles as having a symbolical character, and being, as it were, acted parables, we may see in it that which represents an analogous stage in the spiritual growth of men, when truths for which before they had no faculty of vision are seen for the first time, but are not as yet apprehended in their full or definite proportions. They need a second touch of the Divine Hand, the passing away of another film of ignorance or prejudice, and then they too see all things clearly.

(35) Every man.—The better MSS. give “all things.”

Clearly.—This is probably the right rendering of the true reading; but the received text gives a word which implies that he was far, as well as clear, sighted.

(36) Neither go into the town.—As in other works of healing, so in this, our Lord seems to have prescribed quietude after, as well as before, the miracle, as a spiritual discipline—partly, we may believe, because the work that had been done called for prayer for the right use of the new, or the restored, power; partly (as in Matt. xii. 15), because He would not seem Himself to court the fame of publicity. Following the line of thought taken in the Note on verse 24, we may extend the application to the work of spiritual illumination. Here also it is not good that the first clear apprehension of spiritual truths should be followed by the hasty utterances of the excitement of the new-born life.


The towns of Cæsarea Philippi.—Better, villages.

He asked his disciples.—The tense of the Greek verb implies that it was not a single question only, but a continued and, as it were, searching inquiry. The time was come to test the faith of the disciples thoroughly.

(39) And he charged them.—On the assumption of a connection between the writer of this Gospel and St. Peter (see Introduction), the omission of the promise to the latter, recorded so fully by St. Matthew, may fairly be regarded as an evidence of the humility of the Apostle, who shrank from what might seem a savour of self-assertion.

(31–33) And he began to teach them.—See Notes on Matt. xvi. 21–23. The points peculiar to St. Mark are, (1) that our Lord “spake that saying openly”—the absence of any reticence in this announcement of apparent failure was what startled the disciples; and (2) the graphic touch that as He rebuked Peter, He turned and looked, not on that Apostle only, but on the whole company of the disciples.

(34–36) And when he had called the people unto him with his disciples also, he said unto them, Whosoever will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me. (35) For whosoever will save his life shall lose it; but whosoever shall lose his life for my sake and the gospel’s, the same shall save it. (36) For what shall it profit a man of him. (38) And he began to teach them, that the Son of man must suffer many things, and be rejected of the elders, and of the chief priests, and scribes, and be killed, and after three days rise again. (39) And he spake that saying openly. And Peter took him, and began to rebuke him. (32) But when he had turned about and looked on his disciples, he rebuked Peter, saying, Get thee behind me, Satan: for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but the things that be of men.

(34) And when he had called the people unto him with his disciples also, he said unto them, Whosoever will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me. (35) For whosoever will save his life shall lose it; but whosoever shall lose his life for my sake and the gospel’s, the same shall save it. (36) For what shall it profit a

man of him. (38) And he began to teach them, that the Son of man must suffer many things, and be rejected of the elders, and of the chief priests, and scribes, and be killed, and after three days rise again. (39) And he spake that saying openly. And Peter took him, and began to rebuke him. (32) But when he had turned about and looked on his disciples, he rebuked Peter, saying, Get thee behind me, Satan: for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but the things that be of men.

(34) And when he had called the people unto him with his disciples also, he said unto them, Whosoever will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me. (35) For whosoever will save his life shall lose it; but whosoever shall lose his life for my sake and the gospel’s, the same shall save it. (36) For what shall it profit a

man of him. (38) And he began to teach them, that the Son of man must suffer many things, and be rejected of the elders, and of the chief priests, and scribes, and be killed, and after three days rise again. (39) And he spake that saying openly. And Peter took him, and began to rebuke him. (32) But when he had turned about and looked on his disciples, he rebuked Peter, saying, Get thee behind me, Satan: for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but the things that be of men.

(34) And when he had called the people unto him with his disciples also, he said unto them, Whosoever will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me. (35) For whosoever will save his life shall lose it; but whosoever shall lose his life for my sake and the gospel’s, the same shall save it. (36) For what shall it profit a
man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? (37) Or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul? (38) Whosoever therefore shall be ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation;* of him also shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels.

CHAPTER IX.—(1) And he said unto them, Verily I say unto you, That there be some of them that stand here, mountain apart by themselves: and he with power. (2) And after six days Jesus taketh with him Peter, and James, and John, and leadeth them up into an high mountain apart by themselves: and he was transfigured before them. (3) And his raiment became shining, exceeding white as snow; so as no fuller on earth can white them. (4) And there appeared unto them Elias with Moses: and they were talking with Jesus. (5) And Peter answered and said to Jesus, Master, it is good for us to be here: and let us make three tabernacles; one for thee, and one for Moses and one for Elias. (6) For he wist not what to say; for they were sore afraid. (7) And there was a cloud that overshadowed them: and a voice came out of the cloud, saying, This is my beloved Son: hear him. (8) And suddenly, when they had looked round about, they saw no man any more, save Jesus only with themselves. (9) And as they came down from the mountain, he charged them that they should tell no man what things they had seen, till the Son of man were risen from the dead. (10) And they kept that saying with themselves, questioning one with another what the rising from the dead should mean.

(11) And they asked him, saying, Why say the scribes that Elias must first come? (12) And he answered and told them, Elias verily cometh first, and restoreth all things; and how it is written of the Son of man, that he must suffer many things, and be set at nought. (13) But I say unto you, That Elias is indeed come, and they have done unto him whatsoever they listed, as it is written of him.

had, perhaps, better be rendered "forfeit," as implying, what the other word does not necessarily imply, the idea of a penalty. (38) Whosoever therefore.—Here St. Mark differs from St. Matthew, who omits these words, and agrees, though not quite verbally, with St. Luke. It is obvious that general as the words are, they had a special bearing on those who, like Peter, and probably the other disciples, had shown that they were "ashamed of" the words which had just been spoken.

This adulterous and sinful generation.—The words are not found in St. Luke’s report, but they agree with language which our Lord had used before (Matt. xii. 39; xvi. 4). Their force here lies in the contrast drawn between those from whose frown or scorn the disciples were now shrinking; and the bright hosts in whose presence the faithless should be put to shame when the Son of Man should come in His glory. They were to look on this picture and on that, and ask themselves which ordeal was the most terrible.

IX.

(1) And he said unto them.—The division of the chapters is obviously wrong. The verse ought to come, as in St. Matthew and St. Luke, in immediate connection with the foregoing discourse. The present arrangement may have been made with a view of connecting it with the Transfiguration, as that which was the fulfilment of the promise; but if so, it was based on what is at least a doubtful interpretation. (See Note on Matt. xvi. 28.) The form of the words in St. Mark agrees with St. Luke’s report, “until they shall see the kingdom of God,” rather than with St. Matthew’s “the Son of Man coming in His kingdom.”

Come with power.—The Greek verb implies that they should see it not “coming,” but as having actually come in its completeness. (2–8) And after six days.—See Notes on Matt. xvii. 1–8.

Shining.—Better, perhaps, "glittering.

Exceeding white as snow.—The two last words are wanting in the best MSS. The comparison of the bright raiment with clothes that had just passed through the fuller’s or bleacher’s hands, is, in its homely vividness, peculiar to St. Mark.

Master.—St. Mark, after his manner, gives the Hebrew “Rabbi” for the “Lord” of St. Matthew, and the “Master” of St. Luke.

This is my beloved Son.—It will be noted that St. Mark omits the words “in whom I am well pleased.”

And as they came down from the mountain.—See Notes on Matt. xvi. 9–13.

And they kept that saying with themselves.—We again note what we may describe as a characteristic touch, analysing the mental condition of the disciples in relation to their Master’s teaching.

As it is written of him.—The words are peculiar to St. Mark, and probably point (1) to the special prediction of the coming of Elijah in Mal. iv., and (2) to the parallelism between the career of the Baptist and that of the Tishbite prophet. What had been written of or for the one, the record of bold rebuke and consequent suffering for the Truth, had received its fulfilment in the other.
(14) And when he came to his disciples, he saw a great multitude about them, and the scribes questioning with them. (15) And straightway all the people, when they beheld him, were greatly amazed, and running to him saluted him. (16) And he asked the scribes, What question ye with them? (17) and one of the multitude answered and said, Master, I have brought unto thee my son, which hath a dumb spirit; and wheresoever he taketh him, he teareth him: and he foameth, and gnasheth with his teeth, and pineth away: and I spake to thy disciples that they should cast him out; and they could not. (18) He answereth him, and saith, O faithless generation, how long shall I be with you? how long shall I suffer you? bring him unto me. (19) And they brought him unto him: and when he saw him, straightway the spirit tare him; and he fell on the ground, and wallowed foaming. (20) And he asked his father, How long is it ago since this came unto him? And he said, Of a child. (21) And oftentimes it hath cast him into the fire, and into the waters, to destroy him: but if thou canst do any thing, have compassion on us, and help us. (22) Jesus said unto him, If thou canst believe, all things are possible to him that believeth. (23) And straightway the father of the child cried out, and said with tears, Lord, I believe; help thou mine unbelief. (24) When Jesus saw that the people came running together, he rebuked the foul spirit, saying unto him, Thou dumb and deaf spirit, I charge thee, come out of him, and enter no more into him. (25) And the spirit cried, and rent him sore, and came out of him: and he was as one dead; insomuch that many said, He is dead. (26) But Jesus took him by the hand, and lifted him up; and he arose. (27) And when he was come into the house, his disciples asked him privately, Why could not we cast him out? (28) And he said unto them, This kind can come forth by nothing, but by prayer and fasting.

Was this the way in which a man should speak who came to Him as a Healer? Such a one had to learn the great primary lesson that “all things were possible to him that believeth,” that the secret of previous failure lay, in part at least, in his own want of faith, as well as in that of the scribes and disciples who had tried their arts of exorcism in vain.

And straightway the father of the child cried out, and said with tears, Lord, I believe; help thou mine unbelief. (24) When Jesus saw that the people came running together, he rebuked the foul spirit, saying unto him, Thou dumb and deaf spirit, I charge thee, come out of him, and enter no more into him.

Enter no more into him. —We may note in these words, used by our Lord in this case only, a tender adaptation to the weak faith of the father. He had seen so many relapses, the last state worse than the first, that it was hard for him to take in the thought that the cure would be complete and permanent.

Rent him sore. —The verb is the same as the “tare him” of verse 20, and implies a spasm, as of horror, convulsing the whole frame. The corpse-like falling as one dead, and the cry of many (better, “the many”—i.e., “the greater part, most of them”) that he was dead, and our Lord’s taking the boy by the hand, and the question of the disciples, are all peculiar to St. Mark.

But by prayer and fasting. —The better MSS. omit the last two words. It is possible that they may have been added, like the “tears” of verse 24, to strengthen the words actually spoken, by bringing in
And they departed thence, and passed through Galilee; and he would not that any man should know it. (31) For he taught his disciples, and said unto them, The Son of man is delivered into the hands of men, and they shall kill him; and after that he is killed, he shall rise the third day. (32) But they understood not that saying, and were afraid to ask him. (33) And he came to Capernaum: and being in the house he asked them, What was it that ye disputed among yourselves by the way? (34) But they held their peace: for by the way they had disputed among themselves, who should be the greatest. (35) And he sat down, and called the twelve, and saith unto them, If any man desire to be first, the same shall be last of all, and servant of all. (36) And he took a child, and set it in the midst of them: and when he had taken him in his arms, he said unto them, Whosoever shall receive one of such children in my name, receiveth me: and whosoever shall receive me, receiveth not me, but him that sent me. (37) And John answered him, saying, Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name; and he followeth not us: and we forbade him, because he followeth not us. (38) But Jesus said, Forbid him not: for there is no man which shall do a miracle in my name, that can lightly speak evil of me. (39) For he that is loved a little child in the name of Christ, i.e., for His sake, and after His manner, we are sharers in His spirit, and when we love or receive Him who was one with the Father, we enter into fellowship with Him who is the Supreme and Eternal Love. (Comp. John xiv. 10, 23.) (40) And John answered him, saying, Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name, and he followeth not us: and we forbade him, because he followeth not us. (41) But Jesus said, Forbid him not: for there is no man which shall do a miracle in my name, that can lightly speak evil of me. (42) For he that is loved a little child in the name of Christ, i.e., for His sake, and after His manner, we are sharers in His spirit, and when we love or receive Him who was one with the Father, we enter into fellowship with Him who is the Supreme and Eternal Love. (Comp. John xiv. 10, 23.) (43) And John answered him, saying, Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name; and he followeth not us: and we forbade him, because he followeth not us. (44) But Jesus said, Forbid him not: for there is no man which shall do a miracle in my name, that can lightly speak evil of me. (45) For he that is loved a little child in the name of Christ, i.e., for His sake, and after His manner, we are sharers in His spirit, and when we love or receive Him who was one with the Father, we enter into fellowship with Him who is the Supreme and Eternal Love. (Comp. John xiv. 10, 23.) (46) And John answered him, saying, Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name; and he followeth not us: and we forbade him, because he followeth not us. (47) But Jesus said, Forbid him not: for there is no man which shall do a miracle in my name, that can lightly speak evil of me. (48) For he that is loved a little child in the name of Christ, i.e., for His sake, and after His manner, we are sharers in His spirit, and when we love or receive Him who was one with the Father, we enter into fellowship with Him who is the Supreme and Eternal Love. (Comp. John xiv. 10, 23.) (49) And John answered him, saying, Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name; and he followeth not us: and we forbade him, because he followeth not us. (50) But Jesus said, Forbid him not: for there is no man which shall do a miracle in my name, that can lightly speak evil of me. (51) For he that is loved a little child in the name of Christ, i.e., for His sake, and after His manner, we are sharers in His spirit, and when we love or receive Him who was one with the Father, we enter into fellowship with Him who is the Supreme and Eternal Love. (Comp. John xiv. 10, 23.)
not against us.

(41) For whosoever shall give you a cup of water to drink in my name, because ye belong to Christ, verily I say unto you, he shall not lose his reward. (42) And whosoever shall offend one of these little ones that believe in me, it is better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and he were cast into the sea. (43) And if thy hand offend thee, cut it off: it is better for thee to enter into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched: (44) where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.

wants, in ways more or less irregular, or with faith more or less imperfect. In all such cases we need to recall the words: "For as many be sanctified, so much is it better for us." (45) Whosoever shall give you a cup of water—See Note on Matt. x. 42. The reproduction of the promise in so different a context is significant as an instance of our Lord's method of teaching, reiterating words of blessing and of wisdom till they were engraved indelibly on the minds of those who heard them.

(42-45) Whosoever shall offend.—See Notes on Matt. xviii. 6-9. The verbal, or all but verbal, reproduction of those verses indicates the impression which they had made on the disciples. It may be noted, however, that St. Mark omits the "Woe unto the world because of offences . . ." which we find in St. Matthew, and that the emphatic thrice-repeated words, "Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is never quenched," are omitted in some of the best MSS., and that the same MSS., and others, omit both verses 44 and 45, leaving verse 48 to stand as the only description of Gehenna.

(43) Into hell.—Better, Gehenna, to distinguish it from the other word "Hades," also translated "Hell." (See Notes on Matt. v. 29.)

(45) Where their worm dieth not.—The words are taken almost litteratim from the closing verse of Isaiah (lxvi. 24), where they appear as part of the description of the triumph of Jehovah. The true worshippers should serve in His Temple continually, and they should go forth and see the carcases of the transgressors, "for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched, and they shall be an abhorrence to all flesh." The scenery is, like that of Isa. lxiii. 1-8, drawn from the slaughter of earthly battles, and the prophet exults in vision over the putrid carcases and the blazing fires that consume them, and thinks of that scene as perpetuated throughout eternity.

The imagery was thus already familiar, and it coalesced naturally with the ideas of Gehenna. Possibly the valley of Hinnom, as the great cloaca of Jerusalem, receiving its solid as well as its fluid sewage, with putrid offal and blazing fires consuming them, had become in this way a visible type of the unseen Gehenna; but the authorities are hardly definite enough to warrant the positive statement that it presented such a scene. The interpretation of the symbols (for a literal acceptance of the words is obviously out of the question) is not far to seek. Well-nigh all Christian thinkers have seen in the gnawing worm, the anguished conscience of the memory of a sin that retains its wonted force as the expression of the righteousness of God (Heb. xii. 29) manifesting itself to the consciousness of the sinner in all its awfulness, purifying where there is any desire, and therefore capacity, for purification, but never altering its essential character, even as the fire "never can be quenched." So much the words declare distinctly, as the law of righteous retribution. They do not absolutely exclude the thought that the fire may consume or destroy that which it cannot purify; still less do they affirm that it will.

(46) Every one shall be salted with fire.—The verse presents considerable difficulties, both as regards the reading and the interpretation. Many of the best MSS. omit the latter clause; one of the best omits the first. It is as if transcribers felt that either clause was more intelligible by itself than the two taken together. Accepting both clauses as, on the whole, sufficiently authenticated, we have to deal with their meaning. (1) The most generally received interpretation of the first clause is that which eliminates from the process of salting the idea of purifying, or preserving from corruption, and sees in it only the symbol of perpetuation. So taken, the words become an emphatic assertion of the endlessness of future punishment—as in Kebbe's lines:

"Salted with fire, they seem to show
How spirits lost in endless woe
May undecaying live."

Against this, however, it may be urged (a) that it arbitrarily limits the "every one" of the sentence to those who are finally condemned and are cast into Gehenna; (b) that it is scarcely conceivable that the same word, "salted," should be used in such contrasted senses in the same verse; (c) that the uniform symbolism of "salt," as representing the spiritual element that purifies and preserves from taint (see Matt. v. 13; Luke xiv. 34; Col. iv. 6; Lev. ii. 13), is against this application of it. We have to ask whether "fire" appears with a like symbolism and with an application as universal as that of this verse. And the answer is found partly in "the baptism with the Holy Ghost and with fire" of which the Baptist spoke (Matt. iii. 11); the "fire already kindled" of our Lord's teaching (Mark ix. 49); the "fire" which "shall try every man's work of what sort it is" of 1 Cor. iii. 13; the "fire that tries men's faith" of 1 Pet. i. 7. In these passages there can be no shadow of doubt that "fire" represents the
every sacrifice shall be salted with salt.  
(50) Salt is good: but if the salt have lost his saltiness, wherewith will ye season it? Have salt in yourselves, and have peace one with another.

CHAPTER X.—(1) And he arose from thence, and cometh into the coasts of Judea by the farther side of Jordan: and the people resort unto him again; and, as he was wont, he taught them again.

(2) And the Pharisees came to him, and asked him, Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife? tempting him.

(3) And he answered and said unto them, What did Moses command you?  
(4) And they said, Moses suffered to write a bill of divorcement, and to put her away.  
(5) And Jesus answered and said unto them, For the hardness of your heart he wrote you this precept.  
(6) But from the beginning of the creation God made them male and female. (7) For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and cleave to his wife: (8) and they twain shall be one flesh: so then they are no more twain, but one flesh.  
(9) What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder. (10) And in the house his disciples asked him again of the same matter.  
(11) And he saith unto them, Whosoever shall put away his wife, and marry another, committeth adultery against her.  
(12) And if a woman shall put away her husband, and be married to another, she committeth adultery.  
(13) And they brought young children to him, that he should touch them: and his disciples rebuked those that brought them. (14) But when Jesus saw it, he was much displeased, and said unto them, Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of heaven.
come unto me, and forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God. (15) Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein. (16) And he took them up in his arms, put his hands upon them, and blessed them.

(17) And when he was gone forth into the way, there came one running, and kneeled to him, and asked him, Good Master, what shall I do that I may inherit eternal life? (18) And Jesus said unto him, Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is, God. (19) Thou knowest the commandments, Do not commit adultery, Do not kill, Do not steal, Do not bear false witness, Defraud not, Honour thy father and mother. (20) And he answered and said unto him, Master, all these have I observed from my youth. (21) Then Jesus beholding him loved him, and said unto him, One thing thou lackest: go thy way, sell whatsoever thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come, take up the cross, and follow me. (22) And he was sad at that saying, and went away grieved: for he had great possessions.

(23) And Jesus looked round about, and saith unto his disciples, How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God! (24) And the disciples were astonished at his words. But Jesus answereth again, and saith unto them, Children, how hard is it for them that trust in riches to enter into the kingdom of God! (25) It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God. (26) And they were astonished out of measure, saying among themselves, Who then can be saved? (27) And Jesus looking upon them saith, With men it is impossible, but not with God: for with God all things are possible.

(28) Then Peter began to say unto him, Lo, we have left all, and have followed thee. (29) And Jesus answered and said, Verily I say unto you, There is no man that hath left house, or taking up the cross, and follow me. Had no wages of the reaper been kept back: no sharp bargains driven with widows or orphans or the poor? (30) Then Jesus beholding him loved him.—Better, looking, or gazing on him. The fact is narrated by St. Mark only, and implies that the love showed itself in the steadfast look, perhaps also in the kiss upon the brow with which the Rabbis of the time showed their approval of their more promising disciples. Come, take up the cross.—This also is peculiar to St. Mark. In using such words our Lord taught the questioner, as He had before taught His disciples, with what clear prevision He looked forward to the form and manner of His death.

(31) And he was sad at that saying.—Better, He frowned. The word is the same as that translated “lowering” in Matt. xvi. 3. (32) And Jesus looked round.—The glance and gesture are mentioned by St. Mark only. (33) How hard is it for them that trust in riches.—The words have the appearance of limiting, and so softening, the seeming sternness of the previous utterance. There is, however, good reason for thinking, as they are wanting in the best MSS., that they were added by some one who sought to tone down the words of warning to what seemed a rational medium. Omitting the doubtful words, the sentence runs, “How hard is it to enter into the kingdom of God!”—hard alike for rich and poor, though, as the words that follow show, it was hardest for the former.

(34) Then Peter began to say unto him.—See Notes on Matt. xix. 27—30. St. Mark omits the question which St. Matthew adds to St. Peter’s words, “What shall we have therefore?” (35) Verily I say unto you.—St. Mark, possibly as writing for Gentile converts, omits the special pro-
brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my
sake, and the gospel's; (30) but he shall receive an hundredfold now in this
time, houses, and brethren, and sisters, and
mothers, and children, and lands, with
persecutions; and in the world to come
eternal life. (31) But many that are first
shall be last;" and the last first.

(32) And they were in the way going
up to Jerusalem; and Jesus went before them: and they were amazed;
and as they followed, they were afraid.
And he took again the twelve, and
began to tell them what things should
happen unto him, (33) saying, Behold, we go up to Jerusalem; and the Son of
man shall be delivered unto the chief
priests, and unto the scribes; and they
shall condemn him to death, and shall
deliver him to the Gentiles: (34) and
they shall mock him, and shall scourge
him, and shall spit upon him, and shall
kill him: and the third day he shall
rise again.

(35) And James and John, the sons of
Zebedee, came unto him, saying, Master,
we would that thou shouldest do for us
whatsoever we shall desire. (36) And he
said unto them, What would ye that I
should do for you? (37) They said unto
him, Grant unto us that we may sit, one
on thy right hand, and the other on thy
left hand, in thy glory. (38) But Jesus
said unto them, Ye know not what ye
ask: can ye drink of the cup that I
drink of? and be baptized with the
baptism that I am baptized with? (39) And they said unto him, We can.
And Jesus said unto them, Ye shall
indeed drink of the cup that I drink of;
and with the baptism that I am baptized
withal shall ye be baptized: (40) but to
sit on my right hand and on my left
hand is not mine to give; but it shall be
given to them for whom it is prepared.
And when the ten heard it, they
began to be much displeased with James
and John. (42) But Jesus called them
to him, and saith unto them, Ye know
that they which are accounted 1 to rule
over the Gentiles exercise lordship over
them; and their great ones exercise
authority upon them. (43) But so shall
it not be among you: but whosoever
will be great among you, shall be your
minister: (44) and whosoever of you
shall be the chiefest, shall be servant of all.
For even the Son of man came not
to be ministered unto, but to minister,
and to give his life a ransom for many.
And they came to Jericho: and

1 Or, think good.
2 Luke 22. 23.
3 Luke 22. 22.
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as he went out of Jericho with his disciples and a great number of people, blind Bartimaeus, the son of Timaeus, sat by the highway side begging.

(47) And when he heard that it was Jesus of Nazareth, he began to cry out, and say, Jesus, thou son of David, have mercy on me. (48) And many charged him that he should hold his peace; but he cried the more a great deal, saying, Jesus, son of David, have mercy on me. (49) And Jesus stood still, and commanded him to be called. And they called the blind man, saying unto him, Be of good comfort; he calleth thee. (50) And he, casting away his garment, rose, and made thee whole. (51) And immediately he received his sight, and followed Jesus in the way.

CHAPTER XI.—(1) And when they came nigh to Jerusalem, unto Bethpage and Bethany, at the mount of Olives, he senteth forth two of his disciples, (2) and saith unto them, Go your way into the village over against you: and as soon as ye be entered into it, ye shall find a colt tied, whereon never man sat; loose him, and bring him. (3) And if any man say unto you, Why do ye this? say ye that the Lord hath need of him; and straightway he will send him hither. (4) And they went their way, and found the colt tied by the door without in a place where two ways met; and they loose him. (5) And certain of them that stood there said unto them, What do ye, loosing the colt? (6) And they said unto them even as Jesus had commanded: and they let them go. (7) And they brought the colt to Jesus, and cast their garments on him; and he sat upon him. (8) And many spread their garments in the way: and others cut down branches off the trees, and strawed them in the way. (9) And they that went before, and they that followed, cried, saying, Hosanna; Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord: (10) Blessed be the kingdom of our father King.
The Barren Fig-tree.

David, that cometh in the name of the Lord: Hosanna in the highest. (11) And Jesus went into Jerusalem, and into the temple: and when he had looked round about upon all things, and now the eventide was come, he went out unto Bethany with the Twelve.

(12) And on the morrow, when they were come from Bethany, he was hungry. (13) And seeing a fig tree afar off having leaves, he came, if haply he might find any thing thereon: and when he came to it, he found nothing but leaves; for the time of figs was not yet.

(14) And Jesus answered and said unto it, No man eat fruit of thee hereafter for ever. And his disciples heard it.

(15) And they come to Jerusalem: and Jesus went into the temple, and began to cast out them that sold and bought in the temple, and overthrew the tables of the moneychangers, and the seats of them that sold doves; (16) and would not suffer that any man should carry any vessel through the temple. (17) And he taught, saying unto them, Is it not written, My house shall be called of all nations the house of prayer? but ye have made it a den of thieves. (18) And the scribes and chief priests heard it, and sought how they might destroy him: for they feared him, because all the people was astonished at his doctrine. (19) And when even was come, he went out of the city.

(20) And in the morning, as they passed by, they saw the fig tree dried up from the roots. (21) And Peter calling to remembrance saith unto him, Master, behold, the fig tree which thou cursedst is withered away. (22) And Jesus answering saith unto them, Have faith in God. (23) For verily I say unto you, That whosoever shall say unto this mountain, Be thou cast into the sea; and shall not doubt in his heart, but shall believe that those things which he saith shall come to pass; he shall have whatsoever he saith. (24) Therefore I say unto you, What things soever ye desire, when ye pray, believe that ye receive them, and ye shall have them. (25) And when ye stand praying, forgive, if ye have ought against any: that your Father also which is in heaven may forgive you your
there come to him the chief priests, and the scribes, and the elders, (29) and say unto him, By what authority dost thou these things? and who gave thee this authority to do these things? (30) And Jesus answered them saying, whether it be from heaven, or of men? (31) And they reasoned with themselves, saying, If we shall say, From heaven; he will say, Why then did ye not believe him? (32) But if we shall say, Of men; they feared the people: for all men counted John, that he was a prophet indeed. (33) And they answered and said unto Jesus, We cannot tell. And Jesus answering saith unto them, Neither do I tell you by what authority I do these things.

CHAPTER XII.—(1) And he began to speak unto them by parables. (2) A certain man planted a vineyard, and set an hedge about it, and digged a place for the winefat, and built a tower, and let it out to husbandmen, and went into a far country. (3) And at the season he sent to the husbandmen a servant, that he might receive from the husbandmen of the fruit of the vineyard. (4) And they caught him, and beat him, and sent him away empty. (5) And again he sent unto them another servant; and at him they cast stones, and wounded him in the head, and sent him away shamefully handled. (6) And again he sent another; and him they killed, and many others; beating some, and killing some. (7) Having yet therefore one son, his well-beloved, he sent him also last unto them, saying, They will reverence my son. (8) But those husbandmen said among themselves, This is the heir; come, let us kill him, and the inheritance shall be our's. (9) And they took him, and killed him, and cast him out of the vineyard. (10) And have ye not read this scripture; The stone which the builders rejected is become the head of the corner: this was the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes? (11) And they sought to lay hold on him, but...
feared the people: for they knew that he had spoken the parable against them: and he left him, and went their way.

(13) And they send unto him certain of the Pharisees and of the Herodians, to catch him in his words. (14) And when they were come, they say unto him, Master, we know that thou art true, and carest for no man: for thou regardest not the person of men, but teachest the way of God in truth: Is it lawful to give tribute to Caesar, or not? (15) Shall we give, or shall we not give? But he, knowing their hypocrisy, said unto them, Why tempt ye me? bring me a penny, that I may see it. (16) And they brought it. And he saith unto them, Whose is this image and superscription? And they said unto him, Caesar's. (17) And Jesus answering said unto them,Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's. And they marvelled at him.

(18) Then come unto him the Sadducees, which say there is no resurrection; and they asked him, saying, (19) Master, Moses wrote unto us, If a man's brother die, and leave his wife behind him, and leave no children, that his brother should take his wife, and raise up seed unto his brother. (20) Now there were seven brethren: and the first took his wife, and dying left no seed. (21) And the second took her, and died, neither left he any seed: and the third likewise. (22) And the seven had her, and left no seed: last of all the woman died also. (23) In the resurrection therefore, when they shall rise, whose wife shall she be of them? for the seven had her to wife. (24) And Jesus answering said unto them, Do ye not therefore err, because ye know not the scriptures, neither the power of God? (25) For when they shall rise from the dead, they neither marry, nor are given in marriage; but are as the angels which are in heaven. (26) And as touching the dead, that they rise: have ye not read in the book of Moses, how in the bush God spake unto him, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? (27) He is not the God of the dead, but the God of the living: ye therefore do greatly err.

(28) And one of the scribes came, and having heard them reasoning together, and perceiving that he had answered them well, asked him, Which is the first commandment of all? (29) And Jesus answered him, The first of all the commandments is, Hear, O Israel; The Lord our God is one Lord: (30) and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength: this is the first commandment. (31) And the second is like, namely this, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. There is none other commandment greater than these. (32) And the scribe said unto him, Well,
Master, thou hast said the truth: for there is one God; and there is none other but he: (33) and to love him with all the heart, and with all the understanding, and with all the soul, and with all the strength, and to love his neighbour as himself, is more than all whole burnt offerings and sacrifices. (34) And when Jesus saw that he answered discreetly, he said unto him, Thou art not far from the kingdom of God. And no man after that durst ask him any question. (35) And Jesus answered and said, while he taught in the temple, How say the scribes that Christ is the son of David? (36) For David himself said by the Holy Ghost, The Lord said to my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool. (37) David therefore himself calleth him Lord; and whence is he then his son? And the common people heard him gladly. (38) And he said unto them in his doctrine, Beware of the scribes, which love to go in long clothing, and love salutations in the marketplaces, (39) and the chief seats in the synagogues, and the uppermost rooms at feasts: (40) which devour widows’ houses; and for a pretence make long prayers: these shall receive greater damnation. (41) And Jesus sat over against the treasury, and beheld how the people cast money into it: and many that were rich cast in much. (42) And there came a certain poor widow, and she threw in two mites, which make a farthing. (43) And he...
called unto him his disciples, and saith unto them, Verily I say unto you, That this poor widow hath cast more in, than all they which have cast into the treasury: (44) for all they did cast in of their abundance; but she of her want did cast in all that she had, even all her living.

CHAPTER XIII.—(1) And as he went out of the temple, one of his disciples saith unto him, Master, see what manner of stones and what buildings are here! (2) And Jesus answering said unto him, Seest thou these great buildings? there shall not be left one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down. (3) And as he sat upon the mount of Olives over against the temple, Peter and James and John and Andrew asked him privately, (4) Tell us, when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign when all these things shall be fulfilled? (5) And Jesus answering them began to say, Take heed lest any man deceive you: (6) for many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ; and shall deceive many. (7) And when ye shall hear of wars and rumours of wars, be ye not troubled: for such things must needs be; but the end shall not be yet. (8) For nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom: and there shall be earthquakes in divers places, and there shall be famines and troubles: these are the beginnings of sorrows. (9) But take heed to yourselves: for they shall deliver you up to councils; and in the synagogues ye shall be beaten: and ye shall be brought before rulers and kings for my sake, for a

judge of acts by other than a quantitative standard. For him the widow's mites and the ointment that might have been sold for 300 pence stood on the same level, so far as each was the expression of a generous and self-sacrificing love. (44) They did cast in of their abundance she of her want.—The contrast between the two Greek words is somewhat stronger: They of their superfluity she of her deficiency. We recognise the same standard of judgment, possibly even an allusive reference to our Lord's language, in St. Paul's praises of the churches of Macedonia, whose "deep poverty" had "abounded unto the riches of their liberality" (2 Cor. viii. 1—2). Even all her living.—This was not necessarily involved in the act itself, but the woman may have become known to our Lord in one of His previous visits to Jerusalem, or we may see in the statement an instance of His divine insight into the lives and characters of men, like that shown in the case of the woman of Samaria (John iv. 18).

XIII. (1) One of his disciples.—Note St. Mark's vivid way of giving the very words of the disciples, instead of saying with St. Matthew that they "came to show" the buildings of the Temple.

Here, again, the juxtaposition of narratives in St. Mark gives them a special point. The "stones" of Herod's Temple (for it was to him chiefly that it owed its magnificence) were of sculptured marble. The "buildings," or structures, included columns, chambers, porticoes that were, as St. Luke tells us (xxi. 3), the "votive offerings of the faithful." The disciples gazed on these with the natural admiration of Galilean peasants. In spite of the lesson they had just received—a lesson meant, it may be, to correct the tendency which our Lord discerned—they were still measuring things by their quantity and size. They admired the "goodly stones" more than the "widow's mite." They were now to be taught that, while the one should be spoken of throughout the whole world, the other should be destroyed, so that not a vestige should remain. We cannot say who spoke the words, but it is at least probable that it came from one of the four who are named in verse 3.

Over against the temple.—The view which the position commanded, and which St. Mark alone mentions, made all that followed more vivid and impressive. It may well have been at or near the very spot at which, a few days before, He had paused as "He beheld the city and wept over it." (Luke xix. 41).

Peter and James and John and Andrew.—The list of names is noticeable (1) as being given by St. Mark only; (2) as the only instance in which the name of Andrew appears in conjunction with the three who were on other occasions within the inner circle of companionship; (3) in the position given to Andrew, though the first called of the disciples (John i. 41), as the last in the list.

When shall these things be?—Note, as, perhaps, characteristic of a Gospel written for Gentiles, the use of the vaguer words for the more definite "sign of Thy coming, and of the end of the world," in Matt. xxiv. 3.

And Jesus answering them began to say.—The report which follows, common as it is to the first three Gospels, serves as an admirable example of the extent of variation compatible with substantial accuracy, and with the recognition of an inspired guidance as ensuring that accuracy. The discourse obviously made a deep impression on those who heard it, as afterwards on those to whom they repeated it, and so it passed from mouth to mouth, but probably it was not committed to writing till the events which it foretold came within the horizon. On all points common to the three records, see Notes on Matt. xxiv.

I am Christ.—Literally, I am He. The word Christ being a necessary inference from the context.

For such things must needs be.—Better, for it must needs be.

But take heed to yourselves.—The emphatic repetition of the warning is peculiar to St. Mark (comp. verse 23). The description of the sufferings of the disciples (verses 9—13) is found in Luke xxi. 12 and in Matt. x. 17—22 (where see Notes), but not in St. Matthew's report of this discourse.
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testimony against them. (10) And the gospel must first be published among all nations. (11) But when they shall lead you,¢ and deliver you up, take no thought beforehand what ye shall speak, neither do ye premeditate: but whatsoever shall be given you in that hour, that speak ye: for it is not ye that speak, but the Holy Ghost. (12) Now the brother shall betray the brother to death, and the father the son; and children shall rise up against their parents, and shall cause them to be put to death. (13) And ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake: but he that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved.

(14) But when ye shall see the abomination of desolation,4 spoken of by Daniel the prophet, standing where it ought not, (let him that readeth understand,) then let them that be in Judæa flee to the mountains: (15) and let him that is on the housetop not go down into the house, neither enter therein, to take any thing out of his house: (16) and let him that is in the field not turn back again for to take up his garment. (17) But woe to them that are with child, and to them that give suck in those days! (18) And pray ye that your flight be not in the winter. (19) For in those days shall be affliction, such as was not from the beginning of the creation which God created unto this time, neither shall be. (20) And except that the Lord had shortened those days, no flesh should be saved: but for the elect's sake, whom he hath chosen, he hath shortened the days. (21) And then if any man shall say to you, Lo, here is Christ; or, lo, he is there; believe him not: (22) for false Christs and false prophets shall rise, and shall shew signs and wonders, to seduce, if it were possible, even the elect. (23) But take ye heed: behold, I have foretold you all things.

(24) But in those days, after that tribulation, the sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, (25) and the stars of heaven shall fall, and the powers that are in heaven shall be shaken. (26) And then shall they see the Son of man coming in the clouds with great power and glory. (27) And then shall he send his angels, and shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from the uttermost part of the earth to the uttermost part of heaven. (28) Now learn a parable of the fig tree; When her branch is yet tender, and putteth forth leaves, ye know that summer is near: (29) so ye in like manner, when ye shall see these things come to pass, know that it is nigh, even at the doors. (30) Verily I say unto you, that this generation shall not pass, till all these things be done. (31) Heaven and earth shall pass away: but my words shall not pass away.

(32) But of that day and that hour

(11) It is not ye that speak, but the Holy Ghost.—In the parallel passage of Matt. x. 20 we have, "the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you." In Luke xxii. 31, "I will give you a mouth and wisdom." St. Mark's use of the more definite term reminds us of chap. xii. 36 (where see Note), and may, probably, be connected with St. Peter's habitual language. (Comp. Acts ii. 33—38; viii. 15; x. 47; 2 Pet. i. 21.)

(12) Now the brother.—Literally, and the brother.

(14—20) But when ye shall see.—See Notes on Matt. xxiv. 15—25.

Standing where it ought not.—St. Mark substitutes this for "in the holy place" of St. Matthew. Of the two, the former seems, in its enigmatic form, more likely to have been the phrase actually used; the latter to have been an explanation. The words "spoken of by Daniel the prophet" are omitted in many of the best MSS.

(19) From the beginning of the creation which God created.—Note the fuller form which replaces St. Matthew's "from the beginning of the world."
knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father. (33) Take ye heed, watch and pray: for ye know not when the time is. (34) For the Son of man is as a man taking a far journey, who left his house, and gave authority to his servants, and to every man his work, and commanded the porter to watch. (35) Watch ye therefore: for ye know not when the master of the house cometh, at even, or at midnight, or at the cockcrowing, or in the morning: (36) lest coming suddenly he find you sleeping. (37) And what I say unto you I say unto all, Watch.

implied by St. Paul, when he says that our Lord "being in the form of God . . . made Himself of no reputation" (or better, emptied Himself), "and took upon Him the form of a servant." (See Note on Phil. ii. 6, 7.) It is clear that we cannot consistently take the word "knoweth" as having a different meaning in this clause from that which it bears in the others; and we must therefore reject all interpretations which explain away the force of the words as meaning only that the Son did not declare His knowledge of the time of the far-off event.

(33) Take ye heed.—Note once more the characteristic iteration of the warning. It would almost seem, from the very different conclusions of the discourse in the three Gospels, as if they had been based up to this point on a common document which then stopped and left them to a greater divergency of memory or tradition. The omission of St. Matthew's reference to the history of Noah is, perhaps, characteristic of St. Mark's as a Gentile Gospel.

(34) For the Son of man is as a man taking a far journey.—The italics indicate, as usual, that the words are not found in the Greek. Their absence, seeming, as they do, essential to the meaning of the sentence, is singular. A possible explanation is, that we have an imperfect fragmentary report, as from a note taken at the time, of that which appears, in a developed form, as the parable of the Talents in Matt. xxi. 14—30.

And commanded the porter to watch.—This feature is unique in our Lord's parables, and, as such, seems to call for a special interpretation. The "servants" we accept at once as the disciples, and we understand generally what was the authority and the work assigned to them. But who was specifically the "gate-keeper" or "porter"? The answer appears to be found in the promise of the keys of the kingdom that had been made to St. Peter (Matt. xvi. 19). It was his work to open the door of that kingdom wide, to be ready for His Lord's coming in any of those manifold senses which experience would unfold to him. We may accordingly venture to trace in St. Mark's record, here as elsewhere, the influence of the Apostle. That word "the porter" was, he felt, meant for him, and this he remembered when much that had been recorded by others had faded from his recollection. If we adopt this application of the word here, it throws light on the somewhat difficult reference to the "porter" of the sheep-fold in John x. 3.

CHAPTER XIV.—(1) After two days was the feast of the passover, and of unleavened bread: and the chief priests and the scribes sought how they might take him by craft, and put him to death. (2) But they said, Not on the feast day, lest there be an uproar of the people.

(3) And being in Bethany in the house of Simon the leper, as he sat at meat, there came a woman having an alabaster box of ointment of spikenard very precious; and she brake the box, and poured it on his head. (4) And there were some that had indignation within themselves, and said, Why was this waste of the oint-

(35) The master of the house.—Better, the Lord of the house. The Greek word is not the same as that commonly rendered the "goodman" or "master" of the house.

At even, or at midnight.—The four times correspond roughly to the four watches of the night, beginning at 9 P.M., 3 A.M., 9 A.M. The words may be noted as having left, and having been intended to leave, on St. Peter's mind, the impression that the promise of the coming of his Lord was undeﬁned as to times or seasons, which is so prominent in 2 Pet. iii. Each of the seasons named has had its counterpart, we may well believe, embracing many centuries of the world's history.

(36) Lest coming suddenly he find you sleeping.—As before we traced a kind of echo of the parable of the Talents, so here we recognise something like a fragmentary reminiscence of that of the Wise and Foolish Virgins.

(37) Watch.—The impression which this command made on the hearts of Christians, is seen in a striking manner in the use of such names as Gregory, Vigilius, and the like.

XIV.

(1, 2) After two days was the feast of the passover.—See Notes on Matt. xxvi. 1—5. Better, was the passover, and the feast of unleavened bread. The latter designation is common to St. Mark and St. Luke, as an explanation intended for Gentile readers. The same fact accounts, perhaps, for the omission by both of the name of Caiaphas as the chief mover in the scheme.

(3—9) And being in Bethany.—See Notes on Matt. xxvi. 6—13.

Ointment of spikenard.—The Greek word so translated is, as the various renderings in the margin show, of doubtful import. It is used by St. John (xii. 3) in his account of the same facts.

She brake the box.—As in the "breaking through" the roof in Mark ii. 4, the vivid touch that brings the manner of the act distinctly before our eyes is found in St. Mark only. The Greek word implies not so much the breaking of the neck of the costly jar or flask, but the crushing it in its entirety with both her hands.

(4) There were some that had indignation.—Note St. Mark's limitation of the murmurers to some," as an intermediate stage between St. Matthew's "the disciples" and St. John's naming "Judas."
ment made? (5) for it might have been sold for more than three hundred pence, and have been given to the poor. And they murmured against her. (6) And Jesus said, Let her alone; why trouble ye her? she hath wrought a good work on me. (7) For ye have the poor with you always, and whosoever ye will ye may do them good: but me ye have not always. (8) She hath done what she could: she is come aforehand to anoint my body to the burying. (9) Verily I say unto you, Wheresoever this gospel shall be preached throughout the whole world, this also that she hath done shall be spoken of for a memorial of her.

(10) And Judas Iscariot, one of the twelve, went unto the chief priests, to betray him unto them. (11) And when they heard it, they were glad, and promised to give him money. And he sought how he might conveniently be betrayed.

(12) And the first day of unleavened bread, when they killed the passover, his disciples said unto him, Where wilt thou that we go and prepare that thou mayest eat the passover? (13) And he senteth forth two of his disciples, and saith unto them, Go ye into the city, and there shall meet you a man bearing a pitcher of water: follow him. (14) And wheresoever he shall go in, say ye to the goodman of the house, The Master saith, Where is the guestchamber, where I shall eat the passover with my disciples? (15) And he will shew you a large upper room furnished and prepared: there make ready for us. (16) And his disciples went forth, and came into the city, and found as he had said unto them: and they made ready the passover. (17) And in the evening he cometh with the twelve. (18) And as they sat and did eat, Jesus said, Verily I say unto you, One of you which eateth with me shall betray me. (19) And they began to be sorrowful, and to say unto him one by one, Is it I? and another said, Is it I? (20) And he answered and said unto them, It is one of the twelve, that dippseth with me in the dish. (21) The Son of man indeed goeth, as it is written of him: but woe to that man by whom the Son of man is betrayed! good were it for that man if he had never been born.

(22) And as they did eat, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and brake it, and gave to them, and said, Take, eat: this is my body. (23) And he took the cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them: and they all drank of it. (24) And he said unto them, This is my
blood of the new testament, which is shed for many. (25) Verily I say unto you, I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine, until that day that I drink it new in the kingdom of God.

(26) And when they had sung an hymn, they went out into the mount of Olives. (27) And Jesus saith unto them, All ye shall be offended because of me this night: (28) for it is written, I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered. (29) But after that I am risen, I will go before you into Galilee. (30) But Peter said unto him, Although all shall be offended, yet will I not. (31) And Jesus saith unto him, Verily I say unto thee, That this day, even in this night, before the cock crow twice, thou shalt deny me thrice. (32) But he spake the more vehemently, If I should die with thee, I will not deny thee in any wise. Likewise also said they all. (33) And they came to a place which was named Gethsemane; and he saith to his disciples, Sit ye here, while I shall pray. (34) And he taketh with him Peter and James and John, and began to be sore amazed, and to be very heavy; (35) and saith unto them, My soul is exceeding sorrowful unto death: tarry ye here, and watch. (36) And he went forward a little, and fell on the ground, and prayed that, if it were possible, the hour might pass from him. (37) And he said, Abba, Father, all things are possible unto thee; take away this cup from me: nevertheless not what I will, but what thou wilt. (38) And he cometh, and findeth them sleeping, and saith unto Peter, Simon, sleepest thou? couldest thou not watch one hour? (39) Watch ye and pray, lest ye enter into temptation. The spirit truly is ready, but the flesh is weak. (40) And again he went away, and prayed, and spake the same words. (41) And when he returned, he found them asleep again, (for their eyes were heavy,) neither wist they what to answer him. (42) And he cometh the third time, and saith unto them, Sleep on now, and take your rest: it is enough, the hour is come; behold, the Son of man is betrayed into the hands of sinners. (43) And immediately, while he yet spake, cometh Judas, one of the twelve, and with him a great multitude with swords and staves, from the chief priests and the scribes and the elders. (44) And he that betrayed him had given them a token, saying, Whomsoever I shall kiss, that same is he; take him, and lead him away safely. (45) And as soon as he was come, he goeth straightway to him, and saith, Master, master; and kissed him. (46) And they laid their hands on him, and took him. (47) And one of them that stood by drew a sword, and smote a servant of the high priest, and cut off

Matthew and St. Luke give the question in the plural, St. Mark reports it in the singular, and joins it with the emphatic utterance of the name of the disciple. His report, too, includes the two questions which appear separately in the other two Gospels.

And immediately, while he yet spake. — See Notes on Matt. xxvi. 51—56.
his ear. (48) And Jesus answered and said unto them, Are ye come out, as against a thief, with swords and with staves to take me? (49) I was daily with you in the temple teaching, and ye took me not; but the scriptures must be fulfilled. (50) And they all forsook him, and fled. (51) And there followed him a certain young man, having a linen cloth cast about his naked body; and the young men laid hold on him: (52) and he left the linen cloth, and fled from them naked.

(53) And they led Jesus away to the high priest; and with him were assembled all the chief priests and the elders and the scribes. (54) And Peter followed him afar off, even into the palace of the high priest: and he sat with the servants, and warmed himself at the fire. (55) And the chief priests and all the council sought for witness against Jesus to put him to death; and found none. (56) For many bare false witness against him, but their witness agreed not together. (57) And there arose certain, and bare false witness against him, saying, (58) We heard him say, I will destroy this temple that is made with hands, and within three days I will build another made without hands. (59) But neither so did their witness agree together. (60) And the high priest stood up in the midst, and asked Jesus, saying, Answerest thou nothing? what is it which these witness against thee? (61) But he held his peace, and answered nothing. Again the high priest asked...
him, and said unto him, Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed? And Jesus said, I am; and ye shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven.

Then the high priest rent his clothes, and saith, What need we any further witnesses? Ye have heard the blasphemy: what think ye? And they all condemned him to be guilty of death. And some began to spit on him, and to cover his face, and to buffet him, and to say unto him, Prophecy: and the servants did strike him with the palms of their hands.

And as Peter was beneath in the palace, there cometh one of the maids of the high priest: and when she saw Peter warming himself, she looked upon him, and said, And thou also wast with Jesus of Nazareth. But he denied, saying, I know not, neither understand I what thou sayest. And he went out into the porch; and the cock crew.

And a maid saw him again, and began to say to them that stood by, This is one of them. And he denied it. And a little after, they that stood by said again to Peter, Surely thou art one of them: for thou art a Galilean, and thy speech agreeth thereto. But he began to curse and to swear, saying, I know not this man of whom ye speak.

And the second time the cock crew. And Peter called to mind the word that Jesus said unto him, Before the cock crow twice, thou shalt deny me thrice. And when he thought thereon, he wept.

CHAPTER XV.—(1) And straightway in the morning the chief priests held a consultation with the elders and scribes and the whole council, and bound Jesus, and carried him away, and delivered him to Pilate. (2) And Pilate asked him, Art thou the King of the Jews? And he answering said unto him, Thou sayest it. And the chief priests accused him of many things: but he answered nothing. (4) And Pilate asked him again, saying, Answerest thou nothing? behold how many things they witness against thee. (5) But Jesus yet answered nothing; so that Pilate marvelled. (6) Now at that feast he released unto them one prisoner, whomsoever they desired. (7) And there was one named Barabbas, which lay bound with
them that had made insurrection with him, who had committed murder in the insurrection. (8) And the multitude crying aloud began to desire him to do as he had ever done unto them. (9) But Pilate answered them, saying, Will ye that I release unto you the King of the Jews? (10) For he knew that the chief priests had delivered him for envy. (11) But the chief priests moved the people, that he should rather release Barabbas unto them. (12) And Pilate answered and said again unto them, What will ye then that I shall do unto him whom ye call the King of the Jews? (13) And they cried out again, Crucify him. (14) Then Pilate said unto them, Why, what evil hath he done? And they cried out the more exceedingly, Crucify him. (15) And so Pilate, willing to content the people, released Barabbas unto them, and delivered Jesus, when he had scourged him, to be crucified. (16) And the soldiers led him away into the hall, called Praetorium; and they call together the whole band. (17) And they clothed him with purple, and platted a crown of thorns, and put it about his head, (18) and began to salute him, Hail, King of the Jews! (19) And they smote him on the head with a reed, and did spit upon him, and bowing their knees worshipped him. (20) And when they had mocked him, they took off the purple from him, and put his own clothes on him, and led him out to crucify him. (21) And they compel one Simon a Cyrenian, a who passed by, coming out of the country, the father of Alexander and Rufus, to bear his cross. (22) And they gave him to drink wine mingled with myrrh: but he received it not. (23) And when they had crucified him, they parted his garments, casting lots upon them, what every man should take. (24) And it was the third hour, and they crucified him. (25) And the superscription of his accusation was written over, THE KING OF THE JEWS. (26) And with him they crucify two thieves; the one on his right hand, and the other on
The Death of Jesus.

ST. MARK, XV.

The Entombment.

his left. (29) And the scripture was fulfilled, which saith, And he was numbered with the transgressors: a (29) And they that passed by railed on him, wagging their heads, and saying, Ah, thou that destroyest the temple, and buildest it in three days, (30) save thyself, and come down from the cross. (31) Likewise also the chief priests mocking said among themselves with the scribes, He saved others; himself he cannot save. (32) Let Christ the King of Israel descend now from the cross, that we may see and believe. And they that were crucified with him reviled him. (33) And when the sixth hour was come, there was darkness over the whole land until the ninth hour. (34) And at the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice, saying, Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani? which is, being interpreted, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me? (35) And some of them that stood by, when they heard it, said, Behold, he calleth Elias. (36) And one ran and filled a spunge full of vinegar, and put it on a reed, and gave him to drink, saying, Let alone; let us see whether Elias will come to take him down. (37) And Jesus cried with a loud voice, and gave up the ghost. (38) And the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom. (39) And when the centurion, which stood over against him, saw that he so cried out, and gave up the ghost, he said, Truly this man was the Son of God. (40) There were also women looking on afar off, among whom was Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James the less and of Joses, and Salome; (41) who also, when he was in Galilee, followed him, and ministered unto him:) and many other women which came up with him unto Jerusalem. (42) And now when the even was come, 4 because it was the preparation, that is, the day before the sabbath, (43) Joseph of Arimathaea, an honourable counsellor, which also waited for the kingdom of God, came, and went in boldly unto Pilate, and craved the body of Jesus. (44) And when Pilate wondered if he were already dead: and calling unto him the centurion, he asked him whether he had been any while dead. (45) And when he knew it of the centurion, he gave the body to Joseph. (46) And he bought fine linen, and took him down, and wrapped him in the linen, and laid him in a sepulchre which was hewn out of a rock, and rolled a stone unto the door of the sepulchre. (47) And Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of Joses beheld where he was laid.

(29) And the scripture was fulfilled.—The verse, if genuine, would be noticeable as one of the few instances in which St. Mark dwells on the fulfilment of prophecy; but it is omitted by nearly all the better MSS., and probably originated in a marginal note, calling attention to the fulfilment of the prophecy which we find quoted by our Lord as about to be fulfilled in Luke xxi. 37.
(29) Ah.—The interjection, which in its Greek form expresses a kind of inarticulate scorn, is peculiar to St. Mark, and may be noted as another instance of his habit of reproducing the very sounds that had been uttered.
(30) Save thyself.—The order of the clauses should be inverted, come down from the cross, and save Thyself.
(32) Let Christ.—Better, the Christ. The article is emphatic, and the word had not yet come to be used only as a name.
(32) Eloi, Eloi.—Here, again, the form which St. Mark gives is a closer reproduction of the very sounds of the Aramaic form of the word than that in St. Matthew, who gives the Hebrew as it stands in Ps. xxii. 1.
(32) When the centurion.—St. Mark, after his manner, uses the actual Latin word, St Matthew the Greek equivalent.

(40) Among whom was Mary Magdalene.—The list is the same as that in Matt. xxvii. 56, with the exceptions (1) of the epithet “less,” or better, little, as applied to James, and (2) the name of Salome instead of “the mother of Zebedee’s children.”
(42) The preparation, that is, the day before the sabbath.—The explanation, like that in chap. vii. 2, 3, is characteristic of St. Mark, as writing for Gentile readers. It fixes, with hardly the shadow of a doubt, the meaning of the word “preparation,” as given in the Note on Matt. xxvii. 62.
(43) Joseph of Arimathæa.—The account given of him is fuller than in St. Matthew. The phrase, “which also waited for the kingdom of God,” has its parallel in Luke xxiii. 51.
(44) Went in boldly.—Better, waxed bold, and went in. There is an implied contrast between his boldness now and his previous timidity.
(44) And Pilate marvelled.—The wonder of Pilate, and his calling the centurion (the article points to his being the same that had been mentioned in verse 39), are peculiar to St. Mark.
(46) He bought fine linen.—Better, a fine linen sheet. The word is the same as in Matt. xxvii. 59. The fact that it was bought just before the Sabbath began is peculiar to St. Mark.
(47) Mary the mother of Joses.—In Matt. xxvii. 51 she is described simply as “the other Mary.”
CHAPTER XVI.—(1) And when the sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James, and Salome, had bought sweet spices, that they might come and anoint him. (2) And very early in the morning the first day of the week, they came unto the sepulchre at the rising of the sun. (3) And they said among themselves, Who shall roll us away the stone from the door of the sepulchre? (4) And when they looked, they saw that the stone was rolled away: for it was very great. (5) And entering into the sepulchre, they saw a young man sitting on the right side, clothed in a long white garment; and they were afraid. (6) And he saith unto them, Be not affrighted: Ye seek Jesus of Nazareth, which was crucified: he is risen; he is not here: behold the place where they laid him. (7) But go your way, tell his disciples and Peter that he goeth before you into Galilee: there shall ye see him, as he said unto you. (8) And they went out quickly, and fled from the sepulchre; for they trembled and were amazed: neither said they any thing to any man; for they were afraid.

(9-11) Now when Jesus was risen early the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven devils. (10) And she went and told them that had been with him, as they mourned and wept. (11) And they, when they had heard that he was alive, and had been seen of her, believed not.

(12) After that he appeared in another form unto two of them as they walked,
and went into the country. (13) And they went and told it unto the residue: neither believed they them.

(14) Afterward he appeared unto the eleven as they sat at meat, and upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them which had seen him after he was risen. (15) And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. (16) He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall not be damned. (17) And these signs shall follow them that believe; In my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; (18) they shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover.

(19) So then after the Lord had spoken unto them, he was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God.

And they went forth, and preached every where, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following. Amen.

---

(14) Afterward he appeared unto the eleven.——See Notes on Luke xxiv. 36—43.

(15) And he said unto them.——See Notes on Matt. xxviii. 16—20. There is much, however, that is so distinct in St. Mark's report as to suggest the thought that it may have referred to a different occasion.

Preach the gospel to every creature.——Better, to the whole creation. The universality of the word is, of course, limited by the nature of the case.

(16) He that believeth not shall be damned.——Better, shall be condemned. The Greek word does not necessarily imply the idea of irreversible endless condemnation which has come to be attached to the English one.

(17) They shall speak with new tongues.—This is noticeable as being the only distinct reference in the Gospels to the form of the Pentecostal gift. The promise of the Spirit itself had been prominent, however, throughout our Lord's teaching (Luke xi. 13; John xiv. 17, 26), and appears from Acts i. 8 to have been specially renewed between the Resurrection and Ascension. On the nature of the gift itself, see Notes on Acts ii. 4; x. 46; xix. 6; i Cor. xii. 10; xiv. 4—26.

(18) They shall take up serpents.——The instance of St. Paul at Melita is the only recorded example of the kind (Acts xxviii. 1—6). Power over "serpents and scorpions" had, it will be remembered, been given before (Luke x. 19).

If they drink any deadly thing . . .—Of this there is no recorded instance in the New Testament, but it finds an illustration in the tradition of the poisoned cup which was offered to St. John.

(19—20) So then after the Lord had spoken.—See Note on Luke xxiv. 53. St. Matthew, it will be remembered, gives no account of the Ascension. (See Note on Matt. xxviii. 20.) St. Mark and St. Luke record it briefly. St. John implies it in his report of our Lord's words (vi. 62; xx. 17). In Acts i. 3—11 it is narrated with greater fulness.

The form of the last two verses, the use of the "Lord" instead of Jesus, suggests the thought of their being a later addition to the original records of our Lord's life and teaching. (See Note on Luke vii. 13.)
THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. LUKE.
INTRODUCTION

TO

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. LUKE.

I. The writer. — But one person bearing the name of Luke, or, in its Greek form, Lucas, appears in the New Testament; and of him the direct notices are few and meagre. He is named as being with St. Paul during his first imprisonment at Rome, and is described as "the beloved physician" (Col. iv. 14). He is still with him, stress being laid on his being the only friend who remained, when the Apostle's work was drawing to its close (2 Tim. iv. 11). Beyond these facts all is inference or conjecture. Both conjecture and inference are, however, in this case, full of interest, present many unexpected coincidences, and, by the convergence of many different lines of circumstantial evidence, raise the probabilities which attach to each taken separately into something not far from certainty as to their collective result.

The name itself is suggestive. It does not appear as such in any classical writer, or on any Greek or Latin inscription. Its form, however, shows that it is a contraction from Lucanus, as Apollos is from Apollonius, or Silas from Silvanus, and not, as some have thought, another form of Lucius. This name, again in its turn, was not a common one, and we naturally ask what associations were connected with it. Its most probable etymology points to its being derived from the region of southern Italy known as Lucania. Lucas, or Lucanus, would be a natural name for a slave or freedman, having no family name as his own, who had come, or whose father had come, from that region. Assuming, for the present, St. Luke’s authorship of the Acts, we find in the supposition that this was the origin of his name an explanation of the obvious familiarity with Italian topography shown in his mention of Puteoli, Appii Forum, and the Three Taverns, in Acts xxviii. 13–15. The name Lucanus was, however, borne at this time by a writer, M. Annaeus Lucanus, who stands high in the list of Latin poets, as the author of the Pharsalia, an epic which takes as its subject the great struggle for power between Julius Caesar and Pompeius. As he was born, not in Italy, but in Spain (at Corduba, the modern Cordova), the name with him must have had another than a local significance. Was there any link of association connecting the two men who bore a name which was, as we have seen, far from a common one? We are here in a region of conjecture; but on the assumption that there was some such link, we have a probable explanation (1) of the favour shown to St. Luke’s friend and companion, the great Apostle of the Gentiles, by the uncle of the poet, J. Annaeus Gallio, the Proconsul of Achaia (Acts xviii. 14–17), and (2) of the early tradition of a friendship between St. Paul and another uncle, the Stoic philosopher, Seneca, issuing in the correspondence of fourteen letters, which, in the time of Jerome (de Vit. Illust. c. 12) and Augustine (Epist. cliii. 14), was read with interest, and often quoted as a fragment of Apostolic literature. The letters that are now extant under that name are, in the judgment of well-nigh all critics, spurious; but the fact that a writer in the third or fourth century thought it worth while to compose such a correspondence, implies that he was able to take for granted a general belief in the friendship which it pre-supposes; and the many coincidences of thought and language between the Apostle and the Philosopher (as seen, e.g., in the “Essay on St. Paul and Seneca,” in Dr. Lightfoot’s Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians) are at least striking enough to suggest, if not intercourse, at least some derivation from a common source. Seneca was, it must be remembered, officially connected with the Court of Nero during St. Paul’s imprisonment; and when the name of the prisoner and of his doctrine was spread through the whole Praetorium (Phil. i. 13), and congregations of disciples were to be found even among the slaves of the Imperial household (Phil. iv. 22), it was not likely that a man in his position should remain ignorant of the teacher whose influence was spreading so widely. If the friend and companion of the prisoner bore the same name as the nephew of the philosopher, that coincidence would help to attract attention. If, as the coincidence itself suggests, there had been any previous connection between the two, we have an hypothesis into which all the facts of the case fit in with an almost surprising symmetry. The poet Lucan, we may note, was born A.D. 39. The date of St. Luke’s birth we have no materials for fixing, but the impression left by the facts of the case is that he was about the same age as St. Paul,† and therefore older than the poet by thirty or forty years. Was the one named after the other? And does this imply a connection of the whole family with the beloved physician? This, it is obvious, would give an additional support to the superstructure of inferences already raised.‡

* It follows from this that the Evangelist cannot be identified, as some have thought, with Lucius of Cyrene, who is mentioned as a disciple among the prophets and teachers at Antioch (Acts xiii. 1), or the Lucius who is named as a kinsman of St. Paul’s (Rom. xvi. 21). If that identification had been possible, the traditional name of Cyrene for its School of Medicine (Herod. iii. 131), would have had a special interest in connection with St. Luke’s calling.

† St. Paul, e.g., never speaks of him as he does of younger disciples, like Timothy or Titus, as his “child,” or “son, in the faith.”

‡ Lucan, as has been said above, was born at Cordova. Now, it is remarkable that when St. Paul was planning an extended journey with St. Luke as his companion, Spain, and not Rome, was to be its ultimate goal (Rom. xv. 29). That country had a large element of Jews in its population in the third and fourth centuries, and it is probable that they had settled there, as in Cyrene and Carthage, from an early period of the Dispersion. Cordova, as one of the chief seats of Roman culture, was certain to attract them, and we find it at a later period one of the chief seats of medieval Rabbinism, with a
The incidental mention of St. Luke's name in Col. iv. 14, places him on more solid ground. He is emphatically distinguished from "those of the resurrection"—Mark and others who are named in Col. iv. 10, 11. He was, i.e., a Gentile by birth, and this fact, it is obvious, is important on all the questions affecting his relations with the Apostle of the Gentiles, and the aim and characteristic features of his writings.

The fact that he was "a physician" suggests other inferences. That profession in the early days of the Empire was held almost exclusively by freedmen, or the sons of freedmen (the Liberitini of Acts viii. 19). Shut out more or less completely from military or official life, were led to devote themselves to science, or art, or literature. The well-known list of the members of the household of the Empress Livia, the wife of Augustus, compiled from the Columbarium, a sepulchre which was opened at Rome in A.D. 1720, presents many examples of names with the word medicus attached to them; among them may be noted that of Tyrannus, the name which appears in Acts xix. 9 as the owner of the "school" or lecture-room at Ephesus, in which St. Paul received his disciples. Where, we ask, was one who made choice of that profession likely to seek for his education? The answer to that question leads us into yet a new region of coincidences. On the one hand, the town of Crotone, in Southern Italy, had a reputation of some centuries standing for its School of Medicine (Herod. iii. 131), and this would fall in with the hypothesis of the Evangelist's Lucanian origin.

On the other, of all the medical schools of the time, there were none that stood higher in reputation than that of Tarsus, and few that stood so high. The leading physicians of the time, Aretæus the Cappodacian, Dioscorides of Anazarba in Cilicia, Athenæus of the Cilician Attaleia, could hardly have received their training elsewhere. Within a few miles of Tarsus, at Egin, on the coast of Cilicia, was a great Temple of Æsculapius, which, as resorted to by sick persons from all countries who came to consult the priests of the Temple (the Asclepiads, i.e., the guild or brotherhood of Æsculapius), offered the nearest analogue to a modern hospital, as a place for observation and practice. If Tarsus were thus the place, or one of the places, to which Luke went to gain his professional knowledge and experience, we have again examples of names with the word medicus, and again a connexion which explains many of the facts, more or less perplexing, in the Apostolic history. There is no record of St. Paul's first meeting with him, or of his conversion to the faith. If, with almost all interpreters of repute, we see in the sudden use of the first person plural in Acts xvi. 10, a proof of companionship then beginning between the writer of the book and the Apostle whose labours he narrates, the naturalness with which it comes, must be the fault of presentation, or facie evidence of previous acquaintance. But there were other names at that time connected with Tarsus which have an interest for the Christian student. All that we read in the Acts suggests the thought that the Cyriotic Jew, the Levite, Joses Barnabas, the Son of Consolation, received his education at Tarsus, and there learnt to love and honour the tent-maker Rabbi, for

the reality of whose conversion he was the first to vouch (Acts ix. 27), to whom he turned when his work pressed hard on him, as the follow-labourer most like-minded with himself (Acts xi. 25), the separation from whom, when they parted, brought with it a bitterness which is hardly intelligible, except on the assumption of a previous affection that was now wounded to the quick (Acts xv. 39). Not altogether, again, without some points of contact with St. Luke, is the fact that the great geographer Strabo, a native of Cappadocia, whose full description of Tarsus (Geog. xii. p. 627) is solely based upon his own personal observation, visited that city about A.D. 17, and on the supposition, either of actual contact, or of the attention called to his writings among the students of what we may well call the University of Tarsus, we may legitimately trace his influence as working indirectly in the uniform accuracy of all the incidental geographical notices that occur in St. Luke's Gospel and in the Acts. (See the Notes on these books.) At Tarsus also, at or about the same period, was to be seen another conspicuous character of the time, the great wonder-working impostor, Apollo­nius of Tyana, whose life was afterwards published as a counterfeit and rival parallel to that of Christ, and in whom St. Luke might have seen the great prototype of all the "workers with curious arts," with their books of charms and incantations, whom he describes as yielding to the mightier power of St. Paul (Acts xix. 11—12).

St. Luke's character as a physician may be considered from three distinct points of view, each of which has a special interest of its own. (1) As influencing his style and language; (2) as affecting his personal relations with St. Paul; and (3) as giving him opportunities for acquiring the knowledge which we find in the books commonly ascribed to him. Each of these call for a special, though brief, notice.

(1) The differences of style in St. Luke's Gospel as compared with the two that precede it, the proofs of a higher culture, the more rhythmical structure of his sentences, which are traceable even by the merely English reader, in such passages, e.g., as chap. i. 1—4, are in the Greek original conspicuous throughout, the only exceptions being the portions of his Gospel which, like chaps. i., from verse 5, and ii., are apparently translations from a lost Hebrew or Aramaic document. The use of technical phraseology is, in like manner, traceable in his mention of the "fevers (the word is plural in the Greek), and dysentery," of which Publius was healed at Malta (Acts xxviii. 8), in "the feet" (not the common ἀρέτας, ἀέρος, but the more precise ἄρετας, ἀέτος) "and ankle bones" of Acts iii. 7; in the "scales" that fell from St. Paul's eyes (Acts ix. 18); in the "trance," or, more literally, ecstasy, connected with St. Peter's vision (Acts xxi. 9, 10), as brought on by the Apostle's exposure to the noontide sun after long-continued fasting; in the special adjective used for "eaten of worms," in Acts xii. 23; in his notice of the "virtue," or healing power, that flowed forth from our Lord's body (Luke viii. 46); and of the sweat in "clots," or drops like as of blood, that issued from it in the Agony of Gethsemane (Luke xxii. 44).

(2) It is noticeable in tracing the connection of St. Paul and St. Luke, that on each occasion when the one joins the other for a time, it is after the Apostle had suffered in a more than common degree from the bodily infirmities that oppressed him. When they met at Troad, it was after he had been detained in Galatia by "the infirmity of his flesh" (Gal. iv. 13). When the
one joins the other in the voyage to Jerusalem, it is after St. Paul had had "the sentence of death" in himself, had been "dying daily," had been "delivered from so great a death," had been carrying about in his body the dying of the Lord Jesus (2 Cor. i. 9, iv. 10—12, 16). From that time St. Luke seems scarcely to have left his friend, except, perhaps, for short intervals; and the way in which St. Paul speaks of him as "the beloved physician," makes it almost a matter of certainty that it was by his ministrations as a physician that he had made himself "beloved." The constant companionship of one with St. Paul's knowledge and special culture is sure, sooner or later, to affect St. Paul's thoughts and language, and traces of this influence are to be found in many of the Epistles. Most of these are naturally more manifest in the Greek than in the English words; but we may note as examples the frequent use of the idea of "health" as the standard of life and teaching, as seen in the phrases "sound," or better, "healthy, doctrine" (γραμματείας) of 1 Tim. i. 10, vi. 3, 2 Tim. i. 13, and in the "doting," or better, "diseased" of 1 Tim. vi. 4; in the spread of error being like that of a gangrene or cancer (2 Tim. ii. 17); in the word for "puffed up," which implies the delirium of a fever of the typhus type (τυφωμένος, typhotheis) in 1 Tim. iii. 6, vi. 4, 2 Tim. iii. 4; in the conscience seared, or better, catarinated, till it has become callous (1 Tim. iv. 2); in the malady of "itching ears" (2 Tim. iv. 3); in the "bodily exercise" or training (literally, the training of the gymnasmum) that profiteth little (1 Tim. iv. 8); in the precept which enjoined on Timothy, as a means of keeping his mind in a state of equipoise and purity, uncontaminated by the evil with which his office brought to him contact, to "drink no longer water," only, but "to use a little wine, for his stomach's sake and his health," (not "satisfying") of the flesh (Col. ii. 23). These words are, in almost all cases, characteristic of the Greek of Hippocrates and other medical writers, and the same may be said of the Greek words used by St. Paul for "dung" (κατεργαζόμενα, skatolaha, Phil. iii. 9), for "occasion" (ἀφόρμη, ἀφόρμη, 1 Tim. v. 14), for "gazing" or "looking earnestly" (ἀνεμένω, 2 Cor. iii. 7), if the word is used twenty times by St. Paul (not "satisfying") by him only), for "charge" (1 Tim. i. 3, 18), for "contention" (i.e., παροξυσμός) in Acts xv. 39.

(3) It is obvious that in the East, then as now, the calling of a physician was a passport to many social regions into which it was otherwise difficult to find access. A physician of experience arriving in this or that city, would be likely to become acquainted, not with the poor only, but with men of official rank and women of the higher class. How far, and in what special way this helped St. Luke to obtain the information which he wanted for his Gospel, will call for inquiry further on. Here it will be enough to note that such channels of information were sure to be opened to him.

If, on the data that have been given, it is reasonable to suppose that St. Paul and St. Luke had met at Tarsus, it is almost a matter of certainty that their friendship was continued at Antioch. Here the tradition, given by Eusebius (Hist. iii. 4), that St. Luke was a resident in the latter city, agrees with the natural inference from the prominence which he gives to the Christian society there as the mother of all the Gentile churches (Acts xi. 19—30), from his knowledge of the names of its pastors and teachers (Acts xiii. 1—3), from the fulness with which he relates the early stages of the great controversy with the Judaisers (Acts xv. 1—22, 26—35), from Antioch, how he, accepting and before the natural conclusion from the change of pronouns, he must have gone to Troas (Acts xvi. 10), and probably begun or continued there his labours in the gospel, which in a later time won St. Paul's glowing praise (2 Cor. viii. 18).* Hence he went with St. Paul to Philippi, and, as far as we can judge, remained there during the whole period of the Apostle's work at Corinth and Ephesus, the friend and guide of Lydia and Euodia, and Syntyche and other women who laboured with him in the gospel (Phil. iv. 2, 3), until after a visit to Corinth (2 Cor. viii. 18), he joined him again, and the Apostle returned from his winter sojourn in that city at Philippi, was with him once more at Troas, sailed with him to Miletus, and so to Tyre and Ptolemais and Cesarea, went up with him to Jerusalem, and remained with him or near him during his two years' imprisonment under Felix or Festus (Acts xx.—xxvi.). Then came the voyage to Italy, narrated with the graphic precision of an eye-witness, and throughout in the first person plural (Acts xxvi. 1—44); then the shipwreck at Melita, and the arrival in Italy, and the two years (broken, perhaps, if we assume Luke, as seems probable, to be the "true yoke-fellow" of Phil. iv. 3, by a short visit to Philippi) of the first imprisonment at Rome (Col. iv. 14; Philm. verse 24). Then came the last unrecorded missionary journey of St. Paul in Spain, Asia, Macedonia, Achaia,† during which St. Luke probably continued with him; and then we find him, the last clear glimpse we get, still at the side of his friend and master, when all others were proving time-serving and faithless (2 Tim. iv. 10). Beyond this we have nothing definite. Tradition, not earlier than the fourth century (Epiphanius, Haer. 61), says that he preached in Italy, Gaul, Dalmatia, and Macedonia; that he was a painter as well as physician, and was specially famous for seven portraits of the Virgin; that he lived to the age of eighty-four; that he was crucified at Elea on an olive tree, in the Peloponnesus; or, according to another story, died a natural death in Bithynia. His bones are related to have been brought to Constantinople from Patras in Achaia by order of the Emperor Constantine, and to have been deposited in the Church of the Apostles.

II. The Authorship of the Gospel.—The two earliest witnesses to the existence of a Gospel recognised as written by St. Luke, are (1) Irenaeus, and (2) the Muratorian Fragment. (See General Introduction on the Canon of the New Testament.) The former, dwelling

* There are, it is believed, no sufficient reasons for rejecting the reference of this passage to St. Luke. It is not meant that St. Paul speaks of his gospel as a book, but the physician was an Evangelist in the primitive as well as the later sense of the word, and no one was so likely to have been chosen by St. Paul to be one of the representatives of the Macedonian churches. The voyage of the Apostle may be inferred from his plans (Phil. ii. 24; Philon. verse 22), partly from the reference to Asia in 2 Tim. i. 13, Macedonia if Tim. i. 39, Corinth (2 Tim. iv. 26), I have ventured to suggest Spain as also probable. It is hardly likely that St. Paul would have abandoned the strong desire which he expressed in Rom. xv. 24. And in there was, as has been shown to be probable, a personal connection between Luke and the family of Cordova, there would be fresh motives for his going there. Clement of Alexandria (Hist. iii. 4) it may be mentioned, speaks of him as having travelled to the furthest boundary of the West (Epist. ad Cor. c. 5), a phrase which would hardly have been used by a resident of Rome itself. The tradition as to an evangelising journey into Spain became, as the years passed, more and more accepted by Epiphanius, Chrysostom, Jerome, and Theodoret.
on the necessity of there being neither more nor less than four Gospels, as there are four elements, four cardinal points, and the like, acknowledges St. Luke's as one of the four. Pressing the analogy of the four symbolic figures of the Cherubim, he compares the Gospel which he names as Luke's to the calf, as representing the priestly, sacrificial side of our Lord's work. "As such," he says, "it began with Zacharias burning incense in the Temple" (Adv. Haer. ii.). In another passage he speaks of "Luke, the companion of Paul," as having "written in a book the gospel which the latter preached" (Adv. Haer. iii. 1). The Muratorian Fragment, which has suffered the loss of its first sentences, and so fails to give direct evidence as to St. Matthew and St. Mark, begins accordingly with St. Luke, mentioning, however, his Gospel as the third. What follows is interesting, though being, like the whole fragment, in the language of an obviously illiterate scribe, and presumably a translation from a Greek original, it is at once corrupt and obscure. The nearest approach to an intelligible rendering would be as follows — "Luke the physician, after the ascension of Christ, when St. Paul had chosen him, as being zealous of what was just and right (juris studium), wrote in his own name, and as it seemed good to him (ex opinione, apparently with an implied reference to Luke i. 2). Yet he himself did not see the Lord in the flesh, and did what he did as he could best attain to it, and so he began his narrative from the birth of John." The passage is every way important, as showing (1) the early identification of the writer of the third Gospel with Luke the physician; (2) the absence of any early tradition that he was one of the Seventy; (3) the fact that the first two chapters were part of the Gospel as known to the writer of the Fragment, or of the still older document which he translated. Papias, as far as the fragments of his writings that remain show, who names St. Matthew and St. Mark, is silent as to St. Luke. Justin, who does not name the writer of any Gospel, speaks of the "records of the Apostles, which are called Gospels," as having been written either by Apostles themselves, or by those who followed them closely (using the same Greek word here as St. Luke uses in chap. i. 2), and cites in immediate connection with this the fact of the sweat that was as great drops of blood (Dial. c. Tryph. c. 22). It seems all but certain from this that he had read the narrative of Luke xxii. 44 as we have it, and that he ascribed the authorship of it to a companion of the Apostles. So Tertullian, who recognises four Gospels, and four only, speaks of "John and Matthew as Apostles, of Luke and Mark as helpers of the Apostles (Cont. Marc. iv. 2); and Origen (in Euseb. Hist. Eccles. vi. 25), speaks of the Gospel according to St. Luke as being "cited and approved by Paul," referring apparently to the expression "according to my Gospel" (Rom. ii. 16; xvi. 25; 2 Tim. i. 8), and to "the brother whose praise is in the Gospel," in 2 Cor. viii. 18, 19.

III. The sources of the Gospel.—The question, Where did the writer of this Gospel collect his information, is especially one of special interest. In St. Matthew we have, according to the traditional authorship, personal recollection as a groundwork, helped by the oral or written teaching previously current in the Church. In St. Mark (see Introduction to that Gospel), we have substantially the same oral or written teaching, modified by the personal recollections of St. Peter. St. Luke, on the other hand, disclaims the character of an eye-witness (chap. i. 2), and confesses that he is only a compiler, claiming simply the credit of having done his best to verify the facts which he narrates. St. Paul, to whom he specially devoted himself, was, as far as personal knowledge went, in the same position as himself. Where, then, taking the facts of St. Luke's life, as given above, was it probable that he found his materials?

(1) At Antioch, if not before, the Evangelist would be likely to come in contact with not a few who had seen "eye-witnesses and ministers of the word." Those who were scattered after the persecution that began with the death of Stephen (Acts xi. 19), and the prophets who came from Jerusalem with Agabus (Acts xi. 28), the latter probably forming part of the company of the Seventy (see Note on Luke x. 1), must have included some, at least, of persons so qualified. There, too, he must have met with Manaen, the foster-brother of the Tetrarch, and may have derived from him much that he narrates as to the ministry of the Baptist (iii. 1—20); our Lord's testimony to him (vii. 18—34), the relation between Herod and Pilate, and the part which the former took in the history of the Crucifixion (xxii. 5—12), the estimate which our Lord had passed upon his character (xiii. 32). That acquaintance served probably, in the nature of things, to introduce him to a knowledge of the other members of the Herodian family, of whom we learn so much from him, and, of the Evangelists, from him only (iii. 1; Acts xi. 1—25; xxv. 13; xxvi. 32).

(2) During the years of St. Luke's work at T'roas and Philippi, there were, we may presume, but few such opportunities; but when he accompanied St. Paul on his last journey to Jerusalem, they must have been multiplied indefinitely. Mnason of Cyprus, the old disciple (a disciple from the beginning, as the word signifies, Acts xx. 16), must have had much to tell him. During St. Paul's stay at Cæsarea there was ample time for him to become acquainted with the current oral, or, as his own words imply, written teaching of the churches of Palestine, which formed the groundwork of what is common to him and the first two Gospels, as well as with the many facts that connect themselves with that city in the narrative of the Acts. We cannot, however, think of a man of St. Luke's culture bent upon writing a history, because he was not satisfied with the "many" fragmentary records that he found already in circulation, resting at Cæsarea during the two years of St. Paul's imprisonment without pushing his inquiries further. We may think of him accordingly as journeying in regions where he knew our Lord had worked, most of which lay within two or three days' easy journey, while yet there was little record of His ministry there, and so collecting such facts as the raising of the widow's son at Nain (vii. 11—17), the appearance of the risen Lord to the disciples at Emmaus (xxiv. 13—35), the full record, peculiar to this Gospel, of His ministry and teaching in Perea.

(3) The profession of St. Luke as a physician, probably also the character that he had acquired as the guide and adviser of the sisterhood at Philippi (see Notes on that Epistle), would naturally give him access to a whole circle of eye-witnesses who were not so likely to come within the range of St. Matthew and St. Mark. He alone mentions the company of devout women who followed Jesus during part, at least, of His ministry (viii. 2, 3), and as he gives the names of the chief members of the company, it is natural to infer that he was personally acquainted with them. So far as they were sharers in the feelings
of other women, we may believe, with hardly the shadow of a doubt, that they would dwell especially on all that connected itself with the childhood youth of the Lord whom they had loved with such devout tenderness, that the bereaved mother whom St. John had taken to his own home (John xix. 27)—sometimes, perhaps, in Galilee, sometimes in Jerusalem—would be the centre of their reverential love. From them, therefore, as those who would be sure to treasure up such a record, St. Luke may well have derived the narrative—obviously a translation from the Hebrew or Aramaic of Palestine—which forms the introduction to his Gospel (chaps. i. and ii.), and which is distinct in character and style from the rest of his Gospel. But informants such as these would be sure to treasure up also the special instances of our Lord's tenderness and sympathy for women like themselves, and it is accordingly not more than a legitimate inference from the facts of human nature to trace to them such narratives as that of the woman that was a sinner (vii. 39—50), of the contrasted characters of the two sisters at Bethany (x. 38—42), of the woman who cried out, “Blessed is the womb that bare thee . . .” (xi. 27), of the daughters of Jerusalem who met their Lord on His way to Calvary (xiii. 27—29), of those, again, who had come up from Galilee and who stood afar off beholding His death upon the cross (xvi. 41), and of their buying spices and ointment for His entombment (xxii. 56).

On the whole, then, everything tends to the belief that St. Luke's statement that he had carefully traced to their sources, as far as he could, the facts which he narrates, was no idle boast; that he had many and ample opportunities for doing so; and that he did this, as we have seen above, with the culture and discernment which his previous training was likely to have imparted. It is obvious, however, that coming, as he did, into the field of inquiry some thirty, or at least twenty, years or so after the events, many of the facts and sayings would reach him in a comparatively isolated form; and though there is an obvious and earnest endeavour to relate them, as he says, "in order," it might not always be easy to ascertain what that order had actually been. And this is, in part at least, the probable explanation of the seeming dislocation of facts which we find on comparing his Gospel with those of St. Matthew and St. Mark. (See Notes on Matt. viii. 1; ix. 1.)

IV. The first readers of the Gospel.—St. Luke's record differs in a very marked way from the other three in being addressed, or, as we should say, dedicated, to an individual. Who and what Theophilus was, we have but few data for conjecturing. The epithet "most excellent"—the same word as that used by Tertullus in addressing Felix (Acts xxiv. 3)—implies social or official position of some dignity. The absence of that epithet in the dedication of the other Gospels (iv. 3), and St. Luke wrote to raise the knowledge so gained to a standard of greater completeness. The name, it may be noted, was, like Timotheus, not an uncommon one. Among St. Luke's contemporaries, it was borne by one of the Jewish high priests, the brother-in-law of Caiaphas (Jos. Ant. xiv. 4, § 3), who probably was responsible for St. Paul's mission of persecution to Damascus, and by some official at Athens who was condemned for perjury by the Areopagus (Tacit. Ann. ii. 55). Beyond this all is conjecture, or tradition which dissolves into conjecture. He is said to have been, by this or that ecclesiastical writer, an Achaean, or an Alexandrian, or an Antiochian; he has been widely identified by some modern critics, with one or other of the two persons thus named; it has been held by others that the name (= “one who loves God”) simply designated the ideal Christian reader whom St. Luke had in view.

It is, however, reasonable to infer that the Gospel, though dedicated to him, was meant for the wider circle of the class of which he was the representative, i.e., in other words, that it was meant to be especially a Gospel for the educated heathen. It will be seen in what follows, that this view is confirmed by its more prominent characteristics.

V. The characteristics of the Gospel.—(1) It has been said, not without some measure of truth, that one main purpose of the Acts of the Apostles was to reconcile the two parties in the Apostolic Church which tended to arrange themselves, with more or less of open antagonism, under the names of St. Peter and St. Paul, by showing that the two Apostles were substantially of one mind; that the former had opened the door of faith unto the Gentiles (Acts x. 48), and had consented to the great charter of their freedom (Acts xv. 7); that the latter had shown his reverence for the ceremonial law by twice taking it on himself, wholly or in part, the vow of a Nazarite (Acts xviii. 18, xxi. 26). Something of the same catholicity of purpose is to be found in the Gospel which bears St. Luke's name. It was obviously natural that it should be so in the work of the friend of one who became as a Jew to Jews, and as a Greek to Greeks (1 Cor. ix. 20). Thus we have the whole history of the first two chapters, and the genealogy in chap. iii., obviously meeting the tastes, in the first instance of Jewish readers on the one side, and on the other the choice of narratives or teachings that specially bring out the width and universality of the love of God, the breaking down of the barriers of Jewish exclusiveness, the reference to the widow of Sarepta and Naaman the Syrian (iv. 26, 27), the mission of the Seventy as indicating the universality of the kingdom (x. 1), the parable of the penitent robber (xxii. 43), the parables of the Good Samaritan (x. 30—37), of the Lost Sheep, the Lost Piece of Money, and the Prodigal Son (chap. xv.); midway between the two, the story of Zacchaeus, the publican, treated as a heathen, and yet recognised as a son of Abraham (xix. 9).

(2) In the Acts, again, especially in the earlier chapters, we note a manifest tendency in the writer to dwell on all acts of self-denial, and on the lavish generosity which made the life of the Apostolic Church the realisation, in part at least, of an ideal communism

* It will be noted that our Lord's words (xxiii. 29), "Blessed are the poor in spirit," were probably spoken to a publican, treated as a heathen, and yet recognised as a son of Abraham (xix. 9).
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Acts ii. 44, 45; iv. 32, 37; vi. 1; ix. 36). So in the Gospel we recognize, over and above what he has in common with others, a principle of selection, leading him to dwell on all parts of our Lord's teaching that pointed in the same direction. The parables of the Rich Fool (xii. 16—21), of the Rich Man and Lazarus (xvi. 19—31), of the Unjust Steward, with its direct and immediate application (xvi. 1—14); the counsel to the Pharisees to "give alms," and so to find a more than ceremonial purity (xi. 41); to His disciples to sell what they have and to seek for treasures in heaven (xii. 33); the beatitudes that fall on the poor and the hungry (vi. 20, 21), are all instances of His desire to impress this ideal of an unselfish life upon the minds of his readers. Even in his account of the Baptist's teaching, we find him supplying what neither St. Matthew nor St. Mark had given—the counsel which John gave to the people—"He that hath two coats let him impart to him that hath none" (iii. 11). In this also we may recognize the work of one who was like-minded with St. Paul. He, too, learnt the Gospel with his own hands, and was made minister to the necessities of others (Acts xx. 34), and loved to dwell on the pattern which Christ had set when, "being rich, He for our sakes became poor" (2 Cor. viii. 9), and praised those whose deep poverty had abounded to the riches of their liberality (2 Cor. viii. 2). He, too, had learnt the lesson that a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things that he possesseth (Luke xii. 15), and had been initiated into the mystery of knowing how, with an equal mind, to be full and to be hungry, to abound and to suffer need. (See Note on Phil. iv. 12.) He, too, warns men against the deceitfulness of riches, and the hurtful lusts springing from them that plunge men in the abyss of destruction (1 Tim. vi. 9, 17).

Lastly, we cannot fail to note, as we read his Gospel, the special stress which he, far more than St. Matthew or St. Mark, lays upon the prayers of the Christ. It is from him we learn that it was as Jesus was "praying" at His baptism that the heavens were opened (iii. 21); that it was while He was praying that the fashion of His countenance was altered, and there came on Him the glory of the Transfiguration (ix. 29); that He was "praying" when the disciples came and asked Him to "give alms," and so to find a more than ceremonial purity (xi. 41); to His disciples to sell what they have and to seek for treasures in heaven (xii. 33); the beatitudes that fall on the poor and the hungry (vi. 20, 21), are all instances of His desire to impress this ideal of an unselfish life upon the minds of his readers. Even in his account of the Baptist's teaching, we find him supplying what neither St. Matthew nor St. Mark had given—the counsel which John gave to the people—"He that hath two coats let him impart to him that hath none" (iii. 11). In this also we may recognize the work of one who was like-minded with St. Paul. He, too, learnt the lesson that a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things that he possesseth (Luke xii. 15), and had been initiated into the mystery of knowing how, with an equal mind, to be full and to be hungry, to abound and to suffer need. (See Note on Phil. iv. 12.) He, too, warns men against the deceitfulness of riches, and the hurtful lusts springing from them that plunge men in the abyss of destruction (1 Tim. vi. 9, 17).

VI. Relations to St. Matthew and St. Mark.—It would be a fair summary of the account of the Gospel of St. Luke thus given, to say that it is in its universality, its tenderness, its spirit of self-sacrifice, pre-eminently the Gospel of the Saintly Luke, presenting to us that aspect of our Lord's ministry in which He appears as the great Example, no less than the great Teacher. In other words, since He is represented as at once holy, undefiled, and separate from sinners (Heb. vii. 26), and as able to have compassion on their infirmities (Heb. iv. 15), it is the Gospel of the Son of Man as the great High Priest of humanity in the human phase of that priesthood. It follows with a marvellous fitness upon the Gospel of St. Matthew, that had brought before us the portraiture of the true King and the true Scribe—upon that of St. Mark, in which we have seen the lineaments of the true Servant of the Lord. It prepares the way for that of St. John, which presents the Incarnate Word as manifesting His Eternal Priesthood in its sacrificial and mediatorial aspects. In its pervading line and spirit, it is, as we have seen, essentially Pauline. In its language and style, however, it presents not a few affinities with an Epistle, the Pauline authorship of which is at least questionable, and which not a few have seen reason to look upon as the work of Apollos—the Epistle to the Hebrews. On this ground chiefly many critics, beginning with Clement of Alexandria (about A.D. 200), a man of wide and varied culture, have held that Epistle to have been the work of St. Luke, elaborating and polishing the thoughts of St. Paul (Euseb. Hist. vi. 14). It has, he says, speaking as a critic of style, "the same complexion" as the Acts. Other considerations, it is believed, outweigh the former arts based on that fact; but the resemblance is sufficient to indicate that there were some affinities connecting the two writers, and the most natural is that which supposes them both to have had an Alexandrian training, and to have formed their style upon the more rhetorical books of the later Hellenistic additions to the canon of the Old Testament, such as the Books of Maccabees as the model of history, and the Wisdom of Solomon and Ecclesiastics for that of the more systematic treatment of doctrine. The points of resemblance between the Book of Wisdom and the Epistle to the Hebrews are indeed so numerous as to have suggested to the present writer the thought of identity of authorship.*

It is, of course, obvious to remark that many of the facts referred to are found also in the other Gospels, and formed part of the current oral teaching out of which the first three Gospels grew. Admitting this, however, it is clear that the history of Apollos brought him specially within the range of those who were likely to be conversant with St. Luke's teaching; and if we suppose him to have any written record before him, it is far more likely to have been the third Gospel than either the first or second. The two men, who were friends and companions of the same Apostle, were, at any rate, likely to have met and known each other, and if so it would not be strange that, with like character and like culture, there should be a reciprocal influence between them. Traces of that influence are to be found, it is believed, in the references in the Epistle to some of the passages which, though common to the other Gospels, are yet specially characteristic of this Gospel; to the temptations of the Son of Man as giving Him power to sympathise with sinners, though Himself without sin (Heb. iv. 15); to His prayers and supplications and strong crying (Heb. v. 7, 8); to His endurance of the cross, despising the shame (Heb. xii. 2); His endurance also of the contradiction of sinners (Heb. xii. 3); to His being the Mediator of a new covenant (Heb. xii. 24), the great Shepherd of the sheep (Heb. xiii. 20).

* The facts that bear upon St. Luke's work, as the writer of the Acts of the Apostles, are naturally reserved for the Introduction to that Book.
CHAPTER I.—(1) Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us, (2) even as they delivered them unto us, which from the beginning were eyewitnesses, and ministers of the word; (3) it seemed good to me also, having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first, to write unto thee in order, most excellent Theophilus, (4) that thou mightest know the certainty of those things, wherein thou hast been instructed.

(5) There was in the days of Herod, the king of Judæa, a certain priest named Zacharias, of the course of Abia: and his wife was of the daughters of Aaron, before the account called Demetri the sixth year.

(1) Forasmuch as many have taken in hand. —On the general bearing of this passage on the questions connected with the authorship and plan of the Gospel, see the Introduction. Here we note (1), what is visible in the English, but is yet more conspicuous in the Greek, the finished structure of the sentences as compared with the simpler openings of the other Gospels; (2) the evidence which the verse supplies of the existence of many written documents professing to give an account of the Gospel history at the time when St. Luke wrote—i.e., probably before St. Paul’s death in A.D. 65. The “many” may have included St. Matthew and St. Mark, but we cannot say. There is no tone of disparagement in the way in which the writer speaks of his predecessors. He simply feels that they have not exhausted the subject, and that his inquiries have enabled him to add something.

(2) Even as they delivered them unto us.—There is something noticeable in the candour with which the writer disclaims the character of an eyewitness. The word “delivered” is the same as that to which are formed the oral teaching—in its later sense, teaching preparatory to baptism. The passage is important as showing the author’s plan of bringing order into the Gospel history.

(3) Having had perfect understanding of all things. —Better, having traced (or investigated) all things from their source. The verb used is one which implies following the course of events step by step.

(4) Wherein thou hast been instructed.—The verb used is that from which are formed the words “catechise,” “catechumen,” &c., and implies oral teaching—in its later sense, teaching preparatory to baptism. The passage is important as showing that such instruction mainly turned on the facts of our Lord’s life, death, and resurrection, and on the records of His teaching.

(5) There was in the days of Herod.—The writer begins, as he had promised, with the first facts in the divine order of events. The two chapters that follow have every appearance of having been based originally on an independent document, and that probably a Hebrew one. On its probable sources, see Introduction. On Herod and this period of his reign, see Notes on Matt. ii. 1.

Zacharias.—The name (=“he who remembers Jehovah,” or, perhaps, “he whom Jehovah remembers”) had been borne by many in the history of Israel, among others by the son of Jehoiada (2 Chron. xxiv. 30), and by the prophet of the return from the Babylonian Captivity.

Of the course of Abia.—The Greek word so translated implies a system of rotation, each “set” or “course” of the priests serving from Sabbath to Sabbath. That named after Abia, or Abijah, appears
and her name was Elisabeth. (6) And they were both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless. (7) And they had no child, because that Elisabeth was barren, and they both were now well stricken in years. (8) And it came to pass, that while he executed the priest’s office before God in the order of his course, (9) according to the custom of the priest’s office, his lot was to burn incense when he went into the temple of the Lord. (10) And the whole multitude of the people were praying without at the time of incense. (11) And there appeared unto him an angel of the Lord standing on the right side of the altar of incense. (12) And when Zacharias saw him, he was troubled, and fear fell upon him. (13) But the angel said unto him, Fear not, Zacharias: for thy prayer is heard; and thy wife Elisabeth shall bear thee a son, and thou shalt call his name John. (14) And thou shalt have joy and gladness; and many shall rejoice at his birth. (15) For he shall be great in the sight of the Lord, and shall drink neither
wine nor strong drink; and he shall be filled with the Holy Ghost, even from his mother’s womb. (19) And many of the children of Israel shall he turn to the Lord their God. (17) And he shall go before him in the spirit and power of Elias, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the just; to make ready a people prepared for the Lord. (18) And Zacharias said unto the angel, Whereby shall I know this? for I am an old man, and my wife well stricken in years. (19) And the angel answering said unto him, I am Gabriel, that stand in the presence of God; and am sent to speak unto thee, and to shew thee these glad tidings. (20) And, behold, thou shalt be dumb, and not able to speak, until the day that these things shall be performed, because thou believest not my words, which shall be fulfilled in their season. (21) And the people waited for Zacharias, and marvelled that he tarried so long in the temple. (22) And when he came out, he could not speak unto them; and they perceived that he had seen a vision in the temple: for he beckoned unto them, and remained speechless. (23) And it came to pass, that, as soon as the days of his ministration were accomplished, he departed to his own house. (24) And after those days his wife Elisabeth conceived, and hid herself five months, saying, (25) Thus hath the Lord dealt with me in the days wherein he looked on me, to take away my reproach among men. (26) And in the sixth month the angel Gabriel was sent from God unto a city of Galilee,
named Nazareth, (27) to a virgin espoused to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David; and the virgin's name was Mary. (29) And the angel came in unto her, and said, Hail, thou that art highly favoured, 1 the Lord is with thee; blessed art thou among women. (29) And when she saw him, she was troubled at his saying, and cast

A city of Galilee, named Nazareth.—The town so named (now en-Nazirah) was situated in a valley among the hills that rise to a height of about 500 feet on the north of the Plain of Esdraelon. The valley itself is richly cultivated. The grassy slopes of the hills are clothed in spring-time with flowers. On one side there is a steep ridge that forms something like a precipice (chap. iv. 29). In the rainy season the streams flow down the slopes of the hills and rush in torrents through the valleys. From a hill just behind the town, the modern Nebi Ismail, there is one of the finest views in Palestine, including Lebanon and Hermon to the north, Carmel to the west, with glimpses of the Mediterranean, and to the south the Plain of Esdraelon and the mountains of Samaria, to the east and south-east Gilead, and Tabor, and Gilboa. It is a three days' journey from Jerusalem, about twenty miles from Ptolemais, and eighteen from the Sea of Galilee, six from Mount Tabor, about six from Cana, and nine from Nain. The name, as stated in the Note on Matt. ii. 23, was probably derived from the Hebrew Netser (=a branch), and conveying something of the same meaning as our -hurst, or -holm, in English topography.

(29) To a virgin espoused to a man whose name was Joseph.—Of the parentage of Mary the canonical Gospels tell us nothing, and the legends of the apocryphal have no claim to credit. That her mother's name was Anna, that she surpassed the maidens of her own age in wisdom, that she went as a child into the Temple, that she had many who sought her hand, and that they agreed to decide the claims by laying their rods before the Holy Place and seeing which budded, and that Joseph thus became the accepted suitor—this may be worth mentioning, as having left its impress on Christian art, but it has no claim to the character even of tradition. The scanty notices in the Gospels are (1) that she was a "cousin," or more generally a "kinswoman," of Elisabeth, and may, therefore, have been, by her parentage, wholly or in part of the daughters of Aaron. (2) That she had a sister who, according to a somewhat doubtful construction of an ambiguous sentence, may also have borne the name of Mary or Mariam (the "Miriam" of the Old Testament), and been afterwards the wife of Cleophas, or, more correctly, Clophas (John xix. 25). The absence of any mention of her parents suggests the thought that she depended and trusted on the divine, and that the Nativity presupposes poverty. Assuming the Magnificat to have been not merely the sudden inspiration of the moment, but, in some sense, the utterance of the cherished thoughts of years, we may think of her as feeding upon the psalms and hymns and prophecies of the Sacred Books, and knowing, as she did, that the man to whom she was betrothed was of the house of David, this may well have drawn her expectations of redemption into the line of looking for the Christ, who was to be the son of David. Of Joseph, we know that he was, possibly by a twofold lineage (but see Note on chap. iii. 23), the heir of that house, and must have known himself to be so. He was but a carpenter in a Galilean village, probably older than his betrothed, possibly a widower with sons and daughters, possibly the guardian of nephews and nieces who had been left orphans, but the documents which contained his genealogy must have been precious heirlooms, and the hopes that God would raise up the tabernacle of David that had fallen, to which one of those sons or nephews afterwards gave utterance (Acts xx. 16), could never have been utterly extinguished.

1 Or, graciously. 
*gratia* occurs, or, is understood, in the R. V. throughout, see ver. 45 of the text. 
1 Isa. 7. 14; 
Matt. i. 21.
give unto him the throne of his father David: (33) and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; 4 and of his kingdom there shall be no end. (34) Then said Mary unto the angel, How shall this be, seeing I know not a man? (35) And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God. (36) And, behold, thy cousin Elisabeth, she hath also conceived a son in her old age: and this is the sixth month with her, who was called barren. (37) For with God nothing shall be impossible. (38) And Mary said, Behold the handmaid of the Lord; be it unto me according to thy word. And the angel departed from her. (39) And Mary arose in those days, and went into the hill country with haste, into a city of Juda; (40) and entered into the house of Zacharias, and saluted Elisabeth. (41) And it came to pass, that, when Elisabeth heard the
Elisabeth was filled with the Holy Ghost.—What had been predicted of the Child (verse 15) was now fulfilled ex abundantiis in the mother. The fact related, so far as we look to human sources of information, must obviously have come to St. Luke, directly or indirectly, from the Virgin herself.

Blessed art thou among women.—The language, like that of most of the utterances in these chapters, is taken from the poetry of the older Scriptures, but there is a singular contrast between its application there to the murderess Jael (Judg. v. 24), and here to the mother of the Lord.

Whence is this to me . . .?—The sudden inspiration bids Elizabeth, rising above all lower thoughts, to recognise that the child of Mary would be also the Son of the Highest. The contrast leaves no room for doubt that she used the word "Lord" in its highest sense. "Great" as her own son was to be (verse 15) in the sight of the Lord, here was the mother of One yet greater, even of the Lord Himself.

Blessed is she that believed.—The two renderings, "for there shall be," and "that there shall be," are equally tenable grammatically. On internal grounds there seems a balance in favour of the latter, as the other interpretation appears to make the fulfilment of the promise dependent upon the Virgin's faith.

My soul doth magnify the Lord.—We come to the first of the great canticles recorded by St. Luke, which, since the time of Cassarius of Arles (A.D. 540), who first introduced them into public worship, have formed part of the hymnal treasures of Western Christendom. We may think of the Virgin as having committed to writing at the time, or having remembered afterwards, possibly with some natural modifications, what she then spoke. Here the song of praise is manifestly based upon that of Hannah (1 Sam. ii. 1—10), both in its opening words and in much of its substance, and is so far significant of the hopes, and, if we may so speak, studies, of the maiden of Nazareth.

In God my Saviour.—We may well believe that this choice of the name was determined by the meaning of the name, implying God's work of salvation, which she had been told was to be given to her Son.

The low estate of his handmaiden.—Note the recurrence of the word that had been used in verse 37, as expressing the character which she was now ready to accept, whatever it might involve.

All generations shall call me blessed.—The words have, of course, been partly instrumental in bringing about their own fulfilment; but what a vision of the future they must have implied then on the part of the village maiden who uttered them! Not her kinswoman only, but all generations should join in that beatitude.

His mercy is on them that fear him.—The words, as read by those for whom St. Luke wrote, would seem almost to foreshadow the Gospel of the Apostle of the Gentiles. Those that "feared God" were to be found not only among the children of Abraham, but also among "every nation" (Acts x. 2, 35), and He would shew forth His mercy to all in whom that temper should be found.

He hath shewed strength.—Literally, He wrought strength. Here the parallelism with 1 Sam. ii. 3 becomes very close. Of whom the speaker thought as among the "proud," we cannot know. They may have been the potentates of the world in which she lived, Herod and the Emperor of Rome. They may have been the men of Jerusalem, who despised Galilee; or those of the other towns and villages of Galilee, who despised Nazareth; or, though less probably, those of Nazareth itself, who despised the carpenter and his betrothed.

The mighty.—The word (that from which we get our English "dynasty") is applied to the One of great authority" under Candace, in Acts viii. 27, and is used as a divine name in "the blessed and only Potentate" of 1 Tim. vi. 15. Here it is used generally of all human rulers.

From their seats.—Better, their thrones, as the word is for the most part translated. (Comp. Matt. xix. 28, and in this very chapter, verse 32.)

Of low degree.—The adjective is that from which the noun translated "low estate," in verse 48, had been formed.

He hath filled the hungry.—It is interesting to note the manner in which the song of the Virgin anticipates the beatitudes of the Sermon on the Plain as reported by St. Luke (vi. 21). The words, like those of the beatitudes, have both their literal and their spiritual fulfilsment. Both those who trusted in their earthly riches, and those who gloried in their fancied spiritual wealth, were sent empty away, while the "hungry," those who craved for a higher blessedness, were filled with the peace and righteousness which they sought.

He hath holpen his servant Israel.—Up to this point the hymn has been one of personal thanks-
membrance of his mercy;" (55) as he spake to our fathers, to Abraham, and to his seed for ever. (56) And Mary abode with her about three months, and returned to her own house. (57) Now Elisabeth’s full time came that she should be delivered; and she brought forth a son. (58) And her neighbours and her cousins heard how the Lord had shewed great mercy upon her; and they rejoiced with her. (59) And it came to pass, that on the eighth day they came to circumcise the child; and they called him Zacharias, after the name of his father. (60) And his mother answered and said, Not so; but he shall be called John. (61) And they said unto her, There is none of thy kindred that is called by this name. (62) And they made signs to his father, how he would have him called. (63) And he asked for a writing table, and wrote, saying, His name is John. And they marvelled all. (64) And his mouth was opened immediately, and his tongue loosed, and he spake, and praised God. (65) And fear came on all that dwelt round about them: and all these sayings, and was commonly followed by a feast. It was also, as baptism has come to be, the time on which the child received the name which was to bear its witness of the prayers of his parents for him, and of his personal relation to the God of his fathers. (66) They called him John. (67) The Greek tense is strictly imperfect—they were calling him. The choice of the name commonly rested with the father, but the kinsfolk seem to have assumed that, in the drunkenness of the father, the duty devolved on them, and they, according to a custom not uncommon, showed their respect for the father by choosing his name. (68) Not so; but he shall be called John. (69) It is obvious from what follows that the writing-tablet had been in frequent use, and in this way the husband must have told the wife of the name which had been given by the angel. (70) There is none of thy kindred. . . . The fact is not without interest, as probably showing that Zacharias did not come within the circle of those related to the Sadducean high priests, among whom (some thirty years later, it is true) we find that name (Acts iv. 6, v. 17). (71) They made signs to his father. It seems probable—almost, indeed, certain—from this, that Zacharias was deprived of the power of hearing as well as speech, and had passed into the condition of one who was naturally a deaf mute. (72) A writing table. (73) John. It is obvious from what follows that the writing-tablet had been in frequent use, and in this way the husband must have told the wife of the name which had been given by the angel. (74) His name is John. There is something emphatic in the use of the present tense. It was not a question to be discussed. The name had been given already. (75) And they marvelled all. This confirms the view given above as to the previous deafness of Zacharias. There would have been no ground for wonder, had he heard the discussion. It was the coincidence that surprised them, hardly less than the utterance. (76) His tongue loosed. The verb is the same as the translators because the one previously used applied strictly only to the mouth. (77) He spake, and praised God. Probably, in substance, if not in words, as in the hymn that follows. The insertion of the two verses that follow seems to imply that some interval of time passed before its actual utterance. (78) The Circumcision of John the Baptist. ST. LUKE, I. The Naming of the Child.
were noise abroad throughout all the hill country of Judea. (66) And all
they that heard them laid them up in their hearts, saying, What manner of
child shall this be! And the hand of the Lord was with him. (67) And his
father Zacharias was filled with the Holy Ghost, and prophesied, saying,
(68) Blessed be the Lord God of Israel; for he hath visited and redeemed his
people, (69) and hath raised up an horn of salvation for us in the house of his
servant David; (70) as he spake by the mouth of his holy prophets, which have
been since the world began: (71) that we should be saved from our enemies,
and from the hand of all that hate us; (72) to perform the mercy promised
unto our fathers, and to remember his holy covenant; (73) the oath which he swore
to our father Abraham," (74) that he would grant unto us, that we being

south of Jerusalem, which reaches its highest point at Hebron. (See Note on verse 39.) The whole verse
describes the gradual spread of the report of the events from the immediate neighbourhood to the wider
district of which it formed a part.

(66) What manner of child shall this be?—Better, what shall this child be? The question was not,
what kind of child He should be, but what the child would do for God.

And the hand of the Lord was with him.—Some good MSS. give, "for the hand of the Lord," as
giving the reason for the previous question. The "hand" implies, in the familiar language of the Old
Testament (e.g., Judg. ii. 15; 2 Chron. xxx. 12; Ezra vii. 9), what we more commonly call the "guidance" or
the "providence" of God. The phrase was essentially a Hebrew one; one of the vivid anthropomorphic idioms
which they could use more boldly than other nations, because they had clearer thoughts of God as not made
after the similitude of men (Deut. iv. 12).

(67) Was filled with the Holy Ghost, and prophesied.—The latter word appears to be used in apposition with "the horn of salvation" of verse 69.

(68) Blessed be the Lord God of Israel.—The we find an allusion to John or Jochanan
in 1 Sam. xix. 20; 1 Cor. xiv. 24, 25). The hymn
that follows appears as the report, written, probably, by Zachariah himself, of the praises that had been
uttered in the first moments of his recovered gift of speech. As such, we may think of it as expressing the
ten-up thoughts of the months of silence. The fire had long been kindling, and at last he spake with
his fire, with his tongue.

(69) Hath raised up an horn of salvation.—The symbolism of the horn comes from Ps. cxxxii. 17,
where it is used of the representative of the House of David, and answers to the "Anointed" of the other
clause of the verse. It originated obviously in the impression made by the horns of the bull or stag, as the
symbols of strength. The name of the horn in the Psalms, Zacharias uses it as a description of the
coming Christ, who is to be raised up in the House of David.

(70) His holy prophets, which have been since the world began.—The words were probably more
than a lofty paraphrase of the more usual language, "of old time," "of ancient days," and imply a refer-
cence to the great first Gospel, as it has been called, of Gen. iii. 15, as well as to those made to Abraham,
who is the first person named as a prophet (Gen. xx. 7).

(71) That we should be saved from our enemies.—Literally, salvation from our enemies,
in apposition with "the horn of salvation" of verse 69. The "enemies" present to the thoughts of Zacharias
may have been the Roman conquerors of Judea; the
Idumaean House of Herod may have been among "those
who hate us." (72) To perform the mercy.—The verse has been
thought, and with apparent reason, to contain a reference,
after the manner of the ancient prophets (comp. Isa. viii. 3 ; Mic. i. 10–15), to the name of the speaker,
his wife, and of his child. In "performing mercy," we
find an allusion to John or Jochanan (= "The Lord be
merciful"); in "remembering His holy covenant," to
the name Zacharias (= "Whom Jehovah remembers");
in the "oath" of verse 73, to that of Elizabeth or Elisheba (= "The oath of my God"). The play upon
the words would, of course, be obvious in the original
Hebrew (i.e., Aramaic) of the hymn, which we have
only in its Greek version.

His holy covenant.—The covenant is clearly that
made with Abraham in Gen. xv. 18. In thus going
back to that as the starting-point of the New Cov-
enant which was to be made in Christ, Zacharias antici-
pates the teaching of St. Paul in Gal. iii. 15–19.

(73) The oath.—The oath is in apposition to the
covenant" of the preceding verse, though not gram-
matically in the same case with it.

(74) That he would grant unto us . . .—The form
of the Greek indicates even more definitely than the
English that this was the end to which the "coven-
ant" and the "oath" had all along been pointing.

Might serve him without fear.—The service is
that of worship as well as obedience. This was the
end for which deliverance from enemies was but a
means. Here, again, the form of the hope points to
The Hymn of Zacharias.

ST. LUKE, II.

The Decree of Augustus.

delivered out of the hand of our enemies might serve him without fear, (75) in holiness and righteousness before him, all the days of our life. (76) And thou, child, shalt be called the prophet of the Highest: for thou shalt go before the face of the Lord to prepare his ways; (77) to give knowledge of salvation unto his people by 1 the remission of their sins, (78) through the tender mercy 2 of our God; whereby the day-spring 3 from on high hath visited us, (79) to give light to them that sit in darkness and in the shadow of death, to guide our feet into the way of peace. (80) And the child grew, and waxed strong in spirit, and was in the deserts till the day of his shewing unto Israel.

CHAPTER II.—(1) And it came to pass in those days, that there went out a decree from Cesar Augustus, that all

its early date. What prospect was there, when St. Luke wrote his Gospel, of any deliverance of the Jews from their earthly enemies? By that time, what was transitoriness in the hymn had vanished, and the words had gained the higher permanent sense which they have had for centuries in the worship of the Church of Christ.

(75) In holiness and righteousness.—The same combination is found, though in an inverted order, in Eph. iv. 24. "Holiness" 18 has special reference to man's relations to God; "justice" to those which connect him with his fellow men; but, like all such words, they more or less overlap.

(76) Thou, child, shalt be called the prophet of the Highest.—Note the recurrence of the same divine name that had appeared in chap. i. 32, 33.

Thou shalt go before the face of the Lord.—The verse is, as it were, an echo of two great prophecies, combining the "going before Jehovah" of Mal. iii. 1, with the "preparing the way" of Isa. xl. 3. (77) To give knowledge of salvation.—This, as the form of the Greek verb shows, was to be the object of the Baptist's mission. Men had lost sight of the true nature of salvation. They were wrapt in dreams of deliverance from outward enemies, and needed to be taught that it consisted in forgiveness for the sins of the past, and power to overcome sins in the future.

The remission of their sins.—Historically, this was the first utterance of the words in the Gospel records, and we may well think of it as having helped to determine the form which the work of the Baptist eventually took. It is interesting to compare it with our Lord's words at the Last Supper (Matt. xxv. 28), and so to think of it as being the key-note of the whole work from the beginning to the end. Different in outward form as were the ministries of the Baptist and our Lord, they agreed in this.

(78) Through the tender mercy.—Literally, on account of the bowels of mercy of our God. After this manner the Jews spoke of what we should call "the heart" of God. The word was a favourite one with St. Paul, as in the Greek of 2 Cor. vii. 15; Phil. i. 8; ii. 1; Col. iii. 12. The pity that moved the heart of God is thought of, not as the instrument through which, but on account of which, the work of the Baptist was to be accomplished.

The day-spring from on high.—The English word expresses the force of the Greek very beautifully. The dawn is seen in the East rising upward, breaking through the darkness. We must remember, however, that the word had acquired another specially Messianic association, through its use in the LXX. version as the equivalent for the "Branch," "that which springs upward," of Jer. xxiii. 5; Zech. iii. 8. Here the thought of the sunrise is prominent, and it connects itself with such predictions as, "The glory of the Lord hath risen upon thee" (Isa. ix. 1), "The sun of righteousness shall rise" (Mal. iv. 2). What had become a Messianic name is taken in its primary sense, and turned into a parable.

Hath visited us.—Better, hath looked upon us.

(79) To give light to them that sit in darkness.—The words are an echo of those of Isa. ix. 2, which we have already met with in Matt. iv. 16, where see Note. Here they carry on the thought of the sunrise lighting up the path of those who had sat all night long in the dark ravine, and whose feet were now guided into "the way of peace," that word including, as it always did, with the Hebrew, every form of blessedness.

(80) And the child grew.—We have no materials for filling up this brief outline of the thirty years that followed in the Baptist's life. The usual Jewish education, the observance of the Nazarite vow, the death of his parents while he was comparatively young, an early retirement from the world to the deserts that surrounded the western shores of the Dead Sea, study and meditation given to the Law and the Prophets, the steadfast waiting for the consolation of Israel, possible intercourse with the Essenes who lived in that region, or with hermit-teachers, like Bannus, the master of Josephus (Life, c. 1), whose form of life was after the same fashion as his own; this we may surmise as probable, but we cannot say more. Whatever may have been the surroundings of his life, he entered upon his work in a spirit which was intensely personal and original.

II.

(1) There went out a decree.—The passage that follows has given rise to almost endless discussion. The main facts may be summed up as follows:—(1) The word "taxed" is used in its older English sense of "simple" "registration," and in that sense is a true equivalent for the Greek word. The corresponding verb appears in Heb. xii. 23. It does not involve, as to modern ears it seems to do, the payment of taxes. The "world" (literally, the inhabited world, οἰκουμένη,—the word from which we form the word "oecumenical" as applied to councils) is taken, as throughout the New Testament, for the Roman empire. When Augustus is said to have decreed, was a general census. (2) It may be admitted that no Roman or Jewish historian speaks distinctly of such a general census as made at this time. On the other hand, the collection of statistical returns of this nature was an ever-recurring feature of the policy of Augustus. We read of such returns at intervals of about ten years during the whole period of his government. In B.C. 27, when he offered
The Taxing of Cyrenius.

ST. LUKE, II.

The Journey to Bethlehem.

The world should be taxed.1 (2) (And this taxing was first made when Cyrenius was governor of Syria.) (3) And all went to be taxed, every one into his own city. (4) And Joseph also went up from Galilee, out of the city of Nazareth, into Judaea, unto the city of David, which is called Bethlehem; (because he was of the house and lineage of David:) (5) to be taxed with Mary his espoused wife, being great with child. (6) And so it was, that, while they were there,
the days were accomplished that she should be delivered. (7) And she brought forth her firstborn son, and wrapped him in swaddling clothes, and laid him in a manger; because there was no room for them in the inn. (8) And there were in the same country shepherds abiding in the field, keeping watch. 

necessarily because she too had to be registered at Bethlehem, but because her state, as “being great with child,” made her, in a special sense, dependent on Joseph's presence and protection. 

(7) She brought forth her first-born son.—On the question whether anything may be inferred from the word “first-born,” as to the subsequent life of Mary and Joseph, see Note on Matt. i. 25. 

Wrapped him in swaddling clothes.—After the manner of the East, then, as now, these were fastened tightly round the whole body of the child, con­fining both head and arms.

Laid him in a manger.—A tradition found in the Apocryphal Gospel of the Infancy fixes a cave near Bethlehem as the scene of the Nativity, and Justin Martyr finds in this a fulfilment of the LXX. version of Isa. xxxiii. 16, “His place of defence shall be in a lofty cave.” Caves in the limestone rocks of Judea were so often used as stables, that there is nothing improbable in the tradition. The present Church of the Nativity has beneath it a natural crypt or cavern, in which St. Jerome is said to have passed many years, compiling his Latin translation (that known as the Vulgate) of the Sacred Scriptures. The traditional ox and ass, which appear in well-nigh every stage of Christian art in pictures of the Nativity, are probably traceable to a fanciful interpretation of Isa. i. 3, which is, indeed, cited in the Apocryphal Gospel ascribed to St. Matthew, as being thus fulfilled.

There was no room for them in the inn.—The statement implies that the town was crowded with persons who had come up to be registered there—some, perhaps, exulting, like Joseph, in their descent from David. The inn of Bethlehem—what in modern Eastern travel is known as a khan or caravanserai, as distinct from a hostelry (the “inn” of chap. x. 34)—offered the shelter of its walls and roofs, and that only. It had a memorable history of its own, being named in Jer. xii. 17, as the “inn of Chimham,” the place of rendezvous from which travellers started on their journey to Egypt. It was so called after the son of Barzillai, whom David seems to have treated as an adopted son (2 Sam. xix. 37, 38), and was probably built by him in his patron's city as a testimony of his gratitude.

(8) Shepherds abiding in the field.—The fact has been thought, on the supposition that sheep were commonly folded during the winter months, to have a bearing adverse to the common traditional view which fixes December 25 as the day of the Nativity. At that season, it has been urged, the weather was commonly too inclement for shepherds and sheep to pass the night in the open air, and there was too little grass for pasturage. In summer, on the other hand, the grass on the hills is rapidly burnt up. The season at which the grass is greenest is that just before the Passover (Mark vi. 39; John xii. 24); but, on the whole, this appears the most probable date. The traditional season which does not appear as such till the fourth century, may have been chosen for quite other reasons—possibly to displace the old Saturnalia, which coincided with the winter solstice. It is noticeable that the earliest Latin hymns connected with the festival of Christmas dwell on the birth as the rising of the Sun of Righteousness on the world's wintry darkness.

Keeping watch.—Literally, keeping their night-watches, as in Matt. xiv. 25. Who the shepherds were, or why they were thus chosen as the first to hear the glad tidings, we cannot know. Analogy suggests the thought that it was an anchor to their prayers, the fulfilment of their hopes that the prophecies were then looking for “the consolation of Israel.” We may venture, perhaps, to think of the shepherds of Bethlehem as cherishing the traditions of David’s shepherd-life, and the expectations which, as we know from Matt. ii. 5, John vii. 42, were then current throughout Judea—that the coming of the Christ was not far off, and that Bethlehem was to witness His appearing, as thus gaining a higher spiritual receptivity than others. The statement in the Mishnas that the sheaf intended for sacrifice in the Temple were pastured in the fields of Bethlehem, gives a special interest to the fact thus narrated, and may, perhaps, in part, explain the faith and devotion of the shepherds. They had been rejoicing, at the Paschal season, over the spring-tide birth of the lambs of their flocks. They now heard of the birth of “the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world” (John i. 29).

(9) Came upon them.—The Greek verb, like the English, implies a sudden appearance. The form of the angel was probably, as in Mark xvi. 5, that of a young man in white apparel. (See Note on chap. i. 12). The wings of angels are, without exception, an after-thought of Christian imagination, those of Isa. vi. 2, Ezek. i. 6, Rev. iv. 8, being connected with the mysterious figures of the cherubim, the “living creatures” seen in apocalyptic vision.

The glory of the Lord.—The word suggests the thought of the Shechinah, or cloud of intolerable brightness, which was the token of the divine presence in the Tabernacle and the Temple (1 Kings viii. 10—11; Isa. vi. 1—3). (See Note on John i. 14.) Never before had there been such a manifestation to such men as these. What had been the privilege of patriarchs and priests was now granted to shepherds, and the first proclamation of the glad tidings was to those who were poor in their outward life as well as in spirit.

(10) Fear not.—It is worth noting that this is almost the normal accompaniment of the angelic manifestations in the Gospel (Matt. xxviii. 5—10; Luke i. 13, 30). They were intended to lessen, not to increase the dread which men feel on being brought into contact with the supernatural world.

I bring you good tidings.—The verb is formed from the word for glad tidings, which we translate as “good” —i.e., good news.

Which shall be to all people.—Better, to all the people. The words point, in the first instance, to the
day in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord. (12) And this shall be a sign unto you: Ye shall find the babe wrapped in swaddling clothes, lying in a manger. (13) And suddenly there was with the angel a multitude of the heavenly host praising God, and saying, (14) Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men. (15) And it came to pass, as the angels were gone away from them into heaven, the shepherds said one to another, Let us now go even unto Bethlehem, and see this thing which is come to pass, which the Lord hath made known unto us. (16) And they came with haste, and found Mary, and Joseph, and the babe lying in a manger. (17) And when they had seen it, they made known abroad the saying which was told them concerning this child. (18) And all they that heard it wondered at those things which were told them by the shepherds. (19) But Mary kept all these things, and pondered them in her heart.

And the shepherds returned, glorifying and praising God for all the things that they had heard and seen, as it was told unto them. (20) And when eight days were accomplished for the circumcision of the child, his name was called JESUS, which was so named of the

joy which shall be for Israel as God's "people," and as such distinguished from the other "nations" of the world (Comp. chap. ii. 32.)

The phrase, or its equivalent, "the host of heaven," is common in the later books of the Old Testament, but is there used with the visible "hosts" of sun, moon, and stars, which were worshipped by Israel (Jer. viii. 2; ix. 13; 2 Chron. xxxiii. 3.) In this sense we find it in St. Stephen's speech (Acts vii. 42). Here it is obviously used of the angels of God as forming the armies of the great King. The great name of the Lord of Hosts, the Lord of Sabaoth, was probably intended to include both the seen and the unseen hosts, the stars in the firmament, and the angels in heaven. Its use in the New Testament is confined to these two passages. The Hebrew word is found, in Old Testament quotations, in Rom. ix. 29, Jas. v. 4.

Glory to God in the highest.--The words seem to have formed one of the familiar doxologies of the Jews, and, as such, reappear among the shouts of the multitude on the occasion of our Lord's kingly entry into Jerusalem (chap. xix. 39). The idea implied in the words "in the highest" (the Greek is plural), is that the praise is heard in the very heaven of heavens, in the highest regions of the universe.

On earth peace, good will toward men.--The better MSS. give, "on earth peace among men of good will"—i.e., among men who are the objects of the good will, the approval and love of God. The other construction, "Peace to men of peace," which the Christian Year has made familiar, is hardly consistent with the general usage of the New Testament as to the word rendered "good will." The construction is the same as in "His dear Son," literally, the Son of His Love, in Col. i. 13. The word is one which both our Lord (Matt. xi. 25; Luke x. 21) and St. Paul use of the divine will in its aspect of benevolence, and the corresponding verb appears, as uttered by the divine voices, at the Baptism and Transfiguration (Matt. iii. 17; xviii. 5). The words stand in the Greek, as in the English, without a verb, and may therefore be understood either as a proclamation or a prayer. The "peace on earth" has not unfrequently been connected, as in Milton's Ode on the Nativity, with the fact that the Roman empire was then at peace, and the gates of the Temple were closed because there was no need for the power of the god to go forth in defence of its armies. It is obvious, however, that the "peace" of the angels' hymn is something far higher than any "such as the world giveth"—peace between man and God, and therefore peace within the souls of all who are thus reconciled. We may see a reference to the thought, possibly even to the words of the angelic song, in St. Paul's way of speaking of Christ as being Himself "our peace" (Eph. ii. 14).}

The shepherds.--Some, but not the best, MSS. give, as in the margin, "the men the shepherds," as if to emphasise the contrast between the "angels" who departed and the "men" who remained.

This thing . . . which the Lord hath made known.—Literally, this word, or spoken thing. The choice of the Greek word seems to indicate that St. Luke was translating from the Aramaic.

They came with haste.—The scene has naturally been a favourite subject of Christian art, and the adoration of the shepherds is, perhaps, implied, though not stated, in the narrative. The conventional accessories, however, of the ox and the ass, and the bright light glowing forth from the cradle, belong only to the legends of the Apocryphal Gospels. (See Notes on verse 7.)

They made known abroad . . .—The fact must be borne in mind, as tending to the agitation which reached its height on the arrival of the Magi in Jerusalem. (See Note on Matt. ii. 3.)

Mary kept all these things.—On the assumption that the whole narrative is traceable to the Virgin herself as its first author, these brief and simple touches as to her own feelings are of singular interest. She could not as yet understand all that had been said and done, but she received it in faith, and waited till it should be made clear. It was enough for her to know that her Child was, in some sense, the Son of God and the hope of Israel. The contrast between the simplicity and purity of St. Luke's narrative, and the fantastic and often prurient details of the Apocryphal Gospel of the Infancy is every way suggestive.

When eight days were accomplished . . .—Hence the Feast of the Circumcision in the Church Calendar comes on January 1st, and so, not without
angel before he was conceived in the womb. (22) And when the days of her purification according to the law of Moses were accomplished, they brought him to Jerusalem, to present him to the Lord; (23) (as it is written in the law of the Lord, Every male that openeth the womb shall be called holy to the Lord;) (24) and to offer a sacrifice according to that which is said in the law of the Lord, A. pair of turtledoves, or two young pigeons. (25) And, behold, there was a man in Jerusalem, whose name was Simeon; and the same man was just and devout, waiting for the consolation of Israel: and the Holy Ghost was upon him. (26) And it was revealed unto him by the Holy Ghost, that he should not see death, before he had seen the Lord's Christ. (27) And he came by the Spirit into the temple: and when the parents brought in the child Jesus, to do for him after the custom of the law, (28) then took he
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in the Temple.

(22) When the days of her purification . . .

The primary idea of the law of Lev. xii. 1-6, would seem to have been that of witnessing to the taint of imperfection and sin attaching to every child of man, just as that of circumcision (its merely physical aspects being put aside) was that of the repression or control of one chief element of that sinfulness. Here neither was necessary; but the whole mystery of the birth was not as yet revealed to Mary, and therefore her act was simply one of devout obedience to the law under which she lived. The period of purification lasted for forty days from the birth, bringing the Feast of the Purification in our Church Calendar to February 2nd.

To present him to the Lord.—This, as the next verse shows, was only done according to the law of Ex. xiii. 2, when the firstborn child was a son. It was obviously a witness of the idea of the priesthood of the firstborn—a survival of the idea in practice, even after the functions of that priesthood had been superseded by the priesthood of the sons of Aaron. The firstborn of every house had still a dedicated life, and was to think of himself as consecrated to special duties. Comp. Heb. xii. 23 as giving the expansion of the thought to the whole company of those who are the firstborn, as they are also the firstfruits of humanity (Gen. i. 8). As a formal expression of the obligation thus devolving on them, they had to be redeemed by the payment of five shekels to the actual Aaronic priesthood (Num. xviii. 15).

(24) A pair of turtle doves.—The law of Lev. xii. 5allowed these to be substituted for the normal sacrifice of a lamb as a burnt-offering, and a pigeon or dove as a sin-offering, when the mother was not able to offer the former. We may see, therefore, in this fact, another indication of the poverty of Joseph and his espoused wife. The offering had, like all other sacrifices, to be made in the Temple. It seems all but certain that this visit to Jerusalem must have preceded the visit of the Magi. After that, it would have been perilous in the extreme, and the narrative of Matt. ii. implies an immediate departure for Egypt after they had left.

(25) Whose name was Simeon.—Some writers have identified the man thus described with a very memorable Simeon in the annals of the Jewish scribes, the son of Hillel, and the father of Gamaliel. He became president of the Sanhedrin, A.D. 13. Singularly enough, the Mishna, the great collection of expositions of the Law by the leading Rabbis, passes over his name altogether, and this suggests the thought that it may have done so because he was under a cloud, as believing in the prophet of Nazareth. On this assumption, his looking for the consolation of Israel may be connected on one side with the fact that he, too, was of the house of David, and on the other, with the cautious counsel of Gamaliel in Acts v. 38, 39. Against this view there is the fact that St. Luke’s way of speaking leaves the impression that the Simeon of whom he spoke was of a very advanced age, waiting for his departure, and that he, who names Gamaliel’s position (Acts v. 34), would hardly have passed over Simeon’s. There was an aged Essene of this name living at the time of Herod’s death, who rebuked Archelaus for marrying his brother’s widow, and prophesied his downfall, and who more nearly fulfils the conditions; but the name was so common that all conjectures are very precarious.

Devout.—The Greek word expresses the cautious, scrupulous side of the religious life, and is therefore used always in the New Testament (Acts ii. 12; viii. 22; xii. 12) of Jewish devoutness.

The consolation of Israel.—This is the first occurrence of this word. In its general use it included the idea of counsel as well as comfort. Here the latter is obviously the dominant thought. We cannot pass over the words without remembering that the Child of whom Simeon spoke called Himself the Comforter, and promised His disciples to send them another, who should be a special moment of inspiration, rather than a continuous guidance.

(26) It was revealed unto him.—The Greek word is the same as that rendered “warned” in Matt. ii. 12. It implies a divine oracular communication, but rests on a different idea from the “unveiling,” which lies at the root of the word “reveal.” The message in this case came clearly as an answer to prayers and yearnings.

The Lord’s Christ.—The word retains all the fulness of its meaning—the Messiah, the Anointed of Jehovah.

(27) He came by the Spirit.—Better, as in Rev. i. 10, in the Spirit—i.e., in a spiritual state in which the power of the Divine Spirit was the pervading element.

The parents.—Here, as in verses 33 and 48, St. Luke does not shrink from reproducing what was obviously the familiar phraseology of the household of
him up in his arms, and blessed God, and said, (29) Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, according to thy word: (30) for mine eyes have seen thy salvation, (31) which thou hast prepared before the face of all people; (32) a light to lighten the Gentiles, and the glory of thy people Israel. (33) And Joseph and his mother marvelled at those things which were spoken of him. (34) And Simeon blessed them, and said unto Mary his mother, Behold, this child is set for the fall and rising again of many in Israel; and for a sign which shall be spoken against; (35) (yea, a sword shall pierce through thy own soul also,) that the thoughts of many hearts may be revealed. (36) And there was one Anna, a prophetess, the daughter of Phanuel, of the tribe of Aser: she

ST. LUKE, II. Anna the Prophetess.

The Hymn of Simeon.

In common life it is almost obvious that no other phraseology was possible. To do for him after the custom of the law. — In common practice, the child would have been presented to the priest who offered the two turtle doves on behalf of the parents. In this instance Simeon, though not a priest (there is, at least, nothing but a legend in an Apocryphal Gospel to fix that character on him), on himself, standing by the priest, to receive the child as he was presented. This fits in, as far as it goes, with the idea of his having been an Essene, revered as possessing prophetic gifts. (See Notes on verse 25.)

(29) Now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace. — It is not expedient to alter the translation, but we have to remember that the central idea is that of the manumission of a slave. The word for Lord is not the usual Κύριος, but Despotes — a word seldom used of God, and then almost always of the relation of a master and the slave who is such by inheritance or purchase (Acts iv. 24; 2 Pet. ii. 1; Jude verse 4; Rev. vi. 10, are the only other instances of its use). Simeon speaks as a slave who, through the night of long, weary years, has been standing on the watch-tower of expectancy, and is at last set free by the rising of the Sun.

According to thy word. — The reference is to the oracle which had been uttered within his soul, and was now being fulfilled.

(30) Mine eyes have seen thy salvation. — The Greek word is not the usual feminine noun expressing the abstract idea of salvation, but the neuter of the adjective — that which brings or works out salvation. Its use here is probably determined by its appearance in the LXX. version of Isa. iii. 10, as quoted in chap. vii. 6. He saw in that infant child the means of deliverance for the world.

(31) Before the face of all people. — Literally, of all peoples. The word expresses the universality of the salvation which the next verse contemplates in its application to the two great divisions of the human family.

(32) To lighten the Gentiles. — Literally, for a revelation to the Gentiles. The idea is strictly that of the withdrawal of the "veil spread over all nations" of Isa. xxxv. 7.

The glory of thy people Israel. — Here, again, the language is the natural utterance of the hope of the time, not the after-thought of later years. The Christ whom Israel had rejected was hardly "the glory of the people" when St. Luke wrote his Gospel.

(33) And Joseph and his mother. — The better MSS. give His father and his mother. The present reading has apparently been substituted for this through feelings of reverence, but it has quite sufficient authority in verses 27 and 48.

(34) This child is set for the fall and rising again. — The words start from the thought of Isa. viii.
was of a great age, and had lived with an husband seven years from her virginity; \(^37\) and she was a widow of about fourscore and four years, which departed not from the temple, but served God with fastings and prayers night and day. \(^38\) And she coming in that instant gave thanks likewise unto the Lord, and spake of him to all them that looked for redemption in Jerusalem. \(^39\) And she coming in that instant gave thanks likewise unto the Lord, and spake of him to all them that looked for redemption in Jerusalem. \(^39\) And she coming in that instant gave thanks likewise unto the Lord, and spake of him to all them that looked for redemption in Jerusalem.\(^40\)

when they had performed all things according to the law of the Lord, they returned into Galilee, to their own city Nazareth. \(^40\) And the child grew, and waxed strong in spirit, filled with wisdom: and the grace of God was upon him. \(^41\) Now his parents went to Jerusalem every year at the feast of the passover.\(^a\) \(^42\) And when he was twelve years old, they went up to Jerusalem

that which the legends of Apocryphal Gospels assign to the mother of the Virgin. She is named, as if it were a well-known fact, as having been the wife of Phanuel, and she is not of the tribe of Judah, but of Aser. That tribe, then, though belonging to the Ten

Filled with wisdom. — The Greek participle implies the continuous process of “being filled,” and so conveys the thought expressed in verse 52, of an increase of wisdom. The soul of Jesus was human, i.e., subject to the conditions and limitations of human knowledge, and learnt as others learn. The heresy of Apollinaris, who construed this expression as meaning that in the assumption that the Divine Word (the Logos of St. John’s Gospel) took, in our Lord’s humanity, the place of the human mind or intellect, is thus, as it were, anticipated and condemned.

The grace of God was upon him. — The words seem chosen to express a different thought from that used to describe the growth of the Baptist. Here there was more than guidance, more than strength, a manifest outflowing of the divine favour in the moral beauty of a perfectly holy childhood.

On the history of the period between this and the next verses, see Excursus in the Notes on Matt. ii.

(41) His parents went to Jerusalem. — The law of Moses required the attendance of all males at the three feasts of Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles (Ex. xxiii. 17; Deut. xvi. 16). The dispersion of the Jews had, of course, relaxed the obligation for those who lived at a distance: but it was still more or less generally recognised by those who dwelt in Palestine, and the school of Hillel held the Passover to be binding upon women as well as men. The yearly journey to Jerusalem may therefore be taken as an indication of devout obedience, not without its bearing on the thoughts of the child who, during those visits, remained behind in the home at Nazareth.

(42) When he was twelve years old. — The stages of Jewish childhood were marked as follows:—At three the boy was weaned, and wore for the first time the fringed or tasseled garment prescribed by Num. xv. 38—41, and Deut. xxii. 12. His education began, at first under the mother’s care. At five he was to learn the Law, at first by extracts written on scrolls of the more important passages, the Shema or Creed of Deut. ii. 4, the Hallel or Festival Psalms (Pss. cxlv. — cxviii., cxxxvi.), and by catechetical teaching in school. At twelve he became more directly responsible for his obedience to the Law, and on the day when he attained the age of thirteen, put on for the first time the phylacteries which were worn at the recital of his daily prayer. (See Note on Matt. xxiii. 5.) It was accordingly an epoch of transition analogous to that which obtains among us at Confirmation. It was, therefore, in strict accordance with usage, with perhaps a slight anticipation of the actual day, that the “child Jesus” should, at the age of twelve, have gone up with His parents to Jerusalem. If the conjecture suggested in the Notes on verse 8, that the birth of our Lord coincided with the Paschal Season, be accepted, He may
they found him in the temple, sitting in the midst of the doctors, both hearing them, and asking them questions. (47) And all that heard him were astonished at his understanding and answers. (46) And when they saw him, they were amazed; and his mother said unto him, Son, why hast thou thus dealt with us? behold, thy father and I have sought thee sorrowing. (40) And he said unto them, How is it that ye sought me? wist ye not that I must be

have learnt much from the Rabbis, my teachers; I have learnt more from the Rabbis, my colleagues; but from my scholars I have learnt most of all.” It is interesting to think that among the doctors then present may have been the venerable Hillel, then verging upon his hundredth year; his son and successor, Simeon; his grandson, the then youthful Gamaliel; Jonathan, the writer of the Chaldee Targum or Paraphrase of the Sacred Books; and Shammai, the rival of Hillel, who “bound” where the latter “loosed.”

Both hearing them, and asking them questions.—The method of teaching was, we see, essentially and reciprocally catechetical. The kind of questions current in the schools would include such as, What is the great commandment of the Law? What may or may not be done on the Sabbath? How is such a precept to be paraphrased; what is its true meaning? As the Targum of Jonathan included the books of Joshua, Judges, 1 and 2 Samuel, 1 and 2 Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the twelve Minor Prophets, the questions may probably have turned also on the meaning of prophecies, the expectations of the Christ, and the like. The legends of the Apocryphal Gospels make the wisdom of the child Jesus take a wide range over astronomy and other sciences.

(47) At his understanding and answers.—The first word seems to point to the discernment which showed itself in the questions as well as the answers. The egotism of Josephus leads him to speak of him—self as having, at the age of fourteen—when he too had become “a child of the Law”—caused a like astonishment by his intelligence; so that the chief priests and principal men of the city used to come and consult him upon difficult questions in the interpretation of the Law (Life, i. 1). The fact is so far interesting as showing that the class of teachers retained the same kind of interest in quick and promising scholars.

(46) Behold, thy father and I have sought.—The latter clause expresses a continuous act, We were seeking thee; and our Lord uses the same tense in His answer.

(40) Wist ye not . . . ?—This is, as it were, the holy Child’s defence against the implied reproach in His mother’s question. Had they reflected, there need have been no seeking; they would have known what He was doing and where He was.

About my Father’s business.—Literally, in the things that are My Father’s—i.e., in His work, the vague width of the words covering also, perhaps, the meaning “in My Father’s house,” the rendering adopted in the old Syriac version. The words are the first recorded utterance of the Son of Man, and they are a prophecy of that consciousness of direct Sonship, closer and more
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about my Father's business? (50) And they understood not the saying which he spake unto them. (51) And he went down with them, and came to Nazareth, and was subject unto them: but his mother kept all these sayings in her heart. (50) And Jesus increased in wisdom and stature,1 and in favour with God and man.

CHAPTER III.—(4) Now in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cesar, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judæa, and Herod being tetrarch of

ineffable than that of any other of the sons of men, which is afterwards the dominant idea of which His whole life is a manifestation. We find in a Gospel in other respects very unlike St. John's, the germ of what there comes out so fully in such words as, "My Father worketh hitherto, and I also work." (John v. 17), "I and My Father are One." (John x. 30). The words are obviously emphasised as an answer to Mary's words, "Thy father." Subject unto His parents as He had been before and was afterwards, was a higher Fatherhood for Him than that of any earthly adoption.

(50) They understood not the saying.—We are apt to think that they should have understood, and sceptical criticism has seen in this a contradiction to the previous history of the Annunciation and the Birth. Twelve years, however, of the life of childhood after the outward pattern of that of other children, may have dulled the impressions that had then been made; and even if they, in part, understood the words as referring to the marvel of His birth, they were still in the dark as to what He meant by being "about His Father's business." As it was, though it was the first flash of a great light, there was but a momentary. It faded into "the light of common day," and life went on in its quiet and simple fashion as before. It is clear, at any rate, that the writer of the Gospel was not conscious of any inconsistency between the later and the earlier narratives of the childhood of the Christ.

(51) Was subject unto them.—There was, therefore, in the years that followed, no premature assumption of authority—nothing but the pattern of a life perfect in all its home-relationships. In such a household as that of the carpenter of Nazareth, this subjectation must, in the nature of things, have involved much manual and menial work—a share in the toil alike of the workshop and the house.

His mother kept all these sayings.—The repetition of words like those of verse 19 is significant. The twelve years that had passed had not changed the character of the Virgin Mother. It was still conspicuous, more even than that of Joseph, for the faith which accepted what it could not understand, and waited patiently for the solution of its perplexities.

(50) Jesus increased in wisdom and stature.—Here again we have nothing but a normal orderly development. With Him, as with others, wisdom widened with the years, and came into His human soul through the same channels and by the same processes as into the souls of others—instruction, e.g., in the school of Nazareth, and attendance at its synagogue—the difference being that He, in every stage, attained the perfection of moral and spiritual wisdom which belongs to that stage; there being in Him no sin or selfishness or pride, such as checks the growth of wisdom in all others. In striking contrast with the true record of conquered it about B.C. 20, it was given to Herod the rank of a city under the name of Julias. Our Lord's ministry brought Him into the region under Philip's rule just before the Transfiguration (Matt. xvii. 1).

Iturea offers a link between the Old Testament and the New. It was named after Jetur (pronounced Yetur) a son of Ishmael (Gen. xxv. 15). Aristobulus conquered it about B.C. 55, and offered its inhabitants the choice of exile or Judaism. Some submitted, others found a refuge in the slopes of Hermon. When conquered by Augustus, B.C. 20, it was given to Herod the Great, and was bequeathed by him to Philip. The region lay between Hermon, Trachonitis, Gaulanitis,

1 Or, age.
Galilee, and his brother Philip tetrarch of Iturea and of the region of Trachonitis, and Lysanias the tetrarch of Abilene. 

(2) Anna and Caiaphas being the high priests, the word of God came unto John the son of Zacharias in the wilderness. 

(3) And he came into all the country about Jordan, preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins; 

(4) as it is written in the book of the words of Esaias the prophet, saying, The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight. 

(5) Every valley shall be filled, and every mountain and hill shall be brought low; and the crooked shall be made straight, and the rough ways shall be made smooth; 

(6) and all flesh shall see the salvation of God. 

(7) Then said he to the multitude that came forth to be baptized of him, O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come? 

(8) Bring therefore fruits worthy of repentance, and begin not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham for our father; for I say unto you, That God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham. 

(9) And now also the axe is laid unto the root of the trees: every tree therefore which bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire. 

(10) And the people asked him, saying, What shall we do then? 

(11) He answereth and saith unto them, He that hath two coats, let him impart to him that hath none; and he that 

And he came into all the country . . . — The words paint the mission-work of John somewhat more vividly than those of St. Matthew and St. Mark, who represent the people flocking to Him from Jerusalem and Judea. The two facts together complete the picture. 

The baptism of repentance.—See Notes on Matt. iii. 1—11, and Mark i. 4—6. In his description of the Baptist, St. Luke agrees verbally with the latter. 

The voice of one crying in the wilderness. — See Note on Matt. iii. 3. 

Every valley shall be filled. — The fuller citation by St. Luke, as compared with the other Gospels, is interesting, and suggests the thought that he was led to see in the manifold aspects of the Baptist's ministry a fulfillment of this part of the prophecy. The "valley" was filled, when lowly and penitent souls received the assurance of pardon; "mountains and hills" were "brought low" when the pride of Pharisees and Sadducees was rebuked; the "crooked made straight" when Publicans learnt to be honest; the "rough places smooth" when soldiers were taught to do violence to no man. The imagery is, of course, taken from the work of pioneers levelling a road for the march of a great king. 

The salvation of God. — The same word is used as in chap. ii. 30, where see Note. 

Then said he to the multitude. — Better, multitudes. In St. Matthew the words "Generation" (or broad) "of vipers" are related, probably with greater accuracy, as having been addressed specifically to the Pharisees and Sadducees. On the question itself, see Note on Matt. iii. 7. 

And the people asked him . . . — The questions that follow are peculiar to St. Luke. They are interesting as showing that the work of the Baptist was not that of a mere preacher of repentance. Confession of sins followed naturally on the part of the penitents; that was followed, as naturally, by guidance for the conscience. St. Luke, as a physician of the soul, may well have delighted to place on record this example of true spiritual therapies. 

He that hath two coats. — The remedy, in this case, was simple and practical. Selfishness was the root of evil. It was to be conquered not by religious emotions only, but by acts of unselfishness.
hath meat, let him do likewise. (12) Then came also publicans to be baptized, and said unto him, Master, what shall we do? (13) And he said unto them, Do violence to no man, neither accuse any falsely; and be content with your wages. (14) And the soldiers likewise demanded of him, saying, And what shall we do? And he said unto them, Do violence to no man, nor yet accuse any falsely; and be content with your wages.

(15) And as the people were in expectation, and all men mused in their hearts of John, whether he were the Christ, or not; (16) John answered, saying unto them, All that walketh in the valley of the shadow of death to fear: (17) whose fan is in His hand, and he will throughly purge his floor, and will gather the wheat into his garner; but the chaff he will burn with fire unquenchable. (18) And many other things in his exhortation preached he unto the people.

(19) But Herod the tetrarch, being reproved by him for Herodias his brother Philip’s wife, and for all the evils which Herod had done, added yet this above all, that he shut up John in prison. (20) Now when all the people were baptized, it came to pass, that Jesus also being baptized, and praying, the heaven was opened, (21) and the Holy Ghost descended in a bodily shape like a dove upon him, and a voice came from heaven which said, Thou art my beloved son; in thee I am well pleased.

(22) In a bodily shape.-The words are peculiar to St. Luke, and tend to confirm the traditional symbolism which finds in the dove the emblem of the
And Jesus himself began to be about thirty years of age, being (as was supposed) the son of Joseph, which was the son of Heli, (24) which was the son of Matthat, which was the son of Levi, which was the son of Melchi, which was the son of Janna, which was the son of Joseph, (25) which was the son of Mattathias, which was the son of Amos, which was the son of Naum, which was the son of Easi, which was the son of Nage, (26) which was the son of Maath, which was the son of Mattathias, which was the son of Semei, of Jacob by birth, and of Heli by adoption, or conversely. (b) Jacob and Heli may have been half brothers—sons of the same mother—by different fathers, Matthias and Matthat, or these two may be different forms of the name of the same person, and one of the two brothers may have died without issue, and the other married his widow to raise up seed unto his brother. On either of these assumptions, both the genealogies give Joseph's descent. This would be sufficient, as St. Matthew's record shows, to place the son of Mary in the position of the heir of the house of David. We have, however, on this theory, to account for the fact that two different genealogies were treasured up in the family of Joseph; and the explanation commonly offered is natural enough. St. Matthew, it is said, gives the line of kingly succession, the names of those who were, one after another, the heirs of the royal house; St. Luke that of Joseph's natural parentage, descending from David as the parent stock, but through the line of Nathan, and taking by adoption its place in the royal line when that had failed. The fact that from David to Salathiel St. Matthew gives us the line of kings, and St. Luke that of those who were outside the line, is so far in favour of this hypothesis. (c) A third and, as it seems to the present writer, more probable view is, that we have here the genealogy, not of Joseph, but of Mary, the words "being (as was supposed) the son of Joseph" being a parenthesis, and the first link being Jesus (the heir, and in that sense, son, of Heli). On this hypothesis, the Virgin, as well as Joseph, was of the house and lineage of David; and our Lord was literally, as well as by adoption, "of the seed of David according to the flesh" (Rom. i. 3), on the mother's side through the line of Nathan, on the reputed father's through that of Solomon. This view has at least the merit of giving a sufficient reason for the appearance of the two different genealogies. Everything too, as we have seen in the Introduction, points to the conclusion that the materials for the first three chapters of St. Luke's Gospel came to him through the company of devout women who gathered round the mother of Jesus; and if so, what more natural than that they should have preserved and passed on to him the document on which she rested her claim to be of David's lineage?
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which was the son of Joseph, which was the son of Juda, (27) which was the son of Joanna, which was the son of Rhesa, which was the son of Zorobabel, which was the son of Salathiel, which was the son of Ner, (28) which was the son of Melchi, which was the son of Addi, which was the son of Cosam, which was the son of Elmodam, which was the son of Er, (29) which was the son of Jose, which was the son of Elizeer, which was the son of Jorim, which was the son of Matthan, which was the son of Levi, (30) which was the son of Simeon, which

Holy Spirit. They, at least, fail in naturally with this view; but the other construction, that the Holy Spirit descended, after the manner of a dove, first hovering and then resting, in a bodily form (undefined) of some sort, is, at least, not excluded.

Began to be about thirty years of age.—At this age the Levites entered on their full work (Num. iv. 23, 30, 35), a kind of probationary period beginning at twenty-five (Num. viii. 24) or even, in later times, when their work was lighter, at twenty (1 Chron. xxiii. 27). No age was fixed for the beginning of the priesthood, nor of the prophet's work; but it may fairly be inferred that thirty was looked on for the fact that two different genealogies were treated its place in the royal line when that had failed.
was the son of Juda, which was the son of Joseph, which was the son of Jonan, which was the son of Eliaakim, (33) which was the son of Melea, which was the son of Menan, which was the son of Mattatha, which was the son of Nathan, which was the son of David, (32) which was the son of Jesse, which was the son of Obed, which was the son of Booz, which was the son of Salmon, which was the son of Naasson, (33) which was the son of Aminadab, which was the son of Aram, which was the son of Esrom, which was the son of Phares, which was the son of Juda, (34) which was the son of Jacob, which was the son of Isaac, which was the son of Abraham, which was the son of Thara, which was the son of Nachor, (35) which was the son of Saruch, which was the son of Ragau, which was the son of Phalec, which was the son of Heber, which was the son of Sala, (36) which was the son of Cainan, which was the son of Heber, which was the son of Arphaxad, which was the son of Sem, which was the son of Noe, which was the son of Lamech, (37) which was the son of Mathusala, which was the son of Enoch, which was the son of Jared, which was the son of Maleleel, which was the son of Cainan, (38) which was the son of Seth, which was the son of Adam, which was the son of God.

CHAPTER IV.—(1) And Jesus being full of the Holy Ghost returned from
he brought him to Jerusalem, and set him on a pinnacle of the temple, and said unto him, If thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down from hence: (10) for it is written, He shall give his angels charge over thee, to keep thee: (11) and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone. (12) And Jesus answering said unto him, It is said, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God. (13) And when the devil had ended all the temptation, he departed from him for a season.

(14) And Jesus returned in the power of the Spirit into Galilee: and there went out a fame of him through all the region round about. (15) And he taught in their synagogues, being glorified of all.

(16) And he came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up: and, as his custom was, he went into the synagogue on the sabbath day, and stood up

Matthew and St. Mark, and agree with the Spirit given “not by measure” of John iii. 34.

(9) Command this stone.—The singular form is somewhat more vivid than the plural, “these stones,” in St. Matthew.

(10) The kingdoms of the world.—St. Luke uses the word (literally, the inhabited world) which was commonly used as co-extensive with the Roman empire. On the difference in the order of the temptations, see Note on Matt. iv. 5.

In a moment of time.—The concentration of what seems an almost endless succession of images into the consciousness of a moment is eminently characteristic of the activity of the human soul in the state of ecstasy or vision.

(9) For that is delivered unto me.—Better, hath been delivered unto me. The specific assertion of the usurped dominion, though implied in St. Matthew, is in its form peculiar to St. Luke. (See Note on Matt. iv. 9.)

The notion that any such delegated sovereignty had been assigned to the Tempter, either before or after his fall from his first estate, has, it need hardly be said, no foundation in Scripture. It asserts that “the earth is the Lord’s, and the fulness thereof” (Ps. xxiv. 1); and the claim of the Tempter was a lying boast, resting only on the permitted activity and temporary predominance of evil in the actual course of the world’s history.

(10) When the devil had ended all the temptation.—Better, had completed every kind of temptation. The three trials were each typical in character, and taken together they made up the cycle of those to which our Lord’s human nature was then open.

For a season.—Till a [convenient] season—i.e., till the close of the great work, the time of the power of darkness (chap. xxii. 53), when the prince of this world again came (John xiv. 30), and, trying then the power of suffering, as he had before tried the allurements of the world, found that he was foiled in the latter temptation as he had been in the earlier.
for to read. (17) And there was delivered unto him the book of the prophet Esaias. And when he had opened the book, he found the place where it was written, (18) The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, 4 because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, (19) to preach the acceptable year of the Lord. (20) And he closed after an absence possibly of some months, with the new power that had already made Him famous. The work of preaching was also open to any person of adequate culture, who had a "word of exhortation" to address to the worshippers. (Comp. Acts xiii. 15.) The constitution of the synagogue in thus admitting the teaching functions of qualified laymen, was distinctly opposed to the root-idea of sacerdotalism.

(17) The book of the prophet Esaias.—The Law—i.e., the Pentateuch—was commonly written on one long roll. The other books, in like manner—singly or combined, according to their length—were written on rolls of parchment, and were unrolled from the cylinder to which they were fastened. Here, it is clear, Isaiah formed a roll by itself. It is a natural inference from the fact that it was given to Him, that it contained the prophetic lesson for the day. In the calendar of modern Jews, the lessons from Isaiah run parallel with those from Deuteronomy. The chapter which He read stands as the second lesson for the day of Atonement. We cannot prove that the existing order obtained in the time of our Lord's ministry, but everything in Judaism rests mainly on old traditions; and there is therefore nothing extravagant in the belief that it was on the day of Atonement that the great Atoner thus struck what was the key-note of His whole work.

What he had opened the book.—Better, when He had unrolled.

(18) The Spirit of the Lord is upon me.—The passage that follows reproduces, with a few unimportant variations, the LXX. version of Isa. ixi. 1, 2. The words "to heal the broken-hearted" are not in the best MSS. "To set at liberty them that are bruised" is not found in the present text of Isaiah. It is a legitimate inference that the passage which Jesus thus read was one in which He wished men to see the leading idea of His ministry. Glad tidings for the poor, remission of sins, comfort for the mourners, these were what He proclaimed now. These were proclaimed again in the beatitudes of the Sermon on the Mount. We cannot fail to connect the opening words with the descent of the Spirit at His baptism. That was the "unction from the Holy One" (1 John ii. 20) which made Him the Christ, the true anointed of the Lord.

The blindness is that of those who have been imprisoned in the darkness. (19) The acceptable year of the Lord.—The primary reference was to the year of Jubilee, when land that had been mortgaged returned to its owner, and debts were forgiven, and Israelite slaves released (Lev. xxv. 9, 10). It was to our Lord, as it had been to Isaiah, the type of the "year" of the divine kingdom. A somewhat slavish literalism, which the study of St. John's Gospel (chaps. ii., v., vi., vii., xii.) would have dispelled in an hour, led some of the Fathers to infer from this that our Lord's ministry lasted but for a single year.

(20) And he closed the book.—Better, rolled up, as describing the actual manner of closing. The description is characteristic as indicating (1) that it probably came in the first instance from an eye-witness, and (2) the calmness and deliberation with which our Lord acted.

And sat down.—This conveys to us the idea of falling back to a place of comparative obscurity among the congregation. To the Jew it implied just the opposite. The chair near the place from which the lesson was read was the pulpit of the Rabbi, and to sit down in that chair (as in Matt. v. 1, xxiii. 2) was an assumption by our Lord, apparently for the first time in that synagogue, of the preacher's function. This led to the eager, fixed gaze of wonder which the next clause speaks of.

Fastened on him.—The Greek word so rendered is noticeable as being used twelve times by St. Luke, (chiefly in the Acts), and twice by St. Paul (2 Cor. iii. 7, 13), and by no other writer of the New Testament. It had been used by Aristotle in his scientific writings, and was probably a half-technical word which St. Luke's studies as a physician had brought into his vocabulary, and which St. Paul learnt, as it were, from him.

(21) This day is this scripture fulfilled.—It is obvious that we have here only the opening words of the sermon preached on the text from Isaiah. There must have been more than this, remembered too vaguely for record, to explain the admiration of which the next clause speaks. But this was what startled them: He had left them as the son of the carpenter—mother, brethren, sisters were still among them—and now He came back claiming to be the Christ, and to make words that had seemed to speak of a far-off glorious dream, as a living and present reality.

(22) The gracious words.—Literally, the words of grace. It is noticeable that the latter noun does not occur at all in St. Matthew or St. Mark, becomes prominent in the Acts, and is afterwards the most characteristic word of the Epistles of St. Paul and St. Peter.

(23) Physician, heal thyself.—There is something interesting in our finding this proverb in the Gospel of the beloved physician. May we think of him as hearing the proverb casually, tracking out its application,
Capernaum, do also here in thy country. (24) And he said, Verily I say unto you, No prophet is accepted in his own country.* (25) But I tell you of a truth, many widows were in Israel in the days of Elias, when the heaven was shut up three years and six months, when great famine was throughout all the land; (26) but unto none of them was Elias sent, save unto Sarepta, a city of Sidon, unto a woman that was a widow. (27) And many lepers were in Israel in the time of Eliseus the prophet; and none of them was cleansed, saving Naaman the Syrian. (28) And all they in the synagogue, when they heard these things, were filled with wrath, (29) and rose up, and thrust him out of the city, and led him unto the brow of the hill whereon their city was built, that they might cast him down headlong. (30) But he passing through the midst of them went his way, (31) and came down to Capernaum, a city of Galilee, and taught and so coming on this history? It was, probably, so far as is known, a common Jewish proverb; but there is no trace of it in Greek writers, and it was therefore likely to attract his notice. (24) No prophet is accepted. —The proverb is remarkable as having been quoted by our Lord certainly as flinging from the Tarpeian rock was at Rome; but our Lord's ministry is a striking instance of possessed righteousness have in themselves a power, often proved, to baffie the fury of an angry mob. (25) And came down to Capernaum. —See Note on Matt. iv. 13. St. Luke, it will be noticed, often proved, to baffle the fury of an angry mob. And the name of our Lord's ministry is a striking instance of possessed righteousness have in themselves a power, often proved, to baffie the fury of an angry mob. (26) Eliseus the prophet. —The original gives, as was natural, the Greek form of Elisha, as before of Elijah. (27) Eliseus the prophet. —The original gives, as was natural, the Greek form of Elisha, as before of Elijah. (28) Were filled with wrath. —The admiration they had felt at first was soon turned into bitterness. They heard themselves spoken of as though there might be a faith in Zidon and in Syria which was not found in Israel, of which they themselves were altogether destitute. (29) The brow of the hill. —See Notes on chap. i. 26. The hill now shown as the Mount of Precipitation is about two miles from the city, and could hardly have been the place referred to. There is, however, a cliff about forty feet high close to the city. (30) He passing through the midst of them. —The words do not necessarily involve a directly supernatural delivance, as though the multitude had been smitten with blindness, or our Lord had become invisible. We have no right to insert miracles in the Gospel records. Calmness, silence, the moral power of self possessed righteousness have in themselves a power, often proved, to baffle the fury of an angry mob. (31) And came down to Capernaum. —See Note on Matt. iv. 13. St. Luke, it will be noticed, gives, what St. Matthew does not give, the reason of the removal. (32) At his doctrine. —Better, His teaching, as elsewhere. The form and manner was what amazed men. (33) His word was with power. —The word used is the same as the “authority” of Matt. vii. 29. There was no timid references to the traditions of the elders or the dictum of this or that scribe, as such as they were familiar with in the sermons they commonly heard in their synagogues. And in the synagogue. —See Notes on Mark i. 23—27. The narrative, as being common to these two Gospels, and not found in St. Matthew, may be looked on as having probably been communicated by one Evangelist to the other when they met at Rome (Col. iv. 10, 14). See Introduction to St. Mark. (35) And he arose out of the synagogue. —See Notes on Matt. viii. 14. Peculiar to St. Luke and
Healing of Simon's Wife's Mother.

ST. LUKE, V. The Miraculous Draught of Fishes.

Simon's wife's mother was taken with a great fever; and they besought him for her. (39) And he stood over her, and rebuked the fever; and it left her: and immediately she arose and ministered unto them.

(40) Now when the sun was setting, all they that had any sick with divers diseases brought them unto him; and he laid his hands on every one of them, and healed them. (41) And devils also came out of many, crying out, and saying, Thou art Christ the Son of God. And he rebuking them suffered them not to speak; (1) for they knew that he was Christ. (42) And when it was day, he departed and went into a desert place: and the people sought him, and came unto him, and stayed him, that he should not depart from them. (43) And he said unto them, I must preach the kingdom of God to other cities also; for therefore am I sent. (44) And he preached in the synagogues of Galilee.

CHAPTER V.—(1) And it came to pass, that, as the people pressed upon him to hear the word of God, he stood by the lake of Gennesaret, (2) and saw two ships standing by the lake: but the fishermen were gone out of them, and were washing their nets. (3) And he entered into one of the ships, which was Simon's, and prayed him that he would thrust out a little from the land. And he sat down, and taught the people out of the ship. (4) Now when he had left speaking, he said unto Simon, Launch out into the deep, and let down your nets for a draught. (5) And Simon answering said unto him, Master, we have toiled all the night, and have

indicating what we may venture to call accurate diagnosis, are the “great fever,” our Lord’s “rebuking” the fever, and the “immediate” rising to minister.

(40, 41) Now when the sun was setting.—See Notes on Matt. viii. 16, 17. Common to St. Luke and St. Mark are the “divers diseases,” and the silence imposed on the demoniacs. The words of the demoniacs, “Thou art the Son of God,” and “they knew that He was the Christ,” are peculiar to this Gospel.

(42—44) And when it was . . . —Again we have a narrative omitted by St. Matthew, but common to St. Luke and St. Mark. See Notes on Mark i. 33—39.

The people sought him.—The Greek tense implies continued seeking.

And stayed him.—Better, tried to stay Him. Their wish was that He should remain at Capernaum, heal their sick, teach them, and perhaps also that they and their fellow-townsmen might thus share in the fame of the new Prophet.

(43) I must preach.—Better, I must declare the glad tidings of the kingdom. The Greek verb is literally “to evangelise,” and is quite distinct from that commonly translated “preach.”

To other cities also.—Literally, to the other cities, with a special reference, probably, to those of Galilee.

(44) He preached.—Literally, was preaching.

V.

(1—11) And it came to pass . . . —See Notes on Matt. iv. 18—22. The narrative here has so many points in common with that in St. Matthew and St. Mark (i. 16—20) that it has been supposed by most commentators to be a different report of the same facts. It is supposed to be all but incredible that the call to the four disciples, the promise that they should be “fishers of men,” their leaving all and following their Master, could have been repeated after comparatively so short an interval. On the other hand, St. Luke places it after the healing of Simon's wife's mother; St. Mark and St. Matthew place what they relate before.

(4) Let down your nets.—It is, perhaps, a slight indication that the narrative of St. Luke does not give the same event as the other Gospels, that they use a different word for “net,” and one that has, technically, quite a distinct meaning. St. Luke's word, however, is generic, and may therefore include the other; and the other two use it when they speak of the disciples leaving their “nets.”

(5) Master, we have toiled all the night.—The word translated Master (epistolos) is not the same as that (didaskalos, teacher) in the other Gospels, and often in this also, and is peculiar to St. Luke. It
And when Simon Peter saw it, he fell down at Jesus' knees, saying, Depart from me; for I am a sinful man, O Lord. (9) For he was astonished, and all that were with him, at the draught of the fishes which they had taken: (10) and so was also James, and John, the sons of Zebedee, which were partners with Simon. And Jesus said unto Simon, Fear not; from henceforth thou shalt catch men. (11) And when they had brought their ships to land, they forsook all, and followed him.

And it came to pass, when he was in a certain city, behold a man full of leprosy: who seeing Jesus fell on his face, and besought him, saying, Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean. (13) And he put forth his hand, and touched him, saying, I will: be thou clean. And immediately the leprosy departed from him. (14) And he charged him to tell no man: but go, and shew thyself to the priest, and offer for thy cleansing, according as Moses commanded, for a testimony unto them. (15) But so much the more went there a fame abroad of him: and great multitudes came together to hear, and to be healed by him of his infirmities.

And he withdrew himself into the wilderness, and prayed. (17) And it came to pass on a certain day, as he was teaching, that there were Pharisees and doctors of the law sitting by, which were come out of every town of Galilee, and Judæa, and Jerusalem: and the power of the Lord was present to heal them.

And, behold, men brought in a bed a man which was taken with a fit; (18) and when Peter saw it, he answered, Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make him clean. (19) And he charged him to tell no man: but go, and shew thyself to the priest, and offer for thy cleansing, according as Moses commanded, for a testimony unto them. (20) But so much the more went there a fame abroad of him: and great multitudes came together to hear, and to be healed by him of his infirmities.

A man full of leprosy. See Notes on Matt. viii. 2—4. The precise description is peculiar to, and characteristic of, St. Luke, as is also the man's name, "Abba, Father." The latter is interesting as explaining the more general "worshipping" of St. Mark.

So much the more. The statement agrees with St. Mark, St. Matthew closing his account with the command given to the leper. Both the verbs, "went" and "came together," are in the tense that implies continuous action.

He withdrew himself into the wilderness. Literally, into the wildernesses, agreeing with St. Mark's "in desert places," now in one part, now in another, of the unclosed, uncultivated country. The addition that he was praying there is peculiar to St. Luke, who, throughout his Gospel, lays stress on this feature in our Lord's life. (See Introduction.)

It came to pass ... —See Notes on Matt. ix. 1—8.

Pharisees and doctors of the law. The description of the crowd of listeners is peculiar to St. Luke. The fact that many of the doctors of the law had come from Jerusalem is obviously important in its connection with St. John's account (chaps. ii., v.) of our Lord's previous work in that city, and as explaining the part now taken by them.

Was present to heal them. If we retain the plural pronoun, it must be taken generally as meaning those who sought healing. The better MSS., however, give the singular, and then it must be taken, "the power of the Lord (i.e., of God) was present for His (work of) healing."

Which was taken with a palsy. Literally, paralysed, or palsy-stricken, a somewhat more technical,
palsy;* and they sought means to bring him in, and to lay him before him. (19) And when they could not find by what way they might bring him in because of the multitude, they went upon the housetop, and let him down through the tiling with his couch into the midst before Jesus. (20) And when he saw their faith, he said unto him, Man, thy sins are forgiven thee. (21) And the scribes and the Pharisees began to reason, saying, Who is this which speaketh blasphemies? Where can he forgive sins, but God alone? (22) But when Jesus perceived their thoughts, he answering said unto them, What reason ye in your hearts? (23) Whether is easier, to say, Thy sins be forgiven thee; or to say, Rise up and walk? (24) But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power upon earth to forgive sins, (he said unto the sick of the palsy,) I say unto thee, Arise, and take up thy couch, and go into thine house. (25) And immediately he rose up before them, and took up that whereon he lay, and departed to his own house, glorifying God. (26) And they were all amazed, and they glorified God, and were filled with fear, saying, We have seen strange things to day.

and therefore characteristic word than the “sick of the palsy” in the other Gospels.
(19) With his couch.—The Greek word is the diminutive of the word translated “bed” in verse 13, and is used, apparently, as St. Mark uses the Latin grabatuin, to show how it was that the process described was possible.
(22) When Jesus perceived their thoughts.—Better, their reasonings, the Greek noun being formed from the verb used in verse 21.
(25) Glorifying God.—The fact that the man himself did this as well as the by-standers is peculiar to St. Luke.
(26) They glorified God.—Noticeable as common to all the three reports. The precise expression, “We have seen strange things to-day” (literally, things beyond expectation), is peculiar to St. Luke.
(22) And followed him.—Not then only, but continually, the verb being in the imperfect tense.
(26) A great feast.—The fact stated agrees with St. Mark, but the precise phrase is peculiar to St. Luke. The noun means literally a reception, and agrees, curiously enough, with the most modern use of that word.

Of publicans and of others.—It is, perhaps, characteristic of St. Luke as a Gentile that he will not use the word “sinners” as St. Matthew and St. Mark appear to have used it, as popularly including heathen as such, and substitutes the vaguer word “others.”

* Murmured.—Better, were murmuring. In reporting what was said by others, St. Luke naturally gives the word “siners” as it was actually spoken.
(31) They that are whole.—Better, they that are in health. Note, as once more characteristic of the “physician,” the use of this term instead of “they that are strong,” the strict meaning of the Greek word used in the other two Gospels. (See Introduction.)
(32) I came not.—Strictly, I have not come. But sinners to repentance.—In the best MSS. the last word is added by St. Luke only. One MS. (the Sinaiitic) has the remarkable various-reading “the ungodly” for “sinners,” as if from a recollection of Rom. v. 6, 7.
(33–39) Why do the disciples of John fast often, and make prayers, and likewise the disciples of the Pharisees; but thine eat and drink? (34) And he said unto them, Can ye make the children of the bride-chamber fast, while the bridegroom is with them? (35) But the days will come, when the bridegroom shall be taken away from them, and then shall they fast in those days.
(36) And he spake also a parable unto them; No man putteth a piece of a new garment upon an old; if otherwise, then

The Call of Levi the Publican.

ST. LUKE, V.
both the new maketh a rent, and the piece that was taken out of the new agrée not with the old. (37) And no man putteth new wine into old bottles; else the new wine will burst the bottles, and be spilled, and the bottles shall perish. (38) But new wine must be put into new bottles; and both are preserved. (39) No man also having drunk old wine straightway desireth new: for he saith, The old is better.

CHAPTER VI. (1) And it came to pass on the second sabbath after the first, that he went through the corn fields; and his disciples plucked the ears of corn, and did eat, rubbing them in their hands. (2) And certain of the Pharisees said unto them, Why do ye that which is not lawful to do on the sabbath days? (3) And Jesus answering them said, Have ye not read so much as this, what David did, when gathered. It could not therefore be much earlier than the Passover, when the barley harvest began, and not much later than the Pentecost, when the wheat was ripe. If it preceded, as it appears to have done (see chap. ix. 12), the feeding of the Five Thousand, it must have been before the Passover (John vi. 4). The conjectures, such as they are, are as follows:

(1.) The first Sabbath of the second month of the year, taking Nisan (in which the Passover occurred) as the first month.
(2.) The first Sabbath after the second day of the Passover, that day being itself kept as a supplementary feast.
(3.) The first Sabbath in the second year of the sabbatical cycle of seven years.
(4.) As the Jewish year had two beginnings, one (the civil) reckoning from the month Tisri (including part of September and October); the other (the ecclesiastical) from Nisan, it has been supposed that the first Sabbath in Tisri was called first-first, the first in Nisan second-first.
(5.) The Sabbath in the Pentecostal week, the second chief or first Sabbath, as that in the Passover week was the first.
(6.) The day after the new moon, when, through some accident, its appearance had not been reported to the Sanhedrin in time for the sacrifice connected with it. In such a case the second day was kept as the monthly feast, i.e., received the honours of the first, and so might come to be known technically as the second-first. If it coincided, as often it must have done, with the actual Sabbath, such a day might naturally be called a second-first Sabbath.

In the total depth of information it is impossible to speak decisively in favour of any one of these views. The last has the merit of at least suggesting the way in which St. Luke may have become acquainted with so peculiar a term. We know from Jewish writers in the Mishna that the new-moon feast was determined by the personal observation of watchmen appointed by the Sanhedrin, and not by astronomical calculation, and it was when they failed to observe or report it in time that the rule stated above came into play. We know from Col. ii. 16, that the observance of that feast had risen into a new prominence in the ritual of a sect which there is every reason to identify with that of the Essenes. (See Note on Col. ii. 16.) Among those whom St. Luke seems to have known at Antioch we find the name of Manon, or Monahem, the foster-brother of Herod the Tetrarch (Acts xii. 1), presumably, as many commentators have suggested, the son or grandson of Monahem, an Essene prophet, who had predicted the future sovereignty of Herod the Great. (See Introduction.) In this way, accordingly, if such a technical nomenclature were in use, as it was
himself was an hungred, and they which were with him; (4) how he went into the house of God, and did take and eat the shewbread, and gave also to them that were with him; which it is not lawful to eat but for the priests alone? (5) And he said unto them, That the Son of man is Lord also of the sabbath. (6) And it came to pass also on another sabbath, that he entered into the synagogue and taught: and there was a man whose right hand was withered. (7) And the scribes and Pharisees watched him, whether he would heal on the sabbath day; that they might find an accusation against him. (8) But he knew their thoughts, and said to the man which had the withered hand, Rise up, and stand forth in the midst. And he arose and stood forth. (9) Then said Jesus unto them, I will ask you one thing; Is it lawful on the sabbath days to do good, or to do evil? to save life, or to destroy it? (10) And looking round about upon them all, he said unto the man, Stretch forth thy hand. And he did so: and his hand was restored whole as the other. (11) And they were filled with madness; and communed one with another what they might do to Jesus. (12) And it came to pass in those days, that he went out into a mountain to pray, and continued all night in prayer to God.

(13) And when it was day, he called unto him his disciples; and of them he likely to be among the Essenes, St. Luke was likely to hear it. We may add further, that Manaen, from his position, was likely to have been brought into contact with the Baptist; that he could scarcely fail to have been impressed with a life which was so entirely moulded, outwardly at least, on the Essene type; and must have passed through the teaching of John to that of Christ. We find this incident following in immediate sequence upon one in which the disciples of John were prominent (chap. v. 33). May we not think therefore, with some reason, of Manaen having been among them, and of his having supplied St. Luke with the technical term that fixed the very difficulty presented by the word must, on the authority omit the perplexing word, and that some conjectures are, however, eminently unscholarly; and that one still more closely with St. Mark than with St. Matthew, he assigns to the choice of the Twelve, St. Luke agrees much more closely than either agrees with St. Matthew.

(10) And looking round about upon them.—See Notes on Mark iii. 4.

(11) They were filled with madness.—The expression is peculiar to St. Luke's report.

Communed one with another.—It seems singular that Luke, who in other respects seems to have had so many points of contact with people connected with the Herods (see Introduction), should have omitted the fact which St. Mark records, that it was with the Herodians that the Pharisees took counsel. Possibly, however, his very acquaintance with the men so named may have made him reluctant to give a special prominence to the part they had taken against the Christ. St. Mark, it will be remembered, says that they took counsel (or, held a council) that they might destroy him.

(12) He went out into a mountain to pray.—Better, into the mountain, or, the hill-country. The stress laid on the prayers of Jesus is again characteristic of St. Luke.

Continued all night in prayer to God.—The original, at least, admits of another rendering. The word translated "prayer" (proseuche) had come to be applied to the place dedicated to prayer—the chapel or oratory by the river-side, or on the mountain-side, where there was a running stream available for ablutions, to which devout Jews could retire for their devotions. Such a proseuche there seems to have been at Philippi (Acts xvi. 13). Another is named at Halicarnassus. Such, the language of Roman poets (in qua te quaro proseuche), Juvenal, Sat. iii. 296) shows us, there were at Rome. The fact mentioned by Josephus that there was one near Tiberias (Life, c. 54) shows that they were not unknown in Galilee. The precise combination of words—literally, in the prayer of God—is not found elsewhere for prayer as offered to God.

(13) And when it was day.—In the place which he assigns to the choice of the Twelve, St. Luke agrees more closely with St. Mark than with St. Matthew, who makes it precede the narratives of the disciples plucking the ears of corn, and the healing of the withered hand, which here it follows. A precisely-
chose twelve, whom also he named apostles; a Simon, (whom he also named Peter,) and Andrew his brother, James and John, Philip and Bartholomew, Matthew and Thomas, James the son of Alphaeus, and Simon called Zelotes, and Judas the brother of James, and Judas Iscariot, which also was the traitor. And he came down with them, and stood in the plain, and the company of his disciples, and a great multitude of people out of all Judæa and Jeru-

salem, and from the sea coast of Tyre and Sidon, which came to hear him, and to be healed of their diseases; and they that were vexed with unclean spirits: and they were healed. And the whole multitude sought to touch him: for there went virtue out of him, and healed them all.

And he lifted up his eyes on his disciples, and said, Blessed be ye poor: c for your's is the kingdom of God. (21)

Blessed are ye that hunger now: for ye shall be filled. Blessed are ye that weep now, for ye shall laugh. (23)

The conclusion there arrived at—that the two discourses differ so widely from each other in their substance and in their position in the Gospel narrative, that it is a less violent hypothesis to infer that they were spoken at different times than to assume that the two Evangelists inserted or omitted, as they thought fit, in reporting the same discourse—will be taken here as the basis of interpretation. It was quite after our Lord's method of teaching that He should thus reproduce, with more or less variation, what He had taught before. The English, "Blessed be ye poor," is ambiguous, as leaving it uncertain whether the words are the declaration of a fact or the utterance of a prayer. Better, Blessed are ye poor. We note at once the absence of the qualifying words of St. Matthew's "poor in spirit." Assume the identity of the two discourses, and then we have to think of St. Luke or his informant as omitting words, and those singularly important words, which our Lord had spoken; and this, it is obvious, presents a far greater difficulty than the thought that our Lord varied the aspects of the truths which He presented, now affirming the blessedness of the "poor in spirit," now that of those who were literally "poor," as having less to hinder them from the attainment of the higher poverty. See Notes on Matt. v. 3. It seems to have been St. Luke's special aim to collect as much as he could of our Lord's teaching as to the danger of riches. (See Introduction.)

Note the substitution of the "kingdom of God" for the "kingdom of heaven" in St. Matthew.

Blessed are ye that hunger now. In the second beatitude, as in the first, we note the absence of the words that seem to give the blessing on those that "hunger and thirst after righteousness" its specially spiritual character. The law implied is obviously the same as before. Fulness of bread, a life abounding in comforts and luxuries, like that of the rich man in the parable of chap. xvi. 19, tends to dull the edge of appetite for higher things. Those who know what the hunger of the body is, can understand better, and are more likely to feel, the hunger of the soul.

Blessed are ye that weep now: for ye shall laugh. The clause is remarkable as being (with its counterpart in verse 20) the only instance in the New Testament of the use of laughter " as the symbol of spiritual joy. In Is. xlv. 9 it comes in as representing worldly gladness; but the Greek word was too much associated with the lower forms of mirth to find ready acceptance. It is probable that the Aramaic word which our Lord used, like the mirth or laughter which entered into the name of Isaac (Gen. xxi. 6), had a somewhat higher meaning. Hebrew laughter was a
The Blessings and the Woes.

ST. LUKE, VI.

The Law of Love.

now: for ye shall laugh. (22) Blessed are ye, when men shall hate you, and when they shall separate you from their company, and shall reproach you, and cast out your name as evil, for the Son of man's sake. (23) Rejoice ye in that day, and leap for joy: for, behold, your reward is great in heaven: for in the like manner did their fathers unto the prophets. (24) But woe unto you that are rich! for ye have received your consolation. (25) Woe unto you that are full! for ye shall hunger. Woe unto you that laugh now! for ye shall mourn and weep. (26) Woe unto you, when all men shall speak well of you! for so did their fathers to the false prophets.

somewhat graver thing than that of Greek or Roman. It had had no comedy to degrade it.

(27) But I say unto you which hear, Love your enemies, do good to them which hate you, (28) bless them that curse you, and pray for them which despitefully use you. (29) And unto him that smiteth thee on the one cheek offer also the other; and him that taketh away thy cloak forbid not to take thy coat also. (30) Give to every man that asketh of thee; and of him that taketh away thy goods ask them not again. (31) And as ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise. (32) For if ye love them which love you, what thank have ye? for sinners also love those that love them. (33) And if ye do good to them which do good to you, thank of that implied in the maxim, Vox populi, vox Dei. Truth, in matters which, like religion or politics, impinge on men's interests or prejudices, is often, if not always, on the side of the minority, sometimes even on that of one who is as an Athanasius contra mundum. On the other hand, praise (Phil. iv. 8) and good repute (1 Tim. iii. 7) have their value as the witnesses borne by the moral sense of men, when not deadened or perverted to the beauty of holiness, the testimonia animae naturaliter Christianae to the moral excellence of the followers of Christ.

(22) Blessed are ye.—See Notes on Matt. v. 10—12. The sense “when they shall separate you from their company” is peculiar to St. Luke, and refers to the excommunication or exclusion from the synagogue, and therefore from social fellowship, of which we read in John xvi. 2.

(23) Leapt for joy.—The word is peculiar to St. Luke in the New Testament, and occurs elsewhere only in chap. i. 41, 44.

(24) But woe unto you that are rich!—Better, woe for you, the tone being, as sometimes (though as Matt. xxiii. 13; Mark xiii. 17; Luke xxi. 23.) We enter here on what is a distinct feature of the Sermon on the Plain—the woes that, as it were, balance the beatitudes. It obviously lay in St. Luke’s purpose, as a physician of the soul, to treasure up and record all our Lord’s warnings against the perilous temptations that wealth brings with it. The truth thus stated in its naked awfulness is reproduced afterwards in the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus (chap. xvi. 19).

Ye have received your consolation.—Better, simply, ye have your consolation—i.e., all that you understand or care for, all, therefore, that you can have. The thought appears again in the words of Abraham, “Thou in thy lifetime receivedst thy good things” (chap. xvi. 25.) The verb is the same as in “they have their reward,” in Matt. vi. 5.

(25) Woe unto you that are full!—The fulness is, as the context shows, that of the satiety of over-indulgence. The word is closely connected with that fulness (rather than “satisfying”) of the flesh of which St. Paul speak in Col. ii. 23.

Woe unto you that laugh now!—We note here, as so often elsewhere, an echo of our Lord’s teaching, in that of James the brother of the Lord. He, too, presents the same contrast, “Let your laughter be turned to mourning” (Jas. iv. 9).

(26) So did their fathers to the false prophets.—The words are of very wide application, but it is probable that there is a special reference in them to the time of Hezekiah and the later kings of Judah. (Comp. Isa. xxx. 19; Jer. v. 31.) They open a wide question as to the worth of praise as a test of human conduct, and tend to a conclusion quite the reverse
have ye? for sinners also do even the same. (34) If ye lend to them . . .—This special illustration of the law of unselfish kindness is in this collocation peculiar to St. Luke; but it is implied in the precept of Matt. v. 42.

To receive as much again.—It is noticeable, as implying that the precepts were given in the first instance to Jewish hearers, that receiving interest on lend according to the law of Christ, and do not let the children of the Highest: for he is the loan is not contemplated at all. (See Note on the absence of immediate profit the kind unto the unthankful and evil.

The well-known passage in no°blest reward shall be great, and ye shall be "gracious." same.

Hoping for nothing again; and your enemies, and do good, and lend, hoping for nothing again; and your reward shall be great, and ye shall be the children of the Highest: for he is kind unto the unthankful and to the evil. (36) Be ye therefore merciful, as your Father also is merciful. (37) Judge not, and ye shall not be judged: con-
master. And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but perceivest not the beam that is in thine own eye? Either how canst thou say to thy brother, Brother, let me pull out the mote that is in thine eye, when thou thyself beholdest not the beam that is in thine own eye? Thou hypocrite, cast out first the beam out of thine own eye, and then shalt thou see clearly to pull out the mote that is in thy brother's eye. For a good tree bringeth not forth corrupt fruit; neither doth a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. For every tree is known by his own fruit. For of thorns men do not gather figs, nor of a bramble bush gather they grapes. A good man out of the good treasure of his heart bringeth forth that which is good; and an evil man out of the evil treasure of his heart bringeth forth that which is evil: for of the abundance of the heart his mouth speaketh.

And why call ye me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say? Whosoever cometh to me, and heareth my sayings, and doeth them, I will shew you to whom he is like: He is like a man which built an house, and dug deep, and laid the foundation on a rock: and when the flood arose, the stream beat vehemently upon that house, and could not shake it: for it was founded upon a rock. But he that heareth, and doeth not, is like a man that without a foundation built an house upon the earth; against which the stream did beat vehemently, and immediately it fell; and the ruin of that house was great.

CHAPTER VII.—Now when he had ended all his sayings in the audience
of the people, he entered into Capernaum. And a certain centurion's servant, who was dear unto him, was sick, and ready to die. And when he heard of Jesus, he sent unto him the elders of the Jews, beseeching him that he would come and heal his servant. And when they came to Jesus, they besought him instantly, saying, That he was worthy for whom he should do this: for he loveth our nation, and he hath built us a synagogue. Then Jesus went with them. And when he was now not far from the house, the centurion sent friends to him, saying unto him, Lord, trouble not thyself: for I am not worthy that thou shouldest enter under my roof: wherefore neither thought I myself worthy to come unto thee: but say in a word, and my servant shall be healed. For I also am a man set under authority, having under me soldiers, and I say unto one, Go, and he goeth; and to another, Come, and he cometh; and to my servant, Do this, and he doeth it. When Jesus heard these things, he marvelled at him, and turned him about, and said unto the people that followed him, I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel. And they that were sent, returning to the house, found the servant whole that had been sick.

And it came to pass the day after, that he went into a city called Nain; and many of his disciples went with him, and much people. Now when he came nigh to the gate of the city, behold, there was a dead man carried into a city called Nain.—The sequence of events is the same as that in Matt. viii. 5—13; and, as far as it goes, this is an element of evidence against the conclusion that the Sermon on the Mountain and that on the Plain were altogether independent. Looking, however, at the manifest dislocation of facts in one or both of the Gospels, St. Matthew placing between the Sermon on the Mount and the healing of the centurion's servant, the healing of the leper, which St. Luke gives in chap. v. 12—16, the agreement in this instance can hardly be looked at as more than accidental. A certain centurion's servant.—See Notes on Matt. viii. 5—13. Was dear unto him.—Literally, was precious, the dearness of value, but not necessarily of affection. St. Luke is here, contrary to what we might have expected, less precise than St. Matthew, who states that the slave was "sick of the palsy." Had the physician been unable to satisfy himself from what he heard as to the nature of the disease? The details that follow show that he had made inquiries, and was able to supply some details which St. Matthew had not given.

He sent unto him the elders of the Jews.—The noun has no article. Better, He sent unto Him elders; not as the English suggests, the whole body of elders belonging to the synagogue or town. This is peculiar to St. Luke, and is obviously important as bearing on the position and character of the centurion. He was, like Cornelius, at least half a proselyte.

They besought him instantly.—Better, earnestly, or earnestly, the adverb "instantly" having practically lost the meaning which our translators attached to it.

He hath built us a synagogue.—Literally, the synagogue, a well-known and conspicuous building, probably the only one in Capernaum, and so identical with that of which the ruins have been lately discovered by the Palestine Exploration Society. (See Note on Matt. iv. 13.) Then Jesus went with them.—Literally, And Jesus was going with them. Whenever a centurion sent friends to him.—The pre-
out, the only son of his mother, and she was a widow: and much people of the city was with her. (13) And when the Lord saw her, he had compassion on her, and said unto her, Weep not. (14) And he came and touched the bier: and they that bare him stood still. And he said, Young man, I say unto thee, Arise. (15) And he that was dead sat up, and began to speak. And he delivered him to his mother. (16) And there came a fear on all: and they glorified God, saying, That a great prophet is risen up among us; and, That God hath visited his people. (17) And this rumour of him went forth throughout all Judea, and throughout all the region round about. (18) And the disciples of John shewed him of all these things. (19) And John calling unto him two of his disciples sent them to Jesus, saying, Art thou he that should come? or look we for another? (20) When the men were come unto him, they said, John Baptist hath sent us unto thee, saying, Art thou he that should come? or look we for another? (21) And in that same hour he cured many of their infirmities and plagues, and of evil spirits; and unto many that were blind he gave sight. (22) Then Jesus answering said unto them, Go your way, and tell John

(13) And when the Lord saw her.—The words are noticeable as being one of the comparatively few instances in which the term “the Lord” is used absolutely instead of Jesus. As far as it goes it confirms the view suggested in the previous Note, that the narrative came from those who had a profound reverence for the Master they had followed, and at a time when they had learnt thus to speak of Him. (Comp. the language of Mary Magdalene in John xx. 2, 13.) It may be noted further that this use of “the Lord” occurs more frequently in St. Luke and St. John than in the other Gospels. Comp. Luke vii. 31; x. 1; xi. 39; xii. 42; xvii. 5, 6; xix. 8; xxii. 61; John iv. 1; vi. 23; xx. 18, 20, 25; xxi. 7, 12. The last three or four references show that the disciples habitually used the same modes of speech, but it would not follow that in their lips it necessarily stood at first only as “Sir,” or “Master.” After the Resurrection, doubtless, it rose to its higher meaning, as in the exclamations of St. Thomas (John xx. 28; comp. John xx. 25), and of St. John (John xxi. 7).

He had compassion.—Note, in this instance, as in so many others (e.g., Matt. xx. 34; Mark i. 41), how our Lord’s works of wonder spring not from a distinct purpose to offer credentials of His mission, but from the outflow of His infinite sympathy with human suffering.

(14) He came and touched the bier.—The noun so translated is used by classical authors in various senses. Here the facts make it clear that it was after the Jewish manner of burial. It was not a closed-up coffin, like the mummy-cases of Egypt, but an open bier on which the corpse lay wrapped up in its winding-sheet and swathing bands, as in the description of the entombment of Lazarus (John xi. 44) and of our Lord (John xx. 6, 7), with the sudarium, the napkin or handkerchief, laid lightly over the face. The immediate effect of the touch was that they who bore the bier “stood still.” They must have marvelled, that One who was known as a Teacher should touch that which “stood still.” They must have marvelled, that One who was known as a Teacher should touch that which “stood still.” They must have marvelled, that One who was known as a Teacher should touch that which “stood still.” They must have marvelled, that One who was known as a Teacher should touch that which “stood still.” They must have marvelled, that One who was known as a Teacher should touch that which “stood still.” They must have marvelled, that One who was known as a Teacher should touch that which “stood still.” They must have marvelled, that One who was known as a Teacher should touch that which “stood still.” They must have marvelled, that One who was known as a Teacher should touch that which “stood still.” They must have marvelled, that One who was known as a Teacher should touch that which “stood still.” They must have marvelled, that One who was known as a Teacher should touch that which “stood still.” They must have marvelled, that One who was known as a Teacher should touch that which “stood still.” They must have marvelled, that One who was known as a Teacher should touch that which “stood still.” They must have marvelled, that One who was known as a Teacher should touch that which “stood still.” They must have marvelled, that One who was known as a Teacher should touch that which “stood still.” They must have marvelled, that One who was known as a Teacher should touch that which “stood still.” They must have marvelled, that One who was known as a Teacher should touch that which “stood still.” They must have marvelled, that One who was known as a Teacher should touch that which “stood still.” They must have marvelled, that One who was known as a Teacher should touch that which “stood still.” They must have marvelled, that One who was known as a Teacher should touch that which “stood still.” They must have marvelled, that One who was known as a Teacher should touch that which “stood still.” They must have marvelled, that One who was known as a Teacher should touch that which “stood still.” They must have marvelled, that One who was known as a Teacher should touch that which “stood still.” They must have marvelled, that One who was known as a Teacher should touch that which “stood still.” They must have marvelled, that One who was known as a Teacher should touch that which “stood still.” They must have marvelled, that One who was known as a Teacher should touch that which “stood still.” They must have marvelled, that One who was known as a Teacher should touch that which “stood still.” They must have marvelled, that One who was known as a Teacher should touch that which “stood still.” They must have marvelled, that One who was known as a Teacher should touch that which “stood still.” They must have marvelled, that One who was known as a Teacher should touch that which “stood still.” They must have marvelled, that One who was known as a Teacher should touch that which “stood still.” They must have marvelled, that One who was known as a Teacher should touch that which “stood still.” They must have marvelled, that One who was known as a Teacher should touch that which “stood still.” They must have marvelled, that One who was known as a Teacher should touch that which “stood still.” They must have marvelled, that One who was known as a Teacher should touch that which “stood still.” They must have marvelled, that One who was known as a Teacher should touch that which “stood still.” They must have marvelled, that One who was known as a Teacher should touch that which “stood still.” They must have marvelled, that One who was known as a Teacher should touch that which “stood still.” They must have marvelled, that One who was known as a Teacher should touch that which “stood still.” They must have marvelled, that One who was known as a Teacher should touch that which “stood still.”

(15) He delivered him to his mother.—Literally, He gave him. The mother was, probably, following at some little distance with the other mourners. As she came up she received her son as given to her once again, “God-given,” in a higher sense then when she had rejoiced that a man-child was born into the world.

(16) A great prophet.—This, we must remember, was the first instance of our Lord’s power as put forth to raise the dead, that of Jairus’s daughter following in chap. viii. 40—56. In the history of the Old Testament there were examples of such wonders having been wrought by Elijah (1 Kings xvii. 22) and Elisha (2 Kings iv. 34), and the people drew the natural inference that here there was at least a prophet of the same order.

That God hath visited his people.—The same word as in chap. i. 68, 78, where see Notes.

(17) This rumour of him went forth throughout all Judea.—Nain itself was in Galilee, and St. Luke apparently names Judea, as wishing to show how far the fame of the miracle had spread.

(18—23) And the disciples of John shewed him.—See Notes on Matt. xi. 2—6. The fact, mentioned by St. Luke only, that the “disciples of John” reported these things, suggests some interesting coincidences: (1) It implies that they had been present at our Lord’s miracles, and had heard His teaching, and we have seen them as present in Matt. ix. 14, Mark ii. 18. (2) It shows that though John was in prison, his disciples were allowed free access to him. (3) The fulness of St. Luke’s narrative in verse 21 suggests the thought that St. Luke may have heard what he records from one of those disciples, possibly from Manaen (see Introduction, and Note on chap. vi. 1) the foster-brother of the Tetrarch.

(19) Two of his disciples.—According to some MSS. of St. Matthew, which give simply, sent through his disciples, St. Luke’s account is the only one that gives the number of the disciples sent.

Sent them to Jesus.—Some of the best MSS. give, “to the Lord.” (See Note on verse 13.)

(20) He that should come.—Literally, as in St. Matthew, He that cometh, or, the coming One.

(21) And in that same hour he cured . . . .—The statement of the facts is peculiar to St. Luke, and obviously adds much force to our Lord’s answer. He pointed to what was passing before the eyes of the questioners.

Plagues.—See Note on Mark iii. 10.

(22) Go your way.—The exact agreement of the answer as reported in the two Gospels is significant as to the impression which they made at the time on those who heard them.
The Witness of Jesus to John the Baptist. ST. LUKE, VII. The Children sitting in the Market-place.

what things ye have seen and heard; how that the blind see, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead are raised, to the poor the gospel is preached. (23) And blessed is he, whosoever shall not be offended in me.

(24) And when the messengers of John were departed, he began to speak unto the people concerning John, What went ye out into the wilderness for to see? A reed shaken with the wind? (25) But what went ye out for to see? A man clothed in soft raiment? Behold, they which are gorgeously apparelled, and live delicately, are in kings' courts. (26) But what went ye out for to see? A prophet? Yea, I say unto you, and much more than a prophet. (27) This is he, of whom it is written, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee. (28) For I say unto you, Among those that are born of women there is not a greater prophet than John the Baptist: but he that is least in the kingdom of God is greater than he. (29) And all the people that heard him, and the publicans, justified God, being baptized with the baptism of John. (30) But the Pharisees and lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves, being not baptized of him.

(31) And the Lord said, Whereunto then shall I liken the men of this generation? (32) They are like unto children sitting in the marketplace, and calling one to another, and saying, We have piped unto you, and ye have not danced; we have mourned to you, and ye have not wept. (33) For John the Baptist came neither eating bread nor drinking wine; and ye say, He hath a devil. (34) The Son of man is come eating and drinking; and ye say, Behold a gluttonous man, and a winebibber, a friend of publicans and sinners! (35) But wisdom is justified of all her children.

(36) And one of the Pharisees desired him that he would eat with him. And he went into the Pharisee's house, and sat down to meat.

(37) And when the messengers of John were departed.—See Notes on Matt. xi. 7—19. The two narratives agree very closely. The few variations will be noticed as they occur.

(25) They which are gorgeously apparelled, and live delicately.—The words are more vivid than those in St. Matthew ("they that wear soft clothing"), and bring out the idea of ostentatious display and extravagant excess of luxury, as well as self-indulgence. Such forms of selfishness were common among the house of Herod and their followers. So Josephus describes the "royal apparel" of Agrippa (Acta xii. 21) as glittering with gold and silver tissues. The words must have gone home to the hearers,—itself a statement, probably intended for his Gentile readers, as to the effect produced by the preaching of the Baptist on the two classes who stood at opposite extremes of the social and religious life of Judæa.

Justified God.—Better, perhaps, acknowledged God as righteous. The word is commonly applied in this sense to man rather than to God ; but it appears so used in the quotation in Rom. iii. 4 from the LXX. version of Ps. li. 2. Here it has a special significance in connection with the statement that follows it, verse 95, that "wisdom is justified of all her children."
sat down to meat. (37) And, behold, a woman in the city, which was a sinner, when she knew that Jesus sat at meat in the Pharisee's house, brought an alabaster box of ointment, (38) and stood at his feet behind him weeping, and began to wash his feet with tears, and did wipe them with the hairs of her head, and kissed his feet, and anointed them with the ointment. (39) Now when the Pharisee which had bidden him saw it, he spake within himself, saying, This man, if he were a prophet, would have known who and what manner of woman this is that toucheth him: for she is a sinner. (40) And Jesus answering said unto him, Simon, I have somewhat to say unto thee. And he saith, Master,
The Two Debtors.
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say on. (41) There was a certain creditor which had two debtors: the one owed five hundred pence, and the other fifty. (42) And when they had nothing to pay, he frankly forgave them both. Tell me therefore, which of them will love him most? (43) Simon answered and said, I suppose that he, to whom he forgave most. And he said unto him, Thou hast rightly judged. (44) And he turned to the woman, and said unto Simon, Seest thou this woman? I entered into thine house, thou gavest me no water for my feet: but she hath washed my feet with tears, and wiped them with the hairs of her head. (45) Thou gavest me no kiss: but this woman since the time I came in hath not ceased to kiss my feet. (46) My head with oil thou didst not anoint: but this woman hath anointed my feet with ointment. (47) Wherefore I say unto thee, Her sins, which are many, are forgiven; for she loved much: but to whom little is forgiven, the same loveth little. (48) And he said unto her, Thy sins are forgiven.

was too common to suggest any identification. It is a somewhat singular coincidence that the two anointings should have happened (comp. Matt. xxvi. 6) each of them in the house of a Simon, but it cannot be looked on as more than accidental.

Master, say on.—The term used is one which implied recognition of our Lord's character as a teacher or Rabbi.

(41) There was a certain creditor . . .—The parable is a striking resemblance to that of Two Debtors in Matt. xviii. 23. Here, however, the debts, though different, are not separated by so wide an interval as are the ten thousand talents and the hundred pence. The debts are both within the range of common human experience. The "pence" are, of course, the Roman denarius, worth about sevenpence-halfpenny each. The application of the parable treats the woman as a greater debtor than the Pharisee. She had committed greater sins. Each was equally powerless to pay the debt—i.e., to make atonement for his or her sins. Whatever hope either had lay in the fact that pardon was offered to both as a matter of free gift and bounty.

Frankly.—Better, freely—i.e., gratuitously, as an act of bounty. So Shakespeare—

"I do beseech your grace . . . now to forgive me frankly."

Henry VIII, Act II, Scene 1.

(43) I suppose that he . . .—The same word occurs in the same sense as Acts ii. 15. As used here, it seems to carry with it a tone partly of indifference, partly of uneasiness and perplexity as to what the drift of the parable might be.

(44) Thou gavest me no water for my feet.—There had, then, been no real respect or reverence in the Pharisee's invitation. It was hardly more than an act of ostentatious patronage. It was honour enough for the carpenter's son to be admitted into the house. The acts of courtesy which were due to well-nigh every guest (comp. Notes on Matt. iii. 11; John xiii. 5; I Tim. v. 10), and which a Rabbi might expect as a thing of course, were, in his judgment, superfluous. Possibly the fact which afterwards drew down the censure of the Pharisee (Mark vii. 8) had already become known, and may have influenced Simon, if the new Teacher cared so little about ablutions, why take the trouble to provide them for Him?

(45) Thou gavest me no kiss.—This also, as we see in the case of Judas (see Note on Matt. xxvi. 49), was a customary mark of respect to one who claimed the character of a Rabbi. So the disciples of Ephesus kissed St. Paul on parting (Acts xx. 37). So the "holy kiss," the "kiss of peace," became part of the ritual of most of the ancient Liturgies (Rom. xvi. 16; 1 Cor. xvi. 20).

(46) My head with oil thou didst not anoint.—This also, though not so common as the kiss and the washing of the feet, was yet a mark of courtesy due to an honoured guest. For one who had journeyed to a feast under the burning sun of Syria, it brought with it a sense of comfort and refreshment which made it a bit of spiritual reality. For the usage, see Ps. xxii. 5, xiv. 7; Eccles. ix. 8. Partly because the use of oil or chrism became more directly symbolic in the ritual of the Christian Church—as in baptism, confirmation, extreme unction, the coronation of kings—partly because in other climates its necessity was not felt, the practice, as belonging to common life, has dropped into disuse. Note the contrast between the olive "oil," which was commonly used, and the more costly "ointment."

(47) Her sins, which are many, are forgiven.—Grammatically, the words admit of two interpretations, equally tenable. (1) Love may be represented as the ground of forgiveness, existing prior to it, and accepted as that which made forgiveness possible; or (2) it may be thought of as the natural consequence of the sense of being forgiven, and its manifestations as being therefore an evidence of a real and complete forgiveness. The whole drift of the previous parable is in favour of the latter explanation. The antecedent conditions of forgiveness, repentance, and faith—faith in Christ where He has been manifested to the soul as such; faith in Him as the Light that lighteth every man where He has not so been manifested—must be pre-supposed in her case as in others. And the faith was pre-eminently one that worked by love," from the first moment of its nascent life. In such cases we may if need be, distinguish for the sake of accuracy of thought, and say that it is faith and not love that justifies, but it is an evil thing to distinguish in order to divide.

Note in detail (1) that the tense used is the perfect, "Her sins . . . have been forgiven her;" (2) that the many sins of her past life are not, as we should say, ignored, but are admitted, as far as the judgment of the Pharisee was concerned, and pressed home upon her own conscience; (3) the thought subtly implied in the concluding words, not that the sins of the Pharisee were few, but that he thought them few, and that therefore the sanctity of his love was a witness that he had but an equally scant consciousness of forgiveness.

(48) Thy sins are forgiven.—Better, as before, Thy sins have been forgiven. The words throw light
The Journey through Galilee.

Chapter VIII.—And it came to pass afterward, that he went throughout every city and village, preaching and shewing the glad tidings of the kingdom of God: and the twelve were with him, and certain women, which had been healed of evil spirits and infirmities, Mary called Magdalene, out of whom went seven devils, and Joanna the wife of Chuza Herod’s steward, and Susanna, and many others, which ministered unto him of their substance.

Upon the meaning and force of all like formulae of absolution. It is, perhaps, matter for regret that any other formula, as the Absolvo te, which dates, be it remembered, from the thirteenth century, has ever been substituted for them. They did not for the first time convey forgiveness. That had been, as the context indicates, sealed and assured before by an unspoken absolution. But they came as words of power from the great Absolver, to banish every lingering doubt or fear, to confirm every faint and trembling hope that had elsewhere found refuge. He knew the secrets of her soul, and could therefore affirm in the fulness of His knowledge that she fulfilled the conditions of forgiveness. Others, it is clear, can only so affirm in proportion as their insight approximates to His.

Who is this that forgiveth sins also?—Better, Who is this that even forgiveth sins! The thought that underlay the question, though apparently the questioners were different, was the same as that which had found utterance when like words were spoken in the synagogue at Capernaum. (See chap. v. 31; Mark ii. 6; and Notes on Matt. ix. 3.)

Thy faith hath saved thee.—From the merely controversial point of view these words have a value in ascribing the justification or salvation of the woman to faith, and not to love. Those who go deeper than controversy will find in them the further lesson that theqh three preconditions of faith. We cannot love any one—not even God—unless we first trust Him as being worthy of our love. She trusted that the Prophet of Nazareth would not scorn or reject her, and therefore she loved Him, and showed her love in acts, and, in loving Him, she loved, consciously or unconsciously, the Father that had sent Him.

Go in peace.—The Greek form is somewhat more expressive than the English. Our idiom hardly allows us to say “Go into peace,” and yet that is the exact meaning of the original. “Peace” is as a new home to which the penitent is bidden to turn as to a place of refuge.

And it came to pass afterward.—The last word is the same as that translated “in order,” in chap. i. 3, and is interesting as showing the importance of St. Luke’s purpose to narrate events, so far as he could, in their exact sequence. He is the only writer in the New Testament who uses it. The verse sums up an undefined and otherwise unrecorded range of work.

And certain women.—The words bring before us a feature in this period of our Lord’s ministry not elsewhere recorded though implied in chap. xxiii. 49. The Master and the disciples formed at this period one travelling company. When they arrived at town or village, they held what we, in the current Church-language of our time, should call a Mission, the
And when much people were gathered together, and were come to him out of every city, he spake by a parable: A sower went out to sow his seed: and as he sowed, some fell by the way side; and it was trodden down, and the fowls of the air devoured it. And some fell upon a rock; and as soon as it was sprung up, it withered away, because it lacked moisture. And some fell among thorns; and the thorns sprang up with it, and choked it. And other fell on good ground, and sprang up, and bare fruit an hundred-fold. And when he had said these things, he cried, He that hath ears to hear, let him hear. And his disciples asked him, saying, What might this parable be? And he said, Unto you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of God: but to others in parables; that seeing they might not see, and hearing they might not understand. The seed is the word of God. Those by the way side are they that hear; then cometh the devil, and taketh away the word out of their hearts, lest they should believe and be saved. They on the rock are they, which, when they hear, receive the word with joy; and these have no root, which for a while believe, and in time of temptation fall away. And that which fell among thorns are they, which, when they have heard, go forth, and are choked with cares and riches and pleasures of this life, and bring no fruit to perfection. But that on the good ground are they, which in an honest and good heart, having heard the word, keep it, and bring forth fruit with patience.

ST. LUKE, VIII. The Parable interpreted.

Meet us in the well-known Apocryphal addition to the Book of Daniel known as Susanna and the Elders. Nothing further is known of the person thus named. Many others.—It seems clear that St. Luke must have come into personal contact with some, at least, of those whom he describes so fully. They were, we may well believe, among the "eye-witnesses and ministers of the word" (chap. i. 2) from whom he derived much of his information. (See Introduction.)

And when much people were gathered . . .—The narrative is less precise than that in St. Matthew. It is possible that the parable may have been repeated more than once.

A sower went out to sow.—See Notes on Matt. xiii. 3-23. Better, the sower. The vivid touch that being different from that in the other two Gospels sprang up with it. No man, when he hath lighted a candle, covereth it with a vessel, or

The seed is the word of God. This takes the place in St. Luke's interpretation of "the word of the kingdom" in St. Matthew. The "word of God" is obviously to be taken in its widest sense, as including every form by which a revelation from God is conveyed to the mind of man.

And cometh the devil.—Note St. Luke's use of this word instead of the "Satan" of St. Mark and "the wicked one" of St. Matthew, and his fuller statement of the purpose, "lest they should believe and be saved."

In time of temptation.—The form of the temptation (or better, trial) is explained by the "tribulation or persecution" of the other two reports. So St. Luke gives "fall away" where the others give "they are offended."

Cares and riches and pleasures of this life.—Better, simply, of life. St. Luke's word (bios) being different from that in the other two Gospels (sow, a time, or period—and so used for "the world"). The insertion of "pleasures" is peculiar to St. Luke, as is also the specific "bring no fruit to perfection" instead of "becometh unfruitful." The one Greek word which St. Luke uses, and for which the English version substitutes five, occurs nowhere else in the New Testament, and belonging, as it does, to the vocabulary of a more polished literature, is characteristic of his general culture.

In an honest and good heart.—The Greek for "honest" has a somewhat higher meaning than that which now attaches to the English, and may be better expressed by noble or honourable. The two adjectives were frequently joined together by Greek ethical writers (kalokagathos), the nobly-good, and so applied to the best forms of an aristocracy, or claimed by those who professed to represent it, to express the highest ideal of moral excellence.

With patience.—Better, with perseverence, or steadfastness. The word implies something more vigorous than the passive submission which we commonly associate with "patience." The thought is the same as in "be that endureth to the end" (Matt. x. 22; xxiv. 13), but the noun does not occur in the other Gospels. It occurs thirteen times in St. Paul's Epistles. No man, when he hath lighted a candle.
putteth it under a bed; but setteth it on a candlestick, that they which enter in may see the light. (17) For nothing is secret, that shall not be made manifest: neither any thing hid, that shall not be known and come abroad. (18) Take heed therefore how ye hear: for whosoever hath, to him shall be given; and whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken even that which he seemeth to have.¹

(19) Then came to him his mother and his brethren, and could not come at him for the press. (20) And it was told him by certain which said, Thy mother and thy brethren stand without, desiring to see thee. (21) And he answered and said unto them, My mother and my brethren are these which hear the word of God, and do it.

(22) Now it came to pass on a certain day, that he went into a ship with his disciples: and he said unto them, Let us go over unto the other side of the lake. And they launched forth. (23) But as they sailed he fell asleep; and there came down a storm of wind on the lake; and they were filled with water, and were in jeopardy. (24) And they came to him, and awoke him, saying, Master, master, we perish. Then he arose, and rebuked the wind and the sea; and there came an calm to the sea:

(25) It was told him by certain which said, . . . Better, more simply, it was told Him. Looking to the greater fulness of St. Mark's report, we may, perhaps, infer that this was one of the facts which St. Luke learnt from St. Mark when they met at Rome. (See Introduction.)

(26) My mother and my brethren.—The answer agrees very closely with that in the other Gospels. But note the use of "the word of God," instead of "the will of God" in St. Mark, and "the will of my Father" in St. Matthew, as throwing light on the meaning of the former phrase, and showing its fulness and width of meaning. (27) It came to pass on a certain day.—See Notes on Matt. viii. 18, 23—27, and Mark iv. 35—41. Literally, on one of the days. The vagueness of St. Luke's note of time, as compared with the more precise statements in St. Matthew (viii. 18) and St. Mark (iv. 35), is perhaps characteristic of this Evangelist as an inquirer coming late into the field, aiming at exactness, not always succeeding in satisfying himself as to the precise sequence of events, and honestly confessing when he has failed to do so.

Unto the other side of the lake—i.e., from the western to the eastern shore. It would seem from the Greek name of the district, Peræa (= the other-side country) as if the term was a colloquial designation of the eastern shore, even without reference to the starting-point.

The lake.—The uniform use of the more accurate term by St. Luke as a stranger, as contrasted with the equally uniform use of the more popular and local designation of the "sea" in the other three Gospels, written by, or under the influence of, Galileans, is characteristic of one who may have been a student of Strabo. (See Introduction.)

(28) He fell asleep.—The verb so rendered differs from the "was asleep" of the other Gospels, and this is the only place of the New Testament in which it occurs. It is a somewhat more technical word, and is so far characteristic of the physician-historian.

They were filled.—Better, they were filling, the sense describing the process, not the completion.

(29) Master, master.—We note another characteristic feature of Luke's phraseology. The Greek word (epistates) which he, and he only, uses in the New Testament, is his equivalent, here and elsewhere, for the "Rabbi" or "Master" (didaskalos), in the sense of "teacher," which we find in the other Gospels.

For the press.—Better, by reason of the multitude.
raged the water: and they ceased, and there was a calm. (25) And he said unto them, Where is your faith? And they being afraid wondered, saying one to another, What manner of man is this! for he commandeth even the winds and water, and they obey him.

(26) And they arrived at the country of the Gadarenes, which is over against Galilee. (27) And when he went forth to land, there met him out of the city a certain man, which had devils long time, and ware no clothes, neither abode in any house, but in the tombs. (28) When he saw Jesus, he cried out, and fell down before him, and with a loud voice said, What have I to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of God most high? I beseech thee, torment me not. (29) For he had commanded the unclean spirit to come out of the man. For oftentimes it had caught him: and he was kept bound with chains and in fetters; and he brake the bands, and was driven of the devil into the wilderness.) (30) And Jesus asked him, saying, What is thy name? And he said, Legion: because many devils were entered into him. (31) And they besought him that he would not command them to go out into the deep. (32) And there was there an herd of many swine feeding on the mountain: and they besought him that he would suffer them to enter into them. And he suffered them. (33) Then went the devils out of the man, and entered into the swine: and the herd ran violently down a steep place into the lake, and were choked. (34) When they that fed them saw what was done, they fled, and went and told it in the city and in the country. (35) Then they went out to see what was done; and came to Jesus, and found the man out of whom the devils were departed, sitting at the feet of Jesus, clothed, and in his right mind: and they were afraid. (36) They also which saw it told them by what means he that was possessed of the devils was healed.

(37) Then the whole multitude of the country of the Gadarenes round about besought him to depart from them; for they were taken with great fear; and he went up into the ship, and returned back again. (38) Now the man out of whom the devils were departed besought him that he might be with him: but Jesus sent him away, saying, (39) Return to thine own house, and shew how

St. Luke uses this word also, but apparently only in connection with our Lord's actual work as a teacher, and adopts epistates (literally, the head or president of a company, but sometimes used also of the head-master of a school or gymnasium) for other occasions. It was, as this fact implies, the more classical word of the two.

The raging of the water. — Literally, the wave or billow of the water. The term is peculiar to St. Luke's Gospel. (29) What manner of man. — Better, Who then is this? And water. — Better, and the water.

(29-30) And they arrived at the country of the Gadarenes. — See Notes on Matt. viii. 28-34, and Mark v. 1-20. Here again St. Mark and St. Luke agree in their order, and differ from St. Matthew. The better MSS. give “Gerasenes” or “Gergesenes.” See Note on Matt. viii. 28 for the localities.

Which is over against Galilee. — St. Luke's description of the region, which the other two Gospels name without describing, is characteristic of a foreigner writing for foreigners.

(27) And ware no clothes. — The English is stronger than the Greek warrants. Better, wore no cloak, or outer garment. (Comp. Note on Matt. v. 40.) Singularly enough, St. Luke is the only Evangelist who mentions this fact. It is as though he had taken pains to inquire whether this case of frenzied insanity had presented the phenomenon with which his experience as a physician had made him familiar in others.

(28) What have I to do with thee? — Note the exact agreement with St. Mark's report rather than St. Matthew's, both as to there being but one demoniac, and as to the words used by him.

(29) Driven of the devil .... — Better, by the demon, to show that it is still the unclean spirit, and not the great Enemy, that is spoken of.

Into the wilderness. — The Greek word is plural, as in chaps. i. 50, v. 16. St. Luke, it may be noted, is the only writer who so uses it.

(30) Legion. — Here again St. Mark and St. Luke agree.

(31) To go out into the deep. — Better, into the abyss. The word is not found in the other Gospels, and it clearly means, not the deep waters of the Galilean lake, but the pit, the “bottomless pit” of Rev. ix. 1, 2, 11. The man, identifying himself with the demons, asks for any doom rather than that.

(32) Down a steep place. — Better, down the cliff.

(33) In this country. — Better, in the town. The noun is in the plural, and is so rendered in Matt. xxi. 5.

(34) Sitting at the feet of Jesus. — This feature is peculiar to St. Luke's narrative. The demoniac was now in the same attitude of rapt attention as that in which we find afterwards Mary the sister of Lazarus (chap. x. 39).

(35) By what means .... — Better, how; stress being laid on the manner rather than the instrumentality.

(36) They were taken with great fear. — Better, they were oppressed.

(37) Throughout the whole city. — The city was, of course, according to the reading adopted, Gerassa, or Gadara.
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great things God hath done unto thee. And he went his way, and published throughout the whole city how great things Jesus had done unto him. (46) And it came to pass, that, when Jesus was returned, the people gladly received him; for they were all waiting for him.

(41) And, behold, there came a man named Jairus, and he was a ruler of the synagogue: and he fell down at Jesus' feet, and besought him that he would come into his house: (44) for he had one only daughter, about twelve years of age, and she lay a dying. But as he went the people thronged him.

(45) And a woman having an issue of blood twelve years, which had spent all her living upon physicians, neither could she be healed of any, (44) came behind him, and touched the border of his garment: and immediately her issue of blood stanched. (45) And Jesus said, Who touched me? When all denied, Peter and they that were with him said, Master, the multitude throng thee and press thee, and sayest thou, Who touched me? (46) And Jesus said, Somebody hath touched me: for I perceive that virtue is gone out of me. (47) And when the woman saw that she was not hid, she came trembling, and falling down before him, she declared unto him before all the people for what cause she had touched him, and how she was healed immediately. (48) And he said unto her, Daughter, be of good comfort: thy faith hath made thee whole; go in peace.

While he yet spake, there came one from the ruler of the synagogue's house, saying to him, Thy daughter is dead; trouble not the Master. (50) But when Jesus heard it, he answered him, saying, Fear not; believe only, and she shall be made whole. (51) And when he came into the house, he suffered no man to go in, save Peter, and James, and John, and the father and the mother of the maid. (52) And all wept, and bewailed her: but he said, Weep not; she is not dead, but sleepeth. (53) And they laughed him to scorn, knowing that she was dead. (54) And he put them all out, and took her by the hand, and called, saying, Maid, arise. (55) And her spirit came again, and she arose straightway: and he commanded to give her meat. (56) And her parents were astonished: but he charged them that they should tell no man what was done.

CHAPTER IX. (1) Then he called his twelve disciples together, and gave them power and authority over all devils, and to cure diseases. (2) And he sent them to preach the kingdom of God, and to heal the sick. (3) And he said unto them, Take nothing for your journey, neither staves, nor scrip, neither
bread, neither money; neither have two coats apiece. (4) And whatsoever house ye enter into, there abide, and thence depart. (5) And whosoever will not receive you, when ye go out of that city, shake off the very dust from your feet for a testimony against them. (6) And they departed, and went through the towns, preaching the gospel, and healing every where.

(7) Now Herod the tetrarch heard of all that was done by him: * and he was perplexed, because that it was said of some, that John was risen from the dead; (9) and of some, that Elias had appeared; and of others, that one of the old prophets was risen again. (8) And Herod said, John have I beheaded: but who is this, of whom I hear such things? And he desired to see him.

(10) And the apostles, when they were returned, told him all that they had done. And he took them, and went aside privately into a desert place belonging to the city called Bethsaida. (11) And the people, when they knew it, followed him: and he received them, and spake unto them of the kingdom of God, and healed them that had need of healing. (12) And when the day began to wear away, * then came the twelve, and said unto him, Send the multitude away, that they may go into the towns and country round about, and lodge, and get victuals: for we are here in a desert place. (13) But he said unto them, Give ye them to eat. And they said, We have no more but five loaves and two fishes; except we should go and buy meat for all this people. (14) For they were about five thousand men. And he said to his disciples, Make them sit down by fifties in a company. (15) And they did so, and made them all sit down.

(16) Then he took the five loaves and the two fishes, and looking up to heaven, he blessed them, and brake, and gave to the disciples to set before the multitude. (17) And they did eat, and were all filled: and there was taken up of fragments that remained to them twelve baskets. (18) And it came to pass, as he was alone praying, his disciples were with him; * and he asked them, saying, Whom say the people that I am? (19) They answering said, John the Baptist; but some say, Elias; and others say, that one of the old prophets is risen again. (20) He said unto them, But whom say ye that I am? Peter answering said, The Christ of God. (21) And he straitly charged them, and commanded them to tell no man that thing; (22) saying, The Son of man must
The Conditions of Discipleship.

ST. LUKE, IX.

The Transfiguration.

suffer many things, and be rejected of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be slain, and be raised the third day.

(23) And he said to them all, If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow me. (24) For whosoever will save his life shall lose it: but whosoever will lose his life for my sake, the same shall save it. (25) For what is a man advantaged, if he gain the whole world, and lose himself, or be cast away? (26) For whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words, of him shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he shall come in his own glory, and in his Father’s, and of the holy angels. (27) But I tell you of a truth, there be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the kingdom of God.

(28) And it came to pass about an eight days after these sayings, he took Peter and John and James, and went up into a mountain to pray. (29) And as he prayed, the fashion of his countenance was altered, and his raiment was white and glistering. (30) And, behold, there talked with him two men, which were Moses and Elias: (31) who appeared in glory, and spake of his decease which he should accomplish at Jerusalem. (32) But Peter and they that were with him were heavy with sleep: and when they were awake, they saw his glory, and the two men that stood with him. (33) And it came to pass, as they departed from him, Peter said unto Jesus, Master, it is good for us to be here: and let us make three tabernacles; one for thee, and one for Moses, and one for Elias: not knowing what he said. (34) While he thus spake, there came a cloud, and overshadowed them: and they feared as they entered into the cloud. (35) And there came a voice out of the cloud, saying, This is my beloved Son: hear him. (36) And when the voice was past, Jesus was found alone. And they kept it close, and told no man in those days any of those things which they had seen.

(37) And it came to pass, that on the next day, when they were come down from the hill, much people met him.
And, behold, a man of the company cried out, saying, Master, I beseech thee look upon my son: for he is mine only child. And, lo, a spirit taketh him, and he suddenly crieth out; and it teareth him that he foameth again; and bruising him hardly departeth from him. And I besought thy disciples to cast him out; and they could not. And Jesus answering said, O faithless and perverse generation, how long shall I be with you, and suffer you? Bring thy son hither. And Jesus rebuked the unclean spirit, and healed the child, and delivered him again to his father.

And they were all amazed at the mighty power of God. But while they wondered every one at all things which Jesus did, he said unto his disciples, Let these sayings sink down into your ears: for the Son of man shall be delivered into the hands of men. But they understood not this saying, and it was hid from them, that they perceived it not; and they feared to ask him of that saying.

Then there arose a reasoning among them, which of them should be greatest. And Jesus, perceiving the thought of their heart, took a child, and set him by him, and said unto them, Whosoever shall receive this child in my name receiveth me: and whosoever shall receive me receiveth him that sent me: for he that is least among you all, the same shall be great.

And John answered and said, Master; we saw one casting out devils in thy name; and we forbade them, because he followeth not with us. And Jesus said unto him, Forbid him not: for he that is not against us is for us.

And it came to pass, when the time was come that he should be received up, he stedfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem. And sent messengers before his face.
The Village of the Samaritans.

The Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them. And they went to another village.

And it came to pass, that, as they went in the way, a certain man said unto him, Lord, I will follow thee whithersoever thou goest. And Jesus said unto him, Foxes have holes, and birds of the air have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head. (And he said unto another, Follow me. But he said, Lord, suffer me first to go and bury my father.)

ST. LUKE, IX.

Excuses of Three Disciples.

Hamath, and Sepharvaim (2 Kings xvii. 24), to occupy the district thus left depopulated, and from these the Samaritans of later history were descended. They were accordingly of alien races, and their neighbours of Judah kept up the memory of their foreign origin by speaking of them as Cuthimans. Under the influence of a priest of Israel sent by the king of Assyria, they became worshippers of Jehovah (2 Kings xvii. 41), and on the return of Judah and Benjamin from the Captivity, they sought to be admitted as co-religionists, to share with them in the work of rebuilding the Temple, and therefore to obtain like privileges as worshippers in its courts. That claim was, however, refused, and they in return, b.c. 409, guided by Manaseh, a priest who had been expelled from Jerusalem by Nehemiah for an unlawful marriage with the daughter of Sanballat the Horonite (Neh. xii. 28), obtained permission from the Persian king, Darius Nothus, to erect a temple on Mount Gerizim. Jos. Josephus, it should be added (Ant. xi. 7), places the whole story much later, in the time of Darius Nothus and Alexander the Great. The new worship thus started, placed them at once in the position of a rival and schismatic sect; and their after-history presented the usual features of such antagonism. They refused all hospitality to pilgrims on their way to Jerusalem, or would way-lay and maltreat them on their journey. They mocked the more distant Jews by false signals of the rising of the Paschal moon at Jerusalem. (See Note on chap. vi. 1.)

When his disciples James and John saw this, they said, Lord, wilt thou that we command fire to come down from heaven, and consume them, even as Elias did? But he turned, and rebuked them, and said, Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of. For the Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them. And they went to another village.

They did not receive him. The reason thus given exactly agrees with what has been stated above. It will be remembered that when He had visited Samaria before, it was on His return, not directly from Jerusalem, but from some unknown region of Judaea where He had been baptising (John iii. 22; iv. 3). When His disciples James and John saw this, The burning zeal of the sons of Zebedee, more fiery even than that of Peter, was eminently characteristic of those whom our Lord had named as the Sons of Thunder (Mark iii. 17). Their anger was probably heightened by the contrast with His former reception in a city of the same people (John iv. 40, 41), and by the feeling that what seemed to them an act of marvellous condescension was thus rudely repelled. Did not such a people deserve a punishment like that which Elijah had inflicted on the messengers of Ahab (2 Kings 2.10, 12, 14)? The latter words, "as Elias did," are, however, wanting in some of the best MSS.

Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of. The words admit of two constructions: (1) that the disciples did not know that the Spirit that had been given "not by measure" to their Master, and promised by Him to them (Matt. x. 20; John iii. 34), was one of gentleness and love; (2) that they did not know that in yielding to what they thought a righteous anger, they were really yielding themselves to the evil mind, or the personal Evil Spirit which was at enmity with God. Looking to the general use of the word "spirit" in our Lord's teaching, the former way of taking the words seems, on the whole, preferable, and agrees better with what follows. The Spirit which had claimed them for its own was one that led Him to save and not to destroy. The whole clause, however, is wanting in the best MSS.

For the Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives. Here, again, we have to note the absence of the words from many of the better MSS. It is, perhaps, open to conjecture that they were inserted from an oral tradition that had preserved what the Evangelist in his written record had omitted. Lord, I will follow thee. See Notes on Matt. viii. 19—22. The two anecdotes, if we may so call them, are placed by the two Evangelists in a very different connection. It is clear that their isolated,
bury their dead: but go thou and preach the kingdom of God. (62) And another also said, Lord, I will follow thee; but let me first go bid them farewell, which are at home at my house. (62) And Jesus said unto him, No man, having put his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God.

CHAPTER X.—(1) After these things the Lord appointed other seventy also, fragmentary character, with no definite notes of time and place, left a large margin to the discretion of each compiler as to where they should appear. The difference between the “certain man” of St. Luke’s report, and the “scribe” of St. Matthew’s, slight as it is, takes its place among the signs of the mutual independence of the two Gospels. (61) Lord, I will follow thee.—This third example of our Lord’s method of dealing with half-hearted disciples is peculiar to St. Luke. Here, as in the first instance, there is what has the appearance of a spontaneous offer, coupled with a plea for postponement. The man pleads a wish to take a formal farewell of his kindred. The form of expression, the absence of any definite mention of father, or wife, or children, half-suggests the thought that the man was free from the closer and more binding ties of relationship, and that the plea urged was therefore hollow and unreal. (62) No man, having put his hand to the plough...—The image which our Lord used was, as usual, one that went home to the personal experience of His hearers. They were of the peasant class, and they knew that the eye of the ploughman if he is to do his work well, must be kept straight before him at the line of the furrow which he is making. To look back while working, is to mar the work entirely. The man who so looks is therefore, ipso facto, disqualified for the work of God’s kingdom.

(1) After these things the Lord appointed other seventy also.—Some MSS. of importance give “seventy-two,” but the evidence preponderates in favour of the reading “seventy.” The number had a three-fold significance. (1) Seventy elders had been appointed by Moses to help him in his work of teaching and judging the people (Num. xi. 16), and to these the spirit of prophecy had been given. (2) In appointing the Seventy our Lord revived, as it were, the order or “school” of prophets which had been so long extinct. The existence of such men in every Church is implied in well-nigh every Epistle (e.g., Acts xiii. 1; xv. 32; 1 Cor. xii. 28; xiv. 29; 1 Thess. v. 20), and the fact that St. Paul and others join together the “Apostles and Prophets” as having been jointly the foundation on which the Church was built (Eph. ii. 20; iii. 5; iv. 11; 2 Pet. iii. 2), makes it probable that the latter words, no less than the former, pointed in the first instance to a known and definite body. The Seventy presented such a body. They, though not sharers in the special authority and functions of the Twelve, were yet endowed with like prophetic powers, and the mysteries of the kingdom were revealed to them (verse 21). (2) As the Sanhedrin or great Council of scribes and priests and elders consisted of seventy members besides the president, the number having been fixed on the assumption that they were the successors of those whom Moses had chosen, our Lord’s choice of the number could hardly fail to suggest the thought that the seventy disciples were placed by Him in a position of direct contrast with the existing Council, as an assembly guided, not by the traditions of men, but by direct inspiration. (3) But the number seventy had come to have another symbolic significance which could not fail to have a special interest. Partially by a rough reckoning of the names of the nations in Gen. x., partly on account of the mystical completeness of the number itself, seventy had come to be the representative number of all the nations of the world; and so, in the Feast of Tabernacles, which in any harmonistic arrangement of the Gospel narrative must have almost immediately preceded the mission of the Seventy (see Note on John vii. 2), a great sacrifice of seventy oxen was offered as on behalf of all the non-Israelite members of the great family of mankind (Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. in Joann. vii.). Bearing this in mind, and remembering the words that our Lord had spoken during that feast as to the “other sheep, not of that fold” (John x. 16), which He had come to gather, we may see in what is here recorded a step full of meaning, a distinct and formal witness of the future universality of the Church of Christ. The omission, in the charge addressed to them, of the command given to the Twelve against entering into the way of the Gentiles or any city of the Samaritans (Matt. x. 5) is on this view full of interest.

The question, of course, occurs to us how it was that such a mission should have been omitted by St. Matthew and St. Mark. To this, only partial answers can be given. (1) The mission belonged to the last period of our Lord’s ministry, where their records are comparatively scanty, and was confined to the region, apparently of Perea and Judæa, which He was then about to visit. (2) It was one in which, from the nature of the case, the Twelve were not sharers, and which, therefore, naturally came to occupy a less prominent place in the recollections of those from whom the narratives of the first two Gospels were primarily derived.

The harvest truly is great.—See Note on Matt. ix. 37. The verses that follow contain, as might have been expected from the analogous circumstances, much in common with those spoken on the mission of the Twelve. We have here, as in the sermons on the Mount and on the Plain, an example of our Lord’s repeating the expression of the same thoughts in nearly the same language.

As lambs among wolves.—See Note on Matt. x. 16.

(4) Carry neither purse, nor scrip, nor shoes: and salute no man by his name.—See Notes on Matt. x. 9, 10; Mark vi. 8.
the way. (5) And into whatsoever house ye enter, first say, Peace be to this house. (6) And if the son of peace be there, your peace shall rest upon it: if not, it shall turn to you again. (7) And in the same house remain, eating and drinking such things as they give: for the labourer is worthy of his hire. Go not from house to house. (8) And into whatsoever city ye enter, and they receive you, eat such things as are set before you: (9) and heal the sick that are therein, and say unto them, The kingdom of God is come nigh unto you. (10) But into whatsoever city ye enter, and they receive you not, go your ways out into the streets of the same, and say, (11) Even the very dust of your city, which cleaveth on us, we do wipe off against you: notwithstanding be ye sure of this, that the kingdom of God is come nigh unto you. (12) But I say unto you, that it shall be more tolerable in that day for Sodom, than for that city. (13) Woe unto thee, Chorazin! Woe unto thee, Bethsaida! For if the mighty works had been done in Tyre and Sidon, which have been done in you, they had a great while ago repented, sitting in sackcloth and ashes. (14) But it shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon at the judgment, than for you. (15) And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted to heaven, shalt be thrust down to hell. (16) He that heareth you heareth me; and he that despiseth me despiseth him that sent me. (17) And the seventy returned again with joy, saying, Lord, even the devils are subject unto us through thy name. (18) And he said unto them, I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven.—The tense of the first Greek verb implies continuous action: I was beholding Satan as he fell. While they were working their Master had been following them in spirit, gazing, as it were, on each stage of their victorious conflict. Their triumph over the demons was the beginning and the earnest of a final conquest over Satan as "the prince of the demons." There may, possibly, be a reference to the belief then beginning to be current among the Jews as to the fall of Satan after his creation. It is obvious from the immediate sequence of the two facts that the mission of the Seventy was, as stated above, confined within narrow limits of space and time. Lord, even the devils are subject unto us through thy name. (19) And the seventy returned again with joy. (13-16) Woe unto thee, Chorazin! —See Notes on Matt. x. 12-13. St. Luke gives, what is only implied in St. Matthew, the very form of the salutation. (7) And in the same house remain. —See Note on Matt. x. 11. The labourer is worthy of his hire. —See Note on Matt. x. 10. The exact reproduction of the words by St. Paul in 1 Tim. v. 18, as a citation from "the Scripture," is every way interesting. The Apostle could scarcely have failed to have become acquainted, during his long companionship with St. Luke, with the materials which the Evangelist was collecting for his great work. We can hardly doubt, accordingly, that he quotes this as one of the sayings of the Lord Jesus, as he quotes another in Acts xx. 35, and clothes it with the same authority as the older Scripture. On this assumption, the Gospel of St. Luke must have been, in part, at least, written and reconstructed at the time when the Pastoral Epistles were written. (8) Eat such things as are set before you. —The precise form of the precept is peculiar to St. Luke, but the spirit is the same as that of the words which Matthew gives, what is only implied in St. Matthew, the very form of the salutation. (8) Eat such things as are set before you. —The precise form of the precept is peculiar to St. Luke, but the spirit is the same as that of the words which Matthew gives, what is only implied in St. Matthew, the very form of the salutation. (8) Eat such things as are set before you. —The precise form of the precept is peculiar to St. Luke, but the spirit is the same as that of the words which Matthew gives, what is only implied in St. Matthew, the very form of the salutation. (9) and heal the sick that are therein, and say unto them, The kingdom of God is come nigh unto you. (10) But into whatsoever city ye enter, and they receive you not, go your ways out into the streets of the same, and say, (11) Even the very dust of your city, which cleaveth on us, we do wipe off against you: notwithstanding be ye sure of this, that the kingdom of God is come nigh unto you. (12) But I say unto you, that it shall be more tolerable in that day for Sodom, than for that city. (13) Woe unto thee, Chorazin! Woe unto thee, Bethsaida! For if the mighty works had been done in Tyre and Sidon, which have been done in you, they had a great while ago repented, sitting in sackcloth and ashes. (14) But it shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon at the judgment, than for you. (15) And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted to heaven, shalt be thrust down to hell. (16) He that heareth you heareth me; and he that despiseth me despiseth him that sent me. (17) And the seventy returned again with joy, saying, Lord, even the devils are subject unto us through thy name. (18) And he said unto them, I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven.—The tense of the first Greek verb implies continuous action: I was beholding Satan as he fell. While they were working their Master had been following them in spirit, gazing, as it were, on each stage of their victorious conflict. Their triumph over the demons was the beginning and the earnest of a final conquest over Satan as "the prince of the demons." There may, possibly, be a reference to the belief then beginning to be current among the Jews as to the fall of Satan after his creation; but the primary meaning of our Lord's words is that he was now dethroned from his usurped dominion in the "high places" (comp. Eph. vi. 12), which symbolised the spiritual region of the soul and mind of man. The imagery reappears in a developed form in Rev. xii. 9.
Behold, I give unto you power to tread on serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy: and nothing shall by any means hurt you. (20) Notwithstanding in this rejoice not, that the spirits are subject unto you; but rather rejoice, because your names are written in heaven. (21) In that hour Jesus rejoiced in spirit, and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes: even so, Father; for so it seemed good in thy sight. (22) All things are delivered to me of my Father: and no man knoweth who the Son is, but the Father; and who the Father is, but the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal him. (23) And he turned him unto his disciples, and said privately, Blessed are the eyes which see the things that ye see; "(24) for I tell you, that many prophets and kings have desired to see those things which ye see, and have not seen them; and to hear those things which ye hear, and have not heard them. (25) And, behold, a certain lawyer stood up, and tempted him, saying, Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life? (26) He said unto him, What is written in the law? how readest thou? (27) And

The words that follow are found also in Matt. xxi. 25 —27 (see Notes on those verses), but the opening clause that introduces them is peculiar to St. Luke, and is noticeable as the one instance where the word "rejoiced," which appears in the Magnificat (chap. i. 47), is used of our Lord's human feeling of exultation. It indicates what one may call the enthusiasm of spiritual joy more than any other synonym, and conveys the impression that the disciples must have noticed something exceptional in their Lord's look and manner. The verbal agreement with St. Matthew indicates that both the Evangelists must have drawn from a common source, documentary or oral. (28)

All things are delivered to me.—The marginal reading, which prefixed "And turning to His disciples" to this verse instead of the next, can hardly be regarded as more than a transcriber's error.

(23—24) Blessed are the eyes which see the things that ye see. —Another instance of repeated words, St. Matthew reporting them as spoken after the parable of the Sower (Matt. xii. 16). See Note on that verse.

(24) Many prophets and kings . . . .—There is a slight verbal difference here as compared with St. Matthew's report, which gives "prophets and righteous men."

And, behold, a certain lawyer stood up.—On the word "lawyer" and its difference from the more generic "scribe," see Note on Matt. xxii. 35. Here, as there, the "tempting" does not necessarily imply hostile purpose. It was simply a test-question to see if the new Teacher was sound in His view of the ethical obligations of the Law.

The question, though the same as that of the young man in Matt. xix. 16, is not asked in the same tone.
he answering said, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbour as thyself. (28) And he said unto him, Thou hast answered right: this do, and thou shalt live. (29) But he, willing to justify himself, said unto Jesus, And who is my neighbour? (30) And Jesus answering said, A certain man went down from Jerusalem to Jericho, and fell among thieves, which stripped him of his raiment, and wounded him, and departed, leaving him half dead. (31) And by chance there came down a certain priest that way: and when he saw him, he passed by on the other side. (32) And likewise a Levite, when he was at the place, came and looked on him, and passed by on the other side. (33) But a certain Samaritan, as he journeyed, came where he was: and when he saw him, he had compassion on him, (34) and went to him, and bound up his wounds, pouring in oil and wine, and set him on his own work of preaching the gospel of the Kingdom. Its power.

There it was asked by one anxiously seeking to inherit eternal life. Here there is a certain tone of self-conscious superiority, which required a different treatment. As the method of Socrates was to make his men conscious of their ignorance of the true meaning of words which they repeated glibly, so here our Lord parries the question in the New Testament in which the phrase occurs. (31) By chance...—The passage is the only one in the New Testament in which the phrase occurs. Our Lord seems to use it as with a touch of what we have elsewhere termed irony. It seemed so casual, as such opportunities always do to men who neglect them, and yet it was, in the purpose of God, the test-moment of each man’s character and life.

There came down.—Better, as before, there was going down. A certain priest.—Jericho was at this time a priestly city, and so the journey of the priest from Jerusalem, as if returning from his week of sacerdotal offices there, has a touch of vivid naturalness. He, too, like the questioner, had been doing his duty to God, according to his measure of that duty.

Passed by on the other side.—The priest shrank, it might be, (1) from the trouble and peril of wounded with a man whom robbers had just attacked, and (2) from the fear of incurring a ceremonist delimitation by coming into contact with what might possibly be a corpse before he reached it. He accordingly “passed by on the other side,” not of the road only, but of the ravine through which the road passed.

Likewise a Levite.—The passage is memorable as the only mention of Levites in the Gospels. He is represented as at once better and worse than the priest—better in that he does not altogether turn aside, but “comes” and looks; worse in that his second thoughts are at variance with his first, and prevail against them. If he has more light, he also sins more against it. He, too, may have been coming, like the priest, from his week of service in the Temple.

A certain Samaritan.—For the chief facts connected with the Samaritans and their relation to the Jews, see Note on chap. ix. 52. There is something noticeable in the change of word. It was not likely that the hated alien should be coming down from Jerusalem. His journey would probably be to, or from, Bethel and Gerizim. He was not, as the others were, near a home to which they might have taken the wounded sufferer. Here there is a true human feeling in one who outwardly was involved in heresy and schism, and our Lord singles that out as infinitely preferable to the form of godliness without its power.

And went to him.—Every detail is in harmony with the tender pity described in the previous verse. All fear of risk from robbers, or from the police of Rome, who might take him for a robber, is put aside; the
beast, and brought him to an inn, and took care of him. (35) And on the morrow when he departed, he took out two pence,1 and gave them to the host, and said unto him, Take care of him; and whatsoever thou spendest more, when I come again, I will repay thee.

(35) Which now of these three, thinkest thou, was neighbour unto him that fell among the thieves? (37) And he said, He that shewed mercy on him. Then said Jesus unto him, Go, and do thou likewise.

(38) Now it came to pass, as they went, that he entered into a certain village: and a certain woman named Martha

"oil and wine," which had been provided for personal refreshment, are freely given to be used, according to the primitive surgery of the time, the latter for cleansing the wounds, the former for soothing inflammation. His own beast (better, ass, as the word is translated in Matt. xxi. 5; 2 Pet. ii. 16) is given up, and he goes on foot; he takes the wounded man to an inn, and there provides for his guests, while in the earlier passage we have the Eastern caravanserai, where the guests simply find shelter, and arrange their meals for themselves.

(35) Two pence—i.e., two denarii, according to Matt. xx. 2 the average wages of a labourer for two days; or, taking the estimate of Mark vi. 37, enough for a meal of twenty-five men. It was therefore a sufficient and liberal provision for all probable contingencies. This, however, was not, in the Samaritan’s judgment, enough, and he gave a carte blanche for whatever else might be required.

(36) Which now of these three . . . ?—There is a certain subtle discernment in the form of the question. The point under discussion was as to whom the Jew should look on as his neighbour. It is answered indirectly by the narrative, which showed who had proved himself a neighbour to the Jew. The Samaritan had shown himself a better interpreter of the commandment than the orthodox scribe. He had recognised a neighbour even in the Jew. The Jew therefore should recognise a neighbour even in the Samaritan. From the human point of view there is something noble in the manner in which our Lord thus singles out the Samaritan as a type of excellence, after His own recent repulse (chap. ix. 53) by men of the same race; something also courageous in His doing so after He had been recently reproached as being Himself a Samaritan (John viii. 48). It may be noted that His journey, “as it were in secret” (John vii. 10), to the Feast of Tabernacles, must have probably led Him through Samaria, and that in all probability He must have spent the first day of the Feast in that country. (See Note on John vii. 48.)

(37) Go, and do thou likewise.—This was the practical, though not the formal, answer to the question of the lawyer. If he acted in the spirit of the Samaritan, he would need no “nicely-calculated less or more” of casuistic distinctions as to who was and who was not his neighbour. Fellowship in the same human nature, and any kind of even passing contact, were enough to constitute a ground for neighbourly kindness. Of such a question it may be said, Solvitur amando. We love, and the problem presents no difficulty.

Nothing should lead us away from recognising this as the main lesson of the parable. But there is another application of it which, within limits, is legitimate enough as a development of thought, and which has commended itself to so many devout minds, both in ancient and modern times, that it at least deserves a notice. Christ Himself, it is said, is the great pattern of a wide, universal love for man as man, acting out the lesson which the parable teaches in its highest form. May we not think of Him as shadowed forth in the good Samaritan, as accepting, in that sense, the name which had been flung at Him in scorn? Starting from this thought, the circumstances fit in with a strange aptness. The traveller stands as representing mankind at large. The journey is from Jerusalem, the heavenly city, the paradise of man’s first estate, to Jericho, the evil and accursed city (Josh. vi. 17), the sin into which man entered by yielding to temptation. The robbers are the powers of evil, who strip him of his robe of innocence and purity, who smite him sore, and leave him, as regards his higher life, half-dead. The priest and the Levite represent the Law in its sacrificial and ceremonial aspects, and they have no power to relieve or rescue. The Christ comes and helps where they have failed. The beast on which He rides is the human nature in which the Word dwelt, and it is upon that humanity of His that He bids us rest for comfort and support. The inn represents the visible Church of Christ, and the host His pastors and teachers; even the two pence, perhaps, the ordinances and means of grace committed to the Church. There is an obvious risk, in all such application, of an element that is fantastic and unreal; but the main line of parallelism seems to commend itself, if not to the reason, at least to the imagination of the devout interpreter.

(38) He entered into a certain village.—The identity of the two names that follow, and, we may add, of the characters connected with the names, leaves hardly room for doubt that the village thus spoken of was Bethany. (See Note on Matt. xxi. 1.) St. Luke’s reason for not giving the name is probably connected with the singular reticence of the first three Gospels as to the family of Lazarus. St. Matthew (xxvi. 7) and St. Mark (xiv. 3) narrate the anointing, which we learn from John xii. 3 to have been the act of Mary, but suppress her name. St. Luke gives, in this section, a characteristic anecdote of the two sisters, but suppresses the name of the village in which they lived. None of the first three Gospels names Lazarus, though there seems some reason to believe that the first two narrate a fact in which he took a prominent part (see Note on Matt. xix. 16), and that the third gives the name with a special reference to him. (See Note on chap. xvi. 20.) A probable explanation is that, both on spiritual and perhaps social grounds, reticence as to the family of Bethany was, for a time, generally maintained among the disciples of Jerusalem, and that St. Luke, coming at a later period, and finding his way, as a physician, into the company of devout women, named one fact that seemed of special interest. (See Introduction, and Note on chap. vii. 1.)

Martha.—The name does not appear in the Old Testament, and is Aramaic rather than Hebrew. It has a point of contact with secular history in having
Martha and Mary.

ST. LUKE, XI.

The Prayer of Jesus.

received him into her house. (30) And she had a sister called Mary, which also sat at Jesus' feet, and heard his word. (40) But Martha was cumbered about much serving, and came to him, and said, Lord, dost thou not care that my sister hath left me to serve alone? bid her therefore that she help me. (41) And Jesus answered and said unto her, Martha, Martha, thou art careful and

been borne by the Syrian prophetesses who accompanied the Roman general, Marius, in his Numidian campaigns. Its meaning, as the feminine of Maran (= Lord), and therefore equivalent to the Greek Kyria, suggests the possible identity of the sister of Lazarus with the elect Kyria (or elect Lady), to whom St. John addressed his second Epistle. (See Note on 2 John 1.)

A sister called Mary, which also sat at Jesus' feet. The better MSS. give, "at the Lord's feet." Few readers can fail to notice the identity of character here and in the entirely independent narrations of John xi. and xii. There also Martha is active (John xi. 20) and conspicuous in serving (John xii. 2). Mary, meditative and emotional, pouring her whole soul into one act of love (John xi. 31: xii. 3).

Martha was cumbered.—Literally, was distracted; drawn hither and thither by conflicting cares.

About much serving.—We may probably infer from this that our Lord had been invited as an honored guest, and that Mary had been asked to meet Him; and, so far, the narrative agrees with what is suggested by the narrative of John xi. as to the social position of the household at Bethany. The use of a like word in chap. xii. 42 suggests that this also may have passed from the abstract to the concrete sense, and have been used for a household of many servants as well as for the act of serving.

Came to him.—The Greek word implies something like a hasty movement to interrupt the calm tenor of the Lord's discourse. The hasty vehement complaint that follows is quite in keeping with this.

That she help me.—More literally, that she join in helping.

And Jesus answered.—The better MSS. give, "And the Lord answered." (See Note on chap. vii. 13.)

Martha, Martha.—We note a special tenderness of reproof in the two-fold utterance of the name, of which this and the like iteration of "Simon, Simon," in chap. xii. 31, are the only examples in our Lord's recorded utterances during His earthly ministry. (Comp. "Saul, Saul," in Acts ix. 4.)

Thou art careful.—The verb is the same as the "take thought" of Matt. vi. 25, and throws light upon the meaning of that phrase.

But one thing is needful.—Some of the better MSS. present a singular various-reading. There is need of few things, or of one only. It is obvious that this might be taken either literally or spiritually. They might mean (1) that He who spoke, and the others who were coming, needed not the many things about which Martha was troubled, but a few only, or even but a single dish, to supply their wants; or (2) that the true life of men needed but a few things, such as faith, obedience, the fear of God, or even but one only, the devout and intent love which Mary was then showing. The latter interpretation is clearly most in harmony with our Lord's usual teaching, though the former has something like a parallel in the teaching of verse 7 of this very chapter. It is not improbable that our Lord designedly used words which had an outer and an inner meaning, the latter intended chiefly for those who "had ears to hear." There is a singular coincidence between the words here spoken to Martha and those addressed to the young ruler ("one thing thou lackest"), whom we have seen reason to identify with her brother. (See Note on Matt. ix. 16.) The omission of "few things" in the received text, may have originated in the wish to give an exclusive prominence to the higher meaning.

Mary hath chosen that good part.—The Greek noun is very nearly the same as that which the younger son, in chap. xv. 12, uses for "the portion of goods," the good part or portion here being nothing less than the eternal life which is the gift of God. Here too we may trace something approaching to a half-playful mingling of the higher and lower meanings of the word which was used in the Greek version of the Old Testament at once for Benjamin's mess, i.e., portion of food (Gen. xiii. 34), and for God as the "portion" of His people (Ps. lixii. 26). Even on the assumption that our Lord spoke in Aramaic, and not in Greek, a like play upon the word would have been equally possible.

The two sisters have come to be regarded as the representatives respectively of the active and the contemplative forms of the religious life, and there is, of course, a certain measure of truth in this view. On the other hand, however, it must be remembered that Martha's activity, with its manifold distractions, was not Christian activity, and that Mary's contemplation passed, when the time came for it, as in John xii. 3, into full and intense activity. The contrast is rather that between singleness of heart and the character which St. James describes as "double-minded" (Jas. i. 8), i.e., divided in its affections.

XI.

1. As he was praying in a certain place.—The facts of the case as here narrated, the common practice of the Jews, and the analogy of the prayers in John xii. 41, Matt. xxvi. 39, and, we may add, of the thanksgiving in chap. x. 21, Matt. xi. 25, all lead to the conclusion that our Lord prayed aloud, and that some, at least, of the disciples heard Him. They listened, unable to follow, or to record what they had heard, and they wished to be able to enter into His spirit and pray as He prayed.

Teach us to pray, as John also taught his disciples.—It seems, at first sight, to follow from this that the disciple who asked this had not been present when the Sermon on the Mount was spoken. It is conceivable, however, that, knowing the pattern prayer which had then been given, he had thought it adapted for the multitude, and not for the special scholars and disciples—too short and simple as compared, on the one
hand, with the devotions which John had prescribed to his disciples, as he prescribed also fasting and almsgiving (Matt. ix. 14; Luke iii. 11), and with the fuller utterances, as of rapt communion with God, of his Master. The prayers of John’s disciples were probably, like those of the Pharisees, offered three times a day, the third, the sixth, and the ninth hours, and after the pattern of the well-known “Eighteen Prayers,” which made up the Jewish manual of private devotion.

(2) When ye pray, say, . . . The reproduction, with only a verbal variation here and there, which may well have been the work of the reporter, of what had been given in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. vi. 9—11), is every way significant. That which had been given to the multitude was enough for them. If they wanted to be taught to pray at all, if earnest desires did not spontaneously clothe themselves in “daily bread” in both the higher and lower senses, was better than to indulge in any amplitude of rhetoric.

(3—4) Our Father which art in heaven.—See Notes on Matt. vi. 9—11. The following variations may be noticed. (1) The better MSS. omit “our” and “which art in heaven,” and begin with the simple “Father.” It was, of course, natural enough that it should be, in course of time, adapted by transcribers to the form which was in common use. (2) Many of the best MSS., again, omit the whole clause, “Thy will be done, as in heaven, so in earth,” which may have been inserted with the same purpose. (3) St. Luke substitutes “day by day” for “this day,” and so implies that the word ἐπιοίκιον (epiosios), translated “daily,” must have some other meaning. (See Excursus II. on Notes to St. Matthew.) (4) St. Luke uses the word “sins” instead of “debt,” as being, perhaps, more adapted to the minds of his Gentile readers, while he retains the primary idea of St. Matthew’s term in the words, “every one that is indebted to us.” The familiar “Forgive us our trespasses,” of the Prayer Book, it may be noted, is not found in the Authorised version at all, and comes to us you, . . . “as connected with the previous illustration; and (2) the addition of the “scorpion” to the “serpent,” as though the recent combination of the two words in chap. x. 19 had so associated them that the one was naturally followed by the other.

(5) Which of you shall have a friend . . .?—The illustration, we can hardly call it a parable, is peculiar to St. Luke, and, as setting forth the power of prayer, is specially characteristic of him. (See Introduction.) The familiar tone, as of one appealing to each man’s natural good-will, and the dramatic vividness of the dialogue, make it almost unique in our Lord’s teaching. “Midnight” is chosen as being the time at which, above all others, men expect to be left to their repose. The unexpected visitor asks for “three loaves,” one for himself, one for the guest, one as a reserve; and he so far trusts his friend as to hope that he will recognise the claims of his friendship for another. So, the implied lesson is, should the man who prays think that God will care for those for whom he pleads, and will give them also their “daily bread” in both the higher and the lower senses of the word.

(7) Trouble me not.—As afterwards in the parable of the Unjust Judge, so here, the illustrative matter cannot be pressed into an interpretation. It seems, indeed, to have been purposely so stated that it could only suggest an a fortiori argument. Thus man might answer, but so does not God. If prayer prevails over apathy and impatience, how much more will it prevail when we pray to One who knows our necessities before we ask Him? The picture drawn is obviously from a poor man’s house, children and parents sleeping in the same room, the younger children (the Greek word is a diminutive) in the same bed. The word here, however, differs from the other two commonly translated “bed” (e.g., Matt. ix. 2, 6; Mark ii. 4, 9), and probably means the divan or raised platform, which often filled nearly half a room in a Jewish or Eastern house.

(8) Because of his importance.—Literally, because of his shamelessness. The word is not used elsewhere in the New Testament, and exactly expresses the pertinacity that knows no restraint.

(9—12) Ask, and it shall be given you.—See Notes on Matt. viii. 7—11; but note (1) the greater impressiveness of the opening words, “And I say unto you, . . .” as connected with the previous illustration; and (2) the addition of the “scorpion” to the “serpent,” as though the recent combination of the two words in chap. x. 19 had so associated them that the one was naturally followed by the other.

are with me in bed; I cannot rise and give thee. (8) I say unto you, Though he will not rise and give him, because he is his friend, yet because of his importance he will rise and give him as many as he needeth. (9) And I say unto you, Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you. (10) For every one that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened. (11) If a son shall ask bread of any of you that is a father, will he give him a stone? or if he ask a fish, will he for a fish give him a serpent? (12) Or if he shall ask an egg, will he offer him a scorpion?
Can Beelzebub cast out Devils?

ST. LUKE, XI. The Strong Man Spoiled by the Stronger.

(13) If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children: how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?

(14) And he was casting out a devil, and it was dumb. And it came to pass, when the devil was gone out, the dumb spake; and the people wondered. (15) But some of them said, He casteth out devils through Beelzebub the chief of the devils." (16) And others, tempting him, sought of him a sign from heaven.

(17) But he, knowing their thoughts, said unto them, Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation; and a house divided against a house falleth. (18) If Satan also be divided against himself, how shall his kingdom stand? because ye say that I cast out devils through Beelzebub. (19) And if I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your sons cast them out? therefore shall they be your judges. (20) But if I with the finger of God cast out devils, no doubt the kingdom of God is come upon you. (21) When a strong man armed keepeth his palace, his goods are in peace; (22) but when a stronger than he shall come upon him, and overcome him, he taketh from him all his armour wherein he trusted, and divideth his spoils. (23) He that is not with me is against me: and he that gathereth not with me scattereth. (24) When the unclean spirit is gone out of a man, he walketh through dry places, seeking rest; and finding none, he saith, I will return unto my house whence I came out. (25) And when he cometh, he findeth it swept and garnished.

(26) Then goeth he, and taketh to him seven other spirits more wicked than himself; and they enter in, and dwell there: and the last state of that man is worse than the first.

(27) And it came to pass, as he spake these things, a certain woman of the company lifted up her voice, and said unto him, Blessed is the womb that bare thee, and the paps which thou hast sucked. (28) But he said, Yea rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God, and keep it.

(28) How much more shall your heavenly Father . . . ?—We note a change here also, the one highest gift of the "Holy Spirit" taking the place of the wider and less definite "good things" in Matt. vii. 11. The variation is significant, as belonging to a later stage of our Lord's teaching, and especially as spoken probably to some of the Seventy, who were thus taught to ask boldly for the Spirit which was to make them in very deed a company of prophets. (See Note on chap. x. 1.)

(17-25) He was casting out a devil.—See Notes on Matt. xii. 22-30.

(20) If I with the finger of God . . . —Note the substitution of this language for "by the Spirit of God," etc., in Matt. xii. 22, and its connection with the use by the older prophets of "the hand of the Lord," to indicate the state which issued in prophetic inspiration (Ezek. i. 3; xxxvii. 1), and with "the finger of God" as writing the Commandments on the tables of stone (Ex. xxxii. 19), and Pharaoh's confession that "the finger of God" was with Moses and Aaron in the wonders which they wrought (Ex. viii. 19). The meaning of this boldly anthropomorphic language is sufficiently obvious. As the "hand" denotes power generally, so the "finger" symbolises power in its concentrated and specially-directed energy.

(21-25) When a strong man armed keepeth his palace.—See Notes on Matt. xii. 29, 30. The only noticeable variations are the use of "palace" for "house;' of the strong man being "armed," of the "armour" or "panoply" (the same word as in Eph. vi. 11) in which he trusted; of the "division of the spoils." It is throughout a fuller and more vivid report, but apparently of the same sayings.

(24-26) When the unclean spirit is gone out of a man.—See Notes on Matt. xii. 43-45. Here the only variations are (1) the omission of the house being "empty," and (2) of the application of the parable to "this wicked generation.

(27) A certain woman of the company.—The incident is peculiar to St. Luke, and, like many other of the facts recorded by him, seems to have been derived from the company of devout women (chap. viii. 1; see Introduction) with whom he came into contact. It is interesting as being the first direct fulfilment of the words of the Magnificat, "All generations shall call me blessed" (chap. i. 46), and as showing how the Son of Mary in this instance, as in Matt. xii. 46-50, extended the beatitude. There is at once a singular agreement in the manner in which each incident, embodying substantially the same lesson, follows on the parable of the Unclean Spirit, and a singular difference in the forms which the incident takes in the two narratives. A possible solution of the problem thus presented may be found in supposing the exclamation which St. Luke records to have been uttered by one of the women who was present when as St. Matthew relates (xii. 47), one said unto Him, "Behold Thy mother and Thy brethren stand without . . ."

(28) Blessed are they that hear the word of God.—The term thus used clearly designates here the message of the Kingdom spoken by our Lord Himself, as in the parable of the Sower (Matt. xiii. 20). In its wider application, it of course includes, though it must
And when the people were gathered thick together, he began to say, This is an evil generation: they seek a sign; and there shall no sign be given it, but the sign of Jonas the prophet. For as Jonas was a sign unto the Ninevites, so shall also the Son of man be to this generation. The queen of the south shall rise up in the judgment with the men of this generation, and condemn them: for she came from the utmost parts of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and, behold, a greater than Solomon is here. No man, when he hath lighted a candle, putteth it in a secret place, neither under a bushel, but on a candlestick, that they which come in may see the light. The light of the body is the eye: therefore when thine eye is single, thy whole body is full of light; but when thine eye is evil, thy body also is full of darkness. Take heed therefore that the light which is in thee be not darkness. And as he spake, a certain Pharisee besought him to dine with him: and he went in, and sat down to meat. And when the Pharisee saw it, he marvelled that he had not first washed. The variations in St. Luke are (1) the omission of the explanation of the manner in which the sign of the prophet Jonah was to be fulfilled by the three days and three nights in the heart of the earth; (2) the position of the reference to the queen of the south, as coming between the sign of Jonah and the rising of the men of Nineveh. In other respects the agreement is more than usually complete.

No man, when he hath lighted a candle, . . . . .—See Note on Matt. v. 15. Here also it seems, on the whole, more probable that we have a portion of our Lord's previous teaching repeated by Him in almost identical terms, than that a fragment of that teaching has either been torn from its proper context by St. Luke, or artificially woven into a discourse to which it did not belong by St. Matthew. Better, as in St. Matthew, lighted a lamp . . . under the bushel . . . on the lampstand.

The light of the body is the eye.—See Note on Matt. vi. 22. In some respects the sequence of thought in St. Luke differs from that in St. Matthew, and seems somewhat closer. In the Sermon on the Mount, the company of Christ's disciples are the light, and each of them is as the lamp on its proper stand, and the teaching as to the "light of the body," and the corresponding "eye" of the soul, is separated from that illustration by our Lord's comment on the corrupt traditional interpretations of the scribes. Here the two thoughts are brought into close proximity. The moral sense, the "vision and the faculty divine" that has its intuitions of eternal truths, this is the light which is so set that those who "are entering in" (this feature, as in chap. viii. 16, is peculiar to St. Luke)—the seekers and inquirers who are drawn to look in, as it were, upon the house of Christ's Church, the "unlearned," or "unbelievers" of 1 Cor. xiv. 23—may see the light and turn to it.

Take heed therefore that the light . . . . —Better, See to it whether the light that is in thee be darkness. This takes the place in St. Luke's report of St. Matthew's (vi. 23) "If the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness!" The warning is one which calls men to self-scrutiny. They need to examine their primary beliefs, their very intuitions of right and wrong, lest all they do should be vitiated at its very source. The call to do this implies that they must have a Light by which to judge their light, a Standard by which to test their standard, and that Light and Standard are found in the teaching of the Light that lighteth every man, in the recorded words and acts of the Son of Man.

If thy whole body therefore be full of light.—The statement reads at first like an identical proposition. "If thy whole body be full of light, it shall be full of light all over." The apparent truism is, however, the most expressive utterance of a truth. If the "whole body"—life in all its various manifestations—is illumined by the divine light; if the character is in its measure perfect, as that of the Father is perfect, who is Light, and in whom is no darkness at all (1 John i. 5); if passion, prejudice, ignorance are no longer there—then that character is . . . . . . We expect to hear something else as a climax of praise, but there is no higher word possible; the whole character is "full of light," illumined, flooded by the eternal Light.

A certain Pharisee besought him to dine with him.—On the act, and the feeling which it implied, see Note on chap. vii. 36. The word translated "dine" implies a morning or noon-tide meal, as distinct from the supper of the evening.

He marvelled that he had not first washed.—See Notes on Matt. xv. 2; Mark vii. 3. Here the word "washed" (literally, though of course not in the technical sense, baptized) implies actual immersion, or, at least, a process that took in the whole body. Mark vii. 4 shows that this was the Pharisaic standard of ceremonial purity.
The Pharisees Reproved.
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The Lawyers also Reproved.

before dinner. (39) And the Lord said unto him, Now do ye Pharisees make clean the outside of the cup and the platter; but your inward part is full of ravening and wickedness. (40) Ye fools, did not he that made that which is without make that which is within also? (41) But rather give alms of such things as ye have; and, behold, all things are clean unto you. (42) But woe unto you, Pharisees! for ye tithe mint and rue and all manner of herbs, and pass over judgment and the love of God: these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone. (43) Woe unto you, Pharisees! for ye love the uppermost seats in the synagogues, and greetings in the markets.

(44) Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye are as graves which appear not, and the men that walk over them are not aware of them. (45) Then answered one of the lawyers, and said unto him, Master, thus saying thou reproachest us also. (46) And he said, Woe unto you also, ye lawyers! for ye lade men with burdens grievous to be borne, and ye yourselves touch not the burdens with one of your fingers. (47) Woe unto you! for ye build the sepulchres of the prophets, and your fathers killed them. (48) Truly ye bear witness that ye allow the deeds of your fathers: for they indeed killed them, and ye build their sepulchres. (49) Therefore also said the wisdom of

Ye are as graves which appear not.—The comparison, though drawn from the same object, presents a different phase of it. In St. Matthew the contrast is between the whitened surface and the decaying bones within. Here the whitewash is worn out, and there is nothing to distinguish the graves, and men walk over them without knowing what lies below the surface.

Ye are as graves which appear not.—The better MSS. give simply, Ye are as graves, and imply a latent parabolic application of the previous words. Outward, positive ceremonial law, ordering the cleansing of the outside of the cup and of the platter, the eternal moral law requiring truth in the inward parts,—these had, to say the least, the same Maker, and one was not to be neglected for the other.

(41) But rather give alms of such things as ye have.—This, too, is peculiar to St. Luke. In the underlying principle of its teaching it sweeps away the whole fabric of the law of ceremonial purity, as the words of St. Matt. xv. 10–20 had, on different grounds, done before. The distinction between the two phases of the truth is that here greater stress is laid on the active purifying power of the love of which alms, if not given for the sake of man’s praise, is the natural expression, that which defies is the unselfishness of love.

(48) Truly ye bear witness that ye allow.—The better MSS. give, Truly are ye witnesses, and ye allow. The word “allow” has, as always in the English Bible, the meaning of “approving of,” “consenting to,” “having pleasure in.” The last phrase is the rendering of the same Greek word in Rom. i. 32 and would express the meaning here. The derivation of “allow” from the French allower and the Latin adaudare, shows this to be the true sense. On the rest of the verse, see Note on Matt. xxiii. 31.

(49) Therefore also said the wisdom of God.—The words that follow are in the main the same as those of Matt. xxiii. 34–36, where see Notes. There are, however, some remarkable variations, each of which suggests some questions of interest. (1) The words here appear at first sight as if they were a quotation from a book recognised as of divine authority, and not
God, I will send them prophets and apostles, and some of them they shall slay and persecute: (50) that the blood of all the prophets, which was shed from the foundation of the world, may be required of this generation; (51) from the blood of Abel unto the blood of Zacharias, which perished between the altar and the temple: verily I say unto you, It shall be required of this generation.

(52) Woe unto you, lawyers! for ye have taken away the key of knowledge: ye entered not in yourselves, and them that were entering in ye hindered. (53) And as he said these things unto them, the scribes and the Pharisees began to urge him vehemently, and to provoke him to speak of many things: (54) laying wait for him, and seeking to catch something out of his mouth, that they might accuse him.

CHAPTER XII.—(1) In the mean time, when there were gathered together an innumerable multitude of people, insomuch that they trode one upon another, he began to say unto his disciples first of all, Beware ye of the demoralising casuistry, fantastic legends, these took the place of a free and reverential study of the meaning of the sacred Books. Those who “were entering in,” answer to the souls not far from the kingdom of God, waiting for the consolation of Israel, pressing as with eagerness to the spiritual meaning of Law and Prophet. Such, at one stage of his life, must have been the Evangelist himself. This, it will be noted, is the third occurrence of the word Leaven in St. Luke’s Gospel. (See Notes on chaps. viii. 18, x. 33.) It is obvious that the passage, as a whole, throws light on the promise of the “keys” of the kingdom made to Peter. (See Note on Matt. xvi. 19.)

(55) And as he said these things unto them.—The better MSS. give, “When He had gone forth from thence . . . .” as though Jesus had left the house after uttering the “woe” of verse 52, and was followed by the crowd of angry and embittered disputants.

To provoke him to speak.—The Greek verb has literally the sense of “causing to speak impromptu, without thought,” and is happily enough rendered by the English text.

(56) Laying wait for him.—The better MSS. give the verse in a somewhat simpler form, laying wait to catch something out of His mouth. The words throw light on the subsequent question about paying tribute to Cesar (Matt. xxii. 15—22; Mark xii. 13—17), and show it to have been the acting out of a pre-concerted policy.

XII.

(1) In the mean time.—More literally, When the myriads of the multitude were gathered together. The words must be taken in immediate sequence with the close of the previous chapter. The dispute that had begun in the Pharisee’s house, and had been carried on by the lawyers and scribes as they followed Jesus from it, attracted notice. As on the occasion of the “unwashed hands” (Matt. xv. 10), He appeals from the scribes to the people, or rather to His own disciples, scattered among the people. The scene may be compared, in the vividness of its description, with the picture of the crowd at Capernaum (Mark ii. 1, 2).

Beware ye of the leaven of the Pharisees.—This again was obviously an expression that had become almost proverbial in our Lord’s lips (Matt. xvi. 6). Here, however, the leaven is more definitely specified as “hypocrisy”—i.e., unreality, the simulation, conscious or unconscious, of a holiness which we do not possess. It does not follow that the Pharisees were deliberate impostors of the Tartuffe type. With them, as with other forms of religionism, it was doubt-
Who is to be feared?

ST. LUKE, XII. Blasphemy against the Son of Man

leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy. (2) For there is nothing covered, that shall not be revealed; neither hid, that shall not be known. (3) Therefore whatsoever ye have spoken in darkness shall be heard in the light; and that which ye have spoken in the ear in closets shall be proclaimed upon the house-tops. (4) And I say unto you, my friends, Be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do. (5) But I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear: Fear him, which after he hath killed hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you, Fear him. (6) Are not five sparrows sold for two farthings, and not one of them is forgotten before God? (7) But even the very hairs of your head are all numbered. Fear not therefore: ye are of more value than many sparrows. (8) Also I say unto you, Whosoever shall confess me before men, him shall the Son of man also confess before the angels of God: (9) but he that denieth me before men shall be denied before the angels of God. (10) And whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but unto him that blasphemeth against the Holy Ghost it shall not be forgiven. (11) And when they bring you unto the synagogues, and unto magistrates, and powers, take ye no thought how or what thing ye shall answer, or what ye shall say: (12) for the Holy Ghost shall teach you in the same hour what ye ought to say. (13) And one of the company said unto him, Master, speak to my brother, that he divide the inheritance with me. (14) And he said unto him, Man, who

less true that the worst hypocrisy was that which did not know itself to be hypocritical. (See Note on Matt. vi. 2.)

(2) For there is nothing covered.—More accurately, but there is nothing . . . The Greek conjunction cannot possibly have the meaning of “for,” and the latter word suggests a logical connection which is different from that of the original. What our Lord seems to say is, “Beware ye of . . . hypocrisy . . . ; but, whether ye beware or not, know that all that is now secret will one day be manifested.” On the verse itself, see Note on Matt. x. 25. The connection in the two passages is, however, very different. There the underlying thought of a future day of revelation (see 1 Cor. iv. 5) is made a motive to caution, lest we should be trusting in the counterfeit of truth and holiness. The force of the two Greek words would, perhaps, be better expressed by, There is nothing veiled that shall not be unveiled.

(3) Therefore whatsoever ye have spoken in darkness.—See Note on Matt. x. 27. There is, it will be noted, a difference of the same character in the last verse. As recorded in St. Matthew, it is “What I tell you in darkness, that speak ye in light.” The disciples were warned of their responsibility and duty as hearers, bound to teach publicly what had been received in secret; here as a motive to caution, lest we should be trusting in the counterfeit of truth and holiness. The force of the two Greek words would, perhaps, be better expressed by, There is nothing veiled that shall not be unveiled.

(4) And I say unto you my friends.—See Notes on Marks x. 28—32. The opening words, however, in their tender sympathy, anticipating the language of John xv. 14, 15, may be noted as peculiar to St. Luke.

(5) Are not five sparrows sold for two farthings?—The variation from St. Matthew’s “two sparrows sold for a farthing,” seems to reproduce the very bargains of the market-place. The sparrow was of so little value that the odd bird was thrown in to tempt the purchasers. Both this difference, and that between “not one of them shall fall to the ground without your Father,” in St. Matthew, and “not one of them is forgotten before God,” in St. Luke, are proofs, again, of the independence of the two Gospels.

(6) Also I say unto you.—Again we note another like variation between St. Matthew’s “before My Father which is in Heaven,” and St. Luke’s “before the angels of God.”

(7) And whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of man.—See Note on Matt. xii. 32. Here the words which had first been uttered in connection with the special charge of “casting out devils by Beelzebub,” seem to be repeated in their more general bearing.

(8) And when they bring you unto the synagogues.—See Note on Matt. x. 18, 19. What had been a special promise to the Twelve is now extended to all whom the Lord calls His friends. Note, as characteristic of St. Luke’s phraseology, the combination “magistrates” (better, principalities, or authorities) and “powers,” the same combination of the two words meeting us again in chap. xx. 20, and 1 Cor. xv. 24; Eph. iii. 10; Col. i. 16, ii. 15; Titus iii. 1. It would seem to be one of the many phrases which had passed from the Evangelist to the Apostle, or conversely.

(9) And one of the company.—Better, one of the multitude. The request implied a recognition of our Lord’s character as a scribe or Rabbi, but it was for the purpose of asking Him to assume that office in its purely secular aspect. As interpreters of the Law, the scribes were appealed to as advocates and arbiters in questions of property or marriage. The precise nature of the case is not stated here, but the words of the petitioner suggest that he was a younger son, who, on his father’s death, claimed from his elder brother more than the share which, according to the usual practice of a double portion for the first-born (2 Kings ii. 9), of right belonged to him, and expected apparently a full moiety.

(10) Man, who made me a judge . . . ?—This is the only instance of our Lord’s so addressing one
The Parable of the Rich Fool.
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Warnings against Covetousness.

made me a judge or a divider over you? (12) And he said unto them, Take heed, and beware of covetousness: for a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth. (13) And he spake a parable unto them, saying, The ground of a certain rich man brought forth plentifully: (17) and he thought within himself, saying, What shall I do, because I have no room where to bestow my fruits? (18) And he said, This will I do; I will pull down my barns, and build greater; and there will I bestow all my fruits and my goods. (19) And I will say to my soul, Soul, thou hast much goods laid up for many years; take thine ease, eat, drink, and be merry. (20) But God said unto him, Thou fool, this night thy soul shall be required of thee; then whose shall those things be, which thou hast provided? (21) So is he that layeth up treasure for himself, and is not rich toward God.

(22) And he said unto his disciples, Therefore I say unto you, Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat: neither for the body, what ye shall put on. (23) The life is more than meat, and the body is more than raiment. (24) Consider the ravens: for they neither sow nor reap; which neither have storehouse nor barn; and God feedeth them: how much more are ye better than the fowls? (25) And which of you with taking thought can add to his stature one cubit? (26) If ye then be not able to do that thing which is least, why

The Parable of the Rich Fool.

who had come to Him as a questioner. As in Rom. ii. 1, 3, the form, “O man,” was one which expressed grave censure and indignation. Was it for this that men came to Him instead of seeking for the kingdom of God? He accordingly distinctly repudiates any but the purely spiritual aspect of a scribe’s work, and will neither act publicly as judge nor privately as arbitrator. (Comp. John viii. 11.)

(13) Take heed, and beware of covetousness. —The better MSS. give, “of all (i.e., every form of) covetousness.” Our Lord’s words show that He had read the secret of the man’s heart. Greed was there, with all its subtle temptations, leading the man to think that “life” was not worth living unless he had a superfluity of goods. The general truth is illustrated by a parable, obviously selected by St. Luke, as specially enforcing the truth which he held to be of primary importance. (See Introduction.)

(17) And he thought within himself. —The parable, like that of the Good Samaritan, is more than a similitude, and reads like an actual history. There is an almost dramatic vividness in the rich man’s soliloquy. It was the very “superfluity” of the man’s goods that became a new cause of anxiety. In such a case half was more than the whole. So far as life depended on property, it would have been better had the property been less.

(18) I will pull down my barns. —The Greek noun (apotheke, whence our “apothecary,”) has a somewhat wider meaning, and includes storehouses or warehouses of all kinds.

All my fruits. —Here, too, the Greek word is somewhat wider. Literally, produce—i.e., crops of every kind.

Eat, drink, and be merry. —The words remind us of St. Paul’s “Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die” (1 Cor. xv. 31), and may possibly have suggested them. There is, however, a suggestive difference in the context. Extremes meet, and the life of self-indulgence may spring either from an undue expectation of a lengthened life, or from unduly dwelling on the fact of its shortness, without taking into account the judgment that comes after it. The latter, as in the “carmen dicum” of Horace, Odes, i. 11, 8), was the current language of popular Epicureanism; the former seems to have been more characteristic of a corrupt Judaism. (Comp. Jas. iv. 13.) In acting on it the Jew with his far outlook, as he dreamt, into the future, was sinking to the level of the dissolute heathen, who was content to live in and for the present only.

(20) But God said unto him. —The bold anthropomorphic phrase seems intended to suggest the thought not only that death came suddenly, but that the man felt that it came from God as the chastisement of his folly. Thy soul shall be required. —Literally, “thy soul; shall he be required of thee?” (Ps. xxxix. 6).

Then whose shall those things be? —The words indicate one of the disturbing thoughts that vex the souls of the wealthy, “He heareth up riches, and knoweth not who shall gather them.” (Ps. xxxix. 6.)

Take no thought for your life. —Another reproduction, in a distinct context, and as drawn forth by a special occasion, of the general teaching of Matt. vi. 25. (26) Consider the ravens. —See Notes on Matt. vi. 26, 27. Here, however, we have the more specific “ravens” instead of the wider “fowls of the air,” as another example of independence. The choice of the special illustration was possibly determined by the language of the Psalmist. “He giveth to the beast his dews, and to the young ravens which cry” (Ps. cxliv. 9).

If ye then be not able to do that thing which is least. —The words are peculiar to St. Luke’s report. If no amount of anxious care can add one cubit to our stature or the measure of our days (see Notes on Matt. vi. 27), how much less can we control all the myriad contingencies upon which the happiness of the future may depend!
The Promis of the Kingdom.

ST. LUKE, XII.

The Treasure and the Heart.

take ye thought for the rest? (27) Consider the lilies how they grow; they toil not, they spin not; and yet I say unto you, that Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these. (28) If then God so clothe the grass, which is to day in the field, and to morrow is cast into the oven; how much more will he clothe you, O ye of little faith? (29) And seek ye what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink, neither be ye of doubtful mind. For all these things do the nations of the world seek after: and your Father knoweth that ye have need of these things. (30) But rather seek ye the kingdom of God; and all these things shall be added unto you. (31) Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom. (32) Sell that ye have, and give alms; provide yourselves bags which wax not old, a treasure in the heavens that faileth not, where no thief approacheth, neither moth corrupteth. (33) For where your treasure is, there will your heart be also. (34) Let your loins be girded about, and your lights burning; (35) and ye yourselves like unto men that wait for their lord, when he will return from the wedding; that when he cometh and knocketh, they may open unto him immediately. (36) Blessed are those servants, whom the lord when he cometh shall find watching: verily I say unto you, that he shall gird himself, and make them to sit down to meat, and will come forth and serve them. (37) And if he shall used in the New Testament for "purse" or "bag" it was the most classical.

Where no thief approacheth.—See Note on Matt. vi. 20. The form is in some respects briefer here, but the "treasure that faileth not" is a touch peculiar to St. Luke. The adjective which he uses is a rare one, and not found elsewhere in the New Testament; but one from the same root, in Wisd. of Sol. vii. 14, viii. 18, describes wisdom as "a treasure that never faileth." (38) For where your treasure is.—See Note on Matt. vii. 21.

(27-31) Consider the lilies how they grow.—See Notes on Matt. vi. 28-33. There are, however, some noticeable variations, as (1) in verse 27, in the better MSS., they spin not, they weave not; (2) the use in verse 29 of a new verb, "Neither be ye of doubtful mind." The word is not found elsewhere in the New Testament, and is so far characteristic of St. Luke's special culture. But its etymology and its classical use make it equivalent to "Be not tossed to and fro like a ship out on the open sea;" and so taken, it presents a parallel to St. James's description of the "man that wavereth," as "like a wave of the sea driven with the wind and tossed." (32) Fear not, little flock.—The words continue to be spoken to the inner circle of the disciples. They are "the little flock" (the Greek has the article) to whom the Father was pleased to give the kingdom which is "righteousness and peace and joy." There is an implied recognition of the fact, that the "flock" had passed beyond the stage of seeking for the kingdom. In its essence it was theirs already.

It is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom.—Literally, Your Father was well-pleased to give. As resting upon an object, the Greek verb appears in chap. iii. 22; Matt. iii. 17; xii. 18; xvii. 5; Mark i. 11. As followed by a verb of action, it is used, in the New Testament, only by St. Luke and St. Paul, and so forms another link in the chain of coincidences connecting them. (Comp. Rom. xv. 26; Gal. i. 15; Col. i. 10; and elsewhere.)

(35) Sell that ye have.—In its generalised form the precept is peculiar to St. Luke, but it has its parallel in the command given to the young ruler. (See Note on Matt. xix. 21.) It was clearly one of the precepts which his own characteristic tendencies led him to record (see Introduction), and which found its fulfilment in the overflowing love that showed itself in the first days of the Church of the Apostles (Acts ii. 45). Subsequent experience may have modified the duty of Literal obedience, but the principle implied in it, that it is wise to sit loose to earthly possessions, possessing them as though we possessed not (1 Cor. vii. 30), is one which has not lost its force.

Provide yourselves bags . . .—The Greek word for bags (elsewhere "purse," chap. xxii. 35), may be noticed as peculiar to St. Luke. Of the three words used in the New Testament for "purse" or "bag" it was the most classical.
come in the second watch, or come in the third watch, and find them so, blessed are those servants. (38) And this know, that if the goodman of the house had known what hour the thief would come, he would have watched, and not have suffered his house to be broken through. (40) Be ye therefore ready also: for the Son of man cometh at an hour when ye think not.

(41) Then Peter said unto him, Lord, speakest thou this parable unto us, or even to all? (42) And the Lord said, Who then is that faithful and wise steward, whom his lord shall make ruler over his household, to give them their portion of meat in due season? (43) Blessed is that servant, whom his lord when he cometh shall find so doing. (44) Of a truth I say unto you, that he will make him ruler over all that he hath. (45) But if that servant shall say in his heart, My lord delayeth his coming; and shall begin to beat the menservants and maidsens, and to eat and drink, and to be drunken; (46) the lord of that servant will come in a day when he looketh not for him, and at an hour when he is not aware, and will cut him in sunder, and will appoint him his portion with the unbelievers. (47) And that servant, which knew his lord’s will, and prepared not himself, neither did according to his will, shall be beaten with many stripes. (48) But he that knew not, and did commit things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with few stripes. For unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall be much required: and to whom men have committed much, of him they will ask the more.

(49) I am come to send fire on the earth. And how I desire to light a bruise, but it is not meet. (50) For I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance.”

ST. LUKE, XII. The Unfaithful Servant.

1 Matt. 24. 43.

1 Or, cut him off.

(39, 40) And this know, that if the goodman of the house...—Better, “if the master of the house.” See Notes on Matt. xxiv. 43, 44, where the words are almost identical.

(41) Then Peter said unto him.—The motive of Peter’s question is not given. Interpreted by the like question in Matt. xix. 27 (where see Note), it is natural to suppose that he dwelt, not so much on the last words of warning, as on the greatness of the promise which is held out in verse 37. Was that to be the common blessing of all believers, or the special reward of those who had forsaken all?

(42—46) Who then is that faithful and wise steward?—See Notes on Matt. xxiv. 45—51. Here the words come as an answer to Peter’s question. The promise was spoken, not for the Twelve only, but for every faithful and wise steward. The words are as the germ of the parable which sets forth the wisdom, though not the faithfulness, of the Unjust Steward (chap. xvi. 8—10). If wisdom and prudence alone deserved the praise there bestowed on it, what would be due to wisdom and faithfulness united? In St. Paul’s words, “It is required in stewards that a man be found faithful” (1 Cor iv. 2), we may, perhaps, recognise one of the many traces left on his Epistles by the companionship of St. Luke. (See Introduction.)

(45) To beat the menservants.—Literally, the boys, but in the sense which the word had acquired, like the French garçon, as used generally for servants of any age. Note the more specific terms as compared with the “ fellow-servants” of St. Matthew.

(46) With the unbelievers.—Better, perhaps, in a less technical sense, the unfaithful, the word affording sharp contrast with the “ faithful and wise steward” of verse 43.

(47) And that servant, which knew his lord’s will.—The verses that follow (47—50) are peculiar to St. Luke, and every word is full of profoundest interest. First there comes a warning to the disciples who knew their Lord’s will, who had been told to watch for His coming, to prepare themselves and others for it. That “will” included the use of all gifts and opportunities, as in the parables of the Founds and the Talents, with faithfulness and activity in using them. On those who, with their eyes open, were sinning against light and knowledge (our Lord’s words had, we can scarcely doubt, a latent reference to Judas) there should come, as used generally for servants men as a trust or deposit.” (Comp. 1 Tim. vi. 20; 2 Tim. i. 12, 14.)

(48) I am come to send fire on the earth.—The two clauses differ slightly, though they are parallel in meaning; the first referring to “ gifts” which involve what we speak of as a general moral responsibility, the second to that which has been solemnly “committed to men as a trust or deposit.” (Comp. 1 Tim. vi. 20; 2 Tim. i. 12, 14.)

Unto whomsoever much is given.—The two clauses differ slightly, though they are parallel in meaning; the first referring to “ gifts” which involve what we speak of as a general moral responsibility, the second to that which has been solemnly “committed to men as a trust or deposit.” (Comp. 1 Tim. vi. 20; 2 Tim. i. 12, 14.)

(49) I am come to send fire on the earth.—There is a strange unique abruptness in the utterance. We are compelled to assume a parenthesis, a moment’s pause, a moment’s thought, as in one whose gaze looks out into the future, and who at once feels its terrors and yet accepts them. The fire which He came to send is the fire of judgment which shall burn up the chaff (see Note on Matt. iii. 12), the baptism of fire which shall purify and cleanse as well as destroy. The Son of Man knew that this, with all its terrors, was what He came to work. If the fire was already kindled, if judgment was already passed, the Son of Man knew that this, with all its terrors, was what He came to work. If the fire was already kindled, if judgment was already passed, the Son of Man knew that this, with all its terrors, was what He came to work.
earth; and what will I, if it be already kindled? (50) But I have a baptism to be baptized with; and how am I straitened till it be accomplished! (51) Suppose ye that I am come to give peace on earth? * I tell you, Nay; but rather division: (52) for from henceforth there shall be five in one house divided, three against two, and two against three. (53) The father shall be divided against the son, and the son against the father; the mother against the daughter, and the daughter against the mother; the mother in law against her daughter in law, and the daughter in law against her mother in law.

(54) And he said also to the people, When ye see a cloud rise out of the west,—straightway ye say, There cometh a shower; and so it is. (55) And when ye see the south wind blow ye say, There will be heat; and it cometh to pass. (56) Ye hypocrites, ye can discern the face of the sky and of the earth; but how is it that ye do not discern this time? (57) Yea, and why even of yourselves judge ye not what is right?

(58) When thou goest with thine adversary to the magistrate, as thou art in the way, give diligence that thou mayest be delivered from him; lest he hale thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and the officer cast thee into prison. (59) I tell thee, thou shalt not depart hence, till thou hast paid the very last mite.

(57) Yea, and why even of yourselves judge ye not what is right?—Better, judge that which is just. The meaning of the words is not that they did not know what was right, but that they did not act upon their knowledge. They were passing an unrighteous judgment on the preachers of repentance, on the Baptist and on the Christ, because they came to tell them of the time of their visitation, when their action ought to have been as true and spontaneous as their daily judgment about the weather. It is possible, though not, I think, probable, that the question "Why even of yourselves ... ?" may have some reference to the request of the disciple, in verse 13, that our Lord would act as judge.

(58) When thou goest with thine adversary to the court ...:—Better, with all the MSS., For as thou goest ... The conjunction would seem to have been omitted by the translators because they did not see the sequence of thought implied in it. There is, indeed, something at first strangely abrupt in this reproduction of what had appeared in the Sermon on the Mount as part of our Lord's teaching as to the true meaning of the command "Thou shall not kill." (See Note on Matt. v. 25.) There the words are spoken at once of earthly adversaries and magistrates and of the great Judge of all. Is it so in this place also? Is this the "just judgment" to which verse 57 referred, in contrast with the prevailing bitterness and hardness of men in the quarrels brought on chiefly by their greed of gain? The answer to the question is found in accepting, as before, both the literal meaning and that of which it becomes a parable, with, perhaps, a greater stress than before on the spiritual aspect of the words. Our Lord is speaking to the people; there has been no immediate reference, as before, to the Sixth Commandment. His teaching has taken a wider range, and the old words, as it were, come back, with every point of the parable brought into full clearness. The "adversary" is the Law that accuses them (John v. 45); the judge is none other than the Judge of all the earth; and then all follows in due order as before.

(59) I tell thee, thou shalt not depart hence; till thou hast paid the very last mite.
CHAPTER XIII. — (1) There were present at that season some that told him of the Galileans, whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices. (2) And Jesus answering said unto them, Suppose ye that these Galileans were sinners above all the Galileans, because they suffered such things? (3) I tell you, Nay: but, except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish. (4) Or those eighteen, upon whom the tower in Siloam fell, and slew them, think ye that they were sinners above all men that dwelt in Jerusalem? (5) I tell you, Nay: but, except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish. (6) He spake also this parable: A certain man had a fig tree planted in his vineyard; and he came and sought fruit thereon, and found none. (7) Then said he unto the dresser of his vineyard, Behold, these three years I come seeking fruit on this fig tree, and find none: cut it down; why cumbereth it of God are leading them to repentance. The sharp warning of the Baptist, “Every plant that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down” (Matt. iii. 10), is expanded into a parable. As regards the outward framework of the story, we have only to note that the joint culture of the fig-tree and the vine was so common as to have passed into a proverb (2 Kings xviii. 31; Song of Sol. ii. 13). The interpretation of the parable as to its general drift is easy enough. The barren fig-tree is the symbol of a fruitless profession of godliness; the delay represents the forbearance of God in allowing yet a time for repentance. When we come to details, however, serious difficulties present themselves. If we take the fig-tree as representing Israel, what are we to make of the vineyard? If the owner of the vineyard be Christ, who is the vine-dresser? Do the three years refer to the actual duration of our Lord’s ministry? Answers to these questions will be found in the following considerations: —(1) The vineyard is uniformly in the parabolic language of Scripture the symbol of Israel. (See Note on Matt. xxii. 33.) (2) The owner of that vineyard is none other than the great King, the Lord of Hosts (Isa. v. 7). (3) If this be so, then the fig-tree must stand for something else than Israel as a nation, and the context points to its being the symbol of the individual soul, which inheriting its place in a divine order, is as a tree planted in the garden of the Lord. (Comp. Ps. i. 3; Jer. xviii. 8.) (4) The “three years” in which the owner comes seeking fruit can, on this view, answer neither to the three stages of Revelation—Patriarchal, Mosaic, and Prophetic—nor the three years of our Lord’s ministry, but represent, as the symbol of completeness, the full opportunities given to men, the calls to repentance and conversion which come to them in the several stages of their lives in youth, manhood, age. (5) The dresser of the vineyard, following the same line of thought, is the Lord Jesus Himself, who intercedes, as for the nation as a whole, so for each individual member of the nation. He pleads for delay. He will do what can be done by “digging” into the fallow ground of the soul, and by imparting new sources of nourishment or fruitfulness. If these avail, well. If not, the fig-tree, by implication every fig-tree in the vineyard that continued barren, would be cut down. (7) Why cumbereth it the ground? — The Greek verb means more than that the fig-tree was what we call a useless burden or incumbrance, and implies positive injury. It is commonly rendered by “bring to nought,” or some like phrase. (In 1 Cor. xii. 8 it is rendered “fail.”) This would seem, indeed, to have been the old meaning of the English verb. Comp. Shakespeare’s Julius Caesar, iii. 1: —

"Domestic fury, and fierce civil strife. Shall cumber all the parts of Italy."
the ground? (8) And he answering said unto him, Lord, let it alone this year also, till I shall dig about it, and dung it: (9) and if it bear fruit, well: and if not, then after that thou shalt cut it down.

(10) And he was teaching in one of the synagogues on the sabbath. (11) And, behold, there was a woman which had a spirit of infirmity eighteen years, and was bowed together, and could in no wise lift up herself. (12) And when Jesus saw her, he called her to him, and said unto her, Woman, thou art loosed from thine infirmity. (13) And he laid his hands on her: and immediately she was made straight, and glorified God. (14) And the ruler of the synagogue answered with indignation, because that Jesus had healed on

(8) And dung it.—Literally, and put dung. Homely as the imagery is, it suggests fertilising and gracious influences not less vividly than the dew or rain from heaven, and points, perhaps, specifically to such as are working on us in our earthly surroundings, as contrasted with the directly supernatural action of God's grace.

(9) And if it bear fruit.—Some of the better MSS. have, if it bear fruit in the time to come. . . . With either reading the sentence is elliptical, and the insertion of “well,” as in the English, is needed to convey its meaning.

(10) And he was teaching in one of the synagogues.—The narrative that follows is peculiar to St. Luke. The definiteness as to time and place indicate that it was probably one of the previously unrecorded traditions which he met with when he entered on his personal search for materials. This is in part confirmed by the use of “the Lord” in verse 15. (See Note on chap. vii. 13.)

(11) Behold, there was a woman . . . . — The description indicates the accuracy of the trained observer. The duration of the affliction (as in Acts ix. 33), the symptoms of permanent curvature of the spine, the very form of the two participles, bent together . . . . unable to unbend, are all characteristic. The phrase a “spirit of infirmity,” i.e., an evil spirit producing bodily infirmity, implies a diagnosis that the source of the perverseness, as in some forms of catalspsy and aphasia, was in the region in which soul and body act and react on each other. The presence of such a sufferer in the synagogue may, perhaps, be held to imply habitual devotion, and therefore the faith that made her receptive of the healing power.

(12) Woman, thou art loosed from thine infirmity.—Better, thou hast been loosed . . . . The words were obviously a test of the woman’s faith. Would she, on hearing the words, make the effort to do what she had not done for eighteen years? The verb, it may be noted, is in the perfect. The work of healing was already completed.

(13) And he laid his hands on her.—The bodily act was, as in the analogous cases of the blind and dumb (see Note on Matt. ix. 29), a help to the faith which was necessary, on the woman’s part, that she might receive the full benefit of the divine act of power. When this was done, she poured forth her joy (as the imagery is, it suggests fertilising and gracious influences not less vividly than the dew or rain from heaven, and points, perhaps, specifically to such as are working on us in our earthly surroundings, as contrasted with the directly supernatural action of God’s grace).

(14) And the ruler of the synagogue answered with indignation, because that Jesus had healed on

(15) The Lord then answered him, and said, Thou hypocrite, doth not each one of you on the sabbath loose his ox or his ass from the stall, and lead him away to watering?

(16) And ought not this woman, being a daughter of Abraham, whom Satan hath bound, lo, these eighteen years, be loosed from this bond on the sabbath day? (17) And when he had said these things, all his adversaries were ashamed: and all the people rejoiced for all the glorious things that were done by him.

(18) Then said he, Unto what is the kingdom of God like? and whereunto shall I resemble it? (19) It is like a
fowl of the air lodged in the branches grew, and waxed a great tree; and the impenitent people's life grain of mustard seed, which a man took, and cast into his garden; and it grew, and waxed a great tree; and the Second Book of Esdras. This book is probably (in part, at least, certainly, see 2 Esdr. viii. 28, 29), post-Christian, and has been assigned to the time of Nero, or Domitian, or Trajan; but it reflects with a wonderful fulness the fevered, anxious thoughts that were working among both Jews and Gentiles, and among these none is so prominent as that "many are created, but few shall be saved" (2 Esdr. viii. 1, 3, 55). Among the strange cabbalistic fancies of the Rabbis, one was an attempt to fix the number of the saved by the numerical value of the letters of this or that text that prophesied of the Kingdom of Heaven. Assuming the question to be of this nature, its form indicates that it was a speculative inquiry. A man anxious and in earnest would have asked, "What must I do to be saved?" And, being a speculative question, our Lord put it aside, gave no direct answer, and sought to force the man back on the thought of what was needed that he himself might take his place in that company.

And he went through the cities and villages, teaching, and journeying toward Jerusalem. Then said one unto him, Lord, are there few that be saved? And he said unto them,

Strive to enter in at the strait gate: for many, I say unto you, will seek to enter in, and shall not be able. When once the master of the house is risen up, and hath shut to the door, and ye begin to stand without, and to knock at the door, saying, Lord, Lord, open unto us; and he shall answer and say unto you, I know you not whence ye are: then shall ye begin to say, We have eaten and drunk in thy presence, and thou hast taught in our streets. But he shall say, I tell you, I know you not whence ye are; depart from me, all ye workers of iniquity. There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.

in the absence of any apparent trace of sequence, is that we have an isolated fragment of our Lord's teaching, torn from the context in which we find it in St. Matthew. On the other hand, we must remember (1) that our Lord was in the synagogue, and it was on the Sabbath day, and that so both time and place favored for teaching of some kind; and (2) that the parables that follow may well be regarded but as samples of the teaching which those who were in the synagogue had treasured up in their memories. They were fit and edifying parables at any time; not least so, assuredly, at this. When proof had been given that the Kingdom of God had indeed come nigh unto men, it was well to set before them something as to its nature, its extent, its mode of working inwardly and outwardly; and the fact that the similitudes which did this had been used before, did not necessarily make them inapplicable or unprofitable when used again.

And he went through the cities and villages, teaching, and journeying.—Literally, making a journey, as implying a circuit deliberately planned. This is apparently the continuation of the same journey as that of which chap. ix. 51 recorded the beginning. There seems reason to believe, as stated in the Note on that passage, that it lay chiefly through the cities and villages of Perea, the modern Hauran, on the east side of the Jordan. Such a journey, though with comparatively little record of what happened on it, is implied in Matt. xix. 1, Mark x. 1, in the retirement beyond Jordan of John x. 40. It had led our Lord at first through Samaria (chap. ix. 52), then back to Samaria and Galilee again (chap. xvii. 11), then either from the east, crossing the river, or from the west to Jericho (chap. xvii. 35).

Are there few that be saved?—More accurately, that are being saved, or, that are in the way of salvation. The Greek participle is present, not perfect, and this sense should be borne in mind both here and in 2 Cor. vi. 15—still more so, perhaps, in Acts, ii. 47, where the English version gives, with a singular innslicity, "such as should be saved." We are left to conjecture to what class the questioner belonged, and what feelings prompted the question. Was he thinking of salvation in the higher Christian sense of the term, or of safety from that destruction of which Christ had spoken as coming on the impenitent people? In the mind of the questioner the two things may have been blended together, but the answer clearly points to the former, and we have sufficient evidence that such questions were agitating men's minds in the apocryphal Revelation known as the Second Book of Esdras. The Greek participle is present, not perfect, and this sense should be borne in mind both here and in 2 Cor. vi. 15—still more so, perhaps, in Acts, ii. 47, where the English version gives, with a singular innslicity, "such as should be saved." We are left to conjecture to what class the questioner belonged, and what feelings prompted the question. Was he thinking of salvation in the higher Christian sense of the term, or of safety from that destruction of which Christ had spoken as coming on the impenitent people? In the mind of the questioner the two things may have been blended together, but the answer clearly points to the former, and we have sufficient evidence that such questions were agitating men's minds in the apocryphal Revelation known as the Second Book of Esdras. This book is probably (in part, at least, certainly, see 2 Esdr. viii. 28, 29), post-Christian, and has been assigned to the time of Nero, or Domitian, or Trajan; but it reflects with a wonderful fulness the fevered, anxious thoughts that were working among both Jews and Gentiles, and among these none is so prominent as that "many are created, but few shall be saved" (2 Esdr. viii. 1, 3, 55). Among the strange cabbalistic fancies of the Rabbis, one was an attempt to fix the number of the saved by the numerical value of the letters of this or that text that prophesied of the Kingdom of Heaven. Assuming the question to be of this nature, its form indicates that it was a speculative inquiry. A man anxious and in earnest would have asked, "What must I do to be saved?" And, being a speculative question, our Lord put it aside, gave no direct answer, and sought to force the man back on the thought of what was needed that he himself might take his place in that company.

Strive to enter in at the strait gate.—See Notes on Matt. vii. 13, 14. Another instance of general teaching adapted to a special occasion. We note, however, the variation, "strive to enter in"—i.e., struggle as the wrestler struggles (the word being the same as that in 1 Cor. ix. 25; 1 Tim. vi. 12), instead of the simple "enter ye in," and the compression of the whole illustration.

When once the master of the house . . .—The passage contains elements that are common at once to Matt. vii. 22, 23, and xxv. 10—12, where see Notes.

We have eaten and drunk . . ., and Thou didst teach. The words differ slightly from those in Matt. vii. 22, which put higher claims into the mouths of the speakers, "Did we not prophecey in Thy name . . .?" They are, i.e., the representatives of those who hold office in the Church of God, yet have not truly submitted themselves to the guidance of the Divine Teacher. Here the words clearly point to actual companionship, to the hopes that men were building on the fact that they had once sat at meat, in the house of Publican or Pharisee, with the Prophet whom they acknowledged as the Christ. In its wider application it, of course, includes all who in any sense eat and drink with Him now in visible fellowship with His Church, and who rest their hopes of eternal life on that outward communion. There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.—See Notes on Matt. xi. 12; but notice, as an interesting variation, the addition of the "prophets" to the names of the three patriarchs.
and gnashing of teeth, when ye shall see Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets, in the kingdom of God, and you yourselves thrust out.

(30) And they shall come from the east, and from the west, and from the north, and from the south, and shall sit down in the kingdom of God. (30) And, behold, there are last which shall be first, and there are first which shall be last.2

(31) The same day there came certain of the Pharisees, saying unto him, Get thee out, and depart hence: for Herod will kill thee.

(32) And he said unto them, Go ye, and tell that fox, Behold, I cast out devils, and I do cures to day and to morrow, and the third day I shall be perfected. (33) Nevertheless I must walk to day, and to morrow, and the day following: for it cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem.

(34) O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee; how often would I have gathered thy children together, as a hen doth gather her brood under her wings, and ye would not!

(35) Behold, your house is left unto you desolate: and verily I say unto you, Ye shall not see me, until the time come when ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord.

(33) Nevertheless I must walk.—Better, I must journey, or, I must go onward, the word being that used in chap. xxiii. 8, perhaps, supplies the answer to that question. Herod “hoped to have seen some miracle done by Him,” and Jesus, reading his thoughts, tells him that the time for such sights and wonders was all but over. One day, and yet another, and yet a third—so our Lord describes, in proverbial speech (comp. the analogous forms of Ex. v. 14; Hos. vi. 2), an interval of very short duration, and then “I am perfected.” The word is strictly a present tense used predictively, and may be either middle or passive in its meaning, the latter being most in harmony with the use of the verb elsewhere. “Then I am brought to the end; then I reach the goal of this human life of Mine.” Very noteworthy in connection with this passage is the prominence given to the verb throughout the Epistle to the Hebrews, as, e.g., in Heb. ii. 9, “In the days of his flesh, when he had offered unto God many offerings, having in the course of years attained to perfection.”

(34) O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killest the prophets.—See Notes on Matt. xxiii. 31-37. Here, as in other like cases, we have to choose between the alternatives of the words having been spoken on two different though similar occasions, or of one of the
CHAPTER XIV.—(1) And it came to pass, as he went into the house of one of the chief Pharisees to eat bread on the sabbath day, that they watched him. (2) And, behold, there was a certain man before him which had the dropsy. (3) And Jesus answering spake unto the lawyers and Pharisees, saying, Is it lawful to heal on the sabbath day? (4) And they held their peace. And he took him, and healed him, and let him go; (5) and answered them, saying, Which of you shall have an ass or an ox fallen into a pit, and will not straightway pull him out on the sabbath day? (6) And they could not answer him again to these things. (7) And he put forth a parable to those which were bidden, when he marked how they chose out the chief rooms; saying unto them, (8) When thou art bidden of any man to a wedding, sit not down in the highest room; lest a more honourable man than thou be bidden of him; (9) and he that bade thee and him come and say to thee, Give this man a lowest room.—At first sight the words seem to suggest lower motives than those by which the disciples of Christ should regulate their lives—an artificial and calculating rather than a real humility. Three explanations may be given of what is a very real

Evangelists misplacing the words which were actually spoken but once. As with most other passages thus re-appearing in a different context, I hold the former to be by far the most probable. In each report, it may be noted, they fit into the context with a perfectly natural coherence.

XIV.

(1) Into the house of one of the chief Pharisees. Better, of the rulers of the Pharisees. The meaning of the phrase is probably more definite than that suggested by the English. The man was either a “ruler” in the same sense as Nicodemus (John iii. 1), or the rich young man in Luke xxi. 18—i.e., a member of the Sanhedrin (which seems most likely)—or else occupied a high position in the lay-hierarchy (if the phrase may be allowed) which had developed itself in the organisation of Pharisaism.

To eat bread on the Sabbath day. Sabbath feasts were then, as at a later time, part of the social life of the Jews, and were often—subject, of course, to the condition that the food was cold—occasions of great luxury and display. Augustine speaks of them as including dancing and song, and the “Sabbath luxury” of the Jews became a proverb. On the motives of the Pharisee—probably half respect and half curiosity—see Notes on chap. vii. 36.

(2) A certain man before him which had the dropsy. This is the only miracle of the kind recorded in the Gospels. The term which St. Luke uses is strictly technical (hydropticus), and we may fairly see in the narrative another illustration of his professional character. He, more than others, had been led to specific inquiries as to the nature of the diseases which our Lord had healed. (See Introduction.) The man may have been an invited guest, or the feast may have been one of the semi-public ones in which the richer Pharisees displayed their hospitality. (3) Unto the lawyers. See Note on Matt. xii. 35. The teaching of our Lord is identical in substance, and nearly so in form, with that in chap. vi. 6—11, Matt. xii. 9—14, Mark iii. 1—6. Here, however, it will be noticed, our Lord takes the initiative in the controversy, whereas before the scribes and Pharisees had asked Him the question. Possibly some report of what had then passed had reached the ears of those who were now present, and caused them to be silent both before and after the question.

(4) And he took him. Better, he laid hold on him. The healing was, in this instance, effected by actual contact.

(5) Which of you shall have an ass or an ox . . . .—The line of thought is all but identical with that of chap. xiii. 15. Here, as there, the outward features of Jewish life are the same as they had been in Ex. xx. 17, and Isa. i. 3. The “ox and the ass” are the beasts which common men use and value. The horse belongs to conquerors and kings. This is said with reference to the received text. Many of the best MSS., however, read, “Which of you shall have a son, or an ox . . . .?” and, on the whole, this reading seems likely to be the true one. The familiar combination of the ox and the ass would naturally lead a transcriber to substitute ἔβος (ass) for βός (son). There would be nothing to tempt any one to a change in the opposite direction.

Fallen into a pit. Literally, into a well, as in John iv. 6—11, but the word was applied also, as in Rev. ix. 1, 2, to “wells without water”—i.e., as here, to “pits.”

And will not straightway pull him out. The words appeal to the common action and natural impulse of men, but the casuistry of the Pharisees had, as a matter of fact, given a different answer. Food might be let down to the ox or ass, but no effort to pull him out was to be made till the Sabbath rest was over.

(6) And they could not answer him again. The Greek is, perhaps, a little more emphatic—“They had no power, they were powerless to answer him.”

(7) And he put forth a parable. The passage has the interest of being, in conjunction with chap. xi. 43, the germ of the great invective of Matt. xxiii. 6, and the verses that may follow. (See Notes there.)

Chief rooms. Better, chief places, or chief couches; literally, the chief places to recline in after the Eastern fashion. This, again, implies the semi-public character of the feast. The host did not at first place his guests according to his own notions of fitness. They were left to struggle for precedence. What follows is hardly a parable in our modern sense of the term, but is so called as being something more than a mere precept, and as illustrated by a half-dramatic dialogue.

(8) Sit not down. Literally, recline not.

Lest a more honourable man than thou . . . . Literally, the words imply that the common practice was for the guests to seat themselves; then, as in the parable of the wedding garment (Matt. xxii. 11), the host came in to sit to the guests.

(9) And thou begin with shame to take the lowest room. At first sight the words seem to suggest lower motives than those by which the disciples of Christ should regulate their lives—an artificial and calculating rather than a real humility. Three explanations may be given of what is a very real
The sequel determines the whole history of the many churches of Christendom.

Friend, go up higher: then shalt thou cometh, he may say unto thee, "Sit down in the lowest room." Better, as before, recline for the verb, and place, or couch, for the noun.

Friend.—The Greek word is not the same as in Matt. xx. 13 (where see Note), xxi. 12, xxvi. 50, but is the same as in John xi. 11, xv. 14. The difference is suggestive. The first word addressed to the humble and lowly guest speaks of confidence and affection. He is welcomed as, in the highest sense, the "friend" of the giver of the feast.

Worship...—Better, honour, or glory, the same word as in John v. 44, xii. 43.

Whosoever exalteth himself shall be abased.—The reproduction of the teaching in words which are almost an echo of these, in 1 Pet. v. 5, is interesting as showing the impression which it had made on the minds of the disciples.

A dinner or a supper.—The two words were used respectively for the morning and the evening meal—the former, like the Continental déjeuner, being taken commonly a little before noon, the latter, about sunset.

Thy friends, or thy brethren.—The words were clearly chosen as including the classes of guests who were then present. Our Lord saw in that Sabbath feast nothing but an ostentatious hospitality, calculating on a return in kind. It might not be wrong in itself, but it could take no place, as the Pharisees clearly thought it would do, in the list of good works by which he sought to win God's favour. The very fact that it met with its reward on earth excluded it, almost ipso facto, from the reward of the resurrection of the just.

And when one of them that sat at meat with him heard these things, he said unto him, Blessed is he that shall eat bread in the kingdom of God.

then said he unto him, A certain man made a great supper, and bade many; and sent his servant at supper time addressed to the humble and lowly guest, as less ostentatious, and for the receivers, as tending to the formation of a higher character, than the open feast of the Eastern form of benevolence. The essence of the beatitude, as distinct from its form, remains for all who give freely, without calculation or expectation of reward, to those who can give them no recompense in return, who have nothing to offer but their thanks and prayers.

At the resurrection of the just.—The passage has the interest of being the first occurrence of the word "resurrection" in our Lord's teaching. On this point our Lord, while rebuking the pride and hypocrisy of the Pharisees, accepted the fundamental doctrine of their system, and so furnished a precedent for St. Paul's conduct in Acts xxii. 6.

Blessed is he that shall eat bread...—The form of the exclamation was obviously determined by the words which our Lord had just spoken. It may have been a more or less familiar formula among devout Jews who expected the coming of the Christ. It may have embodied some recollections of the great disquisitions at Capernaum (John vi. 26—59). On the whole it seems more natural to see in it a burst of honest, unwonted enthusiasm, kindled by sympathy with what our Lord had said, than to regard it as spoken hypocritically, with a view to drawing from His lips some heretical utterance that might ensure His condemnation.

A certain man made a great supper...—Historically this has the interest of being the first occurrence of the "feast" imagery in our Lord's teaching. Here, as with so many of His parables, it is suggested by the occasion. Afterwards, as in Matt. xxii. 1—13, it is reproduced in an altered and expanded form. Here, as there, the giver of the feast is God.

And bade many.—The sequel determines the primary application of the word to the Jewish people. But it need hardly be said that it admits of manifold secondary, or even tertiary, applications through the whole history of the many churches of Christendom.

And sent his servant.—The servant stands in this parable as the representative of the whole order of prophets and apostles—of all who, like the Baptist and the Twelve, had been sent to invite men...
The Excuses of the Invited Guests. ST. LUKE, XIV. Guests from the Highways and Hedges.

time to say to them that were bidden, come; for all things are now ready. (18) And they all with one consent began to make excuse. The first said unto him, I have bought a piece of ground, and I must needs go and see it: I pray thee have me excused. (19) And another said, I have bought five yoke of oxen, and I go to prove them: I pray thee have me excused. (20) And another said, I have married a wife, and therefore I cannot come. (21) So that servant came, and shewed his lord these things. Then the master of the house being angry said to his servant, Go out quickly into the streets and lanes of the city, and bring in hither the poor, and the maimed, and the halt, and the blind. (22) And the servant said, Lord, it is done as thou hast commanded; and yet there is room. (23) And the lord said unto the servant, Go out into the highways and hedges, and compel them to come in, that my house may be filled. (24) For I say unto you, That none of those men which were bidden shall taste of my supper.

to the Kingdom. “The time of supper” is, in the primary application, the time of our Lord’s coming, when the Kingdom of Heaven was first proclaimed as nigh at hand. All things—pardon, peace, blessedness—were now ready for those who would accept them. (18) They all with one consent...—The Greek phrase, as the italics show, is elliptical; but the English idiom expresses its meaning whether we take the omitted noun to be “voice,” or “consent,” or “mind.” To make excuse.—To beg off would, perhaps, be too colloquial, but it exactly expresses the force of the Greek verb. I have bought a piece of ground.—The Greek noun implies a little more than the English—better, perhaps, a farm (see Notes on Mark vi. 36); and the tense in each case is strictly one in which a man naturally speaks of the immediate past—“I bought but now.” (19) Five yoke of oxen.—The number was one which came within the reach of any peasant farmer of moderate competence. (Comp. Elisha’s twelve yoke of oxen, I Kings xix. 19.) (20) I have married a wife.—It may be noted that the Law of Moses allowed men to plead this, and the building of a house, or planting of a vineyard, as a ground for exemption from military service (Deut. xx. 4—7). The sin of the invited guests was that they treated the invitation to the feast as though it were as burdensome as a military conscription. In the interpretation of the parable, the bearing of this is obvious. Men are invited to the highest spiritual blessings, and they look askance at the invitation, as though it called for something that answers to this “compulsion” in the work of Christian preachers, but the weapons of their warfare are not carnal (2 Cor. v. 14), and the constraint which they bring to bear on men is that of “the love of Christ” (2 Cor. v. 14). The only instances of the other kind of compulsion in the Apostolic age are when Saul “compelled” men and women to blaspheme (Acts xxvi. 11), or the Judaizers “compelled” Gentile converts to be circumcised (Gal. ii. 12).

There may be filled.—It is obvious that we cannot introduce space-limits into the interpretation of the parable. The gates of the Father’s house are open for evermore, and in its “many mansions” (John xiv. 2) there is, and ever will be, room for all who come. (24) None of those men which were bidden...—Here again we may not press a literal interpretation of the parable. The absolute exclusion of the whole company of the first-invited guests has its antitype in the general rejection of Israel from fellowship with the Church of Christ. It lies in the very nature of a parable that it deals roughly with general facts, and so it passes over in this instance what would have answered to the admission of a chosen few.” the
ST. LUKE, XIV.

The Salt losing its Savour.

man began to build, and was not able to finish. (31) Or what king, going to make war against another king, sitteth not down first, and consulteth whether he be able with ten thousand to meet him that cometh against him with twenty thousand? (32) Or else, while the other is yet a great way off, he sendeth an ambassage, and desirereth conditions of peace. (33) So likewise, whosoever he be of you that forsaketh not all that he hath, he cannot be my disciple.

(34) Salt is good: but if the salt have lost his savour, wherewith shall it be seasoned? (35) It is neither fit for the land, nor yet for the dunghill; but men

that being, in His case, nothing less than the sacrifice of His own life.

(32) Desirereth conditions of peace.—Literally, the things that make for peace. The phrase is the same as that in chap. xix. 42, “the things that belong unto thy peace.” Are we to see any special significance in this addition to the general teaching of the previous verse, and if so, what is it? The answer seems to be that what our Lord teaches is the necessity of thoroughness in what we do. If we cannot make up our minds to the cost involved in warring against the world and its evil, we had better come to terms with it, and live in such peace as we can thus gain. If we shrink from the thought of fighting against God, we had better accept His conditions of peace. The worst folly of all is to enter into the conflict with a wavering will, not caring to know what “the things belonging to our peace” actually are, or to endeavour to stand apart in an impossible neutrality. Taking the highest application of the parable, He who spoke it had counted the cost, and therefore carried on the war with evil to the last, and would make no terms with it.

(33) Whosoever he be of you that forsaketh not all that he hath.—Like words had been spoken before, as in Matt. x. 37—39, where see Notes. Here they appear in a yet stronger form, “not hating” taking the place of “loving more,” and they are spoken, not to the Twelve only, but to the whole multitude of eager would-be followers. Self-renunciation, pushed, if necessary, to the extremest issues, is with Jesus the one indispensable condition of discipleship. He asks for nothing less than the heart, and that cannot be given by halves.

(27) Whosoever doth not bear his cross.—See Note on Matt. x. 38. As now uttered, however, the words had a fresh significance as interpreted by what the disciples had heard from their Master’s lips between Peter’s confession and the Transfiguration (chap. ix. 22, 23). That “bearing of the cross” was becoming every day more clear and terrible in its growing nearness.

(28—30) Which of you, intending to build a tower.—The words do not depend for their meaning on any local or personal allusion, but it is quite possible that their force may have been heightened for those who heard them by the memory of recent facts. Pilate had begun to build—certainly an aqueduct, probably a tower—and had not been able to finish. (See Notes on chap. xiii. 4; Matt. xxvii. 15.) He had not “counted the cost,” and when he was hindered from laying hands on the Corban, or treasure of the Temple, his resources failed.

(31) What king, going to make war against another king.—Here also there may have been a side-glance at contemporary history. The Tetrarch’s divorce of his first wife had involved him in a war with her father Aretas, an Arabian king or ethnarch (see Note on chap. iii. 14), in which his army was destroyed, and the Jewish historian sees in this the commencement of all his subsequent misfortunes (Jos. Ant. v., xviii. 5, § 1).

In the spiritual interpretation of the two parables, the tower reminds us of the house in Matt. vii. 24—27, and so stands for the structure of a holy life reared on the one Foundation; the warfare brings to our remembrance the conflict described in Matt. xii. 29. Here it stands partly for the conflict which every Christian carries on against sin, the world, and the devil, and of which we should take a clear estimate before we enter on it, partly for the greater war on which Christ Himself had entered, and of which He too had counted the cost—
cast it out. He that hath ears to hear, let him hear.

CHAPTER XV.—(1) Then drew near unto him all the publicans and sinners for to hear him. (2) And the Pharisees and scribes murmured, saying, This man receiveth sinners, and eateth with them. (3) And he spake this parable unto them, saying, (4) What man of you, having an hundred sheep, if he lose one of them, doth not leave the ninety

independence of the saying as here recorded. A new use of salt, distinct from that of preserving food, or its symbolic meaning in sacrifice, is brought before us, and becomes the ground-work of a new parable. The use of salt is usually a lower and humbler one than the others. The salt serves, mingling with the dung-hill, to manure and prepare the ground for the reception of the seed. Bear this in mind, and the interpretation of the parable, connected, as it thus is, with that of the Fig-tree (see Note on chap. xiii. 8), is obvious. A corrupt church cannot even exercise an influence for good over the secular life of the nation which it represents. The religious man whose religion has become an hypocrisy cannot even be a good citizen, or help others forward in the duties of their active life by teaching or example. The church and the individual man are alike fit only to be “cast out”—to become, i.e., a by-word and proverb of reproach. Our Lord’s sense, if we may so speak, of the depth and fulness of the meaning of His words, is shown by His emphatic reproduction of the words of that which had accompanied His first parable, “He that hath ears to hear, let him hear.”

XV.

(1) Then drew near unto him . . .—Better, and all the publicans and the sinners were drawing near to hear Him. There is not quite the same direct sequence in the Greek as in the English, but what follows comes naturally after the mention of the “multitudes” in chap. xiv. 25. Publicans and sinners knew that Jesus had turned, as in indignation, from the house of the Pharisees, and this, it may be, gave them courage to approach Him. (3) And the Pharisees and scribes . . .—Here, too, we may well believe that the speakers were some of the guests of chap. xiv. 15. They had followed Him to see what He would do, and were at once startled and shocked to find the Teacher who had spoken so sternly to those who were professedly godly, not only talking to, but eating with, those who were, at any rate, regarded as ungodly and sinful. (4) What man of you, having an hundred sheep . . .?—The meaning of the parable is so clear that it requires but little in the way of explanation. It gains, however, fresh force and interest if we remember that it followed on the great parable of the Good Shepherd in John x. 1—16, and on the compassion for the lost sheep of which we read in Matt. x. 30. The thought was, if we may use the language which rises to our lips, a dominant idea in the mind of Him who spoke. The primary application of that idea is clearly to be found in the immediate occasion of the parable, in the love which bids the Son of Man to concentrate His thoughts and energy and prayers on some one soul among those publicans and sinners who were thus gathered together; but it is, at least, a legitimate extension of it to think of it as embracing also His whole redemptive work as the Son of God, leaving the “ninety and nine,” the hosts of unfallen angels and archangels, or, it may be, unfallen beings more like ourselves in other worlds than ours, and coming to the rescue of the collective humanity which had fallen and wandered from the fold. (5) And when he hath found it, he layeth it on his shoulders.—Here again we have a three-fold series of parallel applications: the love of Jesus for each wandering sheep, bearing and sustaining it in its weakness; the love which led Him to take upon Him our nature, and to bear its infirmities; the love which leads those in whom the mind of Christ is formed to follow in His footsteps, and to act as He acted. (6) He calleth together his friends and neighbours.—The recurrence of the two words so soon after chap. xiv. 12 is suggestive. There are times when we do well to recognize the natural and social ties that bind man to man. Chiefly is it right to do so when we make them sharers in our own spiritual life, and raise and purify their life by calling on them to sympathize, not with our sufferings only, but with our purer and nobler joys. In its bearing upon our Lord’s own work we may think of His “friends and neighbours” as being the disciples whom He had chosen; we may think also of “the angels of God,” and the spirits of the just made perfect, who rejoice over one sinner that repenteth. (7) Ninety and nine just persons, which need no repentance.—As regards the men and women among whom our Lord carried on His work, we cannot see in these words anything but a grave and indignant protest, veiled under the form of an apparent concession, against the self-righteousness of the Pharisees. His call to repent had been addressed to all. That all offended in many things; that for a man to say he had not sinned was a lying boast—this was the first postulate of every preacher of the gospel,—whatever school of thought he might represent (Rom. iii. 23; Jas. iii. 2; 1 John i. 8). Once, indeed, the opposite thought had appeared in the devotional utterance of a penitent Israelite—“Thou therefore, O Lord, that art the God of the just, hast not appointed repentance to the just, as to Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, which have not sinned against Thee” (Prop. of Manasseh in the Apocrypha); but there it was accompanied by personal contrition and confession. The man felt in his humility, how unlike he was to those saints of God. It was reserved for the Pharisees to develop the thought
The Lost Piece of Silver.

ST. LUKE, XV. The Two Sons.

I had lost. (10) Likewise, I say unto you, there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repeneth.

(11) And he said, A certain man had two sons: (12) and the younger of them said to his father, Father, give me the portion of goods that falleth to me.

(8) Either what woman having ten pieces of silver, if she lose one piece, doth not light a candle, and sweep the house, and seek diligently till she find it? (9) And when she hath found it, she calleth her friends and her neighbours together, saying, Rejoice with me; for I have found the piece which

The coin is what it is because it has on it the king's image and superscription. Man is precious because he too has the image and superscription of the great King, the spiritual attributes of Thought and Will, by which he resembles God, stamped upon him. (2) There is, perhaps, a special significance in the fact that the coin is lost in the house, while the sheep strays from the fold. What seems implied here is the possibility that a soul that is precious in the sight of God may be lost even within the society, Israel or the Church of Christ, which is for the time being the visible house of God. (3) It is a woman who seeks, and not a man, and the change, at least, reminds us of the woman in the parable of the Leave. (See Note on Matt. xii. 33.) It is hardly an adequate explanation in either case, though it may be true in itself, that the variation was made to interest a different class of hearers, the women who were listening, who had no experience in going after the sheep that was lost. We must at least see in it the lesson that what we call feminine virtues and graces are needed for the deliverance of souls that have fallen—patience, and diligence, and minute observation—not less than what we think of as the more manly qualities of courage, and enterprise, and endurance. Lastly, in the “woman” of the parable we may venture to see that which answers in part to the ideal representation of Wisdom in the book of Proverbs (chaps. viii., ix.), in part to the Church as answering in its collective unity to the ideal of womanhood, as Christ Himself does to the ideal of manhood (Eph. v. 23).

Doth not light a candle, and . . . seek diligently . . . ? The symbolic meaning of each act lies almost on the surface. To “light the candle” can be nothing else than to use all available means for discovering the possible good that lies hidden or seemingly lost. In the later actual life of the Church, faithful preaching of the word answers to the one, faithful organisation of charity to the other. The rest of the parable is simply an identical reproduction, mutatis mutandis, of the situation of the former.

(11) And he said, A certain man had two sons.

—We enter here on one of the parables which are not only peculiar to St. Luke’s Gospel, but have something of a different character, as giving more than those we find in the other Gospels, the incidents of a story of common daily life. As with the Good Samaritan, it seems open to us to believe that it rested on a substratum of facts that had actually occurred. It is obvious that in the then social state of Palestine, brought into contact as the Jews were with the great cities of the Roman empire, such a history as that here recorded must have been but too painfully familiar.

In the immediate application of the parable, the father is the great Father of the souls of men; the elder son represents the respectively religious Pharisees; the younger stands for the class of publicans and sinners. In its subsequent developments it applies to the two types of character which answers to these in any age or country. On a wider scale, but with a less close parallelism, the elder son may stand for Israel according to the flesh; the younger for the whole heathen world. Looking back to the genealogies of Gen. v. 10, ix. 18, and even (according to the true construction of the words) x. 21, they correspond respectively to the descendants of Shem and those of Japheth. It is obvious from the whole structure of the parable that the elder son cannot represent the unfallen part of God’s creation; and, so far as it goes, this tells against that interpretation of the ninety and nine sheep, or the nine pieces of silver.

(22) The younger of them said to his father.

—Its bearing on the individual life, the younger son represents the temper that is eager for independence, self-asserting, energetic; the elder that which is contemplative, devout, ceremonial, quiescent. As the latter pre-eminently characterises, as noticed above, the sons of Shem as distinguished from those of Japheth, the Semitic as distinct from the Aryan race, the younger son represents primarily the Jew who has yielded to non-Jewish tendencies; and on the wider scale of interpretation, stands for the whole Gentile world. The contrast between the Esau and Jacob types of character is reproduced (Gen. xxxv. 27), only here the elder brother answers to Jacob and the younger to Esau, the variation indicating that the former is with all its short-comings the natural heir of the double portion of the first-born in the spiritual inheritance of God’s kingdom. Israel remains within comparatively narrow limits of thought and habituation. Japheth is “enlarged” (Gen. ix. 27) and goes forth with all his marvellous gifts of speech and thought, and fancy and invention.

Divided unto them his living.—In the normal scale of distribution, the elder son would have as his portion two-thirds of the personal, and possibly also of the real, property, the younger the remainder. In the framework of the story, the father and the elder son become, as it were, tenants in common (verse 31), the former still retaining the general direction of affairs. The contrast of things so described represents roughly the life of Israel under its theocracy, acknowledging God as its true King and Father.
And he divided unto them his living.
(13) And not many days after the younger son gathered all together, and took his journey into a far country, and there wasted his substance with riotous living.
(14) And when he had spent all, there arose a mighty famine in that land; and he began to be in want. 

(13) Took his journey into a far country.—Such instances of emigration were, we may believe, familiar things in most towns of Galilee and Judea. The young man left his home, and started, bent on pleasure or on gain, for Alexandria, or Rome, or Corinth, and rumour came home of riotous living, and a fortune wasted upon harlots, sabbaths broken, synagogues unvisited, perhaps even of participation in idol feasts. In the interpretation that lies below the surface, the “far country” is the state of the human spirit, of the Gentile world, in their wanderings far off from God. The “riotous living” is the reckless waste of noble gifts and highest energies on unbridled sensuality of life, or sensual, i.e., idolatrous, forms of worship. The fearful history traced in Rom. i. 19-32, is but too faithful a picture of the wanderings of the younger son.

(14) There arose a mighty famine in that land.—This again was no unwonted incident. The famine which “came to pass in the days of Claudius Cesar” (Acts xi. 28) was more extensive and memorable than others, but it was far from standing alone. And now the pinch came. His treasure was gone, and for the fulness of bread there was hunger and “cleanliness of teeth” (Amos iv. 6). In the individual interpretation of the parable, the mighty famine is the yearning of the soul’s unsatisfied desire, the absence of its true food, of “the bread that cometh down from heaven.” (See Notes on John vi. 32.) In its wider range it is the craving of humanity for what it cannot find when appetites are not satisfied, and their wonted supply ceases—the famine, not of broad and of water, but of hearing the word of the Lord (Amos vii. 11); the want of a message from the Eternal Father to sustain the life of His children.

(15) Joined himself.—Literally, to one of the citizens. In the outer story of the parable, this would emphasise the misery into which the man had fallen. The son of Abraham had to depend upon the bounty of an alien. In the two lines of interpretation, the “citizen” is one who all along has been of the world, worldly, living for no higher end than gain or pleasure. The prodigal is as one who, called to a higher life, has forfeited its light of hearing the word of the Lord (Amos vii. 11); the want of a message from the Eternal Father to sustain the life of His children.

(17) And when he came to himself.—The phrase is wonderfully suggestive. The man’s guilt was, that he had been self-indulgent; but he had been living to a self which was not his true self. The first step in his repentance is to wake as out of an evil dream, and to be conscious of his better nature, and then there comes the memory of happy days which is as “Sorrow’s crown of sorrow.” The “hired servants” are obviously those who serve God, not in the spirit of filial love, but from the hope of a reward. Even in that lower form of duty they find what satisfies their wants. They have not the craving of unsatisfied desire which the son feels who has cast away his sonship. He envies them, and would fain be as they are.
enough and to spare, and I perish with hunger! (18) I will arise and go to my father, and will say unto him, Father, I have sinned against heaven, and before thee, and am no more worthy to be called thy son: make me as one of thy hired servants. (20) And he arose, and came to his father. But when he was yet a great way off, his father saw him, and had compassion, and ran, and fell on his neck, and kissed him. (21) And the son said unto him, Father, I have sinned against heaven, and in thy sight, and am no more worthy to be called thy son. (22) But the father said to his servants, Bring forth the best robe, and put it on him; and put a ring on his hand, and shoes on his feet: (23) and bring hither the fatted calf, and kill it; and let us eat, and be merry: (24) for this my son was dead, and is alive again; he was lost, and is found. And they began to be merry. (25) Now his elder son was in the field: and as he came

(18) I will arise and go to my father.—This, then, was the firstfruits of repentance. He remembers that he has a father, and trusts in that father’s love; but he dares not claim the old position which he had so recklessly cast away. He is content to be as one of the “hired servants.” Spiritually, the first impulse of the contrite heart is to take the lowest place, to wish for the drudgery of daily duties, or even menial service, if only it may be near its Father in heaven, and by slow degrees regain His favour and earn the wages of His praise.

I have sinned...—More strictly, I sinned, as going back in thought to the first act of sin as virtually including all that grew out of it.

(20) When he was yet a great way off.—In the story of the parable we must think of the wanderer as coming back weary, foot-sore, hungry, and in rags. In the interpretation, the state of the penitent is that of one who is poor in spirit, hungering and thirsting after righteousness (Matt. v. 3, 6), with knees that are feeble and hands that hang down (Heb. xii. 12), conscious of his nakedness and needing something else than the “filthy rags” of his own righteousness (Isa. lxiv. 6) to cover it. And he is yet “a great way off”—not as yet near the home of peace, the light of the Father’s countenance—but even there, there comes to him the joy of all joys, the love of the Father finds him, and he is conscious of the love. There is the contact of his soul with the Divine Presence which answers to the Father’s kiss.

(21) Father, I have sinned against heaven.—The iteration of the self-same words comes to us with a wonderful power and pathos. The contrite soul does not play with its contrition, or seek to vary its expression. But the change is as suggestive as the repetition. Now that he has seen his father, he cannot bring himself to say again, “Make me as one of thy hired servants.” That had been a natural and right wish; but when they have felt the Father’s kiss, though still confessing that they are unworthy to be called sons, they cannot be satisfied with anything less than sonship.

(22) Bring forth the best robe.—It is hardly necessary, perhaps, in such a parable, to press the symbolic interpretation of each minute detail; but in this instance the symbolism lies so near the surface that it is at least well to ask ourselves what meaning either earlier or later associations would lead the disciples to attach to them. The “best robe” cannot well be other than the “garment of praise” (Isa. lix. 3), the vesture of righteousness, the new life and immortality with which it is the desire of the penitent to be clothed upon; the ring, as the signet upon the right hand (Jer. xxii. 24), must be the token of the special favour of the Giver, the seal of His “calling and election;” the shoes must answer to that “preparation” or “readiness” which comes from the gospel of peace (Eph. vi. 15), and which makes him eager to do his work as a messenger of Christ; the fatted calf (comp Ex. xi. 5) even when he tried to cover it, and am no more worthy to be called thy son. (22) But the father said to his servants, Bring forth the best robe, and put it on him; and put a ring on his hand, and shoes on his feet: (23) and bring hither the fatted calf, and kill it; and let us eat, and be merry: (24) for this my son was dead, and is alive again; he was lost, and is found. And they began to be merry. (25) Now his elder son was in the field: and as he came

(23) Bring hither the fatted calf.—It is interesting to remember the impression which this part of the parable made on one of the great teachers of the Church as early as the second century. Irenæus (see Introduction) saw in it an illustration of what seemed to him the special characteristic of St. Luke’s Gospel, viz., the stress which it lays on the priestly aspect of our Lord’s work and ministry. We note, after our more modern method, (1) that in the framework of the story, the definite article points to “the calf” that had been fattened as for some special feast of joy. It answers accordingly to the “feast of fat things” of Isa. xxv. 6—i.e., to the joy of the full fruition of the presence of God; and there is, perhaps, in the command to “kill it” (the word used is the technical one for slaying a sacrificial victim) a half-suggestion that this was only possible through a sacrifice and death. The fatted calf thus comes to represent to us that of which the Eucharistic feast is at once a symbol, a witness, and a pledge.

(24) This my son was dead.—The words, looked at merely as part of the story, have a wonderful pathos. Absence, alienation, the self-chosen shame, this had made the father think of the son as “dead.” Death would indeed have been far easier to bear. Spiritually, we are taught that repentance is nothing less than the passing from the death of sin to the life of righteousness, from the “graves of lust” (Num. xi. 34) to the power of the resurrection. The “lost” and “found” appear as furnishing the link that connects this with the preceding parables, and makes the trilogy, as it were, complete.

(25) He heard musick and dancing.—This brings in a new feature. The father, like the chief actors in the other parables, had called together his “friends and neighbours,” and they were rejoicing after the manner of the East. There was “musick,” literally, a symphony, or concert, implying voices as well as instruments. The word occurs nowhere else in the New Testament, but it is found in the LXX. version of Dan. iii. 5, 10, where indeed the Hebrew,
and drew nigh to the house, he heard music and dancing. (26) And he called one of the servants, and asked what these things meant. (27) And he said unto him, Thy brother is come; and thy father hath killed the fatted calf, because he hath received him safe and sound. (28) And he was angry, and would not go in: therefore came his father out, and intreated him. (29) And he answering said to his father, Lo, these many years do I serve thee, neither transgressed I at any time thy commandment: and yet thou never gavest me a kid, that I might make merry with my friends; (30) but as soon as this thy son was come, which hath devoured thy living with harlots, thou hast killed for him the fatted calf. (31) And he said unto him, Son, thou art ever with me, and all that I have is thine. (32) It was meet that we should make merry, and be glad: for this thy brother was dead, and is alive again; and was lost, and is found.

CHAPTER XVI.—(1) And he said also unto his disciples, There was a
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me a kid, that I might make merry with my friends: (30) but as soon as this thy son was come, which hath devoured thy living with harlots, thou hast killed for him the fatted calf. (31) And he said unto him, Son, thou art ever with me, and all that I have is thine. (32) It was meet that we should make merry, and be glad: for this thy brother was dead, and is alive again; and was lost, and is found.

CHAPTER XVI.—(1) And he said also unto his disciples, There was a
certain rich man, which had a steward; and the same was accused unto him that he had wasted his goods. (2) And he called him, and said unto him, How is it that I hear this of thee? give an account of thy stewardship; for thou mayest be no longer steward. (3) Then the steward said within himself, What

shall I do? for my lord taketh away from me the stewardship; I cannot dig; to beg I am ashamed. (4) I am resolved what to do, that, when I am put out of the stewardship, they may receive me into their houses. (5) So he called every one of his lord’s debtors unto him, and said unto the first, How much owest

faithful” (1 Cor. iv. 1, 2). We start, then, with this clue. The Unjust Steward represents primarily the scribes and teachers in their teaching and ministerial functions. But though spoken in the hearing of the Pharisees, the parable was addressed, not to them, but “to the disciples.” And the reason of this is obvious. They, too, were called to be “stewards;” they, too, collectively and individually, would have to give an account of their stewardship. But if this is what the steward represents, then the rich man, like the “householder” in other parables, can be none else than God, who both appoints the stewards and calls them to account. In the further extension of the parable it is, of course, applicable to all who have any “goods” entrusted to them, any gifts and opportunities, any vocation and ministry in the great kingdom of God.

The same was accused unto him that he had wasted his goods.—(1) The Greek word for “was accused” commonly carries with it the idea of false, calumnious accusation. Probably, however, the idea connected with it, as seen in the word diabolos, or devil, which is derived from it, is that of malignant accusation, whether the charge were true or false. It is conceivable that it may have been purposely chosen to suggest the thought that the great Adversary was at once tempting the double-minded teachers to their life of hypocrisy, and exulting at their fall. If we ask why this was only suggested and not more directly expressed, as it would have been if some one accuser had been named, the answer is found in the fact that the one great Accuser has many mouth-pieces, diaboli among the diaboles (see the word used for “false accusers” in Tit. ii. 3), and that there was no lack of such comments, more or less malevolent, on the inconsistencies of the professedly religious class. (2) There is an obvious purpose in using the same word, in the hearing of the same persons, as that which, in chap. xv. occurs suddenly. The dramatic abruptness of the parable leaves us uncertain who “they” are that are to “receive” him. The context that follows immediately supplies the deficiency. What answers to this, in the interpretation, is the moment when a Church or party or an individual teacher, halts between two policies—one that of striving after righteousness, and the other of secular expediency—and makes up its mind to adopt that which promises the most immediate and most profitable results.

How is it that I hear this of thee?—(1) The opening words of the steward’s master imply wonder as well as indignation. They remind us so far of the words of the lord of the vineyard in another parable, “Wherefore, when I looked that it should bring forth grapes, brought it forth wild grapes?” (Isa. v. 4). Speaking after the manner of men, it was a marvel and a mystery that men with so high a calling as the scribes and teachers of Israel should have proved so unfaithful to their trust. (2) The words that follow, given an account of thy stewardship; for thou mayest be no longer steward.” While they admit legitimately enough a personal application to each individual at the close of any period of trust and probation, and therefore at the close of life, are yet far from being limited to that application, and in their primary significance, do not even admit it. The close of a stewardship, for a party like the Pharisees—for a school like that of the scribes—for any Church or section of a Church—is when its day of judgment comes, when its work in the Kingdom is done, when history, and God in history, pass their sentence upon it. And that day of judgment was coming fast upon those who then heard the parable.

I cannot dig; to beg I am ashamed.—In the outer framework of the parable there is something eminently characteristic in this utterance of the steward’s thoughts. He has lost the manliness and strength which would have fitted him for actual labour. He retains the false shame which makes him prefer fraud to poverty. He shudders at the thought that it might be his lot to sit, like Lazarus, and ask an alms at the rich man’s door. Spiritually, we may see what happens to a religious caste or order, like the Pharisees, when it forfeits its true calling by misuse. It has lost the power to prepare the ground for future fruitfulness by the “digging,” which answers, as in chap. xiii. 8, to the preliminary work of education and other influences that lie outside direct religious activity. It is religious and ecclesiastical, or it is nothing. It is ashamed to confess its spiritual poverty, and to own that it is “poor, and blind, and naked” (Rev. iii. 17). Anything seems better than either of these alternatives.
thou unto my lord? (6) And he said, An hundred measures\(^1\) of oil. And he said unto him, Take thy bill, and sit down quickly, and write fifty. (7) Then said he to another, And how much owest thou? And he said, An hundred measures\(^2\) of wheat. And he said unto him, Take thy bill, and write four-score. (8) And the lord commended the unjust steward, because he had done wisely: for the children of this world are in their generation wiser than the

have the sense of that burden upon them. It neither gives the sense of peace or pardon, nor asserts the righteous severity of God's commandments. It keeps their consciences uneasy, and traffics in its absolute.

(6) Take thy bill, and sit down quickly.—The better MSS. give, thy bills, or thy documents, in the plural. These would include that which answered to the modern lease, the contract which specified the rent, and probably also the memorandum of the due delivery of the annual share of the produce. In this case the measure is the Hebrew both, which has been variously estimated, the data being uncertain and conflicting, at from one to three gallons to the higher number stated in the marginal note. The steward by thus tempting the debtors with an immediate gain, and making them sharers in his frauds, took the readiest and most direct means of securing at once their favour and their silence. That which answered to this in the first application of the parable was the conduct of the Pharisees, just in proportion as they lost the moral force which they had once exercised, in accommodating their casuistry to the selfishness of their followers. Thus by their Corban teaching (see Note on Matt. xv. 5) they released men from the obligation of supporting parents, and made perjury easy by their artificial distinctions as to oaths (Matt. v. 33; xxii. 16-22), gave a wide license to lust by their doctrine of divorce (Matt. v. 31; xix. 3), and substituted the paying tithes of mint, and anise, and cummin for the weightier matters of the Law (Matt. xxiii. 23). Like phenomena have been seen in analogous circumstances in the history of the Christian Church. When Leo X. sent forth his preachers of indulgences with their short and easy methods of salvation; when Jesuit confessors were to be found in every court of Europe, doing nothing to preserve their votaries from a fathomeless licentiousness, when Protestant theologians tuned their voice according to the time, and pandered to the passions of a Henry VIII. or a Landgrave of Hesse; when the preachers of justification by faith turned the grace of God into lasciviousness, or made it compatible with the life of money-making worldliness; when men lower the standard of duty to gain support and popularity—there is the act of the steward in bidding the debtor write fifty measures, when he owed a hundred, finds its counterpart.

(7) An hundred measures of wheat.—Here the measure is the Hebrew cor, which is reckoned as equal to ten baths (the latter, however, is a liquid, the former, a dry measure), and accordingly varies, according to the estimate given above, from thirteen to about ninety-seven gallons. One calculation makes it nearly equal to the English “quarter.”

(8) And the lord commended . . . .—The “lord” is, of course, the rich man of the parable, the steward’s master. He too, in the outer framework of the story, is one of the children of this world, and he admires the sharpness and quickness of the steward’s action. In the interpretation of the story, we trace once more the grave, half-veiled indignation, more keenly incisive than if the veil had been withdrawn, which so often appears in this phase of our Lord’s teaching. If this world were all, there would be a wisdom worthy of praise when a Church or its teachers adapted themselves to men’s passions or interests at the expense of Truth. That which makes such action hateful is that by so doing the children of light transform themselves into the children of this world.

The unjust steward.—Literally, the steward of unrighteousness, St. Luke using the half-Hebrew idiom of a genitive of the characteristic attribute. (Comp. the “mammon of unrighteousness” in verse 9, and the “unjust judge” of chap. xviii. 6, where the same idiom is used.)

The children of this world are in their generation wiser . . . .—Better, for their generation, with a view, i.e., to their own advantages and interests, and those of others like them.

Wiser than the children of light.—The word “wise” is that used by our Lord in “wise as serpents” (see Notes on Matt. x. 16). In “children of light” (literally, sons of light), though usage has made the Hebrew idiom familiar, we have another example of the genitive of characteristic attribute. We may note the recurrence of the phrase (with the variation of the Greek word for “children” instead of “sons”) in Eph. v. 8 as another instance of the way in which the phraseology of St. Paul was influenced by that of the words of the Lord Jesus collected by his fellow-labourer. “Children of light” are those in whom light is the prevailing element of their life, and they are necessarily also children of God; for “God is light, and in Him is no darkness at all” (1 John i. 5).

It must be left to the thoughtful reader to judge how far this exposition of the parable is coherent and satisfying in itself, and in harmony with the general teaching of our Lord. Those who will may compare it, apart from the real or imagined authority of this or that name, with the other interpretations which find in it a lesson (1) to the publicans (like that of chap. iii. 13) to exact no more than that which is appointed them; or (2) to all Christians to be as lenient in dealing with their “debtors” as the steward was with his master’s; or (3) a simple example of quickness and prudence in things temporal, which Christians are to reproduce, mutatis mutandis, in dealing with things eternal; or (4) which hold, as the main point of the parable, that the steward’s master was ignorant of his fraudulent collusion with the debtors; or (5) find in the call to give an account of his stewardship nothing but the approach of death; or (6) teach that the master is Mammon, and that the disciples were accused by the Pharisees of wasting his goods when they became followers of Christ; or (7) that the steward stands for the publicans as a class, and then for all Christians generally; or (8) for Judas Iscariot; or (9) for Pontius Pilate; or (10) for our Lord Himself; or (11) for St. Paul; or (12) for an example of the true penitent; or (13) for the devil. The wild diversity of interpretations which this list partially represents, should make any commentator more or less distrustful of what seems to him an adequate and complete exposition; and it
The Mammon of Unrighteousness.

May well be, even after an exposition as full as the con-
itions of the case seem to render possible, that there
are side-lights in the parable which are yet unnoticed,
and further applications which, as being founded on real
analogies, might be instructive and legitimate.

11 And I say unto you.—The pronoun is emphatic,
and stands, as in Matt. v. 22, 23, 32, in contrast with
or with the "thee," which is always more formal:

Make to yourselves friends of the mammon
of unrighteousness.—On "mammon," comp. Note
on Matt. vi. 24. The word was Syriac in its origin, and
was found also, as Augustine testifies, in Punic. It was
in common use in the Targums or Paraphrases of the
Old Testament, in our Lord's time, for "wealth" or
"riches," and possibly, as stated by Tertullian, whose
authority, as a Carthaginian, may be admitted as of
some weight, was applied to some Syrian deity who,
like the Greek Plutus, was worshipped as wealth per-
owned. If we admit this view, it explains, what other-
wise it is not easy to explain, St. Luke's introduction of
the Syriac word instead of its Greek equivalent. "The
mammon of unrighteousness," the genitive having the
same force as in verse 8, is the wealth to which that
character for the most part attaches, wealth wrongly
and wrongly spent. And yet "of that mammon"
—or, better, out of, or with, the "mammon"—men are
to make friends. The right use of wealth in helping
the poor, making men happier and better, leading them
to repentance and to God, will gain for us friends, perhaps
the very persons whom we have helped, perhaps the
angels of God who rejoice over one sinner that re-
penteth, perhaps even Christ and the Father, who will
receive us into "everlasting habitations."

Into everlasting habitations.—Literally, ever-
lasting tabernacles. The word seems chosen, in con-
trast to the "houses" of verse 4, perhaps in contrast to the "booths" of leaves or branches, transitory and
withering in a few days, which entered into the ritual
of the Feast of Tabernacles (Lev. xxiii. 40; Neh. viii. 15),
or with the "tent" which was the symbol of the
transitory promises of the older Patriarchs (Heb. xi. 9).

10 He that is faithful in that which is least
...—The context shows that by "that which is least"
is meant what men call wealth, and which to most of them
seems as the greatest, highest good. To be faithful
in that is to acknowledge that we have it as stewards,
not as possessors, and shall have to give an account of
our stewardship. The word of warning was meant,
we may believe, specially for the disciples. They,
coming, for the most part, from the poorer classes,
thought that they were in no danger of worshipping
mammon. They are told, probably with special refer-
ence to the traitor Judas, that the love of money may
operate on a narrow as well as on a wide scale, and
commit to your trust the true riches?

12 And if ye have not been faithful in
that which is another man's, who shall
give you that which is your own?

13 No servant 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. (14) And the
Pharisees also, who were covetous,
heard all these things: and they derided him. (15) And he said unto them, Ye are they which justify yourselves before men; but God knoweth your hearts: for that which is highly esteemed among men is abomination in the sight of God. (16) The law and the prophets were until John: since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it. (17) And it is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail. (18) Whosoever putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery: and whosoever marrieth her that is put away from her husband committeth adultery.

(19) There was a certain rich man, which was clothed in purple and fine

had been listening during the previous parable, and that the words, though addressed to the disciples, had been meant also for them. (See Note on verse 1.) The word for "covetous" is literally *lovers of money, as distinct from more general cupidity, and as being used by St. Paul in 2 Tim. iii. 2, and nowhere else in the New Testament, furnishes another instance of the community of language between him and the Evangelist.

**Derided him.**—The verb implies visible rather than audible signs of scorn—the distended nostril, and the sneering lip, the *naso suspendere adunco* of the Roman satirist. It is, i.e., a word that forcibly expresses the physiognomy of contempt (see Gal. vi. 7). Here again we have a word common to the two writers just named. The motive of the derision lies on the surface. That they, the teachers of Israel, should be told that they were like the Unjust Steward, that they were wasting their Lord's goods, that they must make friends with the unrighteous mammon of quite another kind than those whom they were wont to court—this was more than they could stand. They have felt the force of the rebuke, and therefore they stifle it with mockery—

"A little grain of conscience made them sour."

(15) *Ye are they which justify yourselves before men.*—The character described is portrayed afterwards more fully in the parable of chap. xviii. 9—14. The word there used, "this man went down to his house justified rather than the other," is obviously a reference to what is reported here. They forgot, in their self-righteousness and self-vindication, that they stood before God as the Searcher of all hearts.

That which is highly esteemed among men . . .—Literally, *that which is high, or lifted up,* among men. The word is at once wider and more vivid than the English.

Abomination . . .—The word is the same as in "the abomination of desolation" (Matt. xcv. 15), which causes physically nausea and loathing. The word seems chosen as the expression of a divine scorn and indignation, which answered, in part, to their "derision," and was its natural result. (Comp. the bold language of Ps. ii. 4, Prov. i. 26, Rev. iii. 16.)

(16) The law and the prophets were until John. —See Notes on Matt. xi. 14, 15. What had then been said to the disciples of the Baptist is now reproduced to our Lord's own disciples and to the Pharisees. The latter had closed their eyes to the fact that all previous revelations led up to the work of John, as that in its turn was preparatory for the work of Christ.

Every man presseth . . .—The fact asserted, that of a "rush," as we should say, into the Kingdom, but a rush from which the Pharisees had held aloof, answers to the stronger expression in St. Matthew (xi. 12), "the violent take it by force."

(17) It is easier for heaven and earth to pass. —See Notes on Matt. v. 18. Our first impression on reading the words here is that there is less logical sequence in their position. They seem unconnected with the teaching as to the mammon of unrighteousness. It is possible that here, as elsewhere, some links of the chain have been dropped; but the explanation that has been given of the preceding parable gives a sufficient connection. The scribes and Pharisees had been tampering with the sacredness of the laws which are not of to-day or yesterday—"fixed as the everlasting hills"—and they are told that their casuistry cannot set aside the claims of those laws in any single instance, such, e.g., as that which immediately follows.

(18) Whosoever putteth away his wife.—On the special points involved, see Notes on Matt. v. 31, 32; xix. 3—9. Here, again, the explanation that has been given of the parable of the Unjust Steward offers the only satisfactory explanation of the introduction of a topic apparently so irrelevant. The doctrine and discipline of divorce which the Pharisees taught, lowering the sacredness of the life of home, and ministering to the growing laxity of men's morals, was precisely what was meant by the steward's bidding the debtors take their bill and write fifty, or fourscore measures, instead of the hundred. (See Note on verses 6 and 7.)

(19) There was a certain rich man . . .—Here, also, there is a certain appearance of abruptness. But the sneer of verse 14 explains the sequence of thought. On the one side, among those who listened to our Lord, were the Pharisees, living in the love of money and of the enjoyments which money purchased; on the other, the disciples, who had left all to follow their Master, poor with the poverty of beggars. The former had mocked at the counsel that they should make friends with the mammon of unrighteousness, who should receive them into everlasting habitations. They are now taught, and the disciples are taught also, what comes of the other friendship that men for the most part secure with money. It is clear that the section of Pharisees for whom the parable was specially designed, were such as those described as being "in king's houses and in soft raiment, and living delicately" (see Notes on Matt. xi. 8; Luke vii. 25)—the scribes, i.e., who had attached themselves to the court of Herod Antipas, the Herodians, or those who, while differing from them politically, were ready to coalesce with them (Matt. xxvii. 16; Mark iii. 6), and reproduced their mode of life. In the rich man himself we find, generic as the description is, some features which must at least have reminded those who heard the parable, of the luxurious indulgence of the Tetrarch himself, as the "purple garment," rich with the dyes of Tyre, which was hardly worn, except by kings and princes and generals (see Notes on Matt. xxvii. 28; Mark xv. 17); the *byssus,* or fine linen of Egypt, coupled with purple in Rev. xvii. 12, 16, itself not unfrequently of the same colour. The "faring sumptuously" reminds us of the stately pomp of Herod's feasts. (See Notes on Matt. xiv. 6; Mark vi. 14, 21, and the quotation from
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linen, and fared sumptuously every day: (30) and there was a certain beggar named Lazarus, which was laid at his gate, full of sores, (22) and desiring to be fed with the crumbs which fell from the rich man's table: moreover the dogs came and licked his sores. (22) And it came to pass, that the beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom: the rich man also died, and was buried.

Persius cited in the latter.) If we assume that there is this sketch, as it were, of the Tetrarch's character, it is obvious that the teaching of the parable receives a fresh significance. This, then, was what the scribes, even those that were not avowedly of the Herodian school, who should have been teachers of righteousness, were striving after. This was their highest ideal of happiness, and for this they were content to sacrifice their true calling here and their hopes of eternal life hereafter. It was meet that they should learn what was the outcome of such a life when it passed "behind the veil." We may add, too, that this view enables us to trace a sequence of thought where all at first seems unconnected. The reference to the teaching of the scribes as to divorce (verse 18), naturally suggested the most prominent and most recent instance in which their lax casuistry had shown itself most criminally compliant with the vices of a adulterous and incestuous prince.

Fared sumptuously.—More literally, was sumptuously merry. The word is the same as that in chap. xv. 32, and we can hardly doubt that there is a designated contrast between the holy mirth and joy in the one case, and the ignoble revelry of the other. There was "good cheer" in each, but of how different a complexion! (30) And there was a certain beggar named Lazarus.—The word for "beggar," it may be noted, is the same as the "poor" of chap. vi. 20. The occurrence in this one solitary instance of a personal name in our Lord's parables, suggests the question, What was meant by it? Three answers present themselves, each of which is more or less compatible with the other two. (1) There may have been an actual beggar of that name known both to the disciples and the Pharisees. (2) The significance of the name, the current Greek form of Eleazar (="God is the helper"), may have been meant to symbolise the outward wretchedness of one who had no other help. (3) As that which seems most probable, the name may have been intended as a warning to Lazarus of Bethany. He was certainly rich. We have seen some reason to identify him with the young ruler that had great possessions. (See Notes on Matt. xix. 18.) In any case he was exposed to the temptations that wealth brings with it. What more effectual warning could be given him than to hear his own name brought into a parable, as belonging to the beggar who was carried into Abraham's bosom, while his own actual life corresponded more or less closely to that of the rich man who passed into the torments of Hades? Was he not taught in this way, what all else failed to teach him, that if he wished for eternal life he must strip himself of the wealth which made it impossible for him to enter the Kingdom of God? It may be noted that almost every harmonised arrangement of the Gospel history places the parable almost immediately before the death and raising of Lazarus (see Note on John xi. 1), while in some of them the question of the young ruler comes between the two. This connexion, in the thought of a continuous process of spiritual education, by which the things that were "impossible with men" were shown to be "possible with God" (Matt. xix. 26), gives to the picture of the unseen world drawn in symbolic imagery, so as to force itself upon his notice, then an actual experience of the realities of that life; this was what he needed, and this was given him.

Laid at his gate, full of sores.—Literally, at his porch, or gateway. The Greek word for "full of sores" is somewhat more technical than the English one; literally, ulcerated, one which a medical writer like St. Luke would use to express a generally ulcerous state of the whole body. The description led, in course of time, to the application of the leper's name to those who suffered from leprosy, as producing an analogous condition, and so we get the terms, lazar, lazar-house, lazaretto. In the Italian lazaroni: the idea of the beggary is prominent without that of the sores. (22) And desiring to be fed with the crumbs.—The habits of the East, the absence of knives and forks and the like, made the amount of waste of this kind larger than do the habits of modern Europe. (Comp. the language of the Syro-Phoenician woman, in Mark vii. 28.) Here the picture is heightened by two touches. The dogs are there, and get the crumbs, which the man fails to get, and then they come and lick the open sores. The question has been raised whether this touch is meant to intensify the sufferings of the beggar, or to contrast the almost human sympathy of the brute with the brutal apathy of the man. In a European apologue the latter might, perhaps, be a legitimate explanation of the fact thus stated; but with the Eastern feelings, that see in the dog an unclean beast, the scavenger of the streets, we cannot doubt that the beggar would have shrank from their licking, even assuming, which is doubtful, that it brought with it some relief from merely physical pain. It may be noted, too, that the word for "dogs" is not the diminutive form used in Matt. xv. 27, and Mark vii. 28 (where see Note), which implied tameness, but that which is always associated with the idea of abhorrence (Matt. vii. 6; Phil. ili. 2; 2 Pet. ii. 22; Rev. xxi. 18).

Was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom.—Of the three terms in common use among the Jews to express the future state of blessedness—(1) the Garden of Eden, or Paradise; (2) the Throne of Glory; (3) the bosom of Abraham—this was the most widely popular. It rested on the idea of a great feast, in which Abraham was the host. To lie in his bosom, as St. John in that of our Lord's (John xiii. 23), was to be there as the most favoured guest. And this was the position which was assigned to the beggar, obviously not merely as a compensation for the "evil things" he had endured on earth, but as the crown of the faith and patience with which he had borne them. The being "carried by angels" was literally in accord with the popular Jewish belief. Either good angels in general, or the special guardian angels of the righteous, took on them this office.

The rich man also died, and was buried.—As no mention is made of the burial of the beggar, it is obvious that there is something specially distinctive in the word. It had been, we may imagine, a stately burial, with hired mourners and all the pageantry of woe, such as within a few weeks, or even days, was to be the portion of the historic Lazarus of Bethany.
The Rich Man in Hades.

ST. LUKE, XVI.

The Great Gulf fixed.

(23) And in hell.—The Greek word is Hades, not Gehenna; the unseen world of the dead, not the final prison of the souls of the lost. (See Note on Matt. v. 22.) It lies almost on the surface of the parable that it describes an earlier stage of the life after death than that in Matt. xxv. 31-46. There is no mention here of the Advent of the Judge. As far as the parable itself is concerned, there is nothing to exclude the thought that the torments might have in part the character of a discipline as well as of retribution.

In thesending of Lazarus, the word applied originally to the test or touchstone of metals, then to the torture to which men had recourse as the one sure test of the veracity of witnesses, than to torments generally. The nature of the “torments” here is suggested by the “flame” of the next verse, but that word has to be taken with all its symbolic associations, and does not necessarily imply the material element of fire. (See Notes on Mark ix. 40-42.) What is meant is that there shall be for the soul of the evil-doer, when he brings face to face with that holiness of God which is as a consuming fire (Heb. xii. 29), an anguish as intolerable as the touch of earthly flame is to the nerves of the mortal body. The thought is expressed with great beauty in Dr. Newman’s Dream of Gerontius:—

“...And these two pains, so counter and so keen.—
The longing for Him, when thou seest Him not;
The shame of self at thought of seeing Him.—
Will be thy veriest, sharpest purgatory.”

Seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom.—Here again we are in a region of symbolic imagery, under which we discern the truth that the souls of those who have yielded to selfish indulgence will discover after death that those whom they have scorned and neglected during their life are admitted, if worthy of admission, to the enjoyment of a rest and refreshment from which they themselves are, by their own act and deed, excluded.

(24) Send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his finger...—The words, in their relation to the effect of the punishment on the rich man’s character, offer two tenable explanations. On the one hand, they have been thought to indicate the old selfish arrogance and heartlessness of the man who still looks on Lazarus as one who may be sent hither and thither, at any cost of suffering to do his bidding and minister to his ease; on the other, we may see in them the traces of pride conquered, and the cry for mercy at last coming from lips that had never uttered it before, and the craving for help and sympathy from one whom in his lifetime he had despised as beneath his notice. There is something terribly significant in the fact that it is the “tongue” that suffers most in that agonising flame. That was the organ of the sense which the man had pampered by his riotous and sumptuous living; that is now the chief instrument of retribution. The lesson is the same as that which a poet of our own has taught us—

“...Bye gods are just, and of our pleasant vices
Make instruments to scourge us.”

—Shakespeare, King Lear, v. 3.

(25) But Abraham said, Son, ...—There is surely something suggestive that the Patriarch is represented as not disowning the relationship. If we find a meaning in the “friend” of the parables of the Labourers in the Vineyard (see Note on Matt. xx. 13) and the Wedding Garment (see Note on Matt. xxii. 12), we ought not to ignore the thought that seems to be implied here. Here, too, was one who, even in Hades, was recognised as being, now more truly than he had been in his life, a “child” or “son of Abraham.” (Comp. chap. xix. 9.) The word used is the same, in its tone of pity and tenderness, as that which the father used to the elder son in the parable of the Prodigal Son (chap. xv. 31), which our Lord addressed to the man sick of the palsy (Matt. ix. 2), or to His own disciples (John xiii. 33).

Remember.—The word has a terrible force in its bearing upon the question of the future life. Memory intensified, reproducing the past visions, pleasures, and base joys, the mala mentis gaudia of the self-indulgent, and subject to the action of a conscience no longer narcotised into slumber—this makes the sharpest pang of the desired anguish. In Christian eschatology the river of death is no water of Lethe, bringing with it the forgetfulness of past evil.

Thou in thy lifetime receivedst thy good things.—The verb, like “they have their reward,” in Matt. vi. 2, implies that this was all he was to have. There is an emphasis, too, in the presence of the pronoun in the one clause, and its absence in the other. The rich man had made the pleasures of sense “his good things.” They were all that he cared for—all, therefore, that he was to have. He had identified himself with them. The “evil things” of Lazarus, on the other hand, had not been chosen by him; they were external to him, a discipline and a probation through which, turning them to their right use, he passed to his true good.

Now he is comforted.—Shone of the better MSS. give, “now he is comforted here.”

(26) There is a great gulf fixed.—Literally, a chasm, the opening or gaping of the earth. The scene brought before us is like one of the pictures of Dante’s Commedia—steeep rocks and a deep gorge, and on one side the flames that burn and do not consume, and on the other, the fair garden of Paradise and the kingly palace, and the banquet at which Abraham presides. And those that are bearing the penalty, or reaping the reward, of their life are within sight and hearing of each other, and hold conversation and debate. It is obvious that no single detail of such a description can be pressed as a literal representation of the unseen world. What was wanted for the purpose of the parable was the dramatic and pictorial vividness which impresses itself on the minds and hearts of men, and this could not otherwise be gained.

So that they which would pass from hence...—To so far as we may draw any inference from such a detail as this, it suggests the thought that the blessed look with pity and compassion on those who are in the penal fires, and would fain help them if they could.
is a great gulf fixed: so that they which would pass from hence to you cannot; neither can they pass to us, that would come from thence. (27) Then he said, I pray thee therefore, father, that thou wouldest send him to my father's house: (28) for I have five brethren; that he may testify unto them, lest they also come into this place of torment. (29) Abraham saith unto him, They have

Moses and the prophets; let them hear them. (30) And he said, Nay, father Abraham; but if one went unto them from the dead, they will repent. (31) And he said unto him, If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead.

CHAPTER XVII.—(1) Then said he unto the disciples, It is impossible but

They that wish to pass are spoken of in tones which present a striking contrast to the vindiictive exaltation that has sometimes shown itself in Christian writers, such, e.g., as Tertullian (de Spectac. c. 30), and Milton (Reformation in England, ad fin.). A further lesson is, of course, implied, which strikes at the root of the specifically Romish theory of Purgatory and indulgences—viz., that the wish is fruitless, that no interposition of the saints avails beyond the grave. The thought of their intercession that the discipline might escape is, indeed, not absolutely excluded, but that work must continue as long as God wills, i.e., till it attains its end.

(27) I pray thee therefore, father.—The reiterated appeal to Abraham as "father" is suggestive in many ways: (1) as speaking out that in which too many of the rich man's class put an undue trust, resting on the fatherhood of Abraham rather than on that of God (Matt. xii. 9); (2) as showing that the refusal of the Lord to do what he had promised would be, as it were, submissively. There is no rebellious defiance, no blasphemous exclamation, such as men have pictured to themselves as resounding ever more in the realms of darkness. Abraham is the sufferer's father still, and he yet counts on his sympathy.

(28) For I have five brethren.—Here again we are left to choose between opposite views of the motive which prompted the request, as it may apply a selfish fear of reproofs that might aggravate his sufferings. Was it the stirring in him of an unselfish anxiety for others, content to bear his own anguish if only his brothers might escape? Either view is tenable enough, but the latter harmonises more with the humility of the tone in which the request is uttered. The question why "five" are named is again one which we cannot answer with certainty. The allusions which some have found to the five senses, in the indulgence of which the self-indulgent rich man among the hearers of the parable must have passed his life, or to the five books of Moses (!), are simply fantastic. It may have been merely the use of a certain number for an uncertain, as in the case of the five wise and the five foolish virgins (Matt. xxv. 2), or the five talents (Matt. xxv. 15), or the five cities in the land of Egypt (Isa. xix. 18). It may have been an individualising feature, pointing to some conspicuously self-indulgent rich man among the hearers of the parable, and so coming home to him as a warning; or, possibly (following up the hint in the Note on verse 19), to the number of the Tetrarch's surviving brothers. Of these he had had eight, but Aristobulus and Archedas were already dead, and possibly, of course, another. Here, returning to the structure of the parable, there is a special motive for the rich man's wishing Lazarus to be sent. The brothers had seen the beggar lying at his gate. If they were to see him now, as risen from the dead, they would learn that his state had been so much the less miserable in which he lived as in which they had passed and were still passing their lives.

(29) They have Moses and the prophets.—The words are in entire harmony with all the teaching of our Lord. The right use of lower knowledge is the condition of attaining to the higher, and without it signs and wonders avail but little: "He that hath, to him shall be given" (Mark iv. 25); "He that willeth to do the will of God," so far as he knows it, "shall know of the doctrine" which Christ came to proclaim, "whether it be of God" (John vii. 17). It was because the scribes and their followers were unfaithful in this, that more was expected of them. "Moses and the Prophets" were enough to teach them that a life of self-indulgent luxury was evil in itself, and therefore must bring with it, in the end, shame and condemnation. (Comp. Notes on John v. 45, 46.)

(30) But if one went unto them from the dead.—The words are in accordance with the general Jewish craving for a "sign," as the only proof of a revelation from God. (See Notes on Matt. xii. 33; xvi. 1; 1 Cor. i. 22.) The return of one who had passed into the world and brought back a report of its realities would rouse, the rich man thought, the most apathetic. So far the picture is generic, but if we follow up the suggestion which has thrown light upon the parable before, we shall find here also a more individualising feature. It is specially recorded of the Tetrarch that he had hoped to see some miracle done by Jesus (chap. xxii. 8). He had given utterance, when he heard of the miracles that had been actually wrought, to the belief that John the Baptist was "risen from the dead" (see Note on Matt. xiv. 2), and yet that belief had not brought him one step nearer to repentance.

(31) If they hear not Moses and the prophets.—We are accustomed, rightly enough, to look on our Lord's own Resurrection as leading to the great fulfilment of these words. We should not forget, however, that there was another fulfilment more immediately following on them. In a few weeks, or even days, according to the best harmonists, tidings came that Lazarus of Bethany was sick (John xi. 1). In yet a few days more that Lazarus did "rise from the dead;" cured, we may believe, of whatever love of this world's good things had checked his spiritual growth, a witness of the power of Christ to raise, as from the shadow-world of Hades, so also from the darkness of spiritual death to newness of life. And yet that wonder also brought about no repentance. Scribes and Pharisees, and Sadducees and priests simply took counsel together that they might put Lazarus also to death (John xii. 10). We can hardly believe the coincidence of name and fact in this instance to have been undesigned.

XVII.

(1) It is impossible but that offences will come.—In this instance, the absence of any apparent connection might, perhaps, justify us in looking on the
that offences will come; but woe unto him, through whom they come! (2) It was better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and he cast into the sea, than that he should offend one of these little ones.

(3) Take heed to yourselves: If thy brother trespass against thee, rebuke him; and if he repent, forgive him. (4) And if he trespass against thee seven times a day, and seven times in a day turn again to thee, saying, I repent; thou shalt forgive him. (5) And the apostles said unto the Lord, Increase our faith. (6) And the Lord said, If ye had faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye might say unto this sycamine tree, Be thou plucked up by the root, and be thou planted in the sea; and it should obey you. (7) But which of you, having a servant ploughing or feeding cattle, will say unto him by and by, when he

two precepts as having been noted by St. Luke for their own intrinsic value, without regard to the context in which they had been spoken. (See Notes on Matt. xviii. 7.) Even here, however, we must remember that there may have been what we have called "dropped links." It is not hard to see that the self-indulgent life, after the pattern of that of the rich man in the preceding parable, was an "offence" which, in one sense, must have come, in the history of the Christian Church, as it had come in the Jewish, and yet would bring a woe on the man through whom it came.

(2) It were better for him...—See Note on Matt. xviii. 6, where the order of the two sayings is inverted. Assuming the words to have been repeated where we find them here, the "little ones" must mean the disciples of Christ who are, in both senses of the word "offended," by the worldliness of those who profess to be religious. They are made to stumble by the temptation to follow the bad example, or their faith in the reality of godliness is shaken by seeing that the form exists without the power.

(3) Take heed to yourselves.—The position of the words is remarkable, and they have nothing corresponding to them in the parallel passage in Matt. xviii. 21, where see Note. It is as though our Lord saw in the disciples the tendency to sit in judgment on the sins of others, on such sins especially as He had just condemned, and checked it by the words "take heed to yourselves." They were in danger of faults hardly less fatal to the spiritual life than selfish luxury, and one of those faults was the temper of hard and unforgiving judgment. When they saw a conspicuous instance of worldliness or other evil, they did as we so often do—they condemned, but did not "rebuke." In practice, as He taught them by example as by precept, open friendly reproof, aiming at restoration, is the truest path to the forgiveness with which, in the careless estimate of most men, it seems to be incompatible.

(4) If he trespass against thee.—Better, if he sin. The better MSS. omit the words, "against thee," and so make the command more general, and the verb is the same as that in Matt. xviii. 21, the teaching of which is here manifestly reproduced. The outward form seems at first to present a somewhat lower standard of forgiveness, "seven times," instead of "seventy times seven." Here, however, it should be remembered that we have "seven times a day," and the meaning is obviously the same in both passages. No accumulation of offences, however often repeated, is to be allowed to bring us to the hardness which refuses to forgive when the offender says that he repents and asks forgiveness.

The apostles said unto the Lord, Increase our faith.—The form in which the fragment that thus commences is brought before us suggests, as has been stated before (see Notes on chaps. vii. 13, x. 1), that it was a comparatively late addition to the collection of "the words of the Lord Jesus" (Acts xx. 35), and this is confirmed by the exceptional use of "the Apostles" for "the disciples." It may have stood originally in an absolutely isolated form. On the other hand, its position here indicates a sufficiently traceable sequence. That command of a sevenfold—nearly unlimited—forgiveness seemed to make almost too great a strain on their faith. Did it not imply an almost miraculous victory over natural impulses, that could be wrought only by a supernatural grace? Was not the faith that could "remove mountains" wanted, if ever, here—a faith in the pardoning love of the Father, and in their own power to reproduce it? And so, conscious of their weakness, they came with the prayer that has so often come from the lips of yearning, yet weak, disciples of the Christ—reminding us of him who cried, "Lord, I believe; help thou mine unbelief" (see Note on Mark ix. 24)—"Increase our faith." May we not possibly think of Peter as having struggled to obey the rule which had been given to them (Matt. xviii. 22), and as having found himself unequal to the task?

If ye had faith as a grain of mustard seed.—The words remind us, and must have reminded the disciples of Christ who are, in both senses of the word "offended," by the worldliness of those who profess to be religious. They are made to stumble by the temptation to follow the bad example, or their faith in the reality of godliness is shaken by seeing that the form exists without the power.

(5) Take heed to yourselves.—The position of the words is remarkable, and they have nothing corresponding to them in the parallel passage in Matt. xviii. 21, where see Note. It is as though our Lord saw in the disciples the tendency to sit in judgment on the sins of others, on such sins especially as He had just condemned, and checked it by the words "take heed to yourselves." They were in danger of faults hardly less fatal to the spiritual life than selfish luxury, and one of those faults was the temper of hard and unforgiving judgment. When they saw a conspicuous instance of worldliness or other evil, they did as we so often do—they condemned, but did not "rebuke." In practice, as He taught them by example as by precept, open friendly reproof, aiming at restoration, is the truest path to the forgiveness with which, in the careless estimate of most men, it seems to be incompatible.

(6) If he trespass against thee.—Better, if he sin. The better MSS. omit the words, "against thee," and so make the command more general, and the verb is the same as that in Matt. xviii. 21, the teaching of which is here manifestly reproduced. The outward form seems at first to present a somewhat lower standard of forgiveness, "seven times," instead of "seventy times seven." Here, however, it should be remembered that we have "seven times a day," and the meaning is obviously the same in both passages. No accumulation of offences, however often repeated, is to be allowed to bring us to the hardness which refuses to forgive when the offender says that he repents and asks forgiveness.

(7) But which of you, having a servant ploughing or feeding cattle, will say unto him by and by, when he
is come from the field, Go and sit down to meat? (8) And will not rather say unto him, Make ready wherewith I may sup, and gird thyself, and serve me, till I have eaten and drunken; and afterward thou shalt eat and drink? (9) Doth he thank that servant because he did the things that were commanded him? I trow not. (10) So likewise ye, when ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, We are un-

looking for the crown of labour before their work was done, for the wreath of the conqueror before they had fought the battle. He presses home upon them the analogies of common human experience. The slave who had been "ploughing" or "feeding sheep" (the word is that always used of the shepherd's work, as in John x. 3, Acts xi. 23, I Pet. v. 2, etc.) was hearkening to the master's voice; so the partizans are suggestive of latent parables of the spiritual work of the Apostles) is not all at once invited to sit down at the feast. He has first to minister to his master's wants, to see that his soul is satisfied, and then, in due course, his own turn will come. So, in the life of the disciples, outward ministerial labour was to be followed by personal devotion. In other words, the "increase of faith" for which the Apostles prayed, was to come through obedience, outward and inward obedience, to their Master's will. Faith was to show itself in virtue, and virtue would bring knowledge, and knowledge would strengthen faith. Comp. 2 Pet. i. 5, as showing that the lesson had been learnt.

(9) Gird thyself, and serve me.—Better, minister to me. The words receive a fresh significance if we connect them with chap. xii. 37, of which they are, as it were, the complement. Here the Master promises that He will gird Himself, and minister to His disciples. He tells them that He too requires a service. They must give Him the meat and the drink of seeing that led through the one district into the other. The knowledge, and knowledge would strengthen faith. Comp. 2 Pet. i. 5, as showing that the lesson had been learnt.

(9) Doth he thank that servant ... ?—The words are spoken, of course, from the standpoint of the old relations between the master and the slave, not from that of those who recognise that master and slave are alike children of the same Father and servants of the same Master. In order to understand their bearing, we must remember how the subtle poison of self-righteousness was creeping in, even into the souls of the disciples, leading them to ask, "What shall we have therefore?" (Matt. xix. 19), and to ask for high places in His kingdom (Matt. xx. 21).

(10) Say, We are unprofitable servants.—There is something very suggestive in the use of the same word as that which meets us in the parable of the Talents (Matt. xxv. 30). God, we are taught, may re-test of faith. and then they too shall be sharers in His joy. Yet other fellowship has its parallel in the four lepers of the life of the disciples, outward ministerial labour was to be followed by personal devotion. In other words, the "increase of faith" for which the Apostles prayed, was to come through obedience, outward and inward obedience, to their Master's will. Faith was to show itself in virtue, and virtue would bring knowledge, and knowledge would strengthen faith. Comp. 2 Pet. i. 5, as showing that the lesson had been learnt.

(9) Gird thyself, and serve me.—Better, minister to me. The words receive a fresh significance if we connect them with chap. xii. 37, of which they are, as it were, the complement. Here the Master promises that He will gird Himself, and minister to His disciples. He tells them that He too requires a service. They must give Him the meat and the drink of seeing that led through the one district into the other. The knowledge, and knowledge would strengthen faith. Comp. 2 Pet. i. 5, as showing that the lesson had been learnt.

(9) Doth he thank that servant ... ?—The words are spoken, of course, from the standpoint of the old relations between the master and the slave, not from that of those who recognise that master and slave are alike children of the same Father and servants of the same Master. In order to understand their bearing, we must remember how the subtle poison of self-righteousness was creeping in, even into the souls of the disciples, leading them to ask, "What shall we have therefore?" (Matt. xix. 19), and to ask for high places in His kingdom (Matt. xx. 21).

(10) Say, We are unprofitable servants.—There is something very suggestive in the use of the same word as that which meets us in the parable of the Talents (Matt. xxv. 30). God, we are taught, may re-test of faith. and then they too shall be sharers in His joy. Yet other fellowship has its parallel in the four lepers of the life of the disciples, outward ministerial labour was to be followed by personal devotion. In other words, the "increase of faith" for which the Apostles prayed, was to come through obedience, outward and inward obedience, to their Master's will. Faith was to show itself in virtue, and virtue would bring knowledge, and knowledge would strengthen faith. Comp. 2 Pet. i. 5, as showing that the lesson had been learnt.

(9) Gird thyself, and serve me.—Better, minister to me. The words receive a fresh significance if we connect them with chap. xii. 37, of which they are, as it were, the complement. Here the Master promises that He will gird Himself, and minister to His disciples. He tells them that He too requires a service. They must give Him the meat and the drink of seeing that led through the one district into the other. The knowledge, and knowledge would strengthen faith. Comp. 2 Pet. i. 5, as showing that the lesson had been learnt.

(9) Doth he thank that servant ... ?—The words are spoken, of course, from the standpoint of the old relations between the master and the slave, not from that of those who recognise that master and slave are alike children of the same Father and servants of the same Master. In order to understand their bearing, we must remember how the subtle poison of self-righteousness was creeping in, even into the souls of the disciples, leading them to ask, "What shall we have therefore?" (Matt. xix. 19), and to ask for high places in His kingdom (Matt. xx. 21).

(10) Say, We are unprofitable servants.—There is something very suggestive in the use of the same word as that which meets us in the parable of the Talents (Matt. xxv. 30). God, we are taught, may re-test of faith. and then they too shall be sharers in His joy. Yet other fellowship has its parallel in the four lepers of the life of the disciples, outward ministerial labour was to be followed by personal devotion. In other words, the "increase of faith" for which the Apostles prayed, was to come through obedience, outward and inward obedience, to their Master's will. Faith was to show itself in virtue, and virtue would bring knowledge, and knowledge would strengthen faith. Comp. 2 Pet. i. 5, as showing that the lesson had been learnt.

(9) Gird thyself, and serve me.—Better, minister to me. The words receive a fresh significance if we connect them with chap. xii. 37, of which they are, as it were, the complement. Here the Master promises that He will gird Himself, and minister to His disciples. He tells them that He too requires a service. They must give Him the meat and the drink of seeing that led through the one district into the other. The knowledge, and knowledge would strengthen faith. Comp. 2 Pet. i. 5, as showing that the lesson had been learnt.

(9) Doth he thank that servant ... ?—The words are spoken, of course, from the standpoint of the old relations between the master and the slave, not from that of those who recognise that master and slave are alike children of the same Father and servants of the same Master. In order to understand their bearing, we must remember how the subtle poison of self-righteousness was creeping in, even into the souls of the disciples, leading them to ask, "What shall we have therefore?" (Matt. xix. 19), and to ask for high places in His kingdom (Matt. xx. 21).

(10) Say, We are unprofitable servants.—There is something very suggestive in the use of the same word as that which meets us in the parable of the Talents (Matt. xxv. 30). God, we are taught, may re-test of faith. and then they too shall be sharers in His joy. Yet other fellowship has its parallel in the four lepers of
The Samaritan Leper.

ST. LUKE, XVII. The Kingdom of God within Men.

yourselves unto the priests. And it came to pass, that, as they went, they were cleansed. (15) And one of them, when he saw that he was healed, turned back, and with a loud voice glorified God, (16) and fell down on his face at his feet, giving him thanks: and he was a Samaritan. (17) And Jesus answering said, Were there not ten cleansed? but where are the nine? (18) There are not found that returned to give glory to God, save this stranger. (19) And he said unto him, Arise, go thy way: thy faith hath made thee whole.

(20) And when he was demanded of the Pharisees, when the kingdom of God should come, he answered them and said, The kingdom of God cometh not with observation: neither shall they say, Lo here! or, lo there! for, behold, the kingdom of God is within

(15) Turned back, and with a loud voice.--The words imply that the work of healing was not accomplished till the company of lepers were at least out of sight.

(16) And he was a Samaritan.--As in the parable of the Good Samaritan, St. Luke's purpose in the selection of the incident falls in with what may be called the Catholicity of his Gospel, the breaking down of every middle wall of partition that divided the Jew from the other nations of the world. As the narrative is peculiar to his record, we may reasonably believe that it was one of the facts with which he became acquainted in the course of his personal inquiries in Galilee and Samaria. It is significant, in this case, that the barrier had been already broken down for a time by the common pressure of calamity, but no enduring sense of fellowship had as yet taken its place. The nine would seem to have separated themselves from the Samaritan as soon as they were cleansed. Men want more than the “misery” which our common proverb associates with “strange” companions, before they learn the lesson of brotherhood in its fullness.

(17) Were there not ten cleansed?--There is, it is clear, a tone of mingled surprise, and grief, and indignation, in the question thus asked. Looking to the facts of the case, an ethical question of some difficulty presents itself. If the nine had had faith to be healed—and the fact that they were healed implies it—how was it that faith did not show itself further in gratitude and love? The answer is to be found in the analogous phenomena of the spiritual life which are found at times in cases that are as the cleansing of the soul’s leprosy. Men have the faith which justifies; they are pardoned, and they have the sense of freedom from the burden and the disease of sin, and yet their lives show no glow of loving gratitude. They shrink from fellowship with those who, having been sharers in the same blessing with themselves, are separated from them by outward lines of demarcation. We may, perhaps, think, without being over-bold, of the twelve disciples of the Baptist, who continued in their separatist life at Ephesus, without knowing the warmth and love and joy of the indwelling of the Spirit, as presenting such analogous phenomena. (See Notes on Acts xix. 1-7.) The history of most churches or smaller religious societies, perhaps also that of most individual men, presents many more.

(18) Save this stranger.--The word for “stranger” means literally, a man of another race, an alien. It is not found elsewhere in the New Testament, but is used in the LXX. of Isa. lvi. 3. It was probably a term of contempt in common use among the Jews. (Comp. the kindred word “aliens,” with special reference to the Philistines, in Heb. xi. 34, and “one of another nation” in Acts x. 28.) It implied, as did the whole treatment of the Samaritans by the Jews, that the former were not recognised as being, in any sense, children of Abraham.

(19) Thy faith hath made thee whole.--The verb, elsewhere rendered, as in chap. vii. 50, “hath saved thee,” is obviously used here so as to include both its higher and lower meanings. The nine had had sufficient faith for the restoration of the health of their body; his had gone further, and had given a new and purer life to his soul.

(20) When he was demanded of the Pharisees.--The question may have been asked in a different tone, by different classes of those who bore the common name of Pharisee. There were some who were really looking for the coming of the Messianic kingdom; there were some who altogether rejected the claim of Jesus of Nazareth to be the Christ. In the lips of the one set, the question implied a taunt in those of the other, something like impatience. The terms of the answer contain that which met both cases.

Cometh not with observation.--The English noun exactly answers to the meaning of the Greek, as meaning careful and anxious watching. There was, perhaps, a special force in the word, as referring to the two forms of “watching” of which our Lord had been the object. Some of the Pharisees had “observed” Him once and again with a purpose more or less hostile. (Comp. chaps. vi. 7; xiv. 1; Mark iii. 2; where the Greek verb is that from which the noun here used is derived.) Others were looking for some sign from heaven, to show that He was the promised Head of the Kingdom. They are told that when it comes it will not be in conjunction with any such “observation” of outward things; it would burst upon them suddenly. In the meantime they must look for the signs of its presence in quite another region.

The marginal reading, “outward show”—that which is subject to observation—though giving an adequate meaning, is rather a paraphrase than a translation.

(21) The kingdom of God is within you.--The marginal reading, “among you,” has been adopted, somewhat hastily, by most commentators. So taken, the words emphatically assert the actual presence of the Kingdom. It was already in the midst of them at the very time when they were asking when it would appear. The use of the Greek preposition is, however, all but decisive against this interpretation. It is employed for that which is “within,” as contrasted with that which is “without,” as in Matt. xxiii. 26, and in the LXX. version for the “inward parts,” or spiritual nature of man, as contrasted with the outward, as in Ps. ciii. 1; cix. 22; Isa. xvi. 11. It was in that region, in the life which must be born again (John iii. 3), that men were to look for the kingdom; and there, whether they accepted it or rejected it, they would find sufficient tokens of its power.
day that Noe entered into the ark, and the flood came, and destroyed them all. (23) Likewise also it was in the days of Lot; c they did eat, they drank, they bought, they sold, they planted, they builded; (29) but the same day that Lot went out of Sodom it rained fire and brimstone from heaven, and destroyed them all. (30) Even thus shall it be in the day when the Son of man is revealed. (31) In that day, he which shall be upon the housetop, and his stuff in the house, let him not come down to take it away: and he that is in the field, let him likewise not return back. (32) Remember Lot's wife. (33) Whosoever shall seek to save his life shall lose it; " and who-

The Days of Noah and of Lot.

The Day of the Son of Man.
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(22) When ye shall desire to see one of the days of the Son of man.—The words express both the backward glance of regret, and the forward look of yearning expectation. The former feeling had been described before, when the disciples were told that the children of the bride-chamber should fast when the Bridegroom should be taken from them (chap. v. 34; Matt. ix. 15; Mark ii. 19). The latter was expressed by one of those who were now listening, when he spoke of men as “looking for and eagerly hasting” the coming of the day of God (2 Pet. iii. 12); by another, when he recorded the cry of the souls beneath the altar, “How long, O Lord?” (Rev. vi. 10). It is, we must remember, the disciples, and not the Pharisees, who are now addressed. In the long, weary years of conflict that lay before them, they would often wish that they could be back again in the pleasant days of friendly converse in the old Galilean life, or that they could be carried forward to the day of the final victory. Analogous emotions of both kinds have, of course, been felt by the successors of the disciples in all ages of the Church. They ask, Why the former days were better than the latter? (Eccles. vii. 10); they ask also, in half-murmuring impatience, “Why tarry the wheels of His chariots?” (Judg. v. 28); sometimes, even in the accents of unbelief, “Where is the promise of His coming?” (2 Pet. iii. 4).

(23) See here; or, see there.—See Note on Matt. xxiv. 23. The words are all but identical, but the difference in the context and the occasion should be noticed as another illustration of that reproduction of the same forms of thought and language to which attention has so often been called.

(24) For as the lightning.—See Note on Matt. xxiv. 27. There is, however, a noticeable variation in the form: the two “parts under heaven” taking the place of the “east” and the “west,” and the “day of the Son of Man” taking the place of the more formal “coming,” or parousia, which, as far as the Gospels are concerned, occurs only in St. Matthew. There is also, perhaps, more pictorial vividness in the two words, “lighteneth,” “shineth,” than in St. Matthew’s “cometh out” and “appeareth,” which is probably the right rendering of the word there translated “shineth.” In any case, the words in St. Matthew are less vivid in their force.

(25) But first must be suffer many things.—See Notes on Matt. xvi. 21, xvii. 22. The interposition of this prophecy of the Passion in a discourse which bears primarily on the Second Advent is an individualising feature of this record of St. Luke’s.

(26) For as the lightning.—See Notes on Matt. xxiv. 26, 27. Here, also, the “days” of the Son of Man take the place of the parousia.

(27) They did eat, they drank.—Better, as in St. Matthew, they were eating and drinking, marrying, ... ; the tense throughout being that which implies continuous and repeated action.

The flood.—The Greek word is always used in the New Testament for the deluge of Noah, that meaning having been stamped on it by the use of it in the LXX. version in Gen. vi. 17, vii. 6, 7, 10, 17.

Likewise also as it was in the days of Lot.—The illustration does not occur in the otherwise parallel passage of Matt. xxiv. 26, 27, but was naturally suggested by our Lord’s frequent reference to the Cities of the Plain (chap. x. 12; Matt. x. 15; xi. 23). The allusion to Lot in 2 Pet. ii. 7, may perhaps be traced to the impression made on the Apostle by this revival of the history.

They bought, they sold.—As in the preceding verse, the imperfect tense is used, they were buying, they were selling. There is a characteristic difference in the insertion of these verbs and the two which follow, as indicating a higher advance in social life than in the days of Noah.

(28) It rained fire and brimstone.—The combination of the two Greek words is found in the LXX. version of Gen. xix. 24, and obviously suggested the like combination here and in Rev. xiv. 10, xx. 13, xxi. 8.

(29) He which shall be upon the housetop, and his stuff in the house, let him not come down to take it away: and he that is in the field, let him likewise not return back. (30) Remember Lot’s wife. (31) Whosoever shall seek to save his life shall lose it; and who-
soever shall lose his life shall preserve it. 

(34) I tell you, in that night there shall be two men in one bed; the one shall be taken, and the other left. 

(35) Two women shall be grinding together; the one shall be taken, and the other left. 

(36) Two men shall be in the field; the one shall be taken, and the other left. 

And they answered and said unto him, Where, Lord? And he said unto them, Wheresoever the body is, thither will the eagles be gathered together.

CHAPTER XVIII.—(1) And he spake where by “purchase” (Acts xx. 28; 1 Tim. iii. 13), and perhaps always suggests, as the other word for “save” does not suggest, the idea of some transaction of the kind. So here, the man must purchase, as it were, his lower life at the price of the higher, and he will be a loser by the bargain.

Shall preserve it.—Here, again, the English verb is weak. Better, shall give life to it. The same Greek word occurs in the better MSS. of 1 Tim. vi. 13, and is there rendered by “quicken,” and in its passive form in Acts vii. 49, where it should be translated preserved alive, and this is clearly the meaning here. The man who is content to risk his natural life shall gain a life of a higher spiritual order.

(34, 35) Two men in one bed.—See Notes on Matt. xxiv. 40, 41. The one to be “taken” is probably here, as there, the man who is rescued from destruction. Here there is a variation enough to prove independence, the “two in one bed” being prefixed to the examples given in St. Matthew as an instance of even closer companionship.

(37) Where, Lord?—The question comes in naturally here, where the future had been foreshadowed in parables and dark sayings. It would not have been natural in Matt. xxiv. 28, where the whole context determined the locality of which our Lord was speaking.

Wheresoever the body is.—See Note on Matt. xxiv. 28, where the only variation being the use of “body” instead of “carcase.” The repetition of the half-proverbial saying at a later period indicates its importance as a law of God’s government. Men ask where His judgments fall, and the answer is that they fall wherever they are needed.

ST. LUKE, XVIII. The Widow and the Unjust Judge.

a parable unto them to this end, that men ought always to pray; and not to faint; (2) saying, There was in a city a judge, which feared not God, neither regarded man: (3) and there was a widow in that city; and she came unto him, saying, Avenge me of mine adversary. 

(4) And he would not for a while: but afterward he said within himself, Though I fear not God, nor regard man; (5) yet because this widow troubleth me, I will avenge her, lest by her continual coming she weary me. (6) And the Lord said, Hear what the unjust judge saith.

The case put for the purpose of the parable was obviously an extreme one. Every motive that ordinarily leads men in office to act rightly was absent. Conscience was dead, and there was no love of approbation or fear of blame to supply its place.

(3) There was a widow in that city.—The neglect of the cause of the widow had always been noted by Lawgiver and Prophet—and it was one of the notes of a high ethical standard in both—as the extremest form of oppressive tyranny (Ex. xxii. 22; Deut. x. 18, xxvii. 19; Isa. i. 17, 25; Ezek. xii. 7). Comp. also the speech of the widow of Tekoah (2 Sam. xiv. 2, 5).

She came unto him.—The tense implies continual coming.

Avenge me of mine adversary.—The term is used in its legal sense. She was plaintiff, and he defendant, or, it may be, vice versâ. The judge put off his decision, and the “law’s delay” was worse to her than the original wrong had been.

(4) He would not for a while.—The judge was callous and dead to pity, even for that extremest wretchedness. The pleadings of the widow were simply an annoyance, which at first he bore with indifference.

Though I fear not God, nor regard man.—Here, also, there is a graphic touch of intensity. The man had passed beyond the stage of hypocrisy, conscious or unconscious, and saw himself even as others, even as God, saw him.

(5) Lest by her continual coming she weary me.—The latter verb is again one which takes its place instead of “carcase.”

The unjust judge.—Literally, the judge of injustice, as with the unjust steward in chap. xvi. 8, the usual adjective giving way to the stronger, more Hebraic idiom of the characterising genitive.
(7) And shall not God avenge his own elect?—There is at first something which jars on us in this choice of an extreme instance of human unrighteousness as a parable from which we are to learn the nature and the power of prayer. It is not as it was with the Unjust Steward, for there, according to the true interpretation of the parable, the unrighteous man stood for those who were relatively, at least, themselves unrighteous. It is a partial explanation that our Lord presses home upon the disciples an a fortiori argument. If reiterated entreaties prevail with men, whose character and wills are set against them, how much more with God, in whom character and will anticipate the prayer? Even so, however, we have the difficulty that the idea of prayer as prevailing, at last, through manifold repetitions, seems at variance with the teaching that condemns vain repetitions, on the ground that our Father knows our necessities before we ask Him. (See Note and the love of many was waxing cold. And yet in the Gospel, men were witnessing a primary, though partial, fulfillment of the prophecy. Iniquity was abounding, and the love of many was waxing cold. And yet in one sense He was near, even at the doors (Jas. v. 8, 9), when men thought that the wheels of His chariot drove slowly. So has it been, and so will it be, in the great "days of the Lord" in the Church's history, which are preludes of the final Advent; so shall it be in that Advent itself.

(8) When the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?—The question implies, it is obvious, an answer in the negative. When St. Luke wrote his Gospel, men were witnessing a primary, though partial, fulfillment of the prophecy. Iniquity was abounding, and the love of many was waxing cold. And yet in one sense He was near, even at the doors (Jas. v. 8, 9), when men thought that the wheels of His chariot drove slowly. So has it been, and so will it be, in the great "days of the Lord" in the Church's history, which are preludes of the final Advent; so shall it be in that Advent itself.

(9) Unto certain which trusted in themselves . . .—Here, as above, the purpose of the parable is stated at the outset. It is, perhaps, open for us to think that isolated fragments of our Lord's teaching, treasured up here and there in the memory of the disciples, and written down in answer to St. Luke's inquiries in the second stage of the growth of the Gospel records, would be likely to have such an introduction.

The "certain which trusted" are not specified as being actually Pharisees, and included, we may believe, disciples in whom the Pharisee temper was gaining the mastery, and who needed to be taught as by a reductio ad absurdum, what it naturally led to.

Despised others. —Literally, the rest—viz., all others. The word for "despise," literally, count as nothing, is again one of those which St. Luke has, and the other Evangelists have not (that in Mark ix. 12 differs in form), but which is frequent in the vocabulary of St. Paul (Rom. xiv. 3, 10; 1 Cor. xvi. 11, et al.). This universal depreciation of others would seem almost an exaggeration, if experience did not show—e.g., as in the history of Montanism and ambiguous forms of error—how easily men and women, religious societies and orders, drift into it, and how hard it is to set any limits to the monomania of egotism—above all, of religious egotism. It never uttered itself, perhaps, in a more repulsive form than when the Pharisees came to speak of the great mass of their brother-Israelites as the brute people, the "people of the earth."

(10) Went up into the temple.—The peculiar form of the verb, "went up," was strictly justified by the position of the Temple. It stood on what had been Mount Moriah, and rose high above the other buildings of the city.

The one a Pharisee, and the other a publican.

—The two words would be more pictorially suggestive to
The Thanksgiving of the Pharisee.  
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The Cry of the Publican.

(11) The Pharisee stood and prayed thus with himself, God, I thank thee, that I am not as other men are, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as this publican. (12) I fast twice in the week, I give tithes of all that I possess. (13) And the publican, standing afar off, would not lift up so much as his eyes unto the heavens, but smote upon his breast, saying, God, be merciful to me a sinner. (14) I tell you that this man went down to his house justified rather than the other: for every one that exalteth himself shall be humbled; and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted.

The disciples that they are, at first, to us. They would see the Pharisee with his broad blue sash, or fringe, and the Tephillin (prayers), or phylacteries, fastened conspicuously on brow and shoulder; the publican in his common working dress, with no outward badge to testify that he was a child of the Covenant. Here, as in the case of the Good Samaritan and the Prodigal Son (where see Notes), the parable may have stated actual facts. Of one such publican we read not long afterwards. (See Note on chap. xix. 8.)

(11) The Pharisee stood and prayed thus with himself.—A false stress has often been laid on the Pharisee's attitude, as though his standing erect was in itself an indication of his self-righteous pride. But the parallel, that stood, and although another tense of the same verb is used, it is an over-subtle refinement to see this difference between the two forms. Standing was, indeed, with the Jews, the customary attitude of prayer. The self-same participle is used here of the Pharisee, and in chap. xix. 8 of Zaccheus. The order of the words in the Greek is "standing by (or, with) himself, prayed thus (or, as follows)"; and it is a question of punctuation whether the words point to the Pharisee's standing "by himself," shrinking from contact with others, and so making himself the "observed of all observers," or, as in the Authorised version, that he "prayed with himself." The general use of the proposition is all but decisive in favour of the latter view. It does not follow, however, as has been somewhat hastily assumed, that the prayer was a silent one, that even he would not have dared to utter aloud such a boast as that which follows. There was nothing in the character of the typical Pharisee to lead him to any such sense of shame; and silent prayer, never customary among the Jews at any time, would have been at variance with every tradition of the Pharisees. (Comp. Notes on Matt. vi. 5, 7.) So far as the phrase has any special point, it indicates that he was not praying to God at all; he was practically praying to himself, congratulating himself, half-consciously, that he had no need to pray, in the sense of asking for pardon, or peace, or righteousness, though it might be right, by way of example, to perform his acts of devotion and to thank God for what he had received. The words remind us—(1) of the title which Marcus Aurelius gave to his Stoic Meditations—"Thoughts (or better, perhaps, communings) with himself"—in which he, too, begins with thanksgiving and self-gratulations on the progress he had made in virtue from his youth onward (Medit. i. 4); (2) of the more modern theory which recognizes the value of prayer as raising the thoughts of man to a higher level, by a kind of self-memorising action, but excludes from it altogether the confession of sin, or the supplication for pardon, or the "making our wants known unto God" (Phil. iv. 6). The verb for "prayed" is in the tense which implies continuance. He was making a long address, of which this was a sample (chap. xx. 47).

God, I thank thee that I am not as other men are, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as this publican. That I am not as other men.—Here, as before, the rest of mankind. This was the first false step. He did not compare his own imperfections with the infinite perfections of the Eternal, but with the imagined greater imperfections of his fellow-men, and so he stood as one who had gained the shore, and looked with pride, but not with pity, on those who were still struggling in the deep waters.

Extortioners, unjust, adulterers, ...—The first word was aptly chosen, and was obviously suggested by the presence of the other suppliant. "Six publicans and half-a-dozen extortioners" had become a proverb; and the offensive epithet, if not to be heard by the publican, was, at any rate, mentally directed at him. In actual life, as our Lord teaches, there was a far worse, because a more hypocritical, "extortion" practised generally by the Pharisees themselves (Matt. xxiii. 25; Luke xi. 39). The other words are more generally put, but they were obviously spoken with side glances at this or that bystander. The language of Cromwell in dissolving the Long Parliament, saying to one "Thou art an adulterer," and to another "Thou art a drunkard and a glutton," to a third "and thou an extortioner," offers a curious instance of unconscious parallelism (Hume's History of England, chap. ix.).

Or even as this publican.—This was the climax of all. He saw the man smiling on his breast in anguish, and no touch of pity, no desire to say a word of comfort, rises in his soul. The pontiff is only a foil to the lustre of his own virtues, and gives the zest of contrast to his own insatiable vanity. The very pronoun has the ring of scorn in it.

(12) I fast twice in the week.—From the negative side of his self-analysis the Pharisee passes to the positive. The Stoic Emperor is a little less systematic, or rather groups his thanksgiving after a different plan, and, it must be owned, with a higher ethical standard. On the fasts of the Pharisees on the third and fifth days of the week, see Note on Matt. vi. 16.

I give tithes of all that I possess.—Better, of all that I acquire, as in Matt. x. 9; Acts i. 18. Tithe was a tax on produce, not on property. The boast of the Pharisee is, that he paid the lesser tithes, as well as the greater—of mint, anise, and cummin (Matt. xxiii. 23), as well as of corn and wine and oil. There is something obviously intended to be significant in the man's selection of the good deeds on which he prides himself. He does not think, as Job did in his boastful mood, that he had been "a father to the poor," and had "made the widow's heart to sing for joy" (Job xix. 13, 16), nor look back, as Nehemiah looked, upon good deeds done for his country (Neh. xiii. 14, 22, 31) in the work of reformation. For him fasting and tithes have come to supersede the "weightier matters of the Law" (Matt. xxiii. 23).

(13) And the publican, standing afar off.—The words point to a sense of shame, which kept the publican away from the crowd of worshippers who pressed forward to the ark-end of the outer court of the Temple—away, above all, from the devout and respectable Pharisee. So might some "forlorn and desperate
heaven, but smote upon his breast, saying, God be merciful to me a sinner. (14) I tell you, this man went down to his house justified rather than the other; for every one that exalteth himself shall be abased; and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted.

(15) And they brought unto him also infants, that he would touch them: but when his disciples saw it, they rebuked them. (16) But Jesus called them unto him, and said, Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God. (17) Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child shall in no wise enter therein.

(18) And a certain ruler asked him, saying, Good Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life? (19) And Jesus said unto him, Why callest thou me good? none is good, save one, that is, God. (20) Thou knowest the commandments, Do not commit adultery, Do not kill, Do not steal, Do not bear false witness, Honour thy father and thy mother. (21) And he said, All these have I kept from my youth up. (22) Now when Jesus heard these things, he said unto him, Yet lackest thou one thing:
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or "covered" or "velled," rather than hidden. Some such thought of dimmed perception was in St. Paul's mind when he said of the unbelieving Jews that, as they heard the Law and the Prophets, "the veil was upon their hearts" (2 Cor. iii. 15).

(35) As he was come nigh unto Jericho.—
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(31) Then he took unto him the twelve, and said unto them, Behold, we go up to Jerusalem, and all things that are written by the prophets concerning the Son of man shall be accomplished.

(32) For he shall be delivered unto the Gentiles, and shall be mocked, and spitefully entreated, and spitted on: (33) and they shall scourge him, and put him to death: and the third day he shall rise again. (34) And they under­

stood none of these things: and this saying was hid from them, neither knew they the things which were spoken.

(35) And it came to pass, that as he was come nigh unto Jericho, a certain

(33) He was very sorrowful.—St. Luke's word stands half-way between St. Matthew's "sorrowing" and St. Mark's vivid "lowering" or "frowning." (See Note on Mark x. 22.)

He was very rich.—St. Luke's equivalent for he had great possessions. There is, perhaps, something suggestive, especially on the view which has been taken as to the identity of the young ruler, and the purport of the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, in the use of the very same adjective as had been employed in that parable.

(24—27) When Jesus saw that he was very sorrowful.—See Notes on Matt. xxx. 23—26; Mark x. 23—27. The better MSS. give simply, When Jesus saw him, He said . . . .

How hardly shall they that have riches . . .

—Another verbal agreement with St. Mark.

(25) Through a needle's eye.—The Greek word for "needle" in the better MSS. differs from that in St. Matthew and St. Mark, and is a more classical word. That which the others use was unknown to Attic writers. The fact, small as it is, takes its place among the signs of St. Luke's culture.

(26) And they that heard it.—St. Luke's way of putting the fact suggests the thought either that others may have been present besides the disciples who are named in the other Gospels, or that only some of the disciples heard what had been said.

(27) The things which are impossible with men.—The answer is substantially the same as we find in the other Gospels, but it assumes in St. Luke something more of the form of a generalised axiom.

(32—34) Then he took unto him the twelve.—See Notes on Matt. xx. 17—19; Mark x. 32—34. St. Luke, like St. Mark, passes over the parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard. The insertion of the reference to the prophecies of the Passion is, on the other hand, peculiar to him, and is, perhaps, connected with the prominence given to those prophecies in chap. xxiv. 27, 44, 45.

(32) He shall be delivered unto the Gentiles.—The words are nearly the same as in the other Gospels, but the "spitefully entreated" is peculiar to St. Luke.

(34) They understood none of these things.—The whole verse is peculiar to St. Luke, and reproduces what had been said before in chap. ix. 45, where see Note. It is as though his professional habit of analysis led him to dwell on these psychological phenomena as explaining the subsequent bewildermont of the disciples, and their slowness to believe that their Lord had risen from the dead (chap. xxiv. 11, 21, 25, 38). They heard the words, but, as we say, did not "take in" their meaning. For a like analysis, see Note on chap. xxii. 45.

This saying was hid from them.—The verb so rendered occurs here only in the New Testament. Its precise meaning is "covered" or "velled," rather than hidden. Some such thought of dimmed perception was in St. Paul's mind when he said of the unbelieving Jews that, as they heard the Law and the Prophets, "the veil was upon their hearts" (2 Cor. iii. 15).
The Blind Man at Jericho.

ST. LUKE, XIX. Zacchaeus the Chief of the Publicans.

blind man sat by the way side begging; (36) and hearing the multitude pass by, he asked what it meant. (37) And they told him, that Jesus of Nazareth passeth by. (38) And he cried, saying, Jesus thou son of David, have mercy on me. (39) And they which went before rebuked him, that he should hold his peace: but he cried so much the more, Thou son of David, have mercy on me. (40) And Jesus stood, and commanded him to be brought unto him: and when he was come near, he asked him, (41) saying, What wilt thou that I shall do unto thee? And he said, Lord, that I may receive my sight. (42) And Jesus said unto him, Receive thy sight: thy faith hath saved thee. (43) And immediately he received his sight, and followed him, glorifying God: and all the people, when they saw it, gave praise unto God.

CHAPTER XIX.—(1) And Jesus entered and passed through Jericho. (2) And, behold, there was a man named Zaccheus, which was the chief among the publicans, and he was rich. (3) And he sought to see Jesus who he was; and could not for the press, because he was little of stature. (4) And he ran before, and climbed up into a sycamore tree to

Matt. xx. 29—34; Mark x. 46—52. St. Luke, for some reason, passes over the ambitious request of the sons of Zebedee. He agrees with St. Mark, and not with St. Matthew, as to there being one blind man, and as to the miracle being wrought on the approach to Jericho, not on the departure from it. (36) Hearing the multitude pass by.—Better, a multitude, the Greek having no article, and its absence better expressing the vague impression left on the blind man by the sound of many footsteps and voices. (39) They which went before—viz., those who were in advance of Jesus; probably, if we suppose Mark x. 32 to represent the usual order, not the disciples, but a portion of the crowd. On “the Son of David,” see Note on Matt. ix. 27. (41) Lord, that I may receive my sight.—As St. Luke uses “Lord” (kyrie) for St. Mark’s “Rabbônî,” it may be inferred that he uses it in a somewhat higher sense than either of his two words for Master. (See Notes on chap. v. 5, viii. 24.) (42) Thy faith hath saved thee.—Better, as in St. Mark, Thy faith hath made thee whole, the immediate reference being obviously to the restoration of the man’s sight, and that which was in the immediate future being recognised as already ideally completed. Beyond this, as in the use of the same formula in chap. vii. 50, there lies in the word a reference to the salvation, the healthiness of spiritual vision, of which the restoration of bodily sight was at once the type and the earnest. (46) Glorifying God.—The account of the effect of the miracle on the blind man himself, and on the people, is peculiar to St. Luke, and seems to belong to the class of phenomena which he loved to study (chaps. v. 25, 26; viii. 16; Acts iii. 8; xiv. 10, 11).

XIX.

(1) And passed through Jericho.—Better, and was passing through. The narrative that follows is peculiar to this Gospel.

(2) There was a man named Zaccheus, . . .—The name appears in the Old Testament in the form Zaccai (Ezra ii. 8; Neh. vii. 14), and meant “pure” or “innocent.” Rabbinic writers mention a Zaccheus as living at Jericho about this time, the father of a famous Rabbi, Jochanan or John.

The chief among the publicans.—The position of Jericho near the fords of the Jordan made it a natural trade-centre for the imports from the Gilead country—myrrh and balsam. Under the government of Herod and Archelaus it became once more a city of palm-trees (Judg. i. 16), and their dates and palm-honey were probably liable to an octroi duty. The “farming” system adopted in the Roman revenue probably gave Zaccheus the status of a middle-man or sub-contractor between the great capitalists of the equestrian order at Rome, the real publicani, and the “publicans” commonly so-called, who were the actual collectors. As such he had as abundant opportunities for enriching himself as a Turkish pacha, and, as we may infer from his own words, had probably not altogether escaped the temptations of his calling.

(3) He sought.—Better, was seeking. The verb expresses vividly the oft-repeated attempts of the man, little of stature, to get a glimpse of the Prophet as He passed.

For the press.—The word is the same as that elsewhere rendered “multitude” or “crowd.” The motive is left to be inferred. It was not mere curiosity, for that would not have met with the Lord’s warm approval. Had he heard that there was a publican like himself among the chosen disciples of the Teacher whom the people were receiving as the Son of David? Had some one told him of the parable of the Pharisee and the Publican? Had the fame of the miracle wrought on the entrance into Jericho made him eager to see the Worker?

He was little of stature.—The individualising feature may be accepted, in connection with what follows, either as a touch of consummate art, or a note of artless truthfulness.

(4) And climbed up into a sycamore tree.—The name of “sycamore” has been variously applied—(1) to a species of maple (Acer pseudo-platanus); (2) to the mulberry (Morus nigra), more properly, “sycomine,” as in chap. xvii. 6; and (3) to the fig mulberry (Ficus sycomorus). The last is the tree here meant. It grows to a considerable height in the Jordan valley, and was much used by builders and carpenters (1 Kings x. 27). The care taken by St. Luke to distinguish between the “sycamine” of chap. xvii. 6 (where see Note), and the “sycamore” here, may fairly be noted as an instance of botanical accuracy, such as was likely to be found in a physician. We can picture the scene to our mind’s eye—the eager, wistful, suppling face looking down from the fresh green foliage (it was early spring), and meeting the gaze of Jesus as He passed.
The Law required in the case of false imprisonment to come out of the house, for to-day I must abide at thy house. And he made haste, and came down, and received him joyfully.

And when they saw it, they all murmured, saying, That he was gone to be guest with a man that is a sinner.

(5) To-day I must abide at thy house.—The words gain a fresh significance, if we remember that Jericho was at this time one of the chosen cities of the priests. (See Note on chap. x. 30.) Our Lord passed over their houses, and those of the Pharisees, in order to pass the night in the house of the publican. There, we may believe, He saw an opening for a spiritual work which He did not find elsewhere.

(6) Received him joyfully.—The joy is significant as implying previous yearning, a desire for communion with the new Teacher, the wish to sit at His feet and drink in the words of eternal life.

(7) They all murmured.—Better, were all murmuring. It is significant that the murmur was not confined to a special section of rigorous Pharisees, but came from the whole crowd. The chief publican was clearly not popular, and probably the priestly tone of the place (see Note on verse 5) gave additional strength to all caste feelings. We are carried forward in this verse from the promise to the performance. Our Lord was in the house when the murmurs found expression.

With a man that is a sinner.—The term was obviously used from the popular Pharisaic standpoint, as attaching necessarily to the calling of Zacchaeus. He had placed Himself on a level with the heathen or the vilest Jew, and ought to be treated accordingly.

Zacchæus stood, and said unto the Lord... The word for “stood” is the same as that used in the parable of the Pharisee and the Publican (chap. xviii. 11). Too much stress has, perhaps, been laid on its supposed force as indicating self-assertion in both cases. It does not seem to imply more than that Zacchaeus, in his own house, hearing the murmurs of those who looked in at doors or windows, rose from his couch, and stood up, and in the hearing of all, said what follows. The phrase, “unto the Lord,” indicates, as elsewhere, that the facts were recorded by St. Luke at a comparatively late period. (See Note on chap. vii. 11.)

The half of my goods I give. —It seems more natural to see in this the statement of a new purpose than that of an habitual practice. In the absence of any words implying a command of this nature, we must assume either that it was a spontaneous impulse of large-hearted devotion, or, possibly, that Zacchaeus had heard of the command given but a few days before to the young ruler (chap. xviii. 22). The promise implies immediate distribution. The compensation for wrongs that men might have suffered at his hands was to come out of the remaining half.

I restore him fourfold. —The Greek phrase, “If I have taken anything,” hardly implies doubt as to the fact, and is used like our English “wherever.”

I restore him fourfold.—Here, also, it seems best to recognize in the words a new purpose. He is ready to compensate now for whatever wrong had been done before. There seems, indeed, something almost ludicrously incongruous in a devout man boasting that his rule of life is to make amends to those whom he deliberately cheats, and the special force of the verb practically excludes the idea of involuntary wrong.

The Law required in cases of voluntary restitution the addition of one-fifth of the value of the thing restored (Lev. v. 5; Num. v. 7). The whole force of the history seems lost if we suppose Zacchaeus, as some have done, to have been a model of a virtuous publican before he sought to see Jesus. On that supposition his words are like those of the Pharisee in the parable, a self-righteous boast. The stirrings of repentance must, indeed, have begun before, and the man, when he welcomed our Lord’s presence, and trusted His words, was “justified by faith.” Is it too utterly bold a conjecture that He who saw Nathanael under the fig-tree (John i. 48), had seen Zacchaeus in the Temple, and that the figure in the parable of chap. xviii. 14, was in fact a portrait?

This day is salvation come to this house.—The Greek tense, This day came there salvation to this house, has a force which it is not easy to express in English, implying that the salvation was already looked back upon as completed in the past. In one sense salvation had come in the personal presence of the Saviour, but we must remember all that the word implied—deliverance, not from the penalty only, but from the habit and the power of sin. This had come, and the words and acts of Zacchaeus showed the fruits. And it comes to him because “he also is a child of Abraham.” The Abraham character was in him, as that of the true Israel was in Nicodemus (John i. 47). A son of Abraham, like him in his noble generosity (comp. Gen. xiii. 9; xiv. 23), was found where, to the common observer, it would have seemed as hopeless to look for one as among the stones of the Jordan valley (Matt. iii. 9).

The Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost. —Like words had been spoken once before, under circumstances that presented a very striking contrast to those now before us. Then the loving purpose of the Christ had for its object the “little child,” as yet untouched by the world’s offences (Matt. xviii. 2, 11): now it rested on the publican, whose manhood had been marred by them. The same law of work is reproduced in a more emphatic form. There it had been that He “came to save:” here it is that He came to “seek” as well.
The Parable of the Pounds.

ST. LUKE, XIX.

The Good and Faithful Servant.

(11) And as they heard these things, he added and spake a parable, because he was nigh to Jerusalem, and because they thought that the kingdom of God should immediately appear. (12) He said therefore, a certain nobleman went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return. (13) And he called his ten servants, and delivered them ten pounds,¹ and said unto them, Occupy till I come. (14) But his citizens hated him, and sent a message after him, saying, We will not have this man to reign over us. (15) And it came to pass, that when he was returned, having received the kingdom, then he commanded these servants to be called unto him, to whom he had given the money, that he might know how much every man had gained by trading. (16) Then came the first, saying, Lord, thy pound hath gained ten pounds. (17) And he said unto him, Well, thou good servant: because thou hast been faithful in a very little, have

(18) A certain nobleman went into a far country.—As in chap. xviii. 1, 9, so here, it is characteristic of St. Luke that he states, more fully than is common in the other Gospels, the occasion and the purpose of the parable which follows. The verse throws light upon all the history that follows. In all previous visits to Jerusalem our Lord had gone up either alone or accompanied only by His chosen disciples. Now He was followed by a crowd, gathering strength as they journeyed on, and roused, by their very nearness to the Holy City, to an almost uncontrollable excitement. The time for delay, they thought, had come to an end. He was about to claim the throne of His father David. The Kingdom of God would "immediately appear." The parable shows us, and was, in part, meant to teach us, that the King would never return. (Comp. 2 Pet. iii. 9, 16, 21, 22, in the sense of "trading." The English verb meets us in Ezek. xxvii. 9, 16, 21, 22, as in John iv. 46, where the word means a "king's officer." Here it is simply a "man of noble family." In the interpretation of the parable we may see a prophetic announcement by our Lord of His own departure to the "far country," that lay behind the veil, to receive His Kingdom, and of His subsequent return.

(19) Then came the first, saying, Lord, thy pound hath gained ten pounds.—The increase is not used by any other New Testament writer. It is later on, when their complaints were brought before the Emperor, and led to his deposition and banishment, that the King would never return. (Comp. 2 Pet. iii. 23.)

(20) And delivered them ten pounds.—In this, again, we have a noticeable difference. Here we begin with equality; in Matt. xxv. 15 the servants start with unequal amounts, "according to their several ability." So far as we lay stress on the difference, it implies that the trust in this case is that which all the several grades of increase correspond to the thirty, the sixty, and the hundred. The pound, or mna, was, in Greek numismatics, not a coin, but a sum equal to the sixtieth part of a talent. The Greek name was probably derived from the Hebrew 'maneh. According to another estimate it was equal to 25 shekels, or 100 drachmae or denarii. The word meets us, as far as the New Testament is concerned, in this parable only.

(21) Occupye till I come.—The Greek verb "occupy" occurs here. (See also the Prayer Book version of Ps. xxvii.)

(22) But his citizens hated him, and sent a message after him.—Here, also, recent history supplied a feature in the parable. This was precisely what the Jews had done in the case of Archelaus, both at the time referred to in the Note on verse 12, and later on, when their complaints were brought before the Emperor, and led to his deposition and banishment to Gaul. That which answers to it in the inner meaning of the parable is the unwillingness of the Jews—or, taking a wider view of the interpretation, of mankind at large—to accept the law of Christ or acknowledge His sovereignty.

(23) It came to pass, that when he was returned.—See Note on Matt. xxv. 19. The absence of the words "after a long time" is noticeable, and suggests the thought that our Lord may have added them in the later form of the parable as a further safeguard against the prevalent expectations of the immediate coming of the Kingdom, and, we may add, against the thought which sprang up afterwards in men's minds, that there was no kingdom to be received, and that the King would never return. (Comp. 2 Pet. iii. 4.)

(24) Had gained by trading.—The Greek verb is a compound form of that translated "occupy" in verse 13. The increase is on a larger scale than in the parable in Matt. xxv. There each of the faithful servants gains as much again as he had received. Here the gain is tenfold (1,000 per cent.). Adopting the view which has been taken of the distinctive ideas of the two parables, it may be said that what is suggested is the almost boundless opening for good acquired by the simple acceptance of the truth, apart from the opportunities offered by special gifts and functions. So interpreted, the several grades of increase correspond to the thirty, sixty, and hundredfold in the parable of the Sower. (See Note on Matt. xiii. 23.)

(25) Because thou hast been faithful in a very little.—More literally, because thou didst become...
unto every one which hath shall be

and not exclusively that which we call usurious. and Bethany.—On the general narrative, see Notes

for I feared thee, because thou art an austere man: thou takest up that thou laystest not down, and reapest that thou didst not sow. (22) And he saith unto him, Out of thine own mouth will I judge thee, thou wicked servant. Thou knewest that I was an austere man, taking up that I laid not down, and reaping that I did not sow: (23) wherefore then gavest not thou my

money into the bank, that at my coming I might have required mine own with usury? (24) And he said unto them that stood by, Take from him the pound, and give it to him that hath ten pounds. (25) (And they said unto him, Lord, he hath ten pounds.) (26) For I say unto you, That unto every one which hath shall be given; a and from him that hath not, even that he hath shall be taken away from him. (27) But those mine enemies, which would not that I should reign over them, bring hither, and slay them before me.

(28) And when he had thus spoken, he went before, ascending up to Jerusalem.

(29) And it came to pass, when he was

faithful. The words are in their substance like those in St. Matthew, but their absolute identity with those in the lesson drawn from the parable of the Unjust Steward (see Note on chap. xvi. 10) is every way suggestive. This parable is connected with that as its natural sequel and development.

Have thou authority over ten cities.—The truth implied in Matt. xxv. 21 (where see Note), that the reward of faithfulness in this life, and probably in the life to come, will be found in yet wider opportunities for good which are transferred from those who have not used them to those that will. May we not think of some such feeling as working among those members of the Church of the Circumcision, who did not hold out to Paul and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship (Gal. ii. 9)? When Calatia received the gospel from one who had already planted churches far and wide, St. Luke may well have seen in it an illustration of the pound taken from the slothful servant and given to him that had ten.

(30) Thy pound, which I have kept . . .—Literally, which I kept—i.e., all along. He had never made any effort at doing service, in slided here with greater distinctness. Authority over ten cities must have something corresponding to it, some energy and work of guidance, in the realities of the unseen world, and cannot simply be understood as fulfilled in the beatific vision or the life of ceaseless praise and adoration.

(31) I feared thee, because thou art an austere man.—The Greek adjective (from which the English word is derived) is not used elsewhere in the New Testament. Literally, it means dry, and so, hard and stiff. In 2 Mac. xiv. 30 it is translated “churlish.” On the plea of the wicked servant, see Note on Matt. xxv. 22.

(32) Out of thine own mouth will I judge thee.—See Note on Matt. xxv. 26. These words are, perhaps, somewhat more emphatic than in the parallel passage. The very term which the servant had dared to apply to his lord, is repeated with a solemn impressiveness.

(33) Into the bank.—Literally, the table, or counter. The Greek substantive is the root of the word translated “exchangers” in Matt. xxv. 27 (where see Note).

That at my coming I might have required . . .—Literally, And when I came I should have got it with interest.

Usury.—The word is used (as in Matt. xxv. 27) in its older meaning, as including interest of any kind, and not exclusively that which we call usurious.

(35) And they said unto him, Lord . . .—The touch of wonder, perhaps of indignation, is peculiar to St. Luke. It can scarcely be thought of as simply an element of dramatic vividness. It foreshadows the feelings with which men have in all ages looked on those greater than themselves. They grudge the influence and opportunities for good which are transferred from those who have not used them to those that will. May we not think of some such feeling as working among those members of the Church of the Circumcision, who did not hold out to Paul and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship (Gal. ii. 9)? When Calatia received the gospel from one who had already planted churches far and wide, St. Luke may well have seen in it an illustration of the pound taken from the slothful servant and given to him that had ten.

(36) Unto every one which hath shall be given.—This again takes its place among the oft-repeated axioms of our Lord’s teaching. It meets us after the parable of the Sower (chap. viii. 15; Matt. xiii. 12; Mark iv. 25), in that of the Talents (Matt. xx.xv. 29), and here. (See Notes on the several passages.)

(37) But those mine enemies.—This feature of the parable is peculiar to St. Luke’s report. Like the earlier portions of the outer framework of the story, it had an historical groundwork in the conduct of Archelaus on his return from Rome (Jos. Wars, ii. 7, § 3). Spiritually, it represents, in bold figures drawn from the acts of tyrant kings, the ultimate victory of the Christ over the unbelieving and rebellious. (Comp. 1 Cor. xv. 25.) They who will not have Him to reign over them will learn that He does reign, and having shut Love out, will themselves be shut out from Love.

(38) He went before, ascending up to Jerusalem.—Better, going up, as elsewhere throughout the New Testament. The words indicate the same mode of journeying as that which we have traced before—the Master going on in advance, and the disciples following. (See Notes on chap. viii. 1; Mark x. 32.)

The journey from Jericho to Jerusalem was literally an ascent all the way (see Note on chap. x. 39), and in this sense, as well as following the language common to most nations, in speaking of their capitals, the verb might well be used. The English word “ascend,” however, is not used elsewhere in the New Testament of any earthly journeys.
come nigh to Bethphage and Bethany, at the Mount of Olives, he sent two of his disciples, (30) saying, Go ye into the village over against you; in the which at your entering ye shall find a colt tied, whereon yet never man sat: loose him, and bring him hither. (31) And if any man ask you, Why do ye loose him? thus shall ye say unto him, Because the Lord hath need of him. (32) And they that were sent went their way, and found even as he had said unto them. (33) And as they were loosing the colt, the owners thereof said unto them, Why loose ye the colt? (34) And they said, The Lord hath need of him. (35) And they brought him to Jesus: and they cast their garments upon the colt, and they set Jesus thereon. (36) And as he went, they spread their clothes in the way. (37) And when he was come nigh, even now at the descent of the Mount of Olives, the whole multitude of the disciples began to rejoice and praise God with a loud voice for all the mighty works that they had seen; (38) saying, Blessed be the King that cometh in the name of the Lord: peace in heaven, and glory in the highest. (39) And some of the Pharisees from among the multitude said unto him, Master, rebuke thy disciples. (40) And he answered and said unto them, I tell you that, if these should hold their peace, the stones would immediately cry out. (41) And when he was come near, he beheld the city, and wept over it,
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The Cleansing of the Temple.

(42) saying, If thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy day, the things which belong unto thy peace! but now they are hid from thine eyes. (43) For the days shall come upon thee, that thine enemies shall cast a trench about thee, and compass thee round, and keep thee in on every side, (44) and shall lay thee even with the ground, and thy children within thee; and they shall not leave in thee one stone upon another; because thou knewest not the time of thy visitation. (45) And he went into the temple, and began to cast out them that sold therein, and them that bought; (46) saying unto them, It is written, My house is the house of prayer: but ye have made it a den of thieves. (47) And he taught daily in the temple. But the chief priests and the scribes sought at all times to destroy him, and could not find what they might do: for all the people were very attentive to hear him.

CHAPTER XX.—(1) And it came to pass, that on one of those days, as he taught the people in the temple, and preached the gospel, the chief priests and the scribes came upon him with the elders, (2) and spake unto him, saying, Tell us, by what authority doest thou
the vineyard: but the husbandmen treated the servant: and they beat him also, and wounded him, and sent him away empty.

(11) And again he sent another servant: and they beat him also, and entreated him shamefully, and sent him away empty. (12) And again he sent a third: and they wounded him also, and cast him out. (13) Then said the lord of the vineyard, What shall I do? I will send my beloved son: it may be they will reverence him when they see him. (14) But when the husbandmen saw him, they reasoned among themselves, saying, This is the heir: come, let us kill him, that the inheritance may be our's. (15) So they cast him out of the vineyard, and killed him. What therefore shall the lord of the vineyard do unto them? (16) He shall come and destroy these husbandmen, and shall give the vineyard to others. And when they heard it, they said, God forbid.

(17) And he beheld them, and said, What is this then that is written, The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner? (18) Whosoever shall fall upon that stone shall be broken; but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder.

(19) And the chief priests and the scribes the same hour sought to lay hands on him; and they feared the people: for they perceived that he had spoken this parable against them. (20) And they watched him, and sent forth spies, which should feign themselves just men, that they might take hold of his words, that so they might deliver him unto the power and authority of the governor.

(6) All the people will stone us.—St. Luke gives the more vivid utterance in place of the more general “we fear the people” in the other Gospels. As indicating the readiness of the people of Jerusalem to proceed to extremities of this kind, we may refer to their treatment of our Lord (John viii. 59; x. 31) and Stephen (Acts vii. 58, 59). The presence of this, as well as of the last section, in the first three Gospels, with so little variation, indicates the impression which these facts and teaching made at the time, and probably also that they occupied a prominent place in the early records that served as the basis of our present Gospels.

A certain man planted a vineyard.—The absence of the fuller detail in St. Matthew and St. Mark shows that St. Luke’s report was not derived from them, but probably from a version, orally repeated, of that which they reported more fully. On the other hand, the addition of “for a long time” is peculiar to St. Luke, and reminds us of the like phrase in Matt. xxv. 19.

(10) Beat him, and sent him away empty.—The description agrees almost verbally with St. Mark.

And sent him away empty.—The emphatic repetition of the words that had been used in the previous verse is peculiar to St. Luke.

(12) They wounded him also.—The verb is peculiar to St. Luke, and has a characteristic half-surgical ring in it. It is used by him again in Acts xix. 16.

(13) It may be.—The doubt implied in the qualification is a feature peculiar to St. Luke’s report. The better MSS. omit the clause “when they see him.”

(16) He shall come and destroy these husbandmen.—St. Luke agrees with St. Mark in putting these words into our Lord’s lips, and not, as St. Matthew does, into those of the by-standers. They said, God forbid.—No other English phrase could well be substituted for this, but it is worth remembering that the name of God does not appear in the original, and that the ejaculation is simply, as it were, a negative Amen, “So be it not.” Its insertion here is peculiar to St. Luke, nor does it occur elsewhere in the Gospels. St. Paul uses it frequently, as in Rom. iii. 4, 6, 31; vi. 2, 15, et al.

(17) And he beheld them.—Better, He looked on them. The Greek verb implies the gaze turned and fixed on its object, in addition to the mere act of beholding.

Whosoever shall fall upon that stone.—See Note on Matt. xxii. 44. The verse, which is omitted by many of the best MSS. in St. Matthew, is found in all MSS. of St. Luke. If we were to receive it, on this evidence, as belonging strictly to the latter Gospel only, the Greek word for “bruised” might take its place among those classical, or perhaps quasi-medical, terms characteristic of St. Luke. (See Note on verse 12, and Introduction.)

(20) And they watched him.—See Notes on Matt. xxii. 15—22 and Mark xii. 13—17.

And sent forth spies.—The noun is, again, one of St. Luke’s characteristic words not used by any
other New Testament writer. It expresses rather the act of those who lie in ambush, than that of "spies" in the strict sense of the words. St. Luke is, on the one hand, less definite as to the parties to the conspiracy than the other Gospels, and on the other hand more explicit as to its aim. They wanted materials for an accusation before Pilate, as well as for one before the Sanhedrin. On the omission of the name of the Herodians, see Note on chap. vi. 11.

Power and authority.—We have again the characteristic combination of the two substantives. (See Note on chap. xii. 11.)

(21) Neither acceptest thou the person of any. —To “accept the person” takes the place of “regarding” or “looking at” the person of Matt. xxii. 16, where see Note. The precise combination which St. Luke uses meets us again in Gal. ii. 6.

(22) is it lawful for us to give tribute unto Cæsar, or no? (23) But he perceived their craftiness, and said unto them, Why tempt ye me? (24) Shew me a penny. (26) And they could not take hold of his words before the people: and they marvelled at his answer, and held their peace.

(27) Then came to him certain of the Sadducees, which deny that there is any resurrection; and they asked him, saying, Master, Moses wrote unto us, If any man’s brother die, having a wife, and he die without children, that his brother should take his wife, and raise up seed unto his brother. (28) There were therefore seven brethren: and the first took a wife, and died without children. (29) And the second took her to wife, and he died childless. (30) And the third took her; and in like manner the seven also: and they left no children, and died. (31) Therefore in the resurrection whose wife of them is she? for seven had her to wife. (32) Last of all the woman died also. (33) And Jesus answering said unto them, The children of this world marry, and are given in marriage: (34) but they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that resurrection were those, and not the children of this world, nor the children of the resurrection. (35) Now that the dead are raised, even Moses shewed at the bush, when he calleth the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. (36) For he is not a God of the unresurrected, but of the living. And the third marrieth her. (37) For the dead are raised up, and they have an inheritance in the heavens, as Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and all the children of Abraham have their inheritance.

The children of God, being the children of the resurrection.—It is obvious that here the resurrection is assumed to be unto life and to a share in the divine kingdom. The fact that men were counted worthy to obtain that resurrection was a proof that they were “children of God,” and as such on the same footing as those other “sons of God,” whom the language of Scripture (Job i. 6; xxxviii. 7, and possibly Gen. vi. 12) identified with the angels. (38) Even Moses shewed at the bush. —The precise meaning of the verb is that of “indicating,” “pointing to,” rather than actually “shewing.” In his mode of reference to the words of Ex. ii. 6, St. Luke agrees with St. Mark (xii. 26).

(39) For they are dead, and are equal to the angels of God.—Another word common to St. Luke and St. Paul (2 Thess. i. 5), and to them only in the New Testament. (40) They which shall be accounted worthy. —The record of this teaching is peculiar to St. Luke. The implied thought is that death and marriage are correlative facts in God’s government of the world, the one filling up the gaps which are caused by the other. In the life eternal there is no need for an addition in this way to the number of the elect, and therefore there is no provision for it.

Equal unto the angels.—The one Greek word which answers to the English four is again peculiar to St. Luke.

The children of God, being the children of the resurrection.—It is obvious that here the resurrection is assumed to be unto life and to a share in the divine kingdom. The fact that men were counted worthy to obtain that resurrection was a proof that they were “children of God,” and as such on the same footing as those other “sons of God,” whom the language of Scripture (Job i. 6; xxxviii. 7, and possibly Gen. vi. 12) identified with the angels. (39) Even Moses shewed at the bush. —The precise meaning of the verb is that of “indicating,” “pointing to,” rather than actually “shewing.” In his mode of reference to the words of Ex. ii. 6, St. Luke agrees with St. Mark (xii. 26).

For they are dead, and are equal to the angels of God.—Another word common to St. Luke and St. Paul (2 Thess. i. 5), and to them only in the New Testament. (40) They which shall be accounted worthy. —The record of this teaching is peculiar to St. Luke. The implied thought is that death and marriage are correlative facts in God’s government of the world, the one filling up the gaps which are caused by the other. In the life eternal there is no need for an addition in this way to the number of the elect, and therefore there is no provision for it.
dead, but of the living: for all live unto him.

(30) Then certain of the scribes answering said, Master, thou hast well said.

(31) And after that they durst not ask him any question at all. (41) And he said unto them, How say they that Christ is David's son? (42) And David himself saith in the book of Psalms, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, (43) till I make thine enemies thy footstool. (44) David therefore calleth him Lord, how is he then his son?

(45) Then in the audience of all the people he said unto his disciples, (46) Beware of the scribes, which desire to walk in long robes, and love greetings in the markets, and the highest seats in the synagogues, and the chief rooms at feasts; (47) which devour widows' houses, and for a shew make long prayers: the same shall receive greater damnation.

CHAPTER XXI.—(1) And he looked up, and saw the rich men casting their gifts into the treasury. (2) And he saw also a certain poor widow casting in thither two mites. (3) And he said, Of a truth I say unto you, that this poor widow hath cast in more than they all: (4) for all these have of their abundance cast in unto the offerings of God: but she of her penury hath cast in all the living that she had.

(5) And as some spake of the temple, how it was adorned with goodly stones and gifts, he said, (6) As for these things which ye behold, the days will come, in which there shall not be left one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down. (7) And they asked him,

meaning of those that precede them. All life, in the truest, highest sense of that term, depends upon our relation to God. We live to Him, and in Him. And so when He reveals Himself as the God of those who have passed from earth, He witnesses that that relation continues still. They are not dead, but are still living unto Him. We may, perhaps, connect the thought thus expressed with St. Paul's words, "in Him we live, and move, and have our being," in his speech at Athens. (See Note on Acts xvii. 28.)

(39) Master, thou hast well said.—The words came, it is obvious, from the better section of the Pharisees, who welcomed this new defence of the relation to God. We live to Him, and in Him. And so when He reveals Himself as the God of those who have passed from earth, He witnesses that that relation continues still. They are not dead, but are still living unto Him. We may, perhaps, connect the thought thus expressed with St. Paul's words, "in Him we live, and move, and have our being," in his speech at Athens. (See Note on Acts xvii. 28.)

(40) They durst not ask him any question at all.—The singular omission by St. Luke of the question which is recorded by St. Matthew (xxii. 34—40) and St. Mark (xii. 28—34), and which would have fallen in so well with the general scope and tenor of his Gospel, may take its place, though we cannot account for it except on the supposition that he did not know the facts, as one of the many proofs of his entire independence as a narrator.

(41, 42) How say they that Christ is David's son?—Better, that the Christ. See Notes on Matt. xxii. 41—46; Mark xii. 35—37. The implied subject of the verb is clearly, as in St. Mark, "the scribes." St. Luke agrees with St. Mark in not giving the preliminary question, "What think ye of Christ? . . ." which we find in St. Matthew.

(45—47) Then in the audience of all the people.—Better, in the hearing. See Notes on Matt. xxiii., especially verses 6 and 7, and Mark xii. 38—40. St. Luke's report agrees almost verbally with the latter.

Chief rooms.—Better, chief place.

XXI.

(1—4) And saw the rich men casting their gifts.—See Notes on Mark xii. 41—44. This may, perhaps, be thought of as one of the incidents which St. Luke derived from verbal communication with his brother-evangelist. (See Introduction.)

(6) A certain poor widow.—St. Luke's word for "poor" differs from St. Mark's, and seems to have been carefully chosen to express the fact that the widow, though "needy," and compelled to work for her scanty maintenance, was yet not a "beggar," as the more common word for "poor" suggested. It is not found elsewhere in the New Testament.

(9) Of a truth.—St. Luke's use (according to the better MSS.) of the Greek for "truly," instead of St. Mark's "Amen" (so in the Greek), may, perhaps, be noted as characteristic.

(4) For all these have . . . cast.—Better, all these cast . . . , and so in the next clause.

Unto the offerings of God.—The better MSS. omit the last two words. "Offerings," literally, gifts. (6, 6) And as some spake of the temple.—See Notes on Matt. xxiv. 1, 2; Mark xiii. 1, 2, where the "some" are identified with the disciples.

Goodly stones.—These were probably so called, either as being sculptured, or as being of marble, or porphyry, or other of the more precious materials used in building.

Gifts.—St. Luke uses the more strictly classical word for "offerings," according to some of the best MSS., in the self-same form as the Anathema (1 Cor. xi. 3; xvi. 12), which elsewhere in the New Testament is confined to the idea of that which is set apart, not for a blessing, but a curse. The fact that he is the only writer to use it in its good sense is characteristic of his Gentile and classical training. Other MSS., however, give the more usual term, Anathema, as if it had been found necessary to distinguish the form of the word according to its uses.

(7—10) Master, but when shall these things be?—See Notes on Matt. xxiv. 3—14; Mark xiii. 3—13. St. Luke omits the Mount of Olives as being the scene of the question and the prophecy, and the names of the questioners, the latter being given by St. Mark only. The variations in the report throughout imply an independent source—probably oral—of information, as distinct from transcription either from one of the Gospels or from a document common to both of them. On the whole, he agrees much more with St. Mark than St. Matthew.
saying, Master, but when shall these things be? and what sign will there be when these things shall come to pass? (9) And he said, Take heed that ye be not deceived: for many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ; and the time draweth near: go ye not therefore after them. (10) But when ye shall hear of wars and commotions, be not terrified: for these things must first come to pass; but the end is not by and by. (11) Then said he unto them,* Nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom: (12) and great earthquakes shall be in divers places, and famines, and pestilences; and fearful sights and great signs shall there be from heaven. (13) But before all these, they shall lay their hands on you, and persecute you, delivering you up to the synagogues, and into prisons, being brought before kings and rulers for my name's sake. (14) And it shall turn to you for a testimony. (15) Settle it therefore in your hearts, not to meditate before what ye shall answer; (16) for I will give you a mouth and wisdom, which all your adversaries shall not be able to gainsay nor resist. (17) And ye shall be betrayed both by parents, and brethren, and kinsfolks, and friends; and some of you shall they cause to be put to death. (18) And ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake. (19) But there shall not an hair of your head perish. (20) In your patience possess ye your souls. (21) And when ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, it is not the end.
then know that the desolation thereof is nigh. (21) Then let them which are in Judea flee to the mountains; and let them which are in the midst of it depart out; and let not them that are in the countries enter thereinto. (22) For these be the days of vengeance, that all things which are written may be fulfilled. (23) But woe unto them that are with child, and to them that give suck, in those days! for there shall be great distress in the land, and wrath upon this people. (24) And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations: and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled.

(25) And there shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars; and upon the earth distress of nations, with perplexity; the sea and the waves roaring; (26) men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth: for the powers of heaven shall be shaken. (27) And then shall they see the Son of man coming in a cloud with power and great glory. (28) And when these things begin to come to pass, then look up, and lift up your heads; for your redemption draweth nigh.

15—21: Mark xiii. 14—19. This is St. Luke's equivalent, possibly chosen as more intelligible for his Gentile readers, for "the abomination of desolation," which we find in St. Matthew and St. Mark. As far as it goes, it favours the view that he and others saw the "abomination" in the presence of the invading armies. On the other hand, it is possible, accepting, as we must accept, the thought of a substituted phrase, that we have one which, while it gives a partial explanation, fails to exhaust the meaning of the darker and more mysterious phrase. The occurrence of the word "desolation" in the latter clause of the verse, obviously favours the hypothesis now suggested.

(21) Let not them that are in the countries ... The noun is sometimes rendered "coasts," sometimes "region," sometimes "fields." The latter meaning would seem to be that here intended. Comp. John iv. 35, Jas. v. 4, where the word is so rendered.

(22) These be the days of vengeance.-The words answer to the "great tribulation" of St. Matthew and St. Mark, and seem, as indeed does St. Luke's report of the discourse throughout, to be of the nature of a paraphrase. The word "vengeance" may have been chosen, on this view, in allusive reference to the teaching of chap. xviii. 7, 8. It may be noted as one which, though not exclusively used by them, is yet characteristic both of St. Luke and St. Paul (Rom. xi. 21; 2 Cor. vii. 11; and 2 Thess. i. 8). The reference to the "things which are (better, have been) written," is peculiar to St. Luke.

(23) Great distress in the land.—Literally, great need, or necessity. The word, which St. Luke uses as an equivalent for "tribulation," is not found in the other Gospels in this sense. It is, however, so used by St. Paul (1 Cor. vii. 20; 2 Cor. vi. 4; xii. 10; 1 Thess. iii. 7).

(24) And they shall fall by the edge of the sword.—There is nothing in the parallel prophecies of the other two Gospels that answers to this special the New Testament. The word for "perplexity" is the other two Gospels that answers to this special the New Testament. The word for "perplexity" is

(25) And there shall be signs in the sun,—See Notes on Matt. xxiv. 29—35, Mark xiii. 24—31, where the "signs" are defined as the "sun being darkened, and the moon not giving her light."

(26) Distress of nations.—The Greek for the first noun means literally, constraint, the sense of being menaced in, as when we say "in great straits." It is used by St. Paul in 2 Cor. ii. 4, and not elsewhere in the New Testament. The word for "perplexity" is used by St. Luke only.

(27) The sea and the waves roaring.—The better MSS. give a different punctuation and reading, with perplexity from the roar of the sea, and of the surge, or wave. In the common reading we have another instance of agreement with St. Paul, in 1 Cor. xiii. 1, where the word is rendered "thinking"—better, echoing, or resounding. Assuming, as has been suggested above, that St. Luke's report is of the nature of a paraphrase, we may, perhaps, connect this feature in it with his own experience. To one who had known the perils of waters narrated in Acts xxvii., no picture of the more dread phenomena of nature could be complete without "the sea and the waves roaring."

(28) Men's hearts failing them for fear.—The word so rendered is used by St. Luke only in the New Testament. Its literal meaning is to breathe out the soul, and it was, therefore, a word which would naturally enter into the vocabulary of a physician, both in its primary and figurative sense. The mental state which it expresses exactly agrees with that described in Acts xxvii. 20, in connection with the tempest.

(29) Look up.—The Greek word, literally, bend up, or turn up, meets us here and in chap. xiii. 11, and nowhere else in the New Testament, except in the doubtful passage of John viii. 7, 10.

Redemption.—The word, familiar as it is to us, is, in the special form here used, another of those characteristic of St. Paul's phraseology (Rom. iii. 24; vii. 25; 1 Cor. i. 30; Ephe. i. 7, et al.). It occurs also in Heb. ix. 15, xi. 35. In its primary meaning here it points to the complete deliverance of the disciples from Jewish persecutions in Palestine that followed on the
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(29) And he spake to them a parable; Behold the fig tree, and all the trees; (30) when they now shoot forth, ye see and know of your own selves that summer is now nigh at hand. (31) So likewise ye, when ye see these things come to pass, know ye that the kingdom of God is nigh at hand. (32) Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass away, till all be fulfilled. (33) Heaven and earth shall pass away: but my words shall not pass away.

(34) And take heed to yourselves, lest at any time your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting, and drunkenness, and cares of this life, and so that day come upon you unawares. (35) For as a snare destruction of Jerusalem. The Church of Christ was then delivered from what had been its most formidable danger.

(36) And all the trees.—The addition is peculiar to St. Luke. It confirms the impression that the words, which were spoken just before the Passover, when the flush of spring-tide life was seen in every grove and forest, were suggested by what met the eye of the disciples on the Mount of Olives. (See Note on Matt. xxiv. 32.) One such tree, we know, had been found in full foliage (Matt. xxi. 19).

(37) Know ye that the kingdom of God is nigh at hand.—St. Luke's paraphrase fills up and explains what stands in St. Matthew and St. Mark more simply, "It is near, even at the doors."

(38, 39) Verily I say unto you.—Here the variation ceases for a time, and the two verses are identical with Matt. xxiv. 34, 35, and Mark xiii. 30, 31.

(40) Take heed to yourselves, lest at any time . . . —We again pass into what has nothing corresponding to it in the other reports of the discourse, and may therefore be assumed to be of the nature of a paraphrase. We note in it, as such, that, as far as the New Testament is concerned, St. Luke only uses the words for "overcharged" and "surfeiting" (the latter word belonged, more or less, to the vocabulary of medical science); St. Luke and St. Paul alone those for "drunkenness" (Rom. xiii. 13; Gal. v. 21), and cares of "this life" (1 Cor. vi. 3, 4), and "unawares" (1 Thess. v. 3). In the last passage we have what reads almost like a distinct echo from this verse. The whole passage, it may be noted, falls in with St. Luke's characteristic tendency to record all portions of our Lord's teaching that warned men against sensuality and worldliness.

(41) As a snare . . . —The word is not found in the other Gospels, but is used several times by St. Paul (Rom. xi. 9; 1 Tim. iii. 7; vi. 9; 2 Tim. ii. 26).

(42) Them that dwell . . . —Elsewhere in the New Testament, the verb is used in its literal meaning of "sitting." In the sense of "dwelling" or "residing," we find it, probably, again in Acts ii. 2.

(43) Pray always.—The word is not the same commonly used for "pray," but occurs once only in the other Gospels (Matt. ix. 38). St. Luke uses it fifteen times in the Gospel and Acts together, and St. Paul six times (2 Cor. v. 20; viii. 4; x. 2, et seq.). It is not used by any other New Testament writer.

That ye may be accounted worthy . . . —See Note on chap. xx. 35. The better MSS., however, give, "that ye may have strength to escape."

To stand before the Son of man.—The same proposition is used with special reference to the final judgment in 2 Cor. v. 10, 1 Thess. iii. 13.

(44) In the day time . . . at night.—Literally, in the days . . . the nights, the words pointing to the mode in which the week was spent from the first day to the evening of the fifth.

Abode.—The word is better translated lodged in Matt. xxi. 12. Strictly speaking, it meant to lodge, not in a room, but in the court-yard of a house; and so was used generally, in military language, for a "bivouac." It would seem to have been chosen by both Evangelists (it does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament) to include the fact, implied in all four, and definitely stated by St. John, that most of the nights were spent not in a house, but in the garden, or orchard, of Gethsemane (John xviii. 1, 2).

That is called the mount of Olives.—Better, perhaps, here, as in chap. xix. 29 (where see Note), that is called Olivet.

(45) all the people came early in the morning.—The Greek verb, which answers to the five last words, does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament, but is not uncommon in the Greek version of the Old, as in Gen. x. 2, 27; Song Sol. vii. 12; and figuratively, in Job viii. 5; Jer. xxx. 3; Wisd. vi. 14. It may be that the general statement thus given includes the fourth and fifth days of the week of the Passion, but it is remarkable that all three Gospels are silent as to anything that happened on those days till we come to the Paschal Supper. We may, perhaps, reverently conjecture that they were spent by our Lord, in part at least, in Gethsemane (John xviii. 2), in prayer and meditation, in preparing Himself and the disciples for the coming trials of the Passion. Possibly, also, the narrative of the Woman taken in Adultery, which occupies so strangely doubtful a position in St. John's Gospel, may find its true place here. (See Note on John viii. 1.)

XXII.

(1, 2) Now, the feast of unleavened bread . . . —See Notes on Matt. xxvi. 1—5; Mark xiv. 1, 2. St. Luke's way of giving a preliminary explanation of the Jews' Passover is characteristic of the Gentile Evangelist,
priests and scribes sought how they might kill him; for they feared the people.

5 Then entered Satan into Judas surnamed Iscariot, being of the number of the twelve. (And he went his way, and communed with the chief priests and captains, how he might betray him unto them. (And they were glad, and covenanted to give him money. (And he promised, and sought opportunity to betray him unto them in the absence of the multitude. 1

7 Then came the day of unleavened bread, 2 when the passover must be killed. (And he sent and said unto Peter and John, Go and prepare us the passover, that we may eat. (And they said unto him, Where wilt thou that we prepare? (And he said unto them, Behold, when ye are entered into the city, there shall a man meet you, bearing a pitcher of water; follow him into the house where he entereth in. (And ye shall say unto the man of the house, The Master saith unto thee, Where is the guest chamber, where I shall eat the passover with my disciples? (And he shall show you a large upper room furnished: there make ready. (And they went, and found as he had said unto them; and they made ready the passover. (And when the hour was come, 3 he sat down, and the twelve apostles with him. (And he said unto them, With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer: 4 for I say unto you,
I will not any more eat thereof, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God. (17) And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and said, Take this, and divide it among yourselves: (19) for I say unto you, I will not drink of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come. (18) And he took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave unto them, saying, This is my body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me. (20) Likewise also the cup after supper, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you. (21) But, behold, the hand of him that betrayeth me is with me on the table. (22) And truly the Son of man goeth, as it was determined: but woe unto that man by whom the Son of man is betrayed. For it had been better for that man not to have been born.

Note. Here the word “fulfilled” presents a new depth of meaning. The “Passover” was fulfilled in the kingdom of God: (1) in the sacrifice on the cross; (2) in every commemoration of that sacrifice by the acts which He appointed. Every such act was one of Communion, not only of the disciples with each other, but with Him, and in it He is, as it were, joining in the feast with them. Hereafter, as in the promise of Rev. iii. 20, “I will sup with him, and he with Me,” there will be a yet fuller consummation. (Comp. verse 18.)

(17) Take this, and divide it among yourselves.—The cup was probably the first of the three cups of wine, or wine mingled with water, which Jewish custom had added to the ritual of the Passover. As being a distinct act from that of verse 20, it is natural to infer that it had a distinct symbolic meaning. Looking to the fact that wine is partly the symbol, partly the antithesis, of spiritual energy in its highest form (comp. Zech. ii. 3; Acts ii. 13; Eph. v. 18), and to the re-appearance of the same somewhat exceptional word for “divide,” in the tongues “ parted, or divided,” or distributed” (”cleft ” is a mistranslation), in Acts ii. 3, we may see in this cup the symbol of the bestowal of the spiritual powers which each of the disciples was to receive, according to the gift of the self-same Spirit, who “divideth to every man severally as He will ” (the Greek word in 1 Cor. xii. 11 is, however, different, though expressing the same thought), just as the second was the pledge of a yet closer fellowship with His own divine life.

(18) I will not drink of the fruit of the vine.—Better, of the product. (See Notes on Matt. xxvi. 29; Mark xiv. 25.) Here the words precede, in the other Gospels they follow, the institution of the Lord’s Supper. It is not probable that the same words were repeated both before and after. The position which it occupies here, as standing parallel to what had before been said of the Passover, seems on the whole in favour of St. Luke’s arrangement. On the other hand, it is noticeable, whatever explanation may be given of it, that St. Matthew and St. Mark omit (in the best MSS.) the word “new” as connected with the “covenant,” and emphasise it as connected with “the fruit of the vine,” while he omits in the latter case, and emphasises it in the former. It is, perhaps, allowable to think of him as taught by St. Paul, and possibly by Apollos, to embrace more fully than they did, in all its importance, the idea of the New Covenant as set forth in Gal. iii., iv., and Heb. vii.—x.

(19, 20) He took bread, and gave thanks.—See Notes on Matt. xxvi. 26–28; Mark xiv. 22–25. The other two reports give “He blessed,” instead of “He gave thanks.” There is no real difference between them. Thanksgiving and blessing both entered into what we may call the Jewish “Grace,” and were so far convertible terms. It is noticeable that St. Paul’s account, in 1 Cor. xi. 23, agrees on this point with St. Luke’s.

Which is given for you.—Literally, which is now in the act of being given. The sacrifice was already inchoate in will. St. Paul’s report omits the participle. This do in remembrance of me.—Literally, as My memorial, or, as your memorial of Me. The words are common to St. Luke and St. Paul, but are not found in the other two reports. The word for “remembrance” occurs, in the New Testament, only here and in Heb. v. 3. In the Greek version of the Old Testament it is applied to the shew-bread (Lev. xxiv. 7), to the blowing of trumpets (Num. x. 10), in the titles of Ps. xxxviii. 1 (“to bring to remembrance,”) and Ps. lx. 1. The word had thus acquired the associations connected with a religious memorial, and might be applied to a sacrifice as commemorative, though it did not in itself involve the idea of sacrificing. The fact that our Lord and His disciples had been eating of a sacrifice which was also a memorial, gives a special force to the words thus used. In time to come, they were to remember Him as having Himself, sacrificed Himself, for them, and this was to be the memorial in which memory was to express itself, and by which it was to be quickened. It may be noted that the early Liturgies, as a rule, follow St. Luke’s report, attaching the word “memorial” sometimes to the bread, sometimes to the cup, sometimes to both.

(20) This cup is the new testament in my blood.—Better, New Covenant. The adjective is, in the best MSS., peculiar to St. Luke, as also is the “shed for you” instead of “shed for many.” The participle is in the present tense, which is being shed, like the being given, in verse 19. St. Paul and St. Luke agree in placing the giving of the cup “after they had mopped.” (See Note on Matt. xxvi. 28.)

(21–23) But, behold, the hand of him that betrayeth me . . .—See Notes on Matt. xxvi. 21, 25; Mark xiv. 18, 21; John xiii. 21, 35. St. Luke’s account is here the briefest, St. John’s by far the fullest. There is again a slight discrepancy in the order of facts, St. Luke placing the mention of the Betrayal after, St. Matthew and St. Mark before, the institution of the memorial. “St. John, who makes no mention of the institution, leaves the question open. On the whole, the order of the first two Gospels seems here the most probable, and agrees better with the fourth. The data before us do not enable us to say with certainty whether Judas partook of the memorial; but, if we follow the first two Gospels, it would seem probable that he did not.

As it was determined.—The word is eminently characteristic of St. Luke. (Comp. Acts ii. 23; x. 42; xvii. 28, 31.)

Woe unto that man . . .—As occurring in all the first three Gospels, the words must be noted as
unto that man by whom he is betrayed! (23) And they began to enquire among themselves, which of them it was that should do this thing.

(24) And there was also a strife among them, which of them should be accounted the greatest. (25) And he said unto them, the kings of the Gentiles exercise lordship over them; and they that exercise authority upon them are called benefactors. (26) But ye shall not be

among those that had made an indelible impression on those who heard them, and were therefore reproduced verbatim in the midst of many variations on other points of the narrative.

(24) And there was also a strife among them. The incident that follows is peculiar to St. Luke. The noun which he uses for "strife" does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament, but the corresponding adjective meets us in the "contentious" of 1 Cor. x. 16. The dispute was apparently the sequel of many previous debates of the same kind, as, e.g., in chap. ix. 46; Matt. viii. 1; Mark ix. 34; and the prayer of the two sons of Zebedee (Matt. xx. 23; Mark x. 37). What had just passed probably led to its revival. Who was greatest? Was it Peter, to whom had been promised the keys of the kingdom, or John, who reclined on the Master's bosom, or Andrew, who had been first-called? Even the disciples who were in the second group of the Twelve, might have cherished the hope that those who had been thus rebuked for their ambition or their want of faith had left a place vacant to which they might now hopefully aspire.

(25) The kings of the Gentiles exercise lordship over them. See Notes on Matt. xx. 25; Mark x. 42. The repetition of the same words that had then been spoken in answer to the petition of the sons of Zebedee, suggests the probability that they were again prominent in the strife for pre-eminence.

Are called benefactors. This takes the place of "their great ones exercise authority upon them," in St. Matthew and St. Mark. Antiochus VII. of Syria, and Ptolemy III. of Egypt, were examples of kings who had borne the title - as contrasted with "let him become," in the corresponding adjective of which we lose in the English. This was never so named in the New Testament.

(26) He that is greatest among you, let him be as the younger. —The latter word naturally "carried with it, as in the old monastic rule, juniores ad labores, the idea of service. In Acts v. 6, "the young men" appear as a distinct body in the society of disciples, with functions like those of the later deacons or sextons; and the same sense is, perhaps, traceable in 1 Tim. v. 1; Tit. ii. 6; 1 Pet. v. 5.

He that is chief. —Here again the Greek word came to have a half-technical sense as equivalent, or nearly so, to bishop or presbyter. So in Heb. xii. 7, 17, 24, where it is rendered "they that have the rule over you."

He that doth serve. —The verb is the same as that from which the word "deacon" is derived, and, with Matt. xxiii. 11, Mark x. 46, probably suggested the ecclesiastical use of the word. It is noticeable that the first recorded example of that use is in the salutation to "the bishops and deacons" of Philip (Phil. i. 1), the Church which more than any other was under St. Luke's influence. The "seven" of Acts vi. 3, 5, of whom we commonly speak as the first deacons, are never so named in the New Testament.

(27) Ye are they which have continued with me in my temptations. (28) And I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed me; (29) that ye may eat and drink at my table. The True Law of Greatness.

So: but he that is greatest among you, let him be as the younger; and he that is chief, as he that doth serve. (27) For whether is greater, he that sitteth at meat, or he that serveth? is not he that sitteth at meat? but I am among you as he that serveth. (28) Ye are they which have continued with me in my temptations. (29) And I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed me; (30) that ye may eat and drink at my table. —The promise is the same as that implied in what had been already said in verse 16.

And sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel. —See Note on Matt. xix. 28. The repetition of the promise at the moment when apparent failure was close at hand, is significant as carrying the words into a higher region of symbolic meaning. Not on any thrones of earth were those disciples to sit, any more than the Master was to sit
The Prayer of Christ for Peter.

ST. LUKE, XXII.
The Two Swords.

and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel.

(33) And the Lord said, Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat: (32) but I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not: and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren. (33) And he said unto him, Lord, I am ready to go with thee, both into prison, and to death. (34) And he said, I tell thee, Peter, the cock shall not crow this day, before that thou shalt thrice deny that thou knowest me. (35) And he said unto them, (34) When I sent you without purse, and scrip, and shoes, lacked ye any thing? And they said, Nothing.

(36) Then said he unto them, But now, he that hath a purse, let him take it, and likewise his scrip: and he that hath no sword, let him sell his garment, and buy one. (37) For I say unto you, that this is written must yet be accomplished in me, and He was reckoned among the transgressors: (36) for the things concerning me have an end.

(38) And they said, Lord, behold, here are two swords. And he said unto them, It is enough.

(33) And the Lord said, Simon, Simon.—The first three Gospels agree in placing the warning to Peter after the institution of the Lord's Supper. The two-fold utterance of the name, as in the case of Martha (chap. x. 41), is significant of the emphasis of sadness.

Satan hath desired to have you.—Both this word, and the "I have prayed," are in the Greek tense which indicates an act thought of as belonging entirely to the past. The Lord speaks as though He had taken part in some scene like that in which the opening of Job (i. 6—12; ii. 1—6), or that which had come in vision before the prophet Zechariah (iii. 1—5), and had prevailed by His intercession against the Tempter and Accuser.

That he may sift you as wheat.—The word and the figure are peculiar to St. Luke's record. The main idea is, however, the same as that of the winnowing fan in Matt. iii. 11; the word for "sift" implying a like process working on a smaller scale. The word for "you" is plural. The fiery trial by which the wheat was to be separated from the chaff was to embrace the whole company of the disciples as a body. There is a latent encouragement in the very word chosen. They would have seemed to counsel the prudence showing that the weapons of their warfare were not carnal (2 Cor. x. 4). What follows supplies a probable explanation. The Master knew that two of the disciples (Peter and another) had brought swords with them, and with that acceptance of the thoughts of others which we have so often traced, He sadly, as it were, with the gentle sympathy with which a man feels afterwards that the weapons of his war were not meant to use it in His defence. It is not likely that He would teach them to use it in their own, as they preached the gospel of the Kingdom. True teachers felt afterwards that the weapons of their warfare were not carnal (2 Cor. x. 4). What follows supplies a probable explanation. The Master knew that two of the disciples (Peter and another) had brought swords with them, and with that acceptance of the thoughts of others which we have so often traced, He sadly, and yet, as it were, with the gentle sympathy with which a man speaks to those who are children in age or character, conveyed His warnings in the form which met their fears and hopes. If they meant to trust in swords, a time was coming when they would sorely need them.

(37) He that hath a purse, let him take it.—The word for "purse" is the same as in chap. x. 4, where see Note. On "scrip." See Note on Matt. x. 10. If the words had stopped short of the "sword," we could have received their literal meaning without difficulty. They would have seemed to counsel the prudence which provides for want, instead of a simple trust, as before, in the providence of God, and so would have sanctioned all equitable forms of Church organisation and endowment. The mention of the "sword," however, introduces a new element of thought. Our Lord's words to Peter (Matt. xxvi. 52) show that the disciples were not meant to use it in His defence. It is not likely that He would teach them to use it in their own, as they preached the gospel of the Kingdom. True teachers felt afterwards that the weapons of their warfare were not carnal (2 Cor. x. 4). What follows supplies a probable explanation. The Master knew that two of the disciples (Peter and another) had brought swords with them, and with that acceptance of the thoughts of others which we have so often traced, He sadly, and yet, as it were, with the gentle sympathy with which a man speaks to those who are children in age or character, conveyed His warnings in the form which met their fears and hopes. If they meant to trust in swords, a time was coming when they would sorely need them.

(35) When I sent you without purse, and scrip.—The words refer specially to the command given to the disciples in chap. x. 4; Matt. x. 9, 10. The whole incident is peculiar to St. Luke. The appeal to their past experience is interesting as showing that on their first mission they were welcomed by those who heard them, and received food and shelter that met all their wants.

(38) He that hath a purse, let him take it.—The word for "purse" is the same as in chap. x. 4, where see Note. On "scrip," see Note on Matt. x. 10. If the words had stopped short of the "sword," we could have received their literal meaning without difficulty. They would have seemed to counsel the prudence which provides for want, instead of a simple trust, as before, in the providence of God, and so would have sanctioned all equitable forms of Church organisation and endowment. The mention of the "sword," however, introduces a new element of thought. Our Lord's words to Peter (Matt. xxvi. 52) show that the disciples were not meant to use it in His defence. It is not likely that He would teach them to use it in their own, as they preached the gospel of the Kingdom. True teachers felt afterwards that the weapons of their warfare were not carnal (2 Cor. x. 4). What follows supplies a probable explanation. The Master knew that two of the disciples (Peter and another) had brought swords with them, and with that acceptance of the thoughts of others which we have so often traced, He sadly, and yet, as it were, with the gentle sympathy with which a man speaks to those who are children in age or character, conveyed His warnings in the form which met their fears and hopes. If they meant to trust in swords, a time was coming when they would sorely need them.

(37) And he was reckoned among the transgressors.—Literally, the lawless ones, or, breakers of the law. The distinct reference to the words of Isa. lii. 12 is remarkable as showing that the picture of the righteous sufferer in that chapter had all along been present, if we may so speak, to our Lord's thoughts as that which He Himself had to realise. It was, as it were, a hint given to the disciples before the Passion, that they might learn, when it came, that it was part of the divine purpose that the Christ should so suffer; not singled out for the honour of a martyr's death, but hurried as a malefactor, with other malefactors, to the death of the rebel or the robber.

(38) Behold, here are two swords.—Peter, we find, had one (John xviii. 19); we can only conjecture who had the other. Possibly, Andrew; possibly, one of the sons of thunder."
And he came out, and went, as he was wont, to the mount of Olives; and his disciples also followed him. (40) And when he was at the place, he said unto them, Pray that ye enter not into temptation. (41) And he was withdrawn from them about a stone's cast, and kneeled down, and prayed, saying, Father, if thou be willing, remove this cup from me: nevertheless not my will, but thine, be done. (45) And there appeared an angel unto him from heaven, strengthening him. (46) And being in an agony he prayed more earnestly: and his sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground. (45) And when he arose from prayer, and was come to his disciples, he found them sleeping for sorrow, and said unto them, Why to endure even to the end. And that strength would show itself to others, to disciples who watched Him afar off, in a new expression and look, flashes of victorious strength and joy alternating with throb and spasms of anguish. Whence could that strength come but from the messengers of His Father, in Whose presence, and in communion with Whom He habitually lived (Matt. iv. 11; John i. 51). The ministrations which had been with Him in His first temptation were now with Him in the last (Matt. iv. 11). As to (1) we may think of one of the disciples who were present having reported to the "devout women," from whom St. Luke doubtfully, as we have seen, derived so much of the materials for his Gospel (see Introduction), that he had thus seen what seemed to him to admit of no other explanation.

About a stone's cast.—The descriptive touch, implying a report coming directly or indirectly from an eye-witness, is peculiar to St. Luke. (46) Kneeled down, and prayed. — Literally, and was praying. The tense of the latter verb implies continuous and sustained prayer. (45) Not my will, but thine, be done. — See Notes on Matt. xxvi. 39. Here there is a more distinct echo of the prayer which He had taught His disciples, He, too, could say, "Lead us not into temptation," but that prayer was subject, now explicitly, as at all times implicitly, to the antecedent condition that it was in harmony with "Thy will." (45) There appeared an angel unto him from heaven. — This and the following verses are omitted by not a few of the best MSS., but the balance of evidence is, on the whole, in their favour. Assuming their truth as part of the Gospel, we ask,— (1) How came the fact to be known to St. Luke, when St. Matthew and St. Mark had made no mention of it? and (2) What is the precise nature of the fact narrated? As regards (2), it may be noted that the angel is said to have "appeared to him," to our Lord only, and not to the disciples. He was conscious of a new strength,

It is enough. — Here again there is a touch of grave irony. The "two swords" were enough, and more than enough, for Him who did not need them to use the swords at all. The word for "enough" may be noted as used far more often by St. Luke than in the other Gospels. The mystical interpretation which sees in the two swords the symbol of the spiritual and temporal authority committed to St. Peter, and to the Pope as his successor, stands on a level with that which finds the relations of the Church and the State foreshadowed in the "two great lights" of Christ and St. Peter. Both are matters of the dreams of a diseased fancy, and find their fit home at last in the limbo of vanities.

Both are simply the dreams of a diseased fancy, and to the "devout women," from whom St. Luke probably, as we have seen, derived so much of the materials for his Gospel (see Introduction), that he had thus seen what seemed to him to admit of no other explanation.

And being in an agony. — The Greek noun primarily describes a "conflict" or "struggle," rather than mere physical pain. The phenomenon described is obviously one which would have a special interest for one of St. Luke's calling, and the four words which he uses for "agony," "drops," "sweat," "more earnestly" (literally, more intensely), though not exclusively technical, are yet such as a medical writer would naturally use. They do not occur elsewhere in the New Testament. The form of the expression, "as it were, great drops (better, clots) of blood," leaves us uncertain, as the same Greek word does in "descending like a dove," in Matt. iii. 16, whether it applies to manner or to visible appearance. On the latter, and generally received view, the phenomenon is not unparalleled, both in ancient and modern times. (Comp. the very term, "bloody sweat," noted as a symptom of extreme exhaustion in Aristotle, Hist. Anim. iii. 19, and Medical Gazette for December, 1848, quoted by Alford.) If we ask who were St. Luke's informants, we may think either, as before, of one of the disciples, or, possibly, one of the women from whom, as above, he manifestly derived so much that he records. That "bloody sweat" must have left its traces upon the tunic that our Lord wore, and when the soldiers cast lots for it (Matt. xxvii. 35; John xix. 24), Mary Magdalene, who stood by the cross, may possibly have noticed the fact (John xix. 25), nor could it well have escaped the notice of Nico­demus and Joseph when they embalmed the body (John xix. 40). The words agree with the previous statement in chap. xxi. 37, and with John xviii. 2. Here, as in the parallel passage of Matt. xxvi. 39 (where see Note), we have to insert the discourses of John xiv.—xvi., 51. The ministrations which had been with Him in His first temptation were now with Him in the last (Matt. iv. 11). As to (1) we may think of one of the disciples who were present having reported to the "devout women," from whom St. Luke doubtfully, as we have seen, derived so much of the materials for his Gospel (see Introduction), that he had thus seen what seemed to him to admit of no other explanation.

And being in an agony. — The Greek noun primarily describes a "conflict" or "struggle," rather than mere physical pain. The phenomenon described is obviously one which would have a special interest for one of St. Luke's calling, and the four words which he uses for "agony," "drops," "sweat," "more earnestly" (literally, more intensely), though not exclusively technical, are yet such as a medical writer would naturally use. They do not occur elsewhere in the New Testament. The form of the expression, "as it were, great drops (better, clots) of blood," leaves us uncertain, as the same Greek word does in "descending like a dove," in Matt. iii. 16, whether it applies to manner or to visible appearance. On the latter, and generally received view, the phenomenon is not unparalleled, both in ancient and modern times. (Comp. the very term, "bloody sweat," noted as a symptom of extreme exhaustion in Aristotle, Hist. Anim. iii. 19, and Medical Gazette for December, 1848, quoted by Alford.) If we ask who were St. Luke's informants, we may think either, as before, of one of the disciples, or, possibly, one of the women from whom, as above, he manifestly derived so much that he records. That "bloody sweat" must have left its traces upon the tunic that our Lord wore, and when the soldiers cast lots for it (Matt. xxvii. 35; John xix. 24), Mary Magdalene, who stood by the cross, may possibly have noticed the fact (John xix. 25), nor could it well have escaped the notice of Nicodemus and Joseph when they embalmed the body (John xix. 40).
The Kiss of Judas.

ST. LUKE, XXII. Peter’s Three-fold Denial.

sleep ye? rise and pray, lest ye enter into temptation.

(47) And while he yet spake, behold a multitude, and he that was called Judas, one of the twelve, went before them, and drew near unto Jesus to kiss him. (48) But Jesus said unto him, Judas, betrayest thou the Son of man with a kiss? (49) When they which were about him saw what would follow, they said unto him, Lord, shall we smite with the sword?

(50) And one of them smote the servant of the high priest, and cut off his right ear. (51) And Jesus answered and said, Suffer ye thus far. And he touched his ear, and healed him. (52) Then Jesus said unto the chief priests, and captains of the temple, and the elders, which were come to him, Be ye come out, as against a thief, with swords and staves?

(53) When I was daily with you in the temple, ye stretched forth no hands against me: but this is your hour, and the power of darkness.

(54) Then took they him, and led him, and brought him into the high priest’s house. And Peter followed afar off. (55) And when they had kindled a fire in the midst of the hall, and were set down together, Peter sat down among them. (56) But a certain maid beheld him as he sat by the fire, and earnestly looked upon him, and said, This man was also with him. (57) And he denied him, saying, Woman, I know him not. (58) And after a little while another saw him, and said, Thou art also of them. And Peter said, Man, I am not. (59) And about the space of one hour after another confidently affirmed, saying, Of a truth this fellow also was with him: for he is a Galilean. (60) And Peter said, Man, I know not what thou

---

(47-49) And while he yet spake.—See Notes on Matt. xxvi. 47—50. Mark xiv. 45—46.

Went before them.—The tense implies, not that Judas then left those with whom he had walked before, but that he was seen walking, as he had been all along, in advance of the others. He was “guide to them that took Jesus” (Acts i. 16).

(46) Judas, betrayest thou the Son of man?—The first three Gospels all record the Traitor’s kiss. St. Luke alone reports the question. In our Lord’s use of the words, “the Son of Man,” we may trace a two-fold purpose. It was the old familiar title by which He had been wont to speak of Himself in connection with the disciples, and it appealed to memory and conscience. It was the name which was specially connected with His office as Judge and King (Dan. vii. 13), and so it came as a warning of the terrible retribution which the Traitor was preparing for himself.

(48) Whom they which were about him.—The phrase is apparently chosen as more accurate than “the disciples” would have been. Those who spoke were probably the three that had been nearest to Him, and possibly one or two others who had rushed forward.

(50—55) And one of them.—See Notes on Matt. xxvii. 52—56; Mark xiv. 47—49. It will be remembered that all the four Gospels relate the incident, but that St. John alone gives the name of the disciple. It is possibly characteristic of St. Luke’s technical accuracy that he uses the diminutive form of “ear,” as if part only were cut off. In Deut. xv. 17 it seems to be applied specially to the fleshy lobe of the ear.

(51) Suffer ye thus far.—The words and the incident are peculiar to St. Luke. We are not told to whom the words were spoken. If to the disciples, they were a command to be patient, and to let things take their course. If, as is possible, to the servants and officers, they were a plea for His disciples—“Do not visit them with punishment for this one act.” The immediate healing of the ear is in favour of the latter view, as tending to conciliation.

(52) Then Jesus said unto the chief priests.—St. Luke stands alone in recording the presence of the men of higher rank with the officers and multitude. On the “captains of the Temple,” see Note on verse 4.

As against a thief, with swords and staves.—Better, as against a robber, and with swords and clubs. (See Note on Matt. xxvi. 55.)

(53) This is your hour, and the power of darkness.—The words are peculiar to St. Luke in this connection, but they present a point of coincidence, (1) as regards the phrase, with St. Paul (Col. i. 13); and (2) as regards the thought, with St. John (xiv. 30). In identifying the power that worked through human instruments against Him with darkness, our Lord virtually claims to be Himself the Light (John viii. 12).

(54—59) Then took they him.—See Notes on Matt. xvi. 57, 53, 69—75; Mark xiv. 53—72. Peter’s following “afar off” may be noted as a feature common to the first three Gospels.

(60) When they had kindled a fire.—The fire is mentioned by St. Luke in common with St. Mark and St. John.

Of the hall.—Better, of the court-yard—“hall” with us conveying the idea of a covered space inside the house.

(56) As he sat by the fire.—Literally, by the light, or blaze, as in Mark xiv. 54.

Earnestly looked upon him.—The verb and adverb are both expressed by St. Luke’s characteristic word. (See Note on chap. iv. 20.)

This man was also with him.—Minute as the coincidence is, it is interesting to note that it is through St. John’s narrative that we get the explanation of the “also.” St. John had been already seen and known as a disciple of Jesus (John xviii. 15).

(60) Man.—The noun so used in the vocative always implies a certain touch of anger or impatience. (See Note on chap. xii. 14.)

(69) About the space of one hour after.—Literally, about one hour having intervened, the verb so rendered being peculiar to St. Luke in the New Testament (chap. xxiv. 51; Acts xxvii. 28).
Confidently affirmed.—This word also is peculiar to St. Luke (Acts xii. 15). (65) And the Lord turned, and looked upon Peter.—The glance which was thus the turning point of Peter’s life, is mentioned only by St. Luke. As he was sitting in the porch, our Lord must have looked on the disciple as He was being led from Annas to the more public trial before the Sanhedrin. The form in which the fact is narrated, “the Lord turned,” points, probably, as in other instances, to its having been gathered by St. Luke from his informants at a time when that mode of naming Him had become habitual; and possibly in answer to inquiries, natural in one who sought to analyse the motives that led to action, as to what had brought about the change that led Peter, as in a moment, from the curses of denial to the tears of penitence. (65-73) And the men that held Jesus . . .—See Notes on Matt. xxvi. 59—68; Mark xiv. 55—65. The verbs “mocked” and “smote” are both in the tense that implies continued action. (66) Prophecy, who is it that smote thee?—On the popular view of the lower form of Judaism that identified prophecy with clairvoyance, see Note. on Matt. xxvi. 68. (66-71) And as soon as it was day.—See Notes on Matt. xxvii. 11—14; Mark xv. 2—5. The special mention of the hour, though agreeing with what is implied in the other Gospels, is peculiar to St. Luke. The elders of the people.—Literally, the presbytery of the people. St. Luke uses here, and in Acts xxii. 5, the collective singular noun, instead of the masculine plural. St. Paul uses it of the assembly of the elders of the Church, in 1 Tim. iv. 14. (67) Art thou the Christ?—St. Luke passes over the earlier stages of the trial, the false-witnesses that did not agree, the charge of threatening to destroy the Temple, and the silence of Jesus until solemnly adjured. If I tell you, ye will not believe.—The answer is reported only by St. Luke. It is interpreted by what we find in St. John. Our Lord had told them (John viii. 58; x. 30), and they had not believed. (68) Ye will not answer me, nor let me go.—The last clause is omitted by the best MSS. The first clearly refers to the question which He had so recently put to priests and scribes, whether the Christ was the son of David only, or also the Lord of David; and which they had been unable to answer (Matt. xxii. 41—46). The words were accordingly an indirect protest against their claim to question Him, when they had proved themselves impotent to solve a primary problem as to the being and character of the Messiah. (69) Hereafter shall the Son of man sit.—Literally, From this time forth shall the Son of Man be sitting. In St. Luke’s shorter record the immediate sequence of this confession upon an apparent refusal to answer seems hardly consistent. The narrative of St. Matthew shows that the change of purpose or of action was caused by the solemn adjuration of the high priest, which no longer left Him the alternative of silence. The form of the answer, too, is somewhat altered. Not “ye shall see,” but simply “shall be sitting,” as though the dominant thought in St. Luke’s mind in reporting the words was that even in the agony and death that were so soon to come on Him, our Lord found Himself glorified (John xii. 23). The Cross was His Throne, and while hanging on it, He was in spirit sitting at the right hand of the Father. (70) Ye say that I am.—The question, as asked by the whole company of priests and elders, is given only by St. Luke. It apparently followed, as a spontaneous cry of indignant horror, on the answer which had been made to the adjuration of the high priest. The answer is complete in itself; but it implies, as in the less ambiguous forms in St. Matthew and St. Mark, the confession that He actually was what they had asked Him. The “I am” has something of the same significance as in John vii. 24, 25; viii. 58 (where see Notes). XXIII.

(1—5) And the whole multitude of them arose.—See Notes on Matt. xxvii. 11—14; Mark xv. 2—5. (2) Perverting the nation, and forbidding to give tribute . . .—St. Luke’s report of the accusation is more definite than that in the other Gospels. The question asked in chap. xx. 20—26, was obviously intended to lead up to this; and though then baffled by our Lord’s answer, the priests now brought, backed by false witnesses, the charge for which they had hoped to find evidence in His own words. It seems probable
that he himself is Christ a King. And Pilate asked him, saying, Art thou the King of the Jews? And he answered him and said, Thou sayest it. Then said Pilate to the chief priests and to the people, I find no fault in this man. And they were the more fierce, saying, He stirreth up the people, teaching throughout all Jewry, beginning from Galilee to this place. When Pilate heard of Galilee, he asked whether the man were a Galilean. And as soon as he knew that he belonged unto Herod's jurisdiction, he sent him to Herod, who himself also was at Jerusalem at that time.

He was desirous to see him of a long season.—The vague feeling of wonder had begun soon after the death of the Baptist. It had its beginning in hearing of wonders; it ended in a desire to see one. It was mingled, possibly, with a feeling of bitter enmity which no miracle could remove. (See Note on chap. xii. 31.)

He answered him nothing.—We can hardly help asking ourselves what were likely to have been among Herod's questions. Did the Prisoner who stood before him really claim to be a King? Did He proclaim Himself as the Christ? Was He John the Baptist, risen from the dead? If not, who and what were his earthly parents? The unbroken silence of the Accused must have been strangely impressive at the time, and is singularly suggestive when we remember how He had answered Caiaphas when He had been adjured in the name of the living God. He had spoken to Pilate in the tones of a sad gentleness. He had spoken to Pilate in the tones of a sad gentleness.

Teaching throughout all Jewry.—This is one of the few passages in which the old English equivalent for Judaea retains its place in the Authorised version (Dan. v. 13); in the Prayer Book version of the Psalms, from the Great Bible (see Introduction), we find it in Ps. xxi. 1. Traces of the general use of the word remain in Shakespeare's way of speaking of "a prodigy of Jewry," and in the Old Jewry as the name of the Jews' quarter in ancient London. The charge of "beginning from Galilee" probably rested upon the crowds that had followed Him on His last journey to Jerusalem.

When Pilate heard of Galilee.—The incident that follows is peculiar to St. Luke, and may have been obtained by him from Manaen or other persons connected with the Herodian household with whom he appears to have come in contact. (See Introduction.) It is obvious that Pilate catches at the word in the hope of shifting on another the responsibility of condemning One whom he believed to be innocent and had learnt to respect, while yet he had not the courage to acquit Him.

Unto Herod's jurisdiction.—The word is the same as that commonly translated "authority," but the English exactly expresses its meaning here.

Who himself also was at Jerusalem.—It was, of course, no strange thing that the Tetrarch of Galilee, professing Judaism, should come up to keep the Passover in the Holy City. And it is clear that he kept a kind of court there, had his so-called Herodian Rabbis with him (see Notes on Mark iii. 6, xii. 13), and was attended by his troops (verse 11). Up to this time he had remained in silent seclusion, and no visits of courtesy had been exchanged between him and Pilate.

And when Herod saw Jesus, he was exceeding glad: for he was desirous to see him of a long season, because he had heard many things of him; and he hoped to have seen some miracle done by him. Then he questioned with him in many words; but he answered him nothing. And the chief priests and scribes stood and vehemently accused him. (1) And Herod with his men of war set him at nought, and mocked him, and arrayed him in a gorgeous robe.
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Gorgeous robe, and sent him again to Pilate.

(12) And the same day Pilate and Herod were made friends together: for before they were at enmity between themselves.

(13) And Pilate, when he had called together the chief priests and the rulers and the people, said unto them, Ye have brought this man unto me, as one that perverteth the people: and, behold, I, having examined him before you, have found no fault in this man touching those things whereof ye accuse him: (15) no, nor yet Herod: for I sent you to him; and, lo, nothing worthy of death is done unto him.

(16) I will therefore chastise him, and release him. (17) (For of necessity he must release one unto them at the feast.) (18) And they cried out all at once, saying, Away with this man, and release unto us Barabbas: (19) (who for a certain sedition made in the city, had once spoken of those who were "gorgeously appareled." (See Notes on Matt. xi. 8; Luke vii. 25.)

(19) Before they were at enmity between themselves.—The special cause of enmity is not known. Possibly the massacre of the Galileans, mentioned in chap. xiii. 1, may have had somewhat to do with it. The union of the two in their enmity against Jesus, though not mentioned in the Gospels, is referred to in the first recorded hymn of the Church of Christ (Acts iv. 27). Herod, however, it will be noted, passes no formal sentence. He is satisfied with Pilate's mark of respect for his jurisdiction.

(13–23) And Pilate, when he had called together . . . —See Notes on Matt. xxvii. 15–23; Mark xv. 6–14. The first summons to the members of the Council, and the reference to Herod's examination of the Prisoner are, as the sequel of the previous incident, peculiar to St. Luke.

(14) I sent you to him.—The better MSS. give, "he sent him back to us." Nothing worthy of death is done unto him.

—Better, is done by Him. The translators appear to have mistaken the construction, and to have taken the words as meaning "nothing worthy of death has been done to—i.e., against—Herod." The error is common to all the English versions.

(15) I will therefore chastise him.—The primary meaning of the word was to correct as children are corrected, thence to use the rod, as in Prov. xix. 18; xxix. 17. As used here it implied the Roman punishment of scourging. Pilate was here, as throughout, halting between two opinions, convinced of the innocence of the Accused, yet afraid to oppose the people. Would it not be enough, he thought, that they should see him treated as guilty of a minor offence? Would they not accept His release as part of the ceremonial of the day?

(17) For of necessity he must release one unto them.—Literally, he had a necessity. The better MSS. are singularly divided as to this verse. Most omit it altogether. One, followed by some of the versions, has it after verse 19. It would seem probable from these facts that the narrative was originally written without it, that it was then felt that the release of Barabbas required an explanation, and that a note was first added in the margin, either by a transcriber or by the writer himself in a duplicate copy, and then found its way into the text. The precise form of the phrase, to "have a necessity," is not found in the other Gospels, but is common to St. Luke (xi. 18 and here), and St. Paul (1 Cor. vii. 37). It is found also in Heb. vii. 27; Jude verse 3. On the practice thus described, see Note on Matt. xxvii. 15.

(20) Who for a certain sedition.—St. Luke's and St. Mark's accounts agree more closely than the others. St. John alone speaks of Barabbas as a "robber;" St. Matthew merely calls him a "notable prisoner."

(23) They were instant.—Literally, they pressed upon Him. As the adjective is almost passing into the list of obsolete words, it may be well to remind the reader that it has the force of "urgent." So we have "instant in prayer" (Rom. xii. 12), "be instant in season, out of season" (2 Tim. iv. 2).

(25) And of the chief priests.—The words are omitted in many of the best MSS.

(28) And Pilate gave sentence.—See Notes on Matt. xxvii. 24–30; Mark xv. 15–19. St. Luke's account is here the briefest of the four, St. John's by far the fullest. Here we read nothing of the outrages of Pilate's troops, the purple robe, and the crown of thorns. The omissions are significant, in conjunction with that which is peculiar to him, as pointing to the sources of his information. Those who were present at Herod's court were not likely to know fully what was passing in the Praetorium.

(29) Whom they had desired.—Better, whom they were asking for. The tense is imperfect, not pluperfect, and implies that the cries were still continuing.

(27) A great company of people, and of women.—Here, again, we come across a characteristic
company of people, and of women, which also bewailed and lamented him. (28) But Jesus turning unto them said, Daughters of Jerusalem, weep not for me, but weep for yourselves, and for your children. (29) For, behold, the days are coming, in the which they shall say, Blessed are the barren, and the wombs that never bare, and the paps which never gave suck. (30) Then shall they begin to say to the mountains, Fall on us; and to the hills, Cover us. (31) For if they do these things in a green tree, what shall be done in the dry? (32) And there were also two other malefactors, led with him to be put to death. (33) And when they were come to the place, which is called Calvary, there they crucified him, and the malefactors, one on the right hand, and the other on the left. (34) Then said Jesus, Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do. And they parted his raiment, and cast lots. (35) And the people stood beholding. And the rulers also with them derided him, saying, He saved others; let him save himself, if he be Christ,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST. LUKE, XXIII.</th>
<th>The Title on the Cross.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the chosen of God.</td>
<td>(39) And the soldiers also mocked him, coming to him, and offering him vinegar, (53) and saying, if thou be the king of the Jews, save thyself. (38) And a superscription also was written over him in letters of Greek, and Latin, and Hebrew, THIS IS THE KING OF THE JEWS. (39) And one of the malefactors which were hanged railed on him, saying, if thou be Christ, save thyself and us.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(49) But the other answering rebuked him, saying, Dost not thou fear God, seeing thou art in the same condemnation? (41) And we indeed justly; for we receive the due reward of our deeds: but this man hath done nothing amiss. (42) And he said unto Jesus, Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom. (43) And Jesus said unto him, Verily I say unto thee, To day shalt thou be with me in paradise.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| (54) This man hath done nothing amiss. — The confident assertion may have rested on previous knowledge of our Lord's life and character, or on some report that had reached him on his way to Golgotha, or on Pilate's confession that he found no fault in him. (42) Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom. — More accurately, in Thy kingdom. There is something singularly touching in the trust implied in the form of the appeal. He asks for no special boon, no place on the right hand or on the left; no room in the King's palace. He is content not to be forgotten, certain that if the King remember him at all, it will be with thoughts of tenderness and pity. |

| (53) Offering him vinegar. — Not even the prayer for their forgiveness had touched the hearts of the soldiers. But still, they knew not what they did, and did but follow, after their nature, in the path in which others led the way. Possibly too, rude as their natures were, there was a touch of rough kindliness mingling in their mockery, as shown in the offer of the vinegar, or sour wine, which they had brought for their own use (see Note on Matt. xxvii. 45). — unless, indeed, we suppose the refinement of cruelty which held it before the eyes left; no room in the King's palace. He is content not to be forgotten, certain that if the King remember him at all, it will be with thoughts of tenderness and pity. |

| (38) And a superscription. — See Note on Matt. xxvii. 38. |

| (39) And one of the malefactors. — The incident that follows is singularly characteristic of St. Luke. If we ask how he came to know what the other Gospels pass over, we may, I think, find his probable informant once more in the devout women who followed Jesus to the place of Crucifixion, and who stood near enough to the cross to hear what was then spoken. The word for “hanged” is used by St. Luke (Acts v. 30, x. 39) and St. Paul (Gal. iii. 13) as applied to crucifixion. |

| (40) But the other answering rebuked him. — On the legends connected with the penitent thief, see Notes on Matt. xxvii. 44. Dysmas, or Titus, as they name him, had once before looked on the face of the Christ. He had been one of a band of robbers that attacked the holy travellers in their flight from Bethlehem, and had then pleaded for their lives. The Virgin Mother had blessed him. The child Christ had foretold his suffering and his repentance. Now, as he gazed on the face of the divine Sufferer, he recognised the features of the infant Jesus (Gosp. of Infancy, viii. 1—8; Gosp. of Nicodemus, ii. 10). Confining ourselves to what St. Luke records, we may think of him as impressed by the holiness and patience of Him he looked on. What such a One claimed to be, that He must have a right to claim, and so the very words uttered in mockery, “Christ, the King of Israel,” became an element in his conversion. This, of course, implies that he cherished Messianic hopes of some kind, if only of the vague nature then common among his people. Yet deeper in the ground-work of his character there must have been the fear of God, the reverence and awe rising out of a sense of sin, the absence of which he noted in his companion. He accepted his punishment as just, and in so doing made it reformatory and not simply penal. |

| (41) Offering him vinegar. — Not even the prayer for their forgiveness had touched the hearts of the soldiers. But still, they knew not what they did, and did but follow, after their nature, in the path in which others led the way. Possibly too, rude as their natures were, there was a touch of rough kindliness mingling in their mockery, as shown in the offer of the vinegar, or sour wine, which they had brought for their own use (see Note on Matt. xxvii. 45). — unless, indeed, we suppose the refinement of cruelty which held it before the eyes left; no room in the King's palace. He is content not to be forgotten, certain that if the King remember him at all, it will be with thoughts of tenderness and pity. |

| (37) Offering him vinegar. — Not even the prayer for their forgiveness had touched the hearts of the soldiers. But still, they knew not what they did, and did but follow, after their nature, in the path in which others led the way. Possibly too, rude as their natures were, there was a touch of rough kindliness mingling in their mockery, as shown in the offer of the vinegar, or sour wine, which they had brought for their own use (see Note on Matt. xxvii. 45). — unless, indeed, we suppose the refinement of cruelty which held it before the eyes left; no room in the King's palace. He is content not to be forgotten, certain that if the King remember him at all, it will be with thoughts of tenderness and pity. |

| (36) Offering him vinegar. — Not even the prayer for their forgiveness had touched the hearts of the soldiers. But still, they knew not what they did, and did but follow, after their nature, in the path in which others led the way. Possibly too, rude as their natures were, there was a touch of rough kindliness mingling in their mockery, as shown in the offer of the vinegar, or sour wine, which they had brought for their own use (see Note on Matt. xxvii. 45). — unless, indeed, we suppose the refinement of cruelty which held it before the eyes left; no room in the King's palace. He is content not to be forgotten, certain that if the King remember him at all, it will be with thoughts of tenderness and pity. |

| (35) Offering him vinegar. — Not even the prayer for their forgiveness had touched the hearts of the soldiers. But still, they knew not what they did, and did but follow, after their nature, in the path in which others led the way. Possibly too, rude as their natures were, there was a touch of rough kindliness mingling in their mockery, as shown in the offer of the vinegar, or sour wine, which they had brought for their own use (see Note on Matt. xxvii. 45). — unless, indeed, we suppose the refinement of cruelty which held it before the eyes left; no room in the King's palace. He is content not to be forgotten, certain that if the King remember him at all, it will be with thoughts of tenderness and pity. |

| (34) Offering him vinegar. — Not even the prayer for their forgiveness had touched the hearts of the soldiers. But still, they knew not what they did, and did but follow, after their nature, in the path in which others led the way. Possibly too, rude as their natures were, there was a touch of rough kindliness mingling in their mockery, as shown in the offer of the vinegar, or sour wine, which they had brought for their own use (see Note on Matt. xxvii. 45). — unless, indeed, we suppose the refinement of cruelty which held it before the eyes left; no room in the King's palace. He is content not to be forgotten, certain that if the King remember him at all, it will be with thoughts of tenderness and pity. |

| (33) Offering him vinegar. — Not even the prayer for their forgiveness had touched the hearts of the soldiers. But still, they knew not what they did, and did but follow, after their nature, in the path in which others led the way. Possibly too, rude as their natures were, there was a touch of rough kindliness mingling in their mockery, as shown in the offer of the vinegar, or sour wine, which they had brought for their own use (see Note on Matt. xxvii. 45). — unless, indeed, we suppose the refinement of cruelty which held it before the eyes left; no room in the King's palace. He is content not to be forgotten, certain that if the King remember him at all, it will be with thoughts of tenderness and pity. |

| (32) Offering him vinegar. — Not even the prayer for their forgiveness had touched the hearts of the soldiers. But still, they knew not what they did, and did but follow, after their nature, in the path in which others led the way. Possibly too, rude as their natures were, there was a touch of rough kindliness mingling in their mockery, as shown in the offer of the vinegar, or sour wine, which they had brought for their own use (see Note on Matt. xxvii. 45). — unless, indeed, we suppose the refinement of cruelty which held it before the eyes left; no room in the King's palace. He is content not to be forgotten, certain that if the King remember him at all, it will be with thoughts of tenderness and pity. |

| (31) Offering him vinegar. — Not even the prayer for their forgiveness had touched the hearts of the soldiers. But still, they knew not what they did, and did but follow, after their nature, in the path in which others led the way. Possibly too, rude as their natures were, there was a touch of rough kindliness mingling in their mockery, as shown in the offer of the vinegar, or sour wine, which they had brought for their own use (see Note on Matt. xxvii. 45). — unless, indeed, we suppose the refinement of cruelty which held it before the eyes left; no room in the King's palace. He is content not to be forgotten, certain that if the King remember him at all, it will be with thoughts of tenderness and pity. |

| (30) Offering him vinegar. — Not even the prayer for their forgiveness had touched the hearts of the soldiers. But still, they knew not what they did, and did but follow, after their nature, in the path in which others led the way. Possibly too, rude as their natures were, there was a touch of rough kindliness mingling in their mockery, as shown in the offer of the vinegar, or sour wine, which they had brought for their own use (see Note on Matt. xxvii. 45). — unless, indeed, we suppose the refinement of cruelty which held it before the eyes left; no room in the King's palace. He is content not to be forgotten, certain that if the King remember him at all, it will be with thoughts of tenderness and pity. |
And it was about the sixth hour, and there was a darkness over all the earth until the ninth hour. And the sun was darkened, and the veil of the temple was rent in the midst.

And when Jesus had cried with a loud voice, he said, Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit: and having said thus, he gave up the ghost. Now when the centurion saw what was done, he glorified God, saying, Certainly this was a righteous man. And all the people that came together to that sight, beholding the things which were done, smote their breasts, and returned. And all his acquaintance, penitent should enter at once into the highest joy of the Kingdom. Are we right in thinking that there was no fulfilment of the words till death had released the spirit from its thraldom? May there not even then have been an ineffable joy, such as made the flames of the fiery furnace to be as a "moist whistling wind" (Song of Three Childr. verse 27, in the Apocrypha), such as martyrs have in a thousand cases known, acting almost as a physical anesthetic acts? The penitent thief is naturally prominent in the Apocryphal legends of our Lord's descent into Hades, seen by His side as He enters Paradise (Gosp. of Nocodemus, ii. 10).

And it was about the sixth hour.—See Notes on Matt. xxvii. 45—50; Mark xv, 33—37.

We can only conjecturally account for the omission of the "ELI, ELI, LAMA SABACHHTANI," so prominent in the other two reports; but it is at least conceivable, assuming the same sources of information as before, that the women who stood by the cross may have shrunk from repeating words so terrible, and have loved to dwell rather on those which seemed to them to speak, not of abandonment, but of an absolute and unshaken trust. It is remarkable that this, like the cry of apparent despair, is a quotation from the Psalms (Psl. xxxi. 6).

And when Jesus had cried with a loud voice, he said . . . .—Better, And Jesus cried with a loud voice, and said . . . . The English text emphasizes too strongly the distinctness of the act, possibly with the implied suggestion that the cry might have consisted of the words which St. Luke does not report. On the other hand, the other Gospels make the "great cry" immediately precede death.

He gave up the ghost.—Better, He expired, or breathed out His spirit; the verb containing the root from which the Greek for "spirit" is derived. The Greek of St. John, which appears in English as though it were the same as St. Luke's, corresponds more closely to the final utterance, "He delivered up His spirit."

Now when the centurion saw what was done . . . .—See Notes on Matt. xxvii. 54, 55; Mark xv, 40—41. The phrase "glorified God" is, as has been noticed already (chap. v. 26), specially characteristic of St. Luke. The substitution of "this was a righteous man," for "this was the Son of God," may, perhaps, have originated in a wish to express the exact measure, and not more, of the sense in which the centurion had used the seemingly higher words, and the women that followed him from Galilee, stood afar off, beholding these things.

And, behold, there was a man named Joseph, a counsellor; and he was a good man, and a just: (the same had not consented to the counsel and deed of them;) he was of Arimathea, a city of the Jews: who also himself waited for the kingdom of God. This man went unto Pilate, and begged the body of Jesus. And he took it down, and wrapped it in linen, and laid it in a sepulchre that was hewn in stone, wherein never man before was laid. And that day was the prepara-
The Sabbath after the Crucifixion.
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The Women at the Sepulchre.

The Sabbath drew on.—Literally, the Sabbath was dawning. It is a question whether the word is used here of the actual beginning of the Sabbath—which was, of course, at sunset after the Crucifixion—or, as St. Matthew appears to use it (xxviii. 1), for the actual dawn. The later Rabbis appear to have spoken of the day “dawning” in the sense of its beginning at sunset, and so far support the former interpretation. It was possible, however, under the emergencies of the case, that the entombment began before the sunset, and may have been finished during the night, or that, in common speech and usage, the Sabbath, though theoretically beginning on Friday evening at sunset, was not practically recognised till Saturday at sunrise.

And the women also.—Here again we come upon traces of St. Luke’s informants. The other Gospels speak of one or two by name. He knows that others belonging to the company of women who came with Jesus from Galilee (note the recurrence of the same description as in verse 49) had taken part in the work. They had stood within view of the cross. They saw the body taken down. They followed (it was not far) to the garden owned by Nicodemus.

They returned, and prepared spices and ointments.—This seems at first inconsistent with their “buying” spices after the Sabbath was over (chap. xxiv. 1). Possibly, we have two groups of women—the two Maries and “Joanna and the others” (chap. xxv. 10)—taking part in the same work; possibly, what they did on the Friday afternoon or evening was not enough, and it was necessary to buy more spices as soon as shops were open on Saturday evening.

Rested the Sabbath day.—It is noticeable that this is the only record in the Gospels of that memorable Sabbath. Can we picture to ourselves how it was spent by those who had taken part in the great drama of the previous day,—Caiaphas and the priests officiating in the Temple services of that day, after their hurried Passover, just in time to fulfil the bare letter of the law, on the previous afternoon; the crowds that had mocked and scoffed on Golgotha crowding the courts of the Temple, or attending in the synagogues of Hebrew or Hellenistic Jews; scribes and Pharisees preaching sermons on the history and meaning of the Passover, and connecting it with the hope of a fresh deliverance for Israel? And the disciples, where were they?—did they return to Galilee each to his own farm, or retrace their steps, or wander about the hills?—or, in the guest-chamber where they had eaten their Paschal supper, or, as that was apparently a new room to them (chap. xxii. 8, 9), in some other inn or lodging in the city, or its suburbs? On that Sabbath, John and Peter must have met, and the penitent must have found in his friend’s love the pledge and earnest of his Lord’s forgiveness; and the Twelve and the Seventy bringing the spices which they had prepared, and certain others with them.

And they found the stone rolled away from the sepulchre. And they entered in, and found not the body of the Lord Jesus. And it came to pass, as they were much perplexed thereabout, behold, two men stood by them in shining garments: and as they were afraid, and bowed down their faces to the earth, they said unto them, Why seek ye the living among the dead?

(XXIV.)

(1—8) Now upon the first day of the week.—See Notes on Matt. xxviii. 1—4; Mark xvi. 1—4.

Very early in the morning.—The original has a more poetical form “in the deep dawn,” agreeing with “while it was yet dark.” The last clause, “certain others with them,” is not found in the best MSS., and may have been inserted by transcribers to bring in the second group, who are named in the other Gospels, but not in this.

Two men stood by them.—St. Mark and St. Matthew mention one only. Had St. Matthew given the two, it might have been urged by adverse critics that this duplication of phenomena, as in the case of the demons (Matt. vii. 28), and the blind men at Jericho (Matt. xx. 50), was an idiosyncrasy of his. As it is, we must suppose that each set of informants—the two Maries, and the “others” from whom it seems probable that St. Luke’s report was derived—described what they themselves had seen. At such moments of terror and astonishment, perception and memory are not always very definite in their reports.

Why seek ye the living among the dead?—Better, as in the margin, Him that liveth. The
The Vision of Angels.
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(6) He is not here, but is risen: remember how he spake unto you when he was yet in Galilee," (chap. vii. 2). It is not an unreasonable Jesus himself drew near, and went with member how he spake unto you when he was yet in Galilee, and the third day rise again. (9) And they remembered his words, and returned from the sepulchre, and told all these things unto the eleven, and to all the rest. (10) It was Mary Magdalene, and Joanna, and Mary the mother of James, and other women that were with them, which told these things unto the apostles. (11) And their words seemed to them as idle tales, and they believed not. (12) Then arose Peter, and ran unto the sepulchre; and stooping down, he beheld the linen clothes laid by themselves, and departed, wondering in himself at that which was come to pass.

(13) And, behold, two of them went that same day to a village called Emmaus, which was from Jerusalem about threescore furlongs. (14) And they talked together of all these things which had happened. (15) And it came to pass, that, while they communed together and reasoned, Jesus himself drew near, and went with them. (16) But

question was enough to change the whole current of their thoughts. The Lord whom they came to honour as dead was in very deed "living," was emphatically "He that liveth," alive for evermore (Rev. i. 18). The primary meaning of the words is, of course, limited to this; but like the parallel, "let the dead bury their dead" (see Note on Matt. viii. 22), they suggest manifold applications. It is in vain that we seek "Him that liveth" in dead works, dead formulae, dead or dying institutions. The eternal life that is in Christ is not to be found by looking into the graves of the past in the world's history, or in those of our individual life. In both cases it is better to rise, as on the "stepping-stones of our dead selves," to "higher things." (6) Remember how he spake unto you.—The direct appeal to the memory of the women is peculiar to St. Luke, and shows us what does not lie on the surface of the Gospel history, that they, too, were among those to whom were uttered the prophecies of the Passion and the Resurrection of which we read in chap. ix. 43-45. In the words of Matt. xxviii. 6, "He is risen, as He said," we have an indirect reference to the same character.

(7) Into the hands of sinful men.—The adjective does not appear in the earlier report. It is probably used here, more or less, in its popular Jewish meaning, as applied to "sinners of the Gentiles" (Gal. iv. 25). (8) And they remembered his words.—It would be better to end the previous verse with a fullstop, and begin the next sentence, And they returned . . . . . (9-11) To all the rest.—So Matt. xxviii. 8 as to "the disciples," as a wider term than "Apostles." We may naturally think of many at least of the Seventy as being among the "rest." (10) Mary Magdalene, and Joanna.—St. Luke alone names the latter in the Resurrection history, as he alone had named her before, as following our Lord in Galilee (chap. vii. 2). It is not an unreasonable inference from this that she was probably his chief informant.

(11) Idle tales.—The one Greek word which is thus rendered occurs nowhere else in the New Testament. It is applied strictly to the trifling, half-idiotic babble of dotage. (12) Then arose Peter.—See Notes on John xx. 3-10. The fact of Peter's visit to the sepulchre is common to St. Luke and St. John, but the former does not mention the companionship of the beloved disciple. On the assumption of Joanna being St. Luke's informant, we can understand that she told what she remembered, Peter's impetuous rush to the sepulchre, and did not notice that he was followed by his friend.

Stooping down.—The word was sometimes used alone, as in Jas. i. 25, 1 Pet. i. 12, for the act of stooping down to look. (13) And, behold, two of them.—The long and singularly interesting narrative that follows is peculiar to St. Luke, and must be looked upon as among the "gleaning of the grapes," which rewarded his researches even after the full vintage had apparently been gathered in by others. The Emmaus in Galilee, about a mile from Tiberias, was famous for its medicinal warm springs (Jos. Ant. xvii. 2, § 3; Wars, iv. 1, § 3), and had the narrative referred to it, we might have supposed St. Luke to have visited it on that account. We have no record of any such springs in the Emmaus near Jerusalem, which is also named by Josephus (Wars, vii. 6, § 6) as at a distance of sixty stadia, or furlongs, from Jerusalem. The name, however, was probably, as Josephus states (as above), significant, connected with the modern Arabic term, Hammâm, or Hammam, for a "bath," and indicating, therefore, like the Latin "Aqua," or the French "Aix," the presence of such springs, and if so, the same hypothesis may fit in here. In the case of the Emmaus (afterwards Nicopolis), in the plain of Philistia, there was a fountain mentioned by early writers as famous for its healing powers (Euseb. Chron. 41). We can hardly doubt, from the prominence given to the name of Cleopas, that he was St. Luke's informant. We are not told when the disciples started, but as it was "towards evening" when they reached Emmaus, it could not well have been before their noontide meal. The fulness with which the whole account is given may well lead us to think of it as taken down at the time from the lips of the narrator.

(15) While they communed together . . . . —The verb is the same as that translated "talked" in the preceding verse.

Jesus himself drew near, and went with them.—Excluding, as we must do in such a case, the element of chance, we are left to conjecture the reasons for this special manifestation. Neither of the two travellers belonged to the Twelve. They may possibly have been of the number of the Seventy. May we think that it was in tender sympathy with the trials to which their thoughtful and yearning temper specially exposed them, that their Master thus drew near to them? They had cherished the hope that the kingdom of God would immediately appear (chap. xix. 11), and now it seemed further off than ever. And He came, partly, it may be, with altered garb and tone, partly as
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their eyes were holden that they should not know him. (17) And he said unto them, What manner of communications are these that ye have one to another, as ye walk, and are sad? (18) And the one of them, whose name was Cleopas, answering said unto him, Art thou only a stranger in Jerusalem, and hast not known the things which are come to pass there in these days? (19) And he said unto them, What things? And they said unto him, Concerning Jesus of Nazareth, which was a prophet mighty in deed and word before God and all the people: (20) and how the chief priests and our rulers delivered him to be condemned to death, and holding their senses under supernatural control, so that they knew Him not. He was to them as a man of like passions with themselves. (Comp. the appearance to Mary Magdalene, John xx. 15.)

(17) What manner of communications . . . ?—Literally, What are these words that ye bandy to and fro with one another?

And are sad.—The adjective is the same as that used of the hypocrites in Matt. vi. 16. The better MSS. make the question stop at “as ye walk,” and then add, “And they stood sad in countenance.” Over and above the authority for this reading, it has unquestionably the merit of greater dramatic vividness.

(18) One of them, whose name was Cleopas.—The name is to be distinguished from the Cleopas of John xix. 25, which was probably a Greekised form of the Aramaic name of a Galilean disciple. Here the name is a Greek contraction of Cleopatros (so Antipas, from Antipatros), and so far, as connected with Cleopatra, indicates Hellenistic and probably Alexandrian antecedents. This may in part, perhaps, account for his imparting to St. Luke what had not found its way into the current oral teaching of the Hebrew Church at Jerusalem, as embodied in the narratives of St. Matthew and St. Mark.

Art thou only a stranger in Jerusalem?—The English is, at least, ambiguous. Better, Art thou a sojourner . . . ?

(19) What things?—Literally, What kind of things?

Concerning Jesus of Nazareth, which was a prophet.—The words indicate the precise stage of faith which the two disciples had reached. They believed in Jesus as a prophet; they hoped that He would redeem Israel. They had not risen to the belief that He was the Christ, the Son of God. And now even that faith was tottering. The whole narrative suggests that our Lord was choosing this exceptional method of dealing with them as a step in the spiritual education which was to lead them on to the higher truth.

(20) Delivered him to be condemned to death.—Literally, to a sentence of death. The words are strictly accurate. The Sanhedrin had not, strictly speaking, passed a sentence of death, though they had voted for condemning our Lord on a capital charge. For that they had to deliver Him up to the secular arm of Pilate.

And have crucified him.—Better, and crucified Him, the tense being the same as “delivered.”

(21) But we trusted.—The pronoun is emphatic. “We, the disciples, were hoping . . . ,” whatever might be the judgment of others.

Which should have redeemed Israel.—More exactly, He that is about to redeem . . . The two travellers belonged apparently to those who now, at the time of the Nativity, were waiting for redemption in Jerusalem (chap. ii. 38).

(22) Made us astonished.—The Greek verb is that from which we get our word “ecstasy,” taken transitively. Literally, they startled us.

Early.—Strictly speaking, at day-break, or early dawn.

(23) A vision of angels.—The word for “vision” is used of what Zacharias saw in the Temple (chap. i. 22), of the “visions” of which St. Paul was tempted to boast (2 Cor. xii. 1). It does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament.

(24) And certain of them which were with us.—The words have the interest of presenting an obvious, undisguised coincidence with St. John’s report of the visit of Peter and John (xx. 3). The naturalness of the manner in which the two Apostles are mentioned, but not named, “certain of them which were with us,” may be noted, so far as it goes, as a sign of truthfulness. A later writer constructing a narrative would have brought in the two conspicuous names.

(25) O fools, and slow of heart to believe.—The word for “fools” (more literally, silly, senseless) is not that which is used in Matt. v. 22, xxii. 17, but one belonging to a somewhat higher style of language. It is used by St. Paul of the “foolish Galatians” (Gal. iii. 1), and elsewhere, and by no other New Testament writer. The word of reproof sounds strong, but we must remember that our Lord had already given hints as to the true interpretation of Messianic prophecies (chap. ix. 22, 44; Mark xiv. 21), which might have led thoughtful men to see that they pointed to suffering and death, as well as to sovereignty and triumph.

(26) Ought not Christ to have suffered?—Better, the Christ. The thought that the sufferings were a necessary condition of the glory that followed,
Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory? (27) And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself. (28) And they drew nigh unto the village, whither they went: and he made as though he would have gone further. (29) But they constrained him, saying, Abide with us: for it is toward evening, and the day is far spent. And he went in to tarry with them. (30) And it came to pass, as he sat at meat with them,

he took bread, and blessed it, and brake, and gave to them. (31) And their eyes were opened, and they knew him; and he vanished out of their sight. (32) And they said one to another, Did not our heart burn within us, while he talked with us by the way, and while he opened to us the scriptures? (33) And they rose up the same hour, and returned to Jerusalem, and found the eleven gathered together, and them that were with them, (34) saying, The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared

became from this time forth almost as an axiom of Christian thought. So we read of “the sufferings of the Christ, and the glory that should follow” (1 Pet. i. 11). (27) Beginning at Moses and all the prophets. —Better, from Moses. Here, then, if not before, there was a full “opening of the Scriptures” on all that pertained to the work and office of the Christ, and it is, at least, a legitimate inference to believe that we find the echoes of the great lesson thus given in all, or most, of the interpretations of Messianic prophecies in the written or spoken teaching of the Apostles. From the great first gospel of Gen. iii. 15, to the last utterance of the last of the Prophets announcing the coming of Elijah (Mal. iv. 5), with special stress, doubtless, on prophecies, such as those of Pss. xvi., xxii., Isa. lii., that spoke of sufferings and of death as belonging to the perfect picture of the Servant of the Lord, and the ideal King, the unfolding of the divine purpose was now made clear to those who before had been “slow of heart to believe.” (28) He made as though he would have gone further.—This was, it is obvious, the crucial test of the effect of the Lord’s previous teaching. Did they feel a new light flowing in upon their souls, bringing new meanings into what had before been obscure and hard sayings? Were they content to let the unknown Teacher pass on, and see no more of Him? Their answer showed, in words that meet us afterwards, that their “hearts” already “burnt within them.” Here, also, we note the method of the Divine Teacher as an example for other teachers. We often impress truth more effectively, and stimulate the desire for further knowledge, by suspending for a time the continued incantation of it. (29) Abide with us: for it is toward evening. —As part of the narrative, the words have the interest of bringing before us the eager desire of the disciples to know more of the wisdom which they had been drinking in from the lips of the unknown Teacher. They could not bring themselves to part with one who had done so much for them. Devout imagination has, however, legitimately read other meanings in it. “Abide with me” has become the burden of the most popular of evening hymns, the true prayer for the evening of each day, for the evening of each man’s life, for the moments when hopes fail and we come one with another and are sad; for those, also, when our hearts burn within us in the half-consciousness that Christ is speaking to us through the lips of human teachers. (30) He took bread, and blessed it.—Had the two travellers been of the number of the Twelve, we might have thought of the words and acts as reminding them of their last Supper with their Lord. As it was, we must think of those words and acts as meant to teach them, and, through them, others, the same lesson that had then been taught to the Twelve, that it would be in the “breaking of bread” that they would hereafter come to recognize their Master’s presence. And they, too, we must remember, whether they were of the Seventy, or among the wider company of disciples, must have had memories, it may be of multitudes fed with the scanty provision of a few barley loaves, it may be of quiet evenings without a multitude, when they had looked on the same act, and heard the same words of blessing. This meal, too, became so full of spiritual significance that we may well anticipate the technical language of theology and say that it was to them “sacramental.”

(31) And he vanished out of their sight.—Literally, He became invisible. The adjective does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament. In the order of time this is the first example of the new conditions of our Lord’s risen life. It was not that He rose and left the room in which they sat. In a moment they knew Him with all the fulness of recognition; and then they saw Him no more. The work for which He had come to them was done. He had imparted comfort and insight, and had brought them into communion with Himself, and then they were to be taught that that communion was no longer to depend, as before, on a visible and localised presence. (Comp. verse 39; John xx. 19, 26.) (32) Did not our heart burn within us . . . ?—More accurately, Was not our heart burning . . . ? the tense both of this and of the other verbs implying a continuous and not a momentary state or act. (33) They rose up the same hour.—As it was towards evening when they had arrived at Emmaus, and its distance from Jerusalem was about eight miles, they must have reached the chamber where the Eleven were assembled after nighttime. If we identify this gathering with that of John xx. 19, there were but ten Apostles present, Thomas being absent. (34) The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to Simon.—Of the manifestation thus referred to, we have no other record in the Gospels. It occurs, however, a prominent place in those which St. Paul enumerates (1 Cor. xvi. 5), and takes its place among the phenomena of St. Luke’s acquaintance with the substance of St. Luke’s Gospel. What passed at the meeting we can only reverently imagine. Before the Passion, the Lord had “turned and looked” on Peter with a glance of tender and sorrowful reproof (chap. xxii. 61). Now, we may
Appearance of the Risen Lord

ST. LUKE, XXIV.

to the Eleven at Jerusalem.

to Simon. (33) And they told what things were done in the way, and how he was known of them in breaking of bread.

(34) And as they thus spake, Jesus himself stood in the midst of them; and saith unto them, Peace be unto you. (35) But they were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they had seen a spirit. (36) And he said unto them, Why are ye troubled? and why do thoughts arise in your hearts? (37) Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have. (38) And when he had thus spoken, he shewed them his hands and his feet. (39) And as he thus shewed them, he said, Handle me, and see: for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as thou seest mine. (40) And when he had thus spoken, he shewed them his hands and his feet. (41) And while they yet believed not for joy, they said unto him, Art thou then the Christ, the Son of the blessed Virgin Mary? (42) And he said unto them, Peace be unto you.-The words do not appear anywhere else as addressed by our Lord to His disciples, but they were, as we find in Matt. x. 12, Luke x. 5, identical with the customary salutation of the Jews, so that we may fairly assume that here also the familiar words, as before the familiar act, were meant to help the disciples to recognise His presence. St. John records (chap. xx. 19) the same salutation at the same interview.

(43) Supposed that they had seen a spirit.—The account agrees with that in John xx. 19, who adds the fact that the doors of the room had been closed for fear of the Jews. The mode of appearance in both Gospels suggests the idea, as in verse 31, of new conditions of existence, exempted from the physical logical analysis. As men sleep for sorrow (chap. xxii. 31), have been the staple article of diet. Honey—as in the histories of the Five Thousand and the Four, and, we may add, in the narrative of John xxi. 9—seems to have been the staple article of diet. Honey—as in the proverbial speech which described Canaan as a land flowing with milk and honey (Ex. iii. 8, 17; Deut. xxvi. 9, 15; Jer. xi. 5, et al.), as in the histories of Samson (Judg. xiv. 8) and Jonathan (1 Sam. xiv. 27) and John the Baptist (Matt. iii. 4)—was common enough to enter into the diet of the poor. Even in a time of scarcity, when the corn and the olive crops failed, or were laid waste, butter and honey remained as a resource which did not fail (Isa. vii. 15, 22).

(44) These are the words which I spake unto you. As with the travellers to Emmaus, so now with...
The Scriptures opened.
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The Parting at Bethany.

phets, and in the psalms, concerning me. (45) Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the scriptures, (46) and said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behaved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day: (47) and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem. (48) And ye are witnesses of these things.

(49) And, behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you: a but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high.

(50) And he led them out as far as to Bethany, and he lifted up his hands, and blessed them. (51) And it came to pass, The discourses preserved by St. John show, however, that there had been the more recent and more definite promise of the Comforter (John xiv. 16, xv. 26), and so far St. Luke's report, vague as it is, presents an undesigned coincidence.
while he blessed them, he was parted from them, and carried up into heaven.

And they worshipped him, and re-

52] And they worshipped him.—These words also are absent from most of the best MSS. If they stand as part of the text, we must remember that they describe the attitude of prostrate adoration.

With great joy.—Now, at last, the disciples found the fulfilment of their Lord's promise that "their sorrow should be turned into joy," and that joy—the joy of knowing that their Lord and their Friend was at the right hand of the Father—was one which no man could take from them (John xvi. 20, 22).

53] And were continually in the temple.—The statement is obviously not inconsistent with that in the Acts (i. 13), that they were abiding in an upper-chamber in Jerusalem. What it indicates is, that their days were spent, not in the routine of common life, but in the prayer of fervent expectation; and for this no place was so fitting as the Temple, which their Master had taught them to look on as in very deed His "Father's house," the "house of prayer," in which the soul of the true worshipper could find access to its God (chap. xx. 46; John ii. 16). There, too, we must remember all the memories of the precious days that had preceded the Passion would be with them in their fullest intensity. We find the same pattern of life presented in Acts iii. 1.

Amen.—The word is wanting in the best MSS., as it is also in many in Matt. xxviii. 20, Mark xvi. 20, and John xx. 31. In each case it was probably added by the transcriber in devout thankfulness at the completion of his task.
We pause on the threshold that leads from the Three Gospels to the Fourth, as from the Holy Place to the Holy of Holies; and I feel that there can be no better introduction to that innermost sanctuary than the hymn of which it has been truly said, that “sacred Latin poetry scarcely possesses, if indeed it possess,” anything grander or loftier. (Archbishop Trench, *Sacred Latin Poetry*, p. 72.) Many readers of this Volume will, I believe, thank me for giving them the opportunity of reading that hymn in the unapproachable majesty of the original. Others will, I hope, appreciate it in some measure, even in the weaker medium of a translation. The writer is unknown, but he was clearly one who had been trained in the school of Adam of St. Victor, whose hymn on the Cherubic Emblems of the Gospels has been already given (p. xliv.), and the disciple was not inferior to his master.

E. H. P.

**DE S. JOANNE EVANGELISTA.**

**Verbum Dei, Deo Natum,**

**Quod nec factum, nec creatum,**

**Venit de caelestibus,**

**Hoc vidit, hoc attractivit,**

**Hoc de coelo reservavit,**

**Joannes hominibus.**

**Inter illos primitivos**

**Veros veri fontis rivos**

**Joannes exiit,**

**Toti mundo propinare**

**Nectar illud salutare,**

**Quod de throno prodit.**

**Celum transit, veri rotam**

**Solis vidit, ilia totam**

**Mentis figens aciem ;**

**Speculator spiritus,**

**Quasi Seraphim sub aliis,**

**Dei vidit faciem.**

**Audit in gyro sedis**

**Quid peallat cum citharadis,**

**Quater seni proceres ;**

**De sigillo Trinitatis**

**Impressit characteres.**

**Volat a vis sine meta.**

**Quo nee vates nee prophetas**

**Evolavit altius ;**

**Tam implenda quam impleta,**

**Purus homo purius,**

**He scanned, with still undazzled eye,**

**The future and the past.**

**The bridegroom, clad in garments red,**

**Sui cum aliis,**

**He sends, and will no longer hide**

**Heaven’s deepest mysteries.**

**O loved one, bear, if thou can’t tell**

**Of Him whom thou dost love so well,**

**Glad tidings to the Bride ;**

**Tell of the angels’ food they taste,**

**Who with the Bridegroom’s presence graced,**

**Are resting at His side.**

**Tell of the soul’s true bread unpriced,**

**Christ’s supper, on the breast of Christ**

**In wondrous rapture taken ;**

**That we may sing before the Throne**

**His praises, whom as Lord we own,**

**The Lamb we worship slain.**
THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN.
Quarti euangeliorum Iohannis ex decipulis cohortantibus condescipulis et epssuis dixit conieunatemihi odiotriduoe et quid cuique fuerit revelatum alterutrum nobis ennarremus eadem nocte reue latum andreae ex apostolis ut recognis centibus cuntis Iohannis suo nomine cuntadiscribernet ideo licitisaria sin culis euangeliorum libris principia doceantur Nihil tamen differt credentiunom uno ac principali spudearlatsint in omnibus omnia de natuinetate de passione de resurrectione de conuesatione cum decipulis suis ac de gemino eius audentu Primo In humilitate dispectus quod fode tus eundum potetate regali pre claram quod futurum est quid ergo mirum si Iohannes tam constantersincula etia In epistulis suis proferat dicens In semeipsv Quae uidimus oculis nostris et auribus auditimus et mansus nostrae palpauerunt hacc scripsimus nobis

[Tregelles, Canon Muratorianus. See Introduction, page 377.]
INTRODUCTION TO
THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN.

I. Life of the Apostle John.
II. Authorship of the Gospel.
III. Time when and Place where the Gospel was written.

I. Life of the Apostle John.—Our sources of information for the life of the Apostle John are, (1) the Four Gospels themselves; (2) the Acts of the Apostles, with references in the Epistles; (3) the traditions which have come to us in the history of the early Church.

(1) From the Gospels we know that St. John was the son of Zebedee and Salome.

The father is mentioned only once in the narrative (Matt. iv. 21, 22; Mark i. 19, 20), but the name occurs frequently as distinguishing the sons. He had "hired servants" (Mark i. 20); and John's own connection with the family of the high priest (John xvi. 57; but see Note here), and the committal of Mary to his care (John xix. 27), may also point to a position removed at least from the necessity, but not from the practice, of labour, which was customary among Jews of all classes (Matt. iv. 21).

Of Salome we know little more. It has been assumed above that she was the wife of Zebedee, and the mother of St. John; and the assumption is based upon a comparison of Matt. xx. 29, xxvi. 56; Mark xv. 40; xvi. 1. (Comp. Notes on these passages.) It has also been frequently assumed that she was the sister of Mary, the mother of our Lord, mentioned in John xix. 25 (comp. Note there); and although this cannot be regarded as proved, it is the most probable interpretation. It would follow from this that St. John was the cousin-german of our Lord. Salome was also one of the band of women who ministered unto the Lord of their substance (Matt. xxvii. 56; Luke viii. 3); and this falls in with the general impression which the narrative gives of the position of the family. She was present at the Crucifixion (Mark xv. 40), and was one of those who brought spices for the embalmment (Mark xvi. 1). In one other passage she is mentioned, and there she appears as asking for her two sons the position of honour in the Messianic kingdom (Matt. xx. 20 et seq.). Her prominence as compared with her husband, and the title "mother of Zebedee's children," makes it probable that she outlived him, and that the influence of the mother, whose zeal and love for her sons are illustrated in her ambitious request for them, was that which chiefly moulded the Apostle's earlier years.

Another member of the household is known to us—James, who is usually mentioned first, and was presumably the elder of the pair of brothers. At the time of his death he was, however, known to St. Luke as "James the brother of John" (Acts xii. 2), and the same writer inverts the order of the names in the same chapter (Luke ix. 28 [7th reading], 52). In Acts i. 13, too, the better reading is Peter and John and James. The home of the family was on the shores of the Lake of Galilee, at Bethsaida, according to the usual conclusion from Luke v. 9 and John i. 44; or, perhaps, at Capernaum, which was not far from Bethsaida (Mark i. 29).

The sons of Jonas were companions of the sons of Zebedee when they are first mentioned, and had probably been friends in boyhood and youth. Whether the home was at Bethsaida or Capernaum, the Apostle was by birth a Galilean, as were all the Twelve, with the exception, perhaps, of Judas Iscariot. (Comp. Notes on chap. vi. 71, and Acts ii. 7.) He belonged, then, to the free, industrious, and warlike people of the North, who were despised by the more cultured inhabitants of Jerusalem, and upon whom the yoke of Judaism pressed less heavily than it did upon the dwellers in Judaea. Removed from the influence of scribes and Pharisees on the one hand, he would on the other hand grow up in contact with men of alien races and creeds, who were found in large numbers in the populous cities of Galilee. The union of Jewish and Greek characteristics which mark the man would be thus formed insensibly in the boy.

We know too little of the family life in Galilee eighteen centuries ago to be able to realise with any fulness and certainty how the years of the Apostle's boyhood and youth were spent; and yet there are certain bold lines which can be distinctly traced. Up to the age of six he, like other Jewish children, would be taught by his parents at home, and then sent to one of the public schools, which, in the period after the Captivity, had been established in every town and important village in Judaea and Galilee. We know that after the fall of Jerusalem Tiberias became the seat of the most famous rabbinic school, and it is probable that there were already established on the shores of the Sea of Galilee the seminaries of doctors who had been themselves trained at Jerusalem. The lad would have gone to one of these higher seminaries at the age of sixteen, and would thus have been fitted for the work which, in the providence of God, lay before him, though he was not technically trained at the feet of a rabbi, and was therefore classed among the "unlearned and ignorant" (Acts iv. 13).

At the age of twelve or thirteen, John would have been taken up, as we know that Jesus was, to keep the feasts at Jerusalem. The holy city, bound up with prophecy and psalm; the temple, the centre of every highest hope and thought which, at mother's knee or at the feet of the teacher, had been instilled into his
mind, now burst in all the glory of its reality upon this Galilaean boy. What Oxford and Cambridge are to English schoolboys, or Rome to the pilgrim from distant lands, all this, and a thousand times more than all this, was the city of Zion to the Jewish pilgrim. Well may it be that the gorgeous ritual of the temple so impressed itself upon the receptive youthful mind as to form the imagery in which the visions of the Apocalypse were afterwards to be clothed.

These visits would be repeated three times each year, and form the great events in the year's course. The caravans, the pilgrim-songs, the discourses of rabbis and teachers, the ritual of the feasts themselves, would all leave their mark upon the opening mind, and lead to question and answer as to what these things meant.

In the intervals between the feasts, there would be the regular synagogue services and instructions, the converse with teachers and friends, the daily task in his father's trade, the growth and development of character in and through all these outer circumstances.

The most prominent thought of the times, the subject on which men were ever musing and speaking of, was the expectation of the Messiah. Probably every well-trained Jewish boy expected that the Messiah would appear in his own life. But with this expectation of the Messiah there were hopes of freedom from the oppression of Rome; and the deep feeling of the masses frequently found vent in open insurrection. One remarkable attempt to throw off the hated yoke, which was for a time successful—when Judas the Gaulonite, and Sadoc the Pharisee, ruled the whole country—must have occurred when John was yet a boy, and his spirit must have been fired by the cry of their watchword, "God only is our Lord and Master." (Comp. Jos. Ant. xviii. 1.)

And so the years went on. Boyhood passed into youth, and youth into manhood. The study of the law and the prophets, the singing of psalms, the utterance of prayers, the feelings and hopes of his countrymen, must, with successive years, have brought a new meaning. The dreams of childhood and visions of youth grew into the deeper thoughts and fuller hopes of manhood.

Such was the relation of John's mind to the preparation of the past and to the hopes of the future, when the Baptist appeared as the herald of the coming King, and passing from Judaea northwards through the Jordan Valley, cried with a voice which, like a trumpet-blast, awoke men from their spiritual slumber, "Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." Among those who flocked to this new teacher were the sons of Zebedee and the sons of Jonas. The first chapter of this Gospel leads to the thought that they were prominent among the Forerunner's disciples; and to the heart of no one, it may be, of all who heard him did his burning words come with greater power than to that of the young follower whose name was in the after-history to eclipse his own. For days, or weeks, or months, perhaps, the spirit of John the Baptist was leading the life of John the Son of Zebedee onward from Old Testament prophecy to Him in whom Old Testament prophecy was to be fulfilled. Neither knew, indeed, that the fulfillment was so near at hand until the Baptist saw the Messiah coming to be baptized, and the disciple heard the cry, "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sins of the world." On the following day the words so full of meaning were again spoken, and a pair of disciples, of whom Andrew was one, and John almost certainly the other, passed from the discipleship of the Baptist to that of the Messiah Him-
Fourth Gospel itself. There he is the son of love, gentleness, receiving rather than the son of thunder; and these are the aspects of his character which have for the most part impressed themselves on Christian art and thought. The difference has often been noted, and for the most part noted by those who have drawn from it the inference that the two pictures cannot represent the same man, and that the latter is the ideal of an after age. But the picture of the natural man, taken in the fire and vigour of youth, may furnish but few points of resemblance with what which represents him in the mellow ripeness of age. Great minds are wholly changed by half a century of expansion and growth; and experience would seem to show that the earnest, forceful, impulsive character is that which ripens into calm and gentle love. If the youth represents love bursting forth in active strength, the old age represents love passively resting in being loved. The pictures, it should be remembered also, are drawn from different stand-points. The former is from without, representing the character in youth, as seen in his manifestations by others; the latter is from within, representing the character at the close of life, as the writer knew himself, and knew himself to be receptive of the love of Christ.

(2) For the next period of the life of St. John our only authorities are the Acts of the Apostles and their letters. Here, as in the Gospels, he is closely connected with St. Peter. They are named together among those who were "in the upper room" (chap. i. 38); they go up to the Temple together (chap. iii. 1), and are together before the Sanhedrin (chap. iv. 13, 19); they are sent together on the mission to Samaria (chap. viii. 14). Both are in Jerusalem after the Herodian persecution, in which James was killed with the sword (chap. xi. 2), and are at the first great council (chap. xv. 6; comp. Gal. ii. 9). These scanty notices give all that we know of a period which must have extended over some twenty years. While James was the first bishop of the Jerusalem Church, and Peter was the leader of Christianity among the Jews, it can hardly be that St. John was living a life of retirement. Other missions, like that to the Samaritans, may in part have occupied this interval; or he may have carried on a work less prominent, but not less useful, than that of St. Peter and St. James in Jerusalem itself; or he may have returned to Galilee to do a like work there. Wherever he dwelt he doubtless regarded the solemn commitment of the Virgin Mary to his care (chap. xiv. 26) as binding while she lived. If we may accept the traditions which place her death in the year a.D. 43 as approximately true, it may account for the fact that St. John is not mentioned with St. Peter and St. James as in Jerusalem during St. Paul's first visit after his conversion, about a.D. 38 (Gal. i. 18, 19); but he is so mentioned, and is regarded as one of the "pillars of the Church," at the visit to the council in a.D. 51 (Gal. ii. 9).

In connection with this residence at Jerusalem, extending, it may be, over many years, we have to bear in mind that while Galilee is the scene of the narrative of the earlier Gospels, Jerusalem is specially that of the Fourth. It assumes a minute acquaintance with persons and places which could be possessed only by one who had resided in the city. (Comp. p. 374.)

(3) Passing to the later period of the Apostolic life, we are left without any certain guide. He is nowhere mentioned in the New Testament after the Jerusalem council in a.D. 51. It would seem probable that he was not there during St. Paul's visit of Acts xxii., but the argument from silence ought never to be pressed, nor should it be forgotten that St. Luke records the visit only in so far as it concerned St. Paul. We may with greater reason infer that he was not at Ephesus when St. Paul bade farewell to the elders of that city (Acts xx.,) nor yet when he wrote the Ephesian epistle and the later pastoral letters. It may be, indeed, that he had left Jerusalem, but had not yet arrived at Ephesus. A work of which we have no record is suggested by some MSS. of the First Epistle, which assert that it was written to the Parthians, and a tradition of such work seems to have been known to Augustine. It is, however, more probable that the Apostle continued in Jerusalem until the destruction of the city, and that he was then borne on the westward-flowing current of Christianity to the city of Ephesus, which, from the middle of the first to the middle of the second century, was its most important centre. (Comp. § III. p. 376.)

Ephesus was the link between the east and the west, between the mystic philosophies of Asia and the schools of Greece. More than any other city it had a charm for St. Paul, who had preached in it and the surrounding towns during three years, and it was the link between the Churches, which he saw flourish under his care, and in the midst of which he saw also seeds of future error. (Acts xx. 29, 30. Comp. Notes on Acts xix., and Introduction to the Epistle to the Ephesians.) From the Book of Revelation (Notes on chaps. i. 9—ii. 29) we may infer that, in addition to Ephesus, the surrounding Churches of Smyrna, and Pergamos, and Thyatira, and Sardis, and Philadelphia, and Laodicea were the special objects of the Apostle's care, and that in one of the persecutions which fell upon the early Church he was banished to the island of Patmos. (Comp. Introduction to the Book of Revelation.) Returning from Patmos to Ephesus after the accession of Nerva, if we may accept the early tradition, he continued there to an extreme old age, combating heresies, and teaching the truth.

The old age of St. John became the centre of legends, partly based upon fact, and partly ideal, which the early Christians loved to tell, and many of which have come down to our own day. They thought of his life as charmed, so that poison could not affect it, nor any form of death destroy it; they told—and it was not, Clement of Alexandria says, a story, but a true account—how the old man pursued a lost convert, whom he had committed to the care of a bishop in Asia Minor, and regained him in the robber's den; how, like the Jewish high priest, he went upon his head the plate of gold inscribed with "Holiness to the Lord;" how he, with something of the spirit of earlier days, flew from the bath in which the heretic Cerinthus was, lest it should fall upon him; how he was borne into the church when all power to move was gone, and, as if echoing the farewell words of Christ, which he himself had heard, said, "Little children, love one another, little children, love one another," and how, when asked why he always said this one thing, the old man replied, "Because this is the Lord's command, and if this is done, all is done."

Cassian (Collat. xxiv. c. 2) relates an anecdote, which may be given as an illustration of the impression of the Asiatic Church with regard to the character of the Apostle. "The blessed Evangelist was one day gently stroking a partridge, when a young man, returning from hunting, asked in astonishment how a man so illustrious could spend his time in such a manner? "What have you got in your hand?" replied the Apostle. 'A bow,' said the young man. 'Why is it not strung?' "Because if I carried it strung always it would lose the elasticity which I shall want it in when
I draw the arrow. "Do not be angry, then, my young friend, if I sometimes in this way unstring my spirit, which may otherwise lose its spring, and fail at the very moment when I shall need its power."

But space would fail to enter on a field so tempting and so full of beauty as the traditional history of the old age of St. John. Uncertain as we have found the history to be, we cannot expect to have any exact knowledge of the time of his death. Irenaeus speaks of him as alive after the accession of Trajan (A.D. 98); Jerome places the death at sixty-eight years after the Crucifixion. He lived, then, until near the close of the first century, or, it may be, that he lived on into the second century; and if we accept the tradition that he was some years younger than our Lord, we have to think of him—the martyr in will, but not in deed—as sinking peacefully to the grave, beneath the weight of more than fourscore years and ten.

[For the matter of this section, comp. Godet, Introduction, Historique et Critique, 1876, pp. 35—75 (translated in Clark's Library); Lücke, Commentar, 1840, vol. i., pp. 6, 48); Neander, Planting of Christianity (Bohn's Library); Stanley, Sermons and Essays on the Apostolic Age; Macaulay, Life and Writings of St. John, 1876; Trench (Francis), Life and Character of St. John, 1859; Plumptre, Article "John the Apostle," in Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, vol. i., pp. 1105 et seq.; Archbishop Tait, "St. John's Connection with Christian History and Evidence," Good Words, July, 1868; Miss Yonge, The Pupils of St. John the Divine.]

II. Authorship of the Gospel.—The evidence for the authorship of any writing consists of two distinct branches, of which one (1) traces the external history of the writing, and the other (2) is based upon the contents of the writing itself.

(1) The writing which everybody now understands by "The Gospel according to St. John" has borne this title through the whole history of the Church, and during by far the greater part of that history has borne it without question. From the last quarter of the second century to the last quarter of the eighteenth century, the writing was received with almost one consent, as the authentic witness of the Apostle John; but this period of clear and unbroken reception was preceded by one of twilight, in which it is difficult to trace the lines of evidence, and has been followed by one of destructive criticism, extending to our own day. It is believed that to every new investigator who unites competence with candour, the light of the second century becomes more and more clear in the evidence it supplies of the reception of the Gospel as St. John's; and that the chief result of the criticism which would destroy, has been to bring out a criticism of defence which has made the external evidence of the Johannine authorship more conclusive than it has ever been before.

The evidence adduced for the reception of the Gospel as by St. John, at the close of the second century, comes from every quarter of the Church. Irenaeus at Lyons, himself a disciple of Polycarp, who was a disciple of St. John; Tertullian at Carthage, writing against the heretic Marcion; Clement at Alexandria; the Muratorian Fragment at Rome (comp. General Introduction, page XLI, and § IV., p. 377); the Peshito version from Syria; the Old Latin from Africa—all are witnesses, speaking with a voice the meaning of which cannot be doubted, and the authority of which cannot be impeached.

Following the line of evidence backwards through the earlier decades of the century, we meet with a fragmentary literature; and the value of the evidence depends upon considerations such as how far we have a rational ground to expect that in Apologies, Letters, Homilies, Apocalyptic Visions, there would be references to a writing like the Fourth Gospel; how far such references are actually found; how far the literary habits of the age justify us in saying that a reference is or is not a quotation; how far it is likely that a Gospel which is confessably much later than the others, and was possibly (see p. 377) for years known only to a limited circle, should, in comparison with these, have influenced the scanty literature of the next age.

To discuss this question is, obviously, far beyond the limits of the present sketch, and requires an acquaintance with languages and a literature, which can hardly be within the reach of those for whom the present pages are meant. The result to which the opinions of the most competent scholars seems to be tending is, that we have in the literature of the earlier part of the second century fully as much reference to the Fourth Gospel as we could reasonably expect it to furnish; and that a full and fair examination of that literature, even as it has come down to us, must pronounce it to be in support of the Johannine authorship. Upon this point, those of us who are ordinary readers must be content to accept the witness of experts; and there are few students of English Divinity who will doubt that the writer of the following words speaks with an authority shared by no living author.

"If the same amount of written matter—occupying a very few pages in all—were extracted accidentally from the current theological literature of our day, the chance, unless I am mistaken, would be strongly against our finding so many indications of the use of this Gospel. In every one of the writers, from Polycarp and Papias to Polycrates, we have observed phenomena which bear witness, directly or indirectly, and with different degrees of distinctness, to its recognition. It is quite possible for critical ingenuity to find a reason for discrediting each instance in turn. An objector may urge in one case that the writing itself is a forgery; in a second, that the particular passage is an interpolation; in a third, that the supposed quotation is the original, and the language of the Evangelist the copy; in a fourth, that the incident or saying was not deduced from this Gospel, but from some apocryphal work containing a parallel narrative. By a sufficient number of assumptions, which lie beyond the range of verification, the evidence may be set aside. But the early existence and recognition of the Fourth Gospel is the one simple postulate which explains all the facts. The law of gravitation accounts for the various phenomena of motion, the falling of a stone, the jet of a fountain, the orbits of the planets, and so forth. It is quite possible for any one who is so disposed to reject this explanation of nature. Provided that he is allowed to postulate a new force for every new fact with which he is confronted, he has nothing to fear. He will then—

Gird the sphere
With centric and eccentric scribbled o'er
Cycle and epicycle, orbs in orb,

happy in his immunity. But the other theory will prevail, nevertheless, by reason of its simplicity." (Prof. Lightfoot, in Contemporary Review, Feb., 1876.)

Important as these results of modern scholarship are, the results attained by the greatest thinkers and scholars at the close of the second century itself are of
still greater importance. We have seen above that there was a general consensus of independent testimony to the acceptance of the Gospel by St. John. The evidential value of this fact cannot be over-estimated. Men like Ireneus, and Tertullian, and Clement, were neither morally dishonest nor intellectually incapable. They had to deal, moreover, with opponents who would quickly have exposed deceit and detected error. They and their opponents were intellectually, as well as physically, the leaders of the second century; their own lives went back far into it; they were removed from generation only from the probable date of St. John’s death; they had means of inquiry which we have not, and evidence upon which to base their judgment which has been for the most part lost; and it is scarcely too much to say that, had it been wholly lost, the convictions based upon this evidence would have remained irresistible. The evidence of the Versions is of the same nature, showing that the translators accepted this Gospel as an undoubted portion of the sacred canon. We find that the moment the historic mists which hang over the second century pass away, the reception of the Gospel stands out in the clear light as an undoubted fact. The light did not create this reception, but made visible that which was there before.

The Gospel continued to be received, not without heat and there an objection, but without any of historic importance, until the close of the eighteenth century, when Edward Evanson published The Disnance of the Four generally received Evangelists, and the Evidence of their Authenticity Examined (Ipswich, 1792; 8vo). The object was to show that the Fourth Gospel was from a Platonist of the second century. Evanson was answered in the following year by Dr. Priestley and David Simpson, and for a time the scene of the controversy was shifted from English ground. The seed sown took root on the Continent, where it brought forth a host of smaller works, and notably the Von Gottes Sohn der Welt Heiland of Herder (Riga, 1797), in which the author seeks to show that St. John described an ideal not an historic Christ. The well-known Introduction of Hug (1st ed., 1808) and Eichhorn (1st ed., 1810) seem to have produced a strong reaction, and during the next decade the older opinion was again triumphantly in Germany. In 1820 there appeared at Leipzig Bretschneider’s famous Probabilis, in which he endeavoured to show the inconsistencies between the Fourth Gospel and the earlier three, and to prove that the writer was not an eye-witness, nor a native of Palestine, nor a Jew, and therefore not St. John. The work was more thorough than any of its predecessors, and sent a shock through the whole theological world. There were, of course, many replies, and in the following year Bretschneider himself seems to have departed from his positions, and stated that his object was to promote the truth by discussing the subject. Once again came the reaction; and now, indeed, German thought, led by Schleiermacher, and sending forth Lübeck’s Commentary (1st ed., 1820; 2nd ed., 1833; 3rd ed., first part, 1840), which is still a classical work on the subject, was in danger of the other extreme of exalting the Fourth Gospel at the expense of the earlier Gospels. This cool maintained its ascendency until 1835, when another shock was sent through Europe by the “Life of Jesus” of David Friedrich Strauss (Das Leben Jesu, kritisch bearbeitet, Tübingen, 1835-6). The position of Strauss himself with regard to the Fourth Gospel was simply negative. He denied that the Gospel was by St. John, but did not venture upon the harder task of finding another author. But disciples are bolder than their master, and the Tübingen school did not long shrink from a positive hypothesis. Differing on other points, Baur, 1844, Zeller, 1845, and Schwegrer, 1846, agreed that the Fourth Gospel belonged to the second half of the second century. Later investigations have again led to a reaction, and the Gospel is now confidently asserted to be the product of the first half of the century. To take but two representative names—Hilgenfeld (Einleitung, Leipzig, 1875) does not now doubt that the Gospel was written between A.D. 135 and 140, and Keim (Jesus von Nazara, 1877) would now, with equal confidence, give about A.D. 130 as its date. The last phase of the history again leads us to English ground, and must be fresh in the memory of English readers. The author of Supernatural Religion (London, 1st ed., 1874; 6th ed., 1875) could not pass over the question of the Fourth Gospel, and concluded that “there is the strongest reason for believing that it was not written by the son of Zebedee.” English scholars have been no longer able to look at the question from without; it has been brought home to them, and has demanded an answer at their hands. That answer has been, and is being given, and the apparent result is that to the author of no English work published during the present generation will the seekers of truth have more cause to be thankful than to the anonymous author of Supernatural Religion, who was led to inquiry upon this subject.

(2) Passing to the writing itself, we have to ask what answer the Fourth Gospel gives to the honest inquirer about its authorship. The inquiry is a wide one, and depends upon the careful study of the whole Gospel. Many points in the inquiry are indicated in the Notes of this Commentary, and others will suggest themselves to the attentive reader. This section can only hope to point out the method in which he should pursue the inquiry. (Comp. especially Sandy’s Authorship of the Fourth Gospel, chap. xii.)

The chief centres round which modern criticism has grouped her questions respecting the internal evidence, are the following:

(a) Was the author a Jew?—The line between the Hebrew and Greek languages—between Hebrew and Gentile modes of thought—is so definitely and clearly drawn that there ought to be to this question an undoubted answer. The Gospel deals with the ministry of our Lord among the Jews, and it ought not to be difficult to say, with an approach to certainty, whether or not the many Jewish questions which necessarily arise are treated as a Jew naturally would treat them, and as no one but a Jew possibly could treat them. This, like every question related to the authorship of the Fourth Gospel, has met with answers diametrically opposed to each other; and yet the evidence for an affirmative answer seems irresistible.

1. The evidence of style can carry no weight with one unacquainted with the Hebrew and Greek languages, but the best Hebraists do not doubt that the style of the Fourth Gospel, while much more Greek than that of the Apocalypse, is still essentially Hebrew. Even Keim admits this (Jesus von Nazara, vol. i. p. 116); and Ewald regards it as beyond question that the writer is a “genuine Hebrew, who carries in himself the spirit of his mother tongue” (Johanneischen Schriften, vol. i. p. 44). (Comp. e.g. Notes on chaps. i. 8, 19, 38, 51, and xiii. 1.) It is not, however, simply that individual expressions are Hebraic, but that the Hebrew spirit comes out in the whole tone and structure of the writing.

2. Still more important than the evidence of style is that which comes from the exact acquaintance with
the current Hebrew thoughts, into which a Gentile could not possibly have thrown himself. (Comp., as a few instances out of many, the thoughts about the Messiah in chaps. i. 19–28; iv. 25; vi. 14, 15, et al.; about baptism, i. 25; iii. 22; iv. 2; about purification, ii. 6; iii. 25; xi. 55, et al.; about the Samaritans, iv. 9, 22; about the Sabbath, v. 1 et seq.; ix. 14 et seq.; about circumcision, v. 22; about the notion that a Rabbi may not speak with a woman, iv. 27; about the Jew’s manner of burying, xi. 44, and xix. 40.) These thoughts meet us in every chapter. They flow naturally from the Jewish mind, and could flow from no other.

3. Not less striking than the acquaintance with current Jewish ideas is the knowledge of the Jewish Scriptures. The Fourth Gospel is, in this respect, almost as Hebrew as the first. There can be no need to quote passages, but there are some of special interest because they show that the writer did not know the Old Testament through the Greek version (LXX.) only; but that he translated for his Greek readers from the original Hebrew text. (Comp. Notes on chaps. i. 29; xii. 13, 15, 38, and 40; xiii. 18; xiv. 37.)

4. The prominence given to the Jewish feasts, and the way in which the writer makes them centres, and groups events and discourses around them, is one of the striking features of the Gospel. We have Passover (chaps. ii. 13, 23; vi. 4; xii. 1; xviii. 28); Tabernacles (vii. 3; Dedication (x. 22); “A Feast of the Jews” (? Purim, v. 1). The writer does not simply name these feasts, but knows their history, and significance, and ritual. He is familiar with “the last day, the great day,” of Tabernacles (vii. 37), and with the technical “Lesser Festival” (Note on vii. 14); with the fact that Dedication was in winter (x. 42); and with the “preparation” of the Passover (xiv. 31).

(b) Was the author a native of Palestine?—Attention is frequently directed in the Notes to the minute knowledge of places. It will be sufficient here to refer to chaps. i. 28 (Bethany beyond Jordan), 44 (Bethsaida), 46 (Nazareth); ii. 1 (Can;); iii. 23 (Ælonon); iv. 5* (Sychar); v. 2 (Boethsea); vii. 20 (The Treasury); ix. 7 (Siloam); x. 23 (Solomon’s Porch), 40 (Bethany, comp. i. 28); xii. 54 (Lyamphras); xvii. 1 (Pedron), 15 (the high priest’s palace); x. 13 (Gabbatha), 17 (Golgotha); xx. 18 (Bethany near Jerusalem).

There is constantly some explanation added to a name, or to a phrase, or to an event, or to the moment it is mentioned some incident connected with it occurs to the writer’s mind. Many of these examples show an exact acquaintance with the topography of Jerusalem, which must have been acquired before its destruction. The customs of the Temple are familiarly known (chap. ii. 13–17); and not less so are the haunts and habits of the fishermen on the Sea of Tiberias (chaps. vii. 17–21, 22–24; xxi. 6–11), or the synagogue (chap. vii. 16). The argument from these details is cumulative, and, taken as a whole, must be acknowledged to be of very great weight. Let the reader carefully note the incidental way in which all this accuracy comes out, and he will feel that it is not acquired, and that the one simple explanation is that it belongs to a writer who was born and had lived among the places he is writing of, and now dwells upon them with loving memory.

* The writer takes this opportunity of remarking that the suggestion made in the Note on this word in chap. iv. 5, that Askare = Askchar, has been already made by Prof. Lightfoot, in the Contemporary Review for May, 1875. When the Note was being printed he sought, without success, for any confirmation of the suggestion, which probably arose from a latent reminiscence of Prof. Lightfoot’s article.

(c) Did the author live at the time of our Lord’s ministry?—The remarks upon Jerusalem immediately above have their bearing upon this question also, but that which is here specially important is to estimate the evidence which comes from the circle of thoughts in the midst of which the Gospel was written. How difficult it is at any period to realise the ideas of an earlier period every dramatist and writer of fiction knows. He may clothe his characters in the dress of their day, and surround them with the manners and customs of the past, but unless they are in a consummate master’s hands they will think and speak in the present. The question then is, does the writer of the Fourth Gospel think and speak the thoughts and words of the first century or not? Now the fall of Jerusalem was a great gulf across which the ideas of the Jews about the Messiah could not pass. With it disappeared from the minds of that generation all hope for a temporal Messianic reign in Jerusalem. And yet this expectation runs like a thread through the whole texture of this Gospel. The inference is that the writer grew up amidst this expectation—lived through the conflict between Jesus, who taught the spiritual nature of Messiah’s kingdom, and the Jews, who could grasp only the temporal—and narrated at the close of the century that in which he himself had taken part, and which with him survived the destruction of Jerusalem.

Other instances of this knowledge of the thoughts of the period are of frequent occurrence. Comp., e.g., chaps. iv. 20, 21 (Jerusalem, the place of worship); vii. 1–13 (murmuring among the people about Jesus); ix. 8 (the neighbours’ remark about the blind beggar); xv. 21 (division among the Jews); xvi. 47—53 (consultation of the Sanhedrin); chap. xix. (the various phases of thought during the trial).

(d) Was the author an Apostle?—The Fourth Gospel tells us more of what passed in the Apostolic circle than we can gather from the whole of the three earlier Gospels. The writer is as familiar with the thoughts which were suggested at the time to the Apostles as he is with the thoughts of the Jews exemplified in the last section. Take, e.g., chap. ii. 20–22, where the writer records the saying of our Lord regarding the Temple, and how the disciples understood this after the resurrection. There are instances of the same kind of knowledge in chaps. ix. 7–13, xvi. 16, and xx. 22, 23, where the reader may without difficulty note others.

The minute knowledge of incidents in the relation between the Apostles and the Lord would seem to point exclusively to one of the Twelve as the writer. Comp. chaps. i. 38, 50 (Andrew, Simon, Philip, Nathaniel, and the unnamed disciple); vi. 5–7 (the question to Philip); 9 (Andrew’s remark); 68 (Peter’s answer); 70 (the excited remark about Judas); ix. 2 (the question about the man born blind); x. 16 (the character of Thomas and the name Didymus, comp. xiv. 5; xx. 24, 28; xxi. 2); xii. 21, 22 (visit of the Greeks); xiii. (the Last Supper); xvi. 16 (the exact position of Peter and the other disciples and the porteress); xx. 9, 20, and the reader may without difficulty note others.

The Notes point out in several instances the agreement between the character of Peter as drawn in the Fourth Gospel and that which is found in the Synoptists. More striking still, because inconceivable, except by one who drew it from the life, is the character of our Lord Himself. As we try and think out the writer’s representation of the human life of Christ, we feel that we are being guided by one who is not
picturing to us an ideal, but is declaring to us that which was from the beginning, which he had heard which he had seen with his eyes, which he had looked upon, and his hands had handled of the Word of Life. (Comp. 1 John i. 3.)

(e) *Was the author an eye-witness?—* This question has in part been answered above; but it will add strength to the opinion which is probably fixing itself in the candid reader’s mind if some of the instances of vivid picturing which Renan and others have noticed in this Gospel are collected here.

With such to persons, all that has been said of individual Apostles applies. Add to them Nicodemus (chap. iii., Note); Martha and Mary (xi.); the women at the cross (xix. 25); the Magdalene (xxi. 1).

2. The indication of places and of feasts given above apply also in answer to this question.

3. The writer knows the days and the hours when events occurred. He was there, and is writing from memory, and knows that it was about the tenth (i. 39), or seventh (iv. 52), or sixth hour (iv. 6; xix. 14). (Comp. chaps. i. 29—35, 43; ii. 13; iv. 40; xi. 6, 39; xii. 1.)

4. We find running all through the Gospel an exactness of description, a representation of the whole scene photographed, as it were, on the writer’s Lord. The only explanation is, that the studied, the evidence will in all its fulness be such as he thinks of them, see the whole picture before whole, and the Gospel itself is carefully read and the phenomena, and does violence to none, is that thus only are the facts explained and the conditions true.

Was the author one of the sons of Zebedee?—Assuming that he was an eye-witness and an Apostle, we are sure that he was not Andrew, who is named in the Gospel four times, nor Peter (thirty-three times), nor Philip (twice), nor Nathanael (five times), nor Thomas (five times), nor Judas Iscariot (eight times), nor Judas, not Iscariot (ones). Of the five other Apostles, Matthew is necessarily excluded, and James the son of Alpheus, and Simon the Canaanite occupy too unimportant a position in the Synoptic narrative to bring them within the limits of our hypothesis.

The sons of Zebedee remain. Now, what is the relation of the Fourth Gospel to them? While they are prominent among the members of the first Apostolic group in the Synoptists, and in the Acts of the Apostles, they are not even mentioned in this Gospel. In chap. i. 41 (see Note there), it is probable that both are referred to, but neither are named. In chap. xxi. 2, they are, on any interpretation, placed in an inferiority of order unknown to the earlier or later history, and are probably named last of those who were Apostles. This omission of names is not confined to the sons. It was so with the mother also. All we know of her comes from the earlier Gospels. We have, indeed, from chap. xix. 25 that she was one of the women at the cross; but we have to turn to the parallel passages before we read of Salome or the mother of Zebedee’s children.

Such are the facts; but if one of these brothers is the writer of this Gospel, then, and as far as we now know, thus only are the facts explained and the conditions met. But if the author was one of the sons of Zebedee, we can go a step further and assert that he was St. John, for St. James was a martyr in the Herodian persecution (Acts xii. 1; A.D. 44.).

(g) *Was the author the “disciple whom Jesus loved?”*—(Chaps. xiii. 23; xix. 26; xx. 2; xxi. 7, 20. Comp. xviii. 15; xx. 2, 3, 4, 8.) The concluding words of the Gospel (chap. xxi. 24), as compared with verses 7 and 20, formally assert this identification. It may be granted that these words are not those of the writer, but an attestation on the part of the Ephesian Church. Still they are part of the Gospel as it was first published, and are the words of one who claims to speak from personal knowledge.

But admitting that the writer was the disciple whom Jesus loved, then we have the key to what seems an impossible omission of the sons of Zebedee in this Gospel. The writer deliberately omits all mention of his own family, but his writing is the record of events in which he had himself taken part, and in this lies its value. His own personality cannot therefore be suppressed. He is present in all he writes, and yet the presence is felt, not seen. A veil rests over it—a name given to him, it may be, by his brethren, and cherished by him as the most honoured name that man could bear; but beneath the veil lives the person of John, the son of Zebedee and Salome, and the Apostle of the Lord.

We have now found in the Gospel answers to the questions which have been so often asked, and very variously answered, during the last half-century. If the answers are taken as but small parts of a great whole, and the Gospel itself is carefully read and studied, the evidence will in all its fulness be such as cannot be gainsaid. In the spirit of the striking words which we have quoted above (p. 372), it may be said that while here minute criticism thinks it may trace an error, or there some part of the evidence may be explained away—while various separate hypotheses may be invented to account for the various separate facts—the one postulate which accounts for the whole of the phenomena, and does violence to none, is that the Fourth Gospel is the work of the Apostle whose name it bears.

Here the two lines of external and internal evidence meet, and if each points only with a high degree of probability, then both together must approximate to certainty.

The indirect line of argument may fairly be used as evidence which leads to the same results. The Fourth Gospel existed as a matter of fact, and was accepted as by St. John, in the last quarter of the second century. If it is asserted that the author was not St. John, we have a right to demand of the assertor that he should account for the fact of its existence, and for the fact of its reception at that time, as the work of the Apostle. This demand has never been met with evidence which would for a moment stand the test of examination.

From one point of view the arguments we have now followed will to most readers seem satisfactory; from another point of view they are painful enough. The fact must be apparent to all that many men have followed out these same arguments to a wholly different result. Among them are men of the highest intellectual culture, and with special knowledge of these special subjects; men whose ability no one has a right to question, and whose honesty no one has a right to impeach. And yet contradictory results cannot both be true. If Lightfoot and Westcott, Ewald and Luthardt
are right, then Strauss and Baur, Keim and Hilgenfeld are wrong. Assertions like the following cannot be reconciled:—

"The elaborate explanations, however, by which the phenomena of the Fourth Gospel are reconciled with the assumption that it was composed by the Apostle John are in vain, and there is not a single item of evidence within the first century and a half which does not agree with internal testimony in opposing the supposition." *

"We have seen that whilst there is not one particle of evidence during a century and a half after the events recorded in the Fourth Gospel that it was composed by the son of Zebedee, there is, on the contrary, the strongest reason for believing that he did not write it." *

"That John is really the author of the Gospel, and that no other planned or interpreted it than he who at all times is named as its author, cannot be doubted or denied, however often in our own times critics have been pleased to doubt and deny it on grounds which are wholly foreign to the subject; on the contrary, every argument, from every quarter to which we can look, every trace and record, combine together to render any serious doubt upon the question absolutely impossible." (Heinrich Ewald, quoted by Professor Westcott as "calm and decisive words," which "are simply true." †

"Those who since the first discussion of this question have been really conversant with it, never could have had, and never have had, a moment's doubt. As the attack on St. John has become fiercer and fiercer, and more solidly established, error has been pursued into its last hiding-place, and at this moment the facts before us are such that no man who does not will knowingly to choose error and reject truth can dare to say that the Fourth Gospel is not the work of the Apostle John." §

In one case or the other the human intellect, honestly inquiring for the true, has been convinced of the false. Plain men may well ask, Which are we to believe, or how can we be certain that either is true? The negative criticism has not shrunk from poisoning its arrows with the assertion that bigotry in favour of received opinions has closed the eyes of its opponents to the light of truth. It may sometimes be so; but unless much of the criticism of the present day is strangely misread, there is a blinding bigotry which prevents men from seeing the truth of received opinions simply because they have been received. There are minds to which the "semper, ubique, et ab omnibus" marks out an opinion for rejection, or at least for cavil. And yet the world is wiser than any one man in it, and truth has been written in other languages than German, and seventeen centuries of a belief which has borne the noblest results and commanded the assent of the noblest intellects, will hold its ground against the changing moods of the last fifty years. The "higher criticism" must not wonder if humbler minds withhold their assent to its dicta until it has agreed upon some common ground of faith which is not always shifting, and individual disciples have proved the depth of their own convictions by adhering to them. These combatants in the battle between error and truth are men of war armed in the armour of their schools, but plain men will feel that they have not essayed this armour and cannot wear it; and will go down to the battle with the moral Philistines who threaten Israel, trusting in the simple pebble of the old faith, and in the arm served by a firm trust in the presence of God.

The Fourth Gospel foreshadows its own history. It tells of Light, Truth, Life, Love, rejected by the mere intellect, but accepted by the whole man; and it has been with the historical as with the personal Christ represented in its pages. "Men learned to know Him, and be in love with Him before they fully understood what He was and what He did. The faith which in the Gospel stories we see asked for and given, secured, and educated, is a faith which fastens itself on a living Saviour, though it can but little comprehend the method or even the nature of the salvation . . . As it was with the disciples, so also it is with ourselves. The evidential works have their own most important, most necessary office; but the Lord Himself is His own evidence, and secures our confidence, love, and adoration by what He is, more than by what He does."**

For the many to whom the evidences as to the authorship of the Fourth Gospel must come as the testimony of others, and to whom the conflict of testimony must oftentimes bring perplexity, the ultimate test must lie in the appeal of the Gospel to the whole man. If the heart studies the Christ as portrayed in this writing, it will need no other proof of His divinity, but will bow before Him with the confession, "Truly this was the Son of God." Yes; and it will feel also that the penman was one who, more deeply than any other of the sons of men, drank of the Spirit of Christ—that he was a disciple who loved the Lord, a disciple whom Jesus loved; and it will feel that the voice of the Church is the voice of the heart of humanity, feeling as itself feels and speaking as itself speaks, that this writing is the Gospel of Jesus Christ, and that it is the "Gospel according to St. John." [*For the matter of this section the student may conveniently refer to Lieke, Godet, and Liddon, as before; Luthardt, St. John the Author of the First Gospel, English translation, Clark, 1875, in which the Appendix on the Literature, revised and enlarged by Gregory, is a valuable and distinctive feature; Hutton, Essays Theological and Literary, vol. i. pp. 144—276, 1871; Sanday, Authorship and Historical Character of the Fourth Gospel, 1875; The Gospels in the Second Century, 1876; Westcott's Introduction, Ed. 4, 1872, and Canon of the New Testament, Ed. 3, 1870; or in an easier form, Bible in the Church, Ed. 2, 1866; Leathes, The Witness of St. John to Christ, 1870, The Religion of the Christ, 1874: Lightfoot, Articles in the Contemporary Review, beginning in December, 1874; Article, "The Authorship of the Fourth Gospel," in Edinburgh Review, January, 1877; Articles on "St. John, and Modern Criticism," by Beyerling, in Contemporary Review, October and November, 1877; and on the other side, Supernatural Religion, Ed. 6, 1875, vol. ii. pp. 251—476; Davidson, Introduction to the New Testament, 1868, vol. ii. pp. 323—408; Taylor, The Fourth Gospel, Ed. 2, 1870.]

III. Time when and Place where the Fourth Gospel was written.—(1) If the Gospel was written by St. John, its date must be placed within the limits of the first century. There is good reason for thinking

that the last chapter (see Notes upon it) is an appendix, coming chiefly from the hand of the Apostle himself, but that the closing verses (24 and 25) give the corroborative testimony of others. The fact of an appendix, and the difference of its style from that of the earlier writing, points to an interval of some years, during which it may be, the original Gospel was known to a limited circle before it was openly published. This appendix is, however, incorporated with the earlier writing in all the oldest copies and versions, and was probably, therefore, thus incorporated during the lifetime of the Apostle. The beginning of the last decade of the first century is a limit, then, after which the Gospel could not have been written by St. John. In fixing a limit before which it could not have been written, there is greater difficulty, but the following considerations point to a date certainly not earlier than A.D. 70, and probably not earlier than A.D. 80.

(a) The absence of all reference to St. John in the Pastoral Epistles of St. Paul. (b) The style, though strongly Hebraic, is much less so than the Book of Revelation. It is Hebrew partly clothed in Greek, and for this development of thought and language we may assign a period of ten or twenty years. The relation of the Epistles and the Apocalypse to the Gospel belongs to the Introductions to those books; but it will be found that the Gospel probably occupies a middle place, being considerably later than the Apocalypse, and somewhat earlier than the Epistles.

(c) The subject-matter of the Gospel, while representing a later development of theology than that of the Epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians, points to a much earlier development than that which we find in the earliest of the Gnostic systems at the beginning of the second century. (Comp. Eus. *Hist.* A. p. 552.)

(d) The references to the Jews, their customs, places, &c., are as much as at a distance and in the past, and needing explanation in the present. See, e.g., chaps. iv. 9; v. 13 (comp. xi. 18); vi. 16, 18; vii. 13, and the instances given above (pp. 373-5).

The earliest historical evidence we have is that of Irenæus, who places the Gospel according to St. John after the other three, i.e., as he places the Gospels according to St. Mark and St. Luke after the deaths of St. Peter and St. Paul, not earlier than A.D. 70, and probably thirty years later. (See Eusebius, *Eccles. Hist.*, v. 3.)

The general voice of antiquity gave A.D. 85 or 86 as the exact year, and while we cannot regard this as authoritative, it falls in with the probabilities of the case. Without fixing the year thus definitely, we may regard the date as one which could not be much earlier than A.D. 80, or much later than A.D. 90, and conclude that the Gospel in its present form approximates to the later, rather than to the earlier date.

(2) The passage of Irenæus above referred to gives us also a definite statement that the place from which the Gospel was written was Ephesus. "Afterwards, John, the disciple of the Lord, who also leaned on His breast—he again put forth his Gospel while he abode in Ephesus in Asia" (Against Heresies, iii. 1, Oxford Trans., p. 204; also Eusebius, *Eccles. Hist.*, v. 8). This statement is confirmed by the whole tenor of tradition from the second century downwards, and was never, seemingly, questioned until the commencement of the nineteenth century. It falls in with the other scanty hints of facts in St. John's life, and is in entire harmony with the stand-point of the Gospel. It will be unnecessary to weary the reader with proofs of that which hardly needs to be proved. The facts may be found in a convenient form in Luthardt, *St. John the Author of the Fourth Gospel*, Eng. Trans., pp. 115, 166, but even Davidson admits that "Luzelberger and Keim push their scepticism too far in denying John's residence in Asia Minor."

Again, the indirect argument holds good. If Ephesus is not the place from which the Gospel was written, what other place can be named with any show of probability? The only city besides Ephesus in which we might have expected the thoughts of the Prologue is Alexandria (comp. Eus. *Hist.* A: Doctrine of the Word, p. 552), but there is not the shadow of a reason for connecting St. John with this city.

IV. The Purpose which the Writer had in View.—Here, again, there are two lines of evidence which may guide our inquiries: (1) the statements of early writers, which may represent a tradition coming from the time of publication when the purpose was well known; and (2) the indications which may be gathered from the writing itself.

(1) The earliest statement we possess is that of the Muratorian Fragment (see p. 368, and comp. Tregelles, *Canon Muratorianus*, 1867, pp. 1-21, and 32-35), which tells us that "The author of the fourth Gospel was John, one of the disciples. He said to his fellow disciples and bishops who entreated him, 'Fast with me for three days from to-day, and whatever shall be made known to each of us, let us relate it to each other.' In the same night it was revealed to Andrew, one of the Apostles, that John should relate all things in his own name with the recognition of them all. And, therefore, though various elements are taught in the several books of the Gospels, this makes no difference to the faith of believers, since all things are set forth in all of them in one supreme spirit, about the birth, the passion, the resurrection, the conversation with the disciples, and His double advent, the first in the lowness of humiliation which (has been accomplished), the second in the glory of royal power, which is to come. What wonder, therefore, is it if John so constantly brings forward, even in his Epistle, particular (phrases), saying in his own person, 'What we have seen with our eyes, and heard with our ears, and our hands have handled, these things have we written unto you.' For he thus wisheth to be an eye-witness, but also a bearer, and more than this, a writer in order, of all the wonderful works of the Lord."

On this question the testimony of Irenæus has a special value, from the fact that he was separated from the time of St. John by one generation only, and was directly connected, through Polycarp, with the circle in which the Gospel was first circulated. It may be well, therefore, to quote his words at some length:

"In course of preaching this faith, John, the disciple of the Lord, desirous by preaching of the Gospel to remove the error which Cerinthus had been sowing among men; and long before him those who are called Nicolaitans, who are an offshoot of the knowledge [Gnosis] falsely so called; to confound them and persuade men that there is but one God, who made all things by His word, and not, as they affirm, that the Creator is one person, the Father of the Lord; and he also confesseth that there is a difference of persons between the Son of the Creator and the Christ from the higher Aeons, who both remained impassible, descending on Jesus, the Son of the Creator, and glided back again to his own Pleroma; and that the Beginning is the Only Begotten,
but the Word the true Son of the Only Begotten; and that the created system to which we belong was not made by the First Deity, but by some Power far distant from the Royalty which is above all, and which knows not the God who is over all. And he added that Jesus was not born of a virgin (for that seemed to him impossible), but was the son of Joseph and Mary like all other men, and had more power than men in justice, prudence, and wisdom. And that after His baptism there descended on Him from that Royalty which is above all, Christ in the figure of a dove, and that He then declared the unknown Father and did mighty works; but that in the end Christ again soared back from Jesus, and that Jesus suffered and rose again, but Christ remained impossible as being spiritual' (lib. i., cap. xxvi., Oxford Trans., p. 77).

In lib. iii., cap. iii., Oxford Trans., p. 208, Irenæus relates the story of the Apostle flying from Cerinthus in the bath. This is repeated in Eusebius, lib. iii., cap. xxv., Bagster’s Trans., p. 131.

Tertullian, Epiphanius, and Jerome agree in the statement that the Gospel was written to meet the heresy of Cerinthus: “And a certain Cerinthus, too, in Asia, taught that the world was not made by the First God, but by a certain Power far separated and distant from the Royalty which is above all, and which knows not the God who is over all. And he added that Jesus was not born of a virgin (for that seemed to him impossible), but was the son of Joseph and Mary like all other men, and had more power than men in justice, prudence, and wisdom. And that after His baptism there descended on Him from that Royalty which is above all, Christ in the figure of a dove, and that He then declared the unknown Father and did mighty works; but that in the end Christ again soared back from Jesus, and that Jesus suffered and rose again, but Christ remained impossible as being spiritual” (lib. i., cap. xxvi., Oxford Trans., p. 77).

In lib. iii., cap. iii., Oxford Trans., p. 208, Irenæus applies this to Cerinthus, but the very term hagios (comp. Eusebius A: Doctrine of the Word, p. 552) shows that the writer did not contemplate his school only. There was an easy connection between Ephesus and Alexandria at the time, and we have an example of it in the teaching of Apollos in Acts xviii. 24. Now the distinctive tenets of all Gnosticism were that the Creator was not the Supreme God, and that matter was the source of all evil. In “all things were created by Him,” we have the answer to one; in “The Word was made flesh,” the answer to the other. The writer gives in chap. ii., verses 1–5, a formal statement of his own purpose: “These are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through His name.” It is usual to refer to these words as though nothing was further from the writer’s thoughts than any polemic purpose. But in the passage quoted from Irenæus, on the heresy of Cerinthus, it will be seen that the separation of the divine Christ from the human Jesus was a prominent tenet. The verse declares that the purpose of the Gospel was to establish the identity of the human Jesus and the Christ who is the Son of God, as an article of faith, that in that faith they might have life through His name.

Eusebius gives no authority beyond “they say” for the statement that St. John had seen the earlier Gospels, and it does not follow that he had seen them in their present form. That he could have done so is, a priori, improbable, and there is no evidence of any such circulation of them as would be implied. It is further improbable from the relation between the subject-matter of the fourth Gospel as compared with the three; it contains too much that is common to all to
be regarded as a mere supplement; it differs too much in arrangement, and even in details, to have been based upon a study of the others. Moreover it is in itself a complete work, and nowhere gives any indication that it was intended to be simply an appendix to other works.

The origin of the Gospels has been dealt with in the General Introduction (see p. xxvii.). There would be, probably, in the first generation after the life of Christ an oral Gospel, in which all the chief events of His career, and chief discourses were preserved. In different Churches different parts would be committed to writing, and carefully preserved, and compared with similar writings elsewhere. Such documents would form the basis of the Synoptic Gospels. Such documents doubtless existed at Ephesus, and John had access to them; but it is to his personal remembrance of Christ's life and work, and his residence in Jerusalem, and his close union with the Virgin Mary, that we are to trace his special information. Mary, and his own mother Salome, and Mary Magdalene, and Nicodemus, and the family of Bethany, and the Church at Jerusalem, are the sources from which he would have learnt of events beyond his personal knowledge.

[For the matter of this section comp., in addition to the books quoted, Lücke and Godet as before (this part of Lücke's Einleitung is of great value, and may be read in the Prolegomena of Alford, who adopts it, and in that of Wordsworth, who rejects it); Mansel, *The Gnostic Heresies of the First and Second Centuries*, 1875; Neander, *Church History*, § 4, Clark's Eng. Trans., vol. i., pp. 67-93; Ueberweg, *History of Philosophy*, Eng. Trans., 1874, § 77; Wood's *Discoveries at Ephesus*, Lond., 1877; *Introductions*, in this Commentary, to the Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians.]

**V. CONTENTS AND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE GOSPEL.** The Gospel is divided into two main sections at the close of chap. xii. The great subject of the first of these sections is the manifestation of Christ; and that of the second is the result of this manifestation. The first represents the life; the second, the passion, death, and resurrection. Subdividing these main sections, we have the following outline of the general contents of the Gospel:

1. Prologue. The link with the eternity of the past (chap. i. 1-18).
2. Manifestation of Jesus. Varying degrees of acceptance (chaps. i. 19-iv. 54).
3. The fuller revelation and growth of unbelief among the Jews (chaps. v. 1-xii. 50).
4. The fuller revelation and growth of faith among the disciples (chaps. xiii. 1-xvii. 26).
5. The climax of unbelief. Voluntary surrender and crucifixion of Jesus (chaps. xviii. 1-xix. 42).
6. The climax of faith. Resurrection and appearances of Jesus (chap. xx.).
7. Epilogue. The link with the eternity of the future (chap. xxi.).

The reader will find a detailed analysis of these sections and their parts for the sake of convenient reference in the following notes. It has been attempted by a consecutive enumeration to indicate the lines of thought running through the whole Gospel; but these are many, and a brief sketch may be helpful to those who attempt to trace them.

1. The Prologue (chap. i. 1-18) strikes, in a few words, the keynote of the whole. The Word with God, and God, revealed to men, made flesh—this is the central thought. The effect of the revelation, received not, received; light not comprehended in darkness, but ever shining; this, which runs like a thread through the whole Gospel, is as a subsidiary thought present here.

2. The manifestation of Jesus (chaps. i. 19-iv. 54) is introduced by the witness of the Baptist, and one of the characteristic words of the Gospel, which has already occurred in verse 8 (see Note on it), is made prominent in the very first sentence of the narrative proper. This witness of John is uttered to messengers from the Sanhedrin, is repeated when Jesus is seen coming unto him, and spoken yet again on the following day.

The witness of John is followed by the witness of Christ Himself. At first He manifests Himself in private to the disciples, when their hearts respond to His witness, and at the marriage feast, when the voice of nature joins itself with that of man; and then publicly, beginning in His Father's house, and proceeding in a widening circle, from the Temple at Jerusalem to the city, and then to Judea, and then Samaria, and then Galilee. Typical characters represent this manifestation and its effects—Nicodemus, the Master in Israel; the despised woman of despised Samaria, herself steeped in sin; the courtier of alien race, led to faith through suffering and love. This period is one of acceptance in Jerusalem (chap. ii. 23); Judea (chap. iii. 29); Samaria (chap. iv. 39-42); Galilee (chap. iv. 45, 49); and yet its brightness is crossed by dark lines (chap. ii. 24, 25), and the struggle between light and darkness is not absent (chap. iii. 18, 21).

3. Following this public manifestation, we have in the third section (chaps. v. 1-xii. 50) the fuller revelation of Christ; and, side by side with it, the progressive stages of unbelief among the Jews.

He is Life, and shows this in the energy given to the impotent man at the pool of Bethesda; but they persecute Him because He did these things on the Sabbath day. He shows that His work is one with the Father's, but they seek to kill Him as a blasphemer. Thus early is the issue of the struggle foreshadowed; and thus early does He point out that the final issue is not in physical death, and trace to the absence of moral preparation the true reason of His rejection (chap. v.).

He is Life, and shows this in blessing the food which gives sustenance to thousands, and in declaring Himself to be "the bread of life," but they think of manna in the desert, and murmur at one whom they knew to be Jesus-bar-Joseph claiming to have come down from heaven; and again the line between reception and rejection is drawn. Many go back, but some rise to a higher faith; yet even the light which shines in this inner circle is crossed by the presence of one who is a devil (chap. vi.).

He is Truth, and declares at the Feasts of Tabernacles that His teaching is from heaven, and that He Himself is from heaven, whither He will return. The perception of truth is in the will to obey it. He that willth to do His will shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God. The effect of this teaching is that many believe.

4. The fuller revelation and the progressive stages of unbelief among the Jews.

Be His life, and shows this in blessing the food which gives sustenance to thousands, and in declaring Himself to be "the bread of life," but they think of manna in the desert, and murmur at one whom they knew to be Jesus-bar-Joseph claiming to have come down from heaven; and again the line between reception and rejection is drawn. Many go back, but some rise to a higher faith; yet even the light which shines in this inner circle is crossed by the presence of one who is a devil (chap. vi.).

He is Truth, and declares at the Feasts of Tabernacles that His teaching is from heaven, and that He Himself is from heaven, whither He will return. The perception of truth is in the will to obey it. He that willth to do His will shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God. The effect of this teaching is that many believe.

5. The fuller revelation and the progressive stages of unbelief among the Jews.

Be His life, and shows this in blessing the food which gives sustenance to thousands, and in declaring Himself to be "the bread of life," but they think of manna in the desert, and murmur at one whom they knew to be Jesus-bar-Joseph claiming to have come down from heaven; and again the line between reception and rejection is drawn. Many go back, but some rise to a higher faith; yet even the light which shines in this inner circle is crossed by the presence of one who is a devil (chap. vi.).

He is Truth, and declares at the Feasts of Tabernacles that His teaching is from heaven, and that He Himself is from heaven, whither He will return. The perception of truth is in the will to obey it. He that willth to do His will shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God. The effect of this teaching is that many believe.

6. The fuller revelation and the progressive stages of unbelief among the Jews.

Be His life, and shows this in blessing the food which gives sustenance to thousands, and in declaring Himself to be "the bread of life," but they think of manna in the desert, and murmur at one whom they knew to be Jesus-bar-Joseph claiming to have come down from heaven; and again the line between reception and rejection is drawn. Many go back, but some rise to a higher faith; yet even the light which shines in this inner circle is crossed by the presence of one who is a devil (chap. vi.).

He is Truth, and declares at the Feasts of Tabernacles that His teaching is from heaven, and that He Himself is from heaven, whither He will return. The perception of truth is in the will to obey it. He that willth to do His will shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God. The effect of this teaching is that many believe.
is, what are true discipleship and true freedom and true life, by the word of the Son, who was before Abraham. Their hatred passes from words to acts, and they take up stones to cast at Him (chap. vii. 12—59). [The paragraph from chaps. vili. 53—vili. 11 does not belong to this place. See Note upon it.]

He is Light, and shows this by giving physical sight to the man born blind. The Pharisees seek to disprove, and then to discredit, the miracle, and again there is a division. Some say that this man is not of God because He keepeth not the Sabbath. Others ask how a man that is a sinner can do such miracles. Jesus Himself declares the separation which His coming makes between those who are spiritually blind and those who spiritually see (chap. ix.).

He is Love, and declares this in the allegory of the Good Shepherd. Again a division is made prominent between those who are willing to accept and those who have willed to reject Him. Then comes Dedication, and the request to declare plainly whether He is the Christ. The answer brings again to them the earlier teaching of moral preparedness, and they take up stones to stone Him. They justify their act by the charge of blasphemy, which He proves from the Scriptures to be without foundation. But their determination has gone beyond the reach of reason, and they seek again to take Him. Rejected by His own, and in His own city, He withdraws from it to Bethany beyond Jordan. The darkness comprehends not the light, but still it shineth, and “many believed on Him there” (chap. x.).

He is Life, and Truth, and Love, and shows this in going again to Judea to conquer death, and reveal the fuller truth of the Resurrection and Life, and sympathise with the sorrowing home. The attributes of divinity are so fully manifested that many of the Jews believe, but with the clearer light the darkness is also made more fully visible, and the Sanhedrin formally decrees His death. When this decree is passed He again withdraws to the wilderness, but disciples are still with Him (chap. xi.).

As the Passover draws near He is again at Bethany. Love to Him is shown in the devotion of Mary; the intimate and personal oneness in the bosom of the family of God because He keepeth not the Sabbath. Others ask, “How can this man give light?” and Mary estimates His work in the devotion of Mary; the intimate and personal oneness in the bosom of the family of God. Other disciples, too, give to His ministry, to His teaching, to His work, to His death, and now that the world has gone after Him, and there is the band of women in the last office of loving service, the Master has become the Shepherd of His flock, and the Good Shepherd. Again a division is made prominent between those who are willing to accept and those who have willed to reject Him. Then comes Dedication, and the request to declare plainly whether He is the Christ. The answer brings again to them the earlier teaching of moral preparedness, and they take up stones to stone Him. They justify their act by the charge of blasphemy, which He proves from the Scriptures to be without foundation. But their determination has gone beyond the reach of reason, and they seek again to take Him. Rejected by His own, and in His own city, He withdraws from it to Bethany beyond Jordan. The darkness comprehends not the light, but still it shineth, and “many believed on Him there” (chap. x.).

He is Life, and Truth, and Love, and shows this in going again to Judea to conquer death, and reveal the fuller truth of the Resurrection and Life, and sympathise with the sorrowing home. The attributes of divinity are so fully manifested that many of the Jews believe, but with the clearer light the darkness is also made more fully visible, and the Sanhedrin formally decrees His death. When this decree is passed He again withdraws to the wilderness, but disciples are still with Him (chap. xi.).

(4) With the next section (chaps. xili. 1—xvili. 26) we pass from the revelation to the Jews of the fuller truths of the disciples. And here is the passing from hatred to love, from darkness to light; but as in the deepest darkness of rejection rays of light are ever present, so the fullest light of acceptance is never free from shadows.

His Love is shown by the significant act of washing the disciples’ feet, and this is spiritually interpreted. His words of love cannot, however, apply to all, for the dark presence of the betrayer is still with them. When Hatred withdraws from the presence of Love, and Judas goes out into the night, then the deeper thoughts of Jesus (which are as the revelation of heaven to earth) are spoken without reserve. This discourse continues from chaps. xiii. 31—xvi. 33, when it passes into the prayer of the seventeenth chapter.

It tells them of His glory because He is going to the Father; of the Father’s house where He will welcome them; that He is the Way, the Truth, and the Life; that being absent, He will still be present, answering their prayers, sending to them the Paraclete, abiding in them; that His peace shall remain with them. It tells, in the allegory of the Vine, that there is an unseen spiritual union between Him and the Church, and every individual member of it; that there is, therefore, to be union between themselves; that the world will necessarily hate them because they are not of it; but that the Paraclete in them, and they themselves, of their own knowledge, should be the witness to the world.

It tells them the truth so hard to learn—that His own departure is expedient; declares the coming and the office of the Paraclete, and His own spiritual power with them, and comforts them with the thought of the full revelation of the Father, and the final victory over the world which He has overcome. Their faith rises to the sure conviction that He is from God. But even this full acceptance is not unclouded; He knows they will all be scattered, and leave Him alone.

And then having in fulness of love taught them, He lifts His eyes to heaven and prays for Himself, for the disciples, and for all believers, that in Him, as believers, they may have the communion with the Godhead which comes from the revelation of the Father through the Son.

(5) But here again in the narrative Darkness alternates with Light, and Hatred with Love. From the sacred calm of this inner circle we pass (chaps. xviil. 1—xix. 42) to the betrayal and apprehension, the trials before the Jewish and Roman authorities, the committal and crucifixion, the death and burial. Unbelief has reached its climax, and hatred gazes upon Him whom it has crucified.

(6) But love is greater than hatred, and light than darkness, and life than death. From the climax of unbelief we pass to the climax of faith, Nicodemus, ruler of the Jews, and Joseph of Arimathaea, join with the band of women in the last office of love. The appearance to Mary Magdalen, to the ten Apostles, to the eleven now including Thomas, has carried conviction to all, and drawn from Him who is last to believe the fullest expression of faith, “My Lord and my God” (chap. xx.).

The writer has traced the struggle between acceptance and rejection through its successive stages, and now that the victory is won the purpose of His work is fulfilled. There is a faith more blessed than sight, and these things are written that we may believe.

(7) The things which the writer has told are but a few of those with which his memory was stored. There were many signs not written in this book. He afterwards (comp. Notes on chap. xxi.) adds one of those which serves as a link with the future, in part, perhaps, to prevent a misconception which had sprung up about His own life. Other disciples, too, give to His writing the stamp of their own knowledge of its certain truth.

Such are the characteristics of this Gospel. We feel as we read them that we are in a region of thoughts widely different from those of the earlier Gospels.
The characteristic thoughts naturally express themselves in characteristic words, and many of these are dwelt upon in the following Notes. The reader will not need to be reminded, as he again and again comes upon "truth" (twenty-five times), "true" (ideally, nine times), "witness" (substantive and verb, forty-seven times), "believe" (ninety-eight times), "world" (seventy-eight times), "sign" (seventeen times), that he has in such words the special forms which express the special thoughts which have come to us through St. John. Some characteristics in style have been pointed out in § II. as bearing upon the authorship of the Gospel.

VI. Sketch of the Literature of the Subject.—References have already been given, under the earlier sections of this Introduction, to works where the reader may find fuller information upon the different topics dealt with. Here it is intended to note such works as the ordinary reader may without difficulty have access to, and which bear upon the subject-matter of the Gospel itself.

Of the older commentaries, Chrysostom's Homilies on the Gospel of St. John, and the Tractatus 124 in Joannes of Augustine, may be read in the Oxford Library of the Fathers. The Commentary of Cyril of Alexandria has lately been translated by Mr. P. E. Pusey, Oxford, 1875. The Aurea Catena of Thomas Aquinas is accessible in the Oxford translation of 1841–45.

Of more modern Commentaries, Lampe’s three quarto volumes in Latin (Basileae, 1725–27), take the first place, and are a storehouse from which almost all his successors have freely borrowed. The century and a half which has passed since his book appeared has been fruitful in works on St. John. A selection of exegetical works prefixed to the second volume of Meyer’s Commentary, Eng. Trans., 1875, contains more than forty published during this period, and the number may be largely increased. The Appendix to the English translation of Luthardt’s St. John the Author of the Fourth Gospel, contains a list of some 500 works and articles upon the authenticity and genuineness alone, which has been published since the year 1790.


In our own country the Commentaries of Wordsworth, 1868, and Alford, Ed. 7, 1874, are known to all students of the New Testament, and the latter work has been also arranged specially for English readers (1868). Two works, which are less known than they deserve to be, may be specially noted as furnishing in a convenient form the patristic interpretation: Commentary on the Authorized English Version of the Gospel according to St. John, by the Rev. F. H. Dunwell, London, 1872; and The Gospel of John, illustrated from Ancient and Modern Authors, by Rev. J. Ford, London, 1852. Two other English books on this Gospel deal specially with its subject-matter: the well-known Discourses at Lincoln’s Inn of the late Frederick Denison Maurice, a work marked by his spiritual insight and earnest devotion, and containing a striking criticism on Baur’s mythical theory, Camb. 1857; and The Doctrinal System of St. John, by Professor Lias, London, 1875.

For all questions of geography, chronology, and Jewish antiquities, the English reader has the latest results of scholarship in the Biblical Dictionaries edited by Dr. William Smith and by Dr. Kitto, Ed. 3, 1866; in Dean Stanley’s Sinai and Palestine; in the Reports of the “Palestine Exploration Fund”; in the Synopsis of Dr. Karl Wieseler, Eng. Trans., 1864; in the Chronological and Geographical Introduction of Dr. Ch. Ed. Caspari, Eng. Trans., 1876. Special reference may be made to the articles on Jewish subjects by Dr. Ginsburg in Kitto’s Cyclopaedia. See, e.g., in connection with this Gospel the articles on “Education,” “Dispersion,” “Dedication” “Purim,” “Passover,” and “Tabernacles.”

On questions of the text, and the translation of the text, a very valuable help has been furnished in The Holy Bible, with Various Renderings and Readings from the Best Authorities, London, 1876; this Gospel has also been revised by “Five Clergymen,” London, 1857, and the results have been incorporated in The New Testament, Authorised Version Revised, London, 1876, of the late Dean Alford, who was one of them.

The aim of the present writer has been to help the English reader to understand the Gospel according to St. John. Within the brief limits of time and space at his command, he has tried to think out and express the writer’s meaning; and in the many difficulties which beset his path, he has not consciously neglected any important guide. He is not unaware that some subjects are dwelt upon but briefly, and that others are entirely passed over, upon which the reader may seek information; but the pages of a Commentary are not those of a Cyclopaedia, and his own pages are but part of a greater whole. He trusts that no part of any text has been passed over without an honest attempt to ascertain and give its true meaning. The attempt will not be in vain if it helps any who have not access to works of greater learning and scholarship, to study and learn for themselves the meaning of words which, without such such study, no one can teach.

It remains for the writer to express his obligations to the works which he has above mentioned, and to many others from which, directly and indirectly, thoughts have been suggested. To Lücke, Luthardt (especially in the Analysis), Godet, and Alford (both Commentary and Translation), he is conscious of owing a constant debt; but the work which has influenced his own thoughts most in the study of the New Testament, and without which the following Notes, though entirely differing from it in purpose and character, could not have been written, is the Kritisch Exegetisches Handbuch of Dr. Heinrich Meyer.
THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN.

CHAPTER I.—(1) In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. (2) The same was in the beginning with God. (3) All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made. (4) In him was life; and the life was the light of men.

[1. Prologue (verses 1—18).

THE WORD (1) was God (verses 1—5); became man (verses 6—13); revealed the Father (verses 14—18).

(1) In the beginning.—The reference to the opening words of the Old Testament is obvious, and is the more striking when we remember that a Jew would constantly speak of and quote from the book of Genesis as Breshibit ("in the beginning"). It is quite in harmony with the Hebrew tone of this Gospel to do so, and it can hardly be that St. John wrote his Breshibit without having that of Moses present to his mind, and without being guided by its meaning. We have then, in the earlier words, a law of interpretation for the later, and this law excludes every such sense as "the Everlasting Father" or "the divine wisdom," which is before all things, though both these have been supported by his and there a name of weight; much more does this law, strengthened as it is by the whole context, exclude any such sense as "the commencement of Christ's work on earth," which owes its existence to the foregone conclusion of a theory, and is marked by the absence of any support of weight. Our law seems equally to exclude from these words the idea of "antiority to time," which is expressed, not in them, but in the substantive verb which immediately follows. The Mosaic conception of "beginning" is marked by the first creative act. St. John places himself at the same starting point of time, but before he speaks of any creation he asserts the pre-existence of the Creator. In this "beginning" there already "was" the Word. (See expressions of this thought in chap. xvi. 5; Prov. viii. 23; 1 John i. 1; Rev. iii. 14.)

Was the Word.—See Excursus A: Doctrine of the Word.

With God.—These words express the co-existence, but at the same time the distinction of person. They imply relation with, intercourse with. (Comp. the "in the bosom of the Father" of verse 18, and "Let us make man" of Gen. i. 26.) "Throned face to face with God," "the gaze ever directed towards God," have in its widest sense; the life of the body, even of organisms which we commonly think of as inanimate, the life of the spirit; life in the present, so far as there is communion with the eternal source of life; life in the future, when the idea shall be realised and the communion be complete.

Was.—This is in the Greek the same verb of existence that we have had in verses 1 and 2, and is different from the word in verse 3. Comp. Notes on verse 6, and chap. vii. 58. It places us, then, at the same starting
of men. (5) And the light shineth in darkness; and the darkness comprehended it not.

dpoint of time. The Word was ever life, and from the first existence of any creature became a source of life to others. But the "was" of the first clause of this verse should not be pressed, for we are not quite certain that the original text contained it. Two of our oldest MSS. have "is," which is supported by other evidence, and is in itself of more probable reading. The meaning in this case would be "in the Word there was ever life." Creation is not merely a definite act. There is a constant development of the germs implanted in all the varied forms of being, and these find their sustaining power in the one central source of life. The thought will meet us again in verse 17; but see especially the expression, "upholding all things by the word of his power" (Heb. i. 3, Note). The "was" was the light of men.—We are led from the relation of the Word to the universe to His relation to mankind. That which to lower beings in the scale of creation was more or less fully life, as the nature of each was more or less receptive of its power, is to the being endowed with a moral nature and made in the divine image the satisfaction of every moral need, and the revelation of the divine Being. The "was" still carries us back to the first days of time, when creation in all the beauty of its youth was unostained by sin, when no night had fallen on the moral world, but when there was the brightness of an ever-constant noon-tide in the presence of God. But here, too, the "was" passes in sense into the "is." God is light, and in Him there is no darkness at all. In every man there are rays of light, stronger or feebleer, in greater or lesser darkness. In every man there is a power to see the light, and open his soul to it, and the more he has it still to crave for more. This going forth of the soul to God, is the seeking for life. The Word is the going forth of God to the soul. He is life. In the feeling after, there is finding. The moral struggle is the moral strength. The eye that seeks for light cannot seek in vain. The life was and is the light of men. (6) There was a man sent from God, whose name was John. (7) The same came as a witness, to bear witness of as they followed the voice which called, or received God's law for men, or told forth the word which came to them from Him; true are they of every poet, thinker, statesman, who has grasped some higher truth, or chased some lurking doubt, or taught a nation noble deeds; true are they of every evangelist, martyr, philanthropist, who has preached and gospelled to the heart of men, who has in life death witnessed to its truth, who has shown its power in deeds of mercy and of love; true are they of the humblest Christian who seeks to walk in the light, and from the sick-chamber of the lowliest home may be letting a light shine before men which leads them to glorify the Father which is in heaven. The Light is ever shining, oftentimes, indeed, coloured as it passes through the differing minds of different men, meeting us across the space that separates continents, and the time that separates ages, in widely varying hues; but these shades pass into each other, and in the harmony of all is the pure light of truth.

Comprehended it not.—The meaning of this word differs from that rendered "knew not" in verse 10. The thought here is that the darkness did not lay hold of, did not appropriate the light, so as itself to become light; the thought there is that individuals did not recognize it. Compare Notes on Rom. ix. 30; I Cor. ix. 24; Phil. iii. 12, 13, where the same Greek word occurs. See also Eph. iii. 18, which is the only passage in the New Testament, besides the present one, where the word is rendered by "comprehend."

There was a man, or, There appeared a man. The word is the same as that which is used in verse 3, "were made," "was made," and, as contrasted with the verb "was" in verses 1, 2, 4, signifies the coming into being, as contrasted with original existence. In the same way "man" is emphatically opposed to "the Word," who is the subject of the previous verses. "The Word was God." the man was "sent from God." On the mission of John, see Notes on Matt. iii. The name was not uncommon, but it is striking that it is given here without the usual distinguishing "Baptist." The writer stood to him in the relation of disciple to teacher. To him he was the "forerunner, the least in the kingdom of heaven became greater than he was, and to after ages the disciple became the John, and his earlier master is given the title "Baptist," which distinguishes the man and commemorates the work.

For a Witness.—Stress is laid upon the work of John as "witness." This was generally the object of his coming. It was specially to "bear witness of the Light." The purpose of testimony is conviction "that all men through him might believe," i.e., through John, through his witness. Compare with this purpose of the Baptist's work the purpose of the Apostle's writing, as he himself expresses it in the closing words of chap. xx.; and also the condition and work of the Apostles, as laid down by St. Peter at the first meeting after the Resurrection (Acts i. 21, 22). The word "witness" with its connotation is one of the key-notes of the Johannine writings recurring alike in the Gospel, the Epistles, and the Apocalypse. This is partly concealed from the general reader by the various
the Light, that all men through him might believe. (8) He was not that Light, but was sent to bear witness of that Light. (9) That was the true Light, which lighteth every man that cometh renderings “record,” “testimony,” “witness,” for the one Greek root; but he may see by consulting any English concordance under these words, how frequently the thought was in the Apostle’s mind. See especially Rev. i. 2, 9, Notes.

(8) He was not that Light, but was sent.—It is necessary to repeat the statement of John’s position and work in an emphatic form. Now first for 400 years a great teacher had appeared in Israel. The events of his birth and life had excited the attention of the masses; his bold message, like the cry of another Elias, found its way in burning words to the slumbering hearts of men; and even from the least likely classes, from Pharisee and Sadducee, from publican and soldier, there came the heart’s question, “What history of the world, and as opposed to all more or less imperfect repre- ceived not.

(9) That was the true Light.—The right rendering of this verse is uncertain. It would, probably, give a better sense to translate it, The true Light which lighteth every man was coming into the world, i.e., was manifesting itself at the time when John was bearing witness and men were mistaking the lamp for the light. (Comp. chap. v. 35, Note.)

The true Light was not “true” as opposed to “false,” but “true” as answering to the perfect ideal, and as opposed to all more or less imperfect representations. The meaning of the Greek is quite clear. The difficulty arises from the fact that in English there is but one word to represent the two ideas. The word for the fuller meaning of “ideally true” is not confined to St. John, but is naturally of very frequent recurrence in his writings. The adjective is used nine times in this Gospel, and not at all in the other three. A comparison of the passages will show how important it is to get a right conception of what the word means, and will help to give it. (See chaps. iv. 23, 37; vi. 28; viii. 16; ix. 3; xix. 35.) But, as ideally true, the Light was not subject to the changing conditions of time and space, but was and is true for all humanity, and “lighteth every man.”

(10) In the world.—This manifestation in the flesh recalls the pre-incarnate existence during the whole history of the world, and the creative act itself. (Comp. verses 2 and 3, Note). The two facts are the constant presence of the true Light, and the creation of the world by Him. The world, then, in its highest creature presentation, was the true Light, ought to have have recognised Him. Spirit ought to have felt and known His presence. In this would have been the exercise of its true power and its highest good. But the world was sense-bound, and lost its spiritual perception, and “knew Him not.”

This verse brings back again the thought of verses 3—5, to prepare for the deeper gloom which follows.

(11) He came, as distinct from the “was” of the previous verse, passes on to the historic advent; but as that was but the more distinct act of which there had been foreshadowings in every appearance and revelation of God, these Advents of the Old Testament are not excluded.

(12) Yet the light ever shineth, and the better things lie hidden.
received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name: (13) which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God. (14) And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth.

(15) John bare witness of him, and said, "As many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name: (13) which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God."

The Incarnation.

1 Or, the right, or, privilege. a Matt. i. 16.
cried, saying, This was he of whom I spake, He that cometh after me is preferred before me: for he was before me. (16) And of his fulness have all we received, and grace for grace. (17) For the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ. (18) No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.
The Jews sent to Question

ST. JOHN, I.

John the Baptist.

(19) And this is the record of John, when the Jews sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem to ask him, Who art thou? (20) And he confessed, and denied not; but confessed, I am not the Christ. (21) And they asked him, What then? Art thou Elias? And he saith, I am not. Art thou that prophet? And he answered, No. (22) Then said they unto him, Who art thou? that we may give an answer to them that sent us. What sayest thou of thyself? (23) He said, I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Make straight the way of the Lord, as said the prophet Esaias. (24) And they which were sent of the Pharisees, (25) And they asked him, and said unto him, Why baptizest thou then, if that no man hath ever so known God as to be His interpreter; that the human conception of God as "terrible" and "great" and "marvellous" (Eccles. xliii. 29) is not that of His essential character; that the true conception is that of the loving Father in whose bosom is the only Son, and that this Son is the only true Word uttering to man the will and character and being of God.

2. Manifestation of Jesus. Varying Degrees of Acceptance (chaps. i. 19—iv. 54).

(a) To the messengers of the Sanhedrin (verses 19—28);
(b) At the appearance of Jesus (verses 29—34);
(c) To the two disciples (verses 35—40.)

(19) The narrative is connected with the prologue by the record of John, which is common to both (verse 15), and opens therefore with "And." The Jews.—This term, originally applied to the members of the tribe of Judah, was extended after the Captivity to the whole nation of which that tribe was the chief part. Used by St. John more than seventy times, it is to be understood generally of the representatives of the nation, and of the inhabitants of Judea, and of these as opposed to the teaching and work of Christ. He was himself a Jew, but the true idea of Judaism had led him to the Messiah, and the old name is to him but as the husk that had been burst in the growth of life. It remains for them to whom the name was all, and who, trying to cramp life within rigid forms, had crushed out its power.

Priests and Levites.—The word "Levite" occurs only twice elsewhere in the New Testament—in the parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke x. 32), and in the description of Joses (Acts iv. 36). It is clear from such passages as 2 Chron. xxii. 7—9; xxxv. 3; Neh. viii. 7, that part of the function of the Levites was to give instruction in the Law, and it is probable that the "scribes" were often identical with them. We have, then, here two divisions of the Sanhedrin, as we have two in the frequent phrase of the other Evangelists, "scribes," and "elders," the scribes (Levites) being common to both, and the three divisions being priests, Levites (scribes), and elders (notables). (Comp. verse 24, and Note on Matt. v. 20.)

From Jerusalem. It is to be taken with "sent," not with "priests and Levites." Emphasis is laid upon the fact that the work of John had excited so much attention that the Sanhedrin sent from Jerusalem to make an official 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. (Comp. Luke xxiii. 33.)

(20) Confessed, and denied not; but confessed. —Comp. for the style, Note on verse 3.

That we may give an answer. —The better reading places the pronoun in the most emphatic position: "It is not I who am the Messiah." He understands their question, then, "Who art thou?" as expressing the general expectation, "Is it thou who art the Messiah?"

(23) What then? —Not "What art thou then?" but expressing surprise at the answer, and passing on with impudence to the alternative, "Art thou Elias?" (Comp. on this and the following question, Deut. xviii. 15, 18; Isai. xi. ff.; Mal. iv. 5; 2 Macc. i. 1—8; and Note on Matt. xvi. 14). The angel had announced that "he shall go before Him in the spirit and power of Elias." The Lord declared "Elias is come already" (Matt. xxi. 11, 19, and yet the Forerunner can assert that, in the literal sense in which they ask the question and would understand the answer, he is not Elias, still less "the prophet," by which, whether thinking of the words of Moses or the fuller vision of Isaiah from which he immediately quotes, he would understand the Messiah himself.

(22) That we may give an answer. —He has given the "No" to all the ideas they had formed of him. There is nothing left to them but to draw the definite statement from himself, or to return to their senders empty handed.

(23) But he still gives the "No." They think of his person and his work. He thinks of neither. His eye is fixed on the coming One. In this presence his own personality has no existence. He is as a voice, not to be inquired about but heard. They are acting as men who ask questions about the messenger of a great king who is coming to them and is at hand, instead of hastening with every effort to make ready for him. (Comp. Note on Matt. iii. 3.)

(24) They which were sent. —The best MSS. omit the relative, and the verse thus becomes, "And they had been sent from the Pharisees." (For account of the Pharisees, see Note on Matt. iii. 7.) The statement is made to explain the question which follows, but it should be observed that in this Gospel, where the Sadducees are nowhere mentioned, the term "Pharisees" seems to be used almost in the sense of "Sanhedrin." (Comp. chap. iv. 1; viii. 3; xi. 46, 57.)

(25) Why baptizest thou then? —Baptism, which was certainly one of the initiatory rites of proselytes in the second or third century A.D., was probably so before the work of the Baptist. It is not baptism, therefore, which is strange to the questioners, but the fact that he places Jews and even Pharisees (Matt. iii. 7) in an analogous position to that of proselytes, and makes them to pass through a rite which marks them out as impure, and needing to be cleansed before they enter "the kingdom of heaven." By what authority does he these things? They had interpreted such passages as Ezek. xxxvi. 25 ff. to mean that Baptism should be one of the marks of Messiah's work. None less than the Christ, or Elias, or "the prophet" could
thou be not that Christ, nor Elias, neither that prophet? (26) John answered them, saying, I baptize with water: but there standeth one among you, whom ye know not; (27) he it is, who coming after me is preferred before me, whose shoe's latchet I am not worthy to unloose. (28) These things were done in Bethabara beyond Jordan, where John was baptizing.

(29) The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, Behold the me, whose shoe's latchet I am not worthy to unloose. (28) These things were done in Bethabara beyond Jordan, where John was baptizing.

(29) The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, Behold the
Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world. (30) This is He of whom I said, After me cometh one greater than I, the straps of which is preferred before me: for he was before me. (31) And I knew him not: but that he should be made manifest to Israel, therefore am I come baptizing with water. (32) And John bare record, saying, I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon him. (33) And I knew him not: but he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, "Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost." (34) And I saw, and bare record that this is the Son of God.

(35) Again the next day after John stood, and two of his disciples; (36) and looking upon Jesus as he walked, he saith, Behold the Lamb of God! (37) And the two disciples heard him speak, and they followed Jesus. (38) Then Jesus turned, and saw them following, and saith unto them, What seek ye? They said unto him, Rabbi, (which is to say, being interpreted, Master,) where

Isaiah 5, as above, fully establishes this. The Baptist probably used the very word of the prophet; but the Evangelist does not. In recording this for Greek readers, use the word of the LXX. as St. Peter does (1 Pet. ii. 24, "harrow sin in His own body"), but re-translates, and chooses the wider word which includes both meanings.

(30) This is He.—These words meet us here for the third time. They come in verse 15, and in part in verse 27. Here, as before, they are a quotation of an earlier and unrecorded statement of the Baptist, uttered in proverbial form, and to be understood in their fulfillment. (Comp. chap. iii. 30.)

(31) And I knew him not.—Better, and I also knew Him not; so again in verse 33. The reference is to "whom ye know not" of verse 26, and the assertion is not, therefore, inconsistent with the fact that John did know Him on His approach to baptism (Matt. iii. 13, see Note). In the sense that they did not know Him standing among them, he did not know Him, though with the incidents of His birth and earlier years and even features he must have been familiar. It cannot be that the Son of Mary was unknown to the son of Elizabeth, though One had dwelt in Nazareth and the other "was in the deserts till the day of his showing unto Israel" (Luke i. 80; ii. 51). He knew not all, but there must have been many wondering thoughts of that wondrous life. Could it be the life that all looked for? but no; there was little of the Jewish idea of the Messiah in the carpenter of a country village (comp. Mark vi. 3). What he did know was, that his own work as herald declared "that He should be made manifest to Israel," and in that conviction he proclaimed the coming King, and began the Messianic baptism. The Person would be His own witness. Heaven would give its own sign to those who could spiritually read it. The Baptist with the Spirit would Himself be so fully baptised with the Spirit coming upon and dwelling in Him, that to the spiritual eye it would take visual form and be seen "as a dove descending from heaven."

Am I come.—Better, come.

(32, 33) In these verses the Evangelist again makes prominent the solemn witness of John, giving the process by which conviction had come to his own mind.

(32) I saw.—Better, I have seen, or beheld. The vision is in its result ever present, and is all-conclusive evidence. (Comp. the words in their historic setting, Matt. iii. 16.)

(34) And I saw and bare record.—Better, and I have seen and have borne witness, as in verse 32. The result of personal conviction was, that he forthwith testified to others, and continued to do so until the present. One of the sayings taught to his scholars was, "He was (existed) before me." The revelation of the baptism and the voice heard by the Baptist (Matt. iii. 17) has given to this its true meaning. Teacher has now learnt, and learner is now taught, that Jesus is this pre-existent Being, the Messiah, the Son of God.

(35) Again the next day after John stood.—Better, The next day again John was standing. The description is of a scene present to the mind, and by one of the two disciples (verse 40). The "again" refers to verse 29.

Two of his disciples.—There is no reason for thinking that these were absent on the previous day, and that the testimony is specially repeated for them. Rather it is that, in that band of disciples too, there is an inner circle of those who, because they can receive more, are taught more. They had heard the words before, it may be he had talked together about them, at least in individual thought had tried to follow them, and now they have come to the Teacher again. Can we doubt what questions fill the heart or shape themselves in word? He had passed through their struggle from darkness into light. There is a Presence with them which he now knows, and before which his own work must cease. The passing voice is no longer needed now that the abiding Word has come. Can we doubt what his answer is?

(36) And looking upon.—Better, and he looked upon Jesus as He was walking, and saith. The word "looked upon" expresses a fixed, earnest gaze. (Comp. verse 42; Matt. xii. 26; Mark x. 21, 27; &c.) At this look, all the old thoughts in their fulness come crowding back. Yes. It is He, "Behold the Lamb of God!"

(37) The disciples understand the words as the teacher meant them. There is no word cutting the link between himself and them; that would have been hard to speak, hard to hear. There is no word bidding them follow Jesus; that cannot be needed.

(38) Jesus turned, and saw them following.—They follow wishing, and yet not daring, to question Him. He sees this, and seeks to draw them forth by Himself asking the first question. They are not prepared for this question, and wish for more than a passing interview. They inquire, "Where dost thou sojourn?" "Where are you staying for the night?" They will visit Him and ask the many things they seek. They address Him as "Rabbi," placing themselves in the position of His scholars; but they have not yet learnt all that John had taught them of His office. The title is natural from them, for it was the then current title of a revered teacher, and one that John's disciples applied to him (chap. iii. 26); but the writer remembers it was
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and of Philip

him to Jesus. And when Jesus beheld him, he said, Thou art Simon the son of Jona: thou shalt be called Cephas, which is by interpretation, A stone.

(42) Beheld.—See Note on verse 29.

A Stone.—Better, Peter, as in margin. The word means a stone, but the writer translated for Greek, not for English readers. The rule of the previous verse, which places the Greek word in the text and the English word in the margin, should be followed here.

(43) The day following Jesus would go forth into Galilee, and findeth Philip, and saith unto him, Follow me. (44) Now Philip was of Bethsaida, the city of Andrew and Peter. (45) Philip findeth Nathanael, and saith unto him, We have found him of whom Moses in the

a modern word (comp. Matt. xxiii. 7, 8), known to Jews only since the days of Hillel (president of the Sanhedrin about b.c. 30), not likely to be known to Greeks at all, and he therefore translates it, as he does Messias and Cephas in this same section.

(38) Come and see.—They think of a visit later, it may be, on the following day. He bids them come at once. We know not where. We have no hint of any words spoken. It was the sacred turning-point of the writer's own life, and its incidents are fixed in a depth of thought and feeling that no human eye may penetrate. But he remembers the very hour. It was as we should say four o'clock in the afternoon (see marg.), for there is no sufficient reason for thinking that the Babylonian method of counting the hours, usual at Ephesus as at Jerusalem, is departed from in this Gospel.

(40) One of the two.—The Evangelist will even here draw the veil over his own identity (see Introduction). The one is Andrew, even now marked out as brother of the better-known Simon Peter. On these names comp. Note on Matt. x. 2-4; but it should be observed here, that on this first day, as the earnest of the harvest to come, we have the two pairs of brothers, the sons of Zebedee (comp. next verse), and sons of Jonas, who are ever leaders in the apostolic band.

[2] Jesus Manifests Himself to Individuals (chaps. i. 41—ii. 11):

(a) To the first disciples—the witness of man (verses 41—51);

(b) At Cana of Galilee—the witness of nature (1—11.)

(41) He first findeth his own brother.—The probable explanation of this verse, and the only one which gives an adequate meaning to "first" and "his own," is that each of the two disciples in the fulness of his fresh joy went to seek his own brother, that Andrew found Peter first, and that John records this, and by the form in which he does so implies, but does not state, that he himself found James. To have stated this would have been to break through the personal reserve which he imposed upon himself. (Comp. Matt. iv. 18—21; Mark i. 16—19; Luke v. 1—10.)

We have found.—Implying a previous seeking, and that both were under the impulse of the general movement leading men to expect the Messiah. It is implied, too, that Simon was near, and therefore probably a hearer of the Baptist.

Messias.—The Hebrew form of the name occurs in the New Testament only here and in chap. iv. 25, in both cases in a vivid picture of events fixed in the memory. Elsewhere, John, as the other sacred writers, uses the LXX. translation, "Christ," and even here he adds it (comp., e.g., in this chap. verses 20 and 25). Both words mean "anointed" (see margin, and comp. Ps. xlv. 8).

(42) Beheld.—See Note on verse 29.

A Stone.—Better, Peter, as in margin. The word means a stone, but the writer translated for Greek, not for English readers. The rule of the previous verse, which places the Greek word in the text and the English word in the margin, should be followed here.

(43) The day following Jesus would go forth into Galilee, and findeth Philip, and saith unto him, Follow me. (44) Now Philip was of Bethsaida, the city of Andrew and Peter. (45) Philip findeth Nathanael, and saith unto him, We have found him of whom Moses in the
The call of

ST. JOHN, I.

Nathanael.

Theodorus, God's gift. The former is found in Num. i. 8; 1 Chron. ii. 14. The latter is preserved in the names Theodore and Dorothea. He belonged to the town to which Jesus was going (Cana of Galilee, chap. xxi. 2). Philip then probably went with Jesus and found Nathanael at or near Cana (verse 48). He is, perhaps, the same person as Bartholomew; but on this see chap. xxi. 2, and Note on Matt. x. 3. The more formal statement of the proof in this case, as compared with that of the two brothers (verse 41), agrees with the general character of Philip and with the less close relationship.

Of Nazareth.—Better, from Nazareth. Nothing can be argued from these words, or those which follow, as to ignorance of the fact of, or the events attending, the birth at Bethlehem. It is to be noted that the words are Philip's, not the writer's. Very possibly, one who had been in the company of Jesus for a few hours only was then unacquainted with these incidents. In any case he expresses the common belief of the neighbourhood and the time, and it is an instance of St. John's dramatic accuracy that he gives the words as they were spoken, and does not attempt to interpret them by later events or by his own knowledge. (Comp. chaps. vii. 42, 52; viii. 53, et al.)

(46) The question is not, “Can the Messiah come out of Nazareth,” but “Can there any good thing come?” The question is asked by an inhabitant of a neighbouring village who looks upon the familiar town with something of local jealousy and scorn; but the form of the question would seem to point to an ill repute in reference to its people. The place is unknown to earlier history, and is not mentioned even in Josephus; but what we find in Mark vi. 6 and Luke iv. 29 agrees with Nathanael's opinion. (For account of the town, comp. Note on Luke i. 26.)

Come and see expresses the fulness of his own conviction. An interview had brought certainty to his own mind. It would do so likewise to that of his friend.

(47) Jesus saw Nathanael coming.—Nathanael is not once willing that his prejudice should give way before the force of truth. He is coming, when the look directed towards others rests also upon him. It finds the character which it tests earnest and honest. What gave rise to the form in which this is expressed is not stated. There is clearly some unexpressed link with the history of Jacob. The word for “guile” is the same word as the LXX. word for “subtility” in Gen. xxviii. 35. The thought then is, “Behold one who is true to the name of Israel, and in whom there is something of the Jacob” (Gen. xxviii. 36). There is something in the words which comes as a revelation to Nathanael. Were they a proof that the Presence before whom he stood read to the very depths of his own thought? Under the shade of a tree, where Jews were accustomed to retire for meditation and prayer, had the Old Testament history of Jacob been present to his mind? Was he too “left alone,” and did he “prevail with God”? And does he now hear the inmost thought expressed in words, carrying certainty to his soul, and giving him too the victory of seeing God “face to face with life preserved”? (Gen. xxxiii. 24).

(48) The natural explanation of the verse seems to be that Nathanael was at his own house when Philip called him to hear the glad news of the Messiah. The words rendered “under the fig-tree” include the going there and being there. It was the fig-tree of his own garden (1 Kings iv. 25; Mic. iv.; Zech. iii. 10) where, and not at the corners of the streets, or to be seen of men, he was in the honesty of his heart praying to God. Unseen as he thought by any eye, he was seen by Him to whose coming every true Israelite looked, and the answer to the true thought and prayer was then as ever close at hand; but at hand, in the human form in which men find it so hard to read the Divine, and in the ordinary events in which men find it hard to realise God. A travelling Rabbi! He is the Messiah. From Nazareth the All Good cometh! This meeting, then, was not the first. There was an actual Messianic Presence in Nathanael's inmost thought. He is now startled, and asks, “Whence knowest Thou me?” We have never seen each other before. But in the deepest sense, the Messiah was there; “when thou wast under the fig-tree, I saw thee.”

(49) Thou art the Son of God.—The recognition begets recognition. That strange Presence he had felt as a spiritual power quickening hope and thought, making prophets' words living truths, filling with a true meaning the current beliefs about the Messiah;—yes; it goes through and through him again now. It is there before him. “Rabbi, Thou art the Son of God; Thou art the King of Israel.” (For these titles as existing in the Messianic expectation of the day, comp. chaps. xi. 27; xii. 13, 15; Matt. xxv. 63; Mark iii. 11; v. 7. See also Note on the quotation from Zech. in Matt. xxi. 5.)

(50) Believest thou.—This is not necessarily a question, and a fuller sense is obtained by taking it as an assertion. (Comp. the same word in chaps. xv. 31, and xx. 29.) On this evidence thou believest: the use of the faith-faculty strengthens it. Thou shalt see greater things than these.

(51) Verily, verily.—This is the first use of this formula of doubled words, which is not found in the New Testament outside St. John's Gospel. They are always spoken by our Lord, and connected with some deeper truth, to which they direct attention. They represent, in a reduplicated form, the Hebrew “Amen,” which is common in the Old Testament as an adverb, and twice occurs doubled (Num. v. 22; Neh. vii. 6). In the Hebraic style of the Apocalypse the word is a proper name of “the faithful and true witness” (Rev. iii. 14).
The Marriage in Cana of Galilee.

Verily, verily, I say unto you, Hereafter ye shall see heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man.

CHAPTER II.—(1) And the third day there was a marriage in Cana of Galilee; and the mother of Jesus was there; (2) and both Jesus was called, and his disciples, to the marriage. (3) And when they wanted wine, the mother of Jesus saith unto him, They

I say unto you ... ye shall see.—The earlier words have been addressed to Nathanael. The truth expressed in these holds for all disciples, and is spoken to all who were then present—to Andrew and John and Peter and James (verse 41) and Philip, as well as to Nathanael.

Hereafter is omitted by several ancient authorities, including the Sinaitic and Vatican MSS., but there is early evidence for the insertion, and as the omission removes a difficulty in the interpretation, it is probably to be traced to this source. If retained, the better reading, henceforth, from this time onadza.

Heaven opened.—More exactly, the heaven opened, made and continuing open. The thought was familiar, for Psalmist and Prophet had uttered it to God in the prayers, “Bow Thy heavens, O Lord, and come down” (Ps. exlv. 5); “O that Thou wouldest rend the heavens, that Thou wouldest come down” (Isa. Iv. 6). The Presence then before Nathanael was the answer to these longings of the soul.

The angels of God ascending and descending.—Referring again to the history of Jacob (Gen. xxvii. 12, 13).

The Son of man.—This is probably the first time that this phrase, which became the ordinary title used by our Lord of Himself, fell from His lips; but it meets us some forty distinct times in the earlier Gospels, and has been explained in the Note on Matt. viii. 20. It will be enough to observe here that it is suggested by, and is in part opposed to and in part the complement of, the titles used by Nathanael. He could clothe the Messianic idea only in Jewish titles, “Son of God,” “King of Israel.” The true expression of the idea was not Hebrew, but human, “the Son of Man,” “the Word made flesh;” “the Son, the true representative of the race, the Second Adam, in whom all are made alive; the Son of Man. The word is ἄνθρωπος, not ἄρχος; homo, not vir. It is man as man; not Jew as holier than Greek; not free-man as noble than bond-man; not man as distinct from woman: but humanity in all space and time and circumstance; in its weakness as in its strength; in its sorrows as in its joys; in its death as in its life. And here lies the explanation of the whole verse. The ladder from earth to heaven is in the truth “The Word was made flesh.” In that great truth heaven was, and has remained, opened. From that time these messengers were ever going back and forward between humanity and God’s. The cry of every erring and helpless child to its Father for guidance and strength; the silent appeal of the wronged and down-trodden to the All-Just Avenger; the fears and hopes of the soul burdened by the unbearable weight of sin, and casting itself on the mercy of the Eternal Love—all these are borne by messengers who always behold the face of God (Matt. xvii. 18). And every light that falls upon the path, and strength that nerves the moral frame; every comfort to the heart smarting beneath its wrong; every sense of forgiveness, atonement, peace—all these like angels descend that ladder coming from heaven to earth. Ascending precedes descending, as in the vision of old. Heaven’s messengers are ever ready to descend when earth’s will bid them come. The revelation of the fullest truth of God is never wanting to the heart that is open to receive it. The ladder is set upon the earth, but it reaches to heaven, and the Lord stands above it. It goes down to the very depths of man’s weakness, wretchedness, and sin; and he may lay hold of it, and step by step ascend it. In the Incarnation, Divinity took human form on earth; in the Ascension, Humanity was raised to heaven.

I. (1) The third day—i.e., from the last note of time in chap. i. 43, giving one clear day between the call of Philip and the day of the marriage.

Cana of Galilee has been identified with both Kānet el-Jelil, or Khurbet Kānet, and Kefr Kenna. The monks of Nazareth and local tradition claim the latter place as the scene of the miracle, but this tradition has not been traced earlier than the seventeenth century, and the best modern authorities do not accept it. (But comp., in support of Kefr Kenna, Zeller in Report of Palestine Exploration Fund, iii. 1869.)

Kānet el-Jelil, on the other hand, is the rendering of the Arabic version, and Sawul, as early as A.D. 1103, describes it as the place “where the Lord turned water into wine at the wedding.” (Early Travels in Palestine, p. 47). The strength of the argument is in the identity of name in the original, whereas Kenna is quite distinct. Travellers describe it as an obscure, uninhabited village in ruins. They were formerly shown the house where the marriage took place here, and even the water-pots, but these are now shown at the rival Kefr Kenna. The ruins are on the side of a hill looking over the plain of El Buttauf, rather more than six miles to the N. or N.E. of Nazareth, and so answering the early evidence for the insertion, and as the omission renders is, from this time onwards.

When they wanted wine.—Better, the wine having failed.

They have no wine.—The question “What was the import of this remark?” has been often asked, and very variously answered. And yet the answer does not seem far to seek. The next verses fix its meaning as the expectation of an outcome of supernatural power. This is quite in harmony with the mother’s hopes and...
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have no wine. (4) Jesus saith unto her, Woman, what have I to do with thee? mine hour is not yet come. (5) His mother saith unto the servants, Whatever he saith unto you, do it. (6) And there were set there six waterpots of stone, after the manner of the purifying of the Jews, containing two or three

firkins apiece. (7) Jesus saith unto them, Fill the waterpots with water. And they filled them up to the brim. (8) And he saith unto them, Draw out now, and bear unto the governor of the feast. And they bare it. (9) When the ruler of the feast had tasted the water that was made wine, and knew not

musings, without any previous miracle on which to base them (verse 11). For many long years she had kept in her heart the Son's words and deeds (Luke ii. 51). She must have heard of John the Baptist's witness, of the events of the Baptism six weeks now past, and on that very day every hope must have started into new life, as she heard from those who came with Him how conviction had seized upon their own minds. To cause the miracle, he from that moment left all and followed Christ. The Prologue to St. John attributed to Jerome says that "John, wishing to marry, was called from the wedding by our Lord" (Trench On Miracles, p. 98). See Matt. xix. 29 et seq., and Luke xiv. 26.

Waterpots, or pitchers, like to but larger than the vessels used for carrying water, as in chap. iv. 28. These were placed in the outer court, away from the guest-chamber, for the governor of the feast is ignorant of the circumstances (verse 9). It is natural that an eyewitness should remember the number and know roughly their size. There were six of them, containing about twenty gallons apiece; but hidden meanings referring to the number or the quantity are brought to the text, not derived from it. The measure rendered "firkin" is metretes, which is used for the Hebrew, "bath" in 2 Chron. iv. 5. This (Jos. Ant. viii. 2, § 9) gives nearly nine gallons as the value of the "firkin," which multiplied by two or three gives the contents of each pitcher as from about eighteen to twenty-seven gallons; or, approximately, from 100 to 150 gallons for the whole. Our own word "firkin" is probably "a little fourth," and equal to nine gallons, or the fourth of a barrel (comp. Tide, which is one-third). It is used only here in the Bible.

Fill the waterpots.—It is implied that the pitchers were wholly or in part empty, the water in them having been used for the ablutions before the feast. The persons ordered are the servants (verse 5). "Up to the brim" marks the willing care with which the order was obeyed, and an expectation through the household of some work to be wrought.

Draw out now, and bear unto the governor of the feast.—A vessel was let down into the pitcher, and was then carried to the ruler of the feast, who would distribute the wine in it to the guests. Ruler rather than "governor." The same English word should be used throughout the two verses. What exact office is denoted by the Greek word is uncertain, as it occurs nowhere else in the Bible, and is very rare in the classical authors. The chief English commentators (Alford, Wordsworth, Trench) are agreed that he was chosen by the guests from among their own number, but this opinion has not commanded the general assent of the learned. It seems much reason to think that the person intended is what we should call the "head-waiter," whose duty it was to taste the viands and wines, to arrange the tables and couches, and to be generally responsible for the feast.

Water that had become wine.—Better, water that had become wine. At what moment did the trans-
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The beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana of Galilee, and manifested forth his glory; and his disciples believed on him.

that which is worse: but thou hast kept the good wine until now. (11) This beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana of Galilee, and manifested forth his glory; and his disciples believed on him.

absolutely first and not the first in Cana which is meant.

It is important to note here that St. John uses only once, and that in our Lord's test of the courtier, and connected with "sign" (chap. iv. 48), the word which represents "miracle," "wonder," "portent," and that he nowhere uses the word which represents "powers" or "mighty works." For him they are simply "works," and these "works" are "signs." He thinks of our Lord as the agent in all creation, and the source of all life (chap. i. 2, 3); but this being so, no display of power impresses him, and he uses only was that which was carried to the ruler and actually needed to supply the guests. The reason based upon the mention of the number and contents of the pitchers (verse 6) is certainly not a strong one. It is quite natural to find these stated in the picturesque style of this Gospel, and there is no care to give more than a rough estimate of the size from a remembrance either of these pitchers or of pitchers generally used for this purpose. There is more force in the general impression derived from verse 7. It may be fairly asked why was more water placed in readiness than was needed? But the pitchers would be in any case re-filled for ablutions after the feast. They were at hand, meeting the eye. All possibility of collusion is thus excluded. They had been used not long before; they would very soon be used again. The filling of all leaves to the servants the choice of one or more from which to draw. There is an unfilling potential supply; it becomes an actual supply only when needed and appropriated by human want. This, as every supernatural work, is made to depend upon faith. There is no demand for this faith in filling water-pots with water; it is otherwise when they draw it, and bear it in the usual tankard to the ruler, in answer to the demand for wine. Here, as everywhere in divine action, there is an economy in the use of power. There is no miracle of "luxury" or "waste" or "excess." The evils of the higher criticism are—like the additions of expositors, as that the feast lasted for a week or more, or their perversions, as that the wine was in no sense intoxicating—superstructures without a foundation.

(10) When men have well drunk.—The same Greek word is used in the LXX. in Gen. xliii. 34, and rendered in the Authorised version "were merry," but its general use in the Old Testament, as in classical writers, and in invariable use in the New Testament (Matt. xxiv. 49; Acts ii. 15; 1 Cor. xi. 20; 1 Thess. v. 7; Rev. xvii. 6, are the only passages) is to express the state of drunkenness. Our translators have shrunk from that rendering here, though it was before them in the "When men be dronke," of Tyndall and Cranmer. The physical meaning of the word is to saturate with moisture, as we say, to be drenched, which is the same word as drunk. There is clearly no reference to the present feast. It is a coarse jest of the ruler's, the sort of remark that forms part of the stock in trade of a hired manager of banquets.

(11) This beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana of Galilee, or, more exactly, This did Jesus in Cana of Galilee as the beginning of His signs. The form of the sentence makes it certain that it is the
(12) After this he went down to Capernaum, he, and his mother, and his brethren, and his disciples: and they continued there not many days.

(13) And the Jews' passover was at hand, and Jesus went up to Jerusalem,

(14) and found in the temple those that sold oxen and sheep and doves, and the changers of money sitting: (15) and when he had made a scourge of small cords,

he drove them all out of the temple, and the sheep, and the oxen, and poured out the changers' money, and overthrew the tables; (16) and said unto them that sold doves, Take these things hence; make not my Father's house an house of merchandise. (17) And his disciples remembered that it was written, The zeal of thine house hath eaten me up.


(a) In Jerusalem—the Temple (chap. ii. 12—22);

(b) In Jerusalem—the city (chaps. ii. 23—iii. 21);

Nicodemus: The new birth (verses 1—8);

Belief (verses 9—15);

Judgment (verses 16—21);

(c) In Judaea (chap. iii. 22—36). The Baptist.

(12) After this he went down to Capernaum.

—For the position of Capernaum comp. Note on Matt. iv. 13. It was on the shore of the lake of Tiberias, and He must have gone "down" to it from any locality among the hills of Galilee. The words do not imply that they went to Capernaum direct from Cana. The "after this" allows of a return to Nazareth, and the mention of the "brethren" makes such a return probable. The place of this sojourn in the order of events belongs to the narrative of the earlier Gospels, and here, as elsewhere, questions which recur are treated each occurrence would be to save the trouble of reference at the cost of much space; and this would be ill-saved; the spiritual profit arising from constant reference is one which no earnest student of the Gospels could desire to lose. He will wish to study every event in that life in every word which records it. (Comp. Matt. iv. 13 et seq., and ix. 1; Mark iii. 21—31, and vi. 3; Luke iv. 16—30). For the "brethren of the Lord," see Note on Matt. xii. 55.

(13) And the passover, a feast of the Jews.—

Here, again, we are on common ground with the earlier Gospels. They place a cleansing of the Temple at the close of our Lord's ministry at the only Passover which comes within the scope of their narrative. The subject has been dealt with in Notes on Matt. xxi. 12 et seq. (Comp. also Introduction: The Chronological Harmony of the Gospels, p. xxxv.) The careful reader will not fail to observe the graphic touches peculiar to this narrative—the money-changers sitting, the sacrificial animals, the making of the scourge, the money poured out, the order to remove the doves which could not be driven out. We feel all through in the presence of an eye-witness. It is worth remembering that on the eve of the Passover the head of every family carefully collected all the leaven in the house, and there was a general cleansing. He was doing in His Father's house, it may be, what was then being done in every house in Jerusalem. The remark will be seen to have an important bearing on the question of the repetition of the cleansing.

(15) And the sheep, and the oxen.—For this read, both the sheep and the oxen. The change is of only one word, but it gives an entirely different sense. The driving out with the scourge was not of "all (men) and sheep and oxen," but of "all," i.e., both sheep and oxen.

(16) My Father's house.—Some among those present now (verse 18) may have been present in that same house when He, a lad of twelve years, was there at the Passover, and after questions and answers, higher and deeper than these doctors could grasp, claimed God as His true Father (Luke ii. 49). That repeated claim meant now must have been clear to all. Their own messengers had brought them John's witness; their reports must have come before, and come with, the crowd of Galilean pilgrims; the disciples are themselves with Him (verse 17), and their hearts are too full for silence; but there was more than all this. Those expounders of the oracles of God who remembered that Elijah was to come before the day of the Lord, must have remembered, too, that the Lord was to come to this Temple, like a refiner's fire, and like fullers' soap (Mal. iii. 1—3; iv. 5). That fire was in their midst, and from that Presence buyers and sellers and changers shrunk back in awe, none daring to resist; that cleansing was then taking place, and the Son was claiming the sanctity and reverence due to His Father's house. He has before claimed to be Son of Man. The Messianic title is publicly claimed before the official representatives of the people at the great national festival, in the Temple, at Jerusalem. If, while this scene is fresh in our minds, we think again of the marriage at Cana, we shall feel how different the manifestations are, and that this latter was not, and was not intended to be, a public declaration of His person and work. Now we understand what seemed hard before, that the assertion "Mine hour is not yet come" (verse 4) immediately precedes the first sign. This sign was at a family gathering known only to few, probably not to all who were there, for "the ruler knew not whence it was" (verse 9), and no effect is described as resulting from it, except that the little band of disciples believed (verse 11). The "forth," which in the English version seems to mark an effect upon others, is not found in the Greek. It is within the circle of the other Gospel narratives, but is included in none of them. It left no such impression in the mind of St. Peter as to lead him to include it in the Gospel of his interpreter, St. Mark, or upon Mary herself as to lead her to include it in the answers she must have given to the questions of St. Luke. It was, indeed, the first sign in Cana of Galilee, but the scene before us is the announcement to the world.

(17) Was written . . . . hath eaten me up.—More literally, is written . . . . shall eat me up. The verse is full of interest in many ways. It gives us the thought of the disciples at the time (comp. verse 22) which could be known only to one of their number. It shows us what we too seldom realise in reading the New Testament, that the Jewish mind was filled to overflowing with thoughts of the Old Testament. The child was taught to say by heart large portions of the Law and Psalms and Prophets, and they formed the
Then answered the Jews and said unto him, What sign shewest thou unto us, seeing that thou doest these things? (20) Jesus answered and said unto them, Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up. (22) Then said the Jews, Forty and six years was this temple in building, and wilt thou rear it up in three days? (24) But he spake of the temple of his body. (26) When the Deity was the body of the Incarnate Word. The Temple of wood and stone was but the representative of the Divine Presence. That Presence was then actually in their midst. They had no reverence for the inner temple; for, like its outer courts, it had become a house of merchandise, and was fast becoming a den of thieves. This very demand for an outward sign, while all around them feel a spiritual power, shows they have as little reverence for the other. They will destroy the real shrine; the shrine of wood and stone even will not be left to represent a Presence no longer among them. He will raise up the temple of His body the third day, and in that resurrection will be the foundation stone of the spiritual temple for the world. The word "temple" by the Jews in this double sense is attested by their interpretation of the Old Testament. We have an example of the use of "tabernacle" in a parallel sense in chap. i. 14 (comp. 2 Pet. i. 13, 14), and the full idea of a spiritual worship and presence in chap. iv. 21—24. The sign may have been suggested by the double thought then present—the Jews destroying the sanctuary of the material Temple, the disciples seeing in Him one consumed by zeal for a better temple. 

The change of tense, from the past of the Psalmist to the future here, is itself significant. The words were true of the inner burning which consumed the prophet-priest. They come to the heart as true, with a fuller truth, of Christ's spirit burning with righteous indignation, and cast down by deepest sorrow; but shrinking not from the painful task, which leaves its mark falling on that face as the shadow of a deeper darkness. They are to be, in a deeper sense, truer still.

(20) They profess to seek a sign for evidence; they use it for cavil.

Forty and six years was this temple in building.—It is implied that it was not then finished. The date of the completion is given by Josephus (Ant. xx. 9, § 7) as A.D. 64. The same author gives the eighteenth year of the reign of Herod the Great (Nisan 734—Nisan 735, A.D. 28) as the commencement of the renewal of the Temple of Zerubbabel (Ant. xiv. 11, § 1). This would give A.D. 781—782, i.e., A.D. 28—29, as the date of the cleansing. In another passage Josephus gives the month Kislev A.D. 734, as the date of the festival connected with the building of the Temple (Ant. xiv. 16, § 4). This would fix our present date as the Passover of A.D. 781, i.e., A.D. 28. St. Luke furnishes the date of the commencement of the ministry of John the Baptist. If we count the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius (comp. Note on Luke iii. 1) from the commencement of his first reign with Augustus (A.D. 765, i.e., A.D. 12), this date will be A.D. 780, i.e., A.D. 27. The present Passover was in the following year, i.e., as before, A.D. 28. The sole reign of Tiberius commenced two years later (A.D. 14), so that while we have certainly no discrepancy between the two independent dates, we have probably a very striking coincidence. Its bearing upon the authenticity of the present Gospel is evident.

Rear it up represents the same Greek word as "raise up," in the previous verse; but the word fits the double meaning. It is the regular term for raising from the dead; but it is also used of rearing up a building, e.g., in 3 Esdras v. 44; Ecclus. xlix. 11.

(21) But he spake. Literally, was speaking. This is the solution of the enigma as the disciples read it in the after history. It is remarkable that we have the interpretation of the spiritual temple in Mark xiv. 58 (see Note there, and comp. chap. iv. 21, 23).

(22) That he had said this unto them. The better texts omit "unto them." For the way in which

very texture of the mind, ready to pass into conscious thought whenever occasion suggested. With the exception of the 22nd Psalm, no part of the Old Testament is so frequently referred to in the New as the psalm from which these words are taken (iv. 26-29); yet that psalm could not have been in its historic meaning Messianic (see, e.g., verses 5, 22—26). This reference to it gives us, then, their method of interpretation. Every human life is typical. The persecution without reason, the wrong heaped upon the innocent, the appeal to and trust in Jehovah, the song of thanksgiving from him whose parted throat was weary of calling—all this was true of some representative suffering of earlier days, and we may hear in it also, certainly the voice of Jeremiah; but it was true of him in that he was a forerunner of the representative sufferer. The darker features of the psalm belong to the individual; the Life which sustains in all, and the Light which illumines in all, was even then in the world, though men knew Him not. The words of Jeremiah are Messianic, because his life—like every noble, self-forgetting, others' sorrow bearing, man and God loving life—was itself Messianic.

There are bigots o incredulity. Knowledge is de- nunciation. Every human life is typical. The persecution without reason, the wrong heaped upon the innocent, the appeal to and trust in Jehovah, the song of thanksgiving from him whose parted throat was weary of calling—all this was true of some representative suffering of earlier days, and we may hear in it also, certainly the voice of Jeremiah; but it was true of him in that he was a forerunner of the representative sufferer. The darker features of the psalm belong to the individual; the Life which sustains in all, and the Light which illumines in all, was even then in the world, though men knew Him not. The words of Jeremiah are Messianic, because his life—like every noble, self-forgetting, others' sorrow bearing, man and God loving life—was itself Messianic.

The change of tense, from the past of the Psalmist to the future here, is itself significant. The words were true of the inner burning which consumed the prophet-priest. They come to the heart as true, with a fuller truth, of Christ's spirit burning with righteous indignation, and cast down by deepest sorrow; but shrinking not from the painful task, which leaves its mark falling on that face as the shadow of a deeper darkness. They are to be, in a deeper sense, truer still.

Then answered the Jews. —Comp. for the meaning of "the Jews" chap. i. 19; and for their question, Matt. xxi. 23. The Mosaic legislation contained a warning against the efficiency of the test by signs (Deut. xiii. 1—3), but it was of the essence of Pharisaism to cling to it (Matt. xii. 38; 1 Cor. xiv. 16, § 4). This would give A.D. 781—782, i.e., A.D. 28—29, as the date of the cleansing. In another passage Josephus gives the month Kislev A.D. 734, as the date of the festival connected with the building of the Temple (Ant. xiv. 16, § 4). This would fix our present date as the Passover of A.D. 781, i.e., A.D. 28. St. Luke furnishes the date of the commencement of the ministry of John the Baptist. If we count the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius (comp. Note on Luke iii. 1) from the commencement of his first reign with Augustus (A.D. 765, i.e., A.D. 12), this date will be A.D. 780, i.e., A.D. 27. The present Passover was in the following year, i.e., as before, A.D. 28. The sole reign of Tiberius commenced two years later (A.D. 14), so that while we have certainly no discrepancy between the two independent dates, we have probably a very striking coincidence. Its bearing upon the authenticity of the present Gospel is evident.

Rear it up represents the same Greek word as "raise up," in the previous verse; but the word fits the double meaning. It is the regular term for raising from the dead; but it is also used of rearing up a building, e.g., in 3 Esdras v. 44; Ecclus. xlix. 11.

But he spake. Literally, was speaking. This is the solution of the enigma as the disciples read it in the after history. It is remarkable that we have the interpretation of the spiritual temple in Mark xiv. 58 (see Note there, and comp. chap. iv. 21, 23).

That he had said this unto them. The better texts omit "unto them." For the way in which

The Demand for a Sign. ST. JOHN. II. The Temple of Christ's Body.
Therefore he was risen from the dead; his disciples remembered that he had said this unto them; and they believed the scripture, and the word which Jesus had said.

Now when he was in Jerusalem at the passover, in the feast day, many believed in his name, when they saw the miracles which he did. But Jesus did not commit himself unto them, because he knew all men, and needed not that any should testify of man: for he knew what was in man.

CHAPTER III. — (1) There was a man of the Pharisees, named Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews: (2) the same came to Jesus by night, and said unto him, Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God: for no man can do these miracles that thou doest, except God be with him.

III.

(1) There was a man. — Read, But there was a man. Our division of chapters breaks the connection, and the omission of the conjunction leads us to think of the visit of Nicodemus as quite distinct from what has gone before; whereas it really rises out of it (comp. verse 2 with chap. ii. 23).

The name Nicodemus was not uncommon among the Jews, but like Stephen, Philip, Jason, etc., was derived from their intercourse with the Greeks. (Comp. e.g., Demosth. 549, 23, and Jos. Ant. xiv. 3, § 2.) Of this particular Nicodemus, we know with certainty nothing more than is told us in this Gospel (chaps. vii. 50; xix. 39). The Talmud mentions a Nak’dimon, so called from a miracle performed by him, who was the son of Gorion, and whose real name was Donai. It also gives the name Donai as one of the disciples of Jesus. He was one of the three richest Jews when Titus besieged Jerusalem, but his family was reduced to the most abject poverty. So far the Talmud. The inference is that this change of fortune is connected with his becoming a Christian and with the persecution which followed, and he is himself identified with the Nicodemus of the Gospel. We can only say this may be so. The reader who cares for more on the subject will find full references in Lampe, and the extracts from the Talmud translated in Lightfoot. Others may be content to accept this latter writer’s conclusion. “It is not worth while to take great pains in a question which is very involved, if we may not also call it useless.” (For the “Pharisees,” to which sect Nicodemus belonged, comp. chap. i. 23, and Matt. iii. 7.)

Ruler of the Jews. — One of the Sanhedrin (comp. chap. i. 19, Note). This is made certain by the position of Nicodemus, in chap. vii. 50.

(2) By night. — This has impressed itself upon the writer’s mind, so that it becomes part of the description of Nicodemus in chap. xix. 39, and in some MSS. in chap. vii. 50. We have to think of him as having heard the answer of the messengers sent to the Baptist (chap. i. 20 et seq.), as present at the cleansing of the Temple, as the witness of miracles in Jerusalem, as by these means convinced that this Teacher had a message from God, and resolved to hear it. But the Sanhedrin had
The New Birth is the

ST. JOHN, III.

Entrance to the Kingdom of God.

(3) Jesus answered and said unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God. (4) Nicodemus saith unto him, How can a man be born when he is old? can he enter the second time into his mother's womb, and be born? (5) Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot

officially taken a hostile position, and an individual member of it did not openly take any other. His own conviction is expressed by his coming to Jesus at all; his fear of public opinion and of the possible exclusion from the synagogue by his coming at night. (Comp. chap. xii. 42, 43.)

Rabbi.—The customary title of reverence for a teacher (comp. Note on chap. i. 38), but given here by a technically trained Rabbi to One who had no formal title to it (chap. vii. 15).

We know that thou art a teacher come from God.—This explains the title he has used. He does not go beyond this. There has been, as in the case of John the Baptist, sufficient to prove a more than human mission, but with this there has been nothing to meet the common Messianic expectation. Still, if this is a Prophet, working miracles like those of old, and evidently sent from God, He will be able to solve all doubts, and answer the questions pressing on the hearts of men. The plural pronoun expresses nothing more than the general conviction that the power to work miracles was a divine attestation of the teaching (chap. ix. 18, 33). There were, indeed, others in the same mental position as Nicodemus, but none accompanied him; and it is not probable that his visit was known to any of them. The "we" occurs again in our Lord's reply in verse 11, and it may be that both find their true explanation in the fact that this interview took place more in the house, and in the presence of John, who had led Nicodemus to come, as he himself had gone, with doubting heart, to the place where Jesus was dwelling (chap. i. 38).

(3) Jesus answered and said unto him.—The words of Nicodemus are clearly only a preface to further questions. Jesus at once answers these questions; the answer being, as it frequently is, to the unexpressed thought (comp. e.g., chap. ii. 13). The coming of the Messiah, the Divine Glory, God's Kingdom, these are the thoughts which filled men's minds. These miracles—in what relation did they stand to it? This Teacher—what message from God had He about it?

Verily, verily, I say unto thee.—(Comp. chap. i. 51.) The words are in the decisive tone of authority and certainty. "This is God's teaching for thee, teacher as thou thyself art" (verse 10).

Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.—Our translators have followed the ancient expositors in giving the alternative renderings "born again" and "born from above" (margin). Chrysostom notes the two currents of interpretation in his day; and in our own day the opinions of scholars, whether we count them or weigh them, may be summed up for either view. There can be no doubt that the Greek word (էבר) is found with both meanings. It is equally certain that St. John elsewhere uses it in the local sense "from above" only (chaps. iii. 31; xii. 23); but these instances are not sufficient to establish an usus loquentis, and the sense here, and in verse 7, must be taken in connection with the meaning of the verb. (Comp. the same word in Luke i. 33, "from the very first," and Gal. iv. 9, "again.") What has not, perhaps, been sufficiently noted is, that the Greek word is not the true key to the difficulty, and that its double sense has led men to seek the meaning in a wrong direction. The dialogue was between One who was called and one who really was a Rabbi. The word actually used almost certainly conveyed but one sense, and it is this sense which the Syriac version, coming to us from the second century, and closely connected with the Palestinian dialect of the first century, has preserved. This version reads "from the beginning;" "afresh," "anew." This is the sense which St. John wishes to express for his Greek readers, and the word used by him exactly does express it. That the Greek word has another meaning also, which expresses the same thought from another point of view, may have determined its choice. This other point of view was certainly not absent from the circle of the writer's thoughts (comp. chap. i. 13).

On "the kingdom of God," which is of frequent occurrence in the earlier Gospels, but in St. John is found only here and in verse 5, comp. Note on Matt. iii. 2. To "see" the kingdom is, in New Testament usage, equivalent to "enter into the kingdom," verse 5, where indeed some MSS. read "see." (Comp. in this chap. verse 36, and Luke ii. 26; Acts ii. 27; Heb. xi. 5; 1 Pet. iii. 10; Rev. xviii. 7.) The condition of the spiritual vision which can see this kingdom is spiritual life, and this life is dependent on being born anew.

How can a man be born...?—Nicodemus understands the words "born again" in the sense given above. The thought is not wholly strange to him. The Rabbis were accustomed to speak of proselytes as children, and the term "new creature" (comp. 2 Cor. v. 17) was in frequent use to express the call of Abraham. But he is himself a child of Abraham, a member of the theocratic kingdom, and is expecting the Messiah, the Divine Glory, God's Kingdom, these are the thoughts which filled men's minds. The plural pronoun expresses nothing more than the general conviction that the power to work miracles was a divine attestation of the teaching (chap. ix. 18, 33). There were, indeed, others in the same mental position as Nicodemus, but none accompanied him; and it is not probable that his visit was known to any of them. The "we" occurs again in our Lord's reply in verse 11, and it may be that both find their true explanation in the fact that this interview took place more in the house, and in the presence of John, who had led Nicodemus to come, as he himself had gone, with doubting heart, to the place where Jesus was dwelling (chap. i. 38).
closely connected with that of discourse in Capernaum (chap. vi.), and so far as it is a subject for the pages of a Commentary at all, it will be better to treat of it in connection with that discourse. (See Excursus C. —The Sacramental Teaching of St. John’s Gospel.) Our task here is to ask what meaning the words were intended to convey to the hearer; and this seems not to admit of doubt. The baptism of proselytes was already present to the thought; the baptism of John had excited the attention of all Jerusalem, and the Sanhedrin had officially inquired into it. Jesus Himself had submitted to it, but “the Pharisees and lawyers” (Nicodemus was both) “rejected the counsel of God against themselves, being not baptised of him” (Luke vii. 29). The key to the present verse is found in the declaration of John, “I baptise with water . . . He baptiseth with the Holy Ghost” (chap. i. 26, 33); and this key must have been then in the mind of Nicodemus. The message was, baptism with water; baptism with water, by which the Gentile had been admitted as a new-born babe to Judaism, the rite representing the cleansing of the life from heathen pollutions, and devotion to the service of the true God; baptism with water, which John had preached in his ministry of reformation (comp. Matt. iii. 7), declaring a like cleansing as needed for Jew and Gentile, Pharisee and publican, as the gate to the kingdom of heaven, which was at hand; baptism with water, which demanded a public profession in the presence of witnesses, and an open loyalty to the new kingdom, not a visit by night, under the secrecy of darkness —this is the message of God to the teacher seeking admission to His kingdom. This he would understand. It would now be clear to him why John came baptising, and why Jews were themselves baptised confessing their sins. There is no further explanation of the “outward and visible sign,” but the teaching passes on to the “inward and spiritual sign,” i.e., the baptism of the Holy Ghost, the birth of the Spirit, which was the work of the Messiah Himself. Of this, indeed, there were foreshadowings and promises in the Old Testament Scriptures (comp. e.g., Ezek. xxxvi. 25 et seq.; Jer. xxxi. 33; Joel ii. 28); but the deeper meaning of such passages was buried beneath the ruins of the schools of prophets, and few among later teachers had penetrated to it. It is hard for this Rabbi to see it, even when it is brought home to him.

(6) That which is born of the flesh is flesh.—The first step is to remind him of the law of likeness in natural generation. "Flesh," as distinct from "spirit," is human nature in so far as it is common with animal nature, consisting of the bodily frame and its animal life, feelings, and passions. "Flesh," as opposed to "spirit," is this nature as not under the guidance of the human spirit, which is itself the shrine of the Divine Spirit, and therefore it is sinful. (Comp. Gal. v. 16 et seq.; vi. 8.) It is this nature in its material constitution, and subject to sin, which is transmitted from father to son. The physical life itself is dependent upon birth. That which is born of the flesh is flesh.

There is an analogous law of spiritual generation. Spirit as opposed to flesh is the differentia of man as distinct from all other creatures. It is the image of God in him, the seat of the capacity for the communion with God, which is the true principle of life. In the natural man this is crushed and dormant; in the spiritual man it has been quickened by the influence of the Holy Ghost. This is a new life in him, and the spiritual life, like the physical, is dependent upon birth. That which is born of the Spirit is spirit.

(7) Ye must be born again.—The laws of natural and spiritual generation have been stated as general truths, holding good for all mankind, "that which is born." But there is a special application to the present case. "Marvel not that I said unto thee (teacher as thou art) that ye (children of Abraham as ye are) must be born again." In so far as they were children of Abraham according to the flesh, they were children of Abraham’s physical and sinful nature. The law of that, as of all human nature, was that flesh ruled animal life, and animal life ruled spirit, and the whole man became carnal, bringing forth the fruits of the flesh. The law of the regenerate nature was that the spirit, born by the influence of the Divine Spirit, rose to a new life of communion with God, controlled the lower life, with its affections, feelings, and desires, and that these thus controlled became the motive power of the body; the whole man thus became spiritual, bringing forth the fruits of the Spirit. (Comp. Note on 1 Thess. v. 23.) For them, then, as for all, it was no matter of wonder, it was an absolute necessity of their true life, that they should be born anew.

(8) The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof.—Better (see Note below), the Spirit breatheth where He willeth, and thou hearest His voice. These words are an explanation of the spiritual birth, the necessity of which has been asserted in the previous verses. They must have come to Nicodemus, bringing in their sound echoes of the old familiar words, "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul" (Gen. ii. 7). These words would bring to the mind thoughts of the human body, cold, lifeless, corpse-like; of the breath of life passing into it; of the beating pulse, the opening eye, the action of nerve, muscle, and limb, as, in obedience to God’s will, matter became the framework of spirit, and man became a living soul. There are parallel thoughts of the spirit existing in capacity for life and union with God, but crushed beneath the physical life with its imperative demands for support, and the sensible life with its engrossing pleasures and pains, and sorrows and joys; of the Spirit of God breathing upon it; and of the dormant power awakening into a new life of noblest thoughts and hopes and energies, when man is born of the Spirit.

And yet the new spiritual birth, like the physical, cannot be explained. We can observe the phenomena, we cannot trace the principle of life. He breatheth where He willeth, in the wide world of man, free as the wind of heaven, bound by no limits of country or of race. The voice is heard speaking to the man himself, and through him to others; there is the evidence of the new birth in the new life. We know not whence He comes, or whither He goes. We cannot fix the
So is every one that is born of the Spirit.

(9) Nicodemus answered and said unto him, How can these things be? (10) Jesus answered and said unto him, Art thou a master of Israel, and knowest not these things?

How can these things be?—The answer to the previous question has spoken of a spiritual birth and a spiritual life and a spiritual kingdom, but all this is in a region of which the Rabbinic schools knew nothing. They were the authorised exponents of Law and Prophets; they knew the precise number of words, and the shape of letters; the form of a phylactery, and the width of a fringe; the tithing of garden herbs, and the manner of washing the hands; but spirit, life, a man's soul born again!—how can these things be?

Art thou a master of Israel?—Better, Art thou the teacher of Israel? The article is emphatic, and points to the position of Nicodemus as a teacher of repute—the well-known teacher; or possibly it is to be understood of the Sanhedrin as represented by him—Is this the teaching of Israel? There is something of just indignation here, as everywhere when the words of Jesus Christ are addressed to the hypocrisy of the Pharisees. You who teach others, have you need to learn the very first lessons of true religion? You who claim to loose and bind men, and place heavy burdens on them which they cannot bear, are you without the simplest real knowledge of what God is, or of what man is? Do teachers of Israel know not these things when they lie beneath every page of the Old Testament Scriptures?

Once again the “Verily, verily” of deeper truth. “We speak that we do know” is in sharp contrast to their formal teaching of matters external to the truth. The plural is not usual in the language of Christ, and the immediate passage to the singular forbids us to accept the usual grammatical explanation that it is the plural of majesty. He apparently joins others with Himself—those who have spoken and known and testified, and whose testimony has been rejected by the Jews. We have to think of him whose life-work was to bear witness of the Light (chap. i. 8), and of the band of disciples who form a little school round their Master, and who in Jerusalem, as in Galilee, testified of Him; and it may even be that in the house and presence of one of that
testify that we have seen; and ye receive not our witness. (12) If I have told you earthly things, and ye believe not, how shall ye believe, if I tell you of heavenly things? (13) And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven.

(14) And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up:

... And hardly do we who came down from heaven, was ever in heaven; and returned again to earth; but there was One then speaking with him who had been in heaven with God, and could tell him its real terrors. He had that knowledge which a man could obtain only by ascending to heaven, and He came down from heaven with it. From the human point of view He was as one who had already ascended and descended. (Comp. Note on chap. i. 51.) This is the evident meaning of the sentence, and the form is quite consistent with it. To explain the perfect tense of the future ascension, or to introduce the idea of the “hypostatic union,” by virtue of which the human nature may be said to have ascended into heaven with the divine, is, to give an explanation, not of the text, but of a misunderstanding of it. (But comp. chap. vi. 62.)

Which is in heaven.—These words are omitted in some MSS., including the Sinaitic and the Vatican. The judgment of most modern editors (not including Westcott and Hort) retains them. It is an instance where it is hard to account for the insertion by a copyist, but where the omission is not unlikely, owing to its seeming difficulty. And yet the difficulty is one which vanishes before the true idea of heaven. If heaven is thought of as a place infinitely distant beyond clouds and sky, or as a time in the far future when this world’s life shall end, then it is indeed hard to understand what is here meant by “the Son of Man which is in heaven;” and a copyist may well have found in omission the easiest solution of the difficulty. But if heaven is something wholly different from this coldness of distance in space or time; if it is a state, a life, in which we are, which is in us—now in part, hereafter in its fulness—then may we understand and with glad hearts hold to the vital truth that the Son of Man, who came down from heaven, was ever in heaven; and that every son of man who is born of water and of the Spirit is “made a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor (in the present, κατοίκος) of the kingdom of heaven.”

(14) And as Moses lifted up.—This verse is closely connected by the conjunction “and” with what has gone before. Jesus has taught that in Himself heaven and earth meet; so that, while subject to the conditions of human life, He, the Son of Man, the representative of humanity, is in heaven. He goes on to show that what is true of the representative is, through Him, true of the whole race. Again the Old Testament Scriptures form the basis of the teaching to their expounder. The people in the wilderness bitten by the fiery serpents, the poison-virus spreading through their veins, and causing burning pain, torpor, and death—this was symbolical of the world lying in the misery, restlessness, and spiritual death, which came from the Serpent’s victory in Paradise. The serpent of brass lifted up by Moses, in which the sufferer saw the means of recovery determined by God, and was healed by faith in Him—this was symbolical of the means of salvation determined by God for the world. (Comp. the phrase “lifted up” in chaps. viii. 28; xii. 32; and, as an exact parallel with this passage, chap. xii. 34.) Nicodemus must have understood that the healing power of the serpent of brass was in the fact that it led men to trust in Jehovah, who had appointed it. This was the current Jewish interpretation. Comp. the Jerusalem Targum—“Their faces were to be fixed on their Father who is in
The Son of Man must be lifted up.  

ST. JOHN, III.  

He came to Save and not to Condemn.

The Son of man be lifted up: (15) that 

whosoever believeth in him should not 

perish, but have eternal life.  (16) For 

God so loved the world, that 

he gave his only begotten Son, (17) For 

that he might be lifted up; (16) that 

whosoever believeth in him should not 

perish, but have everlasting life.  (20) 

He that believeth on him is not 

condemned: but he that believeth not is 

condemned already, because he hath 

not believed in the name of the only be-

heaven;” so the Targum of Jonathan ben-Uziel, “The heart was fixed on the name of the word of Jehovah;” so, again, the Wisdom of Solomon, “For he that turned himself toward it was not saved by the thing that he saw, but by Thee, that art the Saviour of all” (xvi. 7; see the whole passage, xvi. 6—13). It was the sign of the Eternal in power and in love present to save, and the man who realised that presence lived with a new life. In the divine counsels it was willed, and must be, that the Son of Man should be the witness to the world of the Eternal Power and Love which saves every man who grasps it.

(15) Not perish, but . . . These words have been added here from the following verse. Omitting them, the sentence should be rendered, that every one who believeth hath life in him eternal life. This construction is borne out by a comparison of chaps. v. 39; xvi. 33; xx. 31. “To believe in Him” is not used by St. John. (See Note on chap. i. 12.) The thought of this verse is that as every Israelite, believing in God, had in the brazen serpent a message from God; so every man who believes in God ever had this message in God in the crucified Son of Man. The object of faith is not here expressed. The words speak only of the man who believeth, whose heart is open to spiritual truth. That man has, in Jesus Christ and Him crucified, a truth which goes to his inmost spirit, sending a new life through his whole being. To the non-believer this may be but the self-sacrifice of heroism. To the believer it is Light breaking upon the darkness of his soul; it is Life bursting the cold sepulchre of a deadened spirit; it is Love winning its way through the scales of a hardened heart; it is Money deeper and wider even than his sin; it is Hope bracing the man to a new life of holiness; it is the Word of God, and in Him he has eternal life. The reader will not forget that the lifting up the serpent of brass followed the confession of the people. “We have sinned . . . pray unto the Lord that He take away the serpents from us” (Num. xxii. 7).

(16) The last verse has spoken of “every one who believeth.” The thought went beyond the limits that Rabbis set to the kingdom of God. Its only limit is humanity. This thought is now repeated and strengthened by the “might not perish,” and the love of God is made the foundation on which it rests. Perhaps no verse in the Bible has been so much explained as this; perhaps no verse can be so little explained. Most young preachers have sermons upon it; older men learn that its meaning must be felt and thought rather than spoken. Still less can it be written; and this Note may not attempt to do more than indicate some lines of thought which may help to lead to others.

God so loved the world.—Familiar as the words are to us, they were uttered to Nicodemus for the first time. They are the revelation of the nature of God, and the ground of our love to God and man. (Comp. Notes on 1 John iv. 7—11.)

His only begotten Son.—Here, once again, the Old Testament Scriptures suggest and explain the words used. Every Jew knew, and loved to think and tell of his forefather who was willing to sacrifice his own and only son in obedience to what he thought to be the will of God (Gen. xxii.). But Love gives, and does not require, sacrifice. God wills not that Abraham should give his son, but He gave His only begotten Son. The dread power that man has ever conceived—that is not God; the pursuing vengeance that sin has ever imagined—that is not God; the unsatisfied anger that sacrifice has ever suggested—that is not God. But all that human thought has ever gathered of tenderness, forgiveness, love, in the relation of father to only child—all this is, in the faintness of an earth-drawn picture, an approach to the true idea of God. Yes, the true idea is infinitely beyond all this; for the love for the world gives to the love for the only begotten Son.

Believeth in.—Better, believeth upon. The preposition is not the same as in the last verse. (Comp. chap. i. 12.) There the thought was of the Son of Man lifted up, in whom every one who believes and can interpret spiritual truth, ever has eternal life. Here the thought is of the Son of God given for the world, and every one who believes upon, casts his whole being upon Him, and, like Abraham, in will rests all upon God, finds that God has provided Himself a lamb for a burnt-offering instead of human sacrifice or death.

Evetlasting life.—Better, as the same Greek word is rendered in the previous verse, eternal life. For the meaning of this word see Note on Matt. xxv. 46. It is of frequent use in this Gospel (seventeen times), and always used in reference to life. It has, in Jesus Christ and Him crucified, a truth which goes to his inmost spirit, sending a new life through his whole being. To the non-believer this may be but the self-sacrifice of heroism. To the believer it is Light breaking upon the darkness of his soul; it is Life bursting the cold sepulchre of a deadened spirit; it is Love winning its way through the scales of a hardened heart; it is Money deeper and wider even than his sin; it is Hope bracing the man to a new life of holiness; it is the Word of God, and in Him he has eternal life. The reader will not forget that the lifting up the serpent of brass followed the confession of the people. “We have sinned . . . pray unto the Lord that He take away the serpents from us” (Num. xxii. 7).

(17) To condemn the world gives to the English reader a stronger impression than that of the original Greek. The word (καταδικάζω, the Latin c(κ)erna, and the English dis-cern) means originally to separate, and in the moral sense to separate good from evil. Passing from the act to the effect, it may mean to absolve; but as the usual effect of separation is to exclude the evil, the word has attached to itself more frequently the idea of condemnation. Our word judge, which has itself something of this double meaning, is probably the best rendering in this context.

Part of the current belief about the Messiah’s advent was, that he would destroy the Gentile world. The authorised expositions of many texts of the Old Testament asserted this, and Nicodemus must oftentimes have heard it and taught it. God’s love for, and gift to, the world has just been declared. This truth runs counter to their belief, and is now stated: as an express denial of it. The purpose of the Messiah’s mission is not to judge, but to save. The latter clause of the verse changes the order of the thought. It would naturally be “but that He might save the world.” The inversion makes prominent the action of man in willing to be saved.

(18) He that believeth on him is not condemned: again, judged is better than “condemned.” There is, moreover, an important change of tense in this verse, which the Authorised version does not mark.
gotten Son of God. (19) And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil. (20) For every one that doeth evil clearly. He that believeth on Him, is not judged: but he that believeth not hath been (and is) already judged. Because he hath not believed.—The human spirit fulfills the end of its being, and finds its highest good, in communion with God. It cannot, then, fail to recognize and believe in a revelation of God. This revelation has been made in the only way in which it can be fully made (comp. chap. i. 18), in the person of the only begotten Son. The very fact that He is rejected is the judgment of the spirit which rejects. It has lost by neglect its power to perceive, or by will it hides itself from God. “I heard Thy voice in the garden, and I was afraid, because I was naked; and I hid myself” (Gen. iii. 10).

(20) And this is the condemnation. — For “condemnation” read judgment; for “light” and “darkness,” the light and the darkness. The object is salvation, not judgment (verse 17); but the salvation is determined by the judgment of the evil. The light makes the darkness visible. Both were before men. That they chose darkness was the act of their own will, and this act of the will was determined by the evil of their deeds. “The light shineth in the darkness, and the darkness comprehendeth it not.” (Comp. Note on chap. i. 5.)

The words are general, but they must have had, for him who then heard them, a special force. It was night. He had avoided the light of day, and like men who go forth to deeds of darkness under cover of darkness, he had come in secrecy to Jesus. His own conscience told him that he was in the presence of a Teacher sent from God (verse 2); but he has checked the voice of conscience. He has shrunken from coming to this Teacher in the light of day, and has loved the darkness of the night.

(21) But he that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved. (21) But he that doeth truth cometh to the light, that his deeds may be made manifest, that they are wrought in God.

that immorality shuns the light and warps the will, and thus darkens knowledge and weakens faith; but we remember too seldom, the deadening effect of an unreal and aimless existence which is not truly a life.

Should be reproved.—The margin will show that our translators felt a difficulty about this word (see Notes on Matt. xviii. 15), where it is rendered “tell him his fault,” and comp. the other instances in this Gospel, chap. viii. 9, 45 (“convince” in both), and especially chap. xvi. 8 (“reprove,” and margin “convince”). The moral idea is exactly illustrated by the action of light, which makes manifest the wrong, and leads the conscience to see it and repent of it. It is through this chastening that the man passes from darkness to light. It is because men shrink from this chastening that they hate the light. (Comp. Notes on the remarkable parallel in Eph. v. 11 et seq.).

should be reproved. He that doeth truth is opposed to “him that practiseth evil.” With fixed purpose he doeth not that which is evil or worthless, but that which, when every veil by which it is hidden from himself or others is removed, remains morally true. Regarding truth as the work of life, he cometh to the light, and though for him too it will be a revelation of sins and errors, and deeds of shame, he hates them the moment he knows them, cuts them from his life at whatever cost, and carries his whole being to the light that it may become really true, and that its true works may be made manifest. He will hate the darkness, for he can have nothing to conceal in it. He will love the light, for everything which it reproves he reproves too, and every ray he can gather from it becomes part of the truth which is his life-work. For the remarkable expression “to do the truth,” which, with its opposite “to do a lie” (chap. viii. 44; Rev. xxi. 27; xii. 15), is common in Rabbinic literature, comp. John xiv. 6, and 1 John 1. 6; and for “walking in truth,” comp. 2 John 4, and 3 John 3, 4. In 1 Cor. xiii. 6, “truth” is opposed to “iniquity.”

That they are wrought in God.—Perhaps better, because they are wrought in God. This is the reason of their being made manifest in the light revealed in the person of Christ. However full the light which had guided men’s steps had been, it was still part of the truth which lighteth every man, and must lead to Him. Every work wrought in God had already bound them in union with Him, and prepared them to receive Him. That Light was in the world, in the Law and Prophets of the Old Testament Scriptures (Matt. v. 17), in the witness of things invisible ever borne by the things that are made (Rom. i. 20), in the law written upon the hearts of men (Rom. ii. 14, 15). As before (verse 19), these words are general, but we may deduce from them a special meaning. He who spoke them warrants our applying them to characters, like the true Nathanael, in whom there is no guile (chap. i. 47); like the rockman Peter (chap. i. 42); like the witness John (Matt. xi. 11). Some ground was good when the Sower went forth to sow.

Two thoughts are suggested to us at the close of this first discourse. One is, that the writer, with perfect naturalness, says nothing of the effect on Nicodemus, but leaves the after-glimpses to tell their own tale.
Jesus in the Land of Judea.

(22) After these things came Jesus and his disciples into the land of Judea; and there he tarried with them, and baptized.  
(23) And John also was baptizing in Enon near to Salim, because there was much water there: and they came, and were baptized.  
(24) For John was not yet cast into prison.  

Then there arose a question between some of John's disciples and the Jews about purifying.  
(25) And they came unto John, and said unto him,  

"Rabbi, he that was with thee beyond Jordan, to whom thou barest witness, behold, the same baptizeth, and all men come to him.  

(27) John answered and said, A man can receive one nothing, except it be given him from heaven.  

(28) Ye yourselves bear me witness, that I said, I am not the Christ, but that I am sent before him.  

(29) He that hath the bride is the bridegroom: but the friend of the bridegroom, which standeth and heareth him, rejoiceth greatly because of the master's work really was, are jealous of what seems to them the rival work of Jesus. He had been with John; the Baptist had borne witness to Him. Now He seems to usurp his work, and the throngs which had crowded to the Forerunner go to Him. (Comp. Notes on chaps. i. 8; iv. 2.)

Barest witness.—Better, hast borne witness.  
(27) Do these words apply to the Baptist himself, or to Christ? Do they mean "I cannot assume this higher position which you wish to give me, because it is not given me by heaven;" or, "His work, with its influence over men, ought to convince you that His mission is divine?" Expositors have given, now this, now that answer. The immediate connection with verse 26 points to the latter view as the correct one (but see Alford's Note on the other side). The power that had shown itself in word and work, teaching as none ever taught before, binding men—aye, some of their own brotherhood—to Himself, convincing men whose minds were open to the truth that He was the very Christ—all this could only have been received from heaven. Did they feel the movement around them? Let them recognise it as divine, and seek to be borne with it. (See Note on chap. vi. 36.)

(29) Ye yourselves bear me witness. —They remembered (verse 26) that John had borne witness to Jesus. Did they not remember too what he had said? He had from the first known his own work, and the greater work. Some of his disciples had known it also, and had gone from him to Jesus. This which they see was the necessary result of the truth he had ever declared.

(29) He that hath the bride is the bridegroom.  
—This is the only instance in this Gospel where the familiar imagery of an Eastern marriage meets us. (See Note on Matt. ix. 15, where we have the same imagery in the answer of our Lord to these same disciples of John, then taking sides with the Pharisees, on the question of fasting.) The "friend of the bridegroom"—called by the Hebrews "Shobab," and by the Greeks "Paranymph"—was charged with the preliminaries of the marriage. He arranged the contract, acted for the bridegroom during the betrothal, and arranged for, and presided at, the festivities of the wedding-day itself. It was a position of honour, in proportion to the position of the bridegroom himself, and was given to his chief friend. That friend then rejoiced in his joy, and there was none brighter on that day than he. This in John's thought is an illustration of his own position. The bridegroom is the Messiah; the bride is the Kingdom of God—the church, consisting of all who with pure hearts are willing to receive Him; the friend who has arranged the betrothal, who has
bridegroom's voice: this my joy therefore is fulfilled. (30) He must increase, but I must decrease. (31) He that cometh from above is above all: he that is of the earth is earthly, and speaketh of the earth: he that cometh from heaven is above all. (32) And what he hath seen and heard, that he testifieth; and no man receiveth his testimony. (33) He that hath received his testimony hath set to his seal that God is true. (34) For he whom God hath sent speaketh the words of God: for God giveth not the Spirit by measure present to his own mind. Yet he may well have said "no man." Of the crowds that thronged to his own baptism, of those who were then thronging to the baptism of Jesus, how many were there who were receiving like testimony of the things seen and heard? (Comp. again verse 11.) How great the first promise, how bitter the last disappointment, of the Baptist's life! These words of intense feeling are not to be measured by the cold standard of a formal exactness. And still it may be that the sadness of his tone arises from the fact that of those to whom he speaks, and at the time when he speaks, there was literally no one receiving this testimony, but all were seeking to make the earthly teacher a rival of the divine. The tense is present; those in the next verse are past.

(30) He must increase, but I must decrease. — The office of the paraprynce ceases when the marriage is accomplished. It must be so. So too in the interpretation. His own work was well-nigh done, but he is filled with the sense of having done his work, not with disappointment that it pales before the brightness of the work which is to follow. This is the text of the Forerunner's life. Well will it be for those followers of Christ whose lives shall be sermons on it! (31) He that cometh from above. — (Comp. Note on verse 13, and chap. viii. 23.) It is expressed in another form in the last clause of the verse. In verse 13, above all persons and, as the context limits the sense, specially above all teachers. He that is of the earth is earthly. — This is the right sense, but the force of the words is lessened by not preserving the three-fold "of the earth" which is in the Greek. "He who is of the earth, of the earth he is, and of the earth he speaketh." The first marks out the Baptist's origin, as opposed to Him that cometh from above; the second asserts that the nature is, in accord with this origin, human and limited in faculty, as opposed to that of Him who is above all; the third declares that his teaching is from the standpoint of human nature and limited faculty, embracing indeed divine subjects and receiving divine revelation (chap. i. 33), but having this treasure in earthen vessels, imperfectly realising it, and imperfectly teaching it (verse 33). Then the contrast carries him away from this thought of self, in all its weakness, to dwell on the fulness of the teaching of the perfect Teacher, and he emphatically repeats, with the change of words suggested by "of the earth," what he has before said of it, "He that cometh from heaven is above all." This repetition is the answer to the jealousy of his disciples, who wished to place him in a position of rivalry with Jesus. It is the answer to all self-assertion on the part of human teachers. And what he hath seen and heard. — This is the opposite of the third point, the speaking of the earth in the last verse. Divine in origin, divine in nature, He is divine in teaching. That teaching, too, is a witness of things seen and heard. (Comp. Notes on chap. vi. 11, 12.) It was a message from the Father's home, brought by the Son Himself. His own message was but that of a servant who did not fully know its meaning. No man receiveth his testimony. — These words are shown by those which immediately follow to go in their pathos beyond the strict limit of the facts prepared these hearts, is John himself. He now stands and hears the Bridegroom. Some of those who had been prepared by him for the Bridegroom would have come, it may be, and told him of his words. He is now near at hand. Throngs crowd to Him. The bride is receiving like testimony of the things seen and heard? The Baptist's origin, as opposed to Him who is above all; the third of culture, race, and creed, has raised up in every age those followers of Christ whose lives shall be sermons had been so. Earlier disciples, as Andrew and John (chap. i. 40), had passed from the Forerunner to the Great Teacher, and had heard in His words that which went to the divine in their own spirits, and had come from the short first meeting with the conviction, "We have found the Messias." They received the witness, and, as they heard it, they too became witnesses. Just as a man sets his private seal — here, probably, the common Eastern stamp that affixed the name is thought of — and by it attests the truth of a document, so they attested, in the power which that witness had over their lives, their recognition of it as truth. It has always been so. The moral fitness of Christianity to meet the spiritual needs of men, and its moral power over the lives of men in all the varying circumstances of culture, race, and creed, has raised up in every age an holy army of witnesses, who have set their seal to its divine truth. (Comp. for the thought of sealing, chap. vi. 27; Rom. iv. 11; xv. 26; 1 Cor. ix. 2; &c.) For he whom God hath sent. — Better, he whom God sent. The acceptance of the witness of things seen and heard is the attestation by the human spirit of the truthfulness of God, for Jesus is as one sent from God to declare Him. It is the divine image in man which recognises divinity. Every human faculty finds its true work, and true satisfaction, and the true object of its being, in Him; and therefore the whole man knows that His words are true, and recognises that He speaks the words of God. (Comp. 1 John v. 10.) For God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto him. — The italics will show that the words "unto Him" are added in our version; and it is probable that the word "God," which has been repeated from the first clause of the verse, should be also omitted here. We have then to read, "For He giveth not the Spirit by measure;" or, possibly, "For the Spirit giveth not by measure." If, however, we remember that John the Baptist is the speaker, and that he had seen "the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and coming upon Him" (see Note on Matt. iii. 16, and comp. such passages as Luke xi. 13, and in this Gospel chap. xiv. 16, and xv. 26), we shall still interpret the words...
in the sense which our version gives. The words “by measure,” in the sense of limitation, are frequent in the classical and rabbinical writings. The Rabbis seem to have applied the phrase to prophets and teachers, saying that the Spirit dwelt in the prophets only in a certain measure. Comp. 2 Kings v. 9, where Elisha prays for “a double portion,” or, more exactly, a portion of two—the portion of the first-born son (Deut. xxi. 17)—of the spirit of Elijah. The same thought meets us in St. Paul (himself a pupil of Gamaliel), who speaks of “the self-same Spirit dividing to every man severally as He will” (see 1 Cor. xii. 4—12). The opposite of this thought, then, is before us here. God gives in this case not as in others. The Son who cometh from above is above all. There is no gift of prophet, or of teacher, which is not given to Him. He has the fulness of the spiritual gifts which in part are given to men, and He speaks the very words of God. It will be noted that John is still expounding to his disciples the meaning of his own declaration, “He must increase, but I must decrease.”

(35) The Father loveth the Son.—Comp. Note on Matt. xi. 27, which is remarkable as an instance of what we call distinctly Johannine thought and diction in the earlier Gospels. We shall meet the words again in chap. v. 20.

(36) He that believeth not the Son.—Better, he that obeyeth not the Son. The word, which occurs only here in the Gospels, is not the same as that at the beginning of the verse, and shows that the faith there intended is the subjection of the will to the Son, to whom the Father hath given all things (verse 35). (Comp. “obedience to the faith,” Rom. i. 5.)

Shall not see life is contrasted with the present possession of the believer. He has life; the man who disobeys has not, and while he disobeys shall not see life, for he cannot be a subject of a kingdom to whose laws he refuses allegiance. But there is also a fearful positive contrast. There is for him a present possession, which shall also remain.

The wrath of God abideth on him.—Once only in the four Gospels does this term, so full of tremendous meaning, meet us, and that in the Gospel of fullest love, and in a context which speaks of the Father’s love to the Son, and of eternal life, which is the portion of all who believe on the Son. It must be so. This word is almost certainly part of the original text, though it is not found in some MSS. Its omission is due to a difficulty of interpretation. What is the previous return into Galilee? The only one mentioned in this Gospel is that of chap. i. 43. We have had another note of time in chap. iii. 24, from which we learn that this Judean period of the ministry preceded the imprisonment of John, and therefore the commencement of the Galilean ministry recorded in Matt. iv. 12 (see Note there) and Mark i. 14. This second return, then, is the starting-point of the history of our Lord’s work in Galilee as told by the earlier Gospels.

(4) He must needs go through Samaria—i.e., following the shortest and most usual road, and the one we find Him taking from Galilee to Jerusalem (Luke ix. 52; see Note there). Josephus spoke of this as the customary way of the Galileans going up during the feasts at Jerusalem (Ant. xx. 6, § 1). The Pharisees, indeed, took the longer road through Perea, to avoid
needs go through Samaria. (5) Then cometh he to a city of Samaria, which is called Sychar, near to the parcel of

contact with the country and the people of Samaria, but it is within the purpose of His life and work ("needs go," i.e., was necessary, and it should go") to travel through Samaria, as in Judaea, the principles of true religion and worship, which would cut away the foundations of all local jealousies and feuds, and establish for all nations the spiritual service of the universal Father (verses 21—24).

(5) The "Samaria" of this chapter is the province into which the older kingdom had degenerated, and which took its name from the capital city. This was the Shomeron built by Omri, on a hill purchased from Shemer (1 Kings xvi. 23, 24). The city was given by Augustus to Herod the Great, who rebuilt it, and called it after the Emperor, Sebaste, a name which survives in the modern village Sebastitch.

Sychar involves questions of greater uncertainty. The reading may be regarded as beyond doubt, the attempts to substitute "Sychem," or "Sichem," being obviously made to avoid the topographical difficulty. The older geographers, followed by many modern commentators, suppose the word to be an intentional variation of the word Sychem, by which the Jews expressed their contempt for the city of the Samaritans, the sound being very nearly that of the Hebrew words for "lie" and "drunken." Others suppose the change of termination is a natural dialectic variation. (Comp. Ben., the Hebrew for son, as in Benjamin, Gen. xxxv. 18, which in the later language became Bar, as in Simon Bar-jona, Matt. xvi. 17.) These considerations, supported by the statement that Sychar is the same place as Shechem; but it is very improbable that St. John would have spoken of a city so well known as Shechem with the prefix "which is called," or would have thought it necessary to define it as "near to the parcel of ground . . . ." The only other places with the same prefix are Ephraim (chap. xi. 54), the Pavement (chap. xix. 13), and Golgotha (chap. xix. 17), but in the latter instances, as in the mention of Thomas called Didymus (chaps. xi. 16, xx. 24), the words do not imply a sobriquet (comp. Farrar, Life of Christ, i. 206, note, and Grove in Smith's Dictionary of Bible, "Sychar"), but are a citation of the names in Hebrew and Greek, for the benefit of that at Shechem. This the children of Israel understood, for they gave this region to Ephraim (JOSH. xvi.), and the parcel of ground became the resting-place for the bones of Joseph (Josh. xxiv. 32, 33).

(6) Jacob's well is one of the few spots about the position of which all travellers are agreed. Jesus, passing from south to west would pass up the valley of Mochna until the road turns sharp to the west, to enter the valley of Shechem between Ebol and Gerizim. Here is Jacob's field, and in the field is Jacob's well. It is dug in the rock, and is about 9 feet in diameter. The older travellers described it as more than 100 feet deep, and with several feet of water. Modern travellers have generally found it dry. Wilson describes it, in 1843, as only 75 feet deep.

Sat thus on the well.—Better, was sitting thus at the well. The words are one of the instances of exact knowledge which meet us in this Gospel. The tense is the descriptive imperfect. He was thus sitting when the woman came. He thus recalls the picture as it was impressed and remained fixed in the writer's mind. He saw Him wearied by the nocturne journey, sitting thus by the well, while they went on to the city to procure food. The reality of this fatigue, as one of the
journey, sat thus on the well: and it was about the sixth hour. (7) There cometh a woman of Samaria to draw water; Jesus saith unto her, Give me to drink. (8) (For his disciples were gone away unto the city to buy meat.) (9) Then saith the woman of Samaria unto him, How is it that thou, being a Jew, askest drink of me, whom am a woman of Samaria? for the Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans.

instances witnessing to the reality of His human nature, is important.

About the sixth hour—i.e., as elsewhere in St. John, following the ordinary mode of counting, about 12 o'clock. (Comp. Note on chap. i. 39.) It is contended, on the other hand, that this was not the usual time for women to resort to the wells to draw water, but the narrative perhaps implies an unusual hour, as it speaks of only one woman there.

Of Samaria—i.e., of the country (verse 1), not of the city. The well was nine miles farther north. She was of the people inhabiting the valley between Ebal and Gerizim, not, like Himself, a chance passenger by now (Luke ix. 52, 53).

Give me to drink is the almost always asked and almost never refused favour as the traveller meets the native by the well-side. He was weary by the heat of the journey, and seeks the ordinary refreshment. (9) For introduces His reason for asking this favour of her. The disciples had gone on. He was alone, and without the means of getting water for Himself (verse 11).

Meat—Better, food, as the former word is misleading in modern English. See Gen. i. 29, 30, and Deut. xx. 20, where herbs and fruits are termed “meat.” It will be remembered that the meat-offering did not consist of flesh, but of flour and oil and ears of corn (Lev. ii.).

(9) Woman of Samaria (twice).—Better, Samaritan woman. In both cases the Greek is the adjective. It is the religious and national position as a Samarian, which is prominent in this verse.

Being a Jew.—This she would know from dress and language. It has been noted that the Hebrew for “thou wouldest have asked of me that living water” is ḡāzēh, the letter Shin, or Shin, which was one of the distinctive points in the Ephraimite pronunciation. They did not say Shihboleth, but Sibboleth (Judges xii. 5, 6). They would not say “Tāni lish’koth,” but “Tāni līsh’koth.”

For the Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans.—The original has not the articles, For Jews have no dealings with Samaritans. This is a remark made by the writer to explain the point of the woman’s question. She wondered that a Jew, weary and thirsty though he might be, should speak to her. For the origin of the Samaritans, see 2 Kings xvii. 24–41, and Note on Luke ix. 52. The later Jewish authors abound in terms of reproach for them—e.g., “He who eats the bread of a Samaritan is as he who eats swine’s flesh;” “No Samaritan shall be made a proselyte;” “He who has no share in the resurrection of the dead” (Porḥa, Rabbi Elieser, 95; comp. Farrar, Life of Christ, i. 208, note). Jesus Himself speaks of a Samaritan as an alien (Luke xvii. 15, 18; comp. x. 33), and it is called a Samaritan and possessed of a devil (comp. chap. viii. 48). But the strictest Jews allowed exceptions to the forbidden intercourse. If bread was interdicted, fruit and vegetables were not; if boiled eggs were forbidden, fresh ones were not. At no time probably did the Galileans follow the practice of the Judeans in this matter, and hence they go to the city to buy food, while the woman asks this question of a Jew whom she met on the road from Jerusalem. Later, it was only “because His face was as though He would go to Jerusalem” that the Samaritan village did not receive Him; and it is the Evangelist of the Jerusalem ministry, who would have called down fire from heaven upon, who adds this note of explanation for His Greek readers now (Luke ix. 52, 53).

If thou knewest the gift of God.—Expositors differ very widely as to the meaning to be given to “the gift of God” and “living water.” See, e.g., the summaries of views in the notes of Meyer and Godet, both of which are now translated into English. Yet there can be little doubt of the true meaning if we observe the true sign for the unbelief of the Samarita. He had stand by the deep well that for centuries has been God’s gift of refreshment to man and beast; you have the means of drawing the water, and are thus the apparent benefactor to Him who asks for your aid. It is not really so. There is a deep well of spiritual truth in communion with God, as necessary for man’s true life as water is for the natural life. I stand here with the means to draw, with the power to enter the depths hidden from man, and reveal to your spirit the Being of God. It is really you that are the traveller in the journey of life, weary with the burning heat of its trials, and travel-stained by the sins through which you have passed, thirsting in the hopes and fears of that spirit that cannot rest apart from God, helpless at the very side of the well, for the Eternal is ever near you, and you know Him not. If you knew this gift of God, and knew Who it is that is now here to reveal it to you, you would have asked, and He would have given you that Spirit, which would have been in you as a fountain of living water.

(11) The woman saith unto him, Sir . . .—Her tone changes to one of respect. Something in His voice and manner, it may be, has touched her. She does not understand His words, but she is conscious of their latent force. She feels the presence of One who teaches with authority, and the “Thou being a Jew,” passes to the reverential “Sir.” Still, she does not see how He can give her living water. Where will He get it? He has no means for drawing it, and the water in the well is far below His reach. His word, too, strikes her, and she dwells on it;—“that living water.” She thinks of spring water, as in Gen. xxvi. 19, and Lev. xiv. 5, where the Hebrew is “living water.” He cannot draw from that well. Does He know of another, with better water? The word used here for “well” is different from that in verse 6, where
The Well of Water.

ST. JOHN, IV.

Springing up into Life.

Art thou greater than our father Jacob, which gave us the well, and drank thereof himself, and his children, and his cattle? (12) Jesus answered and said unto her, Whosoever drunketh of this water shall thirst again: (14) but whosoever drunketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life. (15) The woman saith unto him, Sir, give me this water, that I thirst not, neither come hither to draw. (16) Jesus saith unto her, Go, call thy husband, and come hither. (17) The woman answered and said, I have no husband. Jesus said unto her, Thou hast well said, I have no husband; (18) for thou hast had five husbands; and he whom thou now hast is not thy husband: in that saidst thou truly. (19) The woman saith unto him, Sir, I perceive that thou art a prophet. (20) Our fathers worshipped in this mountain; and ye say, that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship. (21) But the true worship is this, that the spirit and the understanding should worship. (22) Jesus saith unto her, Woman, believe me, the hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father. (23) ye worship ye know not what; we know what we worship, for salvation is from the Jews. (24) The Father seeketh such to worship him. (25) For the Father is the Spirit, and his worshipers shall worship in the Spirit and in truth. (26) The woman saith, I know that Jesus is a prophet. (27) Canst thou be greater than our father Jacob, which gave us the well, and drank thereof himself, and his children, and his cattle? (12) Art thou greater than our father Jacob, which gave us the well, and drank thereof himself, and his children, and his cattle? (12) Art thou greater . . . ?—Again, the pronoun is the emphatic word, “Thou surely art not greater.” (14) The well used to satisfy the wants of the patriarch, and his household, and his flocks, and has come down from him to us. It is surely sufficient for all our wants.” This claim of Jacob as their father was through Ephraim and Joseph, and the well was part of “the parcel of ground that Jacob gave to his son Joseph” (verse 5). There was abundance of water near to it, but a patriarchal household could not depend for a necessity of life upon neighbours who may be hostile, and Jacob had dug this well in his own purchased plot. It was sacred, then, as the very spot where their asserted ancestor had digged his well and built his altar. There was an unbroken continuity in the history of the place, and it was prized the more because it was not so in the history of the people. (13, 14) Whosoever drunketh of this water.—Jesus does not answer her question, but asserts the universal recurrence of thirst, after even the water of Jacob’s well, to lead her to the thought that His “living water” is something widely different. (15) The water that I shall give him.—These words are emphatic as opposed to this water. It is not an external supply, which must be sought to meet the recurring physical want, but it is the inner never-failing source, the fountain of living water, which satisfies every want as it occurs. He who has it, therefore, can never thirst. Coming from the source of all life, it issues in eternal life. (Comp. Notes on chap. vii. 37, 38.)

Come hither.—The Sinaitic and Vatican and some other MSS. read, “come through hither,” or as Alford, who adopts the reading, renders it, “come all the way hither.” Godet also adopts the reading, but renders it, in the service of a forced explanation, “pass by here,” thinking that the woman was on her way home from work at meal-time, and that this accounts for her presence at the well at noon. He regards this as sans doute, but the reading itself is at least uncertain, and is probably to be explained by its first syllable being added from the last syllable of the previous word; and the translation is more than uncertain. The woman understands the words in their physical sense. How many a toilsome hour, how many a weary journey would she be saved!

Go, call thy husband.—She has asked for this living water. She knows not that the well must first be dug. In the depth of her spirit there is a power of life; but like the source of a spring, it is hidden. Many a hard rock of impenitence was there, and many a layer of every-day transgression, and many a habit once formable as clay, now hard as adamant, what a history it has revealed! But she will hide it from Him and from herself. “I have no husband” (or, according to the Sinaitic MS., more emphatically still, A husband I have not).

In that saidst thou truly.—The stroke goes deeper. It lays bare the secrets of all those years over which she thought the veil of the past had for ever been drawn. The bright days of joy and dark days of sin; the heart’s promises made and broken; the sad days of death, which five times over had robbed her of a husband; or, worse than death, the sin which had severed the sacred bonds; the shame of the present shameless life—all these are at least hidden from a stranger. But His words pierce to the inmost thoughts, and prove Him to know all the acts of her life (verse 29). “Thou hast well said, A husband I have not. The holy name may not be given to the paramour thou now hast; with the loss of purity is linked the loss of truthfulness; the very truth thou utterest is meant to convey to Me an untruth, but to One who knows all, the words are really true;—“in that saidst thou truly.”

But who can it be who thus enters her mind and reads the pages of her memory as if it were a book? He must be as one of those of olden time of whom she had heard. The tone of reverence prevails again, “Sir, I perceive that thou art a prophet.”

Our fathers worshipped.—She gives a sudden turn to the conversation. It is not that the question of worship is the all-engrossing problem of her mind, for which she seeks solution at this prophet’s hands. Such questions hardly came then within the circle of a Samaritan woman’s thoughts, and this woman’s life had not been such as to make her an exception to the rule; but the heart, quivering before the eye that reads it as it never before had read itself, shrinks from the light that is let in upon it. She will speak of any-
to worship. Jesus saith unto her, 

Woman, believe me, the hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father. Ye worship ye know not what; we know what we worship: for salvation is of the Jews. But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for the Father

thing rather than of self. There is the mountain over-hanging them, the theme of many a discussion between Samaritan and Jew; she will ask the prophet to decide that question. 

Woman (comp. Note on ii. 4), believe me, the hour cometh. Better, there cometh an hour. The Authorized version of the latter clause gives the correct sense, if it is punctuated as follows: "When ye shall, neither in this mountain nor yet in Jerusalem, worship the Father;" "when ye shall worship, but without the limitation of holy places; when ye shall worship the Father of mankind, before whom Jew, and Samaritan, and Gentile are brethren. Both these thoughts are suggested by her words. She had referred more than once to the claim which arose from direct descent from the patriarch (verses 12—20). But the Father is God, and the hour coming, and then present (verse 23), in Christ's mission, had the Fatherhood of God and the sonship of humanity as its message to the world.

In this mountain. Sychar was between Ebal and Mount Gerizim. Jerusalem, on the other hand, had never once been named in the Pentateuch, which was the only part of the Jewish canon which they accepted. It was but a modern city in comparison with the claim that Gerizim was a holy place from the time of Abraham downwards.

(22) For salvation is of the Jews. —This verse has sorely tried critics who seek to construct the Gospel out of their judgments of what it should be. It can be no difficulty to those who seek to form their judgments from the Gospel as it is. Assume that the Gospel belongs to the Greek thought of the close of the second century, and that the form of the temple had been in ruins, but she refers in the present to the temple at Jerusalem, where the form of worship was every day gone through. From that temple He had just come. The ruins of the one are before Him, the ruins of the other are present to His thoughts (chap. ii. 18—22). Both centres of local worship are to cease. She had referred more than once to the claim which arose from direct descent from the patriarch (verses 12—20). But the Father is God, and the hour coming, and then present (verse 23), in Christ's mission, had the Fatherhood of God and the sonship of humanity as its message to the world.

The contrast between "our fathers" and the emphatic "ye" carries back the thoughts to the rival temple and worship on Mount Gerizim from the time of Nehemiah. The enmity took its rise in the refusal to accept the help of the Samaritans in the restoration of the temple at Jerusalem (Ezra iv. 2; comp. 2 Kings xvii. 24 et seq.). The next step is recorded in Neh. xiii. 23. Manasseh, the son of Joiada, the son of Elisheba, the high priest, had married a daughter of Sanballat, and was chased from Jerusalem. Sanballat thereupon supported his son-in-law in establishing a rival worship, but it is not clear that the temple was built until a century later, in the time of Alexander the Great. The authority for the details of the history is Josephus (Ant. xi. 8, § 2), but he seems to confuse Sanballat the Persian satrap, with Sanballat the Horonite. In any case, from the erection of the temple on Mount Gerizim, the schism was complete. The temple was destroyed by John Hyrcanus, about B.C. 129 (Ant. xiii. 9, § 1), but the mountain on which it stood continued to be, and is to this day, the holy place of the Samaritans. All travellers in the Holy Land describe their Passover, still eaten on this mountain in accordance with the ritual of the Pentateuch. They claimed that this mountain, and not Jerusalem, was the true scene of the sacrifice of Isaac, and Gentile tradition marked it out as the meeting-place with Melchizedek (Enose Prep. Evang. ix. 22). In accordance with their claim, they had changed in every instance the reading of the Pentateuch, "God will choose a spot" (Deut. xii. 14; xviii. 6, &c.), into "He has chosen," i.e., Gerizim. "Ebal," in Deut. xxv. 5, had become "Gerizim," and the Ten Commandments in Exodus and Deuteronomy are fol-

owed by an interpolated command to erect an altar in Mount Gerizim. Jerusalem, on the other hand, had never once been named in the Pentateuch, which was the only part of the Jewish canon which they accepted. It was but a modern city in comparison with the claim that Gerizim was a holy place from the time of Abraham downwards.

The "ye" of this verse is in answer to the "ye" of verse 20. She identifies Him with those who claim Jerusalem as the place of worship. That "ye" contained its own answer. In using it she had said that the Messiah was of the Jews.

(23) But the hour cometh. —Better, as in verse 21, but there cometh an hour. He adds to this thought, what He could not add to the previous one, "and now is." Local worship was not yet giving way to spiritual; but a band of true worshippers was being gathered, and some were then following Him. In spirit and in truth. —The link between human nature and the divine is in the human spirit, which is the shrine of the Holy Spirit (1 Cor. vi. 19). All true approach to God must therefore be in spirit. (Comp. Rom. i. 9, and Eph. vi. 18.) Place, and time, and words, and postures, and sounds, and all things from without, are important only in so far as they aid in abstraction from the sensible world, and in elevation of the spirit within. The moment they distract they hinder true worship. Ritual cannot be discussed without risk of spiritual loss. The words "in truth," already expressed in true worshippers, and repeated in the following verse, are more than "truly." Sincerity is not a test of acceptable worship, though it is a requisite. Bigots sincerely think they do God's service. Worship which is "in
ST. JOHN, IV. The Woman calls the Men of the City.

Jesus declares Himself the Messiah.

seeketh such to worship him. (24) God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth. 
(25) The woman saith unto him, I know that Messias cometh, which is called Christ: when he is come, he will tell us all things. (26) Jesus saith unto her, I that speak unto thee am he.

(27) And upon this came his disciples, and marvelled that he talked with the woman: yet no man said, What seekest thou? or, Why talkest thou with her? (28) The woman then left her waterpot, and went her way into the city, and saith to the men, (29) Come, see a man, which told me all things that ever I did: is not this the Christ? (30) Then they went out of the city, and came unto him.

(31) In the mean while his disciples

truth" is in harmony with the nature of the God whom we worship. To think of God in hearing His truth, to kindle the soul by hymns of praise, to realise the earlier portions of collects and prayers which utter His attributes, are necessary to the truth of the petitions, and thanksgivings, and adorations of worship. The model prayer of Christianity brings home to the heart the Fatherhood of God in its first words.

For the Father seeketh such to worship him.—Better, for such the Father also seeketh His worshippers to be. The word "such," i.e., of this character. This also expresses the worship, on the part of the true worshippers, is in accordance with the divine will: "the Father also (on His part) . . ." The reader will not fail to note the emphasis in this reply on the word "Father" (verse 21 and twice in this verse). This name of God, which we teach children to lips in earliest years, came to her, it may be, now for the first time. He is not Vengeance to be appeased, nor Power to be dreaded, but Love to be received. (Comp. Note on chap. iii. 16.) It is when men learn to think of God as Father that merely local and material worship must cease. The universal desire and practice of worship is the witness to a universal object of worship. The yearning of the human spirit is that of a child seeking the author of his being. The seeking is not human only. The Father also seeketh His child, and seeth him when he is a great way off (Luke xvi. 20).

(24) God is a Spirit.—Better, God is spirit. His will has been expressed in the seeking. But His very nature and essence is spirit, and it follows from this that all true worship must be spiritual. The appeal is here made to a doctrine of special prominence in the Samaritan theology. They had altered a number of passages in the Pentateuch, which seemed to them to speak of God in language properly applicable to man, and to ascribe to Him human form and feelings. But to believe in the spiritual essence of God contained its own answer both as to place and mode of worship.

The second "Him"("they that worship Him") should be omitted, as the italics show.

(25) I know that Messias cometh. —She is puzzled by these new doctrines. "Father! "Spirit!" what did all this mean? Was God in any way sense like the father who in childhood's happy days had protected, and forgiven, and loved? Was the divine nature in any real sense approached by human nature in its highest and best moments, when it seemed lifted above earth, and things of the earth? Was there for her a Father who could still forgive, a Spirit whom her spirit could still love, and in the grasp of that love lift itself to virtue and truth? How different are His words to any she has ever heard before! She, as others, feels half unconsciously their power. Her answer is also a question. He, whom her countrymen called "The Converter," or "The Returner," and expected from such passages as Gen. xlix. 10 and Deut. xviii. 15, and whom the Hebrews called "Messias," and Hellenists called "Christ," would come, and with Him the answer to every question. She uses the present tense, "Messias cometh," Can it be that He stands before her now? (Comp. verse 29.)

(26) I that speak unto thee.—The announcement is being made. The solution of some of the problems which she connects with the Messianic advent is contained in the very words she has heard. Am he—i.e., the Messiah. (Comp. especially Notes on chap. vili. 24, 58.)

(27) With the woman.—Better, probably, with a woman. They are surprised, not at His talking with a Samaritan, but at His talking in public with a woman, which was directly contrary to the Rabbinic precepts. The words of the Law were to be burnt rather than taught to a woman. A man should not speak in public to his own wife. They would like to ask Him, as He asked some of them (chap. i. 38), what He sought to speak of God in language properly applicable to man, and to ascribe to Him human form and feelings. But to believe in the spiritual essence of God contained its own answer both as to place and mode of worship.

The waterpot left behind was a pledge of her return; and it is to us a mark of the presence of him who has related the incidents.

(28) Is not this the Christ?—Better, is this the Christ? She felt that He was a prophet when His words revealed her past life (verse 19). She has had the thought of Christ present to her mind when He teaches the nature of true worship (verse 25). She has heard that He is the Messiah from His own lips (verse 26); but she does not frame her question so as to expect the answer "Yes!" she states the fact of His knowing the life, known perhaps to many of them, and leaves them to form their own judgment.

(29) Came unto him.—Literally, were coming unto Him. They were still on the way when the conversation in verses 31–38 took place. The general expectation of the Messiah, and the receptive spirit of the Samaritans, is shown in her alacrity to go and tell the men of the place, and in their desire at once to see Him for themselves. Many, indeed, were convinced by her statement only (verses 39, 40).

(30) Master.—The Hebrew word Rabbi has been preserved in the earlier passages (chaps. i. 38, 49; iii. 2, 26), and will meet us again in vi. 25. It is less ambiguous than the English word, and should be restored here and in chaps. ix. 2 and xi. 28.

They had left Him weary by the side of the well (verse 6) and had gone to the town. They now return with the food they had obtained, and ask Him to partake of it.
ST. JOHN, IV.  

The Fields white unto Harvest.

prayed him, saying, Master, eat. (32) But he said unto them, I have meat to eat that ye know not of. (33) Therefore said the disciples one to another, Hath any man brought him ought to eat? (34) Jesus saith unto them, My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to finish his work. (35) Say not ye, There are yet four months, and then cometh harvest? behold, I say unto you, Lift up your eyes, and look on the fields; for they are white already to harvest. (36) And he that reapeth receiveth wages, and gathereth fruit unto life eternal; that both he that soweth and he that reapeth may rejoice together. (37) And herein is that saying true, One soweth, and another reapeth. (38) I sent you to a Jewish leap-year, with a month added (Wieseler's Synopsis, Eng. Trans., p. 187), some time about the middle of the month Tebeth (January) as the date of this conversation. (Comp. chap. v. 1.) For the idea of the harvest, comp. Matt. ix. 36—38, and the parable of the Sower, Matt. xiii. 3 et seq.

(33) I have meat to eat that ye know not of.—The emphasis is on the pronouns, which are opposed to each other. “Meat” is better rendered food (see Note on verse 8). The Greek word here is the same as in chap. vi. 27, 55.

(35) Hath any man brought him ought to eat?—The question expects the negative answer, “Surely she hath not!” Surely she is not there, and you should understand His words in the ordinary sense. He proceeds to explain their real meaning.

(34) My meat.—Better, My food, as before (verse 8). To do the will...to finish.—Better, that I may do the will, ...that I may finish. These verbs point out the end which He ever kept in view. In some of the best MSS., and in the received text, the tenses are different. That I may be constantly doing the will of Him that sent Me, and may then at last complete His work. (Comp. chap. xvii. 4.)

This work He speaks of here, and in verse 32, as actual food, as the supply of the truest needs, and the satisfaction of the truest desires of His nature. (Comp. Note on Matt. iv. 4.) Analogies to this are within the limits of every man’s experience, and, faint as they are, help us to learn something of what this spiritual sustenance was. The command of duty, the cheering power of hope, the stimulus of success, are forces that supply to weak and weary nerves and muscles, the vigour of a new life. Under them the soldier can forget his wounds, the martyr smile at the lion or the passer by before the harvest has come. This is as true to them as it is to you. They have food to eat that ye know not of.

(35) Say not ye, There are yet four months.—The emphasis in this verse should be laid upon “ye.” It follows immediately out of the contrast between the natural and spiritual food. Every outer fact is the sign of an inner truth. They, here, as the woman in verse 11, as the teacher of Israel (chap. iii. 4), as the Jews (chap. ii. 20), speak in the language of the outer facts only. He speaks of the spiritual realities personified on the fields of springing corn, they would say that in four months there would be harvest. He sees signs of life springing up from seed sown in receptive hearts; and eyes lifted up and directed to the wide fields of the world’s nations would see that the fulness of time was come, and that the fields were even now white to harvest. The Samaritans coming to Him are as the firstfruits, the earnest of the abundant sheaves which shall follow.

Four months.—This gives us probably a note on time. There is no evidence that it was a proverbial saying, and the form of the sentence is against the supposition. The legal beginning of harvest was fixed (Lev. xxiii. 10; Deut. xvi. 9) for the 16th of Nisan (April). This would give us in that year, which was the middle of the month Tebeth (January) as the date of this conversation. (Comp. chap. v. 1.) For the idea of the harvest, comp. Matt. ix. 36—38, and the parable of the Sower, Matt. xiii. 3 et seq.

(36) And he that reapeth.—The wages of the reaper is the joy—the greatest that the heart can know—of gathering others who are as 11ave been reaped in his field, and are sown above the surface, to form the faster for the reaper. That he is white already to harvest. The Samaritans coming to Him are as the firstfruits, the earnest of the abundant harvest. He sees signs of life springing up from seed sown in receptive hearts; and eyes lifted up and directed to the wide fields of the world’s nations would see that the fulness of time was come, and that the fields were even now white to harvest. The Samaritans coming to Him are as the firstfruits, the earnest of the abundant sheaves which shall follow.

Four months.—This gives us probably a note on time. There is no evidence that it was a proverbial saying, and the form of the sentence is against the supposition. The legal beginning of harvest was fixed (Lev. xxiii. 10; Deut. xvi. 9) for the 16th of Nisan (April). This would give us in that year, which was the middle of the month Tebeth (January) as the date of this conversation. (Comp. chap. v. 1.) For the idea of the harvest, comp. Matt. ix. 36—38, and the parable of the Sower, Matt. xiii. 3 et seq.

(37) Herein is that saying true—i.e., in the deeper sense of the word true (comp. Note on chap. i. 9)—has its realisation; is ideally true. The proverb itself was known both to the Greeks and to the Romans (see examples in Schöttgen and Lampe), but the reference is probably to the Old Testament Scriptures. Those who heard it would certainly think of such passages as Deut. vi. 11, or Isa. lxx. 21, 22. The saying expressed something of the bitterness of human disappointment, which in darker moments all men have felt. They have sown in hopes and plans and works, which have never sprung above the surface, or have been reaped in their results by other men; or they themselves have passed away before the harvest has come. This is as true in earlier times as it is to us. This is the ideal truth. The saying is realised in the relation between sower and reaper, which was true then, and holds true of every sower who really sows the good seed. He, too, has a daily work and a daily sustenance in the will of Him that sent him. In the inner consciousness of that work being done, and the hope of its completion, he has food no less real than that of him who reaps the harvest. That he stands alone is the result of his rising above his generation; that he is little understood, or rewarded, by those for whom he works, will be a disappointment to his friends, but, in his truest thoughts, not to himself. His satisfaction will be hard for men to understand. “Surely no one has brought him to eat!” “I have food to eat that ye know not of.” Men smile at this as sentiment or enthusiasm; but this food has been the strength of the best lives, and noblest deeds, of humanity.

(38) I sent you to reap.—The pronouns are again emphatic. “I sent you to reap;” and the statement is of wide meaning. He is ever the Sower. All others are more or less fully reapers, though in the degree in which they really reap they will become likened unto Him, and will become reapers too. We all inherit from the past the greatest part of our mental and spiritual knowledge. The child of to-day knows more than the philosopher of early history.
Other men laboured, and ye are entered into their labours. — Or, others have laboured. In the immediate application to the present case, the "others" is to be interpreted of Christ Himself, who had been sowing during their absence, and it may be of the woman who has sown this seed by her testimony to the Samaritans. Or the plural may be chosen as in contrast with the plural ye, and as pointing to the general faith, while the immediate reference is to Christ only.

Many of the Samaritans of that city believed. — The willingness to receive the truth on the part of the Samaritans, is contrasted with the rejection of it on the part of the Jews. They refused the witness of a great prophet; these accept the witness of a woman. Their minds were prepared by the general expectation of the Messiah; and this woman witnesses that Jesus had revealed to her the whole past of her life. There is here a sign they do not question.

When the Samaritans were come. — The next step in their faith is to go to Him and ask Him to remain with them, that they too may learn from Him; and He, a Jew, accepts the hospitality of Samaria, and abides with them for two days.

And many more believed. — The veil is left on the part of the Samaritans, is contrasted with the rejection of it on the part of the Jews. They refused the witness of a great prophet; these accept the witness of a woman. Their minds were prepared by the general expectation of the Messiah; and this woman witnesses that Jesus had revealed to her the whole past of her life. There is here a sign they do not question.

When the Samaritans were come. — The next step in their faith is to go to Him and ask Him to remain with them, that they too may learn from Him; and He, a Jew, accepts the hospitality of Samaria, and abides with them for two days.

And many more believed. — The veil is left on the part of the Samaritans, is contrasted with the rejection of it on the part of the Jews. They refused the witness of a great prophet; these accept the witness of a woman. Their minds were prepared by the general expectation of the Messiah; and this woman witnesses that Jesus had revealed to her the whole past of her life. There is here a sign they do not question.

When the Samaritans were come. — The next step in their faith is to go to Him and ask Him to remain with them, that they too may learn from Him; and He, a Jew, accepts the hospitality of Samaria, and abides with them for two days.

And many more believed. — The veil is left on the part of the Samaritans, is contrasted with the rejection of it on the part of the Jews. They refused the witness of a great prophet; these accept the witness of a woman. Their minds were prepared by the general expectation of the Messiah; and this woman witnesses that Jesus had revealed to her the whole past of her life. There is here a sign they do not question.

When the Samaritans were come. — The next step in their faith is to go to Him and ask Him to remain with them, that they too may learn from Him; and He, a Jew, accepts the hospitality of Samaria, and abides with them for two days.

And many more believed. — The veil is left on the part of the Samaritans, is contrasted with the rejection of it on the part of the Jews. They refused the witness of a great prophet; these accept the witness of a woman. Their minds were prepared by the general expectation of the Messiah; and this woman witnesses that Jesus had revealed to her the whole past of her life. There is here a sign they do not question.

When the Samaritans were come. — The next step in their faith is to go to Him and ask Him to remain with them, that they too may learn from Him; and He, a Jew, accepts the hospitality of Samaria, and abides with them for two days.

And many more believed. — The veil is left on the part of the Samaritans, is contrasted with the rejection of it on the part of the Jews. They refused the witness of a great prophet; these accept the witness of a woman. Their minds were prepared by the general expectation of the Messiah; and this woman witnesses that Jesus had revealed to her the whole past of her life. There is here a sign they do not question.

When the Samaritans were come. — The next step in their faith is to go to Him and ask Him to remain with them, that they too may learn from Him; and He, a Jew, accepts the hospitality of Samaria, and abides with them for two days.

And many more believed. — The veil is left on the part of the Samaritans, is contrasted with the rejection of it on the part of the Jews. They refused the witness of a great prophet; these accept the witness of a woman. Their minds were prepared by the general expectation of the Messiah; and this woman witnesses that Jesus had revealed to her the whole past of her life. There is here a sign they do not question.

When the Samaritans were come. — The next step in their faith is to go to Him and ask Him to remain with them, that they too may learn from Him; and He, a Jew, accepts the hospitality of Samaria, and abides with them for two days.

And many more believed. — The veil is left on the part of the Samaritans, is contrasted with the rejection of it on the part of the Jews. They refused the witness of a great prophet; these accept the witness of a woman. Their minds were prepared by the general expectation of the Messiah; and this woman witnesses that Jesus had revealed to her the whole past of her life. There is here a sign they do not question.

When the Samaritans were come. — The next step in their faith is to go to Him and ask Him to remain with them, that they too may learn from Him; and He, a Jew, accepts the hospitality of Samaria, and abides with them for two days.

And many more believed. — The veil is left on the part of the Samaritans, is contrasted with the rejection of it on the part of the Jews. They refused the witness of a great prophet; these accept the witness of a woman. Their minds were prepared by the general expectation of the Messiah; and this woman witnesses that Jesus had revealed to her the whole past of her life. There is here a sign they do not question.

When the Samaritans were come. — The next step in their faith is to go to Him and ask Him to remain with them, that they too may learn from Him; and He, a Jew, accepts the hospitality of Samaria, and abides with them for two days.

And many more believed. — The veil is left on the part of the Samaritans, is contrasted with the rejection of it on the part of the Jews. They refused the witness of a great prophet; these accept the witness of a woman. Their minds were prepared by the general expectation of the Messiah; and this woman witnesses that Jesus had revealed to her the whole past of her life. There is here a sign they do not question.

When the Samaritans were come. — The next step in their faith is to go to Him and ask Him to remain with them, that they too may learn from Him; and He, a Jew, accepts the hospitality of Samaria, and abides with them for two days.

And many more believed. — The veil is left on the part of the Samaritans, is contrasted with the rejection of it on the part of the Jews. They refused the witness of a great prophet; these accept the witness of a woman. Their minds were prepared by the general expectation of the Messiah; and this woman witnesses that Jesus had revealed to her the whole past of her life. There is here a sign they do not question.

When the Samaritans were come. — The next step in their faith is to go to Him and ask Him to remain with them, that they too may learn from Him; and He, a Jew, accepts the hospitality of Samaria, and abides with them for two days.

And many more believed. — The veil is left on the part of the Samaritans, is contrasted with the rejection of it on the part of the Jews. They refused the witness of a great prophet; these accept the witness of a woman. Their minds were prepared by the general expectation of the Messiah; and this woman witnesses that Jesus had revealed to her the whole past of her life. There is here a sign they do not question.
whose son was sick at Capernaum. (47) When he heard that Jesus was come out of Judea into Galilee, he went unto him, and besought him that he would come down, and heal his son: for he was at the point of death. (48) Then said Jesus unto him, Except ye see signs and wonders, ye will not believe. (49) The nobleman saith unto him, Sir, come down ere my child die. (50) Jesus saith unto him, Go thy way; thy son liveth. And the man believed the word that Jesus had spoken unto him, and he went his way. (51) And as he was now going down, his servants met him, and told him, saying, Thy son liveth. (52) Then enquired he of them the hour when he began to amend. And they said unto him, Yesterday at the seventh hour the fever left him. (53) So the father knew that it was at the same hour, in which Jesus said unto him,
CHAPTER V.—(1) After this there was a feast of the Jews; a and Jesus went up to Jerusalem. (2) Now there is at Jerusalem by the sheep market a

[3. The fuller Revelation, and Growth of Unbelief among the Jews (chaps. v. 1—xii. 50).

(1) Jesus is Life (chaps. v. 1—vi. 71).
   (a) This follows from the unity of Son and Father (chap. v.).
   (b) Energy given to strengthen the weak (verses 1—9).
   (c) Persecution by the Jews (verses 10—18).
   (d) Teaching of Jesus (verses 19—47):
      The Father's work also the Son's (verses 19 and 20);
      The spiritual resurrection and judgment (verses 21—27);
      The physical resurrection and judgment (verses 28—30);
      Witness, and the reason of its rejection (verses 31—47.)

(1) A feast of the Jews.—The writer does not tell us what feast this was, and we must be content to remain without certain knowledge. There is, perhaps, no Jewish feast with which it has not been identified, and it has been even proclaimed confidently that it must have been the Day of Atonement (Caspari, Chron. and Geogr., Introd., Eng. Trans., p. 130). Our reading is to be regarded as the better one, though not a few authorities insert the article, and interpret “the Feast” to mean the Feast of Passover.

The time-limits are chap. iv. 35, which was in Tebeth (January), and chap. vi. 4, which brings us to the next Passover in Nisan (April), i.e., an interval of four months, the year being an intercalary one with the month V'Adar (and Adar) added, or, as we should say, with two months of March. The only feast which falls in this interval is the Feast of Purim, and it is with this that the best modern opinion identifies the feast of our text. It was kept on the 14th of Adar (March), in commemoration of the deliverance of the Jews from the plots of Haman, and took its name from the lots cast by him (Esth. iii. 7; ix. 24 et seq.). It was one of the most popular feasts (Jos. Ant. xi. 6, § 18), and was characterised by festive rejoicings, presents, and gifts to the poor. At the same time it was not one of the great feasts, and while the writer names the Passover (chaps. ii. 13; vi. 4; xiii. 1), the Feast of Tabernacles (chap. vii. 2), and even that of the Dedication (chap. x. 22), this has no further importance in the narrative than to account for the fact of Jesus being again in Jerusalem. (Comp. Introduction: Chronological Harmony of the Gospels, p. xxxv.).

(2) Now there is at Jerusalem.—We have no certain knowledge of the time referred to in the last, nor of the place referred to in this verse. For “sheep-market,” we should read with the margin, sheep-gate (Neh. iii. 1, 32; xii. 39). This gate was known well enough to fix the locality of the pool, but is itself now unknown. St. Stephen's Gate, which has been the traditional identification, did not exist until the time of Agrippa. There is some temptation in the interpretation of the Vulgate adopted by some modern travellers and commentators, which supplies the substantival from the immediate context, and reads “sheep-pool.” But the fact that the Greek adjective

Before, in the case of the Samaritans (verses 41, 42), and of the disciples themselves (chap. ii. 11), the successive development of faith.

(54) This is again the second.—The English version has inserted the article, which is not found in the Greek, and has added in italics. But there seems to be no reason why two miracles should not be performed under circumstances in some respects analogous, and the knowledge of the healing in this case may well be compared in the method of every one of the Jewish intercede (Luke vii. 3).

(3) The nobleman is almost certainly a Jew; the centurion is certainly a Gentile (Matt. viii. 10 et seq.; Luke vii. 9).

(4) Here the words of miracle are spoken at Cana; there at Capernaum (Matt. viii. 5; Luke vii. 1).

(5) Here the illness is a fever; there paralysis (Matt. viii. 6).

(6) Here the father pleads that Jesus will go down with him; there the centurion deprecates His going, and asks Him to command with a word only (Matt. viii. 7; Luke vii. 7).

(7) Here the Lord speaks the word only, and does not go down; there apparently He does both (Matt. viii. 13; Luke vii. 6).

(8) Here the Lord blames the half-faith which demands signs and wonders; there He marvels at the fulness of faith, and, it may be in reference to this very nobleman, says, “In no one have I found so great faith in Israel” (Matt. viii. 10).
The Pool of Bethesda.

ST. JOHN, V.

The Man with an Infirmity.

The Pool of Bethesda.

pool, which is called in the Hebrew

Bethesda, having five porches.

(3) In these lay a great multitude of

impotent folk, of blind, halt, withered,

waiting for the moving of the water.

(4) For an angel went down at a certain

season into the pool, and troubled the

water: whosoever then first after the

troubling of the water stepped in was

made whole of whatsoever disease he

had. (5) And a certain man was there,

which had an infirmity thirty and eight

years. (6) When Jesus saw him lie,

and knew that he had been now a long

time in that case, he saith unto him,

Wilt thou be made whole? (7) The

impotent man answered him, Sir, I

have no man, when the water is troubled,

to put me into the pool: but while I

am coming, another steppeth down

for "sheep," is used here only in the New Testament,

and in the Old Testament only in the passages of Neho-

miah referred to above, seems to fix the meaning beyond

doubt.

Bethesda means "house of mercy." The "He-

brew tongue" is the then current Hebrew, what we

ordinarily call Aramaic, or Syro-Chaldaic. The spot is

pointed out traditionally as Birket Israel, near the fort

of Antonia, but since Dr. Robinson's rejection of this,

it has been generally abandoned. He himself adopted

the "Fountain of the Virgin," which is intermittent.

He saw the water rise to the height of a foot in five

minutes, and was told that this occurs sometimes two or

three times a day. The fountain is connected with the

pool of Siloam, and probably with the fountain under the

Grand Mosque. The seventh edition of Alford's Commen-
tary contains an interesting letter, pointing out that

Siloam itself was probably the pool of Bethesda, and

that the remains of four columns in the east wall of the

pool, with four others in the centre, show that there

was a structure half covering it, which resting upon four

columns would give five spaces or porches. The fact

that this pool is called Siloam in chap. ix. 7 does not

oppose this view. The word "called" here, is more

exactly surnamed, and "House of Mercy" may well

have been given to the structure, and thus extended to

the pool in addition to its own name. But to pass from

the uncertain, it is established beyond doubt, (1) that

there are, and then were, on the east of Jerusalem

mineral springs; (2) that these are, and then were, inter-

mittent; and (3) that such springs are resorted to in the

East just as they are in Europe.

(5) In these lay a great multitude.—The word

"great" before multitude, and the latter clause of the

verse "waiting for the moving of the water," and the whole

of verse 4, is omitted by most of the oldest

MSS., including the Sinaitic and the Vatican, and

is judged to be not part of the original text by a

consensus of modern editors, including Tischendorf,

Tregelles, Alford, and Westcott and Hort. It is

interesting to note how a gloss like this has found its

way into the narrative, and, for ninety-nine out of every

hundred readers, is now regarded as an integral part

of St. John's Gospel. We meet with it very early. It

is found in the Alexandrian MS., and in the Latin

and early Syrian versions. Tertullian refers to it. This

points to a wide acceptance from the second century

downwards, and points doubtless to the popular inter-

pretation of that day. It explains the man's own view

in verse 5, and the fact of the multitude assembled

round the pool (verse 3). The bubbling water moving

as it were with life, and in its healing power seeming to

convey new energy to blind and halt and lame, was to

them as the presence of a living messenger of God. They

knew not its constituent elements, and could not trace

the law of its action, but they knew the Source of all

good, who gave intellect to man and healing influence

to matter, effect to the remedy and skill to the physi-
cian, and they accepted the gift as direct from Him.

Scientists of the present century will smile at these

Christians of the second century. The Biblical criti-
cite is glad that he can remove these words from the record,

and cannot be called upon to explain them. But it

may be fairly asked, which is most truly scientific—
to grasp the Ultimate Cause of all, even without the

knowledge of intermediate links; or to trace these

links, and express them in so-called laws, and make

these abstract laws lifeless representatives of the

living God? There is a via media which, here as else-
where, wisdom will seek rather than either extreme.

All true theology must be, in the best sense, scientific;

and all true science must be, in the best sense, religious.

(8) Thirty and eight years.—The period ex-

presses, not his age on the one hand, nor the time of his

being at Bethesda on the other, but the time during

which he had suffered from the infirmity. Helpless and

friendless, having spent half the lot of human life in

that condition, he appeals without an uttered word to

the Mercy which is present in the House of Mercy;

and to him alone of those He healed does Christ of His

own accord address the first question. The infirmity was

in some way connected with youthful sin (verse 14), and

the sufferer and his history would be well known to

those at Jerusalem. The exact knowledge of the writer

tells us that for thirty-eight years he had paid sin's

penalty.

(9) And now Jesus sees him lying there among the

throng of sufferers, and every ache of every limb, and

every sorrow of every heart told of the perfection of life

marred by the curse of sin; but this man's own sin had

left its mark upon him, which men may read and con-
demn, though within the whitest fairness of their own

outer deeds, the soul's life was by sin palsied to its

very core. But he hears, in tones that went to the

heart as he listened to them, the strange question,

stranger indeed than "Wilt thou . . . . . ?" "Wilt

thou to be made whole?"

(10) What does the question mean? Will this

Stranger, whom he has never seen before, do for him

what none of those who often saw him had ever done?

Will he watch for the bubbling water, and place him

first in it? Is there one being in all the world who

regards his state as calling for loving pity, rather than

scornful loathing?

I have no man.—There is an eloquence of hel-

lessness more powerful than that of words. Day by
day he has watched, listened for the first sound, caught

the first movement in the bath, summoned the feeble

vestiges of strength to an action on which all depended,

and hoping each succeeding time, in spite of despair in

which last time's hope has been engulfed, has been

coming, when "another goeth down before." "I have

no man" is to-day the helpless, unspoken cry of thou-

sands imaged here.
before me. (8) Jesus saith unto him, Rise, take up thy bed, and walk. (9) And immediately the man was made whole, and took up his bed, and walked: and on the same day was the sabbath. (10) The Jews therefore said unto him that was cured, It is the sabbath day: it is not lawful for thee to carry thy bed. (11) He answered them, He that made me whole, the same said unto me, Take up thy bed, and walk. (12) Then asked they him, What man is that which said unto thee, Take up thy bed, and walk? (13) And he that was healed wist not who it was: for Jesus had conveyed himself away, a multitude being in that place. (14) Afterward Jesus findeth him in the temple, and said unto him, Behold, thou art made whole: sin no more, lest a worse thing

(8) Jesus saith unto him.—There is no formal demand, or formal statement of faith as preceding the healing. (Comp., e.g., Notes on Matt. xiii. 58; Mark ix. 24.) Men have often wondered at this. If faith is an expression in words or anything outside man, then there is room for wonder; but if it be a living principle, the “seeing Him who is invisible” (Heb. xi. 27), then surely we may seek in vain for a more striking instance of its power than in this man; who, in all, and through all, and in spite of all, trusted in, and looked for, the mercy of God, and had faith to be healed.

Jesus sees in him this receptive power, which in his very helplessness is strength, and calls it forth. He who could barely move is told to rise! he who had for eight-and-thirty years lain on his bed is to carry that bed and walk!

(9) The man was made whole.—The sufferer was known; the healing is in the striking form that none could gainsay.

(10) The Jews therefore said unto him.—But what they cannot deny they can cavil at. One might have expected from human hearts wonder and thankfulness that the man could walk at all. We find from the formalism which had bound the letter round men until it had well nigh crushed all heart out of them, the murmur that the carrying of his bed was not lawful on the Sabbath. This is not the only place in this Gospel where the words and works of Christ clashed with the current views of the sanctity of the Sabbath day. (Comp. chaps. vii. 24; ix. 14.) The general question has been treated in Notes on Matt. xii. 10–12. Here it will be sufficient to note that the bearing of burdens was specially forbidden in the Prophecy of Jeremiah: “Take heed to yourselves, and bear no burden on the Sabbath day” (xvi. 21; comp. Neh. xiii. 13 et seq.), and that the Rabbis pressed this to include a burden of any kind. They said, for example, “If any man on the Sabbath bring in or take out anything on the Sabbath from a public to a private place, it thoughtlessly he hath done this he shall sacrifice for his sin; but if wilfully, he shall be cut off and shall be stoned.”

(11) He that made me whole.—The man basing the use of his power upon the will of Him who had given it. That has been the one divine voice he has heard, and it cannot be wrong for him to obey it.

(12) What man is that which said unto thee ...?—They pass over the giving of the power, and quote only the command which comes under their technical prohibition. The life and strength of once-palsied limb is as nothing; the fact that this man was breaking their tradition is secondary. The real motive is a charge against Him who was potent in the body of the Jewish people was feeling as a life-current, quickening deadened energies, and rousing men to a sense of God’s presence in their midst. Aye, and these Jews of Judaism feel the thrill of this current all around them, though their will tries to isolate them by the coldness of unbelief from a power which they have not directed, and which they refuse to be directed by. Men and women who have been all their lives living in moral helplessness, waiting and looking for God, yet never helped by God’s priests and rulers, are now standing and moving in the strength that their new Teacher gives. They cannot deny it, but can they prevent it? This spirit is life, but there is still the letter which killeth. It draws them to the heart to see His power in their midst, but there is the body of Rabbinic precept and oral law. He has now crossed that. They will apply it to stamp out His work and kill Him.

Take up thy bed, and walk.—Omit “thy bed,” with the best MSS. It is inserted from the previous verse. Their passionate question expresses itself in the fewest words.

(13) For Jesus had conveyed himself away.—The second clause of this verse, as is shown by the marginal rendering, was not intended by our translators to convey the impression that a crowd had assembled round the scene of the miracle, and that to avoid this Jesus passed away from the place. In that case the man must have known who He was. Still the English does probably convey this meaning to most readers, and it would be better to give a freer rendering—For Jesus disappeared among the multitude which was in the place. The presence of the multitude is not given as the reason for His going away, but as explaining the fact that He passed on with them after having spoken to the man, and was thus unknown to him.

(14) Afterward.—There is no mark of time. Probably it was on the same day. Perhaps the first use of his restored power was to go to the Temple and pay his thank-offering to God.

Sin no more.—These words connect his past sufferings with individual sin. He has been freed from the effects, but if they have been truly remedial he has been freed from the cause too. He is in God’s house. Let him accept restored powers as God’s gift, and let their devotion be true thank-offering. The imperative is present, and points to a permanent condition of life—“Be not any more a sinner.”

A worse thing.—There is, then, something worse than a life of unmoving helplessness: There is a sadness of tone even as He says, “Behold, thou art made whole;” just as there is a sigh when He says, “Ephphatha: Be opened!” (Mark vii. 34). There are men for whom it had been good never to have been born (Matt. xxvi. 24). There are limbs that had better never have moved. There are lives that had better have sunk in the negative inaction of death, than have their selves and others in positive deed and speech and thought of life. The power of existence is of infinite grandeur, but it is also of infinite responsibility. It has within its reach the highest good for self and for
come unto thee. (15) The man departed, and told the Jews that it was Jesus, which had made him whole. (16) And therefore did the Jews persecute Jesus, and sought to slay him, because he had done these things on the sabbath day. (17) But Jesus answered them, My Father worketh hitherto, and I work. (18) Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only

mankind; but if the God-given power is sacrificed to sin there is within its reach an unutterable depth of woe.

(15) The man departed, and told the Jews.—We are not told what reason underlay his report to the Jews. It is natural that he should give the answer which he could not give before (verse 13), and that he should wish to secure himself from the charge of breaking the Sabbath, which by imprisonment he shrank from. The narrative does not suggest that he did this in a tone of defiance, which has been found here from a remembrance of chap. ix., still less that he used his new strength immediately to bring a charge against the Giver of it. The impression is rather, that he felt that this power came from a prophet sent by God, and that he told this to those who were God's representatives to the nation, supposing that they would recognise Him too. (19) The words, "and sought to slay Him," should be omitted. They have been inserted in some MSS. to show the earlier unrecorded miracles were also performed claims for Him in the prologue (chap. i. 1-18), and for "His Father," His origin and development as beyond doubt what He means by the term "My Father," and the attribute of ceaseless energy. It was a claim which none other had ever made, that God was in a peculiar sense His own Father. They feel it is a claim to divinity, a "making Himself equal with God."

The more to kill him.—This implies what is included in the persecution of verse 15. (Comp. Matt. xii. 14; Mark iii. 6; Luke vi. 7-11.)

(16) My Father worketh hitherto (or, up to this moment).—They charge Him with breaking the law of God. His answer to this charge is that His action was the result of His worship and unity with that God. The very idea of God implied action. This was familiar to the thought of the day. Comp., e.g., in the contemporary Philo, "God never ceases working; but as to burn is the property of fire, and to be cold is the property of snow, thus also to work is the property of God, and much the more, inasmuch as He is the origin of action for all others" (Legis Allegor. i. 3. See the whole section. The English reader will find it in Bohn's Ed., vol i., p. 53). The rest on the seventh day was the completion of the works of creation (see this stated emphatically in Gen. ii. 2, 3). It was not, it could not be, a cessation in divine work, or in the flow of divine energy. That was not nor day nor night, nor summer nor winter, nor Sabbath nor Jubilees. For man, and animal, and tree, and field, this alternation of a time of production and a time of reception was needed, but God was the ever-constant source of energy and life for all in heaven and earth and sea. The power going forth to heal that sufferer was the same power which sustained them in well-being. The strength which passed through his half-dead frame, and bade it live, was the same which every Sabbath morning awoke them from death's image, sleep, and would awake from death itself (verse 21). The sun shone, and fruitful showers fell, and flower burst its bud, and harvest ripened, and they themselves, in energy of life, had grown on every day alike. God ever worketh up to this present moment. That God is also Father. The Son, therefore, worketh in the same way. This poor sufferer, lying helpless, is of the same human nature with the Son of God. He has in faith and hope made himself receptive of the divine energy, and that energy which can know no Sabbath, but is ever going forth to every heart that can receive it, hath made him whole.

(18) For "had broken, read did He break, and for "His Father," His origin and development as beyond doubt what He means by the term "My Father," and the attribute of ceaseless energy. It was a claim which none other had ever made, that God was in a peculiar sense His own Father. They feel it is a claim to divinity, a "making Himself equal with God."

(19) The Son can do nothing of himself.—The key to this and the following verses is in the relation of Father and Son, from which they start. The Jews saw in this equality with God blasphemy, and sought to kill Him. Men have since seen and now see in it inferiority, and a proof that Christ did not claim for Himself the glory which the Apostle claims for Him in the prologue (chap. i. 1-18), and which the Church has ever in reverent adoration placed as a crown upon His brow. The words "Son," "Father," are the answer to both. Did they accuse Him of blasphemy? He is a Son. The very essence of blasphemy was independence of, and rivalry with, God. He claimed no such position, but was as a Son subject to His Father's will, was as a Son morally unable to do anything apart from the Father, so the relation of Father implies moral inability to do anything apart from the Father, so the relation of Father implies moral necessity to impart all to the Son

Greater works than these.—The works which He had done could only be explained by the unity of His work with God's work has for its basis the Eternal Love, which showeth to the Son all that the Father doeth. As the relation of Son implies moral inability to do anything apart from the Father, so the relation of Father implies moral necessity to impart all to the Son. The Unity of Christ's Work

St. John, V.

with that of the Father's.
him all things that himself doeth: and he will shew him greater works than these, that ye may marvel.

(23) For as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them; even so the Son quickeneth whom he will. (22) For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son:

(23) that all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father. He that honoureth not the Son honoureth not the Father which hath sent him. (24) Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life. (23) Verily, verily, I say unto you, The hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God: and they that hear shall live. (23) For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself;

The following verses (21—29) show what these greater works are. They are the Resurrection and the Judgment; but these are regarded as spiritual as well as physical, as present as well as future. Once again the background of the thought is to be found in verse 17. Resurrection and Judgment were the work of the Father—“My Father worketh hitherto;” but the manifestation in limits of space and time is the work of the Son—“and I work.”

For as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them.—The “them” after “quickeneth” is better omitted. The words are purposely general. Raising the dead and making alive are attributes of God. “He kills and He makes alive” (Deut. xxxii. 39). “He bringeth down to the underworld and bringeth up” (1 Sam. ii. 6; Tobit xiii. 2). “He has the power of life and death” (Wisd. xvi. 13). These are the Son’s power in the Father doing, and these also He doeth in like manner. He, too, has the power to quicken whom He will, and He useth that power. Deadened souls have felt it, and are living in the new-born life. There is in His word, for the man who heareth it and believes it, a moral change which is nothing other than an actual passing out of death into life (verse 24).

(22) For the Father judgeth no man.—Better, For not even doth the Father judge any man; and if not the Father, to whom judgment belongeth, then none other but the Son to whom He hath committed all judgment. To judge (comp. verse 29) is the opposite of to quicken in the previous verse. The fact that the Son hath power to judge is correlative with His power to quicken whom He will. The spiritual life given to, and received by, some (verse 24), is a separation from, and a judgment of, others. The eternal life which shall be given to some, shall be the eternal separation from, and exclusion of, others. The reason why judgment is committed to the Son is given in verse 27 as resulting from His humanity. It is stated here as resulting from His divinity. It is that this power, like the quickening power of verse 21, should lead all to give to the Son honour equal to that which they render to the Father. Again, this relation is urged against those who professed to honour God, and as a proof of it were seeking to kill His Son. That Sonship, expressing at once subordination and unity, necessarily involved the Fatherhood. To reject Him was to reject the Father who sent Him. (Comp. verses 24, 30, 36, 37.)

(24) Verily, verily, I say unto you.—(Comp. verses 19 and 25, and Note on chap. i. 51.) For “shall not come into condemnation,” read doth not come into judgment. (Comp. Note on chap. iii. 15.)

The repeated “verily” introduces, as elsewhere, one of the deeper spiritual truths which He came to teach. This truth explains the “whom He willeth” of verse 21 to have no limit but that of human receptivity. It again brings out the unity of Father and Son. The Son’s word is the revelation of the Father. He that honoureth not the Son honoureth not the Father which hath sent
and hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man.

Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation. I can of mine own self do nothing: as I hear, I judge: and my judgment is just; because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath sent me.

If I bear witness of myself, my witness is not true. There is another that heareth the Father's voice, and knoweth that which thou sayest is true. Ye sent me unto John, and he bare witness unto...
The Witness of Works.

ST. JOHN, V.

The Unreceptivity of the Jews.

same works that I do, bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me. (37) And the Father himself, which hath sent me, hath borne witness of me. Ye have neither heard his voice at any time, nor seen his shape. (38) And ye have not his word abiding in you: for whom he hath sent, him ye believe not.

But I receive not testimony ...—There is no reason for changing the word. The substantive, and verbs from verse 31, have been rendered by "witness;" and it is better to keep it here. The English also fails to give the article, and is therefore misleading. He did receive witness from men—had received witness from John—but this was not the witness upon which all was based. Its purpose was to lead them to Christ Himself, and He now refers to it, to show them its true position, that that purpose might be fulfilled. But those things I say, that ye might be saved. The emphasis of the clause should be placed upon the pronoun "ye." The thought is, that our Lord These "works" are not confined to what we speak and do, but to the knowledge of our origin in God's purpose, and that knowledge must be received if we would be saved. He had a greater witness than that of John, but this they were not yet prepared to receive. They had received John for a season, and had rejoiced in his light. He refers to him now that that light may lead them to the true Source of Light. Some of those who had sent to the Baptist marvelled upon his words and his deeds, and had a deeper sense than any which had come to them before, and may find in them words leading to salvation.

He was a burning and a shining light.—Better, He was the lamp that is lighted and (then) giveth light. The statement of the Prologue, "He was not the Light, but came to bear witness of the Light" (chap. i. 8), shows how important this change is. The word rendered "light" occurs again in Matt. v. 15; vi. 22; Mark iv. 21; Luke xvi. 16; xi. 32, 33, 34, 36; xii. 35; xv. 8; 2 Pet. i. 19; Rev. xviii. 23; xxi. 23; xxii. 5. The reader who will take the trouble to compare these passages, will see clearly the difference in the Greek words. It should be lamp in all these instances. The article in "the lamp" is to be explained from a reference to the one lamp of every home. (Comp. Notes on Matt. v. 15 and Mark iv. 21.) The term was in common use to denote a distinguished hero or teacher. The Habbites were often called "Lamps of the Law," and David was "The Lamp of Israel" (2 Sam. xxv. 17). Comp. the remarkable parallel spoken of the Baptist's great prototype, "Then stood up Elias the prophet, as fire, and his word was kindled like a lamp" (Ecclus. xlviii. 1). Others explain the words here claiming God's fatherhood in word for Himself, and has met with an answer of the Jews, (Comp. Note on chap. i. 7, 17.) They profess to be men, and teachers of other men; but when speaking of this John, our Lord found a similitude of their generation in the changing moods of little children playing in the market-place (Matt. xi. 16). For "hath given Me" read, with the better MSS., gave Me. The pronouns in "But I have" and in "that I do," are emphatic.

In this verse He returns to the thought of verse 32. The parenthesis in verses 33—35 show that John was not the other there spoken of, and this verse shows that the special form of witness which He referred to was that of the works, which works He was then doing, and the voice of which they ought to have heard. These "works" are not confined to what we speak of as miracles, but include the several parts of His Messianic work, which it was His food to finish (chap. iv. 34), and which He speaks of as finished (chap. xvii. 4; see Note there). There is a special reference here to the power to quicken and authority to judge, in verses 21, 22.

Hath borne witness of me.—The marginal reference interprets this testimony of the Father by the voices from heaven spoken at the Baptist and on the Mount of Transfiguration. Both are indeed illustrations, and are naturally suggested by the imagery of voice and shape in the latter half of the verse; but one was at this moment in the future, and the other was a definite event which would have required a more definite reference. The Greek, indeed, distinguishes between the Incarnation at a definite point in time and the witness which was continued—And the Father Himself which sent Me (not "hath sent Me") hath borne witness of Me.

“His voice” and “His shape” are both general, and the “at any time” extends over the whole duration of previous revelation. Literally the clause is, Voice of Him ye have not at any time heard, nor shape of Him have ye seen. The reference to the revelation of the Old Testament Scriptures is, moreover, demanded by the immediate context, while the voice at the Baptism and the Transfiguration are not only absent from the present circle of thoughts, but also from St. John’s Gospel. Jesus is answering a charge of breaking God’s law, and of making Himself equal with God because he has claimed God’s fatherhood in word for Himself, and has manifested it in life-power for man. That charge was but an example of their unresource spirit. Through the whole history of the nation, He had been revealing Himself to them. Through the chief knowledge-giving senses, eye and ear, they should have learnt in that past history to see God in the act of mercy, to hear Him in the word of love. They jealous for God’s honour! Ah! it was then as it had been ever. Voice of God they could not hear. Vision of God they could not see.

Abiding in you.—This striking thought of the word taking up its abode in the mind, and forming the mind in which it dwells, meets us only in St. John. (Comp. chap. xv. 7; 1 John ii. 14; 24; iii. 9, 17; and Note on chap. vi. 30.) They had, indeed, the word of
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God, but they had it not as a power ever living in them. They locked it up with sacred care in ark and synagogue, but it found no home in their inmost life, and had no real power on their practice. They could take it up and put it down. It was something outside themselves. Had it been in them, it would have produced in them a moral consciousness, which would have accepted, as of the same nature with itself, every fuller revelation from God. Their own spirits, moulded by the word of God dwelling in them, would have received the Word of God now among them. 

\[\text{Holy Bible} \text{, } \text{ST. JOHN, V.} \text{, } \text{but will not come to the Living Word.}\]

Search the scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life; and they are they which testify of me.

(40) And ye will not come to me, that ye might have life.  

I receive not honour from men.

The lesson is wide in its bearing. The Rabbinic spirit is not confined to Rabbis, nor is the merely literal study of the Scriptures limited to those of Judaea. Dictionaries, and grammars, and commentaries, are tools; but the precious ore is in the mine, and is to be extracted by every man for himself. He who wisely uses the best means will know most of God and His truth; but this knowledge no man can purchase, and the essentials of it none need lack. It is to be learned in the closet, rather than in the library; in action and trust, rather than in scholarship and thought. Religion is not philosophy, and the world by knowledge has never known God. For every humble heart that willeth to be a scholar, God Himself willeth to be the Teacher.  

(41) If I receive not honour. — The word is better rendered glory here, and in verse 44. Jesus continues to dwell, in the remainder of the discourse (verses 41-47), on the true cause of their incredulity. ’ Ye
Self-seeking the true Cause of Unbelief.

ST. JOHN, V.

Moses is their Accuser.

(42) But I know you, that ye have not the love of God in you. (43) I am come in my Father's name, and ye receive me not: if another shall come in his own name, him ye will receive. (44) How can ye believe, which receive honour one of another, and seek not the honour that cometh from God only? (45) Do not think that I will accuse you to the Father: there is one that accuseth you, even Moses, in whom ye trust. (46) For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me: for he wrote of me." (47) But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?

will not come to Me," is the central thought. But was it, then, to follow this young Teacher, while they themselves had schools and disciples who held their teaching sacred, and their persons in honour, and addressed them as "Rabbi"? No! this is not the true coming to Him. They seek glory from men. He does not receive it (verse 34).

(42) Ye have not the love of God.—The principle which excludes the seeking honour from men, is the love of God. They were, they said, jealous for God's honour. They held the sacred laws, and the foundation of the Theocracy, was the love of God. This every Jew professed, and bound round round brow and arm the holy texts which declared it (Deut. vi. 4-9; xi. 13-21). The Pharisees made broad the phylacteries which contained these words (Matt. xxiii. 5). They had them without, but they had not the principle within. There were sure marks which He had read in the heart as plain as the letters worn on the body, and therefore knew that they had not the love of God in them.

(43) I am come in my Father's name.—So far from self-assertion or honour-seeking, He came in the name of, as representing, the Father, guided only by His will, doing only His work (chap. iv. 34). Had they loved the Father, they must have received and reverenced His Son (chap. vii. 42; Matt. xxi. 37 et seq.). The absence of love is at the root of the rejection. The true Israelite became the true Christian (chap. i. 47), but these were not true members of the Old Covenant, and could not therefore pass into the New.

If another shall come in his own name.—Comp. the direct prophecy of false Christs and prophets in Matt. xxiv. 24, and see Note there. The word "come" in this clause links the meaning with that of the "come" in the previous clause, and is to be understood of a false Messianic claim in opposition to the true. Sixty-four false Christs have been enumerated as appearing after the true Christ, and these words are often taken as a prophecy of one of the most famous of these, as Bar-Kochba. Not a few of the Fathers have understood the words of Antichrist. Perhaps the only definite reference is to the mental condition of the Jews. They would receive any other who came in his own authority, and seeking his own glory. There would be no higher principle to which everything must yield. The seeker of power would fulfill their carnal interpretation, of Messianic hopes. He would flatter and honour them, and therefore they would receive him.

(44) How can ye believe . . .?—The emphasis is again on the pronoun. It is not possible that ye should believe in Me, as our whole position is entirely different. Ye receive glory from men. I do not (verse 41). I am come in My Father's name (verse 43). Ye do not seek the glory which is from God. We are, then, in wholly distinct spheres of life, and action, and thought. To believe would be to give up your whole present life. While ye are what ye are, it cannot be.

The marginal reference compares the parallel thought of chap. xii. 43. This is obscured in the English version by a difference of words for the same Greek word. Here, as in verse 41, it would be more exact to read glory for "honour," and in chap. xii. 43, glory for "praise."

From God only.—Better, from the only God. Comp. Rom. xvi. 27; I Tim. i. 17, and vi. 15, 16; Jude 25. The article before "glory" should be noted. They received glory one of another. They sought not the glory, which was a divine attribute. (Comp. chap. i. 14.) Their charge against Him was that He made Himself equal with God. The religious men, the spiritualists, they were really idolaters. Each man, receiving glory from another, was in the place of a god to that other. Each man giving this glory to another, was rendering to a fellow man that which belonged to God only. They, not He, were robbing God of His glory.

(45) Do not think that I will accuse you to the Father.—His words were words of direct accusation, which must have cut from the Father, and it might have seemed to follow from what He said, that He would accuse them to the Father. He guards against this misinterpretation. Love cannot accuse; He cannot be an accuser. He is ever a judge, only because love must judge hatred, and light must judge darkness, by revealing it. (Comp. Note on chap. iii. 19.) And yet the very revelation of love and light condemns hatred and darkness. The heart, then, needs no accuser, for it accuses itself; it needs no penalty so fearful as that of the soul which is awakened to its own sin, and cannot itself forgive that sin, and, therefore, cannot receive the forgiveness of the Infinite Love, which always forgives. Their accusation was their rejection of light and love in the past, and Moses was their accuser. This is the thought of the following verses.

(46) For had ye believed Moses.—The present incredulity springs from that of the past. If they had really believed Moses, they would have seen in the whole spirit of the Pentateuch a manifestation of God, which would have led them to the fuller manifestation in Christ. Worship, and sacrifice, and offering, and priesthood, were all meant to teach. Their very name for "law" (Torah) meant "instruction." But they accepted what the senses could know, and never went down beneath this surface to its true significance,—i.e., they never believed Moses. We have here, in another form, the thought of verses 39, 40.

For he wrote of me.—See the marginal references; but the thought is not to be confined to these passages.

(47) The emphasis of the contrast here is not between "writings" and "words," but between "his" and "My." It is a repetition of the thought of the previous verse, with an advance in time. They had not believed Moses, and therefore had not believed Him. They do not believe, for they do not read the spiritual meaning of the writings of Moses even now. What ground of hope is left? His words, revealing the deeper truths of the kingdom of God, will fall upon their ears as so many unmeaning sounds. (Comp. Note on chap. iii. 12.)
CHAPTER VI. — (1) After these things Jesus went over the sea of Galilee, which is the sea of Tiberias.
(2) And a great multitude followed him, because they saw his miracles which he did on them that were diseased. (3) And Jesus went up into a mountain, and there he sat with his disciples. (4) And the passover, a feast of the Jews, was nigh.
(5) When Jesus then lifted up his eyes, and saw a great company come unto him, he saith unto Philip, Whence shall we buy bread, that these may eat? (6) And this he said to prove him: for he himself knew what he would do.

VI.
(1) Jesus is Life (continued).
(b) His Incarnation is life for mankind (chap. vi.).
(a) Food given to sustain the hungry (verses 1—15).
(b) His body not subject to natural laws (verses 16—21).
(c) The multitude follow Him (verses 22—25).
(d) Teaching of Jesus (verses 26—58):
   The work of God (verses 26—29);
   The Bread of Life (verses 30—50);
   The true food (flesh) and the true drink (blood) (verses 51—58).
(e) The effect of the teaching — on the one hand defection, on the other a fuller confession of faith (verses 59—71).

The feeding of the Five Thousand is the one miracle related in every Gospel. See Matt. xiv. 13—21; Mark vi. 30—44; Luke ix. 10—17, and Notes on these verses, for the position in the narrative and the common incidents. Here it will be enough to mark the details peculiar to St. John.

The fact that this miracle of the Galilean ministry finds a place also in the record of the Judaean ministry, is to be explained by the discourse which follows. Here, as elsewhere, the principle which has guided the writer's choice is that the signs are a teaching by word (comp. Note on chap. ii. 11), and that those signs produce the fullest faith and life (chap. xx. 31) which led up to the fullest teaching by word. We shall find, too (verse 41), that the discourse is addressed to Jews of Jerusalem among others, so that the chapter, though belonging locally to Galilee, is really within the sphere of St. John's narrative.

(1) After these things. — Allowing an undefined interval, which is filled up by the earlier Gospels. We need not adopt the purely arbitrary supposition that a portion of the Gospel between chaps. v. and vi. has been lost, nor yet connect them in immediate order of time. For St. John the discourse is that for which the whole is recorded. The exact sequence of events is by him left undetermined.

Went over the sea of Galilee — i.e., crossed over from Galilee to the eastern side of the lake.

Sea of Tiberias. — Comp. chap. xxii. 1; but the phrases are not precisely the same. There it is simply "sea of Tiberias." Here it is "sea of Galilee, of Tiberias," the latter term being either an alternative rendering for Greek readers (comp. Note on chap. i. 28, a), or a limitation to that part of the lake which was opposite to Tiberias. We shall find reason to believe that the last chapter of the Gospel should be regarded as an appendix, and the present passage may mark the transition between the other names for the lake which meet us in the other Gospels, and the later name, which meets us for the first time in St. John, but was afterwards common in Greek writers. The town itself is named in the New Testament only in this chap., verse 23. It was on the west of the lake, and is the present well-known Tabariyeh. Built by Herod the Tetrarch, it was, in accordance with the Herodian policy of courting Rome, named after the Emperor Tiberius. Eusebius tells us that it was commenced in the fourteenth year of Tiberius, which is itself an uncertain date (comp. Note on chap. ii. 20); but we may accept it as placing the building in the time of our Lord, and as explaining that the name of the town does not meet us in the earlier Gospels, while it has at a late date, and at all events for Greek readers, extended to the lake.

(2) A great multitude. — This is added by St. John only, and is not simply a following phrase. — Were the verb "beholding" not used here, the parallel passages would be.

(3) A mountain. — Better, the mountain, or, perhaps, the hill-country on the east shore of the sea. See the parallel passages.

(4) A feast. — Better, the feast. Comp. chap. v. 1. This is added by St. John only, and is not simply a note of time, but gives a key of interpretation to the sign itself, and to the discourse which followed.

(5) The converse with Philip is also peculiar to this Gospel. (Comp. chap. xiv. 8 et seq.) The impression of the immediate antecedents of the miracle is different from, but not opposed to, that of the other narratives. They all represent the request coming from the disciples as the first step. St. John does not say it was not so. They represent what took place as seen from the outer circle; he, from the point of view of those near to his Master. We may think of the group of disciples seated round Him, and of the first-called Andrew and Peter, James and John, and Philip (comp. chap. i. 40 et seq.) as closer to Him than the others, who come and speak to Him about the multitudes. While the wants of all are present, the wants of the individuals are not absent. There is something in the character of Philip which this occasion may test. To him is the question spoken which may yet have been an answer to their remark. For "saw a great company come," read saw that a great multitude cometh. It is the vivid present of the crowd coming. "Whence shall we buy bread...?" or rather, Where are we to buy bread? with the best MSS.
(6) And this he said to prove him. — This gives us a glimpse into the educational method of the
The Barley Loaves and Fishes.

ST. JOHN, VI. The Twelve Baskets full of Fragments.

(7) Philip answered him, Two hundred pennyworth of bread is not sufficient for them, that every one of them may take a little. (8) One of his disciples, Andrew, Simon Peter's brother, saith unto him, (9) There is a lad here, which hath five barley loaves, and two small fishes: but what are they among so many? (10) And Jesus said, Make the men sit down. Now there was much grass in the place. So the men sat down, in number about five thousand. (11) And Jesus took the loaves; and when he had given thanks, he distributed to the disciples, and the disciples to them that were set down; and likewise of the fishes as much as they would. (12) When they were filled, he said unto his disciples, Gather up the fragments that remain, that nothing be lost. (13) Therefore they gathered them together, and filled twelve baskets with the fragments of the five barley loaves, which remained over and above unto them that had eaten. (14) Then those men, when they had seen the great Teacher. There is for Him no difficulty. He of Himself knows what He is about to do. But Philip had, we may think, been present at Cana of Galilee, and had seen the wine multiplied to supply the needs of all. Other signs had spoken to the eye, and a fuller teaching had spoken to the ear to the eye. How far had he either spoken to the spirit? He had felt the Divine Presence in separate instances. Had he realised it as a law of life, holding for every need that could arise? The student has learnt individual facts, but has he laid hold of the principle which underlies them? The one is from without, and depends upon the teacher; the other is from within, and is the true education of the man himself. He has been taught; he is now to be examined.

(7) Philip answered him.—The answer proves that Philip has not really learnt the lessons of the earlier teaching. The question does not suggest to him the true answer of divine sufficiency, but leads him to think of the human difficulty. He looks on the vast throng of people. At the lowest estimate, it would take the value of 200 denarii to feed them—in present money-value nearly £7; in actual labour-value nearly a workman's yearly wage. The denarius is the value of a day's work in the parable (Matt. xx. 2 et seq.). In A.D. 14, on the accession of Tiberius, one of the causes of revolt in the Pannonian legions is the smallness of their pay, and one of their demands (Tacit. Ann. i. 26) is a penny a day. For Philip this large sum seems an impossibility. He states the difficulty, and leaves it.

(8) One of his disciples.—Within the inner circle around Him—and this, too, is told us only by St. John—is another of the early disciples. He was one of the two disciples of the Baptist who first followed Jesus, and John's own companion (chap. i. 40). He is always named as one of the first group of the Twelve (comp. Note on Matt. x. 2), and in some way was specially connected with Philip (chap. i. 44). Here, and in chap. xii. 22 (see Note), they are named together, and also in the lists in Mark iii. 18 and Acts i. 13.

(9) Again the account of the eye-witness is the more full and life-like. All tell of the five loaves and two fishes. John knows that they are barley loaves—the ordinary black bread of the Galilean peasant; and that the loaves and fishes are not the property of the disciples, but of a lad or slave who has followed the crowd, in the hope, it may be, of finding a purchaser for them.

The word for "lad" is a diminutive occurring only here (not in the best text of Matt. xi. 18), and in many MSS. is accompanied by "servant," The word may mean a servant, but it more probably means a child. One lad! What could he bear for so many?

Two small fishes.—Better, two fishes. This word, too, is rightly regarded as a diminutive, but it is not a diminutive of "fish." The original root means to boil; thus the substantive is used, as in Homer, of boiled meat, and then of anything eaten as a relish with bread, and specially of fish. This diminutive is used in the New Testament only here and in verse 11, and in chap. xxi. verses 9, 10, 13. A comparison of the passages will make it clear that St. John means by the word the ordinary relish of fish, which formed, with bread, the staple food of the people.

The whole force of Andrew's remark, with its diminutive words, rests upon the smallness of their power to help, while Philip had dwelt on the greatness of the need.

(10) Much grass.—This is an addition in this account. St. Mark, who also represents the impression of an eye-witness, tells us that the grass was green (chap. vi. 39). We know from verse 4 that it was at the time of the Passover—i.e., about our April, when the hill-country on the west of the lake would naturally be clothed with verdure.

So the men sat down.—The word ( ἀρτοθήκης ) means men as such, as distinct from women. (Comp. Note on chap. i. 51.) St. Matthew tells us there were five thousand men besides the women and children (chap. xiv. 21; see Note there).

(11) The better MSS. omit "to the disciples, and the disciples to." It is included in the sense, but is not here expressed in word.

(12) Gather up the fragments.—Again St. John connects immediately with our Lord what the other Evangelists relate of the disciples. It is from this passage only that we know that the gathering of the fragments followed His express command.


(14) Miracle.—Better, sign. (Comp. chap. ii. 11.)

That Jesus did.—Better, that He did. The example is instructive, as showing how words were added at the beginning of a portion read in church. See, among other examples, in the Book of Common Prayer, the Gospels for St. John the Evangelist's Day (John xxii. 19), Quinquagesima (Luke xviii. 31), the Third Sunday in Lent (Luke xi. 14), the Fifth Sunday in Lent (John vii. 46), the Second Sunday after Easter (John x. 11).

This is of a truth that prophet.—This verse is peculiar to St. John. The reception or rejection of Christ is always present to His thoughts. He remembers that the effect of the miracle on the minds of those men, was that they were convinced that this was the Prophet whom they expected, and for whom they had before taken John the Baptist (chap. i. 21).
Jesus crosses over to Capernaum.

ST. JOHN, VI. The Storm on the Lake.

Miracle that Jesus did, said, This is of a truth that prophet that should come into the world.

(15) When Jesus therefore perceived that they would come and take him by force, to make him a king, he departed again into a mountain himself alone.

(16) And when even was now come, his disciples went down unto the sea, and entered into a ship, and went over the sea toward Capernaum. And it was now dark, and Jesus was not come to them. (19) And the sea arose by reason of a great wind that blew. (21) So when they had rowed about five and twenty or thirty furlongs, they see Jesus walking on the sea, and drawing nigh unto the ship: and they were afraid. (23) But he saith unto them, It is I; be not afraid. (21) Then they willingly received him into the ship: and immediately the ship was at the land whither they went. (22) The day following, when the people

With the plain meaning of these definite words. On the other hand, it is not necessary to suppose that St. John here adds the narrative of another miracle. Where all was miraculous this may well, indeed, have been thought so too; but the analogy of the miracles of our Lord does not lead us to expect the use of divine power to accomplish what was within the reach of human effort. It would on this supposition be difficult to understand why the earlier Gospels omit what would surely have seemed to be among the greatest miracles, and why St. John mentions it only in a passing sentence. The words appear rather to contrast the ease and rapidity with which the second half of the voyage was accomplished in His presence, before which the winds and waves were hushed into a calm, and their fears and doubts passed into courage and hope; with the first half, when the sea kept rising, and a strong wind kept blowing, and they rowed against it for five-and-twenty or thirty furlongs. The word rendered “immediately”—which is more exactly our straightway—may find its full meaning in the straight line of the boat’s after-course, as contrasted with its being tossed hither and thither during the storm. The whole context seems to find its full meaning in the sense of difficulty and danger before our Lord was received into the boat, and in the sense of safety and peace afterwards. The Psalmist of the English Christian Year has expressed this in familiar words—

“Thou art the light and dark,
Steer through the tempest Thine own ark;
And the howling wintry sea
We are in part if we have Thee.”

It is scarcely too much to think that the familiar words of him who is Psalmist of Jewish and Christian year alike were present to the mind of St. John—

“For He commandeth, and raiseth the stormy wind, Which lifteth up the waves of (the deep). They mount up to the heaven, They go down again to the depths: Their soul is melted because of trouble. He maketh the storm a calm, So that the waves thereof are still. Then are they glad because they be quiet: So he bringeth them unto their desired haven.”

(See the whole passage, Ps. civ. 23—33.)

The miracle is followed in the other accounts by the healings in the land of Gennesareth. (See Matt. xiv. 34—36; Mark v. 53—56.) For St. John the whole leads up to the discourse at Capernaum. He has told how our Lord and the disciples have crossed again to the west of the lake, but the narrative at once returns to the multitude who have seen the sign, and for whom there remains the interpretation.

(28) The people.—Better, the multitude. It is the same word which in verse 5 is rendered “company.”
On the other side of the sea—i.e., on the eastern side. The writer's starting-point is now Capernaum. In verse 25 the same words mean the western side, the starting-point of the multitude being the scene of the miracle.

Save that one whereinto his disciples were entered.—Better, save one, with the best MSS. The addition has arisen from an explanatory gloss.

Howbeit there came other boats.—This is a parenthesis to explain the fact that while on the previous evening they saw only one boat, there were now several. The multitude came in part from the west of the lake, and the boats crossed over in the morning for them. It is possible that a harbour or centre of merchandise is pointed out by “nigh unto the place.”

The Lord had given thanks.—This act had impressed itself upon the writer. Because the Lord had blessed the bread it was that the multitude had whereof to eat.

When the people.—Better, the multitude, as before. It is not necessary to suppose that the whole 5,000 crossed over. The crowd came probably in part from the eastern side, and many would continue their journey to Jerusalem (comp. verse 2). If indeed we press the words of verse 22, “the multitude which [still] stood on the other side of the sea,” they would include the remnant only.

Therefore saw.—Resuming verse 22. The sentence is long and involved, and this has been, as we may expect, followed by some variations in the text. “Saw,” in verse 22, should be interpreted of the previous evening, and the same word here of the day of their own embarking. They knew there was only one boat, and that the disciples had gone away in it, but Jesus had not. They expected therefore to find Him among themselves, but did not. Meanwhile, other boats had come across from Tiberias. From these they may have learnt that He was not there.

They also took shipping.—Better, they themselves entered into the boats.

Rabbi, when camest thou hither?—This discourse took place in the synagogue at Capernaum (verse 53). They are amazed to find Him here. When and how could He have come? He had not gone in the boat with the disciples, and no other boats had crossed but those in which they themselves came. On the title Rabbi, see Note on chap. i. 38.

Jesus does not answer their question. There is an earlier sign than that about which they now ask, the spiritual significance of which neither they nor the disciples have realised (Mark vi. 52). He does not satisfy their curiosity, but with the solemn “Verily, verily,” begins to reveal this hidden truth.

Not because ye saw the miracles.—Better, not because ye saw signs. There is no article in the original, and the common rendering “miracles” quite misses the sense. They had seen miracles and had felt their force as wonders; what they had not done was to enter into the spiritual significance, and see in them signs of the eternal truth. They regarded the whole matter from without. It was to them nothing more than an eating yesterday, which may be repeated to-day; or it may be He will allow them to take Him and make Him King now, though He did not then.

Labour not for the meat which perisheth.—This is one of the instances in which the reader of the English Bible has in the margin a much better rendering than in the text. Work not shows the verbal connection with verses 28, 29, 30, which is wholly lost in “labour not.” It will be instructive to compare the other passages in this Gospel where the word occurs: chaps. iii. 21 (wrought in God); v. 17; ix. 4. Work not is better than “work not for,” by which the words have been sometimes rendered. The sense is, “Work not out—lot it not be the result of your constant working—to have food (comp. chap. iv. 32) which perisheth; but let your work be one worthy of your endeavour; food which endureth unto eternal life, which food the Son of Man will give to you.”

For him hath God the Father sealed.—The emphasis of the original is seen better by preserving the order of the words, for Him hath the Father sealed, even God. (Comp. Note on chap. iii. 33.)

This verse confirms the meaning given to the preceding words. They understand them in that sense. There are works for them to do which are appointed of God. What shall they do that they may work these works? They had seen Him doing mighty works, which clearly showed the power of God. Are there for them works of a like kind? What steps must they take that they too may work them?

This is the work of God.—They speak of “works,” regarding life as an aggregate of individual deeds. He speaks of “work,” regarding separate acts as the outcome of principle. His own works (chap. v. 36) made one complete work (chap. xvii. 4). They had one great work to do, which indeed seemed not a work, but which when realised would be the living principle of every work, and would be as food abiding unto eternal life.
None who Come shall be Cast Out, but all shall be Raised up at the Last Day.

and believe not. (37) All that the Father giveth me shall come to me; and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out. (38) For I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me. (39) And this is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day. (40) And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life; and I

sent me, that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day. (40) And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life; and I
will raise him up at the last day. (41) The Jews then murmured at him, because he said, I am the bread which came down from heaven. (42) And they said, Is not this Jesus, the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know? how is it then that he saith, I came down from heaven? (43) Jesus therefore answered and said unto them, Murmur not among yourselves. (44) No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him: and I will raise him up at the last day. (45) It is written in the prophets, And they shall be all taught of God. (46) Every man therefore that hath heard, and hath of these verses. There can be no doubt that the change indicated gives the original reading, and it will be seen that the relation of "Father" and "Son" is thus preserved.

Every one which seeth the Son.—We pass here to the individuals who compose the great mass of humanity. It is the divine will that no one should be excluded, but that he may have eternal life (comp. chaps. iii. 15 and v. 24): this is the Father's gift in the person of the Son. The exercise of the mental power to see Him, the reception of Him and trust upon Him: this is man's acceptance of God's gift. The word rendered "seeth" means to look upon, to contemplate, and is the first step towards a true faith.

The analogy of the previous verse makes it probable that we should render the last clause of this verse, and that I should raise him up at the last day. The difference of tenses is important. The believer has now the principle of eternal life, but this is to be his in its fulness when he shall be raised up at the last day. This thought of the final victory is the joyful refrain—was drawn of God, and he only it was who could now come to Him whom God sent. Others were drawn of evil, because they had submitted themselves to its power. They had chosen darkness, and could not now see the light; they had bound themselves in the silken cords of sin, which had hardened into fetters of iron; they had lost themselves in the labyrinths of what they thought wisdom, and did not recognise the true and living way which was opened for them.

The word "draw" need not perplex us; and all the theories opposed to the width of divine love and influence, and to the freedom of human will and action, which have been built upon it, are at once seen to be without support, when we remember that the only other passage in the New Testament where it occurs in a moral sense is in the declaration: "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto Me" (chap. xii. 32).

(41) The Jews murmured at him.—Better, concerning Him, as in chap. vii. 12. 32. Here, too, it was "among themselves" (verse 43). With the true spirit of objectors, they do not regard what He has since said in explanation, but fasten upon what they do not understand in its most striking form. Perhaps they have not listened to what has followed; indeed, the words imply that they were for some time talking to one another, and interrupting His discourse, and that this led to His answering them. They are the Jewish authorities, representing, and probably in part consisting of, members of the Sanhedrin. (Comp. Note on chap. i. 19.)

(42) Is not this Jesus?—Here is something definite. He has spoken of being the Bread of Life, and of the Bread from Heaven. Putting together verses 33, 35, 38, they in effect quote His words. But His natural descent and birth was in its outer facts well known, though all its mysteries were still stored in the mother's heart, and waiting for the human life's completion before they should be revealed. "Jesus Bar-Joseph" would be the name by which He was commonly called; Joseph and Mary had been known, probably, to many in the crowd; attention had now for more than a year been fixed upon Him; and the genealogies would have been searched and local inquiries made. All these indications point to an ordinary life in a Galilean village. It is human, and therefore they think it cannot be divine. They can conceive a coming in the clouds of heaven: that would be a miracle and tell of God; but the birth of a child is no miracle! the existence of life itself—and such an existence, and such a life—is no sign! All this they cannot read. "How does He then say, I am come down from heaven?" (Comp. verse 38 and Note on chap. vii. 27.)

(43) He does not meet their difficulty. It does not appear, indeed, that it was expressed to Him. He seeks to silence the interruption which their murmuring among themselves has caused, and resumes the discourse broken at verse 40.

(44) No man can come to me.—The subject is still the mystery of the varying effects of His revelation on the minds of men. They have been prepared upon their present mental state, which is itself the result of acceptance of, or rejection of, divine influence. The Father which sent Him had, by law, and prophets, and worship, been preparing them. The history of each individual life had been a succession, in every conscious hour, of influences for good or for evil. The mind stood between these, and willed for one or other.

He who day by day, with all his light and strength, however little that all might have been, had sought the pure, and true, and good—had sought really to know God—was drawn of God, and he only it was who could now come to Him whom God sent. Others were drawn of evil, because they had submitted themselves to its power. They had chosen darkness, and could not now see the light; they had bound themselves in the silken cords of sin, which had hardened into fetters of iron; they had lost themselves in the labyrinths of what they thought wisdom, and did not recognise the true and living way which was opened for them.

The word "draw" need not perplex us; and all the theories opposed to the width of divine love and influence, and to the freedom of human will and action, which have been built upon it, are at once seen to be without support, when we remember that the only other passage in the New Testament where it occurs in a moral sense is in the declaration: "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto Me" (chap. xii. 32).

(45) It is written in the prophets...—i.e., in the Book of the Prophets. (Comp. Matt. ii. 23; Mark i. 2; Acts vii. 42, and xiii. 40.) The immediate reference is to the LXX, translation of Isa. liv. 13, but the same thought runs through other passages of the prophets, as Jer. xxxi. 34, and Joel iii. 1 et seq. The words bring out the meaning of the Father's drawing referred to in verse 44, and point out the extent of the divine teaching by which "all" are taught, and the personal receptivity and effort by which "every man" hears and learns. The teaching is universal, but it may not be heard, and when heard may not be learnt.

Every man therefore that hath heard.—Better, Every man that hath heard, omitting "therefore," with the best MSS.

Cometh unto me.—This is co-extensive with the previous hearing and learning. They who had listened for God's voice would recognise His. They who had been God's disciples would be His too. (Comp. chap. v. 46.)
No man hath seen the Father. ST. JOHN, VI. The Living Bread from Heaven.

But this hearing and learning of the Father was the preparation for, not the substitute for, the fuller revelation in the person of the Son. Once again He declares that ‘No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath been the interpreter.’ (See Note on chap. i. 18; and comp. chaps. iii. 13 and viii. 38.) Every man, in proportion as he had been taught of God, would feel how little he knew of God, and there would be in him the yearning desire and the trained faculty to see Him who is of God.

He that believeth.—This thought gives a new force to what He has said in verse 40. He there declared the father’s will, that every one seeing the Son and believing on Him may have eternal life. No man had ever seen the Father, but the Son was then standing in human form before them, and this will was being accomplished, and for the believer eternal life was not only of the future but of the actual present, ‘He hath eternal life.’ (Comp. chaps. i. 18 and v. 24.)

I am that bread of life.—Better, I am the bread of life. The words, which seem to them so hard to fathom (verse 41), are only an expression of this truth in the form of their own demand (verse 31). The essence of life is unseen; bread is the visible form which contains and imparts it. The invisible God is the source of eternal life; the human nature of the Son of God is the visible form which contains and imparts this to the souls of men.

Your fathers . . . and are dead.—Better, . . . and died. The manna which their fathers ate (verse 31) did lead them to a greater work than this which He has done. It is related to Him in the fact that those who ate it afterwards died; whereas He is the true spiritual food for the world, and those who feed upon Him shall not afterwards die. That was manna, special in time and circumstance; this is bread, the true sustenance for all times and all circumstances. That seemed to them to come from heaven, and this from earth; but this outer earth-born form of flesh contains the true life, in the only way in which humanity could receive it. The life itself cometh down from heaven.

I am the living bread.—The words are again repeated (comp. verses 35 and 48), but with a new fulness of meaning. He spoke before of bread which was ‘of life,’ characterised by life, producing life. He now speaks of this bread as ‘living,’ containing the principle of life in itself. (Comp. chaps. iv. 13, 14, v. 25.) Once again, too, He answers their demand for bread ‘from heaven’ (verse 31). The lifeless manna fell and lay upon the ground until they gathered it, and passed to corruption if they did not. Each day’s supply met the need of each day, but met that only. He is the bread containing life in Himself, coming by His own will and act from heaven, living among men, imparting life to those who eat by coming to and believing on Him, so that it becomes in them a principle of life, too, which cannot die, but shall live for ever.

And the bread that I will give is my flesh.—The following words, ‘which I will give,’ should be, probably, omitted, and the whole clause should be read—And the bread that I will give is my flesh for the life of the world. The words are in every way full of meaning, and the history of their interpretation is a long chapter in the history of Christian doctrine. Their connection with the words used at the institution of the Lord’s Supper will be dealt with in Excursus C: The Sacramental Teaching of St. John’s Gospel. Their meaning for the immediate hearers is to be found in the thoughts which led up to them, and which they would suggest to a spiritually-minded Jew. They are, indeed, to be spiritually interpreted (verses 53 and 54), and many, even among the disciples, felt it was a hard saying which they could not hear (verse 60); but the elements of the interpretation are to be sought in the Jewish mind. They have followed Him after a miracle which multiplied a few common barley loaves and fishes, and made them more than enough for thousands (verses 22–24); He has rebuked the mere bread-seeking spirit, and declared to them the true food (verses 26, 28); they have demanded a sign from heaven like the manna (verses 30, 31); He has answered that the manna was the Father’s gift, and that He is the true bread from heaven (verses 32–35); He has shown parenthetically the real ground of their unbelief (verses 36–46), and again returned to the thought of the bread of life which they have murmured at (verses 41, 42), and which He has more fully explained (verses 47–51). He now identifies the bread of which He has spoken with His flesh, and says that He will give that for the life of the world. This form of human flesh is, as it were, the vehicle by which life is conveyed; it is the word by which the Eternal Spirit speaks to the spirit of man. (Comp. chap. i. 18, which is the only other passage in this Gospel, and Luke xxiv. 39, of the resurrection body, which is the only other passage in the New Testament, where the word ‘flesh’ is used of the person of Christ.) These are the thoughts which have immediately led to those words; but many a chord in the Jewish mind ought to have vibrated to them. The emphatic ‘I will give,’ whether it is repeated or not, refers perhaps to the contrast with Moses (verse 32), but certainly to a gift in the future, and, therefore, not to the Incarnation, but to the Crucifixion. The great Teacher, whom many of them had heard, realised that the human form they now looked upon was the ‘Lamb of God’ of Isaiah’s prophecy (chap. i. 36, Note). It was now the time of their Paschal Feast (verse 4), when Jewish families were assembling to eat the flesh which told of the deliverance from Egyptian bondage and the birth of the nation’s life. Every day of Temple service told of flesh given in sacrifice for sin, and eaten in maintenance of the individual life. His words, uttered at this Passover, and fulfilled at the next, announce a gift of His own flesh as the true Paschal Lamb, as the sacrifice for the sins of the world, and as the sustenance of the true life of mankind.
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The principle of animal life, but no man really gives this principle of life to the flesh, and the strength of life sustained by food. But the communication of life is not temporary, is the physical seat of animal life, and that the blood (55) is our home life, that of every day, the sense of the word in the only other place in the New Testament where it occurs (Matt. xxiv. 38) confirms this.

And I will raise him up at the last day.—The thought of the eternal life, which is the present possession of the spirit in communion with God, leads on once again to the fuller expansion of that life in the final victory over death. (Comp. verses 40 and 44.)

For my flesh is meat indeed.—Better, for My flesh is true food, and My blood is true drink. This verse further explains that he who eateth the flesh and drinketh the blood hath eternal life, for he has the true elements of life. It is an answer, too, to those he has heard from them. for "eateth" is a stronger word than that before used, meaning literally the act of dividing the food by the teeth; but this meaning is not to be pressed. It is simply the present tense, which describes the process of eating, and is the same word which is used in verses 56, 57, 58, and in chap. xiii. 18. The thought of the eternal life, which is the present condition of the soul, is expressed by drinking the blood itself: that is, by receiving into the human spirit the atonement represented by it, and with this the very principle of life. They may not receive into the human frame the principle of animal life, but no man really has spiritual life who does not receive into the immost source of his being the life-principle revealed in the person of Christ. This is to pass through and through his moral frame, like the blood which traverses the body, hidden from sight, but passing from the central heart through artery and vein, bearing life in its course to muscle, and nerve, and tissue. It is to traverse the soul, passing from the Eternal Life and Love, which is the heart of the universe, through the humanity of Christ, and carrying in its course life and energy for every cell of man.

Life in you.—More exactly, life in yourselves. This is more fully expressed in verses 56 and 57.

raise him up at the last day. (55) For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. (56) He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him. (57) As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father: so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me. (58) This is that bread which came down from
Many Disciples murmur. ST. JOHN, VI. The Words are Spirit and Life.

Doth this offend you? (62) What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before? (63) It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life. (64) But there are some of you that believe not. For Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that believed not, and who should betray him.

(60) As he taught in Capernaum.—If we accept the identification of Capernaum with Tell-Hûm, which is in every way probable (comp. Note on Matt. iv. 13), we have good reason for believing that modern discovery has traced out the foundations of the synagogue in which this discourse was spoken. It was a gift to the Jews by a devout Gentile (Luke vii. 5), and as such, of greater architectural beauty than was common among Galilean synagogues. Corinthian capitals and a heavy cornice and frieze are among the very ornaments which our Lord's eyes saw there eighteen centuries ago. On one of the lintels of the door he may trace a sculptured pot of manna, and connect with it the thoughts of the manna which the fathers did eat, and died: just as in a Christian church he may trace the emblems of the bread of life, which a man may eat of and not die. A plan and details of the synagogue, with an account by Captain Wilson, R.E., who led the Second Quarterly Statement of the Palestine Exploration Fund (June, 1869). The same society has published a photograph of the ruins.

(61) Many therefore of his disciples—i.e., of the disciples in the wider sense; those who more or less fully were accepting His teaching, and were regarded as His followers. From verse 64, the Apostles would seem to be included in the more general designation. In verse 67 they are separately addressed.

This is an hard saying: who can hear it?—i.e., not hard to be understood, but hard to hear, a stumbling-block in the way of their faith. For the word itself, comp. Matt. xxv. 24. His meaning was, indeed, not read by them, but the literal meaning was painfully clear, and one to which they will not listen. (Comp. chap. x. 20.) They do not raise any formal objection to Him, but friends and companions who had talked together of the Teacher and His teaching before, talk again now, and many of them who have followed Him up to this point can follow Him no more.

(62) When Jesus knew in himself that his disciples murmured.—The tenses in the original describe the scene in the present: Jesus as knowing, the disciples as murmuring. The knowledge is in Himself, uninformed by them, and His teaching is addressed to the thoughts of their hearts. They were placing themselves in the position of the Jews (verse 41), and were making the stepping-stone of spiritual knowledge, up which faith would have walked, into a rock of offence over which blindness fell.

(63) What and if ye shall see . . . ?—Our version adds the word "what," as will be seen from the italics, but it rightly expresses the sense. Literally, we should read, If then ye should behold the Son of Man ascending up where He was before? The Ascension would be the proof of the coming down from heaven (verse 58), which is part of the teaching they cannot now accept. The margin refers to the more formal statement of this in chap. iii. 13. The reader should also compare chap. xx. 17, where the Ascension is again assumed, and Eph. iv. 9, 10. Comments on these incidental references by St. John to an event he does not record have been made too frequently without noting that, in each case, the speaker is Jesus, to whose thoughts this end of subjection to earthly laws, in subjecting them to Himself, was ever present. St. John, in his own narrative, nowhere mentions the fact of the Ascension, nor does he in any way refer to it. That he could write these words without doing so is an assurance of his own knowledge of the glorious sequel of the Resurrection, and of its unquestioned acceptance in the Church.

(65) It is the spirit that quickeneth.—The word "quickeneth," though it has almost passed from everyday use, will probably hold its place in theological use, and convey for the most part the true meaning. If it is retained here, it must, however, be noted that it is a compound of the words "giving life," and this is a somewhat anomalous phrase. (Comp. chaps. vii. 39 and xvi. 7 et seq.). We are to find in them, therefore, a deeper meaning than the ordinary one that His teaching is to be, not carnally, but spiritually understood. They think of a physical eating of His flesh, and this offense them; but what if they, who have thought of bread descending from heaven, see His body ascending into heaven? They will know then that He cannot have meant this. And the Descent of the Spirit will follow the Ascension of the Son, and men full of the Holy Spirit will have brought to their remembrance all these words (chap. xiv. 26), and they will then know what the true feeding on Him is, and these very words which He has spoken will carry their lessons to the inmost being, and be realised, not simply in a spiritual sense, but as spirit and as life.

(64) There are some of you that believe not.—Later, the word "disciple" became synonymous with the word "believer," but there are those now following Him just as they would follow any Rabbi, and, regarding Him as a merely human teacher, they fall short of the faith which was the first qualification for true discipleship. They had heard, it may be, the Sermon on the Mount, and such teaching as that of Matt. xiii. In part they could understand this, and therefore in part believed; but when faith was really needed, it was found not really to exist: for faith is accepting what is not demonstrable to the mere reason, and seeing what is invisible.

From the beginning.—This is a relative term, and is to be interpreted from the context. It means here the beginning of their discipleship, "saw in their hearts the varying kinds of ground on which the good seed fell, and in their acts and words the varying effects.
Many Disciples go away.

ST. JOHN, VI. The Confession of Peter.

And he said, Therefore said I unto you, that no man can come unto me, except it were given unto him of my Father. (65) 

From that time many of his disciples went back, and walked no more with him. (66) 

Then said Jesus unto the twelve, Will ye also go away? (67) 

Then Simon Peter answered him, Lord, to whom shall we go? thou hast the words of eternal life. (68) And we believe and are sure that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God. (69) 

Jesus answered them, Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil? (70) 

He spake of Judas Iscariot the son of Simon: for he it was that should betray him, being one of the twelve.

There were hearts like the hardened wayside, but it may have been ploughed; like the stony places, but that shoveling rock may have been broken through; like the thorns, but they may have been rooted up; and all may have become, as some were, like the good and fruit-bearing ground. (65) 

No man can come unto me.—Unless the fields had been prepared it was in vain to sow the seed. No effort on the sower's part could make them receptive. The fact that they believed not, declared that their hearts were not prepared, but did not affect the goodness of the seed. This defection did not surprise Him. He had already used words which anticipated it. (Comp. Note on verses 37 and 44.) 

It will be observed that this verse follows in the teaching of Christ immediately on the first clause of verse 64, the second clause being a statement of the writer. (66) 

From that time.—The addition of the word "time" has given a definite and questionable meaning to the Greek, which is indefinite. "From that" probably means "on that account," because of the words He had spoken. The actual departure was the result of the teaching, which tested their faith and found it wanting, and was at that time, not gradually from that time onwards. (Comp. Note on chap. xix. 12.) 

Many of his disciples.—Co-extensive with the same term in verse 60. (67) 

Will ye also go away?—We have to think of the disciples grouped round Him, the Twelve—now a distinct body, and so well known that St. John names them for the first time without a note—being nearer to Him than the rest, and of these the first four (see Note on Matt. x. 2) the nearest. Many go away from Him. Men He had taught, borne with in all their weakness and darkness, watched as some light seemed to dawn upon them, hoped for, prayed for, lived for, and would die for, turn back. Yes; that heart, too, can feel the bitterness of disappointment. He looks at the Twelve close to Him, and says to them, Ye also do not wish to go away? The question expects the answer it receives. There He has hope still. 

Then Simon Peter answered.—The look may have been directed to Peter, or here, as elsewhere, his natural character makes him spokesman for the Twelve. And striking is his speech. "Go away? To whom? They had left all to follow Him, and find all in Him. The Baptist is not living, and they know no other teacher. Go away? How could it be, when His words are eternal life?" (verse 33.) (68) 

And we believe and are sure.—Better, We have believed and are sure. (Comp. chap. i. 41, 42.) Go away? The faith which first burned in their hearts has passed into the calm certainty of settled knowledge. Thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God, has found its way into this place from the confession of Matt. xvi. 16. The almost certain reading here is, Thou art the Holy One of God. They had heard this title ascribed to Him by beings from the spirit world (comp. Note on Mark i. 24), and it has been, perhaps, suggested by the present discourse (verses 32 and 46). Like the title Messiah, or Christ, it marks out the consecration to His work. (Comp. John x. 30; 1 Eph. ii. 20; Rev. iii. 7.) The true reading brings out the successive confessions, which are certainly twice, and probably three times, spoken by Peter. This is the second, coming between that of Matt. xiv. 33 and that of Matt. xvi. 16. (See Notes at these places.) (70) 

One of you is a devil.—But even the brightness of His hope in them is not marrered by a shadow; and this shadow is not in its fearful darkness by the light of the truth, which, like a flash of inspiration, has come to Peter's heart, and has been spoken in the names of all. No human joy is for the Man of Sorrows unmarred. The very height to which these eleven have risen, through doubt and difficulty, in honest hearts and earnest lives, shows the depth to which one, with like power and capacity, like call and opportunity, had fallen. The order of the words is emphatic in the sadness which asks the question. Did I not choose you twelve, and of you one is devil? There was the same choice for all, and the choice made, as it is always made, from their fitness and promise for the work for which all were chosen. And of even twelve, one who was subject for hope then is beyond hope now. There may be mystery connected with this life of Judas which none of us can understand; there are certainly warnings connected with it which none of us can refuse to heed. 

A devil.—The meaning would be more exactly given, perhaps, if the word were simply rendered devil, but this can hardly be expressed in English. See Note on Matt. xvi. 23, and, further on Judas, see Notes on Acts i. 16—25. (71) 

Judas Iscariot the son of Simon.—The best MSS. read, Judas, the son of Simon Iscariotes. On the name see the list of the Apostles in Matt. x. 4. If we accept the most probable interpretation of Iscariot as Is K'riot, a man of K'riot,—and this is supported by the variation of MSS. in this place, some of which read "from Kariotes," and the best of which, as we see, apply the title Iscariot to Simon—then Judas belonged to the tribe of Judah (Josh. xv. 25), and is the only one of the Apostles who was not a Galilean (Acts ii. 23). This connects itself with the antagonistic position of the Jews from Jerusalem. 

That should betray him.—Not indicating that Judas was then plotting the betrayal. (Comp. chap. xiii. 2.) This remark is made by the writer to explain the strong words of the previous verse. 

Being one of the twelve.—Or, although he was one of the Twelve, the exact shade of meaning of the participle being defined by the context. It marks, again, the tragic contrast between what might have been expected and what was actually realised. One of the Twelve, devil! one of the Twelve, the betrayer!
Jews sought to kill him. Now the Jews' feast of tabernacles was at hand. His brethren therefore said unto him, Depart hence, and go into Judaea, that thy disciples also may see the works that thou doest. For there is no man that doeth any thing in secret, and he himself seeketh to be known openly. If thou do these things, shew thyself to the world.

Then Jesus said unto them, My time is not yet come: but your time is always ready.

The world cannot hate you; but me it hateth, because I testify of it, that thy disciples also may see the works that thou doest. For there is no man that doeth any thing in secret, and he himself seeketh to be known openly. If thou do these things, shew thyself to the world.

For neither did his brethren believe in him. Then Jesus said unto them, My time is not yet come: but your time is always ready. The world cannot hate you; but me it hateth, because I testify of it, that thy disciples also may see the works that thou doest. For there is no man that doeth any thing in secret, and he himself seeketh to be known openly. If thou do these things, shew thyself to the world.

For neither did his brethren believe in him. Then Jesus said unto them, My time is not yet come: but your time is always ready. The world cannot hate you; but me it hateth, because I testify of it, that thy disciples also may see the works that thou doest. For there is no man that doeth any thing in secret, and he himself seeketh to be known openly. If thou do these things, shew thyself to the world.

For neither did his brethren believe in him. Then Jesus said unto them, My time is not yet come: but your time is always ready. The world cannot hate you; but me it hateth, because I testify of it, that thy disciples also may see the works that thou doest. For there is no man that doeth any thing in secret, and he himself seeketh to be known openly. If thou do these things, shew thyself to the world.

For neither did his brethren believe in him. Then Jesus said unto them, My time is not yet come: but your time is always ready. The world cannot hate you; but me it hateth, because I testify of it, that thy disciples also may see the works that thou doest. For there is no man that doeth any thing in secret, and he himself seeketh to be known openly. If thou do these things, shew thyself to the world.
that the works thereof are evil. (8) Go ye up unto this feast: I go not up yet unto this feast; for my time is not yet full come. (9) When he had said these words unto them, he abode still in Galilee.

(10) But when his brethren were gone up, then went he also up unto the feast, not openly, but as it were in secret. (11) Then the Jews sought him at the feast, and said, Where is he?

be a witness against the evil of its deeds. This is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men love darkness rather than light, because their deeds are evil. But men who love darkness must also hate light. Its very presence makes the darkness visible; and nothing cuts to the very quick, like that which makes the darkness a possibility.

(8) Go ye up unto this feast.—This should be, rather, Go ye up unto the feast, with the stress on the pronoun “ye,” and the article instead of the demonstrative “this.”

I go not up yet unto this feast.—The “yet” is of doubtful authority, though it is found in some early MSS. and versions, and the more so because it removes an apparent difficulty. Without it, the words do not involve a change of purpose, and Porphyry’s often-repeated charge of fickleness has no real ground. He is not going up unto the feast in the sense in which they intended—openly, with the usual caravan from Galilee. Another going up publicly, as they intended, and with an issue the dark presages of which now crowd upon Him, is present to His mind. “Ye, go ye up to the feast; I go not up yet unto this feast.” The verb is in the present, and its meaning does not exclude a going up afterwards. (See also Note on verse 10.) They were then going; the caravan was preparing to start. I am not going up (now). The time is coming, but it has not yet fully come. (Comp. Note on Luke ix. 51.)

(9) He abode still in Galilee.—We find Him in Jerusalem between the 16th and 20th of Tishri (verse 14), and He could not therefore have remained behind them for more than three or four days. We have no record of any companion with Him until chap. ix. 2; but it is probable that some at least of the Apostolic band remained with Him in Galilee and went with Him to Jerusalem. (Comp. Note on Luke ix. 51.) If John returned to Jerusalem after the discourse at Capernaum (comp. Introduction), we have an explanation of the brevity with which he treats the period between Passover and Tabernacles.

(10) But when his brethren were gone up, then went he also up unto the feast. — The words “unto the feast” are misplaced in the Received text, upon which our version is based. The right reading is, “unto this feast,” and the pronoun “this.”

Not openly, but as it were in secret—i.e., not with the usual company. Judging from His practice at another time (chap. iv. 4), He would go through Samaria, while the caravan would go on the Eastern side of the Jordan.

(11) The Jews—i.e., as before, and as in verses 13 and 15, the official representatives of the nation. They kept seeking Him at the feast, where they naturally expected that He would be, and kept asking, without naming Him, Where is He? which is almost equivalent to Where is this fellow? Their question points out that their hostility had gone as far as a definite plot against Him, and that the knowledge of this was widely spread.

(12) And there was much murmuring among the people. The original word for “people” is here, and here only in St. John, in the plural, and is best rendered by multitudes. It refers to the throngs of people assembled during the various parts of the ritual of the feast, and, perhaps, especially on the one hand to the Galilean multitude, some of whom had been present at the last great work recorded in this Gospel, and some of whom had been present at other works, and influenced by other teaching of Jesus and the Apostles; and on the other hand, to the Judaean multitude, who had been prevented from accepting Him in the same degree by the stronger influence of the hierarchy. Among these multitudes there arose, as before among the Jews and among the disciples (chap. vi. 41 and 61), a murmuring; but the subject of this discussion is not His teaching, but His character. Their practical test-question was, Is He a good man, or a deceiver? (Comp. Matt. xxvii. 63.) Some would think of deceit and words which had established His goodness beyond all doubt; but if He is a good man, then His claim cannot be false. Others would think of deceivers, who had led away the multitude before (comp. Notes on Acts v. 36, 37), and that He was one of them.

(13) No man cannot fairly be limited, as it generally has been, to the multitude who believed in Him. It discloses to us rather a reign of terror, in which opinion was stifled, and men dared not speak openly on either side until authority had determined what they should say. Now about the midst of the feast. (14) Better, But now, when it was the middle of the feast. (Comp. verse 8.) This was the technical Chól Mo‘̀dî or Mo‘̀dî Katôn, “the Middle of the Feast,” or “the Lesser Feast.” He had taken no part in the greater festival itself, and now He appears in the Temple, as far as we know, for the first time as a public teacher, probably (verse 19) as an expounder of some Scripture which had been read.

(15) How knoweth this man letters?—Their spirit is seen in that at which they marvel. It is not the substance of His teaching that excites their attention, but the fact that He who has never been technically trained as a Rabbi is acquainted with the literature of the schools. (See Acts xxvi. 24, “much learning,”
having never learned? (18) Jesus answered them, and said, My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me. (17) If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself. (18) He that speaketh of himself seeketh his own glory: but he that seeketh his glory that sent him, the same is true, and no unrighteousness is in him. (19) Did not Moses give you the law, and yet none of you keepest the law? Why go ye about to kill me? (20) The people answered and said, Thou hast a devil: who goeth about to kill thee? (21) Jesus answered and said unto them, I have heard the teaching of them of every honest heart; but the truth holds good for every honest heart these pilgrims know how far from their own thoughts and of comfort and of hope is spoken alike to all in our position and His, but the general form of the expressions, "He that speaketh of himself . . ." "He that seeketh His glory . . ." show that this is not the exclusive reference. They, too, hold good of every man who speaketh of himself, and of every man who seeketh the glory of Him that sent Him.

Did not Moses . . .?—The note of interrogation should be placed at the end of the first clause. The verse would then read, Did not Moses give you the law? and none of you doeth the law. Why seek ye to kill Me? So far from the will to do God’s will, without which they could not know His teaching, they had the Law, which they all professed to accept, and yet no one kept it (chap. iv. 16-47). This thought follows naturally on verses 17 and 18, and, like the whole of this teaching, grows out of the truths of chap. v.; but it may be that this reference to Moses and the Law has a special fitness, as suggested by the feast. Moses had commanded that the Law should be read in every Sabbatical year at this very festival (Deut. xxxi. 10); and there is good reason for believing that the current year was a Sabbatical year. The first portion of the Law which it was customary to read was Deut. i. 1-18. Within this section (verse 17) came the command, “Thou shalt not kill.” They were, then, in their persecution of Him (chap. v. 18), breaking the Law, of which their presence at the feast was a professed obedience.

The people. —They know that the rulers have sought for Him (verse 11), but are not aware of their intention to kill Him. When this is referred to, it is “by some of them of Jerusalem” (verse 25). These pilgrims know how far from their own thoughts is any such idea, and they think that its presence in His thoughts must be the work of a demon. (Comp. Note on Matt. xi. 18.) They utter this, not in hostility, but in wonder that He can think so.

I have done one work. —i.e., the one conspicuous work of healing the infirm man on the Sabbath day, which He did at His last visit to Jerusalem. We have already had a reference to other works in chap. v. 25, and He Himself refers to His many good works in chap. v. 25.

Ye all marvel. —This answer is addressed to the multitude who said “Thou hast a devil,” when He spoke of the intention to kill Him. This work on the
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done one work, and ye all marvel. (22) Moses therefore gave unto you circumcision;—(not because it is of Moses, but of the fathers;) and ye on the sabbath day circumcise a man. (23) If a man on the sabbath day receive circumcision, that the law of Moses should not be broken; are ye angry at me, because I have made a man every whit whole on the sabbath day? (24) Judge not according to the appearance, but judge righteous judgment. (25) Then said some of them of Jerusalem, Is not this he, whom they seek to kill? (26) But, lo, he speaketh boldly, and they say nothing unto him. Do the rulers know indeed that this is the very Christ? (27) Howbeit we know this man whence he is: but when Christ cometh, no man knoweth whence he is. (28) Then cried Jesus in the temple as he taught, saying, Ye both know me, and ye know

Sabbath day, which provoked the deadly hostility of the hierarchy (chap. vi. 16, 18), was cause of wonder to them all. They, too, though not in the same degree, were led by it to take a hostile position.

Moses therefore gave unto you circumcision.—Some MSS., and many editors, place the "therefore," or, on this account, at the close of the last verse, reading, "Ye all marvel on this account," and then the present verse, "Moses gave unto you circumcision." For the reading of our version is, however, better supported, and agrees better with the writer's style. "On this account hath Moses given you circumcision, not because it is of Moses, but of the fathers." The argument is, "Ye circumcise on the Sabbath day because circumcision is part of the Mosaic law; but Moses gave you circumcision because he had an anterior and higher authority for it, and in practice you recognize this and make it override the Sabbath. But if the circumcision is allowed, why not a deed of mercy? This is the bear Him speaking openly, and those who sought His conviction of the truth of His claim.

The rule of circumcision on the eighth day (Gen. xvii. 12, xxii. 4) was adopted in the Mosaic law (Lev. xii. 3), and strictly adhered to— we have examples in the New Testament, in Luke i. 59, ii. 21, and Phil. iii. 5—and if the eighth day fell on the Sabbath, then, according to Rabbinic precept, "circumcision vacated the Sabbath." The school of Hillel the Great—and disciples of this school were at the time of our Lord the chief teachers at Jerusalem (comp. Note on v. 39)—gave as a reason for this that the "Sabbath Law was one of the Negative and the Circumcision Law one of the Positive Precepts, and that the Positive destroys the Negative." His appeal, then, is an example of His knowledge of their technical law, at which they wondered in verse 15. Indeed, the argument itself is an example of Hillel's first great law of interpretation—"that the Major may be inferred from the Minor." If circumcision be lawful on the Sabbath, much more is it lawful to restore the whole man. For other instances in which our Lord used this famous Canon of Interpretation, comp. Matt. vii. 11 and x. 29—31.

Judge not according to the appearance.—He has put the case before them in its true light, and from their own point of view. There was another Positive Precept of Moses which these judges were forgetting, though it, too, formed part of the first section of the Law read at Tabernacles (Deut. i. 16, 17). Let them who profess to judge Him by the Law obey it, and form a just and honest opinion, and not be biased by the appearance of a mere technicality. Even if His work did fall under the condemnation of what they held to be the letter of the Mosaic law (comp. Note on chap. v. 10), they knew perfectly well—and their own practice as to circumcision proved this—that it did so in appearance only.

Then said some of them of Jerusalem.—These Jerusalemites are distinct from the multitude of verse 20, and are acquainted with the intention which seemed so impossible to the latter.

But they, too, have reason for wonder. They hear Him speaking openly, and those who sought His death listen to Him without reply. Are they, then, convinced of the truth of His claim?

Do the rulers know indeed . . .?—Read, Have the rulers come to know indeed that this Man is the Christ? The word "very" is omitted by the best MSS. The word "indeed" shows that the questioners think it impossible that the rulers can have recognised Him.

Howbeit we know this man.—They at once supply a corrective answer to their own question. They know this Man whence He is. He is the carpenter's son, and His mother, and brethren, and sisters, are well known (Matt. xiii. 55, 56). His brothers, indeed, are part of that multitude (verse 10). They know that the Messiah will be of the seed and town of David (verse 42); but they have no knowledge of an earthly home and earthly relations, and all their ideas are of a Being who will not be subject to the ordinary conditions of life, and whose immediate origin man can know. God's Anointed living among them as a man, with mother, and brothers, and sisters! This cannot be. What meant the coming in the clouds of heaven of Daniel's vision (Dan. vii. 13), or the coming suddenly to the temple of Malachi's prophecy? (Mal. iii. 1.) Why did Isaiah tell of His being "Wonderful, Counselor, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace?" (Isa. ix. 6.) In such thoughts they fulfilled another prophecy of the same Isaiah, which their own Rabbis interpreted of the Messiah, "He hath no form nor comeliness; and when we shall see Him, there is no beauty that we should desire Him" (Isa. lii. 2).
Whence I am; and I am not come of myself, but he that sent me is true, whom ye know not. (29) But I know him: for I am from him, and he hath sent me. (30) Then they sought to take him: but no man laid hands on him, because his hour was not yet come. (31) And many of the people believed on him, and said, When Christ cometh, will he do more miracles than these which this man hath done? (32) The Pharisees heard that the people murmured such things concerning him; and the Pharisees and the chief priests sent officers to take him. (33) Then said Jesus unto them, Yet a
He will go to the Father.
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little while am I with you, and then I go unto him that sent me. (34) Ye shall seek me, and shall not find me; and where I am, thither ye cannot come.

(35) Then said the Jews among themselves, Whither will he go, that we shall not find him? will he go unto the dispersed among the Gentiles, and teach

them," and it is clear, from verse 35, that the words are addressed to the hierarchy generally.

Yet a little while am I with you.—Their action is the first attempt to take Him by force. It brings to His mind the thought that the end is at hand. But a little while more, and the hour will have come. The manifestation of God's love to man will then be completed in its crowning sacrifice, and when the work of His mission is completed, He will return to Him that sent Him.

(34) Ye shall seek me, and shall not find me.—These words are to be interpreted in connection with chap. viii. 21, where they are repeated, and with chap. xiii. 33, where they are quoted and applied to the disciples. This will exclude any special reference, such as to the destruction of Jerusalem and to the seeking Him in the miseries which should follow, which most expositors have found here. The words refer rather to the most general truth now presented to His mind, and applicable to all alike, that the time was at hand when He would return to the Father, and His bodily presence would be unapproachable, alike by those who should seek in hatred, or those who should seek in love.

(35) Whither will he go that we shall not find him?—He had said in verse 33, "I go unto Him that sent Me," and in verse 28 He had declared that they knew not Him that sent Him. There is, then, no contradiction between these verses, and the only other instance of its occurrence in the Bible, besides the Authorized version, cxlvii. 2, "He gathereth together the scattering abroad of the Jews to Jerusalem" (Comp. Ant. vii. 3, § l). Under the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes, they spread over a wider area, including the whole of Asia Minor, and thence to the islands and mainland of Greece. It was much more numerous than either that to Babylon, or of Egypt, but the synagogues of this Diaspora formed the connecting-links between the older and the newer revelation, and were the first buildings in which Jesus was preached as the Messiah.

But though thus scattered abroad, the Jews of the Diaspora regarded Jerusalem as the common religious centre, and maintained a close communion with the spiritual authorities who dwelt there. They sent their messengers to the Temple, and were represented by numerous synagogues in the city, and flocked in large numbers to the chief festivals. (Comp. Notes on Acts ii. 9—11.) The Diaspora, then, was a network of Judaism, spreading to every place of intellectual or commercial importance, and linking it to Jerusalem, and a means by which the teaching of the Old Testament was made familiarly known, even in the cities of the Gentiles.

Moses of old time hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues every sabbath day" (Acts xx. 21).

Such was the dispersion among the Gentiles of which these rulers of the Jews speak. They ask the question in evident scorn. "Will this Rabbi, leaving Jerusalem, the centre of light and learning, go to those who dwell among the heathen, and become a teacher of the very heathen themselves?" We feel that there is some fact which gives point to their question, and is not apparent in the narrative. We shall find this, it may be, if we remember that He Himself had before this crossed the limits of the Holy Land, and had given words to teach and power to save, in the case of the Greek woman who was a Syro-Phenician by nation. (Comp. Notes on Matt. xv. 21—28; Mark vii. 24—30.) More fully still do the words find their interpretation in the after history. They are, like the words of Caiaphas (chap. xii. 49—51), an unconscious prophecy, and may be taken as summing up in one sentence the method of procedure in the earliest mission-work of the church. The great high-roads of the Diaspora were those which the Apostles followed. Every apostolic church of the Gentiles may be said to have grown out of a synagogue of the Jews. There is a striking instance of the irony of history, in the fact that the very words of these Jews of Palestine are recorded in the Greek language, by a Jew of Palestine, presiding over a Christian church, in a Gentile city.

For 

"Gentiles," the margin reads "Greeks," and
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The Gentiles? (36) What manner of saying is this that he said, Ye shall seek me, and shall not find me; and where I am, thither ye cannot come? (37) In the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst, let him come unto me, and drink. (38) He that believeth on me, as the scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow by the words, “If any man thirst.” He stands there on the great day of the feast, and around Him are men who for seven successive mornings have witnessed acts and uttered words telling, though they know it not, of the true satisfaction of spiritual thirst, and thinking of the descent of showers on the thirsty ground, and in some vague way of the Holy Spirit’s presence. They are as the woman of Samaria was by the side of the true well. For every one who really knew his need, the source of living water was at hand. (Comp. Notes on chap. iv. 7—15.) That very Feast of Tabernacles, with its dwelling in tents, moreover, brought vividly to their minds the wilderness-life; and as in the past chapter the manna has formed the basis of His teaching about the Bread of Life, so here the striking of the rock and the streams gushing forth in the desert would be present to their minds. In the interpretation of one who was himself a Pharisee, and was taught in the schools of Jerusalem, “that rock was Christ” (1 Cor. x. 4).

(39) There can be little doubt that our English version rightly gives the meaning of the original here; though representatives of both the earliest and the latest schools of interpretation have tried so to read the verse as to avoid its difficulties. Some would attach the first clause to the preceding verse, reading, “If any man thirst, let him come unto Me; and let him that believeth on Me drink.” Others would have us think that the words, “as the Scripture hath said,” belong to the clause before them, and not to that which follows, making the sense, “He that believeth on Me according to the Scriptures, out of his belly (I say) shall flow rivers of living water.” The reader of the English will, it is believed, feel, and the reader of the Greek will feel still more strongly, that these are attempts to avoid what it is hard to explain, and that while they miss the difficulty they also miss the meaning.

He that believeth on me . . .—We have here an advance on the thought, “If any man thirst let him come unto Me, and drink.” For what is meant is the satisfaction of the individual mind. This teaches the fuller truth that every one in living communion with Christ becomes himself the centre of spiritual influence. There is in him a power of life which, when quickened by faith, flows forth as a river, carrying life and refreshment to others. No spirit grasps a great truth which satisfies its own yearnings as the waters of the fountain slake physical thirst, without longing to send it forth to others who are seeking what he himself had sought. There is in him a river whose waters no barrier can confine. This is the spirit of the prophet and the evangelist, of the martyr and the missionary. It is the spirit of every great teacher. It is the link which binds men together and makes the life of every Christian approach the life of Christ, for he lives not for himself but for the world.

The exact words “Out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water” are not found in any part of the Canonical Scriptures of the Old Testament, and yet Christ Himself utters them with the formula of quotation. This will be a difficulty only to those who value letter and syllable above spirit and substance. It may be that the words which our Lord actually
rivers of living water. (39) But this spake he of the Spirit, whom they that believe on him should receive: for the Holy Ghost was not yet given; because that Jesus was not yet glorified.)

(40) Many of the people therefore, when they heard this saying, said, Of a truth this is the Prophet. (41) Others said, This is the Christ. But some said, Shall Christ come out of Galilee?

(42) Hath not the scripture said, That Christ cometh of the seed of David, and out of the town of Bethlehem, where David was? (43) So there was a division among the people because of him.

(44) And some of them would have taken him; but no man laid hands on him.

(45) Then came the officers to the chief priests and Pharisees: and they said unto them, Why have ye not brought him?—The word for division is our word "schism." It is found in the earlier Gospels in one instance only, "the rent is made worse" (Matt. ix. 16; Mark ii. 21). This is nearer to the older meaning of the word, which is used, for example, of the hoofs of animals, and the leaves of trees. St. John uses it only to mark this rent into two parties of the Jewish multitude, here and in chaps. ix. 16 and x. 19. In St. Paul it is used of the divisions of the Church at Corinth (1 Cor. i. 10; xi. 18; xii. 25). The use of the word in its ethical sense may belong in some special way to Ephesus, for only in writings from this city do we find it in Biblical Greek. Later, both the word and the fact denoted by it passed into the history of the Church.

(44) And some of them would have taken him—i.e., those who asked "Dost the Christ, then, come out of Galilee?" (verse 41.) The officers of the Sanhedrin were present all this time (verse 32), and are immediately mentioned as distinct from the "some" of this verse.

No man laid hands on him.—Comp. verse 30. The reason is not here repeated. The fact is in part explained by the existence of a section who received Him as the Prophet and as the Christ, and in part by the power of His presence and words which impressed even the officers sent to take Him. (Comp. chap. xviii. 6.)

(45) Then came the officers to the chief priests and Pharisees.—(Comp. Note on chap. xviii. 3.) They had been sent (verse 32), not with a definite warrant to bring Him by force, but to watch their opportunity, and seize any pretext for doing so which might arise. "The chief priests and Pharisees" are the Sanhedrin who met (verse 32), and, though it was a festival, seemed to have continued in session, expecting the return of their servants.

Why have ye not brought him?—Their question shows the object of the mission. It is asked in the bitterness of disappointed craft. In the presence of the multitude they dared not proceed by open force, and the fulness of the word was every hour gaining ground. If their officers could have brought Him on some technical charge away from the people and into their own chamber, all would then have been in their own hands.
him? (46) The officers answered, Never man spake like this man. (47) They then answered them the Pharisees, Are ye also deceived? (48) Have any of the rulers or of the Pharisees believed on him? (49) But this people who knoweth not the law are cursed. (50) Nicodemus

(46) Never man spake like this man.—Some of the oldest MSS., including the Vatican, have a shorter text, “Never man spake thus”; but the longer reading is to be preferred. The very officers acknowledged His power, and tell the professed teachers, whose opinions and words were the rule of all Jewish life, that never man spake as He whom they sought to take! It is probable that in the section immediately preceding (verses 32–34), St. John gives us only a résumé of what Jesus had said, and that words which have not come down to us were among those which produced so profound an impression on the officers.

(47) Are ye also deceived?—The emphasis is upon the ye. “Ye whose duty it is simply to obey, who were sent to bring Him captive before us—do ye also yield to His power?” It is the Pharisees who ask this, and their spirit is shown in the matter of their question. They make no inquiry as to what He had said, though it must have struck them as a phenomenon demanding explanation that their own officials had been convinced by His teaching. It is at once assumed that they, too, had been deceived. It is this sort of the Pharisees who speak of Him as “that deceiver” (Matt. xxvii. 63).

(48) The rulers were the Sanhedrin, among whose official duties it was to prevent the introduction of false doctrines. (Comp. Note on i. 19.) “The Pharisees” were the orthodox party of the day, and they are the persons who ask the question. The matter was to be decided by authority, and not by truth. In the pride of the certainty that no one in a position of power or authority had believed on Jesus, they ask the scornful question, “Hath any one of the rulers or of the Pharisees believed?” They are stung to the very heart at seeing first the multitude, then their own officials, going after Him. They know not that there is one sitting in their midst, both ruler and Pharisee, who long before had listened to the teaching of the Galilean, and was in heart, if not in name, a disciple (chap. iii.), and that during this very feast many of the chief Jews will believe on Him (chap. viii. 30, 31).

(49) But this people who knoweth not the law . . .—The words express “Those people there, among whom you have been, and with whose opinion you have been coinciding, instead of holding the authoritative opinion which we have declared, and which we alone can declare. We are the interpreters of the Law, and have the key of knowledge. That ignorant rabble uninstructed in the Law are cursed.

(50) Are cursed. The writings of the Rabbis are full of scorn and contempt for the un instructed multitude, whom they called ‘am ha’arēts, “people of the earth,” as opposed to those instructed in the Law, whom they called ‘am kādeṣ, “holy people.” These words are an expression of this contempt. Some have supposed that they are meant to express the ban of excommunication, which they use as a weapon of compulsion in chap. ix. 22, but this is quite out of the question as applied here to the multitude.

(51) Doth our law judge any man?—He identifies Himself with them. He, like they, is an expounder of the Law. The question is a mere attempt to find a loophole by which to dismiss Him. (2) They answered and said unto Him, Art thou also of Galilee? Search, and look: for out of Galilee ariseth no prophet.
CHAPTER VIII.—(1) Jesus went unto the mount of Olives. (2) And early in the morning he came again into the temple, and all the people came unto him; and he sat down, and taught them. (3) And the scribes and Pharisees

(53) And every man went unto his own house.

And every man went unto his own house.—This is not to be taken, then, as marking the close of the discussion in the Sanhedrin. It joins the inserted section with something which has preceded, but we have no means of judging what this was.

VIII.

(1) It is an instructive example of the way in which the artificial division into chapters often mars the sense, that one verse of this section is found at the close of the last chapter, and the remainder in this.

Jesus went unto the mount of Olives.—The Mount of Olives is nowhere mentioned by St. John. In chap. xviii. 1 he describes the locality, but without this name (see Note there). His habit, moreover, in giving topographical details of Palestine is to explain them for his Greek readers. (See Note on chap. iv. 5.)

(2) And early in the morning he came again into the temple.—This agrees with His custom during the week preceding the Crucifixion. (Comp. Luke xxii. 37, 38.) The words, "and He sat down and taught them," are not found in the Cambridge MS., which is the oldest authority for the section.

(3) And the scribes and Pharisees . . .—This is the common phrase of the earlier Gospels, but "the scribes" are never named by St. John. His word to denote the hierarchy in their opposition to Christ is "the Jews." (See Note on chap. i. 19.)

(4) The Cambridge MS. reads, "the priests say unto Him, tempting Him, that they might have to accuse Him," adding the word "priests," and placing here the first words of the sixth verse of the Received text.

(5) Now Moses in the law commanded us, that such should be stoned.—If we interpret the words strictly, the case they contemplate is not that referred to in Lev. xx. 10, and quoted here in the margin, but that of Deut. xxii. 23, 24, which was the only case for which stoning was specified as a punishment. And it would be a case of rare occurrence, and perhaps for this very reason, one on which the opinions of later Rabbis were divided. Strangulation was regarded as the punishment intended when no other was specified; and in the Talmudic distinction in cases of this kind, stoning and strangulation are named as the respective punishments.—Ephraim, si adultera cum nupta, strangulanda; cum despensata tantum, lapidanda. Ephraim Sacerdotis, si adultera cum nupta, lapidanda; cum despensata tantum, comburenda (Sanhedrin, fol. 51, 2).

But what sayest thou?—The question is, like that about the tribute money (Matt. xxii. 17), a snare in which they hope to take Him whatever answer He may give. If He answers that she should be stoned, this would excite the opposition of the multitude, for a lax state of morality had practically made the laws against unchastity a dead letter. The immorality of Rome had spread through the provinces of the empire, and although the Jews were less infected by it than others, the court of the Herods had introduced its worst forms, and Christ Himself speaks of them as "an evil and adulterous generation" (Matt. xii. 39. Comp. Jas. iv. 4. To have pronounced for a severe law against common forms of sin would have been to undermine popular support, and it is this only that the rulers had to fear. To have pronounced for capital punishment would moreover have brought Him into collision with the Roman government, which reserved to itself the power of life and death. (Comp. chaps. xvii. 31 and xix. 7.) Had He uttered a word in derogation of the majesty of the Roman empire, the charge of treason—in which case to be accused was practically to be condemned—would at once have been brought against Him. (Comp. Notes on chap. xix. 12, 15.) It is clearly the more severe view that the form of the question is intended to draw forth. "Moses said, in express words, . . .; what dost Thou say? You surely will not differ from Moses?" But if He had taken the lazer view, then this, like the Sabbath question, would have been a charge of breaking the Law. He would have been brought before the Sanhedrin as a false Messiah, for the true Messiah was to establish the Law.

(6) On the text, see Note on verse 4. The last words, in italics, which are an explanatory gloss, should also be omitted. The verse will then read, "But Jesus stooped down, and with His finger wrote on the ground"—or, more exactly, was writing on the ground. It is the imperfect of the continued action, and it points to the narrator's vivid remembrance of the scene. What precise meaning we are to attach to this action is, and must remain, uncertain. Any inquiry as to what He wrote is excluded by the fact that the narrative would certainly have recorded it had it been known; and though writing on sand was practised in the Rabbinic schools, this writing was on the pavement of the Temple (verse 2). We have to seek the meaning, then, in the symbolism of the action, remembering that the teaching by action and gesture, common everywhere, has always been specially common in the East; and of the many interpretations which may be given, that which seems upon the whole least liable to objection is, that He deprecated the office of judge which they wished to impose on Him.
Jesus stooped down, and with his finger wrote on the ground, as though he heard them not. (7) So when they continued asking him, he lifted up himself, and said unto them, He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her. (8) And again he stooped down, and wrote on the ground. (9) And they which heard it, being convicted by their own conscience, went out one by one, beginning at the eldest, even unto the last: and Jesus was left alone, and the woman standing in the midst. (10) When Jesus had lifted up himself, and saw none but the woman, he said unto her, Woman, where are those thine accusers? hath no man condemned thee? (11) She said, No man, Lord. And Jesus said unto her, Woman, we know not whether the word “Lord” read “the stone,” the stone referred to in verse 5. was simply the “Sir” of courtesy, or whether it contained something of the reverence of worship. He knew all.

and chose this method of intimating that He took no interest in what they were saying. The commentators tell us that this was a common method of signifying intentional disregard.

An alternative interpretation may be suggested. They had quoted the Law, and asked for His opinion. They were themselves the interpreters of the Law. He claimed no such office. (Comp. Luke xii. 14.) He stoops down and writes, as in the action intimating that the Law of God was written on tablets of stone, and its decrees were immutable. They, by their technical interpretation and tradition, were making it of none effect. He came to fulfill it. The majesty of duty is sinned against by these refinements of casuistry. They are now daring to violate the sacredness of law by making it the subject of a question by which they hope to encompass His death. The solemn silence, as He stooped down in that Temple and wrote upon its pavement, must have spoken in a power greater than that of words.

(7) So when they continued asking him.—He would have avoided their question, and continued, as is here implied, for some time in the action of writing; but they will now interrupt that action. It seems to them that He cannot avoid the snare in which they have placed Him, and that He is seeking the only escape in silence. But there is an answer of which they think not, and this He stands up to give.

He that is without sin among you.—The word rendered “without sin” is frequent in the classical writers, but is found in this place only in the New Testament. It takes here a special meaning from the context, and is to be understood of the class of sins of which her sin was an instance. (Comp. the word “sinner” as used in Luke vii. 37.) Of the immorality among the Jewish rulers, which gives force to these words, evidence is not wanting. Still the wider meaning is probably not excluded. They who ask this question about the Seventh Commandment were themselves breaking the Sixth and the Ninth. It is to be noted, in the application of this answer, that our Lord does not lay down sinlessness as the necessary condition of fitness for taking part in the punishment of guilt. This would be to nullify law, for there could be no human executive power. He is not speaking in a case brought before the appointed tribunal, but in a case where men assume to themselves the position of judges of another’s guilt. In the judgment, while he wears the robe of justice, the individual man ceases to exist, and he becomes the representative of God; but these can now speak only as men, and condemn her only by the contrast of a higher purity. (Comp. Notes on chap. x. 34 et seq.)

(8) And wrote on the ground.—The Cambridge MS. inserts, “with His finger,” as in verse 6. The repeated action repeats His determination to avoid the office of judge. He has answered them, and He leaves His answer to do its work. There is a law written in their hearts, and this, while He now writes on the ground, is convicting them.

There is a strange addition at the end of the verse, in one of the older MSS. of this section, showing how men have tried to give a definite meaning to the action of writing. It reads, “and wrote on the ground the sin of each one of them.”

(9) The readings of the texts here differ considerably, but without any essential difference of meaning. Being convicted by their own conscience is probably an addition made by some copist to explain the meaning, which is quite clear without it.

Beginning at the eldest.—Literally, beginning at the elders; but our version gives the right sense, and prevents the possible mistake of understanding the word to mean the elders of the people. So “the last” should probably be taken, not of the lowest in official rank, but of the last who went out.

And Jesus was left alone, and the woman standing in the midst.—The scribes and Pharisees had probably stood close to Him. The woman was at some little distance, naturally shrinking from their gaze; but there is a crowd of people, including the disciples, around her, for they are in the Temple, and before this interruption He was engaged in teaching the people (verse 2). Her accusers had set her in the midst (verse 2), where she now stands. The whole scene is pictured with the minute detail of an eye-witness, who remembers how the persons were grouped, how the accusers went out one after another, and then, how Jesus was left alone, apart from the crowd, but that the others were still present.

(10) Where are those thine accusers? — Here again the Cambridge MS. has a shorter reading—“Where are they?” “Hath no man condemned thee?” or, more exactly, Did no man condemn thee? The “man” is in contrast to “thine accusers” or “they.” “Of all who brought the charge against thee, was there not one to condemn thee?” The question is put to her to lead to thoughts of her sin. He has spoken words which have carried a lesson to them: he has now a lesson for her.

(11) She said, No man, Lord.—She simply answers His question. There is no plea for forgiveness. There is no attempt at defence. We know not what passed in her heart; we know not what was written upon her countenance. We know not whether the word “Lord” was simply the “Sir” of courtesy, or whether it contained something of the reverence of worship. He knew all.
Neither do I condemn thee: go, and sin no more.—Or, more exactly, and be no more a sinner. There is no expression of forgiveness or peace as we find in other cases. (Comp. Matt. ix. 2; Luke vii. 48.) He does not condemn her, for “God sent not His Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through Him might be saved” (chap. iii. 17). His words must have come to her as words of mercy in contrast to the angry words of those who dragged her before Him. He does not condemn her, and yet by these words she must have been condemned more truly than by any words of accuser. He does not condemn her; and yet the very words which bid her go are the condemnation of her sin. (Comp. chap. v. 14.) As in the case of the woman of Samaria (chap. iv.), there is something in the tone and manner of dealing with this woman which goes beyond all words; and as we read the narrative the poem completes the picture, and we feel it preserves for us a real incident in our Lord’s ministry of mercy. It is a mark of truthfulness that the narrative tells us no more. It has not the completeness of an apocryphal story. We feel we should like to know more. She passed from His presence as her accusers had before. What came afterwards to her and to them? Did she, in obedience to the words now heard, go forth to a new life, rising through penitence and faith to pardon, peace, purity? Did they who shrunk from His presence now, so learn His words as to come to that Presence again, seeking not judgment on others, but pardon for themselves? Over all the veil is drawn. We may not trace the history of lives known only to themselves and to God; but the lessons are patent, and remain to condemn every human judgment of another’s sin; to condemn every sin in our own lives; to declare to every sinner the forgiveness which condemns not.

[2) JESUS IS TRUTH, LIGHT, AND LOVE (cont.).
(b) Jesus is Light (chaps. viii. 12—ix. 41).
(a) He declares Himself to be the Light, and appeals to the witness of the Father and of Himself (verses 12—20).]

Then spake Jesus again unto them, saying, I am the light of the world: He that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of thoughts of the water given in abundance to those dying of thirst, so this illumination was bound up with thoughts of the pillar of fire which was the guide of those who walked in darkness. And in this case, as in that, it is probably the absence of the incident on the last day of the feast which gives special force to our Lord’s words. Since the teaching of the last chapter, there had been an interval of, it may be, several hours. We may naturally think that the shades of evening were now drawing on. He is standing in the Treasury near to the court of the women (Note on verse 20), where for the six nights last past there had been a great light, reminding those who could read its meaning of the greater light which illumined the footsteps of their fathers. On this night the light is not to shine; but the true Light, which was ever in the world, is now in His own Temple, speaking the words of light and life to His own people. This verse is one of the many instances in which our Lord’s words are to illumine, not only the Temple, or Jerusalem, or Judea, or the Dispersion, but the world. He that followeth me shall not walk in darkness.—Strong and full of hope as these words are in the English rendering, the Greek is more emphatic still. The negative is in its strongest form, expressing “shall by no means,” “shall in no wise,” “walk in darkness.” The possibility is excluded from the thought. “God is light, and in Him is no darkness at all.” If a man makes a false step in life, it is because he seeks other guides in his own thoughts or in subjection to the thoughts of other men. He that seeks to follow the true Light—to follow, not precede it; to follow always, not only when it coincides with his own will; to follow patiently and trustfully, step by step, wherever it may lead—cannot walk in darkness, for he is never without the presence of the Light. Here, as so often, stress is laid on the individuality and universality of the divine love on the one side, and the action of the human will on the other. There can be no doubt, “shall by no means walk in darkness”; there can be no limit, “he that followeth”; there can be no halting, “he that followeth.” The light ever points the way; it is he who day by day follows it who cannot miss the way. Perception of truth attends its practice. The true journey of this life is here presented as a constant activity; in vii. 37, the source of this action is found in a constant receptivity.

But shall have the light of life.—For the thought of “light” and “life” in contrast to “darkness” and “death,” comp. Note on chap. i. 5. The sense of the present passage is that he who follows Christ, not only has a light which guides his feet, but that through participation in the Messianic life he actually possesses that light in himself. He is no more dead, but has eternal life. (Comp. chap. xi. 15.) He no more abides in darkness (chap. xii. 46), but the Light which lighteneth every man abideth in him.

This verse is one of the many instances in which our familiar knowledge of the words of Jesus, in some degree, takes from the impression they would leave on us if we heard them for the first time. There is in them the calm assertion of conscious divinity, which in its very simplicity carries its own proof. It needed no formal proof for He Himself knows it to be true; it needed no formal proof, for those who heard Him felt His words to be divine—“Never man spake like this
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ST. JOHN, VIII. They Judge after the Flesh.

life. (13) The Pharisees therefore said unto him, Thou bearest record of thyself; thy record is not true. (14) Jesus answered and said unto them, Though I bear record of myself, yet my record is true: for I know whence I came, and whither I go; but ye cannot tell whence I come, and whither I go. (15) Ye judge after the flesh; I judge no man. (16) And yet if I judge, my judgment is true: for I am not alone, but I and the Father that sent me. (17) It is also written in nature, that the testimony of two men is true.

Man,” “He taught them as One having authority, and not as the scribes.” (Comp. verse 28.) The witness to the existence of natural light is the eye formed to receive its rays; the witness to the existence of the Light of the world is the eye of the spirit conscious of a night of darkness, which has passed into the brightness of the presence of the Sun of Righteousness.

(13) Thou bearest record of thyself; thy record is not true.—Better, Thou bearest witness of Thyself; Thy witness is not true. (Comp. Note on chap. v. 31.) The Authorised version here, by a change of word, renders the connection less obvious than it really is. The Pharisees, standing probably in the front of the crowd listening to Him, bring a technical objection to His statement, and one which He had Himself admitted the force of. “According to your own words,” they mean, “what you now say is not valid.” They stand in the light of day, but demand a formal proof that the Sun has risen.

(14) Though I bear record of myself, yet my record is true.—For “record” read in each instance witness, as in verse 13. The pronoun is emphatic. “Even if I do bear witness of Myself, yet My witness is true.” He had before quoted their law of evidence (chap. v. 31), and showed that He fulfilled its canons. He is about to show this again (verses 17 and 18), but He claims first that in reality the law cannot apply to Him. They claim a human proof of that which transcends human knowledge. They claim the evidence of a witness, to a truth for which there could not possibly be a human witness.

For I know whence I came, and whither I go.—The requirement of two witnesses was based on the imperfection of individual knowledge, and the untrustworthiness of individual veracity. His evidence, as that of One who knew every circumstance affecting that of which He testified, was valid for the perfection of His knowledge implied that He was divine. He and He only of all who have appeared in human form, knew the origin and issue of His life; He and He only knew the Father’s home from which He came, and to which He was about to return. For the same words, “I go,” or, I go away, as applied to His voluntary death, comp. chap. vii. 33. But ye cannot tell whence I come, and whither I go.—The Greek word for “cannot” is the same as that for “know” in the previous clause. For “and” most of the better MSS. read or. Making these corrections we have, But ye know not whence I come, or whither I go. The change of tense is to be noted. Speaking of His own knowledge, He refers to the Incarnation in the historic past, “I came.” Speaking of their continued ignorance, He refers to the coming as continuing in the present. Every renewed act and word was a coming to them from God. (See chap. iii. 31.) He knew in knowledge, the whence of past coming and the whither of future going. They knew neither the one nor the other. They do not even know His present mission. Once again His present teaching takes up words uttered before. They had said, “When the Christ cometh no man knoweth whence He is” (chap. vii. 27). He has, then, fulfilled their test. He had said, “Ye both know Me, and do know whence I am” (chap. vii. 28); but that knowledge was of the earthly life only, and He now speaks to them of heaven.

(18) Ye judge after the flesh; I judge no man.—The pronouns are placed in emphatic contrast. “You on your part . . . I for My part.” We must beware of the common mistake of finding the origin of this thought of judgment in verses 10 and 11, which as we have seen do not belong to this context. It arises rather from verse 13. The statement of the Pharisees, “Thou art bearing witness concerning Thyself; Thy witness is not true,” was a condemnatory judgment based upon appearances. (Comp. Note on chap. vii. 24.) They allowed these appearances to carry them away from a righteous judgment. They looked at the form of human flesh, and declared His witness false. Had they listened to the words He spoke, and judged according to their spiritual meaning, they would have heard the voice of the Messiah and have seen the Light of the world.

This thought of the Pharisees, in their ignorance judging that which they know not, suggests by contrast the thought that He in perfect knowledge judges no one. (Comp. chap. iii. 17.)

(19) And yet if I judge, my judgment is true.—Though judgment was not the object of His mission, it was, as He had taught in chap. iii. 19 (see Note there), the result of the manifestation of the Light. But in the cases in which the result followed, the judgment was not according to the flesh, but was in accord with the essential truth. The better reading here is, probably, the deeper word for ideally true, which we have before. (Comp. Note on chap. i. 9.)

For I am not alone, but I and the Father that sent me.—Comp. Note on chap. v. 30. Here, as there, He identifies every act of judgment with the eternal and unchangeable truth of the Father.

(17) It is also written in your law.—He now proceeds to show again that the technical requirement of the Law was satisfied by His witness. The term “your law” is material, as addressed to those who were professed expounders of it and accused Him of being a transgressor of it. (Comp. the parallel reference to the Law in chaps. x. 34, xv. 25.) To assert that Jesus placed Himself in a position of antagonism to the Mosaic law, is to forget the teaching of the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. v. 17); and to assert that the Jesus of the Fourth Gospel differs in this respect from the character as portrayed by the earlier Evangelists, is to forget the teaching of the last verse of chap. v., and, indeed, to miss the whole force of these very passages. He does not, indeed, say “our law,” as it was for them what it could not be for Him; but He mentions it to show in each case that He fulfilled it.

That the testimony of two men is true.—See Deut. xix. 15 and xv. 15, and comp. Notes on Matt. xviii. 16 and Mark xiv. 55, 56. The words are here quoted freely, and “two men” is substituted for “two or three witnesses,” which we find in both the passages in Deuteronomy. This prepares the way for the full thought of the “witness,” in the next verse. The requirement of the Law would be satisfied with the
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-known me, ye should have known my Father also. (20) These words spake Jesus in the treasury, as he taught in the temple: and no man laid hands on him; for his hour was not yet come.

(21) Then said Jesus again unto them, I go my way, and ye shall seek me, and public places in the Temple area. He taught, then, openly and fearlessly. The chamber in which the Sanhedrin held their session was between the court of the women and that of the men. They had on that very day been assembled to take counsel against Him (vii. 45—52). This gives point to the words which follow, “and no man laid hands on Him, for His hour was not yet come.” The court of the women, moreover, was the spot where the great candelabra stood. (See Note on verse 12.)

[(b) Jesus is Light (continued).]

(8) His return to the Father misunderstood by the Jews, and explained by Him (verses 21—29.)

Then said Jesus again unto them.—The best MSS. omit the word “Jesus,” and read, He said, therefore, again unto them. The word “therefore” connects the discourse which follows with something which has gone before, probably with the fact that no man laid hands on Him, for His hour was not yet come. He is still free to address the multitude, and after an interval does so. This interval is marked by the word “again,” but is not necessarily more than a short break in the discourse. We shall find reason for believing (see Note on chap. ix. 14) that the whole of the teaching and work which is included between chaps. vii. 37 and x. 21, is probably to be placed on the last and great day of the feast. The persons addressed are the people assembled round Him in the Temple. Some of the officials take part in the discussion, for it is “the Jews” who reply in the next verse. We have to think, it may be, of men gathered together in small groups discussing what He had before said. Some are really inquiring with earnest hearts about Him. The rulers are trying to suppress the growing conviction of the multitude. There are thus two currents of thought and feeling, which are found in the honest hearts of the untutored multitude; they know little of argument, and dare not interpret the Scriptures for themselves, but in their rough-and-ready way they are grasping the truth; the heart of man is bowing before the presence of its God. The other is found in the priests and rulers to whom, as a holy and learned caste, the representatives of God to man and the interpreters of their Sacred Books, the people are in intellectual and moral bondage. They seek to bind with their fetters hearts that are finding their way to the truth. Some of these groups have moved on, it may be, and others have taken their place. Seeing a new audience near Him, Jesus speaks to them again; for it is not probable that the words of verse 27 apply wholly to the same persons as those in verse 19.

I go my way.—The rendering is a little tinged by the following thought. The Greek word is the same as in verse 14, where it is rendered “I go.” There, as here, I go away is better. It was, let us again remind ourselves, the last day of the feast, and now its closing hours have come. That thronging multitude would be before the close of another day, leaving Jerusalem to spread itself through all the extent of Palestine and

your law, that the testimony of two men is true. (18) I am one that bear witness of myself, and the Father that sent me beareth witness of me. (19) Then said they unto him, Where is thy Father? Jesus answered, Ye neither know me, nor my Father: if ye had evidence of two men: He has the witness of two Persons, but each is divine.

(18) I am one that bear witness of myself.—The Greek has no word to express the English “one.” It is more exactly, I am He who beareth witness. The twofold witness is (1) in His own individuality—I, who know whence I came and whither I go, testify of Myself to you who know neither; and (2) in the fact that the Father sent Him. He is the Ambassador from the Father, accredited by the Father’s works and the voice from heaven, and His word is official as well as personal.

The thought is closely connected with that of verse 16. His judgment is not individual judgment, because of the union with the Father. His witness is not only individual witness, but that of the Father also. The whole passage should be carefully compared with the close of chap. v.

(20) These words spake Jesus in the treasury. —Comp. Notes on Mark xii. 41 and Luke xxi. 1. From the passage it is clear that the word “treasury” was applied to the brazen trumpet-shaped chests placed in the court of the women for the reception of alms. There were thirteen of them, and each bore an inscription showing to what purpose the alms placed in it would be devoted. Here the word is apparently used of the place itself in which the chests were deposited, or the preposition must be taken as including the immediate neighbourhood. This notice of place is interesting in many ways. The court of the women was one of the most

The Greek has no word to express the English “one.” It is more exactly, I am He who beareth witness. The twofold witness is (1) in His own individuality—I, who know whence I came and whither I go, testify of Myself to you who know neither; and (2) in the fact that the Father sent Him. He is the Ambassador from the Father, accredited by the Father’s works and the voice from heaven, and His word is official as well as personal.

The thought is closely connected with that of verse 16. His judgment is not individual judgment, because of the union with the Father. His witness is not only individual witness, but that of the Father also. The whole passage should be carefully compared with the close of chap. v.

(20) These words spake Jesus in the treasury.—Comp. Notes on Mark xii. 41 and Luke xxi. 1. From the passage it is clear that the word “treasury” was applied to the brazen trumpet-shaped chests placed in the court of the women for the reception of alms. There were thirteen of them, and each bore an inscription showing to what purpose the alms placed in it would be devoted. Here the word is apparently used of the place itself in which the chests were deposited, or the preposition must be taken as including the immediate neighbourhood. This notice of place is interesting in many ways. The court of the women was one of the most
shall die in your sins: whither I go, ye cannot come. (22) Then said the Jews, Will he kill himself? because he saith, Whither I go, ye cannot come. (23) And he said unto them, Ye are from beneath; I am from above: ye are of this world; the earth, and, by devotion to things of the earth, they are destroying the spirit made in the image of God, which is within them, and the link between them and heaven. He is from above: ye are of this world. There is in all the discourse the solemn feeling that these are the last words for many who hear Him.

Ye shall seek me, and shall die in your sins. — Comp. Notes on chap. vii. 34, 36. But here the result of the seeking and not finding is declared in the sadness of its fatal issue. “In your sins” is not quite exact, and is, perhaps, somewhat misleading. The Greek has the singular not the plural, and should be rendered “in your sin.” It points out the state of sin, rather than actual transgressions. This latter thought is expressed where the words are repeated in verse 24.

(22) Then said the Jews, Will he kill himself? — They see the deeper meaning of His words, and yet know acts of sin which resulted from their sinful state.

Because he saith, Whither I go, ye cannot come.—Comp. Note on chap. vii. 35. Then they had asked in scorn if He would go to the Dispersion and teach the heathen? If so, they certainly could not follow Him. Here there is the same scorn. If He intends to go to Hades, He will indeed be beyond their reach. They expect to go to Abraham’s bosom: between Him and them there will be the great gulf which no one can pass. (Comp. Notes on Luke xvi. 22-26.) Many expositors have seen here a reference to the deeper idea of the gulf between heaven and hell, but it is not that between souls in Abraham’s bosom and souls in Hades. It is the gulf between heaven and earth. This He brings out in two pairs of antithetic clauses. (Comp. Note on chap. i. 3.) These clauses interpret each other, and no deeper meaning is to be given to the first pair than is borne by the second. We may arrange them in a pair of affirmatives and a pair of negatives—

Ye are from beneath; ye are of this world; I am from above; I am of this world; the earth, and, by devotion to things of the earth, they are destroying the spirit made in the image of God, which is within them, and the link between them and heaven. He is from above: ye are of this world.

I am not of this world. (24) I said therefore unto you, that ye shall die in your sins: for if ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins. (25) Then said they unto him, Who art thou? And Jesus saith unto them, Even the

His going away: their Perversion of it; ST. JOHN, VIII. His Explanations of it.

We have thus the full Hebrew expression of one thought, and this is the thought which John the Baptist, from another point of view, taught his disciples in chap. iii. 31. They are by origin and nature of the earth. He was by origin and nature from heaven. Of the earth, their feelings and thoughts and life were of the earth, and, by devotion to things of the earth, they are destroying the spirit made in the image of God, which is within them, and the link between them and heaven. He is from above: ye are of this world. There is in all the discourse the solemn feeling that these are the last words for many who hear Him.

Ye shall seek me, and shall die in your sins. — Comp. Notes on chap. vii. 34, 36. But here the result of the seeking and not finding is declared in the sadness of its fatal issue. “In your sins” is not quite exact, and is, perhaps, somewhat misleading. The Greek has the singular not the plural, and should be rendered “in your sin.” It points out the state of sin, rather than actual transgressions. This latter thought is expressed where the words are repeated in verse 24.

(22) Then said the Jews, Will he kill himself? — They see the deeper meaning of His words, and yet know acts of sin which resulted from their sinful state.

Because he saith, Whither I go, ye cannot come.—Comp. Note on chap. vii. 35. Then they had asked in scorn if He would go to the Dispersion and teach the heathen? If so, they certainly could not follow Him. Here there is the same scorn. If He intends to go to Hades, He will indeed be beyond their reach. They expect to go to Abraham’s bosom: between Him and them there will be the great gulf which no one can pass. (Comp. Notes on Luke xvi. 22-26.) Many expositors have seen here a reference to the deeper idea of the gulf between heaven and hell, but it is not that between souls in Abraham’s bosom and souls in Hades. It is the gulf between heaven and earth. This He brings out in two pairs of antithetic clauses. (Comp. Note on chap. i. 3.) These clauses interpret each other, and no deeper meaning is to be given to the first pair than is borne by the second. We may arrange them in a pair of affirmatives and a pair of negatives—

Ye are from beneath; ye are of this world; I am from above; I am of this world; the earth, and, by devotion to things of the earth, they are destroying the spirit made in the image of God, which is within them, and the link between them and heaven. He is from above: ye are of this world. There is in all the discourse the solemn feeling that these are the last words for many who hear Him.

Ye shall seek me, and shall die in your sins. — Comp. Notes on chap. vii. 34, 36. But here the result of the seeking and not finding is declared in the sadness of its fatal issue. “In your sins” is not quite exact, and is, perhaps, somewhat misleading. The Greek has the singular not the plural, and should be rendered “in your sin.” It points out the state of sin, rather than actual transgressions. This latter thought is expressed where the words are repeated in verse 24.

(22) Then said the Jews, Will he kill himself? — They see the deeper meaning of His words, and yet know acts of sin which resulted from their sinful state.

Because he saith, Whither I go, ye cannot come.—Comp. Note on chap. vii. 35. Then they had asked in scorn if He would go to the Dispersion and teach the heathen? If so, they certainly could not follow Him. Here there is the same scorn. If He intends to go to Hades, He will indeed be beyond their reach. They expect to go to Abraham’s bosom: between Him and them there will be the great gulf which no one can pass. (Comp. Notes on Luke xvi. 22-26.) Many expositors have seen here a reference to the deeper idea of the gulf between heaven and hell, but it is not that between souls in Abraham’s bosom and souls in Hades. It is the gulf between heaven and earth. This He brings out in two pairs of antithetic clauses. (Comp. Note on chap. i. 3.) These clauses interpret each other, and no deeper meaning is to be given to the first pair than is borne by the second. We may arrange them in a pair of affirmatives and a pair of negatives—

Ye are from beneath; ye are of this world; I am from above; I am of this world;
His Teaching is the Truth, ST. JOHN, VIII.

Which the Father has taught Him.

said Jesus unto them, When ye have lifted up the Son of man, then shall ye know that I am he, and that I do nothing of myself; but as my Father hath taught me, I speak these things. (28) And he that sent me is with me: the Father hath not left me alone; and those spoken of now, are “the Jews” (comp. verses 13 and 22); and they are probably in part identical with those of whom our Lord tells us there, that they knew neither Him nor the Father. Of these men St. John tells us now that they did not know that the Sender and the Father are one. The statement of their want of perception, which strikes us as so marvellous, is made just because it was marvellous. St. John remembers it many years afterwards, and remembers that on account of it, Jesus proceeded to declare more fully that every act He did was done in the Father, and that every word He spoke was taught by the Father, with that in every event of His life the Father was present. (28) Then said Jesus unto them.—Better, Therefore . . . The teaching arises immediately out of the want of understanding just mentioned.

When ye have lifted up the Son of man.—Better, When ye shall have lifted up . . . (Comp. Notes on chaps. iii. 14, vi. 62, and xii. 32, 34.) Both the Crucifixion and Ascension are implied here. Now, for the first time, they are marked out as the instruments of the Crucifixion (comp. Acts iii. 15), and therefore the means by which He will return to His Father’s throne. Then shall ye know . . .—These words confirm the view that the teaching of these verses arises immediately out of their present ignorance. Then the veil will be removed. Then the death of Christ will be followed by His glory. As we read these words they impress us with that calm of assured certainty with which they are uttered (comp. verse 12) before the events, and reminds us of the signal way in which they were fulfilled. (Comp., e.g., Notes on Matt. xxiii. 39 and Acts ii. 37.)

That I am he.—Comp. Note on verse 24.

And that I do nothing of myself.—This is dependent on “know that” in the previous clause; as is the remainder of the verse, and probably the first clause of the following verse also. They will then know, that He is divine, and that the acts and words which they cannot now understand are part of the divine life in union with the Father. Now they marvel and ask, “How knoweth this man letters, having never learned?” (chap. vii. 15); then they shall know that according as the Father taught Him, He spake these things. Now they cannot understand the witness of the Father (verse 19); then they shall know that He that sent Him was with Him. (29) The Father hath not left me alone.—The Greek words mean exactly, the Father (or, as the better MSS. read, without change of meaning, He) left Me not alone, and they are sometimes taken to refer to the time of His mission into the world. The context rather points to their application to every moment of life. He was ever conscious of a Presence which they know not of, but which the future should reveal to them. We shall find Him resting in this consciousness again when He looks on to the dark hour when the disciples shall be scattered every man to his own, and He shall be left as men would think alone. (Comp. Note on chap. xvi. 32.)

statement which may be made the ground of a technical charge; but this He again avoids.

His teaching unto them, Even the same that I said unto you from the beginning. (26) I have many things to say and to judge of you: but he that sent me is true; and I speak to the world those things which I have heard of him. (27) They understood not that he spake to them of the Father. (28) Then

Almost every word of this answer is in the Greek John tells us now that they did not know that the Sender and the Crucifixion are implied here. Now, in this discourse to do so again. There are present to His mind also the great events, and reminds us of the signal way in which they

therefore those of whom our Lord tells us there, that they knew neither Him nor the Father. Of these men St. John tells us now that they did not know that the Sender and the Father are one. The statement of their want of perception, which strikes us as so marvellous, is made just because it was marvellous. St. John remembers it many years afterwards, and remembers that on account of it, Jesus proceeded to declare more fully that every act He did was done in the Father, and that every word He spoke was taught by the Father, with that in every event of His life the Father was present.

when He spake to them of the Father. We have seen in Note on verse 21 that a new discourse commences there, and that the hearers are not necessarily the same as those who had asked the question and heard the answer of verse 19. Still the speakers then,
True Discipleship, St. John, VIII. and Freedom by the Truth.

For I do always those things that please him.—It would be less ambiguous to read, because I do always. . . . The words furnish the reason for the presence of the Father in every act and moment of His life. All things done by Him at all times were in accordance with the Father’s will. In His human nature perpetual communion is conditioned by perpetual obedience. The same thought recurs in His words to the disciples in chap. xiv. 10. Comp. also, on the relation of the Son to the Father, Note on chap. v. 19.

Emphasis should be laid here upon the pronoun, “for I do always.” It was true of His human nature, as distinct from all others, that no act, at any moment of life, had once it shall perish on the truth of the vision of the Father’s presence. Later in this same discourse (verse 46) He appeals to their knowledge of His holy life. Here, in words that none other in human form could ever utter, He appeals to His own consciousness of a life, every act of which was pleasing in the presence of God.

[(b) Jesus is Light (continued).]

(g) True discipleship and freedom (verses 30—59).

Freedom by the Son’s word (verses 30—36).

Natural and ethical sonship (verses 37—47).

Eternal life by the Son’s word. The Son’s eternity (verses 48—59.)

(30) Many believed on him.—Wonder has often been expressed at the want of apprehension spoken of in verse 27. There is surely no less room for wonder in the faith spoken of here. Those who believe are of the rulers (“those Jews,” verse 31). The words which they now heard (verses 28, 29) contain nothing of what we commonly call proof. They are an appeal to the future which should prove them true, and to His own consciousness of perfect obedience to the Father’s will, and of unbroken realisation of the Father’s presence. They are indeed, in part, words which men have since dwelt upon to prove that He who uttered them did not claim to be divine. It was not so with those who heard Him. They are watching for a technical assertion of His divinity, and do not hear it; but they are convinced by the power of His words that He is divine. (Comp. Note on chap. vii. 31.) These scribes and Pharisees feel, as their officers felt before, that “Never man spake like this Man.” Where was priest or Rabbi who could appeal to the spotless purity of a life? There is the irresistible power of truth in the appeal which carries conviction to the heart. We have already found in the case of Nicodemus an example, probably not a solitary one, of a faith among the rulers which dared not confess itself. (See also chap. xii. 42.)

(33) Then said Jesus to those Jews which believed on him. —Better, to those Jews who had believed Him. The act of faith is mentioned in the believers; but the explanation is to be found in our previous verse. They are here placed among the believers, with an expression of contrast mixed with, perhaps, something of wonder—Jews and yet believers.

If ye continue in my word.—Or, If ye abide in My word. Comp. Note on chap. xv. 7, where we have the opposite form of the thought, “If ye abide in Me, and My words abide in you.” See also for this idea of abiding. Notes on chap. v. 37, 38. His word was the expression of the eternal truth of God, and He therefore was the one great Teacher. Every other must sit as a disciple at His feet, and continue in daily learning and in daily living to grasp the truth which, in that word and that word only, was revealed to man.

Here, as very frequently, part of the force of the sentence is expressed in the emphasis of the pronoun, “If ye continue in My word.” “Ye, on your part, ye who now believe, but have not the courage to rank yourselves openly among My disciples.”

Then are ye my disciples indeed.—The insertion of “then” does not improve the rendering—“If ye continue in My word, ye are My disciples indeed.” The words imply that He who reads the heart has no confidence in this momentary conviction, which will not stand the test of true discipleship, and all that this includes. (Comp. Notes on chap. ii. 23—25 and vi. 66.)

(32) And ye shall know the truth.—In the great Intercessory Prayer of chap. xvi., Jesus prays for His disciples: “Sanctify them in the truth: Thy word is truth” (verse 17). In the answer to the question of Thomas in chap. xiv., He declares, “I am the way, the truth, and the life” (verse 6). It is this thought that is present in the connection between continuance in His word and knowledge of the truth here. These Jews professed to know the truth, and to be the official expounders of it. They had yet to learn that truth was not only a system, but also a power; not only some­thing to be written or spoken, but also something to be felt and lived. If they abide in His word they will indeed be His disciples; living the life of truth, they will gain perception of truth. “Being true,” they will “in love grow up into him in all things, which is the head, even Christ” (Eph. iv. 15).

And the truth shall make you free.—Here, as in chap. xvii. 17, truth and holiness are spoken of as correlative. The light of truth dispels the darkness in which lies the stronghold of evil. Sin is the bondage of the powers of the soul, and this bondage is willed because the soul does not see its fearful evil. When it perceives the truth, there comes to it a power which rouses it from its stupor, and strengthens it to break the fetters by which it has been bound. Freedom from the Roman rule was one of the national hopes bound up with Messiah’s Advent. There is indeed a freedom from a more crushing foe than the legions of Rome. (Comp. Notes on Mark v. 9; Luke viii. 30.)

(33) They answered him.—i.e., the Jews who had believed in Him (verse 31). There is no indication that this answer was made by others standing near, nor would this supposition have been made but for the difficulty of applying some of the words which follow (verses 40, 44) to those who had ever professedly been believers; but the explanation is to be found in our Lord’s own warning words in verse 31. He has tested their faith, and they fail in the first steps of discipleship.

We be Abraham’s seed, and were never in bondage to any man:—Their pride misinterprets
The Service of Sin.

ST. JOHN, VIII.

The Servant and the Son.

be made free? (54) Jesus answered them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin. (55) And the servant abideth not in the house for ever: but the Son abideth ever. (56) If the Son therefore shall make you free.

His words, and expresses itself in a boast which passes the limits of historical truth. It had been promised to Abraham, "I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven, and as the sand which is upon the sea shore; and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies" (Gen. xxi. 17). This seed they were. This promise they interpret of national prosperity. Abraham's seed in bondage! the thought is impossible. As in other cases (comp. chap. vii. 52), they forget part of the facts of history, for they have never learned their lessons. The Egyptian slavery and Babylonian captivity are passed over. That very generation witnessed around them the insignia of Rome, paid taxes to Rome, used the coin of Rome, but it was the policy of the empire to leave to the subject provinces a nominal freedom; and it may be that stress is laid on the words "been in bondage," which occur nowhere else in the Gospels. Those then living may have said with truth that they had never been in actual bondage, and the current expectation of the Messiah at that time may have led them to interpret the promise to Abraham specially of themselves.

(54) Whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin.—The Cambridge MS. and some of the Fathers omit the words "of sin"; but this is clearly to avoid the difficulty of the connection of thought, and they must be regarded as an integral part of the text.

(55) The servant abideth not.—Better, Now the servant abideth not. It has been rendered by "bondman," and this brings out the connection of the word with that for "was in bondage," in the last verse.

(56) If the Son therefore shall make you free.

Ye shall be free indeed.—Or, ye shall be free in reality.—The word "Son" in this verse, should be read "son." The clause is the expression of a legal maxim holding good for all servants and for all sons, but here specially applied to the sonship in Abraham's household. It is not before the next verse that there is the transference of thought to the Son in the household of the Divine Father. In this verse the thought is that if they were really the children of Abraham they would be of Abraham's spiritual nature, abiding in his home, and inheriting the promises made to him. They had not continued in the spiritual freedom of sons, but had departed from the house and had become spiritually bondmen. (56) If the Son therefore shall make you free.

—Now the thought of verses 31 and 32 is repeated in special reference to the position they had claimed for themselves. There is need for the emancipation of which He has spoken, and His mission in the world is to proclaim it. If they will enter into spiritual union with Him, and abide in this new spiritual relation, it will make them new creatures, freed from sin by the power of truth. In the language of St. Paul, as quoted above, "Christ will be formed in them." They will become "members of Christ" and "children of God." The Son of the divine household will make them free, and in Him they will become members of the great family of God Himself. (Comp. the same thought of the divine household as addressed by St. Paul specially to Gentiles, in Eph. ii. 11-22.) See also in this Gospel, chap. xiv. 2, 3.
Seed according to the Flesh; ST. JOHN, VIII. and Children according to the Spirit.

shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed. (37) I know that ye are Abraham’s seed; but ye seek to kill me, because my word hath no place in you. (38) I speak that which I have seen with my Father: and ye do that which ye have seen with your father. (39) They answered and said unto him, Abraham

perfect freedom.” We feel, as we think of him in bonds before Agrippa, or a prisoner at Rome, that he is more truly free than governor or Caesar before whom he stands, and more truly free than he himself was when he was armed with authority to bind men and women because they were Christians. The chains that bind the body cannot bind the spirit, whose chains have been loosed. He is free indeed, for the Son has made him free.

(37) I know that ye are Abraham’s seed.—He uses the word which they had used in verse 33, and now, without any further mention of Abraham, He has since used the word “Son,” but does not apply it to them. In verse 39 He refuses to acknowledge that they are Abraham’s “children.”

But ye seek to kill me.—The difficulty of understanding these words to refer to those who believed on Him (verses 30, 31), have led to the opinion that others of the hierarchy answer in verse 33. This seems unnatural, and is opposed to the words which immediately follow. As a party, they had been, and still were, seeking to kill Him. These believers, by their question in verse 33, were showing the spirit which declined discipleship, were identifying themselves with His opponents.

Because my word hath no place in you.—Better, makes no progress in you, “does not advance, does not gain ground in you.” That meaning is established by undoubted examples, and is in exact agreement with the thought of the context. In verse 31 the test was, “If ye abide in My word.” Their question proves that their faith was momentary. The word had not penetrated the surface of their thoughts, but they had not so received it as to allow it to advance into the mind and influence their conduct.

(38) I speak that which I have seen with my Father.—Some of the older MSS. read “the” for “My,” but without change of sense. For the thought, comp. verse 28, where we have the same connection between doing and speaking. He is the Word, and His work is to speak what He had seen in His eternal existence with the Father.

And ye do that which ye have seen with your father.—For “seen,” the better reading is probably heard. Here, as in the previous clause, some MSS. omit the possessive pronoun with “father,” but it is rightly inserted to express the meaning. The clauses are in direct opposition to each other, and this is shown by the emphatic personal pronouns—“I, on My part . . . My Father.” “You, on your part . . . your father.” The tenses of the verbs, too, are to be distinguished—“That which I have seen” (during My whole existence in eternity). “That which ye heard” (when ye became servants of sin). The cases of the substantives are also different—“I have seen with my Father” (signifying existence with. Comp. chap. i. 1). “Ye heard from your father” (what he directed).

Again, there is a word in the original which it is hard to represent in English, and which our version altogether omits. It is not simply “and ye do,” but and ye therefore, or accordingly, do.” It is the same principle of union between Father and Son which directs His work, which is to reveal God, and their work, of which the seeking to kill Him is an instance.

(39) They answered and said unto him, Abraham is our father.—They feel the meaning which has not yet been expressed (comp. verse 44), and claim the descent from Abraham which He has already allowed (verse 37).

If ye were Abraham’s children, ye would do the works of Abraham.—Almost all the better MSS. read, “If ye are,” for “If ye were.” This must mean, “If ye are Abraham’s children—but the supposition is excluded, for ye would do the works of Abraham, and this is opposed to fact.” They are the physical seed of the patriarch, but they are not the ethical children, for the true child would bear the moral impress of the father which would be seen in his works. The thought of the previous verse is again present here.

The distinction between “seed” and “children” is another instance of an idea which meets us in this section, and was developed in the writings of St. Paul. (Comp. Rom. ix. 7 et seq.)

(40) But now ye seek to kill me—i.e., As a matter of fact, in opposition to the conduct which would characterise the true children of Abraham, ye are seeking to kill Me. (Comp. Note on verse 37.)

The man that hath told you the truth, which I have heard (better, which I heard) from God.—The term “a man,” expresses His revelation, by means of human form, of the divine truth which He heard in the pre-human state (verse 38). The crime of seeking to kill Him is aggravated by the fact that He was One who came to tell them truth, and that from God. They seek to destroy the human life which for the sake of humanity He has assumed.

This did not Abraham.—It is usual to explain these words by a reference to Abraham’s receptivity of the divine truth and messengers (see Gen. xii.; xiv.; xviii.; xxiii.); but they probably point to the whole course of the patriarchal life as directly opposed to the spirit of those who claim to be his children.

(41) Ye do the deeds of your father.—It is better to read works rather than “deeds,” as in verse 39. They did not the works of Abraham. They did the works of that father, who is now more clearly pointed out, but still not named. Before, when he was referred to (verse 38), they could answer that Abraham was their father; but their works prove that they are not the true children of Abraham (verses 39, 40). They see that a spiritual father is intended, and they will claim God as their Father.

We be not born of fornication.—The meaning of this is to be found in the fact that the word became in the Old Testament prophets a frequent symbol for idolatry. (Comp. Isa. i. 21; Jer. ii. 29, and iii. 8, 9; Ezek. xvi.; Hos. i. 2 (especially), ii. 4, and iii. 11.) They,
of fornication; we have one Father, even God. (42) Jesus said unto them, If God were your Father, ye would love me: for I proceeded forth and came from God; neither came I of myself, but he sent me. (43) Why do ye not understand my speech? even because ye cannot hear my word. (44) Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father

**Ye cannot hear.**—Comp. Note on chap. vi. 60. The sense is, "Ye cannot hear, so as to receive and obey." He supplies the answer to His own question. In the following verses (44-47), He expresses this answer more fully.

(44) Ye are of your father the devil.—"Ye" is emphatic. "Ye who have claimed Abraham and God as your father. Ye are of the father, but that father is the devil." The possessive pronoun (your) is not expressed in the Greek, and the form of the sentence is one which would have required it if it were included in the sense. The father who has been referred to in verses 38 and 41 is now definitely named. The relation between father and son is maintained, but the father of the thoughts and acts of those to whom He speaks was not God, not Abraham, but the devil.

**And the lusts of your father ye will do.**—Better, ye desire to do, ye will to do. The verb is not an auxiliary, as it appears to be in our version, but expresses the determination of the will. (Comp. Notes on chaps. v. 40 and vii. 17.)

He was a murderer from the beginning.—Comp. Wisd. ii. 23, 24. "For God created man to be immortal, and made him to be an image of His own eternity. Nevertheless, through envy of the devil came death into the world, and they that do hold of his side do find it." So St. Paul, "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin" (Rom. v. 12). The Fall was the murder of the human race; and it is in reference to this, of which the fratricide in the first family was a signal result, that the Tempter is called a murderer from the beginning (see Note on chap. i. 1). "Cain was of that wicked one, and slew his brother." (Comp. Notes on 1 John i. 8-12, where the thought is expanded.) The reference to the murderer is suggested here by the fact that the Jews had been seeking to kill our Lord (verse 40). They are true to the nature which their father had from the beginning.

And abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him.—Better, and standeth not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. The word is not that which we have before had in the sense of "abide" (see Note on chap. v. 38), and the tense of the verb is present in meaning. The words do not refer to the fall of the devil, which is here implied but not stated, but to his constant character. He has no place in the sphere of the truth; it is not the region of his action and outer life; and the result of this is that there is no truth in the sphere of his thought and inner life. Had he been true, he would have come to stand in the light and life of truth.

When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own.—This is in contrast to the work of Christ (verses 28, 40) and to the work of the Holy Spirit (Note on chap. xvi. 13). The Holy Spirit will not speak of Himself; He came to speak the truth which He heard from God. The devil speaketh a lie (comp. Gen. iii.), and this is of his own (see Note on Matt. xii. 35).

For he is a liar, and the father of it.—Better, and the father of the liar. This is probably
of it. (45) And because I tell you the truth, ye believe me not. (46) Which of you convinceth me of sin? and if I say the truth, why do ye not believe me? (47) He that is of God heareth God's words: ye therefore hear them not, be-
cause ye are not of God. (48) Then answered the Jews, and said unto him, Say we not well that thou art a Samaritan, and hast a devil? (49) Jesus answered, I have not a devil; but I honour my Father, and ye do dishonour me.

ST. JOHN, VIII.

the Voice of God.

God's Children would hear
They dis honour the Son, ST. JOHN, VIII., but the Father honoureth Him.

(50) And I seek not mine own glory: there is one that seeketh and judgeth.
(51) Verily, verily, I say unto you, If a man keep my saying, he shall never see death. (52) Then said the Jews unto him, Now we know that thou hast a devil. Abraham is dead, and the prophets; and thou sayest, If a man keep my saying, he shall never taste of death. This is the answer to their question, "Whom makest thou thyself?" as asked by the Samaritan woman in chap. iv. 12. It is my Father that honoureth me; of whom ye say, that he is your God: I honour my Father, and ye do dishonour me. — There is a connection between all His works and words and the unseen world. It is the union of Father and Son, and His life had been the constant honouring of the Father, whose will it was His meat to do (chap. iv. 31). Their works and words were as constantly — and this last calumny is an instance of it — dishonouring Him. The contrast suggests that this dishonour was not of Him only, but also of the Father whom He honoured, and whom they claimed as their God.

(50) And I seek not mine own glory. — The words are immediately connected with those which have preceded. They dishonoured Him. This to one who sought His own glory would have been matter of concern. For Him whose whole life was one of self-denial, their dishonour finds nothing which it can wound. His words repeat what He had taught them before. (See Notes on chaps. v. 41 and vii. 18.)

There is one that seeketh and judgeth. — Comp. chap. v. 45. The thought here is that though He Himself seeks not His own glory, the Father seeketh for the honour of the Son, and judgeth between Him and those who dishonour Him. The result of the judgment as to those who keep not His word is expressed in the next verse; and as to Himself in chap. xvi. 10.

(51) If a man keep my saying, he shall never see death. — Better, If a man keep My word. Our version obscures the close connection with the thought of "continuing in His word" in verse 31; and also that with "he that heareth my word," in chap. v. 24. This last passage is the key to the words before us. Here, as there, the thought of judgment and death leads to the opposite thought of coming not into judgment, but passing out of death into life. Here, as there, the believer is thought of as possessing the true spiritual life which cannot see death, but shall pass into the fuller spiritual life hereafter.

Another interpretation of the phrase rendered "He shall never see death," is "he shall never see death for ever." — "he shall indeed die, but that death shall nothing be in the world which is for ever." This is the thought in the collect in "The Order for the Burial of the Dead." It is the union of Father spiritual life, and continues to live in communion with Him who received God's covenant, himself died, and if the opposite thought of coming not into judgment, but Whom makest thou thyself? — Better, If a man keep My word, as in last verse.

He shall never taste of death. — The expression is stronger than that which He had used, "shall never see death." They use it to put in the strongest way their wonder at the impossible promise which He had uttered. It has occurred before in Matt. xvi. 28. (See Note there.) It occurs again in the New Testament only in Heb. ii. 9.

(52) Art thou greater than our father Abraham, which is dead? — The question is exactly the same, with the substitution of "Abraham" for "Jacob," as that asked by the Samaritan woman in chap. iv. 12 (see Note). "Surely thou art not greater than our father Abraham, who indeed died?"

Whom makest thou thyself? — If Abraham, who received God's covenant, himself died, and if the prophets, who uttered the oracles of God, themselves died, what kind of person dost Thou assert Thyself to be that Thy word shall deliver men from death? The same phrase occurs again in chaps. v. 18, x. 33, xix. 7.

If I honour myself, my honour is nothing. — The word rendered "honour" is not the same as that in verse 49. It is better to read glorify here. Following all the better MSS., the tense is past. We have then, If I shall have glorified Myself, My glory is nothing. Stress is to be laid upon the pronoun. "If I, for My part, as distinct from the Father, shall have glorified Myself,"

It is My Father that honoureth me. — Better, as before, . . . glorifieth Me. This is the answer to their question, "Whom makest Thou Thyself?" The attribute of life in Himself, and the power to communicate this to those who kept His word, was the gift of the Father to the Son. (See Note on chap. v. 26.)

Of whom ye say that he is your God. — Some of the better MSS., and most modern editors, read . . . "He is our God." The identification of the Father with the God of Israel is important. It may be, as
yet ye have not known him; but I know him: and if I should say, I know him not, I shall be a liar like unto you: but I know him, and keep his saying. (56) Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day: and he saw it, and was glad." (57) Then said the some have supposed, that the phrase, "He is our God," belonged to common liturgical forms or hymns, and was thus frequently on their lips.

(58) Thou art not yet fifty years old.—There is no reason to doubt that we have the correct reading here, for he says, "As the gospel and all the Elders witness" (Lib. ii. chap. xxii. § 5; Oxford Translation, p. 160). But "fifty years" was the period of full manhood (Num. iv. 3, 39; viii. 24). This is expressed in round numbers, and there is no need for comparison with the two thousand years which had passed since the close of Abraham's earthly life. The thought is, "Thou art still a young man, and hast thou seen Abraham who died two centuries ago?"

Before Abraham was, I am.—Better, Before Abraham was born, I am. (Comp. Note on chap. i. 6; and see another striking instance in Luke vi. 36, "Become ye merciful as your Father also is merciful.") Here they ask in wonder, not unmixed with scorn, if He was coeval with Abraham. The answer is that Abraham, like all men, came into being. There was a time when he was not. But there was never a time when the Son of God was not. In the time before Abraham, in the eternity before time (chap. i. 1), He still was. No word which expresses becoming can be used of His existence. He is the I AM, present equally in the human "was," and "is," and "is to come." (59) Then took they up stones to cast at him.—At last the meaning of His words flashes upon them. They had heard this I AM before (verse 24) without perceiving that in it He applied to Himself the name Jehovah. Now there is no room for doubt. His own Divinity is the only explanation of what He has said; and it is in these words so plainly asserted, that those who had constantly misunderstood can misunderstand no more. The subtleties of later days, by which men have tried to show that there is no claim to Divinity here, was not suggested to their minds. They will not acknowledge the claim, but they feel that He has made it. They have heard the fearful words which seemed to them as blasphemy, and they take up the stones which are at hand for the rebuilding of the Temple, in which they are, to cast at the Lord of the Temple. (Comp. chap. x. 33.)

"Going through the midst of them, and so passed by."—These words are omitted in a majority of the better MSS. They were probably inserted in
going through the midst of them, and so passed by.

CHAPTER IX. — (1) And as Jesus passed by, he saw a man which was blind from his birth. (2) And his disciples asked him, saying, Master, who did sin, this man, or his parents, that he was born blind? (3) Jesus answered, Neither hath this man sinned, nor his parents.

IX.

[(b) Jesus is Light (continued).]

(8) Physical light given to the man born blind (chap. ix. 1-42):
The miracle itself (verses 1-12).
The objections of the Pharisees, and the witness of the sufferer (verses 13-34).
Physical light and darkness; spiritual light and darkness (verses 35-41.)

(1) And as Jesus passed by. — Better, And as He was passing by. The words are immediately connected with those of the preceding verse, "and went out of the Temple." It was then, as He was leaving the Temple to escape the fury of His enemies who had taken up stones to cast at Him, and was passing by the place where the blind man was, that His eye fell upon him. The day was the Sabbath of the preceding discourse, now drawing to its close. (Comp. verses 4 and 14, and chap. viii. 12.) The place was probably some spot near the Temple, perhaps one of its gates. We know that beggars were placed near these gates to ask alms (Acts iii. 2), and this man was well known as one who sat and begged (verse 8).

A man which was blind from his birth. — The fact was well known, and was probably publicly proclaimed by the man himself or his parents (verse 20) as an aggravation of his misery, and as a plea for the alms of passers by. Of the six miracles connected with blindness which are recorded in the Gospels, this is the only case described as blindness from birth. In this lies its special characteristic, for "since the world began, was it not heard that any man opened the eyes of one that was born blind" (verse 32).

(2) Who did sin, this man, or his parents? — The disciples noticed that He looked at the man, and it may be that He halted as He was walking by. Their attention is directed to the sufferer, and with suffering they connect the idea of sin. They ask a question which may have come to them many times before, and which has in various forms come to men's hearts many times since. Some of them may have heard it discussed in Rabbinic schools, and may have wished to know what answer He whom they had come to regard as greater than the Rabbis, would give. But it is a question not of the learned only, but of men generally, and those who now ask it do not propound it as a matter for discussion, but as a mystery of human life brought home to them in all its darkness, and for which they seek a solution at His hands. His teaching on the wider questions of the existence of evil and the connection of sin and suffering, though coming in the order of events after these words, and in part probably arising out of them, has in the order of the record occurred before them, and has been already dealt with in Notes on Luke xiii. 1-5. What is special to the question, as it meets us here, is that what is deemed to be the punishment had come with birth before possibility of thought or action, and therefore, as we think, before possibility of sin.

The form of the question puts two alternatives on precisely the same grounds; and we have no right therefore to assume that one of them is excluded by the questioners themselves. The fact of sin is stated as beyond question. The problem is, "Was the sin of that of his parents?" The latter alternative is familiar to us, and daily experience shows us that within limits it holds good in both the moral and the physical worlds. It was clearly taught in the Second Commandment, and there is abundant evidence that the belief was at this time widely spread. We have greater difficulty in tracing the origin of the former alternative. It is not easy to accept the view that they thought of sin in his mother's womb, though it seems certain that the Jews currently interpreted such passages as Gen. xvi. 22, and Ps. li. 7 in this sense. That a more or less definite belief in the transmigration of souls was common among Jews at the time of our Lord's ministry, is made probable by references in Philo and Josephus. We know it was a doctrine of the Essenes and of the Cabbala; and we find it in the nearly contemporary words of the Wisdom of Solomon, "Yea rather being good, I came into a body undefiled." (viii. 20). Still it has been urged that it is not likely that such a belief would have made its way among the fishermen of Galilee. We have to remember, however, that among the disciples there are now men of Jerusalem as well as of Galilee, and that questions which men found hard to understand were constantly being raised and answered in the Rabbinic schools. In the meetings of the yearly festivals the answers of great Rabbis would be talked over and become generally known, and be handed on as maxims to those who knew little of the principle on which they were based. It was, then, probably with some thought that the life in this maimed body may not have been the first stage of his existence, that they ask, Did this man sin?

(3) Jesus answered, Neither hath this man sinned, nor his parents. — The answer is, of course, to be understood with the limitation of the question, "that he was born blind." Neither his special sin nor theirs was the cause of the blindness. Our version does not give quite accurately the form of the answer. It should be, Neither did this man sin, nor his parents. Their question sought to establish a connection between the suffering and some definite act of sin. The answer asserts that no such connection exists, and our Lord's words remain a warning against the spirit of judging other men's lives, and tracing in the misfortunes and sorrows which they have to bear the results of individual sin or the proof of divine displeasure. There is a chain connecting the sin of humanity and its woe, but the links are not traceable by the human eye. In the Providence of God vicarious suffering is often the noble lot of the noblest members of our race. No burden of human sorrow was ever so great as that borne by Him who knew no human sin.
The Work to be done in the Day.

ST. JOHN, IX. Jesus Anoints the Eyes of the Blind Man.

I am in the world, I am the light of the world. a (6) When he had thus spoken, he spat on the ground, and made clay of the spittle, and he anointed the eyes of the blind man with the clay, b

But that the works of God should be made manifest in him.—They had sought to trace back the result of sin which they saw before them to a definite cause. He will trace it back to the region of the divine counsel, where purpose and result are one. Evil cannot be resolved into a higher good: it is the result of the choice exercised by freedom, and without freedom goodness could not be virtue. Permitted by God, it is yet overruled by Him. It has borne its fearful fruit in the death and curse of humanity, but its works have led to the manifestation of the works of God in the divine plan of redemption. It is so in this instance. The blindness of this beggar will have its result, and therefore in the divine counsel had its purpose, in the light which will dawn upon the spiritual as well as upon the physical blindness, and from which we are to draw this further doctrine of the twofold blindness which immediately followed.

(4) I must work the works of him that sent me, while it is day.—The better reading is probably that which has us, instead of “I,” and perhaps also that which has has, instead of “me”; but this latter change is not so well supported by MS. authority. The clause would read then, We must work the works of Him that sent Me (or us) while it is day. He identifies the disciples with Himself in the redemptive work of His mission. There are before them this striking instance of the power of evil. He and they are there to manifest the power of good. They must gird themselves to the task. If we are right in placing the whole section from chaps. vii. 37—x. 21 on the same great day of the Feast (comp. Note on verse 14), then this work must have come near the close of the day. The sun sinking to the west may have reminded them that the day was passing away, and that the night was approaching. He was reminded of the day of life, and the night of death. He will not be long in the world (verse 5). That night will be the close of His human work, and the shadows of evening are already falling upon Him.

The night cometh, when no man can work.—He does not except even Himself from the pro­

verbial law. The day of opportunity passes, never to return. His own great work of doing the work of Him that sent Him, could only be done when that day was present. It has, of course, been ever done in the work of His church under the guidance of His Spirit; but the work of His own human activity on earth ceased when the night came. Comp. chap. xi. 9 for this thought of the hours of the day.

As long as I am in the world, I am the light of the world.—Better, when I am in the world. The thought is that the two things necessarily co-exist. He is the True Light, and therefore the Light cannot be in the world without shining in its darkness. (Comp. Note on chap. i. 5.) The thought is here closely connected with His teaching in the Temple but a short time before (chap. viii. 12, “I am the Light of the world”), and also with the removal of physical and spiritual darkness which immediately followed.

And he anointed the eyes of the blind man with the clay.—The words “blind man” are omitted in some of the older MSS. The marginal rendering, and He spread the clay upon the eyes of the blind man (or, upon his eyes), is to be preferred.

The details given in this and the next verse are evidently to be regarded as part of the sign. They impressed themselves as such upon the eye-witnesses, and they have been recorded as such for us. We have then to seek their interpretation. At the outset we are met by the Undoubted fact that our Lord here made use of means which, in part at least, were natural, and found their place in the ordinary prescriptions of the day. We know from the pages of Pliny, and Tacitus, and Suetonius, that the salvia féguna was held to be a remedy in cases of blindness, and that the same remedy was used by the Jews is established by the writings of the Rabbis. That clay was so used is not equally certain, but this may be regarded as the vehicle by means of which the saliva was applied. Here, then, as elsewhere, we may recognise the Divine manifested by means of the human. We see the power of every-day life blessed to meet a case that was beyond human power. Physicians had applied such means commonly to cases of post-natal blindness, but congenital blindness had always been regarded as incurable, and no instance to the contrary had ever been heard of (verse 32). The Great Physician, then, by using the ordinary means, will teach men that the healing powers of nature are His gracious gift, and that they are to be used when their human hands have failed. Our daily sustenance of health and strength, our restored power after sickness or accident, the whole of ordinary life, which we too commonly connect only with ordinary means, is lifted to the higher region of union with Him in whom we live, and move, and have our being.

Another interpretation sees in the use of clay a symbolical meaning which is to be traced to the first Creation, when man was formed from the dust of the earth. We find this as early as Irenæus, and it may well, therefore, represent an oral explanation, going back to the days of the Evangelist himself. The thought would be that our Lord will here exercise the same creative power as that which made man, and will complete, by the gift of sight, this man, who had hitherto been maimed and without the chief organ of sense.

The use of means by which the healing power is conveyed is common to this instance with that of the blind man at Bethsaida (Mark viii. 22—26), and that of the deaf and dumb man in Decapolis (Mark vii. 32—37); while the two blind men in the house (Matt. ix. 27—31), and the two blind men at Jericho (Matt. xx. 29—34), are touched and receive their sight. The reader is referred to the Notes on these passages of St. Matthew and St. Mark. Here it will be enough to observe that in each case the loss of a channel of communication between the individual and the outer world is compensated by some special means which may help to assure him of the presence of the true Healer, and may furnish a foundation for his faith and hope. The deaf man cannot hear the tones of a voice that tells of mercy and love, but the touch applied to the ear may in part convey the same gracious truths. The blind man cannot see the look of compassion which others can see, but the saliva — the clay applied to the eye gives force to the word which is heard by the ear. In every case we should remember that the means is chiefly moral, preparing in the sufferer a mental condition which can
And said unto him, Go, wash in the pool of Siloam, (which is by interpretation, Sent.) He went his way therefore, and washed, and came seeing.

The neighbours therefore, and they which before had seen him that he was blind, said, Is not this he that sat and begged?

He answered and said, A man that is called Jesus made clay, and anointed mine eyes, and said unto me, Go to the pool Siloam.

And came seeing.—These words need no Note for the reader who will pause to think of them, but we often pass over them without remembering. The whole world of visual objects now first burst upon the mind of him who was healed. We can only know in part what a revelation this was, but we may by thought realise it in some degree. There is no reference to his coming again to our Lord. He returned apparently to his usual dwelling, and this agrees with the mention of "neighbours" in the following verse.

They which before had seen him that he was blind. —The better reading is,—that he was a beggar. The persons are the neighbours, who from living near him knew all about him, and those who used to see him at the spot where he sat begging.

Both classes, of course, knew that he was blind.

Is not this he that sat and begged?—Better, Is not this he that sitteth and beggeth? The tenses are present, marking his usual custom.

He is like him. —The more probable reading is, No; but he is like him. It is not that these speakers agree with some hesitation with those who assert the identity. They oppose to it their own opinion, that it is a case of resemblance only. He himself sets the question at rest by declaring that he is the same person.

The verse, and indeed the whole narrative, is one of the many striking instances of the natural form which is taken by the narrative of one personally acquainted with all the facts. We may suppose that St. John recorded this from the lips of the man himself. We can see the whole picture;—the man returning, observed by one or two neighbours, who spread the story; the excitement of their curiosity; the question whether he is really the same; some struck by the points of identity in the features, and declaring that he is; others struck by the features of the opened eyes lighting up the whole face, and declaring that he is not; the simple declaration of the man himself, which is at once accepted as decisive—all this passes before us just as it occurred.

How were thine eyes opened? — They wonder at the change wrought in him, and seek to know how it happened. The question is important if we adopt the better reading, beggar, for "blind," in verse 8, as showing that they knew he had been blind, the moment they knew that he was the same person who used to sit and beg.

A man that is called Jesus. —Some of the better MSS. read, "The Man that is called Jesus," implying that He would be known to the blind man and his friends. They can hardly have failed to hear of His teaching at the feast.
They bring him to the Pharisees.

ST. JOHN, IX.

The Division among them.

Pool of Siloam, and wash: and I went and washed, and I received sight. (12) Then said they unto him, Where is he? He said, I know not.

(13) They brought to the Pharisees him that aforetime was blind. (14) And it was the sabbath day when Jesus made the clay, and opened his eyes.

(15) Then again the Pharisees also asked him how he had received his sight. He said unto them, He put clay upon mine eyes, and I washed, and do see. (16) Therefore said some of the Pharisees, This man is not of God, because he keepeth not the sabbath day. Others said, How can a man that is a sinner do such miracles? And there was a division among them. (17) They say unto the blind man again, What sayest thou of him, that he hath opened thine eyes?

Made clay, and anointed mine eyes.—He gives the details in order, omitting the spitting on the ground, which he had not seen.

And I received sight.—The Greek word means exactly, "to see again." The power, though given in that instance for the first time, was usually a restored power, and this is expressed in the word. This man uses the ordinary language of men, though, in strictness it was not applicable to his own case. This use of the word is, moreover, justified by other examples.

(12) I know not.—He had not returned to our Lord (verse 7), who was passing by when He spoke to him (verse 1), and by the time the man had gone to the pool and had returned would have gone beyond his knowledge.

(14) They brought to the Pharisees.—More exactly, They bring . . . The present tense speaks of what they did, as the writer thinks of it in actual occurrence. Their question in the previous verse, and the fact stated in the following verse, seem to indicate that they did this in the spirit of opposition to our Lord. They may have been influenced also, as the parents were, by the agreement of the Jews to excommunicate any who should confess Christ (verse 22). By the term, "to the Pharisees," we are not to understand the Sanhedrin, which did not meet on the Sabbath, and which is not spoken of by St. John as simply the Pharisees, but a body of the leading Pharisees who were the most bitter foes of Christ, and who seem at this time to have formed practically a permanent committee of the Sanhedrin, always ready to take counsel or action against Him. (Comp. Notes on chap. vii. 52, 45, 48.)

(14) And it was the sabbath day—i.e., most probably, the last day, that great day of the feast of chap. vii. 37. Nothing has taken place which makes it necessary to suppose any interval, and though the discourses seem long, they would have occupied but a short time in delivery. The whole narrative follows in unbroken order, which makes it difficult to suppose that this time intervened.

When Jesus made the clay.—This is mentioned as a servile work which contravened the Sabbath law. The anointing the eyes with spittle on the Sabbath was specially forbidden by the decrees of the Rabbis. They held that no work of healing might be performed on the Sabbath except in cases of immediate danger.

On the question of our Lord's relation to the Sabbath. (Comp. Notes on chap. v. 16 of sec., and on Matt. xii. 10; Luke xiii. 11-16, and xiv. 1-5.

(15) Then again the Pharisees also asked.—As the neighbours and acquaintance had done before (verse 10).

He said unto them, He put clay upon mine eyes.—The answer is the same as before, but briefer. It is that of a man who is answering against his will (comp. verse 27) and does not care to say more than he is obliged to.

And do see.—This differs from "I received sight" (verse 11). He now speaks as in conscious possession of the power to see. (Comp. verse 25.)

(10) This man is not of God, because he keepeth not the sabbath day.—See Note on verse 14, and reference there. Here the truth of the miracle is granted, but it is urged that the power by which it is wrought cannot be of God, because it was exercised on the Sabbath day. The inference is, that it was done by the influence of the power of evil.

Others said, How can a man that is a sinner do such miracles?—This question is asked by the better party among the Pharisees, represented, as we know, by Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathæus, and perhaps by Gamaliel. They see the inference implied in the earlier question, and appeal to the nature of the miracles wrought. Works of mercy, and love, and power, were not the product of a life of sin, or of communion with the powers of darkness. We find evidence of this better spirit among the Pharisees before, in the question of Nicodemus (chap. vii. 21). It has now extended to others. The teaching on the earlier work on the Sabbath (chap. v.) has led some among them, at least, to look with allowance upon this.

And there was a division among them.—Comp. Note on chap. vii. 40.

(17) They say unto the blind man again.—The question is not asked by either of the parties, for this must have been noted, but by the assembly generally. They who questioned him in verse 15, question him again now. They have bowed themselves among themselves, and they ask what impression the fact of the miracle had left upon him who was the object of it, with regard to the person of Him who had performed it.

What sayest thou of him, that he hath opened thine eyes?—Stress is laid on the pronoun. What sayest thou? He ought to know better than any one, seeing that his eyes had been opened, and this they admit, while the nature of his witness is uncertain: but immediately that is given they disbelieve the fact of the miracle, and soon reject with scorn him they question now (verse 34).

The English reader should observe the punctuation here, which rightly makes the question one. It is sometimes read as though it were, "What sayest thou of Him? that He hath opened thine eyes?" It is not, however, the fact which is here questioned, but the opinion of the man, based upon the fact, for the present assumed as true, which is called for.

Ho is a prophet.—The education of the man has been doing its work, and he is convinced that the power which has healed him is direct from God, and that the person who has exercised it is a messenger from God. His words are uttered in the brevity and calmness of clear conviction, and they are the direct negative to the
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They question the Parents, who

He said, He is a prophet. (39) But the Jews did not believe concerning him, that he had been blind, and received his sight, until they called the parents of him that had received his sight. (38) And they asked them, saying, Is this your son, who ye say was born blind? how then doth he now see? (20) His parents answered them and said, We know that this is our son, and that he was born blind: (21) but by what means he now seeth, we know not; or who hath opened his eyes, we know not: he is of age; ask him: he shall speak for himself. (22) These words spake his parents, because they feared the Jews: for the Jews had agreed already, that if any man did confess that he was Christ, he should be put out of the synagogue. (23) Therefore said his parents, He is of age; ask him. (24) Then again called they the man that was blind, and said unto him, Give God the praise; we know that this man is a
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refer them to the Man himself.

statement of the Pharisees, "This man is not from God." (Comp chaps. iii. 2, iv. 19, vi. 14.) It is important to note, that even in the language of the ordinary people, the word " prophet " did not mean simply a predictor of events in the future, but one who was as the representative of God. He was not only or chiefly a "fore-teller," but a "forth-teller," declaring God's truth, revealing His will and character, bearing the witness of divine works; but as the future is ever present to the divine counsels, prophecy, in the narrower sense, may be part of the work of the true prophet. (38) But the Jews did not believe.—Better, The Jews therefore did not believe. The words are connected, as an inference, with those which precede. Because of this explanation of the fact, they are driven to the expedient of disbelieving the fact itself. The designation of those who take this position is remarkable. The substantive is not unexpressed, as in verse 17, nor is it "the Pharisees," as in verse 16, but it is the term which we have met with again and again, as marking out the leaders of the Jerusalem party who were opposed to Christ. (Comp. Note on chap. i. 19.)

Until they called the parents.—After they have done so, they can affect to doubt the fact no longer (verse 26). But they hoped that the parents would from fear (verse 22) have given an answer which would have enabled them to deny the identity of person, or the fact of congenital blindness. (19) Is this your son, who ye say was born blind?—The "ye" is emphatic; ye say he was born blind, as opposed to us, for we do not believe it. There are three questions. Is this your son? Do ye still say that he was born blind? which is incredible, as he now possesses the faculty of sight (verse 32). If you do, how do you account for the fact that he now sees? How then doth he now see?—Their question means—"How does it come to pass, since he was born blind, that he all at once seeth?" The word rendered "now," here and in verses 21 and 22, conveys the idea of the suddenness of the change which had taken place. (20) We know that this is our son...—The two earlier questions of matter of fact they can answer with certainty. They know, as none besides themselves can know, that he was their son, and they know the painful truth that he was born blind. (21) But by what means he now seeth.—Better, but how he now seeth. The answer is in the exact words of the question, which is not seen in our version. They will not pass beyond the plain matters of fact of which they were certain.

Or who hath opened his eyes.—They pass here to a fourth question, which was not asked, but which they see to be the real point which the Pharisees are aiming at, and in which they have determined not to be entangled.

He is of age, ask him.—The better reading here is probably that which places "ask him" first. (22) For the Jews had agreed already, that he is of age. The Received text has been influenced by verse 23. The Greek expresses with the fullest emphasis, which it is not easy to preserve in English, that they intend to have nothing to do with this third question, but to leave it to their son to answer. Literally, it is, Ask him; he is of full age; he himself will speak concerning himself.

(23) For the Jews had agreed already.—This does not imply a formal decree of the Sanhedrin, but an agreement on the part of the leaders which they had made known to the people, and which they would have had little difficulty in carrying into effect. The word rendered "agreed" occurs again in the New Testament only twice. It expresses the covenant made with Judas, in Luke xxii. 5, and the agreement of the Jews to kill Paul, in Acts xxii. 20.

He should be put out of the synagogue.—Comp. chap. xvi. 2, and Note on Luke vi. 22. The Jews at a later date distinguished three kinds of excommunication. (1) The lightest continued for thirty days, and prescribed four cubits as a distance within which the person may not approach any one, not even wife or children; with this limitation, it did not make exclusion from the synagogue necessary. (2) The severer included absolute banishment from all religious meetings, and absolute giving up of intercourse with all persons, and was formally pronounced with curses. (3) The severest was a perpetual banishment from all meetings, and a practical exclusion from the fellowship of God's people. It has been sometimes supposed that the words of Luke vi. 22, (a) "separate you," (b) "reproach you," (c) "cast out your name," refer to these gradations, but probably the only practice known in the time of our Lord was that which was later regarded as the intermediate form, falling short of perpetual banishment, but being, while the ban lasted, exclusion from all the cherished privileges of an Israelite.

(23) See Note on verse 21.

(24) Then again called they the man that was blind.—He had not been present during the interview with his parents. They now wish him to believe that they have ascertained from his parents either that he was not their son, or that he was not really born blind. It is useless for him, therefore, to persist in his belief that a prophet had given him the power to see.

Give God the praise.—Better, Give glory to God. This phrase is very generally misunderstood, though almost all competent authorities are agreed as to its
sinner. (25) He answered and said, Whether he be a sinner or no, I know not; one thing I know, that, whereas I was blind, now I see. (26) Then said they to him again, What did he to thee? how opened he thine eyes? (27) He answered them, I have told you already, and ye did not hear: wherefore would ye hear it again? will ye also be his disciples? (28) Then they reviled him, and said, Thou art his disciple; but we are Moses' disciples. (29) We know that God spake unto Moses: as for this fellow, we know not from whom he is. His first answer was in the lowest possible words (verse 15, compared with verse 7), and even these he will not repeat. There is some difficulty about the meaning of the word "hear" in the two clauses of this verse. When the man says "Ye did not hear," we naturally understand "did not heed;" but when he goes on to say, "Wherefore would ye hear it again?" the word clearly has its ordinary sense of hearing. The same word occurs in the two clauses in the Greek, just as it does in the English, and we are scarcely justified in giving it two distinct meanings. If we were to read both clauses as questions, we should avoid this difficulty, and get a sense which would suit the evident feeling of the man. He is impatient, and expresses this in a series of rapid questions. "I have told you already, and did ye not hear? wherefore would ye hear it again? will ye also be His disciples?"

Will ye also be His disciples?—The words refer probably, to some who are His disciples, not to the man himself as being, or being ready to become, a disciple. This is a further stage of his spiritual education which is to follow, but has not yet arrived (verses 35—38). The man must have known of the existence of a band of disciples, who indeed in his presence had questioned their Master concerning him (verse 2), and it is not unlikely that while the parents were being questioned, the son may have learnt more concerning the work of Christ. The question puts the irony in the severest form, "Surely ye also do not wish to become His disciples?" It may have been designed, or may only have been as an arrow drawn at a venture; but there must have been among those of whom it was asked, men who tried in vain to encase themselves in the armour of authority, which would repel his shaft and silence him. It must have gone through the joints of the harness and pierced to the hearts of men like Nicodemus, who were half-disciples without the "courage of their convictions." Here was the blind beggar making an open avowal of that which the Pharisees and rulers dared only to confess by night (chap. iii. 2).

(28) Then they reviled him.—The Greek word occurs only here in the Gospels. The other passages where it occurs in the New Testament are Acts xxiii. 4, 1 Cor. iv. 12, and 1 Pet. ii. 23. It expresses the passionate outburst of their anger, which was excited by his question, and finds vent in heaping reproaches upon him.

Thou art his disciple.—They cast his own reproach back upon himself, but in stronger words than he had used they mark out the distinction between Jesus and themselves. Thou art that Man's disciple.

But we are Moses' disciples.—The emphasis of the words is important. We, as opposed to thou; Moses, as opposed to that Man's. (29) We know that God spake unto Moses.—Better, We know that God hath spoken unto Moses. "He was commissioned," they would say, "by God, and received a revelation from God which remains to us." They would press here, as before, the authority of the great Lawgiver, which to every Israelite was...
The Man marvels that they know not whence Jesus is.

ST. JOHN, IX.

He asserts, as a truth which agrees with the whole teaching of the Old Testament, and with all the religious instincts of men, that there would be no communion between such a man and heaven. Such a one could not be commissioned as a prophet, or so heard in heaven as to have power to work miracles on earth. (Comp. Notes on chap. xi. 41, 42, and Acts iii. 12.) Men have sometimes taken the words altogether apart from their context, and read into them a dark meaning which they cannot be rightly made to bear. Neither these words, nor any words of God, assign any limit to the divine grace, which extendeth to every penitent sinner; nor is there any voice of any child of man lifted to heaven, which is not heard by the Father who is in heaven.

It has often been noted here that the words are spoken by one whose authority does not make them binding upon us; but it is clear that they were accepted as a general truth. We need no other explanation if we bear in mind the special sense which is here attached to the word “sinner.”

(38) Since the world began was it not heard.—Literally, from the world-age was it not heard. The phrase is a reminiscence of Isa. lix. 4. (Comp. also Note on Luke i. 70.)

The eyes of one that was born blind.—This differentiates the miracle from the others in cases of blindness, and still more from all ordinary cures of maladies of the eyes. The man expresses what was simply true, that no science or skill had at that time been equal to the removal of blindness which had accompanied birth. That modern science has succeeded in making even this possible, is altogether beside the question, unless it is pretended that human skill could effect it under like conditions and with the same means. For the man himself there had been years of darkness without a ray of hope, for none had ever dreamt that recovery was within the limits of possibility; and now that the blessing has come, he regards it as the gift of God, and doubts not that the immediate giver is from God.

(33) If this man were not of God.—His argument meets each of their assertions. His general assumption, admitted as a universal truth (verse 31), had denied their assertion that this Man was a sinner. His conclusion now denies that assertion, “This Man is not of God” (verse 16).

Thou could do nothing—i.e., nothing of this kind, no miracle such as this, much less this miracle itself.

(34) Thou wast altogether born in sins.—Their reproach now takes the most malignant form, and shrinks not from casting in his teeth the calamity of his birth as the mark of special sin. “Thou didst come into the world,” these words mean, “bearing the curse of God upon thy face.” Thou hast said that God heareth not sinners; and from God there is no forgiveness. “Thy life in its first moments bore the marks of some fearful crime.”

And dost thou teach us?—i.e., “Dost thou, marked more than is the common lot of man by sin, teach us, who are the authorised teachers and expositors of the word.”
of the truth?" For any one to have doubted their authority would have seemed out of question; but here was one who had been a beggar, one of the "people of the earth," untrained in the Law, and therefore cursed (comp. Notes on chap. viii. 40), and, more than this, altogether born in sin, who was actually teaching them! And they cast him out. These words are generally taken to mean excommunication, as in the margin, and it is certain that they may have this sense. (Comp. 3 John 10.) Having this meaning before them, our translators did not, however, think it the better one, and their view seems to be borne out by the general impression which we get from the narrative. The man with all his boldness has not technically fallen under the ban they had threatened, for he has not "confessed the question," (verse 22). A decree of the Sanhedrin would have been necessary, and this must have been formally pronounced. Now, we feel that in a detailed narrative such as we have here, all this would hardly be told in a single short sentence. It seems to be rather that their anger has now passed all bounds. They cannot refute the truth which, in his honest, homely way, he has put before them. They can only heap reproaches upon him, and thrust him by force out of their presence. (35) Jesus heard that they had cast him out; and when he had found him.—There is no hint of time or place. We may naturally suppose that this seeking and finding on the part of our Lord followed immediately on the expulsion by the Pharisees. His parents had, for fear of the Pharisees, forsaken him; and they who should have been as the shepherd of this sheep of the flock of Israel, had thrust him from them; but in his case, too, the words of the Psalmist were to be fulfilled, "When my father and my mother forsake me, the Lord taketh me up." The Good Shepherd, who gathereth the lambs with His arm, and carrieth them in His bosom, is at hand to lead him. (36) Dost thou believe on the Son of God?—The title He had before taught him had been learnt, is the necessary expression of his faith in the Son of God. (37) And he said, Lord, I believe.—The answer reminds us of that to the woman of Samaria, "I that speak unto thee am He" (chap. iv. 26); but here both the sense of sight and that of hearing are appealed to as conveying knowledge to the mind. There is a special fitness in the emphasis thus laid upon the seeing Him, in the case of one whose very power to see was witness to the presence of the Messiah. The words do not refer to any earlier meeting, but the perfect tense refers to the completion of the act of vision and the abiding impression. (38) And he said, Lord, I believe.—The title is repeated, but now with the deeper meaning. His half-belief has passed into full conviction. The spiritual education has led him step by step from "the Man that is called Jesus" (verse 11) to the confession that He is a prophet" (verse 27), and that He is the Messiah (verse 28), to the belief that He is the blessing of the true" (verse 32), to the confession of the Messiah. It is the course of a plain man in the honesty of his heart, daring to think for himself, and to act upon his convictions. He declines to be silenced by authority, or ensnared in the mazes of argument. The ultimate facts of his own consciousness supply him with a definite foundation of truth, and this is immovable. The steps by which he advances in knowledge are a striking comment on the promise (chap. vii. 17). And he worshipped him.—The act of adoration is the necessary expression of his faith in the Son of God. We may not think that he has yet learnt all that this term includes; but he has at least learnt that the Son of God has the attribute of the divine glory, and is the object of human worship. It should be noted that St. John uses the word here rendered "worshipped" only in the speaking of the worship of God. (Comp. also chaps. iv. 20—24, and xii. 20.) (39) For judgment I am come into this world.—These words arise immediately out of what has preceded. The beggar has passed from a state of physical blindness, and has received the faculty of sight. He has passed from a state of spiritual blindness, and has received the power to recognize and believe on Jesus.
True Discipleship, ST. JOHN, VIII.

and Freedom by the Truth.

for I do always those things that please him.

(30) As he spake these words, many believed on him. (33) Then said Jesus to those Jews which believed on him, If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed; (32) and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.

(33) They answered him, We be Abraham's seed, and were never in bondage to any man: how sayest thou, Ye shall

For I do always those things that please him.—It would be less ambiguous to read, because I do always . . . The words furnish the reason for the presence of the Father in every act and moment of His life. All things done by Him at all times were in accordance with the Father's will. In His human nature perpetual communion is conditioned by perpetual obedience. The same thought recurs in His words to the disciples in chap. xv. 10. Comp. also, on the relation of the Son to the Father, Note on chap. v. 19.

Emphasis should be laid here upon the pronoun, "for I do always." It was true of His human nature, as distinct from all others, that no act, at any moment of life, had cast its shadow on the brightness of the vision of the Father's presence. Later in the same discourse (verse 46) He appeals to their knowledge of His holy life. Here, in words that none other in human form could ever utter, He appeals to His own consciousness of a life, every act of which was pleasing in the presence of God.

[(b) Jesus is Light (continued).]

(7) True discipleship and freedom (verses 30—59).

Freedom by the Son's word (verses 30—36).

Natural and ethical sonship (verses 37—47).

Eternal life by the Son's word.

The Son's eternity (verses 48—59).

(30) Many believed on him.—Wonder has often been expressed at the want of apprehension spoken of in verse 27. There is surely no less room for wonder in the faith spoken of here. Those who believe are of the Father's presence. Later in this same discourse (verse 46) He appeals to their knowledge of His holy life. Here, in words that none other in human form could ever utter, He appeals to His own consciousness of a life, every act of which was pleasing in the presence of God.

(32) Then said Jesus to those Jews which believed on Him.—Better, to those Jews who had believed Him. The act of faith is mentioned in the believers; but the explanation is to be found in our present passage. In this verse and in the previous verse, they are here placed among the believers, with an expression of contrast mixed with, perhaps, something of wonder—Jews and yet believers. If ye continue in my word.—Or, If ye abide in My word. Comp. Note on chap. xv. 7, where we have the opposite form of the thought, "If ye abide in Me, and My words abide in you." See also for this idea of abiding, Notes on chap. v. 37, 38. His word was the expression of the eternal truth of God, and He therefore was the one great Teacher. Every other must sit as a disciple at His feet, and continue in daily learning and in daily living to grasp the truth which, in that word and that word only, was revealed to man.

Here, as very frequently, part of the force of the sentence is expressed in the emphasis of the pronoun, "If ye continue in My word." "Ye, on your part, ye who now believe, but have not the courage to rank yourselves openly among My disciples. . . . You are indeed My disciples indeed.—The insertion of "then" does not improve the rendering—"If ye continue in My word, ye are My disciples indeed." The words imply that He who reads the heart has no confidence in this momentary conviction, which will not stand the test of true discipleship, and all that this includes. (Comp. Notes on chap. xi. 23—25 and vi. 66.)

(33) And ye shall know the truth.—In the great Intercessory Prayer of chap. xvii., Jesus prays for His disciples: "Sanctify them in the truth: Thy word is truth" (verse 17). In the answer to the question of Thomas in chap. xiv., He declares, "I am the way, the truth, and the life" (verse 6). It is this thought that is present in the connection between continuance in His word and knowledge of the truth here. These Jews professed to know the truth, and to be the official expounders of it. They had yet to learn that truth was not only a system, but also a power; not only something to be written or spoken, but also something to be felt and lived. If they abide in His word they will indeed be His disciples; living the life of truth, they will gain perception of truth. "Being true," they will "in love grow up into Him in all things, which is the head, even Christ" (Eph. iv. 15).

And the truth shall make you free.—Here, as in chap. xvi. 17, truth and holiness are spoken of as correlative. The light of truth dispels the darkness in which lies the stronghold of evil. Sin is the bondage of the powers of the soul, and this bondage is willed because the soul does not see its fearful evil. When it perceives the truth, there comes to it a power which robs it from its stuper, and strengthens it to break the fetters by which it has been bound. Freedom from the Roman rule was one of the national hopes bound up with Messiah's Advent. There is indeed a freedom from a more crushing foe than the legions of Rome. (Comp. Notes on Mark v. 9; Luke-viii. 30.)

(33) They answered him—i.e., the Jews who had believed in Him (verse 31). There is no indication that this answer was made by others standing near, nor would this supposition have been made but for the difficulty of applying some of the words which follow (verses 40, 44) to those who had ever professedly been believers; but the explanation is to be found in our Lord's own warning words in verse 31. He has tested their faith, and they fail in the first steps of discipleship.

We be Abraham's seed, and were never in bondage to any man.—Their pride misinterprets
be made free?—(34) Jesus answered them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin.*—(35) And the servant abideth not in the house for ever: but the Son abideth ever. (36) If the Son therefore

His words, and expresses itself in a boast which passes the limits of historical truth. It had been promised to Abraham, “I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven, and as the sand which is upon the sea shore; and thy seed shall possess the gates of his enemies” (Gen. xxii. 17). This seed they were. This promise they interpret of national prosperity. Abraham’s seed in bondage! the thought is impossible. As in other cases (comp. chap. vii. 52), they forget part of the facts of history, for they have never learned their lessons. The Egyptian slavery and Babylonian captivity are passed over. That very generation witnessed around them the insignia of Rome, paid taxes to Rome, used the coin of Rome, but it was the policy of the empire to leave to the subject provinces a nominal freedom; and it may be that stress is laid on the words “been in bondage,” which occur nowhere else in the Gospels. Those then living may have said with truth that they had never been in actual bondage, and the current expectation of the Messiah at that time may have led them to interpret the promise to Isaac, and the sons of the promise, as the child of the servant, as “working iniquity” (Matt. vii. 21, 23.) The truth is taught in the generality of a well-known maxim, but it has for them a special application. They claimed to be Abraham’s seed, and therefore free. Let their lives decide the question of their freedom. He could appeal (verses 22, 29) to a perfect harmony with the divine will, and therefore had a perfect freedom. For many of them the voice of conscience must have spoken in terrible words, and must have revealed the chain which had bound them, hand and foot, in the slavery of sin.

Is the servant of sin.—The word means bond-servant, or slave. It has been rendered “bondman,” and this brings out the connection of the word with that for “was in bondage,” in the last verse.

It is striking that we have this same thought in the letters of both St. Paul and St. Peter. (See margin.)

(35) And the servant abideth not.—Better, Now the bondman abideth not... as in the last verse.

The Son abideth ever.—Better, for ever, as in the earlier clause. The Greek words are precisely the same. This contrast between the position of the slave, who is a chattel that may be bought or bartered or sold, and has no affinity with the members of the house, and no permanent right in it; and the son, in whose veins is the master’s blood, and who is heir of all things, is obvious and general; but here, again, the present meaning is special. They claim to be the seed of Abraham. Did they remember the history of Isaac and Ishmael? The son of the freewoman abideth in the house; the son of the bondmaid is cast out. Here, once again, too, we have the pupil of Gamaliel taking up and expanding this thought, showing that it was within the range of current exposition. Read carefully Gal. iv. 19—31, remembering that the Epistle belongs to the middle of the half-century which separates the utterance of these words by Christ from their record by St. John.

The Greek word for “abideth” is the word which is rendered “continue” in verse 31, and the Authorised version further obscures the connection by placing a paragraph division between these verses. If we read again verses 31 and 32, noting the close connection between abiding, truth, and freedom; and the next verses, 35 and 36, noting the connection between abiding, the Son, and freedom, we shall have, it is believed, a simpler clue to the meaning than any of the usual explanations.

Our version mleads by the use of the capital. The word “Son” in this verse, should be read “son.” The clause is the expression of a legal maxim holding good for all servants and for all sons, but here specially applied to the sonship in Abraham’s household. It is not before the next verse that there is the transference of thought to the Son in the household of the Father. In this verse the thought is that if they were really the children of Abraham they would be of Abraham’s spiritual nature, abiding in his home, and inheriting the promises made to him. They had not continued in the spiritual freedom of sons, but had departed from the house and had become, spiritually, bondmen.

(36) If the Son therefore shall make you free.—Now the thought of verses 31 and 32 is repeated in special reference to the position they had claimed for themselves. There is need for the emancipation of which He has spoken, and His mission in the world is to proclaim it. If they will enter into spiritual union with Him, and abide in this new spiritual relation, it will make them new creatures, freed from sin by the power of truth. In the language of St. Paul, as quoted above, “Christ will be formed in them.” They will become “members of Christ,” and “children of God.” The Son of the divine household will make them free, and in Him they will become members of the great family of God Himself. (Comp. the same thought of the divine household as addressed by St. Paul specially to Gentiles, in Eph. ii. 11—22. See also in this Gospel, chap. xiv. 2, 3.)

Ye shall be free indeed.—Or, ye shall be free in reality.—The word is not the same as that rendered “indeed” in verse 31. They claimed political freedom, but they were in reality the subjects of Rome. They claimed religious freedom, but they were in reality the slaves to the letter. They claimed moral freedom, but they were in reality the bondmen of sin. The freedom which the Son proclaimed was in reality freedom, for it was the freedom of their true life delivered from the thraldom of sin and brought into union with God. For the spirit of man, that in knowledge of the truth revealed through the Son can contemplate the Father and the eternal home, there is a real freedom that no power can restrain. All through this context the thoughts pass unbidden to the teaching of St. Paul, the great apostle of freedom. There could be no fuller illustration of the words than is furnished in his life. He, like St. Peter and St. John (Rom. i. 1, e.g.; 2 Pet. i. 1; Rev. i. 1), had learnt to regard himself as a “bondservant,” but it was of Christ, “whose service is...
indeed. (37) I know that ye are Abraham’s seed; but ye seek to kill me, because my word hath no place in you. (38) I speak that which I have seen with my Father: and ye do that which ye have seen with your father. (39) They answered and said unto him, Abraham is our father. Jesus saith unto them, If ye were Abraham’s children, ye would do the works of Abraham. (40) But now ye seek to kill me, a man that hath told you the truth, which I have heard of God: this did not Abraham. (41) Ye do the deeds of your father. Then said they to him, We be not born

to represent in English, and which our version altogether omits. It is not simply “and ye do,” but “and ye therefore, or accordingly, do.” It is the same principle of union between Father and Son which directs His work, which is to reveal God, and their work, of which the seeking to kill Him is an instance.

(38) They answered and said unto him, Abraham is our father.—They feigned the meaning which has not yet been expressed (comp. verse 44), and claim the descent from Abraham which He has already allowed (verse 37).

If ye were Abraham’s children, ye would do the works of Abraham.—Almost all the better MSS. read, “If ye are,” for “If ye were.” This must mean, “If ye are Abraham’s children—but the supposition is excluded, for ye would do the works of Abraham, and this is opposed to fact.” They are the physical seed of the patriarch, but they are not the ethical children, for the true child would bear the moral impress of the father which would be seen in his works. The thought of the previous verse is again present here.

The distinction between “seed” and “children” is another instance of an idea which meets us in this section, and was developed in the writings of S. Paul. (Comp. Rom. ix. 7 et seq.)

(40) But now ye seek to kill me—i.e., As a matter of fact, in opposition to the conduct which would characterise the true children of Abraham, ye are seeking to kill Me. (Comp. Note on verse 37.)

A man that hath told you the truth, which I have heard (better, which I heard) from God.—The term “a man,” expresses His revelation, by means of human form, of the divine truth which He heard in the pre-human state (verse 38). The crime of seeking to kill Him is aggravated by the fact that He was One who came to tell them truth, and that from God. They seek to destroy the human life which for the sake of humanity He has assumed.

This did not Abraham.—It is usual to explain these words by a reference to Abraham’s receptivity of the divine truth and messengers (see Gen. xi.; xiv.; xviii.; xxiii.); but they probably point to the whole course of the patriarchal life as directly opposed to the spirit of those who claim to be his children.

(41) Ye do the deeds of your father.—It is better to read works rather than “deeds,” as in verse 39. They did not the works of Abraham. They did the works of that father, who is now more clearly pointed out, but still not named. Before, when he was referred to (verse 35), they could answer that Abraham was their father; but the fact is now clear that they are not the true children of Abraham (verses 39, 40). They see that a spiritual father is intended, and they will claim God as their Father.

We be not born of fornication.—The meaning of this is to be found in the fact that the word became in the Old Testament prophets a frequent symbol for idolatry. (Comp. Isa. i. 21; Jer. ii. 20, and iii. 8, 9; Ezek. xvi.; Hos. i. 2 (especially), ii. 4, and iii. 11.) They,
of fornication; we have one Father, even God. (42) Jesus said unto them, If God were your Father, ye would love me: for I proceeded forth and came from God; neither came I of myself, but he sent me. (43) Why do ye not understand my speech? even because ye cannot hear my word. (44) Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father

as distinguished from the nations among whom they dwelt, had maintained a pure monotheism, and had never been idolaters, or children born of spiritual fornication.

We have one Father, even God.—"We" is strongly expressive, expressing their pride in the theocracy, and their spiritual superiority to other nations. There may be in this pride also a touch of the scorn with which they asked "Will He go unto the dispersion of the Gentiles?" (chap. viii. 35), or with which they called His person into question, as they did in every discussion (verse 48). "Howbeit every nation made gods of their own, and put them in the high places which the Samaritans had made, every nation in their cities wherein they dwelt." This is the historian's account of the spiritual paternity of the Samaritans, and these Jews may well have felt their superiority in contrast with their neighbours. (See the whole passage in 2 Kings xviii. 26—41, especially verses 30, 31.)

(42) If God were your Father, ye would love me.—This follows because they would then be in a relationship of spiritual affinity to Him. God's children would bear the spiritual image of their Father, and would love Him who came from God, but they were seeking to kill Him (verse 40).

I proceeded forth and came from God.—Better, am come, am here. His presence with them was the result of His proceeding from God. As the Son of God He had eternal fellowship with the Father. The Incarnation was not the mission of one whose existence was separate from that of God, but it was the mission of the Son who proceeded from the Father. (Comp. chap. xvi. 27 et seq.)

Neither came I of myself, but he sent me.—Literally, for not even of Myself am I come, but He sent Me; as opposed to the thought that His origin was distinct from the Father. His coming was not His own act, but was a mission from God to the world.

But if He is sent from God, if He is present with them from God, if He proceeded from the Father, it must be that all who are true children of God would recognise and love Him.

It is important to note here that in our Lord's own words there is an assertion of the oneness of nature and of will with that of the Father, and yet the distinction of person is maintained. He is come from God, but He proceeded from the divine essence. He proceeded forth, and yet He was sent.

(43) Why do ye not understand my speech, ... my word.—The distinction between "speech" (the form) and "word" (the matter which was spoken) is rightly preserved. Comp. chap. xii. 48, "the word that I have spoken." A good instance of the meaning of "speech" is in Matt. xxv. 73, "thy speech bewrayeth thee." From verse 33 onwards, they had constantly misunderstood His expressions. The reason is that the subject-matter of His discourse is altogether above them. He is speaking of spiritual things, which are spiritually discerned. They, if children of the Father whom they claimed, would recognise these spiritual truths and know the language of home.

Ye cannot hear.—Comp. Note on chap. vii. 60. The sense is, "Ye cannot hear, so as to receive and obey," He supplies the answer to His own question. In the following verses (44—47), He expresses this answer more fully.

(44) Ye are of your father the devil.—"Ye" is emphatic. "Ye who have claimed Abraham and God as your father. Ye are of the father, but that father is the devil." The possessive pronoun (your) is not expressed in the Greek, and the form of the sentence is one which would have required it if it were included in the sense. The father who has been referred to in verses 38 and 41 is now definitely named. The relation between father and son is maintained, but the father of the thoughts and acts of those to whom He speaks was not God, not Abraham, but the devil.

And the lusts of your father ye will do.—Better, ye desire to do, ye will to do. The verb is not an auxiliary, as it appears to be in our version, but expresses the determination of the will. (Comp. Notes on chaps. v. 40 and vii. 17.)

He was a murderer from the beginning.—Comp. Wisd. ii. 23, 24, "For God created man to be immortal, and made him to be an image of His own eternity. Nevertheless, through envy of the devil came death into the world, and they that do hold of his side do find it." So St. Paul, "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin" (Rom. v. 12). The Fall was the murder of the human race; and it is in reference to this, of which the fratricide in the first family was a signal result, that the Tempter is called a murderer from the beginning (see Note on chap. i. 1). "Cain was of that wicked one, and slew his brother." (Comp. Notes on 1 John iii. 8—12, where the thought is expanded.) The reference to the murderer is suggested here by the fact that the Jews had been seeking to kill our Lord (verse 40). They are true to the nature which their father had from the beginning.

And abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him.—Better, and standeth not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. The word is not that which we have before had in the sense of "abide" (see Note on chap. v. 38), and the tense of the verb is present in meaning. The words do not refer to the fall of the devil, which is here implied but not stated, but to his constant character. He has no place in the sphere of the truth; it is not the region of his action and outer life; and the result of this is that there is no truth in the sphere of his thought and inner life. Had he been true, he would have come to stand in the light and life of truth.

When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own.—This is in contrast to the work of Christ (verses 28, 40) and to the work of the Holy Spirit (Note on chap. xvi. 13.) The Holy Spirit will not speak of Himself; He came to speak the truth which He heard from God. The devil speaketh a lie (comp. Gen. iii.), and this is of his own (see Note on Matt. xii. 35).

For he is a liar, and the father of it.—Better, and the father of the liar. This is probably
God's Children would hear

ST. JOHN, VIII.

the Voice of God.

of it. (45) And because I tell you the truth, ye believe me not. (46) Which of you convinceth me of sin? and if I say the truth, why do ye not believe me? (47) He that is of God heareth God's words: ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not of God. (48) Then answered the Jews, and said unto him, Say we not well that thou art a Samaritan, and hast a devil? (49) Jesus answered, I have not a devil; but I honour my Father, and ye do dishonour me. (50) And because I tell you the truth—The pronoun is full of emphatic meaning. And I, as contrary to him, because I tell you the truth, as contrary to the lie which is his characteristic.

Ye believe me not—i.e., ye believe not what I say. It does not mean, Ye believe not on Me, but Ye accept not the truth which I speak. There is something startling in this sharp opposition of truth and unbelief. To speak the truth is commonly to command belief. The mind of man is so constituted that truth is the first object of its search. Here was perfect truth presented to men, and they refused to accept it, because it was the truth, and they were themselves, children of him who was a liar.

Which of you convinceth me of sin?—He appeals to their knowledge of His sinless life, as in verse 29 He asserted His own knowledge of entire conformity to His Father's will. It is an appeal that spotless purity alone could make, and is His own testimony uttered in the dignity of certain knowledge. (Comp. 1 John iii. 9.)

If I say the truth, why do ye not believe me?—We may suppose that the last question was probably followed by a pause, during which any one might have answered the challenge. No one of all who had watched Him in Galilee and Judea dared utter a syllable. Their silence is the seal to His own testimony. But if He is thought of by these as without sin, they cannot think of His words as untrue. They admit, then, that He speaks the truth, and yet they do not believe. On the absolute sinlessness of Christ, comp. 1 John iii. 5; 2 Cor. v. 21; 1 Pet. i. 19; i. 22.

He that is of God heareth God's words.—Again He answers the question which He has Himself asked, and gives more fully the same reason which He gave in verse 43. In verse 44 He asserted that they were of the father the devil, and therefore lived to do evil: in the same way who is of God does the will of God, and hears the words of God. The words of God are those which He has been speaking unto them (verse 26). Here, then, is the answer to the question, "Why do ye not believe Me?" Rabbis and priests, teachers of the Law, judges of truth, offerers of sacrifice, keepers of feasts, worshippers in synagogues and Temple—they were all this; but they were not "of God."

Say we not well that thou art a Samaritan, and hast a devil?—The words imply that the saying was customary among the Pharisees. The knowledge of this, and the simple way in which the fact is told, is one of many instances of the writer's minute acquaintance with what was said and done by the leaders of the Jerusalem party. There is no instance given of the term "Samaritan" being applied to our Lord, but the term itself is frequently used by the Rabbis as one of opprobrium. The history of the fourth chapter is at once suggested to our minds, and was probably not absent from theirs. (Comp. Note on chap. vii. 35.) There may have been facts more immediately connected with this very Feast of Tabernacles present to their minds, which are unknown to us. The going up secretly of chap. vii. 10, must almost certainly have been through Samaria. He had kept the last Passover in the despised Galilee (chap. vi. 4). Had He kept Tabernacles in the hated Samaria? It is worth noting that the word Samaritan, in the singular, as applied to an individual, occurs but twice, except here and in chap. iv. One instance is in the parable spoken at no long interval after the present discourse (Luke x. 25—37). The other tells us that the only one of the ten lepers who turned back to glorify God "was a Samaritan" (Luke xvii. 16).

The rendering, "and hast a devil," is one which, probably, cannot now be improved. Wyclif's word here is "fiend," which in this sense is obsolete. But every reader of the Greek must feel how little our English word can represent the two distinct ideas, represented by two distinct words here and in verse 44. "Demon," used originally for the lower divinities, and not unfrequently for the gods, passed in the Scriptures, which taught the knowledge of the true God, into the sense of an evil spirit. Thus the word which could represent the attendant genius of Socrates came to express what we speak of as demoniacal possession, and the supposed power of witchcraft and sorcery. Socrates is made to say, "For this reason, therefore, rather than for any other, he calls them demons, because they were prudent and knowing" (daemones, Plato, Cratylus, xxiii.). The history of Simon Magus reminds us that the people of Samaria, from the least to the greatest, had been for a long time under the influence of his sorceries (Acts viii. 9 et seq.), and it is probable that there is a special connection in the words here, "Thou art a Samaritan, and hast a demon." (Comp. Encyclexus III. on Notes to St. Matthew's Gospel, p. 185.)

Jesus answered, I have not a devil.—One of the disciples, who was probably present on this day, and heard these words, speaks of Christ our example, "From henceforth I am called the Son of Man," When He suffered He threatened not; but committed Himself to Him that judgeth righteously " (1 Pet. ii. 23). The charge of being a Samaritan He passes over. His words soon after taught that a Samaritan may be more truly the child of God than priest or Levite is.
And I seek not mine own glory: there is one that seeketh and judgeth. (50)

Verily, verily, I say unto you, If a man keep my saying, he shall never see death. (51)

Then said the Jews unto him, Now we know that thou hast a devil. Abraham is dead, and the prophets; and thou sayest, If a man keep my saying, he shall never taste of death. (52)

I honour my Father, and ye do dishonour me.—There is a connection between all His words and the unseen world. It is the union of Father and Son, and His life had been the constant honouring of the Father, whose will it was His meat to do (chap. iv. 31). Their works and words were as constantly—and this last columny is an instance of it—dishonouring Him. The contrast suggests that this dishonour was not of Him only; but also of the Father whom He honoured, and whom they claimed as their God.

And I seek not mine own glory.—The words are immediately connected with those which have preceded. They dishonoured Him. This to one who sought His own glory would have been matter of concern. For Him whose whole life was one of self-denial, their dishonour finds nothing which it can wound. His words repeat what He had taught them before. (See Notes on chaps. v. 41 and vii. 18.)

There is one that seeketh and judgeth.—Comp. chap. v. 45. The thought here is that though He Himself seeks not His own glory, the Father seeketh for the honour of the Son, and judgeth between Him and those who dishonour Him. The result of the judgment as to those who keep not His word is expressed in the next verse; and as to Himself in chap. xvi. 10.

If a man keep my saying, he shall never see death.—Better, If a man keep My word. Our version obscures the close connection with the thought of “continuing in His word” in verse 31; and also that with “He that heareth my word,” in chap. v. 24. This last passage is the key to the words before us. Here, as there, the thought of judgment and death leads to the opposite thought of coming not into judgment, but passing out of death into life. Here, as there, the believer is thought of as possessing the true spiritual life which cannot see death, but shall pass into the fuller spiritual life hereafter.

Another interpretation of the phrase rendered “He shall never see death,” is “he shall not see death for ever”—i.e., “he shall indeed die, but that death only in this world, it shall not be in the world which is to come.” This is the thought in the collect in “The Order for the Burial of the Dead” . . . “our Lord Jesus Christ, who is the resurrection and the life; in whom whosoever believeth shall live, though he die; and whosoever liveth and believeth in him shall not die eternally.”

The following are the only passages in St. John where exactly the same formula is used, and a comparison of them will make it clear that it means, as does the Hebrew formula on which it is based, that which we express by “never,” or “certainly never,” “by no means ever,” for the negative is in its strongest form (chaps. iv. 14, verse 52 in this chap., x. 28, xi. 26, xiii. 8). The first and last of these passages refer to subjects (“shall never think,” “shall never wash my feet”), which do not admit any possibility of doubt. The others are all parallel to the present text, in thought as well as in word. In all there is the fuller meaning that for the believer who now has spiritual life, and continues to live in communion with God, there cannot be death. “He shall never see death.” What we think of as death is but a sleep. (See Note on chap. xi. 11.) Death has been swallowed up of life, and physical death is thought of, in its true sense, as an entering into life.

Abraham is dead, and the prophets.—They still “do not understand His speech,” and take His words in a merely physical sense. In that sense they were impossible, for they are contradicted by the fact that death came to the great Patriarch and the prophets, and if to them, then surely, much more to ordinary men. They regard it as conclusive that their assertion in verse 45 is correct. No one, except a man under the influence of a demon, would make an assertion so opposed to the almost unbroken experience of mankind.

If a man keep my saying.—Better, If a man keep My word, as in last verse.

He shall never taste of death.—The expression is stronger than that which He had used, “shall never see death.” They use it to put in the strongest way their wonder at the impossible promise which He had uttered. It has occurred before in Matt. xvi. 28. (See Note there.) It occurs again in the New Testament only in Heb. ii. 9.

Art thou greater than our father Abraham, which is dead?—The question is exactly the same, with the substitution of “Abraham” for “Jacob,” as that asked by the Samaritan woman in chap. iv. 12 (see Note). “Surely thou art not greater than our father Abraham, who indeed died?”

Whom makest thou thyself?—’If Abraham, who received God’s covenant, himself died, and if the prophets, who uttered the oracles of God, themselves died, what kind of person dost Thou assert Thyself to be that Thy word shall deliver men from death?’ The same phrase occurs again in chaps. x. 33, xix. 7.

If I honour myself, my honour is nothing.—The word rendered “honour” is not the same as that in verse 49. It is better to read glorify here. Following all the better MSS., the tense is past. We have then, If I shall have glorified Myself, My glory is nothing. Stress is to be laid upon the pronoun. “If I, for My part, as distinct from the Father, shall have glorified Myself,”

It is my Father that honoureth me.—Better, as before, . . . glorifieth Me. This is the answer to their question, “Whom makest Thou Thyself?” The attribute of life in Himself, and the power to communicate this to those who kept His word, was the gift of the Father to the Son. (See Note on chap. x. 26.)

Of whom ye say, that he is your God.—Some of the better MSS., and most modern editors, read . . . “He is our God.” The identification of the Father with the God of Israel is important. It may be, as
The Joy of Abraham at His Day.

ST. JOHN, VIII.

Jews unto him, Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham? (58) Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I am. (59) Then took they up stones to cast at him: but Jesus hid himself, and went out of the temple,

(53) yet ye have not known him; but I know him; and if I should say, I know him not, I shall be a liar like unto you: but I know him, and keep his saying. (56) Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day: and he saw it, and was glad. (57) Then said the great Patriarch is spoken of as knowing and rejoicing in the fact of the Incarnation. The faculty of reason cannot explain how it is, but the faculty of faith can receive the truth that there is a “communion of saints,” and finds in it a comfort which robs separation of its bitterness, and a power which strengthens all the motives to a holy and devoted life. (Comp. Luke xvi. 19—31; Heb. xii. 1.)

(55) Yet ye have not known him; but I know him.—The frequency of lip-assertion was not accompanied by any true heart-knowledge. The Father who glorified Him was the God whom they professed to serve. Their question, “Whom maketh Thou Thyself?” has its explanation in the fact that this service was independent of any real knowledge of God. The two verbs “know” and “known” here do not represent the same Greek word. More exactly the rendering should be, And ye have not come to know Him: but I know Him. The one clause expresses acquired recognition; the other expresses immediate essential know-[150:73]—Wisdom of God. To assert this knowledge is to make Himself greater than Abraham and the prophets; but there is untruth in silence as well as in utterance, and His very truthfulness demands the assertion.

But I know Him, and keep His saying.—Or better, His word, as in verses 51, 52. Again the positive statement is made in the certainty of His full knowledge, and this is followed by a statement of the observance of the same condition of communion with the Father which He had made necessary for communion of the disciples with Himself.

(56) Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day.—They had asked in scorn if He were greater than their father Abraham (verse 53). His words have shown that He was. He now, with the thoughts of verse 39 still present, contrasts the exultation of him whom they claimed as father, when he saw from afar the Messianic advent, with their rejection of the Messiah who is actually among them. Abraham realised the fullness of the promises made to him, and believed in the Lord that the blessing should be fulfilled to his seed. He, too, had kept God’s word, and in the true sense had not seen death (see Gen. xv. 1—6; xvii.; xvi. 1—6; and xxii. 15). The words, “My day,” are used, as in Luke xvii. 22, for the manifestation of Christ on earth.

And he saw it, and was glad.—This is the historic fulfilment of the joy which looked forward to the day of Christ. Our Lord reveals here a truth of the unseen world that is beyond human knowledge or explanation. From that world Abraham was cognisant of the facts of the Incarnation, and saw in it the accomplishment of the promise which had brought joy to shepherds watching their flocks, as the Patriarch had watched his; there came an angel, as angels had come to him, and a multitude of the heavenly host, exulting in the good news to men. In that joy Abraham had part. The truth comes as a ray of light across the abyss which separates the saints in heaven from saints on earth. As in the parable, where Lazarus is in Abraham’s bosom, the rich man is represented as knowing and caring for his brethren on earth, so here some have supposed, that the phrase, “He is our God,” belonged to common liturgical forms or hymns, and was thus frequently on their lips.

(55) Yet ye have not known him; but I know him.—The frequency of lip-assertion was not accompanied by any true heart-knowledge. The Father who glorified Him was the God whom they professed to serve. Their question, “Whom maketh Thou Thyself?” has its explanation in the fact that this service was independent of any real knowledge of God. The two verbs “know” and “known” here do not represent the same Greek word. More exactly the rendering should be, And ye have not come to know Him: but I know Him. The one clause expresses acquired recognition; the other expresses immediate essential know-

(56) Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day: and he saw it, and was glad. (57) Then said the Father of its bitterness, and a power which strengthens all the subtleties of later days, by which reason cannot explain how it is, but the faculty of faith

(58) Before Abraham was, I am.—Better, Before Abraham was born, I am. (Comp. Note on chap. vi. 6; and see another striking instance in Luke vi. 36, “Become ye merciful as your Father also is merciful.”) Here they ask in wonder, not unmixed with scorn, if He was coeval with Abraham. The answer is that Abraham, like all men, came into being. There was a time when he was not. But there was never a time when the Son of God was not. In the time before Abraham, in the eternity before time (chap. i. 1), He was still was, No word which expresses becoming can be used of His existence. He is the I AM, present equally for the rebuilding of the Temple, in which they are, to cast at the Lord of the Temple. (Comp. chap. x. 33.)

Going through the midst of them, and so passed by.—These words are omitted in a majority of the better MSS. They were probably inserted in
The Question about the Man born Blind.

ST. JOHN, IX.

A.D. 32.

The disciples asked him, saying, Master, who did sin, this man, or his parents, that he was born blind? (2) Jesus answered, Neither hath this man sinned, nor his parents. (3) The form of the question puts two alternatives on precisely the same grounds; and we have no right therefore to assume that one of them is excluded by the questioners themselves. The fact of sin is stated as beyond question. The problem is, "Was the sin that of the man himself, or of his parents?" The latter alternative is familiar to us, and daily experience shows us that within limits it holds good in both the moral and the physical worlds. It was clearly taught in the Second Commandment, and there is abundant evidence that the belief was at this time widely spread. We have greater difficulty in tracing the origin of the former alternative. It is not easy to accept the view that they thought of sin in his mother's womb, though it seems certain that the Jews currently interpreted such passages as Gen. xxv. 22, and Ps. ii. 7 in this sense. That a more or less definite belief in the transmigration of souls was common among Jews at the time of our Lord's ministry, is made probable by references in Philo and Josephus. We know it was a doctrine of the Essenes and of the Cabbala; and we find it in the nearly contemporary words of the Wisdom of Solomon, "Yes rather being good, I came into a body unfledged." (vii. 20). Still it has been urged that it is not likely that such a belief would have made its way among the fishermen of Galilee. We have to remember, however, that among the disciples there are now men of Jerusalem as well as of Galilee, and that questions which men found hard to understand were constantly being raised and answered in the Rabbinic schools. In the meetings of the yearly festivals the answers of great Rabbis would be talked over and become generally known, and be handed on as maxims to those who knew little of the principle on which they were based. It was, then, probably with some thought that the life in this maimed body may not have been the first stage of his existence, that they ask, Did this man sin?

CHAPTER IX.—(1) And as Jesus passed by, he saw a man which was blind from his birth. (2) And his disciples asked him, saying, Master, who did sin, this man, or his parents, that he was born blind? (3) Jesus answered, Neither hath this man sinned, nor his parents. It is hard to understand were constantly being raised and answered in the Rabbinic schools. In the meetings of the yearly festivals the answers of great Rabbis would be talked over and become generally known, and be handed on as maxims to those who knew little of the principle on which they were based. It was, then, probably with some thought that the life in this maimed body may not have been the first stage of his existence, that they ask, Did this man sin?

A man which was blind from his birth.—The fact was well known, and was probably publicly proclaimed by the man himself or his parents (verse 20) as an aggravation of his misery, and as a plea for the alms of passers by. Of the six miracles connected with blindness which are recorded in the Gospels, this is the only case described as blindness from birth. In this lies its special character; for "since the world began, was it not heard that any man opened the eyes of one that was born blind?" (verse 32).

Who did sin, this man, or his parents?—The disciples noticed that He looked at the man, and it may be that He halted as He was walking by. Their attention is directed to the sufferer, and with suffering they connect the idea of sin. They ask a question which may have come to them many times before, and which has in various forms come to men's hearts many times since. Some of them may have heard it discussed in Rabbinic schools, and may have wished to know what answer He whom they had come to regard as greater than the Rabbis, would give. But it is a question not of the learned only, but of men generally, and those who now ask it do not propound it as a matter for discussion, but as a mystery of human life brought to them in all its darkness, and for which they seek a solution at His hands. His teaching on the wider questions of the existence of evil and the connection of sin and suffering, though coming in the order of events after these words, and in part probably arising out of them, has in the order of the record occurred before them, and has been already dealt with in Notes on Luke xii. 1-5. What is special to the question, as it meets us here, is that what is deemed to be the punishment had come with birth, before possibility of thought or action, and therefore, as we think, before probability of sin.

The disciples noticed that He looked at the man, and it may be that He halted as He was walking by. Their attention is directed to the sufferer, and with suffering they connect the idea of sin. They ask a question which may have come to them many times before, and which has in various forms come to men's hearts many times since. Some of them may have heard it discussed in Rabbinic schools, and may have wished to know what answer He whom they had come to regard as greater than the Rabbis, would give. But it is a question not of the learned only, but of men generally, and those who now ask it do not propound it as a matter for discussion, but as a mystery of human life brought home to them in all its darkness, and for which they seek a solution at His hands. His teaching on the wider questions of the existence of evil and the connection of sin and suffering, though coming in the order of events after these words, and in part probably arising out of them, has in the order of the record occurred before them, and has been already dealt with in Notes on Luke xii. 1-5. What is special to the question, as it meets us here, is that what is deemed to be the punishment had come with birth, before possibility of thought or action, and therefore, as we think, before probability of sin.

The disciples noticed that He looked at the man, and it may be that He halted as He was walking by. Their attention is directed to the sufferer, and with suffering they connect the idea of sin. They ask a question which may have come to them many times before, and which has in various forms come to men's hearts many times since. Some of them may have heard it discussed in Rabbinic schools, and may have wished to know what answer He whom they had come to regard as greater than the Rabbis, would give. But it is a question not of the learned only, but of men generally, and those who now ask it do not propound it as a matter for discussion, but as a mystery of human life brought home to them in all its darkness, and for which they seek a solution at His hands. His teaching on the wider questions of the existence of evil and the connection of sin and suffering, though coming in the order of events after these words, and in part probably arising out of them, has in the order of the record occurred before them, and has been already dealt with in Notes on Luke xii. 1-5. What is special to the question, as it meets us here, is that what is deemed to be the punishment had come with birth, before possibility of thought or action, and therefore, as we think, before probability of sin.
parents: but that the works of God should be made manifest in him. (4) I must work the works of him that sent me, while it is day: the night cometh, when no man can work. (5) As long as

But that the works of God should be made manifest in him.—They had sought to trace back the result of sin which they saw before them to a defile. He will trace back to the region of the divine counsel, where purpose and result are one. Evil cannot be resolved into a higher good; it is the result of the choice exercised by freedom, and without freedom goodness could not be virtue. Permitted by God, it is yet overruled by Him. It has borne its fearful fruit in the death and curse of humanity, but its works have led to the manifestation of the works of God in the divine plan of redemption. It is so in this instance. The blindness of this beggar will have its result, and therefore in the divine counsel had its purpose, in the light which will dawn upon the spiritual as well as upon the physical blindness, and from him will dawn upon the world.

(4) I must work the works of him that sent me, while it is day.—The better reading is probably that which has ee, instead of “I,” and perhaps also that which has us, instead of “me”; but this latter change is not so well supported by MS. authority. The clause would read then, We must work the works of Him that sent Me (or &e) while it is day. He identifies the disciples with Himself in the redemptive work of His mission. There is before them a striking instance of the power of evil. He and they are there to manifest the power of good. They must gird themselves to the task. If we are right in placing the whole section from chaps. vii. 37—x. 21 on the same great day of the Feast (comp. Note on verse 14), then this work must have come near the close of the day. The sun sinking to the west may have reminded them that the day was passing away, and that the night was approaching. He was reminded of the day of life, and the night of death. He will not be long in the world (verse 5). That night will be the close of His human work, and the shadows of evening are already falling upon Him.

The night cometh, when no man can work.—He does not except even Himself from the proverbial law. The day of opportunity passes, never to return. His own great work of doing the work of Him that sent Him, could only be done when that day was present. It has, of course, been ever done in the work of His church under the guidance of His Spirit; but the work of His own human activity on earth ceased when the night came. Comp. chap. xi. 9 for this thought of the hours of the day.

(5) As long as I am in the world, I am the light of the world.—Better, when I am in the world. The thought is that the two things necessarily co-exist. He is the true Light, and this true Light cannot be in the world without shining in its darkness. (Comp. Note on chap. 1. 5.) The thought is here closely connected with His teaching in the Temple but a short time before (chap. viii. 12, “I am the Light of the world”), and also with the removal of physical and spiritual darkness which immediately followed.

(6) And he anointed the eyes of the blind man with the clay.—The words “blind man” are omitted in some of the older MSS. The marginal rendering, and He spread the clay upon the eyes of the blind man (or, upon his eyes), is to be preferred.

I am in the world, I am the light of the world. (6) When he had thus spoken, he spat on the ground, and made clay of the spittle, and anointed the eyes of the blind man with the clay,

The details given in this and the next verse are evidently to be regarded as part of the sign. They impressed themselves as such upon the eye-witnesses, and they have been recorded as such by them, to be sought by the interpreter. At the outset we are met by the undoubted fact that our Lord here made use of means which, in part at least, were natural, and found their place in the ordinary prescriptions of the day. We know from the pages of Pliny, and Tacitus, and Suetonius, that the salva jejuna was held to be a remedy in cases of blindness, and that the same remedy was used by the Jews is established by the writings of the Rabbis. That clay was so used is not equally certain, but this may be regarded as the vehicle by means of which the saliva was applied. Here, then, as elsewhere, we may recognise the Divine manifested by means of the human, and see the ordinary remedy of every-day life blessed to meet a case that was beyond human power. Physicians had applied such means commonly to cases of post-natal blindness, but congenital blindness had always been regarded as incurable, and no instance to the contrary had ever been heard of (verse 32). The Great Physician, then, by using the ordinary means, will teach men that the healing powers of nature are His gracious gift, and that they are increased at the Giver’s will. Our daily sustenance in health and strength, our restored power after sickness or accident, the whole of ordinary life, which we too commonly connect only with ordinary means, is lifted to the higher region of union with Him in whom we live, and move, and have our being.

Another interpretation sees in the use of clay a symbol which is to be traced to the first Creation, when man was formed from the dust of the earth. We find this as early as Irenaeus, and it may well, therefore, represent an oral explanation, going back to the days of the Evangelist himself. The thought would be that our Lord will here exercise the same creative power as that which made man, and will complete, by the gift of sight, this man, who had hitherto been maimed and without the chief organ of sense.

The use of means by which the healing power is conveyed is common to this instance with that of the blind man at Bethsaida (Mark viii. 22—26), and that of the deaf and dumb man in Decapolis (Mark vii. 32—37); while the two blind men in the house (Matt. x. 27—31), and the two blind men at Jericho (Matt. xx. 29—34), are touched and receive their sight. The reader is referred to the Notes on these passages of St. Matthew and St. Mark. Here it will be enough to observe that in each case the loss of a channel of communication between the individual man and the outer world is compensated by some special means which may help to assure him of the presence of the true Healer, and may furnish a foundation for his faith and hope. The deaf man cannot hear the tones of a voice that tells of mercy and love, but the touch applied to the ear may in part convey the same gracious truths. The blind man cannot see the look of compassion which others can see, but the saliva or the clay applied to the eye gives force to the word which is heard by the ear. In every case we should remember that the means is chiefly moral, preparing in the sufferer a mental condition which can
The Pool of Siloam.

(7) And said unto him, Go, wash in the pool of Siloam, (which is by interpretation, Sent.) He went his way therefore, and washed, and came seeing.

(8) The neighbours therefore, and they which before had seen him that he was blind, said, Is not this he that sat and begged? (6) Some said, This is he: others said, He is like him: but he said, I am he. (10) Therefore said they unto him, How were thine eyes opened? (11) He answered and said, A man that is called Jesus made clay, and anointed mine eyes, and said unto me, Go to the pool which is by interpretation, Sent.—St. John we adopt the better reading, 

receive the gift of healing, and that the physical gift is itself regarded as a stage in the spiritual education. The wisest physicians of the body, and the wisest physicians of the soul, have alike sought to follow in the steps of Him who is their common Master. There are conditions of physical disease for which the best medicines would be faith, and love, and hope—a mind at peace with itself and with God. There are morbid states of spiritual life that have their cause in physical derangement, and would find their truest remedy in the healthy tone of a restored and vigorous body.

(7) Go, wash in the pool of Siloam.—Comp. Notes on chap. v. 2 ("Bethesda"), and on Luke xiii. 4 ("the tower in Siloam"). The locality is almost without doubt that now known by the Arabic form of the same name, the Birka Sielón, which is in the lower Tyropoeon valley, between the Temple mountain and Mount Zion. It is about a quarter of a mile from the present city wall, but in the time of our Lord the wall extended up to it (Jos. Wars, v. 4, § 1; so the Antonine Itinerary in the fourth century). The place is frequently mentioned by Josephus, and there is every reason to believe that in the present pool we have the Siloah of Neh. iii. 15, the Shiloah of Isa. viii. 6, and the Siloam of the present passage. The form of the word here used by St. John is that found in the Greek translation of both the Old Testament passages.

The words "wash in," mean literally, wash into, that is, "wash so that the clay from the eyes will pass into the tank."

The attempt to show that in the waters of Siloam, too, we have an ordinary remedial agent, must be abandoned, at least as far as regards blindness. The command recalls that to Naaman the Syrian (2 Kings v. 10), and not improbably recalled it to the mind of the blind man. In any case, it is a further stage in his spiritual education. It is a demand on the faith which realises the presence of the Power to heal. The place is chosen, perhaps, as a well-known spot, or as one at some little distance, so as to afford time for reflection and a test for obedience. It may be, however, that there is another reason for the choice. The pool of Siloam was bound up with all the religious feelings of the Feast of Tabernacles. A solemn procession went each morning to it, and carried water from it to the Temple. That water had already led to the teaching of the gift of the Spirit to every man who should receive the Messiah (see Notes on chap. vii. 37 et seq.), uttered, perhaps, on this very day (comp. verse 1). There would be attached, then, to the pool of Siloam a sacred significance that would be in itself a help to faith.

(8) They which before had seen him that he was blind.—The better reading is, that he was a beggar. The persons are the neighbours, who from living near knew all about him, and those who used to see him at the spot where he sat begging. Both classes, of course, knew that he was blind.

Is not this he that sat and begged?—Better, Is not this he that sitteth and beggeth? The tenses are present, marking his usual custom.

(9) He is like him.—The more probable reading is, No; but he is like him. It is not that these speakers agree with some hesitation with those who assert the identity. They oppose to it their own opinion, that it is a case of resemblance only. He himself sets the question at rest by declaring that he is the same person.

The verse, and indeed the whole narrative, is one of the many striking instances of the natural form which is taken by the narrative of one personally acquainted with all the facts. We may suppose that St. John recorded this from the lips of the man himself. We can still see the whole picture,—the man returning, observed by one or two neighbours, who spread the story; the excitement of their curiosity; the question whether he is really the same; some struck by the points of identity in the features, and declaring that he is; others struck by the features of the opened eyes lighting up the whole face, and declaring that he is not; the simple declaration of the man himself, which is at once accepted as decisive—all this passes before us just as it occurred.

(10) How were thine eyes opened?—They wonder at the change wrought in him, and seek to know how it happened. The question is important if we adopt the better reading, beggar, for "blind," in verse 8, as showing that they knew he had been blind, the moment they knew that he was the same person who used to sit and beg.

(11) A man that is called Jesus.—Some of the better MSS. read, "The Man that is called Jesus," implying that He would be known to the blind man and his friends. They can hardly have failed to hear of His teaching at the feast.
They bring him to the Pharisees.

The Divination among them.

They bring him to the Pharisees. — He gives the details in order, omitting the spitting on the ground, which he had not seen.

And I received sight. — The Greek word means exactly, “to see again.” The power, though given in this instance for the first time, was usually a restored power, and this is expressed in the word. This man uses the ordinary language of men, though, in strictness it was not applicable to his own case. This use of the word is, moreover, justified by other examples.

(12) I know not. — He had not returned to our Lord (verse 7), who was passing by when He spoke to him (verse 1), and by the time the man had gone to the pool and had returned would have gone beyond his knowledge.

(13) They brought to the Pharisees. — More exactly, They bring . . . . The present tense speaks of what they did, as the writer thinks of it in actual occurrence. Their question in the previous verse, and the fact stated in the following verse, seem to indicate that they did this in the spirit of opposition to our Lord. They may have been influenced also, as the parents were, by the agreement of the Jews to excommunicate any who should confess Christ (verse 22). By the term, “to the Pharisees,” we are not to understand the Sanhedrin, which did not meet on the Sabbath, and which is not spoken of by St. John as simply “the Pharisees,” but a body of the leading Pharisees who were the most bitter foes of Christ, and who seem at this time to have formed practically a permanent committee of the Sanhedrin, always ready to take counsel or action against Him. (Comp. Notes on chap. vii. 32, 43, 48.)

(14) And it was the sabbath day — i.e., most probably, the last day, that great day of the feast of chap. vii. 37. Nothing has taken place which makes it necessary to suppose any interval, and though the discourses seem long, they would have occupied but a short time in delivery. The whole narrative follows in unbroken order, which makes it difficult to suppose that a break intervened.

When Jesus made the clay. — This is mentioned as a service work which contravened the Sabbath law. The anointing the eyes with spittle on the Sabbath was specially forbidden by the decrees of the Rabbis. They held that no work of healing might be performed on the Sabbath except in cases of immediate danger.

On the question of our Lord’s relation to the Sabbath day, comp. Note on chap. v. 18 et seq., and on Matt. xii. 10; Luke xiii. 11–16, and xiv. 1–5.

(15) Then again the Pharisees also asked. — As the neighbours and acquaintances had done before (verse 10).

He said unto them, He put clay upon mine eyes. — The answer is the same as before, but briefer. It is that of a man who is answering against his will (comp. verse 27) and does not care to say more than he is obliged to.

And do see. — This differs from “I received sight” (verse 11). He now speaks as in conscious possession of the power to see. (Comp. verse 25.)

(16) This man is not of God, because he keepeth not the sabbath day. — See Note on verse 14, and reference there. Here the truth of the miracle is granted, but it is urged that the power by which it was wrought cannot be of God, because it was exercised on the Sabbath day. The inference is, that it was done by the influence of the power of evil.

Others said, How can a man that is a sinner do such miracles? — This question is asked by the better party among the Pharisees, represented, as we know, by Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathaea, and perhaps by Gamaliel. They see the inference implied in the earlier question, and appeal to the nature of the miracles wrought. Works of mercy, and love, and power, were not the product of a life of sin, or of communion with the powers of darkness. We find evidence of this better spirit among the Pharisees before, in the question of Nicodemus (chap. vii. 21). It has now extended to others. The teaching on the earlier work on the Sabbath (chap. v.) has led some among them, at least, to look with allowance upon this.

And there was a division among them. — Comp. Note on chap. vii. 40.

(17) They say unto the blind man again. — The question is not asked by either of the parties, for this must have been noted, but by the assembly generally. They who questioned him in verse 15, question him again now. They have differed among themselves, and they ask what impression the fact of the miracle had left upon him who was the object of it, with regard to the person of Him who had performed it.

What sayest thou of him, that he hath opened thine eyes? — Stress is laid on the pronoun. What sayest thou? He ought to know better than any one, seeing that his eyes had been opened, and this they admit, while the nature of his witness is uncertain; but immediately that is given they disbelieve the fact of the miracle, and soon reject with scorn him they question now (verse 34).

The English reader should observe the punctuation here, which rightly makes the question one. It is sometimes read as though it were, “What sayest thou of Him? that He hath opened thine eyes?” It is not, however, the fact which is here questioned, but the opinion of the man, based upon the fact, for the present assumed as true, which is called for.

He is a prophet. — The education of the man has been doing its work, and he is convinced that the power which has healed him is direct from God, and that the person who has exercised it is a messenger from God. His words are uttered in the brevity and calmness of clear conviction, and they are the direct negative to the
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They question the Parents, who refer them to the Man himself.

He said, He is a prophet. (18) But the Jews did not believe concerning him, that he had been blind, and received his sight, until they called the parents of him that had received his sight. (19) And they asked them, saying, Is this your son, who ye say was born blind? how then doth he now see? (20) His parents answered them and said, We know that this is our son, and that he was born blind: (21) but by what means he now seeth, we know not; or who hath opened his eyes, we know not: he is of age; ask him: he shall speak for himself. (22) These words spake his parents, because they feared the Jews: for the Jews had agreed already, that if any man did confess that he was Christ, he should be put out of the synagogue. (21) Therefore said his parents, He is of age; ask him. (24) Then again called they the man that was blind, and said unto him, Give God the praise: we know that this man is a

statement of the Pharisees. “This man is not from God.” (Comp. chaps. iii. 2, iv. 19, vi. 14.) It is important to note, that even in the language of the ordinary people, the word “prophet” did not mean simply a predictor of events in the future, but one who was the representative of God. He was not only or chiefly a “fore-teller,” but a “forth-teller,” declaring God’s truth, revealing His will and character, bearing the witness of divine works; but as the future is ever present to the divine counsels, prophecy, in the narrower sense, may be part of the work of the true prophet.

(19) But the Jews did not believe.—Better, The Jews therefore did not believe. The words are connected, as an inference, with those which precede. Because of this explanation of the fact, they are driven to the expedient of disbelieving the fact itself. The designation of those who take this position is remarkable. The substantives is not unexpressed, as in verse 17, nor is it “the Pharisees,” as in verse 18, but it is the term which we have met with again and again, as marking out the leaders of the Jerusalem party who were opposed to Christ. (Comp. Note on chap. i. 19.)

Until they called the parents.—After they have done so, they can affect to doubt the fact no longer (verse 20). But they hoped that the parents would from fear (verse 22) have given an answer which would have enabled them to deny the identity of person, or the fact of congenital blindness.

(19) Is this your son, who ye say was born blind?—The “ye” is emphatic; ye say he was born blind, as opposed to us, for we do not believe it. There are three questions. Is this your son? Do ye still say that he was born blind? which is incredible, as he now possesses the faculty of sight (verse 32). If you do, how do you account for the fact that he now sees?

How then doth he now see?—Their question means—“How does it come to pass, since he was born blind, that he all at once seeth?” The word rendered “now,” here and in verses 21 and 25, conveys the idea of the suddenness of the change which had taken place.

(20) We know that this is our son . . .—The two earlier questions of matter of fact they can answer with certainty. They know, as none besides themselves can know, that he was their son, and they know the painful truth that he was born blind.

(21) But by what means he now seeth.—Better, but how he now seeth. The answer is in the exact words of the question, which is not seen in our version. They will not pass beyond the plain matters of fact of which they were certain.

Or who hath opened his eyes.—They pass here to a fourth question, which was not asked, but which they see to be the real point which the Pharisees are...
sinner. (25) He answered and said, Whether he be a sinner or no, I know not: one thing I know, that, whereas I was blind, now I see. (26) Then said they to him again, What did he to thee? how opened he thine eyes? (27) He answered them, I have told you already, and ye did not hear: wherefore would ye hear it again? will ye also be His disciples? (25) Then they reviled him, and said, Thou art his disciple; but we are Moses' disciples. (29) We know that God spake unto Moses: as for this fellow, we know not from

true meaning. It is not "Give God the praise for your cure, instead of this Man, who is a sinner. Trace the gift to its true source, and give glory to the true Giver." This is wholly opposed to the context, for they are assuming that no cure has really taken place. The phrase is rather an adijuration calling upon the man to speak, as in God's presence, and confess the whole truth. (Comp. the words of Joshua to Achan, "My son, give, I pray thee, glory to the Lord God of Israel, and make confession unto Him; and tell me now what thou hast done; hide it not from me," Josh. vii. 19. Comp. also 1 Sam. vi. 5; Jer. xii. 16; 1 Esdr. ix. 8; Rev. xvi. 9.)

We know that this man is a sinner.—Some of them had said before that He was not from God, while others had felt that such miracles were inconsistent with the belief that He was a sinner. The man himself had declared his simple conviction that He was a prophet (verses 16 and 17). They now assert, with the emphasis of an authority which is beyond question, that they know Him to be a sinner.

(25) Whether he be a sinner or no, I know not.—The words, "or no," are added to the text, but rightly complete the meaning. He, like his parents, will confine himself to matters of fact coming under his own certain knowledge. They had declared authoritatively that they knew this Man to be one whose life was characterised by sin. He is convinced that this cannot be so (verses 31, 33), but he does not dispute their assertion; he simply makes his own, which cannot be gainsaid, and which cuts the ground from under them.

One thing I know.—For this use of "one thing" to mark the chief thing which is so important that all others are excluded, and it is left as the only one in the mind, comp. Mark x. 21 ("one thing thou lackest") and Luke x. 42 ("one thing is needful").

Whereas I was blind, now I see.—Better, Being a blind man, now I see. He places the two things in contrast. He was the well-known "blind man," whose experience of his own blindness had extended from birth to manhood. They declare that he has not been healed. He is conscious of his power to see, and this one thing he affirms. The difficulty is of their making; let them explain it as they think best.

(26) Then said they to him again.—Failing to establish their denial of the fact, they repeat their questionings as to the means used. They hope, it may be, to detect some difference in the accounts, or something which they can construe in a charge against our Lord; or, perhaps, as some have suggested, their repeated questions are merely to gain time or to combat their fear. His honest boldness is too much for their craft. Their simple, unvarnished answer, as in God's presence has been answered in a way they little expected, and the questions they now repeat are asked because they know not what to say.

(27) I have told you already, and ye did not hear.—The man becomes weary of this cross-questioning, the purpose of which is sufficiently clear to him.

Their first answer was in the fewest possible words (verse 15, compared with verse 7), and even these he will not repeat. There is some difficulty about the meaning of the word "hear" in the two clauses of this verse. When the man says "Ye did not hear," we naturally understand "did not heed;" but when he goes on to say, "Wherefore would ye hear it again?" the word clearly has its ordinary sense of hearing. The same word occurs in the two clauses in the Greek, just as it does in the English, and we are scarcely justified in giving it two distinct meanings. If we were to read both clauses as questions, we should avoid this difficulty, and get a sense which would suit the evident feeling of the man. He is impatient, and expresses this in a series of rapid questions. "I have told you already, and did ye not hear? wherefore would ye hear it again? will ye also be His disciples?"

Will ye also be His disciples?—The words refer, probably, to some who are His disciples, not to the man himself as being, or being ready to become, a disciple. This is a further stage of his spiritual education which is to follow, but has not yet arrived (verses 35—38). The man must have known of the existence of a band of disciples, who indeed in his presence had questioned their Master concerning him (verse 2), and it is not unlikely that while the parents were being questioned, the son may have learnt more concerning the work of Christ. The question puts the irony in the severest form. "Surely ye also do not wish to become His disciples?" It may have been designed, or may only have been as an arrow drawn at a venture; but there must have been among those of whom it was asked, men who tried in vain to encase themselves in the armour of authority, which would repel his shaft and silence him. It must have gone through the joints of the harness and pierced to the hearts of men like Nicodemus, who were half-disciples without the "courage of their convictions." Here was the blind beggar making an open avowal of that which the Pharisees and rulers dared only to confess by night (chap. iii. 2).

(25) Then they reviled him.—The Greek word occurs only here in the Gospels. The other passages where it occurs in the New Testament are Acts xxiii. 4, 1 Cor. iv. 12, and 1 Pet. ii. 23. It expresses the passionate outburst of their anger, which was excited by his question, and finds vent in heaping reproaches upon him.

Thou art his disciple.—They cast his own reproach back upon himself, but in stronger words than he had used they mark out the distinction between Jesus and themselves. Thou art that Man's disciple.

But we are Moses' disciples.—The emphasis of the words is important. We, as opposed to thou; Moses, as opposed to the Man.

(29) We know that God spake unto Moses.—Better, We know that God hath spoken unto Moses. "He was commissioned," they would say, "by God, and received a revelation from God which remains to us." They would press here, as before, the authority of the great Lawgiver, which to every Israelite was
The Man marvels that they
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know not whence Jesus is.

The man answered and said unto them, Why herein is a marvellous thing, that ye know not from whence he is, and yet he hath opened mine eyes. (30) Now we know that God heareth not sinners: but if any man be a worshipper of God, and doeth his will, him he heareth. (32) Since the world began was it not heard that any man opened the eyes of one that was born blind. (33) If this man were not of God, he could do nothing. (34) They answered and said unto him, Thou wast altogether born in sins, and He asserts, as a truth which agrees with the whole teaching of the Old Testament, and with all the religious instincts of men, that there would be no communion between such a man and heaven. Such a one could not be commissioned as a prophet, or so heard in heaven as to have power to work miracles on earth.

As for this fellow, we know not from whence he is.—In our English version the words in italics are added, but they do not express more than the single Greek word, which is used with contempt. Before they had said, "Howbeit we know this Man whence He is; but when Christ cometh, no man knoweth whence He is" (chap. vii. 27; see Notes on this and the next verse). They here oppose the divine authority of the mission of Moses, which was acknowledged by all, to the absence, as they would say, of any such authority for the work of Jesus. Their words are meant to convey more than they express, coming as they do in sharp contrast with "God spake unto Moses." They would say again, "This Man is not of God" (verse 16), "we know that this Man is a sinner" (verse 24). For the expression, "whence He is," i.e., "what authority He has," comp. chap. xix. 9, and Matt. xvi. 23.

Why herein is a marvellous thing.—Several of the better MSS. read more emphatically, the marvellous thing. He again puts two contradictory positions—their assertion that they knew not by what authority Jesus did these things (whence He was), and the evident fact that He had opened his eyes. He cannot reconcile their statement with what he knows to be true, and he states his wonder in the strongest form.

That ye know not from whence he is—i.e., ye whose business it is to know, ye who claim for yourselves a special knowledge of all such questions, and whose duty it is to inquire into the authority of any one who asserts that he is a teacher or a prophet. (Comp. Note on chap. i. 24.)

Now we know that God heareth not sinners.—What they should have known, but asserted that they did not, he proceeds to declare. The argument of this and the two following verses may be stated in syllogistic form, thus:—(1) God heareth not sinners. (2) That God heareth this Man is certain, for such a miracle could be performed only by divine power. (3) This Man, therefore, is not a sinner, but is from God.

He assumes as a general truth, which all accepted, that God heareth not sinners. This is based upon numerous passages in the Old Testament Scriptures—e.g., Isa. lxiv. 4; Pss. lxxvi. 18, and cxvii. 7; Prov. xxv. 8, 29; Job xxvii. 9, and xxxv. 13. We are, of course, to understand the word "sinner" in the sense in which they had used it in verses 16 and 24. They had said that they knew this Man to be a sinner, and they meant one who was a sinner in a darker sense than that in which the word may be applied to all men,
of the truth?" For any one to have doubted their authority would have seemed out of question; but here was one who had been a beggar, one of the "people of the earth," untrained in the Law, and therefore cursed (comp. Note on chap. vii. 40), and, more than this, altogether born in sin, who was actually teaching them! And they cast him out. These words are generally taken to mean excommunication, as in the margin, and it is certain that they may have this sense. (Comp. 3 John 10.) Having this meaning before them, our translators did not, however, think it the better one, and their view seems to be borne out by the general impression which we get from the narrative. The man with all his boldness has not technically fallen under the ban they had threatened, for he has not "confessed that He was Christ" (verse 22). A decree of the Sanhedrin would have been necessary, and this must have been formally pronounced. Now, we feel that in a detailed narrative such as we have here, all this would hardly be told in a single short sentence. It seems to be rather that their anger has now passed all bounds. They cannot refute the truth which, in his honest, homely way, he has put before them. They can only heap reproaches upon him, and thrust him by force out of their presence.

(35) Jesus heard that they had cast him out; and when he had found him, he said unto him, Dost thou believe on the Son of God? (36) He answered and said, Who is he, Lord, that I might believe on him? (37) And Jesus said unto him, Thou hast both seen him, and it is he that talketh with thee. (38) And he said, Lord, I believe. And he worshipped him. (39) And Jesus said, For judgment I came into this world...
The coming of Christ gives Spiritual Light, ST. JOHN, X. and reveals Spiritual Darkness

am come into this world, that they which see not might see; and that they which see might be made blind. (40) And some of the Pharisees which were with him heard these words, and said unto him, Are we blind also? (41) Jesus said unto them, If ye were blind, ye should have no sin: but now ye say, We see; therefore your sin remaineth.

CHAPTER X.—(1) Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that entereth not by

Christ as the Son of God. He did not see, but the result of the manifestation of the Messiah is for him that he now does see. Conscious of his own spiritual blindness, he asked, "Who is He, Lord, that I might believe on Him?" and to him, as to every earnest and humble seeker after truth, because in all his seeming need he really "hath," there is given that he may "have more abundance." In marked contrast to this spirit of humility and desire to come to the light, was that of the Pharisees. They claimed to have the "key of knowledge" (Matt. x. 25), and were, as a Pharisee represents him who is "called a Jew," "confident that they were guides of the blind, lights of them which are in darkness" (Rom. ii. 17 et seq.; comp. 1 Cor. i. 21; iii. 18). Conscious of their own spiritual light, they felt no need of a True Light, and therefore could not see it; and from them, as from every careless and self-trusting possessor of truth, because, in all his seeming blindness, there is taken away "even that he hath." (Comp. Note on chap. i. 16.)

This passing from darkness to light, and from light to darkness, suggests thoughts which our Lord has already uttered in chap. iii. 17—19, and which will meet us again more fully in chap. xii. 37—50. (See Notes on these passages.) Judgment is not the ultimate end of His coming, for He came to save the world; but it is an end, and therefore a result. The special form of the word rendered "judgment" in this place is used nowhere else by St. John, and indicates that what is here thought of is not the act of judging, but the concrete result—the sentence pronounced after judgment. His coming was a bringing light into the darkness of men's hearts, a testing of the false and the true, and as men accepted or rejected Him they pronounced a judicial sentence upon themselves. That light judged no man, and yet by it every man was judged.

That they which see not might see,—The force of these words lies in the fact that the phrases, "they which see not" and "they which see," are to be interpreted as from their own point of view—"That they which think they see not might really see; and that they which think they see might really be made blind." (40) And some of the Pharisees which were with him.—The words in the preceding verse are not addressed specially to one. The Pharisees would be still watching our Lord, and some had probably followed the beggar, expecting that our Lord would seek him, and hoping that the interview might furnish some ground for a fresh charge against one or both of them. It is the presence of mental conditions such as theirs and such as his that has brought again to our Lord's thoughts the judicial result of His manifestation, and this rises to His lips as an utterance of the solemn thought that fills His mind. The Pharisees hear this exclamation, and apply to themselves that which their own state suggested; but which was expressed as, and is, a wide law, holding true for all mankind.

Are we blind also?—They misunderstand His words, for He has asserted of the blind ("they which see not") that the result of His coming is "that they which might see." But yet they do not understand the words in a physical sense, in which they could have had no application to themselves. Care is required to catch the force of the term in these three verses, and it may be well to distinguish again the meanings attached to the word blind. It is used (1) for physical blindness. This has been its meaning throughout the chapter. It suggests the imagery in these verses, but is not itself present in the thought which is of spiritual, blindness only. (2) For conscious spiritual blindness ("they which see not," "they which think they see not"), which is really the first step to spiritual sight. (3) For unconscious spiritual blindness ("they which see," "they which think they see"), which is really the first step to a total loss of spiritual perception.

(4) If ye were blind, ye should have no sin.—His answer is that He does not place them among those who are in this second sense blind. If they were among those "which see not" they would be conscious of their blindness, and would seek for spiritual light. They would ask, "Who is He, Lord, that we may believe on Him?" and would not ask in vain. In that case their present rejection of Him would arise from ignorance willing to be overcome, and this ignorance, not being wilful, would not be sin. Conscious ignorance would be the first step towards knowledge.

But now ye say, We see.—Their true place is among those who were spiritually blind, and were unconscious of it, "they which see," "they which think they see." For them the first step towards true spiritual light must be a consciousness of blindness. As it is, as long as they think that they see, there is no ground for hope. (Comp. Matt. ix. 12, 13.)

Therefore your sin remaineth.—The word "therefore" should probably be omitted. The words "Your sin remaineth," or better, Your sin abideth (comp. Note on chap. iii. 36), stand alone in their awful solemnity. They stand side by side with "Ye say, We see." The two states are one. The assertion of spiritual knowledge and independence was the original cause of sin (Gen. iii. 8), and while spiritual pride exists sin cannot cease.

[((2) JESUS IS TRUTH, LIGHT, AND LOVE (cont.). (c) Jesus is Love (chap. x. 1—42). (a) The Good Shepherd, who giveth His life for the sheep (verses 1—20). (b) The discourse at the Feast of the Dedication (verses 22—38). The true sheep hear the Shepherd's voice (verses 23—30). The charge of blasphemy shown by their Scriptures to be groundless (verses 30—38). (7) Rejected in Jerusalem, Jesus goes away beyond Jordan.)}}

(1) Verily, verily, I say unto you.—This formula is not used at the beginning of a fresh discourse, but is, in every case, the solemn introduction of some development of our Lord's deeper teaching. (Comp. Note on chap. i. 51.) We are not, then, to regard this chapter as a new subject, but as part of the teaching commenced.
The Allegory of the Good Shepherd.

ST. JOHN, X. The Sheepfold, the Shepherd, the Porter.

The door into the sheepfold, but climbeth up some other way, the same is a thief and a robber. (2) But he that entereth in by the door is the shepherd of the sheep. (3) To him the porter openeth; and the sheep hear his voice: and he ever felt of the wants and woes of the masses of mankind? This poor blind beggar was an example of their treatment of the weaker ones of the flock. In spirit, if not in deed (chap. ix. 35, 36), they had thrust him out from the fold of God. The true Shepherd had sought and found this lost sheep, who is now standing near, in His presence and in that of the false shepherds. He teaches who the Shepherd and what the flock of God really are.

On the meaning of "the door," see the fuller expansion in verses 7—9.

Climbeth up some other way.—Or, more exactly, climbeth up from elsewhere.—i.e., from some part of the fence, away from the door where the porter is watching.

The same is a thief and a robber.—The former of these words means the petty thief who commits the smaller or unobserved robbery. The latter means the brigand or highwayman, and is applied, e.g., to Barabbas and to the two crucified with our Lord. The words are repeated in verse 8. They are probably joined together to express, in all its fulness, the idea which is common to both. If we press the individual sense of each, it may be that the false shepherds united the meaner faults and the greater crimes.

(3) But he that entereth in by the door.—See Notes on verses 7—9.

Is the shepherd of the sheep.—Better, is a shepherd of the sheep. The word here (comp. verse 12) simply characterizes him that entereth by the door as a shepherd, in opposition to the robber who climbeth over the fence.

To him the porter openeth.—The word "porter" is not, perhaps, misleading to many, but for the sake of the possible few, it may be noted that door-keeper is what is here meant. There is no further interpretation of what, in the spiritual fold, corresponds to the office of the porter, whereas the door and the shepherd are successively made the text of fuller expositions of Christ's own work. We are not, therefore, to regard the "porter" as an essential part of the allegory (comp. verse 5), nor need we trouble ourselves with the various expositions which have been given of it. At the same time, we should not forget that the thought is one which impressed itself on the mind of St. Paul. At Ephesus "a great and effectual door was opened unto him" (1 Cor. vi. 9); "when he came to Troas to preach Christ's gospel a door was opened unto him of the Lord" (2 Cor. ii. 12); the Colossians are exhorted to pray that "a door of the word (the gospel) may be opened, to speak the mystery of Christ" (Col. iv. 3); at the close of the first missionary journey he and Barnabas told how "God had opened the door of faith unto the Gentiles" (Acts xiv. 27). We have St. Paul's authority, therefore, for understanding by the "door-keeper" if we are to interpret it here, the Holy Spirit, whose special work it is to determine who are shepherds and sheep, and to call each to the work and position given to him by God. We must be careful to note, with this interpretation, that St. Paul gives divine titles to Him who thus opens the door, lest, from the humble position of the porter in the material fold, we should be led to unworthy thoughts of Him who is neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding.

And the sheep hear his voice.—The reference is here to the whole of the sheep in the fold; they are
The Sheep follow the Shepherd,

And he calleth his own sheep by name, and leadeth them out. (4) And when he putteth forth his own sheep, he goeth before them, and the sheep follow him: for they know his voice. (5) And a stranger will they not follow, but will flee from him: for they know not the voice of strangers. (6) This parable spake Jesus unto them: but they understood not what things they were which he spake unto them.

Then said Jesus unto them again,—Better, this allegory spake Jesus unto them. The word rendered "parable" is the wider word (παροιμία, paroimia) which includes every kind of figurative and proverbial teaching, every kind of speech, as the etymology reminds us, which departs from the usual course (ὁποῖα, oimos). St. John nowhere uses the word "parable." The word paroimia occurs again in chap. xvi. 25, 29, and once besides in the New Testament; this is in 2 Pet. ii. 22 ("according to the true proverb"), in a quotation from the Greek version of Prov. xxvi. 11, where the Hebrew word is māshāl. (Comp. Note on Matt. xiii. 3, and Trench On the Parables, pp. 8—10.) The discourse of this chapter differs from the true parable, which is a story in which the outer facts are kept wholly distinct from the ideal truths that are to be taught; whereas here the form and the idea interpenetrate each other at every point. It is so in the other so-called "parable" in this Gospel (chap. xv.). Strictly speaking, neither the "Good Shepherd," nor the "True Vine" is a parable. Both are "allegories," or rather, they are, as there is every reason to think, allegorical interpretations of actual events in the material world, which are thus made the vehicle of spiritual truths. It will follow from this that the interpretation of every point in the history of the material facts (e.g., "the porter" in verse 3) is not always to be pressed. In the parable the story is made to express the spiritual truth, and with greater or lesser fullness every point in it may have its spiritual counterpart. The outer facts which are allegorised exist independently of the spiritual truth. The fact that they express it at some central points is all that is necessary for the allegory, and greater caution should attend the use of any addition to the interpretation which is given.

But they understood not what things they were...—They of course understood the outer facts, then passing before their eyes, or, in any case, well known to them. What they did not understand was the spiritual truths underlying these phenomena. They must have known His words had some spiritual meaning. They were accustomed to every form of allegorical teaching, and they could not have thought that He was simply describing them the every-day events of the shepherd's life. But they who think that they see (chap. ix. 41) are spiritually blind, and cannot understand the elements of divine truth.

Then said Jesus unto them again.—Better, Therefore said Jesus again, the words "unto them" being of uncertain authority. He says what follows
Verily, verily, I say unto you, I am the door of the sheep. (8) All that ever came before me are thieves and robbers: but the sheep did not hear them. (9) I am the door: by me if any man enter in, he shall be saved, and shall go into the sheep-fold. Our Lord returns to the words, and explains them more fully, in verse 9.

All that ever came before me are thieves and robbers.—Comp. Note on verse 1. The Saxon MS. and several of the early versions read this verse without the words translated “before Me,” but the balance of authority is strongly in their favour; and the fact of their being hard to understand, or having been misunderstood, is the probable reason of their omission. Retaining them, as we seem bound to do, we are also bound to give them their ordinary temporal meaning. There can be but one rendering which suggests itself to the unbiased mind, and that is the rendering of our version. The Greek words and the English words are equally plain, and other renderings are due to the exigencies of interpretation.

Attention should be paid to the present tense of the verb “are” in this sentence, which seems in itself to suggest that the words which follow find their application in the case of the persons then actually living.

All that ever came before me are thieves and robbers.—Comp. Note on verse 1. The Saxon MS. and several of the early versions read this verse without the words translated “before Me,” but the balance of authority is strongly in their favour; and the fact of their being hard to understand, or having been misunderstood, is the probable reason of their omission. Retaining them, as we seem bound to do, we are also bound to give them their ordinary temporal meaning. There can be but one rendering which suggests itself to the unbiased mind, and that is the rendering of our version. The Greek words and the English words are equally plain, and other renderings are due to the exigencies of interpretation.

What, then, do the words mean? Their force seems to be all-inclusive; and yet they cannot contradict Christ’s own words, which have excluded Abraham, Moses, the prophets, John the Baptist, and from any possibility of such thoughts. (See chaps. iv. 22; v. 33, 39; vi. 19.) They cannot, on the other hand, be limited to false Christs, who did not come before but after our Lord. (Comp. Note on chap. v. 43.) Here, as often, the true meaning seems for the most part to have been overlooked because men have sought it elsewhere than in the words themselves, and in their place among other words. The thought which precedes and which follows is that Jesus is Himself “the door.” “All that ever came before Me” is in immediate contrast to this thought, and the sense is, “all professing to be themselves the door, to be the means by which men enter the fold, to be the Mediator between man and God.” The Old Testament teachers cannot be meant, because they witnessed to the true door. But there had been growing up since the return from the Captivity, and the close of the Old Testament canon, a priestly caste in the place of the prophetic schools, and these men had been in practice, if not in word, claiming for themselves the position of door to the kingdom of God. There were Hillels and Shammais, heads of parties and of factions, whose word was to their followers as the word of God; there were Pharisees then standing round Him who had solemnly decreed that any one who should confess Him to be the Messiah should be shut out from Temple and from synagogue, and that they themselves would in God’s name pronounce a curse upon his head (chap. ix. 22). As “thieves” were they, and as “robbers;” wolves in sheep’s clothing, stealing into the flock of Christ and rending those who were the true sheep. (Comp. the analogous language of Luke xi. 52.) The lawyers closed the door and plundered and oppressed those whom they kept outside.
in and out, and find pasture. (10) The thief cometh not, but for to steal, and to kill, and to destroy: I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly. (11) I am the good shepherd. *I am the good shepherd. (Works, vol. i., p. 371, in Ante-Nicene Library), or Clement of Alexandria (Works, vol. i., pp. 149, 468, A.N. Lib.). We find it in the very earliest efforts of Christian art, in painting, embroidery, and even statuary. (See Sugler's Handbook, Italian Schools, Lady Eastlake's Trans., 4th Ed., pp. 5 and 6.) It comes to us naturally in our hymns and prayers. The pastoral staff is the fit emblem of the Bishop's work, and the Pastor is the name by which the humble way-side flock thinks of him who in Christ's name is appointed to be their guide. Giveth his life for the sheep. (12) But he that is an hireling, and not the shepherd, whose own the sheep are not, seeth the wolf coming, and leaveth the sheep, and fleeth: and the wolf catcheth them, and scattereth the sheep.
(13) The hireling fleeth. He spake of "false prophets" as "ravening wolves" (Matt. vii. 15). He went forth the Twelve "as sheep in the midst of wolves" (Matt. x. 16), and the Seventy, whose mission, we shall see (comp. Note on verse 22), was connected with the teaching of this chapter, "as lambs among wolves" (Luke x. 3). St. Paul foresaw that in the very city from which St. John wrote this Gospel, "after his departing, grievous liars would enter in among them, not sparing the flock" (Acts xx. 20). These are the only passages in the New Testament where the word occurs, and from them we may gather that while wolves represent all false teachers and foes to truth, "the wolf" represents him who is the source from whence they come. As all hirelings are related to the Good Shepherd, so are all wolves to the wolf whose work they do.

(15) The hireling fleeth.—These words are again an addition to the text, and should be omitted with the great majority of the best authorities. If we omit them this verse must be immediately connected with that which precedes, the last clause of which is a parenthesis—"He that is an hireling, and not the shepherd, whose own the sheep are not, seeth the wolf coming, and leaveth the sheep, and fleeth (and the wolf catcheth them), because he is an hireling, and careth not for the sheep." The sense is not affected by the omission, and the words were apparently added as a gloss to make the meaning clear. The thought of the hireling is repeated to express the nature of the man, and to strengthen the contrast with the Good Shepherd which immediately follows.

(14) And know my sheep, and am known of mine.—Better, and know those who are Mine, and those who are Mine know Me. The thought of the Good Shepherd is repeated to show that it expresses the closest communion between the shepherd and the sheep. It is not simply that the sheep know the Shepherd's voice but they partake of His nature, and the solemn form in which He expresses this union is in likening it to that between His Father and Himself.

As the Father knoweth me, even so know I the Father. —Better, . . . and I know the Father. Our version, by its rendering, and by the division of the words, fails to give the full meaning, and there is thus, indeed, no reason for the assertion of the mutual knowledge of the Father and the Son. But connecting the words with those of the previous verse, we have, "I am the Good Shepherd, and know those who are Mine, and those who are Mine know Me, even as the Father knoweth Me, and I know the Father." This deeper sense of union between the human spirit and Himself, and the wondrous likening of it to the union of Himself and the Father, is present to His mind as the result of His laying down His life for the sheep. (Comp. Notes on chap. xi. 52 and xii. 32.)

They also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice. —This deeper union which is promised, but unity. The distinction is not merely of one word, but upon it depends a wide and important truth. It is not unity of fold which is regarded as the nature of the Church, but unity of flock. There will be many folds, in many nations, in many ages, in many climes. But for all Christians there will be one true Shepherd who layeth down His life for the sheep, and all these differing folds shall, through living unity with Him, make one vast flock.

Therefore doth my Father love me . . .

For the meaning of this difficult verse, comp. Notes on chap. v. 17 et seq., and on Phil. ii. 8, 9. The thought is that in the relation between the Father and the natural human nature of Christ, the reason of the Father's love is based upon the self-devotion of the Son. He who so loved the world that he gave His only-begotten Son to die for it, loves the Son who of His own will
He has Power to lay down His Life, and to take it again.

ST. JOHN, X.

again among the Jews for these sayings.

(19) There was a division therefore again...
The words carry us back to those of chap. ix. 16, where a like division was noted.

Among the Jews.—The Phari"sees are mentioned before, and they are the persons who have been present all through this discourse. (Comp. chap. ix. 40.) The word "is mad" is here, and in chap. ix. 16, applied to them. They were identifying themselves with, and becoming leaders of, the party who were the enemies of Christ. (Comp. Note on chap. i. 19.)

(20) He hath a devil, and is mad.—Comp. Note on chap. viii. 48. The words "and is mad" are explanatory of the possession by a demon.

(21) Others said, These are not the words of him that hath a devil. Can a devil open the eyes of the blind?—We trace here again the presence of the better party among the faiths drin, which we found before (chap. ix. 16), "the Pharisees," they would say, "are words of calm teaching. The possession by a demon disorders, frenzies, makes the slave of madness. It is inconsistent with words like these."

Can a devil open the eyes of the blind?—"Surely a devil cannot open the eyes of the blind?" is the form their question took. They go back from the teaching to the great sign which gave rise to it, and they find that word and word are alike opposed to the thought of being the result of a demon's presence. Such a miracle had never before been known. A demon does not give the power to do a prophet's work. (Comp. Notes on chap. ix. 16 and Matt. xii. 24.)

(22) Between the last verse and this there is an interval of time which may be roughly taken as two months. Wieseler has calculated that the last day of the Feast of Tabernacles was on October 19, and the Feast of the Dedication on December 20. (See Chron., Synops., Eng. Trans., p. 435; and comp. Note on chap. vii. 2, and Chronological Harmony of the Gospels, p. xxxv.) In this interval we may with great probability place the events and teaching contained in Luke x. 1—xiii. 21, with the parallels in St. Matthew. (Comp. Note on Luke x. 1.) The connection suggests several points of interest:

1. At the Feast of Tabernacles there was a practice, one of those which witnessed to a feeling wider than that of those who acted in it, of offering up seventy oxen for the seventy nations of the world, the number being taken partly from the list in Genesis, and partly from a vague idea of its sanctity. The number seventy was thus brought before the people with the recognition of the heathen world as within the hope of salvation, and the minds of men were prepared for the mission of the Seventy, which followed at no long interval.

2. Verse 16 of this chapter finds the commencement of its fulfilment in this mission. The appointment of a new body of disciples, whose very number is symbolic of a wider work, was the first step in the bringing in of the "other sheep." The Twelve answered to the number of the tribes of Israel; but the
And Jesus walked in the temple, and it was winter. (23) And Jesus walked in the temple in Solomon’s porch. (24) Then came the Jews round about him, and said unto him, How long dost thou make us to doubt? 25 If thou be the Christ, tell us plainly. (25) Jesus answered them, I told you, and ye believed not: the works

Seventy represent the nations of the world. The directions for this work to each body are nearly identical, but the restrictions laid upon the Twelve are not laid upon the Seventy.

(3) The reference in Luke x. 3 to the wolves among whom they would be as lambs, throws light upon verse 12. He who would lay down His life for them would expose them to the wolves because He as the Good Shepherd would save them from the wolf.

And it was at Jerusalem.—Better, And the Feast of the Dedication was being held at Jerusalem.—Although St. John gives no hint that our Lord had left the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, this specific mention of the place implies a return from a distance, for the words would be out of place if He had continued there during the interval since verse 21. They cannot be restricted to the feast, which was not confined to Jerusalem, but was universally observed by the Jews.

The reference in the margin warns us against the error of understanding “the Feast of the Dedication” as a feast in honour of the dedication of Solomon’s or Zerubbabel’s temple. We know of no annual festival connected with these dedications, and the statement that this feast was “in the winter” makes it almost certain that it was the feast instituted, B.C. 164, by Judas Maccabeus, in commemoration of the cleansing of the Temple after its profanation by Antiochus Epiphanes (1 Mach. iv. 24–59). It extended over eight days, beginning on the 25th of the month Kislev, which answers to parts of our November and December.

It is still called “Chanuca,” the Dedication, while St. John’s Greek name for it, which was adopted by the Vulgate (Encrenia), is familiar to English ears in connection with another commemoration. In this, and in other rejoicings, illumination was a prominent feature, and it was sometimes called the “Feast of Lights.” The Temple and private houses were illuminated, and it was customary in the houses of the more wealthy and pious Jews to have a light for each member of the family, increasing by an additional light for each evening of the feast. The illumination has been sometimes traced to the discovery in the temple by the Maccabees of a vial of oil, sealed with the high priest’s ring. This, it is said, was sufficient for the lamps for one evening only, but was miraculously multiplied so as to suffice for eight evenings, which was therefore devoted to annual illuminations in remembrance of this gift of God (Talmud, Shabbath 21b).

And it was winter.—Better, It was winter. These words should then be connected with the following verse. Our division breaks the sense.

(23) And Jesus walked in the temple . . . .—Better, and Jesus was walking. The scene is remembered and pictured as it took place.

In Solomon’s porch. The place is mentioned again in Acts iii. 11 and iv. 12. It was rather a cloister or arcade than what we usually call a porch. It is said to have been on the east of the Temple, and to have been a relic of the original building which had succumbed to fires and destructions, and had brought down its founder’s name from its founder’s time. (Comp. Jos. Ant. xx. 9, § 7.) It does not seem clear, however, that Josephus calls anything more than the eastern wall by the name of Solomon, and he calls the cloister above it simply the “Eastern cloister.” It is more likely that the true position of “Solomon’s porch” is to be found in one of the subterranean structures which existed in the time of our Lord, and exist now as they did in the time of Solomon. Caspari would identify the corridor under El-Aksa with “Solomon’s porch,” and thus connect the place where our Lord walked at this feast with the Holy Church of Zion, and the place of the outpouring of the Holy Ghost. (Chron. and Geogr., Introd., Appendix. § 22; Eng. Trans., pp. 297–9. Comp. Note on refs. in Acts.) The place as mentioned here is another instance of the writer’s remembrance of topographical details connected with the Temple. (Comp. chap. viii. 20.) The fact that it was winter, and the fact that He was walking in this covered cloister or crypt, explain each other.

(24) Then came the Jews round about him.—The words mean literally, they encircled Him. It is again the impression of one who saw what he records. He remembers how they stood in a circle round our Lord, and watched Him with eager eyes as they asked their question.

How long dost thou make us to doubt?—Literally, How long dost Thou lift up our souls? or, as the margin, “How long dost Thou keep us in suspense?” The words exactly express what was probably the real state of fluctuation in which many of these Jews then were. They do not in the true sense “believe” (verses 25, 26), and they soon pass to the other extreme of seeking to stone Him (verse 31); but in many of them the last miracle, and the words accompanying it, had left a conviction that He was more than human, and not possessed by a demon. (See Note on verse 21.)

Two months have passed away, not, we may think, without many an earnest thought and much anxious weighing of evidence concerning Him. And now the feast of Dedication has come, and what thoughts have come with it? It is the Feast of Lights, and He had declared Himself the Light of the world. It is the Feast of Freedom, telling how the Maccabees had freed their nation from the tyranny of Antiochus Epiphanes, and He has declared that “If the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed” (chap. viii. 36). It is the feast which commemorates the cleansing of the Temple, and His first public appearance in the Temple was to cleanse it and claim it as His Father’s house. May there not be, then, a close connection between the statement that “it was the Feast of the Dedication,” and the question, “How long dost thou excite our souls?” Was He, the question would seem to ask, really the Messiah or not? though by the Jews. (Comp. Jos. Ant. xx. 9, § 7.) It does not seem possible otherwise. Their misconception of the Messianic work had made the very word Messiah an impossible one for
that I do in my Father’s name, they bear witness of me. (20) But ye believe not, because ye are not of my sheep, as I said unto you. (22) My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me: (23) and I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand. (24) My Father, which gave them me, is greater than all; and no man is able to pluck them out of my Father’s hand. (25) I and my Father are one.

**Eternal life.**—Comp. verse 10, where the word “eternal” is added in some readings. Here the verb is in the present, “I give (am now giving) them.” (Comp. chap. iii. 15; v. 24; vi. 47 et seq.) We cannot be too careful to observe that our Lord’s thoughts of “eternal life” is never of the future only. It is a development, rather than a simply future existence. We shall live eternally, because we now live spiritually in communion with the Spirit who is Eternal.

And they shall never perish.—Comp. Notes on chap. viii. 51, and xi. 25, 26. The negative is in the strongest form—“They shall by no means perish for ever.”

Neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand.—Better (comp. verse 18), and none shall pluck them. . . The words should not be limited by the insertion of the word man. They are to be taken as including every spiritual foe; all thieves and robbers that would break into the fold; all wolves that would rend the flock; the adversary who “as a roaring lion walketh about seeking whom he may devour.” (Comp. especially for the full thought of no separation from Christ, Rom. viii. 38, 39.) The words “out of my hand” express alike the strength which protects, and guidance which leads, and comfort which cherishes. (See Isa. xl. 11.) Out of this hand none shall pluck. Yet we are to bear in mind that the sheep itself may wander from the shepherd’s care, and that all the fulness of these promises depends upon the human will, which is included in the first clause, “My sheep hear my voice. . . and they follow me.”

(26) But ye believe not.—Comp. Notes on verses 5, 14, 16.

(28) My Father, which gave them me, is greater than all.—For the thought that they are given by the Father, comp. Note on chap. vi. 37. Here our version has rightly made no limiting addition to “all” (comp. last verse). In the width of the word, which extends to every creature and to every power, and even to the Son in His subordination to the Father, the Father is thought of as greater than all. Again the thought mounts with each succeeding sentence: (1) “None shall pluck them out of My hand;” (2) “They are My Father’s gifts, and He is greater than all;” (3) “None shall pluck them out of My Father’s hand.”

(29) My Father is one.—The last clause of verse 29 is identical with the last clause of verse 28 if we identify “Father’s” with “My.” This our Lord now formally does. The last verses have told of power greater than all, and these words are an assertion that in the infinity of All-mighty Power the Son is one with the Father. They are more than this, for the Greek word for “one” is neuter, and the thought is not, therefore, of unity of person, but of unity of essence. “The Son is of one substance with the Father.” In the plural “are” there is the assertion of distinctness as against Sabellianism, and in the “one” there is the assertion of co-ordination as against Arianism. At recurring periods in the history of exegesis men have tried to establish that these words do not imply more than unity of will between the Father and the Son. We have seen above that they assert both oneness of power and oneness of nature;
They accuse Him of Blasphemy.

(31) Then the Jews took up stones again to stone him. (32) Jesus answered them, Many good works have I shewed you from my Father; for which of those works do ye stone me? (33) The Jews answered him, saying, For a good work we stone thee not; but for blasphemy; and because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God. (34) Jesus answered them, Is it not written in your law, I said, Ye are gods? (35) If he called them gods,—in the Hebrew of the Psalm, as in the Greek here, the pronoun is emphatic. "I myself said, Ye are gods?" The words are probably to be understood in the Psalm as spoken by God, who sits in judgment on the judges whom He had appointed, and gives the name of "gods" (Elohim) as representing Himself. See Ex. iv. 16; vii. 1; xviii. 15; xvi. 6; xxii. 8, 28; Deut. i. 17; 1 Sam. xxvi. 13; Psa. vii. 5 and xlv. 6; and comp. Perowne's Notes on Ps. lxxxii., and article "God," in Kitto's Biblical Cyclopædia, Ed. 3, vol. ii., p. 144 et seq.

(36) If he called them gods.—The argument is another example of Hillel's famous First Canon of Interpretation—that the greater may be inferred from the less. The pronoun "he" (He) refers probably to God (see Note on verse 34), or the rendering may be "it," as referring to "law"—i.e., the Psalm.

For which of those works do ye stone me?—Again there is a fulness of meaning in the Greek which it is difficult to convey in translation. The word rendered "which" marks, not simple distinction, but quality. (Comp. "What kind of commandment," Note on Matt. xxii. 36.) "What is the character," our Lord would ask, "of that one of these works on account of which ye are about to stone Me?" If they had thought this question, it must have been led to see that the quality of the works proved that they were from God, and that therefore He by whom they had been wrought, was also from God. This thought of the quality of the works had been in the minds of some of them (chap. ix. 16). Its true issue would have been to worship Him as God; they are preparing to stone Him as a blasphemer.

(37) The Jews answered him.—Comp. for the thoughts of this verse Notes on verse 30 and on chap. v. 18.

For a good work . . . but for blasphemy.—The word rendered "for" is not the causal "on account of," which we have in the last verse, but "concerning," the technical form for an indictment. For the Mosaic law concerning blasphemy, see Lev. xxix. 10—16.

Is it not written in your law?—Comp. Note on chap. viii. 17. The passage here quoted is in Psa. lxxiii. 6, but the term "Law" is here used in a wider sense for the whole of the Old Testament. There are other examples of this usage in chaps. vii. 49, xii. 34, and xv. 25; Rom. iii. 19; 1 Cor. xiv. 21.

I said, Ye are gods?—In the Hebrew of the Psalm, as in the Greek here, the pronoun is emphatic. "I myself said, Ye are gods?" The words are probably to be understood in the Psalm as spoken by God, who sits in judgment on the judges whom He had appointed, and gives the name of "gods" (Elohim) as representing Himself. See Ex. iv. 16; vii. 1; xviii. 15; xvi. 6; xxii. 8, 28; Deut. i. 17; 1 Sam. xxvi. 13; Psa. vii. 5 and xlv. 6; and comp. Perowne's Notes on Ps. lxxxii., and article "God," in Kitto's Biblical Cyclopædia, Ed. 3, vol. ii., p. 144 et seq.

If he called them gods.—The argument is another example of Hillel's famous First Canon of Interpretation—that the greater may be inferred from the less. The pronoun "he" (He) refers probably to God (see Note on verse 34), or the rendering may be "it," as referring to "law"—i.e., the Psalm.

Unto whom the word of God came—i.e., the word declaring "Ye are gods," and pointing back to the time indicated by "I said," when each one was set apart to be a representative of God, and in that he had His authority to bear also His name.

The scripture cannot be broken.—More literally, cannot be loosened. Comp. Notes on Matt. v. 18, 19, and for the word rendered "broken" see also in this Gospel chaps. v. 18 and vii. 23.

Whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world.—Better, Whom the Father sanctified, and sent into the world. The tense refers to the time of His consecration to His Messianic work, and to the Incarnation, which was the commencement of it.

Because I said, I am the Son of God.—He had not said this in express words, but, as we have seen, it is directly implied in verses 29 and 30, and the Jews had so understood what He said (verse 33).

So far, then, the argument is simply a technical one, such as formed the topic of those controversies in Rabbinic schools, and based on the letter of the Scriptures. The law (Psalm) applied the term "Elohim" (gods) to men representing God; no word of that Scripture could fail to hold good; how much more, therefore (a minnori ad majus), could the term Son of God be applied to Him who was not a man consecrated to any earthly office, but consecrated by God, and sent into the world to represent God to the world (Comp. Note on chap. i. 18). Their charge of blasphemy is, on their own principles, without the shadow of foundation. But in these words there is a deeper meaning than this technical one. When we speak of "men representing God," we are already in thought foreshadowing the central truth of the Incarnation. Priests who offered sacrificial for sins, and kings who ruled God's people, and prophets...
I said, I am the Son of God? (37) If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not. (38) But if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the works: that ye may know, and believe, that the Father is in me, and I in him. (39) Therefore they sought again to take him: but he escaped out of their hand.

(40) And went away again beyond Jordan. — Comp. Note on chap. i. 28. In Matt. xix. I have the fuller expression, “the coasts of Judaea beyond Jordan,” referring to the same locality. The whole of Judaea proper was Cis-Jordanic and the “Judah upon Jordan” (Josh. xix. 34) was the boundary toward the sun-rising “of the tribe of Naphtali—i.e., it answered to what was afterwards known as Gaulonitis, and is now known as the Jolan. Josephus (Wars, i. 3) expressly enumerates Gaulonitis as belonging to Judæa in the time of our Lord. For the explanation of this spread of the name, which has always been a geographical cux, see von Raumer’s argument in Dr. Caspari’s summary (Chron. and Geogr., Introd., Eng. Trans., p. 40.) We have to think, then, probably of Bethania or Tellal-nikh, to the north of the Sea of Galilee, on the eastern side of the Jordan, as the place of our Lord’s retirement. He had taught the Jews by divine words, and they had sought to stone Him (verse 31, and chap. viii. 59). He had appealed to divine works, and they had attempted to take Him by force (verse 39, and chap. vii. 30, 32, 44). He sees in all this the darkness which foreshadows the night, and He retires from the city to visit it no more until the final Passover, when the night will be at hand. “O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not!”

And there he abode. — How long we have no means of judging. The time from Dedication to Passover (December to April) is divided, by the visit to Bethany near Jerusalem, and the raising of Lazarus, into two parts of uncertain duration, one of which is spent in Gaulonitis and the other in Ephraim (chap. xi. 54).

(41) And many resorted unto him. — It is one of the key-notes of this Gospel, struck in its opening words (see Note on chap. i. 5), and recurring at frequent intervals, that in the midst of events the deepest darkness the light is never absent. In contrast with the rejection at Jerusalem there is the reception on the old ground, which brings memories of early days and bright hopes, which are not without their fulfilment now. The mission of the Seventy, and Christ’s own work in Galilee before the Feast of the Dedication (comp. Note on verse 22), accounts for the number who now come to Him.

And said, John did no miracle: but all things. . . . — Better, as before, John did no sign. . . . This was not said to Him, but was a general remark suggested by the associations of the spot. The remark assigns to John the position as a witness which he claimed for himself, and which the Evangelist has made prominent in the narrative of His work. He did no sign, and therefore came short of the glory of Him whose signs they had seen and heard of; but more than any other he had recognised that glory, and directed men to it. His spiritual intuition, in advance of the generation in which he lived, was itself a sign, and all things which he had said about the Messiah had, in the events which had taken place since they had seen Him

who told forth God’s will, were consecrated to their holy office because there was the divine in them which could truly be called “god.” Every holy life was in its degree a type of the Incarnate life of the Son of God. But He was the ideally true Priest sacrificing Himself for the world, the ideally true Prophet declaring God’s will in its fulness, the ideally true King ruling in righteousness. Every holy life was as a ray of the divine glory manifest in human flesh, but all these rays were centred in the nimbus of glory which rested as a crown on the head of Jesus Christ. (42) If I do not the works of my Father.—He has met the charge of blasphemy on technical grounds. In this and the following verse He advances from their defence to the ultimate test. Whether He is a blasphemer or not depends upon whether He represents God or not, and to prove this He appeals again to the works. Are they or are they not the works of the Father? (verse 32; comp. chaps. v. 17, 36; ix. 3; x. 16). If I do not the works of my Father. — He has met the charge of blasphemy on technical grounds. In this and the following verse He advances from their defence to the ultimate test. Whether He is a blasphemer or not depends upon whether He represents God or not, and to prove this He appeals again to the works. Are they or are they not the works of the Father? (verse 32; comp. chaps. v. 17, 36; ix. 3; x. 16). (43) Note on chap. xx. 29. — Let them test the works, think of into two parts of uncertain duration, one of which is spent in Gaulonitis and the other in Ephraim (chap. xi. 54).

That ye may know, and believe, that the Father is in me. — The more probable text is, that ye may perceive, and may know that the Father is in me, and I in him. (44) He appeals to the sight of those who have not faith. (Comp. Note on chap. xx. 29.) Let them test the works, think of into two parts of uncertain duration, one of which is spent in Gaulonitis and the other in Ephraim (chap. xi. 54).

But if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the works. — A higher faith would have believed Him. Had they truly known their own spiritual needs, and truly known the meaning of that great truth He had taught, they would have found in Him the true satisfaction of the mind’s cravings, and the faculty of faith would have rested in the object of its existence. For all this the Old Testament had been a preparation; but their minds had not been prepared by it. He will take therefore their own lower ground, and appeal to the sight of those who have not faith. (Comp. Note on chap. i. 28.) Let them test the works, think of their character, as some of them had already done (chap. ix. 16), and see at least that these are of the Father. That ye may know, and believe, that the Father is in me. — The more probable text is, that ye may perceive, and may (permanently) know that the Father is in me. But if I do not the works of my Father, believe me not. (38) But if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the works: that ye may know, and believe, that the Father is in me, and I in him. (39) Therefore they sought again to take him: but he escaped out of their hand. — Nothing is said of the manner, and there is no reason to suppose anything more than, while they were plotting how they might take Him, He passed out of the Temple. (Comp. chap. viii. 59.) But he escaped out of their hand. — Nothing is said of the manner, and there is no reason to suppose anything more than, while they were plotting how they might take Him, He passed out of the Temple. (Comp. chap. viii. 59.)
The Illness of Lazarus.

ST. JOHN, XI.

The Sisters send to Jesus.

that John spake of this man were true.

(42) And many believed on him there.

CHAPTER XI.—(1) Now a certain man was sick, named Lazarus, of Bethany, the town of Mary and her sister Martha.  

(2) It was that Mary which anointed the Lord with ointment, and wiped his feet with her hair, whose brother Lazarus was sick.  

(3) Therefore his sisters sent unto him, saying, Lord, behold, he whom thou lovest is sick.  

(4) When Jesus heard that, he said, This sickness is not unto death, but for the glory of God, that the Son of God might be glorified thereby.

in that place before, been proved to be true. The witness of the past is linked to that of the present. The enthusiasm which John had kindled still burns.

(43) And many believed on him there. The word "there" is, in the best texts, in a position of emphasis. "And there many believed on Him." It marks the contrast between the rejection in Jerusalem and the reception at Bethania.

XI. 

(3) LIFE, TRUTH, LIGHT, AND LOVE MORE FULLY MANIFESTED. CORRESPONDING INCREASE OF THE UNBELIEF OF THE JEWS (chaps. xi. 1—xii. 50).

(a) Lazarus restored to life (chap. xi. 1—46).

(b) The journey to Bethany. Sleep and death (verses 1—16).

(c) The interview with Martha. The resurrection and the life (verses 17—27).

(4) The interview with Mary. Sorrows and love (verses 28—38).

(d) The open sepulchre. The corruptible and incorruption (verses 39—46).

(1) Now a certain man was sick.—This is connected with the preceding narrative to introduce the reason for our Lord's leaving His retirement to go again into the neighbourhood of Jerusalem.

Named Lazarus, of Bethany.—For the name "Lazarus," comp. Note on Luke xvi. 20, where it occurs as the solitary instance of a name in our Lord's parables. It will be seen from the Chronological Harmony of the Gospels, p. xxxvi., that the parable was closely connected with the miracle in order of time. It is in every way probable that the form in which the truths of the world beyond the grave took shape was suggested by the incidents which are here recorded. See also the suggestion that this Lazarus may have been identical with the young man that had great possessions, in Notes on Matt. xix. 16 et seq. The induction rests upon a enumeration of instances which makes it at least probable in a high degree.

"Bethany," too, is familiar to us from the earlier Gospels (Matt. xxi. 17; xxvi. 6; Mark xi. 12; xiv. 3; Luke xix. 29; xxiv. 50). The modern name, El-Azirieh, or El-Lazirieh, connects it with the events of this chapter, being formed from El-Azir, the Arabic form of the name Lazarus. It is a poor village on the eastern slope of the Mount of Olives, about two miles from Jerusalem (verse 18).

The town of Mary and her sister Martha.—Better, the village . . . (Comp. Luke x. 38.) This is the general meaning of the Greek word, which is distinguished from that for "city" or "town," as in Matt. ix. 35, x. 11; but John uses it in chap. vii. 42 for Bethlehem. For the relative position of Mary and Martha, comp. Notes on Luke x. 42—43. The younger sister is here mentioned first as the better known from the events related in verse 2. Lazarus was probably younger than his sisters (chap. xii. 2). The village was known, then, in the circles of the first disciples, as the village of Mary and Martha, by way of distinction from the "Bethany beyond Jordan"; and the distinction is marked here on account of the paragraph in the end of the preceding chapter. (See chap. i. 28.)

(2) It was that Mary which anointed the Lord.—Comp. Notes on Matt. xxvi. 6 et seq., and Mark xiv. 3 et seq. John himself relates the anointing in chap. xii. 3 et seq. Here he simply mentions it as distinguishing Mary from others of the same name, and assumes it as a well-known incident which had become, as Christ declared it should be, "told for a memorial of her wheresoever the gospel had been preached" (Matt. xxvi. 13). Still, the other Evangelists had not told the name, and St. John, when the name first occurs in his narrative, connects it with the person whose deed of love was known to all.

There is no sufficient reason for identifying Mary of Bethany with the "woman which was a sinner" (see Notes on Luke vii. 37 et seq.), or for identifying either with Mary Magdalene.

This verse should not be placed in parenthesis, as in our version. It is immediately connected with the verse which precedes, as well as with that which follows.

(3) Therefore his sisters sent unto him.—Better, The sisters therefore sent unto Him—i.e., because of the fact of the illness, which has been repeated at the close of the last verse, and also because of the intimacy between our Lord and this family, of which the anointing was a proof. (Comp. verse 5.)

Lord, behold, he whom thou lovest is sick.—The words are given in the touching simplicity of the message just as they were sent by the sorrowing sisters. They feel that the sad news needs no addition, and that there is no necessity for a prayer for help. Weakness, conscious of strength which loves, needs but to utter itself. (Comp. verse 5.)

(4) When Jesus heard that, he said.—These words are not simply an answer sent to the sisters, but the uttered thought which arose in our Lord's mind as He heard that Lazarus was ill, and were spoken in the presence of the disciples who were with Him, and doubtless in that of the messengers also.

This sickness is not unto death—i.e., "will not issue in death: will not have death as its final result." (Comp. verses 11 and 14, and chap. viii. 5.)

But for the glory of God—i.e., "the furtherance and accomplishment of the glory of God."

That the Son of God might be glorified thereby.—This furtherance of the glory of God with the purpose of glorifying the Son carries us back, as all the expositors note, to the oneness of the work of the Father and Son which has been made prominent in our Lord's words. (Comp. chap. x. 38, and references in Notes there.) But the words seem to carry us forwards as well as backwards. In the next chapter (verse 23) our Lord says, "The hour is come that the Son of Man should be glorified," and the reference
(3) Now Jesus loved Martha, and her sister, and Lazarus. (6) When he had heard therefore that he was sick, he abode two days still in the same place where he was. (7) Then after that saith he to his disciples, Let us go into Judæa again. (8) His disciples say unto him, Master, the Jews of late sought to stone thee; and goest thou thither again?

(9) Jesus answered, Are there not twelve hours in the day? If any man walk in the day, he stumbleth not, because he seeth the light of this world. (10) But if a man walk in the night, he stumbleth, because there is no light in him. (11) These things said he: and after that he saith unto them, Our friend Lazarus sleepeth; but I go, that I may awake to His death. Is that thought absent from the words here? The sickness of Lazarus would not indeed issue in death, though it would end in what men call death, and would be the immediate cause leading to the death of the Son of Man. The one would be as a sleep from which he would awake, the other should be the glorifying the Son of God, which would issue in the life of the world.

"Thereby" is probably to be interpreted "by means of the illness," and "by means of the glory." This verse should be compared with chap. ix. 3. Here, as there, part of the meaning is that the glory of God would be effect in the person of him upon whom the miracle would be wrought. It was a spiritual crisis in the case of the man born blind. It cannot have been otherwise in the case of Lazarus.

(9) Now Jesus loved Martha.—It is not easy to see the connection of this verse with that which precedes, or with that which immediately follows. The fact of His abiding two days where He was, seems, indeed, opposed to the thought of His special love for the family. The most probable explanation is that which connects verses 5, 6, and 7 together, and makes the love the motive for going into Judæa again.

The word rendered "loved" here is different from that in verse 3. There the word signifies the love of tender affection; here the word means the love of chosen friendship. (Comp. chaps. xx. 2 and xxi. 15 et seq.) The difference here is not to be explained, as it frequently has been, by the difference in the persons who were the objects of the love; but by the difference of the persons whose words we read. In the language of the sisters, whose hearts are moved by the brother's illness, the word of fullest emotion is natural. In the language of the Evangelist the other word is no less so.

It will be observed that in this verse, as in verse 19 et seq., Martha takes the first place as the elder sister.

(6) When he had heard therefore.—Better, When He heard therefore... He abode two days still.—It is usual to explain this delay as caused by His wish to test the faith of the sisters, or by the nature of the work which He was then doing, and was unwilling to leave. But the first reason passes over the fact that their faith had been shown in their message to Him; and the second postulates His presence at Bethany as necessary for the restoration of Lazarus. (Comp. chap. iv. 48, 50.) A juster view is that which remembers the principle which He had taught at the first miracle (chap. ii. 4), that the hours of His work were marked out by signs that He alone could read, but that every hour had its work, and every work its hour. (Comp. verses 4 and 9, and chap. ix. 3, 4.)

A comparison with verse 11 makes it certain that Lazarus was dead before they set out for Judæa, but he was living when the words of verse 4 were spoken. The fact of death may have determined the hour of their departure.

(7) Let us go into Judæa again.—He does not mark out the place more definitely, and the word "again" recalls the dangers from which they had escaped at the close of their last visit to Jerusalem.

(8) Master, the Jews of late sought to stone thee.—Better, Rabbi, the Jews were just now seeking to stone Thee. (Comp. Notes on chaps. i. 39 and x. 31.) They think of the danger to Him, and are not without thought of the danger to themselves (verse 16). It shows that the hatred of the Jews had made it unsafe for our Lord and His disciples to be within their reach. The impression we derive from this verse is that the retirement into Gaulonitis had been of no long duration, when the message from Bethany came to interrupt it.

(9) Are there not twelve hours in the day?—Or more exactly, Are not the hours of the day twelve? They had expressed their fears that danger and death would be the result of going into Judæa. His answer would say that the darkness of the night which they dreaded could not come yet. The natural night would come not until its appointed hour, until the twelve hours of the day had run their course. The day of His life is marked out by limits no less sure. The night indeed cometh, but it is as yet full day, and in that day He and they must do the work which is appointed of the Father. (Comp. verse 6; and Notes on chaps. ii. 4; vii. 30; viii. 20; ix. 21; xii. 27; xvii. 1.)

Incidentally these words bear on the question of St. John's method of counting the hours of the day, and support the view which from other passages seems quite evident that he follows the ordinary Babylonian numeration. (Comp. Notes on chaps. i. 40; iv. 6, 52; xix. 14.)

Because he seeth the light of this world—i.e., the natural light of the sun. While the earth is illumined by it, men follow the course of their work without danger of stumbling. In the application to their own position, the truth holds good. The day of His work is illumined by the light of heaven, and for Him and them there is safety.

(10) But if a man walk in the night...—He passes in this verse from the material to the spiritual truth. This first clause still holds of the natural night, and the danger to men who walk in it, but it holds, too, of the darkness in which men walk who do not see, as He is seeing, the light of heaven falling upon the moral path. In the second clause the moral truth is expressed with a prominence which excludes the other.

Because there is no light in him...—The light is now not that "of this world," but that which is within man.

(11) Our friend Lazarus sleepeth.—Better, Our friend Lazarus is fallen asleep. They had probably understood the words of verse 4 to express that the illness was not mortal, and that Lazarus would recover. They have seen, therefore, no reason for facing the danger of Judæa (verses 7 and 8). He now supplies
Sleep and Death.

ST. JOHN, XI.

Jesus goes to Bethany.

him out of sleep. (12) Then said his disciples, Lord, if he sleep, he shall do well. (13) Howbeit Jesus spake of his death; but they thought that he had spoken of taking of rest in sleep. (14) Then said Jesus unto them plainly, Lazarus is dead. (15) And I am glad for your sakes that I was not there, to the intent ye may believe; nevertheless let us go unto him. (16) Then said Thomas, which is called Didymus, unto his fellow disciples, Let us also go, that we may die with him.

(17) Then when Jesus came, he found that reason, and for the first time speaks of going to the family at Bethany.

His words “our friend” gently remind them that Lazarus was their friend as well as His, for they as well as He had probably been welcome guests in the well-known house.

The fact of our Lord’s knowledge of the death of Lazarus is stated by St. John without any explanation. From his point of view it could need none. He who needed not that any should testify of man, because of His own self-knowledge of what was in man (chap. II. 25), needed not that any should testify of what had passed in the chamber of His friend.

For the idea of sleep as the image of death, comp. Notes on chap. viii. 51, Matt. ix. 24, and I Thess. iv. 14. It is not unfrequent in other passages of both the Old and New Testaments, and, from the time of Homer downwards, poets have spoken of sleep and death as twin-sisters.

(12) Then said his disciples.—Better, Therefore . . . Their remark immediately arises out of what our Lord has said. They are glad to catch at any reason for not going to Judea.

If he sleep, he shall do well.—More exactly, If he be fallen asleep, he shall be saved. There could be, therefore, no reason for His going, as the disease had passed the crisis. Sleep is given by the Rabbis as one of six favourable symptoms, and that it is so is a common-place in authors of all periods. From the apparent suddenness of the attack, and rapidity of the progress of the disease, it would seem to have been the “great fever” which was common in Palestine (comp. chap. iv. 52, and especially Note on Luke iv. 38), and in which sleep would be the sign that the fever had ceased.

(13) They thought that he had spoken of taking of rest in sleep.—These words forbid the thought that they really understood that Lazarus was dead, but did not wish to seem to know it. Three of them, indeed, had heard our Lord apply the word “sleep” to death before (Matt. ix. 24), but this instance of misunderstanding on their part takes its place with others of a like kind, as showing that the surface-meaning of words was that which naturally suggested itself to them. (Comp. Matt. xvi. 6—12, and Luke xxii. 38.) It is not likely that all “the three” were present during this interview. If it took place at Talamith, then the nearness of Bethsaida and the other towns of Galilee have led some of the Twelve to visit their old homes. (Comp. chap. i. 28 and 48 et seq.) We can hardly imagine that Peter was present without taking a prominent part in the conversation, or that Thomas would have been in his presence the representative of the other disciples. (Comp. Notes on the Catalogues of the Apostles in Matt. x. 3, Mark iii. 18, Luke vi. 13, in all of which he is coupled with Matthew, whose twin-brother he possibly was; and in Acts i. 13, where he is coupled with Philip. The name belonged probably to his childhood, and we are wholly without the knowledge which can explain it. The various theories which attempt to do so, from the statement of the Apostolical constitution that he had a twin sister Lydia, to the view that the name was given by our Lord to signify his double or halting spiritual nature, are never more than, and are sometimes much less than, elaborate guesses. We may well believe that the name is due to the fact that he was a twin, but of whom it is of no importance that we should know, and it is quite certain that we cannot know.

And yet Peter, John, and Judas, are the only Apostles whose characters we know as well. This is owing to three incidents preserved to us by St. John—the present passage, chap. xiv. 5, and chap. xx. 24 et seq. We have before us here a man looking at events from a mind full of the deepest apprehension. He is without hope that a return to Judea can have any but one issue for his Master. The night is so clearly seen that the brightness of day is obscured. But with all this there is the full love of a devoted disciple, who will follow his Master even unto death.

(17) Then when Jesus came—i.e., to the neighbourhood of Bethany. He did not at once enter the village itself (verses 29, 30).
He found that he had lain in the grave four days already.—The Jewish custom was to bury on the day of death. (Comp. Acts v. 6–10.) The whole tone of the narrative places the time of death at the point indicated by the summons to go into Judaea, in verse 7 (see Note there). Counting the parts of the days on which they set out and on which they arrived as included in the four days, in accordance with the Jewish method, we have two whole days and parts of two other days spent upon the journey. There is no indication that they halted on the way, but everything suggests rather that they went as quickly as possible. The common view, which supposes the place where John was baptising to have been on the southern Jordan, cannot be made consistent with this long journey; and it is usual to assume that Lazarus died on the day that the message reached the Lord, and after his death our Lord remained two days where He was, and that the fourth day was occupied on the journey to Bethany. It is believed that the meaning of the narrative is brought out more fully by the interpretation which has been followed above, and that the four days for the journey is perfectly natural on the supposition which has been adopted, that the journey was from Tell-antipatris, which was north of the Sea of Galilee.

Bethany was nigh unto Jerusalem.—This way of speaking of places in the past tense is not found in the other Gospels. (Comp., in this Gospel, chaps. xviii. 1 and xix. 41; and, on the other hand, Note on chap. v. 2.) The explanation may be that from St. John's point of view, writing after the destruction of Jerusalem, the buildings and gardens could no longer be described as still existing.

But I know, that even now, whatsoever thou wilt ask of God .—The words express a half-formed hope, which she dare not express, perhaps dare not even think, that her brother may be restored to life again. She had heard probably of the young maid whose body was resuscitated by the life which had just left it (comp. Mark v. 35 et seq.; Luke viii. 41, 42), and of the young man whose body was being carried to the grave, when at His command it was restored living to the widowed mother. (Comp. Luke vii. 11 et seq.) Her brother had been the friend of Jesus; they had all trusted in His power and His love. Words had come to them from Him telling that this sickness should not issue in death, but that it should further glorify the Son. And now He is Himself present. His words cannot fail, and He Himself cannot be there without a purpose. She dare not say more; but she rests in this, that there is unity of power and will between Him and the Father. Whatev—ever He asks, God will give.

 Thy brother shall rise again.—These words, spoken as they were by our Lord after the purpose of His journey, as expressed in verse 11, and immediately before the accomplishment of it, cannot be taken to exclude the restoration of Lazarus to physical life. At the same time, the form of the words clearly point, as Martha understood them to point, to "the
The Resurrection and the Life.
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which should come into the world. (28) And when she had so said, she went her way, and called Mary her sister secretly, saying, The Master is come, and calleth for thee. (29) As soon as she heard that, she arose quickly, and came unto him. (30) Now Jesus was not yet come into the town, but was in that place where Martha met him. (31) The Jews then which were with her in the house, and comforted her, when

brother shall rise again. (24) Martha said unto him, I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day." They are chosen for this very purpose; to lead her from the passionate longing for her brother's restoration, and from a vague thought of the Lord's power and will to restore him, to a wider and truer conception of what life really is, and to a realisation of the truth that for a true believer in Him there can be no such thing as death. This "sign," like every other, is to be no mere wonder, nor is it to be limited to our restored life. It is to lead to the spiritual truth which is signified; and is to be for them and for mankind the true conquest of death by Life. (25) Jesus said unto her, I am the resurrection and the life: he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live: (26) and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die. Believest thou this? (27) She saith unto him, Yea, Lord; I believe that thou art the Christ, the Son of God, who is teaching her now. The Master is come (better, though he have died . . . ) He has told her. It is not that she expresses her disappointment as we have stood He had told her. It is not that she expresses her thoughts and hoped of a future life, being Himself the power which shall raise them at the last day, and could therefore raise them now. This is because He is also "the Life," and therefore every one in communion with Him shall live. He that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live.—Better, though he have died . . . She thinks and speaks of Lazarus as dead. He ascerts that in the true thought of the spiritual life the fact of physical death does not interrupt that life. (28) And whosoever liveth and believeth in me.—This is to be understood of the physical life answering to "though he have died" of the last verse. Still never die.—Comp. especially Note on chap. v. 29. He shall be not means die. But through the infinite course of ages shall there be that which makes for him the sting of death. The fact of what we call physical death is not denied, but in the fulness of the thought of life it is regarded as the passage to a now and higher life.

(27) She saith unto him, Yea, Lord.—This is her answer expresses something of disappointment. Her whole heart had been fixed on which makes for him the sting of death. The fact of physical death does not interrupt that life. The Pharisees v. 31.) He is not named, but Mary at once answered. (28) He is the resurrection . . . —Her answer expresses something of disappointment. Her whole heart had been fixed on one thought, and in all that had passed her hopes had found a support which seemed to warrant the hope for fulness of the thought of the resurrection. (29) He shall rise again in the resurrection . . . —Her answer expresses something of disappointment. Her whole heart had been fixed on one thought, and in all that had passed her hopes had found a support which seemed to warrant the hope for fulfillment. She is now reminded of a general truth which she had rested in before, but this does not satisfy the satisfaction she had formed now. We have all felt something of her disappointment as we have stood beside the sepulchre. We have known, with a knowledge more full than hers, that "he shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day;" but this knowledge has often had little power to remove the deep sorrow of the heart. We conquer the pagan thought "lost for ever" but we are often conquered by the thought "lost for the present."

For the thought of the resurrection, comp. Notes on chap. v. 29 and Luke xiv. 14. The Pharisees expected the resurrection of the just to accompany the Messianic advent. (Comp. Dan. xii. 2 and 2 Macc. vii. 9.) Still, the answer is in advance of that which we should expect, as compared with the dimness which Jews who were with her (verses 19, 31). This, we have proceeded to give the foundation on which that answer rested.

I believe that thou art the Christ.—The word means, "I have believed, and do now; "I have convinced myself, and do believe." But this being so, convinced that He is the Messiah, she has in that conviction the ground for believing all that He has now taught her of Resurrection and Life. (28) And called Mary her sister secretly.—It was done secretly to avoid attracting the notice of the Jews who were with her (verses 19, 31). This, we have seen (verse 20), accounts for the fact that our Lord did not Himself go to the house. That the care was not unnecessary is seen from verse 46.

The Master is come (better, is here), and calleth for thee.—The word here rendered "Master" is not the Hebrew Rabbi (comp. Note on chap. i. 38), but the Greek word answering to our "Teacher." (Comp. chap. xiii. 13, 14.) He is not named, but Mary at once knows who is intended. (Comp. Mark xiv. 14.) Perhaps the name was that by which they usually spoke of Him who had been their Teacher. We are not told that our Lord sent for Mary, but we must assume that Martha conveyed the message which she herself had heard. (29) She arose quickly.—She was sitting in the house (verse 20), after the manner of mourners. The news she now hears tells her that their true Comforter was at hand, and she at once goes forth to meet Him.

(30) Now Jesus was not yet come into the town.—Better, as before, into the village (verse 1).

Where Martha met him.—Comp. verse 20.

(31) And comforted her.—Better, were comforting her—i.e., were engaged in the prescribed ceremonial of those who were called comforters.
The Weeping of Mary, ST. JOHN, XI.

The better reading is, thinking, She goeth... The practice was and is common among the Orientals, as well as among other nations.

Their following her, defeats the object Martha had in view in calling her secretly. We may say, also, that it defeated our Lord's object in remaining outside the village; but this is not inconsistent with His knowing that it would be so.

Lord, if thou hadst been here.—The words are precisely the same as those which Martha had uttered (verse 21). She adds no more. It may be that she was prevented doing more by the Jews; but the next verse suggests rather that her emotion was too powerful for words, and that the only possible language was that of a suppliant lying at His feet and weeping.

He groaned in the spirit, and was troubled.—The word rendered "groaned" occurs, besides in this verse and verse 38, three times in the New Testament; in Matthew ix. 38 (“and Jesus groaneth and was troubled”); Mark 6:64 (“and He groaned in the spirit, and was troubled”); and John 11:35 (“and He groaned in the spirit, and was troubled”). Comp. Notes at these places. The original meaning of the word is “to snort, as of horses.” Passing to the moral sense, it expresses disturbance of the mind—vehement agitation. This may express itself in sharp admonition, in words of anger against a person, or in a physical shudder, answering to the intensity of the emotion. In each of the passages in the earlier Gospels the word is accompanied by an object upon which the feeling is directed. In the present context it does not go beyond the subject of the feeling. Here it is “in the spirit” (comp. chap. xiii. 21); and in verse 38 it is “in Himself.” Both mean the same thing; and point to the inner moral depth of His righteous indignation; the object of it, however, is not expressed.

For the rendering “and was troubled,” the margin gives, as the exact force of the Greek, “and He troubled Himself”; and this is to be preferred. These words do not express the inner emotion; for that has been expressed in the strong words which have gone before. They point rather to the physical movement which accompanied the emotion, and made known to others the indignation which was excited in His own spirit. The force of the whole sentence would require, in English, some such rendering as “He was indignant in the spirit, and caused Himself to shudder.”

Very different views have been put forth as to the cause of this intensity of emotion in our Lord. The cause supplied by the text is that He saw Mary lying at His feet weeping; and the Jews also weeping which came with her. Real sorrow, which calls forth all His sympathy, is accompanied by the mockery of those which can shed tears for the brother, whom they afterwards seek to kill (chap. xii. 10)! These Jews are those who had sought to stone their Teacher, and had resolved to cut off from all religious and social inter-

They said unto him, Lord, come and see. (35) Jesus wept. (36) Then said the Jews, Behold how he loved him! (37) And some of them said, Could not course every one who acknowledged Him as the Messiah! With hearts full of hatred they can profess to be comforters, and can mingle their tears with hers. The severest words that fell from the lips of Christ were those which denounced the hypocrisy of priests, Pharisees, and scribes. It is this hypocrisy which now stirs in His spirit an anger so intense that it causes nerve and muscle and limb to tremble beneath its force.

Where have ye laid him?—The question is directed, of course, to the sisters. This is further shown by the answer, “Lord, come and see.” Both question and answer are expressed in the shortest form. Grief speaks in the lowest possible words. (38) Jesus wept.—The word is different from that which is used to express weeping in verse 33; but this latter is used of our Lord in Luke xix. 41. The present word means not the cry of lamentation, nor the wail of excessive grief, but the calm shedding of tears. They are on the way to the sepulchre, near to which they have now arrived. He is conscious of the power which He is about to exercise, and that the first result will be the glory of God (verse 4); but He is conscious also of the suffering hearts near Him, and the sympathy with human sorrow is no less part of His nature than the union with divine strength. Men have wondered to find in the Gospel which opens with the express declaration of the divinity of our Lord, and at a moment when that divinity was about to receive its fullest manifestation, these words, which point them still to human weakness. But the central thought of St. John’s Gospel is “The Word was made flesh,” and He is for us the Resurrection and the Life, because He has been manifested to us, not as an abstraction which the intellect only could receive, but as a person, living a human life, and knowing its sorrows, whom the heart can grasp and love. A “God in tears” has provoked the smile of the stoic and the scorn of the unbeliever; but Christianity is not a gospel of self-sufficiency, and its message is not merely to the human intellect. It is salvation for the whole man and for every man; and the sorrowing heart of humanity has never seen more clearly the divinity of the Son of Man than when it has seen His glory shining through His human tears.

Then said the Jews—i.e., part of them. (See the next verse.) The term “Jews” is repeated with a frequency (verses 33 and 38) which makes prominent their hostile position.

Behold how he loved him!—Or, more exactly, how He used to love him. The word used is the strong word for love which the sisters had themselves used in verse 3. “How He must have loved him,” they think, “during his life, if He thus sheds tears for him after his death!”

And some of them said.—Better. But some of them said—i.e., another party of the Jews, differing from those mentioned in the last verse.

Could not this man, which opened the eyes of the blind...?—They refer to the greatest miracle...
They come to the Sepulchre.

ST. JOHN, XI.

The Prayer of Jesus.

hath been dead four days. (40) Jesus saith unto her, Said I not unto thee, that, if thou wouldest believe, thou shouldst see the glory of God? (41) Then they took away the stone from the place where the dead was laid. And Jesus lifted up his eyes, and said, Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me. (42) And I knew that thou

which had taken place within the limits of their own knowledge. The other miracle of raising the dead they must have heard of, but had not believed. What they think of here is not raising the dead, but the possibility of preventing death; and their question is meant to imply that He could not have prevented this death. If He could, surely He would have done so for one whom He had loved, and would have come at once, instead of waiting until death had taken place. The inference they would draw is that, after all, the present failure is a proof that He did not open the eyes of the blind.

(38) Jesus therefore again groaning in himself cometh to the grave. It was a cave, and a stone lay upon it. (39) Jesus said, Take ye away the stone. Martha, the sister of him that was dead, saith unto him, Lord, by this time he stinketh: for he

ST. JOHN, XI.

the manner of the Jews was to embalm only with the pronoun, of Jewish embalming mentioned in the Old Testament -The meaning depends upon the emphatic position of the expression that of Asa (2 Chron. xvi. 14). The body had been embalmed (verse 44); been uttered aloud in the presence of the multitude. That thought is rather of the sepulchre than of death—"for moment as the time of its realisation by the Son.

In this man, which opened the eyes of the blind," have caused that even this man should not have died? (38) Jesus therefore again groaning in himself cometh to the grave. It was a cave, and a stone lay upon it. (30) Jesus said, Take ye away the stone. Martha, the sister of him that was dead, saith unto him, Lord, by this time he stinketh: for he

And I knew that thou

The fact that the body had been in the sepulchre four days is given by the sister as a proof that decomposition must have taken place, and expositors have generally assumed that it was so. This is, however, not stated in the text, and the assumption is opposed by the fact that there was an interval during which the sepulchre was open, and Jesus prayed to the Father (verses 41, 42).

(40) If thou wouldest believe, thou shouldst see the glory of God.—He takes her back to the promise which she had heard from the messengers (verse 4), and which had led to her brightest hopes, and animads her too of evil thinking and her own faith (verses 21—27). Her last remark had more of the human and less of the divine than was contained in her earliest words (verse 22). Then her faith had reached "whatsoever Thou shalt ask"; and later she had accepted the truth, "He that believeth in Me, though he have died, yet shall he live." "Let her hold fast to this faith," His words would now say, in a gentleness that is yet not wholly without rebuke, "and she shall see the glory of God." By this more is meant than the restoration of Lazarus to physical life. That was seen by those who did not believe; for her it should be a sign, teaching that He is the Resurrection and the Life.

(41) Then they took away the stone.—This could be done without difficulty, for it would be nothing more than a rough slab placed at the entrance of the cave, to prevent the approach of jackals or other beasts of prey.

From the place where the dead was laid is omitted by all the better MSS. It is an unnecessary gloss, to explain what stone is meant.

And Jesus lifted up his eyes, and said ...—His attitude, as well as His words, is meant to express that the work which He is about to do, is one of the works from His Father.

I thank thee that thou hast heard me.—Better, I thank Thee that Thou didst hear Me; the time referred to being that of the offering of the prayer. Of this we have no notice. It was the will of the Son expressing itself in moral harmony with the will of the Father. "I seek not Mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath sent Me" (chap. v. 30; comp. chap. xii. 27, 28), and therefore in the expression receiving the answer. The promise of verse 4 was the utterance of the divine will to the disciples and the messengers, and we are, it may be, to think of that moment as the time of its realisation by the Son.

This thanksgiving for the answer to His prayer has been uttered aloud in the presence of the multitude. The verse which follows was spoken to prevent a misunderstanding on the part of the disciples and in all times.

And I knew that thou heardest me always.—The meaning depends upon the emphatic position of the pronoun, "I, for My part, knew." "It is not for My own sake that I speak these words." This union...
hearest me always: but because of the people which stand by I said it, that they may believe that thou hast sent me. (43) And when he thus had spoken, he cried with a loud voice, Lazarus, come forth. (44) And he that was dead came forth, bound hand and foot with grave-clothes: and his face was bound about with a napkin. Jesus saith unto them, Loose him, and let him go.

(45) Then many of the Jews which came to Mary, and had seen the things which Jesus did, believed on him. (46) But some of them went forth, bound hand and foot with which kept the spice from falling out. (Comp. chap. xix. 40.) We find it used elsewhere for straps and thongs generally. They were made of rushes, linen, and other materials. The word is used once in the Greek of the Old Testament, where it means the belts by which beds are girded (Prov. vii. 16).

And his face was bound about with a napkin.—For the word “napkin,” comp. Note on Luke xix. 20. It means here the cloth placed round the forehead and under the chin, but probably not covering the face.

Loose him, and let him go.—This command is in itself strong proof that the earlier part of the verse is not to be interpreted as a narrative of miraculous incidents.

(45) Then many of the Jews which came to Mary, and had seen . . .—Better, Many therefore of the Jews, which had come to Mary and seen . . . The comma should be placed after the word Jews. The Greek cannot mean, “Then many of the Jews, i.e., of those which came to Mary.” It must mean, “Many therefore of the Jews, i.e., all those which had come to Mary.” The miracle is so utterly beyond all their conceptions that it carries conviction to every heart, and leaves no further possibility of doubt. They are called those “which had come to Mary,” because they had remained with her after Martha had gone to meet our Lord, and had followed her when she herself went.

(46) But some of them went their ways to the Pharisees—i.e., necessarily, some of those who had been with Mary, and had seen the things which Jesus did, and had believed. But why did they then go and tell the Pharisees? It is contrary to their position as believers to think that they did this as informers against Jesus. What they have seen has carried conviction to their own minds, and they report it to the Pharisees, either as a proof that He really was the Messiah, or in any case to demand from them a judgment on the facts which they report.


(b) The council of the Jews. The decree of death against the Giver of Life (verses 47—53).

(c) The withdrawal to Ephraim. Many seek for Jesus (verses 54—57).

(d) The supper at Bethany. Mary, Judas, the chief priests (love, selfishness, hatred) (chap. xii. 1—11).

(e) The entry into Jerusalem. The King and His people (verses 12—19).

(f) The wider kingdom (verses 20—36).

Certain Greeks would see Jesus. The firstfruits of the West (verses 20—22).

The seed and the harvest. Life in death (verses 23—25).
They fear the Romans. ST. JOHN, XI. The unconscious Prophecy of Caiaphas.

their ways to the Pharisees, and told them what things Jesus had done.

(47) Then gathered the chief priests and the Pharisees a council, and said, What do we? for this man doeth many miracles.

(48) If we let him thus alone, all men will believe on him: and the Romans shall come and take away both our place and nation. (49) And one of them, named Caiaphas, being the high priest that same year, said unto them, Ye know nothing at all, (50) nor consider that it is expedient for us, that one man

(f) The wider kingdom (continued).


(g) The final issue of the unbelief of the Jews.

(a) The writer's own judgment (verses 37—43)—On no-faith (verses 37—41); On half-faith (verses 42, 43).

(b) The Judgment of Jesus (verses 44—50).
The rejection of light (verse 46); love ("that I might save the world," verse 47); truth (verse 49); life (verse 50).

(47) Then gathered the chief priests and the Pharisees a council.—Matters have reached too serious a stage for them to allow further delay. Opponents have become believers; enemies have become friends; and there are men of their own rank, and men with whom they had taken counsel against Him, who have now believed. The Pharisees go in their difficulty to the chief priests, who were for the most part Sadducees, and they together summon a meeting of the Sanhedrin.

What do we? for this man doeth many miracles.—The note of interrogation may be placed in the middle or at the end of the clause. The latter has been the work and teaching of Christ. He had performed miracles. The question is asked in the present tense; and one of the chief priests named Caiaphas—known as the chief of the Pharisees—made the declaration.

(48) If we let him thus alone, all men will believe on him: and the Romans shall come and take away both our place and nation. (49) And one of them, named Caiaphas, being the high priest that same year, said unto them, Ye know nothing at all, (50) nor consider that it is expedient for us, that one man

moment destroy the national life, which only existed on sufferance.

The attempts to prove that "our place" can mean "the Temple" must now be given up; and if we attach a local meaning to the word we must understand it of Jerusalem. It may, however, be questioned whether the word has any local signification here. Like our word "standing," and "place," and "position," it certainly may have a moral sense, and New Testament examples of this usage are frequent. (See Acts i. 23; xxv. 16; Rom. xiv. 16; Heb. xii. 17.) It is suggested that this sense is more in harmony with the feeling of the Pharisees. They possessed no local power; and the city could not be taken away from them more entirely than it already was. Their existence as rulers depended upon the Mosaic law and upon the services of the Temple. Round these centres they had gathered human tradition and ordinance, to which they clung because they only could interpret them, and they only could use the vast powers which were thus exercised over men. The Law had become practically an intricate system of ritual. With this the Roman empire, following its usual policy, had not interfered, and the Jewish hierarchy had become the centre and the rulers of the national life. But in direct opposition to both of them had been the work and teaching of Christ. He had sought to establish for law and service the simplicity of their first spiritual principles. His spiritual teaching was a cutting to the very root of their whole being. If all the people believed on Him their raison d'être would be gone, and the Romans would no longer suffer an implement of imperio, which they now allowed because it swayed the masses of the people. They would take both their position, and with it the rank which they still claimed as a nation.

The emphatic position of the word "our" should be noted, and also that "place and nation" are linked together as one complex thought attached to it.

(49) And one of them, named Caiaphas.—Comp. Notes on Matt. xxvi. 3; Luke iii. 2. His proper name was Joseph, and the name Caiaphas is the Syriac form of Cephas. He, like Peter, took the name of "Rockman," as a title to indicate his work! For the succession of high priests at this time, see Jos. Ant. xviii. 2, 2. Caiaphas himself was priest from A.D. 25—36.

Being the high priest that same year.—The words occur again in verse 51 and in chap. xviii. 13. They are used with a solemnity of meaning to express "that fatal and decisive year."

Ye know nothing at all.—There had probably been various suggestions made by different members of the Sanhedrin which seemed to him to miss the mark, or to fall short of the one means which would have a successful issue.

(50) Nor consider that it is expedient for us...—This remarkable counsel has linked itself in St. John's thoughts with the name of Caiaphas. He quotes it again in chap. xviii. 31.
should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not. (51) And this spake he not of himself; but being high priest that year, he prophesied that Jesus should die for that nation; (52) and not for that nation only, but that also he should gather together in one the children of God that were scattered abroad. (53) Then from that day forth they took counsel together for to put him to death. (54) Jesus therefore walked no more openly among the Jews; but went thence unto a country near to the wilderness, into a city called Ephraim, and there continued with his disciples.

(55) And the Jews’ passover was nigh at hand: and many went out of the

Should die for the people, and that the whole nation ...—Different words are used here in the Greek, as in the English. The former word represents the theocratic people, those who were united together as the servants of God; the latter word is that which is used in verse 48, and represents the political nation as one of the nations of the earth.

(53) And this spake he not of himself.—There is a moral beauty in the words, in spite of the diabolical intent with which they are uttered; and St. John adds the explanation that they had an origin higher than he who spake them. Writing after the events, he has seen them fulfilled, and regards them as an unconscious prophecy. Like another Balaam, Caiaphas was the oracle of God in spite of himself, and there is in his words a meaning far beyond any that he had intended.

Being high priest that year, he prophesied that Jesus should die for that nation.—He stood, therefore, in a relation which made him the official representative of God to the people, and gave him an official capacity to convey God’s truth. This was represented in the days of Samuel by the Urim and Thummim; and John, himself a Jew, still thinks of the high priest’s breast as bearing the oracle which declared the will of God, whatever unworthy human thoughts may have filled the heart beneath. It may be that another reference to the high priest’s office is present in these thrice-written words. It was the high priest’s duty to “enter within the veil,” and “make an atonement for the children of Israel for all their sins once a year” (Lev. xvi.). In that year the veil was rent, and the first step taken by which the holy place was destroyed, and the high priest’s office ceased to exist. With the destruction of the holy place the Jewish day of Atonement lost its significance, but the high priest that year, by his counsel and action in the Sanhedrin, was causing the sacrifice which should be presented by another high priest, in the Holy of Holies as an Atonement for the world—“Christ being come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by His own blood He entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption” (Heb. ix. 4, 11, 12).

(56) And not for that nation only.—Caiaphas had said “die for the people,” using the word which meant the people of the Jews. St. John said, “die for that nation,” using the wider word which meant the nation as one of the nations of the earth. He now passes to a wider meaning still. He has lived to see a special purifications before the Passover, but on the other hand, he has lived to see that God’s children in all nations, who shall be one flock under one shepherd.

(55) Then from that day forth they took counsel ...—On that day, then, the Sanhedrin officially decreed His death. The remaining question was how they could carry out this decree without exciting a popular tumult, or bringing themselves into collision with the Romans. (Comp. Note on Matt. xxvi. 4.)

(54) Jesus therefore walked no more openly among the Jews.—He had heard of the decree of the Sanhedrin which had been publicly made known (verse 57), and therefore avoided persons who would have carried it into effect.

“The Jews” are, as before, the hostile party. The passage is a good illustration of St. John’s use of the theocratic people, those who were united together as the servants of God; the latter word is that which among the Jews—He had heard of the decree of God’s children in all nations, who shall be one flock under one shepherd.

But went thence unto a country near to the wilderness.—All the better MSS. read “unto the country . . .” as in contrast to the city, Jerusalem, where “the Jews” dwelt. He went from Bethany, when He had heard of what had taken place at Jerusalem, “unto the country.” This is further defined as “near to the wilderness,” and then the name of the city is given.

Into a city called Ephraim.—The position of this “city” is not known. The MSS. spell it variously as Ephraim, Ephrem, Ephram, and Ephratha. Eusebius and Jerome both assumed it to be the same place as Ephraim, but differed as to its position, the former fixing it at eight, and the latter at twenty miles, north-east from Jerusalem. Both would place it, therefore, in Judea; and this agrees with its position “near to the wilderness,” for the desert of Judea extended nearly as far as Jericho. In 2 Chron. xiii. 19, we have an Ephraim or Ephron (according to the written text and the LXX.) in connection with the neighbourhood of Bethel. This is mentioned by Josephus (Wars, iv. 9, § 9), and is near to the wilderness of Bethaven. It is possibly the place named here; but a Jew would naturally use the phrase “the wilderness,” to mean the desert of Judea. Dr. Robinson would identify Ephraim and Ephron with Ophrah (Josh. xvii. 23; 1 Sam. xvii. 23), and fix the locality at the modern el-Taisibeh, four or five miles east from Bethel, and sixteen from Jerusalem, which would agree roughly with the position assigned by Jerome. We must be content to leave the matter in this uncertainty. (Comp. Note on Luke xvii. 11.)

(56) And the Jews’ passover was nigh at hand.—Comp. Notes on chaps. ii. 13, and vi. 4.

Out of the country.—Not the country near Ephraim, but the country generally, as opposed to the city.

To purify themselves.—The Law ordained no special purifications before the Passover, but on the general principle of ceremonial cleanness, a large number of pilgrims would necessarily go up before the feast to observe the legal rites and offer the remembrances. The time required varied from one to six days. (Comp. Gen. xxxv. 2; Ex. xix. 10, 11; Num. ix. 10; 2 Chron. xxx. 17, 18; and Notes on chap. xviii. 28, and Acts xxi. 24, 26; xxiv. 18.)
country up to Jerusalem before the passover, to purify themselves. Then sought they for Jesus, and spake among themselves, as they stood in the temple, What think ye, that he will not come to the feast? Now both the chief priests and the Pharisees had given a commandment, that, if any man knew where he were, he should shew it, that they might take him.

CHAPTER XII.—(1) Then Jesus six days before the passover came to Bethan-

(56) Then sought they for Jesus, and spake (1) They words imply a continuance of seeking and speaking. They describe the scene as it took place day after day as they stood in the Temple courts. They had heard numbers of recent events in the various parts from which they had come. Many of them had seen and heard Him at earlier feasts at Jerusalem, and they wonder whether He will come to the Passover, or whether the decree of the Jews will deter Him.

What think ye, that he will not come to the feast?—The words contain two questions: What think ye? That He will not come to the feast? He has not been seen in any of the caravans, and the place of His retirement is not known to them. They ask the question one of another; but the tone of doubt is prevalent.

(57) Now both the chief priests and the Pharisees.—If the word rendered “both” is regarded as part of the text, it would connect this verse with the fact that the people sought for Jesus—They on the one hand sought and asked questions about Him; but besides this, the chief priests and the Pharisees had given commandment. But the great majority of the best MSS. omit the word, and we must therefore read, Now the chief priests and the Pharisees had given commandment. The words are an explanation of their question—Will He come in the face of this commandment? Their resolve to take Him has been arrived at as the result of their counsel (verse 53).

II.

(1) Then Jesus six days before the Passover came to Bethany.—The whole question of the arrangement of days during this last great week depends upon the day which we adopt with regard to the day on which our Lord was crucified. The discussion of this is reserved for a separate Note, where it may be fully dealt with. (Comp. Ex cursus F: The Day of the Crucifixion of our Lord.)

(2) There they made him a supper.—Comp. Notes on Matt. xvi, 5 et seq., and Mark xiv, 3 et seq., which are clearly accounts of the same supper. Here the details peculiar to St. John, who was an eyewitness, will be noted. St. Matthew gives no indication of the day. St. Mark seems to place it two days before the Passover; but comp. Notes on Mark xvi, 1, 2. Both the other accounts tell us that the supper was in the house of Simon the leper. St. John does not define the place more definitely than to say that it was in Bethany; but he alone adds the facts that Martha was still serving, and that Lazarus was present as a guest.

And Martha served.—The tense of this verb differs from that of the others in the verse, and implies the continued act of serving, whilst “made a feast” is the statement of the fact as a whole. (Comp. Luke x, 40.)

Lazarus was one of them that sat at the table with him.—This is a natural touch answering to the impression that the fact made. It is closely connected with the statement of the preceding verse, “Lazarus had been dead, whom he raised from the dead.” Here was one sitting at meat with them who had lain in the sepulchre four days. The meal is in his case, as afterwards in that of our Lord Himself (Luke xxiv. 41-43), a physical proof of the Resurrection; and his presence by the side of our Lord calls forth from Mary the anointing, which testifies to her gratitude and love.

(3) Then took Mary a pound of ointment of spikenard.—Here, again, St. John alone gives the name of her whom St. Matthew and St. Mark call “a woman,” and here, too, she is true to the earlier character as we have it drawn in St. Luke (x. 40, 42). From this passage also we know that it was a “pound” of ointment which she took. The other accounts tell us that it was an “alabaster box.” This pound was the Greek libra, the Latin “libra,” the pound of twelve ounces.

For the “ointment of spikenard,” see Mark xiv. 3. It may perhaps mean “Nard Pistik,” or Pistik ointment, the word Pistik being a local name. The fact that this peculiar word occurs only in these two passages points to this as the probable explanation.

And anointed the feet of Jesus, and wiped them with her hair.—St. Matthew and St. Mark both state that she anointed His head. This was the usual custom (comp. Note on Luke vii. 46, and Ps. lxxxiii. 5); but St. John remembers that the act of love went beyond that of common esteem, in the depth of its gratitude and reverence, and anointed the feet, and wiped them with her own hair.

And the house was filled with the odour of the ointment.—The ointment was imported from the East in sealed flasks, which were broken when it was used. The strong perfume then escaped, and spread through the house (Mark xiv. 3).

(4) Then saith one of his disciples, Judas Iscariot.—Comp. Notes on chap. vi. 70, 71. St. Matthew tells us that the question was asked by “the disciples;” St. Mark, that it was asked by “certain persons;” St. John remembers that it was Judas who spoke, and he remembers that his words were characteristic of the man (verse 6). He implies by the form in which he relates these words, that he spoke for himself, and that the others did not join in his feeling.

(5) Why was not this ointment sold for three hundred pence?—Both the earlier Gospels
three hundred pence, and given to the poor? (6) This he said, not that he cared for the poor; but because he was a thief, and had the bag, and bare what was put therein. (7) Then said Jesus, Let her alone: against the day of my burying hath she kept this. (8) For the poor always ye have with you; but me ye have not always.

(9) Much people of the Jews therefore knew that he was there; and they came not for Jesus' sake only, but that they might see Lazarus also, whom he had raised from the dead.

(10) But the chief priests consulted that they might put Lazarus also to death; (11) because that by reason of him many of the Jews went away, and believed on Jesus.

(12) On the next day much people that were come to the feast, when they heard that Jesus was coming to Jerusalem,

(13) took branches of palm trees, and went forth to meet him, and cried,
Hosanna: Blessed is the King of Israel that cometh in the name of the Lord.

(14) And Jesus, when he had found a young ass, sat thereon; as it is written,

(15) Fear not, daughter of Sion: behold, thy King cometh, sitting on an ass's colt.

(16) These things understood not his disciples at the first: but when Jesus was glorified, then remembered they that these things were written of him, and that they had done these things unto him. (17) The people therefore that was with him when he called Lazarus out of his grave, and raised him from the dead, bare record. (18) For this cause the people also met him, for that they heard that he had done this miracle. (19) The Pharisees therefore said among themselves, Perceive ye how ye prevail nothing? behold, the world is gone after him.

(20) And there were certain Greeks

of palm trees”), and for that rendered “palm trees,” comp. Rev. vii. 9. Neither word occurs elsewhere in the New Testament. Again, the fuller Synoptic narrative includes but does not state this particular.

Hosanna: Blessed is the King of Israel that cometh in the name of the Lord.—The better reading is, Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord, and the King of Israel. These words of their cry are peculiar to St. John. The fullest report is St. Matthew’s (see Note on verse 9). That all the accounts differ is natural, and they have all preserved to us some distinctive acclamation with which the crowds welcomed Him whom they received as the Messiah. The exvii. Psalm, from which these acclamations are taken (see verses 25 and 26), was currently interpreted as Messianic, and formed part of the Hallel chanted at Pasover. (Comp. Note on chap. vii. 37.)

It is important to observe that St. John, like St. Matthew, does not follow the Greek of the LXX. in translating the Hebrew word “Hosanna,” but preserves the Hebrew sound in Greek letters. Comp. Rev. xix. 6, where the word “Alleluia” is transliterated in the same way.

(14) And Jesus, when he had found a young ass, sat thereon.—St. John simply mentions this to introduce the prophecy. The others all give the incidents in detail. “Having found,” does not imply that the colt was found without the search which the other Evangelists record. (Comp. the same word in chap. ix. 39.) It has been noted, as illustrating the fact, that the word “found” includes the sending the disciples to look for the colt, that it is the same Greek word which Archimedes used when he found the object of his search, and cried. Eureka! Eureka!

(15) Fear not, daughter of Sion.—The quotation is made freely, and in an abbreviated form. (Comp. the fuller form in Matt. xxi. 5, and Note upon it there.) It is in the two Hebrew Gospels only that the connection of the fact with the prophecy is mentioned.

Sitting on an ass’s colt.—The Greek (LXX.) has “a young ass.” St. John’s translation is nearer to the Hebrew. (Comp. Introduction, p. 374.)

(16) These things understood not his disciples at the first...—Comp. Notes on chap. li. 22 and xx. 9. It is a touch peculiar to St. John, and exactly in his manner. He remembers the difference between the spiritual receptivity, before and after Pentecost, in the Apostolic band itself. He remembers how the Old Testament Scriptures became filled with a new life and meaning, as the Spirit brought to the memory authority; and had then gone after Him. (Comp. Note on verse 9.)

When Jesus was glorified.—Comp. Note on chap. vii. 30.

The Lord had done these things unto Him.—The narrative implies, these, the incidents which the others state. The phrase “these things” occurs three times, referring emphatically to the correspondence between the prophecy and the actual incidents.

(17) When he called Lazarus...—Several MSS. and some of the oldest versions read, “bare record that He called Lazarus out of the grave, and raised him from the dead.” The difference in the texts is only that of one letter (τετυπ and τιτυπ). If we take the reading which was adopted by our translators, and which is best supported, we must distinguish between the multitude mentioned in this verse, and that mentioned in verse 13. The meaning of this text is that the Jews of verses 9 and 11, and those of chap. xi. 45, with the people of Bethany, bear witness of the event, the recurrence of which they had themselves seen; and that this testimony was received by the multitudes of verse 12.

If we take the alternative, but less probable text, the multitude in both verses will be one and the same.

(18) For this cause the people—i.e. (see last verse), the multitude of verse 12.

For that they heard...this miracle.—The emphatic form of the sentence points out that the raising of Lazarus was the miracle which carried the entire conviction of the multitude. They had heard of and in some cases seen the miracles, but this stood by itself, as witness which could not be gainsaid.

(19) Perceive ye how ye prevail nothing?—The words may be also read, “Look how ye profit nothing” (imperative); or, Ye perceive how ye profit nothing (indicative). Upon the whole this last is to be preferred. They blame each other for the failure of all their plans (comp. chap. xii. 47), and prepare themselves to accept the counsel of Caiaphas.

Behold, the world is gone after him.—They use terms which express the bitterness of their despair. They who had asked in scorn, “Have any of the rulers or of the Pharisees believed on him?” who called “cursed” “this people who knoweth not the law” who followed Him (chap. vii. 48, 49), have heard Jews of Jerusalem express their belief in Him; and now, see Him whom they are seeking to kill, borne as the Messiah at the head of a throng of pilgrims.

The words rendered “gone after him” apply that they had gone away from themselves, and rejected their authority; and had then gone after Him. (Comp. Note on verse 11.)

(20) And there were certain Greeks.—Comp. Note on chap. vii. 35, where we have the same word in the original, and Acts vi. 1; ix. 29; and xi. 20. They were not Hellenists, i.e., Greek Jews, but Hellenes, i.e., Gentiles.
Among them that came up to worship at the feast: (22) the same came therefore to Philip, which was of Bethsaida of Galilee, and desired him, saying, Sir, we would see Jesus. (22) Philip cometh

Among them that came up to worship at the feast.—The words imply that they were in the habit of going up to Jerusalem at the feasts, i.e., that though Greeks by birth, they had been admitted to the privileges of Judaism. They belonged to the class known as “Proselytes of the Gate.” (Comp. Notes on Matt. xxiii. 15 and Acts vii. 27.)

(22) The same came therefore to Philip.—We have no indication of the time when, or of the place where, these words were spoken. St. John alone gives us this incident, and he gives us this incident only, of all that occurred, as we know from the earlier Gospels, between the entry into Jerusalem and the Last Supper; and he relates this coming of the Greeks not for the sake of the fact itself, but for that of the discourse which followed upon it. He is careful, therefore, only to mention it, and is not concerned, for the purpose he has in view, with any of the historic details. The last words of the discourse (verse 36) do, however, intimate that they were followed by a retirement from public teaching, and from public appearance in Jerusalem. They would, then, be among the last words spoken in the Temple before the retirement to Bethany, on the evening of what we call Wednesday. (Comp. Luke xxi. 37.) They were uttered, probably, in the Court of the Gentiles, as He passed from the Court of the Women, which, as the most public place for Jewish assemblies, was the frequent scene of His teaching. On the previous day, the Court of the Gentiles had been cleansed from the traffic and merchandise which had been customary in it, and the temple had been declared to be “a house of prayer for all nations.” The court of the Gentiles was divided from the inner square of the Temple by a stone fence, bearing upon pillars, placed at regular distances, the following words in Greek and Latin:—

“No alien must pass within the fence round the Temple and the court. If any one be caught doing so, he must blame himself for the death that will follow.” This prohibition was known before, from Josephus (Ant. xv. 11, 5); but in our own day one of the very slabs, bearing the exact words, has been discovered by M. Ganneau during the excavations of the Palestine Exploration Fund. (Comp. Note on Acts xxii. 28, 29, and especially the Note on Mark xi. 17.) The events and the words of these days must have brought strange thoughts to the minds of proselytes, men who were worshippers of the one God by personal conviction, and not because of the faith of their ancestors; and with hearts filled with wonder as to what these things meant—half-grasping, it may be, the truth that this middle wall of partition should be broken down—they ask for a special interview with Jesus. (Comp. Eph. ii. 12 et seq.)

Which was of Bethsaida of Galilee.—The mention of this place again here seems to intend that it should be told as explaining why these Greeks came to Philip. They may have themselves come from the neighbourhood of Bethsaida, or from one of the Greek cities of Decapolis.

Philip cometh and telleth Andrew.—It is a striking coincidence, and perhaps more than this, that the Greeks thus came into connection with the only Apostles who bear Greek names; and may themselves have had some special connection by birth, or residence, or culture with Greek civilisation. The names have occurred together before (chaps. i. 44; vi. 7, 8): they were fellow-townsmen and friends. But Andrew was also brother of Simon Peter, and is one of the first group of four in the apostolic band. (Comp. Mark xii. 3.) The Greeks then naturally come to Philip, and Philip consults his friend Andrew, who is in a position of greater intimacy with the Lord than he himself is, and they come together and tell Jesus.

(23) And Jesus answered them, saying, The hour is come, that the Son of man should be glorified. (24) Verily, verily, we would see Jesus.
I say unto you, Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone: but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit. (25) He that loveth his life shall lose it; and he that hateth his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal. (26) If any man serve me, let him follow me; and where I am, there shall also my servant be: if any man serve me, him will my Father honour.

Now is my soul troubled; and what shall I say? Father, save me

The Seed and the Harvest.

ST. JOHN, XII.

Life lost and Life kept.

This law Christ now teaches to be a law also of the moral world, and one to which His own life is subject. Here too life issues from death. The moral power which is the life of the world finds its source in the death of the Son of man. "He is life." "In Him is life." "He quickens whom He will." "Whosoever believeth in Him hath eternal life." These truths this Gospel has told us again and again: but Christ now tells that while He is still on earth this life exists, but in its germs; and that in His death it will burst forth, and grow up, and multiply itself in the great spiritual harvest of the world. Such was the prophecy. The history of all that is best, and truest, and noblest in the life of eighteen centuries comes to us as the fulfilment. Hearts hardened, sinful, dead, that have been led to think of His death, and in thoughts of it have felt germs of life springing up and bursting the husks of their former prison, and growing up into living powers which have changed their whole being; this is the individual fulfilment that has come to many and may come to all.

(25) He that loveth his life shall lose it.—The reading here is uncertain, and may be, perhaps with slightly more probability is, He that loveth his life loses it—i.e., that the loss of life is not in the future only, but that in the present, in every moment when a man loves and seeks to save his own life, he is then, and by that very seeking, actually losing it.

The words of this verse are familiar to us from the earlier Gospels, and have been explained in Notes on Matt. x. 39; xvi. 25; Mark viii. 35; Luke ix. 24; xvii. 33. The disciples had heard them laid down as the law of their own life and work. They now hear the mysterious words again, and they are asserted as the law to which even His life is submitted. There is even in His human nature a physical and emotional life which would shrink from sacrifice and death (verse 27; comp. Note on Matt. xxvi. 39), but in self-sacrifice and death is His own glory and the life of the world. There is in all human nature a principle which would seek as the highest good the life of the body and of the soul, as distinct from the higher life of the spirit, and would shrink from sacrifice and death; but the true principle of life is of the spirit, and only in the sacrifice of the desires of the lower physical and emotional life is that spiritual life realised.

(26) If any man serve me, let him follow me.—The close connection of verses 23—25 make it certain that the spiritual law of sacrifice is there applied to the life of our Lord Himself. This verse makes it equally certain that the law is applied to those who follow Him. The point of the whole teaching is missed unless we think of the Greeks as present. They had come as volunteers into His service. Did they know what the discipleship was? Were they prepared to follow Him in self-sacrifice, that through sacrifice they may obtain eternal life? It had been the condition of earlier discipleship. It is laid down for the new disciples, and in the presence of the older ones who in the dark days that have now come were to learn what sacrifice meant. The Greeks needed no less than the Hebrews to learn it; the men of a wider civilization and more philosophic thought no less than the fishermen of Galilee and the scribes of Jerusalem. All self-sacrificing, whether in the coarser forms of pleasure and power or in the more refined forms of emotion and thought, is self-loving; all self-sacrifice, whether in the daily round of duty to man or in the devotion of the whole self to God, is self-saving. Self-seeking is always akin to, and oftentimes with, hatred of others; and hatred is death. Self-sacrifice is akin to, and one with, love to others; and love is life.

And where I am, there shall also my servant be.—This is an anticipation of the glory of the Son of man for which the hour had already come. (Comp. Note on chap. xvii. 24.)

If any man serve me, him will my Father honour.—The condition is the same as in the first clause of the verse, the difference of that which follows upon the condition again bringing out in the fulness of its meaning the law of life through sacrifice:

"let him follow Me" . . . "he that hateth his life in this world"

"If any man serve Me," "him will my Father honour" . . . "shall keep it unto life eternal."

The honour of the servant after his work is done is in the same relation to that work as the glory of the Son of man is to His work. This honour will consist in his being where the Son of man is; and this will be the Father's gift (chap. xvi. 24).

Now is my soul troubled; and what shall I say?—The word rendered "soul" is the same word as that rendered "life" in verse 25. (Comp. especially Matt. xvi. 25, 26.) It is the seat of the natural feelings and emotions, and, as the fatal hour approaches, our Lord is in that region of His human life troubled. There is a real shrinking from the darkness of the death which is at hand. The conflict exists but for a moment, but in all its fearfulness is real, and then the cup of the world's woe is seized and drunk to its bitter dregs. Men have sometimes wondered that St. John passes over the agony of the garden of Gethsemane, but the agony of Gethsemane is here, and the very words of Matt. xxvi. 39 are echoed. Men have wondered, too, that in the life of the Son of man a struggle such as this could have had even a moment's place. Not a few, indeed, would at any cost read the words otherwise. But they cannot be read otherwise, either on the written page or in the hearts of men. That troubled soul asked, "What shall I say? Blessed reality! In that struggle humanity struggled, and in that victory humanity won.

Father, save me from this hour: but for this cause came I unto this hour.—It is uncertain whether the first words of this sentence are a prayer, or whether they should be read as a question. In the latter case the meaning would be, "What shall I say? Shall I say, Father save Me from this hour? But no: for this cause came I unto this hour. I cannot shrink back or seek to be delivered from it." As a prayer
from this hour: but for this cause came I unto this hour. 

The people therefore, that stood by, and heard it, said that it thundered: others said, An angel spake to him. 

Jesus answered and said, This voice came not because of me, but for your sakes. 

Now is the judgment of this world: now shall the prince of this world be cast out. 

And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto heaven does not forbid our understanding also that this voice was heard more or less distinctly, or was as a voice not heard at all, in proportion as the hearts of the hearers were or were not receptive of the voice of God. 

To some it seemed but as natural thunder, but their own Scripture had taught again and again “God thundereth marvellously with His voice: great things doeth He which we cannot comprehend,” and the religious interpretation of nature hears everywhere the voice of God. Others, and these must have been Pharisees (comp. Acts xxiii. 8, 9), recognise a voice which is more than that of nature or of man, and think that an angel hath spoken. (Comp. Note on chap. v. 4.)

This voice came not because of me, but for your sakes. More exactly, not for My sake did this voice come, but for your sakes. These words are an answer to the thoughts, spoken and unspoken, of the multitude. Jesus Himself knew that the Father heareth Him always, but this answer is a sign to others. (Comp. chap. xi. 41, 42.) He calls it a voice in answer to those who said it thundered, or that an angel had spoken. There was that, then, which seemed to them but the thunder's sound or an angel's word, which, coming in answer to His prayer and after His teaching, should have been, to ears ready to hear and minds willing to receive, the voice of God witnessing to the mission of His Son.

Now shall the prince of this world be cast out. The title “prince of this world” was the regular Rabbinic title for Satan, whom they regarded as the ruler of the Gentiles, the Jews not being included in his kingdom. The reign of the true Messiah is over the Gentile and Jewish world alike; Gentiles as well as Jews are at this moment in the temple listening to Him; Jews as well as Gentiles have been subjects of the prince of this world (chap. viii. 44; Rom. ii.). The world itself, as opposed to Christ, is condemned, for its unbelief crucifies Jesus Christ; but the Resurrection and Ascension are Heaven’s witness that He is the Son of God. The world’s condemnation is followed by the casting out of its ruler.

The whole future is present to the mind of Christ, and in the confidence of victory He uses the emphatic “now” of both the judgment of the world and the dethronement of its prince. It should be noted, however, that the tenses differ. The one is thought of as the immediate result of His death; the other is the gradual victory of truth, and is spoken of in the same future as the drawing all men of the following verse.
me. (32) This he said, signifying what death he should die. (33) The people answered him, We have heard out of the law that Christ abideth for ever:—

The manner of His Death.

ST. JOHN, XII.

The moral power of the Cross.

(32) And I, if I be lifted up from the earth,—
The pronoun is strongly emphatic. "And I," in opposition to the prince of this world; the conqueror in opposition to the vanquished foe. The conditional form of the "lifted up," which follows, gives rise to the "troubled soul" of verse 27. He knows that it will be so, but He leaves the future to declare its own truths. Comp. the phrases, "If it be possible," "If this may not pass away from Me" (Matt. xxvi. 39, 42), and Note on chap. xiv. 3. The words "lifted up" have occurred before in chaps. iii. 14 and viii. 25; but the context here shows that they include the thought of the ascension into heaven. It is from the heavenly throne that the Messiah will rule over His spiritual kingdom.

Will draw all men unto me.—Better, . . . unto Myself. The words "all men" are not to be limited by interpretations which refer them to nations, or to elect persons within nations; but are to be taken in all the fulness of their width as meaning simply what they say—"all." The drawing unto Himself is the assertion of His reign over the world, from which the prince of evil shall be cast out. He will Himself be the centre of the new kingdom, from which none shall be shut out. These Greeks who are drawn to Him now are the first-fruits of the harvest of which the whole world is the field, and of which the last day is to be the great ingathering. The word "draw" occurs once in the New Testament, besides this passage, in a moral sense (chap. vi. 44; comp. Note on it there). It is accomplished in the work of the Holy Spirit, whose mission to the Church was dependent on the ascension of our Lord (chaps. vii. 39 and xvi. 7); and the promise is fulfilled even in the case of those who resist the Holy Spirit’s influence. They are drawn by the moral power of the life and death and resurrection of Christ brought home to them by the Holy Ghost; but no moral power can compel a will which is free. (Comp. Note on chap. vi. 37.) The whole mission-work of the Church and every effort which Christianity brings to bear upon the earth again implies the power of man to reject it. But we may not say this moral power is not leading men to Christ, where we can least trace it, and we may not say that there is any limit where its influence ends. (Comp. Note on 1 Pet. iii. 19.)

(33) By what death he should die.—Better, by what manner of death . . . (Comp. chap. xviii. 32.) The words are the Apostle’s interpretation of the saying of our Lord. He remembers it as he has recorded it twice before (chaps. iii. 14 and viii. 28), but he adds here words ("from the earth") which supply another thought, though the two thoughts are not inconsistent. The words bear the double sense, and looking back upon the fact of the Crucifixion, he sees in that a lifting up which was part of the great moral victory over the world, and in the very cross of shame he sees the throne of glory.

(34) We have heard out of the law that Christ abideth for ever . . . .—The term "law" refers to the whole of the Old Testament Scripture, as we have seen in chap. x. 34. (Comp. Note there.) They may have referred to such passages as Ps. lxxxix. 36 and cx. 4; Isa. ix. 6; Dan. vii. 13, 14. This remark is an instance of the knowledge of Rabbinc theology which interpreted such passages of a temporal Messianic reign. They had witnessed His triumphal entry into the royal city, and had joined in the acclamations which hailed Him as their King. They expected Him to free them from Roman bondage, and to rule over them in an earthly paradise to which there should be no end. The Christ they thought was to abide for ever.

and how sayest thou, The Son of man must be lifted up? who is this Son of man? (35) Then Jesus said unto them, Yet a little while is the light with you.—It is better, as we have often seen, to read Therefore for "Then." The word connects what follows closely with what has gone before. It was because of their question that Jesus said this. And yet it is not said that "He answered them," because what He said was not a direct answer. They are asking questions in which we may trace the spirit, if not the very words, of the formal, literal objectors who had, with like technicalities, stifled the truth whenever it was springing up in their minds. Such
Walking in Light, and in Darkness.

Walk while ye have the light, lest darkness come upon you: for he that walketh in darkness knoweth not whither he goeth. (36) While ye have light, believe in the light, that ye may be the children of light. These things spake Jesus, and departed, and did hide himself from them.

(37) But though he had done so many miracles before them, yet they believed not on him: (38) that the saying of Esaias the prophet might be fulfilled, which he spake, Lord, who hath believed our report? and to whom hath the arm of the Lord been revealed? (39) Therefore they could not believe, because that
The Blinded Eyes and Hardened Hearts. ST. JOHN, XII.

Esaias said again, (40) He hath blinded their eyes, and hardened their heart, that they should not see with their eyes, nor understand with their heart, and be converted, and I should heal them. (41) These things said Esaias, when he saw his glory, and spake of him. (42) Nevertheless among the chief teaching by parables, and has based it upon this prophecy of Isaiah (Matt. xiii. 14). The principle was that which has been repeated in His last public words (verses 35 and 36); that power used is increased, and power neglected destroys itself. Here, then, in these prophetic words was the reason they could not believe. Wilful rejection had been followed by rejection which was no longer within the power of the will. With this statement of St. John’s should be compared our Lord’s words on the same subject in chaps. vi. 40 and vi. 37, Notes, and St. Paul’s arguments in Rom. ix.—xi.

(40) He hath blinded their eyes, and hardened their heart . . . .—These words are quoted three times in the New Testament. Our Lord, as we have seen, quotes them as explaining His own teaching (Matt. xiii. 14); St. John quotes them here to explain the rejection of that teaching; St. Paul quotes them in Acts xxviii. 26, to explain the rejection of the Gospel by the Jews at Rome. Yet we are to remember that the prophet and those who quote him are all witnesses that within Israel there were eyes which were not blinded and hearts which were not hardened. Isaiah, John, and Paul, were all Jews; and our Lord Himself was, in His human nature, of the seed of Abraham. Isaiah’s prophecy is accompanied by the promise of a holy seed (verse 13); St. John quotes these words, and adds that “even of the rulers many believed” (verse 42); St. Paul quotes them when “some believed the things which were spoken and some believed not” (verse 24); our Lord quotes them, and immediately says, “But blessed are your eyes, for they see, and your ears, for they hear.” There is, indeed, a judicial blindness and a judicial hardening—let no one therefore presume; but these come only to eyes that will not to see, and to hearts that will not to hear—let no man therefore despair. The quotation in this place does not follow exactly either the Hebrew or the Greek of the passage in Isaiah. In the Hebrew text, as in the Authorized version, the prophet is commanded to “make the heart of this people fat.” . . . The Greek text says simply, “The heart of this people was hardened.” . . . St. John represents the action which God commanded to be done as done by Himself, and speaks of it in the past tense. And I should heal them.—The pronoun here refers to Christ. St. John in his interpretation of the prophecy has made God (“He”) the author of the judicial blindness and hardness, and represents Christ as the physician. This clause is, however, not to be taken separately, but is governed by “that not” which precedes. The effect of their not turning was that Christ could not heal them.

On the whole verse comp. Note on Matt. xiii. 14, and Acts xxviii. 26. (41) These things said Esaias, when he saw his glory.—The better text is, . . . because he saw His glory. (Comp. Note on the reading in chap. xii. 17.) The result of seeing His glory was that he spake of Him. This is St. John’s interpretation of the prophecy. Isaiah himself tells us, “I saw also the Lord sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up, and His train filled the temple” (chap. vi. 1). But no man hath seen God at any time. The Word is the express image of His Person. This glory was of the pre-incarnate Word, who was in the beginning with God, and was God. Nevertheless among the chief rulers also many believed on him; but because of the Pharisees they did not confess him, lest they should be put out of the synagogue; (43) for they loved the praise of men more than the praise of God. (44) Jesus cried and said, He that believeth on me, believeth not on me, but because of the Pharisees they did not confess him, lest they should be put out of the synagogue; (45) for they loved the praise of men more than the praise of God.
but on him that sent me. (45) And he that seeth me seeth him that sent me. (46) I am come a light into the world, that whosoever believeth on me should not abide in darkness. (47) And if any man hear my words, and believe not, I judge him not: for I came not to judge the world, but to save the world. (48) He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him: the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day. (49) For I have not spoken of myself; but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak. (50) And I know that his commandment is life everlasting. —i.e., the commission of the Messianic work. It is better to read here, as before, eternal life. (Comp. chap. iii. 15, et al.) The Son speaks not of Himself, but He speaks as executing this commission, which brings spiritual and eternal life to the world. It could not be otherwise. This commandment being eternal life, the whole teaching of the Messiah must simply be an utterance of it. As the Father said unto me, so I speak.—This clause answers to “what I should say and what I should speak” in the last verse. The external revelation is regarded as the work of the Son. That which the Father says is the truth revealed, and the matter and form are here identified.

CHAPTER XIII.—(1) Now before the feast of the passover, when Jesus knew that his hour was come that he should depart out of this world unto the Father, having loved his own which were in the world,a He said unto them, I am not come to you; but to the world. . . . (48) For I have not spoken of myself; but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak. (50) And I know that his commandment is life everlasting: whatsoever I speak therefore, even as the Father said unto me, so I speak.

[4. The fuller Revelation, and Growth of Faith among the Disciples (chaps. xiii. 1—xvii. 26).]

(1) LOVE MANIFESTED IN HUMILIATION (chap. xiii. 1—30).
(a) The washing of the disciples’ feet (verses 1—11);
(b) The spiritual interpretation of this act (verses 12—28);
(c) The Betrayal. Hatred passes from the presence of love (verses 21—30).

(2) Now before the feast of the passover.—Comp. chaps. xii. 1, 12, 36, and Excur. F: The Day of the Crucifixion of our Lord.

When Jesus knew that his hour was come . . . —He knew during the course of His earthly work that His hour was not yet come, and again and again declared this. (Comp. Note on chaps. ii. 4; vii. 6; xi. 9.) Now He knows with equal certainty that the hour is at hand that He should depart unto the Father.

Having loved his own which were in the world . . . —By “his own” are here meant those who by believing on Him had received power to become the sons of God; those who by walking according as they had light were becoming sons of light. They are the true members of the family of God. (Comp. Note on chap. i. 11, 12.) The words as here used refer
world, he loved them unto the end.
(2) And supper being ended, the devil having now put into the heart of Judas Iscariot, Simon’s son, to betray Him;
(3) Jesus knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands, and

specially to those who had been called by Him, and had left all and followed Him. He is the head of this family, and He knows that these His “little children” (verse 33) will be left as orphans (chap. xiv. 18). He would depart out of the world; “they would be left “in the world,” as sheep among wolves, and as sheep without their shepherd.’ St. John places these facts in touching contrast. His thoughts are for them and not for Himself. For Him there would be the return to the glory of His Father’s throne, but His mind dwells on the bereavement and sorrow of those He leaves behind, and this moves Him to a special manifestation of His love.

He loved them unto the end.—It has been usual to regard these the words of the continuance of our Lord’s love—“Having loved His own, He continued to love them until the last moment.” This is, of course, true, but is a truth so certain and necessary from every conception of our Lord’s character as St. John has portrayed it, that we may doubt whether he would in this formal way state it. And though the phrase rendered “unto the end” sometimes means “finally”—as, e.g., in the New Testament, Luke xvii. 5, and 1 Thess. ii. 16 (see Notes)—the sense, “unto the end” is very rare, and the general meaning is, “in the fullest degree,” “up to the limit.” It thus answers exactly to our “extremely.”

What seems not to have been noted is that the whole sentence may be a common Hebrew idiom in the Greek dress. It belongs to the simple syntax of a primitive people to express intensity by repetition. The Vale of Sodom was “pits, pits of bitumen” (Gen.xiv.10). The intensity of the verbal idea was expressed in like manner by a simple form of the verb which brought the thought before the mind, and then by the special form which denoted the action.

This is sometimes preserved in the English, as, e.g., in Gen. xx. 17—“That in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed” (I will bless thee abundantly, and will multiply thy seed exceedingly). Sometimes it is not. We have, e.g., in Amos ix. 8, “I will not utterly destroy the house of Jacob, saith the Lord,” where the Hebrew is literally, “Destroying I will not destroy . . . (Vulgata, covering non conserum). In these passages the English exactly follows the Greek—i.e., the Greek in the passage of Genesis repeats the words as the Hebrew does, and in that of Amos, expresses the intensity by an adverbial phrase (τις τεκαστα). Not that phrase is exactly the same as the one used by St. John here, and which is rendered "unto the end." St. John was a Jew writing in Greek. May we not naturally expect a Hebrew thought in the Greek form? He thinks of the intensity of our Lord’s love, and speaks of it in the simple expressiveness of the old Hebrew phrase, “Loving, he loved them with fulness of love.” (Comp. chap. xii. 13.) This is not given as an amended rendering, because authority has been sought for it without success; but it is offered, as an explanation to the reader. The reader will find in Schleusner’s Lexicon Veteris Testamenti other instances which support this view.

that he was come from God, and went to God; (4) he riseth from supper, and laid aside his garments; and took a towel, and girded himself. (5) After that he poureth water into a bason, and began to wash the disciples’ feet, and to
ST. JOHN, XIII.

Simon Peter’s Impulsive Refusal, and Acceptance of the Washing.

wipe them with the towel wherewith he was girded. (6) Then cometh he to Simon Peter: and Peter saith unto him, Lord, dost thou wash my feet? (7) Jesus answered and said unto him, What I do thou knowest not now; but thou shalt know hereafter. (8) Peter saith unto him, Thou shalt never wash my feet. Jesus answered him, If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me. (9) Simon Peter saith unto him, Lord, not my feet only, but also my hands and my head. (10) Jesus saith to him, He that is washed needeth not save to wash his feet, but is our Lord promises him. He sees no ground on which our Lord’s act can possibly be one which he can permit. Note that the emphasis is on the negative. The pronoun “my” is again not to be emphasised, nor is “Thou” in this passage. “Thou shalt never wash my feet.”

If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me.—Our Lord has already intimated (verse 7) that His deed was symbolic, and He now refers to the truth underlying the outer act. The key to His meaning is to be found in His own words in verses 13—17. By the act of washing their feet, He, their Lord, taught the spirit of self-sacrifice and love in opposition to the spirit of self-seeking and pride which ruled even in the Apostles’ hearts. That lesson every servant and apostle of Jesus Christ must learn, for the servant is not greater than the Lord, nor the Apostle than the Sender. That lesson Peter was refusing to learn in the pride of his own impulsive will, which seemed to be humility. But unless he learns to accept the love of Christ’s humiliation, and is so cleansed by its power that he yields his human will wholly to the divine, and learns in self-sacrifice what the spirit of Christ really is, he can have no part in Him. The lesson is a hard one, but it is necessary; the sacrifice of will may be harder than that of life; but the strong man must become as the little child before he can enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.

For the phrase, “Thou hast no part with me,” which is again a Hebrew thought in Greek dress, comp. Matt. xxv. 51, and Luke xii. 46. It is frequent in the Old Testament. See, e.g., Deut. xii. 12, “He hath no part nor inheritance with you.” (9) Lord, not my feet only, but also my hands and my head.—Peter still misunderstands the meaning; but he is true to his loving impulsive character. No part with his Master! He will give up anything, everything. He knows not what this washing means, and cannot conceive that it is fitting for Christ to wash his feet; but if it in any sense can mean having a part with Christ, then not the feet only, but the whole man.

(10) He that is washed needeth not save to wash his feet.—Better, He who hath bathed . . . St. Peter’s words have implied that he was wholly unclean, and needed for feet, and head, and hands, for the whole man, a moral cleansing. Christ answers that this was not so. The man who has been bathed is clean, but his feet coming in contact with the dust of the road need to be washed. It was so morally. They had been cleansed; their whole moral life had been changed, but they were liable to the corruption of everyday life through which they walked, and needed to be cleansed from the pollution of it. That day had furnished an example; their pride and self-seeking was of the spirit of the world, and not of the spirit of Christ; His act was a cleansing from that, but it did not imply that they were not clean. The lesson is that all, from Apostles downwards, need the daily renewing of the grace of God; and that none should find in failure,
clean every whit: and ye are clean, but not all. (11) For he knew who should betray him; therefore said he, Ye are not all clean.

(12) So after he had washed their feet, and had taken his garments, and was set down again, he said unto them, Know ye what I have done to you? (13) Ye call me Master and Lord: and ye say well; for so I am. (14) If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet; ye also ought to wash one another's feet. (15) For I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you. (16) Verily, verily, I say unto you, The servant is not greater than his lord; neither he that is sent greater than he that sent him. (17) If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them.

(18) I speak not of you all: I know whom I have chosen: but that the scripture may be fulfilled, He that eateth bread with me hath lifted up his another's feet.

or even in the evil which clings to his daily path, reason for questioning the reality of the moral change which has made him the child of God.

And ye are clean, but not all.—This is the moral application, accompanied by the mournful thought that it was not true of all. One there was among those who had been bathed who had allowed evil to enter into his heart and pollute it. For him cleansing had been neglected, and the daily corruption of the world had remained; evil thoughts had been harboured, until at length they had made corrupt the whole man. (Comp. Note on chap. xv. 4.)

(11) For he knew who should betray him.—Comp. chap. xvi. 2, and Note on Matt. xxvi. 48. This is the first reference to the betrayal during the feast. The words are words of warning, spoken in the love which even then might have redeemed and cleansed the heart, if it had been open to receive it. The feet of Judas were washed by his Master. Had he heard the lesson of humility and love, he might have conquered the foul spirit of ambition and covetousness which was carrying him to destruction.

(12) And was set down again.—This means in the reclining position customary at meals. Comp. Luke xii. 37; xiii. 14; and in this Gospel chap. vi. 10 and xxi. 20. Here it implies that the washing of the feet preceded the supper (verse 1).

Know ye what I have done to you?—This question is asked, not to be answered, but to direct their attention to what He had done, and to the interpretation which follows—"Do ye perceive what I have done? This is the meaning of it."

(13) Ye call me Master and Lord.—i.e., Master in the sense of Teacher. The word in the original is not "Rabbi." (Comp. Note on chap. xi. 28.) The Jewish pupils called their teachers "Rabbi" and "Mar" (Teacher), and it was not permitted to any pupil to call his teacher by his proper name (Sanhedr., fol. 100, § 1). The word "Master" here refers to His position as their Teacher; the word Lord to the reverence which they paid to Him. These were the common titles of everyday life which He here asserts for Himself.

Ye ought also to wash one another's feet.—The argument is a fortiori. If He had so humbled Himself as to do the work of a servant for them, much more ought they to humble themselves for each other. To make his words as striking as possible, they are prefaced by the emphatic if, and "Master and Lord" is repeated from the previous verse, but in the inverse order, to give special prominence to the word of greater dignity.

(15) That ye should do as I have done to you.—The example is in the principle, not in the specific act; it is not "that which I have done to you," but "according as I have done to you." The imitation is to be worked out in applying the same principle of love and self-sacrifice in all the varying circumstances of life in which we are placed.

(16) The servant is not greater than his lord.—These words have already occurred in the earlier Gospels in another connection. (Comp. Note on Matt. x. 24, and Luke vi. 40.) They occur again in this Gospel in chap. xv. 20.

If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them.—The first clause of this verse assumes their knowledge of the things which He had been teaching them (verses 13—17). They were, indeed, old lessons taught before in word, and now taught in act and word.

The second clause makes their blessedness depend upon their combining action with knowledge. They had known the truth before, but their knowledge had not profited them, and they needed on this very day to be taught them again.

(18) I speak not of you all.—The thought of their blessedness brings back again the dark thought that there is one present who will not do these things, and who cannot therefore be blessed.

I know whom I have chosen.—Comp. Note on chap. vi. 70. The pronoun is strongly emphatic, "I (for My part) know whom I have chosen." (See next verse.)

But that the scripture may be fulfilled.—Comp. Note on chap. xii. 38. There is an ellipsis after "but," which is most simply filled up by some such phrase as "all this was done!" "but all this was done that the Scripture . . ." (Comp. chap. xix. 36 and Matt. xvi. 36.) Others would make the connection to be, "But I have chosen them that the Scripture . . ."

He that eateth bread with me hath lifted up his heel against me.—Comp. especially Note on the quotation in chap. ii. 18, from Ps. lix. The present words are a free rendering of the Greek (LXX.) of Ps. xli. 9; but the LXX. follow the Hebrew more literally, and read, " hath made great his heel." This is here interpreted to mean, "lifted up his heel," which the Bible version of the Psalm gives, with the literal rendering magnified in the margin. The Prayer Book version follows the Vulgate in reading "hath laid great weight for Me."

Our Lord's quotation omits the earlier part of the verse, "Mine own familiar friend whom I trusted." He knew whom He had chosen. "He knew what was in man, and did not trust Himself to them" (chap. ii. 24, 25). It is by no means certain that we are justified in following the title of the Psalm, and ascribing it to David. It is not improbable that here, as in Ps. lxix., we have the words of Jeremiah, and the special reference to the friend is unknown. If the Psalm was by
Jesus announces His Betrayal.

ST. JOHN, XIII. The Beloved Disciple’s Question.

heal against me.” (19) Now I tell you before it come, that, when it is come to pass, ye may believe that I am he. (20) Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that receiveth whomsoever I send receiveth me; and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me.

(21) When Jesus had thus said, he

John remembers the look of astonishment, and the way in which each tried to read the countenance of his brother as they all heard the words, which asserted that there was a traitor in their midst. He was nearest to our Lord, and knew what others may not have known, how Peter beckoned to him, and how he put the question to our Lord. This is the moment which has been caught in Leonardo da Vinci’s famous masterpiece in the refectory of the Dominican Fathers at Milan. The painting itself has almost passed away, but perhaps no work of art is so widely known. The three Apostles mentioned in the text are all on the right of our Lord. John is nearest to Him, and leaning towards Peter, who stretches behind Judas. Between him and Peter. This verse can have no better comment than a study of this great picture, accompanied by the chapter in Lanzi’s Storia Pistorica or Mrs. Jameson’s Sacred and Legendary Art, would provide, and Englishmen have a noble copy of it in their own National Gallery. (See the Sacred and Legendary Art, Ed. 3, 1857, vol. i., p. 209.)

(22) Then the disciples looked one another.

—Leonardo’s picture is in one respect misleading, and, like most paintings of the Lord’s Supper, has not represented the method in which the guests reclined rather than sat at table. Each leaned on his left arm, leaving the right arm free. The feet were stretched out behind the guest on his right hand, and the back of the head reached near to the bosom of the guest on the left. (Comp. Note on verse 25.) The Jews followed this Persian method of reclining on couches at meals from the time of the Captivity, and this method of eating the Passover had the special significance of security and possession of the Promised Land, as opposed to the attitude of one undertaking a journey, which was part of the original institution (Ex. xii. 11).

One of his disciples, whom Jesus loved—i.e., John himself. (Comp. chap. xxi. 2, 7, 20—23, and Introduction, p. 375.) The same designation occurs also in chap. xix. 26.

(24) Simon Peter therefore beckoned to him.

—The tense in the original is present. “Simon Peter therefore beckons,” or, makes a sign. We have to remember that those Apostles were both members of the first group, who are from some special characteristics nearest to our Lord and loved by both—disciples of the Baptist (chap. i. 40, 41), and we may think of them in the earlier as in the later work as in a special sense companions and friends. (Comp. chap. xx. 2; Acts iii. 1; iv. 13.)

That he should ask who it should be of whom he spake.—The better reading is, and saith unto him, Say who it is of whom He speaketh. St. Peter supposes that the disciple whom Jesus loved is
him, that he should ask who it should be of whom he spake. (25) He then lying on Jesus' breast saith unto him, Lord, who is it? (26) Jesus answered, He it is, to whom I shall give a sop, when I have dipped it. And when he had dipped the sop, he gave it to Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon. (27) And after the sop Satan entered into him. Then said Jesus unto him, That thou dost, do quickly. (28) Now no man at the table knew for what intent he spake this unto him. (29) For some of them thought, because Judas had the bag, that Jesus had said unto him, Buy those things that we have need of against the feast; or, that he should give something to the poor. (30) He then having received the sop went immediately out: and it was night.

more than any other in the confidence of his Master, and that he knew who was here referred to, and makes a sign to him to tell what he knew.

(25) He then lying on Jesus' breast.—Several good authorities, including the Vatican and the Cambridge MSS., insert the word “thus.” “He then leaning thus describes the action just as it took place (comp. Note on chap. iv. 6); but the balance of authority is against the insertion. The action is, however, exactly described in the original, for the words “lying” and “breast” are both different from those in verse 23. The English preserves this difference, but hardly conveys the full meaning. There the beloved disciple is described as reclining towards his Master's bosom. Here he leans upon (or leans back upon, as the authorities read), the Master's breast, and asks Him the question, “Who is it?” (26) He it is, to whom I shall give a sop, when I have dipped it.—The better reading is probably, “He it is for whom I shall dip the morsel and give it to him; but the change does not affect the sense. The pronouns are emphatic. “He it is for whom I . . . ?” The word “morsel” or “sop” occurs in the New Testament only in this context. The meaning is illustrated by the use in the LXX. in Ruth ii. 14 (“Come thou hither, and thou shalt eat of the bread and dip thy morsel in the vinegar”); and Job xxxi. 17 (“And if I ate my morsel alone, and did not impart it to the orphan”). The cognate verb occurs twice in the New Testament—Rom. xii. 20 and 1 Cor. xii. 3. (See Notes on these passages.) The original root of the word means “to rub.” Hence it is “anything rubbed or broken off.” It was often used for a mouthful just like “morsel,” which means literally, a little bite. As used here, the word means any portion of food. The general explanation that the morsel was dipped in the Charosheth (comp. Note on Matt. xxvi. 28) implies that this supper was the Paschal Supper. (See Excursus F: The Day of the Crucifixion of our Lord.)

Our Lord would preside at the meal, and distribute to each guest his portion. When John asked the question, He was about to give the morsel to Judas. He avoids the name, and makes the act which He is about to perform convey the answer to the question. That act is the token of friendship and love which even now would redeem the heart full of treachery, if that heart would but receive it. (Comp. verse 18.)

He gave it to Judas Iscariot.—Better, He takes and gives . . . , with the majority of good MSS. Note the solemn and sad fulness with which the name of Judas is again given by the Evangelist. (Comp. Matt. xxvi. 25.)

(27) And after the sop Satan entered into him.—The Greek expresses more vividly the very moment when the mind finally cast out love, and left itself as a possession for Satan. “And after the sop, then Satan entered into him.” It was at that moment, when the last effort had been tried, and tried in vain, when the heart hardened itself to receive from Jesus the sacred pledge of love, while it was plotting in black hatred how to betray Him; it was then, that hope took her flight from a realm of gloom where she could no longer dwell, and light ceased to shine in a darkness that would not comprehend it.

Then said Jesus unto him.—Better, Jesus therefore said unto him. It was because He read the secrets of the heart, and saw that it was wholly given up to evil that He said it.

That thou dost, do quickly.—The Greek is exactly, more quickly. “Carry out your plans even more quickly than you have proposed. Do the fatal deed at once. It is resolved, and every effort to win thee has failed. A fixed resolve is nothing less than the deed itself.”

(28) Now no man at the table knew.—This is a comment of the Apostle's, as he writes in remembrance of the impression made at the time upon all who were present. They heard our Lord say to Judas, “What thou dost, do quickly;” but none of them knew until afterwards that these words referred to the betrayal.

(29) Because Judas had the bag.—Comp. Notes on chap. xii. 6.

Buy those things that we have need of against the feast.—Here, again, it will be better to postpone the consideration of details in the order of the events of this week, and to deal with the question as a whole. (Comp. Excursus F: The Day of the Crucifixion of our Lord.)

That he should give something to the poor. —Such gifts seem to have been made at all festivals. Their thought was probably of gifts to enable the poor to obtain the lamb and other requisites for keeping the Passover.

(30) He then having received the sop.—Comp. Note on verse 27. The narrative is resumed from that point, verses 28 and 29 being an explanatory note added by the writer. Returning to the record of what took place, he dwells again, on the moment of receiving the sop as that in which the betrayer took the fatal step which could not be retraced.

And it was night.—These words doubtless state the physical fact that at the time when Judas left the room the darkness of night had already come on. He went out, and went out into the darkness of night. We cannot say that the writer meant them to express more than this, and yet we feel that there is in them a fulness of meaning that cannot have been unintentional. It was night; and he stepped forth from light into darkness; from the presence and guidance of the Light of the World, to be possessed by and guided by the prince of darkness. It was night; and St. John could
Therefore, when he was gone out, Jesus said, Now is the Son of man glorified, and God is glorified in him. If God be glorified in him, God shall also glorify him in himself, and shall straightway glorify him. Little children, yet a little while I am with you. Ye shall seek me; and as I said unto the Jews, Whither I go, ye cannot come; so now I say to you. A new commandment I give unto you, That ye love one another; as I have loved you, that ye also love one another. By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another.
Simon Peter’s Confidence, ST. JOHN, XIV. and the Warning of Jesus.

(36) Simon Peter said unto him, Lord, whither goest thou? Jesus answered him, Whither I go, thou canst not follow me now; but thou shalt follow me afterwards. (37) Peter said unto him, Lord, why cannot I follow thee now? I will lay down my life for thy sake." (38) Jesus answered him, Wilt thou lay down thy life for my sake? Verily, verily, I say unto thee, The cock shall not crow, till thou hast denied me thrice.

CHAPTER XIV.—(1) Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, believe also in me. (2) In my Father’s house are many mansions.
The Mansions in the Father’s House, ST. JOHN, XIV. and the Way which leads to it.

house are many mansions: if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. (5) And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also. (4) And whither I go ye know, and the way ye know. (5) Thomas saith unto him, Lord, we know not whither thou goest; and how can we know the way? (6) Jesus saith unto him, I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me. (7) If ye had known me, ye should have known xiii. 33.) They did not, indeed, fully know this, but the means of knowing it was within their reach, and His own words had declared it. (Comp., e.g., chaps. x. 1 and xi. 25.) They ought to have known it, and His words now are meant to contrast what they ought to have known with what they really did know, in order that He may more fully instruct them. To know our ignorance is the first step to its removal.

(5) Thomas saith unto him.—Comp., for the character of Thomas, chaps. xiii. 16; xx. 24; xxi. 2.

Lord, we know not whither thou goest.—Our Lord’s words had laid stress upon the “way.” Thomas lays stress upon the “whither.” His mind seeks for measured certainty. In all that he has heard of the Father’s house of many mansions, of being with the Lord, there is much that he cannot understand. The Messiah, they thought, would come, and upon earth. Where was this vast royal home, with dwelling-places for all, to which Christ was going first, and to which they were to follow? They knew not whither, and without that knowledge they cannot even think of the way.

I am the way.—The pronoun is emphatic, “I, and none besides Me.” “The way” is again made prominent, reversing the order which Thomas had used. He and He only is the means through which men can approach to the Father. (Comp. Notes on chap. i. 18, and on 1 Tim. ii. 5.)

The truth, and the life.—Better, and the Truth, and the Life. The thought of His being the Way through which men come to the Father is the reverse side of the thought that in Him the Father is revealed to men, that He is Himself the Eternal Truth, that He is Himself the Source of eternal life. (Comp. chaps. i. 14, 17; vi. 50, 51; xi. 24, 26.) Had they known what His earlier words meant, they would have had other than temporal and local thoughts of the Father’s house, and would have known Him to be the Way.

No man cometh unto the Father, but by me.—This was the answer to the doubt of Thomas. This was the true “whither” which they knew not. The thought of heaven is not of a place far above, or of a character of Thomas, chaps. xi. 16; xx. 24; xxi. 2.

I will go and prepare a place for you.—The better MSS. read, “For I . . .” connecting the clause with the earlier part of the verse. He is going away to prepare a place for them; and this also proves the existence of the home. There is to be then no separation; He is to enter within the veil, but it is to be as Forerunner on our behalf (Heb. vi. 20). “When Thou hast overcome the sharpness of death, Thou didst open the kingdom of heaven to all believers.”

And if I go and prepare . . .—For the form of the expression, comp. Notes on chap. xii. 32, and i. John ii. 28. It does not imply uncertainty, but expresses that the fact is in the region of the future, which is clear to Him, and will unfold itself to them.

I will come again, and receive you unto myself.—This clause has been variously explained of the resurrection; of the death of individual disciples; of the spiritual presence of our Lord in the Church; of the coming again of the Lord in the Parousia of the last day, when all who believe in Him shall be received unto Himself. The difficulty has arisen from taking the words “I will come again,” as necessarily referring to the same time as those which follow—“I will receive you unto Myself,” whereas they are in the present tense, and should be literally rendered, I am coming again. They refer rather, as the same words refer when used in verse 18, to His constant spiritual presence in their midst; whereas the reception of them to Himself is to be understood of the complete union with all who accompany that spiritual presence; a union which will be commenced in this life, advanced by the death of individuals, and completed in the final coming again. (Comp. chap. xvii. 24.)

And whither I go ye know, and the way ye know.—The better reading is, And whither I go, ye know the way, i.e., “Ye know that I am the way to the Father, whither I am going.” (Comp. verse 6, and chap.
my Father also: and from henceforth ye know him, and have seen him. 

(6) Philip saith unto him, Lord, shew us the Father, and it sufficeth us.

(9) Jesus saith unto him, Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? he that hath seen me hath seen the Father; and how sayest thou then, Shew us the

thus, "If ye had recognised Me, ye would have known My Father also." If ye had recognised who I really am, ye would have known that I and My Father are one.

And from henceforth ye know him, and have seen him. — Comp. chap. xiii. 31, where the glorifying of the Son of Man is regarded as in the future which is immediately present. He can, therefore, say that from this time onwards, after the full declaration of Himself in verses 6 and 9 et seq., they know and have seen the Father.

(8) Philip saith unto him. — Comp. for the character of Philip chaps. i. 44 et seq.; vi. 5 et seq.; xii. 21 et seq. He is joined with Thomas at the head of the second group of the Apostles, in Acts i. 13.

Lord, shew us the Father, and it sufficeth us. — He catches at the word "seen" and thinks of some revelation of the glory of God as that vouchsafed to Moses, or it may be of a vision like that which three of their number had seen, and of which others had heard, in the Mount of Transfiguration. One such vision of the Father, he thinks, would remove all their doubts; and would satisfy the deepest longings of their hearts.

(9) Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? — More exactly, ... hast thou not recognised Me, as in verse 7. Comp. the reference in verse 5, from which it will be seen that Philip was one of the first-called disciples, and had occupied a prominent position in the band of Apostles. There is in our Lord's words a tone of sadness and of warning. They utter the loneliness of a holiness and greatness which is not understood. The close of life is at hand, and Philip, who had followed Him from the first, shows by this question that he did not even know what the work and purposes of that life had been. They speak to all Christian teachers, thinkers, workers. There is a possibility that men should be in the closest apparent nearness to Christ, and yet have never learnt the meaning of the words they constantly hear and utter; and have never truly known the purpose of Christ's life.

He that hath seen me hath seen the Father. — Comp. Note on verse 7, and Philip's own answer to Nathanael, "Come and see" (chap. i. 46). The demand of Philip is one which is constantly being read, and the answer is one that constantly holds good. Men are ever thinking and saying, "Shew us the Father and it sufficeth us." "Give us something in religion upon the soul can rest. We are weary of the doubts, and strife, and dogmas which are too often called religion. We want something which can be real food for the soul. We cannot feed upon the husks which the swine do eat; and we believe that in the Father's house there is, even for the hired servants, bread enough and to spare. We are not irreligious, but we are impatient of what is put before us as religion. Give us truth! Give us life! Let it be free and open as the air of heaven, and we will gladly accept it, embrace it, live it." All this is the heart of the child seeking the presence of the Father. That Father has been manifested in the person of the Son. In the Life and Truth revealed in Him is the full revelation of God. In Him is the Bread of Life to satisfy every want of every man. He that hath seen Him hath seen the Father. How then can men say, Shew us the Father? (Comp. Note on chap. xii. 44, 45.)

(10) Believeth thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? — Comp. Note on chap. x. 37. He had there taught this truth to the Jews; but Philip's words seem to show that even the disciples did not fully receive it. The order of the clauses is reversed here, in accordance with the thought of the context, which is of knowledge of the Son, and of the Father through the Son.

The words that I speak unto you I speak not of myself. — This refers not to His present teaching only or chiefly, but to the whole of His manifestation of the character and attributes of God. All His words had been a revelation of the Father whom Philip now asks to see. (Comp. chap. viii. 38.)

But the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works. — The better reading is, but the Father that dwelleth in Me doeth His own works. This is the proof that He does not speak of Himself; and both clauses are together the proof of the indwelling of the Son in the Father and the Father in the Son. The works manifested in time in the power of the Incarnate Word are not His works, but those of the Father, who abides in the Son, and is revealed through Him. (Comp. chap. viii. 28, and Note there.)

(11) Believe me that I am in the Father. — He passes now from Philip, and addresses Himself to the whole body of the apostles. He claims from them a personal trust in Himself, which should accept His statement that He and the Father were immanent in each other.

Or else believe me for the very works' sake. — If they cannot receive the truth on the testimony of His word, He will take lower ground with them. He will place before them the evidence He had done. (Comp. Note on chaps. v. 19, 20, and x. 37, 38.)

(12) Verily, verily, I say unto you. — Comp. Note on chap. i. 51.

He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also. — He that by faith becomes one with the Son shall have the Son, and therefore also the Father, dwelling in him (verses 11, 20, 25), and shall himself become an instrument through which God, who dwelleth in him, shall carry into effect His own works. He shall, therefore, do works of the same kind as those which the Son Himself doeth.
on me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do; because I go unto my Father.

(13) And whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, that will I do; that the Father may be glorified in the Son. (14) If ye shall ask any thing in my name, I will do it.

St. John, XIV.

The promise of another Advocate.

(15) If ye love me, keep my commandments. (16) And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever;

(17) even the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him; but ye

And greater works than these shall he do.—Comp. Notes on chap. v. 20, and on Matt. xxi. 21, 22. The explanation of these greater works is not to be sought in the individual instances of miraculous power exercised by the apostles, but in the whole work of the Church. The Day of Pentecost witnessed the first fulfilment of this prophecy; but it has been fulfilled also in every great moral and spiritual victory. Every revival of a truly religious spirit has been an instance of it; every mission-field has been a witness to it. In every child of man brought to see the Father, and know the Father’s love as revealed in Jesus Christ, has been a work such as He did. In the world-wide extent of Christianity there is a work greater even than any which He Himself did in the flesh. He left His kingdom as one of the smallest of the influences on the earth; but it has grown up as a mighty power over all the kingdoms of the world, and all that is purest and best in civilization and culture has found shelter in its branches.

Because I go unto my Father.—The better reading is, because I go unto the Father. The words are to be connected not with one clause only, but with all the earlier parts of the verse. They are the reason why the believer shall do the works that Christ does, as well as the reason why he shall do greater works. The earthly work of Christ will have ceased, and He will have gone to the Father. The believers will be then His representatives on earth, as He will be their representative in heaven. Therefore will they do His works, and the works shall be greater because He will be at the Father’s right hand, and will do whatsoever they shall ask in His name.

(15) And whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, that will I do.—Comp. chap. xv. 16, and xvi. 23. The prayer is thought of as addressed to the Father; but we are to understand the following verse, thought of as coming from the Son, who is one with the Father. The width and limitation of the promise are both to be noted. It is “whatsoever ye shall ask,” and it is “ask in My name.” This means, as My representatives on earth (comp. Notes on previous verse), as persons doing My work, living in My spirit, seeking as I have sought to do the will of the Father. It follows from this that personal petitions are never contemplated here, except as they are for the glory of God; and that petitions asked in ignorance may be most truly answered when they are not granted. The prayer of Gethsemane—“If it be possible, let this cup pass from Me: nevertheless, not My will, but Thine be done,” should teach what prayer in the name and spirit of Christ means. We commonly attach to our prayers, “through Jesus Christ our Lord.” We do not always bear in mind that this implies an absolute self-sacrifice, and is a prayer that our very prayers may not be answered except in so far as they are in accordance with the divine will. (Comp. Note on 2 Cor. xii. 8, 9.)

That the Father may be glorified in the Son.—Comp. Notes on chaps. xi. 4; xii. 28; xiii. 31.
know him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you. (19) I will not
leave you comfortless: I will come to you. (20) Yet a little while, and the
world seeth me no more; but ye see me: because I live, ye shall live also.
(20) At that day ye shall know that I am
in my Father, and ye in me, and I in
you. (21) He that hath my commandments,
and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me: and he that loveth me shall
be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and will manifest myself to him.
(22) Judas saith unto him, not Iscariot,
Lord, how is it that thou wilt manifest
thyself unto us, and not unto the
world seeth me no more; but ye see
you.

Whom the world cannot receive.—The Holy
Spirit can be received only by those who have the
spiritual faculty. It cannot be otherwise. The un­
believing world, caring only for things of the same,
has lost its spiritual perception. It has no eye to
see and no heart to know spiritual things, for they
are spiritually discerned. (Comp. Note on 1 Cor.
ii. 14.)

But ye know him; for he dwelleth with you, and
shall be in you.—The better text is, . . . and
is in you. The verbs are in the present tense, de­
scribing the receptivity of the disciples as opposed
to the moral blindness of the world. They had,
during our Lord’s work and teaching in their midst,
exercised and strengthened their spiritual faculties.
They had in part received the Spirit, and by that
reception were prepared for the fuller gift. They
knew Him. He was in their midst. He was then,
and therefore should be in the future, a living power,
dwelling in their inmost life.

I will not leave you comfortless.—Better
with the margin, I will not leave you orphans, which
exactly represents the Greek word. “Comfortless” is
unfortunate, as it suggests a connection with “Com­
forter” which does not exist in the original. Our
translators have rendered the word by “fatherless”
in James i. 27, which is the only other passage where
it occurs in the New Testament, and Wiclif has
“fatherless” here. He thinks of them as His children
whom He is leaving in the world (comp. chap. xii. 33),
but He will not leave them destitute and bereaved.
I will come to you.—This coming, as is shown by
the whole context, is the spiritual presence in the person
of the Paraclete.

Yet a little while.—Comp. chaps. xiii. 33 and
xvi. 16.

But ye see me—i.e., in the spiritual presence
of the Paraclete. The words may indeed have their first
fulfilment in the appearances of the forty days (comp.
Acts x. 41), but these appearances were themselves steps in the education which was leading the disciples
from a trust in the physical to a trust in the spiritual
presence. (Comp. chap. xx. 17.) To the world the
grave seemed the closing scene. They saw Him no
more; they thought of him as dead. To the believers
who had the power to see Him He appeared as living,
and in very deed was more truly with them and in
them than He had been before. Because I live, ye shall live also.—Better, for
I live, and ye shall live. Our Lord speaks of His own
life in the present. It is the essential life of which
He is Himself the Source, and which is not affected
by the physical death through which He is about to pass.
They also who believe in Him shall have even here this
principle of life, which in them too shall be affected by
no change, but shall develop into the fulness of the
life hereafter. Because He lives, and because they too
shall live, therefore shall they see Him and realise His
presence when the world seeth Him no more.

At that day ye shall know—i.e., the day of
the gift of the Comforter, in whom Christ shall come
to them. In the first reference the Day of Pentecost
is meant, but the words hold good of every spiritual
quickening, and will hold good of the final coming in
the last day. The pronoun “ye” is emphatic—“Ye
shall know for yourselves.”

That I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I
in you.—Comp. Note on chap. x. 38. The result of
this spiritual illumination would be that they should of
themselves know the immanence of the Son in the
Father, and their own union with the Father through
Him. They ask now (verse 8) for a manifestation of
the Father. The Spirit should so bring the life of
Christ to their hearts that they would read in it the
manifestation of the Father, and feel that in and
through that life their own spirit has communion with
God. The Spirit would witness with their spirit that
they were the children of God. They would seek no
longer for a Theophany from without, but in the depth
of their inmost lives would cry, “Abba, Father.”

He that hath my commandments.—Comp.
verse 15 and chap. v. 36. This verse points out the
successive degrees which led up to the full mani­
festation of Christ. The first step is the moral ap­
prehension and practical observance of our Lord’s
commandments, which necessarily result from love to
Christ.

He it is that loveth me.—The next step is the
special receptivity of the Father’s love which he who
loves Christ possesses and therefore there is a special
sense in which the Father loves him. The words express
with fulness of emphasis, “He it is, and he only.”

And I will love him, and will manifest my­
self to him.—The special love of the Son follows
from the special love of the Father, and is accom­
pained by the full manifestation of the Son. This is further
explained in verse 23.

Judas saith unto him, not Iscariot.—That
he was “not Iscariot” is mentioned to distinguish
him beyond all possibility of confusion from him who
had gone out into the darkness, and was no longer one
of their number (chap. xiii. 30). He is commonly
identified with “Lebbeus whose surname was Tha­
deus” (comp. Note on Matt. x. 3), and was a brother
or son of James (Luke vi. 15).

How is it that thou wilt manifest thyself
unto us, and not unto the world?—The word “manifest” has brought to the mind of Judas, as the
word “see” had to the mind of Philip (verse 7),
thoughts of a visible manifestation such as to Moses
(Ex. xxxiii. 13, 18), and such as they expected would
attend the advent of the Messiah (Mal. iii. 1). But
it was contrary to every thought of the Messiah that
this manifestation should be to a few only. His reign
was to be the judgment of the Gentiles, and the estab­
lishment of the Theocracy.

The words rendered, “How is it that . . .? a mean
literally, What has happened that . . .? The words
world? (23) Jesus answered and said unto him, If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him. (24) He that loveth me not keepeth not my sayings: and the word which ye hear is not mine, but the Father's which sent me.

of our Lord, speaking of His manifestation, take Judas by surprise. He wonders whether anything has occurred to cause what he thinks a departure from the Messianic manifestation.

If a man love me, he will keep my words.—Our Lord repeats the condition necessary on the part of man in order that the manifestation of God to him may be possible. Then, as an answer to the question of Judas, the world in its unbelief and rejection of Christ's words, and without the spirit of love, could not receive this manifestation.

We will come unto him, and make our abode with him.—For the plural, comp. Note on chap. x. 30. For the word "abode," comp. Note on verse 2. The thought of God as dwelling and among the people was familiar to the disciples from the Old Testament Scriptures (see, e.g., Ex. xxv. 8; xxxix. 45; Lev. xxvi. 11, 12; Ezek. xxxvii. 26), and the thought of the spiritual temple in the heart of man was not unknown to contemporary writers. Philo has a remarkable parallel in his treatise, De Cherubin, p. 126, "Since therefore He (God) thus invisibly enters into the region of the soul, let us prepare that place, in the best way the case admits of, to be an abode worthy of God; for if we do not, He, without our being aware of it, will quit us and migrate to some other habitation which shall appear to Him to be more excellently provided" (Bohn's ed., vol. i., p. 199. See the whole of chap. xxi.). Schöttgen, in his note, quotes from a Rabbinical writer who says, "Blessed is the man who strives daily to make himself approved unto God, and prepares himself to receive the divine guest." (Comp. 1 Cor. iii. 16; vi. 19; and Rev. iii. 20.)

He that loveth me not keepeth not my sayings.—He has shown in the previous verse how the Father and the Son can take up their abode in the parted, "Shalom! Shalom!" (Peace! Peace!) just as "Salaam! Salaam!" in our own day. (See 1 Sam. i. 17; Luke vii. 50; Acts xvi. 36; Jas. ii. 19; Eph. vi. 23; 1 Pet. v. 14; 3 John 15.)

He will leave them as a legacy the gift of peace. And this peace is more than a meaningless sound or even a true wish. He repeats it with the emphatic "My," and speaks of it as an actual possession which He imparts to them. "Peace on earth" was the angels' message when they announced His birth; "peace to you" was His own greeting when He returned victorious from the grave. "He is our peace" (Eph. ii. 14), and this peace is the farewell gift to the disciples from whom He is now departing. (Comp. chaps. xiv. 26; xvi. 23; xx. 13, 21, 26.)

Not as the world giveth, give I unto you.—The contrast is not between the emptiness of the world's salutations and the reality of His own gift, but between His legacy to them and the legacies ordinarily left by the world. He gives them not land or houses or possessions, but "peace;" and that "His own peace;" "the peace of God which passeth all understanding."
unto you. Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid. (28) Ye have heard how I said unto you, I go away, and come again unto you. If ye loved me, ye would rejoice, because I said, I go unto the Father: for my Father is greater than I. (29) And now I have told you before it come to pass, that, when it is come to pass, ye might believe. (30) Hereafter I will not talk much with you: for the prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing in me. (31) But that the world may know that I love the Father; and as the Father gave me commandment, even so do I. Arise, let us go hence. 

Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid.—These are in part the words of the first verse, and are now repeated as a joyous note of triumph. Possessing the peace which He gives them, having another Advocate in the person of the Holy Spirit, having the Father and the Son ever abiding in them, there cannot be, even when He is about to leave them, room for trouble or for fear. 
The word here rendered “be afraid” occurs nowhere else in the New Testament. It points especially to the cowardice of fear. The cognate substantive is used in 2 Tim. i. 7, and the adjective in Matt. viii. 26; Mark iv. 40; and Rev. xxi. 8. (28) Ye have heard how I said unto you.—Better, Ye heard how I said unto you. (See verses 19 and 20.) 

If ye loved me, ye would rejoice.—True love seeks another’s good and not its own. Their sorrow at His departure was at its root selfish, as all sorrow for those who depart to be with God is, however little we think so. His departure would be the return to the glory of the Father’s throne, and was matter for joy and not for sorrow. For them also it was expedient. (Comp. Notes on chap. xvi. 6, 7.) 

For my Father is greater than I.—These words have naturally formed the subject of controversy in every period of the Church’s history, between those who deny and those who accept the truth that the Son is “very God, of the substance of the Father, begotten before all worlds.” And, as in all controversies, statements have been made on either side which cannot be supported by the words themselves. On the part of those who assert the divine nature, it has been contended that the Father is greater than the Son only as regards the Father’s authority over the Son; and this is not here thought of. In this passage, as in others of the New Testament, it is plainly asserted that in the divine nature there is a subordination of the Son to the Father. (See, e.g., verse 16; chap. xvii. 5; 1 Cor. iii. 23; xi. 3; xv. 27, 28; Phil. ii. 9, 11; and especially Note on chap. v. 19 et seq.) On the part of those who deny the divinity of our Lord, it has been contended that this text asserts the inferiority of His nature to that of the Father, whereas the only key to their perplexity would have been utterly by one who meant in them to assert His own divine essence. If we try to imagine a man saying, “God is greater than I,” we feel at once that He who really said them claimed for Himself that He was truly God. (28) And now I have told you before it come to pass.—Comp. chap. xiii. 19. Here, again, He tells them the event before the accomplishment, that it may serve to strengthen their faith. Two interpretations of this verse are possible. (1) That He told them of the coming of the Advocate to teach all truth, and bring all things to their remembrance, in order that in the fulfilment of this they may, with increase of faith, believe in Him. (2) That He told them of His going to the Father, in order that when the hour of departure came they may believe that He had gone to the Father. Upon the whole, and especially considering the close parallel with chap. xiii. 29, the first seems the more probable meaning. (30) Hereafter I will not talk much with you.—Better, I will no more, or, I will not continue to talk much with you. The discourse is broken by the thought that the hour of the conflict is at hand, and that He must go forth to meet it. 

For the prince of this world cometh.—Better, is coming. The approach is thought of as then taking place. For the phrase, “prince of this world,” comp. Note on chap. xii. 31. The prince of evil is here regarded as working in and by Judas, who is carrying out his plans and doing his work. (Comp. Notes on chaps. vi. 70 and xiii. 2, 27.) 

And hath nothing in me.—The words are to be taken in their full and absolute meaning, and they assert that the prince of this world possesses nothing in the person of Christ. In Him he has never for a moment ruled. For this appeal to perfect sinlessness, comp. Note on chap. viii. 29. It follows from this that His surrender of Himself is entirely voluntary. (Comp. Note on chap. x. 18.) 

(31) The most probable arrangement of this verse is to omit the period after “so I do,” and to consider all down to this point as governed by “that.” We shall read then, “But, that the world may know that I love the Father, and that as the Father gave Me commandment, so I do, arise, let us go hence.” He has asserted, in the previous verse, the sinlessness which makes His act wholly self-determined. He now expresses the subordination of His own to the Father’s will, and summons the Apostles to rise up with Him from the table, and go forth from this world. But that the world . . .—The words seem to point back to “the prince of this world” who has just been mentioned. The prince cometh, but it is to a defeat; and the very world over which he has ruled will see in the self-sacrifice of Jesus the love of the Father. That love will reclaim them from the bondage of the oppressor and restore them to the freedom of children.

It is an interesting question which we cannot hope with certainty to solve, whether or not in obedience to the command they went from the room at once. In other words, were the discourse of chaps. xv. and xvi., and the prayer of chap. xvii., uttered in the room after the summons to depart, or on the way to the garden of Gethsemane? The immediate connection of the opening words of the next chapter with the present verse naturally leads to the opinion that they were spoken in the same place, and, in the absence of any hint of a change, it is safe not to assume any. The words of chap. xviii. 1 are probably those which express the act to which the words our Lord has just spoken summon them. But comp. Chronological Harmony of the Gospels, p. xxxv.
The allegory of the vine

CHAPTER XV.—(1) I am the true vine, and my Father is the husbandman. (2) Every branch in me that beareth not fruit he taketh away; and every branch that beareth fruit, he purgeth it, that it may bring forth more fruit. (3) Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you. (4) Abide in me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; no more can ye, except ye abide in me. (5) I am the vine, ye are the branches: He that abideth in me, and I in him, the same man. We are not to interpret these words, as they frequently have been interpreted, of the unbelieving world, or of the Jews; but of Christians in name, who claim to be branches of the true vine. These the Husbandman watcheth day by day. He knoweth them, and readeth the inner realities of their lives, and every one that is fruitless He taketh away.

And every branch that beareth fruit, he purgeth it.—Better, he cleanseth it. (Comp. Heb. i. 3.) This means in the natural vine the cutting off of shoots which run to waste, and the removal of every excrescence which hinders the growth of the branch. It means in the spiritual training the checking of natural impulses and affections, and the removal of every excrescence by which it be a blemish. This picture of the pruning of the vine is found in Antwerp, carved on the doors of the Temple (Jos. Wars, v. 5, § 4; Ant. xii. 11, § 3); or the vineyards seen in the distance by moonlight, or the pruner's knives, which can misdirect or weaken the energy of the spiritual life, and thus diminish its fruitfulness. A vine which has been pruned—here a tendril cut off, and there one bent back—here a shoot that seemed of fairest promise to the unskilled eye unsparedly severed by the vine-dresser, who sees it is worthless—here a branch, in itself good, made to yield its place to one that is better, and itself trained to fill another place—such is the familiar picture of the natural vine—such also, to a wisdom higher than ours, is the picture of human life.

(3) Now ye are clean. Better, Already are ye clean. The pronoun is emphatic. “Already are ye, as distinct from others who will become clean in the future.” (Comp. Note on chap. xiii. 10.)

The word which I have spoken unto you.—Better, on account of the word which I have spoken unto you. This word was the revelation of God to them, and by reason of its moral power they had been cleansed. We are not to limit the reference to chap. xiii. 10, but are to understand it of our Lord’s whole teaching. (See chaps. v. 24; viii. 31, 32; xii. 48; xvii. 10; and comp. Note on Eph. v. 26.)

(4) Abide in me, and I in you. The clauses are here connected as cause and effect. The second is the promise, which will not fail if the command of the first be observed. The union then, and all that follows from it, is placed within the power of the human will. All is contained in the words, “Abide in Me.” He who obeys this command has Christ abiding in him, and is a fruitful branch of the true vine.

As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself.—The branch regarded of itself, apart from (“except it abide in”) the vine, has no original source of life. The sap flows from the vine to branch and tendril and leaf and fruit. The branch of itself is a lifeless organ, and only fulfils its functions when it is connected with the vine. So in the spiritual life, men apart from Christ have no original source of life and fruitfulness. The true life flows from Him to every branch that abides in Him, quickening by its power the whole man, and making him fruitful in good. The man who lives without faith in God may be said to exist, rather than to live, and misses the true aim of his being.

(5) I am the vine, ye are the branches. The
bringeth forth much fruit : for without me ye can do nothing. (6) If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered ; and men gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned. (7) If ye abide in me, and my words abide in you, ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you. (8) Herein is my Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit ; so shall ye be my disciples. (9) As the Father hath loved me, so have I loved you ; continue ye in my love. (10) If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love; even as I have kept my Father’s commandments, and abide in his love.

ST. JOHN, XV.

Fruitfulness and unfruitfulness

1st clause is repeated to bring out the contrast with the second. It has been implied, but not directly stated, that they are the branches. It may be that there was a pause after the end of the fourth verse, accompanied by a look at the disciples, or at that which suggested the imagery of the vine. His words would then continue with the sense, “Yes, it is so. That is the true relation between us. I am the vine, ye are the branches. The fruitful branches represent men that abide in Me . . .”

For without me ye can do nothing.—Better, separate from Me, or, apart from Me. (Comp. margin.) The words bring out the fulness of the meaning of the fruitfulness of the man who abides in Christ. It is he, and he only, who brings forth fruit, for he who is separate from Christ can bear no fruit. The words have often been unduly pressed, to exclude all moral power apart from Christ, whereas the whole context limits them to the fruit-bearing of the Christian life. The persons thought of all through this allegory are true and false Christians, and nothing is said of the influence on men of the wider teaching of God, the Light of the Logos ever in the world. A moral power outside the limits of Christianity is clearly recognized in the New Testament. (Comp., e.g., Rom. ii. 14, 15, Notes.)

(6) If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch . . .—The thoughts pass from the fruitful to the sterile branch, from the man who abideth to the man who will not abide in Christ. In the natural vineyard such a branch was cast forth, and then withered, and was gathered with others into bundles, and burned. The vivid picture illustrates the fearful history of a man who will not abide in Christ.

And they are burned.—Better, and they burn. The tenses of this verse should be carefully observed. The burning of the withered branches of the natural vine suggests the final judgment, and the whole is thought of from that time. Hence the earlier verbs are in the past, and the later in the present tense.

(7) If ye abide in me, and my words abide in you . . .—He is now passing from the figure of a man, and is gathering with others into bundles, and burned. The words bring out the fulness of the meaning of the fruitfulness of the man who abides in Christ.

Ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you.—The reading is not certain, but the first verb should probably be imperative, “Ask what ye will . . .” The promise in all its width is the same as that in chap. xiv. 13, 14 (see Note there), and it is attended by the same condition, for they who abide not in Christ, and in whom Christ’s words abide, cannot pray otherwise than in His name.

(8) Herein is my Father glorified.—This clause is generally understood of the words which follow as it is taken in our English version, but the rendering is liable to the objection that it gives a forced meaning to the word “that” (“ἐν αὐτῷ”), which is properly used to express purpose. We may here (as in chaps. iv. 37 and xvi. 30) take “herein” to refer to the words which have gone before. By so doing we give a natural meaning to the words, and get a satisfactory sense for the sentence. The thought then will be, “In this doing whatever ye ask, my Father is glorified, in order that ye may bear much fruit, and that ye may become my disciples.”

So shall ye be my disciples.—Better, and may become My disciples. The pronoun is strongly emphatic. The living union with Christ, which made all their prayers, prayers in His name, and prayers which He would answer, and made them abound with fruit to the glory of God, was the characteristic which marked them as His true disciples.

(9) As the Father hath loved me, so have I loved you.—Better, As the Father hath loved Me, I have also loved you. He had passed from the thought of their discipleship to the foundation of their union with Him and with God. It was in the eternal love of the Father, ever going forth to the Son, and from the Son ever going forth to all who would receive it. The Father’s love and presence was ever with the Son, because the Son ever did those things which were pleasing to Him. (Comp. Note on chap. viii. 31.) The love of the Son is ever present wherever willing heart of obedient disciple is open to its power.

Continue ye in my love.—Better, abide ye in My love. The word “continue” misses the connection with the context. By “My love” is meant, not “love to Me in your hearts,” but, “My love towards you.” The one produces the other. “We love Him because He hath first loved us;” but that which is prominent in the thought here is His love to the disciples, which He has just compared to the Father’s love to Himself.

(10) If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love.—Comp. chap. xiv. 21, 24. The keeping of His commandments is the outward proof of love towards Him; so that the love of the human heart towards Christ, which itself flows from Christ’s love to us (see Note on previous verse), becomes the condition of abiding in that love. While we cherish love for Him, our hearts are abiding in that state which can receive His love for us.

Even as I have kept my Father’s commandments . . .—Comp. Note on verse 9 and reference there. This is again an appeal to His perfect sinlessness, and willing subordination as Son to the Father. We should notice also that the keeping of the commandments is not an arbitrary condition imposed upon human love, but a necessary result of love itself, and therefore as true in the relation of the Son to the Father as it is in our relation to Him. Because the Son loved the Father, therefore He kept His commandments, and in this love He abode in the Father’s love. Because we love God we necessarily keep His commandments, and in this love is the receptive power which constitutes abiding in the divine love.
These things have I spoken unto you, that my joy might remain in you, and that your joy might be full. This is my commandment, That ye love one another, as I have loved you. Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends. Ye are my friends; if ye do whatsoever I command you. Henceforth I call you not servants; for the servant knoweth not what his lord doeth: but I have called you friends; for all things that I have heard of my Father I have made known unto you. Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you, and ordained you, that ye should go and bring forth fruit, and that your fruit should remain: that whatsoever ye ask the Father in my name, he will give it you. Better, the things which I command you. Henceforth I call you not servants.

If ye do whatsoever I command you—
Comp. chap. xiv. 21, 23.}

(Henceforth I call you not servants.—
Comp. chap. xiv. 20.) For the word “servant,” as applied to them, comp. chaps. xii. 26; xiii. 13. It is used again in this discourse (verse 20), but with reference to an earlier saying. In chap. xx. 17, he calls them brethren. The word here rendered “servant” means literally “bond-servant,” “slave.” He will not apply this to them, but the foremost Apostles felt that His service was perfect freedom, and it became the common title which they applied to themselves. (Comp., e.g., Rom. i. 1; Jas. i. 1; 2 Pet. i. 1; Rev. i. 1.)

For the servant knoweth not what his lord doeth.—
The part of the slave is mechanical obedience, without any principle of love between his master and himself. He knows nothing of the purpose or aim of his master, and although he sees the deeds which are done, he knows not what his master doeth. There is no occasion to read the word “doeth” as though it were “will do” (future), which has not unfrequently been accepted as the explanation.

For all things that I have heard of my Father I have made known unto you.—i.e., He had treated them as friends and sharers in His common work. He has revealed to them the character of His love towards the Father, and of the Father’s love towards Him. The brightness of that joy lit up the darkest hours of His own human life, and He wills that it should light up theirs. In the consciousness of their love to God, and of God’s love to them, there would be in them as part of their true life, joy which no sorrow could ever overcome. They were as men with troubled hearts. He has told them of the true source of peace. His own peace He has to them—a joy which sheds its light over the whole of consciousness of their love to God, and of God’s love to them brethren. The word here rendered “servant” means literally “bond-servant,” “slave.” He will not apply this to them, but the foremost Apostles felt that His service was perfect freedom, and it became the common title which they applied to themselves. (Comp., e.g., Rom. i. 1; Jas. i. 1; 2 Pet. i. 1; Rev. i. 1.)

For all things that I have heard of my Father I have made known unto you.—i.e., He had treated them as friends and sharers in their common work. He has revealed to them the character and attributes of the Father, and kept back from them no truth of which they could understand the meaning. There is no contradiction with chap. xvi. 12. The reason He had not told them more was not on His part, but on theirs. They could not then receive more, but in the future He would by the Holy Spirit declare to them all truth.

Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you.—Comp. Luke vi. 12 et seq., and in this Gospel chaps. vi. 70, and xiii. 18. The thought of His love for them, which had exalted them from the position of slaves to friends, from fishermen to Apostles, is made to remind them again (verse 17) of the duty of love to each other. In verse 20 he reminds them of the words which accompanied His own act of humility in washing their feet (chap. xiii. 13, 19). The chiefest Apostle owed all to His gift and election, and should be ready to sacrifice all for his brethren, as He Himself was.

And ordained you.—The word “ordained” has acquired a special sense in modern English which is here misleading, and it will be better, therefore, to read appointed.

That ye should go and bring forth fruit.—
Comp. Matt. xiii. 44; xviii. 15; xix. 21, for the idea of going away and doing something. It implies here the activity of the Apostles as distinct from that of Christ. Each one as a branch ever joined to Christ was to grow away from Him in the development of his own work, and was to bring forth his own fruit. The margin compares Matt. xxviii., 19, probably, with the
The World’s hatred of Him and them,  ST. JOHN, XV. and the cause of it.

me, they will also persecute you; if they have kept my saying, they will keep your’s also.  (21) But all these things will they do unto you for my name’s sake, because they know not him that sent me.  (22) If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin: but now they have no cloak for their sin.  (23) He that hateth me hateth my Father also.  (24) If I had not done among them the works which none other man did, they had not had sin:

1 Or, excuse.

They met the evidence of works in a different sense; and Matt. x. 24, where it is used (24) If I had not done among them the world’s hatred, because it was in the face of His revelation to them by both word (verse 22) and work (verse 24). Apart from this revelation, their sin would have belonged to the times of ignorance, which God overlooked (Acts xvii. 30, 31). It would have been the negative evil of men who know not. It was now the positive evil of men who, knowing the truth, wilfully reject it.

But now they have no cloak for their sin.—Better, as in the margin, they have no excuse for their sin. The Greek phrase occurs only here in the New Testament. The word “cloak” as used with sin is familiar to us from the exhortation in the Book of Common Prayer. The idea is rather to cover up, to hide as with a garment, so that they may not be seen; whereas here the idea is of excuse for manifest sin.

(23) He that hateth me hateth my Father also.—Comp. Note on chap. v. 23, and verse 18 in this context. Again the darkness of the world’s hatred is drawn in the successive degrees of sin. Hatred against the disciples is hatred against the Master whom they represent. Hatred against the Son is hatred against the Father whom He represents. Hatred of the Father! There can be no greater darkness. The sinfulness of sin has in this thought reached its limit. God is love. The heart that can hate love has hardened itself, and cannot be loved.

(24) If I had not done among them the works.—Comp. Note on verse 22, and for the evidence of our Lord’s works, see chap. v. 36; ix. 3, 4, 24; x. 21, 37; xiv. 10. They met the evidence of works by the assertion that He was a sinner, and possessed a

thought of their fulfilling the Apostle’s missionary work. This view has been commonly adopted, but it gives to the word “go” a fulness of meaning which is scarcely warranted.

And that your fruit should remain.—Comp. Note on chap. iv. 36; and see 2 John verse 8, and Rev. xiv. 13.

That whatsoever ye shall ask of the Father.—Comp. Notes on verses 7 and 8.

(17) These things I command you—i.e., the things of which He has spoken from verse 1 onwards, and especially from verses 12-16. After speaking them He comes back to the purpose from which this section started, “that ye love one another.”

We must beware of the not unfrequent mistake of interpreting “these things” of the words which follow, as if it were, “I command you this, viz., to love one another.” The thought is, “I am giving you these precepts that you may love one another.”

(18) If the world hate you.—He has spoken of their close union with Himself, and of their love to each other. He proceeds in the remainder of the chapter to speak of their relation to the world. There is a striking contrast between the “love” in the last verse, and the “hatred” in this. There was the more need for them to be close bound to each other, and to their Lord, on account of the hatred which awaited them in the world.

Ye know that it hated me before it hated you.—It is better to take the first word as an imperative, “Know that it hated . . . ” The very hatred is here traced to its true cause, which is ignorance of God. The Apostles were those sent by Christ. He Himself was the Apostle of the Father. They would hate His messenger, and hate Him, the messenger of God, because they knew not God.

(20) Remember the word that I said unto you.—Comp. chap. xiii. 16, where the saying is used in a different sense; and Matt. x. 24, where it is used in the same connection in which we find it here.

If they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you; if they have kept my saying . . . —The meaning is exactly that which is expressed in the rendering of the English version. The two things are necessarily united, as Christ and His disciples are united. His word is their word. The relation of the world to the one would be that which it had been to the other.

(21) But all these things will they do unto you.—These words are themselves an interpretation of the previous verse. They suppose the persecution and hatred to take place, and they give as the true fact that this would be done to them as representing their Lord. The Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles are a commentary on this text. (Comp., among numerous passages, Acts iv. 17; ix. 14; Gal. iii. 17.)

Because they know not him that sent me.—The hatred is here traced to its true cause, which is ignorance of God. The Apostles were those sent by Christ. He Himself was the Apostle of the Father. They would hate His messenger, and hate Him, the messenger of God, because they knew not God.

(22) If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin.—In this and the following verses (22-25) our Lord shows the sinfulness of the world’s hatred, because it was in the face of His revelation to them by both word (verse 22) and work (verse 24). Apart from this revelation, their sin would have belonged to the times of ignorance, which God overlooked (Acts xvii. 30, 31). It would have been the negative evil of men who know not. It was now the positive evil of men who, knowing the truth, wilfully reject it.

But now they have no cloak for their sin.—Better, as in the margin, they have no excuse for their sin. The Greek phrase occurs only here in the New Testament. The word “cloak” as used with sin is familiar to us from the exhortation in the Book of Common Prayer. The idea is rather to cover up, to hide as with a garment, so that they may not be seen; whereas here the idea is of excuse for manifest sin.

(23) He that hateth me hateth my Father also.—Comp. Note on chap. v. 23, and verse 18 in this context. Again the darkness of the world’s hatred is drawn in the successive degrees of sin. Hatred against the disciples is hatred against the Master whom they represent. Hatred against the Son is hatred against the Father whom He represents. Hatred of the Father! There can be no greater darkness. The sinfulness of sin has in this thought reached its limit. God is love. The heart that can hate love has hardened itself, and cannot be loved.

(24) If I had not done among them the works.—Comp. Note on verse 22, and for the evidence of our Lord’s works, see chap. v. 36; ix. 3, 4, 24; x. 21, 37; xiv. 10. They met the evidence of works by the assertion that He was a sinner, and possessed a
but now have they both seen and hated both me and my Father. (25) But this
cometh to pass, that the word might be
fulfilled that is written in their law,
They hated me without a cause. (26) But when the Comforter is come,
whom I will send unto you from the
Father, even the Spirit of truth, which
proceedeth from the Father, he shall
testify of me: (27) and ye also shall bear
witness, because ye have been with me
from the beginning.

CHAPTER XVI.—(1) These things
have I spoken unto you, that ye should
not be offended. (2) They shall put you
out of the synagogues: yea, the time
cometh, that whosoever killeth thee will
devil. Their hatred led them to ascribe the highest
good to the power of evil. To such hearts there are no
channels by which goodness can approach. (Comp.
especially Note on Matth. xii. 31, 32.)

(26) But this cometh to pass, that the word
might be fulfilled:—The words in italics are
not found in the original, but they rightly complete the
sense. For the phrase, “might be fulfilled,” comp.
Notes on chap. xii. 38 and xii. 18.

That is written in their law.—Comp. Note on
chap. x. 34.

They hated me without a cause.—The passage
immediately referred to is probably that of the
Messianic Psalm (lix. 4). The words are found also
in Pss. xxxv. 19 (see marg. ref.), and less distinctly in
Pss. cix. 3, and cxix. 161. (Comp. especially Note on the
quotation from this same Psalm in chap. ii. 17.)
The words, “without a cause,” rightly express the
meaning of the Hebrew word in the Psalm. The
Greek follows the LXX., which expresses the thought
“inae ius,” or “in vain.” This is, however, not the idea
of the context here. They had no reason for their sin, and therefore they hated Him
without a cause. True were these words of many an
earlier sufferer; but they were in their fulness true,
they were “fulfilled,” only in the one sinless Sufferer.
(29) But when the Comforter is come.—Better,
but when the Advocate is come. (Comp. Excursus G.)

Whom I will send unto you from the
Father.—Comp. chap. xiv. 16, and Note on verse 26.
The pronoun here emphatic, “Whom I will
send...” The mission by the Father in answer to
the Son’s prayer, and the mission by the Father in
the Son’s name, and the mission by the Son Himself,
are thought of as one and the same thing.

Even the Spirit of truth.—Comp. Note on chap.
xiv. 17.

Which proceedeth from the Father.—The
force of these words is to give weight to the witness
which the Spirit shall bear of the Son. He is the
Advocate whom the Son will send from the Father,
but He is also and emphatically the Spirit of Truth
proceeding from the Father, and His witness therefore
will be that of the Father Himself. These two clauses
(“whom I will send unto you from the Father,”
“which proceedeth from the Father”) are to be regarded
as parallels; and both of them probably refer to
the office of the Holy Spirit. The Vulgate renders the
verb in the latter clause by the word “procedit,” and the
older expositors generally understood it of the
person of the Holy Ghost. The Eastern Church, from
the days of Theodore of Mopsuestia downwads, have
claimed this text as proving the procession of the Holy
Spirit from the Father only, and have quoted it as
decisive against the addition of the “filioque clause” in
the Nicene Creed. The Western Church, comparing it
with chap. xvi. 15, and such texts as Rom. vii. 9;
Gal. iv. 6; Phil. i. 9; 1 Pet. i. 11, have held that it
includes the procession from the Son. If it refers to
the person of the Holy Spirit, it must be granted that
the ipissima verba of our Lord are in favour of the
interpretation of the Greek Church; but if it refers, as
with much greater probability it does, to the office of
the Holy Ghost, then these words have no bearing upon
the doctrinal question at issue. The student should
read on this subject, Pearson On the Creed, Art. viii.,
more particularly his invaluable collection of notes.

He shall testify of me.—Better, shall bear
witness of Me. (Comp. Notes on chap. i. 7 and 1 John v. 6).

And ye also shall bear witness.—(2) The tense
is present, and ye also bear witness; or, and ye also
are witnesses. (Comp. Notes on Luke xxiv. 48, 49.)
The Apostles themselves distinguished between their
own witness of things which had come within their own
experience and the witness borne by the power of the
Holy Spirit, of which the Day of Pentecost was the
first great instance. (Comp. Acts v. 32.)

Because ye have been with me from the
beginning.—Comp. chap. i. 7, and Notes on Acts
i. 21, 22. The “beginning” of course means the
beginning of the Messianic teaching and works of which
they were to be witnesses.

(2) THE LAST WORDS OF DEEPEST MEANING
TO THE FAITHFUL FEW (continued).

(f) Their relation to the world and the promise
of the Paraclete explained more fully
(chap. xvi. 1—33).

(a) Though the world will hate them, it is still
expedient that He should depart from
them (verses 1—7).

(b) The coming of the Paraclete and His
office (verses 8—15);

(g) His own departure and return. Their
sorrow the birth-pangs of joy (verses
16—24);

(e) He promises a full revelation of the
Father (verses 25—29).

(f) Their faith is now weak, though they
think it strong (verses 29—32); their
future shall be one of tribulation, but
He has overcome the world (verse 33.)

(1) These things have I spoken unto you.—
Comp. Note on chap. xv. 17. Here, too, the reference is
to the things which he had just said (verses 17—27).
He had foretold them of the hatred of the world and also
of the witness of the Spirit.

That ye should not be offended.—Comp. Matt.
xi. 6; xiii. 21; xxv. 10, et al. In St. John the word
occurs only here and in chap. vi. 61.

(2) They shall put you out of the syna-
gogues.—Comp. Notes on chaps. ix. 22, xii. 42.

Will think that he doeth God service.—
Better, will think that he offereth to God a sacrificial
think that he doeth God service. (5) And these things will they do unto you, because they have not known the Father, nor me. (4) But these things have I told you, that when the time shall come, ye may remember that I told you of them. And these things I said not unto you at the beginning, because I was with you. (5) But now I go my way to him that sent me; and none of you asketh me, Whither goest thou? (6) But because I have said these things unto you, sorrow hath filled your heart. (7) Nevertheless I tell you the truth; It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you.

service. The word rendered “doeth” in the Authorized version, is the technical word for offering sacrifice. (Comp., e.g., Notes on Matt. v. 23 and vi. 6.) The word rendered “service” means the service of worship. This will be seen by a comparison of the other instances where it occurs in the New Testament—they are Rom. ix. 4, and xii. 1, and Heb. ix. 1, 6. A Rabbinic comment on Num. xxv. 18, is, “Whosoever sheddest the blood of the wicked is as he who offereth sacrifice.” The mark of St. Stephen, or St. Paul’s account of himself as a persecutor (Acts xxvi. 9; Gal. i. 13, 14), shows how these words were fulfilled in the first years of the Church’s history, and such accounts are not absent from that history’s latest page.

(3) Because they have not known the Father, nor me.—Comp. Note on chap. xv. 21. He repeats that ignorance of God is the cause of the world’s hatred and persecution, and adds here that it is ignorance of God revealed in Himself. There is a special force in the mention of this ignorance in connection with the previous verse. Men think that in exclusion, and anathemas, and persecutions, and deaths of men made like themselves in the image of God, they are offering to God an acceptable sacrifice. They can know nothing of the true nature of the living Father who pitieth every child, and willeth not the death of a sinner, and gave His only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life. They know nothing of the long-suffering and compassion of the Son of Man, who pleaded even for His murderers, “Father, forgive them, they know not what they do.” (4) But these things have I told you .... He recurs to the thought of verse 1. (Comp. also chaps. xiii. 19 and xiv. 28.) He strengthens them by forewarning them. When the persecution comes they will remember His word, and find in it support for their faith and evidence of His presence with them.

These things I said not unto you at the beginning, because I was with you.—While with them, He would spare them, and it was against Himself that the hatred of His foes was directed. When He shall have left them they will represent Him, and must stand in the foreground of the battle. These words seem to be opposed to Matt. x. and parallel passages, where our Lord did tell the Apostles at the time of their call of the persecutions which awaited them. (See especially verses 17, 21, 28.) The passages are not, however, really inconsistent, for these things in this verse (comp. verses 3 and 1, and chap. xv. 21) refers to the full account He has given them of the world’s hatred and the principles lying at the foot of it, and the manner in which it was to be met by the Spirit’s witness and their witness of Him. These things which the infant Church would have to meet, and without His bodily presence, He told them not at the beginning.

(5) But now I go my way to him that sent me.—(Comp. chaps. xiii. 1 and xiv. 12.) The work of His apostleship on earth was drawing to its close, and He was about to return to the Father from whom He had received it. This was to Him matter of joy, and if they had really loved Him would have been so to them. They would have thought of the future before Him, as He was then thinking, in the fulness of His love, of the future before them.

And none of you asketh me, Whither goest thou?—Peter had asked this very question (chap. xiii. 36), and Thomas had implied it (chap. xiv. 5), but what the words here mean is this: None of you out of love for Me asking about the place whither I am going. Your thoughts are not with Me. It is to you as nothing that I am returning to Him that sent Me.”

(6) Sorrow hath filled your heart.—The thought of their own separation from Him, and of the dark future which lay before them, so filled their hearts that it left room for no thoughts of Him, and the brightness of the glory to which He was returning.

(7) Nevertheless I tell you the truth.—The words He is about to utter are words of strange sound for the ears of disciples, and He prefaced them by an appeal to His own knowledge and candour in dealing with them, as in chap. xiv. 2. The pronoun bears the weight of the emphasis, “I, who know all.” It is expedient for you that I go away.—“There is no cause,” He would say, “for the deep sorrow which has filled your hearts. It is for your advantage that I, as distinct from the Paraclete, who is to come, should go away” (chap. xiv. 16). Yes; for those who had left all to follow Him; for those who had none to go but Himself (chap. vi. 68); for those whose hopes were all centred in Him, it was—hard and incomprehensible as the saying must have seemed—an advantage that He should go away.

For if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you. (Comp. Excursus G.) For the connection between the departure of Christ and the coming of the Advocate, comp. Notes on chap. vii. 39, and Acts ii. 33. We may not fathom the deep counsels of God in which the reason of these words is to be found; but the order fixed in these counsels was that the Son of Man should complete His work on earth, and offer the sacrifice of Himself for sin, and rise from the dead, and ascend to the Father’s throne, before the Advocate should come. The Son of Man was to be glorified before the Spirit was to be given. Humanity was to ascend to heaven before the Spirit could be sent to humanity on earth. The revelation of saving truth was to be complete before inspiration was to breathe it as the breath of life into man’s soul. The conviction of sin, righteousness, and judgment could only follow the finished work of Christ. But if I depart, I will send him unto you.—Our translators have sought to show the distinction between the words used in the earlier clauses, “I go away,” and that used here, “I depart”; but probably few English readers will have observed it. The former
And when he is come, he will reprove the world.—Better, as in margin, convince the world. (Comp. chaps. iii. 20 and vii. 46.) The only other passages where it occurs in the Gospels are in Matt. xviii. 15, and Luke iii. 19. It is not in the better reading of John viii. 9; but it occurs not uncommonly in the Epistles. (See especially Note on 1 Cor. xiv. 24.) This conviction of the world is by witness concerning Christ (chap. xv. 26). It is the revelation to the hearts of men of the character and work of Christ, and, therefore, a refutation of the evil in their hearts. The result of this conviction is two-fold, according as men embrace it, accept its chastening discipline, and are saved by it; or reject it, and in the rejection harden their hearts, and are thus condemned by it. (Comp. 2 Cor. ii. 15, 16.) The effect of St. Peter’s sermon on the Day of Pentecost is the going up to the cross there can be to this verse; but the comment is continued in the whole history of the Church’s work. The remainder of the verse enumerates the three steps in this conviction, which are more fully defined in the three following verses.

(9) Of sin, because they believe not on me.—This should not be interpreted, as it very frequently is, of the sin of unbelief, but of sin generally; unbelief in Christ is stated as the cause of sin. Sin is missing the aim of life, the disordered action of powers that have lost their controlling principle. Christ is the revelation to the world of the Father’s love. In union with God through Him the soul finds the centre of its being, and the true purpose of its life. By the witness of Christ the Holy Spirit convicts men that He is the centre of the moral harmony of the Universe, and that through Him their spirits have access to God. This conviction reveals to them their sin, because they believe not on Him. Its effect can be twofold, according as we are convinced and converted by it, or refuse its influence and remain convicted.

(10) Of righteousness, because I go to my Father.—In the conviction of sin, the world is convinced of its own sin by the Spirit’s representation of Christ to it. That representation of Christ brings also the conviction of righteousness, but this is the righteousness of Christ, not that of the world. The conviction of Christ’s righteousness necessarily precedes that of the heart’s own sin. The light makes the darkness visible, and the revelation of the darkness shows the clearness of the light. The special reason of the conviction of righteousness is the resurrection and ascension of our Lord. Men had called Him a sinner (chap. ix. 24), and His crucifixion was the world’s assertion that He was a malefactor (chap. xviii. 30); but even when He was hanging upon the cross there came to the centurion’s mind the conviction, “Truly this Man was innocent” (see Note on Luke xxiii. 47); and His return to the Father was Heaven’s witness to His righteousness. For the way in which this conviction was brought home to the hearts of the Apostles, and through them to the hearts of mankind, comp. especially Acts ii. 27, 31, 36, 38; See also Acts iii. 14; vii. 52; 1 Pet. iii. 18; 1 John ii. 1, 29; iii. 7.

And ye see me no more.—The word means, “look upon,” “behold.” The going to the Father would cause them to be their guide—i.e., they are parts of the revelation which the minds of the disciples are not yet fitted to receive.

You cannot bear them now.—Comp. chap. xv. 15. The statements are not opposed to each other. On His side there is the readiness to impart to them as friends all things that He had heard from the Father. But revelation can only be made to the mind which can accept it; and for those who have only in general knowledge. They would include, doubtless, the many difficulties which attend every interpretation of verses 7—11. All that can be attempted is to place the reader in possession of what seems to be the simplest meaning of the words. A more full treatment is the less necessary as a complete discussion of the whole subject is easily accessible in the Sermons of the late Archdeacon of Lewes, preached before the University of Cambridge, in 1840. The Notes attached to the Sermons are an exhaustive summary of the views held in ancient and modern times by men most capable of judging. (See J. C. Hare, Mission of the Comforter, Ed. 3, 1876.)

I have yet many things to say unto you.—The “many things” are defined by the next verse to be things with regard to which the Spirit of Truth shall be their guide—i.e., they are parts of the revelation which the minds of the disciples are not yet fitted to receive.

The fact that there were truths which Christ Himself could not teach is a lesson which men who profess to teach in Christ’s name have too seldom learnt. St. Paul found in it a rule for his own practice. He, too, fed the world, and of judgment: (9) of sin, because they believe not on me; (10) of righteousness, because I go to my Father, and ye see me no more; (11) of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged.

The conviction of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment: (9) of sin, because they believe not on me; (10) of righteousness, because I go to my Father, and ye see me no more; (11) of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged.
you, but ye cannot bear them now. (13) Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will shew you things to come. (14) He shall glorify me: for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you. (15) All things that the Father hath are mine: therefore said I, that he shall take of mine, and shall shew it unto you. (16) A little while, and ye shall not see me: and again, a little while, and ye shall see me, because I go before him. Better, and He will announce to you the things to come.

(Comp. Notes on 1 Cor. iii. 3.) It is true, indeed, that no one can teach who does not possess a higher knowledge than that of his pupil; but it is no less true that no one can really teach who does not take the lower ground of his pupil’s knowledge, and from that lead him to his own. Truths which the cultured mind accepts as obvious would appear no less so to the peasant if he were carefully taught them. Too often the weaker brother finds a stumbling-block in the very steps which should lead him to a higher truth, because he approaches them blindly, and without a guide. For the breach which exists between the higher Christian thought of our day and the faith of the masses of the people, Christian teachers are in no small degree responsible, and the only means by which the chasm may be bridged is to teach Christ’s truths as He Himself showed them into the territory, and unfold to them the message. Disciples to whom it was spoken (15) of Jesus in the Text, “Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God, and every spirit that confesseth not Jesus is not of God.” (Comp. Notes on 1 John iv. 1, 2.) The Revelation of Christ is not an imperfect revelation but the fulness of the truth is for the disciples an unknown territory. They are spiritually as blind men, feeling after the truth, but not able to see it. The Spirit of Truth will take them by the hand, and, step by step, as they have strength to follow, will guide them into the territory, and unfold to them the treasures it contains. The promise has a special meaning for the disciples to whom it was spoken; but it holds good for every disciple who seeks to know the truth. We may pray—without doubt that the prayer is in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and without doubt that it will be answered—

“Come, Holy Ghost, our souls inspire, And lighten with celestial fire. Enable with perpetual light The dulness of our blinded sight.”

The scriptures, “instructed unto the kingdom of heaven, and bringing forth out of their treasure things new and old” (Matt. xiii. 52), may know that they can seek, and not seek in vain, a higher than human guidance, and may hope “by the same Spirit to have a right judgment in all things, and evermore to rejoice in His holy comfort.”

For he shall not speak of himself.—Comp. Notes on chaps. v. 18 and vii. 17, 18. The Holy Spirit’s power to guide into the truth depends upon the fact that He, like the Son Himself, will represent to the world the eternal truth of God. He, too, is subordinate to the Father, and His work is to seek the glory of Him that sent Him. (Comp., on the other hand, chap. viii. 44, where the essence of the He is that the devil speaketh of his own.)

And he will show you things to come.——

Better, and He will announce to you the things to come. (Comp. Notes on Rev. i. 1; xxii. 6, 20.) We must again be on our guard against drawing limits which Christ has not drawn. These words, too, have their fulfilment in the Spirit’s illumination in all time; but we may still find their first and special meaning in the Revelation to the Apostolic Church, of which St. John’s Apocalypse is the most prominent example.

For he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you.—Better, as in verse 13, . . . announce it unto you. This is the test of the Spirit, “Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God, and every spirit that confesseth not Jesus is not of God.” (Comp. Notes on 1 John iv. 1, 2.) The Revelation of Christ is not an imperfect revelation which the Holy Spirit is to supplement. It is a full revelation imperfectly received, and His office is to illumine the heart, and bring home to it the things of Christ.

(13) All things that the Father hath are mine.—He has told them that the Spirit’s work is to glorify Him, to receive of His, and announce to the world. The ground of this saying is in the fact that the Son is the Revealer of the Father, and that the fulness of the truth (verse 13) is given unto Him. The words appear from the context not to express the spiritual relation of the Son to the Father, but the fulness of the communication to Him in His human nature of the divine truth which He should reveal to man. (Comp. Notes on chaps. i. 18; vii. 42; x. 36; xvii. 10; Matt. xxvii; Col. i. 12; ii. 2, 3.)

For he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you.—Better, He taketh of Mine, and shall declare it unto you. The present expresses the unchanging relation of the Spirit to the Son. It should be noted that in these verses (14 and 15) there is an implication of the following doctrinal truths. They are implied, let us remember, in the words of our Lord Himself, and that they are implied and not stated increases the force of their meaning:—(1) The divinity of the Son: “He shall glorify Me;” “All things that the Father hath are Mine.” (2) The personality of the Holy Ghost: “He shall receive of Mine.” The Greek word,  

(16) A little while, and ye shall not see me.——

The better rendering is A little while, and ye no longer behold Me. For the sense, comp. Notes on chap. xiv. 18, 19. The time here referred to is that between the moment of His speaking to them and His death.

And again, a little while, and ye shall see me.——

The time here referred to is the interval between His death and the Day of Pentecost. That the vision
The Meaning of "a little while."

ST. JOHN, XVI. Their Sorrow the Birth-pangs of Joy.

(17) Then said some of his disciples among themselves, What is this that he saith unto us, A little while, and ye shall not see me: and again, a little while, and ye shall see me: and, Because I go to the Father?

(18) They said therefore, What is this that he saith, A little while? we cannot tell what he saith. (19) Now Jesus knew that they were desirous to ask him, and said unto them, Do ye enquire among yourselves of that I said, A little while, and ye shall not see me: and again, a little while, and ye shall see me?

The purpose of His enigmatic saying is to be understood of our Lord's presence in the person of the Paraclete (chap. xiv. 18, 19), is confirmed by verse 23. Note that in this clause the verb ("see") is different from that in the preceding clause ("beheld"). The latter refers rather to the physical, and the former to the spiritual vision. (Comp. xx. 23.)

Because I go to the Father.—The majority of the better MSS. omit these words at this place. They have probably been inserted here from the end of the next verse. (Comp. Note there.)

(17, 18) Then said some of his disciples among themselves.—Better, Therefore said . . . The question arises out of what He has said. They draw aside and discuss the matter privately. It is beyond their comprehension, and seems to be contradictory. Better, A little while, and ye shall not see me.—Better, A little while, and ye behold Me not, as in verse 16.

Because I go to the Father.—So far they have quoted word for word what He had said in the previous verse. They now connect it with what He had said in verses 7 and 10, and this forms the ground of their surprise. There He had spoken of their beholding Him no more because He goeth to the Father. Here He speaks of a little while, after which they shall not behold Him, and again a little while, after which they shall see Him. They cannot reconcile these things. They cannot tell what He saith.

(19) Now Jesus knew that they were desirous to ask him.—The purpose of His enigmatic saying (verse 28) has been accomplished. Their attention has been excited, and they have taken the first step towards knowledge. They inquire among themselves, and this spirit of inquiry which He reads in their hearts (comp. chaps. ii. 25, vi. 6) He proceeds to answer. The first part of His answer is concerned with their difficulty about the "a little while." In verse 28 He answers their thought about His going to the Father.

(20) Verily, verily, I say unto you.—Comp. Note on chap. i. 51.

That ye shall weep and lament, but the world shall rejoice.—Comp. chap. xx. 11, and Luke xxiii. 27. In the original the contrast between the sorrow of the disciples and the joy of the world is rendered the more striking by the order of the words, "Weep and lament shall ye, but the world shall rejoice." The tears and the scoffs at the cross were the accomplishment of this prophecy.

And ye shall be sorrowful, but your sorrow shall become joy. The expression is a full one. It is not simply that they shall pass from sorrow to joy, but that the sorrow itself shall become joy. They will rejoice in the presence of the Lord, when after a little while they will see Him and will feel that the separation necessarily went before the union, and that the sorrow was itself a matter of joy because it was the necessary cause of the joy (verse 7, and chap. xx. 20).

A woman when she is in travail hath sorrow;—The Greek is more exactly, the woman in travail hath pangs—that is, "the woman in the well-known illustration." (See Note on chap. xv. 15.) This figure was of frequent use in the prophets. (Comp. Isa. xxi. 3; xxvi. 17, 18, and especially lxxvi. 7, 8; Jer. iv. 31; xxi. 23; xxx. 6; Hos. xiii. 14, 14; Mic. iv. 9, 10.)

That a man is born into the world.—The word is the wider word for "human being." (Comp. Note on chap. i. 51.) The thought is of the joy of maternity swelling up the pangs of child-birth. These cease to exist, but that continues. She forgets the one in the fulness of the other.

For the phrase "into the world " comp. chaps. i. 9 and xviii. 37. (22) And ye now therefore have sorrow.—The same word is used. The hour of their travail-pangs was at hand; but it would pass away, and the fulness of joy would come in the constant presence of their Lord. Their sorrow would be but temporary; their joy would be abiding. The point of comparison between their state, and the familiar illustration of a woman in travail, is the passage from extreme suffering to extreme joy. We are not justified in taking the illustration as a parable, and interpreting it of the death of Christ as the birth-pang of a perfect humanity. This is the general interpretation of the more mystical expositors, and has been unfolded with great truth and beauty; but it is not an exposition of the present text.

But I will see you again, and your heart shall rejoice.—In verse 19 He had said "Ye shall see," This is the obverse of the same truth. He will again be with them, and see them as they will see Him. The words include too the thought of His deep sympathy with them. He sees them now in the depth of their sorrow, and feels with them in that. He will see them again in the time of their joy, and will rejoice with them in that. And ye shall ask me nothing.—Comp. Acts i. 6. The time here referred to is, as we have seen (verse 16), the time of the gift of the
ST. JOHN, XVI.

The Love of the Father Himself.

Verily, verily, I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give it you.* (24) Hitherto they have asked nothing in my name: ask, and ye shall receive, that your joy may be full. (25) These things have I spoken unto you in proverbs: but the time cometh, when I shall no more speak unto you in proverbs, but I shall shew you plainly of the Father. (26) At that day ye shall ask in my name: and I say not unto you, that I will pray the Father for you: (27) for the Father himself loveth you, because ye have loved me, and have believed that I came out from God. (28) I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world: again, I leave the world, and go to the Father.

Paraclete, who shall fully illumine them, so that they shall not need to ask the meaning of new thoughts and words as they have done hitherto. (Comp., e.g., the certain knowledge of Peter’s speech in Acts ii, with the misunderstandings of these last days of the Lord’s ministry.)

Verily, verily, I say unto you.—Comp. chap. i. 51. As we have so often found, these words precede a truth of weighty import.

Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give it you.—The more probable rendering is, Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father, He will give it you in My name. The thought is that the prayer is offered in Christ’s name (comp. Note on chap. xiv. 13, and in this context verse 24), and that the answer to every such prayer is in virtue of His name. The fact that we pray in His name makes it certain that the prayer will be answered. The fact that the prayer is answered is proof that it was in Christ’s name.

Hitherto have ye asked nothing in my name.—Comp. Note on chap. xiv. 13. They had not up to this time received the Holy Spirit. When He came, He was as the presence of Christ dwelling in them. Under His influence their will became the will of Christ, and their thoughts the thoughts of Christ, and their prayers the prayers of Christ. They had not yet so learnt Him as to pray in His name. It would be otherwise in that day.

Ask, and ye shall receive, that your joy may be full.—The future is thought of as already present, and they are directed to ask, as though they had already entered into the new region of spiritual life. The pangs of the present travailing are passing away (verse 22). The fulness of joy is already at hand. (Comp. Note on chap. xvi. 11.)

These things have I spoken unto you in proverbs.—Better, as in the margin, . . . in parables. So in the second clause of the verse and in verse 29. (Comp. Note on chap. x. 6.) “These things” refers specially to what He had just said from verse 16 onwards. There is a sense in which it is necessarily true of all Christ’s teaching, and of all teaching in words. They are but parables until the truth which they contain has been thought out by the man that hears them. For the disciples much of Christ’s teaching remained in a parabolic form, until the Spirit brought all things which He had said to the mind, and quickened their minds so that they could grasp its meaning. (Comp., e.g., chap. ii. 20—52.)

But the time cometh, when I shall no more speak unto you in proverbs.—For “proverbs,” read parables, as in last verse. For the time referred to, comp. verses 16 and 23. In that time He will be present with them in the Advocate, and will no longer need parables or words, but will to the depth of their spirit, as it were, to them in all fulness and plainness the eternal truth of the Father (verse 13 et seq.).

(24) Hitherto have ye asked nothing in my name.—Comp. Notes on verses 23 and 24. When guided by the Paraclete, the life will be subject to the will of Christ, and the prayer will be in His name.

And I say not unto you, that I will pray the Father for you.—These words have often been taken to mean, “That I will pray the Father for you, is a matter of course, of which I need not tell you;” but this sense is excluded by the following verse. The thought is rather, “I do not speak of praying for you, because in the presence of the Advocate you will yourselves be able to pray in My name, to the Father.” Our Lord is thought of as not necessary for them, and yet the form of the words implies that He will pray for them if it should be needful. While their hearts are the temples of the Holy Ghost, and they maintain communion with the Father, they will need no other Advocate, but “If any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous” (1 John ii. 1). Comp. chaps. xiv. 16 and xvii. 9, which refer to the time which precedes the gift of the Holy Ghost.

(25) These things have I spoken unto you in proverbs.—Better, as in the margin, . . . in parables. So in the second clause of the verse and in verse 29. (Comp. Note on chap. x. 6.) “These things” refers specially to what He had just said from verse 16 onwards. There is a sense in which it is necessarily true of all Christ’s teaching, and of all teaching in words. They are but parables until the truth which they contain has been thought out by the man that hears them. For the disciples much of Christ’s teaching remained in a parabolic form, until the Spirit brought all things which He had said to the mind, and quickened their minds so that they could grasp its meaning. (Comp., e.g., chap. ii. 20—52.)

But the time cometh, when I shall no more speak unto you in proverbs.—For “proverbs,” read parables, as in last verse. For the time referred to, comp. verses 16 and 23. In that time He will be present with them in the Advocate, and will no longer need parables or words, but will to the depth of their spirit, as it were, to them in all fulness and plainness the eternal truth of the Father (verse 13 et seq.).

(26) At that day ye shall ask in my name.—Comp. Notes on verses 23 and 24. When guided by the Paraclete, the life will be subject to the will of Christ, and the prayer will be in His name.

And I say not unto you, that I will pray the Father for you.—These words have often been taken to mean, “That I will pray the Father for you, is a matter of course, of which I need not tell you;” but this sense is excluded by the following verse. The thought is rather, “I do not speak of praying for you, because in the presence of the Advocate you will yourselves be able to pray in My name, to the Father.” Our Lord is thought of as not necessary for them, and yet the form of the words implies that He will pray for them if it should be needful. While their hearts are the temples of the Holy Ghost, and they maintain communion with the Father, they will need no other Advocate, but “If any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous” (1 John ii. 1). Comp. chaps. xiv. 16 and xvii. 9, which refer to the time which precedes the gift of the Holy Ghost.

(27) For the Father himself loveth you, because ye have loved me.—Comp. Notes on chap. xiv. 21, 23. The introduction of the thought again here reminds us that, although in the fulness of the higher spiritual life there is communion between the Father and the human spirit, because the Father Himself ever loveth the heart which can receive His love, this power to receive the love of the Father is itself the result of loving the Son, who has revealed Him. Our Lord is leading them to the fuller truths of spiritual communion with God, and even tells them that this will be independent of mediation; but the very words which tell them that it will be independent of mediation, tell them that all depends upon His own mediation and the manifestation of the love of God in His own person.

And have believed that I came out from God.—The reading is uncertain. Several of the better MSS. read, . . . that I came forth from the Father.” (Comp. the first words of the next verse and chap. xiii. 3.) The perfect tenses represent their love and faith as completed, and continuing in the present. It is striking that the order of the words makes faith follow love. This order may be chosen to mark emphatically the connection between the Father’s love for the disciples and their love for the Son; but it also suggests that their convictions were the result of having their hearts opened by love so that they received the truth.

(28) I came forth from the Father.—Comp. Note on verse 19. He repeats with emphasis that which in the last verse He stated as believed by them—"It is true. I did come forth from the Father, and came into the world. But what follows from this? Heaven, and not earth, is My home. I leave the world again and return to the Father." They had accepted the truth of the Incarnation, but in this there was
Their Conviction and Faith.  

ST. JOHN, XVI.  

His Knowledge of their Weakness.

(29) His disciples said unto him, Lo, now speakest thou plainly, and speakest no proverb.  

(30) Now are we sure that thou knowest all things, and needest not that any man should ask thee: by this we believe that thou camest forth from God.  

(31) Jesus answered them, Do ye now believe?  

(32) Behold, the hour cometh, yea, is now come, that ye shall be scattered, every man to his own, and shall leave me alone: and yet I am not alone, because the Father is with me.  

(33) These things I have spoken unto you, that in me ye might have peace. In the world ye shall have tribulation: but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world.

And yet I am not alone, because the Father is with me.—They would each flee to his own place of sojourn. He, too, though apparently left alone, had His own home in the presence of the Father, which was ever with Him. The fact of their leaving Him could not in truth have added to His sense of loneliness. He must, even when surrounded by them, have always been alone. The thoughts of His mind were so infinitely beyond them, that the true sympathy which binds souls in companionship could never have had place. And yet He was never alone for His life was one of constant communion with the Father. (Comp. the consciousness of this in chap. viii. 23.) Once only do we find the vision of the Father’s presence eclipsed for a moment by the thick darkness of the world’s sin; but the wail of agony, “My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?” (Matt. xxvii. 46) is straightforwardly followed by the assurance of His presence, “Father, into Thy hands I commend My spirit” (Luke xxiii. 46.) —Alone and not alone. It was so in the human life of our Lord; it is so in the life of His followers. There is a sense in which each one is alone; and there is a depth of being into which no human friend can ever enter. There is a loneliness which of itself would lead to despair, were it not that its very existence tells of and leads to the never-failing communion with God:—

“Who hath the Father and the Son May be left—but not alone.”

(33) These things I have spoken unto you . . .—At the conclusion of the discourse He sums up in a single thought what was the object of it, “Peace in Him. In the world, indeed, tribulation, but this as conquered in Him, and not interrupting the true peace in Him.” The thought is closely allied to that of the last verse, “Alone and not alone;” “Troubled, and yet having peace.” He had spoken of this from chap. xiv. onwards, and from xv. 18—xvi. 4 specially of the tribulation which awaited them. (Comp. St. Paul’s experience of these contrasts in 2 Cor. iv. 8 et seq.)

That in me ye might have peace.—Comp. Notes on chaps. xiv. 27 and xv. 7.

In the world ye shall have tribulation.—The reading of the better MSS. is, “In the world ye have tribulation.” It is the general statement of their relation to the world. The two clauses answer to each other—the one defining the origin of their inner, the other of their outer life. The life in the world is but the life as it is seen by others; the true life is that which is in communion with God through Christ, and that is one of never-failing peace, which no tribulation can ever affect. Peace is the Christian’s birthright, and his joy no one taketh from him (verse 22, chap. xiv. 27).

But be of good cheer: I have overcome the world.—The pronoun is strongly emphatic, “I have Myself overcome the world.” He speaks of the assured victory as though it were already accomplished. (See
CHAPTER XVII.—(1) These words spake Jesus, and lifted up his eyes to heaven, and said, Father, the hour is come; glorify thy Son, that thy Son also may glorify thee: (2) as thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him. (3) And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent. (4) I have glorified thee on the earth: I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do. (5) And now, O Father, glorify thou me

Note on verse 11 and chaps. xii. 31 and xiii. 31.) Here is the reason why they should take courage and be of good cheer. He is the Captain of their salvation, and has already won the victory. The enemies they fear, the world in which they have tribulation, are already captives following in the Conqueror's train. They themselves have pledges of victory in and through His victory.

XVII.

(3) Love Manifested in His Intercessory Prayer (chap. xvii. 1—26). He Prays—

(a) For Himself; the glory of the Son (verses 1—5);
(b) For the disciples; their union with the Father and the Son (verses 6—19);
(c) For all believers; their union (verses 20, 21); their communion with the Godhead (verses 22—24); which results from the revelation to them of the Father (verses 25, 26).

(1) These words spake Jesus, and lifted up his eyes to heaven.—Comp. Note on chap. xiv. 31. If the view thus adopted is the correct one, it follows of those to whom eternal life is given. (Comp. Notes of feeling, and irrespective of place. This chapter of the previous verse is that the Messianic work of heart uplifted to the God to whom and by whom it was That they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent, et al. Matthew 28. 18.)

Bengel speaks of this chapter as the simplest in the whole Bible. The key to the thought is in the presence of the Spirit, who shall guide into all truth (chap. xvi. 26).

Father, the hour is come.—Father, without any addition, as in verses 5, 21, 24. Comp., “Our Father,” in the prayer taught to the disciples, and “Holy Father” and “Righteous Father” in verses 11 and 25. In the first petition of this prayer the disciples are not identified with Him, and yet He does not by the use of the singular person exclude them. Through Him they and all believers receive the spirit of adoption, and cry, as He cried, “Abba, Father.” For the thought of the hour, comp. chaps. xii. 23, 28, and xiii. 1, 31, 32.

Glorify thy Son, that thy Son also may glorify thee.—What is meant by glorifying the Son is further explained in verse 5. But this implies the dark path of death, which has to be trodden before that glory will be attained. (Comp. chap. xii. 23 et seq.) The glorifying of the Father by the Son is the manifestation of God's glory in the completion of the Messianic work by the mission of the Advocate and the future victories of the Church. This is further explained in verses 2—4.

(2) As thou hast given him power over all flesh.—Better, According as thou gavest Him . . . This is the ground on which the prayer in verse I is based. (Comp. chaps. x 36 and xii. 3.) The glory for which He asks is in accordance with the decree which appointed His Messianic work.

“All flesh” represents a Greek translation of a Hebrew phrase. It occurs again in Matt. xxv. 22; Mark xii. 20; Luke iii. 3; Acts ii. 17; Rom. iii. 20; 1 Cor. i. 9, and xv. 39; Gal. ii. 16; 1 Pet. i. 24. St. John uses it in this place only. Its especial signification is humanity as such, considered in its weakness and imperfection.

That he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him.—Literally, That all whom thou gavest Him, He may give to eternal life. (Comp. verse 6, and Note on chap. vi. 37 et seq.) The word “all” is in the Greek a neuter singular, and signifies collectively the whole body of humanity given to Christ. The word for “to them” is masculine and plural, and signifies the individual reception on the part of those to whom eternal life is given. (Comp. Notes on chap. vi. 39, 40.)

(3) And this is life eternal.—For these words, which are more frequent in St. John than in any other of the New Testament writers, comp. chaps. iii. 15, 16, 26; v. 24, 39; vi. 27, 40, 47, 54, 68; x. 22; xii. 25, 50; 1 John i. 2; ii. 15; iii. 15; v. 11, 13, 20. The thought of the previous verse is that the Messianic work of Christ is to give eternal life to those whom God has given Him. The thought of the following verse is that He has accomplished this work. In this verse He shows in what its accomplishment consists—viz., in revealing men to the only true God through Jesus Christ.

That they might know thee the only true God.—Better, That they might recognize Thee as the only true God. (Comp. Notes on chaps. i. 9, and xiv. 7.) And Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.—Better, And Him, whom Thou didst send, Jesus, as Messiah. Eternal life consists in the knowledge of the Father as the only Being answering to the ideal thought of God; and in this knowledge manifested in Him, whom God anointed and sent into the world to declare His attributes and character. Only in the Word made flesh can we hear the voice of mercy, forgiveness, love, fatherhood; which comes to men as the breath of life, so that they become living souls.

(4) I have glorified thee on the earth: I have finished the work . . .—Better, I glorified Thee on earth: I finished the work . . . The former sentence is explained by the latter. God was glorified in the completion of the Messianic work of Christ. For this conception of the work of life, which includes the whole life as manifesting God to man, comp. Notes on chaps. v. 36; ix. 4; x. 25 et al.

(5) And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self.—These words are exactly parallel with the commencement of the previous verse. “I”...
With thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was. (6) I have manifested thy name unto the men which thou gavest me out of the world: thine they were, and thou gavest them me; and they have kept thy word. (7) Now they have known that all things whatsoever thou hast given me are of thee. (8) For I have given unto them the words which thou gavest me; and they have received them, and have known surely that I came out from thee, and they have believed that thou didst send me. (9) I pray for them: I pray not for the world, but for them which thou hast given me;

"Thou, \( \text{Thou-Me}, \) on earth, "with Thine own self." (Comp. chap. xiii. 31, 32.)

With the glory which I had with thee before the world was.—This clause admits of but one meaning—viz., that Jesus claimed for Himself the possession of the divine glory in His pre-existent state before the world was; and that He claimed this in personality distinct from, but in essence one with God. (Comp. chap. i. 1 and 18, and on the whole passage, Notes on Phil. iii. 4-7.) The special importance of the thought here is that it is uttered in the words of Christ Himself, and that those words are a prayer to the Father. There can be no explanation of verses 1-5 of this chapter, which denies that our Lord Jesus Christ claimed for Himself that He was divine, and co-eternal with the Father.

(6) I have manifested (better, \textit{I manifested}) thy name unto the men which thou gavest me (better, \textit{Thou hast given Me}) out of the world.—This manifestation of the name of God is the making Him known as the only true God, and the glorifying Him on earth of verses 3 and 4. For the special form in which the thought is expressed ("Thy name "), comp. Note on Matt. vi. 9.

He thinks of the disciples as a body separated from the world (comp. Note on chap. xv. 19), and as given to Him by the Father. (Comp. Note on chap. vi. 37.)

Thine they were, and thou gavest (better, \textit{had given}) them me.—The meaning of these words is that they were morally prepared by the earlier manifestation of God for the fuller manifestation in Christ. They were God's in more than name, and therefore when Christ was revealed to them, they recognised Him of whom Moses and the prophets did speak. (Comp. chap. i. 37 et seq., and especially Notes on chaps. v. 46; vi. 37; viii. 47.)

And they have kept thy word.—Comp. Notes on chaps. vii. 51, and xiv. 23. He says here, "Thy word," not, "My word," because the thought of these verses (6-8) is that they were originally and were still the Father's. They had been given to the Son, but this was only the completion of the revelation of the Father to them. Christ's word was that of the Father who sent Him. (Comp. Notes on chaps. vii. 16; xii. 48, 49.)

(7) Now they have known ... Better, Now they do know. The word means "They have come to know, and do know." (Comp. Note on chap. xvi. 30.) This is the result of their spiritual training—in its fulness, indeed, still future, but regarded as in the immediate present.

All things whatsoever thou hast given me are of thee. —We ought to assign no limit to the extent of these words. The lesson He had been teaching them, and which they were fully to know, was that the whole life of Christ—the words He had spoken (chap. xii. 49), the works He had done (chap. v. 36)—was a manifestation of the Father.

For I have given unto them the words which thou gavest me.—Our Lord explains in this verse how the disciples attained to the knowledge He had spoken of in verse 7, and lays stress in the first place on His own work in teaching them, "I, on My part, have given unto them," and on the matter taught as that which the Father had committed unto Him (chap. xiii. 49).

And they have received them.—Not less emphatic is the work of the disciples themselves. "They on their part received them." Others had been taught, and did not receive. The teaching was the same; the varying effect was in the heart of the hearer. (Comp. chap. i. 12 and 18.)

He has spoken of the teaching and the reception. He proceeds to the two-fold result.

And have known (better, and knew) surely that I came out from thee.—Comp. Notes on more fully (verses 6-8). They are the Father's, for all things which are the Son's are the Father's, and all things which are the Father's are the Son's (verse 10).
They are His and therefore the Father's.

St. John, XVII. He commits them to the Father's care.

for they are thine. (10) And all mine are thine, and thine are mine; and I am glorified in them. (11) And now I am no more in the world, but these are in the world, and I come to thee. Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one, as we are. (12) While I was with them in the world, I kept them in thy name: those that thou gavest me I have kept, and none of them is lost, but the son of perdition; that the scripture might be fulfilled. (13) And now come I to thee; and these

(10) And all mine are thine, and thine are mine.—Better, And all My things are Thine, and Thy things are Mine. The Authorised version leaves the impression that the pronouns are masculine, and that persons are exclusively meant; whereas the words are all-inclusive, and assert absolute community in all things between the Father and the Son.

And I am glorified in them.—The division of verses is unfortunate, as the last words of this verse are closely connected with the last words of verse 9, and the general assertion which intervenes is a parenthesis. The thought is, “For they are Thine (and all My things are Thine, and Thy things are Mine), and I am glorified in them.” The fact that Christ is glorified in them forms, then, a second reason for His special watchfulness by means of which this result was accomplished, in part realised (verses 6—8; comp. chap. xv. 3), and is more fully to be realised in that future of the Spirit’s work which all through this chapter is regarded as present. (Comp. Note on chap. xvi. 14.)

(11) And now I am no more in the world.—The immediate future is still regarded as present. The words have a special reference to the interval between His death and the day of Pentecost, which would be for the disciples a time of darkness and danger, when they would have special need of the Father’s care.

Holy Father.—Comp. verses 1, 24, 25. There is a special fitness in the word “Holy” here, as in opposition to the world. The disciples were left in the world, but they were not of the world (verse 14). These were spiritually God’s children, separated from the world (verse 6), and He commits them to the Holy Father, that He may keep them from the evil of the world.

Keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me.—The reading is slightly doubtful, but if we take what would certainly seem to be the true text, the rendering should be, Keep them in Thy name which Thou hast given Me. (Comp. verse 12.) The Authorised version renders the same words by “through Thy name” in this verse, and by “in Thy name” in verse 12. This thought appears to be that the revelation of the nature of God by Christ to the world (verse 6), was that which He Himself received from the Father. “I have not spoken of Myself, but the Father which sent Me, He gave Me a commandment what I should say and what I should speak.” (Comp. Note on chap. xii. 49.)

That they may be one, as we are.—This clause depends upon the words, “Keep them in Thy name.” These words are realised in the fact that they had known Christ’s whole life to be the utterance of God to their spirits (verses 6—8). He prays that they may be kept in this knowledge in order that they may so know the Father through Him, as to become themselves one with the Father.

(12) While I was with them in the world.—Comp. the opening words of verse 11. During His presence with them there was not this special need for commending them to the Father’s care. His relation to them now is as that of a parent blessing and praying for His children before He is taken away from them. (Comp. chap. xiii. 33.)

I kept them in thy name: those that thou gavest me I have kept.—Better (comp. previous verse), I kept them in Thy name which Thou gavest Me, and guarded them. The pronoun is emphatic. “While I was in the world I kept them. I am now praying that Thou wouldest keep them.” The words “kept” and “guarded” differ slightly in meaning, the former pointing to the preservation in the truth revealed to them, and the latter to the watchfulness by means of which this result was obtained. The former may be compared to the feeding of the flock, the latter to the care which protects from the wild beasts around. (Comp. chap. x. 29—30.)

And none of them is lost, but the son of perdition.—Better, None of them perished, except the son of perdition. The tense is the same as that of the word “guarded.” The Good Shepherd watched His flock, and such was His care that none perished but the “son of perdition.” Of him the words carefully state that “he perished.” He, then, was included in “them which Thou gavest Me.” For him there was the same preservation and the same guardianship as for those who remained in the fold. The sheep wandered from the flock, and was lost by his own act. (Comp. especially Notes on chap. vi. 37—39 and 71. See also chap. xviii. 9.)

The term, “son of perdition,” is a well-known Hebrew idiom, by which the lack of qualitative adjectives is expressed. The abstract substantive, which expresses this quality, “a disobedient child is, e.g., “a son of disobedience;” other common instances are “children of light,” “children of darkness.” A “son of perdition” is one in whose nature there is the quality expressed by “perdition.” The phrase is used in Isa. lvi. 4 to express the apostacy of the Israelites (in English version, “children of transgression”). It occurs once again in 2 Thess. ii. 3, of the “man of sin.” (Comp. Notes there.) It is used, in the Gospel of Nicodemus, of the devil. In the present passage it is difficult to express the meaning in English, because we have no verb of the same root as the abstract substantive “perdition,” and no abstract substantive of the same root as the verb “perish.” No exact translation can therefore give in English the point of our Lord’s words, “And none of them perished except him whose nature it was to perish.” Here, as often (comp. Note on chap. x. 16), the reader who can consult Luther’s German will find that he exactly hits the sense: “Und ist keiner von ihnen verloren ohne das verlorene Kind.”

That the scripture might be fulfilled.—Comp. Note on chap. xiii. 18, and Acts i. 20.

(13) And now I come to thee;—Comp. the first words of verse 12, with which these are in contrast.
things I speak in the world, that they might have my joy fulfilled in themselves. (14) I have given them thy word; and the world hath hated them, because they are not of the world, even as I am not of the world. (15) I pray not that thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that thou shouldest keep them from the evil. (16) They are not of the world.—These words are repeated from verse 14. The thought of their being still in the world leads on to their mission in the world, and the prayer passes from the thought of preservation to that of their sanctification for their work. Their fitness for this is prominent in this verse. Already they are not of the world, even as He is not of the world.

 Sanctify them through thy truth.—Better, in Thy truth. Truth was the sphere in which their sanctification was to take place. They had through Christ received the Father's word, which was truth, and had passed into a new region of life, separate from the world (verses 6—14). He has prayed that the Father would preserve them in this, and now He prays further that the Father would in this new region of life set them apart for the work to which He had sent them (verse 18).

The idea at the root of the word rendered "sanctify," is not holiness, but separation. It is opposed not to what is impure, but to what is common, and is constantly used in the Greek of the Old Testament for the consecration of persons and things to the service of God. Hence our Lord can use it of Himself in chap. x. 36, and in this context (verse 19; these are the only places where it occurs in St. John's writings). He was Himself "set apart and sent into the world." He has to send them into the world in the same way (verse 18, and chap. x. 36), and prays that they may be in the same way consecrated for their work.

Thy word is truth.—There is a strong emphasis in the pronoun "Thy word is truth." This word they had kept (verses 6—8). It had become the region of their life. They are to be the channels through which it is to pass to others (verse 20). They are already in the higher sphere of truth, in which their entire consecration is to take place, when the gifts of the Holy Spirit shall descend upon them.

As thou hast sent me into the world.—Better, As Thou didst send Me. The tense points out the definite moment of His mission. (Comp. chap. x. 36.)

So have I also sent them into the world.—Better, I also sent. Comp. Notes on Matt. x. 5; Luke vi. 13. In the very word "Apostles" their mission was contained; but the thought here comprehends the immediate future of their wider mission. (Comp. Note on chap. xx. 21.)

And for their sakes I sanctify myself.—Comp. Note on verse 17. The consecration here thought of is that to the work which was immediately before Him—the offering Himself as a sacrifice. The word was in frequent use in the special sense of an offering or sacrifice set apart to God. As a New Testament example of this, comp. Rom. xv. 16. By this consecration of Himself—which in a wider sense is for all men, but in the special sense is "for their sakes." He will, as both Priest and Sacrifice, enter into the Holy of Holies of the heavenly temple, and will send the Holy Ghost, who will consecrate them.

That they also might be sanctified through the truth.—Better, as in the margin, . . . might be
He prays for all Believers,

ST. JOHN, XVII. that they may be made perfect in one.

through the truth. 1 (20) Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word; (21) that they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me. (22) And the glory which thou gavest me I have given them; that they may be one, even as we are one: (23) I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one; and that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, as thou hast loved me. (24) Father, I would that where I am they also may be with me; that they may behold my glory, which thou hast given me: for thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world. (25) Glorify me therefore with thyself, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was. (26) I have manifested thy name unto the men which thou gavest me out of the world: thine they were, and thou gavest them me; and they have kept thy word. (27) Now they have seen thy name manifested in me, and I have manifested thy word in the world: (28) and I am come and have manifested unto them thy name; and will manifest it: that the love wherewith thou hast loved me may be in them, and I in them. (29) I pray for them: I pray not for the world, but for them which thou hast given me; for they are thine. (30) And all mine are thine, and thine are mine; and I am glorified in them. (31) And now I am no more in the world, but these are in the world; and I come to thee. Holy Father, keep through thine own name them which thou hast given me, that they may be one, as we are. (32) While I was with them in the world, I kept them in thy name: those that thou gavest me I have kept, and none of them is lost, but the Son of man which is lifted up, will draw all men unto himself. (33) And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent. (34) I have given them thy word; and the world hath hated them, because they are not of the world, even as I am not of the world. (35) My prayer is not that thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that thou shouldest keep them from the evil. (36) They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world. (37) Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth. (38) As thou hast sent me into the world, even so I do in the world. Give them the glory which thou hast given me; for they were received of thee. (39) And I have kept them in thy name which thou gavest me; and I have kept them, and I will keep them, and the world shall know that thou hast given me them, and hast loved them as thou hast loved me. (40) Father, I will that they also whom thou hast given me be with me where I am; that they may behold my glory, which thou hast given me out of the world. (41) Father of mercies, and God of all comfort, whoart in all our tribulations for the comfort of thy children, we beseech thee to vouchsafe to grant unto thy loving Church, that it may be so established in the unity of the Holy Spirit, as that neither vulgar ambition, nor the mischiefs of the world, may ever divide among the members of the Mystical Body of Christ. Amen.
He prays that they may be with Him, ST. JOHN, XVIII. for they have known the Father.

loved me. (24) Father, I will that they also, whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am; that they may behold my glory, which thou hast given me: for thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world. (25) O righteous Father, the world hath not known thee: but I have known thee, and these have known that thou hast sent me. (26) And I have declared unto them thy name, and will declare it: that the love wherewith thou hast loved me may be in them, and I in them.

CHAPTER XVIII.—(1) When Jesus had spoken these words, he went forth

God, and in their knowledge of Him had passed through a moral change, by which they were no longer of the world, but were sons of God (chap. 1. 12).

And I have declared unto them thy name, and will declare it. The Greek word here rendered "declared" is of the same root as the verb rendered "known" in the previous verse. It is better to preserve this connection by rendering the clause, And I made known Thy name unto them, and will make it known. His whole teaching had been a making known of the name, character, will of God, to them. In part this had been received, but in part only. The first steps in the spiritual lessons had been taken, but in His Presence in the Paraclete He will guide them into all truth, and make known to hearts quickened to receive it, the love of God which paseth knowledge.

That the love wherewith thou hast loved (better, didst love) me may be in them, and I in them.—Comp. Note on chap. x. 9. The thought of Christ's prayer in this verse is expanded in St. Paul's prayer in Eph. iii. 17-19. It is more than that God may love the disciples, even as He loved the Son; it is that they may so know the nature of God that this love may be in them, dwelling in them as the principle of their life. And then the thought passes on to that fulness which has been present all through this last discourse and prayer, "and I in them." (Comp. verse 23.) Going from them, to be yet with them; not to be with them only as a Person without, but as a power within. "I in them" are the last words of the Intercessory Prayer. The words remain in all their comfort for them in whom "Christ is formed;" in all their encouragement for doubting hearts seeking to know God; in all their warning for hearts that do not seek His presence. They are the prayer of Him who knoweth that the Father always heareth Him.

XVIII.

[5. The Climax of Unbelief. Voluntary Surrender and Crucifixion of Jesus (chaps. xviii. 1—xix. 42).]

(1) THE BETRAYAL AND APPREHENSION (verses 1—11).

(2) THE TRIALS BEFORE THE JEWISH AUTHORITIES (verses 12—27);
   (a) Before Annas (verses 12—23);
   (b) Before Caiaphas (verse 24).
   (c) Denied by St. Peter (verses 17, 25, 27).

(3) THE TRIALS BEFORE THE ROMAN PROCONSUL (chaps. xviii. 28—xix. 18);
   (a) The first examination. The Kingdom of truth (verses 35—40);
   (b) The second examination. The scourging and mock royalty (chap. xix. 1—6);
   (c) The third examination. The power from above (verses 7—11);
   (d) The public trial and committal (verses 12—16).
He goes to a Garden over the Cedron. St. John, xviii. Judas and a Band follow Him.

with his disciples over the brook Cedron, where was a garden, into the which he entered, and his disciples. (2) And Judas also, which betrayed him, knew the place: for Jesus ofttimes resorted thither with his disciples. (3) Judas then, having received a band of men and officers from the chief priests and Pharisees. — Better, the band, and officers from the chief priests and Pharisees. The other Gospels tell us of a "great multitude" (Matt.), or a "multitude" (Mark and Luke). St. John uses the technical word for the Roman cohort. It was the garrison band from Fort Antonia, at the north-east corner of the Temple. This well-known "band" is mentioned again in the New Testament (verse 12; Matt. xxvii. 27; Mark xv. 16; Acts xxi. 31). (Comp. Notes at these places.) The word occurs also in Acts x. 1 ("the Italian band") and xxvii. 1 ("Augustus' band"). The Authorized version misleadingly uses, by closely connecting in one clause two distinct things, "a band of men and officers." The band was Roman; the "officers" were the Temple servants, of whom we read in chap. vii. 32 and 45. These were sent, here, as there, by the chief priests and Pharisees, with Judas for their guide, and their authority was supported by the civil power.

Lanterns and torches and weapons. — Better, with torches and lamps (Matt. xxv. 1) and arms. The torches and lamps were part of the regular military equipment for night service. Dionysius describes soldiers rushing out of their tents with torches and lamps in the same words which are used here (chap. xi. 40). They are not mentioned in the other Gospels. St. Matthew and St. Mark describe the "weapons" as "swords and staves."

(4) Jesus therefore, knowing all things that should come upon him, went forth, and said unto them, Whom seek ye? (5) They answered him, Jesus of Nazareth. Jesus saith unto them, I am he. And Judas also, which betrayed him, stood with
They fall back before His Presence. ST. JOHN, XVIII. He is led away to Annas.

(6) As soon then as he had said unto them, I am \(\text{he}^\text{1}\), they went backward, and fell to the ground. (7) Then asked he them again, Whom seek ye? And they said, Jesus of Nazareth. (8) Jesus answered, I have told you that I am \(\text{he}^\text{1}\): if therefore ye seek me, let them go their way; (9) that the saying might be fulfilled, which he spake, Of them which thou gavest me have I lost none." (10) Then Simon Peter having a sword drew it, and smote the high priest’s servant, and cut off his right ear. The servant’s name was Malchus. (11) Then said Jesus unto Peter, Put up thy sword into the sheath: the cup which my Father hath given me, shall I not drink it? (12) Then the band and the captain and officers of the Jews took Jesus, and bound him, (33) and led him away to Annas first; for he was father in law to

hearing the words “I am \(\text{he}^\text{1}\), they fell to the ground, as though fear passed from him to those with him. (6) They went backward, and fell to the ground.—There is nothing in the narrative to suggest that our Lord put forth miraculous power to cause this terror. The impression is rather that it was produced (10) by the majesty of His person, and by the answer which it might be fulfilled, which he spake, Of him, which thou gavest me have I lost none. (8) Note on Matt. xxvi. 51. The fact is recorded by all the Evangelists. St. John only tells us that it was done by Peter, and that the servant’s name was Malchus. He is also careful to note, as St. Luke does too, that it was the “right ear.” (11) Put up thy sword into the sheath.—Comp. Note on Matt. xxvi. 32. Here again St. John’s narrative is more vivid and exact. St. Matthew has “place” for “sheath.”

The cup which my Father hath given me, shall I not drink it?—Comp. Notes on Matt. xx; xxvi. 39. This is the only instance of the occurrence of this familiar imagery in St. John. St. Peter’s act is one of opposition to what Jesus Himself knew to be the will of the Father. There is in the words a tender trustfulness which robs the cup of all its bitterness—“The cup which My Father hath given Me. They are, as it were, an echo of the prayer in the Garden of Gethsemane, which is not recorded by St. John. It is the Father to whom He has prayed, and solemnly committed the disciples (chap. xvi.); the Father whose presence never leaves Him (chap. xvi. 32); the Father into whose hands He is about from the cross to commend His Spirit (Luke xiii. 46). (12) Then the band and the captain and officers of the Jews.—A stop should be placed after “capitain.” The “band and the captain” were the Roman cohort (comp. Note on verse 3) and their tribune (Chiliarch; comp. Mark vi. 21). The “officers of the Jews” were, as before, the Temple servants (see above, verse 3), and the apparitors of the Sanhedrin.

Took Jesus, and bound him.—Comp. Notes on Matt. xxvi. 50, and xxvi. 2. (13, 14) And led him away to Annas first.—Comp, for account of Annas Note on Luke iii. 2, and Acts iv. 6. This trial before Annas was probably a preliminary investigation, distinct from the formal trial before Caiaphas, narrated in the earlier Gospels. (Comp. verses 19 and 24.)

For he was father in law to Caiaphas.—The personal relationship between Annas and Caiaphas had led to a closeness of connection in official duties, which makes it difficult, with our partial knowledge of the circumstances, to trace the position taken by each in the trial of our Lord. This remark of St. John’s suggests that Annas may have occupied part of the high priest’s palace. He had been high priest. He is called high priest in the following year (Acts iv. 6). His age would have given him authority in the Sanhedrin,
Caiaphas, which was the high priest that same year. 1 (14) Now Caiaphas was he, which gave counsel to the Jews, that it was expedient that one man should die for the people. 2 (15) And Simon Peter followed Jesus, and so did another disciple: that disciple was known unto the high priest, and went in with Jesus into the palace of the high priest. (16) But Peter stood at the door without. Then went out that other disciple, which was known unto the high priest, and spake unto her that kept the door, and brought in Peter. (17) Then saith the damsel that kept the door unto Peter, Art thou also one of this man's disciples? He saith, I am not. (18) And the servants and officers stood there, who had made a fire of coals; for it was cold: and they warmed themselves: and Peter stood with them, and warmed himself. (19) The high priest then asked Jesus of his disciples, and of his doctrine.

which Caiaphas himself is not likely to have questioned, and he may have been President of the Sanhedrin or Father of the Beth Din (House of Judgment). Whether officially, or personally, or both, he was, from the Jewish point of view, a person whose counsel and influence were of the utmost importance, and to him they brought Jesus for this doctrinal investigation (verse 19). It is, however, necessary that He should be sent to the legal high priest for official trial in the presence of the Sanhedrin (verse 24), before being handed over to the civil power (verse 28). It does not follow that the high priest (Caiaphas) was not present at this investigation; it was altogether of an informal character. And Simon Peter followed Jesus. Better, And Simon Peter was following Jesus. (Comp. Matt. xxi. 58.) Another discourse. —The reading is not certain, but the majority of the better MSS. support the text of the Authorised version. Others have, “The other disciple,” which is preferable. The phrase “that disciple was known unto the high priest” has been usual to understand that John himself is intended by this designation, and this opinion agrees with the general reticence of the Gospel with regard to him. (Comp. chaps. i. 40; xii. 23; xix. 26; and Introduction, p. 375.) It agrees also with the fact that Peter and John are elsewhere found in special connection with each other (Luke xxii. 3; Acts i. 13; iii. 1; iii. 3, 4, 11; iv. 13, 19; vii. 18). We are warranted, therefore, in saying that this opinion is probable, but not in assuming that it is necessarily true, as is often done. It may be, for instance, that by this term the Evangelist indicates his brother James, who is never mentioned in this Gospel. The fact that he is himself called “the disciple whom Jesus loved” (chap. xiii. 23, and xix. 26; comp. Introduction, p. 375), is against rather than for the opinion that he is here called “another disciple.” If we adopt the reading, “the other disciple,” the opinion has more support.

Was known unto the high priest. —How he was known we have no means of judging. We may, however, note that the name “John” occurs among the names of the kindred of the high priest in Acts iv. 6.

Into the palace of the high priest. —Better, perhaps, into the court of the high priest. (Comp. Matt. xxi. 39, 58.) St. John uses the word elsewhere only of the sheepfold (chap. x. 1, 16). It has been established beyond doubt that the title “high priest” may have been and often was given to those who had held the sacred office. We cannot, therefore, say positively that it is not here given to Annas. It is, however, in the highest degree improbable that it is given in this chapter, after the words of verse 13, to Annas and Caiaphas without distinction. The writer has in that verse clearly marked out Caiaphas as the high priest that year, and consistency requires that we should uniformly understand him to be designated by the title. The apparent difficulty here is met by the remark in verse 13, that Annas was father-in-law to Caiaphas. (See Note there.)

But Peter stood at the door without. —i.e., at the door of the court. He remained here with the crowd. Jesus as a prisoner, and the other disciple as a friend of the high priest, went into the court.

Unto her that kept the door. —Comp. Acts xi. 18 and 2 Sam. iv. 6 (LXX.). That woman “kept the door” among the Jews we know from Josephus (Ant. vii. 2. § 1).


Art not thou also one of this man’s disciples? —i.e., “Thou as well as thy friend, whom I know.” There is no charge brought against him. The words are apparently simply words of recognition, or as furnishing a reason for admitting him with his friend, but Peter is conscious that he had attempted to kill, and had succeeded in wounding, one of the high priest’s servants. He therefore dreads this recognition.

And the servants and officers stood there. —i.e., in the quadrangular court. The “servants” are the household servants or slaves of the high priest. The officers are the Temple servants. (Comp. Note on verse 3.)

A fire of coals. —In the Greek this phrase is expressed by one word which occurs again in the New Testament in chap. xxi. 9; and in the LXX. in Ecclus. xi. 30, 32; and 4 Mace. ix. 20. It means a glowing fire. One of the Greek translators (Aquila) uses it in Ps. cxix. 4 (English version cxx. 4: “coals of juniper” —that is, of the broom plant). Peter stood with them, and warmed himself. —It is implied that the other disciple had been admitted into the house. As the houses were usually constructed, the court would be visible from the interior. Peter has already been identified as a disciple. To stand aloof would have been to call further attention to himself. He joins the company, therefore, round the fire.

The high priest then asked Jesus. —Comp. Notes on verse 15. By the “high priest” is probably meant Caiaphas, though his preliminary investigation was held before Annas, and in his house, or that part of the high priest’s palace occupied by him.

Of his disciples, and of his doctrine. —This was the general subject of a series of questions. He
Jesus answered him, I spake openly to the world; I ever taught in the synagogue, and in the temple, whether the Jews always resort; and in secret have I said nothing. 21 Why askest thou me? as I have said unto thee, behold, they know what I said. 22 And when he had thus spoken, one of the officers which stood by struck Jesus with the palm of his hand, saying, Art thou the high priest? 23 Jesus answered him, If I have spoken evil, bear witness of the evil: but if well, why smitest thou me? 24 Now Annas had sent him bound unto Caiaphas the high priest. 25 And Simon Peter stood and warmed himself. They said therefore unto him, Art not thou also one of his disciples? He denied it, and said, I am not. 26 One of the servants of the high priest, being his kinsman whose ear Peter cut off, saith, Did not I see thee in the garden with him? 27 Jesus answered, I spake openly to the world; I ever taught in the synagogue, and in the temple, whether the Jews always resort; and in secret have I said nothing. 28 Why askest thou me? as I have said unto thee, behold, they know what I said. 29 For I spake not of myself; but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment, and I that come down from heaven, as he said unto me, Thou must speak, and judge: and I spake, judgment, because I am come to do the will of him which sent me. 30 They answered and said unto him, Art thou then a ruler, and wouldst thou not judge for us? It is a well-saying of our scribes, and the pharisaists, that we should eat and drink in the house of judgment; until they end, they take away from us the morsel. 31 Why dost thou not judge our cause? Every one of them taketh his neighbour's money with his right hand. 32 Jesus answered them, Have ye not read that which is written in the law, The stone which the builders refuse is become the head of the corner? This was done by others, but not by me. And therefore all the people who do hear it should keep it in their minds. 33 Now when he had said these things, one of the officers standing by lifted up his hand, saying, What we have heard from thy mouth is true. 34 Jesus answered and said unto him, Doth our law judge a man without a place before the fact? 35 I do not judge anyone, but as the law saith, I am appointed a ruler, to give life and death on earth. 36 Here is the commandment that he gave me, Execute judgment without fear or partiality. 37 Do not ye hear how I spake to you, and ye received it not? But I spake to you, and ye believed not. Therefore they that have received it have approved the word of God. 38 For I am not witting whether ye receive it or not. Receive it, and judge ye. 39 The people answered and said, We know not. 40 He saith therefore unto them, Neither will I tell you by what authority I do these things. 41 They say unto him, What then? for we would know of thee, of what authority dost thou execute these things? 42 He saith unto them, Is it not written unto you, That in the temple, and in the house of our fathers are written, Ye are gods? 43 If he were a deceiver, he would have made himself one of the high priests; but the scripture saith that the Lord said unto him, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee. 44 Now this is said, not to Rabbinism, but to the High Priest. 45 The Lord who is in the temple, and his scriptures are written, Ye are gods. 46 They answered him, Only the scripture saith, One of the officers standing by lifted up his hand, saying, What we have heard from thy mouth is true. 47 And they spake even as the commandment of the chief priests and the Pharisees required them, for they were afraid of the people. 48 And in that hour was Jesus troubled in spirit, and saith, Now is the counsel of God fulfilled in effect. 49 And he began to beseech his disciples, saying, The days come, that after I am taken up unto the heavens, I will send the promise of my Father unto you. 50 When they had heard this, they proceeded to be waiting in Jerusalem, that the promise of the Father might be fulfilled.
thee in the garden with him? (27) Peter then denied again: and immediately the cock crew.

(28) Then led they Jesus from Caiaphas unto the hall of judgment: and it was early; and they themselves went not into the judgment hall, lest they should be defiled; but that they might eat the passover. (29) Pilate then went out unto them, and said, What accusation bring ye against this man? (30) They answered and said unto him, If he were not a malefactor, we would not have delivered him up unto thee. (31) Then said Pilate unto them, Take ye him, and judge him according to your law. The Jews therefore said unto him, It is not lawful for us to put any man to death: (32) that the saying of Jesus might be fulfilled, which he spake, signifying what death he should die. (33) Then Pilate entered into the judgment hall again, and called Jesus, and said unto him, Art thou the King of the Jews? (34) He answered, saying, Thou sayest that I am a king. To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice. (35) The Jews therefore say unto him, Art thou a king then? Jesus answered them, Say ye this thing of me, or do ye after the counsel of the chief priests? (36) This shall be my answer unto you, etc. The Jews therefore said among themselves, What need we any further witness? (37) For we have heard him say, that this is a man who teacheth men from heaven: no man can teach like him, if he be not from heaven. (38) Art thou a king then? Jesus answered them, Say ye this thing of me, or do ye after the counsel of the chief priests? (39) This shall be my answer unto you, etc. The Jews therefore said among themselves, What need we any further witness? (40) For we have heard him say, that this is a man who teacheth men from heaven: no man can teach like him, if he be not from heaven.

Pilate therefore was scandalized at them, and said unto them, Art thou a king then? Jesus answered him, Say ye this thing of me, or do ye after the counsel of the chief priests? This shall be my answer unto you, etc. The Jews therefore said among themselves, What need we any further witness? For we have heard him say, that this is a man who teacheth men from heaven: no man can teach like him, if he be not from heaven.

Excursus F: The Day of the Crucifixion of our Lord.

Pilate therefore was scandalized at them, and said unto them, Art thou a king then? Jesus answered him, Say ye this thing of me, or do ye after the counsel of the chief priests? This shall be my answer unto you, etc. The Jews therefore said among themselves, What need we any further witness? For we have heard him say, that this is a man who teacheth men from heaven: no man can teach like him, if he be not from heaven.
the Jews? (34) Jesus answered him, Sayest thou this thing of thyself, or did others tell it thee of me? (35) Pilate answered, Am I a Jew? Thine own nation and the chief priests have delivered thee unto me: what hast thou done? (36) Jesus answered, My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my kingdom not from hence. (37) Art thou a king then? The sentence is both a question and an inference from the word "kingdom" of the previous verse. There is a strong emphasis, and it may be sarcasm, expressed in the pronoun, "Does it not follow then that Thou art a king?"

Thou sayest that I am a king.—Or, perhaps, Thou sayest; for I am a king. (Comp. Matt. xxvi. 25.)

To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world.—Better, Into this end have I been born, and unto this end am I come unto the world. Our translators have rendered the second part of these words by different English words—"To this end," "for this cause," intending probably that the first phrase should be understood of the words which precede, and the second of those which follow: "To this end (that I may be a king) was I born, and for this (that I may bear witness unto the truth) came I into the world." Had this been the meaning, it would have been almost certainly expressed by the usual distinction in Greek; and in the absence of any such distinction, the natural interpretation is, "To be king have I been born, and to be a king came I into the world, in order that I may bear witness unto the truth." The birth and the entrance into the world both refer to the Incarnation, but make emphatic the thought that the birth in time of Him who existed with the Father before all time, was the manifestation in the world of Him who came forth from the Father. This thought of "coming into the world" is frequent in St. John. (Comp. especially chaps. x. 36 and xvi. 28.)

That I should bear witness unto the truth.—Comp. Note on chap. i. 8. He has indeed a kingdom, and He came into the world to be a king; but His rule is that of the majesty of Truth, and His kingdom is to be established by His witness of the eternal truth which He had known with His Father, and which He alone could declare to man. (Comp. Notes on chaps. i. 18 and xvi. 13.) He came to be a witness—a martyr—to the truth, and to send forth others to be witnesses and martyrs to the same truth, through the Holy Spirit, who should guide them into all truth. Such was His kingdom; such the power by which it was to rule. It was not of this world: it possessed neither land nor treasury, neither senate nor legions, neither consuls nor procurators; but it was to extend its sceptre over all the kingdoms of the earth. (Comp. Notes on chap. xvi. 13.)

Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice.—He has spoken of His kingdom. Who are its subjects, and what its power over them? Every one is included who, following the light which God has placed in his soul, comes to "the true Light which lighteth every man"; who, made in the image of God, and with capacities for knowing God, seeks truly to know Him; every one who, in an honest and true heart, is of the truth, and therefore hears the voice of Him who is the Truth. The thought is familiar to us from the earlier chapters of the Gospel. (Comp. e.g., iii. 21; vii. 17; viii. 47; x. 18.)
is of the truth heareth my voice. (38) Pilate saith unto him, What is truth? And when he had said this, he went out again unto the Jews, and saith unto them, I find in him no fault at all. (39) But ye have a custom, that I should release unto you one at the passover: will ye therefore that I release unto you the King of the Jews? (40) Then cried they all again, saying, Not this man, but Barabbas. Now Barabbas was a robber.

CHAPTER XIX.—(1) Then Pilate therefore took Jesus, and scourged him. (2) And the soldiers platted a crown of thorns, and put it on his head, and they put on him a purple robe, (3) and said, Hail, King of the Jews! and they smote him with their hands. (4) Pilate therefore went forth again, and saith unto them, Behold, I bring him forth to you, that ye may know that I find no fault in him. (5) Then came Jesus forth, wearing the crown of thorns, and the purple robe. And Pilate saith unto them, Behold the man! (6) When the chief priests therefore and officers saw him, they cried out, saying, Crucify...
Re-examination before Pilate.

ST. JOHN, XIX.

who seeks to release Him.

him, crucify him. Pilate saith unto them, Take ye him, and crucify him: for I find no fault in him. (7) The Jews answered him, We have a law, and by our law he ought to die, because he made himself the Son of God.

(8) When Pilate therefore heard that saying, he was the more afraid; (9) and went again into the judgment hall, and saith unto Jesus, Whence art thou? But Jesus gave him no answer. (10) Then

passionate hatred, and they frustrate any other cry which may arise by that of "Crucify Him!" (Comp. Matt. xxvii. 22.)

Take ye him, and crucify him: for I find no fault in him.—Comp. Notes on chap. xviii. 31 and 38. "Crucify Him," the words mean, "if you dare to do so; there is no charge on which I can condemn Him; and I will be no party to your act."

(7) We have a law, and by our law he ought to die.—The better reading is, . . . and by the law He ought to die. (Comp. Lev. xxiv. 16.)

This latter surmise of Pilate's tamely, and appeal to their own law, which, in accordance with the general Roman policy, was in force in all questions which did not directly affect the Government. They change the accusation then from one of treason against Caesar (verse 33), of which Pilate claimed to be judge, to one of blasphemy against God, of which they only could be judges; and assert that Jesus is by that law guilty of a capital offence, for which He ought to die. (Comp. Matt. xxvi. 62—66, and Luke xxiii. 71.)

(8) When Pilate therefore heard that saying, he was the more afraid.—That is, as the verses which follow show, he was the more afraid because of his wonder of course, the power which was given to him by God. He indeed had sin, for he acted against His will; but not the greater sin, for he did not act against the full light of truth.

And went again into the judgment hall, and saith unto Jesus.—He had brought Jesus out to the people. He now led Him back to the palace in order to inquire further of Him in private.

Whence art thou?—The question is based upon the claim to be Son of God, of which he had heard. He knew that Jesus was a Galilean before sending Him to Herod (Luke xxiii. 6). It is not of His earthly habitation, therefore, that he inquires, but of His origin and nature. (Comp. the same word, and in the same sense, in chap. viii. 14, and Matt. xxi. 25.)

But Jesus gave him no answer.—This silence of our Lord was the more surprising, because he had treated it with the impertinence which showed he could not receive it now. Not of the truth, he could not hear the voice of the Son of God, and therefore that voice did not speak.

Thou couldst have no power at all against me, except it were given thee from above: therefore he that delivered me unto thee hath the greater sin. (12) And from thenceforth Pilate sought to release him: but the Jews cried out, saying, If thou let this man

saith Pilate unto him, Speakest thou not unto me? knowest thou not that I have power to crucify thee, and have power to release thee? (11) Jesus answered, Thou couldst have no power at all against me, except it were given thee from above: therefore he that delivered me unto thee hath the greater sin. (12) And from thenceforth Pilate sought to release him: but the Jews cried out, saying, If thou let this man
The Terror of Caesar's Name.

Go, thou art not Caesar's friend: who­soever maketh himself a king speaketh against Caesar.

(13) When Pilate therefore heard that saying, he brought Jesus forth, and sat down in the judgment seat in a place that is called the Pavement, but in the Hebrew, Gabbatha. (14) And it was the preparation of the passover, and about the sixth hour: and he saith unto the Jews, Behold your King! (15) But they cried out, Away with him, away with governor was proof. The jealous fear of Tiberius had made "treason" a crime, of which the accusation was practically the proof, and the proof was death. The pages of Tacitus and Suetonius abound with examples of ruin wreaked on families in the name of the "law of treason." (Comp. Merivale: History of the Romans under the Empire, vol. v., p. 143 et seq.) Here was One who had claimed to be a king, and Pilate was seeking to release Him. They knew, indeed, that it was a claim to be "king" in a sense widely different from any which would have affected the empire of Caesar; but Pilate has refused to condemn Him on the political charge without formal trial, and he has refused to accept their own condemnation of Jesus on the charge of blasphemy. He dare not refuse the force of an appeal which says that he is not Caesar's friend, and suggests an accusation against himself at Rome. See Note on Matt. xxvii. 52, and passover.—Comp. Note on Matt. xxvii. 27.) Josephus mentions that the whole sanctuary to which Pilate came out, if we identify the impression that it was made "stone-paved," and was the Greek name for the tesselated "pavement" of marble and coloured stones with which the time of the Crucifixion, and they thus agree generally with St. John's account. (2) That St. John distinguishes between the condemnation to be scourged (verse 1) and that to be crucified. In St. Matthew and St. Mark the flagellation is regarded as the preliminary and part of the punishment. If it was the third hour at which this commenced.—i.e., if the incident of verse 1 of this chapter is to be assigned to nine o'clock—then the Crucifixion itself would naturally come about twelve o'clock. (3) That St. John is not careful to give the time more than roughly "about the sixth hour." The hours of that day may well be confused, for their sorrow would have made minutes seem as hours, and the sun, which on other days marked the hours, was on that day itself darkened. St. Matthew is equally uncertain at what exact time there was the cry with a loud voice (xxvii. 46), and St. Luke does not give the exact time when the darkness commenced (xxvii. 44). (4) That the third, sixth, and ninth hours (comp. Matt. xx. 3, 5) seem to have been, in common life, rough divisions of the day, corresponding to the watches of the night. An event occurring at ten o'clock might have been spoken of roughly as about the third hour, while it might, on the other hand, be thought of as within the division called the sixth hour. (5) That St. John's narrative is that of an eye­witness, relating what he himself saw and remembered. (Comp. Chronological Harmony of the Gospels, p. xxv.) (14) Behold your King!—The words are spoken in bitter irony towards the Jews, as those in the following verse and those written over the cross (verse 19). (Comp. Note on Matt. xxvii. 37.) (15) But they cried out . . .—Better, they cried out therefore . . . They feel the sting of Pilate's irony, therefore cry the more passionately, "Away with Him, away with Him, crucify Him."
him, crucify him. Pilate saith unto them, Shall I crucify your King? The chief priests answered, We have no king but Caesar.

(10) Then delivered he him therefore unto them to be crucified. And they took Jesus, and led him away. (12) And he bearing his cross went forth into a place called the place of a skull, which is called in the Hebrew Golgotha: (19) where they crucified him, and two other with him, on either side one, and Jesus in the midst.

(19) And Pilate wrote a title, and put it on the cross. And the writing was,

JESUS OF NAZARETH THE KING OF THE JEWS. (20) This title then read many of the Jews: for the place where Jesus was crucified was nigh to the city: and it was written in Hebrew, and Greek, and Latin. (21) Then said the chief priests of the Jews to Pilate, Write not, The King of the Jews; but that he said, I am King of the Jews.

(22) Pilate answered, What I have written I have written.

(23) Then the soldiers, when they had crucified Jesus, took his garments, and made four parts, to every soldier a part; and also his coat: now the coat was Many of the Jews.—That is, of the hierarchical party, as generally in this Gospel. (Comp. Note on ch. i. 19.) It has been sometimes understood here of the people generally, because the inscription was written in the three languages; but the last clause of the verse furnishes the reason for the action of the chief priests in the next verse. It would be better to punctuate the verses thus: “This title therefore read many of the Jews, because the place where Jesus was crucified was nigh to the city. And it was written in Hebrew, and Greek, and Latin. Therefore did the chief priests...”

Nigh to the city.—Comp. Note on Matt. xxvii. 33.

Hebrew, and Greek, and Latin.—“Hebrew,” i.e., the current Syro-Chaldaic, was the language of the people generally. The precise form which occurs here is used in the New Testament only by St. John (chaps. v. 2; xix. 13, 17, 20; xx. 16; Rev. x. 11; xvi. 16). “Greek” was the most widely-known language of the time. “Latin” was the official language of the Roman Empire.

(23) Then said the chief priests of the Jews to Pilate.—Better, They said unto him...; i.e., because the inscription could be read by all comers, and the Messianic title, “King of the Jews,” would be exposed to scorn. Yet these are the men who said, in order to accomplish the death of Jesus, “We have no king but Caesar.”

The expression, “chief priests of the Jews,” occurs only here in the New Testament, perhaps in contrast to the title, “King of the Jews,” to indicate that their anxiety about the title came from them as representatives of the national honour.

What I have written I have written.—The words are a formula to signify that the thing was done and could not be undone. There are frequent instances of similar expressions in the Rabbinical writings.

(24) On verses 23, 24, comp. Notes on Matt. xxvii. 35, 36; Mark xvi. 24; Luke xxiii. 34. St. John’s account is again more full than any of the others.

And made four parts, to every soldier a part.—The soldiers there who carried the sentence into execution were one of the usual quaternions (Acts xii. 4), under the command of a centurion.

Also his coat: now the coat was without seam.—More exactly, the tunic, or under-garment. It reached from the neck to the feet, while the outer “garment” was a square rug thrown round the body. Ordinarily the tunic consisted of two pieces connected at the shoulder by clasps; but that worn by Jesus was made in one piece. This seems to have been the rule.
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without seam, woven\(^1\) from the top throughout. \(^{(24)}\) They said therefore among themselves, Let us not rend it, but cast lots for it, whose it shall be: that the scripture might be fulfilled, which saith, They parted my raiment among them, and for my vesture they did cast lots.\(^4\) These things therefore the soldiers did.

\(^{(23)}\) Now there stood by the cross of Jesus his mother, and his mother's sister, Mary the wife of Clopas,\(^2\) and Mary Magdalene. \(^{(25)}\) When Jesus therefore saw his mother, and the disciple standing by, whom he loved, he saith unto his mother, Woman, behold thy son! \(^{(27)}\) Then saith he to the disciple, Behold thy mother! And from that hour that disciple took her unto his own home.

\(^{(28)}\) After this, Jesus knowing that all things were now accomplished, that the scripture might be fulfilled, saith, I thirst,\(^5\) \(^{(29)}\) Now there was set a vessel full of vinegar: and they filled a spunge with vinegar, and put it upon hyssop,
and put it to his mouth. (30) When Jesus therefore had received the vinegar, he said, It is finished: and he bowed his head, and gave up the ghost.

(31) The Jews therefore, because it was the preparation, that the bodies should not remain upon the cross on the sabbath day, (for that sabbath day was an high day,) besought Pilate that their legs might be broken, and that they might be taken away. (32) Then came the soldiers, and brake the legs of the first, and of the other which was crucified with him. (33) But when they came to Jesus, and saw that he was dead already, they brake not his legs: (34) but one of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side, and forthwith came there out blood and water. (35) And he that saw it bare record, and his record is true:

and put it to his mouth. (30) When Jesus therefore had received the vinegar, he said, It is finished: and he bowed his head, and gave up the ghost.

(31) The Jews therefore, because it was the preparation, that the bodies should not remain upon the cross on the sabbath day, (for that sabbath day was an high day,) besought Pilate that their legs might be broken, and that they might be taken away. (32) Then came the soldiers, and brake the legs of the first, and of the other which was crucified with him. (33) But when they came to Jesus, and saw that he was dead already, they brake not his legs: (34) but one of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side, and forthwith came there out blood and water. (35) And he that saw it bare record, and his record is true:

and put it to his mouth. (30) When Jesus therefore had received the vinegar, he said, It is finished: and he bowed his head, and gave up the ghost.

(31) The Jews therefore, because it was the preparation, that the bodies should not remain upon the cross on the sabbath day, (for that sabbath day was an high day,) besought Pilate that their legs might be broken, and that they might be taken away. (32) Then came the soldiers, and brake the legs of the first, and of the other which was crucified with him. (33) But when they came to Jesus, and saw that he was dead already, they brake not his legs: (34) but one of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side, and forthwith came there out blood and water. (35) And he that saw it bare record, and his record is true:
and he knoweth that he saith true, that ye might believe. (38) For these things were done, that the scripture should be fulfilled, A bone of him shall not be broken. (37) And again another scripture saith, They shall look on him whom they pierced. (38) And after this Joseph of Arimathea, being a disciple of Jesus, but secretly for fear of the Jews, besought Pilate that he might take away the body of Jesus: and Pilate gave him leave. He came therefore, and took the body of Jesus. (39) And there came also Nicodemus, which at the first came to Jesus by night, and brought a mixture of myrrh and aloes, about an hundred pound weight. (40) Then took they the body of Jesus, and wound it in linen clothes with the spices, as the manner of the Jews is to bury. (41) Now in the place where he was crucified there was

"he that saw it"—who testified to the fact, and one who therefore knew it to be true. The word rendered "true" in this clause is the emphatic word for "ideally true," which is familiar to the readers of this Gospel. (Comp. Note on chap. i. 9.) It answers to the idea of what evidence should be, because it is the evidence of one who himself saw what he witnesses.

And he knoweth that he saith true, that ye might believe.—The witness was ideally true, and therefore the things witnessed were actually true. He cannot doubt this, and he testifies it in order that others may find in these truths ground for, and the confirmation of, their faith.

(36) For these things were done (better, came to pass), that the scripture should be fulfilled.—The emphatic witness of the previous verse is not therefore to be confined to the one fact of the flowing by side with Nicodemus, and ascribes the same trait of character to both.

(38) Nicodemus, which at the first came to Jesus by night.—He is mentioned only by St. John. (Comp. Notes on chap. iii. 1, 2 and viii. 39.)

A mixture of myrrh and aloes.—For "myrrh," comp. Note on Matt. ii. 11. "Aloes" are not elsewhere mentioned in the New Testament, but they are joined with myrrh in the Messianic Psalm xlv. 8. The aloes is an Eastern odoriferous wood—to be distinguished from the aloes of commerce—and chips of the better kinds are now said to be worth their weight in gold. The myrrh and aloes were probably pulverised and mixed together, and then placed in the linen in which the body was wrapped.

About an hundred pound weight.—Comp. Notes on chap. xii. 3 et seq. The quantity is clearly much more than could have been placed in the linen which surrounded the body; but the offering was one of love, and part of it may have been placed in the sepulchre. We read of the burial of Asa, that they "laid him in the bed which was filled with sweet odours and divers kinds of spices prepared by the apothecaries' art" (2 Chron. xvi. 14). (40) And wound it in linen clothes with the spices.—Comp. Notes on Luke xxiv. 12. The same word does not occur, but the manner of the Jews to bury has been also illustrated in the Note on chap. xi. 44.

(41) Now in the place where he was crucified there was a garden.—Comp. chap. xviii. 1. St. John's account makes the choice of the sepulchre depend on its nearness to the place of crucifixion; the account in the earlier Gospels makes it depend on the fact that the sepulchre belonged to Joseph. The one account implies the other; and the burial, under the circumstances, required both that the sepulchre should be at hand, and that its owner should be willing that the body should be placed in it.
a garden; and in the garden a new sepulchre, wherein was never man yet laid. (42) There laid they Jesus therefore because of the Jews' preparation day; for the sepulchre was nigh at hand.

CHAPTER XX.—(1) The first day of the week cometh Mary Magdalene early, when it was yet dark, unto the sepulchre, and seeth the stone taken away from the sepulchre. (2) Then she runneth, and cometh to Simon Peter, and to the other disciple, whom Jesus loved, and saith unto them, They have taken away the Lord out of the sepulchre, and we know not where they have laid him. (5) Peter therefore went forth, and that other disciple, and came to the sepulchre. (4) So they ran both together: and the other disciple did outrun Peter, and came first to the sepulchre. (5) And he stooping down, and looking in, saw the linen clothes lying; yet went he not in.—He is restrained by wonder, not unaccompanied, perhaps, by fear, at what he sees, and waits for his friend and companion.

A new sepulchre, wherein was never man yet laid.—An emphatic combination of the two statements made in Matt. xxvii. 60 and Luke xxi. 23.

(2) The Jews' preparation day.—Comp. verses 14, 31, and Excursus F: The Day of the Crucifixion of our Lord, p. 559.

XX.


(1) St. Peter and St. John at the Empty Sepulchre. They see and believe (verses 1–10).


(3) The First Appearance to the Ten. Peace to them and to the World (verses 19–23).


(5) Close of the Original Gospel at this Highest Reach of Faith. Its Object: Life through Believing (verses 30, 31].

(6) For the visit of the women to the sepulchre, and their announcement to the disciples (verses 1, 2), comp. generally Notes on Matt. xxvii. 1–4, 8; Mark xvi. 1–4, 8; Luke xxiv. 1–3, 9–11. Each of the three narratives separates the return from the visit by an account of the appearance of the angels at the sepulchre.

The first day of the week.—The same phrase occurs in Luke xiv. 1.

Cometh Mary Magdalene.—St. Matthew has, “Mary Magdalene and the other Mary;” St. Mark has, “Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James, and Salome;” St. Luke has, “The women which had come with Him from Galilee” (xxii. 55), and enumerates them in xxiv. 10, as “Mary Magdalene, and Joanna, and Mary the mother of James, and the others with them.” St. John speaks of only one of the group, who was specially prominent.

And seeth the stone taken away from the sepulchre.—This fact is made emphatic in all the accounts. See especially Luke xiv. 2.

(2) To Simon Peter, and to the other disciple.—St. Matthew has, “to His disciples,” St. Luke has, “to the Eleven, and to all the rest.” St. John relates only that announcement of which he had special personal knowledge.

For “the other disciple” comp. Introduction, p. 375. For the connection between St. John and St. Peter, comp. Introduction, p. 371.
They go to the Sepulchre, and return Home. ST. JOHN, XX.

Mary sees a Vision of Angels.

(6) And went into the sepulchre, and seeth the linen clothes lie.—Better, . . . beholdeth the linen clothes lie. The word is not the same as that in verse 5, but expresses the close observation of the linen clothes by St. Peter, while St. John did but see them from without.

(7) And the napkin, that was about his head. —Comp. Note on chap. xi. 44.

Not lying with the linen clothes, but wrapped together . . .—This was not seen from without (verse 5), but was in a separate place, perhaps on the inner side of the sepulchre. In this description and in this verse the minute knowledge and remembrance of an eye-witness reaches its climax. The very fact that the napkin was folded did not escape the writer's eye, nor fade from his memory.

Then went in also that other disciple . . .—If the vivid details of this picture impress us with the fact that we are in the presence of an eye-witness, none the less do the traits of character remind us of all that we know from other sources of the actors in the scene. The bold impetuosity of St. Peter, and the gentle reverence of St. John, are represented in him who quickly entered into the sepulchre, and in him who stood gazing into it, and afterwards went in. He went in, "therefore," as the original exactly means, because he had from Peter of what he had seen.

And he saw, and believed.—The gentle character was also the more receptive, and this appears to be intimated in this verse. Nothing is said of St. Peter's faith, but St. John seems to veil us for the inner history of his own spiritual life. The word for "see" is different from either of those used before in verses 5 and 6. (Comp. Luke x. 13.) It is not that he saw, as from a distance, nor yet that he beheld that which was immediately presented to the gaze; it is not that he saw in any merely physical sense, but that he saw with the eye of the mind, and grasped the truth which lay beneath the phenomena around him. He saw, and he who had believed before, found in this fact the stepping-stone to a higher faith. (Comp. Note on chap. ii. 11.)

(8) For as yet they knew not the scriptures.—This explains in what sense it was that St. John now believed. Up to this time they knew not the meaning of the Scripture which foretold the Resurrection; but from that moment at least they recognised in the fact of the absent body of Christ the truth that He must rise again. (Comp. Notes on chap. ii. 21, 22.)

That he must rise again from the dead.—Comp. especially Notes on Luke xiv. 28, 44.

(9) Then the disciples went away again unto their own home. —More exactly, of course, to their lodgings in Jerusalem. They had accomplished the object of their visit to the sepulchre. One, at least, had realised, and he must have told his thoughts to his friend, that the Lord was not to be looked for in the empty grave, and that Mary's fears (verse 2) were groundless. No enemies had taken the body away. They return, then, with hearts filled with this truth, to ponder over its meaning, or to tell it to others of the Eleven, or to wonder and to wait until He should come again to them, as He had promised.

(10) Then the disciples went away again unto their own home. —Comp. Matt. xxviii. 5–7; Mark xvi. 5–7; Luke xxiv. 4–8. This is to be regarded as a distinct vision to Mary, which, from the fulness with which it is recorded, we must suppose that she herself related to the Evangelist. (Comp. Introduction, p. 379.) It rests therefore, upon her testimony, and as a vision to her only may seem to be less certainly objective than the other appearances. Great caution is, however, necessary in estimating the truth of that which is wholly beyond the application of our ordinary canons of evidence. If we admit the earlier vision of angels, of which there were several witnesses, there can be no reason for rejecting this; and if the evidence was at the time sufficient to convince the Evangelist, who himself had seen no such vision, but was guided by the Spirit to accept and record this, as seen by Mary, we have a decisive judgment of higher authority than any which criticism can attain.

With the words "in white" we are, of course, to understand raiment. The ellipsis is frequent in the classic, and indeed in all writers.

The one at the head, and the other at the feet.—The idea is apparently that of sitting and watching the body. She had feared that some outrage had been wrought upon the body; but God had given His angels charge concerning Him.

(11) But Mary stood without at the sepulchre weeping: and as she wept, she stooped down, and looked into the sepulchre, (12) and seeth two angels in white sitting, the one at the head, and the other at the feet, where the body of Jesus had lain. (13) And they say unto her, Woman, why weepest thou? She saith unto them, Because...
ST. JOHN, XX.

The Appearance of Jesus.

they have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him. (14) And when she had thus said, she turned herself back, and saw Jesus standing, and knew not that it was Jesus. (15) Jesus saith unto her, Woman, why weepest thou? whom seekest thou? She, supposing him to be the gardener, saith unto him, Sir, if thou have borne him hence, tell me where thou hast laid him, and I will take him away. (16) Jesus saith unto her, Mary. She turned herself, and saith unto him, Rabboni; which is to say, Master. (17) Jesus saith unto her, Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father: but go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend

Note on the plural, “we know not,” in verse 2.) She is here alone, speaking to strangers, and may, therefore, have used the singular, whether she went in the early morning with other women or not.

(14) And saw Jesus standing, and knew not that it was Jesus. — There is no need to imagine an external cause for her turning round, and if there was one it is useless for us to ask what it was. She has expressed her woe, and turns aside again to weep, when she sees another form. Weighed down by her sorrow, not looking intently, it may be, or seeing indistinctly through tear-filled eyes, she does not recognise her Lord. We know not what the appearance was. Figure, feature, clothing, there must have been; but these differing, in this as in other manifestations, from those with which they had been familiar. She, perhaps, hardly looked at all, but supposed that the only person there at that early hour would be the keeper of the garden.

(15) Sir, if thou have borne him hence ... — The word rendered “Sir” is generally a mark of respect, but like the corresponding word in most languages, was also used to a stranger, and even to an inferior. The “gardener,” moreover, corresponded more to what we would have been a servant. But she would cling to a visible condition which had not yet been accomplished. He would have been a servant of Joseph of Arimathæa, and as such may have become known to Mary at the time of embalming. She says, with emphasis, “If thou hast borne Him hence;” turning away from the angles to address him. The word rendered “borne” here means properly “to bear,” and then “bear away,” “remove,” and then “remove secretly.” (Comp. chap. xii. 6.) Of this last meaning there are many undoubted examples in Josephus, and this seems clearly to be the thought here.

Tell me where thou hast laid him, and I will take him away. — Three times she refers to the Lord simply by the pronoun “Him.” She has named Him in the previous verse, and perhaps thinks that the gardener had heard those words; but the impression formed from her eager words is that her own mind is so entirely filled with the one subject, that she supposes it to be in the minds of others. The same passionate eagerness is heard in the words which follow. Devotion such as hers does not weigh difficulties. A place of safety for that sacred body is the object of her will; and that will neither dreads danger nor sees that the task would be physically impossible, but asserts in the confidence of its own strength, “and I will take Him away.”

(16) Jesus saith unto her, Mary. — It is to that devoted love that the first words of the risen Lord are spoken. He who knew her whole past, and knew that her devotion to Him had sprung from the freedom from the thraldom of human woe. Because He is My Father, He is also your Father, and his presence, and has not learnt the truth so hard to learn. “It is expedient for you that I go away” (chap. xvi. 7).

But go to my brethren, and say unto them. — Comp. Notes on Matt. xxviii. 10, and on chap. xv. 15. There is a special force in the word “brethren” as spoken by the risen Lord, in that it declares the continuance of His human nature. (See Heb. ii. 11.)

I ascend unto my Father, and your Father. — The present is used of the future, which He regards as immediately at hand. The message to the brethren is an assurance that the going to the Father, of which He had so often spoken to them, was about to be realised. The victory over death has been accomplished. This appearance on earth is an earnest of the return to heaven. “Unto My Father,” He now says, “and your Father.” It is a more emphatic expression than “our Father” would have been. “I ascend unto My Father. Because He is My Father, He is also your Father, and you are My brethren.”
unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God. (19) Mary Magdalene came and told the disciples that she had seen the Lord, and that he had spoken these things unto her.

(19) Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you. (20) And when he had so said, he shewed unto them his hands and his side. Then were the disciples glad, when they saw the Lord. (21) Then said Jesus to them again, Peace be unto you: as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. (22) And when he had

My God, and your God.—This phrase contains the same fulness of meaning, and adds the special thought of the continuity of the human nature of our Lord, which has already appeared in the word “brethren.” (See Note above.)

Mary Magdalene came and told the disciples.—Better, Mary Magdalene cometh, and announcesth the disciples. The coming is described from the point of view of the writer, who was one of the disciples.

(19) For this appearance to the disciples (verses 19—25) comp. Notes on Mark xvii. 14 and Luke xiv. 38—43. Between the last verse and this we must suppose to occur the bribing of the guard (Matt. xxviii. 11—15), and the conversation on the way to Emmaus (Luke xiv. 13—35; see also Mark xvi. 12, 13, and comp. Chronological Harmony of the Gospels, p. xxxiv.)

When the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled...—This fact is noted here and in verse 26, and the obvious intention is to point out that the appearance was preternatural. The body of the risen Lord was indeed the body of His human life, but it was not subject to the ordinary conditions of human life. The power that had upheld it as He walked upon the Sea of Galilee (chap. vi. 16—21) made it during those forty days independent of laws of gravitation and of material resistance. (Comp. Notes on Luke xiv. 15, 16, 31. 39.) The supposition that the doors were shut, and were miraculously opened (comp. Acts xii. 46), is opposed to the general impression of the context, and the incident is one which would probably have been mentioned.

The “fear of the Jews” naturally followed the Crucifixion. The Shepherd was struck, and the flock was scattered. They would remember, too, His own words, which foretold persecution for them (chap. xv. 18 et seq.), and there may have been definite charges against some of them. Peter, e.g., had drawn upon himself the hostility of the high priest’s household, and John was known to be among the disciples. (Comp. chap. xviii. 8. 26 et seq.)

Peace be unto you.—The salutation is given also in Luke xiv. 36. (Comp., in this Gospel, Note on chap. xiv. 27.) The well-known words of greeting would come to them now, as her own name came to Mary (verse 16), bringing, as familiar tones fell upon the ear, the assurance of the Master’s presence in their midst. But the words would also have the fuller meaning of a message from the spirit-world to them. It is a voice from the darkness beyond the grave into which the living have tried in vain to see, and that voice is one of peace. It is the message of the conqueror of death to man who has conquered in and through Him, declaring that the victory is won. It is the message of at-one-ment, declaring the peace which flows from pardoned sin and reconciliation with God to the disciples themselves, and through them, as the apostles of peace, to all mankind.
said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost: (23) Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them: and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained. (24) But Thomas, one of the twelve, called Didymus, was not with them when Jesus came. (25) The other dis-

striking word which had been used to describe the act by which God breathed into man’s nostrils the breath of life. He writes as one who remembered how the in-fluence of that moment on their future lives was a new spiritual creation, by which they were called, as it were, out of death into life. It was the first step in that great moral change which passed over the disciples after the Crucifixion, and of which the day of Pentecost witnessed the accomplishment.

And saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost.—These words are not, on the one hand, to be understood as simply a promise of the future gift of the Holy Ghost, for they are a definite imperative, referring to the moment when they were spoken; nor on the other hand, to be taken as the promised advantage of the Paraclete (chap. xiv. 16 et seq.), for the gift of the Holy Ghost was not yet, because Jesus was not yet glorified (chaps. vii. 39, xvi. 7 et seq.). The meaning is that He then gave to them a sign, which was itself to faithful hearts as the firstfruits of that which was to come. His act was sacramental, and with the outer and visible sign there was the inward and spiritual grace. The very word used was that used when He said to them, “This (receive ye), eat; this is My body” (Matt. xxvi. 26; Mark xiv. 22). It would come to them now with a fulness of sacred meaning. The Risen Body is present with them. The constant spiritual Presence in the person of the Paraclete is promised to them. They again hear the words “Receive ye,” and the very command implies the power to obey. (Comp. Excursus C: The Sacramental Teaching of St. John’s Gospel, p. 556.)

(23) Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them:—Comp. for the “power of the keys,” the Notes on Matt. xvi. 19, and xviii. 18. Assuming what has there been said, it will be sufficient to add that this power is here immediately connected with the representative character of the disciples as apostles sent by Christ, as He was Himself sent by the Father (verse 21), and that its validity is dependent upon their reception of the Holy Ghost (verse 22), by whom Christ Himself is present in them (chaps. xiv. 18, xvi. 7—11). Since He was sent, they are not sent to condemn the world, but that the world through Him might be saved; but in their work, as in His, men are condemned because the light is come into the world, and men love darkness rather than light. The ultimate principles upon which this power rests are those stated above—the being sent by Christ, and the reception of the Holy Ghost. God has promised forgiveness wherever there is repentance; He has not promised repentance when there is no belief. It results from every declaration of forgiveness made in the name of the Father through Jesus Christ, that hearts which in penitence accept it receive remission of their sins, and that the hardness of the hearts which wilfully reject it is by their rejection increased, and the very words by which their sins would be remitted become the words by which they are retained.

(Comp. especially Notes on chap. iii. 17 et seq.; xvi. 8 et seq.; and 2 Cor. ii. 15, 16.)

On individual words in this verse it is important to note that in the better text the tense of that rendered “are remitted” is a strict present, while that rendered “are retained” is in the perfect-present. The difference is not easy to preserve in English, but the thought seems to be, “Whose soever sins ye remit—a change in their condition is taking place—their sins are being remitted by God; whose soever ye retain—their condition remains unchanged—they have been, and are retained.”

(24) But Thomas, one of the twelve, called Didymus . . .—Comp. Notes on chaps. xi. 16 and xiv. 5. It is in harmony with the desponding character that looks upon the visit to Jerusalem as necessarily leading to death, that he now is as one who has given up the common hope of the band of disciples, and is not present with them. It has happened as he had thought; the death he had foretold has come to pass. Is this the end of all the Messianic hopes which he had cherished? Is the grave the “whither,” and the cross the “way,” which they knew not?

(25) Except I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print of the nails.—This demand for the evidence of his own senses, and refusal to admit the testimony of eye-witnesses, though these were the whole of his ten brethren in the Apostolic band, remind us of the demand made to Christ Himself, “We know not whither Thou goest, and how can we know the way?” The reading of the second clause varies between “place of the nails.” The word used is that which was to come. His act was sacramental, and with the end of all the Messianic hopes which he had cherished? Is the grave the “whither,” and the cross the “way,” which they knew not?

The reading of the second clause varies between “print of the nails” and “place of the nails.” The Greek words vary by only one letter (πτέρνα, “print”; πτέρνος, “place”), so that copyists may easily have taken one for the other. If we read “place,” it answers to the touch of the finger, as “print” does to the sight of the eye; but, on the other hand, there is in the repetition an expression of determination, almost, we may say, amounting to obstinacy, which corresponds with the position which Thomas is taking.

And thrust my hand into his side.—Comp. verse 20. The feet are not mentioned, but the hands and the side would be demonstrative evidence. We cannot properly infer from this verse that the feet were not nailed. I will not believe.—The determination is expressed in its strongest form by the double Greek negative, “I will by no means believe.”

(26) And after eight days again his disciples were within.—That is, on the octave of the first appearance to them; as we should now say, on the first Sunday after Easter. There was no reason for thinking that they had not met together during the interval, and that their meeting was a special observance of the Lord’s Day. At the same time this appearance on the recurrence of the first day of the week would take its place among the steps by which the disciples passed from the observance of the Jewish Sabbath to that of the Christian Sunday.
The Appearance to the Eleven.

ST. JOHN, XX. A higher Faith than that of Sight.

Then came Jesus, the doors being shut, and stood in the midst, and said, 

Peace be unto you. (27) Then saith he to Thomas, Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side: and be not faithless, but believing. (28) And Thomas answered and said unto him, My Lord and my God. (29) Jesus saith unto him, Thomas, because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed: blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed.

(30) And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book: (31) but these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God.

The place is obviously the same as that of the first appearance, and the doors are shut for the same reason. (Comp. Note on verse 20.)

The repetition of the greeting, "Peace be unto you," is partly the natural salutation as He appears to them, but now indeed full of a new meaning, which the thoughts of the week must have written upon their hearts. Partly, it may be, it is specially intended to include Thomas, who was not present when it was spoken before.

(27) Then saith he to Thomas. . . . This implies a knowledge of the words of verse 25, which in itself would carry conviction to the mind of Thomas. This repetition must have carried with this conviction a sense of shame at his unbelief.

And be not faithless, but believing. —Better, and become not unbelieving, but believing. The words do not apply to the fact of the Resurrection only, but to the general spiritual condition of the Apostle. He was in danger of passing from the state of a believer in Christ to that of an unbeliever. His demand for the evidence of the senses was a step backward, a resting on the less, not on the more, certain. His Master would have him retrace that step, and become one who rests upon the intuition of the Spirit.

(28) Thomas answered and said unto him. —It is implied that he did not make use of the tests which his Master offered him, but that he at once expressed the fulness of his conviction. This is confirmed by the words of the next verse, "Because thou hast seen Me, My Lord and my God." These words are preceded by "saith unto him," and are followed by "because thou hast seen Me, thou hast believed," and the words "my Lord" can only be referred to Christ. (Comp. verse 13.) The sentence, therefore, without violence to the context, be taken as an exclamation addressed to God, and is to be understood in the natural meaning of a confession by the Apostle that his Lord was also God.

(29) Jesus saith unto him, Thomas, because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed. —The name "Thomas" is omitted in all the better MSS., and the order of the other words suggests that they should be read interrogatively—Jesus saith unto him, Because thou hast seen Me, hast thou believed? The tense of the word rendered "hast thou believed" is the perfect-present—"hast thou become, and art thou a believer?" The command of verse 27 had done its work, and the words are words of approval; but yet they are not wholly so. He had arrived at conviction by means of the senses, but the higher blessedness was that of those who see by the eye of the spirit and not by that of the body; who base their confidence on the conviction of the faith-faculty, and are independent of the changing phenomena of the senses.

Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed. —The truth is expressed in its general form. It is not to be understood in any special sense of the Ten, for the Greek is against it, and the other disciple also had seen and had believed; but it includes all who have become believers without having seen. This blessedness is thought of as existing from the moment of believing, and the act of faith is therefore spoken of in the past tense. The words look forward to the development of the Church which was to be founded upon the Apostolic witness, and whose faith must ever be in the unseen. (Comp. Notes on chap. i. 9 and 1 Pet. i. 9.)

(30) And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples. —More exactly, Ye, and indeed many and other signs did Jesus. (Comp. Note on chap. ii. 11.) We must understand the "signs" not of the proofs of the Resurrection only, but of the works wrought during the whole life. The writer's narrative is drawing to a close, and he explains the fact that he has recorded so little of a life which contained so much. There were, indeed, many other signs which he, as an eye-witness, remembered, but which it was not within his purpose to relate.

That he refers to the whole work of Christ, and not to the Risen Life only, is clear, because (1) there were not "many other signs" during the forty days; (2) the words "did Jesus" are not applicable to the manifestation to the disciples; (3) the words "in this book" refer to all that has preceded.

It would seem to follow from this that these verses (30 and 31) are the conclusion of the original Gospel, and that chap. xxi. is to be regarded as a postscript or appendix. We shall find reason for believing that, though an appendix, it proceeded from the hand of the Apostle himself.

(31) But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God. —We have here the writer's own statement of his object in writing his narrative, and also the explanation of what seems an abrupt end. His object is that of those who see by the eye of the spirit and not by that of the body; who base their confidence on the conviction of the faith-faculty, and are independent of the changing phenomena of the senses.

Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed. —The truth is expressed in its general form. It is not to be understood in any special sense of the Ten, for the Greek is against it, and the other disciple also had seen and had believed; but it includes all who have become believers without having seen. This blessedness is thought of as existing from the moment of believing, and the act of faith is therefore spoken of in the past tense. The words look forward to the development of the Church which was to be founded upon the Apostolic witness, and whose faith must ever be in the unseen. (Comp. Notes on chap. i. 9 and 1 Pet. i. 9.)

(30) And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book: (31) but these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God.

This is the object he had in recording them. On the special meaning of these words as connected with the Gnostic heresies of the time, comp. Introduction, p. 378.
of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name.

CHAPTER XXI. — (1) After these things Jesus shewed himself again to the disciples at the sea of Tiberias; and on this wise shewed he himself. (2) There were together Simon Peter, and Thomas called Didymus, and Nathanael of Cana in Galilee, and the sons of Zebedee, and two other of his disciples. (3) Simon Peter saith unto them, I go a fishing. They say unto him, We also go with thee. They went forth, and entered into a ship immediately; and that night they caught nothing. (4) But when the morning was now come, Jesus stood on the shore: but the disciples knew not that it was Jesus. (5) Then Jesus saith unto them, Children, have ye any meat? — The word rendered “Children” is often used by St. John (chaps. vi. 60, 66; vii. 3; viii. 31; xvii. 19). If they were Andrew and Philip, which has been supposed from chap. i. 40, 43, it is not easy to understand their position in the list, or the absence of their names.

And that believing ye might have life through his name.—Better, ... in His name. Thus the last words bring us back again to the first. (Comp. Notes on chap. i. 4, 12.)

XXI.

[7. The Epilogue to the Gospel. The Link between the Past and the Future (chap. xxii.).]

(1) THE DRAUGHT OF FISHES (verses 1—8).
(2) THE BREAKFAST. THE THIRD MANIFESTATION OF JESUS TO THE DISCIPLES (verses 9—14).
(4) THE CLOSE OF THE GOSPEL. CORROBORATIVE WITNESS TO ITS TRUTH:
(a) By fellow disciples (verse 24);
(b) By an amanuensis (verse 25.).

(1) After these things.—Comp. the same expression in chaps. v. 1, vi. 1, and vii. 1. It denotes not immediate succession, but rather an interval during which other events have taken place. Here it connects the events of this chapter with the Gospel which has been brought to a conclusion in chap. xx. 30, 31. At a later period than the last-mentioned there, occurred the events to be mentioned here.

Jesus shewed himself again to the disciples.—Better, He manifested Himself again to the disciples. The word “Jesus” is of uncertain authority, and has probably been inserted because a Church Lesson began at this place. (Comp. Notes on chap. vi. 14.) The pronoun connects the narrative immediately with that which has gone before.

The word rendered “shewed Himself” (manifested Himself) is used elsewhere of our Lord’s appearance only in Mark xvi. 12, 14, where it is passive (see Note there), and in verse 14 of this chapter. The argument that this chapter is not the original part of St. John’s Gospel cannot, however, be fairly said to be strengthened by this fact. The word occurs only once besides in the Synoptic Gospels (Mark iv. 32), while it is distinctly a Johannine word (chaps. i. 31; ii. 11; iii. 21; vii. 4; ix. 3; xvii. 6; 1 John i. 2 (twice); ii. 19, 28; iii. 2 (twice), 5, 8; iv. 9; Rev. iii. 18; xv. 4).

The reflective expression, “manifested Himself,” is, moreover, in St. John’s style. (Comp. chaps. vii. 4 and xi. 33.) The word “again” is another link with what has gone before, connecting this manifestation with that of chap. xx. 19, 26.

At the sea of Tiberias.—Comp. Note on chap. vi. 1. The name is found only in St. John.

(2) There were together Simon Peter, and Thomas called Didymus.—It is most probable that we have here the names of all in the group of seven who were Apostles, and that the two unnamed persons were disciples in the wider sense in which the word is often used by St. John (chaps. vi. 60, 66; vii. 3; viii. 31; xvii. 19). If they were Andrew and Philip, which has been supposed from chap. i. 40, 43, it is not easy to understand their position in the list, or the absence of their names.

Thomas is not named by the other Evangelists, except in the lists of the Apostles. (Comp. chaps. xi. 16; xiv. 5; xx. 24 et seq.)

Nathanael is named only by St. John. (Comp. Notes on chap. i. 45 et seq.) He is probably to be identified with the “Bartholomew” of the earlier Gospels; this latter name being a patronymic. (Comp. Note on Matt. x. 3, 4.) The descriptive note “of Cana in Galilee” is added here only.

The sons of Zebedee are not elsewhere given by St. John as a description of himself and his brother, but this is the only place in which he names himself and his brother in a list with others. In St. Luke’s account of the earlier draught of fishes, the “sons of Zebedee” are named as partners with “Simon” (chap. v. 10). Their position here agrees with the Johannine authorship of the chapter. In the lists in the other Gospels, and the Acts of the Apostles, James and John are uniformly prominent in the first group.

(3) Simon Peter saith unto them, I go a fishing.—The words are the vivid representation by an ear-witness of what actually took place as they re-

And that night they caught nothing.—Comp. for the fact Luke v. 5; but the words are different. The word here rendered “caught” occurs nowhere in the other Gospels, but is found again in this chapter (verse 10), and six times in the earlier chapters of the Gospel (vii. 30, 32, 44; vii. 20; x. 39; xi. 57). It occurs also in Rev. xix. 20.

(4) Jesus stood on the shore.—Comp. chap. xx. 19, 26. The words express the sudden appearance without any indication of His coming. He was then standing in the midst, or on the shore, but no one knew whence or how.

The disciples knew not that it was Jesus.—Comp. chap. xx. 14.

(5) Children, have ye any meat? — The word rendered “Children” (or, as the margin has it, Sons), is used in addressing others only by St. John among the New Testament writers (1 John ii. 14 and 18). It is not the word used in chap. xiii. 33, where we have an expression denoting His affectionate tenderness for the disciples, which would not have been appropriate here, for He does not at once reveal His identity to...
The command to cast the net.

ST. JOHN, XXI.

The Draught of Fishes.

ye any meat? They answered him, No.

(6) And he said unto them, Cast the net on the right side of the ship, and ye shall find. They cast therefore, and now they were not able to draw it for the multitude of fishes. (7) Therefore that disciple whom Jesus loved saith unto Peter, It is the Lord. Now when Simon Peter heard that it was the Lord, he girt his fisher's coat unto him, (for he was naked,) and did cast himself into the sea. (8) And the other disciples came in a little ship; (for they were not far from land, but as it were two hundred cubits,) dragging the net with fishes. (9) As soon then as they were come to land, they saw a fire of coals there, and fish laid thereon, and bread. (10) Jesus saith unto them, Bring of the fish which ye have now caught. (11) Simon Peter went up, and drew the net to land full of great fishes, an

how they were able to drag the net in tow. The Greek preposition used with "cubits" (literally, "two hundred cubits off") is used of distance only by St. John (chap. xi. 18 and Rev. xiv. 20).

Draggmg the net with fishes.—Comp. Note on verse 6. The Greek is more exactly, . . . . with the (literally, of the) fishes—i.e., those with which the net had been filled (verse 6).

(9) They saw a fire of coals there, and fish laid thereon, and bread.—In the original the tenses are present, describing the scene as it was impressed on the mind of the writer. They saw a fire of coals and fish lying thereon, and bread, or, perhaps, . . . . and a fish lying thereon, and a loaf.

For "fire of coals" comp. Note on chap. xviii. 18.

For the word rendered "fish," comp. verses 10 and 13, and Notes on chap. vi. 9 and 11. In this passage and in verse 13 only it occurs in the singular, but it seems clear that it may be collective, as our word "fish."

(10) Bring of the fish which ye have now caught.—Comp. Note on last verse. It is implied that they did so, and thus furnished part of the meal of which they are about to partake.

(11) Simon Peter went up. The better reading inserts "therefore": Simon Peter therefore went up—i.e., because of Christ's command. He went up into the ship now lying on the shore with one end of the net fastened to it, and drew the remainder of the net to the shore.

Full of great fishes, an hundred and fifty and three.—The greatness and the number are dwelt upon because in any ordinary haul of fish a large proportion would be small and valueless, and be cast into the lake again (Comp. Matt. xiii. 47 et seq.). These were all "great," and their size and number led to an exact account being taken of them. This would be talked of among the Apostles and their friends and fellow-craftsmen, and is, with the picturesque exactness which is characteristic of St. John, recorded here.

We have no clue to any mystical interpretation of this number, and it is probably not intended to convey one. The various meanings which men have read into it, such as that it represents one of every kind of fish known to the natural history of the day; or that one hundred represents the Gentile nations, fifty the Jews, and three the Trinity; or that there is a reference to the 153,600 proselytes of 2 Chron. ii. 17; or that it expresses symbolically the name of Simon Peter, take their place among the eccentricities of exegesis from which even the latest results of criticism are not free. Still, as all the more spiritual interpreters, from St. Augustine downwards, have seen, the differences between this and the earlier miracle (Luke v. 1—11) are too striking to be
The Significant Meal

ST. JOHN, XXI.

The Thrice-asked Question.

hundred and fifty and three: and for all there were so many, yet was not the net broken.

(12) Jesus saith unto them, Come and dine. And none of the disciples durst ask him, Who art thou? knowing that it was the Lord. (13) Jesus then cometh, and taketh bread, and giveth them, and fish likewise. (14) This is now the third time that Jesus shewed himself to his disciples, after that he was risen from the dead.

(15) So when they had dined, Jesus saith to Simon Peter, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me more than these? He saith unto him, Yea, Lord; thou knowest that I love thee. He saith unto him, Feed my lambs. (16) He saith to him again the second time, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me? He saith himself to his disciples, after that he was risen from the dead.

unintentional. That represents the visible Church, containing good and bad; the net is cast without special direction as to side; the net was broken and many escaped. This represents God's elect, foreknown by Him; all are good; the net is brought to shore, and none are lost. (See Notes on the parable of the Dragnet in Matt. xii. 47—50, and comp. especially Trench, Notes on the Gospels, ii. 37-39, and 39.) This is the third instance of the verb in the New Testament. The meal referred to was the early morning meal which we call breakfast (verse 4).

And none of the disciples durst ask him . . .—Comp. chap. iv. 27. They approach Him in reverent silence. Knowing it is the Lord, they yet desire the assurance in His own words, and still they do not dare to ask, “Who art thou?” The Greek word rendered “ask” means to “prove,” “inquire.” It is found elsewhere in the New Testament in Matt. ii. 8 and x. 11 only. The word rendered “durst,” is also not found again in St. John, but its use in the Gospels is—except in the instance of Nicodemus, “who went in boldly unto Pilate” (Mark xv. 43)—confined to the expression of the reverence which dared not question our Lord. (Comp. Matt. xxii. 46; Mark xii. 34; Luke xix. 40.) In all these instances it is used with a negative, and with a verb of inquiry, as here.

(15) Jesus saith to Simon Peter, Simon, son of Jonas.—The better text here and in verses 16 and 17, is, Simon, son of John. The contrast of the name by which the Evangelist denotes, and with that by which the Lord addresses Peter, at once strikes us as significant, and the more so because it comes in a context containing several significant verbal contrasts. Our Lord's words would seem to address him as one who

had fallen from the steadfastness of the Rock-man, and had been true rather to his natural than to his apostolic name. (Comp. Note on chap. i. 42, and Matt. xvi. 17.)

L医治 thou me more than these?—i.e., than these disciples who are present here with thee. It seems unnecessary to add this explanation, but not a few English notes on this verse explain the word “these” of the fishes, or of the boats and nets, as though the question was, “Lovest thou Me more than thy worldly calling? Art thou willing to give up all for Me?” The obvious reference is to Peter's own comparison of himself with others in the confidence of love which he thought could never fail. (Comp. Matt. xxvi. 33; Mark xiv. 29.)

The thrice-asked question has been generally understood to have special force in the restoration of him who had thrice denied his Lord, and now thrice declares his love for Him, and is thrice entrusted with a work for Him; and we feel that this interpretation gives a natural meaning to the emphasis of these verses. It may not be fanciful to trace significance, even in the external circumstances under which the question was asked. By the side of the lake after casting his net into the sea had Peter first been called to be a fisher of men (Matt. iv. 19). The lake, the very spot on the shore, the boats, the boat, would bring back to his mind in all their fulness the thoughts of the day which had been the turning-point of his life. By the side of the “fire of coals” (see Note on chap. xviii. 18, the only other place where the word occurs) he had denied his Lord. As the eye rests upon the “fire of coals” before him, and he is conscious of the presence of the Lord, who knows all things (verse 17), burning thoughts of penitence and shame may have come to his mind, and these may have been the true preparation for the words which follow.

Yea, Lord; thou knowest that I love thee.—Peter uses a less strong expression for love than that which had been used by our Lord. The question seems to ask, “Dost thou in the full determination of the will, in profound reverence and devotion, love Me?” The answer seems to say, “Thou knowest me; I dare not now declare this fixed determination of the will, but in the fulness of personal affection I dare answer, and Thou knowest that even in my denials it was true, ‘I love Thee.’”

He saith unto him, Feed my lambs.—More exactly, little lambs.

(19) He saith to him again the second time.—The question is repeated in exactly the same form, except that our Lord does not continue the comparison “more than these.” He uses the same word for the higher, more intellectual love, and Peter replies by the same declaration of personal attachment, and the same appeal to his Master's knowledge of him.
Feed my sheep. — Better, be a shepherd of My sheep. The Vatican and Paris MSS. read "little sheep" here, and in the following verse. (See Note there.)

(17) He saith unto him the third time.—Again the question is asked, but this time the Lord uses Peter's own word, and His question seems to say, "Doest thou, in personal affection and devotion, really love Me?" The third time, to him who had three times denied! and this time the love which Peter knows has ever filled his soul seems to be doubted. The question cuts to the very quick, and in the agony of the time (comp. Matt. viii. 14) in middle age. Thee. was crucified, As a good shepherd, giving his life for the sheep who are Christ's. He who had been loved and forgiven, held up that he might not fall, restored after he had fallen, is to be to others what Christ had been to him—feeding men with spiritual truths as they can bear them, gently guiding and caring for those who are as the weak ones of the flock through ignorance, prejudice, waywardness. The chief work of the chief Apostle, he had been taught that to personal surrender previous to being girded by the writer, and...
And when he had spoken this, he saith unto him, Follow me. (20) Then Peter, turning about, seeth the disciple whom Jesus loved following; which also leaned on his breast at supper, and said, Lord, which is he that betrayeth thee? (22) Peter seeing him saith to Jesus, Lord, and what shall this man do? (22) Jesus saith unto him, If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? follow thou me. (23) Then went this saying abroad among the brethren, that that disciple should not die: yet Jesus said not unto him, He shall not die; but, If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?

follow Christ meant to take up the cross (Matt. x. 38); it was his words which drew from Christ the utterance, "If any man will come after Me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross and follow Me" (Matt. xvi. 24); to his question at the Last Supper came the answer, "Whither I go, thou canst not follow Me now; but thou shalt follow Me afterwards" (chap. xiii. 30); and now the command has come again with the prophecy of martyrdom, and it must have carried to his mind the thought that he was to follow the Lord in suffering and death itself, and through the dark path which He had trodden was to follow Him to the Father's home.

(20) Peter, turning about, seeth the disciple whom Jesus loved following.—We must suppose that St. Peter had retired with our Lord, and that St. John seeing this had followed at a distance. He had been the companion and friend of St. Peter (comp. Introduction, p. 371). More than any other—and this is made prominent here—he had entered into close communion with the Lord Himself. He was called the "disciple whom Jesus loved" (comp. chap. xx. 2, and Introduction, p. 375); he had leaned on His breast at supper, and, at a sign from Peter, had asked who was the traitor; he may well think that for him too there was some glimpse into the future, some declaration of what his path should be; or in that mingling of act and thought, of sign and thing signified, which run all through these verses, his following may indicate that he too, though he had never dared to say so, was ready to follow wherever the Master went.

(21) Lord, and what shall this man do?—The motive prompting this question was probably that of loving interest in the future of his friend. It may well be that the two friends, in the sadness of the dark days through which they had passed, had talked together of what their Master's predictions of the future meant, and had wondered what there was in store for themselves. They knew the world to be hate as it had hated Him, and they never knew what its hatred for Him was. One of them had learnt that he was to follow his Lord in death as in life, and he now sees the other following them as they draw apart from the group, and wonders how the future of his friend as he knew his own.

(22) If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?—The answer must be taken as reproving the spirit which would inquire into another's life and work, with the effect of weakening the force of its own. Here, as in all the earlier details of St. Peter's life, his character is emotional, earnest, loving, but wanting in depth, and not without self-confidence. The words "Follow Me," the meaning of which he has not missed, may well have led him to thoughts and questions of what that path should be, and the truth may well have sunk into the depth of his heart, there to germinate and burst forth in principle and act. But he is at once taken up with other thoughts. He is told to follow, but is ready to lead. He would know and guide his friend's life rather than his own. To him, and to all, there comes the truth that the Father is the husbandman, and it is He who trains every branch of the vine. There is a spiritual companionship which strengthens and helps all who join in it; there is a spiritual guidance which is not without danger to the true strength of him that is led, nor yet to that of him who leads.

The word rendered "tarry" is that which we have before had for "abide" (see chap. xii. 34, and comp. Phil. i. 25 and 1 Cor. xv. 6). It is here opposed to "Follow Me" (in the martyrdom), and means to abide in life.

The phrase, "If I will that he tarry till I come," is one of those the meaning of which cannot be ascertained with certainty, and to which, therefore, every variety of meaning has been given. We have already seen that the Coming of the Lord was thought of in more than one sense. (Comp. especially Notes on Matt. xvi. 28 and Matt. xxiv.; and see also in this Gospel, Note on chap. xiv. 3.) The interpretation which has found most support is that which takes the "coming of the Lord" to mean the destruction of Jerusalem, which St. John, and perhaps he only of the Apostles, lived to see. But the context seems to exclude this meaning, for the mistake of verse 23 would surely have been corrected by a reference to the fact that St. John had survived, and wrote the Gospel after, the "coming of the Lord." The interpretation which the next verse itself suggests is that our Lord made no statement, but expressed a supposition, "If I will," "If it even be that I will," and this both gives the exact meaning of the Greek, and corresponds with the remainder of our Lord's answer. He is directing St. Peter to think of his own future, and not of his friend's; and He puts a supposition which, even if it were true, would not make that friend's life a subject for him then to think of. Had our Lord told him that St. John should remain on earth until His coming, in any sense of the word, then He would have given an answer, which He clearly declined to give.

Follow thou me.—The pronoun "thou" is strongly emphatic. "Thy brother's life is no matter for thy care. Thy work is for thyself to follow Me." (23) Then (better, therefore) went this saying abroad among the brethren.—For the word "brethren" comp. Notes on Matt. xxiii. 8 and Acts ix. 30. As a general name for the disciples, it is not elsewhere found in the Gospels, but we have the key to it in our Lord's own words to Mary Magdalene (chap. xx. 17).

Jesus said not unto him, He shall not die; but, If . . . .—The mistake of the brethren arose from their not attending to the force of the conditional particle. They took as a statement what had been said as a supposition, and understood it in the then current belief that the Second Advent would come in their
The Testimony of others
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to the Truth of the Record.

(24) This is the disciple which testifieth of these things, and wrote these things: and we know that his testimony is true.

(25) And there are also many other things which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written. Amen.

own generation. (Comp. 1 Cor. xv. 51, 52; 1 Thess. iv. 17.)

The mistake and its correction are both interesting in their bearing upon the date of the Gospel, and they furnish that kind of evidence which is perfectly natural as a growth, but which cannot possibly be made.

(1) The impression that St. John would not die belongs to the period when the Second Advent was looked for as within the limits of lifetime. This period ceased with the first generation of Christians, and the mistake would therefore point to the close of the first century as a limit beyond which the date of the Gospel cannot be placed.

(2) The mistake having been made, the obvious correction after St. John's death would have been simply to record that event. The correction of the text would place these words within his lifetime.

(24) This is the disciple which testifieth of these things, and wrote these things.—Comp. chap. xx. 30, 31. As we have there the formal close of what seems to have been the original Gospel, we have here the formal close of the epilogue. The words are, however, too wide to be limited to the epilogue, and clearly refer to all that has preceded. They identify the writer with the disciple just mentioned, i.e., the disciple whom Jesus loved, and the form of the sentence implies that he who wrote these things was still living, and bearing witness to their truth. He is still testifying to the things of which he wrote.

And we know that his testimony is true.—Our first and natural thought is that these are not the words of the writer of the Gospel, but the additional witness of persons knowing him and testifying to his writing. It is usual to explain the "we know" by referring to 1 John v. 18, 19, 20; but the plural of a letter ought not to be quoted to explain the plural in an historic document, and it is probable that the natural thought is the true one. But though the words are an addition, they are a contemporaneous addition present in every important MS. and version, and an undoubted part of the original text. We cannot tell who are the persons whose words we here read—Andrew it may be, or Philip, or some of the seventy disciples who had been witnesses of the work of Christ, or some of the Ephesian Church, as Aristion or John the Presbyter, who felt that the Apostle's personal character gave the stamp of truth to all he said, and add here the conviction that all these words were true. (Comp. Introduction, p. 377.)

(25) And there are also many other things which Jesus did . . . .-The MSS. evidence for this verse is also so conclusive that almost every competent editor inserts it in his text, but it is not found in the famous Sinaitic Codex. The transference from the plural to the singular—"We know" (verse 24), "I suppose" (in this verse)—has led to the supposition, which is in every way probable, that it is the individual testimony of an amanuensis who, from personal knowledge of the life of Christ, or from knowledge derived from the Apostle John or from others, feels that full beyond all human thought as this Gospel is, it is but a part of the greater fulness. No book could record, no words could tell, what that life was, or what things Jesus did. The disciples saw and believed, and wrote these things that we may believe, and in believing may have life in His name.

The word "Amen" is not found in the better MSS., and in no part of the written text. It is the natural prayer of some copyist, as it is the natural prayer of every devout reader that the writer's purpose may be fulfilled.

The chief MSS. have a subscription appended to the Gospel. "According to John" (Vatican); "Gospel according to John" (Sinaitic &?), Alexandrine, Paris, Basle); "Gospel according to John is ended;" "Gospel according to Luke begins" (Cambridge).
EXCURSUS A: DOCTRINE OF THE WORD.

These well-known lines are quoted here because they forcibly express the difficulty, not to say the impossibility, of fully knowing and fully conveying the sense of the term ὁ χριστός (Logos), which in our version is rendered "Word." To understand the meaning of Logos is to understand the Gospel according to St. John; and one of the greatest difficulties which the English reader of St. John has to encounter is that it cannot be translated. Our own English term "Word" was chosen as representing Verbum, which is found in all the Latin versions, though in the second century both Sermo (discourse) and Ratio (reason) seem to have been in use as renderings. In a Latin translation of Athanasius de Incarnatione (1612) the rendering of Logos is Verbum et Ratio, and this presents the double meaning of the term, which it is of the utmost importance to bear in mind. The nearest English derivative is "Logic," which is from an adjective derived from logos; and we understand by it, not an art or science which has to do with words, but one which has to do with thought and reason. The Greeks used logos in both senses, and Aristotle (Postcr. Anal. 1, 10) found it necessary to distinguish between the "logos within" (thought) and the "logos without" (speech). The Stoics introduced the phrase logos endiathetos (verbum mentis) for "thought," and logos prophorikos (verbum oris) for "speech"; and these phrases were made prominent in the language of theology by Philo Judæus. The term, then, is two-sided, and the English term "Word" not only fails altogether to approach the meaning of the "logos within" (verbum mentis), but it also fails to represent the most important part of that side of the meaning which it does approach; for the "logos without" (verbum oris) is speech or discourse, rather than the detached "word.”

The term logos occurs frequently in the New Testament in the sense of utterance; but when used in this sense it differs from the kindred words (rhema and epos) in that it always has to do with the living voice. It may mean that which any one said—sc., discourse, argument, doctrine, narrative, matter (about which speech was made); so, on the other hand, it is often used for reason (the faculty), account (to take and to give), reckoning, cause. St. John himself uses the term in this Gospel some thirty-six times in the more general meaning. In the Prologue it is used four times, and in each instance with reference to the person of our Lord. In 1 John i. 1 (see Note there) the phrase "Word of Life" occurs; and in 1 John v. 7 the term "Word" is found absolutely, but this verse is not in any MS. older than the fifteenth century. In Rev. xix. 13 the term "Word of God" is found, and in Heb. iv. 12, 13 (see Note), the Greek term is found the term "word of God," and "account" ("with whom we have to do"). But the absolute use of the term Logos in a personal sense is confined to the four instances in the Prologue of this Gospel, and it is this special meaning which we have to investigate.

The answers to our inquiry must be sought in the sense attached to the term at the time when, and by the persons among whom, the Gospel was written. In the opening verses of St. John we are at once in the midst of thoughts and terms quite distinct from any with which we are familiar from the earlier Gospels; but they are clearly quite familiar to both the writer and his readers. He uses them without note or comment, and assumes that they convey a known and definite meaning. Now, there are three circles in which we find these thoughts and terms then current:—

(1) We meet with the term Logos, expressing a person or personified attribute, in the Gnostic systems which flourished at the commencement of the second century. In Basilides (became prominent about A.D. 125) the Logos is the second of the intelligences which were evolved from the Supreme God—"Mind first is born of the unborn Father, from it again Reason (Logos) is born; then from Reason, Prudence; and from Prudence, Wisdom and Power; and from Wisdom and Power, the Virtues and Princes and Angels—those whom they call the ‘first.’" (Irenæus, i, xxiv. 3; Oxford Trans. p. 72.)

In Valentinus, who seems to have been a Christian in earlier life (proeminent A.D. 140—160), we meet with a more complicated development. The first principle is Prôarche, or First Beginning; Propator, or First Father; Bythos, or the Deep. He is eternal and un-begotten, and existed in repose through boundless ages. With Him there existed the Thought (Ennoia) of His mind who is also called Grace and Silence. When Bythos willed to put forth from Himself the beginning of all things, Thought conceived and brought forth
in the revelation to Moses (Ex. iii. 14). In Isa. lxii. 7-10, the Targum of Jonathan reads the Memra for the Angel, the Redeemer, and Jehovah; and in Mal. iii. identifies the Coming One with the Angel of the Covenant, and the Memra of the Lord. Dr. Etheridge noted in the Targum of Oukelos, in the Pentateuch only, more than 150 places in which the Memra da-Yeya is spoken of. In the later Targums it is still more frequent.

(3) Another region of thought in which we find analogies to the doctrine of the Word, is the Judaico-Alexandrine philosophy, which is represented by Philo. A Jew by birth, and descended from a priestly family, Philo was some thirty years old at the commencement of the Christian era. From the study of the Old Testament he passed to that of Plato and Pythagoras, and with such devotion that there was a common proverb, "Either Plato philosophises, or Philo platonises." He drank not less deeply of the spirit of other teachers and in the allegorical interpretation of the Essenes, the Caballists, and the Therapeute, he found the mean between the Hebrew tradition of his youth and the Greek freedom of thought with which he became familiar in later years. The dualism of the Greek philosophers and the Biblical account of creation were both rejected by the Eastern theory of emanation. He thought of God as Eternal Light, from Whom all light comes; whose radiance cannot be gazed upon by human eyes, but which was reflected in the Word, or, as the Scripture calls it, Divine Wisdom. This he conceived to be not a mere abstraction, but an emanation, a real existence, and a person. He calls Him, for example, the "first begotten of God," the "Archangel," and, adopting the language of the Stoics (comp. p. 552), the Logos Endiathetos. From this proceeded a second emanation, the Logos Prophorikos, which manifests the Logos Endiathetos, and is Himself manifested by the Universe. The Logos is, then, in the conception of Philo, the link between the Universe and God, between objective matter and the spiritual Light which man cannot approach. On the spiritual side, the Logos is spoken of in terms which make it not seldom doubtful whether the thought is of a person or of an idea; on the material side, the Logos is the active reason and energy, and sometimes seems to be almost identified with the Universe itself. The bridge passes imperceptibly into the territory on either side.

Such are, in a few words, the systems of thought, which stand in relation more or less appreciable to the Johannine doctrine of the Word. The question is, from which, if indeed from any one of these, was the form of St. John's teaching derived?

The Gnostic systems are excluded if our conclusion as to the authorship and date of the Gospel is valid. (Comp. Introduction, pp. 372, 376 et seq.). They are also excluded by independent comparison with the Gospel, and thus they afford a confirmation of that conclusion. They are in the relation of the complex to the simple, the development to the germ. Any one who will carefully read the extract from Memra da-Yeya which is given above will find good reason for believing that he is describing a system which may naturally enough have been developed from St. John; but from which the doctrine of St. John could not have been developed. The one is as the stream flowing in all its clearness from the fountain; the other is as the same stream lower in its course, made turbid by the admixture of human thoughts.

There remains the Judaico-Alexandrine philosophy, of
which Philo is the leading representative, and the Hebrew thoughts expressed in the Old Testament paraphrases, and in the developments of later Judaism. We are to bear in mind, however, that the line between these cannot be drawn with such clearness and certainty as men generally seem to suppose. The Chaldean paraphrases contain an Eastern element with which the nation was imbued during its long captivity, and Philo himself borrowed much from Oriental modes of thought. He was, moreover, a Jew, and the Jewish Scriptures and these very Targums were the foundation of his mental training. His philosophy is avowedly based upon the Old Testament. We are to bear in mind also when we speak of the philosophy of Philo that no philosopher arises without a cause, or lives without an effect. Philo represents a great current of thought which influenced himself and his generation, and which he deepened and widened. Of that current Alexandria and Ephesus were the two great centres, the former specially representing Judaism in contact with the freer thought of Greece, and the latter specially representing Judaism in contact with the theosophies of Asia, but both meeting and permeating each other in these great cities. (Comp. Introduction, p. 376.)

We have to think, then, of St. John as trained in the knowledge of the Hebrew Scripture and the paraphrases which explained them, and accustomed from childhood to hear of the Memra da-Yege, the Word of the Lord, as the representative of God to man. Through the teaching of the Baptist he is led to the Christ, and during the whole of Christ's ministry learns the truth that He only had seen the Father, and was the Apostle of God to the world. After Christ's death the Resurrection strengthens every conviction and removes every doubt. The presence of the Spirit at Pentecost brings back the words He had given them as a revelation from God, and quickens the soul with the inspiration which gives the power to understand them. Then the Apostle goes forth to his work as a witness of what he had seen and heard, and for half a century fulfils this work. Then he writes what he so many times had told of Christ's words and Christ's works. He is living in the midst of men round whom and in whom that current of Judeo-Alexandrine thought has been flowing for two generations. He hears men talking of the Beginning, of Logos, of Life, of Light, of Pleroma, of Shekinah, of Only-Begotten, of Grace, of Truth, and he prefixes to his Gospel a short preface which declares to them that all these thoughts of theirs were but shadows of the true. There was a Being from all eternity face to face with God, and that Being was the true Logos, and He was not only with God, but was God. By Him did the universe come into existence. In Him was Life and the Light of men—the true ideal Light which lighteneth every man. And not only was that Logos truly God, but He was truly man; the Incarnation was the answer to the problem which their systems of thought had vainly tried to fathom. The Logos, on the spiritual side, from eternity God; on the material side, in time, become flesh: this was the answer which Philo had dimly forecast. He was the Shekinah tabernacled among men, manifesting the glory of the Only-Begotten. In Him was the Pleroma. By Jesus Christ came Grace and Truth. No man had ever seen the brightness of the glory of the presence of God, but the Only-Begotten was the true Interpreter, declaring the Fatherhood of God to man.

Such is the Johannine doctrine of the Word. Shaping itself, as it must have done, if it was to be understood at Ephesus at the close of the first century, in the then current forms of thought, and in the then current terms, it expresses in all its fulness the great truth of the Incarnation. It has bridged for ever the gulf between God and man in the person of One who is both God and man; and this union was possible because there is in man a "logos within"—reason, thought, conscience;—because there is in the spiritual nature of man that which is capable of communion with God.

[This subject is dealt with in the works mentioned in the Introduction, and in a very convenient form in Liddon's Bampton Lectures and Westcott's Introduction. Lücke's treatment of it (Ed. 3, vol. i., p. 249 et seq.) is one of the most valuable parts of his invaluable Commentary. See also Dorner, Doctrine of the Person of Christ, vol. i., especially Mr. Simon's Appendix, p. 327 et seq., Eng. Trans.; Mansel's article "Philosophy," in Kitto's Biblical Encyclopedia, vol. iii., p. 520 et seq.; Etheridge, Translations of the Targums on the Pentateuch, p. 14 et seq.]

**EXCURSUS B: SOME VARIATIONS IN THE TEXT OF ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL.**

It has often been found necessary in the preceding Notes to refer to readings differing from the Received text, on which our Authorised version is based. To justify or discuss these in any degree of fulness would be beyond the scope of the present volume; but it may be of interest, as well as of importance, to give, in two or three typical cases, an outline of the method by which the results are obtained.

Chap. i. 18.—The Authorised version reads here, "the only begotten Son," and the Received text, upon which it is based, has μονογενὴς Υἱὸς. But soon after the middle of the second century we find the reading μονογενῆς ὅτι—"only begotten God"—which has at least an equal, if not a superior, claim to be considered the original text.

The external evidence, judged by the testimony of MSS., of versions, and of quotations in extant works, must be admitted to be in favour of the reading, "only begotten God."
Nyssa, Cyril of Alexandria. “The only begotten Son” is read by Eusebius, Athanasius, Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and by the Latin writers from Tertullian downwards. The uncertain text of many of the Fathers makes their witness doubtful; but this at least seems clear, that the decided weight of Patristic evidence is in favour of “only begotten God.” Tregelles lays stress upon the fact that Arius adopted this reading; but it must be observed that Arius very likely con sidered “God,” as here used, in a secondary sense, and so might have regarded the passage as latently, though not on the surface, favouring his own views.

The external evidence being thus in favour of “only begotten God,” we have to inquire whether there is any sufficient ground on which it can be set aside. We are at once met by the fact that the term is unique, and therefore, it is often said, not likely to occur; whereas “the only begotten Son” is perfectly natural, and occurs in St. John in chap. iii. 16, 18, and I John iv. 18. But we are to remember that what is unnatural to us would have been so to copyists and translators; and the fact that we have an unusual term strongly supported by external evidence is of weight just in proportion as the term is unusual. Nor need a unique term be a matter of suspicion in this Prologue, where we have found so much that is not paralleled in other parts of the New Testament. (Comp. Eusebius A.)

It has been sometimes thought that “only begotten Son” may have been changed into “only begotten God” from a dogmatic bias. We have seen that Only Begotten (Monogenes) was one of the scribes in the Ogdoad of Valentinus (p. 553); but there was the greatest care to separate the scribes from the original Bythos, and no copyist in the Valentinian interest would have applied the term “God” to the “Only Begotten.” Unique as the term was, and unknown to Christian orthodoxy, no copyist, on the other hand, would have ventured to adopt it in the interests of Christianity.

A priori reasons would seem, then, to unite with external evidence in favour of the unfamiliar reading, “only begotten God.” We find it beyond all question soon after the middle of the second century. It is almost impossible, to believe that the word was not set purposely and quite impossible to believe that it was by accident, read instead of “only begotten Son,” and the only alternative is that it is part of the original Gospel. The doubtful word was probably written, with the usual contraction, in the uncial characters, 66 (ΘΕΟΤΟΚ), and this was read by copyists as the more familiar 70 (ΤΙΟΤ); and thus by the change of a single letter and the addition of the article, “only begotten God” passed into “the only begotten Son,” and the original text passed into an oblivion, from which it has never been rescued.

But although the term “only begotten God” is unfamiliar to us, it is not foreign to the thought of the Prologue, the very central idea of which is that the Logos was with God, and was God. The eternal Sonship of the Logos is expressed in the parallel sentence “in the bosom of the Father,” and in this term “only begotten God,” the Prologue repeats emphatically at its conclusion the text with which it opened: “In the beginning was the Logos, and the Logos was with God, and the Logos was God.” The omission of the article gives the sentence a meaning which it is difficult to express in translation, but which in Greek makes the term “only begotten God” an assertion—“No man hath seen God at any time; only begotten God as He is, He who is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him.”

[Comp. for fuller information on this important read- ing Professor Abbot’s articles in the Andover Bibli theca Sacra (Oct. 1861), and Unitarian Review (June, 1875), and Professor Drummond in Theological Review (Oct. 1871). There is an elaborate and careful note based on Professor Abbot’s article in Alford’s Commentary, in loco. He decides for the Recived text, which is followed also by Wordsworth (but without any note on the reading); Tischendorf, and Scrivener. Tregelles, on the other hand, reads “only begotten God,” which is also adopted by Westcott and Hort. The remarkable Dissertation upon it, read before the University of Cambridge by Dr. Hort in 1876, will perhaps turn the current of thoughtful opinion in favour of the reading he advocates.]

Chap. vii. 53—viii. 12.—This section illustrates a critical question of a wholly different nature. We have in the Received text no less than twelve verses which, by the admission of all competent authorities, have no valid claim to be considered part of the Gospel according to St. John. They are found in no Greek MS. earlier than the sixth century; they are not an original part of any of the oldest versions; they are not quoted as by St. John before the last half of the fourth century.

The external evidence leaves, therefore, no room for doubt that they are an interpolation, and as we have seen in the Notes upon the passages, this is entirely borne out by the matter and style of the verses themselves, and by the break which they cause in the narrative. At the same time they leave the impression, which becomes more vivid on every fresh study of the section, that they are a genuine record of an incident in the life and teaching of Christ. It would have been impossible for any writer in the early Church to have risen so far above the ordinary feeling upon such a question; and their whole tone is that of the words of Christ, and not of the words of man.

But if they are the words of Christ, and yet not part of the Fourth Gospel, how did they come to be inserted in this place? We must remember, as this Gospel itself reminds us, that we have no complete record of the works and words of Christ, and that there must have been many incidents treasured in the memory of the first disciples which have not come down to us. (Comp. Acts xx. 35, and Note there.) We know from Eusebius that many such incidents were narrated in the five books of Papias, who thus gives his own purpose and plan—"I shall not regret to subjoin to my interpretations also, for your benefit, whatsoever I have at any time accurately ascertained and treasured up in my memory, as I have received it from the elders, and have recorded it in order to give additional confirmation to the truth by my testimony. For I have never, like many, delighted in my interpretations also, for your benefit, whatsoever I have at any time accurately ascertained and treasured up in my memory, as I have received it from the elders, and have recorded it in order to give additional confirmation to the truth by my testimony. For I have never, like many, delighted to hear those that tell many things, but those that teach the truth; neither those that record foreign precepts, but those that are given from the Lord to our faith, and that came from the truth itself. But if I met with any one who had been a follower of the elders anywhere, I made it a point to inquire what were the declarations of the elders; what was said by Andrew, Peter, or Philip; what by Thomas, James, John, Matthew, or any other of the disciples of our Lord; what was said by Aristion and by the presbyter John, disciples of the Lord; for I do not think that I derived so much benefit from books as from the living voice of those that are still surviving" (Euseb. Eccles. Hist. iii. xxxix.; Bagster’s Trasn., p. 142). At the end of the same chapter.
ST. JOHN.

Eusebius says, "He also gives another history, of a woman who had been accused of many sins before the Lord." The reference is almost certainly to the incident in the present paragraph, and in it we have the probable key to the insertion here. A copyist would write the section from Papias in the margin of his MS., perhaps, as Ewald suggests, to illustrate the statement, "Ye judge after the flesh; I judge no man" (chap. viii. 18); and from the margin it found its way, as other such passages did, into the Cambridge and other MSS. Adopted from the margin, it would be placed in the text where there was space for it on the page of the MS., and this would account for the fact that it is found in different positions; for it is placed by one MS. after chap. vii. 36; by several at the end of the Gospel; by four important curators at the end of Luke xxii. The copyists felt, then, that it was an incident which should have a place in their MSS., but they felt free to decide that place at their own discretion.

Augustine held that the passage had been omitted on the ground of the supposed encouragement it gave to lax views, and this position has been maintained by others in ancient and modern times. It does not, however, account (1) for the fact that chap. vii. 53 is part of the doubtful passage; (2) the great variations of place and of readings in the MSS. where it is found; (3) the internal differences of matter and style. (Comp. Scrivener's New Testament Criticism, Ed. 2, p. 530 at seq.; Alford's note in loco, in which he incorporates the results of Lücke's full discussion; Lightfoot, in Contempary Review, Oct. 1875.)

Chap. xviii. 1.—This is a variation of another kind, and one of little practical importance, except that the Received text has furnished ground for one of the instances quoted in proof of the position that the writer was unacquainted with Hebrew, for even if the true reading be "of the cedars" (oriiJv ,c,op.,v) the Alexandrian MSS. would have no accents, and he would make the article agree with it, reading τω κεδρων ("of the cedars"). Another copyist would do just the opposite, changing the number of the substantive to agree with the article, and reading τω κέδρων ("of the Cedar", or "of the cedars"). In this way the reading of the Alexandrian MS., which is adopted in the Authorised version, explains, on the one hand, how that of the Sinaitic and Cambridge MSS., and, on the other hand, how that of the Vatican MS., would arise; and being the only one of the three which explains the others, it probably represents the original text.

There is in any case no foundation for the argument that the writer was acquainted with Hebrew, for even if the true reading be "of the cedars" (τω κέδρων) a Jew may have chosen it to represent the Hebrew word from its similarity in sound. It is remarkable that in the LXX. translation of 2 Sam. xv. 23 the word occurs twice (once in the Hebrew and English), i.e., as an appellative and as a proper name. Comp. 1 Kings xv. 13 (LXX.).

EXCURSUS C: THE SACRAMENTAL TEACHING OF ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL.

The Fourth Gospel contains no record of the institution of Holy Baptism or of the Eucharist. This will not surprise us if we remember that it belonged to a generation later than the journeys and letters of St. Paul, in which we find that both sacraments had become part of the regular life of the Church. That which was constant and unchangeable was the form in which the events and words of the Last Supper were recorded, and the discourses at Capernaum could not have been written at the close of the first century without being understood by the writer, and without being intended to be understood by the readers, as discourses on Holy Baptism and the Eucharist. In the Notes on these chapters an attempt has been made to bring out their true meaning in detail, and to these the reader is referred. Nor are we concerned here with the controversies which in after ages have gathered round these centres. All that can be attempted is to point out that the differences of opinion with regard to the general interpretation of the chapters as a whole have arisen from reading them with preconceived convictions as to their meaning, and from con­founding things which ought to be distinguished. It may be granted that no one who heard the discourse at Capernaum could understand it of the solemn institution, which was still in the future, and then wholly outside any possibility of current thought; but it does not follow that the discourse was not intended to teach the doctrine of the Eucharist, and to be interpreted in the events and words of the Last Supper. It takes its place among the many things which the disciples afterwards remembered that He had said unto them, and which He had recorded in the Scripture and had promised which Jesus had said. (Comp. Note on chap. ii. 22.) The conclusion that the words have no reference to the Eucharist would require the statement, not that the disciples could not understand them at the time, but that Jesus Himself did not; and no one who is prepared to admit that to Him the future was as the present, and that when He said, "I am the Bread of Life," Exce® ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you," He knew that He
would also take bread and break it, and say, “This is My body, which is given for you; this do in remembrance of Me;” and would take the cup, and say, “This cup is the new testament in My blood, which is shed for you,” can doubt that He taught in word at the one Passover that which He taught in act and word at the other. It may be granted, again, that when St. John heard, with or from Nicodemus, of the new birth which was of water and of the Spirit, he may have asked, as the teacher of Israel did, “How can these things be?” but the statement that the discourse does not apply to the sacrament of Baptism is inconsistent with the commission to the Apostles to baptise all nations, and the fact that the day of Pentecost and the history of the Apostolic Church must have brought to the writer’s mind in all its fulness what the meaning of the spiritual birth was. It may be granted that these truths, as they were revealed by Jesus Christ, were beyond the comprehension of any who heard them, and that the teaching of these chapters is inconsistent with the degree of faith and spiritual receptivity which even at the end of our Lord’s ministry is found in the circle of the Apostles; but we are to remember once more that the inspiration of the Holy Spirit is in this very Gospel itself promised to guide them into all truth, and that in the person of him who records the promise there is the evidence that it had been fulfilled.

We have seen in chap. xx. 22, 23, how the Apostle thinks of the act of breathing on the disciples, with which Jesus accompanied the gift of the Holy Ghost and the power to remit sins, as itself a sacramental sign; and throughout the Gospel we have seen how he regards every work of Jesus as a sign of a spiritual reality beyond. The whole Gospel is, so to speak, sacramental. The Word became flesh, and the whole life in the flesh was a manifestation which the physical eye could look upon and the physical ear could hear, that by means of these senses the human spirit may perceive the nature of the Eternal Spirit in whose image it was made. The spiritual was manifested in material form, that in it the spiritual nature of man embodied in material form may have communion with God. Every word and work was “an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace,” and at the time when the Apostle wrote two of these signs were specially regarded by the Church as those “ordained by Christ Himself as a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof.” (Comp. Notes on Matt. xxvi. 26–29; xxviii. 19; Mark xiv. 22–25; Luke xxii. 19, 20; Acts ii. 46; 1 Cor. xi.)

EXCURSUS D: THE DISCOURSES IN ST. JOHN’S GOSPEL.

No difficulty with regard to this Gospel has been more strongly felt by those who accept the authenticity, or more cogently urged by those who reject it, than the way in which the discourses of Our Lord as they are recorded in the Fourth Gospel differ from the shorter detached sayings and parables with which we are familiar in the Synoptists. “Il faut faire un choix,” says M. Renan, “si Jesus parlait comme de veut Matthieu, il n’a pu parler comme le veut Jean.” This is not all; for not only are these discourses of Jesus unlike those of the earlier Gospels, but the Fourth Gospel preserves unity of style, whether Jesus is speaking, or John the Baptist, or the writer himself. Further, while this style widely differs from that of the earlier Gospels, it very clearly resembles that of the First Epistle of St. John.

This difference must, to a large extent, be at once admitted by every candid inquirer; but M. Renan’s inference will not follow unless the difference is so great that it cannot be accounted for. It may be assumed here that the arguments of the Introduction have led the reader to think that the Johannine Authorship of the Gospel is, at least, in the highest degree probable. The writer claims, as we have seen (p. 374), to be an eye-witness and to have seen and heard that which he records, and others give their sanction to the claim. It follows, therefore, even if all that has been said about these discourses and their difference from those of the Synoptists can be established, that we have nothing more than a difficulty which our ignorance cannot explain; but this cannot weigh against the position which, on so many other grounds, has been established. But is the difference—great as it undoubtedly is—wholly inexplicable, or, indeed, greater than under all the circumstances we have a right to expect?

(1) It must be remembered, in the first place, that the ground common to the Fourth Gospel and the earlier three is much greater than it is often supposed to be. The following parallels are given that the reader may conveniently estimate it. The texts may be found quoted in parallel columns in Godet and Luthardt; and the weight of their cumulative testimony can be felt only by one who will carefully compare them.

Chap. ii. 19; Matt. xxvi. 61, xxvii. 40; Mark xiv. 58, xvi. 29.
— ili. 18; Mark xvi. 16.
— iv. 44; Matt. xiii. 57; Mark vi. 4.
— v. 8; Matt. ix. 6; Mark ii. 9; Luke v. 24.
— vi. 20; Matt. xiv. 27; Mark i. 50.
— — 35; Matt. v. 6; Luke vi. 21.
— — 37; Matt. xi. 28, 29.
— — 46; Matt. xii. 22; Luke x. 22.
— xii. 7; Matt. xxvi. 12; Mark xiv. 8.
— — 8; Matt. xxvi. 11; Mark xiv. 7.
— — 27; Matt. xxvi. 38; Mark xiv. 24.
— xiii. 3; Matt. xi. 27.
— — 18, and xv. 20; Matt. x. 24; Luke vi. 40.
— — 20; Matt. x. 40; Luke x. 19.
— — 21; Matt. xxvi. 31; Mark xiv. 18.
— — 38; Matt. xxvi. 34; Mark xiv. 39; Luke xxii. 34.
— xiv. 18; Matt. xxviii. 20.
— — 23; Mark xii. 32.
— — 31; Matt. xxvi. 46.
— xv. 21; Matt. x. 22.
— xvi. 32; Matt. xxvi. 31; Mark xiv. 27.
— xvii. 2; Matt. xxviii. 18.
— xvi. 11; Matt. xxvi. 55.
— — 17; Matt. xxviii. 11; Mark xv. 2; Luke xxiii. 3.
— xx. 23; Matt. xvi. 19, and xviii. 18.

The passages in Matt. xi. 25–27 and xv. 13 and Luke x. 22 should be specially noticed, as containing thoughts like those which meet us in St. John.

(2) If we accept the common belief that our Lord spoke in the current Syro-Chaldaic, then the discourses...
of the Greek Gospels are translations, and a translator's own style naturally impresses itself upon his work.

(3) The scene of the Fourth Gospel is, for the most part, Jerusalem; that of the Synoptists is Galilee. In the one case our Lord is chiefly addressing scribes and Pharisees, Rabbis and elders; in the other case He is chiefly addressing the multitudes of Galilee, peasants and fishermen, who flocked to hear Him. It is true that one of the most striking of the discourses of the Fourth Gospel was delivered in the synagogue at Capernaum (chap. vi. 59), but in this discourse it is the hierarchical party ("the Jews," see Note on chap. i. 19) who murmur at Him, and it is to them that the discourse is chiefly addressed. In the difference in the discourses greater than that between a University sermon of a distinguished teacher, and the address delivered in a village church or in the open air by the same man?

(4) We possess no part of the teaching of Christ in full. The Fourth Gospel does not profess to be more than an historical résumé, a fragment of a great whole, which could not possibly be produced (chaps. xx. 30, 31; xxii. 24, 25). We read it in detached portions, and think of it as representing the teaching of the ministerial life of Christ; but we seldom realise that the whole of the teaching which we have occupied but a few hours in delivery, whilst it is set in an historical framework which extends over months and years. Now, in making a summary of the discourses of Christ, nothing is more natural than that each writer should have chosen such portions as fell in with the bent of his own mind, the depth of his own perception, and the special object in writing which he himself had in view. And as nothing is more natural, so nothing can be more providential than that the teaching of Christ should be thus preserved as it presented itself to minds of widely differing types, who are representatives of the differing thoughts and culture of every age. From this it results that the peasant and the fisherman, the scribe and the scholar, in all places and in all times, alike find in the doctrine of Christ the truth that satisfies the soul.

(5) The unity of style in the whole of the Fourth Gospel, and the similarity between that of the Gospel and that of the First Epistle, must be evident to every thoughtful reader. It does not follow that this style is wholly St. John's. Surely we may believe rather that the loving and beloved disciple, who in closest intimacy drank of his Master's spirit and listened to His words, caught in some degree the very form in which that Master spoke. The difficulty felt as to the unity of style is in truth an argument of no small weight in favour of the authenticity. No criticism has been able to dismember this Gospel, and assign part to one writer and part to another. It stands as a whole, and the conviction which comes from the study of individual parts applies therefore to every part. The unity of style with that of the Epistle enables us to add the independent testimony which we have for the Epistle (comp. Introduction to it) to the general testimony in favour of the Gospel.

(6) Still it is impossible to deny that there is a subjective element in the discourses recorded in the Fourth Gospel; they cannot have been stored in the mind of the beloved disciple for fifty years without bearing the impress of that mind. He cannot have written in Ephesus at the close of the first century without being influenced by the current of thought in the midst of which he lived; and the purpose with which the Gospel was written (see Introduction, p. 377) must have moulded the form which it took. But is it therefore the less authentic? Does it the less produce the exact teaching of Christ? To answer these questions in the affirmative is to forget that the author, like other holy men of old, was inspired of God; to forget that the man was inspired, not the form or the word; to forget that presence of the Paraclete which was, as this very Gospel emphatically declares, "to teach all things, and bring all things to remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you," and "to guide into all truth."

It is not, then, necessary to make our choice between St. Matthew and St. John, or to believe that the Gospel is not the "Gospel of Jesus Christ," because it is "the Gospel according to St. John." Rather, it is necessary to study the words and works of Christ as each Evangelist, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, has recorded them, and in each part to seek to catch something of the fulness of that life which no record can convey; and as the experience of men in all ages has proved, there is no part in which that life is so fully presented as in the discourses related by St. John. [Comp. Westcott, Introduction, p. 281 et seq.; Sanday, Authorship and Historical Character of the Fourth Gospel, p. 69 et seq.; Godet, Introduction, pp. 163—205; Luthardt, St. John the Author of the Fourth Gospel, pp. 224—344; and especially the comparison between the Sermon on the Mount and the Teaching in the Fourth Gospel, appended to Professor Maurice's Discourses, pp. 485—482.]

EXCURSUS E: THE OMISSION OF THE RAISING OF LAZARUS IN THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS.

This omission has so often been made a difficulty, and to many minds is perhaps so real a difficulty, that a few words may be added upon it, though the Notes have already indicated what is probably the true solution. (Comp. especially Notes on chap. xi. 8—16.) If, as there is every reason to believe, the Gospel according to St. Mark represents the original document on which the Synoptic Gospels are founded; and if St. Mark is also the interpreter of St. Peter, who wrote whatev­ever he recorded with great accuracy (Euseb. Ecles. Hist. iii. 39; comp. Introduction to St. Mark), then the absence of St. Peter from the body of disciples who journeyed to Bethany with our Lord would be a sufficient reason why this miracle was not included in the Synoptic tradition, and why it is therefore not recorded in any one of the earlier Gospels.

No stress can be laid upon the common explanation that silence was imposed upon the Evangelists who wrote during the lifetime of the sisters or of Lazarus himself. There is no such reticence in the case of the young man at Nain, or of the daughter of Jairus; and the feeling forces itself upon the mind that such an explanation owes its existence to the necessity which has been felt to explain the difficulty somehow. This necessity has been felt, perhaps, too strongly. To us the miracle seems to stand alone as an exercise of power which every one who knew of it must have regarded as we regard it, and which no record of the
life and works of Christ could omit. But the miracle differs essentially from others only in the fulness of our knowledge of it, and the circumstances which attended it. Each Evangelist does record a miracle of raising from the dead, and St. Luke records two. They are not dwelt upon as in any way beyond the limits of the miraculous power of Christ, which every Evangelist fully sets forth. All Jews, indeed, had expected such power to accompany the Messianic reign; they knew from their Scriptures that it had been vouchsafed to Elijah; they record (Matt. xi. 5; Luke vii. 22), without any comment, the answer to the Baptist, "The blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, and the poor have the gospel preached to them." And St. Luke records also in the Acts that the power of life and death was committed to the Apostles. The common feeling is shown in this very narrative, where the Jews ask, "Could not this Man which opened the eyes of the blind have caused that even this man should not have died?" (xi. 37.)

Stress may with greater confidence be laid upon the fact that the miracle at Bethany does not fall in the local sphere of the Synoptic narratives, but that it does naturally fall in with the Jerusalem ministry, which is specially related by St. John. His connection with the city, and residence in it, would certainly bring him into contact with the family at Bethany, and supply him with details which no other Evangelist would know. Knowing this incident himself, and knowing that the Synoptists had not recorded it, knowing too that it explained much that they did record, and was indeed the key without which the events of the last week could not be accounted for, he here, as elsewhere, adds to their narrative that which was lacking in it. It is one of the many instances in which the exact fitting of independent portions of the history prove that they are parts of one great whole.

The question of the authenticity of this record is, of course, implied in the often-asked question, "Why is it found only in St. John?" and behind this lies the wider question of the credibility of miracles. All that has been said in the Introduction on the Authenticity of the Gospel as a whole applies to this part of it; and there is no part of it which bears the impress of historical truth more fully than this does. The characters of Martha and Mary, the dialogue, the feelings of the Jews, the whole picture, are drawn to the life.

The silence of the record is itself significant. It is an inspired historian, and not a forger of the miraculous, in whose narrative Lazarus himself utters no word.

"Where wert thou, brother, those four days?"
There lives no record of deep
Which telling what it is to die
Had surely added praise to praise.

Behold a man raised up by Christ!
The rest remaineth unreveald;
He told it not: or something said
The life of that Evangelist!"

EXCURSUS F: THE DAY OF THE CRUCIFIXION OF OUR LORD.

[For this Excurseus, which deals with a difficulty belonging to the Four Gospels rather than to the Fourth Gospel, Professor Plumptre has been kind enough to make himself responsible.]

(1) The narratives of the first Three Gospels, and that of the Fourth, agree in the statement that on the night that immediately preceded the betrayal or the crucifixion of our Lord, He and His disciples met together at a supper. As to what that supper was they seem at first as altogether irreconcilable, and conclusions have been drawn from it unfavourable to the authority of one or both the narratives. Those who look on the Gospel of St. John as the work of a writer of the second century, see in this discrepancy a desire to give a sanction to the local usage of the Church of Ephesus, or to force upon his readers, as in his relation of "a bone of Him shall not be broken" (John xix. 36), the correspondence between the Passover and the death of Christ. Those who accept the Gospel as St. John's, wholly or in part, see in his narrative a correction, designed or undesigned, of the narrative of the Three, and look on that narrative accordingly as more or less untrustworthy. Some even of those who shrink from these conclusions have been content to rest in the conviction that we have no adequate data for the solution of the problem.

Some minor difficulties gather round the main question. It was not likely, it has been urged, that on the very night of the Passover the high priests should have taken the counsel and the action that led to the capture in Gethsemane; nor that on the day that followed, "a day of holy convocation" (Ex. xii. 16), they should have sat in judgment, and appeared as accusers before Pilate and Herod; nor that Simon of Cyrene should have come from the country (Mark xv. 21); nor that Judas should be supposed to have been sent, if it were the Paschal Supper, to make purchases of any kind—as if the sheps in Jerusalem would on such a night be open (John xiii. 29).
The day of the Crucifixion is described by all four Evangelists as "the preparation," which it is assumed must mean "the preparation for the Passover". In St. John (xix. 14) it is definitely spoken of as "the preparation of the Passover."

(3) Some solutions of the problem, which rest on insufficient evidence, may be briefly noticed and dismissed. (a) It has been supposed that our Lord purposely anticipated the legal Paschal Supper, and that the words "With desire I have desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer" (Luke xxii. 15), were an intimate of that purpose. Against this, however, there is the fact that the disciples, who could have had no such anticipatory purpose, ask the question where they are to prepare, and then actually prepare the Passover as a thing of course, and that the Three Gospels, as we have seen, all speak of the Last Supper as being actually on the first day of the feast of unleavened bread, which is the Passover. (b) It has been conjectured that the Galilean usage as to the Passover may have varied from that of Judaea; but of this there is not the shadow of evidence, nor is it likely that the priests, who had to take part in the slaying of the Paschal lambs would have acquiesced in what would seem to them a glaring violation of their ritual. (c) Stress has been laid on the fact that in the later ritual of the Passover week a solemn meal was eaten on the day that followed the sacrifice of the Paschal lamb, which was known as the Čapagah (= festivity, or festive meal). This also was a feast upon flesh that had been offered in sacrifice, and it has been thought by some who seek to reconcile the four narratives, that this was the feast for which Judas was supposed to be ordered to make provision, that this was "the Passover, the prospect of which led the high priests to keep clear of entering under the roof of the Praetorium. In many ways this seems, at first, an adequate solution of the difficulty, but there is no evidence that the term "the Passover," which had such a strictly definite significance, was ever extended to include this subordinate festivity.

(4) It remains to examine the narratives somewhat more closely, and with an effort to realize, as well as we can, the progress of the events which they narrate. As a preliminary stage in the inquiry, we may note two or three facts which cannot well be excluded from consideration. (a) The narrative of the first Three Gospels, probably independent of each other, represents, on any assumption, the wide-spread tradition of the churches of Judaea, of Syria, and of Asia, of St. Matthew, St. Peter, and St. Paul. It is antecedently improbable that that tradition could have been wrong in so material a fact. (b) The Fourth Gospel, whether by St. John or a later writer, must, on any assumption, have been written when that tradition had obtained possession of well-nigh all the churches. It is antecedently improbable either that such a writer should contradict the tradition without knowing that he did so, or that, if he knew it, he should do so silently and without stating that his version of the facts was more accurate than that commonly received. It is at least a probable explanation of his omitting to narrate the institution of the Lord's Supper that the record of that institution was recited whenever the disciples met to break bread at Epheus as elsewhere (1 Cor. xi. 23-26), and that he felt, therefore, that it was better to record what others had left untold than to repeat that with which men were already familiar. If he was not conscious of any contradiction, then his mode of narrating, simply and without emphasis noting facts as they occurred, was natural enough.

(5) It remains to be seen whether there is, after all, any real discrepancy. Let us picture to ourselves, assuming for a time that the Last Supper was the Paschal meal, what was passing in Jerusalem on the afternoon of that 14th of Nisan. The Passover lamb was, according to the law (Ex. xii. 6; Lev. xxiii. 5; Num. ix. 3, 5), to be slain "between the two evenings." The meaning of the formula is not certain. If, as some have supposed, it meant between the evening of the 14th and that of the 15th of Nisan, it gives a space of twenty-four hours within which the lamb might be slain and eaten, and then the whole apparent tradition between the two narratives disappears. It was open to the disciples to eat their Passover on the 14th of Nisan, to the priests to eat theirs on the 15th. The occurrence, however, of the same expression in the rules as to the daily evening sacrifice (Ex. xxix. 39, 41; Num. xxviii. 4) excludes this interpretation, and it seems more probable that it covered the period that preceded and followed the setting of the sun. (Comp. Dent. vi. 2.) Looking to the prominence given to the ninth hour (3 P.M.), the connection with the evening sacrifice and prayer (Acts iii. 1), it would be probable enough that the slaughter of the Paschal lambs would begin at that hour, and this conclusion is expressly confirmed by Josephus, who states that they were slain from the ninth to the eleventh hour, i.e., from 3 to 5 P.M. (Wars, vi. 9, § 3). It is clear, however, that the process would take up the whole of that time, and would tend to stretch beyond it. Josephus (ut supra) reckons the number of lambs that had to be sacrificed at 270,000. Some were certain to begin their Paschal meal two hours before the others.
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and sent on their errand, as they had been once before on the "great day" of the Feast of Tabernacles (John vii. 37—45). Messages are despatched to call the members of the Sanhedrin (or, at least, a sufficient number for the purpose) to the hurried meeting, which was held before dawn. Assume these facts, and all runs smoothly. When Judas leaves, the disciples, looking forward to the usual festive Chagigah on the following day, the feast as distinct from the Passover, suppose that he is gone to prepare for that, and there is no ground for thinking that at that hour the markets would be shut, or that lambs, and bread, and wine might not be purchased, or, at least, ordered for the following day. When the priests, on the other hand, refused to enter into the Praetorium, "lest they should be defiled," it was because they, and they alone, perhaps, in all Jerusalem, had still to eat the Passover which others had eaten on the previous evening. Had their meal been due on the evening that followed the Crucifixion, their scruples would have been needless. They had but to wash and wait till sunset, and they would have been purified from all defilement. With them the case was more urgent. Probably even the pressure of hunger made them anxious to finish the untasted meal of the previous evening. It was them about 4 or 5 a.m. When Pilate gave his sentence it was "about the sixth hour," i.e., assuming St. John to use the Roman reckoning of the hours, 6 a.m. (But see Notes on John iv. 6, and xix. 14.) Then their work was done. As soon as they had left the matter in Pilate's hands they could eat their Passover, turning the supper into a breakfast. This they had time for while their Victim was being mocked by the Roman soldiers and led out to Calvary. When it was over, they were able to reappear between 9 a.m. and noon, and to bear their part in the mockings and blasphemies of the multitude (Matt. xxvii. 41; Mark xv. 31). The disciples, on the other hand, who had eaten their Passover, found nothing to hinder them (this is obviously true, at least, of the writer of the Fourth Gospel) from going into the Praetorium, hearing what passed between Pilate and his prisoner (John xvii. 38—40), and witnessing, it may be, the scourgings and the mockings. Joseph of Arimathea was not deterred by any fear of defilement from going to Pilate, for he too had, we must believe, eaten his Passover at the proper time (Matt. xxvii. 57).

(7) So far, then, on this view all is natural and consistent. St. John omits the fact of the meal being the Passover, which was not deterred by any fear of defilement from going to Pilate, for he too had, we must believe, eaten his Passover at the proper time (Matt. xxvii. 57).

(8) There remains only a few minor points above noticed. And (a) as to the Preparation. Here the answer lies on the surface. That name (Parasketē) was given to the day of the week, our Friday, the day before the Sabbath, and had absolutely nothing to do with any preparation for the Passover. The Gospels show beyond the shadow of a doubt (Mark xv. 42; Matt. xxvii. 62; Luke xxii. 54). If any confirmation were wanted, it may be found in the fact that the name is applied in a Graeco-Roman decree quoted by Josephus (Ant. xvi. 6, § 2) to the week-day which answers to our Friday. Even the phrase which seems most to suggest a different view, the "preparation of the Passover" in John xix. 14, does not mean more, on any strict interpretation, than the "Passover Friday," the Friday in the Passover week, and coming, therefore, before a Sabbath more solemn than others (John xix. 31). It may be noted further that the term Paraskēvit was adopted by the Church, Western as well as Eastern, as a synonym for the Dies Veneris, or Friday. (b) The supposed difficulty as to Simon of Cyrene is of the slightest possible character. There is nothing to indicate that he was coming from field-labour. And if he had eaten his Passover on the previous day, either in Jerusalem or its immediate neighbourhood, there was nothing either in law or custom to prevent his entering the city on the following morning. (c) The questions connected with the action of the priests, and the thoughts of the disciples as to the meaning of our Lord's command to Judas, have been already dealt with. It remains, in submitting this explanation to the judgment of the thoughtful reader, that I should acknowledge my obligations to the exhaustive article on Passover by the late Rev. S. Clark, M.A., in the Dictionary of the Bible, and to two articles on The Last Supper of the Lord in vols. viii. and ix. of the Contemporary Review by the Rev. Professor Milligan, D.D., of Aberdeen.

EXCURSUS G: THE MEANING OF THE WORD "PARACLETE." "A Paraclete, then, in the notion of the Scriptures is an Intercessor."—BP. PEARSON.

In the Notes on chaps. xiv. 16 and 26, xv. 26, and xvi. 7, the word Paraclete (παρακλητός) has been rendered Advocate in preference to "Comforter," which is the translation in the Authorised version. The object of this Excursus is to explain the sense of St. John, and to explain the phrase for which the older rendering is probably destined to become obsolete, i.e., for the present, holds a place in the memory and feelings of English readers, from which it will not be removed unless a sufficient reason be shown.

The facts of the case are briefly as follows:—

1. The word παρακλητός is a verbal adjective of passive signification, the simple meaning of which is "a person called to the side of another." It acquired the sense of an agent, and the constant meaning in the
classical writers is "Advocate," in the technical forensic sense. This latter word is of exactly the same formation, and expresses in Latin just what Paraclete expresses in Greek. No instance can be quoted in which παράκλητος is used by any classical writer in the sense of "Comforter." It is quite beside the question to quote passages in which derivatives of the same root are used in this sense; the point is that παράκλητος acquired a definite technical meaning, and neither has nor can have any other meaning.

(2) The classical usage being thus undoubted, we have next to examine its meaning in Biblical Greek. It nowhere occurs in the LXX. translation of the Old Testament, though other derivatives of the same root are common. In Job xvi. 2 ("miserable comforters are ye all") the active form, παράκλητος, is used, not the passive, παράκλητος. In the Greek of the New Testament it occurs only in this Gospel and in 1 John ii. 1, where it is rendered "Advocate." The phrase, "another Paraclete," in chap. xiv. 16, implies that Christ thought of Himself, as St. John in the Epistle speaks of Him, as a Paraclete; and no one can doubt that in these five passages the word has one and the same meaning. It can hardly be doubted, further, that the necessary meaning in the context is "Advocate," and if we follow that the meaning of the word in the Greek of St. John is the same as that in the Greek of the classical authors.

(3) That the meaning of "Advocate" was attached to the word in the Greek of the first and second Christian centuries may be seen from the following passages:

"For it was indispensable that the man who was consecrated to the Father of the world should have as a Paraclete His Son, the being most perfect in all virtue, to procure forgiveness of sins and a supply of unlimited blessings." (Philo, Vit. Mos. iii. 14; Bohn's Trans., vol. iii., p. 102.)

The student of Philo will find the word used in the same sense in de Josepho, § 40, and in Flaccem, §§ 3 and 5. These references are of special value from the fact that Philo was, like St. John, a Jew by birth and culture, who became later in life a student of the Greek language and literature. (Comp. Excursus A, p. 552.)

"Who will be our advocate if our deeds are found not to be holy and upright?" ( Clem. Rom. cap. 6.)

"Advocates of the rich, unjust judges of the poor, sinners in all things." (Ep. of Barnabas, cap. xx., speaking of those who walk in "the path of darkness;" Hooke's Trans., p. 101.)

(4) It is true that many Greek Fathers take παράκλητος, both in the Gospel and the Epistle, in the active sense. "He is called Paraclete," says Cyril of Jerusalem, "because He comforts, and consoles, and helps our weakness." (Catech. xvi. 20.) How this error arose—for that an error it is all analogy of words of like form goes to show—it is not difficult to see. The word παράκλητος occurs only five times in the New, and nowhere in the Old Testament. The cognate active forms, meaning comfort, exhort, console, occur frequently in the LXX., and considerably more than 100 times in the New Testament. Read, e.g., 2 Cor. i. 1—7. The ordinary sense, then, overrode the technical meaning of one form of the word, and the idea of advocacy was lost in that of comfort.

(5) The Vulgate reads in the Gospel Paracleatus, or Paracletus, and Advocatus in the Epistle; but the old Latin originally had Advocatus throughout. (Comp. Tertullian, adv. Prax. cap. ix.; De Monog. cap. iii.)

(6) These facts taken together have convinced most scholars who have investigated the question, that "Comforter" cannot be regarded as a tenable rendering of the Greek word παράκλητος, and the conviction is one which seems to be extending among English scholars. But here, as in other cases which we have met in the study of St. John, the attention of scholars has been directed too exclusively to the meaning of the Greek word. It is important to bear in mind that the author is, like Philo, a Jew writing Greek, and in this fact we shall, it is believed, find the true key to the sense in which he used the word. The Hebrews had, in their contact with other nations, borrowed many words from them, and it necessarily followed from the conquests of Greece and Rome that the Greek and Latin military and legal terms were well known to them. Now παράκλητος was, as we have seen above, a technical legal term, and it was literally taken over into the later Hebrew and written Paraklit, or, in the definite form, Paraklita. It means, when thus taken over, "Advocate," and a careful examination of the Talmudic passages, quoted in Buxtort and Levy, leaves the impression that it has no other meaning. The opposite Greek word, κατηγορος (Katagoros, accuser), was adopted in the same way. Like παράκλητος, it was clipped if its termination, and was written Katakegir. κατηγορος was used in Palestine in the first century we know from Acts xxiii. 30, 35; xxiv. 8, 16, 18; and from the interpolated passage, John viii. 10. In all these cases the full Greek word is used. But St. John himself has occasion to speak of an "accuser of the brethren" (Rev. xii. 10), and what word does he use? He actually writes in Greek the clipped Hebrew form Kattegor, a word which is wholly unknown to the Greek language, and which was so strange to copyists that they altered it, and wrote the fuller form. The Gospel and the Epistle tell us then of a Paraclete ever present with the believer, and of a Paraclete who is with the Father; the Apocalypse tells of the "Kattegor of the brethren." With this contrast in his mind, let the reader turn to such a passage as the following, taken from the Mishna, "Rabbi Elina ben Jacob saith, 'He that keepeth one commandment obtains for himself one Paraklit, he who obtains for himself one Katagor'" (Kittel, fol. 11); or the following, "If a man have distinguished Paraklita he is snatched from death" (Schab. fol. 32, 1); and it will be hardly necessary to produce further proof that Advocate is the true meaning of the word Paraclete. Two other important facts bearing upon the meaning of this word in the later Hebrew and Syriac languages, may, however, be noted. (a) The word Paraklita is twice used in the Targum on Job, viz., in xvi. 20, where the Targum reads, "My Paraklita are my friends" (Hebr., "My mockers are my friends;" or, "My friends scorn me," Auth. vers.), and in xxiii. 23, where it reads, "An angel as Paraclete," where the Hebrew is probably, "An angel as mediator;" Auth. vers., "A messenger with him, an interpreter." It is significant that Paraklita is not used in the Targum of Job xvi. 2 (see above, § 2), though it almost certainly would have been had it meant "Comforter," for it was at hand, and occurs in the very same chapter. (b) The word Paraklita is used in each of the passages in this Gospel, and also in the passage in the Epistle in the Peshito-Syriac translation. This fact means that the word was in the second century incorporated in the cognate Syriac language, and that if it be taken to mean Advocate in the Epistle it must
be so taken in the Gospel also. The same version also renders Κατέγρ in Rev. xii. 10 by a derivative of the Greek word.

(7) It is believed that enough has now been said to justify the rendering in the Notes, and to show that "Comforter" cannot be retained as a translation of παρελπς, at any rate in the modern sense of the word. It may be questioned, however, whether our translators did not include the sense of "Advocate" in the word "Comforter" (Low Lat., Confortare; Old Fr., Conforter), which originally meant "strengthener," "supporter." The older meaning of the word will be at once seen in the following passages from Wiclif's version:

"And he coumfortide hym with nailes that it shulde not be moued" (Isa. xli. 7; A.V., "fastened").

"And an angell apperide to him fro hevene and coumfortide him" (Luke xxii. 43; A.V., "strengthening him").

"And whanne he hadde take mete he was coumfortid" (Acts ix. 19; A.V., "he was strengthened").

"I mai alle thingis in him that coumf ortith me" (Phil. iv. 13; A.V., "that strengtheneth me").

This sense is not uncommon in Elizabethan English. Thus Hooker, e.g., says, "The evidence of God's own testimony, added unto the natural assent of reason, concerning the certainty of them, doth not a little comfort and confirm the same" (Eccles. Pol., Book i.);

and again,—

"The very prayer of Christ obtained angels to be sent Him as comforters in His agony" (Ibid., Bk. v. § 48).

The truth that the Holy Ghost is the Comforter is independent of this translation, and is, indeed, more fully established by the rendering Advocate. The comfort which comes from His presence is not simply that of consolation in sorrow, but, that of counsel, guidance, pleading with God, conviction of the world. He is to abide in the disciples for ever, and teach them all things (chap. xiv. 16, 17, 26); to witness with them of Christ (chap. xv. 26); to convict the world of sin, righteousness, judgment; to guide the disciples into all truth (chap. xvi. 7—13); to make intercession with groanings which cannot be uttered (Rom. viii. 26), as Christ Himself had done (chap. xvii.), and as the great High Priest ever liveth to do (Heb. vii. 25). He is "another Advocate," to be to believers in all time what Christ was to the first disciples, to be in men an Advocate on earth as Christ is for men an Advocate with the Father (1 John ii. 1). [Comp. Lightfoot On a Fresh Revision of the New Testament, pp. 50—55; Trench On the Authorised Version, p. 23; and especially Hare, Mission of the Comforter, Note K, p. 309, Ed. 3; and Pearson On the Creed, p. 329, Note. The student will find references to the Rabbinical writings and Targums in Schöttgen, vol. i., p. 1119, and Buxtorf's and Levy's lexicons under the words Πρακλητ(a), Κατέγρ(a), and Σαμνιγόρ.]