

CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL  
COMMENTARY  
ON  
THE NEW TESTAMENT.

BY  
HEINRICH AUGUST WILHELM MEYER, TH.D.,  
OBERCONSISTORIALRATH, HANNOVER.

*From the German, with the Sanction of the Author.*

THE TRANSLATION REVISED AND EDITED BY  
WILLIAM P. DICKSON, D.D.,  
AND  
FREDERICK CROMBIE, D.D.

PART I.  
*THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW.*  
VOL. I.

EDINBURGH:  
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.

PRINTED BY MORRISON AND GIBB LIMITED.

FOR

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.

LONDON: SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT, AND CO. LIMITED.

NEW YORK: CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS.

TORONTO: FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY.

CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL  
HANDBOOK  
TO THE  
GOSPEL OF MATTHEW.

BY  
HEINRICH AUGUST WILHELM MEYER, TH.D.,  
OBERCONSISTORIALRATH, HANNOVER.

TRANSLATED FROM THE SIXTH EDITION OF THE GERMAN BY  
REV. PETER CHRISTIE.

THE TRANSLATION REVISED AND EDITED BY  
FREDERICK CROMBIE, D.D.,  
PROFESSOR OF BIBLICAL CRITICISM, ST. MARY'S COLLEGE, ST. ANDREWS.

VOL. I.

EDINBURGH:  
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.

## PREFATORY NOTE BY THE EDITOR.

---



THE translation of this first volume of the *Commentary* on Matthew has been made from the last (sixth) edition of the original, which had been carefully revised by Dr. Meyer himself, and which has been recently edited from his manuscript, with very slight alterations, by Dr. Albert Ritschl, of Göttingen. The translator of the portion extending from the sixth chapter to the end is the Rev. Peter Christie, of Abbey St. Bathans, who has performed his work with care and ability ; but the whole has been revised and carried through the press by myself. As in the volumes of the series already published, reference has been made throughout to the English translations of Winer's and Buttman's Grammars of New Testament Greek, and frequently also to translations of other German works, quoted or referred to by Dr. Meyer. For the copious Bibliographical list prefixed to the book, I am indebted to my learned friend and co-editor Professor Dickson, who has also translated the biographical sketch of Dr. Meyer by his son, which accompanies it.

For a statement of the circumstances which have led to the issue of the *Commentary* of Dr. Meyer in an English translation, of the special grounds for preferring it to the kindred work of de Wette, and of the reasons which have induced the editors to undertake the work of revising the



several portions of the translation in the interests of technical accuracy and uniformity, the reader may be referred to the "General Preface," prefixed by Dr. Dickson to the volume first issued, viz. *Romans*, vol. I.

It is only necessary to say further, that the editors are not to be held as concurring in Dr. Meyer's opinions on some matters embraced in this volume, such as his theory of the original composition of the Gospel, and his views regarding the credibility of certain portions of the history.

FREDERICK CROMBIE.

ST. MARY'S COLLEGE, ST. ANDREWS

31<sup>st</sup> October 1877.

## BIOGRAPHICAL NOTICE OF DR. MEYER

BY HIS SON, DR GUSTAV MEYER, PH.D.

---



MY father, who died on the 21st June 1873, was born in Gotha on the 10th January 1800. On the 12th January he was baptized in the St. Margaret's Church, and received the names *Heinrich August Wilhelm*. His father was shoemaker to the ducal court, and was a native of Rügheim in Lower Franconia. An old family document,—a certificate of my grandfather's baptism,—composed with the pleasing diffuseness of the olden time, states that Rügheim was "under the dominion of the most reverend Prince and Lord of the Holy Roman Empire, Lord Francis Louis, Bishop of Bamberg and Würzburg." It is a peculiarity of this document, drawn up in 1781, that the name is never written Meyer, but always Majer or Mayer. My late father was a tender child, and a crayon portrait which has been preserved, representing him when a boy of about seven years of age, shows a pale and delicate face—in which, however, the large, earnest-looking eye suggests an active mind. His bodily training was anything but effeminate. He practised swimming and skating, not merely as a schoolboy and a student, but at a much later age, when such exercises had long been given up by many of his companions. And it was in truth not a time for rearing boys tenderly. One of his earliest recollections was of the autumn of 1806, when, not quite seven years old, he saw the prisoners from the battle of Jena confined in the churches of his native town. Gotha lay in the line of retreat

of the beaten French in the days of October 1813; and he was an eye-witness of the way in which the Cossacks drove before them and made havoc of the magnificent Imperial Guard.

He received his school training in the Gymnasium of his native town, which had a reputation passing far beyond the narrow bounds of the little province, and could point to pupils drawn from the most remote regions. His teachers were Döring, Kaltwasser, Galletti, Kries, Schulz, Regel, Uckert, Rost, and eventually also Bretschneider as religious instructor. At the Gymnasium of Gotha he laid the foundations of his classical culture; there he first acquired a deep and thorough familiarity with the laws of the Greek and Roman languages,—a tenacious adherence to which was a characteristic feature of his later labours, and not unfrequently brought on him the reproach of pedantic stiffness. While he greatly lamented the neglect of modern languages during his days at school, he was yet far from granting that the methods of instruction pursued in the Gymnasia of more recent times, or the requirements of the *Abiturient* examination, were preferable to those of his youth. He conceived that in former times there were greater facilities for each individual following out his own course of self-development. It was not to be denied that an *Abiturient* of the present day, after having passed a good examination, could show a greater extent and wider range of knowledge; but it was to be feared that this knowledge was more of an encyclopaedic nature, and excluded thoroughness and depth. Be this as it may,—and the question is not even now to be held as decided,—the grammar-schoolboy, August Meyer, who had gradually been advanced to the highest class and to the foremost place in it, must have been esteemed by his teachers as one who had well bestowed his time and strength on following out his predominant bias—bordering perhaps on one-sidedness—for the classical languages.

The third centenary celebration of the Reformation was duly honoured even in the Gymnasium at Gotha. To Meyer was entrusted the Latin address on the occasion, which was to be delivered in hexameters. There lies before me the third edition of Heyne's *Tibullus*, which was presented to him by

some of the citizens "in celebration of the jubilee festival of the Reformation, 1817, upon the recommendation of his teachers." Half a year after this incident, important at all events in the career of a grammar-schoolboy, namely, at Easter 1818, he passed his *Abiturient*-examination, and entered the University of Jena to study theology. "These were different times," he was wont to say, "from the present. Everything was much simpler and less luxurious than now, when the course of study costs more than twice as much, and yet not twice as much is learned." All honour to the greater simplicity of those days; but unless money had had a far greater value then than now, such a course of study, moderate as it was in price, would not have been possible for him even with the strictest frugality. The father of the young student of theology had sustained a serious loss of means by the continuance of the troubles of war, the quartering of troops in large numbers, severe sickness, and other misfortunes. His son cost him at Jena 80 thalers (£12) half-yearly. He had no exhibition, no free board; only he had, of course, mostly free clothing, the renewal of which was as a rule reserved for the holidays. And yet he was withal no recluse. The charm of the fresh student-life, which, just after the War of Liberation, burst into so fair a bloom, had strong attractions for him. He was a member of the great *Burschenschaft*. Most leaves of his note-book exhibited the crossed rapiers with the G. E. F. V. of the fraternity. Thoroughly simple must have been the social life of that joyous academic youth of 1818 and 1819! Should these lines perhaps meet the eyes of one or another of my father's old comrades, especially in Thuringia,—and some are still there, he was wont to say, but not many,—they will possibly awaken recollections of the cheap *Commerse* in the public market, of the drinking and guitar-playing, of the rapier duels fought out in the open street, of the journeyings home at vacation time,—fifteen hours on foot from Jena to Gotha, without putting up for the night, not seldom in bad weather, in snow and rain. Many who shared these journeys are doubtless no longer surviving. One who, on account of his ever-ready knowledge of Greek, was called by his friends the

Count of ἐπί, equally prepared for conflict with the rapier or with the tongue, was especially often mentioned by him, and held in sincere esteem. He was called away long before him, and died universally respected as a Head-master in our province. After the unhappy deed of Karl Sand in March 1819, and the dissolution of the great *Burschenschaft* which thereupon ensued, my father took no further part in student-life, but applied himself all the more zealously to those studies of which he had not hitherto been neglectful. His theological teachers were Gabler, Schott, Danz, Baumgarten-Crusius, Kosegarten the Orientalist, Eichstädt the philologist, Fries the philosopher, and Luden the historian. As he was fond of recalling—and not without regret that their days were over—the lectures read in Latin, such as Schott's, he often also, and with pleasure, called to mind the discussions on theological subjects, which were started by the young students even in their walks and were conducted *in Latin*. He felt himself least attracted by the prelections on philosophy; his whole bent was already at that time decidedly towards the field of languages.

After a curriculum of two years and a half, at Michaelmas 1820 he left the University; and entered, as domestic tutor, the educational institution of Pastor Oppermann, who subsequently became his father-in-law, at Grone near Göttingen. The time for young theologians then was similar to what it is now. They were wholly, or almost wholly, spared that long and laborious career of domestic tutorship, which led many a one, amidst the subsequent crowd pressing forward to the study of theology, to lose heart and hope. At Easter 1821 he underwent his examination as *candidate* at Gotha, and soon he had the choice between an appointment in the Gymnasium of his native city and a pastorate. He chose the latter; and in December 1822 was nominated as pastor at Osthausen in the district of Kranichfeld, which subsequently (1826) was ceded, on the division of the ducal inheritance, from Gotha to Meiningen. In January of the following year, when exactly twenty-three years old, he was installed as pastor in Osthausen; and in July of the same year he brought home from Grone to fair Thuringia his youth-

ful bride. How soon afterwards came a change of times! To the candidates who not long thereafter appeared in numbers exceeding the demand,—men, who had but finished their examinations at the age of thirty, whose hair not seldom began to get suspiciously grey while they were still domestic tutors, and who counted the duration of their affianced state at least by *lustres*,—it must have sounded almost like a fable, that a young theologian had established for himself a home of his own as an independent pastor at the age of twenty-three. God, who bestowed on him this great favour, granted to him also a duration of the married state for almost forty years.

The pleasant leisure which fell to the young pastor's lot in a community of about 400 souls—for which down to the close of his life he cherished the utmost affection—did not make his mind indolent or his hands idle. It was natural that so juvenile a pastor should still for a time address himself to private study before coming before the public as an author, and all the more so in his case, seeing that in 1827 he went to Hannover for the purpose of passing a *Colloquium*, with a view to acquire the privilege of naturalization in the then existing kingdom. But as early as the year 1829 there was issued by Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht—the esteemed publishing-house, with which he so long maintained most friendly relations—the first portion of his work on the New Testament, containing the Greek text and the German translation. In the year 1830 followed his *Libri symbolici Ecclesiae Lutheranae*. In the same year—as a fruit of his Colloquium, and probably also of the services already rendered by him in the field of theological literature—he was appointed as pastor at Harste, near Göttingen. Although he had paved the way for such a step by acquiring naturalization in 1827, and had by his marriage with the pastor's daughter in Grone become half a Hannoverian, and indeed a man of Göttingen, the breaking up of the home established seven years before at Osthausen was a sore trial to my parents. On the day after Christmas, amidst a severe snowstorm, when they doubly missed their wonted comfortable abode, they set out on their perilous journey from Osthausen amidst tears shed alike by those departing and by

those left behind. It was not till the third day that the hardships and perils of the winter-migration were over. Their new relations were not at first of too agreeable a nature. They needed to be gradually inured to their new position in life before they could feel themselves at home in it. With the far less perfect communication at that time between the several districts of our country, and with the loose connection subsisting between one portion of the Germanic Federation and another, a journey from the Meiningen to the Göttingen district was a more distant, and a transference of abode thither in more than one respect a more difficult, matter than at present. Yet, in spite of the many new impressions which had to be formed and assimilated,—the power of which did not permit him in the remotest degree to anticipate that he would part from this community also with deep pain,—my father did not allow his scientific labours to lie in abeyance. In the beginning of the year 1832 appeared the second part of his work on the New Testament, containing the Commentary. The long time that elapsed between the first part (1829) and the second is explained by “the change of his place of abode, and the edition of the *Libri symbolici*, issued in the jubilee-year of the Augsburg Confession” (Preface, 20th Jan. 1832). The Commentary, according to the original plan, was to form two divisions, the first of which was to extend to the Book of Acts (inclusive), and the second was to embrace the remaining books. That this idea proved a mistaken one; that the work has extended to 16 divisions; that his own strength did not suffice to overtake the constantly increasing labour; that new editions were continually needed; that an English translation of it is in the press,—all this is evidence of the rare favour which the Commentary has retained for more than forty years among the theological public of all schools. It would be surprising, if in so long a period the standpoint of the author, diligent as he was and unwearied in research, had not undergone modifications; and that in the course of years his views did become more positive, is a fact well known to his readers; but to the principle of grammatico-historical interpretation, on which so much stress is laid in the Preface

of 1832, he remained unalterably faithful down to the close of his life. And as a zealous representative of this school he will maintain his place in the history of exegesis, whatever new literary productions time may bring to light.

With a rare activity of mind, he had the skill to lay hold of whatever—whether from friends or from opponents—could be of service to him. The circumstance that he mastered without difficulty the contents of the most voluminous Latin exegetes, and most conscientiously consulted the old Greek expositors, cannot surprise us, when we consider his preponderant leaning to classical studies ; but the facts, that he used with ease commentaries written in English and French, that he never left out of view works composed in Dutch, and that he made himself master of Gothic so far as in a critical and exegetical point of view he had need of it,—all serve to attest alike his uncommon qualifications and his iron diligence. Everything new that made its appearance in the field of theological literature, especially in the domain of exegesis, excited his interest ; sparing in self-indulgence otherwise, he conceived that, so far as concerned the acquisition of books, he had need to put a restraint on himself ; as regards edition, place of publication, size, rarity, and the like, he had an astonishing memory. The administration of a large and liberally supported library seemed to him to be an enviable lot. The theological public hardly needs to be told that studies so comprehensive in range required of course years, and many years, to reach maturity, and that between the Commentary on Matthew of the year 1832 and the fifth edition of the same work in 1864, a very considerable difference in every respect is discernible. Among the MSS. left behind him I find a sixth edition of his Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew, which, although according to his own expression not yet quite ripe for the press, to judge from a superficial glance through it, deserves in every respect to be pronounced an improvement on its predecessor. He was in the habit of long polishing at a work and correcting it, before he marked it “ready for the press.” The ninth division—the Epistles to the Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon—was being printed in a fourth edition, when an



incurable visceral disorder threw him on his last short, but painful, sickbed.

It was beyond doubt in great measure a result of the favour which his Commentary enjoyed, that the author was at a comparatively early age withdrawn from the quiet work of a rural pastor and called to Hoya as superintendent at Michaelmas 1837. In this position as *Ephorus* and as preacher in a country town, whose inhabitants must be presumed to have had other claims than those of simple villagers, two aspects of his nature had opportunity to show and further develop themselves—that of the practical man of business, and that of the pulpit orator. In the first-named relation he was thoroughly exact; his principle was “to be always ready.” To postpone disagreeable affairs, to put off irksome reports, was just as impossible for him as to leave accounts unpaid. He vied with his fellow-commissary, the no less exact von Honstedt, former high-steward at Hoya, in the quick despatch of the business on hand, and the art of gaining something from the day—namely, by early rising. As a pulpit orator he strove honestly and with success to expound the word of the cross in plain and simple form as the power of God unto salvation, and he was listened to with pleasure so long as he acted as a preacher (till Midsummer 1848).

His ministry in Hoya lasted only four years, during which the publication of his Commentary went on with unabated vigour. At Michaelmas 1844 he was called to Hannover as Consistorialrath, Superintendent, and chief pastor of the *Neustädter St. Johanniskirche*. I well remember the many attestations of unfeigned affection and cordial attachment, when on the clear sunny autumn day, thirty-two years ago, he departed from Hoya to enter upon the more stirring and more responsible career before him in the capital. None but a man in the prime of his vigour could do justice at once to his position in the supreme ecclesiastical court, and to the duties of superintendent and pastor in a community of more than 5000 souls. He had but little ministerial help in his pastoral office. It was his duty to preach every Sunday forenoon; a scantily paid court-chaplain, who was obliged to make up the deficiency

of his income by giving private lessons, had regularly the service in the afternoon, and was expected, moreover, to act for him in any pastoral duties when at any time he was hindered from discharging them. But how often it happened that he was called away even from the sittings of the Consistory to administer baptism to infants apparently dying and the communion to the sick, because his court-chaplain was under the necessity of giving private lessons somewhere! It required, in truth, a stubborn following out of his principle of "being always ready" (as in fact it was his wont, almost without exception, to prepare for his sermon even on the Monday), to remain faithful to his vocation as an exegete amidst this burden of work. It was again the early hours of the morning which put him in a position to do so. He obtained an honourable recognition of the services thus rendered at Easter 1845, when he was nominated by the Faculty at Göttingen Doctor of Theology, "*propter eximiam eruditionem artemque theologicam eamque praecipue editis excellentissimis doctissimisque in libros Novi Testamenti commentariis, quibus consensu omnium de ornanda et amplificanda hermeneutica sacra praeclarissime meruit, comprobata.*"

Hitherto the lines of the son of the court-shoemaker in Gotha had fallen in pleasant places; but he was now to see days in which the hand of the Lord was to be laid heavily upon him. It was doubtless in part a result of the unusual demands made on his strength—to which was added his taking part in the Church Conference at Berlin in the winter of 1846—that at the end of February in that year he was stretched by a severe visceral affection on a sickbed, which long threatened to be his last. But the goodness of God averted the danger, and preserved him still for a number of years to his friends and to theological science. The strenuous care of the now long departed Hofrath Holscher was successful in putting him on the way to slow recovery, which was accelerated in a most gratifying manner by a visit to the mineral waters of Marienbad. But the old indomitable strength was gone. This he perceived only too plainly, even when he had for the second time gratefully felt the benefit

of the Bohemian medicinal springs. His weakened health imperatively demanded a change in his manner of life, and a consequent diminution of the burden of labour that lay upon him. Henceforth he became—what he had never previously allowed himself the time for—a habitual walker. Every morning between 7 and 8 o'clock, after having previously devoted some hours to exegesis, in wind and storm, summer and winter, even on the morning of the Sundays when he had to preach, he took his accustomed walk, to which he ascribed in no small degree his gradual recovery of strength. At the same time he became a zealous water-drinker, and he called water and walking his two great physicians. The lightening of his labour, that was so essentially necessary, came at Midsummer 1848, when he resigned his duties as Ephorus and pastor, in order to devote himself henceforth solely to the Consistory, in which, however, as may readily be understood, the measure of his labours became greater in point both of quality and of quantity. Many of the clergy of our province belonging to the days when there were still three examinations to be passed and that in Latin, will recollect with pleasure the time when he conducted the preliminary, and regularly took part in the stricter, trials. His easily intelligible Latin, and his definite and clear mode of putting questions, were specially spoken of with praise.

His aged mother witnessed with just pride his enjoyment of the fruit of his exertions; she did not die till the year 1851, after she had had, and had conferred, the pleasure of a visit to him at Hannover. On the Christmas eve of 1858 he stood by the bier of a son of much promise, who, as a teacher of the deaf and dumb at Hildesheim, was carried off by typhus, away from his parental home, in the flower of his age, at twenty-three. This blow was no doubt far more severe than that by which, in 1847, God took from him a boy of seven years; but under this painful trial the word of the cross approved itself to him a power of God. In May 1861 he became *Oberconsistorialrath*. The constant uncertainty of his health, moreover, and in particular a very annoying sleeplessness, made him even at that time entertain the idea of

superannuation. In the summer of 1863 he sought and found partial relief at the springs of Homburg. In January 1864 the hand of God dissolved the marriage-tie, which he had formed in the year 1823. In the preface to the fifth edition of the Commentary on St. Matthew he has penned a well-deserved tribute to the memory of the faithful companion of his life, who had shared with him the joys and sorrows of forty years.

From the Midsummer of this year down to his death—exactly, therefore, nine years—he lived under the same roof with me, affectionately tended by my wife, the teacher, friend, companion, I might almost say playmate, of his two granddaughters.

On 1st October 1865 he retired from official life, on which occasion, in honourable recognition of his lengthened services, he obtained a higher decoration of the Guelphic Order which he had already worn since 1847—the cross of a Commander of the Second Class. At first he retained some share in conducting the examinations; but this official employment, too, he soon gave up. Twice after his superannuation he was present by direction of the Government at Halle to take part in the Conference, which occupied itself with the settlement of a uniform text for Luther's translation of the Bible, and the fruit of which was the edition of 1870, published at the Canstein Bible-Institute. Now that, at the age of sixty-five, he was released from professional activity in the strict sense of the term, he could devote his life the more tranquilly to science and to the pleasure of the society of his friends. His two granddaughters accompanied him regularly on his walks in the morning; and I know several houses, the inmates of which looked out every day upon the company regularly making its appearance, in which hoary age, with blooming youth playing around it, seemed to return to the bright days of childhood. And the kindly grandfather in the midst of his granddaughters on these morning walks was not monosyllabic or mute. On these occasions jest and earnest alternated with instructions and reflections of the most varied character. Punctually every morning at the same

hour he returned home from these walks, which he continued to his last day of health. But he returned not in order to be idle. He was wont by way of joke, even after his superannuation, to speak of how precisely his time was meted out, and how strictly he had to husband it. The earlier rapidity of his writing no doubt ceased, and increasing age imperatively demanded pauses, where his more youthful vigour would not have even felt the need of a break.

To all political party-proceedings he was thoroughly hostile; but he followed the mighty events of the years 1866 and 1870 with the liveliest interest. When the German question was being solved by blood and iron, when old thrones tottered and fell, he had a cordial sympathy with much that was disappearing irretrievably; but he did not obstinately close his eyes to the gratifying fruit which sprang up on the bloody soil of 1866. Difficult as it certainly would have been for the old man to reconcile himself to altogether new relations of allegiance, he sincerely rejoiced over the increasing strength of Germany, and that with the greater reason, because he knew from the experiences of his youth how sad was the prospect in those days when Germany was simply a geographical idea. And if the year 1866 may have kept alive some bitter recollections now and then in one who had grown grey in the service of the kingdom of Hannover, he well understood the language of thunder, in which God spoke to the nations in 1870, and he recognised the sovereign sway of the Almighty, who with strong arm saved us from the house of bondage. To a man, who in the years of his boyhood had so often heard the French shout of victory, had seen the great Napoleon, had passed through the times of the Rhenish Confederation, and had grown up to manhood in the period when so many political hopes were nipped in the bud, the blows of Weissenburg and Wörth, the united onset of all Germans, appeared almost like a fable. How often he changed the direction of his accustomed walks, in order to hear at the telegraph-office of new victories and heroic deeds! And how grateful was he, who had shared in the times of sore

calamity and ignominy, for what God permitted the Germans to achieve! He was born under the last Emperor of the house of Hapsburg; could anything else be expected of the Protestant exegete, than that he should cordially rejoice at the mode in which the German Empire was reconstituted on the 18th January 1871 at Versailles?

In the sphere of religion, as in that of politics, all ill-temper and irritation were odious and repugnant to him. He had, in the course of time, as every reader of his exegetical work well enough knows, become more positive in his views; but he was far removed from any confessional narrow-mindedness or persecuting spirit. He desired that there should be no stunting or spoiling of the homely, simple words of Scripture either from one side or another; and he deeply lamented it, wherever it occurred, let the cause of it be what it would. He never concealed his conviction; it has gone abroad everywhere in many thousand copies of his book; and he carried with him to the grave the hope that it would please God, in His own time, to complete the work of the Reformation.

A mere outward observer of the tranquil and regular course of life of my late father might not surmise, but those who were in closer intercourse with him for the last two years could not conceal from themselves, that his day was verging to its close. No doubt he still always rose, summer and winter, immediately after four o'clock; he was constantly to be seen beginning his walks at the same time; his interest in his favourite science was still the same; but his daily life became more and more circumscribed in its range, and the pendulum of his day's work vibrated more and more slowly, so that its total cessation could not but be apprehended. The journeys to the house of his son-in-law, Superintendent Steding at Drausfeld, where he had so often found refreshment and diffused joy by his visits, had long since ceased. After a fall, which he met with about a year before his death, his walks were curtailed. To this outward occasion he attributed what was probably a consequence of gradual decline of strength and advancing age.

The Lord of life and death, who had so graciously dealt

with him for seventy-three years, as he himself most gratefully acknowledged, spared him also from prolonged suffering at the last. On the 15th June he still followed quite his usual mode of life; he spent the afternoon with contentment and cheerfulness in his garden, then took a little walk, and went to rest punctually at eight o'clock, as he always did in his latter years. The walk on that Sunday afternoon was to be his last, and the unfolding glories of the summer were not to be seen by him again with the bodily eye. During the night, towards one o'clock, he awoke us, as he was suffering from violent iliac pains. With the calmest composure he recognised the hand of the Lord, which would remove him from the scene of his rich and fruitful labours. He declared that he was willing and ready to depart, asking only for a speedy and not too painful end. The medical aid which at once hastened to his side afforded indeed momentary relief by beneficial injections of morphia; but the eye of science saw the same danger as those around him had immediately felt and foreboded.<sup>1</sup> It was an incurable visceral affection, which was conjectured to be connected with the severe illness that he had happily survived twenty-seven years before. On the 19th June a transient gleam of hope shone once more for a short time. "Willingly," he said on this day, after an uneasy night, "would I still remain with you; but willingly am I also ready to depart, if God calls me." It was but a brief gleam of the setting sun before the approach of night. This we could not but soon perceive, and this he himself saw with the manly Christian self-possession, by means of which he had been so often in life a comfort and example to us. Soon after there set in a state of half-slumber, during which the most diversified images flitted in chequered succession before his mind. Now he saw himself seated before a large page from the New Testament, on which he was employed in commenting, while he fancied

<sup>1</sup> I may here be allowed, under the natural impulse of melancholy recollection conscious of its indebtedness, to mention with the most sincere thanks the considerate and devoted care of the physicians in attendance on him—the chief-physician Dr. Köllner and chief-staff-physician Dr. Hübener. So often did they afford to their dying patient the great blessing of mitigating his pain, where their tried skill had limits assigned to it by a higher hand.

that he held the pipe in his mouth. In this way had he devoted many a quiet morning hour to his favourite study, when his window had been the only one lighted up in the street. Then, again, he busied himself with the Fatherland; "Germany, Germany above all," we heard him distinctly say. Was it that the recollections of his cheerful student-days, when the *Burschenschaft* was full of fervour and enthusiasm specially for the Fatherland, became interwoven with the mighty events of his latter years? Soon afterwards he saw clearly the cross, of which he had so often during his long life experienced and diffused the blessing. On the 20th June there was given the fatally significant intimation that he might be allowed to partake of anything which he wished. He made no further use of it than to take some beer, of which he had always been fond. But it was only for a passing moment; and the beer also soon remained untouched, just as his pipe and box, formerly his inseparable attendants, had since his sickness lost their power of attraction. Violent vomiting and the weary *singultus*, which hardly abated for a moment, announced but too plainly that the end of that busy life was closely approaching. Shortly before 10 P.M., on the 21st June, he entered without struggle upon his rest. His wish, often and urgently expressed during his lifetime and also on his deathbed, that his body might be opened for medical examination, was complied with on the following day. The result was to exhibit such visceral adhesion and intussusception,—beyond doubt an after-effect of his earlier illness,—that even the daring venture of a surgical operation could not have been attended with success. On Midsummer-day he was buried in the Neustädter churchyard, where he had so often, during the exercise of his pastoral functions, stood by the open grave of members of his flock. On the cross at his tomb are placed the words from Rom. xiv. 8: "Whether we live, we live unto the Lord; whether we die, we die unto the Lord. Whether we live therefore or die, we are the Lord's."



## PREFACE TO THE PRESENT (SIXTH) EDITION.

---



THE venerable author of the *Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Gospel of Matthew*, who was called away from this life just this day two years ago, left behind him a complete revision of the book with a view to a sixth edition of it. He was most conscientiously careful in keeping the successive editions, that were ever being called for, of the several portions of his *Commentary on the New Testament* thoroughly on a level with the competing critical and exegetical labours of his contemporaries. Accordingly he had prepared in good time the matter to be substituted for the fifth edition of the present part, which appeared in 1864. The few material changes and the supplementary additions, by which this edition is distinguished from its predecessor, are thus wholly the work of Meyer. The undersigned, out of friendship for the publisher, and out of dutiful affection towards the author, with whom he was closely connected in his latter years, undertook to look over the manuscript, and has accordingly deemed himself entitled merely to make alterations of minor compass in form and style. This Preface, therefore, has no other object than simply to introduce the book afresh to the theological public, to whom there is no need that I should descant on the merits of the deceased author in order to keep alive his memory and the enduring intellectual influence of his work.

PROFESSOR DR. A. RITSCHL

GÖTTINGEN, 21st June 1875.

## EXEGETICAL LITERATURE.



[THE following list—which is not meant to be exhaustive, but is intended to embrace the more important works in the several departments to which it applies—contains commentaries, or collections of notes, which relate to the New Testament as a whole, to the four Gospels as such, to the three Synoptic Gospels (including the chief Harmonies), or to the Gospel of Matthew in particular, along with the principal editions of the Greek New Testament that are referred to in the critical remarks prefixed to each chapter, and the more noteworthy Grammars and *Léxicons* of New Testament Greek. It does not include (with the exception of some half-dozen works that contain considerable exegetical matter) the large number of treatises dealing with questions of Introduction or of historical criticism in relation to the Gospels, because these are generally specified by Meyer when he refers to them; nor does it contain monographs on chapters or sections, which are generally noticed by Meyer *in loc.* Works mainly of a popular or practical character have, with a few exceptions, been excluded, since, however valuable they may be on their own account, they have but little affinity with the strictly exegetical character of the present work. The editions quoted are usually the earliest; *al.* appended denotes that the book has been more or less frequently reissued; † marks the date of the author's death; *c.* = *circa*, an approximation to it.—W. P. D.]

- ALBERTI (Johannes), † 1762, Prof. Theol. at Leyden: *Observationes philologicae in sacros N. F. libros.* 8°, Lugd. Bat. 1725.  
 ALEXANDER (Joseph Addison), D.D., † 1860, Prof. Bibl. and Eccl. History at Princeton: *The Gospel according to Matthew explained.* 12°, New York [and Lond.] 1861.  
 ALFORD (Henry), D.D., † 1871, Dean of Canterbury: *The Greek Testament, with a critically revised text . . . and a critical and exegetical commentary.* 4 vols. 8°, Lond. 1849–61, *al.*

- ANGER** (Rudolph), † 1866, Prof. Theol. at Leipzig: *Synopsis Evangeliorum Matthaei, Marci, Lucae*. . . . 8°, Lips. 1852.
- ANNOTATIONS** upon all the books of the O. and N. Testament . . . by the joint labour of certain learned divines thereunto appointed . . . [by the Westminster Assembly of Divines]. 2 vols. 2°, Lond. 1645, *al.*
- ANSELM**, of Laon, † 1117, Teacher of Schol. Theol. at Paris: *Glossa interlinearis*. 2°, Basil. 1502, *al.*
- AQUINAS** (Thomas), † 1274, Scholastic philosopher: *Catena vere aurea in quatuor Evangelia*. 2°, s. l. 1474, *al.*  
[Translated by Dr. Pusey and others. 4 vols. in 8. 8°, Oxf. 1841-45.]
- ARETIUS** (Benedict), † 1574, Prof. Theol. at Berne: *Commentarii in quatuor Evangelia*. 8°, Lausannae, 1577, *al.*  
*Commentarii in N. T.* 2°, Paris. 1607, *al.*
- ARIAS MONTANO** (Benito), † 1598, Spanish monk, Editor of the *Antwerp Polyglott*: *Elucidationes in quatuor Evangelia*. 4°, Antwerp. 1573.
- ARNAULD** (Antoine), † 1694, Port Royalist. *Historia et concordia evangelica*. 12°, Paris. 1643, *al.*
- ARNOLDI** (Matthias): *Commentar zum Evangelium des h. Matthäus*. 8°, Trier, 1856.
- AUGUSTINUS** (Aurelius), † 430, Bishop of Hippo: *Exegetica commentaria in N. T., viz. De consensu Evangelistarum libri iv.; De sermone Domini in Monte libri ii.; Quaestionum Evangelicorum libri ii.; Quaestionum septendecim in Evang. secundum Matthaeum liber i.; In Joannis Evangelium tractatus cxiv.; in Epistolam Joannis ad Parthos tractatus x.; Expositio quarundam propositionum ex Epistola ad Romanos, liber i.; Epistolae ad Romanos inchoata expositio, liber i.; Expositio Epistolae ad Galatas, liber i.* [Opera, tom. iii. ed. Benedict. 2°, Paris. 1680, *al.*]  
[Partly translated in "Library of the Fathers" and in "Works of St. Augustine."]
- BAUMGARTEN-CRUSIUS** (Ludwig Friedrich Otto), † 1843, Prof. Theol. at Jena: *Commentar über das Evang. das Matthäus [und über die Evang. des Markus und Lukas]*. 8°, Jena, 1844-45.
- BAXTER** (Richard), † 1691, Nonconformist divine: *A paraphrase on the N. T., with notes*. . . . 4°, Lond. 1685, *al.*
- BEAUSOBRE** (Isaac de), † 1738, French pastor at Berlin: *Remarques historiques, critiques et philologiques sur le N. T.* 2 tomes. 4°, La Haye, 1742.

- And LENFANT (Jacques), † 1728, French pastor at Berlin :  
 Le N. T. . . . traduit en françois . . . avec des notes littérales,  
 pour éclairir le texte. 2 tomes. 4°, Amst. 1718, *al.*
- BEDA (Venerabilis), † 735, monk at Jarrow : *Commentarii in quatuor Evangelia.* [Opera.]
- BEELEN (Jean-Théodore), R. C. Prof. Or. Lang. at Louvain : *Grammatica Graecitatis N. T.* . . . 8°, Lovanii, 1857.
- BENGEL (Johann Albrecht), † 1751, Prelate in Wurtemberg : *N. T. Graecum ita adornatum, ut textus probatarum editionum medullam, margo variantium lectionum . . . delectum, apparatus subjunctus criseos sacrae, Millianae praesertim, compendium, limam, supplementum ac fructum exhibeat.* 4°, Tubing. 1734, *al.*
- Gnomon N. T., in quo ex nativa verborum vi simplicitas, profunditas, concinnitas, salubritas sensuum coelestium indicatur. 4°, Tubing. 1742, *al.* [Translated by Rev. A. R. Faussett. 5 vols. Edin. 1857–58, *al.*]
- Richtige Harmonie der vier Evangelisten. 8°, Tübing. 1736, *al.*
- BERLEPSCH (August, Freiherr von) : *Quatuor N. T. Evangelia . . . orthodoxe explanata.* . . . Ratisb. 1849.
- BÉZE [BEZA] (Theodore de), † 1605, Pastor at Geneva : *N. T. sive N. Foedus, cujus Graeco textui respondent interpretationes duae, una vetus, altera nova Theodori Bezae . . . Ejusdem Th. Bezae annotationes . . .* 2°, Genev. 1565, *al.*
- BISPING (August), R. C. Prof. Theol. at Münster : *Exegetisches Handbuch zum N. T.* 9 Bände. 8°, Münster, 1867–76.
- BLEEK (Friedrich), † 1859, Prof. Theol. at Bonn : *Synoptische Erklärung der drei ersten Evangelien.* 2 Bände. 8°, Leip. 1862.
- BLOOMFIELD (Samuel Thomas), D.D., † Vicar of Bisbrooke : *The Greek Testament, accompanied with English notes, critical, philological, and exegetical.* 2 vols. 8°, Lond. 1829, *al.*
- Recensio synoptica annotationis sacrae . . .* 8 voll. 8°, Lond. 1826–28.
- BOS (Lambert), † 1717, Prof. of Greek at Franeker : *Observationes miscellaneae ad loca quaedam . . . N. F.* 8°, Franek. 1707.
- Exercitationes philologicae in quibus N. F. loca nonnulla ex auctoribus Graecis illustrantur.* 8°, Franek. 1700, *al.*
- BRENT (Johann), † 1570, Provost at Stuttgart : *Commentarii in Matthaeum, Marcum et Lucam.* [Opera. Tom. v.] 2°, Tubing. 1590.
- BRETSCHNEIDER (Karl Gottlieb), † 1848, General Superintendent at Gotha : *Lexicon manuale Graeco-Latinum in libros N. T.* 2 voll. 8°, Lips. 1824, *al.*

- BROWN (John), D.D., † 1858, Prof. Exeg. Theol. to United Presbyterian Church, Edinburgh : Discourses and sayings of our Lord illustrated in a series of expositions. 3 vols. 8°, Edin. 1850.
- BROWN (David), D.D., Principal of Free Church College at Aberdeen : A commentary, critical, experimental, and practical, on the New Testament. [Vols. V. VI. of Commentary . . . by Dr. Jamieson, Rev. A. R. Fausset, and Dr. Brown. 8°, Glasg. 1864-74.]
- BUCER (Martin), † 1551, Prof. Theol. at Cambridge : In sacra quatuor Evangelia enarrationes perpetuae. . . . 8°, Argent. 1527, *al.*
- BULLINGER (Heinrich), † 1575, Pastor at Zürich. N. T. historia evangelica sigillatim per quatuor Evangelistas descripta, una cum Act. Apost. omnibusque Epistolis Apostolorum explicata commentariis. 2°, Turici, 1554, *al.*
- BUNSEN (Christian Carl Josias von), † 1860, German statesman : Vollständiges Bibelwerk für die Gemeinde. . . . 10 Bände. 8°, Leip. 1858-70.
- [Band IV. Die Bücher des N. B. Herausgegeben von Heinrich Julius Holtzmann.]
- BURMAN (Franciscus), † 1719, Prof. Theol. at Utrecht : Harmonie ofte overeenstemminge der vier h. Evangelisten. 4°, Amst. 1713, *al.*
- BURTON (Edward), D.D., † 1836, Prof. Theol. at Oxford : The Greek Testament with English notes. 2 vols. 8°, Oxf. 1831, *al.*
- BUTTMANN (Alexander), retired Professor at Berlin : Grammatik des neuest. Sprachgebrauchs, im Anschlusse an Ph. Buttmann's Griechische Grammatik bearbeitet. 8°, Berlin, 1859.
- [Authorized translation (by J. H. Thayer), with numerous additions and corrections by the author. 8°, Andover, 1873.]
- CAJETANUS [TOMMASO DA VIO], † 1534, Cardinal : In quatuor Evangelia et Acta Apostolorum . . . ad sensum quem vocant literalem commentarii. . . . 2°, Venet. 1530, *al.*
- CALIXTUS (Georg), † 1656, Prof. Theol. at Helmstädt : Quatuor Evangelicorum scriptorum concordia, et locorum . . . difficiliorum explicatio. 4°, Halberstadii, 1624, *al.*
- CALMET (Augustin), † 1757, Abbot of Senones : Commentaire litteral sur tous les livres de l'A. et du N. Testament. 23 tomes. 4°, Paris, 1707-16, *al.*
- CALOVIVS (Abraham), † 1676, General Superintendent at Wittenberg : Biblia Testamenti Veteris [et Novi] illustrata. . . . 2°, Francof. ad M. 1672-76, *al.*
- [Tom. IV. Cum Harmonia evangelica noviter concinnata.]

- CALVIN [CHAUVIN] (Jean), † 1564, Reformer: *Commentarii in Harmoniam ex Evangelistis tribus . . . compositam*. . . .  
 2°, Genev. 1553, *al.*  
 [Translated by Rev. W. Pringle. 8°, Edin. 1844-45.]
- CAMERARIUS (Joachim), † 1574, Prof. of Greek at Leipzig: *Notatio figurarum sermonis in quatuor libris Evangeliorum, indicata verborum significatione et orationis sententia*. . . . *Et in scriptis apostolicis*. . . .  
 4°, Lips. 1572.  
 Subsequently issued under the title, "*Commentarius in N. F.* . . ." along with Beza's *N. T. and Annotations*.  
 2°, Cantab. 1642.
- CAMERON (John), † 1625, Prof. Theol. at Montauban: *Praelectiones in selectiora quaedam loca N. T.* 3 voll. 4°, Salmur. 1626-28, *al.*  
*Myrothecium evangelicum, hoc est, N. T., loca quamplurima vel illustrata, vel explicata vel vindicata*. . . . 4°, Genev. 1632.
- CAMPBELL (George), D.D., † 1796, Principal of Marischal College, Aberdeen: *The four Gospels translated from the Greek, with preliminary dissertations and notes critical and explanatory*. 2 vols. 4°, Lond. 1789, *al.*
- CAPPEL (Jacques) [CAPPELLUS], † 1624, Prof. Theol. at Sedan: *Observationes in N. T.* . . . nunc demum . . . in lucem editae, procurante Ludovico Cappello [† 1658, Prof. Theol. at Saumur] . . . una cum ejusdem Lud. Cappelli *Spicilegio*. . . .  
 4°, Amstel. 1657.
- CARPENTER (Lant), LL.D., † 1840, Unitarian Minister at Bristol: *A harmony or synoptical arrangement of the Gospels*. 2d ed. 8°, Lond. 1838.
- CARTWRIGHT (Thomas), † 1603, Puritan divine: *Harmonia evangelica, commentario analytico, metaphrastico et practico illustrata*. 4°, Amstel. 1627, *al.*
- CASTALIO [CHATEILLON] (Sebastian), † 1563, Prof. of Greek at Basel: *Biblia V. et N. T. ex versione Sebast. Castalionis cum ejusdem annotationibus*. 2°, Basil. 1551, *al.*
- CATENAE Patrum. See CRAMER, CORDERIUS, POSSINUS.
- CHAPMAN (Richard), B.A. *A Greek harmony of the Gospels* . . . with notes. 4°, Lond. 1836.
- CHEMNITZ (Martin), † 1586, Teacher of Theol. at Brunswick: *Harmonia quatuor Evangelistarum, a . . . D. Martino Chemnitio primum inchoata: D. Polycarpo Lysero post continuata, atque D. Johanne Gerharδο tandem felicissime absoluta*. 3 voll. 2°, Francof. 1652, *al.*  
 [First issued separately, 1593-1627.]
- CHRYSOSTOMUS (Joannes), † 407, Archbishop of Constantinople: *Homiliae in Matthaeum* [Opera, ed. Bened. VII., *al.*].—*Homiliae*

in Matth. Graece, textum . . . emendavit, praecipuam lectionis varietatem adscripsit, annotationibus . . . instruxit Fredericus Field. 3 voll. 8°, Cantab. 1839.

[Translated in "Library of the Fathers." 8°, Oxf. 1843-51.]

CHYTRAEUS [KOCHHAFF] (David), † 1600, Prof. Theol. at Rostock: Commentarius in Evangelium Matthaei. 8°, Vitemb. 1555, *al.*

CLARIO [CLARIUS] (Isidoro), † 1555, Bishop of Foligno: Vulgata editio V. et N. T., quorum alterum ad Graecam veritatem emendatum est . . . adjectis . . . scholiis . . . locupletibus. . .

2°, Venet. 1542, *al.*

CLARKE (Adam), † 1832, Wesleyan minister: The Bible . . . with a commentary and critical notes. 8 vols. 4°, Lond. 1810-26.

CLARKE (Samuel), D.D., † 1729, Rector of St. James', Westminster: A paraphrase of the four Evangelists . . . with critical notes on the more difficult passages. 4°, Lond. 1701-02, *al.*

CLAUSEN (Henrik Nicolai), Prof. Theol. at Copenhagen: Quatuor Evangeliorum tabulae synopticae. Juxta rationes temporum . . . composuit, annotationibusque . . . instruxit H. N. Clausen.

8°, Kopenh. 1829.

Fortolkning af de synoptiske Evangelier. 2 parts.

8°, Copenh. 1850.

CLERICUS [LE CLERC] (Jean), † 1736, Prof. Eccles. Hist. at Amsterdam: Harmonia evangelica Graece et Latine. . .

2°, Amstel. 1699, *al.*

[Translated. 4°, Lond. 1701. See also HAMMOND.]

CONANT (Thomas J.), D.D., Prof. Heb. at New York: The Gospel of Matthew . . . With a revised version, and critical and philological notes. [American Bible Union.] New York, 1860.

CORDERIUS [CORDIER] (Balthasar), † 1650, Jesuit: Catena Graecorum patrum triginta in Matthaeum, collectore Niceta episcopo Serrarum. Cum versione Latina ed. B. Corderius.

2°, Tolosae, 1647.

CRAMER (John Anthony), D.D., † 1848, Principal of New Inn Hall, Oxford: Catenae Graecorum Patrum in Novum Testamentum. 8 voll. 8°, Oxon. 1838-44.

CRELL (Johann), † 1633, Socinian teacher at Racow: Opera omnia exegetica sive in plerosque libros N. T. commentarii . . . [Opera. I.-III.] 2°, Eleutheropoli [Amstel.], 1656.

CREMER (Hermann), Prof. Theol. at Greifswald: Biblisch-theologisches Wörterbuch der neutestamentlichen Graecität.

8°, Gotha, 1866, *al.*

[Translated by D. W. Simon, Ph.D., and William Urwick, M.A.]

8°, Edin. 1872.]

CRITICI SACRI sive doctissimorum virorum in sacra Biblia annotationes

et tractatus [In N. T. : Vallae, Revii, Erasmi, Vatabli, Castalionis, Munsteri, Clarii, Drusii, Zegeri, Grotii, Scaligeri, Cameroni, Pricaei et aliorum]. 9 tomi. 2°, Lond. 1660, *al.*

DEYLING (Salomon), † 1755, Prof. Theol. at Leipzig: *Observationes sacrae, in quibus multae Scripturae V. ac N. T. dubia vexata solvuntur, loca difficiliora . . . illustrantur. . . .* 5 partes.

4°, Lips. 1708-48, *al.*

DICKSON (David), † 1662, Prof. Theol. at Edinburgh: *A brief exposition of the Gospel according to Matthew.* 12°, Lond. 1651.

DIEU (Louis de), † 1642, Prof. at Walloon College, Leyden: *Animadversiones sive commentarius in quatuor Evangelia. . . .*

4°, Lugd. Bat. 1631, *al.*

*Critica sacra, seu animadversiones in loca quaedam difficiliora V. et N. T. variis in locis ex auctoris manuscriptis aucta.*

2°, Amstel. 1693.

DILHERR (Johann Michael), † 1669, Prof. Theol. at Nürnberg: *Eclogae sacrae N. T. Syriacae, Graecae et Latinae, cum observationibus philologicis.* 12°, Jenae, 1638, *al.*

DIONYSIUS CARTHUSIANUS [DENYS DE RYCKEL], † 1471, Carthusian monk: *Commentarii in universos S. S. libros.* 2°, Colon. 1530-36.

DODDRIDGE (Philip), D.D., † 1751, Nonconformist minister at Northampton: *The family expositor; or, a paraphrase and version of the N. T., with critical notes. . . .* 3 vols.

4°, Lond. 1738-47, *al.*

DOUGHTY [DOUGTAEUS] (John), † 1672, Rector of Cheam, Surrey: *Analecta sacra, sive excursus philologici breves super diversis S. S. locis.* 2 voll. 8°, Lond. 1658-60, *al.*

DRUSIUS (Joannes) [VAN DEN DRIESCHE], † 1616, Prof. Or. Lang. at Franeker: *Annotationum in totum Jesu Christi Testamentum; sive praeteritorum libri decem. Et pars altera. . . .*

4°, Franek. 1612-16.

*Ad voces Ebraeas N. T. commentarius duplex.*

4°, Franek. 1606, *al.*

EBRARD (Johann Heinrich August), Consistorialrath at Erlangen: *Wissenschaftliche Kritik der evangelischen Geschichte. . . .*

8°, Erlangen, 1841, *al.* 3<sup>te</sup> Auflage. 8°, Frankf. 1866.

[Translated in "Foreign Theological Library."]

ECKERMANN (Jakob Christian Rudolph), † 1836, Prof. Theol. at Kiel: *Erklärung aller dunklen Stellen des N. T.* 3 Bände.

8°, Kiel, 1806-08.

EICHTHAL (Gustave de), *Les Evangiles.* 1<sup>re</sup> partie: *examen critique et comparatif des trois premiers Evangiles.* 8°, Paris, 1863.



- ELSLEY (J.), M.A., Vicar of Burneston: Annotations on the Four Gospels; compiled and abridged. . . . 2 vols.  
8°, Lond. 1799, *al.*
- ELSNER (Jakob), † 1750, Consistorialrath at Berlin: Observationes sacrae in N. F. libros. . . . 2 voll. 8°, Traject. 1720-28.  
Commentarius critico-philologicus in Evangelium Matthaei, edidit et notulas quasdam adjecit Ferdinandus Stosch. 2 voll. 4°, Zwollae, 1767-69.
- ELZEVIUS, or ELZEVIER, name of the celebrated family of printers at Leyden. The abbreviation Elz. denotes the edition of the N. T. issued in 1633 [N. T. Ex regis aliisque optimis editionibus cum cura impressum, 12°, Lugd. 1633], and frequently reprinted, which presents what is called the *Textus Receptus*.
- EPISCOPIUS (Simon), † 1643, Prof. Theol. at Amsterdam: Notae breves in xxiv. priora capita Matthaei. [Opera theol. 2°, Amstel. 1650.]
- ERASMUS (Desiderius), † 1536: Novum Testamentum omne, diligenter recognitum et emendatum. . . . 2°, Basil. 1516. *Editio princeps* followed by others edited by Erasmus in 1519, 1522, 1527, and 1535.—Adnotationes in Novum Testamentum, 2°, Basil. 1516, *et al.*—Paraphrases in Novum Testamentum, 2°, Basil. 1522, *et al.* [Translated. 2 vols. 2°, Lond. 1548, *al.*]
- EUTHYMIUS ZIGABENUS, † c. 1118, Greek monk: Commentarius in quatuor Evangelia Graece et Latine. Textum Graecum . . . suis animadversionibus edidit C. F. Matthaei. 3 tomi in 4. 8°, Lips. 1792.
- EWALD (Georg Heinrich August), † 1876, Prof. Or. Lang. at Göttingen: Die drei ersten Evangelien übersetzt und erklärt. 8°, Götting. 1850, *al.*
- FABRICIUS (Johann Albrecht), † 1736, Prof. Eloq. at Hamburg: Observationes selectae in varia loca N. T. 8°, Hamb. 1712.
- FERUS [WILD] (Johannes), † 1554, Cathedral Preacher at Mentz: Enarrationes in Matthaëum. 2°, Mogunt. 1559, *al.*
- FISCHER (Johann Friedrich), † 1799, Principal of the Fürsten Collegium at Leipzig: Prolusiones in quibus varii loci librorum divinatorum utriusque Testamenti . . . explicantur atque illustrantur. . . . 8°, Lips. 1779.
- FLACIUS Illyricus (Matthias) [FLACH], † 1575, Prof. Theol. at Jena: Clavis scripturae sacrae, seu de sermone sacr. litterarum. 2°, Basil. 1567, *al.*  
Glossa compendiaria in Novum Testamentum. 2° Basil. 1570, *al.*

- FRIEDLIEB** (Joseph Heinrich), R. C. Prof. Theol. at Breslau: *Quatuor Evangelia sacra in harmoniam redacta* . . . 8°, Vratisl. 1847.
- FRITZSCHE** (Karl Friedrich August), † 1846, Prof. Theol. at Rostock: *Evangelium Matthaei recensuit et cum commentariis perpetuis edidit D. C. F. A. Fritzsche.* 8°, Lips. 1826.
- GAGNAEUS** (Johannes) [Jean de GAGNÉE], † 1549, Rector of Univ. of Paris: *In quatuor . . . Evangelia necnon Actus Apostolorum scholia ex praecipuis Graecorum et Latinorum scriptis selecta.* 2°, Paris. 1552, *al.*
- GEHRINGER** (Joseph), R. C.: *Synoptische Zusammenstellung des griechischen Textes der vier Evangelien.* 8°, Tübing. 1842.
- GERHARD** (Johann), † 1637, Prof. Theol. at Jena: *Adnotationes posthumae in Evangelium Matthaei.* 2°, Jenae, 1663. *Harmonia quatuor Evangelistarum.* See CHEMNITZ (Martin).
- GILL** (John), † 1771, Baptist pastor in Southwark: *An exposition of the New Testament.* 3 vols. 2°, Lond. 1743–48, *al.*
- GLÖCKLER** (Conrad): *Die Evangelien des Matthäus, Markus, und Lukas in Uebereinstimmung gebracht und erklärt.* 2 Abtheilungen. 8°, Frankf. 1834.
- GRATZ** (Aloys): *Kritisch-historischer Commentar über das Evangelium Matthaei.* 2 Theile. 8°, Tübing. 1821–23.
- GREEN** (Thomas Sheldon), M.A., Headmaster of Grammar School at Ashby de la Zouch: *Treatise on the grammar of the N. T. dialect.* . . . 8°, Lond. 1842, *al.*
- GRESWELL** (Edward), B.D., Vice-Pres. of Corpus Christi Coll., Oxford: *Harmonia evangelica, sive quatuor Evangelia Graece, pro temporis et rerum serie in partes quinque distributa.* 8°, Oxon. 1830, *al.*
- Dissertations upon the principles and arrangement of a Harmony of the Gospels.* 3 vols. 8°, Oxf. 1830.
- An exposition of the parables and of other parts of the Gospels.* 5 vols. in 6. 8°, Oxf. 1834–35.
- GRIESBACH** (Johann Jakob), † 1812, Prof. Theol. at Jena: *Novum Testamentum Graece. Textum ad fidem codicum, versionum et Patrum recensuit et lectionis varietatem adjecit D. Jo. Ja. Griesbach. Editio secunda.* 8°, Halis, 1796–1809, *al.*
- Synopsis Evangeliorum.* . . . 8°, Halae, 1776, *al.*
- GRIMM** (Karl Ludwig Willibald), Prof. Theol. at Jena: *Lexicon Graeco-Latinum in libros Novi Testamenti.* 8°, Lips. 1868.
- GRINFIELD** (Edward William), M.A.: *N. T. Graecum. Editio Hellenistica.* 2 voll. *Scholia Hellenistica in N. T.* . . . 2 voll. 8°, Lond. 1843–48.

- GROTIUS** (Hugo), † 1645, Dutch statesman: *Annotationes in N. T.* 2°, Paris, 1644. *al.*—*Annotationes in N. T. Denuo emendatius editae.* 9 voll. 8°, Groning. 1826–34.
- HAHN** (August), † 1863, General Superintendent in Breslau: *N. T. Græce, post J. A. H. Tittmannum ad fidem optimorum librorum secundis curis recognovit, lectionumque varietatem subjecit Augustus Hahn.* 8°, Lips. 1840.
- HAMMOND** (Henry), D.D., † 1660, Sub-dean of Christ Church, Oxford: *Paraphrase and annotations upon all the books of the N. T.* 2°, Lond. 1653, *al.*  
[*Ex Anglica lingua in Latinum transtulit suisque animadversionibus auxit J. Clericus.* 2°, Amstel. 1698, *al.*]
- HARDOUIN** (Jean), † 1729, Jesuit: *Commentarius in N. T.* 2°, Hagae-Com. 1741.
- HEINSIUS** (Daniel), † 1665, Prof. Hist. at Leyden: *Sacrarum exercitationum ad N. T. libri xx.* . . . 2°, Lugd. Bat. 1639, *al.*
- HENGEL** (Wessel Albert van), Prof. Theol. at Leyden: *Annotatio ad loca nonnulla N. T.* 8°, Amstel. 1824.
- HEUMANN** (Christoph August), † 1764, Prof. Theol. at Göttingen: *Erklärung des N. T.* 12 Bände. 8°, Hannov. 1750–63.
- HIERONYMUS** (Eusebius Sophronius), † 420, monk at Bethlehem: *Commentarius in Matthaeum.* [Opera.]
- HILARIUS** Pictaviensis, † 368, Bishop of Poitiers: *In Evangelium Matthaei commentarius.* [Opera. I. ed. Bened.] 2°, Paris. 1693.
- HOLTZMANN** (Heinrich Johann), Prof. Theol. in Heidelberg: *Die Synoptische Evangelien, ihr Ursprung und geschichtlicher Charakter.* [See also BUNSEN.] 8°, Leip. 1863.
- HOMBERGH** zu Vach (Johann Friedrich), † 1748, Prof. of Laws at Marburg: *Parerga sacra, seu observationes quaedam ad N. T.* 4°, Traj. ad Rhen. 1712, *al.*
- HUNNIUS** (Aegidius), † 1603, General Superintendent at Wittenberg: *Thesaurus evangelicus complectens commentarios in quatuor Evangelistas et Actus Apost. nunc primum hac forma editus.* 2°, Vitemb. 1706.  
*Thesaurus apostolicus, complectens commentarios in omnes N. T. Epistolas et Apocalypsin Joannis . . . novis, quae antea deficiebant, commentationibus auctus . . .* 2°, Vitemb. 1707. [Also, *Opera Latina*, III., IV. 2°, Vitemb. 1607.]
- JANSENIUS** (Cornelius), † 1638, R. C. Bishop of Ypres: *Tetrateuchus; seu commentarius in quatuor Evangelia.* 4°, Lovanii, 1639, *al.*

- JANSENIUS** (Cornelius), † 1576, R. C. Bishop of Ghent: *Concordia evangelica*. . . . 4°, Lovanii, 1549, *al.*  
*Commentariorum in suam Concordiam ac totam historiam evangelicam partes IV.* 2°, Lovanii, 1571, *al.*
- JUNIUS** (Franciscus) [FRANCOIS DU JON], † 1602, Prof. Theol. at Leyden: *Sacra parallela, id est, comparatio locorum S. S., qui ex Testamento Vetere in Novo adducuntur.* . . . 8°, Lond. 1588, *al.*
- KÄUFFER** (Johann Ernst Rudolph), Court chaplain in Dresden: *N. T. Graece . . . edidit et . . . brevibus notis instruxit J. E. R. Käuffer. Fasc. I. Evangelium Matthaei.* 12°, Lips. 1827.
- KEUCHEN** (Peter), † 1689, Pastor at Arnheim: *Adnotata in quatuor Evangelistas et Acta apostolorum.* 4°, Amstel. 1689, *al.*  
*Annotata in omnes N. T. libros.* 4°, Amstel. 1709.
- KISTEMAKER** (Johann Hyazinth), † 1834, R. C. Prof. Theol. at Münster: *Die Evangelien uebersetzt und erklärt.* 4 Bände. 8°, Münster, 1818–20.
- KNAPP** (Georg Christian), † 1825, Prof. Theol. at Halle: *N. T. Graece Recognovit atque insignioris lectionum varietatis et argumentorum notationes subjunxit G. Ch. Knapp.* 4°, Hal. 1797, *al.*  
*Scripta varii argumenti maximam partem exegetica atque historica.* 8°, Hal. 1805, *al.*
- KNATCHBULL** (Sir Norton), Bart., † 1684: *Animadversiones in libros N. T.* 8°, Lond. 1659, *al.*
- KÖCHER** (Johann Christoph), † 1772, Prof. Theol. at Jena: *Analecta philologica et exegetica in quatuor S. S. Evangelia, quibus J. C. Wolfii Curae philol. et crit. supplentur atque augentur.* 4°, Altenb. 1766.
- KÖSTLIN** (Karl Reinhold), Prof. Theol. at Tübingen: *Der Ursprung und die Komposition der synoptischen Evangelien.* 8°, Stuttg. 1853.
- KRAFFT** (Johann Christian Gottlob Ludwig), † 1845, Prof. Theol. at Erlangen: *Chronologie und Harmonie der vier Evangelien. Herausgegeben von Dr. Burger.* 8°, Erlang. 1848.
- KREBS** (Johann Tobias), † 1782, Rector at Grimma: *Observationes in N. T. e Flavio Josepho.* 8°, Lips. 1755.
- KUINOEL** [KÜHNÖL] (Christian Gottlieb), † 1841, Prof. Theol. at Giessen: *Commentarius in libros N. T. historicos.* 4 voll. 8°, Lips. 1807–18, *al.*  
*Observationes ad N. T. ex libris Apocryphis V. T.* 8°, Lips. 1794.

- KUTTNER** (Christian Gottfried), † 1789: *Hypomnemata in N. T., quibus Graecitas ejus explicatur et scholiis . . . illustratur.* 8°, Lips. 1780.
- KYPKE** (Georg David), † 1779, Prof. Or. Lang. at Königsberg: *Observationes sacrae in N. F. libros ex auctoribus potissimum Graecis et antiquitatibus.* 2 partes. 8°, Vratislav. 1755.
- LACHMANN** (Karl), † 1851, Prof. Philos. at Berlin: *Novum Testamentum Graece et Latine, Carolus Lachmannus recensuit, Philippus Buttmannus lectionis auctoritates apposuit.* 2 voll. 8°, Berol. 1842-50.
- LAMY** (Bernard), † 1715, R. C. Teacher of Theol. at Grenoble: *Historia, sive concordia quatuor Evangelistarum.* 12°, Paris. 1689. *Commentarius in Harmoniam. . . .* 2 voll. 4°, Paris. 1699.
- LANGE** (Joachim), † 1744, Prof. Theol. at Halle: *Evangelisches Licht und Recht; oder richtige und erbauliche Erklärung der heiligen vier Evangelisten und der Apostelgeschichte.* 2°, Halae, 1735. *Apostolisches Licht und Recht. . . .* 2°, Halae, 1729. *Apocalyptisches Licht und Recht. . . .* 2°, Halae, 1730. *Biblia parenthetica . . . darinnen der biblische Text durch gewisse mit andern Littern darzwischen gesetzte Worte nach dem Grundtext erläutert wird.* 2 Bände. 2°, Leip. 1743.
- LANGE** (Johann Peter), Prof. Theol. at Bonn: *Das Evangelium des Matthaeus theologisch-homiletisch bearbeitet.* [Theol.-hom. Bibelwerk.] 8°, Bielefeld, 1857, *al.* [Translated from the 3d German ed., with additions . . . by Philip Schaff, D.D. New York and Edin. 1865, *al.*]
- LAPIDE** (Cornelius à) [VAN DEN STEEN], † 1637, S. J., Prof. Sac. Scrip. at Louvain: *Commentaria in V. ac N. Testamentum.* 10 voll. 2°, Antverp. 1664, *al.*
- LEIGH** (Edward), M.P., † 1671: *Annotations upon the N. T.* 2°, Lond. 1650, *al.* *Critica sacra. . . .* 4°, Lond. 1650, *al.*
- LIGHTFOOT** (John), D.D., † 1675, Master of Catherine Hall, Cambridge: *The harmony of the four Evangelists among themselves and with the O. T., with an explanation of the chief difficulties. . . .* 4°, Lond. 1644-50, *al.* *Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae . . . issued separately first in English and subsequently in Latin.* 4°, 1644-64, *al.* Edited by H. Gandell. 4 vols. 8°, Oxf. 1859. [On the four Gospels, Acts, part of Romans, and 1 Corinthians.]
- LIVERMORE** (Abiel Abbot), Minister at Cincinnati: *The four Gospels, with a commentary.* 12°, Boston, U. S., 1850.

- LOESNER** (Christoph Friedrich), † 1803, Prof. Sac. Philol. at Leipzig: *Observationes ad N. T. e Philone Alexandrino.* 8°, Lips. 1777.
- LUCAS** (Francois), † 1619, R. C. Dean at St. Omer: *Commentarius in quatuor Evangelia.* 2 voll. 2°, Antv. 1606.  
*Supplementum commentarii in Lucam et in Joannem.* 2 voll. 2°, Antverp. 1612, *al.*
- LUTHER** (Martin), † 1546, Reformer: *Annotationes in aliquot capita [1-18] Matthaei. . . [Opera.]*
- LYRA** (Nicolas de), † 1340, Franciscan monk: *Postillae perpetuae; sive brevia commentaria in universa Biblia.* 2°, Romae, 1471, *al.*
- MACKNIGHT** (James), D.D., † 1800, Minister at Edinburgh: *A harmony of the Gospels, in which the natural order of each is preserved. With a paraphrase and notes.* 2 vols. 4°, Lond. 1756, *al.*
- MALDONATO** (Juan), † 1583, Jesuit: *Commentarii in quatuor Evangelistas.* 2 voll. 2°, Mussiponti, 1596, *al.*
- MARIANA** (Juan), † 1624, Jesuit: *Scholia brevia in V. et N. Testamentum.* 2°, Matriti, 1619, *al.*
- MARLORAT** (Augustin), † 1563, Pastor at Rouen: *Novi Testamenti catholica expositio ecclesiastica . . . seu bibliotheca expositionum N. T.* 2°, Genev. 1561, *al.*
- MATTHAEI** (Christian Friedrich von), † 1811, Prof. of Class. Lit. at Moscow: *N. T. . . Graece et Latine. Varias lectiones . . . ex centum codicibus Mss. vulgavit . . . scholia Graeca . . . addidit animadversiones criticas adjecit et edidit C. F. Matthaei.* 12 voll. 8°, Rigae, 1782-88.
- MAYER** (Ferdinand Georg), Prof. of Greek and Heb. at Vienna: *Beiträge zur Erklärung des Evang. Matthaei für Sprachkundige.* 8°, Wien, 1818.
- MELANCHTHON** (Philipp), † 1560, Reformer: *Breves commentarii in Matthaeum.* 8°, Argentor. 1523, *al.*
- MENOCHIO** (Giovanni Stefano), † 1655, Jesuit at Rome: *Brevis expositio sensus litteralis totius Scripturae. . .* 3 voll. 2°, Colon. 1630, *al.*
- MEUSCHEN** (Johann Gerhard), † 1743, Prof. Theol. at Coburg: *Novum Testamentum ex Talmude et antiquitatibus Hebraeorum illustratum curis . . . B. Scheidii, J. H. Danzii et J. Rhenferdi, editumque cum suis propriis dissertationibus a J. G. Meuschen.* 4°, Lips. 1736.

- MEYER** (Johann Friedrich von), † 1849, Jurist in Frankfort: Die heilige Schrift in berichtigter Uebersetzung Martin Luther's mit kurzen Anmerkungen. 3 Theile. 8°, Frankf. 1818, *al.*
- MICHAELIS** (Johann David), † 1791, Prof. Or. Lit. at Göttingen: Uebersetzung des N. T. 2 Bände. 4°, Götting. 1790. Anmerkungen für Ungelehrte zu seiner Uebersetzung des N. T. 4 Theile. 4°, Götting. 1790–92.
- MILL** (John), D.D., † 1707, Principal of St. Edmund's Hall, Oxford: Novum Testamentum Graecum cum lectionibus variantibus . . . et in easdem notis. . . . 2°, Oxon. 1707. [ . . . Collectionem Millianam recensuit . . . suisque accessionibus locupletavit Ludolphus Kusterus. 2°, Amstel. 1710.]
- MOLDENHAUER** (Johann Heinrich Daniel), † 1790, Pastor at Hamburg: Das N. T. übersetzt und so erklärt dass ein jeder Ungelehrter es verstehen kann. 2 Bände. 8°, Quedlinb. 1787–88.
- MOLLER** (Sebastian Heinrich), † 1827, Pastor at Gierstädt in Gotha: Neue Ansichten schwieriger Stellen aus den vier Evang. 8°, Gotha, 1819.
- MORISON** (James), D.D., Prof. Theol. to the Evangelical Union, Glasgow: Commentary on the Gospel according to Matthew. 8°, Lond. 1870.
- MÜNSTER** (Sebastian), † 1552, Prof. Heb. at Heidelberg: Evangelium secundum Matthaeum in lingua Hebraica, cum versione Latina atque succinctis annotationibus. 2°, Basil. 1537.
- MUNTKE** (Kaspar Fredrik), † 1763, Prof. of Greek at Copenhagen: Observationes philologicae in sacros N. T. libros, ex Diodoro Siculo collectae. 8°, Hafn. 1755.
- MUSCULUS** [MEUSSLIN] (Wolfgang), † 1573, Prof. Theol. at Berne: Commentarius in Matthaeum. 2°, Basil. 1548, *al.*
- NEWCOME** (William), D.D., † 1800, Archbishop of Armagh: An harmony of the Gospels. . . . Observations subjoined. 2°, Lond. 1778, *al.*
- NICETAS** Serrariensis. See **CORDERIUS**.
- NORTON** (Andrews), † 1853, formerly Prof. Sac. Lit. at Harvard: A translation of the Gospels, with notes. 2 vols. 8°, Boston, U. S., 1855.
- NOVARINO** (Luigi), † 1658, Theatine monk: Matthaeus expensus, sive notae in Evangelium Matthaei. . . . 2°, Venet. 1629. Marcus expensus. . . . 2°, Lugd. 1642. Lucas expensus. . . . 2°, Lugd. 1643.
- OECOLAMPADIUS** (Johann) [HAUSSCHEIN], † 1531, Pastor at Basel: Elarrationes in Evangelium Matthaei. 8°, Basil. 1536.

- OLEARIUS** (Gottfried), † 1715, Prof. Theol. at Leipzig: *Observationes sacrae ad Evangelium Matthaei.* 4°, Lips. 1713, *al.*
- OLSHAUSEN** (Hermann), † 1839, Prof. Theol. at Erlangen: *Biblischer Commentar über sämtliche Schriften des N. T. Fortgesetzt von J. H. A. Ebrard and A. Wiesinger.* 7 Bände. 8°, Königsb. 1830–62.  
[Translated in "Foreign Theological Library." 9 vols. 8°, Edin. 1847–63.]
- ORIGENES**, † 254, Catechist at Alexandria: *Commentaria in Matthaei Evangelium; Series veteris interpretationis commentariorum Origenis in Matthaeum; Homiliae in Lucam; Commentarii in Evangelium Joannis; Commentaria in Epist. ad Romanos; Fragmenta in Lucam, Acta Apostolorum, Epistolas Pauli.* [Opera. Ed. Bened. III., IV.]—*Philocalia, de obscuris S. S. locis . . . ex variis Origenis commentariis excerpta. . .* 4°, Paris. 1609, *al.*
- OSIANDER** (Andreas), † 1552, Prof. Theol. at Königsberg: *Harmoniae evangelicae libri quatuor, Graece et Latine. . . Item elenchus Harmoniae: adnotationum liber unus.* 2°, Basil. 1537, *al.*
- PALAIRET** (Elias), † 1765, French pastor at London: *Observationes philologico-criticae in sacros N. F. libros, quorum plurima loca ex auctoribus potissimum Graecis exponuntur. . .* 8°, Lugd. Bat. 1752.  
*Specimen exercitationum philol.-crit. in sacros N. F. libros.* 8°, Lond. 1755.
- PAREUS** (David) [WAENGLER], † 1622, Prof. Theol. at Heidelberg: *Commentarius in Matthaeum.* 4°, Oxon. 1631.
- PAULUS** (Heinrich Eberhard Gottlob), † 1851, Prof. Eccl. Hist. at Heidelberg: *Philologisch-kritischer und historischer Commentar über das N. T.* 4 Theile. 8°, Leip. 1800–04.  
*Exegetisches Handbuch über die drei ersten Evangelien.* 3 Theile in 6 Hälften. 8°, Heidelb. 1830–33.
- PEARCE** (Zachary), D.D., † 1774, Bishop of Rochester: *A commentary, with notes, on the four Evangelists and Acts of the Apostles. . .* 2 vols. 4°, Lond. 1777.
- PELLICAN** (Konrad), † 1556, Prof. Heb. at Zürich: *Commentarii in libros V. ac N. Testamenti.* 7 voll. 2°, Tiguri, 1532–37.
- PISCATOR** [FISCHER] (Johann), † 1626, Conrector at Herborn: *Commentarii in omnes libros V. et N. Testamenti.* 4 voll. 2°, Herbornae, 1643–45.  
[In omnes libros N. T. 2 voll. 4°, Herbornae, 1613.]



- PLANCK (Heinrich), † 1831, Prof. Theol. at Göttingen: Entwurf einen neuen synoptischen Zusammenstellung der drey ersten Evangelien. . . . 8°, Götting. 1809.
- POOLE [POLUS] (Matthew), † 1679, Nonconformist: Synopsis criticorum aliorumque S. S. interpretum et commentatorum. 5 voll. 2°, Lond. 1669–74, *al.*
- POSSINUS (Peter), † c. 1650, Jesuit at Rome: Spicilegium, seu commentaria in loca selecta quatuor Evangeliorum. 2°, Romae, 1673. Catena Patrum Graecorum unius et viginti in Matthaeum. 2°, Tolosae, 1646.
- PRICAEUS [PRICE] (John), † 1676, Prof. of Greek at Pisa: Commentarii in varios N. T. libros. . . . 2°, Lond. 1660.
- PRIESTLEY (Joseph), † 1804, formerly Unitarian minister: Harmony of the Evangelists in Greek, to which are prefixed critical dissertations in English. 4°, Lond. 1777 [and in English, 1780].
- RABANUS MAURUS, † 856, Archbishop of Mentz: Commentarii in Evangelium Matthaei. [Opera.]
- RADBERTUS (Paschasius), † 865, Abbot at Corbie: Expositionis in Evangelium Matthaei libri duodecim. [Opera, ed. Sirmond, I.]
- RINCK (Wilhelm Friedrich), Pastor at Grenzach in Baden: Lucubratio critica in Act. App. Epistolas catholicas et Paulinas in qua . . . observationes ad plurima loca cum Apostoli tum Evangeliorum dijudicanda et emendanda proponuntur. 8°, Basil. 1830.
- REICHEL (Vincent), Prof. N. T. Exeg. at Prague: Quatuor sacra Evangelia in pericopas harmon. chronologice ordinatas dispartita. . . . 2 partes. 8°, Prag. 1840.
- REUSS (Edouard), Prof. Theol. at Strassburg: La Bible.—Traduction nouvelle avec introductions et commentaires.—N. T. 1° partie, Histoire evangelique (Synopse des trois premiers Evangiles); 2° partie, Histoire apostolique (Actes des Apôtres). 8°, Paris, 1874–76.
- ROBINSON (Edward), D.D., † 1864, Prof. Bib. Lit. at New York: A harmony of the four Gospels in Greek. 8°, Boston, U. S., 1845, *al.*
- A Greek and English lexicon of the N. T. 8°, Boston, 1836, *al.* [Edited by A. Negris and J. Duncan, Edin. 1844, *al.*; and by S. T. Bloomfield, Lond. 1837, *al.*]
- ROEDIGER (Moritz), † 1837, Pastor at Halle: Synopsis Evangeliorum . . . Textum . . . ex ordine Griesbachiano dispartitum cum varia scriptura selecta edidit M. Roediger. 8°, Hal. 1829.
- ROSENMÜLLER (Johann Georg), † 1815, Prof. Theol. at Leipzig: Scholia in N. T. 5 voll. 8°, Nuremb. 1777, *al.*

- RUS** (Johann Reinhard), † 1738, Prof. Theol. at Jena; *Harmonia Evangelistarum*. . . 3 partes in 4 voll. 8°, Jenae, 1727–30.
- SA** (Manoel), † 1596, Portuguese Jesuit: *Notationes in totam sacram Scriptaram*. . . 4°, Antverp. 1598, *al.*  
*Scholia in quatuor Evangelia*. . . 4°, Antverp. 1596, *al.*
- SALMERON** (Alphonso), † 1585, Spanish Jesuit: *Commentarii in Evangelicam Historiam et in Acta Apostolorum* [in omnes Epistolas et Apocalypsin]. 16 voll. 2°, Matriti, 1597–1602, *al.*
- SAND** [**SANDIUS**] (Christoph), † 1680, Socinian, residing at Amsterdam: *Interpretationes paradoxae quatuor Evangeliorum*. . . 8°, Cosmopoli [Amstel.], 1669, *al.*
- SCALIGER** (Joseph Justus), † 1609, Hon. Prof. at Leyden: *Notae in N. T.*  
 [In N. T. Graec. 8°, Lond. 1622, *al.*, and in the *Critici sacri*.]
- SCHEGG** (Peter), R. C. Prof. of N. T. Exegesis at Munich: *Evangelium nach Matthäus übersetzt und erklärt*. 3 Bände. 8°, Münch. 1856–58.
- SCHIRLITZ** (Samuel Christian), Prof. at Erfurt: *Grundzüge des neutestamentlichen Gräcität*. 8°, Giessen, 1861.
- SCHLEUSNER** (Johann Friedrich), † 1831, Prof. Theol. at Wittenberg: *Novum lexicon Graeco-latinum in N. T.* 2 voll. 8°, Lips. 1792, *al.*
- SCHLICHTING** (Jonas), † 1564, Socinian teacher at Racow: *Commentaria posthuma in plerosque N. T. libros*. 2 partes. 2°, Irenopoli [Amstel.], 1656.
- SCHMID** (Erasmus), † 1637, Prof. of Greek at Leipzig: *Opus sacrum posthumum, in quo continentur versio N. T. nova . . . et notae et animadversiones in idem*. 2°, Norimb. 1658.
- SCHMID** (Sebastian), † 1696, Prof. Theol. at Strassburg: *Biblia sacra; sive Testamentum V. et N., ex linguis originalibus in linguam Latinam translatum*. . . 4°, Argent. 1696.
- SCHMIDT** (Johann Ernst Christian), † 1831, Prof. of Eccl. Hist. in Giessen: *Philologisch-kritische Clavis über das N. T.* 8°, Gissae, 1796–1805.
- SCHOLZ** (Johann Martin Augustin), † 1853, R. C. Prof. Theol. in Bonn: *Novum Testamentum Graece. Textum ad fidem testium criticorum recensuit, lectionum familias subiecit . . . ex Graecis codd. mss. . . copias criticas addidit J. M. Aug. Scholz* 2 voll. 4°, Lips. 1830–35.  
*Die heilige Schrift des N. T. übersetzt, erklärt und . . . erläutert*. 8°, Frankf. 1828–30.
- SCHOTT** (Heinrich August), † 1835, Prof. Theol. at Jena: *Novum Testamentum Graece nova versione Latina illustratum*. . .

præcipuaque lectionis et interpretationis diversitate instructum. 8°, Lips. 1805, *al.*

SCHÖTTGEN (Christian), † 1751, Rector in Dresden: *Horæ Hebraicæ et Talmudicæ* in N. T. 2 partes. 4°, Dresd. et Lips. 1733–42. *Novum lexicon Graeco-Latinum* in N. T. 8°. Lips. 1746, *al.*

SCHULZ (David), † 1854, Prof. Theol. at Breslau: *Novum Testamentum Graece* [Griesbachii]. Vol. I. *Evangelia complectens. Editionem tertiam emendatam et auctam curavit D. Schulz.* 8°, Berol. 1827

*De aliquot N. T. locorum lectione et interpretatione.*

8°, Vratisl. 1833.

SCULTETUS (Abraham), † 1625, Prof. Theol. at Heidelberg: *Exercitationes evangelicæ.* . . . 4°, Amstel. 1624.

SEILER (Georg Friedrich), † 1807, Prof. Theol. at Erlangen: *Übersetzung der Schriften des N. T. mit beigefügten Erklärungen dunkler und schwerer Stellen.* 2 Theile. 8°, Erlangen, 1806.

SEVIN (Hermann), Theol. tutor at Heidelberg: *Die drei ersten Evangelien synoptisch zusammengestellt.* 8°, Wiesbaden, 1866.

SPANHEIM (Friedrich), † 1649, Prof. Theol. at Leyden: *Dubia evangelica partim ἐξηγητικά, partim ἐλεγκτικά* discussa et vindicata . . . 3 partes. 4°, Genev. 1639, *al.*

SPANHEIM (Friedrich), † 1701, Prof. Theol. at Leyden: *Evangelicæ vindiciæ; seu loca illustriora ex Evangeliiis ac præcipue illo Matthæi a falsis . . . interpretamentis vindicata . . . Libri tres.* 4°, Heidelb.-Lugd. Bat. 1663–85.

STEPHANUS [ESTIENNE or STEPHENS] (Robert), † 1559, Printer at Paris: *Novum Testamentum. Ex bibliotheca regia.* [Editio Regia.] 2°, Paris. 1550, *al.*  
*Harmonia evangelica.* Paris. 1553.

STIER (Rudolph Ewald), † 1862, Superintendent in Eisleben: *Die Reden des Herrn Jesu. Andeutungen für gläubiges Verständniss derselben.* 7 Bände. 8°, Barmen, 1853–55.  
[Translated in "Foreign Theol. Library." 8 vols. 8°, Edin. 1855–58.]

STOLZ (Johann Jakob), † 1821, Pastor in Bremen: *Uebersetzung der sämtlichen Schriften des N. T. . . .* 8°, Zürich, 1781–82, *al.*  
*Anmerkungen zu seiner Uebersetzung. . . .* 8°, Hannov. 1796–1802.

STRIGEL (Victorin), † 1569, Prof. Theol. at Heidelberg: *Hypomnemata in omnes libros N. T. . . .* 8°, Lips. 1565, *al.*

STROUD (William), M.D.: *A new Greek harmony of the four Gospels. . . .* 4°, Lond. 1853.

- TARNOVIUS** [TARNOW] (Johannes), † 1629, Prof. Theol. at Rostock :  
*Exercitationem biblicarum libri quatuor, in quibus verus . . .*  
*sensus locorum multorum . . . inquitur.* . . .  
 4°, Rostoch. 1619, *al.*
- THEILE** (Karl Gottfried Wilhelm), † 1854, Prof. Theol. at Leipzig :  
*Novum Testamentum Graece ex recognitione Knappii emenda-*  
*tius edidit, annotationem criticam adjecit C. G. G. Theile.*  
 12°, Lips. 1841–44, *al.*
- THEOPHYLACTUS**, after 1107, Archbishop of Achrida in Bulgaria :  
*Commentarii in quatuor Evangelistas Graece.*  
 2°, Romae, 1552, *al.*
- THIESS** (Johann Otto), † 1810, Prof. Theol. at Kiel : *Das N. T. neu*  
*übersetzt und mit einer durchaus anwendbaren Erklärung.*  
 4 Theile. 8°, Hamb. 1791–1800.  
*Neuer kritischer Commentar über das N. T.*  
 Halle, 1804–1806.
- TIL** (Salomon van), † 1713, Prof. Theol. at Leyden : *Het Evangelium*  
*das h. Apostels Matthaei, na eene beknopte ontleding . . .*  
*betoogt.* 4°, Dord. 1683.
- TIRINUS** (Jacques), † 1636, Jesuit at Antwerp : *Commentarius in*  
*sacram Scripturam.* 2 voll. 2°, Antverp. 1645, *al.*
- TISCHENDORF** (Lobegott Friedrich Constantin), † 1874, Prof. Bibl.  
*Palaeogr. at Leipzig : Novum Test. Graece. Textum ad anti-*  
*quorum testium fidem recensuit, brevem apparatus criticum*  
*subjunxit L. F. C. Tischendorf.* 12°, Lips. 1841, *al.*  
*N. T. Graece. Ad antiquos testes denuo recensuit apparatus*  
*criticum omni studio perfectum apposuit, commentationem*  
*isagogicam praetexuit . . . Editio septima.* 2 partes.  
 8°, Lips. 1859.  
*. . . Ad antiquissimos testes denuo recensuit . . . Editio octava*  
*critica major.* 2 voll. 8°, Lips. 1869–72.  
*Synopsis evangelica . . . Concinnavit, brevi commentario*  
*illustravit. . .* 8°, Lips. 1851, *al.* Ed. tertia, 1871.
- TOINARD** (Nicolas), † 1706, Seigneur de Villan-Blin : *Evangeliorum*  
*harmonia Graeco-Latina. . .* 2°, Paris. 1707, *al.*
- TREGELLES** (Samuel Prideaux), LL.D., † 1872 : *The Greek New*  
*Testament edited from ancient authorities, with the various*  
*readings of all the ancient mss. . . together with the Latin*  
*version of Jerome . . .* 4 parts. 4°, Lond. 1857–70.
- VALCKENAER** (Ludwig Kaspar), † 1785, Prof. of Greek at Leyden :  
*Selecta e scholis L. C. Valckenarii in libros quosdam N. T.*  
*Edidit Eberhardus Wassenbergh.* 2 partes.  
 8°. Amstel. 1815–17.

- VALLA (Lorenzo), † 1457, Humanist: *Adnotationes in N. T. ex diversorum utriusque linguae, Graecae et Latinae, codicum collatione.* 2°, Paris. 1505, *al.*
- VATER (Johann Severinus), † 1826, Prof. Or. Lang. at Halle: *Nov. Test. Textum Griesbachii et Knappii denuo recognovit, delectu varietatum lectionis . . . adnotatione cum critica tum exegetica . . . instruxit J. S. Vater.* 8°, Hal. Sax. 1824.
- VOLKMAR (Gustav), Prof. Theol. in Zürich: *Die Evangelien, oder Marcus und die Synopsis der kanonischen und ausserkanonischen Evangelien, nach dem ältesten Text, mit historisch-exegetischen Commentar.* 8°, Leip. 1870.
- WAHL (Christian Abraham), † 1855, Consistorialrath at Dresden: *Clavis N. T. philologica.* 2 partes. 8°, Lips. 1822, *al.*
- WALAEUS (Balduin), Teacher at Leyden: *N. T. libri historici Graece et Latine perpetuo commentario . . . illustrati . . .* 4°, Lugd. Bat. 1653, *al.*
- WALCH (Johann Georg), † 1775, Prof. Theol. at Jena: *Observationes in N. T. libros.* 8°, Jenae, 1727.
- WEBER (Michael), † 1833, Prof. Theol. at Halle: *Eclogae exegetico-criticae ad nonnullos librorum N. T. historicorum locos.* 14 partes. 4°, Hal. 1825–32.
- WEBSTER (William), M.A., and WILKINSON (William Francis), M.A.: *The Greek Testament, with notes grammatical and exegetical.* 2 vols. 8°, Lond. 1855–61.
- WEISS (Bernhard), Prof. Theol. at Kiel: *Das Marcusevangelium, und seine synoptische Parallelen.* 8°, Berl. 1872.
- WEISSE (Christian Hermann), † 1866, retired Prof. at Leipzig: *Die evangelische Geschichte kritisch und philosophisch bearbeitet.* 2 Bände. 8°, Leip. 1838.
- WEIZSÄCKER (Karl Heinrich), Prof. Theol. at Tübingen: *Untersuchungen über die evangelische Geschichte.* 8°, Gotha, 1864.
- WELLS (Edward), † 1724, Rector of Blechley: *An help for the more easy and clear understanding of the Holy Scriptures . . . paraphrase . . . annotations. . . .* 8 vols. [First issued separately.] 4°, Lond. 1727.
- WETSTEIN (Johann Jakob), † 1754, Prof. in the Remonstrant College at Amsterdam: *Novum Testamentum Graecum editionis receptae cum lectionibus variantibus . . . necnon commentario pleniore . . . opera. . . . J. J. Wetstenii.* 2 partes. 2°, Amstel. 1751–52.
- WETTE (Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de), † 1849, Prof. Theol. at Basel: *Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum N. T.* 3 Bände. 8°, Leip. 1836–48, *al.*

- Die heilige Schrift des A. und N. Testaments uebersetzt. . . .  
8°, Heidelb. 1831-32.  
[Previously translated by de Wette and Augusti, 1809-14.]  
—Synopsis Evangeliorum . . . (along with F. LÜCKE).  
4°, Berol. 1818.
- WHITBY (Daniel), D.D., † 1726, Rector of St. Edmunds, Salisbury:  
A paraphrase and commentary on the N. T. 2 vols.  
2°, Lond. 1703, *al.*
- WHITE (Joseph), D.D., † 1814, Prof. of Arabic at Oxford: Diatesaron. . . .  
8°, Oxon. 1799, *al.*
- WIESELER (Karl), Prof. Theol. at Greifswald: Chronologische Synopse der Evangelien. 8°, Hamb. 1843.
- WILKE (Christian Gottlob), † 1856, formerly pastor at Hermannsdorf: Clavis N. T. philologica. 8°, Dresd. 1840.  
. . . Quem librum ita castigavit et emendavit ut novum opus haberi possit C. L. W. Grimm. 8°, Lips. 1868.  
Der Urevangelist oder exegetisch - kritische Untersuchung über des Verwandtschaftsverhältniss der drei ersten Evangelien. 8°, Dresd. 1838.
- WINER (Georg Benedict), † 1858, Prof. Theol. at Leipzig: Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms als sichere Grundlage der neutest. Exegese bearbeitet. 8°, Leip. 1822, *al.*  
. . . Siebente Auflage besorgt von Dr. Gottlieb Lünemann.  
8°, Leip. 1867.  
[Translated . . . with large additions and full indexes by Professor W. F. Moulton, D.D., 8°, Edin. 1877; and by Professor J. H. Thayer, 8°, Boston, 1872.]
- WOLF (Johann Christoph), † 1739, Pastor in Hamburg: Curae philologicae et criticae in N. T. 5 voll. 4°, Basil. 1741.  
[Previously issued separately, 1725-35.]
- WOLZOGEN (Johann Ludwig von), † 1661, Socinian: Commentarius in Evangelium Matthaei, Marci, Lucae, Johannis. [Opera. 2°, Amstel. 1668.]
- ZEGER (Tacitus Nicolas), † 1559, R. C. monk at Louvain: Scholia in omnes N. T. libros. 8°, Colon. 1553.
- ZWINGLI (Ulrich), † 1531, Reformer: Adnotationes in Evangelistarum scripta. [Opera. Vol. IV.]

# GOSPEL OF MATTHEW.

---

## INTRODUCTION.

### SEC. I.—BIOGRAPHICAL NOTICE OF MATTHEW.



REGARDING the life and ministry of the Apostle Matthew, exceedingly little is known to us that is historically certain. In Mark ii. 14, his father is named *Alphaeus*. According to Euthymius Zigabenus, Grotius on Matt. ix. 9, Paulus, Bretschneider, Credner, Ewald, and others, this individual is said to have been identical with the father of James the Less. But this assumption is rendered extremely improbable by the circumstance, that in the lists of the apostles (Matt. x. 3; Mark iii. 18; Luke vi. 15; Acts i. 13) Matthew is not grouped along with that James, and that the name *חלפאי* was of very frequent occurrence, and it would only be admissible if in Mark ii. 14 the name *Levi* designated a different person from the Apostle Matthew, in which case Levi would not have been an apostle.

It was *Matthew* who, before he passed over to the service of Jesus, was called *Levi*, and was a collector of taxes by the lake of Tiberias, where he was called away by Jesus from the receipt of custom. From Matt. ix. 9, compared with Mark ii. 14 and Luke v. 27, it is sufficiently evident that the two names *Matthew* and *Levi* denote the same individual; for the agreement between these passages in language and contents is so obvious, that *Levi*, who is manifestly called to be *an apostle*, and whose name is yet *wanting* in all the lists of the apostles.

must be found again in that Matthew who *is named* in all these lists; so that we must assume that, in conformity with the custom of the Jews to adopt on the occasion of decisive changes in their life a name indicative of the change, he called himself, after his entrance on the apostolate, no longer מַתְתִּי, but מַתְתִּיָּה, *i.e.* מַתְתִּיָּה (Theodore = Gift of God). This name, as in the cases of Peter and Paul, so completely displaced the old one, that even in the history of his call, given in our Gospel of Matthew, he is, at the expense of accuracy, called, in virtue of a historical ὕστερον πρότερον, by the new name (ix. 9); while Mark, on the other hand, and after him Luke, *observing here* greater exactness, designate the tax-gatherer, in their narrative of his call, by his Jewish name, in doing which they might assume that his identity with the Apostle Matthew was universally known; while in their lists of the apostles (Mark iii. 18; Luke vi. 15; Acts i. 13), where the *apostolic* names must stand, they rightly place the name *Matthew*.

In this way we dispose of the view, opposed to the prevailing tradition, that Matthew and Levi were *two different* individuals (Heracleon in Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* iv. 9, p. 505, ed. Potter; and Origen, *c. Celsum*, i. 13), and yet two tax-gatherers (Grotius, Michaelis, and Sieffert, *Ursprung d. erst. Canon. Evang.* p. 59, Neander, Bleek doubtfully), where Sieffert supposes that in the Gospel of Matthew the similar history of the call of Levi was referred through mistake by the Greek editor to Matthew, because the latter also was a tax-gatherer. So also, substantially, Ewald, Keim, Grimm in the *Stud. u. Kritik*. 1870, p. 723 ff. From Clement of Alexandria, *Paedag.* ii. 1, p. 174, ed. Potter, we learn that the Apostle Matthew was an adherent of that stricter Jewish-Christian asceticism which refrained from eating animal food (comp. on Rom. xiv. 1 ff.); and we have no reason to doubt that statement. Regarding his labours beyond the limits of Palestine (ἐφ' ἑτέροις, Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 24) nothing certain is known, and it is only more recent writers who are able to mention particular countries as the field of his labour, especially *Ethiopia* (Rufinus, *H. E.* x. 9; Socrates, *H. E.* i. 19;



Nicephorus, ii. 41), but also Macedonia and several Asiatic countries. See, generally, Cave, *Antiquitt. Ap.* p. 553 ff.; Florini, *Exercitatt. hist. philol.* p. 23 ff.; Credner, *Einleitung*, I. p. 59. His death, which according to Socrates took place in Ethiopia, according to Isidore of Seville, in Macedonia, is already stated by Heracleon (in Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* iv. 9, p. 595, ed. Potter) to have been the result of natural causes; which is also confirmed by Clement, Origen, and Tertullian, in so far as they mention only Peter, Paul, and James the Elder as martyrs among the apostles. As to his alleged death by martyrdom (Nicephorus, ii. 41), see the Roman martyrology on the 21st Sept. (the Greek Church observe the 18th Nov.), *Acta et Martyr. Matth.* in Tischendorf's *Acta Apost. Apocr.* p. 167 ff.

## SEC. II.—APOSTOLIC ORIGIN AND ORIGINAL LANGUAGE OF THE GOSPEL.

(1.) *In the form in which the Gospel now exists, it cannot have originally proceeded from the hands of the Apostle Matthew.* The evidence in favour of this view consists not merely of the many indefinite statements of time, place, and other things which are irreconcilable with the living recollection of an apostolic eye-witness and a participator in the events, even upon the assumption of a plan of arrangement carried out mainly in accordance with the subject-matter; not merely in the partial want of clearness and directness, which is a prominent feature in many of the historical portions (even ix. 9 ff. included), and not seldom makes itself felt to such a degree that we must in this respect allow the preference to the accounts of Mark and Luke; not merely in the want of historical connection in the citation and introduction of a substantial portion of the didactic discourses of Jesus, by which the fact is disclosed that they were not originally interwoven in a living connection with the history; but also—and these elements are, in connection with the above, decisive—the reception of narratives, the unhistorical character of which must certainly have been known to an apostle (such as, even in the

history of the Passion, that of the watchers by the grave, and of the resurrection of many dead bodies); the reception of the preliminary history with its legendary enlargements, which far oversteps the original beginning of the gospel announcement (Mark i. 1, comp. John i. 19) and its original contents (Acts x. 37 ff.; Papias in Eusebius, *H. E.* iii. 39: τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα), and which already presents a later historical formation, added to the original gospel history; the reception of the enlarged narrative of the Temptation, the non-developed form of which in Mark is certainly older; but most strikingly of all, the many, and in part very essential, corrections which our Matthew must receive from the fourth Gospel, and several of which (especially those relating to the last Supper and the day of Jesus' death, as well as to the appearances of the risen Saviour) are of such a kind that the variations in question certainly exclude apostolic testimony on one side, and this, considering the genuineness of John which we must decidedly assume, can only affect the credibility of Matthew. To this, moreover, is to be added the relation of dependence (see Section IV.) which we must assume of our Matthew upon *Mark*, which is incompatible with the composition of the former by an apostle.

(2.) *Nevertheless, it must be regarded as a fact, placed beyond all doubt by the tradition of the church, that our Matthew is the Greek translation of an original Hebrew (Aramaic) writing, clothed with the apostolic authority of Matthew as the author.* So ancient and unanimous is this tradition. For (a) *Papias*, a pupil, not indeed (not even according to Irenaeus, v. 33. 4) of the *Apostle* John, but certainly of the *Presbyter*, says,<sup>1</sup> according to the statement of Eusebius (iii. 39), in the frag-

<sup>1</sup> Eusebius introduces the above-quoted statement regarding Matthew with these words: *περὶ δὲ τοῦ Ματθαίου ταῦτα εἰρηται.* There can be no doubt that these are the words of *Eusebius*, and that their meaning is, "*regarding Matthew, however, it is thus stated* (in Papias)," since there immediately precede the words *ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἰστορεῖται τῷ Παπῳ περὶ τοῦ Μάρκου.* It may be doubted, however, whether Eusebius, as he has just quoted with regard to *Mark* what Papias relates concerning him from a communication received from the *Presbyter*, meant to quote the statement of Papias which follows respecting *Matthew* as derived from the same source or not. As Eusebius, however, in what

ment there preserved of his work *λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξήγησις*:<sup>1</sup> *Ματθαῖος μὲν οὖν Ἑβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνετάξατο* (*al. συνεγράψατο*), *ἡρμήνευσε δ' αὐτὰ ὡς ἦν δυνατὸς ἕκαστος*. An attempt has indeed been made to weaken this very ancient testimony, reaching back to the very apostolic age, that Matthew wrote in Hebrew, by means of the well-known *σφόδρα γὰρ σμικρὸς ἦν τὸν νοῦν*,<sup>2</sup> which Eusebius states regarding Papias; but Eusebius by that expression refers to what he had stated immediately before regarding the *millenarianism* of the man. A simple historical remark, which stood in no connection either with millenarianism or with accounts of fabulous miracles (to which Papias, according to Eusebius, was inclined), cannot, owing to that depreciatory judgment, be *a priori* regarded as suspicious, especially if, as in the present case, there is added the confirmation of the whole subsequent tradition of the church. The supposition, however, that Papias is indebted for his statement to the Nazarenes and Ebionites (Wetstein, Hug), is pure imagination; since one *narrative*, which he had in common with the Gospel

precedes, refers to the Presbyter only the statement of Papias regarding *Mark*, and that purposely at the very beginning (*ἀναγκαῖος νῦν προθέσομιν . . . παράδοσιν, ἣν περὶ Μάρκου ἐκτίθεται διὰ τούτων· καὶ τοῦτο ὁ πρεσβύτερος ἔλιγε· Μάρκος, κ. τ. λ.*); as he, on the other hand, introduces the statement regarding Matthew with the quite simple expression *περὶ δὲ τοῦ Ματθ. ταῦτα εἰρηται*, without again making any mention of the Presbyter,—we can thus discover no sufficient reason for taking this statement also to be derived from a communication of the *Presbyter*. It contains, rather, only the simple quotation of what *Papias* says regarding Matthew. This in answer to Sieffert, Ebrard, Thiersch, Delitzsch, and others.

<sup>1</sup> See on Papias and his fragment, Holtzmann, *Synopt. Evang.* p. 248 ff.; Weizsäcker, *Untersuch. üb. d. evang. Geschichte*, p. 27 ff.; Ewald, *Jahrb.* VI. p. 55 ff.; Steitz in Herzog's *Encykl.* XI. p. 79 f.; Zyro, *neue Beleucht. d. Papiasstelle*, 1869; Zahn in the *Stud. u. Kritik.* 1866, p. 649 ff.; Riggenbach in the *Jahrb. f. D. Theologie*, 1868, p. 319 ff. In answer to the two last (who regard Papias as a pupil of the *Apostle John*), see Steitz in the *Stud. u. Kritik.* 1868, p. 63 ff., and in the *Jahrb. f. D. Theologie*, 1869, p. 138 ff.; comp. also Overbeck in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift*, 1867, p. 35 ff., and Hilgenfeld, *ibidem*, p. 179 ff. [also, *D. Papias-Fragment*, von Wilh. Weiffenbach, Giessen 1874; and *D. Papias-Fragment*, von Carl L. Leimbach, Gotha 1875.—Ed.].

<sup>2</sup> The counterbalance of praise, that Papias was *ὅτι μάλιστα λογιώτατος καὶ ὧς γραφῆς εὐδῆμων* (Eusebius, iii. 36), falls to the ground, as these words are spurious.

according to the Hebrews (Eusebius, iii. 39 : ἐκτέθεται δὲ καὶ ἄλλην ἱστορίαν περὶ γυναικὸς ἐπὶ πολλαῖς ἀμαρτίαις διαβληθείσης ἐπὶ τοῦ κυρίου, ἣν τὸ καθ' Ἑβραίους εὐαγγέλιον περιέχει, where these last words belong to Eusebius, and do not contain a remark of Papias), stands altogether without any reference to the above statement concerning Matthew.

(b) Irenaeus, *Haer.* iii. 1. 1, relates : ὁ μὲν δὲ Ματθαῖος ἐν τοῖς Ἑβραίοις τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ αὐτῶν καὶ γραφὴν ἐξήνεγκεν εὐαγγελίου, τοῦ Πέτρου κ. τοῦ Παύλου ἐν Ῥώμῃ εὐαγγελιζομένων κ. θεμελιούντων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. Against this it has been objected, that Irenaeus borrowed his judgment from Papias, whom he esteemed very highly as the friend of Polycarp (*Haer.* v. 33). But, irrespective of this, that if this objection is to deprive the testimony of weight, the authority of Papias must first fall to the ground, it is extremely arbitrary, seeing we have now no longer any other authorities contemporary with Papias, to regard him, and no one else, as the author of the tradition in question, which, yet, is uncontradicted throughout the whole of ecclesiastical antiquity. And Irenaeus was not the man to repeat at random. See Tertullian, *de test. anim.* i.; Hieronymus, *ep. ad Magn.* 85.

(c) Of *Pantaenus*, Eusebius (v. 10) says : ὁ Πάνταινος καὶ εἰς Ἰνδοὺς (probably the inhabitants of Southern Arabia) ἐλθεῖν λέγεται· ἐνθα λόγος εὑρεῖν αὐτὸν προφθάσαν τὴν αὐτοῦ παρουσίαν τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον εὐαγγέλιον παρὰ τισιν αὐτόθι τὸν Χριστὸν ἐπεγνωκόσιν, οἷς Βαρθολομαῖον τῶν ἀποστόλων ἔνα κηρύξαι, αὐτοῖς τε Ἑβραίων γράμμασι τὴν τοῦ Ματθαίου καταλεῖψαι γραφὴν ἣν καὶ σῶζεσθαι εἰς τὸν δηλούμενον χρόνον. This testimony, which is certainly independent of the authority of Papias, records, indeed, a *legend*; but this description refers not to the *Hebrew Matthew of itself*, but to the statement that Pantaenus *found* it among the Indians, and that Bartholomew had *brought it thither* (Thilo, *Acta Thomae*, p. 108 f.). Irrespective of this, Pantaenus, in keeping with his whole position in life, certainly knew so much Hebrew that he could recognise a Hebrew Matthew as such. If, however, the objection has often been raised, that it is not clear from the words whether an *original* Hebrew writing or

a translation into Hebrew is meant (see also Harless, *Lucubr. evangelia canon. spectant.* Erlangen 1841, I. p. 12), there speaks in favour of the former view the tradition of the entire ancient church concerning the original Hebrew writing of Matthew, a tradition which is followed by Eusebius (see afterwards, under *e*); he must therefore have actually *designated* it as a translation, if he did not wish to recall the fact which was universally known, that the Gospel was composed in Hebrew. The same holds true of the account by Jerome, *de vir. illust.* 36: "Reperit [Pantaenus in India], Bartholomaeum de duodecim apostolis adventum Domini nostri Jesu Christi juxta Matthaei evangelium praedicasse, quod *Hebraicis literis scriptum* revertens Alexandriam secum detulit." (*d*) Origen in Eusebius, vi. 25: ὅτι πρῶτον μὲν γέγραπται τὸ κατὰ τὸν ποτὲ τελώνην, ὕστερον δὲ ἀπόστολον Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ Ματθαῖον, ἐκδεδωκότα αὐτὸ τοῖς ἀπὸ Ἰουδαϊσμοῦ πιστεύουσι γράμμασιν Ἑβραϊκοῖς συντεταγμένον. He indicates tradition, indeed, as the source of his narrative (ὡς ἐν παραδόσει μαθών); but the witness of tradition on so thoroughly undogmatic a point from the mouth of the critical and learned investigator, who, in so doing, expresses neither doubt nor disagreement, contains especial weight; while to make Origen derive this tradition from Papias and Irenaeus (Harless, *l.c.* p. 11), is just as arbitrary as to derive it merely from the Jewish Christians, and, on that account, to relegate it to the sphere of error. (*e*) Eusebius, iii. 24: Ματθαῖος μὲν γὰρ πρότερον Ἑβραίοις κηρύξας, ὡς ἔμελλε καὶ ἐφ' ἑτέρους ἰέναι, πατρίῳ γλώττῃ γραφῇ παραδούς τὸ κατ' αὐτὸν εὐαγγέλιον, τὸ λείπον τῇ αὐτοῦ παρουσίᾳ τούτοις ἀφ' ὧν ἐστέλλετο, διὰ τῆς γραφῆς ἀπεπλήρου. Comp. *ad Marin. Quaest.* ii. in Mai, *Script. vet. nov. collectio*, I. p. 64 f.: λέλεκται δὲ ὁψὲ τοῦ σαββάτου παρὰ τοῦ ἐρμηνεύσαντος τὴν γραφήν· ὁ μὲν γὰρ εὐαγγελιστὴς Ματθαῖος Ἑβραῖδι γλώττῃ παρέδωκε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, κ.τ.λ. It is already evident from the latter passage that Eusebius relates that the Gospel was composed in Hebrew, not merely as a matter of history, but that he himself also adopted that view, against which his own remark on Ps. lxxviii. 2 has been erroneously appealed to (in Montfaucon,

*Collect. Patr. Grec.* I. p. 466): ἀντὶ τοῦ φθέγξομαι προβλήματα ἀπ' ἀρχῆς Ἑβραῖος ὧν ὁ Ματθαῖος οἰκεία ἐκδόσει κέχρηται εἰπὼν ἐρεύξομαι κεκρυμμένα ἀπὸ καταβολῆς. For οἰκεία ἐκδόσει cannot here be his own (Greek) translation of the passage of the Hebrew psalm (Marsh, Hug, and several others), but only—as the reference to Ἑβραῖος ὧν, and the antithesis to *Aquila* which there follows, clearly show—a vernacular, i.e. Hebrew edition of the original text, so that the meaning is: Matthew transcribed the words of the psalm from a Hebrew edition into his (Hebrew) Gospel; the result of which was, that in the Greek they now agree neither with the LXX. (φθέγξομαι προβλήματα ἀπ' ἀρχῆς) nor with *Aquila*, the Greek editions of which (ἀνθ' οὗ ὁ μὲν Ἀκύλας ὁμβρήσω αἰνίγματα ἐξ ἀρχῆθεν, ἐκδέδωκεν, Eusebius continues) had no influence on Matthew, who wrote in Hebrew. (f) Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catechet.* 14: Ματθαῖος ὁ γράψας τὸ εὐαγγέλιον Ἑβραϊδὶ γλώσση τοῦτο ἔγραψεν. (g) Epiphanius, *Haer.* xxx. 3: Ματθαῖος μόνος Ἑβραῖστὶ καὶ Ἑβραϊκοῖς γράμμασιν ἐν τῇ καινῇ διαθήκῃ ἐποιήσατο τὴν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἑκθεσὶν τε καὶ κήρυγμα. *Comp.* li. 5, also xxx. 6, where a converted Jew testifies that he discovered the Hebrew Matthew in a treasure-chamber. (h) Jerome, *Praef. in Matt.*: “Matthaeus in Judaea evangelium Hebraeo sermone edidit ob eorum vel maxime causam, qui in Jesum crediderant ex Judaeis.” *Comp. de vir. ill.* 3, where he assures us that he discovered the original Hebrew text among the Nazarenes in Beroea in Syria, and that he transcribed it. *Comp.* also *Ep. ad Damas.* IV. p. 148, ed. Paris; *ad Hedib.* IV. p. 173; *in Jes.* III. p. 64; *in Hos.* III. p. 134.—The testimonies of Gregory Nazianzen, Chrysostom, Augustine, and of later Fathers, may, after those already mentioned, be passed over, as well as that also of the Syrian Church in Asseman's *Bibl. Orient.* III. p. 8.—The weight of this unanimous and ancient tradition has secured acceptance down to the most recent times, notwithstanding the opposition of many critics,<sup>1</sup> for the hypothesis also that Matthew wrote in Hebrew (Richard Simon, Mill, Michaelis,

<sup>1</sup> See the history of this controversy in Credner, *Einleitung*, I. p. 78 ff.; Neu-decker, p. 195 ff.

Marsh, Storr, Corrodi, J. E. Ch. Schmidt, Haenlein, Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Ziegler, Kuinoel, Gratz, Guericke, Olshausen, Klener (*de authent. Ev. Matth.*, Göttingen 1861), Sieffert, Ebrard, Baur, Weisse, Thiersch, Tholuck, Lange, Luthardt (*de compos. Ev. Matth.*, Leipzig 1871), Güder (in Herzog's *Encykl.* IX. p. 166), and others). The opposite view of a *Greek* original of our Gospel, from which the polemic interest which operated in the older Protestantism, in opposition to tradition and the Vulgate, has long ago disappeared, is found in Erasmus, Cajetan, Beza, Calvin, Flacius, Gerhard, Calov., Erasmus Schmidt, Clericus, Lightfoot, Majus, Fabricius, Wetstein, Masch (*Grundspr. d. Ev. Matth.*, Halle 1755), Schubert (*Diss.*, Göttingen 1810), Hug, Paulus, Fritzsche, Theile (in Winer's and Engelhardt's *krit. Journal*, II. p. 181 ff. 346 ff.), Buslav (*Diss.*, 1826), Schott, Credner, Volkmar, Neudecker, Kuhn, B. Crusius, Harless, Thiersch (with reference to the canonical Matthew, which, according to him, is a second edition of the apostle's original work in Hebrew), de Wette, Bleek, Ewald, Ritschl (in the *theolog. Jahrb.* 1851, p. 536 ff.), Köstlin (*Ursprung u. Kompos. der synopt. Ev.*, Stuttgart 1853), Hilgenfeld, Anger (*Ratio, quæ loci V. T. in Ev. Matth. laudantur*, 3 Programme, Leipzig 1861 f.), Holtzmann (*synopt. Ev.* 1863), Tischendorf, Keim, and others, predominantly also by Delitzsch, but is entirely destitute of any *external* foundation, as the unanimous tradition of the church is rather insuperably opposed to it; while to deduce the latter from an error occasioned by the Gospel according to the Hebrews (Bleek, Tischendorf, Keim, and others), is a decision of critical peremptoriness which must give way especially before the testimony of Jerome, who was minutely acquainted with the Gospel according to the Hebrews, as well as with the Hebrew Matthew. The loss of the Hebrew original is all the more explicable the more early and widely the Greek Matthew was circulated; while the heretics obtained possession of the Hebrew work, and caused it to lose canonical authority. The *internal* grounds, moreover, on which stress has been laid, are sufficient only to show that our Matthew *might* be an original composition in Greek, but not that it *is* (actually)

such. For the dissemination of the Greek language in Palestine at that time (Hug) so little excludes, especially considering the predilection of the people for their own language (Acts xxi. 40, xxii. 2), the composition of a Hebrew Gospel, that it only makes the early translation of such a work into Greek more conceivable. If, further, it has been observed (Credner, sec. 46) that to the Hebrew feminine  $\text{נִי}$  no male function (i. 18) can be ascribed without the antecedent medium of the Greek tongue, as indeed in the Gospel according to the Hebrews the *maternal* position towards Christ is actually assigned to the Holy Spirit (Credner, *Beiträge*, I. p. 402 f.); so, on the other hand, it holds good that in i. 18 no *male* function of the Spirit is at all spoken of, but a generation in which the specifically *sexual* meaning remains out of consideration, as, moreover, the Greek  $\piνεῦμα$  is not *masculine*. The unimportant play upon the word in vi. 16 might already have its impress in the original, but may also, either from intention or accident, have originated with the translator. With respect to xxvii. 46, see the remarks *in loc.* The frequent identity of expression, moreover, in Matthew with Mark and Luke, does not necessarily point to an original composition of the former in Greek, but leaves this question quite unaffected, as the translated Matthew might either have been made use of by the later Synoptics, or might even have originated also from the use of the latter, or of common sources. The most plausible support for an original composition in Greek is found in the circumstance that a portion, although a small one, of the quotations from the Old Testament, especially those which are cited as Messianic predictions (comp. Jerome, *de vir. ill.* 3; and see, especially, the copious dissertation by Credner, *Beiträge*, I. p. 393 ff.; Bleek, *Beitr.* p. 57 ff.; Ritschl, in the *theolog. Jahrb.* 1851, p. 520 ff.; Köstlin, p. 36 ff.; Anger, *l.c.*; Holtzmann, p. 258 ff.; Keim, *Gesch. Jesu*, I. p. 59 ff.), do not follow the LXX., but deviate with more or less freedom from it, although taking account also of the same, and follow the original text as the case requires. This presents the appearance of not being the work of a translator, who would have adhered



more mechanically to the LXX. But, irrespective of the fact that this observation is by no means always beyond doubt with regard to the individual passages to which it is applied (Delitzsch in the *Zeitschr. f. Luther. Theologie*, 1850, p. 463 f., and *Entsteh. u. Anl. d. kanon. Ev.* I. p. 13 ff.; Weiss in *Stud. u. Kritik*, 1861, p. 91 f.), we are not at liberty to prescribe limits so narrow either to the freedom and peculiarity of the manner of citation which was followed in the Hebrew work, or to that of the translator,—who, as generally throughout his work, so also in the rendering of the quotations, might go to work with pragmatic independence,—that the tradition of a Hebrew original of the Gospel would be excluded as incorrect. This conclusion no more follows, than it would be at all necessary to suppose that the translator must have had as the basis of his text that of a *different* writer, more familiar with the Old Testament (Baur); or that this variation betrays evidence of the hand of a second redactor (Hilgenfeld, Keim).

(3.) *The original Hebrew writing, however, from which our present Matthew proceeded through being translated into Greek, must, apart from the language, have been in contents and form, in whole and in part, substantially the same as our Greek Matthew.* The general evidence in favour of this view is, that throughout the ancient church our Greek Matthew was already used as if it had been the authentic text itself. Accordingly, although the church knew that it was a text which had arisen only through a translation, it cannot have been aware of any essential deviation from the original. Jerome, however, in particular, *de vir. ill.* 3, who was minutely acquainted with the Hebrew original, and made a transcript of it, makes mention of it in such a way that the reader can only presuppose its agreement with the translation, and makes (on Matt. vi. 11, *ad Hedib.* IV. p. 173, on  $\delta\psi\epsilon$ , xxviii. 1) exegetical remarks, which rest upon the presupposition that it is a literal translation. The same holds true in reference to the passages of Eusebius quoted under 2 *e.* On the whole, no trace is anywhere found that the Greek Gospel in its relation to the original Hebrew work was regarded as anything else

than a translation in the proper sense; and therefore the opinion which has recently become current, that it is a *free redaction*, extended by additions (Sieffert, Klenner, Schott, *über d. Authenticit. d. Ev. Matth.*, 1834, Delitzsch), is destitute of all historical basis. If, however, our Greek Gospel of Matthew is to be regarded as a simple translation, not as an altered and extended revision; if, moreover, the Hebrew work, which was translated, consequently possessed, at the time when the translation was made, the same substantial extent, contents, and expression which are presented by our present Matthew,—then it follows, agreeably to what is observed under (1.), that the Hebrew document cannot have been composed by the apostle in the shape in which it was translated into Greek.

(4.) *Notwithstanding, the Apostle Matthew must have had in the Hebrew composition, of which our present Gospel is a translation, so substantial a part, that it could, on sufficient historical grounds, vindicate its claim to be regarded, in the ancient and universal tradition of the church, as the Hebrew εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Ματθαῖον.* To ascertain what this part was, we must go back to the oldest of the witnesses in question, which in fact discloses the original relation of the apostle to the Gospel which bears his name. The witness of *Papias*, namely, in Eusebius, iii. 39 (above under 2 a), declares that Matthew, and that in the Hebrew tongue, “τὰ λόγια συνετάξατο,” where the—to us unknown—context of the Fragment must have shown the λόγια to be those of the Lord. According to this view, his own work, composed by himself, was a σύνταξις or (according to the reading συνεγράψατο) a συγγραφή τῶν λογίων, consequently nothing else than a placing together, an orderly arrangement (comp. on σύνταξις with gen. in this literary sense, Polybius, xxx. 4. 11, i. 4. ii. 8, iv. 5. 11; Diodorus Sic. i. 3, xiv. 117), of the sayings of the Lord (Acts vii. 38; Rom. iii. 2; Heb. v. 12; 1 Pet. iv. 11); as in the Classics also λόγια is always used of sentences, especially divine, oracular sentences, and the like (Krüger on *Thucyd.* ii. 8. 2). A similar undertaking was that of Papias himself, in his work: λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξήγησις, which consisted of five books (συγγράμματα). He also gave the λόγια of Christ;

but in such a way that he *explained* (ἐξηγήσατο, comp. on John i. 18) their divine meaning historically (Eusebius himself quotes such a history), and from *other sources* (thus, according to Eusebius, he also made use of testimonies from some New Testament Epistles); Matthew, on the other hand, had given no ἐξηγήσεις, but only a σύνταξις of the Lord's sayings. The work of Papias was an *Interpretatio* (Jerome: "*explanatio*"); that of Matthew was only an orderly *Collectio* of the same. Schleiermacher in the *Stud. u. Kritik*. 1832, p. 735, has the merit of having brought forward and made good<sup>1</sup> the precise and proper meaning of λόγια: he has been rightly followed by Schneckenburger, *Ursprung des ersten kanon. Evang.* 1834, by Lachmann in the *Stud. u. Kritik*. 1835, p. 577 ff., Credner, Weisse, Wieseler, B. Crusius, Ewald, Köstlin, Reuss, Weizsäcker, and others;<sup>2</sup> also by Holtzmann, p. 251 ff.; Steitz in

<sup>1</sup> Although he did not correctly hit the meaning of the second part of the testimony of Papias: ἡρμηνεύει δ' αὐτὰ ὡς ἂν δυνατός ἦεν. He referred this ἡρμηνεύει to the explanation furnished by the addition of the relative histories. But the bearing of ἡρμηνεύει is to be sought simply in Ἑβραϊδὶ διαλίκτης, so that the meaning which Papias wishes to convey must be this: every one translated (Xen. *Anab.* v. 4. 4; Esdras iv. 7; additions to Esther vii. fin.) the λόγια which were arranged together in Hebrew, according to his capacity,—which refers to *that* use which, whether ecclesiastically or privately, the Greek Christians made of Matthew's collection of Hebrew sayings, in order to render them intelligible, by such a process of translation, to those who needed a translation in order to understand them. They were translated (orally and in writing) by every one who undertook the work, as well as he was able to do it. When Papias wrote this, such a self-translation, varying always according to the capacity of each individual, was no longer requisite, as our Greek Matthew had already attained ecclesiastical authority, and the λόγια, originally written in Hebrew, were contained in it. It is because he was aware of this that ἡρμηνεύει is employed, and this ought not to have been called in question (Bleek, Holtzmann, and others); but it does not follow that the whole of our Gospel of Matthew (only composed in Hebrew) was the original work written by the apostle himself.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. also Réville, *Etudes crit. sur St. Matth.* 1862, p. 1 ff., who has sought to determine more exactly out of our Matthew the parts of the original λόγια. Holtzmann's view is different: he seeks to reconstruct the collection of sayings chiefly out of Luke. See his *synopt. Evang.* p. 140 ff.; according to him, Luke made more use of it than Matthew, the 5th and 23d chapters of the latter being derived from special sources. Weizsäcker, Weisse (*protest. Kzeit.* 1863, No. 23), Grau, and others, rightly defend the view, that the collection of sayings is preponderantly contained in the *first* Gospel, whose *name* already rests upon this.

the *Stud. u. Kritik*. 1868, p. 68; Grau, *Entwicklungsgeschicht. d. N. T.* I. p. 173 f.; Scholten, *d. älteste Evang. übers. v. Redepenning*, 1869, p. 244 f. On the other hand, many others have found in the *λόγια* even evangelic history, so that it would be a designation *a potiori* for the entire contents of a Gospel. So Lücke in the *Stud. u. Kritik*. 1833, p. 501 f., Kern, Hug, Frommann in the *Stud. u. Kritik*. 1840, p. 912 ff., Harless, Ebrard, Baur, Delitzsch, Guericke, Bleek, Weiss (partly), Hilgenfeld, Thiersch, Güder, Luthardt, Kahnis, Anger, Keim, Zahn. This is quite untenable, because Papias shortly before designates the entire contents of a Gospel (that of Mark) in quite a different way, viz.: τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα (comp. Acts i. 1); and because, in the title of his work: ἐξήγησις τῶν λογίων κυριακῶν, he undoubtedly understood the *λόγια* in the proper sense of the word, i.e. τὰ λεχθέντα, *effata*, so that the history which his book contained belonged not to the *λόγια*, but to the ἐξήγησις which he gave of the *λόγια*. And with a comparative glance at this his literary task, he says of Peter: οὐχ ὥσπερ σύνταξιν τῶν κυριακῶν ποιούμενος λόγων (var. λογίων),—words which are not therefore to be used to prove the identity of meaning between *λόγια* and *λεχθέντα* and *πραχθέντα* (as is still done by Keim and Zahn); comp. § 4, Rem. 1. On the other hand, our Matthew contains in its present shape so much proper history, so much that is not given as a mere accompaniment of the discourses, or as framework for their insertion, that the entire contents cannot be designated by the one-sided τὰ *λόγια*, especially if we look to the title of the work of Papias itself. The later Patristic usage of τὰ *λόγια*, however (in answer to Hug and Ebrard), does not apply here, inasmuch as the view, according to which the contents of the N. T. in general, even the *historical* parts, were regarded as inspired, and in so far as *λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ*, did not yet exist in the time of Papias nor in his writings (Credner, *Beitr.* I. p. 23 f.; Kahnis, *vom heilig. Geist.* p. 210 ff.; Holtzmann, p. 251), against which view the ὡς γέγραπται in Barnabas 5 can prove nothing (comp. on John, *Introd.* § 2, 2).—According, then, to this opinion, the Apostle Matthew, agreeably to the testimony of Papias, has

composed a *digest of the sayings of Christ*,<sup>1</sup> and that in the Hebrew tongue, but not yet a proper gospel history, although, perhaps, the *λόγια* might be briefly accompanied, now and again, with special introductory remarks of a historical kind, and a gospel history was thereby, in some measure, formed beforehand. It is this collection of sayings now which obtained and secured for the Gospel, which was afterwards further elaborated out of it, the name of the apostle as author, the name *εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Ματθαῖον*. The collection of Hebrew sayings, namely, such as it proceeded from the apostle, was, in the hands of the Hebrew Christians, for whom it was intended, gradually expanded by the interweaving of the history into that gospel writing which, translated into Greek, presents itself in the present Gospel; and which, under the name of the apostle, rightly obtained the recognition of the church in so far that the *σύνταξις τῶν λόγων*, which was composed by Matthew himself, was substantially contained in it, and was the kernel out of which the whole grew. This apostolic kernel by itself perished; but the name of the apostle, which had passed over from it to the Hebrew Gospel work which so originated, led to the latter being regarded as the original composition of Matthew himself,—a view which lies at the foundation of the testimonies of Irenaeus, Origen, Eusebius, Epiphanius, Jerome, and others. In any case, however, this Hebrew work, which gradually grew out of the collection of sayings, must, before it was translated into Greek, have undergone a systematic, final redaction, by means of which it received the form which corresponds to our present Greek Matthew, for the latter is always attested only as a *translation*; and it is precisely to this final redaction, before the translation was made, that the recognition of the work by the church as apostolic must have been appended and

<sup>1</sup> It is arbitrary to think only of *longer*, actual *discourses* (Köstlin), and to exclude shorter sayings, gnomes, and the like. *Both* are to be understood. So also Photius, *Cod.* 228, p. 248, where τὰ κυριακὰ λόγια corresponds to the τὰ ἀποστολικὰ κηρύγματα which follow. Without any reason, Anger, III. p. 7, employs the passage as a proof that *λόγια* denotes the entire Gospel. See, on the other hand, also Weizsäcker, p. 92.

confirmed, because in the rendering of the work into Greek, the Hebrew was only *translated*,—a view which underlies the testimonies and quotations of the Fathers throughout. The Hebrew original, which arose out of the apostle's collection of sayings, and which corresponds to our present Matthew, fell, after it was translated, into obscurity, and gradually became lost,<sup>1</sup> although it must have been preserved for a long time as an isolated work in Nazarene circles (besides and alongside of the so-called Gospel according to the Hebrews), where it was still found in Beroea by Jerome, who made a transcript of it, and who also testifies that it existed down to his own day in the library of Pamphilus at Caesarea (*de vir. illust.* 3). — That the translator was *one* individual, is attested by the fixed style of expression which runs throughout the whole (Credner, *Einleit.* § 37; Holtzmann, p. 292 ff.); *who* he was, cannot be at all determined: “quod quis postea in Graecum transtulerit, non satis certum est,” Jerome. The opinions, that the translation was executed by *Matthew himself* (Bengel, Guericke, Schott, Olshausen, Thiersch), or at least with his co-operation (Guericke),—or *by another apostle* (Casaubon, Gerhard), perhaps James the Lord's brother (*Synopsis S. S.* Pseudo-Athanasius), or even by John (Theophylact, *Scholia on Matthew*, Subscriptions in the MSS.), or was prepared *under the eye and commission of the apostles* (Ebrard),—or that *two* of the disciples of Matthew had written down, the one in Aramaic, the other in Greek, the tradition preserved by the apostle (Orelli, *Selecta Patr. Eccles. Capita*, 1821, p. 10),—easily connect themselves with dogmatic presuppositions, but are destitute of all historical foundation, and must, in consequence of the testimony which Papias bears as to *what* Matthew wrote, altogether fall to the ground. — If, as the result of all that precedes, the share of the apostle in the work which bears his name must be referred back to his Hebrew σύνταξις τῶν λογίων, and in so far the book as a whole cannot be called apostolic in the narrower sense, but “already a secondary narrative” (Baur),

<sup>1</sup> The Syriac Matthew, which Cureton has edited, and which he regards as a translation of the original Hebrew writing (London 1858), has been derived from the Greek text. See Ewald, *Jahrb.* IX. p. 77 ff.

the apostolic *authenticity*,<sup>1</sup> which has been strictly defended down to the most recent time, can remain only in a very relative degree. If, however, the gospel history thereby loses this direct guarantee, so far as in many single points it would lack the weighty authority of the apostle and eye-witness as a voucher, yet the gain is to be more highly estimated which it derives from being completely emancipated from the contradictory statements of two apostles on which apologetic harmonists, since Augustine, Osiander, Chemnitz, Gerhard, Calovius, Bengel, Storr, and others,<sup>2</sup> have exercised their inventive ingenuity with the Sisyphus-labour of a one-sided acuteness, and from seeing the decisive authority of John in relation to the first Gospel altogether unshackled. To this authority must also be subordinated the discourses of Jesus in individual parts, which, considering the genetic development under which our Matthew gradually grew up out of the collection of sayings, cannot have remained unchanged (especially those relating to the last things and to the last Supper). Yet the greater portion of them, so far as they belong to the non-Johannean stage of action, are independent of and unaffected by the Johannean accounts of the discourses. If, namely, as our Gospels furnish the actual proof of it, there was formed earliest of all a *Galilean* cycle of gospel history which extended itself to Judea only at the last great termination of

<sup>1</sup> See, especially, Theile in Winer's *krit. Journ.* II. p. 181 ff. 346 ff.; Heidenreich, *das.* III. p. 129 ff. 385 ff.; Kuinoel, Fritzsche, Kern, Schott, Guericke; Olshausen, *Apostolica Ev. Matth. or. def.*, Erlangen 1835-37; Rördam, *de fide patr. eccles. antiquiss. in iis, quae de orig. evv. can. maxim Matth. tradider.*, Hafniae 1839; Harless, Ebrard, Thiersch, Delitzsch, Hengstenberg, and others.

<sup>2</sup> Even the most recent, which is set forth in the most consistent form with the acuteness of comprehensive learning by Wieseler in his *chronol. Synopse*, 1843 (translated by Venables), and later, down to his *Beitr. zur Würdig. d. Ev.* 1869; in the most bulky shape with the roughness of passionate feeling by Ebrard in his *wissensch. Krit. d. evang. Gesch.* ed. 3, 1868 (2d ed. translated; Clark, Edinburgh). Harmonizers have done much harm by fostering the opinion that the gospel history needed their brittle support. The substance of this history is altogether independent of such help, as was already correctly recognised by Griesbach. The discord of harmonists, however, with each other is only the process of the self-dissolution of their artificial labours, the result of which has been less to the advantage of the history itself than of its opponents.

the history; so it is conceivable enough, since Galilee was actually the principal theatre of the ministry of Jesus, that Matthew in his *σύνταξις τῶν λογίων* already confined himself to this cycle, while it was reserved for John first, when evangelic historical composition had reached its culminating point, to include the whole of the Judaic teaching and acting,—nay, by supplementing that older and defective range of narrative, to place it in the foreground of the history. Delitzsch, in connection with his fiction of a pentateuchal construction of our Gospel (see afterwards, Section IV.), without any reason regards Matthew as the *creator* of the Galilean gospel type: he only connected himself with it by his collection of sayings, which an apostle could also do if he did not wish to write a *history* of Jesus.

REMARK.—The Hebrew Matthew was adopted, as by the Hebrew Christians in general, so by the *Nazarenes and Ebionites* in particular, as *their* Gospel, and was overlaid (by the Ebionites, who omitted the two first chapters, still more than by the Nazarenes) with heretical and apocryphal additions and partial changes, as well by spinning out as by omitting, by which process arose the *εὐαγγέλιον καθ' Ἑβραίους*; see the fragments of the same collected from the Fathers in Credner's *Beitr.* I. p. 380 ff.; by Hilgenfeld in his *Zeitschrift*, 1863, p. 345 ff.; and in the *N. T. extra Canon. recept.* IV. According to Eusebius, iii. 39, Papias had already received into his work an apocryphal history, which was contained<sup>1</sup> in the *εὐαγγέλιον καθ' Ἑβραίους*, and which had been already made use of by Ignatius, *ad Smyrn.* 3 (see Jerome, *de vir. illust.* 16), and by Hegesippus (see Eusebius, iv. 22, iii. 20; Photius, *Bibl. Cod.* 232). This essential relationship of the *εὐαγγέλιον καθ' Ἑβραίους* — the

<sup>1</sup> The remark of Eusebius, *ἐν τῷ καθ' Ἑβραίους εὐαγγέλιον περίχει*, leaves it doubtful whether he intended by the remark to note the apocryphal character of this history, or at the same time to point to the source from which Papias had taken it. According to the connection, since two apostolic letters had just previously been mentioned as having been used by Papias; and now, with the addition of the above remark, another, *i.e.* a non-apostolic history is quoted, which Papias is said to have narrated,—it is more probable that Eusebius wished to point to the use of the Gospel according to the Hebrews by Papias (in answer to Ewald and several others). The history itself (*περὶ γυναικὸς ἰσὶ πολλαῖς ἀμαρτίαις διαβληθείσης ἐπὶ τοῦ κυρίου*), moreover, is not to be regarded as that of the adulteress in John.



contents of which, according to the remains that have been preserved, must have been extensive,<sup>1</sup> and wrought up with skill and some degree of boldness (see Ewald, *Jahrb.* VI. p. 37 ff.)—to the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew, makes it explicable how the former might be regarded by many who did not possess an exact acquaintance with it, as the Hebrew Matthew itself (Jerome, *contra Pelag.* iii. 2, “*Ut plerique autumant;*” *ad Matt.* xii. 13, “*quod vocatur a plerisque Matthaei authenticum*”). To the number of these belonged also Epiphanius, who says (*Haer.* xxix. 9) that the *Nazarenos* possessed τὸ κατὰ Ματθ. εὐαγγέλιον πληρέστατον (comp. Irenæus, *Haer.* iii. 11. 7) ἑβραϊστί, but who, nevertheless, does not know whether it also contained the genealogy. Of the *Ebionites*, on the other hand, he states (*Haer.* xxx. 3. 13) that they did not possess the Gospel of Matthew in a complete form, but νενοθευμένον καὶ ἡκροστηριασμένον, and quotes passages from the Ebionitic Ἑβραϊκόν. We must suppose that he had an exact acquaintance only with the Ebionite edition of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, probably derived from Ebionite writings. Jerome, on the other hand, had a minute acquaintance with the *evangelium secundum Hebraeos*, and, in opposition to the view which has recently become current, definitely distinguished it from the Hebrew Matthew.<sup>2</sup> Of the latter, namely, which he found in use among the *Nazarenos* at Beroea, he made a transcript (*de vir. illust.* 3); the Gospel according to the Hebrews, of which, consequently, there could not have been as yet any widely diffused and recognised translation, he translated into Greek and Latin (*de vir. illust.* 2, *ad Mich.* vii. 6, *ad Matt.* xii. 13), which of course he did not do in the case of the Hebrew Matthew, as that Matthew was everywhere extant in Greek and also in Latin. Jerome

<sup>1</sup> According to the stichometry of Nicephorus, it contained 2200 στίχοι; the Gospel of Matthew, 2500. See Credner, *zur Gesch. d. Kanon*, p. 120.

<sup>2</sup> It is objected to this (see also Anger, III. p. 12), that Jerome in his epistle to Hedibia (*Opp.* I. p. 826, ed. Vallarsi), on ch. xxviii. 1, remarks: “*Mihi videtur evangelista Matthaeus, qui evangelium Hebraico sermone conscripsit, non tam vespere dixisse quam sero, et eum, qui interpretatus est, verbi ambiguitate deceptum, non sero interpretatum esse, sed vespere.*” Because Jerome employs here only a *videtur*, the word is said to betray on his part a *non-acquaintance* with the original Hebrew writing. This objection is erroneous. Jerome rather means that the Hebrew word, employed by Matthew, is ambiguous; that it may signify *vespere* and *sero*; that Matthew appears to have expressed by it the latter conception, while the translator took it in the former sense. What Hebrew word stood in the passage Jerome does not state; it may probably have been כַּפְנוֹת הַשָּׁבַת.

consequently could not share the erroneous opinion of the *plerique* above mentioned; and the very precarious assumption—precarious because of his well-known acquaintance with the Hebrew language—that he held it at a former time, but abandoned it afterwards (Credner, de Wette, Holtzmann, Tischendorf, and several others), or at least expressed himself more cautiously regarding it (Hilgenfeld), is altogether baseless, and is only still more condemned by Credner's arbitrary hypothesis (*Beiträge*, I. p. 394). It is, however, also conceivable that it was precisely among the Nazarenes that he found the Hebrew Matthew, as they naturally attached great value to *that* Gospel, out of which their own Gospel, the *evangelium secund. Hebraeos*, had grown. Of the former (*de vir. ill.* 3), as well as of the latter (*c. Pelag.* iii. 2), there was a copy in the library at Caesarea. As Jerome almost always names only the *Nazarenes* as those who use the *evangelium sec. Hebraeos*, while he says nothing of any special *Ebionitic* Gospel; nay, on Matt. xii. 13, designates the Gospel according to the Hebrews as that “quo utuntur Nazareni et Ebionitae,” he does not appear to have known any special Ebionitic edition, or to have paid any attention to it; while he simply adhered to the older, more original, and more widely disseminated form of the work, in which it was authoritative among the Nazarenes, and was certainly also retained in use among the Ebionites side by side with their still more vitiated gospel writing. The supposition that the *evangelium sec. Hebraeos* arose out of a *Greek* original (Credner, Bleek, de Wette, Delitzsch, Reuss, Hilgenfeld, Holtzmann; comp. also Sepp, *d. Hebr. Evang.* 1870), has against it the statement of the Fathers (Eusebius, iv. 22; Epiphanius, *Haeres.* xxx. 3. 13; and especially Jerome), who presuppose a Hebrew original; while, further, there stands in conflict with it the old and widely disseminated confusion between that Gospel and the original Hebrew work of Matthew. The alleged wavering, moreover, between the texts of Matthew and Luke, which has been found in some fragmentary portions, is so unessential (see the passages in de Wette, sec. 64a), that the fluidity of oral tradition is fully sufficient to explain it. Just as little can that hypothesis find any support from the individual passages, which are still said to betray the Greek original (of Matthew), from which the *evangelium sec. Hebraeos* arose by means of an Aramaic edition. For, as regards the *ἐχρῖς* in Epiphanius, *Haer.* xxx. 13, see on Matt. iii. 4. And when Jerome, on ch. xxvii. 16, relates that in that Gospel the name *Barabbas* was explained by *filius magistri eorum*, it has been

erroneously assumed that the Greek accusative *Βαραββᾶν* was taken as an indeclinable noun (בר רבהון = בר רבון). So Paulus, Credner, Bleek, Holtzmann. Such a degree of ignorance of Greek, precisely when it is said to be a translation from that language, cannot at all be assumed, especially as the Greek *Βαραββ* was written with only one ρ, and the name *בראבא* and *Βαραββᾶς* was very common. "*Filius magistri eorum*" is rather to be regarded simply as an instance of forced rabbinical interpretation, where *אבא* was referred, in the improper sense of *magister*, to the devil; and in support of this interpretation, an *eorum*, giving a more precise definition, was, freely enough, subjoined.<sup>1</sup> When, further, according to Jerome on Matt. xxiii. 35, *filius Jojadae* stood in the Gospel according to the Hebrews in place of *υιοῦ Βαραχίου*, this does not necessarily presuppose the Greek text, the mistake in which was corrected by the Gospel according to the Hebrews, but the *בר יודע* may just as appropriately, and quite independently of the Greek Matthew, have found its way in, owing to a more correct statement of the tradition, in room of the erroneous name already received into the original Hebrew text. Just as little, finally, is any importance to be attached to this, that, according to Jerome on Matt. vi. 11, instead of *τὸν ἐπιούσιον* there stood in the Gospel according to the Hebrews *מחר*, since there exists no difference of meaning between these two words. See on Matt. *l.c.* None of these data (still less that which, according to Jerome, the Gospel according to the Hebrews, ch. xxv. 51, contained respecting the breaking of the *supraliminare* templi; and what was formerly adduced, still especially by Delitzsch, *Entsteh. u. Anl. d. kanon. Evang.* I. p. 21 f.) is fitted to lay a foundation for the opinion that that apocryphal Gospel was derived from a Greek original, and especially from our Greek Matthew, or from the (alleged) Greek document which formed the foundation of the same, which is said to have undergone in the Gospels of the Nazarenes and Ebionites only other redactions, independently of the canonical one (Hilgenfeld, *Evangel.* p. 117).—The converse view, that our Greek Matthew proceeded from a Greek translation of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, which was subjected to modification of various kinds until it finally became fixed in its present shape in our canonical Gospel of Matthew

<sup>1</sup> Quite in the same way has even Theophylact himself explained the name by *τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῶν, τοῦ διαβόλου*. See on ch. xxvii. 16. The interpretation of the name as "*filius patris, h. e. diaboli*," was, on the whole, very common. See Jerome on Ps. cviii., *Opp.* vii. 2, p. 206.

(probably about the year 130 A.D.), Schwegler, Baur, renders necessary the unhistorical supposition, which especially contravenes the testimony of Jerome, that the Hebrew writing of Matthew was identical with the Gospel according to the Hebrews; leaves the old and universal canonical recognition of our Matthew, in view of the rejection by the church of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, unexplained; overlooks, further, that the assumed transformations which our canonical Matthew underwent prior to its being finally fixed, must—since, according to the unanimous testimony of the church, it is a *translation*—have related not to the Greek, but only to the Hebrew work; and it must, finally, refer the relative quotations of Justin (and of the Clementines, see Uhlhorn, *Homil. u. Recog. d. Clemens*, p. 119 ff.) to the Gospel according to the Hebrews, or assume as a source the Gospel of Peter and other unknown apocrypha (Schliemann, Schwegler, Baur, Zeller, Hilgenfeld, after Credner's example), although it is precisely our Matthew and Luke which are most largely and unmistakeably employed by Justin in his quotations from the ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων, although freely and from memory, and under the influence of the oral tradition which had become current, and which stood at his command (Semisch, *d. Apost. Denkwürdigk. Justin's*, 1848 [Eng. transl. Messrs. Clark's Cab. Libr.]; Delitzsch, *Entsteh. u. Anl. d. kanon. Evang.* I. p. 26 ff.; Ritschl in the *theolog. Jahrb.* 1851, p. 482 ff.). See, generally, on the priority of the Gospel of Matthew to that of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, which is most decidedly and persistently denied by Hilgenfeld; Köstlin, p. 118 ff.; Bleek, *Beitr.* p. 60 ff., *Einl.* p. 104 ff.; Frank in the *Stud. u. Kritik.* 1848, p. 369 ff.; Ewald, *Jahrb.* VI. p. 36 ff.; Keim, *Gesch. Jesu*, I. 29 ff.; Grau, *Entwicklungsgesch. d. N. T.* I. p. 265 ff.; Volkmar, and others.

### SEC. III.—READERS, AND OBJECT OF THE GOSPEL—TIME OF ITS COMPOSITION.

Not merely was the collection of discourses composed by Matthew himself intended for the Jewish Christians of Palestine, but the Hebrew Gospel also, which gradually grew out of that collection, as *already appears* from the language of the work itself, and as is confirmed by the testimonies of the Fathers (Irenaeus, *Haer.* iii. 1; Origen in Eusebius, vi. 25; Eusebius, Jerome, and others). Hence the frequent quotations from the

O. T. to prove that the history of Jesus is the fulfilment of Messianic prophecy,—quotations, amongst which are to be classed even such as, without some explanatory addition, were intelligible only to those who were acquainted with the Hebrew language (i. 22) and the Hebrew prophetic manner of expression (ii. 23); and hence, also, as a rule, all in the Gospel is presupposed as known which, in reference to manners and customs, to religious and civil, to geographical and topographical relations, could not but be known to residents in Palestine as such; while, on the contrary, by the other evangelists (comp. Mark vii. 2–4 with Matt. xv. 2), such remarks, explanations, etc. as were unnecessary for the inhabitant of Palestine, are frequently added in consideration of readers living out of that country. That the unknown *translator*, however, had also in view Jewish Christians *out of Palestine*, is clear from the very fact of his undertaking a translation. It was in reference to such readers that some interpretations of specially noteworthy names (i. 23, xxvii. 33), and the translation of the exclamation on the cross in xxvii. 46, were added by the translator, to whose account, however, pragmatical observations such as those in ch. xxii. 23, xxviii. 8, 15, are not to be placed.

The *object* which was to be attained, both by Matthew's collection of discourses as well as by the Gospel, could be no other than *to demonstrate Jesus to be the Messiah*, which demonstration is carried out in the Gospel by means of the history and teaching of Jesus (in the collection of discourses by means of His teaching) in such a way that Jesus is set forth as *He who was promised in the O. T.* Credner, *Einkl.* I. p. 60; Ewald, *Jahrb.* II. p. 211. We must regard, however, as entirely alien from this view,<sup>1</sup> the premature thought of a

<sup>1</sup> According to Hilgenfeld, *Evangelien*, p. 106 ff. (see also *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.* 1862, p. 33 ff., 1865, p. 43 ff., 1866, p. 136 ff., and elsewhere), our Gospel is the product of *two opposed factors*. It originated in an apostolic *fundamental document*, which was composed from the particularistic standpoint of strict and close Judaism; the later canonical *working up* of which, however, was effected soon after the destruction of Jerusalem, from the point of view that the Christianity which had been disdainfully rejected by the Jews had a universalistic destination for the heathen world. According to this theory, the incongruous

Jewish Christian (Petrine) *party writing* (so the anonymous work, *Die Evangelien, ihre Geschichte, ihre Verfasser*, Leipzig 1845), with which the universalism which pervades the Gospel from iii. 9 to xxviii. 19 is in decided conflict. The chronological and even historical exactness, which could be in harmony only with a later period (Luke i. 3), retired into the background before this didactic purpose, and the tradition which dominates the Gospel found therein that quite unlimited room to play which was allowed it by the belief of the community, while it was not lessened on account of its wanting the testimony of an eye-witness, owing to its redactor not being an apostle. Considering the Palestinian destination of the work, and the contents assigned it by the collection of the discourses, and by the history itself and its tradition, it was natural and necessary that it should set forth much that was in *antithesis to an unbelieving Judaism and its degenerate leaders*. We are not, however, to assume a special *tendential character* referring to that (Köstlin), or the prosecution of an *anti-Ebonitic* aim (Grau), as that antithesis has its basis in the position of Christ Himself and of His historical work; while upon a Gospel intended for Palestinian Jewish Christians it could not but impress itself spontaneously, without any special purpose, more than on other Gospels.<sup>1</sup>—The principal sections of the Gospel are as follow: (1) History of the birth and childhood, ch. i, ii; (2) Preparations for His appearance

portions are, with great arbitrariness, assigned by Hilgenfeld—although they are irreconcilable even with the scantiest systematic plan of a tendential redaction—to the one or the other of the factors which are supposed as the determining elements, and transposed in part to places where they do not now stand. With much greater caution Baur recognises the *impartiality* of the Gospel; declares it, however, to be at least not altogether free from a particular interest, and from certain tendential leanings, and regards it, besides, as the original and most credible Gospel, although he holds it to have grown up out of the Gospel according to the Hebrews by a process of lengthened development. See, in answer to Hilgenfeld, Holtzmann, p. 378 ff.; Keim, *Geschichtl. Christ.* p. 54 ff. The latter, however, while laying on the whole decided emphasis on the unity of the Gospel, admits that additions of very varying value were made by the individual who worked up the whole (*Gesch. Jesu*, I. p. 68 ff.).

<sup>1</sup> When the principal source of the discourses in Matthew, the collection of sayings, arose, the sharp party severance of Judaism from Paulinism still belonged to the *future*. Comp. Holtzmann, p. 277 ff. By introducing in this

as Messiah, ch. iii.-iv. 11 ; (3) Messianic ministry in Galilee, until His departure from the theatre of His work up to that time, xix. 1 ; (4) Setting out for Judea, and completion of His Messianic ministry and destiny, ch. xix.-xxviii. 20. Plans of a more complicated character (see in Luthardt, *l.c.* p. 14 ff.) are the outcome of subjective presuppositions.

As regards the *time* of composition, the tradition of the church assigns to the Gospel of Matthew the *first* place amongst the canonical Gospels (Origen in Eusebius, vi. 25 ; Epiphanius, *Haer.* li. 4 ; Jerome, *de vir. ill.* 3). Eusebius states more precisely (iii. 24) that Matthew wrote when he wished to take his departure from Palestine ; Irenaeus, however, iii. 1, 2 (comp. Eusebius, v. 8), while Peter and Paul were preaching at Rome. Of these two notices, the first is very indefinite ; but between the two there certainly lies a long period of time, especially since, at the dates when Paul made his first apostolic journeys to Jerusalem (Gal. i. and ii.), there is at least no longer any express trace of Matthew's residence in that city. This very varying tradition of the time of composition is, however, conceivable without any difficulty from this consideration, that Matthew's *collection of sayings* must in reality have been composed at a far earlier date than the *Gospel* which bears his name. The time when the one originated was easily transferred to the other, as at a later date, when the first was no longer extant, the two writings were not, in general, separately distinguished. Nothing, however, could be more natural than that Matthew, when he wished to follow his vocation amongst strangers, should present his Palestinian hearers with a well-arranged collection of the Lord's sayings, which might remain with them as a legacy in place of his oral preaching. The *Gospel*, which then gradually grew out of this collection of sayings, might have been in constant process of formation down to the time indicated by Irenaeus (from 60-70), and then

way these party divisions into our Gospel, we commit a great ὑστέρημα πρῶτον. In Jesus Himself, the consciousness that He was destined for the Jews, and also that He was destined for all nations, lay side by side with each other ; but with Him the two come into view always according to the relations of the moment.—the latter most decidedly at His departure in xxviii. 19.

have received its last redaction, after which also the translation soon followed, consequently shortly *before* the destruction of Jerusalem. For as the Hebrew work is in any case to be placed before the destruction of Jerusalem, so also is the Greek translation; because in xxiv. 29 ff. the Parousia is so definitely predicted as commencing immediately after the desolation of Palestine (comp. xvi. 28, xxiv. 34), that all attempts to evade this conclusion remain ineffectual. On the other hand, we are not to infer from xxiii. 35, xxiv. 15 (Hug, Credner), that at the time when the last chapters were composed the Romans had already taken possession of Galilee, and were upon the point of conquering Judea.<sup>1</sup>—Any more precise determination of the *locality* where it was composed is nowhere pointed to, not even in xix. 1 (see on the passage), where Köstlin finds the residence of the writer presupposed as being in the country to the east of the Jordan, to which view Holtzmann also is inclined (p. 414 f.).

REMARK.—The above notice of time given by Eusebius is more precisely determined: by Eusebius of Caesarea, in the *Chronicon*, as the year 41; by Cosmas Indicopleustes, as in the time of the stoning of Stephen; by Theophylact and Euth. Zigabenus, as eight years after the ascension; by the *Alexandrine Chronicon* and Nicephorus, as fifteen years after the ascension. All these are the outcome of a desire to place the Gospel as early as possible. In modern times, the determination of the time within the 60 years has been for the most part rightly adhered to (Keim, 66). Still, in so doing, any alleged

<sup>1</sup> With regard to xxii. 35, see the commentary. The parenthesis, moreover, in xxiv. 15, ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοεῖτω, only draws attention sharply to the remarkable prediction, but contains nothing from which the βδίλυμα τ. ἱερῶς should announce itself as already begun. Baur, p. 605, deduces from the assumption that the βδίλυμα τῆς ἱερῶς, in xxiv. 15 is the pillar of Jupiter which Hadrian caused to be erected upon the site of the ruined temple, that the Gospel falls within the years 130-140. But see remark 3, after chap. xiv. Köstlin, rightly understanding the destruction in the year 70, yet deals much too freely with the εὐθὺς in xxiv. 29, so as to extend it to a period of about 10 years, and accordingly places the composition of the Gospel *after* the destruction of Jerusalem, about 70-80, when it originated amid the most lively expectation of the Parousia. Within the same time Hilgenfeld also places the final redaction; the fundamental document, however, as early as 50-60.



use of the Apocalypse (Hitzig, Volkmar) is to be left out of consideration.

#### SEC. IV.—RELATIONSHIP OF THE FIRST THREE GOSPELS.<sup>1</sup>

The strange mixture of agreement and divergence in the Synoptics when compared with each other, in which there appears an obvious communion, not merely as to the matter and extent and course of the history, but also as to the words and transactions, extending even to the most accidental minutiae and to the most peculiar expressions,—partly, again, a very varying peculiarity in the manner of receiving and dealing with the subject-matter, as well as in the selection of the expressions and links of connection (see the more minute demonstration of this relation in de Wette, *Einl.* secs. 79, 80; Credner, sec. 67; Wilke, *neutestament. Rhetorik*, p. 435 ff.; Holtzmann, p. 10 ff.), has, since the mechanical strictness of the older theory of inspiration had to yield its place to the claims of scientific investigation, called forth very different attempts at explanation. *Either* all the three Gospels have been derived from a common source, *or* critics have contented themselves with the old hypothesis (see already Augustine, *de consensu Evang.* i. 4), that one evangelist made use of the other,—the later of the earlier one or more, where, however, ancient evangelical writings and the oral traditions of the apostolic age have been called in, and could not fail to be so, by way of aid.

#### I.

A. After Clericus (*Hist. eccl. II. prim. saec.*, Amstelodami 1716, p. 429) had already directed attention, with a view to the explanation of the affinity in question, to ancient gospel

<sup>1</sup> On the history of the investigations bearing upon this subject, see Weiss in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1861, p. 678 ff.; Hilgenfeld in his *Zeitschrift*, 1861, p. 1 ff. 137 f., 1862, p. 1 ff., 1865, p. 171 ff., and in his work, *der Kanon u. d. Kritik d. N. T.* 1863; Holtzmann, *die synopt. Evangelien*, p. 15 ff.; Weizsäcker, p. 10 ff.; Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, I. p. 99 ff.; Volkmar, *Relig. Jesu*, p. 375 ff., and *Urspr. der Evangelien*, 1866, also *die Evangelien oder Markus u. d. Synopsis*, etc., 1870; Scholten, *d. älteste Evang.*, German transl. by Redepenning, 1869; Hilgenfeld in his *Zeitschrift*, 1870, 2 and 4.

writings composed by eye- and ear-witnesses,—while, at a later date, Semler in his translation of Townson's *Discourses on the Four Gospels*, Halle 1783, I. pp. 221, 290, had assumed one or more original Syro-Chaldaic writings, as Lessing also had (*theol. Nachl.* 1785, p. 45 ff.) already regarded the Gospel according to the Hebrews as the common source, in which he was followed by Niemeyer (*Conjecturae ad illustr. plurimor. N. T. scriptor. silentium de primord. vitae J. Ch.*, Hal. 1790), C. F. Weber (*Untersuch. üb. d. Ev. d. Hebr.* 1806), Paulus (*Introductio in N. T. capita selectiora*, Jenae 1799), Thiess, (*Kommentar*, I. p. 18 f.), Schneckenburger, and several others,—it was, first, pupils from the school of Eichhorn (Halfeld and Russwurm in the *Göttinger Preisschriften*, 1793, and see the work of the latter on the origin of the first three Gospels, Ratzeb. 1797), and, soon after, Eichhorn himself (in *d. Bibl. d. bibl. Literatur*, 1794, p. 759 ff.), who came forward with the *hypothesis*, which has become famous, of an original written Gospel, which, with manifold modifications, was adopted by Marsh (Remarks and Additions to Michaelis, *Einl. aus dem Engl. von Rosenmüller*, Gött. I. 1795, II. 1803), Ziegler (in Gabler's *neuest. theol. Journ.* IV. p. 417), Hänlein, Herder (partly), Gratz (see afterwards), Bertholdt, Kuinoel, and several others.

According to Eichhorn, an original Syro-Chaldaic Gospel, composed about the time of the stoning of Stephen, contained the sections common to all the three evangelists; but in such a way that four, likewise Aramaic, editions of the same served as a foundation for the Synoptics,—namely, edition A to Matthew; edition B to Luke; edition C, composed of A and B, to Mark; and besides these, still an edition D to Matthew and Luke alike. The less, however, that in this way the *verbal* agreement was explained, and that too of the Greek Gospel, consisting, as it does so often, of casual and unique expressions, the less could more complicated attempts at explanation fail to be made. Herbert Marsh, *l.c.* II. p. 284 ff., set up the following genealogy:—(1)  $\aleph$ , an original Hebrew Gospel; (2)  $\bar{\aleph}$ , a Greek version of the same; (3)  $\aleph + a + A$ , a transcript of the original Hebrew Gospel, with smaller and larger additions;

(4)  $\aleph + \beta + B$ , another transcript of the same, with other smaller and larger additions; (5)  $\aleph + \gamma + \Gamma$ , a third transcript, again with other additions; (6)  $\beth$ , a Hebrew gnomology in various editions. The *Hebrew Matthew*, according to this theory, originated by means of  $\aleph + \beth + a + A + \gamma + \Gamma$ ; the *Gospel of Luke*, by means of  $\aleph + \beth + \beta + B + \gamma + \Gamma + \bar{\aleph}$ ; the *Gospel of Mark*, by means of  $\aleph + a + A + \beta + B + \bar{\aleph}$ ; the *Greek Matthew*, however, was a translation of the Hebrew Matthew, with the addition of  $\bar{\aleph}$ , and of the Gospels of Luke and Mark.

In order to remove the objections which were raised against him, Eichhorn (*Einl.* I. p. 353 ff.) expanded his view in the following way:—(1) An original Hebrew Gospel; (2) a Greek version of this; (3) a peculiar recension of number 1; (4) a Greek version of number 3, with the use of number 2; (5) another recension of number 1; (6) a third recension, derived from numbers 3 and 5; (7) a fourth recension from number 1, with larger additions; (8) Greek version of number 7, with the use of number 2; (9) a *Hebrew Matthew*, derived from numbers 3 and 7; (10) a *Greek Matthew*, from number 9, with the assistance of numbers 4 and 8; (11) *Mark*, derived from number 6, with the use of numbers 4 and 5; (12) *Luke*, from numbers 5 and 8. The hypothesis of an original written gospel received a somewhat more simple shape from Grätz (*neuer Versuch der Entstehung der drei ersten Evang. zu erklären.* Tüb. 1812) as follows:—(1) An original Hebrew Gospel; (2) an original Greek Gospel, derived from former, with many additions; (3) shorter evangelic documents; (4) *Mark* and *Luke* arose out of number 2, with the help of number 3; (5) a *Hebrew Matthew*, derived from number 1, with additions, partly its own, partly borrowed from a document which here and there agreed with the gnomology employed by Luke; (6) a *Greek version of the Hebrew Matthew*, in making which the Gospel of Mark was consulted, and additions derived from it; (7) interpolations from the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, by means of mutual transpositions of many sections from the one to the other.

Considering the entire want of any historical basis for the

existence of an original written Gospel of the kind in question, although it could not but have been regarded as of very high authority; considering the meagre and defective materials of which it must needs have been composed; considering the contradictions which the testimonies of Luke in his preface, and of the fragment of Papias, carry in themselves to an original *written* Gospel; considering the artificial nature of the structure which is raised up upon a presupposed basis by the arbitrary calling in of materials at will; considering the accumulated and strangely trivial cultivation of authorship, which is presupposed, in opposition to the spirit, the wants, and the hope of the apostolic age; considering the dead mechanical way especially in which the evangelists would have gone to work, altogether without that independent idiosyncrasy which, in the case of apostles and apostolic men, cannot, even in respect to their written activity in the service of the church, be conceived of as wanting without doing injury to the historical character and spirit of the original Christian age; considering the high authority, finally, which the Synoptics have attained, but which they could scarcely have reached by a style of writing history so spiritless, so laboriously fettered, and of so compilatory a character:—it can only be regarded as an advance and a gain, that these artificial hypotheses have again disappeared, and are worthy of note only as evidences of an inventive conjectural criticism, which, when we consider the theological character of its time, cannot astonish us even in respect of the approval which it received. A beneficial recoil from this approval was brought about first by Hug (*Einkl.* 1808, 4te Aufl. 1847), who simply went back to the critical use to which Mark subjected Matthew, and Luke both his predecessors, consequently in harmony with the order of succession in the Canon,—a view which, at the present day, is held most decidedly by Hilgenfeld.

The assumption also of *many kinds of original gospel writings and essays* as sources of the Synoptics (after Clericus, *i.e.*, Semler, Michaelis, Koppe, and others; first, in reference to the third Gospel, by Schleiermacher, *üb. d. Schriften des Luk.* Berlin 1817 [Eng. transl. by late Bishop of St. David's]), is

by no means sufficient to solve the riddle, especially if we keep in view the harmony of the three in respect of their plan and design as a whole; for if we were to explain all the peculiarities of the relation in this way, we would be entangled in a mosaic work of multitudinous combinations and separations, in which there would again fall to the share of the evangelists themselves nothing but a curiously mechanical skill *as their undeserved fate*.

B. Far greater reputation, nay, even permanent approval down to the most recent time (Guericke, Ebrard, Thiersch, and many others; also Schleiermacher, *Einkl.*, ed. Wolde, 1845), has been attained by the hypothesis of an *original oral Gospel*, which, after Eckermann (*theol. Beitr.* V. 2, p. 148), Herder (*Regel d. Zusammenstimm. unserer Evangel. in: von Gottes Sohn, der Welt Heiland*, 1797), has found its most thoroughgoing representative<sup>1</sup> in Gieseler's celebrated *Versuch über die Entstehung und frühesten Schicksale der schriftl. Evang.*, Leipzig 1818. According to this hypothesis, which may be compared with that of Wolf regarding the origin of Homer, the doctrines, acts, and destinies of Christ were, among the apostles and first Christians at Jerusalem, the oft-repeated subject of their conversation, in a greater or less degree, always in proportion as they appeared more or less as witnesses for the Messiahship. The memory of one disciple thus aided that of another in the way of correction and arrangement, so that the facts and discourses were apprehended in a firm living recollection. By this process, however,—through which men who were destined to be fellow-labourers with the apostles were prepared for their vocation, instruction being imparted by one apostle in the presence of the others,—these ἀπομνημονεύματα attained a continuous historical shape; and in order to prevent any

<sup>1</sup> See, besides, Sartorius, *drei Abh. üb. wichtig. Gegenst. d. exeg. u. system. Theol.* 1820; Rettig, *Ephemerid. exeg. Theol.* I., Giessen 1824; Schulz in the *Stud. u. Kritik.* 1829; Schwarz, *über das Verwandtschaftsverhältn. d. Evangelien*, 1844. In reference to Mark, Knobel, *de ev. Marci orig.* 1831. Here belongs also Kalchreuter in the *Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol.* 1861, p. 507 ff., who refers the harmony, without any written medium, to the original Gospel of Christian recollection.

disfiguration, the expression also, and therewith, at the same time, the thought, became fixed,<sup>1</sup> which might take place all the more easily, considering that the state of culture among the first narrators was pretty much the same. There was thus formed a standing, as it were stereotype, narrative, which comprised the sections common to the three Synoptics. As, however, some portions of the history formed more the topic of conversation and of narration to the converts, and others less, always according to their greater or less importance,—which determined, also, a more or less free form of address; and as, in addition, special recollections of the apostles flowed into their addresses,—there are explained in this way the divergencies which are found in some parts of the historical narrative. This oral narrative was impressed upon the memory of those who were intended for the vocation of teaching by frequent repetition. The language of this original type of oral Gospel, the Aramaic, was with all care translated into Greek, when Hellenists in increasing numbers were received into the community. Finally, the word became lettered by the letter, whereby, the individual author, in selecting and setting forth his material, fell in with the wants of his readers; so that *Matthew* handed on a purely Palestinian; *Mark*, a Palestinian Gospel, modified abroad, and for strangers out of Palestine; *Luke*, a Pauline Gospel.

The want, however, of all historical testimony for a *standing* apostolic tradition of that kind; the mechanical method, opposed to the living spirit of the apostolic age and activity, which is presupposed in order to its origination and establishment; the mechanical literary manner in which the evangelists are said to have continued the oral account which pre-existed; the incompleteness and limitation, beyond which a narrative of that kind could not have risen; the want of agreement precisely in the all-important histories of the passion and resurrection of Christ; the circumstance that, as already appears from the Acts of the Apostles and the New Testament

<sup>1</sup> Compare the Rabbinical rule in *Schabb.* f. 15. 1: "Verba praeceptoris sine ullâ immutatione, ut prolata ab illo fuerant, erant recitanda, ne diversa illi affingeretur sententia." See, generally, Gieseler, p. 105 ff.

Epistles, the preachers of the apostolic age (see on Acts xxi. 8) had to deal chiefly with the whole redemptive work of Christ, and that therefore they, by preference, announced His incarnation, His manifestation and ministry, in brief, condensed summary (see, *e.g.*, Acts x. 37-42), His doctrine as a fact viewed as a whole, the testimony to His miracles, His sacrificial death, His resurrection, glorification, and second advent, in doing which they possessed, in their own recollection, and *relatively* in the living tradition, material and warrant enough for the preaching also of the individual doctrines, discourses, acts, and destinies of the Lord, which they certainly had likewise to do in the discharge of this great chief vocation of theirs (comp. 1 Cor. xi. 23, ch. xv. 1 ff.; see also what Papias says of Mark, as the hearer of Peter, in Eusebius, iii. 39), and did not need a previous stereotype didactic preparation; the want of every trace of such a standing type in the New Testament Epistles; finally, the testimonies of Luke and Papias, which are exactly opposed to an original Gospel tradition in the sense *assumed*; the complete breaking through of such already by Luke, and its annulling by John:—all these are just so many reasons why any explanation of the synoptic Gospels upon that hypothesis of an original oral Gospel (without prejudice, however, to the necessary and great influence of oral tradition in general) must be renounced, even apart from this, that the formation of such an original Gospel, by means of the designed co-operation of the apostles, would be simply irreconcilable with the contradictions which are presented by the Gospel of John.

## II.

*The view, according to which one evangelist made use of the other*,—where, however, the *gospel tradition*, as it existed in a living form long before it was recorded in writing (Luke i. 2), as well as old *written documents*, composed before our Gospels (Luke, *l.c.*), come also essentially into consideration,—is the only one which is fitted to enable us to conceive of the synoptic relationship in a natural manner, and in agreement with the history.

The order in which the three originated has, according  
 MATT. c

to this view, been very variously determined. Namely, (1.) according to the order of the canon, *Matthew* wrote first, *Mark* made use of him, and *Luke* of both. So Grotius, Mill, Wetstein, Bengel, Townson (*Abhandlungen über d. vier Evangel.*, aus dem Engl. von Semler, Leipzig 1783, I. p. 275, II. p. 1 ff.), Seiler (*de temp. et ord., quo tria ev. pr. can. scripta sunt*, Erlangen 1805, 1806), Hug, Credner,<sup>1</sup> Hengstenberg, Grau, and several others; of the Tübingen school, Hilgenfeld (*d. Markus-Evangel.*, Lpz. 1850, *krit. Untersuch. üb. d. Evangel. Justin's*, etc., Halle 1850, also in the *theolog. Jahrb.* 1852, p. 102 ff., 158 ff., 1857, p. 381 ff., 408 ff., and *die Evangelien nach ihrer Entstehung*, and 1854, *d. Urchristenthum*, 1855, and in his *wiss. Zeitschrift*, 1859, 1861, 1862, 1863, 1865, 1867, 1870; also in his *Kanon u. Kritik. d. N. T.* 1863), who refers our canonical Matthew to an apostolic documentary work—of a strictly Judeo-Christian character—between the years 60 and 70, which, however, received, immediately after the destruction of Jerusalem, a freer treatment, and in this way attained its present shape, as he also places, as an intermediate link, between Matthew and Mark, not merely the Petrine-Roman tradition, but also a Petrine edition of Matthew, a Gospel of Peter, which was also made use of by the author of our Mark, while he makes the Gospel of Luke to arise out of a Pauline working up of the two first Gospels, and other sources about 100 years after Christ. Augustine's

<sup>1</sup> According to Credner, *Einleit.*, it was not long after the destruction of Jerusalem, "on the border of the transition period from historical tradition to legend," that attempts at a written record of the gospel history were first made. There were found in existence about that time both the Hebrew collection of sayings by the Apostle Matthew, and also those observations which Mark, the companion of Peter, had set down accurately, indeed, but without reference to arrangement, probably after the apostle's death. A Palestinian writer made that work of Matthew, with the aid of Mark's memoranda, as well as of oral tradition, the basis of a written redaction of the gospel history, and there thus originated "our first canonical Gospel, rightly entitled *κατὰ Ματθαῖον*." Another took those memoranda of Mark as the foundation of his work, and, arranging and supplementing, worked up the history in agreement with them, and thus arose the *εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Μάρκον*. Luke, along with oral tradition, already made use of *διηγήσεις* of the gospel history, and amongst these probably of our Matthew and Mark, but more certainly of the *λόγια*, which Matthew himself had written, and of the observations which Mark himself had recorded.



opinion (*de consen. ev. i. 4*) already was : " Marcus *Matthaeum subsequutus tanquam pedissequus et breviator ejus videtur*," which Koppe (Marcus non epitomator Matthaei, 1782) rightly controverts, as is done afterwards also by Herder and others, proceeding from other principles ; and especially by those who assign to Mark the priority among the three (see subsequently). (2.) Matthew, Luke, Mark, the so-called hypothesis of Griesbach. So Owen, *Observations on the Four Gospels*, London 1764 ; Stroth in Eichhorn's *Repert. IX* p. 144 ; and especially Griesbach, *Commentat. qua Marci ev. totum e Matthaei et Lucae commentariis decerpt. esse monstratur*, Jen. 1789, 1790 (also in his *Opsuc.*, ed. Gabler, II. p. 385 ff.) ; Ammon, *de Luca emendatore Matthaei*, Erl. 1805 ; Saunier, *üb. d. Quellen des Ev. Mark.*, Berlin 1825 ; Theile, *de trium prior. ev. necessitud.*, Leipzig 1825, and in Winer's and Engelhardt's *krit. Journ. V. 4*, p. 400 f., Sieffert, Fritzsche, Neudecker, Kern, de Wette, Gfrörer, *heil. Sage*, p. 212 ff., Strauss, Schwarz, *neue Untersuch. üb. d. Verwandtschaftsverhältniss d. synop. Evang.*, Tübingen 1844, p. 277 ff., Bleek, Schwegler in the *theolog. Jahrb.* 1843, p. 203 ff., and in the *nachapost. Zeitalter*, I. p. 457 ff., Baur, p. 548 ff., and *d. Markus-Evangel.*, Tüb. 1851, also in the *theolog. Jahrb.* 1853, p. 54 ff. ; and frequently Strauss, Zeller, Dölling, Köstlin,<sup>1</sup> Kahnis, Keim.

<sup>1</sup> According to Köstlin, our *Matthew*, which first arose between the years 70-80, was composed with the use of the Apostle Matthew's collection of discourses, as well as of the Petrine Gospel, which is intended in Papias' testimony regarding Mark, and of other sources, and experienced its last catholic redaction about the years 90-100. *Luke* made use of *Matthew*, although not as a principal source, but chiefly of South-Palestinian, Judeo-Christian sources, and wrote still in the first century, in Asia Minor, where the Gospel long circulated as a private writing, until it became known in Rome also, where ecclesiastical use was not made of it probably till after the middle of the second century. Our *Mark*, finally, an epitomized, neutral, and irenic work, is dependent upon *Matthew* and *Luke*, as well as on the older written source of *Mark*, is a product of the idea of catholicity upon an originally Judeo-Christian basis, and originated in the Roman Church in the first decennium of the second century. Generally the consideration of the Gospels as *tendential writings*, in which the development of early Christianity into the Old Catholic Church is said to disclose itself, is peculiar to the school of *Baur*, where, however, *Hilgenfeld* claims for his method of apprehending the subject the character of the literary-historical, a name which does not change the nature of the tendential view.

Among these defenders of the priority of Matthew, Delitzsch, in a manner which is peculiar to himself, believes that he has demonstrated the same (see his *neue Unters. üb. Entstehung und Anlage d. kanon. Evangelien*, I. p. 59), namely, by means of a presumed *pentateuchic* plan of the Gospel in harmony with the setting forth of Christianity as a new, not less divine νόμος, raised above that of Moses. This discovery, however, is nothing else than a playing of the Rabbinical mind with a fanciful typology (see especially Lücke: *de eo, quod nimium artis acuminisque est in ea, quae nunc praecipue factitatur sacrae scripturae . . . interpretatione*, Gött. 1853; Baur in the *theolog. Jahrb.* 1854, p. 235 ff.; Weiss in the *deutsch. Zeitschr. Beibl.* 1854, 3), for the sake of laying a foundation for the confident assertion of the author, that to think of the priority of Mark will be henceforth quite impossible,—a remark which has been already abundantly refuted by experience.

(3.) *Mark, Matthew, Luke.* So Storck, *üb. d. Zweck d. evang. Gesch. u. d. Briefe des Johannes*, p. 274 ff., and *de fontibus evang. Matt. et Lucae*, Tüb. 1794 (also in Velthusen, *Commentatt.* III. p. 140 ff.); from Mark, namely, the Hebrew Matthew, and partly, also, Luke were derived, and that the Greek translator of Matthew then made use of Mark and Luke.

The order, *Mark, Matthew, Luke*,<sup>1</sup> is maintained also by Lachmann in the *Stud. u. Kritik.* 1835, p. 570 ff.; Weisse, *evang. Gesch.* 1838, and *Evangelienfr.* 1856, Ewald, Reuss, Thiersch; Tobler, *Evangelienfr.* 1858; Ritschl in the *theolog. Jahrb.* 1851, p. 480 ff.; Plitt, *de compos. evang. synopt.* 1860; Weiss in the *Stud. u. Kritik.* 1861, p. 29 ff., 646 ff., and in the *Jahrb. f. D. Theolog.* 1864, p. 49 ff., 1865, p. 319 ff.;

<sup>1</sup> Against this reputed "*pet child of the most recent criticism*," Keim, in particular (Inaugural Address, *d. menschl. Entwickl. J. Ch.*, Zürich 1861, and in his *Gesch. Jesu*), has come forward in support of Matthew, and to the prejudice of John. Hilgenfeld continues most zealously to contend against the priority of Mark; Kahnis, *Dogmatik*, I. p. 409, classes the same among the "*hardest aberrations of modern criticism*." — Klostermann (*d. Markus-Evang. nach s. Quellenverthe*, 1867) rejects the hypothesis of an original Mark; finds, however, in our Mark the traces of an earlier and more original representation of the history, which may again be recognised in our first Gospel.

compare his *Markus-Evangel.* 1871; Eichthal, *les évangiles*, 1863; Schenkel; Wittichen in the *Jahrb. f. D. Th.* 1862, p. 314 ff., 1866, p. 427 ff.; Holtzmann, *d. synopt. Evangelien*, 1863; Weizsäcker, who assumes a written source common to the three, the extent and arrangement of which may be recognised substantially in the representation of Mark; Scholten, *d. älteste Evang., krit. Unters., aus d. Holländ. v. Redepenning*, 1869. Amongst these, Ewald and Scholten especially have laid down, in very dissimilar ways, a most complicated order of origination. This, according to Ewald, is as follows:—(1) *The oldest Gospel*, describing the most prominent events in the life of Jesus, made use of by the Apostle Paul, probably composed by the Evangelist Philip in the Greek language, but with a Hebrew colouring; (2) *the Hebrew collection of sayings by Matthew*, containing chiefly large portions of discourses, but also narrative introductions; (3) *the Gospel of Mark*, for which 1 and 2 were used, yet of independent origin, although no longer preserved quite in its original form; (4) *the book of the higher history*, which undertook to depict in a new fashion the very heights of the gospel history, and from which proceeds, e.g., the copious narrative of the temptation in Matthew and Luke; (5) *our present Gospel of Matthew*, written in Greek, with the use of 1–4, especially, however, of Mark, and the collection of sayings, probably also of a writing upon the preliminary history; (6, 7, 8) *three different books, which may still be pointed out from the Gospel of Luke*; (9) *the Gospel of Luke*, in which all the hitherto enumerated writings, with the exception, however, of Matthew, were used. According to Scholten, however, a sketch by John Mark, after undergoing a first revision (*Proto-Markus*), was united with Matthew's collection of sayings (*Proto-Matthaeus*), through which process arose a *Deutero-Matthaeus*, a second recension of which (*Trito-Matthaeus*) produced our first canonical Gospel; the latter, however, must also have been already known to a second redactor of the *Proto-Markus*, i.e. to our canonical Mark (*Deutero-Markus*), as is shown by its putting aside the history of the birth. The view of Holtzmann is simpler, who regards an original Mark

(A) as the sole basis of our present Mark, which, however, was also used, after the collection of sayings (A), by Matthew and Luke, yet in such a way that these two, along with A and A, made use also of other smaller written sources and oral traditions. Weiss, again, supposes the *λόγια* to be the original Gospel, with which portions of the history, of the nature of sketches, yet without the history of the birth and passion, were already combined, and then makes our Mark follow at once, as a working up of the original Gospel with the recollections of Peter. The question, whether Luke made use of our Matthew, is denied, not merely by Ewald, but also by Weisse, Reuss, Thiersch, Plitt, Weiss, Holtzmann, Weizsäcker.

(4.) *Mark, Luke, Matthew.* So Wilke (*der Urevangelist*, 1838), B. Bauer. Comp. also Hitzig, *üb. Johann. Markus und seine Schriften*, 1843; and especially Volkmar, *die Evangelien od. Markus u. d. Synopsis*, etc., 1870, according to whom the Gospel of Mark is said to be a self-conscious didactic poem upon a historical basis; the Gospel of Luke a Pauline renewal of the original didactic writing against a Jewish-Christian reaction; while the Gospel of Matthew is a combination of both in the universalistic Jewish-Christian sense. See also Volkmar, *Urspr. uns. Evangelien nach d. Urkunden*, 1866.

(5.) *Luke, Matthew, Mark.* So Büsching, *die vier Evangelisten mit ihren eigenen Worten zusammengesetzt*, Hamb. 1766; Evanson, *The Dissonance of the Four generally received Evangelists*, 1792.

(6.) *Luke, Mark, Matthew.* So Vogel (in Gabler's *Journ. für auserl. theol. Lit.* I. p. 1 ff.). A more minute statement and criticism of these various views belongs to the science of Historico-Critical Introduction. It may here suffice to note the following points.

Since the testimony of Papias regarding the work of Mark furnishes no reason (see afterwards, note 1) for regarding this work as different from our second canonical Gospel; and since our present Gospel of Matthew is not identical with the *σύνταξις τῶν λογίων* which the apostle composed, but is a non-

apostolic historic product which gradually grew up out of this apostolic writing; since, finally, Luke, who already presupposes a manifold evangelic literature, and who wrote after the destruction of Jerusalem, must be regarded in any case as the last of the Synoptists, while the tradition, which assigns the first place to Matthew, may be fully conceived and explained from the very early existence of that apostolic *σύνταξις τῶν λογίων*,—the Gospel of *Mark* thus most naturally presents itself, on a historical consideration of the origin of the three synoptic Gospels—and that without the assumption, which is devoid of historical testimony, and throws everything back into uncertainty, of an original writing,<sup>1</sup> differing from its present form—as the one which is the oldest amongst the three, and which alongside of oral tradition and other original evangelic written sources, exercised a dominant influence upon the others. With this assumption that *Mark* is the oldest of the Synoptics, the distinctive internal character of this Gospel is quite in harmony,—the omission of all preliminary histories which cannot be explained as resulting from design (according to Baur, from neutrality), the beginning [of the history] with the appearance of the Baptist, the as yet altogether undeveloped narrative of the temptation, the circumstantial treatment of the history of the miracles, the freedom from legendary insertions in the history of the Passion which are found in *Matthew*, the objective character which, nevertheless, indi-

<sup>1</sup> Weisse, Ewald, Köstlin, Reuss, Scholten, and several others. It has been sought to determine the unknown magnitude of an original *Mark*, against which Weiss and Klostermann have also decidedly declared themselves, partly by means of a multitude of interpolations (comp. also Wilke and Volkmar) which our *Mark* contains, partly by means of many large omissions which it is said to have experienced, partly by the assumption of many variations in expression, and in the setting forth of individual details. Holtzmann reduces the literary treatment which this original writing received through *Mark*—(1) to abbreviations of the discourses, and to the passing over of minutiae in the narratives; (2) to an important abbreviation at the beginning, and a great gap, occasioned by the Sermon on the Mount, with which, at the same time, two miracles have fallen out; (3) to brief explanatory additions and insertions. Weizsäcker goes further in comparing the evangelic fundamental document, which he assumes, with the present *Mark*. Wittichen, too, finds in the latter a *redaction* of the fundamental document; while Scholten brings out the original *Mark* only after many arbitrary excisions.

cates the theological design and method, and especially the original stamp of direct liveliness and picturesque clearness of style and description. "This enamel of the fresh flower, this full pure life of the materials" (Ewald, *Jahrb.* I. p. 204), cannot be explained from the "tendency towards what is drastic and striking" (Kahnis), or from a purely "subjective manner on the part of the author" (Köstlin), and is not reconcilable with the assumption of a compilatory treatment; while the peculiar omission, moreover, and abbreviation on the one side, and the numerous, more circumstantial narratives and individual features on the other, which Mark exhibits, when compared with Matthew, would be conceivable neither psychologically nor historically, if Mark were the copyist and extractor of Matthew (or even of Matthew and Luke). See especially Weiss, Holtzmann, Weizsäcker, Klostermann. The Gospel of Mark, which, agreeably to its extent, arrangement, and presentation of the gospel material, flowed most directly from the early Christian tradition, must have preceded our present Gospel of Matthew, and it is only the actual composition of the Apostle, Matthew's collection of sayings, which can be regarded as the source which Mark, and that with the independence of his peculiar object, which did not go in quest of copious accounts of *discourses*, made use of from Matthew. His Gospel, moreover, had the authority of Peter in its favour (see the fragment of Papias); and it is all the more explicable, when the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew gradually formed itself amongst the Christians of Palestine out of the Apostle Matthew's collection of sayings, that it obtained a very substantial influence not only upon the shaping of this itself as to contents and form, but was also, at its final redaction and subsequent translation into the Greek language, made use of in such a way that the community even of expressions, which appears so often in the portions that are common, is thereby explained, exactly as at a later time again Luke had the Gospel of Mark also as one of his sources, and by the manner in which he made use of it, might make it appear as if it occupied a middle position between the first and third Gospels, borrowing in a dependent manner from both; a view by which a crying injustice is done

to Mark under the domination of the Griesbachian hypothesis<sup>1</sup> (especially, also, by de Wette, Baur, Köstlin, Bleek, Keim). If accordingly, besides oral tradition, the *σύνταξις τῶν λογίων* of the Apostle Matthew, and our Gospel of Mark, are to be regarded as the chief Christian sources of our first Gospel, to the latter of which sources the relation of our Matthew is often directly that of omission and extraction, there yet must also have been other original evangelic writings in existence, which were worked up along with these when the Gospel was moulding itself into shape. Such individual writings are certainly to be recognised in the genealogy and in the preliminary history, and though less certainly determinable, yet also not to be denied in the further course of the history. The uniformity of the linguistic stamp, which exists in general, finds its sufficient explanation partly in the final redaction which preceded the translation, partly in the unity of the translator.

REMARK 1.—The testimony of the Presbyter John (not of the Evangelist John, as Zahn, Riggenbach, and Klostermann think), in Papias, regarding Mark, as quoted in Eusebius iii. 39, is as follows:—"Μάρκος μὲν, ἑρμηνευτῆς Πέτρου γενόμενος, ὅσα ἐμνημόνευσεν ἀκριβῶς ἔγραψεν, οὐ μέντοι τάξει, τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα· οὔτε γὰρ ἤκουσε τοῦ κυρίου οὔτε παρηκολούθησεν αὐτῷ, ὕστερον δὲ, ὡς ἔφην, Πέτρῳ, ὃς πρὸς τὰς χρείας ἐποιεῖτο τὰς διδασκαλίας, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὥσπερ σύνταξιν τῶν κυριακῶν ποιούμενος λόγων (al. λογίων, as Laemmer reads). Ὡστε οὐδὲν ἡμαρτε Μάρκος οὕτως ἐνια γράψας ὡς ἀπεμνημόνευσεν· ἐνὸς γὰρ ἐποίησατο πρόνοιαν, τοῦ μηδὲν ὧν ἤκουσε παραλιπεῖν ἢ ψεύσασθαι τι ἐν αὐτοῖς. Ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἰστόρηται ἐν Παπίᾳ περὶ τοῦ Μάρκου." This statement, now, in the opinion of Credner (compare also Schleiermacher in the *Stud. u. Kritik*. 1832, p. 758 ff.), Schneckenburger, Weisse, Schwegler, Baur, Köstlin,

<sup>1</sup> Lachmann, *N. T.*, ed. maj. Praef. p. xvi., appropriately says that this hypothesis represents Mark as "*ineptissimum desultorem, qui nunc taedio, modo cupiditate, tum negligentia, denique vecordi studio, inter evangelia Matthaei et Lucae incertus feratur atque oberret.*" The most thorough demonstration of its inaccuracy, see in Holtzmann, p. 113 ff. Compare also the whole of his excellent section upon the linguistic character of the Synoptists (p. 271 ff.). The correct recognition of the linguistic peculiarities of the three decidedly excludes any mechanical compilation.

and others, is said not to be appropriate to our Gospel of Mark, because *τάξεις*, in general, is a feature that is applicable to it. According to Baur, the work meant by Papias is to be conceived of as after the fashion of the Clementine Homilies; according to Köstlin, as a Petrine gospel, containing for the most part discourses of Jesus; according to Ewald and Hilgenfeld, its contents were at least of greater extent than our Mark. But the meaning of the above passage is as follows:—After Mark had become the interpreter, *i.e.* not the translator (Grimm in the *Stud. u. Kritik*. 1872, p. 686), but the secretary of Peter, he committed to writing so much of what had either been spoken or done by Christ as his memory enabled him to recall, although not in the order of historical succession. He could not have adopted the latter plan, because he had been neither a hearer nor a follower of the Lord; but at a later date, as mentioned (*ut dixi*, namely, in the words *ἐρμην. Πέτρου γενόμεν.*), he became a follower of Peter, “*who regulated his doctrinal teaching according to the requirements of the occasion, though not in such a way as if he had intended to set forth the discourses of the Lord in an orderly combination. Mark therefore committed no error in having written down some things in the shape that his recollection presented<sup>1</sup> them to him; for one thing he made of importance, to omit nothing of what he had heard (from Peter), and to falsify none of the statements.*” The *ἔγραψεν*, mentioned at the beginning of the statement, refers then to the writing down which immediately followed the hearing of the addresses of Peter, which might take place *ὡς τάξει*, not according to historical order, but only in the form of notices, in the fashion of Adversaria. The *γράψας*, on the other hand, that follows, refers to the later composition of the Gospel, as clearly appears from the *ἔτινα* which stands beside it (in opposition to the preceding *ὅσα*). This *ἔτινα*, however, brings into prominence some things, out of the entire contents of his Gospel, which might, indeed, have been expected to be given in a *different* way from that in which Mark’s memory recalled them, *i.e.* in a better pragmatic arrange-

Namely, without bringing this *ἔτινα* into the historically connected arrangement. We might also explain *ὡς ἀπικυνημ.* : *as he has related it* in his treatise (comp. Plato, *Theag.* p. 121 D, *Tim.* p. 20 E, *Crit.* 110 B; Xenophon, *Cyr.* viii. 2. 13; Demosthenes, 345. 10. *al.*), *i.e.* in no better order. But the above view is to be preferred on account of the correlation with *ὅσα ἐμνημόνευσεν*.—Observe, moreover, that it is not said that Mark wrote *only* *ἔτινα*, and that therefore he in general wrote *incompletely* (so still Weizsäcker, p. 29); but that he wrote some things *in such way*, etc. Köstlin, Weiss, Klostermann, have taken the right view.



ment and connection ; but in reference to which the presbyter justifies the evangelist on the ground of the accidental, fragmentary style and fashion in which his notices regarding the matter of the Gospel originated. It is not, then, to the gospel writing of Mark as a whole, but only to a *few individual portions of it* (ἐνία), that the presbyter denies the property of τάξις; and he explains this defect, and offers an excuse for it.<sup>1</sup> If, then, there is no ground stated in the words of Papias for any intention to point out in the Gospel of Mark generally a deficiency in definite arrangement (Ebrard, Reuss),—or at least a deficiency in closeness of succession, perhaps also in chronological certainty (Zahn),—these words cannot, on the other side, serve also to prove that our present Gospel is not intended. The οὐ τάξει, seeing it is limited only to *some things*, is to be left entirely in its objective accuracy, as an attested defect in the Gospel of Mark, without our having to refer this attestation to a comparison—lying at its basis—with another Gospel, especially with John (Ewald, *Jahrb.* I. p. 206) or with Matthew (Ebrard, Hilgenfeld, Weiss, Bleek, Holtzmann, and several others), or even with the work of Papias (Weisse). The inference, moreover, is not to be drawn from the present passage, that the alleged original Mark contained chiefly *discourses* of Christ (Köstlin), since οὐχ ὥσπερ σύνταξιν τῶν κυριακῶν ποιούμενος λόγων characterizes *a potiori* the instructions of Peter, and that in a *negative* manner in comparison with Papias' own work, which had the λόγια as its contents. Peter, in his διδασκαλίας, certainly communicated the Lord's sayings, but in a sporadic manner, according to the measure of the varying needs [of his

<sup>1</sup> Compare also Klostermann, *d. Markusevang.* p. 327, who, however, misunderstands the introduction to the passage of Papias, in interpreting, in a way which is linguistically incorrect, ὅσα, which is quantitative, as *qualitative* (consequently, as if οἷα stood in the passage), and ἱρμην. Π. γινόμεν. as a modal definition of ὅσα . . . ἔγραψιν (so also Grau, I. p. 178), where ἱρμηνευτής is said to be a *figurative* expression, in so far as Mark presented to his hearers the addresses of Peter, which they themselves could not hear; and thereby was, as it were, an interpreter of the apostle. Apart from this extension of the meaning of ἱρμηνευτής, which is forced and artificial, and more appropriate to a poetic context than to one of so simple a nature, and which is opposed, moreover, to the testimonies of the Fathers, such as Irenaeus, iii. 10. 6, Tertullian, *c. Marc.* iv. 5, *al.*, Klostermann explains the passage as if the words were : Μάρκος μὲν ἱρμηνευτῆς Πέτρου ἐγίνετο, οἷα ἱρμηνεύουσιν ἀκριβῶς γράψας, or : Μ. μὲν οἷα ἱρμην. ἀκριβῶς ἔγραψιν, οὕτως ἱρμηνευτῆς Πέτρου γινόμενος. Klostermann also errs in this, that he expunges the comma after οὐ μὲν τάξει, and, again, supplies ἀκριβῶς ἔγραψιν after παραχθίνα. Ὅσα ἱρμηνέον. is, rather, an intermediate clause; and the τὰ ὑπὲρ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, etc., is that which Mark wrote ἀκριβῶς, οὐ μόνον τάξει.

hearers], but not in such a way as if he had wished to produce a σύνταξις of them; and he connected them in so far with the relative *historical* instructions, that his companion Mark might write down from the addresses of the apostle to which he had listened, not merely τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ λεχθέντα, but τὰ ἣ λεχθέντα ἡ πραχθέντα.

REMARK 2. — With regard to the order of the synoptic Gospels in respect of their origin, the tradition of the *church* is unanimous for the priority of Matthew, and *almost* unanimous for assigning a middle position to Mark, in opposition to which there is only the isolated notice in Eusebius vi. 14, by Clement of Alexandria, in favour of the hypothesis of Griesbach: προεγράψαι ἔλεγεν τῶν εὐαγγελίων τὰ περιέχοντα τὰς γενεαλογίας. That unanimous tradition, however, is reconcilable also with our view regarding the origin of the Gospels, in so far, namely, that Matthew in reality wrote before Mark, *i.e.* his σύνταξις τῶν λογίων, out of which our present Gospel then grew up. To this relation to the first written source of the Gospel is the *origin* of that tradition to be referred.—Altogether without reason has Baur, in the *theol. Jahrb.* 1853, p. 93, with the approval of Volkmar, interpreted the predicate of Mark, ὁ κολοβοδάκτυλος (*with the mutilated finger*), in the *Philosophumena Origenis*, which cannot, without arbitrariness, be understood otherwise than quite in its proper sense (see Ewald, *Jahrb.* VII. p. 197), of the epitomatory character of the Gospel.

REMARK 3.—Although the Gospel of Mark is the oldest of the Synoptics, and has apparently preserved in part purer and more original traditions than the Gospel of Matthew, it may still be partially inferior in point of originality to the tradition which has stamped its impress upon the latter, since Mark could mainly work up his notices, gathered from his connection with Peter, only by help of *tradition*; and since, on the other side, the Gospel of *Matthew* was moulded into shape *gradually*, and in *Palestine* itself, so that in any case, even apart from the apostolic collection of sayings, which passed over substantially into this Gospel, many older elements of tradition, and older documentary portions than any in Mark, may have been preserved in it. To the critical comparison of the narratives given in Matthew with those of Mark, no hindrance can then be interposed by the placing of the latter first; as in Mark in comparison with Matthew, so also in Matthew in comparison with Mark, we may recognise more original elements, and thus, in so far, partly assign to the first also a primary position.

## SUPERScription.



*Εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Ματθαῖον.*

THIS superscription has the oldest and best witnesses in its favour. Κατὰ Ματθαῖον (B  $\aleph$ , Codd. Lat.) is in conformity with this, because whole volumes bore the title of Εὐαγγέλιον. All longer superscriptions are of later date, as : τὸ κ. Μ. εὐαγγέλιον ; τὸ κ. Μ. ἅγιον εὐαγγέλιον ; εὐαγγέλιον ἐκ τοῦ κ. Μ. ; ἐκ τοῦ κ. Μ. εὐαγγέλιον. Both the latter are derived from Lectionaries. — Instead of Ματθαῖος, Lachmann and Tischendorf write Μαθθαῖος, after B D  $\aleph$ .

*Εὐαγγέλιον* signifies in the old language a present given in return for joyful news (Hom. *Od.* 152, 166 ; Plut. *Ages.* 33 ; 2 Sam. iv. 10 ; Cic. *Att.* ii. 12), or a sacrifice offered up for the same (Xen. *Hell.* i. 6. 26, iv. 3. 7 ; Aristoph. *Eq.* 656 ; Diod. Sic. xv. 74 ; Pollux, v. 129). First in later Greek only does it also mean the good news itself (Plut. *Sert.* 11 ; Lucian. *Asin.* 26 ; Appian, *B. C.* iv. 20 ; LXX. 2 Sam. xviii. 25). So throughout the N. T. (corresponding to the Hebrew מְבִישָׁה), where it signifies κατ' ἐξοχήν, the joyful news of the Messiah's kingdom (Matt. iv. 23, ix. 35, xxiv. 14 ; Acts xx. 24), which news preached *Jesus* as the Messiah. So also in the superscriptions of the Gospels, which present the knowledge of salvation by *Jesus* as the Messiah in *historical* form, *in the form of a historical demonstration of the Messiahship of Jesus*. The designation of our writings as *news of salvation by the Messiah* (εὐαγγέλια) is derived from the most remote ecclesiastical antiquity. See Justin. *Apol.* i. 66, *Dial. c. Tryph.* 100. — κατὰ Ματθαῖον] The knowledge of Messianic

salvation, as it was shaped (in writing) by Matthew. In Vil-loison's Scholia on Homer we have the expressions: "Ὁμηρος κατὰ Ἀρίσταρχον, κατὰ Ζηνόδοτον, κατὰ Ἀριστοφάνην. There is thus also a εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Ματθαῖον, κατὰ Μάρκον, and so on. Comp. Euseb. iii. 24: Ματθαῖος . . . γραφῇ παραδούς τὸ κατ' αὐτὸν εὐαγγ. Matthew is in this way designated as the *author* of this written form of the Gospel, which in itself is one (Credner, *Gesch. d. Kanon*, p. 87). It is incorrect, however, to maintain, as do others, and even Kuinoel, after older writers, that κατὰ denotes *simply* the genitive. For if so, then, firstly, this case, which certainly most obviously suggested itself, and which would also have been analogous to Paul's expression, τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου (Rom. ii. 16, xvi. 25), would have been employed; secondly, the Hebrew ל of authorship, which is to be viewed as the dative of connection, is not applicable here, because the LXX. does not express it by κατὰ; thirdly, even in the passages which are quoted from Greek writers, the genitival relation is not contained directly, but is only derived in the relation of the thing to the persons, as in the numerous passages in Polybius (Schweighauser's *Lex.* p. 323); comp. already, Thuc. vi. 16. 5: ἐν τῷ κατ' αὐτοὺς βίῳ; Bernhardt, p. 241; Valckenaer, *Schol.* I. p. 4; Buttmann, *N. T. Gramm.* p. 137 [E. T. pp. 156, 157]. See also 2 Macc. ii. 13: ἐν τοῖς ὑπομνηματισμοῖς τοῖς κατὰ τὸν Νεεμιάν, and Grimm on the passage. It is quite opposed to history (Introduction, sec. 2) when *others* (Eckermann in the *theolog. Beitr.* 5 Bd. 2 St. p. 106 ff.) fall into the opposite extreme, and draw the inference from κατὰ that the composition is not here ascribed to the evangelists, but that all that is said is, that the writings are composed *after them*, i.e. *after their manner*. So Faustus the Manichæan in Augustine, *c. Faust.* xvii. 2, xxvii. 2, xxxiii. 3; Credner's *Einleit.* §§ 88-90; Jachmann in Ilgen's *Zeitschr.* 1842, 2, p. 13; Volkmar, who sees himself driven, by the fact that Luke and John were the authors of the third and fourth Gospels, to the arbitrary assumption that the superscriptions of the two first Gospels are to be regarded as original, while those of the third and fourth were intentionally added by a third hand for the sake

of uniformity, after the proper meaning of the *κατά* in the two first had come to be lost. Even in the titles of the apocryphal gospels (*εὐαγγέλ. καθ' Ἑβραίων*) *κατά* designates not the readers, for whom they were intended, but the gospel, as it had shaped itself under the hands of the Hebrews, etc., the gospel *as redacted by the Hebrews*, in this sense also shortly termed *Ἑβραϊκόν* (Epiph. *Haer.* xxx. 13).

## CHAPTER I

Vv. 1-17. In the writing of the names there are manifold variations in MSS., verss., and Fathers. Lachm. and Tisch. have in vv. 1, 6, 17 *Δαυεὶδ*, which is attested throughout as the manner of writing the word by the oldest and best MSS.; ver. 5. *Ἰωβήδ*, after B C Δ Ν, verss. Fathers; ver. 8 f. *Ὁζείαν*, *Ὁζείας*, after B Δ Ν; ver. 10. *Ἀμώς*, after B C M Δ Ν, verss. Epiph.; ver. 10 f. *Ἰωσείαν*, *Ἰωσείας*, after B Δ Ν, Sahid.; ver. 15. *Μαθθάν*, after B\*. Lachmann has, besides, in ver. 5, *Βόός*, after C, and Tischendorf (8th ed.) *Βόές*, after B Ν; Lachm. and Tisch. (8th ed.) in ver. 7 f. *Ἀσάφ*, after B C Ν, verss. — Ver. 6. *ὁ βασιλεὺς*, which B Γ Ν, 1, 71, Syr. Copt. Sahid. Arm. al. omit (deleted by Lachm. and Tisch.), has the preponderance of voices in its favour; its emphasis being overlooked on account of what precedes, it was regarded as superfluous, and was easily passed over. — Ver. 11. After *ἐγέννησε*, M U Curss. have *τὸν Ἰωακείμ*. *Ἰωακείμ δὲ ἐγέννησε*. A later interpolation (yet already before Irenaeus), but put in circulation after Porphyry had already reproached the church with a defective genealogy. — Ver. 18. B C P S Z Δ Ν, Curss. Eus. Ath. Max. have *γένεσις*. So also Lachm. and Tisch. Others: *γέννησις*, which has been adopted by Elz. Scholz, and Rinck. The former is to be preferred, because the latter might very easily arise from the frequently preceding *ἐγέννησε* and *ἐγεννήθη*, and might also appear more appropriate to the connection (*partus modus*). Comp. ii. 1, Luke i. 14. — Ver. 19. *παραδειγματίσαι*.] Lachm. and Tisch. have *δειγματίσαι*, only, indeed, after B Z Ν\*\* I, Schol. on Orig., and Euseb., but correctly, as *δειγματίζω* is preserved only in Col. ii. 15, while *παραδειγματίζω* (Heb. vi. 6) is common in the LXX. and elsewhere, and suggested itself, therefore, as the better known and stronger expression (comp. Scholion in Tisch.). — Ver. 24. *διεγερθεῖς*] Lachm. and Tisch. (8th ed.) have *ἐγερθεῖς*, after

B C \* Z 8, Curss. Epiph. The less current compound verb gave place to the very common (comp. ii. 14) simple form. — Ver. 25. τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς τὸν πρωτότοκον] Lachm. and Tisch. have simply υἱόν, after B Z 8, 1, 33, Copt. Sahid. Syr<sup>cu</sup>. Codd. It. Ambr. al. Certainly (comp. especially Bengel) the Received reading has the appearance of having originated from Luke ii. 7 (where there is no various reading). The witnesses, however, in favour of the *Recepta* greatly preponderate; the virginity of Mary, also (against which, according to the testimony of Jerome, doubts were raised in consequence of the πρωτότοκον), certainly more probably suggested the removal of the πρωτότοκον than its insertion. Comp. Mill and Wetstein. Finally, had υἱόν merely been the original reading in the present passage, the πρωτότοκον in Luke ii. 7 could scarcely have remained unassailed.

Ver. 1. Βίβλος γενέσεως] *Book of origin*; סֵפֶר הַחַיִּים, Gen. ii. 4, v. 1, LXX.; comp. Gen. vi. 9, xi. 10. The first verse contains the title of the genealogy which follows in vv. 2–16, which contains the origin of Christ from the Messianic line that runs on from the time of Abraham (genitive of contents). So Beza, Calvin, Grotius, Bengel, Wetstein, Paulus, Kuinoel, Gratz, de Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius, and others. The evangelist adopted the genealogical piece of writing (βίβλος), and which “velut extra corpus historiae prominet” (Grotius), without alteration, as he found it, and with its title also. Others (Bede, Maldonatus, Schleussner) take γένεσις as meaning *life*, and regard the words as a superscription to the entire Gospel: *commentarius de vita Jesu*. Contrary to the usage of the language; for in Judith xii. 18, and Wisdom vii. 5, γένεσις denotes the origin, the commencing point of life; in Plato, *Phaedr.* p. 252 D, it means *existence*; in Hierocles, p. 298, the *creation*, or that which is created; and in Jas. iii. 6, τροχὸς τῆς γενέσεως is the τροχός which begins with birth. And if we were to suppose, with Olearius (comp. Hammond and Vitranga, also Euthym. Zigabenus), that the superscription *liber de originibus Jesu Christi* was selected first with reference to the commencement of the history, to which the further history was then appended with a distinctive designation (comp. Catonis Censorii *Origines*), as חֵיָּוִת also confessedly does not always announce a mere genealogy (Gen.

v. 1 ff., xi. 27 ff.), nay, may even stand without any genealogical list following it (Gen. ii. 4, xxxvii. 2 ff.),—so the immediate connection in which βίβλος . . . Χριστοῦ stands with υἱοῦ Δαυ., υἱοῦ Ἀβρ., here necessitates us to think from the very beginning, in harmony with the context, of the genealogy merely ; and the commencement of ver. 18, where the γένεσις in the narrower sense, the actual origination, is now related, separates the section vv. 18–25 distinctly from the preceding genealogical list, so that the first words of chap. ii., τοῦ δὲ Ἰησοῦ γεννηθέντος, connect themselves, as carrying on the narrative, with vv. 18–25, where the origin of Jesus, down to His actual birth, is related. This is, at the same time, in answer to Fritzsche, who translates it as *volumen de J. Christi originibus*, and, appealing to the words in the beginning of ch. ii., regards βίβλος γενέσεως, κ.τ.λ., as *the superscription of the first chapter* (so also Delitzsch), as well as to Olshausen (see also Ewald and Bleek), who takes it as the superscription of the *two first chapters*. — If the Israelite set a high value, in his own individual instance, upon a series of ancestors of unexceptionable pedigree (Rom. xi. 1 ; Phil. iii. 5 ; Josephus, c. Ap. ii. 7 ; Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* p. 178), how much more must such be found to be the case on the side of the Messiah !—Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ] The name יְהוֹשֻׁעַ (Ex. xxiv. 13 ; Num. xiii. 16), or, after the exile, יֵשׁוּעַ (Neh. vii. 7), יְהוֹשֻׁעַ, was very common,<sup>1</sup>

and denotes *Jehovah is helper*. This meaning, contained in the name Jesus (comp. Sir. xlvi. 1), came to full personal manifestation in Christ, see ver. 21. Χριστός corresponds to the Hebrew מָשִׁיחַ, *anointed*, which was used partly of *priests*, Lev. iv. 3, v. 16, vi. 15, Ps. cv. 15 ; partly of *kings*, 1 Sam. xxiv. 7, 11, Ps. ii. 2, Isa. xlv. 1, comp. Dan. ix. 25, 26 ; as a prophet also, according to 1 Kings xix. 16, might be an anointed person. From the time of the Book of Daniel—for throughout the whole later period also, down to the time of Christ, the Messianic idea was a living one amongst the people<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See the different persons who bear this name in Keim, *Gesch. J. I.* p. 384 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. Langen, *d. Judenthum in Palaestina zur Zeit Christi*, 1866. Weissenbach, *Jesu in regno coel. dignitas*, 1868, p. 47 ff.

—this theocratic name, and that as a *king's* name, was applied, according to the Messianic explanation of the second Psalm, to the king of David's race, whose coming, according to the predictions of the prophets, was ever more ardently looked for, but with hopes that became ever purer, who was to raise the nation to its theocratic consummation, to restore the kingdom to its highest power and glory, and extend his blessings to the heathen as well, while, as a necessary condition to all this, He was, in a religious and moral respect, to work out the true spiritual government of God, and bring it to a victorious termination. See on the development of the idea and hope of the Messiah, especially Ewald, *Gesch. Christ.* p. 133 ff., ed. 3 [E. T. by Glover, p. 140 ff.]; Bertheau in *d. Jahrb. f. D. Th.* IV. p. 595 ff., V. p. 486 ff.; Riehm in *d. Stud. u. Kritik.* 1865, I. and III. [E. T., Clark, Edinburgh, 1876]. According to B. Bauer (comp. Volkmar, *Rel. Jesu*, p. 113), Jesus is said to have first developed the Messianic idea out of His own consciousness, the community to have clothed it in figures, and then to have found these figures also in the Old Testament, while the Jews first received the idea from the Christians! In answer to this view, which frivolously inverts the historical relation, see Ebrard, *Kritik. d. evang. Gesch.*, ed. 3, § 120 ff. [E. T. 2d ed., Clark, Edinburgh, p. 485 f.]; and on the Messianic ideas of the Jews at the time of Christ, especially Hilgenfeld, *Messias Judaeorum libris eorum paulo ante et paulo post Christum natum conscriptis illustratus*, 1869; also Holtzmann in *d. Jahrb. f. D. Theol.* 1867, p. 389 ff., according to whom, however, the original self-consciousness of the Lord had been matured at an earlier date, before He found<sup>1</sup> for it, in His confession of Himself as the Messiah, a name that might be uttered before His contemporaries, and an objective representation that was conceivable for Himself. — The official name *Χριστός*, for Jesus, soon passed over in the language of

<sup>1</sup> In connection with this view, we would be obliged to acquiesce in the belief of a very radical misunderstanding, which would permeate the gospel history from the baptism and the witness of John, namely, that the evangelists “apprehended as a *beginning* what was rather a *result*.” On exegetical grounds this cannot be justified.



the Christians into a *nomen proprium*, in which shape it appears almost universally in the Epistles and in the Acts of the Apostles, with or without the article, after the nature of proper names in general. In the Gospels, *Χριστός* stands as a proper name only in Matt. i. 1, 16, 17, 18; Mark i. 1; John i. 17; and appropriately, because not congruous to the development of the history and its connection, but spoken from the standpoint of the much later period of its composition, in which *Ἰησοῦς Χριστός* had been already long established as a customary *name* in the language of Christians; as here also (comp. Mark i. 1) in the superscription, the whole of the great name *Ἰησοῦς Χριστός* is highly appropriate, nay, necessary. — Further, Jesus could be the bearer of the idea of Messiah, for the realization of which He knew from the beginning that He was sent, in no other way than in its national definiteness, therefore also without the exclusion of its political element, the thought of which, however,—and this appears most fully in John,—was transfigured by Him into the idea of the highest and universal spiritual government of God, so that the religious and moral task of the Messiah was His clear aim from the very outset, in striving after and attaining which He had to prepare the way for the Messiah's kingdom, and finally had to lay its indestructible, necessary *foundation* (founding of the new covenant) by His atoning death, while He pointed to the future, which, according to all the evangelists, was viewed by Himself as near at hand, for the final *establishment*, glory, and power of the kingdom, when He will solemnly appear (Parousia) as the Messiah who is Judge and Ruler. — *υἱὸς Δαυὶδ*] for, according to prophetic promise, He *must* be a descendant of David, otherwise He would not have been the Messiah, John vii. 42; Rom. i. 3; Acts xiii. 22 f.; the Messiah is called pre-eminently מָלִיךְ, Matt. xii. 23, xxi. 9, xxii. 42; Luke xviii. 38. Comp. Wetstein, and *Babylon. Sanhedr.* fol. 97. David is designated as *Abraham's* descendant, because the genealogical table must begin nationally with Abraham, who, according to the promise, is the original ancestor of the series of generations (Gal. iii. 16), so that consequently the venerable chiefs of this genealogy immediately

appear in the superscription. Luke's point of view (iii. 23) goes beyond the sphere of the nation, while Mark (*l.c.*) sets out from the theocratico-dogmatic conception of the Messiah.

Vv. 2, 3. **Κ. τ. ἀδελφούς αὐτ.**] "Promissiones fuere in familia Israelis," Bengel.—Ver. 3. These twin sons of Judah were illegitimate, Gen. xxxviii. 16–30. The Jews were inclined to find a good side to the transgressions of their ancestors, and alleged here, *e.g.*, that Tamar entertained the idea of becoming an ancestress of kings and prophets. See Wetstein and Fritzsche. The reason why Tamar is here brought forward, as well as Rahab, Ruth, and Bathsheba in vv. 5, 6 (for οὐκ ἦν ἔθος γενεαλογεῖσθαι γυναῖκας, Euth. Zigabenus), is not "*ut tacitae Judaeorum objectioni occurreretur*," Wetstein; for the reproach of illegitimate birth was not raised against Jesus in the apostolic age, nor probably before the second century (see Thilo, *ad Cod. Apocr.* I. p. 526 f.), and would be very indelicately referred to by the naming of these women; nor the point of view of *exactness* (Fritzsche), which would not explain why *these* women and no others were mentioned; least of all the tendency to *cast into the shade* the Jewish genealogical tree (Hilgenfeld). In keeping with the whole design of the genealogical register, which must terminate in the wonderful one *who is born of woman*, that reason cannot, without arbitrariness, be found save in this, that the women named entered *in an extraordinary manner* into the mission of continuing the genealogy onwards to the future Messiah, and might thereby appear to the genealogist and the evangelist as *typi Mariae* (Paulus, de Wette, Ebrard; comp. Grotius on ver. 3), and in so doing the historical stains which cleaved to them (to Ruth also, in so far as she was a Moabitess) were not merely fully compensated by the glorious approval which *they* found precisely in the light in which their history was regarded by the nation (Heb. xi. 31; Jas. ii. 25), but far outweighed and even exalted to extraordinary honours. See the numerous Rabbinical passages, relating especially to Tamar, Rahab, and Ruth, in Wetstein *in loc.*, and on Heb. xi. 31. Olshausen is too indefinite: "in order to point to the mar-

vellous gracious leading of God in the ordering of the line of the Messiah." Luther and some of the Fathers drag in here what lies very remote: because Christ interested Himself in sinners; Lange, more remote still, "in order to point to the righteousness which comes, not from external holiness, but from faith;" and Delitzsch (in Rudelbach and Guericke's *Zeitschrift*, 1850, p. 575 f.), "because the *sinless* birth of Mary was prepared throughout by *sin*."

Ver. 5. *Boaz* is also called, in Ruth iv. 21 and 1 Chron. ii. 11, son of Salma; but his mother *Rahab* is not mentioned. The author without doubt drew from a tradition which was then current, and presupposed as known (according to Ewald it was apocryphal), which gave Salma as a wife to her who had risen to honour by her conduct in Jericho (Heb. xi. 31; Jas. ii. 25). The difficulties which, according to Rosenmüller, Kuinoel, and Gratz, arise from the chronology,—namely, that Rahab must have become a mother at seventy or eighty years of age,—are, considering the uncertainty of the genealogical tradition, which already appears in Ruth iv. 20, as well as the freedom of Orientals in general with regard to genealogies, not sufficient to justify here the assumption of some other Rahab. According to *Megill.* f. 14, 2, and *Kohleth* R. 8, 10, Joshua married Rahab,—a tradition which is *not* followed by our genealogy.

Ver. 6. *Τὸν Δαυεὶδ τὸν βασιλέα*] Although an apposition with the article follows the proper name, yet *Δαυεὶδ* also takes the article, not for the sake of uniformity with the preceding name (de Wette), but in order to designate David demonstratively, as already marked out in ver. 1. In ver. 16, also, the article before *Ἰωσήφ*, which is accompanied by an apposition, has, in keeping with the deep significance of his paternal relation to Jesus, demonstrative power (Kühner, II. p. 520). — The *τὸν βασιλέα* also, and the subsequent emphatic repetition of *ὁ βασιλεύς*, are a distinction for David, with whom the Messiah's genealogy entered upon the kingly dignity.—*τῆς τοῦ Οὐρίου*] Such methods of expression by the simple genitive suppose the nature of the relationship in question to be *known*, as here it is that of *wife*. Comp. *Hectoris*

*Andromache*, *Luther's Katharina*, and the like. See Kühner, II. p. 285 f. Winer, p. 178 [E. T. p. 237].

Ver. 8. Ἰορὰμ . . . Ὀζίας] Three kings, Ahaziah, Joaz, and Amaziah, are wanting between these (2 Kings viii. 24; 1 Chron. iii. 11; 2 Chron. xxii. 1, 11, xxiv. 27). The common opinion is that of Jerome, that the omission was made for the sake of obtaining an *equal division* of the names, in order not to go beyond the three Tesseradecades. Such omissions were nothing unusual: 1 Chron. viii. 1; Gen. xvi. 21. See Surenhusius, βιβλ. καταλλ. p. 97. Lightfoot, *Hor.* p. 181. On the same phenomenon in the Book of Enoch, see Ewald in the *Kieler Monatschrift*, 1852, p. 520 f. The evangelist accepted the genealogical list without alteration, just as he found it; and the cause of that omission cannot be pointed out, but probably was only, and that without special design, the similarity of those names, in which way the omission also which occurs in ver. 11 is to be explained. Ebrard and Riggenbach, erroneously introducing the point of view of theocratic illegality (comp. Lange), are of opinion that Matthew omitted the three kings for this reason, that Joram, on account of his marriage with the daughter of Jezebel, and of his conduct, had deserved that his posterity should be exterminated down to the fourth generation (so already some of the Fathers, Maldonatus, Spanheim, Lightfoot); that Matthew accordingly declared the descendants of the heathen Jezebel, down to the fourth generation, unworthy of succeeding to the theocratic throne. This breaks down at once before the simple ἐγέννησε. The omissions are generally not to be regarded as *consciously* made, otherwise they would conflict with ver. 17 (παῖσαι), and would amount to a falsification.

Ver. 11. The son of Josiah was Joakim, and his son was Jechoniah. Here, consequently, a link is wanting, and accordingly several uncials, curss., and a few versions<sup>1</sup> contain the supplement: Ἰωσίας δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰωακείμ· Ἰωακείμ

<sup>1</sup> Amongst the *editions* this interpolation has been received into the text by Colinaeus, H. Stephens, and Er. Schmidt, also by Beza (1st and 2d); by Castalio in his translation. It has been defended by Rinck, *Lucub. crit.* p. 245 f.; Ewald assumes that ver. 11 originally ran: Ἰωσίας δὲ ἔγενν. τ. Ἰωακίμ καὶ τοῦ

δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰεχούαν (1 Chron. iii. 15, 16). The omission is not, with Ebrard, to be explained from the circumstance that under Joakim the land passed under the sway of a foreign power (2 Kings xxiv. 4), and that consequently the theocratic regal right became extinct (against this arbitrary view, see on ver. 8); but merely from a confusion between the two similar names, which, at the same time, contributed to the omission of one of them. This clearly appears from the circumstance that, indeed, several *brothers* of *Joakim* are mentioned (three, see 1 Chron. iii. 15), but not of *Jechoniah*. Zedekiah is, indeed, designated in 2 Chron. xxxvi. 10 as the brother of the latter (and in 1 Chron. iii. 16 as his *son*), but was his *uncle* (2 Kings xxiv. 17; Jer. xxxvii. 1). That our genealogy, however, followed the (erroneous, see Bertheau, p. 430) statement in 2 Chron. xxxvi. 10, is not to be assumed on account of the *plural* τοὺς ἀδελφούς, which rather points to 1 Chron. iii. 15 and the interchange with Joakim. It is quite in an arbitrary manner, finally, that Kuinoel has assigned to the words καὶ . . . αὐτοῦ their place only after Σαλαθίηλ, and Fritzsche has even entirely deleted them as spurious. — ἐπὶ τῆς μετοικ. Βαβυλῶνος] *during* (not *about* the time, Luther and others) the migration. See Bernhardt, p. 246; Kühner, II. p. 430. The statement, however, is inexact, as *Jechoniah* was *carried away* along with others (2 Kings xxiv. 15). The *genitive* Βαβυλ. is used in the sense of εἰς Βαβυλῶνα. Comp. Eurip. *Iph. T.* 1073: γῆς πατρῶας νόστος. Matt. x. 5: ὁδὸς ἐθνῶν; iv. 15, *al.* Winer, p. 176 [E. T. p. 234].

Ver. 12. Μετὰ . . . μετοικ.] *After the migration had taken place.* 1 Chron. iii. 16; 2 Kings xiv. 8; Joseph. *Antt.* x. 9. Not to be translated "*during the exile*" (Krebs, Kypke), which is quite opposed to the language. — μετοικεσία] *change of abode, migration*; consequently here, "*the being carried away to Babylon*," not the sojourn in the exile itself, which would lead to an erroneous view of the μετά. The above meaning is yielded by the Hebrew הָיָה, 1 Chron. v. 22; Ezek. xii. 11;

ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ· Ἰωακὴμ δὲ ἰγένν. τὸν Ἰεχονίαν ἐπὶ τῆς μετοικ. Βαβ. The present form of the text may be an old error of the copyists, occasioned by the similarity of the two names.

2 Kings xxiv. 16; Nah. iii. 10. Comp. the LXX. *Anthol.* 7. 731 (Leon. Tar. 79). The usual word in the classics is *μετοικήσις* (Plato, *Legg.* 8, p. 850 A), also *μετοικισμός* (Plutarch. *Popl.* 22). — *Σαλαθιήλ*] he is called in Luke iii. 27 a son of *Neri* and a grandson of *Melchi*; a variation which, like many others in both genealogies, is to be acknowledged, and not put aside by the assumption of several individuals of the same name, by the presupposing of levirate relationships (Hug, Ebrard), or arbitrary attempts of any other kind. 1 Chron. iii. 17. When, however, in Jer. xxii. 30 the father of Sealthiel is prophetically designated as *יְרֵמְיָהּ*, the prophet himself explains this in the sense that none of his descendants will sit upon the throne of David. Comp. Paulus *in loc.*, Hitzig *on Jerem. l.c.* The Talmudists are more subtle, see Lightfoot *in loc.* Moreover, according to 1 Chron. iii. 19, *Pedaiah* is wanting here between *Salathiel* and *Zerubbabel*. Yet *Zerubbabel* is elsewhere also called the son of *Salathiel* (Ezra iii. 2, v. 2; Hag. i. 1; Luke iii. 27), where, however, 1 Chron. iii. 19 is to be regarded as a *more exact* statement. See Bertheau. Observe, moreover, that also according to 1 Chron. iii. both men belong to the *Solomonic* line.

Ver. 13. None of the members of the genealogy after *Zerubbabel*, whose son *Abiud* is not named in 1 Chron. iii. 19 f. along with the others, occurs in the O. T. The family of David had already fallen into a humble position. But even after the exile, the preservation and, relatively, the restoration of the genealogies remained a subject of national, especially priestly, concern; comp. Joseph. *c. Apion.* This concern could not but be only all the more lively and active in reference to the house of David, with which the expectation of the Messiah was always connected.

Ver. 16. *Ἰακώβ . . . Ἰωσήφ*] In Luke iii. 24, Joseph is called a son of *Eli*. This variation, also, cannot be set aside. As in the case of most great men who have sprung from an obscure origin, so also in the case of Jesus, the ancestors of no reputation were forgotten, and were given by tradition in varying form. The view, however (Epiphanius, Luther, Calovius in answer to Grotius, Bengel, Rosenmüller, Paulus,

Gratz, Hofmann, Olshausen, Ebrard, Lange, Arnoldi, Bisping, Auberlen), that Luke gives the genealogy of *Mary*, and consequently that in Luke iii. 24 Joseph is entered as *son-in-law* of Eli, or Eli as maternal grandfather of Jesus (Spanheim, Wieseler, Riggerbach in the *Stud. u. Kritik*. 1855, p. 585 ff., Krafft), is just as baseless and harmonistically forced an invention as that of Augustine, *de consen. ev.* ii. 3; or of Wetstein, Delitzsch, that Joseph was the *adopted* son of Eli; or that of Julius Africanus in Eusebius i. 7, that Matthew gives the *proper* father of Joseph, while Luke gives his *legal* father according to the law of Levirate marriage (Hug), or conversely (Schleiermacher, after Ambrose and others). The contradictions which our genealogy presents to that of Luke are to be impartially recognised. See a more minute consideration of this in Luke after ch. iii. — It is well known that the Jews (the Talmud, and in Origen, *c. Celsum*, i. 32) call Jesus the son of Pandira<sup>1</sup> or Panthera. See Paulus, *exeget. Handb.* I. p. 290; Nitzsch in the *Stud. u. Kritik*. 1840, 1; Keim, *Leben Jesu*, I. p. 368; Ewald, *Gesch. Christi*, p. 187, ed. 3. — *ἄνδρα*] is to be rendered *husband*, and not (Olshausen, after Theophylact, Grotius) *betrothed*. For when the genealogist wrote, Joseph had been long ago the *husband* of Mary; and the *signification* of *ἀνὴρ* is never that of *sponsus*. — *ἐξ ἧς*] see on Gal. iv. 4. — *ὁ λεγόμενος Χριστός*] if the assumption of Storr (*Zweck d. evangel. Gesch. u. d. Briefe Joh.* p. 273), that this addition expresses the doubt of the genealogist, an unbelieving relative of Jesus, is a pure imagination, and completely opposed to the standpoint of the evangelist, who adopted the genealogy, still we are not to say, with Olshausen (comp. Gersdorf, and already Er. Schmidt), that *λέγεσθαι* here means *to be called, and also actually to be*. This would be to confuse it improperly with *καλεῖσθαι*. See Winer, p. 571 [E. T. 769]. The genealogical source, which found a

<sup>1</sup> פַּנְדִּירָא. Epiphanius, *Haeres.* 78. 7, thus (Πάνθη) terms the father of *Joseph*. John of Damascus, *de fide Orthodox.* iv. 15, removes this name still further back in the roll of ancestors. The Jewish book, *Toledoth Jeschu*, calls the father of Jesus, *Joseph Pandira*. See Eisenmenger, p. 105; Paulus, *exeget. Handb.* I. p. 156 f.; Thilo, *Cod. apocr.* I. p. 526 f.

reception in our Matthew, narrates in a purely historical manner: *who bears the name of Christ* (iv. 18, x. 2, xxvii. 17); for this *name*, which became His from the official designation, was the *distinctive* name of *this* Jesus. Comp., besides, Remark 3, after ver. 17.

Ver. 17. This contains the remark of the evangelist in accordance with (οὖν) this genealogical tree, contained in vv. 2–16. The key to the calculation, according to which the thrice-recurring fourteen links are to be enumerated, lies in vv. 11, 12. According to ver. 11, Josiah begat Jechoniah at the time of the migration to Babylon; consequently Jechoniah must *be included* in the *terminus ad quem*, which is designated by *ἕως τῆς μετοικεσίας Βαβυλῶνος* in ver. 17. The same Jechoniah, however, must just as necessarily again begin the third division, as the same begins with *ἀπὸ τῆς μετοικεσίας Βαβυλῶνος*. Jechoniah, however, who was himself *begotten* at the time of the migration, did not become a *father* until after the migration (ver. 12), so that he therefore belonged as *begotten* to the period *ἕως τῆς μετοικ. Βαβυλ.*, but as a *father* to the period *ἀπὸ τῆς μετοικ. Βαβυλ.*, standing in his relation to the epoch of the *μετοικεσία* as a *twofold person*. It is not so with *David*, as the latter, like every other except Jechoniah, is only named, but not brought into connection with an epoch-making event in the history, in relation to which he might appear as son and father in a twofold personality. He has therefore no right to be counted twice. According to this view, the three tesseradecades are to be thus divided,<sup>1</sup>—

I. 1. *Abraham*; 2. *Isaac*; 3. *Jacob*; 4. *Judah*; 5. *Perez*; 6. *Hezron*; 7. *Ram*; 8. *Aminadab*; 9. *Naasson*; 10. *Salma*; 11. *Boaz*; 12. *Obed*; 13. *Jesse*; 14. *David*.

II. 1. *Solomon*; 2. *Rehoboam*; 3. *Abijah*; 4. *Asa*; 5.

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Strauss, 2d ed.; Hug, *Gutachten*; Wieseler in the *Stud. u. Kritik*. 1845, p. 377; Köstlin, *Urspr. d. synopt. Evang.* p. 30; Hilgenfeld, *Evang.* p. 46; also Riggenbach in the *Stud. u. Kritik*. 1856, p. 580 f., *Leb. Jes.* p. 261. So early as Augustine, and at a later date, Jansen and several others, count Jechoniah twice; so also Schegg; substantially also Chrysostom, Theophylact, Euth. Zigabenus, who only express themselves awkwardly in saying that the time of the *Exile* is placed in *ταῖς γενεαῖς*.



*Jehoshaphat* ; 6. *Joram* ; 7. *Uzziah* ; 8. *Jotham* ; 9. *Ahaz* ; 10. *Hezekiah* ; 11. *Manasseh* ; 12. *Ammon* ; 13. *Josiah* ; 14. *Jechoniah* (ἐπὶ τῆς μετοικεσίας, ver. 11).

III. 1. *Jechoniah* (μετὰ τὴν μετοικεσίαν, ver. 12) ; 2. *Salthiel* ; 3. *Zerubbabel* ; 4. *Abiud* ; 5. *Eliakim* ; 6. *Azor* ; 7. *Zadok* ; 8. *Achim* ; 9. *Eliud* ; 10. *Eleazar* ; 11. *Matthan* ; 12. *Jacob* ; 13. *Joseph* ; 14. *Jesus*.

In the third division we have to notice that *in any case Jesus also must be counted*, because ver. 17 says ἕως τοῦ Χριστοῦ, in keeping with ver. 1, where Ἰησοῦς Χριστός is announced as the subject of the genealogy, and consequently as the last of the entire list. If Jesus were not included in the enumeration, we should then have a genealogy of *Joseph*, and the final terminus must have been said to be ἕως Ἰωσήφ. Certainly, according to our Gospel, no proper *γενεά* existed between Joseph and Jesus, a circumstance which in reality takes away from the entire genealogical tree its character as a genealogy of *Jesus* in the proper sense. The genealogist himself, however, guards so definitely against every misinterpretation by the words τὸν ἄνδρα Μαρίας, ἐξ ἧς ἐγεννήθη Ἰησοῦς, that we distinctly see that he means to carry the descent of Jesus *beyond Joseph* back to David and Abraham, only in so far as Joseph, being *husband of the mother of Jesus*, was His father, merely putatively so indeed, but by the marriage his father in the eye of the law, although not his *real parent*. After all this, we are neither, with Olearius, Bengel, Fritzsche, de Wette (who is followed by Strauss, 4th ed., I. p. 139), Delitzsch, Bleek, and others, to divide thus : (1) Abraham to David, (2) David to Josiah, (3) Jechoniah to Christ ; nor, with Storr (*Diss. in libror. hist. N. T. loca*, p. 1 ff.), Rosenmüller, Kuinoel, Olshausen : (1) Abraham to David, (2) David to Josiah, (3) Josiah to Joseph ; nor are we to say, with Paulus, that among the unknown links, vv. 13–16, one has fallen out owing to the copyists ; nor, with Jerome, Gusset, Wolf, Gratz, to make Jechoniah in ver. 11 into Joiakim, by the insertion of which Ewald completes (see on ver. 11) the second tessera-decade, without counting David twice ; nor, with Ebrard, Lange, Krafft, to insert *Mary* as an intermediate link between

Joseph and Jesus, by whose marriage with Joseph, Jesus became heir to the theocratic throne. The latter is erroneous on this account, that it contradicts the text, which does not speak of succession to the theocratic throne, but of γενεαί, the condition of which is ἐγέννησε and ἐγεννήθη. — We must assume that the *reason for the division* into three tesseradecades was not merely to *aid the memory* (Michaelis, Eichhorn, Kuinoel, Fritzsche), which is not sufficient to explain the emphatic and solemn prominence given to the equal number of links in the three periods, ver. 17; nor even the *Cabbalistic number of the name David* (דוד, i.e. 14; so Surenhusius, Ammon, *Leben Jesu*, I. p. 173), as it is not David, but *Jesus*, that is in question; nor a reminiscence of the forty-two *encampments* in the wilderness (Origen, Luther, Gfrörer, *Philo*, II. p. 429, after Num. xxxiii.), which would be quite arbitrary and foreign to the subject; nor a requirement to the reader to seek out the theocratic references concealed in the genealogy (Ebrard), in doing which Matthew would, without any reason, have proposed the proper design of his genealogical tree as a mere riddle, and by his use of ἐγέννησε would have made the solution itself impossible: but that precisely from Abraham to David fourteen links appeared, which led the author to find fourteen links for the two other periods also, in which, according to Jewish idiosyncrasy, he saw something special, which contained a mystic allusion to the systematic course of divine leading in the Messiah's genealogy, where perhaps also the attraction of holiness in the number seven (the double of which was yielded by the first period) came into play. Comp. Synops. Soh. p. 132. 18: "*Ab Abrahamo usque ad Salom. quindecim sunt generationes, atque tunc luna fuit in plenilunio, a Salomone usque ad Zedekiam iterum sunt quindecim generationes, et tunc luna defecit, et Zedekiae effossi sunt oculi.*" See also Gen. v. 3 ff., xi. 10 ff., where, from Adam to Noah, and from Noah to Abraham, ten links in each case are counted. It is altogether arbitrary, however, because there is no allusion to it in Matthew, when Delitzsch (in Rudelbach and Guericke's *Zeitschrift*, 1850, p. 587 ff.) explains the symmetry of the three tesseradecades from this, that Matthew always makes a

generation from Abraham to David amount to eighty years, but each of the following to forty, and consequently has calculated  $1120 + 560 + 560$  years. To do so is incorrect, because *γενεα* receives its designation from *ἐγέννησε*, it being presupposed that *γενεά* denotes a *generation*.

REMARK 1.—It is clear from *πᾶσαι* that the evangelist supposed that he had the genealogical tree *complete*, and consequently was not aware of the important omissions.

REMARK 2.—Whether *Mary* also was descended from David, as Justin, *Dial. c. Tryph.* xxiii. 45. 100, Irenaeus, iii. 21. 5, Julius Africanus, *ap. Eusebium*, i. 7, Tertullian, and other Fathers, as well as the Apocrypha of the N. T., *e.g. Protev. Jacobi* 10, *de nativ. Mariae*, already teach,<sup>1</sup> is a point upon which any evidence from the N. T. is entirely wanting, as the genealogical tree in Luke is not that of Mary. Nor can a conclusion be drawn to that effect, as is done by the Greek Fathers, from the Davidic descent of Joseph; for even if Mary had been an heiress, which, however, cannot at all be established (comp. on Luke ii. 5), this would be quite a matter of indifference so far as her descent is concerned, since the law in Num. xxxvi. 6 only forbade such daughters to marry into another *tribe*, Ewald, *Alterth.* p. 239 f. [E. T. p. 208], Saalschütz, *M. R.* p. 829 f., and in later times was no longer observed; see Delitzsch, *l.c.* p. 582. The Davidic descent of Mary would follow from passages such as those in Acts ii. 30, Rom. i. 3, 4, 2 Tim. ii. 8, comp. Heb. vii. 14, if we were certain that the view of the supernatural generation of Jesus lay at the basis of these; Luke i. 27, 32, 69 prove nothing, and Luke ii. 4 just as little (in answer to Wieseler, *Beitr. z. Würdig. der Evang.* p. 144); we might rather infer from Luke i. 36 that Mary belonged to the tribe of *Levi*. The Davidic descent of Jesus, however, is established as certain by the predictions of the prophets, which, in reference to so essential a mark of the Messiah, could not remain without fulfilment, as well as by the unanimous testimony of the N. T. (Rom. i. 3; 2 Tim. ii. 8; Heb. vii. 14; John vii. 41; Rev. v. 5, xxii. 16), and is also confirmed by Hegesippus (in Eusebius

<sup>1</sup> In the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, on the other hand, the tribe of Levi is definitely alluded to as that to which Mary belonged. See pp. 542, 546, 654, 689. In another passage, p. 724, she is represented as a descendant of *Judah*. Comp. on Luke i. 36, and see Thilo, *ad Cod. apocr.* p. 375. Ewald's remark, that the *Protev. Jacobi* leaves the tribe of Mary undetermined, is incorrect, ch. x. b. In Thilo, p. 212, it is said: *ὅτι Μαριάμ ἐκ φυλῆς Δαβὶδ Ἰσραήλ*.

iii. 20), according to whom, grandsons of Jude, the Lord's brother, were brought, as descendants of David (ὡς ἐκ γένους ὄντας Δαυίδ), before Domitian. To doubt this descent of Jesus, and to regard it rather as a hypothesis which, as an abstraction deduced from the conception of Messiah, had attached itself to the Messianic predicate *Son of David* (comp. Schleiermacher, Strauss, B. Bauer, Weiss, Schenkel, Holtzmann, Eichthal), is the more unhistorical, that Jesus Himself lays down that descent as a necessary condition of Messiahship; see on Matt. xxii. 42 ff.; besides Keim, *Gesch. Jesu*, I. p. 326 ff., also Weiss, *bibl. Theolog.* § 18, and Ewald, *Gesch. Chr.* p. 242 ff. ed. 3.

REMARK 3.—As the evangelist relates the divine generation of Jesus, he was therefore far removed from the need of constructing a genealogy of *Joseph*, and accordingly we must suppose that the genealogy was *found* and *adopted* by him (Harduin, Paulus, Olshausen, and most moderns), but was not his own *composition* (older view, de Wette, Delitzsch). Add to this that, as clearly appears from Luke, *various* genealogical trees must have been in existence, at the foundation of which, however, had originally<sup>1</sup> lain the view of a natural γένεσις of Jesus, although the expression of such a view had already disappeared from them, so that Matt. i. 16 no longer ran Ἰωσήφ δὲ ἐγέννησεν Ἰησοῦν, and in Luke iii. 23, ὡς ἐνομίζετο was already interpolated. Such anti-Ebionitic alterations in the last link of the current genealogical registers of Jesus are not to be ascribed, first, to the evangelists themselves (Strauss, Schenkel); nor is the alteration in question which occurs in Matthew to be derived from a supposed redactor who dealt freely with a fundamental gospel document of a Judaistic kind (Hilgenfeld).

<sup>1</sup> It must be admitted that the genealogies owe their *origin* to the view that Joseph's paternal relation was real, and that their original purpose bore that Joseph was the actual, and not merely the putative, father of Jesus, because otherwise the composition of a genealogical tree of Joseph would have been without any motive of faith. But we must also grant that the evangelists, so early as the time when they composed their works, found the genealogies with the definite statements announcing the *putative* paternal relationship, and by *that very circumstance* saw it adapted for reception without any contradiction to their belief in the divine generation of Jesus. They saw in it a demonstration of the Davidic descent of Jesus according to the male line of succession, so far as it was *possible* and *allowable* to give such in the deficiency of a human father, that is, back beyond the *reputed father*. The circumstance, however, that Joseph recognised Jesus as a *lawful son*, presented to him in a miraculous manner, although he was not his *flesh and blood* (Delitzsch and others), assuredly leads, in like manner, only to a γινά which is *not real*.

The expression *ὁ λεγόμενος Χριστός* in ver. 16 rather betrays that the genealogical written source passed over into the Gospel in the shape in which it already existed; neither the author nor an editor would have written *ὁ λεγόμενος* (comp. vv. 1, 18), or, had they made an alteration in ver. 16, they would not have allowed it to remain.

Ver. 18. *Τοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*] provided with the article, and placed first with reference to ver. 16. "The origin of *Jesus Christ*, however, was as follows." — *μνηστευθείσης*] On the construction, see Buttmann, *neut. Gram.* p. 270 f. [E. T. 315]. On the *betrothal*, after which the bride still remained in the house of her parents without any closer intercourse with the bridegroom until she was brought home, see Maimonides, *Tract. nishin*; Saalschütz, *M. R.* p. 728 ff.; Keil, *Archaeol.* § 109. — *γάρ*] explicative, *namely*, see Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 234 ff.; Baeumlein, *Partik.* p. 86 ff. — *πρὶν ἥ*] belongs as much as the simple *πρὶν* to the Ionic, and to the middle age of the Attic dialect; see Elmsley, *ad Eur. Med.* 179; Reisig, *ad Soph. Oed. Colm.* 36; it is, however, already found alone in Xenophon (Kühner, *ad Anab.* iv. 5. 1), as also in Thucydides, v. 61. 1, according to our texts (see, however, Krüger *in loc.*), but is foreign to the Attic poets. With the aorist infinitive, it denotes that the act is fully accomplished. Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 726. Comp. Acts ii. 20, vii. 2; Mark xiv. 30; John iv. 49; Tob. xiv. 15. — *συνελθεῖν*] Chrysostom, Theophylact, Euth. Zigabenus, Erasmus, Maldonatus, Jansen, Bengel, Elsner, Loesner, and others understand it of *cohabitation in marriage*. The usage of the language is not opposed to this. See the passages of Philo in Loesner, *Obs.* p. 2; Joseph. *Antt.* vii. 9. 5; Diodorus Siculus, iii. 57, *Test. XII. Patr.* pp. 600, 701. Just as correct, however, in a linguistic point of view (Kypke, *Obs.* p. 1 f.), and at the same time more appropriate to the reference to vv. 20, 24, is the explanation of *others* (Luther, Beza, Er. Schmid, Lightfoot, Grotius, Kypke, Kuinoel, Fritzsche, de Wette, Arnoldi, Bleek) of the *bringing home* and of *domestic* intercourse. *Others* (Calvin, Wetstein, Rosenmüller, Olshausen) combine both explanations. But the author in the present case did *not* con-

ceive the cohabitation in marriage to be connected with the bringing home, see ver. 25. — *εὐρέθη*] Euth. Zigabenus (comp. Chrysostom and Theophylact) appropriately renders it: *ἐφάνη*. *Εὐρέθη δὲ εἶπε διὰ τὸ ἀπροσδόκητον*. *Εὐρεθῆναι* is nowhere equivalent to *εἶναι*. See Winer, p. 572 [E. T. 769]. — *ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχειν* or *φέρειν*, to be pregnant, very often in the LXX., also in Greek writers, Herodotus, iii. 32, *Vit. Hom.* ii.; Plato, *Legg.* vii. p. 792 E. — *ἐκ πν. ἁγ.*] without the article, see Winer, p. 116 [E. T. 151]. *רוח ייְהוָה* or *רוח קדשׁ ייְהוָה*, *πνεῦμα, πν. ἁγιον, πν. τοῦ Θεοῦ*, is the *personal divine principle of the higher, religious-moral, and eternal life*, which works effectually for the true reign of God, and especially for Christianity, which rules in believers, and sanctifies them for the Messiah's kingdom, and which, in reference to the intellect, is the knowledge of divine truth, revelation, prophecy, etc., in reference to morals is the consecration of holiness and power in the moral life of the new birth with its virtues and world-subduing dispositions, bringing about, in particular, the truth and fervour of prayer, the pledge of everlasting life. Here the *πνεῦμα ἁγιον* is that which produces the *human existence of Christ*, through whose action—which so appeared only in this, the single case of its kind—the origin of the embryo in the womb of Mary was causally produced (*ἐκ*) in opposition to human generation, so that the latter is thereby excluded. It is not, however, that divine power of the Spirit (Luke i. 35), which only *concurs* in the action of human generation and makes it effectual, as in the generation of Isaac and of the Baptist, and, as the idea is expressed in the *Sohar Gen.* (comp. Schmidt in the *Bibl. f. Krit. v. Exeg. d. N. T.* I. p. 101): "*Omnes illi, qui sciunt se sanctificare in hoc mundo, ut par est (ubi generant), attrahunt super id Spiritum sanctitatis et exeuntes ab eo illi vocantur filii Jehovae.*" Theodore of Mopsuestia (apud Fred. Fritzsche, *Theodori Mops. in N. T. Commentar.* p. 2): *ὥσπερ γὰρ (τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἁγιον) κοινωνόν ἐστι πατρί τε καὶ υἱῷ εἰς τὴν τοῦ παντὸς δημιουργίαν, οὕτω καὶ τὸ ἐκ τῆς παρθένου τοῦ σωτῆρος σῶμα κατεσκεύασε*. — *ἐκ πνεύμ. ἁγ.*, moreover, is added, not as an object to *εὐρέθη*, but from the *historical* standpoint, to secure at once a correct

judgment upon the ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα (ἐθεράπευσε τὸν λόγον, Euth. Zigabenus).

REMARK.—As regards *the conception of Jesus by a virgin*, we have to notice the following points in their exegetical bearing:—(1) Mary was either a daughter of David (the common view), or she was not. See on ver. 17, Remark 2. In the first case, Jesus, whose *divine* generation is assumed, was, as Matthew and Luke relate, a descendant of David, although not through an unbroken line of *male* succession, but in such a way that His *mother* alone conveyed to Him the Davidic descent. But if Mary were *not* a daughter of David, then, by the divine conception, the possibility of Jesus being a descendant of David is simply *excluded*; because, on that view, the Davidite Joseph remains out of consideration, and this would be in contradiction not only with the statements of prophecy, but also with the unanimous testimony of the N. T. (2) As it is nowhere *said* or *hinted* in the N. T. that Mary was a descendant of David, we must assume that this is tacitly *presupposed* in the narratives of Matthew and Luke. But as a consequence of this supposition, the genealogical trees would lose all their importance, in so far as they are said to prove that Jesus was υἱὸς Δαυεὶδ (ver. 1). *Joseph's* descent from David, upon which in reality *nothing* would turn, would be particularly pointed out; while *Mary's* similar descent, upon which *everything* would depend, would remain unmentioned as being a matter of course, and would not be, even once, incidentally alluded to in what follows, say by θυγάτηρ Δαυεὶδ, as Joseph is at once addressed in ver. 20 as υἱὸς Δαυεὶδ. (3) *Paul* and *Peter* (Rom. i. 3, 4; Acts ii. 30: ἐκ σπέρματος, ἐκ καρποῦ τῆς ὁσφύος; comp. 2 Tim. ii. 8) designate the descent of Jesus from David in such a way, that without calling in the histories of the birth in the first and third Gospels, there is no occasion for deriving the Davidic descent from the *mother*, to the interruption of the male line of succession, for which Gal. iv. 4<sup>1</sup> also affords neither cause nor justification. Nowhere, moreover, where Paul speaks of the *sending* of the Son of God,

<sup>1</sup> Certainly, in Rom. i. 4, Paul expressly refers Christ's relation to God as His Son to His πνεῦμα ἁγιασόντος, not to His σάρξ. See on Rom. i. 3. The supernatural generation is not a logical consequence of his system, as Weiss, *bibl. Theol.* p. 315, thinks. If Paul had conceived the propagation of sin as taking place *by means of generation* (which is probable, although he has not declared himself upon the point), he cannot, in so thinking,—after the history of the fall (2 Cor. xi. 3), and after Ps. li. 7,—have regarded the *woman's* share as a matter of *indifference*.

and of His human yet sinless nature (2 Cor. v. 21 ; Rom. viii. 3 ; Phil. ii. 6 f.), does he betray any indication that he presupposes that divine conception.<sup>1</sup> (4) Just as little does *John*, whose expression *ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο*, although he was so intimate with Jesus and His mother, leaves the question as to the *how* of this *ἐγένετο* without a direct answer, indeed ; but also, where Jesus is definitely designated by others as Joseph's son, contributes no word of correction (i. 46, vi. 42 ; comp. vii. 27),—nay, relates the self-designation "*Son of a man*" from Jesus' own mouth (see on John v. 27), where the context does not allow us to refer *ἀνθρώπου* to His *mother*. (5) It is certain, further, that neither in Nazareth (Matt. xiii. 55 ; Mark vi. 3 ; Luke iv. 22), nor in Capernaum (John vi. 42), nor elsewhere in the neighbourhood (John i. 46), do we meet with such expressions, in which a knowledge of anything extraordinary in the descent of Jesus might be recognised ; and in keeping with this also is the unbelief of His own brethren (John vii. 3),—nay, even the behaviour and bearing of Mary (Mark iii. 21, 31 ; comp. on Matt. xii. 46–50 ; see also Luke ii. 50 f.). (6) We have still to observe, that what is related in ver. 18 would obviously have greatly helped to support the suspicion and reproach of *illegitimate* birth, and yet nowhere throughout the N. T. is there found the slightest whisper of so hostile a report.<sup>2</sup> If, moreover, in the narratives of the first and third evangelists, angelic appearances occur, which, according to the connection of the history, mutually exclude each other (Strauss, I. p. 165 ff. ; Keim, *Gesch. Jesu*, I. p. 362 ff.),—namely, in Matthew, *after* the conception, in order to give an explanation to Joseph ; in Luke, *before* the conception, to make a disclosure to Mary,—nevertheless that divine conception itself might remain, and in and of itself be consistent therewith, if it were elsewhere certainly attested in

<sup>1</sup> We should all the more have expected this origin to have been stated by Paul, that he, on the one side, everywhere ascribes to Christ true and perfect humanity (Rom. v. 15 ; 1 Cor. xv. 21, *al.*), and, on the other, so often gives prominence to His elevation above *sinful* humanity ; for which reason he also designates the *σὰρξ* of Christ—which was human, and yet was not, as in other men, the seat of sin—as *ῥομίωμα σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας* (Rom. viii. 3), with which Heb. ii. 14, 17 also agrees.

<sup>2</sup> The generation (nay, according to Luke ii. 5, the birth also) *before* the marriage was concluded is necessarily connected with faith in the *divine* generation. The reproach of *illegitimate* birth was not raised by the Jews until a later time (Origen, *c. Celsum*, i. 28), as a hostile and base inference from the narratives of Matthew and Luke. Thilo, *ad Cod. Apocr.* I. p. 526 f. They called Jesus a *Mamser* [*i. e.* one born in incest]. See Eisenmenger, *Entdeckt. Judenth.* I. p. 105 ff.



the N. T., or if it could be demonstrated as being an undoubted presupposition, belonging to the conception of Christ as the Son of God.

Taking into account all that precedes, it is clear, in the first place, that the doctrine which became dominant in the church, in opposition to all Ebionitism, of the birth of Jesus Christ from a virgin, is indeed fully justified on exegetical grounds by the preliminary history in Matthew and Luke; but that, secondly, apart from the preliminary history, no glimpse of this doctrine appears anywhere in the N. T.,—nay, that elsewhere in the N. T. it has to encounter considerable difficulties of an exegetical kind, without, however, breaking down before physiological or theological impossibilities (in answer to Strauss). Exegetically, therefore, the proposition of faith, that in Jesus the only-begotten Son of God entered as man into humanity, cannot be made to depend upon the conception, which is recorded only in Matthew and Luke,<sup>1</sup> but must also, irrespective of the latter, remain fast and immutable in its full and real meaning of the incarnation of the divine Logos, which took place, and takes place, in no other; so that that belief cannot be made to depend on the manner in which Jesus was conceived, and in which the Spirit of God acted at the very commencement of His human existence. And this not merely for exegetical, but also for dogmatical reasons, since the incarnation of the Son of God is by no means to be subjected to the rule of universal sinful origin (John iii. 6) in fallen humanity (by which His whole redemptive work would be reduced to nothing); and which indeed must also—considering the supernatural conception—be conceived as exempted on the *mother's* side from this rule of traducianism.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The comparison with heathen *παρθενογενεῖς*, called *παρθέναι* in Homer, such as *Buddha*, *Zoroaster*, *Pythagoras*, *Plato*, *Romulus* (see the literature in Hase, *Leb. Jesu*, § 27 a), should have been here left entirely out of consideration, —partly because they belong, for the most part, to an entirely foreign sphere of life, have no analogies in the N. T., and amount to *apotheoses ex eventu* (Origen, *c. Celsum*, i. 37); partly because so many of the *παρθέναι* are only the fruits of the lust of the gods (see Homer, *Ilias*, xvi. 180 ff.). Far too much weight has been attached to them, and far too much has been transferred to them from the Christian idea of the Son of God, when the thought is found expressed in them that nothing can come forth by the way of natural generation which would correspond to the ideal of the human mind, Olshausen, Neander, Krabbe, Schmid, *bibl. Theol.* I. p. 43; Döllinger, *Heidenth. u. Judenth.* p. 256.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. Schleiermacher, *Christl. Glaube*, § 97, p. 64 ff., and *Leben Jesu*, p. 60 ff. Too much is asserted, when (see also Gess, *Pers. Christ.* p. 218 f.) the limitation is imposed upon the divine counsel and will, that the freedom of

Ver. 19. Ἀνήρ] Although only her *betrothed*, yet, from the standpoint of the writers, designated as her *husband*. The common assumption of a proleptic designation (Gen. xxix. 21) is therefore unfounded. It is different with τὴν γυναῖκά σου in ver. 20. — δίκαιος] not: *aequus et benignus*. So (after Chrysostom and Jerome) Euth. Zigabenus (διὰ τὴν πρᾶότητα καὶ ἀγαθωσύνην), Luther, Grotius, Kuinoel, Fritzsche, B. Crusius, Bleek. For δίκαιος, like דִּיכָא, means generally, *he who is as he ought to be* (Hermann, *ad Soph. Ajac.* 543; Kühner, *ad Xen. Memor.* iv. 4. 5; Gesen. *Thes.* III. p. 1151); therefore *rightly constituted*, and, in a narrower sense, *just*, but never *kind*, although kindness, compassion, and the like may be in given cases the concrete form in which the δικαιοσύνη expresses itself. Here, according to the context, it denotes *the man who acts in a strictly legal manner*. Δίκαιος down to δειγματίσαι contains *two concurring motives*. Joseph was an upright man according to the law, and could not therefore make up his mind to retain Mary, as she was pregnant without him; at the same time he could not bring himself to abandon her publicly; he therefore resolved to adopt the *middle way*, and dismiss her *secretly*. Observe the emphasis of λάθρα. — δειγματίσαι] *to expose*; see on Col. ii. 15. Here the meaning is: *to expose to public shame*. This, however, does not refer to the *punishment of stoning* (Deut. xxii. 23), which was to be inflicted; nor to a *judicial accusation* generally (the *common view*), because δειγματίσαι must mean a *kind of dismissal* opposed to that denoted by λάθρα; comp. de Wette. Therefore: he did not wish to compromise her, which would have been the result had he given her a letter of divorce, and thus dismissed her φανερώς. — λάθρα] *secretly*, in Jesus from original sin must necessarily presuppose the divine conception in the womb of the Virgin. The incarnation of the Logos is, once for all, a mystery of a peculiar kind; the fact is as certain and clear of itself as the manner in which it took place by way of human birth is veiled in mystery, and is in no way determinable *à priori*. This is also in answer to Philippi's assertion (*Dogmatik*, IV. 1, p. 153, ed. 2), that the idea of the God-man stands or falls with that of the birth from a virgin,—a dangerous but erroneous dilemma. Dangerous, because Mary was not free from original sin; erroneous, because God could also have brought about the incarnation of the Logos without original sin in some other way than by a birth from a virgin.

*private*, i.e. by means of a secret, private interview, without a letter of divorce. This would, indeed, have been in opposition to the law in Deut. xxiv. 1, which applied also to betrothed persons (Maimonides, *Tract. נישואין*, c. 1; Wetstein *in loc.*; Philo, *de leg. spec.* p. 788); but he saw himself liable to a collision between the two cases,—of either, in these circumstances, retaining the bride, or of exposing her to public censure by a formal dismissal; and from this no more legal way of escape presented itself than that on which he might with the more propriety lay hold, that the law itself in Deut. *l.c.* speaks only of *married* persons, not of *betrothed*. De Wette thinks, indeed, of dismissal by a *letter of divorcement*, but *under arrangements providing for secrecy*. But the letter of divorce of itself, as it was a public document (see Saalschütz, *M. R.* p. 800 ff.; Ewald, *Alterth.* p. 272 [E. T. p. 203 ff.]), is in contradiction with the *λάθρα*. — On the distinction between *θέλω* and *βούλομαι*, — the former of which expresses *willing in general*, the action of the will, of the inclination, of desire, etc., in general; while *βούλομαι* denotes a *carefully weighed self-determination*, — see Buttmann, *Lexil.* I. p. 26 ff. [E. T., Fishlake, p. 194 ff.], partly corrected by Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* I. p. 316. Observe the aorist *ἐβουλήθη*: *he adopted the resolution*.

Ver. 20. *Ἰδοὺ*] as in Hebrew and in Greek writers, directs attention quickly to an object brought into view. Very frequent in Matthew. — *κατ' ὄναρ*] *in somnis*, Vulg., Virg. *Aen.* ii. 270; *ἐν ὀνείροις*, Niceph. *Schol. in Synes.* p. 442. Frequent in later Greek, but not in the LXX. and Apocrypha; rejected by Photius, p. 149. 25, as *βάρβαρον*; amongst the old writers, commonly only *ὄναρ*. See Phrynichus, ed. Lobeck, p. 423 f.; *κατά* serves to designate the *manner and way*, and yields the adverbial meaning, *in a dream*, *ὄψις ὀνείρου ἐν τῷ ὕπνῳ*, Herod. i. 38. The appearance of the angel was an appearance *in a dream*; see Kühner, II. 1, p. 413. It might denote the *time*, if, as in Joseph. *Antiq.* xi. 9. 3, *κατὰ τοὺς ὕπνους*, or *καθ' ὕπνον* (Gen. xx. 6), had been employed. Express visions in *dreams* in the N. T. are related only by Matthew. Comp. besides, Acts ii. 17. — *υἱὸς Δ.*] The reason of this address

(*nominative*, see Kühner, II. 1, p. 43) is not difficult to see (de Wette); it is highly *natural* in the case of the angel, because he has to bring news of the *Messiah*. B.-Crusius says too little: Joseph is so addressed as one *favoured by God*, or, as he for whom something miraculous was quite appropriate. Fritzsche says too much: "ut ad Mariam ducendam *promtorem* redderet." The former neglects the special connection, the latter imports a meaning. — τὴν γυναῖκά σου] apposition to *Μαριάμ*: the Mary, *who is thy wife*: in which *proleptic* designation there lies an element *stating the cause*. This view (in answer to Fritzsche, who explains: Mary, *as thy wife*) is required by ver. 24. — ἐν αὐτῇ] not for ἐξ αὐτῆς, but also not to be translated, with Fritzsche: *per eam*, as ἐν with *persons* is never merely instrumental, and as the context (ver. 18: ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα ἐκ πν. ἁγ.) demands a different rendering; but, quite literally, *in utero Mariae*, that which has been begotten *in her*.—The *neuter* places the embryo still under the impersonal, *material* point of view. Comp., first, ver. 21: τέξεται δὲ υἱόν. See Wetstein, and on Luke i. 35. — ἐκ πν. ἐστὶν ἁγίου] proceeds from the *Holy Ghost* as author, by whom, accordingly, your suspicions are removed. Observe the *emphatic position*, which lays the determining emphasis upon πνεύματος, in opposition to sexual intercourse. Upon the distinction between ἐνθυμεῖσθαι with the genitive (*rationem habere alic. rei*) and the accusative ("when he had considered this"), see Kühner, *ad Xen. Memorabilia*, i. 1. 17; Krüger on *Thucyd.* i. 42. ;

Ver. 21. Τέξεται δέ] *and she will bear*. "Non additur tibi, ut additur de Zacharia, Luc. i. 13," Bengel. — Καλέσεις . . . Ἰησοῦν] literally: *thou wilt call His name "Jesus."* Comp. LXX. Gen. xvii. 19; 1 Sam. i. 20; Matt. i. 23, 25; Luke i. 13, 31, ii. 21. Exactly so in Hebrew: יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בְּרִיךְ הוּא. The Greeks, however, would say: καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτὸν (or also αὐτῷ) Ἰησοῦν; Matthiae, p. 935 [E. T., Kenrick, p. 675 ff.]; Heindorf, *ad Plat. Phaedr.* p. 238 A. — καλέσεις] the future serves in classical writers to denote the *softened* idea of the imperative. Bernhardt, p. 378; Kühner, II. 1, p. 149. In the LXX. and in the N. T. it is especially used of divine injunctions,

and denotes thereby the imperative sense *apodeictically*, because it supposes the undoubted certainty of the result; comp. Winer, p. 296 [E. T. 396 f.]. So also here, where a *divine command* is issued. When Fritzsche would here retain the proper conception of the *future*, it becomes a mere *prediction*, less appropriate in the connection; for it is less in keeping with the *design of the angelic* annunciation, according to which the bestowal and interpretation of the name Jesus is referred to a divine causality, and consequently the genus of the name itself must, most naturally, appear as *commanded*. — αὐτός] *He and no other*. — τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ] *The people of Israel*: because for *these* first, and then also for the heathen, was the Messiah and His work intended, John iv. 22; Rom. i. 16; Gal. iii. 14. As certainly, moreover, as the manner and fashion in which the promised one was to accomplish the salvation, and by means of His redemptive work has accomplished it, is to be conceived as being present to the eye of *God* at the sending of this news, as certainly must *Joseph* be conceived as regarding it only in its *national* definiteness, consequently as referring to the *theocratic liberation and prosperity* of the people (comp. Luke i. 68 ff.), along with which, however, the *religious and moral renewal* also was regarded as necessary; which renewal must have presupposed the antecedent *forgiveness of sin* (Luke i. 77). ἁμαρτιῶν, therefore, is to be taken, not as *punishment* of sin, but, as always, simply as *sins*. — αὐτοῦ, not to be written αὐτοῦ (for the angel speaks of Him as a third person, and without any antithesis): *His people*, for they *belong* to the Messiah, comp. John i. 11; on the plural αὐτῶν, see Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 114 [E. T. 130].

Vv. 22, 23. No longer the words of the *angel* (in answer to Chrysostom, Theophylact, Euth. Zigabenus, Paulus, Arnoldi), but of the *evangelist*, who continues his historical narrative, and that with a pragmatic observation, which serves to advance his object. Comp. xxi. 4, xxvi. 56 — ἵνα is never ἐκβατικόν: *so that* (Kuinoel and older interpreters), but always τελικόν: *in order that*; it presupposes here that what was done stood in the connection of *purpose* with the O. T. declaration, and

consequently in the connection of the divine necessity, as an actual fact, by which the prophecy *was destined* to be fulfilled. The divine decree, expressed in the latter, *must* be accomplished, and *to that end, this*, namely, which is related from ver. 18 onwards, *came to pass*, and that *according to the whole of its contents* (ὅλον). The prophecy itself is Isa. vii. 14 according to the LXX., without any essential variation. — ἡ παρθένος corresponds here to בְּתוּלָה, which denotes an *unmarried* young woman of nubile years, not also a young woman (for which Prov. xxx. 19 is erroneously appealed to by Gesenius and Knobel). See Hengstenberg, *Christol.* II. p. 53 ff. On the other hand, בְּתוּלָה means *virgin* in the strict sense of the word. The evangelist, nevertheless, interpreting the passage according to its Messianic destination, understands the pregnant Mary as a real *virgin*. Here we have to observe that such interpretations of O. T. passages are not to be referred to any principle of *accommodation* to the views of the time, nor even to a mere occasional *application*, but express the *typical* reference, and therewith the *prophetic* meaning, which the N. T. writers *actually* recognised in the relative passages of the O. T. And in so doing, the *nearest*, i.e. the historical meaning of these passages in and of itself, did not rule the interpretation, but the concrete Messianic contents according to their historical definiteness *a posteriori*—from their actual *fulfilment*—yielded themselves to them as that which the Spirit of God in the prophecies had had in view as the ideal theocratic subject-matter of the forms which they assumed in the history of the time. Comp. Riehm in the *Stud. u. Kritik*. 1869, p. 272 f. [E. T., Clark, Edin. 1876, p. 160 ff.]. The act by which they saw them Messianically *fulfilled*, i.e. their Messianic contents become an accomplished fact, was recognised by them as lying in the purpose of God, when the declaration in question was spoken or written, and therefore as “eventum non modo talem, qui propter veritatem divinam non potuerit non subsequi ineunte N. T.,” Bengel. This Messianic method of understanding the O. T. in the New, which they adopted, had its justification not merely in the historically necessary connection in which the N. T. writers

stood to the popular method of viewing the O. T. in their day, and to its typological freedom of exposition, but as it had its justification also generally in the truth that the idea of the Messiah pervades the whole of the prophecies of the O. T., and is historically realized in Christ; so also, in particular, in the holy guidance of the Spirit, under which they, especially the apostles, were able to recognise, both as a whole as well as in details, the relation of prophecy to its N. T. fulfilment, and consequently the preformations of Christian facts and doctrines, as God, in conformity with His plan of salvation, had caused them to take a beginning in the O. T., although this result was marked by varying degrees of certainty and of clearness of typological tact among the individual writers. Although, according to this view, the N. T. declarations regarding the fulfilment of prophecies are to be presupposed as generally having *accuracy* and *truth* on their side, nevertheless the possibility of erroneous and untenable applications in individual instances, in accordance with the hermeneutical licence of that age, is thereby so little excluded, that an unprejudiced *examination* upon the basis of the original *historical* sense is always requisite. This way of estimating those declarations, as it does justice on the one side to their importance and ethical nature, so on the other it erects the necessary *barrier* against all *arbitrary* typological hankering, which seeks to find a connection between prophecy and fulfilment, between type and antitype, where the N. T. has not attested the existence of such. Comp. also Düsterdieck, *de rei prophet. natura ethica*, Gottingen 1852, p. 79 ff. In reference to types and prophecies generally, we must certainly say with the N. T.: *τούτω πάντες οἱ προφῆται μαρτυροῦσιν κ.τ.λ.*, Acts x. 43, but not with the Rabbins: "Omnes prophetae in universum *non* prophetarunt nisi de diebus Messiae," Sanhedrin, f. 99, 1. As regards Isa. vii. 14,<sup>1</sup> the historical sense is to the effect that the prophet, by his promise of a sign, desires to prevent Ahab from begging the aid of the Assyrians against the confederated Syrians and Ephraimites. The pro-

<sup>1</sup> Comp. H. Schultz, *alttest. Theolog.* II. p. 244 ff.; Engelhardt in the *Luther. Zeitschrift*, 1872, p. 601 ff.

mise itself does not indeed refer directly, by means of an "ideal anticipation," to Mary and Jesus (Hengstenberg), but neither also to the wife of the prophet (Gesenius, Knobel, Olshausen, Keim, Schenkel, and others; comp. also Tholuck, *das A. T. in N. T.* p. 43, ed. 6), nor to any other mother elsewhere of an ordinary child (Stähelin, H. Schultz), but to the mother—who at the time when the prophecy was uttered was still a virgin—of the expected theocratic Saviour, *i.e.* the *Messiah*,<sup>1</sup> the idea of whom lives in the prophetic consciousness, but has attained its *complete historic realization* in Jesus Christ. See especially Ewald on *Isaiah*, p. 339 f., ed. 2; Umbreit in the *Stud. u. Kritik*. 1855, p. 573 ff.; Bertheau in the *Jahrb. f. Deutsche Theologie*, 1859, 4; Drechsler on *Isaiah*, *l.c.*; Delitzsch; Oehler in Herzog's *Encykl.* IX. p. 415; Engelhardt, *l.c.* That we might, however, from the consideration of the fulfilment of the prophetic oracle, accomplished in the birth of Jesus from a *virgin*, find in the word עלמה the mother of the Messiah designated as a *virgin*, follows, as a matter of course, from the meaning of עלמה, which by no means excludes the idea of virginity, and was not first rendered possible by

<sup>1</sup> Hofmann has corrected his earlier explanation (*Weissagung und Erfüllung*, I. p. 221) in point of grammar (*Schriftbeweis*, II. 1, p. 85), but not in accordance with the meaning. He sees in the son of the virgin mother the *Israel* which does not arise in the way of a natural continuation of the present, but in a *miraculous manner*, to which God again turns in mercy. In the person of Jesus this Israel of the future of salvation takes its beginning; while that which in *Isaiah* was figurative language, is now realized in the proper sense. With greater weight and clearness Kahnis (*Dogmatik*, I. p. 345 f.) remarks: The Virgin and Immanuel are definite but ideal persons. The latter is the Israel of the future according to its ideal side; the Virgin, the Israel of the present and of the past according to its ideal side, in accordance with which its vocation is, by virtue of the Spirit of God, to give birth to the holy seed; this Israel will one day come to its true realization in a virgin, who will be the mother of the Messiah. Substantially similar also is the view of W. Schultz in the *Stud. u. Kritik*. 1861, p. 713 ff., who understands by the Virgin the quiet ones in the land, the better portion of the community who are truly susceptible of the working of the Lord. But the whole style of expression, and the connection in the context farther on, are throughout not of such a character that in the Virgin and her son, *ideal*, and indeed *collective* persons, should have been present, first of all, to the prophet's view. I must continue, even after the objections of Hengstenberg, Tholuck, W. Schultz, H. Schultz, and others, to regard Ewald's view as the right one.



the παρθένος of the LXX., by means of the "subtleties of Jewish Christians" (Keim), and this all the less that even παρθένος also in Greek does not always denote virgin in the strict sense, but also "nuptas et devirginatas." See Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* II. p. 210. Matthew might also just as well have made use of νεάνις, which Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus employ. — On the *article*, Bengel appropriately remarks: "ex specula divinae praescientiae singularem demonstrandi vim habet;" she who is *present* to the prophet's eye is intended. — καλέσουσι] *they will call*. The LXX. incorrectly gives καλέσεις. The evangelist generalizes the third person singular of the original Hebrew into the plural. — Ἐμμανουήλ] ܐܡܡܢܐ, *God is with us*, which symbolical name, according to the historical sense in the prophet, derives its significance from the saving by divine help from the destruction threatened by the war in question, but, according to its Messianic fulfilment, which the evangelist now sees beginning, has the same essential meaning as the name *Jesus*. The καλέσουσι τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἐμμανουήλ corresponds to the καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν (ver. 21), and therefore the translator of the Gospel has added the interpretation of the significant name. The Fathers of the church (Hilary, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Lactantius), and expositors like Calvin, Flacius, Maldonatus, Jansen, Schegg, interpreted it of the *divine nature* in Christ. In the divine nature of the Lord as the Son of God is found the *divine help and safety*, which make up the meaning of the name (Jerome), its dogmatic foundation in the *developed Christian consciousness*, as the latter is certainly to be assumed in the evangelists Matthew (ver. 20) and Luke (i. 35), according to whom, as a consequence of the superhuman generation, the superhuman character, not merely the Messianic vocation, is to come forth.

Ver. 24. Ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕπνου] from *the* sleep in which he had had the vision. — καὶ παρέλ.] The course of the thought proceeds simply, without any participial construction, by means of the epexegetic *and*.

Ver. 25. Ἐγίνωσκεν] *He had no sexual intercourse with her (imperfect)*. In this sense ידע is used by the Hebrews,

and *γινώσκειν* by the Greeks of a later age (often in Plutarch); also the Latin *novi* and *cognosco* (Justin, v. 2, xxvii. 3; Ovid. *Meta.* iv. 594; comp. Caesar, *de bello Gallico*, vi. 21: *feminae notitiam habuisse*). See Wetstein and Kypke. Since Epiphanius, Jerome, Chrysostom, Theophylact, Luther, Calvin, very many expositors have maintained, with a view to support the perpetual virginity of Mary, but in opposition to the straightforward and impartial character of the narrative, that Joseph, even after the birth of Jesus, had no sexual intercourse with Mary.<sup>1</sup> — But (1) from *ἕως οὗ* of itself no inference can be drawn either in *favour of* or *against* such a view, as in all statements with “*until*” the *context* alone must decide whether, with regard to that which had not formerly occurred, it is or is not intended to convey that it afterwards took place. But (2) that it is *here* conceived as subsequently taking place, is so clear of itself to every unprejudiced reader from the idea of the marriage arrangement, that Matthew *must* have expressed the thought, “*not only until—but afterwards also he had not*,” if such had been his meaning. That he did *not*, however, mean this is clearly shown (3) by his use of *πρωτότοκον*, which is neither equivalent to *πρῶτος καὶ μόνος* (Theophylact, Euth. Zigabenus), nor does it designate the first-born, *without* assuming others born afterwards (so formerly most expositors). The latter meaning is untenable, because the evangelist employed *πρωτότοκον* as an historian, from the standpoint of the time when his Gospel was composed, and consequently could *not* have used it had Jesus been present to his historical consciousness as the *only* son of Mary. But Jesus, according to Matthew (xii. 46 ff., xiii. 55 f.), had also brothers and sisters, amongst whom He was the *first-born*. Lucian’s remark (*Demonax*, 29), speaking of Agathocles, is correct: *εἰ μὲν πρῶτος, οὐ μόνος· εἰ δὲ μόνος, οὐ πρῶτος*.

<sup>1</sup> As a logical consequence of this supposition, Joseph was made to be a worn-out old man (Thilo, *ad cod. Apocr.* I. p. 361; Keim, *Gesch. Jes.* I. p. 365), and his children were regarded either as children of a former marriage (Origen, Epiphanius, and many other Fathers), or the brothers of Jesus were transformed into cousins (Jerome). Of any advanced age in the case of Joseph there is no trace in the N. T. In John vi. 42, the Jews express themselves in such a way that Joseph might be conceived as still alive at the time.

(4) All *a priori* suppositions are untenable, from which the perpetual virginity of Mary is said to appear,—such as that of Euth. Zigabenus: πὼς ἂν ἐπεχέλησεν, ἥ καὶ ὅλως ἐνεθυμήθη γινῶναι τὴν συλλαβοῦσαν ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ τοιοῦτον δοχεῖον γεγεννημένην; of Olshausen: “it is manifest that Joseph, after such experiences, might with good reason believe that *his* marriage with Mary was intended for another purpose than that of begetting children.” Hofmann has the correct meaning (*Schriftbeweis*, II. 2, p. 405), so also Thiersch, Wieseler, Bleek, Ewald, Laurent, *neut. Stud.* p. 153 ff., Schenkel, Keim, Kahnis, I. p. 426 f. Comp. on the passage before us, Diogenes Laertius, iii. 22, where it is said of Plato’s father: ὅθεν καθαρὰν γάμου φυλάξει ἕως τῆς ἀποκνήσεως; see also Wetstein; Paulus, *exeget. Handb.* I. p. 168 f.; Strauss, I. p. 209 ff. — ἐκάλεσε] is not to be referred to Mary, so that ἕως οὗ ἔτεκε . . . καὶ ἐκάλεσε would be taken together, as Paulus, after some older interpreters, maintains, but to Joseph, as is certain after ver. 21; comp. Grotius.

## CHAPTER II.

VER. 8. ἀκριβ. ἐξετάσατε] According to B C\* D κ, 1, 21, 33, 82, 124, 209, Copt. Sahid. It. Vulg. Syr. p. Eus. Aug., we must read ἐξετάσατε ἀκριβῶς, with Lachm. and Tisch. — Ver. 9. ἔστη] B C D κ, 33, 209, Or. Eus. read ἐστάθη. So Lachm. and Tisch., of the nature of a gloss; for the more precise definition of the conception in the passive, as in xxvii. 11, in almost the same manuscripts. — Ver. 11. εἶδον] Elz.: εὔρον, against decisive testimony. — Ver. 13. φαίνεται κατ' ὄναρ] C K Π, Curss. Theophyl.: κατ' ὄναρ φαίνεται, B: κατ' ὄναρ ἐφάνη. So Lachm. Latter reading is derived from i. 20, which passage also led to the κατ' ὄναρ being placed first. The Received reading is therefore here to be retained, and ver. 19, after B D Z κ, Curss. Verss., to be changed into φαίνεται κατ' ὄναρ (with Lachm. and Tisch.). — Ver. 17. ὑπὸ] B C D Z κ, Curss. Verss. Chrys. Jer. read διὰ. Corresponds to the standing style of quotation in Matth., therefore rightly approved (comp. on iii. 3) by Griesbach and Schultz, after Gersdorf; adopted by Lachm. and Tisch. — Ver. 18. θρῆνος κ. κλαυθμός] B Z κ, 1, 22, Verss. and Latin Fathers have merely κλαυθμός. So Lachm. and Tisch. The Received reading is an extension from that of the LXX. — Ver. 21. ἤλθεν] B C κ: εἰσῆλθεν. So Lachm. and Tisch. 8, correctly: the compound was easily neglected. — Ver. 22. ἐπὶ] is wanting in B κ, Curss. Eus. Deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. 8. But it was all the more easily omitted as unnecessary, because the syllable EI preceded it.

*The genuineness of the whole of the first and second chapters has been controverted, or at least suspected, by Williams (A Free Inquiry into the Authenticity of the First and Second Chapters of St. Matthew's Gospel, Lond. 1771, enlarged, 1790), by Stroth (Eichhorn's Repert. IX. p. 99 ff.), Hess (Biblioth. d. heil. Gesch. I. p. 208 ff.), Ammon (Diss. de Luca emendatore Matthaei, Erl. 1805), J. Jones (Sequel to Ecclesiastical Researches, etc., Lond. 1813). In answer to Williams, Flemming wrote a work (Free Thoughts upon a Free Inquiry, etc., Lond.*

1771), and Velthusen (*The Authenticity of the First and Second Chapters*, etc., Lond. 1771); in answer to Stroth, Henke (*de ev. Matth. integritate*, etc., Helmst. 1782); to Hess, Rau (*Symbola ad quaestionem de authentia*, etc., 1793). Amongst the defenders are Griesbach (*Epimetron ad Comment. crit. in Matth.* II. p. 47 ff.), Schubert (*de infantiae J. C. historiae authentia atque indole*, Gripeswald 1815), Kuinoel (*Proleg.* § 6), Fritzsche (*Commentar. Excurs.* III.), Müller (*üb. d. Aechth. der ersten Kapitel des Evang. nach Matth.*, Trier 1830). Amongst the writers of *Introduction*, Eichhorn and Bertholdt have gone over to the side of the opponents. — *Both chapters are genuine*—that is, they were integral portions of the Hebrew Gospel writing, of which our Matthew is the translation, and consequently belonged to the latter from the very beginning. For (1) all the Codices and Versions contain them, the Fathers of the second and third centuries (Irenaeus, iii. 9. 2 f., Clement of Alexandria, and others) also quote passages from them, and Celsus has made reference to them (*Orig. c. Cels.* i. 28, ii. 32); (2) their contents are highly appropriate to the beginning of a gospel writing composed for Jewish Christians; (3) the beginning of ch. iii. is connected with ii. 23, where the residence of Jesus at Nazareth is mentioned; iv. 13 also manifestly refers to ii. 23. The construction and style of expression are in keeping with the character of the whole Gospel. See Griesbach, *Epimetr.* p. 57; Gersdorf, *Beitr.* p. 38 ff.; Credner, I. p. 62 ff.; Fritzsche, *l.c.* p. 850 ff. — The main argument of those who oppose the genuineness is, *that our chapters were wanting in the Gospel of the Ebionites* (Epiph. *Haer.* xxx. 13). But on a correct estimate of the Gospel *secundum Hebraeos* in its relation to the Gospel of Matthew, that counter argument can be of no weight (see *Introduction*, § 2); and, in accordance with Ebionitic views, it is very conceivable that they did not admit the miraculous preliminary history, and made their Gospel (according to Epiphanius), in keeping with the original gospel type, begin at once with the appearance of the Baptist. It is also related of Tatian (*Theodoret, Haeret. fab.* i. 20): τὰς τε γενεαλογίας περικύψας καὶ τὰ ἄλλα, ὅσα ἐκ σπέρματος Δαβὶδ κατὰ σάρκα γεγεννημένον τὸν κύριον δείκνυσιν. But Tatian was a disciple of Docetism, and his treatment was determined by dogmatic considerations. As, moreover, the genealogy contained in ch. i. implies the use of a piece of writing already in existence, so also the legendary character of both chapters in general,—and the certainly peculiar manner in which the third chapter is connected with them, which, amid all its literal connection with what has preceded it, passes over

the whole history of the youth of Jesus,—appear to point to this, *that the portions composing both chapters were originally special gospel documents.* Ch. i. 1–16 appears to have been *one* such document by itself, then vv. 18–25 a *second*, and ch. ii. a *third*, in which are now found for the first time the locality and time of the birth of Jesus. The unity of the Greek style of expression with that in the other parts of the Gospel is not opposed to this (Ewald, Bleek, Holtzmann), but is to be explained from the unity of the translator. How much, however, considering the free style of quoting Old Testament passages, is to be set down to the account of the first author of these documents, or to that of the Hebrew editor of the Gospel, or to the translator, cannot be determined.

Ver. 1.<sup>1</sup> Γεννηθέντος] The star is to be considered as appearing *contemporaneously with the birth* (ver. 7). But how long it was *after the birth* when the Magi came, is ascertained approximately from ver. 16, according to which, even taking into account all the cruelty of Herod, and his intention to go to work with thorough certainty, the arrival of the Magi is most probably to be placed somewhat more than a year after the birth.

— δέ is *continuative*, leading on to another history connected with the birth of Jesus which has just been related. — Βηθλεὲμ (house of bread) τῆς 'Ιουδαίας, to distinguish it from Bethlehem in the tribe of Zabulon, Josh. xix. 15. Our village (Bethlehem Ephrata, Gen. xxxv. 16, 19), designated in John vii. 42 as κώμη, was situated in the tribe of Judah (Judg. xvii. 9, xix. 1; 1 Sam. xvii. 12), six miles to the south of Jerusalem, now the little manufacturing town *Beit lachm*. See Robinson, *Pal.* II. p. 379 ff.; Tobler, *Bethl. in Paläst.* 1849, and the relative articles in Herzog and Schenkel. —

<sup>1</sup> See on the history of the Magi, Thilo, *Eusebii Emeseni oratio sup. ἀστρονόμων, præmissa de magis et stella quaestione*, Hal. 1835; Münter, *Stern der Weisen*, 1827; Roth (Catholic), *de stella a magis conspecta*, 1865. In reference to chronology based upon astronomical observation, Ideler, *Handb. d. Chronol.* II. p. 339 ff.; Anger in the *Zeitschr. f. histor. Theol.* 1847, p. 347 ff.; Wieseler, *chronol. Synopse u. Beiträge z. Würdigung d. Evang.*, 1869, p. 149 ff.; also in Herzog's *Encykl.* XXI. p. 543 f.; Seyffarth, *Chronol. sacr.* 1846; Weigl, *üb. d. wahre Geburts- u. Sterbejahr J. Chr.* I., Sulzbach 1849; Keim, *Gesch. J.* I. p. 375 ff.

ἐν ἡμέραις] מִיָּמֵי, Gen. xxvi. 1 ; 2 Sam. xxi. 1 ; 1 Kings x. 21. — Ἡρώδου] *Herod the Great*, son of Antipater, received in the year 714 U.C. from the Senate the dignity of king through the influence of Antony, by whom he had been not long before made tetrarch, but first came into the actual possession of his kingdom after the capture of Jerusalem by himself and Sosius in the year 717, and died, after a brilliant and flagitious reign, in 750. See concerning the whole family of Herod, Schlosser, *Gesch. d. Fam. Herodes*, Lpz. 1818 ; Ewald, *Gesch. d. Volks Isr.* IV., and *Gesch. Chr.* p. 95 ff. ed. 3 ; Gerlach in the *Luther. Zeitschr.* 1869, p. 13 ff. ; Hausrath, *neut. Zeitgesch.* I. and II. — μάγοι] The *Magi* (מַגִּי) constituted, amongst the Persians and the Medes, of whom they formed, according to Herod. i. 101, one of the six tribes, a distinguished priestly caste, and occupied themselves principally with the knowledge of the secrets of nature, astrology, and medicine. Herod. i. 32 ; Xen. *Cyr.* viii. 3. 6 ; Diog. Laert. i. 1-9 ; Aelian. *V. H.* ii. 17 ; Porphyry, *de abst. an.* iv. 16 ; Cic. *de div.* i. 41 ; Plin. *N. H.* xxiv. 29, xxx. 2 ; Curt. iii. 3. 8. Amongst the Babylonians also (Jer. xxxix. 3) there was, at the time when the Chaldean dynasty was in power, such an order, of which Daniel became the president (Dan. ii. 48). The name of Magi was then generally transferred, without distinction of country, to all those who had devoted themselves to those sciences, which, however, were frequently also accompanied with the practices of magic and jugglery (Acts viii. 9, xiii. 6, 8). See Wetstein, and Müller in Herzog's *Encykl.* VIII. p. 675 ff. — ἀπὸ ἀνατ.] belongs to μάγοι, *Magi from the East*—that is, *Oriental Magi*. The position of the words most naturally suggests this connection ; but the article (οἱ ἀπὸ ἀνατ.) is not required, because μάγοι is without the article (in answer to Fritzsche, who connects it with παρεγένοντο). The indefinite expression, *eastern lands* (viii. 11, xxiv. 27 ; Luke xiii. 29 ; Rev. xxi. 13), is to be left in its indefiniteness, and in so doing we are to assume that the evangelist himself had no more precise information at his command. If *Arabia* has been thought of (Justin. *c. Tr.* 77 f. ; Epiphanius, Tertullian, Maldonatus, Jansen, Cornelius a Lapide, Grotius, Lightfoot.

Michaelis, Kuinoel, de Wette, Wieseler), or *Persia* (Chrysostom, Theophylact, Euth. Zigabenus, Calvin, Beza, Calovius, Petavius, Casaubon, Wolf, Olshausen), or *Parthia* (Hydus), or *Babylonia* (Paulus), or even *Egypt* (Möller, *neue Ansichten in loc.*), yet we have no sure hold, even in a slight degree, either in the very indefinite *ἀνατολῶν*, or in the nature of the presents in ver. 11. It was entirely baseless to determine their *number* from the *threefold* gifts, and to regard them as *kings*<sup>1</sup> on account of Ps. lxxviii. 30, 32, lxxii. 10; Isa. xlix. 7, lx. 3, 10 (especially since the fifth century; yet Tertullian, *c. Marcion*, already takes this view). Are we to think of *heathens* (so most expositors, including Olshausen, Krabbe, B. - Crusius, Lange, de Wette, Ewald, Hilgenfeld, Bleek, Keim), or of *Jews* (v. d. Hardt, Harenberg in the *Bibl. Brem.* VII. p. 470 ff.; Münter, Paulus, Hofmann, *L. J. von Strauss geprüft*, p. 249; Rettig in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1838, p. 217)? In favour of the first, the question, Where is the new-born King of the *Jews*? is decisive. And how appropriate was it to the idea of Messiah, that the very first-fruits of the distant *heathen* appeared to do homage to the King of the *Jews* (Isa. lx. 3 ff.)! The expectation of the Jews, that their Messiah was to rule over the *world*, might at that period have been sufficiently disseminated throughout the foreign countries of the East (Sueton. *Vesp.* iv.; Tac. *H.* v. 13; Joseph. *B. J.* vi. 5. 4) to lead heathen astrologers, for the object in question, to the Jewish capital. Comp. Dio Cass. *Hist. R.* xlv. 1; Suet. *Oct.* xciv. — *Ἱεροσόλυμα*] In the capital they expected to find, if not the Babe Himself, at least the most certain information regarding Him.

Ver. 2. *Γάρ*] Reason of the question. “De re deque tempore ita certi sunt, ut tantum quaerant *ubi*,” Bengel. — *αὐτοῦ τὸν ἀστέρα*] that is, *the star which indicates Him*. We are to think of a strange star, which had not previously been seen by them, from the rising of which they had inferred the birth of the new King of the Jews, in accordance with their

<sup>1</sup> According to Bede, their names also have been commonly given as *Caspar*, *Melchior*, and *Balthasar* (see Petr. Comestor. *Hist. schol.* 8), but also differently. See Beza in *loc.*, and Paulus, *exeget. Handb.* I. p. 204.



astrological rules. Here we must observe the emphasis on the αὐτοῦ, which is placed first, the star which refers to *Him*, and to no other. From the word ἀστήρ (not ἄστρον) it is indisputably certain, ver. 8, that it is not a *constellation* which is meant. This is in answer to Kepler, *de J. Chr. servator. nostri vero anno natalitio*, 1605; Münter, Ideler, Paulus, Neander, Olshausen (with hesitation), Krabbe, Wieseler, Ebrard, who think of a very close conjunction, which occurred in the year 747 U.C., of Jupiter and Saturn in the sign of the fishes; where Ebrard, however, keeping more closely to the word ἀστήρ, is of opinion that it is not that constellation itself, but the new star of the first magnitude, which Kepler saw appear in the year 1604 at the conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn, and again disappear in 1605; whilst Wieseler summons to his aid a *comet* which was observed in China in 750. The Jew Abarbanel in his *Commentary on Daniel* (1547) inferred, from a similar conjunction in the year 1463, that the birth of the Messiah was at hand, and indicates the sign of the fishes as that which is of importance for the Jews. If ver. 9, however, points only to a *miraculous* star, to one that went and stood in a miraculous manner, then it is evident that neither a *comet* (Origen, Michaelis, Rosenmüller), nor a *fixed star*, nor a *planet*, nor even a *meteor*, is what is meant, which ἀστήρ by itself *might* signify (Schaefer, *ad Apoll. Rh.* II. p. 206). The Fathers of the church (in Suicer, *sub ἀστήρ*) thought even of an angel. The glory of the star is wonderfully portrayed in Ignatius, *Eph.* 19 (sun, moon, and stars, illuminated by it, surround it as a choir), *Protev. Jac.* xxi. See Thilo, *ad Cod. apocr.* I. p. 390 f. The universal belief of antiquity was, that the appearance of stars denoted great changes, and especially the birth of men of importance. Wetstein *in loc.* The Jews in particular believed, in accordance with the Messianic passage, Num. xxiv. 17 (see Baur, *alttest. Weissag.* I., 1861, p. 346 ff.), in a star of the Messiah; Bertholdt, *Christolog. Jud.* p. 55 ff. — ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ] *Several commentators* (Hammond, Paulus, Fritzsche, Ebrard, Wieseler, Ewald) translate: *in the rising*. Comp. Luke i. 78; Wisd. xvi. 28; 2 Macc. x. 28; 3 Esdr. v. 47; Plat. *Polit.* p. 269 A;

Loer. p. 96 D; Stob. *Ecl. Phys.* i. 20; Polybius, xi. 22. 6. In this way the ἀνατολή corresponds to the τεχθείς. And as the ordinary explanation, "in the East" (Luther), in accordance with ver. 1, and especially with the current usage of the word, which in the singular only rarely denotes the East (as in Herodian, iii. 5. 1, ii. 8. 18), would lead us to expect the plural (Gen. ii. 8; Judg. viii. 11; Ezek. xi. 1, xlvii. 8; Bar. iv. 36 f.; 3 Macc. iv. 15; Herod. iv. 8; Polyb. xi. 6. 4, ii. 14. 4), the first rendering is to be preferred. Comp. regarding the use of the word to denote the rising of stars, Valckenaer, *ad Eur. Phoen.* 506. — προσκυνεῖν] ἡμῶν, to show reverence and submission to any one by bowing down with the face toward the ground. Gen. xix. 1, xviii. 2, xlii. 6, xlviii. 12; Herod. i. 134; Nep. *Con.* iii.; Curtius, v. 2, vi. 6. See Hoelemann, *Bibelstud.* I. p. 96 ff. To connect it with the dative (instead of the accus.) is a usage of the later Greek. Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 463.

Ver. 3. Herod was afraid, because he dreaded the overthrow of his throne; the inhabitants of Jerusalem, however, not so much on account of the times of misfortune which were expected to precede the Messiah (Lightfoot on Mark xiii. 19; Bertholdt, *Christol.* p. 45 f.), but in keeping with their special circumstances, because they dreaded the adoption by the tyrant, in the maintenance of his rule, of measures hostile to the people. — Ἱεροσόλυμα] *Feminine* form, occurring only here and in iii. 5, and without any various reading in the Codd. It is found also in Latin (Tac. *Hist.* v. 2; Sueton. *Aug.* xciii.). To take the name as *neuter*, and to supply πόλις (Wetstein, Grimm, Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 16 [E. T. 18]), is not grammatically possible. The feminine form must have been in actual use, although the neuter, as in ver. 1, and Ἱερουσαλήμ, were and remained the prevailing forms.

Ver. 4. Πάντας . . . λαοῦ] is regarded, after Grotius, by Fritzsche, Arnoldi, Lange, not as an *assembly of the Sanhedrin* (so commonly), but an extraordinary convocation of all the high priests and learned men. This explanation, in which, moreover, πάντας is not to be taken literally, is the correct one. Indeed, οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ γραμματεῖς, even without adding

the third element of the Sanhedrin, the *πρεσβύτεροι*, may denote the Sanhedrin (xx. 18, xxi. 15; while, on the other hand, elsewhere, as in xxvi. 47, xxvii. 1, the *γραμματεῖς* are not mentioned along with them). But here *πάντας* is decisive, which would designedly draw attention to a *full* sitting of the high council, and therefore would have made it necessary not to omit an entire class of the members, but to mention in full all the three classes, as in xvi. 21, xxvii. 41; *τοῦ λαοῦ* also stands opposed to the common interpretation, as the latter, in designating the Sanhedrin in Matthew, serves only to denote the *πρεσβύτεροι* more precisely (xxi. 23, xxvi. 3, 47, xxvii. 1). Herod summoned together *all the theologians of the nation*, because he wanted a *theological* answer; *τοῦ λαοῦ* belongs to both words; observe the non-repetition of the article after *καὶ*. — *ἀρχιερεῖς*] certainly comprises partly the actual ruling high priest (*ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς*, פִּהְיֵן הַקֹּדֶשׁ, Lev. xv. 10), partly those who had formerly held this high official post, which very often changed hands under the Herods. See Schürer, *Stud. u. Krit.* 1872, p. 593 ff. That the presidents of the twenty-four classes of priests are also to be understood (Bleek, Ewald), is nowhere certainly attested, and has against it the designation of the office itself, *ἀρχιερεῖς*. Both reasons, moreover, are in opposition to our including, with Wieseler, the priestly nobles, or, with Schürer, the members of the at that time privileged high-priestly families (Joseph. *Bell.* iv. 3. 6), which is not justified by Acts iv. 6, and cannot be proved by a few individual names mentioned in Josephus, whose relation to the high-priesthood is otherwise unknown (Schürer, p. 638 f.). The last high priests who *ruled* before the death of Herod were *Matthias* (5 B.C.), and *Jozarus*, who soon after followed him (Joseph. *Antt.* xvii. 4. 2, xvii. 6. 4). — *γραμματεῖς*] corresponds to the Hebr. סופרים — that is, first, *writers*, then *learned men* (Ezra vii. 6, 11; Neh. viii. 1; Gesenius, *Theo.* II. p. 966). This was the name specially of the expositors of the divine law, who, as Jewish canonists and learned counsellors, belonged chiefly to the sect of the Pharisees, and in part to the Sanhedrin, and were held in great respect. See Lightfoot on the passage, and on xxiii. 13; Leyrer in Herzog's

*Encykl.* XIII. p. 731 ff. — γεννᾶται] not in the sense of the future, but purely present: where is the Messiah born? The theologians were to tell what they knew concerning the birth-place of the Messiah. By this question Herod leaves it quite undetermined whether the birth had already taken place, or was still to come.

Ver. 6. In Mic. v. 1 the sense is: *Although Bethlehem is too unimportant to be reckoned among the cities of the district, yet a ruler in Israel will come forth from it.* In Matthew this thought is, with a slight deviation, changed into: *Bethlehem is undoubtedly an important place, because, etc.* It is therefore unnecessary, with Grotius, to take the passage in Micah as interrogative: "Art thou, then, Bethlehem, too small," etc., and to derive the turn of the thought with οὐδαμῶς from this interrogative interpretation (Hilgenfeld). But the *Ruler* to whom Micah alludes is none other than the *Messianic King* of David's race (see Ewald, *Proph.*), so that in the birth of Jesus this prophecy receives its complete historical fulfilment. Comp. John vii. 42. — ἐν τοῖς ἡγεμόσιν] 𐤇𐤊𐤍𐤏, LXX. ἐν χιλιάσιν. The Hebrew 𐤇𐤊𐤍 denotes the subdivision of the tribes (the thousands, see Ewald, *Alterth.* p. 323 f.; Keil, *Arch.* II. p. 223), which had their principal places and their heads (𐤇𐤊𐤍). See Gesenius, *Thes.* I. p. 106. The translation by ἡγεμόσιν (Chrysostom: φυλάρχοις) clearly shows that either the evangelist himself had read the word in question not 𐤇𐤊𐤍𐤏, but 𐤇𐤊𐤍, or that his translator had committed this mistake. In the Septuagint also 𐤇𐤊𐤍 is rendered by ἡγεμών, Gen. xxxvi. 15 f.; Ex. xv. 15; 1 Chron. i. 51 f.; Ps. lv. 14. According to the words as they stand in Matthew, Bethlehem, the town, appears personified in the midst of the heads of families (Ewald, "amongst the princes of Judah"), amongst whom it had by no means the lowest position. Fritzsche conjectures ταῖς ἡγεμόσιν, in primariis familiarum in Judaea sedibus. But even thus the sense of 𐤇𐤊𐤍 is not yet obtained. How easily, on the contrary, might the evangelist or his translator derive 𐤇𐤊𐤍 from 𐤇𐤊𐤍, as the ἡγούμενος which follows must have been before him! — γῆ] not city, but strip of land, province, which includes the same, 1 Macc. v. 68. Often likewise in the

tragic writers. See Fritzsche *in loc.* Comp. Seidler, *ad Eurip. Troad.* iv. ; Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* I. p. 361. — ἐξελεύσεται] *will come forth*, namely, by *birth*. Thus נָצַח, Gen. xvii. 6. Comp. Heb. vii. 5 ; 1 Macc. i. 10. — ποιμανεῖ] Comp. the Homeric ποιμένες λαῶν. In like manner מֶלֶךְ is used of rulers, 2 Sam. v. 2, vii. 7 ; Jer. xxiii. 2 ff. ; Mic. v. 3.

Ver. 7 f. Ἀάθρα] Inconsistently enough, as that could only arouse suspicion ; but to adopt secret measures is natural to wickedness ! — The question after the time of the appearance [of the star] has its reason in this, that the mistrustful Herod already thinks of the possibility of his not seeing the Magi again, and that he will then still have a hold for taking further proceedings against the mysterious child (ver. 16). — ἡκρίβωσε] with the accusative does not mean : *he investigated minutely* (ἀκριβῶς περί τινος may mean this), but : *after he had made them come to him secretly, he obtained from them a minute knowledge*, and so on. Vulgate appropriately says : “Diligenter didicit.” Comp. Plat. *Charm.* p. 156 A ; Xen. *Mem.* iv. 2. 10 ; Eur. *Hec.* 1192 ; Lucian, *Jov. trag.* 27, *Piscat.* xx. ; Herodian, i. 11. 14. But the passages where it means *to make exact* (Aquila, Isa. xlix. 16 ; Simonides, lxxxiv. ; Xen. *Cyr.* ii. 1. 26) do not apply here. Euth. Zigabenus rightly says : προσεδόκησε γὰρ, ὅτι ὅτε οὗτος (the star) ἐφάνη, τότε πάντως ἐγεννήθη καὶ ὁ Χριστός. — τοῦ φαινομένου ἀστέρος] Grotius : “Non initium, sed *continuitas*.” Herod asked : *How long does the star appear ? how long does it make itself visible ?* namely, since its rising in the east, where ye saw it arise (ver. 9). Thus the present is not to be taken either in the sense of the *aeorist* or of the *imperfect* (de Wette, Bleek). — πέμψας] not *contemporaneous* with the εἶπε (de Wette), but *prior* to it ; comp. xi. 2. After he had directed them to Bethlehem (in consequence of ver. 5 f.), he added the commission, etc. Otherwise it would have been ἐπεμψεν . . . εἰπών.

Ver. 9. Ἀκούσαντες τοῦ βασιλ.] *After they had heard the king*, they set off on their journey. Description of their unsuspecting behaviour. Comp. Theophylact. — καὶ ἰδὼν, ὁ ἀστὴρ, κ.τ.λ.] They travelled by night, in accordance with Eastern custom. See Hasselquist, *Reise nach Paläst.* p. 152. Bengel

appropriately remarks on *ἰδοῦ*: "*Toto itinere non viderant stellam.*" — *δν εἶδον*] The *aurist* in the relative sentence, where we use the *pluperfect*. See Kühner, II. 1, p. 145; Winer, p. 258 [E. T. 343]. — *προῆγεν*] is the *descriptive imperfect*, not *praecesserat* (Hermann, Siiskind, Paulus, Kuinoel), as if the star had again first shone upon them after they had come to Bethlehem. This explanation is ungrammatical (Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 173 [E. T. 200]), and serves only to help to diminish the miraculous element, which is quite opposed to the character of the narrative. The common view alone is in keeping with the words: *the star*, which they had seen in its rising, *went before them on their journey from Jerusalem to Bethlehem, and took up a position over the place* (the house) *where the child was*. Amongst the Greeks also stars are mentioned as extraordinary guides, Elsner, p. 5 f.; Wetstein on the passage. — *ἐπάνω οὐ ἦν*] See ver. 11, *τὴν οἰκίαν*. The going and standing of the star is *miraculous*; hence also the manner in which the particular house is indicated is left undetermined.

Ver. 10. *Ἐχάρησαν*] Euth. Zigabenus correctly says: *ὡς εὐρόντες τὸν ἀψευδέστατον ὁδηγὸν ἐπληροφορήθησαν γὰρ λοιπόν, ὅτι καὶ τὸ ζητούμενον εὐρήσουσι.* — *σφόδρα*] Adverbs at the end; comp. iv. 8; Schaefer, *ad Demosth.* V. p. 367; Bornemann, *ad Xen. Anab.* ii. 6. 9; *Mem.* iii. 5. 17. — *ἐχάρ. χαρ.*] "*Etenim ubi nomen per se ipsum verbi significationem neque circumscibit neque intendit, adminiculo opus est vel adjectivi vel pronominis vel articuli, quo rerum genus certum designatur,*" Lobeck, *Paralip.* p. 507. Therefore here *χαρὰν μεγάλην σφόδρα*. Comp. Mark v. 42b; Wilke, *neutestam. Rhetor.* p. 380. The opposite, *μεγάλην λύπην λυπεῖσθαι*, John iv. 11; *φοβεῖσθαι φόβον μέγαν*, Mark iv. 41.

Ver. 11. *Εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν*] As the Magi did not arrive till some time after the birth (ver. 1), it does not follow indeed from *εἰς τ. οἶκ.* in and by itself that the evangelist makes Jesus be born not in the stable of a friend (Luke), or in a cave (Justin and Apocrypha), but in *Joseph's house*. Certainly, however, the latter follows from this, that, according to Matthew, Bethlehem is the dwelling-place of Joseph; see

Remark after ver. 23. — τὸ παιδίον μετὰ Μαρίας] The non-mention of Joseph is not to be ascribed to any design. — τοὺς θησαυρούς] *the chests which held their treasures*, Xen. *Anab.* v. 4. 27; 1 Macc. iii. 29; 4 Macc. iv. 4. See Wetstein and Valckenaer, *ad Herod.* iv. 162. To find symbolical references in the individual presents is arbitrary. Tertullian and Chrysostom: Incense and myrrh they presented to Him as to a God; Irenaeus, Origen (in answer to Celsus, who ridiculed the divine worship of a *νῆπιος*), Theophylact, Euth. Zigabenus, Erasmus, Luther: as a king, they presented Him with gold; as a God, with incense and with myrrh, ὡς μέλλουσι γεύσασθαι θανάτου. Comp. the Christian *Adamsbuch* in Ewald, *Jahrb.* V. p. 81, which makes the three gifts and their meaning to be derived from Adam. — It was and still is the Eastern custom not to approach princes without presents, Gen. xliii. 11; 1 Sam. x. 27; 1 Kings x. 2; Aelian, *V. H.* i. 31; Harmar, *Beobacht. üb. d. Orient*, II. p. 1 f. That the gifts of the Magi are said to have enabled the poor parents to make out their journey to Egypt (Wetstein, Olshausen, and others), is a strange conceit.

Ver. 12. χρηματισθέντες] Vulgate correctly renders: *responso accepto*: passages in Wetstein, Kypke, Krebs, and Loesner. The question that preceded is *presupposed*, Luke ii. 26; Heb. xi. 7. Comp. on Acts x. 22. Bengel well says: “Sic optarant vel rogarant.” The *passive* is found in this meaning only in the New Testament and in Josephus (*Antt.* iii. 8. 8, xi. 8. 4). — ἀνακάμψαι . . . ἀνεχώρησαν] The latter is not: *they turned back* (vv. 13, 14, 22, iv. 12), but *they withdrew*, went away, made off; ἀνακάμψαι is “*cursum reflectere*.” They were not to *turn back* to Herod, from whom they had come hither, and that with the instruction, ver. 8, but were to select another way to their home, Luke x. 6; Acts xviii. 21; Heb. xi. 15; Herod. ii. 8; Plat. *Phaed.* p. 72 B; Diod. Sic. iii. 54. — The divine direction had for its object, that Herod should not *at once* take measures against the true Child *who was pointed at*.

REMARK.—The narrative regarding the Magi, as it bears in

Matthew the stamp of real history, has its profound truth in the *ideal* sphere, in which the Messianic idea, which was afterwards set forth, realized in all its glory in the historical life of Jesus, surrounded the little known *childhood* of this life with the thoughtful legends—its own creation—preserved in Matthew and Luke. The *ideal truth* of these legends lies in their corresponding relation to the marvellous greatness of the later life of the Lord and His world-embracing work; they are thereby very definitely distinguished from the legendary poetry, which assumed various shapes in the *Apocryphal* narratives of the infancy. Whether, moreover, any real fact may have lain at the basis of the narrative of the Magi,<sup>1</sup> and what the nature of this is, cannot be more minutely ascertained. Certainly Eastern astrologers may, according to the divine appointment, have read in the stars the birth of the Jewish Messiah, who was to be the light of the heathen, and with this knowledge have come to Jerusalem; but how easily did the further miraculous formation of the history lay hold of the popular belief in the appearance of a miraculous star at the birth of the Messiah (see Fabricius, *Cod. pseudepigr.* I. p. 584 f.; Schoettgen, II. p. 531; Bertholdt, *Christol.* § 14),—a belief which probably had its basis in Num. xxiv. 17 compared with Isa. lx. 1 ff. (Schoettgen, II. p. 151 f.), as well as in the Messianic

<sup>1</sup> Schleiermacher, *Schr. d. Lukas*, p. 47, *L. J.* p. 75, assigned a symbolical character to the narrative. According to Bleek, the symbolical point of view ("the first destinies of the Christian church being, as it were, reflected") predominated at least in the mind of the first author; but the preference in point of historical truth is due to Luke. According to de Wette, the narratives contained in ch. ii. are to be regarded more with a dogmatico-religious than with a strictly historical eye; the dangers surrounding the child Jesus are a type of the persecutions awaiting the Messiah and His church, and an imitation of the dangers which threatened the life of the child Moses, and so on. According to Weisse, what is set forth is the recognition which Christianity met with amongst the *heathen*, the hatred it experienced amongst the *Jews*, and then how it took refuge amongst the *Hellenists* in Egypt. According to Ewald, the inner truth of the narrative is the *heavenly Light*, and the *division amongst men*, on the other hand, into the faith of the heathen and the hatred of the Jews. According to Hilgenfeld, it is the expression of the world-historical importance of Jesus, and of the recognition which, amid the hostility of the Jews, He was to find precisely amongst the heathen. According to Köstlin, the narrative has an apologetic object, to declare Jesus in a miraculous manner to be βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων, at the basis of which, perhaps, was the constellation of the year 747. According to Keim, it is an ideal history, the true form of which stands before the eyes of the Christians of all ages, and which proceeded from the fundamental thought of the conflict of the Messiah with the pseudo-Messias (Herod).



expectation that foreign nations would bring gifts to the Messiah (Ps. lxxii. ; Isa. lx.), as on other occasions, also, rich temple gifts had arrived from the East (Zech. vi. 9 ff.). It was easy to connect with this, by way of antithesis to this divine glorifying of the child, the crafty and murderous interference of Herod as the type of decided hostility, with which the *ruling power of the world*, necessarily and conformably to experience, entered with cunning and violence the lists against the manifested Messiah (Luke i. 51 f.), but in vain. If we were to regard the whole narrative, with its details, as actual fact (see amongst the moderns, especially Ebrard and Gerlach), the matter would be very easily decided ; the difficulties also which have been raised against so extraordinary an astral phenomenon, both in itself and from the science of optics, would be authoritatively removed by means of its *miraculous nature* (Eusebius, *Demost. ev.* 9 ; John of Damascus, *de fide orthod.* ii. 7), but there would still remain unexplained the *impolitic* cunning and falsehood of the otherwise so sly and crafty Herod, who allows the Magi to depart without even a guide to make sure of his designs, and without arrangements of any other kind, his expenditure of vigilance and bloodshed, which was as unnecessary as it was without result, and the altogether irreconcilable contradiction between our account and the history narrated by Luke,<sup>1</sup> according to which the child Jesus received homage of an altogether different kind, and is not threatened by any sort of persecution, but at the date when the Magi must have arrived, had been for a long time out of Bethlehem (Luke ii. 39). Considering the legendary character of the star phenomenon, it is not adapted to serve as a chronological determination of the birth of Christ, for which purpose it has been used, especially by Wieseler and Anger, who calculate, according to it, the beginning of the year 750 as the date of that birth. (Ideler, Münter, Schubert, Huschke, Ebrard, 747 ; Kepler, 748 ; Lichtenstein and Weigl, 749 ; Wurm, 751 ; Seyffarth, 752.)

Ver. 13. Ἀναχωρ. δὲ αὐτῶν] The divine direction and flight into Egypt must be conceived as taking place *immediately* after the departure of the Magi. — Ver. 16. φαίνεται]

<sup>1</sup> The assumption (Paulus, Olshausen, Wieseler, Lichtenstein, Ebrard) that the presentation in the temple took place before the arrival of the Magi, breaks down at once before Luke ii. 39. See, besides, Strauss, I. p. 284 ff. The accounts in Matthew and Luke are *irreconcilable* (Schleiermacher, *L. J.* pp. 65 ff., 75). This is also recognised by Bleek, who gives the preference to Luke.

historic present. — The continuation of the narrative in connection with the legend of the murder of the children by Herod makes Jesus take refuge in *Egypt*, not because it was near at hand, not subject to Herod, and inhabited by many Jews, but because a residence in Egypt, and that as an antitype to that of the Israelites in that country, was in accordance with the passage in Hos. xi. 1 (ver. 15). A later age named *Matarea*, near Leontopolis, as the locality (see Paulus, *Merkw. Reisen in d. Orient*, III. p. 256; Schubert, *Reise in d. Morgenl.* II. p. 170). — ἕως ἂν εἶπω σοί] *until I shall have told thee* (ἂν, of a case occurring), that is, that thou shouldst come back again. Ellipsis of the common “*it*” is, since the time of Homer (Nägelsbach on the *Iliad*, pp. 60, 120, ed. 3), in universal use. — τοῦ ἀπολέσαι] Expression of the *intention*; see Kühner, II. p. 204; Buttm. *neut. Gr.* p. 232 [E. T. 270].

Ver. 15. Τὸν υἱόν μου] refers in Hos. xi. 1 (quoted according to the original text) to the people of Israel (Ex. iv. 22; Jer. xxxi. 9). The Septuagint has τὰ τέκνα αὐτοῦ (Israelis). Upon the ἵνα πληρωθῇ, see on i. 22. Here it refers to the arrival of Jesus in Egypt and His residence there, which could not but take place as an antitype to the historical meaning of Hos. xi. 1, in order that that declaration of the prophet might receive its Messianic fulfilment.

Ver. 16. Ἐνεπαίχθη] *mocked, made a fool of*. Sophocles, *Ant.* 794; Lucian, *Trag.* 331; Jacobs, *ad Anthol.* XI. p. 108; Luke xviii. 32; and frequently in N. T., LXX., and Apocrypha. The words are from Herod's point of view. — ἀπὸ διετοῦς] Whether this is to be taken as *masculine, a bienni, from two years onwards* (Syr., Ar., Erasmus, Beza, Bengel, Fritzsche, Bleek), or as *neuter, a bimatu, from the age of two years* (Vulg., Castalio, Calvin, Er. Schmid, Rosenmüller, Gratz), is not determined by the similar passages, Num. i. 3, xx. 45; 3 Esdr. viii. 1; 1 Chron. xxvii. 23; 2 Chron. xxxi. 16. It is in favour, however, of the latter view, that although several are spoken of, yet the singular always stands (not ἀπὸ διетῶν); so likewise the analogy of ἐπὶ διετές, Dem. 1135. 4; Aesch. in *Ctes.* 122; ἐπὶ τριετές, Arist. *H. A.* v. 14. Comp. likewise Arist. *H. A.* ii. 1, and ἀπὸ τριετοῦς, Plat. *Legg.* vii. p. 794 A.

—καὶ κατωτέρω] (beginning) from two years old and (continuing) *downwards*. The opposite expression is: καὶ ἐπάνω (Num. i. 3; 2 Chron. xxxi. 16). The boys of two years old *and* younger, in order the more unfailingly to attain his purpose.—ἡκριβωσε] *he had obtained precise* knowledge (ver. 7). He had therefore ascertained from the Magi that, agreeably to the time of the appearance of the star, the child could not be more than two years old at the most.—ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ὁρίοις αὐτ.] The houses and courts outside of Bethlehem which yet belonged to its borders.

Ver. 18. Jer. xxxi. 15 (freely quoted according to the Septuagint) treats of the leading away of the Jews to Babylon, whose destiny Rachel, the ancestress of the children of Ephraim, bewails. According to the typically prophetic view in *Matthew*, the lamentation and mourning of Rachel, represented by the prophet, has an antitypical reference to the murdering of the children of Bethlehem, who are *her* children, because she was the wife of Jacob, and the mother of Joseph and Benjamin (Gen. xxxv. 18). And this reference was all the more obvious that, according to Gen. xxxv. 19,<sup>1</sup> Rachel was buried at Bethlehem (Robinson, I. p. 373). According to Chrysostom, Theophylact, Euth. Zigabenus, Piscator, Fritzsche, Rachel is regarded as the representative of Bethlehem, or of the mothers of Bethlehem. But why, in keeping with the antitypical view of the prophet's words, should not *Rachel herself* appear as lamenting over the massacre of those children? *Rama*, however, where, according to the prophet, that lamentation resounded, is here the type of *Bethlehem*.—Regarding the *position* of Rama (now the village *er Ram*), near to Gibeah, two hours to the north of Jerusalem, belonging at one time to Ephraim, at another to Benjamin, and on its identity, which is denied by others, with the Ramah of Samuel (Gesenius, *Thes.* III. p. 1275; Thenius, Winer, von Raumer, Keim), see Graf in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1854, p. 858 ff.; Pressel in Herzog's *Encykl.* XII. p. 515 f. There the exiles were kept in custody, Jer. xl. 1.—κλαίουσα] The *participle*,

<sup>1</sup> Where, however, the words הוּא בֵּית לָחֶם are to be regarded as a gloss. See Thenius on 1 Sam. x. 2; Graf in the *Stud. u. Kritik.* 1854, p. 868.

which in general never stands for the finite tense (in answer to de Wette), has here its government either with ἡκούσθη (Fritzsche) or with οὐκ ἤθελε, where καί is to be translated "also" (*Rachel weeping . . . was also inaccessible to consolation*; on the distinction between καὶ οὐκ and οὐδέ, see Hartung, *Partikell.* I. p. 212 f.). The first is to be preferred as the most natural and most appropriate to the emotional style, so that 'Ραχὴλ κλαίονσα links itself on as an *apposition*, and then the author "sequentium sententiarum gravitate commotus a participio ad verbum finitum deflectit," Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* ii. 1. 30. — On the tragic designation οὐκ εἶναι, *mortuum esse*, comp. xlii. 36; Thuc. ii. 44. 2; Herod. iii. 65; Wetstein *in loc.*; Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* I. p. 515.

REMARK.—The slaughter of the children at Bethlehem is closely connected with the appearance of the Magi, and was in its legendary character already extended as early as Justin (*c. Tr.* 78) to *all* the children of Bethlehem. Josephus, who makes such minute mention of the cruelty of Herod (*Antt.* xv. 7. 8, xvi. 11. 3, xvii. 2. 4; see Ottii *Spicileg.* p. 541), is silent regarding this event, which, had it been known to him as a matter of history, he would most probably have mentioned on account of its unexampled *brutality*. The confused narrative of Macrobius (*Sat.* ii. 4)<sup>1</sup> can here determine nothing, because it first proceeded directly or indirectly from the Christian tradition. Finally, the slaughter of the children itself appears not only as an altogether superfluous measure, since, after the surprising homage offered by the Magi, the child, recently born under extraordinary circumstances, must have been universally known in the small and certainly also provincial village of Bethlehem, or could at least have been easily and certainly discovered by the inquiries of the authorities; but also as a very unwise measure, since a summary slaughter of children could *by no means* give the absolute certainty which was aimed at. To understand the *origin* of the legend, it is not enough to point back to the typical element in the childhood of Moses, or even

<sup>1</sup> Ed. Bipont. p. 341 of Augustus: "Cum audisset, inter pueros, quos in Syria Herodes, rex Judaeorum, intra bimatum jussit interfici, filium quoque ejus occisum, ait: melius est Herodis porcum (ῥύν) esse quam filium (νίον)." A confusion of the murder of Antipater (Joseph. *Antt.* xvii. 7) with our history, as if a son of the king himself (in answer to Wieseler, *Beitr.* p. 154) had been among the murdered Syrian children.

to the dangers undergone in childhood by Romulus, Cyrus, and so on (Strauss); but see the Remark after ver. 12. It is arbitrary, however, to exclude the flight of Jesus into Egypt from this cycle of legends, and to explain it historically in an altogether strange fashion, from the terrible commotion in which, after the death of Herod, Jerusalem and the surrounding localities were plunged (Ammon, *L. J. I.* p. 226 f.). It is indissolubly connected with the slaughter of the children, and stands or falls with it; in the preliminary history of Luke there is no place whatever for it.

Vv. 20, 21. *Τεθνήκασιν . . . ζητούντες*] is to be understood *simply of Herod*. The plural is very often used where the conception of a species is to be expressed, and then denotes the subject, not according to *number*, but chiefly according to the category to which it belongs. Reisig, *ad Soph. Oed. C.* 966, and *Conject. in Aristoph.* p. 58; Wunder, *ad Soph. O. R.* 361; Elwert, *Quaestion. ad philolog. sacr.* 1860, p. 10 f.; Winer, p. 165 [E. T. 219]. Frequently, particularly in the tragic writers, it contains a special emphasis, Hermann, *ad Viger.* p. 739, which also announces itself in the present passage. *Others* (Euth. Zigabenus) regard it as including *Herod* and his *councillors* or *servants*. Ver. 19 is decisive against this view. *Others* (Gratz, B. Crusius, de Wette): the plural is put, *because the words are taken from Ex. iv. 19*. But there the plural is required not only by the *πάντες*, which stands in the text, but likewise by the whole connection. The resemblance to Ex. iv. 19 is either accidental, or, more probably, intentionally selected in the consciousness of being a historical parallel. — *εἰς γ. Ἰσρ.*] Note the *extent* and *indefiniteness* of the designation; Joseph could thus afterwards turn his steps to *Galilee* without acting in opposition to the instruction. Comp. 1 Sam. xiii. 19; Ezek. xi. 17. — *ζητεῖν τὴν ψυχὴν*] *שׁוּבָה אֶת־נַפְשׁוֹ*, *seek the soul*—that is, *seek after one's life* (Rom. xi. 3). The present participle with the article used as a substantive, see Winer, p. 103 f. [E. T. 219]. Comp. Dissen, *ad Dem. de cor.* p. 238. — Herod died in *Jericho* (according to Gerlach, in *Jerusalem*) in the year 750, his genitals and bowels being eaten up of worms (Joseph. *Bell.*

i. 33. 1, 5; *Antt.* xvii. 6. 5; Euseb. *H. E.* i. 68), in the thirty-seventh year of his reign, and in the seventieth of his age, Josephus, *Antt.* xvii. 8. 1, xvii. 9. 3. The tyrant *became a prey to despair* at his death, an attempt at suicide having failed in his last extremity.

Ver. 22. Augustus, after the death of Herod and the complications connected with it,<sup>1</sup> divided the kingdom amongst his three sons in such a manner that *Archelaus* received the half of the four quarters of the kingdom, namely, Judea, Idumaea, and Samaria; *Antipas*, Galilee and Perea; *Philip*, Batanea, Trachonitis, and Auranitis. Both the latter were called *Tetrarchs*, but Archelaus obtained the title of *Ethnarch*, Josephus, *Antt.* xvii. 8. 1, xvii. 11. 4, which was to be exchanged for the title of king should he prove worthy of it. But after nine years he was banished by Augustus on account of his cruelty to Vienne (Josephus, *Antt.* xvii. 13. 2; *B. J.* ii. 7. 3), and died there. His territory was added to the province of Syria, and placed under the administration of a procurator. — βασιλεύειν is therefore here taken generally: *regnare*, as it often is in the classics. On ἀντί, compare Herod. i. 108; Xen. *Anab.* i. 1, iv. 2; 2 Chron. xxxiii. 20; 1 Macc. iii. 1, ix. 31, xiii. 4. — ἐφοβήθη] for Archelaus resembled his father in his suspicious and cruel temper, Josephus, *Antt.* xvii. 11. 2 f. — ἐκεῖ ἀπελθεῖν] a well-known attraction: adverbs of rest with verbs of direction, xvii. 20; John vii. 35, viii. 21, xi. 8, xviii. 3; Rom. xv. 24; LXX. Deut. i. 37; 2 Sam. xvii. 18; Winer, p. 439 [E. T. 591]; Bernhardt, p. 349 f. Γαλιλαίας] in the portions of his district belonging to Galilee. (xv. 21, xvi. 13; Acts ii. 10), so that he avoided Judea, and did not return to Bethlehem. The voluptuary Antipas was known to be more humane than Archelaus.

Ver. 23. Ἐλθών] to Galilee. — εἰς πόλιν] εἰς does not belong to ἐλθών (Fritzsche, Olshausen), but to κατόκησεν, beside which it stands in Gen. xiii. 18; κατόκ. includes the movement connected with the settlement, and that in such a way that the latter was the predominating element in the

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Schneckenburger, *neutest. Zeitgesch.* p. 201 ff.; Hausrath, *neut. Zeitgesch.* I. p. 284 ff.; Keim in Schenkel's *Bibellez.*

thought of the writer: he went and settled at *Nazareth*. Comp. iv. 13; Acts vii. 4; 2 Chron. xix. 4. See Kühner, I. p. 471. — Nazareth<sup>1</sup>] in Lower Galilee, in the tribe of Zabulon, situated on a hill (Luke iv. 20), with pleasant environs. Robinson, *Paläst.* III. p. 419 ff.; Ritter, *Erdk.* XVI. p. 739 ff.; Furer, *Wander. durch Paläst.* p. 267 ff.; Tobler, *Nazar. in Paläst.*, 1868. Mentioned neither in the O. T. nor in Josephus. — ὁπῶς] in order that. See i. 22. — διὰ τῶν προφ.] not the plural of category (ver. 20, so Fritzsche), according to which Isaiah only could be meant, but the prophets generally, Luke xviii. 31; Rom. i. 2. — ὁτι] not the *Recitativum*, although its use in the Gospel of Matthew cannot be denied, vii. 23, ix. 18, xiv. 26, xxvii. 43, 47, but “that,” as no individual express statement is quoted. — Ναζωραῖος] of Nazareth, xxvi. 71. In Isa. xi. 1, the Messiah, as the offspring of David, is called נִצְּרִי, shoot, with which, in the representation of the evangelist, this designation was identified, only expressed by another word, namely, נִצְּרָה (Jer. xxiii. 5, xxxiii. 15; Zech. iii. 8, vi. 12; Isa. iv. 2); therefore he wrote, διὰ τῶν προφητῶν. In giving this prophetic title of נִצְּרִי to the Messiah, he entirely disregards the historical meaning of the same (LXX. Isa. xi. 1: ἄνθος), keeps by the relationship of the name Nazareth to the word נִצְּרִי, and recognises, by virtue of the same, in that prophetic Messianic name *Nezer*, the typical reference to this, that Jesus, through His settlement in Nazareth, was to become a *Ναζωραῖος*; the translator therefore, rightly apprehending this typical reference,

<sup>1</sup> Upon the form of the name *Ναζαρά*, which, although attested as ancient in many ways, is yet found only in a few passages in the Mss. of the N. T., and very unequally supported (Tischendorf, 8th ed., has received it into the text in iv. 13, and in Luke iv. 16), see Keim, I. p. 319; comp. also Delitzsch, *Jesus u. Hillel*, p. 13. In the passage before us it is without any support, as well as in xxi. 11, and in the remaining passages of the other evangelists, except Luke i. 26, iv. 16. The form *Ναζαρά* is often found in Mss., as also *Ναζαρά*. But it is the admission of *Ναζαρί* (or *Ναζαρί*) alone into the text that can be justified, and that as the *standing* reading, all the more that even in iv. 13 and in Luke iv. 16 there is by no means a decisive predominance of testimony for *Ναζαρά*, which has no support, moreover, in Acts x. 38. Although *Nazara* was the *original* form of the name (see in answer to Ewald's doubts, Keim, II. p. 421 f.), which is probable, it must notwithstanding have been strange to the evangelists.

expressed the Hebrew נָצִיר by *Ναζωπαῖος*, although he may have also found in the original Hebrew draft of the Gospel בֶּן נָצִיר, or, more probably, נָצִיר. The evangelist must in any case have derived the name Nazareth from נָצִיר, and it is likewise probable in itself; see Hengstenberg, *Christol.* II. p. 124 ff. "*Eruditi Hebraei*" already referred the *Ναζωρ. κληθ.* back to the נָצִיר; see Jerome on Isa. xi. 1, and, more recently, Piscator, Casaubon, Jansen, Maldonatus, Surenhusius, Bauer (*bibl. Theol.* I. p. 163), Fritzsche, Gieseler, Kern, Krabbe, de Wette, B. Crusius, Köstlin, Bleek, Hengstenberg, Kahnis, Anger, formerly also Hilgenfeld. But *others* (Chrysostom, Theophylact, Clericus, Grätz) regard the words as a quotation from a lost prophetic book. But *always*, where in the N. T. the *prophets* are quoted, those in the completed canon are meant. *Others* (Michaelis, Paulus, Kuinoel, Gersdorf, Kauffer, Olshausen, Ebrard, Lange) are of opinion that *Ναζωπαῖος* refers to the despised and melancholy position of the Messiah depicted by the prophets in accordance with Ps. xxii., Isa. liii. For Nazareth was despised, see John i. 47, vii. 52. But the question here is not as to a prophetic *description* (of the lowliness of the Messiah), but as to the definite prophetic *name* (*κληθήσεται*), to which the settlement in Nazareth may correspond; and, indeed, the evangelist must have found the *name itself* in the prophets, and not have inserted it *ex eventu*, namely, because Nazareth served to make the Messiah an object of misapprehension (in answer to Hofmann, *Weissag. u. Erfüll.* p. 66). For that reason also the opinion of *others* is to be rejected (Erasmus, Beza, Calvin, Grotius, Wetstein, Hilgenfeld), who, after Tertullian and Jerome, take *Ναζ.* for the Hebrew נָזִיר, that it might be fulfilled . . . that He shall be (called) a *Nazarite*. Jesus had neither represented Himself to be *such* a consecrated person, Matt. xi. 19, nor can any passage in the prophets be pointed out as referring to this; therefore Ewald, in opposition to *διὰ τῶν προφ.*, assumes the statement to be taken from an *Apocryphal* book, in which the Messiah, on His first appearance, was represented as a *Nazarite*, so that the evangelist was led, from the similarity of the word, to infer a reference to Nazareth. If, however, in *Ναζωπαῖος*



the Hebrew נָצִיר, *Preserver*, has been supposed to be contained, and that in such a way that it had as its basis either Ex. xxxiv. 6 f. (Zuschlag in Guericke's *Zeitschr.* 1854, III. p. 417 ff.) or Ps. xxxi. 24 (Riggenbach in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1855, p. 606 f.), then something entirely foreign is thus imported, as in those passages there is to be found neither a designation of the Messiah nor any prophetic declaration. Still more arbitrary is the reference of Hitzig in the *theol. Jahrb.* 1842, p. 410, to Isa. xlix. 6, where נָצִיר has been taken as *singular*, and explained as a predicate of the Messiah, as the leader of those who are saved. Delitzsch has referred to Isa. xlii. 6; so that Christ is predicted as He who is preserved in dangers (נָצִיר, Isa. xlix. 6), whilst Nazareth was His *place of concealment*.

REMARK.—The evangelist expresses himself in ver. 23 in such a manner that throughout the narrative Nazareth cannot appear to the reader as the original dwelling-place of Joseph and Mary. Bethlehem rather, according to his account, appears to be intended as such (ver. 22), whilst Nazareth was the place of sojourn under the special circumstances which occurred after the death of Herod. The account given by Luke is quite different. This variation is to be admitted, and the reconciliation of both accounts can only be brought about in an arbitrary manner,<sup>1</sup> which is all the more inadmissible that, on the whole, the narratives of Matthew and Luke regarding the birth and early infancy of Jesus in important points mutually exclude

<sup>1</sup> That Joseph, brought to Bethlehem by the census, *settled* there. Matthew accordingly represents Bethlehem as his *dwelling-place*. The flight to Egypt, however, again soon broke up the residence in Bethlehem, so that the sojourn was only a passing one, and therefore Luke rightly regarded the subsequent settlement at Nazareth as a *return* thither. See Neander, Ebrard, Hofmann, Krabbe, Lange. Wieseler's reasons also (*chronolog. Synopse*, p. 35 ff.) against the view that Matthew makes *Bethlehem* appear as the original dwelling-place of Jesus, will not stand. This view is to be regarded, by the account in Matthew, which is to be looked on as *independent*, and *standing by itself*, as a necessary *exegetical result* by means of ver. 22, and is undoubtedly confirmed by ver. 23, where Joseph's settlement in Nazareth appears as something *new*, which must occur *in order to fulfil a prophetic prediction*, so that consequently no reader of Matthew could come to think that Nazareth had been Joseph's dwelling-place. Wieseler, however, has, moreover, strikingly demonstrated the unhistorical nature of the view that Jesus was *born* at Nazareth

each other. Amid all their other variations, however, in the preliminary history in which they are independent of one another, they agree *in this, that Bethlehem was the place of birth*, and it is in opposition to the history to relegate this agreement to the sphere of dogmatic reflection, and to transport the birth of Jesus to *Nazareth* (Strauss, Hilgenfeld, Keim), since the designation of Jesus as belonging to Nazareth (Matt. xiii. 34; Mark vi. 1; Luke iv. 19) finds its natural and complete explanation in the short and passing sojourn of His parents at Bethlehem after His birth, whereas, had Jesus Himself been a *native* of Galilee, He would neither have found a believing reception amongst His people, nor, on the other hand, could His Messiahship have been held to be based on a prophetic foundation. Comp. also Luke ii. 39 and John vii. 42.

## CHAPTER III.

VER. 2. *καὶ λέγων*] Lachm. and Tisch. have merely *λέγων*, only after B  $\aleph$ , Hil. and some Verss. The superfluous *καὶ* was easily overlooked. — Ver. 3. *ὁπῶ*] B C D  $\aleph$ , 1, 13, 33, 124, 157, 209, Syr<sup>cur</sup> Sahid. Aeth. Vulg. It. Sax. read *διὰ*; so Griesbach, Gersdorf, Schulz, Lachm., Tisch. Correctly; see on ii. 17. — Ver. 4. The position *ἦν αὐτοῦ* (Lachm., Tisch.) is, by means of B C D  $\aleph$ , 1, 209, so sufficiently attested, that it must be preferred to the ordinary position *αὐτοῦ ἦν*, which spontaneously suggested itself to the copyists. — Ver. 6. *Ἰορδάνῃ*] B C\* M  $\Delta$   $\aleph$ , Curss., and many Verss. and Fathers, add *ποταμῶ*; so Lachm. and Tisch. 8. Addition from Mark i. 5. — Ver. 7. The *αὐτοῦ* was easily passed over after *βάπτισμα* as unnecessary; it is wanting, however, only in B  $\aleph^*$ , Sahid. Or. Hil., but is deleted by Tisch. 8. — Ver. 8. *καρπὸν ἄξιον*] Elz. has *καρποὺς ἀξίους*, after too weak testimony. Retained by Fritzsche. It arose from the copyists, who deemed the plural more appropriate to the sense, and had Luke iii. 8 in view. — Ver. 10. *δὲ καὶ*] Lachm. Tisch.: *δέ*, which is so preponderantly attested by B C D M  $\Delta$   $\aleph$ , Curss. Verss. Or. Ir. Did. Bas., that *δὲ καὶ* is to be regarded as introduced from Luke iii. 9. — Ver. 14. Instead of *ὁ δὲ Ἰωάννης*, Lachm. and Tisch. 8 have only *ὁ δέ*, after B  $\aleph$ , Sahid. Eus. Correctly; the name was much more easily interpolated than omitted. — Ver. 16. The transposition *εὐθὺς ἀνέβη* in B D  $\aleph$ , Curss. Verss. and Fathers (so Lachm. and Tisch.), is a change, which assigned to the *εὐθὺς* its more usual place (Gersdorf, I. p. 485). — *αὐτῶ*] is bracketed by Lachm., deleted by Tisch., but has a decided preponderance of witnesses in its favour, and its significance was easily misunderstood and passed over. — *καὶ*] before *ἐρχόμε*. is to be defended on decisive testimony, against Tisch. 8; comp. on ver. 2.

Ver. 1. *Ἐν . . . ἐκείναις*]  $\aleph$   $\eta$   $\theta$   $\iota$   $\kappa$   $\lambda$   $\mu$   $\nu$   $\xi$   $\omicron$   $\pi$   $\rho$   $\sigma$   $\tau$   $\upsilon$   $\phi$   $\chi$   $\psi$   $\omega$ , Ex. ii. 11, 23; Isa. xxxviii. 1. Indefinite determination of time, which, however, always points back to a date which has preceded it. Mark

i. 9; Luke ii. 1. Here: *at the time when Jesus still sojourned at Nazareth*. The evangelist passes over the history of the youth of Jesus, and at once goes onwards to the forerunner of the Messiah; for he might not have had at his command any written documents, and sufficiently trustworthy traditions regarding it, since the oldest manner of presenting the gospel history, as still retained in Mark, began first with John the Baptist, to which beginning our evangelist also turns without further delay. It employs in so doing only the very indefinite transition with the same simplicity of unstudied historical writing, as in Ex. ii. 11, where by the same expression is meant the time when Moses still sojourned at the court of Egypt, though not the time of his childhood (ver. 10), but of his manhood. Accordingly, the following hypotheses are unnecessary; that of *Paulus*: in the original document, from which Matthew borrowed the following narrative, something about John the Baptist may have preceded, to which this note of time was appended, which Matthew retained, without adopting that preliminary matter; of *Holtzmann*: that a look forward to Mark i. 9 here betrays itself; of *Schneckenburger* (*üb. d. erste kanon. Ev.* p. 120): that in the gospel according to the Hebrews ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἑρώδου erroneously stood, instead of which Matthew put the indefinite statement before us; of *Hilgenfeld*, *Evang.* p. 55: in the older narrative, which lay at the foundation of our Matthew, the genealogical tree of Jesus was perhaps followed by ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἑρώδου τοῦ βασιλέως τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἦλθεν (or ἐγένετο) Ἰωάννης; compare also Keim, *Gesch. J. I.* p. 61. The correct view was already adopted by Chrysostom and his followers, Beza, Camerarius, Bengel: “Jesu habitante Nazarethae, ii. 23; notatur non breve, sed nulla majori mutatione notabile intervallum.” It is Luke iii. 1 which first gives the more precise determination of time, and that very minutely. — παραγίνεται] Historic present, as in ii. 13. Euth. Zigabenus: πότεν ὁ Ἰωάννης παραγέγονεν; ἀπὸ τῆς ἐνδοτέρας ῥήμου. Opposed to this is the ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ that follows. Matthew has only the more general and indefinite expression: *he arrives, he appears*. Luke xii. 51; Heb. ix. 11. — ὁ βαπτιστ.] Josephus, *Antt.*

xviii. 5. 2: Ἰωάνν. ὁ ἐπικαλούμενος βαπτιστής. — ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τῆς Ἰουδαίας] מְדִבְרָה יְהוּדָה, Judg. i. 16, Josh. xv. 61, a level plain adapted for the feeding of cattle, sparsely cultivated and inhabited,<sup>1</sup> which begins at Tekoa, and extends as far as the Dead Sea. Winer, *Realwörterb. s.v. Wüste*; Tobler, *Denkblätter aus Jerus.* p. 682; Keim, *Gesch. J. I.* p. 484 f. The mention of the locality is more precise in Luke iii. 2 f.; but that in Matthew, in which the wilderness is not marked off geographically from the valley of the Jordan, which was justified by the nature of the soil (Josephus, *Bell.* iii. 10. 7, iv. 8. 2 f.), and involuntarily called forth by the following prophecy, is not incorrect. Comp. Ebrard (in answer to Strauss); Keim, *l.c.* p. 494.

Ver. 2. Μετανοεῖτε] denotes the *transformation of the moral disposition*, which is requisite in order to obtain a share in the kingdom of the Messiah. *Sanhedrin* f. 97, 2: "Si Israelitae poenitentiam agunt, tunc per Goëlem liberantur." In the mouth of John the conception could only be that of the *Old Testament* (שׁוּב, נִחַם), expressing the transformation according to the moral requirements of the *law*, but not yet the *Christian* idea, according to which μετάνοια has as its essential inseparable correlative, faith in Jesus as the Messiah (Mark i. 15), after which the Holy Spirit, received by means of baptism, establishes and completes the new birth from above into true ζωή. John iii. 3, 5; Tit. iii. 5 f.; Acts ii. 38. — ἤγγικε] *it is near*; for John expected that Jesus would set up His kingdom. Comp. iv. 17, x. 7. — ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν] See Fleck, *de regno div.* 1829; Weissenbach, *Jesu in regno coelor. dignitas*, 1868; Keim, *Gesch. J. II.* p. 40 ff.; Kamphausen, *d. Gebet des Herren*, p. 56 ff.; Wittichen, *d. Idee des Reiches Gottes*, 1872. *The kingdom of heaven* (the plural is to be explained from the popular idea of seven heavens; see on 2 Cor. xii. 2) corresponds to the Rabbinical מְלָכוּת הַשָּׁמַיִם

<sup>1</sup> The idea of a flat surface called מְדִבְרָה is given us partially in the *Lüneburger Heath*. See generally, Crome, *Beiträge zur Erklär. des N. T.* p. 41 ff. Not to be confused with עֲרֶבְיָה, *steppe*, concerning which see Credner in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1833, p. 798 ff. Compare in regard to our wilderness, Robinson, *Pal.* II. p. 431.

(Schoettgen, *Diss. de regno coelor.* I. in his *Horae*, I. p. 1147 ff., and Wetstein *in loc.*),—an expression which is used by the Rabbins mostly indeed in the *ethico*-theocratic sense, but also in the *eventually* historical meaning of the theocracy, brought to its consummation by the Messiah (Targum, Mich. iv. 7b in Wetstein). In the N. T. this expression occurs only in Matthew, and that as the usual one, which, as that which was most frequently employed by Jesus Himself, is to be regarded as derived from the collection of sayings (in answer to Weiss). Equivalent in meaning to it are: βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ (also in Matthew, yet much rarer and not everywhere critically certain), βασιλ. τ. Χριστοῦ, ἡ βασιλεία. Comp. Isa. xx. 6; Dan. ii. 44, vii. 14 ff., 26 f. The kingdom of the Messiah is designated by ἡ βασ. τ. οὐρ., because this kingdom, the consummated theocracy in its glory, is no earthly kingdom, John xviii. 36, but belongs to heaven, appears to us as descending from heaven, where, up till that time, its blessings, its salvation, and its δόξα are preserved by God for bestowal at some future period. Although among the Jewish people the theocratic idea, of which the prophets were the bearers, had preserved its root,—and from this people alone, in accordance with its divine preparation and guidance, could the realization of this idea, and with it the salvation of the world, proceed, as, indeed, the profounder minds apprehended and cherished the mighty thought of Messiah in the sense of the true rule of God, and of its destination for the world,—yet the common idea of the people was predominantly political and particularistic, frequently stamped with the fanatical thought of a world-rule and with millenarian ideas (the Messiah raises up the descendants of Abraham, then comes the kingdom which lasts a thousand years, then the resurrection and the condemnatory judgment of the heathen, the descent of the heavenly Jerusalem, and the everlasting life of the descendants of Abraham on the earth, which has been transformed along with the whole universe). In the teaching of Christ, however, and in the apostolic writings, the kingdom of the Messiah is the actual consummation of the prophetic idea of the rule of God; and as it is unaccompanied by millenarian ideas (which exist

only in the non-apostolic Apocalypse), so also is it without any national limitation, so that participation therein rests only on faith in Jesus Christ, and on the moral renewal which is conditioned by the same, and "God all in all" is the last and highest aim, without the thought of the world-rule, and the expectation of the renewal of the world, of the resurrection, of the judgment, and also of the external glory losing their positive validity and necessity,—thoughts which rather form the subject of living Christian hope amidst all the struggles and oppressions of the world. Moreover, those expressions, βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, κ.τ.λ., never signify anything else than the *kingdom of the Messiah* (Koppe, *Exc. I. ad Thess.*), even in those passages where they *appear* to denote the (invisible) church, the moral kingdom of the Christian religion, and such like; or to express some modern abstraction of the concrete conception,<sup>1</sup> which is one given in the history,—an appearance which is eliminated by observing that the manner of expression is frequently *proleptic*, and which has its historical basis in the idea of the nearness of the kingdom, and in the moral development which necessarily precedes its manifestation (comp. Matt. xi. 12, xii. 28, xvi. 19). Comp. on Rom. xiv. 17; 1 Cor. iv. 20; Col. i. 13, iv. 11; Matt. vi. 10. That *John the Baptist* also had, under divine revelation, apprehended the idea of the Messiah's kingdom in the ethical light, free from any limitation to the Jewish people (John i. 29), without, however, entirely giving up the political element, is already shown by ver. 7 ff. It cannot, however, be proved, and is, considering the divine illumination of the Baptist, improbable, and also without any foundation in xi. 3, that too much has been put into his mouth by ascribing to him the definite announcement of the kingdom. If Josephus, in his account of John, makes no mention of any expression

<sup>1</sup> e.g. an organized commonwealth under the principle of the divine will (Tholuck); arrangement of things in which this will has come to its consummation, and now alone is operative (Hofmann). Schleiermacher: "The idea of the kingdom of God must have originated in Christ from His self-consciousness and His perception of sin, if He conceived of *His life as disseminated among the masses*."

pointing to the Messiah,<sup>1</sup> yet this may be sufficiently explained from his want of susceptibility for the higher nature of Christianity, and from his peculiar political relation to the Romans.

Ver. 3. Γάρ] "Causa, cur Johannes ita exoriri tum debuerit, uti v. 1, 2, describitur, quia sic praedictum erat," Bengel. — Does not belong to John's discourse, ver. 3, so that by οὗτος he points to himself, as Er. Schmid, Raphel, Fritzsche, Paulus, Rettig in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1838, p. 205 f., maintain, since so prominent a self-designation has no basis in the connection (John i. 23; on the other hand, John vi. 50, 58); further, the descriptive present ἐστὶ is quite in keeping with παραγίνεται in ver. 1; and αὐτὸς δέ, ver. 4, is quite in keeping with the sense of the objectively and generally delivered prophetic description (the voice of one calling, and so on), and leads to the concrete person thereby intended. — ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ] belongs in the original text to ἐτοιμάσατε, and in the LXX. also there is no reason for separating it from it; but here it belongs to βοῶντος, according to ver. 1: κηρύσσων ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ. This in answer to Rettig, Hofmann, Weissag. u. Erf. II. p. 77 f., and Delitzsch. — The passage, Isa. xi. 3, quoted according to the LXX., contains historically a summons to prepare the way for Jehovah, who is bringing back His people from exile, and to make level the streets which He is to traverse, after the analogy of what used to take place in the East when rulers set out on a journey (Wetstein and Münthe). In this the evangelist recognises (and the Baptist himself had recognised this, John i. 23) the typically prophetic reference to John as the prophet who was to call on the Jews to prepare themselves by repentance for the reception of the Messiah (whose manifestation is the manifestation of Jehovah). In Isaiah, the voice which calls is that of a herald of Jehovah, who desires to begin his journey; in the Messianic fulfilment, it is the voice of the Baptist. — Faith in a God-sent fore-

<sup>1</sup> *Antt.* xviii. 5. 2: Εκτείνει τοῦτον Ἡρώδης, ἀγαθὸν ἄνδρα καὶ τοὺς Ἰουδαίους πελειύοντα ἀρετὴν ἐπασκοῦντας καὶ τῇ πρὸς ἀλλήλους δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν εὐσεβείᾳ χρωμένους βαπτισμῷ συνίεναι· οὗτω γὰρ καὶ τὴν βάπτισιν ἀποδεκτὴν αὐτῷ φανείσθαι, μὴ ἐπὶ τινον ἁμαρτῶδων παραιτήσει χρωμένων, ἀλλ' ἰφ' ἀγνείᾳ τοῦ σώματος, ὅτι δὴ καὶ τῆς ψυχῆς δικαιοσύνῃ περιεκαθαρμένων.



runner of the Messiah, based on prophecy (Mal. iii. 1; Luke i. 17, 76) and confirmed by Jesus Himself (xi. 10, xvii. 11), and attested as realized in the appearance of the Baptist, had in various ways (see Bertholdt, *Christol.* p. 58) assumed the form of the expectation of the return of one of the ancient prophets. Comp. xvi. 14; John i. 21.

Ver. 4. *Αὐτός]* *ipse* autem Johannes, the historical person himself, who is intended (ver. 3) by that *φωνή* of Isaiah. — *εἶχε . . . καμήλου]* *He had his* (distinctive, constantly worn) *robe of camels' hair*. The reading is *αὐτοῦ*, which is neither to be written *αὐτοῦ* (it is used from the standpoint of the narrator, and without any reflective emphasis), nor is it superfluous. Whether are we to think of a garment of camels' skin, or a coarse cloth of camels' hair? Er. Schmid and Fritzsche are of the former opinion. But as *hair* alone is expressly mentioned as the material<sup>1</sup> (comp. also Mark i. 6), the latter is to be preferred. Even at the present day coarse cloth is prepared from camels' hair for clothing and for covering tents. See Harmar, III. p. 356. Of clothes made from the hides of camels (probably, however, from sheep and goat-skins, compare Heb. xi. 37) there is not a trace to be found among either ancient or modern Oriental saints (Harmar, III. p. 374 ff.). — *δεσματίνην]* not of a luxurious material, but like Elijah, 2 Kings i. 8, whose copy he was (comp. Ewald, *Gesch. d. Volks Isr.* III. p. 529). Dress and food are in keeping with the asceticism of the Baptist, and thereby with the profound earnestness of his call to *μετάνοια*. "*Habitus quoque et victus Johannis prædicabat,*" Bengel. — *ἀκρίδες]* Several kinds of *locusts* were eaten, Lev. xi. 22. Comp. Plin. *N. H.* vi. 35, xi. 32, 35. This is still the custom in the East, especially amongst the poorer classes and the Bedouins. The wings and legs are torn off, and the remainder is sprinkled with salt, and either boiled or eaten roasted. Niebuhr, *Reise*, I. p. 402; Harmar, I. p. 274 f.; Rosenmüller, *altes und neues Morgenl. in loco*. The conjectures of the older writers, who, deeming this food unworthy of John, have substituted some-

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* xvii. 24. 3: ὡς ἀντὶ τῶν βασιλικῶν ἐν τάχει περιθέουσαι ἑαυταῖς ἐκ τριχῶν πειποιημέναις.

times *cakes* (ἐγκρίδες),<sup>1</sup> sometimes *crabs* (καρίδες), or *fruits of the nut kind* (ἀκρόδρυα) and other articles, deserve no consideration. — μέλι ἄγριον] Commonly: *honey prepared by wild bees, which in the East flows out of the clefts of the rocks*. Euth. Zigabenus: τὸ ἐν ταῖς τῶν πετρῶν σχισμαῖς ὑπὸ τῶν μελισσῶν γεωργούμενον. Bochart, *Hieroz.* II. 4. 12; Suicer, *Thes.* II. p. 330; Ewald, *Gesch. Isr.* III. p. 50. It is still frequently found in abundance at the present day in the Jewish wilderness. Schulz, *Leitungen d. Höchsten auf den Reisen durch Eur. As. Afr.* V. p. 133; Rosenmüller, I. 1, p. 7; Oedmann, *Sammlungen aus d. Naturk. zur Erkl. d. heil. Schr.* VI. p. 136 f. Others (Suidas, Salmasius, Reland, Michaelis, Kuinoel, Fritzsche, Schegg, Bleek, Volkmar) understand *tree honey*, a substance of the nature of honey which issues from palms, figs, and other trees. Diod. Sic. xix. 94; Wesseling *in loc.*; Plin. *N. H.* xv. 7; Suidas, s.v. ἀκρίς. Comp. Heyne, *ad Virg. Ecl.* iv. 30. Similarly, Polyænus, iv. 3. 32: τὸ ὕον μέλι, the Persian manna. This explanation of *tree honey* is to be preferred, as, according to Diod. Sic. *l.c.* and Suidas, the predicate ἄγριον, as *terminus technicus*, actually designates *this* honey, whilst the expression μέλι ἄγριον cannot be proved to be employed of the honey of wild bees (which, moreover, is the *common* honey).

Ver. 5. Ἡ περίχωρος τοῦ Ἰορδάνου] כְּפַר הַיַּרְדֵּן, Gen. xiii. 10, 11; 1 Kings vii. 47; 2 Chron. iv. 17. The country on both sides of the Jordan, now *Elgor*, see Robinson, *Pal.* II.

<sup>1</sup> Epiph. *Haer.* xxx. 13 quotes from the Gospel according to the Hebrews: καὶ τὸ βρώμα αὐτοῦ, φήσι, μέλι ἄγριον, οὗ ἡ γύσις ἦν τοῦ μάννα ὡς ἐγκρίς ἐν ἱλαίῳ (conjecture: ἐν μέλιτι). A confusion has here been supposed between ἀκρίδες and ἐγκρίδες, and it has been inferred that that Gospel was derived from Greek sources, especially from the Greek Matthew. So also Credner, *Beitr.* I. p. 344 f.; Bleek, *Beitr.* p. 61; Harless, *Erl. Weihnachtsprogr.* 1841, p. 21. Comp. Delitzsch, *Entsteh. u. Anl. d. kanon. Ev.* I. p. 20. But that passage from the Gospel to the Hebrews contains only one kind of sustenance employed by John, the μέλι ἄγριον, the taste of which is described according to Ex. xvi. 31, Num. xi. 8. The Ebionites altogether omitted the locusts, as being animal food, but did not substitute, as Epiphanius erroneously supposes, ἐγκρίδες for ἀκρίδες. The resemblance of the tree honey to the manna could not but be welcome to their Jewish point of view; but because the word ἐγκρίς occurs in the books of Moses in the description of its taste, they adopted it; this has no relation whatever to our ἀκρίδες.

p. 498 ff. Comp. Lightfoot, *Hor.* p. 216. The whole passage conveys an impression of *solemnity*, with which also the naming of the town and district, instead of the *inhabitants* (Nägelsbach on the *Iliad*, p. 103 ff. ed. 3), is connected. The baptism of John has been erroneously regarded as a modified application of the Jewish baptism of proselytes. So Selden (*jus. nat.* ii. 2), Lightfoot (*Hor.* p. 220 ff.), Danz (in Meuschen, *N. T. ex Talm. ill.* pp. 233 ff., 287 ff.), Ziegler (*theol. Abh.* II. p. 132 ff.), Eisenlohr (*hist. Bemerk. üb. d. Taufe*, 1804), Kaiser (*bibl. Theol.* II. p. 160), Kuinoel, Fritzsche, Bengel, *üb. d. Alter d. Jüd. Proselytent.* 1814. For the baptism of proselytes, the oldest testimony to which occurs in the Gemara *Babyl. Jebamoth* xlv. 2, and regarding which Philo, Josephus, and the more ancient Targumists are altogether silent, did not arise till after the destruction of Jerusalem. Schneckenburger, *üb. d. Alter der Jüd. Proselytent. u. deren Zusammenst. m. d. joh. u. chr. Ritus*, 1828; Paulus, *exeg. Handb.* I. p. 307 ff. The reception of proselytes was accomplished, so long as the temple stood, by means of circumcision and the presentation of a sacrifice, which was preceded, like every sacrifice, by a lustration, which the proselyte performed on himself. It is not, however, with this lustration merely, but chiefly with the religious usages of the Jews as regards washings, and their symbolical meaning (Gen. xxxv. 2; Ex. xix. 10; Num. xix. 7, 19; 1 Sam. xvi. 5; Judith xii. 7), that the baptism of John has its general point of connection in the history of the people, although it is precisely as *baptism*, and accompanied by the *confession of sin*, that it appears only as something new given to this dawn of the Messiah's kingdom, under the excitement of the divine revelation, of which John was the bearer. Venerable prophetic pictures and allusions, like Isa. i. 16, iv. 4, xlv. 44, 3 Ez. xxxvi. 25, Zech. xiii. 1, Ps. li. 4, might thus serve to develope it still further in the soul of this last of the prophets. What was symbolized in the baptism of John was the *μετάνοια*. Comp. Josephus, *Antt.* xviii. 5. 2.<sup>1</sup> To this, however, the immersion

<sup>1</sup> See this passage of Josephus above on ver. 2. Without any reason has this meaning been discovered in it, that John viewed his baptism as a *means of*

of the *whole* of the baptized person, as the *μετάνοια*, was to purify the whole man, corresponded with profound significance, and to this the specifically Christian view of the symbolic immersion and emersion afterwards connected itself (Rom. vi. 3 ff.; Tit. iii. 5) by an ethical necessity. — ἐξομολογ.] In the same way as in the case of the sin-offering (Lev. xvi. 21 ff.; Num. v. 7), and in general to be taken as a venerable pre-condition of divine grace and blessing, Ps. xxxii. 5, li. 1 ff.; Ezra ix. 6; Dan. ix. 5. — The *participle* is not to be taken as if it were conditional (Fritzsche: “*si... confiterentur*”), as the subjection to this condition, in the case of every one who came to be baptized, is necessarily required as a matter of course; but: they were baptized *whilst they confessed*, during the confession, which is conceived as connected with the act of baptism itself. Whether is it a summary or a specific confession which is intended? Both may have taken place, varying always according to the individuals and their relations. The *compound*, however (Josephus, *Antt.* viii. 4. 6; passages in Philo; see in Loesner), expresses, as also in Acts xix. 18, Jas. v. 16, an *open* confession.

Ver. 7. The *Pharisees* (from שָׂרִפ, *separavit*, the *separated ones*, διὰ τὴν ἐθελοπερισσοθησκείαν, Epiphanius, *Haer.* i. 16) received, besides the law, also tradition; taught the doctrine of fate, without, however, denying the freedom of the will; of immortality, and that in the case of pious persons, in pure bodies; of good and evil angels, and were, in all the strictness of external righteousness, according to law and statute, the crafty, learned, patriotic, and powerful supporters of the degenerate orthodoxy. The *Sadducees*<sup>1</sup> recognised merely the written law, and that

*covenant*, by explaining βαπτισμῶ συνίνασι to mean: *to unite through or for baptism* (Strauss, Keim, Hausrath). The meaning of the passage is rather: John commanded the Jews *to be wise* in the exercise of virtue, and so on (*sapere*, comp. Rom. iii. 11; 2 Cor. x. 12), *by means of baptism*.

<sup>1</sup> Epiphanius, *Haer.* i. 14: ἰππονόμαζοντες ἑαυτοὺς Σαδδουκαίους δὴθεν ἀπὸ δικαιοσύνης τῆς ἱπποκλήσεως ὀρρωμένους. The Jewish tradition derives it from the proper name Zadok. R. Nathan, *ad Pirke Aboth*, i. 3. The latter is to be preferred, with Ewald, Geiger, Hitzig, and others; see Keim, *Gesch. J. I.* p. 275. Hausrath, *Zeitgesch.* I. p. 118. That name, however, is to be understood as that of an old and distinguished priestly family; 2 Sam. vii. 17, xv. 24; Ezek. xlviii. 11; 1 Macc. vii. 14.

not only of the Pentateuch, but of the whole of the O. T., although according to the strict exposition of the letter, and to the exclusion of tradition; they denied the existence of higher spirits, of fate and personal immortality, and adhered to a strict code of morals; they had less authority with the people than the exclusive orthodox Pharisees, against whom they formed a decided party of opposition, but had much influence over men of rank and wealth. The strictly closed order of *Essenes*, in its separation from the world and the temple, as well as in its ascetic self-satisfaction and self-sanctification, the quiet separatistic holy ones of the land, connected together by community of goods, and under obligation, besides, daily to perform holy lustrations, kept themselves far away from the movement evoked by John. — Observe that the *article is not repeated* before *Σαδδουκ.*, because they are conceived as forming, along with the Pharisees, *one* unworthy category. “Nempe repetitur articulus, ubi distinctio logica aut emphatica ita postulat,” Dissen, *ad Dem. de cor.* p. 574. — ἐπὶ] *not contra* (Olearius), which would be quite opposed to the context, but *telic*, in order to be baptized; comp. Luke xxiii. 48. Why should the Pharisees and Sadducees not also have come to baptism, since they shared with the people the hope of the Messiah, and must have felt also on their part the extraordinary impression made by the appearance of John, and the excitement awakened by it, and, in keeping with their moral conceit, would easily enough have compounded with the confession of sins? It is, however, already probable *à priori*, and certain, by means of Luke vii. 30, that they, at least so far as the majority were concerned, did *not* allow themselves to be baptized, although they had come with this intention, but were repelled in terror by the preaching of repentance and punishment, ver. 8 ff. — There exists, therefore, no variation between this and Luke vii. 30; the Pharisees and Sadducees are no addition by Matthew (Ewald, Holtzmann), and neither is Matthew to be blamed for committing a historical mistake, occasioned by John i. 24 (Schneckenburger, Bleek), nor is Luke to be charged with want of originality in this section (de Wette). But the former relates with more

minuteness than Luke (iii. 7 : τοῖς . . . ὄχλοις) in *separating* the persons in question from the mass along with whom they came. — γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν] *cunning, malignant men* ! xii. 34, xxiii. 33 ; Isa. xiv. 29, lix. 5 ; Ps. lviii. 5 ; Wetstein on the passage. Comp. Dem. 799. 4 : πικρὸν καὶ ἔχιν τὴν φύσιν ἀνδρωπον. — τῆς μελλούσης ὀργῆς] is to be understood of the divine wrath which is revealed at the Messianic judgment (Rom. ii. 5 ; 1 Thess. i. 10). The common belief of the Jews referred this to the heathen (Bertholdt, *Christol.* pp. 203 ff., 223 ff.). John, however, to the godless generally, who would not repent. The *wrath* of God, however, established as a unity in the holy nature of the divine love as its inseparable correlate, is not the *punishment* itself, but the *holy emotion* of absolute displeasure with him who opposes His gracious will, and from this the punishment proceeds as a necessary manifestation of righteousness. The revelation of the divine wrath is not limited to the last judgment (Rom. i. 18 ; 1 Thess. ii. 16 ; Luke xxi. 23), but in it attains its consummation. Comp. Rom. i. 18 and Eph. ii. 3, and so on, especially Ritschl, *de ira Dei*,<sup>1</sup> 1859 ; Bartholomaei in the *Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol.* 1861, II. p. 256 ff. ; Weber, *vom Zorne Gottes*, 1862. — φυγεῖν ἀπό] is, like פָּרַח (Isa. xlviii. 20, xxiv. 18), constructio praegnans : *to flee away from*, xxiii. 33 ; Mark xvi. 8 ; John x. 11 ; Hom. *Od.* xii. 120 : φυγέειν κάρτιστον ἀπ' αὐτῆς, Xen. *Mem.* ii. 6. 31 ; Plat. *Phaed.* p. 62 D. The *infinitive aorist* designates the activity as *momentary*, setting forth the point of time when the wrath breaks forth, in which the *flight* also is realized. *Meaning of the question* : Nobody can have instructed you, that you should escape. Comp. xxiii. 33 : πῶς φύγητε.

Ver. 8. Οὐν] Deduction from what precedes. *In your impenitent condition you cannot escape from the wrath ; proceed then to exhibit that morality of conduct which is appropriate to the change of mind as its result. Instead of your unrepentant*

<sup>1</sup> Who determines the conception, p. 24, thus : "Certum argumentum iustitiae divinae ab humana diversae, quatenus valet ad defendendum adversus homines contumaciter Deo fidem denegantes finem ejus summum et absolutum, per Christum cum genere humano communicatum."

condition, I require of you a practical repentance, the hindrance and opposition to which arises from your overweening conceit as children of Abraham (ver. 9). What John here requires applied, indeed, to the people in general, but was especially appropriate to their scholastic leaders.—τῆς μετανοίας is governed by ἄξιον (Acts xxvi. 20); on καρπὸν ποιεῖν, like עֲשׂוֹת פֶּרִי (occurring likewise in Greek writers), borrowed from fruit-trees, comp. vii. 17 f. *al.*; καρποποιός, Eur. *Rhes.* 964; καρπ. is collective, Gal. v. 22; Eph. v. 9; Phil. i. 11.

Ver. 9. Δόξητε] *Do not allow yourselves to suppose, do not say to yourselves*, 1 Cor. xi. 16; Phil. iii. 4. — λέγειν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς] יִמְרַבְּבוּ, *cogitare secum*. It objectively represents reflection as the language of the mind. Ps. iv. 5, x. 6. xiv. 1; Matt. ix. 21; Luke iii. 8, vii. 49. Delitzsch, *Psych.* p. 180 [E. T. 213]. Comp. λέγειν πρὸς ἑαυτόν in Plat. *Phaed.* p. 88 C. — πατέρα . . . Ἀβραάμ] The Jews of the common sort and their party leaders believed that the descendants of Abraham would, as such, become participators of salvation in the Messiah's kingdom, because Abraham's righteousness would be reckoned as theirs. *Sanhedrin*, f. 901: לְכָל יִשְׂרָאֵל יֵשׁ לָהֶם חֵלֶק לְעוֹלָם הַבָּא Bereschith, R. xviii. 7. Wetstein on the passage. Bertholdt, *Christol.* p. 206 ff. Comp. in the N. T., especially John viii. 33 ff. — ὅτι δύναται, κ.τ.λ.] *God is able, notwithstanding your descent from Abraham, to exclude you from the Messiah's salvation; and, on the other hand, to create and bring forth out of these stones, which lie here around on the bank of the Jordan, such persons as are GENUINE children of Abraham,—that is, as Euth. Zigabenus strikingly expresses it: οἱ τὰς ἀρετὰς αὐτοῦ μιμούμενοι καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς αὐτῷ καταξιούμενοι μερίδος ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν.* Comp. Rom. iv., ix. 6 ff.; Gal. iv.; John viii. 39 f. It is an anticipation, however, to find the calling of the *heathen* here indicated. It follows first from this axiom.

Ver. 10. *Already, however* (it is then high time), *is the decision near at hand*, according to which the unworthy are excluded from Messiah's kingdom, and are consigned to Gehenna. — In ἡδη is contained the thought that the hearers did not yet expect this state of things; see Baeumlein,

*Partik.* p. 139; the presents ἐκκόπτεται and βάλλεται denote what is to happen at once and certainly, with demonstrative definiteness, not the general idea: is accustomed to be hewn down, against which οὖν is decisive (in answer to Fritzsche), the meaning of which is: "that, as a consequence of this, the axe, etc., every tree will be, and so on." See upon the present, Dissen, *ad Pind. Nem.* iv. 39 f., p. 401.

Ver. 11. Yet it is not I who will determine the admission or the exclusion, but He who is greater than I. In Luke iii. 16 there is a special reason assigned for this discourse, in keeping with the use of a more developed tradition on the part of the later redactor. — εἰς μετάνοιαν] denotes the *telic* reference of the baptism (comp. xxviii. 19), which imposes an obligation to μετάνοια. To the characteristic ἐν ὕδατι εἰς μετάνοιαν stands opposed the higher characteristic ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ κ. πυρί, the two elements of which together antithetically correspond to that "baptism by water unto repentance;" see subsequently. — ἐν is, agreeably to the conception of βαπτίζω (*immersion*), not to be taken as *instrumental*, but as *in*, in the meaning of the *element*, in which immersion takes place. Mark i. 5; 1 Cor. x. 2; 2 Kings v. 14; Polyb. v. 47. 2: βαπτιζόμενοι ἐν τοῖς τέλμασι; Hom. *Od.* ix. 392. — ὁ δὲ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος] that is, *the Messiah*. His coming as such is always brought forward with great emphasis in Mark and Luke. The present here also denotes the near and definite beginning of the future. — ἰσχυρότ. μου ἐστίν] In what special relation he is *more powerful* is stated afterwards by αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει, κ.τ.λ. — οὐ οὐκ εἰμί, κ.τ.λ.] In comparison with Him, I am too humble to be fitted to be one of His lowest slaves. To bear the sandals of their masters (βαστάσαι), that is, to bring and take them away, as well as to fasten them on or take them off (the latter in Mark and Luke), was amongst the Jews, Greeks, and Romans the business of slaves of the lowest rank. See Wetstein, Rosenmüller, *Morgenl. in loc.*; comp. Talmud, *Kiddusch.* xxii. 2. — αὐτός] He and no other, i. 21. — ὑμᾶς] was spoken indeed to the Pharisees and Sadducees; but it is not these only who are meant, but the people of Israel in general, who were repre-



sented to the eye of the prophet in them, and in the multitude who were present. — ἐν πν. ἁγ. κ. πυρί] in the *Holy Spirit*, those who have repented ; in *fire* (by which that of Gehenna is meant), the unrepentant. Both are *figuratively* designated as βαπτίζειν, in so far as both are the two opposite sides of the *Messianic lustration*, by which the one are sprinkled with the Holy Ghost (Acts i. 5), the others with hell-fire, as persons baptized are with water. It is explained as referring to the *fire of everlasting punishment*, after Origen and several Fathers, by Kuinoel, Schott (*Opusc.* II. p. 198), Fritzsche, Neander, de Wette, Paulus, Ammon, B. Crusius, Arnoldi, Hofmann, Bleek, Keim, Volkmar, Hengstenberg, Weber, *vom Zorne Gottes*, p. 219 f.; Gess, *Christi Vers. u. Werk*, I. p. 310. But, after Chrysostom and most Catholic expositors, others (Erasmus, Beza, Calvin, Clericus, Wetstein, Storr, Eichhorn, Kauffer, Olshausen, Glöckler, Kuhn, Ewald) understand it of the *fire of the Holy Spirit, which inflames and purifies the spirits of men*. Comp. Isa. iv. 4. These and other explanations, which take πυρί as not referring to the punishments of Gehenna, are refuted by John's own decisive explanation in ver. 12: τὸ δὲ ἄχυρον κατακαύσει πυρὶ ἀσβέστω. It is wrong, accordingly, to refer the πυρί to the *fiery tongues* in Acts ii. (Euth. Zigenbenus, Maldonatus, Elsner, Er. Schmid, Bengel, Ebrard). The omission of καὶ πυρί is much too weakly attested to delete it, with Matthaei and Rinck, *Lucubr. crit.* p. 248. See Griesbach, *Comm. crit.* p. 25 f.

Ver. 12. *And fire*, I say ; for what a separation will it make ! — οὗ] assigns a reason, like our : *He whose* [German, *Er, dessen*]. See Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* II. p. 371 ; Kühner, II. p. 939. It is not, however, as Grotius, Bengel, Storr, Kuinoel think, pleonastic, but the literal translation is to be closely adhered to: *whose fan is in his hand* ; that is, he who has *his* (to him peculiar, comp. ver. 4) fan in his hand ready for use. Comp. LXX. Isa. ix. 5. According to Fritzsche, ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ is epexegetical: "cujus erit ventilabrum, sc. in manu ejus." But such epexegetical remarks, which fall under the point of view of *Appositio partitiva*, stand, as they actually occur, in the same case with the general word, which they define more

minutely (οὐ τὸ πτύον, τῆς χειρὸς αὐτοῦ). See Eph. iii. 5, and remarks *in loc.* — ἄλωνα] ἄλως (Xen. *Oec.* xviii. 6 ; Dem. 1040. 23), in Greek writers commonly after the Attic declension, is the same as ἄλ, a circular firmly-trodden place upon the field itself, where the grain is either trodden out by oxen, or thrashed out by thrashing machines drawn by oxen. Keil, *Arch.* II. p. 114 ; Robinson, III. p. 370. Similarly in Greek writers ; see Hermann, *Privatalterth.* xv. 6, xxiv. 3. The floor is *cleansed* in this way, that the seed grains and the pounded straw and similar refuse are not allowed to lie upon it indiscriminately mingled together, in the state in which the threshing has left this unclean condition of the floor, but the grain and refuse are separated from each other in order to be brought to the place destined for them. In the *figure*, the *floor*, which belongs to the Messiah, is not the *church* (Fathers and many others), nor *mankind* (de Wette), nor the *Jewish nation* (B. Crusius), but, because the *place* of the Messiah's activity must be intended (Ewald), and that, according to the national determination of the idea of the Baptist, the *holy land*, as the proper sphere of the work of the Messiah, not the *world* in general (Bleek), as would have to be assumed according to the Christian fulfilment of the idea. In accordance with this view, we must neither, with Zeger, Fischer, Kuinoel, de Wette, explain τ. ἄλωνα, according to the alleged Hebrew usage (Job xxxix. 12 ; Ruth iii. 2), as *the grain* upon the floor ; nor, with Fritzsche, regard the cleansing as effected, *removendo inde frumentum*, which is an act that does not follow *until* the floor has been cleansed. The διακαθαρίζειν, *to purify thoroughly*, which is not preserved anywhere except in Luke ii. 17, designates the cleansing from one end to the other ; in classical writers διακαθαίρειν, Plat. *Pol.* iii. pp. 399 E, 411 D ; Alciph. iii. 26. — ἀποθήκην] *place for storing up, magazine.* The *grain stores* (σιτόβολιον, Polyb. iii. 100. 4 ; θησαυροὶ σίτου, Strabo, xii. p. 862 ; σιτοδόκη, Pollux) were chiefly dry subterranean vaults. Jahn, *Archäol.* I. 1, p. 376. — ἄχυρον] not merely chaff in the narrower sense of the word (γῆ), but *all those portions of the stalk and ear which contain*

*no grain*, which are torn in pieces by the threshing, and remain over (תִּבְרָתָא), Herod. iv. 72; Xen. *Oec.* xvii. 1, vi. f.; Gen. xxiv. 25; Ex. v. 7. These were used as fuel. Mishna tract, *Schabbath* ii. 1; *Parah.* iv. 3. Paulsen, *vom Ackerbau der Morgenl.* p. 150.—The sense, apart from figurative language, is: *The Messiah will receive into His kingdom those who are found worthy* (comp. xiii. 30); *but upon the unworthy He will inflict in full the everlasting punishments of Gehenna.* Comp. Mal. iii. 19.—ἀσβέστω] *which is not quenched* (Hom. *Il.* xvii. 89; Pind. *Isthm.* iii. 72; Dion. Hal. *Antt.* i. 76, corresponding to the thing portrayed; comp. Isa. lxvi. 24). Not, therefore: *which is not extinguished till all is consumed* (Paulus, Bleek).

REMARK.—John i. 26 is not to be regarded as parallel with Matt. iii. 12, for, according to John, the Baptist speaks *after* the baptism of Jesus, and to the members of the Sanhedrim. And doubtless he had often given expression to his testimony regarding Christ, who was the point which the prophet had in view in his preaching of repentance and baptism.—That he is not yet definitely designated in Matthew as *Elijah* (Luke i. 17; Matt. xi. 10, 14), is rightly regarded as an evidence of the *truth* of the gospel narrative, which has not anticipated the subsequently developed representation of John. To relegate, however, the announcement of the Messiah from the preaching of the Baptist into the realm of *legend* (Strauss) is a mockery of the entire evangelical testimony, and places it below the narrative of Josephus, which was squared according to the ideas of political prudence (*Antt.* xviii. 5. 2).

Ver. 13. Τότε] *at that time*, when John thus preached the advent of the Messiah, and baptized the people, vv. 1–12.—ἀπὸ τ. Γαλιλ.] See ii. 23. It belongs to παραγ. The position is different in ii. 1.—τοῦ βαπτισθ. ὑπ' αὐτοῦ] Jesus wished to be baptized by John (genitive, as in ii. 13), but not in the personal feeling of *sinfulness* (B. Bauer, Strauss, Pécaut), or as the bearer of the guilt of *others* (Riggenbach, Krafft); not even because He, through His *connection* of responsibility *with the unclean people*, was unclean according to the Levitical law (Lange), or because He believed that He was obliged to regard the *collective guilt* of the nation as *His*

guilt (Schenkel); just as little in order to *separate Himself inwardly from the sins* of the nation (Baumgarten), or make it certain that His *σὰρξ ἀσθενείας* should not be opposed to the life of the Spirit (Hofmann, *Weissag. und Erfüll.* II. p. 82), or because the meaning of the baptism is: *the declaration that He is subjected to death for the human race* (Ebrard); not even to bring in here the *divine decision as to His Messiahship* (Paulus), or to *lay the foundation for the faith of others in Him*, so far as baptism is a symbol of the regeneration of those who confess Him (Ammon, *L. J. I.* p. 268), or in order to *honour the baptism of John* by His example (Calvin, Kuinoel, Keim), or to bind Himself to the *observance of the law* (Hofmann, Krabbe, Osiander); or because He had to conduct Himself, before the descent of the Spirit, merely as an Israelite in general. The opinion also of Schleiermacher, that the baptism of Jesus was the *symbolical beginning of His announcement of Himself*, and, at the same time, a *recognition of John's mission*, is foreign to the text. The true meaning appears from ver. 15, namely, *because Jesus was consciously certain that He must, agreeably to God's will, subject Himself to the baptism of His forerunner, in order (vv. 16, 17) to receive the Messianic consecration; that is, the divine declaration that He was the Messiah (ἵνα ἀναδειχθῇ τῷ λαῷ, Euth. Zigabenus), and thereby to belong from that moment solely and entirely to this great vocation.* The Messianic consciousness is not to be regarded as first commencing in Him at the baptism, so that He would be inwardly born, by means of baptism, to be the Messiah, and would become conscious of His divine destination, to full purification and regeneration as the new duty of His life; but the *πρέπον ἐστὶν ἡμῖν*, ver. 15, presupposes a clear certainty regarding His vocation; and John's relation to the same, as in general the existence of that consciousness, must have been the necessary result of His own consciousness, which had attained the maturity of human development, that He was the Son of God. But that baptism, to which He felt certain that He must submit Himself, was to be for Him the *divine ordination to the Messiahship*. It is clear, according to this, that *His baptism was quite different from that of others*

so far as in Him, as a sinless being, there could be no confession of sin ; but the lustrative character of the baptism could only have *the* meaning, that from that moment He was taken away from all His previous relations of life which belonged to the earthly sphere, and became, altogether and exclusively, the Holy One of God, whom the Father consecrated by the Spirit. Although He was this God-sanctified One from the beginning, yet now, as He was aware that this was the will of God, He has, by the assumption of baptism, solemnly bound and devoted Himself to the full execution of His unique destiny,—a *devotion* which was already more than a *vow* (Keim), because it was the actual entrance into the Messianic path of life, which was to receive at the very threshold its divine legitimation for all future time. In so doing, He could, without any consciousness of guilt (xi. 29), associate Himself, in all humility (xi. 29), with the multitude of those whom the feeling of guilt impelled to baptism ; because in His own consciousness there was still the negation of absolute moral goodness, to which He, long afterwards, expressly gave so decided expression (xix. 17).

Ver. 14. According to John i. 33, it was revealed to the Baptist that He upon whom he should see the Spirit descending was the Messiah. It was accordingly not until this moment that the *recognition* of Jesus as the Messiah entered his mind ; and therefore, in the Gospel of John, he says of the time which *preceded* this moment : *καρὼ οὐκ ᾔδειν αὐτόν*. The passage before us is not in contradiction with this, for the *recognition* of the Messiahship of Jesus does not yet lie at its foundation, but *the prophetic anticipation* of the same, which on the approach of Jesus, as that solemn decision was about to begin through the revelation of the *σημεῖον*, seized the soul of the Baptist involuntarily and miraculously, and yet psychologically, in keeping with the spiritual *rapport* prepared by revelation. Comp. Luther : “ he *scents* the Spirit.” Accordingly, we are not to assume in our passage either a recognition only of higher excellence (Hess, Paulus, Hofmann), or a contradiction with John (Strauss, de Wette, Keim), or, after Lücke, Holtzmann, and Scholten, that the oldest and shortest

tradition of Matthew contained merely vv. 16, 17, while vv. 14, 15 were a later addition of the complete Matthew,<sup>1</sup> which Hilgenfeld seeks to support from the silence of Justin regarding the refusal of the Baptist, whilst Keim gives, indeed, the preference to the statement of Matthew over that of John, but still allows it to be very problematical. — διεκώλυνεν] Stronger than the simple verb. The word (which does not occur elsewhere in the N. T. nor in the LXX., yet in Judith iv. 7, xii. 7, and frequently in the classical writers) is *selected*, in keeping with the serious opposition of the astonished John. The *imperfect* is *descriptive*, and, indeed, so much so, that “vere incipit actus, sed ob impedimenta caret eventu,” Schaefer, *ad Eur. Phoen.* 81. Kühner, II. 1, p. 123. John actually repelled Jesus, and *did not baptize Him at once*, but only when the latter had made representations to the contrary effect. — ἐγὼ χρεῖαν, κ.τ.λ.] Grotius: *Si alter nostrum omnino baptizandus sit, ego potius abs te, ut dignissimo, baptismum petere debui.* Thus spoke John in the truest feeling of his own lowliness and sinfulness, in the presence of the long-longed for One, the first recognition of whom suddenly thrilled him. — καὶ σὺ ἔρχῃ πρὸς με;] A question indicative of the *astonishment* with which the Baptist, although he had received the divine declaration, John i. 33, was yet seized, through the impression made on him by the *presence* of the Lord. Moreover, this discourse necessarily excludes the idea that he too connected the baptism of Jesus with the profession of a confession of His sins. Yet the

<sup>1</sup> According to Epiphanius, *Haer.* xxx. 13, the Gospel according to the Hebrews contained the conversation, although with embellishments, but placed it *after* the baptism. The want of originality of this narrative *in itself* (in answer to Schneckenburger, Hilgenfeld) already shows its apocryphal and extravagant character. The correctness of its *position* has found favour, indeed, with Bleek (p. 179 f., and in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1833, p. 436), Usteri (in the same, 1829, p. 446), and Lücke, and Keim also, at the expense of our Gospel; but, after what has been said above, without any reason, as the want of agreement between Matthew and John is only apparent, and is not to be removed by changing the meaning of the simple and definite οὐκ ᾔδειν αὐτόν. See on John i. 31. The *Wolfenbüttel Fragmentist* (vom *Zwecke Jesu*, p. 133 ff.) has notoriously misused John i. 31 to assert that Jesus and John had long been acquainted with each other, and had come to an understanding to work to each other's hands, but to conceal this from the people.

apocryphal *Praedicatio Pauli*, according to Cyprian, *Opp.* p. 142, Rigalt (Credner, *Beitr.* I. p. 360 ff.), had already made Jesus deliver a confession of sin; in the *Evangelium sec. Hebraeos*, on the other hand, quoted by Jerome, *c. Pel.* iii. 1, Jesus answers the request of His mother and His brethren to let Himself be baptized along with them: "Quid peccavi, ut vadam et baptizer ab eo? nisi forte hoc ipsum quod dixi ignorantia est."

Ver. 15. Ἄρτι] *now*, suffer it *just now*. The antithesis of time is here not that of the past (see on Gal. i. 9), but of the future, as in John xiii. 37; 1 Cor. xiii. 12. Chrysostom: οὐ διηνεκῶς ταῦτα ἔσται, ἀλλ' ὅψει με ἐν τούτοις οἷς ἐπιθυμεῖς ἄρτι μέντοι ὑπόμεινον τοῦτο. — The meaning: "*sine paulisper*" (Fritzsche), comp. de Wette: "*let it be for once*," is not sufficient. Schneckenburger, p. 122, regards the ἄφες as having been inappropriately transferred from the Gospel according to the Hebrews. Erroneously, as it there belongs (in the sense: *let it remain*) to the apocryphal addition, according to which *John*, after the baptism of Jesus, prays *the latter* to baptize him; and Jesus answers: ἄφες, ὅτι οὕτως ἐστὶ πρέπον πληρωθῆναι πάντα (Epiphanius, *Haer.* xxx. 13). This apocryphal outgrowth is manifestly a farther spinning out of the tradition, as recorded in Matthew. Several of the Fathers likewise inferred from ἄρτι, in our verse, that John was afterwards baptized by Jesus. — ἡμῖν] *to thee and to me*. To refer it *merely* to Jesus (Chrysostom, Theophylact, Euth. Zigabenus, Glöckler), or, *in the first place* to Jesus (de Wette, Bleek), is opposed to the context. See ver. 14. — πᾶσαν δικαιοσύνην] *all righteousness*, all which as duty it is obligatory on us to do. Ch. F. Fritzsche in Fritzschor. *Opusc.* p. 81. Comp. πληρ. εὐσέβειαν, 4 Macc. xiv. 15. If I do not allow myself to be baptized, and thou dost not baptize me, there remains something unfulfilled (therefore, οὕτω) which ought to be done by us, in accordance with the divine will; then satisfaction is not made by us to *all* righteousness. Comp. on πᾶσαν the plural expression δικαιοσύνην in Sir. xlv. 10; Job ii. 14.

Ver. 16. Εὐθύς] which cannot belong to ἀνέωχθ. (Maldonatus, Grotius, B. Crusius), nor can it be referred to βαπτισθεῖς by supposing a *hyperbaton* (Fritzsche); see Kühner, II. 2, p.

642. Matthew would have written, καὶ εὐθὺς βαπτισθεῖς. It belongs to ἀνέβη, beside which it stands: *after He was baptized, He went up straightway*, etc. This *straightway* was understood at once as a matter of course, but does not belong, however, merely to the *descriptive*, but to the *circumstantial* style of the narrative, *setting forth* the rapid succession (of events). — ἀνεώχθησαν αὐτῷ οἱ οὐρανοί] designates neither a *clearing up* of the heavens (Paulus), nor a *thunderstorm* quickly discharging itself (Kuinoel, Ammon), since the poetic descriptions, as in Sil. It. i. 535 ff., are quite foreign (see Drackenborch, *ad Sil. It.* iii. 136; Heyne, *ad Virg. Aen.* iii. 198) to our simple historical narrative; as, moreover, neither in the Gospel according to the Hebrews, nor in Epiphanius, *Haer.* xxx. 13, nor in Justin, *c. Tryph.* 88,<sup>1</sup> is a thunderstorm meant. Only an *actual parting of the heavens*, out of which opening the Spirit came down, can be intended. Ezek. i. 1; John i. 52; Rev. iv. 1; Acts vii. 56; Isa. lxiv. 1. — αὐτῷ does not refer to the Baptist (Beza, Heumann, Bleek, Kern, Krabbe, de Wette, Baur), since ver. 16 begins a new portion of the history, in which John is no longer the subject. It refers to *Jesus*, and is the dative of *purpose*. *To Him* the heavens open; for it was *on Him* that the Spirit was to descend. Comp. Vulgate. — εἶδε] *Who?* not John, but *Jesus*, without ἐπ' αὐτόν standing for ἐφ' αὐτόν (Kuinoel); Kühner, II. 1, p. 489 f.; Bleek on the passage. The Gospel according to the Hebrews clearly referred εἶδε to *Jesus*, with which Mark i. 10 also decidedly agrees.<sup>2</sup> — ὥσει περιστεράν] The element of comparison is interpreted by modern writers not as referring to the *shape* of the visibly descending Spirit, but to the *manner of descent*, where partly the *swiftness* (Fritzsche), partly the *soft, gentle movement* (Bleek) and *activity* (Neander), and the like, have been imagined as referred to. But as all the four evangelists have precisely the same comparison (Mark i. 10;

<sup>1</sup> In the Gospel according to the Hebrews: περιλάμψιν τὸν τόπον ὥς μίγα. Justin: κατελθόντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ ὕδωρ καὶ πῦρ ἀνέφθη ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ.

<sup>2</sup> Schmidt in the *Jahrb. f. D. Th.* 1869, p. 655, erroneously says: If *Jesus* were the subject, ἐφ' αὐτόν must necessarily have been put. See Buttmann, *neul. Gr.* p. 97 f. [E. T. 111 f.].



Luke iii. 22 ; John i. 32), which, as a mere representation of the manner of the descent, would be just as unessential as it would be an indefinite and ambiguous comparison ; as, farther, Luke expressly says the Spirit descended, *σωματικῶ εἶδει ὥσεὶ περιστερὰ*, where, by the latter words, the *σωματ. εἶδει* is defined more precisely (comp. the Gospel according to the Hebrews in Epiphanius, *Hæc.* xxx. 13 : εἶδε, namely, Jesus, τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ τὸ ἅγιον ἐν εἶδει περιστερᾶς κατελθούσης ; also Justin, *c. Tr.* 88),—so that interpretation appears as a groundless attempt to lessen the miraculous element, and only the old explanation (Origen and the Fathers in Suicer, *Thes. s.v. περιστερὰ*, Euth. Zigabenus, Erasmus, Luther), that *the form of a dove actually appeared*, can be received as the correct one. So also Paulus (who, however, thought of a real dove which accidentally appeared at the time !), de Wette, Kuhn (*L. J.* I. p. 319), Theile (*zur Biogr. Jesu*, p. 48), Keim, Hilgenfeld, who compares 4 Esdr. v. 26. The symbolic element of this divine *σημεῖον* (see remarks after ver. 17) rests just in its appearance in the *form of a dove*, which descends.

Ver. 17. *Φωνὴ . . . λέγουσα*] Here neither is *ἐγένετο* to be supplied, after Luke iii. 22 ; nor does the participle stand for the finite tense. See on ii. 18. But literally : *and lo, there, a voice from heaven which spoke*. Comp. xvii. 5 ; Luke v. 12, xix. 20 ; Acts viii. 27 ; Rev. iv. 1, vi. 2, vii. 9.—*ὁ ἀγαπητός*] *dilectus*, not *unicus* (Loesner, Fischer, Michaelis, and others). The *article*, however, does not express the strengthened conception (*dilectissimus*), as Wetstein and Rosenmüller assert, but is required by *grammar* ; for the emphasis lies on *ὁ υἱός μου*, to which the characteristic attribute is added by way of distinction. Comp. Kühner, II. 1, p. 529 f. Exactly so in the same voice from heaven, xvii. 5.—*ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα*] Hebraistic construction imitative of *בְּיָדוֹ*. See Winer, p. 218 [E. T. 291]. Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* II. p. 371 (Polybius ii. 12. 13 does not apply here) ; frequently in LXX. and Apocrypha.—The *aorist* denotes : *in whom I have had good pleasure* (Eph. i. 4 ; John xvii. 24), who has become the object of my good pleasure. See Hermann, *ad Viger.* p. 746 ; Bernhardt, p. 381 f. ; Kühner, II. 1, p. 134 f. The opposite is *ἐμίσησα*,

Rom. ix. 13; ἡχθηρε κρονίων, Hom. *Il.* xx. 306.—The divine voice solemnly proclaims Jesus to be the *Messiah*, ὁ υἱός μου; which designation, derived from Ps. ii. 7,<sup>1</sup> is in the divine and also in the Christian consciousness not merely the name of an office, but has at the same time a metaphysical meaning, having come forth from the Father's being, κατὰ πνεῦμα, Rom. i. 4, containing the Johannine idea, ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο (according to Matt. i. 20, Luke i. 35, also the origin of the corporeity). That the passage in Isa. lxii. 1 (comp. Matt. xii. 18) lies at the basis of the expression of that voice, either alone (Hilgenfeld) or with others (Keim), has this against it, that ὁ υἱός μου is the characteristic *point*, which is wanting in Isaiah *l.c.*, and that, moreover, the other words in the passage do not specifically correspond with those in Isaiah.

REMARK.—The fact of itself that Jesus was baptized by John, although left doubtful by Fritzsche, admitted only as possible by Weisse, who makes it rather to be a baptism of the Spirit, while relegated by Bruno Bauer to the workshop of later religious reflection, stands so firmly established by the testimony of the Gospels that it has been recognised even by Strauss, although more on *à priori* grounds (*L. J. I.* p. 418). He rejects, however, the more minute points as unhistorical, while Keim sees in it powerful and speaking *figures of spiritual occurrences* which then took place on the Jordan; Schenkel again introduces thoughts which are very remote; and Weizsäcker recognises in it the representation of the installation of Jesus into His vocation as Ruler, and that by the transformation of a vision of Jesus into an external fact, and refers the narrative to later communications probably made by the Lord to His disciples. The historical reality of the more minute details is to be distinguished from the legendary embellishments of them. The first is to be derived from John i. 32–34, according to which *the Baptist*, after an address vouchsafed to him by God, in which was announced to him the descent of the Spirit as

<sup>1</sup> In the Gospel according to the Hebrews the words of the voice ran, according to Epiphanius, *Haer.* xxx. 13: σὺ μου εἶ ὁ υἱὸς ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα· καὶ πάλιν ἐγὼ σήμερον γινώσκω σε. So also substantially in Justin, *c. Tr.* 88. Manifestly an addition from later tradition, which had become current from the well-known passage in Ps. ii. Nevertheless, Hilgenfeld regards that form of the heavenly voice as the more original. See on the opposite side, Weisse, *Evangelienfrage*, p. 190 ff.

the Messianic *σημεῖον* of the person in question, saw the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove descend upon Jesus, and abide upon Him, and, in accordance with this, delivered the testimony that Jesus was the Son of God. The seeing of the Baptist, and the testimony which he delivered regarding it, is accordingly to be considered as based on John i. 32–34, as the source of the tradition preserved in the Synoptics, in the simplest form in Mark. According to Ewald, it was in spirit that *Jesus* saw (namely, the Spirit, like a *dove*, consequently “*in all its liveliness and fulness*,” according to Isa. xi. 2) and heard what He Himself probably related at a later time, and that the Baptist himself also observed in Jesus, as He rose up out of the water, something quite different from what he noticed in other men, and distinguished Him at once by the utterance of some extraordinary words. But, considering the deviation of John’s narrative from that of the Synoptics, and the connection in which John stood to Jesus and the Baptist, there exists no reason why we should not find the original fact in John. Comp. Neander, *L. J.* p. 83 f.; Schleiermacher, p. 144 ff.; Ewald, *Gesch. Chr.* p. 230 f. Moreover, that seeing of the Spirit in the form of a dove is a spiritual act, taking place in a vision (Acts vii. 55, x. 10 ff.), but which was transformed by the tradition of the apostolic age into an external manifestation, as the testimony of John (John i. 34), which was delivered on the basis of this seeing of his, was changed into a heavenly voice (which therefore is not to be taken as *Bath Kol*, least of all “as in the still reverberation of the thunder and in the gentle echo of the air,” as Ammon maintains, *L. J.* p. 273 f.). The more minute contents of the heavenly voice were suggested from Ps. ii. 7, to which also the old extension of the legend in Justin, *c. Tryph.* 88, and in the *Ev. sec. Hebr.* in Epiph. *Haer.* xxx. 13, points. Consequently the appearance of the dove remains as an actual occurrence, but as taking place in vision (Orig. *c. Cels.* i. 43–48. Theodore of Mopsuestia: ἐν εἵδει περιστερᾶς γενομένη ἡ τοῦ πνεύματος κάθοδος οὐ πᾶσιν ὥφθη τοῖς παροῦσιν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τινα πνευματικὴν θεωρίαν ὥφθη μόνῳ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ, καθὼς ἔθος ἦν τοῖς προφήταις ἐν μίσῳ πολλῶν τὰ πᾶσιν ἀθεώρητα βλέπειν . . . ὁπτασία γὰρ ἦν, οὐ φύσις τὸ φαινόμενον),—as also the opening of the heavens (Jerome: “Non reseratione elementorum, sed spiritualibus oculis”). Origen designates the thing as θεωρία νοητική. Comp. Grotius, Neander, Krabbe, de Wette, Bleek, Weizsäcker, Wittichen. Finally, the question<sup>1</sup> whether before the time of Christ the

<sup>1</sup> Talmudic and Rabbinical witnesses, but no pre-Christian ones, are in existence for the *Jewish* manner of regarding it (amongst the *Syrians* the dove was

Jews already regarded the dove as a symbol of the Divine Spirit, is so far a matter of perfect indifference, as the Baptist could have no doubt, *after the divine address vouchsafed to him*, that the seeing the form of a dove descending from heaven was a symbolical manifestation of *the Holy Spirit*; yet it is probable, from the very circumstance that the *ἐκτασία* took place precisely in the form of a *dove*, that this form of representation had its point of connection in an already existing emblematic mode of regarding the Spirit, and that consequently the Rabbinical traditions relating thereto reach back in their origin to the pre-Christian age, without, however (in answer to Lücke on John), having to drag in the very remote figure of the dove descending down *in order to brood*, according to Gen. i. 2. Here it remains undetermined in what properties of the dove (innocence, mildness, and the like; Theodore of Mopsuestia: *φιλόστοργον κ. φιλόανθρωπον ζῶον*) the point of comparison was originally based. Moreover, according to John i. 32 ff., the *purpose* of what took place in vision does not appear to have been the *communication* of the Holy Spirit to Jesus (misinterpreted by the Gnostics as the reception of the *λόγος*), but the making known of Jesus as the Messiah to the Baptist on the part of God, through a *σημεῖον* of the Holy Spirit. In this the difficulty disappears which is derived from the divine nature of Jesus, according to which He could not need the bestowal of the Spirit, whether we understand the Spirit in itself, or as the communicator of a *nova virtus* (Calvin), or as *πνεῦμα προφητικόν* (Thomasius), or as the Spirit of the divine *ἐξουσία* for the work of the Messiah (Hofmann), as the spirit of office (Kahnis), which definite views are not to be separated from the already existing possession of the Spirit. The later doubts of the Baptist, Matt. xi. 2 ff. (in answer to Hilgenfeld, Weizsäcker, Keim), as a momentary darkening of his higher consciousness in human weakness amid all his prophetic greatness, are to be regarded neither as a psychological riddle nor as evidence against his

held sacred as the symbol of the brooding power of nature; see Creuzer, *Symbol.* II. p. 80). See *Chagig.* ii., according to which the Spirit of God, *like a dove*, brooded over the waters (comp. *Bereshith rabba*, f. iv. 4; Sohar, f. xix. 3, on Gen. i. 2, according to which the Spirit brooding on the water is the *Spirit of the Messiah*). Targum on Cant. ii. 12: "*Vox turturis, vox Spiritus s.*" Ir. Gibborim, *ad Gen.* i. 2; *Bemidb. rab.* f. 250. 1. See also Sohar, Num. f. 68, 271 f., where the dove of Noah is placed in typical connection with the Messiah; in Schoettgen, II. p. 537 f. Comp. besides, Lutterbeck, *neutest. Lehrbegr.* I. p. 259 f.; Keim, *Gesch. J. I.* p. 539. The dove was also regarded as a sacred bird in many forms of worship amongst the Greeks.

recognition of Jesus as the Messiah, which was brought about in a miraculous manner; and this is the more conceivable when we take into consideration the *political* element in the idea of the Messiah entertained by the imprisoned John (comp. John i. 29, Remark). If, however, after the baptism of Jesus, His Messianic appearance did not take place in the way in which the Baptist had conceived it, yet the continuous working of the latter, which was not given up after the baptism, can carry with it no well-founded objection to the revelation of Jesus as the Messiah, which is related in the passage before us. Comp. on John iii. 23.

## CHAPTER IV.

VER. 4. ὁ ἄνθρωπος.] Elz., Scholz omit the ὁ. It might easily have been added from the LXX. in Deut. viii. 3, where, however, it is wanting in several witnesses; but as the article is superfluous, and the witnesses *in its favour* greatly preponderate, there are decisive reasons for retaining it. — ἐπὶ παντί] ἐν παντί is found in C D, 13, 21, 59, 124, 300; approved by Griesb., adopted by Fritzsche, Lachm., Tisch. Rightly; ἐπὶ was just as easily suggested by the first clause of the sentence by itself as by the reading of the LXX., which is attested by preponderating witnesses. — Ver. 5. ἵστησιν] B C D Z 8, 1, 33: ἕστησεν. Recommended by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. and Tisch. 8. The aorist interrupts and disturbs the representation as present, and has been introduced from Luke iv. 9. — Ver. 6. λέγει] Lachm., but upon very slight authority, reads εἶπεν, which is not to be adopted, even in ver. 9, instead of λέγει, with Lachm. and Tisch. 8, after B C D Z 8 and Curss. It is taken from Luke. — Ver. 10. ὁπίσω μου] is wanting in Elz., deleted also by Fritzsche and Tisch. 8, bracketed by Lachm. The witnesses are greatly divided, and the preponderance is uncertain (*against* it: B C\* K P S V Δ 8, Curss., Or. Ir. and other Fathers, and several Verss., among which Syr. Vulg.; *in favour*: C\*\* D E L M U T Z, and several Curss., Justin., and many Fathers and Verss., amongst which is It.). An old insertion from xvi. 13, where the circumstance that *Peter* is there the person addressed, might cause the less difficulty that he also is called *Satan*. In Luke iv. 8, ὑπαγε ὁπίσω μου σατ. is also an interpolation. — Ver. 12. ὁ Ἰησοῦς] is wanting in B C\* D Z 8, 16, 33, 61, Copt. Aeth. Or. Eus. Aug. The omission is approved by Griesbach. Rightly; the addition of the subject suggested itself the more easily that a new section begins in ver. 12. Comp. ver. 18. Deleted also by Tisch. — Ver. 18. δέ] Elz. adds ὁ Ἰησοῦς, against decisive testimony. Comp. on ver. 12. — Ver. 23. ὁ λην τ. Γαλιλαί.] Lachm.: ὁ λην τ. Γαλιλαία, without evidence, as not merely C but B also has ἐν ὁ λην τ. Γαλ., which Tisch. has adopted, 8th ed. 8\* has merely ἐν τῇ Γαλ. The reading of

Tisch. 8 is to be adopted; the Received reading is a change made to harmonize with the more common construction.

Vv. 1-11. Temptation of Jesus. Mark i. 12 f.; Luke iv. 1 ff.; Alex. Schweizer, *exeg. hist. Darstellung d. Versuchsgesch. in s. Kritik d. Gegensätze zw. Rationalism. u. Supernat.* 1833; P. Ewald, *d. Versuch. Christi mit Bezugnahme auf d. Versuch. d. Protoplasten.* 1838; Kohlschütter in the *Sächs. Stud.* 1843; Ullmann, *Sündlosigk. Jesu*, ed. 7, 1863; Graul in Guericke's *Zeitschr.* 1844, 3; Pfeiffer in the *Deutsch. Zeitschr.* 1851, No. 36; Koenemann (purely dogmatic) in Guericke's *Zeitschr.* 1850, p. 586 ff.; Laufs in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1853, p. 355 ff.; Nebe, *d. Versuch. d. Herrn u. äussere Thatsache*, 1857; v. Engelhardt, *de Jesu Chr. tentatione*, 1858; Held in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschr.* 1866, p. 384 ff.; Haupt in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1871, p. 209 ff.; Pfeiderer in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschr.* 1870, p. 188 ff.—The narrative in Matthew (and Luke) is a later development of the tradition, the older and still undeveloped form of which is to be found in Mark.—*τότε*] when the Holy Spirit had descended upon Him.—*ἀνέχθη*] *He was led upwards, i.e. from the lower ground of the river bank to the higher lying wilderness.* Luke ii 22, xxii. 66.—*τὴν ἔρημον*] the same wilderness of Judea spoken of in ch. iii. According to the tradition, we are to think of the very rugged wilderness of *Quarantania* (wilderness of Jericho, Josh. xvi. 1), Robinson, *Pal.* II. p. 552; Schubert, *Reise*, III. p. 73; Raumer, p. 47. But in that case a more precise, distinctive designation must have been given; and Mark i. 13, *ἦν μετὰ τῶν θηρίων*, is a point which has a sufficient basis in the idea of the wilderness in general. Nothing in the text points to the wilderness of *Sinai* (Chemnitz, Clericus, Michaelis, Nebe).—*ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος*] *by the Holy Spirit*, which He had received at His baptism. *ἀνέχθη* does not indicate (Acts viii. 39; 2 Kings ii. 16) that He was transported in a miraculous, involuntary manner, but by the power of the Spirit, which is expressed still more strongly in Mark i. 12. Others (Bertholdt, Paulus, Glöckler) understand Jesus' own spirit, Paulus regarding it as an ecstatic condition. This would be opposed to the context (iii. 16), and to the

view of the matter taken by the Synoptics, which, in Luke iv. 1, is expressed without any doubt whatever by the words πνεύματος ἁγίου πλήρης. Euth. Zigabenus well remarks: ἐκδίδωσιν ἑαυτὸν μετὰ τὸ βάπτισμα τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι καὶ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἄγεται πρὸς ὃ ἂν ἐκεῖνο κελεύῃ, καὶ ἀνάγεται εἰς τὴν ἔρημον ἐπὶ τῷ πολεμηθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου. — πειρασθῆναι] designates the purpose for which the Spirit impelled Jesus to go into the wilderness: πειράζειν, to put to the proof, receives its more precise definition in each case from the connection. Here: *whether the Messiah is to be brought to take an unrighteous step which conflicts with His calling and the will of God.* — ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου] In what shape the devil appeared to Him, the text does not say; and the view of the evangelist as to that is left undetermined. Yet the appearance must be conceived of as being *directly* devilish, not at all as taking place in the form of an *angel of light* (Ambrose, Menken), or even of a *man*.

REMARK.—The two opposed principles, ὑπὸ τοῦ πν. and ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβ., are essentially related to one another; and the whole position of the history, moreover, immediately after the descent of the Spirit on Jesus, proves that it is the victory of Jesus, *filled with the Spirit* (Luke iv. 1, 2), over the devil, which is to be set forth. It appears from this how erroneous is the invention of Olshausen, that the condition of Jesus in the wilderness was that of one who *had been abandoned* by the fulness of the Spirit. The opinion of Calvin is similar, although more cautiously expressed, ver. 11: "Interdum Dei gratia, quamvis praesens esset, eum secundum carnis sensum latuit."

Ver. 2. Νηστεύσας] to be taken *absolutely*. Luke iv. 2. Comp. Deut. ix. 9; Ex. xxxiv. 28; 1 Kings xix. 8. It is explained, without reason, by Kuinoel, Kuhn, and many others in the sense of deprivation of the *usual* means of nourishment. This *relative* meaning, which, if presented by the context, would be admissible (Kuhn, *L. J. I.* p. 364 ff.), is here, however, where even the nights are mentioned as well as the days, contradicted by the context, the supernatural character of the history, the intentionally definite statement of Luke (iv. 2), and the types of Moses and Elijah. It is just as irrelevant to change the *forty* days as a sacred number into an *indefinite*



*measure of time* (Köster); or, as a round number, into *several days* (Neander, Krabbe). That, moreover, the forty days' fast became the *occasion of the temptation*, cannot appear as *out of keeping* (Strauss, de Wette) *with the object*, but, according to ver. 1, was contained in the *design of the Spirit*. — ὕστερον] of itself superfluous, indicates, however, the circumstance that the hunger did *not* attack Him *until* He had fasted. Bengel: "Hactenus non tam fuerat tentatio, quam ad eam praeparatio." Comp. the similar usage of εἶτα and ἐπειτα after participles by classical writers, Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Phaed.* p. 70 E.

Ver. 3. Ὁ πειράζων] Part. present taken substantively. See on ii. 20. Here: *the devil*. Comp. 1 Thess. iii. 5. — εἰ] does not indicate that Satan had doubts of Jesus being the Son of God (Origen, Wolf, Bengel), or was not aware of it (Ignat. *Phil. interpol.* 9), comp. xxviii. 40; but the *problematical* expression was to *incite* Jesus to enter upon the unreasonable demand, and to prove Himself the Son of God. Euth. Zigabenus: ᾤετο, ὅτι παρακινισθήσεται τῷ λόγῳ, καθάπερ ὀνειδισθεὶς ἐπὶ τῷ μὴ εἶναι υἱὸς θεοῦ. — υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ] See iii. 17. The devil makes use of *this* designation of the Messiah, not because he deemed Jesus to be only a man, who υἰοθετήθη τῷ θεῷ διὰ τὰς ἀρετὰς αὐτοῦ (Euth. Zigabenus), or because he had become doubtful, owing to the hungering of Jesus, of His divinity, which had been attested at His baptism (Chrysostom); but because Jesus' supernatural relation to God is well known to him, whilst he himself, as the principle opposed to God, has to combat the manifestation and activity of the divine. Observe that by the position of the words the emphasis lies on υἱός: if Thou standest to God in the relation of *Son*. — εἰπέ, ἵνα] ἵνα after verbs of commanding, entreaty, and desire, and the like, does not stand in the sense of the *infinitive*, as is commonly assumed (Winer, de Wette, Bleek), in opposition to the necessary conception of the words, but is, as it always is, an expression of the *purpose, in order that*, the mistaking of which proceeds from this, that it is not usual in the German language to express the object of the command, and so on, in the form of a *purpose*. Here: *speak* (utter a command) *in order that* these stones, and so on.

Comp. xx. 21. The oldest examples from Greek writers after ἐθέλειν, ὄφρα, in Hom. *Il.* i. 133 (see Nägelsbach thereon), occur in Herodotus and Demosthenes. See Schaefer, *ad Dem.* 279. 8: ἀξιούν, ἵνα βοηθήσῃ; Kühner, *II.* 2, p. 519. — οἱ λίθοι οὗτοι] comp. iii. 9. — ἄρτος] *Bread*, in the proper sense; not, like ὄψις, food in general. Comp. vii. 9. — The Son of God must free Himself from the state of hunger, which is unbecoming His dignity, by an act similar to the divine creation, and thus employ His divine power *for His own advantage*. The tempter introduces his lever into the *immediate situation of the moment*.

Ver. 4. Deut. viii. 3, after the LXX., contains the words of Moses addressed to the Israelites, which have reference to the divinely-supplied manna. Note how Jesus repels each one of the three temptations, simply with the sword of the Spirit (Eph. vi. 17). — ἐπ' ἄρτῳ] the preservation of life does not *depend* upon bread alone. Examples of ζῆν ἐπὶ in Kypke, *Obs.* I. p. 14 f.; Markland, *ad Max. Tyr. Diss.* xxvii. 6; Bergler, *ad Alciph.* p. 294. This construction is a common one in classical writers with ἐκ, ἀπό, or the simple dative. — ζήσεται] The future tense designates in Deut. i. 1, and in LXX. as well as here, simply *the future*, that *which will happen*, the case which will occur under given circumstances. So also in classical writers in general sentences. Dissen, *ad Dem. de cor.* p. 369. — ὁ ἄνθρωπος] *universal: Man*. So in the original text and in the LXX.; there is the less reason to depart from this, and to explain it: *de insigni illo homine*, that is, Messiah (Fritzsche), as the *application* of the universal statement to *Himself* on the part of Jesus was a matter of course. — ῥήματι] *Word*, in its proper sense. By every statement which proceeds from the mouth of God, that is, *through every command which is uttered by God*, by which the preservation of life is effected in an extraordinary, supernatural manner (without ἄρτος).<sup>1</sup> Comp. Wisd. xvi. 26. ῥῆμα is

<sup>1</sup> Amongst the Israelites it was effected by means of the manna; therefore we must not say with Euth. Zigabenus: πᾶν ῥῆμα ἐκπορεύμενον διὰ στόματος θεοῦ ἐπὶ τὸν πεινῶντα δίκην τροφῆς συνέχει τὴν ζωὴν αὐτοῦ. Comp. Chrysostom: δύναται ὁ θεὸς καὶ ῥήματι θρίψαι τὸν πεινῶντα. Pfeiderer also refers it to the power of

not *res* (רֶשׁ), not even in xviii. 16, Luke ii. 15, Acts v. 32, 1 Macc. v. 37, since *ἐκπορ. διὰ στομ. θεοῦ* necessarily points to the meaning of *word, declaration*, which, however, is not to be explained, with Fritzsche (comp. Usteri and Ullmann): *omni mandato divino peragendo*.

Ver. 5. *Παραλαμβ.]* *he takes Him with him*, 1 Macc. iii. 37, iv. 1, and frequently in Greek writers. — *τὴν ἁγίαν πόλιν*] שְׁכֵנִי עִיר, Isa. xlviii. 2, lii. 1; Neh. xi. 1. *Jerusalem*, the city of *God*, on account of the national temple, v. 35, xxvii. 53; Luke iv. 9; Sir. xxxvi. 13, xlix. 6; Josephus, *Antt.* iv. 4. 4; Lightfoot, *Hor.* p. 43; Ottii *Spicileg.* p. 9. Even at the present day it is called by the Arabs: *the place of the Sanctuary*, or the *Holy City* [El Kuds]. Hamelsveld, *bibl. Geogr.* I. p. 204 ff.; Rosenmüller, *Morgenl. in loc.* The designation has something *solemn* in contrast to the devil. — *ἵστησιν*] not "*auctor erat, ut Christus (with him) illuc se conferret*" (Kuinoel, Fritzsche), but: *he places Him*, which implies the involuntary nature of the act on the part of Jesus, and the power on the part of the devil. Comp. Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 23: *ἕστησαν . . . τὸν Ἰάκωβον ἐπὶ τὸ πτερύγιον τοῦ ναοῦ*. A more precise determination of what is certainly a miraculous occurrence (conceived of by Jerome as a carrying away *through the air*) is not given in the text, which, however, does not permit us to think of it as something internal taking place in the condition of a trance (Olshausen). Comp. Acts viii. 38. — *τὸ πτερύγιον τοῦ ἱεροῦ*] *the little wing of the temple*<sup>1</sup> is sought for by many on the temple building itself, so that it is either its *battlement* (Luther, Beza, Grotius), that is, the parapet surrounding the roof, or the *ridge* (Fritzsche, Winer), or the *gable, pediment* (Vulgate: *pinnaculum*; Paulus, Bleek), the two latter from their wing shape (  $\wedge$  ), or *roof* generally (Keim, and older expositors. See especially Krebs

spiritual nourishment contained in the divine word; as also Calovius, who says: "*Revocat a verbo potentiae, quo lapides erant in panem convertendi, ad verbum gratiae, cui adhaerentes vivent, etiamsi pane careant.*"

<sup>1</sup> Amongst the Greeks (Strabo, Plutarch, the Scholiasts), *πτέρων*, wing, is specially used in an architectural sense. See the *Lexica*, also Müller, *Archäol.* § 220. 3. On *πτέρυξ* in this sense, comp. Poll. vii. 121; on *πτέρυγιον*, Joseph. *Antt.* xv. 11. 5; on *πτέρωμα*, Vitruv. iii. 3. 9.

on the passage), that is indicated. But, apart from this, that the roofing of the temple house, according to Josephus, *Antt.* v. 5. 6, vi. 5. 1, was furnished on the top with pointed stakes as a protection against birds, and, moreover, on account of the extreme sacredness of the place, would hardly be selected by tradition as the spot where the devil stationed himself, the τοῦ ἱεροῦ is opposed to it, which does not, like ναός, designate the main building of the temple, properly speaking, but the whole area of the temple with its buildings. See Tittmann, *Synon.* p. 178 f. The view, therefore, of those is to be preferred who, with Euth. Zigabenus, Olearius, Reland, Valckenaer, seek the πτερύγιον in an outbuilding of the temple area; where, however, it is again doubtful whether Solomon's portico or the στοὰ βασιλική, the former (Josephus, *Antt.* xx. 9. 7) on the east side, the latter (Josephus, *Antt.* xv. 11. 5) on the south, both standing on an abrupt precipice, is intended. Wetstein and Michaelis prefer the former; Kuinoel, Bretschneider, B. Crusius, Arnoldi, the latter. In favour of the latter is the description of the giddy look down from this portico given in Josephus: εἴ τις ἀπ' ἄκρου τοῦ ταύτης τέγους ἄμφω συντιθεῖς τὰ βάθη διοπτρεύει, σκοτοδινῶν, οὐκ ἐξικνουμένης τῆς ὄψεως εἰς ἀμέτρητον τὸν βυθόν. In Hegesippus, quoted by Eus. ii. 23 (where James preaches downwards from the πτερύγιον τοῦ ναοῦ, and the scribes then go up and throw him down), it is not the gable, but the *pinnacle*, the balustrade of the temple building, which formed a projection (ἀκρωτήριον), that we are to think of. Comp. Hesychius: πτερύγιον ἀκρωτήριον. The article denotes that the locality where the occurrence took place was *well known*.

REMARK.—The second temptation in Matthew is the third in Luke. The transposition was made with a view to the order in which the localities succeeded each other. But in a climactic point of view, how inappropriate is the order in which it occurs in Luke, and how appropriate is that in Matthew,<sup>1</sup> whose

<sup>1</sup> Luther: At the first temptation, the devil appeared as a *black* one; at the second, where he puts forth a word of Scripture, a *light, white* one; at the third, "quite as a *divinely majestic* devil, who comes out straightway, indeed, as if he were God Himself."

greater originality must here also be maintained against Schneckenburger and Krafft. The variation itself, however, is not removed by the circumstance that Matthew only continues the narrative with *τότε* and *πάλιν* (Ebrard), but it remains and is unessential.

Ver. 6. In Ps. xci. 11, 12, according to the LXX., it is God's providential care for the pious in general that is spoken of. Here the tempter, who now himself grasps the weapon of Scripture, which had just been used against him, cunningly applies the *typical* expressions in the Psalms (the figure is borrowed from maternal anxiety) *strictly* to the Messiah. — *ὅτι*], not the *recitative*, but a *part of the passage*.—The Son of God, in reliance on the divine protection, must undertake a *daring miracle of display* in order to win over the masses for Himself. For the multitudes, with a view to influencing whom this miracle is proposed, are understood to be, *as a matter of course*, on the temple area; and therefore we are not to assume, with Kohlschütter, Ullmann, Engelhardt, that it was *only* an exhibition of divine favour and protection, and no public spectacle, which was aimed at. On that view no sufficient reason is shown why Jesus is brought from the wilderness to the most populous centre of the metropolis. Euth. Zigabenus strikingly remarks: *διὰ κενοδοξίας ἐλεῖν αὐτὸν ἐπιχειρεῖ*.

Ver. 7. *Πάλιν*] *rursus*, never signifies in the N. T., not even in 2 Cor. x. 7, Gal. v. 3, 1 John ii. 8, *at quoque, e diverso*, a meaning which it frequently has in classic writers (Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* II. p. 485), as Erasmus, Er. Schmid, Schleusner, B. Crusius, have interpreted it; but here means, *on the other hand*, looking back to the *γέγραπται* of the devil in ver. 6, and introducing another passage of Scripture as something which *again* has been written; comp. v. 33. Bengel well says: *Scriptura per scripturam interpretanda et concilianda*. — *οὐκ ἐκπειράσεις*] future, as in i. 21; the *compound* strengthens the meaning; comp. on 1 Cor. x. 9.—The meaning is: “*Do not let it be a question whether God will save thee from dangers on which thou hast entered uncalled.*”—Flacius: *Si habuisset expressum mandatum dei, non fuisset tentatio*. Deut. vi. 16 (LXX.), comp. Ex. xvii. 2.

Ver. 8 f. Πάσας... κόσμους] בְּלִמְלָכוֹת הָאָרֶץ, Ezra i. 2. Not a hyperbolical expression: *amplissimum terrarum tractum*, but actually *all* the kingdoms of the world, Luke iv. 5. The devil could indeed regard only all *heathen lands* as his disposable possession (Luke iv. 6; Lightfoot, p. 1088; Eisenmenger, *entd. Judenth.* II. p. 820 ff.); but even unto those remote heathen lands, and beyond, and far beyond the small country of Palestine, has the marvellous height of the mountain enabled the eye to look; the Holy Land, with the temple and the peculiar people of God, certainly belonged besides to the Son of God as a matter of course; therefore to explain it away as *omnes Palaestinae regiones* (Krebs, Loesner, Fischer, Gratz) is quite away from the point. — ἐὰν περ. . . . μοι] If Thou wilt have cast Thyself down before me as Thy master, and thereby have manifested Thy homage (ii. 2) to me. By the fulfilment of this demand the devil would have made Jesus unfaithful to Himself, and would have secured his own world-rule over Him. Where the mountain in question is to be sought for (according to Michaelis, it was *Nebo*; according to others, the *Mount of Olives*, *Tabor*, *Moriah*, *Horeb*) is, considering the miraculous nature of the scene (Luke iv. 5: ἐν στιγμή χρόνου), not even to be asked; just as little is δεικνυσιν to be rationalized as if it denoted not merely the actual *pointing*, but also the *verbis demonstrare* (Kuinoel, Glöckler); the δόξα αὐτῶν, moreover, is the *external* splendour of the kingdoms that lay before His eye.

Ver. 10. Ὡς παύει] The spurious words ὀπίσω μου would have to be explained: *go behind me*—that is, go back that I may see thee no longer! ἀφανίσθητι, Euth. Zigabenus. ὀπίσω with the genitive belongs to the LXX. and the Apocrypha, after the Hebrew, אַחֲרַי פֿ; in this way the Greeks construe ὀπισθεν. — σατανᾶ] to infer from this that Jesus now for the first time (too late) recognises Satan (de Wette), is arbitrary, and opposed to the representation of the matter in ver. 1, according to which Jesus cannot have been unaware of the intention of the Holy Spirit, who impelled Him to go into the wilderness. That He now *calls Satan by name*, is in keeping with the growing intensity of the emotion in general,

as well as with the *personal* address of the tempter in ver. 9. "Tentatorem, quum is maxime *favere* videri vult, *Satanam* appellat," Bengel. — κύριον, κ.τ.λ.] *Jehovah alone shalt thou worship*, do homage to Him only as thy master. Deut. vi. 13, according to the LXX., freely applied to the proposal of Satan. According to *this* arrangement, it is by the way of obedience to God that Jesus is aware that He will attain to the government of the world. John xviii. 36; Phil. ii. 6 ff.; Matt. xxviii. 18; Acts x. 36 ff.

Ver. 11. Ἄγγελοι] *Angels*, without the article. — διηκόνουν] *ministered* to Him. The remark of Bengel is correct: "sine dubio pro eo, ac tum opus erat, sc. *allato cibo*." So Luther, Piscator, Jansen, Wolf, Hammond, Michaelis, Paulus, Fritzsche, Strauss, de Wette, Ewald, Bleek, Nebe, Keim. Concerning the use of διακονεῖν in this sense, see Wetstein, and Matthiae, ad Soph. *Phil.* 284; and how pragmatically does *this* appearance of angels, after a series of temptations that have been victoriously withstood, correspond to the appearance of Satan in ver. 3! Comp. 1 Kings xix. 5. *Others*, not referring it to food, say that *extraordinary divine support* (John i. 52) is intended (Calvin, Maldonatus, Kuinoel, Olshausen, Kuhn, Ammon, Ebrard), on which view the angels themselves are partly left out, partly effaced from the narrative; whilst Chrysostom (who compares the carrying of Lazarus by angels into Abraham's bosom), Theophylact, Euth. Zigabenus, Grotius, do not enter into any more minute exposition of the διακονεῖν. But considering the appropriateness of the above definite explanation, it is not right to be satisfied with one that is indefinite and wavering.

REMARK.—According to the representation of the evangelists, the temptation of Jesus by the devil appears in the connection of the history as a *real external marvellous occurrence*. See Ch. F. Fritzsche in Fritzschor. *Opusc.* p. 122 ff. To abide by this view (Michaelis, Storr, Ebrard, P. Ewald, Graul, Könnemann, Arnoldi, Schegg, Delitzsch, Nebe, Engelhardt, Hofmann, Riggenbach, Baumgarten) is a necessary consequence of the denial of any legendary elements in the canonical Gospels, and is equally justifiable with this denial in general. The evangelists were aware that they were relating a *real external history* in time

and space (in answer to Kuhn, Lichtenstein), and the choice only remains between adopting either this view or assuming that of an ideal history in the garb of legend, gradually brought into shape by the power of the idea. All attempts at explaining away the devil and his external appearance are arbitrary contradictions or critical carpings, opposed to the design and representations of the evangelists, more or less of a rationalistic character. This holds good, not merely of the absurd, and, in relation to the third act, even monstrous view of those who, instead of the devil, introduce one or even various *individuals*, perhaps a member of the Sanhedrim or high priest, who wished to examine Jesus and to win Him over, or destroy Him (Herm. v. d. Hardt, *Exegesis loc. difficilior. quat. ev.* p. 470 ff.; Basedow, Venturini, Möller, *neue Ansichten*, p. 20 ff.; Rosenmüller, Kuinoel, Feilmoser in the *Tüb. Quartalschr.* 1828, 1, 2), but also of the view which regards the event as a *vision*, whether this was brought about by the *devil* (Origen? Pseudo-Cyprian, Theodore of Mopsuestia), or by *God* (Farmer, *Inquiry into the Nature and Design of Christ's Temptation*, London, 1761; comp. also Calvin on ver. 5), or by *natural means* (Balth. Becker, Scultetus, Clericus, Wetstein, Bolten, Bertholdt, Jahn, Gabler, Paulus, Gratz, Pfeiderer), or of those who view it as a significant *morning dream* (Meyer in the *Stud. u. Kritik.* 1831, p. 319 ff.),—which interpretations, moreover, are in contradiction with the clear repose and moral definiteness of the divine-human consciousness of Jesus, in virtue of which there never occurs in His life any condition of ecstasy, or a trace of any special manifestations in dreams. Akin to this, but equally offensive to the gospel history, and besides by no means leaving unaffected the moral character of the development of Jesus Himself, if we look to Heb. ii. 18, iv. 15, is the view which transforms the occurrence into an *internal history*, which took place in the thoughts and fancy of Jesus (Döderlein, Eichhorn, *allg. Bibl.* III. p. 283 ff.; Thaddæus d. i. Dereser, *d. Versuch. Christi*, Bonn 1794; Hezel, Augusti, Bretschneider, Weisse, *Kritik d. ev. Gesch.* II. p. 12; Hocheisen in the *Tüb. Zeitschr.* 1833, 2; Kohlschütter, Pfeiffer, Rink, Ammon, Laufs, Schenkel, Held). On this view the devil has again been recently brought forward, on grounds exegetically justifiable, as the operating principle (Krabbe, Hoffmann, Schmid, *bibl. Theol.* I. p. 65; and very indirectly also by Ullmann); while, in a more arbitrary manner, it has been attributed to the disciples that they apprehended in an objective form the inner fact related to them by Jesus, that He had rejected the false idea of the Messiah; whilst



Neander, *L. J.* p. 120 ff., substantially giving up the *reality* of the history of the temptation ("a fragmentary symbolical setting forth of the facts of His inner life," where the manner of the devil's co-operation is left undetermined), holds hesitatingly by its truth; and Kuhn, moreover, is divided between the historical and unhistorical view of the manner of its occurrence. To those who transfer the history into the inner life of Jesus' spirit, belong also Hase and Olshausen, the *former* of whom recognises in it the whole history of His mental growth, probably externalized by Himself, with reference to Ex. xvi., Deut. viii. 2, Ps. xci. 11 f., into an individual fact, but in the tradition assumed to be actual history, and who volatilizes the devil into the spirit of the world; while Olshausen, notwithstanding the *ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος* in ver. 1, finds the reality of the occurrence in this, that the soul of Jesus was exposed to the full operations of the kingdom of darkness; while Lange regards the internal temptation of Jesus as caused by the devil, but brought about by human means—that is, as an assault of the sympathetic inworking of the national and world spirit upon His soul, and as the tentative representatives of this spirit, drags in, by an invention that is his own, the deputation of the Sanhedrim, which had been despatched to John (John i. 19), as they were on their way back to Jerusalem. With more caution and with profounder historical insight, Keim (comp. Weizsäcker, p. 239 ff.) regards the history of the temptation in the light of the victorious beginning of the struggle with Satan, xii. 25 ff., where the historical kernel is the heavy weight of questions and doubts which were imposed on the soul of Jesus whilst He was calmly meditating upon the *obligation* and the *manner* of His vocation to the Messiahship, and on His decision to enter upon it, which had so powerfully taken hold of Him on the banks of the Jordan; on this initial victory Jesus could not have left His disciples without some information. But however we may apprehend the narrative as an historical occurrence in the mind of Jesus, the monstrous nature of the external formation of the history remains the more inexplicable the more directly its origin is brought into connection with Jesus Himself and His circle of disciples, especially as the threefold details of the temptation were still unknown to Mark. To view the event as a *parable*, is in contradiction to the narrative, arbitrary in itself, and alien to the style of parabolic address employed by Jesus elsewhere. So, after older writers, who, however, endanger the sinless character of Jesus, it has been viewed as a symbolical address of Jesus or of one of His disciples directed

against false Messianic hopes. See Schleiermacher, *Schr. d. Lukas*, p. 54 f., and *L. J.* p. 157 ff.; B. Crusius, *bibl. Theol.* p. 303, and on *Matthew*, p. 82; Usteri in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1829, p. 455 ff., who at a later time recanted this opinion, and regarded the narrative as a myth (1832, p. 768); Richter, *formam narrat. Matth.* iv. 1-11, *parabolicam ex Judaeor. opinione de duplici Adamo esse repetend.*, Viteb. 1824; Schweizer, Bleek; comp. Theile, *z. Biogr. J.* p. 49: "a warning directed by some adherent or another in support of the spiritually moral view, in opposition to the chief elements of the earthly Messianic hope." Against the parabolic character, see Hasert in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1830, p. 74 f.; Strauss, *L. J.* I. p. 444 f.; Schmid, *bibl. Theol.* I. p. 60; Engelhardt, *Nebe.*—As now, however, the history of the temptation in the first and third evangelists, viewed as an actual external occurrence, contains not merely a legendary magical scenery which is still foreign to the oldest Gospel, but also absolute impossibilities and contradictions with the moral character of Jesus as filled with the Spirit, who does not at once get rid of Satan, but allows him to proceed to the utmost extreme; as, moreover, this occurrence on the other side stands in contradiction with the devil's cunning and craftiness (Paulus, *exeget. Handb.* I. p. 376), whose assaults as proceeding from the devil against the Son of man would be planned with as much clumsiness as pointlessness,—there thus remains nothing else than to explain the narrative which in Mark still exhibits its first undeveloped beginnings, the first crystallisations of its ideal contents, the subject of which the narrators deemed to be true history, and repeated as such, as a legend, the contents of which, regarded as *thought*, possessed historical truth, and which arose among Jewish Christians,<sup>1</sup> being derived from the idea of the Messiah as opposed to the devil, and the necessity and complete realization of which was exhibited in the whole life and work of Christ, placed, like a compendious programme, an "*epitome omnium tentationum*" (Bengel), at the beginning of the Messianic career, which commenced at the baptism. Not as if

<sup>1</sup> Various conceptions from the legendary or mythical point of view, see in Theiss, Löffler, *kl. Schr.* II. p. 185 ff.; Fritzsche, Usteri in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1832, p. 768 ff.; Strauss, I. p. 479 f.; de Wette, Gfrörer, *Gesch. d. Urchr.* I. 1, p. 379 ff.; Ewald.—The *locality* of the temptation, the *wilderness*, was at once suggested as the idea gradually assumed bodily form from the sojourn of Jesus with the Baptist, and from the popular belief that demons had their dwellings in the wilderness; the *forty days*, however, found their venerable point of connection in the types of Moses and Elias (hardly of the *forty years'* duration of the *wanderings of the people* in the wilderness, which Delitzsch, Baumgarten,

there had not been on the part of Jesus after His baptism, and before His entrance on His work, the most serious preparation and most intense concentration of thought in still retirement, in which the whole opposition of the devil, as well as the manner of His own struggles and conquests which had been peculiarly determined by God, must have presented themselves vividly before His eyes; although this alone could not have given rise to the history of the temptation. For that purpose it was necessary that His holy life, that actual victory over Satan, should first be completed. That narrative might now first have arisen in the living history-moulding power of the ideas which prevails generally throughout the preliminary history, first of all in the form in which it appears in Mark, but soon after gradually expanded into detail, yet again silently excluded by John, considering the impossibility of assigning a place to it in connection with his history. Its expanded form, however, as it lies before us in Matthew and Luke, corresponds with the highest internal truth to the main relations of the opposition directed by the power of the devil against the second Adam and His kingdom,—an opposition which is decidedly to be recognised from the very beginning onwards to the end, and victory over which was the condition of His whole work. In this way the contents of the narrative, the psychological factors of which are quite as much the temptability as the sinlessness of the Lord, certainly belong to the history, but not as a concrete occurrence with its three individual acts, but as a summary reflection of the work of Jesus in His vocation in relation to the demoniacal kingdom, without, however, our being obliged to assume as an historical foundation any internal temptation taking place in thought, and any originally symbolic representation of the same, which was transformed into actual history in the course of tradition (de Wette). This foundation is rather the complete victory of our Lord over the craft and power of the devil, as the whole course of His Messianic life is a series of temptations by the devil, with the result of the latter being conquered both in detail and in the main (Heb.

and others drag in here as a type). They are also not excluded by the statement of Justin. c. *Tr.* 103, that, according to the ἀπομνημον. τ. ἀποστ., the devil came to Jesus ἅμα τῷ ἀναβῆναι αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ ποταμοῦ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου; but this statement agrees with Mark i. 12f. As regards the *individual* temptations, the *first* was thus connected with the forty days' fast of *Moses*, Deut. ix. 9, 18; the second, with the necessity which existed in the case of the Messiah of His *being accredited by miracles*; the *third*, with the certainty of the Messiah's *rule over the world*, by means of which the government of the devil must come to an end.

ii. 18, iv. 15); comp. John xiv. 30. With profound meaning and truth (for *from the very beginning* must Jesus make experience of the enemy of His kingdom, begin the struggle with him, and become certain of the right victory) has the synoptic tradition unanimously assigned to the narrative the early place which it occupies; and the attempt cannot be successful to maintain a later special situation as the historical seat of its origin, as Pfleiderer does, who transposes the vision which he assumes into the time of ch. xv. xvi., making use, moreover, of John vi. 26 for the first act of the temptation. That the history of the temptation in Matthew is even a later insertion derived from oral tradition (Köstlin), is a very arbitrary inference, from the circumstance that ver. 12 does not make any reference to the history of the temptations; Matthew follows Mark, and quotes his short notice from a special source.—The existence of Satan, as well as his *personality*, is attested throughout the whole of the New Testament, and is altogether independent of the view which may be taken of this individual narrative; see in answer to Hofmann, *Schriftbew.*, Philippi, *Dogm.* III. p. 332 ff. ed. 2.

Ver. 12. Fritzsche gives the sense and connection of vv. 12 to 16 thus: "Post conditi in carcerem Johannis famam discessit Jesus in Galilaeam, et relicta Nazareth a Capharnaumi quidem consedit, ut, quemadmodum apud prophetam est, magnis, amisso Johanne, tenebris oppressi Galilaei splendida Messiae luce fruerentur." But it appears, from the words in ver. 12, that Jesus, upon learning that the Baptist had been delivered over to Herod, deemed it dangerous to appear in the same district where the latter had baptized and excited so much attention, and that therefore He withdrew into the more remote Galilee (comp. xii. 15, xiv. 13). This belonged, indeed, to the dominion of Herod Antipas, who had caused the Baptist to be apprehended (xiv. 3); but it removed Jesus more from his attention and that of the hierarchical party, and gave Him the natural retirement of home. According to John iii. 24, John had *not yet been apprehended*, and the journey to Galilee was occasioned by the marriage at Cana (ii. 1). In Luke iv. 14 no external reason is stated for the journey, which is a later avoidance of the inaccuracy of the earlier tradition (retained in Mark and Matthew) (in answer to Schnecken-

burger). The contradiction, however, between Matthew and John is to be recognised, and to the latter is to be assigned the preference in point of accuracy.<sup>1</sup> Comp. on John iii. 24. A longer intervening period between the temptation and the return to Galilee is not hinted at by Matthew (nor even by Mark), and is excluded by Luke.

Vv. 13, 14. *Καφαρναούμ*] so, with Lachmann, Tischendorf, we must write כַּפְרֵנָחִים, *vicus Nachumi*, not χωρίον παρακλήσεως (Origen), or *villa pulcherrima* (Jerome). It was a prosperous manufacturing town on the north-west shore of the Lake of Tiberias. Not mentioned in the Old Test.; in Josephus, *Vit.* lxxii., κώμη Κεφαρνώμη. It has now disappeared, and not even can its site be determined with certainty (*Tell Hûm?* so also Wilson's *Lands of the Bible*, II. p. 137 ff., and Furer in Schenkel's *Bibellez.* III. p. 494 f., likewise Ritter, Ewald, and several others; Robinson,<sup>2</sup> III. p. 543 ff., and *Later Researches*, p. 457 ff.; Saulcy, II. p. 491 ff.; Ritter, *Erdk.* XV. 1, p. 338 ff.). The designation of the situation by τ. παραθαλ. and ἐν ὁρίοις, etc. (where the boundaries of both tribes touch each other), is given with reference to the following prophecy, for which even the position of these boundaries was not a matter of indifference (in answer to Hengstenberg, *Christol.* II. p. 93), as, in consequence of it, the settlement in Capernaum had reference to the districts of both the tribes. — καταλιπ. τ. Ναζαρ.] *why*, Matthew does not say, but see Luke iv. 16 ff. Misconceived in Nazareth, Jesus preferred as a place of settlement the more populous, and,

<sup>1</sup> We cannot say that it is the journey to Galilee, John vi. 1, which is intended in our passage (Wieseler, *chronol. Synopse*, p. 161 f., and *Beitr. z. Würdig. d. Eu.* p. 174 ff.), for that Matthew conceived the journey recorded by him as the *first* after the sojourn in the wilderness, is shown not only by the whole context, but also by ver. 13 ff., where the *settling down* at Capernaum is related, and the reason assigned for it; and by ver. 17, where Jesus first actually *begins* His office as teacher. This holds good against the frequent assumption that the journey to Galilee, Matt. iv. 12, coincides with John iv. 3, 43–45 (Kuhn, Ebrard, Lange, Märcker, *Uebereinst. d. Matth. u. Joh.*, 1868, p. 9). Exegetically, the discrepancy must remain a blank, which is also recognised by Bleek and Keim; by the latter, however, in such a way that he denies to John's account a strictly historical character.

<sup>2</sup> According to Robinson, it is the present *Khân Minieh*, farther south than Tell Hûm; so also Sepp, Keim.

through intercourse with strangers, the more liberally-minded Capernaum. Considering His migratory life and work, neither viii. 5 f. nor viii. 20 can be regarded as not agreeing with the statement in our passage (in answer to Hilgenfeld).

Vv. 15, 16. As the evangelist, ii. 23, found a prophecy in support of the settlement at Nazareth, so also now for the removal to Capernaum, viz. Isa. viii. 22, ix. 1 (quoted from memory, but adhering to the LXX.): *The land of Zabulon and the land of Nephthalim, by the way of the sea, beyond Jordan, Galilee of the Gentiles, the people which sat in darkness,* and so on. — γῆ is not the *vocative*, but the *nominative*, corresponding to ὁ λαός, etc., ver. 16. The article was not required; see Winer, p. 114 f. [E. T. 22]. As, by the ὁδὸν θαλάσσης, the τὴν παραθαλασσίαν expressed of Capernaum in ver. 13 is prophetically established, so must θαλάσσης, in the sense of the evangelist, refer to the Sea of Galilee, the Lake of Gennesareth. These words, namely, determine the situation of γῆ Ζαβ. and γῆ Νεφθ., and are to be translated *seawards*. The absolute accusat. ὁδὸν is quite Hebraistic, like הַדֶּרֶךְ in the sense of *versus* (Ezek. viii. 5, xl. 20, xli. 11 f., xlii. 1 ff.; 1 Kings viii. 48; 2 Chron. vi. 38; Deut. i. 2, 19),—a usage which is partly retained in the LXX. 1 Kings viii. 48, ὁδὸν γῆς αὐτῶν, in the direction of *their land*; exactly so in 2 Chron. vi. 38, and most probably also in Deut. i. 19. In this sense has the evangelist also understood הַדֶּרֶךְ הַיָּם in the original text of the passage before us; so also Aquila and Theodotion, not the LXX., according to B (in A, by an interpolation). No completely corresponding and purely Greek usage is found, as the accusatives of direction, in Bernhardt, p. 144 f., comp. Kühner, II. 1, p. 268 f., do not stand independent of a verb. πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδ. is not, like ὁδὸν θαλ., a determination of the position of γῆ Ζαβ. and γῆ Νεφθ., as these tribes were situated on *this side* the Jordan, while πέραν (in answer to Bengel, Kuinoel, Linder in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1862, p. 553) can never signify *on this side* (Crome, *Beitr.* p. 83 ff.); but it designates, after these two lands, a new land as the theatre of the working of Jesus, viz. *Peraea* (comp. on ver. 25), whose customary designation was עֲבֵר הַיַּרְדֵּן, πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου—that is, *the land*

*east of Jordan.* The evangelist includes this land as well as Γαλιλ. τ. ἐθνῶν, because it stands in the prophetic passage along with the others (not with reference to the Peraean ministry of Jesus, de Wette, Bleek, which has no place here), leaving it, besides, to the reader to decide that it was only in γῇ Ζαβουλὼν . . . θαλάσσης that the specific *element* of locality which was to be demonstrated from the prophecies was contained. The citation, moreover, which specially sets forth that Jesus, after He had quitted Nazareth, settled at Capernaum, on the borders of Zebulon and Naphtali, in their telic connection with a divine prediction (ἵνα of the divine determination), shows in this very circumstance the Messianic fulfilment of the historical relation of the prophetic declaration, according to which there was announced to northern Galilee safety and salvation from the oppression of the Assyrians, and consequently theocratical, political salvation. — Γαλ. τ. ἐθνῶν] מְנַחֵם לְיִשְׂרָאֵל (*district of the heathen*), that is, in keeping with the originally appellative term לְיִשְׂרָאֵל, which had become a proper name, *Upper Galilee*, in the neighbourhood of Phoenicia, inhabited by a mixed population of heathens (Strabo, xvi. p. 760) and Jews. 1 Macc. v. 15: Γαλιλ. ἀλλοφύλων. Its geographical limits are defined by Joseph. *Bell.* iii. 3. 1.

Ver. 16. Ὁ λαὸς ὁ καθήμενος, κ.τ.λ.] In opposition to Γαλιλαία τῶν ἐθνῶν, whose inhabitants are characterized as *darkened*, that is, devoid of divine truth, and sunk in ignorance and sin. The great light, however, which these darkened ones saw is Jesus. — καὶ τοῖς καθημένοις, κ.τ.λ.] repeats the same thought, with the climactic designation of darkness: ἐν χώρᾳ κ. σκιᾷ θανάτου, in the land and darkness, which belong to death. *Death*, that is, *spiritual* death (viii. 22, see on Luke xv. 24), the negation of that living activity which recognises the truth and is morally determined, is *personified*; the land, whose inhabitants are spiritually dead, *belongs to it as the realm of its government, and darkness surrounds it.* The common interpretation of it as ἐν διὰ δυοῖν: "*in regione et in spissis quidem tenebris = in regione spissis tenebris obducta*" (Fritzsche), is, indeed, admissible (see Fritzsche, *Exc.* IV. p.

856; Nägelsbach on Hom. *Il.* iii. 100), but unnecessary, and takes away from the poetic description, which is certainly stronger and more vivid if *θανάτου* is connected not merely with *σκιά* (σνῆς, *infernalis obscuritas*, i.e. crassissima), but also with *χώρα*. On the significant *καθήμενος*, comp. Lam. *l.c.* Pind. *Ol.* i. 133: *ἐν σκότῳ καθήμενος*. "*Sedendi verbum aptum notandae solitudini inerti*" (Bengel). Comp. especially, Jacobs, *ad Anthol.* VI. p. 397; Bremi, *ad Dem. Phil.* I. p. 119. Nägelsbach on Hom. *Il.* i. 134. — *αὐτοῖς*] see Winer, p. 139 f. [E. T. 265]; Buttmann, p. 125 [E. T. 381].

Ver. 17. *Ἀπὸ τότε*] *from that time onwards*—that is, after this return to Nazareth and Capernaum. It determines the commencement of the preaching not *merely* from Capernaum onwards. In the N. T. *ἀπὸ τότε* stands only here, xvi. 21, xxvi. 16; Luke xvi. 16. More frequently in the writers of the *κοινή*, LXX. Ps. xciii. 2; Wetstein *in loc.* Not in classical writers. Phrynichus, ed. Lobeck, p. 461. — *βασ. τῶν οὐρανῶν*] See on iii. 2. Jesus in the presence of the people does not yet designate Himself as the Messiah, but announces in quite a general way the nearness of the Messianic kingdom, the divinely-ordained bearer of which He knew *Himself* to be; this is quite in keeping with the humility and wisdom of His first appearance, when He resumed the preaching of John. The view, that at the beginning He did not regard Himself as the Messiah, but only as a forerunner like John, and only at a later time appropriated to Himself the Messianic idea (Strauss, Schenkel), is in contradiction to all the four Gospels. But in His self-attestation as the Messiah He proceeded to work, according to the Synoptics, in a more *gradual* manner than He did according to John. Comp. Gess, *Christi Person u. Werk*, I. p. 247 ff.

Ver. 18. Comp. Luke v. 1 ff. — *θάλασσο. τῆς Γαλιλ.*] Lake of Gennesareth or Tiberias (see on John vi. 1) is 140 stadia long and 40 broad, with romantic environs, and abounding in fish (Josephus, *Bell.* iii. 10. 7), about 500 feet below the level of the Mediterranean. See Robinson, *Pal.* III. pp. 499, 509; Ritter, *Erdk.* XV. 1, p. 284 ff.; Rüetschi in Herzog's *Encycl.* V.; Keim, *Gesch. J.* I. p. 599 ff. — *τὸν λεγόμε. Πέτρον*] not



α ὕστερον πρότερον, but see on xvi. 18. That the evangelists always have (with the exception of the diplomatic passage, John i. 43) the name *Peter*, which in Paul is certainly found only in Gal. ii. 7 f., not *Cephas*, is explained in the case of Matthew by the circumstance that his Gospel is only a translation, and that at the time of its composition the Greek name had become the *common* one.

Vv. 19, 20. Δεῦτε ὀπίσω μου] *come here after me!* לכו אחרי (2 Kings vi. 19; 1 Kings xi. 5), *be my pupils*. The disciples were in constant attendance on their teacher; Schoettgen, *Hor. in loc.* — ποιήσω . . . ἀνθρώπων] *I will put you in a position to gain men, that they may become members of the kingdom of the Messiah*. Words borrowed from the domain of hunting and fishing (Jer. xvi. 16) often denote the winning over of souls for themselves or others. Wetstein and Loesner, Hemsterbusius, *ad Lucian. Dial. Mort.* viii.; Burmann, *ad Phaedr.* iv. 4. Comp. on 2 Cor. xi. 20. Here the typical phraseology suggested itself from the *circumstances*. — εὐθέως] belongs to ἀφέντες, not to ἡκολ. — ἡκολ.] as disciples. — καταρτίζ., either *arranging* (Bengel) or *repairing* (Vulgate and most commentators). We cannot determine which; Luke has ἀπέπλυναν.

REMARK.—The want of harmony between Matthew iv. 18 ff. and John i. 35 ff. is to be recognised, and is not (as the Fathers of the church, Kuinoel, Gratz, Olshausen, Hoffmann, Krabbe, Neander, Ebrard, Arnoldi, Luthardt, Bleek, Riggenbach, Lange, Ewald, Hausrath, Märcker, have attempted) to be removed by supposing that in Matthew it is a *second* calling of the apostles in question that is recorded, viz. that they had already been at an earlier date (John i. 35 ff.) disciples of Jesus in the wider sense of the word, but that now for the first time they had become so in the narrower sense—that is, had become apostles. Comp. on *John*, remark after ch. i. Matthew does not even agree with Luke v. 4 ff. See remarks on the passage, and Keim, *Gesch. J.* II. p. 215. We must in any case (in answer to Baur, Hilgenfeld) seek the true history of the occurrence in John, in whose account a merely preliminary adherence to Jesus is the less to be thought of, that immediately afterwards οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ go with Him to Cana (ii. 2), to Capernaum (ii. 12), and to Jerusalem (ii. 17, 22). This also in answer to Lücke on *John*, I. p. 466 f., and to Wieseler, who distinguishes

a *threefold act* in the selection of the disciples: the preliminary calling in John i. 35 ff.; the setting apart to be constant attendants, Matt. iv. 18 ff., ix. 9 ff.; and the selection of the Twelve to be apostles, Matt. x. 2-4. Wieseler (*chronol. Synopse*, p. 278) lays especial weight on the circumstance that John names *τοὺς δώδεκα* for the first time in John vi. 67. But John in general, with the exception of this passage (and the verses 70 and 71 belonging to it), only once again expressly mentions the *τοὺς δώδεκα* (viz. in xx. 21), which is determined by the antithetic interest in the context. Especially in vi. 67 are the Twelve opposed to those others, many of whom had deserted Him. Previously, however, John had no opportunity, where this or any other antithetical relation might give him occasion, to give prominence to the number of the Twelve.—Besides, the history of the calling in Matthew, if it were not in contradiction to John, would by no means bear *in itself* a mythical character (Strauss finds in it a copy of the call of Elisha by Elijah, 1 Kings xix. 19 ff.), but is to be explained from the great, directly overwhelming impression made by the appearance of Jesus on minds prepared for it, which Matthew himself experienced (ix. 9); and this also is to be applied to the Johannine account. This narrative, which Schenkel and Keim relegate to the sphere of free invention, does not exclude the profound and certainly original words, "fishers of men," which may have proceeded from the mouth of Jesus to His first called disciples on that day, John i. 40; and upon the basis of these words the narrative of the call, as it is preserved in Matthew and Mark, might easily be formed.

Vv. 23, 24 serve by way of introduction to the Sermon on the Mount, where the description is manifestly exaggerated as regards the time of the *first* ministry of Jesus, and betray the work of a later hand in the redaction of our Gospel. Comp. ix. 35.—The *synagogues* were places of assembly for public worship, where on Sabbaths and feast days (at a later period, also on the second and fifth days of the week, Jerusalem *Megillah*, f. 75. 1; Babylonian *Bava Cama*, f. 82. 1) the people met together for prayer, and to listen to the reading of portions of the Old Testament, which were translated and explained in the vernacular dialect. With the permission of the president, any one who was fitted might deliver addresses. Vitringa, *de synagoga veterum*, Franecker 1696; Keil, *Archäol.*

§ 30 ; Leyrer in Herzog's *Encykl.* XV. p. 299 ff. ; Keim, *Gesch. J. I.* p. 432 ff. — αὐτῶν] *of the Galileans.* — πᾶσαν] *every kind of sickness which was brought to Him.* See Hermann, *ad Viger.* p. 728, μαλακία, *weakness, deprivation of strength through sickness.* Herod. *Vit. Hom.* 36, and often in the LXX. Comp. μαλακίζομαι and μαλακιῶ, Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 389. In the N. T. only in Matthew (x. 35, x. 1). — ἐν τῷ λαῷ] belongs to θεραπ. Comp. Acts v. 12, vi. 8. — Observe that such *summary accumulations* of the activity of Jesus in healing as v. 23 f. (viii. 16, xii. 15) are not mentioned in John's Gospel. They are, moreover, especially at so early a date, not in keeping with the gradual progress of the history, although explicable enough in the case of a simple historian, who, easily anticipating the representation which he had formed from the whole history, gives a summary statement in the account of a single portion of the narrative.

Ver. 24. Εἰς ὅλην τὴν Συρίαν] His reputation spread from Galilee into the whole province. — πάντας τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας] *all the sufferers* that there were. The following ποικίλ. νόσοις belongs not to κακῶς ἔχοντας (Syriac, Euth. Zigabenus), but to συνεχόμενους. — νόσοις κ. βασάνοις] *Sicknesses and torments.* — The first is general, the last special. — καὶ δαιμον. καὶ σελην. κ. παραλυτ.] makes prominent three special kinds of what had previously been described in a general manner, so that the first καὶ is to be rendered: *especially also, particularly also.* — δαιμονιζομένους] according to the popular view, shared by the evangelist: *possessed by demons* (ix. 34, xii. 26), whose bodies had become the seat and organ of demoniacal working ; δαιμόνιον is not a diminutive form, *little devil* (Ewald, Keim), but the neuter of δαιμόνιος as substantive. See Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Ap. Socr.* p. 27 f. They were real sick persons with diseases of a peculiar character (mania, epilepsy, delirium, hypochondria, paralytic condition, temporary dumbness), whose sufferings, being apparently inexplicable from physical causes, were believed to have their foundation not in an abnormal organization, or in natural disturbances of the physical condition, but in diabolical possession—that is, in the actual indwell-

ing of demoniac personalities, very many of which might even be counted in one sick person (Mark v. 9, xvi. 9).<sup>1</sup> This belief, which is conceivable from the decay of the old theocratic consciousness and of its moral strength, which referred all misfortune to God's sending, is, however, a belief which rendered healing possible only through the acceptance of the existing view leaving the idea itself untouched, but made it all the more certain for the Messiah, who has power over the kingdom of devils, and who now, in the pure manifestation of Jesus, accompanied with miraculous

<sup>1</sup> After the old view of actual bodily possession of the sick had, after Balth. Becker (*bezauberte Welt*, iv. 5 ff.), Mead (*medica sacra*, ix.), Wetstein, been, especially by Semler (*Comment. de daemoniis*, 1760, u. *umständliche Untersuch. d. dämonischen Leute*, 1762), successfully refuted, and had disappeared altogether (see also Timmermann, *de daemoniac. evangelior.* 1786; Winzer, *de daemonologia N. T.*, 1812, 1821), although attempts at its defence were not wanting (Storr, *Opusc.* I. p. 53 ff.; Eschenmayer, *Mysticism*, 1823; Jahn, *Nachträge zu s. theol. Werken*, 1821), the old view was again brought forward, partly before (v. Meyer, *Bibeldeut.* p. 40 ff.; Olshausen on Matt. viii. 28, and others), partly after, the assaults of Strauss (Krabbe, Hoffmann, Ebrard, Arnoldi, Hofmann, Steinmeyer), and supported with more or less acuteness, and with turns of a partly obscure and evasive character, especially by means of comparisons with magnetism. Delitzsch, *bibl. Psychol.* p. 293 ff.; Ebrard in Herzog's *Encykl.* III. p. 240 ff. Not so, however, Lange, II. 1, p. 285 ff., who, regarding the condition as a natural one, refers it to a nervous disease, having an elective affinity with demoniacal influences, which the patient as well as the people represented to himself as possession. By this the old view is not retained even in appearance. Against its tenability, however, irrespective of all objections of a physiological and medical kind, the following are decisive proofs: (1) The non-occurrence of demons in the O. T.; (2) the undisputed healing of the same by exorcists (Matt. xii. 27; Mark ix. 38; Josephus, *Antt.* viii. 2. 5; Justin. c. *Tryph.* 85; Lucian. *Philopseud.* 16); as well as (3) the non-occurrence of reliable instances in modern times (? Justinus Kerner, *Gesch. Besessener neuerer Zeit.*, Carlsruhe 1834), although the same sicknesses, which were deemed to be demoniacal, are common; and (4) the complete silence of John, which (comp. especially Luke ix. 49) is the more eloquent the more essentially he also regards miraculous healing as belonging to the work of the Messiah, and the conquest of the devil as the Messiah's task. In John, moreover, diabolical possession is found mentioned (xiii. 27), but not as the effect of physical sickness, but of spiritual domination and obduracy, the so-called *obsessio spiritualis*. Comp. John vii. 28, viii. 48, x. 20. Definite references to the expulsion of demons from the sick are wanting also in Paul's Epistles, although they might be included with others in 1 Cor. xii. 9. Observe, moreover, (5) the demoniacs were not at all filled with godless dispositions and anti-Christian wickedness, which, nevertheless, was necessarily to be expected as the result of the real indwelling of devils.

working, stood victoriously opposed to all diabolic power. Comp. Ewald, *Jahrb.* VII. p. 54 ff., also Bleek, Neander, p. 237 ff. If we assume, however, that *Jesus Himself* shared the opinion of His age and nation regarding the reality of demoniacal possession of the sick (Strauss, Keim, Weiss), we find ourselves in the dilemma of either being obliged again to set up the old doctrine upon the authority of Jesus, or of attributing to the latter an erroneous belief not by any means remote from the religious sphere, and only of a physiological kind, but of an essentially religious character, and which would be irreconcilable with the pure height of the Lord's divine knowledge. — καὶ σελην. κ. παραλυτ.] *Epileptics*, whose sufferings, it was observed, increased as the month advanced (Wetstein), and *sufferers from nervous diseases* (Richter, *de paralyxi*, 1775). Epilepsy also might be of such a kind as to be regarded as *demoniacal* sickness (xvii. 15); here, however, is meant the form of sickness which is regarded as natural.

Ver. 25. Δεκαπόλεως] a strip of land with ten cities (Josephus, *Vit.* 9), chiefly inhabited by the heathen, on the other side of the Jordan, in the north-east of Palestine. As to the towns themselves, which were reckoned as included in it, and to which Scythopolis, Gadara, Hippo, and Pella certainly belonged, there was, so early as the time of Pliny (*H. N.* v. 16), no unanimity of opinion, Lightfoot, *Hor.* p. 563 ff.; Vaihinger in Herzog, III.; Holtzmann in Schenkel's *Bibellex.* — πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου] as in v. 15, xix. 1, Mark iii. 8, a geographical name: *Peraea* (Josephus, *Bell.* ix. 3. 3; Plin. v. 15), the land east of the Jordan, from Mount Hermon down to the river Arnon.

## CHAPTER V.

VER. 1.  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega$ ] is wanting in Lachm., after B. Correction, with a view to improve the style.—Ver. 5. Lachm. Tisch. have this verse *before* ver. 4, but on too weak authority (D, 33, Lat. Verss. Syr<sup>cur</sup> Or. Eus. and other Fathers). A logical bringing together of the  $\pi\tau\omega\chi\omicron\iota\ \tau\omega\ \pi\upsilon\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota$  and of the  $\pi\rho\alpha\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ .—Ver. 9.  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota$ ] bracketed by Lachm., deleted by Tisch. 8, wanting in C D  $\aleph$ , 13, 134, Lat. Verss. Syr. Hil. But how easily would the omission occur in writing, since here the similarly ending  $\nu\iota\omicron\iota$  follows (otherwise in ver. 4 ff.)!—Ver. 11.  $\rho\eta\mu\alpha$ ] is deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. 8, after B D  $\aleph$ , Vulg. It. and other Verss. and some Fathers. But as the word is altogether unnecessary as far as the meaning is concerned, it might easily be omitted, especially after the syllable  $\text{PON}$ .— $\psi\epsilon\upsilon\delta\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota$ ] is wanting only in D, Codd. of the It., and some Fathers, including Origen. Suspected, indeed, by Griesbach, and deleted by Fritzsche, Tisch. 7; wrongly, however, since the word is quite decisively attested (again restored by Tisch. 8). A definition that appeared so much a matter of course might easily be passed over.—Ver. 13.  $\beta\lambda\eta\theta\eta\nu\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\zeta\omega\ \kappa\alpha\iota$ ] Lachm. Tisch. 8;  $\beta\lambda\eta\theta\epsilon\nu\ \epsilon\zeta\omega$ , after B C  $\aleph$ , 1, 33. An attempt to help out the style.—Ver. 22.  $\epsilon\iota\chi\eta$ ] is wanting in B  $\aleph$ , 48, 198, Vulg. Aeth. Or. and some other witnesses. Expressly rejected as spurious as early as Jerome and Augustin. *Retr.* i. 19, and Pseud.-Athan. Iren. and Hil. place it after  $\omicron\rho\gamma$ . Deleted by Fritzsche, Lachm., Tisch. It is an inappropriate addition, resulting from bias, although of very ancient date (already in Syr. It. Eus.).—Ver. 25. The second  $\sigma\epsilon\ \pi\alpha\rho\alpha\delta\omega$  is wanting only in B  $\aleph$ , 1, 13, 124, 127 \* Arm. Aeth. 13, 124, 127 \* Chrys. Hilar. Arn. Deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. 8. Passed over as unnecessary, because its emphasis was mistaken.—Ver. 27.  $\epsilon\acute{\rho}\rho\epsilon\theta\eta$ ] Elz. adds  $\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\alpha\iota\omicron\iota\varsigma$ , for which, however, decisive testimony is wanting. Taken from vv. 21 and 33.—Ver. 28.  $\epsilon\pi\iota\theta$ .  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\eta$ ] Elz.:  $\epsilon\pi\iota\theta$ .  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\epsilon$ , against decisive testimony.  $\aleph$ , 236, Clem. Or. Chrys. Isid. Tert. have no pronoun at all. So Fritzsche and Tisch. 8.

But the testimony for αὐτήν is too strong, and the omission might easily have arisen from its being unnecessary. — Ver. 30. βληθῇ εἰς γέενναν] Lachm. and Tisch.: εἰς γέενναν ἀπέλθῃ, after B D ? κ, Curss. and many Verss. and Fathers; it is uncertain whether also in Or. Correctly; the Received reading is derived from ver. 29. — Ver. 31. ὅτι] is wanting in B D L κ, Curss. Vulg. It. Chrys. Suspected by Griesbach, deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. Rightly. An addition that easily suggested itself. See the exegetical remarks on ii. 23. — Ver. 32. ὃς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ] Lachm. and Tisch. 8: πᾶς ὁ ἀπολύων, after B K L M Δ Π κ, Curss. Vulg. It. and other verss. A change made in accordance with vv. 22, 28; Luke xvi. 18. — μοιχᾶσθαι] Lachm. and Tisch. 8: μοιχευθῆναι. So B D κ, Curss. Theoph. Or. Chrys. Theod. A gloss (*to be seduced to adultery*) to distinguish it from μοιχᾶται, which follows. Lachm. has afterwards καὶ ὁ ἀπολελυμένην γαμήσας, after B and some Curss., connected with the reading πᾶς ὁ ἀπολύων at the beginning of the verse. — Ver. 39. ῥαπίσει] B κ, 33: ῥαπίζει; so Tisch. 8. Correctly; the future is a conformation to ver. 41. — Ver. 42. δίδου] Lachm. and Tisch.: δός, after B D κ, 13, 124, Clem. The Received reading is taken from Luke vi. 30. — Ver. 44. τοῖς μισοῦσιν] Elz.: τοὺς μισοῦντας, against the best and most numerous witnesses. To exchange, with Lachm. and Tisch., the whole passage from εὐλογ. to μισ. ὑμᾶς, after B κ, Curss. Copt. Syr<sup>cur</sup> and many Fathers (including Or. Eus.), and to explain it as an interpolation from Luke, is too bold, since in Luke vi. 27 f. the sentences stand in different order. Omissions, however, caused by the Homoeoteleuta might easily occur. ἐπηρξαζόντων ὑμᾶς καὶ is, however, very suspicious; it is wanting in B κ, Curss. and many Verss. Or. (five times; he has the words twice, but then καὶ διωκ. ὑμᾶς is wanting); also in Cypr. Aug. Lucif. and in others stands after διωκ.; it therefore betrays itself as an interpolation from Luke vi. 28. — Ver. 47. ἀδελφοὺς] φίλους, in E K L M S Δ Π, Curss. Arm. Goth. Bas. Lucif., is a gloss. — ἐθνικοί] Elz.; Matthaei and Scholz have τελῶναι, against B D Z κ, Curss. Verss. and Fathers. Brought hither from ver. 46. — Ver. 48. ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς] Lachm. and Tisch.: ὁ οὐράνιος; also approved by Griesb., in accordance with very important witnesses. Is to be preferred; the Received reading flowed as a gloss from ver. 45.

Ver. 1. See on the Sermon on the Mount, the exposition of Tholuck, ed. 5, 1872. [Achelis, *Die Bergpredigt*, 1875.] Luther's exposition (sermons of 1530), which appeared in

1532. — τοὺς ὄχλους] see iv. 25. The evangelist does not determine either the time or place precisely, yet he by no means agrees with Luke vi. 17.—The μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ are not the *twelve apostles* (Fritzsche, Hilgenfeld), against which ix. 9 is already decisive, but, besides the first four that were selected (iv. 18 ff.) *His disciples* generally, “qui doctrinam ejus sectabantur,” Grotius. — εἰς τὸ ὄρος] The article is not indefinite: *upon a mountain* (Luther, Kuinoel), which explanation of the article is always incorrect (Bengel on xviii. 17), but also not *generic*; *upon the hilly district*, or *on the heights* (Ebrard, Bleek), as ὄρος in the singular (on the plural, comp. xviii. 12, xxiv. 16) in the N. T. is always only a *single hill*, as in classical writers; but τὸ ὄρος designates that hill *which is situated in the place, where* Jesus saw the ὄχλους. Comp. John vi. 3; Euth. Zigabenus: τὸ ὄρος τὸ πλῆσιον. Others (Fritzsche, de Wette) make it the *well-known* hill; comp. Delitzsch: “the Sinai of the New Testament;” Ewald: “the holy hill of the gospel history.” These are arbitrary presuppositions, opposed to the analogy of xiv. 23, xv. 29. It is a misuse of the article, however, to assume that in the Gospels the same mountain is always designated by τὸ ὄρος (Gfrörer, *heil. Sage*, I. p. 139; B. Bauer; Volkmar). Tradition points out the “mount of beatitudes” as near the town of *Saphet*; see Robinson, *Palestine*, III. p. 485. Comp. also Schubert, III. p. 233; Ritter, *Erdk.* XV. 1, p. 387; Keim, *Gesch. J.* II. p. 236.

Ver. 2. Ἀνοίγειν τὸ στόμα] after ἡ ἡ; Vorstius, *de Hebraïsmis*, p. 703 ff. Individual instances also amongst classical writers; Aristophanes, *Av.* 1720; Aeschylus, *Prom.* 612; Lucian, *Philops.* 33. This phrase belongs to the distinctly *descriptive* style of narrative, and denotes of itself nothing else than the opening of the mouth to speak, where the connection alone indicates whether in this descriptive element the *emphasis* of *solemnity*, of *boldness*, or the like is contained or not. Comp. on 2 Cor. vi. 11; Eph. vi. 19. Here, where the first extensive discourse of Jesus, which forms the great programme for the membership of His kingdom, follows, the *solemn* character of the moment, “He opened His mouth,” is not to be mistaken; compare xiii. 35. A similar indication



of purpose in Job iii. 1, Dan. x. 16, Acts viii. 35, x. 34, but not in Acts viii. 14. Luther well says, "There the evangelist makes a preface and shows how Christ placed Himself to deliver the sermon which He intended; that He goes up a mountain, sits down, and opens His mouth, that men may see that He was in earnest." — αὐτούς] τοὺς μαθητάς. Jesus at first directed His discourse to the entire circle of His disciples, but kept also in view the ὄχλοι, who, according to vii. 28, pressed after Him, and became hearers of the discourse; see also Luke vi. 20, vii. 1.

Vv. 3-10. *The beatitudes in general*, in order to set forth, first, in a general way, the moral conditions of future participation in the Messiah's kingdom.—"That is, indeed, a fine, sweet, friendly beginning of His teaching and sermon. For He does not proceed, like Moses, or a teacher of the law, with commands, threats, and terrors, but in a most friendly manner, with pure attractions and allurements, and pleasant promises," Luther. — μακάριοι] "Initiale hoc verbum toties repetitum indicat scopum doctrinae Christi," Bengel. *What* the blessedness is (בְּרָכָה) which He means, is stated by all the causal sentences<sup>1</sup> with ὅτι in vv. 3-10, viz. that which is based on *this*, that they will attain the *salvation of the kingdom*, which is nigh at hand. — οἱ πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι] the אֲבִינִיִּים, עֲנִיִּים (see Isa. lxi. 1, lxvi. 2, and the post-exilian Ps. xxxvii. 11) were those who, according to the theocratic promise of the O. T., had to expect the Messianic blessedness (Luke iv. 18). Jesus, however, according to Matthew, transports the idea of the *poor* (*les misérables*) from the politico-theocratic realm (the members of the oppressed people of God, sunk in poverty and external wretchedness) into the purely moral sphere by means of the dative of more precise definition, τῷ πνεύματι (comp.

<sup>1</sup> These causal sentences justify also the usual enumeration of the Makarisms as the "*seven beatitudes*." For vv. 3 and 10 contain the *same* promise, which, therefore, is to be counted only *once* in order to retain the number seven; comp. Ewald, *Jahrb.* I. p. 133; also Köstlin and Hilgenfeld. Others, like Weizsäcker and Keim, counting ver. 10 specially with the others, arrive at the number *eight*. But Delitzsch, to bring out an analogy with the Decalogue, reckons, besides the μακάριοι in ver. 11, the χαίρειτε κ. ἀγαλλ. also in ver. 12, as "*the full-sounding finale*," and in this way knows how to force out ten beatitudes.

ver. 8): the poor in reference to their spirit, the *spiritually poor*—that is, those who *feel*, as a matter of consciousness, that they are in a miserable, unhappy condition; comp. Isa. lvii. 15; Prov. xxix. 23. The *πτωχεία* intended is then *subjectively* determined according to the consciousness of the subject, so that these latter (comp. vv. 4–6) are conceived of as those *who feel within them the opposite of having enough, and of wanting nothing in a moral point of view*; to whom, consequently, the condition of moral poverty and helplessness is a familiar thing,—as the praying publican, Luke xviii. 10 (the opposite in Rev. iii. 17; 1 Cor. iv. 8), was such a poor man. We have neither to supply an “also” before τῷ πνεύματι, nor, with Baur, to explain it as if it meant οἱ πτωχοὶ, ἀλλὰ τῷ πνεύματι πλούσιοι; comp. 2 Cor. vi. 10. Chrysostom is substantially correct (comp. Theophylact): οἱ ταπεινοὶ κ. συντετριμμένοι τὴν διάνοιαν. Comp. de Wette in the *Stud. von Daub und Creuzer*, III. 2, p. 309 ff.; *de morte expiat.* p. 86 f. Jerome strikingly says: “Adjunxit spiritu, ut humilitatem intelligeres, non penuriam.” Comp. ὑψηλὸς πνεύματι, Eccles. vii. 8. They are not different from the μὴ βλέποντες in John ix. 39. They know that in point of knowledge and moral constitution they are far from divine truth. The declaration that such are blessed, however, at the beginning of the Sermon on the Mount, is in perfect accordance with the *fundamental condition* of participation in the kingdom of the Messiah, the μεταναεῖτε, with the call to which both Jesus and John began their public appearance. The *πτωχεία* τῷ πνεύματι is the precondition of *πλουτεῖν εἰς θεόν* (Luke xii. 21), and of becoming a true *πλούσιος* τῷ πνεύματι (Barnabas 19). These poor people *are* humble, but we are not to say that *πτωχ. τ. πν.* signifies the humble (in answer to Kuinoel and older interpreters); for which reason we have not to appeal to Isa. lxvi. 2, where מַתְנִי does not agree with חֲסִיד. Fritzsche, in a way that is not in harmony with the moral nature and life of the whole discourse, limits the meaning to that of *discernment*: “Homines ingenio et eruditione parum florentes;” so also Chr. Fritzsche, *Nov. Opusc.* p. 241, in which meaning (consequently equivalent to οἱ πτωχοὶ τῇ διανοίᾳ, 18

Origen, *de princ.* iv. 22, calls the Ebionites) the saying was already made a subject of ridicule by Julian. Older Catholics (Maldonatüs and Corn. a Lapide), after Clement of Alexandria and many Fathers, taking πνεύματι of the *self-determination*, misused our passage in support of the vow of *voluntary poverty*. On the other hand, Calovius strikingly remarks: "Paupertas haec spiritualis non est *consilii*, sed *praecepti*." Others (Olearius, Michaelis, Paulus) connect τῷ πνεύματι with μακάριοι: *the poor are spiritually happy*. Opposed to this is the position of the words and ver. 8. Moreover, no example is found in the N. T. or in the Jewish writings, where, in the case of beatitudes, to the μακάριος, or אֲשֶׁרִי, or בְּרֵכִי, any more precise designation of fortune was immediately subjoined. Comp. especially, Knapp, *Scripta var. arg.* pp. 351–380. According to Köstlin, p. 66, the τῷ πνεύματι, which is not expressly read in the Clementines (see Homily xv. 10) and Polycrates ii. (as also τὴν δικαιοσ. ver. 6), is said to be a limiting addition proceeding from later reflection, one of the many changes which must be assumed as having taken place in the original collection of discourses; comp. also Hilgenfeld, Ewald, Bleek, Wittichen, *Jahrb. f. D. Theol.* 1862, p. 323; Holtzmann, p. 176; Schenkel, and others. But see on Luke vi. 23. — ἡ βασιλ. τ. οὐρ.] *the kingdom of heaven* belongs to them (see on iii. 2), namely, as a certain possession *in the future*. Comp. the following *futures*. Observe in all the beatitudes, vv. 3–10, the symmetrically emphatical position of αὐτῶν, αὐτοί; *it is just they who*.

Ver. 4. Οἱ πενθοῦντες] Comp. Isa. lxi. 2, lvii. 17 f. After Chrysostom, these have frequently been understood as those who mourned over their own *sins* and those of others. These are not excluded, but they are not exclusively or specially meant by the general expression (Keim). They are generally *those who are in suffering and distress*. Think, for example, of Lazarus, of the persecuted Christians (John xvi. 20; Heb. xii. 11), of the suffering repentant ones (2 Cor. vii. 9), and so on; for that no unchristian πενθεῖν, no λύπη τοῦ κόσμου, is meant, is (2 Cor. vii. 10) understood of itself from the whole surroundings. The πενθοῦντες shall, Rom. viii. 18,

2 Cor. iv. 17, John xiv. 13, be *comforted* as a matter of fact in the Messiah's kingdom by the enjoyment of its blessedness (Luke ii. 25, xvi. 25), therefore the Messiah Himself is also called מְנַחֵם (Schoettgen, *Hor.* II. p. 18; Wetstein, I. p. 665). According to the beatitudes, which all refer to the Messiah's kingdom, there is no mention of *temporal* comfort by the promise of the forgiveness of sins, and so on. This in answer to Kienlen in the *Stud. u. Kritik.* 1848, p. 681.

Ver. 5. According to Ps. xxxvii. 11, where the LXX. have οἱ δὲ πραεῖς κληρονομήσουσι γῆν. The πραεῖς (xi. 29, xxi. 5) are the *calm, meek sufferers* relying on God's help, who, without bitterness or revenge as the ταπεινοὶ κ. ἡσύχιοι (Isa. lxvi. 2), suffer the cruelties of their tyrants and oppressors. The opposite is χαλεποί (Plat. *Pol.* vi. p. 493 B), πικροί (Dem. 315, 5), ἄγριοι, and the like; Plat. *Def.* p. 412 D: πραότης κατάστασις κινήσεως τῆς ὑπ' ὀργῆς κῶσις ψυχῆς σύμμετρος. Comp. 1 Pet. iii. 4. The very ancient popular (Gen. xv. 7 f.) theocratic conception: *to come into possession of the land* (of Palestine) (in Ps. xxxvii.: after the expulsion of their haughty enemies), has been raised to its antitypical Christian idea, so that *the Messiah's kingdom* and the receiving possession of it is intended. Comp. on Gal. iii. 18; Eph. i. 11.

Ver. 6. Concerning πεινῶν and διψῶν, which regularly govern the genitive *with the accusative*, where the object is conceived as that which endures the action, see examples of this rare use in Kypke, *Obs.* I. p. 17; Loesner, *Obs.* p. 11; and especially Winer, p. 192 [E. T. 256]. The metaphorical meaning (Isa. lv. 1; Ps. xlii. 3; Sir. li. 24) of the verbs is that of *longing desire*. See Pricaeus and Wetstein *in loc.*; as regards διψῶ, also Jacobs, *ad Anthol.* VI. p. 26, VIII. p. 233. The δικαιοσύνη, however, is the *righteousness*, the establishment of which was the aim of Christ's work, and the condition of participation in the Messiah's kingdom. They are designated as such whose "great earnestness, desire, and fervour" (Luther) are directed towards a moral constitution free from guilt. Luther, besides, strikingly draws attention to this, that before all these portions of the beatitudes, "faith must first be there as the tree and headpiece or sum" of

righteousness. — *χορτασθήσονται*] not generally *regni Messiani felicitate* (Fritzsche), but, as the context requires, *δικαιοσύνης*: they will obtain righteousness in full measure, namely, in being declared to be righteous (Rom. v. 19; Gal. v. 5, and remarks thereon) at the judgment of the Messiah (Matt. xxv. 34), and then live for ever in perfect righteousness, so that God will be all in all (1 Cor. xv. 28). Comp. 2 Pet. iii. 13. On the *figurative* *χορτάζ.*, Ps. xvii. 15, cvii. 9.

Ver. 7. *Οἱ ἐλεήμονες*] *the compassionate* (Heb. ii. 17; Hom. *Od.* v. 191) in general, not, as de Wette arbitrarily limits it, in opposition to the desire for revenge and cruelty *against the heathen*, which were contained in the ordinary Messianic hopes. — *ἐλεηθήσονται*] that is, in this way, that they get assigned to them the salvation of the Messiah's kingdom, which will be the highest act of the divine *compassion*, Luke i. 72; Rom. ix. 16, v. 17. The divine maxim, which lies at the foundation of the statement, Matt. vii. 2, xxv. 35. Kienlen is wrong when he says the *ἐλεηθ.* refers to the forgiveness of the sins which still cleave even to the regenerate; it points to this, that the entire bestowal of Messianic salvation is the work of divine grace, which follows in its procedure its own moral rules (faith working by love).

Ver. 8. *Οἱ καθαροὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ*] denotes the *moral blamelessness of the inner life*, the centre of which is the heart, in conformity with the view that *πᾶσα ἁμαρτία ῥύπον ἐτίθησι τῇ ψυχῇ*, Origen, *Hom. in Joh.* lxxiii. 2. Comp. Ps. lxxiii. 1, xxiv. 4; 1 Tim. i. 5, iii. 9; Plat. *Crat.* p. 403 E, *ψυχὴ καθάρᾳ*, p. 405 B, *al.* How this purity is actually attained (by justification and the sanctification of believers) remains even now left over to the future. — *τὸν θεὸν ὁψονται*] certainly refers, according to the analogy of all the other beatitudes, to the *αἰὼν μέλλων*, but is not (in accordance with the Oriental idea of great good fortune in being an intimate friend of the king's, 1 Kings x. 8; Esth. i. 14) to be taken as a typical designation of the *Messianic happiness in general* (Kuinoel, Fritzsche, and others), nor as an *inward* seeing of God (*knowledge, becoming conscious of God, inmost fellowship with God*), as de Wette also understood it to mean direct

*spiritual* fellowship with God here on earth and there in heaven; but, as the words do not allow us to understand it differently: *of the seeing of God who gloriously reveals Himself in the Messiah's kingdom, a seeing which will be attained in the condition of the glorified body*, Rev. vii. 15, xxii. 4; 1 John iii. 2; Heb. xii. 14. Passages like Ex. xxxiii. 20, John i. 18, vi. 46, Col. i. 15, Rom. i. 20, 1 Tim. vi. 16, are not opposed to it, because they refer to seeing with the earthly eye. The seeing of God, who, although Spirit (John iv. 24), has His essential form of manifestation (Phil. ii. 6), will one day be the consummation of the *προσαγωγή* obtained through Christ (Rom. v. 2). Comp. Clem. *Hom.* xvii. 7.

Ver. 9. *Οἱ εἰρηνοποιοί*] not the *peaceful* (*εἰρηνικοί*, Jas. iii. 17, 2 Macc. v. 25; or *εἰρηνεύοντες*, Sir. vi. 7), a meaning which does not appear even in Pollux, i. 41, 152 (Augustine thinks of the *moral inner harmony*; de Wette, on the contrary, of the inclination of the contemporaries of Jesus to war and tumult; Bleek reminds us of Jewish party hatred), but: *the founders of peace* (Xen. *Hist. Gr.* vi. 3. 4; Plut. *Mor.* p. 279 B; comp. Col. i. 20; Prov. x. 10), who as such minister to God's good pleasure, who is the God of peace (Rom. xvi. 20; 2 Cor. xiii. 11), as Christ Himself was the highest Founder of peace (Luke ii. 14; John xvi. 33; Eph. ii. 14 ff.). — *υἱοὶ θεοῦ κληθήσ.*] again a characteristic designation of *community in the future kingdom of the Messiah*, so far, namely, as the participators in it have obtained the *υιοθεσία*, a relation which begins with their reception into the kingdom; comp. on Luke vi. 35. If we import the conception of *being loved by God* (Kuinoel), or of *resemblance to God* (Paulus, de Wette), and the like, then we are not in harmony with the expression, and, contrary to the context, we identify it with the conception of the *temporal* Sonship of God, as it appears in John as a being begotten by God; in Paul, as adoption; see John i. 12, 14. Certainly this temporal Sonship is the moral premiss of that future one; but it is only the latter which can here be meant; comp. Rom. viii. 19, 23. — *κληθήσονται*] What they *are* is designated as expressly *recognised* by the (honourable) name in question, by which they are called. That *καλεῖσθαι* does

not stand for *εἶναι*, see Fritzsche on i. 16 ; Winer, p. 571 f. [E. T. 769]. Comp. Eur. *Hec.* 625 : ὁ δ' ἐν πολίταις τίμιος κεκλημένος ; and Pflugk on the passage ; Hom. *Il.* ii. 260 ; and Nägelsbach *in loc.*

REMARK.—In the beatitudes, vv. 3–9, the various characteristic designations of the Messianic happiness ingeniously correspond to the various designations of the subject, so that in the first declaration, ver. 3, the subject of the promise, the kingdom of the Messiah, is named expressly, and *as a whole*, and in the following it is always those *individual* sides of the happiness of this kingdom that are brought forward which correspond to the subjects designated. Thus, to those who mourn corresponds the state of being comforted ; to the patient sufferers, who now allow themselves to be oppressed, the future condition of possession and mastership ; to the hungry, that of being filled ; to the merciful, the receiving of mercy ; to the pure in heart, the seeing of God, of which no impure person is capable ; to the founders of peace, the sonship of God, who Himself in His own Son has reconciled men to Himself, and to one another. Merely different beams of light from the same glory. At the close, after the seven independent beatitudes, in ver. 10, which is the foundation and transition to the following direct address, the Messiah's kingdom is once more *expressly named, and as a whole*, as in the beginning, ver. 3. In this way vv. 3–10 form *an ingenious and profound harmonious whole*. To this unity and completeness belongs also the *series of the subjects*, which, *taken together*, set forth the whole *position* (vv. 3–5) and the whole *endeavours and life* (vv. 6–9) of the future member of the kingdom. For as to his *position*, he is full of *lowly feeling* (ver. 3), a *bearer of suffering* (ver. 4), in *quiet patience* (ver. 5). But as to his *endeavours and life* : full of *fervour after moral perfection* (ver. 6), he cherishes towards others the feeling of compassionate love (ver. 7), and by the *purity of heart* which he attains (ver. 8), his outward actions tend towards *peace* (ver. 9), whether he also suffer *persecution* (this by way of transition to ver. 11) for righteousness' sake—all springing from the one root, faith in his Lord.

Ver. 10. Comp. 1 Pet. iii. 14, iv. 14. — δικαιούν., as in ver. 6 ἐνεκ. δικ., is, as to substance, not different from ἐνεκεν ἐμοῦ, ver. 11. In communion with Christ there is righteousness, and in this ἐνεκεν ἐμοῦ is expressed the full *Messianic*

consciousness,<sup>1</sup> the certain holy self-feeling of which for the persecuted begins (Acts ix. 4).—To take the αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλ. τ. οὐρ. differently from ver. 3 (Kienlen in *d. Stud. u. Krit.* 1848, p. 678 : ver. 3 is the entrance into the kingdom of God ; ver. 10, the consummation in the same, comp. Lange) is purely arbitrary. See rather the preceding remark.

Vv. 11, 12. Comp. Isa. li. 7 ff. Application of ver. 10 to the disciples. To explain ὀνειδίζειν, *to make reproaches* (Wurm, *Dinarch.* p. 77), and διώκειν (comp. 1 Cor. iv. 12), with Beza, Raphel, and Wolf, of indignities and accusations *before the court*, is an unwarrantable limitation. The whole of the hostility which is to assail His disciples stands even now before the soul of the Lord, and He prepares them for it ; there is accordingly no reason to see in vv. 10–12 an addition by the evangelist (Hilgenfeld).—The ψευδόμενοι, which is to be defended as genuine (see the critical remarks), easily and appropriately connects itself with καθ' ὑμῶν, so that the latter forms with ἔνεκεν ἐμοῦ an emphatic correlative ; the whole participial definition, however, from εἰπωσι to ῥῆμα, is appended as a statement of modality, “in their speaking falsely against you for my sake”—that is, because you belong to me, which is their motive for making lying statements against you. On ψεύδεσθαι with κατά, *contra*, comp. Jas. iii. 14 ; often thus amongst Greek writers.

Ver. 12. Ὁ μισθός] comp. κατεργάζεται, 2 Cor. iv. 17, and remarks thereon. The article denotes : the reward which is *destined, kept in readiness* for you (Matt. xxv. 34 ; Col. i. 5), and that for the indignities, persecutions, and lies borne through faith in me.—ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς] is great in heaven. A reference to the *book of life* (Fritzsche, Gratz), Phil. iv. 3, Rev. iii. 5, xx. 15, xxi. 27, Dan. xii. 1, is not yielded by the text, which only presents the idea that the reward is *laid up in heaven* until the future communication of it, which

<sup>1</sup> This putting forward the person as Lord and Master is, in Weizsäcker's view, p. 151, a reason for regarding ver. 11 f. as a later explanation to the original text. But even in the whole train of the discourse that follows from ver. 17 onwards, such a personal assertion comes out strongly enough ; comp. especially the constant symmetrical recurrence of ἐγὼ δι' λίγω ὑμῖν, and immediately in ver. 17 the expression of the Messianic consciousness, ἦλθον, κ. τ. λ.



begins with the establishment of the kingdom, and therefore not *ἔσται*, but *ἐστί*, is to be supplied; and this is to be taken not as irrespective of time (de Wette), but as present. — *γάρ*] assigns the reason from the recognised certainty (x. 41) that to the *prophets*, who formerly were persecuted in like manner (xxiii. 29 ff.), great reward is reserved in heaven for future communication in the kingdom of the Messiah.—The *prophets* (comp. vii. 52) are a typical example for the disciples. On the *conception* of *μισθός*, which *κατὰ χάριν λογίζεται* (Rom. iv. 4), comp. xx. 1 ff.; Luke xvii. 10; see generally Weiss in *d. Deutsch. Zeitschr.* 1853, p. 40 ff.; *Bibl. Theol.* p. 104 ff.

Vv. 13–16. The course of thought: The more important and influential your destined calling is, all the less ought you to allow yourselves to be dispirited, and to become faithless to your calling through indignities and persecutions; you are the *salt* and the *light*! Weizsäcker rightly claims for this section (in answer to Holtzmann, Weiss) originality in this connection, in which it attaches itself with great significance to the last beatitude and its explanation.

Ver. 13. *Τὸ ἅλας τῆς γῆς*] A figure of the power which counteracts corruption, and preserves in a sound condition—the effect which salt has upon water (2 Kings ii. 20), meat, and such like. Thus the ministry of the disciples was destined by the communication of the divine truth to oppose the spiritual corruption and powerlessness of men, and to be the means of bringing about their moral soundness and power of life. An allusion to the use of salt *in sacrifices* (Mark ix. 49) is not hinted at here (in answer to Tholuck). Comp. rather Col. iv. 6; Theodoret, Heracleon (in Cramer, *Cat.* p. 33): *ἅλας τ. γῆς ἐστὶν τὸ ψυχικὸν ἄρτυμα*. Without this salt humanity would have fallen a prey to spiritual *φθορά*. Fritzsche, overlooking the positive *efficacy* of salt, derives the figure only from its *indispensable nature*. Observe, moreover, how the expression *τῆς γῆς*, as a designation of the *mass* of the inhabitants of the earth, who are to be worked upon by the salt, is as appropriately selected for this figure as *τοῦ κόσμου* for the following one. And Jesus thus even now throws down the thought of *universal* destination into the souls of

the disciples as a spark to be preserved. — *μωρανθῆ]* will have become savourless, Mark ix. 50: *ἀναλον γένηται*; Dioscorides in Wetstein: *ρίζαι γευσάμενῳ μωραί*. — *ἐν τίνι ἀλισθήσεται*;] by what means will it again receive its salting power? Theophylact: *διορθωθήσεται*. Laying figures aside: If you, through failing to preserve the powers bestowed upon you, and by allowing them to perish, become in despondency and torpidity [unfaithful to your destiny and unfitted for your calling, how will you raise yourselves again to the power and efficiency appropriate to your vocation, which you have lost.<sup>1</sup> Your uselessness for your calling will then be an *irreparabile damnum*! “Non enim datur sal salis,” Jansen. Grotius well says, “ipsi emendare alios debebant, non autem exspectare, ut ab aliis ipsi emendarentur.” Augustine, *de serm. in mont.* i. 16. Luther differently: *Wherewith shall one salt*? Erasmus, *Paraphr.*: “quid tandem erit reliquum, quo multitudinis insulsa vita condiatur?” Putting figure aside: Who, then, will supply your place? However appropriate in itself this meaning might be, nevertheless *εἰς οὐδὲν ἰσχύει* stands opposed to it.<sup>2</sup> See also Mark ix. 50. — *ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρ.]* ab hominibus “*obviis quibusque*,” Bengel.

Ver. 14. *Τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου]* As the natural light illumines the world, which in itself is dark, so are ye intended to spiritually enlighten humanity. Christ is *principaliter* the Light (John i. 4, ix. 8, xii., *al.*); the disciples *mediate* (Eph.

<sup>1</sup> Whether the salt can really become quite insipid and without power, and thus lose its essential property, is not at all the question. Jesus puts the case. We need not therefore either appeal, with Paulus, to the salt which has been exposed to the weather and become tasteless, which Maundrell (*Reise nach Pal.* p. 162; Rosenmüller, *Morgenland, in loc.*) found in the district of Aleppo, or make out of the common cooking salt, *saltpetre* (Altmann, Vriemoot), or *asphalt* (v. d. Hardt, Schoettgen), or *sea-salt* (Ebrard).

<sup>2</sup> This *εἰς οὐδὲν ἰσχύει*, etc., clearly sets forth its utter uselessness for the purpose for which it was designed, not the exclusion from the community, or the being rejected by Christ (Luther, Chemnitz, and others), to which the idea, “it is fit for nothing but,” is not appropriate. It would be different if Christ had said *βλῆθήσεται ἔξω*, etc. Theophylact understands exclusion from the dignity of teacher; Chrysostom, Erasmus, and others, the most supreme contempt.—Observe, moreover, that the expression *ἰσχύει* (has power for nothing except, etc.), and so on, contains an *acumen* in its relation to the following passive *βλῆθῆναι*, etc.

iii. 9), as the mediators of His divine truth to men ; and all Christians in general are, as those who are enlightened, also, on their part, bringers of light, and light in the Lord (Phil. ii. 15 ; Eph. v. 8). — οὐ δύναται πόλις, κ.τ.λ.] If you would desire timidly to withdraw into concealment (comp. vv. 11, 13), then that would be conduct as opposed to the purpose for which you are destined as if a town set on a hill should wish to be concealed, or if one were to place (ver. 15) a light under a bushel. — No *definite* town is intended ; Saphet has been conjectured ; see, on the other hand, Robinson, *Pal.* III. p. 587. We are not to think of *Jerusalem* (whose destination the disciples are, in the opinion of Weizsäcker, to realize, p. 336). It is just any city *in general situated upon a hill*.

Ver. 15. Ὑπὸ τοῦ μόδιου] Fulgentius, iii. 6 : "*lucernamque modio contegit.*" The article denotes the grain measure *that is at hand in the house*. On μόδιος, comp. Plut. *Demetr.* 33. It was one-sixth of the μέδιμνος, the μέδιμνος, according to Boeckh, 2602 Paris cubic inches [nearly 12 gallons English]. What *Hebrew* measure did Jesus mention ? most probably *ἡκάρ*, as in Mark xiii. 33.—The καί is the *consecutivum* : *and*, and thus, that is, placed upon the candlestick ; comp. iv. 19 ; Maetzner, *ad Lycurgum*, p. 253. On the *lamps* which were in domestic use, and the *candlesticks* upon which they were placed, see as regards the Greeks, Hermann, *Privatalterth.* xx. 23 ; Becker, *Charikl.* II. p. 214 ff. ; as to the Greek expression *λυχνία*, Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 313.

Ver. 16. Οὕτω] like a burning lamp upon its stand. — τὸ φῶς ὑμῶν] the light, of which you are the trusted possessors. This *shines before men*, if the disciples come forward publicly in their office with fidelity and courage, do not draw back, but spread abroad the gospel boldly and freely. — ὅπως ἴδωσιν ὑμῶν, κ.τ.λ.] *that they may see the excellent works done by you*. These are not their virtues in general, but, in accordance with the whole context from ver. 11, their *ministry* as faithful to its obligations, their *specific works as disciples*, which, however, are also of a *moral* nature. — καὶ δοξάσωσι, κ.τ.λ.] *that He has made you fit* (2 Cor. iii. 5) *to perform such works, they must recognise Him as their author* ; comp. ix. 8 ;

1 Pet. ii. 12. The opposite, Rom. ii. 24. — τ. πατ. ὑμῶν τ. ἐν τοῖς οὐρ.] see on vi. 9. This designation of God, which Christ gives forth from the fundamental standpoint of His gospel, already presupposes instructions previously given to the disciples upon the point. Observe, moreover, that here it is not ὑμῶν which, as formerly, has the emphasis.

Vv. 17-48. Messianic *fulfilment* of the law by the setting forth of which Jesus now, after He had made clear to the disciples their high destiny, desired to establish before all other things *the relation of His ministry to the religion of the Old Testament*, introducing it, indeed, with μὴ νομίσητε, κτλ.; because the thought of an *abrogation* of the law by the Messiah (which was actually current among the Jews, upon the basis of Jer. xxxi. 31, see Gfrörer, *Jahrb. d. Heils*, II. p. 341), and therefore with a renewal of religion from the very foundation, might easily suggest itself so as to become highly injurious, and might give to the work of the disciples themselves an altogether perverted direction, as it was, moreover, maliciously laid hold of by their enemies in order to accuse the Lord (xxvi. 61) and His disciples (Acts vi. 14, xxi. 21). The more designedly Jesus introduces and carries through this part (of His discourse), the less does it suffice to assume the occasion thereto as arising from the law retiring into the background in His daily life, and from a neglect of the law thus inferred (Keim); or from this, that Jesus was accustomed to set out, not from the law, but from the universal truths of faith, from testimonies of nature and life (Weizsäcker, p. 346). In this way the twice sharply emphasized “destroy” especially would appear altogether out of proportion.

Ver. 17.<sup>1</sup> A connection with what precedes is not to be

<sup>1</sup> Special writings upon the passage :—Baumgarten, *doctrina J. Ch. de lege Mos. ex oral. mont.* 1838; Harnack, *Jesus d. Christ oder der Erfüller d. Gesetzes*, 1842; J. E. Meyer, *über d. Verhältn. Jesu und seiner Jünger zum alttest. Gesetz.* 1853. See especially, Ritschl, *altkathol. K.* p. 35 ff.; Bleek in *d. Stud. u. Krit.* 1853, p. 304; Lechler, *ibidem*, 1854, p. 787 ff.; Weiss, *ibidem*, 1858, p. 50 ff., and *bibl. Theol.* § 27; Ewald, *Jahrb.* X. p. 114 ff. The collection of sayings is to be simply regarded as the source of this section, not any special treatise upon the position of Jesus towards that law (Holtzmann); comp. Weiss in *d. Stud. u. Krit.* 1864, p. 56 f.

artificially sought out. Jesus breaks off and introduces the *new section without any intermediate remarks*, which corresponds precisely to its pre-eminent importance (for He shows how the *Christian δικαιοσύνη*, having its root in that of the *Old Testament*, is its consummation). On *μὴ νομίσ. ὅτι ἦλθ.*, comp. x. 34. — ἧ] never stands for *καί* (see Winer, p. 410 [E. T. 549 f.]; comp. on 1 Cor. xi. 27), but is always *distinctive*. Here, to abrogate the one or the other. I have to abrogate neither that nor this. The *νόμος* is the divine *institute* of the law, which has its *original document* in the Pentateuch. The further Old Testament revelation, in so far as its final aim is the Messiah and His work, is represented by *οἱ προφῆται*, who make up its principal part; accordingly, *ὁ νόμος* and *οἱ προφῆται* summarily denote the *whole Old Testament revelation* (comp. Luke xvi. 6), partly as a living divine economy, as here; partly as *γραφή*, as in Luke xxiv. 27; Acts xxiv. 14, xxviii. 23; Rom. iii. 21. Moreover, in the expression *τοὺς προφῆτας* we are not to think of their *predictions as such* (the Greek Fathers, Augustine, Beza, Calovius, and others; also Tholuck, Neander, Harnack, Bleek, Lechler, Schegg, and others), as nobody could imagine that *their* abrogation was to be expected from the Messiah, but, as the connection with *νόμος* shows (and comp. vii. 12, xxii. 40; Luke xvi. 29), and as is in keeping with the manner in which the idea is carried out in the following verses, their contents as *commands*, in which respect the prophets have carried on the development of the law in an ethical manner (Ritschl, *altkath. Kirche*, p. 36 f.). In *νόμος*, however, to think merely of the *moral law* is erroneous, as it always signifies the *entire law*, and the distinction between the ritualistic, civil, and moral law is modern; comp. on Rom. iii. 20. If, afterwards, sentences are given from the *moral law*, yet these are only quotations by way of illustration from the *whole*, from which, however, the *moral precepts* very naturally suggested themselves for quotations, because the idea of righteousness is before the mind. He has fulfilled the *entire law*, and in so doing has not destroyed the slightest provision of the ritualistic or civil code, so far as its *general moral idea* is concerned, but precisely *everything* which

the law prescribes is raised to an ideal, of which the old legal commands are only *στοιχεῖα*. Theophylact well illustrates the matter by the instance of a silhouette, which the painter οὐ καταλύει, but carries out to *completion*, ἀναπληροῖ. — *καταλῦσαι*] often employed by classical writers to denote the dissolution of existing constitutions (specially also of the abrogation of laws, Isocr. p. 129 E; Polyb. iii. 8. 2), which are thereby rendered non-existent and invalid; comp. 2 Macc. ii. 22; John vii. 23; also νόμον καταργεῖν, Rom. iii. 31; ἀθετεῖν, Heb. x. 28; Gal. iii. 15.—The πλήρωσις of the law and the prophets is their fulfilment by the re-establishment of their *absolute* meaning, so that now nothing more is wanting to what they ought to be in accordance with the divine ideas which lie at the foundation of their commands. *It is the perfect development of their ideal reality out of the positive form, in which the same is historically apprehended and limited.* So substantially, Luther, Calvin (comp. before them Chrysostom; he, however, introduces what is incongruous), Lightfoot, Hammond, Paulus, Gratz, de Wette, Olshausen, Ritschl, Ewald, Weiss, Hilgenfeld; likewise Schleiermacher, *L. J.* p. 314 ff., and others. Comp. Tholuck (who, however, brings together the too varying elements of different explanations), also Kahnis, *Dogmat.* I. p. 474, who understands it as the development of what is not completed into something higher, which preserves the substance of the lower. This explanation, which makes absolute the righteousness enjoined and set forth in the law and the prophets, is converted into a certainty by the two verses that follow. The matter is represented by πληρ. as a *making complete* (John xv. 11; 2 Cor. x. 6), in opposition to καταλῦσαι, which expresses the *not allowing the thing to remain*. Others (Bretschneider, Fritzsche): *facere quae de Messia prescripta sunt*; others (Käuffer, B. Crusius, Bleek, Lechler, Weizsäcker, after Beza, Elsner, Vorst, Wolf, and many older interpreters): *legi satisfacere*, as in Rom. xiii. 8, where, in reference to the *prophets*, πληρ. is taken in the common sense of the fulfilment of the *prophecies* (see specially, Euth. Ziga-benus, Calovius, and Bleek), but thereby introducing a reference which is not merely *opposed to the context* (see ver. 18 f.), but

also an unendurable *twofold* reference of *πληρ.*<sup>1</sup> Luther well says: "Christ is speaking of the *fulfilment*, and so deals with *doctrines*, in like manner as He calls '*destroying*' a not acting with works against the law, but a breaking off from the law with the *doctrine*." The fulfilling is "showing the right kernel and understanding, that they may learn what the law is and desires to have." — *I did not come to destroy, but to fulfil*; the object is understood of itself, but the declaration delivered in this *general* way is more solemn without the addition of the pronoun.

REMARK.—The Apostle Paul worked quite in the sense of our passage; his writings are full of the fulfilment of the law in the sense in which Christ means it; and his doctrine of its abrogation refers only to its validity for justification to the exclusion of faith. It is without any ground, therefore, that this passage, and especially vv. 18 f., have been regarded by Baur (*neutest. Theol.* p. 55) as *Judaistic*, and supposed not to have proceeded in this form from Jesus, whom, rather in opposition to the higher standpoint already gained by Him, (Schenkel), the Apostle Matthew has apprehended and edited in so *Judaistic* a manner (Köstlin, p. 55 f.), or the supposed Matthew has made to speak in so anti-Pauline a way (Gfrörer, *h. Sage*, II. p. 84); according to Hilgenfeld, in his *Zeitschr.* 1867, p. 374, ver. 17 is indeed original, but in accordance with the view of the Hebrew gospel; vv. 18 f., however, is an anti-Pauline addition; Weizsäcker sees in ver. 19 only an interpolation; but Schenkel finds in vv. 18 f. the proud assertion of the Pharisee, not Jesus' own conviction. Paul did not advance beyond this declaration (comp. Planck in *d. theol. Jahrb.* 1847, p. 268 ff.), but he applied his right understanding boldly and freely, and

<sup>1</sup> Vitringa, who compares נִסְּךְ, even brings out the meaning "*to expound*." The explanation of Kuinoel goes back to the *legi satisfacere*, but gives as meaning, *docendo vivendoque stabilire*. Comp. Keim, "to teach the law, to do it, and to impose it." The older dogmatic exegetes, who explained it by *satisfacere*, here found the *satisfactio activa*. See, for example, Er. Schmid and Calovius; recently, Philippi, *vom thät. Gehors. Chr.* p. 34; Baumgarten, p. 15. On the other hand, B. Crusius and also Tholuck. According to Bleek, p. 304, Christ has fulfilled the moral law by His sinless life, the ceremonial law by His sacrificial death, by means of which the prophecies also are fulfilled. According to Lechler, Jesus fulfils the law as *doer*, by His holy life and sacrificial death; as *teacher*, in teaching mankind rightly to understand and fulfil the commandments.

in so doing the breaking up of the old form by the new spirit could not but necessarily begin, as Jesus Himself clearly recognised (comp. ix. 16; John iv. 21, 23 f.) and set forth to those who believed in His own person and His completed righteousness (comp. Ritschl). But even in this self-representation of Christ the new principle is not severed from the O. T. piety, but is the highest fulfilment of the latter, its antitypical consummation, its realized ideal. Christianity itself is in so far a law. Comp. Wittichen, p. 328; Holtzmann, p. 457 f.; Weizsäcker, p. 348 f.; see also on Rom. iii. 27; Gal. vi. 2; 1 Cor. ix. 21.

Ver. 18. Ἀμὴν γὰρ λέγω ὑμῖν] *for verily* (ἀμὴν = ἀληθῶς, Luke ix. 27), that is, agreeably to the truth, *do I tell you.* What He now says serves as a *confirmation* of what preceded. This form of assurance, so frequently in the mouth of *Christ*, the bearer of divine truth, is not found in any *apostle*. — ἕως ἂν παρέλθῃ, κ.τ.λ.] *until heaven and earth shall have passed away.* These words of Jesus do not indicate a terminus, after which the law shall *no longer* exist (Paulus, Neander, Lechler, Schleiermacher, Planck, Weizsäcker, and others), but He says: *onwards to the destruction of the world the law will not lose its validity in the slightest point*, by which popular expression (Luke xvi. 17; Job xiv. 12) the duration of the law *after* the final catastrophe of the world is neither taught nor excluded. That the law, however, fulfilled as to its ideal nature, will endure in the new world, is clear from 1 Cor. xiii. 3 (ἀγάπη); 1 Pet. i. 25; 2 Pet. iii. 3 (δικαιοσύνη). The *unending* authority of the law is also taught by Bar. iv. 1; Tob. i. 6; Philo, *vit. Mos.* ii. p. 656; Joseph. *c. Ap.* ii. 38, and the Rabbins. See Bereschith *R.* x. 1, “omni rei suus finis, coelo et terrae suus finis, una excepta re, cui non suus finis, haec est lex.” Schemoth *R.* vi., “nulla litera aboletur a lege in aeternum.” Midrash *Cohel.* f. 71, 4, (lex) “perpetuo manebit in secula seculorum.” The passage in 1 Cor. xv. 28 is not opposed to our explanation; for if God is all in all, the *fulfilled law of God* yet stands in its *absolute authority*. — ἕως ἂν πάντα γένηται] *not: until all the prophecies are fulfilled*, that would then be down to the Parousia (Wetstein, J. E. Meyer, comp. Ewald); nor even till all is carried out theocratically which I have



to perform (Paulus), or what lies shut up in the divine decree (Köstlin), or even until the event shall occur by means of which the observance of the law becomes impossible, and it falls away of itself (Schleiermacher); but, in keeping with the context, *until all which the law requires shall be accomplished* (vi. 10), nothing any longer left unobserved. This sentence is not co-ordinate to the first *ἕως*, but *subordinate* (Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* i. 2. 36): "So long as the world stands shall no iota<sup>1</sup> of the law pass away till all its prescriptions shall be realized." *All* the requirements of the law shall be fulfilled; but before this fulfilment of all shall have begun,<sup>2</sup> not a single iota of the law shall fall till the end of the world. Fritzsche: *till all* (only in thought) *is accomplished*. He assumes, accordingly, agreeably to the analogous use of conditional sentences (Heindorf and Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Phaed.* p. 67 E; Kühner, II. 2, p. 988 f.), a double protasis: (1) *ἕως ἂν παρέλθῃ, κ.τ.λ.*, and (2) *ἕως . . . γένηται*. But the parallel passages, Matt. xxiv. 34, Luke xxi. 32, are already opposed to this; and after the concrete and lively *ἕως ἂν παρέλθῃ ὁ οὐρανὸς κ. ἡ γῆ*, this general and indefinite *ἕως ἂν πάντα γένηται* would be only a vague and lumbering addition. As correlative to *εἰν* and *μία, πάντα* can only mean *all portions of the law*, without, however, *any definite point of time* requiring to be thought of, in which all the commands of the law will be carried out, according to which, then, the duration of the

<sup>1</sup> *Ἰῶτα*, the *smallest* letter, and *κεφαλαία*, *horn*, a little stroke of writing (Plut. *Mor.* p. 1100 A, 1011 D), especially also in single letters (Origen, *ad Ps.* xxxiii.), by which, for example, the following letters are distinguished, Ϛ and ϛ, ϗ and ϙ, ϓ and ϕ. See Lightfoot, Schoettgen, and Wetstein. Both expressions denote the smallest portions of the law; see ver. 19.

<sup>2</sup> In this is contained the *perpetually* abiding obligation of the law; for that condition of things, in which *no* part of the law remains unfulfilled, in which, consequently, all is accomplished, will *never* occur until the end of the world. Of the *πάντα*, moreover, *nothing* is to be excluded which the law contains, not even the *ritualistic* portions, which are to be *morally* fulfilled in their ideal meaning, as *e.g.* the Levitical prescription regarding purification by moral purification, the sacrificial laws by moral self-sacrifice (comp. Rom. xii. 1), and so on, so that in the connection of the whole, in accordance with the idea of *πλήρωσις*, not even the smallest element will perish, but retains its importance and its integral moral connection with the whole. Comp. Tholuck; Gess, *Christi Pers. und Werk*, I. p. 292; and before him, Calvin on ver. 17.

present condition of the world would be conformed. This thought is rendered impossible by the nearness of the Parousia, according to xxiv. 29, 34, as well as by the growth of the tares until the Parousia, according to xiii. 30. The thought is rather, *the law will not lose its binding obligation, which reaches on to the final realization of all its prescriptions, so long as heaven and earth remain.* — Observe, moreover, that the expression in our passage is different from xxiv. 35, where the permanency of the λόγοι of Christ after the end of the world is directly and definitely affirmed, but that in this continued duration of the λόγοι of Christ the duration of the law also is implied, i.e. according to its complete meaning (in answer to Lechler, p. 797); comp. on Luke xvi. 17. “The δικαιοσύνη of the new heavens and of the new earth will be no other than what is here taught,” Delitzsch. So completely one with the idea of the law does Jesus in His spiritual greatness know His moral task to be, not severed from the latter, but placed in its midst.

Ver. 19. Conclusion from ver. 18. On ὅς ἐάν with the conjunctive of the aorist, denoting that which was probably to happen in the future (*the contingent futurum exactum*), see Winer, p. 287 f. [E. T. 385]; Kühner, II. 2, p. 929; ἐάν for ἄν, see Winer, p. 291 [E. T. 390]. — λύση like καταλύσαι, ver. 17;<sup>1</sup> Fritzsche and Arnoldi (after Castalio, Beza, Wolf, and others): *transgressus fuerit*, on account of the ποιήση in the opposition; comp. also Ritschl, p. 40. But this ποιήση partly forms a very appropriate antithesis to the λύση in our sense, which, after καταλύσαι in ver. 17, would be abandoned only from arbitrariness; partly there is by no means wanting between λύνειν and διδάσκειν an appropriate, i.e. a climactic, distinction (they shall declare it to be of no authority, and teach accordingly); partly it is not credible that Jesus should have declared that the transgressor of the

<sup>1</sup> Comp. on λύνειν in the sense of *abrogating, overturning of laws*, John vii. 23; Herod. iii. 82; Demosth. xxi. 12. 186. 14. Ebrard (on Olshausen) erroneously explains it: “the mechanical dissolution of a law into a multitude of casuistical and ritualistic precepts.” The τούτων τῶν ἱλαχίστων should have prevented this view. Amongst Greek writers also the simple verb represents the compound that has preceded it; comp. on Rom. xv. 4.

law was ἐλάχιστον ἐν τῇ βασ. τ. οὐρανῶν, see xi. 11. *Doing* (ποιήσῃ) and *teaching* (διδάξῃ) refer, as a matter of course, without it being necessary to supply any object besides the general word "is" (translated: *whosoever shall have done and taught it*), to that which is *required* in the smallest commandment, and that in the sense of the πλήρωσις, ver. 17. — τῶν ἐντολῶν τούτων τῶν ἐλαχίστων] τούτων points back to what is designated by ἰῶτα and κεραία in ver. 18, not forwards to vv. 22, 28 (Bengel); ἐλαχίστων refers, therefore, not to the Pharisaic distinctions between great and small commandments (see especially, Wetstein, p. 295 f.), but to what *Jesus Himself* had just designated as ἰῶτα and κεραία, those precepts which in reality are the least important. They stand, however, in accordance with the πλήρωσις of the law, in essential organic connection with the ideal contents of the whole, and can therefore be so little regarded as having no authority, that rather he who does this (λύσῃ), and teaches others to act in this manner (διδάξῃ), will obtain only one of the lowest places (one of the lowest grades of dignity and happiness) in the kingdom of the Messiah. He is not to be *excluded* (as Augustine, Luther, Calvin, Calovius, Wolf, Bengel, and others have misinterpreted the meaning of ἐλάχ. κληθ.), because his antinomianism is not a principle, not directed against the law as such, but only against individual precepts of the law, which *in themselves are small*, and whose importance *as a whole* he does not recognise.<sup>1</sup> Comp. 1 Cor. iii. 15.—Note the correlation of τῶν ἐλαχίστων . . . ἐλάχιστος . . . μέγας.

Ver. 20. Γάρ] Unnecessary difficulties have been raised on account of this connection (Ritschl and Bleek, who even declare δέ to be more appropriate), and the obvious sense passed over (de Wette, who, as well as Hilgenfeld, refers back to ver. 17). Jesus does not state any ground for recognising

<sup>1</sup> Ver. 19 stands in so essential a connection with the discourse, that the supposition of Olshausen, that Jesus had in view special acts of an antinomian tendency on the part of some of His disciples, appears just as unnecessary as it is arbitrary. Köstlin and Hilgenfeld find here a very distinct disapproval of the Apostle Paul and of the *Paulinities*, who break free from the law; nay, Paul, thinks Köstlin, was actually *named* by Jewish Christians the smallest (Eph. iii. 8), as he so names himself (1 Cor. xv. 9). A purely imaginary combination.

why there must be distinctions of rank in the kingdom (Ritschl), which must be understood as a matter of course; but He assigns the reason—and how important was that for the vocation of the disciples!—for the *ποιήσῃ κ. διδάξῃ* which He had just uttered, in accordance with its necessary connection: “For if ye do not unite *acting* with *teaching*, then can ye not enter into the kingdom, being upon the same stage of righteousness as the scribes and Pharisees” (xxiii. 2 f., 14). — *περισσ. πλεῖον* is to be rendered: *shall have been more abundant than*.<sup>1</sup> Comp. *περισσεύειν ὑπέρ τινα*, 1 Macc. iii. 30. — *ἡ δικαιοσύνη ὑμῶν*] *your moral righteousness*, as in vv. 6, 10, not the *justitia fidei* (Calovius), although the truly moral life rests upon the latter. — *τῶν γραμματ. κ. Φαρισ.]* well-known *comparatio compendiaris* for *τῆς δικαιοσύνης τῶν, κ.τ.λ.*, Kühner, II. p. 847. It is understood, besides, as a matter of course, that Jesus here has in view the false righteousness of the Pharisees *in general*, so that nobler manifestations, like Gamaliel, Nicodemus, and others, do not determine His general judgment.

Ver. 21. There now follow on to the end of the chapter six—neither five (Hilgenfeld) nor seven (Köstlin)—*antithetic examples* of the fulfilling of the law of Jesus, not merely derived from the Decalogue, or from its second table (Keim), but from the Pentateuch generally; not, however, of an antinomian kind, consequently not in opposition to the divine law itself (Chrysostom and many Fathers, Maldonatus, Neander, Bleek, Socinians and Arminians), but opposed, indeed, to all the manifold limitations and one-sided *apprehensions* and *applications* of the same, as it was represented and followed out in life by the common traditional Judaism, and specially by the *Pharisees*, without insight into the deeper unity and

<sup>1</sup> These men thought and appeared to make themselves prominent by abundant acts of *δικαιοσύνη*, whilst they “*ceremonialem et forensam morali missa tutati sunt*” (Bengel). An abounding in righteousness on the part of His disciples in a *higher degree and measure* of morality, which *πλεον*, however, in accordance with the actual relation of the thing compared, contains in itself an essentially quite different kind of *δικαιοσύνη*, is required by Christ on the ground of faith in Him. That external righteousness, whilst the heart is impure, “does not belong to heaven, but to hell” (Luther).

the purely moral absolute meaning. Comp. also Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* I. p. 599 f.; Harless, *d. Ehescheidungsfrage*, 1861, p. 7 f.; Weiss, Keim. That use of the law produced a false *legalism*, without sincerity and virtue, in opposition to which Jesus wishes to develope and assert the true and full righteous *morality* out of the divine law. — ἡκούσατε] from the law which is read before you (John xii. 34; Rom. ii. 13; Gal. iv. 21; Acts xv. 21), and from the instruction which you have received regarding its exposition. — τοῖς ἀρχαίοις] may grammatically be taken not only as a *dative* (Chrysostom, Theophylact, Euth. Zigabenus, Luther, Erasmus, Grotius, Wetstein, Bengel, and many others; also Tholuck, Neander, de Wette, Ritschl, Bleek, Weizsäcker), but also as an *ablative*: *by the ancients* (see Kühner, II. 1, p. 368 f.; Winer, p. 206 [E. T. 277]); so Beza, Piscator, Schoettgen, Raphel, and many; also Paulus, Kuinoel, Fritzsche, Olshausen, Baumgarten, Ewald, Lechler, Keim. On the *first* rendering, which most obviously suggests itself (Rom. ix. 12, 26; Gal. iii. 16; Rev. vi. 11, ix. 4), the ancients are *the Jewish generations of earlier times* (before Christ), to which Moses and his followers (xxiii. 2 f.), the scribes, spoke (de Wette, Ritschl), not simply the Israelites in the time of Moses, to whom the *latter* spoke (Neander, Bleek); on the *latter* view it is *Moses* (who would not have to be excluded, as Keim maintains), and *his ancient expositors learned in the Scripture*; for there follow their sayings, which are partly *without*, partly accompanied *with*, additions proceeding from the scribes. The decision between these two views is given not merely by the constant usage of the N. T., which joins ἐρρέθη with the dative, but also by the antithesis ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, in which ἐγὼ corresponds to the logical subject of ἐρρέθη, and ὑμῖν to τοῖς ἀρχαίοις; the latter consequently cannot itself be the subject. Luther therefore rightly renders: *that it is said to them of old time.*<sup>1</sup> Pointless

<sup>1</sup> Instead of ἐρρέθη, Lachmann and Tischendorf have, after B D E K V, the form ἐρρήθη. Both forms are found in Plato (see Heindorf, *ad Gorg.* p. 46), to whom, however, Schneider, *ad Pol.* V. p. 450 A, everywhere assigns the latter as the proper one. The first is the more common in the later Greek, and therefore to be preferred in the N. T. See in general, Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 447. Comp. on Rom. ix. 12; Gal. iii. 16.

objections are made by Keim, II. p. 248, who even finds in this view something opposed to the sense; because the people of the present day have not yet heard of that which was enjoined on them of *old time*, but of what has been enjoined upon themselves. On the other hand, it is to be recollected that it was precisely a peculiarity of the Jewish method of instruction, and still is so, to refer the present generation to those of old time, to inculcate upon the former the *παράδοσις* which had been common in ancient times, and had been already given to their forefathers. Thus the people of the present time have certainly heard in the synagogues *what was said to them of old time*. Comp., moreover, Diodorus Siculus xii. 20: *καλῶς εἴρηται τοῖς παλαιοῖς, ὅτι, κ.τ.λ.—οὐ φονεύσεις*] Ex. xx. 12. The prohibition refers to the *act*, though not by itself, but as the effect of anger, of hostility, and so on; for there is also a putting to death which is permitted, nay, even commanded. The Pharisaic explanation and application of the legal saying was confined to the literal prohibition of the *act*; the fulfiller of the law lays open the whole *disposition* that deserves punishment, which, as the ethical condition of the act, was aimed at by the prohibition of the latter. The following words contain a *traditional addition*, although one not alien to the law, by the scribes, who interpreted that prohibition externally. — *κρίσις*, according to ver. 22, opposed to the Sanhedrin, is the *local court*, found, according to Deut. xvi. 18, in every city of Palestine, to which it belonged to take cognizance of and to punish even murder (*execution by the sword*), 2 Chron. xix. 5; Josephus, *Antt.* iv. 8. 14. According to the Rabbins, it consisted of twenty-three members; according to Josephus, of seven. See generally, Tholuck, Keil, *Arch.* II. p. 250 ff. To the higher court of justice, the *Sanhedrin*, ver. 22, it belonged to take cognizance also of crimes punishable by *stoning*.

Ver. 22. I, on the other hand, as the fulfiller of the law, already declare unrighteous *anger* to be as worthy of punishment as the act of murder was declared to be to those of old time; as still more worthy of punishment, however, the expression of such anger in *injurious language*, to which I, in

the worst cases, even assign the punishment of hell. Observe (1) that Jesus does not at all enter into the question of *murder itself*, by which He makes it to be felt that it was something unheard of amongst those who believed on Him; (2) that for the same reason He does not mention any outbursts of anger *in acts*, such as ill-usage and the like; (3) that the abusive words, which are quoted by way of example, represent different degrees of outbursts of anger in speech, in accordance with the malignity of the disposition from which they proceed; and (4) that κρίσις, συνέδριον, γέεννα, illustrate different degrees of greater culpability before God (for κρίσις and συνέδριον are also analogical representations of *divine*, although *temporal*, penal judgment), down to the everlasting damnation; so that (5) as the general moral idea in the concrete discourse, whose plastic ascent in details is not to be pressed, *the highest and holiest severity appears in the point of unlovingness* (comp. 1 John iii. 15), and therein lies *the ideal consummation* of the law, οὐ φονεύσεις, not only in itself, but also in the antithesis of its traditional threat, ὅς δ' ἂν φονεύσῃ, etc. — ὁ ὀργιζόμεν.] has the emphasis of opposition to φονεύειν. — τῷ ἀδελφῷ] does not go beyond the popular conception (a member of the nation, comp. ver. 47), out of which grew at a later time the representation and designation of *Christian brotherly* fellowship. The conception of the πλησίον from the point of view of humanity, Luke x. 29, is not contained in the ἀδελφός.—If εἰκῇ were genuine (but see critical remarks), then this idea would be contained in it, that Jesus does not mean simply being angry, but the being angry without a reason (Rom. xiii. 4; Col. ii. 18), the anger of mere passionateness, *without moral justification*; εἰκῇ would stand as equivalent to ἀλογίστως (Polyb. i. 52. 2), παραλόγως (Polyb. i. 74. 14), ἀσκόπως (Polyb. iv. 14. 6). There is, moreover, a holy anger, which has its basis in what is right, and in its relation to the unholy world. Comp. on Eph. iv. 26. But never ought it to be *unloving and hostile* anger; and that *such* an anger is here meant is shown by the context, therefore εἰκῇ would not even be an *appropriate* closer definition.—ῥακά] as Jerome and Hesychius already correctly interpret

it, is the Chaldee ܠܐܝܢ, *vacuus*, that is, *empty head*!—At that time a very common word of opprobrium. Buxtorf, *Lex. talm.* p. 2254; Lightfoot, *Hor.* p. 264; Wetstein *in loc.* That it is, so far as regards its idea, of the same nature with *μωρέ* that follows, speaks rather in favour of than against this common interpretation. Comp. *κενός* (Jas. ii. 20; Soph. *Ant.* 709), *κενόφρων* (Aesch. *Prom.* 761), *κενόκρανος* (Sibyll. iii. p. 418). Ewald thinks of the Aramaic ܐܦܪܝܐ, and interprets it: *rascal*. — *μωρέ*] ܡܡܠ, *fool*, but in the *moral sense* (Hupfeld on Ps. xiv. 1), as the virtuous man was rightly regarded as wise (comp. Xen. *Mem.* iii. 9. 4) and the wicked as foolish; therefore equivalent to “*wicked*,” and thus a stronger word of opprobrium, one affecting the moral character, than *ῥακά*; see Wetstein. — *εἰς τὴν γέενναν*] literally: *into hell*,<sup>1</sup> which is to be regarded as a pregnant expression from the idea of being *cast down* into hell. Winer, p. 200 [E. T. 267]; Buttmann, p. 148 [E. T. 170]. Plastic representation with the increasing liveliness of the discourse, instead of the more abstract dative. No example elsewhere. *γέεννα*, properly ܓܝܢ ܗܝܢܝܡ, or ܓܝܢ ܒܢ ܗܝܢܝܡ (ܗܝܢܝܡ, name of a man otherwise unknown; other interpretations, as “*valley of howling*,” are arbitrary), a valley to the south of the capital, where the idolatrous Israelites had formerly sacrificed their children to Moloch (2 Kings xxiii. 10; Jer. vii. 32, xix. 2); Ritter, *Erdk.* XVI 1, p. 372; Robinson, *Pal.* II. p. 38. The name of this *hated* locality was transferred to the subterranean abode of the damned. Lightfoot, *Hor.*; Wolf on the passage; Eisenmenger, *Entdecktes Judenthum*, II. p. 323 ff. So always in the N. T., where, however, it is found only in the Synoptics and James.

<sup>1</sup> The attributive genitive τοῦ πυρός (xiii. 42; 2 Thess. i. 8), as an expression of the specific nature, is to be explained from the well-known popular representation of hell (comp. iii. 11, xviii. 8 f., xxv. 41, and elsewhere). The explanation of Kuinoel, who follows the older interpreters, “*is dignus est, qui in valle Hinnomi vivus comburatur*,” is, irrespective of the illegality of burning alive, opposed to the constant usage of *γέεννα* as signifying *hell*, which usage also forbids us to think of the burning of the body in the valley of Hinnom (Michaelis) after execution, or at least of a casting forth of the latter into this detested place (B. Crusius, comp. Tholuck).



Ver. 23 f. Ἐὰν . . . προσφέρῃς] *If thou, then, art about to present thy sacrifice* (δῶρον, viii. 4, xv. 5, xxiii. 18, also in the LXX., Apocrypha, and Greek writers); consequently, art already occupied with the preparation of the same in the temple.<sup>1</sup> This explanation is required by the words ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ θυσ. (*ad aram*), ver. 24. — ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστ.] *to the altar*, in order that the priests may offer it upon the same. — καὶ κεῖ μνησθῆς, κ.τ.λ.] “inter rem sacram magis subit recordatio offensarum, quam in strepitu negotiorum,” Bengel. The *injured* part is the ἀδελφός; differently in Mark xi. 25, where *forgiveness* is required. — ἔμπροσθ. τοῦ θυσιαστ.] A closer definition added to ἐκεῖ. — πρῶτον] *in the first place* (vi. 33), before everything else, what thou now hast to do. Compare τότε afterwards. It is to be connected with ὕπαγε (Luther, Erasmus, Castalio, Bengel, and many others; also Gersdorf, p. 107; de Wette, Ewald, Arnoldi, Bleek). Comp. vii. 5, xiii. 30, xxiii. 26. The connection with διαλλάγη. (Beza, Calvin, Er. Schmidt, and many others; also Kuinoel, Fritzsche, Tholuck, and others) overlooks the essential moment which is contained in the connection precisely by the ὕπαγε, the unavoidable, surprising, nay, repellent removal of oneself from the temple. For that ὕπαγε is not here merely an appeal, *age*, is shown by the context through the words ἄφες ἐκεῖ, etc. In xviii. 15, xix. 21, also, it means *abi.* — διαλλάγηθι] *be reconciled*, deal so that a reconciliation may begin with him who has been injured by thee. Comp. 1 Sam. xxix. 4, and on the passage 1 Cor. vii. 11. In this way the act of sacrifice receives the moral foundation of a disposition pleasing to God, by which it is no mere external work, but is at the same time λογικὴ λατρεία, Rom. xii. 1. Flacius well remarks, *s.v. munus*: “Vult primam haberi rationem moralium, secundum ceremonialium.” Moreover, the distinction asserted by Tittmann to exist between διαλλάσσειν and καταλλάσσειν,

<sup>1</sup> The severance of the Jewish believers from the temple service was only to begin at a later time, John iv. 21. The Catholic exegesis knows, indeed, how to find here the permanent sacrifice of the Eucharist, regarding which Christ is said in the passage before us to have given a law which is for ever valid, Döllinger, *Christenthum und Kirche*, p. 250 f., ed. 2

that the former denotes the removal of *mutual* hostility, the latter that of *one-sided* enmity (*Synon.* p. 102), is decidedly erroneous. Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* I. p. 276 ff.

Ver. 25 f. The precept, to be reconciled with the injured person in order not to be cast into hell by God the judge, is made clear by the prudential doctrine of satisfying a creditor in order not to become liable to imprisonment. To abide merely by the *prudential doctrine* itself which the words convey (Theophylact, Vatablus, and others, including Paulus), is opposed to the context (vv. 21–24); to take the *φυλακή*, however, as the representation of *purgatory* (many Catholics, not Schegg), or of *Sheol* (not Gehenna) (Olshausen), is forbidden by the idea of the judgment, which also excludes the vague and indefinite “transference of that which is destructive for the external life to that which is destructive in a higher sense” (de Wette). Luke xii. 58 has the precept in quite a different connection; but this does not justify us in not regarding it in the present passage as belonging to it (Pott, Kuinoel, Neander, Bleek, Holtzmann, Weiss, and others), since it may be given here and there as a popular symbolical proverb; while precisely here it is most clearly and simply appropriate to the connection. — *εὐνοῶν*] be *well disposed*—that is, inclined to satisfy him by making payment or composition. — *τῷ ἀντιδίκῳ σου*] The *opponent* (in a lawsuit) is to be conceived of as a *creditor* (ver. 26). The *injured brother* is *intended*; comp. ver. 23. Explanations of the Fathers referring it to the *devil* (Clement of Alexandria), to *God* (Augustine), to the *conscience* (Euth. Zigabenus), see in Tholuck. — *ταχύ*] *without delay, without putting off*, xxviii. 7 f.; John xi. 29; Rev. ii. 16. “*Tarda est superbia cordis ad deprecandum et satisfaciendum*,” Bengel. — *ἕως ὅτου*] If by *ταχύ* it was intimated that the compliance should *begin* without delay, so it is now stated that it *shall remain* till the extreme termination: even until thou art with him on the road to the judge—even then still shalt thou yield compliance. Not *of itself* (in answer to Tittmann, *Synon.* p. 167), but, in virtue of the context, is *ἕως* the *inclusive* “until,” as according to the context it may also be *exclusive* (comp. on the passage, i. 25). — The *servant of justice* (*ὑπη-*

ρέτης) belongs to the representative of the legal act; and who is meant thereby, is evident from xiii. 41 f. — βληθήσῃ] The *future*, which might be dependent on μήποτε (Winer, p. 468 f. [E. T. 629]; Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 201 [E. T. 233]; see on the passage, Col. ii. 8), taken *independently*, gives the appropriate emphasis to the tragic closing act.— In ver. 26 is by no means contained the *finality* of the condition of punishment, but its *non-finality*; since the ἀποδιδόναι, that is, the removal of the guilt of sin, is for him who is in *this φυλακή* an impossibility, xviii. 34, xxv. 41, 46, etc. ἕως states, then, a terminus which is never reached. Comp. xviii. 34.—The *quadrans* is  $\frac{1}{4}$  *As* in copper, or 2 λεπτά,  $\frac{3}{4}$  of a farthing (Mark xii. 42); see on the Roman coins in circulation amongst the Jews, Cavedoni, *bibl. Numismat.* I. p. 78 ff.

Ver. 27 f. From vv. 28–30 it appears that the tradition of the Pharisees limited the prohibition in Ex. xx. 14 to adultery proper, and left out of consideration adulterous desires. — βλέπων] *he who looks upon a woman*, opposed to the actual μοιχεύειν. — γυναῖκα] *woman* in general, so that it may be a married (Erasmus, Grotius, Tholuck, de Wette, Bleek) or an unmarried one; for the βλέπων is conceived of as a married man, as is clear from the signification of οὐ μοιχεύσεις, which means *adultery*. — πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτήν] *not ita ut*, etc., *not even in accordance with* (Weiss), but, agreeably to the constant usage of πρὸς with the infinitive, to denote the *telic* reference (vi. 1, xxvi. 12, and elsewhere): *in order to desire her*. The βλέπειν, which terminates in lustful desire, which is kindled and felt to be strengthened by gazing on, is designated. Ὁ γὰρ σπουδάζων ὁρᾶν τὰς εὐμόρφους ὄψεις, αὐτὸς μάλιστα τὴν κάμνον ἀνάπτει τοῦ πάθους, Chrysostom. Comp. Augustine: “qui hoc fine et hoc animo attenderit, ut eam concupiscat, quod jam non est titillari delectatione carnis, sed plene consentire libidini.” He who looks upon a woman with *such* a feeling has already (*jam eo ipso*, Bengel), in virtue of the adulterous desire with which he does so, committed *adultery* with her *in his heart*, which is the seat of feeling and desire. Thus he is, as regards his moral constitution, although without the external act, already an *adulterer*.

Similar proverbs from the Rabbinical writers in Lightfoot and Schoettgen; from the Greek and Roman writers, in Pricaeus. On *μοιχεύειν* with the accusative, comp. Plato, *Rep.* p. 360 B. — *ἐπιθυμείν*] with the accusative, is rare and late. Comp. Ex. xx. 17; Deut. v. 20; Judith xvi. 22; see Winer, p. 192 [E. T. 255]. Even if *αὐτήν* were spurious, it could not be explained with Fritzsche: "ut adsit *mutua cupiditas*."

Ver. 29.<sup>1</sup> *Unconditional self-denial*, however, is required in order not to stumble against the prohibition of adultery in its complete meaning, and thereby to fall into hell. Better for thee that thou decidedly deprive thyself of that which is so dear and indispensable to thee for the temporal life, and the sacrificing of which will be still so painful to thee, than that thou, seduced thereby, and so on. In the *typical* expression of this thought (comp. on Col. iii. 5) the *eye* and *hand* are named, because it is precisely these that are the *media of lust*; and the *right* members, because to these the popular idea gave the superiority over the left, Ex. xxix. 20; 1 Sam. xi. 2; Zech. xi. 17; Aristotle, *de animal. incessu*, iv. The non-typical but *literal* interpretation (Pricaeus, Fritzsche, likewise Ch. F. Fritzsche in his *Nov. Opusc.* p. 347 f., Arnoldi) is not in keeping with the *spirit* of the moral strictness of Jesus; and to help it out by supplying a limitation (perhaps *in the extreme case*, to which, however, it cannot come; comp. Tholuck) is arbitrary. The view, however, which is, indeed, also the *proper* one, but *hyperbolical*, according to which the plucking out is said to represent only the *restraining or limiting the use*, does not satisfy the strength of the expression. So Olshausen, comp. already Grotius. Only the *typical* view, which is also placed beyond doubt by the mention of the *one* eye, satisfies the *words* and *spirit* of Jesus. Yet, having regard to the plastic nature of the figures, it is not the thought "as is done to criminals" (Keim), but merely that of thoroughgoing, *unsparing self-discipline* (Gal. v. 24, vi. 14; Rom. viii. 13). — *σκανδαλίζει*] a typical designation, borrowed from a *trap* (*σκανδάλη* and *σκανδάλεθρον*, the trap-spring), of the idea of

<sup>1</sup> Comp. xviii. 8 f.; Mark ix. 43 ff. Holtzmann assigns the original form to Mark. On the other hand, see Weisa.

reducing to unbelief, heresy, sin, etc. Here it is the latter idea. The word is not found in Greek writers, but in the LXX. and Apocrypha, and very frequently in the N. T. Observe the *present*. What is required is not to take place only after the completion of the seduction. — συμφέρει γάρ σοι, *ἴνα*, κ.τ.λ.] not even here, as nowhere indeed, does *ἴνα* stand instead of the *infinitive* (comp. xviii. 6), but is to be taken as *teleological*: “it is of importance to thee (this plucking out of the eye), in order that one of thy members may be destroyed, and not thy whole body be cast into hell.” Thus Fritzsche alone correctly; comp. Käuffer. The alleged forced nature of this explanation is a deception arising from the *customary* usage of the infinitive in German. — καὶ μὴ ὅλον . . . γέενναν] namely, at the closely impending establishment of the kingdom; comp. x. 28. Ver. 30 is the same thought, solemnly repeated, although not quite in the same words (see the critical remarks). “Sane multos *unius* membri neglecta mortificatio perdit,” Bengel.

Ver. 31 f.<sup>1</sup> In Deut. xxiv. 1 there is stated as a reason for the dismissal which is to be carried out, עֲרִיבָה דְּבָרָה, *something hateful*, loathsome (see Ewald, *Alterthum*. p. 272; Keil, *Archäol.* II. p. 74 f.; Gesenius, *Thes.* II. p. 1068). This was explained by the strict Rabbi *Sammai* and his adherents as referring to adultery and other unchaste behaviour; but the gentle Rabbi *Hillel* and his school as referring to everything in general that displeased the husband (Josephus, *Antt.* iv. 8. 23; *Vita*, 76). Lightfoot, p. 273 ff.; Ewald, *Jahrb.* X. p. 56 ff., 81. Rabbi Abika went still further, who allowed dismissal if the husband found a more beautiful woman; see Wetstein. To these and other (see Othonis, *Lex. Rabb.* p. 504) ill-considered principles—for Hillel's doctrine had become the prevalent one—Christ

<sup>1</sup> The assertion that, if Jesus had delivered this declaration *here*, the discussion regarding divorce in ch. xix. could not have taken place (Köstlin, p. 47; Holtzmann, p. 176 f.), has no foundation, especially as in xix. 3, Mark x. 2, the discussion is called forth by the Pharisees; comp. Weiss. Olshausen and Bleek also find in ch. xix. the historical position for the declaration, which Hilgenfeld regards as a non-original appendix to what precedes; which is also substantially the judgment of Ritschl, who regards the metabatic *ἵνα* in ver. 31 as introducing an objection to vv. 29, 30.

opposes Himself, and draws out from the original and inmost nature of marriage (comp. xix. 4 ff.) a firm rule, preserving the sanctity of the idea, and admitting only *that* as a ground of separation by which *the nature of marriage and its obligations is, as a matter of fact*, directly and immediately destroyed.<sup>1</sup> — ἀπολύσῃ] not *repudiare constituerit* (Fritzsche after Grotius), but *will have dismissed*. In this is implied the *oral declaration* of dismissal, the accomplishment of which as a fact is to take place by means of a letter of divorce. The *command* to give the letter of divorce, moreover, the use of which was already in existence before the law, is only indirectly implied in Deut. xxiv. 1; comp. on xix. 7. The *Greek* expression for the dismissal of the woman is ἀποπέμπειν, Bekker, *Anecd.* p. 421; Bremi, *ad Dem. adv. Onetor.* iv. p. 92. On the wanton practice of the Greeks in this matter, see Hermann, *Privatalterth.* § 30. — ἀποστάσιον] *departure*, that is, by means of a βιβλίον ἀποστασίου, Deut. xxiv. 1; Matt. xix. 7; Mark x. 4; Jer. iii. 8. In Demosthenes, 790. 2, 940. 15, it is the desertion of his master, contrary to duty, by a manumitted slave; Hermann, *l.c.*, § 57. 17. — The formula of the letter of divorce, see in *Alphes. in Gittin*, f. 600; in Lightfoot, p. 277. The *object* of the same was to prove that the marriage had been legally dissolved, and that it was competent to enter into a second marriage with another man (Ewald, *l.c.*). Observe, moreover, how the saying of the scribes, which has been quoted, is a *mutilation* of the legal precept, which had become traditional in the service of their lax principles, as if it, beside the arbitrary act of the man, were merely a question of the formality of the *letter of divorce*.

Ver. 32. Παρεκτὸς λόγου πορν.] that is, except (see on 2 Cor. xi. 28) if an act of whoredom, committed by the woman during marriage (consequently *adultery*, John viii. 41; Amos vii. 17; Hos. iii. 3; Sir. xxvi. 9, xiv. 12), is the motive (λόγος, comp. Thuc. i. 102, iii. 6, lxi. 4; and see on Acts x. 29). In spite of the point of controversy which lies at the foundation, Paulus and Gratz are of opinion—most recently especially, Döllinger, *Christenthum und Kirche*, p. 392 ff.,

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Harless, *Ehescheidungsfrage*, p. 17 ff.

460 ff., ed. 2 (comp. Baeumlein in the *Stud. und Krit.* 1857, p. 336)—that by *πορνεία*, which does not mean adultery,<sup>1</sup> whoredom *before marriage* is meant, so that the man, instead of a virgin, receives one who is no longer so.<sup>2</sup> The correct view is already to be found in Tertullian, and in the whole old exegetical tradition, where, however, on the Catholic side, the permission was limited only to separation *a toro et mensa*. On the subject, comp. the explanation which was specially called forth on a later occasion, xix. 3 ff. But in Mark x. 11, Luke xvi. 18 (also 1 Cor. vii. 10 f.), this exception is not expressed, not as if Jesus had at the beginning made greater concessions to the pre-Christian *Jewish* marriages, and only at a later time completely denied the dissolubility of marriage (Hug, *de conjugii christ. vinculo indissolub.* 1816, who therefore declares, in xix. 9, *μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ* to be spurious), nor even as if that *παρεκτός, κ.τ.λ.*, were a later modification, and not originally spoken by Christ (Bleek, Wittichen, Weiss, Holtzmann, Schenkel, and others), but Mark and Luke regard this exception by itself, understanding it as a matter of course; and rightly so,<sup>3</sup> since adultery *eo ipso* destroys the essence of all marriage obligations; comp. Weiss in *d. Zeitschr. f. christl. Wissensch.* 1856, p. 261. But as the exception which Jesus

<sup>1</sup> It means in general every kind of *whoredom* (Dem. 403. 26, 433. 25, 612. 5). Where it specially refers to *adultery* (*μοιχεία*) this is clear from the context, as here and xix. 9. Thus, for example, it means also the idolatry of the people of God, because that is adultery against Jehovah, *πορνεία*, as in Hos. i. 2; Ezek. xvi. 15, xxiii. 43.

<sup>2</sup> How can one seriously suppose that Jesus could have laid down so slippery an exception! indelicate, uncertain, unwise, a welcome opening to all kinds of severity and chicanery, especially considering the jealousy of the Jews. And the exception would have to hold good also in the case of marriages with widows!

<sup>3</sup> But by the circumstance that Jesus here expressly quotes as an exception this actual ground of separation, which was understood as a matter of course, *He excludes every other* (comp. especially Calovius); and it is incorrect to say that, while He grants one actual ground of separation, He still allows several others (Grotius, de Wette, Bleek, and others; comp. also Werner in *d. Stud. u. Krit.* 1858, p. 702 ff.), which is quite opposed to the point of view of moral *strictness*, from which He excepts only *that* case in which the actual dissolution of the marriage in its innermost nature is directly given. — That Christ bases His answer on the question of divorce purely upon the *nature* of the divine ordinance of marriage as it was already given at the creation (*una*

here makes cannot become devoid of meaning by means of Lev. xx. 10 (in answer to Schegg, see John viii. 3 ff.), so also it is not to be annulled on critical grounds, which in view of the witnesses is impossible (in answer to Keim here and on xix. 9). The second half of the verse also, *καὶ ὅς, κ.τ.λ.*, cannot be condemned with Keim on the authority of D and Codd. in Augustine. — *ποιεῖ αὐτὴν μοιχᾶσθαι*] “*per alias nuptias, quarum potestatem dat divortium*” (Bengel), although, according to that principle, she is still the wife of the first husband; therefore the man also, if he marries again, *μοιχᾶται* (xix. 9). — *καὶ*] not causal, but *and*, and on the other side. — *μοιχᾶται*] because he has intercourse with a person who, according to the divine law, is the wife of another. That by *ἀπολελυμένην*, a woman who is dismissed *illegally*, consequently *not on account of adultery*, is intended, was understood as a matter of course, according to the first half of the verse.

Ver. 33. *Πάλιν*] as in iv. 7. — *οὐκ ἐπιιορκήσεις*] Doctrinal precept, according to Ex. xx. 7; Lev. xix. 12. It is not to the *eighth commandment* that Jesus refers (Keim, following an artificially formed scheme), but the *second commandment* forms the fundamental prohibition of perjury. — The Pharisaic tradition made arbitrary distinctions between oaths that were binding (by Jehovah) and those that were not binding (comp. also Philo, *de Spec. Legg.* p. 770 A). See Light-

*caro*, ix. 5), not upon its *object*, is of decisive importance for the legislation in question, where we have also to observe that the altered *form* of divorce (the *judicial*) can make no change in the *principles* laid down by Jesus. Otherwise the legislation relating to marriage is driven on and on, by way of supposed consistency, to the laxity of the Prussian law and that of other lands (comp. the concessions of Bleek). Moreover, as regards malicious desertion, the declarations of Christ admit of application only so far as that desertion *quoad formam*, consequently according to its essential nature, is fully equivalent to adultery, which, however, must always be a question in each individual case. It cannot be shown from 1 Cor. ix. 15 that malicious desertion was regarded as a reason for dissolving Christian marriage. See on the passage. — Of *that* case of separation, where the *man* commits adultery, Christ does not speak, because the law, which does not know of any dismissal of the man on the part of the woman, presented no occasion to it. But the *application* of the principle in the case of adultery on the part of the woman to that of the man as a ground of divorce rightly follows in accordance with the moral spirit of Jesus; comp. Mark x. 12; Gal. iii. 28; 1 Cor. xi. 11.



foot, p. 280 ; Eisenmenger, II. p. 490 ; Wetstein on ver. 36 ; Michaelis, *Mos. Recht*, V. p. 141 ff., upon their loose principles regarding this matter. The second half of the precept quoted (formulated after Num. xxx. 3 ; Deut. xxxiii. 22) was so weakened by them, that special emphasis was laid upon the words  $\tau\hat{\omega}$  κυρίῳ, and other oaths were deprived of their obligatory powers.

Vv. 34-36. *Μὴ ὀμόσαι ὅλως*] to swear not at all (the adverb placed emphatically at the end, compare ii. 10), dependent upon λέγω ὑμῖν (comp. Plat. *Phaed.* p. 59 E, *Menex.* 240 A), in which the *command* is implied (Jacobs, *ad Anthol.* X. p. 200 ; Kühner, *ad Anab.* v. 7. 34 ; Wunder, *ad Soph. O. C.* 837), interdicts *all kinds of swearing* in general ;<sup>1</sup> not merely that of *common life*, which is at variance with reverence for God (Luther, Calvin, Calovius, Bengel, Fritzsche, Ewald, Tholuck, Harless, Hilgenfeld, Keim, and others), nor even merely oaths regarded "*ex Judaeorum sensu*" (thus Matthaei, *doctrina Christi de jurejur.* Hal. 1847). The simple prohibition, —given, however, to the disciples, and for the life of fellowship of true believers,—and in so far not less *ideal* than the requirements that have preceded, appears from the words themselves (comp. Jas. v. 12), and also from ver. 37. Christianity as it *should* be according to the will of Christ, should know *no oath at all* : τὸ μὴ ὀμνῆναι ὅλως ἐπιτείνει μάλιστα τὴν εὐσέβειαν, Euth. Zigabenus. To the consciousness of the Christian, God should always be so vividly present, that, to him and others in the Christian community, his yea and nay are, in point of reliability, equivalent to an oath. His yea and nay are oath enough. Comp. on ὅλως, *prorsus* (= παντελῶς, Hesychius), Xen. *Mem.* i. 2. 35 : προαγορεύομεν τοῖς νέοις ὅλως μὴ διαλέγ-

<sup>1</sup> Comp. West in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1852, p. 221 ff. ; Nitzsch, *christl. Lehre*, p. 393 ff. ; Werner in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1858, p. 711 ff. ; Wuttke, *Sittenl.* II. § 277 ; Acheili in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1867, p. 436 ff. Jerome had already remarked, with striking simplicity : "evangelica veritas non recipit juramentum cum omnis sermo fidelis pro jurejurando sit." The emphatic ὅλως forbids, however, the limitation only to the forms of the oath *that are afterwards mentioned* (Althaus in *d. Luther. Zeitschr.* 1868, p. 504, and already Theophylact, 1), so that the oath by the name of God would remain unaffected ; in like manner, the restriction of the prohibition to *promissory* oaths (Ficker in the same *Zeitschr.* 1870, p. 633 ff., and already Grotius).

εσθαι, Oecon. xx. 20. Accordingly, it is only in the incomplete temporal condition of Christianity, as well as in the relation to the world in which it is placed, and to the existing relations of the department of public law, to which it conforms itself, that the oath has its necessary, indeed (comp. Heb. vi. 16), but conditional and temporary existence. *Christ* Himself has sworn (xxvi. 63 f.); *Paul* has frequently sworn (Rom. i. 9; 2 Cor. i. 23, xi. 3 f.; Gal. ii. 20; Phil. i. 8); nay, *God* swears to His own people (Gen. xxii. 16, xxvi. 3; Num. xiv. 23; Isa. xlv. 23; Luke i. 73; Acts vii. 17; Heb. vi. 13). Therefore Anabaptists and Quakers are wrong in rejecting an oath *without any exception*, as was already done by Justin, Irenaeus, Clement, Origen, Chrysostom, Jerome, and other Fathers. The various but altogether arbitrary explanations of those who here recognise no absolute prohibition may be seen in Tholuck. The *direct* oath, *by God*, is not indeed expressly mentioned along with others in what follows; its prohibition, however, is implied, just as a matter of course, and entirely, first of all in the general *μὴ ὀμόσαι ὅλως*, as it is the reference to God which constitutes precisely the fundamental conception and nature of the oath, and, as in the doctrine here discussed, ver. 33, the direct oath is contained not only in *οὐκ ἐπιορκ.*, according to Lev. xix. 12, but also expressly in *ἀποδώσεις τῷ κυρίῳ*, etc. If Christ, therefore, had intended to forbid merely the oaths of common life, He would, instead of the altogether general statement, *μὴ ὀμόσαι ὅλως*, have made use of a form of expression excluding oaths to be taken in relation to the magistracy (probably by a *παρεκτός*, as in ver. 32). It is true, indeed, that in the special prohibitions which follow, He mentions only indirect oaths,—consequently not those that are valid in a court of justice,—but just because the prohibition of the direct oath was already contained in *μὴ ὀμόσ. ὅλως*, first of all and before all other kinds of oaths; and His object now is simply to set forth that even indirect swearing fell under the general prohibition of swearing. And He sets this forth in such a way, that in so doing the prohibition of the direct oath forms *the presupposition* of His demonstration, as it could not otherwise be expected

after *μὴ ὁμόσαι ὅλως*. What a scanty *πλήρωσις* of the law—and one altogether out of keeping with the ideal character of the points which preceded—would it have been had Jesus only intended to say: I forbid you “*the wanton oaths of the streets, of the markets*” (Keim), in all their forms!—*μήτε ἐν τῷ οὐρ., κ.τ.λ.*] not to swear in general, nor (specially) by heaven, nor by earth. See on *μὴ . . . μήτε*, Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 709; Kühner, II. 2, p. 828 f.; Winer, p. 454 [E. T. 612]; also Baeumlein, *Part.* p. 222.—The kinds of swearing censured by Jesus were very common amongst the Jews; Philo, *de Spec. Legg.* p. 770 A; Lightfoot, *l.c.*; Meuschen, *N. T. ex Talm. illustr.* p. 58.—*θρόνος θεοῦ* and *ὑποπόδιον . . . αὐτοῦ*] (Isa. lxvi. 1; Matt. xxiii. 22).—*τοῦ μεγ. βασι.*] of *Jehovah* (Ps. xlviii. 2, xc. 4; Job xiii. 18 ff.: therefore the holy city, iv. 5).—*μήτε<sup>1</sup> ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ*] Not merely the Jews (*Berachoth*, f. iii. 2; Lightfoot, *Hor.* p. 281), but also the heathen (Eur. *Hel.* 835), swore *by their head*. Dougtius, *Anal.* II. p. 7 f.; Wetstein on the passage. Comp. the exposition of Virg. *Aen.* ix. 300.—*ὁμνύειν* is by the Greek writers connected with *κατά τινος*, or with the accus. (Jas. v. 12). Here, as in xxiii. 16 ff., Jer. v. 7, Dan. xii. 7, with *ἐν* (in harmony with the idea that the oath cleaves to the object appealed to, comp. on *ὁμολογεῖν ἐν*, x. 32), and with *εἰς* (directing the thought; comp. Plut. *Oth.* 18), after the Hebrew *ב ראשׁ*.—*ὅτι οὐ δύνασαι, κ.τ.λ.*] *for thou art not in a condition to make one single hair* (if it is black) *white* or (if it is white) *black*. There is, of course, no allusion to the *dyeing* of hair. Wolf, Köcher, Kuinoel, and others incorrectly render it: *thou canst not produce a single white or black hair*. On such a signification, what means the mention of the colour? *The meaning of the whole passage is*: “Ye shall not swear by all

<sup>1</sup> If *μηδὲ* were here the reading (Fritzsche), then the meaning would be: *not even by thy head*; see Hartung, *Partik.* I. p. 196. But this reading is neither critically admissible—as it has only *κ*\*\* in its favour—nor exegetically necessary, since the series of negations is symmetrically continued with *μήτε* in *τ. κ.φ. σ.*, which symmetry is not interrupted by *ὁμόσης*, because the latter does not stand before in *τῇ κ.φ. σ.* Matthew might have written *μηδὲ* (comp. also Bornemann, *ad Xen. Anab.* iii. 2. 27; Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* II. p. 123), but he was not obliged to do so.

these objects; for all such oaths are nothing less than the oath directly by God Himself, on account of the relation in which those objects stand to God." In the creature by which thou swearest, its Creator and Lord is affected.

Ver. 37. *Let your manner of asseveration be affirmation or negation, without an oath.* The repetition of the *ναί* and *οὐ* is intended to make prominent the earnest and decisive nature of the assurance.<sup>1</sup> Similar examples of *יָי וְיָי* and *לֹא לֹא* in the Rabbins, in Lightfoot, and Schoettgen, p. 41. Comp. the *ναί καὶ οὐ Πυθαγορικόν* in Ausonius, *Idyll.* 17: "Si consentitur, mora nulla intervenit est est; Si controversum, dissensio subijciet non." As a matter of course, by this representation other asseverations—made, however, without an oath—are not excluded. — *τὸ δὲ περισσ. τουτ.*] whatever is more than yea and nay (*τούτων*), that is *swearing*. — *ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ*] Euth. Zigabenus: *ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου: auctorem habet diabolum.* So Chrysostom, Theophylact, Beza, Zwingli, Castalio, Piscator, Wetstein, and others; also Fritzsche, Keim. Comp. John viii. 44; 1 John iii. 8, 12. Others (Luther, Calovius, Bengel, Rosenmüller, Kuinoel, Paulus, Tholuck, de Wette, Baumgarten Crusius, Ewald, Bleek, and others) take *τοῦ πονηροῦ* as *neuter*, so that it would have to be explained: *is in the category of evil*, is sinful. Comp. the use of *ἐκ τοῦ ἐμφανούς, ἐκ τοῦ εὐπρεποῦς*, etc., Matthiae, p. 1334. But how insipid and devoid of meaning is the closing thought if this be the meaning! how energetic if *ὁ πονηρός*, xiii. 19, 38, is intended! And by this energetic rejection of the oath amongst the ideal people of God, to whom the *completed* law applies, there is no opposition to the *Old Testament* sacredness of an oath. But if under the completed law the mere yea and nay are to have

<sup>1</sup> In answer to Beza's erroneous explanation, "let your affirmative discourse be *yea*, and your negative, *nay*;" and, in answer to Grotius (comp. also Erasmus), who takes the second *ναί* and *οὐ* to refer to the *act* which corresponds to the assurance, so that the meaning would be: "*fidem a nobis praestari debere in promissis etiam injuratis*," see Fritzsche on the passage. According to Hilgenfeld, the original text is said to have been, in accordance with the quotations in Justin (*Apol.* i. 16, p. 63) and the Clementines (Rom. iii. 55, xix. 2): *ἴστω δὲ ἡμῶν τὸ ναὶ ναὶ, καὶ τὸ οὐ οὐ.* Comp. Jas. v. 12; 2 Cor. i. 17. Matthew would appear again to introduce an assurance like an oath. Keim also deems the form of statement as given by Matthew to be less correct.

the weight and reliability of an oath, then this highest moral standard and ordinance of truthfulness would be again taken away and perverted by him who nevertheless should swear; while the yea and nay would again be deprived of the guarantee of truthfulness, which, like all opposition to the truth, would be *diabolical* (John viii. 44). The oath by God could not be rejected by Jesus, *in and by itself*, as ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ, for it certainly rests upon the divine law; but (in answer to Keim) it has, upon the standpoint of the πλήρωσις of the law, given way to the yea and nay, therefore its re-establishment would only be a desertion of these higher stages, a falling away from the moral τελειότης, up to which Christ means to fulfil the law. This could not proceed from God, but only from the enemy of His will and kingdom. In a similar way, as Theophylact rightly saw, circumcision in the O. T. is ordained of God, and is worthy of honour; but to uphold its validity in Christianity to the injury of faith, and of righteousness by faith, is sinful, devilish; 2 Cor. xi. 3, 14. So also with sacrifices, festival days, prohibition of meats, and so on.

Ver. 38. Ὁφθαλμὸν . . . ὀδόντος] supply δώσει, which supplement is presupposed as well known from the saying referred to (see Ex. xxi. 24). In the usual formula (comp. also Lev. xxii. 20, xxiv. 20; Deut. xix. 21) is expressed the *jus talionis*, the carrying out of which was assigned to the magistracy (comp. XII. Tab.: "si membrum rupit, ni cum eo pacit, talio esto"). Instead of seeking and asserting this right before the magistracy, the Christian, in the feeling of true brotherly love, free from all desire of revenge, is to exercise self-denial, and to exhibit a self-sacrificing spirit of concession. Comp. 1 Cor. vi. 7. This *principle* of Christian morality, laid down absolutely as an ideal, by no means excludes, under the determining circumstances of sinful life, the duty of seeking one's legal rights, as is clear, moreover, from the history of Christ and His apostles. That Jesus, moreover, is speaking against the misuse by the Pharisees of the legal standard, *as a standard within the sphere of social life*, is a groundless supposition of Luther, Beza, Calvin, Calovius, Bengel, B. Crusius, Keim, and

others, especially as in ver. 40 *κριθῆναι* follows. But certainly the Pharisees may, unlovingly enough, in cases occurring in social life, have claimed those rights before the magistracy, and have influenced others also to practise similar unloving conduct. Glosses in reference to the payment in money of legal *talio*, see in Lightfoot.

Vv. 39, 40. *Τῷ πονηρῷ*] is neither to be understood of the *devil* (Chrysostom, Theophylact), nor, as *neuter* (Augustine, Luther, Castalio, Calvin, Ewald, and others), of *injustice*; but, in accordance with the antithesis ἀλλ' ὅστις σε ῥαπίζει, etc., and with vv. 40 and 41: *homini maligno*. — Christ names first the *right* cheek, although the blow most naturally strikes first the left, but after the common fashion of naming the left *after* the right. — *κριθῆναι*] *to go to law*. Vulgate well renders: *in judicio contendere*. Comp. on 1 Cor. vi. 1; Rom. iii. 4; and see Wetstein, Nägelsbach on the *Iliad*, p. 305, ed. 3. It refers to *legal* controversy, not to the extra-judicial beginnings of contention (de Wette; also Beza, Grotius, Kuinoel, and others), by which the *distinction* between the two cases, vv. 39 and 40, is quite overlooked. — *χιτῶνα*] *ἡμίση*, the shirt-like *under-garment*, *tunica*; on the other hand, *ἱμάτιον*] *ἡμίση*, *ἡμίση*, the mantle-like *over-garment*, *toga*, which also served for a covering by night, and might not therefore be retained as a pledge over night; Ex. xxii. 26; Deut. xxiv. 13. The *ἱμάτιον* was more valuable and more indispensable than the *χιτῶν*; that is the point which, according to Matthew, Jesus has in view. It is different in Luke vi. 29 (according to the order of succession in covering the body). — *λαβεῖν*] by the lawsuit, which follows from *κριθῆναι*; whilst the pettiness of the object is not opposed to this, seeing that the method of illustration is by way of concrete example.

Ver. 41. *Ἀγγαρεύειν*, passed over from the Persian (see Gesenius, *Thes.* I. p. 23) into Greek, Latin (*angariare*, Vulgate, Augustine, *ep.* 5), and into the Rabbinical dialect (אֲגָרֵי, Buxtorf, *Lex. Rabb.* p. 131; Lightfoot on the passage), *to force into transport service*. The Persian arrangements respecting post messages, instituted by Cyrus, justified the couriers (*ἄγγαροι*) in *making requisitions* from station to station of

men, or cattle, or carriages for the carrying on of their journey, Herodotus, viii. 98; Xenoph. *Cyrop.* viii. 6. 17; Josephus, *Antt.* xii. 2. 3. See Dougtius, *Anal.* II. p. 9 f. Here it refers to *continuing a forced journey*, comp. xxvii. 32. — *μῖλιον*] One thousand steps, or eight stadia, one-fourth of a German mile. A late word found in Strabo.

REMARK.—The spirit of the ethics of Jesus, His own example (John xviii. 22 f.) and that of the apostles (Acts xxiii. 3, xvi. 35, xxvi. 25, xxv. 9 f.), require us to recognise, in these manifestly typical representations, vv. 39–41, not precepts to be literally followed, but precepts which are certainly to be determined *according to their idea*. This idea, which is that of love, yielding and putting to shame in the spirit of self-denial, and overcoming evil with good, is concretely represented in those examples, but has, in the relations of external life and its individual cases, the measure and the limitation of its moral practice. Comp. on ver. 38. Luther appropriately lays emphasis here upon the distinction between what the Christian has to do *as a Christian*, and what *as a worldly person* (in so far as he is in a position or an office, and so on). The Lord leaves to the *state* its own jurisdiction, xxii. 21.

Ver. 42. A precept (in opposition to selfishness) which does not stand indeed in essential connection with what precedes, but which is still brought into connection with it through the natural connection of the thoughts. According to Ewald, who here lays weight (*Jahrb.* I. p. 132 f.) upon the number *seven* in the quotations of the O. T. laws, there must have stood after ver. 41 in the original collection of sayings the following words: *ἡκούσατε, ὅτι ἐβρόθη· οὐ κλέψεις, ἀποδώσεις δὲ τὸ ἱμάτιον τῷ πτωχῷ· ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν τῷ αἰτοῦντι, and so on, and then, ver. 40. The command that is wanting was put together from Ex. xx. 15; Deut. xxiv. 12 f. A very thoughtful conjecture, which is followed by Holtzmann; but unnecessary, for this reason, that the contents and order of the sentences, vv. 40–42, attach themselves to one fundamental thought; and improbable, because not merely an omission, but also a transposition, is assumed, and because τῷ αἰτοῦντι, κ.τ.λ., does not correspond to the prohibition of*

*thieving* as its fulfilment. — δανείσ.] That Jesus did not think of lending out at *interest*, appears from Ex. xxii. 24 ; Lev. xxv. 37 ; Deut. xv. 7, xxiii. 20 ; Ewald, *Alterthumer*, p. 242 f. [E. T. 181].

Ver. 43. Τὸν πλῆσιόν σου] In Lev. xix. 18, πληῖν denotes a *member of the nation*, whereby the proselyte also is included with others ; hatred towards the heathen, however, is not conceived of by the legislator as an antithesis that follows of itself, and therefore we may all the less assume that Jesus Himself introduced *into the law* hatred of one's enemies, as an abstraction from the national exclusiveness, in which the law keeps Judaism towards heathenism, as if it *commanded* this hatred (Weiss, Bleek). The casuistic tradition of the *Pharisees*, however, explained Lev. xix. 18, as the antithetical τ. ἐχθρόν σ. shows, of a *friend*, and deduced therefrom (perhaps with the addition of passages like Deut. xxv. 17–19, comp. Mal. i. 3) the antithesis (which confessedly was also a principle of the common Hellenism), see Stallbaum, ad Plat. *Phil.* 110, p. 154 ; Jacobs, ad *Del. epigr.* p. 144 : καὶ μισήσεις τὸν ἐχθρόν σου, by which was meant not the *national enemy* (Keim), but the personal (σου) *private enemy*, in opposition to the law (Ex. xxiii. 4 f. ; Lev. xix. 18) and to the pious spirit of the Old Covenant (Ps. vii. 5, xxxv. 13 f. ; Job xxxi. 29 ; Prov. xxiv. 17, 29, xxv. 21 f. ; comp. Gen. xlv. 1 ; 1 Sam. xxiv. 7, xviii. 5 ; 2 Kings vi. 22). Jesus Himself also may have understood the Pharisaic addition only to refer to *private enemies*, as is clear from His antithesis, vv. 44 ff.

Ver. 44. Observe the *entire* love which is here required : *disposition, word, act, intercession* ; “ primo fere continetur tertium, et secundum quarto ” (Bengel). But it is as ἀγαπᾶν (*to esteem highly*), not as φιλεῖν (*amare*), that we are required to love our enemy. Comp. on John xi. 5. It rests upon the clearness and strength of the moral will to separate between the *person* of the enemy and his hostile *disposition* towards us, so that the latter does not prevent us from esteeming the former, from blessing it, and applying to it acts of kindness and intercession. The Christian receives this moral clearness and strength, and the consecration of enthusiasm thereto, in his



self-experience of the divine love of one's enemy in Christ (xviii. 21 ff.; Eph. iv. 32; Phil. ii. 1 f.; 1 John iv. 10 f.).

Ver. 45. "Ὅπως γένησθε υἱοὶ, κ.τ.λ.] is commonly understood, in keeping with the ὅτι τὸν ἥλιον, κ.τ.λ., that follows, of the *ethical* condition of *similarity to God*, according to which the child of God also exhibits in himself the *divine* disposition and the *divine* conduct (Eph. v. 1 f.). But the *correct* interpretation is given by ver. 9, and is supported by γένησθε (for γίνεσθαι is never equivalent to εἶναι). What is meant is, as in ver. 9, the *obtaining of the coming salvation in the kingdom of the Messiah*, which, according to the connection, as in ver. 9, is designated as the *future sonship of God*, because the participators in the Messianic blessedness must necessarily be of the same moral nature with God as the original type of love; therefore the words that follow, and ver. 48. — τοῦ ἐν οὐραν.] See on vi. 9. As to the thought, comp. Seneca, *de benef.* iv. 26: "Si deos imitaris, da et ingratis beneficia; nam et sceleratis sol oritur, et piratis patent maria." — ὅτι] is not equivalent to ὅς, but the simple *as* (for), stating that ὅπως γένησθε υἱοὶ, κ.τ.λ., is rightly said. Fritzsche here inappropriately (comp. already Bengel) drags in the usage of εἰς ἐκεῖνο ὅτι (see on John ii. 18, ix. 17, etc.). — ἀνατέλλει] transitive, Hom. *Il.* v. 777; Pind. *Isthm.* vi. 5, v. 111; Soph. *Phil.* 1123; Diod. Sic. xvii. 7; LXX. Gen. iii. 18; Sir. xxxvii. 17; Clem. *Cor.* I. 20. — τὸν ἥλιον αὐτοῦ] "Magnifica appellatio; ipse et fecit solem et gubernat et habet in sua unius potestate" (Bengel). The goodness of God towards His enemies (sinners) Jesus makes His believers feel by the *experimental proof* of His *all* good administration in nature—a proof which, like every one derived *a posteriori* in favour of a single divine attribute, is, on account of opposing experiences (God also *destroys* the good and the evil through natural manifestations), in itself insufficient, but, in *popular* instruction, has its proper place, and is of assured efficacy, with the same right as the *special* consideration of *individual* divine attributes in general.

Ver. 46. *Argumentum e contrario* in favour of the command to love one's enemy; for the mere love of one's *friend* belongs

to no higher stage of moral life than that of the publicans and heathens.—In what follows neither is a *μόνον* to be supplied after *τοὺς ἀγαπ. ὑμᾶς*, nor is *ἔχετε* to be taken for *ἐξέτε* (both in answer to Kuinoel and others). Jesus opposes the doctrine, “*Love them who love you*,” and views the *reward*, as in ver. 12, vi. 1, as a possession, preserved in heaven with God, to be realized in the kingdom of the future. — *οἱ τελῶναι*] *the tax-gatherers* (partly natives, partly Romans), who were employed in the service of the Roman knights, who farmed the revenues. They were generally greatly hated amongst the Jews on account of their severity and avarice, especially, however, for being the servants of the Roman power. Wetstein on the passage; Keim, II. p. 217 f.

Ver. 47. *And if ye shall have welcomed your brethren alone* (saluted them lovingly), what special thing have you done? The conception, “*to act in a friendly manner*” (Luther, Tholuck, Bleek, Hofmann), is not the *significatio*, but certainly the *adsignificatio* of *ἀσπάζεσθαι*, as often in classic writers. Comp. *ἀσπάζεσθαι καὶ φιλεῖν*, Stallbaum, ad Plat. *Ap.* p. 29 D, and *Rep.* 499 A. — *τοὺς ἀδελφ. ὑμῶν μόνον*] is not to be limited to the members of families and other close associations (Tholuck and others), as was already done by the reading *φίλους*, approved of by Griesbach; but it refers to the *members of the nation*, and applies to the national particularism of the Jews; consequently the national antithesis is *οἱ ἔθνικοι*. Comp. Bleek. — *τί περισσόν*] *what preference? what distinguishes you above others*, “*ut decet filios Dei*,” Bengel. Comp. Rom. iii. 1; Soph. *O. R.* 841. Instead of *τί περισσόν*, Justin, *Apol.* i. 15, quotes *τί καινόν*, which substantially agrees with *τί περισσόν*, and belongs only to another form of the idea, not to a higher point of view (Hilgenfeld). See Ritschl in the *Theol. Jahrb.* 1851, p. 490 f.

Ver. 48. *Ἔσεσθε*] imperatively. — *οὖν*] draws a deduction from vv. 44–47, where the emphatic *ὑμεῖς* forms the sublime antithesis to the last-mentioned publicans and heathens. The highest summary of the unending obligation of Christian love. — *τέλειοι*] *ἐν μηδενὶ λειπόμενοι*, Jas. i. 4. Euth. Zigabenus well remarks: *οἱ μὲν ἀγαπῶντες τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας αὐτοὺς*

ἀτελεῖς εἰσιν εἰς ἀγάπην: οἱ δὲ τοὺς ἐχθροὺς, οὗτοι τέλειοι. Comp. Luther: "after the example of the heavenly Father, who does not piece nor divide His love," and already Ignatius, *ad Philad.*, interpol. 3. Thus the closing admonition stands in close relation to what precedes. *Others* (Beza, Fritzsche, Kuinoel, Ewald, who also regards vii. 12 as originally belonging to this passage): *integri, sine vitiiis* in general, without exclusive reference to the commandment of love. They consider the verse as the top-stone of the whole discourse, directed from ver. 20 onwards against the Pharisees. But this anti-Pharisaic tendency is still continued also in ch. vi., and the pointing to the example of God would at least not be appropriate to vv. 27 ff. and to 31 ff. — ὥσπερ] equality of the moral *modality*, ver. 45, by which the relation of the adequate *degree* is not required, and yet the ideal task, the obligation of which is never exhausted (Rom. xiii. 8 ff.), is for ever made sure. Observe, moreover, how this ὥσπερ corresponds, indeed, to the Platonic conception of virtue (ὁμοιοῦσθαι τῷ θεῷ); the latter, however, is surpassed, on the one side, by the specific requirement of *love* as similarity to God; and, on the other, by the idea of God as the *heavenly Father*.

## CHAPTER VI.

VER. 1. After προσέχ. Tisch. inserts δι, no doubt only in conformity with L Z κ, Curss. Verss.; yet correctly, inasmuch as δι would be readily omitted from its coming immediately after the syllable ΤΕ, and from its reference not being noticed. — δι και ο σύνην] Elz. Matth. Scholz have ἐλεημοσύνην, against B D κ, 1, 209, 217, It. (Brix. excepted) Vulg. Or. and some other Fathers. A false gloss. — Ver. 4. αὐτός] not found in B K L U Z κ, Curss. Vulg. It. Copt. Syr<sup>cur</sup> and several Fathers. It seemed superfluous, and was accordingly omitted, and that all the more readily that it is likewise wanting in vv. 6, 18. Cancelled by Fritzsche, Lachm. and Tisch. 8. — σοι] Elz. Griesb. Matth. Scholz add ἐν τῷ φανερώ, which is not found in B D Z κ, Curss. Codd. gr. in Aug. Syr<sup>cur</sup> Copt. Vulg. and several Fathers. Also in the case of ver. 6, the testimonies in favour of omitting are essentially the same; while, as regards ver. 18, the testimony for excluding is far more decided. It should be retained in vv. 4 and 6, but in ver. 18 it is an interpolation, and ought to be deleted.<sup>1</sup> — Ver. 5. προσεύχῃ, οὐκ ἔσῃ] Lachm. and Tisch.: προσεύχῃσθε, οὐκ ἔσεσθε, after B Z, 1, 22, 116, Copt. Sahid. Aeth. Goth. It. Vulg. Or. Chrys. Aug. Correctly; the singular was occasioned by the use of that number in what precedes and follows. κ has προσεύχῃ οὐκ ἔσεσθε; see, however, Tisch. on Cod. κ. — Ver. 12. ἀφίεμεν] D E L Δ Π, 157, 253, Ev. 26: ἀφίεμεν; B Z κ\*, 1, 124 (on the margin), Harl. For. Or. Nyss. Bass.: ἀφήκαμεν. So Lachm. and Tisch. The latter is to be adopted. The reading of the Received text and ἀφίεμεν are from Luke xi. 4, into which, again, as quoted in Origen (once), ἀφήκαμεν has found its way from our present passage. — Ver. 13. πονηροῦ] Elz. Matth. add the doxology: ὅτι σοῦ ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία καὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, Ἀμήν. Against a preponderance of testimony, and contrary to the whole connection with ver. 14 f. A very old (Syr.) addition from the liturgy; one, however, that has assumed

<sup>1</sup> Lachm. and Tisch. have deleted ἐν τῷ φανερώ in all the three passages; in ver. 18 it is also erased by Griesb. Matth. and Scholz.

a variety of forms. — Ver. 15. *τὰ παραπτ. αὐτῶν*] is correctly deleted by Tisch. It is wanting in D  $\aleph$ , Curss. Vulg. It. Syr. Aug., and how easy was it mechanically to insert it as a supplement from ver. 14! — Ver. 18. *σοι*] Elz. Fritzsche add *ἐν τῷ φανερωῷ*; see on ver. 4. — Instead of *κρυπτῷ*, Lachm. and Tisch., in both instances, have *κρυφαίῳ*, after B D  $\aleph$ , 1, 22; correctly, seeing that *κρυπτῷ* is the common reading, and derived from vv. 4, 6. — Ver. 21. Instead of *ὑμῶν*, B  $\aleph$ , 1, 128, and important Verss. and Fathers, have *σου* both times, which Griesb. has recommended, and Fritzsche, Lachm. Tisch. have adopted. Correctly; *ὑμῶν* is taken from Luke xii. 34. — Ver. 22. After the first *ὀφθαλμῶς* Lachm. has *σου*, only after B, Vulg. Aeth. Codd. It. Or. Hil. Taken from the one which follows. Then in what comes next Lachm. places the  $\tilde{\eta}$  immediately after *οὖν*, only according to B. In  $\aleph$  and several Verss. and Fathers *οὖν* is omitted; deleted by Tisch. 8, against decisive testimony. Coming as it does after *ἐάν*, it might easily be left out through an oversight on the part of the transcriber. — Ver. 25. *καὶ τί*] Fritzsche, Lachm.  $\tilde{\eta}$  *τί*, according to B, Curss. and a few Verss. and Fathers. Too inadequate testimony.  $\aleph$  Curss. Verss. and Fathers, who are followed by Tisch. 8, omit *καὶ τί πῖντε* altogether. In conformity with Luke xii. 22. — Ver. 28. Instead of *αὐξήσῃ*, *κοπιᾷ*, and *νήθει*, Lachm. and Tisch. have the *plurals*, after B  $\aleph$ , Curss. Ath. Chrys. Correctly. See Luke xii. 27. Likewise in ver. 32, where Lachm. and Tisch. have *ἐπιζητοῦσιν*, the sing. is used to conform with Luke xii. 30. — Ver. 33. *τ. βασιλ. τ. θεοῦ κ. τ. δικαιοσ. αὐτοῦ*] Lachm.: *τ. δικαιοσ. καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ*, only after B. In  $\aleph$ , *τ. θεοῦ* is wanting; and its omission, in which Tisch. 8 concurs, is favoured by the testimony of the reading in B. Several Verss. and Fathers also leave out *τ. θεοῦ*, which, as being a supplement, ought to be deleted. The testimony is decisive, however, in favour of putting *τ. βασιλ.* first. — Ver. 34. *τὰ ἐαυτῆς*] Lachm. and Tisch. have merely *ἐαυτῆς*, according to important testimony. Correctly; from the genitive not being understood, it was attempted to explain it by means of *τά*, and in other ways (*περὶ ἐαυτῆς*, *ἐαυτῇ*, *ἐαυτῇ*).

Ver. 1. *Connection*: However (*προσέχετε δέ*, *be upon your guard*), to those *doctrines and prescriptions* regarding the true *δικαιοσύνη*, I must add a *warning* with reference to the *practice* of it (*ποιεῖν*, 1 John iii. 7). This warning, stated in general terms in ver. 1, is then specially applied in ver. 2 to *almsgiving*, in ver. 5 to *prayer*, and in ver. 16 to *fasting*.

Accordingly *δικαιοσύνη* is *righteousness* generally (v. 6, 10, 20), and not *benevolence* specially, which, besides, it never means, not even in 2 Cor. ix. 10, any more than *πρῆς* (not even in Prov. x. 2, xi. 4; Dan. iv. 24), which in the LXX., and that more frequently by way of *interpretation*, is rendered by *ἐλεημοσύνη*, in which the *δικαιοσύνη* manifests itself by acts of charity; comp. Tob. ii. 14, xii. 9. — On *εἰ δὲ μῆγε*, after which we are here to supply *προσέχετε τὴν δικαιοσύν. ὑμ. μὴ ποιεῖν*, etc., see on 2 Cor. xi. 16. — *μισθὸν . . . οὐρανοῖς*] See on v. 12, 46.

Ver. 2. *Μὴ σαλπίσσης*] *do not sound a trumpet*, metaphorically: *make no noise and display with it* (Chrysostom, Theophylact, Euth. Zigabenus). Comp. Achill. *Tat.* viii. p. 507; Cic. *ad Div.* xvi. 21: “te buccinatores fore existimationis meae.” Prudent. *de Symmach.* ii. 68. Here *ἔμπρ.* refers to the idea of a person sounding a trumpet, which he holds up to his mouth. Others (Calvin, Calovius, Wolf, Paulus, also *τινές* referred to by Euth. Zigabenus) render: *cause not a trumpet to be sounded before thee*. They think that, in order to make a display, the Pharisees had actually made the poor assemble together by the blowing of trumpets. But the expression itself is as decidedly incompatible with this extraordinary explanation as it is with the notion that what is meant (Homburg, Schoettgen) is the sound produced by the clinking of the *money, dropped into* the alleged trumpet-like *chests in the temple* (see on Mark xii. 41), and this notwithstanding that it is added, *ἐν τ. συναγ. κ. ἐν τ. ῥύμ.* On the injunction generally, comp. Babyl. *Chagig.* f. v. 1: “R. Jannai vidit quendam nummum pauperi dantem palam; cui dixit: praestat non dedisse, quam sic dedisse.” In the *synagogues* it was the practice to collect the alms on the Sabbath; Lightfoot and Wetstein on this passage. — *ὑποκριταί*] in classical writers means *actors*; in the New Testament, *hypocrites*. “Hypocrisis est mixtura malitiae cum specie bonitatis,” Bengel. — *ἀπέχουσι . . . αὐτῶν*] inasmuch as they have already attained what was the sole object of their liberality, popular applause, and therefore have nothing more to expect. *ἀπέχειν*, *to have obtained, to have fully received*. See on Phil. iv. 18.

Ver. 3. Σοῦ δέ] in emphatic contrast to hypocrites. — μὴ γνῶτω ἡ ἀριστερά σου, κ.τ.λ.] The right hand *gives*, let not the left hand know it. Proverbial way of expressing entire freedom from the claiming anything like self-laudation. For sayings of a similar kind among the Fathers, see Suicer, *Thes.* I. p. 508. De Wette, following Paulus, thinks that what is referred to is the *counting* of the money *into the left hand* before it is given away with the right. This is out of place, for the warning is directed, not against a narrow calculating, but against an *ostentatious* almsgiving. For the same reason we must object to the view of Luther, who says: "When you are giving alms with the right hand, see that you are not seeking to *receive* more with the left, but rather put it behind your back," and so on.

Ver. 4. Ὁ βλέπων ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ] *who sees, i.e. knows* what goes on *in secret*, where He is equally present. Grotius and Kuinoel arbitrarily take the words to be equivalent to τὰ ἐν τῷ κρ. — αὐτὸς ἀποδώσει σοι] *He Himself will reward you*, that is, at the Messianic judgment (*i.e. ἐν τῷ φανερῷ*, 2 Cor. v. 10); αὐτός forms a contrast to the *human* rewards, which the hypocrites, with their ostentatious ways of acting, managed to secure in the shape of applause from their fellow-men, ver. 2.

Ver. 5. Οὐκ ἔσεσθε] See the critical remarks. The future, as in v. 48. — ὅτι] as in v. 45. — φιλοῦσιν] *they have pleasure in it, they love to do it*,—a usage frequently met with in classical writers (Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* II. p. 910 f.), though in the New Testament occurring only here and in xxiii. 6 f. — ἐστῶτες] The Jew *stood*, while praying, with the face turned toward the temple or the holy of holies, 1 Sam. i. 26; 1 Kings viii. 22; Mark xi. 25; Luke xviii. 11; Lightfoot, p. 292 f.; at other times, however, also in a kneeling posture, or prostrate on the ground. Therefore the notion of *fixi, immobiles* (Maldonatus), is not implied in the simple ἐστῶτ., which, however, forms a feature in the *picture*; they *love to stand there and pray*. — ἐν ταῖς γονύαις τ. πλ.] not merely when they happen to be surprised, or intentionally allow themselves to be surprised (de Wette), by the hour for prayer, but also at

other times besides the regular hours of devotion, turning the most sacred duty of man into an occasion for hypocritical ostentation.

Ver. 6. *Ταμείου*] *any room in the interior of the house, as opposed to the synagogues and the streets. We are therefore not to think exclusively of the closet in the strict sense of the word, which was called ὑπερῶν; see note on Acts i. 13. For the expression, comp. Isa. xxvi. 20; for ταμείον, conclave, see Xen. Hell. v. 4. 5; Matt. xxiv. 26; Sir. xxix. 12; Tob. vii. 17. — ἀποδώσει σοι] for thy undemonstrative piety. It is not public prayer in itself that Jesus condemns, but praying in an ostentatious manner; rather than this, He would have us betake ourselves to a lonely room. Theophylact: ὁ τόπος οὐ βλάπτει, ἀλλ' ὁ τρόπος καὶ ὁ σκοπός.*

Ver. 7. *Δεῖ*] indicating a transition to the consideration of another abuse of prayer. — *βαττολογεῖν*] (Simplic. *ad Epict.* p. 340) is not to be derived, with Suidas, Eustathius, Erasmus, from some one of the name of *Battus* (passages in Wetstein), who, according to Herod. v. 155, was in the habit of stammering, but, as already Hesychius correctly perceived (*κατὰ μίμησιν τῆς φωνῆς*), is to be regarded as a case of *onomatopoeia* (comp. *Βάτταλος* as a nickname of Demosthenes, *βατταρίζω, βατταρισμός, βατταριστής*), and means, properly speaking, to *stammer*, then to *prate, to babble*, the same thing that is subsequently called *πολυλογία*. Β κ have the form *βατταλογ*; see Tisch. 8. — *οἱ ἐθνικοὶ*] Whose prayers, so wordy and full of repetitions (hence, *fatigare Deos*), were well known. Terent. *Heautont.* v. i. 6 ff. In Rabbinical writers are found recommendations sometimes of long, sometimes of short, prayers (Wetstein). For an example of a Battological Jewish prayer, see Schoettgen, p. 58 f., comp. Matt. xxiii. 15; and for disapproval of long prayers, see Eccles. v. 1, Sir. vii. 14. — *ἐν τῇ πολυλογίᾳ αὐτῶν*] *in consequence of their much speaking; they imagine that this is the cause of their being heard. As to the thing, consider the words of Augustine: "Absit ab oratione multa locutio, sed non desit multa precatio, si fervens perseveret intentio;" the former, he adds, is "rem necessariam superfluis agere verbis," but the multum precari is: "ad eum,*



quem precamur, diuturna et pia cordis excitatione pulsare" (*Ep.* 130. 20, *ad probam*).

Ver. 8. *Οὖν*] seeing that you are expected to shun heathen error. — *οἷδε γὰρ, κ.τ.λ.*] so that, this being the case, that *βαττολογεῖν* is superfluous.

Ver. 9. "Having now rebuked and condemned such false and meaningless prayer, Christ goes on to prescribe a short, neat form of His own to show us how we are to pray, and what we are to pray for," Luther.—The emphasis is, in the first place, on *οὕτως*, and then on *ὑμεῖς*, the latter in contrast to the heathen, the former to the *βαττολογεῖν*; while *οὖν* is equivalent to saying, "inasmuch as ye ought not to be like the heathen when they pray." Therefore, judging from the context, Christ intends *οὕτως* to point to the prayer which follows as an example of one that is *free from vain repetitions*, as an example of what a prayer *ought to be* in respect of its form and contents *if the fault in question is to be entirely avoided*, not as a direct prescribed pattern (comp. Tholuck), excluding other ways of expressing ourselves in prayer. The interpretation, "*in hunc sensum*" (Grotius), is at variance with the context; but that of Fritzsche (in some *brief* way such as this) is not "very meaningless" (de Wette), but *correct*, meaning as he does, not brevity in itself, but in its relation to the *contents* (for *comprehensive* brevity is the opposite of the vain repetitions).—On the Lord's Prayer, which now follows, see Kamphausen, *d. Gebet d. Herrn*, 1866; J. Hanne, in *d. Jahrb. f. D. Th.* 1866, p. 507 ff.; and in Schenkel's *Bibellex.* II. p. 346 ff. According to Luke xi. 1, the same prayer, though in a somewhat shorter form, was given on a different occasion. In regard to this difference of position, it may be noted: (1) That the prayer cannot have been given on *both* occasions, and so given twice (as I formerly believed); for if Jesus has taught His disciples the use of it as early as the time of the Sermon on the Mount, it follows that their request in Luke xi. 1 is unhistorical; but if, on the contrary, the latter is historical, then it is impossible that the Lord's Prayer can have been known in the circle of the disciples from the date of the Sermon on the Mount. (2) That the characteristic

*brevity* of Luke's version, as compared with the fulness of that of Matthew, tells in favour of Luke's originality; but, besides this, there is the fact that the *historical basis* on which Luke's version is founded leaves no room whatever to suspect that legendary influences have been at work in its formation, while it is perfectly conceivable that the author of our version of Matthew, when he came to that part of the Sermon on the Mount where warnings are directed against meaningless repetitions in prayer, took occasion also to put this existing model prayer into our Lord's mouth. Schleiermacher, Baumgarten-Crusius, Sieffert, Olshausen, Neander, de Wette, Ewald, Bleek, Holtzmann, Weiss, Weizsäcker, Schenkel, Hanne, Kamphausen, also rightly declare themselves against the position of the prayer in Matthew as unhistorical. The *material* superiority of Matthew's version (see especially Keim) remains unaffected by this verdict. On the *Marcionitic* form, especially in the first petition, and on the priority of the same as maintained by Hilgenfeld, Zeller, Volkmar, see the critical notes on Luke xi. 2-4. — *πάτερ ἡμῶν*] This form of address, which rarely occurs in the O. T. (Isa. lxiii. 16; Deut. xxxii. 6: in the Apocrypha, in Wisd. ii. 16, xiv. 3; Sir. xxiii. 1, li. 10; Tob. xiii. 4; 3 Macc. vi. 3), but which is constantly employed in the N. T. in accordance with the example of Jesus, who exalted it even into the *name* for God (Mark xiv. 36; Weisse, *Evangelienfr.* p. 200 ff.), brings the petitioner at once into an attitude of perfect confidence in the divine love; "God seeks to entice us with it," and so on, Luther.<sup>1</sup> But the consciousness of our standing as children in the *full and specially Christian sense* (comp. on v. 9), it was not possible perfectly to express in this address till a *later time*, seeing that the relation in question was only to be re-established by the atoning death. — *ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς*] distinguishes Him who is adored in the character of Father as the *true* God, but the *symbolical* explanations that have been given are of an

<sup>1</sup> In his translation, Luther renders it here and in Luke xi. 2 by *unser Vater*; in the Catechism and manuals of prayer and baptism, *Vater unser*, after the Latin *Pater noster*. See Rienecker in *d. Stud. u. Krit.* 1837, p. 328 f. Kamphausen, p. 30 f.

arbitrary character (Kuinoel, "Deus optime maxime, benignissime et potentissime;" de Wette, "the elevation of God above the world;" Baumgarten-Crusius, "God who exists for all men;" Hanne, "Father of all"). Surely such a line of interpretation ought to have been precluded by ver. 10, as well as by the doctrine which teaches that Christ has come from heaven from the Father, that He has returned to heaven to the right hand of the Father, and that He will return again in majesty from heaven. The only true God, though everywhere present (2 Chron. ii. 6), nevertheless has *his special abode* in heaven; heaven is *specially the place where He dwells in majesty, and where the throne of His glory is set* (Isa. lxvi. 1; Ps. ii. 4, cii. 19, cxv. 3; Job xxii. 12 ff.; Acts vii. 55, 56; 1 Tim. vi. 16), from which, too, the Spirit of God (iii. 16; Acts ii.), the voice of God (iii. 17; John xii. 28), and the angels of God (John i. 52) come down. Upon the idea of God's *dwelling-place* is based that very common Jewish invocation אֲבִינוּ שְׁבַשְׁמִים (Lightfoot, p. 229), just as it may be affirmed in a general way that (comp. the θεοὶ οὐρανίῳνες of Homer) "πάντες τὸν ἀνωτάτω τῷ θεῷ τόπον ἀποδιδόασιν," Aristot. *de Coelo*, i. 3. Comp. generally, Ch. F. Fritzsche, *nov. Opusc.* p. 218 ff. Augustine, *Ep.* 187. 16, correctly thinks there may be an allusion to the heavenly temple, "ubi est populus angelorum, quibus aggregandi et coaequandi sumus, cum finita peregrinatione quod promissum est sumserimus." On heaven as a *plural* (in answer to Kamphausen), comp. note on 2 Cor. xii. 2; Eph. iv. 10. — ἁγιασθήτω] Chrysost., Euth. Zigabenus, *δοξασθήτω*; more precisely, *let it be kept sacred* (Ex. xx. 8; Isa. xxix. 23). God's name is, no doubt, "holy in itself" (Luther), objectively and absolutely so; but this holiness must be *asserted and displayed* in the whole being and character of believers ("ut non existiment aliquid sanctum, quod magis offendere timeant," Augustine), inwardly and outwardly, so that disposition, word, and deed are regulated by the acknowledged perfection of God, and brought into harmony with it. Exactly as in the case of שְׁפָטָה, Lev. x. 3, xxii. 2, 32; Ezek. xxviii. 22, xxxviii. 23; Num. xx. 13; Sir. xxxiii. 4; 1 Pet. iii. 15. — τὸ ὄνομά σου] Everything which, in its distinctive

conception, Thy name embraces and expresses, *numen tuum*, Thy entire perfection, as the object revealed to the believer for his apprehension, confession, and worship. So  $\eta\eta\eta\psi$ , Ps. v. 12, ix. 11; Isa. xxix. 23; Ezek. xxxvi. 23; and frequently also in the Apocrypha. Everything impure, repugnant to the nature of God, is a profanation, a  $\beta\epsilon\beta\eta\lambda\omicron\upsilon\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma\tau\omicron\varsigma\delta\nu\omicron\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma\tau\omicron\varsigma\alpha\gamma\iota\omicron\nu$  (Lev. xviii. 21).—Observe once more that the three *imperatives* in vv. 9, 10 are not meant to express the idea of a *resolution and a vow* (Hanne, comp. Weizsäcker), which is opposed to  $\pi\rho\sigma\epsilon\upsilon\chi\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$ , but they are  $\alpha\iota\tau\acute{\eta}\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$  (Phil. iv. 6), *supplications and desires*, as in xxvi. 39, 42.

Ver. 10.<sup>1</sup>  $\text{Ἐλθέτω, κ.τ.λ.}$ ] *Let the kingdom of the Messiah appear.* This was likewise a leading point in the prayers of the Jews, especially in the *Kaddish*, which had been in regular use since the captivity, and which contained the words, *Regnet tuum regnum; redemptio mox veniat.* Hence the canon,  $\text{כל ברכה שאין בה מלכות אינה ברכה}$ . Bab. Berac. f. 40. 2. Here, likewise, *the kingdom of God* is no other than the *kingdom of the Messiah*, the advent of which was the supreme object of pious longing (Luke ii. 25, xvii. 20; Mark xv. 43; Luke xxii. 18, xxiii. 51; 2 Tim. iv. 8). This view of the kingdom and its coming, as the *winding up of the world's history*, a view which was also shared by the principal Fathers (Tertullian, Chrysostom, Augustine, Euth. Zigabenus), is the only one which corresponds with the historical conception of the  $\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$  throughout the whole of the N. T.; comp. on iii. 2, the kingdom *comes* with the Messiah who comes to establish it; Mark xi. 9, 10; Luke xxiii. 42. The *ethical* development (xiii. 31 ff., xxiv. 14; comp. on iii. 2, v. 3 ff., 48; also on Acts iii. 21), which necessarily precedes the advent of the kingdom (Luke xix. 11) and prepares the way for it, and with which the diffusion of Christianity is bound up, xxviii. 19 (Grotius, Kuinoel), forms the *essential condition* of that advent, and through  $\text{ἐλθέτω, κ.τ.λ.}$ , is *thus far indirectly* (as the means toward the wished-for end) *included* in the petition, though

<sup>1</sup> On the inverted order of the second and third petition in Tertullian, see Nitzsch in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1830, p. 846 ff. This transposition appeared more logical and more historical.

not expressly mentioned in so many words, so that we are not called upon either to substitute for the concrete conception of the future kingdom (Luke xxii. 18) one of an ethical, of a more or less rationalistic character (Jerome, Origen, Wetstein: of the moral sway of Christianity; Baumgarten-Crusius: the development of the cause of God among men), or immediately to associate them together. This in answer also to Luther ("God's kingdom comes first of all in time and here below through God's word and faith, and then hereafter in eternity through the revelation of Christ"), Melancthon, Calvin, de Wette, Tholuck, "the kingdom of God typified in Israel, coming in its reality in Christ, and ever more and more perfected by Him as time goes on;" comp. Bleek. — *γενηθήτω, κ.τ.λ.*] *May Thy will* (vii. 21; 1 Thess. iv. 3) *be done, as by the angels* (Ps. ciii. 21), *so also by men*. This is the practical moral necessity in the life of believers, which, with its ideal requirements, is to determine and regulate that life until the fulfilment of the second petition shall have been accomplished. "Thus it is that the third petition, descending into the depths of man's present condition and circumstances, damps the glow of the second," Ewald. "Coelum norma est terrae, in qua aliter alia fiunt omnia," Bengel. Accordingly the will of God here meant is not necessarily the *voluntas discernens* (Beza), but *praecipiens*, which is fulfilled by the good angels of heaven. This petition, which is omitted in Luke, is not to be taken merely as an *explanation* (Kamphausen) of the one which precedes it, nor as *tautological* (Hanne), but as exhibiting to the petitioner for the kingdom *the full extent of moral requirement*, without complying with which it is impossible to be admitted into the kingdom when it actually comes. As, according to ver. 33, the Christian is called upon to strive after the *kingdom* and the *righteousness* of God; so here, after the petition for the coming of the *kingdom*, it is asked that *righteousness*, which is the thing that God *wills*, may be *realized* upon the earth.

Ver. 11. *Τὸν ἄρτον*] same as ἄρτος, *victus*; Gen. xviii. 5; Prov. xxx. 8; 2 Thess. iii. 12; Sir. x. 26; Wisd. xvi. 20. — *τὸν ἐπιούσιον*] occurring nowhere else in the Greek language

but here and in Luke xi. 3. See Origen, *de Orat.* § 27: *ἐοικε πεπλᾶσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν εὐαγγελιστῶν*. It is possible that it may be derived from οὐσία, and accordingly the phrase has been supposed to mean: *the food necessary for subsistence*, *ἡ ἡμῶν*, Prov. xxx. 8. So Syr., Origen, Chrysostom, Theophylact, Euth. Zigabenus, Etym. M.; Beza, Maldonatus, Kuinoel, Tholuck, Ewald (de Wette undecided), Arnoldi, Bleek, Weizsäcker, Keim, Hanne, and probably this explanation has also given rise to the rendering "*daily bread*" (It., Chrysostom, Luther), *ἐφήμερος*, Jas. ii. 15; comp. Victorinus, c. *Ar.* ii. p. 273, Augustine. But οὐσία does not mean *subsistence* (συστασις), but (Ast, *Lex. Plat.* II. p. 491 f.) *essence*, as also *reality*, and, finally, *possessions*, *res familiaris*, in which sense also it is to be taken in Soph. *Trach.* 907 (911), where the words τὰς ἄπαιδας οὐσίας denote a home without children. In deriving the expression, therefore, from οὐσία, the idea of *necessary food*<sup>1</sup> must be brought out in a very indirect way (as Gregory of Nyssa: that which is requisite or sufficient for the support of the body; comp. Chrysostom, Tholuck, Hitzig). Again, if the word were to be derived from οὐσία (εἶναι), it would have to be spelt, not ἐπιούσιος, but ἐπούσιος, in a way analogous to the forms ἐπουσία, *overplus*, ἐπουσιώδης, *non-essential*, which come from εἶναι. Forms in which there is either a different preposition (such as περιούσιος), or in which the derivation has no connection with εἶναι (as ἐπιορκεῖν), have been brought forward without any reason with a view to support the above ordinary explanation. After all this we must, for reasons derived from grammatical considerations (in answer to Leo

<sup>1</sup> To this amounts also the view of Leo Meyer in Kuhn's *Zeitschr. f. vergleich. Sprachforsch.* VII. 6, p. 401 ff., who, however, regards the word as expressing adjectively the idea of the aim involved in the *ἰτί*: "*what ἰτί is*." In this Kamphausen substantially concurs. The word is said to be derived from *ἰκτεῖν*: "*belonging to*," in which the idea of being "*sufficient*" or *necessary* is understood to be implied. But in that case we should also have expected to find *ἰκούσιος*, and besides, *ἰκτεῖν* certainly does not mean *to belong to*, but *to be by*, also *to be standing over*, *to impend*, and so on. This explanation of *ἰκούσιος* is an erroneous etymological conjecture. Bengel very properly observes: "*ἰτί non semper quidem in compositione ante vocalem amittit, sed amittit tamen in ἰκτεσιν*." [See Lightfoot, *A Fresh Revision of the English New Testament*, Appendix on the words *ἰκτεσις*, *περιούσιος*.—Ed.]

Meyer, Weizsäcker, Kamphausen, Keim), prefer the other possible derivation from ἡ ἐπιούσα (therefore from ἐπιέναι), *dies crastinus* (Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 464; Prov. xxvii. 1), which is already expressly given by Ambrose, *lib. v. de sacram.* 4. 24, and according to which we should have to interpret the words as meaning *to-morrow's bread*.<sup>1</sup> So Ar., Aeth., Copt., Sahid., Erasmus, *Annot.*, Scaliger, Salmasius, Grotius, Wolf, Bengel, Wetstein, Valckenaer, *Schol.* I. p. 190, and V; also Winer, p. 92 [E. T. 120], Fritzsche, Käuffer, Schegg, Döllinger, Hilgenfeld, Holtzmann, Schenkel, Wittichen. This explanation, furnished historically by the Gospel according to the Hebrews, where Jerome found מחר, is recommended in the context by the σήμερον, which, besides, has no correlative, nor is it incompatible with ver. 34, where the taking no *thought* for to-morrow does not exclude, but rather presupposes (1 Pet. v. 7), the *asking* for to-morrow's bread, while, moreover, this request is quite justified as a *matter of prayer*, considering how certain is the uncertainty of life's duration. *The granting to-day of to-morrow's bread* is, accordingly, the narrow limit which Christ here assigns to prayers for earthly objects,—a limit not open to the charge of want of modesty (Keim), inasmuch as it is fixed only at *de die in diem*. Of late, Olshausen and Delitzsch ("the bread necessary for man's *spiritual* and *physical* life") have again adopted, at least *along with* the other view, the erroneous explanation,—exegetically inconsistent with σήμερον, but originating in a supposed perverse asceticism, and favoured by the tendency to mystical interpretation generally, no less than by the early (Irenaeus, *Haer.* iv. 18) reference to the Lord's Supper in particular,—the explanation, namely, that what is here meant is *supernatural*,<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Not what is necessary for the *next* meal (Rettig in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1838, p. 238). Baumgarten-Crusius, correctly, "to-day, what we need for *to-morrow*." On σήμερον was founded the very ancient (*Constitut. apost.* vii. 24. 1 f., Tertullian, Cyprian) *daily* use of the Lord's Prayer.

<sup>2</sup> The expression was derived partly from ἐπιών (as Ambrose)—the bread of the world to come (so again Weisse, *Evangelienfr.* p. 201); partly from οὐσία, in which case it was interpreted to mean: the bread requisite for the *life of the soul*; or, as though it were ὑπερσούσιος: panis *supersubstantialis*; as in the Vulg. and Jerome ("super omnes substantias"). Melancthon fully and pointedly

heavenly food (John vi.), as, indeed, many Fathers (Cyprian and Jerome) and older expositors understood *both* kinds of bread to be included

Ver. 12. Ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς, κ.τ.λ.] does not indicate the *extent* (Chrysostom, Baumgarten-Crusius) to which forgiveness is asked from God, which is not in harmony with the tone of the prayer; rather is ὥς the *as* which assigns the reason as well as makes the comparison, doubtless not as being directly equivalent to *nam* (Fritzsche), but it expresses the existence of a frame of mind on the part of the petitioner corresponding to the divine forgiveness: *as then*, we also, and so on. See on John xiii. 34; Schaeffer, *ad Dem.* V. p. 108; Hartung, *Partikell.* I. p. 460; Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 766; comp. Luke xi. 4. Yet not as though human forgiveness can be supposed to merit the divine pardon, but the former is the necessary moral "*requisitum subjecti*" (Calovius) in him who seeks forgiveness from God. Comp. xviii. 21 ff.; Apol. Conf. A. p. 115 f.; *Cat. maj.* p. 528; Kamphausen, p. 113.—ἀφήκαμεν] see the critical remarks. Jesus justly presupposes that the *believer* who asks from God the remission of his own debts *has* already forgiven (Sir. xxviii. 2; Mark xi. 25) those who are indebted to him—that, according to Luke, he does it at the *same time*.

Ver. 13. After the petition for forgiveness of sin, comes now the request to be preserved from *new* sin, negatively and positively, so that both elements constitute but *one* petition. Luke makes no mention whatever of the ἀλλὰ ῥῦσαι, etc. — μὴ εἰσενέγκης, κ.τ.λ.] Neither the idea of mere *permission* (μὴ παραχωρήσης εἰσενεχθῆναι, Euth. Zigabenus, Tertullian, Melanchthon), nor the *emphatic* meanings which have been given, first to the εἰσενέγκης (μὴ καταποθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ πειρασμοῦ, Theophylact), then to the πειρασμός (Jerome, in *Ezek.* xlvi. : "in tentationem, quam ferre non possumus"), and lastly, to the εἰς (Grotius: "*penitus* introducere, ut ei suc-

expresses his opposition to the view of heavenly bread, when he says: "Its advocates are deficient in *eruditio et spirituale iudicium*." However, it is likewise found in Erasmus' *Paraphr.*; but Calvin pronounces: "*prorsus absurdum est.*"



cumbas"), are in keeping with the simple terms employed; such interpretations are rationalistic in their character, as is also, once more, the case with Kamphausen's limitation to temptations *with an evil result*. *God leads into temptation* in so far as, in the course of His administration, He brings about a state of things that may lead to temptation, *i.e.* the *situations and circumstances that furnish an occasion for sinning*; and therefore, if a man happens to encounter such dangers to his soul, it is caused *by God*—it is He who *does* it (1 Cor. x. 13). In this way is solved, at the same time, the apparent contradiction with Jas. i. 13, where it is a question of subjective *inward* temptation, the active principle of which is, not God, but the man's own lusts.<sup>1</sup> In these latter are also to be found, in the case of the believer, and that in consequence of his *σάρξ* (xxvi. 41; Gal. v. 17), the great *moral danger* which renders this prayer a matter of necessity. — ἀλλὰ ῥύσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ] Rom. xv. 31; 1 Thess. i. 10; 2 Thess. iii. 2; 2 Tim. iv. 18. But τοῦ πονηροῦ *may* be *neuter* (Augustine, Luther,—see, however, *Catech. maj.* p. 532 f., —Tholuck, Ewald, Lange, Bleek, Kamphausen) as well as *masculine* (Tertullian, Origen, Chrysostom, Theophylact, Erasmus, Beza, Maldonatus, Kuinoel, Fritzsche, Olshausen, Ebrard, Keim, Hilgenfeld, Hanne). In the former case, it would not mean "*evil*" in general ("omne id, quod felicitati nostrae adversum est," Olearius), but, according to the New Testament use of *πονηρός*, as well as the context, *moral wickedness*, Rom. xii. 9. However, it is more in keeping with the concrete graphic manner of view of the New Testament (v. 37, xiii. 19; John xvii. 15; 1 John ii. 13, iii. 8, 12; Rom. xvi. 20; Eph. vi. 16; 2 Thess. iii. 3), to prefer the *masculine* as meaning the *devil* (κατ' ἐξοχὴν δὲ οὕτως ἐκεῖνος καλεῖται, Chrysostom), whose seductive influence, even over believers, is presupposed in the seventh petition, which also supplicates divine deliverance from this *danger*, by which they know themselves to be *threatened* (ἀπό: away, from; not ἐκ, as in Rom. vii. 24; 2 Cor. i. 10; Col. i. 13; 2 Tim. iii. 11, iv. 17; 2 Pet. ii. 9). Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis*, I. p. 447; Krummacher in the *Stud.*

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Köster, *bibl. Lehre v. d. Versuch*, p. 19 f.

*u. Krit.* 1860, p. 122 ff. For an opposite view of *a* by no means convincing kind, see Kamphausen, p. 136 ff.

REMARKS.—The *Lord's Prayer*, as it stands in Matthew, is an example of a prayer rich and true in respect of its contents, and expressed in language at once brief and comprehensive; see on ver. 9. It is only in an *indirect way* that it presents itself in the light of a summary of the principal *matters* for which one is to pray (Nösselt, *Exercitatt. sacr.* p. 2 ff., Kuinoel, de Wette), inasmuch as Jesus, as matter of course, selected and connected with each other such leading requests as were appropriate to the solemn period when the establishment of His kingdom was at hand, that, by setting before us a prayer of so comprehensive a character, He might render the model thus supplied all the more instructive. Tertullian, indeed, correctly describes the contents of it as *breviarium totius evangelii*. According to Möller (*neue Ansichten*, p. 34 ff.) and Augusti (*Denkwürdigk.* IV. p. 132), the prayer before us is made up merely of the opening words of well-known *Jewish prayers*, which Jesus is supposed to have selected from the mass of Jewish forms of devotion as being eminently adapted for the use of His disciples. Wetstein already was of opinion that it was "*ex formulis Hebraeorum concinnata*." But between the whole of the parallels (Lightfoot, Schoettgen, Wetstein), not even excepting those taken from the synagogal prayer *Kaddisch*, there is only a partial correspondence, especially in the case of the first and second petitions; but lively *echoes* of familiar prayers would so naturally suggest themselves to our Lord, and any reason for rejecting them was so entirely wanting, that the absence of such popularly consecrated echoes, extending to the very words, would even have been matter for surprise.—Augustine divides the contents into seven petitions; and in this he is followed by the Lutheran practice, as also by Tholuck, Bleek, Hilgenfeld. On the other hand, Origen and Chrysostom correctly make six, in which they are followed by the practice of the Reformed church in the catechisms of Geneva and of the Palatinate, as also by Calvin, Keim. As to the *division* of the prayer in respect of *form*, it is sufficient to observe, with Bengel: "*Petita sunt septem, quae universa dividuntur in duas partes. Prior continet tria priora, Patrem spectantia: tuum, tuum, tua; posterior quatuor reliqua, nos spectantia*." According to Calvin, the fourth petition is the beginning of "*quasi secunda tabula*" of the prayer. In regard to the *matter*, the twofold division into *coelestia* and *terrena*, which has been in vogue since Tertullian's time, is substantially

correct; and in the more detailed representation of which there follows—after the *upward flight* towards what is of highest and holiest interest for believers, and the specific nature of which, with the aim for which it longs, and its moral condition, floats before the praying spirit—a *humble frame* of spirit, produced by the consciousness of man's need of God's favour, first in the temporal and then in the moral sphere, in which the realization of that with which the prayer begins can be brought about only through forgiveness, divine guidance, and deliverance from the power of the devil. The division into *vows* and *petitions* (Hanne) is inaccurate; see on ver. 9.

Ver. 14 f. Γάρ] points back to ver. 12, the subject of which is now further discussed. — ἀφῆσαι] like the preceding ἀφῆτε, placed first to render it emphatic. For the thought, the fundamental basis of which was stated in ver. 44 ff., comp. Sir. xxviii. 2 ff.

Ver. 16. Δέ] indicating a transition from the subject of prayer to another kindred subject. — νηστεύετε] here with reference to *private fasting*, which depended on the inclination of the individual (Ewald, *Alterth.* p. 110), though regularly observed by the Pharisees on Thursday (when Moses is supposed to have ascended Mount Sinai) and on Monday (when he is believed to have come down again), but never on the Sabbath and festival days, except at the feast of Purim. Mourning attire was worn during the fasting. Isa. lviii. 5, lxi. 3; Joel ii. 12; Zech. vii. 3; Dan. x. 3; 2 Sam. xii. 20, xiii. 19; 1 Macc. iii. 47. — σκυθρωποί] common in the classics; “plerumque in vitio ponitur et notat hominem non solum tristem et tetricum vultum habentem, sed fingentem vel augentem,” Bremi, *ad Aeschin. adv. Ctesiph.* p. 290 f. — ἀφανίζουσι] is a play upon the word in allusion to φανῶσι. *They conceal* their countenances with a view to their “*being seen of*,” and so on. This is intended to indicate how, partly by sprinkling themselves with ashes, and by the dirt on the unwashed face and beard, and partly by actual veiling of themselves (2 Sam. xv. 30; Esth. vi. 12), they contrive to prevent it being seen what their countenance is really like. It should be observed, however, that ἀφανίζειν does not mean to *disfigure*, but, even in passages like the one quoted from

Stob. *Serm.* 74, 62, with reference to a painted woman, it denotes *to make invisible, e conspectu submovere*. The Vulgate correctly renders by *exterminant*, i.e. *e conspectu remonent*. Beck, *Anecd.* p. 468, 25: ὅλως τὸ ἀνελεῖν καὶ ἀφανὲς ποιῆσαι, ὅπερ ἐκάλουν αἰστώσαι. Hence in Greek writers it is often associated with κρύπτειν.

Ver. 17. Dress thyself as if to go to a festive entertainment. Ps. xxiii. 5; Luke vii. 46; Suicer, *Thes.* I. p. 185; Wetstein. Of course Jesus does not intend the anointing, and so on, to be taken *literally*; but under this *form* of requirement He expresses the *sincerity* which He desires in connection with the—of itself voluntary—practice of fasting. Comp. Chrysostom. The form is one that is suited to an attitude of radical opposition to Jewish formalism. Luther: "If thou so fastest between thyself and thy Father alone, thou hast rightly fasted in that it pleases Him; yet not as if one must not go on a fast-day with few clothes, or unwashed, but the additional ceremony is rejected, because it is observed for the sake of applause, and to hoodwink people with such singular demeanour."

Ver. 18. Τῷ ἐν τῷ κρυφαίῳ] *sc. ὄντι*, i.e. *who is present where we are hidden from human eye*. He who *fasts* is ἐν τῷ κρυφαίῳ everywhere, when he is present as anointed and washed, for in this state of his person no one will be able to recognise him *as fasting*. In accordance with this, we are bound to reject the explanation of Fritzsche, who supplies νηστεύειν ("*eo quod clam inedia in te suscipias*"), which, however, is far-fetched, and introduces a superfluous meaning, besides being inconsistent with ver. 6. — ἀποδώσι σοι] not the fasting by itself, but the sincerely penitent and humble frame of mind, which seeks to express itself in that devout fasting which is free from everything like pretence and ostentation; there is therefore no satisfactory reason for expunging vv. 16–18 (as also vv. 1–6) from the Sermon on the Mount (Wittichen, *Idee des Menschen*, p. 100).

Vv. 19–34. Comp. Luke xii. 33 f., xi. 34 ff., xii. 22 ff. The theme stated in ver. 1 is still pursued, and, without any formal indication of a transition, a new and essential point in

the discourse is here introduced, viz. *care about earthly things*, which is treated (1) as striving after wealth, vv. 19–24, and (2) as care for food and raiment, vv. 25–35. To give up the idea of a fixed plan from this point onwards (de Wette), and especially to regard vv. 19–34 as an irrelevant interpolation (Neander, Bleek, Weiss), is quite unwarranted, for we must not lose sight of the fact that the discourse was intended not merely for the disciples, but for the people as well (vii. 28). The unity of the Sermon on the Mount is not that of a sermon in our sense of the word; but the internal connection of the thought in ver. 19 ff. with what goes before lies in the ἀποδώσει σοι just mentioned, and the object belonging to which is, in fact, the *heavenly treasures*.

Ver. 19. Θησαυρούς] *Treasures*. To understand particular kinds of them, either *stores of corn*, or *costly raiment*, or *gold and silver*, is a mistake, for the special treasure meant would also require to have been specially indicated. — βρώσις] *eating, corroding* in general. Any further defining of the matter, whether with the Vulgate and Luther we understand *rust* (Jas. v. 2, 3) or *weevils* (Clericus, Kuinoel, Baumgarten-Crusius) to be meant, is arbitrary, as is also the assumption of a ἐν διὰ δυοῖν for σῆς βρώσκουσα (Casaubon in Wolf). — ἀφανίζει] *causes to disappear, annihilates*. Comp. note on ver. 16. On ὅπου (*upon earth*) Bengel correctly observes: “Habet vim aetiologiae.” The thieves *dig through* (the wall, comp. Dem. 787. 13, 1268. 12; Job xxiv. 16; Ezek. xii. 5) and steal.

Ver. 20. Ἐν οὐρανῷ] belongs to θησαυρίζετε. By what means is this done? By everything which the Lord has hitherto been insisting upon from ver. 3 onwards as the condition on which those who believe in Him are to obtain eternal salvation, and which therefore constitutes the sum and substance of the δικαιοσύνη that comes through faith in Him. In this way, and not specially by *almsgiving*, xix. 21, which, according to v. 7, vi. 3, is here only included *along with* other matters (in answer to Chrysostom), do men gather treasures (the Messianic felicity) for themselves, which are *reserved* for us with God in heaven until the establishment of the Messiah's

kingdom, in which their *bestowal* is then to take place. Comp. on v. 12.

Ver. 21. For (deep moral obligation to comply with that exhortation) if the treasure which you have gathered is upon earth, so will your heart, with its feelings, dispositions, and tendencies, be also upon the earth as in the congenial sphere of your inner life, will be ethically bound to the earth, and *vice versa*. From the *treasure*, which is the result of effort and the object of love, the *heart* also cannot be separated. In the ground of obligation just stated it is *assumed* that the *believer's* heart must be in *heaven* (Phil. iii. 30; Col. iii. 2 ff.; 2 Cor. iv. 17; 1 John ii. 15 ff.).

Vv. 22, 23. *Connection*: In order to fulfil the duty mentioned in vv. 19, 20, and warranted by what is said in ver. 21, you must not allow the light within you, *i.e.* the *reason* (ὁ νοῦς, Chrysostom), which apprehends divine truth, to become obscured, *i.e.* it must be preserved in that state of normal action in which error and moral evil find no place. The obscuring of this faculty of thought and volition, by which the divine is perceived and morally assimilated, imparts a wrong tendency and complexion to the entire life of the individual man. Comp. Luther: "This is a warning not to allow ourselves to be taken in by fair colours and outward appearance, with which avarice may trick itself out and conceal the knave." The supposition that ver. 22 f. originally stood immediately behind v. 16 (Ewald, *Jahrb.* I. p. 129) is therefore without sufficient logical warrant, and Luke xi. 33-36 may be a later digest of similar import. Observe, moreover, that nothing is said here about the capability of the *natural* reason, purely as such, to apprehend the divine by its own unaided efforts; for Jesus has in view those who are *believers*, whose νοῦς is already under the influence of the divine truth which He has revealed to them (Eph. i. 18; Rom. xxii. 2). However, the *subjective* meaning of ὀφθαλμός and φῶς must be preserved intact, nor is φῶς to be understood, with Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 320, as referring to the holy nature of *God*, which seeks to illuminate the hearts of men.—ὁ λύχνος τοῦ σώματος ἐστιν ὁ ὀφθαλμός] for without the eye the body is in darkness; the blind man

is without light, which comes through the medium of the eye as though it were a lamp. The subject is not ὁ ὀφθαλμός (Luther, Bengel), but ὁ λύχνος τοῦ σώμ., to which corresponds τὸ φῶς τὸ ἐν σοί, the subject in the application of the illustration.—ἀπλοῦς and πονηρός are mostly understood in the sense of: *healthy* (which many have defined more precisely as the opposite of double-sight), and *damaged*. But usage is in favour only of πονηρός being employed in this sense (see Kypke; comp. Plat. *Hipp. min.* p. 374 D: πονηρία ὀφθαλμῶν, also the German expression "*böse Augen*"), but not ἀπλοῦς, which means only *integer* in the *moral* sense of the word. Comp. *Test. XII. patr.* p. 624: ἀπλότης ὀφθαλμῶν, as meaning the opposite of the *dishonest*, hypocritical cast of the eye. Consequently the above meaning is contrary to usage, and both words must be understood in their *moral* signification, so that Jesus has selected the predicates in His illustration in view of the state of things to which the illustration refers, and in which the darkness of the νοῦς is the result of the evil will resisting divine truth (Rom. i. 21). Therefore: if thine eye is *honest*, i.e. if it honestly does its duty,—and: if it is *good for nothing*, i.e. if it maliciously refuses to perform its functions. — φωτεινόν] *is enlightened*, so that it is clear round about him; through the light which is perceived by the eye, no one of his members is in darkness. — εἰ οὖν, κ.τ.λ.] Inference *a minori ad majus*.—τὸ φῶς τὸ ἐν σοί] i.e. the νοῦς especially as *practical* reason (Vernunft). The figurative designation (Philo, *de cond. mund.* I. p. 12: ὅπερ νοῦς ἐν ψυχῇ, τοῦτο ὀφθαλμὸς ἐν σώματι, comp. Plat. *Rep.* vii. p. 533 D: τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς ὄμμα, Soph. p. 254 A. Creuzer, *ad Plot. de pulcr.* p. 361) is suggested by, and is correlative to, ὁ λύχνος, etc., ver. 22. Comp. Euth. Zigabenus: ὁ νοῦς ὁ δωρηθεὶς εἰς τὸ φωτίζειν καὶ ὁδηγεῖν τὴν ψυχὴν. — σκότος] corresponds to πονηρός above, though denoting at the same time the effect of the evil condition. — τὸ σκότος πόσον] s.c. ἐστὶ: *how great then* (since the worthlessness of the outward eye involves one in darkness) *is the darkness*, τὸ σκότος, in which thou liest! But τὸ σκότος, from being put first, is very emphatic. Luther (following the ordinary reading of the Vulg.: *ipsae tenebrae*) and Calvin interpret incorrectly: *how great*

will then be the *darkness itself*. Thine, in that case, is the condition in which there is no susceptibility for that divine truth which would enlighten and sanctify thee; and this darkness, how great is it!

Ver. 24. But certainly do not suppose that ye can combine the eager pursuit of wealth with striving after the kingdom of God! no, *aut, aut!* — *δυσί*] i.e. of course, two who are of opposite characters. — *ἢ γὰρ . . . καταφρονήσει*] he will either hate A and love B, or if not, *vice versâ*, he will cleave to A and despise B. In the second clause *ένός* is *without the article*, because the idea is somewhat different from that in the first, namely: "or he will cleave to *one* (not both) and despise the *other* concerned." — *μισεῖν* and *ἀγαπᾶν*, like *μισῶ* and *ἀγαπᾶ*, are used neither here nor anywhere else (Gen. xxix. 31; Mal. i. 2, 3; Luke xiv. 26, xvi. 13; John xii. 25; Rom. ix. 13) "with a less forcible meaning" (de Wette, Tholuck, Bleek), so as to be equivalent to *posthabere* and *præferre*. See, on the other hand, note on Rom. ix. 12, also Fritzsche on this passage. The *two* masters are conceived of as being of such a nature that the one is *loved*, the other *hated*, and *vice versâ*,—and that in a decided manner, without any intermediate attitude of indifference. Luther: although the world can do it skilfully; and as it is expressed in German, by "carrying the tree on both shoulders." In the second alternative, then, the *καταφρονεῖν* corresponds to the *μισεῖν* as being the effect of the hatred, while to the *ἀγαπᾶν* corresponds the *ἀντέχεσθαι* as the effect of the love. — *ἀνθέξεται*] *he will hold to him*, faithfully cleave to him. Plat. *Rep.* x. p. 600 D; Phil. p. 58 E; Ax. p. 369 E; Dem. 290. 9; 1 Macc. xv. 34; Tit. i. 9. — *μαμωνᾶς*] Chaldee *ܡܡܢܐ*, Syr. *ܡܡܢܐ*, consequently it should be spelt with only one *μ*, and derived, not from *μᾶ*, but from *μᾶ*, so that its origin is to be traced to *ܡܡܢܐ*, *thesaurus* (Gen. xliii. 23). Gesenius, *Thes.* I. p. 552. It means *riches*, and, according to Augustine, is, in the Punic language, equivalent to *lucrum*. In this instance it is personified owing to its connection with *δουλεύειν*, and from its antithesis to *θεῶ*: wealth conceived of as an *idol* (Plutus). Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* p. 1217 f.—Moreover, the idea implied in the *δουλεύειν* prevents the possible abuse of the saying.



Luther says well: To have money and property is not sinful; but what is meant is, that thou shouldst not allow them to be thy *master*, rather that thou shouldst make them serve *thee*, and that thou shouldst be *their* master. Comp. Chrysostom, who quotes the examples of Abraham and Job. According to the axiom in the text, Christ justly (see on Luke xvi. 9, the note) requires *unfaithfulness* in regard to mammon.

Ver. 25. Διὰ τοῦτο] because this double service is impossible. — οὐχὶ ἡ ψυχὴ, κ.τ.λ.] Chrysostom: ὁ τοίνυν τὸ μεῖζον (life and body) δούς πῶς τὸ ἑλαττον (food and clothing) οὐ δώσει; — The care has been unwarrantably limited to *anxious* care, a meaning which is no less unjustifiable in Sir. xxxiv. 1; the context would be expected to furnish such a limitation if it were intended. Jesus does not only forbid believers the πολλὰ μεριμνᾶν (Xen. Cyr. viii. 7. 12), or the ἀλγεινὰς μεριμνάς (Soph. Ant. 850), the μεριμνήματ' ἔχειν βάρη (Soph. Phil. 187), or such like, but His desire is that—simply giving themselves to the *undivided* (*curae animum divorce trahunt*, Terence) *service* of God, ver. 24, and *trusting* to Him with true *singleness* of heart—they should be superior to *all* care whatsoever as to food, drink, etc. (Phil. iv. 6); nevertheless, to create for themselves such cares would amount to *little faith*, ver. 30 ff., or a *half-hearted* faith as compared with their duty of entire resignation to that God whose part it is to provide for them. It is only by absolute and perfect faith that the moral height of αὐτάρκεια (Phil. iv. 11 ff.), and of exemption from earthly care, is to be attained. Comp. A. H. Franke's example in founding the orphanage. — τῇ ψυχῇ] Dative of immediate reference: *in regard to the soul* (as the principle of *physical* life, x. 39, xvi. 25, ii. 20), in so far as it is *sustained* by means of food and drink. In the case of μεριμνᾶν the *object* (τὸ φάγητε) is in the *accusative* (1 Cor. vii. 32–34, xii. 25; Phil. ii. 20, iv. 6).

Ver. 26. Τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ] ὁμιλήσῃς αὐτοῖς, *the birds that fly in the air*, in this wide, free height, are entirely resigned! Genitive of locality, as in ver. 28. This is manifest (in answer to Fritzsche: *towards the heavens*) from the juxtaposition of the words in Gen. i. 25, ii. 19; Ps. viii. 9,

civ. 12; comp. Hom. *Il.* xvii. p. 675: ὑπουρανίων πετεηνῶν. On the saying itself, comp. *Kiddushin*, s. fin.: "Vidistine unquam bruta aut volatilia, quibus esset aliqua officina? et tamen illa nutriuntur absque anxietate." — ὅτι] equivalent to εἰς ἐκεῖνο ὅτι, John ii. 18, ix. 17, xi. 51, xvi. 9; 2 Cor. i. 18, xi. 10. To this belongs all that follows as far as αὐτά. — μᾶλλ διαφέρετε αὐτῶν] This μᾶλλον (*magis*) only strengthens the comparative force of διαφέρειν τινος (*to be superior to any one*). Comp. on Phil. i. 23, and the μᾶλλον that frequently accompanies προαιρεῖσθαι.

Ver. 27. Τὴν ἡλικίαν] *the duration of life* (Hammond, Wolf, Rosenmüller, Kuinoel, Schott, Käuffer, Olshausen, de Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius, Tholuck, Ewald, Bleek, Hilgenfeld). For, after the more comprehensive exhortation of ver. 25, Jesus passes in ver. 26 to the special subject of the *support of life* by means of τροφή, with which subject ver. 27 is intimately connected. Vv. 28–30 refer, in the first place, specially to the body itself, regarded by itself and as an outward object. *The duration of life determined by God is set forth under the figure of a definite lineal measure.* Comp. Ps. xxxix. 6; Mimnermus in Stobaeus, 98. 13. In opposition to this, the only true connection, others (Euth. Zigabenus, Erasmus, Luther, Maldonatus, Jansen, Bengel, Fritzsche), following the Vulgate and Chrysostom, interpret: *the height of the body, the stature*, Luke xix. 3, ii. 52. But what an absurd disproportion would there be in *such* a relation in representing a very trifling addition (Luke xii. 26) by πῆχυν! For πῆχυς, πῆξ, is equivalent to the whole length of the lower part of the arm, two spans or six handbreadths, Böckh, *metrol. Unters.* p. 210 ff. Fenneberg, *üb. d. Längen-, Feld- u. Wegemaasse d. Völk. d. Alterth.* 1859, who thinks, however, without any reason, that the *sacred ell* (*seven handbreadths*) is meant.

Ver. 28. Καὶ περὶ ἐνδύμ.] *the new object of care* placed first in the sentence. — καταμάθετε] *consider, observe*: occurring nowhere else in the New Testament, frequent in Greek writers, Gen. xxiv. 21, xxxiv. 1; Job xxxv. 5. — κρίνον, ἡλὶς, *lilies* generally, various kinds of which grow *wild* in the East, without cultivation by human hands (τοῦ ἀγροῦ). There is

no reason to think merely of the (flower) *emperor's crown* (Kuinoel), or to suppose that *anemones* are intended (Furer in Schenkel's *Bibellex.*); the latter are called *ἀνεμώναι* in Greek. — πῶς] relatively: how, *i.e. with what grace and beauty*, they grow up! To take πῶς αὖξ. *interrogatively* (Palairetus, Fritzsche), so that οὐ κοπ., etc., would form the *answer*, is not so simple, nor is it in keeping with the parallel in ver. 26. *They toil not, neither* (specially) *do they spin*, to provide their raiment. The *plurals* (αὖξανουσιν, etc., see the critical remarks) describe the lilies, not *en masse*, but singly (Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* iv. 3. 12, *ad Anab.* i. 2. 23), and indeed as though they were actual living persons (Krüger on Thuc. i. 58. 1). Comp. in general, Schoemann, *ad Isaem* ix. 8.

Ver. 29. Ἐν πάσῃ τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ] Not even (οὐδέ) Solomon *when he appeared in all his glory*, not merely in his *royal robes* (Kuinoel); it is in περιέβαλετο that the special *part* of the whole δόξα is first mentioned. On the δόξα of Solomon, see 2 Chron. ix. 15 ff.—αὐτοῦ, not αὐτοῦ. Observe further the ἔν: his glorious apparel was not equal to any *one* of these.

Ver. 30. Τὸν χόρτον τοῦ ἀγροῦ] Placed first for sake of emphasis; ὁ χόρτος, however, is simply *the grass*, so that Jesus mentions the *genus* under which the lilies (which grow among the grass) are included, and that intentionally with a view to point them out as *insignificant*; 1 Cor. iii. 12; 1 Pet. i. 24. — σήμερον ὄντα] *which to-day exists*. — εἰς κλίβ. βαλλόμε.] expresses what is *done to-morrow*, hence the *present*. Comp. Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 178 [E. T. 206]. Dried grass with its flower-stalks and such like was also used for the purpose of heating baking ovens (κλίβανοι, or Attic κρίβανοι, see Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 179). Comp. remark on iii. 12; Harmar, *Beobacht. üb. d. Orient*, I. p. 239 f. — πολλῶ μᾶλλ.] expressing *certainty*.

Ver. 32. The second γάρ does not append another reason co-ordinate with the first, but after the injunction contained in ver. 31 has been justified by the reference to the heathen (to whom they are not to compare themselves), this same injunction is provided with an *explanation* of an encouraging nature, so that the first γάρ is *logical*, the second *explanatory*.

as frequently in classical writers (Kühner, *ad Xen. Anab.* v. 6. 6. Frotscher, *ad Hieron.* 11. 6). The referring of the second γάρ to something to be supplied after τὰ ἔθνη, such as “*who know nothing of God*” (Tholuck), is arbitrary. — οἶδε is emphatic; is certainly *known* to your Father, and so on. — ὅτι] *that*, not ὅ, τι (Paulus: *that, which*; Fritzsche: *quatenus*).

Ver. 33. Ζητεῖτε δέ] now states what they ought to do, instead of indulging that care forbidden in ver. 31. — πρῶτον] *in the first place*, before you strive after anything else; your *first* striving. In that case a *second* is, of course, unnecessary, because their food, their drink, and their raiment προστεθήσεται. But in the πρῶτον the subordinate striving after something is not even “*darkly*” sanctioned (de Wette); on the contrary, and notwithstanding the πρῶτον, this striving is *excluded* as much by ver. 32 as by καὶ . . . προστεθ. Accordingly, that *first* striving is the *only* one.—The simple ζητεῖτε is distinguished from ἐπιζητ. not in respect of degree, but only in such a way that the latter points out the *direction* of the striving. Hence ἐπιζητεῖν ἐπὶ τινα, 2 Sam. iii. 8. Comp. note on Rom. xi. 7; Phil. iv. 7.—τὴν βασιλ. καὶ τὴν δικαιοσύνην αὐτοῦ] (see the critical remarks) where the αὐτοῦ belonging to both substantives refers, according to ver. 32, to God, and is meant to convey the idea that what is to form the object and aim of our striving is the *Messianic kingdom*, the becoming partakers in it, the being admitted into it, and the *moral righteousness which God imparts to the believer* to assist him to attain the kingdom. — ταῦτα πάντα] See vv. 31, 32. The distinction between ταῦτα πάντα and πάντα ταῦτα lies merely in this, that in the former it is the demonstrative idea on which the emphasis is placed, whereas in the latter it is the idea of universality that is so. See Winer, p. 510 [E. T. 686]. Comp. Lobeck, *ad Aj.* 1023; Saupp, *ad Hipparch.* VI. 5.—προστεθήσεται] *will be added*, namely, to the moral result of your striving. Comp. the saying of Christ handed down by Clement, Origen, and Eusebius: αἰτεῖτε τὰ μεγάλα, καὶ τὰ μικρὰ ὑμῖν προστεθήσεται καὶ αἰτεῖτε τὰ ἐπουράνια, καὶ τὰ ἐπίγεια προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν (Fabricius, *Cod.*

*Apocr.* i. p. 329), which *differs* from our passage in the generality of its terms, and in having αἰτεῖτε.

Ver. 34. Concluding saying of this section—practical, fresh, bold, and taken from the life.—Fritzsche arranges the words thus: ἡ γὰρ αὔριον μεριμνήσει. Τὰ ἐαυτῆς ἀρκετὸν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, ἡ κακία αὐτῆς. He takes ἡ κακ. αὐτῆς as in apposition with τὰ ἐαυτῆς; which is forced in itself, and precluded by the reading ἐαυτῆς *without* τὰ. If this reading be adopted, the meaning will be as follows: *Therefore* (inference from all that has been said from ver. 25 onwards) *have no care about to-morrow; for to-morrow will care for itself*—will have itself as the object of its care, which you ought not, to-day, to take away from to-morrow (ἡ αὔριον is personified). *The day*, i.e. every day (Bernhardy, p. 315) as it comes round, has enough (does not need to have anything more added, as would be the case if we cared for to-morrow) *in its own evil*, i.e. in its evil nature, as represented by dangers, sorrows, and so on. Luther well observes: Why wilt thou be concerned *beyond* to-day, and take upon thyself the misfortunes of *two* days? Abide by that which to-day lays upon thee: to-morrow, the day will bring thee something else. Comp. on κακία (Chrysostom: *ταλαιπωρία*), Luke xvi. 25; Eccles. vii. 15, xii. 1; Amos iii. 7; Sir. xix. 6; 2 Macc. iv. 47. In classical writers, commonly κακοτής; Hom. *Il.* xi. 382; *Od.* v. 290; Herod. ii. 128; Soph. *El.* 228. Comp. however, also κακία, Thucyd. iii. 58. 1; Plato, *Legg.* vii. p. 814 A. μεριμνᾶν does not occur elsewhere with the *genitive*, but, like φροντίζειν τινος, may be connected with it; Bernhardy, p. 176 f.; Krüger, § 47. 11; Kühner, IV. 1, p. 325. On the well-known neuter usage, ἀρκετον, *sufficient*, see Kühner, II. 1, p. 52 f.

## CHAPTER VII.

VER. 2. μετρηθ.] In opposition to decisive testimony, Elz. has ἀντιμετρηθ., from Luke vi. 38. — Ver. 4. For ἀπό, Lachm. Tisch. 8 read ἐκ, found only in B κ, Curss. With ἐκβάλω and ver. 5 before them, the copyists involuntarily wrote the ἐκ. — Ver. 6. Lachm. and Tisch. have the future καταπατήσουσιν, according to B C L X, 33. With such important testimony in its favour, it is to be preferred to the generally received aor. conj. — Ver. 9. The omission of ἐστιν in B\* L, Curss. and several versions (Lachm.: ἡ τις), as well as the reading ὃν αἰτήσῃ which follows (Lachm. Tisch. 8), is meant to help out the construction. — Ver. 10. καὶ ἐὰν ἰχθὺν αἰτήσῃ] Lachm. Tisch. 8: ἡ καὶ ἰχθὺν αἰτήσῃ, as in B C κ, Curss. Verss., after Luke xi. 11. — Ver. 13. ἡ πύλη] is deleted by Lachm. and bracketed by Tisch. 8, but only, however, after κ Codd. of the It. and Fathers (Clem. Or. Cypr. Hilar. Lucif.). From its resemblance to πλατεῖα immediately preceding, this word was very liable to be omitted. The authority for its omission in ver. 14 is decidedly weaker (κ being in this case against it). Here also it is bracketed by Lachm. and Tisch. 8. — Ver. 14. τί] Elz. and Tisch., with a decided preponderance of testimony against them, prefer ὅτι, which owed its origin to ὅτι πλατεῖα, etc., ver. 13, the meaning of τί not being understood. — Ver. 16. σταφυλήν] Schulz, Lachm. Tisch. 8 have σταφυλᾶς, according to B κ and several Curss. and Verss. The plural originated in consequence of συλλέγ. and σῦκα. — Ver. 18. Tisch. 8. has ἐνεγκεῖν for ποιεῖν in both instances, against decisive testimony. After πᾶν Lachm. has οὖν in brackets (C\*\* L Z, Curss. Verss.). An interpolation for the sake of connection, rendered in Brix. by *enim*, and in Germ. 2 by *autem*. — Ver. 21. After ἐν (Lachm. Tisch. 8: ἐν τοῖς, according to B Z κ) οὐρανοῖς, Fritzsche, following Bengel, inserts οὗτος εἰσελεύσεται εἰς τὴν βασ. τῶν οὐρανῶν, but on far too slender authority. A supplementary gloss. — Ver. 24. ὁμοιωσω αὐτόν] B Z κ, Curss. Verss. and several Fathers have ὁμοιωθήσεται. Derived from ver. 26 for the sake of the nominat. πᾶς. Adopted by Lachm. and Tisch. 8. — Ver. 28. συνετέλεσεν] Lach. Tisch. read ἐτέλεσεν, according

to B C Z? Γ κ, Curss. Or. Chrys. But how easily might the syllable *συν* drop out between ΟΤΕ ΕΤΕ! especially as *συντελεῖν* occurs nowhere else in Matth. — Ver. 29. Lachm. inserts *αὐτῶν καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι* after *γραμματεῖς*, on authorities of unequal value. The evidence is stronger in favour of *αὐτῶν*, which, moreover, is confirmed by κ. Tisch. has adopted merely *αὐτῶν* after *γραμματεῖς*, in which, however, he is right; because, whilst there was no reason for adding *αὐτῶν*, the omission of it was natural in itself, and suggested by Mark i. 22.

Jesus warns (1) against judging, vv. 1–6; urges (2) to prayer, vv. 7–11; then (3) prepares for the transition, ver. 12, to the exhortation to enter the Messianic kingdom through the strait gate, vv. 13, 14; warns (4) against false prophets, vv. 15–23; and concludes with the powerful passage regarding the wise and the foolish man, vv. 24–27.

Ver. 1. Without any intermediate connection, the discourse passes on to a *new* subject. Comp. v. 17, vi. 1. — *μὴ κρίνετε*] *κρίνειν* means nothing more than to *judge*, and the context alone will decide when it is used in the sense of a *condemnatory* judgment, as in Rom. ii. 1, xiv. 4; Gal. v. 10; Heb. x. 30 (frequently in John). In this respect it resembles the Heb. *חָשַׁב*. But in this instance it is proved by ver. 2 and vv. 3–5 that *κρίνειν* is *not* to be explained as synonymous with *κατακρίνειν* (in answer to Theophylact, Euth. Zigabenus, Kuinoel, and Olshausen). Nor is this required, but, on the contrary, plainly forbidden, by Luke vi. 37, for there the difference between *κρίνειν* and *καταδικάζειν* is of the nature of a climax, the latter being the result of the former. Accordingly, the correct interpretation is this: *Do not sit in judgment upon others; do not set yourselves up as judges of their faults* (ver. 3), meaning thereby an officious and self-righteous behaviour (the opposite of that prescribed in Gal. vi. 1–5), *that ye may not become obnoxious to judgment, i.e. that ye may not be subjected to the divine, the Messianic, judgment; that instead of obtaining mercy and the forgiveness of your sins in that judgment, you may not draw down upon yourselves that judicial sentence* (which, according to v. 7, vi. 15, is averted by cherishing a forgiving spirit). To refer *κριθῆτε*

to our being judged by *others* (Erasmus, Calvin, Kuinoel, Fritzsche), and not, with Chrysostom, to the *future* judgment, is wrong; because ver. 2, if referred to the Nemesis of the existing order of things, would not be altogether true; and further, because, throughout His address, Jesus treats the idea of retribution from the Messianic point of view (v. 1-12, 19, 20, 22, 25, 29 f., vi. 1, 4, 6, 14 f., 18, 20, 33, vii. 13, 19, 21, 23, 24 ff.). Of course it is unnecessary to say that, in forbidding judging, Christ is not speaking "*de ministeriis vel officiis divinitus ordinatis, sed de judiciis, quae fiunt extra seu praepter vocationes et gubernationes divinas*," Melancthon. Nor does He forbid the moral judging of others in general, which is inseparable from truth and love, and is at the same time a necessary element in the duty of brotherly *νοῦθετεῖν*. "*Canis pro cane et porcus pro porco est habendus*," Bengel.

Ver. 2. 'Εν] Instrumental repetition of the same thought: *Sota*, ed. Wagenseil, p. 52. Comp. Schoettgen, p. 78. The second ἐν is also instrumental, by *means of*, and μέτρον is to be understood as a *measure of capacity* (Luke vi. 38).

Ver. 3. Κάρφος, a minute fragment of twig, wood, or straw, which, in entering the eye (see Wetstein), becomes the figurative representation of a *slight* moral fault; δοκός, again, is the figure by which a *heinous*<sup>1</sup> fault is denoted. Comp. Lightfoot, p. 307; Buxtorf, *Lex Talm.* p. 2080. Tholuck prefers to find the point of comparison in the *pain* caused by the splinter or beam in the eye. This is inadmissible, for otherwise it could not be said, in reference to the *beam* in the eye, οὐ κατανοεῖς, *i.e.* *thou perceivest not, art not aware*. It is the *magnitude* of his own moral defects that the self-righteous man fails to discover. The *brother*, as in v. 22.

<sup>1</sup> The view of Theophylact, Baumgarten-Crusius, and several others, that the beam in a man's own eye is calculated to make him conscious of his *incapacity for recognising the faults of others*, is foreign to the context. Luther correctly observes: "That He may the more earnestly warn us, He takes a rough simile, and paints the thing before our eyes, pronouncing some such opinion as this,—that every one who judges his neighbour has a huge beam in his eye, while he who is judged has only a tiny chip, (and) that he is ten times more deserving of judgment and condemnation for having condemned others."



Notice, further, the *arrangement of words* so appropriate to the sense in the second clause.

Vv. 4, 5. Or how will it be morally possible for thee to say, and so on. The *πῶς*, like *τί* (*cur*), ver. 3, expresses what is morally absurd. “*Est enim proprium stultitiae, aliorum vitia cernere, oblivisci suorum*,” Cic. *Tusc.* iii. 30. 73. — *καὶ ἰδοὺ, κ.τ.λ.*] The more emphatic from there being no *ἔστι*; and lo, the beam in thine eye! — *ἐκβάλω*] Conjunct. hortatory, and in the present instance, in the sense of calling upon oneself (used also in the singular, see Kühner, II. 1, p. 185; Nägelsbach on *Iliad*, p. 404, ed. 3; Bornemann, in *d. Sächs. Stud.* 1846, p. 30). — *ὑποκριτά*] *Hypocrite*, who pretendest to be free from faults. The attribute is here taken from his demeanour as seen from its *objective side*, while the *subjective side*, which here presents itself as *hypocrisy*, is the conceit of *self-delusion*. — *διαβλέψεις*] neither imperative nor permissive (thou *mayest* see), but *future*. The *result* of self-amendment will be the earnest effort to help others to amendment. Observe the *compound* (correlative of the simple verb, ver. 3) *intenta acie spectabis*. Comp. Plat. *Phaed.* p. 86 D; Arist. *de Som.* 3; Plut. *Mor.* p. 36 E.

Ver. 6. The endeavour to correct the faults of others must be confined within its proper limits, and not allowed to become a casting of holy things to the dogs. As is usual, however, in the case of apophthegms, this progress in the thought is not expressed by a particle (*ἀλλά*). To abandon the idea of connection (Maldonatus, de Wette, Tholuck), or to suppose (Kuinoel, Neander, Bleek; Weiss doubtful) that vv. 6-11, at least ver. 6, do not belong to this passage, is scarcely warranted. — *τὸ ἅγιον*] *the holy*, not the holy *flesh*, *בֶּשֶׂר קֹדֶשׁ*, Jer. xi. 15, Hagg. ii. 12, the flesh of sacrifices (v. d. Hardt, Paulus, Tholuck), which, besides, would require to be more precisely designated, otherwise there would be just as much reason to suppose that the holy *bread*, *לֶחֶם קֹדֶשׁ* (1 Sam. xxi. 5), or any other meat-offering (Lev. xxii. 2), was meant. Christ has in view *the holy* in general, figuratively designating in the first clause only the *persons*, and then, in the second, the holy *thing*. What is *meant* by this, as also by *τοὺς μαργαρίτας* immediately

after, is the *holy*, because *divine evangelic, truth* by which men are converted, and which, by τοὺς μαργα. ὑμῶν, is described as something of the highest value, as the precious jewel which is entrusted to the disciples as its possessors. For Arabian applications of this simile, comp. Gesenius in Rosenm. *Rep.* I. p. 128.—*Dogs and swine*, these impure and thoroughly despised animals, represent those men who are hardened and altogether incapable of receiving evangelic truth, and to whom the holy is utterly foreign and distasteful. The parallelism ought to have precluded the explanation that by both animals two *different* classes of men are intended (the *snappish*, as in Acts xiii. 46; the *filthy livers*, Grotius). — μήποτε καταπ., κ.τ.λ., καὶ στραφέντες, κ.τ.λ.] applies to the *swine*, who are to be conceived of as *wild* animals, as may be seen from αὐτούς and the whole similitude, so that, as the warning proceeds, the figure of the dogs passes out of view, though, as matter of course, it admits of a corresponding application (Pricaeus, Maldonatus, Tholuck). But this is no reason why the words should be referred to *both* classes of animals, nor why the trampling should be assigned to the swine and στράφ. ῥήξ. to the dogs (Theophylact, Hammond, Calovius, Wolf, Kuinoel). For the *future* καταπ. (see the critical remarks), comp. note on Mark xiv. 2; Matt. xiii. 15. — ἐν τοῖς ποσὶν αὐτ.] instrumental — στραφέντες] not: having *changed* to an attitude of open hostility (Chrysostom, Euth. Zigabenus), or to savagery (Loesner), but manifestly, *having turned round upon you* from the pearls, which they have mistaken for food, and which, in their rage, they have trampled under their feet; the meaning of which is, *lest such men profane divine truth* (by blasphemy, mockery, calumny), *and vent upon you their malicious feeling toward the gospel*. In how many ways must the apostles have experienced this in their own case; for, their preaching being addressed to all, they would naturally, as a rule, have to see its *effect* on those who heard it before they could know who were “dogs and swine,” so as then to entice them no *further* with the offer of what is holy, but to shake off the dust, and so on. But the men here in view were to be found among *Jews and Gentiles*. It is foreign to the present passage (not

so xv. 26) to suppose that only the *Gentiles as such* are referred to (Köstlin, Hilgenfeld).

Vv. 7-9. The new passage *concerning prayer* begins, without any trace of connection with what goes before. Comp. note on ver. 1. It is otherwise in Luke xi. 9, which, however, does not affect Matthew's originality (in answer to Holtzmann, Weiss, Weizsäcker), nor does it warrant the opinion that some connecting terms have been omitted. Influenced by a later tradition, Luke has given the sayings in a connection of his own, and one that, so far as can be discovered, has no claim to be preferred to that of Matthew. — αἰτεῖτε, ζητεῖτε, κρούετε] Climax depicting the rising of the prayer into intense fervour, that "he may thereby urge us all the more powerfully to prayer" (Luther). — Ver. 8. The obvious limitation to this promise is sufficiently indicated by ἀγαθά in ver. 11 (1 John v. 14), just as the *childlike*, therefore *believing*, disposition of the petitioner is presupposed<sup>1</sup> in vv. 9-11. — Ver. 9. ἢ] *or*, if that were not the case, then, in the analogous human relation must, and so on. — τίς ἐστιν . . . μὴ λίθον ἐπιδ. αὐτῷ] Dropping of the interrogative construction with which the sentence had begun, and transition to another. A similar change in Luke xi. 11. See Fritzsche, *Conject.* p. 34 ff.; Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 243 f. [E. T. 284]. This irregularity is occasioned by the intervening clause, *quem si filius poposcerit panem*. The sentence is so constructed that it should have run thus: ἢ τίς ἐστιν ἐξ ὑμῶν ἄνθρωπος, ὃν ἐὰν αἰτήσῃ (i.e. ὃς, ἐὰν αὐτὸν αἰτήσῃ, see Kühner, II. 2, p. 913), ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἄρτον, λίθον ἐπιδώσει αὐτῷ (without μὴ); but after the relative clause the construction with μὴ supersedes that at the beginning of the sentence. — μὴ λίθον ἐπιδ. αὐτῷ] *surely he will not give him a stone?* With regard to the *things* compared, notice the *resemblance* between the piece of bread and a stone, and between a fish and a serpent; and

<sup>1</sup> The specific determination of prayer that will certainly be heard, as prayer offered in the name of Jesus (John xiv.-xvi.), was reserved for a further stage of development. Comp. on vi. 13, note 2. It is not the divine relation to men in general (Baur), but to His own believing ones, that Jesus has in view. Comp. Weiss, *bibl. Theol.* p. 67 i., ed. 2.

on the other hand, the contrast with regard to the *persons*: ἐξ ὑμῶν ἄνθρωπος, and ὁ πατήρ ὑμ. ὁ ἐν τ. οὐρανοῖς.

Ver. 11. Πονηροὶ ὄντες] *although ye*, as compared with God, *are morally evil*.<sup>1</sup> Comp. xix. 17. Even Kuinoel has given up the false rendering, *niggardly* (in conformity with Prov. xxiii. 6; Sir. xiv. 5). — οἴδατε διδόναι] *not soletis dare* (Maldonatus, Wetstein, Kuinoel), but *ye know, understand*, how to give (1 Tim. iii. 5, and see note on Phil. iv. 12), not as referring, however, to the *disposition* (de Wette, Fritzsche), which in so doing is rather *presupposed*, but appropriately pointing to the thoughtful nature of paternal love, which, in spite of the *πονηρία*, understands how to render possible the giving of good gifts to children. — δόματα ἀγαθὰ] *wholesome gifts*, in contrast to the stone and the serpent. For the second ἀγαθὰ, Luke xi. 13 has πνεῦμα ἅγιον—a later substitution of the particular for the general. For the inference *a minori ad majus*, comp. Isa. xlix. 15.

Ver. 12. At this point Jesus takes a retrospective glance at all that He has been saying since v. 17,—beginning with Moses and the prophets,—concerning our duty to our neighbour, but introducing, indeed, many other instructions and exhortations. But putting out of view such matters as are foreign to His discourse, He now *recapitulates* all that has been said on the duties we owe to our neighbour, *so that οὖν points back* to v. 17. The correctness of this view is evident from the following: οὗτος γάρ ἐστιν ὁ νόμος, etc., from which it further appears that οὖν does not merely refer back to v. 1–5 (Kuinoel, Neander, Baumgarten-Crusius). As Luther well observes: “With those words He concludes the instructions contained in those three chapters, and gathers them all into one little bundle.” Fritzsche is somewhat illogical when he says that οὖν generalizes the conclusion from οἴδατε δόματα . . . τέκνοις ὑμῶν, which proposition, however, was a

<sup>1</sup> Chrysostom appropriately says: ταῦτα δὲ ἔλεγεν οὐ διαβάλλων τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην φύσιν, οὐδὲ κακίζων τὸ γένος, ἀλλὰ πρὸς ἀντιδιαστολὴν τῆς ἀγαθότητος τῆς αὐτοῦ (of God) τὴν φιλοστοργίαν τὴν πατρικὴν πονηρίαν καλῶν. It is not *original sin*, but the *historical manifestation* of the sin of all men, which is spoken of, of which, however, *original sin* is the internal, natural root. Comp. xv. 19; John iii. 6.

mere *lemma*. Ewald thinks that ver. 12 is here in its wrong place, that its original position was somewhere before ἀγαπᾶτε, v. 44, and might still be repeated after v. 48 ; according to Bleek and Holtzmann, founding on Luke vi. 31, its original position was after v. 42. But it is precisely its significant position as a concluding sentence, along with its reference to the law and the prophets, that Luke *has taken away* from it. Comp. Weiss. On θέλειν ἵνα, see note on Luke vi. 31. — οὕτω] not for ταῦτα, as if the matter were merged in the manner (de Wette), but *in such a manner, in this way*, corresponding, that is, to this your θέλειν.—The *truth* of this Christian maxim lies in this, that the words ὅσα ἂν θέλητε, etc., as spoken by Jesus, and, on the ground of His fulfilment of the law (οὖν), which presupposes faith in Him, can only mean a willing of a truly *moral* kind, and not that of a self-seeking nature, such as the desire for flattery. — οὗτος, etc.] *for this is the sum of moral duty*, and so on.—For parallels from profane writers, see Wetstein ; *Bab. Schabb.* f. 31. 1 : “Quod tibi ipsi odiosum est, proximo ne facias ; nam haec est tota lex.” But being all of a *negative* character, like Tob. iv. 15, they are essentially different from the present passage. For coincidences of a more meagre kind from Greek writers, see Spiess, *Logos Spermat.* p. 24.

Ver. 13. There now follow some additional concluding exhortations and warnings, which in Luke are partly omitted, partly scattered and displaced (in answer to Calvin, Keim) and abridged. With ver. 13 comp. Luke xiii. 24. The thought is one of the *fundamental* thoughts of the Sermon on the Mount. — εἰσέλθετε] where the entering leads to is not stated till ver. 14. — ὅτι] assigning the reason *e contrario*. — εἰς τὴν ἀπώλειαν] i.e. *to eternal death*, as being the punishment of such as are condemned in the Messianic judgment. Phil. i. 28 ; Heb. x. 39 ; 2 Pet. iii. 7, 16. The opposite is ζωή, the eternal life of felicity in the kingdom of the Messiah. *Wide gate and broad way* ; figures representing the pleasures and excesses of sin and wickedness. *Strait gate and narrow way* ; representing, on the other hand, the effort and self-denial which Christian duty imposes. It is only when re-

generated that a man comes first to experience the *lightness* of the yoke (xi. 29), and of the commandments (1 John v. 3), and all the more the further progress he makes in the love of Christ (John xiv. 15 ff.). — ἡ ἀγάπ. εἰς τ. ἀπώλ.] refers equally to ἡ πύλη (Kühner, II. 1, p. 70 f.), to which again the δι' αὐτῆς belongs. There is a similar construction in v. 14, where αὐτήν in like manner refers to πύλη.

Vv. 14, 15. Τί] *quam* (Vulg.): *how* strait is the gate! as conforming to the Sept., which renders נֹחַ in this sense by טִי (2 Sam. vi. 20; Cant. vii. 6; Luke xii. 49), though not good Greek. The rendering *why*, as though there were something *sorrowful* in the question (Fritzsche), is unsuited to the whole tone of the discourse. — εὐρίσκοντες] The strait gate requires to be *sought*, so far is it from being readily seen, or from obtruding itself upon the attention.—By most, the gate is erroneously conceived to be at *the end* of the way; with Bengel, Schegg, and Lange, it is to be understood as at the *beginning* of it, as *opening into it*, for which reason, in vv. 13, 14, the gate is mentioned *before* the way. The entering by the strait gate is therefore the entering *into life* (into the Messiah's kingdom), but still brought about through following the narrow way, which is reached by means of the strait gate. — προσέχετε δέ] But in order to find it, beware, and so on. — The ψευδοπροφῆται are not the *Pharisees* (Tholuck), nor *Jews*, pretending to be divine messengers (Bleek), nor people like *Judas the Galilean* (Acts v. 37, de Wette), but false *Christian* teachers without a divine call (xxiv. 11, 24), as is evident from vv. 21–23. Comp. Chrysostom, Calvin, Grotius, Calovius. A warning in view of *coming* events, and such as Jesus knew His followers would soon be needing. — ἐν ἐνδύμασι προβάτ.] *dressed in sheep's clothing*. Here we are not to think of *literal sheep skins* (Grotius, Kuinoel), seeing that these were worn by others, and were not specially the prophets' dress (comp. iii. 4), but as *emblematic of the outward appearance of innocence and gentleness*, not of the external profession of a member of the *Christian church* ("nominis Christiani extrinsecus superficies," Tertullian, *de praescr.* 4), which would have been admissible only if the context had

spoken of the church in the light of a flock, in which case the false *prophets* would have been far more appropriately represented as in *shepherds'* clothing. Bengel well remarks: "Vestibus ut si essent oves." — ἔσωθεν] *i.e.*, according to the figure; under the sheep's clothing; in *reality*; in their *true inner nature*, which is disguised by hypocrisy. With λύκοι ἄρπαγες, as representing *soul-destroying agency*, comp. Acts xx. 29; John x. 12.

Vv. 16-18. Ἐπιγνώσ.] *Ye will know them, not ye should* (Luther). — The καρποί are the results of principles, as seen in the whole *behaviour*, the *works* (vv. 21, 23, xii. 33), not the *doctrines* (Jerome, Calvin, Calovius). — ἄκανθαι κ. τρίβολοι] *Thorns and thistles* occur together in a corresponding figurative sense in Heb. vi. 8. — οὕτω] application of those images to the false prophets, in such a way, however, that the latter, in keeping with ἀπὸ τ. καρπ. αὐτ. (comp. ver. 20), just before, appear again as *trees*. — ἄ δένδρον ἀγαθόν is, as contrasted with the σαπρόν, a *sound, healthy tree*; for a σαπρόν is not some tree of an inferior species, but one whose organism is *decaying* with age, etc., *rotten*, the σαπρότης of which (Plat. Rep. p. 609 E; Diosc. i. 113), owing to a defective and corrupted state of the sap, admits of nothing in the way of fruit but what is bad, small, and useless. Comp. ξύλον σαπρόν, Job xli. 19. σαπρὸι στέφανοι, Dem. 615. 11. "Bonitas arboris ipsius est veritas et lux interna, etc.; bonitas fructuum est sanctitas vitae. Si fructus essent in doctrina positi, nullus orthodoxus damnari posset," Bengel. With the οὐ δύναται of the corrupt tree, comp. Rom. viii. 7 f. In this emphatic οὐ δύναται lies the *progressive* force of the simile.

Ver. 19. Simply a thought introduced by the way (not as being necessary for the logical connection of vv. 16-20), and pointing to the condemnation to Gehenna which awaits the false prophets. Comp. with iii. 10.

Ver. 20. Ἀπαγε] *itaque* (xvii. 26; Acts xi. 18), pointing to the inference from vv. 17, 18, and, by way of emphasis, introducing once more that which was already stated in ver. 16 as the theme of discourse.

Vv. 21-23. *Jesus now states in literal terms* what He

meant to convey through the simile of the *fruit*. There is much that is arbitrary in the way this passage is dealt with by those who, from their having supposed the *ψευδοπροφ.* of ver. 15 to be Jews, are under the necessity of adopting a different explanation in the present instance. De Wette, going against the context, sees a gradual transition from teachers who teach what is *unsound* (vv. 15–20) to such (teachers and others) as are satisfied with the *mere acknowledgment of their belief*. That it is still the same false prophets against whom the warning in vv. 21–23 is directed, appears from the use of *προεφητεύσαμεν* in ver. 22, and of *οἱ ἐργαζ. τ. ἀνομίαν* in ver. 23, the latter further showing that *καρποὶ πονηροί* is to be understood as denoting the *characteristic mark* of such prophets. — *οὐ πᾶς*] not, *no one* (Elsner, Fritzsche), but, *not every one*, 1 Cor. xv. 39. Winer, p. 161 [E. T. 214]. Not *all* who acknowledge me as their teacher will enter the Messianic kingdom, only *those* among them, and so on. *Many* will not enter therein. Therefore it is not the case that the teachers are not referred to till ver. 22, according to the idea of gradation which de Wette introduces into that verse: “*even those who work in my name,*” and so on. — *κύριε, κύριε*] In addressing their teachers, the Jews employed the title *רַבִּי* or *רַבִּי*. Accordingly it came to be used as a title in addressing the Messiah (John xiii. 13 f.), and in the church itself came to be regarded as the *summary of belief*, inasmuch as it contained the full recognition of the majesty of Jesus’ person (1 Cor. xii. 3; Phil. ii. 11). Christ Himself called no man *master*. It is on this occasion, and while applying to Himself this Messianic title, that He also says for the first time, *ὁ πατήρ μου* (comp. iii. 17). The *twice repeated κύριε* is meant to convey the idea of *earnestness*. See Bornemann, *Schol. in Luc.* p. 53, and in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1843, p. 124. Comp. xxv. 11; Add. *ad Esth.* iii. 2, 3; LXX. Ps. lxxi. 5, 16.

Vv. 22, 23. *Ἐν ἐκ. τῇ ἡμέρᾳ*] Euth. Zigabenus, *ἡμέραν ἐκείνην εἶπε τὴν τῆς κρίσεως, ὡς ἐγνωσμένην καὶ προσδοκῆμένην*. Comp. the Jewish phraseology; Schoettgen, *Hor. in loco.* — *τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι*] not *jussu et auctoritate sua* (as the



majority of commentators, Fritzsche included), as if it had been ἐν τῷ σῶ ὀνόμ., but *by means of Thy name*, i.e. through *Thy name* ("Jesus Messiah"), having satisfied our religious consciousness, and having become the object of our confession. It was by this, as forming the condition and instrument, that the works in question were accomplished. In the casting out of devils and in performing miracles the name was *pronounced*, Acts iii. 6, xix. 13; comp. on Luke ix. 49, x. 17.—Notice the stress laid upon the σῶ, and the threefold repetition of the prominent words τῷ σῶ ὀνόμ., as expressing that by which the individuals in question think to shelter themselves from disapprobation and rejection, and make good their claim to the Messianic kingdom.—προεφητεύσ.] not in the special sense of *foretelling* (Grotius, Fritzsche), but (comp. ver. 15) with reference to those who taught under the influence of a prophetic enthusiasm (see note on 1 Cor. xii. 10). The distinguishing feature in those men is an impure, often fanatical, boldness in the faith, which, though enabling them to perform outward acts of a marvellous nature, yet fails to exercise any influence upon their own moral life—just the sort of thing described by Paul in 1 Cor. xiii. 2, and the manifestations of which are to be met with in every age, especially in times of great religious excitement.—Ver. 23. ὁμολογ.] "*aperte, magna potestas hujus dicti*," Bengel. The conscious dignity of the future *judge of the world*.—ὅτι] *Recitative*. The rendering *because*, to which a different arrangement of the words by Origen, Chrysostom, Cyprian, and others has given rise (ὅτι . . . ὑμᾶς *after ἀποχωρ.*), is less in harmony with the *emotion* of the passage.—ἐγνων] not *probavi* (Kuinoel), but *novi*. Because ("etsi nomen meum allegatis," Bengel) I have never known you, have obtained no knowledge of you whatever, which I would have done (John x. 14) had ye really been in fellowship with me. Comp. Luke xiii. 27. The knowledge is the knowledge of *experience* founded upon the *possession* of a *common life*. Similarly 1 Cor. viii. 3, xiii. 12; Gal. iv. 9.—ἀποχωρεῖτε, κ.τ.λ.] according to Ps. vi. 9. Comp. xxv. 41. οἱ ἐργαζόμε. is used as a substantive; while ἀνομία is the antithesis of δικαιοσύνη, 2 Cor. vi. 14, Heb. i. 9, as in xiii. 41,

xxiii. 28, xxiv. 12. Notice how in this passage the great utterance of vv. 17, 18 continues to echo to the last, and to bear the impress of the final judgment; comp. Rom. ii. 13.

Vv. 24–27. *Conclusion* of the whole sermon, but, as appears from οὖν, taking the form of an inference from what is said immediately before, where admission into the Messianic kingdom is made to depend on moral obedience. — πᾶς οὖν ὅστις, κ.τ.λ.] The nominative with rhetorical emphasis placed anacolouthologically at the beginning in x. 14, xiii. 12, xxiii. 16. See Kühner, II. 1, p. 42; Winer, p. 534 f. [E. T. 718]. — ὁμοιώσω] This *future*, as well as ὁμοιωθήσεται, ver. 26, is not to be taken as referring to the *comparison immediately following* (which is the *common view*), which is not warranted by the interrogatory passages, xi. 16, Mark iv. 30, Luke vii. 31, xiii. 18, 20, but to be understood (like ὁμολογήσω in ver. 23) *of the day of judgment* (Tholuck), when Christ will make him who yields obedience to those sayings of His, like (*i.e.* demonstrate as matter of fact that he is like) a wise man, and so on. Ὁμοιών therefore does not here denote *comparare*, but the actual *making him like to* (Plat. *Rep.* p. 393 C; Matt. vi. 8, xxv. 1, xiii. 24; Rom. ix. 29). See the scholion of Photius in Matthaei, *ad Euth. Zig.* p. 290. De Wette is at one with Fritzsche as regards ὁμοιώσω, but differs from him, however, in his view of ὁμοιωθήσεται as referring to the future result that is developing itself. — φρονίμῳ] as in xxv. 2. — ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν] *upon the rock*. No particular rock is intended, but the category, as in ver. 26: *upon the sand*.—Observe the emphatic, nay solemn, polysyndeta, and (instead of ὅτε or ἐπεὶ, followed by a statement of the consequence; Krüger, *Xen. Anab.* p. 404; Kühner, II. 2, p. 782 f.) the paratactic mode of representation in vv. 25 and 27, as also the important verbal repetition in ver. 27, where, in the last of the assaults, προσέκοψαν (they assailed it) is only a more concrete way of describing the thing than the corresponding προσέπεσον of ver. 25. The three points in the picture are the *roof*, the *foundation*, and the *sides* of the house.—On the *pluperfect* τεθεμελίωτο without the augment, see Winer, p. 70 [E. T. 85]. — μεγάλη] “*magna, sane totalis*,” Bengel.—The *meaning* of this simple but grand *similitude*,

harmonizing in some of its features with Ezek. xiii. 11 ff., is this: Whoever conforms to the teaching just inculcated is certain to obtain salvation in my kingdom, though trying times may await him; but he who is disobedient will lose the expected felicity, and the dire catastrophe that is to precede the advent of the Messiah will overwhelm him with ἀπώλεια (inasmuch as the Messiah, at His coming, will consign him to eternal death).

*With regard to the Sermon generally*, the following points may be noted:—

(1.) It is the same discourse which, though according to a different tradition and redaction, is found in Luke vi. 20–49. For although it is there represented as occurring at a later date and in another locality (ver. 17), and although, in respect of its contents, style, and arrangement it differs widely from that in Matthew, yet, judging from its characteristic introduction and close, its manifold and essential identity as regards the subject-matter, as well as from its mentioning the circumstance that, immediately after, Jesus cured the sick servant in Capernaum (Luke vii. 1 ff.), it is clear that Matthew and Luke do not record two different discourses (Augustine, Erasmus, Andr. Osiander, Molinaeus, Jansen, Büsching, Hess, Storr, Gratz, Krafft), but different versions of one and the same (Origen, Chrysostom, Bucer, Calvin, Chemnitz, Calovius, Bengel, and most modern commentators).

(2.) The preference as regards originality of tradition is not to be accorded to Luke (Schneckenburger, Olshausen, Wilke, B. Bauer, Schenkel, and, in the main, Bleek and Holtzmann), but to *Matthew* (Schleiermacher, Kern, Tholuck, de Wette, Weiss, Weizsäcker, Keim), because, as compared with Matthew, Luke's version is so incomplete in its character, that one sees in it merely the disjointed fragments of what had once been a much more copious discourse. In Matthew, on the other hand, there is that combination of full detail, and sententious brevity, and disregard of connection, which is so natural in the case of a lengthened extemporaneous and spirited address actually delivered, but not suited to the purpose of a mere

compiler of traditions, to whose art Ewald (*Jahrb.* I. p. 131) ascribes the structure of the discourse. The Sermon on the Mount is omitted in Mark. But the view that this evangelist originally borrowed it, though in an abridged form, from Matthew's collection of our Lord's sayings, and that the place where it stood in Mark iii. 19, just before *καὶ ἔρχ. εἰς οἶκον*, may still be traced (Ewald, Holtzmann), rests on the utterly unwarrantable supposition (Introduction, sec. 4) that the second Gospel has not come down to us in its original shape. On the other hand, see especially Weiss. Besides, there is no apparent reason why so important a passage should have been entirely struck out by Mark, if it had been originally there.

(3.) Since the original production of Matthew the apostle consisted of the *λόγια τοῦ κυρίου* (Introduction, sec. 2), it may be assumed that the Sermon on the Mount, as given in the present Gospel of Matthew, was in all essential respects one of the principal elements in that original. However, it is impossible to maintain that it was delivered (and reproduced from memory), in the precise form in which it has been preserved in Matthew. This follows at once from the length of the discourse and the variety of its contents, and is further confirmed by the circumstance that Matthew himself, according to ix. 9, did not as yet belong to the number of those to whom it had been addressed. By way of showing that the Sermon on the Mount cannot have been delivered (Luke vi. 20) till after the choice of the Twelve (Wieseler, Tholuck, Hilgenfeld, Ebrard, Bleek, Holtzmann, Keim), reasons of this sort have been alleged, that, at so early a stage, Jesus could not have indulged in such a polemical style of address toward the Pharisees. This, however, is unsatisfactory, since even a later period would still be open to a similar objection. On the other hand, it is to be observed further, that so important a historical connection (*viz.* with the choice of the Twelve) could not fail to have been preserved among the ancient traditions recorded by Matthew if such connection had actually existed, while again it is in accordance with the natural development of tradition, to suppose that the presence of the *μαθηταί* (Matt. v. 1), which is historically certain, as well as the

numerous important references to the calling of the disciples, may have led to the adoption of a later date in the subsequent traditions. Those who represent the evangelist as introducing the Sermon at an earlier stage than that to which it strictly belongs, are therefore charging him with gross confusion in his determination of the place in which it ought to stand. But although Matthew was not present himself at the Sermon on the Mount, but only reports what he learned indirectly *through* those who were so, still his report so preserves that happy combination of thoughtful purpose with the freedom of extemporaneous speech which distinguished the discourse, that one cannot fail clearly enough to recognise its *substantial originality*. This, however, can only be regarded as a *relative* originality, such as makes it impossible to say not only to what extent the form and arrangement of the discourse have been influenced by new versions of the *λόγια* on the one hand, and new modifications of the Gospel on the other, but also how much of what our Lord altered on some other occasion has been, either unconsciously or intentionally, interwoven with kindred elements in the address. But, in seeking to eliminate such foreign matters, critics have started with subjective assumptions and uncertain views, and so have each arrived at very conflicting results. Utterly inadmissible is the view of Calvin and Semler, which has obtained currency above all through Pott (*de natura atque indoleorat. mont.* 1788) and Kuinoel, that the Sermon on the Mount is a conglomerate, consisting of a great many detached sentences uttered by Jesus on different occasions,<sup>1</sup> and in proof of which we are referred especially to the numerous fragments that are to be found scattered throughout Luke. No doubt, in the case of the Lord's Prayer, vi. 9 ff., the claim of originality

<sup>1</sup> Strauss compares the different materials of the discourse to boulders that have been washed away from their original bed; while Matthew, he thinks, has shown special skill in grouping together the various cognate elements. This is substantially the view of Baur. Both, however, are opposed to the notion that Luke's version is distinguished by greater originality. Holtzmann ascribes to Matthew the arrangement and the grouping of the ideas, while to Jesus again he ascribes the various apothegms that fill up the outline. Weizsäcker regards the discourse as *fabricated, and having no reference to any definite situation,*

must be decided in favour of Luke's account. Otherwise, however, the historical connection of Luke's parallel passages is such as, in no single instance, to justify their claim to the originality in question. In fact, the connection in which most of them stand is less appropriate than that of Matthew (Luke xi. 34-36 compared with Matt. vi. 22 f.; Luke xvi. 17 compared with Matt. v. 18; Luke xii. 58 ff. compared with Matt. v. 24 ff.; Luke xvi. 18 compared with Matt. v. 32), while others leave room for supposing that Jesus has used the same expression twice (Luke xii. 33 f. comp. Matt. vi. 19-21; Luke xiii. 24 comp. Matt. vii. 13; Luke xiii. 25-27 comp. Matt. vii. 22 f.; Luke xiv. 34 comp. Matt. v. 13; Luke xvi. 13 comp. Matt. vi. 24) on different occasions, which is quite possible, especially when we consider the plastic nature of the figurative language employed. For, when Luke himself makes use of the saying about the candle, Matt. v. 15, on two occasions (viii. 16, xi. 33), there is no necessity for thinking (as Weiss does) that he has been betrayed into doing so by Mark iv. 21. Luke's secondary character as regards the Sermon on the Mount is seen, above all, in his omitting Jesus' fundamental exposition of the law. In deriving that exposition from some special treatise dealing with the question of Jesus' attitude towards the law, Holtzmann adopts a view that is peculiarly untenable in the case of the first Gospel (which grew directly out of the *λόγια*); so, on the other hand, Weiss, 1864, p. 56 f.

(4.) Those whom Jesus addressed in the Sermon on the Mount were, in the first instance, His own disciples (v. 1), among whom were present some of those who were afterwards known as the Twelve (iv. 18 ff.), for which reason also a part of the discourse has the apostolic office distinctly in view;

with a view, as he thinks, to show the relation of Jesus to the law, and therewith its introduction into the kingdom of God; what interrupts this branch of the discourse, which was sketched as a unity, viz. v. 11 f., vi. 9 ff., vii. 21-23, are inexplicable additions, and vii. 1-23 contains insertions which have a general relationship to the principal thoughts. According to Weiss, the following passages in particular belong to the insertions: v. 13-16, v. 25 f., vi. 7-15, vi. 19-34, vii. 7-11. The discourse, moreover, is said to have begun originally with only *four* beatitudes.

but the surrounding multitude (vii. 28) had also been listening, and were deeply astonished at the instruction they received. Accordingly, it may well be supposed that though Jesus' words were intended more immediately for the benefit of *His disciples* (v. 2), the listening multitude was by no means overlooked, but formed the outer circle of His audience, so that by look and gesture He could easily make it appear what was intended for the one circle and what for the other; comp. v. 2. What is said of ancient oratory is no less true of the animation with which Jesus spoke: "in antiqua oratione oculus, manus, digitus vice interpretis funguntur" (Wolf, *ad Leptin.* p. 365). These observations will suffice to explain the presence of a mixed teaching suited to the outer and inner circle, partly ideal and partly of a popular and less abstract character (in answer to Wittichen, *Jahrb. f. D. Th.* 1862, p. 318 ff.).

(5.) The object of the sermon cannot have been the consecration of the apostles (Zacharias, Pott, Ewald, *Jahrb.* I. p. 129), partly because the connection in which Luke places this address with the choosing of the Twelve is not to be preferred to the historical connection given in Matthew (see above, under 2); partly because Matthew, who does not record any passage containing special instructions for the apostles till ch. x., makes no mention whatever of such an object (he only says *ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοὺς*, v. 2); and partly because the contents are, as a whole, by no means in keeping with such a special aim as is here supposed. Judging from the contents, the object of *Jesus*, as *the fulfiller of the law and the prophets*, is to set forth the moral conditions of admission to the approaching Messianic kingdom. But the principle of a morality rooted in the heart, on which He insists, is, seeing that it is His disciples that are immediately addressed, necessarily *faith* in Him, as Luther especially has so often and so ably maintained (comp. Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* I. p. 598 ff., Tholuck). The whole discourse is a lively commentary on the words with which Jesus introduced His public ministry: *μετανοεῖτε, ἤγγικε γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν*, setting forth the great moral effects of the *μετάνοια* which He requires, and declaring them to be the condition of Messianic bliss for those who believe in Him. So far the discourse may

be correctly described as the *inaugural address* of His kingdom, as its "magna charta" (Tholuck), less appropriately as the "compendium of His doctrine" (de Wette).

(6.) The passages in which Jesus plainly reveals Himself as the Messiah (v. 17 f., vii. 21 ff.) are not at variance with xvi. 17 (see note on this passage), but fully harmonize with the Messianic conviction of which He was already possessed at His baptism, and which was divinely confirmed on that occasion, and with which He commenced His public ministry (iv. 17); just as in the fourth Gospel, also, He gives expression to His Messianic consciousness from the very outset, both within and beyond the circle of His disciples. Consequently, it is not necessary to suppose that a *ὑστερον πρότερον* (de Wette, Baur) has taken place, which, according to Köstlin, had already been forced into the *λόγια*; nor need we allow ourselves to be driven to the necessity of assigning a later date to the discourse (Tholuck, Hilgenfeld). Besides, in the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus does not as yet assume to Himself any *express* or *formal* designation as Messiah, although a Messianic sense of the importance of His *ἐγώ* runs through the entire discourse; and the notion that His consciousness of being the Messiah only gradually developed itself at a later period (Strauss, Schenkel, Weissenbach), is contrary to the whole testimony of the Gospels.

Ver. 28. *Καὶ ἐγένετο* ὧν. Winer, p. 565 [E. T. 760].—*ἐπὶ*] as throughout the New Testament. In classical Greek the usual construction is with the dat., sometimes with the acc., and more rarely with *ἐπὶ* (Xen. *Cyrop.* i. 4. 27; Polyb. v. 48. 3, ii. 3. 3, *al.*). The discourse, which has been listened to with deep and unwearied attention, having now been brought to a close, there follows an outburst of *astonishment*, "quod nova quaedam majestas et insueta hominum mentes ad se raperet," Calvin. This in answer to Köstlin, p. 77, Holtzmann, who regard this statement as borrowed from Mark i. 22.

Ver. 29. Ὡς διδάσκων] expresses more emphatically than a simple imperf. that it was a *continuous* thing, Kühner, II. 1, p. 35. Winer, p. 526 f. [E. T. 437].—ὡς ἐξουσίαν



ἔχων] *as one who is invested with prophetic authority*, in contrast to the γραμματεῖς, in listening to whom one could hear that they were not *authorized* to speak in the same fearless, candid, unconstrained, convincing, telling, forcible way. "All was full of life, and sounded as though it had hands and feet," Luther. Comp. Luke iv. 32, 36; Mark i. 22, 27; Rev. ix. 19.

## CHAPTER VIII.

VER. 1. καταβάντι δὲ αὐτῶ] Lachm. According to Z Codd. of the It. Hil.: καὶ καταβάντος αὐτοῦ, instead of which B C κ\*\* Curss. have καταβάντος δὲ αὐτοῦ. A mere correction, like the similarly attested εἰσελθόντος δὲ αὐτοῦ, ver. 5, in Lachm. and Tisch. 8. — Ver. 2. ἐλθών] Lachm. and Tisch.: προσελθών, according to B E M Δ κ and several Curss. as well as some Verss. and Fathers. Correctly, *προς* having dropped out owing to the final syllab. of *λεπρός*. — Ver. 3. ὁ Ἰησοῦς] is not found in B C\* κ, Curss. Verss. Deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. A common supplementary addition, and evidently such in the present instance, from its shifting position, for several authorities have it *before* ἤψατο. — Ver. 5. αὐτῶ] Elz.: τῶ Ἰησοῦ, contrary to decisive authorities. — Ver. 8. λόγῳ] Elz.: λόγον, against such decisive authority, that λόγῳ must not be regarded as introduced from Luke vii. 7; but λόγον seems to be a correction through ignorance. — Ver. 9. After ἐξουσίαν Lachm. has τασσόμενος (B κ, 4, 238, 421, Vulg. It. Chrys.); taken from Luke vii. 8. — Ver. 10. οὐδὲ ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ τοσαύτην πίστιν εὑρον] Lachm.: παρ' οὐδενὶ ποσαύτην πίστιν ἐν τῷ Ἰσρ. εὑρον, only according to B, Curss. and several Verss. and Fathers. The same reading, though not so well attested, is also found in Luke vii. 9. An interpretation in which the meaning of οὐδὲ has been missed, and the prefixing of ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ misunderstood (comp. Vulg.). — Ver. 12. ἐκβλήθησ.] Tisch. 8: ἐξελεύσονται, on too slender authority; among the Codd. only κ\*. — Ver. 13. αὐτοῦ] wanting in B κ and several Curss. and Verss. and in Basil. Deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. 8. Passed over as unnecessary. For what immediately follows Lachm. reads ἀπὸ τῆς ὥρας ἐκείνης, in accordance with less important authorities (C Δ). In conformity with ix. 22, xv. 28, xvii. 18. — Ver. 15. αὐτῶ] so also Scholz, Lachm. and Tisch., according to decisive authority. The αὐτοῖς of the Received text, defended by Griesb. and Fritzsche, is taken from Mark i. 31, Luke iv. 39. — Ver. 18. πολλοὺς ὄχλους] Lachm.: ὄχλον, only according to B, but correct. Matth. would certainly have written ὄχλους πολλούς, as in ver. 1, xiii. 2, xv. 30,

and all through; for only in xiv. 14 does he put *πολύς* first, where, however, the *singul.* occurs. Besides, the reading of the Received text might easily be a gloss to strengthen the expression. — Ver. 23. *τὸ πλοῶν*] The article is omitted in B C, Curss. Or., and is deleted by Lachm., but had been left out from not being understood. So also in ix. 1, xiii. 2, in which cases it is deleted by Tisch. 8 as well. — Ver. 25. *οἱ μαθηταί*] The Received text inserts *αὐτοῦ*, which, however, is deleted, in accordance with decisive testimonies. *Οἱ μαθηταί* is also omitted in B  $\aleph$ , Verss. as well as by Jerome, Bede. Bracketed by Lachm., deleted by Tisch. 8. But the omission may be accounted for from the fact that, similarly in the parallels of Mark and Luke, this, the obvious subject, is not expressed. — *ἡμᾶς*] is wanting in B C  $\aleph$  1, 13, 118, 209. Justly deleted by Fritzsche, Lachm. and Tisch.; for, while there seemed to be no reason why it should have been omitted, the insertion of it, on the other hand, would naturally suggest itself, if it did not happen to be noticed how the mode of expression is suited to the feeling of the passage. — Ver. 28. *ἐλθόνει αὐτῷ*] Lachm. Tisch. 8: *ἐλθόντος αὐτοῦ*, according to B C  $\aleph^{**}$  and Curss. See ver. 1. — *Γερασσηῶν*] Fritzsche and Scholz, also Tisch.: *Γαδαρηῶν*, according to B C M  $\Delta$ , Curss. Syr. utr. Perss. Eus. Epiph.; Elz.: *Γεργεσηῶν*, according to C\*\*\* E K L S U V X  $\aleph^*$ . See in general, Orig. iv. p. 140. The reading *Γαδαρηῶν*, which Orig. found *ἐν ὀλίγοις*, has topographical reasons in its favour; *Γερασσηῶν*, however, is supported by Origen's statement, that in his time it was the prevailing reading.<sup>1</sup> — Ver. 29. *σοί*] Elz. and Scholz insert *Ἰησοῦ*, which is not found in B C L  $\aleph$ , Curss. Codd. It. Copt. Cypr. Or. Taken from Mark v. 7, Luke viii. 28. — Ver. 31. *ἐπίτρεψον ἡμῖν ἀπελθεῖν*] Griesb. Lachm. Tisch.: *ἀπόστειλον ἡμᾶς*, according to B  $\aleph$ , Curss. Syr. and the majority of Verss. Correctly; the reading of the Received text is adopted from Luke viii. 32 (where several authorities have *ἀπελθεῖν* instead of *εἰσελθεῖν*). Had it been a correction from Mark v. 12, we should have found *πέμψον* instead of *ἀπόστειλον* in the present passage. — Ver. 32. *εἰς τοὺς χοίρους*] as Lachm. and Tisch. 8, according to B C\*  $\aleph$ , Curss. and most Verss. But the Recept. *εἰς τὴν ἀγέλην τῶν χοίρων* is to be preferred all the more that the adoption of *εἰς τοὺς χοίρους*, from the parallels in Mark and Luke, was favoured by the greater definiteness of meaning (*into the bodies of the swine*). — After *ἡ ἀγέλη* Elz.

<sup>1</sup> *Γερασ.* is still found in the Syr. p. on the margin, Sahid. Sax. It. Vulg. Hilar. Nyss. Ath. Juv. Prud. Adopted by Lachm. For the decision, see exegetical notes. —  $\aleph^*$  has *Γαζαρηνῶν*, which is only another way of pronouncing *Γαδαρ.*; see Grimm on 1 Macc. iv. 15.

inserts *τῶν χοίρων*. It is wanting, indeed, in B C\* M Δ R, Curss. and the majority of Verss., and is deleted by Griesb. Scholz, Lachm. and Tisch. 8. But how easily may it have been omitted as quite unnecessary, owing to the parallels in Mark and Luke! In a case where the meaning was so obvious, there was no motive for inserting it.

Ver. 1. *Αὐτῷ . . . αὐτῷ*] as in v. 40, and frequently in Matthew as well as in classical writers. See Bornemann, *ad Xen. Symp.* iv. 63; Winer, p. 139 f. [E. T. 275].—The healing of the leper occurs in Luke (v. 12 ff.) *before* the Sermon on the Mount, and in Mark (i. 40 ff.) and Luke not till after the healing of Peter's mother-in-law. It is not to be regarded as the *earliest* of *all* the miracles of healing.

Ver. 2. *Λεπρός*] *λέπρα*, *ηγή*, a most dangerous, contagious disease, descending to the fourth generation, which lacerated the body with scales, tetters, and sores; Trusen, *bibl. Krankh.* p. 103 ff.; Kurtz in Herzog's *Encykl.* I. p. 626 ff.; Furer in Schenkel's *Bibelllex.* I. p. 317 ff.; Saalschutz, *M. R.* p. 223 ff. — *κύριε*] To express the reverence that is founded on the recognition of higher power. — *ἐὰν θέλῃς*] entire resignation to the mighty will of Jesus. — *καθαρίσαι*] from the disease that was polluting the body; Plut. *Mor.* p. 134 D. — *ἐκαθαρίσθη αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα*] and immediately *his leprosy was cleansed* (John xi. 32), xiii. 25, xxii. 13, xxv. 51. The *leprosy* is spoken of as cleansed, according to the idea that the *disease* experiences the healing—that the *disease* is healed (iv. 23). Differently and more correctly expressed in Mark i. 42. — On *θέλω*, Bengel aptly observes: “echo prompta ad fidem leprosi maturam.” In answer to Paulus, who understands the cleansing in the sense of *pronouncing clean*,—as also Schenkel, Keim,—see Strauss, II. p. 48 ff., and Bleek.

Ver. 4. *The injunction, not to mention the matter to any one*, cannot be regarded as an evidence of Matthew's dependence on Mark (Holtzman; comp. xii. 15 with Mark i. 43 and iii. 7 ff.), because the connection in Mark is supposed to be somewhat more appropriate, but is only to be taken as expressing a desire on the part of Jesus to prevent any commotion among the people with their fanatical Messianic hopes, at

least as far as, by discouraging publicity, it was in His own power to do so (Chrysostom)—to prevent what, according to Mark i. 45 (Luke v. 15), actually took place through a disregard of this injunction. Comp. ix. 30, xii. 16; Mark iii. 12, v. 43, vii. 36, viii. 26, 30; Matt. xvi. 20, xvii. 9. The miracle was no doubt performed (ver. 1) before the people (in answer to Schenkel), and in the open air; but, in the first place, only those standing near would be in a position to hear or see the course of the miracle with sufficient minuteness; and, secondly, in giving this injunction, Jesus was also keeping in view the fact of the leper's being about to visit Jerusalem, and to sojourn there. Consequently we must reject the view of Maldonatus, Grotius, Bengel, Wetstein, Kuinoel, Paulus, Glöckler, to the effect that He wished to provide against any refusal on the part of the priests to pronounce the man clean. Equally inadmissible is that of Fritzsche, Baumgarten-Crusius, and Keim, that at present, above all, He insisted on the *more important* duty,—that, namely, of the man's subjecting himself to the inspection of the priests, which is not in accordance with the occasional *ῥα* (comp. ix. 31); nor can we accept Olshausen's view, that the motive for the injunction is to be sought in the man himself. Baur holds that the injunction is not to be regarded as historical, but only as the product of tradition, arising out of the application to Jesus of Isa. xlii. 1 ff. But the truth is, that prohibition is not once mentioned in Isa. xlii., which contains only a general description of the Messiah's *humility*. Moreover, it would not be apparent why the passage from Isaiah is not quoted here, when the injunction in question occurs for the first time, but afterwards in xii. 17. — *σεαυτόν*] *thyself*. Instead of making a *talk* about the matter, go and present yourself *in person* before the proper authorities. — *τῷ ἱερεῖ*] Lev. xiv. 2. — *τὸ δῶρον*] the offering prescribed in Lev. xiv. 10, 21. See Ewald, *Alterth.* p. 210 f.; Keil, *Archäol.* § 59. — *εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς*] *as an evidence to them, i.e. to the people*, that thou hast been healed. This reference of *αὐτοῖς* follows contextually from *ῥα*, *μηδενὲ ἐπης*, and that of *μαρτύριον* (evidence *that thou art cleansed*) from a consideration of the object of the legal

prescription in question; see Lev. xiv. 57. It is importing a foreign element, to suppose that the testimony was further meant to show that "I am not abrogating the law" (Chrysostom, Theophylact; see what follows); comp. also Fritzsche, who looks upon the words as containing a remark by Matthew himself: "Haec autem dixit, ut turbare testaretur, se magni facere Mosis instituta." As decisive against the latter view, we have the fact that both Mark and Luke record the words εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς, and that, too, in such a way as to make it evident that they formed part of what was spoken by Jesus (Luke v. 14). Chrysostom and Fathers understand αὐτοῖς as referring to the *priests*, in which case the testimony is regarded as intended to show *either* (what is in itself correct) Jesus' *respect for the law* (Euth. Zigabenus, Bengel, Keim),—to which the person cleansed was expected to bear witness *before* the priests (Chrysostom: εἰς ἔλεγχον, εἰς ἀπόδειξιν, εἰς κατηγορίαν, εἰς ἀγνωμονῶσιν),—or the *reality of the cure*, "si sc. vellent in posterum negare, me tibi sanitatem restituisse" (Kuinoel, Erasmus, Maldonatus, Grotius), and at the same time the *Messiahship* of Jesus (Calovius). According to Olshausen, it is a testimony borne by *the priests themselves* that is meant; inasmuch as, by pronouncing the man clean, they become witnesses to the genuineness of the miracle, and at the same time condemn their own unbelief (a confusion of two things that are no less erroneous than foreign to the purpose). If αὐτοῖς referred to the priests, then of course μαρτύριον could only be understood as meaning an evidence or proof that the cleansing had taken place (Grotius). However, the offering was not *meant* to furnish such evidence *to the priests*, but to the *people*, who were now at liberty to resume their intercourse with the person who had been healed.

REMARK.—Attempts of various kinds have been made to divest the *miracles of Jesus*<sup>1</sup> of their special character, and to

<sup>1</sup> See Schleiermacher, *L. J.* p. 206 ff.; Julius Müller, *de miraculor. J. Ch. natura et necessitate*, I. II. 1839, 1841; Köstlin, *de miraculor. quae Chr. et primi ej. discip. fecerunt, natura et ratione*, 1860; Rothe in *d. Stud. u. Krit.* 1858, p. 21 ff., and *zur Dogmat.* p. 104 ff.; Beyschlag, *ub. d. Bedeut. d. Wunders im Christenth.* 1862; Dorner, *Jesu sündlose Vollkommenh.* 1862,

reduce them to the order of natural events (Paulus), partly by accounting for them on physiological or psychological grounds, and partly by explaining them on certain exegetical, allegorical, or mythical principles of interpretation. Some, again, have sought to remove them entirely from the sphere of actual fact, and to ascribe their origin to legends elaborated out of Old Testament types and prophecies (Strauss); to the influence of religious feeling in the church (B. Bauer); to narratives of an allegorical character (Volkmar); to the desire to embody certain ideas and tendencies of thought in historical incidents (Baur); as well as to mistakes of every sort in the understanding of similitudes and parables (Weisse). To admit the supernatural origin of Christianity is not inconsistent with the idea of its historical continuity (Baur); but the denial of miracles involves both an avowed and a covert *impugning* of the evangelic narrative,—which, as such, is in its substance conditioned by miracles (Holtzmann, p. 510),—and consequently *does away* almost entirely with its historical character. As a further result, Christianity itself is endangered, in so far as it is matter of history and not the product of the independent development of the human mind, and inasmuch as its entrance into the world through the incarnation of the Son of God is analogous to the miracle of creation (Philippi, *Glaubensl.* I. p. 25 ff., ed. 2). The miracles of Jesus, which should always be viewed in connection with His whole redeeming work (Köstlin, 1860, p. 14 ff.), are outward manifestations of the power of God's Spirit, dwelling in Him in virtue of His Sonship, and corresponding to His peculiar relation to the world (Hirzel), as well as to His no less peculiar relation to the living God; their *design* was to authenticate His Messianic mission, and in this lay their telic *necessity*,—a necessity, however, that is always to be regarded as only relative (Schott, *de consilio, quo Jesus mirac. ediderit*, *Opusc.* I. p. 111 ff.). And this according to John ii. 11. In exercising His supernatural power of healing, the usual though not always (Matt. viii. 5 ff.; John iv. 47 ff.; Matt. ix. 23 ff.; Luke xxii. 51) indispensable condition on which He imparted the blessing was faith in that power on the part of the person to be healed; nothing, however, but positive unbelief prevented

p. 51 ff.; Hirzel, *üb. d. Wunder*, 1863; Güder, *üb. d. Wunder*, 1868; Steinmeyer, *Apolog. Beitr.* I. 1866; Baxmann in *d. Jahrb. f. D. Th.* 1863, p. 749 ff.; Köstlin, *ibid.* 1864, p. 205 ff.; Bender, *d. Wunderbeg. d. N. T.* 1871. On the synoptic accounts of the miracles, see Holtzmann, p. 497; and on the various kinds of miracles, Keim, II. 125 ff.; on the miracles of healing, see Weizsäcker, p. 360 ff.

this power from taking effect (Matt. xiii. 58; Mark vi. 5 f.; comp. Julius Müller, II. p. 17); but Christ's heart-searching look (John ii. 25) enabled Him to detect those cases where the attempt would be fruitless. Moreover, the miracles of Jesus are not to be regarded as things that *contradict* or violate the laws of nature, but rather as comprehended within the great system of natural law, the harmonious connection of which in all its parts it is not for us to fathom. In this respect the phenomena of magnetism furnish an analogy, though a poor and imperfect one; and the more that is known of the laws of nature, the idea of any annulling or suspension of these laws only appears the more absurd. See Köstlin, 1860, p. 59 ff., 1864, p. 259 ff.; Rothe, p. 34 ff. The miracles, therefore, are "reflections in nature" of God's revelation of Himself (Bey-schlag), "something strictly in accordance with law" (Nitzsch), which, in the sphere of nature, appears as the necessary and natural correlative of the highest miracle in the spiritual world—viz. the accomplishment of the work of redemption by the incarnate Son of God. As this work has its necessary conditions in the higher order of the moral world established and ruled by the holy God in accordance with His love, so the miracles have theirs in the laws of a higher order of nature corresponding to the loving purposes of the Creator, inasmuch as this latter order, in virtue of the connection between nature and spirit, is upheld by that Being whose spiritual power determines all its movements. Comp. Liebner, *Christologie*, I. p. 351: "The miracles of Christ are occasional manifestations of the complete introduction, through the God-man, of that relation between nature and spirit which is to be perfected in the end of the world"—means by which the λόγος reveals Himself in His human impersonation and work, so that they are always of a moral nature, and have always a moral aim in view, unfolding, in their essential connection with His preaching, the miracle of the incarnation on which His whole work was based (Martensen, *Dogm.* § 155 [E. T. p. 301]). Observe, moreover, how the power to work miracles was a gift and σημεῖον of the apostles (Rom. xv. 19; 2 Cor. xii. 12; Heb. ii. 4), and a χάρισμα of the apostolic church (1 Cor. xii. 9 f.), a fact which warrants us in assuming, indeed in inferring *a minori ad majus*, the reality of the miracles of Jesus Himself—in general, we mean, and without prejudice to the criticism of the narratives in detail. At the same time, in the application of such criticism, the hypothesis of legendary embellishments should be treated with great caution by a modest exegesis, and all the more that,



in the *fourth* Gospel, we have a series of miracles bearing the attestation of one who was an *eye-witness*, and which, in their various features, correspond to many of those recorded by the Synoptists.

Ver. 5. The *centurion* was a Gentile by birth, ver. 10, but connected with Judaism (Luke vii. 3), probably from being a proselyte of the gate, and was serving in the army of Herod Antipas. The narrative is, in the main, identical with Luke vii., differing only in points of minor importance. The question as to which of the two evangelists the preference in point of originality is to be accorded, must be decided not in favour of Matthew (Bleek, Keim), but of *Luke*, whose special statements in the course of the incident (misinterpreted by Strauss and Bruno Bauer, comp. de Wette) cannot, except in an arbitrary way, be ascribed to an amplifying tendency; they bear throughout the stamp of historical and psychological originality, and nothing would have been more superfluous than to have invented them for the sake of giving greater prominence to the man's humility, which is brought out quite as fully and touchingly in Matthew's narrative. Comp. Neander, Krabbe, Lange. For the points of difference in the account John iv. 47 ff., see note on that passage.

Ver. 6. 'Ο παῖς μου] not *son* (Strauss, Neander, Baumgarten-Crusius, Bleek, Hilgenfeld, Keim), but *slave* (Luke vii. 7; Matt. xiv. 2); yet not: my *favourite* slave (Fritzsche, comp. Luke vii. 2); but either the centurion had only the *one*, or else he refers to that *one in particular* whom he had *in view*. From ver. 9, the former appears to be the more probable view. — βέβληται] *is laid down*. Comp. ix. 2. The perf. as denoting the existing condition. The description of the disease is not at *variance* with Luke vii. 2, but more exact. — παραλυτ.] see on iv. 24.

Ver. 7. *And Jesus* (perceiving, from his mode of address and whole demeanour, the centurion's faith in His divine miraculous power) *answered him*: *I* (emphatically) *will come*, and so on. Fritzsche puts it interrogatively. *But* (καί, by way of coupling an objection, Porson, *ad Eur. Phoen.* 1373) *said Jesus to him, Am I to come and heal him* (θεραπ. conj. aor.)? This

this power from taking effect (Matt. xiii. 58; Mark vi. 5 f.; comp. Julius Müller, II. p. 17); but Christ's heart-searching look (John ii. 25) enabled Him to detect those cases where the attempt would be fruitless. Moreover, the miracles of Jesus are not to be regarded as things that *contradict* or violate the laws of nature, but rather as comprehended within the great system of natural law, the harmonious connection of which in all its parts it is not for us to fathom. In this respect the phenomena of magnetism furnish an analogy, though a poor and imperfect one; and the more that is known of the laws of nature, the idea of any annulling or suspension of these laws only appears the more absurd. See Köstlin, 1860, p. 59 ff., 1864, p. 259 ff.; Rothe, p. 34 ff. The miracles, therefore, are "reflections in nature" of God's revelation of Himself (Bey-schlag), "something strictly in accordance with law" (Nitzsch), which, in the sphere of nature, appears as the necessary and natural correlative of the highest miracle in the spiritual world—viz. the accomplishment of the work of redemption by the incarnate Son of God. As this work has its necessary conditions in the higher order of the moral world established and ruled by the holy God in accordance with His love, so the miracles have theirs in the laws of a higher order of nature corresponding to the loving purposes of the Creator, inasmuch as this latter order, in virtue of the connection between nature and spirit, is upheld by that Being whose spiritual power determines all its movements. Comp. Liebner, *Christologie*, I. p. 351: "The miracles of Christ are occasional manifestations of the complete introduction, through the God-man, of that relation between nature and spirit which is to be perfected in the end of the world"—means by which the λόγος reveals Himself in His human impersonation and work, so that they are always of a moral nature, and have always a moral aim in view, unfolding, in their essential connection with His preaching, the miracle of the incarnation on which His whole work was based (Martensen, *Dogm.* § 155 [E. T. p. 301]). Observe, moreover, how the power to work miracles was a gift and σημεῖον of the *apostles* (Rom. xv. 19; 2 Cor. xii. 12; Heb. ii. 4), and a χάρισμα of the *apostolic church* (1 Cor. xii. 9 f.), a fact which warrants us in assuming, indeed in inferring *a minori ad majus*, the reality of the miracles of Jesus Himself—in general, we mean, and without prejudice to the criticism of the narratives in detail. At the same time, in the application of such criticism, the hypothesis of legendary embellishments should be treated with great caution by a modest exegesis, and all the more that,

in the *fourth* Gospel, we have a series of miracles bearing the attestation of one who was an *eye-witness*, and which, in their various features, correspond to many of those recorded by the Synoptists.

Ver. 5. The *centurion* was a Gentile by birth, ver. 10, but connected with Judaism (Luke vii. 3), probably from being a proselyte of the gate, and was serving in the army of Herod Antipas. The narrative is, in the main, identical with Luke vii., differing only in points of minor importance. The question as to which of the two evangelists the preference in point of originality is to be accorded, must be decided not in favour of Matthew (Bleek, Keim), but of *Luke*, whose special statements in the course of the incident (misinterpreted by Strauss and Bruno Bauer, comp. de Wette) cannot, except in an arbitrary way, be ascribed to an amplifying tendency; they bear throughout the stamp of historical and psychological originality, and nothing would have been more superfluous than to have invented them for the sake of giving greater prominence to the man's humility, which is brought out quite as fully and touchingly in Matthew's narrative. Comp. Neander, Krabbe, Lange. For the points of difference in the account John iv. 47 ff., see note on that passage.

Ver. 6. 'Ο παῖς μου] not *son* (Strauss, Neander, Baumgarten-Crusius, Bleek, Hilgenfeld, Keim), but *slave* (Luke vii. 7; Matt. xiv. 2); yet not: my *favourite* slave (Fritzsche, comp. Luke vii. 2); but either the centurion had only the *one*, or else he refers to that *one in particular* whom he had *in view*. From ver. 9, the former appears to be the more probable view. — βέβληται] *is laid down*. Comp. ix. 2. The perf. as denoting the existing condition. The description of the disease is not at *variance* with Luke vii. 2, but more exact. — παραλυτ.] see on iv. 24.

Ver. 7. *And Jesus* (perceiving, from his mode of address and whole demeanour, the centurion's faith in His divine miraculous power) *answered him*: *I* (emphatically) *will come*, and so on. Fritzsche puts it interrogatively. *But* (καί, by way of coupling an objection, Porson, *ad Eur. Phoen.* 1373) *said Jesus to him, Am I to come and heal him* (θεραπ. conj. aor.)? This

is refining more than is necessary, and not in keeping with the simple character of the passage. Bengel well says, "Divina sapientia Jesus, eos sermones proponit, quibus elicit confessionem fidelium eosque antevertit."

Ver. 8. Λόγῳ] Dat. of the means and instrument, as in Luke vii. 7; speak it, *i.e.* command, *with a word*, that he become whole. This is by way of expressing a contrast to the proffered *personal* service. Lobeck, *Paralip.* p. 525.—Here again the ἵνα does not represent the infinitive construction, but: I am not sufficient (worthy enough) *for the purpose that* Thou shouldst go (John i. 27) under my roof (Soph. *Ant.* 1233). As a Gentile by birth, and loving, as he does, the Jewish people (Luke vii.), he feels most deeply his own unworthiness in presence of this great miracle-worker that has arisen among them, and "non superstitione, sed fide dixit, se indignum esse," Maldonatus.

Ver. 9. Καὶ . . . ἐξουσίαν] ἀπὸ τοῦ καθ' ἑαυτὸν ὑποδείγματος κατασκευάζει, ὅτι καὶ λόγῳ μόνῳ δύναται, Euth. Zigabenus. "Ανθρ. ὑπὸ ἐξ. go together (in answer to Fritzsche). The connecting of this substantive with ἔχων, etc., serves to indicate at once his own obedience and that which he exacts and receives from others. It is quite gratuitous to suppose that the centurion regards the disease as caused by *demons* that are compelled to yield to the behests of Jesus (Fritzsche, Ewald); and it is equally so to impute to him the belief that the duty of carrying out those behests is entrusted to *angels* (Erasmus, Wetstein, Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius). From the context it simply appears that he looked upon *diseases* as subject to Christ's authority, and therefore ready to disappear whenever He *ordered* them to do so (Theophylact, Euth. Zigabenus, Bengel, de Wette). It is thus that he commands the *fever* in Luke iv. 39, and it *ceases*. Observe with Bengel the "sapientia fidelis ex ruditate militari pulchre elucens." His inference is a case of reasoning *a minori ad majus*.

Ver. 10. Οὐδὲ ἐν τ. Ἰσρ.] *not even among Israelites*, the people of God, who are in possession of τὰς περὶ ἐμοῦ μαρτυρίας τῶν γραφῶν (Euth. Zigabenus). So the centurion was not a proselyte of righteousness; comp. ver. 11 f., where

*Jews* and *Gentiles* are contrasted with each other. And yet in him faith and humility were found inseparably united as by nature they ought to be, and that more than in the case of the ordinary native Jew. With this unfavourable testimony against Israel, comp. the history of the woman of Canaan, xv. 22 ff.

Ver. 11. Ἀπὸ ἀνατ. καὶ δυσμ.] from the most widely separated quarters of the world—*Gentiles*. Comp. Isa. xlv. 6; Mal. i. 11.—According to Jewish ideas, one of the main elements in the happiness of the Messianic kingdom was the privilege of participating in splendid festive entertainments along with the patriarchs of the nation. Bertholdt, *Christol.* p. 196. Schoettgen on this passage. *Jesus* employs the expression in a symbolical sense (xxvi. 29; Luke xiii. 28, xiv. 15; Rev. xix. 9; Matt. xxii. 30; 1 Cor. xv. 50): *many Gentiles will become believers, and so have their part in the blessings of the Messianic kingdom in happy fellowship with the patriarchs of the people of God*. In sharp contrast to incarnate (iii. 9) Jewish pride, *Tanchum* (in Schoettgen): “In mundo futuro, (dixit Deus) mensam ingentem vobis sternam, quod gentiles videbunt et pudefient.” Bertholdt, p. 176. Hilgenfeld sees in the whole narrative the milder comprehensive Judæo-Christianity of the author of the revised Gospel; but Keim again, while upholding the account in all other points, ascribes ver. 11 f. to the hand that framed the later version, although, with ver. 10, preparing the way for them, the words neither interrupt the connection nor clash with the then standpoint of *Jesus* (iii. 9), seeing that in the Sermon on the Mount (especially vii. 21 f.) He has taken away from the kingdom of God anything like national limitation.

Ver. 12. *The sons of the kingdom: the Jews*, in so far as, according to the divine promise, they have the right, as the theocratic people, to the Messiah's kingdom (John iv. 22; Rom. ix. 4, 5, xi. 16 f.), and are, in consequence, its *potential* subjects. The *article* describes them, *summarily*, in a *body*, *υἱός*, ἰσ., as denoting physical or moral relationship, Winer, p. 223 [E. T. 298]. The *true υἱοὶ τ. βασι.*, who are so in point of *fact*, see xiii. 38. — τὸ ἐξώτερον] *which is outside the* (illuminated) *Messianic banqueting hall*. Wetstein on this

passage, comp. on ἐξώτερος, LXX. Ex. xxvi. 4, xxxvi. 10; Ezek. x. 5; not found in Greek authors. For the thing, see xxii. 13, xxv. 30. It is not some special *degree* of infernal punishment that is represented to us (Grotius), but the punishments themselves, and that as *poena damni et sensus at once*. — ὁ κλαυθμός . . . ὁδόντων] indicating the wail of *suffering*, and the gnashing of teeth that accompanies *despair*. The article points to the well-known (κατ' ἐξοχήν) misery reigning in hell (xiii. 42, 50, xxii. 13, xxiv. 51, xxv. 30). Found in Luke only at xiii. 28, where the same expression occurs on a different occasion,—a circumstance which is not in Luke's favour (de Wette, Gfrörer), but is to be explained from the fact that Jesus made *frequent* use of the figure of the Messianic reclining at table, and of the expression regarding the infernal κλαυθμός, etc.

Ver. 13. Ἐν τῇ ὥρᾳ ἐκ.] ὥρᾳ is emphatic. In the very *hour* in which Jesus was uttering these words, the slave became whole, and that through the divine power of Jesus operating upon him from a distance, as in John iv. 46 ff. The narrative is to be explained neither by a desire to present an enlarging view of the miraculous power of Jesus (Strauss), nor as a parable (Weisse), nor as a historical picture of the way in which God's word acts at a distance upon the Gentiles (Volkmar), nor as being the story of the woman of Canaan metamorphosed (Bruno Bauer); nor are we to construe the proceeding as the providential fulfilment of a general but sure *promise* given by Jesus (Ammon), or, in that case, to have recourse to the supposition that the healing was effected through sending an *intermediate agent* (Paulus). But if, as is alleged, Jesus in His reply only used an affirmation which was *halfway* between a *benediction* depending on God and the faith of the house, and a *positive act* (Keim), it is impossible to reconcile with such vagueness of meaning the simple imperative and the no less impartial statement of the result. Moreover, there exists as little a *psychical contact* between the sick man and Jesus, as at the healing of the daughter of the woman of Canaan, xv. 22, but the *slave* was cured in consideration of the *centurion's* faith.

Ver. 14. Mark i. 29 ff., Luke iv. 38 ff., assign to the following narrative another and earlier position, introducing it immediately after the healing of a demoniac in the synagogue, which Matthew omits. The account in Mark is the original one, but in none of the reports are we to suppose the evangelists to be recording the *earliest* of Jesus' works of healing (Keim). — εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Πέτρου] in which also his brother Andrew lived along with him, Mark i. 29. Not inconsistent with John i. 45, as Peter was a *native* of Bethsaida, though he had *removed* to Capernaum. Whether the house belonged to him cannot be determined. — τὴν πενθερὰν αὐτοῦ] 1 Cor. ix. 5.

Vv. 15, 16. Διηκόνει] at table, John xii. 2 ; Luke x. 40. There is a difference, though an unimportant one, in Luke's account (iv. 39) of the *mode* in which the miracle was performed. — ὁψίας δὲ γεν.] with more precision in Mark and Luke, at sunset. Besides, in the present instance there is nothing of the special reference to the Sabbath which we find in Mark and Luke, but we are merely given to understand that Jesus remains in Peter's house till the evening (comp. on xiv. 15). By this time the report of the miraculous cure had spread throughout the whole place ; hence the crowds that now throng Him with their sick,—a fact which accords but ill with the attempt to destroy or weaken the supernatural character of the act ("mitigating of the fever," and that by gentle soothing words or a sympathetic touch of the hand, Keim, comp. Schenkel). — λόγῳ] without the use of any other means.

Ver. 17. This expelling of demons and healing of diseases were intended, in pursuance of the divine purposes, to be a fulfilment of the prediction in Isa. liii. 4. Observe that this prophecy is fulfilled by Jesus in *another* sense also, viz. by His atoning death (John i. 29 ; 1 Pet. ii. 24).—The passage is quoted from the original (Hebrew) text, but not according to the *historical meaning* of that original, which would involve the necessity of representing the Messiah, in the present instance, as the *atoning sin-bearer* (see Kleinert in *d. Stud. u. Krit.* 1862, p. 723 f.), which, however, is not suited to the

connection—but rather according to that special *typical* reference, which also seems to have been contemplated by that prediction when read in the light of the acts of healing performed by Jesus. At the same time, λαμβάνειν and βαστάζειν must not be taken in a sense contrary to that of נָשָׂא and לָקַח, to take away, to remove (de Wette, Bleek, Grimm); but when their ailments are taken away from the diseased, the marvellous compassionate one who does this stands forth as he who carries them away, and, as it were, bears the burden lifted from the shoulders of others. The idea is plastic, poetical, and not to be understood as meaning an actual personal feeling of the diseases thus removed.

Ver. 18. Εἰς τὸ πέραν] from Capernaum across to the east side of the lake of Tiberias. He wished to retire. Instead of putting the statement in the pragmatic form (it is different in Mark iv. 35) adopted by Matthew, Luke viii. 22 merely says, καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν. According to Baur, it is only the writer of the narrative who, in the historical transitions of this passage (here and ver. 28, ix. 1, 9, 14, 18), “turns the internal connection of all those events into an outward connection as well.”

Ver. 19. Εἰς γραμματεὺς] Never, not even in passages like John vi. 9, Matt xxi. 19, Rev. viii. 13 (in answer to Winer, p. 111 [E. T. p. 145]; Buttman, *neut. Gr.* p. 74 [E. T. 85]), is εἰς equivalent to the indefinite pronoun τις, to which the well-known use of εἰς τις is certainly opposed, but is always found, and that in the N. T. as well, with a certain numerical reference, such as is also to be seen (Blomfield, *Gloss. in Persas*, 333) in the passages referred to in classical writers (Jacobs, *ad Achill. Tat.* p. 398, *ad Anthol.* XII. p. 455). It is used (vi. 24) in the present instance in view of the ἕτερος about to be mentioned in ver. 21; for this γραμματεὺς, ver. 19, and the subsequent ἕτερος, were both of them *disciples* of Jesus. It is therefore to be interpreted thus: *one, a scribe*. It follows from ver. 21 that this γραμματεὺς already belonged to the number of Jesus' disciples in the more general sense of the word, but he now intimated his willingness to become one of His permanent and



intimate followers.—The difference in time and place which, as regards the two incidents, vv. 19–22 (in Mark they are omitted), is found in Luke ix. 57–60, is not to be removed. The question as to which evangelist the preference is to be assigned in point of the historical faithfulness of his narrative, falls to be decided in favour of *Matthew* (Rettig in *d. Stud. v. Krit.* 1838, p. 240 ff.), as compared with the loose and indefinite account in Luke (Schleiermacher, Schneckenburger, Gfrörer, Olshausen, Arnoldi, Holtzmann), who, moreover, adds (ix. 61 f.) still a third, and doubtless no less historical an incident with which he had been made acquainted. Schleiermacher inaptly refers ὅπου ἀν' ἀπέρχῃ to the various roads by which Jesus might travel to Jerusalem (Schleiermacher, *Schrift. d. Luk.* p. 169). It is clear, however, from the fact of this narrative occurring so far on in Luke, that he cannot have supposed that the γραμματεὺς was *Judas Iscariot*, and that the ἑτερος was *Thomas* (Lange). As far was he from supposing that the one was *Bartholomew* and the other *Philip* (Hilgenfeld), according to the discovery already made by Clement of Alexandria.—Observe, further, how quite differently Jesus answers the scribe with his supposed claims as compared with the simple-minded ἑτερος (Ewald), and how in addressing the latter He merely says, ἀκολουθεῖ μοι.

Ver. 20. Κατασκηνώσεις] *Places of abode*, where, as in their quarters, so to speak (Polybius, xi. 26. 5), they used to dwell. Comp. xiii. 32; Wisd. ix. 8; Tob. i. 4; 2 Macc. xiv. 35. Not *nests* specially.—ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.<sup>1</sup> Jesus, who thus designates *Himself* by this title (in Acts vii. 56

<sup>1</sup> For the idea of the Son of man, see Scholten, *de appell. τοῦ υἱοῦ τ. ἀνθρώπου*. 1809; Böhme, *Geheimniss d. Menschensohnes*, 1839; Gass, *de utroque J. Chr. nomine*, 1840; Nebe, *üb. d. Begr. des Namens d. υἱοῦ τ. ἀνθρώπου*, 1860; Baur in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschr.* 1860, p. 274 ff.; Hilgenfeld in his *Zeitschr.* 1863, p. 330 ff.; Holtzmann in the same *Zeitschr.* 1865, p. 213 ff.; Schulze, *vom Menschensohn u. v. Logos*, 1867; Weissenbach, *Jesu in regno coel. dignitas*, 1868; Gess, *Christi Person u. Werk*, I. 1870, pp. 185 ff., 208 ff.; Keim, *Gesch. Jesu*, II. p. 65 ff.; Beyschlag, *Christol. d. N. T.* p. 9 ff.; Ewald, *Gesch. Chr.* p. 304 f., ed. 3; Wittichen, *Idee des Menschen*, 1868; Holsten, *z. Ev. d. Paul. u. Petr.* 1868, p. 179 ff.; Colani, *J. Chr. et les croyances messian.* p. 112 ff., ed. 2; Weiss, *bibl. Theol.* p. 53 ff., ed. 2; Volkmar, *d. Evangelien*, 1870, p. 197 ff.

Stephen does so likewise), means nothing else by it than "the Messiah," according to its *significant prophetic characteristic*, which, assuming it to be known to those whom He addressed, the Lord claims for Himself. But this self-chosen title, the expression of His full Messianic consciousness, is not founded (Delitzsch, Kahnis, *Dogm.* I. p. 446), not even in the first place, at least (Keim), upon Ps. viii. 5, seeing that evidence of a Messianic interpretation of this psalm is nowhere to be found in the New Testament (not even in Matt. xxi. 16). Still less again must we start with the well-known usage in Ezek. ii. 1, iii. 1 (Weizsäcker), which has nothing to do with the Messianic idea. Much rather is it to be traced, and, as specially appears from xxiv. 30, xxvi. 64, to be solely traced, to the impressive account of that prophetic vision, Dan. vii. 13, so familiar to the Jews (John xii. 34), and vividly reflected in the pre-Christian Book of Enoch,—a vision in which the Messiah appears in the clouds, כְּבֹרֵי אֱלֹהִים, *vñs ánthrwpon*, surrounded by the angels that stand beside the throne of the divine Judge, i.e. in a form which, notwithstanding His superhuman heavenly nature, is not different from that of an ordinary man.<sup>1</sup> Comp. Rev. i. 13, xiv. 14; Hengstenberg, *Christol.* III. 1, p. 10 f.; Schulze, *alttest. Theol.* II. p. 330 f.; Ewald, *Gesch. Chr.* p. 146 ff.; Schulze, p. 26 ff.; Weissenbach, p. 14 ff. The whole depended, then, on whether those who were present when Jesus named Himself the Son of man would understand this predicate in Daniel's sense or not. In himself, however, this *Son of man*, whose form had been delineated in Daniel's vision, was Jesus Himself, as the historical *reality*, in so far as in His person He who there appeared in heavenly form had *come down* to earth. As often, therefore, as Jesus, in speaking of Himself, uses the words, "the Son of man," He means nothing else than "the Son of

<sup>1</sup> Hitzig, Schenkel, Keim understand by "the son of man" in Daniel, not the Messiah, but the *people of Israel*. This, however, is unquestionably wrong. See, on the other hand, Ewald, *Jahrb.* III. p. 231 f. On the son of man in the Book of Enoch, see Dillmann, *d. B. Henoch*, p. xx. ff.; Ewald, *Gesch. Chr.* p. 147; Weizsäcker, p. 428; Weissenbach, p. 16 ff.; Wittichen, *Idee des Menschen*, p. 66 ff. On insufficient grounds, Hilgenfeld is disposed to delete ch. xxxvii.—lxxi. of the Book of Enoch as a Christian interpolation.

man in that prophecy of Daniel," *i.e.* the Messiah.<sup>1</sup> But, behind the *consciousness* which led Him to appropriate to Himself this designation from Daniel, there was, at the same time, the correlative element of His *divine* Sonship, the necessary (in answer to Schleiermacher) conviction, more decidedly brought out in John, of His divine pre-existence (as Logos), the *δόξα* of which He had left behind, in order, as the heavenly personage in Daniel's vision, *ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου*, to appear in a form of existence not originally belonging to Him. And so far those are right, who, following the Fathers, have recognised (Grotius contradicted by Calovius) the Pauline *κένωσις* in this self-designation, based as it is upon the consciousness of His pre-existent divinity. Comp. Chrysostom on John iii. 13, where he says: Jesus has so named Himself *ἀπὸ τῆς ἐλάττωνος οὐσίας*; and Augustine, *de consens. ev.* ii. 1, who observes: in this we are taught "quid misericorditer dignatus sit esse pro nobis." It is to import ideas historically inconsistent with Dan. vii., when, in spite of the definite nature of the expression in Dan. vii. 13, it has been so under-

<sup>1</sup> Mark viii. 27 ff., where the settled faith of the disciples is contrasted with the views of the people, is plainly a very decisive passage (in answer to Weisse, *Evangelienfrage*, p. 212 f.) in favour of the Messianic nature of the expression; for in ver. 31 of that chapter *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* is evidently identical with *ὁ Χριστός*, ver. 30. On John xii. 34, see the notes on that passage. Comp. also on Matt. xvi. 13, which passage, according to Hofmann, *Weiss. u. Erf.* II. p. 19, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 79, and Kahnis, is also supposed to contradict our explanation of the *υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*. Only let it be carefully observed that the expression, "the son of man," is not directly synonymous with "the Messiah," but acquired this definite meaning for others only when first they came to refer it, in Daniel's sense, to Jesus, so that it did not *immediately* involve the idea of "the Messiah," but came to do so through the application, on the part of believers, of Daniel's prophetic vision. But we must avoid ascribing to this self-designation any *purpose of concealment* (Ritschl in *d. theolog. Jahrb.* 1851, p. 514; Weisse, Wittichen, Holtzmann, Colani, Hilgenfeld), all the more that Jesus so styles Himself in the hearing of His disciples (already in John i. 52). Comp. with Mark ii. 8. And He so names Himself in the consciousness that in Him the above prediction has been *fulfilled*. For those, indeed, who did not share this belief, this designation of Himself continued, as well it might, to be mysterious and unintelligible, as xvi. 13. But to suppose that Jesus has chosen it "to avoid the consequences of a haphazard Messianic title" (Holtzmann), would be to impute a calculating reserve which would scarcely be consistent with His character.

stood as if Christ meant thereby to describe Himself as *the man in the highest sense* of the word, as the second Adam, as the *ideal* of humanity (Herder, Böhme, Neander, Ebrard, Olshausen, Kahnis, Gess, Lange, Weisse, Beyschlag, Wittichen), or as *the man toward whom*, as its *aim*, the whole history of humanity since Adam has been *tending* (Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 81; Thomasius, *Chr. Per. u. Werk*, II. p. 15), or as the *true man renewed after the image of God* (Schenkel), as He who is filled with the whole fulness of God (Colani), and such like. Fritzsche supposes Jesus to have meant, *filius ille parentum humanorum, qui nunc loquitur, homo ille, quem bene nostis*, i.e. *ego*, and that, on the strength of Dan. vii. 13, the *Christians* were the first to ascribe to the words the signification of *Messiah*. This would only be conceivable if *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* had happened to be a current self-designation *in general*, in which case it would not be necessary to presuppose a special historical reason why *Jesus* should so frequently have used the title in reference to Himself. Consequently Baur is likewise in error in thinking that the expression denotes *the man as such who stands aloof from nothing human, and esteems nothing human foreign to himself*. In like manner Holtzmann's view, viz. that Jesus intends to describe His *central place in the circle of the υἱοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων*, is at variance with the original meaning of the phrase as used in Daniel, and rests upon inferences from expressions which Jesus, while designated as above, has used in reference to Himself, which *predicates*, however, cannot determine the meaning of the *subject*. This, at the same time, in answer to Weizsäcker, p. 428 ff., who thinks that by that expression Jesus had endeavoured to bring His followers to a *higher spiritual conception of the Messiah*, for whom it was possible to appear *without royal splendour*. In *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρ.* He describes Himself as the great Messiah, and that in the form of a human life, but not specially as the *lowly, self-humbling servant of humanity* (Keim), or he who is *intimately bound up with humanity* (Gess, I. p. 186). According to the corresponding passages elsewhere, ideas of this sort are found first to emerge in predicates, and, as a rule, in the course of

the context ; which, however, is not the case here, where the main point is the *contrast*, as seen in the fact that He who is that son of man of the prophet's vision has not where to lay His weary head. Finally, Holsten asserts what is contrary to the whole Christology of the New Testament, as well as irreconcilable with Rom. i. 3 f., when he says that *as Messiah of the αἰὼν οὗτος*, Jesus is Daniel's υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, and that *as Messiah of the future αἰὼν* He passes over into the form of existence belonging to the υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, which latter He is in this present era of time, as being the Son of man, *destined* to become the Son of God. In the *analysis* of the phrase, τοῦ ἀνθρώπου is to be understood neither of *Adam* (Gregory Nazienzen, Erasmus) nor of the *Virgin Mary* (Euth. Zigabenus), but, according to Dan. *l.c.*, to be taken *generically* ; so that, as far as the essential meaning goes, it is in no way different from the *anarthrous* ἀνθρώπου in Daniel. — ποῦ τὴν κεφ. κλίνῃ] *i.e.* a *resting-place*, a sleeping-place which He can call His own. Of course an evidence of poverty (in contrast to the earthly aims of the scribe, which the eye of Jesus had fully penetrated), but of that which is connected with an unsettled life, which is not necessarily to be identified with want (John xiii. 29, xii. 5, xix. 23).

Ver. 21. Τῶν μαθητῶν] of *His disciples*, in the more general sense of the words. This is evident from ἕτερος, which (see note on ver. 19) places him whom it represents in the same category with the *scribe*. According to Luke ix. 59, the ἕτερος is not spoken of as μαθητής, and is *summoned* by Jesus to follow Him, which is to be regarded as an *altered* form of the tradition. — πρῶτον] in the *first place*, before I follow thee, vv. 19, 22. — θάψαι] It was, and, to some extent, is still the practice of the Jews, to bury their dead on the very day on which they die, Matt. ix. 23, Acts v. 7 f.; and it was the sacred duty of sons to attend to the obsequies of their parents. Gen. xxv. 9; Tob. iv. 3; Schoettgen, *Horae*, on this passage.

Ver. 22. Τοὺς νεκροὺς . . . νεκρούς] The first νεκρ. (not the second likewise, as Weisse improperly holds) denotes *the spiritually dead* (comp. on iv. 16, on John v. 21, 25, and on

Luke xv. 24), who are without the spiritual life that comes through Christ. Origen in Cramer's *Catena*: *ψυχὴ ἐν κακίᾳ οὐσα νεκρά ἐστίν*. The second literally; *the dead* belonging to their own circles. Fritzsche (comp. Kaeuffer, *de not. ζωῆς αἰών*. p. 34) interprets literally in both cases: *let the dead bury themselves among one another*, as a paradox by way of refusing the request. What a meaningless view of Jesus' thoughtful way of putting it! The seeming *harshness* of Jesus' reply (in answer to Weisse, Bruno Bauer) must be judged of by considering the necessity which he saw of decided and immediate separation, as compared with the danger of the contrary (Chrysostom); comp. x. 37. Moreover, it is to be inferred from *ἀκολουθεῖ μοι*. Comp. with Luke ix. 60, that *this μαθητής* proceeded at once to follow the Lord, while that *γραμματεὺς* of ver. 19 probably went away like the rich young man mentioned in xix. 22.

Ver. 23 ff. Comp. Mark iv. 36 ff.; Luke viii. 22 ff. — *τὸ πλοῖον*] *the boat standing ready to convey them over*, ver. 18. — *οἱ μαθηταί*] not the *Twelve* in contrast to the multitude, ver. 18 (Fritzsche), which is forbidden by ix. 9, but *His disciples* generally, who, as appears from the context, are in the present instance those who had joined themselves more closely to Him, and were following Him, as the scribe also of ver. 19 and the person indicated in ver. 21 had declared their willingness to do.

Vv. 24, 25. *Σεισμός*] *Agitation*, specially in the sense of earthquake, here: *storm* (Jer. xxiii. 19; Nah. i. 3). — *καλύπτεσθαι*] The waves were dashing over the boat. — *αὐτὸς δὲ ἐκάθευδε*] *but He Himself was sleeping*, contrasting with the *dangerous position of the boat* in which He was. "Securitas potestatis," Ambrose. — *σῶσον, ἀπολλύμεθα*] *Asyndeton* indicating *urgent alarm*, and this alarm with Jesus present was the ground of His *rebuke*.—On the situation of the lake, as rendering it liable to gusts and storms, see Robinson, *Pal. III*. p. 571; Ritter, *Erdk.* XV. p. 308.

Ver. 26. *Ἐπετίμησε*] *incredibly*, on account of the unseasonable fury of its waves. Similarly *נָפַח*, Ps. cvi. 9; Nah. i. 4. Comp. xvii. 18; Luke iv. 39. This *rebuking* of the

elements (at which Schleiermacher took special offence) is the lively plastic poetry, not of the author of the narrative, but of the mighty Ruler.—On τότε Bengel observes: “Animos discipulorum prius, deinde mare composuit.” Unquestionably more original than Mark and Luke; not a case of transforming into the miraculous (Holtzmann). The miraculous does not appear till after the disciples have been addressed. — γαλήνη μέγ.] Ver. 24. σεισμὸς μέγ.—Here was a greater than *Jonas*, xii. 41.

Ver. 27. Οἱ ἄνθρωποι] Meaning *the people who, besides Jesus and His disciples, were also in the boat*, not the disciples<sup>1</sup> included (de Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius, Bleek), seeing that the specially chosen ἄνθρωποι (Matthew does not at all say πάντες) most naturally denotes other parties than those previously mentioned, viz. “quibus nondum innotuerat Christus,” Calvin. Fritzsche’s *homines quotquot hujus portenti nuntium acceperant* is incorrect. From the nature of the case, and by means of the connection with ver. 28, Matthew represents the astonishment and the exclamation as coming immediately after the stilling of the tempest, and in the boat itself. — ὅτι] *seeing that*. Giving the reason for the ποταπός (*qualis*, see on Mark xiii. 1).—The narrative itself must not be traced to a *misconception on the part of the disciples*, who are supposed either to have attributed the cessation of the storm to the presence of Jesus and His observations regarding this condition of the weather (Paulus), or to have misapprehended the Lord’s command to be still, addressed to the storm *within* them at the moment when that which raged without was over (Hase). As little should we have recourse to a *symbolical* explanation of the fact, as though it had been intended to exhibit the superiority of the friend of God to the war of the elements (Ammon), or to represent the tranquillity of the inner life that is brought about by the spirit of Christ

<sup>1</sup> According to Mark iv. 41, Luke viii. 25, it was the *disciples* who uttered the exclamation. Possibly a more original part of the tradition than the statement in Matthew, which presupposes a wider reflection than Mark’s account, that statement being that what the exclamation asked the disciples already *knew*. Moreover, the preference, in all essential respects, is due to Matthew’s account; comp. Weiss in *d. Stud. u. Krit.* 1865, p. 344.

(Schleiermacher). But if Strauss has classed the narrative in the category of *mythical sea stories*, Keim again, though feeling sure that it is founded upon fact, is nevertheless of opinion that the actual event has been retouched, beyond recognition, with the colouring and in the spirit of the psalms (such as cvi., cvii.), while Weizsäcker sees in it nothing more than an evidence of the spiritual power with which, in a case of outward distress, Jesus so works upon the faith of His disciples that they see themselves transported into a world of miracles; the miracle, he thinks, resolves itself into the extraordinary impression produced by what had taken place. It is to do manifest violence to the clear and simple account of the Gospels, to adopt such expedients for divesting the narrative of its supernatural character, as Schenkel also has had recourse to, who thinks that, after the pilot had despaired, Jesus, with assured confidence in His destiny, stood up, and, after rebuking and allaying the fears of those around Him, assumed to Himself the direction of the boat. The text renders it necessary to insist on treating the event (Neander, Steinmeyer) as miraculous—as a proceeding the cause of which is to be found in the divine energy dwelling in the Lord (Luke xi. 20)—in a powerful exercise of His authority over the elements, which there should be no more difficulty in admitting than in the case of His other miracles in the sphere of nature (the feeding, Cana) and upon the bodily organism (even when dead).

Ver. 28 ff. Comp. Mark v. 1 ff.; Luke viii. 26 ff. Comp. Ewald, *Jahrb.* VII. p. 54 ff.—Γερρασηνῶν] Since *Gerasa*, the eastern frontier town of Peraea (Joseph. *Bell.* iii. 3. 3, iv. 9. 1), which Origen and others look upon as even belonging to Arabia, stood much too far to the south-east of the Sea of Tiberias, as the ruins of the town also still prove (Dieterici, *Reisebilder aus d. Morgenl.* 1853, II. p. 275 ff.; Rey, *Voyage dans le Haouran*, 1860); since, further, the reading Γερρασηνῶν has the preponderance of testimony against it, and since that reading has gained currency, if not solely on the strength of Origen's conjecture (on John i. 28, ii. 12; *Opp.* iv. p. 140, ed. de la Rue), at least mainly on the strength of his evidence; since, again, no trace is found of a *Gergesa*



either as town (Origen: πόλις ἀρχαία) or as village (Ebrard), Josephus, in fact, *Antt.* i. 6. 2, expressly stating that of the ancient Γεργεσαῖοι (Gen. xvi. 21, x. 16; Deut. viii. 1; Josh. xxiv. 11) nothing remains but their names; since, finally, the reading Γαδαρηνῶν has important testimony in its favour (see the critical remarks), being also confirmed by Origen, though only as found ἐν ὀλίγοις, and harmonizes with geographical facts,—we are therefore bound to regard that as the original reading, whilst Γερασηνῶν and Γεργεσινῶν must be supposed to owe their origin to a confusion in the matter of geography. Even apart from the authority of Origen, the latter reading came to be accepted and propagated, all the more readily from the circumstance that we are made acquainted with actual *Gergesenes* through the Old Testament. On *Gadara*, at present the village of *Omkeis*, at that time the capital of *Peraea* (Joseph. *Bell.* iv. 7. 3), standing to the south-east of the southern extremity of the Sea of Tiberias, between the latter and the river Mandhur, consult Ritter, *Erdk.* XV. p. 375 ff.; Rüetschi in Herzog's *Encykl.* IV. p. 636 f.; Kneucker in Schenkel's *Bibellew.* II. p. 313 ff. According to Paulus, who defends Γερασινῶν, the district of Gerasa, like the ancient Gilead, must have extended as far as the lake; the πόλις, however, vv. 33, 34, he takes to have been Gadara, as being the *nearest* town. The context makes this impossible. — δύο] According to Mark and Luke, only one. This difference in the tradition (ix. 27, xx. 30) is not to be disposed of by conjectures (Ebrard, Bleek, Holtzmann think that, as might easily enough have happened, Matthew combines with the healing of the Gadarenes that of the demoniacs in the synagogue at Capernaum, Mark i. 23 ff.), but must be allowed to remain as it is. At the same time, it must also be left an open question whether Matthew, with his brief and general narrative (Strauss, de Wette), or Mark and Luke (Weisse), with their lively, graphic representations, are to be understood as giving the more original account. However, should the latter prove to be the case, as is probable at least from the peculiar features in Mark (comp. Weiss, *op. cit.*, p. 342), it is not necessary, with Chrysostom, Augustine, Calvin, to hit upon the arbitrary

method of adjustment implied in supposing that there were no doubt two demoniacs, but that the one—whom Mark (and Luke) accordingly mentions—was far more furious than the other. According to Strauss and Keim, the change to the singular has had the effect of giving a *higher idea* of the extraordinary character of a case of possession by so many demons; Weisse and Schenkel hold the reverse; Weiss thinks the number two owes its origin to the fact of there having been a great many demons. Mere groundless conjectures.—The demoniacs are *lunatics*, furious to a high degree; they took up their abode among the tombs (natural or artificial grottoes in the rocks or in the earth) that were near by, driven thither by their own melancholy, which sought gratification in gloomy terrors and in the midst of impurity (Lightfoot *in loc.*, and on xvii. 15; Schoettgen, p. 92; Wetstein *in loc.*), and which broke out into frenzy when any one happened to pass by. Many old burial vaults are still to be seen at the place on which Gadara formerly stood.

Ver. 29. *Τί ἡμῖν κ. σοί*] See on John ii. 4. The demons, according to their nature, already recognise in Jesus, the Messiah, their mighty and most dangerous enemy, and “*cum terrore appellat filium Dei*,” Bengel. — *πρὸ καιροῦ*] prematurely, i.e. before the Messianic judgment (xxv. 41). — *βασανίσαι ἡμᾶς*] to hurl us, as servants of Satan, down to the torments of Hades (Luke xvi. 23; Rev. xiv. 10, xx. 10). The lunatics identify themselves with the demons by whom they are possessed. It is plain, however, from their very language that they were *Jews*, and not Gentiles (Casaubon, Neander).

Ver. 30. *Μακράν*] relative idea, therefore not incompatible with *ἐκεῖ* in Mark v. 11; Luke viii. 32 (Wilke, Holtzmann). — Seeing the Jews were forbidden (Lightfoot) to keep *swine*, as being unclean animals, the herd must either have been the property of Gentile owners, or been the subject of Jewish trade. — *βοσκομένην*] not to be connected with *ἦν*, but with *ἀγέλην*.

Ver. 31. *Εἰς . . . χοίρων*] They mean: *into the bodies of the swine that were feeding*. To the unclean spirits in the

possessed Jews, anticipating, as they certainly do, their inevitable expulsion, it appears desirable, as well as most easily attainable, that they should find an abode for themselves in impure animals. Eisenmenger, *entdecktes Judenth.* II. p. 447 f. — The request implies that the demoniacs considered themselves to be possessed by a *multitude* of evil spirits, a circumstance noticed in detail by Mark and Luke, from which, however, it may be inferred that the form of the tradition is not the same as the one made use of in our Gospel. The former is so peculiar, that, had Matthew only *abridged* it (Ewald), he would scarcely have omitted so entirely its characteristic features. On the contrary, he followed *another* version of the story which he happened to light upon, and which likewise mentioned *two* demoniacs instead of one; comp. on ver. 28. Probably this is also the source to which we are to trace the expression *δαίμονες*, which does not occur anywhere else in Matthew, and which in Mark v. 12 is of doubtful critical authority.

Ver. 32. *Ἐξελθόντες ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, κ.τ.λ.*] therefore the *demons* who, quitting those who were possessed, enter the bodies of the swine. The idea that the *demoniacs* ran away among the swine is opposed to the narrative. — *καὶ ἰδοὺ, ὥρμησε, κ.τ.λ.*] in consequence of the demons taking possession of the animals, and thereby producing in them a state of fury corresponding to that which had been excited in the men.

Vv. 33, 34. *Πάντα καὶ, κ.τ.λ.*] They reported *everything*, and especially how it had fared from first to last with the two demoniacs (xxi. 21). — *πᾶσα ἡ πόλις*] the Gadarenes. See ver. 28. — *παρεκάλεσαν, ὅπως μεταβῇ, κ.τ.λ.*] The subject of the request is conceived as *the aim in asking* (xiv. 36; Mark v. 10). — The *motive* for the request was fear lest a greater disaster should follow.

REMARK.—Seeing that all the attempts that have been made to evade the force of this narrative—such as saying that the demoniacs themselves had rushed in among the swine, or that the herd perished through some accidental and unknown circumstance (Neander), or that in the *εἰσέρχεσθαι* we have merely

to think of an *operating* in some way or other upon the animals as a whole (Olshausen)—run counter to what is clearly recorded, nothing remains but either to take the whole account as *real history*, and just as it stands (Krabbe, Ebrard, Delitzsch, *bibl. Psychol.* p. 296 ff.; Klostermann, *Markusevang.* p. 101 ff.; Steinmeyer, *apolog. Beitr.* I. p. 144 ff.), in which case it will be necessary to dispose of objections in the best way possible,<sup>1</sup> or else to admit the existence of *legendary elements*, and then eliminate them. The latter course is imperative and inevitable if we are not to look upon the condition of the demoniacs as a case of possession at all (see on iv. 24, note). According to this view of the matter, Jesus is supposed to have cured the two maniacs by means of His wonderful power, transmitting its influence through a humouring of their capricious fancies, and that this yielding to their request to be allowed to enter the swine may have led in a subsequent form of the tradition—a tradition, at the same time, which did not require to be assisted by the supposed recollection of some disaster to a herd of swine that happened about the same time on that side of the lake—

<sup>1</sup> Paulus and Strauss object that the demons would have acted the part of very silly devils, if they had gone so far as immediately to destroy again their new abodes. It is observed by Ebrard, on the other hand, that they were unable to control their wicked desires, or (on Olshausen, p. 306) that the shock to the nervous system of the animals was so much greater than was *expected*. Theophylact and Euth. Zigabenus suppose that their intention was to do damage to the owners, that they might not be disposed to welcome Jesus. Some explain one way and others another. In reply to the objection founded on the *morality* of the thing, Ebrard (comp. Wetstein) pleads the *absolute right* of the Son of God, and that the *object* was to *punish* the Gadarenes for their avarice. Similarly Luther. Comp. Bengel: "*rei erant Gergeseni amittendi gregis; jus et potestatem Jesu res ipsa ostendit*;" so Olshausen, coupling with his own the opinion of Theophylact. Schegg contents himself with supposing that what happened was by way of *testing* the Gadarenes to see whether, to them, the possession of eternal was of more consequence than the loss of temporal things, therefore a matter of discipline and to awaken faith; comp. Arnoldi and Ullmann, *Sündlosigkeit*. p. 176. Bleek thinks the whole question of the morality is one with which he is not called upon to deal, inasmuch as the destruction was not the doing of Jesus, but of the lunatic. According to Steinmeyer, it was not the doing of the demons, but of the animals. The only way of deciding this question is to reply that, according to the text, it was not the demoniacs but the demons that caused the destruction of the swine—a *result which Jesus did not anticipate*. Otherwise it is vain to try further to help matters by the view that it was the Redeemer offering Himself to deliver from the power of Satan and calling for the feeling that nothing was too dear to sacrifice for the sake of this deliverance (Klostermann), in violation of that principle of justice which forbids the use of means so flagrantly unrighteous to attain a holy end.

to the statement being added about the drowning of the whole herd, which addition might take place all the more readily from the fact that swine were unclean and forbidden animals, and considering also how much is often due to the play of popular wit (Ewald), which, in the death of the swine, would pretend to see the demons going down at length to the hell they feared so much. Strangely enough, Lange, *L. J.* II. p. 661, inserts in the text that the *hideous yell* of the demoniac in his last paroxysm has acted like an electric shock upon the herd. Ewald likewise supposes that the last fearful convulsions of the sufferer just before he was quieted may have occasioned such a terror as might readily communicate itself to a whole herd. But in this affair of the demons, not one of the three accounts says anything whatever about last convulsions and such like. Yet Schenkel, too, boldly asserts that, just before the cure took place, there were violent outbursts of the malady, which threw a herd of swine into a panic, and sent them rushing into the water. Keim, on the other hand, favours the view that "*the introduction of the four-footed beasts owes its origin to legend*, inasmuch as it sought to expound the healing from the life, and with bitter mockery of the Jews to explain and avenge the banishing of Jesus from the district." If this is to ascribe too much to legend,—too much to invention and wit, had not, indeed, the presence of a herd offered a handle for it,—then, to say the least of it, Weizsäcker followed the more cautious course when he abandoned the idea of finding out the fact on which the obscure reminiscence may probably have been founded,—although, when we consider the essential uniformity of the three evangelic narratives in other respects, the obscurity, if we keep out of view the difference in the naming of the locality, may not appear sufficiently great to warrant such entire abandonment.

## CHAPTER IX.

VER. 2. ἀφ' ἑωνται] Lachm. Tisch. 8: ἀφ' ἑνται (also ver. 5), only according to B  $\aleph$ , Or. (once). On the other hand, σου αἱ ἀμαρτίαι (Lachm. Tisch.) for σοι αἱ ἀμ. is certainly supported by important testimony, but suspected, however, of being taken from ver. 5. — Ver. 4. ἰδών] Lachm.: εἰδώς, according to B M E\*\* Π\* Curss. Verss. Chrys.; a gloss. Comp. xii. 25; Luke vi. 8. — Ver. 5. σου] Elz.: σοι, against decisive testimony. — ἔγειραι] There is decisive testimony for ἔγειρε. Adopted by Scholz, Lachm. Tisch. Correctly; see the exegetical notes. In all the passages in which ἔγειρε occurs, there is found, as a diff. reading, ἔγειραι. — Ver. 6. ἐγερθεῖς] Lachm.; according to B, Vulg. Codd. of the It.: ἔγειρε. Mechanical repetition from ver. 5. Comp. Mark ii. 11. — Ver. 8. ἐφοβήθησαν] so also Lachm. and Tisch., according to B D  $\aleph$ , Curss. Verss. (also Vulg. It.) and Fathers. θαύμασαν of the Received text is a gloss. — Ver. 9. ἡκολούθησεν] Tisch. 8: ἡκολούθει, on the too slender authority of D  $\aleph$  and three Curss. — Ver. 12. The omission of Ἰησοῦς, favoured by Lachm. and Tisch. 8, rests on too slender authority; while that of αὐτοῦς, which Lachm. and Tisch. leave out, has a preponderance of evidence in its favour. — Ver. 13. ἔλεον] Lachm. and Tisch.: ἔλεος; see the exegetical notes. — ἀμαρτωλούς] Elz., Fritzsche, and Scholz insert εἰς μετάνοιαν, which B D V\* Γ\* Δ  $\aleph$ , Curss. Vulg. It. Syr. utr. Perss. Aeth. al. and several Fathers omit. Supplement from Luke v. 32. — Ver. 14. πολλά] although deleted by Tisch. 8 (only according to B  $\aleph$ \* and three Curss.), has decisive testimony. — Ver. 17. ἀπολοῦνται] Lachm. Tisch. 8: ἀπόλλυνται, after B  $\aleph$ , Curss. Verss. The present is due to the other verbs around it. — ἀμφοτέροι] Elz.: ἀμφοτέρα, against decisive testimony. A correction. — Ver. 18. εἰς ἐλθών] Elz.: ἐλθών, only after Curss.; others: εἰσελθών; others: τις εἰσελθών; others: τις ἐλθών; others: τις (or εἰς) προσελθών; Lachm.: εἰς προσελθών, after B  $\aleph$ \*\*\*. In the original, stood ΕΙΣΕΛΘΩΝ.<sup>1</sup> — Ver. 19. Tisch. 8 (comp. on ver. 9) has ἡκολούθει, after B C D. —

<sup>1</sup> But whether εἰς ἐλθών (Griesb. Scholz, Kuinoel, Fritzsche) or εἰσελθών (Tisch.) should be written, see the exegetical notes.

Ver. 30. Lachm. Tisch. have the rare Alexand. form *ἐνεβριμήθη*, which has B\*  $\kappa$  in its favour, and was replaced by the more usual *ἐνεβριμήσατο*. — Ver. 35. *μαλακίαν*] Elz. inserts *ἐν τῷ λαῷ*, against B C\* D S  $\Delta$   $\kappa$ \*\*, Curss., and several versions and Fathers. Supplement from iv. 23. — Ver. 36. *ἐσχυλμένοι*] Elz.: *ἐκλελυμένοι*. The former, on which the latter is a gloss, rests on decisive testimony.

Vv. 1 ff. Mark ii. 1 ff., Luke v. 17 ff., introduce the account somewhat earlier. Matthew reports, briefly and simply, only the essential points, following, it may be, an older form of the tradition. — *Τὴν ἰδίαν πόλιν*] *Kapernaum*; *ἡ μὲν γὰρ ἤνεγκεν αὐτὸν ἡ Βηθλέεμ· ἡ δὲ ἔθρεψεν ἡ Ναζαρέτ· ἡ δὲ εἶχεν οἰκοῦντα Καπερναοῦμ*, Chrysostom. See iv. 13.

Vv. 2, 3. *Αὐτῶν*] *the paralytic, and those who were carrying him*. — *τέκνον*] affectionately; Mark ii. 5, x. 24; Luke xvi. 25, and elsewhere. Comp. *θύγατερ*, ver. 22. — *ἀφ᾽ ἑωραταί*] *are forgiven*; Doric (Suidas), not an Attic (*Etym. M.*) form of the perf. ind. pass.; Herod. ii. 165, *ἀνέωνται*,<sup>1</sup> with *ἀνείνται* (so Bähr), however, as a different reading; Winer, p. 77 [E. T. 96]; Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 42 [E. T. 49]. Beza correctly observes, that in the perf. is “emphasis minime negligenda.” The view that Christ’s words imply an *accommodation* to the belief of the Jews, and also of the paralytic himself, that diseases are inflicted by way of punishment for sins, is all the more to be rejected that Jesus elsewhere (John ix. 3; Luke xiii. 1) contradicts this belief. He saw into the moral condition of the sick man, precisely as afterwards, ver. 4, He read the thoughts of the scribes (John v. 14, ii. 25), and knew how it came that this paralysis was really the punishment of his special sins (probably of sensuality). Accordingly, he first of all pronounces forgiveness, *as being the moral condition necessary to the healing of the body* (not in order to help the effect upon the physical system by the use of healing psychical agency, Krabbe), and then, having by forgiveness removed the hindrance, He proceeds to impart that healing itself by an exercise of His supernatural power. — *εἶπον ἐν ἑαυτ.*] as in iii. 9. —

<sup>1</sup> See also Phavorinus, p. 330, 49, and Götting, *Lehre vom Accent.* p. 32; Ahrens, *Dial. Dor.* p. 344; Giese, *Dor. Dial.* p. 334 f.

βλασφημ.] through the assumption of divine authority (Ex. xxxiv. 7; comp. with xx. 5 f.). He thereby appeared to be depriving God of the honour that belongs to Him, and to be transferring it to Himself; for they did not ascribe to Him any *prophetic* authority to speak in the name of God.

Ver. 4. The power to discern the thoughts and intentions of others (comp. on ver. 3) was a characteristic mark of the expected Messiah (Wetstein), was present in Jesus in virtue of His nature as the God-man, and analogous to His miraculous power. — *ἵνα τί*] *why?* that is to say, *ἵνα τί γένηται*; Hermann, *ad Vig.* p. 849; Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 631 f. — *πονηρά*] inasmuch, that is, as you regard me as a blasphemer, and that with a malicious intention; whereas the sick man, and those who carried him, were full of faith. In contrast to them is the emphatic *ὑμεῖς* (*you people!*), which, being ignored by important authorities, is deleted by Tischendorf 8.

Ver. 5. *Γάρ*] gives a reason for the thought expressed in the preceding question,—the thought, namely, that they were *not justified* in thinking evil of Him. — *τί ἐστὶν εὐκοπώτερον*] The meaning is unquestionably this; the latter is quite as easy to say as the former, and conversely; the one requires no less power than the other; the same divine *ἐξουσία* enables both to be done; but in order that you may know that I was entitled to say the one, I will now add the other also: Arise, and so on. The result of the latter was accordingly the actual justification of the former. For *τί* in the sense of *πότερον*, comp. Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Phil.* p. 168. — *ἐγείρε* (see the critical remarks) is not a mere interjection, like *ἄγε*, *ἔπειγε* (Fritzsche, *ad Marc.* p. 55 f.), seeing that it is followed by *καί*, and that the circumstance of the *arising* has an essential connection with the incident (see ver. 2, *ἐπὶ κλίν. βεβλημένον*; comp. vv. 6, 7); but the transitive is used *intransitively* (Kühner, II. 1, p. 81 ff.), as is frequently the case, especially in verbs denoting haste (Bernhardy, p. 340). Eur. *Iph. A.* 624: *ἔγειρ' ἀδελφῆς ἐφ' ὑμέναιον εὐτυχῶς*.

Vv. 6, 7. *Ἐξουσίαν ἔχει*] placed near the beginning of the sentence so as to be emphatic: that the Son of man is *empowered* upon earth (not merely to announce, but) to com-



municate the forgiveness of sins. ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς does not belong to ἀφ. ἁμ. (Grotius),—in which case its position would convey an awkward emphasis, and the order of the words would naturally be ἀφ. ἁμ. ἐπὶ τ. γῆς (as Marcion read them),—but it is joined to ἐξουσίαν ἔχει in the consciousness of the ἐξουσία brought with Him *from heaven*. “Coelestem ortum hic sermo sapit,” Bengel. — τότε λέγει τῷ παραλυτ.] is neither to be taken parenthetically, nor is τότε to be understood (Fritzsche), in order to justify the parenthesis; but Matthew’s style is such that no formal apodosis comes after ἀμαρτίας, but rather the call to the paralytic ἐγερθεῖς, etc. Matthew reports this change in regard to the parties addressed with *scrupulous fidelity*; and so, after concluding what Jesus says to the scribes with the anacoluthon ἵνα δὲ εἰδῇτε . . . ἀμαρτίας, he proceeds to add, in the *narrative form*, “then He says to the paralytic.” This is a circumstantial simplicity of style which is not to be met with in polished Greek writers, who would have omitted the τότε λέγει τῷ παραλ. altogether as a mere encumbrance. See passages from Demosthenes in Kypke, I. p. 48 f. — καὶ ἐγερθεῖς, κ.τ.λ.] therefore an immediate and complete cure, which does not favour the far-fetched notion that the declaration of Jesus penetrated the nervous system of the paralytic *as with an electric current* (Schenkel).

Ver. 8. Ἐφοβήθησαν] not equivalent to ἐθαύμασαν (not even in Mark iv. 41; Luke viii. 35), but *they were afraid*. This was naturally the *first* impression produced by the extraordinary circumstance; and then they praised God, and so on. — τοῖς ἀνθρώποις] Not the plural of category (ii. 20), so that only *Jesus* is meant (Kuinoel), but *men* generally,—the human race. In one individual member of the human family they saw this power actually displayed, and regarded it as a new gift of God to *humanity*, for which they gave God praise.

Vv. 9, 10. Comp. Mark ii. 13 ff. (whom Matthew follows) and Luke v. 27 ff. — Καὶ παράγων] not: as He went *farther* (as is *commonly* supposed), but (xx. 30; Mark i. 16, xv. 21; John ix. 1; 1 Cor. vii. 31): as He went away from where (He had cured the paralytic), and *was passing by*

(3 Macc. vi. 16; Polyb. v. 18. 4), the place, that is, where Matthew was. Exactly as in Mark ii. 14, and in ver. 27 below. — *Ματθ. λεγόμεν.*] *Named Matthew* (ii. 23, xxvi. 36, xxvii. 33), anticipation of the apostolic name. — *τὸ τελώνιον*] *the custom-house of the place* (Poll. ix. 28). On Matthew himself and his identity with *Levi* (Mark ii. 14; Luke v. 27), further confirmed in *Constitt. Ap.* viii. 22. 1, see introduction, § 1. Considering the locality, it may be assumed that Matthew already knew something of Jesus, the extraordinary Rabbi and worker of miracles in that district, and that he does not now for the first time and all of a sudden make up his mind to join the company of His disciples (*ἀκολουθεῖν*). What is here recorded is the *moment of the decision* (in answer to Strauss, B. Bauer). This in opposition to Paulus, who interprets thus: "Go with me into thy house!" See Strauss, II. p. 570, who, however, sweeps away everything in the shape of a historical substratum, save the fact that Jesus really had publicans among His disciples, and that probably Matthew had likewise been one of this class;—"that these men had, of course, left the seat at the custom-house to follow Jesus, yet only in the figurative sense peculiar to such modes of expression, and not literally, as the legend depicts it."

Ver. 10. *Ἐγένετο . . . καί*] see note on Luke v. 12. — *ἀνακειμένου*] In classical Greek, *to recline at table* is represented by *κατακεῖσθαι*, as frequently also in the N. T. (Mark ii. 15, xiv. 3), though in Polybius, Athenaeus, and later writers *ἀνακεῖσθαι*, too, is by no means rare. Phrynichus, ed. Lobeck, p. 217. On the custom itself (with the left arm resting on a cushion), comp. note on John xiii. 23. — *ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ*] With the exception of Fritzsche, Bleek, Holtzmann, Keim, Hilgenfeld (yet comp. already the still merely doubtful remark of Bengel), critics have gratuitously assumed the house to have been that of *Matthew*, which accords, no doubt, with Luke v. 29 (not Mark ii. 15), but neither with the simple *ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ* (see ver. 23, xiii. 1, 36, xvii. 25) nor with the connection. Seeing, then, that the publican who *rose* from his seat at the custom-house and *followed* Jesus cannot, of course, have gone to his own residence, nothing else can

have been meant but the house of *Jesus* (in which He lived). There lies the variation as compared with Luke, and like many another, it cannot be disposed of. But de Wette's objection, reproduced by Lichtenstein, Lange, and Hilgenfeld, that it is scarcely probable that Jesus would give feasts, has no force whatever, since Matthew does not say a single word about a *feast*; but surely one may suppose that, when the disciples were present in his residence at Capernaum, Jesus may have eaten, *i.e.* have reclined at table with them. The publicans and sinners who came thither were at the same time hospitably received.—καὶ ἀμαρτωλοῖ] and in general *men of an immoral stamp*, with whom were also classed the publicans as being servants of the Roman government, and often guilty of fraudulent conduct (Luke iii. 13); comp. Luke xix. 7. Observe that Jesus Himself by no means denies the *πονηρὸν εἶναι* in regard to those associated with Him at table, ver. 12 f. They were truly diseased ones, who were now, however, yielding themselves up to the hands of the physician.

Ver. 11. Ἰδόντες] *How* they saw it is conceivable in a variety of ways (in answer to Strauss, B. Bauer), without our requiring to adopt the precise supposition of Ebrard and de Wette, that they saw it from the guests that *were coming out* of the house. May not the Pharisees have *come thither themselves* either accidentally or on purpose? Comp. πορευθέντες, ver. 13; ἐγερθεῖς, ver. 19; and see note on ver. 18.

Ver. 12. The *whole* and the *sick* of the proverb are figurative expressions for the *δίκαιοι* and the *ἀμαρτωλοί*, ver. 13. In the *application* the *Pharisees* are included among the former, not on account of their *comparatively greater* (de Wette), but because of their *fancied*, righteousness, as is evident from the sentiments of Jesus regarding this class of men expressed elsewhere, and likewise from ver. 13. The thought, then, is this: "the righteous (among whom you reckon yourselves) do not need the deliverer, but the sinners." This contains an "*ironica concessio*" to the Pharisees, "*in qua ideo offendi eos docet peccatorum intuitu, quia justitiam sibi arrogant*," Calvin. The objection, that in point of fact Jesus is come to call the self-righteous as well, is only apparent, seeing that He could

not direct His call to these, as such (John ix. 39 ff.), so long as they did not relinquish their pretensions, and were themselves without receptivity for healing.

Ver. 13. After having justified His holding intercourse with publicans and sinners, Jesus with the *δέ* proceeds to tell the Pharisees what they would have to do in order to their receiving His invitation to be healed: "*but go and learn what is meant by that saying of the Scripture* (Hos. vi. 6, LXX.), *I will have mercy and not sacrifice.*" You must understand that first of all, if you are to be of the number of those who are to be invited to enter the Messiah's kingdom: "*for I am not come to call righteous, but sinners*" (1 Tim. i. 15). Through that quotation from the Scripture (mentioned only by Matthew here and xii. 7), it is intended to make the Pharisees understand how much they too were sinners. According to *others*, Jesus wishes to justify His conduct, inasmuch as the exhibition of love and mercy constitutes the Messiah's highest duty (Ewald, Bleek). This, however, is less probable, owing to the *πορευθέντες* with which He dismisses them from His presence, the analogy of xii. 7, and the very apt allusion in *οὐ θυσίαν* to the Pharisees with their legal pride. — *πορευθ. μάθετε*] corresponds to the Rabbinical form *למך* *ללך*, which is used in sending one away, with a view to fuller reflection upon some matter or other, or with a view to being first of all instructed regarding it; see Schoettgen. — *γάρ*] assigns the reason for the *πορευθέντες μάθετε*, through which *μανθάνειν* they are first to be rendered capable of receiving the invitation to participate in the blessings of the kingdom. This invitation is uniformly expressed by the absolute *καλεῖν*. — The *masculine* *ἐλεος* is the *classical* form; the *neuter*, which rarely occurs in Greek authors (Isocr. 18, p. 378; Diod. iii. 18), is the prevailing form in the LXX., Apocrypha, and the New Testament, although the manuscripts show considerable fluctuation. In the present instance, the *neuter*, though possessing the authority of B C\* D *κ* (like xii. 7), was naturally adopted from the LXX. — *καὶ οὐ θυσ.*] The negative is *absolute*, in accordance with the idea *aut . . . aut*. God does not desire sacrifice instead of mercy, but mercy instead of sacrifice. The

latter is an *accessory* (Calvin), in which everything depends on the right *disposition*, which is what God desires.

Ver. 14. Concerning *private fasting*. See note on vi. 16. On the fasting of the *Baptist*, comp. xi. 18. On the fasting of the *Pharisees* (Luke xviii. 12), to whose authority on the rigid observance of the law the disciples of John adhere, see Lightfoot on this passage. Serar. *de Trihaeresio*, p. 36. — *πολλά*] *frequenter*, Vulg., Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Phaed.* p. 61 C, *ad Parmen.* p. 126 B; Kühner, II. 1, p. 270. A not inappropriate addition by Matthew (Weiss, Holtzmann). — *οὐ νηστεύουσιν*) comparatively, to be understood from the standpoint of the questioners, who hold the freedom of the disciples of Jesus, as contrasted with the frequent fasting of themselves and the Pharisees, to be equivalent to *no fasting at all*.

Ver. 15. *Οἱ υἱοὶ* (viii. 12) *τοῦ νυμφῶνος*] (*of the bride chamber*, Joel ii. 16; Tob. vi. 16; Heliod. vii. 8) are the *παρὰ-νύμφιοι*, the friends of the bridegroom, who amid singing and playing of instruments conducted the bride, accompanied by her companions, to the house of her parents-in-law and to the bride-chamber, and remained to take part in the wedding feast, which usually lasted seven days. Pollux, *Onom.* iii. 3; Hirt, *de paranymp. ap. Hebr.* 1748; on the Greek *παρὰ-νύμφιοι*, consult Hermann, *Privatalterth.* § 31, 18. Meaning of the figure: *So long as my disciples have me with them, they are incapable of mourning* (fasting being the expression of mourning): *when once I am taken from them—and that time will inevitably come—then they will fast to express their sorrow.* Christ, the bridegroom of His people until His coming, and then the marriage; see on John iii. 29. It is to be observed that this is the first occasion in Matthew on which Jesus alludes to His *death*, which from the very first He *knew* to be the divinely-appointed and prophetically-announced climax of His work on earth (John i. 29, ii. 19, iii. 14), and did not *come* to know it only by degrees, through the opposition which he experienced; while Hase, Wittichen, Weizsäcker, Keim, postpone the certainty of His having to suffer death—the latter, till that day at Caesarea (chap. xvi.); Holsten even puts it off till immediately before the passion; see, on the other

hand, Gess, *op. cit.*, p. 253 ff. — The *τότε*, which has the tragic emphasis of a sorrowful future (Bremi, *ad Lys.* p. 248, Goth.), expresses only *the particular time specified*, and not all time following *as well*, and while probably not *condemning* fasting in the church, yet indicating it to be a matter in which one is to be regulated, not by legal prescriptions (ver. 16 f.), but by personal inclination and the spontaneous impulses of the mind. Comp. vi. 16 ff.

Vv. 16, 17. *No one puts a patch consisting of cloth that has not been fulled upon an old robe, for that which is meant to fill up the rent* (the patch put on to mend the old garment) *tears off from the* (old rotten) *cloak*, when it gets damp or happens to be spread out, or stretched, or such like. That *αὐτοῦ* does not refer to the piece of unfulled cloth (Euth. Zigabenus, Grotius, de Wette, Bleek), but to the old garment, is suggested by the idea involved in *πλήρωμα* (*id quo res impletur*, Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* II. p. 469). *Τί* is not to be supplied after *αἶρει*, but the idea is: *makes a rent*. Comp. Rev. xxii. 19, and especially Winer, p. 552 [E. T. 757]. The *point of the comparison* lies in the fact that such a proceeding is not only *unsuitable*, but a *positive hindrance to the end in view*. "The old forms of piety amid which John and his disciples still move are not suited to the new religious life emanating from me. To try to embody the latter in the former, is to proceed in a manner as much calculated to defeat its purpose as when one tries to patch an old garment with a piece of unfulled cloth, which, instead of mending it, as it is intended to do, only makes the rent greater than ever; or as when one seeks to fill old bottles with new wine, and ends in losing wine and bottles together. The new life needs new forms." The Catholics, following Chrysostom and Theophylact, and by way of finding something in favour of fastings, have erroneously explained the old garment and old bottles as referring to the *disciples*, from whom, as "*adhuc infirmes et veteri adsuetis homini*" (Jansen), it was, as yet, too much to expect the severer mode of life for which, on the contrary (ver. 17), they would have to be previously prepared by the operation of the Holy Spirit. This is directly opposed to the meaning of Jesus'

words, and not in accordance with the development of the apostolic church (Col. ii. 20 ff.), by which fasting, as legal penance, was necessarily included among the *στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου*, however much it may have been valued and observed as the spontaneous outcome of an inward necessity (Acts xiii. 2 f., xiv. 23 ; 2 Cor. vi. 5, xi. 27). Neander suggests the utterly irrelevant view, that "it is impossible to renovate from without "the old nature of man" (the old garment) through fasting and prayers (which correspond to the new patch).—*Leathern bottles*, for the most part of goats' skins (Hom. *Il.* iii. 247, *Od.* vi. 78, ix. 196, v. 265) with the rough side inward, in which it was and still is the practice (Niebuhr, I. p. 212) in the East to keep and carry about wine. Comp. Judith x. 6 ; Rosenmüller, *Morgenl.* on Josh. ix. 5. — ἀπο-  
 λούνται] *Future*, the *consequence* of what has just been described by the verbs in the present tense. On εἰ δὲ μήγε, even after negative clauses, see note on 2 Cor. xi. 16.

REMARK.—According to Luke v. 33, it was not John's disciples, but the *Pharisees*, who put the question to Jesus about fasting. This difference is interpreted partly in favour of Luke (Schleiermacher, Neander, Bleek), partly of Matthew (de Wette, Holtzmann, Keim), while Strauss rejects both. For my part, I decide for Matthew ; first, because his simpler narrative bears no traces of another hand (which, however, can scarcely be said of that of Luke) ; and then, because the whole answer of Jesus, so *mild* (indeed touching, ver. 15) in its character, indicates that those who put the question can hardly have been the *Pharisees*, to whom He had just spoken in a very different tone. Mark ii. 18 ff., again (which Ewald holds to be the more original), certainly does not represent the pure version of the matter as regards the questioners, who, according to his account, are the disciples of John *and* the Pharisees,—an incongruity, however, which owes its origin to the question itself.

Ver. 18. Ἀρχων] *a president* ; Matthew does not further define the office. According to Mark v. 22, Luke viii. 41, it was the *synagogue-president*, named *Jairus*.—The correct reading is εἰσελθών (comp. the critical remarks), and not εἰς ἐλθών (Gersdorf, Rinck, de Wette, Tischendorf, Ewald), yet not as though the εἰς following were at variance with Matthew's

usual style (xxii. 35, xxiii. 15, xxvi. 40, 69, xxvii. 14; see, on the other hand, v. 41, vi. 27, xii. 11, xviii. 5, xxi. 24); but since this, like the former incident, also occurred at that meal in the residence of Jesus (according to Matthew, not according to Mark and Luke), and as this fact was misapprehended, as most critics misapprehend it still, consequently it was not seen to what *εἰσελθών* might refer, so that it was changed into *εἰς ἐλθών*. According to Matthew, the order of the incidents connected with the meal is as follows: (1) Jesus sends away the Pharisees, vv. 11–13. (2) After them, the disciples of John approach Him with their questions about fasting, and He instructs them, vv. 14–17. (3) While he is still speaking to the latter, a *president enters*, ver. 18, and prefers his request. *Thereupon Jesus rises*, i.e. from the table (ver. 10), and goes away with the *ἄρχων*, ver. 19; and it is not till ver. 28 that we read of His having returned again to His house. — *ἄρτι ἐτελεύτησεν*] *has just now died*. The want of harmony here with Mark v. 23, Luke vii. 49, is to be recognised, but not (Olearius, Kuinoel) to be erroneously explained as meaning *jam moritur, morti est proxima*. Others (Luther, Wolf, Grotius, Rosenmüller, Lange) interpret, with Chrysostom, Theophylact, Euth. Zigabenus: *στοχαζόμενος εἶπεν, ὑπέλαβε γὰρ, ὅτι μέχρι τότε πάντως ἂν ἀπέθανεν*. A harmonizing expedient.—*Laying on of the hand*, the symbol and medium in the communication of a divine benefit, xix. 13; Luke iv. 40, xiii. 13. See on Acts vi. 6, viii. 17 f., xiii. 3, xix. 5; Gen. xlviii. 14; Num. xxvii. 18.—The account of Mark v. 22–42, which is followed by Luke viii. 41 ff., is so unique and fresh in regard to the detail which characterizes it, that it is not to be regarded as a later amplification (Strauss, Baur, Hilgenfeld, Keim, Bleek); that of Matthew follows a condensed form of the tradition, which, moreover, is responsible for straightway introducing the *ἐτελεύτησεν* as if forming part of what the president addressed to Jesus.

Ver. 20. The particular *kind* of *haemorrhage* cannot be determined. *Some*: excess of menstruation. *Others*: haemorrhoids. From its having lasted twelve years, it may be inferred that the ailment was *periodical*. — *ὀπισθεν*] out of modesty



κράσπεδον] LXX. Num. xv. 38, קִרְבַּת. Such was the name given to the tassel which, in accordance with Num. xv. 38 f., the Jew wore on each of the four extremities of his cloak, to remind him of Jehovah's commands. Lund, *Jüd. Heilighth.* ed. Wolf, p. 896 f.; Keil, *Archäol.* § 102; Ewald, *Alterth.* p. 307.—The *article* points to the particular tassel which she touched. Comp. xiv. 36.

Ver. 22. Jesus immediately (see on ver. 4) perceives her object and her faith, and affectionately (θύγατερ, as a term of address, like τέκνον, ver. 2, occurs nowhere else in the New Testament) intimates to her that ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέ σε, *on account of thy faith thou art saved* (healed)! The *perfect* describes what is going to happen directly and immediately, as if it were something already taking place. See Kühner, II. 1, p. 129. Comp. Mark x. 52, Luke xviii. 42, and the counterpart of this among tragic poets, as in ὄλωλα, τέθνηκα, and such like. The cure, according to Matthew, was effected by an exercise of Jesus' will, which responds to the woman's faith in His miraculous power, not through the mere touching of the garment (in answer to Strauss). The result was instantaneous and complete. To try to account for the miracle by the influence of fear (Ammon), religious excitement (Schenkel), a powerful hope quickening the inactive organs (Keim), is not sufficiently in keeping with the well authenticated result, and is inadequate to the removal of so inveterate a malady (the twelve years' duration of which must indeed be ascribed to legend). — ἀπὸ τῆς ὥρ. ἐκ.] not equivalent to ἐν τῇ ὥρ. ἐκ. (viii. 14), but the thing begins to take place *from that hour onward*. Comp. xv. 28, xvii. 18. Ἀπό and ἐν therefore express the same result, the instantaneous cure, *in forms differing according to the manner in which the thing is conceived*.—According to Eusebius, *H. E.* vii. 17, the woman's name was *Veronica* (*Evang. Nicod.* in Thilo, I. p. 561), and a Gentile belonging to Paneas, where she erected a statue to Jesus. However, see Robinson, *neuere Forsch.* p. 537.

Ver. 23. The use of the lugubrious strains of flutes (and horns), such as accompanied the funerals of the Jews (Light-foot on this passage; Geier, *de luctu Hebr.* v. § 16; Grundt,

die Trauergebräuche d. Hebr. 1868), was known also among Greeks and Romans. — *δχλον*] consisting partly of the women hired to mourn, partly of the friends and relations of the president. — *θορυβούμ.*] did not require an article, as being a mere qualifying attribute. Therefore *θορυβ.* is not, with Fritzsche, Ewald, to be referred to *ιδών*.

Vv. 24, 25. *The maid is not to be regarded as being permanently dead, but only as sleeping and certain to come to life again, like one who awakens out of sleep.* Thus, from the standpoint of *His own purpose*, does Jesus clearly and confidently speak of her actual death. "Certus ad miraculum accedit," Bengel. It is wrong to found upon these words the supposition of a *mere apparent death* (Paulus, Schleiermacher, Olshausen, Ewald, Schenkel; Weizsäcker, without being quite decided). See, on the other hand, John xi. 4, 11. This hypothesis is as incompatible with the view of the evangelists as it is inconsistent with a due regard to the character of Jesus. See Krabbe, p. 327 ff. Keim, again, hesitates to accept the idea of an unreal death, yet continues to harbour doubts as to the historical character of the narrative. He thinks that, at least, the firm faith of the president may be accounted for by the later hopes of Christianity, which may have prompted the desire to see, in the risen Christ, the future restorer of the dead already manifesting Himself as such in His earthly ministry,—a matter in connection with which the statement in xi. 5 and the parallel of Elias and Elisha (1 Kings xvii. 17; 2 Kings iv. 8, 18. Comp. Strauss) also fall to be considered. Surely, however, a legendary anticipation of this sort would have been far more fertile in such stories! Then, apart even from the raising of Lazarus related by John, we have always (xi. 5) to show how hazardous it must be to relegate to the region of myths those cases in which Jesus raises the dead, considering what a small number of them is reported. — *ἐξεβλήθη*] Comp. xxi. 12. The request to retire (*ἀναχωρεῖτε*, ver. 24) not having been complied with, a *thrusting out* follows. Mark i. 43; Acts ix. 40.—Notice in *εἰσελθών* (viz. into the chamber of death) the noble simplicity of the concise narrative. — *τὸ*

κορασίου] See Lobeck, *ad Phryg.* p. 74; on ἡ φήμη, Wytttenbach, *ad Julian. Or.* I. p. 159, Lps.

Vv. 27, 28. Δύο τυφλοί] μαθόντες, περὶ ὧν ἐθαυματούργει, καὶ πιστεύσαντες, αὐτὸν εἶναι τὸν προσδοκώμενον Χριστόν, Euth. Zigabenus. Matthew alone records the two miracles, vv. 27-34, but it is rash to regard them (Holtzmann) as a literary device in anticipation of xi. 5. The title "son of David" is surely conceivable enough, considering the works already done by Jesus, and so cannot serve as a ground for regarding the healing of the blind man here recorded as a variation of xx. 29 ff. (Wilke, Bleek, Weiss, Keim). — παραγ. as ver. 9. — εἰς τ. οἰκίαν] in which Jesus resided. Comp. ver. 10.

Ver. 30 f. Ἀνεψύχθησαν . . . ὀφθαλμοί] *they recovered their power of seeing.* Comp. John ix. 10; 2 Kings vi. 17; Isa. xxx. 5, xlii. 7; Ps. cxlvi. 8; Wetstein on this passage. — ἐνεβριμήθη (see the critical remarks): *He was displeased with them,* and said (see on John xi. 33). The *angry tone* (Mark i. 43) of the prohibition is due to the feeling that an unsuccessful result was to be apprehended. To such a feeling correspond the strict terms of the prohibition: *take care to let no one know it!* — διεφήμισαν, κ.τ.λ.] "*propter memoriam gratiae non possunt tacere beneficium,*" Jerome. ἐξελθόντες: out of the house. Ver. 28. Paulus, notwithstanding the context, interprets: out of the town. See also ver. 32, where αὐτῶν ἐξερχομένων can only mean: whilst they were going out from Jesus, out of His house.

Vv. 32, 33.<sup>1</sup> Αὐτῶν] Placed first for sake of emphasis, in contrast to the *new* sufferer who presents himself just as *they* are going out. — ἐφάνη οὕτως] ἐφάνη is impersonal, as in Thucyd. vi. 60. 2 (see Krüger *in loc.*), so that the general "*it*" is to be regarded as matter for explanation. See by all means Krüger, § 61. 5. 6. Nägelsbach, note on *Ilias*, p. 120, ed. 3.

<sup>1</sup> Holtzmann thinks that this story likewise owes its origin merely to an anticipation of xi. 5. According to de Wette, Strauss, Keim, it is identical with the healing mentioned in xii. 22 ff. According to various sources "*marked as a duplicate*" (Keim). The demoniac, ch. xii., is blind and dumb. And see note on xii. 22.

What the matter in question specially is, comes out in the context; vv. 33, 34, ἐκβάλλει τὰ δαιμόνια. Therefore to be taken thus: *never has it*, viz. the casting out of demons, *been displayed in such a manner among the Israelites*. According to Fritzsche, *Jesus forms the subject; never had He shown Himself in so illustrious a fashion* (Rettig in d. Stud. u. Krit. 1838, p. 788 f.). But in that case, how is ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ to be explained? Formerly it was *usual* to interpret thus: οὕτως stands for τοῦτο or τοιοῦτό τι, like the Hebrew יִכֶּנֶּה (1 Sam. xxiii. 17). A grammatical inaccuracy; in all the passages referred to as cases in point (Ps. xlviii. 6; Judg. xix. 30; Neh. viii. 17), neither יִכֶּנֶּה nor οὕτως means anything else than *thus*, as in 1 Sam., *loc. cit.*, καὶ Σαουλ ὁ πατήρ μου οἶδεν οὕτως: *and Saul my father knows it thus*. That false canon is also to be shunned in Mark ii. 12.

Ver. 34. What a contrast to those plaudits of the people! — ἐν τῷ ἄρχοντι τῶν δαιμονίων] His power to cast out demons originates in the prince of demons; everything depends on the *Devil*, he is the power through which he works. Comp. on ἐν, Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* I. p. 597; Winer, p. 364 [E. T. 486]; on ὁ ἄρχων τ. δαιμ., *Ev. Nicod.* 23, where the devil is called ἀρχιδιάβολος; see in addition, Thilo, p. 736.

Ver. 35. Here we have the commencement of a new section, which opens, vv. 35–38, with the introduction to the mission of the Twelve, which introduction has been led up to by the previous narratives. Comp. iv. 23–25. — αὐτῶν] *Masculine*. Comp. iv. 23, xi. 1.

Ver. 36. Ἰδὼν δέ] in the course of this journey. — τοὺς ὄχλους] who were following Him — ἐσκυλμένοι] What is meant is not a herd *torn by wolves* (Bretschneider), which would neither suit the words nor be a fitting illustration of the crowds that followed Him; but a dense flock of sheep which, from *having no shepherd*, and consequently no protection, help, pasture, and guidance, are in a *distressing, painful* condition (*vexati*, Vulg.); and ἐρριμμένοι, not *scattered* (Luther, Beza, Kuinoel, Baumgarten-Crusius, Bleek), which is not the meaning of ῥίπτειν, nor even *neglecti* (Soph. *Aj.* 1250), like the German *weggeworfen* (castaway), (Kypke, Fritzsche, de

Wette), which would be too feeble, coming after ἐσκυλμ.; but *prostrati, thrown down, stretched upon the ground* (frequently in the LXX. and Apocrypha), like sheep exhausted, that are unable to walk any farther (Vulg.: *jacentes*). Comp. Xenoph. *Mem.* iii. 1. 7; Herodian, iii. 12. 18, vi. 8. 15; Polyb. v. 48. 2. Jesus was moved with compassion for them, because they happened to be in such a plight (*essent*; notice how He has expressed His pity in this illustration), and then utters what follows about the harvest and the labourers. We have therefore to regard ἐσκυλμ. and ἐρρίμμ. as illustrations of *spiritual* misery, which are naturally suggested by the sight of the exhausted and prostrate multitudes (that had followed Him for a long distance).—The form ῥεριμμένοι (Lachm. with *spir. len.*) is found only in D. See Lobeck, *Paral.* p. 13; Kühner, I. p. 508; and for the usual *spir. asp.*, Götting, *Accentl.* p. 205. On the form ἐριμμένοι, adopted by Tischendorf after B C 8, etc., consult Kühner, I. p. 903.

Vv. 37, 38. The μαθηταί in the more *comprehensive* sense. The *Twelve* are expressly specified in x. 1 immediately following. — ὁ μὲν θερισμὸς, κ.τ.λ.] The literal (John iv. 35) meaning of which is this: *Great is the multitude of people that may be won for the Messiah's kingdom, and that is already ripe for being so, but small the number of teachers qualified for this spiritual work; pray God therefore, and so on.* Luke x. 2 connects those words with the mission of the Seventy. They are as appropriate in the one case as in the other, and in both cases (according to Bleek, only in Luke x. 2) were actually used by Jesus. But to infer from the *illustration of the harvest* what *season of the year* it happened to be at the time (Hausrath, Keim), is very precarious, considering how the utterances of Jesus abound with all sorts of natural imagery, and especially considering that this present simile was frequently employed. — δεήθητε, κ.τ.λ.] so entirely was He conscious that *His* work was the same as a work of *God*, John iv. 34. — ἐκβάλλη] *force them out*, a strong expression under the conviction of the urgent necessity of the case. Comp. note on Mark i. 12.

## CHAPTER X.

VER. 2. Tisch. 8 has καί before Ἰάκωβος, only according to B  $\aleph^*$  Syr. — Ver. 3.  $\Lambda\epsilon\beta\beta.$  ὁ ἐπικλ. Θαδδ.] Fritzsche: Θαδδ. ὁ ἐπικλ.  $\Lambda\epsilon\beta\beta.$ , only according to 13, 346. Changed because Θαδδ. is really the proper noun.<sup>1</sup> — Ver. 4.  $\kappa\alpha\nu\alpha\nu\acute{\iota}\tau\eta\varsigma$ ] the form  $\kappa\alpha\nu\alpha\nu\alpha\acute{\iota}\delta\varsigma$  (Lachm. Tisch.) is decisively attested. — Ver. 8.  $\kappa\alpha\theta\alpha\rho\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ ] Elz. inserts νεκροὺς ἐγείρετε, which words Griesb. Lachm. and Tisch. 8 (so B C\* D  $\aleph$ ) place after θεραπεύετε, while Fritzsche puts them after ἐκβάλλετε. Correctly struck out by Scholz and Tisch. 7. For besides being suspicious, owing to their omission in C\*\*\* E F G K L M S U V X r  $\Pi$  and very many Curss., also several versions and Fathers,—a suspicion that is heightened by their diversity of position in the unquestionably important authorities which witness in their favour,—they have the appearance of being an interpolation, which, in accordance with the apostolic narrative (Acts ix. 20 ff.), seemed necessary by way of completing the list of miraculous powers that had been conferred. Had the words been original, their contents would in any case have contributed much more to preserve them than to cause their omission. — Ver. 10.  $\rho\acute{\alpha}\beta\delta\omicron\nu$ ] C E F G K L M P S U V X  $\Delta$   $\Pi$  Curss. Copt. Arm. Syr. p. Theoph. have  $\rho\acute{\alpha}\beta\delta\omicron\nu\varsigma$ . Adopted by Scholz and Tisch. Altered because of the preceding plurals, and because what is spoken applies at the same time to a plurality of persons. —  $\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota$ ] should be deleted, see on Luke x. 7. — Ver. 19. The reading fluctuates between  $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\omega\sigma\iota\nu$  (Elz. Tisch. 7),  $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\delta\acute{\omega}\sigma\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\nu$ , and  $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\delta\acute{\omega}\sigma\iota\nu$  (Tisch. 8,

<sup>1</sup> D, 122, Codd. quoted in Augustine, Hesychius, Rufinus, have merely  $\Lambda\epsilon\beta\beta\alpha\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$ . B  $\aleph$ , 17, 124, and several versions have only Θαδδαῖος. So Lachm. I regard the simple  $\Lambda\epsilon\beta\beta\alpha\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$  (with Tisch. and also Ewald) as the original reading. The other readings are derived from Mark iii. 18, because of the identity of Lebbaeus and Thaddaeus. Comp. Bengel, *Appar. crit.* Had the simple Θαδδαῖος been the true one, it would have been impossible to see how  $\Lambda\epsilon\beta\beta\alpha\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$  should have been inserted, seeing it does not occur anywhere else in the New Testament. No doubt D and Codd. of It., also Mark iii. 18, have  $\Lambda\epsilon\beta\beta\alpha\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$ , but against testimony so decisive that it appears to have come there from our present passage.

after B E\*  $\aleph$  and Lachm.). The future is adopted from ver. 17, while the present, which is best authenticated, and most in accordance with the sense, would be easily transformed into the aorist by the omission, on the part of the transcribers, of the middle syllable. — *δοθήσεται* to *λαλήσετε*] is not found in D L, Curss. Arm. Codd. of It. Or. Cyr. and a few Verss. Bracketed by Lachm. Ancient omission occasioned by the homoioteleuton. — Ver. 23. *φεύγετε εἰς τὴν ἄλλην*] Griesb.: *φεύγετε εἰς τὴν ἑτέραν, καὶ ἐκ ταύτης διώκωσιν ὑμᾶς, φεύγετε εἰς τὴν ἄλλην*,<sup>1</sup> after D L, Curss. and some Fathers and Verss., however, with differences in detail. A continuous extension of the sentence. — Ver. 25. *ἐπεκάλεσαν*] Elz.: *ἐκάλεσαν*, against decisive testimony. Lachm. again (defended by Rettig in *Stud. u. Krit.* 1838, p. 477 ff.; Buttmann, *ibid.* 1860, p. 342 f.) has, instead of the accusative, the dative *τῷ οἰκοδεσπότῃ* and *οἰκιακοῖς*, only after B\*, which is to be ascribed to a grammarian who took *ἐπικαλεῖν* as meaning *to reproach*. — Ver. 28. *φοβεῖσθε*] Elz., Fritzsche: *φοβηθῆτε*, against decisive testimony. Adopted from ver. 26. Likewise in ver. 31 we ought, with Lachm. and Tisch., to restore *φοβεῖσθε* in accordance with B D L  $\aleph$ , Curss. Or. Cyr. — *ἀποκτενόντων*] so also Scholz. The *ἀποκτενόντων* (B, Or.) of the Received text is condemned by counter testimony as a grammatical correction. But although the form *ἀποκτενόντων* is supported by important testimony, yet we ought, with Lachm. and Tisch., to follow C D U  $\Gamma$   $\Delta$   $\Pi$   $\aleph$  and Curss. and adopt the Aeolic-Alexandrine form *ἀποκτενόνταν* (see Sturz, *Dial. Al.* p. 128), because *ἀποκτενόντων* as a present is nowhere found, while an aorist, if the verb had had that form, would have been in this instance without meaning. — Ver. 33. The position *καὶ γὰρ αὐτόν* (Beng. Lachm. Tisch. 8) is a mechanical alteration on account of ver. 32.

Ver. 1. Not the *choosing*, but merely the *mission* of the Twelve, is here related; Mark vi. 7; Luke ix. 1. The *choosing* (Mark iii. 14; Luke vi. 13; comp. also John vi. 70), which had taken place some time before,—although a still earlier one, viz. that of the five (iv. 18 ff., ix. 9), is *recorded*, —is *assumed*, as far as the complete circle of the Twelve, to be generally known, which is certainly an omission on the

<sup>1</sup> Instead of the *ἄλλην* of the Received text, Lachm. and Tisch. 8, following B  $\aleph$  33, 265, Or. Petr. Ath. have *ἑτέραν*, which, however, is undoubtedly connected with the above interpolation.

part of the narrator. — ἐξουσίαν] *Authority* over unclean spirits. The following ὥστε is expegetical: *so that they would cast them out.* But καὶ θεραπεύειν, etc., is not dependent on ὥστε also, but on ἐξουσίαν (1 Cor. ix. 5). Power was given to them both to cure demoniacs and to heal those who suffered from natural disease as well; comp. ver. 8. The manner of imparting this power, whether through a laying on of hands, or breathing on them (John xx. 22) through a symbolic act (de Wette), or by communicating to them certain sacred words or signs, or by certain movements of the hands (Ewald), or even by magnetic influences (Weisse), or by the mere effectual word of the Lord (which is more likely, since nothing is specified), is not stated.—On the *genitive*, comp. Mark vi. 7; John xviii. 2; Sir. x. 4.

Ver. 2. Δώδεκα] Theophylact: κατὰ τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῶν δώδεκα φυλῶν; comp. xix. 28. On this occasion, when the mission is understood to take place, it is precisely the designation ἀποστόλων (not occurring elsewhere in Matthew, while in Mark it is found only in vi. 30) that is made choice of, though doubtless also used by Jesus Himself (John xiii. 16; Luke vi. 13), and from that circumstance it gradually came to be employed as the distinguishing official title. — πρῶτος Σίμων] *The first is Simon.* The further numbering of them ceases, for Matthew mentions them in pairs. The placing of Peter first in all the catalogues of the apostles (Mark iii. 16 ff.; Luke vi. 14 ff.; Acts i. 13) is not accidental (Fritzsche), but is due to the fact that he and his brother were looked upon as the πρωτόκλητοι (see, however, John i. 41). This accords with the pre-eminence which he had among the apostles as *primus inter pares* (xvi. 16 ff., xvii. 1, xxiv. 19, xxvii. 26, 37, 40; Luke viii. 45, ix. 32, xxii. 31 f.; John xxi. 15; Acts i. 15, ii. 14, v. 3 f., viii. 14, x. 5, xv. 7; Gal. i. 18, ii. 7), and which was recognised by Jesus Himself. For that they were arranged in the order of their rank is perfectly obvious, not only from the betrayer being uniformly put last, but also from the fact that in all the catalogues James and John, who along with Peter were the Lord's most intimate friends, are mentioned immediately after that apostle



(and Andrew). Moreover, a conjoint view of the four catalogues of the apostles (Ewald, *Gesch. Chr.* p. 395 ff., Bleek, Keim) will confirm Bengel's observation, that "universi ordines habent tres quaterniones, quorum nullus cum alio quicquam permutat; tum in primo semper primus est *Petrus*, in secundo *Philippus* . . . in tertio *Jacobus Alphaei*; in singulis ceteri apostoli loca permutant; proditor semper extremus." — ὁ λεγόμεν. Πέτρος] *who is called Peter* (Schaeffer, *Melet.* p. 14); that was his *usual* apostolic name. — Ἀνδρέας] *Greek name* (found even in Herod. vi. 126), like *Philippus* below. Doubtless both originally had *Hebrew* names which are not recorded.

Ver. 3. Βαρθολομαῖος] תרמאי רב, son of Tolmai, LXX. 2 Sam. xiii. 37, patronymic. His proper name was *Nathanael*; see note on John i. 46, and Keim, II. p. 311. — Θωμᾶς] תומא, Δίδυμος, *twinn* (John xi. 16, xx. 24, xxi. 2), perhaps so called from the nature of his birth. In Eusebius and the Acts of Thomas he is called (see Thilo, p. 94 ff.) Ἰούδας Θωμᾶς ὁ καὶ Δίδυμος. — ὁ τελώνης] In reference to ix. 9 without any special object. — ὁ τοῦ Ἀλφαίου] Matthew's father was likewise called Alphaeus (Mark ii. 14), but this is a different person; see Introduction, sec. 1. — Λεββαῖος] who must be identical with *Judas Jacobi*,<sup>1</sup> Luke vi. 16 (comp. John xiv. 22), Acts i. 13; who, however, is not the author of the New Testament epistle bearing that name. *Lebbaeus* (*the courageous one*, from לב), according to our passage, had become his regular *apostolic* name. According to Mark iii. 18, he had the apostolic name of *Θαδδαῖος* (which must *not* be taken as the correct reading of the present passage; see the critical notes), and it

<sup>1</sup> On the relation of the genitive in *Judas Jacobi* (not *brother*, but *son*), see note on Luke vi. 16; Acts i. 13. Comp. Nonnus, John xiv. 22: Ἰούδας υἱὸς Ἰακώβου. The view that this Judas is a *different* person from Lebbaeus, and that he had succeeded to the place rendered vacant, probably by the death of Lebbaeus (Schleiermacher, Ewald), cannot possibly be entertained, for this reason, that in that case the statement in Luke vi. 13 (ἐκλεξάμενος, etc.) would be simply incorrect, which is not to be supposed in connection with a matter so important and generally known (Rufinus, in *Praef. ad Origen in ep. ad Rom.*). According to Strauss, only the most prominent of the Twelve were known, while the others had places assigned them in conformity with the various traditions that prevailed.

is in vain to inquire how this twofold appellation has arisen. The name *Thaddaeus*, however, is not "deflexio nominis Judae, ut rectius hic distingueretur ab Iscariota" (Lightfoot, Wetstein), but the independent name יִתְנָה, which is also currently used in the Talmud (Lightfoot, Schoettgen, Wetstein). There is the less reason to seek for an etymology of Θαδδ. such as will make the name almost synonymous with Λεββ., as if from מֶמֶ (which, however, signifies *mamma*), or even from יְשׁ, one of the names of God, and meaning *potens* (Ebrard). For the apocryphal but ancient Acts of Lebbeus, see Tischendorf, *Acta ap. apocr.* p. 261 ff. According to these, he received the name Θαδδαῖος when John the Baptist baptized him, and was previously known by the name of *Lebbeus*. This is in accordance with the reading of the Received text in the case of the present passage, and with the designation in the *Constit. apost.*, Λεββαῖος ὁ ἐπικληθεὶς Θαδδαῖος, 6. 14. 1, 8. 25,—a circumstance which, at the same time, goes to show that the name of the apostle as given in Mark is to be preferred to that found in Matthew.

Ver. 4. Ὁ καναναῖος] see the critical remarks. Luke calls him ζηλωτής, the (quondam) *zealot*. Luke vi. 15; Acts i. 13; Chald. ܙܝܠܬܐ; Hebr. ܙܠܬ; Ex. xx. 5, xxxiv. 14; Deut. iv. 24. *Zealots* were a class of men who, like Phinehas (Num. xxv. 9), were fanatical defenders of the theocracy; and who, while taking vengeance on those who wronged it, were themselves frequently guilty of great excesses; Ewald, *Gesch. Chr.* p. 67 f. But the ὁ Καναναῖος (or Κανανίτης, according to the Received text) is not to be explained in this way, inasmuch as this form of the epithet is derived from the name of some *place* or other: the *Canaanite*, or *Cananaean*; comp. Κανανίτης in Strabo, xiv. 5, p. 674 (ἀπὸ κόμης τινος). It cannot be derived from the town of *Cana* in Galilee (Luther, Calovius); in that case it would require to have taken the form *Kanaῖος*, just as the inhabitants of *Κάναι* in Aeolis (Strabo, xiii. 1, p. 581) were called *Kanaῖοι* (Parmenides in *Athen.* 3, p. 76 A). This enigmatical name is to be explained from the fact that, in accordance with his previous character, Simon bore the surname ܙܝܠܬܐ, ζηλωτής, a name which was correctly interpreted

by Luke; but, according to another tradition, was erroneously derived from the *name of a place*, and accordingly came to be rendered *ὁ Καναναῖος*. — Ἰσκαριώτης] אִישׁ קָרְיֹוֹת, a native of Karioth, in the tribe of Judah. Josh. xv. 25; Joseph. *Antt.* vii. 6. 1: Ἰστοβος (אִישׁ טוֹב). There is no evidence that he was the *only one* that did not belong to Galilee (which has induced Ewald to think that the place in question is the town of קֶרְתָּה (Josh. xxi. 34) in the tribe of Zebulun. The proposal of Lightfoot, to derive either from ἀσκηροῦσα, *leather apron*, or from ἀσכρα, *strangulation*, is indeed recommended by de Wette; but like the interpretation אִישׁ שְׁקָרִים, *man of lies* (Paulus, Hengstenberg), it is not suited to the Greek form of the word; nor are de Wette's or Hengstenberg's objections to the ordinary explanation of the name to be regarded as unanswerable. — ὁ καὶ παραδούς αὐτόν] *who also delivered him over* (not *betrayed*, in which case we should have had προδούς). A tragic reminiscence, and ever present to the mind! Καί has the force of *qui idem*; Klotz, ad *Devar.* p. 636.

Vv. 5 ff. From this on to ver. 42 we have the instructions to the Twelve; comp. Mark vi. 8 ff., and especially Luke ix. 3 ff. As in the case of the Sermon on the Mount, so on this occasion also, Luke's parallels are irregular in their connection (in ch. ix. connected with the mission of the Twelve, in ch. x. with the mission of the Seventy). But this is only an additional reason (in answer to Sieffart, Holtzmann) why the preference as respects essential originality—a preference, however, which in no way excludes the idea of the proleptical interweaving of a few later pieces—should also in this instance be given to Matthew, inasmuch as the contents of the passage now before us are undoubtedly taken from his collection of our Lord's sayings. — The *mission itself*, to which Luke xx. 35 points back, and which for this very reason we should be the less inclined to regard as having taken place *repeatedly* (Weisse, Ewald), was intended as a preliminary experiment in the independent exercise of their calling. For *how long?* does not appear. Certainly not merely for one day (Wieseler), although not exactly for several months (Krafft). According to Mark vi. 7, they were sent out by *twos*, which, judging from Luke

x. 1, Matt. xxi. 1, is to be regarded as what originally took place. As to the *result*, Matthew gives nothing in the shape of an historical account.

Ver. 5. With the *Gentiles* (ὁδὸν ἐθνῶν, way leading to the Gentiles, Acts ii. 28, xvi. 17; Kühner, II. 1, p. 286) Jesus associates the *Samaritans*, on account of the hostility which prevailed between the Jews and the Samaritans. The latter had become intermixed during the exile with Gentile colonists, whom Shalmaneser had sent into the country (2 Kings xvii. 24), which caused the Jews who returned from the captivity to exclude them from any participation in their religious services. For this reason the Samaritans tried to prevent the rebuilding of the temple by bringing accusations against them before Cyrus. Upon this and upon disputed questions of a doctrinal and liturgical nature, the hatred referred to was founded. Sir. l. 25 ff.; Lightfoot, p. 327 f. In accordance with the divine plan of salvation (xv. 24), Jesus endeavours, above all, to secure that the gospel shall be preached, in the first instance, to the *Jews* (John iv. 22); so, with a view to the energies of the disciples being steadily directed to the *foremost* matter which would devolve upon them, He in the *meantime* debars them from entering the field of the Gentiles and Samaritans. This arrangement (if we except hints such as viii. 11, xxi. 43, xxii. 9, xxiv. 14) He allows to subsist till after His resurrection; then, and not till then, does He give to the ministry of the apostles that lofty character of a ministry for all men (Matt. xxviii. 19 f.; Acts i. 8), such as, from the first, He must have regarded His own to have been (v. 13). The fact that *Jesus Himself* taught in travelling through Samaria (John iv.), appears to be at variance with the injunction in our passage (Strauss); but this is one of those paradoxes in the Master's proceedings about which the disciples were not to be enlightened till some time afterwards. And what *He* could do, the *disciples* were not yet equal to, so that, in the first place, they were called upon only to undertake the lighter task.

Vv. 6, 7. Τὰ πρόβατα . . . Ἰσραήλ] the members of Israel, the family of Israel (Lev. x. 6; Ex. xix. 3), the theo-

stratic nation, who were alienated from the divine truth and the divine life, and so were found wandering in error, like sheep without a shepherd. Comp. xv. 24. And such sheep (ix. 36) were they *all*, seeing that they were without faith in Him, the heaven-sent Shepherd. For the figure generally, comp. Isa. liii. 6; Jer. l. 8; Ezek. xxxiv. 5. — Ver. 7. ἡγγικεν, κ.τ.λ.] being precisely the same terms as those in which Jesus Himself (iv. 17), and the Baptist before Him, had commenced their preaching (iii. 2).

Vv. 8, 9. Δωρεὰν . . . δότε] with reference to the *miraculous gifts* just mentioned, not to the *teaching*, for which, as a matter of course, nothing was to be asked in return except the bare necessities of life, ver. 10 (1 Cor. ix. 4 ff.). — ἐλάβετε] refers back to ver. 1. — μὴ κτήσησθε] *you must not provide for yourselves*. — The *girdle*, which holds together the loose upper robe, served the double purpose of keeping money as well, the different kinds of which are, in the order of their value, denoted by χρυσόν, ἄργυρον, χαλκόν. Rosenmüller, *Morgenl.* V. p. 53 f. Therefore εἰς τ. ζ. ὑ. : *in your girdles*, is depending on κτήσ.

Ver. 10. Μή] *sc.* κτήσησθε, with which εἰς ὁδόν is to be connected. Πῆρα, a bag slung over the shoulder, see Duncan, *Lex. Hom.* ed. Rost, *s.v.* — δύο χιτῶνας] *two under-garments*, either with a view to wear both at one time (Mark vi. 9), or only one while carrying the other with them in case of need. — ὑποδήματα] namely, for the requirements of the journey, besides the pair already in use. The question whether, as Lightfoot and Salmasius think, it is *shoes* in the strict sense of the word (ὑποδήματα κοῖλα, Becker, *Charicl.* p. 221) that are here meant, or whether it is ordinary *σανδάλια* (Mark vi. 9), is, judging from the usual Oriental mode of covering the feet, to be decided in favour of the sandals, which the Greeks also called by the same name as that in the text (Pollux, VII. 35 ff.). — μηδὲ ῥάβδον] nor a *staff* to carry in the hand for support and self-defence (Tob. v. 17), an unimportant variation from Mark vi. 8. — ἄξιος γὰρ, κ.τ.λ.] a general proposition, the application of which is of course evident enough. Free and unembarrassed by any ὑλικῆς φροντίδος, εἰς μόνην δὲ βλέ-

ποντες τὴν ἐγχειρισθεῖσαν αὐτοῖς διακονίαν (Euth. Zigabenus), such as is represented by the matters just specified, they are to rely upon God's care of them, who will cause them to realize in their own experience how true it is that the labourer is worthy of His support.

Ver. 11. "Ἀξίος] according to what follows: *worthy to provide you lodging at his house*, "ne praedicationis dignitas suscipientis infamia deturpetur," Jerome. Jesus forbids the apostles to indulge in a fickle and frequent shifting of their quarters as a thing unbecoming their office, and as calculated to interfere with the steady progress of their labours. And He directs them to go to private houses, not to the synagogues nor to the market-places, seeing that they were unaccustomed to making public appearances, but also out of regard to the importance of domestic efforts.

Ver. 12. Εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν] This does not mean the house *at which you arrive* (de Wette), but that *which belongs to him whom, on inquiry, you find to be worthy of you* (ver. 11), and where, if the owner is worthy, you are to stay until you remove to another locality. The article is definite as referring to *κάκεϊ*. — ἀσπάσασθε αὐτήν] Euth. Zigabenus: ἐπεύχεσθε εἰρήνην αὐτῇ, the usual form of salutation, ἡ δὲ δι᾽ ὧν, Gen. xl. 23; Judg. xix. 20; Luke x. 5.

Ver. 13. Ἀξία] not "*bonis votis, quae salute dicenda continerentur*" (Fritzsche), but, as in ver. 11, *worthy of your remaining in it*. It should be noticed that ἡ and μὴ ἡ are put first for sake of emphasis; and *should* the house *be* worthy, then come, and so on; but if it *is not* a worthy one, then, and so on. In this way the reference of ἄξιος remains unchanged. — ἐλθέτω] *shall come*, that is *my will*. — ἡ εἰρήνη ὑμῶν] *the blessings brought by you by way of salutation*. — πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐπιστραφήτω] Euth. Zigabenus: μηδὲν ἐνεργησάτω, ἀλλὰ ταύτην μεθ' ἑαυτῶν λαβόντες ἐξέλθετε. An expression which represents the idea to the senses. Isa. xlv. 23, lx. 11.

Ver. 14. Καὶ ὅς ἐάν, κ.τ.λ.] The nominative is a case of *anacoluthon*, and placed at the beginning, so as to be emphatic, as in vii. 24: *Whosoever will not have received you . . . as you quit that house or that town, shake, and so on*. — ἐξέρχεσθαι,

with a simple genitive (Acts xvi. 39); Kühner, II. 1, p. 346. The  $\epsilon\lambda\omega$ , which Lachmann, Tischendorf 8. insert (B D 8), is a gloss upon what is a rare construction in the New Testament. Notice the *present* participle, thereby meaning "upon the threshold," and relatively "at the gate." —  $\eta]$  *or*, should a whole town refuse to receive you and listen to you. The *shaking off the dust* is a sign of the merited *contempt* with which such people are reduced to the level of *Gentiles*, whose very dust is defiling. Lightfoot, p. 331 f.; *Mischna* Surenhusii, VI. p. 151; Wetstein on this passage; Acts xiii. 51, xviii. 6. This forcible meaning of the symbolical injunction is not to be weakened (Grotius, Bleek: "Nil nobis vobiscum ultra commercii est;" de Wette: "Have nothing further to do with them;" Ewald: "Calmly, as though nothing had happened"); on the contrary, it is strengthened by ver. 15. Comp. vii. 6.

Ver. 15.  $\Gamma\eta \Sigma\omicron\delta, \kappa\tau\lambda.$ ] *the land* (those who once inhabited the land) *where Sodom and Gomorrah stood*. The truth of this asseveration is founded on the principle in morals, that the more fully the will of God is proclaimed (Luke xii. 47; Matt. xi. 20 ff.), the greater the guilt of those who resist it. Notice how the resurrection of the wicked also is here assumed (John v. 29); observe likewise how Jesus' words bespeak the highest Messianic self-consciousness.

Ver. 16.  $\text{'}\text{Ι}\delta\omicron\upsilon]$  Introduces demonstratively the thought for which vv. 14, 15 have prepared the way. Such forms of address as  $\text{ἰ}\delta\omicron\upsilon$ ,  $\alpha\gamma\epsilon$ , etc., frequently occur in the *singular* in classical writers also, and that, too, where it is a question of plurality (xviii. 31, xxvi. 65; John i. 29; Acts xiii. 46); see Bremi, *ad Dem. Philipp.* I. 10, p. 119, Goth. —  $\epsilon\gamma\acute{\omega}$ ] here, as always, is *emphatic* (in answer to Fritzsche, de Wette, Bleek): *It is I* who send you into the midst of such dangers; conduct yourselves, then, in such circumstances in a manner becoming those who are *my* messengers; be wise as serpents, and so on. —  $\acute{\omega}\varsigma \pi\rho\acute{\omicron}\beta\alpha\tau\alpha \epsilon\nu \mu\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\varphi \lambda\acute{\upsilon}\kappa\omega\nu]$  *tanquam oves*, etc., *i.e.* so that, as my messengers, you will be in the position of sheep in the midst of wolves. Usually  $\epsilon\nu \mu\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\varphi \lambda\acute{\upsilon}\kappa.$  is made to depend on  $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\omega$ , in which case  $\epsilon\nu$ , in accordance with

its well-known pregnant force (Bernhardy, p. 208 f.), would not only express the direction of the verb, but also convey the idea of *continuing* in the position in question, while ὥς would have the meaning of *as*. This is harsh, inasmuch as the ἀποστέλλω, which occurs so often in the New Testament, is in no other instance (in Luke iv. 19 it is an *abstract* expression) used in such a local sense. Moreover, ἐν μέσῳ gives more striking prominence to the danger than the simple ἐν. — ἀκέραιος] Etym. M.: ὁ μὴ κεκραμένος κακοῖς, ἀλλ' ἀπλοῦς καὶ ἀποίκιλος. Comp. Rom. xvi. 19, Phil. ii. 15, common in classical authors; see Ruhnken, *ad Tim.* p. 18. In view of the dangerous circumstances in which they would be placed, Jesus asks of them to combine (a combination to be realized under the direction of the Holy Spirit, as in ver. 19) *prudence* (in the recognition of danger, in the choice of means for counteracting it, in regard to their demeanour in the midst of it, and so on) with *uprightness*, which shuns every impropriety into which one might be betrayed in the presence of the dangers referred to, and therefore refrains from thinking, choosing, or doing anything of a questionable nature in connection with them. For Rabbinical passages bearing on the wisdom of the serpent (Gen. iii. 1) and the innocence of the dove (Hos. vii. 11), see Schoettgen.—The loftiest example of this combination is *Jesus Himself*; while among the apostles, so far as we know them, the one who ranks highest in this respect is *Paul*.

Ver. 17. Δέ] denoting continuation of this same matter: "But in order to comply with this injunction (*usually* the wisdom alone is arbitrarily supposed to be referred to), *be on your guard*, and so on." The passage that now follows on to ver. 23 originally formed part (comp. Mark xiii. 9 ff.) of the eschatological utterances, but the connection in which it now stands was probably that in which it was already met with in the collection of our Lord's sayings. Comp. xxiv. 9–13; Luke xxi. 12 ff. Then again, taken in detail, the different portions of this address, as given by Matthew, possess the advantage of originality. Comp. Weizsäcker, p. 160 ff. — ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων] The article is not meant to indicate men who



are *hostile* (ver. 16, Erasmus, Fritzsche), who must have been indicated in some other way than by the *simple* article (by τῶν τοιούτων, or such like), or by the general expression ἀνθρώπων; but it is to be understood *generically*: *men in general, taken as a whole*, are conceived of as *hostile*, in accordance with the idea of that κόσμος to which the disciples do not belong (John xv. 19), and by which they are hated (John xvii. 14). — συνέδρια] taken generally, tribunals in general. — ἐν ταῖς συναγ.] That scourging also belonged to the synagogal forms of punishment, as a matter of synagogue discipline, is placed beyond a doubt by the New Testament. See, besides the Synoptists, Acts xxii. 19, xxvi. 11; 2 Cor. xi. 24. The evidence from Rabbinical literature is doubtful.

Ver. 18. Καὶ . . . δέ] *and . . . but* (always separated except in the epic poets), is of the nature of a climax, introducing still another circumstance, whereupon δέ follows this new and emphasized thought. Hartung, *Partikell.* I. p. 181 f.; Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 645; Baumlein, *Partik.* p. 148 f. — ἡγεμόνας] comprises the three kinds of provincial chief magistrates, *propraetors*, *proconsuls*, and *procurators*. Fischer, *de vit. Lex. N. T.* p. 432 ff. — εἰς μαρτύριον . . . ἔθνεσιν] *as a testimony to them and to the Gentiles*, i.e. those wrongs and that violent treatment have this as their object, *that* (through your confession and demeanour) *a testimony regarding me may be given to the Jews and the Gentiles*. Comp. viii. 4, xxi. 14. Let it be observed: (1) that it is arbitrary to refer εἰς μαρτύριον, as is usually done, merely to the last point, καὶ ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνας, etc., seeing that everything, in fact, from παραδώσουσι onwards, belongs to one category and has one common aim; (2) that αὐτοῖς, therefore, cannot point to the ἡγεμόνας and βασιλεῖς, to whom it is *commonly* referred (Baumgarten-Crusius, Bleek), though not in keeping with the distinction expressed by καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, for the truth is, the procurators and kings were *Gentiles* also; but that, as is at once suggested to the reader by this adding on of καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, it rather refers to the *Jews* (Maldonatus, Bengel, Lange, Hilgenfeld, Schegg, following Theophylact), who (αὐτῶν, ver. 17) are the active subjects of παραδώσουσι, μαστιγώσουσιν, and partly also of ἀχθήσθε;

(3) that, according to the context, τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, *to the Gentiles*, refers to the ἡγεμόνας and βασιλεῖς, and their Gentile environment; (4) and lastly, that the further reference of μαρτύριον is to be gathered from ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ: a testimony of me, regarding my person and work. The *dative case*, however, is that of *reference* as regards the μαρτύριον; to define more specifically would be an unwarrantable liberty. This is applicable to the view adopted since Chrysostom: εἰς ἔλεγχον αὐτῶν (Theophylact, Euth. Zigabenus, Erasmus, Beza, Maldonatus, Kuinoel), although this is *included* in that general reference.

Vv. 19, 20. But now, when the delivering of you up actually takes place, give yourselves no anxious concern, and so on. — ἡ τί] not καὶ τί, but the distinctive expression used renders more fully prominent the *two* elements, the *how* and the *what* (Dissen, *ad Dem. de cor.* p. 264), in which “*elegantior notatur cura*” (Bengel). The difficulty, first of all, is with regard to the πῶς; observe, however, that in the sequel only τί is used (“ubi τό quid obtigit, τό quomodo non deest,” Bengel). — δοθήσεται] not docebitur, but suggeretur, by God through the Holy Spirit, Isa. l. 4; Eph. vi. 19; 1 Cor. ii. 10 ff.; Luke xxi. 15.—Observe the difference between τί λαλήσητε and τί λαλήσετε (what you *ought* to speak, and what you will speak); and for this use of τί, see Bernhardt, p. 443. Kühner, II. 2, p. 1016. — οὐ . . . ἀλλά] In this *decided*, and not in any half and half way, does Jesus conceive of that relation, in virtue of which His disciples were to become πνευματικοῖς πνευματικὰ συγκρίνοντες (1 Cor. ii. 13). — ἐστέ] the *future* situation is thought of as *present*.

Ver. 21. Comp. Mic. vii. 6. — ἐπαναστήσ.] not merely before the judges, but generally. It is the expression in classical Greek for *rebellious* rising (ἐπανάστασις, 2 Kings iii. 4; Krüger, *ad Dion.* p. 55); in Greek authors usually with the *dative*, also with ἐπὶ τινι. — θανατώσουσιν] *take away life* (xxvi. 59), *i.e. bring about* their execution. A vivid expression. Comp. also xxvii. 1. The *reason* of this hostile treatment is self-evident, but may be further seen from ver. 22.

Ver. 22. Ὅτι πᾶντων] Popular way of expressing the

*universal* character of the hatred.—*διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου*] because you confess and preach it. Tertullian, *Apol.* 2: “Torquemur confitentes et punimur perseverantes et absolvimur negantes, quia *nominis* proelium est.”—*ὑπομείνας*] *whosoever will have persevered* in the confessing of my name. This is to be inferred from *διὰ τὰ ὄνομά μου*. Comp. note on xxiv. 13.—*εἰς τέλος*] *usque ad finem horum malorum* (Theophylact, Beza, Fritzsche). Others think that the end of *life* is meant, or (as also Bleek) mingle together a variety of references. Contrary to ver. 23.—*σώζεσθαι*] obtain the blessedness of the Messianic kingdom.

Ver. 23. *Ταύτη* and *τὴν ἄλλην* are to be understood *δεικτικῶς*. Jesus points with the finger in the direction of various towns. Your sphere is large enough to admit of your retreating before persecution in order to save others.—*γάρ*] A ground of encouragement for such perseverance.—*οὐ μὴ τελέσητε, κ.τ.λ.*] *You will not have completed your visits* to the towns of the people of Israel; *i.e.*, you will not have accomplished in all of them your mission, associated as it will be with such flights from town to town. Comp. the analogous use of *ἀνύειν* (Raphel, Krebs, Loesner, on this passage), *explere*, in Tibull. i. 4. 69 (Heyne, *Obs.* p. 47); *consummare*, in Flor. i. 18. 1 (see Ducker on the passage). The interpretation: *to bring to Christian perfection* (Maldonatus, Zeger, Jansen, following Hilary; Hofmann, *Weissag. u. Erfüll.* II. p. 267 f.), is an erroneous makeshift, by way of removing the second coming farther into the future. Observe that here, too, as in ver. 5, the apostolic ministry is still confined to Israel—*ἕως ἂν ἔλθῃ*] *until the Son of man will have come, i.e.* the Messiah, such as He has been promised in Daniel's vision (viii. 20), who will then put an end to your troubles, and receive you into the glory of His kingdom. Jesus means neither more nor less than His *second coming* (Matt. xxiv.), which He announces even at this early stage, and as being so near, that xxiv. 14, and even xvi. 28, are not to be reconciled with this view. Different elements of the tradition, which, in the course of experience, came to view the prospect as more remote,—a tradition, however, that was still the product of the existing *γενεά* (xxiv. 34, xiv. 28). The interpretations which explain

away the final coming, content themselves, some with the idea of a vague *coming after* or *coming to their help* (Chrysostom, Theophylact, Euth. Zigabenus, Beza, Kuinoel; even Origen and Theodoret, Heracleon in Cramer's *Cat.* p. 78); others with the *coming through the Holy Spirit* (Calvin, Grotius, Calovius, Bleek), or with supposing that the, as yet too remote, *destruction of Jerusalem* is referred to (Michaelis, Schott, Glöckler, Ebrard, Gess); and others, again, explaining it allegorically of the *victory of Christ's cause* (Baumgarten-Crusius). On the prediction of the second coming itself, see on ch. xxiv.

Ver. 24. Similarly, what follows from here on to the close consists of anticipations of later utterances. Comp. as far as ver. 33; Luke xii. 1 ff., and from ver. 34 onward; Luke xii. 49 ff.—Do not be surprised at such intimations beforehand of the sad troubles that await you; for (as the proverb has it) you need not expect a better fate than that which befalls your Lord and Master. Comp. John v. 20; Rabbinical passages in Schoettgen, p. 98.

Ver. 25. Ἀρκετὸν τῷ μαθητῇ, ἴνα, κ.τ.λ.] *It is enough for the disciple he should be as his Master, i.e. let him satisfy himself with being destined to share the same fate; a better he cannot claim.* For ἴνα, comp. John vi. 29 and the note upon it. — καὶ ὁ δούλος, κ.τ.λ.] by attraction for καὶ τῷ δούλῳ, ἴνα γένηται ὡς ὁ Κύρ. αὐτοῦ. Winer, p. 583 [E. T. 783]. — Βεελζεβούλ, name of the *devil*, which the majority of modern critics (Kuinoel, Fritzsche, de Wette, Bleek, Grimm) agree, with Lightfoot and Buxtorf, in deriving from בְּלִי and בָּזָז, *dominus stercoris*, an expression intended to designate with loathing the prince of all moral impurity. It is supposed, at the same time, that the name *Beelzebub*, the Philistine god of flies, by being changed into *Beelzebul* (*god of dung*), came to be employed, in a jocular way, as a name for the devil. See below on the reading Βεελζεβούβ. But, as against the meaning *god of dung*, there is (1) the form of the name itself, which, if derived from בְּלִי, should have been spelt Βεελξαβήλ, or Βεελζάβελ, according to the analogy of Ἰεξαβήλ (יְצָהבֵל), or Ἰεζάβελ (Rev. ii. 20). (2) The fact that Jesus' own designation of Himself as οἰκοδεσπότης is evidently chosen with reference

to the meaning of *Βεελζεβούλ*, as indeed is clear from *δεσπότης* = *לַעֲבָד*, and that, accordingly, the name *Βεελζεβούλ* must contain something corresponding to *οἶκος* as well. This being so, it is preferable to derive the word from *לַעֲבָד* and *בֵּית*, a *dwelling* (Gusset, Michaelis, Paulus, Jahn, Hitzig, *Philistæer*, p. 314; Hilgenfeld, Volkmar), according to which the devil, as lord of his domain, in which the evil spirits dwell, was called *Dominus domicilii* (but neither *tartari*, as Paulus, nor *domicilii coelestis*, as Hilgenfeld, Keim, suppose). Jesus was, in relation to His disciples (*τοὺς οἰκιακοὺς αὐτοῦ*), the *Herus domesticus*, *הֶרֶס לַעֲבָד* (Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* p. 333); but, in malicious jest, they applied to Him the corresponding name of the devil: *Herus domicilii*. Jerome wrote *Βεελζεβούβ*, from *בֵּית*, *musca*, i.e. *Dominus muscarum*. Such was the name given to a fortune-telling divinity of the Ekronites (2 Kings i. 2, 16), which during an illness was consulted by King Ahaziah, and to which, in connection with the very ancient heathen worship of flies, was ascribed the dominion over those insects, and which therefore was supposed, at the same time, to have the power of averting this scourge of the East. Plin. *N. H.* x. 28; Pausan. viii. 26, 27; Aelian. *H. A.* v. 17; Solin. *Polyh.* 1. But critical testimony most decidedly preponderates in favour of the reading *Βεελζεβούλ*, which might easily have been changed into *Βεελζεβούβ*, on account of what is found in 2 Kings i.; and the greater the correspondence between the meaning of the former name and that of *οἰκοδεσπότης*, it is also the more likely to be the correct form. — That the Jews really called Jesus *Βεελζεβούλ*, is not elsewhere stated in any of the Gospels, though from our present passage the fact cannot be doubted, while it is probably connected with the accusation in ix. 34, xii. 34, though going rather further.

Vv. 26, 27. *Οὖν*] inference from vv. 24, 25: since, from the relation in which, as my disciples, you stand to me as your Master, it cannot surprise you, but must only appear as a necessary participation in the same fate, if they persecute you.—The *γάρ* which follows, then, conjoins with the *μὴ φοβ. αὐτ.* a further *awakening consideration*—that, namely, which arises out of the *victorious publicity* which the gospel is destined

to attain; whereupon is added, in ver. 27, the exhortation—an exhortation in keeping with this divine destiny of the gospel—to labour boldly and fearlessly as preachers of that which He communicates to them in private intercourse. This addition is the more emphatic from there being no connecting particle to introduce it. The thought, “*elucescet tandem orbi vestra sinceritas*,” which *others* (Chrysostom, Theophylact, Theodore, Heracleon in Cramer’s *Cat.*, Erasmus, Grotius, Beza) have found in ver. 26, as well as the reference to the *judgment* (Hilgenfeld), are equally at variance with the context, as seen in ver. 27. For the figurative contrasting of *σκοτία* and *φῶς*, in the case of *λέγειν* and such like, comp. Soph. *Phil.* 578, and Wunder *in loc.*; for *εἰς τ. οὐς*, also a common expression among classical writers for what is told in *confidence*, see Valckenaer, *ad Eurip. Hipp.* 932.

Ver. 28. *Τὸν δυνάμενον . . . γέννην*] who is in a position to consign body and soul, at the day of judgment, to everlasting destruction in Gehenna. Comp. v. 29. It is *God* that is meant, and not the *devil* (Olshausen, Stier). Comp. Jas. iv. 12; Wisd. xvi. 13–15. — *φοβεῖσθαι ἀπό*, as a rendering of פִּיִּי, and expressing the idea of turning away from the object of fear, occurs often in the LXX. and Apocrypha; the only other instance in the New Testament is Luke xii. 4; not found in classical writers at all, though they use *φόβος ἀπό* (Xen. *Cyr.* iii. 3. 53; Polyb. ii. 35. 9, ii. 59. 8). — *μᾶλλον*] *potius*. Euth. Zigabenus: *φόβον οὖν ἀπόσασθε φόβῳ, τὸν τῶν ἀνθρώπων τῷ τοῦ θεοῦ*.

Ver. 26. Further encouragement by pointing to the providence of God. — *στρουθία*] The diminutive is used *advisedly*. Comp. Ps. xi. 1, lxxxiv. 3; Aristot. *H. An.* v. 2, ix. 7. Two *small sparrows* for a single *farthing*. The latter was one-tenth of a drachma, and subsequently it was still less. It is also used by Rabbinical writers to denote the smallest possible price of anything; Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* p. 175, Lightfoot, Schoettgen. — *καί*] is simply *and*, and placed first in the *answer*, which is, in fact, a continuation of the thought contained in the question. See Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* ii. 10. 2. — *ἓν*] a *single*. — *πεσεῖται ἐπὶ τ. γῆν*] not spoken of the

bird that is *caught* in the snare or gin (Irenaeus, Chrysostom, Euth. Zigabenus), but of that which has *dropped dead* from the sky or the branches. — *ἄνευ*] *independently of, without the interference*; the reading *ἄνευ τῆς βουλῆς τοῦ πατρ. ὑμ.* is an old and correct gloss. Comp. the classical expressions *ἄνευ θεοῦ, ἄτερ θεῶν*, and *sine Diis*, Isa. xxxvi. 10.

Ver. 30. *Ἰμῶν δέ*] Put first by way of emphasis. Euth. Zigabenus aptly observes: *ὑμεῖς δὲ τοσοῦτόν ἐστε τίμιοι, ὥστε καὶ πάσας ὑμῶν τρίχας ἡριθμημένας εἶναι παρὰ θεοῦ . . . καὶ λεπτομερῶς οἶδε πάντα τὰ καθ' ὑμᾶς*. Poetical expression for the *providentia specialissima*. Comp. Luke xxi. 18; Acts xxvii. 34; 1 Sam. xiv. 45; 2 Sam. xiv. 11; 1 Kings i. 52; Plato, *Legg.* x. p. 900 C.

Ver. 32 f. *Πᾶς οὖν, κ.τ.λ.*] Nominative, like ver. 14. — *ἐμοί*] is neither a Hebraism nor a Syriac mode of expression; nor does it stand for the dative of advantage; nor does it mean *through me* (Chrysostom); but the personal object of confession is conceived of as the one to *whom* the confession cleaves. Exactly as in Luke xii. 8. Similar to *ὁμνύειν ἐν*, v. 34.—In the apodosis, notice the order: *confess will I also him* (as really one of mine, and so on). — *ἐμπροσθεν . . . οὐρανοῖς*] namely, after my ascension to the glory of heaven as *σύνθρονος* of the Father, xxvi. 64; comp. Rev. iii. 5. — Vv. 32 and 33 contain, as an inference from all that has been said since ver. 16, a final observation in the form of a promise and a threatening, and expressed in so general a way that the disciples are left to make the special application for themselves.—The address, which is drawing to a close in ver. 33, pursues still further the same lofty tone, and that in vivid imagery, in ver. 34, so full is Jesus of the thought of the profound excitement which He feels He is destined to create.

Ver. 34. *Ἦλθον βαλεῖν*] The *telic* style of expression is not only rhetorical, indicating that the *result* is unavoidable, but what Jesus expresses is a *purpose*,—not the *final* design of His coming, but an *intermediate* purpose,—in seeing clearly presented to His view the reciprocally hostile excitement as a necessary transition, which **He** therefore, in keeping with His destiny as Messiah, must be sent first of all to bring forth. —

βαλεῖν] an instance of *zeugma*, in which the thought of a sword is the predominant one, after which the verb also spontaneously suggested itself for εἰρήνην, and all the more naturally the more sudden and powerful was to be the excitement of men's minds, which He, instead of a comfortable peace, was to bring about.

Vv. 35, 36. Comp. ver. 21. Involuntary recollection of Mic. vii. 6. Comp. also Sota xlix. 2, in Schoettgen. — ἡλθον γάρ] solemn repetition. — διχάσαι] *to separate* (Plat. Polit. p. 264 D), i.e. *to place a man in that attitude of party hostility* (δικοστοασία) toward his father which results in their separation, and so on. — νύμφη: *young wife* (common in classical writers), specially in the sense of *daughter-in-law* (in the LXX.). — καὶ ἐχθροὶ, κ.τ.λ.] *imminent, as if already present: and a man's enemies* (are) *the members of his own family!* ἐχθροί is a predicate.

Ver. 37. Demeanour in the midst of this excitement: the love of the family on no account to take precedence of love to Christ, but quite the reverse! The inalienable rights of family affection remain intact, but in subordination to the love of Christ, which determines how far it is of a truly moral nature. — μου ἄξιός] *worthy to belong to me as his Lord and Master.* Comp. Luke xiv. 26.

Ver. 38. *To take up his cross* means, *willingly to undergo the severe trials that fall to his lot* (2 Cor. i. 5; Phil. iii. 10). Figurative expression, borrowed from the practice according to which condemned criminals were compelled to take up their own cross and carry it to the place of execution; xxvii. 32; Luke xxiii. 26; John xix. 16; Artemid. ii. 56, p. 153; Plut. Mor. p. 554 A; Cic. de divin. i. 26; Valer. Max. xi. 7. The form of this expression, founded as it is upon the kind of death which Christ Himself was to die, is one of the indications of that later period from which the passage from ver. 24 onward has been transferred to its present connection. Matthew himself betrays the prolepsis in xvi. 24 f.; comp. Mark viii. 34; Luke xiv. 27. — ὀπίσω μου: in conformity with the Hebrew וַיִּסָּוּ. Comp., however, ἀκολ. κατόπιω τινός, Arist. Plut. xiii.

Ver. 39. Ψυχὴν and αὐτήν have no other meaning than that



of *soul* (ii. 20, vi. 25, ix. 28); but the *point* lies in the reference of the *finding* and *losing* not being the same in the first as in the second half of the verse. "Whoever will have *found* his soul (by a saving of his life in this world through denying me in those times when life is endangered), *will lose it* (namely, through the ἀπώλεια, vii. 13, the eternal death at the second coming; comp. Luke ix. 24 f.); and whoever will have *lost* his soul (through the loss of his life in this world in persecution, through an act of self-sacrifice), *will find it*" (at the resurrection to the eternal ζωή); σωθήσεται, ver. 22. For ἀπόλλ. ψυχῇν, comp. Eur. *Hec.* 21; *Anth. Pal.* vii. 272. 2. The *finding* in the *first* half, accordingly, denotes the saving of the ψυχῇ, when to all appearance hopelessly *endangered* from temporal death; while, in the *second*, it denotes the saving of the ψυχῇ after it has actually *succumbed* to death. The *former* is a finding that issues in eternal death; the *latter*, one that conducts to eternal life.

Vv. 40–42. Before concluding, the reassuring statement is added that: *In all such troubles you are to have the less hesitation in claiming to be entertained and supported by believers; the holier the deeds and the greater (in the Messianic kingdom) the reward of those will prove to be who so receive and maintain you.* Euth. Zigabenus appropriately observes: ταῦτα εἶπεν ἀνοίγων τοῖς μαθηταῖς τὰς οἰκίας τῶν πιστευόντων. Comp. with ver. 40, John xiii. 20; and with ver. 41 f., comp. Mark ix. 37, 41.

Ver. 41. A general expression, the special reference of which to the disciples is found in ver. 42. — εἰς ὄνομα] *from a regard to that which the name implies*, to the prophetic character; δι' αὐτὸ τὸ ὀνομάζεσθαι καὶ εἶναι, Euth. Zigabenus. In Rabbinical writers we find מִשְׁמָחָה. Schoettgen, p. 107; Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* p. 2431. Therefore; for the sake of the *cause* which stamps them with their distinguishing characteristics, for sake of the divine truth which the prophet interprets from the revelation that has been made to him, and for sake of the integrity which the δίκαιος exhibits in his life. — δίκαιον] *an upright man*, correct parallel to προφήτην. The apostles, however, belong to *both* categories, inasmuch as they receive and preach the revelation (προφήται) communicated

by God through Christ, and seeing that, through their faith in the Lord, they are characterized by true and holy righteousness of life (δίκαιοι).—The *reward* of a prophet and of a righteous man is *the same reward, which they will receive* (in the Messianic kingdom).

Ver. 42. "Ενα . . . τούτων] *a single one of these* (δεικτικῶς) *little ones*. According to the whole context, which has been depicting the despised and painful circumstances of the disciples, and is now addressing to them the necessary encouragement, it is to be regarded as *intentional and significant* that Jesus employs the term μικρῶν (not μαθητῶν), an expression which (in answer to Wetstein) is not usual among Rabbinical writers to convey the idea of disciples. Otherwise xviii. 6. — μόνον] *only*, connected with what precedes. — τὸν μισθὸν αὐτοῦ] *the reward awaiting him*, in the kingdom of the Messiah; v. 12. Grotius says correctly: "Docemur hic, facta ex animo, non animum ex factis apud Deum aestimari."

CHAPTER XL

VER. 2. *διὰ*] Elz. Griesb. Matthaei, Scholz: *δύο*, against B C\* D P Z Δ Σ, 33, 124, Syr. utr. Arm. Goth. Codd. of It. From Luke vii. 19. — Ver. 8. *ἱματίοις*] wanting in B D Z Σ, Vulg. Tert. Hil. al. Bracketed by Lachm., deleted by Tisch. Interpolation from Luke. — Ver. 9. *ἰδεῖν; προφήτην;*] Tisch.: *προφήτην ἰδεῖν;* (with mark of interrogation after ἐξήλθ.) So B Z Σ\*. The Received text, notwithstanding its preponderance of testimony, is a mechanical conformation to ver. 8 (comp. Luke). — Ver. 10. Lachm. has bracketed *γάρ* and *ἐγώ*. The former only has important testimony against it (B D Z Σ, Codd. of It. Syr<sup>cur</sup> Or.), is likewise deleted by Tisch., though it may easily have been omitted in consequence of a comparison with Luke vii. 27. — On far too inadequate testimony, Lachm. and Tisch. 7 have *καί* instead of *δε*. — Ver. 15. *ἀκούειν*] is not found in B D, 32. Here and in xiii. 9, 43, it is bracketed by Lachm. and correctly deleted by Tisch. Borrowed from Mark and Luke, where, in all the passages, *ἀκούειν* cannot be disputed. — Ver. 16 f. *παιδίοις ἐν ἀγοραῖς καθημένοις καὶ προσφωνοῦσι τοῖς ἑταίροις αὐτῶν καὶ λέγουσιν*] Rinck, *Lucubr. crit.* p. 257 f.; Lachm. and Tisch.: *παιδίους καθημένοις ἐν ἀγορᾷ* (Tisch. 7: *ἀγοραῖς*, Tisch. 8: *ταῖς ἀγορ.*) ἃ προσφωνοῦντα τοῖς ἑταίροις (Tisch.: *ἐτέροις*) λέγουσιν. On the strength of preponderating testimony this whole reading is to be preferred; it was partially altered in accordance with Luke vii. 32. But the balance of the testimony is decidedly in favour of substituting *ἐτέροις* for *ἑταίροις*; and the former is to be preferred all the more that, for exegetical reasons, it was much more natural to adopt the latter. Testimony is also decidedly in favour of *ἐν ἀγοραῖς*, and that without the article (which is found only in B Z Σ). — *ἐθρηνήσ. ὑμῶν*] Lachm. and Tisch. have merely *ἐθρηνήσ.*, according to B C D Z Σ, Curss. Verss. and Fathers. Correctly; *ὑμῶν* is inserted from what precedes. — Tisch. 8 has *ἔργων* instead of *τέκνων*, but only after B\* Σ, 124, Codd. in Jerome, and Verss. (also Syr.). An interpretation (*ἀ. τ. ἔργων τῶν υἱ. ἀ.*). — Ver. 23. *ἡ ἕως τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὑψωθείσα*] E F G S U V r π\*\*. Curss. Syr. p. Chrys.: *ἡ ὡς*

τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὑψώθης (approved by Griesb. and Rinck, also Tisch. 7, who, however, has correctly deleted τοῦ). But B C D\*\* K, 1, 22, 42, Copt. Aeth. Pers. Wh. Vulg. Corb. For. Ir. (comp. Colb. Germ.): μὴ ἕως οὐρανοῦ ὑψωθήσῃ. The reading of the Received text must be given up, then, on account of the external testimony, and either ἡ . . . ὑψώθης or μὴ . . . ὑψωθήσῃ is to be read. The former is to be preferred. The reading μὴ, etc., originated in the final syllable of Καπαρναούμ having been twice written by the copyist, which necessarily involved the change of ὑψώθης into ὑψωθήσῃ. The other variations arose out of a misunderstanding as to H. It was taken for the *article*, hence the reading in the Received text: ἡ . . . ὑψωθεῖσα. The interrogative reading, μὴ, etc. (Lachm. Tisch. 8), is foreign to the sense (*you will not be raised to heaven, surely?*), a reflection that is here out of place. — *καταβήσῃ*] Lachm. and Tisch. 7: *καταβήσῃ*, after B D, It. Vulg. Syr. al. Ir. Correctly; the reading of the Received text is from Luke x. 15, where the testimony in favour of *καταβήσῃ* is somewhat weaker.

Ver. 1. *Ἐκεῖθεν*] *from where* the sending out of the apostles took place. It is impossible to define the locality further; at all events *Capernaum* is not intended, but some open space (ix. 36) on the road, along which Jesus was at that time prosecuting His journey through Galilee (ix. 35). Whilst the Twelve were out on their missionary tour, Jesus continued His labours by Himself; and it was during this *interval* also that He was visited by the messengers from the Baptist. Where these latter happened to find Him, it is impossible to say. For the *return* of the Twelve, see note on ver. 25. — *αὐτῶν*] in the towns of those to whom He came (*the Galileans*). Comp. iv. 23, ix. 35, xii. 9. Fritzsche refers *αὐτῶν* to the apostles: *in which the apostles had already published the knowledge of the kingdom*. Incorrectly, for the *μετέβη, κ.τ.λ.*, follows at once and immediately upon the conclusion of the instructions to the Twelve.—On the following section, see Wieseler in the *Göttingen Vierteljahrschr.* 1845, p. 197 ff.; Gams, *Joh. d. T. im Gefängn.* 1853; Gademann, in *d. Luth. Zeitschr.* 1852, 4; Grote, *ibid.* 1857, 3, p. 518 ff. Comp. also *Erlang. Zeitschr.* 1857, p. 167 ff.; Keim, II. p. 355 ff.

Vv. 2 ff. Comp. Luke vii. 18 ff., where the account is in-

introduced somewhat earlier, and where nothing is said about the prison (but see Luke iii. 20). — ἀκούσας, κ.τ.λ.] Occasion of the message. See the note after ver. 5. — ἐν τῷ δεσμῳτ.] in the fortress of Machaerus. Joseph. *Antt.* xviii. 5. 2. See on xiv. 3. How John could hear anything of Jesus' works in prison was possible in various ways; most naturally it was through his *disciples*, with whom he was permitted to have intercourse. Luke vii. 18. — τὰ ἔργα] are the *deeds*, the first element in the ποιεῖν τε καὶ διδάσκειν (Acts i. 1). These were for the most part *miracles*, though there is no reason to suppose that they were exclusively so. See on John v. 36. — πέμψας] absolutely, Xen. *Anab.* vii. 1. 2; *Hell.* iii. 2. 9; Thuc. i. 91. 2; Bornem. *Schol. in Luc.* p. lxxv. The following διὰ τῶν μαθητ. αὐτοῦ belongs to εἶπεν αὐτῷ, not to πέμψας (de Wette), because this latter connection would involve the supposition of a Hebraism, יְהִי עִמָּךְ, 1 Sam. xvi. 20, 1 Kings ii. 25, Ex. iv. 13, which is in itself unnecessary.

Ver. 3. Σὺ] Placed first for sake of emphasis. Comp. ἔτερον. — ὁ ἐρχόμενος] *He who is coming* (Heb. x. 37), i.e. the *Messiah*, who, because His advent, as being certain and near, was the object of universal expectation, is called, κατ' ἐξοχήν, the *coming one* (מָשִׁיחַ), perhaps in accordance with Ps. xl. 8. Olshausen, Hilgenfeld, Keim, suggest Ps. cxviii. 26; Hengstenberg suggests Mal. iii. 1; Hitzig, Dan. ix. 26. — ἔτερον] so that thou too wouldst, in that case, be only a forerunner. — προσδοκῶμεν] may be *conjunctive* (as commonly preferred) or *indicative* (Vulg. Erasmus, Beza, Calvin, Fritzsche). The idea of *deliberation* is, for psychological reasons, more appropriate. The *we* in the question is the expression of the *popular* expectation.

Vv. 5, 6. In words that seem an *echo* of Isa. xxxv. 5 f, 8, lxi. 1 ff, though, in accordance with existing circumstances, embracing some *additional* matters, Jesus draws His answer clearly and decidedly from the well-known *facts of His ministry*, which prove Him to be the ἐρχόμενος foretold in prophecy. Comp. Luke iv. 18. The words of the answer form a *resumé* of cases such as those in viii. 2, ix. 1, 23, 27, 32; therefore they cannot have been intended to be taken in

the sense of *spiritual redemption*, which Jesus might lay claim to as regards His works (in answer to de Wette, Keim, Wittichen); comp. Schweizer in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1836, p. 106 ff.; Weiss, *bibl. Theol.*, ed. 2, p. 48; Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 181. — *πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελ.*] well-known passive construction, as in Heb. iv. 2, 6; Gal. ii. 7; Rom. iii. 2; Heb. xi. 2; Bernhardt, p. 341 f. — *πτωχοί*] are the *poor*, the miserable, the friendless, the oppressed and helpless multitude (comp. on v. 3), elsewhere compared to sheep without a shepherd (ix. 36), and likened a little further on to a bruised reed and smoking flax (xii. 20). Such people crowded about our Lord, who proclaimed to them the Messianic deliverance. And this deliverance they actually obtained when, as *πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι*, v. 3, they surrendered themselves to His word under a deep heartfelt consciousness of their need of help. — *σκανδαλ. ἐν ἐμοί*] *will have been offended in me*, so as to have come to entertain false views concerning me, so as to have ceased to believe in me, to have come to distrust me; xiii. 57, xxvi. 31, 33; comp. on v. 29.

REMARK.—Judging from John's question, ver. 2, and Jesus' reply, ver. 6, it is neither unwarrantable nor, as far as can be seen, incompatible with the evangelic narrative, to assume that nothing else is meant than *that John was really in doubt as to the personal Messiahship of Jesus and the nature of that Messiahship altogether*,—a doubt, however, which, after the honourable testimony of Jesus, ver. 7 ff., cannot be regarded as showing a want of spirituality, nor as inconsistent with the standpoint and character of one whom God had sent as the forerunner, and who had been favoured with a divine revelation, but only as a temporary eclipse of his settled conviction, which, owing to human infirmity, had yielded to the influence of despondency. This condition is so explicable psychologically from the popular nature of the form which he expected the Messianic kingdom to assume on the one hand, as well as from his imprisonment on the other, coupled with the absence of any interposition in his favour on the part of Him who, as Messiah in the Baptist's sense, should have given things a totally different turn by manifesting Himself in some sudden, overwhelming, and glorious crisis, and so analogous to undoubted examples of the same thing in other holy men (Moses,

Elias), that there is no foundation for the view that, because of this question of the Baptist (which Strauss even regards as an expression of the first *beginnings* of his faith), the evangelic accounts of his earlier relation to Jesus are to be regarded as overdrawn (on the other hand, Wieseler, *l.c.* p. 203 ff.),—a view which seems to be shared by Weizsäcker, p. 320, and Schenkel. Actual doubt was the *cause* of the question, and furnished the *occasion* for informing him about the works of Jesus, which, as characteristic marks of the Messiah, formed again a counterpoise to his doubts, and so awoke an internal conflict in which the desire to call upon Jesus finally to declare Himself was extremely natural; and, accordingly, there is no reason for Strauss' wonder that, ere this, *ὅτι ἀκούσας* has not been substituted in ver. 2 as a likely reading instead of *ἀκούσας*. From all this, and without importing any subjective element into the accounts, it is to be considered as settled that the Baptist's question proceeded from real doubt as to whether Jesus was the *ἐρχόμενος*, yea or nay; nor is it for a moment to be limited (Paulus, Olshausen, Neander, Fleck, Kuhn, Ebrard, de Wette, Wieseler, Döllinger, and several others; comp. also Hofmann, *Weissag. u. Erf.* II. p. 75; Lichtenstein, *L. J.* p. 256; Hausrath, *Zeitgesch.* I. p. 338; Gess, *Chr. Pers. u. Werk*, I. p. 352) to doubts regarding the *true nature of the Messiah's manifestation and works*; but still less is the whole narrative to be explained by supposing, in accordance with the time-honoured exegetical tradition, that John sent the message *for the benefit of his own disciples*, to confirm in *them* a belief in Jesus as the Messiah (Origen in Cramer's *Catena*, Chrysostom, Augustine, Jerome, Hilary, Theophylact, Euth. Zigabenus, Münster, Luther, Calvin, Beza, Melancthon, Clarius, Zeger, Jansen, Maldonatus, Grotius, Calovius, Bengel), or by seeing in it an expression of *impatience, and an indirect challenge to the Messiah to establish His kingdom without delay* (Lightfoot, Michaelis, Schuster in Eichhorn's *Bibl.* XI. p. 1001 ff.; Leopold, *Joh. d. Täufl.* 1825, p. 96; Kuinoel, Fritzsche, Hase). The correct view was substantially given by so early a writer as Tertullian, and subsequently by Wetstein, Thies, J. E. Ch. Schmidt, Ammon, Löffler, *kl. Schriften*, II. p. 150 ff.; Neander, Krabbe, Bleek, Riggenbach, and several others; comp. also Ewald, *Gesch. Chr.* p. 420, who, however, supposes at the same time that the disciples of John may have been urging him to tell them plainly whether they ought to transfer their allegiance to Jesus or not; similarly Keim, who thinks that John, though hesitating between the alternative: He is the Messiah and He is not

so, was nevertheless more disposed in favour of the affirmative view; so also Schmidt in the *Jahrb. f. D. Th.* 1869, p. 638 ff., who notices the way in which, as he supposes, the Baptist belies his former testimony regarding Christ.

Ver. 7. The answer to John's question has been given; the disciples are withdrawing; but just as they are going away (*πορευομένων*) Jesus turns to the multitude that was present, and with some emotion proceeds to set forth to them, in the plainest way possible, the sacred character and the whole position of the Baptist, and by this means seeks to anticipate or correct any false opinion that might be formed regarding him.—The mark of interrogation should be placed after *θεάσασθαι* (in answer to Paulus and Fritzsche, who put it even after *ἔρημον*); according to the correct reading (see the critical remarks), the animated style of the passage does not change till ver. 9, so that *ἀλλὰ τί ἐξήλθετε* forms a question by itself. — *ἐξήλθετε*] at the time that John appeared in the wilderness. Observe that here stands *θεάσασθαι*, *to behold*, and immediately after the simple *ιδεῖν*, *to see*. The more earnest expression is in keeping with the *first* question. — *κάλ. σαλ.*] *figuratively*, in allusion to the reed growing on the bank of Jordan, and meaning: *a fickle and irresolute man*. Others (Beza, Grotius, Wetstein, Gratz, Fritzsche, de Wette) understand it *literally*: “non credibile est, vos coivisse, ut arundines vento agitatae videretis.” This is not in keeping with the qualifying expression, *ὑπὸ ἀνέμου σαλευόμενον*. And how meaningless the question would be alongside the parallels in vv. 8, 9! Comp. 1 Kings xiv. 15; Ezek. xxix. 6.

Vv. 8, 9. *Ἀλλὰ*] *no, on the contrary*; it is assumed that what has just been asked was not the intention; Hartung, *Partikell.* II. p. 38. Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 13. It seems, from the fact of his sending those messengers, as if John were (1) a man of hesitating, unstable character, ver. 7; or (2) a voluptuary, whose sole concern was how to exchange his condition of hardship for one of luxurious ease, ver. 8. Jesus removes any *impression* of this sort by appealing to His hearers to consult *their own hearts* as to what they had *expected*, and what they had *found* in John. Certainly they had expected neither



a man of fickle mind, nor a voluptuary; but what they had looked for, that they had found in him, namely a prophet (xxi. 26), indeed more than a prophet! Accordingly, there is no apparent reason for regarding (Oppenrieder, *Zeitschr. f. luth. Theologie*, 1856) the clauses containing a statement of the *intention* as the rhetorical expression of the *result* (as if the words were τί ἐξελθόντες εἰς τὴν ἔρ. ἐθεάσασθε). But even to find in the negative questions an *ironical allusion to the character of the Galileans* (Keim), is foreign to the connection, especially as the real motive is given in the third of these questions.—Ver. 9. *ναί* confirms the *προφήτην ἰδεῖν* which has just been asked (see the critical remarks), and that in accordance with its *result*: “*Certainly, I tell you* (you saw a prophet), *and more.*” *περισσότερον* is regarded by Erasmus and Fritzsche as *masculine* (Symmachus, Gen. xlix. 3: οὐκ ἔση περισσότερος, *excellenter*). Nowhere, however, in the New Testament does the simple *περισσότερος* occur as *masculine*, and in this instance the interrogative τί tells in favour of its being taken as *neuter*. Comp. xii. 41 f. Therefore to be rendered: *something more* (Vulgate: *plus*) *than a prophet*,—inasmuch, that is, as he is not only the last and greatest of the prophets, but also because he was sent by God *to prepare the way of the Messiah* through the preaching and baptism of repentance, ver. 10. In a different sense, viz. as the source, the aim, and the fulfiller of all prophecy, is *Christ* more than a prophet. Comp. Kleinschmidt, *d. typolog. Citate d. vier Evang.* p. 45.

Ver. 10 is not an interpolation by the evangelist (Weizsäcker); on the contrary, it forms the connecting link between vv. 9 and 11. The passage is Mal. iii. 1, and is a free rendering of the Hebrew and not from the LXX. In Malachi, Jehovah speaks of His messenger going before *Himself*; here, He addresses the *Messiah*; before *Him* will He send the messenger (not an *angel*). A free application without any substantial change in the contents of the passage, also without any special design in view; comp. remark on iii. 3.

Ver. 11. Ἐν γένν. γυν.] *among those born of woman*. Intended to denote the category of *men* according to that nature which is peculiar to the whole race in virtue of its

origin (mortality, weakness, sinfulness, and so on). Sir. x. 18. Comp. *לֵבִי אֶפְסָה*, Job xiv. 1, xv. 14, xxv. 4; see also on Gal. iv. 4. For *ἐγγήγερται* (by God), comp. Luke vii. 16; John vii. 52; Acts xiii. 22 f. — *μεῖζων*] *a greater, one more distinguished generally*, and that just because he is this promised herald of God who was to precede the Messiah. The words do not warrant our interpreting them to mean: *a greater prophet*, as has been done by Rosenmüller, Kuinoel, and the older critics. — *ὁ δὲ μικρότερος, κ.τ.λ.*] *he, however, who is less in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he*. It is to be observed, (1) that neither here nor elsewhere does the comparative stand for the superlative; (2) that, according to the context, the reference of the comparative (see *μεῖζων Ἰωάννου*, and afterwards *μεῖζων αὐτοῦ*) need not be looked for elsewhere but in *Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ*;<sup>1</sup> (3) that, since *ὁ μικρότερος* cannot refer to Jesus, it is (xviii. 1, 4) necessarily limited and defined by *ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν*, with which it has been connected by Isidore, Cyril, Theodoret, Heracleon (see Cramer, *Cat.* p. 85). Hence it is to be explained thus: *But he who stands lower in the kingdom of the Messiah, stands (according to the divine standard) higher than he*. Not as if John would be *excluded* (as against this, see x. 41) from the kingdom of Messiah that was about to be established, but the standpoint of those who share in the kingdom is compared with the high position which, as still belonging to the ancient theocracy, the Baptist occupies in the *αἰὼν οὗτος*. There he is the *greatest of all*; yet he who is *lower* in the approaching kingdom of the

<sup>1</sup> Therefore not: *less than the others who participate in the kingdom*, as it has been commonly understood of late (Winer, Buttmann, Bleek, Weizsäcker, Keim), according to which view the superlative sense is developed, as in xviii. 1; Luke xxii. 24. So Bengel also: "minimus in regno coelorum est minimus civium regni." Keim sarcastically observes that, according to the view I have given above, John "would still occupy a subordinate place even in heaven," and I confess that I am at a loss to comprehend how one can understand ver. 11 in such a way as to *exclude* (so also Schenkel) the Baptist from the kingdom of heaven, in which, however, the patriarchs and prophets find a place. Where is the Baptist's place to be? Outside the kingdom is *τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώσπον*, viii. 12. And outside the church, if this be understood (though erroneously) as what is meant by the kingdom, is the *κόσμος* of unbelievers. This also in answer to Weizsäcker, p. 411 f.; Weissenbach, p. 31 f.; Weiss.

Messiah, and can by no means compare himself with the eminent personage in question, is, nevertheless, *greater* than he. Thus the *βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν*, raised above the Old Testament order of things, simply appears as the state of *perfection* towards which the theocracy, ending with John, its foremost representative, is only the *first step*. Others (Chrysostom, Hilary, Theophylact, Euth. Zigabenus, Erasmus, Luther, Melancthon, Osiander, Jansen, Corn. a Lapide, Calovius, Fritzsche, Fleck, *de regno div.* p. 83) interpret: *he who, as compared with him, retires into the shade* (Jesus, *μικρότερος κατὰ τὴν ἡλικίαν καὶ κατὰ τὴν πολλῶν δόξαν*, Chrysostom) *will, as Messiah, outshine him in the kingdom of heaven*. These expositors have rightly understood the comparative *μικρότερος* as comparing some one with the Baptist; but how extremely improbable that Jesus, conscious as He was of a Messiahship that had been divinely confirmed at His baptism, and with the multitudes flocking around Him, would have spoken of Himself as *μικρότερος* than John the prisoner! And is it not utterly foreign to the context to suppose that He would here have compared *Himself* with the Baptist? Finally, were the *ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν*, again (referred to what follows), only an awkward toning down of the *sharp* character of the statement, it would have been far more sensible (since Jesus would mean *Himself as the Messiah*, whose greatness in the *Messianic kingdom* is a matter of course) if He had merely said *with regard to Himself*: *ὁ δὲ μικρότερος μείζων αὐτοῦ ἐστίν*.

Ver. 12. After the remark in passing that *ὁ δὲ μικρότερος*, etc., Jesus now continues His testimony regarding John, and, in order to prove what He had just said of him in vv. 10, 11, He calls attention to *the powerful movement in favour of the Messiah's kingdom which had taken place since the commencement of the Baptist's ministry*. — *ἀπὸ τῶν ἡμερ. Ἰωάνν.*] This is not the language of one belonging to a later period, but only such as Jesus could have used at this juncture; for the days when John laboured and flourished were gone by! This in answer to Gfrörer, *heil. Sage*, II. p. 92, and Hilgenfeld. — *βιάζεται*] Hesychius: *βιαίως κρατεῖται*—*it is taken possession of by force, is conquered* (not *magna vi prae-*

*dicatur*, according to the idea imported into the words by Loesner and Fritzsche); Xen. *H. G.* v. 2. 15: πόλεις . . . τὰς βεβιασμένους; Thuc. iv. 10. 5: βιάζοιτο, *it would be forced*; Dem. 84. 24; Zosimus, v. 29; 2 Macc. xiv. 41; Elwert, *Quaestion. ad philol. sacr. N. T.*, 1860, p. 19, who, however, would take the present indicative as meaning *vult expugnari*, which is not required by the context. In this way is described that eager, irresistible striving and struggling after the approaching Messianic kingdom (Chrysostom: πάντες οἱ μετὰ σπουδῆς προσιόντες) which has prevailed since the Baptist began to preach; it is as though it were being *taken by storm*. Comp. the neuter usage in Luke xvi. 16: πᾶς εἰς αὐτὴν βιάζεται; and further, Xen. *Cyr.* iii. 3. 69: βιάσαιντο εἰσω; likewise Thuc. i. 63, vii. 69; Ael. *V. H.* xiii. 32; Herodian, vii. 10. 13; Polyb. i. 74. 5, ii. 67. 2, iv. 71. 5. If *others* have adopted the idea of a *hostile* violence with which the Messianic kingdom is *persecuted* (Lightfoot, Schneckenburger, *Beitr.* p. 49), or violently (Hilgenfeld) crushed and arrested (by the Pharisees and scribes), their view is partly an anachronism, and partly forbidden by the connection with ver. 13 and with what goes before. Finally, to take the verb in a *middle* sense, and as describing the *breaking in* of the kingdom which makes its way in spite of all resistance (Melanchthon, Bengel, Baur, Zyro in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1860, p. 401), is certainly not contrary to usage (Dem. 779. 2; Lucian, *Herm.* 70), but inconsistent with the context in which βιασταὶ follows. — καὶ βιασταὶ ἀρπάζουσιν αὐτήν] *and those who use violent efforts drag it to themselves*. The anarthrous βιασταὶ is not intended to be emphatic; such is now the character of the times, *that those of whom the βιάζεται holds true* achieve a speedy success, in that, while they press forward to join the ranks of my followers, they clutch at the approaching kingdom as though they were seizing spoils, and make it their own. So eager and energetic (no longer calm and expectant) is the interest in regard to the kingdom. The βιασταὶ are, accordingly, *believers struggling hard* for its possession. Jesus Himself (this in answer to Zyro) cannot be included among those who are here in view. Those who interpret βιάζεται in a hostile sense, render

*ἀρπαζουσιν*: they snatch it away from men (according to Schneckenburger, they bar the way to it), in allusion to the conduct of the scribes and Pharisees. For *βιαστής*, comp. Pind. *Ol.* ix. 114; *Pyth.* i. 18. 82, iv. 420, vi. 28; *Nem.* ix. 122; Duncan, *Lex.*, ed. Rost, p. 209. In Pindar also it is always used in a good sense. For *ἀρπάξ*, comp. Xen. *Anab.* iv. 6. 11, vi. 5. 18; Herodian, ii. 6. 10, ii. 3. 23.

Vv. 13, 14 are by way of showing how it happens that, since the commencement of the Baptist's ministry, the Messiah's kingdom has been the object toward which such a violent movement has been directed. All the prophets, and even the law, have prophesied up till John's time; John was the *terminus ad quem* of the period of prophecy which he brought to a close, and he who forms the termination of this epoch then steps upon the scene as the immediate forerunner of the Messiah—as the *Elias* who was to come. Accordingly, that new violent stirring of life among the people must be connected with this manifestation of *Elias*. Others interpret differently, while Bleek and Holtzmann are even inclined to suppose that originally ver. 13 was uttered before ver. 12. — *καὶ ὁ νόμος*] for even with this the era of prophecy began, John v. 46; Acts vii. 37; Rom. x. 6, xi. 19; although prophecy was not the principal function of the law, for which reason the prophets are here mentioned first. Different in v. 17. — *εἰ θέλετε δέξασθαι*] if you—and on this it depends whether by you also he is taken for what he is—will not reject this assurance (see on 1 Cor. ii. 14), but are disposed to receive it with a view to fuller consideration. The reason for interposing this remark is to be found in the fact that the unhappy circumstances in which John was then placed appeared to be inconsistent with such a view of his mission. — *αὐτός*] no other than He. — *Ἡλίας*] in accordance with Mal. iii. 23 (iv. 5), on which the Jews founded the expectation that *Elias*, who had been taken up into heaven, would appear again in bodily form and introduce the Messiah (Wetstein on this passage; Lightfoot on xvii. 10; Schoettgen, p. 148),—an expectation which Jesus regarded as veritably fulfilled in the person and work of the Baptist; in him, according to the ideal

meaning of the prophecy, he saw the promised Elias; comp. Luke i. 17. — ὁ μέλλων ἔρχεσθαι] the usual predicate. Bengel: "sermo est tanquam e prospectu testamenti veteris in novum."

Ver. 15. A request to give due attention to this important statement in ver. 14. Comp. xiii. 9; Mark iv. 9; Luke viii. 8; Ezek. iii. 27; Hom. *Il.* xv. 129.

Vv. 16 ff. After this high testimony respecting the *Baptist*, we have now a painful charge against the *men of his time*, whom, in fact, neither John nor Himself is able to satisfy. In expressive, appropriate, and certainly original terms (in answer to Hilgenfeld), He compares the existing generation to children reproaching their playfellows for not being inclined to chime in either with their merry or their lugubrious strains. *Usually* the *Jews* are supposed to be represented by those refractory playmates, so that *Jesus and John* have necessarily to be understood as corresponding to the children who play the cheerful music, and who mourn (Fritzsche, Oppenrieder, Köster in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1862, p. 346 f.). But (1) the words expressly intimate that the children with their music and lamentation represented the *γενεά*, to which John and Jesus *stand opposed*, so that the latter must therefore correspond to the *ἑτέροις* who are reproached by the *παιδιά*. (2) If the arrangement of the passage is not to be arbitrarily disturbed, the thrice repeated *λέγουσιν* must be held to prove that, since those who speak in vv. 18, 19 are *Jews*, it is to *these* also that the children correspond who are introduced as speaking in ver. 16. (3) If we were to suppose that Jesus and John were represented by those children, then, according to vv. 18 and 19, it would be necessary to reverse the order of the words in ver. 17, so as to run thus: *ἐθρηνήσαμεν ὑμῖν . . . ὑψήσαμεν*, etc. Consequently the ordinary explanation of the illustration is wrong. The correct interpretation is this: *the παιδιά are the Jews; the ἑτεροι are John and Jesus*; first came John, who was far too rigid an ascetic to suit the tastes of the free-living Jews (John v. 35); then came Jesus, and He, again, did not come up to their ascetic and hierarchical standard, and was too lax, in their opinion. The former did

not dance to their music; the latter did not respond to their lamentation (similarly de Wette with a slight deviation, Ewald, Bleek, Keim). — *παιδίοις, κ.τ.λ.*] The allusion is to children who in their play (according to Ewald, it was playing at a *riddle*) imitate the way in which grown-up people give expression to their joy and their sorrow; Rosenmüller, *Morgenl. in loco*. — The *flute was played* at weddings and dancings. — *ἐκόψασθε*] beating upon the breast was the ordinary indication of *grief*; Ezek. xx. 43; Nah. ii. 8; Matt. xxiv. 30; Luke xviii. 13; Hom. *Il.* xviii. 31; Plat. *Phaed.* p. 60 A, *al.*; Herod. vi. 58; Diod. Sic. i. 44; Köster, *Erläut.* p. 92 f. — *τοῖς ἑτέροις*] the *other* children present, who are not among the number of their playmates.

Vv. 18, 19. *Μήτε ἐσθίων μήτε πίνων*] hyperbolical; ἡ μὲν Ἰωάννου δίαίτα δυσπρόσιτος καὶ τραχεία, Euth. Zigenbenus. Comp. iii. 4; Luke i. 15; Dan. x. 3. In contrast to the liberal principles of Jesus, who *ate and drank* without imposing upon Himself Nazarite abstinences (like John) or regular fastings (ix. 14), or without declining (like the Pharisees) to go to entertainments provided by those in a different rank of life from His own. — *δαιμόνιον ἔχει*] which, through perverting His judgment, leads Him into those ascetic eccentricities; comp. John x. 20. — *φαγός*] *glutton*, is a word belonging to a very late period. See Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 434; on the accent, Lipsius, *gramm. Unters.* p. 28. — *καὶ ἐδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς*] not a continuation of the words of the *Jews*, in which case *ἐδικαιώθη* would have to be taken ironically (in answer to Bornemann), but the closing observation of Jesus in reference to the perverse manner in which His own claims and those of John had been treated by the Jews; *and justified* (*i.e.* shown to be the *true wisdom*) *has been the wisdom* (the divine wisdom which has been displayed in John and me) *on the part of her children, i.e.* on the part of those who reverence and obey her (Sir. iv. 11), who, through their having embraced her and followed her guidance, have proved how unwarranted are those judgments of the *profanum vulgus*; comp. Luke vii. 29. *The* (actual) *confirmation has come to wisdom from those devoted to her* (*ἀπό*, comp. on Acts

ii. 22; Hermann, *ad Soph. El.* 65; Kühner, *ad Xen. Anab.* vi. 5. 18; not ὑπό). Those disciples of wisdom are the same who in ver. 12 are said βιάζειν τὴν βασιλείαν; but the καί which introduces the passage "cum vi pronuntiandum est, ut saepe in sententiis oppositionem continentibus, ubi frustra fuere, qui καίτοι requirerent," Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Apol.* p. 29 B. Such a use of καί occurs with special frequency in John. Wolf, *ad Lept.* p. 238; Hartung, *Partikell.* I. p. 147. This view is in the main that of (though in some cases the τέκνα τῆς σοφίας has been too much limited by being understood as referring merely to the disciples of Jesus) Jerome ("ego, qui sum Dei virtus et sapientia Dei, juste fecisse ab apostolis meis filiis comprobatus sum"), Münster, Beza, Vatablus, Calovius, Hammond, Jansen, Fritzsche, Olshausen, de Wette, Ebrard, Bleek, Lange, Hofmann, Keim, Weiss. Yet many, while also retaining the meaning given above, take the aorist, though without any warrant from the text, or any example of it in the New Testament, in the sense of *cherishing* (see Kühner, II. 1, p. 139; Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* I. p. 305), as Kuinoel ("sapientia non nisi a sapientiae cultoribus et amicis probatur et laudatur, reliqui homines eam rident," etc.). Chrysostom, Theophylact, and Castalio understand the words as expressing the thought that *the wisdom manifested in Jesus has nothing to answer for with regard to the Jews* (similarly Weizsäcker); a view to which it may be objected—first, that δικαιώσθαι ἀπό τινος cannot be taken in the sense of *to be free from the guilt of any one* (δικ. ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας τινός; comp. Sir. xxvi. 29; Rom. vi. 7); and secondly, that the *Jews*, unless something in the context should specially suggest or lead to it, cannot straightway be spoken of as the children of wisdom. The latter objection is equally applicable to the explanation of Schneckenburger: *and so wisdom* (which is supposed to mean *God's care for His people*; comp. also Euth. Zigabenus and Grotius) *has been treated cavalierly* (has been arrogantly condemned) *by her own children*, which, moreover, is precluded by the fact that δικαιώσθαι is never used in this sense in the New Testament. Oppenrieder, p. 441 f., likewise understands the children of wisdom to refer to the *Jews*, inasmuch, that is, as they were subjected to the



discipline of divine wisdom. The doings of σοφία were demonstrated to be righteous by the *conduct* of the Jews; that is to say, they had desired, instead of John, a divine messenger of a less ascetic character (and him the divine wisdom sent them in the person of Christ); while, on the other hand, instead of Christ, with His freer manner of life, they desired one more rigorously disposed (and this wish the divine wisdom had gratified by giving them the Baptist). So far Schneckenburger. But this conduct of the Jews was capricious and wilful, and was ill calculated to display the justice of the divine dealings, which it could have done only if it had been supposed to proceed from a feeling of real moral need, for which, however, in vv. 16-19, Jesus shows Himself by no means inclined to give them credit. Besides, one is at a loss to see, even if this view were adopted, how the Jews with their *foolish* and *obstinate* behaviour should come to be called τέκνα τῆς σοφίας. According to Ewald (*Gesch. Chr.* p. 432), Jesus means to say that it is just her wrong-headed children (who quarrel with her) that do most to justify the divine wisdom by their not knowing, with all their wisdom, what they would really like. But this view, again, which necessitates an antiphrastic interpretation of the τέκνα τῆς σοφίας, finds no support in the text, besides involving accessory thoughts to which there is no allusion. Similarly Calvin even understood the words to refer to the *Jews who thought themselves so wise*; before whom, however, wisdom is supposed to assert her dignity and authority through the medium of her genuine children.

Vv. 20 ff. *Then He began*, and so on (ἤρξατο). Luke introduces this upbraiding of the cities at a later stage—that is, on the occasion when the instructions were addressed to the Seventy (x. 13-15), for which he is assigned the preference by Schleiermacher, Schneckenburger, Holtzmann; while de Wette and Keim are justified in going against Luke, who generally uses considerable freedom as to the connection in which he introduces the sayings which in this chapter are all connected with the same subject.—The Gospels make no further mention of the miracles in *Chorazin* and *Bethsaida*

(not far from Capernaum; Robinson, *neuere Forsch.* p. 457 ff.), John xx. 30. — ἐν Τύρῳ κ. Σιδ., κ.τ.λ.] Even these wicked *heathen* cities would have been brought to amendment long ago with deep sorrow for their sins. The penitent sorrow is represented by ἐν σάκκ. κ. σποδῶ, a form of mourning in popular use among the *Jews* (comp. on vi. 16). — ἐν σάκκῳ] *i.e.* in the dark, sack-shaped mourning attire, made of coarse cloth, and drawn over the naked body; Gesenius, *Thes.* III. p. 1336. — Ver. 22. πλήν] *however*, in the sense of *ceterum*, that is, to add nothing more, *I tell you*. Frequently used in this way by classical writers, and comp. note on Eph. v. 33. — Ver. 23. *And thou, Capernaum, who hast been exalted to heaven, i.e.* raised to the highest distinction through my dwelling and labouring within thee, *will be brought down to Hades*, namely, on the day of judgment, to undergo punishment in Gehenna; see ver. 24. Grotius, Kuinoel, Fritzsche interpret the *exaltation* of Capernaum as referring to its *prosperity*, derived from trade, the fisheries, and so on. But this is not in keeping with the connection as indicated by ἐν αἷς ἐγένοντο αἱ πλείσται δυνάμεις αὐτοῦ in ver. 20.—Still more humiliating than the comparison with Tyre and Sidon, is that with *Sodom*; because the responsibility was *greatest* in the case of Capernaum. — ἔμειναν ἄν] This ἄν, here and in ver. 21, is simply according to rule, because the antecedent clauses contain a *sumtio ficta* (Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* I. p. 488).—Ver. 24. Comp. on x. 15. — ὑμῖν . . . σοί] Euth. Zigabenus: τὸ μὲν ὑμῖν πρὸς τοὺς πολίτας τῆς πόλεως ἐκείνης εἴρηται· τὸ δὲ σοὶ πρὸς τὴν πόλιν. The ὑμῖν, that is, does not refer to the audience (see ver. 22).—Observe further in vv. 21–24, first, how the passage assumes the form of a weighty *climax*; and then, secondly, the solemn *parallelism* of the antecedent clauses in vv. 21, 23, and of the threatened punishments in vv. 22, 24.

Ver. 25. Ἀποκρ. means, like ἡγ, *to take up speech*, and that in connection with some given *occasion*, to which what is said is understood to refer by way of rejoinder. Comp. xxii. 1, xxviii. 5; John ii. 18, v. 17, *al.* However, the occasion in this instance is *not stated*. According to Luke x. 21 (Strauss, Ebrard, Bleek, Holtzmann), it was the *return of the Seventy*, of

whom, however, there is no mention in Matthew. Ewald, Weissenborn, and older expositors find it in the *return of the apostles*. See Mark vi. 12, 30; Luke ix. 6, 10. This is the most probable view. Luke has transferred the historical connection of the prayer to the account of the Seventy, which is peculiar to that evangelist; while in xii. 1, Matthew assumes that the Twelve have already returned. The *want of precision* in Matthew's account, which in x. 5 expressly records the *sending out* of the Twelve, but says nothing of their *return*, is, of course, a defect in his narrative; but for this reason we should hesitate all the more to regard it as an evidence that we have here only an interpolation (Hilgenfeld) of this "pearl of the sayings of Jesus" (Keim), which is one of the purest and most genuine, one of Johannean splendour (John viii. 19, x. 15, xiv. 9, xvi. 15). — For ἐξομολογ. with dative, meaning *to praise*, comp. on Rom. xiv. 11; Sir. li. 1. — ταῦτα] *what?* the imperfect narrative does not say what things, for it introduces this thanksgiving from the collection of our Lord's sayings, without hinting why it does so. But from the contents of the prayer, as well as from its supposed occasion,—viz. the return of the Twelve with their cheering report,—it may be *inferred* that Jesus is alluding to *matters connected with the Messianic kingdom which He had communicated to the disciples* (xiii. 11), matters in the proclaiming of which they had been labouring, and at the same time been exercising the miraculous powers conferred upon them. — The σοφοί and συνετοί are the *wise and intelligent generally* (1 Cor. i. 19, iii. 10), but used with special reference to the scribes and Pharisees, who, according to their own opinion and that of the people (John ix. 40), were pre-eminently so. The novices (δ'ἰδιῶται), the disciples, who are unversed in the scholastic wisdom of the Jews. Comp. on this subject, 1 Cor. i. 26 ff. Yet on this occasion we must not suppose the reference to be to the simple and unsophisticated *masses* (Keim), which is not in keeping with ver. 27, nor with the idea of ἀποκάλυψις (comp. xvi. 17) generally, as found in this connection; the contrast applies to two classes of teachers, the one wise and prudent, independently of divine revelation, the others mere novices in point

of learning, but yet recipients of that revelation.—Observe, further, how the subject of thanksgiving does not lie merely in ἀπεκάλυψ. αὐτὰ νηπίοις, but in the *two*,—the ἀπέκρυψας etc., and the ἀπεκάλυψας, etc., being inseparably combined. Both together are the two sides of the one method of proceeding on the part of His all-ruling Father, of the necessity of which Christ was well aware (John ix. 39).

Ver. 26. Solution of the contradiction regarded as a *confirmation* of the ground for thanksgiving. Understand ἐξομολογούμαι σοι before ὅτι (not *because*, but *that*, as in ver. 25). — ἔμπροσθέν σου] belongs to εὐδοκία: *that thus* (and not otherwise) *was done* (was accomplished, comp. vi. 10) *what is well-pleasing before Thee*, in Thy sight; what is to Thee an object pleasing to look upon. Comp. xviii. 14; Heb. xiii. 21. For εὐδοκία, comp. iii. 17; Luke ii. 14.

Ver. 27. Here the prayer ends, and He turns to address the multitude (ver. 28),—but, according to Luke x. 22, it is His disciples,—still full of the great thought of the prayer, under a profound feeling of His peculiar fellowship with God. — πάντα μοι παρεδ.] It is quite as unwarrantable to limit πάντα in any way whatever, as it is to take παρεδόθη as referring to the *revelation of the doctrine* (Grotius, Kuinoel, and others), or to the *representation of the highest spiritual truths* (Keim), which Christ is supposed to have been appointed to communicate to mankind. It is not even to be restricted to all *human souls* (Gess). What Jesus indicates and has in view, is the full power with which, in sending Him forth, the Father is understood to have invested the Son, a power to dispose of *everything* so as to promote the object for which He came; Bengel: “nihil sibi reservavit pater.” Jesus speaks thus in the consciousness of the universal authority (xxviii. 18; Heb. ii. 8) conferred upon Him, from which nothing is excluded (John xiii. 3, xvi. 15); for He means to say, that between Him and the Father there exists such a relation that no one knows the Son, and so on.<sup>1</sup> On both thoughts Christ founds the invita-

<sup>1</sup> In this first clause, to supply the thought from the first—viz., “and to whom the Father is willing to reveal it” (de Wette, following the older expositors)—is arbitrary, for Jesus has just said: πάντα μοι παρεδόθη, etc. To whomsoever the

tion in ver. 28. On the relation of the words πάντα μοι παρεδ. to xxviii. 18, see note on that passage. — ἐπιγινώσκει] means more than the simple verb, viz. *an adequate and full knowledge*, which de Wette wrongly denies (see οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα τις ἐπυγινώσκει). Comp. on 1 Cor. xiii. 12. Nothing is to be inferred from this passage as to the supernatural *origin* of Jesus (in answer to Beyschlag, *Christol.* p. 60). The ἐπιγινώσκειν τὸν υἱόν applies to His whole nature and thinking and acting, not merely to His *moral constitution*, a limitation (in answer to Weiss) which, if necessary, would have been shown to be so in the context by means of the second correlative clause of the verse. — ᾧ ἐὰν βουλ. ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλ.] bears the impress of *superhuman* consciousness. According to the context, we have simply to regard τὸν πατέρα as the *object* of ἀποκαλ. For ἀποκαλ. with a personal object, comp. Gal. i. 16.

Ver. 28. Πάντες] *gratia universalis*. "In this *all* thou oughtest to include thyself as well, and not suppose that thou dost not belong to the number; thou shouldst not seek for another register of God," Melanchthon. — κοπ. καὶ πεφορτ.] through the legal and Pharisaic ordinances under which the man is *exhausted* and *weighed down as with a heavy burden*, without getting rid of the painful consciousness of sin, xxiii. 4. Comp. Acts xv. 10, xiii. 39. — καγώ] *emphatic*: *and I*, what your teachers and guides cannot do. — ἀναπαύσω] I will *procure you rest*, i.e. ἐλευθερώσω καὶ τοῦ τοιούτου κόπου καὶ τοῦ τοιούτου βάρους (Euth. Zigabenus), so as to secure the true *peace of your souls*, John xiv. 27, xvi. 33; Rom. v. 1. Ver. 29 tells in *what way*.

Vv. 29, 30. To regard ζυγός (Olshausen, Calvin) as referring to the *cross*, is at variance with the context. Jesus has

Son reveals the knowledge of the Father, to him He thereby reveals the knowledge of the Son likewise.—Hilgenfeld adopts the Marcionite reading: οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός, καὶ τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ καὶ ᾧ ἂν ὁ υἱός ἀποκαλύψῃ. This reading, being that of the Clementines, Justin, Marcion, has earlier testimony in its favour than that of the Received text, which first appears in Irenaeus in a duly authenticated form; Irenaeus, i. 20. 3, ascribes it to the Marcosians, though he elsewhere adopts it himself. However, an examination of the authorities leads to the conclusion (see Tischendorf) that it must be *excluded from the text*. Comp. also note on Luke x. 21.

in view *His guidance and discipline*, to which they are to subject themselves through faith in Him. Comp. Sir. li. 26, and the very common Rabbinical use of *לִי* in Schoettgen, p. 115 ff. — *ὅτι*] not *that*, but *because*; motive for *μάθετε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ* (*i.e.* learn *in me*, learn *from me*; Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 279 [E. T. 324]), with which words Jesus presents Himself as their moral example, in contrast to the character of the teachers of the law and the Pharisees, who, if they affected to be meek and humble, were, as a rule, not so *at heart* (*τῇ καρδ.* belongs to *both* words), but only in *appearance*, while in reality they were tyrannical and proud. Comp. 2 Cor. x. 1. — *κ. εὐρύσσετε, κ.τ.λ.*] Jer. vi. 16. — *χρηστός*] may mean good and wholesome (comp. *παιδευσις χρηστή*, Plat. *Rep.* p. 424 A), or *suave* (Vulg.), gentle and agreeable. The latter suits the figure and the parallelism. — *τὸ φορτίον μου*] *the burden which I impose* (comp. on Gal vi. 5). — *ἐλαφρόν*] for it is the discipline and duty of *love*, through which *faith* manifests its practical results, 1 John v. 3. “*Omnia levia sunt caritati*” (Augustine), notwithstanding the strait gate and the narrow way, and the cross that is to be borne.

# CHAPTER XII

VER. 3. ἐπεινάσε] Elz. and Fritzsche insert αὐτός, against decisive testimony. From Mark ii. 25; Luke vi. 3. — Ver. 4. ἔφαγεν] Tisch. 8: ἔφαγον, only according to B  $\aleph$ . Altered to suit what follows. — οὐς] Lach. Tisch.:  $\delta$ , after B D 13, 124, Cant. Ver. Harl.\* Correctly; the Received text is a correction in accordance with Mark and Luke. — Ver. 6. — μείζων] B D E G K M S U V  $\Gamma$   $\Pi$ , Curss. and Fathers: μεῖζον. So Fritzsche, Scholz, Lachm. Tisch. Authority and exegesis favour the neuter, by way of explaining which the masculine would readily suggest itself. — Ver. 8. Before τοῦ σαββάτου Elz. inserts καί, which has been deleted in accordance with decisive testimony. From Mark and Luke. — Ver. 10. ἦν τήν] is certainly wanting in B C  $\aleph$ , while Vulg. and Codd. of the It. Copt. leave it doubtful whether they did not read simple ἦν. Ἦν τήν is deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. Correctly. The brevity of Matthew's statement was supplemented from Mark iii. 1, and hence ἐκεῖ came to be inserted between ἦν and τήν (by others at a different place). — Ver. 11. Lachm., following inadequate testimony, reads ἐγείρει instead of ἐγερσε. An error on the part of the transcriber. — Ver. 14. The following arrangement, ἐξελεθόντες δὲ οἱ Φαρ. συμβ. ἔλ. κατ. αὐτοῦ (B C D A  $\aleph$ , Curss. Syr. Copt. It. Vulg. Eus. Chrys. Fritzsche, Gersd. Lachm. Tisch.), is to be preferred to that of the *Received* text (οἱ δ. Φ. σ. ἔλ. κ. ἄ. ἐξ.), as being simpler and more in keeping with Matthew's style. — Ver. 15. ὄχλοι] omitted in B  $\aleph$ , Vulg. It. Eus., deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. Homoeoteleuton. — Ver. 17. With Lachm. and Tisch. we ought to adopt ἵνα instead of ὅπως, in accordance with B C D  $\aleph$ , 1, 33, Or. Eus.; ὅπως was introduced for sake of variety. — Ver. 18. εἰς δν] Lachm. and Tisch. 8 (see note of the latter):  $\delta$ ν, after B  $\aleph$ \* and several Curss. On inadequate testimony, for εἰς would be readily dropped out, from a mechanical effort to conform the construction to  $\delta$ ν ἡρέτισα; ἐν  $\tilde{\varphi}$  in D is a gloss. — Ver. 21. τῷ ὀνόματι] Elz. Fritzsche: ἐν τῷ ὀνόμ., against decisive testimony. ἐν is an interpolation, as is also ἐπὶ in Eus. and several Curss. — Ver. 22. τὸν τυφλὸν καὶ κωφόν] Lachm. and

Tisch. have merely *τὸν κωφὸν* (B D  $\aleph$ , Copt. Syr<sup>ant</sup> Cant. Corb. 1, Germ. 1). But *λαλεῖν* coming first in what follows gave rise partly to the omission of *τυφλόν*, partly to the inverted arrangement: *κωφὸν καὶ τυφλόν* (L X  $\Delta$ , Curss. Syr. Arm.). — Ver. 28. The order *ἐν πνεύμ. θεοῦ ἐγώ*, as against that of the Received text, *ἐγὼ ἐν πνεύμ.*, is supported by decisive testimony (less adequately the arrangement of Lachm. and Tisch.: *κρίται ἔσονται ὑμῶν*, in ver. 27). — Ver. 29. In accordance with B C\* X, Curss., Lachm. and Tisch. have *ἀρπάσαι* instead of *διαρπάσει*. The reading of the Received text is adopted from Mark. In what follows Lachm. has *ἀρπάσει* instead of *διαρπάσει*; so also Tisch. 7, but according to testimony that is far too inadequate. Tisch. 8, following D G K  $\Pi$   $\aleph$ , Curss., reads *διαρπάσῃ*. But still the evidence in favour of *διαρπάσει* remains so strong, that there is but the more reason to look upon *διαρπάσῃ* as a supposed grammatical correction. — Ver. 31. Tisch. 8, following Lachm., has indeed also deleted the second *τοῖς ἀνθρώποις* (after B  $\aleph$ , Curss. Verss. and a few Fathers); it is, however, to be preserved as a solemn yet superfluous repetition. — Ver. 35. Elz., against decisive testimony, inserts *τῆς καρδίας* after the first *θησαυροῦ*. A gloss. But with Tisch. 8, and on the strength of sufficient testimony, *τά* before *ἀγαθά* is to be maintained, in opposition to Griesb. Lachm. Tisch. 7. The article came to be omitted from a desire to conform to the second clause. — Ver. 36. The reading *καλήσουσιν*, adopted by Tisch. (B C  $\aleph$ ), is to be traced to the futures which follow. — Ver. 38. With Lachm. and Tisch. *αὐτῷ* should be inserted after *ἀπεκρίθ.*, in accordance with B C D L M  $\aleph$ , Curss. and most Verss. and Chrys. Perhaps it was omitted from being considered unnecessary. — *καὶ Φαρις.*] is deleted by Lachm. on too inadequate testimony. — Ver. 44. The arrangement: *εἰς τ. οἴκ. μ. ἐπιστρ.* (Lachm. Tisch.), as opposed to that of the Received text (*ἐπιστρ. εἰ. τ. ὁ. μ.*), finds testimony sufficiently strong in B D Z  $\aleph$ . Comp. Luke. — *ἐλθόν]* D F G X  $\Gamma$ , Curss.: *ἐλθών*. So Fritzsche and Tisch. Correctly; the reading of the Received text is here and in Luke xi. 25 a grammatical correction. — Ver. 46. *δέ]* omitted in B  $\aleph$ , Curss. Vulg. It. Deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. 8. But how easily may it have been omitted at the beginning of the new section (one reading even begins with *αὐτοῦ*)! — Ver. 48. *εἰπόντι]* Fritzsche, Lachm. Tisch.: *λέγοντι*, after B D Z  $\Pi$   $\aleph$ , Curss. Correctly. The former has crept in mechanically, in conformity with ver. 47.

Ver. 1 ff. Comp. Mark ii. 23 ff.; Luke vi. 1 ff. Any one was allowed to pluck (*τὶλλειν*, Blomfield, *ad Aesch. Pers. Gloss.*



214) ears of corn in another man's field till he was satisfied. Deut. xxiii. 25. It is customary and allowable even at the present day. Robinson, II. p. 419. But according to Ex. xvi. 22 ff., it might seem as if it were unlawful on the *Sabbath*, and it appears from tradition (Schabb. c. 8 ; Lightfoot and Schoettgen on this passage) that it was actually so regarded. That the disciples did not hold themselves bound by this view, is an evidence of their more liberal spirit. Comp. Weizsäcker, p. 390. — *ἤρξαντο*] After this plucking had *begun*, there came the remonstrance on the part of the Pharisees, ver. 2.—Luke, in accordance with the historical arrangement which he observes, places this incident somewhat earlier ; Mark and Luke introduce it after the question about fasting. Both of them, however, mention only the first of the two proof-texts quoted by Jesus. Matthew, following a tradition that is more original as far as this matter is concerned, supplements the account in Mark, from whom, however, he essentially differs in regard to the object in plucking the corn (see on Mark, and Holtzmann, p. 73).

Vv. 3, 4. *Ἀνέγνωτε*] 1 Sam. xxi. — The spurious *αὐτός* is unnecessary ; *καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ* is connected with *τί ἐποίησεν Δαυεὶδ*. Comp. Thuc. i. 47. 2 : *ἔλεγε δὲ ὁ Στύφωv καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ*, and Poppo's note. — *οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ*] in this instance the *tabernacle*, which was then at Nob. Comp. Ex. xxiii. 19. For the twelve pieces of *shew-bread*, on this occasion called *ἄρτοι τῆς προθέσεως*, i.e. *לֶחֶם הַפָּנֵה*, loaves of the pile (1 Chron. xxiii. 29 ; Ex. xl. 23), elsewhere named *ἄρτοι τοῦ προσώπου*, *לֶחֶם הַפָּנֵה*, loaves of the presence (of God), 1 Sam. xxi. 7, which, as a meat-offering, stood in the holy place, arranged in two rows upon a golden table, and were renewed every Sabbath, those of the previous week being given to the priests, see Lev. xxiv. 5 ff. ; Lund, *Jüd. Heiligth.*, ed. Wolf, p. 134 ff. ; Ewald, *Alterth.* pp. 37, 153 ; Keil, *Arch.* I. p. 91. — *εἰ μὴ*] only appears to stand for *ἀλλά*, and retains its usual meaning of *nisi*. The language, however, assumes the tone of absolute negation : which it was not lawful for Him to eat, nor for those who were with Him, *not lawful except for the priests alone*. The neuter *ὃ* (see the critical remarks)

indicates the category: *what*, i.e. *which kind of food*. See Matthiae, p. 987; Kühner, II. 1, p. 55. Comp. note on Gal. i. 7, ii. 16; Luke iv. 26 f.; Dindorf in *Steph. Thes.* III. p. 190 C; Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* III. p. 195.

Ver. 5. *Ἀνέγνωτε*] Num. xxviii. 9. — *βεβηλοῦσι*] that is, if one were consistently to judge according to your precepts, which forbid every sort of work on the Sabbath as being a desecration of that day. For *βεβηλ.*, *profanant*, comp. Acts xxiv. 6, and see Schleusner, *Thes.* I. p. 558.

Ver. 6. As in ver. 3 f. Jesus had reasoned *a majori* (from the fact of David, when hungry, being allowed to eat the *shew-bread*) *ad minus* (to the fact of the hungry disciples being allowed to *pluck the corn* on the Sabbath), so in ver. 5 He reasons *a minori* (viz. from the *temple*, where the Sabbath is subordinated to the sacrificial arrangements) *ad majus*, viz. to His *own* authority, which transcends the sanctity of the temple, and from acting under which the disciples might well be the less disposed to be bound to keep the Sabbath. The *key* to this argument is to be found in ver. 6, which contains the minor proposition of the conclusion: what is allowable in the case of the servants of the temple, namely, to work on the Sabbath, must be conceded to the servants of Him who is greater than the temple; I am greater than the temple; therefore, and so on.—In all the elevation and truth of His self-consciousness Jesus points with *τοῦ ἱεροῦ μείζον ἐστὶν ὧδε* to *His own person and character* as surpassing the temple in sanctity and greatness; not to the *Messianic work* (Fritzsche, de Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius), with which the plucking of the corn had nothing to do; nor, again, to *the interests of the disciples*! (Paulus, Kuinoel); nor, finally, to the *ἐλεος* in ver. 7 (Baur). The *neuter μείζον*, a *greater thing*, is more weighty than the masculine. Dissen, *ad Dem. de cor.* p. 396. Comp. xi. 9. — *ὧδε*] demonstrative, as in vv. 41, 42. Notice how sublimely great is the consciousness that God is dwelling in Him in a higher sense than in the temple; comp. note on John ii. 19.

Ver. 7. After this defence of His disciples, He shows the Pharisees that in judging them as they had done they were

animated by a perverse *disposition*. He shows how they were destitute of the compassionate love which God requires in Hos. vi. 6, while their thoughts were exclusively directed to sacrifice and ceremonial religion generally. From want of ἔλεος, which would have disposed them to regard the conduct of the hungry ones in a totally different light, they, *i.e.* those ceremonialists, had condemned the disciples. See, besides, note on ix. 13.

Ver. 8. Γάρ] τοὺς ἀναίτιους, I say, *for*, and so on. "Majestate Christi nititur discipulorum innocentia et libertas," Bengel. *The authority of the Messiah* (under which His disciples have acted) is superior to the law of the Sabbath; the latter is subject to His disposal, and must yield to His will. Bertholdt, *Christol.* p. 162 f. For the idea, comp. John v. 18; Holtzmann, p. 458. Others (Grotius, Kuinoel) interpret thus: *Man may set aside the laws regarding the Sabbath*, whenever it is for his advantage to do so. In opposition to the regular use of ὁ υἱὸς τ. ἀνθρ., the argument is different in Mark i. 27.

Vv. 9 ff. Comp. Mark iii. 1 ff.; Luke vi. 6 ff.—Καὶ μεταβὰς ἐκεῖθεν, κ.τ.λ.] therefore on the *same* Sabbath day. Different from Luke, who has ἐν ἑτέρῳ σαββάτῳ, to which further division of time Mark likewise fails to make any reference whatever.—αὐτοῖν] the *Pharisees*, whom He had just sent away. It is impossible to say *where* the synagogue was to which those Pharisees belonged. But to take αὐτῶν without any definite reference, as in xi. 1 ("of the people of the place," de Wette, Bleek), is precluded by ἐπηρώτησαν, etc., of which the *Pharisees* mentioned in ver. 14 are to be regarded as the subject.

Ver. 10. The nature of the affection of the *withered* hand, in which there was a defective circulation (1 Kings xiii. 4; Zech. xi. 17; John v. 3), cannot be further defined. It is certain, however, that what was wrong was not merely a *deficiency in the power of moving* the hand, in which case the cure would be sufficiently explained by our Lord's acting upon the will and the muscular force (Keim).—The traditions forbade healing on the Sabbath, except in cases where life was in

danger. Wetstein and Schoettgen on this passage. — *εἰ*] in the New Testament (Winer, p. 474 [E. T. 639]; Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 214 [E. T. 249]) is so applied, in opposition to classical usage (see Hartung, *Partikell.* II. p. 202 f.; Klotz, *ad Devar.* pp. 508, 511), that it directly introduces the words containing the question. Comp. xix. 3; Luke xiii. 22, xxii. 49; Acts i. 6; occurring also in the LXX., not in the Apocrypha. However, in the order of ideas in the mind of the questioner is to be found the logical connection, which has occasioned and which will explain the indirectly interrogative use of *εἰ* (*I would like to know*, or some such expression), just as we Germans are also in the habit of asking at once: *ob das erlaubt ist?* The character of the questions introduced by *εἰ* is that of uncertainty and hesitation (Hartung, l. 1; Kühner, II. 2, p. 1032), which in this instance is quite in keeping with the *tempting* which the questioners had in view. Fritzsche's purely indirect interpretation ("interrogarunt eum hoc modo, *an liceret*," etc.) is precluded by λέγοντες, and the passages where the question is preceded by some form of address such as κύριε in Acts i. 6; Luke xxii. 49. — ἵνα κατηγορ. αὐτοῦ] before the *local court* (κρίσις, v. 21) in the town, and that on the charge of teaching to violate the law of the Sabbath.

Ver. 11. The construction, like that of vii. 9, is a case of anacoluthon. — The *futures* indicate the supposed possible case; see Kühner, II. 1, p. 147: *what man may there be from among you*, and so on. — πρόβατον ἓν] *one*, which on that account is all the dearer to him. — καὶ ἐὰν ἐμπέσῃ, κ.τ.λ.] There must have been no doubt as to whether such a thing was allowable, for Jesus argues *ex concessio*. The Talmud (*Gemara*) contains no such concession, but answers the question partly in a negative way, and partly by making casuistical stipulations. See the passages in Othonis, *Lex Rabb.* p. 527; Wetstein, and Buxtorf, *Synag.* c. 16. — κρατήσῃ αὐτὸ κ. ἐγρεῖ] descriptive. He *lays hold of* the sheep that has fallen into a ditch (βόθυνον, Xen. *Oec.* xix. 3, not exclusively a well, but any kind of hole, like βόθρος), and, lifting out the animal lying bruised in the pit, he *sets it upon its feet*.

Ver. 12. *Οἶν*] Inference founded on the value which, according to ver. 11, is no doubt set upon an *animal* in such circumstances, notwithstanding the laws of Sabbath observance: *Of how much greater consequence, then, is a man than a sheep?* The *answer* is already involved in the question itself (*is of far more consequence, and so on*); but the *final conclusion* is: *therefore it is allowable to do what is right on the Sabbath.* By means of the general expression *καλῶς ποιεῖν*, which does not mean *to be beneficent* (Kuinoel, de Wette, Bleek), but *recte agere* (Acts x. 33; 1 Cor. vii. 38 f.; Phil. iv. 14; Jas. ii. 8, 19; 2 Pet. i. 19; 3 John 6), the *θεραπεύειν* is ranked under the category of *duty*, and the *moral absurdity* of the question in ver. 10 is thereby exposed. So, by this adroit handling of the argument, the inference of Jesus is secured against all contradiction; de Wette's objection, to the effect that it might have been asked whether the healing did not admit of delay, is founded on a misunderstanding of the *καλῶς ποιεῖν*. This latter is the moral rule by which resting or working on the Sabbath is to be determined.

Vv. 13, 14. *Ἀπεκατεστ.*] just as he was stretching it out, and at the bidding of Jesus. For the double augment, see Winer, p. 69 f. [E. T. 84]. — *ὑγιής*] *result* of the *ἀπεκατεστ.* See Winer, pp. 491, 580 [E. T. 663, 779]; Lübcker, *grammat. Stud.* p. 33 f.; Pflugk, *ad. Hec.* 690. Mark's version of the incident is more animated, fresher, and more original (Keim's opinion is different), and likewise free from the amplification contained in what is said about the animal falling into the well. This saying is introduced by Luke in another form, and in connection with a different incident (Luke xiv. 5), which, however, would not justify us in holding, with Strauss, that the different narratives are only different settings for the saying in question, while supposing at the same time that there is even an allusion here to 1 Kings xiii. 4, 6. According to the *Evang. s. Hebr.* (Hilgenfeld, *N. T. extra can.* IV. 16, 23), the man with the withered hand was a *mason*, who begged to be healed, that he might not be under the necessity of begging. — *ἐξελθόντες*] from the synagogue, ver. 9. — *συμβούλ. ἔλαβ. κατ. αὐτ., ὅπως*] *they devised measures for the purpose of crushing Him*

(see on xxii. 15); the opposition to Him had now assumed this very decided character.

Ver. 15 ff. Vv. 17-21 are peculiar to Matthew. — αὐτοὺς πάντας] all the sick who were among the multitudes. Indefinite expression. On the condensed style of Matthew, 15 f., comp. Mark iii. 7 ff.; Luke vi. 17 ff. — Ver. 16. *He gave them strict injunctions*, in order that, and so on (xvi. 20, xx. 31); for He did not wish, by creating too great a sensation, to provoke His enemies to proceed to extremities before the time. Comp. on viii. 4.—Ver. 17. This ἐπετίμ. αὐτοῖς was designed, in accordance with the divine order in history, to fulfil the prophecy that the Messiah was to act without anything like ostentatious display in His proceedings. On the *silent* majesty of Jesus, comp. Dorner, *Jesu sündlose Vollkommenh.* p. 28 ff.

Ver. 18. Isa. xl. 1 ff., a very free rendering of the original Hebrew text, yet not without some reminiscences of the LXX. For the עֲבַד יְהוָה, which the LXX. (Ἰακώβ ὁ παῖς μου) and modern expositors interpret as applying to Israel as a nation, or the ideal Israel of the prophets, see, besides, the commentaries on Isaiah; Drechsler and Delitzsch in Rudelbach's *Zeitschr.* 1852, 2, p. 258 ff.; Tholuck, *d. Propheten u. ihre Weissag.* p. 158 ff.; Kleinert in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1862, p. 699 ff.; F. Philippi in the *Mecklenb. Zeitschr.* 1864, 5, and 6. Matthew understands it as referring to the *Messiah*. Similarly the Chaldee paraphrasts and Kimchi, in which they are justified by the Messianic *idea*, as fulfilled in Christ, running through the whole passage. See Acts iii. 13, 26, iv. 27, 30; Hengstenberg, *Christol.* II. p. 216 ff., compared with Kleinert, *l.c.* — εἰς ὃν] *in regard to whom*. Direction of the approbation. Comp. 2 Pet. i. 17. The *aorists*, as in iii. 17. — θήσω τὸ πνεῦμα] *i.e.* I will make Him the possessor and the bearer of my Holy Spirit, by whose power He is to work, Isa. xi. 2, lxi. 1; Matt. iii. 16; Acts iv. 27.—κρίσιν] not: *quod fieri par est* (Fritzsche); not: *justice and righteousness* (Bleek); the *good cause* (Schegg); or the *cause of God* (Baumgarten-Crusius); not: *recta cultus divini ratio* (Gerhard); nor: *doctrina divina* (Kuinoel),— which interpretations

have been given in view of the *צדק* of the original (where it denotes *the right*, i.e. what is right and matter of duty in the true theocracy. Comp. Ewald on Isaiah, *l.c.*; Hengstenberg, p. 233; and see in general, Gesenius, *Thes.* III. p. 1464). But in the New Testament *κρίσις* has no other meaning but that of *final sentence, judgment* (also in xxiii. 23); and this, in fact, is the sense in which the Hebrew was *understood* by the LXX. Matthew's Greek expression is doubtless to be understood no less in the sense of a *judicial sentence*, i.e. the *Messianic judgment*, for which the Messiah is preparing the way through His whole ministry, and which is to be consummated at the last day. — *τοῖς ἔθνεσιν*] not: *the nations*, generally, but *the heathen*. Similarly also in ver. 21. The point of fulfilment in the prediction here quoted lies simply in its serving to describe, as it does in ver. 19 f., the unostentatious, meek, and gentle nature of Christ's ministry (ver. 16), so that it is unnecessary to look to what precedes in order to find something corresponding to *τοῖς ἔθνεσι* (some finding it in the *multitudes* that followed Jesus). Jesus did not preach to the *heathen* till He did it through the *apostles*, Eph. ii. 17, a matter altogether beyond the scope of the present passage. It should be observed generally, and especially in the case of somewhat lengthened quotations from the Old Testament, that it is not intended that every detail is to find its corresponding fulfilment, but that such fulfilment is to be looked for only in connection with that which the connection shows to be the main subject under consideration.

Vv. 19, 20. Contrast to the conduct of the Jewish teachers. *He will not wrangle nor cry* (Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 337), and so on.—The *bruised reed* and *smoking wick* represent those who are *spiritually miserable and helpless* (xi. 5), whom Christ does not reduce to utter hopelessness and despair, but (xi. 28) to whom He rather gives comfort, and whose moral life He revives and strengthens. And seeing that ver. 17 refers to ver. 16, they cannot be taken to represent the *sick*, whom Jesus *heals* (Hengstenberg). For those figures, comp. Isa. xxxvi. 6, lviii. 6, xliii. 17. — *ἕως αὐ ἐκβαλεῖ κ.τ.λ.*] *until He shall have led forth to victory the judgment* announced by Him,

i.e. until He shall have finally accomplished it at the last day. For with this holding of the assize is associated the subjection to it of every hostile power. The final holding of it is the *victory* of the judgment. — In ἐκβάλῃ, *forced out*, is implied the idea of *violent effort*, *overcoming the resistance* offered. The words, however, do not correspond to the לֹא־מָצָא יוֹצֵא מִשְׁפָּט, Isa. xlii. 3, but to the עַד־יָבִיטוּ בְּאֶרְץ מִשְׁפָּט, ver. 4, as is evident from ἕως, and from the words καὶ τῷ ὀνόματι, etc., which follow. But this is a very free quotation made from memory, with which, however, the expression in ver. 3 (יוֹצֵא) is at the same time blended.

Ver. 21. Τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ] In Hebrew, לְהוֹרֵתוֹ; LXX., ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόμ. αὐτοῦ. Matthew and the LXX. had a different reading before them (מִשְׁפָּט). This is the only passage in the New Testament in which ἐλπίζω is used with the *dative* (elsewhere and in the LXX. with ἐν, εἰς, or ἐπὶ); it is proved, however, to be good Greek from the fact of its occurring in Thuc. iii. 97. 2, and it is meant to indicate the object on which, as its cause, the hope (of salvation) is resting. *On the ground of His name*, i.e. *on account* (Krüger's note on Thucydides, as above) of that which the name Messiah imports, *the Gentiles will cherish hope*.

Ver. 22. In Luke (xi. 14 ff.) this incident comes in at a later stage, while he reports less of what was spoken on the occasion, and arranges it to some extent in a different, though not the original, order; Mark iii. 22 ff., who omits the incident in question, introduces the discourse which follows in a peculiar connection of his own.—The resemblance of the narrative to that contained in ix. 32 is not due to a mixing together of different incidents,—viz. the healing of the blind man on the one hand, and of the man who was dumb on the other, ix. 27, 32 (Schneckenburger, Hilgenfeld),—nor to the way in which incidents often assume a twofold form in the course of tradition (Strauss, de Wette, Keim), but is founded upon two different events: the former demoniac was dumb, the present one is blind as well,—a circumstance, however, which is not recorded by Luke, who follows a less accurate version. The term Beelzebul, used in this connection as in ix. 34, is one.



however, which may have been found often enough upon the lips of the Pharisees. Its recurrence can no more prove that a later hand has been at work (Baur, Hilgenfeld), than the circumstance that we find ourselves back again into the heart of the contest, although from ver. 14 it seemed to have reached its utmost extremity; for the measures which in ver. 14 the Pharisees are said to have taken, have just led to further and no less bitter hostility, a hostility in keeping with the spirit of the purpose they have in view. — λαλ. κ. βλέβ.] the thing as it actually *takes place*. Casaubon and Fritzsche, without sufficient grounds, assume the existence of a *Chiasmus* here.

Ver. 23 ff. *Μήτι οὗτος, κ.τ.λ.*] Question of *imperfect yet growing* faith, with emphasis upon *οὗτος*: *May this* (who, however, does not possess the qualities looked for in the Messiah) *not possibly be the Messiah?* John iv. 29. To this corresponds the emphatic *οὗτος* in ver. 24. — *ἀκούσαντες*] that question *μήτι οὗτος*, etc. — *εἰπουν*] to the multitude, not to Jesus; for see ver. 25. They desire at once to put a stop to such dangerous language, and that, too, in a very demonstrative way. — *ἐν τῷ Βεελζεβοὺλ, ἄρχοντι τῶν δαιμ.*] See on ix. 34. *ἄρχοντι τ. δ.* is not to be rendered: *the ruler of the demons* (which would have required *τῷ ἄρχ.*), but: *as ruler over the demons*. Pragmatic addition. Mark iii. 22, comp. John vii. 20, x. 20, states the accusation in more specific terms. — *εἰδώς*] comp. ix. 4. The charge urged by the Pharisees is a foolish and desperate expedient proceeding from their hostility to Jesus, the absurdity of which He exposes. — *μερισθεῖσα καθ' αὐτῆς*] *i.e.* divided into parties, which contend with each other to its own destruction. In such a state of matters, a *kingdom* comes to ruin, and a *town* or a *family* must cease to exist; *σταθῆναι* means the same as *στῆναι*, see Bornemann, *ad Xen. Cyr.* II. 1, 11; Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* I. p. 851. — Ver. 26. *καί*] the *and* subjoining the application. — *εἰ ὁ σατανᾶς τὸν σατανᾶν ἐκβάλλει*] not: *the one Satan, the other Satan* (Fritzsche, de Wette), but: if *Satan* cast out *Satan*, if Satan is at once the subject and the object of the casting out, being the latter, inasmuch as the expelled demons

are the servants and representatives of Satan. This is the only correct interpretation of an expression so selected as to be in keeping with the preposterous nature of the charge, for there is *only the one* Satan; there are many *demons*, but only one *Satan*, who is their head. This explanation is an answer to de Wette, who takes exception to the reasoning of Jesus on the ground that Satan may have helped Christ to cast out demons, that by this means he might accomplish his own ends. No, the question is not as to one or two occasional instances of such casting out,—in which it might be quite conceivable that “for the nonce Satan should be faithless to his own spirits,”—but as to exorcism regarded in the light of a *systematic practice, which, as such, is directed against Satan*, and which therefore cannot be attributed to Satan himself, for otherwise he would be destroying his own kingdom.

Ver. 27. A second way of rebutting the charge.—Notice the emphatic antithesis: ἐγώ and οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν. The latter (*people of your own school*; see, in general, note on viii. 12) are exorcists who have even pretended actually to cast out demons (Acts xix. 13; Josephus, *Antt.* viii. 2. 5, *Bell.* vii. 6. 3; Justin, *c. Tryph.* p. 311), who have emanated from the schools of the Pharisees, not the *disciples of Jesus*, as the majority of the Fathers have supposed. “Quod discipuli vestri daemonia ejiciunt, vos Beelzebuli non attribuitis; illi ergo possunt hac in re judices vestri esse, vos ex virulentia haec de actionibus meis pronuntiare,” Lightfoot. Jesus reasons *ex concessis*. — αὐτοὶ (*ipsi*) ὑμῶν are placed together for sake of emphasis.

Ver. 28. Previously it was ἐγώ that was emphatic in the antecedent clause; but here it is ἐν πνεύματι θεοῦ: *but if it is by THE POWER OF GOD'S SPIRIT that I, on the other hand, cast out the demons, then it follows that the KINGDOM OF GOD has come to you*; in the consequent clause (the apodosis) the emphasis is on the words: *the kingdom of God has come*, etc. The reasoning is founded on the axiom, that such deeds, *wrought as they are by the power of God's Spirit*, go to prove that He who performs them is no other than He *who brings in the kingdom*—the Messiah. Where the Messiah is present and work-

ing, there, too, is the *kingdom*; not yet, of course, as completely established, but preparing to become so through its preliminary development in the world. See on Luke xvii. 20 f. For *φθάνειν* (used by classical writers as meaning *to anticipate*, 1 Thess. iv. 15), in the simple sense of *to reach, arrive at*, see on Phil. iii. 16; Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* II. p. 356; Lünemann's note on 1 Thess. ii. 16.—Notice, in the form of the reasoning in vv. 27, 28, the real *dilemma* (*tertium non datur*): *εἰ δέ, etc.*

Ver. 29. "[H] Transition by way of proceeding to give further proof of the actual state of the case. — τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ] The article indicates the *particular* strong man (hero) with whom the *τίς* has to do.—The thought embodied in this illustration is as follows: *Or—if you still hesitate to admit the inference in ver. 28—how is it possible for me to despoil Satan of his servants and instruments* (τὰ σκεύη αὐτοῦ corresponding to the *demons* in the *application*)—withdraw them from his control—*without having first of all conquered him?* Does my casting out of demons not prove that I have subdued Satan,—have deprived him of his power, just as it is necessary to bind a strong man before plundering his house? For ἦ, when serving to introduce a question by way of rejoinder, see Bäumlein, *Partik.* p. 132. The σκεύη in the illustration are the *furniture of the house* (not the weapons), as is evident from τ. οἴκων αὐτοῦ below. Mark iii. 27.—The figurative language may have been suggested by a recollection of Isa. xlix. 24 f.

Ver. 30. Jesus is speaking neither of the Jewish exorcists (Bengel, Schleiermacher, Neander), nor of the uncertain, fickle multitude (Elwert in the *Stud. d. Wirtemb. Geistl.* IX. 1, p. 111 ff.; Ullmann in the *Deutsch. Zeitschr.* 1851, p. 21 ff.; Bleek), neither of which would suit the context; but as little is He expressing Himself in *general terms*; so that μετ' ἐμοῦ must be applied to *Satan*, while Jesus is understood to be representing Himself as Satan's *enemy* (Jerome, Beza, Grotius, Wetstein, Kuinoel, de Wette, Baumgarten - Crusius); for the truth is, He, previously as well as subsequently, speaks of *Himself* in the first person (vv. 28, 31), and He *could* not be

supposed, He who is the Messiah, to represent Himself as taking up a neutral attitude toward Satan. On the contrary, He is speaking of the *Pharisees and their bearing toward Him*, which must necessarily be of a hostile character, since they had refused to make common cause with Him as it behoved them to have done: *He that is not with me is*, as is seen in your case, *my enemy*, and so on.—*συνάγων*] illustration borrowed from harvest operations; iii. 12, vi. 26; John iv. 36.

Ver. 31. *Διὰ τοῦτο*] refers back to all that has been said since ver. 25: *On this account*—because, in bringing such an accusation against me, ver. 24, you have as my enemies (ver. 30) resisted the most undoubted evidence of the contrary (ver. 25 ff.),—*on this account* I must tell you, and so on.—*ἀμαρτ. κ. βλασφ.*] Genus and species: *every sin and* (in particular) *blaspheming* (of sacred things, as of the Messiah Himself, ver. 32).—*ἡ τοῦ πν. βλασφ.*] *Blaspheming of the Spirit* (Mark iii. 29; Luke xii. 10) is the sin in question, and of which that allegation on the part of the Pharisees, ver. 24, is an instance, so that it is probably too much to say, as though the new birth must be presumed, that it can only occur in the case of a *Christian*,—a view which was held by Huther, Quenstedt, and others. As, then, in the present instance the Pharisees had hardened themselves against an unmistakeable revelation of the Spirit of God, as seen in the life and works of Jesus, had in fact taken up an attitude of avowed hostility to this Spirit; so much so that they spoke of His agency as that of the devil: so in general the *βλασφημία τοῦ πνεύματος* may be defined to be the sin which a man commits when he rejects the undoubted revelation of the Holy Spirit, and that not merely with a contemptuous moral indifference (Gurlitt; see, on the other hand, Müller, *Lehre v. d. Sünde*, II. p. 598, ed. 5), but with the evil will struggling to shut out the light of that revelation; and even goes the length of expressing in hostile language his deliberate and conscious opposition to this divine principle, thereby avowing his adherence to his anti-spiritual *confession*. This sin is *not forgiven*, because in the utterly hardened condition which it presupposes, and in which it appears as the extreme point of sinful development, the recep-

tivity for the influences of the Holy Spirit is lost, and nothing remains but conscious and avowed hatred toward this holy agency. In the case of the *Christian*, every conscious sin, and in particular all immoral speech, is also sin against the Holy Spirit (Eph. iv. 30); but what is meant by *blaspheming* the Spirit in the passage before us, is to go to the utmost extremity in apostasy from Christ and *πρὸς θάνατον* (1 John v. 16, and Huther's note). See Grashoff in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1833, p. 935 ff.; Gurlitt, *ibid.* 1834, p. 599 ff.; Tholuck, *ibid.* 1836, p. 401 ff.; Schaf, *d. Sünde wider d. heil. G.* 1841; Jul. Müller, *l.c.*; Alex. ab Oettingen, *de pecc. in Sp. s.* 1856, where the older literature may also be found, and where the different views are criticised.<sup>1</sup> For the way in which the blaspheming against the Spirit is supposed to coincide, as far as the *Christian* is concerned, with the falling away mentioned in Heb. vi. 4–6, see Delitzsch *On the Hebrews*, p. 231 ff.; Lünemann, p. 205 ff. — *οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται*] should not have its meaning twisted by supplying “as a rule,” or such like; nor, with Grotius, is *οὐκ* to be taken comparatively (*more heinous than all other sins*). The simple impossibility of forgiveness is just to be sought in the man's own state of heart, which has become one of extreme hostility to God.

Ver. 32. *Κατὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τ. ἀνθρ.*] *against the Son of man*, such as Daniel promised that the Messiah should be. In this case also (comp. on ix. 6, viii. 20) this select expression indicates the *majesty* of the Messiah in His human manifestation, in contrast to the hostile terms with which it has been assailed. Grotius and Fritzsche erroneously understand it as in contrast to *man* in general. — *ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ*] For if the hostile expressions are directed only against the person of the Messiah as such, not against the Holy Spirit who may be recognised in that person, even without our ascribing to it a Messianic character, it is possible that fuller knowledge, change of disposition, faith, may be created by the Spirit's

<sup>1</sup> At p. 87, Oettingen defines the sin thus: “Impoenitentia perpetua atque incredulitas usque ad finem, quae ex rebellante et obstinatissima repudiatione testimonii Sp. s. evangelio sese manifestantis et in hominum cordibus operantia profecta blasphemando in Sp. s. per verbum et facinus in lucem prodit.”

own influence, whereupon the man will be forgiven. Comp. Luke xxiii. 34. — ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος is the period previous to the coming of the Messiah, ἡγῆ ὁῖν, as Jesus understood it: *the time before the second coming*. Ὁ αἰὼν μέλλων, the period that succeeds the coming of the Messiah, ἡγῆ ὁῖν, as Jesus understood it: *the time that follows the second coming*. Bertholdt, *Christol.* p. 38; Koppe, *Exc.* 1, *ad Ep. ad Eph.* p. 289 ff. — οὐτε ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι] where it would be granted in the shape of acquittal in the judgment, combined with the eternal consequences of such acquittal (everlasting felicity). The threatening of a very different fate—that is to say, the thought of endless punishment—must not be in any way softened down (Chrysostom, de Wette). Schmid, *bibl. Theol.* I. p. 358 (comp. Olshausen and Stirm in the *Jahrb. f. Deutsche Theol.* 1861, p. 300), is quite mistaken in thinking that the period referred to is that between death and judgment, which, in fact, does not belong to the αἰὼν μέλλων at all.

Ver. 33. Euth. Zigabenus says correctly (comp. Hilary, Chrysostom, Theophylact, Erasmus, Beza, Jansen, Raphel, Kypke, Kuinoel, Schegg, Grimm): ποιήσατε ἀντὶ τοῦ εἶπατε. Καταισχύνει δὲ πάλιν ἐτέρως αὐτοὺς, ὡς ἀνακόλουθα καὶ παρὰ φύσιν κατηγοροῦντας. Ἐπεὶ γὰρ τὸ μὲν ἀπελαύνεσθαι τοὺς δαίμονας οὐκ ἐκάκιζον . . . τὸν δὲ ἀπελαύνοντα τούτους διέβαλλον, παραδειγματικῶς αὐτοὺς ἐλέγχει, τὸ μὲν ἔργον παλὸν κρίνοντας, τὸν δὲ ἐργαζόμενον κακόν, ὅτερ ἐστὶν ἐναντιότητος καὶ ἀναισχυντίας. *Either make the tree good (i.e. judge it to be good), and its fruit good; or make the tree bad, and its fruit bad* (see on vii. 17),—do not proceed in the same absurd way as you did when you pronounced an unfavourable judgment upon me, when you made the tree bad (declared me to be an instrument of the devil), and gave him credit for good fruit (the casting out of demons). ποιεῖν, similarly to our *make*, is used to denote the expression of a *judgment* or opinion, therefore in a *declarative* sense. John v. 18, viii. 53, x. 33; 1 John i. 10, v. 10; Xen. *Hist.* vi. 3. 5: ποιεῖσθε δὲ πολεμίους, *you declare them to be enemies*. Stephanus, *Thesaurus*, ed. Paris, VI. p. 1292, and the passages in Raphel, *Herod.* p. 154; Kypke, I. p. 66; among Attic writers usually

in the middle voice. τὸ δένδρον denotes the tree on which you pronounce a judgment, and nothing is to be supplied after τὸν καρπὸν αὐτοῦ. Some (Grotius, Fritzsche), who, however, attach substantially the same meaning to the figurative terms, take ποιεῖν in the sense of *to suppose, assume, animo fingere* (Xen. *Anab.* v. 7. 9; Ast, *Lex. Plat.* III. p. 136 f.), though the imperative is not so well suited to the second clauses, καὶ τὸν καρπὸν, etc. Others, understanding ποιεῖν as meaning, partly *to judge*, as well as partly *to assume*, refer it to the evil disposition of the Pharisees, which can be detected in the kind of language they indulge in. So Munster, Castalio,<sup>1</sup> Maldonatus, and others; also de Wette, Neander, Bleek (comp. Olshausen). But in that case the imperative is no longer appropriate to the second clauses. According to Ewald (comp. Baumgarten-Crusius, and Holtzmann, p. 187), the connection and meaning may be thus stated: "Let it not be supposed that these are but mere words! It is exactly the words . . . that spring from the deepest source, and proceed as it were from the root of a man; like tree, like fruit." ποιήσατε is a bold expression in reference not only to the fruit, as has been supposed, but also to the tree itself ("cultivate the tree well, and thus make the tree good"). But ποιεῖν is not used in this sense (which would have required φύειν instead); and, once more, the imperative expression would scarcely have suited the *second* clauses, for an alternative so *imperious* might, with much more propriety, be addressed to persons who were undecided, *neutral*. Similarly Keim, though without any further grammatical elucidation ("man either makes himself good—a tree which bears good fruit—or makes himself evil").

Ver. 34. Οὐκ ἔστιν θαυμαστὸν, εἰ τοιαῦτα (the preposterous nature of which Jesus has just exposed, ver. 33) βλασφημεῖτε, πονηροὶ γὰρ ὄντες οὐ δύνασθε ἀγαθὰ λαλεῖν. Εἶτα καὶ φυσιο-λογικῶς ἀποδείκνυσι πῶς οὐ δύνανται, Euth. Zigabenus. For γεννήμ. ἐχιδν. comp. iii. 7. — πῶς δύνασθε] moral impossibility founded upon the wickedness of the heart, although not

<sup>1</sup> "Hoc pro certo habere necesse esse, quae arbor sit bona, ejus fractum esse bonum. . . . Atqui ista vestra verba malus fructus est: ex quo consequens est vos stirpem esse malam."

denying that one may still be open to conversion, and that with conversion the impossibility in question must cease to exist. — ἐκ γ. τ. περισσεύμ. τ. καρδ.] *out of that with which the heart is overflowing*, so that with the speaking a partial emptying, outflow, takes place. Beck, *bibl. Seelenl.* p. 68.

Ver. 35. Θησαυρός, here the *inward treasure-house* (*receptaculum*) of the heart's thoughts (Luke vi. 45) which are revealed in words, through which latter they take outward shape, are *thrown out*, as it were, from the heart of the speaker through the channel of the mouth. — πονηροῦ θησαυροῦ] *θησαυρ.* of *wickedness*, also in Eur. *Ion.* 923.

Ver. 36 f. Nominative absolute, as in x. 14, 32. — ἀργόν] meaning, according to the context, *morally useless*, which negative expression brings out the idea more pointedly than πονηρόν, the reading of several Curss., would have done. Comp. λόγοι ἄκαρποι in Plato, *Phaedr.* p. 277 A. — ἐκ γὰρ τῶν λόγων σου, κ.τ.λ.] For on thy words will be founded thine acquittal, on thy words will be founded thy condemnation in the Messianic judgment. The connection required that this matter of a man's accountability for his words should be prominently noticed; and, seeing that the words are to be regarded as the natural outcome of the *disposition*, such accountability is quite consistent with justice; nor does it exclude responsibility for his actions as well, though this does not come into view in connection with the subject now under consideration. With reference to the bearing of this saying on justification by faith, Calovius appropriately observes: "Quid enim aliud sermones sancti, quam *fides sonans*?" and *vice versâ*.

Ver. 38. The narrative is more original than that in Luke xi. 16. — σημεῖον] *a manifestation of miraculous power that, by appealing to the senses, will serve to confirm thy divine mission.* In such a light they had not regarded the cure of the demoniacs, ver. 24. In thus insisting as they did upon yet further proof, they were actuated by a malicious desire to put Him to the test and reduce Him to silence. — ἀπὸ σοῦ] *from Thee Thy sign.*—In deference to Mark viii. 11, Luke xi. 16, many erroneously suppose that in this instance it is specially



α σημεῖον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ that is meant. In xvi. 1, however, the sign is being requested for the *second* time.

Ver. 39. Μοιχαλὶς] ὡς ἀφιστάμενοι ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, Theophylact. The Hebrew (Ps. lxxiii. 27 ; Isa. lvii. 3 ff. ; Ezek. xxiii. 27, *al.*) conceived his sacred relation to God as represented by the figure of marriage, hence idolatry and intercourse with Gentiles were spoken of as adultery. Gesenius, *Theol.* I. p. 422. On this occasion Jesus transfers the figure to *moral unfaithfulness to God*, Jas. iv. 4 ; Rev. ii. 20 ff. — γενεά] *generation*; the representatives of which had certainly made the request, while the multitude, ver. 46, was likewise present. — ἐπιζητεῖ] See on vi. 32. — σημεῖον οὐ δοθήσεται αὐτῇ] Seeing that the demand of the Pharisees had manifestly pointed to a sign of a *higher* order than any with which Jesus had hitherto favoured them,—that is to say, some wonderful manifestation, by which He might now prove, as He had never done before, that He was unquestionably the Messiah—for they would not admit that the miracles they had already seen were possessed of the evidential force of the actual σημεῖον ; it is certain that, in this His reply, Jesus must likewise have used σημεῖον as meaning *pre-eminently* a confirmatory sign of a very special and convincing nature. Consequently there is no need to say that we are here precluded from looking upon the miracles in the light of signs, and that, according to our passage, they were not performed with any such object in view (de Wette) ; rather let us maintain, that they were certainly performed for such a purpose (John xi. 41 f., with which John iv. 48 is not at variance, comp. the note following viii. 4), though, in the present instance, it is not these that are referred to, but a sign κατ' ἐξοχήν, such as the Pharisees contemplated in their demand. Euth. Zigabenus (comp. Chrysostom) inaptly observes: τί οὖν ; οὐκ ἐποίησεν ἕκτοτε σημεῖον ; ἐποίησεν ἀλλ' οὐ δι' αὐτούς, πεπωρωμένοι γὰρ ἦσαν· ἀλλὰ διὰ τὴν τῶν ἄλλων ὠφέλειαν. — τὸ σημ. 'Ιωνᾶ] *which was given in the person of Jonah*, John ii. 1. Jesus thus indicates His *resurrection*, διὰ τὴν ὁμοιότητα, Euth. Zigabenus. Notice the emphasis in the *thrice* repeated σημεῖον.

Ver. 40. Τοῦ κήτους] *the monster of the deep*, Hom. *Il.*

v. 148; *Od.* iv. 446; Buttmann, *Lexil.* II. p. 95. The allusion is to the well-known story in *Jonah* ii. 1.—Jesus was dead only a day and two nights. But, in accordance with the popular method of computation (1 Sam. xxx. 12 f.; Matt. xxvii. 63), the parts of the first and third day are counted as whole days, as would be further suggested by the parallel that is drawn between the fate of the antitype and that of *Jonah*.<sup>1</sup>—The sign of *Jonah* has nothing to do with the withered rod that budded, Num. xvii. (in answer to Delitzsch); *Jonah* is the type.

REMARK.—Luke (xi. 30) gives no *explanation* of the sign of *Jonah* (v. 40), as is also the case with regard to Matt. xvi. 4 (where, indeed, according to Holtzmann, we have only a duplicate of the present narrative). Modern critics (Paulus, Eckermann, Schleiermacher, Dav. Schulz, Strauss, Neander, Krabbe, de Wette, Baumgarten - Crusius, Ammon, Bleek, Weizsäcker, Schenkel) have maintained that what Jesus meant by the sign of *Jonah* was not His resurrection at all, but *His preaching and His whole manifestation*, so that ver. 40 is supposed to be an “*awkward interpolation*,” belonging to a later period (Keim), an interpolation in which it is alleged that an *erroneous interpretation* is put into Jesus’ mouth. But (1) if in ver. 41 it is only the *preaching* of *Jonah* that is mentioned, it is worthy of notice that what is said regarding the *sign* is

<sup>1</sup> But the question as to what Jesus meant by ἵσταί . . . ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ τῆς γῆς, whether His *lying in the grave* (so the greater number of expositors), or His *abode in Hades* (Tertullian, Irenaeus, Theophylact, Bellarmin, Maldonatus, Olshausen, König, *Lehre von Christi Höllenfahrt*, Frankf. 1842, p. 54; Kahnis, *Dogmat.* I. p. 508), is determined by καρδία τῆς γῆς, to which expression the resting in the *grave* does not sufficiently correspond; for the *heart* of the earth can only indicate its lowest *depths*, just as καρδία τῆς θαλάσσης means the depths of the sea in *Jonah* ii. 4, from which the biblical expression καρδία in our present passage seems to have been derived. Again, the parallel in the κοιλία τοῦ πῆτους is, in any case, better suited to the idea of *Hades* than it is to that of a grave cut out of the rock on the surface of the earth. If, on the other hand, Jesus Himself has very distinctly intimated that His dying was to be regarded as a descending into Hades (Luke xxiii. 43), then ἵσταί . . . ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ τ. γ. must be referred to His sojourn there. There is nothing to warrant Güder (*Erschein. Chr. unter d. Todten*, p. 18) in disputing this reference by pointing to such passages as Ex. xv. 8; 2 Sam. xviii. 14. We should mistake the *plastic* nature of the style in such passages as those, if we did not take כּ as referring to the inmost depth.

entirely brought to a close in ver. 40, whereupon, by way of threatening the hearers and putting them to shame, ver. 41 proceeds to state, not what the Ninevites did in consequence of the *sign*, but what they did in consequence of the *preaching* of Jonah; and therefore (2) it is by no means presupposed in ver. 41 that the Ninevites had been made aware of the prophet's fate. (3) Of course, according to the *historical* sense of the narrative, this fate consisted in the prophet's being punished, and then pardoned again; but according to its *typical* reference, it at the same time constituted a σημεῖον, deriving its significance for after times *from its antitype as realized in Christ's resurrection*; that it had been a sign for the Ninevites, is nowhere said. (4) If Jesus is ranked above Jonah in respect of His person or preaching, not in respect of the sign, this, according to what has been said under observation 1, in no way affects the interpretation of the *sign*. (5) The resurrection of Jesus was a sign not merely for believers, but also for unbelievers, who either accepted Him as the Risen One, or became only the more confirmed in their hostility toward him. (6) Ver. 40 savours entirely of the mode and manner in which Jesus elsewhere alludes to His resurrection. Of course, in any case, he is found to predict it only in an *obscure* sort of way (see on xiv. 21), not plainly and in so many words; and accordingly we do not find it more directly intimated in ver. 40, which certainly it would have been if it had been an interpretation of the sign put into the Lord's mouth *ex eventu*. The expression is a remarkable parallel to John ii. 21, where John's explanation of it as referring to the resurrection has been erroneously rejected. It follows from all this that, so far as the subject-matter is concerned, the version of Luke xi. 30 is not to be regarded as differing from that of Matthew, but only as less complete, though evidently proceeding on the understanding that the interpretation of the Jonah-sign is to be taken for granted (Matt. xvi. 4).

Ver. 41 f. Ἀναστήσονται] Men of Nineveh will *come forward*, that is to say, *as witnesses*. Similarly οἱ, Job xvi. 8; Mark xiv. 57; Plat. *Legg.* xi. p. 937 A; Plut. *Marcell.* 27. Precisely similar is the use of ἐγερθήσεται below (comp. xi. 11, xxiv. 11). Others (Augustine, Beza, Elsner, Fritzsche) interpret: *in vitam redibunt*. This is flat and insipid, and inconsistent with ἐν τῇ κρίσει. — μετὰ] *with*, not: *against*. Both parties are supposed to be standing alongside of each other, or

opposite each other, in the judgment. — *κατακρ.*] by their conduct, *ὅτι μετενόησαν*, etc. “Ex ipsorum comparatione isti merito damnabuntur,” Augustine. Comp. Rom. ii. 27. — *ᾧδε*] like ver. 6, refers to the person of Jesus, which is a grander phenomenon than Jonah. For *πλείον*, comp. xii. 6. — *βασίλισσα νότου*] a queen from the South, i.e. from Sheba in Southern Arabia, 1 Kings x. 1 ff.; 2 Chron. ix. 1 ff.

Vv. 43–45. Having foretold that the existing generation would be condemned on the judgment day by the Ninevites and that queen from the South, Jesus now proceeds—according to the account in Matthew, which is undoubtedly original (comp. Weiss, 1864, p. 84 f.)—to explain in an allegorical way the condition of things on which this melancholy certainty is founded. The case of this generation, He says, will be very much like that of a demoniac, into whom the demon that has been expelled from him is ever seeking to return. The demon finds his former abode ready for his reception, and, reinforced by seven others still more wicked than himself, he again enters the demoniac, making his latter condition worse than the former. So will it be with this generation, which, though it should happen to undergo a temporary amendment, will relapse into its old state of confirmed wickedness, and become worse than before. The reason of this is to be found in the fact that the people in question have never entered into true fellowship with Christ, so that their amendment has not proved of a radical kind, has not been of the nature of a new birth. Comp. Luke xi. 23, 24 ff., where the words are connected with what is said in Matt. xii. 30, and are equally allegorical, and not intended literally to describe a case in which demons have actually returned after their expulsion. — *δέ*] the *explanatory autem*. It is quite gratuitous to suppose that in our present Matthew something has dropped out before ver. 43 (Ewald). — *ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*] in whom he had had his abode. — *δι’ ἀνύδρων τόπων*] because *deserts* (*ἡ ἀνυδρος*, the *desert*, in Herod. iii. 4) were reputed to be the dwelling-place of the demons. Tob. viii. 3; Bar. iv. 35; Rev. xviii. 2. — *ἐλθών*, ver. 44 (see the critical remarks), is due to the fact that the *πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον* is viewed in the light

of a *δαιμων*, in accordance with a construction, *κατὰ σύνεσιν*, of which classical writers also make a similar use; see Kühner, II. 1, p. 48 f.; Bornemann in the *Sächs. Stud.* 1846, p. 40. — *σχολάζοντα, σεσαρωμ. κ. κεκοσμ.] empty* (unpossessed), *swept and garnished*, a climax by way of describing the man's condition as one that is calculated to induce re-possession, not to indicate (Bengel, de Wette, Bleek) that healthy state of the soul which forms such an obstacle to the demon in his efforts to regain admission, that he is led to call in the assistance of others. This would be to represent the state of the case in such a way as to make it appear that the demon had found the house *barred against him*; but it would likewise be at variance with the whole *scope* of the allegory, which is designed to exhibit the hopeless *incurability* of the *γενεά*, so that what is pragmatically assumed is not the idea of moral soundness, but merely that of a readiness to welcome the return of evil influence after a temporary amendment. The reinforcement by seven other spirits is not to be ascribed to the need of greater strength in order to regain possession, but rather (hence *πονηρότερα*, not *ισχυρότερα*) to the fiendish desire now to torment the man much more than before; and so, according to our interpretation, it is no more necessary to impute the calling in of those others to the noble motive of sympathetic friendship (de Wette's objection) than it would be in the case of the legion with its association of demons. — *τὰ ἔσχατα]* *the last*, i.e. the condition in which he finds himself under the latter possession; *τὰ πρῶτα*: when there was only one demon within him. 2 Pet. ii. 20; Matt. xxvii. 64.

Vv. 46-50. The same incident is given in Luke viii. 19 ff. in a different but extremely loose connection, and, as there recorded, compares unfavourably with Matthew's version (in answer to Schleiermacher, Keim). The occasion of the incident as given in Mark iii. 20 ff. is altogether peculiar and no doubt historical. — *οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ]* even if nothing more were said, these words would naturally be understood to refer to the *brothers according to the flesh*, sons of Joseph and Mary, born after Jesus; but this reference is placed beyond all doubt by the fact that the *mother* is mentioned at the same

time (Mark iii. 31 ; Luke viii. 19 ; John ii. 12 ; Acts i. 14), just as in xiii. 55 the *father* and the *sisters* are likewise mentioned along with him. The expressions in i. 25, Luke ii. 7, find their explanation in the fact of the existence of those literal *brothers* of Jesus. Comp. note on i. 25 ; 1 Cor. ix. 5. The interpretations which make them *sons of Mary's sister*, or half brothers, *sons of Joseph by a previous marriage*, were wrung from the words even at a very early period (the latter already to be found as a legend in Origen ; the former, especially in Jerome, since whose time it has come to be generally adopted in the West), in consequence of the dogmatic assumption of Mary's perpetual virginity (nay, even of a corresponding state of things on the part of her husband as well), and owing to the extravagant notions which were entertained regarding the superhuman holiness that attached to her person as called to be the mother of Jesus. The same line of interpretation is, for similar reasons, still adopted in the present day by Olshausen, Arnoldi, Friedlieb, *L. J.* § 36 ; Lange, *apost. Zeitalt.* p. 189 ff. ; and in Herzog's *Encykl.* VI. p. 415 ff. ; Lichtenstein, *L. J.* p. 100 ff. ; Hengstenberg on John ii. 12 ; Schegg, and others ; also Döllinger, *Christenth. u. Kirche*, p. 103 f., who take the brothers and sisters for sons and daughters of Alphaeus ; while Hofmann, on the other hand, has abandoned this view, which he had previously maintained (*Erlang. Zeitschr.* 1851, Aug., p. 117), in favour of the correct interpretation (*Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 405 f.). See, besides, Clemen in Winer's *Zeitschr.* 1829, 3, p. 329 ff. ; Blom, *de τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς κυρίου*, 1839 ; Wieseler in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1842, p. 71 ff., and note on Gal. i. 19 ; Schaf, *ueber d. Verh. des Jak. Bruders des Herrn zu Jakob. Alphäi*, 1842 ; Neander, *Gesch. d. Pflanzung u. s. w.* p. 554 ff. ; Hilgenfeld on Gal. p. 138 ff. ; Wijbelingh, *Diss. quis sit epistolae Jacobi scriptor*, 1854, p. 1 ff. ; Riegenbach, *Vorles. üb. d. Leb. d. Herrn*, p. 286 ff. ; Huther on Jas. *Einl.* § 1 ; Kahnis, *Dogm.* I. p. 426 f. ; Wiesinger, *z. Br. Judä Einl.* ; Laurent, *neut. Stud.* p. 153 ff. ; Keim, I. p. 422 ff. For the various interpretations of the Fathers, see Thilo, *Cod. Apocr.* I. p. 262 ff. — ἐξω] The former incident (ver. 22 ff.) must therefore have occurred in some house.

Mark iii. 20 ; Luke viii. 20. — ἐπὶ τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ] not his hearers generally (τοὺς ὄχλους), and yet not merely the Twelve (ver. 50), but those who followed Him in the character of disciples ; *these* He indicated by pointing to them with the finger. — ἰδοὺ ἡ μήτηρ μου, κ.τ.λ.] my nearest relations in the true ideal sense of the word. Comp. Hom. *Il.* vi. 429 ; Dem. 237. 11 ; Xen. *Anab.* i. 3. 6, and Kühner's note ; Eur. *Hec.* 280 f., and Pflugk's note. True kinship with Jesus is established not by physical, but by spiritual relationship ; John i. 12 f., iii. 3 ; Rom. viii. 29. In reference to the seeming *harshness* of the reply, Bengel appropriately observes : " Non spernit matrem, sed anteponit Patrem ; ver. 50, et nunc non agnoscit matrem et fratres sub hoc formali." Comp. Jesus' own requirement in x. 37. He is not to be understood as avowing a sharp determination to break off His connection with them (Weizsäcker, p. 400),—a view, again, which the account in Mark is equally inadequate to support. Besides, it is evident from our passage, compared with Mark iii. 20 f., John vii. 3, that the mother of Jesus, who is placed by the latter in the same category with the brothers, and ranked below the μαθηταί, cannot as yet be fairly classed among the number of His believers, strange as this may seem when viewed in the light of the early gospel narrative (Olshausen has recourse to the fiction of a brief struggle to believe). Again, judging from the whole repelling tendency of His answer, it would appear to be more probable that He declined the interview with His relations *altogether*, than that He *afterwards* still afforded them an opportunity of speaking with Him, as is supposed by Ebrard and Schegg. Be this as it may, there is nothing to justify Chrysostom and Theophylact in charging the mother and the brothers with *ostentation*, inasmuch as they had requested Jesus *to come out to them*, instead of their going in to Him. — ὅστις γὰρ, κ.τ.λ.] spoken in the full consciousness of His being the Son of God, who has *duties incumbent upon Him in virtue of His mission*. — αὐτός] *He*, no other.

## CHAPTER XIII

VER. 1. The omission of *δέ* (Lachm. Tisch. 8) is supported by B *κ*, three Curss. It. Arm. Aeth. Or. But the apparently superfluous *δέ* might very easily be left out, coming as it does before *τῇ*. — *ἀπὸ τ. οἰκ.*] Lachm. Tisch. 8: *ἐκ τ. οἰκ.*, after Z *κ*, 33, Or. Chrys. Weakly attested. Yet B, Or. (once) omit the preposition altogether. — Ver. 2. *τὸ πλοῦτον*] Lachm.: *πλοῦτον* (B C L Z *κ*). But see on viii. 23. — Ver. 4. *ἤλθε*] Lachm.: *ἤλθον*, after D L Z, Curss. Since *κατέφαγεν* below necessarily presupposes the singular, this reading must be regarded as merely an error on the part of the transcriber, which was amended in B, Curss. by substituting *ἐλθόντα* and omitting the following *καί* (so Tisch. 7). Otherwise, Fritzsche, *de conform. N. T. crit. Lachm.* p. 52 f. — Ver. 7. Instead of *ἀπέπνιξαν*, with Tisch. 8, read *ἐπνιξαν*, after D *κ*, Curss. The reading of the Received text is from Luke. — Ver. 9. *ἀκούειν*] is, with Tisch., to be deleted, in accordance with B L *κ*\* Codd. It. See on xi. 15. — Ver. 14. *αὐτοῖς*] Elz.: *ἐπ' αὐτοῖς*, against decisive testimony. An interpretation. — Ver. 15. *συνῶσι*] So Elz. 1624, 1633, 1641, Griesb. Matth. Lachm. Tisch., according to decisive testimony. Scholz: *συνῶσι*. — *ἰάσωμαι*] Lachm. Tisch.: *ἰάσομαι*, after testimony of so decisive a character that it cannot have been derived from the LXX., while the subjunctive mood may have been adopted for sake of conformity with the preceding verbs. Comp. on John xii. 40. — Ver. 16. After *ᾧτα* Lachm. deletes the superfluous *ἡμῶν*, only according to B, Curss. Codd. It. Hil.; and for *ἀκούει*, he and Tisch. read *ἀκούουσιν*, after B C M X *κ* and Curss. Or. Eus. Cyr. Chrys. The latter is a mechanical conformation to the previous verb. — Ver. 17. *γάρ*] is deleted by Tisch. 8, only after X *κ*, Curss. It. Arm. Aeth. Hil. — Ver. 18. For *σπείροντος* Lachm. Tisch. 8 read *σπεύραντος*, after B X *κ*\* Curss. Syr. p. Chrys. Correctly; the *σπείρων* of ver. 3 would still be lingering in the minds of the transcribers. Therefore, in deference to still stronger testimony, should *σπεύραντι* be adopted in ver. 24, with Lachm. and Tisch. 8. — Ver. 22. *τούτου*] omitted after *αἰῶνος* in B D *κ*\* Arm. Cant. Verc. Germ. 1, Corb. 2, Clar. Deleted by Lachm. and



Tisch. Explanatory addition. — Ver. 23. The form *συνιείς* (Lachm. Tisch., after B D  $\aleph$ , 238, Or.) instead of *συνιών* has been adopted in consequence of ver. 19. — Ver. 25. *ἔσπειρε*] Lachm. and Tisch.: *ἐπέσπειρεν*, after B  $\aleph^{**}$  (\* has *ἐπέσπαρκεν*) and Curss. Arm. It. Vulg. Clem. Or. and several Fathers. Correctly; how easily might the preposition be dropped through carelessness in transcribing! More easily than that the *ἐπέσπειρεν*, which occurs nowhere else in the New Testament, should have been inserted as a gloss. — Ver. 27. The article, which in Elz. is placed before *ζιζάνια*, is deleted by Griesb. and the later critics, according to decisive testimony. So also with regard to *τῷ* before *καιρῷ* in ver. 30, where Fritzsche wrongly maintains *τῷ* to be necessary. — Ver. 30. *εἰς δέσμας*] D L X  $\Delta$ , Curss. Or. Chrys. Codd. I. have merely *δέσμας*, some with and others without *αὐτά*. Tisch. 7 has deleted *εἰς* (comp. Rinck), and that correctly; an explanatory addition. — Ver. 32. The form *κατασκηνοῦν* (Lachm. Tisch.) is only found in B\* D; in the case of Mark iv. 32, only in B\*. — Ver. 34. *οὐκ*] Lachm. Tisch.: *οὐδέν*, after B C M  $\Delta$   $\aleph^{*}$  Curss. Syr. p. Arm. Clem. Or. Chrys., should be adopted on the strength of this testimony, and because *οὐκ* is found in Mark, and is by way of toning down the expression. — Ver. 35. *διὰ*]  $\aleph^{*}$  1, 13, 33, 124, 253 insert *Ἡσαίου*, which is supported by Eus. Porphy. and Jerom. A false gloss,<sup>1</sup> notwithstanding that it is adopted by Tisch. 8. Jerom. suggests *Ἀσάφ. — κόσμου*] deleted by Tisch. 8, after B  $\aleph^{**}$  1, 22, several Codd. of the It. Syr<sup>cur</sup> Or. Clem. Eus. The omission was occasioned by the LXX., which has merely *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς*. — Ver. 36. *ὁ Ἰησοῦς*] and *αὐτοῖς*, ver. 37, as well should be deleted as interpolations, according to B D  $\aleph$ , Curss. Verss. and Or. Chrys. — Ver. 40. *καίεται*] Elz. Lachm. and Tisch. 8: *κατακαίεται*, after B D  $\aleph$ . Taken from ver. 30. — For *αἰῶν. τούτου* Lachm. and Tisch. have merely *αἰῶνος*, after B D r  $\aleph$ , Curss. Verss. Cyr. Ir. Hil. Correctly; *τούτου* is quite a common addition, as in ver. 22. — Ver. 44. *πάλιν ὁμοία*] B D  $\aleph$ , Vulg. It. Syr<sup>cur</sup> Copt. Arm. Tisch. have merely *ὁμοία*; Lachm. has *πάλιν* only in brackets. It would be more readily deleted than inserted, for at this point a new series of parables begins, and it would seem to be in its proper

<sup>1</sup> A clear idea of the age of this erroneous addition may be obtained from the fact that it was even found in a copy of Matthew made use of by the Clementine Homilies (see Uhlhorn, *Homil. u. Recogn. d. Clem.* p. 119), and also from the circumstance of Porphyry's chuckling over the *Ἡσαίου* as being an error on the part of the inspired evangelist. But the weight of critical testimony is very decidedly in favour of rejecting *Ἡσαίου* in Matthew as spurious (in answer to Credner, *Beitr.* I. p. 302 ff.; Schneckenburger, p. 136, and Bleek).



less reason for regarding the *similarity of character* which runs through the *seven*, as recorded by Matthew, in the light of an "*overwhelming*" with parables (Strauss), and the less need to ascribe some of them (Keim, comp. Schenkel), and especially those of the mustard seed and the leaven, to a different period, from their being supposed to be applicable (Weizsäcker) to a later order of things. Yet, when we consider that Jesus surveyed the future of his work with a prophetic eye, we need not be at a loss to see how a parabolic address might contemplate a *later* state of things just as fittingly as does the Sermon on the Mount, to which this series of parables stands in the same relation as the superstructure to the foundation of a building. Comp. Ewald, who holds, however, that originally the parables stood in a somewhat different order. — ἀπὸ τ. οἰκίας] is to be taken in connection with ἔξω, xii. 46, and not to be regarded as referring to no house in particular (Hilgenfeld).

Ver. 2. Τὸ πλοῖον] the boat standing by. — ἐπὶ τὸν αἰγιαλόν] *along the shore* (comp. xiv. 19), as in xviii. 12. Winer, p. 380 [E. T. 508]; Nägelsbach, note on Hom. *Il.* ii. 308. The expression is suited to the idea of a gathering of people extending over a considerable space.

Ver. 3 f. Παραβολή (Arist. *Rhet.* ii. 20), ἡγῆ, *the narrating of an incident which, though imaginary, still falls within the sphere of natural events, with the view of thereby illustrating some truth or other* (ἵνα καὶ ἐμφατικώτερον τὸν λόγον ποιήσῃ, καὶ πλείονα τὴν μνήμην ἐνθῇ, καὶ ὑπ' ὄψιν ἀγάγῃ τὰ πράγματα, Chrysostom). See Unger, *de parabolar. Jesu natura, interpretatione, usu*, 1828, who gives the following definition: *collatio per narratiunculam fictam, sed veri similem, serio illustrans rem sublimiorem.*<sup>2</sup> The correct canon for the interpretation of

<sup>1</sup> To be distinguished from the *fable*, which, for example, may introduce *animals, trees*, and such like as speaking and acting. "Fabula est, in qua nec vera nec verisimiles res continentur," Cic. *invent.* i. 19. So far as appears from the New Testament, Christ *never* made use of the fable; as little did the apostles; in the Old Testament, in Judg. ix. 8 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Observe, moreover, that the New Testament παραβολή and ἡγῆ may mean something more comprehensive and less definite (including every description of figurative speech, Mark iii. 23. iv. 30. vii. 17; Luke iv. 23, v. 36, vi. 39.

the parables is already to be found in Chrysostom on xx. 1 : οὐδὲ χρὴ πάντα τὰ ἐν ταῖς παραβολαῖς κατὰ λέξιν περιεργάζεσθαι, ἀλλὰ τὸν σκόπον μαθόντες, δι' ὃν συνετέθη, τοῦτον δρέπεσθαι καὶ μηδὲν πολυπραγμονεῖν περαιτέρω. — ὁ σπείρων] *the sower*, whom I have in view. Present participle, used as a substantive. See on ii. 20. A similar parable is given in the Jerusalem Talmud *Kila'im* I. f. 27. — παρὰ τ. ὁδόν] *upon the road* (which went round the edge of the field), so that it was not ploughed in or harrowed in along with the rest. — τὰ πετρώδη] *the rocky parts*, i.e. "saxum continuum sub terrae superficie tenui," Bengel.

Ver. 6 f. Ἐκαυματ.] *was scorched* (Rev. xvi. 8 f.; Plut. *Mor.* p. 100 D, with reference to fever-heat). — διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν ῥίζαν] Owing to the shallowness of the earth, the seed sent up shoots before the root was duly formed. — ἐπὶ τὰς ἀκάνθ. ] *upon the thorns* (which were about to spring up there), and these *grew up* (ἀνέβησαν, Xen. *Oec.* xix. 18), *shot up*. Comp. Jer. iv. 3; Theophrastus, *c. pl.* ii. 17. 3 : τὸ τῇ ἀκάνθῃ ἐπισπειρόμενον σπέρμα.

Ver. 8. Ἐκατὸν κ.τ.λ.] That *grains* are meant is self-evident, without our having to supply καρπούς. For the great fertility of the East, and especially of Galilee, consult Wetstein on this passage. Dougtius, *Anal.* II. p. 15 f.; Köster, *Erläut.* p. 171; Keim, II. p. 448. However, such points of detail (comp. as to ἑκατόν, Gen. xxvi. 12) should not be pressed, serving as they do merely to enliven and fill out the picture.

Vv. 9, 10. See on xi. 15. — The parabolic discourse is resumed at ver. 24, after Jesus has finished the private exposition of those already spoken, into which he was led in consequence of the question addressed to him by the disciples. The exposition was given in the boat, where it is sufficiently possible to conceive such a conversation to have taken place

xiv. 7; Matt. xv. 15, xxiv. 32) than is implied in the above definition of the *parable* as a hermeneutical *terminus technicus*. Comp. the Johannean *παροιμία* (note on John x. 6). John does not use the word *parable*; but then he does not report any such among the sayings of Jesus, though he has a few allegories; as, for example, those of the vine and the good shepherd.

without the necessity of our regarding the whole situation as *imaginary* (Hilgenfeld), or without our having to suppose it "rather more probable" that the exposition took place after the whole series of parables was brought to a close (Keim). — Ver. 10. The question, which in Matthew is framed to suit the reply (Neander, Weiss, Holtzmann), appears in a different and certainly more original form (in answer to Keim) in Mark iv. 10; Luke viii. 9.

Ver. 11. *Δέδοται*] *by God*, through the unfolding, that is, of your inward powers of perception, not merely by means of the exposition (Weizsäcker, p. 413). The opposite condition, ver. 13. — *γνῶναι*] even without the help of parabolic illustration, although previous to the outpouring of the Spirit, nay, previous to the second coming (1 Cor. xiii. 9 f), this would always be the case only to an imperfect degree. — *τὰ μυστ. τ. βασ. τ. οὐραν.*] *the secret things of the Messiah's kingdom*, things which refer to the Messiah's kingdom. They are called *μυστήρια*, because their *ἀποκάλυψις* was now being brought about for the first time by means of the gospel. Comp. note on Rom. xi. 25, xvi. 25. They are the purposes that are hid in God, which man can only know by the help of divine teaching, and which the gospel unveils. — *ἐκείνοις δὲ οὐ δέδοται*] is still to be connected with *ὅτι* (*because*).

Ver. 12. *Proverbial* saying derived from the experience of ordinary life (xxv. 29): The wealthy man will become still richer even to superabundance; while the poor man, again, will lose the little that still remains to him; see Wetstein. In this instance the saying is used with reference to spiritual possessions, and is applied thus: *With the knowledge you have already acquired, you are ever penetrating more deeply and fully into the things of God's kingdom; the multitude, on the other hand, would lose altogether the little capacity it has for understanding divine truth, unless I were to assist its weak powers of apprehension by parabolic illustrations.* The contrast between the two cases in question is not to be regarded as consisting in *uti* and *non uti* (Grotius), *being willing* and *not being willing* (Schegg). — For the passive *περισσεύεσθαι*, *to be in possession of a superabundance*, see on Luke xv. 17. — *ὅστις ἔχει* is

the nominative absolute, as in vii. 24, x. 14. ἔχειν and οὐκ ἔχειν, in the sense of *rich* and *poor*, is likewise very common in classical authors, Ast, *ad Plat. Legg.* V. p. 172; Bornemann, *ad Xen. Anab.* vi. 6. 38.

Ver. 13. Διὰ τοῦτο] refers to what immediately precedes; because their case is similar to that of the poor, and so they would lose the little that they had; but the ὅτι (*because, namely*) which follows introduces an explanation by way of justifying διὰ τοῦτο (comp. John x. 17), and which depicts in proverbial language (Isa. xxxii. 3, xxxv. 5 f., 9 f.; Jer. v. 21) the people's dulness of apprehension. It is unnecessary to make the reference of διὰ τοῦτο extend so far back as ver. 11 (Fritzsche, de Wette, Bleek). In defiance of grammar, yet in deference to the parallels in Mark and Luke, Olshausen says that ὅτι, *because*, expresses the result intended (ἵνα); similarly Schegg; comp. also Weizsäcker, p. 413.

Vv. 14, 15. Καί] still depending on ὅτι; but, in a manner suited to the simplicity of the language, and the conspicuous reference to the fulfilling of the prophecy, it begins a new sentence: *and*—indeed so utterly incapable are they of comprehending the pure, literal statement of divine truth—is *being fulfilled with regard to them*, and so on. ἀναπληρ., as being more forcible than the simple verb (comp. on Gal. vi. 2, and ἐκπληρ., Acts xiii. 33), is expressly chosen (occurring nowhere else in Matthew, and, as referring to the predictions and such like, not found again in the whole New Testament), and for sake of emphasis placed at the beginning of the sentence; αὐτοῖς is the dative of reference: the fulfilment of the prophet's words is realized in them.—The passage in question is Isa. vi. 9, 10, as found in the LXX. Comp. on John xii. 40; Acts xxviii. 25 ff. —ἐπαχύνθη] in a metaphorical sense, like *pinguis*. See Wetstein. The expression represents the indolent and inactive state into which the energies of the spiritual life have been allowed to sink — βαρέως ἤκουσαν] *they have become dull of hearing* (βαρὺήκοοι). — ἐκάμυσαν] *have they closed*, Isa. vi. 10, xxix. 10; Lam. iii. 44. The genuine Greek form is καταμύειν. See Lobeck, *Phryg.* p. 339 f.; Becker, *Anecd.* I. p. 103. — μήποτε] *ne*; they are not *willing*

to be instructed by me, and morally healed. This shows that, in regard to the weakness of their capacity, it is *their own will that is to blame*.—By adopting the reading *ἰάσομαι* (see the critical remarks) we do not introduce the meaning, which is out of place in the present instance: *and I will heal them* (Fritzsche), but rather effect a change in the construction of *μήποτε* (Heindorf, *ad Plat. Crat.* p. 36; Hermann, *ad Soph. El.* 992; Winer, p. 468 [E. T. 630]), that is, in accordance with the sense (because expressing the *result*). Comp. note on Mark xiv. 2. Notice in *ἰάσομαι* the consciousness of being a personal revelation of God.

REMARK. — According to Matthew, then, the principle on which Jesus proceeds is this: He speaks to the multitude in parables, because this mode of instruction is suited to their intellectual poverty and obtuseness. Plain literal teaching would fail to attract them, and so lead to their conversion, which latter their very obtuseness stubbornly resists. But what is spoken in a parabolic form captivates and lays hold of the man of limited comprehension, so that it does not repel him from his instructor, but rather becomes in him, even though not yet apprehended in its abstract meaning, the starting-point of a further gradual development of fuller understanding and ultimate conversion. There is no reason why de Wette should be stumbled to find that the disciples themselves likewise failed to understand the parable, and were therefore on the same level as the multitudes; therefore, he argues, one is at a loss to see why Jesus did not favour the latter also with an explanation. But the difference between the two cases is, that the disciples, from having been already converted, and from their minds having been already stimulated and developed by intercourse with Jesus, were just in a position to understand the *interpretation*, which the people, on the other hand, were incapable of doing, so that it was necessary to present to them the *mere illustration*, the parable *without the interpretation*, in order to, first, interest and attract them. They had to be treated like children, for whose physical condition the *only* suitable food is milk, and *not* strong meat *likewise*, whereas the disciples had *already* shown themselves capable of receiving the strong meat *as well*. Consequently de Wette is wrong in conceiving of the matter differently from the representation of it given by the evangelists, and which is to this effect: that the object of Jesus

in awakening a spirit of inquiry by means of the parables was, *that those so awakened should come to Him to obtain instruction*; that those who did so are to be regarded as the μαθηταί in the more comprehensive sense of the word; and that to them the explanation was given and the congratulation addressed; while, on the other hand, Jesus pities the unimpressionable multitude, and applies to them the words of Isa. vi. 9 f. (comp. already Münster). Lastly, Hilgenfeld professes to find in this passage indications of the view, censured by Strauss as "melancholy," that the use of parables was not intended to aid weak powers of comprehension, but in the truly literal sense of the words to keep them slumbering. But as regards Matthew, above all, this is out of the question, seeing that in ver. 13 he has ὅτι, and not ἵνα. Comp. Keim also, II. p. 441. It is otherwise in Mark iv. 12; Luke viii. 10.

Vv. 16, 17. 'Τμῶν] stands first for sake of emphasis, and in contrast to the stupid multitude. — μακάριοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοί] Personification of the faculty of sight. Luke xi. 27; Acts v. 9; Isa. lii. 7. — ὅτι βλέπουσι . . . ὅτι ἀκούει] The thought underlying this (and keeping in view vv. 13, 15) may be stated thus: your intellect, as regards the apprehension of divine truth, is not unreceptive and obtuse, but susceptible and active. — γάρ] justifies the congratulation on the ground of the important nature of the matter in question. — δίκαιοι] Upright, holy men of old. Comp. x. 41, xxiii. 29, also ἄγιοι, xxvii. 52. — ἰδεῖν ἃ βλέπετε, κ.τ.λ.] the μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας, ver. 11; Heb. xi. 13, 39. The vision of Abraham, John viii. 56, is foreign to the present passage, from the fact of its not having been seen during his life in the body.—The βλέπειν in ver. 16 was equivalent to, *to be capable of seeing*, while here it means simply *to see*. Comp. note on John ix. 39. But there is no ground for supposing that Matthew has mixed up two distinct discourses (de Wette).

Ver. 18 f. 'Τμεῖς] emphatic, as in ver. 16. — οὖν] for it is with you precisely as has been said in ver. 16. — ἀκούσατε] not: *understand* (de Wette), but: *hear*, attend to the parable, that is, with a view to see the *meaning* that it is intended to convey. — παντὸς, κ.τ.λ.] an anacoluthon. The evangelist had perhaps intended to write: παντὸς ἀκούοντος



— συνιέντος ἐκ τῆς καρδίας ἀρπάζει ὁ πονηρὸς τὸ ἐσπαρμένον, *from the heart of every one that hears without understanding, the wicked one, and so on; but, from the circumstance of the ἔρχεται coming in the way, he was led to break off the construction with which he had set out.* Bornemann in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1849, p. 107. — τ. λόγον τ. βασι.] *the preaching of the Messianic kingdom*, iv. 23, xxiv. 14; Acts i. 3, xxviii. 31. — συνιέντος] *understands, not: attends to it*, which is grammatically and contextually (ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ) wrong (in answer to Beza, Grotius). Mark and Luke say nothing whatever here about the not understanding; it does not appear to have been found in the collection of our Lord's sayings (λογία), but to have been added to the original narrative by way of explanation (Ewald), its adoption being now rendered further necessary owing to the turn given to the sentence by παντός, which latter would otherwise be out of place. The explanation given in this addition happens, however, to be *correct*; for the word that is *not understood*, that is, not appropriated through the understanding, lies on the surface of the heart without being incorporated with the inner life, and therefore, in presence of the devil's temptations, is the more liable to be forgotten again, and cast away, so that faith fails to take possession of the heart (Rom. x. 10). — οὗτός ἐστιν, κ.τ.λ.] *a cutting short of a similitude before it is fully worked out, that is not uncommon owing to the liveliness of the Oriental imagination. Not the man, but the truth taught, is ὁ σπαρείς.* What is meant is to this effect: *This is he in whose case the seed was sown upon the road.* Others (Euth. Zigabenus, Erasmus, Beza, Erasmus Schmid, Maldonatus, Grotius, Bengel, Rosenmüller, Kuinoel) interpret: *This is he who was sown upon the road.* Paulus and Vater refer οὗτος to λόγος. Neither of the explanations harmonizes with vv. 20, 22, 23. That the loss of the seed is tantamount to the loss of one's own life, though not stated in so many words (Lange), is implied in the nature of the case.

Ver. 21. Description of one whose mind is so stirred as instantly to welcome the word with joy, but who, when subjected to the testing influence of affliction, abandons his faith

and relapses into his former condition. Such an one is *without root in his own inner being*, i.e. he is destitute of that faith (Eph. iii. 16 f.) which, as a power in the heart, is fitted to maintain and foster the life that has been momentarily awakened by means of the word. — *πρόσκαιρος*] *temporary*, not lasting, not enduring. See Wetstein. — *θλίψεως ἡ διωγμοῦ*] by means of the "*or*" the *special* is added on to the *general*. — *σκανδαλίζεται*] *he encounters a stumbling-block*, i.e. a temptation to unbelief; see notes on v. 29, i. 6. Affliction in his case proves a *πειρασμός* to which he succumbs. Substantially the same as Luke viii. 13 : *ἀφίστανται*.

Ver. 22. *Ἀκούων*] is simply to *hear*, as in all the other cases in which it is here used; and neither, with Grotius, are we to supply *καὶ μετὰ χαρᾶς λαμβάνων*, nor, with Kuinoel and Bleek, to take it in the sense of *admittere*. — *The care for this world*, which (vv. 39, 49) extends even to the setting up of the promised kingdom (*τούτου* is a correct gloss), is *the care* which men cherish with regard to temporal objects and temporal affairs, as contrasted with the higher concern, the striving after the Messiah's kingdom (vi. 33). Comp. 2 Tim. iv. 10. — *ἀπάτη*] *the deceitfulness of those riches*, which (personified) *delude* men with their enticements; not: "*Delectatio, qua divitiae animos hominum afficiunt*" (Kuinoel), a classical meaning of *ἀπάτη* (Polyb. ii. 56. 12, iv. 20. 5) which is foreign to the New Testament, and which in this instance is as unnecessary as it is flat. 2 Thess. ii. 10; Heb. iii. 13. — *ἄκαρπ. γίν.*] not the *word* (Bengel), but the *man*; see ver. 23.

Ver. 23. *Ὁς*] refers to *ἀκ. κ. συν.* — For the more correct accentuation, *συνίων*, see note on Rom. iii. 11. — *δὴ*] gives significance and prominence to the *ὅς*: *and now this is he who*; "*ut intelligas, ceteros omnes infrugiferos, hunc demum reddere fructum*," Erasmus. See Hartung, *Partikell.* I. p. 274 f.; Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 404; Baeumlein, *Partik.* p. 106. — Whether we ought to read *ὁ μὲν . . . ὁ δὲ . . . ὁ δέ* (Beza, Grotius), or *ὁ μὲν . . . ὁ δὲ . . . ὁ δέ* (Bengel, Lachmann, Tischendorf, following the Vulgate), is certainly not to be determined by Mark iv. 20, though I should say the latter is to be preferred, on account of the solemn emphasis with which, accord-

ing to this reading, the concluding words of the parable itself are repeated at the close of the exposition, without their requiring any particular explanation: *the one* (*seed, i.e., according to the blending which takes place of the figure and the person: one of those who hear and understand*) *brings forth a hundred, the other sixty, and so on.*

Ver. 24. *Αὐτοῖς*] to the multitude. Comp. vv. 3, 10, 34. — *ὡμοιώθη*] the Messiah's kingdom *has become like* (see note on vii. 26). The *aurist* is to be explained from the fact that the Messiah has already appeared, and is now carrying on His work in connection with His kingdom. Comp. xii. 28. — *σπείραντι* (see critical remarks): the sowing *had taken place*; whereupon followed the act that is about to be mentioned. It is to be observed, moreover, that the kingdom is not represented merely by the person of the sower, but by his sowing good seed, and by all that follows thereupon (as far as ver. 30); but to such an extent is the sower the leading feature in the parable, that we are thereby enabled to account for such phraseology as *ὡμοιώθη ἡ βασιλεία . . . ἀνθρώπων σπείραντι*. Comp. ver. 45, xviii. 23, xx. 1.

Ver. 25. *Ζιζάνιον*] *Darnel, lolium temulentum*, a grain resembling wheat, acting injuriously upon the brain and stomach, and likewise known by the name of *αἶρα*; see Suidas. In Talmudic language it is called *רִנֵּי*; Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* p. 680.—The *people* who slept are *men* generally (pragmatic way of hinting that it was during the night, when no one else would be present), not merely the *agri custodes* (Bengel), or the *labourers* (Michaelis, Paulus), whom it would have been necessary to indicate more *particularly* by means of *δοῦλοι* or some similar expression. This little detail forms part of the *drapery* of the parable (comp. xxv. 5), and is not meant to be interpreted (as referring, say to the *sleep of sin*, Calovius; or to the negligence of instructors, Chrysostom, Jerome; or to the slowness of man's spiritual development, Lange), as is further evident from the fact that Jesus Himself has not so explained it. — *αὐτοῦ ὁ ἐχθρ.*] *his enemy*; comp. note on viii. 3—*ἐπισπείρειν*: *to sow over what was previously sown*, Pind. *Nem.* viii. 67; Theophr. *c. pl.* iii. 15. 4; Poll. i. 223.

Vv. 26 ff. It was only when they were in the ear that it was possible to distinguish between the wheat and the tares, which when in the blade resembled it so much. — συλλέξωμεν] *deliberative*; shall we gather together? — ἐκρίζωσθε] ye take out by the root. The roots of tares and wheat are intertwined with each other. — ἅμα αὐτοῖς] along with them. ἅμα, which is in the first instance to be regarded as an *adverb* (hence ἅμα σύν, 1 Thess. iv. 17, v. 10), is also used as a *preposition* by classical writers (which Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 97 f., denies, though without reason), and that not merely in reference to time (xx. 1), but on other occasions, such as the present for example. Herod. vi. 138; Soph. *Phil.* 971, 1015; Polyb. iv. 2. 11, x. 18. 1; comp. Wisd. xviii. 11; 2 Mac. xi. 7.

Ver. 30. Ἐν καιρῷ] without the article, Winer, p. 118 [E. T. 147 ff.]. — δήσατε αὐτὰ δεσμ.] (see critical remarks): bind them into bundles. For this construction of δήσ. with two accusatives, considering the resemblance between it and the root of δεσμ., comp. Kühner, II. 1, p. 274.—The *explanation* of the parable, which latter is different from that given in Mark iv. 26 ff (in answer to Holtzmann, Weiss), is furnished by Jesus Himself in ver. 37 ff. It is to this effect. The visible church, up till the day of judgment, is to comprise within its pale those who are not members of the invisible church, and who shall have no part in the kingdom that is to be established. The separation is not a thing with which man is competent to deal, but must be left in the hands of the Judge. The matter is to be understood, however, in a broad and general way, so that it cannot be said at all to affect the right of individual excommunication and restoration. In regard to individuals, there remains the possibility (to which, however, the parable makes no reference whatever): “ut qui hodie sunt zizania, cras sint frumentum,” Augustine.

Ver. 31. Σίναπι] a herbaceous plant that, in the East, sometimes attains to the height of a small tree; Celsii *Hierob.* II. p. 250 ff. In Attic Greek it is called νᾶπυ, Phrynichus, ed. Lobeck, p. 228. Inasmuch as the plant belongs (ver. 32) to the order of the λαχάνα, it is unnecessary to suppose, with

Ewald (*Jahrb.* II. p. 32 f.), that it is the mustard-tree (*Salvadora Persica*, Linnaeus) that is intended; comp. in preference the expression *δενδρολάχανα* (Theophrastus, *h. pl.* i. 3. 4). — *λαβών*] an instance of the usual circumstantiality (comp. ver. 33), but not intended to convey the idea of the care with which so tiny a seed is taken into the hand (Lange).

Ver. 32. "Ο] refers to *κόκκος σινάπ.*, and owes its gender to the fact of its being attracted by the neuter following; Winer, p. 156 [E. T. 217 ff.]. — *μικρότερον*] not instead of the superlative; see, however, on note xi. 11. But, inasmuch as this is a proverbial expression of a hyperbolical character, little need be made of the fact that seeds of a still more *diminutive* kind are to be met with; comp. xvii. 20, and Lightfoot. "Satis est, *in genere verum esse, quod dicit Dominus,*" Erasmus. — *τῶν λαχάνων*] *than any other vegetable.* — *ὅταν δὲ αὐξ. κ.τ.λ.*] *but when it shall have grown,* portrays the *extraordinary* result that follows the sowing of the tiny little seed. The astonishing nature of such a result is still more forcibly brought out in Luke xiii. 19 by means of *δένδρον μέγα.* — *κατασκ.*] *dwell.* The interpretation of the word as meaning *to build nests* (Erasmus) is not general enough; comp. note on viii. 20.

Ver. 33. *Σάτον*] *שָׂטָן*, one-third of an ephah, a dry measure, and, according to Josephus, *Antt.* ix. 4. 5, and Jerome on this passage, equivalent to one and a half Roman bushels. It befits the *pictorial* style of the passage that it should mention a *definite quantity* of flour; without any special object for doing so, it mentions what appears to be the *usual* quantity (Gen. xviii. 6; Judg. vi. 19; 1 Sam. i. 24). So much the more arbitrary is Lange's remark, that three is the number of the *spirit*. A great deal in the way of *allegorizing* the *three σάτα* is to be found in the Fathers. According to Theodore of Mopsuestia, they denote the Greeks, Jews, and Samaritans; Augustine, Melanchthon suppose them to signify the heart, the soul, and the spirit.

*The parable of the mustard seed* is designed to show that the great community, consisting of those who are to participate in the Messianic kingdom, *i.e.* the true people of God as con-

stituting the body politic of the future kingdom, is destined to develop from a small beginning into a vast multitude, and therefore to grow *extensively*; *πολύμνιον ὄντες ὀλίγον, εἰς ἄπειρον ηὔξηθησαν*, Euth. Zigabenus; Acts i. 15, ii. 41, 47, iv. 4, v. 14, vi. 7, xxi. 20; Rom. xv. 19, xi. 25 f. *The parable of the leaven*, on the other hand, is intended to show how the specific influences of the Messiah's kingdom (Eph. iv. 4 ff.) gradually penetrate the whole of its future subjects, till by this means the entire mass is brought *intensively* into that spiritual condition which qualifies it for being admitted into the kingdom.

Ver. 34. Οὐδὲν ἐλάλει] κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν ἐκείνον δηλαδή, Euth. Zigabenus; comp. Chrysostom. This is further indicated by the *imperfect* relative (previously aorists were being used). The absolute sense in which the words are understood by Baumgarten-Crusius and Hilgenfeld is inconsistent with historical facts; nor could Matthew, or Mark iv. 34, have intended the words to be so taken without being guilty of the grossest absurdity. This in answer no less to Weiss, Holtzmann, Volkmar.

Ver. 35. The circumstance that, on this occasion, Jesus spoke exclusively in parabolic language, was supposed, according to the divine order in history, to be a fulfilling<sup>1</sup> of, and so on. — *προφήτου*] *Asaph*, who in 2 Chron. xxix. 30 is called *הַנְּחִי* (LXX. has *τοῦ προφήτου*). The passage referred

<sup>1</sup> The passage, however, is not a *prophecy* so far as its historical meaning is concerned, but only according to the typical reference which the evangelist discerns in it. In the original Hebrew it is expressly said *לְשֹׁבַב*, not in *parables*, but in a *song of proverbs*, the contents of which, however, though *historical* from beginning to end, "latentes rerum Messiae figuras continebat" (Grotius), and a similar instance of which we meet with afterwards in the discourse of Stephen. Accordingly, the prophet, instructing and warning as he does by means of a typical use of history, is looked upon by the evangelist as the type of *Christ* speaking in parabolic narratives, and through this medium unfolding the mysteries of the completed theocracy. In *Christ* he finds realized what the prophet says with reference to *himself*: *ἀνοίξω*, etc., and *ἰπνύομαι*, etc., the *antitypical fulfilment*, though it must be granted that in doing so it is undoubtedly the expression *ἐν παραβολαῖς* on which he makes the whole thing to turn, but that, availing himself of a freedom acknowledged to be legitimate in the use of types, he has employed that expression in a *special sense*, and one that is foreign to the original Hebrew.

to is Ps. lxxviii. 2, the first half being according to the LXX., the second a free rendering of the Hebrew text. — ἐρεύγεσθαι] *to give forth from the mouth*, מַגִּיד, employed by Alexandrian Jews in the sense of *pronuntiare*, Ps. xviii. 2; Lobeck, *ad Phryg.* p. 63 f. — κεκρυμμ. ἀπὸ καταβ. κόσμ.] *i.e.* τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας, Rom. xvi. 25.

Ver. 36. Τὴν οἰκίαν] the house mentioned in ver. 1. — φράσον; comp. xv. 15. Occurs nowhere else in the New Testament. It denotes speaking in the way of *explaining, unfolding* anything. Plat. *Gorg.* p. 463 E, *Theaet.* p. 180 B; Soph. *Trach.* 158, *Phil.* 555. The reading διασάφησον (Lachmann, after B κ and Origen once) is a correct gloss.

Vv. 37, 38. In explaining this parable Jesus contents Himself, as far as ver. 39, with short positive statements, in order merely to prepare the way for the principal matter with which He has to deal (ver. 40), and thereafter to set it forth with fuller detail. There is consequently no ground for treating this explanation as if it had not belonged to the collection of our Lord's sayings (Ewald, Weiss, Holtzmann),—for regarding it as an interpolation on the part of the evangelist, in advocating which view Weiss lays stress upon a want of harmony between the negative points in the parable and the positive character of the exposition; while Hilgenfeld questions the correctness of this exposition, because he thinks that, as the progress that takes place between the sowing and the harvest corresponds with and is applicable to the whole history of the world, therefore the sower cannot have been Christ, but God and Him only,—an objection which has been already disposed of by the first parable in the series.—*The good seed represents the sons of the kingdom*, the (future) *subjects, citizens* of the Messianic kingdom (comp. note on viii. 12), who are established as such by the Messiah in their spiritual nature, which is adapted thereto (ὁ σπείρων τὸ καλὸν σπέρμα ἐστὶν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ver. 37). It is not "*fruges ex bono semine enatae*" (Fritzsche) that are intended by τὸ δὲ καλὸν σπέρμα, but see vv. 24, 25.—οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ πονηροῦ] whose ethical nature is derived from the devil (see ver. 39). Comp. John viii. 41,

44; 1 John iii. 8, 10. Not specially: the *heretics* (the Fathers and several of the older expositors).

Ver. 39. *Συντέλεια τ. αἰῶνος*] not found in any of the other Gospels: *the close of the* (current) *age* (ver. 22), *i.e. of the pre-Messianic epoch*; the great catastrophe that is to accompany the second coming, and which is to introduce the Messianic judgment, 4 Esdr. vii. 43; Bertholdt, *Christol.* p. 39; comp. vv. 40, 49, xxiv. 3, xxviii. 20; Heb. ix. 26, and see note on xii. 32.—*The reapers are angels*; see xxiv. 31; comp. John xv. 6.

Ver. 40. *Καίεται*] not *κατακαίεται*, but *are set on fire*. No doubt the tares are *consumed* by fire (ver. 30); still the point of the comparison does not lie in their being *consumed*, but in the fact of their *being set on fire*,—a fact which is intended to illustrate the everlasting punishment now beginning to overtake the wicked in Gehenna. John xv. 6; Matt. xxv. 46.—The wicked (the *σκάνδαλα*, ver. 41; the *σαμπρά*, ver. 47) are connected with the church as a mere outward institution, but do not belong to the number of its living members (to the body of Christ). Comp. *Apol. Conf. A.* p. 147 f.; Thomasius, *Chr. Pers. u. Werk*, III. 2, p. 370.

Ver. 41. *Αὐτοῦ . . . αὐτοῦ*] they are His to serve Him whenever He chooses to command; "*majestas filii hominis*," Bengel; comp. note on viii. 20.—*συνλέξουσιν ἐκ*] pregnant expression, equivalent to: *colligent et secernent ex*.—*ἐκ τῆς βασιλ. αὐτοῦ*] for the judgment will take place as soon as the earth has undergone that process of renovation (xxiv. 29 f.; 2 Pet. iii. 13) which is to transform it into the scene of the *Messiah's kingdom*. Moreover, the *separation* about which Jesus here speaks is a separation of persons—of the good on the one hand, from the bad on the other, which, again, is the only means of likewise effecting a separation between good and bad *things*. Comp. xxiv. 31. Jesus distinguishes only between *σκάνδαλα* and *δίκαιοι*, without recognising any intermediate classes of men (xxv. 32 f.), a view which subsequently found its explanation in the doctrine of faith and of justification by faith. The question as to whether or not there are *various degrees* of felicity for the righteous, as of punishment



for the wicked, is one upon which the present passage does not touch. — **σκάνδαλα**] *stumbling-blocks*, i.e. men who, through their unbelief and sin, may put temptation in the way of others. Comp. xvi. 23. Euth. Zigabenus is correct, so far as the substantial meaning is concerned, when he observes: **σκάνδαλα καὶ ποιοῦντες τὴν ἀνομίαν τοὺς αὐτοὺς ὀνομάζει**. For this abstract way of designating individuals by means of the characteristic feature in their character, see Kühner, II. 1, p. 10 f. The *ἀνομία* is immorality, as in vii. 23, xxiii. 28, xxiv. 12.

Ver. 42. The *furnace* (Dan. iii. 6) represents Gehenna. Comp. Rev. xx. 15. — **ὁ κλαυθμός**] see note on viii. 12.

Ver. 43. **Τότε**] *then*, when this purging out of all the **σκάνδαλα** has been effected. — **ἐκλάμψ**.] the compound verb, which is used on purpose (*to shine forth, to burst into light*, Xen. *Cyr.* vii. 1, 2; Plat. *Gorg.* p. 484 A, *Rep.* iv. p. 435 A), and so not to be taken merely as descriptive of eternal felicity in its general aspect, but as conveying the idea of a *sublime display of majestic splendour*, of the *δόξα* of the righteous in the future kingdom of the Messiah. Comp. Dan. xiii. 3; Enoch xxxviii. 4, xxxix. 7, civ. 4. Contrast to the fate of the wicked in the furnace of fire. — **τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῶν**] sweet closing words, full of blessed confidence, xxv. 34.

Vv. 44 ff. **Πάλιν ὁμοία**] introduces a *second* illustration of the kingdom of the Messiah, by way of continuing that instruction of the disciples which began with ver. 36. — **ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ**] *in the field*; the article being *generic*. For cases of treasure-trove mentioned by Greek and Roman writers, consult Wetstein. — **ὃν εὗρων ἄνθρωπος ἔκρυψε**] *which some man found and hid* (again in the field), so as not to be compelled to give it up to the owner of the field, but in the hope of buying the latter, and of then being able legitimately to claim the treasure as having been found on *his own* property. It is mentioned by Bava Mezia f. 28, 2, that, in circumstances precisely similar, R. Emi purchased a hired field in which he had found treasure: "*ut pleno jure thesaurum possideret omnemque litium occasionem praecideret*." Paulus, *exeg. Handb.* II. p. 187, observes correctly: "That it was not necessary, either for the purposes of the parable or for the point to be illustrated, that

Jesus should take into consideration the ethical questions involved in such cases." Fritzsche says: "*quem alibi, credo, repertum nonnemo illuc defoderit.*" But the most natural way is to regard εὐρών as the correlative to κεκρυμμένῳ; while, again, the behaviour here supposed would have been a proceeding as singular in its character as it would have been clearly dishonest toward the owner of the field. — ἀπὸ τῆς χαρᾶς αὐτοῦ] ἀπό marks the *causal* relation (xiv. 26; Luke xxiv. 41; Acts xii. 14; Kühner, II. 1, p. 366 f.), and αὐτοῦ is not the genitive of the *object* (*over the treasure*: Vulgate, Erasmus, Luther, Beza, Calvin, Maldonatus, Jansen, Bengel, Kuinoel, Fritzsche), but, as the ordinary usage demands, the genitive of the *subject*: *on account of his joy*, without its being necessary in consequence to read αὐτοῦ, but αὐτοῦ, as looking at the matter from the standpoint of the speaker. The object is to indicate the peculiar joy *with which his lucky find inspires him*. — ὑπάγει κ.τ.λ.] *Present*: the picture becoming more and more animated. The *idea embodied in the parable* is to this effect: the Messianic kingdom, as being the most valuable of all possessions, can become ours only on condition that we are prepared joyfully to surrender for its sake every other earthly treasure. It is still the same idea that is presented in vv. 45, 46, with, however, this characteristic difference, that in this case the *finding* of the Messiah's kingdom is preceded by a *seeking* after blessedness generally; whereas, in the former case, it was discovered without being sought for, therefore without any previous effort having been *put forth*. — ζητοῦντι] with the view of purchasing such goodly pearls from the owners of them (comp. vii. 6; Prov. iii. 15, viii. 19, and see Schoettgen). — ἓνα] *one, the only one of real worth*; according to the idea contained in the parable, there *exists* only one such. — πέπρακε] the perfect alternating with the aorist (ἡγόρασεν); the former looking back from the standpoint of the speaker to the finished act (*everything has been sold by the merchant*), the latter simply continuing the narrative (*and he bought*). Kühner, II. 1, p. 144 f.

Vv. 47 ff. For αἰγιαλός, see note on Acts xxvii. 39. — τὰ καλά and σαπρά] *the good, i.e. the good fish*, such as were

fit for use, and the *putrid* ones (comp. note on vii. 17), which, already dead and putrefying, are yet enclosed in the *σαγήνη* (large drag-net, Luc. *Pisc.* 51, *Tim.* 22; Plut. *de solert. an.* p. 977 F) along with the others. The men took them out of the net (ἐξῶ) and cast them away.—The aorists in vv. 47 and 48 are to be understood in a historical sense, not as expressing what was the practice, but merely as *narrating* what took place on the occasion, just as in vv. 44, 45, 46.—Observe further, that the net encloses fish of every *γένος*, *i.e.* of every species (that is, according to the literal meaning, out of every nation); yet no *γένος*, as such, is cast away, but only the *putrid* fish belonging to each *γένος*, and that not before the end of the world (in answer to the whole Donatist view).—Ver. 50. Closing refrain, as in ver. 42.

Ver. 52. *Ταῦτα πάντα*] that which has been addressed to the disciples since ver. 36. This *ναὶ κύριε*, this frank acknowledgment, calls forth from Jesus a gladsome *διὰ τοῦτο*, as much as to say, “it is because of such understanding that every one, and so on (such as you are), resembles a householder, and so on.” But for the understanding in question, this similitude would not have been made use of.—*γραμματεὺς*] The *ordinary* conception of a Jewish scribe is here *idealised* and applied to the *Christian* teacher, comp. xxiii. 34. But in order specifically to distinguish the *Christian* *γραμματεὺς* from the Jewish scribes, who were Moses’ disciples (xxiii. 2; John ix. 28), he is significantly described as *μαθητευθεὶς τῇ βασιλ. τ. οὐρ.*, *i.e.* made a disciple of the kingdom of heaven. *μαθητεύειν τινι*, to be a disciple of any one (xxvii. 57; Plut. *Mor.* p. 837 D), is here used *transitively* (*discipulum facere alicui*), comp. xxviii. 19; Acts xiv. 21. The kingdom of heaven is *personified*; the disciples of *Christ* are disciples of the *kingdom of heaven*, of which Christ is the *representative* (comp. xii. 28).—*καὶνὰ καὶ παλαιά*] is on no account to be restricted to any one thing in particular, but to be rendered: *new and old*, *i.e.* things hitherto unknown, and things already known, already taught in former ages, and that in regard both to the matter and the manner. Thus the predictions of the prophets, for example, belong to the things

that are *old*, the evidences of their fulfilment to those that are *new*; the precepts of the law are to be ranked among the *old*, the developing and perfecting of them, in the way exemplified by Christ in Matt. v., among the *new*; the form of parables and similitudes, already in use, is to be referred to the *old*, the Messianic teaching embodied in them is to be included under the *new*. The view that has been much in vogue since Irenaeus, Origen, Chrysostom, and Jerome, and which represents the words as referring to the Old and New *Testament*, or to the *law* and the *gospel* (Olshausen), is a dogmatic limitation. In the *illustration* the *θησαυρός* means the *chest* (ii. 11, xii. 35) in which the householder keeps his money and jewels (not the same thing as *ἀποθήκη*); in the *interpretation* it means the stores of knowledge which the teacher has at his disposal for the purposes of instruction. — *ἐκβάλλει*] *throws out*, thus describing the zeal with which he seeks to communicate instruction. Comp. Luke x. 35.

Vv. 53–58. The majority of more recent critics (Lichtenstein, *L. J.* p. 271 ff., de Wette, Baur, Bleek, Köstlin, Holtzmann, Keim) adhere to the view, received with special favour since Schleiermacher, that this narrative (which, moreover, in Mark vi. 1 ff., comes after the raising of Jairus' daughter) is identical with Luke iv. 16–30. But, in that case, it becomes necessary to set aside the very precise statements in Luke's narrative on the one hand; and, on the other, to tamper with the rigid sequence so distinctly indicated by Matthew in vv. 53, 54, xiv. 1, as has been done in the most awkward way possible by Olshausen ("he came once more to the town in which he had been brought up"). It is not without ample reason that Storr, Paulus, Wieseler, *chronol. Synopse*, p. 284 f., Ewald, have insisted that our passage is *not* identical with Luke iv. 16 ff. What Luke records is an incident that took place during the *first* visit of Jesus to Nazareth after the temptation in the wilderness. The only passage to which this can correspond is Matt. iv. 12, 13, so that in Luke we get an explanation of what Matthew means by his *καταλιπὼν τὴν Ναζαρέτ*. How conceivable, likewise, that on *two* occasions Jesus may have been driven from Nazareth in a similar way,

so that he would be *twice* called upon to utter the words about the prophet being despised in his native place, "Nazarethanis priore reprehensione nihilo factis melioribus," Beza.

Ver. 54. Πατρίδα αὐτοῦ] *Nazareth*, where His parents lived, and where He had been brought up, ii. 23. — πόθεν τούτῳ] τούτῳ is *contemptuous* (Xen. *Anab.* iii. 1. 30; John vi. 42, and frequently), and πόθεν is due to the circumstance that the people knew all about the origin and outward training of Jesus. John vii. 15, vi. 41 f. — καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις] so that in Nazareth also He must not only have taught, but must have performed miracles, although not to the same extent, ver. 58.

Vv. 55 ff. Τοῦ τέκτονος] *of the carpenter*, which, however, also embraces other workers in wood (the cabinetmaker, the cartwright, and such like). See Philo, *Cod. apocr.* I. p. 368 f.; Justin, *c. Tryph.* 88; Suicer, *Thes.* II. p. 1254 f. In Mark vi. 3, Jesus Himself is spoken of by the people as ὁ τέκτων, and certainly not without reason; see note on that passage. — οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ] See note on xii. 46.—According to the reading Ἰωσήφ, there was only one of the sons of that Mary, who was the wife of Alphaeus, who was certainly of the same name, viz. James (xxvii. 56; on the Judas, brother of James, see note on Luke vi. 16). But if this Mary, as is usually supposed, had been the sister of the mother of Jesus, we would have been confronted with the unexampled difficulty of two sisters bearing the same name. However, the passage quoted in support of this view, viz. John xix. 25, should, with Wieseler, be so interpreted as to make it evident that the sister of Jesus' mother was not Mary, but *Salome*. Comp. note on John i. 1. — παῖσαι] therefore hardly to be understood, as some of the Fathers did (in Philo, *Cod. apocr.* p. 363), as meaning only *two*.—Observe, further, that in the course of what is said about the relatives, there is not the slightest indication of their being supposed to be different from the *ordinary inhabitants of the place*. — οὐκ ἔστι προφήτης . . . ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ (not αὐτοῦ) κ. ἐν τ. οἴκ. αὐτ. is (John iv. 44) a principle founded on experience, which is found to apply to the *present* case only as relatively true, seeing that, under different condi-

tions, the contrary might prove to be the case. — The ἐν τ. οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ, *in his own family* (xii. 25), corresponds with John vii. 3, comp. Mark iii. 20. See also the note on xii. 46–50.

Ver. 58. Ἐποίησεν] In Mark vi. 5, put more definitely thus: ἡδύνατο ποιῆσαι. This does not include the idea of unsuccessful attempts, but what is meant is, that the unwillingness of the people to acknowledge the greatness of His person (ver. 55) compelled Jesus, partly on moral (because of their unworthiness) and partly also on psychical grounds (because the condition of faith was wanting), to make but a limited use of His miraculous power.

CHAPTER XIV.

VER. 3. Καὶ ἔθετο ἐν φυλ.] Lachm., after B  $\aleph^*$  Curss.: καὶ ἐν τῇ φυλ. ἀπέθετο. So also Tisch. 8, though without τῇ, after  $\aleph^*$ . The simple ἐν τῇ φυλ. is found in D, Or. (once), but it is adopted from Mark vi. 17. Lachm.'s reading is all the more to be regarded as the original, that ἀπέθετο also occurs once in Origen, and that, in restoring the verb that had been omitted, in accordance with Mark, the simple ἔθετο, without the preposition (comp. Acts v. 25, xii. 4), would most readily have suggested itself. — Φιλίπποῦ] after γυναῖκα is omitted in D, Vulg. Codd. of the It. Aug., is deleted by Tisch. 7, and only bracketed by Tisch. 8. Supplement from Mark, the interpolation: ὅτι αὐτὴν ἐγάμησεν, being derived from the same source. — Ver. 6. γενεσίῳ δὲ ἀγομ.] Lachm. and Tisch.: γενεσίῳ δὲ γενομένοις, after B D L  $\aleph$ , Curss. Correctly. The genitive was by way of explaining the dative, hence the reading γενεσίῳ δὲ γενομένων, and then came ἀγομ. (Received text) as a gloss on γενομ., which gloss is partially found in the case of the dative reading as well (γενεσίῳ δὲ ἀγομμένοις, 1, 22, 59). — Ver. 9. ἐλυπήθη] Lachm. and Tisch.: λυπηθεῖς, omitting the δὲ after διὰ, according to B D, Curss. and Codd. of It. The reading of the Received text is a logical analysis of the participle. — Ver. 12. σῶμα] B C D L  $\aleph$ , Curss. Copt. Syr<sup>cur</sup> have πτῶμα. Recommended by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. and Tisch. 8. Taken from Mark vi. 29. — Ver. 13. With Lachm. and Tisch. 8 we ought to read ἀκούσας δέ, after B D L Z  $\aleph$ , Curss. Verss. Or.; καὶ is a mechanical repetition. With Tisch. read πεζοί for πεζῇ, according to adequate testimony (including  $\aleph$ ). The reading of the Received text is taken from Mark. — Ver. 14. On the strength of important testimony, ὁ Ἰησοῦς after ἐξελθὼν (Elz. Scholz) is deleted. Beginning of a church lesson. Similarly, in ver. 22, after ἡνάγκ. Comp. ver. 25, where, in like manner, ὁ Ἰησοῦς was inserted after αὐτοῦς. — ἐπ' αὐτοῖς] Elz.: ἐπ' αὐτοῦς, against decisive testimony. — Ver. 15. Tisch. has οὖν after ἀπολ., and that only according to C Z  $\aleph$ , 1, 238, Copt. Syr.

p. (on the margin) Or. (twice); but correctly, seeing that οὖν might readily drop out in consequence of the ON immediately preceding it, as well as from its not being found in Mark vi. 36. — Ver. 19. τοὺς χόρτους] The readings τοῦ χόρτου (B C\* & Curss. Or., so Lachm. and Tisch. 8) and τὸν χόρτον (D, Curss.) are to be explained from the circumstance that the plural of χόρτος occurs nowhere else in the New Testament. — λαβών] Elz.: καὶ λαβών, against the best and most numerous authorities. — Ver. 21. The arrangement: παῖδ. κ. γυν. (Lachm.) is, as also in xv. 38, without adequate testimony. — Ver. 22. The deleting of εὐθέως (Tisch. 8), which, no doubt, may have been adopted from Mark, is, however, not warranted by testimony so inadequate as that of C\* & Syr<sup>cur</sup> Chrys. — Ver. 25. ἀπὸ τῆς θάλασσης] Lachm. and Tisch. 8: ἤλαθε, after B C\*\* & Curss. Verss. Or. Eus. Chrys. The preposition overlooked in consequence of the attraction not having been noticed (comp. the simple ἔρχεται in Mark). — ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης] Lachm. and Tisch.: ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν, after B P Δ Θ & Curss. Or. The reading of the Received text is taken from the parallel passages. — Ver. 26. ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν] Lachm. and Tisch. 8: ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης, after B C D T<sup>o</sup> & Curss. Eus. Chrys. Theophyl. Correctly; the accusative crept in mechanically from ver. 25, through not noticing the difference of meaning in the two cases. — Ver. 28. The arrangement ἐλθεῖν πρὸς σε (Lachm. Tisch.) is supported by decisive testimony. — Ver. 29. ἐλθεῖν] Tisch.: καὶ ἤλαθεν, after B C\* (?) Syr<sup>cur</sup> Arm. Chrys. By way of being more definite, since, according to ver. 31, Peter was beside Jesus.

Ver. 1 f. Ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ] See xiii. 54–58. The more original narrative in Mark vi. 14 ff. (comp. Luke ix. 7–9) introduces this circumstance as well as the account of the Baptist's death, between the sending out and the return of the Twelve, which, considering the excitement that had already been created by the doings of Jesus, would appear to be rather early. Yet Luke represents the imprisonment of John as having taken place much earlier still (iii. 19 ff.). — Ἡρώδης] Antipas. Comp. note on ii. 22. Not a word about Jesus, the Jewish Rabbi and worker of miracles, had till now reached the ear of this licentious prince in his palace at Tiberias; because, without doubt, like those who lived about his court, he gave himself no particular concern about matters of this sort: he, upon this occasion, heard of Him for the first time



in consequence of the excitement becoming every day greater and greater. — τ. ἀκοήν Ἰησοῦ, as in iv. 24.

Ver. 2. Τοῖς παισὶν αὐτοῦ] *to his slaves* (comp. note on viii. 6), who, according to Oriental ideas, are no other than his *courtiers*. Comp. 1 Sam. xvi. 17; 1 Macc. i. 6, 8; 3 Esdr. ii. 17; Diod. Sic. xvii. 36. — αὐτός] indicating by its emphasis the terror-stricken conscience: *He, the veritable John*. — ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν] *from the dead*, among whom he was dwelling in Hades. The supposition of Wetstein and Bengel, that Herod was a Sadducee (erroneously founded upon Mark viii. 15, comp. Matt. xvi. 6), is no less inconsistent with what he here says about one having risen from the dead, than the other supposition that he believed this to be a case of *metempsychosis* (Grotius, Gratz, von Cölln); for he assumes that not merely the soul, but that the entire personality of John, has returned. Generally speaking, we do not meet with the doctrine of transmigration among the Jews till some time after; see Delitzsch, *Psychol.* p. 463 f. [E. T. 545 f.]. Herod's language is merely the result of terror, which has been awakened by an evil conscience, and which, with the inconsistency characteristic of mental bewilderment, believes something to have happened—though contrary to all expectation—which, in ordinary circumstances, was looked upon as theoretically impossible; while, again, the opinions that were circulating respecting Jesus (Luke ix. 7 f.) would suggest, in the case before us, the particular idea to which Herod here gives expression. The Pharisaic belief in the resurrection, which was not unknown to Herod, became, in spite of himself, the psychological starting-point. — διὰ τοῦτο] *on this account*, because he is no ordinary man, but one risen from the dead. — αἱ δυνάμεις] the powers manifesting themselves in his miracles.

Ver. 3. *Herodias* was the daughter of Aristobulus, son of Herod the Great, and of Berenice. She married Herod Antipas, who had become so enamoured of her that he put away his wife, the daughter of the Arabian king Aretas. Joseph. *Antt.* xviii. 5. 1, 4. The *brother of this Herod*, Herod Philip (Mark vi. 17), called by Josephus simply Herod, a son of Herod the Great and Mariamne, the high priest's daughter, and not to be

confounded<sup>1</sup> with Philip the *tetrarch*, who was Cleopatra's son, had been disinherited by his father, and was living *privately* at Jerusalem in circumstances of considerable wealth. Joseph. *Antt.* xvii. 1. 2, 8. 2. The *aorists* are not to be taken in the sense of the *pluperfect*, but as purely *historical*. They *relate*, however (Chrysostom: διηγούμενος οὕτως φήσιν), a statement that has been *already made in a previous passage* (iv. 12), namely, that *Herod*, in order to give a more minute account of the last (and now completed, see on ver. 13) destiny of the Baptist, *seized John, bound him, and so on*. Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 173 [E. T. 200].—ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ] Comp. xi. 2; for the pregnant use of the ἐν, see Kühner, II. 1, p. 385 f.; Buttmann, p. 283 [E. T. 329]. What Josephus, *Antt.* xviii. 5. 2, says about *Machaerus* being the place of imprisonment, is not to be regarded as incorrect (Glöckler and Hug, *Gutachten*, p. 32 f.); but see Wieseler, p. 244 f., to be compared, however, with Gerlach as above, p. 49 f. On the date of John's arrest (782 u.c., or 29 Aer. Dion.), see Anger, *rat. temp.* p. 195; Wieseler, p. 238 ff.; and in Herzog's *Encycl.* XXI. p. 548 f., also in his *Beitr.* p. 3 ff. Otherwise, Keim, I. p. 621 ff. (Aer. Dion. 34–35), with whom Hausrath substantially agrees. For ἀπέθετο (see critical notes), comp. 2 Chron. xviii. 26; Polyb. xxiv. 8. 8 (εἰς φυλακὴν).

Ver. 4 f. Οὐκ ἔξεστι] Because Philip was still living, and had a daughter. Lev. xviii. 16, xx. 21; Joseph. *Antt.* xviii. 5. 1, 2; Lightfoot on this passage. For ἔχειν γυναῖκα, as expressing matrimonial possession, see note on 1 Cor. v. 1. It is probable that Herod only made John's bold rebuke a pretext for putting him in prison; the real cause, according to Josephus, xviii. 5. 2 f., was fear lest he should be the means of creating an insurrection.—εἰχον] not: *aestumabant*

<sup>1</sup> Ewald, *Gesch. Chr.* p. 51, thinks that Mark has fallen into this error, and that the omission of the name Philip in Matthew and Luke (iii. 19) should be regarded as intended to correct it. Comp. also Hase, Bleek, Volkmar, Keim. No doubt it is strange that the two sons of Herod the Great should have borne the name *Philip*. But then this was only a surname, while it is to be remembered that Herod had also two sons, both of whom were called *Antipater*. Besides, the two Philips were only half-brothers. See Gerlach also in the *Luther. Zeitschr.* 1869, p. 32 f.; Wieseler, *Beitr.* p. 7.

(a common but ungrammatical rendering), but : *they held him as a prophet*, i.e. they stood to him as to a prophet. This is in conformity with classical usage, according to which ἔχω τινα, with a predicate, expresses the relation in which a person stands to some other person ; for example, φίλους αὐτοὺς ἔχεις (Xen. Symp. iv. 49) : thou standest related to them as to friends ; Eur. *Herc. fur.* 1405 : παῖδ' ὅπως ἔχω σ' ἐμόν, I stand to thee as to a child ; Herodian, i. 13. 16 ; and see likewise the note on Luke xiv. 18 ; Philem. 17. The appended ὥς means : *not otherwise than as*. Krüger, § 57. 3. 1 and 2 ; Kühner, II. 2, p. 995. Similarly also in xxi. 26. Otherwise in Mark xi. 32.

Ver. 6 ff. Γενέσια, *Birthday celebration*. Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 103 f. ; Suicer, *Thes.* I. p. 746 ; Loesner, *Obss.* p. 40. Others (Heinsius, Grotius, Is. Vossius, Paulus) interpret : *a festival by way of commemorating Herod's accession*, because the latter is often compared to a birth, Ps. ii. 7 ; 1 Sam. xiii. 1. An unwarranted departure from ordinary usage. Wieseler likewise takes the word as referring to the accession, but improperly appeals, partly to the fact of its being used to denote a celebration in memory of the dead (Herod. iv. 26), comp. *Lex. rhet.* p. 231, a *figurative* sense which only tells in favour of *our* interpretation, and partly to the Rabbinical ננוסיא של מלכם (Avoda Sara i. 3), where, however, the royal *birthdays* are likewise meant. No instance is to be found in the *Greek* classics (for the Latin *natalis*, see Plin. *Paneg.* 82). —For the dative of time, see Winer, p. 205 [E. T. 276]. — ἡ θυγάτηρ τῆς Ἡρώδ.] and of Philip. She was called *Salome*, and married her uncle, Philip the *tetrarch*. See Josephus, *Antt.* xviii. 5. 4. Her *dancing* was, doubtless, of a mimetic and wanton character. Hor. *Od.* iii. 6. 21. Wetstein on this passage. Moreover, this circumstance of the girl dancing is in keeping with the view that fixes the date of this scene as early as the year 29 ; while it is entirely at variance with Keim's supposition, that it occurred in the year 34-35, by which time Salome had been long married, and, for aught we know, may already have been left a widow ; for which reason Keim considers himself all the more justified in ascribing a legendary character to the narrative, though with-

out interfering in any way with the historical nucleus of the story, which he believes has not been affected by the plastic influence of legend; while Volkmar again declares the whole to be a fabrication. — ἐν τῷ μέσῳ] In the centre of the banqueting hall. The subject of ἤρесе is still ἡ θυγάτηρ. — ὁθεν] as in Acts xxvi. 19, frequently in the Epistle to the Hebrews, and common in classical writers. — προβιβασθεῖσα] urged, induced, prevailed upon, not: instructed (neither is it to be so rendered in Ex. xxxv. 34). See Plat. Prot. p. 328 B; Xen. Mem. i. 5. 1; Polyb. iii. 59. 2, xxiv. 3. 7; Bremi, ad Aeschin. Ctesiph. 28; Kühner, ad Xen. Mem. i. 2. 17. — ὥδε] therefore without any delay. — ἐπὶ πίνακι] upon a plate.

Ver. 9. Δυπηθείς] he was annoyed, διότι ἔμελλε μέγαν ἀνελεῖν ἄνδρα, καὶ κινήσαι πρὸς μῖσος ἑαυτοῦ τὸν ὄχλον, Euth. Zigabenus, comp. ver. 5; Mark vii. 20. Altogether, he was deeply pained at finding matters take this sudden and tragic turn, which is not inconsistent with ver. 5, but may be accounted for psychologically as arising out of that disturbed state of the conscience which this unlooked-for catastrophe has occasioned; consequently, we must not, with Schneckenburger, suppose (comp. Weiss and Holtzmann) that Matthew has failed to notice Mark's statement that Herodias was desirous to see John put to death. This circumstance is involved in what Matthew says in ver. 8. Bengel appropriately observes: "Latuerat in rege iudicii aliquid." — διὰ τοὺς ὅρκ.] The μεθ' ὅρκ. in ver. 6 represents a series of oaths that had been given, one at one time and another at another. — συνανακειμένους] to whom he did not wish to appear as perjured. A case of unlawful adhering to an oath, similar in its character to what was done by Jephthah.

Vv. 10, 11 f. Considering that it would require rather more than two days to return from Machaerus (see note on ver. 3), the fortress on the southern frontier between Peraea and the dominion of Aretas, to Tiberias (where Antipas was residing), Fritzsche thinks that it is out of the question to suppose that the head can have been actually delivered at the feast; comp. Lightfoot. But this circumstance, helping as it does to lend a tragic air to the whole proceeding, is just

one which the reader naturally takes for granted, and one which is found to be necessary in order to give unity and completeness to the scene (Strauss, I. p. 397); so that, with Maldonatus, Grotius, Baumgarten-Crusius, Gerlach, Keim, we must suppose the festival to have taken place in *Machaerus*, and not in Tiberias. Not even Wieseler's view, that the feast was held in *Julias* in Peraea, and that the head was brought thither by messengers travelling post-haste, can be said to be in sufficient accord with the tragic scenery of the simple narrative. The account in Mark (vi. 25, ἐξαυτῆς; ver. 27, ἐνεχθῆναι) is unfavourable to such a view, as is also the ὥδε in ver. 8 and ver. 11, which plainly implies that the thing was done there and then. — ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ] therefore in private by the hand of an assassin. "Trucidatur vir sanctus ne judiciorum quidem ordine servato; nam soutes populo omni inspectanti plecti lex Mosis jubet," Grotius. — καὶ ἐδόθη τ. κ. καὶ ἤνεγκε τ. μ. ἀ.] the horrible scene in a few simple words.—Ver. 12. The *disciples*, to be near their master, had remained somewhere in the neighbourhood of the prison, probably in the town of Machaerus itself. For πτώμα, a *corpse*, see Phrynichus, ed. Lobeck, p. 375.

Ver. 13. Since we find it stated immediately before that κ. ἐλθ. ἀπήγγειλαν τῷ Ἰησοῦ, it is clear that the καὶ ἀκούσας, which is not further defined, can only be referred to the ἀπήγγειλαν of the preceding verse (Jerome, Augustine, Euth. Zigabenus, Erasmus, Maldonatus, de Wette, Ewald, Keim); while the reference to ver. 2, so frequent since Chrysostom's time, is arbitrary, inasmuch as Matthew does not so much as hint at it. There is no anachronism here, occasioned by Mark vi. 31 (Weiss in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1861, p. 40 f.). Matthew does not show such want of skill in the use he makes of Mark; neither does he go to work in so reckless and confused a way as Wilke and Holtzmann would have us believe. But the narrative runs somewhat as follows: (1) Matthew mentions that, at that time, Herod heard of Jesus, who was then in Nazareth, and said: This is John, and so on; (2) thereupon he gives an account of the death of John, to which reference has thus been made; (3) and lastly, he

informs us in ver. 12 f. how Jesus came to hear of this death, and how it led to His retiring into some solitude or other, to shelter Himself for a little from the persecution of Herod, which was probably being directed against Himself as well. From this it would appear that it must have been whilst Herod, who had just beheaded John, was indulging such dangerous thoughts regarding Jesus (ver. 2), that the latter, through hearing from John's own disciples of the fate of their master, so felt the necessity of being upon His guard against Herod's hostility, that He took the precaution to retire lest His own death should be precipitated. Comp. iv. 12, xii. 15. It is clear from the shape in which the narrative is thus presented, that the beheading of John is to be understood as having taken place only a short time before the words of ver. 2 had been uttered, so that the terror that was awakened in Herod's conscience when he heard of Jesus came on the back of his recent crime; but there was no reason why vv. 1 and 2 should have been regarded as a literary expedient devised merely for the purpose of introducing John once more into the narrative. — ἐκεῖθεν] *from the place*, where He had been staying when the intelligence reached Him; whether this was still Nazareth (xiii. 54) or some other locality in Galilee, is determined by ἐν πλοίῳ, according to which it must have been a place upon the sea-coast. — ἔρημον τόπον] according to Luke ix. 10, near to Bethsaida in Gaulonitis, lying within the dominion of Philip the tetrarch. — κατ' ἰδίαν] "nemine assumpto nisi discipulis," Bengel — πεζοί (see critical notes): *by land*, walking round by the head of the lake. — πόλεων] of Galilee.

Ver. 14. Ἐξελθών] that is to say, *from the solitude into which he had retired*. In opposition to ver. 13, Maldonatus and Kuinoel, following Mark vi. 34, interpret: *out of the boat*. — ἐσπλαγχ. ἐπ' αὐτ.] αὐτοῖς refers not merely to the sick (Fritzsche), but, like αὐτῶν below, to the ὄχλος, which, however, became the object of compassion just because of the sick that the people had brought with them. Not so in Mark vi. 34.

Ver. 15 ff. Comp. Mark vi. 35 ff.; Luke ix. 12 ff.; John

vi. 5 ff. 'Ὁψίας] means, in this instance, the *first evening*, which lasted from the ninth till the twelfth hour of the day. It is the *second evening*, extending from the twelfth hour onwards, that is meant in ver. 24. Gesenius, *Thes.* II. p. 1064 f. — ἡ ὥρα] *the time*, i.e. *the time of the day*; comp. Mark xi. 11. Some, like Grotius, understand: *meal time*; others (Fritzsche, Käuffer): *tempus opportunum*, sc. *disserendi et sanandi*. But the "*disserendi*" is a pure importation; and how far the suitable time *for healing* might be said to have gone by, it is impossible to conceive. Our explanation, on the other hand, is demanded by the context (ὀψίας δὲ γενομ.), besides being grammatically certain. See Raphael, *Polyb.*; Ast, *Lex. Plat.* III. p. 580. — ἐαυτοῖς] for *we*, as far as we are concerned, have nothing to give them.—According to John vi. 5 ff., it was *Jesus* who first began to inquire about bread, and that not in consequence of the evening coming on. An unimportant deviation, which shows that even the memory of an apostle may sometimes be at fault. Of greater consequence is the fact that, according to John, Jesus puts the question *whenever he sees* the multitude,—a circumstance made to tell against John by Strauss especially; comp. also Baur and Hilgenfeld. And there can be no doubt that this little detail is an unconscious reflection of the Johannine conception of Christ, according to which it was but natural to suppose that Jesus had Himself intended to work a miracle, and that from the very first, so that in John the recollection of the order of proceeding, which we find recorded by the Synoptists with historical accuracy, had been thrust into the background by the preponderating influence of the ideal conception. Comp. note on John vi. 5 f. John, on the other hand, mentions the more precise and original detail, that it was a παιδάριον who happened to have the bread and fish. — δότε αὐτοῖς ὑμεῖς φάγ.] said in view of what the disciples were immediately to be called upon to do; therefore, from the standpoint of Jesus, an *anticipation of that request*, which the expectation of something in the way of miracle was just about to evoke on the part of the disciples. Bengel well observes: ὑμεῖς, *vos*, significanter. "Rudimenta fidei miraculorum apud discipulos."

Ver. 19. Ἐπὶ τ. χόρτ.] *upon the grass*, xiii. 2.—Participle following upon participle without conjunctions, and in logical subordination. See Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Apol.* p. 27 A; Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* i. 1. 18; Dissen, *ad Dem. de cor.* p. 249.—κλάσας] The loaves were in the form of cakes, a thumb's breadth in thickness, and about the size of a plate. Winer, *Realwörterbuch*, under the word *Backen*. Robinson, *Pal.* III. pp. 40, 293.—In *saying grace* Jesus did what was done by the father of a family. In John it is expressed by εὐχαριστήσας, because the meaning of the grace was the giving of *thanks* (comp. notes on xxvi. 26 f.; 1 Cor. x. 16, xiv. 16); Luke again says: εὐλόγησεν αὐτούς, where we have the idea of a *consecrating* prayer, as in the case of the Lord's supper.

Ver. 20 f. Τῶν κλασμ. is independent of τὸ περισσ. (*the fragments that were over*), with which latter also δώδεκα κοφ. πλήρεις, *twelve baskets full*, is in apposition. In travelling, the Jews carried small *baskets* with them to hold their provisions and other necessities. For κόφινος, see Jacobs, *ad Anthol.* IX. p. 455. It is more general (in Xen. *Anab.* iii. 8. 6, it is used in the sense of a *dung-basket*) than σπυρίς (xv. 37; Acts ix. 25).—ἦραν] *they took up*, from the ground on which the people had been eating. The *subject* of the verb is the *apostles* (John vi. 12); each of the Twelve fills his travelling-basket. But the κλάσματα are the *pieces* (comp. ver. 19, κλάσας) into which the loaves had been divided, and which had so multiplied *in the course of distribution* that a great quantity still remained over.—γυναικ. κ. παιδ.] occurring frequently in classical writers, and sometimes with the order of the words inverted; Maetzner, *ad Lycurg.* p. 75. But observe here the *diminutive* παιδίων, *little children*, whom their mothers either carried in their arms or led by the hand.

REMARK.—To explain away the miracle, as Paulus has done (who thinks that the hospitable example of Jesus may have induced the people to place at His disposal the provisions they had brought along with them; comp. Gfrörer, *Heilighth. u. Wahrh.* p. 171 ff.; Ammon, *L. J.* II. p. 217 f.), is inconsistent with the accounts of all the evangelists, and especially with that



of the eye-witness John. Notwithstanding this, Schleiermacher, *L. J.* p. 234, thought that, even on exegetical principles, the plural *σημαῖα* in John vi. 26 (but see note on this passage) would justify him in declining to rank the incident among the miracles; whilst Schenkel thinks he sees his way to an explanation by supposing what is scarcely possible, viz. that Jesus fed the multitude with a rich supply of *the bread of life from heaven*, which caused them to forget their *ordinary food*, though at the same time He devoutly consecrated for their use the provisions which they had brought with them, or had managed to procure for the present emergency. Weizsäcker likewise leaves the fact, which is supposed to underlie the present narrative, too much in a state of perplexing uncertainty; this element of fact, he thinks, must somehow correspond with the symbolism of the miracle, which is intended to teach us that there is no sphere in which the believer may not become a partaker of the fulness of Jesus' blessing. Keim, adhering above all to the ideal explanation that the bread which Jesus provided was *spiritual* bread, and referring by way of parallel to the story of the manna and the case of Elisha, follows the Paulus-Schenkel line of interpretation, in conceding a residuum of historical fact, though he seems to doubt whether that residuum will be considered worth retaining. But to eliminate the element of *fact altogether*, is no less inconsistent with historical testimony. This, however, has been done by Strauss, who thereupon proceeds to account for the narrative, partly by tracing it to some original parable (Weisse, *I.* p. 510 ff.), partly by treating it as a *myth*, and deriving it from the types of the Old Testament (*Ex.* xvi.; *1 Kings* xvii. 8-16; *2 Kings* iv. 42 ff.) and the popular Messianic ideas (*John* vi. 30 f.), partly by supposing it to belong to the lofty sphere of *ideal legend* (Ewald, see note on *John* vi. 12), and partly by understanding it in a *symbolic* sense (Hase, de Wette). Such a mode of dealing with this incident is the result of denying the possibility of bringing a creative agency to bear upon dead, rather upon artificially prepared materials,—a possibility which is not rendered more conceivable by having recourse to the somewhat poor expedient of supposing that what was done may have been brought about by an accelerated natural process (Olshausen). But that such agency was actually brought to bear, is a historical fact so well established by the unanimous testimony of the evangelists, that we must be contented to accept it with all its incomprehensibility, and, in this case not less than in that of the changing of water into wine at Cana, abandon the hope of being able to get a

clearer conception of the process of the miracle by the help of natural analogies. The symbolical *application*, that is, to the higher *spiritual* food, was made by our Lord Himself in John vi. 26 ff.; but, in doing so, He takes the miraculous feeding with *material* bread as His historical basis and warrant. Moreover, the view of Origen, that it was τῷ λόγῳ καὶ τῇ εὐλογίᾳ that Jesus caused the bread to multiply, is greatly favoured by the fact that the circumstance of the thanksgiving is mentioned by the whole four evangelists, and above all by Luke's expression: εὐλόγησεν αὐτούς.

Ver. 22 f. The walking on the sea comes next in order, in Mark vi. 45 and John vi. 15 as well.<sup>1</sup> Luke omits it altogether. — εὐθὺς ἡνάγκασε] not as though He were already looking forward to some unusual event as about to happen (Keim); He rather wanted to get away from the excited multitudes (who, according to John, had gone the length of wishing to make Him a king), and retire into a solitary place for prayer, ver. 23. The disciples would much rather have remained beside Him, therefore He *compelled* them (Euth. Zigabenus); εὐθ. ἡνάγκ. implies the haste and urgency with which He desires to get them away and to withdraw into retirement,—not an outward *compulsion*, but the *urgere* which takes the form of a command (Kypke, I. p. 286 f.; Hermann, *ad Eur. Bacch.* 462). Comp. Luke xiv. 23. — ἕως οὗ . . . ὄχλους] literally: *until He should have sent the multitude away*; and then He will come after them. The disciples could only

<sup>1</sup> Instead of the mere εἰς τὸ πέραν, ver. 22, Mark vi. 45 specifies *Bethsaida*, and John vi. 17 Capernaum. A more precise determination without substantial difference. Not so Wieseler, *Chronol. Synopse*, p. 274, who thinks that the town mentioned in Mark vi. 45 was the Bethsaida (Julias) situated on the eastern shore of the lake; and that it is intended to be regarded as an *intermediate halting-place*, where the disciples, whom He sends on before Him, were to await His arrival. This view is decidedly forbidden by Matt. xiv. 24 (comp. Mark vi. 47): τὸ δὲ πλοῖον ᾗδεν μίσην τῆς θαλάσσης. ἥν, from which it is clear that what is meant in *πράγειν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ πέραν* is a *direct* crossing of the lake. It is likewise in opposition to John vi. 17, comp. with vv. 21, 24. Wieseler's view was that of Lightfoot before him; it is that which Lange has substantially adopted, although the constantly prevailing usage in regard to the simple εἰς τὸ πέραν, ver. 22 (viii. 18, 28, xvi. 5; Mark iv. 35, v. 1, 21, viii. 13; Luke viii. 22), should have prevented him from doing so.

suppose that He meant to follow them upon foot. Comp. note on John vi. 24, 25. — τὸ ὄρος] the mountain that was close by. See on v. 1. κατ' ἰδίαν belongs to ἀνέβη; ver. 13, xvii. 1. — ὀψίας] second evening, after sunset; ver. 15.

Ver. 24 f. Μέσον] Adjective; with more precision in John vi. 19. At first the voyage had proceeded pleasantly (ἡδῆ), but they began to encounter a storm in the middle of the lake. — βασανίζóm.] not dependent on ἦν: being *plagued* by the waves; vivid picture. — τετάρτη φυλακῇ] πρωτῇ, i.e. in the early morning, from three till somewhere about six o'clock. Since the time of Pompey, the Jews conformed to the Roman practice of dividing the night into four watches of three hours each; formerly, it consisted of three watches of four hours each. See Wetstein and Krebs, p. 39 f.; Winer, *Realwörterbuch*, under the word *Nachtwachen*; and Wieseler, *Synopsis*, p. 406 f. — ἀπῆλθε πρὸς αὐτ.] *He came away down from the mountain to go to them.* Attraction. Hermann, *ad Viger*. p. 891 ff.; Bernhardt, p. 463.—According to the reading: περιπ. ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν (see critical notes): *walking over the sea*; according to the reading of the Received text: π. ἐ. τῆς θαλάσσης: *walking on the sea*. According to both readings alike, we are to understand a miraculous walking *on the water*, but not a walking *along the shore* (ἐπὶ τ. θαλ., on the ground that the shore may be said to be *over* the sea; comp. Xen. *Anab.* iv. 3. 28; Polyb. i. 44. 4; 2 Kings ii. 7; Dan. viii. 2; John xxi. 1), as Paulus, Stolz, Gfrörer, Schenkel are disposed to think; this view is absolutely demanded by the character of the incident which owes its significance to this miraculous part of it, by the solemn stress that is laid on the περιπατ. ἐπὶ τ. θαλ., by the analogy of the περιεπάτησεν ἐπὶ τὰ ὕδατα in ver. 29, by the ridiculous nature of the fear of what was supposed to be an apparition if Jesus had only walked *along the shore*, by the ἀπῆλθε πρὸς αὐτούς in ver. 25, as well as by the fact that, if Jesus had been on the shore (Strauss, II. p. 170), then the disciples, who were in the middle of the lake, forty stadia in breadth, with the roar of the waves sounding in their ears, could not possibly hear what He was saying when He addressed them. It remains, then, that we have here

a case of *miraculous walking on the sea*, which least of all admits of being construed into an act of *swimming* (Bolten); but neither are we to try to explain it by supposing (Olshausen) that, by the exercise of His own will, our Lord's bodily nature became exempted, for the time being, from the conditions of its earthly existence; nor should we attempt to render it intelligible by the help of foreign analogies (the cork-footed men in Lucian. *Ver. hist.* ii. 4; the seeress of Prevoist; the water-treaders, and such like), but, as being akin to the miracle of the stilling of the tempest (iv. 35 ff.), it should rather be examined in the light of that power over the elements which dwells in Christ as the incarnate Son of God. At the same time, it must be confessed that it is utterly impossible to determine by *what means* this miraculous walking was accomplished. From a teleological point of view, it will be deemed sufficient that it serves to form a practical demonstration of the Messiahship of Jesus, a consideration (comp. ver. 33) which was no less present to the minds of the evangelists in constructing their narratives. The credibility of those evangelists—among whom is John, whose personal experience lends additional weight to his testimony—must prove fatal, not only to any attempt to resolve our narrative into a *mythical sea story* (Strauss, who invokes the help of 2 Kings ii. 14, vi. 6, Job ix. 8, and the legends of other nations), or even into a *docetic fiction* (Hilgenfeld), but also to the half and half view, that some *event* or other, which occurred on the night in question, developed (Hase) into one of those genuine *legendary* stories which serve to *embody some particular idea* (in this instance, the walking on the water, Job ix. 8). In the same way Baumgarten-Crusius, on *John*, I. p. 234, regards a case of *walking on the sea*, recorded by John, as the *original* tradition; while Weisse, p. 521 (comp. Schneckenburger, *erst. kan. Ev.* p. 68), avails himself of the *allegorical* view; Bruno Bauer, again, here as elsewhere, pushes negative principles to their extreme limit; and Volkmar sees reflected in the narrative Paul's mission to the Gentiles. Weizsäcker and Keim likewise assume, though with more caution and judgment, the allegorical standpoint, the former being disposed to regard the interposing

of Jesus with His help, and the power of faith in conquering danger, as constituting the essence of the whole; Keim again being inclined to see in the story an allusion to the distress and desolation of the church waiting for her Lord, and not knowing but that He may not come to her help till the very last watch in the night (xxiv. 43; Mark xiii. 35),—an idea which, as he thinks, is indebted in no small degree to Job ix. 8, where God is represented as treading on the waves of the sea. But even this mode of interpretation, though in accordance, it may be, with the *letter*, cannot but do violence to the whole *narrative* as a statement of fact. Comp., besides, the note on John vi. 16—21.

Ver. 26 ff. Ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης (see critical notes): *upon the sea*. There, just at that spot, they saw Him walking as He was coming toward them *over the sea* (ver. 25). Observe the appropriate change of cases. For genitive, comp. Job ix. 8. περιπατῶν . . . ἐπὶ θαλάσσης, Lucian, *Philops.* xiii. ἐφ' ὕδατος βαδίζοντα, *Ver. hist.* ii. 4, *al.*—φάντασμα] They shared (Luke xxiv. 37) the popular belief in apparitions (Plat. *Phaed.* p. 81 D: ψυχῶν σκιοειδῆ φαντάσματα; Eur. *Hec.* 54; Lucian, *Philops.* 29; Wisd. xvii. 15). Comp. the *nocturnos Lemures* in Horace, *Ep.* ii. 2. 209. — Ver. 27. ἐλάλ. αὐτ.] ἀπὸ τῆς φωνῆς δῆλον ἑαυτὸν ποιεῖ, Chrysostom. — Vv. 28—31 are not found in any of the other Gospels, but their contents are entirely in keeping with Peter's temperament (ὁ πανταχοῦ θερμὸς κ. ἀεὶ τῶν ἄλλων προπηδῶν, Chrysostom). — βλέπων] not: *as He perceived*, but: *as He saw*; for, when on the sea, He was in immediate contact with the *manifestations* of the storm. — καταποντίζεσθαι] “pro modo fidei ferebatur ab aqua” (Bengel); namely, by the influence of Christ's power, for which influence, however, he became unreceptive through doubt, and accordingly began to sink.

Ver. 31 f. Εἰς τί ἐδίστ.] διατί πρῶτον μὲν ἐθάρρῃσας, ὕστερον δὲ ἐδειλιάσας; Euth. Zigabenus. For εἰς τί, *wherefore?* comp. xxvi. 8; Wisd. iv. 17; Sir. xxxix. 17, 21; Soph. *Tr.* 403, *Oed. C.* 528, and Hermann's note. — ἐμβάντων αὐτῶν] According to John, Jesus did not go up into the boat, but the disciples *wanted* to take Him on board. A difference

that may be noted, though it is of but trifling importance. See note on John vi. 21. — ἐκόπασεν] Comp. Herod. vii. 191. LXX. Gen. viii. 1. It became calm. Anthol. vii. 630: ἡ μακρὴ κατ' ἐμοῦ δυσπλοίῃ κοπάσει, and see Wetstein.

Ver. 33. Θεοῦ υἱός] the Messiah. See note on iii. 17. The impression recorded in the text was founded, so far as the people were concerned, upon the miraculous walking on the sea itself, and partly upon the connection which existed, and which they recognised as existing, between the calming of the storm and the going on board of Jesus and Peter. οἱ ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ are not the disciples (Hilgenfeld, Schegg, Keim, Scholten), but those who, besides them, were crossing in the boat, the crew and others. Comp. οἱ ἄνθρωποι, viii. 27. By means of an expression of this general nature they are distinguished from the μαθηταί (ver. 26), who had hitherto been in question. Grotius limits the meaning too much when he says: "ipsi nautae." Mark omits this concluding part of the incident, and merely records the great astonishment on the part of the disciples. As it stands in Matthew, it is to be regarded as connecting a traditional amplification with the episode of Peter, which that evangelist has embodied in his narrative, but yet as containing nothing improbable, in so far as it makes it appear that the outburst of astonishment was so great that it expressed itself in the acknowledgment of our Lord's Messiahship, especially as it is to be borne in mind that the miraculous feeding of the multitudes (John vi. 14, 15) had taken place but so short a time before. Moreover, this is, according to Matthew, the first time that Jesus was designated the Son of God by men (iii. 17, iv. 3, viii. 29). According to John (i. 50), He had already been so styled by Nathanael; in the present instance He received the designation from those who, as yet, were not of the number of His disciples.

Ver. 34. Comp. Mark vi. 53 ff. Γῆ Γενηνησ.] that beautiful district of Lower Galilee, stretching along the border of the lake, and measuring thirty stadia in length by twenty in breadth, Josephus, Antt. iii. 10. 8, the *el Guweir* of the present day; Ewald, *Gesch. Chr.* p. 334; Furer in Schenkel's *Bibelllex.* II. p. 324.

Ver. 36. Summary statement, as in iv. 24. — *παρεκάλ.*] descriptive imperfect. — *κρασπέδου*] See note on ix. 20. *They wanted merely to touch Him*, as in ix. 21. — *διεσώθησαν*] *were completely saved* (Xen. *Mem.* ii. 10. 2; Luke vii. 3), so that they quite recovered from their ailments, and that, according to the analogy of the other miracles of healing, *just at once*. Hilgenfeld is wrong in supposing that this took place “without the medium of faith;” as a matter of course, *faith* was implied in their very *παρακαλεῖν*.

## CHAPTER XV.

VER. 1. *οι*] is deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. 8, after B D  $\aleph$ , Curss. Or. But how readily might the article have been overlooked, seeing that, in this passage, it might well appear superfluous, as rather in the way, in fact! Had it been adopted from Mark vii. 1 (whence, according to well-nigh the same testimony, is derived the arrangement  $\Phi\alpha\rho. \kappa. \gamma\rho\alpha\mu\mu.$ , followed by Tisch. 8), it would have been put before  $\gamma\rho\alpha\mu\mu.$  — Ver. 4.  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\lambda\alpha\tau\omicron \lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega\nu$ ] Fritzsche, Lachm.:  $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\pi\epsilon\nu$ , which Griesb. likewise approved, after B D  $T^e$ , 1, 124, and several Verss. and Fathers. Taken from Mark vii. 10. — Ver. 5.  $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota} \omicron\upsilon \mu\grave{\eta} \tau\iota\mu\acute{\eta}\sigma\eta$ ] Lachm. and Tisch. 8:  $\omicron\upsilon \mu\grave{\eta} \tau\iota\mu\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\iota$ , after B C D  $T^e$   $\aleph$  (which has  $\tau\iota\mu\eta\sigma\eta$ ), Curss. Verss. and Fathers. The omission of  $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$  is by way of simplifying the construction. But the future has so much testimony in its favour, besides that of B C D, etc., that (with Tisch.) it must be preferred. In what follows Lachm. has deleted  $\eta \tau\eta\nu \mu\eta\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$  (after B D  $\aleph$   $Syr^{cur}$ ). Omitted in consequence of homoeoteleuton — Ver. 6.  $\tau\eta\nu \acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\omicron\lambda\acute{\eta}\nu$ ] Lachm.:  $\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu \lambda\acute{\omicron}\gamma\omicron\nu$ , after B D  $\aleph^{**}$  Verss. and Fathers; Tisch.:  $\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu \nu\acute{\omicron}\mu\omicron\nu$ , after C  $T^e$   $\aleph^*$  Curss. Ptol. The last is correct;  $\tau. \acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\omicron\lambda.$  is from ver. 3,  $\tau. \lambda\acute{\omicron}\gamma.$  from Mark vii. 13. —  $\acute{\omicron} \lambda\alpha\delta\acute{\varsigma} \omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ ] Elz. Scholz:  $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\gamma\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\iota \mu\omicron\iota \acute{\omicron} \lambda\alpha\delta\acute{\varsigma} \omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma \tau\tilde{\omega} \sigma\acute{\omicron}\mu\alpha\tau\iota \alpha\upsilon\tau\tilde{\omega}\nu \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ , against B D L  $T^e$   $\aleph$ , 33, 124, and many Verss. and Fathers. From the LXX. — Ver. 14.  $\acute{\omicron}\delta\eta\gamma\omicron\acute{\iota} \epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\iota \tau\upsilon\phi\lambda\omicron\acute{\iota} \tau\upsilon\phi\lambda\tilde{\omega}\nu$ ] Numerous variations; Lachm.:  $\tau\upsilon\phi\lambda\omicron\acute{\iota} \epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\iota\nu \acute{\omicron}\delta\eta\gamma\omicron\acute{\iota} \tau\upsilon\phi\lambda\tilde{\omega}\nu$ . So L Z  $\aleph^{**}$ , Curss. and many Verss. and Fathers, and supported also by B D, 209,  $Syr^{cur}$ , which latter have merely  $\tau\upsilon\phi\lambda\omicron\acute{\iota} \epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\iota\nu \acute{\omicron}\delta\eta\gamma\omicron\acute{\iota}$ ,<sup>1</sup> where  $\tau\upsilon\phi\lambda\tilde{\omega}\nu$  has been displaced by the  $\tau\upsilon\phi\lambda\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$  immediately following. Nevertheless, we must prefer to retain the reading of the Received text, which has still strong testimony in its favour, besides being defended by Tisch. The reading of Lachm. is an unsuccessful attempt to amend the style. — Ver. 15.  $\tau\alpha\acute{\upsilon}\tau\eta\nu$ ] deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. 8, after B Z  $\aleph$ , 1, Copt. Or., but it may have been omitted all the more readily from the fact that Mark vii. 17 has no demonstrative, and because the parable

<sup>1</sup>  $\aleph^*$ :  $\acute{\omicron}\delta\eta\gamma\omicron\acute{\iota} \epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\iota\nu \tau\upsilon\phi\lambda\acute{\omicron}\iota.$



does not immediately precede. — Ver. 16. Ἰησοῦς] with Lachm. and Tisch., and on the strength of important testimony, is to be deleted as being a common supplement. — Ver. 17. οὐπω] Fritzsche, Lach. and Tisch.: οὐ, after B D Z, 33, 238, Syr. Syr<sup>cur</sup> Aeth. Arm. It. Vulg. Altered in conformity with Mark vii. 19. — Ver. 22. ἐκράύγασεν αὐτῷ] Lachm.: ἔκραζεν (on the margin: ἔκραζεν), after B D **N**<sup>\*\*</sup> 1; Tisch. 8: ἔκραζεν, after Z **N**<sup>\*</sup> 13, 124, Or. Chrys. But of the two words κράζειν is far more generally used in the New Testament (κραυγάζειν occurs again in Matthew only in xii. 19), and was further suggested here by ver. 23. Αὐτῷ, although having rather stronger testimony against it, is likewise to be maintained; for, with the reading ἐκράυγ., it proved to be somewhat in the way, and hence it was either omitted, or interpreted by means of ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ (D, Cant.), or placed after λέγουσα (Vulg. and Codd. of It.). — Ver. 25. προσεκύνησεν] Elz.: προσεκύνει, which Fritzsche, Lachm. Scholz, Tisch. likewise read, after Griesb. had approved of the aorist and Matthaei had adopted it. The greatest amount of testimony generally is in favour of the aorist; the greatest amount of the *oldest* testimony (including Curss. B D **N**<sup>\*</sup>, though not C), in favour of the imperfect; the latter is to be preferred, partly just because it is better authenticated, and partly because the transcribers were more used to the aorist of προσκυν. — Ver. 26. οὐκ ἔστι καλόν] Fritzsche, Lachm. and Tisch.: οὐκ ἔξειστι, only after D and a few Verss. and Fathers, also Orig. Correctly; the reading of the Received text is from Mark vii. 27. — Ver. 30. Instead of τοῦ Ἰησοῦ we should read αὐτοῦ, with Lachm. and Tisch., according to important testimony. — Ver. 31. For λαλοῦντας, B, Aeth. and a few Curss. have ἀκούοντας. Defended by Buttmann in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1860, p. 348. It is taken from xi. 5. — For ἐδόξασαν, Tisch. 8 reads ἐδόξαζον, only after L **N**, Curss. — Ver. 32. ἡμέραι] Elz.: ἡμέρας, against decisive testimony. Correction. — Ver. 35 f. ἐκέλευσε . . . λαβών] Lachm. and Tisch. 8: παραγγέλως τῷ ὄχλῳ ἀναπ. ἐ. τ. γ. ἔλαβεν (and καί before εὐχαρ. below), after B D **N**, Curss. Or. An attempt to amend the style with the help of expressions taken from Mark. — For ἔδωκε, Tisch. 8 has ἐδίδου, after B D, Curss. Chrys. Taken from Mark viii. 6. — Ver. 39. ἀνέβη] Elz. Schulz, Scholz, Lachm. Tisch. 8: ἐνέβη, only after B **N**, Curss. Correction, because ἐμῆς εἰς τ. πλ. happens to be the common form of expression; viii. 23, ix. 1, xiv. 32. D has ἐνβαίνει.

Ver. 1. The three sections of ch. xv., having as their respective subjects the washing of hands (vv. 1–20), the

woman of Canaan (vv. 21-31), and the feeding of the four thousand (vv. 32-39), occur elsewhere only in Mark (vii. 8), whom Matthew partly abridges and partly supplements. — *τότε*] when He was staying in the country of Gennesareth. — *οἱ ἀπὸ Ἱεροσ. γρ.* (see critical notes): the scribes who belonged to Jerusalem, and had come from that city (Mark vii. 1). Well-known attraction of the preposition with the article. See Kühner, II. 1, p. 473 ff., and *ad Xen. Mem.* iii. 6. 11. Comp. Acts xxi. 27; Col. iv. 16, *al.*

Ver. 2. *Παράδοσις*] *ἄγραφος διδασκαλία*, Hesychius. The Jews, founding upon Deut. iv. 14, xvii. 10, for the most part attached greater importance to this tradition than to the written law. Hence, *Berachoth* f. 3. 2: הכיבים דברי סופרים מדברי תורה. Comp. Schoettgen. They laid special stress upon the traditional precept, founded on Lev. xv. 11, which required that the hands should be washed before every meal (*ἐσθίωσιν, ἄρτον ἐσθίωσιν*, a rendering of the Hebrew אָכַל לֶחֶם). See Lightfoot, Schoettgen, and Wetstein. Jesus and His disciples ignored this *παράδοσις* as such. — *τῶν πρεσβυτ.*] *which had been handed down from the men of olden time* (their forefathers). It is not the *scribes* that are meant (Fritzsche), nor the *elders of the nation* (Bleek, Schegg), but comp. Heb. xi. 2. It is the wise men of ancient times that are in view. Observe, moreover, the studied precision and peremptory tone of the question, which has something of an official air about it. The growing hostility begins to show itself in an open and decided manner.

Ver. 3. *Καί*] *also*, implies a comparison between the *ὑμεῖς* and *οἱ μαθηταί σου*; that is to say, the *παραβαίνειν* is acknowledged to be true of *both* parties, the only difference being in the matters in which the transgression is exemplified. Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 636. — *διὰ τ. παράδ. ὑμ.*] *which you observe*. Notice how the one question is met with another in the *same style*, thereby rendering the *reductio ad absurdum* only the more telling. Luther appropriately remarks that "He places one wedge against the other, and therewith drives the first back."

Ver. 4. Ex. xx. 12, xxi. 17. — *τίμα*] involves the idea of

a practical manifestation of reverence in the form of kind deeds, ver. 5. — *θανάτῳ τελευτ.*] *תָּמָּר לִימָּה*, the meaning of which (*he shall certainly die, be executed*) has not been exactly hit by the LXX. in the phrase *θανάτῳ τελ.*, though it is in conformity with Greek idiom: *He shall end* (ii. 19) *by death* (*execution*, Plat. *Rep.* p. 492 D, and very frequently in classical writers). See Lobeck, *Paral.* p. 523; Köster, *Erläut.* p. 53.

Ver. 5 f. *Δῶρον*] *sc. ἐστι*, *תָּמָּר*, a gift, *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, namely, to God, *i.e.* to the temple. See Lightfoot and, in general, Ewald, *Alterth.* p. 81 ff. Vulgate, Erasmus, Castalio, Maldonatus connect *δῶρον* with *ῥωφέληθῆς*: *a temple-offering, which will be given by me, will bring a blessing to thee.* The conjunctive, however, is clearly independent of *ἐάν*. Chrysostom observes correctly: *δῶρόν ἐστι τοῦτο τῷ θεῷ, ὃ θέλεις ἐξ ἐμοῦ ῥωφέληθῆναι καὶ οὐ δύνασαι λαβεῖν.*—There is an *aposiopesis* after *ῥωφέληθῆς*, whereupon *Jesus* proceeds in His discourse with *καὶ οὐ μὴ τιμήσ.* *But your teaching is:* “*Whoever will have said to his father: It is given to the temple, whatever thou wouldst have got from me by way of helping thee*” (the Jews, of course, understood the *apodosis* to be this: *he is not bound by that commandment, but the obligation is transferred to his Corban*). And (in consequence of this vow) *he will certainly not be honouring.* Comp. Käuffer, *de ζωῆς αἰών.* *notione*, p. 32 f., and Beza, *de Wette*, Keim. Some, however, postpone the *aposiopesis* till the close, and understand *καὶ οὐ μὴ τιμήσ.* as forming part of what is supposed to be spoken by the Pharisees in their teaching: *But whosoever says . . . and does not honour . . .* (he is not liable to punishment). So Fritzsche. But this is not in keeping with usage as regards *οὐ μὴ*; nor is it in itself a probable thing that the Pharisees should have said quite so plainly that the honouring of parents might be dispensed with. Others, again, reject the *aposiopesis*, and regard *καὶ οὐ μὴ τιμ.* etc. as an *apodosis*, taking the words, like the expositors just referred to, as forming part of what is understood to be spoken by the Pharisees: “*whoever says . . . he is not called upon, in such cases, to honour his parents as well.*” Such, after Grotius, is the interpretation of Bengel, Olshausen, Bleek; comp. Winer, p. 558 [E. T. 750, note]. According

to this view, *καί* would be that of the apodosis (Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 636) in a relative construction (Baeumlein, *Partik.* p. 146). But *οὐ μὴ τιμ.* does not mean: he *need* not honour, but: *he assuredly will not honour*; or, as Ewald and Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 391, explain it, he *shall* not honour,—which direct prohibition from the lips of such wily hypocrites as those Pharisees, is far less conceivable than the prudent aposiopesis above referred to.—For *ὠφελεῖσθαι τι ἔκ τινος*, comp. Thuc. vi. 12. 2: *ὠφελθῆ τι ἔκ τῆς ἀρχῆς*, Lys. xxi. 18, xxvii. 2; Aesch. *Prom.* 222; Soph. *Aj.* 533. More frequently with *ὑπό, παρά, ἀπό*. The opposite of it is: *ζημιοῦσθαι τι ἔκ τινος*, Dem. lii. 11. For the passive with accusative of the thing, see Kühner, II 1, p. 279 f.—*καὶ ἡκυρώσατε]* *and you have thereby deprived of its authority.* *ἡκυρ.* is placed first for sake of emphasis, and is stronger than *παραβαίνετε* in ver. 3. That such vows, leading to a repudiation of the fifth commandment, were actually made and held as binding, is evident from Tr. *Nedarim* v. 6, ix. 1. Joseph. *c. Ap.* i. 22.—Ver. 6 is a confirmation, and not a mere echo, of what is said in ver. 3.

Ver. 7 ff. *Καλῶς]* *admirably*, appropriately characterizing.—*προεφήτ.] has predicted*, which de Wette unwarrantably denies to be the meaning of the word in the present instance, understanding *προφ.* in the sense of the inspired utterance generally. Jesus regards Isa. xxix. 13 (not strictly in accordance with the LXX.) as a typical *prediction*, which *has found its fulfilment* in the conduct of the scribes and Pharisees.—*μάτην δέ]* *δέ* denotes a continuation of the matter in hand; and *μάτην* indicates, according to the *usual* explanation, that their *σέβεσθαι* is attended with *no beneficial result* (2 Macc. vii. 18, and classical writers), produces *no moral effect* upon their heart and life, because they teach as doctrines the commandments of men. But seeing that the *μάτην σέβεσθαι* consists of mere lip-service in which the heart plays no part, thus according with the idea involved in *ὑποκριταί*,—and inasmuch as *διδάσκοντες*, etc., is evidence that such is the nature of the service, the interpretation: *sine causa*, found so early as in the Vulgate, is better suited to the context. Their *σέβεσθαι* of God is *meaningless* (*temere*, comp. Soph. *Aj.* 634,

and Lobeck's note, *Ast, Lex. Plat.* II. p. 285), because they do not teach divine, but *human doctrine*, the consequence of which is that the *σέβεσθαι* has no motive principle in the heart, where, on the contrary, human interest takes the place of the fear of God. Comp. the *μάταιος θρησκεία* of Jas. i. 26. For the opposite of such worship, consult John iv. 24. See *Apol. Conf. A.*, pp. 206, 256.—There is no Hebrew word corresponding to *μάτην* in the above quotation from Isaiah; probably the text made use of by the LXX. contained a different reading. — *ἐντάλμ. ἀνθρ.*] promulgating as doctrines, precepts of a merely human origin; comp. Col. ii. 22.

Ver. 10. *Ἐκείνους μὲν ἐπιστομίσας καὶ κατασχύνας ἀφήκεν, ὡς ἀνιάτους, τρέπει δὲ τὸν λόγον πρὸς τὸν ὄχλον, ὡς ἀξιολογώτερον*, Euth. Zigabenus. During the discussion the *ὄχλος* had been standing in the background; He invites them to come near.

Ver. 11. *Κοινοῖ]* makes common, *profanes* (ἁγιάζειν), comp. 4 Macc. vii. 6, nowhere found in classical writers; in the New Testament, in Acts x. 15, xi. 9, xxi. 28; Heb. ix. 13; Rev. xxi. 27. What Jesus has in view at present is not legal, but *moral* defilement, and which is not produced (1 Tim. iv. 4) by what goes into the mouth (food and drink, as well as the partaking of these with unwashed hands), but by that which comes out of it (improper language). So far as can be gathered from the context, he is not saying anything against the *Mosaic* regulations relating to meats, though one cannot help regarding what he does say as so *applicable* to these, as to bring into view the prospect of their abrogation as far as they are merely *ceremonial* (comp. Keim, and Weizsäcker, p. 463), and, as a consequence of this latter, the triumph of the *idea* which they embody, *i.e.* their *fulfilment* (v. 17). Observe, further, that it is meat and drink only *in themselves* considered, that he describes as matters of indifference, saying nothing at present as to the special circumstances in which partaking of the one or the other might be regarded as sinful (excess, offences, 1 Cor. viii., and so on). See ver. 17.

Ver. 12. *Προσελθ.]* Matthew does not say *where?* According to Mark vii. 17, this took place in the house. — *τὸν λόγον]*

Fritzsche and many more take this as referring to vv. 3-9. It is to understand it, with Euth. Zigabenus, as pointing to the saying in ver. 11 (Paulus, de Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius, Bleek). For this, addressed as it was to the multitude, must have been peculiarly displeasing to the Pharisees; and ἀκούσαντες τὸν λόγον would, on any other supposition than the above, be deprived of its significance as stating the ground of offence.

Ver. 13. The correct interpretation is the *ordinary* one (being also that of Ewald and Keim), according to which φυτεία is taken as a figurative way of expressing the *teaching*. The fact of Jesus having attacked their *teaching*, in ver. 11, had given offence to the Pharisees. Consequently He now explains why it is that He does not spare such teaching: *every doctrine, He says, that is not of God, that is merely human in its origin, will pass away and perish*, as the result, that is, of the Messianic reformation which is in the course of developing itself. Nothing is said about the Pharisees *personally* (whom Chrysostom supposes to be *included* in what is said about the teaching) till ver. 14. This in answer to Fritzsche, Olshausen, de Wette, Hilgenfeld, Bleek, who find in the words a prediction of the extirpation of the *Pharisees* ("characters of this stamp will soon have played out their game," de Wette). What is expressed *figuratively* by means of πᾶσα φυτεία, ἣν οὐκ ἐφύτευσεν ὁ πατήρ μου, is the same thing that, in ver. 9, is designated *literally* as διδασκαλίας ἐντάλματα ἀνθρώπων.—On φυτεία, *planting* (Plat. *Theag.* p. 121 C; Xen. *Oec.* vii. 20, xix. 1), i.e. in this instance: *something planted*, comp. Ignatius, *ad Philad.* III. *ad Trall.* xi., where, however, it is not used with regard to false teaching, but with reference to false teachers. In classic Greek the form is φύτευμα, or φυτόν.

Ver. 14. Ἀφετε αὐτούς] *Let them alone, dismiss them from your thoughts!* Comp. Soph. *Phil.* 1043 (1054): ἄφετε γὰρ αὐτόν, μηδὲ προσψάυσῃτ' ἔτι. "Indignos esse pronuntiat, quorum haberi debeat ratio," Calvin.—In the *application* of the general saying: τυφλὸς δὲ τυφλόν, etc., the *falling into a ditch* (cistern, or any other hole in the earth, as in xii. 17) is to be understood as a figurative expression for being cast into

Gehenna. These blind teachers, whose minds are closed against the entrance of divine truth (comp. xxiii. 16; Rom. ii. 19), are with their blind followers hopelessly lost!—Observe what emphasis there is in the fourfold repetition of τυφλοί, etc. The very *acme* of Pharisaic blindness was their maintaining that they were *not* blind, John ix. 40.

Ver. 15. 'Ο Πέτρος] differs, though not materially, from Mark vii. 17. — παραβολῇ] in this instance ψῆς, a *saying* embodied in some figurative representation, an apophthegm. Etym. M.: αἰνιγματώδης λόγος, ὃ πολλοὶ λέγουσι ζήτημα, ἐμφαίνειν μὲν τι, οὐκ αὐτόθεν δὲ πάντως δῆλον ὃ ἀπὸ τῶν ῥημάτων, ἀλλ' ἔχον ἐντὸς διάνοιαν κεκρυμμένην. Comp. note on xiii. 3; φράσον, as in xiii. 36. — ταύτην] It was the saying of ver. 11 that was present to Peter's mind as having giving occasion to the words that had just fallen from Jesus. It is just that same λόγος which, according to ver. 12, had given offence to the Pharisees. But the explanation of it which is now furnished by Jesus is of such a nature as to be by no means self-evident.

Ver. 16. 'Ακμήν] in the sense of *adhuc* (frequently met with in Polybius), belongs to the Greek of a later age. Phrynichus, p. 123, and Lobeck's note. — καὶ ὑμεῖς] *even you*, although you are my regular disciples.

Ver. 17 ff. Οὐπω νοεῖτε, κ.τ.λ.] *Do you not yet understand that*, and so on, notwithstanding all that I have already done to develop your minds?—Food and drink are simply things that pass into the stomach to be digested there, and have nothing in common with man's spiritual nature, with his reason, his will, and his affections and desires (καρδία, the centre of the whole inner life, see note on xxii. 37). Notice the *contrast* between εἰς τὴν κοιλίαν (*abdominal cavity*, see note on John vii. 38) and ἐκ τῆς καρδίας.—Ver. 19. Proof of what is said in ver. 18: for the *heart* is the place where immoral thoughts, murders, adulteries, and so on, therefore where inward and outward sins, are first conceived, and from which they pass into actual transgressions. Accordingly, it is *that* which comes out of the *heart*, and expresses itself by means of the mouth (ver. 18), which defiles the man as a

moral being. The opposite case, in which the heart sends forth what is *good*, presupposes *conversion*.—The *plurals* denote different instances of murder, adultery, and so on (Kühner, II. 1, p. 15 f.; Maetzner, *ad Lycurg.* p. 144 f.), and render the language more *forcible* (Bremi, *ad Aeschin.* p. 326). — *βλασφημ.*] *i.e.* against one's neighbour, on account of the connection with *ψευδομ.* Comp. note on Eph. iv. 31.

Ver. 21. *Ἐκεῖθεν*] See xiv. 34. — *ἀνεχώρησεν*] *He withdrew*, to avoid being entrapped and molested by the Pharisees. Comp. xii. 15, xiv. 13. — *εἰς τὰ μέρη*] *not: towards the districts, versus* (Syr. Grotius, Bengel, Fritzsche, Olshausen), for the only meaning of *εἰς* that naturally and readily suggests itself is: *into the districts* (ii. 22), of Tyre and Sidon. This, however, is not to be understood as implying that Jesus had crossed the borders of Palestine and entered Gentile territory, which is precluded by the words of ver. 22: *ἀπὸ τ. ὁρίων ἐκ. ἐξελθοῦσα*, but as meaning, that he went: *into the* (Galilean) *districts which border upon the precincts of Tyre and Sidon*. Comp. note on Mark vii. 24, according to which evangelist Jesus does not pass through Sidon till afterwards, when proceeding farther on His way (vii. 31). This in answer to Chrysostom, Theophylact, Euth. Zigabenus, de Wette, Arnoldi, Bleek, Schenkel, whose expedient of supposing that Jesus betook Himself to this Gentile valley, not for the purpose of *teaching*, but to make Himself acquainted with the feelings of the people who lived there (Schenkel), may be pronounced to be as arbitrary as the supposition that He only wanted (Calvin) to give *praeludia quaedam* of the conversion of the Gentiles.

Ver. 22. *Χαναναῖα*] Several tribes of the *Canaanites*, *חִנְיָאִי*, who were the original inhabitants of Palestine, went and settled in the north, and founded what was subsequently known as the *Phoenician* nation, Winer, *Realwörterbuch*. Lightfoot on this passage. — *ἐξελθοῦσα*] She crossed the frontier into the contiguous territory of the Jews, where Jesus happened to be. According to Paulus, the woman came *out of her house*; according to de Wette, Bleek: *from some place nearer the centre of the country*. Both views are in opposition to the terms of our passage, which *plainly state* where she came out



from. — *οὐκ ἔστιν* Δαυ.] She so addresses Jesus, because, from living in the neighbourhood of the Jews, she was familiar with their Messianic expectations, and with the Messiah's title, as well as with the Messianic reputation of Jesus. Looking to what is said in ver. 26, she cannot be supposed to have been a proselyte of the gate. The Gentiles also believed in demoniacal possession. — *ἐλέησόν με*] “Suam fecerat pia mater miseriam filiae,” Bengel.

Ver. 23. At first a silent indication, and then an express intimation of His disinclination to favour her. — *ἀπόλυσον αὐτήν*] *send her away*, that is, with her request *granted*. Bengel says well: “Sic *solebat* Jesus dimittere.”—Thus they *begged* Jesus; very frequently in the New Testament (in Matthew, only on this occasion; in Mark, only in vii. 26; in Luke and John, very often; in Paul, only in Phil. iv. 3; 1 Thess. iv. 1, v. 12; 2 Thess. ii. 1), and contrary to classical usage, though according to the LXX. (= *ἐρωτάω*, see Schleusner, *Thes.* II. p. 529). *ἐρωτάω* is used in the sense of *to beg, to request*. It is not so with regard to *ἐπερωτάω*. See note on xvi. 1. — *ὅτι κρᾶζει, κ.τ.λ.*] so importunate is she.

Ver. 24. Those words are addressed to the *disciples* (comp. note on x. 6); the answer to the *woman* comes afterwards in ver. 26.—It is usually supposed that what Jesus had in view was merely *to put her confidence in Him to the test* (Ebrard, Baur, Schenkel, Weiss); whilst Chrysostom, Theophylact, Euth. Zigabenus, Luther, Glöckler, assert that His aim was to furnish her with an opportunity for *displaying her faith*. But the moral sense protests against this apparent cruelty of playing the part of a dissembler with the very intention of tormenting; it rather prefers to recognise in our Lord's demeanour *a sincere disposition to repel*, which, however, is subsequently *conquered* by the woman's unshaken trust (Chrysostom: *καλὴν ἀναίσχυντιαν*). Ewald appropriately observes how, on this occasion, Jesus shows His greatness in a twofold way: first, in prudently and resolutely confining Himself to the sphere of His own country; and then in no less thoughtfully overstepping this limit whenever a higher reason rendered it proper to do so, and as if to foreshadow what was going to

take place a little farther on in the future.—It was not intended that Christ should come to the *Gentiles* in the days of His flesh, but that He should do so at a subsequent period (xxviii. 19), in the person of the Spirit acting through the medium of apostolic preaching (John x. 16; Eph. ii. 17). But the difficulty of reconciling this with viii. 5, xi. 12, on which Hilgenfeld lays some stress, as being in favour of our present narrative, is somewhat lessened by the fact that, according to Luke vii. 2 ff., the centurion was living in the heart of the people, and might be said to be already pretty much identified with Judaism; whereas we have a complete stranger in the case of the woman, before whom Jesus sees Himself called upon, in consequence of their request, ver. 23, strictly to point out to *His disciples* that His mission, so far as its *fundamental object* was concerned, was to be confined *exclusively* to Israel. Volkmar, indeed, makes out that the words were never spoken at all; that their teaching is of a questionable nature; and that the whole thing is an imitation of the story of Elijah and the widow of Zarephath (1 Kings xvii.); while Scholten, p. 213, regards it merely as a *symbolical* representation of the relation of the Gentile world to the kingdom of God, and which had come to be treated as a *fact*.

Ver. 26. *It is not allowable* (see critical notes) *to take (sumere, circumstantial way of putting it, not: to take away) the bread belonging to the children and cast it to the dogs*,—a general proposition for the purpose of expressing the thought: *I must not allow the Gentiles to participate in my blessings, belonging as they do only to the people of Israel* (the children of God, Rom. ix. 4). Jesus speaks “*ex communi gentis loquela potius quam ex sensu suo*” (Lightfoot); for it was the practice among the Jews to designate heathens (and subsequently, Christians also) as *dogs*; see Lightfoot and Wetstein, likewise Eisenmenger, *entdeckt. Judenth.* I. p. 713 ff. For the diminutive, see note on ver. 27. In this passage it is intended to *mitigate the harshness* of the expression.

Ver. 27. *Nai*, as in xi. 9, 26, *confirms* the whole statement of Jesus in ver. 26 (not merely the appellation of dogs, Theophylact, Euth. Zigabenus, Erasmus, Maldonatus); and *καὶ γάρ*

means, as everywhere in the New Testament, and even to a far greater extent among classical writers (who use it but rarely in the sense of *namque*,—*καί* consequently is connective), *for even*; see especially, Kühner, II. 2, p. 855. It gives a reason for the *ναί*; but it is quite according to rule to regard τὰ κυνάρια as the expression to which *καί* is meant to give prominence. Consequently the passage would run thus: *Yes, Lord, Thou art right in what Thou sayest, for even the dogs eat of the crumbs*, and so on; or, to express it negatively (with οὐδὲ γάρ): *for even the dogs are not sent away empty*, and so on. That is to say, this *καί*, so far as can be seen from the context, cannot be intended to serve any other purpose than to suggest a comparison between the κυνάρια and the τέκνα, so that the passage may be paraphrased as follows: *Thou art right, Lord; for not merely the children are filled with bread at the family-meal, but—so richly is the table spread—even the dogs receive their share, inasmuch as they eat of the fragments*, and so on. It would therefore be but the more unseemly to take the children's bread and cast it to the dogs, so as possibly to leave the former unfed. But in thus justifying her *ναί, κύριε*, the woman seeks to suggest the inference to our Lord that He might yet venture to give her *that* which is hinted at in those ψιχία with which the κυνάρια have to be contented. Of course by this she means a share of His abundant mercy, after the wants of Israel have been fully supplied. Following Grotius and Kuinoel, de Wette explains incorrectly: *For it is even usual for the dogs to get nothing but the fragments*. In that case we should have expected to find: *καὶ γὰρ ἀπὸ τῶν ψιχίων ἐσθίει, κ.τ.λ.* Fritzsche (comp. Bleek, Schegg) is likewise wrong when he explains thus: *Yes, Lord, it is allowable to give the bread to the dogs, for*, and so on. As against this view we have not merely *ναί*, which can only be taken as a *confirming*, a justifying of what Jesus had said, not simply the ignoring of *καὶ γάρ*, which it would involve, but also the “repugnandi audacia,” which is not to be excused in consideration of the *κύριε*, and the meaning itself, which would certainly not bear out the idea of a contradiction on the part of the woman. But if there is one thing more than

another that must not be associated with the tender language of this woman, it is the appearance of anything like contradiction. Finally, all interpretations are wrong which would necessitate our having ἀλλά instead of καὶ γάρ (Chrysostom, Luther, Vatablus, Glöckler, Baumgarten-Crusius).—The reason why we find Jesus, ver. 26, and consequently the woman also, ver. 27, making use of the *diminutive* κυνάρια (a classical term, Plat. *Euthyd.* p. 298 D; Xen. *Cyr.* viii. 4. 20, although discarded by Phrynichus, p. 180), is because His idea is that of a *family-meal*, in connection with which it was not unnatural to think of the little *house-dogs* that ran about under the table (comp. τραπέζῃες κύνες, Hom. *Il.* xxiii. 173). The *plural* τῶν κυρίων may be ascribed to the fact that, in what she says, the woman is understood to be stating what is matter of general experience.

Ver. 28. Ἀπὸ τῆς ὥρας ἐκ.] See note on ix. 22.—The miracle is one of *healing from a distance*, as in viii. 13, John iv. 46 ff., and is to be regarded neither as an *allegory* of Jesus' own composing (Weisse, I. p. 527), which came subsequently to be looked upon as the record of a miracle, nor as being a mere case of the miraculous *prediction of the future* (Ammon. *L. J.* II. p. 277).

Vv. 29 ff. Παρὰ τὴν θάλ. τ. Γαλ.] according to Mark vii. 31, the *eastern* shore.—τὸ ὄρος] the mountain just at hand. See notes on v. 1, xiv. 22.—κυλλοῦς] *deformed, lame*, without specifying further; but the word is used not merely with reference to the hands or arms (comp. as evidence to the contrary, the well-known nickname of Vulcan: κυλλοποδίων, Hom. *Il.* xviii. 371, xxi. 331), but also to the feet.—ἐρρίψαν] The *flinging down* is to be taken, not as indicating the careless confidence (Fritzsche, de Wette, Bleek), but rather the *haste* of the people, in consequence of so many sick being brought to Jesus. Comp. Er. Schmid, Bengel. The reference to the *helplessness* of the sick (Baumgarten-Crusius) would be suited only to the case of the χωλοί and κυλλοί.—παρὰ τ. πόδας] for as προσκυνοῦντες it behoved them to prostrate themselves before Him.—Ver. 31. τὸν θεὸν Ἰσρ.] who shows His care for His people by communicating to them,

through Jesus, such extraordinary blessings. 'Ισρ. is added in the consciousness of the advantages they possessed over the neighbouring Gentiles.

Ver. 32. In this second instance of feeding the multitude, and which is likewise recorded in Mark viii. 1 ff. (and that in a more authentic form), Jesus takes the initiative, as in John vi. 5; not so in Matt. xiv. 15. — ἡμέραι τρεῖς] *because they have remained with me, it is now three days, and, and so on.* For this elliptical way of inserting the time in the nominative, see Winer, p. 523 [E. T. 704]; Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 122 [E. T. 139]; Fritzsche, *ad Marc.* p. 310 f. — καὶ οὐκ ἔχουσι. κ.τ.λ.] for in the course of the three days they had consumed the provisions they had brought along with them.

Vv. 33 ff. See note on xiv. 15 ff. — ἡμῖν] “Jam intelligentes discipuli, suas fore in ea re partes aliquas,” Bengel — ὥστε] not a telic particle (de Wette), but what is meant is: such a quantity of bread as will be sufficient for their wants, and so on. The use of ὥστε after τοσοῦτος in a way corresponding to this is of very frequent occurrence (Plat. *Gorg.* p. 458 C). See Sturz, *Lex. Xen.* IV. p. 320; Kühner, II. 2, p. 1003. Notice the emphatic correlation of τοσοῦτοι and τοσοῦτον.—The perplexity of the disciples, and the fact of their making no reference to what was formerly done under similar circumstances, combined with the great resemblance between the two incidents, have led modern critics to assume that Matthew and Mark simply give what is only a *duplicate* narrative of one and the same occurrence (Schleiermacher, Scholz, Kern, Credner, Strauss, Neander, de Wette, Hase, Ewald, Baur, Köstlin, Hilgenfeld, Holtzmann, Weiss, Weizsäcker, Volkmar, Keim, Scholten); while Wilke and Bruno Bauer maintain, though quite unwarrantably, that in Mark the account of the second instance of miraculous feeding is an interpolation; and Weiss, on the other hand, is of opinion that this evangelist has constructed his duplicate out of materials drawn from two distinct sources (1865, p. 346 f.). As a consequence of this duplicate-hypothesis, it has been found necessary to question the authenticity of Matt. xvi. 9 f., Mark viii. 19. The whole difficulty in connection with this matter

arises chiefly out of the question of the disciples, and the fact of their seeming to have no recollection of what took place before,—a difficulty which is not to be got rid of by reminding us of their feeble capacities (Olshausen), but which justifies us in assuming that there were actually two instances of miraculous feeding of a substantially similar character, but that (Bleek) in the early traditions the accounts came to assume pretty much the same shape, all the more that the incidents themselves so closely resembled each other. — Ver. 34. *ἰχθύδια*] Observe the use of the *diminutive* on the part of the *disciples* themselves (“extenuant apparatus,” Bengel); the use of *ἰχθύας*, on the other hand, in the *narrative*, ver. 36. — Ver. 35. *κελεύειν τινα*] occurs nowhere else in the New Testament, though frequently in Homer and later writers (Plat. *Rep.* p. 396 A). See Bornemann in the *Sächs. Stud.* 1843, p. 51. — Ver. 37. *Seven baskets full* is in apposition with *τὸ περισσ. τ. κλασμ.*, as in xiv. 20. — *σπυρίς* is the term regularly employed to denote a basket for *carrying provisions* when on a journey, *sporta*. Comp. Arr. *Ep.* iv. 10. 21; Athen. viii. p. 365 A; Valckenaer, *Schol.* I. p. 455. The *seven* baskets corresponded to the *seven* loaves, ver. 34; the *twelve* baskets, xiv. 20, to the *twelve* apostles. — *χωρίς γυναικ. κ. παιδ.*] See note on xiv. 21.

Ver. 39. The village of *Magdala* (Josh. xix. 38 ?) is not to be regarded as situated on the east (Lightfoot, Wetstein, Cellarius), but on the west side of the lake, where now stands the Mohammedan village of *Mejdel*. See Gesenius on *Burckhardt*, II. p. 559; Buckingham, I. p. 404; Robinson, *Pal.* III. p. 530. This situation likewise corresponds with Mark vii. 21. Comp. note on ver. 29. It is well, however, to take note of the reading *Μαγαδάν* (B D & Syr<sup>cur</sup> Syr. in this instance; similarly Lachmann, Tischendorf; comp. Erasmus and Grotius), or *Μαγεδάν* (Vulgate, It., Jerome, Augustine), which unknown name might readily enough have been supplanted by one rendered more familiar on account of its connection with Mary Magdalene. In C M, Curss. the final syllable is still retained (*Μαγδαλάν*). According to Ewald, *Magadan*, or *Magedan*, refers to the well-known town of *Megiddo*.

But this latter was too far inland (Robinson, III. p. 413 f.; Furer in Schenkel's *Bibelles.*), for it would seem, from what is stated in the text (*ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ πλ. καὶ ἦλθεν*), that the place meant must have been somewhere on the shore, and one admitting of being approached by a boat. Mark viii. 10 calls it *Dalmanutha*.

## CHAPTER XVI.

VER. 3. ὑποκριταί] omitted before τὸ μὲν in C\* D L Δ, Curss. Verss. Aug. Deleted by Lachmann (who has καί instead, only after C\*\*) and Tisch. Correctly; borrowed from Luke xii. 56. — In accordance with important testimony, Lachm. and Tisch. have correctly deleted τοῦ προφήτου, ver. 4 (comp. xii. 39), as also αὐτοῦ, ver. 5. — Ver. 8. ἐλάβετε] Lachm.: ἔχετε, after B D κ, Curss. Vulg. It., and other Verss. (not Or.). Correctly; ἐλάβ. was more likely to be derived mechanically from ver. 7 than ἔχετε to have been adopted from Mark viii. 17. Had the latter been the case, we should likewise have found ἔχομεν in ver. 7. — Ver. 11. ἄρτου] Scholz, Lachm. Tisch.: ἄρτων, which Griesb. likewise approved, in accordance with a preponderance of testimony. The sing. would naturally come more readily to the transcribers, and that on account of the material rather than the numerical contrast. — For προσέχειν, B C\* L κ, Curss. Verss. Or. have: προσέχετε δέ (D, Curss. and Verss., however, omitting the δέ). Correctly adopted by Fritzsche, Lachm. Tisch. The infinitive, as well as the omission of δέ, originated in the reference of the words not having been understood. — Ver. 12. τοῦ ἄρτου] Tisch. 8: τῶν Φαρισαίων κ. Σαδδουκ., only after κ\* 33, Syr<sup>cur</sup>; Lachm. has τῶν ἄρτων, which, however, is not so well supported as in ver. 11 (B L κ\*\*), besides having the appearance of being simply conformed to this verse. — The reading of Tisch. 8 is somewhat of a gloss. — Ver. 13. με] is omitted after τίνα in B κ and several Verss. and Fathers; in C it is found after λέγ. Deleted by Fritzsche and Tisch., bracketed by Lachm. Omitted because, from the circumstance of τ. υἱὸν τ. ἀνθρ. following (otherwise in Mark and Luke), it seemed superfluous and out of place. — Ver. 20. διεστείλατο] Orig. already found ἐπετίμησεν in Codd. So Lachm. after B\* D, Arm. Taken from Mark viii. 30, Luke ix. 21, for διαστέλλω occurs nowhere else in Matthew. — ὁ Χριστός] Elz., after numerous and important Codd. (also C κ\*\*): Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστός. But Ἰησοῦς is omitted by very important authorities, and, as it is out of place in the present connection, the transcriber must have inserted it



mechanically. — Ver. 23. μου εἶ] B C κ, 13, 124 : εἶ ἐμοῦ (so Lachm. Tisch. 8), or εἶ μου. D, Marcell., in Eus. Vulg. It. al. : εἶ ἐμοί (so Fritzsche). With such a want of unanimity among the authorities, the reading of the Received text cannot be said to have a preponderance of testimony, while the variations turn the scales in favour of εἶ ἐμοῦ. — Ver. 26. ὡφελεῖται] Lachm. Tisch. : ὡφεληθήσεται, after B L κ, Curss. Verss. Or. Cyr. Chrys. Altered to be in conformity with the verbs in the future that precede and follow. Comp. also Mark viii. 36, 37. — Ver. 28. τῶν ᾧδε ἰστώτων] Elz. : τῶν ᾧδε ἰστηκότων, after K M π. Fritzsche : τῶν ᾧδε ἰσῶτες, after Ev. 49. Both are to be rejected, owing to the testimony being too inadequate. Scholz and Tisch. 7 : ᾧδε ἰσῶτες, after E F G H V X γ Δ, Curss. No doubt τῶν ᾧδε ἰσώτων is supported by the preponderating testimony of B C D L S U κ, Curss. Or. Ephr. Chrys. Epiph. Theodoret, Damasc., and adopted by Griesb. Lachm. Tisch. 8; still it is clearly taken from Mark ix. 1, Luke ix. 27. It therefore remains that ᾧδε ἰσῶτες is the correct reading.

Ver. 1 ff. Comp. Mark viii. 11 ff. Not a duplicate of the incident recorded in xii. 38 (Strauss, de Wette, Bruno Bauer, Schneckenburger, Volkmar, Weizsäcker, Bleek, Scholten), but *a second demand for a sign*, and that *from heaven*, in which respect it is distinguished from the first. With regard to the alliance between *Pharisees and Sadducees*, supposed by some to be utterly improbable (de Wette, Strauss, Weiss, Scholten), it is sufficient to say, with Theophylact : *κὰν τοῖς δόγμασι δίσταντο Φαρισαῖοι καὶ Σαδδουκαῖοι, ἀλλὰ γε κατὰ Χριστοῦ συμπνέουσι σημεῖον δὲ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ζητοῦσιν, ἐδόκουν γὰρ, ὅτι τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς σημεῖα ἀπὸ δαιμονικῆς δυνάμεως καὶ ἐν Βεελζεβούλ γίνονται*. In the unbelieving hostility with which they are animated, they demand of Him the very highest sign which the Messiah would be expected to give (xxiv. 29 f.; Joel iii. 3 f.), intending thereby to have Him put to the test, but thinking, all the time, that it would be beyond His power to comply with their demand. — *ἐπηρώτησαν*] Their challenge was put in the form of *inquiry*. — The compound *ἐπερωτᾶν* never means : *to request, to beg*; see note on xv. 23. — Their questions had reference to such a sign, by way of Messianic credential, as, coming from *heaven*, would be visible

to their outward eye. — ἐπιδειξάι] *spectandum præbere*, John ii. 18.

Vv. 2, 3 f.<sup>1</sup> Lightfoot, p. 373: "Curiosi erant admodum Judæi in observandis tempestatibus coeli et temperamento æris." Babyl. Joma f. 21. 8; Hieros. Taanith f. 65. 2. For Greek and Roman testimonies relative to the weather signs in our passage, see Wetstein. — εὐδία] *clear weather!* An exclamation in which it is not necessary to supply ἔσται, except, perhaps, in the way of helping the grammatical *analysis*, as also in the case of σήμερον χειμῶν (*stormy weather to-day!*). For the opposite of εὐδία and χειμῶν, comp. Xen. *Hell.* ii. 3. 10: ἐν εὐδία χειμῶνα ποιοῦσιν. — στυγνάζων] *being lowering*. See note on Mark x. 22. — τὸ πρόσωπον] "Omnis rei facies externa," Dissen, *ad Pind. Pyth.* vi. 14, p. 273. — τὰ δὲ σημεῖα τῶν καιρῶν] *the significant phenomena connected with passing events*, the phenomena which present themselves as characteristic features of the time, and point to the impending course of events, just as a red sky at evening portends fine weather, and so on. The expression is a *general* one, hence the *plural* τῶν καιρῶν; so that it was a mistake to understand the σημεῖα as referring to the *miracles of Christ* (Beza, Kuinoel, Fritzsche). Only when the reproach expressed in this general form is *applied*, as the Pharisees and Sadducees were intending to apply it, to the *existing καιρός*, do the miracles of Christ fall to be *included* among the signs, because they indicate the near approach of the Messiah's kingdom. In like manner the *fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy*, such as was to be traced in the events that were then taking place (Grotius), was to be regarded as *among* the signs in question, as also the *Messianic awakening among the people*, Matt. xi. 12 (de Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius). According to Strauss, the saying in vv. 2, 3 is inconceivable. But the truth is, it was peculiarly in keeping with the thoughtful

<sup>1</sup> The whole passage from ὁψίας on to εὐ δύνασθι, ver. 3, is omitted in B V X r N, Curss. Codd. in Jerom. Syr<sup>sc</sup> Arm. Or. (?), while in E it is marked with an asterisk. Tisch. 8 encloses it in brackets. The omission is certainly not to be explained on the physical ground (Bengel) that these signs of the weather are not applicable to every climate, but from the fact that a similar saying does not happen to be found in the corresponding passage in Mark.

manner of Jesus, if, when a sign *from heaven* was demanded, He should refer those demanding it to their own practice of interpreting the *appearances of the sky*, so as to let them see how blinded they were to the signs that already *existed*. A similar saying is found in Luke xii. 54 f., where, however, it is addressed to the multitude. There is no reason for thinking that it appears in its authentic form *only* in Matthew (de Wette), or *only* in Luke (Schleiermacher, Holtzmann), for there is nothing to prevent us from supposing that Jesus may have used similar and in itself very natural language on several occasions. — καὶ καταλιπ. αὐτ. ἀπῆλθε] depicting in a simple way the “*justa severitas*” (Bengel) shown toward those incorrigibles. Comp. xxi. 17.—Comp., besides, the note on xii. 39.

Ver. 5. This, according to Fritzsche, is the voyage mentioned in xv. 39, so that the disciples are supposed to have come shortly after “in eum ipsum locum, quem Jesus cum Pharisaeis disputans tenebat.” Unjustifiable deviation from the very definite account in Mark viii. 13. After disposing of the Pharisees and Sadducees, Jesus crossed over again to the east side of the lake along with His disciples; but Matthew mentions only οἱ μαθηταί, because they alone happen to form the subject of ἐπελάθοντο, though ver. 6 shows, beyond all doubt, that *Jesus crossed along with them*. — ἐπελάθοντο] is neither to be taken (Erasmus, Calvin, Paulus, Hilgenfeld) as a *pluperfect* (see, on the other hand, note on John xviii. 24), nor as equivalent to “*viderunt se oblitos esse*” (Beza, Kuinoel, Fritzsche), but thus: after the disciples had reached the east side, *they forgot* to provide themselves with bread (to serve them for a longer journey). After coming on shore they should have obtained a supply of provisions in view of having a further journey before them, but this *they forgot*. According to Mark viii. 14 ff., which in this instance also is the more authentic version, the following conversation is *not* to be understood as having taken place *in the boat* (Keim, Weiss), but in the course of the further journey after going on shore.

Ver. 6. The craft and malice of the Pharisees and Saddu-

cees were still fresh in His memory, vv. 1-4. — ζύμην τήν διδαχήν] ἐκάλεσεν, ὡς ὁξώδη καὶ σαπρὰν (Euth. Zigabenus); see ver. 12. The allusion is to their peculiar sectarian views, in so far as they deviated from the law. The expression is explained differently in Luke xii. 1. Comp. note on Gal. v. 9; 1 Cor. v. 6. For the figurative use of ῥῖψ by the Rabbis (as denoting the infecting influence of any one who is *bad*), see Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* p. 2303. Lightfoot on this passage. Used differently again in xiii. 33.

Ver. 7 f. Owing to the notion of bread being associated in their minds with that of leaven, the words of Jesus led them to notice that their supply of the former article was exhausted, so that they supposed all the time that His object was to warn them against taking *bread* from the Pharisees and Sadducees. — διελογίζοντο] not *disceptabant* (Grotius, Kypke, Kuinoel), but: *they consulted among themselves, i.e. they deliberate* (λέγοντες) over the matter within their own circle without saying anything to Jesus, who, however, from His being able to penetrate their thoughts, is quite aware of what is going on, ver. 8. Comp. Xen. *Mem.* iii. 5. 1. — ὅτι] not: *recitative*, but: (He says that) *because we have not provided ourselves with bread*. In ver. 8 it means: *over the fact, that*. — τί διαλογ.] *why*, and so on, how meaningless and absurd it is!

Ver. 9 f. After those two miracles you have so recently witnessed (xiv. 15, xv. 32), have you *still* so little penetration as not to understand that the thing to which I am alluding is not literal bread, which you ought to have depended (ὀλιγόπιστ.) on my being able to supply whenever occasion might require, but rather to something of a spiritual nature? Jesus lays no more stress here than He does elsewhere upon the physical benefit of His bread-miracle (de Wette), but simply makes use of it in the way of suggesting deeper reflection.—The difference between κόφ. and σπυρ. does not lie in σπυρίς being larger (Bengel, which does not follow from Acts ix. 25), but in the fact that κόφινος is a general term, whereas σπυρίς denotes a *food-basket* in particular. See note on xiv. 20, xv. 37.

Ver. 11. Πῶς] *how* is it possible! Astonishment in

which a certain amount of censure is expressed. — *προσέχετε δέ*] see critical notes. It is not necessary to supply *εἶπον* (Paulus, Fritzsche), but we are rather to understand that after the question ending with *εἶπον ὑμῖν*, Jesus repeats, and with a view to its being yet more deeply pondered, the warning given in ver. 6, in which case *δέ* is simply continuative (autem): *But* (let me say again) *beware*, and so on.

Ver. 13 ff. Comp. Mark viii. 27 ff.; Luke ix. 18 ff. (which latter evangelist rejoins, at this point, the synoptic narrative, having left it immediately after recording the first miraculous feeding of the multitude, a circumstance which is sometimes alleged as a reason for doubting the authenticity of the second miracle of this kind).—*Caesarea Philippi*, a town in Gaulonitis, at the foot of Mount Lebanon, which was formerly known by the name of Paneas, Plin. *N. H.* v. 15. Philip the tetrarch enlarged and embellished it (Joseph. *Antt.* xviii. 2, *Bell.* ii. 9. 1), and called it *Caesarea* in honour of Caesar (Tiberius). It received the name of *Philippi* in order to distinguish it from *Caesarea Palestinae*. Robinson, *Pal.* III. pp. 612, 626 ff., and *neuere Forsch.* p. 531 ff.; Ritter, *Erdk.* XV. 1, p. 194 ff. — *τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*] See, in general, note on viii. 20. The words are in characteristic apposition with *με*. That is to say, Matthew does not represent Jesus as asking in a general way (as in Mark and Luke) who it was that the people supposed Him to be, but as putting the question in this more special and definite form: *whom do the people suppose me, as the Son of man, to be?* He had very frequently used this title in speaking of Himself; and what He wanted to know was, the nature of the construction which the people put upon the designation in Daniel, which He had ascribed to Himself, whether or not they admitted it to be applicable to Him in its Messianic sense. Comp. Holtzmann in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschr.* 1865, p. 228. From the answer it appears that, as a rule, He was not being taken for the Messiah as yet (that consequently the more general appellation: *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρ.*, was not as yet being applied to Him in the special sense in which Daniel uses it), He was only regarded as a forerunner; but the disciples themselves had understood Him to be the Son of man

in Daniel's sense of the words, and, as being such, they looked upon Him as the *Messiah*, the *Son of God*. Accordingly it is not necessary to regard τ. υἱὸν τ. ἀνθρ. as interpolated by Matthew (Holtzmann, Weizsäcker), thereby destroying the suggestive correlation in which it stands to the expression, *Son of God*, in Peter's reply. It is not surprising that Strauss should have been scandalized at the question, seeing that he understood it in the anticipatory sense of: "whom do the people suppose me to be, *who am the Messiah?*" Beza inserts a mark of interrogation after εἶναι, and then takes the following words by themselves thus: *an Messiam?* But this would involve an anticipation on the part of the questioner which would be quite out of place. De Wette (see note on viii. 20) imports a foreign sense into the passage when he thus explains: "whom do the people say that I am, I, the obscure, humble man who have before me the lofty destiny of being the Messiah, and who am under the necessity of first of all putting forth such efforts in order to secure the recognition of my claims?" Keim's view is correct, though he rejects the με (see critical notes).—Observe, moreover, how it was, after He had performed such mighty deeds in His character of Messiah, and had prepared His disciples by His previous training of them, and when feeling now that the *crisis* was every day drawing nearer, that Jesus leads those disciples to avow in the most decided way possible such a conviction of the truth of the Christian confession as the experience of their own hearts might by this time be expected to justify. Comp. note on ver. 17. As for themselves, they needed a religious confession thus deeply rooted in their convictions to enable them to confront the trying future on which they were about to enter. And to Jesus also it was a source of comfort to find Himself the object of such sincere devotion; comp. John vi. 67 ff. But to say that it was not till now that He Himself became convinced of His Messiahship (Strauss, before 1864, Schenkel), is to contradict the whole previous narrative in every one of the evangelists. Comp. Weizsäcker, Keim, Weissenborn, p. 41 ff.

Ver. 14 f. Ἰωάννην τὸν βαπτ.] Their opinion is similar to that of Antipas, xiv. 2. — Ἠλίαν] These ἄλλοι cannot,

therefore, have realized in the person of the Baptist that coming of Elias which was to precede the advent of the Messiah. — *ἑτεροὶ δέ]* a *distinct* class of opinion which, whatever may have been the subsequent view, was not at that time understood to be in any way connected with the expected coming of Elias. For *ἕτερος*, comp. note on 1 Cor. xii. 9, xv. 40; 2 Cor. xi. 4; Gal. i. 6. As forerunner of the Messiah they expected *Jeremiah*, who at that time was held in very high repute (Ewald, *ad Apoc.* XI. 3), or some other ancient prophet (risen from the dead). Bertholdt, *Christol.* p. 58 f. — *ἢ ἕνα τῶν προφ.]* where we are not to suppose *ἄλλον* to be understood (Fritzsch), but should rather regard the persons in question as intending to say (in a general way): it is *εἰς τῶν προφ.*! without mentioning any one *in particular*. For *εἰς*, see note on viii. 19. — *ὁ μὲν δέ]* from *them* He expected a very *different* kind of confession, and He was not disappointed.

Ver. 16. As was to be expected from his impetuous character, his personal superiority, as well as from the future standing already assigned him in John i. 43, Peter (*τὸ στόμα τῶν ἀποστόλων*, Chrysostom) assumes the part of spokesman, and in a decided and solemn manner (hence: *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος*, the higher, and not, as in xiv. 33, the merely theocratic meaning of which the apostle could as yet but dimly apprehend, it being impossible for him to understand it in all its clearness till after the resurrection, comp. note on Rom. i. 4) declares Jesus to be the *Messiah* (*ὁ Χριστός*), the *Son of the living God* (*τοῦ ζῶντος*, in contrast to the dead idols of the heathen). Both elements combined, the work and the person constituted then, as they do always, the *sum of the Christian confession*. Comp. xxvi. 63; John xi. 27, xx. 31; Phil. ii. 11; 1 John ii. 22 f. Observe the *climax* at the same time; “nam cognitio de Jesu, ut est *filius Dei*, sublimior est quam de eodem, ut est *Christus*,” Bengel.

Ver. 17. *Simon, son (ἱ) of Jona*, a solemnly circumstantial style of address, yet not intended as a *contrast* to the designation of him as Peter which is about to follow (de Wette), in connection with which view many expositors have allegorized the *Βαριωνά* in an arbitrary and nugatory fashion.

but merely on account of the *importance* of the subsequent statement, in which case *Βαριωνά* is to be ascribed to the practice of adding the patronymic designation, and blending the *βάρ.* with the proper name (x. 3 ; Acts xiii. 6 ; Mark x. 46). — *δοτι*] because thou art favoured far above my other followers in having had such a revelation as this. — *σὰρξ κ. αἷμα*] *בשר ודם* (among the Rabbis), paraphrastic expression for *man*, involving the idea of weakness as peculiar to his bodily nature, Sir. xiv. 18 ; Lightfoot on this passage ; Bleek's note on Heb. ii. 14. Comp. the note on Gal. i. 16 ; Eph. vi. 12. Therefore to be interpreted thus: *no weak mortal (mortalium ullus) has communicated this revelation to thee ; but*, and so on. Inasmuch as *ἀποκαλύπτειν*, generally, is a thing to which no human being can pretend, the negative half of the statement only serves to render the positive half all the more emphatic. Others refer *σὰρξ κ. αἷμα* to ordinary knowledge and ideas furnished by the senses, in contradistinction to *πνεῦμα* (de Wette, following Beza, Calvin, Calovius, Neander, Olshausen, Glöckler, Baumgarten-Crusius, Keim). Incorrectly, partly because the lower part of man's nature is denoted simply by *σὰρξ*, not by *σὰρξ κ. αἷμα* (in 1 Cor. xv. 50 the expression flesh and blood is employed in quite a peculiar, a physical sense), partly because *ἀπεκάλυψε* (xi. 25) compels us to think exclusively of a knowledge which is obtained in some other way than through the exercise of one's human faculties. For a similar reason, the blending of both views (Bleek) is no less objectionable. — It must not be supposed that, in describing this confession as the result of a divine revelation, there is anything inconsistent with the fact that, for a long time before, Jesus had, in word and deed, pointed to Himself as the Messiah (comp. above all the Sermon on the Mount, and such passages as xi. 5 f., 27), and had also been so designated by others (John the Baptist, and such passages as viii. 29, xiv. 33), nay, more, that from the very first the disciples themselves had recognised Him as the Messiah, and on the strength of His being so had been induced to devote themselves to His person and service (iv. 19 ; John i. 42, 46, 50) ; nor are we to regard the point of the revelation as consisting in the *ὁ υἱὸς*



τ. θεοῦ τ. ζῶντος, sometimes supposed (Olshausen) to indicate *advanced, more perfect knowledge*, a view which it would be difficult to reconcile with the parallel passages in Mark and Luke; but observe: (1) That Jesus is quite aware that, in spite of the vacillating opinions of the multitude, His disciples continue to regard Him as the Messiah, but, in order to strengthen and elevate both them and Himself before beginning (ver. 21) the painful and trying announcement of His future sufferings, and as furnishing a basis on which to take His stand in doing so, He seeks first of all to elicit from them an express and decided confession of their faith. (2) That Peter acts as the mouthpiece of all the others, and with the utmost decision and heartiness makes such a declaration of his belief as, at this turning-point in His ministry, and at a juncture of such grave import as regards the gloomy future opening up before Him, Jesus must have been longing to hear, and such as He could not fail to be in need of. (3) That He, the heart-searching one, immediately perceives and knows that Peter (as ὁ τοῦ χοροῦ τῶν ἀποστόλων κορυφαῖος, Chrysostom) was enabled to make such a declaration from his having been favoured with a special revelation from God (xi. 27), that He speaks of the distinction thus conferred, and connects with it the promise of the high position which the apostle is destined to hold in the church. Consequently ἀπεκάλυψε is not to be understood as referring to some revelation which had been communicated to the disciples at the outset of their career as followers of Jesus, but it is to be restricted to *Peter*, and to a *special* revelation from God with which *he* had been favoured. This confession, founded as it was upon such a revelation, must naturally have been far more deliberate, far more deeply rooted in conviction, and for the Lord and His work of far greater consequence, than that contained in the exclamation of the people in the boat (xiv. 33) when under the influence of a momentary feeling of amazement, which latter incident, however, our present passage does not require us to treat as unhistorical (Keim and others); comp. note on xiv. 33. — Observe, further, how decidedly the joyful answer of Jesus, with the great promise that accompanies it, forbids

the supposition that He consented to accept the title and dignity of a Messiah only from "not being able to avoid a certain amount of *accommodation*" to the ideas of the people (Schenkel; see, on the other hand, Weissenborn, p. 43 ff.).

Ver. 18. *But I again say to thee.* The point of the comparison in *καὶ γὰρ* is, that Peter having made a certain declaration in reference to Jesus, *Jesus also*, in His turn, now does the same in reference to Peter. — *πέτρος*] as an appellative: thou art *a rock*, Aram. ܡܬܪܐ. The form *ὁ πέτρος*<sup>1</sup> is likewise common among classical writers, and that not merely in the sense of a *stone*, as everywhere in Homer in contradistinction to *πέτρα* (see Duncan, p. 937, ed. Rost, and Buttmann, *Lexil.* II. p. 179), but also as meaning *a rock* (Plat. *Ax.* p. 371 E: *Σιούφου πέτρος*; Soph. *Phil.* 272, *O. C.* 19, 1591; Pind. *Nem.* iv. 46, x. 126). Jesus declares Peter to be *a rock* on account of that strong and steadfast faith in himself to which, under the influence of a special revelation from God, he had just given expression. According to John i. 43, however, Jesus conferred the *name* Cephas upon him at their very first interview (according to Mark iii. 16, somewhat later); but our passage is not to be understood as simply recording the *giving of the name*, or the giving of it for the second time. It is rather intended to be taken as a record of the declaration made by Jesus, to the effect that Simon *was* in reality all that the name conferred upon him *implied*. Consequently our passage is in no way inconsistent with that of John just referred to, which could only have been the case if the words used had been *σὺ κληθήσῃ Πέτρος*. — *καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ*] The emphasis is on *ταύτῃ*, which points to *Peter* (not to *Jesus*, as Augustine would have us suppose), and to be understood thus: on no other than on *this* rock,—hence the *feminine* form in this instance, because it is not so much a question of the name as of the *thing* which it indicates, *i.e.* of that rocky element in the apostle's character which furnished

<sup>1</sup> Among the later poets *ὁ πέτρος* is likewise to be met with. See Jacobs, *ad Anthol.* XIII. p. 22.—The name *Πέτρος* is also to be found in Greek writers of a later age (Leont. Schol. 18); more frequently in the form *Πετραῖος* (Lobeck, *Paral.* p. 342).

so solid a foundation for the superstructure of the church that was to be built upon it. — οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν] *will I build for myself* (μου, as in viii. 3, and frequently; see note on John xi. 32) *the church*. The ἐκκλησία—in the Old Testament קָהָל, Deut. xviii. 16, xxiii. 1, Judg. xxi. 8, the whole assembly of the Jewish people (Acts vii. 38), the theocratic *national assembly* (comp. Sir. xxiv. 1, and Grimm's note)—is used in the New Testament to denote *the community of believers*, the Christian church, which, according to a common figure (1 Cor. iii. 10 f.; Eph. ii. 19 ff.; Gal. ii. 9; 1 Pet. ii. 4 f.), is represented as a *building*, of which Christ here speaks of Himself as the architect, and of Peter as the foundation on which a building is to be raised (vii. 24 f.) that will defy every effort to destroy it. But the term ἐκκλ. was in such current use in its theocratic sense, that it is not necessary to suppose, especially in the case of a saying so prophetic as this, that it has been borrowed from a later order of things and put into Jesus' mouth (Weisse, Bleek, Holtzmann). Besides, there can be no doubt whatever that the *primacy* among the apostles is here assigned to Peter, inasmuch as Christ singles *him* out as that one in particular whose apostolic labours will, in virtue of the *stedfast faith* for which he is peculiarly distinguished, be the means of securing, so far as human effort can do so (comp. Rev. xxi. 14; Gal. ii. 9), the permanence and stability of the church which Jesus is about to found, and to extend more and more in the world. As in accordance with this, we may also mention the precedence given to this disciple in the catalogues of the apostles, and likewise the fact that the New Testament uniformly represents him as being, in point of fact, superior to all the others (Acts xv. 7, ii. 14; Gal. i. 18, ii. 7, 8). This primacy must be impartially conceded, though without involving those inferences which Romanists have founded upon it; for Peter's successors are not for a moment thought of by Jesus, neither can the popes claim to be his successors, nor was Peter himself ever bishop of Rome, nor had he any more to do with the founding the church at Rome than the Apostle Paul (for the false reasoning on this subject, see Döllinger, *Christenth. u. Kirche*, p. 315 ff.)

The explanation frequently had recourse to in anti-popish controversies, to the effect that the rock does not mean Peter himself, but *his steadfast faith and the confession he made of it*<sup>1</sup> (Calovius, Ewald, Lange, Wieseler), is incorrect, because the demonstrative expression: ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ, coming immediately after the σὺ εἶ πέτρος, can only point to the *apostle himself*, as does also the καὶ δώσω, etc., which follows, it being understood, of course, that it was *in consideration of Peter's faith* that the Lord declared him to be a foundation of rock. It is this circumstance also that underlies the reference to the apostle's *faith* on the part of the Fathers (Ambrose: "non de carne Petri, sed de *fide*;" comp. Origen, Cyril, Chrysostom, Augustine).—The expression: πύλαι ᾗδου (which does not require the article, Winer, p. 118 f. [E. T. 147 ff.]), is to be explained by the circumstance that because Hades is a place from which there is no possibility of getting out again (Eustathius, *ad Od.* xi. 276; Blomfield, Gloss. in Aesch. *Pers.* p. 164), it is represented under the figure of a palace with strong gates (Cant. viii. 6 f.; Job xxxviii. 17; Isa. xxxviii. 10; Ps. ix. 14, cvii. 18; Wisd. xvi. 13; 3 Macc. v. 51; Ev. Nicod. xxi., and Thilo's note, p. 718; more frequently also in Homer, as *Il.* viii. 15; Aesch. *Agam.* 1291; Eur. *Hipp.* 56).—οὐ κατισχύουσιν αὐτῆς] So securely will I build my church upon this rock, *that the gates of Hades will not be able to resist it*, will not prove stronger than it; indicating, by means of a comparison, the great strength and stability of the edifice of the church, even when confronted with so powerful a structure as that of Hades, the gates of which, strong as they are, will yet not prove to be stronger than the building of the church; for when the latter becomes perfected in the Messianic kingdom at the second coming, then those gates will be burst open, in order that the souls of the dead may come forth from the subterranean world to participate in the resurrection and the glory of the kingdom (comp. note on 1 Cor. xx. 54 f.), when

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Luther's gloss: "All Christians are Peters on account of the confession here made by Peter, which confession is the rock on which he and all Peters are built." Melancthon, generalizing the *πίτρα*, understands it in the sense of the *verum ministerium*. Comp. *Art. Smalc.* p. 345.

death (who takes away the souls of men to imprison them in Hades), the last enemy, has been destroyed (1 Cor. xv. 26). So far the *victory* of the church over Hades is, of course, affirmed, yet not in such a way as to imply that there had been an *attack* made by the one upon the other, but so as to convey the idea that when the church reaches her perfected condition, then, as a matter of course, the power of the nether world, which snatches away the dead and retains them in its grasp, will also be subdued. This victory presupposes *faith* on the part of the *καταχθονίοι* (Phil. ii. 10), and consequently the previous *descensus Christi ad inferos*. Moreover, had He chosen, Christ might have expressed Himself thus: *καὶ πυλῶν ᾧδου κατισχύσει*; but, keeping in view the comparative idea which underlies the statement, He prefers to give prominence to "the gates of Hades" by making them the subject, *which* circumstance, combined with the use of the *negative* form of expression (Rev. xii. 8), tends to produce a somewhat *solemn* effect. *κατισχύειν τινος*: *prævalere adversus aliquem* (Jer. xv. 18; Ael. N. A. v. 19; comp. *ἀντισχύειν τινος*, Wisd. vii. 30, and *ἰσχύειν κατὰ τινος*, Acts xix. 16). If we adopt the no less grammatical interpretation of: *to overpower, to subdue* (Luther and the majority of commentators), a most *incongruous* idea emerges in reference to the *gates*, and that whether we understand the victory as one over the *devil* (Erasmus, Luther, Beza, Calvin, Calovius, Maldonatus, Michaelis, Keim) or over *death* (Grotius); for the gates of Hades would thus be represented as the *attacking* side, which would hardly be appropriate, and we would have to suppose what, on the other hand, would be foreign to the sense, that all the monsters of hell would rush out through the opened gates (Ewald, comp. also Weizsäcker, p. 494). The point of the comparison lies simply in the *strength* that distinguishes such *solid* gates as those of Hades, and not also in the Oriental use of the gates as a place of *meeting for deliberation* (Glöckler, Arnoldi), as though the hostile *designs* of hell were what was meant. Notwithstanding the progressive nature of the discourse and the immediate subject, Wetstein and Clericus refer *αὐτῆς* to *Peter* (*ταύτη τ. πέτρα*), and suppose the meaning to be: "eum in discrimen

vitae venturum, nec tamen eo absterritum iri," etc.—Notice, besides, the *grandeur* of the expression: "grandes res etiam grandia verba postulant," Dissen, *ad Pind.* p. 715.

Ver. 19. *And I will give to thee the keys of the Messianic kingdom,*<sup>1</sup> i.e. the power of deciding as to who are to be admitted into or excluded from the future kingdom of the Messiah. For the figurative expression, comp. Luke xi. 52; Rev. i. 18, iii. 7, ix. 1, x. 1; Isa. xxii. 22; Ascens. Isa. vi. 6. — δώσω] The future expresses the idea of a *promise* (the gift not being, as yet, actually conferred), as in the case of οἰκοδομήσω, pointing *forward* to the time when Christ will no longer administer the affairs of the church in a direct and personal manner. This *future* already shows that what was meant cannot have been *the office of preaching the gospel*, which preaching is supposed to lead to admission into the kingdom of heaven, wherever God has prepared men's hearts for its reception (Düsterdieck, Julius Müller). The similitude of the *keys* corresponds to the figurative οἰκοδομ., ver. 18, in so far as the ἐκκλησία, ver. 18 (which is to be transformed into the βασιλεία τ. οὐρ. at the second coming), is conceived of as a *house*, the doors of which are opened and locked by means of *keys* (*generally*, not exactly by *two* of them). In regard to *Peter*, however, the figure undergoes some *modification*, inasmuch as it passes from that of the *foundation of rock*, not certainly into the lower one of a gate-keeper, but (comp. Luke xii. 4; 1 Cor. iv. 1, ix. 17; Tit. i. 7) into that of an οἰκονόμος (ταμίας, Isa. xxii. 15 ff.), from the ordinary relation of a disciple to the church to the place of authority hereafter to be assigned him in virtue of that relation. The authority in question is that of a *house-steward*, who is empowered to determine who are to belong and who are not to belong to the household over which his master has commissioned him to preside.<sup>2</sup> All this is expressed by means of

<sup>1</sup> See Ahrens, *d. Amt. Schlüssel*, 1864; Steitz in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1866, p. 436 ff.; likewise the reviews of the first-mentioned work in the *Erlang. Zeitschr.* 1865, 3, p. 137 ff.; and that of Düsterdieck in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1865, p. 743; Julius Müller, *dogm. Abh.* p. 496 ff.

<sup>2</sup> There is no force in the objection that this would be to confound the keys of the *house-steward* with those of the *porter* (Ahrens). The keys of the

an old and sacred symbol, according to which the *keys* of the house are promised to Peter, "that he may open and no man shut, that he may shut and no man open" (Isaiah as above). — For the forms κλεις and (as Tischendorf 8, on inadequate testimony) κλειδας, see Kühner, I. p. 357. — καὶ ὃ ἐὰν δῆσῃς κ.τ.λ.] a necessary adjunct of this power: *and whatsoever thou wilt have forbidden upon earth will be forbidden in heaven* (by God), so that it will, in consequence, prevent admission into the Messianic kingdom; *and whatsoever thou wilt have permitted upon earth* (as not proving a hindrance in the way of admission to the future kingdom) *will be permitted in heaven*. It will depend on thy decision—which God will ratify—what things, as being forbidden, are to disqualify for the kingdom of the Messiah, and what things, as being allowed, are to be regarded as giving a claim to admission. δέειν and λύειν are to be traced to the use, so current among the Jews, of אסר and היתר, in the sense of *to forbid* and *to allow*. Lightfoot, p. 378 ff.; Schoettgen, II. p. 894 f., and Wetstein on this passage; Lengerke's note on Dan. vi. 8; Rosenmüller, *Morgenl.* V. 67; Steitz, p. 438 f. Following Lightfoot, Vitringa, Schoettgen, and others, Fritzsche, Ahrens, Steitz, Weizsäcker, Keim, Gess (I. p. 68), Gottschick in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1873, also adopt this interpretation of those figurative expressions. In the face of this common

house are entrusted to the *steward* for the purpose of opening and locking it; this is all that the figure implies. Whether he opens and locks *in his own person*, or has it done through the medium of a *porter*, is of no consequence whatever, and makes no difference as far as the thing intended to be symbolized is concerned. The *power* of the keys belongs, in any case, to the οἰκονόμος, and not to the θυρωρός. The view of Ahrens, that the keys are to be regarded as those of the rooms, and of the place in which the *family provisions* are stored, the ταμίον, the contents of which it is supposed to be the duty of the steward to distribute (so also Döllinger, *Christenth. u. Kirche*, p. 31), is in opposition to the fact that the thing which is *to be opened and locked* must be understood to be that which is expressed by the genitive immediately after αἰς (accordingly, in this instance, the *kingdom*, not the ταμίον), comp. note on Luke xi. 52, likewise Isaiah as above. Moreover, according to the explanation of Ahrens, those, on whose behalf the ταμίης uses his keys, would have to be regarded as already *within the kingdom* and participating in its blessings, so that there would be no further room for the idea of *exclusion*, which is not in keeping with the contrast which follows.

usage, it would be arbitrary and absurd to think of any other explanation. The same may be said not only of the reference to the *supreme administrative power* in general (Arnoldi and the older Catholics), or to the *treasures of grace* in the church, which Peter is supposed to be able to withhold or bestow as he may deem proper (Schegg), but likewise of the view which represents the words as intended to indicate the power of *admitting into and excluding from the church* (Thaddaeus a S. Adamo, *Commentat.* 1789, Rosenmüller, Lange), and in support of which an appeal is made, notwithstanding the  $\delta$ , to the ancient practice of tying or untying doors; as well as of that other view which has been so currently adopted, after Chrysostom, Theophylact, Euth. Zigabenus, Erasmus, Luther, Beza, Calvin, Maldonatus, to the effect that what Jesus means is the *remission and non-remission of sins*.<sup>1</sup> So Grotius, Olshausen, de Wette, Bleek, Neander, Glöckler, Baumgarten-Crusius, Döllinger, Julius Müller, Düsterdieck. But to quote in connection with this the different and much later saying of Jesus, after His resurrection, John xx. 23, is quite unwarranted; the idea of *sin* is a pure importation, and although  $\lambdaύειν \acute{\alpha}μαρτ.$  may properly enough be understood as meaning: to forgive sins (Isa. xl. 2; 3 Esdr. ix. 13; Sir. xxviii. 8; and see Kypke on xviii. 18), yet the use of  $\deltaέειν \acute{\alpha}μαρτ.$ , in the sense of *retaining* them, is altogether without example. Exception has been taken to the *idea* involved in our interpretation; but considering that high degree of faith to which Peter, as their representative, here shows them to have attained, the apostles must be supposed to possess "the moral power of legislation" (objected to by de Wette) as well, if they are to determine the right of admission to the

<sup>1</sup> In which case the result of *apostolic preaching generally*, i.e. its efficacy in judging men by the *spiritual power of the word* (Julius Müller, comp. Neander and Düsterdieck), ceases to have any significance other than that of a vague abstraction, by no means in keeping with the specific expression of the text, and leaving no room for assigning to Peter any special prerogative. This also in answer to Weiss, *bibl. Theol.* p. 99, 2d ed., who holds that, originally, the words were intended to indicate merely that general commission which was given to the apostles to publish among men the call to the kingdom of God.



Messiah's kingdom ; see Steitz also, p. 458. This legislative authority, conferred upon Peter, can only wear an offensive aspect when it is conceived of as possessing an arbitrary character, and as being in no way determined by the ethical influences of the Holy Spirit, and when it is regarded as being of an absolute nature, as independent of any connection with the rest of the apostles (but see note on xviii. 18). Comp. Wieseler, *Chronol. d. Ap.* p. 587 f. Ahrens, likewise, correctly interprets the words in the sense of *to forbid* and *to allow*, but supposes the words themselves to be derived from the practice of fastening with a knot vessels containing anything of a valuable nature (Hom. *Od.* viii. 447). Artificial and far-fetched, but resulting from the reference of the keys to the ταμείον. — ἔσται δεδεμ.] Observe how that is spoken of as *already done*, which is to take place and be realized immediately on the back of the ὁ ἐὰν δόξης. Comp. Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 267 [E. T. 311]; Kühner, II. 1, p. 35. To such a degree will the two things really *harmonize* with one another.

Ver. 20. Διέστειλατο] *He appointed, strictly enjoined.* Comp. Plat. *Rep.* p. 535 B; Aristot. *Polit.* ii. 5; Judith xi. 12; 2 Macc. xiv. 28; Mark v. 43; Acts xv. 24; Heb. xii. 20. — ὅτι αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ Χ.] *that He Himself is the Messiah.* This αὐτός points back to ver. 14, according to which *some one else* was looked for as the Messiah, while Jesus was only regarded as His forerunner. The *reason* of this prohibition is not that He wanted to anticipate any offence that might afterwards arise in consequence of His sufferings (Chrysostom, Euth. Zigabenus), for Jesus quite foresaw His resurrection and δόξα, and the effect which these would have upon His followers (John xii. 32); but (see note on viii. 4) its explanation is to be found in His uniform desire to avoid awakening and fostering sanguine Messianic hopes among the people.

Ver. 21. Ἀπὸ τότε ἤρξατο] Comp. iv. 17; a note of time marking an important epoch. "Antea non ostenderat," Bengel. To announce His future sufferings<sup>1</sup> to His disciples, and that

<sup>1</sup> Whoever supposes that it was only somewhere about this time that the thought of His impending sufferings and death first began to dawn upon Jesus

immediately after their decided confession, ver. 16, was highly opportune, both as regards their capability and their need—their capability to stand so trying an intimation, and their need of beginning to relinquish their false hopes, and of attaining to a true and exalted conception of what constitutes the work of the Messiah. Mark viii. 31 likewise introduces the *beginning* of the announcement of the future sufferings somewhat prominently after Peter's confession, whereas Luke ix. 21 f. omits it altogether. — δει] Necessity in accordance with a divine purpose, xxvi. 54 ; Luke xxiv. 26 ; John iii. 14. — ἀπελθεῖν εἰς Ἱεροσ.] because connected with καὶ πολλὰ παθεῖν κ.τ.λ., does not forbid the idea of previous visits to Jerusalem mentioned by John (in answer to Hilgenfeld, *Evang.* p. 89); comp. xxiii. 37. — ἀπό] at the hands of; comp. note on xi. 19. — τῶν πρεσβ. κ. ἀρχ. κ. γραμμ.] This circumstantial way of designating the *Sanhedrim* (comp. note on ii. 4) has here something of a solemn character. — ἀποκτανθ.] further detail (though with ver. 24 already in view) reserved for xx. 19. What Jesus contemplates is not being stoned to death by the people (Hausrath), but judicial murder through the decision of a court of justice. — καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμ. ἐγερθῆναι] With so clear and distinct a prediction of the resurrection, it is impossible to reconcile the fact that, utterly disheartened by the death of their Lord, the disciples should have had no expectation whatever that He would come to life again, that they consequently embalmed the body, and that even on the Sunday morning the women wanted to anoint it; that they should have placed a heavy stone at the mouth of the grave, and afterwards are utterly at a loss to account for the empty sepulchre, and treat the statement that He has risen and appeared again as simply incred-

(Hase, Weizsäcker, Keim, Wittichen), can do so only by ignoring previous statements on the part of the Lord, which already point with sufficient clearness to His painful end (see especially ix. 15, x. 38, xii. 40)—statements the testimony of which is to be set aside only by explaining away and rejecting them by the artifice of mixing up together dates of different times, and the like, and thus depriving them of validity, a course which is decidedly opposed to the Gospel of John (comp. i. 29, ii. 19, iii. 14, vi. 51 ff.) so long as its authenticity is recognised!

ible, some of them even doubting His identity when they *do* see Him ; and further, that the risen Jesus appeals, indeed, to an Old Testament prediction (Luke xxiv. 25), but not to His own ; just as John, in like manner, accounts for Peter and himself not believing in the resurrection till they had actually seen the empty grave, merely from their having hitherto failed to understand the *scripture* (John xx. 9). All this is not to be disposed of by simply saying that the disciples had not understood the prediction of Jesus (Mark ix. 22) ; for had it been so plainly and directly uttered, they could not have *failed* to understand it, especially as, in the course of His own ministry, cases had occurred of the dead being restored to life, and as the Messianic hopes of the disciples must have disposed them to give a ready reception to tidings of a resurrection. Then, again, the *fulfilment* would necessarily have had the effect of awakening both their memory and their understanding, and that all the more that precisely then light was being shed upon the mysterious saying regarding the temple of the body (John ii. 21 f.). We must therefore suppose that Jesus had made certain dark, indefinite allusions to His resurrection, which as yet had not been apprehended in their true meaning, and that it was only *ex eventu* that they assumed, in the course of tradition, the clear and definite form of a prediction such as is now before us. It is only such faint, obscure hints that are as yet to be met with in John ii. 19, x. 17 f., and see observation on Matt. xii. 40. Comp. besides, Hasert, *üb. d. Vorhersag. Jesu von s. Tode u. s. Auferst.* 1839, Neander, de Wette, Ammon. Other expositors (Paulus, Hase, Scholten, Schenkel, Volkmar), arbitrarily ignoring those traces of a dim prophetic hint of the resurrection, have contended that, originally, nothing more was meant than a *symbolical* allusion,—an allusion, that is, *to the new impetus that would be given to the cause of Jesus*, while some of them have denied that any announcement of the *death* ever took place at all (Strauss ; see, on the other hand, Ebrard). But the arguments of Süskind (in Flatt's *Magaz.* VII. p. 181 ff.), Heydenreich (in Hüffel's *Zeitschr.* II. p. 7 ff.), Kuinoel, Ebrard, and others in favour of the perfect authenticity of the

definite and literal predictions of the resurrection, are not conclusive, and, to some extent, move in a circle.

Ver. 22. *Προσλαβόμεν.*] *after he had taken Him to himself*, comp. xvii. 1, *i.e.* had taken Him aside to speak to Him privately. The very common interpretation: he took Him *by the hand*, imports what does not belong to the passage. — *ἤρξατο*] for Jesus did not allow him to proceed further with his remonstrances, which had commenced with the words immediately following; see ver. 23. — *ἵλεώς σοι*] *sc. εἴη ὁ θεός*, a wish that God might graciously avert what he had just stated, a rendering of the Hebrew *חַיֵּה*, 2 Sam. xx. 20, xxiii. 17; 1 Chron. xi. 19, LXX. 1 Macc. ii. 21, and see Wetstein. Comp. our: *God forbid!* — *ἔσται*] purely future; expressive of *full confidence*. *Ὁ μὲν ἀπεκαλύφθη, ὁ Πέτρος ὀρθῶς ὡμολόγησεν ὃ δὲ οὐκ ἀπεκαλύφθη, ἐσφάλη*, Theophylact. Peter was startled; nothing, in fact, could have formed a more decided contrast to the Messianic conception on which his confession seemed to have been based, than the idea of a Messiah suffering and dying like a malefactor.

Ver. 23. *Στραφεῖς*] *He turned away*, by way of indicating His horror. — *ὑπαγε ὀπίσω μου*] See note on iv. 10. — *σατανᾶ*] *Satan!* A term of reproach, springing out of the intense displeasure with which He now saw Peter striving, like Satan, against that purpose of God of which he was so profoundly conscious. Not "*moral vexation*" (Keim), but *moral displeasure*. Comp. John vi. 70. Seeing that *Peter's* feelings have changed, it was proper that the testimony of *Jesus* regarding him should undergo a corresponding change (Augustine), although without prejudice to the high position just promised to him by Jesus; for this distinction neither excludes the idea of there being still a strong carnal element in Peter's character, nor does it imply that he was beyond the need of correction; consequently, the evasive interpretation of Catholic expositors who, in this instance, take *σατανᾶ* as an appellative (*adversarius*; so Maldonatus, Jansen, Arnoldi), is utterly groundless. — *σκάνδ. μου εἶ*] *ἐμπόδιόν μου νῦν ὑπάρχεις, ἀντικείμενος τῷ ἐμῷ θελήματι*, Euth. Zigabenus. — *φρονεῖς*] *thou hast in thy mind*; indicating the direction of

his aims, the bent of the practical reason. Comp. note on Rom. viii. 5. — τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ] *matters of divine interest*; because God is to be understood as having ordained the sufferings of Jesus for the purpose of carrying out the plan of redemption. — τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων] who are concerned about having as their Messiah a mere earthly hero and prince.

Ver. 24 f. Comp. Mark viii. 34 ff.; Luke ix. 23 ff. As *I* must suffer, so also must all *my followers*! — ὀπίσω μου ἐλθεῖν] as in iv. 19. — ἑαυτόν] *i.e.* His own natural self; τὸ ἑαυτοῦ θέλημα τὸ φιλήδονον, τὸ φιλόζωον, Euth. Zigabenus. To that which this θέλημα desires, He says: *No!* — ἀράτω τ. στ.] let him not shrink from the pain of a violent death such as He Himself will be called upon to endure. Comp. note on x. 38. — καὶ ἀκολ. μοι] that is, after he has taken up his cross. What goes before indicates the precise *kind* of following which Jesus requires. John xxi. 19. According to the context, it is not a question of *moral* following *generally* (καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν ἄλλην ἀρετὴν ἐπιδεικνύσθω, Theophylact, comp. Euth. Zigabenus, Chrysostom). But, by way of illustrating the idea of *self-denial*, Theophylact appropriately refers to the example of Paul, Gal. ii. 20.—Ver. 25. See note on x. 30.

Ver. 26. Ver. 25, compared with ver. 24, involved the thought that the earthly life must be sacrificed for sake of gaining the eternal. The *reason* of this thought is now brought forward. — ὥφελείται] represents as already present the man's condition at the day of judgment, not an *Attic future* (Bleek). — τὴν δὲ ψυχ. αὐτοῦ ζημιωθῆ] *but will have lost his soul*, that is to say, by his having rendered himself unfit for eternal life, by having, therefore, lost his soul as far as the Messianic ζωή is concerned, and become liable to eternal death. ζημιωθῆ is the opposite of κερδήση. It must not on this ground, and because of the ἀντάλλαγμα which follows, be explained as meaning, to sustain *damage* in his soul (Luther), but: *animae detrimentum pati* (Vulgate), comp. Herod. vii. 39: τοῦ ἐνὸς τὴν ψυχὴν ζημιώσεται, thou wilt lose thine only one through death. — ἥ] It avails a man nothing if he, and so on, *it might be that* (at the judgment) he would have something to give to God with which to purchase back

his lost soul (*ἀντάλλαγμα*, Eur. Or. 1157, frequently met with in the LXX. and Apocrypha). There exists no such means of exchange (*commutationem*, Vulgate), nothing which, in the sight of God and according to His holy standard, would be of such value as to serve as an *ἀντάλλαγμα* for the soul. "Non sufficit mundus," Bengel. Comp. Ritschl in the *Jahrb. f. D. Th.* 1863, p. 234 ff.

Ver. 27. *Γάρ*] justifies and confirms what Jesus has just stated with respect to the loss of the *ψυχή*. I say that not without reason; for assuredly the time of the second coming and of a righteous retribution is drawing near (*μέλλει* being put first for sake of emphasis). — *ἐν τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ πατρ. αὐτ.*] in the same glory as belongs to God. For in this state of glory (John xvii. 5) the ascended Christ occupies the place of *σύνθρονος* of God. — *τὴν πράξιν*] the conduct, the sum of one's doings, including, in particular, that self-denying adherence to their faith and their confession on which, above all, so much depended, in the case of the apostles, in the midst of those persecutions which they were called upon to endure.

Ver. 28. Having affirmed the *certainly* of the second coming and the divine retribution, He now proceeds to do the same with regard to their *nearness*. — *εἰσὶ τινες κ.τ.λ.*] which refers to those present generally, and not merely to the disciples, presupposes that the *majority* of them will have died previous to the event in question. — *γεύσονται θανάτου*] The *experiencing* of death regarded as a *tasting* of it (of its pains). See note on John viii. 52, and Wetstein. — *ἕως κ.τ.λ.*] not as though they were to die *afterwards*, but what is meant is, that they *will still be living* when it takes place. Comp. xxiv. 34; Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 629 f. — *ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ*] not for *εἰς τὴν κ.τ.λ.* (Beza, Raphel, and others), but *as a king in all His regal authority* (Plat. *Rep.* p. 499 B: *τῶν νῦν ἐν δυναστείαις ἢ βασιλείαις ὄντων*). Luke xxiii. 42. There is no substantial difference between the present prediction of Jesus as to *His impending advent in glorious majesty* (comp. x. 23, xxiv. 34), and that in Mark ix. 1; Luke ix. 27. The *βασιλεία* cannot be supposed to come without the *βασιλεύς*. This, at the same time, in

answer to Ebrard (comp. Baumeister in Klaiber's *Studien*, II. 1, p. 19), who interprets this passage, not of the second coming to judgment, but, laying stress on the *ἐν* (against which the *ἐν τῇ δόξῃ*, ver. 27, should have duly warned), understands it as referring to the founding of the church, and particularly to what took place at Pentecost, and that notwithstanding the context and the words *εἰσὶ τῶες*, etc., which, if this view were adopted, would be entirely out of place (Glass, Calovius). It is likewise to explain it away in a manner no less arbitrary, to understand the passage in the sense of a figurative coming in the *destruction of Jerusalem* and the diffusion of Christianity (Jac. Cappellus, Wetstein, Kuinoel, Schott, Glöckler, Bleek), or of the *triumphant historical development of the gospel* (Erasmus, Klostermann, Schenkel), or of the powerful influences of the spirit of the glorified Messiah as extending over the world (Paulus). Others, such as Beda, Vatablus, Maldonatus, Jansen, Clarius, Corn. a Lapide, following Chrysostom, Euth. Zigabenus, Theophylact, have so strangely perverted Christ's prediction as even to make it refer to the *incident of the transfiguration* immediately following. — On the impending advent in general, see the observations at the close of ch. xxiv.

## CHAPTER XVII.

VER. 3. ὠφθησαν] Lachm. and Tisch.: ὠφθη, after B D  $\aleph$ , Curss. and Codd. of the It. The plural is a grammatical correction; the sing. can scarcely be taken from Mark ix. 4. — Ver. 4. ποιήσωμεν] Lachm. and Tisch.: ποιῶσω, after B C  $\aleph$ , Ver. Corb. 1, Germ. 1. Correctly; the plural is from Mark and Luke. — The arrangement Ἠλίᾳ μίαν (Lachm. Tisch.) is supported by decisive testimony. — Ver. 5. φωτεινῇ] Only on the authority of a few Curss. and Ephr. Griesb. and Fritzsche have φωτός, which Olshausen also prefers. An interpretation for the purpose of defining the wonderful nature of the cloud. — The order ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ (inverted in Elz.) is, with Lachm. and Tisch. 8, after B D  $\aleph$ , 1, 33, to be preferred. The reading of the Received text is according to the LXX. — Ver. 7. Lachm. and Tisch. 8: καὶ προσῆλθεν ὁ ἰ. καὶ ἀψάμενος αὐτῶν εἶπεν, after B (in the first half of the sentence also D)  $\aleph$ , Verss. Seeing how much the reading fluctuates in the various authorities, the Received text, from having the balance of testimony in its favour, is not to be abandoned. — Ver. 9. ἐκ] Elz.: ἀπό. Approved by Scholz, against decisive testimony. From Mark ix. 9, for the sake of conformity with the ordinary usage. — ἀναστῆ] Lachm. and Tisch.: ἐγερθῆ, after B D, Sahid. The reading of the Received text is from Mark ix. 9. — Ver. 11. On important testimony, Ἰησοῦς and αὐτοῖς are, with Lachm. and Tisch., to be deleted. Common interpolations. — πρῶτον] is omitted after ἔρχ. in B D  $\aleph$ , Curss. Verss. Aug. Hil; L inserts it after ἀποκατ. Suspected by Griesb., deleted by Fritzsche, Lachm., Tisch. Repetition from ver. 10, in accordance with Mark ix. 12. — Ver. 14. αὐτῶν] which Lachm. and Tisch. have deleted, is omitted in B Z  $\aleph$ , 1, 124, 245, Sahid.; it might easily have been overlooked from coming, as it does, immediately after ἐλθόντων. — αὐτόν] Elz.: αὐτῷ, against decisive testimony. — Ver. 15. πᾶσχει] Lachm.: ἔχει, after B L Z  $\aleph$ , Or. Either an *involuntary* alteration occasioned by the *current* use of the expression κακῶς ἔχειν (iv. 24, viii. 16, ix. 12, xiv. 35), or *intentional*, on account of the apparent pleonasm. — Ver. 17. The order μεθ' ὑμῶν ἔσομαι (Lachm.



Tisch.) is supported by the preponderating testimony of B C D Z  $\aleph$ , Curss. Or., and ought to be adopted. Comp. Mark and Luke. — Ver. 20. ἀπιστίαν] Lachm. Tisch. 8: ὀλιγοπιστίαν, after B  $\aleph$ , Curss. Syr<sup>cur</sup> Sahid. Copt. Arm. Aeth. Or. Chrys. An ancient emendation to soften the expression, ἀπιστίαν, after ver. 17 especially, may have offended pious sensibilities. — The reading μετὰβα ἔνθεν (Lachm. Tisch.) is neither satisfactory nor has it uniform testimony in its favour. — Ver. 21. Tisch. 8 has deleted the whole verse, but only after B  $\aleph^*$  33, and a few Verss. The great preponderance of testimony is in favour of retaining it, although Weiss likewise rejects it. It might have been regarded as inserted from Mark ix. 29 had the terms of the two passages coincided more fully. Why it was omitted, it is really impossible to say; it may only have happened accidentally, and the omission remains an isolated instance. — Ver. 22. ἀναστρεφ.] Lachm. and Tisch. 8: συστρεφ., after B  $\aleph$ , 1, Vulg. Codd. of the It. A gloss, in order that ἀναστρεφ. might not be taken in the sense of *return*. — Ver. 23. ἐγερθήσεται] Lachm.: ἀναστήσεται, after B, Curss. Or. Chrys. From Mark ix. 31. — Ver. 25. ὅτε εἰσῆλθεν] Lachm. and Tisch. 8: εἰσελθόντα, which is found in  $\aleph^*$ ; in B it is: ἐλθόντα; in C: ὅτε ἦλθον; in D: εἰσελθόντι. Others have: ὅτε εἰσῆλθον, εἰσελθόντων, εἰσελθόντος. Seeing there is such variety in the readings, we ought to prefer, not the *simple* verb, which B and C concur in adopting, but the compound form, which is supported by D  $\aleph$  and the numerous authorities in favour of the reading of the Received text; further, the *plural* is to be rejected, inasmuch as it is without adequate testimony and has been inserted from ver. 24; and finally, the reading ὅτε is to be regarded as an analysis of the participle. Consequently the reading εἰσελθόντα should be adopted. — Ver. 26. For λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Πέτρος read, with Lachm. and Tisch. 8, simply εἰπόντος δέ, after B C L  $\aleph$ , Verss. Or. Chrys. The reading of the Received text is somewhat of a gloss.

Ver. 1. Comp. Mark ix. 2 ff.; Luke viii. 28 ff.; 2 Pet. i. 16 ff. Μεθ' ἡμέρας ἑξ] Luke ix. 28: ὥσει ἡμέραι ὀκτώ. This ὥσει makes it unnecessary to have recourse to any expedient for reconciling the numbers. Chrysostom, Jerome, Theophylact, Erasmus, and many others, are of opinion that Luke has included the *dies a quo* and *ad quem*. — εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλόν] Since the fourth century there has been a tradition that the mountain here referred to was mount *Tabor*, the

situation of which, however, was such as altogether to preclude this view. If we are to understand that Jesus remained during the six days in the neighbourhood of Caesarea Philippi, we may, with some probability, suppose that the height in question was one of the peaks of *Hermon*, a clump of hills standing to the north-east of that town.—Those three disciples were the most intimate friends of Jesus. Comp. xxvi. 37. For ἀναφέρει, comp. Luke xxiv. 51; 2 Macc. vi. 10; Polyb. viii. 31. 1. — κατ' ἰδίαν] so that they alone accompanied him to this mountain solitude.

Ver. 2. Μετεμορφ.] *was transfigured*, in the way about to be described. That is to say, His external aspect was changed ("non substantialis, sed accidentalis fuit transformatio," Calovius); His face gleaming like the sun, and His raiment being so white that it shone like light. He appeared in outward heavenly δόξα, which μεγαλειότης (2 Pet. i. 16) was the foreshadowing of His future glorified state (John xii. 16, 23, xvii. 5, xxii. 24; 2 Cor. iii. 18; Matt. xiii. 43). The analogy presented by Ex. xxxiv. 29 comes short in this respect, that, whereas the brightness on the face of Moses was the result of God's having *appeared before him*, in the case of Christ it proceeded from His own divine *nature and life*, the δόξα of which radiated *from within*. — ὡς τὸ φῶς] The aspect of it, therefore, was luminous, radiant.

Ver. 3. Αὐτοῖς] the disciples, ver. 2. They saw conversing with Jesus, Moses and Elias, who, as forerunners of the Messiah, represented the law and the prophets (Schoettgen, Wetstein). Comp. vv. 5, 8. It was not from what Jesus told them afterwards that they came first to know who those two were, but they themselves recognised them at once (ver. 4), though not from their *conversation*, as has been arbitrarily supposed (Theophylact). The recognition was immediate and directly *involved* in the marvellous manifestation itself.—The *subject* of conversation, so far as the accounts of Matthew and Mark are concerned, does not appear to have been once inquired into. According to Ebrard, Jesus communicated to the fathers of the old dispensation the blessed intelligence of his readiness to redeem them by His death. According to

Luke ix. 31, Moses and Elias converse with Jesus about His impending death.

Ver. 4. 'Αποκριθ.] see note on xi. 25. Taking occasion from what he now saw before him, he proceeded to say. — καλόν ἐστιν κ.τ.λ.] is usually interpreted thus: "*Amoenus est, in quo commoremur, locus*" (Fritzsche, Keim); or, what is much to the same effect, it is referred—particularly by Chrysostom, Theophylact, Euth. Zigabenus, Erasmus—to the *security* of the place, protected as it was by the two celestial visitants, in contrast to Jerusalem, where Jesus was destined to suffer. But, inasmuch as the terms used by Peter are ἡμᾶς (not ἡμῖν) and the simple εἶναι (not μένειν); further, inasmuch as what he says is occasioned by the presence of Moses and Elias, and has reference to them, as is likewise proved by the following εἰ θέλεις κ.τ.λ., which implies that he wishes to do something towards enabling Jesus to have a longer interview with them,—it is preferable, with Paulus, Baumgarten-Crusius, Klostermann, Weiss, Volkmar, to interpret as follows: *It is highly opportune that we (disciples) happen to be here* (in which case, therefore, the ἡμᾶς is emphatic); accordingly, I would like to erect (ποιήσω, see critical remarks) tabernacles (out of the brushwood growing around) for you here, with a view to a more prolonged stay. The transition to the *singular* is in keeping with Peter's *temperament*; he would like to make the tabernacles.

Ver. 5 ff. 'Ιδοὺ καὶ . . . ἰδοὺ] lively way of introducing the various points of importance. — νεφέλη φωτεινὴ] a *luminous*, clear, bright *cloud*, represented in Matthew as, without doubt, a *marvellous* phenomenon, not in itself certainly, but in connection with the incident which it accompanies. — ἐπεσκίασεν] A *luminous* cloud *overshadows* them, casts a kind of light and shade over their forms, so that they are rendered less clear than they were before the cloud intervened. Olshausen unwarrantably fancies that ἐπεσκ. has been employed in consequence of the *light having been so strong* as to dazzle the eyes and affect the sight. — αὐτούς] viz. Jesus, Moses, and Elias (ver. 4). The disciples hear the voice *from out* the cloud (vv. 5, 6), are therefore not to be regarded as

being *within* it, as is likewise manifest *a priori* from the fact that the cloud, as was so frequently the case in the Old Testament, is here the sacred symbol of the divine presence (Wetstein on this passage, comp. Fea, *ad Hor. Od.* i. 2. 31), and therefore accompanies those three divine personages as a *σημεῖον* for the disciples, on whose account likewise the voice sounds from the cloud. This in answer to Olearius, Wolf, Bengel, Baumgarten-Crusius, who refer αὐτοῦς to the *disciples*; and to Clericus, who refers it to all who were present. — φωνῇ κ.τ.λ.] no less the voice of *God* than that in iii. 17. — ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ (see critical remarks) is the divine ratification of the words of Moses in Deut. xviii. 15, according to their Messianic import. However, the *hearing* (i.e. faith and obedience) is the point on which stress is to be laid, as is evident from its being put first. This command is *now* in order (not so, as yet, in iii. 17), coming as it does at a time when Jesus had attained to the full dignity of His prophetic office, but when, at the same time, the prospect of what awaited Him was calculated to put the ἀκούειν of the disciples to the severest test. — Vv. 6, 7 occur only in Matthew. Comp. Dan. x. 9 f.; Rev. i. 17. — ἡψατο] "Tactus familiaris et efficax," Bengel.

Ver. 9. Ὅραμα] *the thing seen, spectaculum.* Acts vii. 31; Sir. xliii. 1; Xen. *Cyr.* iii. 3. 66; *de re equestr.* ix. 4; Dem. 1406. 26; Pollux, ii. 54; used in the LXX. with reference to whatever is seen in vision by a prophet. — ἐκ νεκρῶν] *from Sheol*, as the abode τῶν νεκρῶν. On the omission of the article, see Winer, p. 117 [E. T. 153]. The *reason* of the prohibition can only be the same as in xvi. 20, where see note. According to the *mythical* view (see observations after ver. 12), it was intended to explain the circumstance of a narrative composed in a later age, and, nevertheless, one which proceeded from the three witnesses.

Ver. 10. Οὐν] can have no other reference than to the foregoing prohibition (comp. xix. 7): "Seeing that we are forbidden to tell any one about the appearing of Elias which we have just witnessed, and so on, what reason, then, have the scribes for saying that Elias must first come (before the

Messiah appears, to establish His kingdom)?” Does it not follow from Thy prohibition that this teaching of the scribes must be erroneous, seeing that, if it were not so, Thou wouldst not have enjoined us to keep silence regarding this manifestation of Elias? This is likewise in harmony with the *answer* of Jesus, which is to this effect: “That teaching is quite correct; but the Elias whom it speaks of as being the Messiah’s forerunner is not the prophet who has just been seen upon the mount, but John the Baptist, whom they did not recognise, and so on.” This view is so entirely in accordance with the context as to exclude any others, as, for example, that of Euth. Zigabenus, Erasmus, Kuinoel, who, emphasizing *πρώτον*, interpret thus: *διατί οἱ γρ. λέγ., ὅτι Ἡλίαν χρὴ ἐλθεῖν πρὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ; πῶς οὖν οὐκ ἦλθεν οὗτος πρὸ σου;* or that which ascribes to the disciples the idea, of which there is not the remotest hint, that Christ is going to be revealed before the world in His glory, and that therefore there is really no further room for the manifestation and the services of Elias (Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 518); or that of Grotius, Michaelis, Fritzsche, Lange, Olshausen, Bleek, Hengstenberg, who understand the question of the disciples as referring to the circumstance that Elias had not remained, but had so quickly disappeared again (it was believed, though of this the question contains no hint whatever, that Elias would teach the Jews, settle the disputes among their instructors, restore the pot of manna and Aaron’s rod, and so on; Lightfoot on this passage; Winzer, *de ἀποκαταστάσει πάντων*, II., 1821, p. 9); or, again, that of Chrysostom, Theophylact, Neander, Krabbe, Ebrard, who suppose that the object of the question was to know whether the manifestation of Elias, which the scribes had in view, was that which had just taken place, or whether it was some other one yet to come; or, lastly, the expedient of Schleiermacher and Strauss, who think that the whole conversation originated in the disappointment felt in consequence of the prediction regarding the coming of Elias not having been fulfilled, and that it has only found its way into the present connection through an erroneous process of combination. According to Köstlin, p. 75, *οὖν* does not refer

back to the transfiguration at all, but seems to say: "Seeing that the Messiah is already come," which is the idea supposed to be contained in xvi. 13-27. He thinks the connection has been interrupted by the evangelist interpolating the story of the transfiguration between xvi. 27 and xvii. 10.

Ver. 11. In His reply, Jesus admits the correctness of the teaching of the scribes in regard to this matter, and at the same time supplements the quotation made from it by the disciples (by adding κ. ἀποκατ. π.), in which supplement the use of the future-present ἔρχεται and the future ἀποκαταστ. are to be justified on the ground that they are the *ipsissima verba* of the teaching in question. "Unquestionably it is precisely as they say: Elias is coming and will restore everything again." Inasmuch as what is here meant is the work of the coming *Elias*, and not the whole moral work of the *Messiah* in regenerating the world (as in Acts iii. 21), the ἀποκατάστασις πάντων, an expression taken from the rendering of Mal. iv. 6 by the LXX., refers, in the sense of the scribes, to the *restitutio in integrum* (for such is the meaning of the word, see note on Acts iii. 21) of the entire theocratic order of things by way of preparation for the Messiah, in which case we are not to think merely of a moral regeneration of the people, but also of the restoration of outward objects of a sacred character (such as the *urna mannae*, and so on). Jesus, on the other hand, knowing as He does that the promised coming of Elias has been fulfilled in the Baptist (xi. 14), refers to the preaching and preparatory labours of the latter, in which he believes the ἀποκαταστήσει πάντα to have been realized in the highest sense, and in the way most in keeping with the prophet's own words in Mal. iv. 6 (Sir. xlviii. 10; Luke i. 17, iii. 1). The coming of the *real* Elias, who is expected to appear before the *second advent* (Hilary, Chrysostom, Augustine, Theophylact, Euth. Zigabenus, the majority of the older Catholic expositors, likewise Arnoldi, Schegg), is taught by Jesus neither here nor elsewhere. See, on the contrary, ver. 12 f., xi. 14. This also in answer to Lechler in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1854, p. 831.

Ver. 12. Οὐκ ἐπέγνωσαν αὐτόν] that is, as the expected

Elias. The subject is the *γραμματεῖς*, ver. 10. — ἐν αὐτῇ] *towards him*, not classical, but comp. LXX. Gen. xl. 14; Dan. xi. 7; Luke xxiii. 31. — ὅσα ἐθέλησαν] indicating the purely *arbitrary* manner in which they treated him, in contradistinction to the way in which God desired that he should have been received.

REMARK. — *The incident of the transfiguration* has been regarded as a *vision* by so early a writer as Tertullian, *c. Marc.* iv. 22, by Herder, Gratz, Krabbe, Bleek, Weizsäcker, Pressensé, Steinmeyer; it would have been nearer the truth if a distinction had been made between the real and the visionary elements contained in it. We have no vision, but a reality in the glorious change which came over the outward appearance of Jesus, vv. 1, 2, that objective element to which the ecstatic subjective manifestation owed its origin. On the other hand, we cannot but regard as visionary the appearing of Moses and Elias, and that not merely in consequence of ὡφθῆναι, ver. 3 (Acts ii. 3, vii. 26; 1 Tim. iii. 16; 1 Cor. xv. 5 ff.), but owing to the vanishing away of the heavenly visitants in the cloud, and the impossibility of any bodily manifestation, at least of Moses (whose *resurrection* would, according to Deut. xxxiv. 5 f., have to be presupposed).<sup>1</sup> Moreover, Matthew and Mark themselves represent the manifestation of both in such a way, that it is impossible to assert that they regarded it in the light of an actual fact; notice, on the contrary, the different modes of

<sup>1</sup> It is thus that Origen, Jerome, and other Fathers consistently argue. According to Hilgenfeld, the "Ascension of Moses" (*N. T. extra canon.* I. p. 96; *Messias Judaeor.* p. 459) was already known to the evangelist; but the *Ascensio Mosis* belongs, in any case, to a somewhat later period. Grotius saw himself driven to adopt the expedient of supposing that "haec corpora videri possunt a deo in hunc usum asservata," very much as Ambrose had maintained that the body of Moses had been *exempted from putrefaction*. According to Calvin, God had raised the bodies *ad tempus*. Thomas and several other expositors refer the appearing of Moses to the category indicated by the words: "sicut angeli videntur." Similarly Delitzsch, *Psychol.* p. 427 [E. T. 499], according to whom the form in which Moses appeared, and which bore a resemblance to His earthly body, was the immaterial product of his spiritualized psychic nature. Gess, with greater indefiniteness, speaks of the manifestation as a coming forth on the part of Moses and Elias from their state of invisibility. But neither Delitzsch nor Gess satisfies the requirements of the words μὴ αὐτοὺς ὁρᾶν, which in any case presuppose a glorified *corporeity*, or else it amounts to nothing else than a mere appearance. Comp. Beza, who adds: *nisi malumus ecstaticam fuisse visionem*.

conception as implied in *καὶ μετεμορφώθη ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν* (not: *κ. ὤφθη αὐτοῖς μεταμορφωθείς*) and *ὤφθη αὐτοῖς Μωσῆς*, etc. Only in the case of Luke is it manifest that he has followed a tradition which has divested the incident of its visionary character (Luke ix. 30, 31). The of course obvious and common objection, that *three* persons must be supposed to have witnessed the *same* phenomena and to have heard the *same* voice, is deprived of its force if it is conceded, as must necessarily be done, that a supernatural agency was here at work with a view to enable the three leading disciples to have a glimpse beforehand of the approaching glory of Him who was more to them than Moses and the prophets. However, it is attempting too *much* to attempt to show the higher naturalism of the incident (Lange, *L. J.* II. p. 904 ff., thinks that the heavenly nature of Jesus flashed forth from under the earthly; that the disciples had actually had a peep into the spirit world, and had seen Moses and Elias, which was rendered possible in their case through the peculiar frame of Christ's mind and the intercourse with those spirits which He enjoyed), in opposition to which Ewald insists that the event was altogether of an ideal character; that the eternal perfection of the kingdom of God was unquestionably disclosed to view, in such a manner, however, that everything of a lower nature, and which was at all calculated to suggest the form which the narrative ultimately assumed, was lost sight of amid the pure light of a higher sphere of things (*Gesch. Chr.* p. 462). To assume as the foundation of the story (Baumgarten-Crusius) only some *inward manifestation* or other in Jesus Himself, such as led to His obtaining a glimpse of the glory that was to follow His death, is as decidedly *at variance* with the statements of the Gospels as it is to trace the matter to a *vision in a dream* (Rau, *Symbola ad ill. ev. de metamorph.*, etc., 1797; Gabler in the *neuest. theol. Journ.* 1798, p. 517 ff., Kuinoel, Neander), in connection with which view some have likewise had recourse to the idea of a thunderstorm (Gabler), and the presence of two secret followers (Kuinoel). This way of looking at the matter is not favoured by Luke ix. 32. No less inconsistent with the gospel narrative is the hypothesis of a *secret interview with two unknown personages* (Venturini, Paulus, Hase, Schleiermacher), in connection with which, again, a good deal has been made of atinospheric illumination, and the effect of the shadows that were projected (Paulus; Theile, *z. Biogr. J.* p. 55; Ammon, *L. J.* p. 302 ff.). The *mythical* view (Strauss, Scholten, Keim)—which regards the narrative as a legendary invention, and substantially



ascribes its origin to a desire to see the glory of Moses on Sinai repeated in a higher form in the case of Jesus, and to represent the latter as the fulfilment of the law and the prophets—can least of all be justified here, where it is not only at variance with the studied unanimity of the evangelists in regard to the date of the occurrence, but also with the fact that the testimony of the three apostles must have gone far to prevent the myth from finding its way into the circle of their brethren; while, as regards the silence of John, it is certainly not to be explained on anti-docetic grounds (in answer to Schneckenburger, *Beitr.* p. 62 ff., see Strauss, II. p. 250), but it is explicable, to say the least of it, on the ground of his ideal conception of Christ's mundane  $\delta\epsilon\zeta\alpha$ , and no more disproves the reality of the incident in question than his silence regarding so many other important historical facts already recorded by the Synoptists. Further, we must regard as purley subjective, and subversive of the intention and meaning of the evangelists, not merely the *rationalistic* explanation of the incident, according to which Jesus is represented as *telling* the three disciples *in what relation He stood to Moses and Elias*, and as thereby bringing them "*into the light of His Messianic calling*" (Schenkel), but likewise the imaginary notion of an admonitory symbol, after the manner of Rev. i. 12 ff., xi. 3 ff., the historical basis of which is supposed to be contained in the fact that Peter and the first disciples had seen the risen Lord appear in heavenly radiance (Volkmar); and lastly, also the *allegorical* view (Weisse), according to which we are understood to have before us the symbolical conception, originating with the three enraptured apostles themselves, of the light which then dawned upon them in regard to the mission of Jesus, especially in regard to His relation to the old theocracy.—But, according to Bruno Bauer, the incident is to be regarded as the product of the conviction on the part of the church, that, in the principle on which it is founded, the powers of the past have found their glorified centre of unity.—The passage 2 Pet. i. 16–18 can be of no service in the way of confirming the historical character of the incident, except for those who see no reason to reject this Epistle as spurious; but it is of great importance, partly as furnishing, all the same, an ancient testimony in favour of the occurrence itself, and the significance attached to it as a historical event; partly in reference to the telic point of view from which it is to be regarded, namely, as a foreshadowing of the impending  $\delta\epsilon\zeta\alpha$  of the Lord, in which He is to come back again, and into which His most intimate disciples were

in this wonderful way privileged to gaze previous to His sufferings, in order that they might be strengthened for fulfilling the difficult task that would devolve upon them after His ascension. So far as the object of the incident is concerned, it must have been intended expressly for the *disciples*, as is evident from ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ.—According to what has been said above, and judging from what is stated in ix. 31 as to the subject of conversation, it may be affirmed that Luke's account bears the impress of a later stage of development (Fritzsche, Strauss, de Wette, Weisse, Ewald, Weiss), so that in point of originality we must give Matthew the preference (in answer to Schulz, Schleiermacher, Holtzmann, and others), and that even over Mark (comp. Ewald, Köstlin, p. 90; Keim, II. p. 588). See also note on Mark ix. 2 ff.

Ver. 14. Notwithstanding divergence in other respects, the healing of the lunatic (σεληνιαῖς, see note on iv. 24) comes next in order in all the three Synoptists (Mark ix. 14 ff; Luke ix. 37 ff.),—a circumstance which also militates against the mythical view of the transfiguration.—αὐτόν] Comp. Mark i. 40, x. 17. The *accusative* is to be understood as conveying the idea that He was directly touched by the man, as much as to say: *he clasped Him by the knees*. Comp. προσκυνεῖν τινα, προσπίπτειν τινα, προσπίπτειν γόνυ τινος (Pflugk, ad Eur. Hec. 339; Kühner, II. 1, p. 251).

Ver. 15. The lunatic, whose malady was regarded as the result of demoniacal possession (ver. 18; Mark v. 16; Luke v. 39), was evidently suffering from epilepsy, and, according to Mark, deprived of the power of speech as well.—κακῶς πάσχειν] *to be ill* (opposite of εὖ πάσχει), is likewise very common among classical writers. Hom. Od. xvi. 275; Plat. Menex. p. 244 B; Xen. Anab. iii. 3. 7; Herod. iii. 146.

Ver. 17. *O unbelieving and perverse generation!* Comp. Phil. ii. 15. By this Jesus does not mean the scribes (Calvin), but is aiming at His disciples, who are expected to apply the exclamation *to themselves*, in consequence of their not being able to cure the lad of his disease. In no sparing fashion, but filled with painful emotion, He ranks them, owing to their want of an energetic faith, in the *category* of the unbelieving generation, and hence it is that He addresses *it*.

Bengel fitly observes: "severo elencho discipuli accensentur turbae." That the *disciples* are intended (Fritzsche, Baumgarten-Crusius, Steinmeyer, Volkmar), is likewise evident from ver. 20. They wanted the requisite amount of confidence in the miraculous powers conferred upon them by Christ. The *strong* terms ἀπιστος κ. διεστραμμ. (Deut. xxxii. 5; Phil. ii. 5, ii. 15), are to be explained from the deep *emotion* of Jesus. Nor can the people be meant, who are not concerned at all, any more than the father of the sufferer, who, in fact, invoked the help of Jesus because he had faith in Him. The words are consequently to be referred neither to *all who were present* (Paulus, Kuinoel, Olshausen, Krabbe, Bleek, Ewald), nor to the *father* (Chrysostom, Theophylact, Euth. Zigabenus, Grotius), nor to him *and the people* (Keim), in which latter case many go the length of holding that the disciples are exculpated, and the blame of the failure imputed to the father himself (οὐ τῆς ἐκείνων ἀσθενείας τοσούτου τὸ πταῖσμα, ὅσον τῆς σῆς ἀπιστίας, Theophylact). In opposition to the context (vv. 16, 20). Neander and de Wette explain the words in the sense of John iv. 48, as though Jesus were reflecting upon those who as yet have not known what it is to come to Him under a sense of their deepest wants, and so on. — ἕως πότε κ.τ.λ.] a passing touch of impatience in the excitement of the moment: How long is the time going to last during which I must be amongst you and bear with your weakness of faith, want of receptivity, and so on? — φέρετε] like what precedes, is addressed to the *disciples*; it was to *them* that the lunatic had been brought, ver. 16. This in answer to Fritzsche, who thinks that Jesus "generatim loquens" refers to the *father*.

Ver. 18. Ἐπετίμ. αὐτῷ] *He rebuked him*, namely, the *demon* (Fritzsche, Ewald), reproached him for having taken possession of the boy. Comp. viii. 26. For this prolepsis in the reference of αὐτός (which Vulgate, Theophylact, de Wette, Winer, Bleek, refer to the lunatic), see Fritzsche, *Conject.* p. 11 f.; Bornemann, *ad Xen. Symp.* viii. 34. — ἀπὸ τ. ὥρας ἐκ.] as in xv. 28, ix. 22.

Ver. 20. The disciples ought to have applied to themselves

the general exclamation in ver. 17. This they failed to do, hence their question. But the ἀπιστία with which Jesus now charges them is to be understood in a *relative* sense, while the πίστις, of which it is the negation, means simply faith in Jesus Christ, the depositary of supernatural power, so that, in virtue of their fellowship with His life, the disciples, as His servants and the organs of His power, were enabled to operate with greater effect in proportion to the depth and energy of the faith with which they could confide in Him. — ἐὰν ἔχητε] *if you have* (not: *had*). — ὡς κόκκον σιν.] found likewise in Rabbinical writers as a figurative expression for a very *small quantity* of anything. Lightfoot on xiii. 32. The point of the comparison does not lie in the *stimulative* quality of the mustard (Augustine; on the other hand, Maldonatus).— *To remove mountains*, a figurative expression for: *to accomplish extraordinary results*, 1 Cor. xiii. 2. Lightfoot on xxi. 21; Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* p. 1653. For legends in regard to the actual removing of mountains, see Calovius. — οὐδέν] the hyperbole of popular speech. For ἀδυνατ., comp. Job xlii. 2.

Ver. 21. Τοῦτο τὸ γένος] *this species of demons to which the one just expelled belongs*. Otherwise, Euth. Zigabenus: τὸ γένος τῶν δαιμόνων πάντων. So Chrysostom, Theophylact, Elsner, Fritzsche, Bleek. But the τοῦτο, used with special reference to the fact of its being a case of epilepsy, must be intended to specify a kind of demons which it is peculiarly difficult to exorcise. — ἐν προσευχῇ κ. νηστείᾳ] inasmuch as the πίστις is thereby strengthened and elevated, and attains to that pitch which is necessary in order to the casting out of *such* demons. The climax in vv. 20 and 21 may be represented thus: If you have only a slender amount of faith, you will, no doubt, be able to accomplish things of an extraordinary and seemingly impossible nature; but, in order to expel spirits of so stubborn a character as this, you require to have such a degree of faith as can only be reached by means of prayer and fasting. You have neglected the spiritual preparation that is necessary to the attainment of so lofty a faith. Comp. Acts xiv. 23. Prayer and fasting are here represented as means for promoting faith, not as *good works*, which are of

*themselves effectual* in dealing with the demons (Schegg and the older Catholics). Paulus and Ammon incorrectly suppose that the prayer and fasting are required of the *sick persons themselves*, with a view to some dietetic and psychological effect or other being produced upon their bodies; while Chrysostom, Theophylact, and Euth. Zigabenus are of opinion that they are demanded not merely from the *healer*, but *also from the patient*, as necessary weapons to be used against the demon. Inasmuch as *ἐκπορεύεται* is, according to the context, the correlative of *ἐκβαλεῖν*, ver. 19 (comp. also *ἐξῆλθεν*, ver. 18), we must likewise discard the view of Ewald, who thinks that in Matthew there is an allusion to a *class of men* whose character is such that they cannot be induced *to set to work* but with fasting and prayer. Comp. on the contrary, *ἐκπορ.*, Acts xix. 12 (and Mark ix. 29 : *ἐξελεῖν*). — Those who adopt the *mythical* view of the whole incident (Strauss) pretend to find the origin of the legend in 2 Kings iv. 29 ff., which is no less unwarrantable than the interpretation, according to which it is treated as a *symbolical* narrative, intended to rebuke the want of faith on the part of the disciples (Scholten), or as a didactic figure as an admonition of the hidden Christ for an increase of faith amid the violent demoniacal excesses of the time (Volkmar). Moreover, the somewhat more circumstantial account of Mark is of a stamp so peculiar, is so clear and full of meaning, that it is not to be regarded as a later amplification, but the account in Matthew (and Luke) is rather to be looked upon as an abridgment of the former.

Vv. 22, 23. Comp. Mark ix. 30 ff.; Luke ix. 43 ff. — While they were still in Galilee (*ἀναστρεφ.*, Xen. *Cyr.* viii. 8. 7, *Mem.* iv. 3. 8; Thuc. viii. 94; Josh. v. 5), and before they entered Capernaum (ver. 24), Jesus once more (comp. xvi. 21) intimated to His disciples His approaching sufferings, death, and resurrection. This is not a meaningless repetition of xvi. 21 (Köstlin, Hilgenfeld); but this matter was introduced again because Jesus knew how much they required to be prepared for the impending crisis. — *εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρ.*] *into men's hands*, uttered with a painful feeling, sensible as He was of the contrast between such a fate and what He knew to be

His divine dignity. It was in keeping with the feelings now present to the mind of Jesus, not to indicate that fate with so much detail as on the former occasion (xvi. 21). — ἐλυπήθησαν σφόδρα] therefore not impressed by the announcement of the resurrection, although it is said to have been made with so much clearness and precision. This announcement, however, is not found in Luke. See note on xvi. 21.

Ver. 24 ff. Peculiar to Matthew. — After the return from the Babylonian captivity, all males among the Jews of twenty years of age and upwards (on the ground of the command in Ex. xxx. 13 f.; comp. 2 Chron. xxiv. 6: Neh. x. 32; 2 Kings xii. 4 ff.) were required to contribute annually the sum of half a shekel, or two Attic drachmae, or an Alexandrian drachma (LXX. Gen. xxiii. 15; Josh. vii. 21), about half a thaler (1s. 6d. English money), by way of defraying the expenses connected with the temple services. See Saalschütz, *Mos. R.* p. 291 f.; Ewald, *Alterth.* p. 403; Keim, II. p. 599 f. After the destruction of the temple the money went to the Capitol, Joseph. vii. 6. 6. The time for collecting this tax was the fifteenth of the month *Adar*. See *Tract. Schekalim* i. 3, ii. 7; Ideler, *Chronol.* I. pp. 488, 509. Certain expositors have supposed the payment here in question to have been a *civil* one, exacted by the *Roman* government—in other words, a *poll-tax* (see Wolf and Calovius; and of modern writers, consult especially, Wieseler, *Chronol. Synopse*, p. 265 ff., and *Beitr.* p. 108 ff.). This, however, is precluded, not merely by the use of the customary term τὰ δίδραχμα, which was well known to the reader as the temple-tax, but likewise by the incongruity which would thereby be introduced into the succeeding argument, through making it appear as though Jesus had strangely and improperly classed Himself among the kings of this world, with a view to prove with how much reason He could claim to be free. Even had He regarded Himself as *David's* son, He would have been wrong in arguing thus, while, so far as the case before us is concerned, He was, to all intents and purposes, one of the ἀλλοτρίοι. — οἱ . . . λαμβάνοντες] used as a substantive: the collectors. That there were such, though Wieseler denies it, is not only evident from the nature of the case,

seeing that it was not possible for everybody to go to Jerusalem, but is also proved by statements in the *Tr. Schekalim* ("trapezitae in unaquaque civitate," etc.); see also Lightfoot. The plural τὰ δίδραχμα indicates the large number of didrachmae that were collected, seeing that every individual contributed one; and the *article* points to the tax as one that was well known. In the *question* put by the collectors (which question shows that this happened to be the time for collecting, but that Jesus had not paid as yet, though it is impossible to determine whether or not the question was one of a humane character, which would depend entirely upon the *tone* in which it was put) the plural τὰ δίδραχμα indicates that the payment had to be repeated annually, to which the present τελεῖ likewise points. That the collectors should not have asked *Jesus Himself*, and that *Peter* should have happened to be the particular disciple whom they did ask, are probably to be regarded merely as accidental circumstances. But why did they ask at all, and why in a *dubious* tone? They may have assumed or supposed that Jesus would claim to rank with the priests (who did not consider themselves liable for temple-tax, *Tr. Schekal.* i. 4), seeing that His peculiarly holy, even His Messianic, reputation cannot certainly have remained unknown to them.

Ver. 25. From the *ναί* of Peter it is clear that Jesus had *hitherto* been in the habit of paying the tax. — *προέφθασεν*] Since it is stated in ver. 24 that the collectors came to *Peter*, and as one is at a loss to see why, if Jesus had been present at the same time, they should not have asked *Himself*, it follows that the evangelist must have ascribed what Jesus says to Peter to His immediate knowledge of the thoughts of others. Comp. Chrysostom, Theophylact, Euth. Zigabenus, Steinmeyer, Ewald, Keim. Instead of *προέφθασεν λέγων* (Arist. *Eccl.* 884; Thuc. vii. 73. 3) we might also have had *προφθάσας ἔλεγε* (Plat. *Rep.* vi. p. 500 A; Thuc. viii. 51. 1). See Kühner, II. 1, p. 626 f. — *Σίμων*] "appellatio quasi domestica et familiaris," Bengel. Comp. Mark xiv. 37. — *τέλη*] *duty* upon goods. — *κῆνσος*] *Tax* upon individuals and landed property, xxii. 17, 19, the Greek φόρος in contradistinction to τέλος (indirect tax). Comp. note on Luke xx. 22;

Rom. xiii. 7. — ἀπὸ τῶν ἀλλοτρ.] from those who are not members of their family, *i.e.* from their *subjects*.

Ver. 26. Ἀραγε . . . υἱοί] *Application*: Therefore I, as the Son of God, am exempt from the tax which is payable to Jehovah, *i.e.* to His temple. The inference in this argument, which is of the nature of a dilemma, and which proceeds on the self-consciousness of Jesus regarding His supernatural sonship (comp. note on xxii. 45), is an inference *a minori ad majus*, as is indicated by οἱ βασι. τῆς γῆς. If, indeed, in the case of *earthly* kings their *sons* are exempted from the taxes they impose, it follows that the Son of the *heavenly* King, the Son of *God*, can be under no obligation to pay the taxes which *He* imposes (for the temple). The plural οἱ υἱοί is justifiable in the *general proposition* as a *generic* (comp. note on ii. 20) *indefinite* plural, but the *application* must be made to *Jesus* only, not to *Peter* as well (Paulus, Olshausen, Ewald, Lange, Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 131, Gess, Keim), inasmuch as the predicate, in the sense corresponding to the argument, was applicable to Jesus alone, while υἱοί, taken in the *wider* spiritual sense, would embrace not merely Peter and the apostles, but those believers in general whose connection with the Jewish temple was not broken off (John iv. 21) till a somewhat later period. — The principle laid down by Jesus, that He is under no obligation to pay temple-tax on the ground of His being the Son of God, is, *in thesi*, to be simply recognised, and requires no justification (in answer to de Wette); but, *in praxi*, He waives His claim to exemption, and that from a regard to the offence which He would otherwise have given, inasmuch as the fact of His divine sonship, and the μέizon εἶναι τοῦ ἱεροῦ (xii. 6) which it involved, were not recognised beyond the circle of believers, and He would therefore have been looked upon exclusively as an Israelite, as which He was, of course, subject to the law (Gal. iv. 4). If on some other occasion we find Him asserting His Messianic right to subordinate certain legal enactments to His own will (see xii. 8; John vii. 21 ff.), it must be borne in mind that in such cases He had to do with *enemies*, in answer to whose accusation He had to appeal to the authority implied in His being commis-



sioned to bring about the Messianic fulfilment of the law (v. 17). This commission did not supersede His personal obligation, imposed upon Him in His birth and circumcision, to comply with the law, but only gave to His obedience the higher ideal and perfect character which distinguished it. — ἐλεύθεροι] put well forward for sake of emphasis.—The idea that the δίδραχμον is given to *God*, is found likewise in Joseph. *Antt.* xviii. 4. 1.

Ver. 27. *But in order that we may not scandalize them* (the collectors), that we may not give them occasion to misjudge us, as though we despised the temple. Bengel: "illos, qui non noverant jus Jesu." Jesus thus includes *others* along with Himself, not because He regarded Peter as strictly entitled to claim exemption, nor because He was anticipating the time when His followers generally would cease to have such obligations in regard to the temple (Dorner, *Jesu sündlose Volk.* p. 37), but because Peter, who, in like manner, had his residence in Capernaum (viii. 14), had not paid, as yet, any more than Himself. — πορευθείς] belongs to εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν. (*to the sea*), which latter Fritzsche connects with βάλε, which, however, would have the effect of rendering it unduly emphatic. — ἄγκιστρον] It is a *fish-hook* (Hom. *Od.* iv. 369; Herod. ii. 70, *al.*), and not a *net*, which Jesus asks him to throw in, because in this instance it was a question of one particular fish. Consequently this is the only occasion in the Gospels in which mention is made of a fishing with a hook. — τὸν ἀναβάντα] out of the depths. — πρῶτον] the adjective: *the first fish that has come up*. — ἄρον] *lift* it with the hook *out* on the land. Jesus is therefore aware that this one will be the first to snap at the hook. — εὐρήσεις στατήρα] that is, in the mouth of the fish. The *stater* was a coin equivalent to four drachmæ, for which reason it is likewise called a τετράδραχμος, and must not be confounded with the gold stater (20 drachmæ). — ἀντὶ ἐμοῦ κ. σοῦ] not an incorrect expression for καὶ ἀντὶ ἐμοῦ (Fritzsche), but ἀντί is used with reference to the original enactment, Ex. xxx. 12 ff., where the half-shekel is represented as a *ransom for the soul*. Comp. xx. 28. With condescending accommodation, Jesus includes Himself in this view.

REMARK.—The *naturalistic* interpretation of this incident, so far as its miraculous features are concerned,—which, in a teleological respect, and on account of the magical character of the occurrence, Schleiermacher, *L. J.* p. 228, also regarded with suspicion,—has, in conformity with earlier attempts of the kind, been advocated above all by Paulus and Ammon, and consists substantially in supposing that εἰρήσεις σαρ. was accomplished *by the selling of the fish*. But whether ἀνοίξας τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ be referred to *the act of taking the fish from the hook* (Paulus, *Komment.*), or even to *Peter as offering it for sale*, in which case αὐτοῦ is said to signify *on the spot*, we always have, as the result, an incongruous representation and unwarrantable perversion of what, for the narrative of a miracle, is extremely simple and appropriate, to say nothing of so enormous a price for a single fish, and that especially in Capernaum, though Paulus, in spite of the πῶτον, understands the ἰχθύν in a collective sense. The *mythical mode of explaining away* this incident (Strauss, II. p. 184, according to whom it is “a legendary offshoot of tales of the sea”)—the occasion of which is to be found partly in a take of fish by Peter, partly in the stories current about jewels (for example, the ring of Polycrates, Herod. iii. 42) having been found in the inside of fish—breaks down in consequence of its own arbitrariness, and the absence of any thought or Old Testament event in which the myth might be supposed to originate. Again, it would be to make it simply a curiosity (in answer to Strauss in Hilgenfeld’s *Zeitschr.* 1863, p. 293 ff.) to treat it as an invention for the purpose of exhibiting the superiority of Jesus over the circumstances to which He was accommodating Himself. But Hase’s hypothesis, that what was a figurative way of expressing the blessing that attended the labour by means of which the little sum was handily raised, has been transformed, in the popular legend, into an apocryphal miracle, is inconsistent with the fact that the actual miraculous capture of the fish is not once mentioned, an omission which is scarcely in keeping with the usual character of apocryphal narratives. Lastly, the view is no less unfounded which derives the narrative from a parable, in which our Lord is supposed to be representing the contrast between the righteousness of faith that distinguishes the *children* of God, and the legal righteousness of those who are only *slaves* (Weisse, *Evangelienfr.* p. 263 ff.). Besides, this would be to import into the passage the *Pauline* contrast of a similar kind. In short, the incident must continue to be regarded as in every way as historical as the evangelist meant it to be. As for the

difficulties involved in so doing, such as that of the fish snatching the hook with the stater in its mouth (not in the stomach), or that implied in the circumstance that, of all places, Capernaum was the one where Jesus had no need whatever to have recourse to miraculous means for raising the little sum required, they must likewise continue unsolved, belonging as they do to those mysteries that are connected with miracles generally; and while not justifying us in discarding the narrative without other reasons for so doing, they will at least warrant us in letting it stand as it is (de Wette), no matter whether the miraculous character of the affair, so far as Jesus is concerned, is supposed to lie in what He there and then *performed* ("piscis eo ipso momento staterem ex fundo maris afferre jussus est," Bengel), or in what He *knew*, which latter is all that the terms of the passage permit us to suppose (Grotius). Finally, the fact that the *execution* of the order given by Jesus, ver. 27, is not expressly recorded, is no reason why the reality of the thing itself should be questioned; for, considering the character of the Gospel, as well as the attraction which the thing must have had for Peter, the execution in question is to be assumed as a matter of course. But even apart from this, the result promised by Jesus would be sure to follow *in the event* of His order being complied with. For this reason Ewald's view also is unsatisfactory, which is to the effect that Jesus merely wanted to indicate with what *readiness* the money for the tax could be procured, the phraseology which He employed being supposed to proceed upon well-known, although extremely rare, instances of such things being found in fish.