

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
WILLIAM STEWART, D.D.

PART I.—SECOND DIVISION.
THE GOSPELS OF MARK AND LUKE.
VOL. II.

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

PRINTED BY MORRISON AND GIBB,

FOR

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.

LONDON, HAMILTON, ADAMS, AND CO.

DUBLIN, ROBERTSON AND CO.

NEW YORK, SCHUBNER AND WELFORD.

CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL
HANDBOOK
TO THE
GOSPELS OF MARK AND LUKE.

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

TRANSLATED FROM THE FIFTH EDITION OF THE GERMAN BY
REV. ROBERT ERNEST WALLIS, PH.D.

VOL. II.

THE TRANSLATION REVISED AND EDITED BY
WILLIAM STEWART, D.D.,
PROFESSOR OF BIBLICAL CRITICISM IN THE UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW.

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

THE GOSPEL OF LUKE.

CHAPTER III.

VER. 2. Instead of ἐπὶ ἀρχιερέως, Elz. has ἐπὶ ἀρχιερέων, in opposition to decisive evidence. — Ver. 4. λέγοντος] is wanting in B D L Δ 8, min. Copt. Arm. Vulg. It. Or. Eus. Condemned by Griesb., deleted by Rinck, Lachm. Tisch.; taken from Matt. iii. 3. — Ver. 5. εὐθεὶαν] B D 8, min. Vulg. It. Or. Ir. have εὐθείας. So Lachm. and Tisch. A mechanical repetition from ver. 4. The verse bears no trace of its having been altered to agree with the LXX. — Ver. 10. ποιήσομεν] ποιήσωμεν, which Griesb. has recommended, and Scholz, Lachm. Tisch. have adopted, is here and at vv. 12, 14 decisively attested. — Ver. 14. The arrangement τί ποιήσωμεν καὶ ἡμεῖς is, with Lachm. and Tisch., to be adopted, following B C* L 8, min. Syr. Ar. Vulg. Rd. Ver. Brix. Collb.; καὶ ἡμεῖς was omitted, because καί follows again,—an omission which, moreover, the analogy of vv. 10, 12 readily suggested,—and was afterwards restored in the wrong place (*before* τί ποιήσωμεν). — πρὸς αὐτοῦς] Lachm. has αὐτοῖς, following B C* D L 8, min. Vulg. It. The *Recepta* is a repetition from ver. 13. — Ver. 17. καὶ διακαθαρίσῃ] Tisch. has διακαθαῖραι, as also afterwards κ. συναγαγεῖν, on too weak attestation. — Ver. 19. After γυναικός, Elz. has φιλόππου, in opposition to decisive evidence. — Ver. 22. λέγουσαν] is wanting in B D L 8, Copt. Vulg. codd. of It. Ambr. Condemned by Griesb. and Rinck, deleted by Lachm. Tisch. Taken from Matt. iii. 17. Comp. on ver. 4. — σὺ εἶ . . . ἡδόκησα] D, Cant. Ver. Ver. Collb. Corb.* Rd. Clem. Method. Hilar. ap., also codd. in Augustine, have υἱός μου εἶ σὺ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε. An old (Justin, c. *Tryph.* 88) Ebionitic (Epiphan. *Hæc.* xxx. 13) addition, which, echoing the expression in Acts xiii. 33, found its way into the narrative, especially in the case of Luke. — Ver. 23. Many various readings, which, however, are not so well attested as to warrant a departure from the Received text (Lachm. and Tisch. have

adopted $\omega\iota\ \sigma\iota\zeta$, $\omega\zeta$ $\epsilon\iota\sigma\iota\zeta\epsilon\tau\epsilon$, and Tisch. has $\alpha\iota\chi\iota\mu$, after 'Ιησοῦς . — Ver. 23 ff. Many variations in the writing of the proper names. — Ver. 33. τοῦ Ἀράμ] Tisch. has τοῦ Ἀδμεῖν τοῦ Ἀρεί, following B L X r s, Copt. Syr^p. So also Ewald. Rightly; the *Recepta* is a correction in accordance with Matt. i. 4; 1 Chron. ii. 9.

Vv. 1, 2. As, on the one hand, Matt. iii. 1 introduces the appearance of the Baptist without any definite note of time, only with $\epsilon\nu\ \delta\epsilon\ \tauαῖς\ ἡμέραις\ ἐκείναις$; so, on the other, Luke ("the first writer who frames the Gospel history into the great history of the world by giving precise dates," Ewald), in fulfilment of his intention, i. 3, gives for that highly important starting-point of the proclamation of the Gospel ("his quasi scena N. T. panditur," Bengel) a date specified by a sixfold reference to the history of the period, so as to indicate the emperor at Rome and the governors of Palestine, as well as the high priest of the time; namely—(1) *in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar*. Augustus, who was succeeded by his step-son Tiberius, died on the 19th August 767, or the fourteenth year of the era of Dionysius. See Suetonius, *Octav.* 100. Accordingly, it might appear doubtful whether Luke reckons the year 767 or the year 768 as the first; similarly, as Tiberius became co-regent at the end of 764, or in January 765 (Tacit. *Ann.* i. 3; Sueton. *Tib.* 20 f.; Velleius Paterculus, ii. 121), whether Luke begins to reckon from the commencement of the co-regency (Ussher, Voss, Pagius, Clericus, Sepp, Lichtenstein, Tischendorf, and others), or of the sole-government. Since, however, no indication is added which would lead us away from the mode of reckoning the years of the emperors usual among the Romans, and followed even by Josephus,¹ we must abide by the view that the fifteenth year in the passage before us is *the year from the 19th August 781 to the same date 782*. See also Anger, *zur Chronologie d. Lehramtes Christi*, I., Leipzig 1848; Ideler, *Chronol.* I. p. 418.

¹ Also *Antt.* xviii. 6, 10, where $\sigma\chi\omega\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\eta\nu\ \alpha\gamma\chi\eta\nu$ does not refer back to an earlier co-regency of Tiberius, so that $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ would be equivalent to $\mu\acute{o}\nu\omicron\varsigma$; but this $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ indicates simply a contrast between him and Caius, who had been nominated his successor.

Authentication from coins; Sauley, *Athen. français*. 1855, p. 639 f. — (2) *When Pontius Pilate* (see on Matt. xxvii. 2) *was procurator of Judaea*. He held office from the end of 778, or beginning of 779, until 789, in which year he was recalled after an administration of ten years; Joseph. *Antt.* xviii. 4. 2. — (3) *When Herod was tetrarch of Galilee*. Herod Antipas (see on Matt. ii. 22, xiv. 1); this crafty, unprincipled man of the world became tetrarch after the death of his father Herod the Great in 750, and remained so until his deposition in 792. — (4) *When Philip his brother was tetrarch of Ituræa and Trachonitis*. This paternal prince (see Ewald, *Gesch. Chr.* p. 45 f.) became prince in 750, and his reign lasted till his death in 786 or 787, Joseph. *Antt.* xviii. 4. 6. His government extended also over Batanæa and Auranitis, Joseph. *Antt.* xvii. 11. 4, as that of Herod Antipas also took in Peraea. For information as to *Ituræa*, the north-eastern province of Palestine (Münter, *de rebus Ituræcor.* 1824), and as to the neighbouring *Trachonitis* between the Antilibanus and the Arabian mountain ranges, see Winer, *Realwört.* — (5) *When Lysanias was tetrarch of Abilene*. See especially, Hug, *Gutacht.* I. p. 119 ff.; Ebrard, p. 180 ff.; Wieseler, p. 174 ff.; Schweizer in the *Theol. Jahrb.* 1847, p. 1 ff. (who treats the chronology of Luke very unfairly); Wieseler in Herzog's *Encykl.* I. p. 64 ff.; Lichtenstein, p. 131 ff.; Bleek *in loc.* The Lysanias, son of Ptolemaeus, known from Josephus, *Antt.* xv. 4. 1; Dio Cass. 49. 32, as having been murdered by Antony at the instigation of Cleopatra in 718, cannot here be meant, unless Luke has perpetrated a gross chronological blunder; which latter case, indeed, Strauss, Gfrörer, B. Bauer, Hilgenfeld take for granted; while Valesius, on Eus. *H. E.* i. 10; Michaelis, Paulus,¹ Schneckenburger in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1833, p. 1064, would mend matters uncritically enough by omitting *τετραρχοῦντος* (which is never omitted in Luke, see Tischendorf); and the remaining expression: *καὶ τῆς Λυσανίου*

¹ In his Commentary. But in his *Exeget. Handb.* he acquiesces in the text as it stands, and forces upon it, contrary to the letter, the meaning: *when Philip the tetrarch of Ituræa and Trachonitis was also tetrarch over Abilene of Lysanias*. Thus, indeed, the former *old* Lysanias would also here be meant.

'Αβιλῆνης some have attempted to construe, others to guess at the meaning. After the murder of that older Lysanias who is mentioned as ruler of (δυναστεύων) *Chalcis*, between Lebanon and Antilibanus (Joseph. *Antt.* xiv. 7. 4), Antony presented a great part of his possessions to Cleopatra (see Wieseler, p. 179), and she leased them to Herod. Soon afterwards Zenodorus received the lease of the οἶκος τοῦ Λυσανίου (Joseph. *Antt.* xv. 10. 1; *Bell. Jud.* i. 20. 4); but Augustus in 724 compelled him to give up a portion of his lands to Herod (Joseph. *as above*), who after the death of Zenodorus in 734 obtained the rest also, *Antt.* xv. 10. 3. After Herod's death a part of the οἴκου τοῦ Ζηνοδώρου passed over to Philip (*Antt.* xvii. 11. 4; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 6. 3). It is consequently not to be proved that no portion of the territory of that older Lysanias remained in his family. This is rather to be assumed (Casaubon, Krebs, Süsskind the elder, Kuinoel, Süsskind the younger in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1836, p. 431 ff.; Winer, and others), if it is supposed that Abilene also belonged to the principality of that elder Lysanias. But this supposition is itself deficient in proof, since Josephus designates the territory of the elder Lysanias as *Chalcis* (see above), and expressly distinguishes the kingdom of a *later* Lysanias, which Caligula (*Antt.* xviii. 6. 10) and Claudius bestowed on Agrippa I. (*Antt.* xix. 5. 1, xx. 7. 1; *Bell.* ii. 11. 5, ii. 12. 8) from the region of *Chalcis* (*Bell.* ii. 12. 8). But since Abila is first mentioned as belonging to the tetrarchy of this *later* Lysanias (*Antt.* xix. 5. 1), and since the kingdom of the elder Lysanias is nowhere designated a *tetrarchy*, although probably the territory of that younger one is so named,¹ it must be assumed that Josephus, when he mentions Ἀβιλαν τὴν Λυσανίου (*Antt.* xix. 5. 1), and speaks of a tetrarchy of *Lysanias* (*Antt.* xx. 7. 1; comp. *Bell.* ii. 11. 5, ii. 12. 18), still designates the region in question after that *older* Lysanias; but that before 790, when Caligula became emperor, a tetrarchy of a *later*

¹ Of whom, therefore, we have to think even in respect of the Greek *inscription* which Pococke (*Mor. p. 11.* § 177) found at *Nebi Abil* (the ancient Abila), and in which Lysanias is mentioned as *tetrarch*. Comp. Böckh, *Inscr.* 4521, 4523.

Lysanias existed to which Abila¹ belonged, doubtless as his residence, whereas it is quite another question whether this latter Lysanias was a descendant or a relation of that elder one (see Krebs, *Obs.* p. 112). Thus the statement of Luke, by comparison with Josephus, instead of being shown to be *erroneous*, is *confirmed*.²—(6) *When Annas was high priest, and Caiaphas.* Comp. Acts iv. 6. The *reigning* high priest at that time was *Joseph*, named *Caiaphas* (see on Matt. xxvi. 3), who had been appointed by Valerius Gratus, the predecessor of Pontius Pilate, Joseph. *Antt.* xviii. 2, 2. His father-in-law *Annas* held the office of high priest some years before, until Valerius Gratus became procurator, when the office was taken away from him by the new governor, and conferred first on *Ismail*, then on *Eleazar* (a son of Annas), then on *Simon*, and after that on *Caiaphas*. See Josephus, *l.c.* This last continued in office from about 770 till 788 or 789. But Annas retained withal very weighty influence (John xviii. 12 ff.), so that not only did he, as did every one who had been ἀρχιερεύς, continue to be called by the name, but, moreover, he also partially discharged the functions of high priest. In this way we explain the certainly inaccurate expression of Luke (in which Lange, *L. J.* II. 1, p. 165, finds a touch of *irony*, an element surely quite foreign to the simply chronological context), informing the reader who may not be acquainted with the actual state of the case, that Annas was primarily and properly high priest, and next to him Caiaphas also. But according to Acts iv. 6, *Luke himself* must have had this view, so that it must be conceded as a result that this expression is *erroneous*,—an error which, as it sprang from the predominat-

¹ It was situated in the region of the Lebanon, eighteen miles north from Damascus, and thirty-eight miles south from Heliopolis. Ptolem. v. 18; Anton. *Itiner.*; Ritter, *Erdk.* XV. p. 1060. To be distinguished from Abila in Decapolis, and other places of this name (Joseph. v. 1. 1; Bell. ii. 13. 2, iv. 7. 5).

² It is, however, altogether precarious with Lichtenstein, following Hofmann, to gather from the passage before us a proof that Luke did not write till after the destruction of Jerusalem, because, namely, after that crumbling to pieces of the Herodian territories, no further interest would be felt in discovering to whom Abilene belonged at the time of Tiberius. But why not? Not even a chronological interest?

ing influence of Annas, was the more easily possible in proportion to the distance at which Luke stood from that time in which the high priests had changed so frequently; while Annas (whose son-in-law and five sons besides filled the office, Joseph. *Antt.* xx. 9. 1) was accustomed to keep his hand on the helm. To agree with the actual historical relation, Luke would have been obliged to write: ἐπὶ ἀρχιερέως Καϊάφα καὶ Ἄννα. Arbitrary shifts have been resorted to, such as: that at that period the two might have *exchanged annually* in the administration of the office (Beza, Chemnitz, Selden, Calovius, Hug, Friedlieb, *Archäol. d. Leidensgesch.* p. 73 ff.); that Annas was *vicar* (נָסִיחַ, Lightfoot, p. 744 f.) of the high priest (so Scaliger, Casaubon, Grotius, Lightfoot, Reland, Wolf, Kuinoel, and others, comp. de Wette), which, however, is shown to be erroneous by his name being placed first; that he is here represented as *princeps Synedrui* (נִינִי, Lightfoot, p. 746). So Selden, Saubert, Hammond, and recently Wieseler, *Chronol. Synopsis*, p. 186 ff., and in Herzog's *Encykl.* I. p. 354. But as ἀρχιερεύς nowhere of itself means *president of the Sanhedrim*, but in every case nothing else than *chief priest*, it can in this place especially be taken only in this signification, since καὶ Καϊάφα stands alongside. If Luke had intended to say: "under the president Annas and the high priest Caiaphas," he could not have comprehended these distinct offices, as they were at that time actually distinguished (which Selden has abundantly proved), under the one term ἀρχιερέως. Even in xxii. 54, ἀρχιερ. is to be understood of Annas. — ἐγένετο ῥῆμα Θεοῦ κ.τ.λ.] Comp. Jer. i. 2; Isa. xxxviii. 4 f. From this, as from the following καὶ ἦλθεν κ.τ.λ., ver. 3, it is plainly manifest that Luke by his chronological statements at vv. 1, 2 intends to fix the date of nothing else than the *calling and first appearance of John*, not the *year of the death of Jesus* (Sanclemente and many of the Fathers, who, following Luke iv. 19, comp. Isa. lxi. 1 ff., erroneously ascribe to Jesus only one year of his official ministry), but also not of a *second appearance of the Baptist and his imprisonment* (Wieseler¹), or of his *beheading* (Schegg). The mention of the

¹ See in opposition to Wieseler, Elrard, p. 187; Lichtenstein, p. 137 ff.

imprisonment, vv. 19, 20, is rather to be regarded only as a digression, as the continuance of the history proves (ver. 21). The first appearance of John, however, was important enough to have its chronology fixed, since it was regarded as the ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου (Mark i. 1). It was the epoch of the commencement of the work of Jesus Himself (comp. Acts i. 22, x. 37, xiii. 24), and hence Luke, having arrived at this threshold of the Gospel history, ver. 22, when Jesus is baptized by John, makes *at this point* a preliminary pause, and closes the first section of the first division of his book with the genealogical register, ver. 23 ff., in order to relate next the Messianic ministry of Jesus, ch. iv. ff.

Ver. 3. See on Matt. iii. 1 f.; Mark i. 4. — περίχωρον τοῦ Ἰορδ.] Matthew and Mark have ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ. There is no discrepancy; for the apparent discrepancy vanishes with ἦλθε in Luke, compared with the narrative of the baptism in Matthew and Mark.

Vv. 4-6. See on Matt. iii. 3. Luke continues the quotation of Isa. xl. 3 down to the end of ver. 5, following the LXX. freely. The appeal to this prophetic oracle was *one of the commonplaces* of the evangelic tradition in respect of the history of John, and betokens therefore, even in Luke, no special source; he only gives it—unless a *Pauline purpose* is to be attributed to his words (Holtzmann)—*more fully* than Matthew, Mark, and John (i. 23).—In ὡς γέγραπται the same thing is implied that Matthew expresses by οὗτος γάρ ἐστιν ὁ ρηθεὶς. — φάραγξ] Ravine, Thuc. ii. 67. 4; Dem. 793. 6; Polyb. vii. 15. 8; Judith ii. 8. This and the following particulars were types of the *moral obstacles* which were to be removed by the repentance demanded by John for the restoration of the people well prepared for the reception of the Messiah (i. 17). There is much arbitrary trifling on the part of the Fathers and others in interpreting¹ the particulars of this passage. — The *futures* are not imperative in force, but declare what *will happen* in consequence of the command,

¹ Well says Grotius: "Nimirum est anxia eorum περιεργία, qui in dictis ἀλληγορουμίνις singulas partes minutatim exeunt . . . cum satis sit in re tota comparationem intelligi."

ἐτοιμάσατε κ.τ.λ. Καὶ ὄψεται κ.τ.λ. ought to have guarded against the taking the expressions imperatively. — On the use of the Cyrenaie (Herod. iv. 199) word βουνός, *hill*, in Greek, see Schweighäuser, *Lxx. Herod.* I. p. 125 f.; Sturz, *Dial. Al.* p. 154; Lobeck, *ad Phryg.* p. 356. — εἰς εὐθείαν] *scil.* ὁδόν. See Lobeck, *Paralip.* p. 363; Winer, p. 521 [E. T. 738 f.]. — αἱ τραχεῖαι] *scil.* ὁδοί, from what follows, *the rough, uneven ways*. — λείας] *smooth*. Comp. Xen. *Mem.* iii. 10. 1: τὰ τραχέα καὶ τὰ λεία. — τὸ σωτήρ. τ. Θεοῦ] See on ii. 30. It is an addition of the LXX. The salvation of God is the *Messianic* salvation which will appear in and with the advent of the Messiah before all eyes (ὄψεται πᾶσα σάρξ). As to πᾶσα σάρξ, *all flesh*, designating men according to their *need* of deliverance, and pointing to the *universal* destination of God's salvation, see on Acts ii. 16.

Vv. 7–9. See on Matt. iii. 7–10. — ὄχλοις] Kuinoel erroneously says: “Pharisaei et Sadducei.” See rather on Matt. iii. 7.¹ — ἐκπορ.] the present. The people are represented as still on their way. — οὖν] since otherwise you cannot escape the wrath to come. — καὶ μὴ ἄρξησθε κ.τ.λ.] *and begin not to think*, do not allow yourselves to fancy! do not dispose yourselves to the thought! “*Omniem excusationis etiam conatum praecidit*,” Bengel. Bornemann explains as though the words were καὶ μὴ πάλιν (he likens it to the German expression, “das alte Lied anfangen”); and Fritzsche, *ad Matth.* p. 540, as if it meant καὶ μηδέ, *ne quidem*. Comp. also Bengel.

Vv. 10, 11. Special instructions on duty as far as ver. 14 peculiar to Luke, and taken from an unknown source. — οὖν] in pursuance of what was said vv. 7–9. — ποιήσωμεν] (see the critical remarks) is *deliberative*. On the question itself, comp. Acts ii. 37, xvi. 30. — μεταδότω] namely, a χιτών. — ὁ ἔχων βρώματα] not: “qui cibis abundat,” Kuinoel, following older commentators. The demand of the stern preacher of repentance is greater; it is that of *self-denying love*, as it is

¹ The generalization proves nothing on behalf of Luke's having been ignorant of our Matthew (Weiss). From such individual instances an easy argument is drawn, but with great uncertainty, especially as Luke knew and made use of a *multitude* of evangelistic sources of which we know nothing.

perfected from the mouth of Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount.

Vv. 12, 13. *Τελῶναι*] See on Matt. v. 46. — *παρὰ τὸ διατεταγμ. ὑμῖν*] *over and above what is prescribed to you* (to demand in payment). See Winer, p. 215 [E. T. 300 f.]. The unrighteousness and the exactions of those who farmed the taxes are well known. See Paulus, *Exeg. Handb.* I. p. 353 f. On *πράσσειν*, to demand payment, to exact, see Blomfield, *Gloss. ad Aesch. Pers.* 482; Krüger, *ad Xen. Anab.* vii. 6. 17.

Ver. 14. *Στρατενόμενοι*] *those who were engaged in military service*, an idea less extensive than *στρατιῶται*. See the passages in Wetstein. Historically, it is not to be more precisely defined. See references in regard to *Jewish* military service in Grotius. According to Michaelis, there were Thracians, Germans, and Galatians in the service of Herod in his war against Aretas; but this war was later, and certainly *Jewish* soldiers are meant. According to Ewald: soldiers who were chiefly engaged in *police* inspection, *e.g.* in connection with the customs. — *καὶ ἡμεῖς*] *we also*. They expect an injunction similar (*καί*) to that which the publicans received. — *διασεῖν*] *to do violence to*, is used by later writers of *exactions* by threats and other kinds of annoyance (to lay under contribution), as *concutere*. Comp. 3 Macc. vii. 21; see Wetstein, and Schneider, *ad Xen. Mem.* ii. 9. 1. — *συκοφαντεῖν*, in its primitive meaning, although no longer occurring in this sense, is *to be a fig-shower*. According to the usual view (yet see in general, Ast, *ad Plat. Rep.* p. 362; Westermann, *ad Plut. Sol.* 24), it was applied to one who denounced for punishment those who transgressed the prohibition of the export of figs from Attica. According to the actual usage, it means to denounce falsely, to traduce, and, as in this place, to be *guilty of chicane*. It is often thus used also in the Greek writers. See Rettig in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1838, p. 775 ff.; Becker, *Char.* I. p. 289 ff. *Πονηρὸν, πονηρὸν ὁ συκοφάντης ἀεὶ καὶ βάσκανον*, Dem. 307. 23; Herbst, *ad Xen. Symp.* iv. 30, p. 79 f.

Ver. 15. Statement of the circumstances which elicited the following confession; although not found in Matthew and

Mark, it has not been arbitrarily constructed by Luke (Weisse) in order to return again to the connection, ver. 9 (Hilgenfeld, Holtzmann), but was probably derived from the same source as ver. 10 ff., and at all events it is in keeping with the impression made by the appearance of John, and his preaching of baptism and repentance. Comp. John i. 25, where the *more immediate* occasion is narrated. — προσδοκῶντος] *while the people were in expectation.* The people were eagerly listening—for what? This is shown in what follows, namely, for an explanation by John about himself. Comp. Acts xxvii. 33. — μήποτε] *whether not perchance.* Comp. on Gal. ii. 2. — αὐτός] *ipse*, not a third, whose forerunner then he would only be.

Ver. 16. See on Matt. ii. 11; Mark i. 7 f. — ἀπεκρίν.] “interrogare cupientibus,” Bengel. — ἔρχεται] placed first for emphasis. — οὗ . . . αὐτοῦ] Comp. Mark i. 7, vii. 25; Winer, p. 134 [E. T. 183 f.]. — αὐτός] *he* and no other.

Ver. 17. See on Matt. iii. 12.

Vv. 18–20. See on Matt. xiv. 3 ff.; Mark vi. 17 ff. On μὲν οὖν, *quidem igitur*, so that μὲν, “rem praesentem confirmet,” and οὖν, “conclusionem ex rebus ita comparatis conficiat,” see Klotz, *ad Derar.* p. 662 f. — καὶ ἕτερα] *and other matters besides, different in kind* from those already adduced. As to καὶ with πολλά, see Blomfield, *ad Aesch. Pers.* 249; Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* i. 2. 24; and as to ἕτερα, see on Gal. i. 7. — εὐηγγελίζετο τ. λαόν] he supplied the people with the glad announcement of the coming Messiah. On the construction, comp. Acts viii. 25, 40, xiv. 21, xvi. 10; Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 268. — ὁ δὲ Ἡρώδης κ.τ.λ.] an historical digression in which several details are brought together in brief compass for the purpose of at once completing the delineation of John in its chief features. To that description also belonged the contrast between his *work* (εὐηγγελίζ. τ. λαόν) and his *destiny*. The brief intimation of vv. 19, 20 was sufficient for this. — ἐλεγχόμενος κ.τ.λ.] See Matt. xiv. 3 f. — καὶ περὶ πάντων κ.τ.λ.] peculiar to Luke, but, as we gather from Mark vi. 20, essentially historical. The ποιηρῶν, attracted with it, stands thus according to classical usage.

See Matthiae, § 473, quoted by Dissen, *ad Dem. de Cor.* p. 177, 349. — ἐπὶ πᾶσι] to all his wicked deeds. — καὶ κατέκλεισε] simplicity in the style is maintained at the expense of the syntax (Kühner, § 720). — ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ] in the prison, whither he had brought him. Comp. Acts xxvi. 10; Herodian, v. 8. 12, and elsewhere; Xen. *Cyrop.* vi. 4. 10.

Vv. 21, 22. See on Matt. iii. 13-17; Mark i. 9-11. — ἐγένετο δὲ κ.τ.λ.] resumes the thread dropped at ver. 18 in order to add another epitomized narrative, namely, that of the baptism of Jesus. — ἐν τῷ βαπτισθῆναι κ.τ.λ.] Whilst¹ the assembled people (an hyperbolical expression) were being baptized, it came to pass when Jesus also (καί) was baptized and was praying, the heaven was opened, etc. The entire people was therefore present (in opposition to Kuinoel, Krabbe, and others). The characteristic detail, καὶ προσευχ., is peculiar to Luke. — σωματικῶς εἶδει ὥσεί περιστ.] so that He appeared as a bodily dove. See, moreover, on Matthew.

Ver. 23. Αὐτός] as Matt. iii. 4: *He Himself*, to whom this divine σημεῖον, ver. 22, pointed. — ἦν ὥσεί ἐτῶν τριάκοντα ἀρχόμενος] *He was about thirty years of age* (comp. ii. 42; Mark v. 42), when *He made the beginning*,² viz. of His Messianic office. This limitation of the meaning of ἀρχόμενος results from ver. 22, in which Jesus is publicly and solemnly announced by God as the Messiah. So Origen, Euthymius Zigabenus, Jansen, Er. Schmid, Spanheim, Calovius, Clericus, Wolf, Bengel, Griesbach (in Velthusen, *Comment.* I. p. 358), Kuinoel, Anger (*Tempor. rat.* p. 19), de Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius, Ewald, Hengstenberg, Bleek, and others. With the reception of his baptismal consecration, Jesus entered on the

¹ Bleek is in error (following de Wette) when he translates: *when . . . He was baptized.* See ii. 27, viii. 40, ix. 36, xi. 37, xiv. 1, xix. 15, xxiv. 30; in general, Buttmann, *Neut. Gr.* p. 226 f. [E. T. 264].

² So also Paulus, only that, after the example of Calvinus, he further attaches ὧν to ἀρχόμενος, in which case, however, it would be useless, and the subsequent genealogy would be without any connecting link. Wieseler, *Chronol. Synops.* p. 125, placing ἀρχόμενος before ὥσει (so Lachmann in the margin and Tischendorf), explains: "and he was—namely, Jesus when He began—about thirty years of age." Therefore in the most essential point his view is in agreement with ours.

commencement of His destined ministry. Comp. Mark i. 1; Acts i. 21 f., x. 37. The interpretation given by others: "Incipiebat autem Jesus annorum esse fere triginta," Castalio (so Luther, Erasmus, Beza, Vatablus, and many more), could only be justified either by the original running: ἤρξατο εἶναι ὥσεί ἐτῶν τριάκοντα, or ἦν ὥσεί ἔτους τριακοστοῦ ἀρχόμενος. It is true that Grotius endeavours to fortify himself in this interpretation by including in the clause the following ὧν, so that ἀρχομαι ὧν ἐτῶν τριάκοντα might mean: *incipio jam esse tricennarius*. But even if ἦν . . . ὧν be conjoined in Greek usage (see Bornemann, *ad Xen. Cyr.* ii. 3. 13, p. 207, Leipzig), how clumsy would be the expression ἦν ἀρχόμενος ὧν, *incipiebat esse!* and, according to the arrangement of the words, quite intolerable. Even ἐρχόμενος has been *conjectured* (Casaubon).—ὧν] belongs to υἱὸς Ἰωσήφ, and ὡς ἐνομίζετο, *as he was considered* (ὡς ἐδόκει τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις: ὡς γὰρ ἡ ἀλήθεια εἶχεν, οὐκ ἦν υἱὸς αὐτοῦ, Euthymius Zigabenus), is a parenthesis. Paulus, who connects ὧν with ἀρχόμ., explains: *according to custom* (Jesus did not begin His ministry sooner). Comp. on Acts xvi. 13. It is true the connecting of the two participles ἀρχόμενος ὧν would not in itself be ungrammatical (see Pflugk, *ad Hec.* 358); but this way of looking at the matter is altogether wrong, because, in respect of the appearance of the *Messiah*, there could be no question of a custom at all, and the fixing of the age of the *Levites* (Num. iv. 3, 47), which, moreover, was not a custom, but a *law*, has nothing to do with the appearance of a prophet, and especially of the *Messiah*. Comp. further, on ὡς ἐνομίζ., Dem. 1022. 16: οἱ νομιζόμενοι μὲν βίει, μὴ ὄντες δὲ γένει ἐξ αὐτῶν, and the passages in Wetstein. Others (quoted by Wolf, and Wolf himself, Rosenmüller, Osiander) refer ὧν to τοῦ Ἠλί: *existens (cum putaretur filius Josephi) filius*, i.e. *nepos Eli*. So also Schleier in the *Theol. Quartalschr.* 1836, p. 540 ff. Even Wieseler (in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1845, p. 361 ff.) has condescended in like manner (comp. Lightfoot, p. 750) to the desperate expedient of exegetically making it out to be a genealogical tree of *Mary* thus: "*being a son, as it was thought, of Joseph (but, in fact, of Mary), of Eli,*" etc. Wieseler

supports his view by the fact that he reads, with Lachmann and Tischendorf, *ὡς ἐνομίζ.* *after υἱός* (B L 8), and on weaker evidence reads before *Ἰωσήφ* the *τοῦ* which is now again deleted even by Tischendorf. But as, in respect of the received arrangement of *ὡς ἐνομ.*, it is only the *ὦν υἱὸς Ἰωσήφ*, and nothing more (in opposition to Bengel), that is marked out as coming under the *ὡς ἐνομίζετο*, so also is it in the arrangement of Lachmann (only that the latter actually brings into stronger prominence the supposed *filial* relationship to Joseph); and if *τοῦ* is read before *Ἰωσήφ*, no change even in that case arises in the meaning.¹ For it is not *υἱός* that would have to be supplied in every following clause, so that *Jesus* should be designated as the son of each of the persons named, even up to *τοῦ Θεοῦ* inclusively (so Lightfoot, Bengel), but *υἱοῦ* (after *τοῦ*), as the nature of the genealogical table in itself presents it,² making *τοῦ Θεοῦ* also dogmatically indubitable; since, according to Luke's idea of the divine sonship of Jesus, it could not occur to him to represent this *divine* sonship as having been effected through *Adam*. No; if Luke had *thought* what Wieseler reads between the lines in ver. 23, that, namely, Eli was *Mary's* father, he would have known how to *express* it, and would have written something like this: *ὦν, ὡς μὲν ἐνομίζετο, υἱὸς Ἰωσήφ, ὄντως* (xxiii. 47, xxiv. 34) *δὲ Μαρίας τοῦ Ἠλί κ.τ.λ.* But *he desires to give the genealogy of Jesus on the side of His foster-father Joseph*: therefore he writes simply as we read, and as the fact that he wished to express required. As to the originally *Ebionitic* point of view of the genealogies in Matthew and Luke, see on Matt. i. 17, Remark 3.

REMARK.—All attempts to fix the year in which Jesus was born by means of the passage before us are balked by the *ὥσει* of ver. 23. Yet the era of Dionysius bases its date, although incorrectly (754 after the foundation of Rome), on Luke iii.

¹ This indifferent *τοῦ* came into the text with extreme facility, in accordance with the analogy of all the following clauses.

² Instances of a quite similar kind of stringing on the links of a genealogy one after the other by *τοῦ* are found in Herod. iv. 157, vii. 204, viii. 131, and others in Wetstein. The *Vulgate* is right in simply reading, "*filius Joseph. qui fuit Heli, qui fuit Matthat,*" etc.

1, 23. Hase, *L. J.* § 26, follows it, setting aside, because of its mythical associations, the account of Matthew, that the first childhood of Jesus occurred as early as the time of the reign of Herod the Great. But these legendary ingredients do not justify our rejecting a date fixed by a simple reference to the history of the time, for it is rather to be regarded as the nucleus around which the legend gathered. As, however, Herod died in 750 (Anger, *Rat. tempor.* p. 5 f.; Wieseler, *Chronol. Synopse*, p. 50 ff.), the era of Dionysius is at any rate at least about four years in error. If, further, it be necessary, according to this, to place the birth of Jesus *before* the death of Herod, which occurred in the beginning of April, then, even on the assumption that He was born as early as 750 (according to Wieseler, in February of that year), it follows that at the time when the Baptist, who was His senior only by a few months, appeared—according to iii. 1, in the year from the 19th August 781 to 782—He would be about thirty-one years of age, which perfectly agrees with the *ᾠσεί* of ver. 23, and the round number *τριάκοντα*; in which case it must be assumed as certain (comp. Mark i. 9) that He was baptized very soon after the appearance of John, at which precise point His Messianic *ἀρχή* commenced. If, however, as according to Matt. ii. 7, 16 is extremely probable, the birth of Jesus must be placed as early as perhaps a year before the date given above,¹ even the age that thus results of about thirty-two years is sufficiently covered by the indefinite statement of the passage before us; and the year 749 as the year of Christ's birth tallies well enough with the Baptist beginning to preach in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius.²

¹ Not "at least two years, probably even four or more years," Keim, *D. geschichtl. Christus*, p. 140.

² From the fact that, according to the evangelists, Jesus after His baptism began His public official ministry without the intervention of any private teaching, the opinion of the younger Bunsen (*The Hidden Wisdom of Christ*, etc., London 1865, II. p. 461 ff.)—that the Lord, at the beginning of His official career, was forty-six years of age—loses all foundation: It rests upon the misunderstanding of John ii. 20 f., viii. 57, which had already occurred in the case of Irenaeus. See, on the other hand, Rösch in the *Jahrb. f. Deutsche Theol.* 1866, p. 4 ff. The assumption of the latter, that the year 2 before the era of Dionysius was the year of Christ's birth, rests in accordance with ancient tradition, to be sure, yet on the very insecure foundation of the appearance of the star in the history of the Magi, and on distrust of the chronology of Herod and his sons as set forth by Josephus, for which Rösch has not adduced sufficient reasons.

Ver. 27. *Τοῦ Ζοροβάβελ, τοῦ Σαλαθιήλ*] The objection that in this place Luke, although giving the line of David through Nathan, still introduces the same two celebrated names, and at about the same period as does Matt. i. 12, is not arbitrarily to be got rid of. The *identity* of these persons *has been denied* (so, following older commentators, Paulus, Olshausen, Osiander, Wieseler, Bleek), or *a levirate marriage* has been suggested as getting quit of the difficulty (so, following older commentators, Ebrard, who says that Matthew mentions the legal, Luke the natural father of Salathiel), or it has been supposed (so Hofmann, *Weissag. u. Erfüll.* II. p. 37) that Salathiel *adopted* Zerubbabel. But the less reliance can be placed on such arbitrary devices in proportion as historical warranty as to details is wanting in both the divergent genealogies, although they both profess to give a genealogy of *Joseph*. The attempt to reconcile the two must be given up. It is otherwise in respect of the names *Amos* and *Nahum*, ver. 25, which *cannot* be identified with the well-known prophets, and in respect of the names *Levi*, *Simcon*, *Juda*, *Joseph*, vv. 29, 30, which *cannot* be identified with the sons of Jacob, as (in opposition to B. Bauer) is shown by the great difference of time.

Ver. 36. *Τοῦ Καϊνάν*] In Gen. x. 24, xi. 12; 1 Chron. i. 24. *Shalach* (שֶׁלַח) is named as the *son* of Arphaxad. But the genealogy follows the LXX. in Gen. (as above); and certainly the name of *Kenan* also originally stood in Genesis, although the author of 1 Chronicles may not have read it in his copy of Genesis. See Bertheau on 1 Chron. p. 6.

REMARK.—*The genealogy in Luke*, who, moreover, in accordance with his Pauline universalism carries on the genealogical line up to Adam, is appropriately inserted *at this point*, just where the Messianic consecration of Jesus and the commencement therewith made of His ministry are related. Hence, also, the genealogy is given in an *ascending* line, as Luke did not intend, like Matthew, to begin his Gospel just at the birth of Jesus, but went much further back and started with the conception and birth of the Baptist; so in Luke the proper and, in so far as the historical connection was concerned, the right place for the genealogy could not have been, as in Matthew,

at the beginning of the Gospel. Comp. Köstlin, p. 306.—In its contents the genealogy is extremely different from that in Matthew, since from Joseph to David, Luke has *far more* and *almost throughout different* links in the genealogy; since Matthew gives the line of Solomon, while Luke gives that of Nathan (2 Sam. v. 14; 1 Chron. iii. 5), although he introduces into it from the former $\Sigma\alpha\lambda\omega\mu\acute{\alpha}\nu$ and $\Sigma\epsilon\phi\epsilon\beta\acute{\alpha}\beta\epsilon\tau$. Seeking in several ways to get rid of this last-mentioned difficulty (see on ver. 27), many have assumed that *Matthew gives the genealogy of Joseph, while Luke gives that of Mary*. To reconcile this with the text, $\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma$ has been taken to mean: *the son-in-law of Eli*, as, following many older commentators (Luther, also Chemnitz, Calovius, Bengel), Paulus, Olshausen, Krabbe, Ebrard, Riggenbach, Bisping, and others will have it; but this, according to the analogy of the rest of the links in the chain, is quite impossible. The attempt has been made to connect with this the hypothesis of Epiphanius, Grotius, Michaelis, and others, that Mary was an *heir*, whose husband must therefore have belonged to the same family, and must have had his name inscribed in their family register (Michaelis, Olshausen); but this hypothesis itself, while it is equally objectionable in being arbitrary, and in going too far in its application, leaves the question altogether unsolved whether the law of the heir was still in force at that time (see on Matt. i. 17, Rem. 2), even apart from the fact that Mary's Davidic descent is wholly without proof, and extremely doubtful. See on i. 36, ii. 4. Another evasion, with a view to the appropriation of the genealogy to *Mary*, as well as that of Wieseler, is already refuted¹ at ver. 23. See also Bleek, *Beitr.* p. 101 f.—Hence the conclusion must be maintained, that *Luke also gives the genealogy of Joseph*. But if this be so, how are we to reconcile the genealogy with that given in Matthew? It has been supposed that Joseph was *adopted* (Augustine, *de consens. evangel.* ii. 3; Wetstein, Schegg), or more usually, that he sprang from a *levirate marriage* (Julius Africanus in Eusebius, *II. E.* i. 7), so that Matthew adduces his natural father Jacob, while Luke adduces his legal father Eli (Julius Africanus, Theophylact, Euthymius

¹ That Eli was the father of *Mary* is also inferred by Delitzsch on Hebr. p. 290, who suggests that after the premature death of his father Jacob, Joseph was adopted, namely, by this Eli as his foster son, and brought up along with Mary; that thus, therefore, Eli was Joseph's *foster* father, but Mary's *actual* father. What groundless devices! And yet the passage itself is "as simple as possible until we want to force it to say what it does not say," Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 112.

Zigabenus, Augustine), or *vice versâ* (Ambrosius, Grotius, Wetstein, Schleiermacher). But what a complication this hypothesis, in itself quite arbitrary, involves! In this way Eli and Jacob must be taken to be mere *half-brothers*, because they have different fathers and forefathers! So in respect of Salathiel's mother, we must once more call in the help of a levirate marriage, and represent Neri and Jeclonia as in like manner half-brothers! In addition to this, the obligation to the levirate marriage for the half-brother is not authenticated, and the importing of the natural father into the legal genealogy was illegal; finally, we may make the general remark, that neither Matthew nor Luke adds any observation at all in citing the name of Joseph's father, to call attention to any other than the ordinary physical paternal relationship. No; the reconciliation of the two genealogical registers, although they both refer to Joseph, is impossible; but it is very natural and intelligible that, as is usual in the case of great men, whose descent in its individual steps is obscure, no anxiety was felt to investigate his ancestry until long after the death of Jesus—until the living presence of his great manifestation and ministry no longer threw into the shade this matter of subordinate interest. The genealogical industry of the Jewish Christians had collected from tradition and from written documents several registers, which, appearing independently of one another, must have given very different results, as far back as David, in consequence of the obscurity of Joseph's genealogy. The first evangelist adopted a genealogy in accordance with the David-Solomon line; but Luke adopted a totally different one, following the David-Nathan line.¹ But that Luke, as a matter of fact, rejected the genealogy of Matthew, is according to i. 3 to be regarded as a result of his later inquiries, as in general the great and irreconcilable divergence of his preliminary history from that of Matthew suggests the same conclusion. Only the motives of his decision are so completely unknown to us, that to concede to his genealogy the preference (v. Ammon, *L. J.* I. p. 179) remains unsafe, although the derivation of the Davidic descent of Jesus from the *Nathan* (therefore not the royal) line presupposes an investigation, in consequence of which the derivation of that descent through *Solomon*, which doubtless had *first* presented itself, was abandoned in the interest of *rectification* (according to Köstlin, indeed, in the *Ebionitic*

¹ This variation in the Davidic descent of the Messiah occurs also in the later Jewish theology. See Delitzsch in the *Zeitschr. f. Luth. Theol.* 1860, 3, p. 460 f.

interest, in opposition to the royal line stained with crime, and in opposition to worldly royalty in general).—As the genealogy in Matthew is arranged in accordance with a significant *numerical relation* (three times fourteen), a similar relation is also recognisable in the genealogy by Luke (eleven times seven), even although no express reference is made to it. See already Basil. M. III. p. 399 C.

CHAPTER IV.

VER. 1. εἰς τὴν ἔρημον] B D L \aleph , Sahid. codd. of It. have ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ. Approved by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. and Tisch. The *Recepta* is a mechanical alteration in accordance with the parallels. — Ver. 2. Before ἐπείνασε Elz. Scholz have ὕστερον, in opposition to B D L \aleph , vss. Cyr. Beda. From Matt. iv. 2. — Ver. 3. Following nearly the same evidence, read with Lachm. and Tisch. εἶπεν δέ instead of καὶ εἶπεν. — Ver. 4. ἀλλ' ἐπὶ παντὶ ῥήματι Θεοῦ] is wanting in B L \aleph , Sahid. Left out by Tisch. But almost all the versions and Fathers vouch for these words; if they had been *added*, they would, especially in an expression so well known and frequently quoted, have been more closely and perfectly adapted to Matthew. — Ver. 5. ὁ διάβολος] is wanting in B D L \aleph , min. Copt. Sahid. Arm. Cant. Condemned by Griesb., deleted by Tisch. An addition from Matthew. There is almost quite as strong evidence against εἰς ὄρος ὑψ., which nevertheless is found in D, but with the addition of λίαν. Lachm. has bracketed εἰς ὄρος ὑψ. Tisch. has rightly deleted it. The expression ἀναγ. by itself seemed to be in need of the more exact definition, and so it was added from Matthew. — Ver. 7. Instead of πᾶσα, Elz. has πάντα, in opposition to decisive evidence. From Matt. iv. 9. — Ver. 8. Instead of γέγραπται by itself, Elz. has: ὑπαγε ὀπίσω μου σατανᾶ· γέγραπται γάρ. So also has Scholz, but without γάρ; Lachm. has ὑπ. ὀπ. μ. σ. in brackets, and has deleted γάρ. Against ὑπ. ὀπ. μ. σ. are B D L \aleph , min. and most of the vss. Or. Vigil. Ambr. Bede; against γάρ there is decisive evidence. Both the one and the other, deleted by Tisch., are interpolations; see on Matt. iv. 10. — Ver. 9. Instead of υἱός Elz. has ὁ υἱός, in opposition to evidence so decisive that υἱός without the article is not to be derived from ver. 3. — Ver. 11. Instead of καὶ Elz. and the Edd. have καὶ ὅτι. As this ὅτι has by no means the preponderance of evidence against it, and as its omission here may be so easily accounted for by its omission in the parallel passage in Matthew, it ought not to have been condemned by Griesb. — Ver. 17. ἀναπτύξας] A B L \aleph 33, Syr. Copt. Jer. have ἀνοίξας. So Lachm.; but it is an interpretation of the word ἀναπτ., which

occurs in the New Testament only in this place. — Ver. 18. The form *ἐνεξεν* (Elz. *ἐνεξεν*) is decisively attested. Not so decisively, but still with preponderating evidence, is *ἐναγγελίσασθαι* (Elz. *ἐναγγελίζεσθαι*) also attested. — After *ἀπείσταλκέ με* Elz. and Scholz (Lachm. in brackets) have *ἰάσασθαι τοὺς συντετριμμένους τὴν καρδίαν*, which is not found in B D L Ξ S, min. Copt. Aeth. Vulg. ms. It. Sax. Or. and many Fathers. An addition from the LXX. — Ver. 23. Instead of *εἰς Καπ.* (Tisch. following B [and S]: *εἰς τὴν Καπ.*) Elz. Scholz have *ἐν τῇ Καπ.*, in opposition to B D L S, min. Marcion, the reading in these authorities being *εἰς*. An amendment. Comp. the following *ἐν τῇ πατρ. σ.* — Ver. 25. *ἐπι ἔτχ]* B D, min. vss. have merely *ἔτχ*. So Lachm. But how easily EHI would drop out as superfluous, and that too when standing before ETH, a word not unlike EPI in form! — Ver. 26. *Σιδῶνος]* A B C D L X Γ S, min. vss., including Vulg. It. Or., have *Σιδωνιάς*. Approved by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. and Tisch. From the LXX. 1 Kings xvii. 9. — Ver. 29. Before *ὀφρύος* Elz. and Lachm. (the latter by mistake) have *τῆς*, in opposition to decisive evidence. — Instead of *ὥστε* Elz. and Scholz have *εἰς τό*, in opposition to B D L S, min. Marcion, Or. An interpretation. — Ver. 35. *ἐξ]* B D L V Ξ S, min. Vulg. It. Or. have *ἀπ'*. Approved by Griesb. and Schulz. Adopted by Lachm. and Tisch. Rightly; Luke always expresses himself thus. See immediately afterwards the expression *ἐξῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ*, which is in correspondence with Christ's command. — Ver. 38. *ἐκ]* B C D L Q S, min. Or. Cant. have *ἀπ'ό*. Approved by Griesb., adopted by Tisch. Rightly; *ἐκ* is from Mark i. 29. — The article before *πειθερά* (in Elz.) has decisive evidence against it. — Ver. 40. *ἐπιθεῖς]* Lachm. and Tisch. have *ἐπιτιθεῖς*, following B D Q Ξ , min. Vulg. It. Or. *ἐπιθεῖς* was the form most familiar to the transcribers. — Ver. 41. *κράζοντα]* Lachm. Tisch. have *κραυγάζοντα*, following A D E G H Q U V Γ Δ , min. Or. Rightly; the more current word was inserted. After *ὁ εἶ* Elz. Scholz have *ὁ Χριστός*, which has such weighty evidence against it that it must be regarded as a gloss. — Ver. 42. Instead of *ἐπιζήτουν* Elz. has *ἐζήτουν*, in opposition to decisive evidence. — Ver. 43. *εἰς τοῦτο ἀπείσταλμαι]* Lachm. and Tisch. have *ἐπὶ τοῦτο ἀπεστάλην*. Rightly; *ἐπὶ* is in B L S, min., and *ἀπεστάλην* in B D L X S, min. Both the *εἰς* and the perfect form are taken from Mark i. 38, Elz.

Vv. 1–13. See on Matt. iv. 1–11. Comp. Mark i. 13. — According to the reading *ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ* (see the critical remarks), Luke says: *and He was led by the (Holy) Spirit in the wilder-*

ness, whilst *He* was for forty days tempted of the devil. Thus the Spirit had Him in His guidance as His ruling principle (Rom. viii. 14). Luke relates besides, varying from Matthew, that Jesus (1) during forty days (comp. Mark i. 13) was tempted of the devil (how? is not specified), and that then, (2) moreover, the three special temptations related in detail occurred.¹ This variation from Matthew remained also in the *Recepta εἰς τὴν ἔρημον*, in respect of which the translation would be: *He was led of the Spirit into the wilderness in order to be tempted of the devil during the space of forty days* (by reason of the present participle, see on ii. 45). — Ver. 3. τῷ λίθῳ τούτῳ] more concrete than Matt. iv. 4. — Ver. 5. ἀναγαγών] (see the critical remarks) *he led Him upwards* from the wilderness to a more loftily situated place. The “very high mountain” (Matthew) is a more exact definition due to the further developed tradition. Luke has drawn from another source. — ἐν στιγμή ἡρ.] in a point of time, in a moment, a magically simultaneous glimpse; a peculiar feature of the representation.² On the expression, comp. Plut. *Mor.* p. 104 A; Jacobs, *ad Anthol.* VII. p. 126. — Ver. 6. αὐτῶν] τῶν βασιλειῶν. — Observe the emphasis of σοὶ . . . ἐμοί . . . σύ (ver. 7). — παραδέδοται] by God, which the boastful devil cunningly intends to have taken for granted. — Ver. 10 f. ὅτι] not recitative, but: *that*, and then καὶ ὅτι: *and that*. Comp. vii. 16. Otherwise in Matt. iv. 6. — μῆποτε] *ne unquam*, not neces-

¹ According to Hilgenfeld, Luke's dependence on Matthew and Mark is said to be manifested with special clearness from his narrative of the temptation. But just in regard to this narrative he must have followed a distinct source, because otherwise his variation in the sequence of the temptations (see on Matt. iv. 5, Rem.), and the omission of the angels' ministry, would be incomprehensible (which Hilgenfeld therefore declares to be a pure invention), as, moreover, the ἄχρη καιροῦ (ver. 13) peculiar to Luke points to another source.

² The various attempts to make this ἐν στιγμή ἡρόντι intelligible may be seen in Nebe, *d. Versuch. d. Herrn*, Wetzlar 1857, p. 109 ff. The author himself, regarding the temptation as an actual external history, avails himself of the analogy of the *fatum morgani*, but says that before the eye of the Lord the magical picture immediately dissolved. But according to the connection ἐν στιγμή. ἡρ. does not mean that the appearance lasted only a single moment, but that the whole of the kingdoms were brought within the view of Jesus, not as it were successively, but in one moment, notwithstanding their varied local situation upon the whole earth. Bengel says appropriately, “*acuta tentatio*.”

sarily to be written separately (Bornemann); see rather Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* II. p. 107; Lipsius, *Gramm. Unters.* p. 129 f. — Ver. 13. πάντα πειρασμ.] every temptation, so that he had no further temptation in readiness. "Omnia tela consumsit," Bengel. — ἄχρι καιροῦ] until a fitting season, when he would appear anew against Him to tempt Him. It is to be taken *subjectively* of the purpose and idea of the devil; he thought at some later time, at some more fortunate hour, to be able with better success to approach Him. Historically he did not undertake this again directly, but indirectly, as it repeatedly occurred by means of the Pharisees, etc. (John viii. 40 ff.), and at last by means of Judas, xxii. 3¹; but with what glorious result for the tempted! Comp. John xiv. 30. The difference of meaning which Tittmann, *Synon.* p. 37, has asserted (according to which ἄχρι καιροῦ is said to be equivalent to ἕως τέλους) is pure invention. See Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* I. p. 308 f. Whether, moreover, the characteristic addition ἄχρι καιροῦ is a remnant of the primitive form of this narrative (Ewald) or is appended from *later* reflection, is an open question. But it is hardly an addition inserted by *Luke himself* (Bleek, Holtzmann, and others), since it is connected with the omission of the ministry of the angels. This omission is not to be attributed to a realistic effort on the part of Luke (Holtzmann, but see xxii. 43), but must have been a feature of the *source* used by him, and hence the ἄχρι καιροῦ must also have already formed part of it.

Ver. 14. Comp. on Matt. iv. 12; Mark i. 14. The public Galilæan ministry of Jesus begins, ver. 14 forming the introduction, after which, in ver. 15 ff., the detailed narrative follows. Schleiermacher, *Schr. d. Luk.* p. 50, arbitrarily, and contrary to the analogy of the parallels, says: that ver. 15 f.

¹ According to Wieseler, *Synopsis*, p. 201, the persecutions on the part of the Jews are meant, which had begun, John v. 15-18 ff.; there would therefore be a longer interval between vv. 13, 14. But a comparison of ver. 14 with ver. 1 shows that this interval is introduced in the harmonistic interest; moreover, Hofmann's reference to the agony in Gethsemane (*Schriftbew.* II. 1. p. 317) is introduced, since not this, but probably the whole opposition of the hierarchy (John viii. 44), and finally the crime of Judas (John xiii. 2, 27), appears as the work of the devil.

was the conclusion of a document which embraced the baptism, the genealogy, and the temptation. — ἐν τ. δυνάμ. τοῦ πν.] invested with the power of the Holy Spirit: "post victoriam corroboratus," Bengel. — καὶ φήμη κ.τ.λ.] *and rumour went forth*, etc., not anticipating what follows in ver. 15 (de Wette); but it is the rumour of the return of the man who had been so distinguished at his baptism, and had then for upwards of forty days been concealed from view, that is meant. — καθ' ὅλης κ.τ.λ.] *round about the whole neighbourhood*, Acts viii. 31, 42.

Ver. 15. Αὐτός] *He Himself*, the person as opposed to their report.

Ver. 16. As to the relation of the following incident to the similar one in Matt. xiii. 53 ff., Mark vi. 1 ff., see on Matthew. No argument can be drawn from ver. 23 against the view that the incidents are different, for therein a ministry at Capernaum would already be presupposed (Schleiermacher, Kern, de Wette, Weiss, Bleek, Holtzmann, and others), as a previous ministry in that same place in the course of a journey (not while residing there) is fully established by vv. 14, 15. According to Ewald (comp. also his *Gesch. Chr.* p. 345), who, moreover, rightly distinguishes the present from the subsequent appearance at Nazareth, there are incorporated together in Luke two distinct narratives about the discourses of Jesus in Nazareth. But with reference to the mention of Capernaum at ver. 23, see above; the connection, however, between vv. 22 and 23 is sufficiently effected by οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς Ἰωσήφ. In ver. 31 ff. it is not the first appearance of Jesus at Capernaum in general that is related, but the first portion of His ministry *after taking up His residence* there (ver. 31), and a special fact which occurred during that ministry is brought into prominence (ver. 33 ff.). According to Köstlin, p. 205, Luke met with the narrative at a later place in the Gospel history, but placed it here earlier, and allowed the γενόμε. εἰς Καφαρν. inappropriately to remain because it might at a pinch be referred to ver. 15. Assuredly he did not proceed so frivolously and awkwardly, although Holtzmann also (comp. Weizsäcker, p. 398), following Schleier-

macher, etc., accuses him of such an anticipation and self-contradiction, and, moreover, following Baur and Hilgenfeld, makes this anticipation find its motive withal in the supposed typical tendency of ver. 24. — οὗ ἦν τεθραμμ.] an observation inserted to account for the circumstances mentioned in vv. 22, 23. — κατὰ τὸ εἰωθ. αὐτῷ] refers to His visiting the synagogue on the Sabbath, not also to the ἀνέστη. The Sabbath visit to the synagogue was certainly His custom from His youth up. Comp. Bengel and Lange, *L. J.* II. 2, p. 545. — ἀνέστη ἀναγνῶναι] for the Scripture was read *standing* (Vitringa, *Synag.* p. 135 f.; Lightfoot, p. 760 f.; Wetstein *in loc.*); so when Jesus stood up it was a sign that He *wished* to read. It is true, a superintendent of the synagogue was accustomed to *summon* to the reading the person whom he regarded as being fitted for it; but in the case of Jesus, His offering Himself is as much in keeping with His peculiar pre-eminence, as is the immediate acquiescence in His application.

Ver. 17. Ἐπεδόθη] *it was given up to Him*—that is to say, by the officer of the synagogue, Lightfoot, p. 763. — Ἑσαίου] the reading of the *Parascha* (section out of the law), which preceded that of the *Haphthara* (prophetic section), appears to have been already concluded, and perhaps there was actually in the course a *Haphthara* from Isaiah.¹ But in accordance with His special character (as κύριος τοῦ σαββάτου, Matt. xii. 8), Jesus takes the section which He lights upon as soon as it is unrolled (ἀναπτ., comp. Herod. i. 48, 125), and this was a very characteristic Messianic passage, describing by very definite marks the Messiah's person and work. By ἀναπτύξας τὸ βιβλ. and εὔρε the lighting exactly on *this* passage is represented as *fortuitous*, but just on that account as being divinely ordered (according to Theophylact: not κατὰ συντυχίαν, but αὐτοῦ θελήσαντος).

Vv. 18, 19. Isa. lxi. 1, 2, following the LXX. freely. The historical meaning is: that He, the prophet, is inspired and ordained by God to announce to the deeply unfortunate people in

¹ The arrangement of the *present* Haphtharas was not yet settled at the time of Jesus. See Zunz, *Gottesd. Vorträge d. Juden*, p. 6.

their banishment their liberation from captivity, and the blessed future of the restored and glorified theocracy that shall follow thereupon. The *Messianic fulfilment* of this announcement, *i.e.* the realization of their theocratic idea, came to pass in Christ and His ministry.¹—οὐ εἵνεκεν] in the original text וְ: *because*, and to this corresponds οὐ εἵνεκεν: *propterea quod, because*, as οὐνεκεν is very frequently thus used by the classical writers. The expression of the LXX., which Luke preserves, is therefore not erroneous (de Wette and others), nor do the words οὐ εἵνεκεν introduce the protasis of a sentence whose apodosis is left out (Hofmann, *Weissag. u. Erf.* II. p. 96). The form εἵνεκεν (2 Cor. vii. 12) is, moreover, classical; it occurs in Pindar, *Isthm.* viii. 69, frequently in Herodotus (see Schweighauser, *Lex. sub. vcrb.*), Dem. 45. 11. See generally, Krüger, II. § 68. 19. 1 f.—ἐχρισε] a concrete description, borrowed from the anointing of the prophets (1 Kings xix. 16) and priests (Ex. xxviii. 41, xxx. 30), of the *consecration*, which in this instance is to be conceived of as *taking place by means of the spiritual investiture*.²—πτωχοῖς] *the poor* עֲנִיִּים. See on Matt. v. 3. They—in the original Hebrew the *unhappy* *cries*—are more precisely designated by αἰχμαλώτ., as well as by the epithets, which are to be taken in their historical sense typically, τυφλοῖς and τεθραυσμένους (*crushed to pieces*), whereby the misery of the πτωχοί is represented as a blinding and a bruising. According to the typical reference to the Messiah, these predicates refer to the *misery of the spiritual bondage*, the cessation of which the Messiah was to announce and (ἀποστεῖλαι) to accomplish. Moreover, the LXX. varies considerably from the original Hebrew (doubtless the result of a various reading which mixed with this passage the parallel in Isa. xlii. 7), and Luke again does not agree with the LXX., especially in ἀποστεῖλαι τεθραυσμ. ἐν ἀφέσει, which words are from Isa. lviii. 6, whence Luke (not Jesus, who indeed *read* from the roll of the book) or his informant relating from

¹ Comp. Schleiermacher, *L. J.* p. 270 f.

² Observe the difference of tense, ἐχρισε . . . ἀπίσταλκε: He anointed me, He hath sent me (and I am here!); also the lively *asyndeton* in the two verbs (ἀπίστ. without καί), as well as also in the three infinitives.

memory having taken them erroneously, but by an association of ideas easily explained mixed them up in this place. — *ἐνιαυτὸν κυρίου δεκτὸν*] an acceptable year of the Lord, i.e. a welcome, blessed year belonging to Jehovah, whereby is to be understood in the typical reference of the passage the *Messianic period* of blessing, while in the historical sense the blessed *future of the theocracy after the exile* is denoted by the words שְׁנַת־רִצּוֹן לַיהוָה, i.e. a year of satisfaction for Jehovah, which will be for Jehovah the time to show His satisfaction to His people (comp. ii. 14). The passage before us is strangely abused by the *Valentinians*, Clemens, *Hom.* xvii. 19, Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, and many more, to limit the ministry of Jesus to the space of *one year*,¹ which even the connection of the original text, in which a *day of vengeance* against the enemies of God's people follows, ought to have prevented. Even Wieseler, p. 272, makes an extraordinary *chronological* use of *ἐνιαυτός* and of *σήμερον*, ver. 21, in support of his assumption of a parallel with John vi. 1 ff. in regard to time, according to which the sojourn of Jesus in Nazareth is said to have fallen on the Sabbath after Purim 782. The *year* is an allusion to the *year of jubilee* (Lev. xxv. 9), as an inferior prefigurative type of the Messianic redemption. The *three infinitives* are parallel and dependent on ἀπέσταλκέ με, whose purpose they specify. — *ἐν ἀφέσει*] a well-known construction *pregnans*: so that they are now in the condition of deliverance (Polybius, i. 79. 12, xxii. 9. 17), comp. ii. 39.

Vv. 20, 21. Τῷ ὑπηρέτῃ] ὁ ὑπηρέτης, to the officer of the synagogue, who had to take the book-roll back to its place, after it had been folded up by Jesus (πτύξας corresponding to the ἀναπτύξας of ver. 17). — ἐκάθισε] in order now to teach upon the passage which had been read,—this was done sitting (Zunz,

¹ Keim also, *D. geschichtl. Chr.* p. 140 ff., has very recently arrived at this conclusion in view of Origen's statement, *de princip.* iv. 5: "a year and a few months," and that too on the ground of the calculation of the Baptist's death, according to the account of Josephus, *Antt.* xviii. 5, concerning the war of Antipas against Aretas. The testing of this combination does not belong to this place. But the Gospel of John stands decidedly opposed to the one-year duration of Christ's official teaching. See, besides, the discussions on the subject in Weizsäcker, p. 306 ff.

Gottesd. Vorträge d. Juden, p. 337). — ἤρξατο] *He began*. Bengel appropriately says: "Solenne initium." — ἐν τοῖς ὠσὶν ὑμῶν] *in your ears* is this Scripture (this which is written, see on Mark xii. 10) fulfilled—to wit, by the fact that the voice of Him of whom the prophet prophesied has entered into your ears. A concrete individualizing mode of expression. Comp. i. 44, ix. 44; Acts xi. 22; Jas. v. 4; Ecclus. xxv. 9; 1 Macc. x. 7; Bar. i. 3 f.; LXX. Isa. v. 9. How decisively the passage before us testifies in favour of the fact that from the beginning of His ministry Jesus already had the clear and certain consciousness that He was the Messiah!¹ Moreover, that nothing but the *theme* of the discourse delivered by Jesus is here given is manifest from the passage itself, as well as from ver. 22; but He has placed it remarkably close to the beginning of His discourse, and so led the hearer all at once *in medium rem* (comp. Zunz, as above, p. 353). Grotius well says: "Hoc exordio usus Jesus explicavit prophetæ locum et explicando implevit."

Ver. 22. Ἐμαρτύρ. αὐτῷ] *testified in His behalf*, praising Him. See Kypke, Loesner, and Krebs. Frequently in the Acts, Rom. x. 2, Gal. iv. 15, and elsewhere. — ἐπὶ τοῖς λόγοις τῆς χάριτος] *at the sayings of graciousness* (genitivus qualitatis), comp. on Col. iv. 6; Hom. *Od.* viii. 175: χάρις ἀμφιπεριστέφεται ἐπέεσσιν; Ecclus. xxi. 16, xxxvii. 21. — καὶ ἔλεγον] *not: at nonnulli dicebant*, Kuinoel, Paulus, and older commentators; but their amazement, which ought to have been expressed simply at the matter of fact, showed itself, after the fashion of the Abderites, from the background of a limited regard for the person with whom they knew that these λόγοις τ. χάριτος did not correspond. — ὁ υἱὸς Ἰωσήφ] If Luke had intended to anticipate the later history of Matt. xiii. and Mark vi., for what purpose would he have omitted the brothers and sisters?

Vv. 23, 24. Whether what follows, as far as ver. 27, is taken from the *Logia* (Ewald), or from some other written source (Köstlin), or from oral tradition (Holtzmann), cannot be determined. But the *Logia* offers itself most obviously as the source. — πάντως] *certainly*; a certainty that this would

¹ Comp. Beyschlag, *Christ. d. N. T.* p. 36 f.

be the case. See on 1 Cor. ix. 10. — *ἰατρέ κ.τ.λ.*] a figurative proverb (*παραβολή*, *לְפָנֶיךָ*) that occurs also among the Greeks, the Romans, and the Rabbins. See Wetstein and Lightfoot. The meaning here is: *If thou desirest to be a helper of others* (vv. 18, 19, 21), *first help thyself from the malady under which thou art suffering, from the want of consideration and esteem which attaches to thee*; which healing of Himself, as they think, must be effected by means of miracle as a sign of divine attestation. See what follows. Others understand it: *Help thine own fellow-townsmen* (Theophylact, Euthymius Zigabenus, Calvin, Maldonatus, Grotius, Bengel, and others, also Paulus, de Wette, Schegg, Bisping). This is opposed to the meaning of the words, as *σεαυτὸν* and *ἰατρέ* can only be one person. Moreover, the parabolic word concerning the physician is retained only in Luke, whom it might specially interest. — *εἰς Καφαρναούμ*] (the name is to be written thus in Luke also, with Lachmann and Tischendorf) indicates the *direction* of *γενόμενα*, which took place at *Capernaum* (Bernhardy, p. 220), comp. on xxviii. 6. The petty jealousy felt by the small towns against Capernaum is manifest here. — *ὧδε ἐν τῇ πατρ. σου*] *here in thy birth-place*. After the adverb of place comes the place itself, by way of a more vivid designation. Bornemann, *Schol.* p. 34; Fritzsche, *ad Marc.* p. 22. — Ver. 24. But the hindrance to the fulfilment of that *παραβολή*, and also to the working here as at Capernaum, is found in the fact that no prophet, etc. According to this, it is unfounded for Baur, *Evang.* p. 506, to assume that the writer here understood *πατρίς* in a wider reference,¹ so that Paul's experience in the Acts of the Apostles—of being compelled, when rejected by the Jews, to turn to the Gentiles—had already had its precedent here in the history of Jesus Himself. That the whole section—to wit, from *καὶ φήμῃ*, ver. 14, to ver. 30—is an interpolation from the hand of the redactor, is asserted by

¹ Comp. Hilgenfeld, *Evang.* p. 168, "the Jewish home of Christianity;" Holtzmann also, p. 214. Whether in general Luke looked on the rejection of Christ in Nazareth as a "significant prelude for the rejection of Christ by His whole people" (Weiss in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1861, p. 697), cannot be decided at all, as he gives no hint on the subject.

Baur, *Markusevang.* p. 218. — εἴπε δέ] after ver. 23 let a significant pause be supposed.

Vv. 25, 26. In order, however, to quote to you *historical examples*, in which the miraculous power of the prophets was put forth, not for countrymen, but for *strangers*, nay, for Gentiles, I assure you, etc. Jesus knew that here this sternness and open decisiveness on His part were not at all out of place, and that He need not hope to win His hearers; this is only confirmed by the later similar incident in Matt. xiii. 54 ff. — ἐπὶ ἑτῇ τρία κ. μῆνας ἔξ] so also Jas. v. 17. But according to 1 Kings xvii. 1, xviii. 1, the rain returned *in the third year*. Jesus, as also James (see Huther *in loc.*), follows, according to Luke, the *Jewish tradition* (Jalkut Schimoni on 1 Kings xvi. in *Surenhusius*, καταλλ. p. 681), in which in general the number $3\frac{1}{2}$ ($= \frac{1}{2}$ of 7) in the measurement of time (especially a time of misfortune, according to Dan. xii. 7) had become time-honoured (Lightfoot, p. 756, 950; Otto, *Spicileg.* p. 142). It was arbitrary and unsatisfactory to reckon (before 1 Kings xvii. 1), in addition to the three years, the naturally rainless six months *preceding* the rainy season (Benson on Jas. v. 17; Wetstein, Wiesinger, and others; comp. also Lange, II. p. 547 f.), or to date the third year (Beza, Olshausen, Schegg) from the flight of Elias to Sarepta (1 Kings xvii. 9). — πᾶσαν τ. γῆν] not the whole *region* (Beza), but the whole *earth*; popularly hyperbolical.—On Sarepta, situated between Tyre and Sidon, and belonging to the territory of the latter, now the village of Surafend, see Robinson, *Palestine*, III. p. 690 ff. — Σιδῶνος] the name of the *town* of Sidon, as that in whose territory Sarepta lay. — μέγας] in xv. 14 λιμός is *feminine*, as it passed over from the Doric into the κοινή (Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 188). But in this place the reading μεγάλη, approved by Valckenaer, is so weakly attested that it cannot be thought of. — εἰ μὴ] not *sed* (Beza, Kuinoel), but *nisi*; see on Matt. xii. 4

Ver. 27. See 2 Kings v. 14. — ἐπὶ] *at the time*, iii. 2.

Ver. 29. Ἐως ὀφρύος τοῦ ὄρους] *up to the lofty brink (supercilium) of the hill*. See Duncan, *Lex. Hom.*, ed. Rost,

p. 877, and Wetstein. This situation of Nazareth *upon a hill* (ἐφ' οὗ), *i.e. hard by a hill*, is still entirely in accordance with its present position,—“the houses stand on the lower part of the slope of the western hill, which rises steep and high above them,” Robinson, *Pal.* III. p. 419. Especially near the present Maronite church the mountain wall descends right down from forty to fifty feet,¹ Robinson, *l.c.* p. 423; Ritter, *Erdk.* XVI. p. 744. — ὥστε] of what, as they figured to themselves the result was to be. See on Matt. xxiv. 24, xxvii. 1; comp. Luke ix. 52, xx. 20. — κατακρημν.] 2 Chron. xxv. 12; Dem. 446. 11; Josephus, *Antt.* ix. 9. 1.

Ver. 30. Αὐτὸς δέ] *But He, on His part*, while they thus dealt with Him. — διὰ μέσου] *emphatically: passed through the midst of them.* According to Paulus, it was sufficient for this, “that a man of the look and mien of Jesus should turn round with determination in the face of such a *mobile vulgus.*” Comp. Lange, *L. J.* II. p. 548: “an effect of His personal majesty;” and III. p. 376: “a mysterious something in His nature.” Comp. Bleek. According to Schenkel, the whole attempt on the person of Jesus is only a later tradition. On the other hand, the old commentators have: φρουρούμενος τῇ ἡνωμένῃ αὐτῷ θεότητι, Euthymius Zigabenus; comp. Ambrosius, in addition to which it has been further supposed that *He became invisible* (Grotius and others). The latter view is altogether inappropriate, if only on account of διὰ μέσου αὐτ. But certainly there is implied a restraint of his enemies which was *miraculous* and dependent on the will of Jesus. It is otherwise in John viii. 59 (ἐκρύβη). *Why* Jesus did not surrender Himself is rightly pointed out by Theophylact: οὐ τὸ παθεῖν φεύγων, ἀλλὰ τὸν καιρὸν ἀναμένων. — ἐπορεύετο] *went on*, that is to say, towards Capernaum, ver. 31, and therefore not back again to Nazareth as has been harmonistically pretended.

Vv. 31–37. See on Mark i. 21–28, whom Luke with some slight variations follows. — κατήλθεν] *Down from Nazareth,*

¹ The place which is pointed out by tradition as the spot in question is at too great a distance from the town. See Robinson, *l.c.*, and Korte, *Reisen*, p. 215 ff.

which lay higher up, to Capernaum, which was situated on the shore. Comp. Matt. iv. 13. — πόλιν τ. Γαλιλ.] for here Capernaum occurs for the first time in Luke *in the course of the history* (it is otherwise at ver. 23). — ἦν διδάσκ.] expresses the *constant* occupation of teaching *on the Sabbaths* (otherwise in Mark), comp. on Matt. vii. 29. — Ver. 33. πνεῦμα δαιμονίου ἀκαθάρτου] The genitive is a genitive of apposition or of nearer definition (Winer, p. 470 [E. T. 666-7]); and δαιμόνιον, which, according to Greek usage, is in itself applicable to either good or evil spirits, being used by Luke *for the first time* in this passage, is qualified by ἀκαθάρτου. — ἔα] not the imperative of ἐάω (Vulg.: *sine*; Euthymius Zigabenus, *ad Marc.* ἄφες ἡμᾶς, comp. Syr.), but “interjectio admirationis metu mixtae” (Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* I. p. 465): *ha!* Plato, *Prot.* p. 314 D. Seldom occurring elsewhere in prose, even in the New Testament only in this place (not Mark i. 24). See Fritzsche, *ad Marc.* p. 32 f., who, nevertheless, traces back the *origin* of the expression to the imperative form. — ἦλθες κ.τ.λ.] not interrogatively. The words themselves are simply taken from Mark; all the less therefore is any hint to be read into them of the redeeming ministry of Jesus to the Gentile world (Baur, *Evang.* p. 429 f.). — Ver. 35. ῥίψαν] is to be accented thus. See Bornemann, p. 4; comp., nevertheless, Lipsius, *Gramm. Unters.* p. 31 ff. — εἰς μέσον] *He threw him down into the midst* in the synagogue. The article *might*, but *must not*, be added. See the instances from Homer in Duncan, ed. Rost; Krüger, *ad Xen. Anab.* i. 8. 15. Observe, moreover, that here Luke describes more vividly than Mark, although his description is too unimportant “to glorify the miracle” (Holtzmann). — Ver. 36. τίς ὁ λόγος οὗτος] not: *quid hoc rei est?* (Beza, Er. Schmid, Grotius, Kuinoel, de Wette); but: *what sort of a speech is this?* to wit, that which is related in ver. 35; comp. Theophylact: τίς ἡ πρόσταξις αὕτη ἣν προστάσσει, ὅτι ἐξελθε ἐξ αὐτοῦ καὶ φημώθητι. It is otherwise at ver. 32, where λόγος is the discourse which *teaches*; here, the speech which *commands*. Mark i. 27 has, moreover, given the former particular (the διδασχῇ) here again as the object of the people’s astonishment

and conference; but Luke, working after him, *distinguishes* the two, using for both, indeed, the general expression λόγος, but clearly limiting this expression in ver. 32 by διδασχή, and in ver. 36 by ἐπιτάσσει. Baur decides otherwise in the *Theol. Jahrb.* 1853, p. 70. — ὅτι] *since he, etc., accounts for* this question asked in astonishment. — ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ κ. δυνάμ.] *with authority and power.* The former is the *authority* which He possesses, the latter the *power* which He brings into operation. — Ver. 37. ἦχος] *noise* (Acts ii. 2; Heb. xii. 19), a stronger expression for *rumour*. The classical writers use ἦχώ thus (Herod. ix. 24; Pind. *Ol.* xiv. 29).

Vv. 38–41. See on Matt. viii. 14–16; Mark i. 29–34. Matthew places the narrative later, not till after the Sermon on the Mount.¹ — ἀπὸ τῆς συναγωγῆς] He went from the synagogue into the house of Simon. The article before πενθερά is not needed. Winer, p. 108 f. [E. T. 148 ff.]. Luke, the physician, uses the *technical* expression for violent fever-heat: πυρετὸς μέγας (the opposite: μικρός). See Galen, *De diff. febr.* 1, in Wetstein. — ἠρώτησαν] *they asked*; Peter, to wit, and the members of the family,—hence it is not the plural introduced here without reason only from Mark i. 30 (Weiss). — ἐπάνω αὐτῆς] so that He was bending over her. — ἐπετίμ. τῷ πυρετῷ] the fever regarded as a hostile power, and as personal. Mark, whom Matthew follows, has not this detail; whereas both have the touching with the hand. A divergence in the tradition as to the miraculous method of cure. — αὐτοῖς] refers to Jesus, Simon, and the other members of the family. Comp. ἠρώτησαν, ver. 38. — Ver. 40. ἀσθενοῦντας νόσοις] according to Matthew, *demoniacs* and sick persons (comp. Mark), with which Luke nevertheless also agrees at ver. 41.² — τὰς χεῖρας ἐπιτιθεῖς] Matthew has λόγῳ, with

¹ The arrangement in Luke, so far as he places (ch. v.) the call of Peter later, is in any case *not arbitrarily produced*, although he follows the tradition which (as Matthew) does not include the companionship of James and John (so Mark).

² All three also agree essentially as to the time of day (δύνοντας τοῦ ἡλίου). *Until the evening Jesus had remained in the house of Simon*, therefore the sick were first brought to Him there. Thus it was neither with a view to avoiding the heat of the sun, nor to choosing, from "delicacy of feeling," as Lange supposes, the twilight for the public exhibition of infirmities.

reference, however, to the demoniacs. In ἐνὶ ἐκάστῳ, which need not be pressed (Weiss, Holtzmann), are implied the solicitude and the indefatigableness of this miraculous ministry of love. — λαλεῖν, ὅτι] *to speak, because.* See on Mark i. 34.

Vv. 42-44. See on Mark i. 35-39, who is more precise and more vivid. — The bringing of so many sick folks to Him, ver. 40, is to be explained, not by this hasty departure, the appointment of which had been known (Schleiermacher), but, in accordance with the text (ver. 37), by the fame which the public healing of the demoniac in the synagogue had brought Him. — ἕως αὐτοῦ] not simply: *to Him*, but: *even up to Him*, they came in their search, which therefore they did not discontinue until they found Him. Comp. 1 Macc. iii. 26; Acts ix. 38, xxiii. 23. — εἰς τοῦτο] namely, to announce not only here, but everywhere throughout the land, the kingdom of God. — ἀπέσταλμαι] It is otherwise in Mark i. 36, whose expression is original, but had already acquired in the tradition that Luke here follows a doctrinal development with a higher meaning.

CHAPTER V.

VER. 2. The MSS. have ἀπέπλυναν (so Elz. Scholz), ἐπλυναν, ἐπλυνον, ἀπέπλυνον. Tisch. has the second reading, Lachm. the third. The preponderance of evidence wavers between ἐπλυνον (B D) and ἐπλυναν (C* L Q X 8), and excludes the compound form. But since, according to this, even the MSS. which read the *Recepta* (A E F G, etc.) add to the evidence in favour of ἐπλυνΑΝ, this form receives the critical preponderance. The compound form is either a mere clerical error (as Ev. 7 has even ἐπέπλυναν), or a gloss for the sake of more precise specification. — Ver. 6. πλῆθος ἰζυδίων] So Griesb. Matth. Scholz, Tisch., following the greater number of the Uncials, but not B D, which have ἰζυδίων πλῆθος, which Lachm. has again restored. Comp. Vulg. and codd. of It. The reading of Griesb. is to be preferred on account of its preponderating evidence, and still more because the words πλῆθος ποῖός would more readily be brought together by the transcribers than separated. — Ver. 15. As ἐπ' αὐτοῦ is wanting in important authorities, in others stands after ἀκούειν, and A has ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, it is rightly condemned by Griesb., struck out by Lachm. and Tisch. An addition by way of gloss. — Ver. 17. ἐλθὺν δότε] Lachm. has σπειλῶν, following only A* D, min. Goth. Vere. — αὐτοῦ] Tisch. has αὐτῶ, following B L 8. Rightly; αὐτοῦ arose from a misunderstanding, because an accusative of the object appeared necessary. — Ver. 19. ποία] Elz. has ὡς ποία, in opposition to decisive evidence. An interpretation. — Ver. 21. With Lachm. and Tisch. read ἀμαρτίας ἀφεῖναι, according to B D L 8, Cyr. Ambr. The *Recepta* is from Mark ii. 7. But in ver. 24 the form ἀφείλαι (Tisch.) is too weakly attested [Tisch. 8 has ἀφείλαι]. — Ver. 22. The omission of ἀποζηρῶ. (Lachm.) is too feebly accredited. — Ver. 24. παραλυσμένη] Lachm. has παραλυτικῶ, following important authorities, but it is taken from the parallels. — Ver. 25. Instead of ἐφ' ᾧ, Elz. Scholz, Lachm. have ἐφ' ᾧ. But the former has a preponderance of evidence in its favour, and ᾧ more naturally occurred to the transcribers. — Ver. 28. ἡκολούθησεν] Lachm. and Tisch. have ἡκολούθει, following

B D L \equiv 69. The *Recepta* is taken from the parallels. — Ver. 29. Before $\Delta\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ (Tisch. has on very good authority $\Delta\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\varsigma$) the article (Elz.) is on decisive evidence deleted. — Ver. 30. $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\acute{\nu}$] is wanting in D F X \aleph , min. vss., and is regarded with suspicion by Griesb., but it was omitted as being superfluous and apparently irrelevant. The arrangement $\epsilon\iota$ $\Phi\alpha\rho\iota\varsigma$. κ . $\epsilon\iota$ $\gamma\rho$. $\alpha\upsilon\tau$. is, with Lachm. and Tisch., to be adopted in accordance with B C D L \aleph , min. Vulg. It. and others. The *Recepta* is taken from Mark ii. 16. The article before $\tau\epsilon\lambda\omega\nu\omega\nu$, which is not found in Elz., is adopted on decisive evidence by Griesb. Scholz, Lachm. Tisch. $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\rho\tau$., also, is so decisively attested that it is now rightly defended even by Tisch. — Ver. 33. $\delta\acute{\alpha}$ $\tau\acute{\iota}$] is wanting in B L Ξ , 33, 157, Copt.; deleted by Tisch. An addition from the parallels. — Ver. 36. $\imath\mu\alpha\tau\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ $\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\upsilon$] B D L X Ξ \aleph , min. vss. have $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron$ $\imath\mu\alpha\tau\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ $\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\upsilon$ $\sigma\chi\acute{\iota}\varsigma\alpha\varsigma$ (yet $\sigma\chi\acute{\iota}\varsigma\alpha\varsigma$ is not found in X, and also otherwise too weakly attested). Recommended by Griesb., adopted by Tisch. But it is manifestly a gloss inserted for explaining the genitive, for which there appeared a reason in this place although not in the parallels. — $\sigma\chi\acute{\iota}\varsigma\epsilon\iota$ is well attested by B C D L X \aleph , min., and $\sigma\upsilon\mu\phi\omega\nu\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\iota$ still better (by the additional evidence of A). Approved by Schulz, adopted by Lachm. and Tisch. Rightly; $\sigma\chi\acute{\iota}\varsigma\epsilon\iota$ occurred at once in consequence of the preceding $\epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}\beta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota$ and of $\alpha\acute{\gamma}\rho\epsilon\iota$ in the parallels, and then drew after it $\sigma\upsilon\mu\phi\omega\nu\acute{\epsilon}\iota$. — Elz. has $\epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}\beta\lambda\eta\mu\alpha$ $\tau\omicron$ $\acute{\alpha}$. τ . κ . So also Scholz, Lachm. Tisch. But with Griesb. and Rinck $\epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}\beta\lambda\eta\mu\alpha$ is to be condemned, as it is wanting in A E F K M R S U V r Δ , min. Goth. Slav. Theophyl.; in D it stands after $\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\upsilon$, and betrays itself as a gloss added to the absolute $\tau\acute{\alpha}$. — Ver. 38. $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\acute{\alpha}\mu\phi$. $\sigma\upsilon\nu\tau\eta\rho$.] is wanting in B L \aleph , min. Copt. Suspected by Griesb., deleted by Tisch. An addition from Matt. ix. 17, from which passage also Mark ii. 22 has been expanded. — Ver. 39. $\epsilon\upsilon\theta\acute{\epsilon}\omega\varsigma$] is wanting in B C* L \aleph , min. Copt. Arm. Aeth. Deleted by Tisch. An addition for more precise specification.

Vv. 1-11. Matt. iv. 18-22 and Mark i. 16-20 are parallel passages. Nevertheless, the history of the calling in Luke, as compared with it in Matthew and Mark, is *essentially different*, for in these latter the *point* of the incident is *the mere summons and promise* (without the miracle, which, without altering the *nature* of the event, they could not have passed over; in opposition to Ebrard and others); in Luke it is the *miracle of the draught of fishes*

Moreover, in Matthew and Mark no previous acquaintance on the part of Jesus with Peter is presupposed, although, probably, it is in Luke iv. 38 ff., whereby, at the same time, Luke falls into self-contradiction, since v. 8 does not allow it to be supposed that such miraculous experiences have previously occurred to him as, according to iv. 38 ff., Peter had already had in connection with Jesus. Luke follows a source of later and more plastic tradition (in opposition to Schleiermacher, Sieffert, Neander, v. Ammon, who ascribe to Luke the merit of being the earliest), which, fastening in pursuit of symbolic meaning upon the promise in ver. 10 (Matt. iv. 19; Mark i. 17), glorified the story of the call of the fishermen by joining to it a similar story of the draught of fishes, John xxi. (comp. Ewald, *Gesch. Chr.* p. 288); but in the historical sequence after iv. 38 ff. Luke has become confused. — καὶ αὐτός] not: *he also*, but: *and he*; *he on his part*, in respect of this pressing (ἐπικεῖσθαι) of the people upon him. Comp. on vv. 15, 17; as to καί after ἐγένετο, see on ver. 12. — ἐπλυναν] “ut peracto opere,” Bengel; see ver. 5. — Ver. 4. ἐπανάγαγε, the special word for going out into the deep sea (Xen. *Hell.* vi. 2. 28; 2 Macc. xii. 4); the *singular* in reference to Peter alone, who was the steersman of the craft; but χαλάσατε in reference to the whole fisher company in the vessel. Changes of number, to be similarly accounted for by the connection, are often found in the classical writers. See Bornemann, *Schol.* p. 35 f.; Kühner, *ad Xen. Anab.* i. 2. 27. — Ver. 5. ἐπιστάτα] *Superintendent* (see in general, Gatacker, *Op. posth.* p. 877 ff., and Kypke, I. p. 228) occurs only in Luke in the New Testament, and that, too, always addressed to Jesus, while he has not the ῥαββί which is so frequent in the other evangelists. Peter does not yet address Him thus as *his* doctrinal chief, but generally (vv. 1, 3). Comp. xvii. 13. — νυκτός] when fishing was accustomed to be carried on successfully. See Aristotle, *H. A.* viii. 19; Heindorf, *ad Plat. Soph.* p. 287. — ἐπί] of the reason: *for the sake of Thy word* (on the ground of Thy word). Comp. Winer, p. 351 [E. T. 491]: “Senserat Petrus virtutem verborum Jesu,” Bengel. Οὕτως ἦν τὴν

πίστιν θερμὸς καὶ πρὸ τῆς πίστεως, Theophylact. — χαλίσω] Simon speaks thus in his capacity of captain. Comp. afterwards ποιήσαντες. — Ver. 6. διερρήγνυτο] The tearing asunder¹ actually began, but was only beginning. See on i. 59. The assistance for which they signalled prevented further damage. The subsequent phrase ὥστε βυθίζεσθαι is similar. Hence there is no *exaggeration* (Valckenaer, de Wette). — Ver. 7. κατένευσαν] *they made signs to*, according to Euthymius Zigabenus: μὴ δυνάμενοι λαλῆσαι ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκπλήξεως κ. τοῦ φόβου. So also Theophylact. This would have needed to be said. In the whole incident nothing more is implied than that the other craft still lying close to the shore, ver. 2, was too *far away* for the sound of the voice to reach, and hence they were restricted to making signs, which, moreover, for the fishermen of the other boat—who, according to ver. 4, were doubtless eagerly giving attention—was quite sufficient. As to συλλαβ., see on Phil. iv. 3. — Ver. 8. On προσέπεσε τ. γόνασι, comp. Soph. *O. C.* 1604. It might also be put in the *accusative* (Eur. *Hec.* 339, and thereon Pflugk). — ἔξελθε] *out of the ship*. He dimly recognises in Christ a something superhuman, the manifestation of a holy divine power, and in the consciousness of his own sinful nature he is terrified in the presence of this power which may, perchance, cause some misfortune to befall him; just as men feared the like on the appearances of God or of angels. Comp. 1 Kings xvii. 18. Euthymius Zigabenus and Grotius *in loc.* Elsner and Valckenaer are mistaken in saying that Peter speaks thus in accordance with the notion that one ought not to stay on board a ship with any *criminal* (Cic. *De Nat. Deor.* iii. 37; Diog. Laert. i. 86; Horat. *Od.* iii. 2. 26 ff.). He does not indeed avow himself a *criminal*, but only as a *sinful man in general*, who as such cannot without risk continue in the presence of this θεῖος καὶ ὑπερφυῆς ἄνθρωπος (Euthymius

¹ Augustine has interpreted this tearing of the nets allegorically of the *heresies*, and the Saxon Anonymus (p. 212 f.) of *Judaism and the law*; both interpretations being equally arbitrary. There is much allegorical interpretation of the whole narrative in the Fathers (the ship, the church; the net, the doctrine; the sea, the heathen world, etc.).

Zigabenus). See the later exaggeration of the sinfulness of the apostles before their call, in Barnabas 5. — Ver. 9. ἄγρᾱ] in this place is not *the draught*, as at ver. 4, but *that which was caught* (τὸ θηρώμενον, Pol. v. 1), as Xen. *De Venat.* xii. 3, xiii. 13, and frequently. — Ver. 10. This mention of James and John at the end is one of the traces that the narrative grew out of the older history of the call. But certainly *Andrew* was not found in the source from which Luke drew. — ἀνθρώπους] instead of fishes. — ζωγρῶν] *vivos capiens* — in *characteristic* keeping with this *ethical* draught (winning for the Messiah's kingdom), as well as with the figure taken from fishermen (Aristaen. *Ep.* ii. 23).

Vv. 12-14. See on Matt. viii. 1-4; Mark i. 40-44. According to Matthew, immediately after the Sermon on the Mount; in Luke (comp. Mark), without any definite statement of place or time, as a fragment of the evangelic tradition. — ἐγένετο . . . καὶ] as ii. 15; Matt. ix. 10. Καὶ is not *nempe* (Fritzsche, *ad Matth.* p. 341), but, in accordance with Hebraic simplicity, the *and*, which, after the preparatory and yet indefinite ἐγένετο, leads the narrative farther on. The narrator, by means of ἐγένετο together with a note of time, first calls attention to the introduction of *a fact*, and then, in violation of ordinary syntax, he brings in afterwards *what* occurred by the word καὶ. — ἐν μιᾷ τ. πόλ.] according to Mark: in a house. — πλήρης] a high degree of the sickness. — Ver. 14. καὶ αὐτός] *and He*, on His part. — ἀπελθὼν κ.τ.λ.] a transition to the *oratio directa*. See on Mark vi. 8.

Vv. 15, 16. Comp. Mark i. 45. — διήρχετο] The report ran throughout, was spread abroad. So absolutely, Thuc. vi. 46: ἐπειδὴ διήλθεν ὁ λόγος, ὅτι κ.τ.λ.; Soph. *Aj.* 978; Xen. *Anab.* i. 4. 7; Plat. *Ep.* vii. p. 348 B. — μᾶλλ.] in a still higher degree than before; *only all the more*. Comp. xviii. 39. See Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Ap.* p. 30 A; Nägelsbach on the *Iliad*, ed. 3, p. 227. — αὐτός] *He*, however, *He* on his part, in contrast with the multitudes who were longing for Him. — ἦν ὑποχωρῶν ἐν τοῖς ἐρημ.] i.e. *He* was engaged in withdrawing Himself into the desert regions (that were there), and in praying, so that *He* was therefore for the present inaccessible. — καὶ

προσευχόμενος] This detail is given on several occasions by Luke alone. See iii. 21, vi. 12 f., ix. 18, 29, and elsewhere.

Vv. 17-26. See on Matt. ix. 1-8; Mark ii. 1-12. Between this and the foregoing history Matthew has a series of other transactions, the sequence of which he accurately indicates. Luke vaguely says: ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμέρων, which, however, specifies *approximately* the time by means of the connection ("on one of those days," namely, on the journey entered upon at iv. 43 f.). Comp. viii. 22.—καὶ αὐτός] and He, as ver. 1, but here in opposition to the Pharisees, etc., who were surrounding Him.—ἐκ πάσης κώμης κ.τ.λ.] popularly hyperbolic. As to νομοδιδάσκ., see on Matt. xxii. 35.—δύναμις κυρίου κ.τ.λ.] and the *power of the Lord* (of God) *was there* (*præsto erat*, as at Mark viii. 1) *in aid of His healing*. So according to the reading αὐτόν (see the critical remarks). According to the reading αὐτούς, this would have to be taken as a vague designation of the sufferers who were present, referring back to ver. 15; αὐτόν is the *subject*, αὐτούς would be the *object*. Others, as Olshausen and Ewald, have incorrectly referred κυρίου to *Jesus*, whose healing power was stirred up (vi. 19). Wherever Luke in his Gospel calls Christ the Lord, and that, as would here be the case, *in narrative*, he always writes ὁ κύριος with the article. See vii. 13 (31), x. 1, xi. 39, xii. 42, xiii. 15, xvii. 5, 6, xviii. 6, xix. 8, xxii. 31, 61.—In the following narrative the precedence of Mark is indeed to be recognised, but the tracing out of the features of dependence must not be carried too far (in opposition to Weiss in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1861, p. 703 f.).—Ver. 19. εἰσενέγκ.] *into the house*, where Jesus and His hearers (ver. 17) were. Comp. afterwards τὸ δῶμα.—ποίας] qualitative: *in what kind of a way*. On the ὁδοῦ, which must be supplied in analysing the passage, see Bos, *Ellips.*, ed. Schaefer, p. 333; on the genitive of place (comp. xix. 4), see Bernhardt, p. 138; Krüger on Thucyd. iv. 47. 2. Accordingly, although no instance of ποίας and ἐκείνης used absolutely occurs elsewhere, yet the conjecture ποία and ἐκείνη (Bornemann) is not authorized.—διὰ τῶν κεράμων] *through the tiles*, with which the flat roof was

covered, and which they removed from the place in question. Mark ii. 4 describes the proceeding more vividly. See the details, *sub loco*, and Hug, *Gutacht*. II. p. 21 f. — Ver. 21. ἤρξαντο] a bringing into prominence of the *point of commencement* of these presumptuous thoughts. A vivid description. — διαλογίζεσθαι . . . λέγοντες] See on Matt. xvi. 7. They expressed their thoughts *to one another*; hence ver. 22 is not inappropriate (in opposition to Weiss). — Ver. 24. εἶπε τῷ παραλελ.] is not to be put in parenthesis, but see on Matt. ix. 6. — σοί] placed first for the sake of emphasis. — Ver. 25. ἄρας ἐφ' ὃ κατέκειτο] he took up *that on which* (till now) *he lay*, an expression purposely chosen to bring out the changed relation. With reference to ἐφ' ὃ, *on which he was stretched out*, comp. the frequent εἶναι ἐπὶ χθόνα, and the like. See in general, Kühner, § 622 b. — Ver. 26. The narrative is *summary*, but *without precision*, since the impression said to be produced by the miraculous incident (τὰ παρὰ δόξαν γυγνόμενα, Polyb. ix. 16. 2. Comp. Wisd. xvi. 17, xix. 5; 2 Macc. ix. 24; Xen. *Cyr.* vii. 2, 16) applies indeed to the people present (Matt. ix. 8), but not to the Pharisees and scribes.

Vv. 27–39. See on Matt. ix. 9–17; Mark ii. 13–22. — ἐξῆλθε] out of the house, ver. 19. — ἐθεάσατο] He looked at him observingly. — Ver. 28. The order of events is: *after he had forsaken all, he rose up and followed Him*. The imperfect (see the critical remarks) is used for the sake of vividness. ἅπαντα, as in ver. 11, refers to the whole previous occupation and position in life. Bengel well adds: “quo ipso tamen non desiit domus esse sua,” ver. 29. — Ver. 29. καὶ ἦν] *et aderat*, as in ver. 17. — Ver. 30. αὐτῶν] *of the dwellers in the town*. — πρὸς] an antagonistic direction. — Ver. 33. οἱ δὲ εἶπον] As to this variation from Matthew and Mark, see on Matt. ix. 17, Remark. On the association of *fasting and making prayers*, comp. ii. 37, and on ποιεῖσθαι δεήσεις, 1 Tim. ii. 1. — ἐσθ. κ. πίνουσιν] the same thing as οὐ νηστεύουσιν in the parallels, but more strongly expressed. In accordance with the deletion of διατί (see the critical remarks), there remains no *question*, but an *affirmative reflection*. — Ver. 34. μὴ δύνασθε κ.τ.λ.]

ye cannot, etc., brings out the inappropriateness of that reflection in a more concrete form than in Matthew and Mark. — Ver. 35. *καί*] *might* be taken explicatively (*and indeed*) (Bornemann, Bleek). But it is more in keeping with the profound emotion of the discourse to take ἐλεύσονται κ.τ.λ. by itself as a thought broken off, and *καί* in the sense of: *and: But days shall come* (and not tarry) . . . *and when shall be taken away*, etc. — ἐν ἐκείν. ταῖς ἡμέρ.] a painful solemnity of expression, whereby the emphasis is laid upon ἐκείναις. Comp. on Mark ii. 20. — Ver. 36. ἐπίβλημα ἱματ. καινοῦ] *i.e.* a patch cut off from a new garment. By the use of ἱματίου the incongruity of the proceeding comes still more strongly into prominence than by ῥάκους, which is used in Matthew and Mark. An unintentional modification of the tradition—not an alteration proceeding from the Paulinism of the writer, and directed against the syncretism of the Jewish Christians, as Köstlin, p. 174, ingeniously maintains. Even Lange explains the expression by supposing that there floated already before the mind of the Pauline Luke a clearer vision of the Christian community as distinct from Judaism (*L. J.* III. p. 395). — καὶ τὸ καινὸν σχίσει καὶ κ.τ.λ.] comprises the *twofold* mischief which will ensue (*future*, see the critical remarks) if one does not obey that principle taken from experience; *He will not only cut the new (garment) in twain* (in taking off the piece), *but, moreover, the (piece) of the new (garment) will not be in keeping with the old (garment)*. Comp. Kypke, Paulus, de Wette, Bleek, Schegg, even as early as Erasmus. On σχίσει, comp. John xix. 24; Isa. xxxvii. 1. But *usually* τὸ καινόν is explained as the subject, and either σχίσει is taken intransitively (“*scindet se a veteri*,” Bengel), or τὸ παλαιὸν ἱμάτιον is regarded as its object: *the new piece will rend asunder the old garment* (comp. Kuinoel). Incorrectly; since this supplying of the object is not required by the context, but is obtruded for the sake of the harmony with Matt. ix. 16, Mark ii. 21, and τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦ καινοῦ (it is not τὸ καινόν) clearly shows that even to τὸ καινόν we are to understand only ἱμάτιον, not ἐπίβλημα; and, moreover, τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦ καινοῦ would be altogether superfluous and clumsy. — Ver. 39. Peculiar to

Luke; but it is as little to be explained as resulting from later reflection on the difficulty of the mission to the Jews (Weizsäcker), as is the emphasis laid upon the incompatibility of the two, ver. 36. As Jesus in vv. 36-38 made it manifest how unsuitable and injurious it would be to bind up the essence and the life of the new theocracy with the forms and institutions of the old, so now at ver. 39 he once more, by means of a parabolic expression, makes it intelligible *how natural it is that the disciples of John and of the Pharisees should not be able to consent to the giving up of the OLD forms and institutions which had become dear to them, and to the exchanging of them for the NEW life in accordance with ITS fundamental principles*. He says that this should be as little expected as that any one when he has drunk old wine should long for new, since he finds that the old is better. So in substance Theophylact, Euthymius Zigabenus, Erasmus, Clarius, Zeger, Calovius, Wolf, Bengel, Paulus, Olshausen, Lange, and others;¹ and rightly, since even in ver. 37 f. the contrast of the old and new wine typified the contrasted old and new theocratic life. Hence we are neither, with Wetstein, to suppose the meaning reversed: "Pharisæorum austeritas comparatur vino novo, Christi lenitas vino veteri;" nor, with Grotius (comp. Estius and Clericus), to interpret: "Homines non subito ad austeriorem vitam pertrahendos, sed per gradus quosdam assuefaciendos esse" (Jesus, in truth, *had no wish* to accustom them to an "austeriorem vitam!"); nor, with Schegg, to substitute the meaning: "that not till the old wine is expended (in reference to ver. 35) is the new drunk (which refers to fasts, etc., as a remedy for their being deprived of the presence of Christ)." But by the objection that the old wine is actually better (Ecclus. ix. 10, and see Wolf and Wetstein) the parable is unduly pressed (in opposition to

¹ Baur, *Markusevang.* p. 202 (comp. Zeller, *Apost.* p. 15; Hilgenfeld, *Krit. Unters.* p. 403, and in the *Theol. Jahrb.* 1853, p. 200 f.), regards ver. 39, which is wanting in D and codd. of It., as an anti-heretical addition. But the omission is explained simply from the apparent incongruity of the sense, and from the lack of any expression of the kind in the parallel passages, although Lachmann also (*Proef.* p. xxxvi.), but from purely critical hesitation, was doubtful about the genuineness of the verse.

de Wette and others), since in vv. 37-39 the point of comparison is not the quality of the wine in itself, but the *relation of the old and the new*. Outside the point of comparison, *every* parable is apt to be at fault. Moreover, *χρηστός* denotes the *agreeable delicious taste*. Comp. Plut. *Mor.* p. 240 D, 1073 A. The new has, as it were, no *taste* if the old has been found agreeable. But *irony* is as little to be found in ver. 39 as in ver. 37 f., and the *gentle* exculpatory character of the discourse, ver. 39 (which must in no wise be taken to mean full approval, in opposition to Hilgenfeld in the *Thcol. Jahrb.* 1853, p. 215), is perfectly explained from the fact that, according to Matt. ix. 14, it is to be supposed that this conversation about fasting did not originally take place with the Pharisees, but with the disciples of John. See on Matthew. Comp. also Volkmar, *Evang. Marcions*, p. 219 ff. If in the two parables it were desired to abide by the *general* thought of *unsuitableness* (as it would be unsuitable to pour new wine into old skins, and after old wine immediately to drink new; so also it would be unsuitable if my disciples desired to bind themselves to the old institutions), the figure of ver. 39 would be very much *out of harmony* with the appropriate figure in ver. 38, and the unsuitable matter would at ver. 39 be represented in direct *contradiction to fact* (in opposition to de Wette); apart from this, moreover, that *θέλει* (not *πίνει*) applies the saying *subjectively*. According to Kuinoel and Bleek, Jesus spoke the words in ver. 39 at another time. But it is in keeping with the connection, and is certainly taken from the *Logia*.

CHAPTER VI.

VER. 1. δευτεροπρώτῳ] is wanting in B L Σ and seven min. Syr. Ar^p. Perss. Copt. Aeth. codd. of It. Condemned by Schulz, bracketed by Lachm. and Tisch. *Synops.* See the exegetical remarks. — Ver. 2. ἀντοῶς] bracketed by Lachm., is, with Tisch., to be struck out, as it is wanting in B C* L X Σ , min. Copt. Vere. Colb., while D, Cant. read ἀντὶ ἡδὲ. An addition in accordance with the parallels. Of ποιεῖν ἐν, the ἐν alone is to be deleted, with Tisch., on decisive evidence, but not, with Lachm., the ποιεῖν also. — Ver. 3. ἐπέτει] Lachm. has ὅτει, in accordance, indeed, with B C D L X Δ Σ , min.; but taken from the parallels, from which, moreover, the omission of ἔντες (Lachm.) is to be explained, as well as in ver. 4 the reading πῶς (Lachm., following L R X Σ **, min.). — Ver. 4. The omission of ὡς (B D, Cant. Marcion) is to be regarded as a transcriber's error (occasioned by the subsequent ΕΙΣ). If *nothing* had originally been found there, only πῶς, not ὡς would have been added. — ἔλαβε καὶ] Lachm. has λαβὼν, following B C* L X 33, Syr. Copt. Theophyl. The *Recepta* is to be maintained. The words were *left out*,—an omission occasioned the more easily by the similar ἔφαγε καὶ which follows, as the parallels have not ἔλαβε καὶ. The omission occurs, moreover, in D K Σ , min. vss. Ir. Then λαβὼν was introduced as a restoration in better syntactical form. — καὶ τοῦς] B L 1, 112, Syr. Arr. Pers. Arm. Goth. Vulg. It. Theophyl. Ir. Ambr. have merely τοῦς. In view of these important authorities καὶ must be traced to Mark ii. 26 (where the evidence against it is weaker), and should be deleted. — Ver. 6. ὁε καὶ] Lachm. has ὁε, in accordance with B L X Σ , min. vss. Cyr. But why should καὶ have been added? Rather the possibility of dispensing with it alongside of ἐξέρω gave rise to its omission. — Ver. 7. With Lachm. and Tisch. read παρρηγοῦντο (approved also by Griesb.), in accordance with preponderating evidence. See on Mark iii. 2. — After ὁε Elz. has ἀντὶν on weighty evidence, indeed, but it is an addition. Comp. xiv. 1; Mark iii. 2. — βεραπέσεις] Lachm. and Tisch. have βεραπέσει; the future is taken from Mark. — κατηγορίαν] B S X Σ , min. and vss. have κατηγορεῖν. So Tisch. D also vouches for the infinitive.

tive by reading *κατηγόρησαι*, the infinitive being explained in the later reading by the use of the substantive. — Ver. 8. ἀνθρώπων] B L S, min. Cyr. have ἀνδρί. Approved by Griesb., adopted by Tisch. Rightly; τῷ ἀνδρί was omitted by reason of the following τῷ (so still D, Cant.), and then τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ was inserted, in accordance with ver. 6 and Mark iii. 3, instead of τῷ ἀνδρί. — ὁ δέ] Lachm. and Tisch. have καί, following B D L X S, 1, 33, Vulg. It. Copt. Cyr. The former suggested itself more readily to the transcribers. Comp. ver. 10. — Ver. 9. οὖν] Lachm. and Tisch. have δέ, following B D L S, min. Vulg. It. Goth. Not to be decided; οὖν, it is true, is not frequently employed in the Gospel of Luke for continuing the narrative, and the reading wavers mostly between οὖν and δέ; yet it is established in iii. 7, xix. 12, xxii. 36. — ἐπερωτήσω] Tisch. has ἐπερωτῶ, following B L S, 157, Copt. Vulg. Brix. For. Rd. The *Recepta* has resulted from a reminiscence of xx. 3; Mark xi. 29. The present is extremely appropriate to the vivacity of the whole action. — τι or τῷ] Lachm. and Tisch. have εἰ, following B D L S 157, Copt. Vulg. It. Cyr. Aug. In view of these important authorities, and because εἰ fits in with the reading ἐπερωτῶ, which, according to the evidence, is to be approved (see above), εἰ is to be preferred. — ἀπολέσαι] also retained by Lachm. and Tisch., following B D L X S, vss. even Vulg. It. Griesb. and Scholz have ἀποκτεῖναι, which is introduced from Mark iii. 4, whence also comes τοῖς σαββάσιν, instead of which Lachm. and Tisch. have adopted τῷ σαββάτῳ, following B D L S, Cant. Rd. Colb. Corb. For. Aug. — Ver. 10. Instead of αὐτῷ Elz. has τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ, in opposition to preponderating evidence. — After ἐποίησεν (instead of which D X S, min. and most of the vss. read ἐξέτεινεν, which is from Matt. xii. 13; Mark iii. 5) Elz. Scholz, Lachm. Tisch. have οὕτως, which is wanting in important but still not preponderating authorities, and is deleted by Griesb., but defended by Schulz, in accordance with ix. 15, xii. 43. It is to be adopted. The possibility of dispensing with it and the ancient gloss ἐξέτεινεν occasioned the dropping out of the word. — After αὐτοῦ Elz. has ὑγιής, in opposition to decisive evidence. It is from Matt. xii. 13. Moreover, ὡς ἡ ἄλλη (condemned by Griesb., bracketed by Lachm., deleted by Tisch.), which is wanting in B L S, min. Copt. Vulg. Sax. Vere. For. Corb. Rd., is from Matthew. — Ver. 12. ἐξῆλθεν] Lachm. and Tisch. have ἐξελεῖν αὐτόν; which, in accordance with the preponderance of the MSS., is to be preferred. — Vv. 14–16. Before Ἰάκωβ, before Φίλιππ, before Ματθ., before Ἰάκωβ, and before Ἰούδ. Ἰακ., is to be inserted καί, on external evidence (Tisch.). — Ver. 16. ὅς καί] Lachm. and Tisch.

have only $\epsilon\varsigma$, following B L \aleph , min. vss. even Vulg. It. Marcion. Rightly; $\kappa\alpha\iota$ is from the parallels. — Ver. 18. $\epsilon\chi\lambda\omicron\upsilon\mu\epsilon\upsilon$.] Tisch. has $\epsilon\iota\omicron\chi\lambda\omicron$, following very important mss. The compound form was overlooked. — Instead of $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron$ Elz. has $\iota\pi\omicron$, in opposition to decisive evidence. An alteration arising from misunderstanding, because $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron$ $\pi\nu$. $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\theta$. was believed to be dependent upon the participle (comp. Acts v. 16), which error, moreover, gave rise to the $\kappa\alpha\iota$ before $\epsilon\theta\epsilon\rho\alpha\pi$. Lachm. and Tisch. have rightly deleted this $\kappa\alpha\iota$, in accordance with preponderating evidence. — Ver. 23. Instead of $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\eta\tau\epsilon$ Elz. has $\chi\alpha\iota\rho\epsilon\tau\epsilon$, in opposition to decisive evidence. — $\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha$ or $\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}$] Lachm. and Tisch. have $\tau\acute{\alpha}$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}$, following B D Q X Ξ , min. Marcion. The *Recepta* is a transcriber's error. The same reading is to be adopted in ver. 26 on nearly the same evidence; so also in xvii. 30. — Ver. 25. $\iota\mu\tilde{\nu}$ before $\omicron\iota$ $\gamma\epsilon\lambda$. (suspected also by Griesb.) is, in accordance with B K L S X Ξ \aleph , min. Or. Ir., with Tisch., to be struck out. An addition to conform with what precedes. Elz. has $\iota\mu\tilde{\nu}$ also before $\theta\tau\alpha\nu$, ver. 26, in opposition to decisive evidence. But $\iota\tilde{\nu}$ is, with Tisch., following very important evidence, to be inserted after $\epsilon\mu\pi\epsilon\pi\lambda$. — Ver. 26. $\omicron\iota$ $\acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho$.] Elz. Lachm. Tisch. have $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ $\omicron\iota$ $\acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho$. The preponderance of evidence is in favour of $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$, and it is to be maintained in opposition to Griesb. The omission was occasioned by the apparently inappropriate relation to $\omicron\iota$ $\pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\epsilon\varsigma$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\nu$. — Ver. 28. $\iota\mu\tilde{\nu}$] Griesb. Scholz, Lachm. Tisch. have $\iota\mu\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma$. There are weighty authorities on both sides, although the evidence is stronger for $\iota\mu\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma$; but $\iota\mu\tilde{\nu}$ is the more unusual, and is attested even so early as by Justin(?) and Origen; $\iota\mu\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma$ is from Matt. v. 44. — Before $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\epsilon\iota\chi$. Elz. has $\kappa\alpha\iota$, in opposition to decisive evidence. — Ver. 34. The reading $\delta\alpha\iota\delta\iota\zeta\epsilon\tau\epsilon$, although approved by Griesb., is a transcriber's error. Comp. on Rom. xiv. 8. Lachm. has $\delta\alpha\iota\epsilon\iota\sigma\eta\tau\epsilon$ (Tisch.: $\delta\alpha\iota\iota\sigma\eta\tau\epsilon$), following only B Ξ \aleph . 157. — Before $\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\rho\tau\omega\lambda\omicron\iota$ Elz. has $\omicron\iota$, in opposition to decisive evidence. — On evidence as decisive $\tau\omega\tilde{\nu}$ (in Elz.) before $\iota\psi$, ver. 35, is condemned. But $\mu\eta\delta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha$ (Tisch.) instead of $\mu\eta\delta\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ is too weakly attested by Ξ \aleph , Syr.^{mr}, especially as it might easily result from a transcriber's error. — Ver. 36. $\omicron\tilde{\nu}$] is wanting in B D L Ξ \aleph , min. vss. and Fathers. Condemned by Griesb., deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. A connective particle, although not directly taken from Matt. v. 48. — Ver. 39. $\delta\epsilon$] Lachm. and Tisch. have $\delta\epsilon$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$, following preponderating evidence; the $\kappa\alpha\iota$, which might be dispensed with, was passed over. — $\pi\epsilon\sigma\sigma\upsilon\tau\alpha\iota$] Lachm. and Tisch. have $\epsilon\mu\pi\epsilon\sigma\sigma\upsilon\tau\alpha\iota$. The *Recepta* is from Matt. xv. 14. — Ver. 43. $\omicron\tilde{\nu}$] B L Ξ \aleph , min. Copt. Arm. Vere. Germ. add $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\eta$, which

Lachm. has in brackets. With Tisch. to be adopted; the omission of the word that might be dispensed with resulted from Matt. vii. 18. — Ver. 45. Read the second half of the verse: *κ. ὁ πονηρὸς ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ προφέρει τὸ πονηρόν* (Tisch.). In view of B D L *κ*, min. vss. the *ἄνθρωπος* and *θησαυροῦ τῆς καρδίας αὐτοῦ* of the *Recepta* (both condemned by Griesb., and bracketed by Lachm.) are to be regarded as supplementary additions, as also in the next clause *τοῦ* and *τῆς* (deleted by Lachm. and Tisch.). — Ver. 48. *τεθεμελ. γὰρ ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν*] Tisch. has *διὰ τὸ καλῶς οἰκοδομεῖσθαι* [*οἰκοδομηθῆναι* in Tisch. 8] *αὐτῇν*, following B L *κ* *κ*, 33, 157, Syr.^p (in the margin), Copt. The *Recepta* is a gloss from Matt. vii. 25. — Ver. 49. *ἔπαισε*] *συνέπαισε*, which Griesb. has recommended and Tisch. has adopted, is so strongly attested by B D L R *κ* *κ*, that *ἔπαισε* is to be referred to Matthew.

Vv. 1-5. See on Matt. xii. 1-8; Mark ii. 23-28, whom Luke, with some omission, however, follows (see especially ver. 5). Between the foregoing and the present narrative Matthew interposes a series of other incidents. — *ἐν σαββ. δευτεροπρώτῳ*] all explanations are destitute of proof, because *δευτερόπρωτος* never occurs elsewhere. According to the analogy of *δευτερογάμος*, *δευτεροβόλος*, *δευτεροτόκος*, etc., it might be: a Sabbath *which for the second time is the first*. Comp. *δευτεροδεκάτη*, the second tenth, in Jerome, *ad Ez.* 45. According to the analogy of *δευτερέσχατος*, *penultimus*, Heliodorus in Soran. *Chirurg. vet.* p. 94, it might—since from *ἔσχατος* the reckoning must be backwards, while from *πρώτος* it must be forwards, in order to get a *δεύτερος*—be the *second first*, i.e. the *second of two firsts*. All accurate grammatical information is wanting. As, however, if any definite Sabbaths at all had borne the name of *σάββατον δευτερόπρωτον* (and this must be assumed, as Luke took for granted that the expression was a *familiar* one), this name would doubtless occur elsewhere (in the Old Testament, in the LXX., in Philo, Josephus, in the Talmud, etc.); but this is not the case, as the whole Greek literature has not even one instance of the peculiar word *in itself* to show;¹ as among the Synoptics it was

¹ In Eustathius in *Vita Eutych.* n. 95, the Sunday after Easter is called *δευτεροπρώτη κυριακή*; but this epithet manifestly originated from the passage before us.

precisely Luke that could least of all impute to his reader a knowledge of the name; and as, finally, very ancient and important authorities have not got *δευτεροπρώτῳ* at all in the passage before us (see the critical remarks), just as even so early an authority as Syr^p. remarks in the margin: "non est in omni exemplari,"—I regard *δευτεροπρώτῳ* as not being genuine, although, moreover, the suspicion suggests itself that it was omitted "*ignorantia rei*" (Bengel, *Appar. Crit.*, and because the parallel places have nothing similar to it. In consideration of *ἐν ἑτέρῳ σαββ.*, ver. 6, probably the note *πρώτῳ* was written at the side, but a comparison with iv. 31 occasioned the corrective note *δευτέρῳ* to be added, which found its way into the text, partly without (so still Ar^{ro}. and Ar^{ef}.), partly with *πρώτῳ* (thus *δευτέρῳ πρώτῳ*, so still R Γ, min.), so that in the next place, seeing that the two words in juxtaposition were meaningless, the one word *δευτεροπρώτῳ* was coined. Wilke also and Hofmann, according to Lichtenstein; and Lichtenstein himself, as well as Bleek and Holtzmann (comp. Schulz on Griesbach), reject the word; Hilgenfeld regards it as not being altogether certain.¹ Of the several attempts at explanation, I note historically only the following: (1) Chrysostom, *Hom.* 40 in *Matth.*: ὅταν διπλῇ ἡ ἄργία ἢ καὶ τοῦ σαββάτου τοῦ κυρίου καὶ ἑτέρας ἑορτῆς διαδεχομένης, so that thus is understood *a feast-day immediately following the Sabbath*. Comp. Epiphanius, *Haer.* 30, 31. So also Beza, Paulus, and Olshausen. (2) Theophylact understands *a Sabbath, the day before which (παρασκευῇ) had been a feast-day*.² (3) Isidore of Pelusium, *Ep.* iii. 110 (comp. Euthymius Zigabenus, Calvin, Surenhusius, Wolf), thinks that the *πρώτῃ τῶν ἡζύμων* is meant, and was called *δευτεροπρώτῃ*: ἐπειδὴ δεύτερον μὲν ἦν τοῦ πάσχα, πρώτον

¹ Tischendorf had deleted it in his edition of 1849, but in ed. 7 (1859) [also in ed. 8 (1869)] had restored and defended it: now [1867] (in the *Synops.* ed. 2) he has, with Lachmann, bracketed it.

² Comp. Luther's obscure gloss: "the second day after the high Sabbath." Schegg explains the expression even as a *Christian* designation, namely, of the *Saturday after Good Friday*. In opposition to Serno (*Tag des letz. Passahmahls*, 1859, p. 48 ff.), who, according to his mistaken supposition of the doubling of the first and last feast-days, brings out the *sixteenth Nisan*, see Wieseler in Reuter's *Repert.* 1860, p. 138.

δὲ τῶν ἀζύμων ἐσπέρας γὰρ θύοντες τὸ πάσχα τῇ ἐξῆς τὴν τῶν ἀζύμων ἐπανηγύριζον ἑορτήν, ἣν καὶ δευτερόπρωτον ἐκάλουν,— that every festival was called a *Sabbath*. Comp. Saalschütz: “the second day of the first feast (Passover).” (4) Most prevalent has become the view of Scaliger (*Emend. tempor.* VI. p. 557) and Petavius, that it is *the first Sabbath after the second day of the Passover*.¹ Comp. already Epiphanius, *Hæc.* xxx. 31. From the second Easter day (on which the first ripe ears of corn were offered on the altar, Lev. xxiii. 10 ff.; Lightfoot, p. 340) were numbered seven Sabbaths down to Pentecost, Lev. xxiii. 15. Comp. also Winer, *Realwörterb.* II. p. 348 ff.; Ewald, *Jahrb.* I. p. 72, and *Gesch. Chr.* p. 304. (5) According to the same reckoning, distinguishing the three first Sabbaths of the season between Easter and Pentecost from the rest, Red-slob in the *Intell. Bl. der allgem. Lit. Zeit.*, Dec. 1847, p. 570 f., says that it was the *second Sabbath after the second Easter day*, δευτερόπρωτος being equivalent to δεύτερος τῶν πρώτων, therefore about fourteen days after Easter. Comp. Ewald, *Jahrb.* XI. p. 254: that it was the second of the two first Sabbaths of the Passover month. (6) Von Til and Wetstein: that it was *the first Sabbath of the second month* (Igar). So also Storr and others. (7) Credner, *Beitr.* I. p. 357, concludes that according to the κήρυγμα τοῦ Πέτρου (in Clem. *Strom.* vi. 5, p. 760, Pott) the Sabbath at the full moon was called *πρώτου* (a mistaken explanation of the words, see Wieseler, p. 232 f.), and hence that a *Sabbath at the new moon* was to be understood. (8) Hitzig, *Ostern und Pfingst.* p. 19 ff. (agreeing with Theophylact as to the idea conveyed by the word), conceives that it was *the fifteenth Nisan*, which, according to Lev. xxiii. 11, had been called a Sabbath, and was named δευτερόπρ.,

¹ The explanation of Scaliger is followed by Casaubon, Drusius, Lightfoot, Schoettgen, Kuinoel, Neander, de Wette, and many more; and is defended, especially against Paulus, by Lübker in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1835, p. 671 ff. Opposed to Scaliger are Wieseler, *Synopse*, p. 230; Saalschütz, *Mos. R.* p. 394 f.; and aptly Grotius *in loc.* Lange, *L. J.* II. 2, p. 813, tries to improve the explanation of Scaliger by assuming that preceding the cycle between Easter and Pentecost there is a shorter cycle from 1 Nisan to Easter; that the first Sabbath of this first cycle is therefore the *first-first*, while the first Sabbath of that second cycle (from Easter to Pentecost) is the *second-first*.

because (but see, on the other hand, Wieseler, p. 353 ff.) the fourteenth Nisan always fell on a Saturday. (9) Wieseler, *l.c.* p. 231 ff.,¹ thinks that it was the second-first Sabbath of the year in a cycle of seven years, *i.e.* the *first Sabbath of the second year in a week of years*. Already L. Capellus, Rhenferd, and Lampe (*ad Joh.* II. p. 5) understood it to be the first month in the year (*Nisan*), but explained the name from the fact that the year had two first Sabbaths, namely, in Tisri, when the civil year began, and in Nisan, when the ecclesiastical year began. (10) Ebrard, p. 414 f., following Kraft (*Chron. und Herm. d. vier Evang.* p. 18 f.), regards it as the *weekly Sabbath* that occurs *between the first and last Easter days* (feast-Sabbaths). For yet other interpretations (Grotius and Valekenaeer: that the Sabbath before Easter was called the first great one *πρωτόπρωτον*, the Sabbath before Pentecost the second great one *δευτερόπρωτον*, the Sabbath before the feast of Tabernacles *τριτόπρωτον*²), see in Calovius, *Bibl. Ill.*, and Lübkert, *l.c.* — *τοὺς στάχυας*] the ears of corn that offered themselves on the way. — *ἤσθιον ψάχοντες κ.τ.λ.*] they ate (the contents), rubbing them out. The two things happened *at the same time*, so that they continually conveyed to their mouths the grains set free by this rubbing. — Ver. 3. *οὐδὲ τοῦτο*] have you *never so much as read this?* etc. — *όπότε*] *quandoquidem*, *since*, Plato, *Legg.* x. p. 895 B; Euthyd. p. 297 D; Xen. *Anab.* iii. 2. 2; not elsewhere in the New Testament. Comp. Hermann, *ad Soph. O. C.* 1696. — Ver. 4. *ἔξεσται*] with an accusative and infinitive, occurring only here in the New Testament, frequently in the classical writers. Plat. *Polit.* p. 290 D; Xen. *Mem.* i. 1. 9, iii. 12. 8, and else-

¹ Tischendorf, *Synopsis*, ed. 2. now opposes the explanation of Wieseler, with which in ed. 1 he agreed.

² V. Gumpach also (*üb. d. altjüd. Kalend.*, Brüssel 1848) understands a Sabbath of the *second rank*. Very peculiarly Weizsäcker, p. 59, says: "that Luke iv. 16, 31 recounts two Sabbath narratives, and now vi. 1, 6 recounts other two," and that the Sabbath in the passage before us is therefore the *first* of this *second* series of narratives, consequently the *second-first*. But what reader would have been able to discover this reference, especially as between iv. 31 and vi. 1 so many other narratives intervened? Weizsäcker, moreover, pertinently observes, in opposition to every hypothesis of an explanation in accordance with the calculation of the divine services, that our Gospel stands much too remote from things of this kind.

where; also after a preceding dative (Külner, *ad Xen. Mem.* p. 57, ed. 2). — Ver. 5. ἔλεγεν αὐτ.] as Mark, but without the auxiliary thought found in Mark which introduces the conclusion.

REMARK.—In D, which does not read ver. 5 till after ver. 10, the following passage occurs after ver. 4: τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ θεασάμενός τινα ἐργαζόμενον τῷ σαββάτῳ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· ἄνθρωπε, εἰ μὲν οἶδας τί ποιεῖς, μακάριος εἶ· εἰ δὲ μὴ οἶδας, ἐπικατάρατος καὶ παραβάτης εἶ τοῦ νόμου. In substance it certainly bears the stamp of genius, and is sufficiently liberal-minded to admit of its being *original*, even although it is not *genuine*. I regard it as an interpolated fragment of a true tradition.

Vv. 6-11. See on Matt. xii. 9-14; Mark iii. 1-6, in comparison with which Luke's narrative is somewhat weakened (see especially vv. 10, 11). — δὲ καί] for that which now follows *also* took place on a Sabbath. — ἐν ἑτέρῳ σαββ.] inexact, and varying from Matthew. Whether this Sabbath was actually the next following (which Lange finds even in Matthew) is an open question. — Ver. 9. According to the reading ἐπερωτῶ ὑμᾶς, εἰ (see the critical remarks): *I ask you whether*. With the *Recepta*, the MSS. according to the accentuation τι or τί favour one or other of the two different views: *I will ask you something, is it lawful*, etc. ? or: *I will ask you, what is lawful?* The future would be in favour of the former. Comp. Matt. xxi. 24. — Ver. 11. ἀνοίας] *want of understanding, dementia* (Vulg.: *insipientia*), 2 Tim. iii. 9; Wisd. xix. 3, xv. 18; Prov. xxii. 15; Herod. vi. 69; Plat. *Gorg.* p. 514 E, and elsewhere. Also Thucyd. iii. 48. Usually: *madness*. Comp. Plat. *Tim.* p. 86 B: δύο . . . ἀνοίας γένη, τὸ μὲν μανίαν, τὸ δὲ ἀμαθίαν. As to the *Æolic optative form ποιήσειαν* (comp. Acts xvii. 27), see Winer, p. 71 [E. T. 91]. Ellendt, *ad Arrian. Alex.* I. p. 353. Lachmann and Tischendorf have ποιήσαιεν (a correction).

Vv. 12-49. Luke inserts at this point the choice of the Twelve, and then a shorter and less original (see also Weiss in the *Jahrb. f. d. Th.* 1864, p. 52 ff.) edition of the *Sermon on the Mount*.¹ According to Matthew, the choice of the Twelve

¹ That Matthew and Luke gave two *distinct* discourses, delivered in immediate succession (which Augustine supposed), that were related to one another as

had not yet occurred before the Sermon on the Mount; nevertheless it is implied in Matthew, not, indeed, sooner than at x. 1, but after the call of Matthew himself. Luke in substance follows Mark in what concerns the choice of the apostles. But he here assigns to the Sermon on the Mount—which Mark has not got at all—a position different from that in Matthew, following a tradition which attached itself to the locality of the choice of the apostles (τὸ ὄρος) as readily as to the description and the contents of the sermon. See, moreover, Commentary on Matthew. According to Baur, indeed, Luke purposely took from the discourse its place of distinction, and sought in the Pauline interest to weaken it as much as possible.

Vv. 12, 13. Comp. Mark iii. 13–15. — τὸ ὄρος] as Matt. v. 1. — προσεύξασθαι κ.τ.λ.] comp. on v. 16. — ἐν τῇ προσεύχῃ τοῦ Θεοῦ] *in prayer to God*. Genitive of the object (see Winer, p. 167 [E. T. 231 f.]). — τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ] in the wider sense. Comp. ver. 17. — καὶ ἐκλεξάμ. κ.τ.λ.] The connection is: “And after He had chosen for Himself from them twelve . . . and (ver. 17) had come down with them, He took up His position on a plain, and (*scil.* ἔστη, there stood there) a crowd of His disciples, and a great multitude of people . . . who had come to hear Him and to be healed; and they that were tormented were healed of unclean spirits: and all the people sought,” etc. The discovery of Schleiermacher, that ἐκλεξάμ. denotes not the actual choice, but only a *bringing them together*, was a mistaken idea which the word itself ought to have guarded against. Comp. Acts i. 2. — οὗς καὶ ἀπ. ὀνόμ.] An action *concurring* towards the choice, and therefore, according to Luke, contemporaneous (in opposition

esoteric (given to the disciples exclusively) and *exoteric* (in the ears of the people), is neither to be established exegetically, nor is it reconcilable with the creative power of discourse manifested by Jesus at other times, in accordance with which He was certainly capable, at least, of extracting from the original discourse that would be suitable for the people (in opposition to Lange, *L. J.* II. 2, p. 566 ff.). And how much does the discourse in Matthew contain which there was no reason for Jesus keeping back from the people in Luke's supposed exoteric discourse! Comp. also Matt. vii. 28, from which passage it is clear that Matthew neither regarded the discourse as esoteric, nor knew anything of *two discourses*.

to Schleiermacher). Comp. Mark iii. 14, which is the source of this certainly anticipatory statement.

Vv. 14-16. Comp. on Matt. x. 2-4; Mark iii. 16-19. — [ζηλωτήν] Comp. Acts i. 13. See on Matt. x. 4. — 'Ιούδαν 'Ιακώβου] Usually (including even Ebrard and Lange): Judas the *brother* of James, and therefore the son of Alphaeus; but without any foundation in exegesis. At least Jude 1 might be appealed to, where both *Jude* and *James* are natural *brothers of the Lord*. In opposition to supplying ἀδελφός, however, we have to point out in general, that to justify the supplying of the word a special reference must have preceded (as Alciplhr. *Ep.* ii. 2), otherwise we must abide by the usual *υἱός*, as at ver. 15; further, that Matt. x. 2 mentions the pairs of brothers among the apostles most precisely *as such*, but not among them James and Lebbaeus (who is to be regarded as identical with our Judas; see on Matt. x. 2¹). Hence (so also Ewald), here and at Acts i. 13, we must read Judas *son of James*, of which James nothing further is known.² — [προδότης] *Traitor* (2 Macc. v. 15, x. 13, 22; 2 Tim. iii. 4); only here in the New Testament is Judas *thus* designated. Matthew has παραδούς, comp. Mark. Yet comp. Acts vii. 52. — Observe, moreover, that Luke here enumerates the four first-named apostles *in pairs*, as does Matthew; whereas in Acts i. 13 he *places first the three most confidential ones*, as does Mark. We see from this simply that in Acts i. 13 he followed a source containing the latter order, by which he held impartially and without any mechanical reconciliation with the order of the passage before us. The conclusion is much too hasty, which argues that Mark was not before him

¹ Ewald takes a different view, that even during the lifetime of Jesus 'Ιούδας 'Ιακώβου had taken the place of the Thaddaeus (Lebbaeus), who had probably been cut off by death. See his *Gesch. Chr.* p. 323. In this way, indeed, the narrative of Luke in the passage before us, where the *choice* of the Twelve is related, would be incorrect. That hypothesis would only be capable of reconciliation with Acts i. 13. According to Schleiermacher also, *L. J.* p. 369, the persons of the apostolic band were not always the same, and the different catalogues belong to different periods. But when the evangelists wrote, the Twelve were too well known in Christendom, nay, too world-historical, to have allowed the enumeration of different individual members.

² Comp. Nonnus, Paraphrase of John xiv. 22: 'Ιούδας υἱὸς 'Ιακώβου.

till Acts i. 13, and that when he wrote the Gospel he had not yet become acquainted with Mark's work (Weizsäcker).

Ver. 17. Ἐπὶ τόπου πεδινῷ] according to the connection of Luke (ver. 12, εἰς τὸ ὄρος; ver. 17, καταβάς), cannot be otherwise understood than: *on a plain*; not: *over a plain* (Michaelis and Paulus); nor: *on a small overhanging place of the declivity* (Tholuck); comp. Lange, who calls the discourse in Matthew the *Summit-sermon*, and that in Luke the *Terrace-sermon*. The divergence from Matt. v. 1 must be admitted, and remains still, even if a *plateau* is supposed on which jutted out a crest previously ascended by Jesus (Ebrard; comp. Grotius, Bengel, and others; a vacillating arbitrariness in Olshausen). Matthew's narrative is original; Luke has a later tradition. As the crowd of hearers, according to this later tradition, came from greater distances, and were thus represented as more numerous, a *plain* was needed to accommodate them. According to Baur, *Evang.* p. 457, this divergence from Matthew is due also to the tendency of Luke to *degrade* the Sermon on the Mount, which would surely be a very *petty* sort of levelling. — καὶ ὄχλος κ.τ.λ.] *scil. ἔσται*. See on ver. 13. A similar structure in the narrative, viii. 1-3.

Vv. 18, 19. Ἀπὸ πνευμ. ἁκαθ.] belongs to ἐθεραπ. Comp. ver. 17, ἰαθῆναι ἀπό. The καὶ before ἐθεραπ. is not genuine. See the critical remarks. After ἰθεραπ. only a colon is to be placed; the description of the healings is continued. — καὶ ἰᾶτο πάντ.] not to be separated from what precedes by a comma, but δύναμις is the subject. See v. 17. — ἐξήρχ.] Comp. viii. 46: "Significatur non adventitia fuisse efficacia, sed Christo intrinseca ἐκ τῆς θείας φύσεως," Grotius.

Vv. 20, 21. Καὶ αὐτός] *And He*, on His part, as contrasted with this multitude of people seeking His word and His healing power. Comp. v. 1, 16. — εἰς τοὺς μαθητ. αὐτοῦ] in the wider sense, quite as in Matt. v. 2; for see vv. 13, 17. As in Matthew, so here also the discourse is delivered first of all for the circle of the disciples, but in presence of the people, and, moreover, for the people (vii. 1). The *lifting up of His eyes* on the disciples is the *solemn* opening move-

ment, to which in Matthew corresponds the opening of His mouth. — μακάριοι κ.τ.λ.] Luke has only four beatitudes, and omits (just as Matthew does in the case of πενθοῦντες) all indication, not merely that κλαίοντες, but also that πτωχοί and πεινῶντες should be taken ethically, so that according to Luke Jesus has in view the poor and suffering *earthly* position of His disciples and followers, and promises to them compensation for it in the Messiah's kingdom. The fourfold *woe*, then, in ver. 24 ff. has to do with those who are rich and prosperous *on earth* (analogous to the teaching in the narrative of the rich man and Lazarus); comp. i. 53. Certainly Luke has the *later* form of the tradition, which of necessity took its rise in consequence of the affliction of the persecuted Christians as contrasted with the rich, satisfied, laughing, belauded *υἱοῖς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου*; comp. the analogous passages in the Epistle of James, ii. 5, v. 1 ff., iv. 9. This also is especially true of the denunciations of *woe*, which were still unknown to the first evangelist. Comp. Weiss in the *Jahrb. f. d. Theol.* 1864, p. 58 f. (in opposition to Holtzmann). That they were omitted in Matthew from motives of forbearance (Schenkel) is an arbitrary assumption, quite opposed to the spirit of the apostolic church; just as much as the notion that the poverty, etc., pronounced blessed in Matthew, should be *interpreted* spiritually. The late date of Luke's composition, and the greater originality in general which is to be attributed to the discourse in Matthew, taken as it is from the *Logia*,¹ which formed the basis in an especial manner of this latter Gospel, make the reverse view less probable, that (so also Ewald, p. 211; comp. Wittichen in the *Jahrb. f. d. Theol.* 1862, p. 323) the general expressions, as Luke has them, became more specific at a later date, as may

¹ For the *Logia*, not a primitive Mark (Holtzmann), was the original source of the discourse. The form of it given by Luke is derived by Weizsäcker, p. 148, from the collection of discourses of the great intercalation (see on ix. 51), from which the evangelist transplanted it into the earlier period of the foundation of the church. But for the hypothesis of such a disruption of the great whole of the source of this intercalation, ix. 51 ff., there is no trace of proof elsewhere. Moreover, Weizsäcker aptly shows the secondary character of this discourse in Luke, both in itself and in comparison with Matthew.

be seen in Matthew, by reason of possible and partly of actually occurring misunderstanding. Moreover, the difference in itself is not to be got rid of (Tholuck says that the outer misery awakens the inner; Olshausen, that τ. πνεύματι must in Luke be *supplied* !); probably, however, it is to be conceded that Jesus *assumes* as existing the *ethical* condition of the promise in the case of His afflicted people (according to Luke's representation) *as* in His believing and future members of the kingdom; hence the *variation* is no *contradiction*. The *Ebionitic* spirit is foreign to the Pauline Luke (in opposition to Strauss, I. p. 603 f.; Schwegler, and others). — ὑμετέρα] “ Applicatio solatii individualis; congruit *attollens*, nam radii oculorum indigitant,” Bengel. — χορτασθ. and γελάσ.] corresponding representations of the Messianic blessedness.

Ver. 22. Comp. Matt. v. 11 f. — ἀφορίσωσιν] from the congregation of the synagogue and the intercourse of common life. This is the excommunication חָרַם (Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm. s.r.*). Comp. John ix. 22. But that at that time there were already beside this simple excommunication one (חָרַם) or two (חָרַם and חֲרֵם) still higher degrees (see, in general, Grotius on this passage; Winer, *Realw.*) is improbable (Gildemeister, *Blendwerke d. vulgär. Ration.* p. 10 ff.), and, moreover, is not to be inferred from what follows, wherein is depicted the hostility which is associated with the excommunication. — καὶ ἐκβάλωσι τ. ὄν. ὑμ. ὡς ποιηρ.] ἐκβάλλειν is just the German *wegwerfen*, in the sense of *contemptuous rejection*, Plato, *Pol.* ii. p. 377 C, *Crit.* p. 46 B; Soph. *O. C.* 637, 642; Ael. *II. A.* xi. 10; Kypke, I. p. 236; but τὸ ὄνομα is not *auctoritas* (Kypke), nor a designation of the *character* or the faith (de Wette), nor the name of *Christian* (Ewald), which idea (comp. Matt. x. 42; Mark ix. 41) occurs in this place for the first time by means of the following ἐνεκα τοῦ νόου τ. ἀνθρ.; but the *actual personal name*, which designates the individual in question. Hence: *when they shall have rejected your name* (e.g. John, Peter, etc.) *as evil*, i.e. as being of evil meaning, because it represents an evil man in your person.—*on account of the Son of man*,—ye know yourselves as His disciples. The singular ὄνομα is *distributive*. Comp. Ael.

H. A. 5. 4; Polyb. xviii. 28. 4; Krüger, § 44. 1. 7; Winer, p. 157 [E. T. 218]. Others interpret wrongly: When they shall have *exiled* you (Kuinoel), to express which would have required ὑμᾶς ὡς πονηρούς; or: when they shall have *struck out* your names *from the register of names* (Beza and others quoted by Wolf, Michaelis also), which even in form would amount to an unusual tautology with ἀφορίσ.; or: when they shall have *spread* your name *abroad* as evil (*defamed* you) (Grotius, Bengel, Rosenmüller, Schegg), which is ungrammatical, and not to be established by Deut. xxii. 19; or: when they *declare* it as evil (Bleek), which, nevertheless, would be very different from the classical ἔπη ἐκβάλλειν, *to cast up words, verba proferre* (Hom. *Il.* vi. 324; Pind. *Pyth.* ii. 148); and, withal, how feeble and inexpressive!

Ver. 23. Ἐν ἐκείνῃ τ. ἡμερ.] in which they shall have thus dealt with you. σκιρτήσατε: *leap* for joy. — Moreover, see on Matt. v. 12; and as to the repeated γάρ, the second of which is explanatory, on Matt. vi. 32, xviii. 11; Rom. viii. 6.

Vv. 24, 25. The *woes* of the later tradition closely corresponding to the beatitudes. Comp. on ver. 20. — πλὴν] *on the other hand, veruntamen*, so that ἀλλά also might be used as at ver. 35, xi. 41, and elsewhere. See Klotz, *ad Decur.* p. 725. — ὑμῶν] Conceive Jesus here extending His glance beyond the disciples (ver. 20) to a wider circle. — ἀπέχετε] see on Matt. vi. 2. — τὴν παράκλ. ὑμῶν] Instead of receiving the consolation which you would receive by possession of the Messiah's kingdom (comp. ii. 25), if you belonged to the πτωχοί, you have by anticipation what is accounted to you instead of that consolation! Comp. the history of the rich man, ch. xvi. Here the *Messianic retributive punishment* is described *negatively*, and by πεινάσετε, πενθ. κ. κλαύσ., *positively*. — ἐμπεπλησμένοι] ye now are *filled up, satisfied*, Herod. i. 112. Comp. on Col. ii. 23. For the contrast, Luke i. 53. On the nominative, Buttmann, *Neut. Gr.* p. 123 [E. T. 141].

Ver. 26. This woe also, like the previous ones, and opposed to the fourth beatitude, ver. 22, must refer to the *unbelievers*, not to the *disciples* (so usually, see Kuinoel and de Wette), when perchance these latter should fall away, and thereby

gather praise of men. This is not justified by the reference to the false prophets of earlier times, which rather shows that in this *οὐαί* Jesus has in His view, as opposed to His disciples, who had incurred hatred and persecution (ver. 23), the universally praised dignitaries of the Jewish theocracy and teachers of the people, whose business was *ζητεῖν ἀνθρώποις ἀρέσκειν* (Gal. i. 10). Jesus does not address His discourse very definitely and expressly to His followers until ver. 27. — *οἱ πατ. αὐτῶν*] (*τῶν ἀνθρώπων*, those regarded as Jews) so that they all lavished praise upon the false prophets; comp. Jer. v. 31, xxiii. 17; Mic. ii. 11.

Vv. 27, 28. Nevertheless, as far as concerns *your* conduct, those denunciations of woe are not to deter you, etc. Hence there is here no contrast *destitute of point* (Köstlin), although the sayings in vv. 27–36 are in Matthew more originally conceived and arranged (comp. Weiss in the *Jahrb. f. d. Theol.* 1864, p. 55 f.). — *τοῖς ἀκούουσιν*] to you *who hear*, i.e. *who give heed*, *τοῖς πειθομένοις μου*, Euthymius Zigabenus. This is required by the contrast. Moreover, comp. Matt. v. 44. — *καταρώμ.*] with a dative, Hom. *Od.* xix. 330; Herod. iv. 184; Dem. 270. 20, 381. 15; Xen. *Anab.* vii. 7. 48. Elsewhere in the New Testament, in accordance with later usage (Wisd. xii. 11; Eccus. iv. 5 f.), with an accusative. — *ἐπηρεάζειν*] to afflict, is connected by the classical writers with *τινί*, also with *τινός*.

Ver. 29. See on Matt. v. 39 f. — *ἀπὸ τοῦ κ.τ.λ.*] *κωλύειν ἀπὸ τινος*, to keep back from any one; Xen. *Cyrop.* i. 3. 11: *ἀπὸ σοῦ κωλύων*; iii. 3. 51: *ἀπὸ τῶν αἰσχροῶν κωλύσαι*; Gen. xxiii. 6. Erasmus says aptly: “Subito mutatus numerus facit ad inculcandum praeceptum, quod unusquisque sic audire debeat quasi sibi uni dicatur.”

Ver. 30. Comp. Matt. v. 42. *Eccegetically*, the unconditional submission here required cannot to any extent be toned down by means of limitations mentally supplied (in opposition to Michaelis, Storr, Kuinoel, and others). The ethical relations already subsisting in each particular case determine what limitations must actually be made. Comp. the remark after Matt. v. 41. — *παρτί*] to every one. Exclude none, not

even your enemy. But Augustine says appropriately: "*Omni petenti te tribue, non omnia petenti; ut id des, quod dare honeste et juste potes.*" — ἀπαίτει] *demand back* what he has taken from thee. Herod. i. 3: ἀπαιτέειν Ἑλένην, καὶ δίκας τῆς ἀρπαγῆς αἰτέειν.

Ver. 31. Comp. Matt. vii. 12. To the injunction given and specialized at ver. 27 ff. of the love of one's enemy, Jesus now adds the *general moral rule* (Theophylact: νόμον ἔμφυτον ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν ἐγγεγραμμένον), from which, moreover, results the duty of the love of one's enemy. It is self-evident that while this general principle is completely applicable to the love of one's enemy in itself and in general, it is applicable to the special precepts mentioned in vv. 29, 30 only in accordance with the *idea* (of self-denial), whose concrete representation they contain: hence ver. 31 is not in this place *inappropriate* (in opposition to de Wette). — καὶ καθὼς κ.τ.λ.] a simple carrying forward of the discourse to the general principle: *and*, in general, *as ye*, etc. — ἵνα] Contents of the θέλετε under the notion of *purpose*—ye will, that they *should*, etc. Comp. Mark vi. 25, ix. 30, x. 35; John xvii. 24; 1 Cor. xiv. 5. See also Nägelsbach, *Anm. z. Ilias*, ed. 3, p. 62 f.

Vv. 32-34. Comp. Matt. v. 46 f. — καί] simply continuing: *And*, in order still more closely to lay to heart this general love—if ye, etc. — ποία ὑμῶν χάρις ἐστί;] *what thanks have you?* i.e. what kind of a recompense is there for you? The *divine* recompense is meant (ver. 35), which is represented as a return of *beneficence* under the idea of *thanks* ("ob benevoluntatis affectum," Grotius); Matthew, μισθός. — οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ] Matthew, οἱ τελῶναι and οἱ ἐθνικοί. But Luke is speaking not from the national, but from the ethical point of view: *the sinners* (not to be interpreted: *the heathen*, the definite mention of whom the Pauline Luke would not have avoided). As my faithful followers, ye are to stand on a higher platform of morality than do such unconverted ones. — τὰ ὕσα] (to be accented thus, see on Mark xiv. 56) *the return equivalent to the loan*. Tischendorf has in ver. 34 the forms of δανίζειν (*Anth.* XI. 390).

Ver. 35. Πλὴν] *but, verumtamen*, as at ver. 24. — μηδὲν ἀπελπίζοντες] The *usual* view, "*nihil inde sperantes*" (Vulgate; so also Euthymius Zigabenus, Erasmus, Luther, Beza, Calvin, Castalio, Salmasius, Casaubon, Grotius, Wolf, Bengel, Krebs, Valekenauer, Rosenmüller, Kuinoel, de Wette, Ewald, Bleek, and others), is in keeping with the context, ver. 34, but is ungrammatical, and therefore decidedly to be given up. The meaning of ἀπελπίζειν is *desperare*; it belongs to later Greek, and frequently occurs in Diodorus and Polybius, which latter, moreover (xxx. 8. 11), has ἀπελπισμός, *desperatio*. Comp. Wetstein. An erroneous use of the word, however, is the less to be attributed to Luke, that it was also familiar to him from the LXX. (Isa. xxix. 19) and the Apocrypha (2 Macc. ix. 18, where also the accusative stands with it, Ecclus. xxii. 21, xxvii. 21; Judith ix. 11). Hence the true meaning is "*nihil desperantes*" (codd. of It.; so also Homberg, Elsner, Wetstein, Bretschneider, Schegg). It qualifies ἀγαθοποιεῖτε κ. δανείζετε, and μηδὲν is the accusative of the object: *inasmuch as ye consider nothing* (nothing which ye give up by the ἀγαθοποιεῖν and δανείζειν) *as lost* (comp. ἀπελπίζειν τὸ ζῆν, Diod. xvii. 106), bring no offering *hopelessly* (namely, with respect to the recompense, which ye have not to expect from men),—and how will this hope be fulfilled! *Your reward will be great*, etc. Thus in μηδὲν ἀπελπίζοντες is involved the παρ' ἐλπίδα ἐπ' ἐλπίδι πιστεύειν (Rom. iv. 18) in reference to a *higher* reward, where the temporal recompense is not to be hoped for, the "*qui nil potest sperare, desperet nihil*" (Seneca, *Mol.* 163), in reference to the *everlasting* recompense. — καὶ ἔσεσθε υἱοὶ ὑψ.] namely, in the *Messiah's kingdom*. See xx. 36, and on Matt. v. 9, 45. In general, the designation of believers as *sons of God* in the *temporal* life is Pauline (in John: τέκνα Θεοῦ), but not often found in the synoptic Gospels. See Kautzsch in the *Sachs. Stud.* 1843, p. 197 ff. — ὅτι αὐτὸς κ.τ.λ.] *Since He*, on His part, etc. The reason here given rests on the ethical presupposition that the divine Sonship in the Messiah's kingdom is destined for those whose dealings with their fellow-men are similar to the dealings of the Father.

Vv. 36–38. From this exemplar of the divine benignity in

general Jesus now passes over (without οὖν, see the critical remarks) to the special duty of becoming compassionate (γίνεσθε) after God's example (ἐστὶ), and connects therewith (ver. 37 f.) other duties of love with the corresponding Messianic promises. On ver. 37 f. comp. Matt. vii. 1 f. — ἀπολύετε] *set free*, xxii. 68, xxiii. 16. The opposite of what is previously forbidden. — μέτρον καλὸν κ.τ.λ.] a more explicit explanation of δοθήσεται, and a figurative description of the fulness of the Messianic blessedness, οὐ γὰρ φειδομένως ἀντιμετρεῖ ὁ κύριος, ἀλλὰ πλουσίως, Theophylact. — καλόν] *a good*, i.e. not scanty or insufficient, but a full measure; among the Rabbins, מדה טובה, see Schoettgen, I. p. 273. Observe the *climax* of the predicates, in respect of all of which, moreover, it is a measure of *dry* things that is conceived of even in the case of ὑπερεκχ., in connection wherewith Bengel incongruously conceives of *fluidity*. Instead of ὑπερεκχύνω, Greek writers (Diodorus, Aelian, etc.) have only the form ὑπερεκχέω. Instead of σαλεύω, of close packing by means of *shaking*, Greek writers use σαλάσσω. See Lobeck, *Pathol.* p. 87; Jacobs, *ad Anthol.* VII. p. 95, XI. p. 70. — δώσουσιν] *τίνες; οἱ εὐεργετηθέντες πάντως τοῦ Θεοῦ γὰρ ἀποδιδόντος ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν αὐτοὶ δοκοῦσιν ἀποδιδόναι*, Euthymius Zigabenus. But the context offers no definite subject at all. Hence in general: *the persons who give* (Kühner, II. p. 35 f.). It is not doubtful who they are: the servants who execute the judgment, i.e. the *angels*, Matt. xxiv. 31. Comp. on xvi. 9. — κόλπος] the gathered fold of the wide upper garment bound together by the girdle, Jer. xxxii. 18; Isa. lxxv. 6; Ruth iii. 15; Wetstein and Kypke *in loc.* — τῷ γὰρ αὐτῷ μέτρῳ] The *identity* of the measure; e.g. if your measure is *giving*, *beneficence*, the same measure shall be applied in your recompense. The δοθήσ. ὑμῖν does not exclude the larger *quantity of the contents* at the judgment (see what precedes). Theophylact appropriately says: ἔστι γὰρ δίδοναι τῷ αὐτῷ μέτρῳ, οὐ μὴν τοσούτῳ.

Ver. 39 has no connection with what precedes; but, as Luke himself indicates by εἶπε κ.τ.λ., begins a new, independent portion of the discourse. — The *meaning* of the parable: He to whom on his part the knowledge of the divine truth is

wanting cannot lead others who have it not to the Messianic salvation; they will both fall into the Gehenna of moral error and confusion on the way. Comp. Matt. xv. 14, where is the original place of the saying.

Vv. 40. The *rationale* of the preceding statement: *Both shall fall into a ditch*,—therefore not merely the teacher, *but the disciple also*. Otherwise the disciple must *surpass* his teacher—a result which, even in the most fortunate circumstances, is not usually attained. This is thus expressed: *A disciple is not above his teacher, but every one that is fully prepared shall be AS his teacher*, i.e. when he has received the complete preparation in the school of his teacher he will be *equal* to his teacher. He will not *surpass* him. But the disciple must *surpass* his teacher (in knowledge, wisdom, disposition, etc.) if he were not to fall into perdition along with him. The view: *he will be trained as his teacher* (Kuinoel, de Wette, Bleek, and others), i.e. he will be like him in knowledge, disposition, etc., satisfies neither the idea of the specially chosen word *καθηρτ.*, nor its emphatic position, nor the correlation of *ὑπέρ* and *ὥς*. As to *καθηρτισμ.*, see on 1 Cor. i. 10. The saying in Matt. x. 24 f. has a different significance and reference, and cannot be used to limit the meaning here (in opposition to Linder's misinterpretation in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1862, p. 562).

Vv. 41, 42. Luke is not, with confused reminiscence, turning back to Matt. vii. 3 f. (in opposition to de Wette), but the train of thought is: "but in order not to be blind leaders of the blind ye must, before ye would judge (ver. 41) and improve (ver. 42) the moral condition of others, first seriously set about your own knowledge of yourself (ver. 41) and improvement of yourself (ver. 42)." Luke puts the two passages together, but he does it logically.

Vv. 43, 44. Comp. Matt. vii. 16–18, xii. 33 f. For¹ a man's own moral disposition is related to his agency upon others, just as is the nature of the trees to their fruits (*there is no good tree which produces corrupt fruit*, etc.), for (ver. 44)

¹ Bengel aptly says on this γάρ: "Qui sua trabe laborans alienam festucam petit, est similis arbori malae bonum fructum affectanti."

in the case of every tree the peculiar fruit is that from which the tree is known. — οὐδὲ πάλιν δένδρον] (see the critical remarks) *nor, on the other hand, vice versa*, etc. Comp. Xen. *Cyrop.* ii. 1. 4; Plat. *Gorg.* p. 482 D, and elsewhere.

Ver. 45. The application. Comp. Matt. xii. 35. — προφέρει κ.τ.λ. refers here also to *spoken words*. See ἐκ γὰρ κ.τ.λ.

Ver. 46. The *verification*, however, of the spoken word which actually goes forth out of the good treasure of the heart lies not in an abstract confessing of Me, but in joining therewith the doing of that which I say.

Vv. 47-49. See on Matt. vii. 24-27. — ἔσκαψε κ. ἐβάθυνε] not a Hebraism for: *he dug deep* (Grotius and many others), but a rhetorically emphatic *description* of the proceeding: *he dug and deepened*. See Winer, p. 416 [E. T. 588]. Even Beza aptly says: "Crescit oratio." — ἐπὶ τ. πέτραι] down to which he had deepened (sunk his shaft). This is still done in Palestine in the case of solid buildings. See Robinson, *Palestine*, III. p. 428. — διὰ τὸ καλῶς οἰκοδομεῖσθαι αὐτήν] (see the critical remarks) *because it* (in respect of its foundation) *was well built* (namely, with foundation laid upon the rock). — ἀκούσας . . . ποιήσας] *shall have heard . . . shall have done*, namely, in view of the irruption of the last times, full of tribulation, before the Parousia. — καὶ ἐγένετο κ.τ.λ.] in close connection with ἔπεσε, and both with εὐθέως: *and the ruin of that house was great*; a figure of the ἀπώλεια in contrast with the everlasting ζωή, ver. 48, at the Messianic judgment.

CHAPTER VII.

VER. 1. *ἐπει δέ*] Lachm. and Tisch. have *ἐπειδὴ*, following A B C* X 254, 299. This evidence is decisive, especially as D (comp. codd. of It.) is not opposed, for it has *καὶ ἐγένετο οὕτως*. K has *ἐπειδὴ δέ*, whence is explained the rise of the *Recepta*. — Ver. 4. *παρεξῆ*] So also Lachm. and Tisch. The *Recepta* is *παρεξῆς*, in opposition to decisive evidence. — Ver. 10. *ἀσθενοῦντα*] is not found, indeed, in B L 8, min. Copt. codd. of It. (deleted by Lachm. and Tisch.); but it is to be maintained, as the evidence in its favour is preponderating; the omission is very easily to be explained from the possibility of dispensing with the word, but there was no reason to suggest its addition. — Ver. 11. Instead of *ἐν τῷ ἐξῆς*, which Griesb. has approved, and Lachm. has in the margin, the codd. have *ἐν τῇ ἐξῆς*. The evidence for the two readings is about equally balanced. We must come to a conclusion according to the usage of Luke, who expresses "on the following day" by *τῇ ἐξῆς*, *always without ἐν* (Acts xxi. 1, xxv. 17, xxvii. 18; moreover, in Luke ix. 37, where *ἐν* is to be deleted); we must therefore read in this place *ἐν τῷ ἐξῆς*. Comp. viii. 1. Otherwise Schulz. — *ἰκανοί*] is wanting in B D F L 8, min. and most of the vss. Bracketed by Lachm. It is to be retained (even against Rinek, *Lucubr. Crit.* p. 321), the more so on account of the frequency of the *simple* *οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ*, and the facility, therefore, wherewith IKANOI might be passed over by occasion of the following letters KATO. — Ver. 12. After *ἰκανός* Elz. Scholz. Tisch. have *ῥῆ*, which is condemned by Griesb., deleted by Lachm.; it is wanting in authorities so important that it appears as supplementary, as also does the *ῥῆ*, which Lachm. Tisch. read before *χρησά*, although this latter has still stronger attestation. — Ver. 16. *ἐγγίψεται*] A B C L 8, min. have *ἡγγίψθη*, in favour of which, moreover, D bears witness by *ἐγγίγγισθη*. On this evidence it is, with Lachm. and Tisch., to be preferred. — Ver. 21. Instead of *αὐτῇ δέ*, Tisch. has *ἐκείνῃ* on evidence too feeble, and without sufficient internal reason. — Elz. Scholz. have *τὸ ἀέπειν*. This *τὸ* might, in consequence of the preceding *ἐξαπίσκατο*, have just as easily dropt out as slipped

in. But on the ground of the decidedly preponderating counter evidence, it is by Lachm. and Tisch. rightly deleted. — Ver. 22. *ὅτι*] is wanting, it is true, in important authorities (although they are not preponderating), and is deleted by Lachm.; but the omission is explained from Matt. xi. 5. — Vv. 24-26. Instead of *ἐξελήλυθατε*, A B D L \equiv Σ (yet in ver. 26 not A also) have *ἐξήλθατε*; so Lachm. It is from Matt. xi. 7-9. — Ver. 27. *ἰγώ*] is wanting in B D L \equiv Σ , min. Copt. Arm. Vulg. codd. of It. Marcion, and is left out by Lachm. and Tisch. An addition from Matth. — Ver. 28. *προφητῆς*] is deleted, indeed, by Lachm. (in accordance with B K L M X \equiv Σ , min. vss. and Fathers), but was omitted in accordance with Matt. xi. 11, from which place, on the other hand, was added *τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ* (rightly deleted by Tisch.). — Ver. 31. Before *τῶν* Elz. has *εἶπε δὲ ὁ κύριος*, in opposition to decisive evidence. An exegetical addition, in respect of which the preceding passage was taken as historical narration. — Ver. 32. Instead of *καὶ λέγουσιν*, Tisch. has, on too feeble evidence, *λέγοντες*. — Ver. 34. The arrangement *φίλος τέλων*. is decisively attested. The reverse order (Elz.) is from Matth. — Ver. 35. *πάντων*] Lachm. and Tisch. *συνοχῆς*. [not Tisch. 8] have this immediately after *ἀπό*, but in opposition to preponderating evidence. It was omitted in accordance with Matt. xi. 19 (so still in D F L M X, min. Arm. Syr.), and then restored to the position suggested by the most ordinary use. — Ver. 36. The readings *τὸν οἶκον* and *κατεκλήθη* (Lachm. Tisch.) are, on important evidence, to be adopted; *ἀνακλ.* was more familiar to the transcribers; Luke alone has *κατακλ.* — Ver. 37. *ἦτις ἦν*] is found in different positions. B L \equiv Σ , vss. Lachm. Tisch. rightly have it after *γυνή*. In D it is wanting, and from this omission, which is to be explained from the possibility of dispensing with the words, arose their restoration *before* *ἁμαρτ.*, to which they appeared to belong. — Instead of *ἀνάκειται* is to be read, with Lachm. and Tisch., *κατάκειται*. Comp. on ver. 36. — Ver. 42. *δέ*, both here and at ver. 43, has authorities so important against it that it appears to have been inserted as a connective particle; it is deleted by Tisch. — *εἰπέ* is wanting in B D L \equiv Σ , min. Syr. Arr. Perss. Copt. Aeth. Vulg. It. Aug. Suspected by Griesb., deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. But why should it have been added? The entire superfluousness of it was the evident cause of its omission. — Ver. 44. After *ὀριζί* Elz. has *τῆς κεφαλῆς*, in opposition to decisive evidence. An addition from ver. 38.

Vv. 1-10. See on Matt. viii. 5-13. In the present form of Mark's Gospel the section must have been lost at the same

time with the Sermon on the Mount, iii. 19 (Ewald, Holtzmann); both are supposed to have existed in the primitive Mark. Comp. on Mark iii. 19. — ἐπλήρωσε] *cum absolvisset*, so that nothing more of them was wanting, and was left behind. Comp. 1 Macc. iv. 19 (cod. A); Eusebius, *H. E.* iv. 15: πληρώσαντος τὴν προσευχήν. Comp. συνετέλεσε, Matt. vii. 28. — ἀκοάς] as Mark vii. 35. — The healing of the leper, which Matthew introduces before the healing of the servant, Luke has inserted already at v. 12 ff. — Ver. 3. πρεσβυτέρους] as usually: *elders of the people*, who also on their part were sufficiently interested in respect of the circumstance mentioned at ver. 5. Hence not: *chiefs of the synagogue*; ἀρχισυναγώγους, Acts xiii. 15, xviii. 8, 17. — ἄξιός ἐστιν, ᾧ] equivalent to ἄξιός ἐστιν, ἵνα αὐτῷ. See Kühner, § 802. 4; Buttmann, *Neut. Gr.* p. 198 [E. T. 229]. — ἐλθών] Subsequently, in ver. 6, he changed his mind; his confidence *rose to a higher pitch*, so that he is convinced that he needs not to suggest to Him the coming at all. — Ver. 4. παρέξη] The *Recepta* παρέξει, as the second person, is not found anywhere; for ὄψει and βούλει (Winer, p. 70 [E. T. 89]) are forms sanctioned by usage, to which also is to be added οἶει; but other verbs are found only in Aristophanes and the tragic writers (Matthaei, p. 462; Reisig, *ad Soph. Oed. C.* p. xxii. f.). If παρέξει were genuine, it would be the third person of the future active (min.: παρέξεις), and the words would contain the utterance of the petitioners *among themselves*. — Vv. 5, 6. αὐτός] *ipse*, namely, of his own means.¹ The *Gentile* builder did not prejudice the *sanctity* of the building, because that came by means of the *consecration*. See Lightfoot, p. 775. — φίλους] as xv. 6; Acts x. 24, *kinsfolk*, relatives; see Nägelsbach, *Ann. z. Ilias*, ed. 3, p. 374. — Ver. 7. διό] on account of my unworthiness. — οὐδέ] *not at all*. — ἐμαυτόν] in reference to those *who had been sent*, who were to *represent him*,

¹ He was such a friend of Judaism, and dwelt in the Jewish land. This was a sufficient reason for Jesus treating him quite differently from the way in which He afterwards treated the Syrophenician woman. Hilgenfeld persists in tracing Matt. viii. 5 ff. to the supposed universalistic retouching of Matthew. See his *Zeitschr.* 1865, p. 48 ff.

ver. 3. — *παῖς*] equivalent to *δούλος*, ver. 2. According to Baur, it is an unmerited accusation against Luke that he *erroneously interpreted* the *παῖς* of his original source, and nevertheless by oversight *allowed it to remain* in this place (Holtzmann). — Ver. 8. *ὑπὸ ἐξουσ. τασσόμ.*] an expression of military subordination: *one who is placed under orders*. Luke might also have written *τεταγμένος*, but the present depicts in a more lively manner the *concrete* relation *as it constantly occurs in the service*. — Ver. 10. *τὸν ἀσθενούντα δ. ὑγιαίν.*] *the sick slave well* (not: *recovering*). *ἀσθενούντα*, present participle, spoken from the point of view of the *πεμφθέντες*, ver. 6. *Οὐ γὰρ ἅμα . . . ὑγιαίνει τε καὶ νοσεῖ ὁ ἄνθρωπος*, Plat. *Gorg.* p. 495 E. As an explanation of this miraculous healing from a distance, Schenkel can here suggest only the “extraordinary spiritual excitement” of the sick person.

Vv. 11, 12. The raising of the young man at Nain (נַיִן, *a pasture ground*, situated in a south-easterly direction from Nazareth, now a little hamlet of the same name not far from Endor; see Robinson, *Pal.* III. p. 469; Ritter, *Erzk.* XV. p. 407) is recorded in Luke alone; it is uncertain whether he derived the narrative from a written source or from oral tradition. — *ἐν τῷ ἑξῆς*] in the time that followed thereafter, to be construed with *ἐγέν.* Comp. viii. 1. — *μαθηταί*] in the wider sense, vi. 13, xvii. 20. — *ἱκανοί*] in considerable number, Mehlhorn, *De adjectivor. pro adverb. pos. ratione et usu*, Glog. 1828, p. 9 ff.; Kühner, *ad Xen. Anab.* i. 4. 12. — *ὥς δὲ ἤγγισε . . . καὶ ἰδοὺ*] This *καί* introducing the apodosis is a particle denoting something additional: *also*. Comp. ii. 21. When He drew near, *behold, there also was*, etc. See, moreover, Acts i. 11, x. 17. — *τῇ μητρὶ αὐτοῦ*] Comp. ix. 38; Herod. vii. 221: *τὸν δὲ παῖδα . . . ἔοντα οἱ μουνογενέα*; Aeschyl. *Ag.* 872: *μονογενὲς τέκνον πατρί*; Tob. iii. 15; Judg. xi. 34; Winer, p. 189 [E. T. 264 f.]. — The *tombs* (*ἐξεκομίζετο*, comp. Acts v. 6) were outside the towns. See Doughty, *Anat.* II. p. 50 ff. — *καὶ αὕτη χήρα*] *scil.* ἦν, which, moreover, is actually read after *αὕτη* by important authorities. It should be written in its simplest form, *αὕτη* (Vulg. and most of the codd. of It. have: *hacc*). Beza: *κ. αὐτῇ χήρα* (*et ipsi quidem viduae*).

Vv. 13–15. The sympathy with the mother was in itself sufficiently well founded, even without the need of any special (perhaps direct) acquaintance with her circumstances. — *μὴ κλαίει*] “*Consolatio ante opus ostendit operis certo futuri potestatem*,” Bengel. — The *coffin* (*ἡ σορός*) was an uncovered chest. See Wetstein *in loc.*; Harmer, *Beob.* II. p. 141. — The mere *touch* without a word caused the bearers to stand still. A trait of the marvellous. — *νεανίσκε, σοὶ λ.*] The preceding touch had influenced the *bearers*. — *ἀνεκάθισεν*] *He sat upright*. Comp. Acts ix. 40; Xen. *Cyr.* v. 19; Plat. *Phaed.* p. 60 B: *ἀνακαθιζόμενος ἐπὶ τὴν κλίνην*, and thereon Stallbaum. — *ἔδωκεν*] Comp. ix. 42. *His* work had now been done on him.

Vv. 16, 17. *Φόβος*] *Fear*, the first natural impression, v. 26. — *ὅτι . . . καὶ ὅτι*] not recitative (so usually), but *argumentative* (Bornemann), as i. 25: (we praise God) *because . . . and because*. The *recitative ὅτι* occurs nowhere (not even in iv. 10) *twice* in the same discourse; moreover, it is quite arbitrary to assume that in the second half, which is by no means specifically different from the first, we have the words *of others* (Paulus, Kuinoel, Bleek). — They saw in this miracle a *σημεῖον* of a *great prophet*, and in *His* appearance they saw the beginning of the Messianic deliverance (comp. i. 68, 78). — *ὁ λόγος οὗτος*] *This saying*, namely, that a great prophet with his claim made good by a raising from the dead, etc. — *ἐν ὅλῃ τ. Ἰουδ.*] a pregnant expression: *in the whole of Judaea*, whither the saying had penetrated. Comp. Thucyd. iv. 42: *ἐν Λευκαδίᾳ ἀπῆρσαν*. *Judaea* is not here to be understood in the narrower sense of the province, as though this were specified as the theatre of the incident (Weizsäcker), but in the wider sense of *Palestine in general* (i. 5); and by *ἐν πάσῃ τῇ περιχώρῳ*, which is not to be referred to the neighbourhood of *Nain* (Köstlin, p. 231), it is asserted that the rumour had spread abroad even beyond the limits of Palestine. — *περὶ αὐτοῦ*] so that He was mentioned as the subject of the rumour. Comp. v. 15.

REMARK.—The *natural* explanation of this miracle as of the awakening of a *person only apparently dead* (Paulus, Ammon;

comp. Schleiermacher, *L. J.* p. 233) so directly conflicts with the Gospel narrative, and, moreover, places Jesus in so injurious a light of dissimulation and pretence, that it is decisively to be rejected, even apart from the fact that in itself it would be improbable, nay monstrous, to suppose that as often as dead people required His help, He should have chanced every time upon people only apparently dead (to which class in the end even He Himself also must have belonged after His crucifixion?). Further, the *allegorical* explanation (Weisse), as well as also the *identification* of this miracle with the narrative of the daughter of Jairus (Gfrörer, *Heil. Sage*, I. p. 194), and finally, the *mythical* solution (Strauss), depend upon subjective assumptions, which are not sufficient to set aside the objective historical testimony, all the more that this testimony is conjoined, in respect of the nature of the miracle, with that of Matthew (Jairus' daughter) and that of John (Lazarus); and to suspect the three narratives of raisings from the dead taken together because of the gradual climax of their attendant circumstances (Woolston, Strauss: death-bed, coffin, grave) is inadmissible, because Luke has not the history of the raising on the death-bed until later (viii. 50 ff.), and therefore was not consciously aware of that progression to a climax. The raisings of the dead, attested beyond all doubt by all the four evangelists, referred to by Jesus Himself among the proofs of His divine vocation (Matt. xi. 5; Luke vii. 22), kept in lively remembrance in the most ancient church (Justin, *Ap.* i. 48. 22; Origen, *c. Cels.* ii. 48), and hence not to be left on one side as problematical (Schleiermacher, Weizsäcker), are analogous σημεία of the specific Messianic work of the future ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν.

Vv. 18-35. See on Matt. xi. 2-19. Matthew has for reasons of his own given this history a different and less accurate *position*, but he has related it more fully, not omitting just at the beginning, as Luke does, the mention of the Baptist's imprisonment. Luke follows another source. — *περὶ πάντων τούτων*] such as the healing of the servant and the raising of the young man.¹ — Ver. 21. Luke also, the physician, here and elsewhere (comp. vi. 17 f., v. 40 f.) distinguishes between the naturally sick people and demoniacs. Besides, the whole narrative passage, vv. 20, 21, is an addi-

¹ Luke also thus makes the sending of John's disciples to be occasioned by the *works*, the *doings* of Jesus, as Matthew (ἔργα). This in opposition to Wieseler (in the *Gött. Vierteljahrsschr.* 1845, p. 197 ff.).

tion by Luke in his character of historian. — *καὶ τυφλ.*] *and especially, etc.* — *ἐχαρίσατο*] “magnificum verbum,” Bengel. Ver. 25. *τρυφή*] not to be referred to clothing, but to be taken generally, *luxury*. — Ver. 27. Mal. iii. 1 is here, as in Matt. and in Mark i. 2, quoted in a similarly peculiar form, which differs from the LXX. The citation in this form had already become sanctioned by usage. — Ver. 28. *προφήτης*] The reflectiveness of a later period is manifest in the insertion of this word. Matthew is original. — Vv. 29, 30 do not contain an *historical notice introduced by Luke* by way of comment (Paulus, Bornemann, Schleiermacher, Lachmann, Köstlin, Hilgenfeld, Bleek, following older commentators), for his manner elsewhere is opposed to this view, and the spuriousness of *εἶπε δὲ ὁ κύριος*, ver. 31 (in Elz.), is decisive; but the words are *spoken by Jesus*, who alleges the *differing result* which the advent of this greatest of the prophets had produced among the people and among the hierarchs. In respect of this, it is to be conceded that the words in their relation to the power, freshness, and rhetorical vividness of what has gone before bear a more *historical stamp*, and hence might reasonably be regarded as a later interpolation of tradition (Weisse, II. p. 109, makes them an echo of Matt. xxi. 31 f.; comp. de Wette, Holtzmann, and Weiss); Ewald derives them from the *Logia*, where, however, their original place was, according to him, after ver. 27. — *ἐδικαίωσαν τ. Θεόν*] *they justified God*, i.e. they declared by their act that His will to adopt the baptism of John was right. — *βαπτισθ.* is *contemporaneous*. — *τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ*] namely, to become prepared by the baptism of repentance for the approaching kingdom of Messiah. This counsel of God's will (*βουλή*, comp. on Eph. i. 11) *they annulled* (*ἠθέτ.*), they abolished, since they frustrated its realization through their disobedience. Beza says pertinently: “*Abrogarunt, nempe quod ad ipsius rei exitum attinet, quo evasit ipsis exitii instrumentum id, quod eos ad resipiscentiam et salutem vocabat.*” — *εἰς ἑαυτούς*] *with respect to themselves*, a closer limitation of the reference of *ἠθέτησαν*.¹ Bornemann (comp. Castalio): “*quantum ab ipsis pendebat*” (“*alios enim*

¹ Bengel justly observes: “nam ipsum Dei consilium non potuere tollere.”

passi sunt," etc.). This would be τὸ εἰς ἑαυτούς (Soph. *Oed. R.* 706; Eur. *Iph. T.* 697, and elsewhere). — Ver. 31. τοὺς ἀνθρ. τ. γεν. τ.] is related not remotely to ver. 29 (Holtzmann), but Jesus means to have the general designation applied (see also ver. 34) to the *hierarchs*, ver. 30, not to πᾶς ὁ λαός. Comp. Matt. xii. 39, xvi. 4. — εἰσὶν ὁμ.] εἰσὶν has the emphasis. — Ver. 33. As to the form ἔσθων, as we must write with Tischendorf [Tisch. 8 has ἐσθίων], comp. on Mark i. 6. The limitations ἄρτον and οἶνον, which are not found in Matthew, betray themselves to be additions of a later tradition, the former being an echo of Matt. iii. 4; Mark i. 6. — Ver. 35. See on Matt. xi. 19, and observe the appropriate reference of the expression ἐδικαιώθη κ.τ.λ. to ἐδικαιώσαν τ. Θεόν, ver. 29. Even Theophylact, who is mistaken in his interpretation of Matt. *l.c.*, expresses in this place the substantially correct view that the divine wisdom which revealed itself in Jesus and the Baptist received its practical justification in the conduct of their followers.¹ Bornemann considers these words as a continuation of the *antagonistic saying* ἰδοὺ . . . ἁμαρτωλῶν, and, indeed, as bitterly *ironical*: "Et (dicitis): probari, spectari solet sapientia, quae Johannis et Christi propria est, in filiis ejus omnibus, *i.e.* in fructibus ejus omnibus." It is against this view that, apart from the taking of the aorist in the sense of habitual action (see on Matt. *l.c.*), τέκνα τῆς σοφίας can denote only *persons*; that, according to the parallelism with ver. 33, the antagonistic judgment does not go further than ἁμαρτωλῶν; and that Jesus would scarcely break off his discourse with the quotation of an antagonistic sarcasm instead of delivering with His own judgment a final decision in reference to the contradictory phenomena in question. — πάντων] added at the end for emphasis, not by mistake (Holtzmann, Weiss), serves to confirm what is consolatory in the experience declared by ἐδικαιώθη κ.τ.λ.

Ver. 36. This narrative of the anointing is *distinct* from that given in Matt. xxvi. 6 ff.; Mark xiv. 3 ff.; John xii. 1 ff.

¹ Comp. Pressel, *Philolog. Miscellen üb. d. Evang. Matth.* (Schulprogramm), Ulm 1865, p. 3 f., who nevertheless takes ἀπό in the sense of *in* (Matt. vii. 16 and elsewhere), without essential difference of meaning.

See on Matt. xxvi. 6. The supposition that there was *only one* incident of the kind, can be indulged only at *Luke's* expense. He must either *himself* have put aside the actual circumstances, and have added new circumstances (Hug, *Gutacht.* II. p. 98), which is in itself quite improbable, or he must have followed a tradition which had transferred the later incident into an earlier period; comp. Ewald, Bleek, Holtzmann, Schenkel, Weizsäcker; Schleiermacher also, according to whom Luke must have adopted a *distorted* narrative; and Hilgenfeld, according to whom he must have *remodelled* the older narrative on a Pauline basis. But the accounts of Mark and Matthew presuppose a tradition so constant as to time and place, that the supposed erroneous (John xii. 1 ff.) dislocation of the tradition, conjoined with free remodelling, as well as its preference on the part of Luke, can commend itself only less than *the* hypothesis that he is relating an anointing which actually occurred earlier, and, on the other hand, has passed over the similar subsequent incident; hence it is the less to be conceived that Simon could have been the husband of Martha (Hengstenberg). Notwithstanding the fact that the rest of the evangelists relate an anointing, Baur has taken our narrative as an *allegorical poem* (see his *Evang.* p. 501), which, according to him, has its parallel in the section concerning the woman taken in adultery. Strauss sought to confuse together the two narratives of anointing and the account of the woman taken in adultery. According to Eichthal, II. p. 252, the narrative is an interpolation, and that the most pernicious of all from a moral point of view!

Vv. 37, 38. [*Ἦτις ἦν ἐν τ. πόλει ἁμαρτ.*] According to this arrangement (see the critical remarks): *who in the city was a sinner*: she was in the city a person practising prostitution.¹ See on *ἁμαρτωλός* in this sense, Wetstein *in loc.*; Dorvill, *ad Char.* p. 220. Comp. on John viii. 7. The woman through

¹ Grotius says pertinently: "Quid mirum, tales ad Christum confugisse, cum et ad Johannis baptismum venerint? Matt. xxi. 32." Schleiermacher ought not to have explained it away as the "sinful woman in the general sense." She had been a *πόρνη* (Matt. xxi. 31).

the influence of Jesus (it is unknown *how*; perhaps only by hearing His preaching and by observation of His entire ministry) had attained to repentance and faith, and thereby to moral renewal. Now the most fervent love and reverence of gratitude to her deliverer urge her to show Him outward tokens of these sentiments. She does not speak, but her tears, etc., are more eloquent than speech, and they are understood by Jesus. The *imperfect* ἦν does not stand for the pluperfect (Kuinoel and others), but Luke narrates from the standpoint of the public opinion, according to which the woman still *was* (ver. 39) what she, and that probably not long before, *had been*. The view, handed down from ancient times in the Latin Church (see Sepp, *L. J.* II. p. 281 ff.; Schegg *in loc.*), and still defended by Lange,¹ to whom therefore the πόλις is Magdala, which identifies the woman with *Mary Magdalene* (for whose festival the narrative before us is the lesson), and further identifies the latter with the sister of Lazarus, is, though adopted even by Hengstenberg, just as groundless (according to viii. 2, moreover, morally inadmissible) as the supposition that the πόλις in the passage before us is *Jerusalem* (Paulus in his *Comment. v. Exeg. Handb.*; in his *Leben Jesu: Bethany*). *Nain* may be meant, ver. 11 (Kuinoel). It is safer to leave it indefinite as the city *in which dwelt the Pharisee in question*. — ὁπίσω παρὰ τ. πόδ. αὐτ.] According to the well-known custom at meals, Jesus reclined, with naked feet, and these extended *behind* Him, at table. — ἤρξατο] vividness of description attained by making conspicuous the *first thing done*. — τῆς κεφαλῆς] superfluous in itself, but contributing to the vivid *picture* of the proof of affection. — κατεφίλει] as Matt. xxvi. 49. Comp. Polyb. xv. 1. 7: ἀγεννώως τοὺς πόδας καταφιλοῦεν τῶν ἐν τῷ συνεδρίῳ. Among the ancients *the kissing of the feet* was a proof of deep veneration (Kypke, I. p. 242; Dorvill, *ad Charit.* p. 203), which was manifested especially to Rabbins (Othonius, *Lxx.* p. 233; Wetstein *in loc.*). — The *tears* of the woman were those of painful remembrance and of thankful emotion.

Vv. 39, 40. To the Pharisee in his legal coldness and

¹ Heller follows him in Herzog's *Encykl.* IX. p. 104.

conceit, the *essence*, the *moral character* of the proceeding, remains entirely unknown; he sees in the fact that Jesus acquiesces in this homage of the *sinful woman* the proof that He does not know her, and therefore is no prophet, because He allows Himself unawares to be defiled by her who is unclean. — οὗτος] placed first with an emphasis of depreciation. — ποταπή] of *what character*, i. 29. — ἥτις ἅπτ. αὐτοῦ] *she who touches*, comes in contact with Him. — ὅτι] *that she, namely*. — Ver. 40. Jesus saw into the *thoughts* of the Pharisee. The ἔχω κ.τ.λ. is a "*comis praeatio*," Bengel. Observe that the Pharisee himself, in respect of such a scene, does not venture to throw any suspicion of *immorality* on Jesus.

Vv. 41-43. By the one *debtor*¹ the *woman* is typified, by the other *Simon*, both with a view to what is to be said at ver. 47. The supposition that both of them had been *healed* by Jesus of a *disease* (Paulus, Kuinoel), does not, so far as Simon is concerned, find any sure ground (in opposition to Holtzmann) in the ὁ λεπρός of the later narrative of the anointing (in Matthew and Mark). The *creditor* is *Christ*, of whose debtors the one owes Him a ten times heavier debt (referring to the woman in her agony of repentance) than the other (the Pharisee regarded as the righteous man he fancied himself to be). The difference in the degree of guilt is measured by the difference in the subjective *consciousness* of guilt; by this also is measured the much or little of the *forgiveness*, which again has for its result the much or little of the grateful *love* shown to Christ, ver. 41 ff. — μὴ ἐχόντων] "*Ergo non solvitur debitum subsequente amore et grato animo*," Bengel. — On the interpolated εἰπέ, which makes the question more pointed, comp. Bremi, *ad Dem. adv. Phil.* I. p. 119.

Vv. 44-46. Jesus places the affectionate services rendered by the woman in contrast with the cold respectable demeanour of the Pharisee, who had not observed towards Him at all the *customs* of courtesy (foot-washing, kissing) and of deference

¹ Instead of χρεωφ., the late inferior form of writing, χρεφ., is on decisive evidence to be adopted, along with Lachmann and Tischendorf (Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 691).

(anointing of the head). — σου εἰς τ. οἶκ.] I came *into thy house*. The σου being placed first sharpens the rebuke. — That, moreover, even the *foot-washing* before meals was not *absolutely* a rule (it was observed especially in the case of guests coming off a *journey*, Gen. xviii. 4; Judg. xix. 21; 1 Sam. xxv. 41; 2 Thess. v. 10) is plain from John xiii., and hence the neglect on the part of the heartless Pharisee is the more easily explained. — ἔβρεξέ μου τ. πόδ.] *moistened my feet*. Comp. on John xi. 32; Matt. viii. 3. — Observe the contrasts of the *less* and the *greater*:—(1) ὕδωρ and τοῖς δάκρυσιν; (2) φίλημα, which is plainly understood as a kiss upon the *mouth*, and οὐ διέλ. καταφ. μ. τοὺς πόδας; (3) ἐλαίῳ τὴν κεφαλ. and μύρω ἥλ. μ. τοὺς πόδας (μύρον is an aromatic anointing oil, and more precious than ἔλαιον, see Xen. *Conv.* ii. 3). — ἀφ' ἧς εἰσῆλθον] loosely hyperbolic in affectionate consideration,—suggested by the mention of the *kiss* which was appropriate at the *entering*.

Ver. 47. Οὐ χάριν, by Beza, Grotius, Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, de Wette, Ewald, Bleek, and others, is separated from λέγω σοι by a comma, and connected with ἀφείωνται. But the latter has its limitation by ὅτι κ.τ.λ. It is to be interpreted: *on account of which I say unto thee*; on behalf of this her manifestation of love (as a recognition and high estimation thereof) I declare to thee. — ἀφείωνται κ.τ.λ.] *her sins are forgiven, the many* (that she has committed, vv. 37, 39), *since she has loved much*. This ὅτι ἡγάπησε πολὺ expresses not the *cause*, and therefore not the *antecedent* of forgiveness. That the words do express the antecedent of forgiveness is the opinion of the Catholics, who maintain thereby their doctrine of *contritio charitate formata* and of the *merit of works*; and lately, too, of de Wette, who recognises love for Christ and faith in Him as one; of Olshausen, who after his own fashion endeavours to overcome the difficulty of the thought by regarding love as a *receptive* activity; of Paulus, who drags in what is not found in the text; of Baumgarten-Crusius, and of Bleek. Although dogmatic theology is not decisive against this opinion (see the pertinent observations of Melancthon in the *Apol.* iii. 31 ff. p. 87 f.),

yet perhaps the context is, because this view directly contradicts the παραβολή, vv. 41, 42, that lies at its foundation, as well as the ᾧ δὲ ὀλίγον ἀφίεται κ.τ.λ. which immediately follows, if the love does not appear as the *consequent* of the forgiveness; the *antecedent*, i.e. the subjective cause of the forgiveness, is not the love, but the *faith* of the penitent, as is plain from ver. 50. Contextually it is right, therefore, to understand ὅτι of the *ground of recognition or acknowledgment*: Her sins are forgiven, etc., *which is certain, since she has manifested love in an exalted degree*. Bengel says pertinently: "Remissio peccatorum, Simoni non cogitata, probatur a fructu, ver. 42, qui est evidens et in oculos incurrit, quum illa sit occulta;" and Calovius: "probat Christus a posteriori." Comp. Beza, Calvin, Wetstein, Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* I. p. 603 f.; Hilgenfeld also, *Evang.* p. 175. The objection against this view, taken by Olshausen and Bleek, that the aorist ἡγάπησε is inappropriate, is quite a mistake, and is nullified by passages such as John iii. 16. The ἀφίονται expresses that the woman is in the *condition of forgiveness* (in statu gratiae), and that the *criterion* thereof is the much love manifested by her. It is thereafter in ver. 48 that Jesus makes, even to herself, the express declaration. — ᾧ δὲ ὀλίγον ἀφίεται, ὀλίγ. ἀγαπᾷ] a general decision in precise opposition to the first half of the verse, with intentional application to the moral condition of the Pharisee, which is of such a kind that *only a little forgiveness falls to his share, the consequence being that he also manifests but little love* (vv. 44-46). There was too much want of self-knowledge and of repentance in the self-righteous Simon for him to be a subject of *much* forgiveness.

Ver. 48. The *Pharisee* is dismissed, and now Jesus satisfies the *woman's* need, and gives her the formal and direct *assurance* of her pardoned condition. *Subjectively* she was already in this condition through her faith (ver. 50), and her love was the result thereof (ver. 47); but the *objective assurance*, the declared absolution on the part of the forgiver, now completed the moral deliverance (ver. 50) which her faith had wrought.

Ver. 49. "Ἠρξαντο] The *beginning*, the *rising up* of this thought, is noteworthy in Luke's estimation. — τίς οὗτός ἐστιν κ.τ.λ.] a question of displeasure. — καί: *even*.

Ver. 50. Jesus enters not into explanation in answer to these thoughts, but closes the whole scene by *dismissing* the woman with a parting word, intended to confirm her faith by pointing out the *ground* of her spiritual deliverance. — ἡ πίστις σ.] "*fides*, non amor; fides ad nos spectat, amore convincuntur alii," Bengel. — εἰς εἰρήνην] as viii. 48. See on Mark v. 34.

REMARK.—From the correct interpretation of this section it is manifest of itself that this passage, peculiar to Luke, contains nothing without an adequate motive (ver. 37) or obscure (ver. 47); but, on the contrary, the self-consistency of the whole incident, the attractive simplicity and truth with which it is set forth, and the profound clearness and pregnancy of meaning characteristic of the sayings of Jesus, all bear the stamp of originality; and this is especially true also of the description of the woman who is thus silently eloquent by means of her behaviour. This is in opposition to de Wette (comp. also Weiss, II. p. 142 ff.). A distorted narrative (Schleiermacher), a narrative from "a somewhat confused tradition" (Holtzmann), or a narrative gathering together ill-fitting elements (Weizsäcker), is not marked by such internal truth, sensibility, and tenderness.

CHAPTER VIII.

VER. 3. Instead of $\alpha\upsilon\tau\tilde{\omega}$ Scholz and Tisch. have $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\tilde{\omega}$, on preponderating evidence. The singular more readily occurred to the transcribers, partly because $\tilde{\eta}\sigma\alpha\nu\tau\epsilon\delta\epsilon\rho\alpha\pi\epsilon\iota\sigma\mu$ had gone before, partly by reminiscences of Matt. xxvii. 55; Mark xv. 41. — Instead of $\acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{o}$ we must read, with Lachm. and Tisch., on decisive evidence, $\epsilon\zeta$. — Ver. 8. Elz. has $\epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}$. But $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ has decisive attestation. — Ver. 9. $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omicron\upsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma$] is wanting in B D L R Ξ Σ , min. Syr. Perss. Copt. Arm. Vulg. It. Suspected by Griesb., rejected by Wassenb. and Schulz, deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. But the *oratio obliqua* was the cause rather of its omission than of its addition. — Ver. 16. $\epsilon\pi\iota\tau\acute{\iota}\theta\eta\sigma\iota\nu$] Lachm. and Tisch. have $\tau\acute{\iota}\theta\eta\sigma\iota\nu$. See on Mark iv. 21. — Ver. 17. $\omega\delta\gamma\iota\nu\sigma\delta\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$] Lachm. and Tisch. have $\omega\delta\mu\eta\gamma\iota\nu\sigma\delta\eta$, in accordance with B L Ξ Σ , 33. An alteration for the sake of the following $\tilde{\epsilon}\lambda\delta\eta$. — Ver. 20. $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega\iota$] is wanting in B D L Δ Ξ Σ , min. vss., also Vulg. It. Bas. Deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. It is to be maintained; the looseness of construction occasioned in some authorities its simple omission, in others the substitution of $\delta\pi\iota$, as read by Tischendorf. — Ver. 26. $\Gamma\alpha\delta\alpha\rho\eta\nu\tilde{\omega}\nu$] Lachm. and Tisch. [Tisch. 8 has $\Gamma\epsilon\rho\gamma\epsilon\sigma\eta\nu\tilde{\omega}\nu$], following B C ? D, Vulg. It., have $\Gamma\epsilon\alpha\sigma\eta\nu\tilde{\omega}\nu$. L X Σ , min. vss. Epiph. have $\Gamma\epsilon\rho\gamma\epsilon\sigma\eta\nu\tilde{\omega}\nu$. See on Matt. — Ver. 29. Instead of $\pi\alpha\rho\acute{\eta}\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\epsilon$ we must read, with Lachm. and Tisch., $\pi\alpha\rho\acute{\eta}\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\nu$, on decisive evidence. — Ver. 31. $\pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\kappa\acute{\alpha}\lambda\epsilon\iota$] $\pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\kappa\acute{\alpha}\lambda\epsilon\nu$ (Lachm. Tisch.), although strongly attested, is an alteration to suit the connection and following the parallels. — Ver. 32. $\beta\omicron\sigma\sigma\eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega\iota$] Lachm. has $\beta\omicron\sigma\sigma\eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta$, in accordance with B D K U Σ , min. Syr. Aeth. Vere. From the parallels. — $\pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\kappa\acute{\alpha}\lambda\epsilon\omega\iota$] Lachm. and Tisch. have $\pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\kappa\acute{\alpha}\lambda\epsilon\sigma\alpha\nu$, in accordance with B C* L Ξ , min. In Matthew the former, in Mark the latter reading. The evidence is not decisive, but probably the imperfect is from Matthew, as it is only in that Gospel that the reading is without variation. — Ver. 33. Instead of $\epsilon\iota\sigma\tilde{\eta}\lambda\delta\epsilon\nu$, $\epsilon\iota\sigma\eta\lambda\delta\epsilon\nu$ is decisively attested (Lachm. Tisch.). — Ver. 34. $\gamma\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\iota\omega\iota$] With Griesb. Scholz, Lachm. Tisch., who follow decisive evidence, read $\gamma\epsilon\gamma\omega\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$. — $\acute{\alpha}\pi\epsilon\lambda\delta\acute{\omicron}\upsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma$] which Elz. has before $\acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{\eta}\gamma\gamma$, is condemned on decisive evidence. — Ver. 36. $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$] is not found in B C D L P X Σ ,

min. Syr. Pers.^p Copt. Arm. Slav. It. Condemned by Griesb., deleted by Lachm. But as it might be dispensed with, and, moreover, as it is not read in Mark v. 16, it came easily to disappear. — Ver. 37. ἡρώτησαν] Lachm. has ἡρώτησεν, in accordance with A B C K M P x s, min. Verc. An emendation. — Ver. 41. αὐτός] Lachm. has οὗτος, in accordance with B D R, min. Copt. Brix. Verc. Goth. The *Recepta* is to be maintained; the reference of αὐτός was not perceived. — Ver. 42. ἐν δὲ τῷ ὑπάγειν] Lachm. and Tisch. [Tisch. 8 has ἐν δὲ τῷ ὑπάγειν] read καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ πορεύεσθαι, but only on the authority of C D* P, Vulg. also, It. Marcion. The *Recepta* is to be adhered to in consideration of the preponderance of evidence in its favour, and because the frequently used πορεύεσθαι would be more readily imported than ὑπάγειν. — Ver. 43. ὑπ'] Lachm. and Tisch. have ἀπ', in accordance with A B R ≡ 254. The *Recepta* is a correction, instead of which 69 has παρ'. — Ver. 45. Instead of σὺν αὐτῷ Elz. Scholz have μετ' αὐτοῦ, in opposition to decisive evidence (in B, min. and a few vss. the words καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ are wanting altogether). — ζ. λέγεις· τίς ὁ ἀψ. μ.] is, with Tisch., following B L s, min. Copt. Sah. Arm., to be deleted. Taken from Mark, on the basis of ver. 45. — Ver. 48. θάρσει] An addition from Matthew; deleted by Lachm., Tisch. — Ver. 49. Instead of μή Lachm. Tisch. have μηκέτι, in accordance with B D s, Syr.^p (marked with an asterisk), Cant. This μηκέτι, in consequence of Mark v. 35 (τί ἔτι), was written in the margin by way of gloss, and was afterwards taken in, sometimes *alongside of* μή (thus B: μή μηκέτι), sometimes *instead of* it. — Ver. 51. Instead of ἐλθών (Griesb. Scholz, Lachm. Tisch.) Elz. has εἰσελθών, in accordance with B D V, min. Copt. Aeth. This latter is to be restored; the simple form is from Matt. ix. 23, Mark v. 38, and was the more welcome as distinguished from the following εἰσελθεῖν ("et cum venisset domum, non permisit intrare," etc., Vulg.). — οὐδένα] Lachm. and Tisch. have τινὰ σὺν αὐτῷ, upon sufficient evidence. οὐδένα is from Mark v. 37. — Ver. 52. οὐκ] B C D F L X Δ s, min. vss. have οὐ γάρ. Commended by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. and Tisch. [Tisch. 8 has οὐκ]. From Matt. ix. 24, whence also in many authorities τὸ κοράσιον is imported after ἀπέθ. — Ver. 54. ἐκβαλὼν ἕξω πάντ. καί] is wanting in B D L X s, min. Vulg. It. Syr.^{cur} Ambr. Bede. Suspected by Griesb., deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. If the words had been genuine, they would hardly, as recording a detail of the narrative made familiar by Matthew and Mark, have been omitted here. — ἐγείρου] with B C D X s 1, 33, ἔγειρε is in this place also (comp. v. 23 f., vi. 8) to be written. So Lachm. and Tisch. [Tisch. 8 has ἐγείρου]. Comp. on Matt. ix. 5.

Vv. 1-3. A general historical statement in regard to the *continued* official teaching in Galilee, and the *ministry of women* connected therewith. — ἐν τῷ καθέξ.] Comp. vii. 11. — καὶ αὐτός] καί is that which carries forward the narrative after ἐγένετο (see on v. 12), and αὐτός prepares the way for the mention of the *followers* of Jesus (καὶ οἱ δώδεκα κ.τ.λ.). — κατὰ πόλιν] as ver. 4. — Μαγδ.] see on Matt. xxvii. 56. She is neither the woman that anointed Jesus, vii. 37, nor the sister of Lazarus. — ἀφ' ἧς δαιμόν. ἐπτὰ ἐξελήλ.] Comp. Mark xvi. 9. A *simultaneous* possession by seven devils is to be conceived of, so far similar to the condition of the possessed man at Gadara, viii. 30. Comp., even at so early a period, Tertullian, *De Anim.* 25. Lange, *L. J.* II. 1, p. 292, rationalizes: ¹ “a convert whom Jesus had rescued from the heavy *curse of sin.*” Comp. also Hengstenberg on John, II. p. 206, according to whom she was “an *emancipated woman*” who found in Christ the tranquillizing of the *tumult of her emotional nature.* The express τεθεραπευμένοι, *healed*, should certainly have guarded against this view. — ἐπιτρόπου] Matt. xx. 8. He *had* probably *been* a steward, and she was his *widow.* She is also named at xxiv. 10. — Ἡρώδου] Probably *Antipas*, because without any distinguishing limitation. Neither *Joanna* nor *Susanna* is known in any other relation. — διηκόνουν] with means of living and other kinds of necessities, Matt. xxvii. 55.

Vv. 4-15. See on Matt. xiii. 1-23; Mark iv. 1-20. The sequence of events between the message of the Baptist and this parabolic discourse is in Matthew wholly different. — συνίοντος δέ] whilst, however, a great crowd of people came together, also of those who, city by city, drew near to Him. τῶν κ.τ.λ.

¹ That what is here meant is “the ethically culpable and therefore metaphorical possession of an erring soul that was completely under the power of the spirit of the world.” This explaining away of the literal possession (in which, moreover, Fathers such as Gregory and Bede have already preceded him) is not to be defended by comparison of Matt. xii. 43 ff., Luke xx. 24 ff., where certainly the seven demons only serve the purpose of the *parable.* Besides, it is pure invention to find in the *seven* demons the representation of the spirit of the world in its *whole power.* At least, according to this the demon in Matt. xii. 45 would only have needed to take with him *six* other demons.

depends on ὄχλου πολλοῦ, and καί, also, shows that this ὄχλος πολὺς, besides others (such, namely, as were dwelling there), consisted also of those who, city by city, *i.e.* by cities, etc. "Ex quavis urbe erat cohors aliqua," Bengel. — ἐπιπορεύεσθαι, not: to journey after (Rettig in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1838, p. 486), but to journey thither, to draw towards. Comp. Bar. vi. 62; Polyb. iv. 9. 2. Nowhere else in the New Testament; in the Greek writers it is usually found with an accusative of place, in the sense of *peragrarē terram*, and the like. — διὰ παραβ.] by means of a parable. Luke has the parable itself as brief and as little of the pictorial as possible (see especially vv. 6, 8); the original representation of the *Logia* (which Weiss finds in Luke) has already faded away. — Ver. 5. The collocation ὁ σπείρων τοῦ σπεῖραι τὸν σπόρον has somewhat of simple solemnity and earnestness. — μέν] καί follows in ver. 6. See on Mark ix. 12. — καὶ κατεπατ.] not inappropriate, since the discourse is certainly of the foot-path (in opposition to de Wette), but an incidental detail not intended for exposition (ver. 12). — Ver. 7. ἐν μέσῳ] The result of the ἔπεσεν. See on Matt. x. 16; and Krüger, *ad Dion. Hal. Hist.* p. 302. — συμφυεῖσαι] "una cum herba segetis," Erasmus. — Vv. 9-11. τίς . . . αὕτη] namely, κατὰ τὴν ἐρμηνειαν, Euthymius Zigabenus. — τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς ἐν παραβ.] but to the rest the mysteries of the kingdom of God are given in parables, that they, etc. What follows, viz. ἵνα βλέποντες μὴ βλέπωσι κ.τ.λ., is the contrast to γινῶναι. — ἔστι δὲ αὕτη ἡ παραβολή] but what follows is the parable (according to its meaning). — οἱ δὲ παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν] to complete this expression understand σπαρέντες, which is to be borrowed from the foregoing ὁ σπόρος. But since, according to ver. 11, the seed is the Gospel, a quite fitting form into which to put the exposition would perhaps have been τὸ δὲ παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν τούτων ἐστίν, οἱ κ.τ.λ. Vv. 14, 15 come nearer to such a logically exact mode of expression. — Ver. 13. Those, however, (sown) upon the rock are they who, when they shall have heard, receive the word with joy; and these, indeed, have no root, who for a while believe, etc. — Ver. 14. But that which fell among the thorns, these are they who have heard, and, going away among

cares, etc., they are choked. The οὔτοι (instead of τοῦτο) is attracted from what follows (Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* i. 2. 42), as also at ver. 15. — ὑπὸ μεριμνῶν κ.τ.λ.] a modal limitation to πορευόμενοι, so that ὑπὸ marks the accompanying relations, in this case the *impulse, under which* their πορεύεσθαι, that is, their *movement therefrom* (that is, their further life-guidance), proceeds, Bornemann *in loc.*; Bernhardt, p. 268; Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* II. p. 881. The connecting of these words with συμπνίγ. (Theophylact, Castalio, Beza, Elsner, Zeger, Bengel, Kuinoel, de Wette, Ewald, Schegg, and others) has against it the fact that without some qualifying phrase πορευόμενοι would not be a picturesque (de Wette), but an unmeaning addition, into which the interpreters were the first to *introduce* anything characteristic, as Beza, Elsner, Wolf, Valckenaer: *digressi ab audito verbo*, and Majus, Wetstein, Kuinoel, and others: *sensim ac paulatim* (following the supposed meaning of ἄρτι, 2 Sam. iii. 1, and elsewhere). Comp. Ewald, "more and more." — τοῦ βίου] belongs to all the three particulars mentioned. Temporal *cares* (not merely with reference to the poor, but in general), temporal *riches*, and temporal *pleasures* are the conditioning circumstances to which their interest is enchained, and among which their πορεύεσθαι proceeds. — συμπνίγονται] the same which at ver. 7 was expressed actively: αἱ ἄκανθαι ἀνέπνιξαν αὐτό. Hence συμπνίγονται is *passive*; not: *they choke* (what was heard), but: *they are choked*. That which holds good of the seed as a type of the teaching is asserted of the *men* in whose hearts the efficacy of the teaching amounts to nothing. This want of precision is the result of the fact that the *hearers* referred to were *themselves* marked out as the seed among the thorns. — κ. οὐ τελεσφ.] consequence of the συμπνίγ., *they do not bring to maturity*, there occurs in their case no bringing to maturity. Examples in Wetstein and Kypke. — Ver. 15. τὸ δὲ ἐν τ. κ. γῇ] *sc.* πεσόν, ver. 14. — ἐν καρδίᾳ κ.τ.λ.] belongs to κατέχουσι (*keep fast*, see on 1 Cor. xi. 2), and ἀκούσαντες τὸν λόγ. is a qualifying clause inserted parenthetically. — καλῇ κ. ἀγαθῇ] in the truly *moral* meaning (comp. Matt. vii. 17), not according to the Greek idea of εὐγένεια denoted by καλὸς

καγαθός (Welcker, *Theogn. Proleg.* p. xxiv. ff.; Maetzner, *ad Antiph.* p. 137; Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Rep.* 8, p. 569 A). But the heart is morally beautiful and good just by means of the purifying efficacy of the word that is heard, John xv. 3. — ἐν ὑπομονῇ] *perseveringly*. Comp. Rom. ii. 7. A contrast is found in ἀφίστανται, ver. 13. Bengel well says: “est robur animi spe bona sustentatum,” and that therein lies the “summa Christianismi.”

Vv. 16–18. See on Mark iv. 21–25; Matt. v. 15, x. 26, xiii. 12. The *connection* in Luke is substantially the same as in Mark: But if by such explanations as I have now given upon your question (ver. 9) I kindle a light for you, you must also let the same shine further, etc. (see on Mark iv. 21), and thence follows your obligation (βλέπετε οὖν, ver. 18) to listen aright to my teaching. On the *repeated* occurrence of this saying the remark of Euthymius Zigabenus is sufficient: εἰκὸς δὲ, κατὰ διαφόρους καιροὺς τὰ τοιαῦτα τὸν Χριστὸν εἰπεῖν. — Ver. 17. καὶ εἰς φαν. ἔλθῃ] a change in the idea. By the *future* γνωσθήσεται that which is to come is simply asserted as coming to pass; but by the *subjunctive* (ἔλθῃ) it is in such a way asserted that it leads one to *expect* it out of the present, and that without ἂν, because it is not conceived of as dependent on a conditioning circumstance (Klotz, *ad Decar.* p. 158 f.): There is nothing hidden which *shall not be known* and *is not bound to come to publicity*. Comp. on the latter clause, Plato, *Gorgias*, p. 480 C: εἰς τὸ φανερόν ἄγειν τὸ ἀδίκημα; Thucyd. i. 6. 3, 23. 5. — Ver. 18. πῶς] χρὴ γὰρ σπουδαίως κ. ἐπιμελῶς . . . ἀκροᾶσθαι, Euthymius Zigabenus. — ὃς γὰρ ἂν ἔχῃ κ.τ.λ.] a ground of encouragement. The meaning of the proverbial sayings in *this* connection is as in Mark iv. 25, not as in Matt. xiii. 12. — ὃ δοκεῖ ἔχειν] even *what he fancies he possesses*: it is not the *liability to loss*, but the *self-delusion* about possession, the *fanciful presumption* of possession, that is expressed; the μὴ ἔχειν, in fact, occurs when the knowledge has not actually been made a man's own; a man *believes* he has it, and the slight insight which he regards as its possession is again lost. It is not *reproach* against the apostles (Baur, Hilgenfeld), but *warning* that is conveyed in

the form of a general principle. In xix. 26 the expression with *δοκεῖ* would have been inappropriate. But even here the mere *ὁ ἔχει*, as in Mark iv. 25, would have been not only allowable, but even more significant. The *δοκεῖ κ.τ.λ.* already shows the influence of later reflection.

Vv. 19–21. See on Matt. xii. 46–50 ; Mark iii. 31–35. Luke has the section in accordance with Mark, but in a shortened form,¹ without anything to indicate chronological sequence or connection of subject, and he gives it a different position. — Ver. 20. *λεγόντων*] *by its being said*. See Winer, p. 519 [E. T. 736]; Bernhardy, p. 481 ; Bornemann, *Schol.* p. 53. — Ver. 21. *οὗτοι*] *my mother and my brethren are those who, etc.*

Vv. 22–25. See on Matt. viii. 18, 23–27 ; Mark iv. 35–41. In Luke there is no precise note of time, but the voyage is the same ; abridged from Mark. — Ver. 23 f. *ἀφυπνοῦν*] which means to *wake up* (therefore equivalent to *ἀφυπνίζεσθαι*), and also (as in this case) *to fall asleep* (consequently equivalent to *καθυπνοῦν*²), belongs to the late and corrupt Greek. Lobeck, *ad Phryg.* p. 224. — *κατέβη*] from the high ground down to the lake. Comp. Polyb. xxx. 14. 6 : *λαίλαπός τινος ἐκπεπτωκυίας εἰς αὐτούς. — συνεπληροῦντο*] What happened to the *ship* is said of the *sailors*. Examples in Kypke, I. p. 248. Observe the *imperfects* in relation to the preceding aorist. — *διήγειραν*] *they awoke him* (Matt. i. 24) ; but subsequently *ἐγερθεῖς* : *having arisen* (Matt. ii. 14). — Ver. 25. *ἐφοβήθ.*] the disciples, as Mark iv. 41. — The first *καί* is : *even*.

Vv. 26–39. See on Matt. viii. 28–34 ; Mark v. 1–20. Luke follows Mark freely. — *κατέπλ.*] *they arrived*. See Wetstein. — Ver. 27. *ἐκ τῆς πόλεως*] does not belong to *ὑπήντησεν*, but to *ἀνὴρ τις*, alongside of which it stands. To connect the clause with *ὑπήντησεν* would not be contradictory

¹ Therefore it is not to be said, with Baur, *Evang.* p. 467 f., that Luke purposely omitted the words in Matthew : *καὶ ἰκτινίας τ. χίμα αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τ. μαθητὰς ; κ.τ.λ.*, in an interest adverse to the Twelve. It is not the Twelve alone that are meant in Matthew.

² It corresponds exactly to the German “*entschlafen*,” except that this word is not used in the sense of *becoming free from sleep*, which *καθυπνοῦν* might have according to the connection.

to ἐν οἰκίᾳ . . . μνήμασιν, but would require the presupposition, not presented in the text, that the demoniac had just rushed out of the city. — Ver. 28. μὴ με βασαν.] as at Mark v. 7. — Ver. 29. παρήγγελλεν] not in the sense of the pluperfect, but like ἔλεγεν, Mark v. 8. — Nothing is to be put in a parenthesis. — πολλοῖς γὰρ χρόνοις κ.τ.λ.] To account for the command of Jesus the description of his frightful condition is given: *for during a long time* it had fared with him as follows. Comp. Rom. xvi. 25; Acts viii. 11; John ii. 20; Herodian, i. 6. 24: οὐ πολλῷ χρόνῳ; Plut. *Thes.* vi.: χρόνοις πολλοῖς ὕστερον. See generally, Bernhardt, p. 81; Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* I. p. xl. In opposition to usage, Erasmus and Grotius render the words: *often*. So also Valekenær. — συνηρπάκει] may mean: *it had hurried him along with it* (Acts vi. 12, xix. 29, xxvii. 15, and very frequently in the classical writers), but also: *it had* (absolutely and entirely, *συν*) *seized him* (Ar. *Lys.* 437; 4 Macc. v. 3). It is usually taken in the latter sense. But the former is the more certain of the two according to the usage of Luke, corresponds better with its use elsewhere, and likewise agrees perfectly with the connection. For ἐδεσμέιτο κ.τ.λ. then relates what was accustomed to be done with the sufferer in order to prevent this tearing and dragging by the demon; observe the *imperfect*, he *was* (*accustomed to be*) chained, etc. — Ver. 31. αὐτοῖς] as Mark v. 10, from the standpoint of the consciousness of the several demons possessing the man. — ἄβυσσον] *abyss*, i.e. *Hades* (Rom. x. 7). The context teaches that in particular *Gehenna* is meant (comp. Apoc. ix. 1 f., xi. 7, xx. 3). The demons know and dread their *place of punishment*. Mark is different and *more original*; in opposition to Baur, *Markusevangel.* p. 42. — Ver. 33. ἀπεπνίγη] of choking by drowning, Dem. 833, pen.; Raphael, *Polyb.* p. 199; Wakefield, *Silv. Crit.* II. p. 75. Even Hug (*Gutacht.* II. p. 17 f.) attempts to *justify* the destruction of the swine in a way which can only remind us of the maxim, "*qui excusat, accusat.*" — Ver. 35. ἐξῆλθον] the people from the city and from the farms. — παρὰ τ. πόδας] as a scholar with his teacher. The whole of this description, indeed, and the subsequent prohibition, ver. 39, is intended, according to

Baur, *Evang.* p. 430 f., to set forth the demoniac as a *representative of the converted heathen world*. — Ver. 36. *καὶ οἱ ἰδόντες*] the disciples and others who had seen it together. The *καί* places these in contrast even with the people who came thither and found the cure accomplished, and to whom *the eye-witnesses also* of the proceeding narrated it. — Ver. 38. *ἔδέετο*] See on this Ionic form, which, however, was also frequent among Attic writers, Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 220; Schaefer, *ad Greg. Cor.* p. 431; Krüger, *ad Xen. Anab.* vii. 4. 8. The reading *ἔδεῖτο* (B L) is a correction, and *ἔδεεῖτο* (A P, Lachmann) is a transcriber's mistake for this correction. Ver. 39. *πόλιν*] *Galata*, ver. 27. Mark, certainly with greater accuracy, has *ἐν τῇ Δεκαπόλει*.

Vv. 40–56. See on Matt. ix. 1, 18–26; Mark v. 21–43. In Matthew the sequence is different. The narrative of Luke, indeed, is not dependent on that of Mark, but has it in view, without, however, on the whole attaining to its clearness and vividness. — *ἀπεδέξατο*] is usually understood of a *joyous reception* (*ὡς εὐεργέτην καὶ σωτῆρα*, Euthymius Zigabenus); but quite arbitrarily. Comp. Acts xv. 4. The narrative says simply: that on His return the crowd received Him (comp. ix. 11), because all had been in expectation of His coming back; so that thus immediately His ministry was again put in requisition. — Ver. 41. *καὶ αὐτός*] *and He*, after mention of the name comes *the personal position*. Comp. xix. 2. — *ἀπέθνησκεν*] *died* (imperfect), *i.e. was dying*, not: “*obierat, absente mortuamque ignorante patre*” (Fritzsche, *ad Matt.* p. 348). That the death *had not yet taken place* is indicated, Bernhardy, p. 373; Wyttenbach, *ad Plat. Phaed.* p. 142 ff. — *συνέπινον*] a vivid picture: they *stifled* Him; in point of fact the same as *συνέθλιβον*, Mark v. 24. — Ver. 43. *προσαναλώσασα*] *when she even in addition* (over and above her suffering) *had expended*, Dem. 460. 2, 1025. 20; Plat. *Prot.* p. 311 D. — *ἰατροῖς*] *on physicians*. As το ὅλον τ. βίον, comp. Mark xii. 44. — Ver. 45. *ὁ Πέτρος μὲν ᾤετο περὶ ἀπλῆς ἐπαφῆς λέγειν τὸν Χριστὸν . . . αὐτὸς δὲ οὐ περὶ τοιαύτης ἔλεγεν, ἀλλὰ περὶ τῆς γενομένης ἐκ πίστεως*, Euthymius Zigabenus. — Ver. 49. *τις παρὰ τοῦ ἀρχ.*] *i.e. one of*

his dependants. Comp. on Mark iii. 21. — *τέθνηκεν*] placed first for emphasis: *she is dead*. On the distinction from *ἀπέθνησκειν*, ver. 42, comp. Plat. *Phaed.* p. 64 A: *ἀποθνήσκειν τε καὶ τεθνάναι*. — Ver. 51. *εἰσελθεῖν*] into the chamber of death. — Ver. 52 relates to the bewailing crowd assembled in the house (not in the death-chamber), with whom occurred this conversation, ver. 52 f., *while* Jesus and those named at ver. 51 *were passing into* the chamber where the dead body lay. Among those *who laughed*, the three disciples are as little intended to be reckoned¹ in Luke as in Mark, whom he follows. — *ἐκόπτοντο αὐτήν*] a well-known custom, to express one's grief by beating on one's breast. As to the construction of *κόπτεσθαι* (also *τύπτεσθαι*) and *plangere* with an accusative of the object (xxiii. 27) on whose account one beats oneself, see Heyne, *Obss. ad Tibull.* i. 7. 28, p. 71. — Ver. 55. *ἐπέστρεψε κ.τ.λ.*] purposely narrates the reanimation of one that was *actually* dead,² whose spirit had *departed*. In Acts xx. 10 also this idea is found. — *παρήγγ. αὐτοῖς κ.τ.λ.*] following Mark v. 43.

¹ They would not, moreover, have to be understood as associated with those who were put out, if *ἰσβαλ. ἕξω πάντ.* were genuine (but see the critical remarks). Köstlin is right in adducing this against Baur, who detected in this passage a Pauline side-glance to the original apostles.

² How opposed, therefore, is this to the view of an *apparent death*! There cannot remain even a *shadow of uncertainty* as to how the matter is to be regarded (Weizsäcker). Jesus Himself will not leave the crowd in any doubt, but declares (ver. 52) in His pregnant style what must immediately of itself be evident.

CHAPTER IX.

VER. 1. After *ὁῶδε* Elz. Scholz, Lachm. have *μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ*, which is not found in A B D K M S V Γ Δ, min. vss. Fathers. An addition, instead of which other authorities of importance have *ἀποστόλους*. Luke *always* writes *οἱ ὁῶδε* absolutely. So also do Mark and John, but not Matthew. — Ver. 2. *τοὺς ἀσθενήσοντας*] A D L ≡ S, min. have *τ. ἀσθενήσ.* Approved by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. But since in B, Syr.^{cur} Dial. the words are altogether wanting, and, moreover, in the variants occur *τοὺς νοσούντας*, *πάντας τοὺς ἀσθενούντας*, and *omnes infirmitates* (Brix.), the simple *ἰᾶσθαι* (as Tisch. also now has) is to be regarded as original. — Ver. 3. *ῥάβδους* in Elz., instead of *ῥάβδον* in Lachm. and Tisch., has evidence of importance both for and against it. In accordance with A B [B has *ῥάβδον*] Δ, it is to be maintained, since the singular might be introduced from Matt. x. 10 (see on the passage), and mechanically also from Mark vi. 8, just as easily as it could be retained by reason of the singulars alongside of it. — Ver. 5. *ὀέζωνται*] in Elz., instead of *ὀέχωνται* (the latter is approved by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. and Tisch.), has against it authorities so important, that it must be referred to the parallels. — *καὶ τ. καὶ*] This *καὶ* (bracketed by Lachm.) is wanting in B C* D L X ≡ S, 1, 124, Copt. Sahid. codd. of It. Omitted, in accordance with the parallels. — Ver. 7. *ἐπ' αὐτοῦ*] is wanting in B C* D L S, min. vss. Condemned by Griesb., bracketed by Lachm., deleted by Tisch. An addition for the purpose of more precise specification. — Ver. 10. *τόπον ἔρημ. πόλ. καλ. Βηθε.*] Many variants; the reading which is best attested is *πόλιν καλ.συμένην Βηθε.*, which Tisch., following B L X, 33, Copt. Sahid. Erp., has adopted. Rightly; *εἰς πόλιν καλ.* would of necessity arouse objection, as what follows did not take place in a city, but in a desert (comp. ver. 12, and also Mark vi. 31). — Ver. 11. *ὀεζάμ.*] Lachm. and Tisch. have *ἀποὸεζάμ.*, in accordance with B D L X [also Ξ] S, min. Rightly; the *Recepta* is a neglect of the compound form, which form in the New Testament occurs only in Luke. — Ver. 12. Instead of *πορεύσιντες*, Elz. Scholz have *ἀπελθόντες*, in opposition to decisive evidence; it is from the

parallels. — Ver. 14. Before ἀνά, B C D L R Ξ Σ , 33, 157, Sahid. Cant. Or. have ὥσεί, which Tisch. *Synops.* has adopted [ὥσεί is wanting in Tisch. 8]. Rightly; it was omitted, because even Mark has no *indefinite* qualifying word. — Ver. 22. ἐγερθ.] Lachm. has ἀναστῆναι. The authorities are greatly divided, but ἐγερθ. is from Matthew (τ. τρίτη ἡμέρα ἐγερθ.). — Ver. 23. Instead of ἔρχεσθαι, ἀρνησάσθω Elz. Scholz have ἐλθεῖν, ἀπαρνησάσθω, in opposition to preponderating mss. and Or. From the parallels. — καθ' ἡμέραν] condemned by Griesb., deleted by Scholz, Lachm. It has preponderating evidence in its favour; the omission is due to the words being omitted in the parallels. — Ver. 27. ὥδε] B L Ξ Σ , 1, Cyr. have αὐτοῦ. Commended by Griesb., approved by Rinck, adopted by Tisch. Rightly; ὥδε is from the parallels. — The readings ἐσώτων and γεύσωνται (Elz.: ἐστηκότων and γεύσονται) have (the latter strongly) preponderating evidence in their favour. — Ver. 35. ἀγαπητός] B L Ξ Σ , vss. have ἐκλελεγμένος. Commended by Griesb. and Schulz, adopted by Tisch. The *Recepta* is from the parallels. — Ver. 37. ἐν τῇ ἐξῆς] ἐν, in accordance with B L S Σ , 1, 69, is to be deleted. See on vii. 11. — Ver. 38. ἀβ.] Lachm. has ἐβόησεν, in accordance with B C D L Σ , min. A neglect of the compound form, which form occurs elsewhere in the New Testament only in Matt. xxvii. 46, and even there is disregarded by several authorities. — Instead of ἐπιβλέψαι (to be accented thus) Elz. Lachm. have ἐπίβλεψον. Authorities of importance on both sides. The latter is an interpretation. The infinitive ΕΠΙΒΛΕΨΑΙ was taken for an imperative middle. — Ver. 43. ἐποίησεν] Griesb. Lachm. Tisch. have ἐποίηι; decisively attested. — Ver. 48. Instead of ἐστί, which is approved by Griesb., and, moreover, adopted by Lachm. and Tisch., Elz. Scholz have ἔσται. But ἐστί is attested by B C L X Ξ Σ , min. vss. (also Vulg. It.) Or. (thrice); the future was introduced in reference to the future kingdom of heaven. — Ver. 50. Instead of ὑμῶν Elz. has ἡμῶν both times, in opposition to preponderating evidence. See on Mark ix. 40. — Ver. 54. ὥς κ. 'Ηλ. ἐπ.] is wanting in B L Ξ Σ , 71, 157, vss. (Vulg. also and codd. of It.) Jer. (?). Suspected by Griesb. (following Mill), deleted by Tisch. But how easily the indirect rebuke of Elias, contained in what follows, would make these words objectionable! — Ver. 55. καὶ εἶπεν . . . ὑμεῖς] is wanting in A B C E, etc., also Σ , min. Copt. Aeth. Sax. Germ. 1, Gat. Fathers. Condemned by Griesb., deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. The words have such a weight of evidence against them that they would have to be rejected, if it could be explained how they got into the text. How easily, on the other hand, might an *intentional*

omission, out of consideration for Elias, occur! Moreover, the simple, short, and pregnant word of rebuke is so unlike a transcriber's addition, and so worthy of Jesus Himself, as, on the other hand, it is hardly to be conceived that Luke would have limited himself on an occasion of so unprecedented a kind only to the bare ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς. But the additional clause which follows in Elz. is decidedly spurious: ὁ γὰρ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἔλθει ψυχὰς ἀνθρώπων ἀπολῆσαι, ἀλλὰ σῶσαι. — Ver. 57. ἐγένετο δέ] Lachm. Tisch. have καί, in accordance with B C L X Ξ Σ , min. Syr. Perss. Copt. Aeth. Arm. Rightly; a new section was here begun (a lection also), and attention was called to this by adding ἐγένετο to καί (so D, 346, Cant. Vere. Colb.), or by writing ἐγένετο δέ, in accordance with ver. 51. — κύριε] is wanting in B D L Ξ Σ , min. Copt. Arm. Vulg. codd. of It. Condemned by Griesb., deleted by Lachm. But since it stood at the end of the sentence, and since the parallel passage, Matt. viii. 19, had no corresponding word at the end, κύριε would the more easily drop out. — Ver. 62. εἰς τὴν βασιλίαν.] B L Ξ Σ , 1, 33, Vulg. It. Clem. Or. have τῇ βασιλείᾳ. So Lachm. and Tisch. The *Recepta* is explanatory.

Vv. 1–6. See on Matt. x. 1, 7, 9–11, 14; Mark vi. 7–13. Luke follows Mark, and *to that circumstance*, not to any depreciation of the Twelve by contrast with the Seventy (Baur), is due the *shorter form* of the succeeding discourse. — καὶ νόσους θεραπεύει.] depends on δύναμ. κ. ἐξουσ. (power and authority, iv. 36). The reference to ἔδωκεν (Bengel, Bornemann) is more remote, since the νόσους θεραπεύειν is actually a δύναμις κ. ἐξουσία. — Ver. 3. μήτε ἀνὰ δύο χιτ. ἔχειν] *nor even to have two under-garments* (one in use and one to spare). A mingling of two constructions, as though μηδὲν αἶρειν had been previously said. See Ellendt, *ad Arrian. Al.* I. p. 167; Winer, p. 283 [E. T. 397]. For the explanation of the infinitive with εἶπε there is no need of supplying δεῖν (Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* pp. 753 f., 772); but this idea is implied in the infinitive itself. See Kühner, *ad Xen. Anab.* v. 7. 34. It would be possible to take the infinitive *for the imperative* (Kuinoel and many of the earlier critics, comp. also Buttmann, *Neut. Gr.* p. 233 [E. T. 271 f.], who understands λέγω) only if the connection brought out a precise injunction partaking of the nature of an express command (see generally,

Winer, p. 282 [E. T. 397]; Bernhardt, p. 358; Pflugk, *ad Eur. Heracl.* 314), which, however, in this case, since the imperative precedes, and, moreover, immediately follows, is not applicable. — Ver. 5. καὶ τ. κον.] *Even the dust also*; see Hartung, *Partikell.* I. p. 134. — ἐπ' αὐτ.] *against them*, more definite than Mark: αὐτοῖς. Theophylact: εἰς ἑλεγχον αὐτῶν καὶ κατὰκρισιν.

Vv. 7-9. See on Matt. xiv. 1 f.; Mark vi. 14-16. — To the ἤκουσεν of Mark vi. 14, which Luke in this place evidently has before him, he adds a definite object, although taken very generally, by means of τὰ γινόμενα πάντα: *everything which was done*, whereby is meant, which was done *by Jesus* (ver. 9). — διηπόρει] *he was in great perplexity*, and could not in the least arrive at certainty as to what he should think of the person of Jesus. This was the uncertainty of an evil conscience. Only Luke has the word in the New Testament. It very often occurs in the classical writers. On the accentuation ὑπό τινων, see Lipsius, *Gramm. Unters.* p. 49. — Ver. 8. ἐφάνη] “*Nam Elias non erat mortuus*,” Bengel. — Ver. 9. What Matthew and Mark make Herod utter definitely, according to Luke he leaves *uncertain*; the account of Luke is hardly more original (de Wette, Bleek), but, on the contrary, follows a more faded tradition, for the character of the secondary writer is to be discerned in the entire narrative (in opposition to Weizsäcker). The twofold ἐγὼ has the emphasis of the terrified heart. — ἐξήτει ἰδεῖν αὐτόν] *he longed to see Him*. Comp. xxiii. 8. He hoped, by means of a personal conference (viii. 20) with this marvellous man, to get quit of his distressing uncertainty. That Herod seemed disposed to greet Him as the risen John, and that accordingly Christ had the prospect of a glowing reception at court, Lange reads into the simple words just as arbitrarily as Eichthal reads into them a partiality for Herod on the part of Luke.

Vv. 10-17. See on Matt. xiv. 13-21; Mark vi. 30-44; John vi. 1 ff. According to the reading εἰς πόλιν καλουμένην Βηθσ. (see the critical remarks), εἰς is to be understood *of the direction whither (versus)*, and ver. 11 ff. is to be conceived as said of what happened *on the way to Bethsaida*. The Bethsaida meant at Mark vi. 45, on the *western* shore of the

lake (*Βηθσ. τῆς Γαλιλ.*, John xii. 21; Matt. xi. 21), is not the one intended, but Bethsaida-Julias, on the eastern shore in lower Gaulonitis (see on Mark viii. 22), as Michaelis, Fischer, Paulus, Robinson, Ebrard, Lange, Ewald, Schegg, and others suppose, on the ground of Mark vi. 45, where from the place of the miraculous feeding the passage is made *across* to the *western* Bethsaida. For the denial of this assumption, and for the maintenance of the view that Luke, in variation from the parallel passages, transposed the miraculous feeding to the *western* shore (Winer, de Wette, Hilgenfeld, Holtzmann, Eichthal, and with some hesitation Bleek), there is no foundation at all in Luke's text. For although Jesus had returned from Gadara to the western side of the lake (viii. 37, 40), yet between this point of time and the miraculous feeding come the sending forth of the Twelve, and the period that elapsed until their return (ix. 1-10). *Where* they, on their return, met with Jesus, Luke does not say, and for this meeting the locality *may* be assumed to have been the eastern side of the lake where Bethsaida-Julias was situated. But if it is supposed, as is certainly more natural, that they met with Him again *at the place* whence they had been sent forth by Him on the *western* border of the lake, it is no contradiction of this that Jesus, according to Luke, wished to retire with His disciples by the country road to *that* Bethsaida which was situated at the north-eastern point of the lake (Bethsaida-Julias); and it is just this seeking for *solitude* which can alone be urged in favour of the more remote Bethsaida on the further side. The whole difference therefore comes to this, that, according to Luke, they went to the place of the miraculous feeding *by land*, but according to Mark (and Matthew), *by ship*. — Ver. 11. ἀποδεξ.] He did not send them back, although He desired to be alone, but received them. — ἐπισιτισμόν] *Provisions*, a word which occurs only in this place in the New Testament, but is often found in the classical writers. Comp. Judith ii. 18, iv. 5. — Ver. 13. πλεῖον ἤ] These words do not fit into the construction. See Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 410; Krüger, *ad Dion.* p. 287; Schoemann, *ad Is.* p. 444. — εἰ μῆτι κ.τ.λ.] *unless, perchance, etc.*; this is neither to be regarded as a *direct question* (Kypke, Rosenmüller),

nor is the thought: "even therewith we cannot feed them," to be previously supplied (Beza, Grotius, de Wette, and others). On the contrary, the two parts of the sentence are closely connected: *We have not more than . . . unless, perchance, we shall have bought.* The tone of the address is not one of irony (Camerarius, Homberg, Kuinoel), as is often expressed by *εἰ μή* (Kühner, II. p. 561; Maetzner, *ad Lycurg. in Leocr.* p. 317), but of embarrassment at the manifest impossibility of carrying the order into effect (*ἡμεῖς . . . εἰς πάντα τὸν λαόν*). On *εἰ* with a *subjunctive*, which is to be recognised even in the Attic writers, although rarely, but is of frequent use in the later Greek, see Winer, p. 263 [E. T. 368]; Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* ii. 1. 12; Poppo, *ad Cyrop.* iii. 3. 50; Klotz, *ad Derr.* p. 500 ff.; Ellendt, *Lcx. Soph.* I. p. 491. Winer is mistaken in regarding the mood in this case as a *deliberative subjunctive* not dependent on *εἰ*, as Buttmann, p. 191 [E. T. 221], also takes it. See above for the connection; and on the difference of meaning between the subjunctive with and without *ἄν* (condition absolutely, without dependence upon circumstances that may or may not happen), see Hermann, *De part. ἄν*, ii. 7, p. 95; Hartung, *Partikell.* II. p. 301. — *ἡμεῖς*] with emphasis; for previously they had advised to leave the people themselves to procure food. — Ver. 14. Observe the numerical relation, *five* loaves, *five* thousand, ranks of companies by *fifty*. To form *such* companies is, in Luke, said to have been commanded even by *Jesus Himself*. The tradition is gradually rounded into shape as we advance from Matthew (and John) to Luke. — Ver. 16. *εὐλόγ. αὐτοῦς*] an intimation of the *benediction* uttered in prayer, which was effectual in causing the increase. Matthew and Mark have it otherwise. — Ver. 17. *κλασμάτων*] is, in accordance with the opinion of Valckenaer, Lachmann, and Tischendorf, to be regarded as governed by *κόφιννοι δώδεκα*. If, in accordance with the usual view, it had been construed with *τὸ περισσ. αὐτ.*, it would have been *τῶν κλασμ.* (comp. Matt. xiv. 20; Soph. *El.* 1280: *τὰ μὲν περισσεύοντα τῶν λόγων ἄφες*; Plat. *Legg.* ix. p. 855 A) or *τὰ περισσεύσαντα αὐτοῖς κλάσματα* (John vi. 12). Luke reproduces the *κλασμά-*

των δώδεκα κοφίους of Mark. Since, moreover, *κλασμάτων* contains a reference to *κατέκλασε*, ver. 16, it is manifest that the fanciful view of Lange, *L. J.* II. p. 309 f., is untenable: that Jesus, indeed, miraculously fed the thousands; but that the *superfluity arose from the fact* that the people, disposed by the love of Jesus to brotherly feeling, had immediately laid open *their own stores*. Thus the miraculous character of the transaction is combined with the natural explanation of Paulus and Ammon. With what a unanimous *untruthfulness* must in this case all the four reporters of the history *have been silent* about the people's private stores. Just as persistent are they in their silence about the *symbolic* nature of the feeding behind which the marvellous *How* of the incident is put out of sight (Weizsäcker). Schenkel mingles together most discordant elements for explaining away the miracle, not rejecting even provisions brought with them, and in part procured in haste. But what is the meaning of Mark viii. 18-20? And are all six narratives equally a misunderstanding?

Vv. 18-20. See on Matt. xvi. 13-16; Mark viii. 27-29. As to the second miraculous feeding Luke is silent; a silence which Schleiermacher and many others, even Weizsäcker, make use of in opposition to the reality of the second miracle (see in general on Matt. xv. 33). But this silence is related to the enigmatical hiatus which Luke has left between vv. 17 and 18, entirely passing over everything that occurs in Mark vi. 45-viii. 27, and in the parallel passage of Matthew. No explanation is given of this omission, and it seems to have been occasioned by some casualty unknown to us. Possibly the only reason was that in this place he had before him another written source besides Mark, which did not comprise the fragments in question, and from which, moreover, he borrowed the peculiar situation with which ver. 18 begins. Special purposes for the omission (Hilgenfeld, Weiss, p. 699 f.) are arbitrarily assumed, as if in his idea the portion omitted were, on the one hand, not of sufficient importance, on the other, too detailed (as the history of the Canaanitish woman), and the like. Weizsäcker, p. 66 f., proceeds more critically, but still unsatisfactorily, when he relegates the events to ix. 51 ff.,

where occur several points of contact with the fragments here passed over. — Ver. 19. ἄλλοι δέ] without a previous οἱ μὲν. See on Matt. xxviii. 17; Mark x. 32. The opinion: Ἰωάνν. τ. βαπτ., as that of the majority, is first of all declared without limitation. — Ver. 20. ὁ Πέτρος] προφηδᾶ τῶν λοιπῶν καὶ στόμα πάντων γενόμενος, Theophylact. — τὸν Χριστὸν τ. Θεοῦ] See on ii. 26.

Vv. 21, 22. See on Matt. xvi. 20 f.; Mark ix. 30 f. Neither the discourse of Jesus about the rock (Matt. xvi. 17-19), nor His reproof of Peter as Satan (Matt. xvi. 22 f.; Mark viii. 32 f.), is found in the Pauline Luke, who did not find the former in Mark (see on Mark viii. 29). If he had omitted the saying concerning the rock *because of a tendency* (Baur and others), he could *not* in the same interest have passed over the rebuke of Peter as Satan. — Ver. 22. ὅτι] argumentative. Tell no one, etc., since it is the appointment of God (xxiv. 26) that the Messiah, after many sufferings, etc., should attain to His Messianic attestation by the resurrection (Rom. i. 4). Thus, for the present, the Lord quenches the ardour of that confession, that it may not interfere with that onward movement of the divine appointment which is still first of all necessary. — ἀπό] *on the part of*. See Buttmann, *Neut. Gr.* p. 280 [E. T. 326].

Vv. 23-27. See on Matt. xvi. 24-28; Mark viii. 34-ix. 1. — πρὸς πάντας] *to all*, is not to be taken as: *in reference to* all, nor is it said in contrast to Peter, so that what Matthew relates, xvi. 22 f., may be unconsciously presupposed (de Wette leaves the choice between the two); but as αὐτοῖς, ver 21, refers to the apostles, πάντας must refer to a wider circle. Luke leaves it to the reader to conclude from πάντας that there were still others close by to whom, beside the disciples, that which follows was addressed. Comp. on Mark viii. 34. Ver. 18 does not exclude the approach of others which may have occurred meanwhile. But with ver. 22 closed the confidential discourse with the Twelve; what Jesus has now yet further to enter upon in continuation of the communication of ver. 22 is to be said not merely to them, but to *all*. — καθ' ἡμέραν] involuntarily suggested by the experience of

a later period; 1 Cor. xv. 31; Rom. viii. 36; 2 Cor. iv. 16 f. — Ver. 25. *ἐαυτὸν δὲ ἀπολ. ἢ ζημ.*] if he . . . *however, shall have lost himself, or have suffered damage* (ἢ, not equivalent to *καί*, but introducing another word for the same idea). *Himself*, i.e. not “*his better self*” (de Wette), but, according to ver. 24, *his own life*. Excluded from the Messiah’s kingdom, the man is in the condition of *θάνατος*; not *living* (in the *ζωὴ αἰώνιος*), he is *dead*; he is *dead* as well as *no more present* (*οὐκ εἰσί*, Matt. ii. 18), he has lost *himself*. — Ver. 26. *ἐν τῇ δόξῃ κ.τ.λ.*] A threefold glory:—(1) His own, which He has absolutely as the exalted Messiah (comp. xxiv. 26); (2) The glory of God, which accompanies Him who comes down from the throne of God; (3) The glory of the angels, who surround with their brightness Him who comes down from God’s throne (comp. Matt. xxviii. 3 and elsewhere; Hahn, *Theol. d. N. T.* § 116). The genitives have all the *same* reference, genitives of the *subject*. — Ver. 27. *ἀληθῶς*] not belonging to *λέγω* (in that case it would be a translation of *ἀμὴν*, and would come first, as in xii. 44, xxi. 3), but to what follows. — *αὐτοῦ*] (see the critical remarks) *here*, Acts xv. 34; Matt. xxvi. 36; Plato, *Polit.* i. p. 327 C, and elsewhere. — *τὴν βασιλ. τ. Θεοῦ*] *the kingdom of the Messiah*, not less definite, but simpler than Matthew and Mark.

Vv. 28–36. See on Matt. xvii. 1–13; Mark ix. 2–13. — *ὥσεὶ ἡμέραι ὀκτώ*] without construction (comp. ver. 13), see on Matt. xv. 32; Winer, pp. 458, 497 [E. T. 648 f., 704]; Buttman, *Neutest. Gr.* p. 122 [E. T. 139]. The *ὥσεὶ* protects Luke from the reproach of representing himself as paying more attention than Mark to chronology (Holtzmann). — *προσεύξασθαι*] See on v. 16. — Ver. 29. *τὸ εἶδος*] *the appearance* of His countenance: “*Transformatio splendorem addidit, faciem non subtraxit*,” Jerome. — *λευκός*] not instead of an adverb, but *ἐξαστρ.* is a second predicate added on by way of climax without *καί* (Dissen, *ad Pind.* p. 304), *white, glistening*. On *ἐξαστρ.*, comp. LXX. Ezek. i. 4, 7; Nah. iii. 3; Thryphiod. 103. — Ver. 31. *τὴν ἔξοδον αὐτοῦ*] *His departure*, namely, from His life and work on earth: through His death, resurrection, and ascension (Joseph.

Antt. iv. 8. 2). *Comp. Wisd.* iii. 2, vii. 6; 2 *Pet.* i. 15, and the passages in Suicer, *Thes.* I. p. 287, 1142; Elsner, *Obs.* p. 219. Corresponding to this is εἶσδος, *Acts* xiii. 24. This subject of the συλλαλεῖν, of which neither Matthew nor Mark has any hint, first appeared in Luke from the later tradition which very naturally attained to this reflection, and, moreover, might gather it from Mark ix. 9; Matt. xvii. 9.¹ — πληροῦν] The departure is conceived of as divinely fore-ordained, therefore as being fulfilled when it actually occurred. See Kypke, I. p. 253. — Ver. 32. But Peter and his companions, while this was going on before them, were weighed down with sleep (drowsy); as they nevertheless remained awake, were not actually asleep, they saw, etc. — On βεβαρημ. ὕπνῳ, *comp. Matt.* xxvi. 43; Jacobs, *ad Anthol.* VI. p. 77. — διαγρηγ.] is not to be explained as it usually is, *postquam exspectati sunt* (Castalio), but (so also Schegg), *when, however, they had thoroughly awakened.* *Comp. Herodian*, iii. 4. 8: πάσης τῆς νυκτός . . . διαγρηγορήσαντες; Vulg. (Lachmann): *vigilantes.* — Ver. 33. According to Luke, Peter desires by his proposal to prevent the departure of Moses and Elias. — μὴ εἰδὼς ὃ λέγει] He was not conscious to himself of what he said (so much had the marvellous appearance that had presented itself to him as he struggled with sleep confused him), otherwise he would not have proposed anything so improper. The whole feature of the drowsiness of the disciples belongs to a later form of the tradition, which, even as early as Mark, is no longer so primitive as in Matthew. Reflection sought to make the saying about the building of tabernacles intelligible; but the tendency-critics were the first to suggest that there was a design of throwing the primitive apostles, especially Peter, into the shade (Baur, *Evang.* p. 435, *Markus-evang.* p. 68; Hilgenfeld, *Evang.* p. 179, 181; see, on the other hand, Köstlin, p. 200). — Ver. 34 f. ἐπεσκίασεν αὐτούς] αὐτούς, as at ver. 33, refers to Moses and Elias, who are separating from Jesus, not to the disciples (see on Matt. xvii. 5). It is otherwise in Matthew, who has not the detail ἐν τῷ διαχωρίζεσθαι αὐτοὺς ἀπ' αὐτοῦ. — While Peter speaks

¹ *Comp. Weizsäcker, Evang. Gesch.* p. 481.

with Jesus, the cloud appears which overshadows the departing Moses and Elias. These (continuing their departure) pass away into the cloud; the voice resounds and the entire appearance is past, Jesus is alone. — ἐκλελεγμ.] See the critical remarks; comp. xxiii. 35. — Of the conversation on the subject of Elias, Luke has nothing. It was remote from his Gentile-Christian interest. But all the less are we to impute an *anti-Jewish purpose* (such as that he would not have John regarded as Elias) to Luke, whose style, moreover, elsewhere tends to abbreviation (in opposition to Baur in the *Theol. Jahrb.* 1853, p. 80). — Ver. 36. ἐσίγησαν] Of the command of Jesus, with a view to this result, the abbreviating Luke has nothing.

Vv. 37–45. See on Matt. xvii. 14–23; Mark ix. 14–32, the latter of which Luke follows on the whole, but abbreviating. — τῇ ἐξῆς ἡμέρᾳ] According to Luke, the transfiguration took place at night, ver. 32. — Ver. 38. ἐπιβλέψαι] to look upon, with helpful pity to cast eyes upon. Comp. i. 48; Eccus. xxxiii. 1; Tob. iii. 3, 15; Judith xiii. 4. See the critical remarks. The *middle voice* does not occur. μονογενῆς in this passage, as at viii. 42, is found only in Luke. — Ver. 39. κράζει] does not refer to the *demon* (Bornemann), but to the *son*, since καὶ ἐξαίφνης introduces the result which is brought about in the possessed one by the πνεῦμα λαμβάνει αὐτόν. The sudden change of the subjects is the less surprising when we take into account the rapid impassioned delineation. See Winer, p. 556 [E. T. 787], and Schoemann, *ad Is.* p. 294 f. — μόγῳς] hardly, with trouble and danger; used only here in the New Testament. — συντρίβον αὐτόν] whilst he bruises him (even still—as he yields). Conceive of a paroxysm in which the demoniac ferociously beats and knocks and throws himself down. This *literal* meaning of συντρ. is, on account of the vivid description in the context, to be preferred to the *figurative* meaning—*frets, wears away* (Kypke, Kainoel, Bornemann, Ewald), although Mark has ξηραίνεται, in another collocation, however. — Ver. 42. ἔτι δὲ προσερχ. αὐτοῦ] but as he was still coming — not yet altogether fully come up. —

ἐρρήξεν . . . συνεσπάραξεν] a climax describing the convulsive action, *he tore him, and convulsed him* (comp. *σπαραγμός, cramp*). — *ἰάσατο τ. π.*] namely, by the expulsion of the demon. — *ἐπὶ τ. μεγαλειότη. τ. Θεοῦ*] *at the majesty* (Josephus, *Antt. Prooem.* p. 5; Athen. iv. p. 130 F) *of God*. "Ὡνιοντο γὰρ, οἱ κ' ἐξ ἰδίας δυνάμεως, ἀλλ' ἐκ Θεοῦ ταῦτα τερατουργεῖν αὐτόν, Euthymius Zigabenus. — *ἐποίει*] *Imperfect* (see the critical remarks). Their wonder was excited by the *miracles of Jesus as a whole*, among which was to be reckoned *also* that special case. — Ver. 44. *θέσθε ὑμεῖς κ.τ.λ.*] *Place ye, on your part, etc.* The disciples were to continue mindful of this expression of amazement (*τοὺς λόγους τούτους*) on account of the contrast (*ὁ γὰρ υἱὸς κ.τ.λ.*) in which his own destiny would soon appear therewith. They were therefore to build no hopes thereupon, but only thence to recognise the *mobile vulgus*! Bornemann, de Wette, Schegg refer *τ. λόγ. τούτ.* to *ὁ γὰρ υἱὸς κ.τ.λ.*, so that *γάρ* would be explanatory (*to wit*). So already Erasmus. But the above reference of the *plural* *τοὺς λ. τούτ.* most readily suggests itself according to the context; since, on the one hand, *πάντων δὲ θαυμαζόντων* preceded (comp. subsequently the singular *τὸ ῥῆμα*, ver. 45); and, on the other, the argumentative use of *γάρ* seems the most simple and natural. — *εἰς χεῖρ. ἀνθρώπ.*] *into the hands of men*, He, who has just been marvelled at as the manifestation of the majesty of God. — Ver. 45. *ἵνα*] purely a particle of purpose, expressing the object of the divine decree. — *αἰσθωνται*] that they should not *become aware* of it. The idea of the divine decree is that their spiritual perception through the internal *αἰσθητήρια* (Heb. v. 14), their intellectual *αἰσθησις* (Phil. i. 9), was not to attain to the meaning of the saying. The verb occurs only here in the New Testament. — *καὶ ἐφοβούντο κ.τ.λ.* See on Mark ix. 32. — The whole description of this failure to understand is only a superficial expansion of Mark ix. 32, and not an intentional depreciation of the Twelve in the Pauline interest (Baur, Hilgenfeld).

Vv. 46-50. See on Matt. xviii. 1-5; Mark ix. 33-40. — *εἰσῆλθε κ.τ.λ.*] *then came a thought in their hearts*. A well-

known pregnancy of expression in respect of *ἐν*, wherein the result of the *εἰσέρχεσθαι* — *the bring in them* — is the *pre-dominant* idea. See Bernhardy, p. 208. Another mode of regarding the rising of thoughts in the mind is expressed at xxiv. 38. — *τίς ἂν κ.τ.λ.*] *who probably* (possibly, see Kühner, II. p. 478) *would be greater, i.e. more to be preferred among them.*¹ Comp. on 1 Cor. xiii. 13. This question of rank, which Mark introduces with greater historical detail, is not referred in Mark and Luke specially to the Messiah's kingdom, as is the case in Matthew. See on Mark ix. 33. The *occasion* of the question is not stated in Mark and Luke (otherwise in Matt. xviii. 1), and is by Theophylact quite arbitrarily sought in the cure of the demoniac, which the disciples had not been able to accomplish, and in view of the failure were throwing the blame upon one another. — *παρ' ἑαυτῆς*] *close to Himself.* In such a position opposite to the disciples, as clearly *to make common cause with Jesus Himself* (see ver. 48). — Ver. 48. The *meaning and train of thought* in Luke are substantially the same as in Mark ix. 36 f., as also in Matt. xviii. 2 ff.; the same principles are enunciated in the same sense. The *child* placed there is the living type of the *humble* disciple as he, in opposition to that arrogant disposition in ver. 46, ought to be. And *this child* standing there as such a moral type, *i.e. every disciple of Christ like to him in unassuming humility, is so highly esteemed before God*, that whosoever lovingly receives him, etc. *For* (*γάρ*, introducing a confirmatory explanation) *he who is less* (than the others) *among you all* (to wit, subjectively, according to his own estimation of himself) *is great* (objectively, in accordance with his real worth). Therefore the saying of Jesus in Luke ought not to have been explained as *wanting in point* (de Wette) or *without connection* (Strauss), nor should it have been maintained that the placing of the child before the disciples was originally without reference to

¹ Not: *greater than they*, as Weiss in the *Jahrb. f. D. Theol.* p. 96, supposes. That their question, according to Luke, was not so devoid of understanding is shown, moreover, by *μικρότερος; ἐν πᾶσιν ὑμῖν*, ver. 48. Luke therefore had no wish to set aside the contest about rank.

the dispute about rank (Weisse). — Ver. 49. As to the connection of thought with what precedes, see on Mark ix. 38. Luke follows him with abbreviations. But any reference to an attack on the ministerial efficiency of the Apostle Paul (Köstlin, p. 201) is quite arbitrarily read into ver. 50. — ἐπὶ τ. ὀνόμ. σου] *on the ground of Thy name*, giving out Him as the authority which the demons had to obey. In this sense they *used* the name of Jesus in the expulsion of demons. Comp. xxi. 8, xxiv. 47; Acts iv. 17 f.; and for actual cases, Acts iii. 6, 16, xvi. 18. — ἀκολ. μεθ' ἡμῶν] a frequent construction in the classical writers also, Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 353 f. Comp. Rev. vi. 8, xiv. 13.

Ver. 51 ff. Luke now enters upon his narrative of the journey of Jesus to Jerusalem at the close of His earthly career, and transfers to this journey all that follows as far as xviii. 30.¹ Not until xviii. 15 does he again go parallel with Matthew and Mark. The journey is not *direct*, for in that case only three days would have been needed for it, but it is to be conceived of as a slow *circuit* whose *final goal*, however, is Jerusalem and the final development there. The *direct* journey towards Jerusalem does not begin till the departure from Jericho, xviii. 35. Jesus, with His face towards Jerusalem, wishes to pass through Samaria (vv. 52, 53); but being rejected, He turns again towards Galilee, and does not appear again on the borders of Samaria till xvii. 11,² whence it is plain that Luke did *not* transfer the history of Martha and Mary (x. 38) to Bethany, in which respect, according to John, he was assuredly in error. This being conceded, and in consideration of Luke in general having so much that is peculiar

¹ That there is actually before us in this place a *narrative of a journey* has indeed been denied, but only under the pressure of harmonistic criticism. Even Weiss rightly maintains its character as the narrative of a journey whose goal is Jerusalem. Still its contents are not to be limited to the ministry of Jesus outside of Galilee. See also Weizsäcker, p. 207.

² Therefore it is not to be said that Luke makes the chief part of the journey pass through Samaria, whereby, according to Baur (*Evangel.* p. 433 f.), he wished to support the Pauline universalism by the authority of Jesus. In ver. 51 ff. Luke relates only an *attempt* to pass through Samaria, which, however (ver. 56), was abandoned. This, moreover, is opposed to Baur's comparison of the Gospel of Luke with that of John (p. 488), and opposed to Köstlin, p. 189.

to himself,—since he, following his sources and investigations (i. 3), so frequently varies from Matthew and Mark in the sequence of events and the combination of discourses,—the judgment of de Wette appears wrong: that the whole section, namely, is an unchronological and unhistorical collection, probably occasioned by the circumstance that Luke had met with much evangelical material which he did not know how to insert elsewhere, and therefore threw together in this place (comp. also Reuss, § 206; Hofmann, *Schriftb.* II. 2, p. 355). In that case the very opposite of Luke's assurance (i. 3) would be true, and Bruno Bauer's sneer on the subject of the journey would not be without reason. He must actually have found the chronological arrangement of what is recorded in this large section as belonging to the end of the sojourn in Galilee, and this must have determined his special treatment, in respect of which he intersperses at xiii. 22 and xvii. 11 hints for enabling the reader to make out his whereabouts in the history (comp. Ewald). But Kuinoel (following Marsh and Eichhorn) quite arbitrarily deduces the section ix. 51–xviii. 14 from a *geonology* bearing upon the last journey of Christ, on the margin of which also much belonging to an earlier time was written. The assumption of Schleiermacher, moreover, is incapable of proof (comp. Olshausen and Neander, Ebrard also, and Bleek): that there are here blended together the narratives of *two* journeys to Jerusalem—to the feast of the Dedication and to the Passover. So also Hofmann, *Weissag. u. Erfüll.* II. p. 113. Decidedly opposed to this, however, is the fact that the intercalation of *other* historical elements (x. 25–xviii. 31) must again be assumed. Finally, the assertion of Wieseler (*Chronol. Synopse*, p. 319 ff.), that ix. 51–xiii. 21 is parallel with John vii. 10–x. 42 (then xiii. 22–xvii. 10 with John xi. 1–54; and lastly, xvii. 11–xix. 28 with John xi. 55–xii. 11), so that thus Luke in ix. 51 is introducing, not the last journey to Jerusalem, but the last but two, is negatived on purely exegetical grounds by τῆς ἀναλίσψεως (see subsequently). The *older* harmonistic schemes also placed the journey in question parallel with John vii. 10, but got themselves, awkwardly enough, out of the difficulty of τῆς ἀναλίσψεως by means of the evasion: “non enim Lucas dicit,

dies illos jam *impletos* esse, sed factum hoc esse, *dum complerentur*," Calovius. In various ways attempts have been made to solve the question, *whence Luke derived his narrative* (see especially Ewald, *Jahrb.* II. p. 222, and *Evang.* p. 282 ff.; Weizsäcker, p. 209 ff.). Yet, apart from his general sources, in regard to which, however, it is not needful, in view of the *Logia*, to presuppose a later treatment and transposition (Ewald), it can scarcely be inferred as to the general result that in this peculiar portion of his Gospel down to xviii. 14 a special evangelical document, a special *source containing a journey*, must have been in Luke's possession, and that this was rich in fragments of discourse, partly, indeed, in such as occur also in the *Logia*, although differently arranged, and in part differently put together, but pre-eminently rich in parabolic and narrative discourses, such as were in accordance with the Pauline views; for the entire omission of these discourses by Matthew and Mark sufficiently proves that (in opposition to Holtzmann) they did *not* as yet appear in the *Logia*, but formed an anthology of the Lord's original sayings that grew up out of a later development. Weizsäcker, p. 141 ff., has ingeniously endeavoured to indicate the relations of the several portions to the doctrinal necessities of *the apostolic age*, in regard to which, however, much remains problematical, and in much he takes for granted tendencies whose existence cannot be proved. It is totally unfounded to attribute to Luke any *modification* of his accounts brought about by *motives of partisanship*¹ (Baur, Köstlin, and others), in respect of which Köstlin, p. 236, supposes that he vaguely and contradictorily worked up an older narrative about the journey through Samaria and Peraea, because after he had once brought Jesus to Samaria he would not wish to mention expressly His leaving this region again immediately. (But see on ver. 56.)

Ver. 51. 'Εν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι κ.τ.λ.] *when the days of His taking up* (i.e. the days when their consummation ordained by God, His assumption, was to occur) *were entirely completed*, i.e.

¹ That thus, for instance, by the narrative of the fiery zeal of the sons of Zebedee he just desired to prove how little they were capable of going beyond the limits of Judaism. Comp. Hilgenfeld, *Evang.* p. 182 f.

when the period of His receiving up (*assumptio*, Vulg.) was very near. Euthymius Zigabenus aptly says: ἡμέρας τῆς ἀναλήψεως αὐτοῦ λέγει τὸν καιρὸν τὸν ἀφορισθέντα μέχρι τῆς ἀναλήψεως αὐτοῦ τῆς ἀπὸ γῆς εἰς οὐρανόν. In the New Testament ἀνάληψις occurs only in this place. But it appears in the same sense of *the taking up into heaven*, and that likewise of the Messiah, in the *Test. XVI. Patr.* p. 585: καὶ μεγαλυνθήσεται ἐν τῇ οἰκουμένῃ ἕως ἀναλήψεως αὐτοῦ; and in the Fathers (see Suicer, *Thes.* I. p. 282); although in the New Testament the verb ἀναλαμβάνεσθαι is the *customary* word to express *this heavenly reception*, Mark xvi. 19; Acts i. 2, 11, 22; 1 Tim. iii. 16. Comp. 1 Macc. ii. 58; Ecclus. xlviii. 9; 2 Kings ii. 11; Ecclus. xlix. 14; Tobit iii. 6. The objections of Wieseler are unfounded: that the plural τὰς ἡμέρας, as well as the absence of any more precise limitation for ἀνάληψις. (εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν), is opposed to this view. The plural is as much in place here¹ as at ii. 6, 22; Acts ix. 23; and ἀνάληψις, without more precise limitation, in no way needed such a limitation, because by means of αὐτοῦ it leaves it absolutely without doubt that the *current* idea of Christ's assumption is meant, as, moreover, ἀνελάφθη, Acts i. 2, and 1 Tim. iii. 16, although without any local definition, presented no ambiguity to the Christian consciousness. Comp. the ecclesiastical *usus loquendi* of *assumptio* without qualification. Wieseler himself explains: "when the days drew to an end in which He found a reception (in Galilee, to wit), He journeyed towards Jerusalem in order to work there." An erroneous device, the necessary result of harmonistic endeavours. Nobody could guess at the supplementary "in Galilee;" and what a singularly unsuitable representation, since, indeed, Jesus up to this time almost always, and even so late as at ver. 43, found *appreciation and admiration* in Galilee! —

¹ If Luke had written τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τ. ἀν2., he would thereby have declared that what followed happened on *the very day* of the assumption. Comp. Acts ii. 1. But Bengel well says: "unus erat dies assumptionis in coelum, sed quadraginta dies a resurrectione, imo etiam hi dies ante passionem erant instar pasceves. Instabat adhuc passio, crux, mors, sepulcrum, sed per hæc omnia ad metam prospexit Jesus, cuius sensum imitatur stylus evangelistæ." Comp. John xii. 23, xiii. 3, 31, xvii., and elsewhere.

αὐτός] *ipse*, in view of the subsequent sending forward of His messengers. — τὸ πρόσωπ. αὐτοῦ ἐστήρ.] *He settled* (stedfastly directed) *His countenance*,—a Hebraism (סִפְּוּ סִפְּוּ), Jer. xxi. 10, xlii. 15, xliv. 12; Gen. xxxi. 21; 2 Kings xii. 18; Dan. xi. 17, to be traced to the source that he made use of. Comp. Gesenius (who points out the existence of the same usage in Arabic and Syriac) in Rosenmüller, *Rep.* I. p. 136, and *Thesaur.* II. p. 1109. The meaning is: He adopted His settled purpose to journey to Jerusalem (τοῦ πορεύεσθαι, *genitive of purpose*); ἀφώρισεν, ἐκύρωσεν, ἔστησε βουλὴν, Theophylact.

Vv. 52, 53. Ἀγγέλους does not as yet mean the Seventy (Neander), and ὥστε is as at iv. 29. — ἐτοιμάσαι αὐτῷ] *to make preparation for Him* (comp. Mark xiv. 15), i.e. in this case: ἐτοιμάσαι ὑποδοχὴν πρὸς καταγωγὴν αὐτοῦ, Euthymius Zigabenus. — Ver. 53. καὶ οὐκ ἐδέξαντο αὐτόν] which rejection was accomplished by the refusal given to the messengers that He had sent before, see ver. 52. That Jesus Himself followed them is not implied in the passage. — ὅτι τὸ πρόσωπον, not because *generally* He was journeying towards Jerusalem (ἐναντίως γὰρ οἱ Σαμαρεῖται πρὸς τοὺς Ἱεροσολυμίτας διέκειντο, Euthymius Zigabenus; so usually), for through Samaria passed the *usual* pilgrims' road of the Galileans, Josephus, *Antt.* xx. 6. 1; *Vit.* 52; comp. John iv. 4; nor yet because they were unwilling to lodge "so large a Jewish procession" as the train of disciples (Lange, of which, however, nothing appears),—but *because they regarded an alleged Messiah journeying towards Jerusalem as not being the actual Messiah*. We must think of the messengers themselves announcing Jesus as the Messiah, although, besides, according to John iv., the knowledge of His Messianic call might have already penetrated from Galilee to the Samaritan villages; but the Samaritans did not expect of the Messiah (see the expositors on John iv. 25) the observance of festivals in Jerusalem, but the restoration and glorification of the worship upon Gerizim. (Comp. Bertholdt, *Christol.* p. 21 f.) The expression τὸ πρόσωπ. αὐτοῦ ἦν πορευόμ. is a Hebraism, Ex. xxxiii. 14; 2 Sam. xvii. 11.

Vv. 54-56. Ἰδόντες] they saw it in the return of the

messengers, who would not otherwise have come back. — The two disciples are not to be identified with the messengers (Euthymius Zigabenus, Erasmus). — *πῦρ*] *Fire*, not: *fulmen* (Wetstein, Kuinoel), a modern mode of explaining away, of which, neither in 2 Kings i. 10–12 (when at the word of Elias fire from heaven devours the people of Ahaziah) nor on the part of the disciples is there any notion. — *οὐκ οἴδατε κ.τ.λ.*] As in respect of *ὑμεῖς* the emphatic contrast with Elias is not to be disregarded (“retunditur provocatio ad Eliam,” Bengel), so it is objectionable to explain, with Bornemann: “Nonne perpenditis, qualem vos . . . animum prodatis? Certe non humaniorem, quam modo vobis Samaritani praestitierunt.” The Samaritans had not, indeed, refused to receive Jesus *from lack of humanity*; see on ver. 53. Rightly the expositors have explained *οἷου πνεύματος* of a spirit *which is differently disposed from that displayed by Elias*. In that respect the *form* of the saying has been taken by some *affirmatively* (so Erasmus, Beza, Castalio, Calvin, Grotius, and others; latest of all, Ewald), some *interrogatively* (so Luther, Zeger, and most of the later critics); but the *matter* of it has been so understood that Jesus is made to say to the disciples *either* (a) that they knew not that they were allowing themselves to be guided by a wholly different spirit from that of Elias (see as early as Augustine, *C. Adimant.* 17, Calvin, Grotius: “Putatis vos agi Spiritu tali, quali olim Elias . . . ; sed erratis. Habetis quidem *ζηλον*, sed *οὐ κατ’ ἐπίγνωσιν*, et qui proinde humani est affectus, non divinae motionis”), so in substance Ch. F. Fritzsche also in his *Nov. Opusc.* p. 264; *or* (b) that they knew not that they as His disciples were to follow the guidance of a wholly different spirit from that of Elias,—the evangelical spirit of meekness, not the legal spirit of severity (so Theophylact, Erasmus, Zeger, Jansen, Bengel, and most of the later commentators). The view under (a) bears *on the face of it* the motives on which it depends, viz. to avoid making Jesus rebuke the spirit of Elias. The view under (b) is simply in accordance with the words, and is to be preferred in the interrogative form, as being more appropriate to the earnestness of the questioner; yet *πνεύματος* is not to be explained, as most

of the later commentators explain it, of the *human* spirit ("affectus animi," Grotius), but (rightly, even so early as Euthymius Zigabenus) of the *Holy* Spirit.¹ To this *objective* πνεῦμα the categorical ἐστὲ points (which does not mean: *ye ought to be*). As to εἶναι τινος, whereby is expressed *the relation of dependence*, see on Mark ix. 41, and Winer, p. 176 [E. T. 243 f.]. — Ver. 56. ἐτέραν] into a village which was *not Samaritan*. Theophylact: ὅτι οὐκ ἐδέξαντο αὐτὸν, οὐδὲ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς Σαμάρειαν. Thus the journey at its very commencement diverged from the direct course that had been decided on (in opposition to Wieseler, p. 326). To suppose the further progress of the journey through Samaria (in this place consequently Schenkel misplaces the incident in John iv.) is altogether without authority in the text.

Vv. 57-60. See on Matt. viii. 19-22, who has placed the incidents earlier. These little narratives circulated probably in general without definite historical arrangement. Arbitrarily enough, Lange² finds the three unnamed ones that follow, vv. 57, 59, 61, in Judas Iscariot, Thomas, and Matthew. According to Luke, they were assuredly none of the twelve (vi. 13 ff.). — πορευομένων αὐτῶν] to wit, εἰς ἐτέραν κώμην, ver. 56. — ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ] is to be taken with what follows (Lachmann). If, as is usually the case, it were connected with πορ. αὐτ., it would simply be useless. — ἀπελθόντι] Case of attraction, Kühner, II. p. 344. — Ver. 60. διαγγέλλε κ.τ.λ.] *announce everywhere* (διά, comp. Rom. ix. 17) *the kingdom of God*, the imminent establishment of the Messiah's kingdom.

Vv. 61, 62. Peculiar to Luke. — ἀποτάξασθαι κ.τ.λ.] *to say farewell to my family*. Comp. 2 Cor. ii. 13, and see on Mark vi. 45; Vulg.: "renuntiare." So also Augustine, Maldonatus, and others. Literally, and likewise rightly (see xiv. 33;

¹ Τοῦτο γὰρ ἀγαθόν ἐστι καὶ ἀνεξίκακον, Euthymius Zigabenus. But not as though Jesus indirectly *denied* to Elias the Holy Spirit (comp. already on i. 17), but in His disciples the Holy Spirit is in His operations different from what He was in the old prophets, seeing that He was in them the instrument of the divine chastisement.

² He—just as arbitrarily, since the brief narratives omit all such details—represents the first as being of a sanguine, the second of a melancholic, the third of a phlegmatic temperament. See *L. J.* III. p. 424.

Lobeck, *ad Phryg.* p. 24). But the answer of Jesus, ver. 62, gives for ἀποτάξ. the idea of attachment, not of renunciation. — τοῖς εἰς κ.τ.λ., according to the above explanation of ἀποτάξ., must be *masculine*, not *uter.* (Vulgate in Lachmann, Augustine, Maldonatus, Paulus.) — εἰς] not instead of ἐν (thus de Wette, however), but a case of attraction, such as we very frequently meet with in the classical writers. The two ideas, ἀπέρχεσθαι εἰς τὸν οἶκόν μου and ἀποτάξ. τοῖς ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ μου, are so blended together that the former is forced into the latter, and has driven out ἐν for εἰς. See in general, Kühner, II. p. 318 f., *ad Xen. Anab.* i. 1. 5. Comp. Buttmann, *Neut. Gr.* p. 286 [E. T. 332]. — Ver. 62. The meaning of the proverbial saying, in which, moreover, “cum proverbio significatur, cui rei aptetur proverbium” (Grotius) is, *No one who has offered to labour in my service, and, withal, still attaches his interest to his earlier relations* (βλέπων πάλιν ἐπὶ τὸν κῖσμον, Theophylact), *is well fitted* (adapted, available) *for the kingdom of the Messiah* (to labour for it). Entire devotion, not divided service! On εἰς τι βλέπειν, *oculos aliquo convertere*, see Tittmann, *Synon.* p. 112.

CHAPTER X.

VER. 1. ἐξδομήζοντα] B D M, 42, Syr.^{cur.} Perss. Arm. Vulg. Cant. Vere. Colb. For. Rd. Sax. and many Fathers add δὺο here, and most of them likewise at ver. 17; Lachmann has adopted the latter in brackets. Supposed to be a more exact fixing of the number in accordance with the relation (12 times 6). — Ver. 2. Instead of the first οὖν, Lachm. Tisch. have δέ; see on vi. 9. — Ver. 3. ἐγώ] is wanting in A B 8, min. Arm. Vulg. ms. codd. of It. Lachm. Tisch. It is from Matt. x. 16. — Ver. 5. εἰσέρχῃθε] Here and at ver. 10 εἰσέλθῃτε must be read, on preponderating evidence. Approved by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. and Tisch. If it were not original, but an alteration, εἰσέρχῃθε at ver. 8 would not have been acquiesced in. — Ver. 6 f. Lachm. and Tisch. have rightly deleted μὲν after εἰς, the article before νόμος, and ἐστὶ, ver. 7. — Ver. 8. δ' αὖ] Lachm. Tisch. have αὖ, according to evidence not preponderating; and how easily the δ', that might be dispensed with, would drop away, since already the connecting particle was found in καὶ! — Ver. 11. After ἡμῶν Griesb. has added εἰς τοῦς πατέρας ἡμῶν, in accordance with decisive authorities, among which, however, B D R 8, min. Sax. It. want ἡμῶν, which therefore Lachm. and Tisch. have not adopted with the rest. But it was just this word ἡμῶν that occasioned the omission of the words in question, because the transcriber passed on immediately from ἡμῶν to ἡμῶν. Hence the reading of Griesbach is to be maintained in its integrity. — After ἡγγίζεν, Elz. Scholz have ἐφ' ἡμᾶς, in opposition to authorities so important that it can only appear as a repetition from ver. 9. — Ver. 12. After λέγω Elz. [Tisch. 8 also] has οὕτως (Lachm. in brackets), opposed to very important evidence. A connective addition. — Ver. 13. ἐγένοντο] B D L 8, min. have ἐγενήθησαν. So Lachm. and Tisch. The *Recepta* is from Matt. xi. 21. — καθήμεναι] Lachm. and Tisch. have καθήμενοι, in accordance with decisive evidence. The *Recepta* is a grammatical alteration. — Ver. 15. ἡ ἑως τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὑψωθείσα] Lachm. Tisch. have μὴ ἑως οὐρανοῦ ὑψωθείσῃ, in accordance with B D L 8, Syr.^{cur.} Aeth. Copt. It. To be rejected as at Matt. xi. 24. — Ver. 19. οἰδοῦμαι] Tisch. has

δίδωκα, following B C* L X 8, vss. Or. Caes. Bas. Cyr. Epiph. Chrys. Rightly; the present tense more readily occurred to the transcribers. — ἀδικήσῃ] Lachm. and Tisch. have ἀδικήσει, on authority so important that ἀδικήσῃ must be regarded as a grammatical alteration. — Ver. 20. After χαίρ. δέ Elz. has μᾶλλον, in opposition to largely preponderating evidence. An addition for toning down the expression. — Instead of ἐγγράφη Tisch. has ἐγγέγραπται, following B L X 8, 1, 33, Eus. Bas. Cyr. [Tisch. 8 has ἐνέγραπται, following 8 B]. But the compound, as well as the perfect tense, looks like a more precise definition of the original ἐγγράφη. — Ver. 21. After πνεύματι B C D K L X 8, min. vss. (even Vulg. It.) have τῷ ἁγίῳ. Adopted by Lachm. and Tisch. A pious addition; the transcribers would hardly have omitted the adjective, especially as in ver. 20 τὰ πνεύματα had just gone before in an entirely different sense. — Ver. 22 is introduced in Elz. Scholz, Lachm. [Tisch. 8] by καὶ στραφεῖς πρὸς τοὺς μαθητάς εἶπε. The words are to be retained, in opposition to Griesb. and Tisch. [Tisch. 8 has the words]; they are wanting in B D L M 8, min. vss. (even Vulg. codd. of It.) Ir., but they were omitted partly in accordance with Matthew, partly because, on account of ver. 23, they seemed inappropriate in this place. If they had been adopted out of ver. 23, κατ' ἰδίαν also, which in ver. 23 is omitted only by D, vss., would have been taken up with them, and the words would be wanting in ver. 23 in one set of the authorities. — Ver. 27. Lachm. and Tisch. have, indeed, ἐξ ὅλης τ. καρδίας σ., but then ἐν ὅλη τ. ψυχῇ σ. κ. ἐν ὅλη τ. ἰσχύϊ σ. κ. ἐν ὅλη τ. διανοίᾳ σ., on evidence so important that the *Receipta*, which throughout reads ἐκ, must be traced to the LXX. D, min. It. have throughout ἐν, from Matt. xxii. 37. — Ver. 29. δικάσειν] Lachm. Tisch. have δικάσιῶσαι, on decisive evidence. — Ver. 30. τυχχάριστα] deleted by Lachm. and Tisch., in accordance with B D L 8, min. Copt. Arm. Vulg. It. It was altogether superfluous, and was therefore passed over; there was no motive for adding it. — For a similar reason γινόμενος, ver. 32, is to be maintained, in opposition to Tisch. [Tisch. *Synops.* indeed omits it, but Tisch. 8 has restored it]. — Ver. 33. αὐτὸν] is wanting in B C L 8, 1, 33, 254, Vere. Vind. Colb. Rd. Bracketed by Lachm., deleted by Tisch. Rightly. It is from ver. 31. — Ver. 35. ἐξελθών] is wanting in B D L X 8, min. Syr. Arr. Perss. Aeth. Copt. Vulg. It. Chrys. Condemned by Griesb. and Schulz (by the latter as "vox molestissima"), deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. To be maintained. The similar ἐκβαλὼν which follows occasioned the omission of the word, which, besides, appeared cumbrous. — Ver. 36. αὐ]

bracketed by Lachm., deleted by Tisch., in accordance with B L Ξ Σ , min. vss. A connective addition. The arrangement $\pi\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$ $\delta\omicron\kappa\epsilon\tau$ $\sigma\omicron\iota$ (Elz. Lachm. have $\delta\omicron\kappa.$ $\sigma.$ $\pi\lambda\eta\sigma.$) is decisively attested. — Instead of $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\kappa\alpha\theta\acute{\iota}\sigma\alpha\sigma\alpha$, read, with Tisch. in ver. 39, $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\kappa\alpha\theta\epsilon\sigma\theta\acute{\iota}\sigma\alpha$, in accordance with A B C* L Ξ Σ . The *Recepta* is the easier reading. — Ver. 41. $\tau\upsilon\rho\beta\acute{\alpha}\zeta\eta$] Lachm. [Tisch. 8 also] has $\theta\omicron\rho\upsilon\beta\acute{\alpha}\zeta\eta$, in accordance with B C D L Σ 1, 33, Bas. Evagr. An interpretation in accordance with the frequently occurring $\theta\omicron\rho\upsilon\beta\omicron\varsigma$. — The reading $\omicron\lambda\acute{\iota}\gamma\omega\nu$ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu$ $\chi\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha$ η $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ (B C** L Σ , 1, 33, Copt. Aeth. Arm. Arr. Fathers) and similar readings have originated from the explanation which takes the passage as meaning one *dish*.

Ver. 1. The appointment and mission of the Seventy are transferred by Luke to this last journey of Christ, and are narrated as if they were supposed by the author to have some reference to ix. 52 ($\acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota\lambda\epsilon\nu$. . . $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$). Hence: $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, which does not refer to the Twelve (Bleek and others), but to the intimation, which is nearer to it, both in place and meaning, in ix. 52; and $\mu\epsilon\tau\grave{\alpha}$ $\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha$, which points back to ix. 57–62, although de Wette regards the reference as obscure and inappropriate. With arbitrary erroneousness Olshausen says that in this communication there is adopted a fragment from an earlier period, and that $\mu\epsilon\tau\grave{\alpha}$ $\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha$ is not chronological (*after this*, see v. 27, xviii. 4), but *besides* (following Schleiermacher, p. 169). — $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\epsilon}\delta\epsilon\iota\chi\epsilon\nu$] *renuntiavit*, He announced them as nominated, Acts i. 24; 2 Macc. ix. 25, x. 11, xiv. 26; 3 Esdr. i. 37, ii. 3; occurs often in the classical writers; comp. $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon\iota\chi\iota\varsigma$, i. 80. — $\acute{\epsilon}\beta\delta\omicron\mu\acute{\eta}\kappa\omicron\nu\tau\alpha$] In accordance with the apostolic number of twelve, so far as this had reference to the *tribes* of the people, it is probable that Jesus had in view the ancient Hebrew analogue of the seventy (originally seventy-two) *elders of the people* (see Ewald, *Altenth.* p. 284 f.; Saalschütz, *Mos. R.* p. 39). It is unlikely that there is any reference to the *Gentile nations* numbering seventy, according to Gen. x. (Eisenmenger, *Entdeckt. Judenthum*, II. p. 3, 736 f.; Gieseler, *Versuch*, p. 128), since there is no mention at all of any destination for the *Gentiles* (a subject on which Luke, least of all, would have been silent; in opposition to Olshausen, de Wette, Bleek, Gieseler, and others, especially

Baur and his school, Köstlin also); nay, according to ix. 53-56, and according to the particulars of the journey, *Samaria* should not at all be regarded (in opposition to Wieseler, p. 326 f., Baur, and others) as the theatre of their ministry. Moreover, no reference is to be assumed (as with Theophylact, Euthymius Zigabenus, Valla, and others) to the seventy palm-trees of Ex. xv. 27. — *οὗ*] see Winer, p. 419 [E. T. 592]. Lange, II. p. 1057 f., is wrong in explaining: into the places *which He had Himself previously designed to visit*; that Jesus, namely, sent the Seventy through *Samaria*; that He Himself did *not* make this circuit, but that, nevertheless, *He was not willing to give up* the Samaritan people (as representatives of the seventy Gentile nations), and therefore determined to convey the gospel to them *by means of* the Seventy. Against this invention of a "generous revenge," *πρὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ* and the imperfect *ἤμελλεν* are decisive. In general it is a mistake to assume that the mission of the Seventy *went beyond the bounds of Judaism*—on which assumption Baur and his school base the supposed *Pauline* tendency of the narrative. The region of the Samaritans is scarcely trodden before it is again forsaken, ix. 56, *prior to* the appointment of the Seventy. Weiss in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1861, p. 711, is right in saying: "Of any appointment of the seventy disciples for Samaria, or for the heathen world at all, there is not a single word said." Comp. Holtzmann, p. 393.

REMARK. —The *narrative of the Seventy* has been relegated into the unhistorical domain by Strauss, de Wette, Gfrörer (*Jahrb. d. Heils.* II. p. 371), Theile (*z. Biogr. J.* p. 51 f.), von Ammon (*L. J.* II. p. 355 ff.), Baur (*Evang.* p. 498 ff.), Schwegler, Bruno Bauer, Köstlin, Zeller, Ritschl, and others. But (1) as they accept the position that this was only a temporary and special appointment for the present journey, and not a permanent function, ver. 1, the silence of the rest of the evangelists, who indeed have not in general the detailed thread of this journey, as well as the silence of the subsequent history about their doings, is very easy to understand. — (2) That Jesus in general had around Him a larger circle of constant disciples, besides the Twelve, from whom He could appoint seventy for a special commission, is in itself, and from the evidence of such passages

as Acts i. 15, 21, 1 Cor. xv. 6, as well as John vi. 60, not to be doubted. — (3) The tradition would hardly have restrained itself within these narrow limits, but would have gone further than simply to allow the Seventy to be appointed and sent forth, and then to return and vanish; and would especially have passed over into the apostolic history. — (4) That Jesus gave them a commission similar to that which He gave the Twelve, arose from the similar character of their temporary relation, in respect whereof, moreover, it is to be conceded that the tradition involuntarily mingles elements out of the two commissions.¹ (5) If the narrative had been, as has been supposed (see especially Baur, *Evang.* p. 435 ff., 498 ff.), an invention of the author, intended typically to keep the apostolic call of Paul in incessant contrast with that of the Twelve, it would have been just as necessary as it was easy to the inventor to relate what they did, or at least to inweave into the commission characteristic references to the ministry of Paul, yet these are entirely wanting (comp. rather xxiv. 47 f.; Acts i. 8); moreover, the Acts of the Apostles would not have been perfectly silent about the Seventy. In like manner as Baur, Köstlin also, p. 267 f., judges, deriving the narrative, as an account typically prefiguring the mission to the heathen,² from the supposed Gospel of Peter, without, however, acquiescing in the *opposition* to the Twelve asserted by Baur. Ewald (*Evang.* p. 285, *Gesch. Chr.* p. 349), with whom in substance Holtzmann, p. 392 f., agrees, refers the narrative to a later period, in which the gradual disappearance of the Twelve gave to the Lord's remaining companions so much more importance, that what was at first true only of the Twelve was involuntarily transferred to a wider circle; comp. also Weizsäcker, p. 161 f., 409 f. But against this also the reasons specified under 1-4 hold good. Ewald, in his *Gesch. d. Apost. Zeitalt.* p. 158, supposes that they belonged to the hundred and twenty persons mentioned in Acts i. 15. — The *purpose* of the mission was not in any way to further the personal faith of those who were sent (Hase, p. 200; Krabbe, p. 306), but, as is

¹ According to Baur, elements of the commission given to the *Twelve* are transferred *tendentally* by the *evangelist* to the discourse to the Seventy, in order to give the preference to the latter, as being the true and genuine disciples. Comp. also Baur, *Das Christenthum der drei ersten Jahrh.* p. 76 f.; Hilgenfeld, *Evang.* p. 183 ff. See, in general, against such supposed tendencies of Luke in regard to the primitive apostles, Holtzmann, p. 394 f.; Weiss, p. 709 ff. Weizsäcker, p. 163, rightly emphasizes the fact that it is just these sayings which, in an eminent measure, must have been the common property of tradition.

² Comp. Weizsäcker, p. 409.

evident from the commission itself (see especially ver. 9), to prepare, by miraculous cures and by preaching, for the imminent advent of the Messiah. This entire journey of Jesus was intended to afford the people an opportunity for a final decision before the Lord's departure from what had up to this time been His field of action, and to be in every quarter that *Messianic* entry which culminated in the final entry into Jerusalem. This function of forerunners, which, according to ver. 1, was held in that respect by the Seventy, is at variance neither with ver. 7, which assumes no relatively long sojourn, but only forbids the change of quarters, nor with the return at ver. 17, which was necessary for pointing out the route of the journey. — The *source* from which Luke derived the section is none other than that of the entire narrative of the journey (see on ix. 51). That he gave to a fragment of the *Logia* "an expansion of the original title, from a mere calculation of what was probable," is too hastily concluded by Holtzmann, p. 146.

Ver. 2. Comp. Matt. ix. 37 f. First of all, Christ makes them apprehend the greatness of their task, and (ver. 3) their risk, and then gives them (ver. 4 ff.) rules of conduct.¹ — ὀλίγοι] notwithstanding your numbers, ye are still far from sufficient² πρὸς τὸ πλῆθος τῶν μελλόντων πιστεῦειν (Euthymius Zigabenus) ! — ἐκβάλλη] In this is contained the importance, the urgency of the mission: *should drive forth* (comp. on Mark i. 12; 1 Macc. xii. 27).

Ver. 3. See on Matt. x. 16, where πρόβατα appears. A different form of the tradition, not to be explained as though Jesus called the Twelve πρόβατα as being τελειότερους (Euthymius Zigabenus). Comp. John xxi. 15-17.

Ver. 4. Comp. ix. 3; Matt. x. 9. — βαλλάντιον] a purse;

¹ But the prohibition against going to the heathens and the Samaritans, Matt. x. 5, He does not give to the Seventy, and that for the simple reason that they had precisely to make the journey only as it was definitely marked out to them in ver. 1 (through Galilee). For this that prohibition would not have been at all appropriate.

² According to Weiss, Jesus, in respect of ὀλίγοι, must have thought originally of Himself, while Luke thought of the Twelve. The former view contradicts the words of the passage, the latter the context. But that the discourse was originally addressed to the Twelve does not follow from xxii. 35, for the passage there alluded to is to be sought in ix. 3 (although with certain coincidences from x. 4).

found only in Luke in the New Testament, frequently in the Greek writers. The spelling with λλ is decisively attested in the New Testament, although in itself the spelling with one λ would be more correct. See Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Leg. I.* p. 348 D. — *μηδένα . . . ἀσπάσθησθε*] not a prohibition of the *desire of good-will* (Olshausen, B.-Crusius), or of *making a bustle* (as Lange conjectures), which would have to be found in the *context*, but which has opposed to it *κατὰ τὴν ὁδόν*; but a *command to make haste*, so as to avoid every delay upon the road that might not be necessary for the performance of their task. In this respect there is no need of any reference to the circumstantial modes of greeting (embraces, benedictions, kisses, and the like). Comp. 2 Kings iv. 29. Jesus impresses on them the *properare ad rem!* in accordance with the object of the mission, vv. 1, 9, and in a concrete form, which should not be pressed to a literal meaning. Theophylact well says: *διὰ τὸ μὴ ἀποσχολεῖσθαι περὶ ἀνθρωπίνους ἀσπασμούς καὶ φιλοφρονήσεις, καὶ ἐκ τούτου πρὸς τὸ κήρυγμα ἐμποδίζεσθαι.*

Vv. 5, 6. See on Matt. x. 12 f. — The construction *εἰς ἣν κ.τ.λ.* is the same as in ver. 8. Comp. on Matt. x. 14. — *υἱὸς εἰρήνης*] *a son of salvation*, i.e. one who is fit to receive salvation, not different in substance from the *ἄξιος* in Matthew. Its opposite is *υἱὸς ὀργῆς* (Eph. ii. 3), *τῆς ἀπωλείας* (John xvii. 12), *τῆς ἀπειθείας* (Eph. v. 6), *γέέννης* (Matt. xxiii. 15). Comp. in general on Matt. viii. 12.

Ver. 7. Comp. ix. 4; Matt. x. 11. — *ἐν αὐτῇ δὲ τῇ οἰκίᾳ*] not: *in eadem autem domo* (Vulgate, Luther, Bleek), but as it does not run *ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ οἰκίᾳ*: but *in the house* (in question) *itself*, which has inhabitants so worthy. — *μένετε*] the more specific explanation *μὴ μεταβαίνετε κ.τ.λ.* follows. — As to *ἔσθοντες*, as it is also to be read here, see on vii. 33. — *τὰ παρ' αὐτῶν*] *that which is theirs* (comp. Mark v. 26). See Bernhardy, p. 255. Not different from this is *τὰ παρατιθέμενα ὑμῖν*, ver. 8. The messengers were to partake without hesitation of the provisions of the people, for, etc. This *statement of the reason*, however, should have prevented Baur from explaining it of the *unhesitating partaking of heathen meats* (according to 1 Cor. ix. 7 f., x. 27), even apart from the

fact that no mention is made of *heathen* houses at all. This is also in opposition to Köstlin, p. 234; Hilgenfeld, *Evang.* p. 183, and Weizsäcker, p. 163.

Vv. 8, 9. Πόλις] It is seen from this that in the direction previously given, ver. 5 ff., Jesus had contemplated villages and single dwelling-houses. Thus ver. 5 ff. corresponds to the καὶ τόπον, and ver. 8 ff. to the πόλιν, ver. 1. — καὶ δέχ. ὑμ.] a transition into the demonstrative expression instead of the continuance of the relative form; comp. Bremi, *ad Dem. Ol.* p. 177; Buttman, *Neut. Gr.* p. 328 [E. T. 383]. — ἐσθίετε] as though καὶ ἐὰν κ.τ.λ. had been previously said. An emphatic anacoluthon. See Bornemann, *Schol.* p. 65 f. — αὐτοῖς] the inhabitants. Comp. δέχονται. — ἡγγικεν] a promise of participation in the kingdom of Messiah near at hand. On ἐφ' ὑμᾶς, comp. Matt. xii. 28; Ps. xxvii. 2; 1 Macc. v. 40, 42.

Vv. 10, 11. Comp. ix. 5; Matt. x. 14. The refusal to receive them is represented as following immediately upon their entrance; hence the present εἰσέρχ. The representation of ver. 8 was different: εἰσέλθῃτε (see the critical remarks). — ἐξελθόντες] out of the house into which ye have entered. — ὑμῖν] so that ye should have it again; a symbol of the most contemptuous renunciation, as in Matthew. — ἡγγικεν κ.τ.λ.] a threatening reference to their penal exclusion from the salvation of the kingdom. See ver. 12 ff. Observe that ἐφ' ὑμᾶς is wanting this time; see the critical remarks.

Ver. 12. Comp. Matt. x. 15.

Vv. 13–15. See on Matt. xi. 21–24. Luke has not here any mistaken reminiscence (de Wette), but the disaster of these Galilean cities lay sufficiently close to the heart of Jesus to force from Him the denunciation of woe *more than once*, and here, indeed, in very appropriate connection, since this woe brings into the light and confirms what has just been said at ver. 12 by the example of the cities which had rejected Jesus Himself. — καθήμενοι (see the critical remarks): the inhabitants, namely. See Buttman, *Neut. Gram.* p. 114 [E. T. 130].

Ver. 16. Comp. Matt. x. 40; John xiii. 20, xii. 48. A confirmation in principle of the fact that He placed on equal grounds the cities that reject *them* with those that reject *Himself*.

In the second part the saying rises to a climax (ἀθετ. τ. ἀποστ. με). A deepening of the emotion; a solemn conclusion.

Vv. 17-20. The fact that the account of the return of the Seventy follows immediately cannot prove that in the history of this journey (from ix. 51 onward) Luke is not holding the chronological thread (Olshausen). In accordance with the purpose of the mission (ver. 1), some must have returned very soon, others later, so that Jesus might anticipate the return of one portion of them before the return of those who had gone farther, and Luke might equally exclude the summary narration of the return without passing over anything of importance that intervened. — καὶ τὰ δαιμόνια κ.τ.λ.] over which He had not given to them, as He had to the Twelve (ix. 1), an express authority: "Plura in effectu experti sunt, quam Jesus expresserat," Bengel. This is necessarily implied in καί; but it is not to be inferred, as Köstlin assumes, that Luke regarded the casting out of demons as the *highest* χάρισμα. — ἐν τῷ ὀνόμ. σ.] *by means of Thy name*, by the fact of our utterance of it. Comp. on ix. 49; Matt. vii. 22. Otherwise in Mark xvi. 17. — Ver. 18. This I *saw* happen in this wise when I sent you forth (ἐθεώρουν, imperf.)! This your victorious agency against Satan (whose servants the demons are) was not hidden from me. I *beheld* at that time (in the spirit, in idea) *Satan fallen like a lightning flash from heaven*, i.e. I then¹

¹ Without any ground in the context, ἐθεώρουν has been dated farther back in various ways. Lange, *L. J.* II. 2, p. 1070 f. (comp. also Philippi, *Glaubenslehre*, III. p. 308), refers it to the *temptation in the desert*, and conceives that with the rebuke of Christ, Get thee hence from me! Satan was "cast forth from the heavenly circle of Christ and His people." Gregory Nazianzen and other Fathers, Euthymius Zigabeus, Maldonatus, and others, refer it to the *time of Christ's incarnation*, by which Satan was cast down, a result which Christ here describes as a "dux belli suas narrans victorias" (Maldonatus). Other Fathers, including Origen and Theophylact, Erasmus and others, refer it to the *fall of the devil by sin*, whereby he lost his place in heaven. Thus also Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* I. p. 443, who indeed would have "the fall from heaven" to signify only the loss of the fellowship of the supramundane life of God (p. 458). According to this, the imperfect must have its reference to a fact of which Christ was a witness when He was still the λόγος ἁσαρκος. But against the explanation of Satan's fall by sin, it is decisive that with this overthrow of Satan his power on earth was not *broken*, but it then first *began*. The explanation is therefore quite opposed to the connection in which our passage stands,

perceived the swift overthrow of Satan from his lofty power, in so lively a manner that it presented itself to me in my inward perception, as if he were like a flash of lightning (so swift, so momentary !) hurled out of heaven (*πесύντα*, not the present). The whole reply of Jesus (comp. vv. 19, 20) is rich in imagination, full of vivid imagery, confirming the triumphant assertion of the disciples in equally joyous excitement.¹ Comp. Rev. xii. 9; and on the fact itself, John xii. 31, where no more than here is intended any allusion to the downfall of the hierarchical party (Schenkel). He does not mean to speak of a *vision* (von Ammon, *L. J.* II. p. 359), since such a thing nowhere occurs in His experience, inasmuch as in consideration of His direct perception He had no need of such intermediate helps; but He means an intuition of His *knowledge*, and speaks of it under a vivid, lifelike form, which the imagination is able to grasp. The relative tense *ἐθεώρουν* might also be referred to the time of the disciples' ministry (de Wette, Bleek, Schegg; comp. Bengel, tentatively, "*quum egistis*"); yet this is the less appropriate to the assertion of the instantaneous *πесύντα*, and to the comparison with the lightning's flash, that the ministry of the Seventy

since Jesus is not at all desirous of warning against arrogance (the view of many Fathers), but must certainly be speaking of the *destruction* of the devil's power, of the *overthrow* of the devilish strength. Hence also Hilgenfeld is quite mistaken, *Evang.* p. 184, in making it refer to Rev. xii. 9, saying that Jesus saw how the devil "even now is working with special energy upon the earth," that with the near approach of the passion of Jesus (not for the first time shortly before the last day) came therefore the point of time when the devil, who had been driven out of the field, should develop his power anew. Moreover, Hahn, *Theol. d. N. T.* I. p. 342, rightly referring *ἐθεώρουν* to the time of sending out the Seventy, finds the meaning to be: I beheld Satan *descend* from heaven with the rapidity of lightning to *hinder your work*; but fear ye not, behold I give you power, etc. In accordance with the context, *πесύντα* must mean the *knocking down* of the devil, not his descent from heaven; but the connection which Hahn makes with ver. 19 is neither intimated (in any wise by ἀλλ' ἰδοὺ κ.τ.λ.), nor does it suit the correct reading *δίδωνα*.

¹ Against this view Hofmann objects that it is foreign to the connection (wherefore?), and that it gives to the mission an importance that does not belong to it. But was it then something of little importance to send forth seventy new combatants against Satan's power? Could not the commander of this new warrior band behold, in the spirit, when He sent them forth, the devil's overthrow?

lasted for a time. — The representation *ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πρὸς ὅντα*¹ does not in any way presuppose Satan's abode in heaven (as to Paul's representation of the abode of the demons in the atmosphere, see on Eph. ii. 2), but corresponds to the thought of highly exalted power, as above, ver. 15, and Isa. xiv. 12; the representation, however, of its swiftness and suddenness by comparison with a *flash of lightning* was by reason of the *τοῦ οὐρανοῦ* as natural and appropriate as is the comparison of the lightning in Matt. xxiv. 27. — Ver. 19. According to the reading *δέδωκα* (see the critical remarks), Jesus gives them not a mere *supplementary* explanation (objection by de Wette), but He explains to them *what a much greater power* still they had received from Him and possessed (*perfect*) than that which they had experienced in the subjection of the demons. This investiture with power occurred before the sending of them forth, although it is not expressly mentioned in the commission, ver. 2 ff.; but it was left to become clear to their consciousness through experience, and they had already partially begun to be conscious of it in the subjection of the demons to their power. — *τοῦ πατεῖν ἐπάνω ὄψεων κ. σκορπ.*] a figurative description (in accordance with Ps. xci. 13, and see the Rabbinical passages in Wetstein) of the dangerous *Satanic powers*, which the Seventy were to tread under their feet, as warriors do their conquered foes (Rom. xvi. 20). — *καί*] and generally. — The *emphasis* of the discourse as it advances lies on *πάσαν* and *οὐδέν*. — *τοῦ ἐχθροῦ*] of the *enemy*, of whom our Lord is speaking, and that is none other than *Satan*. Comp. *Test. XII. Patr.* p. 657: *προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ Σατανᾶ . . . Κατέναντι τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ ἐχθροῦ στήσεται.* Matt. xiii. 25; 1 Pet. v. 8. — *οὐδέν*] is the accusative neuter: and *in nothing will it* (the *δύναμις τοῦ ἐχθροῦ*) *harm you*; comp. Acts xxv. 10; Gal.

¹ *ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ* is not to be taken with *ἀστραπήν*, as Schleiermacher would have it, who, moreover, takes pains in his *Vorles. üb. d. L. J.* p. 333 ff., with subtlety at variance with true exegesis, to exclude the doctrine of the devil from the teaching of Jesus. He says that Jesus speaks of the devil according to a current representation,—just as people speak of ghosts, without believing in their reality, and as we say that the sun rises, though everybody knows that the sun does not in reality rise.

iv. 12; Philem. 18; Wolf, *ad Dem. Lept.* p. 343. — ἀδικήσει (see the critical remarks): as to the *future* after οὐ μὴ, see on Matt. xxvi. 35; Mark xiv. 31. — Ver. 20. Nevertheless your rejoicing should have for its object a higher good than that authority over spirits. Theophylact well says: παιδεύων δὲ αὐτοὺς μὴ ὑψηλοφρονεῖν, φησὶ πλὴν ἐν τούτῳ κ.τ.λ. In accordance with his presuppositions, Baur, *Evang.* p. 439, thinks that the evangelist had Rev. xxi. 14 in view, and that he in a partisan spirit referred¹ to the *Seventy* the absolute significance in respect of the kingdom of God which the apocalyptic writer attributes to the *Twelve*. — μὴ χαίρετε κ.τ.λ.] *rejoice not . . . but rejoice.* Not a relative (*non tam . . . quam*, see Kuinoel, de Wette, and many others), but an *absolute* negation with rhetorical emphasis (Winer, p. 439 [E. T. 620, 621]), although “gaudium non vetatur, sed in ordinem redigitur,” Bengel. — ὅτι τὰ ὀνόμ. κ.τ.λ.] an embodiment of the thought: *that ye are destined by God to be in the future participators in the eternal Messianic life*, in accordance with the poetic representation of the *Book of Life* kept by God (Ex. xxxii. 32 f.; Ps. lxxix. 29; Isa. iv. 3; Phil. iv. 3; Rev. iii. 5; comp. on Matt. v. 12) in which their names had been written (ἐγράφη). The predestination thereby set forth is that which occurred before the beginning of time in Christ (Eph. i. 4). See on Phil. iv. 3.

Vv. 21, 22. See on Matt. xi. 25–27.² Luke places this thanksgiving prayer in immediate chronological connection (*in the same hour*) with the return of the Seventy. Theophylact says: ὥσπερ πατὴρ ἀγαθὸς παῖδας ἰδὼν κατορθώσαντάς

¹ Which, however, by a glance at Rev. iii. 5, xvii. 8, is shown to be erroneous. Moreover, according to Weizsäcker, vv. 18–20 are said to be of the “latest origin.”

² Keim, *Geschichtl. Christus*, p. 51, sees here the *climax reached of the consciousness* of the divine Sonship, and that hence there now appears, instead of the “*your Father*,” as hitherto, the designation “*my Father*.” But on the one hand “*your Father*” is still said at the same time and later (xii. 30, 32; Matt. x. 20, xviii. 14, xxiii. 9), and on the other Jesus, not to mention ii. 49, says “*my Father*” even as early as in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. vii. 21). Baur, indeed (*Neutest. Theol.* p. 86), knows no other way of getting rid of the offence which this expression of Matt. vii. 21 gives him than by attributing the words to a *later* period of the ministry of Jesus. It is easy in this way to set aside what will not fit into our notions.

τι, οὕτω καὶ ὁ σωτὴρ ἀγάζεται, ὅτι τοιούτων ἀγαθῶν ἡξιώθησαν οἱ ἀπόστολοι. Still this chronological position is hardly the historical one. See on Matth. — τῷ πνεύματι] not the *Holy Spirit* (see the critical remarks). Comp. i. 47. It is His own πνεῦμα ἀγιοσύνης, Rom. i. 4. The opposite of this, ἡγαλλ. τ. πν., occurs in John xi. 33. — ταῦτα] finds in Luke its reference in ὅτι τὰ ὀνόματα ὑμῶν κ.τ.λ., ver. 20, and is hence to be understood¹ of the knowledge of the life eternal in the kingdom of Messiah (comp. viii. 10 : γινῶναι τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας). — Ver. 22. καὶ στραφεῖς κ.τ.λ.] (see the critical remarks). From the prayer to God He turns in the following words to the *disciples* (the Seventy and the Twelve). — πρὸς τοὺς μαθ.] belongs to στραφεῖς. Comp. vii. 44, xiv. 25. As to the idea of the πάντα μοι παρεδ., which is not, as with Baur, Schenkel, and others, to be referred merely to the spiritual and moral region, see on Matt. xxviii. 18. — γινώσκει] That the Marcionite reading ἔγνων is the original one, and not a gnostic alteration, is rendered probable by the very ancient date at which it is found (Justin, the Clementines, the Marcosites). Comp. on Matt. xi. 27. The gnostic interpretation of ἔγνων, which is contested by the Clementines (xviii. 13 f.), very easily brought about the change into the present tense. See (after Baur, Hilgenfeld, Semisch, Köstlin, Volkmar) Zeller, *Apostelg.* p. 13 f. — τίς] in respect of His nature, counsel, will, thought, etc. In what way, however, τίς ἐστιν ὁ πατήρ is said to be gnostic rather than biblical (Köstlin, p. 161) it is not easy to see. The Father who has sent the Son has His perfect revelation for the first time in Him. Comp. John xiv. 9. — ᾧ ἐὰν βούλ.] Comp. concerning the Spirit, 1 Cor. xii. 11. This will of the Son, however, in virtue of His essential and moral unity with the Father, is no other than the Father's will, which the Son has to fulfil. Comp. Gess, *Pers. Chr.* p. 18 f. Observe, again, that the negation, which is not to be relatively explained away, οὐδεὶς . . . εἰ μὴ, establishes a relation of a *unique kind*, namely, that of the *metaphysical* fellowship.

¹ Not, of the power over the demons, as Wittichen, *d. Idee Gottes als des Vaters*, 1865, p. 30, wishes to have it. To that also belongs πάντα, ver. 22.

Vv. 23, 24. See on Matt. xiii. 16 f., where the historical connection is quite different. But the significant beatitude may have been spoken on different occasions, especially with a different reference of meaning (as here in particular βλέπειν has a different sense from what it has in Matthew). — καὶ στραφεῖς κ.τ.λ.] Here we have a further step in the narrative (comp. ver. 22), which is marked by κατ' ἰδίαν, to be taken along with στραφεῖς. This turning, *which excluded* the others who were present (see ver. 25), is to be regarded as perceptible by the movement and gesture of the speaker. "Lucas accurate notare solet pausas et flexus sermonum Domini," Bengel. Consequently the reproach of *inappropriateness*, occasioned by the omission of δεῦτε πρὸς με πάντες (in Matthew), does not touch Luke (Holtzmann, p. 147 ; Weiss). — καὶ βασιλεῖς] peculiar to Luke. Think of David, Solomon, Hezekiah, and others. — ἰδεῖν . . . ἀκούετε] The point of the contrast varies : to see what *ye* see . . . and to hear what *ye* (actually) *hear*. Comp. on 2 Cor. xi. 29.

Ver. 25 ff. This transaction is *different* from the later narrative of Matt. xxii. 35 ff. (comp. Mark xii. 28 ff.). The fact that the same passages of the law are quoted cannot outweigh the difference of time and place, of the point of the question, of the person quoting the passages, and of the further course of the conference. Comp. Strauss, I. p. 650 f., who, however, also holds Matthew and Mark as distinct, and thus maintains three variations of the tradition upon the one subject, viz. that Jesus laid stress on the two commandments as the foremost of the law ; while Köstlin, p. 275, supposes that Luke arbitrarily took the question, ver. 25, out of its original place in Matthew and Mark, and himself made it the entire introduction to the parable (ver. 30 ff.). Comp. Holtzmann : "two independent sections brought by Luke within one frame." — ἐκπειράζων αὐτόν] προσεδόκησεν παγιδεῦσαι τὸν Χριστὸν εἰς τὸ πάντως ἐπιτάξαι τι ἐναντίον τῷ νόμῳ, Euthymius Zigabenns. As to ἐκπειράζ., *to try thoroughly*, see on 1 Cor. x. 9.

Vv. 26, 27. Πῶς ἀναγνώσκεις] מַאי מֵאֵי, a customary Rabbinical formula to give occasion to a scriptural citation, Lightfoot, p. 794. — πῶς] *how*, that is, with what words, not

instead of τί (Kypke and others). Comp. πὼς φῆς, πὼς λέγεις, πὼς δοκεῖς, and the like. Observe that ἐν τῷ νόμῳ is placed first for the sake of emphasis, and that the *doubled* expression of the question indicates the *urgency* of the questioner. Lechler in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1854, p. 802, is wrong in explaining the passage as if it were πὼς σὺ ἀναγ. — Ver. 27. The lawyer quotes Dent. vi. 5 along with Lev. xix. 18. The Jews had to repeat daily morning and evening the former passage, together with Deut. xi. 13 ff. (Berac. f. 3. 3; comp. on Mark xii. 29); it appeared also on the phylacteries (see on Matt. xxiii. 5), but not Lev. xix. 18; hence the opinion of Kuinoel: "Jesum digito monstrasse thecam illam, qua se ornaverant legis peritus," must be rejected. The reason why the lawyer answered *entirely in the meaning of Jesus*, and especially adds the passage from Leviticus, is found in the fact that his attention was directed not to what had *immediately preceded*, but to the problem τίς ἐστὶ μου πλησίον; and that he used the question τί ποιήσας κ.τ.λ., ver. 25, only as an introduction thereto. To this question, familiar as he was with the principles of Jesus, he must have expected an answer in which the duty of the love of one's neighbour was not wanting, and thereto he would then attach the special question meant to tempt him, viz. τίς ἐστὶ μου πλησίον; But since the dialogue takes such a turn that he himself becomes the respondent, he gives *the* answer which he had expected *from Jesus*; and now for his own self-justification—to show, to wit, that notwithstanding that correct answer, he did not ask his question without reason, but still needs more detailed instruction, he adds the problem under cover of which the temptation was to be brought in. The questioner, unexpectedly made to play the part of the respondent, thus keeps his object in view with presence of mind and craftiness, and it can neither be asserted that by his reply, in keeping with the meaning of Jesus, he at once gave himself up as a captive (de Wette), nor that this reply was not suggested till the question of Jesus was interposed (Bleek).

Vv. 28, 29. Τοῦτο ποίει] τοῦτο has the emphasis corresponding to the τί of ver. 25. — ζήσῃ] ζῶν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσεις,

ver. 25. It is thus that Jesus declared the fundamental law of the divine retribution, as Paul, Rom. ii. 13. But as to the manner in which this moral, fundamental law leads to the necessity of the righteousness of faith (see on Romans, *loc. cit.*), there was no occasion for Him to explain further in the presence of the legal tempter. — Ver. 29. *δικαιῶσαι ἑαυτόν*] namely, in reference to his question, to prove that he had put it with reason and justice; see on ver. 26 f. Comp. also Maldonatus, de Wette, Bleek, Schegg. The view that he wished to represent himself as being honestly disposed, xvi. 15 (*so usually*), has against it¹ the purpose with which the scribe had presented himself, *ἐκπειράζων αὐτόν*, in spite of which he himself has still answered rightly, ver. 27. — *καὶ τίς κ.τ.λ.*] See on the *καί* occurring thus abruptly and taking up the other's discourse, Hartung, *Partikell.* I. p. 146 f.; Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* I. p. 879 f.; "Mire ad ἡθος facit," Bengel. — *πλησίον*] without an article, hence: *who is neighbour to me?* Comp. ver. 36. See Bornemann, *Schol.* p. 69; Winer, p. 118 f. [E. T. 163]. The *clement of temptation* consisted in this, that from the mouth of Jesus was expected some sort of heterodox reply which should deviate from the Rabbinical definition that the Jew's nearest neighbour is his fellow-Jew.

Vv. 30, 31. *Ἐπολαμβάνειν*, in the sense of "taking up the discourse of another by way of reply," occurs only here in the New Testament, and hence is probably taken by Luke from the source used by him. It is frequent in the LXX. (ἐπι) and in the classical writers. Comp. Herod. vii. 101: *ὁ δὲ ὑπολαβὼν ἔφη*; Dem. 594. 21, 600. 20; Polyb. iv. 85. 4, xv. 8. 1. — *ἀνθρώπος τις*] without any more definite limitation, which, however, is not to be regarded as intentional (Paulus thinks that it is meant to intimate that the Samaritan asked no questions about his nationality, comp. also Schenkel), but leaves it to be understood of itself, by means of the context, that a *Jew* is meant (not a heathen, as Olshausen takes it), in

¹ Lange, *L. J.* II. p. 1076, conjectures that the scribe wished, as the disciples had just returned from Samaria, to call Jesus to account in respect of this fellowship with the Samaritans—which could not be the way to life. But the Seventy had not been to Samaria at all. Comp. on ver. 1 and ix. 56.

virtue of the contrast between Jew and Samaritan. — *Ἰεριχώ*] See on Matt. xx. 29. It was separated from Jerusalem by a desert region (Joseph. *Bell.* iv. 8. 3), which was unsafe because of robbers (Jerome on Jer. iii. 2). It was not a priestly city. — *περιέπεσεν*] *he met with robbers, fell among them*, as *περιπίπτειν τινί*, *incidere in aliquem*, is very often used in the classical writers (Herod. vi. 105, viii. 94, vi. 41; Dem. 1264. 26; Xen. *Anab.* vii. 3. 38; Polyb. iii. 53. 6). There is no question here about chancing upon unfortunate *circumstances*, for this would have required the dative of an abstract noun (such as *συμφορή, τύχη κ.τ.λ.*). — *οὐ καὶ κ.τ.λ.*] This and the subsequent *καί* correspond to one another; *et . . . et*. They took his clothes off him in order to rob him of them, and while doing so they beat him (because he resisted). The two participles therefore stand in the correct sequence of what actually occurred (in opposition to de Wette). — *τυγχάνοντα*] not equivalent to *ὄντα*, but: they left him when *he was just half dead*¹ (this was the condition to which he was reduced). Comp. Plat. *Prot.* p. 313 E, and elsewhere. See Ast, *Lex. Plat.* III. p. 420. *ὄντα* might have been added besides, Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 277. — *ἀντιπαρήλθεν*] *ex adverso praeteriit* (Winer, *de verb. compos.* III. p. 18), he passed by on the opposite side. This *ἀντι* gives a clear idea of the cold behaviour of the hard-hearted passer-by. The word occurs elsewhere only in Strat. vii. 2 (Jacobs, *Anthol.* III. p. 70) and Wisd. xvi. 10 (in which place, however, it means *ex adverso advenire*; see Grimm). Comp. *ἀντιπαριέναι*, Xen. *Anab.* iv. 3. 17; *Hell.* v. 4. 38.

Ver. 32. Observe the climax in the description—*having reached the place* (in question), *he went, when he had come* (approached) *and seen* (the state of the case), *by on the other side*. On *γενόμεν. κατά*, comp. Herod. iii. 86: *ὥς κατὰ τοῦτο τὸ χωρίον ἐγένοντο*; Xen. *Cyrop.* vii. 1. 14, and elsewhere. Comp. ver. 33.

Ver. 34. *Ἐπιχέων κ.τ.λ.*] *while he*, as he was binding them up, *poured on them oil and wine*, the ordinary remedy in the

¹ The expression makes us feel the *unconcernedness* of the robbers about the unfortunate man whom they left to his fate *just as he was*.

case of wounds (see the passages in Wetstein and Paulus), which he carried with him for any casual need. — ἐπὶ τὸ ἴδιον κτήνος] *on his own beast* (his ass), so that thus he himself gave up its use. — πανδοχείον] instead of the Attic πανδοκεῖον. Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 307. The word has also passed over into the Rabbinical vocabulary: פונדק, see Lightfoot, p. 799. We must picture to ourselves a *caravanserai*, over which presided an ordinary landlord.

Vv. 35, 36. Ἐπὶ] as in Mark xv. 1; Acts iii. 1: *towards the morrow*, when it was about to dawn. — ἐξελθὼν] out of the inn. He gave the money to the landlord *outside* (*past* participle). The *small* amount, however, that he gave him presupposes the thought of a very *early* return. — ἐκβαλὼν] a vivid picture; out of his purse. Comp. Matt. xiii. 52. — προσδαπαν.] *thou shalt have expended in addition thereto*, besides; Lucian, *Ep. Sat.* xxxix.; *Corp. inser.* 108, 8. — ἐγὼ] with emphasis; the unfortunate man was not to have the claim made on him. — ἐπανέρχεσθαι] signifies “reditum in eum ipsum locum,” Tittmann, *Synon.* p. 232. Very frequently in use in the classical writers. — γεγονέναι] *to have become* by what he had done. On γίνεσθαι, in the sense of *se praesumere*, see Kühner, *ad Xen. Anab.* i. 7. 4. Flacius, *Clav.* II. p. 330, well says: “omnes quidem tres erant jure, sed unicus facto aut officio.” — τοῦ ἔμπεσ. εἰς τ. λ.] *who fell among the thieves.* See Sturz, *Lex. Xen.* II. p. 153.

Ver. 37. Ὁ ποιήσας κ.τ.λ.] Bengel: “Non invitus abstinet legisperitus appellatione propria Samaritae.” On the expression, comp. i. 72. — τὸ ἔλεος] the compassion related; καὶ σὺ: *thou also*; not to be joined to πορεύου (Lachmann), but to ποίει. Comp. vi. 31.

REMARK.—Instead of giving to the theoretical question of the scribe, ver. 29, a direct and theoretical decision as to whom he was to regard as his neighbour, Jesus, by the feigned (according to Grotius and others, the circumstance actually occurred) history of the compassionate Samaritan, with all the force of the contrast that puts to shame the cold Jewish arrogance, gives a practical lesson *on the question: how one actually becomes the neighbour of ANOTHER*, namely, by the exercise of helpful love, independently of the nationality and religion of

the persons concerned. And the questioner, in being dismissed with the direction, *καὶ σὺ ποίει ὁμοίως*, has therein indirectly the answer to his question, *τίς ἐστὶ μου πλησίον*; namely: Every one, without distinction of people and faith, to whom the circumstances analogous to the instance of the Samaritan direct thee to exercise helpful love in order thereby to become *his* neighbour, thou hast to regard as *thy* neighbour. This turn on the part of Jesus, like every feature of the improvised narrative, bears the stamp of originality in the pregnancy of its meaning, in the insight which suggested it, and in the quiet and yet perfectly frank way in which the questioner, by a direct personal appeal, was put to the blush.¹

Ver. 38. *Ἐν τῷ πορεύεσθαι*] to be understood of the continuation of the journey to Jerusalem. See ix. 51, 57, x. 1. But Jesus cannot yet be in *Bethany* (see xiii. 22, xvii. 11), where Martha and Mary dwelt (John xi. 1, xii. 1 f.), and hence it is to be supposed that Luke, because he was unacquainted with the more detailed circumstances of the persons concerned, transposed this incident, which must have occurred in Bethany, and that on an earlier festal journey, not merely to the last journey, but also to some other village, and that a village of Galilee. The tradition, or the written source, which he followed had preserved the fact and the names of the persons, but not the time and place of the incident. If we regard Luke as unacquainted with those particulars, the absence of all mention of *Lazarus* is the less surprising, seeing that the substance of the history concerns the *sisters* only (in opposition to Strauss, I. p. 751). — *καὶ αὐτός*] *καί* is the usual *and* after *ἐγένετο*, and *αὐτός* brings Jesus Himself into prominence above the company of travellers (*αὐτούς*). *Ἦε, ὦν*

¹ The Fathers, as Origen, Ambrose, Augustine, Theophylact, Euthymius Zigabenus, have been able to impart mystical meanings to the individual points of the history. Thus the *ἄνθρωπός τις* signifies *Adam*; Jerusalem, *paradise*; Jericho, *the world*; the thieves, *the demons*; the priest, *the law*; the Levite, the *prophets*; the Samaritan, *Christ*; the beast, *Christ's body*; the inn, the *church*; the landlord, the *bishop*; the Denarii, the *Old and New Testaments*; the return, the *Parousia*. See especially Origen, *Hom. 34 in Luc.*, and Theophylact, *sub loc.* Luther also similarly allegorises in his sermons. Calvin wisely says: "Scripturæ major habenda est reverentia, quam ut germanum ejus sensum hac licentia transfigurare liceat."

His part, without the disciples, went into the village and abode at the house of Martha. — The notion that *Martha* was the wife (Bleek, Hengstenberg) or widow (Paulus) of Simon the leper, is based upon mistaken harmonistics. See on vii. 36 ff. and Matt. xxvi. 6 f. Whether she was a widow at all (Grotius) does not appear. She was the housekeeper and manager of the household, and probably the elder sister.

Vv. 39, 40. *Τῇδε*] This word usually refers to what follows, but here in a vividly realizing manner it points to *what has gone before*, as sometimes also occurs in the classical writers. See Bernhardt, p. 278; Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* i. 2. 3, iii. 3. 12. — *ἡ καί*] *καί* is not: *even* (Bornemann), which would have no reference to explain it in the context; but: *moreover*, bringing into prominence the fact that Mary, besides whatever else she did in her mind after the coming of Jesus, *moreover* seated herself at His feet, etc. See Klotz, *ad Derar.* p. 636. — The form *παρακαθέσθαισα*] (see the critical remarks), from *παρακαθέζομαι*, *to sit down near to*, belongs to later Greek. Joseph. *Antt.* vi. 11. 9. — Mary sits there as a *learner* (Acts xxii. 3), not as a *companion at table* (at the right of Jesus, where His outstretched feet were), as Paulus and Kuinoel will have it (women *sat* at table; see Wetstein *in loc.*). For the text as yet says nothing of the *meal*, but only of the hospitable reception in general (ver. 38), and, moreover, ver. 40 alludes generally to the attendance on and entertainment of the honoured and beloved Guest, wherein Martha was exhausting her hospitality. There is no trace of any reclining at table; the context in *κ. ἤκουε τ. λόγ. αὐτ.* points only to the idea of the *female disciple*. — *περισπᾶσθαι*, in the sense of the *being withdrawn from attention and solicitude by reason of occupations*, belongs to later Greek. See Lobeck, *ad Phryg.* p. 415. Comp. Plut. *Mor.* p. 517 C: *περισπασμὸς κ. μεθολκὴ τῆς πολυπραγμοσύνης*. The expression *περί τι*, *about something*, connected with verbs of *being busied*, of *taking trouble*, and the like, is also very frequent in Greek writers. — *κατέλιπε*] *reliquit*; she had therefore gone away from what she was doing, and had placed herself at the feet of Jesus. — *ἵνα*] therefore speak to her *in order that*. Comp. on Matt. iv. 3.

— As to *συναντιλαμβάνεσθαι τινι*, to give a hand with anybody, i.e. to help anybody, comp. on Rom. viii. 26.

Vv. 41, 42. *Περὶ πολλὰ*] Thou art anxious, and weariest thyself (art in the confusion of business) about many things, see ver. 40. On *τυρβάζεσθαι περὶ τι*, comp. Aristoph. *Ran.* 1007. — *ἐνὸς δέ ἐστι χρεία*] A contrast with *πολλὰ*: but of one thing there is need; one thing is necessary, that is to say, as an object of care and trouble. By these words Jesus, in accordance with the context, can mean nothing else than that from which Martha had withdrawn, while Mary was bestowing pains upon it—the undivided devotion to His word for the sake of salvation, although in tenderness He abstains from mentioning it by name, but leaves the reference of the expression, in itself only general, to be first discovered from the words which follow. In respect of the neuter *ἐνός* nothing is to be supplemented any more than there is in respect of *πολλὰ*. Following Gregory, Bede, Theophylact, Zeger, Michaelis, and others (comp. Erasmus in the *Annotations*), Paulus understands: *one dish*, “we need not many kinds,” and *τὴν ἀγαθὴν μερίδα* is then taken as meaning *the really good portion*,¹ which figuratively represents the participation in communion with Jesus. The former, especially after the impressive *Μάρθα, Μάρθα*, would have been just as trivial and out of harmony with the serious manner of Jesus as the latter would have been discourteous to the well-intentioned hostess. Nachtigall also mistakes (in Henke’s *Magaz.* VI. p. 355), and Stolz agrees with him in interpreting: *one person is enough* (in the kitchen), in opposition to which the contrast of *πολλὰ* is decisive, seeing that according to it *ἐνός* must be *neuter*. — *τὴν ἀγαθὴν μερίδα*] *the good part*. That, namely, about which care and pains are taken, consists, according to the various kinds of these objects, of several parts. Mary has selected for herself among these, for her care and pains, the good part; and this is, in accordance with the subject, nothing else than precisely that *ἐν* which is necessary—that portion of the objects of solicitude and labour which is *the good one*, the *good portion*,

¹ Comp. the form of speech, *πρὸς μερίδας διπνῶν*, to dine in portions, and see examples in Wetstein.

which only *one* can be. More vaguely Grotius, Elsner, Kypke, Kuinoel, and others put it: the good *occupation*; and de Wette, generalizing this: the good *destination of life*. Comp. also Euthymius Zigabenus: δύο μερίδες πολιτείας ἐπαινεται, ἡ μὲν πρακτική, ἡ δὲ θεωρητική. — τὴν ἀγαθὴν] neither means *optimum* (Kuinoel and others), nor does it imply that the care of Martha, in which assuredly love also was expressed, was *mala* (Fritzsche, *Conject.* I. p. 19); but it designates the portion as the good one κατ' ἐξοχὴν. — ἥτις οὐκ ἀφαιρ. ἀπ' αὐτ.] refers certainly, first of all, to Martha's appeal, ver. 40. Hence it means: *which shall not be taken away from her*; she shall keep it, Mark iv. 25, whereby, however, Jesus at the same time, in thoughtful reference to further issues, points, in His characteristically significant manner, to the *everlasting* possession of this μερίς. By ἥτις, which is not equivalent to ἡ, what follows is described as belonging to the *essence* of the ἀγαθὴ μερίς: *quippe quac.* "Transit amor multitudinis et remanet caritas unitatis," Augustine. — Those who have found in Mary's devotion the representation of the Pauline πίστις, and in the nature of Martha that of zeal for the law, so that the evangelist is made to describe the party relations of his own day (Baur, Zeller, Schweigler, Hilgenfeld), have, by a *coup* quite as unjustifiable as it was clumsy, transferred this relic of the home life of Jesus into the foreign region of allegory, where it would only inaptly idealize the party relations of the later period.

CHAPTER XI.

Vv. 2-4. Elz. and Scholz have after *πάτερ: ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς*, and after *βασιλ. σου: γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου, ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*. After *πειρασμόν* Elz. has *ἀλλὰ ῥῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ*. Lachm. also (not Tisch.) reads all this; but he has *ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς* (without *τῆς*) in brackets. The important authorities both for and against these additions lead us to regard them as supplements taken from the usual form of the Lord's Prayer in Matt. vi. 6, 9 ff. According to Gregory of Nyssa (comp. Maxim.), instead of *ἐλθέτω . . . σου* Luke must have written *ἐλθέτω τὸ ἄγιον πνεῦμά σου ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ καθαρисάτω ἡμᾶς*. An ancient gloss.¹ — Ver. 4. The form *ἀφίόμεν* is, on decisive evidence, to be adopted, with Lachm. and Tisch. — Vv. 9, 10. The authorities for *ἀνοιγέσεται* and *ἀνοιχθήσεται* are about equally balanced. Tisch. has rightly adopted the latter. The *Recepta* is from Matt. vii. 7 f. — Ver. 11. Instead of *ἐξ ὑμῶν* Elz. has simply *ὑμῶν*, in opposition to decisive evidence. On similar evidence, moreover, *ἡ* is subsequently adopted instead of *εἰ* (Elz.), and at ver. 13 *δόματα ἀγαθά* (reversed in Elz.). — Ver. 12. Instead of *ἡ καὶ ἐάν* Tisch. has merely *ἡ καί*, following B L S, min. But *ἐάν* was the more easily omitted, since it does not occur in the foregoing verse. On the other hand, *αἰτήσεις* is so decisively attested that it is, with Tisch., to be adopted instead of the *Recepta αἰτήση*. — Ver. 15. *τῷ* before *ἄρχοντι* is wanting in Elz. Scholz, but is decisively attested; the omission is explained from Matt. xii. 24. — Ver. 19. *κριταὶ ὑμῶν αὐτοί*] B D, Lachm. Tisch. have *αὐτοὶ ὑμῶν κριταί*. A C K L M U, min. Vulg. It.

¹ Thus or similarly Marcion read the *first* petition, and Hilgenfeld, *Kritik. Unters.* p. 470, and Volkmar, p. 196, regard the petition in this place about the Holy Ghost as original (because specifically Pauline), and the canonical text as an alteration in accordance with Matthew; see also Hilgenfeld in the *Theol. Jahrb.* 1853, p. 222 f., and in his *Evangel.* p. 187 f.; Zeller, *Apostelgesch.* p. 14. But ver. 13 easily occasioned the alteration, welcome as it was to the one-sided Paulinism, seeing that by its means the Holy Spirit was represented as the chief of what was to be asked for from God. Comp. Tholuck, *Bergpred.* p. 347 f.

have αὐτοὶ κριταὶ ἐμὲν. So also has **8**, which, however, places ἔσονται before ἐμ. [Tisch. 8 has adopted the reading of **8**]. Accordingly, the evidence is decisive against the *Recepta*. The omission of αὐτοὶ (it is wanting still in 113) occasioned its being very variously placed when it was reintroduced. The place assigned to it by Lachm. is the rather to be preferred, as B D, the authorities in its favour, have in Matt. xii. 27: αὐτοὶ κριταὶ ἔσονται. ἐμὲν, and have not therefore borrowed their arrangement in this passage from Matthew. The Vulgate, on the other hand, has also in Matt. *loc.*: αὐτοὶ κριταὶ ἐμὲν ἔσονται; hence the reading of A C, etc., is probably due to a conformity with Matthew. — Ver. 22. The article before ἰσχυροί, is wanting in B D L F **8**, and is, with Lachm. and Tisch., to be deleted. It was introduced in accordance with ὁ ἰσχυρός, ver. 21. — Ver. 25. Instead of ἐνθάδε, important authorities (but not A B L **8**) have ἐνθάδε. Rightly; see on Matt. xii. 44. — Ver. 29. After ἰωᾶ Elz. Scholz have τοῦ προφήτου, in opposition to important evidence. It is from Matt. xii. 39, whence, however, the *Recepta* ἐπιζητεῖ was also derived, instead of which ζητεῖ, with Tisch., is to be read. Moreover, in accordance with Lachm. and Tisch., γυνὴ is again to be inserted before πατέρα. — Ver. 32. **Novi**] A B C E** G L M U X r Δ **8**, min. Syr. Vulg. It. have *Novi*]. Recommended by Griesb., adopted by Scholz, Lachm. [Tisch. 8 has *Novi*]. Rightly: Luke has followed Matthew (xii. 41) *verbatim*. — Ver. 34. After the first ἐμβαλεῖς, (Griesb. and the later editors have rightly added αὐτῷ. The omission is explained from Matt. vi. 22; its insertion, however, is decisively attested. — *ἐν*] after ὅταν is wanting in preponderating authorities. Suspected by Griesb., deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. It is an addition from Matt. vi. 23. — Ver. 42. After ταῦτα Griesb. has inserted ὁ, which Lachm. brackets, while Tisch. has deleted it; it is too weakly attested, and is from Matt. xxiii. 23. — ἀξίον] Lachm. and Tisch. have παρὲς, in accordance with B* L **8*** min. The *Recepta* is from Matthew. A has a fusion of the two: παραξίνας; D, Ver. have not got the word at all. — Ver. 44. After ἐμὲν Elz. (and Lachm. in brackets) has γαματισὶς κ. φαρμακίαι, ὑποκρίται. So also Scholz, but in opposition to evidence so important, that it can only be regarded as an addition from Matt. xxiii. 27. — αἱ before πικρῶν, is, on preponderating evidence, to be deleted. It arose from the preceding syllable. Suspected by Griesb., deleted by Lachm. [retained by Tisch. 8]. — Ver. 48. **μικροπικρῶν**] Tisch. has *μικροπικρῶν ἔσται*, in accordance with B L **8**, Or. The *Recepta* is from Matt. xxiii. 31. — ἀνδρὶ τῷ μικροῦ] is not found in B D L **8**, Cant. Ver. Vere. Rd. Vind.

Condemned by Griesb., bracketed by Lachm., deleted by Tisch. The words, both read and arranged differently by different authorities, are a supplement, in accordance with Matthew. — Ver. 51. The article before *αἵματος* in both cases is, with Lachm. and Tisch., in accordance with important evidence, to be struck out as an addition. — Ver. 53. *λέγοντος δὲ αὐτοῦ ταῦτα πρὸς αὐτούς*] B C L 8, 33, Copt. have *κἀκεῖθεν ἐξελθόντος αὐτοῦ*. This is, with Tisch., to be adopted. The authorities in favour of the *Recepta* have variations and additions, which indicate that they have originated as glosses. — Ver. 54. Many variations in the form of glosses. Lachm. follows the *Recepta*, only omitting *καὶ* before *ἤστ.* Tisch. has simply *ἐνεδρ., θηρεῦσαι τι ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ*, founding it mainly on B L 8. All the rest consists of additions for the sake of more explicit statement.

Vv. 1-4. See on Matt. vi. 9 ff. In Luke it is only apparent that the Lord's Prayer is placed too late,¹ to the extent of his having passed it over in the Sermon on the Mount, and from another source related a later occasion for it (which, according to Baur, indeed, he only created from his own reflection). Hence its position in Luke is not to be described as historically more correct (Calvin, Schleiermacher, Olshausen, Neander, Ewald, Bleek, Weizsäcker, Schenkel, and others), but both the positions are to be regarded as correct.² Comp. on Matt. vi. 9. So far as concerns the prayer itself, we have the full flow of its primitive fulness and excellence in Matthew. The peculiar and shorter form in Luke (see the critical remarks) is one of the proofs that the apostolic church did not use the Lord's Prayer as a *formula*. — The matter of fact referred to in *καθὼς καὶ Ἰωάννης κ.τ.λ.* is altogether unknown. Probably, however, John's disciples had a *definitely formulated* prayer given them by their teacher. — The *τις τῶν μαθητῶν* is to be regarded as belonging to the

¹ Schenkel, p. 291, transposes the circumstance of the giving of the prayer to the disciples even to the period after the arrival in Judaea, since, indeed, the scene at Bethany, x. 38 f., was already related. But Luke did not think of Bethany at all as the locality of this scene.

² Without, however, by means of harmonistic violence, doing away with the historical difference of the two situations, as does Ebrard, p. 356 f. In Luke, *time, place, and occasion* are different from what they are in Matthew, comp. Luke vi. 17 ff.

wider circle of disciples. After so long and confidential an intercourse of prayer with the Lord Himself, one of the *Twelve* would hardly have now made the request, or had need to do so. Probably it was a *later* disciple, perhaps formerly one of John's disciples, who, at the time of the Sermon on the Mount, was not yet in the company of Jesus. The sight, possibly also the hearing of the Lord praying, had now deeply stirred in him the need which he expresses, and in answer he receives the same prayer in substance which was given at an earlier stage to the *first* disciples. — *αὐτοῖς*, ver. 2: *to the disciples who were present*, one of whom had made the request, ver. 1. *ἐπιούσιον*] *cratinum*, see on Matt. vi. 11.¹ — *τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν*] needed day by day, *daily*. See Bernhardt, p. 329. — *καὶ γὰρ αὐτοί*] The special *consideration* placed before God for the exercise of His forgiveness, founded in the divine order of grace (Matt. vi. 14; Mark xi. 25), is here more directly and more strongly expressed than in Matthew. — *ἀφίωμεν*] (see the critical remarks) from the form *ἀφίω*, Eccles. ii. 18; Mark i. 34, xi. 16. See generally, Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* I. p. 174. — *παντὶ ὀφείλονται ἡμῖν*] *to every one, when he is indebted to us* (in an ethical sense). Comp. Wiener, p. 101 [E. T. 138]. The article before *ὀφείλονται* is too weakly attested, and is a grammatical addition.

Vv. 5–8. After He had *taught* them to pray, He gives them the *certainty that the prayer will be heard*. The construction is *interrogative* down to *παραθήσω αὐτῷ*, ver. 6; at *κάκεινος*, ver. 7, the interrogative construction is abandoned,

¹ The attempt of Hitzig (in the *Theol. Jahrb.* p. 1854, 131) to explain the enigmatical word, to wit, by *ἐν ἰσού*, according to which it is made to mean, the nourishment *equivalent to the hunger*, is without any real etymological analogy, and probably was only a passing fancy. Weizsäcker, p. 407, is mistaken in finding as a parallel the word *ἐπιζύσιος* in respect of the idea *panem necessarium*. This, indeed, does not come from *οὐσία*, but from *ἐξουσία*, and this latter from *ἐξιστι*. Moreover, the *תנא* of the Gospel to the Hebrews cannot betray that the first understanding of the word had *become lost* at an early date, but, considering the high antiquity of this Gospel, it can only appear as a *preservation* of the first mode of understanding it, especially as the *Logia* was written in Hebrew. In order to express the idea: *necessary* (thus *ἀναγκαῖος*, *ἰσχυρὸς*), there assuredly was no need of any free and, for that purpose, faulty word-making.

and the sentence proceeds as if it were a *conditional* one (ἐάν), in accordance with which also the apodosis beginning at ver. 8 (λέγω ὑμῖν κ.τ.λ.) is turned. Comp. on Matt. vii. 9. This *anacoluthon* is occasioned by the long dialogue in the *oratio directa*: φίλε κ.τ.λ., after which it is not observed that the first εἶπη (ver. 5) had no ἐάν to govern it, but was independent.¹ — τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν ἔξει κ.τ.λ.] The sentence has become unmanageable; but its drift, as originally conceived, though not carried out, was probably: *Which of you shall be so circumstanced as to have a friend, and to go to him, etc., and would not receive from him the answer, etc.? Nevertheless I say unto you, etc.* — καὶ εἶπη αὐτῷ] The sentence passes over into the deliberative form. The converse case is found in Antiph. Or. i. 4: πρὸς τίνας οὖν ἔλθῃ τις βοηθούς, ἢ ποῖ τὴν καταφυγὴν ποιήσεται . . . ; See thereon, Maetzner, p. 130. — Ver. 7. τὰ παῖδιά μου] the father does not wish to disturb his *little children* in their sleep. — εἰς τ. κοίτην] they are *into bed*. See on Mark ii. 1. — Ver. 8. διὰ γε κ.τ.λ.] *at least on account of his impudence*. On the structure of the sentence, comp. xviii. 4 f. On the *position* of γέ *before* the idea to which it gives emphasis, see Nägelsbach, *Anm. z. Ilias*, ed. 3, p. 118.

Vv. 9, 10. Comp. Matt. vii. 7 f. Practical application of the above, extending to ver. 13, in propositions which Christ may have repeatedly made use of in His exhortations to prayer. — καὶ γὰρ ὑμῖν λέγω] Comp. Luke xvi. 9. *Also I say unto you*. Observe (1) that καὶ γὰρ places what *Jesus* is here saying in an incidental parallel with the δώσει αὐτῷ ὅσων χρήζει which immediately precedes: that according to the measure of this granting of prayer, to that extent goes *also His* precept to the disciples, etc.; (2) that next to καὶ γὰρ the emphasis rests on ὑμῖν (in ver. 8 the emphasis rested upon λέγω), inasmuch as *Jesus* declares what He also, on His part, gives *to the disciples* to take to heart. Consequently καὶ γὰρ corresponds to the subject

¹ Hence the less difficult reading of Lachmann, ἐπεὶ, ver. 5, following A D, etc., is a correct indication of the construction, namely, that not with εἶπη, ver. 5 (Bleek, Ewald), but, first of all, with κακεῖνος, ver. 7, does the sentence proceed as if what went before were conditionally stated. If, with Lachmann and Tischendorf, a point is placed before λέγω ὑμῖν, ver. 8, a complete break in the sentence needlessly arises.

of δώσει, and ὑμῶν to the αὐτῷ of ver. 8. The *teaching itself*, so far as Jesus deduces it from that παραβολή, depends on the argument *a minori ad majus*: If a friend in your usual relations of intercourse grants to his friend even a troublesome petition, although not from friendship, yet at least for the sake of getting quit of the petitioner's importunity; how much more should you trust in God that He will give you what you pray for! The tendency of the παραβολή points therefore not, as it is usually understood, to *perseverance* in prayer, for of this, indeed, Jesus *says nothing* in His application, vv. 9, 10, but to the *certainly of prayer being heard*.

Vv. 11–13. Comp. on Matt. vii. 9–11. Still on the hearing of prayer, but now in respect of the *object* petitioned for, which is introduced by the particle δέ expressing transition from one subject to another. — The *construction* here also is an instance of anacoluthon (comp. on ver. 5), so that the sentence is continued by μὴ λίθον κ.τ.λ., as if instead of the question a *conditional* protasis (as at ver. 12) had preceded. — τὸν πατέρα] Whom of you will his son ask *as his father* for a loaf? — ὁ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ δώσει] Attraction, instead of ὁ ἐν οὐρανῷ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ δώσει. See on ix. 61, and Buttmann, *Neut. Gr.* p. 323 [E. T. 377]. — πνεῦμα ἅγιον] this highest and best gift; a more definite, but a later form of the tradition than that which is found in Matthew. Comp. the critical remarks on ver. 2.

Vv. 14–22. See on Matt. xii. 22–29; Mark iii. 22 ff. Luke agrees with Matthew rather than with Mark. — ἦν ἐκβάλλ.] he was busied therein. — καὶ αὐτό] and he himself, the demon, by way of distinguishing him from the possessed person. — κωφόν] See on Mark ix. 17. — Ver. 16. A variation from Matthew in the connection of this (in Luke premature) demand for a sign (see on Matt. xii. 38), and in its purport (ἐξ οὐρανοῦ). — Ver. 17. καὶ οἶκος ἐπὶ οἶκον πίπτει] a graphic description of the desolation just indicated by ἐρημοῦνται: *and house falleth upon house*. This is to be taken quite literally of the overthrow of towns, in which a building tumbling into ruins strikes on the one adjoining it, and falls upon it. Thus rightly Vulgate, Luther, Erasmus, and others,

Bleek also. Comp. Thucyd. ii. 84. 2 : *ναῦς τε νηὶ προσέπιπτε*. This meaning, inasmuch as it is still more strongly descriptive, is to be preferred to the view of Buttmann, which in itself is equally correct (*Neut. Gr.* p. 291 [E. T. 338]) : *House after house*. Many other commentators take *οἶκος* as meaning *family*, and explain *either* (Bornemann), "*and one family falls away after another*" (on *ἐπὶ*, comp. Phil. ii. 27), or (so the greater number, Euthymius Zigabenus, Beza, Grotius, Valckenaer, Kuinoel, Paulus, de Wette) they supply *διαμερισθείς* after *οἶκον*, and take *ἐπὶ οἶκον* as equivalent to *ἐφ' αὐτόν* : "*et familia a se ipsa dissidens salva esse nequit*" (Kuinoel). It may be argued against the latter view, that if the meaning expressed by *ἐφ' αὐτόν* had been intended, the very parallelism of the passage would have required *ἐφ' αὐτόν* to be *inserted*, and that *οἶκος ἐπὶ οἶκον* could not in any wise express this reflexive meaning, but could only signify : *one house against the other*. The whole explanation is the work of the Harmonists. It may be argued against Bornemann, that after *ἐρρημοῦνται* the thought which his interpretation brings out is much too weak, and consequently is not sufficiently in accordance with the context. We are to picture to ourselves a kingdom which is devastated by civil war. — Ver. 18. *καὶ ὁ Σαταν.*] *Satan also*, corresponding with the instance just referred to. — *ὅτι λέγετε κ.τ.λ.*] the reason of the question. — Ver. 20. *ἐν δακτύλῳ Θεοῦ*] Matthew : *ἐν πνεύματι Θεοῦ*. Luke's mode of expressing the divine agency (Ex. viii. 19 ; Ps. viii. 3 ; Philo, *Vit. Mos.* p. 619 C ; Suicer, *Thes.* I. p. 820) appeals more to the senses, especially that of sight. It is a more concrete form of the later tradition. — Ver. 21. *ὁ ἰσχυρός*] as *τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ*, Matt. xii. 29. — *καθωπλισμένος*] not the subject (Luther), but : *armed*. — *τὴν αὐτοῦ αὐλήν*] not : his *palace* (see on Matt. xxvi. 3), but : his own *premises*, at whose entrance he keeps watch. — *ἐν εἰρήνῃ ἐστί κ.τ.λ.*] This is the *usual* result of that watching. But the case is otherwise if a stronger than he, etc. See what follows. Thus in me has a stronger than Satan come upon him, and vanquished him ! — *τὰ σκῦλα αὐτοῦ*] *the spoils taken from him*.

Ver. 23. After Jesus has repelled the accusation : *ἐν Βεελ-*

ξεβούλ κ.τ.λ., ver. 15, He pronounces *upon the relation to Him of those men spoken of in ver. 15* (see on Matt. xii. 30), and then adds—

Vv. 24–26, a figurative discourse, in which He sets forth their *in corrigibility*. See on Matt. xii. 43–45. Luke, indeed, gives the saying concerning the sin against the Holy Ghost (Mark iii. 28 f.; Matt. xii. 31 f.), but not until xii. 10; and therefore it is wrong to say that he omitted it in the interest of the Pauline doctrine of the forgiveness of sins (Baur).

Vv. 27, 28. A woman (assuredly a *mother*), following without restraint her true understanding and impulse, publicly and earnestly pays to Jesus her tribute of admiration. Luke alone has this feminine type of character also (comp. x. 38 ff.), which bears the stamp of originality, on the one hand, in the genuine *ναϊρετέ* of the woman (“bene sentit, sed muliebriter loquitur,” Bengel); on the other, in the reply of Jesus forthwith turning to the highest practical interest. This answer contains so absolutely the highest truth that lay at the heart of Jesus in His ministry, that Strauss, I. p. 719 (comp. Weizsäcker, p. 169), concludes, very erroneously, from the resemblance of the passage to viii. 21, that there were two different frames or moulds of the tradition in which this saying of Christ was set. The incident is not parallel even with Mark iii. 31 ff. (Holtzmann), even although in its idea it is similar. — ἐπάρασα | ὑψώσασα· σφόδρα γὰρ ἀποδεξαμένη τοὺς λόγους αὐτοῦ, μεγαλοφώνως ἐμακάρισε τὴν γεννήσασαν αὐτὸν ὡς τοιοῦτου μητέρα γενέσθαι ἀξιωθείσαν, Euthymius Zigabenus. — ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου] out of the crowd she lifted up her voice. — μακαρία κ.τ.λ.] See analogous beatitudes from the Rabbins and classical writers in Wetstein, Schoettgen, and Elsner, *Obs.* p. 226. — Ver. 28. μενούνη] may serve as *corrective* (*imo vero*) as well as *confirmatory* (*utique*). See generally, Hartung, *Partikell.* II. p. 400; Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* i. 3. 9, ii. 7. 5. In this passage it is the former, comp. Rom. ix. 20, x. 18; Jesus does not deny His mother's blessedness, but He defines the predicate *μακάριος*, not as the woman had done, as a special *external* relation, but as a general *moral* relation, which *might* be established in the case of *every one*, and under which even

Mary was brought, so that thus the benediction upon the mother, merely considered *as mother*, is corrected. The position of *μενοῦν* and *μενοῦνγε* at the beginning of the sentence belongs to the later Greek usage. See examples in Wetstein, Sturz, *Dial. Al.* p. 203; Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 342.

Vv. 29-32. See on Matt. xii. 39-42. Jesus now, down to ver. 36, turns His attention to the dismissal of those *ἕτεροι* who had craved from Him a *σημεῖον ἐξ οὐρανοῦ* (ver. 16). — *ἤρξατο*] He first began this portion of His address when the crowds were still assembling thither, *i.e.* were assembling in still greater numbers (*ἐπαθροίζ.*), comp. Plut. *Anton.* 44. But it is arbitrary to regard this introductory notice of the assembling of the people as deduced by Luke himself from the condemnation of the entire generation (Weizsäcker). — Ver. 30. Comp. Matt. xvi. 4. *Jonah* was for the Ninevites a sign (divinely sent) by means of his personal destiny, *ὅτι ὑπερφυῶς ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας τοῦ κήτους ἐρρύσθη τριήμερος*. *Jesus* became for that generation a sign (divinely sent, and that as Messiah) likewise by His personal destiny, *ὅτι ὑπερφυῶς ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας τῆς γῆς ἀνέστη τριήμερος*, Euthymius Zigabenus. In opposition to those who interpret the sign of Jonah only of Christ's *word* (as even Schenkel and Weizsäcker, p. 431), see on Matt. xii. 40, Remark. The sign of Jonah belongs entirely to the *future* (*δοθήσεται . . . ἔσται*). — Ver. 31 f. does not stand in a *wrong* order (de Wette), although the order in Matthew is probably the original, while that in Luke is arranged chronologically and by way of climax. — *μετὰ τῶν ἀνδρῶν κ.τ.λ.*] she will appear *with the men*, etc., brings into greater prominence the *woman's* condemning example. — *ἄνδρες Νινευῖται*] without an article: *Men of Nineveh*.

Vv. 33-36. Comp. viii. 16; Mark iv. 21; and see on Matt. v. 15, vi. 22 f. — No awkward (Baur), unconnected (Bleek, Ritschl) interpolation, but the introduction of the passage in this place depends on the *connection of thought*: "Here is more than Solomon, more than Jonah (vv. 31, 32). But this knowledge (the exceeding knowledge of Christ, Phil. iii. 8), once kindled at my word, ought not to be suppressed and made inoperative, but, like a light placed upon a candlestick,

it ought to be allowed to operate unrestrainedly upon others also;¹ for the attainment of which result (ver. 34 ff.) it is indeed necessary to preserve clear and undimmed one's own inner light, *i.e.* the power of perception that receives the divine truth." Certainly the train of thought in Matthew is easier and clearer, but Luke found them in the source whence he obtained them in the connection in which he gives them. — εἰς κρυπτήν] not instead of the *neuter*, for which the feminine never stands in the New Testament (not even in Matt. xxi. 42), nor is it according to the analogy of εἰς μακράν, εἰς μίαν, and the like (see Bernhardt, p. 221) adverbial (see Bornemann), since no instance of such a use of κρυπτήν can be produced, but the accent must be placed on the penult, εἰς κρύπτῃν: *into a concealed passage, into a vault (cellar)*. Thus ἡ κρύπτῃ in Athen. iv. p. 205 A. Comp. the Latin *crypta*, Sueton. *Calig.* 58; Vitruv. vi. 8; Prudent. *Hippol.* 154: "Mersa latebrosis crypta patet foveis." The certainty of the *usus loquendi* and the appropriateness of the meaning confirm this explanation, although it occurs in none of the versions, and among the MSS. only in Γ. Yet Euthymius Zigabenus seems to give it in τὴν ἀπόκρυφον οἰκίαν: in recent times, Valekenæer, Matthæi (ed. min. I. p. 395), Kuinoel, Bretschneider, Bleek, Holtzmann, Winer, p. 213 [E. T. 298], have it. Comp. Beza.

Ver. 35. *See therefore*; take care, *lest*, etc. Beza well says: "*Considera, num.*" Comp. Buttmann, *Neut. Gr.* p. 209 [E. T. 243]. Gal. vi. 1 is not quite similar, for there μὴ stands with the *subjunctive*, and means: *that not*. — τὸ φῶς τὸ ἐν σοί] ὁ τοῦς ὁ φωταγωγὸς τῆς ψυχῆς σου, Euthymius Zigabenus. — σκότος ἐστίν] ὑπὸ τῶν παθῶν, Euthymius Zigabenus.

Ver. 36. Οὐν] taking up again the thought of ver. 34: καὶ ὅλον τὸ σῶμά σου φωτεινὸν ἐστίν. — In the *protasis* the emphasis lies on ὅλον, which therefore is more precisely explained by μὴ ἔχον τι μέρ. σκοτ.; but in the *apodosis* φωτεινὸν has

¹ These words have nothing further to do with the refusal of the sign. This is in opposition to Hilgenfeld, who regards the connection as being: that there is no need at all of such a sign, since, indeed, Jesus does not conceal His light, etc. Comp. also Weizsäcker, p. 157. Besides, the discourse, ver. 33, manifestly does not describe a *procedure* that takes place, but a *duty*.

the emphasis, and the kind and degree of this light are illustrated (comp. ver. 34) by *ὡς ὅταν κ.τ.λ.*: "If therefore thy body is *absolutely and entirely* bright, without having any part dark, then *bright* shall it be absolutely and entirely, *as when the light with its beam enlightens thee.*" For then is the eye rightly constituted, fulfilling its purpose (see on Matt. vi. 22); but the eye stands to the body in the relation of the light, ver. 34. It is *complete* enlightenment, therefore, not merely partial, of which this normal condition of light (*ὡς ὅταν κ.τ.λ.*) is affirmed. Ἀπὸ τοῦ κατὰ τὸ σῶμα παραδείγματος περὶ τῆς ψυχῆς δίδωσι νοεῖν . . . Ἐὰν αὕτη ὅλη φωτεινὴ εἴη, μὴ ἔχουσα μηδὲν μέρος ἐσκοτισμένον πάθει, μήτε τὸ λογιστικὸν, μήτε τὸ θυμικόν, μήτε τὸ ἐπιθυμικόν, ἔσται φωτεινὴ ὅλη οὕτως, ὡς ὅταν ὁ λύχνος τῇ ἀστραπῇ αὐτοῦ φωτίζει σε, Euthymius Zigabenus. The observation of the above diversity of emphasis in the protasis and apodosis, which is clearly indicated by the varied position of ὅλον with respect to φωτεινόν, removes the appearance of tautology in the two members, renders needless the awkward *change of the punctuation* advocated by Vogel (*de conjecturarum usu in crisi* N. T. p. 37 f.) and Rinck: εἰ οὖν τὸ σῶμά σου ὅλον, φωτεινὸν μὴ ἔχον τι μέρος, σκοτεινόν, ἔσται φωτεινόν ὅλον κ.τ.λ., and sets aside the *conjectures* that have been broached, such as those of Michaelis (*Eintl.* I. p. 739): ἔσται φωτ. τὸ ὅλον (body and soul), or ὁλόον; of Bornemann: that the first ὅλον is a gloss; of Eichthal: that instead of "thy *body*" must be meant "thine *eye*" (comp. already Maldonatus). — ὁ λύχνος] the lamp of the room, ver. 33.

Vv. 37-54. See on Matt. xxiii. 1.

Ver. 37. Ἐν δὲ τῷ λαλῆσαι] that is to say, what had preceded at ver. 29 ff. — ἀριστήσῃ] refers no more than ἄριστον at Matt. xxii. 4 to the principal meal, but to the *breakfast* (in opposition to Kuinoel, de Wette, and others). See xiv. 12. — Ἥιδει μὲν τὴν τῶν Φαρισαίων σκαιότητα ὁ κύριος, ἀλλ' ὅμως συνεσιᾶται αὐτοῖς δι' αὐτὸ τοῦτο, ὅτι πονηροὶ ἦσαν καὶ διορθώσεως ἔχρον, Theophylact. — In the following discourse itself, Luke, under the guidance of the source he is using, gives a much more limited selection from the *Logia*, abbreviating and generalizing much of the contents.

Vv. 38, 39. Ἐβαπτ. πρὸ τ. ἀρίστ.] See on Mark vii. 2.¹ Luke does not say that the Pharisee *expressed* his surprise; Jesus recognises his thoughts immediately. Comp. Augustine. Schleiermacher, p. 180 f., directly contradicts the narrative when he places these sayings of Jesus *after the meal*, saying that they were first spoken *outside the house*. See, on the other hand, Strauss, I. p. 654, who, however, likewise takes objection to their supposed *awkwardness* (comp. Gfrörer, *Heil. Sage*, I. p. 243, de Wette, Ritschl, Holtzmann, Eichthal). This judgment applies an inappropriate standard to the special relation in which Jesus stood to the Pharisees, seeing that when confronting them He felt a higher destiny than the maintenance of the respect due to a host moving Him (comp. vii. 39 ff.); and hence the perception of the fitness of things which guided the tradition to connecting *these* sayings with a *meal* was not *in itself* erroneous, although, if we follow Matt. xxiii., we must conclude that this connection was first made at a later date. Apart from this, however, the connection is quite capable of being explained, not, perhaps, from the mention of cups and platters, but *from the circumstance* that Jesus several times when occasion offered, and possibly about that period when He was a guest in the houses of Pharisees, gave vent to His righteous moral indignation in His anti-Pharisaic sayings. Comp. xiv. 1 ff. — νῦν] a silent contrast with a better πάλαι: as it *now* stands with you, as far as things have gone with you, etc. Comp. Grotius, who brings into comparison: ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη. — τὸ δὲ ἔσωθεν ὑμῶν] ὑμῶν does not belong to ἀρπ. κ. πονηρ. (Kypke, Kninoel, Paulus, Bleek, and others, following Beza's suggestion), so that what is inside, the contents of the *cup* and *platter*, τὰ ἐνόντα, ver. 41, would be meant, which would agree with Matt. xxiii. 25, but is opposed to the order of the words here. On the contrary, the outside of the cup, etc., is contrasted with the *inward nature of the persons*. Ye cleanse the former, but the latter is full of robbery and corruption (comp. on Rom. i. 29). The concrete expression ἀρπαγή, as the object of

¹ Jesus had just come out of the crowd, nay, He had just expelled a demon, ver. 14. Hence they expected that He would first cleanse Himself by a *bath* before the morning meal (comp. on Mark vii. 4).

endeavour, corresponds to the disposition of *πλεονεξία*, which in Mark vii. 22, Rom. i. 29, is associated with *πονηρία*. — Matt. xxiii. 25 has the saying in a more original form. The conception in Luke, although not in itself inappropriate (Weiss), shows traces of the influence of reflective interpretation, as is also evident from a comparison of ver. 40 with Matt. xxiii. 26.

Ver. 40. Jesus now shows how *irrational* (*ἄφρονες*) this is from the *religious* point of view. — *οὐχ ὁ ποιήσας κ.τ.λ.*] *did not He* (God) *who made that which is without* (i.e. everything external in general, *res externas*) *also make that which is within* (*res internas*)? How absurd, therefore, for you to cleanse what belongs to the *rebus externis*, the outside of the cup, but allow that which belongs to the *rebus internis*, your inner life and effort, to be full of robbery, etc.; that ye do not devote to the one *and* to the other (therefore *to both*) the cleansing care that is due to God's work! Consequently τὸ ἔξωθεν is the *category* to which belongs τὸ ἔξωθεν τ. ποτ. κ. τ. πίν., ver. 39, and τὸ ἔσωθεν the *category* to which belongs τὸ ἔσωθεν ὑμῶν, ver. 39. In opposition to the context, others limit the words to the relation of *body* and *spirit* (Theophylact, Euthymius Zigabenus, and many others, Bornemann also), which is not permitted by τὸ ἔξωθεν τοῦ ποτηρίου, ver. 39. Others limit them to the *materiale patinae et poculi* and the *cibum et potum*, which τὸ ἔσωθεν ὑμῶν, ver. 39, does not allow (in opposition to Starck, *Notae select.* p. 91, and Wolf, Paulus also and Bleek). Kuinoel (following Elsner and Kypke) makes the sentence affirmative: "*Non qui exterius purgavit, pocula patinasque, (eadem opera) etiam interius purgavit, cibos;*" but this view, besides being open to the objection drawn from τὸ ἔσωθεν ὑμῶν, ver. 39, is opposed to the *usus loquendi* of the words ἐποίησε and ποιήσας.

Ver. 41. A prescription how they are to effect the true purification. Πλήν is *verumtamen* (see on vi. 24): *Still*, in order to set aside this foolish incongruity, *give that which is therein* (the contents of your cups and platters) *as alms, and behold everything is pure unto you* . . . this loving activity will then make your entire ceremonial purifications superfluous for you. All that you now believe you are compelled to

subordinate to your customs of washings (the context gives this as the reference of the *πάντα*) will stand to you (to your consciousness) in the relation of purity. On the idea, comp. Hos. vi. 6 (Matt. ix. 13, xii. 7). *τὰ ἐνόντα* has the emphasis: *yet what is in them*, etc. Moreover, it is of itself obvious, according to the meaning of Jesus, that He sets this value not on the external work of love in itself, but on the disposition evinced thereby. Comp. xvi. 9. The more unnecessary was the view which regarded the passage as *ironical* (Erasmus, Lightfoot, and others, including Kuinoel, Schleiermacher, Neander, Bornemann), and according to which Jesus repeats the peculiar maxim of the Pharisees for attaining righteousness by works: "Attamen date modo stipem pauperibus, tunc ex vestra opinione parum solliciti esse potestis de victu injuste comparato, tunc vobis omnia pura sunt," Kuinoel. Irony would come in only if in the text were expressed, not *date*, but *datis*. Moreover, the Pharisees would not have said *τὰ ἐνόντα*, but *ἐκ τῶν ἐνόντων*. Besides, notwithstanding the Old Testament praise of this virtue (Prov. xvi. 6; Dan. iv. 24; Eccles. iii. 30, xxix. 12; Tob. iv. 10, xii. 9, and elsewhere), and notwithstanding the Rabbinical "Eleemosyna aequipollet omnibus virtutibus" (*Bara bathra*, f. 9. 1), charitableness (apart from *ostentatious* almsgiving, Matt. vi. 2) was so far from being the strong side of the Pharisees (Matt. xxiii. 13, 14; Mark vii. 11) that Jesus had sufficient reason to inculcate on them that virtue instead of their worthless washings. — *τὰ ἐνόντα*] *that which is therein*. It might also mean, not: *quod superest*, i.e. *τὸ λοιπόν* (Vulgate), but perhaps: *that which is at hand*, *that which ye have* (Theophylact: *τὰ ὑπάρχοντα ὑμῶν*; Euthymius Zigabenus: *τὰ ἐναποκείμενα*; Luther: *Of that which is there*), or *which is possible* (Grotius, Morus), to justify which *δοῦναι* would have to be understood; but the connection requires the reference to the cups and platters.

Vv. 42, 43. See on Matt. xxiii. 23, 6 f. But woe unto you, ye have quite different maxims! — *παρέρχεσθε*] *ye have out of consideration*, as at xv. 29, and frequently in Greek writers, Judith xi. 10. — *ἀγαπᾶτε*] *ye place a high value thereupon*. Comp. John xii. 43.

Ver. 44. See on Matt. xxiii. 27. Yet here the comparison is different. — τὰ ἄδηλα] *the undiscernible*, which are not noticeable as graves in consequence of whitewash (Matt. *l.c.*) or otherwise. — καὶ] simplicity of style; the periodic structure would have linked on the clause by means of a relative, but this loose construction adds the point more independently and more emphatically. — περιπατοῦντες] without an article (see the critical remarks): *while they walk*. — οὐκ οἶδασιν] *know it not*, that they are walking on graves.

Ver. 45. This νομικός was no *Sadducee* (Paulus, yet see his *Exeget. Handb.*), because he otherwise would not have applied these reproaches to himself as well as to the Pharisees, and Jesus would not have continued to discourse so entirely in an anti-*Pharisaic* tone, but he likewise was a *Pharisee*, as in general were most of the νομικοί. That he only *partially* professed the principles of the Pharisees is assumed by de Wette on account of καὶ ἡμᾶς, in which, however, is implied “not merely the common Pharisees (the laity), but *even us*, the learned, thou art aspersing.” The scribe calls what was a righteous ὀνειδίζειν (Matt. xi. 20; Mark xvi. 14) by the name of ὑβρίζειν (xviii. 32; Acts xiv. 5; Matt. xxii. 6). Although this episode is not mentioned in Matthew, there is no sufficient ground to doubt its historical character. Comp. on xii. 41. Consequently, all that follows down to ver. 52 is addressed to the νομικοί, as they are once again addressed at the close by name, ver. 52. But it is not to be proved that Luke in his representation had in view the legalists of the *apostolic* time (Weizsäcker), although the words recorded must needs touch them, just as they were also concerned in the denunciations of Matt. xxiii.

Ver. 46. See on Matt. xxiii. 4.

Vv. 47, 48. See on Matt. xxiii. 29-31. The sting of the discourse is in Matthew keener and sharper. — ὅτι οἰκοδομεῖτε . . . οἱ δὲ πατέρες κ.τ.λ.] *because ye build . . . but your fathers slew them*. By this *building*, which renews the remembrance of the murder of the prophets, ye actually give *testimony and consent* to the deeds of your fathers, ver. 48. Otherwise ye would leave to ruin and forgetfulness those

graves which recall these deeds of shame! It is true the graves were built for the purpose of *honouring* the prophets, but the *conduct* of the builders was such that their way of regarding the prophets, as proved by this hostile behaviour, was reasonably and truly declared by Jesus to be a practical contradiction of that purpose. He declares how, in accordance with this behaviour, the matter *objectively* and *actually* stood. Consequently, there is neither any deeper meaning to be supposed as needing to be introduced, as Lange, *L. J.* II. 2, p. 840, has unhappily enough attempted; nor is ἄρα to be taken as interrogative (Schleiermacher). The second clause of the contrast, οἱ δὲ πατέρες κ.τ.λ., is introduced without any preparation (without a previous μέν; otherwise at ver. 48), but just with so much the greater force, and hence no μέν is to be supplied (Kuinoel; see, on the other hand, Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 356 f.; Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* II. p. 423). — In view of the reading ὑμεῖς δὲ οἰκοδομεῖτε, ver. 48 (without αὐτῶν τὰ μνημεῖα, see the critical remarks), we must translate: *but ye build! ye carry on buildings.* That this building had reference to the *tombs of the prophets* is self-evident. The brief expression is more passionate, pregnant, incisive.

Vv. 49–51. See on Matt. xxiii. 34–39. — διὰ τοῦτο] on account of this your agreement with your fathers as murderers of the prophets, which affinity the wisdom of God had in view when it gave its judgment. Under the *guidance* of the doctors of the law, the people among whom the gospel teachers were sent (εἰς αὐτούς) rejected these latter, etc. See ver. 52. — ἡ σοφία τ. Θεοῦ] Doubtless a *quotation*, as is proved by εἶπεν and αὐτούς, but *not from the Old Testament*, since no such passage occurs in it (Olshausen mentions 2 Chron. xxiv. 19 interrogatively, but what a difference!), and quotations from the Old Testament are never introduced by ἡ σοφία τ. Θεοῦ.¹ To suppose a *lost Jewish writing*, however, which

¹ The passage is very inaccurately treated by Köstlin, p. 163, according to whom Luke has here heaped misunderstanding on misunderstanding. He is said to have referred the entire utterance to the *Old Testament* prophets, and on that account to have placed before it π. ἡ σοφία τ. Θεοῦ εἶπεν, in order to give to it the character of an ancient prophecy, which, however, had no existence at all, etc.

either may have had this title (Ewald, Bleek, Baumgarten-Crusius, Weizsäcker) or may have introduced the חכמת יהוה as speaking (Paulus),¹ is contrary to the analogy of all the rest of the quotations made by Jesus, as well as to the evangelical tradition itself, which, according to Matt. xxiii. 34, attributed these words to *Jesus*. Accordingly, it is to be supposed (Neander, *L. J.* p. 655 ; Gess, *Person Chr.* p. 29 ; comp. also Ritschl, *Evang. Marcions*, p. 89) that Jesus is here quoting *one of His own earlier utterances* (observe the past tense εἶπεν), so that He represents *the wisdom of God* (Wisd. vii. 27 ; Matt. xi. 19 ; Luke vii. 35) as having spoken through Him. Allied to this is the idea of the λόγος. According to this, however, the original form of the passage is not to be found in Luke (Olshausen, Bleek) ; for while Matthew gives this remarkable utterance in a directly present form, Luke's method of recording it transfers to the mouth of Jesus what rather was a *later* mode of citing it, and gives it in the shape of a result of reflective theology akin to the doctrine of the Logos.²—

¹ Strauss also, in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift*, 1863, p. 87 ff., who is thinking entirely of a *Christian* document.

² The utterance in Matthew, ἐγὼ ἀποστείλω κ.τ.λ., was historically indicated in the Church by : ἡ σοφία τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶπεν ἀποστείλω κ.τ.λ. And Luke here makes *Jesus Himself* speak in this later mode of indicating it. It is a ὑστερον πρότερον in form. According to Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* I. p. 101 (comp. also Schegg), Jesus announces God's counsel in the form of a word of God. Comp. Grotius and van Hengel, *Annot.* p. 16 f. To this view εἰς αὐτοῦς (instead of εἰς ὑμᾶς) would certainly not be opposed, since those whom the speech concerned might be opposed as third persons to the wisdom of God which was speaking. But instead of εἶπεν might be expected λέγει ; for *now* through *Jesus* the divine wisdom would declare its counsel (Heb. iii. 10, to which Hofmann refers, is different, because there εἶπον in connection with προσέχευσα actually relates to the past). Moreover, if by ἡ σοφία τοῦ Θεοῦ were not meant the *personal* wisdom of God that appeared in *Christ*, and emitted the utterance, it would not be conceivable why it should not simply have been said : διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ὁ Θεὸς λέγει. Nowhere else in the New Testament is a declaration of God called a declaration of the divine wisdom. Besides, according to Matt. xxiii. 34, *Jesus* is the subject of ἀποστείλω ; and this is also the case in the passage before us, if ἡ σοφία τ. Θεοῦ is understood of the person of Christ as being the personal self-revelation of the divine wisdom. *Christ* sends to His Church the prophets and apostles (x. 3), Eph. iv. 11. Riggenbach's explanation (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1855, p. 599 f.) is similar to that of Hofmann,—though more correct in taking the σοφία τ. Θεοῦ in the Logos-sense, but interpreting the past tense εἶπεν by an "at all times" arbitrarily supplied.

ἐκδιώξ.] to drive out of the land. — ἵνα ἐκζητ. κ.τ.λ.] an appointment in the divine decree. The expression corresponds to the Hebrew דָּן עִוְבָד, 2 Sam. iv. 11; Ezek. iii. 18, 20, which sets forth the vengeance for blood. — The series of prophets in the more general sense begins with *Abel* as the first *holy* man.

Ver. 52. See on Matt. xxiii. 14. The *genitive* of the thing with τ. κλειδα denotes that which is opened by the key (Matt. xvi. 19; Rev. i. 18, ix. 1, xx. 1), since here we are not to supply τῆς βασιλείας with κλειδα, and take τ. γνώσεως as a genitive of *apposition* (Düsterdieck in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1865, p. 750). Comp. Isa. xxii. 22. — The γνώσις, the knowledge κατ' ἐξοχήν, i.e. the knowledge of the divine saving truth, as this was given in the manifestation and the preaching of Christ, is compared to a closed *house*, to get into which the *key* is needed. The νομικοί have *taken away* this key, i.e. they have by means of their teaching, opposed as it is to the saving truth (because only directed to traditional knowledge and fulfilling of the law), made the people incapable of recognising this truth. — ἤρατε] *tulistis* (Vulgate); the reading ἀπεκρύψατε found in D is a correct gloss. If they had recognised and taught, as Paul did subsequently, the law as παιδαγωγὸς εἰς Χριστόν (Gal. iii. 24), they would have *used* the key for the true knowledge for themselves and others, but not *taken it away*,¹ and *made it inaccessible* for use. They have *taken it away*; so entirely in opposition to their theocratic position of being the κλειδοῦχοι have they acted. — On the figurative idea of the key of knowledge, comp. viii. 10: ὑμῖν δέδοται γινῶναι τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας τ. Θεοῦ. The aorists are altogether to be taken in the sense of *the completed treatment*; they indicate what the νομικοί have *accomplished*

¹ Ahrens, *Amt d. Schlüssel*, p. 9 ff., takes ἤρατε as: *ye bear* (more strictly: *ye have taken to you*) the key of knowledge, to wit: as those who ought to be its οἰκονόμοι. Thus, however, the reason of the οὐαί would not yet appear in ὅτι ἤρατε κ.τ.λ., nor until the following αὐτοὶ οὐκ κ.τ.λ.; and hence the latter would have required to be linked on by ἀλλὰ, or at least by δέ; or else instead of ἤρατε the *participle* would have required to be used. Many of the older commentators, as Erasmus, Elsner, Wolf, Maldonatus, took ἔρατε as: *ye have arrogated to yourselves*, which, however, it does not mean.

by their efforts: τοὺς εἰσερχομένους, however, are those *who were intending* to enter.

Vv. 53, 54. *Κἀκεῖθεν ἐξελθόντος αὐτοῦ*] (see the critical remarks) *and when He had gone forth thence* (from the Pharisee's house, ver. 37). — As to the distinction between *γραμματεῖς* and *νομικοί*, see on Matt. xxii. 35. The *νομικοί* are included in the *γραμματ. κ. Φαρισ.* Comp. on ver. 45. — *ἐνέχειν*] not: *to be angry* (as usually interpreted), which would require a qualifying addition such as *χόλον* (Herod. i. 118, vi. 119, viii. 27), but: they began *terribly to give heed to Him*, which in accordance with the context is to be understood of *hostile attention* (enmity). So also Mark vi. 19; Gen. xlix. 23; *Test. XII. Patr.* p. 682; in the good sense: Jamblichus, *Vit. Pyth.* 6. — *ἀποστοματίζειν*¹] means first of all: *to recite away from the mouth*, i.e. *by heart* (Plat. *Euthyd.* p. 276 C, 277 A; Wetstein *in loc.*); then transitively: *to get out of one by questioning* (Pollux, ii. 102; Suidas: *ἀποστοματίζειν φασὶ τὸν διδάσκαλον, ὅταν κελεύει τὸν παῖδα λέγειν ἅττα ἀπὸ στόματος*). See Ruhnken, *Tim.* p. 43 f. So here; it is the *ἀπαιτεῖν αὐτοσχεδίους κ. ἀνεπισκέπτους ἀποκρίσεις ἐρωτημάτων δολερῶν*, Euthymius Zigabenus. — Ver. 54. According to the corrected reading (see the critical remarks): *while they lay in wait for Him, in order to catch up* (to get by hunting) *something out of His mouth*. See instances of *θηρεῦσαι* in this metaphorical sense, in Wetstein.

¹ The Vulgate has *os ejus opprimere*, whereby it expresses the reading *ἐπιστομαΐζειν*, which still occurs in a few cursives. Luther follows the Vulgate.

CHAPTER XII.

VER. 4. Here also (comp. on Matt. x. 28; Mark xii. 5) read, following A E K L U V F Δ S, min., with Lachm. and Tisch., ἀποκτείνουσιν. — Ver. 7. οὖν] is wanting in B L R 157, Copt. Sahid. codd. of It. Ambr. Bracketed by Lachm., deleted by Tisch. From Matt. x. 31. — Ver. 11. προσφέρωσιν] B L X S, min. Vulg. codd. of It. have εἰσφέρωσιν. So Tisch. D, Clem. Or. Cyr. of Jerus. Ver. have φέρωσιν. The latter is to be preferred; the compound forms are attempts at more accurate definition; had either of them been original there was no occasion for substituting the simple form. — Ver. 14. διζαστήν] Lachm. and Tisch. have κριτήν, in accordance with B L S, min. Sahid., as also D, 28, 33, Cant. Colb. Marcion, which have not ἢ μεριστ. — διζαστ. was introduced by way of gloss, through a comparison of Acts vii. 27, 35. — Ver. 15. πάσης πλεονεξί. is to be adopted on decisive evidence (Elz. Scholz have τῆς πλ.). — Instead of the *second* αὐτοῦ, Lachm. and Tisch. have αὐτῶ, in favour of which is the evidence of B D F L R S** min. Bas. Titus of Bostra, Cyr. Rightly; αὐτοῦ is a mechanical repetition of what has gone before. — Ver. 22. After ψυχῇ Elz. Scholz have ὑμῶν. Condemned by Griesb., deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. on decisive evidence. It is from Matt. vi. 25; whence also in B, min. vss. ὑμῶν has also been interpolated after σώματι. — Ver. 23. ἡ γὰρ ψυχὴ is indeed attested by authorities of importance (B D L M S V X S, min. vss. Clement); yet γὰρ (bracketed by Lachm., deleted by Tisch.) betrays itself as a connective addition, in opposition to which is the evidence also of οὐχὶ ἡ ψυχὴ in min. (following Matthew). — Ver. 25. The omission of μεριμῶν (Tisch.) is too weakly attested by D and two cursives for us to be able to regard the word as an addition from Matthew [Tisch. 8 has restored it]. The Homoioteleuton after ὑμῶν might easily cause its being dropped out. — Ver. 26. οὐτε] Lachm. and Tisch. have οὐδέ. Necessary, and sufficiently attested by B L S, etc. — Ver. 27. πῶς αὐξάνει· οὐ κοπ. οὐδέ νήθει] D, Vere. Syr.^{cur.} Marcion? Clem. have πῶς οὐτε νήθει οὐτε ὑφαίνει. So Tisch., and rightly; the *Recepta* is from Matt. vi. 28. —

Ver. 28. τὸν χόρτον ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ σήμε. ὄντα] many variations. Both the word τῷ and the order of the *Recepta* are due to Matt. vi. 30. Following B L 8, etc., we must read with Tisch. ἐν ἀγρῷ τὸν χόρτον σήμερον ὄντα [Tisch. 8, following 8, B L Δ, 262, Sah. Copt., has ὄντα σήμερον] (Lachm. has τ. χόρτον σήμε. ἐν ἀγρ. ὄντα). — Ver. 31. Elz. Scholz have τοῦ Θεοῦ. But the well-attested αὐτοῦ was supplanted by τοῦ Θεοῦ, following Matt. vi. 33, whence also was imported πάντα after ταῦτα (Elz. Scholz). — Ver. 36. ἀναλύσει] ἀναλύση is decisively attested, and is hence, with Lachm. and Tisch., to be preferred. — Ver. 38. οἱ δοῦλοι] is wanting in B D L 8, vss. Ir. Suspected by Griesb., deleted by Tisch. An addition in accordance with ver. 37 [Tisch. 8 has also deleted ἐκεῖνοι, which is wanting in 8*]. — Ver. 40. οὖν] is to be struck out with Lachm. and Tisch., as also is αὐτῷ [not omitted by Tisch. 8], ver. 41. — Ver. 42. Instead of ὁ φρόν., Elz. Scholz have καὶ φρόν., in opposition to preponderating evidence. καὶ is from Matt. xxiv. 45. — Ver. 47. ἐαυτοῦ] Lachm. and Tisch. have αὐτοῦ on very weighty evidence. The *Recepta* is to be maintained. The significance of the reciprocal pronoun was very often not observed by the transcribers. — Ver. 49. Instead of εἰς, Lachm. and Tisch. have ἐπί. The authorities are much divided, but ἐπί bears the suspicion of having come in through a reminiscence of Matt. x. 34. — Ver. 53. διαμερισθήσεται] Lachm. and Tisch. (both of them joining it to what has gone before) have διαμερισθήσονται, in accordance with important uncials (including B D 8) and a few cursives, Sahid. Vulg. codd. of It. Fathers. Rightly; it was attracted to what follows (so also most of the editions), which appeared to need a verb, and therefore was put in the singular. According to almost equally strong attestation we must read τὴν θυγατέρα and τὴν μητέρα instead of θυγατρί and μητρί (Lachm. and Tisch. omitting the unequally attested article). The *Recepta* resulted from involuntary conformity to what precedes. — Ver. 54. τὴν νεφέλ.] The article is wanting in A B L X Δ 8, min. Lachm. Tisch. But how easily was τὴν, which in itself is superfluous, passed over between ᾧδε and Νεφέλ.! — Ver. 58. παραδῶ] Lachm. and Tisch. have παραδώσει. Rightly; the transcribers carried on the construction, as in Matt. v. 25. So also subsequently, instead of βάλλῃ (Elz.) or βάλῃ (Griesb. Scholz) is to be read, with Lachm. and Tisch., βαλεῖ.

Ver. 1. During what was narrated in xi. 53, 54 (ἐν οἷς), therefore while the scribes and Pharisees are pressing the Lord after He has left the house with captious questions, the

crowd, without number, had gathered together (ἐπισυναχθ.), and now at various intervals He holds the following discourse, primarily indeed addressing His disciples (πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ, ver. 22), yet turning at times expressly to the people (vv. 15 ff., 54 ff.), and in general in such a manner (ver. 41) that the multitude also was intended to hear the whole, and in its more general reference to apply it to themselves. With the exception of the interlude, vv. 13–21, the discourse is original only in this way, that very diverse, certainly in themselves original, fragments of the *Logia* are put together; but when the result is compared with the analogous procedure of Matthew in the Sermon on the Mount, Matthew is found to be the more original of the two. Among the longer discourses in Luke none is so much of a mosaic as the present. Although the historical situation of ver. 1 is not invented, yet by the designed and plainly exaggerated bringing together of a great multitude of people it is confused. It would be too disproportioned an apparatus merely to illustrate the contents of ver. 2 f. (Weizsäcker). — τῶν μυριάδων] The article denotes the innumerable *assembled mass* of the people (very hyperbolically, comp. Acts xxi. 20). — ὥστε καταπατ. ἀλλήλ.] οὕτως ἐφιέμενοι ἕκαστος πλησιάζειν αὐτῷ, Theophylact. — ἤρξατο] *He began*, pictorial style. — πρῶτον] *before all*, is to be taken with προσέχετε, comp. ix. 61, x. 5; Gersdorf, p. 107. It does not belong to what precedes (Luther, Bengel, Knapp, Schulz, Scholz, Paulus, Lachmann, Tischendorf), in connection with which it would be absolutely superfluous, although A C D 8, etc., do take it thus. Ewald well says, “As a *first duty*.” — τῆς ζύμης] see on Matt. xvi. 6; Mark viii. 15. Here also is not *meant* the vice of *hypocrisy* (the usual interpretation), because in that case the next clause would have ἡ ὑπόκρισις (with the article); but it glances back to the subject of the previous conversation at the table,¹ and means: *the pernicious doctrines and principles*. Of these He says: *their nature is hypocrisy*; therein lies *what constitutes the reason* of the warning (ἦτις, *quippe quare*).

¹ Therefore not to be interpreted of the *Judaizers* of the *apostolic times* (Weizsäcker, p. 364); just as little is xvi. 14.

Vv. 2-10. See on Matt. x. 26-33. The *connection* is indicated by means of the continuative δέ: "Ye must the more, however, be on your guard against this hypocritical ζύμη, since your teaching is destined to the greatest publicity for the future." Comp. Mark iv. 22. Publicity which lies open to the world's judgment, and hypocritical character which must shun disclosure, are irreconcilable. If you would not dread the former, the latter must remain far from you. According to Weiss, Luke has given to the whole saying only the meaning, that everything concealed by hypocrisy nevertheless one day comes to light, and therefore, even every word, however secretly it is spoken, shall come one day to publicity. But this supposition, without any ground for it, attributes to Luke a complete misapprehension of the meaning. — Ver. 3. ἀνθ' ὧν] *quare, wherefore*. See Hermann, *ad Viger.* p. 710; Schaefer, *Appar. Dem.* I. p. 846. — ὅσα ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ κ.τ.λ.] Everything which (in dread of persecutions) ye shall have spoken in the darkness, *i.e.* shall have taught in secret, shall (in the triumph of my cause) be heard in the clear daylight, *i.e.* shall be known in full publicity by your preaching and the preaching of others. The expression ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ used of the *apostolic* agency is not inappropriate (de Wette), since it characterizes it not in general, but only under certain circumstances (ver. 4). But certainly the original form of the saying is found in Matt. x. 27, while in Luke it was altered to suit the *apostolic* experiences after these had often enough proved the necessity of teaching in secret what at a later period came to be publicly proclaimed before the whole world,¹ when the gospel, as in Luke's time, was triumphantly spread abroad. — ἐν τῷ φωτί] in the clear day; Hom. *Od.* xxi. 429; Xen. *Cyr.* iv. 2. 26; Wisd. xviii. 4. — Ver. 4. If Jesus reminded His disciples by ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ and πρὸς τὸ οὖς . . .

¹ According to Hilgenfeld, *Evang.* p. 192 (comp. his *Zeitschrift*, 1865, p. 192), and Köstlin, p. 147, this publicity is regarded as having been meant as a contrast to the *ministry of the Twelve*, because they had chiefly limited themselves to the circle of Judaism. It is not indeed in agreement with this that *that which is secret* should so purposely be made prominent. The Twelve neither limited their ministry *merely* to Judaism, nor did they minister among the Jews in quietness and secrecy like preachers in a corner.

ἐν τ. ταμείοις, ver. 3, of the impending pressure of persecutions, He now exhorts them to *fearlessness in presence of their persecutors*. — τοῖς φίλοις μου] for as such they were the object of persecution. — μετὰ ταῦτα] μετὰ τὸ ἀποκτείναι. The *plural* depends on the idea of being put to death, *comprising all the modes of taking away life*. See Kühner, II. p. 423. — Ver. 5 f. Observe the marked emphasis on the φοβήθητε. — Vv. 8–10. Not an admonition for the disciples to remain faithful, for ver. 10 would not be appropriate to that, inasmuch as there was no occasion to be anxious at all about their speaking against the Son of man, and it would have been even inappropriate to bid them beware of the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost; ¹ but Jesus adds to the previous encouragements a new one (λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν, comp. ver. 4), saying to them how *momentous for the eternal destiny of men is the apostolic work conducted by the Holy Spirit, how even the decision of the judgment on men would be given in accordance with the result of the work of the apostles among them*. Hence, ver. 10 has been wrongly regarded as not pertinent to this (Kuinoel, de Wette); while, on the other hand, Schleiermacher considers the arrangement of Matt. xii. as less appropriate, in that he introduces a contrast of the *present time* (in which the Son is resisted) with the *future* (when the more rapid and mighty agency of the Spirit is blasphemed). In itself the saying is appropriate in both places, nay, it may have been uttered more than once; but in Matthew and Mark we have its closest historical connection and position.

¹ Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 312, insists on regarding the blasphemy against the Spirit in this place as not distinct from the denial of Jesus. He says that this denial, in the case of those, namely, who had not only had the earthly human manifestation of Jesus before them, but had received the Holy Spirit, is blasphemy against the Spirit. But it is very arbitrary to assume, in contradiction to Matt. xii. 31, Mark iii. 29, that the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit presupposes that the Spirit has already been received. The blasphemers of the Spirit are malevolently conscious and hardened opposers of Christ. They may certainly have already had the Spirit and have apostatized and become such opposers (Heb. x. 29); but if such people were to be understood in this passage, some clearer indication should have been given. Still, how far from the Lord must even the mere thought have been, that the disciples, His friends, ver. 4, could ever change into such malignant blasphemers!

— As to the *blasphemy against the Holy Spirit*, see on Matt. xii. 31 f.

Vv. 11, 12. But when they bring you—following out this denial of me and blasphemy against the Spirit—to the synagogues, etc. — *πῶς ἢ τί*] Care not about the kind and manner, or the substance of your defence. See also on Matt. x. 19; Mark xiii. 11. On *ἀπολογ.* *τί*, comp. Xen. *Mem.* iv. 8. 4; Dem. 227. 13; Plat. *Gorg.* p. 521 A, *Phaed.* p. 69 D, *Polit.* 4, p. 420 B; Acts xxiv. 10.

Vv. 13–21. Peculiar to Luke; from his *source containing the account of the journey*. — Ver. 13 f. *τίς*] certainly no attendant of Jesus (Lightfoot, Kuinoel, and others), as Luke himself points out by *ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου*; besides, such a one would have known Jesus better than is betrayed by this uncongenial request. It was a Jew on whom the endowments and authority of Jesus produced such an impression that he thought he might be able to make use of Him in the matter of his inheritance. Whether he was a *younger* brother who grudged to the first-born his double share of the inheritance (Ewald), must be left in doubt. — *ἐκ τ. ὄχλ.*] belongs to *εἶπε*, as is shown by the order. The mode of address, *ἄνθρωπε*, has a tone of disapproval, Rom. ii. 1, ix. 20; Plat. *Protag.* p. 350 D; Soph. *Aj.* 778, 1132. Observe that Jesus instantly rejects the application that concerns a purely worldly matter; on the other hand, He elsewhere gives a decision on the question of divorce.¹

Ver. 15. Jesus recognised *πλεονεξία* as that which had stirred up the quarrel between the brothers, and uses the occasion to utter a warning against it. — *πρὸς αὐτούς*] *i.e.* *πρὸς τὸν ὄχλον*, ver. 13. — *ὅτι οὐκ ἐν τῷ περισσεύειν κ.τ.λ.*] *for not by the fact of a man's possessing abundance does his life* (the support of his life) *consist in his possessions*. This—the fact that one's life consists in one's possessions—is not dependent on the *abundance* of the possession, but—this, the contrast unexpressed, but resulting from ver. 30—on the will of God,

¹ This is worthy of consideration also in respect of the question: whether matters of marriage belong to the competency of the spiritual or the temporal tribunal?

who calls away the selfish collector of treasures from the midst of his abundance. The simple thought then is: *It is not superfluity that avails to support a man's life by what he possesses.* "Vivitur parvo bene." To this literal meaning, moreover, the following parable corresponds, since it does not authorize us to understand ζωή in its pregnant reference: *true life*, σωτηρία, or the like (Kuinoel, Bornemann, Olshausen, Ewald, and the older commentators); on the other hand, Kaeuffer, *De ζωῆς αἰών.* not. p. 12 f.¹ Observe, moreover, that οὐκ has been placed at the beginning, before ἐν τῷ περισσ., because of the contrast which is implied, and that τινί, according to the usual construction, that of the Vulgate, goes most readily with περισσεύειν (xxi. 4; Tob. iv. 16; Dion. Hal. iii. 11), and is not governed by what follows. An additional reason for this construction lies in the fact that thus the following αὐτοῦ is not superfluous. Finally, it is to be noted that εἶναι ἐκ is the frequent *proficisci ex, prodire ex.* De Wette is wrong in saying: "*for though any one has superfluity, his life is not a part of his possessions, i.e. he retains it not because he has these possessions.*" In this manner εἶναι ἐκ would mean, *to which belong*; but it is decisive against this view entirely that οὐκ ἐν τῷ περισσεύειν must be taken *together*, while in respect thereof, according to the former view, no *contrast* can be conceived; for the life is *in no case* a part of our possessions (in the above sense).

Vv. 16-19. On the idea of this parable, comp. Ps. xlix. 18; Ecclus. xi. 17 ff. — εὐφόρησεν] not in the sense of the pluperfect (Luther, Castalio, and others), but: *bore well.* Examples of this late and rare verb (Hipp. Ep. 1274, 20; Joseph. B. ll. ii. 21. 2) may be found in Κυρκε. Comp. εὐφέρως φέρειν (Lobeck, *Paralip.* p. 533). — ἡ χώρα] *the estate*, Xen. Cyr.

¹ Kuinoel: "Non si quis in abundantia divitiarum versatur, felicitas ejus a divitiis pendet." Bornemann (*Schol.* p. 82, and in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1843, p. 128 ff.): "Nemini propterea, quod abunde habet, felicitas paratur ex opibus, quas possidet (sed ex pietate et fiducia in Deo posita)." Olshausen says that there are two propositions blended together: "Life consists not in superfluity" (the true life), and "nothing spiritual can proceed from earthly possessions." Ewald says: "If man has not from his external wealth in general what can be rightly called his life, he has it not, or rather he has it still less by the fact that this, his external wealth, increases by his appeasing his covetousness."

viii. 4. 28 ; Jerome, x. 5, and elsewhere. — Ver. 17 ff. Observe the increasing vivacity of the description of the “*animi sine requie quieti*” (Bengel). — οὐκ ἔχω ποῦ] “quasi nusquam essent quibus pascendis possent impendi,” Grotius. — καθελῶ μου κ.τ.λ.] *I will pull down my storehouses* (Matt. iii. 12). — τὰ γεννήματα] see on Matt. xxvi. 29. — καὶ τ. ἀγ. μ.] *and in general*, my possessions. — τῇ ψυχῇ μου] not equivalent to *mihi*, but: *to my soul*, the seat of the affections; in this case, of the excessive longing for pleasure. Comp. on i. 46, and see Jacobs, *ad Del. Epigr.* VII. 1. How frequently also in the Greek writers the actions of the Ego are predicated of the soul, may be seen in Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Rep.* II. p. 365 A. — ἀναπαύου κ.τ.λ.] An instance of “*asyndeton*,” expressing eager anticipation of the enjoyment longed for. On the thought, comp. Ecclus. xi. 19 ; Tob. vii. 9 ; Plaut. *Mil. Glor.* iii. 1. 83 ; Soph. *Dan.* VI. (181, Dind.): ζῆ, πῖνε, φέρβου.

Vv. 20, 21. Εἶπε κ.τ.λ.] is not to be converted into a *decrevit* (Kuinoel), etc. We have, indeed, no history ; πλάττεται γὰρ ταῦτα ἡ παραβολή, Theophylact. — ταύτῃ] with emphasis. — ἀπαιτοῦσιν] the categoric plural (see on Matt. ii. 20), which therefore does not prevent our regarding *God Himself* as the author of what was done, although the subject is left undetermined. The thought of a *robber and murderer* (Paulus, Bornemann) is not to be allowed on account of ver. 21. — τίνι ἔσται] not to thee will it belong, but to others! — Ver. 21. So, having incurred the loss of his happiness by the unexpected appearance of death, *is he who collects treasure for himself* (for his own possession and enjoyment), *and is not rich in reference to God* ; i.e. is not rich in such wise that his wealth passes over to God (Rom. x. 12), by his possession, namely, of treasures in heaven, which God saves up in order to impart them to the man when Messiah's kingdom shall be set up. See on Matt. v. 12, vi. 20. Comp. 1 Tim. vi. 19, and on Col. i. 5. The πλουτεῖν εἰς θεόν (unless, however, εἰς is to be taken for ἐν, as Luther, Beza, Calovius, and others would have it) is substantially the same as ἔχειν θησαυροὺς ἐν οὐρανῷ (comp. ver. 33), and it is realized through δικαιοσύνη, and in the case of the rich man, especially through loving activity

(Matt. xix. 21; Luke xvi. 9), such as Christ desires, Matt. vi. 2-4. It is not temporal possession of wealth which *is applied in usum et honorem Dei* (Majus, Elsner, Kypke, comp. Möller, *Neue Ansichten*, p. 201 ff.), but the higher *ideal* possession of wealth, the being rich in Messianic possessions laid up with God, and one day to be received from Him, which is wanting to the egoistic *θησαυρίζων ἑαυτῷ*. Against the former view, entertained by Majus and the rest, it is decisive that the negation of the *being* rich in relation to God (not of the *becoming* rich) is regarded as bound up with the selfish *heaping up* of treasure. This withal in opposition to Bornemann: "qui quod dives est prosperoque in augendis divitiis successu utitur, sibi tribuit, non Deo."

Vv. 22-31. See on Matt. vi. 25-33. Jesus now turns from the people (ver. 16) again to His disciples. — *διὰ τοῦτο*] because this is the state of things with the *θησαυρίζων ἑαυτῷ* κ. μὴ εἰς θεὸν πλουτῶν. — Ver. 24. *τοὺς κόρακας*] not in reference to the *young ravens* forsaken by the old ones (Job xxxviii. 41; Ps. cxlvii. 9); but a *common and very numerous* species of bird is mentioned (the *pulli* corvorum must otherwise have been expressly named: in opposition to Grotius and others). — Ver. 28. According to the *Recepta* (but see the critical remarks), *ἐν τῷ ἄγρῳ* would have to be connected with *ὄντα*; on the other hand, following the reading of the amended texts: *but if in the field God in such wise clothes the grass, which to-day is here and to-morrow is cast into an oven*, etc. Instead of *ἀμφιέννυσι*, we must read, with Lachmann, *ἀμφιάζει*, or, with Tischendorf, *ἀμφιέζει*. Both forms belong to later Greek (Themist., Plut., LXX.). — Ver. 29. *καὶ ὑμεῖς*] as the ravens and the lilies. — *μὴ μετεωρίζεσθε*] The Vulgate rightly translates: "nolite in sublime tolli;" and Luther: "be not high-minded." *Exalt not yourselves; lift not yourselves up to lofty claims*, which is to be taken as referring not to mere eating and drinking, but generally. The *usus loquendi* of *μετεωρίζεσθαι*, *efferrī*, physically and (Aristoph. *Av.* 1447; Polyb. iii. 70. 1, iv. 59. 4, vii. 4. 6; Diodor. xi. 32. 41) psychically is well known. See also the passages from Philo in Loesner, p. 116. But others (Castalio, Beza, Grotius,

Maldonatus, Hammond, Wolf, Bengel, Krebs, Valekenae, Rosenmüller, Kuinoel, Paulus, Bleek, and many more) have: *nec inter spem metumque fluctuctis*. Comp. Ewald: "waver not, lose not your balance." The view of Euthymius Zigabenus also is that Christ refers to τὸν περισπασμὸν τὸν ἀπὸ τῶν οὐρανίων ἐπὶ τὰ γῆϊνα. Certainly, as μετέωρος may mean: *fluctuans* (see Schweighäuser, *Lex. Pol.* p. 387; Josephus, *Antt.* iv. 3. 1, *Bell.* iv. 2. 5), μετεωρίζειν may signify: *to make wavering* (Dem. 169. 23; Polyb. v. 70. 10; *Schol. ad Soph. Oed. R.* 924; Eurip. *Or.* 1537); but there appears no reason in the connection for departing from the above, which is the *usual* meaning in which the word is currently employed, even in the LXX. and in the apocryphal writers (2 Macc. vii. 34, v. 17; 3 Macc. vi. 5). This μετεωρ. has for its opposite the συναπάγεσθαι τοῖς ταπεινοῖς, Rom. xii. 16.

Ver. 32. Peculiar to Luke. An encouragement to fearlessness in the endeavour after the Messiah's kingdom, by means of the promise of the divinely-assured final result. — μὴ φοβοῦ] in consideration of their external powerlessness and weakness (τὸ μικρ. ποίμνιον). But *Christians generally*, as such, are not the *little*¹ flock (which is not to be changed into a *poor* oppressed band, as de Wette, following Grotius, does), but the little community of the *disciples* (ver. 22), as whose head He was their *shepherd* (comp. John x. 12; Matt. xxvi. 31). — εὐδόκησεν] *it has pleased* your Father. See on Rom. xv. 26; Col. i. 19. — δοῦναι ὑμῖν τ. β.] see xx. 29 f.

Vv. 33, 34. Comp. Matt. vi. 19-21. This end is so important that, in order to strive thereafter with your whole interest (ver. 34), ye must renounce your earthly possessions, etc. This selling and giving up of the proceeds as alms (ἐλεημοσ., as xi. 41) is not required of *all* Christians (ver. 22), as de Wette will have it, but of the *disciples*, who, in the discharge of their office, *needed* perfect release from what is temporal. All the less do the words furnish a basis for the *consilium evangelicum* and the *vow* of poverty (Bisping). — ἑαυτοῖς] while ye give to *others*. — βαλλάντια (x. 4) μὴ

¹ But ποίμνιον is not a diminutive, as Bengel supposed, but is a contraction for ποιμένιον.

παλαιούμενα is explained by the following *θησαυρὸν . . . οὐρανοῖς*.¹ As to this *θησαυρός*, comp. on ver. 21.

Vv. 35, 36. Only echoes of the following references to the *Parousia* occur at Matt. xxiv. 42 ff. All the less is the originality to be attributed *only* to Luke (Olshausen) *or* to Matthew (Kninoel). In Luke the exhortations to preparedness for the *Parousia* are readily accounted for by the previous promise of the Messiah's kingdom (ver. 32) and the requirement associated therewith (ver. 33). — *ἑστώσαν . . . καιόμενοι*] The meaning stripped of figure is: *Be in readiness, upright and faithful to your calling be prepared to receive the coming Messiah.* The nimble movement that was necessary to the servant made requisite *the girding up of the outer garment round the loins* (1 Pet. i. 13, and see Wetstein), and slaves must naturally have had *burning lamps* for the reception of the master when he returned home at night. The *ὑμῶν* emphatically placed first, as *ὑμεῖς* at ver. 36, corresponds to the special duty of *disciples*; that *your loins* should be girded, . . . and that *ye* like men, etc. — *ἀνθρώποις*] *i.e.* according to the context: *slaves*, as it is frequently used in the classical writers, Mark xiv. 12. — *ἐκ τῶν γάμων*] not: from *his* marriage, but from the marriage, *at which he* (as a guest) *has been present.* For *his* marriage is *after* the *Parousia* (see on Matt. xxii. 2, xxv. 1). The detail of the figure is not to be pressed into interpretation further than to imply the *blessed condition* (τὴν ἄνω εὐφροσύνην κ. ἀγαλλίασιν, Euthymius Zigabenus) from which the Messiah returns. — *ἐλθόντος . . . ἀνοίξ. αὐτῷ*] a well-known construction, Winer, p. 186 [E. T. 258 f.]. On the direct *πότε*, see Buttmann, *Neut. Gr.* p. 215 f. [E. T. 251].

Ver. 37. A symbolic representation of the most blessed *recompense*, which the servants of Christ, who are faithful to their calling, shall receive from Him at His *Parousia*. It is not the idea of the great and general Messianic banquets (Matt. viii. 11) that underlies this, but it is the thought of a

¹ To refer the *βαλλάντ. μὴ παλ.* to the “*everlastingly fresh power of apprehension* in respect of the eternal possessions,” was a fancy of Lange’s opposed to the context (*L. J.* II. 2, p. 851).

special marriage-feast for those servants (the disciples). That the washing of the disciples' feet by Jesus, John xiii., gave occasion (de Wette) to the mode of representation, according to which the Lord Himself serves ("promissio de *ministrando* honorificentissima et maxima omnium," Bengel), is the less probable the greater the difference is seen to be between the idea expressed by the foot-washing and that which is here set forth. The thought of the *Saturnalia* (Grotius, comp. Paulus and Olshausen) brings in something wholly foreign, as also the calling of the slaves to partake in certain sacred feasts according to the law, Deut. xii. 17 f., xvi. 11 f., is something very different from the idea of *this* feast (in opposition to Kuinoel, de Wette, and others), in respect of which, moreover, it has been assumed (see Heumann, Kuinoel, de Wette) that the Lord *brought with Him* meats *from the wedding feast*,—an assumption which is as needless as it is incapable of proof. — *περιζώσεται κ.τ.λ.*] a vivid representation of the individual details among which even the *drawing near* to those waiting (*παρελθών*) is not wanting. — The parable, xvii. 7-10, has an entirely different lesson in view; hence there is no contradiction between the two.

Ver. 38. The earlier or later *time* of the Advent will make no difference in this blessed recompense. Jesus does not mention the *first* of the four night-watches (see on Matt. xiv. 25), because in this the marriage-feast took place; nor the *fourth*, because so late a return would have been unusual, and in this place contrary to the decorum of the events that were represented.

Vv. 39, 40. See on Matt. xxiv. 43 f. The less, however, should ye be wanting in watchfulness, since the Messiah will appear unexpectedly like a thief in the night. A sudden change of figures, but appropriate for sharpening the warning in question, and not at all startling to people accustomed to the sudden turns of Oriental imagery. Whether, moreover, the passage has received its true historical place here or in the discourse on the end of the world, Matt. xxiv., cannot be decided.

Ver. 41. Certainly original (in opposition to de Wette,
LUKE II. L

Holtzmann, Weizsäcker, Weiss), the more certainly, the finer are the threads with which what follows down to ver. 48 is linked on to *such* a question. The succeeding passage at least offered no *occasion* for either the tradition or Luke inventing the question. If it had been suggested to Luke by Mark xiii. 37, the answer of Jesus would also have been in closer agreement with the meaning of the passage in Mark. — *πρός*] *in reference to, for us*, comp. xx. 19; Rom. x. 21. — *τὴν παραβ. ταύτ.*] to wit, of the slaves who wait for their lord, ver. 36 ff. See ver. 42 ff. The reference to the master of the house and the thief, ver. 39, belonged also thereto as a concrete warning example. — *ἢ καί*] Peter asks whether the parable is intended for the disciples, *or also* (or at the same time also) has a general reference.

Vv. 42–44. In the pregnant style characteristic of Jesus as it most of all appears in John, He makes no direct reply to that question, but proceeds with His parable of the servants, and among these He now for the first time begins to speak of that *one* (the apostles generally cannot be described in vv. 42–46) whom He, before His departure, would set over the rest of the household as *οἰκονόμος* (the post destined for *Peter*!). He depicts his great recompense in the event of his being faithful, and his heavy punishment in the event of his being unfaithful (down to ver. 48); and He consequently made Peter, whose question betrayed an inconsiderate exaltation above the crowd, understand His reply to mean: Instead of meddling with that question, thou hast thine own consequent position to keep in view with fear and trembling! Then, however, ver. 47 f., he links on the *general* law of retribution under which *every one* comes, and which *every one* has to lay to heart. As to the reference of *τίς ἄρα*, and the relation of the question to ver. 43, see on Matt. xxiv. 45 f.

Vv. 45, 46. But if that slave, whom the lord will place over his servants as *οἰκονόμος* (ver. 42), instead of being faithful, shall have thought, etc. — Moreover, see on Matt. xxv. 48–51. — *μετὰ τῶν ἀπίστ.*] *with the faithless* (ver. 42), whose final destiny is the punishment of Gehenna (ver. 5).

Vv. 47, 48. This passage, which is peculiar to Luke, gives

explanatory information of a general kind, yet related to Matt. xxv. 14 ff., to account for the *severity* of the punishment, ver. 46. This will ensue, in accordance with the general rule of retribution coming into operation at the return of the Lord: that that slave, etc. *Ἐκεῖνος*, though placed first for emphasis, does not refer to the single concrete person indicated at ver. 45, but is a general term indicating the class to which the *οἰκονόμος* also belongs; and *δέ* carries on the meaning with *an explanatory force* (Hermann, *ad Viger.* p. 845; Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* ii. 1. 1). — *ἐαυτοῦ*] *of his own Lord*, makes the responsibility to be felt the more strongly. — *ἐτοιμάσας*] *ἐαυτόν* is not to be supplied (Luther, Kuinoel, and many others), but: and *has not made ready*, has made no preparation. Comp. ix. 52. It belongs also to *πρὸς τὸ θέλ. αὐτοῦ*. — *δαρήσεται πολλὰς*] *πληγὰς δηλονότι* (see Schaefer, *ad Bos. Ell.* p. 387; Valckenaer, *Schol.* p. 214; Winer, p. 520 [E. T. 737]), *τοντέστι κολασθήσονται χαλεπῶς, διότι εἰδότες κατεφρόνησαν*, Euthymius Zigabenus. On the accusative, comp. *μαστιγοῦσθαι πληγὰς*, Plat. *Legg.* viii. p. 845 B, and see Buttmann, *Neut. Gr.* p. 164 [E. T. 189]. — Ver. 48. *ὁ δὲ μὴ γινούς*] but the slave, *who shall not have learnt to know it*. Such a one cannot be left *without* punishment, not because he has not obeyed *the Lord's will* (for that has remained unknown to him), but because he has done that which *deserves* punishment; even for such a one there is that which *deserves* punishment, because, in general, he had the immediate moral consciousness of his relation to his Lord as a subjective standard (comp. Rom. ii. 12 ff.), even although he did not possess the objective law of the Lord's will positively made known to him, on which account also a lighter punishment ensues. Theophylact and Euthymius Zigabenus are wrong in thinking here of such as *could* have learnt to know the Lord's will, but from laziness and frivolity *have not* learnt to know it. An arbitrary limitation; and can *such* an ignorance diminish the responsibility? Rom. i. 28 ff. We can the less regard the responsibility as diminished when we remember that by *ὁ δὲ μὴ γινούς* is described the case of a slave of *Christ*, who has remained ignorant of

his Lord's will. — παντὶ δὲ κ.τ.λ.] *but of every one*, in order, moreover, still to add this general law as explanatory information on the subject of that so severe punishment, ver. 46, etc. — ἐδόθη πολὺ] in official *duties*, as to the οἰκονόμος. — πολὺ ζητήσεται] in official *efficiency*. The collocation of πολὺ, πολὺ, and then πολὺ, περισσότερον, has a special emphasis. — The second member ᾧ παρέθεντο (the categoric plural, as at ver. 20: in reality κύριος is the subject) κ.τ.λ. is a parallel similar in meaning to the first, but with the *climax*: περισσότερον, which is not to be taken as: "*plus quam aliis, quibus non tam multa concredita sunt*" (Kuinoel, Bleek, following Beza, Grotius, and others, which would be insipid, and a mere matter of course), but: in the case of him to whom much has been entrusted (with whom a large sum has been deposited), *still more* than this entrusted πολὺ will be required of him. In this statement is implied the presupposition that the capital sum must have been *increased* by interest of exchange or by profit of commerce. Comp. Matt. xxv. 15 ff. The deposit was not to lie idle. On παρατίθεσθαι, comp. Herod. vi. 86; Xen. *R. Ath.* ii. 16; Polybius, iii. 17. 10, xxxiii. 12. 3; Tob. i. 14; 1 Macc. ix. 35. The *construction* in both members is a well-known form of attraction, Kühner, II. p. 512; Buttmann, *Neut. Gr.* p. 247 [E. T. 288].

Ver. 49 f. The sequence of thought is found in this, that the whole of that earnest sense of responsibility, which characterizes the faithfulness just demanded, must be only infinitely intensified by the heavy trials of the near future, which the Lord brings vividly before His view. — πῦρ] *Fire*, is a figurative designation, not of the *Holy Spirit*, as most of the Fathers and others, including Bengel, will have it, nor of the *word of God* with its purifying power (Bleek); but, as is manifest from ver. 51 ff., of the vehement *spiritual excitement*, forcing its way through all earthly relations, and loosing their closest ties, which Christ was destined to kindle. The lighting up of this fire, which by means of His teaching and work He had already prepared, was to be effected by His death (see ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν, ver. 52), which became the subject of offence, as, on the other hand, of His divine courage of faith and life (comp.

ii. 35). The expression itself βαλεῖν ἐπὶ τ. γῆν proceeded from the consciousness of His *heavenly* origin. Comp. Matt. x. 34. — καὶ τί θέλω κ.τ.λ.] It is the usual and the correct view, held also by Kuinoel, Olshausen, de Wette, Bleek, which interprets: *and how earnestly I wish, if (that) it were already kindled!* ἐπισπεύδει γὰρ τὴν ἀναψιν τούτου τοῦ πυρός, Theophylact. Regarding the τί, see on Matt. vii. 14. Moreover, the *usus loquendi* of εἰ with θέλω (instead of the more confident ὅτι, as with θαυμάζω, etc.; see on Mark xv. 44) is not to be disputed. See Eccus. xxiii. 14: θελήσεις εἰ μὴ ἐγενήθης; Herod. ix. 14, also vi. 52: βουλομένην δὲ εἴ πως ἀμφοτέροι γενοίαιτο βασιλέες. Accordingly, there is no sufficient reason for the view of Grotius, which disjoins the utterance into question and answer: *And what do I wish? If it should be already kindled!* This is less simple, and fails to bring out the correspondence between the expression in question and the parallel exclamation in ver. 50. The particle εἰ is used not merely with the optative (see Pflugk, *ad Eur. Hec.* 836), but also with the indicative in the imperfect and aorist in the sense of *utinam, dummodo*; in the latter case the non-accomplishment is known to the person who utters the wish. Comp. xix. 42; Josh. vii. 7; Grotius *in loc.*; Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 516; in the Greek prose writers it is usual to find εἴθε or εἰ γάρ in such a sense. Bornemann takes τί for *cur*, and εἰ as ἐπεὶ: “*et cur ignem volo in terram conjicere, cum jam accensus sit? remota quaestione: non opus est accendam.*” But without considering the extremely insipid thought which is thus expressed, ver. 52 in this way requires that the kindling of the fire should be regarded as still future. This, moreover, is in opposition to Ewald: *and what will I (can I be surprised), if it be already kindled?* — Jesus entertains the wish that the fire were already kindled, *because between the present time and this kindling lay His approaching grievous passion*, which must still first be undergone; see ver. 50.

Ver. 50. δέ] places in face of the εἰ ἤδη ἀνήφθη! just wished for, what is still to happen first: *But I have a baptism to be baptized with.* This baptism is His deep *passion* awaiting Him, into which He is to be plunged (comp. on Mark x. 38):

and He *has* this baptism as the destiny ordained for Him, and consequently appropriated to Him. — καὶ πῶς συνέχομαι κ.τ.λ.] *and how am I distressed* (comp. viii. 37; Dem. 1484. 23, 1472. 18) *till the time that it shall be accomplished!* A true and vivid expression of human shrinking at the presentment of the agonies that were imminent, similar to what we find in Gethsemane and at John xii. 27. It was a misapprehension of the human feeling of Jesus and of the whole tenor of the context, to make out of συνέχομαι an urgency of *longing* (ὥσπερ ἀγωνιῶ διὰ τὴν βραδυτήτα, Euthymius Zigabenus, comp. Theophylact). So also de Wette and Bleek, who wrongly appeal to Phil. i. 23. See on the passage, also on 2 Cor. v. 14. Jesus does not *long* for and *hasten* to death, but He *submits* Himself to and *obeys* the counsel of God (comp. John xii. 27; Phil. ii. 8; Rom. v. 19, and elsewhere), when His hour is come (John xiii. 1 and elsewhere). Ewald takes the question as making in sense a *negative* assertion: I must *not* make myself anxious (comp. on πῶς, ver. 56), I must in all patience allow this worst suffering to befall me. This agrees with Ewald's view of τί θέλω κ.τ.λ., ver. 49; but, according to our view, it does not correspond with the parallelism. And Jesus actually experienced anguish of heart (comp. 2 Cor. ii. 4, συνοχὴ καρδίας) at the thought of His passion, without detracting from His patience and submissiveness.

Vv. 51–53. See on Matt. x. 34 f., where the representation is partly *simplified*, partly, on the model of Mic. vii. 6, *enriched*. — ἀλλ' ἤ] *but only*, originated from ἄλλο and ἤ, without, however, its being required to write ἄλλ' ἤ. See on this expression in general, Krüger, *d. formula ἀλλ' ἤ et affinitum particul. etc. natura et usu*, Brunsvig. 1834; Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 31 ff. Comp. on 2 Cor. i. 13. Otherwise Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Phædr.* p. 81 B. — ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν] Jesus already realizes His approaching *death*. Comp. xxii. 69. — In ver. 53 are *three hostile couples*; the description therefore is *different* from that at ver. 52, not a more detailed statement of the circumstances mentioned in ver. 52 (Bleek).

Vv. 54–56. See on Matt. xvi. 2 f. The reason of those

hostile separations, spoken of in ver. 52 f., lay, on the part of the *people* in whose bosom they were sure to arise, in the *mistaking of the Messianic period* as such. Hence the rebuke that now follows is addressed *to the people*; it is otherwise in the historical connection that appears in Matthew. Still the significant saying, in different forms, may have been uttered on two different occasions. — τὴν νεφέλην] *the cloud*, which shows itself. — ἀπὸ δυσμ.] therefore from the region of the sea. Comp. 1 Kings viii. 44, and see Robinson, *Pal.* II. p. 305. — εὐθέως] so undoubted it is to you. — Ver. 55. νότον πνέοντα] *scil.* ἴδητε, to wit, in the objects moved by it. — Ver. 56. ὑποκριταί] see on Matt. xvi. 3. Not unsuitable as an address to the people (de Wette), but it *has in view* among the people, especially through pharisaical influence (xii. 1), the *untrue nature* (the ὑπόκρισις) which, as such, made them blind to the signs of the times! — τὸν δὲ καιρὸν τοῦτον] *but this season*, the phenomena of which so unmistakeably present to you the nearness of the Messiah's kingdom (and Jesus Himself as the Messiah), how is it possible that ye should leave it so unexamined?

Vv. 57-59. See on Matt. v. 25 f. Pott (*de natura . . . orat. mont.* p. 13), Kuinoel, de Wette refuse to acknowledge any connection (comp. Euthymius Zigabenus: ἐφ' ἑτερον μετέβη λόγον), and assume a mistaken reminiscence, suggested by the affinity of δοκιμάζειν and κρίνειν. But Luke did not weave together the discourses of Jesus in so thoughtless a manner. The train of thought, even although the connection is less clear and appropriate, is as follows: As, however, it turns to your reproach that ye do not rightly estimate the *present time*, so not less also is it your reproach that ye do not *of your own selves* judge what is duty. Jesus refers to the duty of *repentance* which is still seasonable, and by means of the rhetorical figure *metaschematismus*—since He pictures repentance as an agreement with an adversary who has a pecuniary claim to make, but by this adversary He means (not the devil, Euthymius Zigabenus, nor the poor, Michaelis; but) *God*, to whom man is a debtor—He represents this duty of repentance as still seasonable, in order not to incur the divine punishment, like

the accused person who still seasonably comes to terms with his creditor. — *καὶ ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν*] *even of yourselves*, even of your own independent judgment. Comp. Bengel: “sine signis et citra considerationem hujus temporis.” These words indicate the *progressive advance* of the discourse. Comp. on xxi. 30. — Ver. 58. *γάρ*] explanatory. — *ὥς*] is the simple *sicuti*: *As thou, namely, art in the act of going away with thine adversary to an archon* (in correspondence with this condition of time and circumstance), *give diligence on the way*, etc.; while you are still on the way, before it is too late, make the attempt, that may avert the danger. *ὑπάγεις* has the emphasis (comp. subsequently *ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ*); so close is the time of decision! Both the *ἄρχων* and the *κριτής* must be considered as *local magistrates* (*κριτής* not as an assessor of the *Sanhedrim*, with which *κατασύρῃ* is not in accord, for this certainly cannot be taken as a dragging to *Jerusalem*). Comp. *κρίσις*, Matt. v. 21, and the remark thereafter. By one of the *archons*, *i.e.* of the chief city officials, who, namely, is a competent person in matters of debt, the accused is recognised as liable to pay, and in default of payment the *κριτής*, who happens to be subordinate to the *ἄρχων*, orders compulsion to be used. For the rest, this handing over from one official to another belongs to the details of civic procedure, without being intended for special *interpretation*. — *δὲς ἐργασίαν*] *da operam*, a Latin idiom, probably taken from the common speech, Hermogenes, *de Invent.* iii. 5. 7; Salmasius and Tittmaun (*Synon.* p. 102), following Theophylact, erroneously interpret: *give interest*. This is not the meaning of *ἐργασία*, and the Israelites were forbidden to take interest from one another (Michaelis, *Mos. R.* § 154 f.; Saalschütz, *M. R.* pp. 184, 278, 857). — *ἀπηλλάχθαι ἀπ' αὐτοῦ*] *in order to be delivered from him*, Xen. *Anab.* vii. 1. 4; Plat. *Legg.* ix. p. 868 D; Josephus, *Antt.* x. C. 2, and elsewhere. The genitive might also stand alone, Thuc. iii. 63; Dem. 11. 16, 237. 14, and elsewhere, and the passages in Kypke and Loesner. Settlement is to be conceived of as obtained by payment or by arrangement. Comp. Dem. 34. 22. — *ὁ πράκτωρ*] *exactor*, collector, bailiff. In Athens the collector of the court fees

and fines was so called (Böckh, *Staatshaush.* I. pp. 167, 403 ; Hermann, *Staatsalterth.* § 151. 3). The *πράκτωρ* also is part of the *imagery*, without contemplating thereby any special interpretation (otherwise, the angels would have to be understood, Matt. xiii. 41 f.). — τὸ ἔσχ. λεπτόν] (Mark xii. 42): to wit, of the debt sued for. But this terminus in the punitive condition depicted (in the Gehenna) is *never* attained. Comp. on Matt. xviii. 34.

CHAPTER XIII.

Vv. 3 and 5. The evidence in the two verses is so divided between μετανοήτε (Elz.) and μετανοήσητε (Lach.), as also between ὡσαύτως and ὁμοίως (Lachm. has in both places ὁμοίως, which Elz. reads only in ver. 5), that it affords us no means of decision. Tisch. reads in ver. 3, μετανοήτε . . . ὁμοίως, but in ver. 5, μετανοήσητε . . . ὡσαύτως. It is certain that the one passage was changed in accordance with the other,—most probably ver. 5 in accordance with ver. 3, and that consequently both passages are not, as by Lachm., to be read alike, because in that case no reason would have been suggested for the variation. — Ver. 4. Instead of ὁδοί Lachm. and Tisch. have, on preponderating evidence, αὐτοί. The *Recepta* is a frequent alteration. — Ver. 6. The arrangement περυσυμ. ἐν τ. ἀμπ. αὐτ. (Lachm. Tisch.) is preponderatingly attested, and still more strongly is ζήτων καρπ. (Elz. has καρπ. ζ.). — Ver. 7. After ἔτη Tisch. has ἀφ' ὧν, following B D L T⁵ **8**, *al.* Rightly; it was passed over because it could be dispensed with. — Ver. 8. Elz. has κοπρίαν. But decisive authorities have λίπρια. The feminine form was more common from its use in the LXX. — Ver. 11. ἦν] is wanting after γυνή in B L T⁵ X **8**, min. vss. Lachm. Tisch. A frequent addition. — Ver. 12. τῆς] Lachm. has ἀπὸ τῆς, in accordance with A D X Π **8**, min. An exegetical expansion. — Ver. 14. ταύταις] A B L, etc. have αὐταῖς. So too Lachm. and Tisch. Rightly; ταύταις occurred readily to the transcribers; comp. on ver. 4. — Ver. 15. Instead of ὑποκριτά (Elz.), ὑποκριταί is rightly approved by Griesb., and adopted by Lachm. and Tisch., in accordance with considerably preponderating evidence. The singular was introduced in accordance with the foregoing αὐτῷ. In the previous clause instead of αὖν read ὁί, with Lachm. and Tisch., in accordance with B D L **8**, min. Syr. Copt. Sahid. Vulg. It. This ὁί easily dropped out after the last syllable of ὑποκριτή (thus still in one cod. of It.), and the connection that was thus broken was wrongly restored in some authorities by αὖν, in others by καί (16, Aeth.). — On the other hand, in ver. 18, instead of ὁί we are to adopt αὖν with Tisch., following B L **8**, min. Vulg. It. *al.*, the reference of which was

not understood. — Ver. 19. μέγα] is wanting in B D L T^s s, 251, vss. Ambr. Suspected by Griesb., bracketed by Lachm. [omitted by Tisch. 8]. Omitted in accordance with Matt. xiii. 32. — Ver. 24. πύλης] Griesb. Lachm. Tisch. have θύρας. The *Recepta* is from Matt. vii. 13. — Ver. 25. We are here to read κύριε only once, with Tisch., following B L s, 157, Copt. Sahid. Vulg. It. Sax. The repetition is from Matt. xxv. 11. — Ver. 31. ἡμέρα] Tisch. has ὥρα, which is so weightily attested by A B* D L R X s, min., and is so frequent in Luke, that ἡμέρα appears as having come in by means of the subsequent numeration of days. — Ver. 32. ἐπιτελῶ] Lachm. and Tisch. have ἀποτελῶ, in accordance with B L s, 33, 124, to which also D is associated by ἀποτελοῦμαι, — it was displaced by the more familiar word ἐπιτελῶ. — Ver. 35. After ὑμῶν Elz. has ἔρημος, in opposition to preponderating evidence. An exegetical addition in this place and at Matt. xxiii. 38. — ἔως αὖ] this αὖ is wanting in B D K L R, min., in accordance with Matt. xxiii. 39. — ἡξῆ] Lachm. and Tisch. have ἡξί, in accordance with A D V Δ Δ, min. The weight of these authorities is all the more considerable in this place that B L M R X s have not ἡξῆ ὅτε at all, which omission occurred in accordance with Matthew.

Vv. 1-9. Peculiar to Luke;¹ from the source of his account of the journey. At the same moment (when Jesus had spoken the foregoing discourse) there were some there with the news (παρήσαν τινες ἀπαγγέλλοντες, Diod. Sic. xvii. 8) of the *Galileans* (τῶν Γαλιλ. indicates by the article that their fate was known) whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices. This expression is a tragically vivid representation of the thought: "whom Pilate caused to be put to death while

¹ The narrative, vv. 1-5 (also vv. 6-9), was not found, according to Epiphanius and Tertullian, in the text of Marcion. This omission is certainly not to be regarded as intentional, or proceeding from dogmatic motives, but yet it is not to be explained by the supposition that the fragment did not originally appear in Luke (Baur, *Markusevang.* p. 195 f.). It bears in itself so clearly the stamp of primitive originality that Ewald, p. 292, is able to ascribe it to the oldest evangelical source, Köstlin, p. 231, to a Jewish local source. In opposition to Volkmar's attempt (p. 102 f.) to prove the omission in Marcion as having been dogmatically occasioned (comp. also Zeller, *Apostelg.* p. 21), see Hilgenfeld in the *Theol. Jahrb.* 1853, p. 224 ff. Yet even Köstlin, p. 304, seeks dogmatically to account for the omission by Marcion, on assumptions, indeed, in accordance with which Marcion would have been obliged to strike out no one can tell how much more.

engaged in their sacrifices." See similar passages in Wetstein. That the communication was made with evil intention to represent the murdered people as special sinners (Lange), is a hasty inference from the answer of Jesus. — *μετὰ τῶν θυσιῶν αὐτ.*] not instead of *μετὰ τοῦ αἵματος τῶν θυσ. αὐτ.*, which abbreviation, although in itself allowable, would here be arbitrarily assumed; but we may regard the people as actually engaged in the slaughter or cutting up, or in otherwise working with their sacrifice at the altar (in the outer court) (Saalschütz, *M. R.* p. 318), in which they were struck down or stabbed, so that their blood streamed forth on their offering. — The *incident itself*, which the *τινές* who had arrived mention as a novelty, is not otherwise known to us. Josephus, *Antt.* xviii. 5, is speaking of the *Samaritans*, and what he says belongs to a later date (in opposition to Beza). To think of followers of *Judas the Gaulonite* (Theophylact, Euthymius Zigabenus, Grotius, and others) is arbitrary; but the conjecture that they were enthusiastic *devotees of Jesus* (Lange) is preposterous, because it does not agree with the subsequent explanation of the Lord. Probably they had made themselves suspected or guilty of (secret) sedition, to which the Galileans were extremely prone (Joseph. *Antt.* xvii. 9. 3; Wetstein on the passage; see especially Rettig in the *Stud. und Kritik.* 1838, p. 980 f.). It is possible also that in the tumult that arose on account of the aqueduct built by Pilate (Joseph. *Antt.* xviii. 3. 2) they also had been drawn in (Ewald, *Gesch. Chr.* p. 40), with which building, moreover, might be connected the falling of the tower, ver. 4.

Vv. 2, 3. Jesus makes use of this news by way of warning, and to stir them up to repentance. He points to the slaughter of those people as an example of the divine punishment, which teaches not that the persons concerned are the most deserving of punishment, but that punishment, if carried into effect against *individuals*, must fall upon *all* (to wit, the whole class, so that in the *application* the *Messianic* punishment of eternal *ἀπώλεια* is intended¹) if they should not have repented. — *παρά*] *more than*; see Bernhardt, p. 259; Buttmann, *Neut.*

¹ Not the destruction of Jerusalem, as Grotius and many will have it.

Gr. p. 292 [E. T. 339]. — ἐγένοντο] not *were* (ἦσαν), but *became* (see generally, C. F. A. Fritzsche in *Fritzschor. Opusc.* p. 284 f.)—to wit, declaratory: that they became *known* as sinners by the fact, namely, that they suffered such things (πεπόνθ.), *perf.*, see Winer, p. 242 [E. T. 338].

Vv. 4, 5. Likewise historically unknown. — ὁ πύργος] the *well-known* tower. What sort of a one it was is altogether uncertain; perhaps a tower of the town-walls (Joseph. *Bell.* v. 4. 2), so that the *spring* of Siloah is here meant (Joseph. *l.c.* says of the walls of the ancient city, πρὸς νότον ὑπὲρ τὴν Σιλωὰμ ἐπιστρέφον πηγὴν). As to the spring (on the south-east side of the ancient city) and the pool of Siloah, see on John ix. 7. — ἐν τ. Σιλ.] ἐν of the immediate neighbourhood, *ut.* Comp. Xen. *Anab.* iv. 8. 32, and thereon, Kühner, *Hom. Il.* xviii. 521, and elsewhere. — καὶ ἀπέκτ. αὐτούς] a genuine Greek transition from a relative to a demonstrative sentence on account of the different government of the two verbs. Comp. on x. 8. — αὐτοῖς] (see the critical remarks) *they on their part*, in opposition to the others, taking them up emphatically, Bornemann, *ad Sympos.* iv. 63, p. 154; Bernhardt, p. 290. Observe that ὡσαύτως is stronger than ὁμοίως, and hence most appropriately used at ver. 5.

Vv. 6-9. Doctrine: the forbearance of God (of the Lord of the vineyard) endures only a short time longer; the ministry of *me* (the ἀμπελουργός) to you is the last attempt, and on it follows the decision—the decision of the Messianic judgment. Comp. iii. 9. Explanations entering more into detail, for instance, of the *three years* (Augustine, Theophylact, Bisping, and others: the times of the law, the prophets, and Jesus; Euthymius Zigabenus: the τρεῖς πολιτεῖαι of the judges, the kings, and the high priests), in which, moreover, are not to be found the years of the ministry of Jesus (Jansen, Bengel, Michaelis, Wieseler, *Synopse*, p. 202, but that there would appear, besides the three years, a *fourth* also, in which the results of the manuring were to show themselves), mistake the colouring of the parable for its purpose.¹ — συκὴν εἰχέ τις]

¹ Grotius aptly says that the three years indicate in general the whole period before Christ: "quo Deus patientissime expectavit Judaeorum emenda-

a certain person possessed a fig-tree. The fig-tree in the vineyard is not opposed to Deut. xxii. 9, for there trees are not spoken of. — Ver. 7. According to the reading *τρ. ἔτη ἀφ' οὗ* (see the critical remarks): *It is three years since I*, etc. Comp. Thucyd. i. 18. 2. — *ἵνατί καὶ κ.τ.λ.*] *wherefore also* (besides that it itself bears nothing), see Hermann, *ad Viger.* p. 837; Klotz, *ad Derar.* p. 635 ff. The *καὶ* belongs, as is often the case in questions, to the whole sentence (Baumlein, *Partikeln*, p. 152). — *καταργεῖ*] *it makes the land useless*—to wit, by useless occupation of the space, by exhausting and shading it. Examples of *καταργεῖν*, *inertem facere*, Eur. *Phoen.* 760; Ezra iv. 21, 23, v. 5, vi. 8. — Ver. 8. *καὶ τοῦτο τὸ ἔτος*] *the present year also*—as already those three ineffectual past years. — *ἕως ὅτου κ.τ.λ.*] *until the time that I shall have dug*, etc.—whereupon there shall occur, even according to the result, what is said at ver. 9. — *κἂν μὲν ποιήσῃ καρπὸν*] *and in case perchance it shall have brought forth fruit*—even in the classical writers a frequent aposiopesis of the apodosis *καλῶς ἔχει*. See Valckenaer, *Schol.* p. 217; Hermann, *ad Viger.* p. 833; Buttmann, *Neut. Gr.* p. 339 [E. T. 396]. On the interchange of *εἰάν* and *εἰ* in such antitheses, in which the first conditional sentence is spoken with reference to the result, comp. Sauppe, *ad Xen. Mem.* ii. 6. 37; Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Phaed.* p. 93 B, *Gorg.* p. 470 A; Winer, p. 263 [E. T. 369]. — *εἰς τὸ μέλλον*] *sc. ἔτος*, *at the following year*, which therefore comes in with the next year's fig-harvest, thou shalt cut it down. Let it still therefore remain so long. Comp. on i. 20. To supply *ἔτος* is by means of the correlation to *τοῦτο τὸ ἔτος*, ver. 8, more strictly textual than the general notion *postea* (as it is usually taken). — *ἐκκόψεις*] “Non dicit vinitor: *excindam*, coll. ver. 7, sed rem refert ad dominum; desinit tamen pro ficu deprecari,” Bengel.

Vv. 10–17. A Sabbath cure peculiar to Luke, without any more precise specifying of time and place. He might find a motive for inserting it just in this place in his source of the narrative of the journey itself. But to explain its position.

tionem.” Within three years, as a rule, the tree when planted bore fruit, Wetstein *in loc.* The people addressed are the *ταῖς*, ver. 1 as ver. 2, but as members of God's people (the vineyard), not as inhabitants of Jerusalem (Weizsäcker).

tion here from the fact that the three years of ver. 7 had reminded him of the eighteen years of ver. 11 (Holtzmann, p. 153) would be fantastic. — Ver. 11. ἦν] *adcrat.* — πνεῦμα ἀσθενείας] *a spirit of weakness, i.e. a demon* (see ver. 16), who paralyzed her muscular powers, so that she could not straighten herself. This conception of ἀσθέν. is more in accordance with the context than the general one of *sickness*. — εἰς τὸ παντελές] comp. Heb. vii. 25, and thereon Bleek; *Act.* xii. 20, v. 7. It belongs adverbially not to μὴ δύναμ. (de Wette, Bleek, and most commentators), but to ἀνακύψαι, with which it stands. She was bowed together (*Ecclus.* xii. 11, xix. 26 f., and in the Greek writers), and from this position to straighten herself up perfectly was to her impossible. — Ver. 12. ἀπολέλυσαι] *thou art loosed*; that which will immediately occur is represented as already *completed*. — Ver. 14. ἀποκριθεῖς] See on Matt. xi. 25. — τῷ ὄχλῳ] Taking his stand upon Deut. v. 13, he blames—not directly Jesus, for he could not for shame do so, but—the *people*, not specially the woman at all: Jesus was to be attacked *indirectly*. — Ver. 15. ὑποκριταί] Euthymius Zigabenus aptly says: ὑποκριτὰς ὠνόμασε τοὺς κατὰ τὸν ἀρχισυνάγωγον (the class of men to which he belonged, the hierarchical opposition, comp. ver. 17), ὡς ὑποκρινομένους μὲν τιμᾶν τοῦ σαββάτου νόμον, ἐκδικοῦντας δὲ τὸν φθόνον ἑαυτῶν. — ἀπαγαγών] pictorially, “*ad opus demonstrandum*,” Bengel. — Ver. 16. The argument is *a minori ad majus* (as xiv. 5), and the *majus* is significantly indicated by the doubled description θυγατέρα Ἀβρ. οὖσαν (comp. xix. 9) and ἦν ἔδησεν ὁ Σατανᾶς κ.τ.λ. “*Singula verba habent emphasin*” (Grotius),—a remark which holds good also of the vividly introduced ἰδοῦ, comp. Deut. viii. 4. As a *daughter of Abraham*, she belongs to the special people of God, and must hence be wrested from the *devil*. Of *spiritual* relationship with Abraham (Lechler in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1854, p. 821) nothing is said. — ἦν ἔδησεν ὁ σατ.] since he, namely, by means of one of his servants, a demon, has taken away her liberty in the manner mentioned at ver. 11. — δέκα κ.τ.λ. is not a *nominative*, but an *accusative* of the *duration of time*. Comp. ver. 8, xv. 29, and elsewhere. — Ver. 17. κατησχύν.

πάντ. οἱ ἀντικ. αὐτ.] Comp. Isa. xlv. 16. — γινομένοις] *Present*; describing the glorious work of Jesus as *continuing*.

Vv. 18–20. Comp. on Matt. xiii. 31–33; Mark iv. 31 f. — ἔλεγε οὖν] does not introduce the parables which follow in an indefinite and random manner (Strauss, I. p. 626; comp. de Wette and Holtzmann), which is erroneously inferred from ver. 17 regarded as a closing remark, and denies to Luke even the commonest skill in the management of his materials; but after the conclusion of the preceding incident (ver. 17) Jesus, in consequence (οὖν, see the critical remarks) of the joy manifested by the people, sees Himself justified in conceiving the fairest hopes on behalf of the Messianic kingdom, and these He gives utterance to in these parables. This is how we find it in Luke; and his mode of connecting them with the context is so consistent with the facts, that from this quarter there is no opposition to our assuming as original in this place what, if not an exact repetition of the two parables already spoken at Matt. xiii. and Mark iv., was at least an express reference to them. Even in the source of his narrative of the journey from which Luke draws from ix. 51 onwards, they might have been connected with the foregoing section, vv. 10–17. — Ver. 19. εἰς κῆπον ἑαυτοῦ] *into a garden belonging to himself*, where it was protected, where he could observe and foster it, etc. — Ver. 20. πάλιν] *once more*; for the question of ver. 18 is *repeated*.

Ver. 21. Introduction of a new act in the progress of the journey (ix. 57, x. 38, xvii. 11). The mention of the journey holds the historical thread. — καὶ πορ. ποιούμε.] *teaching, and at the same time*, etc.

Ver. 23. This questioner was certainly a *confessor* of Jesus, ver. 24 ff. There is nothing besides this that we can define more precisely, except that the question itself might be called forth by the stringency of the claims of Jesus. — As to εἰ,¹ see on Matt. xii. 10.

¹ That in direct questions *ei* should be used as the recitative *ἔτι*, which would have to be explained by a transition of the *oratio obliqua* into the *oratio directa*, even after the learned investigation of Lipsius, *Paulin. Rechtfertigungsschre*, 1853, p. 30 ff., I must doubt, since we should find this use of *ei* much more

Ver. 24. *Πρὸς αὐτοῦς*] refers to those who were present, of whom the questioner was one. Jesus, giving after His manner a practical application to the theoretical question, answers not directly, but by means of the admonition: *Strive to enter in* (to the Messiah's kingdom, to which that question referred, conceived of as a house) *by the narrow door, since many in vain shall attempt to enter.* Therein is implied: "Instead of concerning yourselves with the question whether they who attain to salvation are only *few*, reflect rather that *many shall not* attain it, and set out therefore on the right road to attaining it." — *διὰ τῆς στενῆς θύρας*] (see the critical remarks) reminds us of a house which has, besides the usual door, also a distinct *small* one, and only by means of this is admission possible: so the attainment of salvation is possible only by means of the *μετάνοια*. The figurative representation, which Jesus has already made use of in the Sermon on the Mount, Matt. vii. 13, is here repeated and modified; the *simple* *διὰ τῆς στεν. θύρ.*, without any more definite explanation (comp., on the other hand, Matt. *l.c.*), bears the stamp of a reference to something already previously propounded (in opposition to de Wette, Weiss, and others, who are in doubt as to the originality of the saying in this place). — *ζητήσουσιν*] weaker than *ἀγωνίζεσθε*. — *εἰσελθεῖν*] in general; *διὰ τῆς στενῆς θύρας* is not repeated. — *κ. οὐκ ἰσχύσουσιν*] because they omit *ἀγωνίζεσθαι εἰσελθεῖν διὰ τῆς στενῆς θύρας*, *i.e.* they have not repented.

Vv. 25-27.¹ If you are *excluded* from the kingdom of Messiah, you shall then in vain urge your external connection with me! *Πλάττει γὰρ οἰκοδεσπότην τινὰ καθήμενον κ.*

frequently elsewhere, and since in the isolated places where it occurs it is just the meaning of the *doubtful* question (*whether indeed?*) which is very appropriate (Matt. xii. 10, xix. 3; Luke xiii. 23, xxii. 49; Acts i. 6, vii. 1, xix. 2, xxi. 37, xxii. 25). On the classical beginnings of this usage, nothing likewise is to be decided other than on the New Testament usage, to wit, with Ast, *Lex. Plat.* I. p. 601: "*Dubitanter* interrogat, ita ut interrogatio *videatur* directa esse."

¹ Down to ver. 29 we have a series of reminiscences of very varied discourses linked together in Luke's source of the journey, which are found in several portions of Matthew taken from the *Logia*.

ὑποδεχόμενον (at the repast, ver. 29) τοὺς φίλους αὐτοῦ (rather his family; see subsequently on πόθεν), εἶτα ἐγειρόμενον κ. ἀποκλείοντα τὴν θύραν τοῦ οἴκου αὐτοῦ, κ. μὴ συγχωροῦντα τοῖς ἄλλοις εἰσελθεῖν, Euthymius Zigabenus. The construction is such that the apodosis begins with τότε, ver. 26 (Bengel, Bornemann), and continues down to ἀδικίας, ver. 27, in accordance with which the punctuation should be adjusted. The apodosis does not begin as early as καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς, ver. 25 (the usual mode of punctuation), so that with ver. 26 a new sentence would begin; for the former καί, which would not be a sign of the apodosis (de Wette), but would mean *also*, would be superfluous and confusing, whereas τότε presents itself, according to a usage known to every one (v. 35, xxi. 20, and elsewhere), of itself, and according to the meaning, as the division of the sentence. It is according to the meaning, for thus the apodosis brings out the principal point, namely, the urging of the relation of external connection and (observe only the continuation of the apodosis through ver. 27) its fruitlessness. Lachmann (following Beza) connects ἀφ' οὗ . . . ἀνοιξοῦν ἡμῖν (after which he places a full stop) with καὶ οὐκ ἰσχύσουσιν, ver. 24. Schegg follows him. But opposed to this is the second person ἄρξῃσθε, which is not in accordance with ἰσχύσουσιν, but carries forward the address that began with ἀγωνίζεσθε. Ewald conceives the apodosis as beginning as early as καὶ ἄρξῃσθε, ver. 25, but in such a manner that this apodosis is transformed into a second protasis. The harshness of this supposition is increased still more by the fact that if we read ἄρξῃσθε, ver. 26, the force of the protasis must come up anew with the repetition of the sound.¹ — καὶ ἄρξῃσθε] can only arbitrarily be limited to κρούειν, as though it ran ἄρξ. ἔξω ἐστῶτες κρούειν (Fritzsche, *ad Matth.* p. 541). It refers to both the infinitives. The people have begun the persistent standing there and knocking, in respect of which they say: Lord, open to us; then the master of the house answers that he knows them not (Matt. xxv. 12), etc.; next, they begin to

¹ This reading, indeed, has in its favour A D K L M T⁵ X Γ Δ Π N and many min., but it is a mechanical repetition of the subjunctive from ver. 25. Yet it is now adopted by Tischendorf [Tisch. 8 has ἀρξ.σθι].

say something else, to wit, their ἐφάγομεν κ.τ.λ. Thus there appears in ἄρξῃσθε and ἄρξεσθε, ver. 26, a very vivid representation of their several fruitless *attempts*. — καὶ ἀποκρ. ἐρεῖ ὑμ.] a graphic transition to the future: after that . . . ye shall have begun . . . and he shall say. At the same time, however, it is a departure from the regular construction,¹ as though ἄν had *not* gone before (Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 142). — οὐκ οἶδα ὑμᾶς πόθεν ἐστέ] Comp. John vii. 27; Winer, p. 551 [E. T. 781]. — πόθεν] i.e. of what family (see on John vii. 27); ye are not members of my house, but of another that is unknown to me. — Ver. 26 f. ἐνώπιόν σου] before thine eyes, as thy guests, but corresponding in a more lively manner to the expression of the master of the house than the mere μετά σου. — ἐν ταῖς πλαταῖς. ἡμ. ἐδίδαξ.] A divergence from the person describing to the person described, which occurs in ver. 27 in ἀπόστητε . . . ἀδικίας,² and at ver. 28 f. Bengel aptly says on ver. 27: "Iterantur eadem verba; stat sententia; sed iterantur cum emphasi." For the rest, comp. on Matt. vii. 22 f. According to the tendency-critics, the doers of iniquity in Matthew must be *Pauline*-Christians, but in Luke *Jewish*-Christians; see Hilgenfeld, *Krit. Unters.* p. 184 f., *Evang.* p. 196, *Zeitschr.* 1865, p. 192. What crafty turns the evangelists have got credit for! *Antinomians* (Weizsäcker) are not meant at all, but *immoral adherents*.

Vv. 28, 29. Comp. on Matt. viii. 11 f. The words of *Jesus*. — ἐκεῖ] there, in the place to which ye shall thus be turned away. For the most part it is understood *temporally*, ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ, Euthymius Zigabenus. Rarely thus in the classical writers (Soph. *Phil.* 394; Bornemann, *Schol.* p. 90 f.), but never (yet comp. ἐκεῖθεν, Acts xiii. 21) in the New Testament; and here the context points definitely by ἀπόστητε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ to the well-known *locality*, as, moreover, the *standing type*

¹ On the question discussed in so many ways whether in the classical writers (except Homer) ἄν stands with the future (Brunck, Heindorf, Hermann, Hartung, Stallbaum, Reisig, Kühner, Krüger, and many others) or not, see especially Hermann, *de part. ἄν*, p. 30 ff.; Hartung, *Partikell.* II. p. 282 ff. (both in *favour of it*); and Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 118 ff. (*against it*).

² On ἰργάτης, a doer of good or evil (so only in this place in the New Testament), comp. Xen. *Mem.* ii. 1. 27: τῶν καλῶν καὶ σμερῶν ἰργάτην; 1 Macc. iii. 6.

of this formula *sanctioned by use* (Matt. xiii. 42, 50, xxii. 13, xxiv. 51, xxv. 30) with ἐκεῖ leads one to think only of that locality. — ὅταν ὀψησθε] What contrasts! They saw the *patriarchs* and *prophets* established in the *kingdom*, but *in themselves* experience the *sense of being cast out*, and instead of them come *heathens* from the east and west, etc. On the subjunctive form ὀψησθε, see Buttmann, *Neut. Gr.* p. 31 [E. T. 36]. — Ἀβρ. κ. Ἰσ. κ. Ἰακώβ] Comp. Matt. viii. 11. The Marcionite reading πάντας τοὺς δικαίους is an intentional removal of the patriarchs (Volkmar, comp. Zeller, *Apostely.* p. 17). It was not original, so that the canonical reading cannot be said to have been introduced in accordance with Matt. *l.c.*, or in opposition to Marcion's views (Hilgenfeld, Baur). — ἐκβαλλομ. ἔξω] agrees with the figure, although the persons concerned *are not admitted at all*; for they are *members of the family*, and as such, *i.e.* as originally belonging to the theocratic community of the patriarchs and prophets, they are by their rejection practically ἐκβαλλόμενοι ἔξω. The *present* tense is justifiable, since the ὁρᾶν κ.τ.λ. at the time of the ἔσται ἡ κλαυθμός will be already *past*. Hence: if ye *shall have seen yourselves* as such, *become* (not *are*) the cast out. *After* they shall have seen this measure carried out, they shall be in hell, where there shall be weeping, etc.

Ver. 30. Comp. on Matt. xix. 30, xx. 16. — εἰσὶν] (*before* the establishment of the kingdom; ἔσονται) *after it, in the kingdom*. — ἔσχατοι] *i.e.* those who have not become believers till very late (as such, born heathens, ver. 29). — ἔσονται πρῶτοι] Members of the first rank in the kingdom of Messiah. The originality of this maxim, uttered in several forms and in various connections, is to be claimed exclusively for no particular place.

Ver. 31 ff. as far as ver. 33 peculiar to Luke from the source of his narrative of the journey. — According to xvii. 11, the incident occurred in Galilee, with which ix. 51 ff. (see on the passage) is not inconsistent. — That the Pharisees did not merely *give out on pretence* their statement in reference to Antipas (Theophylact, Euthymius Zigabenus, Maldonatus, and others, including Olshausen and Ebrard), but actually had

instructions from him, because he himself wished to be rid of the dreaded miracle-worker (ix. 7, 9) out of his dominions, is plain from τῇ ἀλώπεκι ταύτῃ, ver. 32, whereby is declared His penetration of the subtle cunning¹ of Herod (not of the Pharisees); in the contrary case, Jesus would have had no ground for characterizing him just as He did, and that too in the consciousness of His higher prophetic and regal dignity. But that Herod used even the enemies of Jesus for this purpose was not unwisely calculated, because he could rely upon them, since they also, on their part, must be glad to see Him removed out of their district, and because the cunning of the Pharisees for the execution of such like purposes was at all events better known to him than were the frequent exposures which they had experienced at the hands of Jesus. On the proverbial ἀλώπηξ, comp. Pind. *Pyth.* ii. 141; Plat. *Pol.* ii. p. 365 C; and thereupon, Stallbaum; Plut. *Sol.* 30. Comp. ἀλωπεκίζειν in Aristoph. *Vesp.* 1241; also κίναδος, Dem. 281. 22, 307. 23; Soph. *Aj.* 103.

Ver. 32. Ἰδοὺ, ἐκβάλλω . . . τελειοῦμαι] *Behold, I cast out demons, and I accomplish cures to-day and to-morrow, and on the third day I come to an end*; to wit, not in general with my work, with my course (Acts xx. 24), or the like, but, according to the context, with *these castings out and cures*. A definitely appropriate answer, frank and free, in opposition to timid cunning. To-day and to-morrow I allow myself not to be disturbed in my work here in the land of Herod, but prosecute it without hindrance till the day after to-morrow, when I come to a conclusion with it. Jesus, however, mentions precisely His *miraculous working*, not His teaching, because He knew that the former, but not the latter, had excited the apprehension of Herod. — τελειοῦμαι] (the present of the certain future, not the Attic future) might be the middle (Jamblichus, *Vit. Pyth.* 158); but in all the passages of the New

¹ As a type of cunning and knavery, the epithet *fox* is so generally frequent, and this figure is here so appropriate, that it appears quite groundless for Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 315, to suppose that by the fox is meant the *destroyer of the vineyard* (comp. Cant. ii. 15). References to the Song of Songs are not in general to be discerned anywhere in the New Testament, comp. on John iii. 29.

Testament, and, as a rule, among the Greek writers, *τελειοῦσθαι* is *passive*. So also here; comp. Vulg. It.: *consummator*. *τελειοῦν* means *ad finem perducere*, the passive *τελειοῦσθαι* *ad finem pervenire*. Hence: *I come to a conclusion, I have done*; with what? the context shows, see above. Against the explanation of the end *of life*, so that the meaning would amount to *morior* (Theophylact, Euthymius Zigabenus, Beza, Calvin, Grotius, Bengel, Kypke, and many others; comp. also Neander, Baumgarten-Crusius, Schegg, Bisping, Linder in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1862, p. 564), are decisive even the statements of the days which, in their definiteness,¹ could not be taken (as even Kuinoel, Ewald, and others will have them) proverbially (*σήμερον κ. αὔρ.*: *per breve tempus*, and *τῇ τρίτῃ*: *paulo post*; comp. Hos. vi. 2), as also *πορεύεσθαι*, ver. 33. Just as little reason is there for seeing prefigured in the three *days*, the three *years* of the official ministry of Jesus (Weizsäcker, p. 312).

Ver. 33. *Nevertheless* (although I am not, through your advice, disconcerted in that three days' ministry) *the necessity still lies before me, to-day and to-morrow and the next day, to obey your πορεύου ἐντεῦθεν*, since it is not allowable that a prophet, etc. Jesus means to say, "Nevertheless it cannot at all be otherwise than that I should conjoin with this work, which is still to be done to-day and to-morrow and the next day, the departure from Galilee, since I shall not perish in Galilee, as Herod threatens, but in order to perish must proceed to Jerusalem, which after all has the monopoly, that a prophet must not be slain out of it." In the answer, which as looking approaching death in the face at once boldly condemns the threatening of the timid prince, are accordingly involved the three positions—(1) I have undertaken to labour three days more in Galilee, and in that undertaking I will not be disconcerted; (2) nevertheless, I must in these three days contrive my departure from Galilee;² and wherefore this? in

¹ *E.g.* the expression is different in Dem. *De Cor.* § 195: *μία ἡμέρα καὶ δύο καὶ τριῖς*. See Dissen on the passage, p. 362.

² The inference is not here to be drawn (so Wieseler, *Synopsis*, p. 321) that Jesus was still distant three days' journey from the end of His expedition

order to escape the death with which Herod threatens me? No; (3) I must do this because I must not in Galilee—not outside of Jerusalem, but just in that place of the murder of prophets—*die*; and therefore must make for Jerusalem.¹ — πορεύεσθαι] *depart*, ver. 31. It is not in contradiction with ver. 22, for *while travelling* Jesus was accustomed to cast out demons, and to perform cures. If He wished to do the *latter*, He could at the same time do the *former*. Most of the commentators (even Grotius, Kuinoel, Olshausen) are grammatically and contextually wrong (see ver. 31) in the explanation: *travel about undisturbed in my occupations*. When others, following Syr., limit πορεύεσθαι merely to τῇ ἐχομένῃ, interpreting it either as *to depart* (Theophylact, Casaubon) or *to die* (Euthymius Zigabenus, Elsner), they supply (comp. also Neander) after αὐριον a thought such as ἐργάζεσθαι or ἐνεργῆσαι ἃ εἶπον. This is indeed to make the impossible possible! — οὐκ ἐνδέχεται] *it cannot be done, it is not possible* (2 Macc. xi. 18, and see Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Rep.* vi. p. 501 C), with ironically excited emotion makes the frequent and usual hyperbolically to appear as *necessary* (for all the prophets were *not* actually slain in Jerusalem, as is shown even in the instance of the Baptist) for the purpose of showing how *empty* the threatening of Herod appears to Jesus, since He must rather go to *Jerusalem* to die. The opinion (Grotius, Drusius, Knatchbull, Lightfoot, Wolf, and others) that He

(*Jerusalem*, not *Bethany*, as Wieseler will have it, see ver. 22, and on ix. 51 ff.). The occupation of these three days is rather, according to ver. 32, principally the casting out of demons and healings; but the *journey* must have been *bound up* therewith, so that Jesus intends on the third day to reach the limit to which in xvii. 11 He has already come.

¹ Schleiermacher is wrong in assuming (*Schr. d. Luk.* p. 195) that Jesus means to say that He must still abide two days in the place, *and then for two days more journey quietly*, etc. In ver. 33 they are indeed *the same days* as in ver. 32. De Wette considers the saying as unimportant,—that it is probably incorrectly reported; and Holtzmann finds the section so obscure that on that account Matthew omitted it. According to Baur, Jesus marks out the *πρὸς εὐσθαι*, the progress on His journey never to be interrupted as His *proper task*, which would be in harmony with the Pauline character of the Gospel. With this conflicts the statement giving the reason ὅτι οὐκ ἐνδέχεται κ.τ.λ. Bleek conjectures that σήμε. κ. αὐρ. καὶ was introduced from ver. 32 by a transcriber's error at an early period.

refers to the right belonging exclusively to the Sanhedrim of judging prophets and condemning them to death (*Sanhedr.* f. 2. 1, f. 89. 1, and elsewhere) is mistaken, since the matter here in question is of the actual ἀπολέσθαι, and since Jesus could not place Himself on a level with those who were condemned as *false* prophets. Comp. Winer in Zimmerman's *Monatsschr.* II. 3, p. 206.

Vv. 34, 35. See on Matt. xxiii. 37 ff. The *original* place of this exclamation is in Matthew (in opposition to Olshausen, Wieseler, Holtzmann, and others), although the connection in which Luke gives it from his source of the journey is *not* to be called *inappropriate* (in opposition to Schleiermacher, de Wette, Bleek). The painful reminder and announcement appears on the part of Jesus natural enough after ver. 33, and in the face of the theocratic hypocrites, ver. 35 is a striking dismissal. — τὴν ἐαυτῆς νοσσιάν] *her own nest*, namely, with the chickens therein, her own brood. Comp. Plat. *Pol.* viii. p. 548 A; Herod. iii. 111, often in the LXX. As to the testimony of the passage before us to an already frequent ministry of Jesus in Jerusalem, see on Matt. xxiii. 38 f., Remark. Comp. Weizsäcker, p. 310. But Schenkel, in opposition to all the evangelical notices, conjectures that during His supposed single sojourn in Judea (where He now is) He was oftener in Jerusalem. According to Keim (*D. geschichtl. Chr.* p. 34), Luke must at least have understood *all the Jews* as the children of Jerusalem, which, however, according to the context (vv. 33, 35), is not correct. In Luke the apostrophe refers to the *remote* inhabitants of the central seat of the theocracy. — Ver. 35. Continued apostrophe to the inhabitants of Jerusalem. — λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν κ.τ.λ.] cannot refer to the festal procession that was close at hand (Erasmus, Er. Schmid, Stein; Paulus, according to whom the meaning must be, “*before* the festival caravans I shall not come!”¹), which would yield the most nugatory and inappropriate thought in a pompous form, as the conclusion of a solemn denunciation

¹ Comp. Wieseler, *Synopse*, p. 322, whom this erroneous reference drives to explain the passage in Matthew as a spurious addition. See on Matthew. Even Holtzmann sees here nothing but the dismissal “*until the next Passover festival.*”

of threatening. It refers to the *Parousia* (see already Theophylact), and the train of thought is: "The divine protection departs from your city (*ἀφίεται ὑμῖν ὁ οἶκ. ὑμ.*, see on Matt. xxiii. 38), and in this abandonment I shall not appear to you as a helper, —ye shall not see me until I come to the establishment of my kingdom, and shall receive your (then no further to be withheld) homage as the Messiah." The meaning is somewhat different from what it is in Matthew. Observe, namely—(1) that Luke has not the *ἀπάρτι* of Matthew (and, moreover, could not have it, since he has the saying *before* the festal entry); (2) that, therefore, in Luke the time of the *οὐ μὴ με ἴδῃτε* must be the duration of the previously declared abandonment; (3) that instead of *λέγω γάρ* (Matt.) Luke places *λέγω δέ*, which *δέ* is not to be taken as explanatory, in the *sense* of *γάρ* (because it is not followed by *ἀπάρτι* as in Matthew), but as *in continuation, autem*, as an advance towards a new point in the announcement: "Ye shall be abandoned, *but how long?* abandoned *even till my Parousia.*" Comp. the expression *ζητήσετέ με κ. οὐχ εὑρήσετε* in John vii. 34: the *restoration of Israel*, so that by *ἕως κ.τ.λ.* would be meant the conversion of the people (Holmann, *Schriftb.* II. 2, p. 90 ff.), is neither here nor elsewhere taught in the New Testament. — *ἕως ἡξει* (see the critical remarks) *ὅτε εἴπητε*] *till it* (the point of time) *shall be, when ye shall have said.* The subjunctive after *ὅτε* without *ἄν*: "si res non ad cogitationem refertur et eventus tantummodo spectatur," Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 688. See on this specially Homeric use, even Thiersch in the *Act. Monac.* I. p. 13 ff.; Bernhardt, p. 397 f., 400. In this place to consider the subjunctive as occasioned by *ἕως* (Buttmann, *Ncut. Gr.* p. 199 [E. T. 231 f.]) is arbitrary.

CHAPTER XIV.

VER. 3. *ει]* is wanting in B D L \aleph , min. Pers. Copt. Syr.^{Jer.} Cant. Brix. Condemned by Griesb. and Schulz, deleted by Tisch. It is from Matt. xii. 10. — *θεραπεύειν]* B D L \aleph , min. have *θεραπεύσαι*, to which these authorities and vss. add *ἢ οὐ*. This *θεραπεύσαι ἢ οὐ* is, with Lachm. (who, however, brackets *ἢ οὐ*) and Tisch., to be adopted. The *Recepta* is from Matt. xii. 10. — Ver. 5. Instead of *ὅτι* in Elz., *ὡς* is to be read, on preponderating evidence. Recommended by Griesb., adopted by Matth. Scholz, Lachm. Tisch.; comp. also Rinck. The heterogeneous collocation *ὡς ἢ βοῦς* excited objection, so that *ὡς* was displaced in some authorities by *ὅτι* (following xiii. 15), in others by *πρόβατον* (D, Cant., following Matt. xii. 11). — Ver. 10. Elz. has *ἀνάπαισον*, which on decisive evidence is to be rejected. The most important MSS. are divided between *ἀνάπαισι* (Matth. Scholz, Rinck, Lachm. Tisch.) and *ἀνάπαισαι* (Griesb. Schulz, Fritzsche, *ad Marc.* p. 640). Although the attestation of *ἀνάπαισι* (A B* E II K S U V r \aleph , min.) is still stronger than that of *ἀνάπαισαι*, yet the latter is to be preferred. The less familiar form gave place to one that was better known. To regard *ἀνάπαισαι* as a clerical error (so Tisch. and Winer, p. 69 [E. T. 87]) is the more precarious, as the same clerical error must be assumed also at xvii. 7. — Ver. 16. *μέγα]* B** D Δ , min. Clem. have *μέγαν*. So Lachm. Rightly; *μέγα* is an amendment [Tisch. 8 has *μέγα]*. — Ver. 18. The order *πάντες παραιτ.* is, with Lachm. and Tisch., to be preferred on decisive evidence. — Ver. 21. After *ὁσῶλος* Elz. has *ἐκείνος*, which is condemned by Griesb., and on decisive evidence struck out by Lachm. and Tisch. An exegetical addition. — *χωλούς κ. τυφλούς]* Lachm. and Tisch. have *τυφλούς κ. χωλούς*. Rightly; the evidence in favour thereof preponderates; the omission of *καὶ χωλ.* (A, min. Syr.^{Jer.}) occasioned the restoration in the order given at ver. 13. — Ver. 27. *τὸν σταυρ. ἑαυτοῦ* is found in A B L** M Δ , min. Lachm. Tisch. The *Recepta* τ. στ. αὐτοῦ is from Matt. x. 38. — Ver. 28. Elz. has *τὰ πρὸς ἀπαρτ.*, in opposition to decisive evidence. With Griesb. Scholz, Tisch. merely *εἰς ἀπαρτ.* is to be read, in accordance

with B D L R, min. $\tau\acute{\alpha}$ was added as a completion (A E G H K M S U r Δ Λ Σ , min. Lachm. have $\tau\acute{\alpha}$ $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$), and $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ was explained by $\pi\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$. Comp. ver. 32. — Ver. 31. The arrangement $\epsilon\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omega$ βασιλ. συμβ. (Lachm. Tisch.) is decisively attested, as well as also $\upsilon\piαντ\eta\sigmaαι$. — Ver. 34. Instead of $\kappaαλόν$ read, with Tisch., following B L X Σ , min. vss., $\kappaαλὸν οὖν$. Being apparently inappropriate, $οὖν$ dropped out the more easily after the syllable ON. — $\epsilon\grave{\alpha}\nu$ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$] B D L X Σ , min. vss. Fathers have $\epsilon\grave{\alpha}\nu$ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ $\kappaα\iota$. So rightly, Lachm. and Tisch. $\kappaα\iota$ was passed over in accordance with Matt. v. 13; Mark ix. 50.

Vv. 1-6 peculiar to Luke from his source of the narrative of the journey. — *Ἐν τῷ ἐλθεῖν κ.τ.λ.*] *when He came*, to wit, in the progress of the journey, xiii. 33. — *τῶν ἀρχόντων τ. Φαρισαίων*] not: *of the members of the Sanhedrim belonging to the Pharisees* (Grotius, Kuinoel, and many others), such as Nicodemus therefore, John iii. 1; for the incident is in *Galilee* (not *Jerusalem*, as Grotius; not *Judea*, as Schenkel will have it), and, literally, it means nothing more than: *of the Pharisee leaders*, i.e. *of the chiefs of the Pharisees*. It is not to be defined more precisely; but men such as Hillel, Schammai, Gamaliel, and others belong to this category. — *σαββάτῳ*] the holiness of which (the preparation occurred previously) was not opposed to it, nay, "*lautiores erant isto die illis mensae . . . idque ipsis judicantibus ex pietate et religione*," Lightfoot. Comp. Neh. viii. 10; Tob. ii. 1; also John xii. 2; Wetstein *in loc.*; Spencer, *de leg. rit.* p. 87 ff. — *φαγεῖν ἄρτον*] comp. Matt. xv. 2. Jesus was *invited*, ver. 12. — *καὶ αὐτοί*] This is the common use of $\kappaα\iota$ after $\epsilon\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\tauο$; $\alphaὐτοί$, *they on their part*, the Pharisees. — *παρατηρούμ.*] generally, whether He would give them occasion for charge or complaint. Otherwise, vi. 7. — Ver. 2. *And behold a dropsical man was there in His presence*. This denotes the unexpected sight of the presence (not as a guest, see ver. 4) of the sick man, who ἦν *ίστάμενος, καὶ μὴ τολμῶν μὲν ζητῆσαι θεραπείαν διὰ τὸ σάββατον καὶ τοὺς Φαρισαίους· φαινόμενος δὲ μόνον, ἵνα ἰδὼν οἰκτειρήσῃ τοῦτον ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ καὶ ἀπαλλάξῃ τοῦ ὕδρωπος*, Euthymius Zigabenus. The view of many (see also Wetstein, Kuinoel, Glöckler, Lange), that the sick man was intentionally brought in by the Pharisees, is the more arbitrary, as ver. 2 is

not linked on by γάρ. Moreover, the cure occurred *before the dinner*, ver. 7. — Ver. 3. ἀποκριθ.] at this appearance of the sick man. — Ver. 4. ἐπιλαβόμενος] a *taking hold* which brought about the miraculous cure, stronger than ἀψάμενος.¹ Otherwise Mark viii. 23. The accusative αὐτόν is not dependent on ἐπιλ. See Buttmann, *Neut. Gr.* p. 140 [E. T. 160]. — Ver. 5. Comp. on Matt. xii. 11. The construction is such that the nominative of τίνος ὕμῶν is the subject in the second half of the sentence. Comp. generally, Bernhardt, p. 468; Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Phaed.* p. 72 B. — In respect of the reading υἱός (see the critical remarks; Mill, Bornemann, and Lachmann, *Præf.* II. p. vii., unjustifiably conjecture ὄϊς), which is not inappropriate (de Wette), the conclusion of Jesus is not drawn, as xiii. 15 f., *a minori ad majus*,² but from the ethical principle that the helpful compassion which we show in reference to that which is *our own* (be it son or beast) on the Sabbath, we are also bound to show *to others* (love thy neighbour as thyself).

Vv. 7–11. On the special propriety of this table conversation (in opposition to Gfrörer, *Heil. Sage*, I. p. 265, de Wette, Schenkel, Eichthal), comp. on xi. 38 f. Here, again, the circumstance especially which had just occurred with the dropsical man had prepared a point of view widely different from that of customary politeness. — παραβολήν] “*sumtam a moribus externis, spectantem interna*,” Bengel. The moral significance of this figurative apophthegm (בִּרְמָה) may be seen at ver. 11. — ἐπέχων] *attendens*, comp. on Acts iii. 5, and see Valckenaer. — πρωτοκλισ.] See on Matt. xxiii. 6; Lightfoot, p. 836. — Ver. 8. εἰς γάμους] not generally: to an *entertainment*, but: to a *wedding*, in respect of which, however, a special purpose is not to be assumed (Bengel thinks that “*civilitatis causa*” Jesus did not name a feast in general); but the typical representation of the future establishment of the kingdom as

¹ Paulus after his fashion makes use of the word for the naturalizing of the miracle: “Probably Jesus took him aside, and looked after the operation of the means previously employed.”

² This reading, moreover, sets aside the opinion of Schleiermacher, p. 196, that in respect of the quotation of this expression there is no reference back to xiii. 10.

a wedding celebration obviously suggested the expression (Matt. xxii.). — Ver. 9. ὁ σὲ κ. αὐτὸν καλέσας] not: who invited *thyself also* (Bornemann), which would lay upon σέ an unfounded emphasis, so much as: qui *te et illum* vocavit (Vulgate), the *impartial* host who must be just to *both*. — ἐρεῖ σοι] *future*, not dependent on μήποτε (comp. on Matt. v. 25), but an independent clause begins with καὶ ἐλθών. — καὶ τότε ἄρξῃ] the shame of the *initial movement* of taking possession of the last place in which he now must acquiesce,¹ after his previously assumed πρωτοκλισία is here made prominent. — Ver. 10. ἀνάπεσαι] 1 aor. *imperative middle*, which tense occurs also in Josephus, *Bell.* vii. 6. 4 (διεκπέσασθαι); Fritzsche, *ad Marc.* p. 641, takes it as *future*, formed after the analogy of φάγεσαι and πίεσαι (xvii. 8). But these forms come from the future forms φάγομαι and πίομαι, and hence are not analogous to the one before us. — ἵνα] corresponds to the μήποτε, ver. 8, and denotes the *purpose* of the ἀνάπεσαι εἰς τ. ἔσχ. τόπον. The *result* is then specified by τότε ἔσται. — προσανάβηθι] The host occupies the position where the higher place is (πρός=hither). Comp. moreover, Prov. xxv. 7. — Ver. 11. Comp. Matt. xxiii. 12. A *general* law of retribution, but with an intentional application to the *Messianic* retribution. Comp. *Erubin*, f. xiii. 2: "Qui semet ipsum deprimit; eum S. B. exaltat; et qui se ipsum exaltat, eum S. B. deprimit."

Vv. 12-14. Doubtless the collocation of the company at table suggested these words, which likewise are meant not probably as an actual table arrangement, but parabolically, as a foil to the customary teaching, that instead of arranging the manifestations of human friendliness with a view to receiving a return, we should make such manifestations just to those who cannot repay them again; then shall we receive requital in the kingdom of the Messiah. At the root of this lies the idea that the temporal requital striven after excludes the *Messianic* compensation, the idea of the ἀπέχειν τὸν μισθόν (Matt. vi. 2, v. 16). There is no allusion in this place to the

¹ For the intervening places are already rightly arranged, and not to be changed. "Qui semel cedere jubetur, longe removetur," Bengel.

calling of the *heathen* (Schenkel). — μή] not: *non tam* or *non tantum* (Kuinoel, and many others), which here would be even *logically* wrong on account of μήποτε κ. αὐτοί σε ἀντικ. Jesus gives, indeed, only a *figurative* discourse. — φώνει] purposely chosen; the manifest, obvious element of the καλεῖν (ver. 13) is denoted. — πλουσίους] belongs only to γείτονας (in opposition to Grotius). — μήποτε κ.τ.λ.] “*Hic metus mundo ignotus est, ut metus divitiarum,*” Bengel. — ἀντικαλέσωσι] Comp. Xen. *Symp.* i. 15: οὔτε μὴν ὡς ἀντικληθησόμενος, καλεῖ μέ τις, ἐπεὶ πάντες ἴσασιν, ὅτι ἀρχὴν οὐδὲ νομίζεται εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν οἰκίαν δεῖπνον εἰσφέρεισθαι. — In respect of καὶ αὐτοί the general idea of the *invitation* has presented itself. — Ver. 13. ἀναπήρους] maimed; Plat. *Crit.* p. 53 A: χῶλοι καὶ τυφλοὶ καὶ ἄλλοι ἀνάπηροι. — Ver. 14. ἀνταποδοθήσεται] Thucyd. iii. 40; Plat. *Phaedr.* p. 236 C; Rom. xi. 35; 1 Thess. iii. 9; placed first for emphasis. — ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει τῶν δικαίων] This is the ἀνάστασις ζωῆς, see on John v. 28. The Jewish doctrine of a *double* resurrection is confirmed not only by Paul (1 Cor. xv. 22 f.; 1 Thess. iv. 16; comp. Acts xxiv. 15), but also in this place by Christ (comp. also Matt. xxiv. 31). Comp. xx. 34–36. Otherwise τῶν δικαίων would be a superfluous and unmeaning addition.¹ Moreover, it could not be taken by the pharisaic *heavers* in any other sense than in the *particularistic* one, but not in such a manner as that Jesus, because He had the δικαίους directly in view, only mentioned the resurrection *of these*, without thereby excluding that of the remaining people as contemporary (in opposition to Kaeufer, *De ζωῆς αἰών. not.* p. 52). The doctrine of the millennial kingdom between the first and second resurrection adopted in the Apocalypse (Bertholdt, *Christol.* § 38) is not, however, confirmed, nor are the Rabbinical traditions, partly varying very much among themselves on the several stages of the resurrection (Eisenmenger, *Entdeckt. Judenth.* II. p. 901 ff.); further, the assumption is not confirmed, according to which the *Israelites in themselves* were understood as the δικαίους who

¹ It would be so also if it did not presuppose any ἀνάστασις τῶν ἀδίκων at all. This is against Georgii in Zeller's *Jahrb.* 1845, I. p. 141, who finds in the Synoptic Gospels *only* a resurrection of the pious.

should first arise (Bertholdt, § 35; Eisenmenger, II. p. 902), or at least the righteous *among* the Israelites (Eisenmenger, *l.c.*). Jesus means the righteous in the *moral* sense, as the context shows (see vv. 13 f., 16 ff.), without limitation of race. The specific definition of the idea of those first to be awakened as οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ (1 Cor. xv. 23; comp. 1 Thess. iv. 16) lay of necessity in the development of the Christian consciousness of the δικαιοσύνη only to be attained in Christ.

Ver. 15. To the idea of the ἀνάστασις τῶν δικαίων is very naturally linked in the case of this fellow-guest the thought of the future eating (φάγεται, *future*) with the patriarchs of the nation (Matt. viii. 11; Luke xiii. 28 f.; Bertholdt, *Christol.* § 39) in the (millennial) Messianic kingdom about to be set up. This transporting prospect, in which his mistaken security is manifested, compels his exclamation.

Vv. 16, 17. Jesus answers with a parable which comes from the source of the account of the journey (not identical, but similar is Matt. xxii. 1 ff., see *in loc.*), in which He keeps to the idea of a banquet, and thereby depicts the Messianic blessedness, but without reserve cuts off the prospect of that guest in reference to it and its like by teaching figuratively that they, the representatives of the theocracy, would deprive themselves of the Messianic salvation (ver. 24), because for the sake of their earthly objects of ambition they despised the repeated invitation to the Messianic kingdom (vv. 17-20). On the other hand, the poor and the unfortunate of the people (ver. 21), and even the heathen (ver. 23), are called, and being obedient to the call are adopted into the kingdom. "Progreditur vocatio ad remotiores, vi semper majore pensans moram," Bengel. — μέγαν (see the critical remarks): the masculine form δέϊπνος is rare (Æsop. *Fragm.* 129) and late. See Bast, *Ep. Cr. Αγγ.* p. 22, 61. — ἐκάλεσε] refers in the interpretation to the call by the prophets. — Ver. 17. τὸν δούλον αὐτοῦ] κατ' ἐξοχήν. Grotius well says *vocatorem*, to be interpreted of the Messiah at whose advent ἤγγικε ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, Matt. iv. 17. — On the custom even now in use in the East of a repetition of the invitation when all is prepared, see Rosenmüller, *Morgenl.* V. p. 192 f.

Vv. 18-20. "*Ἡρξαντο*] brings into prominence the beginning as a striking contrast to what has gone before. Comp. Fritzsche, *ad Matth.* p. 541. — *ἀπὸ μιᾶς*] "Utut enim diversas causas adferant, in eo tamen conveniunt, quod sua practexant negotia," Calovius. On the adverbial use of *ἀπὸ μιᾶς*, comp. *ἀπὸ τῆς ἰσῆς* (Thuc. i. 15. 3), *ἀπ' εὐθείας* (Plut. *Symp.* i. 4. 8), *ἐξ ὁρθῆς* (Polyb. xv. 27), *διὰ πάσης* (Thucyd. i. 14. 3), and many others. It may be explained on the principle that the prepositions which originally express concrete local relations, come in time to denote the more abstract relations of mode; see especially, Lobeck, *Paralip.* p. 363. — *παρατεῖσθαι*] *to deprecate*; praying to excuse, 2 Macc. ii. 31; Acts xxv. 11, and elsewhere; and see Wetstein and Held, *ad Plut. Timoleon*, p. 496. — *καὶ ἔχω ἀνάγκην κ.τ.λ.*] not as though he had bought the estate without seeing it (Wetstein, de Wette, and others), which is unnatural, even if a recommendation of it on the part of others, and the like, is supposed; but because even *after* a completed purchase there is the natural necessity to make a proper inspection of one's new possession in order to become acquainted with it, to make further arrangements, and the like. The excuses are therefore not in themselves absurd, which, according to Lange, *L. J.* II. 1, p. 376, must be the intention in order to represent the vehement confusedness. — *ἔχε με παρητ.*] *have me as one who is begged off*; not a Latinism (Kuinoel, Bleek, and many older commentators), nor to be interpreted: *regard me as one*, etc. (Kypke), but *ἔχειν τινα*, with an added accusative of a substantive, participle, or adjective, expresses the relation of possession according to a special quality. Comp. Xen. *Cyrop.* iii. 1. 35: *οὐ θαρρόδυντά με ἔξεις*; Ages. vi. 5: *τούς γε μὴν πολεμίους εἶχε ψέγειν μὲν οἱ δυναμένους, κ.τ.λ.*; 2 Macc. xv. 36; 3 Macc. ix. 21. See also on Matt. xiv. 5. Hence: *Place thyself in such wise to me that I am an excused person*; let me be to thee an excused person, i.e. according to the meaning: accept my apology. — Ver. 19. *πορεύομαι*] Already *in idea* he is just going forth. — Ver. 20. "Hic excusator, quo speciosiore et honestiorem videtur habere causam, eo est ceteris importunior," Bengel. On the excuse itself, comp. Deut. xxiv. 5; Hom. *Il.*

ii. 231; Herod. i. 36, where Croesus declines for his son the Mysian proposal for a hunting expedition: *νεόγαμός τε γάρ ἐστι καὶ ταῦτά οἱ νῦν μέλει*. 1 Cor. vii. 33 is to the point.

Vv. 21-24. *Εἰς τὰς πλατείας κ. ῥύμας*] *into the (broad) streets and (narrow) lanes*. Comp. Isa. xv. 3. On *ῥύμη* = *στενωπός*, see Phrynichus, p. 404, and thereon Lobeck. — Ver. 22. Here the narrative is supposed to be silent, leaving it to be understood that the servant went away again, and after fulfilment of the commission returned. But with what reason is this supposed in the narrative, otherwise so circumstantial? No; the servant, when repulsed by those who had been invited, did *of his own accord* what the master here directs him, so that he can say *at once* to this behest: *it is done*, etc. This point in the interpretation is, moreover, strikingly appropriate to *Jesus*, who, by the preaching of the gospel to the poor and miserable among the people, had already before His return to God fulfilled this divine counsel, in regard to which He did not need further instruction. — Ver. 23. *This* commission to the servant is fulfilled by Him through the *apostles*, comp. Eph. ii. 17. — *φραγμούς*] not: *places fenced in*, which the word does not mean, but: *go forth into the ways* (highways and other roads outside the town) *and hedges* (beside which wanderers, beggars, houseless folk have camped). In the interpretation: *αἱ κατοικίαι τῶν ἐθνῶν*, Euthymius Zigabenus. — *ἀνάγκασον*] as Matt. xiv. 22. The time presses! A strikingly picturesque touch, which, moreover, found its corresponding history in the urgent holy zeal of the apostles (especially of Paul) for winning the heathen to the faith; but its pernicious abuse, in the case of Augustine and many others, in their approval of the *correction of heretics* (see, on the other hand, Grotius and Calovius). Maldonatus well says: “adeo rogandos, adeo incitandos, ut quodammodo compelli videantur.” — *γεμισθῇ*] “Nec natura nec gratia patitur vacuum. Multitudo beatorum: extremis mundi temporibus maximam plenitudinis suae partem nanciscens,” Bengel. — Ver. 24. Not an assertion of *Jesus* (Kuinoel, Paulus, and others), but of the *master of the house*, which is certain from *μου τοῦ δείπνου* (*now shall taste*

of my supper), since Jesus in the parable appears as the *servant*. — γάρ] for the empty place is *not* to be occupied by you. — ὑμῖν] spoken to the servant, and to those who were supposed to be elsewhere than there present. Euthymius Zigabenus, moreover, says aptly: διὰ τοῦτον οὖν τὸν λόγον ἡ ὅλη παραβολὴ συνετέθη. (comp. ver. 15, to the substance of which this conclusion reverts. Those who are *excluded* are thus those Jews who have despised the call of Christ, but who, as the representatives and chiefs of God's people, were first of all by the gospel invited and laid under obligation to follow the invitation to the kingdom (κεκλημένοι and παραιτούμενοι, ver. 17 ff.); not the Jews *in general*, as Baur supposes, in accordance with his assumption of a Gentile-Christian tendency.

Vv. 25, 26. After the meal was over, Jesus goes forward on His journey towards Jerusalem, and draws with Him much people, as they thronged everywhere in Galilee upon the marvellous teacher (xii. i, ix. 11, and elsewhere). But the nearer He is to His own painful self-surrender, the more decidedly and ideally His claims emerge. To the dependent and undecided people going with Him He addresses Himself with the claim of the perfect, most self-denying surrender required of His disciples. Comp. Matt. x. 37, where the same claim, although less ideal in form, is made, and is addressed exclusively to the apostles. With the Christian communions (Weizsäcker) these instructions have even in Luke nothing to do. — εἴ τις ἔρχεται πρὸς με] namely, with a view to hearken to me as a confessor and follower. — μισεῖ] not *minus amat*, or the like (Kuinoel, de Wette, and many others); see, on the other hand, on Matt. vi. 24. Father, mother, etc., as even also the special desire for the preservation of one's own life (comp. Matt. x. 39), are assumed as being *in opposition* to fellowship with Christ (comp. xii. 53), so that, according to Matt. vi. 24, comp. Luke xvi. 3, in respect of the love of the one Lord the *hatred* of others must find place.¹ — ἔτι δὲ καί] besides, also, moreover; the extreme case of all is yet added. "Saepe qui inferiorem sancti oculi

¹ Comp. Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 327 f.

gradum visus erat assequi, in altiore deficit," Bengel. — *μαθητὴς εἶναι*] ver. 27, *εἶναι μαθητὴς*. The emphasis in both cases rests on *μαθητὴς*, but in ver. 27 more strongly.

Ver. 27. Comp. Matt. x. 38, xvi. 24; Mark viii. 34, x. 21; Luke ix. 23. *He who does not as the bearer of his own cross follow me, etc.*

Vv. 28-33. Peculiar to Luke from the source that he has followed since ix. 51. — *γάρ*] Reason for the *οὐ δύναται . . . μαθητὴς*. Since he, namely, is as little able to fulfil this great and heavy task¹ as any one is able to build a tower if he has not the necessary means, etc.: thus the latter serves for corroboration of the former. Comp. ver. 33. — *θέλων*] *if he will*. The article (*who will*) is unnecessary, and too weakly attested (in opposition to Bornemann). — *καθίσας ψηφίζει*] "*ut intelligas diligentem atque exactam supputationem*," Erasmus. — *εἰ ἔχει*] *sc. τὴν δαπάνην*. — *ἀπαρτισμός*, *completion*, only to be found in Dion. Hal. *De compos. verb.* 24. On the use of *ἀπαρτίζω* in Greek, see Lobeck, *ad Phryg.* p. 447. — Ver. 30. *οὗτος*] with scornful emphasis: *this man, forsooth!* — Ver. 31. *συμβαλεῖν*] intransitive: *to encounter, conflicte*, 1 Macc. iv. 34; 2 Macc. viii. 23, xiv. 17. See Wetstein and Kypke. — *εἰς πόλεμον*] belongs to *συμβαλεῖν*: *for a battle*. Thus frequently *συμβάλλειν τινι εἰς μάχην* (see Kypke); *εἰς* in the sense of the *purpose*. Comp. *πρὸς μάχην*, Polyb. x. 37. 4, also Xen. *Cyrop.* vii. 1. 20: *εἰς μονομαχίαν πρὸς τινα*; Strabo, xiv. p. 676. — *βουλευέται*] *deliberates* with his generals and counsellors. Comp. Acts v. 33, xv. 37. — *ἐν δέκα χιλ.*] *ἐν, in the midst of, surrounded by, amongst*. Comp. Jude 14. — Ver. 32. *εἰ δὲ μήγε*] *sc. δυνατὸς εἶη*. See on Matt. vi. 1, and Dindorf, *ad Dem. Praef.* p. v. f. — *τὰ πρὸς εἰρήνην*] *quae ad pacem componendam spectant*, arrangements for peace. Comp. *Test. XII. Patr.* p. 599. Contrast: *τὰ πρὸς τὸν πόλεμον*, Xen. *Anab.* iv. 3. 10. On the whole sentence,

¹ More precise interpretations of the figures are not justified. Especially the second ought not to have been expounded, as it has often been, of the *struggle against the devil* (Augustine: "*simplicitatem Christiani dimicaturi cum duplicitate diaboli*"), to which, indeed, the peacemaking of ver. 32 would be wholly inappropriate.

comp. Xen. *Mem.* iii. 6. 8. — Ver. 33. The *application*, and consequently the *doctrine*, of both examples as a commentary on the *γάρ* of ver. 28. — *πᾶσι τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ ὑπάρχ.*] the general statement to which the special instances, ver. 26, belong. *ἑαυτοῦ* has the emphasis of the *self-denial*. Comp. ver. 27.

Vv. 34, 35. Comp. on Matt. v. 13; Mark ix. 50. Jesus uttered the saying about salt more than once, and with differences in the details. Here He commits to His hearers by *ὁ ἔχων ὅτα ἀκούειν, ἀκούετω*, the charge of themselves giving the interpretation according to what has gone before. But this interpretation depends on the fact that *τὸ ἅλας* must represent the preceding *μου εἶναι μαθητής*. Comp. Matt. *lc.* Hence: *It is therefore* (*οὖν*, see the critical remarks) *something glorious*—to wit, in respect of this all-renouncing decision which is appropriate to it—to be my disciple, and as such to effect the maintenance of the power of spiritual life among men, as salt is the means of maintaining the freshness of life in the region of nature. But if ever my disciple (through turning back to selfish interests) loses this his peculiarity, this spiritual salting power, by what means can he again attain it? Such a *μαθητής* is then absolutely useless, and he is excluded (at the judgment) from the Messiah's kingdom. — *ἐὰν δὲ καί*] (see the critical remarks): *if, however, even the salt*, etc., which is no longer to be expected from *this substance* according to its nature. — *οὔτε εἰς γῆν κ.τ.λ.*] *it is fitted neither for food nor for manure* (to improve neither the former nor the latter). In respect of the salt that has become insipid, no other use would be conceivable than to be employed as manure, but neither *immediately* nor *mediately* is it of use for that; it is *perfectly useless*! Guard against such interpretations as that of Euthymius Zigabenus: *γῆν μὲν λέγει τοὺς μαθητάς . . . κοπρίαν δὲ τοὺς διδασκάλους*:—*ἔξω*] with strong emphasis placed first—*out* it is cast!

CHAPTER XV.

VER. 2. οἱ Φαρις.] With Lachm. and Tisch. read οἱ τ. Φαρις., in accordance with B D L Σ . The $\tau\epsilon$ is certainly not an addition of the transcribers. — Ver. 9. Instead of συγκαλεῖται Tisch. has συγκαλεῖ, on important yet not preponderating evidence [Tisch. 8 has συνκαλεῖ]. It is from ver. 6, where συγκαλεῖ is decisively attested. — Ver. 14. ἰσχυροῖς] A B D L R Σ , min. have ἰσχυρά. Recommended by Griesbach, adopted by Lachm. and Tisch. Those mss. preponderate, and the masculine is an amendment, in accordance with customary usage, and according to iv. 25. Comp. on Acts xi. 28. — Ver. 16. γεμίσαι τὴν κοιτίαν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ] B D L R Σ , min. vss. have χορτασθῆναι ἐκ. An interpretation. — Ver. 17. περισσεύουσιν] A B P and a few min. Tit. have περισσεύονται. Rightly; the active was introduced, in accordance with the wonted usage. — The ὡδε added by Griesb. is not found, indeed, in important authorities, and it stands in B L Σ , Lachm. after λιμῶ, but it has plainly been absorbed by ἐγὼ δέ; hence also the placing of it before λιμῶ, in accordance with D R U, min. vss. Chrys., is, with Griesb. Scholz, Tisch., to be preferred [Tisch. 8 has λιμῶ ὡδε]. — Ver. 19. Before οὐκέτι Elz. has καί, but in opposition to decisive evidence. Moreover, at ver. 21 this καί is to be deleted, on preponderating evidence. — Ver. 22. Lachm. and Tisch. [not Tisch. 8] have ταχύ before ἐξενέγκατε, in accordance with B L X Σ , vss., also Vulg. It. Jer. D also adds weight to the evidence with ταχέως. ταχύ is to be regarded as genuine. Copyists would have added a more familiar word as εὐθέως, or at least as, with D, ταχέως (xiv. 21). ταχύ does not occur at all elsewhere in Luke; still the omission is not to be explained by this fact, but simply as an old clerical error. — τὴν στολήν] τὴν has decisive mss. against it, and is, according to Lachm. and Tisch., to be deleted as an addition. — Ver. 23. ἐνέγκαντες] B L R X Σ , Vulg. It. Copt. Sahid. have φέρετε. So Tisch. The participle is an attempt to improve the style. D also testifies in favour of the imperative by ἐνέγκατε (ver. 22). — Ver. 24. καὶ ἀπολ.] καὶ is rightly condemned by Griesb., on decisive evidence, and deleted by Lachm. and Tisch.

The second $\tilde{\nu}$, however, has against it, in D Q, min., evidence too feeble for it to be deleted. Yet, according to A B L S*, it must be placed *before* ἀπολ. (Lachm. Tisch.). The position *after* ἀπολ. is a harmonizing of it with *εξρ.* $\tilde{\nu}$. — Ver. 32. Instead of ἀνέζησαν, read with Tisch., following B L R Δ S, min., ἐζησαν. The former is from ver. 24. — In the same manner is to be explained the omission of καὶ before ἀπολ. in Tisch. (following D X S). But $\tilde{\nu}$ is here to be deleted, on decisive mss. (Lachm. Tisch.; condemned also by Griesb.).

Vv. 1, 2. Introduction to a new, important, and for the most part parabolic set of discourses (down to xvii. 10), which were uttered after the incidents previously narrated on the continuance of the journey (xiv. 25), and are set forth by Luke in accordance with his source of the story of the journey. After that exacting discourse, to wit, xiv. 25–35, many of the publicans and sinners at once attached themselves to Jesus (which psychologically was intelligible enough); and He was so far from rejecting them, that He even fraternized with them at table. This arouses the murmuring of the Pharisees, and thereupon He takes the opportunity of directing the discourse as far as xv. 32 to *these* (ver. 3), and then of addressing xvi. 1–13 to *His followers*; whereupon He again being specially induced (xvi. 14) discourses anew against the *Pharisees* (xvi. 15–31), and finally closes the scene with instructions to *His disciples*. — ἦσαν ἐγγιζ.] They were actually engaged in, busied with, drawing near to Him. The usual view: *solebant accedere*, is arbitrary, because in that way the connection with what precedes is needlessly abandoned. — πάντες] a hyperbole of simple narrative. The throng of such people became greater and greater. Comp. v. 29 f. — καὶ οἱ ἁμαρτ.] as Matt. ix. 10. — διεγόγγυζον] διὰ “certandi significationem addit,” Hermann, *ad Viger.* p. 856. Hence always of *several*, whose *alternate* murmuring is meant, xix. 7; Ecclus. xxxiv. 24; Ex. xvi. 2, 8, xvii. 3, and elsewhere; Heliodor. vii. 27. — προσδέχεται] *receives them*, does not reject them. It is quite general, and only with κ. συνεσθίει αὐτοῖς does any special meaning come in.

Vv. 4–7. Comp. on Matt. xviii. 12–14. But in Luke there is still the primitive freshness in the pictorial *repré-*

sensation, nevertheless the reference and the application are different. — ἐπί] *after*, with the purpose of *fetching it*. See Bernhardy, p. 252. — Ver. 5. ἐπὶ τ. ὤμους ἑαυτοῦ] *on his own shoulders*; ἑαυτοῦ strengthens the description of the joyous solicitude which relieves the beloved creature from further running alone. — φίλους] *kinsmen*, as at vii. 6. — Ver. 9. ἔσται] The future refers to every circumstance of the kind that occurs. — ἡ ἐπὶ κ.τ.λ.] As to ἡ without a preceding comparative, see on Matt. xviii. 8, and Buttmann, *Neut. Gr.* p. 309 [E. T. 360]. By the *ninety and nine righteous* Jesus means the *legally righteous*, whom He characterizes by οἵτινες (*quippe qui*) οὐ χρεῖαν ἔχ. μεταν. from the *legal* standpoint, not from that of the inner character. *They need not repentance*, so far as they have not swerved from the standard prescribed by the law, while in a purely moral relation their condition *may* be altogether different, and as a rule *was* altogether different (as in the case of the Pharisees). Hence, moreover, is explained the *greater* joy over a single sinner that repents. The eldest son in the parable of the prodigal son is distinctively and aptly described as such a righteous man, so that, in accordance with the context, an *actually virtuous man* (as *usually*) cannot be conceived of, for in that case the *greater* joy would have to be regarded as only an *anthropopathic* detail ("quia insperata aut prope desperata magis nos afficiunt," Grotius).

Vv. 8-10. The same teaching by means of a similar parable, which, however, is not found also in Matthew, yet without express repetition of the *comparative* joy. — συγκαλεῖται] *convocat sibi*, describing the action more precisely than συγκαλεῖ, ver. 6. Comp. ix. 1, xxiii. 13; Acts x. 24, xxviii. 17. — ἐνώπ. τ. ἀγγέλων τ. θεοῦ] a special expression of what is meant by ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, ver. 7. *The joy of God* is rendered perceptible, as He, surrounded by the angels, allows it to be recognised *in the presence of them*. Comp. xii. 8.

Ver. 11. Jesus Himself has very definitely declared the doctrinal contents of the two foregoing parables, vv. 7, 10. In order now by more special detail and by all the liveliness of contrast to make palpable this doctrine, and especially the

growth and course of sin, the growth and course of repentance, the joy of God thereupon, and the demeanour of the legally righteous towards this joy, He adds a third parable, as distinguished and complete in its psychological delicacy and its picturesque truth in depicting human circumstances and affections as in its clear and profound insight into the divine disposition,—the pearl among the doctrinal utterances of Jesus, which are preserved to us by Luke alone, and among all parables the most beautiful and most comprehensive. The parable has nothing to do with Matt. xxi. 28–30 (in opposition to Holtzmann, p. 155), nor is it a new form of the parable of the lost sheep (Eichthal). By the *youngest* son Jesus denotes generally the *sinner who repents*, by the *eldest* son generally the *legally righteous*; not specially by the former the *publicans*, and by the latter the *Pharisees* (so also Wittichen, *Idee Gottes als d. Vaters*, p. 35 ff.); the application, however, of the characteristic features in question to *both* of these could not be mistaken any more than the application of the doctrine declared in ver. 7. The interpretation of the two sons—of the eldest by the *Jews*, of the youngest by the *Gentiles*, in accordance with the relation of both to *Christianity* (already Augustine, *Quæst. Ec.* ii. 33; Bede, and others; recently carried out in great detail, especially by Zeller in the *Theol. Jahrb.* 1843, p. 81 f.; Baur, *ibid.* 1845, p. 522 f.; Baur, *d. canon. Evang.* p. 510 f.; comp. Schwegler, *Nachapost. Zeitalter*, II. p. 47 f.; Ritschl, *Evang. Marcions*, p. 282 f.; Volkmar, *Evang. Marcions*, p. 66 f., 248; Hilgenfeld, *Evang.* p. 198; Schenkel, p. 195)—confuses the *applicability* of the parable with its *occasion* and *purpose*, and was in the highest degree welcome to the view which attributed to the gospel a tendential reference to later concrete conditions; but, in accordance with the occasion of the whole discourse as stated at vv. 1, 2, and in accordance with the doctrine of the same declared at vv. 7, 10, it is wholly mistaken, comp. Köstlin, p. 225 ff. It did not at all enter into the *purpose of the compilation* to refer to such a secondary interpretation (in opposition to Weizsäcker). Moreover, the more this parable is a triumph of the purely ethical aspect of the teaching of Jesus, and the more important

it is on the side of practical Christianity, so much the more have we to guard against attaching undue significance to special points which constitute the drapery of the parable, and to details which are merely artistic (Fathers, and especially Catholic expositors down to the time of Schegg and Bisping, partially also Olshausen). Thus, for example, Augustine understood by the squandered means, the *image of God*; by the *λῑμός*, the *indigentia verbi veritatis*; by the citizen of the far country, the *devil*; by the swine, the *demons*; by the husks, the *doctrinas sacculares*, etc. So, in substance, Ambrose, Jerome, and others. Diverging in certain particulars, Theophylact and Euthymius Zigabenus.

Vv. 12, 13. Ὁ νεώτερος] νεώτερον δὲ ὀνομάζει τὸν ἁμαρτωλὸν ὡς νηπιόφρονα καὶ εὐεξαπάτητον, Euthymius Zigabenus. — τὸ ἐπιβάλλον μέρος] the portion falling to my share, that which belongs to me, Herod. iv. 115; Dem. 312. 2, 317. 1; Diod. Sic. xiv. 17; Polyb. xviii. 24. 1, vi. 34. 1, and elsewhere. See also Wetstein and Kypke, I. p. 289. According to the Hebrew law of inheritance, there fell to the younger son only half as much as the first-born received (Deut. xxi. 17; Michaelis, *Mos. R.* § 79; Saalschütz, p. 820 f.). The son asks that this his future portion of inheritance be given to him in advance. The father grants "non quod oportebat, sed quod licebat facere," Maldonatus. An agreement, according to an approximate estimate, must be presupposed. But the granting of his request is a necessary part of the parable, on account of human *freedom*. "Discedentes a se non prohibet, redeuntes amplectitur," Maldonatus. — διείλεν αὐτοῖς] to both the sons, in such wise, however, as to reserve to himself until his death the right of *usufruct* over the portion of the eldest, and the latter remained in his service, vv. 29–31. — τὸν βίον] Mark xii. 44; Luke viii. 43: that whereon the family lived, i.e. nothing else than their means. Hesiod. *Op.* 230. 575; Herod. i. 31, viii. 51, and frequently. Paulus (comp. Michaelis) makes, without reason, a distinction between this and οὐσία, which, according to him, is the whole means, saying that the father, however, divided merely his stock of provisions, not his capital. See, on the other hand, ver. 31.

— Ver. 13. μετ' οὐ πολλ. ἡμέρ.] The greediness for unlimited pleasure urged him to haste. — ἅπαντα] what, namely, he had received as his portion of the inheritance, partly *in natura*, partly in money in settlement of what could not be taken with him. — ἀσώτως] *recklessly*, Dem. 1025. 19; Josephus, *Antt.* xii. 4. 8. Comp. on Eph. v. 18. *The sinful nature is developed from an independence which, under the influence of sinful longing, shakes itself loose from God* (comp. Ps. lxxiii. 27) *by the satisfaction of immoral pleasure.*

Vv. 14–17. *The divine ordinance of external misery, however, in connection with the consequences of sin, reawakens consideration and self-knowledge and the craving after God!* — ἰσχυρά] (see the critical remarks) comp. on iv. 25. — κατὰ τὴν χώραν] *κατά* of extension, *throughout*, as viii. 39. Winer, p. 356 [E. T. 499]. — καὶ αὐτός] *and he*, on his part. — ἤρξατο] The commencement of his new state is regarded as important. — Ver. 15. ἐκολλήθη] *he clung to, attached himself to*, makes the obtrusiveness of his action palpable. — καὶ ἔπεμψεν αὐτόν] The previous object becomes the subject. See Stallbaum, *ad Protag.* p. 320 A, B; Kühner, *ad Xen. Anab.* i. 4. 5; Bernhardt, p. 468. — βόσκειν χοίρους] *to keep swine*; what an ignominious occupation for the ruined Jew! — Ver. 16. γεμίσαι τ. κοιλίαν αὐτοῦ] *to fill his belly* (comp. Themist. *Or.* xxiii. p. 293 D); a choice expression for the impetuous *craving of the hungry man*. — ἀπό] *from*, *i.e.* by means of a portion, as with verbs of eating, Winer, p. 179 [E. T. 248]. — κεράτιον] *Cornicle*, the sweetish fruit of the locust-tree (*ceratonia siliqua* of Linnaeus), used as food for swine, and by the poor as a means of nourishment, Galen. VI. p. 355. See Bochart, *Hieroz.* I. p. 708; Rosenmüller, *Morgenl.* V. p. 198 f.; Robinson, *Pal.* III. p. 272. — κ. οὐδεὶς ἐδίδου αὐτῷ] *not food* (Wolf, Rosenmüller, Paulus), but, according to the context, *κεράτια*. When the swine driven home were fed therewith, which was the occupation of others, he was hungry even for that brutish provender, and no one gave it to him. No man troubled himself concerning the hungry one, to satisfy him even in this manner. That he should eat *with the swine* is appropriately not regarded as a possibility. Moreover, it is not presupposed

that he received *still worse* food than *κεράτια* (Kuinoel, de Wette), but only that he received his maintenance on account of the famine in excessively small *quantity*, by reason whereof his hunger was so great that he, etc. — Ver. 17. εἰς ἑαυτὸν δὲ ἐλθὼν] εἰς ἑαυτὸν preceding, in contrast to the external misery, *but having come to himself* (i.e. having recovered his senses). See examples in Kypke. Comp. ἐν ἑαυτῷ γίνεσθαι, Xen. *Anab.* i. 5. 17; Acts xii. 11. It is the *moral self-understanding*, which had become strange and remote to him, in respect of his condition and his need. — περισσ. and λιμῷ are correlative; ἄρτων is not contrasted with *κερατίοις* (Olshausen), but *περισσ. ἄρτ.* is the contrast to the *little bread*, which did not appease his hunger. *περισεύονται* (see the critical remarks) is *passive*. *They are provided with more than enough*, receive superfluity of bread, Matt. xiii. 12, xxv. 29. Comp. *περισεύειν τινά*, 1 Thess. iii. 12; Athen. ii. p. 42 B.

Vv. 18, 19. With this coming to himself and longing is associated the corresponding *determination*, namely, *to turn back to God, to confess to Him his guilt and unworthiness, and to petition for grace*. In this petition, however, the humility which belongs to the consciousness of guilt sets aside the thought of *complete* restoration. — εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν] *against heaven*. Comp. Matt. xviii. 15, 21, and elsewhere; εἰς τὸ θεῖον, Plat. *Phaedr.* p. 243 C. Heaven does not *denote* God, but is, as the abode of the Godhead and of the pure spirits, *personified*, so that this holy heavenly world appears as injured and offended by sin. — ἐνώπιον σοῦ] comp. 1 Sam. vii. 6, x. 1; Ps. li. 4; Tob. iii. 3; Judith v. 17; Susann. 23. The meaning is: I have so sinned that I have transgressed *before Thee*, i.e. *in relation to Thee*. The moral relation of the deed to the offended subject is thus rendered palpable, as though this subject had suffered in respect of the deed; the *moral* reference is set forth as *visible*. Grotius, moreover, well says: "Non in aetatem, non in malos consultatores culpam rejicit, sed nudam parat sine excusatione confessionem." — Ver. 19. οὐκέτι] *not: not yet* (Paulus), but: *no longer*. — ποιήσόν με κ.τ.λ.] *i.e.* place me in the position of being as one of thy day-labourers. Comp. Gen. xlviii. 20; Isa. xli. 15. *Without* ὥς the petition would aim at the result of

making him a day-labourer; *with* ὡς its purport is: although he is a son, yet to place him no otherwise *than if* he were one of the day-labourers.

Vv. 20–24. *God's compassion in the carrying out of the repentant resolve; after it is carried out, the joyous receiving of him again to perfect sonship.* — καὶ ἀναστὰς κ.τ.λ.] the resolution is no sooner taken than its execution begins. — πρὸς τ. πατέρα ἑαυτοῦ] *to his own father*; no other became the refuge of the unhappy son. There is an affecting touch in ἑαυτοῦ. — κατεφίλησεν] *he kissed him again and again*; see on Matt. xxvi. 48. — Ver. 21. The ποιήσόν με ὡς ἓνα τ. μισθ. σου of ver. 19 is repressed by the demeanour of his father's love; the deeply moved son cannot bring these words to his lips in the presence of such paternal affection. A psychologically delicate and significant representation. — Ver. 22. "Filio respondet re ipsa," Bengel. — στολὴν τὴν πρώτην] *a robe, the first that we have in the house—to wit, according to its rank and worth, i.e. τὴν τιμιωτάτην*, Euthymius Zigabenus. The idea—the one that had previously been worn by him (Theophylact, Calovius), which would be the righteousness lost in Adam—is opposed to ver. 13 in the service of dogmatic interpretation. Moreover, αὐτοῦ would have been added in that connection. With regard to the article after the anarthrous substantive, see Winer, p. 126 f. [E. T. 174 f.]. The στολή is the long and wide overcoat of the people of distinction, Mark xii. 38, xvi. 5; Rev. vi. 11. The δακτύλιος, i.e. *signet ring* (Herod. ii. 38), and the ὑποδήματα (slaves went barefooted), are signs of the *free man*, which he who had returned was to be as a *son of the house*. — Ver. 23. τὸν μόσχον τὸν σιτ.] the well-known one which stands in the stall. — θύσατε] *slaughter*, as at ver. 30, not: *sacrifice* (Elsner). — φαγόντες εὐφρανθ.] not: *lacti epulemur* (Kuinoel), but: *epulantes lactemur*. Beware of forced interpretations like the following: according to Olshausen (comp. Jerome, Euthymius Zigabenus, and others), the στολή πρώτη denotes the divine righteousness (Rev. iii. 18, vii. 13, xix. 8); the ring, the seal of the Spirit; the sandals, the capacity to walk in God's ways (Eph. vi. 15): according to Jerome, Ambrose, Augustine, Euthymius Zigabenus, Theophy-

lact, and others, the fattened calf is Christ! Comp. also Lange, *L. J.* II. 1, p. 381. — Ver. 24. νεκρὸς ἦν κ. ἀνέξ. κ.τ.λ.] is meant by the father in a *moral* sense: νέκρωσιν μὲν καὶ ἀπώλειαν φησὶ τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας, ἀναζώωσιν δὲ καὶ εὑρεσιν τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς μετανοίας, Euthymius Zigabenus. A well-known mode of speaking of death and life (Matt. iv. 16, viii. 22; 1 Tim. v. 6; Eph. v. 14; Rom. vi. 13; passages from the Rabbins, Schoettgen, *Hor.* p. 877 f.; from the classical writers, Bornemann, *Schol.* p. 97). In favour of this view it is manifest of itself that the father says absolutely νεκρὸς ἦν, which he *cannot* mean in the literal sense of the words; further, that after the approach related in ver. 20 f. his soul could be full only of the *moral* change of his son's condition; finally, that he utters the same words, ver. 32, to the eldest son, who, being acquainted with the previous condition of his brother (ver. 30), *could* understand them only morally. The utterance of the servant, ὅτι ὑγιαίνοντα αὐτὸν ἀπέλαβεν, ver. 27, is not opposed to this; for he speaks thus of the returned son of the house, only generally of his condition as it first presents itself to him, beyond which the slave has not to go. He has the right feeling of discretion, that respectfully, in accordance with his position, it does not become him to repeat the judgment of the father, but rather to abide by that external circumstance (*that he has received him back sound*). Even this feature belongs to the lifelike *delicate points* of this history. On all accounts the view is to be dismissed of Paulus, de Wette, and Bleek: νεκρός, *dead as far as I am concerned* (by his remoteness and his dissolute life, and ἀπολωλώς: *lost*, in the sense of *disappeared*). — εὐφραίνεσθαι] *to be glad*. The *feast* is naturally understood according to ver. 23.

Vv. 25-32. The *legally righteous one*. Instead of sharing the divine joy over the converted sinner, he is envious, regards himself—in respect of his legality, according to which he has been on his guard against momentary transgression—as neglected, and judges unlovingly about his brother, and discontentedly about God. A striking commentary on ver. 7; and how fitted to put to the blush the murmuring Pharisees and scribes, ver. 2! — συμφων. κ. χορῶν] *not*:

the singing and the dancing (Luther), but, without the article : *concert and choral dance*, *ῥήμη, ῥήμη*. Music and dancing (commonly given by hired people) belonged to the entertainments of solemn festivals. See Matt. xiv. 6 ; Rosenmüller, *Morgenl. in loc.* ; Wetstein. — Ver. 26. *τί εἴη ταῦτα*] *what this would be likely to signify*. Comp. Acts x. 17. See Matthiae, § 488. 7 ; Krüger, *ad Xen. Anab.* i. 10. 14. — Ver. 27. The slave mentions only the fatted calf, because this happened to be most closely associated with the festival of music and dancing. — *ὕγιαίνοντα*] *not : morally safe and sound (ἀποβαλόντα τὴν νόσον διὰ τῆς μετανοίας, Euthymius Zigabenus, Kyrike, Kuinoel, and many more), but, as is only fitting in the mouth of the slave (comp. on ver. 24), bodily safe and sound*. — Ver. 28. *οὖν*] in consequence of this refusal of the son. Yet, as with Lachmann and Tischendorf, the more strongly attested *δέ* is to be read. — *παρεκάλει*] *he exhorted him to come in*. — he spoke him fair ; see on 1 Cor. iv. 13. — Ver. 29. *καὶ ἐμοί*] The *ἐμοί* placed first has the emphasis of wounded selfish feeling. Contrast ver. 30. — *ἔριφον*] *a young kid*, of far less value than the fatted calf ! Still more significant is the reading *ἐρίφιον* in B, Sahid. (a young *kidling*), which Ewald approves, and the delicacy of which the transcribers might easily have passed over. Comp. Matt. xxv. 33 ; Tob. ii. 11. — Ver. 30. *ὁ υἱός σου οὗτος*] *this son of thine*, in the highest degree contemptuous. He was not going to call him his *brother*. On the other hand, the father, ver. 32 : *ὁ ἀδελφός σου οὗτος*. How bitter, moreover, is : “ *who has devoured for thee thy living*,” and *μετὰ πορνῶν*, as contrasted with *μετὰ τῶν φιλῶν μου* ! — Ver. 31. *τέκνον*] full of love. — *σὺ πάντοτε κ.τ.λ.*] represents to the heart of the jealous brother the two great prerogatives that he had above his brother (hence the emphatic *σὺ*). *Thy constant association with me* (while, on the other hand, thy brother was separated far and long from me), *and the circumstance that my whole possessions belong to thee* (as to the future heir of all, ver. 12), *ought to raise thee far above such envious dispositions and judgments* ! — Ver. 32. *εὐφρανθήναι*] stands first with the emphasis of contrast, in opposition to such ill-humour. — *ἔδει*] not to be supplemented

by σέ, but generally *it was fitting or necessary*,—a justification of the prearranged joy of the house, which, under the circumstances, was a moral necessity. — ἔζησεν] (see the critical remarks) was dead, and *has become alive*, Matt. ix. 18; John v. 25; Rom. xiv. 9.

REMARK.—(1) The exclusive title to the *κληρονομία*, which, according to ver. 31, is adjudged to those who are legally upright, has its justification *in principle*; οἱ ποιηταὶ νόμου δικαιοσύνησονται, Rom. ii. 13. — (2) For the adoption of sinners into this prerogative, which belongs in principle to the legally righteous, the parable indicates the method of self-knowledge, of repentance, and of confidence in the grace of God (faith). But the interposition of this grace through the death of reconciliation, and consequently the more specific definition of that confidence, Jesus leaves unnoticed, leaving these particulars to the further development of faith and doctrine after the atoning death *had taken place*; just as, moreover, He in general, according to the synoptic Gospels, limits Himself only to single hints of the doctrine of reconciliation as seed-corn for the future (Matt. xx. 28, xxvi. 28; otherwise in John). — (3) As the reality does not correspond to the idea of legal righteousness, He points to the example of the son who has continued in outward conformity to the law, but therewith is proud of his virtue, unbrotherly and unfilial, and consequently holds up to the Pharisees a mirror for self-contemplation, the picture in which must tell them how very much they also needed repentance (in order to see the title in principle to legal righteousness realized in themselves), instead of censuring the fellowship of Jesus with publicans and sinners (vv. 7, 1, 2).

CHAPTER XVI.

VER. 2. $\delta\omega\lambda\acute{\eta}\sigma\eta$] B D P \mathfrak{s} , min. have $\delta\acute{\omega}\eta$, which Bornemann in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1843, p. 121, approves, and Tisch. has now adopted. But if it were genuine, it would have been changed, not into $\delta\omega\lambda\acute{\eta}\sigma\eta$, but into $\delta\acute{\omega}\nu\alpha\sigma\alpha\iota$. The *present* came more readily to the transcribers, hence also $\delta\acute{\omega}\eta$ was introduced. — Ver. 6. $\kappa\alpha\iota \epsilon\tilde{\iota}\pi\epsilon\nu$] Lachm. and Tisch. have $\acute{\omicron} \acute{\omicron}\epsilon \epsilon\tilde{\iota}\pi\epsilon\nu$, in accordance with A B L R \mathfrak{s} , min. Copt. Theophyl. (D has $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\pi\epsilon\nu \acute{\omicron}\acute{\iota}$). The *Recepta* easily originated in the desire to vary the expression used in the preceding clause. — $\tau\acute{\omicron} \gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\mu\mu\alpha$] Lachm. and Tisch. have $\tau\acute{\omicron} \gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\mu\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$, in accordance with B D L \mathfrak{s} , Copt. Goth. codd. of It. So also in ver. 7. Rightly: the singular came more readily to the transcribers, because *one* writing was thought of (Vulg.: *cautionem*, Cod. Pal.: *chirographum*, X: $\tau\acute{\omicron} \gamma\rho\alpha\mu\mu\alpha\tau\epsilon\delta\nu$). — Ver. 7. $\kappa\alpha\iota \lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\iota$] $\kappa\alpha\iota$ is to be struck out, as with Lachm. and Tisch., in accordance with B L R, min. vss., as a connective addition, instead of which D has $\acute{\omicron} \acute{\omicron}\epsilon$. — Ver. 9. $\epsilon\kappa\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\iota\pi\eta\tau\epsilon$] E G H K M S V r Δ A, min. have $\epsilon\kappa\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\iota\pi\eta\tau\epsilon$ (Δ has $\epsilon\kappa\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\iota\pi\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon$). B* D L R \mathfrak{s}^* have $\epsilon\kappa\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\iota\pi\eta$; A B** X, $\epsilon\kappa\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\iota\pi\eta$. Several versions also read one of these two. Hence the *Recepta* has decisive evidence against it. Since to understand the everlasting habitations as the word for *death*, and consequently to change it into the plural so readily suggested itself, I regard the *singular* as original, though not $\epsilon\kappa\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\iota\pi\eta$ (Schulz, Scholz, Lachm. Tisch.), but $\epsilon\kappa\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\iota\pi\eta$, since the important authorities which read $\epsilon\kappa\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\iota\pi\eta\tau\epsilon$ (so Matthei) are also in favour of this present form; just as, moreover, the aorist in itself, according to the sense (*cum defecisset*), presented itself most readily to the uncritical transcribers. — Ver. 18. The second $\tau\acute{\omicron}\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\epsilon}$ has evidence so important against it that (condemned by Griesbach, deleted by Lachm. and Tisch.) it must be regarded as a mechanical repetition. — Ver. 20. $\tilde{\eta}$ and $\acute{\omicron}\epsilon$ are wanting in B D L X \mathfrak{s} , min. vss. Clem. Suspected by Griesbach, bracketed by Lachm., deleted by Tisch. But if $\tilde{\eta}$ had been added, $\kappa\alpha\iota$ would have been inserted instead of $\acute{\omicron}\epsilon$, after the model of ver. 19. On the other hand, after $\Lambda\alpha\zeta\alpha\epsilon\text{O}\Sigma$ it was easy to pass over $\acute{\omicron}\epsilon$, which then also caused the omis-

sion of ἤν. — Ver. 21. ψυχῶν τῶν] is wanting in B L 8* min. vss. Fathers. Bracketed by Lachm., deleted by Rinck and Tisch. A gloss, following Matt. xv. 27. — Instead of ἀπέλειχον is to be written, with Lachm. and Tisch., ἐπέλειχον, in accordance with A B L X 8 (D has ἐλειχον). — Ver. 25. σύ, which Elz. Lachm. have after ἀπέλ. αβες, is not found in B D G H L 8, min. vss. (including Vulg. It.), Fathers; and in A it does not come in till after σου. An addition for the sake of the contrast. — ὥδε is so decisively attested, that ὅδε (Elz.) can only appear as an alteration for the sake of the contrast. — Ver. 26. Instead of ἐνθεν Elz. has ἐντεθεν, in opposition to decisive evidence. The more frequent form forced itself in (ἐνθεν does not elsewhere occur in the N. T.). The entire omission of the word is too weakly attested by D, Cant. Colb. Dial. c. Marc. — οἱ ἐκεῖθεν] B D 8* Arm. Vulg. It. Ambr. Lachm. have merely ἐκεῖθεν. Rightly; οἱ is an addition in accordance with what has gone before.

On the parable of the dishonest steward, see Schreiber, *historico-critica explicationum parabolae de improbo oecon. descriptio*, Lips. 1803 (in which the earlier literature is detailed); Loeffler in the *Magaz. f. Pred.* III. 1, p. 80 ff. (in his *Kl. Schr.* II. p. 196 ff.); Keil in the *Anal.* II. 2, p. 152 ff.; Bertholdt in five *Programmes*, Erl. 1814–1819; Schleiermacher, *Schr. d. Luk.* 1817, p. 203 ff.; D. Schulz, *über die Parab. vom Verwalter*, Bresl. 1821; Möller, *neue Ansichten*, p. 206 ff.; Grossmann, *de procurat. parab. Christi ex re provinciali Rom. illustr.*, Lips. 1824; Rauch in Winer's *Krit. Journ.* 1825, p. 285 ff.; Niedner, *Dissert.*, Lips. 1826, in the *Commentatt. theol. ed. Rosenmüller et Maurer*, II. 1, p. 74 ff.; Bahnmeyer in Klaiber's *Stud.* I. 1, p. 27 ff.; Gelpke, *nov. tentam. parab. etc.*, Lips. 1829; Jensen in the *Stud. und Krit.* 1829, p. 699 ff.; Hartmann, *Comm. de oecon. impr.*, Lips. 1830; Zyro in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1831, p. 776 ff.; Schneckenburger, *Beitr.* p. 53 ff.; Dettinger in the *Tübingen Zeitschr.* 1834, 4, p. 40 ff.; Steudel, *ibid.* p. 96 ff.; Fink in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1834, p. 313 ff.; Steinwerder, *üb. d. Gleichn. vom ungerecht. Haushalt.*, Stuttg. 1840; Brauns in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1842, p. 1012 ff.; Francke in the *Stud. d. Sächs. Geistl.* 1842, p. 45 ff.; Heppe, *Diss. d. loco Luc. xvi. 1–9*, Marb. 1844 (in opposition to Francke); H. Bauer in Zeller's *Theol. Jahrb.* 1845, 3, p. 519 ff.; Eichstädt, *parabolam J. Chr. de oeconomio impr. retrac-*

tavit, Jen. 1847; Harnisch also, *a. Erklärung des Gleichn.* etc., Magdeburg, 1847; Wieseler in the *Gött. Viertelj.-Schr.* 1849, p. 190 ff.; Meuss, in *parab. J. Chr. de occon. injusto*, Vratisl. 1857; Hölbe in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1858, p. 527 ff.; Engelhardt in "*Gesetz und Zeugnis*," 1859, p. 262 ff.; (Eylau) in *Meklenb. Kirchenbl.* 1862, Nr. 4-6; Lahmeyer, *Lüneb. Schulprogr.* 1863; Köster in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1865, p. 725 ff.

Ver. 1. After Jesus has given, as far as xv. 32, the needful explanation to the Pharisees and scribes in reference to their murmuring at His associating Himself with the publicans and sinners, He now turns also (*δὲ καί*) to His disciples with the parabolic discussion of the doctrine *how they were to use earthly possessions in order to come into the Messiah's kingdom*. For according to ver. 9 nothing else is the teaching of the following parable, which consequently is, even in its vocabulary (Köstlin, p. 274), similar to the parable at xii. 16 ff. Every other doctrine that has been found therein has first been put there. The *ἄνθρωπος πλούσιος* is *Mammon*, comp. ver. 13; the *οἰκονόμος* represents the *μαθηταί*. Just as (1) the steward was denounced for squandering the property of his lord, so also the *μαθηταί*, maintaining in Christ an entirely different interest and a different purpose of life from that of collecting earthly wealth (Matt. vi. 19 f.; Luke xii. 33, xviii. 22), must needs appear to the enemies, the rather that these were themselves covetous (ver. 14), as wasteful managers of the riches of Mammon (Matt. vi. 24), and as such must be decried by them, ver. 1. As, further, (2) the steward came into the position of having his dismissal from his service announced to him by the rich man, so also it would come upon the *μαθηταί* that Mammon would withdraw from them the stewardship of his goods, *i.e.* that they would come into poverty, ver. 2 f. As, however, (3) the steward was prudent enough before his dismissal, while he still had the disposal of his lord's wealth, to make use of the latter for his subsequent provision by making for himself friends therewith who would receive him into their houses, which prudence the rich man praised in spite of the dishonesty of the measure; so also should the *μαθηταί* by liberal expenditure of the goods of Mammon,

which were still at their disposal, provide for themselves friends, so as subsequently to attain in their impoverishment provision for eternity, the reception into the Messiah's kingdom. The more detailed explanation will be found on the special passages. The text in itself does not indicate any definite *connection with what has preceded*, but is only linked on externally, without any mention of an internal progress in the discussion: *but He said also*—as the foregoing to the Pharisees, so that which now follows to *His disciples*.¹ But Jesus very naturally comes direct to the treatment of *this* theme, because just at that time there were very many *publicans* among His *μαθηταί* (xv. 1) on whom, after their decision in His favour, devolved as their first duty the application of the goods of Mammon in the way mentioned (xii. 33). It is just as natural that, at the same time, the contrast with the Pharisees, just before so humiliatingly rebuked, those covetous ones (ver. 14) to whom the *ποιεῖν ἑαυτοῖς φίλους ἐκ τ. μαμ. τῆς ἀδικίας* was so extremely foreign (xi. 41, xx. 47), helped to urge to *this* theme. Other attempts to make out the connection are arbitrary, as, for instance, that of Schleiermacher (besides that it depends on an erroneous interpretation of the parable itself), that Jesus is passing over to a *vindication of the publicans*, so far as they showed themselves gentle and beneficent towards their people; or that of Olshausen, that He wishes to represent the compassion that in ch. xv. He has exhibited *in God*, now also in ch. xvi. as the duty of *men*. But there is no reason for *denying the existence* of any connection, as de Wette does. — *πρὸς τ. μαθητ. αὐτοῦ*] not merely the Twelve, but the disciples in the *more extended* sense, in contrast with the opposition which was likewise present. Comp. Matt. viii. 21; Luke vi. 13, vii. 11, xix. 37, and elsewhere. The parable had the first reference to the publicans that happened to be among them (xv. 1), but it concerned also, so far as there were generally still wealthy people among them, the disciples in general. See above. — *ἄνθρωπός τις ἦν πλούσιος*] not to be defined more particularly than these words themselves and vv. 5–7 indicate. To think of the

¹ Not as Wieseler will have it, *beside* the Pharisees, to His disciples *also*.

Romans (Schleiermacher), or the *Roman Emperor* (Grossmann¹), in the interpretation, is quite foreign to the subject. Moreover, it is not, as is *usually* explained, *God*² that is to be understood; with which notion ver. 8 would conflict, as well as the circumstance that actually the *dismissal* from the service of the rich man brings with it the same shelter to which, in the application, ver. 9 corresponds,³ the reception into the

¹ He finds in the *οικονόμος* a *Roman provincial governor*, who, towards the end of his oppressive government, has adopted indulgent measures, in order to earn for himself the favour of the inhabitants of the province. He says that thence Jesus, ver. 9, draws the doctrine that as such a one in worldly things behaved himself wisely for an earthly end, so in divine things prudence should be manifested, in order to attain eternal life. Schleiermacher thinks that the rich man represents the Romans, the steward the publicans, the debtors the Jewish people, and that Christ intends to say, that if the publicans in their calling show themselves gentle and beneficent, the Romans, the enemies of the people, will themselves praise them in their hearts; and thus also have ye every cause to concede to them, even in anticipation of the time when this relation ceases (according to the reading *εκλίπη*, ver. 9), the citizenship in the *βασιλεία τ. θ.*

² Observe that this interpretation proceeds on an *a priori* basis, and is therefore improbable; because in both the other passages, where in Luke *ἄνθρωπός τις πλούσιος* is the subject of a parable (xii. 16, xvi. 19), the rich man represents a very unholy personality, in which is typified the service of Mammon and of luxury.

³ The *usual* interpretation (substantially followed also by Wieseler, Bleek, Köster) is in its leading features that of Theophylact and Euthymius Zigabenus: that the possessor of earthly wealth is not the actual proprietor, that being God, but only the steward. If he has not used the wealth according to God's will, he is accused, but dismissed by death. Hence he should be prudent enough, while there is still time, to apply the wealth entrusted to him charitably according to God's will, in order to get into heaven. Comp. Ewald, p. 299: "Every rich man, since he must again surrender all earthly riches at least at death, is yet only placed over them as a steward by God, as by a lord who is far removed, but who one day will claim a reckoning; and he is certainly wise and prudent not to allow the riches to lie useless, but rather, by his effectual application of them, to make to himself friends for the right time; but one ought only to gain for himself friends with his riches for the purpose that in the moment when he must, at least as constrained by death, give them up, he should be received by them into the everlasting tabernacles of heaven." Baur, *Evang.* p. 450 ff., proceeding from the fundamentally *Ebionitic* view, says that the rich man is God in His absolute dominion over all; that in the steward is represented the *αἰὼν οὗτος*, whose doings, however, are determined by the adequate relation of the means to the end; that this prudence is a quality which even the children of light need, since they must know how to set the *αἰὼν οὗτος* in the right relation to the *αἰὼν μέλλων*, and hence to be willing to renounce all that pertains to the former in order to attain the latter; that ver. 9 means that he is not at all to trouble himself with Mammon, but entirely to rid himself of wealth, and hence to

everlasting habitations. But neither is it the *devil*, as ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, as Olshausen¹ would have it, that is meant, since in the connection of the parable the relation to the κόσμος² in general, and its representatives, is not spoken of, but specially the relation to temporal *wealth*.³ Hence its representative, *i.e.* Mammon, is to be understood; but we must not, with de Wette, give the matter up in despair, and say that the rich man has *no* significance, or (Ebrard) that he serves only as *filling up* (comp. also Lahmeyer); he has the significance of a definite person *feigned*, who, however, as such, was *well known* to the hearers (Matt. vi. 24), and also at ver. 13 is expressly

use it for an object of beneficence, because the αἰὼν οὗτος and the αἰὼν μέλλων reciprocally exclude one another. To this Ebionitic view of wealth, as of a benefit in itself unlawful and foreign to the kingdom of God, Hilgenfeld also recurs.

¹ His view is that the publicans may be conceived of as being, by their external relations, in the service of the ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου. According to ver. 13, God was to be regarded as the other true Lord who stood opposed (as the representative of the δεχόμενοι εἰς τὰς αἰωνίους σκηνάς, ver. 9) to this οἰκοδομητοῦ. It was just the prudent διασκορπίζων τὰ ὑπάρχοντα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πλουσίου, who in a right manner serves this true Lord; he despises the one in order wholly to belong to the other; he labours with the possessions of the one for the purpose of the other. But *in opposition* to his true advantage, therefore not prudently, does he act who, like the Pharisees, seeks to place the service of the one on an equality with that of the other. Sec, in opposition to Olshausen, Schneckenburger, *l.c.*

² Midway between Olshausen's interpretation and mine (of Mammon, see subsequently), Schegg makes the rich man mean the *personified* κόσμος. But the idea of κόσμος is here *too wide*, the point in the subject is definitely *the being rich*; hence also at ver. 14, φιλάργυροι. Schenkel also has adopted the interpretation of the rich man as of *Mammon*. Comp. Lange, *L. J.* II. 1, p. 391, III. p. 463.

³ This also in opposition to H. Bauer, *l.c.* p. 529 ff., who finds in the rich man the *theocratic chiefs of the people*, whose chief wealth was the theocracy itself. The οἰκονόμοι must have been the *Jewish Christians*; the *debtors*, the ἀμαρτωλοί and ἰθνηκοί, to whom the primitive community more and more conceded a share in the Messianic blessings. The *dismissal* of the οἰκονόμος was the excommunication of the primitive church; the *friends* were the *Gentiles*, to whom a portion of the legal claims had been *remitted* by the Christians. The *digging* and *begging* must be a new subjection under the chiefs of Israel, with which the primitive church will no longer exchange their free position! The διχισθαι εἰς οἴκους probably points to the necessity of restoring a perfect living intercourse with the converted Gentiles! An arbitrary exercise of ingenuity, making an ὑστέρων πρότερον of the parables of Jesus, by which they are wrenched away from the living present and changed into enigmatical predictions. According to the *Sächs. Anonymus*, the steward is even held to be Paul, who disposed of the wealth of salvation for the benefit of the Gentiles.

steward. The concluding words of ver. 13 are the key of the parable; hence, also, it is not to be maintained, with Köster, that a rich man is only conceived of with reference to the steward. — *οἰκονόμος*] a house steward, *ταμίης*, who had to take the supervision of the domestics, the stewardship of the household, the rental of the property, etc. Comp. xii. 42. and see Heppe, p. 9 ff.; Ahrens, *Amt d. Schlüssel*, p. 12 ff. Such were usually *ἀδούλοι*; but it is implied in vv. 3, 4 that the case of a free man is contemplated in this passage. To conceive of the *οἰκονόμος* as a farmer of portion of the property, is neither permitted by the word nor by the context (in opposition to Hölbe). In the interpretation of the parable the *οἰκονόμος* neither represents *any* in general, nor specially the *evangelists* (thus most interpreters, following the Fathers), nor yet the *Israelitish people* and their leaders (Meuss), nor *sinner*s (Maldonatus and others), nor even *Judas Iscariot* (Bertholdt), also neither the *Pharisees* (Vittinga, Zyro, Baumgarten-Crusius¹), nor the *publicans* (Schleiermacher, Hölbe), but the *μαθηταί*, as is plain from ver. 9, where the conduct analogous to the behaviour of the *οἰκονόμος* is enjoined upon them. The *μαθηταί*, especially those who were publicans before they passed over to

¹ According to Zyro, the meaning of the parable is: Ye Pharisees are stewards of a heavenly treasure—the law; but ye are unfaithful stewards, indulgent towards yourselves, strict towards others; so worthless, even ye are already *condemned*, as was he in the parable; and even your power and your dignity will ~~soon~~ disappear. Therefore, as ye are like to him in your *ἐξουσία*, be ye also like to him in your *φρόνῃς*, strict towards yourselves, benevolent towards others, and that of *οὐκ ὀφείλουσιν*. According to Baumgarten-Crusius, Christ desires a *disapproving* of the disposition and conduct of the Pharisees in respect of the works of love—to direct the disciples to appropriate to themselves something thereof in a better manner. That, namely, which the Pharisees did as sinners in order to cover their sins, and in so-called good works, the disciples were to do, not as sinners, but in order to *exult* by sympathetic *love* ~~in~~ the inequality of the relations of life. Bornemann also explains the *οἰκονόμος* of the Pharisees. See on ver. 9. We ~~must~~ ^{can} similarly distinguish, as in the parable of the prodigal son (see on xv. 11), the *primitive* meaning (according to which the steward was a *heathen functionary* who oppressed the Jews, but afterwards took their part) from the meaning attached to it by the *composer*, according to which the steward was a type of the unbelieving *old Jews*, who might receive a reversion of the kingdom of heaven if they took up the cause of their fellow-believers who had become Christians. This is a sort of double meaning, which neither in itself nor in its twofold contents has any foundation in the text.

Christ, were concerned with temporal wealth, and were therefore stewards, not of God, but of Mammon. — διεβλήθη αὐτῷ] *he was denounced to him* (on the dative, comp. Herod. v. 35, viii. 22; Plat. *Polit.* viii. p. 566 B; Soph. *Phil.* 578; Eur. *Hec.* 863, and thereon, Pflugk; elsewhere also with εἰς or πρὸς with accusative). Although the word, which occurs only in this place in the New Testament, is not always used of *groundless, false* accusations, though this is *mostly* the case (see Schweighäuser, *Lex. Herod.* I. p. 154), yet it is still no *vacua media*, but expresses, even where a corresponding matter of fact lies at the foundation (as Num. xxii. 22; Dan. iii. 8, vi. 25; 2 Macc. iii. 11; 4 Macc. iv. 1, and in the passages in Kypke, I. p. 296), *hostile denunciation, accusation*, Niedner, p. 32 ff. Comp. the passages from Xenophon in Sturz, I. p. 673. See also Dem. 155. 7, where the διαβάλλοντες and the κόλακες are contrasted. So also here; Luther aptly says: "he was *ill spoken of*." Vulg.: "diffamatus est." There was some foundation in fact (hence, moreover, the steward does not defend himself), but the manner in which he was denounced manifested a hostile purpose. Thus, moreover, in the relation *portrayed* in that of the μαθηταί to temporal riches, as the unfaithful stewards of which they manifested themselves to the covetous Pharisees by their entrance into the Christian conversion, there lay at the foundation *the fact* that they had no further interest in Mammon, and were no longer φιλόργυροι. Compare the instance of Zacchaeus. Köster says wrongly that the hitherto *faithful* steward had only been *slandered*, and had only allowed himself to be betrayed into a knavish trick for the first time by the necessity arising from the dismissal. No; this knavish trick was only the path of unfaithfulness on which he had hitherto walked, and on which he took a new start to get out of his difficulty. Against the supposition of the faithfulness of the steward, see on ver. 3. — ὡς διασκορπίζων] *as squandering* (xv. 13), i.e. so he was *represented*.¹ Comp. Xen. *Hell.*

¹ To gather from ὡς that the indebtedness was unfounded (Hölbe) is unjustifiable. ὡς might also be used in the case of a well-founded διεβάζεσθαι, and hence in itself decides nothing at all. Comp. Buttmann, *Neut. Gr.* p. 263 [E. T. 397].

ii. 3. 23: *διέβαλλον ὡς λυμαίνόμενον*, and thus frequently; Jas. ii. 9. It might also have been *ὡς with the optative*; Herod. viii. 90, and elsewhere. Erroneously, moreover, in view of the present, the Vulg. reads (comp. Luther): *quasi dissipasset*. — *τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτοῦ*] therefore the possessions, the means and property (xi. 21, xii. 15, 33, xix. 8), *of his lord*.¹

Ver. 2. *Τί τοῦτο ἀκούω περὶ σοῦ*;] *what is this that I hear concerning thee?* *quid hoc est, quod de te audio?* A well-known contraction of a relative clause with an interrogative clause; Plat. *Gorg.* p. 452 D, and elsewhere. See Kühner, II. § 841. 1; Fritzsche, *ad Marc.* p. 780; Bornemann, *Schol.* p. 97, and in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1843, p. 120. Comp. *Test. XII. Patr.* p. 715: *τί ταῦτα ἀκούω*; Acts xiv. 15. The frequency of this *usus loquendi*, and the appropriateness of the sense just at the opening of the reckoning, gives to the interpretation the preference over this: *wherefore* do I hear, etc., Kuinoel, de Wette, Meuss, and others (comp. Luther, and so early as the Gothic version). — *ἀπόδος κ.τ.λ.*] *give the (due) reckoning of thy stewardship*. The master desires to see the state of affairs made plain. On *λόγον διδόναι, ἀποδιδόναι* (Matt. xii. 36; Acts xix. 40; Rom. xiv. 12), see Schweighäuser's *Lex. Herod.* II. p. 74. Comp. *τὸν λόγον ἀπῆτουν*, Dem. 868. 5. — *οὐ γάρ*] *for thou shalt not*, etc. The master decides thus according to what he had heard, and what he regards as established.

Ver. 3. This reflexion of the steward issued from the consciousness that he cannot deny his guilt, for he sees his dismissal as the near and certain result (*ἀφαιρείται, present*) of the rendering of the account demanded of him. If he were to be represented as innocent, the parable must needs have placed in his mouth a justification, or at least have assigned to him the corresponding epithet. This is also in opposi-

¹ Therefore not the possessions of the *debtors*, to which result van Oosterzee comes, assuming that the steward had made the debtors (who were tenants) pay more than he had given up and paid over to his lord; in the alteration of the bases he had only the right sums introduced which he had hitherto brought into account.

tion to Francke,¹ Hölbe. — ὅτι] equivalent to εἰς ἐκεῖνο ὅτι, see on Mark xvi. 14. — σκάπτειν] in fields, gardens, vineyards; it is represented in Greek writers also as the last resource of the impoverished;² Aristoph. *Av.* 1432: σκάπτειν γὰρ οὐκ ἐπίσταμαι. See Wolf and Kypke. — οὐκ ἰσχύω] not being accustomed to such labour, he feels that his strength is not equal to it. — ἐπαυτεῖν] *infinitive*, not *participial*. On the distinction in sense, see Maetzner, *ad Lycurg.* p. 165. These reflections are not inserted with a view to the *interpretation*, but only for the *depicting* of the crisis.

Ver. 4. The word ἔγνων, coming in without any connecting particle, depicts in a lively manner what was passing in his mind, and is true to nature. The *aeorist* is used not as being the same as the *perfect*, although de Wette will have it so, but expresses the moment of occurrence: *I have come to the knowledge*. Bengel well says: "Subito consilium cepit." — ὅταν μετασταθῶ] *when* (quando) *I shall have been dismissed*. He thus expresses himself to indicate the critical point of time, imminent to him by reason of the near experience that he is expecting, after the occurrence of which the δέχεσθαι κ.τ.λ. is to take place. Comp. ver. 9. — δέξονται] the debtors

¹ According to Francke, Jesus desires to represent the risks of being rich in the passionate rich man, who arranges the dismissal without any inquiry. He is the indebted chief person. The steward is falsely accused: he is driven from the house as not ἄδικος; but the rich man, first of all, drives him by his cruelty to the ἀδικία, which, moreover, was only a momentary one, as the (inequitable) γράμματα were only once used; while, on the other hand, they were only used for the purpose of putting matters on an equitable footing again. In the latter reference Dav. Schulz precedes with the assumption, that the steward wished before his dismissal to do some good. He assumes with equal contradiction of the text, that the setting down of the items of account was done *with the knowledge of the master*. Comp. also Schneckenburger, p. 57.

² Hence—for the steward, before he decides on the expedient, ver. 4, sees digging and begging before him—it is not to be supposed, with Brauns, that he paid the amounts written down, ver. 6 f., from his own funds. Contrary to the text, contrary to ver. 3 f., and contrary to τῆς ἀδικίας, ver. 8, which refers to that writing down. This, moreover, is in opposition to Hölbe, who, in a similar misinterpretation of vv. 6, 7, brings out as the meaning of the parable, that "the publicans, decried by the Pharisees as robbers, etc., are frequently not so. In spite of their being repudiated, they are equitable people, and frequently combine with great experience of life and prudence a heart so noble that they acquire friends as soon as this is only known."

of his master, οἱ ῥηθῆναι μέλλοντες, Euthymius Zigabenus. See Buttmann, *Neut. Gr.* p. 117 [E. T. 134]. — οἴκους] *houses*, not *families* (Schulz), comp. ver. 9.

Vv. 5-7. Τῶν χρεωφειλ.] *of the debtors*, they had borrowed the natural products named from the stores of the rich man. This agrees better with the word, the opposite of which is δανειστής (vii. 41; Plut. *Caes.* 12), than the notion of *tenants*. — From ἕνα ἕκαστον it is seen that subsequently the *two* debtors are mentioned *by way of example*. — τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ] *By the debtors of his own master* he knew how to help himself. — πόσον ὀφείλεις κ.τ.λ.] *Going to work promptly and surely*, he questions their own acknowledgment of obligation, which must agree with the contents of the bond. — Ver. 6. βάτους] ὁ δὲ βάτος (ΠΞ) δύνανται χωρῆσαι ξέστας ἐβδομήκοντα δύο, Josephus, *Antt.* viii. 2. 9. Therefore equal to an Attic *μετρητής*. — δέξαι] *take away*. The steward, who has the documents in his keeping, gives up the bill (τὰ γράμματα, that which is written, in the plural used even of one document, see on Gal. vi. 11), that the debtor may *alter the number*. Usually, that he may write *a new bond with the smaller amount*. But this is not contained in the words; moreover, for that purpose not the *surrender* of the document, but its destruction, would have been necessary. — καθίσας] *pictorial*. ταχέως belongs not to this graphic detail, καθίσας (Luther and others, including Ewald), but to γράψον; the latter corresponds to the *haste* to which the carrying out of an injustice urges. — Ver. 7. ἐτέρῳ] to another. Comp. xix. 20. — κόρους] ὁ δὲ κόρος (ΓΔ) δύνανται μεδίμνους ἄπτικους δέκα, Josephus, *Antt.* xv. 9. 2. — The *diversity* of the deduction, vv. 6, 7, is merely the change of the concrete picturing without any special purpose in view. Comp. already Euthymius Zigabenus.

Ver. 8. Ὁ κύριος] not *Jesus* (Erasmus, Luther, *Pred.*; Weizsäcker also, p. 213 f.), but, as is proved by ver. 9, *the master of the steward*, to whom the measure taken by the latter had become known. — τὸν οἰκονόμ. τῆς ἀδικ.] *ἀδικ.* is a genitive of *quality* (see on ii. 14), *the unrighteous steward*; of *such* a quality he had shown himself in his service, as well by the waste in general as specially by his proceeding with the

debtors.¹ The *dogmatic* idea (Schulz) is out of place in the context. Schleiermacher and Bornemann (comp. also Paulus) construe τῆς ἀδικίας with ἐπήνεσεν: *iniquitatis causa*. Grammatically correct (Dion. Hal. *Rhet.* xiv.; Joseph. *Antt.* xii. 4. 5; Bernhardt, p. 152; Kühner, II. p. 192; Bornemann, *Schol.* p. 98), but here it is in contradiction with the parallel expression: ἐκ τοῦ μαμωνᾶ τῆς ἀδικίας, ver. 9. Comp. also ὁ κριτὴς τῆς ἀδικίας, xviii. 6. And it is not the ἀδικία, but the *prudence*, that is the subject of the praise,² as is shown from the analogy of ver. 9. τῆς ἀδικίας is intended to make it clear that the master praised the steward even in spite of his dishonest behaviour, *because he had dealt prudently*. In the dishonest man he praised "his procedure, so well advised and to the purpose, with the property that still remained under his control" (Schulz, p. 103), even although from a moral point of view this prudence was only the wisdom of the serpent (Matt. x. 16), so that he was not the πιστὸς οἰκονόμος ὁ φρόνιμος (xii. 42), but only φρόνιμος, who had hit on the practical *savoir faire*. — ὅτι οἱ υἱοὶ κ.τ.λ.] Immediately after the words φρονίμως ἐποίησεν, Jesus adds a general maxim,³ *in justification of the predicate used* (φρονίμως). Consequently: "Et merito quidem illius prudentiam laudavit, nam quod prudentiam quidem attinet, filii hujus saeculi, etc.," Maldonatus. Francke erroneously says (compare the

¹ The expression τῆς ἀδικίας contains the judgment of Jesus on the conduct of the οἰκονόμος, vv. 5-7, which, nevertheless, the master praised with reference to the prudence employed. Hence τῆς ἀδικίας is decidedly opposed to the assumption that the steward was honest, and it is only a device springing from necessity to which Hölbe clings, that the faithful steward is called οἰκον. τῆς ἀδικίας only in the sense of his calumniators.

² We may imagine the master calling out to the steward from his own worldly standpoint something like this: Truly thou hast accomplished a *prudent* stroke! Thy practical *wisdom* is worthy of all honour! Comp. Terent. *Heaut.* iii. 2. 26. But to conclude that the steward *remained in his service*, is altogether opposed to the teaching of the parable (in opposition to Baumgarten-Crusius, Hölbe).

³ Not a piece of *irony* upon the Pharisees (Zyro), as Brauns also assumes, understanding by the children of this world the *publicans*, who were *condemned* as children of the world; and by the children of light, the *Pharisees*, as the *educated* children of light. So also Hölbe. Extorted by an erroneous interpretation of the whole parable. Textually the children of the world could only be those to whom the steward belonged by virtue of his *unrighteous* dealing (τῆς ἀδικίας).

“perhaps,” etc., of de Wette) that *ὅτι οἱ υἱοὶ κ.τ.λ.* refers to the *ἐπήνεσεν ὁ κύριος*. This the context forbids by the correlation of *φρονίμως* and *φρονιμώτεροι*. *The sons* (see on Matt. viii. 12) *of this generation* (τῆς ἐξῆς, see on Matt. xii. 32) are those who belong in their moral nature and endeavour to the period of the world prior to the Messianic times, not men who are aspiring after the *βασίλειά τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τὴν δικαιοσύνην αὐτοῦ* (Matt. vi. 33). Comp. xx. 34. See examples of the Rabbinical *אמלך נב* in Schoettgen, *Hor.* p. 298, and Wetstein. *The sons of light* are those who, withdrawn from temporal interests, have devoted themselves wholly to the divine *ἀλήθεια* revealed by Christ, and are enlightened and governed by it, John xii. 36; 1 Thess. v. 5; Eph. v. 8. *The former are more prudent than the latter*, not absolutely, but *εἰς τὴν γενεὰν τὴν ἑαυτῶν*, in reference to their own generation, i.e. in relation to their own kindred, if they have to do with those who, like themselves, are children of this world, as that steward was so prudent in reference to the debtors. The whole body of the children of the world—a category of like-minded men—is described as a *generation*, a clan of connections; and how appropriately, since they appear precisely as *υἱοί*! Observe, moreover, the marked prominence of *τὴν ἑαυτῶν*, which includes the contrasted saying that that higher degree of prudence is not exercised, if they have to deal *with others* who are not of their own kind. With unerring sagacity they know, as is shown by that steward in his dealing with the debtors, how, in their relations to companions of their own stamp, to turn the advantage of the latter to their own proper advantage. On the other hand, in relation to the children of light, they are not in a condition for such prudent measures, because these are not available for the immoral adjustment of the selfish ends of those men, as was the case with those debtors who by their own dishonesty were serviceable to the dishonest sagacity of the steward by the falsification of their bonds.¹ Kuinoel and Paulus, following older commentators, explain: in relation to their *con-*

¹ *εἰς* is therefore to be taken in the quite usual sense of: *in reference to*, but not to be twisted into: *after the manner*, or *after the measure* (Lahnmeier), and

temporaries. But how unmeaning would be this addition, and how neglected would be the emphatic τὴν ἑαυτῶν! Grotius, in opposition to the words themselves, explains: "in *rebus suis*;" Wieseler: for the *duration of their life*, for the brief time of their earthly existence; Hölbe: in their own *manner*, according to their own *fashion*. Comp. Schulz, Lange, and others: after their *kind*; de Wette, Eylau: in their *sphere of life*.—Moreover, εἰς τ. γεν. κ.τ.λ. is not to be referred to *both* classes of men (Kuinoel, Olshausen, de Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius, Brauns, and others), but merely to the υἱοὺς τ. κόσμου. τ. (comp. Dettinger, as above, p. 60 f.), as the words themselves require it as well as the sense; for the prudence of the children of light *in general*, not merely in their relation to those like them, is surpassed by that prudence which the children of the world know how to apply εἰς τὴν γενεὰν τὴν ἑαυτῶν. On such wisdom the latter concentrate and use their effort, whereas the children of light can pursue only holy purposes with moral means, and consequently (as sons of *wisdom*) must necessarily fall behind in the worldly *prudence*, in which *morality* is of no account. As, however, *He also from them* (καὶ γὰρ ὑμῖν) requires prudence, Jesus says,

Ver. 9, giving the application of the whole parable for His disciples who were present — καὶ γὰρ ὑμῖν λέγω, not: καὶ γὰρ λέγω ὑμῖν; comp. on xi. 9. καὶ γὰρ corresponds to the preceding ὁ κύριος, and ὑμῖν to τὸν οἶκον. τῆς ἀδικ. As the master praised that steward on account of his prudence, so *also* must *I* commend to *you* an analogous prudent course of conduct,¹ but in how much higher a sense! — ποιήσατε ἑαυτοῖς φίλους κ.τ.λ.] *provide for yourselves friends, etc.* It is evident whom Jesus means by these friends from the final sentence, ἵνα δέξωνται ὑμᾶς κ.τ.λ. Those who receive you, to wit, are the *angels* (Matt. xxiv. 31; Mark xiii. 27); and *these* are made *friends* of by the beneficent application of riches (comp. xv. 10; to be explained from the mode of expression: τολεῖν εἰς; Ἑλληνας, and the like (see Saupp, *ad Xen. Mem.* iv. 2. 37).

¹ An argument *a minori ad majus* ("si laudari potuit ille . . . quanto amplius placent Domino," etc. Augustine, comp. Euthymius Zigabenus, Grotius, Cornelius a Lapide, Maldonatus, and others, including Ebrard, p. 424) is a pure importation.

Matt. xviii. 10, xxv. 31, xxiv. 31). Thus they correspond to the *χρεωφειλεταῖς* of the parable, but *indirectly*. Ambrose, at so early a period, has this true interpretation, and very recently Ewald. The reference to *God* (Wolf, Kuinoel, Niedner, and others) or to *Christ* (Olshausen), either alone or *with the addition* of the angels (see also Bleek), is not appropriate, since the reception into the Messiah's kingdom is the duty of the *ministering* spirits, accompanied by whom the Lord appears in His glory (ix. 26). According to the *usual* interpretation, *those to whom deeds of love have been done*, the poor, etc., are meant (so also Wieseler, Meuss, Lahmeyer), whose gratitude is earned as the steward has earned the gratitude of the debtors. But in this case *ἵνα δέξωνται ὑμᾶς* must be subjected to a strained interpretation. See below. The *ἐαυτοῖς*, *to yourselves*, standing emphatically even *before ποιῆς*. in B L R s* Tisch., corresponds to the idea that the (higher) analogy of an application *for their own use*, as in the case of that steward, is to be admitted.—*ἐκ τοῦ μαμ. τῆς ἀδικ.*] *ἐκ* denotes that the result proceeds from making use of Mammon, Matthiae, p. 1333; Bernhardt, p. 230; Ellendt, *Lex Soph.* I. p. 550 f. But *Mammon*, the idea of which is, moreover, in no way to be extended to the *totality of the earthly life* (Eylau), is not to be taken in this place as at ver. 13, *personally* (comp. on Matt. vi. 24), but as *neutral*, as at ver. 11, *wealth*.—*τῆς ἀδικίας*] Genitivus *qualitatis*, as at ver. 8: *of the unrighteous Mammon*. As at ver. 8 this predicate is attached to the *steward*, because he had *acted* unrighteously towards his lord, so here it is attached to *wealth*, because it, as in the case of that steward, serves, according to usual experience (comp. xviii. 24 f.), *as an instrument of unrighteous dealing*. The moral characteristic of the *use* of it is represented as *adhering to itself*. Other explanations, instead of being suggested by the context, are read into the passage isolated from the context, to wit, that of Jerome, Augustine,¹ Calvin, Olearius, Maldonatus, Lightfoot, Bertholdt, Rosenmüller, Möller, Bornemann, and

¹ Still Augustine admits (Comment. in Ps. xlviii.) even the *communistic* interpretation: "quia ea ipsa iniquitas est, quod tu habes, alter non habet, tu abundas et alter eget." This is foreign to the context.

others: opes *injuste partae* (comp. Euthymius Zigabenus: ὡς ἐξ ἀδικίας θησαυρισθέντα, τῆς ἐκ τοῦ μὴ διαμερίζεσθαι τὰ περιττὰ τούτου τοῖς πένησιν); that of Drusius, Michaelis, Schreiter, Kuinoel, Wieseler, and others (comp. Dettinger and H. Bauer): opes *fallaces*, or *wealth which allures* (Löffler, Köster); that of Paulus (*Exeg. Handb.*): that Mammon is designated as *unrighteous towards the disciples*, to whom he has communicated little; that of Schulz and Olshausen: opes *impias* (Olshausen: "the bond by which every individual is linked to the αἰὼν οὗτος and its princes"); that of Heppe: that wealth is so designated as being no *true actual* possession (ver. 11); and others. Moreover, a *hidden irony* (Eylau) against an Ebionitic error of the disciples, as if they had imputed to what is earthly in itself the character of ἀδικία, is remote from the words, since the predicate is taken from the conduct of the steward. There are analogous expressions of the Targumists, in which the characteristic peculiarity of Mammon is given by means of a superadded substantive (as ממן דשרר, ממן דמון); see in Lightfoot, p. 844. The value of the predicate τῆς ἀδικ., so far as the structure of the discourse is concerned, seems to be, that this application of wealth for selfish advantage is entirely conformable to the *improba indoles* thereof, according to which it allows itself to be used, instead of only for the purpose of serving the interest of its possessor (Mammon), for the selfish advantage of those who have it to administer. The epithet is *contemptuous*. Ye cannot, considering its nature, better make use of so worthless a thing! Bornemann, *Schol.* p. 98 ff., and in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1843, p. 116 ff., finds the whole precept ποιήσατε κ.τ.λ. to be in contradiction with the moral teaching of Christ, and conjectures: οὐ ποιήσετε κ.τ.λ., "*non facietis (nolite facere) vobis amicos ex opibus injuste collectis*," etc.,¹ without any trace in the evidence for the text. And the doubt of Bornemann is

¹ Bornemann assumes as the meaning of the parable: "Phariseos Christus ait de alienis bonis liberales esse, idque sui commodi causa, atque eorum praeferretos (ἀνθρώπους πλούσιους, ver. 1) non modo hanc in subditis perversitatem et vitiositatem non vituperare et punire, sed etiam laudare prudentiam eorum et calliditatem. At suos id nunquam imitaturos esse Christus certo confidit," etc. This interpretation is erroneous, if only for the reason, that the steward is

solved by the consideration that (1) Jesus does not bid the disciples *provide* themselves with Mammon in a similar way to the steward (the steward did not *provide himself* with wealth at all, rather he bestowed it on the debtors, but for his own advantage), but to apply the riches which they, as having hitherto been *οἰκονόμοι* of Mammon, still had at their disposal, in a similar way to that steward, to make themselves friends; (2) that Jesus requires of His disciples to forsake all (v. 27, xviii. 22 ff., comp. xii. 33) is the less in conflict with the passage before us, that at that time there were around Him so many publicans and sinners who had previously entered into His service (out of the service of Mammon), and for these the words of Jesus contained the command to forsake all just in the special form appropriate to the relations in which they stood. In respect of *μαθητάς*, ver. 1, we are not to conceive exclusively only of the Twelve, and of such as already *had* forsaken all; (3) our text does not conflict with the context (ver. 13), as it rather claims in substance the *giving up* of the service of Mammon, and its claim corresponds to the *μὴ θησαυρίζετε ὑμῖν κ.τ.λ.*, besides allowing the idea of laying up treasure in heaven (see *ἴνα ὅταν ἐκλ. κ.τ.λ.*) to appear in a concrete form. — *ὅταν ἐκλείπῃ*] (see the critical remarks) *when it fails*, i.e. when it *ceases*. Comp. xxii. 32; Heb. i. 12; Xen. *Hell.* i. 5. 2: *ἔχων δὲ ἤκειν τάλαντα πεντακόσια· ἐὰν δὲ ταῦτα ἐκλείπῃ κ.τ.λ.*; 1 Sam. ix. 7; 1 Macc. iii. 29, 45; Ecclus. xiv. 19, xlii. 24; and frequently in the LXX. and in the Apocrypha. This *ὅταν ἐκλ.* indeed corresponds to the point of the parable: *ὅταν μετασταθῶ*, ver. 4, but signifies in the application intended to be made—the catastrophe of the *Parousia*, at the appearance of which, in the *σχῆμα τοῦ κόσμου τούτου* which precedes it, the temporal riches come to an end and *cease to exist* (vi. 24; Jas. v. 1 ff.; Luke xvii. 26 ff.), whereas then the treasures laid up in heaven (Matt. vi. 20; Luke xii. 33, xviii. 22) occupy their place (comp. also 1 Tim. vi. 19), and

liberal with the property of his own master. Consequently the Pharisees would be represented as liberal, not *de bonis alienis*, but with the property *of their own chiefs*. In general, however, it is decisive against Bornemann that no parable is intended to teach *the opposite* of itself.

the complete ἀπάτη of riches (Matt. xiii. 22) is revealed. This reference to the *Parousia* is required in the context by the αἰωνίους σκηνάς, whereby the *setting up of the kingdom* (here also conceived of as near) is referred to. The *Recepta* ἐκλείπητε¹ would mean: *when ye shall have died* (Plat. *Legg.* vi. p. 759 E, ix. p. 836 E; Xen. *Cyr.* viii. 7. 26; Isa. xi. 10, LXX.; Gen. xxv. 8, xlix. 33; Tob. xiv. 11; *Test. XII. Patr.* p. 529). But after *death* that which is first to be expected is not the kingdom of Messiah, or the life *in heaven* to which reference is usually made (even by Bleek), but the paradise in Sheol (ver. 22), to which, however, the predicate αἰωνίους is not appropriate (in opposition to Engelhardt). Moreover, Jesus could not refer His disciples to the condition after their *death*, since, according to the synoptic Gospels (and see also on John xiv. 3), He had placed the *Parousia* and the setting up of the kingdom in the lifetime even of that generation² (Luke xxi. 32, ix. 27). Hence the *Recepta* is to be rejected even on these internal grounds, and to be traced to the idea of the later eschatology. The *everlasting tabernacles* correspond to the εἰς τοὺς οἴκους αὐτῶν in the parable, ver. 4, and typically denote, probably in reference to the moveable tabernacles in the wilderness (comp. Hos. xii. 10; Zech. xiv. 16; Ps. cxviii. 15), the *kingdom of Messiah* in respect of its everlasting duration. Thus God promises in 4 Esdr. ii. 11: "Et dabo eis *tabernacula aeterna*, quae praeparaveram illis," where, in accordance with the context, doubtless the kingdom of Messiah is meant. — δέξονται] not impersonal (Köster and others), but in respect of φίλους, and according to the analogy of ver. 4, the *friends* provided are to be understood, consequently the *angels* (see above); comp. Ambrose. If φίλους be explained

¹ Luther translates: "*when ye faint*," but explains this of *dying*, when ye "must leave all behind you." Comp. Ewald (reading ἐκλείπητε): when ye *can no longer help yourselves*, i.e. when ye *die*. Contextually Meuss refers (ἐκλείπητε) it to the last judgment; but with what far-fetched and artificial interpretation: "*quando emigratis*, scil. *e mamnone iniquitatis*, qui adhuc refugio vobis fuit!"

² Hence also the reading which gives the singular ἐκλείπη (Wieseler ἐκλίπη) is not to be understood, with Wieseler: if he *leaves you in the lurch* (in death); which, apart from there being no ὅμως expressed, would be very harsh.

as denoting *men*, the poor and the like, since the text hints nothing of a future elevation of these to the dignity of stewards (in opposition to Meuss), *δέξονται* must be understood of the thankful and *welcoming* reception; but in this interpretation it would be strangely presupposed that the *φίλοι* would be already in the everlasting habitations when the benefactors *come thither*, or there must somehow be understood a *mediate* *δέχεσθαι* (Grotius: "*efficient ut recipiamini*"), wherein there would be especial reference to the *meritoriousness of alms* (xi. 41, see especially Maldonatus and Hilgenfeld, the latter of whom recalls the *prayer* of the poor in the Pastor of Hermas); but for an interpretation of that kind there is, according to ver. 4, absolutely no justification, and as little for an explanation according to the idea contained in Matt. xxv. 40 (Beza, Calvin, and others, including Wieseler); comp. Luther (*Pred.*): "*Men shall not do it, but they shall be witnesses of our faith which is proved to them, for the sake of which God receives us into the everlasting habitations.*" Luther, however, further adds appropriately that in this there is taught no merit of works.

REMARK.—The circumstance that Jesus sets before His disciples the prudence of a *dishonest* proceeding as an example, would not have been the occasion of such unspeakable misrepresentations and such unrighteous judgments (most contemptibly in Eichthal) if the principle: *ὁ δόλος δὲ οὐ δοξάζεται μαμωνᾷ*, ver. 13, had been kept in view, and it had been considered accordingly that even the *μαθηταί*, in fact, by beneficent application of their property, *must have acted unfaithful* towards *Mammon* in order to be *faithful* towards their contrasted Master, towards *God*.¹ In this *unfaithfulness* their prudence

¹ Hence also the expedient which many have adopted of maintaining that attention is not directed to the morality of the steward's conduct, but only to the *prudence in itself* worthy of imitation (see Luther, Calvin, Grotius, Michaelis, Löffler, Bleek, and many others) must be regarded as mistaken, as on general grounds it is unworthy of Christ. The unfaithfulness which is represented is manifested *towards Mammon*, and this was intended to appear to the disciples not merely as prudence, but also as *duty*. Hence also there was no need for attempting to prevent the misunderstanding, that for a good end an evil means was commended (which Koster finds in vv. 10 13). Ebrard (on Olshausen,

was to consist, because that was the way to attain for themselves the Messianic provision. If further objection has been taken *on the ground* that in the expedient of the steward *no special prudence is contained*, it is to be considered that the doctrinal precept intended at ver. 9 claimed to set forth just such or a similar manifestation of prudence as the parable contains. On the other hand, the device of a more complicated and refined subtlety would not have corresponded with that simple doctrine which was to be rendered palpable, to make to themselves friends of the unrighteous Mammon, etc.

Vv. 10-12. These verses give more detailed information regarding the precept in ver. 9. "*Without the specified application of the possessions of Mammon, to wit, ye cannot receive the Messianic riches.*" This is shown, on the ground of a general principle of experience (ver. 10) from a twofold specific peculiarity of both kinds of wealth, by the argument *a minori ad majus*.—*The faithful in the least is also faithful in much; and the unrighteous in the least is also unrighteous in much*¹—a *locus communis* which is to be left in its entire proverbial generality. It is fitted for very varied application to individual cases. For *what* special conclusion it is *here* intended to serve as a major proposition is contained in ver. 11 f.—πιστὸς ἐν ἐλαχ. is conceived as one united idea. Comp. on Gal. iii. 26; Eph. iv. 1.—Ver. 11. *In the unrighteous Mammon* (here also neuter, and altogether as in ver. 9) those are *faithful* who, according to the precept in ver. 9, so apply it that they make for themselves friends therewith. This faithfulness is meant not from the standpoint of the mammon-mind, but of the divine mind (ver. 13).—ἐγένεσθε] *have become*, before the Messianic decision,—an expression of the moral development.—τὸ ἀληθινόν] placed first as a more emphatic contrast to ἐν τῷ ἀδίκῳ μαμ. (comp. ix. 20, xxiii.

p. 678 f.) says: that the dishonest steward is not so much a symbol as an *instance* of a man who, *in the sphere of unrighteousness* and sin, practises the virtue of prudence; that from him the Christian was to learn the practice of prudence, but *in the sphere of righteousness*. But thus the *contrast* in which the point would lie is first of all *put into* the passage.

¹ Views in harmony with vv. 10 and 12 occur in Clem. Cor. ii. 8; but to conclude therefrom that there is a relationship with the gospel of the Egyptians (Köstlin, p. 223) is very arbitrary.

31): *that which is true*, which is not merely a wealth that is regarded as such, but ("Jesus loquitur e sensu coelesti," Bengel) the ideally real and genuine riches (comp. on John i. 9), i.e. *the salvation of the kingdom of Messiah*. Observe the demonstrative force of the article. De Wette, Bleek, and many others, following older writers, wrongly understand the *spiritual* wealth, the *Spirit*; compare Olshausen: "heavenly powers of the Spirit." It must be that which previously was symbolized by the reception into the everlasting habitations; hence also it cannot be "the revealed truths, the Gospel" (Ewald), or "the *spiritual* riches of the kingdom of heaven" (Wieseler), the "*gifts of grace*" (Lahmeyer), and the like. The objection against our view, that πιστεύσει is not in harmony with it (Wieseler), is not fatal, comp. xix. 17. The contrast indeed is not verbally complete (ἄδικον . . . δίκαιον), but substantially just, since anything that is unrighteous cannot be τὸ ἀληθινόν, but the two are essentially in contrast. — Ver. 12. ἐν τῷ ἀλλοτρίῳ] another specific attribute of the temporal riches, *in what is alien*, i.e. *in that which belongs to another*. For ye are not the possessor, but *Mammon* (in the parable the rich man whose wealth the οἰκονόμος did not possess, but only managed). Altogether arbitrary is the spiritualizing explanation of de Wette, that it is "what does not immediately belong to the sphere of light and Spirit" (comp. Lahmeyer), as well as that of Hölbe, "in the truth which belongs to God." The contrary: τὸ ὑμέτερον, *that which is yours*, by which again is characterized not spiritual wealth, but the *salvation of the Messianic kingdom*,—to wit, as that which shall be the *property* of man, for that is indeed the hereditary possession, the κληρονομία (Acts xx. 32; Rom. viii. 17; Gal. iii. 18; Eph. i. 14; Matt. xxv. 34, and elsewhere), the treasure laid up by him in heaven (Matt. vi. 19–21), his πολίτευμα in heaven (Phil. iii. 20), not a mere possession by *stewardship* of that which belongs to another as its owner, as is the case in respect of earthly wealth. It is an arbitrary interpolation in II. Bauer, *op. cit.* p. 540 f., who understands ἐλάχιστον and ἀλλότριον as the ἄδικος μαμ. of the *legal condition*, to which is to be attributed no absolute significance.

Ver. 13. A principle which does not cohere with *what follows* (Holtzmann), but proves as indubitable the denial which is implied in the *previous question*: "ye shall in the supposed case not receive the Messianic salvation." Ye are, to wit, in this case servants of *Mammon*, and cannot as such be *God's* servants, because to serve two masters is morally impossible. Moreover, see on Matt. vi. 24.

Vv. 14, 15. The mocking sneer (*ἐκμυκτηρίζε·ν*, xxiii. 35; 2 Sam. xix. 21; Ps. ii. 4, xxxiv. 19; 3 Esdr. i. 53) of the Pharisees, who indeed so well knew their pretended sanctity to be compatible with their striving after temporal possessions, Jesus, in ver. 15, discloses at its *source*, which was the self-conceit of their righteousness. *ὑμεῖς ἐστέ κ.τ.λ.*, *ye are the people who make yourselves righteous* (i.e. *declare yourselves as righteous*) *before men*. Contrast: the *divine δικαίωσις* as it especially became the substance of the Pauline Gospel.¹ The Pharisee in the temple, xviii. 11 f., gives a repulsive illustration of the *δικαιοῦν ἑαυτόν*, and he even ventures it in the presence of God. — *ὅτι τὸ ἐν ἀνθρώποις ὑψ. κ.τ.λ.*] *since, indeed, that which is lofty* (standing in high estimation) *among men is an abomination before God*. Comp. Ps. cxxxviii. 6. Thence it is plainly evident that God knows your (evil) hearts, otherwise that which is lofty among men would also be highly esteemed with Him, and not appear as an abomination. This *generally* expressed judgment of God has as its concrete background the seemingly holy condition of the Pharisees, and hence is not indeed to be arbitrarily limited (*multa, quae, etc.*, Kuinoel); but, moreover, neither is it to be pressed to an *absolute* and *equal* application to all, although in relative variation of degrees it is valid without exception. Schleiermacher and Paulus find a concealed reference to Herod Antipas; but this without the slightest hint in the connection could not possibly present itself to the hearers; the less that even ver. 13 cannot be referred to the relation of Herod to Herodias

¹ To attribute *δικαιοσύνη* as the fundamental demand of Christianity to the influence of *Pharisaism* on the development of Christ (see especially, Keim, *Der Geschichtl. Chr.* p. 35) is the more doubtful, as this fundamental thought prevails throughout the whole Old Testament.

(see already Tertullian, *c. Marc.* iv. 34), since this latter was not forsaken by Philip, but had separated herself arbitrarily from him.

Vv. 16, 17. The sequence of thought is: after Jesus had declared His judgment on His adversaries, according to which, moreover, they belong to the category of the *βδέλυγμα ἐνώπιον τ. Θεοῦ*, He now tells them *on the ground of what standard* this judgment has reference to them, namely, *on the ground of the Mosaic law* (comp. John v. 45), of which not the smallest element should lose its validity by the fact that since John the kingdom of the Messiah was announced, and every man endeavoured forcibly to come into it. The stress lies on ver. 17, and ver. 16 is preparatory, but finds its motive in the fact that the announcement of the kingdom, and the general endeavour after the kingdom which had begun from the time of John, might easily throw upon Jesus the suspicion of putting back the old principle, that of the law, into the shade. But no; no single *κεραία* of the law fails, and that is the standard according to which ye are an abomination in the sight of God.¹ *The want of connection* is only external, not in the sequence of thought, and hence is not, as with Schulz, Strauss, and de Wette (comp. also Bleek), to be referred to mistaken recollections from Matthew. Already the source of Luke's account of the journey had *here* operated in vv. 16–18, which in Matthew has its *historical* position. Luke follows his source of information, but it is not without plan that he has supplemented from the *Logia* (Holtzmann), nor has he pieced the passages together like mosaic (Weizsäcker). — *ὁ νόμος κ. οἱ προφῆται ἕως Ἰωάνν.*] We are not to supply (following Matt. xi. 13) *προεφίτευσαν* (Euthymius Zigabenus, and many others), but from what follows (see Kühner, II. p. 605), *ἐκηρύσσοντο*.²

¹ Grotius and others assume as the connection: "Ne miremini, si majora dilectionis opera nunc quam olim exigantur; id enim postulat temporum ratio. . . . Mosis et prophetarum libri . . . functi sunt velut puerorum magisterio; . . . a Johanne incipit ætas melior," etc. Against this is ver. 17, and, in general (comp. Calovius), the manner in which Jesus honours the law (comp. ver. 31).

² Others supplement *ἦσαν* (de Wette, comp. Ewald), which likewise is allowable, and instead of this Theophylact, correctly explaining, places *ἔχον τὰς κεφαλὰς*. In the place of the Old Testament preaching has now appeared since

As the law and the prophets were announced down to the time of John, so from that time onwards (even through John himself) the joyful tidings of the kingdom of the Messiah appeared, and with what result! *Every man*¹ *presses forcibly into it*; “*vi ingruit pia*,” Bengel. Comp. *Xen. Cyr.* iii. 3. 69: *εἰ καὶ βιάσαιντο εἰσῶ*; Thucyd. i. 63. 4: *βιάσασθαι ἐς τὴν Ποτίδαιαν*, vii. 69. 4: *βιάσασθαι ἐς τὸ ἔξω*. See on Matt. xi. 12. — *πεσεῖν*] *to fall into decay*, with reference to its obligation, the opposite of *remaining in force*. Comp. 1 Cor. xiii. 8; Rom. ix. 6; Ruth iii. 18; Judith vi. 9, and elsewhere; Herod. vii. 18; Plat. *Eut.* p. 14 D. Moreover, see on Matt. v. 18. — The νόμος, ver. 17, is not to be taken in any other sense than in ver. 16 (in opposition to Volkmar, p. 208, who understands the *moral law* contained in the legal code); but assuredly the *continuance* here declared, the *remaining in force* of the νόμος, is referred to its ideal contents. The reading of Marcion: τῶν λόγων μου, instead of τοῦ νόμου, is not the original text, as though Luke had transposed Matt. v. 18 into its opposite, but an inappropriate dogmatic alteration (in opposition to Baur, Hilgenfeld). Comp. Ritschl in the *Theol. Jahrb.* 1851, p. 351 f.; Köstlin, p. 303 f.; Zeller, *Apost.* p. 15 f.; Franck in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1855, p. 311 f.; Volkmar, p. 207 ff., whose conjecture, τῶν λόγων τοῦ Θεοῦ, is, moreover, quite superfluous. Against the supposed antinomianism of Luke, see generally Holtzmann, p. 397; Lechler, *Apost. Zeit.* p. 157 f.

Ver. 18. See on Matt. v. 32, xix. 9. Of what Christ has just said of the continual obligation of the law he now gives

John the New Testament preaching. But thereby the *annulling* of the law is not declared (in opposition to Baur, according to whom Luke must have transformed the words of Matt. xi. 13 to this meaning), but, as ver. 17 shows, the obligation of the law is established in a higher sense. This is also in opposition to Schenkel, p. 385, who, mistaking the connection, considers ver. 17 as an assertion of the Pharisees, and ver. 18 as its confutation, but that already Luke himself has ceased to perceive the relation between the two verses. Nay, Schenkel even *strikes at* Matt. v. 18 f. Keim rightly says that Jesus *nowhere* in the synoptic Gospels has declared the abolition of the law. See his *Geschichtl. Chr.* p. 57 f.

¹ A popular expression of the *general urgency*. Hence πᾶς is neither to be pressed, nor, with Bengel, to be supplemented by βιάζομενος. Moreover, βιάζεται is not to be taken of that “*quod fieri debeat*” (so Elwert, *Quæst. et observatt. ad philol. sacr.* 1860, p. 20).

an isolated *example*, as Luke found it here already in his original source. For the choice of this place (not the original one) a special *inducement* must have been conceived of, which Luke does not mention; perhaps only, in general, the remembrance of the varieties of doctrine prevailing at that time on the question of divorce (see on Matt. xix. 3); perhaps, also, the thought that among those Pharisees were such as had done that which the verse mentions (comp. Euthymius Zigabenus). — The saying, however, in the mind of Jesus, serves as a voucher for the *obligation of the law* without exception, on the ground of Gen. ii. 24. See on Matt. xix. 4 ff.; Mark xvi. 6 ff. Olshausen explains this of *spiritual* fornication,¹ that what God had joined together (*i.e.* the law according to its everlasting significance, ver. 17), the Pharisees had arbitrarily loosed (in that they loved money and wealth more than God), and that which God had loosed (*i.e.* the Old Testament theocracy in its temporary aspect, ver. 16), they wished to maintain as obligatory, and had thus practised a twofold spiritual adultery. How arbitrary, without the slightest hint in the text! The supposed meaning of the second member would be altogether without correspondence to the expressions, and the Pharisees might have used the first member directly for their justification, in order to confirm their prohibition of any accession to the Gospel. As to the obviousness of the *exception* which *adultery* makes in reference to the prohibition of divorce, see on Matt. v. 32.

Ver. 19. After Jesus in vv. 15–18 has rebuked the Pharisees, He now *justifies* in opposition to them the doctrines, vv. 9–13, on account of which they had derided Him,—showing them in the following fictitious doctrinal narrative (which is not, as with Hengstenberg, to be transferred to the repast of Bethany) *to what riches lead if they are not applied in the manner prescribed in ver. 9*, to the ποιεῖν ἑαυτῷ φίλους.²

¹ Comp. also H. Bauer, *op. cit.* p. 544, who thinks the meaning is that Israel is not to separate himself from the Mosaic law, and not to urge it upon the heathens.

² The opinion, that by the rich man is meant *Herod Antipas* (Schleiermacher, Paulus), is a pure invention.

Comp. Theophylact. De Wette (comp. Holtzmann) wrongly denies all connection with what goes before, and finds set forth only the thought: *Blessed are the poor; woe to the rich* (vi. 20, 24), so that there is wanting any *moral* view of the future retribution, and hence the suspicion arises that in the first portion, vv. 19–26, “the well-known prejudice” of Luke, or of his informant, against riches and in favour of poverty, is arbitrarily introduced. Comp. Schwegler, l. p. 59; also Köstlin, p. 271, and Hilgenfeld, according to whom the parable no longer appears in its primitive form, and must have received from Luke an appendix hostile to the Jews. The *moral* standard of the retribution is at ver. 27 ff., so emphatically made prominent¹ that it is unreasonable to separate it from the first part of the narrative, and (Strauss, l. p. 632; comp. Schwegler, Baur, Zeller) to speak of the *Essene*-like contempt of riches (Josephus, *Bell.* ii. 8. 3). — δε] transitional, *but to put the matter now, so as to act upon your will*, etc. See above. — καὶ ἐνεδιδύσκ.] a simple connective link, where the periodic style would have turned the phrase by means of a relative, as is done subsequently in ver. 20. — πορφύρ. κ. βύσσ.] His upper garment was of purple wool, his underclothing of Egyptian byssus (white cotton), which among

¹ See also H. Bauer in Zeller's *Theol. Jahrb.* 1845, 3, p. 525, who, however, understands by the rich man the Jewish popular rulers, and by Lazarus the poor Jewish Christians (Ebionites), to the assistance of whom, in their bodily needs, the Gentile Christians (the *κύνες*) had come (Acts xi. 29 f., xxiv. 17, and elsewhere). Such forced interpretations readily occur if the parable is to be explained according to assumed tendencies of the author. Zeller in the *Theol. Jahrb.* 1843, p. 83 f., explains riches and poverty in the parable before us in a *spiritual sense* of Judaism and heathenism; according to Schwegler, however, the similitude is, at least from ver. 27 onward, carried on in the anti-Judaic sense. Baur is of the same opinion, and lays stress upon the manner in which the conclusion exhibits the relation of the Jews (who did not believe in the risen Christ) to Christianity; comp. also Hilgenfeld, *Evang.* p. 201 f. Weizsäcker also finds in it the influence of Ebionitic ideas. Comp. on ver. 1, xv. 11. But in his opinion (see p. 215) the parable concerning Lazarus received a *wider development*, according to which it *now* typifies the unbelieving Judaism, which does not allow itself to be converted by Moses and the prophets, and does not believe, moreover, in the risen Christ; the *rich Judaism* as opposed to the *poor Jewish Christianity* (comp. p. 502). Thus, moreover, the whole parable, as given by Luke, is turned into a *ὑστερον πρότερον* on the ground of the abstractions of church history.

the Hebrews was frequently used for delicate and luxurious materials. — Jesus does not give any *name* for the rich man, which is not to be taken, as by many of the Fathers, as a suggestion of *reproach* (Euthymius Zigabenus refers to Ps. xv. 4), and in general, the absence of the name is to be regarded as unintentional; for the poor man, however, even a significant *name* readily presented itself to the *sympathy* of Jesus. Tradition calls the rich man *Νινευῆς*, which, according to a Scholiast, appeared also in certain mss.; as, moreover, the Sahidic version has the addition: *cujus erat nomen Nineue*.

Vv. 20, 21. In view of the *significance* of the name, we can the less conclude, with Calvin and others, following Tertullian, that this is an *actual history*, since even at so early a period Theophylact describes the occurrence of the circumstances as *ἀνοήτως*.¹ *Λάζαρος*, i.e. *רפא*, abbreviated for *רפא*, *Dus auxilium*, as frequently also among the Rabbins. See Lightfoot on John xi. 1. Not: *רפא*, *auxilio destitutus* (Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, and others). But that any kind of confusion with the Lazarus from Bethany had arisen (de Wette) is a quite arbitrary conjecture. Just as groundless, moreover, is it either to doubt of the historical reality of the Lazarus of the fourth Gospel and his resurrection, because of the Lazarus of the parable being fictitious; or, on the other hand, to support this historical character by the assumption that Jesus in the parable referred to the actual Lazarus (Hengstenberg). The two men called Lazarus have nothing to do with one another. The name which the Lazarus of Bethany actually bore is here a *symbolically chosen* name, and how appropriate it is! — *ἐβέβλητο*] not: *was* laid down (Paulus, Baumgarten-Crusius), but pluperfect, *had been* thrown down. The poor sick man had been cast down there in order to procure for him what fell from the rich man's table. Even in Matt. viii. 6, ix. 2, the idea is not merely that of *lying*, but of *being cast* down. --- *πρὸς τὸν πυλῶνα*] *there at the gate* (see on Matt. xxvi. 71), which led from the *προαύλιον* into the house. The form *εἰλκωμένος* (Lachmann,

¹ Nevertheless, the houses of the rich man and of Lazarus are still shown to this day on the Via dolorosa (Robinson, I. p. 387).

Tischendorf), *afflicted with ulcers* (from ἐλκώ), is convincingly attested, and that in opposition to the usage elsewhere (Eur. *Alc.* 878 : ἤλκωσεν; Plut. *Phoc.* 2 : τὰ ἤλκωμένα); but it was probably formed by Luke, according to the analogy of the augment of ἔλκω and ἐλκύω (Lobeck, *Paral.* p. 35 f.). — Ver. 21. ἐπιθυμῶν] *desiring*, craving after it. Whether he received of what fell or not is left undecided by the expression *in itself*, and de Wette (comp. Bleek) leaves the matter as it is, there being, as he thinks, nothing at all said about what was done or not done, but only about a lot and a condition. But the following ἀλλὰ καὶ κ.τ.λ. shows that the craving was *not* satisfied, which, moreover, presents itself *a priori* according to the *purpose* of the description as the most natural thing. The addition borrowed from xv. 16 : καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐδίδου αὐτῷ, in min. and vss., after πλουσίου, is hence (comp. xv. 16) a gloss *correct in sense*. — ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ κύνες κ.τ.λ.] *but*, instead of being satisfied, *even still* (καί, see Hartung, *Partikell.* I. p. 134) *the dogs came*, etc. An aggravation of the misery, and that too not merely as depicting the negative evil of *neglect* (ἀλλὰ καὶ ἔρημος τῶν θεραπευσόντων, Theophylact; comp. Euthymius Zigabenus), but also *positively*: the unclean beasts and their licking (ἐπέλειχον) aggravating the pain of the helpless creature! According to others (Jerome, Erasmus, Calvin, Wetstein, Michaelis, and others, including Kuinoel, Paulus, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Ewald, Bleek), even the dogs appeared to have *compassion* upon him. So also Klinckhardt, *super parab. de hom. divite et Lazaro*, Lips. 1831. But the *idea of contrast* which ἀλλά must introduce would not thus be made prominent, nor the *accumulation* which καί indicates, nor would the whole strength of the contrast between vv. 21, 22 remain. According to Bornemann, the meaning is: οὐ μόνον ἐχορτάσθη . . . ἀλλὰ καὶ κ.τ.λ., “egestati ejus micæ de divitis mensa allatae, vulneribus succurrebant canes.” This is opposed to the purpose of the doctrinal narrative, to which purpose corresponds rather the *unmitigated* greatness of the suffering (ver. 25; moreover, the rich man’s suffering in Hades is not *mitigated*).

Vv. 22, 23. Ἀπενεχθῆναι αὐτόν] *not his soul* merely (“non

possunt ingredi Paradisum nisi justī, quorum *animae* eo feruntur per angelos," *Targum* on Cantic. iv. 12), but the *dead person* who is not *buried* (as the rich man was, ver. 23), but instead thereof *is carried away by the angels* ("antequam egrederentur socii ex hac area, mortui sunt R. Jose et R. Chiskia et R. Jesa; et viderunt, quod angeli sancti *eos* deportarent in illud velum expansum," *Idra Rabba*, 1137 f.), and that too into Abraham's bosom, where he lives once more and is blessed (ver. 24 f.). Ewald also, and Schegg, hold the correct view. The *usual* device, that the burial of the poor man was left without mention, as being worthy of no consideration, is an evasion, the more arbitrary in proportion as the narrative is a *fictitious* one, the *doctrine* of which indeed concerns only the condition of the *souls* in Hades, while its concrete poetic *representation* concerns *the whole man*; hence Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* I. p. 359, mistaking very inconsiderately the poetic character of the description, calls our explanation folly. — εἰς τὸν κόλπ. 'Αβρ.] בחיקו של אברהם, among the Rabbins also a frequent sensuous representation of special blessedness in Paradise,¹ where the departed referred to are in intimate fellowship with the patriarch who loves them (resting on his breast). Comp. Wetstein. See also 4 Macc. xiii. 16, where Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob receive the dead into their bosom. The κόλπ. 'Αβρ. is therefore not of the same import as Paradise, xxiii. 43, but *Abraham is in Paradise* (comp. on John viii. 56), and has there received Lazarus *to his bosom*. The representa-

¹ Not of the *heavenly* blessedness, in respect of which the κόλπ. 'Αβρ. has been made into "*sinus gratiae divinae*, in quem Abraham pater credentium receptus est" (Calovius). In this way dogmatic theology is at no loss to come to terms with exegesis, maintaining that the *sinus Abrahæ* is not to be understood *subjectively*, "quasi ab Abrahamo et in ipsius sinu receptus Lazarus sit" (and this is nevertheless the only correct view), but *objectively*, as that bosom which "*Abrahamum seu objectum fovet in complexu suo*." Even Lechler in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1854, p. 820 f., doubts that an abode of Abraham *in Hades* may be meant; but without sufficient reason. His reason, at least,—that the angels elsewhere bring about the intercourse between earth and heaven, not between earth and *Sheol*,—is not to the purpose. For the angels have also, in the passage before us, the service of mediation between heaven and earth; they are sent from heaven to the earth to bear Lazarus into Abraham's bosom in the paradise of *Sheol*. The reveries of the later Jews about the angels in the lower paradise, see in Eisenmenger, II. p. 309 ff.

tion of a *repast* (Grotius, Bengel, Michaelis, Kuinoel, and others) does not belong to this place, but refers to the Messianic kingdom (Matt. viii. 11). — *καὶ ἐτάφη*] so that therefore it was not with him as it was with Lazarus, who was carried by the angels, etc. It is usually supposed by way of addition to this: *splendidly, in accordance with his position, and the like.* This is purely arbitrary. — Ver. 23. *Hades* corresponds to the Hebrew *Sheol*, which in the LXX. is translated by *ᾗδης*, and hence denotes the whole subterranean place of abode of departed souls until the resurrection, divided into *Paradise* (xxiii. 43) for the pious, and *Gehenna* for the godless. Ruth R. i. 1: “Illi descendunt in Paradisum, hi vero descendunt in Gehennam.” That *ᾗδης* in itself does not mean the place of punishment alone—hell, although the context may bring with it the reference thereto, is very clearly evident in the New Testament from Acts ii. 27, 31.¹ This is in opposition to West in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1858, p. 265. From the Old Testament, compare especially Gen. xxxvii. 35. The reward and punishment in Hades is a *preliminary* one until the full retribution after resurrection and judgment. The *upper Paradise*, which is in heaven, is not to be confounded with that *lower* one. See on 2 Cor. xii. 3 f. — *ἐν τῷ ᾗδῃ*] which *region* of Hades is meant, is shown by the context. Moreover, let it be observed that the poetry of the narrative transfers even the rich man *as to his whole person* to Hades, see ver. 24, whither he, however, comes down *from the grave*.² — *ἐπάρας τ. ὀφθ. ὀρᾷ Ἀβρ.*] for “Paradisus et Gehenna ita posita sunt, ut ex uno in alterum prospiciant,” *Midr.* on Eccles. vii. 14. Paradise is not conceived of as *higher* in situation (see, on the other hand, ver. 26), but the rich man in his torment has not yet

¹ Comp. Güder in Herzog's *Encyklop.* V. p. 442, and see Grotius on the passage.

² In view of the poetic character of these representations, it is very precarious (see Delitzsch, *Bibl. Psychol.* p. 429 ff.) to seek to gather from them anything on the constitution of a psychical body in the intermediate state (to give instruction on which subject is not at all the purpose of the narrative). Scripture (even 2 Cor. v. 1 ff.) leaves us without any disclosure on this point; hence all the less are we to give heed to declarations of clairvoyants, and to theosophic and other kind of speculations.

until now lifted up his eyes in order to look around him, beyond his nearest neighbourhood. — ἐν τοῖς κόλποις] the plural, as is often the case also in the classical writers since Homer.

Ver. 24. Καὶ αὐτός] and he, on his part, as opposed to the patriarch and to Lazarus. — The poetical discourse as it advances now gives us a *conversation* from the two parts of Hades (for Rabbinical analogies, see in Lightfoot, p. 864 f.), in which, however, the prayer for the service of Lazarus is not on the part of the rich man continued *presumption*¹ (Lange, *L. J.* II. 1, p. 394: "that Lazarus was to be sent on an errand for him"), but finds its motive simply in the fact that it is precisely Lazarus whom he sees reposing on Abraham's bosom. The text does not go further, but leaves to be felt with sufficient profundity what is the humiliating *reversal* of the relation (that the despised beggar was now to be the reviver of the rich man). — τὸ ἄκρον τ. δακτ.] even only such a *smallest cooling*, what a favour it would be to him in his glowing heat! Lange grotesquely conjectures that he asks only for such a *delicate touching*, because he had seen Lazarus in the *impurity of his sores*. In his condition he certainly had done with such reflections. — ὕδατος] Genitivus *materialis*. See Bernhardt, p. 168; Buttmann, *Neut. Gr.* p. 148 [E. T. 170].

Ver. 25. Τέκνον] an address of sympathizing patriarchal love. — The *emphasis* of the refusal lies on ἀπέλαβες, which is hence placed first: that thou hast *received* thy good things; *there is nothing more in arrears for thee as thy due acquittance* (see on xviii. 30), hence to thy lot cannot fall the refreshing craved. Compare the ἀπέχειν τὴν παράκλησιν, vi. 26. If the rich man had not used his treasures for splendour and pleasure, but charitably for others (ver. 9), he would, when that splendour and pleasure had passed away from him, have still retained as arrears in his favour the happiness which he had dispensed with. — τὰ ἀγαθά σου] i.e. the *sum of thy happiness*. — ὁμοίως] i.e. ἀπέλαβεν ἐν τῇ ζωῇ αὐτοῦ. — τὰ κακά] i.e. the *sum of the evil*, corresponding by way of contrast to the τὰ ἀγαθά σου. Observe that αὐτοῦ is not

¹ Comp. also Bengel: "Adhuc vilipendit Lazarum heluo."

added. — *νῦν δὲ κ.τ.λ.*] *but now*, the reversed condition! He has the happiness left in arrear for him; thou, the sufferings left in arrear for thee! That Lazarus is not to be conceived of as *simply* a poor man and unfortunate, but as a *pious* man, who, without special deserving, is a suffering victim, is plain by virtue of the contrast from the unconverted state of the rich man, which brought him into Gehenna, ver. 28 ff. He was one of those to whom applied the *μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοὶ κ.τ.λ.*, vi. 21. Only this is not to be concluded from the *silence* of Lazarus before the rich man's door and in the bosom of Abraham (Lange: "a princely proud, silent beggar—a humble blessed child of God without self-exaltation in the bosom of glory"), for the chief person, and therefore the *speaker*, is the *rich man*. — *παρακαλεῖται*] see on Matt. v. 4; 2 Thess. ii. 16. The notion that the earthly happiness of the rich man had been the recompense for his *τινα ἀρετήν*, and the misery of Lazarus the punishment for his *τινα κακίαν* (Euthymius Zigabenus, Theophylact; comp. Rabbins in Wetstein), is an incongruous reflection.

Ver. 26. *Ἐπὶ πᾶσι τούτοις*] *Moreover, in addition to all*. Comp. iii. 20. See on Eph. vi. 16, and Wetstein. There follows now after the argumentum *ab aequo*, ver. 25, still the argumentum *ab impossibili* for the non-compliance with the request. — *χάσμα*] *a yawning chasm, cleft*, frequently found in the classical writers; comp. *χάσμα μέγα* in the LXX. 2 Sam. xviii. 17. The idea of *such* a separation between the two portions of Hades does not occur among the Rabbins, among whom sometimes a separating *wall* is mentioned, sometimes it is said that the intervening space is only a hand, nay, only a thread in breadth. See Lightfoot, p. 857; Eisenmenger, *Entdeckt. Judenth.* II. p. 314 i. The chasm belongs to the *poetical* representation; the *thought* is the unalterable separation. The reference to Hesiod, *Theog.* 740, where in *Tartarus itself* is a *χάσμα* (comp. Eur. *Phoen.* 1599), is inappropriate. — *ἐστήρικται*] *is established*, so that it is never again closed. — *ὅπως*] purpose of the *μεταξύ* down to *ἐστήρ.* — *διαβῆναι*] *pass over*. — *μηδὲ κ.τ.λ.*] omitting the article before *ἐκείθεν*: *and therewith thry may not cross over thence to us*. The subject

is self-evident. The *Recepta* οἱ ἐκεῖθεν would have to be explained either, with Buttmann, by supplying θέλοντες διαβῆναι, or as a case of attraction instead of οἱ ἐκεῖ ἐκεῖθεν, Kühner, II. p. 319. Comp. Plat. *Cratyl.* p. 403 D; Thuc. viii. 107. 2.

Vv. 27-31. What riches lead to when they are not applied according to ver. 9, is shown vv. 19-26. In order, however, to escape from this perdition while there is still time, *repentance* is necessary, and for this *the law and the prophets* are the appointed means (comp. vv. 16, 17); and, indeed, these are so perfectly sufficient that even the return of a dead person to life would not be more effectual. — Ver. 28. ὅπως] Purpose of the sending; ἔχω . . . ἀδελφ. is a parenthetic clause; his style is pathetic. — διαμαρτύρ.] *that he may testify to them*, to wit, of the situation in which I am placed, because I have not repented. Ὅρα πῶς ὑπὸ τῆς κολάσεως εἰς συναισθήσιν ἦλθεν, Theophylact. — Ver. 29. ἀκουσάτωσαν αὐτῶν] *they should give heed (listen) to them!* — Ver. 30. οὐχί] *nay!* they will not hear them. The echo of his own experience gained in the position of secure obduracy! — ἀπὸ νεκρῶν] belongs to πορευθῆ. — Ver. 31. οὐδὲ ἐάν] *not even (not at all). if.* — πεισθήσονται] not immediately πιστεύουσιν (Vulg. Euthymius Zigabenus, Luther, and others), but: *they will be moved, will be won over*, namely, to repent. — A reference to the resurrection of *Jesus* (Olshausen), or to the manifestation of *Elias* (Baumgarten-Crusius), is altogether remote, although the word of Abraham has certainly *approved itself historically* even in reference to the risen Christ. The illustration, moreover, by the example of Lazarus of Bethany, who brought intelligence from Hades, and whom the Jews would have killed, John xii. 10. is not to the point (Chrysostom, Theophylact, Euthymius Zigabenus).

CHAPTER XVII.

VER. 1. Instead of τοῦ μὴ Elz. has merely μὴ. But τοῦ is decisively attested. Tischendorf has the arrangement τοῦ τὰ σκ. μὴ ἐλθ., following B L X \aleph ; the usual order of the words was favoured because of Matt. xviii. 7. — οὐαὶ δέ] B D L \aleph , min. vss. Lachm. have πλὴν οὐαὶ. From Matt. xviii. 7. — Ver. 2. μύλος ὀνιχός] B D L \aleph , min. vss., including Vulg. It., have λίθος μυλινός. Recommended by Griesbach, adopted by Lachm. and Tisch.; the *Recepta* is from Matt. xviii. 6. — Ver. 3. δέ] is wanting in B D L X \aleph , min. vss., also Vulg. It. Condemned by Griesb., deleted by Rinck, Lachm. Tisch. A connective addition, in accordance with Matt. xviii. 15, from which place, moreover, εἰς σέ is intruded, in Elz. Scholz, after ἀμάρτη. — Ver. 4. ἀμάρτη] Decisive authorities have ἀμαρτήση. Approved by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. and Tisch.; ἀμάρτη is a mechanical repetition from ver. 3. — The second τῆς ἡμέρας has such important evidence against it, that Rinck, Lachm. Tisch. have rightly deleted it. An exegetical addition to balance the previous clause. — After ἐπιστρέψῃ Elz. adds ἐπὶ σέ. In any case wrong; since A B D L X Λ \aleph , min. Clem. have πρὸς σε (approved by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. and Tisch.), while E F G H K M S U V Γ Δ , min. vss. Or. Dam. have nothing at all (so Griesb. Matth. Scholz). πρὸς σε is preponderatingly attested; it was variously supplied (ἐπὶ, εἰς) when passed over as superfluous. — Ver. 6. Instead of εἴχεται there is stronger evidence in favour of ἔχεται (so Tisch.); the former is an emendation. — Ver. 7. ἀνάπαισαι] Between this form and ἀνάπαισε (Matth. Lachm. Tisch.), the authorities are very much divided. The former was corrected by the latter as in xiv. 10. — Ver. 9. ἐλείψω] is not found in decisive witnesses; deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. An addition for the sake of more precise statement, which, moreover, is accomplished in Elz. by adding αὐτῷ after διαταχθ. — οὐ δοκῶ] is wanting in B L X \aleph , min. Copt. Arm. Aeth. Verc. Cypr. Bracketed by Lachm., deleted by Tisch. But how easily might the following οὐτῶ become an occasion for the omission! For the addition just of these superfluous and yet peculiar words there was no

reason. — Ver. 10. The second $\delta\tau\iota$ is wanting in A B D I 8, min. Slav. Vulg. It. Or. and other Fathers. Suspected by Griesb., deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. A connective addition. — Ver. 11. $\delta\alpha\mu\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\upsilon$] D has merely $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\upsilon$, which, dependent on $\delta\iota\acute{\eta}\rho\chi\epsilon\tau\omicron$, is to be considered as an exegetic marginal note. The $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\upsilon$ written on the margin occasioned the readings $\delta\alpha\mu\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\upsilon$ (B L 8, 28, Lachm. [Tisch. 8]), which *usus loquendi* is foreign to the New Testament, and $\alpha\acute{\nu}\alpha\mu\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\upsilon$ (i. 13. 69, *al.*). — Ver. 23. Before the second $\iota\delta\omicron\upsilon$ Elz. Scholz, Lachm. have $\tilde{\eta}$, but in opposition to B D K L X II, min. Slav. Vulg. ms. Theophylact. An addition, according to the analogy of Matt. xxiv. 23. Tisch. has the arrangement $\iota\delta\omicron\upsilon\ \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\epsilon\tilde{\iota}$, $\iota\delta\omicron\upsilon\ \tilde{\omega}\delta\epsilon$, following B L, Copt., and in any case it occurred more naturally to the transcribers, partly on its own account, partly following ver. 21 and Matt. xxiv. 23, to place $\tilde{\omega}\delta\epsilon$ first. — Ver. 24. After $\tilde{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$ Elz. has $\kappa\alpha\iota$; bracketed by Lachm., deleted by Tisch. A very easily occurring addition (comp. ver. 26), which has preponderating evidence against it. Comp. on Matt. xxiv. 27. — $\epsilon\upsilon\ \tau\tilde{\eta}\ \eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$] is, indeed, deleted by Lachm., but is wanting only in B D, 220, codd. of It., and is to be maintained. If it had been added, $\epsilon\upsilon\ \tau\tilde{\eta}\ \pi\alpha\rho\upsilon\sigma\iota\alpha\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ would have been written, according to Matt. xxiv. 27, and this would have had not merely a few (248, codd. of It. Ambr.), but preponderating authorities. The omission may easily have arisen by means of the homocoteleuton $\alpha\acute{\nu}\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\tau\omicron\ \dots\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\tau\omicron$. — Ver. 27. $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\epsilon\gamma\alpha\mu\acute{\iota}\zeta\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron$] Lachm. Tisch., on preponderating evidence, have $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\alpha\mu\acute{\iota}\zeta\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron$. Rightly; the former is a kind of gloss, following Matt. xxiv. 38. — Ver. 30. Here also, as at vi. 23, $\tau\acute{\alpha}\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}$ is to be read, in accordance with B D K X II 8** min. — Ver. 34 f. The articles before $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\varsigma$ and before $\mu\iota\alpha$ in Elz. Tisch. (the second also in Scholz, Lachm. [Tisch. 8]) have such strong evidence against them, that they appear to have been added, according to the analogy of $\acute{\omicron}\ \acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$ and $\eta\ \acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\rho\alpha$. — After ver. 35 Elz. Scholz have (ver. 36): $\Delta\upsilon\omicron\ \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\tau\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\upsilon\ \tau\tilde{\omega}\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\gamma\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\cdot\ \acute{\omicron}\ \epsilon\tilde{\iota}\varsigma\ \pi\alpha\rho\alpha\lambda\eta\phi\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$, $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\omicron}\ \acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\phi\epsilon\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$. Against such decisive evidence, that we cannot suppose an omission occasioned by the homocoteleuton (Scholz), but an interpolation from Matt. xxiv. 24. — $\sigma\upsilon\eta\alpha\chi\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\omicron\upsilon\tau\alpha\iota\ \acute{\omicron}\ \acute{\alpha}\epsilon\tau\omicron\iota$] Tisch. has $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\omicron}\ \acute{\alpha}\epsilon\tau\omicron\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\sigma\upsilon\eta\alpha\chi\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\omicron\upsilon\tau\alpha\iota$, on very important evidence. The *Recepta* is from Matt. xxiv. 28.

Vv. 1–4. The Pharisees (xvi. 14) are despatched and dismissed (xvi. 15–31), and Jesus now again turns Himself, as at xvi. 1, to His disciples, and that with an *instruction and admonition in reference to σκάνδαλα*, a subject which He

approached the more naturally that it was precisely the conduct of the Pharisees which had occasioned the entire set of discourses (xv. 2), and especially had introduced the last portion (xvi. 14), that was of a very offensive nature to the disciples of Jesus, and might become injurious to their moral judgment and behaviour. Comp. already Theophylact. The course of the previous discourse therefore still goes on, and it is unfair to Luke to deny to the formula εἶπε δὲ κ.τ.λ. the attestation of the point of time, and to maintain that there is no connection with the entire section, vv. 1-10 (de Wette, Holtzmann; comp. Michaelis, Paulus, Kuinoel). — The contents of vv. 1-4 are of such a kind that these sayings, especially in a dissimilar form, might be used several times on various occasions (comp. Matt. xviii. 7, 6, 15, 21 f.). In the form in which Luke gives them, he found them in his original source of the journey.¹ — ἀνένδεκτόν ἐστι] equivalent to οὐκ ἐνδέχεται, xiii. 33, not preserved elsewhere than in Gregor. Cor. and Artem. *Oncir.* ii. 70. The expression ἐνδεκτόν ἐστι occurs in Apollonius, *de Constr.* p. 181, 10, *de Adv.* p. 544, 1. — τοῦ μὴ ἐλθεῖν] the genitive dependent on the neuter adjective used as a substantive (Kühner, II. p. 122): the *impossible* (impossibility) of *their not coming* occurs. Winer views it otherwise, p. 293 [E. T. 412]. — λυσιτελεῖ αὐτῷ, εἰ] *it is profitable for him, if*. In what follows observe the perfects, *cast around, and he is thrown*, by which the matter is declared as completed, and in its completion is made present. — ἥ] as xv. 7. — ἵνα] *than to deceive, i.e. than if he remained alive to deceive*. The being drowned is here conceived of as *before* the completion of the deceiving. Matthew has it otherwise, xviii. 6. — τῶν μικρῶν τούτων] pointing to those *present*, not, however, *children* (Bengel and others), but *disciples*, who were still feeble, and therefore easily led astray, — *little ones* among the disciples, beginners and simple ones.

¹ According to Holtzmann (comp. Weiss), Luke attempts the return to Mark ix. 42 (Matt. xviii. 6), but finds the assertions of Mark ix. 43-47 "too glaring and paradoxical." But these assertions were already from the *Logia* too widely known and current for this; and how wanting in motive would be that return, which still would not be carried out! Comp. Weiss in the *Jahrb. f. D. Theol.* 1864, p. 101.

According to xv. 1, 2, it is to be supposed that some of them at least were converted publicans and sinners. To explain the expression from Matt. xviii. 6 or x. 42 is not allowable, since there it has in its connection a reason for its insertion, which does not occur here.—Ver. 3. “Considering that offences against the weak are thus inevitable and punishable, I warn you: *Be on guard for yourselves*, take care of yourselves lest offences occur in your own circle.” *In what way* especially such offences are to be avoided, the following exhortation then declares, to wit, by indefatigable *forgiving love*, by that disposition therefore which was, in fact, so greatly wanting to the Pharisees, that they could murmur, as at xv. 2. — ἀμάρτη] *shall have committed a fault*, namely, *against thee*, which the context proves by ἄφες αὐτῷ and ver. 4. — ἐπιτίμ. αὐτῷ] *censure him*, ἐπίπληξον ἀδελφικῶς τε καὶ διορθωτικῶς, Euthymius Zigabenus. Comp. 2 Tim. iv. 2. — ἐπιστρέψῃ] *a graphic touch*, shall have *turned round*, i.e. shall have *come back* to thee (πρός σε belongs to this). He has previously turned away from him, and departed.—The representation by means of ἐπτάκις κ.τ.λ. (comp. Ps. cxix. 164) finds its justification in its *purpose*, to wit, to lay stress upon forgiveness as *incapable of being wearied out*; hence we are not to think of the possible want of principle of such an offender, nor to regard the expression either as a misunderstanding (Michaelis) or as a transformation from Matt. xviii. 21 f. (de Wette, Weiss). Whether ver. 4 stood in the *Logia* after Matt. xviii. 15 is an open question, at least it does not form the necessary pre-supposition of Matt. xviii. 21.

Vv. 5, 6. At the conclusion of the whole of the great set of discourses, now at length appear separately *the Twelve* (οἱ ἀπόστολοι, not to be identified with the μαθηταῖς in general, ver. 1, xvi. 1) with a special request. They feel that the moral strength of their faith in Jesus, i.e. just the *loving power* of their faith, is not great enough for that great task which is just set them at ver. 4, and ask openly, and with entire confidence in His divine spiritual power, Give us *more faith*, i.e. stronger energetic faith! It is addition in the sense of *intensifying the quality*. To suppose a want of connection

(Paulus, Schleiermacher, de Wette, Holtzmann), would be justifiable only if it were necessary for *πίστις* to mean *belief in miracles* (comp. Matt. xvii. 20); but this the answer in nowise requires. The answer, ver. 6, says: "This your prayer shows that faith (which Jesus, indeed, conceives of in the ideal sense, as it *ought* to be) is still wholly wanting to you! If you had it even only in very small measure, instead of finding obedience to that rule too difficult, ye would undertake and see accomplished that even which appears impossible (which requires the highest moral power and strength)." According to the reading *ἔχετε* (see the critical remarks) the idea *changes*. In the protasis the relation is simply *stated*, but the apodosis is conditioned by the idea that that which is stated *is not, however, actually present*. Comp. on 2 Cor. xi. 4; Kühner, *ad Xen. Anab.* vii. 6. 15.¹ — *ὑπήκουσεν*] not again imperfect, but aorist: ye would say, . . . *and it would have obeyed you* (immediately even upon your saying). Comp. *Xen. Anab.* v. 8. 13. On the *mulberry tree*, see Pliny, *N. H.* xiii. 14; Dioscor. i. 182.

Vv. 7-10. To such efficiency will faith bring you, but guard yourselves withal from any claim of your own meritoriousness! Thus, instead of an immediate fulfilment of their prayer, ver. 5, as conceived by them, Jesus, by the suggestion, quite as humbling as it was encouraging, that is contained in ver. 6, and by the warning that is contained in ver. 7 ff., opens up to His disciples the way on which He has to lead them in psychological development to the desired increase of faith. Here also Maldonatus, Kuinoel, de Wette, Neander, Bleek, Holtzmann deny the connection. — *ὅς κ.τ.λ.*] *ἐστὶ* is to be supplied before. — *ἐνθὲως*] is connected by Erasmus, Beza, Calvin, de Wette, Bleek, and others with *ἐρεῖ*. But that it belongs to what *follows* (Luther, Bengel, Lachmann, Tischen-

¹ Otherwise Buttmann in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1858, p. 483: "Ye ask for an increase of your faith? Have ye then not enough? Verily, and if ye only had faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye would be able, *if ye wished* (i.e. if ye had confidence in your own faith,—the courage of faith,—or made the right use of your faith), to say to this fig tree," etc. But the "*if ye would*" is interpolated; the *εἰ* with *ἐλάττει* simply signifies: in a case that may happen if the case of such a miraculous transplantation were supposed.

dorf, Ewald, and others) is indicated in the context by *μετὰ ταῦτα φάγεσαι κ.τ.λ.*, which is the opposite of *εὐθέως παρελθ. ἀνάπεσαι*. As to *ἀνάπεσαι*, see on xiv. 10. — Ver. 8. *ἀλλ' οὐχὶ κ.τ.λ.*] but will he not say to him? *ἀλλά* refers to the negative meaning of the foregoing question. See Krüger, *ad Anab.* ii. 1. 10; Kühner, *ad Mem.* i. 2. 2. — *ἕως φάγω κ.τ.λ.*] until I shall have eaten and drunk, so long must the *διακονεῖν* last. — *φάγεσαι κ. πίεσαι*] futures. See Winer, pp. 81, 82 [E. T. 109, 110]. — Ver. 9. *μὴ χάριν ἔχει*] still he does not feel thankful to the servant, does he? which would be the case if the master did not first have Himself served. On *χάριν ἔχει*, comp. 1 Tim. i. 12; it is purely classical, Bremi, *ad Lys.* p. 152. — *τὰ διαταχθ.*] the ploughing or tending. — Ver. 10. *οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς κ.τ.λ.*] like the slave, to whom no thanks are due. We are not to supply *ἐστέ* after *ὑμεῖς*. — *ἀχρεῖοι*] unprofitable slaves. Comp. Xen. *Mem.* i. 2. 54: *ὁ τι ἀχρεῖον ἦ καὶ ἀνωφελές*. On the contemptuous meaning, see Lobeck, *ad Aj.* 745. The point of view of this predicate¹ is, according to the context (see what follows), this, that the *profit* does not begin until the servant goes beyond his obligation. If he do less than his obligation, he is *hurtful*; if he come up to his duty, it is true he has caused no damage, but still neither has he achieved any positive *χρεία*, and must hence acknowledge himself a *δούλος ἀχρεῖος*, who as being such has no claims to make on his Lord for praise and reward. Judged by this ethical standard, the *χρεία* lies beyond the point of duty, for the coming up to this point simply averts the *damage* which, arising from the *defect* of performance, would otherwise accrue. The impossibility, however, even of coming up to this point not only excludes all *opera supererogativa*, but, moreover, cutting off all merit of works, forms the ethical foundation of justification by faith. The meaning “worthless” (J. Müller, *v. d. Sünde*, I. p. 74) is not the signification of the word (any more than in LXX. 2 Sam. vi. 22, *לֹא־עוֹשֵׂה*), but it follows

¹ Otherwise Matt. xxv. 30. The different reference in the two passages is explained from the relative nature of the conception. Bengel aptly says: “Miser est, quem Dominus servum inutilem appellat Matt. xxv. 30; beatus, qui se ipse. . . . Etiam angeli possunt se servos inutiles appellare Dei.”

at once from this. Moreover, the passage before us does not stand in contradiction to xii. 37, since the absence of merit on the part of man, by which Jesus here desires to *humble* him, does not exclude the divine reward of grace, by which in xii. 37 He *encourages* him. It is incorrect to say that Jesus promised to His disciples no other reward than that which is found in the fulfilment of duty itself (Schenkel).

Vv. 11-19. The great discussion from xv. 1 onwards is now concluded. Now, before proceeding with his narration, Luke first gives into the reader's hands again the thread of the account of the journey (comp. ix. 51, xiii. 22). According to de Wette, indeed, this is a *confused* reminiscence of the journey, and according to Schleiermacher an original introductory formula left standing by the compiler. — καὶ αὐτός] As to καί, see on v. 12. αὐτός: *he on his part*, independently of other travellers to the festival who were wont to travel direct through Samaria, Joseph. *Antt.* xx. 6. 1. — διὰ μέσου Σαμαρ. κ. Γαλιλ.] According to the usage of μέσου (with or without an article, see Sturz, *Lex. Xen.* III. p. 120) with a genitive, this may mean either *through the midst of Samaria and Galilee* (iv. 30; Jer. xxxvii. 4; Amos v. 17; Bornemann, *ad Xen. Anab.* i. 2. 23), or *through the strip of country forming the common boundary of Samaria and Galilee, i.e. between the two countries on the borders*. So Xen. *Anab.* i. 4. 4: διὰ μέσου (*in the midst through between the two walls*) δὲ ῥεῖ τούτων ποταμός; Plat. *Leg.* vii. p. 805 E. Comp. ἀνὰ μέσον, Ezek. xxii. 26; Judg. xv. 4; 1 Kings v. 12. The former (Vulg. and many others, including de Wette) is opposed to the context, since Samaria is named *first*, but the πορεύεσθαι εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ led first through *Galilee*.¹ No; according to Luke, Jesus Himself jour-

¹ According to this understanding Jesus must have journeyed, not southwards, but northwards, which Paulus and Olshausen actually suppose, understanding it of a subordinate journey from Ephraim (John xi. 54). But this is totally opposed to the direction (εἰς Ἱερουσ.) specified in the context, in respect of which Jesus is wrongly transferred already at x. 38 to Bethany. See on ix. 51. Schleiermacher's view of this passage is altogether untenable, as well as that of de Wette, according to whom (comp. Strauss, II. p. 202) the notice is only intended to explain the presence of a Samaritan, and therefore Σαμαρεία; is put first. As though Luke would have written in such a thoughtless mechanical fashion!

neyed *in the midst, between* ("in confinio," Bengel), *through the two countries*, so that He kept on the boundary, having before Him on the south Samaria, on the north Galilee. See also Wetstein, Schleiermacher, Bleek, Hofmann, *Weissag. u. Erfüll.* II. p. 113; Lange, *L. J.* II. 2, p. 1065. His direction is to be regarded as from west to east, as in xviii. 35 He comes into the neighbourhood of Jericho. Now as Jericho is situated not far from the Jordan, but Luke says nothing of any passing over to Perea (nevertheless Wetstein assumes this crossing over, which is said to have occurred at Scythopolis, so also Lichtenstein, p. 318), it is thus, according to Luke, to be assumed that Jesus journeyed across on the boundary of Samaria and Galilee eastward as far as the Jordan, and then passing downwards on the Jordan reached Jericho. A disagreement with Matthew and Mark, who make Him journey through Perea. See on Matt. xix. 1. — That *Σαμαρείας* is named *first*, has its natural reason in the previous statement of the direction *εἰς Ἱερουσ.*, in accordance with which, in mentioning the borders, Luke has first of all in view the *forward movement* corresponding to this direction. The narrative contained in ver. 12 ff. Luke has not "constructed out of tradition" (Holtzmann), but has borrowed it from his source of the journey. — *δέκα*] *οἱ ἐννέα μὲν Ἰουδαῖοι ἦσαν, ὁ δὲ εἰς Σαμαρείτης ἡ κοινωνία δὲ τῆς νόσου τότε συνήθροισεν αὐτοὺς ἀκούσαντας, ὅτι διέρχεται ὁ Χριστός*, Euthymius Zigabenus. — *πόρρωθεν*] *μὴ τολμῶντες ἐγγίσαι* (Theophylact)—to wit, as being unclean, to whom closer intercourse with others was forbidden (Lev. xiii. 46; Num. v. 2 f.). See on Mark i. 43, and the relative Rabbinical regulations in Lightfoot, Schoettgen, and Wetstein. — Ver. 13. *αὐτοί*] *they on their part* took the initiative. — Ver. 14. *ιδὼν*] *when He had looked upon them*, had His attention first directed to them by their cry for help. — *πορευθέντες κ.τ.λ.*] for on the road their leprosy was to disappear; see what follows, where indeed Paulus, in spite of the *ἐν τῷ ὑπάγειν* (which is made to mean: when they agreed to go!), interprets *ἐκαθαρίσθ.*, *they were declared to be not infectious!* — *τοῖς ἱερεῦσι*] the Samaritan to be inspected and declared clean must go to a Samaritan priest.—Ver. 15.

ιδών, ὅτι ἰάθη] even before his coming to the priest,¹ who had therefore communicated to him *no* remedy (in opposition to Paulus). — Ver. 16. κ. αὐτὸς ἦν Σαμαρεῖτ.] *and as for him, he was a Samaritan* (by way of distinction from the rest). This is made use of (Strauss, II. p. 53 f.) for the view that the entire narrative is woven together from traditions of the healings of leprosy and from parables which recorded Samaritan examples. This audacious scepticism is emulated by Eichthal, II. p. 285 f. — Ver. 17. οἱ δέκα] *all the ten*; οἱ ἐννέα, *the remaining nine*. See Kühner, II. p. 135 f. — Ver. 18. οὐχ εὔρεθ. κ.τ.λ.] *have they not been found* as returning, etc. Comp. on Matt. i. 18. — τῷ θεῷ] who through me has accomplished their cure. Comp. ver. 15. Proper gratitude to God does not detract from *him who is the medium* of the benefit. Comp. ver. 16. — ὁ ἀλλογενής] heightens the guilt of the nine. The word does not occur in classical Greek; often in the LXX. and the Apocrypha, especially of Gentiles. The Greeks use ἀλλόφυλος, ἀλλοεθνής. The Samaritans were of *foreign descent*, on account of their Cuthaic blood. Comp. on Matt. x. 5; 2 Kings xvii. 24. — Ver. 19. Jesus dismisses the thankful one, giving him, however, to understand what was the *cause* of his deliverance — a germ for the further development of his inner life! Thy *faith* (in my divine power, ver. 15) hath delivered thee. This faith had not yet the specific *Messianic* substance; as yet, Jesus to him was only a divine, miraculously powerful teacher. See ver. 13.

Vv. 20, 21. What follows, and indeed as far as xviii. 30, still belongs to these border villages, ver. 12. It is not till xviii. 31 that the further journey is intimated, on which, at xviii. 35, follows the approach to Jericho. — To consider the question of the Pharisees as a *mocking* one (Theophylact, Euthymius Zigabenus, Calvin, Paulus, Kuinoel, and others),

¹ If the Samaritan had first been to the priest (Calvin, Schleiermacher), Jesus could not have put the question which He asks at ver. 17 f., since the nine Jews had a much farther journey to the priests. The return of the Samaritan is to be conceived of as very soon after the departure, so that the whole scene took place while still in the village.

is unfounded. According to the analogy of other Pharisaic questions, and according to the indirect manner of the answer of Jesus, an intention *to tempt Him* is rather to be supposed. They wished to perplex Him, since he represented Himself by words and (as just at this moment) by deeds as the Messiah, by the problem, *When is the kingdom of Messiah coming?* — *μετὰ παρατήρησεως*] *μετά* of accompanying circumstances (Bernhardy, p. 255): *under observation*, i.e. the coming of the Messiah's kingdom is not so conditioned that this coming could be *observed* as a visible development, or that it could be said, in consequence of such observation, that here or there is the kingdom. See what follows. The coming is *ἀπαράτηρητον*—it develops itself *unnoticed*. This statement, however, does not deny that the kingdom *is a thing of the future* (Ewald: "as something which should first come in the future, as a wonderful occurrence, and for which men must first be on the watch"), but only that in its approach *it will meet the eye*. In the signification of watching and waiting for, *παρατήρησις* would convey the idea of *malice* (*insidiosa observatio*, Polybius, xvi. 22. 8); but in the further descriptive *οὐδέ* (*not even*) *ἐροῦσιν κ.τ.λ.*, is implied only the denial of the *visibility* of the event which, developing itself ("gradatim et successive," Bengel), might be able to be *observed* (comp. *παρατήρησις τῶν ἄστρον*, Diod. Sic. i. 28). But if the advent of the kingdom happens in such a manner that it cannot be subjected to human observation, it is thereby at the same time asserted that neither can any limited point of time *when* it shall come (*πότε*, ver. 20) be specified. The idea: *with pomp* (Beza, Grotius, Wetstein, comp. Kuinoel and others), conveys *more* than the text, which, moreover, does not indicate any reference to heathenish astrology or augury (Lange). — *οὐδέ ἐροῦσιν*] Grotius aptly says: "non erit quod dicatur." On the more definite *future* after the more general *present*, see Disson, *ad Dem. de Cor.* p. 368 f. — *ἰδοὺ γάρ*] a lively and emphatic repetition of the *ἰδοὺ* at the beginning of the argument urged against them. This, as well as the repetition of the subject, *ἡ βασιλ. τ. Θεοῦ*, has in it something solemn. — *ἐντὸς ὑμῶν*] the contrary of *ἐκτός*, *ἔξω*: *intra vos*, *in your circle*, *in the midst of you*. Comp. Xen.

Anab. i. 10. 3 : ὅποσα ἐντὸς αὐτῶν καὶ χρήματα καὶ ἄνθρωποι ἐγίνοντο ; *Hell.* ii. 3. 19 ; *Thuc.* vii. 5. 3 ; *Dem.* 977. 7 ; *Plat. Leg.* vii. p. 789 A : ἐντος τῶν ἐαυτῶν μητέρων ; *Aelian, Hist.* ii. 5. 15. So Euthymius Zigabenus, Beza, Grotius, Calovius, Wolf, Bengel, and others, including Kuinoel, Paulus, Schleiermacher, Fleck in Winer's *Exeg. Stud.* I. p. 150 ff., Bornemann, Kaeuffer, *de ζωῆς αἰ. not.* p. 51, de Wette, Ewald, Bleek, Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 146. *In the midst of them* the Messianic kingdom was, so far as He, the *Messiah*, was and worked (comp. xi. 20 ; *Matt.* xii. 28) among them (μέσος ὑμῶν, *John* i. 26). For where He was and worked, He, the legitimate King and Bearer of the kingdom, ordained thereto of the Father (xxii. 29), there was the Messianic kingdom (which was to be formally and completely established at the *Parousia*) in its temporal development, like the seed, the grain of mustard seed, the leaven, etc. Rightly, therefore, does Jesus argue (γάρ) from the ἐντὸς ὑμῶν ἐστίν that it comes unnoticed, and not in an appearance to be observed, wherein He certainly evades the point of the Pharisaic question which referred to the *currently expected* appearing of the kingdom (comp. ix. 27, xxi. 28) in so far as the ἐρχεσθαι, which He means refers to the development *in time* ; an evasion, however, which was fully calculated to make them feel the impudent *prying spirit* of the question they had started, and to bring near to the questioners the highest *practical* necessity in respect of the coming of the kingdom (the perception of the Messiah who was already in the midst of them). If others¹ have explained ἐντὸς ὑμῶν by *in animis vestris* (Chrysostom, Theophylact, Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, Vatablus, and others, including Ch. F. Fritzsche in Rosenmüller, *Repert.* II. p. 154 ff., Olshausen, Glöckler, Schaubach in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1845, p. 169 ff., Köstlin, Hilgenfeld, Schegg), there is, it is true, no objection to be raised on the score of grammar (comp. *Plat. Tim.* p. 45 B, *Soph.* p. 263 E, *Pol.* iii. p. 401 D ; *Ps.* xxxviii. 4, cix. 22, ciii. 1 ; *Ecclus.* xix. 23 ; *Matt.* xxiii. 26) ; but it is decidedly opposed to this that ὑμῶν refers to the

¹ So also Lange, *L. J.* II. 2, p. 1080, yet blending with it the other explanation.

Pharisees, in whose hearts nothing certainly found a place less than did the ethical kingdom of God,¹ as well as the fact that the idea itself—to wit, of the kingdom of God, as of an ethical condition in the internal nature of the Ego (“a divine-human heart-phenomenon,” Lange)—is *modern*, not historico-biblical (not even contained in Rom. xiv. 17; 1 Cor. iv. 20; Col. i. 13).

Ver. 22. The Pharisees have got their answer. But Jesus does not allow the point of their question to be lost thereby, but turns now to His disciples (probably after the departure of the Pharisees, as they do not appear again in what follows, and as the discourses themselves bear an unreserved character, wholly different from ver. 20 f.), in order to give to them instructions in reference to the question raised by the Pharisees, and that not on the temporal development of the kingdom of the Messiah wherewith He had despatched them, but on the *actual solemn appearing of the Messiah* in the *Parousia*. “Calamities will arouse in them the longing after it, and false Messiahs will appear, whom they are not to follow; for, like the lightning, so immediately and universally will He reveal Himself in His glorious manifestation,” vv. 22–24. See further on ver. 25. We have here the discourse of the future from the *source of the account of the journey*. This and the *synoptic* discourse on the same subject, xxi. 5 ff., Luke keeps separate. Comp. Weizsäcker, pp. 82 f., 182, and see the remark after ver. 37. — *μίαν τῶν ἡμερῶν τοῦ υἱοῦ τ. ἀνθρ. ἰδεῖν*] *i.e.* to see the appearance of a single day of the *Messianic period* (of the *αἶων μέλλων*), in order, to wit, to refresh yourselves by its blessedness. Comp. Grotius, Olshausen, de Wette, Lange, Bleek. Your longing will be: Oh, for only *one* Messianic day in this time of tribulation!—a longing indeed not to be realized, but a natural outbreak under the pressure of afflictions.—*Usually*, yet not suitably in accordance with ver. 26: “erit tempus, quo vel uno die meo

¹ Quite opposed to the words of the passage is the evasion of Olshausen, that the expression only establishes the *possibility* of the reception of the Pharisees into the kingdom, inasmuch as the inwardness of its revelation is laid down as its *general criterion*.

conspectu, mea consuetudine, qua jam perfrui minime, frui cupiatis," Kuinoel; comp. Ewald. — καὶ οὐκ ὄψεσθε] because, to wit, the point of time of the *Parousia* is not yet come; it has its *horas et moras*.

Vv. 23, 24. See on Matt. xxiv. 23-27. — ἐροῦσιν κ.τ.λ.] on the occasion of the appearance of false Messiahs. A locality of fixed limits, moreover (comp. ver. 21), does not characterize the *solemn* appearing of the kingdom. — ἰδοὺ . . . ὦδε] namely: is the Messiah! — μὴ ἀπέλθ. μηδὲ διώξ.] a climax: *Go not forth, nor follow after (sectamini)*, to wit, those of whom this is asserted. — Ver. 24. *The lightning which lightens*; comp. similar expressions in Lobeck, *Paral.* p. 503. — ἐκ τῆς] Supply *χώρας*. See Bos, *Ellips.* ed. Schaefer, pp. 560, 562; Winer, p. 522 [E. T. 740]: *flashing out from the one region under the heaven* (which expands under the heaven, ὑπό with an accusative) *lightens even to the other* (opposite one¹). — οὕτως] in such a manner of appearance as manifests itself in a moment and universally.

Ver. 25. What will yet first *precede* the *Parousia*, and (1) in respect of the Messiah Himself: He must (comp. ix. 22, xxiv. 26) first suffer and be rejected, ver. 25; and (2) in respect of the profane world: it will continue in security in its usual earthly doing and striving, until the crisis, universally ruinous for it, shall suddenly break in as in the days of Noah and of Lot, vv. 26-30. See further on ver. 31.

Vv. 26, 27. Comp. Matt. xxiv. 37 f. — καθὼς ἐγένετο κ.τ.λ.] to wit, that men carelessly and securely pursued their accustomed striving till they were overtaken by the flood. — ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τ. υἱοῦ τ. ἀνθρώπου] in the days in which the appearance of the Messiah will come. — Ver. 27. ἦσθιον, ἔπυνον κ.τ.λ.] a vividly graphic asyndeton. — καὶ ἦλθεν] not to be connected with ἄχρι ἧς ἡμέρας (Bleek). See Gen. vii. 4, 10.

Vv. 28-30. Ὁμοίως] does not belong to ἅπαντας (Bornemann, who assumes a Latinism: *perdidit omnes pariter atque ut accidit*), against which is to be set the similarity of the

¹ What Lange reads into the passage, "from the old world to the new," is not there at all. Comp. Matt. xxiv. 27.

twofold καὶ ἀπώλεσεν ἅπαντας, vv. 27 and 29. Moreover, we are not to conceive of ἔσται again after ὁμ. καί (Paulus, Bleek), against which is ver. 30; but *similiter quoque, sicuti accidit*, etc. This ὁμοίως καί is afterwards *again taken up* by κατὰ τὰ αὐτά, ver. 30, and the ἡσθιον . . . ἅπαντας that lies between the two is *crasegetically* annexed to the ὡς ἐγένετο, as in vii. 11, viii. 40, and frequently; so that ἡσθιον . . . ἅπαντας is not to be put in a parenthesis at all (Lachmann), but neither is any point to be placed after ἅπαντας (Tischendorf). — Ver. 29 f. ἔβρεξε] *scil.* θεός. Comp. Matt. v. 45; Gen. xix. 24. In remembrance of the latter passage the subject is presupposed as known, and hence the verb is not intransitive, as at Rev. xi. 6 (Grotius). On the use of the word in classical Greek, see Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 291. — πύρ κ. θεῖον] Comp. Hom. *Od.* xxii. 493; it is not to be transformed into *lightnings* (Kuinoel); Jesus follows the representation of Gen. xix. — ἀποκαλύπτεται] *is revealed*, 1 Pet. v. 4; 1 John ii. 28, iii. 2. Up to that time He is *hidden* with God in His glory, Col. iii. 3 f.; 2 Thess. i. 7; 1 Cor. i. 7; 1 Pet. i. 7, iv. 13.

Vv. 31–33. At that day it is well to abandon all earthly possession, wherefore I call to your remembrance the example of Lot's wife. Even the temporal *life* must be abandoned by him who wishes not to lose the life eternal. — ὅς ἔσται ἐπὶ τοῦ δώμ. κ.τ.λ.] indicates certainly the undelayed *flight with abandonment of earthly possession*, but not, as at Matt. xxiv. 17, Mark xiii. 15, the flight in the destruction of Jerusalem, of which here there is no mention, but the *flight for deliverance to the coming Messiah* at the catastrophe which immediately precedes His *Parousia*, Matt. xxiv. 29–31. Then nothing of temporal possession should any more fetter the interest. Hence de Wette is wrong in regarding (comp. Weiss) the expression as unsuitably occurring in this place. — καὶ τ. σκ. αὐτοῦ] see Bernhardy, p. 304. — Ver. 32. τῆς γυναικὸς Λώτ.] whose fate was the consequence of her looking back contrary to the injunction (Gen. xix. 26), which she would not have done if she had given up all attachment to the perishing possessions, and had only hastened to the divine deliverance.

Comp. Wisd. x. 7 f. — Ver. 33. Comp. ix. 24, and on Matt. x. 39 ; Mark viii. 35. — ζῆτήσῃ . . . ἀπολέσῃ] in the time of that final catastrophe ἀπολέσει . . . ζωογον.: in the decision at the *Parousia*—ζωογονεῖν, to *preserve alive*, as Acts vii. 19, and in the LXX. See Biel and Schleusner.

Vv. 34, 35. But the decision at the *Parousia*, what a *separation* it will be!—a separation of those who are in the temporal life united in a perfectly common position. This is symbolically represented in two examples. Comp., moreover, on Matt. xxiv. 40 f. — ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτί] which Bengel, in opposition to the context, explains: in this *present* night, is neither to be interpreted *in tempore illo calamitoso* (Kuinoel, who says that the night is *imago miseriae* ; Micah iii. 6 ; comp. Grotius and Bleek), nor to be pressed to the conclusion that the *Parousia* is definitely ordained to take place by *night* (de Wette, who finds the ground for this view in the comparison of the Messiah with a thief in the night), in respect of which the following grinding at the mill as an occupation of the day-time is held as left standing inappropriately from Matthew, but the horror of the night belongs to the *imagery* of the concrete representation.¹ At ver. 35, however, there is again a departure from this feature, because a graphic touch of a different kind is added to the idea. Day and hour, even the Son knoweth not, Matt. xxiv. 36 ; comp. Acts i. 7. — ἐπὶ κλίνης μιᾶς] not in general: they shall be *bed-fellows* (Lange), but, according to the words and the concrete representation: they shall find themselves *on one bed*. A warning against precipitate separation of mingled domestic relations (Lange) is altogether foreign to this passage.

Ver. 37. Ποῦ] not: *quomodo* (Kuinoel), against which ungrammatical rendering even the following ὅπου ought to have guarded him; but: *where* will this separation occur? As to what follows, see on Matt. xxiv. 28. On σῶμα, *corpse* (of man or beast, the latter here), see Duncan, *Lex. Homcr.* ed. Rost, p. 1069. Comp. xxiii. 52 ; Acts ix. 40.

¹ It is not on account of the example of the two in bed together that the night is named (Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 626), but conversely the idea of the night-time suggested that illustration.

REMARK.—With regard to the discourses which are set forth here, vv. 22-37, but in Matt. xxiv. at another time and in another connection, viz. in that of the great discourse on the end of the world (comp. Luke xxi.), some have attributed (Schleiermacher, p. 215 ff., 265 ff., Neander, Olshausen, Bleek), others have denied (de Wette), *originality* to Luke. The latter view depends upon the assertion of a want of connection, and partial inappropriateness of the expressions in Luke, which assumption, however, is not justified by the exposition. But the former cannot be allowed at the expense of Matthew (see especially Schleiermacher, who supposes in Matthew a mingling of the originally separate discourses, Luke xvii. 22 ff. and xxi. 5 ff.), since even in Matthew everything stands in strictly linked connection; but Luke xxi., in the same way as Matthew, places the *Parousia* in connection with the destruction of Jerusalem, xxi. 25 ff. (comp. Strauss, II. p. 338). Without doing injustice to the one or the other evangelist, originality is to be conceded to *both*, so that Luke xvii. 22 ff. has preserved, in accordance with his original source, a discourse spoken by Jesus, which, not preserved by Matthew, and belonging to an earlier period than Matt. xxiv. and Luke xxi., has the characteristic feature *that it remains entirely apart from connection with the destruction of Jerusalem*. That the substance of its contents was repeated by Jesus Himself in the great discourse of Matt. xxiv., is, in respect of the similarity of the material, intelligible enough, and this holds good especially of the characteristic words—lightning, deluge, eagles. But it cannot be decided how much in the execution and form is carried over from the one discourse into the other by the mingling processes of reminiscence and tradition, the rather that in general we can ascribe to the discourses in the synoptic Gospels on the end of the world originality only within certain limits, *i.e.* originality modified by the reflection and expectation of the church (see on Matt. xxiv., Remarks).

CHAPTER XVIII.

VER. 1. δὲ καί] B L M S, min. Copt. codd. of It. Or. have δέ. So Lachm. Tisch. But the καί, which might be dispensed with, was easily passed over; it is wanting also in ver. 9 in not unimportant authorities (bracketed by Lachm.). After προσεύχ. Lachm. and Tisch. have αὐτοῦς. It is preponderatingly attested; there would have been no reason for its addition; while in favour of its omission, the word being superfluous, it may be noticed that προσεύχ.σθαι would the more readily be followed by καί, that in the *doctrine* of the parable the *generality* of the reference most readily presented itself. — Ver. 5. ὑποπιᾶζ] Griesb. recommends ὑποπιᾶζῃ on insufficient attestation. It was altered from misunderstanding, as also in the case of the variant ὑποπιέζῃ. Comp. on 1 Cor. ix. 27. — Ver. 7. ποιήσει] ποιήσῃ is so decisively attested that, with Lachm. Tisch., it is to be adopted. The future was introduced by anticipation of ver. 8. — μακροθυμεῖ (Lachm. Tisch.) is also attested quite decisively, instead of which μακροθυμῶν (Elz.) was intended to assist the construction of the sentence. — Ver. 13. εἰς before τ. στήθος is wanting in B D K L Q X Π S, min. Slav. Arm. Vulg. It. Or. Antioch. Cypr. Deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. But why should it have been added? As being perfectly superfluous (comp. xxiii. 48, xxii. 64), it was overlooked. — Ver. 14. Elz. has ἡ ἐκεῖνος, which, on decisive evidence, is to be condemned. Griesb. Matth. Scholz, Tisch. have ἡ γὰρ ἐκεῖνος, following A E G H K M P Q S U V X Γ Δ Λ, min. Syr.^p Goth. Bas. ms. Theophyl. Grot. and Lachm. have παρ' ἐκεῖνον, in accordance with B L S, min. Copt. Sahid. Or. Naz. (Vulg.: *ab illo*). To these is added also indirectly D, with μᾶλλον παρ' ἐκεῖνον τὸν Φαρισαῖον (comp. Syr. Pers.^p It. Cypr. Hilar. Ambr. Aug.). The reading of Lachm. is consequently the oldest; and since ἡ γὰρ ἐκεῖνος is opposed to the sense, it is to be judged that ΓΑΡ came into the text instead of ΠΑΡ by a transcriber's error of ancient date, and became blended with the gloss ἡ ἐκεῖνος. — Ver. 15. ἐπετίμησαν] B D G L S, min. Lachm. Tisch. have ἐπετίμων; the *Recepta* is from Matt. xix. 13. — Ver. 22. διὰ δόξ] A D L M R Δ S, min. Fathers have δόξ. So Lachm. It is

from the parallels, from which, moreover, came also ἐν οὐρανῷ, instead of which is to be read, with Lachm. and Tisch., following B D, ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς (A L R S [Tisch. 8] read : ἐν οὐρανοῖς). — Ver. 24. περίλυπ. γενόμε.] is wanting in B L S, min. Copt.; deleted by Tisch. But it was in accordance with the parallels more easily passed over than added. — Ver. 25. τρυμαλιᾶς] Lachm. and Tisch. have τρήματος, in accordance with B D S, 49. Rightly; in accordance with Matthew and Mark, there was introduced in some authorities τρυπήματος (L R, min.), in others τρυμαλιᾶς (A E F G, etc. Elz.). — Instead of ῥαφίδος read, with Lachm. and Tisch., βελόνης, in accordance with B D L S, min. The former is from the parallels. — εἰσελθεῖν] Lachm. has διελθεῖν. It is more weakly attested, and the reading is to be decided as at Matt. xix. 24. — Ver. 28. ἀφήκαμεν πάντα καὶ] Lachm. and Tisch. have ἀφέντες τὰ ἴδια, in accordance with B D L S** min. vss., and this (Griesb.) also recommended. The *Recepta* is from the parallels. — Ver. 30. ἀπολάβη] B D M, min. have λάβη. So Lachm. The simple form is from the parallels, just as D, in particular, takes εἰν μὴ λάβη from Mark x. 30. — Ver. 39. σιωπήσῃ] The preponderatingly attested σιγήσῃ is adopted by Schulz, Lachm. and Tisch. The *Recepta* is from the parallels. In the New Testament only Luke and Paul have the verb σιγᾶν. — Ver. 41. λέγων before τί is, with Tisch., to be deleted, in accordance with B D L X S, 57, as a familiar addition, instead of which Or. has εἰπών.

Ver. 1. What Jesus has hitherto said of His *Parousia* was of such weighty and everlastingly decisive concern for His disciples, that it was calculated to stimulate them to unremitting prayer, that they might become partakers of the ἐκδίκησις which the *Parousia* was to bring to them (ver. 7). Hence (without the omission of any intervening dialogue, Schleiermacher, Olshausen) now follows the parable of the widow and the unjust judge, peculiar to Luke, and its application (vv. 1–8). This parable is no addition inserted without a motive (Köstlin, Holtzmann), nor is it taken from the *Logia*; but it comes from the source of the account of the journey. Weizsäcker alleges that it must have been a *later* growth, annexed by Luke to his source of the narrative of the journey; that the judge is the heathen magistracy; the widow, the church bereaved after the departure of Christ; her adversary, the hostile Judaism. Here also (comp. on xv. 11, xvi. 1, 19) is a transferring of later relations to an early period without

sufficient reason. — *πρός*] *in reference to*. — *πάντοτε*] It is not the continual *disposition* of prayer ("as the breath of the inner man," Olshausen) that is meant, but the constant *actual* prayer, in respect of which, however, *πάντοτε* is not to be pressed, but to be taken in a popularly hyperbolical sense. Comp. ver. 7; 1 Thess. i. 17. — *έκκακεῖν*] *to become discouraged*, not: *in their vocation* (Schleiermacher), but, according to the context: *in their prayers*. As to the form *έκκ.*, for which Lachm. has *έγκ.* (and Tischendorf: *ένκ.*), which, although here preponderatingly attested, is to be regarded as an improvement, see on 2 Cor. iv. 1.

Vv. 2, 3. *Τὸν θεὸν . . . κ. ἄνθρωπ. κ.τ.λ.*] Similar characterizations from profane writers may be seen in Wetstein. Bengel well says: "Horum respectum alterutrum certe plerisque mortalium movere solet et injustitiam (ver. 6) judicium cohibere." — *έντρεπόμ.*] *standing in awe of*, Matt. xxi. 37; Luke xx. 13; 2 Thess. iii. 15; Heb. xii. 9. In the Greek writers more frequently used with a genitive. The disposition implied by *έντρεπόμ.* is *respect and regard*. — *ήρχετο*] Grotius aptly says: *ventitabat*. See Kühner, II. p. 76 f. — *έκδίκησόν με ἀπὸ κ.τ.λ.*] *revenge me* (and deliver me by this my judicial restitution) *of*, etc. Comp. Judg. xi. 36: *ποιήσαι σοι κύριον έκδίκησιν . . . ἀπὸ τῶν υἱῶν Ἀμμών*.

Vv. 4, 5. *Ἐπὶ χρόνον*] *for a time*, Hom. *Il.* ii. 299; Plat. *Protag.* p. 344 B, *Phaed.* p. 84 C; Nägelsbach, *Anm. z. Ilias*, ed. 3, p. 284. — *διάγε*] as at xi. 8. — *ἵνα μὴ κ.τ.λ.*] is explained: *that she may not continually* (*εἰς τέλος* equal to *διὰ τέλους*, see Kypke and Wetstein; comp. *ἔλ, ἔλῃ*) *come and plague me*. See also Luther's gloss. But that *ύπωπιάζω* (*to strike any one's eyes black and blue*, see Wetstein) is to be taken in the general sense of *harass, annoy*, there is no proof, since it is an error to adduce not merely 1 Cor. ix. 27, but also Aristoph. *Pax* 541, where the *πόλεις ύπωπιασμένοι* are represented as smitten and wounded persons, and hence the word is to be taken in the *literal* sense, *to beat black and blue*. But the assumption of a *Latinism*, after the manner of *obtundere* (Beza, Grotius), is arbitrary, and does not at all correspond with the special idea of the Greek word. Accordingly there

is nothing left us but to interpret: *that she may not at last come and beat my face black and blue.* The judge mockingly puts the case of the woman at length becoming desperate, and actually laying hands on him and beating his face black and blue. The Vulgate rightly has it: *sugillet me.* Comp. also Bleek and Schegg. On εἰς τέλος, *at the end, finally*, comp. Herod. iii. 40, ix. 37; Xen. *Oec.* xvii. 10; Soph. *Phil.* 407, and thereupon Hermann; Gen. xvi. 4, and elsewhere. τέλος, without any preposition, might also have been used.

Vv. 6, 7. *Hear what the unrighteous judge (ὁ κρίτης τῆς ἀδικίας, see on xvi. 8) says! But God, will He not, etc.* In this contrast lies the conclusion that the ἐκδίκησις, on which that worthless judge decided in respect of the perseveringly praying widow who was so troublesome to him, is the more certainly to be expected from God in respect of the elect, who are so dear to Him, and who so constantly cry to Him for the final decision. On οὐ μὴ in a question, see Winer, pp. 449, 454 [E. T. 634, 642].—According to the reading κ. μακροθυμεῖ ἐπ' αὐτοῖς (see the critical remarks), the most simple explanation is: but God, will He not fulfil the avenging of His elect, *and does He tarry¹ for their sakes?* and is it His concern, in reference to them, to delay His interposition, or postpone His aid? See Ecclus. xxxii. 18. Comp. Maldonatus, Grotius, Bornemann in the *Stud. d. Sächs. Geisl.* 1842, p. 69 f., Bleek. In respect of the delay which nevertheless, according to human judgment, does occur, Grotius rightly observes: "illud ipsum tempus, quamvis longum interdum ferentibus videatur, re vera exiguum est imo momentaneum, unde τὸ παραντίκα τῆς θλίψεως dixit Paulus, 2 Cor. iv. 17." According to Bengel and Ewald, καὶ μακροθυμεῖ ἐπ' αὐτ. is connected hebraistically with τῶν βοώντων: *and over them He is forbearing*; whereby the delay of the ἐκδίκησις would be derived from the patience with which God still allows to His elect further time for more perfect sanctification (2 Pet. iii. 9). According to the construction, this would be harder, and in its meaning less in correspondence with the

¹ The expression μακροθυμεῖ corresponds to the idea of the ἐκδίκησις, which includes within it the punishment of the enemies.

subsequent ἐν τάχει. The *Recepta* would have to be understood: will He not . . . fulfil, *even although He delays in reference to them?*¹—that is to say, with that ἐκδίκησις of them; καίτοι μακροθυμῶν καὶ φαινόμενος ἀνηκουστὲν τῶν δεομένων αὐτοῦ νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας, Theophylact, not, with Hassler (in the *Tüb. Zeitschrift*, 1832): since *He is still patient towards them*, i.e. does not lose patience as that judge did. For, apart from the incorrect view of the use of the καί, the thought itself is unsuited to the doctrinal narrative, since it *was* actually through the judge's loss of patience (rather: his becoming annoyed) that the ἐκδίκησις of the woman was brought about. Moreover, de Wette is wrong in remarking against the reading μακροθυμεῖ, and its meaning, that if the thought that God delays were removed, the parable would have no meaning at all, since μακροθ. corresponds to the οὐκ ἤθελ. ἐπὶ χρόνον, ver. 4. Therein is lost sight of the fact that the example of the unrighteous judge teaches *e contrario* (see already Augustine, *Serm.* 36) the procedure of God. — The ἐκδίκησις τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν consists in the deliverance from their enemies who are punished at the *Parousia*, and in their own exaltation to the salvation of the Messiah's kingdom for which they are chosen. Comp. xxi. 22. The idea of this ἐκδίκησις enters so essentially into the texture of the New Testament eschatology, that in various forms it runs through the entire New Testament, and hence it is not easily to be seen why it should be regarded as standing apart from the views of our evangelist, and should remind us of the fiery zeal of the apocalyptic writer (Köstlin, Hilgenfeld). Comp. preceding passages in Luke (i. 51 ff., 71 ff.).

Ver. 8. An answer to the two parts of the preceding question: (1) ποιήσει . . . αὐτῶν, and (2) ἐν τάχει. — This ἐν τάχει is the opposite of delay (μακροθυμεῖ, ver. 7): *quickly, without delay* (Acts xii. 7, xxii. 18, xxv. 4; Rom. xvi. 20; 1 Tim. iii. 14; Rev. i. 1, ii. 5, xxii. 6; Wisd. xviii. 14; Pind. *Nem.* v. 35; Xen. *Cyr.* vi. 1. 12), declaring the *speedy advent*²

¹ Lange is wrong in saying: although even over them He rules *high-mindedly* (and therefore inscrutably).

² It is in vain to weary oneself and twist about in the attempt to explain away this simple meaning of the words, as, for example, Ebrard does on Rev.

of the *Parousia* (ix. 27), at which shall follow the ἐκδίκησις. — πλὴν ὁ υἱὸς κ.τ.λ.] It is to be accentuated ἄρα (so also Lachmann and Tischendorf); comp. on Gal. ii. 17. In connection with the glad promise, to wit, which Jesus has just given in reference to the elect, there comes painfully into His consciousness the thought what a want of faith in Him He would nevertheless meet with at His *Parousia*. This He expresses in the sorrowful question: *Nevertheless will the Son of man when He is come find faith on the earth?* Theophylact well says: ἐν σχήματι ἐρωτήσεως τὸ σπένιον τῶν τότε εὑρεθισομένων πιστῶν ὑποσημαίνων. The subject: ὁ υἱὸς τ. ἀνθρ. and ἐλθὼν is, with a sorrowful emphasis, placed before the interrogative ἄρα, on account of the contrast with what follows. See Klotz, *ad Derar.* p. 183. The πίστις is the faith in Jesus the Messiah, which many of His confessors not persevering unto the end will have given up, so that they do not belong to the elect (Matt. xxiv. 5, 10 ff., 24), and He will meet them as unbelievers.¹ Hence there is no reason for concluding from the passage before us (de Wette), that the putting of the parable into its present shape probably belongs to a time when the hope of the *Parousia* had begun somewhat to waver (2 Pet. iii. 3 f.). — ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς] is correlative with the coming down from heaven, which is meant by ἐλθὼν.

Ver. 9. It is the more arbitrary to assume that the following doctrinal narrative was originally delivered in another connection (Paulus, Olshausen, de Wette; comp. Kuinoel), that it rather affords a confirmation of the probability (see on xvii. 22) that the Pharisees, after our Lord's rejoinder to them, xvii. 20 f., were no longer present. The *historical connection* with what precedes is not more closely to be indicated than

I. 1, p. 104. There is only this to be said, that the final deliverance, how long soever it may appear to be delayed as to its beginning, shall still be so *internally and potentially hastened* that it shall be made an *unexpectedly* hasty ending to the condition of tribulation that precedes it. See, on the other hand, Düsterdieck.

¹ So many, as the Lord sees, shall be seduced into unbelief (as to the ἰστοῦ; αἰὼν πονηρός, comp. on Gal. i. 4), that in grief thereat He puts the question *generally*, whether He shall find faith. Herein lies a sorrowful *hyperbole* of expression.

is pointed out by the characterization of the *τινές* as *τοὺς πεποιθ.* κ.τ.λ. These men, according to ver. 9, must in some way or another have made manifest their disposition, and thereby have given occasion to Jesus to deliver the following discourse as far as ver. 14. *Who are the people?* Assuredly not *Pharisees*, since it is actually a Pharisee that Jesus presents as a warning example. Possibly they were conceited *followers of Jesus* (Schleiermacher, de Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius), but more probably: *Jews* of a Pharisaic disposition, since Luke does not here, as at ver. 1, designate the disciples expressly, and it was just for *Jews* of this kind that not only the example of the Pharisee, but also that of the *publican*, was the most humiliating. — *πρός*] He spoke to them. To take it as at ver. 1 (Kuinoel, de Wette, and many others) is unsuitable, since there are *persons* in this place, and the context suggests no occasion for departing from the usual *ad quosdam* (Vulgate). — *τινας τοὺς πεποιθότας*] designates the persons in the abstract indefinitely, but in the quality in question specifically. See on Gal. i. 7, and Bornemann, *Schol.* p. 113; Bernhardt, p. 318. — *ἐφ' ἑαυτ.*] they put on *themselves* the confidence that they were righteous. For *others* they did not entertain this confidence, but assumed the contrary and despised them.

Vv. 11, 12. *Σταθείς*] See on Matt. vi. 5. *He took his stand*, a trait of assurance, comp. xix. 8; Acts ii. 14. See, on the other hand, ver. 13: *μακρόθεν ἑστώς*. — *πρὸς ἑαυτόν*] does not belong to *σταθείς*, so that it would mean *apart* (Syr., Beza, Grotius, Paulus, Baumgarten-Crusius, Ewald, and others), which would be *καθ' ἑαυτόν* (Xen. *Anab.* v. 10. 11; Acts xxviii. 16; Jas. ii. 17; Zech. xii. 12), as D actually reads; but to *προσηύχετο* (Luther, Castalio, Bengel, Wetstein, and others, including Olshausen, de Wette, Bleek¹): *by himself, to himself*, apud animum suum, as at 2 Macc. xi. 13, and frequently in the classical writers: *λέγειν πρὸς ἑαυτόν*, to speak in thought, and the like. Naturally he would not allow such a prayer to be heard. The publican is otherwise, ver. 13. — *ὅτι οὐκ εἰμὶ κ.τ.λ.*] *πρότερον γὰρ εἶπεν ὁ οὐκ ἔστιν*,

¹ From this construction it is plain that in B L S^c min. Vulg. Copt. Arm. Slav. Or. Bas. Cyp. *πρὸς ἑαυτ.* stands *after ταῦτα*.

καὶ τότε κατέλεξεν ἃ ἐστίν, Theophylact. — οἱ λοιποὶ τῶν ἀνθρ.] comp. Rev. ix. 20; Kühner, II. p. 122.¹ — ἄδικοι] *unjust* in the more limited sense. — ὡς οὗτος ὁ τελώνης] contemptuously, *this publican here!* “who skins and scrapes every one, and clutches wherever he can,” Luther, *Predigt.* — Ver. 12. νηστεύω] of *private fasting*, which was observed *twice* in the week (τοῦ σαββ., Mark xvi. 9; 1 Cor. xvi. 2), on Thursday and Monday. See on Matt. vi. 16, ix. 14; Lightfoot, p. 866. — κτῶμαι] not *possideo* (Vulgate, Castalio, Beza, and others), which would be *κέκτημαι*, but: what I *acquire for myself*. He gives tithes of *everything*, what he gains in natural products, everything without exception. The vain-glorious πάντα ὅσα has the emphasis; his payment of tithes is *beyond what the law required*, as at Matt. xxiii. 23. Moreover, comp. Pirke Aboth, ii. 13: “Quando oras, noli in precibus bona tua enumerare, sed fac preces misericordiarum et pro gratia impetranda coram Deo.”

Vv. 13, 14. Μακρόθεν] comp. xxiii. 49. The context gives as the meaning neither: the *forecourt of the Gentiles* (the publican was a Jew), nor: *far from the sanctuary*, but: far away from the *Pharisee*, of whom hitherto our Lord has been speaking. Behind this bold, self-righteous man the humble one in the diffidence of his consciousness of sin had remained at a distance, not venturing to advance further. — ἐστῶς:] “Nec σταθείς, nec in genua procumbens, ne spectetur orans,” Bengel. — οὐδὲ τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς] *not even his eyes*, to say nothing of his whole head and his hands (1 Tim. ii. 8; and see Grotius). Comp. Tacitus, *Hist.* iv. 72: “Stabant conscientia flagitii moestae fixis in terram oculis.” — *The beating of the breast* was the outward sign of *mourning*. See on viii. 52. If the Pharisee had only a proud thanksgiving, the publican has only a *humble petition*. — μοι τῷ ἁμαρτ.] Observe the article. Bengel rightly says: “de nemine alio homine cogitat.” — Ver. 14. κατέβη κ.τ.λ.] a lively picture of the result, in which the emphasis rests on παρ’ ἐκεῖνον, as is shown by the following ὅτι πᾶς κ.τ.λ. — δέδικ.] in the Pauline

¹ “Duas classes Phariseus facit; in alteram conjicit totum genus humanum, altera, melior, ipse sibi solus esse videtur,” Bengel.

sense : *justified*, i.e. accepted by God as righteous. The Epistle to the Romans is the most complete commentary on the whole of this doctrinal history, without, however, it being necessary to take the publican as the representative of *heathenism* (Schenkel). — The reading *παρ' ἐκεῖνον* (see the critical remarks) is in the sense of the *comparison* (xiii. 2, 4; Bernhardt, p. 258 f.): *pro illo*, in respect of which the context decides whether what is declared is applicable to the other one in question, only in a lesser degree (as xiii. 2, 4), or *not at all* (as here; comp. Xen. *Mém.* i. 4. 14), whether, therefore, the expressed preference is relative or *absolute*.¹ Comp. Luther's gloss: "The former went home, not justified, but condemned." It is similar at Matt. xxi. 31; John iii. 19; 1 Tim. i. 4. The reading: ἢ γὰρ ἐκεῖνος, would have to be explained *interrogatively*, and that not in the sense of the familiar interrogative form: ἢ γάρ, *is it not true?* (Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 594), but, with Bornemann (and Glöckler): "*or did the former one go justified to his house?*" But how unsuitable in the connection (it is otherwise at xx. 4), since λέγω ὑμῖν leads one to expect, and actually supplies, only a *categorical* statement! And this use of γάρ after the interrogative ἢ is rationally conceivable, it is true, but no instance of it can be produced. The *Recepta* ἢ ἐκεῖνος, although critically objectionable, is founded on the correct feeling that ἢ in this place could only be the usual comparative, but γάρ alongside of it would be meaningless. — ὅτι πᾶς κ.τ.λ.] as xiv. 11.

Vv. 15-17. See on Matt. xix. 13-15; Mark x. 13-16. The peculiar source of which Luke has hitherto availed himself, which supplied the material from ix. 51, now ends, or Luke leaves it, and becomes substantially synoptic again, following Mark especially, although, while he does so, he still has special passages of his own (see especially xix. 1-10). The *place and time* of what follows as far as ver. 31 are, according to Luke, still the same as of what has preceded (from xvii. 11). — καὶ τὰ βρέφη] *their children also*, so that not merely the people themselves came to Him. The word itself marks out the children more specially (*infants*, ii. 12, 16)

¹ See also van Hengel, *ad Rom.* I. p. 138 f.

than *παιδιά* in Matthew and Mark, the latter of whom Luke follows, although omitting his conclusion, ver. 16, to which abbreviating treatment no special purpose (in opposition to Hofmann, II. 2, p. 194) is to be imputed. — *ἄπτηται*] the *present tense*, brings the situation before us. — Ver. 16. *προσκαλ. αὐτά*] He directed His *call* to the *infants* themselves (probably: come to me, little ones!), and then *spoke* to those who *carried* them, etc.

Vv. 18–27. See on Matt. xix. 16–26; Mark x. 17–27. — *ἄρχων*] perhaps a ruler of the synagogue; comp. Matt. ix. 18. Luke alone has this more precise designation of the man from tradition, and herein diverges from Matt. xix. 20. — In the answer of Jesus, ver. 19, Luke simply follows Mark, abbreviating also at ver. 20. The Marcionite reading: *ὁ γὰρ ἀγαθὸς εἰς ἐστίν, ὁ θεὸς ὁ πατήρ*, is nothing but an old gloss (in opposition to Volkmar, Hilgenfeld), not more Marcionite than the reading of the text, and this latter is no anti-Marcionite alteration. Both forms of the expression are already found in Justin, and our Gospel of Luke is to be regarded (Zeller, *Apostelg.* p. 32 f.) as his source for the form which agrees with the passage before us (*c. Tryph.* 101). Comp. on Mark x. 17. — Ver. 22. *ἔτι ἔν σοι λείπει*] does not presuppose the *truth*, but only the *case* of what is affirmed by the *ἄρχων*. It does not, moreover, assert the necessity of selling one's goods and distributing them to the poor, in order to be perfect in general, but only for the person in question, in accordance with his special circumstances, for the sake of special trial. See on Matt. xix. 21. Hence there is not to be found, with de Wette, in the words an application of the saying of Jesus that gives any pretext for mistaken representations.

Vv. 28–30. See on Matt. xix. 27–29; Mark x. 28–30, the latter of whom Luke follows with abridgment. — *ὃς οὐ μὴ κ.τ.λ.*] Comp. Mark xiii. 2. In respect of no one who has forsaken, etc., will it be the case that he does not receive, etc. In the choice of *ἀπολάβη* there is implied the idea of what he receives being *due*. Comp. xvi. 25, vi. 34, xxiii. 41; Dem. 78. 3: *ἂν τε λάβητε, ἂν τ' ἀπολάβητε*; 162. 17: *λαμβάνειν μὲν οὐκ εἶων, ἀπολαμβάνειν δὲ συνεβούλευον*.

Vv. 31-34. See on Matt. xx. 17-19; Mark x. 32-34. Luke, it is true, abridges Mark's narrative, yet he also expands it by the reference to the fulfilment of Scripture, ver. 31, and by the observation in ver. 34. — παραλαβὼν κ.τ.λ.] A continuation of the journey, on which at ver. 35 ff. the narrative then again lingers at Jericho. — τῷ υἱῷ τ. ἀνθρ.] belongs to τὰ γεγραμμ., next to which it stands: *everything shall be completed, i.e. shall come to its complete actual fulfilment* (comp. xxii. 37), *which is written by the prophets with reference to the Son of man* (with the destination for Him, in order to become actual in Him). On the dative of reference with γράφειν, comp. 3 Macc. vi. 41. The reading περὶ τοῦ υἱ. τ. ἀνθρ. (D, Vulg. al.) is an inaccurate gloss on the correct construction. Others (Castalio and many more, including Kuinoel, Bornemann, Schegg, comp. Buttmann, *Neut. Gr.* p. 154 [E. T. 178], who refers it to both τελεσθ. and γεγραμμ.) connect it with τελεσθ., and explain either: *upon* the Son of man, as Matt. xiii. 14 (so the majority), or *of* Him (Bornemann, following Beza). But even apart from the fact that the position of the words rather suggests the connection given above, the unlimited πάντα τὰ γεγρ. is opposed to the latter, since the prophets have written much, which was neither to be fulfilled *upon* nor *of* the Messiah. Besides, the following ver. 32 f. is opposed to Bornemann, seeing it is not there said what the Messiah should *do*, but what He should *suffer*. — Ver. 34. An emphatic prolixity, even more than at ix. 45. The failure to understand has reference not to the *meaning of the words*, but to the *fact* as the Messianic destiny. — ἀπ' αὐτῶν] comp. ix. 45, x. 21, xix. 42, frequently in the LXX.

Vv. 35-43. See on Matt. xx. 29-34; Mark x. 46-52. Luke, reproducing Mark's narrative in an abridged form, adds nevertheless independently the important conclusion (ver. 43), and follows a variation of the tradition in transposing the circumstance so as to make it *precede* the entry. But the purpose of annexing the history of Zaccheus was in no wise needed to occasion this departure from Mark (in opposition to Bleek and Holtzmann). — Ver. 36. τί εἶη τοῦτο] without ἄν (see the critical remarks), asks, *quite specifically, what this*

should be (not: what this might possibly be). See Hermann, *ad Viger.* p. 742. Comp. Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Lach.* p. 190 B; Maetzner, *ad Antiph.* p. 130. — Ver. 43. The poetic *αἶνος* (see Buttman, *Lexil.* II. p. 112 ff.) appears only here and in Matt. xxi. 16 (a quotation from the LXX.) in the New Testament; more frequently in the LXX. and the Apocrypha.

CHAPTER XIX.

VER. 2. οὗτος ἦν] Lachm. has αὐτός [ἦν]. B K Π, min. Arm. Vulg. Ver. For. Vind. have only αὐτός. Tisch. has ην only, following L Σ, min. Copt. Goth. only. The *Recepta* is to be maintained; οὗτος was in some authorities altered mechanically into αὐτός, in accordance with the foregoing word; in others, omitted as being superfluous, on which assumption, sometimes also ἦν, nay, even καί (D), dropped away also. — Ver. 4. συκομορέαν] see the exegetical remarks. — Instead of ἐκείνης Elz. has δι' ἐκείνης, in opposition to decisive evidence, on the strength of which, also at ver. 7, πάντες is to be read instead of ἅπαντες. — Ver. 5. εἶδεν αὐτὸν καί] is wanting in B L Σ, min. vss. Tisch. The transcriber passed at once from εἶδεν to εἰπεν. — Ver. 13. ἔωξ] A B D K L R Σ, min. Or. Lucif. have ἐν ᾧ. Approved by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. and Tisch.; ἔωξ is an interpretation. — Ver. 15. ἐδῶκε] Lachm. Tisch. have ἐδοῶκε, in accordance with B D L Σ, min. Cant. Verc. (Or.: ἐδοῶκε). An emendation. — Ver. 17. εἶ] Lachm. and Tisch. have εἶγε, following B D, min. Vulg. It. Or. Lucif. The *Recepta* is from Matt. xxv. 23. — Ver. 20. ἔτερος] Lachm. and Tisch. have ὁ ἕτερος, in accordance with B D L R Σ** min. A mechanical repetition of the article, in accordance with vv. 16, 18. — Ver. 23. τήν] is wanting in authorities so decisive, that, with Matth. Lachm. Tisch., it must be deleted. — The position of αὐτό immediately after ἄν has, it is true, A B L Σ in its favour (Lachm. Tisch.), yet the old reading ἀνέπραξα in A is against it, as it manifestly originated from the collocation of ἄν and ππραξα. So in Δ, ΑΝΕΠΡΑΞΑ is written as one word, although translated as two words. The separation might easily be marked by αὐτό placed between them. — Ver. 26. Since γάρ is wanting in important authorities, while Vulg. It. have *autem*, it is to be regarded, with Tisch., as a connective addition, in accordance with Matt. xxv. 29. — ἃς αὐτοῦ] is bracketed by Lachm., deleted by Tisch. It is wanting in B L Σ, min. Lucif., and has slipped in mechanically from Matt. xiii. 12, although there the construction is different. Comp. Mark iv. 25. — Ver. 27. ἐκείνου]

B K L M Σ , min. Didym. have *τούτους*. To be preferred, with Bornem. and Tisch.; *ἐκ* is an amendment by way of designating the absent. — Ver. 31. *αὐτῶ]* is wanting in B D F L R Σ , min. vss. Or. Bracketed by Lachm., deleted by Tisch. The omission is occasioned by its absence in the parallels. — Ver. 34. Before *ὁ κύριος* Lachm. Tisch. have *ὅτι*, certainly on preponderating evidence, but it is repeated from ver. 31. — Ver. 37. *πασῶν]* Lachm. has *πάντων*, following B D. But *πάντων* came in through the reading *γινόμενων* (instead of *δυνάμ.*), which is still found in D. — Ver. 40. Lachm. and Tisch. have *σιωπήσουσιν*, in accordance with A B L R Δ Σ , min., to which also D adds confirmation by *σιγήσουσιν*. The *Recepta* is by way of an improvement. — Instead of *κεκράζονται* B L Σ have *κράζουσιν*, which rare form Tisch. has rightly adopted. — Ver. 41. Elz. Griesb. Scholz have *ἐπ' αὐτῶ*. But *ἐπ' αὐτῶν* is decisively attested. So Schulz, Lachm. Tisch. — Ver. 42. *καὶ σὺ καὶ γε ἐν τῇ ἡμ. σου ταύτῃ]* Lachm. has bracketed *καὶ γε*, and deleted *σου*; the former is wanting in B D L Σ , 157, vss. Or.; the latter in A B D L Σ , min. vss. Or. Eus. Bas. Both are to be retained; *καὶ γε* dropped out in consequence of the preceding *καὶ σὺ*, and then this drew after it the omission of *σου*, which after the simple *καὶ σὺ* (without *καὶ γε*) did not seem in place. — The second *σου* is, indeed, wanting in B L Σ , 259, Or. Ir. (bracketed by Lachm.); but how easily might the word, which, moreover, might be dispensed with, drop out between the syllables *NIIN* and *NYN*! — Ver. 45. *ἐν αὐτῶ]* is wanting in B C L Σ , min. Copt. Arm. Goth. Rd. Or. In most of these authorities *καὶ ἀγοράζοντας* is also wanting. Tisch. deletes both, and both are from the parallels, from which D Δ , vss. have added still more. — Ver. 46. Tisch. has *καὶ ἔσται ὁ οἶκ. μου οἶκ. πρὸς ἐν γ.*, following B L R Σ (in which, however, *κ. ἔσται* is wanting by the first hand), min. Copt. Arm. Or. Rightly; the *Recepta* is from the parallels, from which, moreover, appears in C** *κληθήσεται* instead of *ἔσται*.

Vv. 1, 2. This history¹ with the stamp of Luke's language is worked up by him from tradition. — *ὀνόματι καλούμ.]* Comp. i. 61. Classical writers would have said *ὄνομα καλ.* (Herod. i. 173; Plat. *Crat.* p. 483 B). — *Ζακχαῖος]* = 'זק, *pure*, Ezra ii. 9; Neh. vii. 14. Even the *name* (among the Rabbins also, see Lightfoot, p. 870) shows him to be a *Jew*. See on ver. 9 and Castalio *in loc.* The Clementines represent him as a companion of Peter, and by him consecrated as bishop of

¹ According to Eichthal, II. p. 291, a mistaken copy of the call of Matthew (Matt. ix.)!

Caesarea. See *Hom.* iii. 63, *Recogn.* iii. 65. Comp. *Constit. Apost.* vi. 8. 3, vii. 46. 1. — *αὐτός*] after the *name* (as viii. 41), his *personal* condition. — *ἀρχιτελώνης*] *chief publican or tax-collector*, probably a steward of the Roman farmer of the taxes, entrusted with supervision of the ordinary tax-collectors. Comp. Salmasius, *de foen. trapez.* p. 245 f.; Burm. *vectig. populi Rom.* p. 134. The tribute in Jericho may have had to do especially with the trade carried on there in the production and export of *balsam* (a trade which now no longer exists, see Robinson, *Pal.* II. p. 537). — *καὶ οὗτος ἦν*] a prolix simplicity of style. Comp. ii. 37, vii. 12, xx. 28.

Vv. 3, 4. *Τίς ἐστὶ*] *i.e.* which among those who were passing by is Jesus. "*Fama notum vultu noscere cupiebat*," Grotius. — *προδραμὼν ἔμπροσθεν*] Comp. Tob. xi. 2; Plat. *Gorg.* p. 497 A; Xen. *Cyrop.* iv. 2. 23. — *συκομορέαν*] The form *μορέα* occurs in Nicander as quoted by Athen. I. p. 51, and *συκομορέα*, Geop. x. 3. 7; more frequently *συκόμορος* (Dioscor. i. 184; Aq. Am. vii. 14; Suidas). The authorities, however, are very much divided between *συκομορέαν* (so now Tischendorf also, following B L D S) and *συκομορέαν* (Lachmann); Galen also has *μωρέα*, *de comp. med.* 5 (in Wetstein on xvii. 6). As, nevertheless, the reading *συκομοραίαν* also adds to the support of *συκομόρ.*, although it is plainly a transcriber's error, the *Recepta* is to be maintained. The word itself is = *συκάμινος* (see Dioscor. i. 184): *Egyptian fig tree*, xvii. 6. — *ἐκείνης*] see on v. 9. — *διέρχεσθαι*] *to pass through*, through the city, ver. 1.

Vv. 5-7. Whether Jesus had any personal knowledge of Zacchaeus, is a matter which could be decided only by circumstances unknown to us; and hence to bring in the higher knowledge of Jesus (Olshausen), as seeing him nevertheless directly in his *inner nature*, is in the case before us a course without sufficient justification, although Strauss, I. p. 575 f., builds thereon the view that the history is a variation of the theme of the intercourse with the publicans. According to Paulus, some one *named* the man to him. — *σήμερον*] emphatically, comp. ver. 9. *This day* is the day so important to thee, when I must abide in thy house (stay the night,

John i. 39). *δεῖ* is spoken from the consciousness of the *divine appointment* (ver. 10), "as if He could not dispense with Zacchaeus, whom, nevertheless, everybody else avoided as a great sinner" (Luther, *Predigt.*). — Ver. 7. The murmurers (*διογογγ.*, see on xv. 2) are Jews, who accompanied Jesus to the house of Zacchaeus, situated (ver. 1) before the city on the way towards Jerusalem, and here at the entrance, probably in the forecourt where the publican came to meet Jesus, saw how joyously he receives Him. Comp. on ver. 11. — *παρὰ ἄμ. ἀνδρί*] belongs to *καταλῦσαι*.

Ver. 8. The supposition "Jesu cohortationes et monitiones tantam vim habuisse in Zacchaei animum," etc. (Kuinoel, comp. Grotius), and that the murmuring and the vow did not occur till the morning of the departure (Schleiermacher, Olshausen), has no foundation in the text, in accordance with which it was rather the *immediate personal impression* of Jesus that seized and took possession of the wealthy chief publican in that manner. His *vow* includes the consciousness of his unworthiness of the great happiness that has befallen him through the entertainment of the Messiah, and his determination, for the sake of this happiness, to make abundant compensation for his former guilt. According to Paulus, the publican wished to confute the charge *παρὰ ἁμαρτ. ἀνδρί*, and said *εἴ τινός τι ἐσυκοφ. κ.τ.λ.* in the conviction of his innocence. This is opposed to the context, opposed to the preceding *τὰ ἡμῖς. κ.τ.λ.*, and opposed to ver. 10; moreover, his whole style of asserting his innocence would be an unbecoming piece of parade. — *σταθείς*] *he stood forth* before Jesus,—a joyful confidence. Comp. on xviii. 11. — *ἡμῖς*] The form *ἡμίσεια* (Lachmann), which Attic writers approve, is a correction either from *ἡμίση* or from *ἡμίσεια*.¹ As to the substantival neuter, see Kühner, § 479 b; Bornemann, *ad Xen. Cyrop.* viii. 3. 41. — *εἴ τινός τι ἐσυκοφ.*] *If I have taken*

¹ Tischendorf, namely, has adopted *το ἡμίσεια*, in accordance with B L Q A S. Certainly in the classical writers *ἡμίσεια* (scil. *μεῖρα* or *μερίς*) is the substantival feminine of *ἡμισυς*, Thuc. vi. 62. 4; Plat. *Lep.* 12, p. 956 D, *Ep.* vii. p. 347 C; Dem. 430. 8; Lucian, *Herm.* 48; while *τὰ ἡμίσεια* occurs also at least in Antonin. *Lib.* ii. p. 16; hence it is all the more probable that Luke wrote it, but it was then changed into *ἡμίσεια*, and finally into *ἡμίση*.

anything from any one by fraud. The verb (iii. 14) is construed like ἀποστερεῖν τινός τι (Plut. *Dem.* iv.; Soph. *Phil.* 1267), ἀπολαύειν τινός τι (Xen. *Hier.* vii. 9, *Mem.* i. 6. 2; Plat. *Crit.* p. 54 A; Arist. *Nub.* 1231); among the Greeks with παρά, Lys. p. 177, 32. The εἰ is not to make the matter uncertain, as though he were conscious to himself of no such extortion, but εἴ . . . τι is the milder expression of self-confession instead of ὁ, τι. See Dissen, *ad Dem. de cor.* p. 195. — τετραπλοῦν] he professes himself ready for a measure of compensation, such as was ordained for theft, *Ex.* xxi. 37; 1 Sam. xii. 3. Comp. Keil, *Arch.* § 154. 3. In respect of breach of trust and the like, it was ordained only that a fifth part above the value should be restored (Lev. v. 21 ff.; Num. v. 6 f.).

Vv. 9, 10. Πρὸς αὐτόν] to him, πρὸς, as vv. 5, 8; not: in reference to him (Grotius, Rosenmüller, Kuinoel, de Wette, and others), so that Jesus spoke to the disciples or to the people (Paulus). He speaks to Zacchaeus, but not in the second person (τῷ οἴκῳ σου), because what He said was to serve at the same time as a correction for those murmurers (ver. 7, comp. on ver. 11), and consequently was to have a more general destination. Hence it is also at least unnecessary, with Ewald, to assume an audible *soliloquy* of Jesus, and to read πρὸς αὐτόν (to himself) (comp. πρὸς ἑαυτόν, xviii. 11). — καθότι καὶ αὐτὸς κ.τ.λ.] in accordance with the fact that (i. 7; Acts ii. 21; in the New Testament used only by Luke) he also (as other Jews, although he is despised as a sinner) is a son of Abraham, —as which he belongs to the saving solicitude of the Messiah. Comp. xiii. 16. It is not the *worthiness* (Grotius, Kuinoel, Bleek, and others), but the *theocratic claim* that is meant. Cyprian, Tertullian, Chrysostom, Maldonatus, and others, including Schenkel, who regard Zacchaeus as a *Gentile*, are compelled to take υἱὸς Ἀβρ. in an *ethical* sense ("quamvis genere non sit, tamen fide est," Maldonatus). But that he was a Gentile is in itself (see also on ver. 2), and according to ver. 8, not to be supposed, and is not implied in ver. 7. — Ver. 10. γάρ] justifies what is said at ver. 9: with full right do I say that this day is salvation come to this house (the

family of this house), etc., *for the Messiah has come to seek and to save that which is lost*, i.e. those who have incurred eternal ruin. The collective neuter used of persons, as in John xvii. 2; on the thought, see 1 Tim. i. 15. — ἡλθε] emphatically placed first; for Jesus declares the purpose of His *appearance*. — ζητῆσαι] might be suggested by the idea of a *shepherd* (xv. 4); still the text contains no closer reference of that kind. Hence it is rather a general expression of the *seeking of the love that is solicitous for souls*. Comp. 2 Cor. xii. 14. Moreover, comp. on Matt. xviii. 11.

Ver. 11. As to the relation of the following parable to Matt. xxv. 14–30,¹ see on Matthew; the form in Luke is not the original one; see also Weiss in the *Jahrb. f. D. Th.* 1864, p. 128 ff. — ἀκούοντων δὲ αὐτῶν ταῦτα] *But because they heard this* (ver. 8 ff.), whereby their Messianic anticipations could only be strengthened; see what follows. Not the disciples (Grotius and others), but only those *murmurers*, ver. 7, could be the *subject*—the single plural-subject which preceded. The scene is this—the people in attendance have accompanied Jesus as far as the entrance into the house (as far as into the forecourt), when they also observe how Zacchaeus joyously welcomes Jesus, and they murmur; whereon Zacchaeus speaks the words, ver. 8, and Jesus the rejoinder, vv. 9 and 10. — Both utterances therefore are spoken while they are still at the entrance, so that the murmuring crowd also listens to what is said. The connection is neither disclosed first of all from the contents of the parable (Weizsäcker), nor is it obscure (de Wette, Holtzmann), but it is darkened by the interpreters (see also Schleiermacher). — προσθεῖς] *adding to*, still continuing—a Hebraism, as at Gen. xxxviii. 5, Job xxix. 1, and elsewhere; Winer, p. 416 [E. T. 588]. In pure Greek the expression would run προσθεὶς παραβ. εἶπεν. — εἶπε παραβ.] Comp. xviii. 9. — ἐγγύς] 150 stadia, Joseph. *Bell.* iv. 8. 3.

¹ In affinity with the contents of this parable is the word which Christ, according to Clem. *Homil.* ii. 51, iii. 50, xviii. 20, and Apelles in Epiphani. *Haer.* 44. 2, is said to have spoken: γίνεσθι δόκιμοι πραιπιτῆται. The wide publication of this saying in Christian antiquity (Clem. Alex., Origen, etc.) makes it probable (in opposition to Lechler, *Apost. Zeit.* p. 458) that it actually was a word of Christ's.

— ὅτι παραχρῆμα κ.τ.λ.] ὑπέλαβον, ὅτι διὰ τοῦτο ἄνεισι νῦν εἰς Ἱερουσ., ἵνα βασιλεύσῃ ἐν αὐτῇ, Euthymius Zigabenus. — ἀναφαίνεσθαι] *to come to light*. — The people think of the *glorious* setting up of the kingdom believed in by them. This verse, moreover, does not exclude from the connection of Luke the history of the entrance, ver. 29 ff., which Marcion rejected. Comp. Hilgenfeld, *Krit. Unters.* p. 466.

Vv. 12, 13. Here is represented a man of noble descent, a nobleman, who journeys into the far country to the governor, who possesses the supremacy, in order to receive, as a vassal, from him regal power over those who have been his fellow-citizens up to that time. This representation is borrowed from the circumstances of governors in Palestine at that time, the kings of which, the Herods, received from Rome their *βασιλεία*; especially the instance of Archelaus, in respect of the fruitless protest raised against him by the Jews (Joseph. *Antt.* xvii. 11. 1), is sufficiently similar, reasonably to derive the parabolic narrative, so far as that part of it is concerned, from the remembrance of that transaction.¹ — εἰς χώραν μακράν] a contrast with the *παραχρῆμα*, ver. 11, for Jesus must first go into heaven to the Father, but not consequently removing the *Parousia* beyond the duration of the lifetime of the generation (Baur, Zeller), since the reckoning at the return has to do with the same servants. — ἐαυτῷ] he wished to receive the kingly dignity *for himself*, although till then there had been another king. — Ver. 13. ἐαυτοῦ] *ten slaves of his own*, of whom therefore he might rightly expect the care of his interest. Comp. on Matt. xxv. 14. — δέκα μνᾶς] *to wit, to each one*.² The Attic mina = 100 drachmas, *i.e.* according to Wurm, *de ponderum etc. rationibus*, p. 266, = from 22 thal. 16 grosch. to 24 thal. 3 grosch. Vienna standard money [*scil.* = from

¹ Possibly even the locality suggested to Jesus the reference to Archelaus. For in Jericho stood the royal palace which Archelaus had built with great magnificence, Joseph. *Antt.* xvii. 13. 1.

² An essential variation from Matt. xxv. The equality of the pecuniary sum which is given to all shows that it was not the (very varied) charismatic endowment for office, but the office itself, that was meant to be typified, whose equal claims and duties, however, were observed by the individuals very differently and with very unequal result.

£3, 7s. 8d. to £3, 12s. 4d.]. The small sum astonishes us (even if we should understand thereby *Hebrew* minae; one מנה = 100 shekels, 1 Kings x. 17; 2 Chron. ix. 16). Compare, on the other hand, the talents, Matt. xxv. But in Matt. *l.c.* the lord transfers to his servants *his whole property*; here, he has only devoted *a definite sum of money* to the purpose of putting ten servants to the proof therewith, and the smallness of this amount corresponds to what is so carefully emphasized in our parable, viz. the relation of faithfulness *in the least* to its *great* recompense, ver. 17, which relation is less regarded in the parable in Matthew; hence in his Gospel (xxv. 21, 23) it is only said ἐπὶ ὀλίγα (not as in Luke xix. 17, ἐν ἐλαχίστῳ); and the recompense of the individuals is stated indefinitely and in similar terms. The device that the lord took most of his money *with him on the journey* (Kuinoel) explains nothing; but the assumption of a mistake in the translation (Michaelis), whereby out of minae is made *portions* (מנה), is sheer invention. — πραγματ.] follow commercial pursuits, Plut. Sull. vii. 17, Cat. min. 54; Lucian, Philops. 36. — ἐν ᾧ ἔρχομαι] during which (to wit, during this your πραγματεύεσθαι) I come, i.e. *in the midst of which I return*. As to ἔρχ. in the sense of *coming again*, which the context affords, see on John iv. 16.

Vv. 14, 15. The embassy sent forth after him (ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ) goes to the bestower of the kingdom; hence τοῦτον; "*fastidiose loquuntur*," Bengel. — οἱ πολῖται αὐτοῦ] his fellow-citizens, Plat. Protag. p. 315 C, and frequently; Gen. xxiii. 11. — οὐ θέλομεν κ.τ.λ.] not instead of θέλομεν τοῦτον οὐ βασιλ. (Markland, *ad Lys.* I. p. 280 f.; Bornemann), but definite rejection: we will not that this man shall be king. On βασιλεύσαι (*Aor.*), see Schaefer, *App. ad Dem.* III. p. 457. — Ver. 15. In respect of the form γνοῖ (Lachmann, Tischendorf), see on Mark v. 43. — τίς τι] who gained anything, and what he gained? See on Mark xv. 24. — διαπραγματ.] not: "*negotiaudo lucratus esset*" (Castalio, so usually), but: *had undertaken*. Comp. Dion. Hal. iii. 72. Passages where διαπραγμ. means *perscrutari* are not in point here, Plat. *Phaed.* p. 77 D, 95 E.

Vv. 16, 17. *Ἡ μὲν σου κ.τ.λ.*] “Modeste lucrum acceptum fert herili pecuniae, non industriae suae,” Grotius, comparing 1 Cor. xv. 10. On *προσειργάσ.*, *has gained to it*, comp. Xen. *Hell.* iii. 1. 28. — *εὖγε* (see the critical remarks): *well done! bravo!* Comp. on Matt. xxv. 21. — *Since thou in the least hast become faithful* (actually, not: *hast been*), *be thou ruler over ten cities.* Comp. xvi. 10.

Ver. 21. As to this apology and its rejection, ver. 22 f., see on Matt. xxv. 24 ff. — *αἴρεις κ.τ.λ.*] a closer reference to the meaning of *ἄνθρ. αὐστηρὸς εἶ*, comp. ver. 22, hence no longer dependent on *ὅτι*, *thou takest up what thou hast not laid down.* This is to be left in the generality of its proverbial form as an expression of the unsparingness of the property of others, which, however, is here conceived of not as dishonest, but in stringent vindication of legitimate claims. The servant pretends that he was afraid for the possible case of the loss of the mina; that the rigorous lord would indemnify himself for it from his property. De Wette and Bleek are wrong in reading: *thou claimest back* what thou hast not *entrusted*,—opposed to which is the literal meaning of *αἴρεις* and its correlation with *ἔθηκας*. Moreover, ver. 23 is not in harmony therewith. Comp. rather the injunction in Josephus, *c. Ap.* 2: *ὃ μὴ κατέθηκε τις, οὐκ ἀναιρήσεται*, and the law of Solon in Diog. Laert. i. 2. 9: *ἂ μὴ ἔθου, μὴ ἀνέλῃ*. The *austere* character (*αὐστηρὸς*) consists in the regardlessness of the inhumanity, in respect of which is experienced the “*summum jus, summa injuria.*” The epithet *σκληρὸς* in Matthew denotes the same thing, but under a different figurative representation (in opposition to Tittmann, *Synon.* p. 139).

Vv. 23, 24. The question comes in abruptly with *καί*, laying bare the contradiction between the clauses. See Hartung, *Partikell.* I. p. 147. — *ἐπὶ τράπεζαν* (without an article, see the critical remarks), *on a banker's table.* The sign of interrogation is to be placed, with Lachmann and Tischendorf, after *τράπεζαν*. *καὶ ἐγὼ* (Lachmann, Tischendorf: *κἀγώ*) κ.τ.λ. is then the result which, in the event hinted at by *διὰ τί* κ.τ.λ. (*ἄν*, see Buttmann, *Neut. Gr.* p. 187 [E. T. 216]), would have followed. — Ver. 24. *τ. παρεστ.*] *i.e.* the *satellites*, i. 19.

— τὰς δέκα μνᾶς] *the ten minae* mentioned at ver. 16, therefore not those which *he had from the beginning*, but those which he has *acquired* for himself with the mina that was entrusted to him.

Ver. 25 interrupts the discourse, since at ver. 26 the king (not Jesus) continues, as is proved by ver. 27; hence, with Lachmann and Ewald, ver. 25 is to be put in parentheses, but not, with Bleek, to be set aside as an interpolation. — Ver. 26 justifies (even without γάρ, see the critical remarks) the direction contained in ver. 24 by a general principle; but the parenthesis of ver. 25 contains the reason *wherefore* the king added this justification.

Ver. 27. Πλὴν] *Besides*—breaking off. The further arrangement of the king turns away now, that is to say, from the slaves just conferred with, and has to do with those *enemies*, ver. 14, about whom the decision is still pending. — τούτους (see the critical remarks), although referring to those who were absent, describes them as present in the idea of the speaker and the hearers, Wolf, *ad Dem. Lept.* p. 295; Heindorf, *ad Phaed.* p. 60; Bornemann, *Schol.* p. 120. — κατασφάξ.] *Slay them*; the strong expression is *chosen* as shadowing forth the completeness of the condemnation to everlasting death at the final judgment. Comp. Xen. *Anab.* iv. 1. 23; Herod. viii. 127; Sophl. *O. R.* 730; Diod. Sic. xii. 76; 2 Macc. v. 12.

The doctrine of the parable, according to Luke's form of it, concerns, on the one hand, the Jewish people that would not receive Jesus as the Messiah (comp. John i. 11); and, on the other, the disciples who were to make application of the official charge entrusted to them (the μνᾶ which each had equally received) zealously as far as possible in the interest of the Messiah until His *Parousia*. The Messiah thus appears in a twofold relation: to His perverse people and to His servants. *The latter* are to be called to account at the *Parousia*, and according to the measure of the actual discharge of official duty committed equally to all, will be exalted to a proportionally high degree of participation in the Messianic dominion (comp. Rom. v. 17, viii. 17; 1 Cor. iv. 8; 2 Tim. ii. 12).

This happiness, however, will be so far from falling to the lot of the indolent servant, who in any case is inexcusable,¹ that he was rather to be deprived of the official position of service which he had received, and consequently was to receive no kind of share in the future glory of the kingdom, to which, nevertheless, he also had been appointed. But *the former*, the antagonistic Jews, are to be dealt with by the returning Messiah with the heaviest punishments.

Ver. 28. The narrative is wanting in precision, since, according to ver. 5 f., this ἐπορεύετο did not take place till the next morning. — ἔμπροσθεν] *He went before* ("præcedebat," Vulg.), i.e. according to the context (ver. 29), *at the head of His disciples*. Comp. Mark x. 32. Erasmus, Kypke, Kuinoel, Ewald, and others have: *He went forwards*, *He pursued His journey*. This would be the simple ἐπορεύετο (xiii. 33 and elsewhere) or ἐπορ. εἰς τὸ ἔμπροσθεν.

Vv. 29—38. See on Matt. xxi. 1—9; Mark xi. 1—10. Luke follows Mark, yet not without something peculiar to himself towards the end. With Fritzsche, *ad Marc.* p. 794 f., Lachmann, and Tischendorf, we must certainly place the accent thus on the word ἐλαιών, *olive-grove, olivetum*; not as though, if it were ἐλαιὼν, the article would *in itself* be necessary (after ἐλαι. ὄρος would have to be repeated), but because Luke, when he designates the mountain as the "Mount of Olives," constantly has the article (ver. 37, xxii. 39); but besides, in Acts i. 12, where he likewise adds καλούμ., he undoubtedly uses the form ἐλαιών as a name. Hence, at Luke xxi. 37 also, ἐλαιών is to be written. Comp. Joseph. *Antt.* vii. 9. 2: διὰ τοῦ ἐλαιῶνος ὄρους. On the *nominative*, in respect of a verb of naming, see Lobeck, *ad Phryg.* p. 517; Fritzsche, *l.c.*; Bernhardt, p. 66. — Ver. 31. ὅτι] *because*, an answer to διὰ τί. — Ver. 33. οἱ κύριοι] the actual possessor and those belonging to him. — Ver. 35. ἐαυτῶν] they use *their own upper garments* for a riding cushion in their reverence and love

¹ Ver. 23 serves to mark this inexcusableness in the concrete illustration. The text does not give any further verbal interpretation of the banker's counter. Lange, *L. J.* II. 1, p. 414, finds that by the τράπεζα is depicted the church or the congregation to which the office might have been given back.

for the Lord. So *ἐαυτῶν* serves for a vivid *colouring* of the narrative. — Ver. 37. *ἐγγίζοντος . . . πρὸς τῇ καταβ.]* *πρὸς*, not of the movement *whither* (de Wette), but a pregnant union of the direction (*ἐγγίζ.*) with the *where* (when He approached at the declivity). See generally, Kühner II. p. 316. In Homer *πρὸς* is often found thus with the dative. — *ἤρξαντο*] for this was only the last station of the Messiah's entry. — *τῶν μαθητῶν*] in the wider sense. — *εἶδον*] for all the Messianic mighty works which they, as companions of Jesus, had seen. — Ver. 38. *ἐν ὀνόμ. κ.]* belongs to *ἐρχόμ.*, according to a frequent transposition. See Bornemann, *Schol.* p. 121 f.; Kühner, *ad Xen. Anab.* iv. 2. 18. Comp. xxiii. 48. — *εἰρήνη κ.τ.λ.]* The thought that "*with God is salvation* (which He is now purposing to communicate by means of the Messiah), *and He is praised* (for it) *in the height* (by the angels, comp. ii. 14)," is expressed in a hymnic form by the parallelism: "Salvation is in the heaven, and glory in the highest." Luke gives the acclamation, according to a tradition, which had avoided the Hebrew Hosanna.

Ver. 39 ff. Peculiar to Luke, and as far as ver. 44 taken from tradition. — *ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου*] *from out of the multitude*, among whom they found themselves. — *ἐπιτίμησον*] *rebuke* (this crying). — *σιωπήσουσιν*] (see the critical remarks) indicative after *ἐάν*, so that the meaning of *ἄν* clings wholly to the conditioning particle, and does not affect the verb: *if* these become silent. See Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 474. — *οἱ λίθοι κράξ.]* The sense is: this outbreak of the divine praise is not to be restrained. Comp. Hab. ii. 11; Servius, *ad Virg. Ecl.* v. 28; Chagiga, f. 16. 1: "Ne dicas: quis testabitur contra me? *Lapides domus ejus . . . testabuntur contra eum.*" See also the passages in Wetstein. — Ver. 41. *ἐπ' αὐτήν*] *over it*, comp. xxiii. 28. The direction of the weeping to its object; in the classical writers with a simple accusative, also with *ἐπί τινι* (Rev. xviii. 11). Observe, further, the *audible* weeping of Jesus at the view of Jerusalem, not the silent *δακρύνειν* as at the grave of Lazarus, John xi. 35. — *εἰ ἔγνως κ.τ.λ.]* *if only thou hadst known and, indeed, in this thy day, what belongs to thy salvation!* Pathetic aposiopesis, and consequently an

expression of the *fruitlessness of the wish*; comp. on xxii. 42, and on John vi. 62; Buttmann, *Neut. Gr.* p. 339 [E. T. 396]. Euthymius Zigabenus aptly says: *εἰώθασι γὰρ οἱ κλαίοντες ἐπικόπτεσθαι τοὺς λόγους ὑπὸ τῆς τοῦ πάθους σφοδρότητος. What served for the salvation of Jerusalem was the reception of Jesus as the Messiah.* — καὶ σύ] as my μαθηταί. — καὶ γε] *et quidem*. See on Acts ii. 18. — ἐν τῇ ἡμ. σου] *i.e.* in this day given to thee for thy deliverance. Comp. τὸν καιρὸν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς σου, ver. 44; Ps. cxviii. 24. — νῦν δέ] as, however, now the circumstances actually are, *but thus*; often thus since Homer after conditional clauses (John viii. 40; 1 Cor. xii. 20). — ἐκρύβη] by divine decree; see John xii. 37 ff.; Rom. xi. 7 f. — Ver. 43. ὅτι ἤξουσιν κ.τ.λ.] ὅτι does not introduce *what* has been concealed (this is rather τὰ πρὸς εἰρήνην σου), but it brings a prophetic *confirmation* of the νῦν δὲ κ.τ.λ. that has just been said: *for there shall come* (not tarry), etc. The certainty of this miserable future *proves* that what serves for thy salvation has become veiled from thine eyes. Following Lachmann, only a comma is to be placed before ὅτι. In what follows, observe the solemn five-fold repetition of καὶ in the affecting unperiodic discourse. The first takes the place of ὅτε (xvii. 22, xxiii. 44; Rom. ii. 16; John iv. 21; and see on Mark xv. 25). — χάρακα] masculine: *a palisaded wall*, Polyb. i. 29. 3, viii. 34. 3, x. 39. 1, xviii. 1. 1. On χάρακα βάλλειν, see Plut. *Aem. P.* 17, *Marcell.* 18. As a *feminine*, it is limited by the grammarians to the signification of *vine-prop*, but see Lobeck, *ad Phryg.* p. 61 f. — σοι] Comp. Xen. *Mem.* ii. 1. 14: ταῖς πόλεσιν ἐρύματα περιβάλλονται. According to Herod. i. 163, and elsewhere, σέ might also be used. In the Jewish war the rampart was actually erected (hence Schenkel considers this point as *vaticinium ex eventu*), burnt up by the Jews, and replaced by Titus with a wall. See Joseph. v. 6. 2, v. 12. 2 ff. — συνέξουσιν] *keep close*, see on Phil. i. 23. — Ver. 44. ἐδαφιοῦσί σε] *they shall level thee* (Polyb. vi. 33. 6), *i.e.* *make thee like to the ground*. Comp. Amos ix. 14; also κατασκάπτειν εἰς ἔδαφος, Thuc. iv. 109. 1. Comp. iii. 68. 2. The following κ. τὰ τέκνα σ. ἐν σοί is added by a *zeugma*, so that now ἐδαφίζω has the signification,

frequent in the LXX., *to dash on the ground* (Hos. xiv. 1; Nah. iii. 10; Ps. cxxxvii. 9). The *children* of the city are its *inhabitants*, Matt. xxiii. 37; Luke xiii. 34; Gal. iv. 25. The city is *figuratively* regarded as a mother, hence τὰ τέκνα are not to be understood (Kuinoel) of the *actual* children (*infantes*). — τὸν καιρ. τ. ἐπισκ. σου] *the time of the solicitude concerning thee*, when God interested Himself for thee by means of the offer of the Messianic salvation through me. Comp. 1 Pet. ii. 12; Prov. xxix. 13; Job xxix. 4; Wisd. ii. 10, iii. 7; Ecclus. xviii. 19; 3 Macc. v. 42, and thereon Grimm. ἐπισκοπή in itself is a *vox media*, and in the LXX. and Apocrypha (Wisd. xiv. 11, xix. 15) is frequently also used when God concerns Himself with any one *in punishment*. The word does not occur in the classical writers.

Vv. 45, 46. See on Matt. xxi. 12 f.; Mark xi. 15–17. Luke proceeds by brief extracts, and, moreover, gives the saying in Isa. lvi. 7 not as Mark gives it, but in the abbreviated form of Matthew. — ἤρξατο] He *began* therewith His Messianic ministry in the temple. Schleiermacher erroneously regards vv. 45, 46 as the concluding formula of the narrative of the journey.

Vv. 47, 48. Καὶ οἱ πρῶτοι τ. λαοῦ] The worldly aristocracy, yet with special emphasis. — ἐξεκρέματο κ.τ.λ.] *the people hung upon Him as they hearkened to Him*. “Populi assiduitas aditum hostibus obstruebat,” Bengel. On ἐκκρέμαμαι with a genitive, comp. Plut. *Mar.* 12, and the passages in Wetstein. With ἐκ, Gen. xlv. 30; Plat. *Lrg.* v. p. 731 E.

CHAPTER XX.

VER. 1. *ἐκείνων*] is wanting in the authorities of greatest importance. Condemned by Griesb., deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. An addition for greater precision. — *ἀρχιερεῖς*] A E G H K U V Γ Δ Λ, min. Goth. Slav. Theophyl. have *ιερεῖς*. Recommended by Griesb., adopted by Matth. and Tisch. The *Recepta* is from the parallels. — Ver. 3. *ἐνα*] is wanting in B L R S, min. Syr. Copt. Colb. For. Tol. It stands *after* λόγ. in A K M U* min. Condemned by Griesb., deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. It is from the parallels, from which also οὖν is introduced after *διὰ* τι, ver. 5. — Ver. 10. *δῶσιν*] *δώσουσιν* is so strongly attested by A B L M Q S, min., that it is to be adopted, with Lachm. and Tisch., and *δῶσιν* to be regarded as a grammatical emendation. — Ver. 13. *ιδόντες*] is wanting in B C D L Q S, min. vss. Ambr., and is condemned by Griesb., deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. The superfluous word was omitted on account of the parallels; there was no reason for its addition. — Ver. 14. *ἐαυτούς*] Tisch. has *ἀλλήλους*, following B D L R S, min. vss. The *Recepta* is from ver. 5 and Mark xii. 7; comp. Matt. xxi. 38. From the parallels also comes *δεῦτε*, which, in accordance with very important evidence, is deleted by Rinck, Lachm. and Tisch. Luke nowhere has the word. — Ver. 19. With Lachm. and Tisch., on preponderant evidence, read: *οἱ γραμμ. καὶ οἱ ἀρχιερ.* — Ver. 20. *εἰς τό*] B C D L S have *ὥστε*, which, with Bornemann, Lachm. and Tisch., is to be adopted; the *εἰς τό*, foreign to Luke, is an interpretation. — Ver. 23. *τί με πειράζετε*] condemned by Griesb. and Rinck, deleted by Tisch., following B L S, min. Copt. Arm. Rightly; it is from Matt. xxii. 18, whence also in C ὑποκριταί, too, is interpolated. — Ver. 24. Instead of *δείξατε* Elz. has *ἐπιδείξατε*, in opposition to decisive evidence; it is from Matth. — After *δηνάριον* Lachm. has in brackets *οἱ δὲ ἔδειξαν, καὶ εἶπεν*. Not strongly enough attested by B L S, min. vss. to appear otherwise than a gloss in accordance with the parallels. — Ver. 27. *ἀντιλέγοντες*] B C D L S, min. vss. have *λέγοντες*. Approved by Schulz and Fritzsche, *ad Marc.* XII. 8. An emendation, according to the parallels. — Ver. 28. Instead of the second *ἀποθάνη*,

B L P Σ *** min. vss. (including Vulg. It.) Lachm. [Tisch. S] have merely η . An attempt at improvement suggested by ignorance. — Vv. 30, 31. Much confusion among the authorities. Lachm. has retained the *Recepta*, nevertheless he places before $\omega\sigma\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\varsigma$ another $\omega\sigma\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\varsigma$ in brackets, and throws out the $\kappa\alpha\iota$ which Elz. has after $\epsilon\pi\tau\acute{\alpha}$, with Griesb. and Scholz. I agree with Tisch. in regarding as original the text of B D L Σ , 157: $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \delta\ \delta\epsilon\upsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \delta\ \tau\rho\acute{\iota}\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\lambda\alpha\beta\epsilon\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\eta\nu\ \omega\sigma\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\varsigma\ \delta\epsilon\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \omicron\iota\ \epsilon\pi\tau\acute{\alpha}\ \omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\ \tau\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\eta\nu\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\epsilon\theta$. Comp. Bornem. in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1843, p. 136; also Rinck, *Lucubr.* p. 333. To this text the gloss $\epsilon\lambda\alpha\beta\epsilon\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\eta\nu$ was added to $\delta\ \delta\epsilon\upsilon\tau$.; this occasioned the dropping out of these words in their true place, and there appeared: $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \delta\ \delta\epsilon\upsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\lambda\alpha\beta\epsilon\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\eta\nu\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \delta\ \tau\rho\acute{\iota}\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \lambda$. Thus still Copt. The deleting of $\epsilon\lambda\alpha\beta\epsilon\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\eta\nu$ in this spurious place, without restoring them again to the genuine one, occasioned the text of D: $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \delta\ \delta\epsilon\upsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \delta\ \tau\rho\acute{\iota}\tau\omicron\varsigma$ (without $\epsilon\lambda\alpha\upsilon\tau$). The *Recepta* has grown up out of circumstantial glosses. Even the double $\omega\sigma\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\varsigma$ (A E II V r Δ , min. Goth. Syr., taken by Matth. into the text) is a gloss; it was thought to be necessary to complete the simple $\epsilon\lambda\alpha\beta\epsilon\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\eta\nu$. The $\kappa\alpha\iota$, which Elz. has after $\epsilon\pi\tau\acute{\alpha}$, is indeed defended by Rinck, but decisively condemned by the authorities. A connective addition made from misunderstanding. — Ver. 32 is, as by Tisch., to be read: $\upsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \eta\ \gamma\upsilon\nu\eta\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\epsilon\delta\alpha\nu\epsilon\nu$ (Lachm.: $\upsilon\sigma\tau$. $\acute{\alpha}\pi\epsilon\theta$. $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \gamma$). The *Recepta* is from Matth. — Ver. 33. The order of the words: $\eta\ \gamma\upsilon\nu\eta\ \omicron\upsilon\nu\ \epsilon\nu\ \tau\eta\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\sigma\tau$. (B L), is, with Tisch., to be preferred; it was altered in accordance with the parallels. — Ver. 34. $\epsilon\kappa\gamma\alpha\mu\acute{\iota}\sigma\kappa\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\iota$] objectionable, since A K M P U r Δ , min. have $\epsilon\kappa\gamma\alpha\mu\acute{\iota}\zeta\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\iota$, while B L Σ , min. Or. Epiph. Nyss. have $\gamma\alpha\mu\acute{\iota}\sigma\kappa\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\iota$. Read the latter, with Lachm. and Tisch. The *Recepta* and $\epsilon\kappa\gamma\alpha\mu\acute{\iota}\zeta\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\iota$ are glosses to give greater precision. Equally, however, at ver. 35 also is not to be read $\gamma\alpha\mu\acute{\iota}\zeta\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\iota$, with Matth. Lachm. Tisch., in accordance with D L Q R Δ Σ , but $\gamma\alpha\mu\acute{\iota}\sigma\kappa\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\iota$, in accordance with B. — Ver. 40. $\omicron\varsigma$] B L Σ , min. Copt. Tisch. have $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$. Rightly; $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ was not understood.

Vv. 1-8. See on Matt. xxi. 23-27; Mark xi. 27-33. Luke follows Mark with some abbreviation, and with some material peculiar to himself, as also in the further portions of this chapter. — $\epsilon\nu\ \mu\acute{\iota}\alpha\ \tau\omicron\omega\nu\ \eta\mu\epsilon\rho\omega\nu$] (without $\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu\omega\nu$, see the critical remarks) is, as v. 17, viii. 22, an *approximate* statement of the date; the days *in question* are meant, to wit, of the stay in Jerusalem. Schleiermacher is arbitrary in seeing here the beginning of a special document. — $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\sigma\tau\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$] *came*

upon. The idea of *suddenness* and *unexpectedness* is not of itself contained in the word, and needed to be expressed (as xxi. 34; Isocr. viii. 41; Philo Flacc. p. 981 C, *al.* in Loesner), or at least suggested by the context (comp. on ii. 9). — Ver. 2. ἡ] introduces a more definite idea of the point of the question. — Ver. 3. καὶ εἵπατέ μοι] καί is the simple *and*: I will ask you, *and tell me* (what I shall ask you). Then follows the question itself. — *συνελογ.*] *they reckoned, they considered*. Only here in the New Testament, frequently in the classical writers. — Ver. 6. πᾶς ὁ λαὸς καταλιθ. ἡμᾶς] a later form of the tradition. The word is not elsewhere retained. Comp. καταλιθοῦν in Josephus, καταλιθοβολεῖν, Ex. xvii. 4. It denotes the stoning *down*.

Vv. 9-19. See on Matt. xxi. 33-46; Mark xii. 1-12. — ἡρξάτο] after that despatch of the members of the Sanhedrim. — πρὸς τ. λαόν] “*muniendum contra interpellationem antistitum*,” Bengel. Otherwise in Matt. and Mark, according to whom the discourse is addressed *directly* to the members of the Sanhedrim, and these, according to Luke, are also *present* (ver. 19). — Ver. 10. δώσουσιν] (see the critical remarks): see on 1 Cor. ix. 18; Eph. vi. 3. — αὐτῷ] *to him*, the possessor of the vineyard, by the servants. — Ver. 11. προσέθετο πέμψαι] a Hebraism, Gen. iv. 2, and elsewhere. Comp. on xix. 11, and see Valckenaer, p. 253 f. — Ver. 13. ἴσως] *perchance*. The corresponding German word (*vielleicht*) expresses not mere conjecture, but, although in a still doubting form, his *expectation* (“*spem rationi congruentem*,” Bengel). See Locella, *ad Xen. Eph.* p. 213; Bornemann, *Schol.* p. 122 f.; Ellendt, *Lex. Soph.* I. p. 855. Only here in the New Testament. — Ver. 14. ἰδόντες δὲ αὐτόν] with emphasis, corresponding to the previous τοῦτον ἰδόντες. — Ver. 16. εἶπον] Persons from the people in ver. 9, who have comprehended, although dimly, the foreshadowing of evil. — μὴ γένοιτο] (see on Rom. iii. 4), to wit, that the γεωργοί lay hands themselves on the son, kill him, and bring about the ἀπολέσει κ.τ.λ.! — Ver. 17. οὖν] *what then*, if your μὴ γένοιτο is to be allowed, *what then is this scriptural saying*, etc. It is meaningless, there is nothing in it. — Ver. 19. καὶ ἐφοβ.] καί, *and yet*;

comp. on Mark xii. 12. — ἐγνώσαν] *the people*, to wit,¹ whose understanding the passage of Scripture, ver. 17 f., accompanied by the heart-penetrating glance of Jesus (ἐμβλέψας), has opened.

Vv. 20–26. See on Matt. xxii. 15–22; Mark xii. 13–17. — παρατηρήσ.] *having watched*, so that they had thus further lain in wait for Him after that hour, ver. 19, in order to be able to entrap Him. — ἐγκαθέτους] *people instigated*, secretly commissioned, Plat. *Axiach.* p. 368 E; Dem. 1483. 1; Polyb. xiii. 5. 1; Joseph. *Antt.* vi. 5. 2. — ἐαυτοὺς δικαίους εἶναι] who feigned *that they themselves were strict observers of the law*, who, therefore, by the pressure of their own consciences (not instigated by other people), came with the following question. These therefore are such “qui tum, quum maxime fallunt, id agunt, ut viri boni videantur,” Cicero, *Off.* i. 13. — ἐπιλάβ.] The subject is the members of the Sanhedrim. — αὐτοῦ λόγου] *in order to take hold of Him on a word*. αὐτοῦ does not depend on λόγου (Kypke, Kuinoel, Bleek), but on ἐπιλάβ., and λόγου is the secondary object. See Job xxx. 18. Xen. *Anab.* iv. 7. 12: ἐπιλαμβάνεται αὐτοῦ τῆς ἔντος. The Vulgate rightly has: “eum in sermone.” — ὥστε (see the critical remarks), as iv. 29; Matt. xxiv. 24. — τῇ ἀρχῇ κ. τῇ ἐξουσίᾳ. τ. ἡγ.] *to the supremacy and (and especially) the power of the procurator*. To combine the two (“*the supremacy and power of the magistrate*,” Beza, de Wette, Bleek) is not indeed *forbidden* by the repetition of the article, but it is *opposed* by it, because this repetition would have no motive. — Ver. 21. λαμβάν. πρόσωπ.] *art not a partisan*. See on Gal. ii. 6. — Ver. 22. φόρον] *capitation and land-tribute*, to be distinguished from τέλος, the indirect tribute (the tax on merchandise), see Kypke, II. p. 183 f., and already Thomas Magister, p. 900, ed. Bern. Comp. Rom. xiii. 7. Luke uses the *Greek* instead of the Roman word κῆνσον, found in Matthew and Mark. — Ver. 26. Observe the careful depicting of the triumph of Jesus. Comp. ver. 39 f.

¹ See on Mark xii. 12. The reference to the scribes and chief priests involves us in subtleties as in Grotius, Lange, *L. J.* III. p. 494, and others. πρὸς αὐτοῖς refers first of all to the hierarchs.

Vv. 27-40. See on Matt. xxii. 23-33 ; Mark xii. 18-27. — οἱ ἀντιλέγοντες] does not belong by an abnormal apposition to τῶν Σαδδουκαίων (thus usually, including Winer, p. 471 [E. T. 668]), but to τινές. These τινές, namely, *so far as they were* τινές τῶν Σαδδουκ., are more precisely characterized by οἱ ἀντιλέγ. κ.τ.λ.: *People who there concerted together* (participle with article, see Kühner, II. p. 131). — ἀνάστ. μὴ εἶναι] On μὴ and infinitive after ἀντιλέγ., comp. Xen. *Anab.* ii. 5. 29, and see in general Bernhardt, p. 364 ; Hartung, *Partikell.* II. p. 168. — Ver. 28. καὶ οὗτος κ.τ.λ.] *and indeed shall have died without children.* See Matthiae, p. 1040. — Ver. 29. οὖν] for the subsequent procedure took place *in consequence* of that law. — Ver. 30 f. According to the rectified text (see the critical remarks): *And the second and the third took her ; in like manner, moreover, also* (as those three who had taken her and died childless) *the seven* (collectively, comp. xvii. 17) *left behind no children, and died.* Logically ἀπέθανον ought to precede, but the emphasis of οὐ κατέλ. τέκνα has occasioned the ὕστερον πρότερον. See Kühner, II. p. 629 ; Bornemann, *Schol.* p. 125. — Ver. 34 f. οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου] Comp. on xvi. 8. Yet here what is meant is not according to the ethical, but the *physical* idea: *the men of the pre-Messianic periods of the world.* — οἱ δὲ καταξιωθ. κ.τ.λ.] *but they who* (at the *Parousia*) *shall be counted worthy* (comp. 2 Thess. i. 5) *to become partakers of the future age* (the Messianic period), *and of the resurrection from the dead.* Herein is to be observed— (1) that here is likewise a πρότερον ὕστερον (comp. on ver. 31), for the resurrection *discloses* the participation in the αἰὼν ἐκεῖνος; but the context (see also τῆς ἀναστάσ. υἱοὶ ὄντες, ver. 36) shows that Jesus has in view *only* those *who are to be raised*, apart from those who are *still living* here at the *Parousia*, comp. Rom. viii. 11 ; (2) according to the connection (καταξιωθ., and see ver. 36), the resurrection here meant is defined as *the first*, the ἀνάστασις τῶν δικαίων (see on xiv. 14). — The *genitives* τοῦ αἰῶν. ἐκ. and τῆς ἀναστ. are governed by τυχεῖν. Comp. Aesch. *Prom.* 239 : τοιούτου τυχεῖν οὐκ ἤξιώθην ; Winer, p. 566 [E. T. 761]. Moreover, comp. the Rabbinical *dignus futuro saeculo* וְכֹחַ עוֹלָם הַבָּא, in

Schoettgen and Wetstein. — Ver. 36. With Lachmann, following A B D L P, we must write οὐδέ¹ (Winer, p. 434 f. [E. T. 614]; Buttmann, p. 315 [E. T. 368]): *for neither can they die any more.* The immortality of those who have risen again, even if it does not exclude the difference of sex absolutely (comp. Delitzsch, *Bibl. Psych.* p. 459²), still excludes marriage among them, since propagation presupposes a mortal race; ἐνταῦθα μὲν γὰρ ἐπεὶ θάνατος, διὰ τοῦτο γάμος, Theophylact. — ἰσάγγ. . . ὄντες] gives the reason of the οὐδὲ ἀποθανεῖν ἔτι δύνανται; their immortality depends upon their changed nature, which will be—(1) *equality with the angels*; and (2) *sonship of God*. The former in respect of their higher and no longer fleshly corporeality (in opposition to Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* I. p. 316 f.; Delitzsch, and others; comp. on Matt. xxii. 30); the latter plainly not in the moral, but in the metaphysical sense; they, as risen again, have entered into the *participation of divine life and divine glory* (comp. on Matt. v. 9, 45), in respect of which the freedom from death is essential. See on υἱοὶ Θεοῦ, so far as it is used in Matthew and Luke (in Mark this designation does not occur) of the faithful only in respect of their condition *after the Parousia*, the apt remarks of Kaeuffer in the *Sächs. Stud.* 1843, p. 202 ff. But the expression cannot be borrowed from the Old Testament designation of the *angels* as sons of God (so Wittichen, *Ideen Gottes als d. Vaters*, p. 43), since the risen ones shall only be angel-like, not *angels*. — Ver. 37. Observe the special selected word ἐμῆνυσεν, which denotes the announcement of something *concealed* (John xi. 57; Acts xxiii. 30; 1 Cor. x. 28; Thuc. iv. 89; Herod. i. 23; Soph. *O. R.* 102; Plut. *Tim.* p. 27 B). — καὶ Μ.] i.e. *even Moses*, to whom ye are

¹ Comp. the critical remarks on xii. 26. The *Recepta* οὐτε is to be regarded as a mechanical repetition from what has gone before. Bornemann defends οὐτε by the supposition that it corresponds with the following καὶ. But in that case ἰσάγγ. γὰρ εἰς must be placed in a parenthesis, which, indeed, Lachmann does, although it is nowise notified, not even by the twofold εἰς, whereby the two predicates are emphatically kept apart.

² Who nevertheless assumes without proof (p. 102) that Adam's body, before the creation of the woman, was *externally without sex*, and that this also is the case with the bodies of the risen.

nevertheless appealing for a proof of the contrary, ver. 28. — ὥς λέγει κύριον κ.τ.λ.] “narrando sc. quod Deus dixerat,” Grotius. — Ver. 38. πάντες γὰρ αὐτῷ ζῶσιν] *for all* (whose God He is) *are living to Him*. The emphasis lies on πάντες: *no one* is dead to Him. αὐτῷ is the dative of reference: *in respect of Him*, that is, *in relation to Him* who is their God, they are—even although dead in relation to men—*living*.¹ This state of living *actually* has place in the intermediate state of Paradise,² where they, although dead in reference to living men, continue to live to God, and therewith is established the future resurrection as the necessary completion of this state of living. The argumentation in Luke is accordingly, by the addition of ver. 38, not different from that in Matthew and Mark, and it takes no inappropriate turn (de Wette), whereby the thought must have suffered (Weizsäcker), but is the same grand application of the divine utterance as in Matthew and Mark (see on Matthew), only enriched by that short explanatory clause ἀλλὰ ζώντων, which was introduced into the tradition,³ certainly at a later date, but without affecting the substance, except in the way of indicating the point of the argument. The αὐτῷ, however, cannot without arbitrariness be taken, according to Acts xvii. 28, as though it were ἐν αὐτῷ (Ewald: “all men, so far as they have a true life, have it only in God”). — Ver. 40. γάρ] (see the critical remarks) gives an explanation as to ver. 39. The tables had been turned; a few *praised Him*, for any further

¹ 4 Macc. xvi. 25: οἱ διὰ τὸν Θεὸν ἀποθνήσκοντες ζῶσι τῷ Θεῷ, ὥσπερ Ἀβραάμ, Ἰσαὰκ, καὶ Ἰακώβ, καὶ πάντες οἱ πατριάρχαι, is so far parallel as in that place ζῶσι τῷ Θεῷ is likewise said of the state of existence in relation to God in Paradise. Moreover, 4 Macc. vii. 19 belongs to this subject, as being a passage in harmony with the text before us. Comp. Grimm thereupon, p. 332.

² The ζῶσιν subsists not merely in the *view* of God, who considers them in reference to their future resurrection as living, as J. Müller, *v. d. Sünde*, II. p. 397, makes out.

³ The syllogism of the passage is correctly and clearly expressed in substance by Beza: “Quorum Deus est Deus, illi vivunt, ver. 38; Abrahami, Isaaci et Jacobi Deus est Deus, ver. 37; ergo illi vivunt, et quum nondum revixerint corpore, necesse est, ut suo tempore sint corporibus excitatis revicturi.” On the penetrating and fruitful exegesis of Jesus which leaves untouched the historical meaning, but is able to develope its ideal contents (comp. Matt. v. 17), see the apt remarks in Weizsäcker, p. 359 f.

hostile *putting of questions*, such as might be expected instead of praise, was no more to be thought of. So completely He stood as *victor* there again (comp. on ver. 26). With the narrative of the greatest commandment, Mark xii. 28-34, of which Luke is said to have retained only the beginning and the end (vv. 39, 40), the evangelist has here nothing at all to do (in opposition to Holtzmann). There is nothing of a *reminiscence* of Mark xii. 28 (Weiss) in ver. 39; there appears no sort of reason to attribute such poverty to Luke.

Vv. 41-44. See on Matt. xxii. 41-46; Mark xii. 35-37. εἰπε δὲ πρὸς αὐτ.] to the scribes, ver. 39 f., and indeed (otherwise Matthew and Mark) immediately after what is before related. Without reason, Grotius says: *de illis*, as ver. 19.

Vv. 45-47. See on Matt. xxiii. 1, 6, 7, 14; Mark xii. 38-40; which latter Luke closely follows after he has proceeded with considerable abbreviation in vv. 41-44.

CHAPTER XXI.

VER. 2. *Καί*] bracketed by Lachm. It is wanting in B K L M Q X Π Σ, min. Or. But A E G H S U V Γ Δ Α, min. have it after *τινα*. Thus Tisch. [not Tisch. 8]. This is correct. From ignorance objection was taken to this arrangement, and *καί* was sometimes placed before, and sometimes was struck out altogether.—
 Ver. 3. *πλεῖον*] Lachm. and Tisch. have *πλείω*, which would have to be adopted if it were not too feebly attested by D Q X, min.—
 — Ver. 4. *τοῦ Θεοῦ*] is wanting in B L X Σ, min. Copt. Syr.^{cu}. Syr.^{jer}. Deleted by Tisch. An exegetical addition.—
 Ver. 6. After *λίθω* Lachm. and Tisch. [Tisch. *synops.*, but not Tisch. 8] have *ᾧδε*, in accordance with B L Σ, min. Copt. Other authorities have it before *λίθος*. D, codd. of It. have *ἐν τοίχῳ ᾧδε*. An addition from Matthew.—
 Ver. 8. *οὖν*] is to be deleted, with Lachm. and Tisch., in accordance with B D L X Σ, min. vss. A connective addition.—
 Ver. 14. The reading *ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις* (Lachm. Tisch.), instead of *εἰς τὰς κ.*, is decisively attested.—
 Ver. 15. Elz. Matth. Scholz have *ἀντειπεῖν οὐδὲ ἀντιστῆναι*. But instead of *οὐδέ*, A K M R, min. Slav. Brix. Or. Cyr. Didym. Griesb. have *ἤ*. Sometimes with *ἤ*, sometimes with *οὐδέ*, D L Σ, min. Ar. p. Erp. Arm. Slav. Vulg. Or. have the two verbs in the reverse order. Hence Lachm. has *ἀντιστῆναι οὐδὲ ἀντειπεῖν*, and Tisch. has *ἀντιστῆναι ἢ ἀντειπεῖν*. These variations are to be explained from the fact that *ἀντειπεῖν*, with *ἤ* or *οὐδέ*, on account of the similar beginning of the following verb, was *passed over*. So according to D, Syr. Pers.^p Vulg. ms. codd. of It. Cypr. Aug. Rinck. When the passage was restored, the verbs were placed in different order; and instead of *ἤ* after the previous *οὐ*, *οὐδέ* was inserted. Accordingly, read with Griesbach: *ἀντειπεῖν ἢ ἀντιστ.*—
 — Ver. 19. Elz. Matth. Scholz, Tisch. have *κτῆσαι*. But A B, min. Syr.^{omn.} Arr. Aeth. Vulg. It. (not Vind. Cant.) Or. Macar. Marcion, ^{ac} according to Tertullian, have *κτῆσεσθε*. Recommended by Griesb., approved by Rinck, adopted by Lachm. The *Recepta* is an interpretation of the future taken imperatively.—
 Ver. 22. Elz. has *πληρωθῆναι*. But *πλησθῆναι* is decisively attested.—
 Ver. 23. *δέ*] deleted by Lachm. and Tisch., following B D L, Arr.

It. Theophyl. An addition from the parallels. — After ἰργή Elz. has ἐν, in opposition to decisive evidence. — Ver. 24. ἄχρι] Lachm. Tisch. have ἄχρις (Tisch. ἄχρι) ὧς, on decisive evidence. Luke always joins ἄχρι to a genitive. — Ver. 25. ἐν ἀπορίᾳ, ἡχούσῃ] Griesb. Lachm. Tisch. have ἐν ἀπορίᾳ ἡχούς, on decisive evidence. The *Recepta* is an interpretation. — Ver. 33. παρελθούσι] Lachm. and Tisch. have παρελεύσονται, in accordance with B D L 8, min. Rightly. See on Mark xiii. 31. — Ver. 35. Lachm. and Tisch. place γάρ after ἐπελεύσεται, so that ὡς παγίς belongs to ver. 34. Thus B D L 8, 157, Copt. It. Meth. Marcion, according to Tertull. I regard the *Recepta* as being right, as the preceding clause contains a qualifying word (αἰζηνίᾳ), but what follows in ver. 35 needed a similar qualification (ὡς παγίς). Through mistaking this, and attracting ὡς παγίς as a correlative of αἰζηνίᾳ, to the preceding clause, γάρ has been put out of its right place. Instead of ἐπελεύσεται, however, read with Lachm. and Tisch., in accordance with B D 8, ἐπισεύσεται. The doubly compounded form disappeared through error on the part of the transcribers, as frequently happened. — Ver. 36. καταξ.] Tisch. has κατασχύσητε, following B L X 8, min. Copt. Aeth. Ar. p. Rightly; the *Recepta* is a very old gloss in accordance with xx. 35, comp. 2 Thess. i. 5. — ταῦτα is deleted by Matth. and Tisch. [Tisch. ^{synops.}, not Tisch. 8]. But most of the principal mss. [including 8c] (not 8) and vss. have it. Nevertheless, it remains doubtful whether it is to be read *before* (B D L X, [8c] Elz. Lachm. [Tisch. 8]) or *after* πάντα (A C* M). If πάντα ταῦτα τῷ is original, the omission of the superfluous ταῦτα is the more easily explained. — After ver. 38 four cursives have the section concerning the woman taken in adultery, John vii. 53–viii. 11.

Vv. 1–4. See on Mark xii. 41–44. — ἀναβλέψας] previously, xx. 45 ff., Jesus spoke to His disciples surrounding Him; now He lifts up His glance from these to the people farther off, and sees, etc. He must therefore have stood not far from the γαζοφυλάκ. — τοὺς βύλλοντας . . . πλουσίους] is connected together: *the rich men casting in*. After πλουσίους might also be supplied ὄντας (Bornemann), in which case, however, the meaning comes out less appropriately, for they were not rich people only who were casting in (comp. Mark xii. 41). — Ver. 2. τινα καὶ χήραν (see the critical remarks): *aliquam, eamque viduam egeram*. Comp. Plat. *Phaed.* p. 58 D, and thereon Stallbaum. Καί is: *and indeed*. — Ver. 4. οὔτοι refers to the

more remote subject (Förtsch, *Obss. in Lys.* p. 74; Winer, p. 142 [E. T. 195]). Jesus *points* to the persons in question. — εἰς τὰ δῶρα] *to the gifts* (that were in the treasury), not: *quæ donarent* (Beza), to which the article is opposed.

Vv. 5-38. See on Matt. xxiv. 25; Mark xiii. In Luke a very free reproduction from the *Logia* and Mark. That this discourse was spoken on the Mount of Olives (Matt. Mark), there is in him no trace. Rather, according to him, it still belongs to the transactions in the temple, which began xx. 1 (comp. ver. 37); hence, moreover, the ἀναθήματα are found only in Luke.

Vv. 5, 6. Καί τινων λεγ. κ.τ.λ.] These expressions gave the occasion for Jesus to utter the following discourse, and that, as is plain from the discourse itself, to His *disciples* (the apostles also included), to whom, moreover, the τινές belonged. — ἀναθήμασι] Lachmann and Tischendorf, following A D X 8, have the Hellenistic form ἀναθέμασι (see Lobeck, *ad Phryg.* p. 249, 445; *Paralip.* p. 391 ff., 417, 424). On the many *votive offerings* of the temple, partly also such as the two Herods had given, and even Ptolemy Euergetes, see Joseph. *Bell.* vi. 5. 2; *Antt.* xv. 11. 3, xvii. 6. 3; *c. Apion.* I. 1064; Ottii *Spicileg.* p. 176 f., and generally, Ewald, *Alterth.* p. 81 ff. The most splendid was the golden vine, presented by Herod the Great. See Grotius. For the votive gifts of *Julia*, see in Philo, p. 1036 D. — ταῦτα ἃ θεωρ.] Nominative absolute. See on Matt. vii. 24; Bernhardt, p. 69; Buttmann, *Neut. Gr.* p. 325 f. [E. T. 379 f.].

Vv. 7-10. Ἐπληρώτ.] those τινές. — οὖν] since in consequence of this assurance of thine that destruction shall occur; *when*, therefore, shall it occur? — τί τὸ σημεῖον κ.τ.λ.] not an incorrect departure from Matt. xxiv. 3 (de Wette), but substantially as Mark xiii. 4, from whom Matthew differs by a more precise statement of the point of the question. — Ver. 8. ὁ καιρός] the *Messianic* point of time—that of the setting up of the kingdom. — Ver. 9. ἀκαταστ.] *tumults*; see on 2 Cor. vi. 5. — Ver. 10. τότε ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς] *then*, after these preliminary warnings, entering upon the further description of the impending judgment. Casaubon, following Beza, connects τότε with

ἐγερθ. In that case the insertion of ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς would be absolutely without motive. The motive is found precisely in τότε, which, however, notifies simply only a resting-point of the discourse, not "a much later point of time," to which what follows would belong (Holtzmann, following Köstlin), which variation as to time Luke might have put into the mouth of Jesus as easily as at ver. 12.

Ver. 11. Ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ belongs not only to σημεῖα (B, Lachmann: ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ σημ.), but also to φόβητρα, because in the connection the latter needs some qualifying clause. μεγάλη belongs to both. Moreover, comp. with reference to this detail which Luke has here, 4 Esdr. v. 4. On φόβητρα (terrific appearances), comp. Plat. *Ax.* p. 367 A; Lucian, *Philop.* 9; Isa. xix. 17. As to κατὰ τόπους, see on Matt. xxiv. 7.

Vv. 12, 13. Πρὸ δὲ τούτων π.] otherwise in Matthew and Mark. But Luke follows a later modification of the tradition moulded after the result.¹ In opposition to the words of the passage (for πρό means nothing else than *before*, *previously*), but with a harmonistic end in view, Ebrard, *Diss. adv. erron. non-nullor. opinion.* etc. p. 34, says: "persecutiones non post ceteras demum calamitates, sed *inter primas esse perferendas*."—Ver. 13. εἰς μαρτύριον] but it shall turn (comp. Phil. i. 19) to you *for a witness*, i.e. not: εἰς ἔλεγχον τῶν μὴ πιστευσάντων (Euthymius Zigabenus), but it will have for you the result *that ye bear witness for me*. The context requires this by means of ἕνεκεν τοῦ ὀνόμ. μου, ver. 12, and see ver. 14 f. The matter itself is regarded as something *great* and *honourable* (εἰς μαρτυρίου δόξαν, Theophylact). Comp. Acts v. 41. For the testimony itself, see for example Acts iv. 11 f. The reference to *martyrdom* (Baur, Hilgenfeld, Holtzmann) is opposed to the context and brings in a later *usus loquendi*.

Vv. 14, 15. Comp. xii. 11 f.; Matt. x. 19 f.; Mark xiii. 11 f.—ἐγώ] stands with great emphasis at the beginning,

¹ In respect of this Baur, *Erang.* p. 477 (comp. his *Markuserang.* p. 99 f.), thinks that Luke desires to claim what has been previously said by Jesus "altogether specially for His Apostle Paul." Comp. also Köstlin, p. 158, and Holtzmann. But then it would have been an easy thing for him to name more specially *Pauline* sufferings. Compare rather Matt. x. 17 f.

opposed to the *προμελετ. ἀπολογ.* of the disciples. Bengel well says: "Jesus loquitur pro statu exaltationis suae." — *στόμα*] a concrete representation of *speech*. Comp. Soph. *Oed. R.* 671, *Oed. C.* 685. A kindred idea, Ex. iv. 16; Isa. xv. 19. — *ἀντειπεῖν*] corresponds to *στόμα*, and *ἀντιστ.* to *σοφίαν* (comp. Acts vi. 10). — The promise was to be fulfilled by the *Holy Ghost* as the *Paraclete*, John xiv. Comp. Acts vi. 10. But a reference to the fate of *Stephen* (Holtzmann) is not sufficiently indicated.

Ver. 16. *Καί*] Bengel rightly says: "non modo ab alienis." Comp., besides, Mark xiii. 12 f.

Vv. 18, 19. Comp. 1 Sam. xiv. 45; 2 Sam. xiv. 11; 1 Kings i. 52; Acts xxvii. 34. But the meaning cannot be, "ye shall remain *unharméd in life and limb*," against which interpretation the preceding *καὶ θανατ. ἐξ ὑμῶν*, ver. 16, is decisive, since *θανατ.* cannot be taken, as by Volkmar, of mere *danger* of death; rather *ἀπόληται* is to be taken in a *Messianic* sense. Comp. the following *κτήσεσθε τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν*. Hence: no hair of your head shall be subject to the everlasting *ἀπώλεια*, i.e. *you shall not come by the slightest harm as to the Messianic salvation*; but rather, ver. 19: *through your endurance* (Matt. x. 22, xxiv. 13; Mark xiii. 13), in these persecutions, *ye shall gain your souls*, whereby is denoted the acquisition of the Messianic salvation; the latter is regarded as the *life*, and the opposite as *death*. Comp. ix. 25, xvii. 33, also *ζημιοῦσθαι τὴν ψυχὴν*, Mark viii. 36. The form of the expression *θριξ ἐκ τ. κεφ. κ.τ.λ.* has therefore a *proverbial* character (Matt. x. 30), and is not to be taken in such a manner as that God would restore again every hair at the resurrection (Zeller in the *Theol. Jahrb.* 1851, p. 336; comp. his *Apostelg.* p. 18 f.). The omission of the verse in Marcion shows that at an early period there was already found therein a contradiction to ver. 16, as Gfrörer, Baur, Hilgenfeld, and others still find there. This apparent impropriety makes it the more improbable that ver. 18 should be a later addition (Wilke, Baur, Hilgenfeld), perhaps from Acts xvii. 34.

Vv. 20-22. Comp. Matt. xxiv. 15-18; Mark xiii. 14-16. What was to happen *πρὸ τούτων πάντων*, ver. 12, is now con-

cluded. From this point the discourse continues where it broke off at ver. 12. — *κυκλουμ.*] representing the object as already conceived in the situation and therein perceived (Bernhardy, p. 477; Kühner, II. p. 357), *being surrounded on all sides*.¹ — Ver. 21. *οἱ ἐν τ. Ἰουδ.*] refers to the *Christians*; this follows from ver. 20. — *αὐτῆς*] has reference to *Jerusalem*, as subsequently *εἰς αὐτήν*. Theophylact: *ἐκτραγωδεῖ οὖν τὰ δεινὰ ἃ τότε τὴν πόλιν περιστήσεται . . . μὴ προσδοκίωσαν, ὅτι ἡ πόλις τειχέρης οὐσα φυλάξει αὐτούς. — ἐν ταῖς χώραις*] not in the *provinces* (de Wette), but in the *fields* (xii. 16), in contrast to the city into which one *εἰσέρχεται* from the country. People are not to do this, but to flee.² — Ver. 22. *τοῦ πλησθῆναι κ.τ.λ.*] a statement of the divine counsel: *that all may be fulfilled which is written*. Without this day of vengeance, an essential portion of the prophetic predictions, in which the desolation of the city and the country is in so many different ways announced as a judgment, must remain unfulfilled. The prophecy of Daniel is, moreover, meant *along with the others*, but not exclusively. Comp. already Euthymius Zigabenus.

Vv. 23, 24. Comp. Matt. xxiv. 19 ff.; Mark xiii. 17 ff., to both of which Luke is related sometimes by abridgment, sometimes by more precise statements *ex eventu*. — *Ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*] *on the earth*, without special definition (comp. v. 24, xviii. 8, xxi. 25). The latter is then introduced in the second member (*τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ*) by *καί* (and especially); but *μεγάλη* belongs to both. On the divine *ὀργή*, which is punitively accomplished in such calamities, comp. 1 Macc. i. 64, ii. 49;

¹ Wieseler, in the profound discussion in the *Gott. Vierteljahrschr.* 2 Jahrg. 2 Heft, p. 210, finds in the words *κυκλ. ὑπὸ στρατοπ. κ.τ.λ.* an explanation of the *βόλιγμα τῆς ἱερμώσεως*, Matt. xxiv. 15, which Luke gave for his Gentile-Christian readers. He thereby maintains his interpretation of the *βόλιγμα* of the Roman standards, and of the *τέπος ἄγιος*, Matt. l.c., of the environs of Jerusalem. Certainly our passage corresponds to the *βόλιγμα τῆς ἱερμώσεως* in Matthew and Mark. But Luke did not want to *explain* the expression of Daniel, but *instead of* it he stated something of a *more general character*, and that from his later standpoint, at which the time of the abomination of desolation on the temple area must needs appear to him a term *too late* for flight. We have here an *alteration* of the original *ex eventu*.

² But the expressions are too general for a reference directly to the flight of the Christians to Pella (Volkmar, *Evang. Marcion's*, p. 69).

2 Macc. v. 17; Dan. viii. 19. — τῷ λ. τ.] dependent on ἔσται. — Ver. 24. στόματι μαχαίρας] *by the mouth of the sword*, Heb. xi. 34. Thus frequently מִפִּי הַחֶבֶר, Gen. xxxiv. 26; Deut. xiii. 16, and elsewhere. Comp. Ecclus. xxviii. 18; Judith ii. 27; 1 Macc. v. 28. The sword is poetically (Hom. *Il.* xv. 389; Porson, *ad Eurip. Or.* 1279; Schaefer) represented as a biting animal (by its sharpness; hence μάχ. δίστομος, two-edged). Comp. πολέμου στόμα, Hom. *Il.* x. 8, xix. 313. The subject of πεισ. and αἰχμαλ. is: those who belong to this people. — αἰχμαλωτ.] According to Joseph. *Bell.* vi. 9. 2, ninety-seven thousand were taken prisoners, and, for the most part, dragged to Egypt and into the provinces. — Ἱερουσαλ.] when conquered and laid waste (ver. 20), in opposition to Paulus, who finds merely the besetting of the city by a hostile force here expressed. — ἔσται πατουμ. ὑπὸ ἐθνῶν] *shall be trodden under foot of the Gentiles*, a contemptuous ill-treatment; the holy city thus profaned is personified. Comp. Isa. x. 6; 1 Macc. iii. 45 (see Grimm, *in loc.*), iv. 60; Rev. xi. 2; Philo, *In Flacc.* p. 974 C; Soph. *Ant.* 741. — ἄχρις . . . ἐθνῶν] *till the times of the Gentiles shall be fulfilled*, i.e. till the time that the periods which are appointed to the Gentile nations for the completion of divine judgments (not the *period of grace* for the Gentiles, as Ebrard foists into the passage) *shall have run out*. Comp. Rev. xi. 2. Such times of the Gentiles are ended in the case in question by the *Parousia* (vv. 25 f., 27), which is to occur during the lifetime of the hearers (ver. 28); hence those *καιροί* are in no way to be regarded as of longer duration,¹ which Dorner, *de orat. Ch. eschatolog.* p. 73, ought not to have concluded from the plural, since it makes no difference with respect to duration whether a period of time is regarded as unity, or according to the plurality of its constituent parts. See, for example, 2 Tim. iii. 1 comp. with iv. 3; 1 Tim. iv. 1; Ecclus. xxxix. 31; 1 Macc. iv. 59; 2 Macc. xii. 30. In opposition to Schwegler, who likewise finds betrayed in the passage a knowledge of a long duration, and therein the late composition of the Gospel; see Franck in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1855,

¹ "Non infertur hinc, templum cultumque umbratilem instauratum iri," Bengel. Comp. Calov. *in loc.*, and our remark after Rom. xi. 27.

p. 347 f. Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 643, erroneously dates the beginning of the *καιροὶ ἐθνῶν* not from the taking of Jerusalem, supposing, on the contrary, the meaning to be: till the time, in which the world belongs to the nations, shall be at an end, and the people of God shall receive the dominion. In answer to this, it may be said, on the one hand, that the thought of the dominion of the world (according to Dan. vii. 14, 27) is a pure interpolation; on the other, that the *καιροὶ ἐθνῶν* would be the *καιροί*, which were familiar to all from the prophecies, and which had already begun to run their course, so that at the time of Jesus and long before they were regarded as in process of fulfilment. This is the reason for our having *οἱ καιροί* with the article (comp. xix. 44). Comp. on *καιροί* without the article, Tob. xiv. 5; Acts iii. 20, 21. By a perverse appeal to history, it has been explained as having reference to the fall of heathenism under Constantine (Clericus), and to the conversion¹ of the heathen-world (see in Wolf; also Dorner, *l.c.* p. 68). Comp. Lange, who suggests withal the thought of the Mohammedans.

Vv. 25, 26. There now follows what should come to pass at the end of the said times of the Gentiles before the *Parousia*. Since Luke, writing in the time in which such *καιροὶ ἐθνῶν* are still passing, has adopted these also into the prophecy from the tradition expanded *ex eventu*, the *Parousia* in his statement could not be immediately linked on to the destruction of Jerusalem, as was the case in Mark xiii. 24, and still more definitely by means of *εὐθέως* in Matt. xxiv. 29. In the midst between these two catastrophes actually already came those *καιροί*. — *συνοχῇ ἐθνῶν κ.τ.λ.*] Distress (2 Cor. ii. 4) of nations in perplexity at the roaring of the seas and waves. Luke alone has this fearful feature. The genitive *ἡχοῦς*² (see the critical remarks) indicates that to which the *ἀπορία* refers. Comp. Herod. iv. 83: *τῶν Σκυθέων τὴν ἀπορίην*; Herodian, iv. 14. 1: *ἐν . . . ἀπορίᾳ τοῦ πρακτέου*. Ground-

¹ Comp. Luther's gloss: "till the heathens shall be converted to the faith, i.e. till the end of the world."

² From the nominative *ἡχώ* (not *ἡχορ*); hence not to be accented *ἡχοῦς*, but *ἡχῶς*.

lessly Bornemann conjectures ἐν ἀπειρίᾳ. The καὶ "vocem angustiore (σάλος, *breakers*) annectit latiori," Kypke. — Ver. 26. ἀποψυχ. ἀνθρώπ.] *while men give up the ghost* (Thuc. i. 134. 3; Bion, i. 9; Alciph. Ep. iii. 72; 4 Macc. xv. 15) for fear, etc. It might be taken, moreover, of mere faintness (Hom. Od. xxiv. 348), but the stronger expression corresponds more to the progressive colouring of the description. — αἱ γὰρ δυνάμ. κ.τ.λ.] not a clause limping after (de Wette), but an energetic declaration coming in at the close as to the cause of these phenomena. See, besides, on Matt. xxiv. 29.

Vv. 27, 28. Comp. on ver. 27; Matt. xxiv. 30; Mark xiii. 26. — Καὶ τότε] *and then*; after the previous occurrence of these σημεῖα. — ἀρχομ. δὲ τούτων] *but when these begin*; these appearances, ver. 25 f. They are therefore not conceived of as of long continuance. — ἀνακύψατε κ.τ.λ.] *lift yourselves up*, raise yourselves (till then bowed down under afflictions, ver. 12 ff., comp. xii. 32) erect (hopefully). Comp. Dorville, *ad Charit.* p. 177. — ἡ ἀπολύτρ. ὑμ.] *which shall follow by means of my Parousia*. Comp. the ἐκδίκησις τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν, xviii. 7.

Vv. 29-33. See on Matt. xxiv. 32-35; Mark xiii. 28-31. — ἀφ' ἐαυτῶν] "*etiamsi nemo vos doceat*," Bengel. Comp. xii. 57; John xviii. 34, xi. 51; 2 Cor. iii. 5. — γινώσκετε is indicative in ver. 30, imperative in ver. 31.

Vv. 34-36, peculiar to Luke. Ἐαυτοῖς has the emphasis; from the external phenomena the attention of the hearers is directed *to themselves*. The ὑμῶν placed first contains a contrast with *others* who are in such a condition as is here forbidden.¹ — βαρηθῶσιν] even in the classical writers often used of the psychical oppression that presses down the energy of the spiritual activity by means of wine, sorrow, etc. Hom. Od. iii. 139; Theocr. xvii. 61; Plut. *Aem. P.* 34. See generally, Jacobs, *ad Anthol.* VI. p. 77. On the distinction between κραιπάλη, *giddiness* from *yesterday's* debauch, and μέθη, see Valckenaer, *Schol.* p. 262. The *figurative* interpre-

¹ Comp. on these warnings the expression quoted by Justin, c. Tr. 47, as a saying of Christ: ἐν οἷς ἂν ὑμᾶς καταλάβω, ἐν τούτοις καὶ πρηνῶ. Similarly Clem. Alex., *quis dives salv.* 40, quotes it.

tation (Bleek) of *want of moral circumspection* is arbitrary. Comp. xii. 45; Eph. v. 18. This want is the *consequence* of the βαρηθ., whereby it happens "that the heart cannot turn itself to Christ's word," Luther, *Predigt*. — μεριμν. βιωτικαῖς] with cares, "quae ad victum parandum vitaeque usum faciunt," Erasmus. Comp. 1 Cor. vi. 3; Polyb. iv. 73. 8: βιωτικαὶ χρεῖαι; and see Lobeck, *ad Phryg.* p. 355. — αἰφνίδιος] *as one who is unexpected* (1 Thess. v. 3, often in Thucydides); thus conceived adjectivally, not adverbially. See Krüger, § 57. 5, A 4; Winer, p. 412 [E. T. 583]. — ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἐπιστῇ] *should come upon you*, which, according to the context, is conceived of as something sudden (comp. on ii. 9). The day is personified. — Ver. 35. ὡς παγὶς γὰρ κ.τ.λ.] gives a reason for the warning καὶ (μήποτε) αἰφνίδιος ἐφ' ὑμᾶς κ.τ.λ. All the more were they to guard against this, as the *Parousia* will come upon all as a snare (Isa. xxiv. 17), thus *unobserved, and suddenly bringing destruction on them*. This must arouse you to hold yourselves in readiness for it, because otherwise ye also shall be overtaken and hurried away by this universal sudden ruin. For the figure, comp. Rom. xi. 9. It is a snare which is thrown over a wild beast. — ἐπεισελεύσεται] (see the critical remarks) it will *come in* upon all. In the doubly compounded form (comp. 1 Macc. xvi. 16, often in the classical writers) ἐπί denotes the direction, and εἰς the coming in from without (from heaven). — καθημένους] not generally: who *dwell*, but: who *sit* (comp. Jer. xxv. 29), expressing the comfortable, secure condition. Comp. on Matt. iv. 16. Theophylact: ἐν ἀμεριμνίᾳ διάγοντες καὶ ἀργίᾳ. — Ver. 36. ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ] belongs to δεόμενοι. Comp. xviii. 1, 7. Others, as Luther and Bleek, connect it with ἀργ. — ἵνα] the purpose, and therefore contents of the prayer. — κατισχύσητε] (see the critical remarks) *have the power*; be in the position. So κατισχ. with infinitive, Wisd. xvii. 5; Isa. xxii. 4, and often in the later Greek writers. — ἐκφυγεῖν κ.τ.λ.] *to escape from all this*, etc., i.e. in all the perilous circumstances whose occurrence I have announced to you as preceding the *Parousia* (from ver. 8 onward), to deliver your life, which is to be understood in the higher meaning of ver. 19. — καὶ σταθῆναι

κ.τ.λ.] *and to be placed before the Messiah.* This will be done by the angels who shall bring together the ἐκλεκτούς from the whole earth to the Messiah appearing in glory. Matt. xxiv. 31; Mark xiii. 27. Nothing is said here about *standing* in the *judgment* (in opposition to Erasmus, Beza, Grotius, Kuinoel, and many others).

Vv. 37, 38. The discourse, begun at xx. 1, with its varied scenes, is now closed. There is even now a general historical communication upon those last days of Jesus in Jerusalem, from which it is plain that according to Luke He still continued to teach in the temple. There is a difference from Matthew (comp. Mark xiii. 1), according to whom He is no longer in the temple when He delivers His eschatological discourse, and does not again set foot in it after xxiii. 39. — ἐλαιών] Thus to be accented in this place also. See on xix. 29. — ἐξερχόμενος] participle *present*, because ηὐλίζετο (with εἰς, comp. Tob. xiv. 10) is conceived of in the sense of the direction: *going out* (from the temple into the open air) *He went to His nightly abode on the Mount of Olives.* — Ver. 38. ὠρθριζε πρὸς αὐτόν] *rose up early to resort to Him*, to hear Him in the temple. Thus rightly Luther (comp. Vulgate), Erasmus, Beza, Bengel, and many others, including Lange, Ewald, Bleek, and as early as Tertullian and Theophylact. Others, including de Wette, have: *there sought Him eagerly*, following LXX. Ps. lxxviii. 34; Ecclus. iv. 12, vi. 36 (not Job viii. 5). But the context, according to ver. 37, justifies only the above explanation, which, moreover, corresponds to the general classical usage of ὀρθεύω (for which, according to Moeris, ὀρθρίζω is the Hellenistic form). See Theocritus, x. 58; Eurip. *Tro.* 182; Luc. *Gall.* i.; also the LXX. in Biel and Schleusner, *sub voce* ὀρθρίζω; 1 Macc. iv. 52, vi. 33, xi. 67 (ὠρθρισαν τὸ πρῶτ' εἰς τὸ πεδῖον Νασώρ); Evang. Nicod. 15 (ὠρθρισαν . . . εἰς τὸν οἶκον Νικοδήμου). Comp. in general, Grimm on Wisd. vi. 14.

CHAPTER XXII.

VER. 5. ἀργύριον] A C K U X, min. Syr. Slav. Eus. Theophyl. have ἀργύρια. See on Mark xiv. 11. — Ver. 6. καὶ ἐξωμόλ.] is wanting in Lachm., in opposition to decisive evidence. The omission occurred the more readily that ΚΑΙ ΕΞ follows, and Matthew and Mark have nothing similar. — Ver. 10. οὗ] A K M P R, min. have οὗ ἐάν. B C L S, Vulg. It. have εἰς ἤν. So Lachm. and Tisch. As the *Recepta*, according to this, has preponderating evidence against it, while οὗ ἐάν is grammatically erroneous (ἐάν is from Mark xiv. 14), we must read εἰς ἤν, instead of which was placed, in inexact recollection of Mark xiv. 14, οὗ (157: ὁποῦ). — Ver. 12. ἀνάγαιον (Elz.: ἀνώγειον) is decisively attested. Comp. on Mark xiv. 15. — Ver. 14. δῶδεκα] is wanting in B D S, 157, vss., and is deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. It was written in the margin in agreement with the parallels, and came into the text in some authorities alongside of ἀπόστολ., in others instead of it (L X). Comp. also on ix. 1. — Ver. 16. οὐδέτι] is wanting in A B C* ? H L S, min. Copt. Sahid. Vere. Epiph. Marcion. Rejected by Schulz, bracketed by Lachm. But how easily, being in itself superfluous, it came to be overlooked between ὅτι and οὐ! If it had crept in from Mark xiv. 25, it would rather have found its place at ver. 18. — ἐξ αὐτοῦ] αὐτό is read by Lachm. [and Tisch. 8], in accordance with [S] B C ? L, min. Syr. Copt. Sahid. It. Vulg. Epiph. The *Recepta* is to be maintained. The accusative was introduced in accordance with ver. 15. Opposed to it, moreover, is the evidence of D, min. Cant., which have ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, wherein the preposition was altered in conformity with ver. 18. — Ver. 17. A D K M U, min. Lachm. have τὸ ποτήρ. The article forced itself in here from the form used in the Lord's Supper (ver. 20). — Ver. 20. ὡσανῦν. κ. τ. ποτήρ.] Tisch. has κ. τ. ποτήρ. ὡσανῦν, following B L S, Copt. Sahid.; the *Recepta* is from 1 Cor. xi. 25. — Ver. 22. καὶ] Tisch. has ὅτι, following B D L S, 157, Copt. Sahid. Rightly; ὅτι dropped out before ΟΥΙ (see subsequently on μὲν), as it is still wanting in Vere. Cant. Or.; and then καὶ was interpolated as a connecting particle. — μὲν] is, with Tischendorf, to be placed after οὐδὲ, following B L T S** (D has it before ὁ). The usual

position *before* υἱός is from Matthew and Mark. — In what follows read, with Lachm. and Tisch., κατὰ τὸ ὠρισμένον πορ. The arrangement in the *Recepta* is in accordance with the parallels. — Ver. 30. Elz. Scholz have καθίσθηθε. But Matth. Lachm. Tisch. have, on preponderating evidence, καθίσσεσθε [Tisch. 8 has καθήσεσθε]. This was changed, on account of the construction, into the subjunctive, as though dependent on ἵνα. — Ver. 32. ἐκλείπη] Matth. Lachm. Tisch. have ἐκλίπη, in accordance with B D K L M U X S, min.; it is accordingly to be preferred. The present offered itself more readily to the transcribers. But στήρισον instead of στήριξον is decisively attested (Lachm. Tisch.). — Ver. 34. πρίν ἢ] B L T S, min.: ἕως. So Lachm. and Tisch. D has ἕως ὅτου; K M X, min. have ἕως οὗ. Moreover, vss. (Syr. Vulg. It. al.) have *donec*. πρίν (Q) and πρίν ἢ (A E G H S U V r Δ Δ) were written in the margin from Matthew and Mark. — I regard ἕως ὅτου or ἕως οὗ as genuine. See on xxi. 24. — ἀπαρν. μὴ εἰδέναι με] Lachm. Tisch. have με ἀπαρν. εἰδέναι, in accordance with B D L M Q T X S [Tisch. 8 has returned to ἀπαρν. μὴ εἰδέναι με]. The μὴ was omitted as superfluous, but μέ was pushed forwards in accordance with Mark xiv. 30 (see thereupon the critical remarks). — Ver. 35. On decisive evidence βαλλαντίου is to be written, and in ver. 36: βαλλάντιον. — Ver. 37. ἐτι] is not found, indeed, in A B D H L Q X S, min. vss. (except Vulg.), but after ὅτι its omission occurred too easily to be rightly suspected, according to Griesbach; rejected, according to Schulz; deleted, according to Lachm. Tisch. — Ver. 42. παρενεγκεῖν] Lachm. has παρένεγκε, in accordance with B D, min. Vulg. It. (not Vind. Cant.) Syr.^p. Syr.^{ca}. Or. Dam. Tert. Ambr.; Tisch. has παρενέγκαι, in accordance with K L M R π S, min. Both readings were meant to help out the construction in accordance with Mark xiv. 36. Subsequently is to be written, with Rinck and Tisch., τοῦτο τὸ ποτήρ. The order in the *Recepta*, τὸ ποτ. τοῦτο, is from the parallels. — Vv. 43 and 44 are bracketed by Lachm. They are wanting in A B R T, Sahid. and some cursives; are marked with asterisks in E S V Δ π, min.; in others with obelisks; in the lectionaries adopted into the section Matt. xxvi. 2–xxvii. 2; and as early as Epiphanius, Hilary, and Jerome their omission in mss. is observed. But they are already acknowledged by Justin. Iren. Hippol. Epiph., etc. See Tisch. The verses are genuine. Their omission is the work of the orthodox, to whom their contents appeared objectionable in respect of the divinity of Christ. See already Epiph. *Ancor.* 31. According to Ewald, Luke wrote ver. 44 from the “Book of the higher history” only in the margin, but

ver. 43 was excluded by the comparison with Matthew and Mark. — Ver. 47. *οἱ*] has so important evidence against it (deleted by Lachm. and Tisch.) that it seems to be a connective addition. — Instead of *αὐτοῖς* Elz. has *αὐτῶν*, in opposition to decisive evidence. A correction. — Ver. 55. *ἀψάντων*] B L T *ς*, Eus. Tisch. have *περιαψάντων*; the *Recepta* is a neglect of the compound verb, which is elsewhere foreign to the New Testament. — *αὐτῶν* after *συγκαθ.* is, with Lachm. and Tisch., to be deleted as a frequent addition. — *ἐν μέσῳ*] Tisch. has *μέσος*, following B L T, min. The former is an interpretation. — Ver. 61. After *φωνήσαι* Tisch. has *σήμερον*, following B K L M T X *π* *ς*, min. vss. The omission came from the parallels. — Ver. 62. After *ἔξω, ὁ Πέτρος* is to be maintained, against Griesb. and Tisch., although it is wanting in important authorities. Being troublesome, and not occurring in the parallels, it was passed over. — Ver. 63. Instead of *αὐτόν*, Elz. Matth. Scholz have *τῷ Ἰησοῦν*. The subject was written in the margin because another subject precedes. — Ver. 64. *ἔτυπτον αὐτοῦ τὸ πρόσωπον καὶ*] is wanting in B K L M *π* *ς*, Copt. Vind. Corb. Ver. Coll. Bracketed by Lachm., deleted by Rinck and Tisch. It is an expansion by way of a gloss, which in D, vss. is not the same, and which the omission of *δέρντες*, ver. 63, drew after it. The glossing process began with the writing on the margin at the first *αὐτόν*: *αὐτοῦ τὸ πρόσωπον*, as 1, 209, vss. still read instead of *αὐτόν*; then *ἔτυπτον* was added in some authorities before, in others after, because *δέρντες* was attracted to what preceded. — Ver. 66. Elz. Lachm. have *ἑαυτῶν*; Matth. Scholz, Tisch.: *αὐτῶν*. The *Recepta* is to be retained in accordance with A Δ, min.: it was not understood. — Ver. 68. Read, with Tisch., simply *ἐὰν οἱ* (even Lachm. has deleted *καὶ*) *ἐρωτήσω, οὐ μὴ ἀποκριθῇτε*, in accordance with B L T *ς*, min. vss. Cyr. The addition *μοι ἢ ἀπολύετε* is an unsuitable expansion. — Ver. 69. After *ὧν* is to be added, with Lachm. and Tisch., *οἱ*, on decisive evidence. — Ver. 71. The order of the words, *τί ἐτι ἔχ. μαρτ. χρείαν*, is to be preferred, with Tisch., following B L T. The order in the *Textus receptus*, *τ. ἐ. χ. ἐ. μ.*, is from the parallels.

Vv. 1, 2. With more detail and definiteness Matt. xxvi. 1–5 and Mark xiv. 1 f. (Luke follows Mark with abbreviation). — *ἐφοβ. γ. τὸν λαόν*] the adherents that Jesus found among the people (xxi. 38) made them afraid; hence they endeavoured to discover *ways and means* to remove Him, i.e. *μέθοδον, πῶς ἀνελόντες αὐτὸν οὐ κινδυνεύουσιν*, Theophyl.

Vv. 3-6. See on Matt. xxvi. 14-16; Mark xiv. 10 f. Luke passes over the history of the anointing, having already related an earlier one (vii. 37). — εἰσῆλθε] The part played by the devil, who “sensus omnes occupat” (Calvin), is conceived of as an actual *intrusion*, as εἰσέρχεσθαι is the word constantly used to express the intrusion of demons into bodies (viii. 30, 32 f., xi. 27). Comp. John xiii. 27 (in regard to John xiii. 2, see on the passage). — Ἰσκαρ.] See on Matt. x. 4. — ὄντα ἐκ τοῦ ἀρ. τ. δ.] familiar to the reader (vi. 16), but a *tragic* addition. — Ver. 4. τοῖς στρατηγοῖς] As ὁ στρατηγός is the chief of all the Levitical temple guards (Acts iv. 1, v. 26; Joseph. *Bell.* vi. 5. 3), אִשֵּׁי הַר הַבֵּית, probably the leaders of the several guards who were placed under Him are here meant also, consequently the entire Levitical body of officers. Comp. χιλίαρχοι, 3 Esdr. i. 9. See Lightfoot, p. 879. — Ver. 5. συνέθεντο] The several moments in the incident, as these are accurately traced by Luke, are: (1) Judas opens the correspondence, ver. 4; (2) they are pleased thereat; (3) *they engage* (Herod. ix. 53; Xen. *Anab.* i. 9. 7, *Hell.* iii. 5. 6; Herodian, v. 3. 23; Joseph. *Antt.* xiii. 4. 7; 4 Macc. iv. 16) *to give him money*; and the last step is, (4) Judas makes his acknowledgment, *promises* (ἐξωμολ., *spondit*; elsewhere only the simple form is used in this sense, as Plat. *Symp.* p. 196 C; Jer. xlv. 25; Joseph. *Antt.* viii. 4. 3), and seeks henceforth a favourable opportunity, etc. — Ver. 6. ἄτερ ὄχλου] *without attracting a crowd*. The opposite is μετὰ ὄχλου, Acts xxiv. 18. (Comp. Hom. *Il.* v. 473: φῆς που ἄτερ λαῶν πόλιν ἐξέμεν. The word ἄτερ, frequently occurring in the poets, occurs only here and at ver. 35 in the New Testament. Comp. 2 Macc. xii. 15; rarely, moreover, in the later Greek prose writers, as Plut. *Num.* xiv.; Dion. Hal. iii. 10.

Vv. 7-13. See on Matt. xxvi. 17-19; Mark xiv. 12-16. Luke *names* the disciples, and makes *Jesus* take the initiative. The latter is a quite immaterial difference; the former is a more precise statement of the later tradition, in respect of which a special tendency is assumed (Baur supposes that the two are intended to represent the Judaism of the older apostles). — ἦλθε] *there came*, *there appeared* the day. Comp.

v. 35, xxiii. 29 ; Acts ii. 20, and elsewhere.¹ — ἡ ἡμέρα] not ἡ ἑορτή again, as in ver. 1, because the latter denotes the whole festival, not the single day of the feast (in opposition to Wieseler, *Synopse*, p. 397). — Ver. 11. ἐρεῖτε] a future with the force of an imperative: *and ye shall say*. — τῷ οἰκοδεσπότῃ τῆς οἴκ.] See, on such pleonastic combinations, Bornemann *in loc.* ; Lobeck, *Paralip.* p. 536 f. ; also Valckenaer, *Schol.* p. 264 f.

Vv. 14–18. On ver. 14 comp. Matt. xxvi. 20 ; Mark xiv. 17. “ Describitur, vv. 15–18, quaedam quasi prolusio s. coenae, coll. Matt. xxvi. 29,” Bengel. — Ver. 15. ἐπιθυμία ἐπεθύμησα] *I have earnestly longed*, Gen. xxxi. 30. See Winer. p. 413 [E. T. 584]. This longing rested on the fact (see ver. 16) that this Passover meal was actually His last, and as such was to be of special importance and sacredness. Thus He could only earnestly wish that His passion should not begin before the Passover ; hence : πρὸ τοῦ με παθεῖν. — τοῦτο] pointing to : *this*, which is already there. — Ver. 16. οὐκέτι κ.τ.λ.] namely, after the present meal. — ἐξ αὐτοῦ] of the Passover. — ἕως ὅτου κ.τ.λ.] *till that it* (the Passover) *shall be fulfilled in the kingdom of God*. The rationalistic interpretation : “ sed aliquando vos in coelo mecum gaudiis propriis ac summis perfruemini ” (Kuinoel), is purely arbitrary. Jesus means actually a *Passover* (specifically such a one, not merely the Messianic feasts in general, Matt. viii. 11 ; Luke xxii. 30, xiv. 15) in the Messiah’s kingdom, which should hold the same relation to the temporal Passover as that which is perfect (absolute) holds to the incomplete. This corresponds to the idea of the new world (of the ἀποκατάστασις, παλιγγενεσία), and of the perfected theocracy in the αἰὼν μέλλων. Comp. on Matt. xxvi. 29. The *impersonal* view (Paulus, Baumgarten-Crusius), according to which the meaning is said to be :

¹ Paschke is in error when he says, in the *Theol. Quartalschr.* 1851, p. 410 ff., that ἤλθι means here : he came near ; and that at Matt. xxvi. 17, Mark xiv. 12, τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν ἀζύμων means : on the day before the Passover. Moreover, Ewald (*Gesch. Chr.* p. 459 f.) decides that, in so far as the words of Luke are concerned (not also of Matthew and Mark), the day before the Passover might be meant. But by ἐν ᾧ ἴδεν κ.τ.λ., as well as by the further course of the narrative, the day is definitely enough indicated as the same as in Matthew and Mark.

till the establishment of the kingdom shall be brought about, is an evasion opposed to the context. Completely without foundation, moreover, Schenkel says that the *adoption of the Gentiles* into the divine covenant is the fulfilment of the Old Testament Passover. — Ver. 17 f. According to Luke, Jesus, after He had spoken quite at the beginning of the meal the words, vv. 15, 16, receives a cup handed to Him (δεξάμενος, not the same as λαβών, ver. 19), and after giving thanks hands it to the disciples that they might share it (the wine in it) *among themselves* (observe the emphatic *ἐαυτοῖς*), for He assures them that He should certainly not drink, etc. *He therefore*, according to Luke, *declines to drink of the Passover wine*, wherefore also in ver. 18 the absolute οὐ μὴ, but in ver. 16 the relative οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ, is used.

REMARK.—Although this refusal to drink the wine, which is not to be explained away, is *in itself* psychologically conceivable in so deeply moved and painful a state of mind, yet it is improbable in consideration of the characteristic element of the Passover. In respect of this, the drinking of the Passover wine was certainly so essential, and, in the consciousness of the person celebrating the rite, so necessary, that the not drinking, and especially on the part of the Host Himself, would have appeared absolutely as contrary to the law, irreligious, scandalous, an interruption which, on the part of Jesus, can hardly be credible. Since then Mark and Matthew, moreover, have nothing at all about a refusal of the wine, but rather do not bring in the assurance, οὐ μὴ πίω κ.τ.λ., until the conclusion of the meal, Mark xiv. 25, Matt. xxvi. 29; and since Matthew uses the emphatic ἀπ' ἄρτι, wherein is intimated that Jesus had just drunk with them once more,—the narrative of Luke, vv. 17, 18, is to be regarded as not original, and it is to be assumed that Jesus indeed spoke, vv. 15, 16, at the beginning of the meal (in opposition to Kuinoel and Paulus), but that what is found in Matt. xxvi. 29 has been removed back by the tradition on account of the analogy of ver. 16, and placed after ver. 16, beside which ver. 17 easily appeared as a link, without the necessity of attributing to Luke the construction of a piece of mosaic from a twofold source (as Holtzmann wishes to do), especially as ver. 17 is not yet the *cup of the Lord's Supper*. According to Baur, *Evang.* p. 482 f., Luke must have been led by 1 Cor. x., where, moreover, the ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας is emphatically placed first, to

distinguish two acts in the Lord's Supper (comp. also Ritschl, *Evang. Marcion's*, p. 108), one with the leading idea of *ζωωνία*, and the other with that of *ἀνάμνησις*. He must have here represented the first by the help of Matt. xxvi. 29. He must thus probably still have expressly brought in the supposed leading idea of *ζωωνία*, as Paul also has done in respect of the bread. In general, the use made by Luke of the Pauline *Epistles*, which here even Hilgenfeld (comp. Holtzmann, p. 237) considers as unmistakeable, is quite incapable of proof.

Vv. 19, 20. See on Matt. xxvi. 26–28; Mark xiv. 22 f.; 1 Cor. xi. 23 ff. Luke agrees with Paul, not, however, repeating, in the case of the cup, the expression *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε κ.τ.λ.*, which is not found at all in Matthew and Mark. — *τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον*] *which for your advantage* (to procure your reconciliation and justification, and your Messianic salvation, comp. on Matt. xx. 28) *is given up*. The entire context suggests the qualifying clause *εἰς θάνατον*. Comp. Gal. i. 4; Rom. viii. 32; 1 Tim. ii. 6; Tit. ii. 16. In respect of the expression, Wetstein justly compares Libanius, *Orat.* 35, p. 705: *καὶ τὸ σῶμα ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐπέδωκεν*, and similar passages. — *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε*] to wit, the breaking of the bread after thanksgiving, and the distribution and partaking of the same. On *ποιεῖν*, occupying the place of more definite verbs, which the context suggests, see Bornemann, and Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* iii. 8. 2; Schoemann, *ad Is. de Ap. her.* 35. — *εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνη.*] *for the remembrance of me*.¹ See Winer, p. 138 [E. T. 192]. It is a mistake to say that this purpose of the Lord's Supper must be appropriate only to the partaking of the *real* body and blood of Christ (see Kahnis, *Lehre v. Abendm.* p. 87). Rather in respect of *such* a partaking that statement of purpose appears too disproportioned and weak;²

¹ To lay a contrasted emphasis on *ἐμὴν* (*not in remembrance of the deliverance from Egypt*; so Ländner, *Abendm.* p. 91 f., and Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 218) is mistaken, because not suggested in the context. See Rückert, *Abendm.* p. 200 f.

² Kahnis says: "Only when body and blood are *essentially present* and *essentially living* can the remembrance of the death which they have passed through and swallowed up in victory and life be made prominent as a separate point, without giving rise to a feeble and bungling tautology." But the point

since it would already certify far *more* than the *remembrance*; in opposition to which the idea of the ἀνάμνησις of that which the symbols represent, is in keeping with the *symbolic* character of the celebration (Plat. *Phaed.* p. 74 A: τὴν ἀνάμνησιν εἶναι μὲν ἀφ' ὁμοίων). Comp. Justin, *Ap.* I. 66, where it is said of the cup: εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ. — Ver. 20. ὡσαύτως] to wit, λαβὼν εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς. — τὸ ποτήριον] the cup before them. — μετὰ τὸ δεῖπνῆσαι] “facto transitu ad majora et ultima,” Bengel. It was, to wit, the *fourth* cup which made the *conclusion* of the whole meal. See on Matt. xxvi. 27. — τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον κ.τ.λ.] *this cup is the new covenant by means of my blood, i.e.* it is the new covenant by the fact that it contains my blood, which is shed for your salvation. Comp. on 1 Cor. xi. 25. In the wine which is poured into the cup Jesus sees His (atoning, Rom. iii. 25, v. 3) blood, which is on the point of being shed; and because through this shedding of His blood the new covenant is to be established, he explains the cup, by virtue of its contents, as the new covenant—a *symbolism* natural to the deeply-moved, solemn state of mind, to which no greater wrong can be done than is perpetrated by the controversies about the *cst.* which Luke has not at all! Paul, in 1 Cor. xi. 25, inserts ἐστὶν after διαθήκη, and consequently also, in so far as the passage before us is concerned, forbids the affixing ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου to ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη, as many of the older (not Luther¹) and of the more recent writers (not Kalnis, Osiander,

on which stress is laid in this assertion, “which they have passed through and swallowed up in victory and life,” does not in reality appear at all there, but is added in thought and read into the passage. Rightly does Keim bring forward in the *Jahrb. f. Deutsche Theol.* 1859, p. 94, that the significance of the last supper as a *remembrance* cannot be maintained together with the orthodox interpretation of the words of institution. He aptly shows that the symbolical understanding of the words of institution, “this is,” etc., is the correct one, and comes to the conclusion that the essential actual body was *spiritually* represented by the word to *faith*, but was not *bodily* given in corporeal presence to *every* recipient. Comp. on Matt. xxvi. 26, and on 1 Cor. xi. 24. How even Kalnis subsequently gave up the orthodox doctrine of the Lord's Supper, see in his *Dogmat.* I. p. 616 ff. But how even to this day the Catholics make out the continuity of the sacrifice of Jesus by the priests, see in Döllinger, *Christenth. und Kirche*, p. 38, and Schegg.

¹ In his *Gr. Bekenntn.* : “for the reason that Christ's blood is there.”

Rückert, p. 232) do. So also even Ehrard (*d. Dogma vom heil. Abendm.* I. p. 113), who, besides, lays an emphasis upon μου not belonging to it, at least according to the expression of Luke, when he interprets the passage: "the new covenant made in my blood, not in the sacrificial blood of the Old Testament." — ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη] opposed to the old Mosaic covenant, whose condition was the fulfilling of the law (in the new: faith). See on 1 Cor. xi. 25. — τὸ . . . ἐκχυνόμενον] belongs, although in the nominative, to τῷ αἵματί μου, as an exegetical clause. The abnormal use of the case is occasioned by the fact that, according to ver. 19, the idea prevails: that the cup (in respect of its contents) is the blood of the new covenant which is shed. Consequently τὸ . . . ἐκχυνόμενον is applied to τῷ αἵματί μου because τὸ αἷμά μου has floated before the mind of the speaker as the logical predicate, even although it did not become the grammatical predicate. Thus the nominative expression more emphatically brings into prominence what is declared of the blood (τὸ . . . ἐκχυν.) than would be the case if it were joined on in the dative. Comp. Jas. iii. 8 (where μεστῇ ἰοῦ is joined to the logical subject γλώσσα, which, however, is not the grammatical subject); Rev. iii. 12, viii. 9; Mark xii. 40; John i. 14; Kühner, § 677; Winer, pp. 471, 473 [E. T. 668–670 f.]. According to Baur's view, τὸ . . . ἐκχυνόμενον comes back to a very awkward transposition of the words from Matt. xxvi. 28. Comp. also Rückert, p. 208, and Bleek and Holtzmann. Erroneously Euthymius Zigabenus, Calovius, Jansen, Michaelis, and others, including Bornemann, read: "*poculum, quod in vestram salutem effunditur.*" What is this supposed to mean? Calovius answers: "*Dicitur effusum pro nobis propter sanguinem, quem Christus mediante poculo praebebat.*" A forcible dislocation which, moreover, occurs in other old dogmatical writers, Chemnitz, Gerhard, and others. See Kahnis, *Abendm.* p. 103. This reference to the cup appeared to give a support to the explanation of the actual blood.

REMARK.—In the words of institution all four narrators vary from one another, although not essentially, which serves to prove that a mode of formulating them had not yet taken any fixed shape. Luke agrees the most closely with Paul, which is

explained by his relation to him. The Pauline narrative, however, attains great weight, indeed, through his ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου, 1 Cor. xi. 23 (see on the passage), and the ministry of the apostle makes it conceivable how *his* formula might fix itself liturgically; this, however, does not prevent our recovering the most primitive form of the words of Jesus in the simple narrative of Mark, which gradually underwent expansions. Wilke, *Urevang.* p. 142, is wrong in regarding ver. 20 in Luke as a later addition. The first distribution of the cup, ver. 17, does not indeed yet belong entirely to the Lord's Supper, and as yet has no symbolism. According to Ewald (see his *Jahrb.* II. p. 194 f.), the agreement between Luke and Paul is explained by the fact that both have in this particular used one source (the oldest Gospel, probably composed by Philip the evangelist). But in general there is no proof of Paul's having made use of a written Gospel; neither in particular is the passage in 1 Cor. xi. 23, ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου, in any way favourable to that supposition.

Vv. 21-23. Luke has this reference to the traitor (which, according to Luke, diverges from all the rest, without any more precise statement) in a wrong position, where it probably has been placed by way of transition to the following dispute about precedence. According to Matt. xxvi. 21 ff., Mark xiv. 18 ff., it is to be placed at the beginning of the meal, and that in such a manner that the departure of Judas¹ ensued before the institution of the Lord's Supper; comp. on Matt. xxvi. 25, and see the remark after John xiii. 38. — πλὴν] *notwithstanding*, although my blood is shed for you. Not a limitation of the ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν (Hofmann), but, without such a reflection, a contrast to that love which is on the point of offering its own life. In spite of this πλὴν, which carries on the Lord's discourse, to place the departure of the traitor, even according to Luke, before the Lord's Supper, is only possible to the greatest harmonistic arbitrariness, in respect of which, indeed, the statement that Luke does not relate according to the order of time (Ebrard, p. 522; Lichtenstein, p. 401) is the most convenient and ready resource. — ἡ χεὶρ

¹ According to Schenkel, Jesus allowed Judas to take part in the Lord's Supper, which (he thinks) is a convincing proof against all external ecclesiastical discipline (even against confession)!

κ.τ.λ.] *The hand of my betrayer*, etc. It was still on the table (ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης), after the eating of the bread, for the sake of partaking of the cup (ver. 20), and Jesus mentions the hand as the correlative of the idea παραδιδόναι. There is contained therein a *tragic* feature. — Ver. 22. ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς μὲν (see the critical remarks) κ.τ.λ. discloses the objective ground of this mournful experience, ver. 21—to wit, the divine appointment of the death of the Messiah, which none the less (πλὴν οὐαὶ κ.τ.λ.) leaves the person concerned under the imputation (of the subjectively free action). — Ver. 23. συζητεῖν, *to confer, dispute*, and πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς, *among themselves*, as Mark i. 27. — τοῦτο] i.e. the παραδιδόναι. With the emphasis of horror τοῦτο is placed before the governing verb. On πράσσειν of *traitorous* transactions, comp. Thucyd. iv. 89. 3, 110. 2.

Vv. 24–30. Earlier fragments of discourses (Matt. xx. 25 f., xix. 28; comp. Mark x. 42 ff.), for whose appropriateness in this place the occasion narrated by Luke, ἐγένετο δὲ καὶ φιλονεκία ἐν αὐτ., is neither psychologically probable, nor is it, from an historical point of view, adequately accounted for. Many have considered ver. 24 ff. as giving occasion to the *footwashing* (Paulus, Kuinoel, Sieffert, Lange, and others, including Strauss), which, however, would have any probability only if Luke placed the contest about precedence at the *beginning* of the meal. Nay, the already *past* footwashing, which, according to John, is to be assumed, only makes the situation of this contest about precedence in Luke still more improbable. That, moreover, only the *association of ideas* between the questions of ver. 23 and ver. 24 caused Luke to insert here this contest about precedence (Strauss, l. p. 723 f.; Holtzmann) is the more unfounded that Luke has already at ix. 46 related one dispute about precedence. Rather, he must have followed a definite tradition, which certainly may have taken its rise from the idea embodied in the story of the footwashing, and may have attracted here into a wrong position what is historically earlier. — δὲ καὶ] *but also*, in addition to that συζητεῖν. — δοκεῖ] *is esteemed*, Gal. ii. 6. Bengel well says: “Quis sit omnium suffragiis.” — μείζων] *of higher rank*; to regard ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν as understood

(Kuinoel and others) is an arbitrary proceeding, according to Matt. xviii. 1. Comp. on ix. 46; Mark ix. 33. — Ver. 25. τῶν ἐθνῶν] *of the Gentiles*. — οἱ ἐξουσιάζ. αὐτ.] These are the *magnates* (Matt. xx. 25), rulers of the Gentiles *after* their kings. — εὐεργέται, a title of honour: *benefactors*, i.e. *of great merit* in respect of the state, possibly in respect of the government (Herod. viii. 85). Comp. εὐεργέτην ἀπογραφῆναι, Herod. viii. 85; Thuc. i. 129. 3; Xen. *Rep. Ath.* iii. 11; Lys. *pro Polyst.* 19. ψηφίζεσθαι τι εὐεργεσίαν, Dem. 475. 10; Wolf, *Lept.* p. 282; Meier, *de proxenia*, Hal. 1843, p. 10, 15; Hermann, *Staatsalterth.* § 116. 6. Similarly our “*Excellencies*.” — Ver. 26. οὐχ οὕτως] It is sufficient to supply ἐστέ (others take ποιεῖτε). See what follows. *Ye are not to be thus*, as that one should let himself be distinguished in rank from the others. — ὁ μείζων] not: “*qui cupit maximus esse*,” Kuinoel, but: *he that is greater among you*, who really is so, let him condescend so as to place himself on an equality with the younger, and claim no more than he. ὁ νεώτερος does not mean *the less*, and does not refer to one in the circle of the twelve, but it means *one who is younger* than the others, and denotes a believing youth. It must be supposed that such were present, performing the service. Comp. the parallel διακονῶν. See also Acts v. 6, 10. — ὁ ἡγούμενος] *he who rules*, standing at the head. Comp. Matt. ii. 6; Acts xv. 22; Heb. xiii. 7, 17, 24; 3 Esdr. viii. 44; 1 Macc. ix. 30, and elsewhere. This use, moreover, is so frequent among the Greek writers (Dem. 654. 22; Soph. *Phil.* 386; Polyb. i. 15. 4, 31. 1, iii. 4. 6; Herodian, vii. 1. 22; Lucian, *Alex.* 44; Diod. Sic. i. 72), and the designation is so general, that the expression does not need to be derived actually from later times (Lipsius, *de Clem. Rom. Ep.* p. 29). — Ver. 27. To this condescending renunciation *my example* engages you. For although I stand to you in the relation of the ἀνακείμενος to the διακόνους, yet I bear myself in the midst of you no otherwise than as if I were your servant. The reference to the *footwashing*, which has been here assumed (even by de Wette and Bleek), could not be expected by Luke to be discovered by any reader. It is, moreover, superfluous; for the present repast might of itself

give sufficient occasion for the designation of the relation by means of ἀνακείμ. and διάκον., and Jesus was in the highest sense of self-surrender actually the διάκονος of His disciples, as this found its indelible expression just at this time in the distribution of the last supper. Comp. Matt. xx. 28. — ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν] more significant (*in the midst of you*) than ἐν ὑμῖν; He did not separate Himself from them as one more distinguished than they. — Ver. 28. ὑμεῖς δὲ κ.τ.λ.] in order now, after this humiliation of His disciples' desire of precedence, to induce them to seek their true exaltation, to wit, by means of the assurance of their future dominion and honour in the *kingdom of the Messiah*, He proceeds in such a way as to contrast with *His* relation to *them* (ἐγὼ δὲ ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν, ver. 27) *their* relation to *Him* (ὕμεῖς δὲ . . . μετ' ἐμοῦ), as the recompense of which He then assures to them the Messianic glory: *But ye are they who have continued with me in my temptations*, etc. Erasmus aptly paraphrases the πειρασμούς: "quibus pater coelestis voluit exploratam ac spectatam esse meam obedientiam." These were the many injuries, persecutions, snares, perils of life, etc. (comp. Heb. ii. 18, iv. 15), for the bitter experience of which neither πειρασμός nor διαμένειν are expressions too strong (in opposition to de Wette); the former in respect of its relative idea being not too strong, nor the latter, if we consider the contrast of the Messianic anticipations of the time. — Ver. 29. καὶ γὰρ] and *I*, on my part, as a recompense for it. — διατίθεμαι] *I ordain* for you (herewith) dominion, as my Father (in His counsel known to me) has ordained for me dominion — both in the kingdom of the Messiah. βασιλ. belongs to both verbs, not merely as a parenthesis, so that ἵνα κ.τ.λ. contains the object of διατίθεμαι ὑμ. (Ewald, Bleek, and others), since ver. 30 contains the idea of the συμβασιλεύειν. — διατίθ. is not said of *testamentary* appointment (Er. Schmid, Alberti, Krebs; see Plat. *Leg.* ii. p. 922 B, E, 923 C; Dem. 1067. 1; Joseph. *Antt.* xiii. 16. 1; Arist. *Pol.* ii. 9), since the same meaning could not be retained in the second member, but in general *dispono*, *I ordain* for you (2 Chron. vii. 18; Gen. xv. 18; 1 Macc. i. 11; Xen. *Cyr.* v. 2. 9, and elsewhere). On the idea, comp. 2 Tim. ii. 12. —

Ver. 30. ἵνα] purpose of this assignment of dominion. — ἐπὶ τ. τραπ. μ.] at the table takes place the eating and drinking. Comp. ver. 21. This is said not merely of the Messianic *Passover* (vv. 16, 18), but of the Messianic table fellowship in general. Comp. xiii. 29; Matt. viii. 11. — According to the reading καθίσεσθε (see the critical remarks), the construction of the ἵνα does not run on, but the saying is *promissory*: and ye shall sit, etc., whereby this highest point comes forward more emphatically than if the future were made dependent on ἵνα (as is done by Buttmann, *Neut. Gr.* p. 202 [E. T. 234]). — ἐπὶ θρόνων] δώδεκα is not added, as in Matt. xix. 28, on account of Judas. Christ is the divine Lord-superior of the βασιλεία till the consummation of all things (1 Cor. xv. 28), and gives to His disciples a share therein.

Vv. 31-34. The conversation with Peter concerning his denial is found in John also at the supper, while Matthew and Mark, on the other hand, place it on the way to Gethsemane. But how possible it is that the momentous word, which had already been spoken at the supper, was returned to again on the journey by night! so that in this way both narratives are correct in regard to the point of time. The words addressed to Peter in ver. 31 f. are peculiar to Luke, and are so characteristic in substance and in form, that they seem to be original, and not the offspring of tradition. The words εἶπε δὲ ὁ κύριος (which, nevertheless, are not found in B L T, Copt. Sahid., and are hence suspicious, and deleted by Tischendorf), if they are genuine, separate what follows from what precedes as a special opening of a discourse the occasion of which Luke does not state, and probably, moreover, could not, and hence the question at issue cannot be decided. — Σίμων, Σίμων] *urgently* warning, as x. 41; Acts ix. 4. — ἐξητήσατο ὑμᾶς] *he has demanded you* (thee and thy fellow-disciples) *for himself, longed for you into his power*, sibi tendendos postulavit; namely, *from God*, as he once did in the case of Job (Job i.). A similar allusion to the history of Job may be found in the *Test. XII. Patr.* p. 729: εἰὰν τὰ πνεύματα τοῦ Βελιάρ εἰς πᾶσαν πονηρίαν θλίψεως ἐξαιτήσονται ὑμᾶς. Comp. *Const. Apost.* vi. 5. 4. The compound ἐξητ. refers to the contem-

plated *surrender* out of God's power and protection. Comp. Herod. i. 74: οὐ γὰρ . . . ἐξεδίδου τοὺς Σκύθας ἐξαιτέοντι Κναξάρει; Plat. *Mence.* p. 245 B; Polyb. iv. 66. 9, xxx. 8. 6. Moreover, the meaning is not to be reduced to a mere "*imminent vobis tentationes*" (Kuinoel), but the actual *will of the devil* (ὁ γὰρ διάβολος πολὺς ἐπέκειτο ζητεῖν ὑμᾶς ἐκβαλεῖν τῆς ἐμῆς στοργῆς καὶ προδότας ἀποδεῖξαι, Theophylact), which is known to Jesus, is by Him declared, and only the *form* of the expression by means of ἐξηγήσατο is, in allusion to the history of Job, figurative, so that the meaning is: The devil wishes to have you in his power, as he once upon a time asked to have Job in his power. — τοῦ σινιάσαι] so far as the ancient Greek writers are concerned, the verb σινιάζω¹ is not to be found; but according to Photius, p. 512, 22, Hesychius, Suidas, and the Greek Fathers (see Suicer, *Thes.* II. p. 961 f.; van Hengel, *Annot.* p. 31 f.), the meaning is without doubt: *in order to sift you* (κοσκινεύειν); σίνιον γὰρ παρά τισι καλεῖται τὸ παρ' ἡμῖν κόσκινον, ἐν ᾧ ὁ σῖτος τῇδε κάκεισε μεταφερόμενος ταράσσεται, Euthymius Zigabenus. The *point of comparison* is the ταράσσειν which puts to the test. As the wheat in the sieve is shaken backwards and forwards, and thus the refuse separates itself from the grains, and falls out; so Satan wishes to trouble you and toss you about (by vexations, terrors, dangers, afflictions), in order to bring your faithfulness to me to decay. — Ver. 32. ἐγὼ δέ] spoken in the consciousness of the greater power which *He* by *His* prayer has in opposition to the demand of Satan. "Ostenderat periculum, ostendit remedium," Maldonatus. — περὶ σοῦ] Comp. previously ὑμᾶς; "totus sane hic sermo Domini praesupponit, Petrum esse primum apostolorum, quo stante aut cadente ceteri aut minus aut magis periclitarentur," Bengel. Jesus here means a *more special* intercession than in John xvii. 15. — ἵνα μὴ ἐκλείπη κ.τ.λ.] that thy faith in me cease not, that thou mayest not be unfaithful, and fall away from me. Jesus knows this prayer is heard, in spite of the temporary unfaithfulness of the denial, the approaching occurrence of which he

¹ Ignatius, *Smyrn. Interpol.* 7, has σινιασέειν, plainly in reference to the passage before us.

likewise knows. "Defecit in Petro ἡ ἐνέργεια τῆς πίστεως ad tempus," Grotius. Therefore he goes on: *and thou at a future time* (καὶ σύ, opposed to the ἐγὼ δέ), *when thou shalt be converted* (without figure: *resipueris, μετανοήσας*, Theophylact), *strengthen thy brethren* (thy fellow-disciples); be their support, which maintains and strengthens them, when they become wavering in their faith. Even here we have the dignity and duty of the primate, which was not to cease through the momentary fall. For the idea of *στηρίζειν*, see especially Acts xiv. 22. On the form *στήρισον*, see Winer, p. 82 [E. T. 110]. According to Bede, Maldonatus, Grotius, Bengel, van Hengel, *Annot.* p. 1 ff., Ewald, and others, ἐπίστρ. is a Hebraism (נשׂו): *versus, vicissim*, so that the meaning would be: what I have done to thee, do thou in turn to thy brethren. This is contrary to the *usus loquendi* of the New Testament (even Acts vii. 42, xv. 36). But it is inconsistent with the context when Wetstein takes ἐπίστρ. *actively*: "*convertens fratres tuos*," since Jesus has the *fall* of Peter (ver. 34) in His view. — Ver. 33 f. Comp. on Matt. xxvi. 32-35; Mark xiv. 20-31. The ἐπιστρέψας provoked the self-confidence of the apostle. — μετὰ σοῦ] stands with passionate emphasis at the beginning; ἐκ πολλῆς ἀγάπης θρασύνεται καὶ ὑπισχνεῖται τὰ τέως αὐτῷ ἀδύνατα, Theophylact. — Πέτρε] not Σίμων this time. The *significant* name in contradiction with the conduct. — μῆ] after ἀπαρν., as xx. 27.

Vv. 35-38. Peculiar to Luke, from tradition or from some other unknown source. But the utterance itself is in respect of its contents so remarkably significant, that we are bound to hold by its originality, and not to say that it was introduced into this place for the sake of explaining the subsequent stroke with the sword (Schleiermacher, Strauss, de Wette), or the reason why Judas is afterwards represented as appearing with armed men (Holtzmann). — καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς] A pause must be supposed as occurring before what follows, the *connection of the thought* being: not without reason have I uttered words so momentous (vv. 31-34), for now your position, when I am no more with you, will be entirely different from what it was formerly; there comes for you the time of

care for yourselves and of contest!—*ὅτε ἀπέστειλα κ.τ.λ.*] ix. 3; comp. x. 4.—Ver. 36. *οὖν*] in consequence of this acknowledgment.—*ἀράτω*] not: “*tollat, ut emat gladium*” (Erasmus, Beza, and others), but: *let him take it up*, in order to bear it. The representation of the thought now refers to the time when ye can no more be unconcerned about your maintenance, but must yourselves care for it in the world which for you is inhospitable.—*καὶ ὁ μὴ ἔχων*] to wit, *βαλλάντιον καὶ πήραν*. The contrast allows nothing else. Hence *μάχαιραν* is erroneously suggested as implied (Beza, Jansen, Paulus, Baumgarten-Crusius, Lange, Ewald, Bleek, and others), and equally erroneously is the general reference suggested: *he who is without means* (Kuinoel, Olshausen, Schegg). Jesus means to say, how far more necessary still than purse and scrip, nay, even more necessary than the upper garment, should now be to them a *sword*, for defence and protection against hostile attacks. But observe in this connection (1) that he wishes for the purchase of the sword, not by those *merely* who have no purse and knapsack, but, on the contrary, whilst he requires it of these, yea, requires it with the sacrifice of the cloak, otherwise so needful, yet he regards it as a self-evident duty on the part of those who have the means for the purchase. The form of his utterance is a parallelism, in which the second member supplements and throws a new light upon the first. (2) Nevertheless Jesus does not desire that His disciples should actually carry and use the sword (Matt. xxvi. 52), but He speaks in such a manner as *figuratively to represent* in what a hostile relation they should henceforth find the world arrayed against them, and what resistance and struggle on their part would now be necessary in their apostolic missionary journeys. That the discourse is in reference to these is clearly proved by *βαλλάντ.* and *πήραν*, in opposition to Olshausen, who perversely allegorizes the whole passage, so that *βαλλάντ.* and *πήρ.* are taken to signify the means for the *spiritual* life, and *μάχ.* the sword of the *Spirit*, Eph. vi. 17 (comp. also Erasmus).—Ver. 37. A confirmation of the *ἀλλὰ νῦν κ.τ.λ.* For since, moreover, *that* (“*etiamnum hoc extremum post tot alia,*” Bengel) must still be fulfilled on

me which is written in Isa. liii. 12; so ye, as my disciples, cannot expect for yourselves anything better than what I have announced to you, ver. 36. The cogency of the proof follows from the presupposition that the disciple is not above his master (Matt. x. 24 f.; John xv. 20). On the δέι of the divine counsel, comp. Matt. xxvi. 54 (Acts ii. 23), and observe how inconsistent therewith it is to regard the passion of Jesus as a *fortuitous occurrence* (Hofmann). — καὶ μετὰ αὐν. ἔλογ.] καί, *and*, adopted together with the rest as a constituent part of the passage quoted. The *completion* (the Messianic fulfilment, xviii. 31) of the prophecy began with the arrest (ver. 52), and comprehended the whole subsequent treatment until the death. — καὶ γὰρ τὰ περὶ ἐμοῦ τέλ. ἔχει] *for, moreover, that which concerneth me has to come to an end; i.e., for, moreover, with my destiny, as with the destiny of him of whom Isaiah speaks, there is an end.* Observe that Jesus did not previously say τὸ εἰς ἐμὲ γεγραμμένον κ.τ.λ. or the like, but τὸ γεγρ. δεῖ τελεσθ. ἐν ἐμοί, so that He does not *explain* the passage immediately of *Himself* (Olshausen), but asserts that it must be fulfilled in *Him*, in respect of which it is plain from καὶ γὰρ κ.τ.λ. that He conceived of *another* as the subject of the first *historical* meaning of the passage (whom? is another question, comp. Acts viii. 34), of whom He was the antitype, so that in Him is found the antitypal historical fulfilment of that which is predicted in reference to the servant of God. On τὰ περὶ ἐμοῦ, see Kühner, II. p. 119; on τέλος ἔχει, Mark iii. 26; Plat. *Pol.* iii. p. 392 C; Dem. 932. 4, and the examples from Xenophon in Sturz, IV. p. 275. Most commentators (Euthymius Zigabenus, Luther, Beza, Calvin, Bengel, and many others, including Kuinoel, Olshausen, de Wette, Bleek) read: *for, moreover, that which is written of me*, like other prophecies, *is about to be accomplished*, as though γεγραμμένα formed part of the sentence, as at xxiv. 44, or flowed from the context, as at xxiv. 27. Comp. Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* II. p. 380. But what a nugatory argument! and what is the meaning of the καί (which certainly most of them leave wholly unnoticed), since, indeed, it is just the *Messianic* prophecies which constitute the *main substance* of prophecy, and do not come in merely

by the way? — Ver. 38. The disciples, not understanding the utterance about the sword, imagined that Christ required them to have swords actually¹ ready for defence from impending violence. Peter had one of the two swords (ver. 50). They may have been worn on the last journey, or even on account of the risk of these days they may have been first procured with a view to circumstances that might occur. *Butcher's knives* (from the cutting up of the lamb, as supposed by Euthymius Zigabenus, following Chrysostom) they could not be, according to ver. 36, although the word, so early as the time of Homer (Döderlein, *Glossar*. I. p. 201 f.), but never in the New Testament, has this signification. — *ἱκανόν ἐστι*] a gentle turning aside of further discussion, with a touch of sorrowful irony: *it is enough!* More than your two swords ye need not! Comp. Castalio on the passage. The disciples, carrying out this idea, must have at once concluded that Jesus had still probably meant something else than an actual purchase of swords, ver. 36.² The significance of the answer so conceived gives to this view the preference over the explanation of others (Theophylact, Calovius, Jansen, Wolf, Bisping, Kuinoel): *enough of this matter!* Compare the Rabbinical *נָתַן* in Schoettgen, p. 314 ff. Olshausen and de Wette combine the two, saying that Jesus spoke *in a twofold sense*; comp. Bleek. Without sufficient reason, since the setting aside of the subject is found also in our view.—Boniface VIII. proves from the passage before us the double sword of the papal sovereignty, the *spiritual* and *temporal* jurisdiction! “*Protervum ludibrium*” (Calvin).

Vv. 39–46. See on Matt. xxvi. 36–46; Mark xiv. 32–42. The originality is on the side of Matthew and Mark. Luke by condensing disturbs the clearness of the single narrative, and mixes up with it legendary elements. — Ver. 40. *ἐπεὶ*

¹ Schleiermacher even has forced this misunderstanding (*L. J.* p. 417 f.) to a groundless combination; namely, that Jesus wished the swords for the case of an *unofficial* assault.

² Comp. Luther's gloss: “It is of no more avail to fight with the bodily sword, but henceforth it is of avail to suffer for the sake of the gospel, and to bear the cross; for the devil cannot be fought against with steel, therefore there is need to venture all on that, and only to take the spiritual sword, the word of God.”

τοῦ τόπου] *at the place* whither He wished to go,—*had arrived at the spot.* On γίνεσθαι in the sense of *come*, see Nägelsbach, *Anm. z. Ilias*, ed. 3, p. 295. — προσεύχεσθε, κ.τ.λ.] which Matt. xxvi. 41 and Mark xiv. 38 do not insert till later. Luke abbreviates, but to the prejudice of the appropriateness of the narrative. He is not to be supposed capable of having confounded the prayer of Jesus (Matt. xxvi. 36) with that of the disciples (de Wette). — Ver. 41. αὐτός] *He* on His part, in contrast with the disciples. — ἀπεσπάρσθη] *avulsus est*, Vulgate; *He was drawn away* from them, not involuntarily, but perchance in the urgency of His emotion, which forced Him to be alone, so that He, as it were, was forcibly separated from His disciples, with whom He otherwise would have remained. Ancient scholium on Soph. *Aj.* 1003, ἀποσπᾶν τὸ βιαίως χωρίζειν τὰ κεκολλημένα. Comp. Acts xxi. 1, and the passages in Kypke, also Pflugk, *ad Eur. Hec.* 225. It might indeed also mean simply: *secessit* (Kuinoel, de Wette, Bleek, and many others); comp. 2 Macc. xii. 10, 17; Xen. *Anab.* ii. 2. 12; but the above view explains the choice of the word, which is not elsewhere used in the New Testament for the frequent idea, “He withdrew Himself.” — ὥσει λίθου βολήν] *a distance of about a stone’s throw*, therefore not so far that He could not be heard by the disciples in the still night. On the expression, comp. *Il.* xxiii. 529; Thuc. v. 65. 1; LXX. Gen. xxi. 16. On the accusative of measure, see Kühner, § 556. — Ver. 42. εἰ βούλει παρενεγκεῖν κ.τ.λ.] *if Thou art willing to bear aside* (Mark xiv. 36) *this cup from me.* — The apodosis (παρένεγκε) is in the urgency of the mental excitement suppressed by the following thought (comp. xix. 41). The momentary longing after deliverance yields immediately to unconditional submission. See Winer, p. 529 [E. T. 750]; Buttmann, p. 339 [E. T. 396]. — θέλημα] not βουλή or βούλημα, which would not have been appropriate to μου. Comp. on Matt. i. 19; Eph. i. 11. — Ver. 43. *The appearance of the angel*, understood by Luke historically and externally (ὥφθη ἀπ’ οὐρανοῦ), is by Olshausen (see, in answer to him, Dettinger in the *Tüb. Zeitschr.* 1838, p. 46 f.) erroneously taken as an *internal* phenomenon (but see i. 11, xxiv. 34; Acts ii. 3, vii. 2, 30,

ix. 17, xvi. 9, xxvi. 16), and interpreted as signifying an "influx of spiritual powers." But of the *strengthening* itself is not to be made a *bodily* invigoration, as at Acts ix. 19 (Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* I. p. 391; Schegg), but it is to be left as an enhancement of *spiritual* powers,¹ as, according to the just narrated prayerful disposition, the context suggests. His submission to the Father's will, just expressed in the prayer, was the subjective condition of this strengthening, and on this submission being manifested the strengthening was objectively effected by the angel. Thus the narrative of Luke; but the circumstance that neither Matthew (John does not give the narrative of the agony at all) nor Mark relates this singular and remarkable angelic strengthening, although the latter would have had the testimony of *Peter* on his side, authorizes all the more the view of a *legendary* origination of the narrative (Gabler in *Theolog. Journ.* I. pp. 109 ff., 217 ff.; Schleiermacher, Strauss, Hase, Theile, Holtzmann, comp. Bleek, Schenkel, and others), the nearer the *decisive* resolve of Jesus (whether regarded in itself, or as compared with the history of the temptation and such expressions as John i. 52) approached to such an increase of strength, which decisive resolve, however, in the tradition took the shape of an external fact perceived by the senses. Dettinger, *l.c.*; Ebrard, p. 528; Olshausen, Schegg; Lange also, *L. J.* II. 3, p. 1430, and others, adduce insufficient grounds in favour of the *historical* view. The older *dogmatic* devices to explain the *manner* in which this strengthening came about, wherein orthodoxy comforted itself with the doctrine of the *κένωσις*, may be seen in Calovius. — Ver. 44. Further particulars. According to Luke, the decisive resolve of Jesus: τὸ σὸν γενέσθω, was crowned with the strengthening angelic appearance; and thus decided and equipped for resistance, He now endured (comp. Heb. v. 7 f., and thereupon Lünemann and Delitzsch) the agony (ἀγωνία, Dem. 236. 19; Polyb. viii. 21. 2; 2 Macc. iii. 14, xv. 19), which was now beginning, fervently praying (as before the appearance), which agony increased even to the bloody sweat. Luke has con-

¹ Theodore of Mopsuestia (ed. Fritzsche, p. 16) says: διελθὲν τὴν λύπην κατὰ φύσιν ἀνθρώπων καὶ ἰσχύεται καὶ ἰνισχύεται ὑπὸ ἀγγέλου.

ceived the strengthening influence as *increasing as the agony increased*. The sweat of Jesus (in the height of the agony) was like to drops of blood falling down. This is referred by Theophylact, Euthymius Zigabenus, Grotius, Calixtus, Hammond, Michaelis, Valckenaer, and most of the later commentators, including Paulus, Kuinoel, Olshausen, Bleek, merely to the *size and consistence* of the drops of sweat. So also Dettinger, *l.c.*, and Hug, *Gutacht*. II. p. 145. Comp. Lange, II. 3, p. 1433. Thus in a naturalistic direction the point of comparison found in αἵματος is robbed of its characteristic importance, and Luke would have concluded his description, rising to a climax, with nothing but this: and Jesus fell into the most violent sweat! No! αἵματος only receives its due in being referred to the *nature* of the sweat, and this nature is viewed as foreshadowing the coming bloodshedding. Hence also the strongly descriptive word θρόμβοι is chosen; for θρόμβος is not simply a drop (σταγών, στάλαγμα), but a *clot of coagulated fluid* (milk and the like), and is often used especially of coagulated blood (Aesch. *Eum.* 184; *Choroph.* 533, 545; Plat. *Crit.* p. 120 A: θρόμβον ἐνέβαλλον αἵματος; Dioscor. 13: θρόμβοις αἵματος). See Jacobs, *ad Anthol.* VII. p. 379; Blomfield, *Gloss. Choroph.* 526. Consequently that sweat of Jesus was indeed no mass of blood (opposed to which is ὡσεὶ), but a *profusion of bloody sweat*, which was mingled with portions of blood, and as it flowed down appeared as clots of blood trickling down to the ground.¹ So in substance most of the Fathers, Erasmus, Calvin, Calovius, Wolf, Bengel, and others, including Strauss, Ebrard, Schegg. As to the *historical character* of the matter, it would come under the same judgment as that of the angelic strengthening, were it independent of the analogies of sweat of blood elsewhere occurring (Aristotle, *H. A.* iii. 19; Bartholinus, *de Cruce*, pp. 184 ff., 193 ff.; Gruner, *de J. C. morte vera*, pp. 33 ff., 109 f.; Loenartz, *de sudore sanguin.*, Bonn 1850). — Ver. 45. ἀπὸ

¹ Justin, c. *Tr.* 103, relates from the ἀπομνημονεύμασι simply: ὅτι ἰδρῶς ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι κατεχίετο. Therein is found no essential variation from the passage before us. For θρόμβος, even in the classical writers, is used without αἵματος, of a coagulated mass of blood. See Blomfield, *l.c.*

τῆς λύπης] *by reason of the sorrow* in which they were. An attempt to explain the strange sleep which had overmastered the whole band of disciples. Is it, however, sufficient? Hardly in this case, where in the chilly night of spring (John xviii. 18) Jesus was so near, and was in a situation exciting the deepest interest and the most intense participation in the sympathy of His disciples. In itself there is justice in the observation that continuous deep grief relaxes into sleep. See examples in Pricaeus, *ad Apulej. Metom.* p. 660 f., and Wetstein. Calvin suggests *Satanic* temptation as the cause first of this sleep, and then of the blow with the sword.

Vv. 47-53. See on Matt. xxvi. 47-56, Mark xiv. 43-52, in both of which the linking on of what follows by means of *ἐτι αὐτοῦ λαλ.* is better suited to the sense. Luke in this part uses in general less original sources. — *ὁ λεγόμεν. Ἰούδ.] who is called Judas.* Comp. ver. 1; Matt. ii. 23, xxvi. 3, 14, xxviii. 33, and elsewhere. — *εἰς τῶν δώδεκα]* as ver. 3. — *προήρχετο αὐτούς]* See on Mark vi. 33. — Ver. 48. *φιλήματι]* placed first for emphasis; *φίλου ἀσπασμῷ ἐχθροῦ ἔργον τὴν προδοσίαν μινύεις;* Theophylact. That the kiss was *concerted* with the enemies (Mark xiv. 44) Luke leaves to be gathered only mediately from the words of Jesus. — Ver. 49.¹ *εἰ πατάξομεν κ.τ.λ.] whether we shall smite by means of the sword?* Comp. xiii. 23; Acts i. 6, and elsewhere. See on Matt. xii. 10 and on Luke xiii. 23. Grotius says rightly: “Dubii inter id, quod natura dictabat, et saepe inculcata patientiae praecepta dominum quid faciendum sit rogant. At Petrus non expectato Domini responso ad vim vi arcendam accingitur.” — Ver. 50. *τὸ δεξιόν]* as also John xviii. 10 has it. — Ver. 51. *ἔατε ἕως τούτου]* is a prohibitory summons to the disciples: *sinite usque huc* (Vulg.), which Augustine, *de cons. ev.* iii. 5, aptly explains: “*permittendi sunt hucusque*

¹ Vv. 49-51, as also already at vv. 35-38, was objectionable to Marcion, and was omitted in his gospel. See Volkmar, p. 69 f. Hilgenfeld decides otherwise in the *Theol. Jahrb.* 1853, p. 240 f., where he, indeed, likewise concedes the genuineness, but supposes that the deletion may have happened in the Romish Church even *before* Marcion.

progredi." Let them go so far as even to take me prisoner ! Comp. Luther, Maldonatus, and others ; recently also Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 437, and Schegg. Grotius, Bengel, Wetstein, Kuinoel, Olshausen, Bleek, and others have explained : *cease* (comp. Acts v. 38 ; Hom. *Il.* xxi. 221, *al.*) ! *so far !* (not farther ! comp. Lev. xxvi. 18 ; Job xxxviii. 11). To this it stands opposed that herein is found no disapproval of the blow with the sword, but only the prohibition to go any further ; and, moreover, this not at all negatively expressed, as it would have most obviously occurred by means of some such expression as *μὴ πορρώτέρω* or the like. Others take the words as an address to those who were *taking Him prisoner*, and thus *τούτου* either as *neuter* and *temporal* : "*missum facite me usque ad id tempus, quo vulnus illius hominis sanavero*" (Bornemann, so also Hammond, Kypke, de Wette, Lange, II. 3, p. 1461, III. p. 512), or *τούτου* as *neuter*, indeed, but *local* : let me go *thither* where the wounded man is (Paulus), or *τούτου* as *masculine* : let me go *to this man* in order to heal him (Stolz, Baumgarten-Crusius). Against these views the objection is that the context in the word *ἀποκριθεὶς* shows nothing else than a reply to the disciples, as Jesus does not turn to His enemies till ver. 52. — *καὶ ἄψάμ. κ.τ.λ.*] On account of *ἀφεῖλεν*, ver. 50, this is to be referred to the *place* and the remains of the ear that had been cut off ; and *ιάσατο αὐτόν* to the healing of the wound (not : replacing of the ear). With desperate arbitrariness Paulus says that He touched the wound in order to examine it, and told the man what he must do to heal it ! Luke alone records the healing ; and it can the less be cleared of the suspicion of being a legendary accretion (comp. Strauss, II. p. 461 ; Baumgarten-Crusius, Holtzmann, and others), like vv. 43, 44, that even John, who narrates the blow with the sword so circumstantially, says nothing about it. — Ver. 52. *πρὸς τοὺς παραγενομ. κ.τ.λ.*] These chief priests, etc., were therefore, according to Luke, associated with that *ὄχλος*, ver. 47. Inappropriate in itself, and in opposition to the rest of the evangelists. An error on the part of tradition, probably through confusion with John xviii. 20 f. Comp. on Matt. xxvi. 47, 55. Ebrard,

p. 532, is in error when he says that Luke is speaking of those *who had just then newly approached*. So also Lange. Opposed to this is the *arist* participle. — Ver. 53. ἀλλ' αὐτῇ κ.τ.λ.] informs us of the reason that they had not laid hands on Him sooner in spite of His daily association with them: *But this* (the present hour) *is your* (that which is ordained for you for the execution of your work, according to divine decree) *hour, and* (*this, this power in which ye now are acting*) *the power of darkness, i.e.* the power which is given to darkness (in the ethical sense, the power opposed to the divine ἀλήθεια, opposed to φῶς). Observe the great emphasis on the ἡμῶν by being placed so near the beginning of the clause. The expression τοῦ σκότους, not τῆς ἁμαρτίας (so Kuinoel and Olshausen explain it), not τοῦ διαβόλου (so Euthymius Zigabenus, Calvin, Grotius, Bengel, Baumgarten-Crusius, and others), is *chosen* in reference to the actual night, which it *was* at this time; but it is not the actual darkness of night that is *meant* ("only the darkness gives you courage and power to lay hold of me," de Wette, comp. Neander, Bleek, and older commentators), for this quite commonplace thought would declare nothing on the *destiny* of that hour and power.

Vv. 54-62. See on Matt. xxvi. 57 f., 69-75; Mark xiv. 53 f., 66-72. Jesus is led into the house of the high priest, in the court of which (vv. 61, 63), according to Luke, who follows a diverging tradition, He is kept and subjected to mockery till daybreak (ver. 66), when the Sanhedrim comes together. According to Matthew and Mark, the Sanhedrim assemble immediately after the arrival of Jesus, and examine Him. The two narratives cannot be reconciled, but the preference is to be given to Luke in so far as he agrees with John. See below on τοῦ ἀρχιερ. Moreover, Luke is not self-contradictory (in opposition to Strauss), as the chief priests and elders mentioned at ver. 52 are to be regarded only as individuals, and probably as deputed by the Sanhedrim. — τοῦ ἀρχιερ.] As Luke did not regard Caiaphas (the general opinion), but Annas, as the officiating high priest (see on iii. 2 and Acts iv. 6), the latter is to be understood in this place. Comp. Bleek, *Beitr.* p. 39 ff., and Holtzmann. Luke, indeed,

thus falls into a new variation from Matthew, but partially comes into harmony with John so far, that is, as the latter likewise represents Jesus as brought at first to Annas, and so far also as in Luke and in John the denials occur in the court of *Annas*. But of a *trial* before Annas (John xviii. 19 ff.) Luke has nothing, yet it finds its historical place naturally enough immediately after εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ ἀρχιερ., when the prisoner, as may be supposed, was announced. Wieseler also, *Synopse*, p. 405, comes to the result that Luke xxii. 54-65 belongs to what occurred in the house of *Annas*, but comes to it in another way. Comp. on iii. 2. — Ver. 55. περιψάντων] (see the critical remarks) *after they had kindled around* (Phalaris, *Ep.* v. p. 28), *i.e.* had set it in full blaze. The insertion of αὐτῶν was not needful, Kühner, *ad Xen. Anab.* i. 2. 17. — Ver. 56. ἀτενίσασα] *after she had looked keenly upon* him, iv. 20, and very often in the Acts of the Apostles. See Jacobs, *ad Anthol.* VI. p. 259. — Ver. 58. ἕτερος] A variation from Matthew and Mark. For Luke does not think of a maid; rather he distinguishes the interrogator here as *masculine*, by ἕτερος and ἄνθρωπε, from the female questioner of ver. 56 f.; hence Ebrard (comp. Wetstein) is wrong in contenting himself with the indefinite sense, "*somebody else.*" — Ver. 59. ἄλλος τις] several, according to Matthew and Mark. As to the variations of the four Gospels in the account of the denials, see in general on Matt. xxvi. 75, Remark. — Ver. 61. According to Luke, therefore, Jesus is *still also in the court*, and, down to ver. 66, is kept there in custody (ver. 63). Certainly it is psychologically extremely improbable that Peter should have perpetrated the denials in the presence of Jesus, which, moreover, is contrary to the other Gospels. But a reconciliation of them with Luke is impossible; and, moreover, *the* assumption that Jesus looked upon Peter as He was led from Annas to Caiaphas and passed close by the disciple in the court (John xviii. 24, so Olshausen, Schweizer, Ebrard), is inadmissible, as, according to John, it is already the *second* denial that occurs about the same time as this leading away of Jesus, but according to Luke, ver. 59, there is an interval of about an hour between the second and third

denial. — ἐνέβλεψε] What a holy power is in this silent glance, according to the narrative of Luke !

Vv. 63–65. See on Matt. xxvi. 67 f.; Mark xiv. 65. Luke follows an entirely different tradition—different in respect of the time, the place, and the persons who were engaged in the mockery. The same characteristic ill-treatment (smiting—demand for prophecy), the original connection of which is in Matthew and Mark (in opposition to Schleiermacher), had arranged itself variously in tradition. Against the supposition of many times repeated mockery must be reckoned the identity and peculiarity of its essential element (in opposition to Ebrard and others). — δέρειν and παίειν are distinguished as to *scourge* (Jacobs, *Del. Epigr.* vi. 63) and to *smite in general*.

Vv. 66, 67. According to Luke, the *Sanhedrim* now first comes together after daybreak, and Jesus is led in for trial. *Where* it assembled Luke does not say, and there is nothing therefore opposed to our finding in this place the leading away from the court of Annas (see on ver. 54) into the house of Caiaphas (John xviii. 24). The trial itself, as to its matter, is plainly the same which Matthew—although immediately after the bringing in of Jesus—makes to be held in the house of Caiaphas. See Matt. xxvi. 59 ff. Luke relates the matter and proceedings in a merely summary and imperfect manner. — τὸ πρεσβυτέριον κ.τ.λ.] *the elders of the people, (the) chief priests, and scribes*. These are the three constituent elements of the Sanhedrim. Comp. ix. 22, xx. 1. On πρεσβυτέριον, denoting the elders as a corporation, comp. Acts xxii. 5. By the non-repetition of the article the three parts are bound into a unity, in respect of which the difference of the gender and number is no difficulty (comp. Plato, *Pol.* vi. p. 501 D : τοῦ ὄντος τε καὶ ἀληθείας ἐραστὰς; Soph. *Oed. C.* 850 : πατρίδα τε τὴν σὴν καὶ φίλους; especially in respect of the collective nature of πρεσβυτέριον. See in general, Krüger, § 58. 2. 1; Winer, p. 115 f. [E. T. 157 f.]. — ἀνήγαγον] The subject is the assembled members of the Sanhedrim who had *caused* Him to be brought up. ἀνα indicates a locality *situated higher*, as contrasted with the court of Annas, in which locality the

Sanhedrim were met. — εἰς τὸ συνέδρ. αὐτῶν] *into their own concensus, into their own council gathering*, in order now *themselves* to proceed further with Him. Comp. the use of συνέδριον of the Amphictyonic council, also of the Roman and the Carthaginian Senate (Polyb. xl. 6. 6, i. 11. 1, 31. 8). — Ver. 67. εἰ σὺ κ.τ.λ.] may mean: *If thou art the Messiah, tell us* (Vulgate, Luther, and most commentators), or: *Tell us whether thou art the Messiah* (Castalio, Bornemann, Ewald, and others), or: *Is it the case that thou art the Messiah? Tell us* (Erasmus). The first is the simplest, and corresponds to the purpose of framing the question so as to elicit an affirmative answer.

Vv. 68, 69. Matthew and Mark have not the evasive answer, ver. 68; and the explanation of Jesus: ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν κ.τ.λ., does not come in there till after the distinct affirmation. Their narrative has the advantage of internal probability. Luke has worked up the material more catechetically. — ἐὰν δὲ καὶ ἐρωτ.] *but in case I also* (should not limit myself merely to the confession that I am He, but also) *should ask*, should put before you questions which are connected therewith, *ye would certainly not answer* (see the critical remarks). — ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν δέ] “*Ab hoc puncto, quum dimittere non vultis. Hoc ipsum erat iter ad gloriam*,” Bengel. On the position of δέ, see Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 378 f. Moreover, see on Matt. xxvi. 64; yet Luke has avoided the certainly original ὁψέσθαι, and thus made the utterance less abrupt.

Vv. 70, 71. Ὁ υἱὸς τ. Θεοῦ] *This* designation of the Messiah is suggested by ἐκ δεξιῶν . . . Θεοῦ, in recollection of Ps. cx.; for “*colligebant ex praedicto ver. 69*,” Bengel. And their conclusion was right. — ὅτι ἐγὼ εἶμι] ὅτι, argumentatively, comp. John xviii. 37; ἐγώ, with emphasis, corresponding to the σὺ of vv. 67 and 70. — μαρτυρίας] that He gives Himself out to be the Messiah.

CHAPTER XXIII.

VER. 1. Elz. has ἡγαγεν. But ἔγαγον is decisively attested. — Ver. 2. After ἔθνος we find ἡμῶν in the more important authorities. So Lachm. and Tisch. As no reason occurred for adding it in the way of gloss, it has more probably been passed over as superfluous. — Ver. 6. Γαλιλαίαν] is wanting in B L T s, Copt. Tisch. Passed over as superfluous and troublesome. — Ver. 8. ἐξ ἱκανοῦ] ἐξ ἱκανῶν χρόνων (B D L T s, Lachm. Tisch.) and ἐξ ἱκανοῦ χρόνου (H M X, min. Vulg. It.) are expansions in the way of gloss. — πολλὰ is wanting in B D K L M [T π] s, min. vss. Condemned by Griesb., deleted by Tisch. An addition to make the statement more precise, which some cursives have after αὐτοῦ. — Ver. 11. περιβ. αὐτόν] αὐτόν is wanting in B L T s, 52, Vulg. codd. of It. Bracketed by Lachm., deleted by Tisch. A superfluous exegetical addition, instead of which R S U r, min. have αὐτῷ. — Ver. 15. ἀνέπεμψα γὰρ ὑμᾶς πρ. αὐτόν] B K L M π s, min. vss. have ἀνέπεμψεν γὰρ αὐτόν πρὸς ὑμᾶς (B: ὑμᾶς). An alteration in accordance with ver. 11. There are yet other attempts at improvement in the authorities. — After ver. 16 Elz. Scholz have (ver. 17) ἀνάγκην δὲ εἶχεν ἀπολύειν αὐτοὺς κατὰ ἐνέργειαν ἑνα. This is wanting in A B K L T π, Copt. Sahid. Vere., and does not occur in D, Aeth. Syr.^{cu} till after ver. 19. There are many variations also in the details. An old gloss. Condemned also by Griesb., bracketed by Lachm. and [omitted by] Tisch. [8]. — Ver. 19. Instead of βεβλήμεν. εἰς τ. φ. Tisch. has βληθεῖς ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ, in opposition to preponderating evidence; and the aorist participle is not appropriate grammatically (comp. Buttmann, *Neut. Gr.* p. 265 [E. T. 309 f.]). — Ver. 20. ὁδῷ] Lachm. and Tisch. have ὁδῇ, on decisive evidence. — Ver. 21. Elz. Scholz have σταύρωσον, σταύρωσον. But B D s, Or. Eus. Cyr. have σταυρου, σταυρου, which Griesbach approved (as *perispomenon*), Lachm. and Tisch. adopted (as *paravylone*). The *Recepta* is from Mark xv. 13 f.; John xix. 6, 15. — Ver. 23. καὶ τῶν ἀρχιερ.] bracketed by Lachm., condemned also by Rinck, deleted by Tisch. It is wanting in B L s, 130, *al.* Copt. Sahid. Vulg. codd. of It. But for what purpose should it have been

added? It would be far easier to overlook it as superfluously straggling after αὐτοῖν. — Ver. 24. ὁ δέ] Lachm. and Tisch. have καί, in accordance with B L Σ , 157, It. The *Recepta* is from Mark xv. 15, whence also, and from Matt. xxvii. 26, αὐτοῖς (ver. 25) came in, which Elz. reads after ἀπέλ. δέ. — Ver. 26. Σίμωνος κ.τ.λ.] Lachm. and Tisch. have Σίμονά τινα Κυρηναῖον ἐρχόμενον, on important evidence indeed; but the parallels suggested the accusative. Elz. has τοῦ before ἐρχ., in opposition to decisive evidence. — Ver. 27. αἱ καί] Lachm. has merely αἱ. Since the authorities against καί are decisive (A B C* D L X, min. Syr. Copt. Sahid. Arm. Vulg. It. Theophyl.), it is to be deleted, and to be explained from αἱ having been written twice, or as an arbitrary addition, from the well-known usage in Luke. In Σ αἱ καί is wanting. — Ver. 29. ἐθήλ.ασαν] B C* L Σ , min. It. have ἔθρεψαν, to which, moreover, C** D approach with ἐξέθρεψαν. ἔθρεψ. is to be adopted, with Lachm. and Tisch. The *Recepta* is an interpretation. — Ver. 34. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς . . . ποιοῦσιν] bracketed by Lachm. The words are wanting in B D* Σ ** 38, 435, Sahid. Cant. Ver. Verc. Variations in details. An ancient omission, according to the parallels, which have not this prayer. It bears, moreover, the stamp of originality in itself; it is also attested by Clem. *Hom.* xi. 20, and belongs to the peculiar features of the history of the passion which Luke has retained. — κλήρον] Tisch. has κλήρους, following A X, min. Syr.^{cu.} [according to Tisch. 8, Syr.^{cu.} favours either reading, but κλήρους is vouched for by Syr.^{jer.} and by the text (not the margin) of Syr.^{p.}] Slav. Vulg. It. Aug.; the singular is from the parallel and Ps. xxii. 19. — Ver. 35. The καί after δέ is wanting in D Σ , min. Vulg. It. Eus. Lachm. Tisch. The subsequent σὺν αὐτοῖς is wanting in B C D L Q X Σ , min. Syr. Pers.^{p.} Ar.^{p.} Erp. Copt. Aeth. Cant. Ver. Colb. Corb. Rd. Bracketed by Lachm.; σὺν αὐτοῖς is to be deleted; it was added in order, according to the parallels, to allow the mocking by the people also to take place; καί, however, is to be maintained, partly on account of its preponderating attestation, partly because it suggested the addition of σὺν αὐτοῖς, but appeared inappropriate without this addition. — Ver. 36. καί] after προσ-ερχ. is, on preponderating evidence, with Tisch. (Lachm. has only bracketed it), to be deleted. A connective addition. — Ver. 38. γεγραμμένη] Since B L Σ , Copt. Sahid. have not this at all, while A D Q have ἐπιγεγρ. (so Lachm.), and C* X, min. have γεγρ. after αὐτοῖς, the word is, with Tisch., to be deleted as an exegetical addition. — γράμμασιν . . . Ἐβρ.] is wanting in B C* L, Copt. Sahid. Syr.^{cu.} Verc. Deleted by

Tisch., by Lachm. only bracketed. It is a very ancient addition from John xix. 20. — *ὁδοῖς ἑστίν*] is wanting in C, Colb., and is found in others, sometimes with (D, 124, Cant. Corb.), sometimes without *ἑστίν* (B L Σ , Vere.), not until after *Ἰουδαίων*; hence there is a strong suspicion of its being a supplement. Lachm. and Tisch. have *ὁ βασιλ. ἐξ τ. Ἰουδ. οὐτος*, although Lachm. brackets *ὁδοῖς*. — Ver. 39. *εἰ σὺ εἶ*] Tisch. has *ὅχι σὺ εἶ*, according to B C* L Σ , vss.; the *Recepta* is from ver. 37, whence also the *λέγων*, which precedes these words, and which is wanting in B L, has intruded. — Ver. 42. *κύριε*] is wanting in B C* D L M* Σ , min. Copt. Sahid. Syr.^{Jer.} Cant. Vere. Or.(once). Bracketed by Lachm., deleted by Tisch. An addition, which Q, Corb. Brix. Syr.^{cu} Hil. have before *μνήσθ.*¹ — Ver. 44. *ἦν δέ*] Lachm. Tisch. have *καὶ ἦν ἥδη*, in accordance with sufficient evidence. Both the insertion of *δέ* and the omission of *ἥδη* were occasioned by the parallels. — Ver. 45. *καὶ ἕκαστ. ὁ ἡλίου*] appeared unsuitable after ver. 44, and was therefore in C** ? 33 (not by Marcion, according to Epiphanius) omitted (which omission Griesb. commended), while others put in its place, as a gloss on what precedes, *τοῦ ἡλίου ἐκλείποντος* (B) or *ἐκλείπ.* (C* L Σ , min. vss. Or.; so Tisch.). — Ver. 46. *παραθήσομαι*] *παρατίθεμαι* (commended by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. and Tisch.) is decisively attested. The *Recepta* is from LXX. Ps. xxxi. 5. — Ver. 48. *θεωροῦντες*] Lachm. and Tisch. have *θεωρήσαντες*, which is founded on B C D L R X Σ , min. Colb. — A has omitted *θεωρ. τ. γ.* The aorist is logically necessary. — After *τύπτ.* Elz. Scholz have *ἑαυτῶν*, in opposition to A B C* D L Σ , in spite of which authorities Lachm. has nevertheless retained it. A superfluous addition, instead of which U X r have *αὐτοῦν*. — Ver. 49. *αὐτοῦ*] Lachm. and Tisch. have *αὐτῷ*, which is sufficiently attested by A B L P, 33, 64, for *αὐτοῦ* to be traced to the inaccuracy of the transcribers. Before *μακρ.* Lachm. Tisch. have *ἀπὸ*, in accordance with B D L Σ . From the parallels. — Ver. 51. Elz. Scholz have *ὅς καὶ προσεδέχετο καὶ αὐτός*. But B C D L Σ , 69, Copt. codd. of It. have merely *ὅς προσεδέχετο*. So Lachm. Tisch. From Matthew and Mark was written on the margin sometimes only *καί*, sometimes *καὶ αὐτός*, both of which readings are combined in the *Recepta*. There are many other variations, which together make the *Recepta* so much the more suspicious. — Ver. 53. Lachm. Tisch. have deleted the first *αὐτό*, in accordance, indeed, with B C D L Σ , min. Vulg. It. (not Ver.); but being superfluous, and being regarded as awkwardly in the way, it was easily

¹ Still in connection with this deletion of the *κύριε* is to be read previously with Tisch., following B C* L Σ * Copt. Sahid. : *καὶ ἰλγιν' Ἰησοῦ*.

passed over. — ἐθελ. αὐτό] Lachm. and Tisch. have ἐθελ. αὐτόν, in accordance with B C D S, Vulg. It. Copt. Rightly; αὐτό is a repetition from what precedes. — Ver. 54. παρασκευή] Lachm. Tisch. have παρασκευῆς, in accordance with B C* L S, min. Vulg. codd. of It. Copt. Sahid. Since even the evidence of D is not in favour of the *Recepta* (it has πρὸ σαββάτου), the authorities in favour of the genitive are all the stronger, especially as παρασκευή was easily regarded by the transcribers as a name. Hence the genitive is to be preferred. — The καὶ before σάββ. is, with Lachm. and Tisch., in accordance with B C* L S, min. vss., to be retained. It slipped out in consequence of the omission of the entire clause κ. σάββ. ἐπεφ. (so still D, Colb.), and then was restored without the superfluous καί. — Ver. 55. Elz. Scholz have δὲ καὶ γυναῖκες. Certainly erroneous, since the decisive authorities have sometimes left out καί altogether (so Tisch.), sometimes have instead of it αἱ (so Lachm.). The latter is right. From δὲ αἱ arose the δὲ καί so frequent in Luke. But the article is necessary, in accordance with ver. 49.

Vv. 1-3. Comp. on Matt. xxvii. 2, 11; Mark xv. 1, 2. Luke relates the special charge, ver. 2, very precisely.¹ The preliminary investigation of the case before the Sanhedrim, xxii. 66 ff., had yielded the result, that Jesus asserted that He was the Messiah. This they now apply in presence of the political power to the political (anti-Roman) side. — ἤρξαντο] Beginning of the accusation scene. — διαστρέφ.] *perverting, misleading*. Comp. Polyb. v. 41. 1: ἀφίστασθαι καὶ διαστρέφειν; Ecclus. xi. 34. — τὸ ἔθν. ἡμ.] *our nation*, John xi. 50. — κωλύοντα] *mediately, to wit, by representing Himself, etc.*² — Χριστὸν βασιλέα] *a King-Messiah*. βασιλέα is added in connection with the *political* turn which they gave to the charge.

Vv. 4, 5. In the avowal itself Pilate finds the sign that *nothing blame-worthy*, etc.,—to him it is the expression of the

¹ Marcion, as quoted by Epiph., has enriched the accusation with two points more, namely, after τὸ ἔθνος ἡμῶν: καὶ καταλύοντα τὸν νόμον κ. τοὺς προφῆτας, and after βασιλ. εἶναι: καὶ ἀποστρέφοντα τὰς γυναῖκας κ. τὰ τέκνα.

² Thus, according to the *Recepta*, λίγοντα. Still the reading καὶ λίγοντα (B L T S, vss.) is, with Tischendorf, to be preferred, in which the two points κωλύοντα κ. τ. λ. and λίγοντα κ. τ. λ. are put forward independently. How easily the καὶ might drop out after διδόναι!

fixed idea of a harmless visionary. — ἐπίσχουν] is not, as there is no object in connection with it, to be taken actively (they *strengthened* their denunciation); but, with the Vulgate, Luther, Beza, and many others: *they grew stronger*, i.e. *they became more emphatic, more energetic*. Comp. Diod. v. 59; 1 Macc. vi. 6, and the correlative κατίσχουν, ver. 23. Both kinds of usage are frequent in the LXX. — ἀνασείει] Observe, on the one hand, the *present*, denoting such a *persistent* urgency; and, on the other, the stronger and more direct expression than ver. 2 (διαστρέφ.) now used: *he stirs up* (Mark xv. 11; Polyb. *Fr. Hist.* 66; Wesseling, *ad Diodor.* I. p. 615). — ἀρξάμ. κ.τ.λ.] as Matt. xx. 8.

Vv. 6, 7. Pilate was glad to seize the opportunity, when he heard the name of Galilee (ἀκούσας Γαλιλαῖ), instead of defending the guiltless, to draw himself out of the business at first, at least by a preliminary reference to the judgment of Herod,¹ which might cause him possibly to be transported to Galilee, and so he might be relieved of the transaction. Herod Antipas was tetrarch of *Galilee* and *Peraea*. Comp. iii. 1. — ἀνέπεμψεν] *he sent Him up*,—as the word, moreover, is used among the Greeks of the sending of delinquents to a higher judicature. Comp. Polyb. i. 7. 12, xxix. 11. 9. In the same manner ἀνάγειν; comp. on Acts xxv. 21; but at ver. 11 it is: *he sent back* (Philem. 11).

Vv. 8, 9. The frivolous tetrarch, in an unkingly manner, on the assumption that he had only either to accept or to reject Him,² immediately upon the sight of Jesus begins to rejoice at the satisfaction of his curiosity. — ἦν γὰρ θέλων κ.τ.λ.] *for from a long time he had been desirous*. — On ἐξ ἱκανοῦ, comp. the Greek neutral expressions: ἐκ πολλοῦ, ἐκ πλείστου, ἐξ ὀλίγου, ἐξ ἐκείνου, and the like; ἐφ' ἱκανόν, 2 Macc. viii. 25. — ἀκούειν] continually. — ἤλπιζε κ.τ.λ.] “ut oculos et animum re nova pasceret more aulae,” Grotius. — οὐδὲν ἀπεκρίνατο] is to be explained from the nature of

¹ Scarcely merely for the sake of learning the *opinion* of Herod (Ewald), for this is not made self-evident by the simple ἀντιμύσειν; nor, moreover, for the sake of learning the truth from Herod (Neander).

² Comp. Schleiermacher, *L. J.* p. 456.

the questions, and from Jesus seeing through Herod's purpose. — *αὐτὸς δέ*] But He on His part.

Vv. 10-12. *Εἰστήκεισαν*] *they stood there*. They had brought Him to Herod. — *εὐτόμως*] with passionate energy. Comp. 2 Macc. xii. 23; Acts xviii. 28, often in the Greek writers. — Ver. 11. Prudently enough Herod does not enter into the charges,—frivolously enough he thinks that justice will be done to the obstinate enthusiast as to a fool, not by means of investigation and punishment, but by contempt and mockery. — *σὺν τοῖς στρατεύμασιν αὐτοῦ*] These *troops* are the *body of satellites* by whom He is surrounded. — *ἐσθῆτα λαμπρ.*] a *gorgeous robe*, which is not to be defined more strictly. A *toga candida* (Polyb. x. 4. 8, x. 5. 1), which Beza, Kuinoel, Lange, and others suppose, is less in accordance with the situation, in which Jesus was to be caricatured, not as a *candidate*, but as a *king*. As such He was to appear again before Pilate *splendidly* clothed (but whether actually in *purple* or not is not expressed in the word). Comp. Xen. *Cyrop.* ii. 4. 5. Bengel, moreover, aptly remarks: "Herodes videtur *contemptim* voluisse significare, se nil metuere ab hoc rege." — Ver. 12. *ὄντες*] along with *ὑπάρχειν*, for the sake of making the situation more strongly prominent. See Dissen, *ad Dem. de Cor.* p. 258 f. — *πρὸς ἑαυτούς*] not *ἀλλήλους* this time, simply "ut varietur oratio," Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* ii. 6. 20. The cause of the previous enmity is unknown; possibly, however, it had originated from disputes about jurisdiction, since that consideration of Herod's jurisdiction (of the *fori originis*), even although Herod prudently made no further use of it, but sent back the accused, brought about the reconciliation. According to Justin, *c. Tr.* 103, Pilate sent Jesus to Herod *to please him* (*χαριζόμενος*).

REMARK.—The narrative of the sending to Herod (comp. Acts iv. 27) has the stamp of originality, and might as an *interlude*, having no bearing on the further course of the history, easily disappear from the connection of the tradition, so that its preservation is only due to Luke's investigation; and even John, in his narrative of the trial before Pilate, leaves it entirely out of consideration. He leaps over it after the words: ἐγὼ

οὐδεμίαν αἰτίαν εὗρισκω ἐν αὐτῷ, xviii. 38 (not after ver. 40, Tholuck, Olshausen), and hence makes Pilate immediately connect the words of ver. 39, which in the narrative of Luke correspond to the words of ver. 16. But not as though John had not known the intervening incident (de Wette; a conclusion in itself wholly improbable, and going much too far; such, for example, as might be applied equally to the Lord's Supper, to the agony in the garden, etc.); but, on the contrary, in accordance with the freedom of his peculiar composition, since *all* the evangelists did their work *eclectically*. Lightly Strauss, II. p. 500, satisfied himself with the conjecture that the "anecdote" arose from the endeavour to place Jesus before all possible judgment-seats in Jerusalem. Baur, however (*Evang.* p. 489), derives the narrative from the endeavour to have the innocence of Jesus attested as conspicuously as possible in the anti-Judaic interest, to lay the guilt on Judaism, and to relieve Pilate as much as possible from the burden (so also Schenkel, p. 405); comp. Eichthal's frivolous judgment, ii. p. 308.

V. 13–16. Καὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντ.] and in general the members of the Sanhedrim. Comp. xxiv. 20. — Ver. 14. ἐγὼ] *I, for my part*, to which afterwards corresponds ἀλλ' οὐδὲ Ἡρώδης. — ἐνώπιον ὑμῶν] *having examined Him in your presence*, according to ver. 3; but there is a variation in John xviii. 33 f. — οὐδὲν . . . αἴτιον ὧν κ.τ.λ.] *I have found nothing in this man which could be charged upon him, of that which ye* (οὐδὲν ὧν = οὐδὲν τούτων, *α*) *complain of against him*. On αἴτιον, *guilty, punishable*, comp. vv. 4, 22; on κατηγορ. κατά τινος, very rare in the Greek writers, see Xen. *Hell.* i. 7. 6: τῶν τε κατηγορούντων κατὰ τῶν στρατηγῶν. Wolf, *ad Dem. Lept.* p. 213. — Ver. 15. ἀλλ' οὐδὲ Ἡρώδης] *scil. εὗρεν κ.τ.λ., nor has even Herod* (who yet knows the Jewish circumstances so accurately), etc. Comp. C. F. A. Fritzsche, in *Fritzscheior. Opusc.* p. 178. — καὶ ἰδοὺ κ.τ.λ.] *Result of what was done in presence of Herod, which now appears; hence ἐστὶ πεπραγμένον*, which does not mean: *has been done by Him*; but: *is done by Him*. — Ver. 16. The chastisement (what kind of chastisement is left indefinite) is here merely *thrown out* as a satisfaction; hence there is no essential variation from John xviii. 39, and no confusion with John xix. 1–4. Comp.

also on Matt. xxvii. 26. Bengel rightly says: "Hic coepit *uiniūm concedere* Pilatus;" and thereby he had placed the attainment of his purpose beyond his power. Μαλακὸς δέ τις ὁ Πιλάτος καὶ ἤκιστα ὑπὲρ ἀληθείας ἐνστατικός· ἐδεδοίκει γὰρ τὴν συκοφαντίαν, μήπως διαβληθῇ ὡς τὸν ἀντάρτην ἀπολύσας, Theophylact.

Vv. 18-23. A condensed account down to the final condemnation, ver. 24 f. — Αἶρε] *c medio tolle*, — a demand for His death. Comp. Acts xxi. 36, xxii. 22; Dion. Hal. iv. 4, and elsewhere. — ὅστις] *quippe qui*, not equivalent to the simple *qui*, but: a man of such a kind that he, etc. — ἦν βεβλημ.] not a paraphrase of the pluperfect, but denoting the *condition*. — Ver. 20. προσεφώνησε] made an address. Comp. Acts xxi. 40. — Ver. 21. σταύρου] Imperative *active*, not *middle*; *paroxytone*, not *perispomenon*. — Ver. 22. γάρ] as Matt. xxvii. 23. — Ver. 23. ἐπέκειντο] *they pressed, they urged*, instabant, Vulg. Comp. v. 1; 3 Macc. i. 22, often thus in the classical writers. — κατίσχυον] *they became predominant, they prevailed*. Comp. Polyb. vi. 51. 6, xx. 5. 6; Matt. xvi. 18.

Vv. 24, 25. Ἐπέκρινε] *he pronounced the final sentence*, Plat. Leg. vi. p. 768 A; Dem. 1477. 22, and elsewhere; 2 Macc. iv. 48; 3 Macc. iv. 2. — ἀπέλυσε κ.τ.λ.] a tragic contrast. Comp. Acts iii. 14.

Vv. 26-32. Luke proceeds in a very abbreviating fashion, yet with intercalations of original matter, down to ver. 49. The observation ἐρχομ. ἀπ' ἀγροῦ belongs (as Ebrard at an earlier period also supposed, but now, on Olshausen, ed. 4, p. 52, questions), as does ver. 56, to the synoptical traces of the working day. See on Mark xv. 21. — The following saying of Jesus to the women is preserved only by Luke, extremely appropriate to the love and fervour at the threshold of death, and certainly from an original tradition. — Ver. 27. κ. γυναικῶν] *of women also*, not ministering female friends, but other women; and, indeed, according to ver. 28, from the city, as the female sex is accustomed in general to be very sympathizing and tender at executions; ἐκόπτ., as viii. 52. — Ver. 28 f. The address is: that they were not to weep *over*

Him (for He was on His way to meet a glorious future); nevertheless *over themselves* they ought to weep, etc., for (see ver. 29) over them was impending a terrible future (the destruction of Jerusalem). The contrast of emphasis lies upon ἐπ' ἐμέ and ἐφ' αὐτάς; by the position of the one at the end and of the other at the beginning, and the consequent juxtaposition as closely as possible of the two expressions, the emphasis is strengthened.—μακάριαι] The maternal heart, in truth, feels, besides its own suffering, still more keenly the sufferings of beloved children, Eur. *Andr.* 395. On ἔθρεψαν (see the critical remarks), comp. Aesch. *Choeph.* 543: μασθὼν . . . ἐμὸν θρεπτήριον. — Ver. 30. The mountains and hills were to—such is the wish of those who are in despair—not perchance *hide* them from the calamitous catastrophe and place them in security (comp. Isa. ii. 19, 21), but, as the words themselves (comp. with Hos. x. 8; Rev. vi. 16) indicate, the destructive landslip which covers them was to *take them away* by *sudden death* from the intolerable evil.—ἄρξονται] *an outbreaking* of the greatest anguish. The subject is the people in general (the Jews), not the *steriles* (Bengel). — Ver. 31. Reason on which this announcement of evil was based, ver. 29 f. "If they thus treat the guiltless and the righteous, what shall happen to the godless (to themselves)?" On the figure of the *green* (Ps. i. 5) and the *dry tree*, comp. Ezek. xxi. 3; *Sanhedr.* f. 93. 1. This last saying of Jesus, vv. 28–31, is one great memorial more, at once of His self-denial and of His sinless consciousness, as well as of His certain insight into the counsel of the divine retribution, which now allows itself no longer to be averted, but to be even once more *announced* with the pain of rejected love, and not to be withheld. — Ver. 32. κακοῦργοι] *delining* more closely the ἑτεροὶ δύο. Comp. ver. 33. See Bornemann, *Schol.* p. 147 f.; Winer, p. 469 [E. T. 665]; Krüger, *Anab.* i. 4. 2.

Vv. 33, 34. Κρανίον] A Greek translation of Γολγοθᾶ, *a skull*, so named from its *form*. See on Matt. xxvii. 33, and Ewald, *Gesch. Chr.* p. 485, who discovers in the name Golgotha the hill named *Gareb* in Jer. xxxi. 39. — Ver. 34.

In *ἄφες αὐτοῖς* Jesus refers to *His enemies*, who indeed were the sinning subjects, not to the *Roman soldiers* (Michaelis, Paulus, Kuinoel, Ewald, Wittichen, following older commentators, and as early as in Euthymius Zigabenus), who discharged the office of executioners only involuntarily and morally uninterested therein; so that in their case there could be no allusion either to imputation or to forgiveness. The *mockery* of the soldiers (Paulus, Kuinoel, Bleek also) is in respect of the crucifixion purely an invention. But in respect of the *crucifixion* (τί ποιοῦσι) is the prayer uttered in which from the innermost heart of Jesus breathes the deepest love which regards the crime in the mildest light, not indeed removing, but extenuating¹ the guilt, as a result of the want of knowledge of the nature of the deed (for they were slaying the *Messiah* of the people, whom they, however, had not recognised as such), and consequently the deed was capable of forgiveness. Even this prayer is a relic of the Crucified One, which Luke alone has preserved for us from a written or oral source. In Acts iii. 17, vii. 60, its echo is heard. Comp. 1 Cor. ii. 8, and the same prayer of the dying James in Eusebius, ii. 23. — *διαμεριζόμεν.*] at the division. — *κλήρους* (see the critical remarks): *lots*. Comp. on Mark xv. 24.

Vv. 35—38. According to the corrected text (see the critical remarks), it is not in Luke the people that mock (comp., on the other hand, Matt. xxvii. 39 f.; Mark xv. 29 f.), for they rather stand there as spectators, but the members of the Sanhedrim. *δὲ καί* refers merely to the *ἐκμυκτηρίζειν* of the *ἄρχοντες*. To the standing by and looking on of the people (not further sympathizing) is added, *however, also mockery* on the part of the *members of the Sanhedrim*. On *ἐξεμυκτ.* comp. Ps. xxii. 8, and see on xvi. 14. — *οὗτος*] *this fellow!* with scornful contempt. — *ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκλεκτός*] ix. 35. — Ver. 36 is not a misunderstanding of Matt. xxvii. 48 (de Wette), but something special which the other evangelists

¹ Comp. J. Müller, *v. d. Sünde*, I. p. 285; Schleiermacher, *L. J.* p. 453 f. Against the opinion of Buttmann in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1860, p. 353, see Graf in the same, 1861, p. 749 ff.

have not got. A mocking *offer*, not an actual giving to drink ; for here the offer was *not* made by means of a sponge, so that naturally Jesus *could not accept* the drink. The proceeding was a grim joke ! — Ver. 38. ἐπ' αὐτῷ] *over Him* on the cross. The supplementary statement of the *title on the cross* (see on Matt. xxvii. 37) explains the fact that the soldiers scoffed at Him as the *King of the Jews*.

Vv. 39–43. Εἰς] A difference from Mark xv. 32 and from Matt. xxvii. 44 ; see on the passages. — οὐχὶ (see the critical remarks) σὺ εἶ ὁ Χρ. is a jeering question, *Art thou not the Messiah?* — Ver. 40. οὐδὲ φοβῇ σὺ] not : *Dost not even thou fear* (de Wette, Bleek, following the Vulg., Grotius, Lange, and others, that would be οὐδὲ σὺ φ.)? but : *Hast thou no fear*¹ *at all on thy part before God*, since thou art in the same condemnation (as this Jesus whom thou revilest)? This similarity of position in suffering the judicial condemnation of the cross is the reason wherefore he ought at least *to be afraid* before God, and not continue to practise blasphemous outrage. — Ver. 41. οὐδὲν ἄτοπον] *nothing unlawful* ; see in general, Länemann on 2 Thess. iii. 2. The very general expression marks the innocence so much the more strongly. — Ver. 42. *Think on me* (to raise me from the dead, and to receive me into the Messiah's kingdom) *when Thou shalt have come in Thy kingly glory* (as Matt. xvi. 28). The promises of Jesus in regard to His *Parousia* must have been known to the robber,—which might easily enough be the case in Jerusalem,—and does not actually presuppose the instructions of Jesus ; yet he may also have heard Him himself, and now have remembered what he had heard. The extraordinary element of the agonizing situation in the view of death had now as its result the extraordinary effect of firm faith in those promises ; hence there is no sufficient reason on account of this faith, in which he even excelled the apostles, to relegate the entire history into the region of *unhistorical legend*² (Strauss, II. p. 519 ; Zeller in his *Jahrb.* 1843, I. p. 78 ; Schenkel,

¹ To say nothing, moreover, of penitent humility and resignation.

² For *apocryphal fables*, which subsequently linked themselves thereto, see Thilo, *ad Evang. Infant.* 23, p. 143.

Eichthal), in which has been found in the different demeanour of the two robbers even the representation of the different behaviour of the Jews and Gentiles towards the preaching of the crucified Christ (Schwegler, II. p. 50 f.). Others (Vulgate, Luther, and many others, including Kuinoel and Ewald) have taken ἐν in a pregnant sense as equal to εἰς, which is erroneous, since Jesus Himself establishes His kingdom; but to conceive of the *supramundane* kingdom (Euthymius Zigabenus, Grotius, Bornemann) brings with it the supposition, which in Luke is out of place, that the robber has heard the saying of Jesus at John xviii. 36. — Ver. 43. σήμερον] does not belong to λέγω σοι (a view already quoted in Theophylact, and rightly estimated by the phrase ἐκβιάζονται τὸ ῥῆμα), in respect of which it would be idle and unmeaning (this also in opposition to Weitzel in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1836, p. 957), but to what follows. The Lord knew that His own death and the robber's would take place *to-day*. In the case of the robber it was accelerated by means of breaking the legs. — On the *classical* word παράδεισος (Park), see Poppo, *ad Xen. Cyr.* i. 3. 14. The LXX. Gen. ii. 8 f. give this name to the dwelling-place of the first pair; the blessedness of this place, however, very naturally occasioned the naming, in the later Jewish theology, of the *portion of Hades in which the souls of the righteous after death dwell till the resurrection*, paradise. Comp. also the Book of Enoch xxii. 9 f. Not to be confounded with the *heavenly* paradise, 2 Cor. xii. 4; Rev. ii. 7. See on xvi. 23; Lightfoot and Wetstein on the passage. In the answer of Jesus there was probably not implied a divergence from the kind and manner in which the petitioner conceived to himself the fulfilment of his petition (Schleiermacher), but it presented simply and without veil, as well as in the most directly comforting form, the certainty of his petition being granted, since if his soul came into paradise, participation in the resurrection of the just and in the kingdom of the Messiah could not fail him. Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 1, p. 488, rationalizes the idea of paradise. Where the blessed communion of man with God is realized, there, he says, is paradise. This abstraction is surely erroneous, for this reason, that according to it the risen

souls must be in paradise, which is nowhere taught—they are in Messiah's kingdom. By μετ' ἐμοῦ Jesus expresses definitely His *descensus ad inferos* (König, *Lehre von d. Höllenf.* p. 45 ff.; Güder, *Lehre v. d. Erschein. Jesu Chr. unter d. Todten*, p. 33 ff.), in respect of which the fact that here circumstances required the mention of *paradise* only, and not of Gehenna, does not exclude what is contained in 1 Pet. iii. 18 f., as though we had here “a passage contradicting the analogy of doctrine” (de Wette). See, on the other hand, also West in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1858, p. 252 ff.

Vv. 44–46. See on Matt. xxvii. 45, 50 f.; Mark xv. 33, 37 f. According to Luke, the connection of events was as follows: It was already about the sixth hour, when there is darkness over the whole earth till the ninth hour (yet the sun is still visible),—then the sun also vanishes in darkness—the veil is rent—Jesus utters His last cry, and dies.—καί] as xix. 43; Mark xv. 25.—τὸ πνεῦμά μου] *my spirit*, comprehending the whole spiritual nature, contrasted with the dying body; Acts vii. 59. Comp. in general, Hahn, *Theol. d. N. T.* I. p. 410.—Ver. 46. εἰς χεῖράς σου κ.τ.λ.] from Ps. xxxi. 6, which words Jesus makes His own, *committing His spirit wholly to the disposal of God*; and this perfect surrender to God, whose control extends even to Hades (xvi. 22; Wisd. iii. 1; Acts ii. 27), is not out of keeping with ver. 43.—This prayer is to be placed *after* the τετέλεσται of John xix. 30, and corresponds to the παρέδωκεν τὸ πνεῦμα of John. Probably, however, the idea παρέδωκεν τὸ πνεῦμα was only by the more accurately explaining tradition moulded into the definite words, as Luke has them.

Vv. 47–49. See on Matt. xxvii. 54–56; Mark xv. 39–41. τὸ γενόμενον] *that which had happened*, namely, how Jesus had uttered the last loud cry, and had expired. Comp. Mark xv. 39, whom Luke follows. To refer it still further back (even to include also what is narrated in ver. 44 f.) is forbidden by the ἐσχίσθη κ.τ.λ., to which ἰδών cannot also refer. The plural expression, however, τὰ γενόμενα, ver. 48, has a wider reference, since, in accordance with συμπαραγ. ἐπὶ τ. θεωρίαν ταύτ., it must include the entire process of the crucifixion down

to ver. 46. — ἐδόξασε τ. θεόν] *i.e. practically*, by His confession, which redounded to the honour of God. Comp. John ix. 24. In this confession, however, δίκαιος (instead of *the Son of God* in Mark and Matthew) is a product of later reflection. — ἐπὶ τὴν θεωρίαν ταύτ.] objectively: *ad hoc spectaculum*, as θεωρία (occurring only here in the New Testament) is often applied by Greek writers to plays, public festivals, etc. — τύπτοντες τὰ στήθη] *grief* (viii. 52, xviii. 13). According to Luke, the people did not, indeed, join in the mockery (ver. 35), though they probably chimed in with the accusation and the demand for His death (vv. 4, 5, 13, 18, 21, 23), and hence they prove themselves the *mobile vulgus*. The *special circumstances* had made them change their tune. — Ver. 49. πάντες οἱ γνωστοὶ αὐτῷ] those, to wit, who were present in Jerusalem. Luke alone has this statement, which, however, is so summary that even by the expression ἀπὸ μακρόθεν it does not contradict the narrative of John xix. 25. — γυναῖκες] viii. 2 f. — ὀρώσαι τ.] belonging to εἰστήκεισαν.

Vv. 50–56. See on Matt. xxvii. 57–61; Mark xv. 42–47. Luke follows Mark with abbreviations, although with some peculiarities. — ὑπάρχ.] belonging to βουλ. — δίκαιος] *justus*, in the narrower meaning; see the following parenthesis. It is a special side of ἀγαθός (*excellent*). — Ver. 51. οὐκ ἦν συγκ.] *was not in agreement* with their decision. Comp. on ver. 19; and as to συγκατατίθεμαι, *assentior*, see Locella, *ad Xen. Eph.* p. 209. — κ. τῇ πράξει] *and to the practice*, the evil act. See on Rom. viii. 13; Col. iii. 9. Comp. Xen. *Anab.* vii. 6. 17. — αὐτῶν] τῶν βουλευτῶν, as is implied in βουλευτής, ver. 50, Winer, p. 132 [E. T. 182]. — Ver. 52. οὗτος] recapitulating, Kühner, II. p. 330. — Ver. 53. λαξευτῷ] *hewn in stone* (Deut. iv. 49), therefore neither dug nor built. — οὐ οὐκ ἦν κ.τ.λ.] Comp. xix. 30; a more definite mode of expressing the καινῶ in Matthew. Comp. John xix. 41. In respect of the emphatically cumulative negatives, see Winer, p. 443 [E. T. 626]. — Ver. 54. *And it was the preparation day* (the day of preparation for the Sabbath, πρόσαββατον). Even here (comp. on Mark xv. 42) no trace of a festival day is to be found in the day of Jesus' death. Comp. vv. 26, 56. — ἐπέφωσκε] elsewhere of

the breaking of the *natural* day (of the day *light*; see Matt. xxviii. 1); but here of the *legal* daybreak, which began with sunset. Not an *inaccuracy* of expression, in which only prevailed the idea of the *beginning* of the day, but according to the Jewish mode of expression, which still, moreover, gave to the legal beginning of the day, at the closing in of *night*, the name of *איר*, on account of the lighting of the lamps, which the natural evening made necessary. See the passages from the Rabbinical writers in Lightfoot, p. 892 f. Comp. *Er. Nicol.* 12. That this mode of designation specially applied to the beginning of the *Sabbath*, on account of the *Sabbath* lights (see Lightfoot, Zeger, Clarius, Wetstein, Kuinoel, Bleek, and others), cannot be proved. The *imperfect* means: *it would begin*, was on the point of beginning. See Bernhardt, p. 373. — Ver. 55. *κατακολουθ.*] *following after*, going after from the place of the cross, ver. 49, to the place of the grave, ver. 53. In the New Testament the word is found again only in Acts xvi. 17; comp. Jer. xvii. 16; Polyb. vi. 42. 2; Long. iii. 15. The meaning: “as far as *down there into* the grave,” is an addition of Lange’s; in *κατά* is found the idea of going *after*. — Ver. 56. *μέν*] to which corresponds the *δέ*, xxiv. 1; hence at the end of the chapter only a comma is to be placed. — According to Mark, they did not buy the spices till later. See on Mark xvi. 1. In Luke there is no offence against the Jewish observance (Schenkel), which assuredly was well enough known to him, but there is a trace of the working day in the tradition which he follows. Comp. on ver. 26; John xviii. 28, xiii. 29; Bleek, *Beitr.* p. 137. Ebrard on Olshausen, p. 53 f., gives explanations which are only evasions, but which are of the less importance, as in this place Luke, with his inconsequent notice, stands alone.

CHAPTER XXIV.

VER. 1. The reading βαθείως (Lachm. Tisch.), instead of the *Recepta* βαθύς, is so decisively attested by A B C D 8, etc., that the adjective form βαθύς must appear as the alteration of ignorant transcribers. — καὶ τινες σὺν αὐτοῖς] is wanting in B C* L 8 33, Copt. Aeth. Vulg. It. (not Brix.) Dionys. Alex. Eus. Aug. Suspected by Griesb., deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. A supplementary addition, in accordance with ver. 10, for which occasion seemed the rather to be given that Luke neither mentions Salome (Mark xvi. 1) in this place nor at ver. 10. D has further expanded the addition. — Ver. 3. Instead of καὶ εἰσελθεῖν is to be read, with Lachm. and Tisch., on preponderating evidence, εἰσελθεῖν δέ. The former is from Mark. — Ver. 4. ἐσθῆτες αἱ αἰσχροί. Lachm. Tisch. have ἐσθῆτες αἰσχροί, in accordance with B D 8, Syr. al. Vulg. It. Eus. But the accustomed singular expression easily forced itself in. — Ver. 5. τὸ πρόσωπον] τὰ πρόσωπα is attested by a preponderance of authorities. So Tisch. It is the more to be preferred in proportion as the singular suggested itself the more readily to the transcribers. — Ver. 10. Elz. Lachm. Tisch. have ἦσαν δέ; Griesb.: ἦ, εἰ, on too feeble evidence. The words are wanting altogether in A D r and a few vss. The connection has not been apprehended, and for the restoration thereof, sometimes ἦσαν δέ has been omitted (in order to connect it closely with what has preceded), sometimes αἱ has been intercalated afterwards (before ἐλέγον), sometimes both have been done. This αἱ is, with Lachm. Tisch., on decisive evidence, to be deleted. — After the second Μαρία is to be inserted ἡ, with Lachm. and Tisch., on preponderating evidence. — Ver. 12 is wanting in D, Syr.^{Jer.} Cant. Ver. Verc. Rd. Rejected by Schulz and Rinck. Bracketed by Lachm. and [deleted by] Tisch. [8]. But even if the great attestation is not in itself sufficient to justify a decision in favour of its genuineness (comp. on vv. 36, 39, 51 f.), still an interpolator from John xx. 5 ff. would have mentioned not only Peter, but also the ἄλλος μαθητής (comp. ver. 24); and the words ὁδόνια, παρακλύπτειν, and ἀπῆλθε πρὸς ἑαυτ. (John, *loc. cit.*) might, indeed, have been suggested to Luke from a source

emanating from a Johannine tradition; on the other hand, it is just the incompleteness of the notice, as well as the want of agreement in the contents with ver. 24, that would furnish a very obvious occasion for objection and for deletion. *Κείμενα* is suspicious, as it is wanting in B Σ , min. Copt. Sahid. Syr.^{cu}. Eus.; in other authorities it is placed after *μόνα*. — Ver. 18. Elz. Lachm. have *ἐν Ἱερουσ.* But decisive authorities are in favour of *Ἱερουσ.* simply (Griesb. Matth. Scholz, Tisch.); *ἐν* is an exegetic insertion. The exceedingly weakly attested *εἰς*, which nevertheless Griesb. has commended, proceeds from the last syllable of *παροικεῖς*. — Ver. 21. After *ἀλλά γε* read, with Lachm. and Tisch., *καί* (B D L Σ), which disappeared because it could be dispensed with. — Ver. 28. *προσέποιετο*] A B D L Σ , min. have *προσέποιήσατο*. Commended by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. Tisch. A correction, in accordance with the preceding and following aorists. — Ver. 29. After *ἐπέκλειεν* is to be adopted *ῥῶθ*. It is found in B L Σ , min. Arr. Copt. Syr. Slav. ms. Vulg. It., was easily passed over by occasion of the following *ἡμερα*, and perhaps if it had been added, would rather have been annexed to the foregoing *ὅτι πρὸς ἑσπ. ἐστί*. — Ver. 32. *καὶ ὥς*] Lachm. and Tisch. have merely *ὥς*, in accordance with B D L Σ 33, also codd. of It. Ambr. Aug. Or. (which, however, omit *ὥς ἐλ. ἡμ.*). Rightly; *καί* was inserted for the connection, and in several versions even supplanted the *ὥς*. — Ver. 36. After *εἰρήνη ὑμῶν* Lachm. has in brackets *ἐγὼ εἰμι, μὴ φοβησθε*, following G P, min. vss. Ambr. Aug. An addition from John vi. 20. But, moreover, the preceding *κ. λέγ. αὐτοῖς· εἰρ. ὑμῶν*, although it is wanting only in D and codd. of It. (deleted by Tisch.), is extremely open to the suspicion of being added from John xx. 19. See also Lachm. in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1830, p. 843. A reason for its omission, if it had been original, would be hard to perceive. — Ver. 38. Instead of *ἐν ταῖς καρῶ*. B D, codd. of It. *al.* Lachm. and Tisch. have the *singular*; the plural is an amendment. — Ver. 39. *αὐτὸς ἐγὼ εἰμι*] Several different arrangements of the words occur in the mss. and vss. Lachm. and Tisch. have *ἐγὼ εἰμι αὐτός*, in accordance with B L Σ 33. — Ver. 40 is wanting only in D, codd. of It. Syr.^{cu}, but is deleted by Tisch., and comes under the same suspicion of being added from John (xx. 20) as the words *κ. λέγ. αὐτ. εἰρ. ὑμ.*, ver. 36. — Ver. 42. *καὶ ἀπὸ μετρίσσε. κτηρ.*] suspected by Griesb., deleted by Lachm. Tisch., in accordance with A B D L Σ Cant. Clem. Or. Eus. Epiph. Ath. Cyr. An ancient omission on the part of a transcriber, probably only occasioned by *καὶ . . . καὶ*. The peculiarity of the food betrays no interpolation; *καὶ ἄρτου* or *καὶ ἄρτον* (comp.

John xxi. 9) would rather have been added. — Ver. 46. *καὶ οὕτως ἔδει*] is wanting in B C* D L **8**, Copt. Aeth. Arr. codd. of It. Fathers. Suspected by Griesbach and Rinck, bracketed by Tachm., deleted by Tisch. An addition in the way of gloss. — Ver. 47. *ἀρξάμενον*] The reading *ἀρξάμενοι* in B C* L N X **8** 33, Copt. Aeth. Tisch. is to help out the construction, in connection with the omission of *δέ*, ver. 48 (which Tisch., following B C* L **8**, has deleted). — Ver. 51 f. The omission of *καὶ ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τ. οὐρανόν*, and at the same time of *προσκυνοῦσαι τες αὐτόν* in the same set of authorities (D, Cant. Ver. Vere. Corb. Rd. Aug.), throws on both (the former is wanting also in **8***) the grave suspicion (comp. on vv. 36, 39) of being added for the sake of completeness. — Ver. 53. In a few authorities *αἰνοῦντες καὶ* is wanting (which Griesb., in accordance with B C* L **8**, Ar. p., regards as suspicious); in others *καὶ εὐλογοῦντες* (which Tisch., in accordance with D, codd. of It. Copt. Aug., has kept out). The *Recepta* is to be maintained, since *αἰνεῖν τ. Θεόν* is especially frequent in Luke, but neither *αἰνοῦντες* nor *εὐλογοῦντες* offered occasion for an addition by way of gloss. But *κ. εὐλ.* might easily drop out in consequence of the homocoteleuton in *αἰνοῦντες* and *εὐλογοῦντες*.

Vv. 1-12. Comp. on Matt. xxviii. 1-8; Mark xvi. 1-8. — The question of the special *sources* from which Luke has taken the considerable portion that is peculiar to him in the account of the resurrection (Griesbach: from the mouth of the Joanna named by him alone, ver. 10), as well as in all that still follows that account, cannot be decided; but assuredly he did not as yet know the conclusion of Mark as it now stands. — *βαθείως* (see the critical remarks): the adverb¹ of degree is immediately annexed to a substantive. See on 2 Cor. xi. 23. Hence: *deep in the morning*, i.e. in the first morning twilight. Comp. Plat. *Crit.* p. 43 A, *Prot.* p. 310 A. The opposite is: *ὁ ἔσχατος ὄρθρος*, Theocr. xxiv. 63. — Ver. 2. *εὐρον δὲ κ.τ.λ.*] agrees as little as Mark xvi. 4 with the narrative of the rolling away of the stone in Matt. xxviii. 2. — Ver. 4. *ἐν τῷ διαπορ. αὐτ. περὶ τούτου*] *while they were in great perplexity concerning this*. Comp.

¹ *βαθείως* might, it is true, be also the *genitive* of the *adjective* (see generally, Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 246 f.). Thus Bleek, Buttmann, and Schegg. Only no certain instance of such a *genitive* form occurs in the New Testament.

Plat. *Phaedr.* p. 237 A, *Soph.* p. 217 A, *Tim.* p. 49 B. In the New Testament only in Luke. Still Lachmann and Tischendorf have the simple form ἀπορεῖσθαι (B C D L 8), but this easily crept in through neglect of the compound form. Also ix. 7, Acts ii. 12, the reading ἡπορεῖτο occurs. — ἐπέστ.] as ii. 9. — ἄνδρες] The angels (ver. 23) are designated according to the *form of the appearance* which they had in the view of the women.¹ Comp. Acts i. 10; Mark xvi. 5. And their clothes had a *glowing* brightness (ἀστραπτ.). — Ver. 5. τί ζητεῖτε κ.τ.λ.] indicating the groundlessness of their search. — τὸν ζῶντα] denotes Jesus not as Him *who is Himself the life* (Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, following John i. 4), nor yet the *conquering* life (de Wette), but, according to the context, quite simply *Him who is alive*, and no νεκρός. Comp. ver. 23. — μετὰ τῶν νεκρῶν] the grave is *in general* conceived of as the place *where the dead are*, where, therefore, he who is sought, is sought *among the dead*. Ver. 6 f. ὡς ἐλάλ.] ix. 22, xviii. 32 f. The reference to Galilee (Matthew and Mark) Luke could not adopt; see vv. 49, 50. — τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρ.] The designation of Himself previously used by Jesus. After the resurrection He no longer calls Himself by this name. Comp. ver. 26. ἀνθρώπ. ἄμαρτ.] *heathens*. Comp. xviii. 32; Gal. ii. 15. Otherwise Matt. xxvi. 45. — Ver. 8. It is psychologically improbable that the remembrance occurred to them now for the first time and at the prompting of the angel, if Jesus actually foretold His resurrection in terms so definite. But see on Matt. xvi. 21. — Ver. 9. κ. πᾶσι τοῖς λοιποῖς] who adhered to the company of the disciples as followers of Jesus. — Ver. 10 f. According to the corrected reading (see the critical remarks), ἦσαν δὲ . . . Ἰακώβου is a supplementary enumeration of the most eminent of the women who brought the tidings; after which by means of καὶ αἱ λοιπαὶ κ.τ.λ. the same bringing of

¹ Schleiermacher makes out of this, *persons commissioned* by Joseph of Arimathea. By means of such, Joseph had had the body of Jesus brought away from the grave, in which it had been provisionally laid. See *L. J.* p. 471. At an earlier period Schleiermacher made another shift, but not a better. See Strauss in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschr.* 1863, p. 386 ff.

the tidings is related also of their female companions, and then by *καὶ ἐφάνησαν κ.τ.λ.* the narration is further continued. *There were, however* (these women who returned and announced, etc.), *Mary Magdalene and Joanna and Mary the mother of James; moreover* (*καί*), *the rest of the women with them told this to the apostles, and their words appeared to them as a fable, and they believed them not.* As to *Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of James*, see on Matt. xxvii. 55 f.; as to *Joanna*, on Luke viii. 3. — *ἐφάνησαν*] the plural of the verb with the neuter plural (see, in general, Winer, p. 456 [E. T. 645]) denotes here the declarations of *the several individual persons*. See Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* iv. 3. 12. — *λῆρος*] *a foolish rumour, trick.* Plat. *Protag.* p. 347 D, *Hipp. maj.* p. 304 B: *λήρους καὶ φλυαρίας*; Xen. *Hist.* iv. 8. 15; Arist. *Plut.* 23, and elsewhere; Soph. *Trach.* 435: *ληρεῖν ἀνδρὸς οὐχὶ σῶφρονος.* — Ver. 12. The disciples did not believe the women, *but Peter*, hasty and impetuous as he was, desired to inform himself by his own sight about this enigmatical state of affairs. To take *ἔδραμεν* as a pluperfect (Paulus) is on account of *βλέπει* impossible; a perverted system of harmonizing, in which even Calvin led the way. Of the *ἄλλος μαθητῆς* of John xx. 3, Luke says nothing, but, according to ver. 24, does not exclude him. The account is vague in the connection of its several parts,¹ as even ver. 34 presupposes something that is not related. — *παρακίψ.*] *stooping down* into the grave, John xx. 5, 11. — *μόνα*] so that thus the corpse was gone.² — *πρὸς ἑαυτ.*] *not: with Himself* (as Mark xiv. 4;

¹ Since vv. 24 and 34 presuppose what nevertheless is not previously narrated, it is certainly to be assumed that vv. 1-12 and ver. 13 ff. have been taken from two distinct sources, which Luke in his working up has not sufficiently compared together. There has not been wanting here, moreover, the supposition of a *tendency*. According to Baur (*Theol. Jahrb.* 1853, p. 61), the scene at Emmaus is to put in the *background* the manifestation which was made only to *Peter*.

² That the grave was empty is so decidedly and clearly in the whole of the New Testament (in opposition to Weizsäcker, p. 572) the correlative of the resurrection of Jesus (see also Rom. vi. 4; Col. ii. 12), that it is not at all to the purpose when Keim (*Geschichtl. Chr.* p. 134) adds to the expression of his belief in an appearance of Jesus in glorified corporeality, "*it makes no matter whether the grave was empty or not.*" Keim, moreover, contends with force against the visionary view of the resurrection. See against this kind of view,

Luke xviii. 11), so that it would belong to *θαυμάζων* (Luther, Castalio, Grotius, Wolf, Schegg, and others, following the Vulgate), in which case, however, it would be superfluous, and its position before *θαυμάζων* would have no motive; but it belongs to ἀπῆλθε: *to his home*, i.e. πρὸς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ διαγωγὴν, Euthymius Zigabenus. Comp. John xx. 10. Examples in Κυρκε, I. p. 337. — *θαυμάζ.* τὸ γεγονός] *συνῆκε γὰρ, ὅτι οὐ μετετέθη· ἡ γὰρ ἂν μετὰ τῶν ὀθνίων μετετέθη*, Euthymius Zigabenus.¹ Comp. John xx. 7 f.

Vv. 13, 14. *The journey to Emmaus*, peculiar to Luke. Mark xvi. 12 is a meagre intimation of the same history from another source. — *ἦσαν πορ.*] were on the way. — *ἐξ αὐτῶν*] in general: of the followers of Jesus, ἐκ τῶν ὅλων μαθητῶν, Euthymius Zigabenus. They did not belong to the *twelve* (see ver. 33); whether they were of the *secenty* (Jerome, Euthymius Zigabenus, and others) cannot be determined. In other respects they are perfectly unknown. Luke, ver. 18, *names* only the one (*Κλεόπας* is the same as *Κλεόπατρος*, distinct from the Hebrew name *Κλωπᾶς*, John xix. 25, or *Alphacus*), and that, indeed, accidentally, because he introduces him actually *speaking*. In this way it is left in doubt whether he knew the name of the other or not (Ambrose calls him *Ammaon*). From the fact of his not being named, there is neither to be concluded a greater (Bornemann) nor a less (Kuinoel) degree of knowledge regarding him; and who he may have been is not at all to be conjectured, although

also Gebhardt, *D. Aufersteh. Christ.* 1864, p. 18 ff.; Düsterdieck, *Apol. Beitr.* I. p. 8 ff.; Weiss in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1866, p. 173 f.; Uhlhorn, *D. modernen Darstell. d. Leb. Jesu*, 1866, p. 115 ff.

¹ Even this simple observation of Euthymius Zigabenus is sufficient to show that every other cause by which the corpse may have disappeared from the grave, apart from His resurrection, is inconceivable. Schenkel, indeed (in his *Zeitschr.* 1865, 5), when he defines the resurrection as "*the real mysterious self-revelation of the personality of Christ emerging living and imperishable from death*," uses for this purpose *no* grave, since he makes the personality of Christ emerge only from *death*, not from the *grave*. But the certainty that Christ came forth from the *grave* is at the foundation of every mention of the resurrection throughout the whole New Testament, in which reference, especially also the moral idea of *συνάπτεισθαι* and *συνγίμεισθαι* Χριστῷ (Rom. vi. 4; Col. ii. 12, iii. 1; Eph. ii. 6) is of importance.

Nathanael (so Epiphanius), *Bartholomew*, *Peter*, or another *Simon* (Origen, Cyril), nay, in spite of i. 2, *Luke* himself (in Theophylact, so also Lange, I. p. 252), and even, conjecturally (Holtzmann), the younger *James*, as having made the journey with his father Alphaeus (but in 1 Cor. xv. 7 the Lord's brother is meant)—have been guessed. — 'Εμμαούς] in Josephus, *Bell.* vii. 6. 6. 'Αμμαούς, a village, also according to Josephus 60 stadia ($7\frac{1}{2}$ geographical miles) in a north-western direction from Jerusalem—not to be confounded, as has often been done since Eusebius and Jerome (Robinson, *Pal.* III. p. 281 f.), with the town of Emmaus, 1 Macc. iii. 40, ix. 50, in the plain of Judaea, which since the third century after Christ has been named Nicopolis, and is 176 stadia from Jerusalem.¹ See, in general, Ritter's *Palestine*, XVI. pp. 512, 545; Arnold in Herzog's *Encykl.* III. p. 778 f.; Thrupp in *The Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology*, 1860, p. 262 ff.; Zschokke, *D. neutest. Emmaus*, 1865, who, following tradition, is again in favour of the present village of *Kubeibeh*, and that on the ground of the more recent measurement of the distance from Jerusalem. Others: *Culonich*; others: *Kurjat et Enab*. — Ver. 14. κ. αὐτοῖ] and they, on their part, said, in view of the appearance of Jesus to them, ver. 15 f. — περὶ πάντων τῶν συμβεβηκ. τούτων] vv. 1–12. In their subsequent discourse with the unknown one at ver. 18 ff. they are more prolix. On ὁμιλεῖν = διαλέγεσθαι, comp. Xen. *Anab.* iv. 3. 2.

Vv. 15, 16. καὶ αὐτός] καί is the usual form after ἐγένετο (comp. ver. 4; see on v. 12), and αὐτός, *He Himself*, of whom they were speaking. — ἐγγίσας] probably overtaking them from behind. — ἐκρατοῦντο κ.τ.λ.] they were held so that they knew Him not. Examples of κρατεῖσθαι of organs of the body: *impediri, quominus vim et actionem sibi propriam cœserant*, see in Kypke. The expression itself, which indicates a peculiar external influence, not to speak of its telic connection, as well as the correlative διηνοίχθησαν κ.τ.λ. in ver. 31, should have

¹ Hence we find, in some mss. (including N) and vss., the reading ἱκατὸν ἱξήκοντα, which Tisch. συμπαρ on insufficient evidence prefers [Tisch. 8 has returned to ἱξήκοντα]. Even Arnold expresses himself as not averse to identifying it with Nicopolis.

prevented their failure to recognise Him from being attributed to an unfamiliar dress of Jesus, and to an alteration of His countenance by the tortures of crucifixion; or, on the other hand, to the disciples' own dejection (Paulus, Kuinoel, Lange, and others). The text represents only a *wonderful divine* effect. The matter is otherwise represented in Mark xvi. 12, where Jesus appears ἐν ἑτέρᾳ μορφῇ.

Vv. 17, 18. *What are these discourses that ye in turn throw out to one another as ye walk, and are of gloomy countenance?* Instead of καὶ οὗτοι σκυθρωποί, the address passes over into the finite verb, bringing out this characteristic more emphatically, Matthiae, § 632; Kühner, § 675. 4. After καί we are not to supply τί (Beza). The relative clause οὓς ἀντιβάλλ. πρ. ἄλλ. corresponds to the idea of συζητεῖν (disputare). — σὺ μόνος παροικεῖς κ.τ.λ.] *Dost thou alone dwell as a stranger in Jerusalem, and hast not learned, etc.?* In respect of this question of surprise, it is to be considered—(1) that the destiny of Jesus is so entirely the only thought in the soul of the two disciples, and appears to them now so absolutely as the only possible subject of their conversation and their sadness, that *from their standpoint* they instantly conclude from the question of the unknown one that he cannot at all *know* what has come to pass, since otherwise he would not begin by *asking* of what they speak and why they look sad; (2) that μόνος belongs to παροικεῖς and καὶ οὐκ ἔγνω; so that thus παροικεῖς Ἰερ. καὶ οὐκ ἔγνω (there is no comma to be placed before καί), *taken together*, constitute the ground of their question, whether it is he alone in whose experience this is the case. Hence it is wrong to take καί in the place of a relative. Comp. John vii. 4. — παροικεῖν Ἰερουσ. may either mean: *dwell as a stranger in Jerusalem* (thus often in the LXX.; usually with ἐν, but also with the accusative, Gen. xvii. 8; Ex. vi. 4), or: *dwell near, at Jerusalem* (Grotius, Rosenmüller, and, with hesitation, Bleek; comp. Xen. *De redit.* i. 5; Isocr. *Panegy.* 162; Thuc. iii. 93; Lucian, *D. M.* ii. 1); thus Ἰερουσ. would be in the *dative*. The former view is the usual and the correct one (comp. Heb. xi. 9; Acts vii. 6, xiii. 17; 1 Pet. i. 17, ii. 11), since the disciples might recognise the unknown, perchance, as

a *foreign pilgrim to the feast* (even from his dialect), but not as a *dweller in the vicinity* of Jerusalem. Ungrammatically (not to be supported by passages such as Gen. xxiv. 37; Num. xx. 15; Ps. xv. 1, cxx. 6, where the LXX. have translated יָבֹן and יָבֹן by terms more specific than the original), Theophylact, also Zeger and others, have taken παροικεῖν as simply *to dwell*; and Castalio, Vatablus, Clarius, and Kuinoel have taken it in the figurative sense of ξένον εἶναι and *hospitem esse*: "de iis, qui quid agatur ignorant, *art thou then alone so strange to Jerusalem?*"

Vv. 19-21. Ποῖα] *scil.* οὐκ ἔγνων γεγόμενα κ.τ.λ. The *qualitative* word of interrogation presupposes things of a *special* kind which must have happened; προσποιεῖται ἄγνοιαν, Euthymius Zigabenus. — οἱ δὲ εἶπον] Probably here also Cleopas was the speaker, and the other added his own assent to what was said. — ὃς ἐγένετο] not: who *was* (thus usually), but: who *became*, whereby the idea *se præstitit, se præbuit* (see Kühner, *ad Xen. Anab.* i. 7. 4), is expressed. — ἀνὴρ προφ.] an honourable expression, Bernhardt, p. 48. — δυνατὸς ἐν ἔργῳ κ. λόγῳ] Comp. Thuc. i. 139. 4, where Pericles is called λέγειν τε καὶ πρᾶσσειν δυνατώτατος. ἐν marks the *sphere* wherein, etc. Comp. Acts xviii. 24, vii. 22; Judith xi. 8; Eccus. xxi. 8. In the classical writers the mere dative of the instrument is the usual form. See Bornemann, *Schol.* p. 159. See examples of both arrangements: ἔργῳ κ. λ. and λόγῳ κ. ἔ., in Lobeck, *Paralip.* p. 64 f.; Bornemann, *ad Xen. Mem.* ii. 3. 6; Pflugk, *ad Eur. Hec.* 373. In this place ἔργῳ is put first as containing the first ground of acknowledgment of the Messianic dignity. Comp. Acts i. 1; John x. 38; Acts x. 38. — ἐναντίον κ.τ.λ.] *i.e.* so that He represented Himself as such to God and the whole people. — Ver. 20. ὅπως τε] *et quomodo*, still depending on the οὐκ ἔγνω of ver. 18, which is mentally supplied as governing τὰ περὶ Ἰησοῦ κ.τ.λ. On εἰς κρίμα θανάτου, *to the condemnation of death*, comp. xxiii. 24. — καὶ ἐσταύρωσαν] for it was *their* work that He was crucified by the governor. Comp. Acts ii. 23. — Ver. 21. ἡμεῖς δὲ ἠλπίζομεν] *but we*, on our part, *were entertaining the hope* (observe the *imperfect*), etc. This hope, demolished by the crucifixion, how soon was it again inflamed! Acts i. 6. — αὐτός] *He*, and no other —

λυτροῦσθαι] according to the politico-theocratic idea of the national Messiah. Comp. Acts i. 6, and see Theophylact. — ἀλλὰ γέ] *but indeed*, although we cherished this hope. See Hermann, *ad Eur. Ion.* 1345, *Proef.* p. xx.; Kühner, *ad Xen. Mem.* i. 2. 12. On the immediate juxtaposition of the two particles, a usage foreign to the older Greek writers, see Bornemann, *Schol.* p. 160; Klotz, *ad Devar.* pp. 15 f., 25; Stallbaum, *ad Plat. Rep.* I. p. 331 B. — καί] (see the critical remarks): *besides*. — σὺν πᾶσι τούτοις] σὺν denotes the accompanying circumstance: *with all this*, i.e. with the having undergone all this fate, namely, of being delivered up and crucified (ver. 20). Comp. Neh. v. 18; 3 Macc. i. 22; and see, generally, Ellendt, *Lee. Soph.* II. p. 763. — τρίτην ταύτην ἡμέραν ἄγει σήμερον] The subject is *Jesus*, who immediately before was the subject emphatically made prominent. Comp. Beza, Kypke. ἄγειν, of time: *to spend*; as e.g. δέκατον ἔτος ἄγειν, *to be in the tenth year*, and the like, does not belong merely to the later Greek.¹ Compare the passages in Kypke. τρίτην ταύτην ἡμέραν is equivalent to ταύτην τρίτην οὖσαν ἡμέραν, or ταύτην, ἢ τρίτη ἐστὶν ἡμέρα. See Kühner, *ad Xen. Anab.* iv. 7. 5. Comp. iii. 5. 9. Hence: *But indeed, besides all this, He passes this present day as the third since*, etc. In this case, it is true, σήμερον is superfluous, but it corresponds to the painful excitement of the words. Comp. Mark xiv. 29. ἄγει has been ungrammatically taken as *impersonal*: *agitur* (Grotius, Bengel, Rosenmüller, Kuinoel, de Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius, Ewald, Buttmann, Bleek, and others); while others grasp at arbitrary modes of supplying the subject, as ὁ χρόνος (Camerarius), Θεός (Heinsius), ὁ ἡλίος (Er. Schmid, Heumann). Bornemann regards Ἰσραὴλ as the subject: “*Is dies, quem Israel hodie celebrat, tertius est, ex quo*,” etc. But the context leads us neither to Israel nor to the mention of the celebration of the festival.

Vv. 22, 23. Nevertheless on this frustration of our hopes the following also has occurred, which has again aroused them, and still (ver. 24) has left them till now unfulfilled. — ἐξ ἡμῶν] *from our company*. ὡς ἡμεῖς πισταί, Euthymius Ziga-

¹ Sophocles, *El.* 258, has: ἵππῃ ποῖας ἡμῖμας δοκίς μ' ἄγειν: *What kind of days thinkest thou I am spending?*

benus. — ὄρθρῃαι] an Attic form, instead of which, however, the later ὄρθριναί (see Sturz, *Dial. Muc.* p. 186; Lobeck, *ad Phryg.* p. 51) is preponderatingly attested, and is, with Lachmann and Tischendorf, to be preferred. — καὶ μὴ εὗρ.] καὶ . . . ἦλθον, instead of carrying on the participial expression in conformity with γερόμεναι, continues with greater emphasis in an independent sentence. — καὶ ὅπτασίαν κ.τ.λ.] καί: and moreover, besides the fact that they found not the body. — οὐ λέγουσιν] indicative, the direct vision mingling in a lively manner with the *oratio obliqua*, Bernhardt, p. 299; Reisig, *Conject.* p. 226 f.

Ver. 24. Τινές] therefore not merely Peter, ver. 12. But did Luke conceive these several persons as having gone together? Probably, according to the analogy of ver. 22. Moreover, comp. on ver. 12. — οὕτω καθὼς κ.τ.λ.] namely, that the corpse was not in the grave. — αὐτὸν δὲ οὐκ εἶδον] but Him, Him who yet, according to that angelic assurance narrated by the women, was to live, Him they saw not; a tragical conclusion!

Vv. 25, 26. Αὐτός] He on His part, after the disciples had thus helplessly expressed themselves. — ἀνόητοι (Rom. i. 14; Gal. iii. 2 f.), without intelligence, refers to the understanding, and βραδεῖς τῇ καρδίᾳ to the whole internal living activity, in respect of which (dative) its dulness, i.e. its deficiency in the proper susceptibility and fixedness of purpose, is reproved. σκληροκαρδία, Mark xvi. 14, is stronger. On βραδύς as tardus in the spiritual sense, comp. *Il.* x. 226; Plat. *Defin.* p. 415 E: δυσμαθία βραδυτῆς ἐν μαθήσει. Theophr. *Mor. not.* 14: ἡ βραδυτῆς τῆς ψυχῆς. The opposite: ἀγχείους, Plat. *Phaedr.* p. 239 A; Diog. Laert. vii. 93; also ὀξύς, Plat. *Rep.* vii. p. 526 B. — τοῦ πιστεύειν] a genitive of nearer definition dependent on βραδεῖς (see Winer, p. 290 [E. T. 407]); slow to believing confidence in. — On πιστεύειν ἐπί with a dative, comp. Matt. xxvii. 42; Rom. ix. 33, x. 11; 1 Tim. i. 16; 1 Pet. ii. 6. — πᾶσιν] not merely referring to a single thing. There was wanting to them the faith without exception, otherwise they would have recognised even the suffering and death of the Messiah as prophesied, and have rightly discerned them; ἔστι γὰρ πιστεύειν καὶ μερικῶς καὶ καθόλου, Theophylact. —

Ver. 26. *Must not the Messiah*, etc., namely, according to the prophetically announced divine decree. Comp. ver. 44 ff. — **ταῦτα**] with emphasis: *this*, which He, to wit, had in fact suffered, and which causes you to be so cast down. — **καὶ εἰσελθ. εἰς τ. δόξαν αὐτοῦ**] not as though He had already by the resurrection in itself, and before the ascension, attained to His **δόξα** (for His *heavenly* condition is not until His *glory* after death, see ix. 26, xxi. 27; Phil. ii. 9 f.; 1 Pet. i. 21; 1 Tim. iii. 16; John xx. 17, xvii. 5, and elsewhere), but out of the foregoing **ἔδει, δεῖ** is here to be supplied: *and must He not attain unto His glory?* Wherefore, on the one hand, those sufferings needed first to precede; and, on the other, He must be again alive. The definite **εἰσελθ. εἰς τ. δόξ.** is not to be evaporated into the general “*attain His destination*” (Schleiermacher). As to supplying the verb in another tense, see Bornemann on xxiv. 27, *ad Xen. Apol.* § 26; and, generally, Krüger, § 62. 4. 1; also Nägelsbach, *Anm. z. Ilias*, ed. 3, p. 76.

Ver. 27. **Καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τ. προφ.] ἀρχάμενος** is to be conceived of *successively*: *He began from Moses*, and when He had finished with him, *from all the prophets*, taking them one by one in succession, consequently making of each one of them a new commencement of His **διερμηνεύσεις**. Thus the reproach of a *careless* (Winer), *inexact* (Buttmann, Bleek), or *defective* (de Wette) mode of expression (Acts iii. 24) becomes, to say the least, unnecessary. What *special passages* Jesus referred to, Luke unfortunately does not tell us. Theophylact adduces many, and specially Jacob Capellus, from Gen. iii. 15 down to 2 Chron. Comp. also Erasmus, *Paraphr.*¹ — **διερμηνεύειν**] *He interpreted* (Acts ix. 36; 1 Cor. xii. 30; 2 Macc. i. 36; Polyb. iii. 22. 3., to wit, by explanation according to their destination referred to Him, *i.e.* having their fulfilment in Him. — **τὰ περὶ αὐτοῦ**] *scil. γεγραμμένα*, implied in *γραφαῖς*; otherwise, xxii. 37.

Vv. 28, 29. **Ἐσχηματίζετο πορρώτέρω πορεύεσθαι ὡς ἀπλῶς συνοδοιπóρος**, Euthymius Zigabenus. He desired to prompt the *invitation*, which was a matter of *decorum*, but

¹ In respect of the prophecies bearing upon the *sufferings* of the Messiah, see, in general, Hengstenberg, *Christol.* III. 2, p. 88 ff.

knew that it would follow. Comp. Mark vi. 48. The *imperfect* προσεποιεῖτο (*He feigned, gave Himself the air*) and then the *aorist* παρεβιάσαντο: a lively representation. — πορεύεσθαι] not: that He *is constrained* or *wishes* to go farther, but we must conceive that for appearance' sake He actually began to move forward. — Ver. 29. On παρεβιάσ., *they constrained*, to wit, by means of urgent entreaty, comp. Acts xvi. 15; Gen. xix. 3; also ἀναγκάζειν, xiv. 23; Matt. xiv. 22. They felt their holiest interests engaged to this stranger (ver. 32). That these two disciples *dwelt* in Emmaus is possible, but follows just as little from μέινον μεθ' ἡμῶν (comp. τοῦ μέναι σὺν αὐτοῖς) as from εἰσῆλθε. For to the latter expression is not to be supplied εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτῶν, but from ver. 28: εἰς τὴν κώμην; that invitation, however, does not of necessity mean: *stay in our lodging*, but may just as well signify: *stay in our company, pass the night with us in the house of our host*. Comp. John i. 39 f.

Ver. 30. Jesus proceeds not as a *guest*, but as the *master of the house*, according to His accustomed manner in the circle of His disciples; thus, it is true, that does not appear *by which* they recognise Him, but probably it is the external situation, corresponding to the opening of their eyes that now follows, which enhances the certainty and the impression of the recognition. Comp. ver. 35. — εὐλόγησε] “Tres, qui simul comedunt, tenentur ad gratias indicendum,” Berac. f. 45, 1. It is the master of the house giving thanks before the meal. It is quite arbitrary for most of the church Fathers (Augustine, Chrysostom, Theophylact, and many others) and Catholics (so also Sepp, not Schegg, but Bisping) to decide that *Jesus celebrated the Lord's Supper*,¹ from which even the ἐν τῷ κατακλιθ. ought to have guarded them, since this in fact points to the time before the proper beginning of the meal (*as they reclined*). Comp. on iii. 21.

¹ The Catholics make use of vv. 30 and 35 as a defence of their *Eucharistic sub una specie*. See the *Confut. Confess. Aug.* II. 1. Even Melancthon does not refuse to explain the passage before us of the Lord's Supper, disapproving, nevertheless, of the conclusion drawn from it: *unam partem tantum datam esse; “quia partis appellatione reliquum significatur communi consuetudine sermonis,”* Apol. x. 7, p. 234.

Ver. 31. *Αὐτῶν δὲ διανοίχθησαν οἱ ὀφθαλμοί]* is the opposite of *οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτῶν ἐκρατοῦντο*, ver. 16. As the latter, so also the former, according to Luke, is to be referred to extraordinary *divine causation*. This is opposed to the view (Paulus, Kuinoel, and others) that the disciples, only by means of the accustomed breaking of bread and giving of thanks by Jesus, wherein they had more attentively considered Him and had seen His pierced hands, arrived at the recognition of Him who until then had been unknown to them. Comp. on ver. 30. — *αὐτῶν]* with lively emphasis placed first. What *Jesus* did is previously described. — *ἀνοίγειν]* (more strongly *διανοίγειν*) *τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς*, which is often used of the healing of blind people (Matt. ix. 30, xx. 33; John ix. 10, 14, 17, x. 21, xi. 37), describes in a picturesque manner the endowing with a capacity, bodily or spiritual, *of recognising what before was unknown*, Gen. iii. 5, 7, xxi. 19; 2 Kings vi. 17, 20; comp. Acts xxvi. 8. — *ἄφαντος ἐγένετο ἀπ' αὐτῶν]* *He passed away from them invisibly*. Comp. on *γίνεσθαι ἀπό τινος*, to withdraw from any one, Xen. *Mem.* i. 2. 25; Bar. iii. 21. Luke intends manifestly to narrate *a sudden invisible withdrawal effected through divine agency*; hence those do wrong to his intention and to the expression who, like Kuinoel, make out of it only a *subito ab eis discessit*, so that this departure would not have been observed till it occurred (Schleiermacher, *L. J.* p. 474). Beza well says that Luke has not said *αὐτοῖς*, but *ἀπ' αὐτῶν*; “ne quis existimet praesentem quidem Christum cum ipsis mansisse, sed corpore, quod cerni non posset.” The Ubiquists supported the doctrine of the invisible presence of Christ’s body by the passage before us. Comp. Calovius. — On the word *ἄφαντος*—which is very frequent in the poets, but only rarely used in prose, and that of a late period, and, moreover, is not found in the LXX. and the Apocrypha—instead of the classical prose word *ἄφανής*, see Wesseling, *ad Diod.* iv. 65.

Vv. 32, 33. *Οὐχὶ ἡ καρδιά ἡμῶν κατομένη ἦν ἐν ἡμῖν;]* *Was not our heart on fire within us?* The *extraordinarily lively emotions* are, as in all languages, represented under the image of burning, of heat, of being inflamed, and the like,

Wetstein and Kypke *in loc.*; Musgrave, *ad Soph. Aj.* 473. Hence the meaning: *Was not our heart in an extraordinarily ferrent commotion?* Comp. Ps. xxxix. 4; Jer. xx. 9. Quite naturally the two disciples abstain from explaining more fully the excitement of feeling that they had experienced, because such an excitement, comprehending several affections, rises into consciousness, as divided into its special elements, the less in proportion as its experiences are deep, urgent, and marvellous. The *connection* of the question with what precedes is: "Vere Christus est, nam non alia potuit esse causa, cur in via eo loquente tantopere animus noster inflammaretur," Maldonatus. — ὥς διύνοιγεν κ.τ.λ.] without καί (see the critical remarks) adds the special to the general *asyndetically*, in which form that which is urgent and impressive of the recollection expresses itself. — Ver. 33. αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ] Certainly after such an experience the meal of which they had intended to partake was immediately given up. They had now no more irresistible necessity than that of *communicating* with their fellow-disciples in Jerusalem, and "jam non timent iter nocturnum, quod antea dissuaserant ignoto comiti, ver. 29," Bengel.

Vv. 34, 35. Λέγοντας] belongs to τοὺς ἑνδεκα καὶ τοὺς συν αὐτοῖς, who in a body met them as they arrived with the cry: ἡγέρθη ὁ κύριος κ.τ.λ. On the discrepancy with Mark xvi. 13, see on the passage. — ἡγέρθη and ὤφθη are placed first with triumphant emphasis, as contrasted with what is narrated at vv. 11, 12. The appearance to *Peter*, which Luke has not related further (but see 1 Cor. xv. 5), took place in the interval, after what is contained in ver. 12. "Apparitiones utrimque factae, quibus se invicem confirmabant illi, quibus obtigerant," Bengel. — Σίμωνι] at that time the name which was still the general favourite in the circle of the disciples. According to Lange's fancy, the apostle after his fall laid aside his name of *Peter*, as a priest his consecrated robe, and an officer his sword. Jesus Himself named him, indeed, before and after his fall, almost exclusively *Simon* (Matt. xvii. 25; Mark xiv. 37; Luke xxii. 31; John xxi. 15). In Luke xxii. 34, Πέτρε has a special

significance. — Moreover, ver. 34 ought to have forbidden the assumption that Luke distinguishes the two disciples who went to Emmaus above the apostles (Hilgenfeld). — Ver. 35. *καὶ αὐτοί*] *and they* on their part, as contrasted with those who were assembled. — *ἐν τῇ κλάσει*] not: *in* the breaking, but *at the time of* the breaking. See on ver. 31.

Vv. 36, 37. *Αὐτὸς ἔσται ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν*] *He Himself stood in the midst of them.* These words point to the fact that Luke, who already at ver. 31 has related also a sudden disappearance and vanishing of Jesus, conceived of a *marvellous, instantaneous appearance of the Risen One in the circle of His disciples*, and this is confirmed by the narrative in John xx. 19 of the appearance of Jesus within closed doors. The subsequently (ver. 37) related impression upon those who were assembled is, moreover, easily explained from this fact, although they had just before spoken as specified at ver. 34. — *ἐν μέσῳ*] “*id significantius quam in medium*,” Bengel. — *εἰρήνη ὑμῖν*] *Peace to you!* The usual Jewish greeting *שלום*, x. 5. — Ver. 37. *πνεῦμα*] a departed *spirit*, which, having come from Hades, appeared as an *umbra* in an apparent body; the same that Matthew, xiv. 26, calls *φάντασμα*.

Ver. 38. *Wherefore arise thoughts in your heart?* i.e., *wherefore have ye not immediately and without any consideration* (see on Phil. ii. 14) *recognised me as the person I am?*

Ver. 39. In the *first* half of the verse Jesus desires to remove from His disciples their *consternation*, and that by means of their being required to convince themselves *that it is He Himself* (no other); in the *second* half He desires to oppose *the notion of a πνεῦμα*, and that in such a way that they should be persuaded that it is He *bodily*. The two parts of ver. 39 correspond, that is to say, to the two parts of ver. 38. — *τὰς χεῖράς μου κ. τ. πόδας μ.*] These, pointed to as a proof that it is *He Himself*, must afford this proof by the traces of the crucifixion, namely, by the *wounds of the nails* in the hands and feet (as to the nailing of the feet, see on Matt. xxvii. 35). Comp. John xx. 20.¹ Accord-

¹ Without reason Schleiermacher says of these wounds: “*they may have been two or four*” (p. 447). He has indeed taken up a position of great indifference

ing to Paulus and de Wette, Jesus pointed to His hands and feet as the *uncovered* parts, in order to oppose the notion of a spirit. In this way αὐτὸς ἐγὼ would have to be understood of the *reality*, not of the *identity* of His appearance. But the hands and the feet were seen even without special pointing to them; the latter presupposes a characteristic to be recognised by closer inspection. Even this characteristic, however, could not prove the *reality* (since it might appear as well in a φάντασμα or εἰδωλον), but probably the *identity* though apart from the reality, for which latter the conviction was to be added by means of *touch*. — ὅτι] is in both cases: *that*. On σάρκα κ. ὁστέα οὐκ ἔχει, comp. Hom. Od. xi. 219.

Vv. 41-43. "Ετι] in the sense of *still*; see Schneider, *ad Plat. Rep.* p. 449 C. — ἀπὸ τῆς χαρᾶς] *on account of the* (presently experienced by them, comp. xxii. 45; Acts xii. 14; Matt. xiii. 44) *joy*. That a great and happy surprise keeps back and delays the full conviction of the truth of the happy event itself, is a matter of psychological experience; Liv. xxxix. 49: *Vix sibimet ipsi prae nec opinato gaudio credentes*. — εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ἔχετε κ.τ.λ.] πρὸς πλείονα πίστιν καὶ βεβαιωτέραν ἀπόδειξιν τοῦ μὴ δοκεῖν φάσμ., Euthymius Zigabenus. — καὶ ἀπὸ μελισσ. κηρίου] *and (some) of a bee's honeycomb (fatus)*. μελισσίου is added as a distinction from any other kind of honey. The word, however, does not elsewhere occur, but μελισσαῖος (Nicander, *Th.* 611); 1 Sam. xiv. 27: κηρίον τοῦ μέλιτος. On διδόναι ἀπό, comp. xx. 10. — Ver. 43. ἔφαγεν] in respect of which what had already gone before (vv. 39, 40) must keep at a distance the idea of a merely *apparent* eating, such as is attributed to angels, Tob. xii. 19 (comp. Gen. xviii. 8, xix. 3). Comp. Acts x. 41.

Ver. 44. Εἶπεν δὲ αὐτοῖς] after the eating; a continuation of the same scene. According to the simple narrative, it is altogether unwarrantable to place an interval between these

about the question whether Jesus was actually or only apparently dead (in respect of which he sophistically misuses Acts ii. 27); but still a merely apparent death does not come to the same thing, and it is only opposed to the (true) view of the resurrection that the disciples took *internal* for *external* phenomena. See especially p. 471.

two passages.¹ No impartial reader could do this, and how easy would it have been for Luke to give a hint to that effect! — οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι κ.τ.λ.] *these* (namely, that I—as ye have now convinced yourselves—after my sufferings and death have actually arisen) *are the words* (in their *realization*, namely) *which I spoke to you while I was yet with you*, to wit, *that all things must be fulfilled*, etc. (the *substance* of the λόγοι). Jesus assuredly often actually *said* this to them, according to the substance generally. Comp. xviii. 31 f., xxii. 37; Matt. xxvi. 56, and elsewhere. — ἔτι ὃν σὺν ὑμ.] for by death He was *separated* from them, and the earlier association with them was not, moreover, now again after the resurrection restored.² — ἐν τῷ νόμῳ Μ. κ. προφ. κ. ψαλμοῖς] certainly contains in itself that which is essential of the Jewish tripartite division of the Canon into *law* (תּוֹרָה), *prophets* (נְבִיאִים), and *Hagiographa* (כְּתוּבִים). Under the *law* was reckoned merely the Pentateuch; under the *prophets*, Joshua, Judges, 1st and 2d Samuel, 1st and 2d Kings (נְבִיאִים ראשונים), and

¹ But to say, with Ebrard, p. 596, that the passage vv. 44–49 depicts in general the *whole of the teaching communicated to the disciples by Christ* after His resurrection, is just as marvellous a despairing clutch of harmonistics. So also older harmonists, and even Grotius. Wieseler, in the *Chronol. Synopse*, p. 423 f., like Bengel and others, places between ver. 43 and ver. 44 the *forty days*, after the lapse of which ver. 44 ff. is spoken on the day of the ascension. But his proof depends on the *presupposition* that in the Gospel and in Acts i. Luke must needs follow the *same* tradition in respect of the time of the ascension. The separation of ver. 44 from what precedes ought not only to have been prevented by the use of the δὲ (comp. on ver. 50), but also by the use of the οὗτοι, referring as it does to what goes before. Lange, *L. J.* II. 3, p. 1679, represents ver. 45, beginning with ὅτε δὲ ἀναξεν κ.τ.λ., as denoting the forty days' ministry of Jesus begun on that evening; for he maintains that the unfolding of the knowledge did *not* occur *in a moment*. But why not? At least there needed no longer time for that purpose than for the instructions of ver. 27. Rightly, Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* II. 2, p. 5, declares himself opposed to separations of that kind; nevertheless, he afterwards comes back to a similar arbitrary interpolation of the forty days in vv. 45–49. If the place for the forty days has first been found here, there is indeed sufficient room to place the direction of ver. 49, κατέβηκεν ἐν τῇ πόλει κ.τ.λ., first *after the return* of the disciples from Galilee, as Lange does; but Luke does not, since he here absolutely excludes a withdrawal on their part to Galilee. Ewald rightly recognises (*Gesch. des Apost. Zeitalt.* p. 93) that Luke limits all appearances of the Risen One to the resurrection Sunday. So also, impartially, Bleek, Holtzmann.

² Grotius well says: "nam tunc tantum κατ' οἰκνομίαν illis aderat."

the prophets properly so called, except Daniel (נְבִיאִים אֲחֵרִים); under the *Hagiographa*, all the rest of the canonical Scriptures, including Daniel, Esther, Ezra and Nehemiah (the two reckoned together as one book), and Chronicles. See Bava Bathra f. xiv. 2; Lightfoot, p. 900. Yet, according to the use of *προφητ.* and *ψαλμ.* elsewhere (comp. xx. 42) from the mouth of Jesus, it is not to be assumed that He by these two designations intended to express that definite literary historical extent of the נְבִיאִים, and the whole of the *Hagiographa*. He means the *prophets proper* who have prophesied of Him (ver. 25), from whom He certainly, moreover, did not think Daniel excluded (Matt. xxiv. 15); and by *ψαλμ.*, the *actual* Psalms in the *accustomed* sense as that portion of the Scripture in which, besides the law and the prophets, the Messianic prophecy is chiefly deposited. Moreover, observe the non-repetition of the article before *προφ.* and *ψαλμ.*, whereby the three portions appear in their *connection* as constituting one whole of prophecy.

Vv. 46, 47. *Καὶ οὕτως ἔδει* being deleted (see the critical remarks), the passage reads: *for thus it is written that the Messiah should suffer and rise again, etc., and that there should be announced, etc.* By means of *ὅτι* Jesus adds the circumstance *in the way of motive*, on account of which He opened their *νοῦς*, etc.; *οὕτω*, however, has its reference in these instructions just given: *in the manner, in such a way* as I have just introduced you into the understanding of the Scripture. What follows, being conceived under the form of *doctrinal positions* ("the Messiah suffers," etc.) as far as the end of ver. 47, is then *the Messianic summary* of Old Testament prophecy. — *ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόμ. αὐτοῦ*] *on the foundation of His name*—on the confession of this name, to wit, by which the whole evangelic agency is supported—depends the announcement of repentance and forgiveness, as far as concerns their specific purpose and their characteristic nature. Comp. Acts iii. 16, iv. 17 f., v. 28, 40. — *ἀρξάμενον*] for which Erasmus and Markland conjectured *ἀρξαμένων*,¹ is the *impr-*

¹ As D actually reads. Other attempts at improvement: *ἀρξαιμένην*, *ἀρξάμενος*. In respect of *ἀρξάμενοι*, followed by Ewald, see the critical remarks.

sonal accusative neuter: incipiendo (Herodotus, iii. 91, and thereon Schweighäuser), *i.e. so that it* (the office of the *κηρυχ-θῆναι*) *begins, i.e. from Jerusalem* (Ast, *Lex. Plat.* I. p. 288). See Winer, p. 550 [E. T. 779]; Bornemann, *Schol. in loc.* Comp. Buttman, *Newest. Gr.* p. 321 [E. T. 374 f.]. — ἀπὸ Ἱερουσα.] as the metropolis of the whole theocracy. Comp. Isa. ii. 3, xl. 9, and elsewhere; Acts i. 8; Rom. xv. 19. — εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη] *among all nations*, Matt. xxviii. 19.

Ver. 48. Ἔστε] indicative. — τοῦτων] is arbitrarily referred only to the sufferings and the resurrection (so also Kuinoel and de Wette). It must belong to all the *three* points previously mentioned. Hence: "But it is your business to testify that according to the prophecies of Scripture the Messiah actually suffered, and is risen again, and repentance and forgiveness are announced on the ground of His name," etc. Of the former two points the apostles were eye-witnesses; of the last, they were themselves the first executors, and could therefore in their office testify of their experience that according to the prophecies of Scripture is announced, etc.

Ver. 49. Encouragement to this calling of bearing witness by assurance of the sending of the Spirit, and they were not to leave Jerusalem until after they had received this mission. Comp. Acts i. 4. They were therefore soon to receive it, and not before their reception of it to enter upon their calling. — ἐγώ] *it is I who send*. The *present* of the near and certain future. Moreover, this assurance has as its presupposition the approaching ascension. Comp. John vii. 39, xvi. 7, 13-15; Acts ii. 33. — καθίσατε κ.τ.λ.] In respect of the difference of the evangelical traditions about the place of sojourn of the risen Lord and His disciples, see on Matt. xxviii. 10. On καθίζειν, *to remain*, to abide in peace, comp. Acts xviii. 11. — Jesus characterizes *the gifts of the Holy Ghost* by the expression τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πατρὸς μου (Acts i. 4), *so far as God promised the bestowal thereof by prophetic prediction*.¹ Joel iii.

¹ The discrepancy, apparent indeed, though too much insisted on by Strauss, II. p. 645 ff., between the passage before us and John xx. 22 f. is perfectly explained when it is observed that in this passage *the communication of the*

1, 2; Isa. xlv. 1 ff.; Ezek. xxxvi. 27, xxxix. 29. Comp. Acts ii. 16 ff.; and on Eph. i. 13; Gal. iii. 14. The pouring out of the Spirit is the *realization* of the promise of the Father.—*ἔως οὗ ἐνδύσησθε δύναμιν ἐξ ὑψους*] *till ye have been endued with* (definitely; hence without *ἄν*) *power from on high* (*rim coelitus suppeditatam*), to wit (comp. Acts i. 8), *by the Holy Spirit*. The power is *distinct* from the Spirit Himself, i. 35. The metaphoric use of *ἐνδύεσθαι* and other verbs of clothing, to denote spiritual relations into which man is translated or translates himself (comp. also Rom. xiii. 14; Gal. iii. 27; Eph. iv. 24; Col. iii. 12), is not a Hebraism, but is also frequently found in the classical writers. See Kypke, I. p. 345. Comp. 1 Macc. i. 28; Ecclus. xxvii. 8; *Test. XII. Patr.* p. 587. So the Latin *inducere*, Liv. iii. 33; Quint. i. 1, and elsewhere; and the Hebrew עֲבֹדָה, Judg. vi. 34; 1 Chron. xii. 18.—*ἐξ ὑψους*] comp. Eph. iv. 8.

Ver. 50. *Ἐξίγαγε κ.τ.λ.*] namely, from Jerusalem (vv. 33, 49), and that after the scene just related (vv. 36–49). Observe in respect of this—(1) that this *ἐξίγγ. κ.τ.λ.* does not agree with Acts x. 40, 41, because Jesus had openly showed Himself. (2) The immediate linking on by *δέ*, and therein the absence of any other specification of time, excludes (compare also the similar circumstance in Mark xvi. 19, 20) decisively the *forty days*, and makes the ascension appear as if it had occurred on the day of the resurrection. Comp. Zeller, *Apostelgesch.* p. 77 f.; Schleiermacher, *L. J.* p. 463. The usual naive assumption is nothing else than an arbitrary attempt at harmonizing: *οὐ τότε ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ τεσσαρακοστῇ ἡμέρᾳ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν· τὰ γὰρ ἐν τῷ μέσῳ παρέδραμεν ὁ εὐαγγελιστής*, Euthymius Zigabenus. Comp. Theophylact, Kuinoel, Elbrarl, and many others, including Gebhardt, *Auferst. Chr.* p. 51 f. Luke himself could neither *wish* to leave the reader to guess this, nor could the reader *guess* it. That Luke also in other places goes on with *δέ* without any definite connection (in discourses: xvi. 1, xvii. 1, xviii. 1, xx. 41; in events: xx. 27, 41, 45,

Spirit κατ' ἱστορίαν, which was the substance of the *prophetic promise*, is meant, and that this which was to follow *at Pentecost* does not exclude an earlier and preliminary communication.

xxi. 1; de Wette, comp. Elbrand) in such an extension as this (according to de Wette, he *forgot* in ver. 50 to specify the late date), is an entirely erroneous supposition. There remains nothing else than the exegetic result—that a *twofold* tradition had grown up—to wit—(1) that Jesus, *even on the day of the resurrection*, ascended into heaven (Mark xvi., Luke in the Gospel); and (2) that after His resurrection *He abode still for a series of days* (according to the Acts of the Apostles, forty days) *upon the earth* (Matthew, John). Luke in the Gospel followed the *former* tradition, but in the Acts *the latter*. Hence we may infer in regard to the latter account, either that he did not learn it until after the compiling of his Gospel, or, which is more probable, that he adopted it as the correct account. As to the variation in the traditions regarding the *locality* of the appearances of the risen Lord, see on Matt. xxviii. 10. — ἐξω] with verbs compounded with ἐκ; see Lobeck, *ad Aj.* p. 334, *ad Phryn.* p. 10; Bornemann, *Schol.* p. 166. — ἕως εἰς Βηθ.] *as far as to Bethany*, not necessarily into the village itself, but (comp. Matt. xxi. 1) as far as to the part of the Mount of Olives where it enters into Bethany. Comp. Acts i. 12. — ἐπάρας τ. χειρας] the gesture of blessing, Lev. ix. 22.

Ver. 51. Ἐν τῷ εὐλογ.] therefore still *during* the blessing, —not immediately after, but actually engaged in the discourse and attitude of blessing on parting from them. According to the usual reading: διέστη ἀπ' αὐτῶν κ. ἀνεφέρ. εἰς τ. οὐραν.. *He separated Himself from them*, and (more specific statement of this separation) *was taken up into heaven*. The passive voice does not require us to assume that there were *any agents* to carry Him up (according to de Wette, probably *angels* or a *cloud*). The *imperfect* is pictorial. Luke thinks of the ascension as a *visible* incident, which he has more fully represented at Acts i. According to Paulus, indeed, κ. ἀνεφέρ. εἰς τ. οὐρ. is held to be only an *inference*! Moreover, if the words κ. ἀνεφέρ. εἰς τ. οὐρ. are not genuine (see the critical remarks), then the ascension is certainly *meant* even by the mere διέστη ἀπ' αὐτῶν; but here it is not yet definitely *indicated*, which indication, together with the detailed *description*, Luke reserves for the beginning of his second book,—till then, that διέστη

ἀπ' αὐτῶν was sufficient,—the matter of fact of which was already incidentally mentioned at ix. 51, and was elsewhere familiar. On δέσση, *secessit*, comp. Hom. *Il.* xii. 86, xvi. 470; Valckenaer, *Schol. in loc.*

REMARK.—On the subject of the *ascension*¹ the following considerations are to be noted:—(1) Considered in general, it is incontestably established as an *actual fact* by means of the testimony of the New Testament.² For, besides that in the passage before us it is historically narrated (comp. with Acts i. and Mark xvi.), it is also expressly predicted by Jesus Himself, John xx. 17 (comp. as early as the suggestion in vi. 62); it is expressly mentioned by the apostles as having happened (Acts ii. 32, 33, iii. 21; 1 Pet. iii. 22; Col. iii. 1 ff.; Eph. ii. 6, iv. 10. Comp. Acts vii. 56; 1 Tim. iii. 16; Heb. ix. 24); and it forms—and that, too, as a *bodily* exaltation into heaven to the throne of the glory of God—the necessary historical presupposition of the whole preaching of the *Parousia* (which is a real and bodily return) as of the resuscitation of the dead and transformation of the living (which changes have their necessary condition in the glorified body of Him who is to accomplish them, viz. Christ, 1 Cor. xv. 5 ff., 8, 16, 22, 23; Phil. iii. 20, 21, and elsewhere). (2) But the idea of a *visibly, yea, sensibly glorious event* must the rather be considered as an addition of subsequent tradition which grew up as a reflection of the idea of the *Parousia*, Acts i. 11, since only Luke, and that certainly merely in the Acts (Mark not at all, xvi. 18), expressly relates

¹ *Heaven* is not herein to be taken in the sense of the omnipresence of the courts of God, as the old Lutheran orthodoxy, in the interest of the doctrine of Christ's ubiquity, would have it (thus also Thomasius, *Christi Pers. u. Werk*, II. p. 282 ff.), or of the unextended ground of life which bears the entire expanse of space (Schoeberlen, *Grundl. d. Heils*, p. 67), but *locally*, of the dwelling-place of the glory of God; see on Matt. vi. 9; Mark xvi. 18; Acts iii. 21. Erroneously, likewise in the sense of ubiquity, says Gess, *Pers. Chr.* p. 265: "Where Jesus, according to His divinity, chooses to be essentially present, there He will also be according to His human corporeality." No; according to the New Testament view, it must mean: *He there effectuates this His presence by the Holy Spirit in whom He communicates Himself.* See, especially, John xiv.-xvi.; Rom. viii. 9, 10. A becoming bodily present is a marvellous exception, as in the case of Paul's conversion, see on Acts ix. 3. Calvin, *Inst.* II. 16, rightly designates the being of Christ in *heaven* as a *corporalis absentia* from the earth.

² Against the denial of the capability of historical testimony to prove the actuality of miracles in general, see, especially, Rothe, *zur Dogmat.* p. 84 ff.

an event *of that kind*; but the first and fourth evangelists, although John had been an eye-witness, are wholly silent on the subject (including John vi. 62), which they hardly either morally could have been or historically would have ventured to be, since such a highest and final external glorification would have incontrovertibly made good, even from a literary point of view, the forcible impression which that event would have necessarily produced upon the faithful, and would have just as naturally and incontrovertibly put forward this most splendid Messianic *σπλῆν* as the worthiest and most glorious capestone—the *return* to heaven corresponding to the heavenly *origin*. The reasons by which it has been sought to explain and justify their silence (see *e.g.* in Flatt's *Maga.* VIII. p. 67; Olshausen; Krabbe, p. 532 f.; Hug, *Gutacht.* II. p. 254 ff.; Ebrard, p. 602; Lange, II. p. 1762 ff.) are nothing more than forced, feeble, and even psychologically untenable evasions. Comp. Strauss, II. p. 657 f. (3) The *body of the risen Lord* was not yet in the state of glorification (it has flesh and bones, still bears the scars of the wounds, is touched, breathes, eats, speaks, walks, etc., in opposition to Theophylact, Augustine,¹ Krabbe, Ewald, Thomasius, Keim, and the old dogmatic writers); but, moreover, no longer of the same constitution as before the resurrection (Schleiermacher), but, as Origen already perceived, in a condition standing midway between² mundane corporeality and supra-mundane glorification—and immortal (Rom. vi. 9, 10). Although, on account of the want of any analogy within our experience, such a condition of necessity does not admit of a more exact representation, yet still it explains in general the sort of estrangement between the risen Lord and His disciples,—the partial doubt of the latter as to His identity, His not being hindered by the crucifixion wounds, His marvellous appearance and disappearance, and the like; moreover, by the consideration that Jesus rose again in a *changed* bodily constitution, the *physiological* scruples which have been raised against His rising from not merely apparent death are removed. The actual *glorification* whereby His body became the *σῶμα πνευματικόν* (1 Cor. xv. 45–47), the *σῶμα τῆς ἁγίας αὐτοῦ* (Phil. iii. 21), first began in the moment

¹ "Claritas in Christi corpore, cum resurrexit, ab oculis discipulorum potius abscondita fuisse, quam defuisse credenda est," Augustine, *De cir. Dei*, xxii. 9.

² Comp. Martensen's *Dogmat.* § 172; Schmid, *Bibl. Theol.* I. p. 118; Hasse, *Leben d. verkört. Erlös.* p. 113, who, however, mingling truth and error, represents the resurrection body of Christ already as *σῶμα πνευματικόν* ("a confluence of spirit and body," p. 123). More accurately, Taute, *Religions-philosophie*, 1852, II. 1, p. 340 ff.

of the ascension, when His body was transformed into the spiritual body, as they who are still living at the time of the *Parousia* shall be *transformed* (1 Cor. xv. 51, 52), still with this difference, that the body of the latter up to that moment is still mortal (1 Cor. xv. 53), whereas the body of Christ, even from the time of the resurrection, was immortal; hence also an appeal to the marvellous healing power of Jesus, which was powerfully exercised on Himself (Hase, *L. J.* § 118), is here insufficient and inapplicable. The perfecting of this glorification of the body of Christ is not to be regarded as a matter to be perceived by the senses, since in general a glorified bodily organ does not fall into the category of things perceptible by human sense. The same is the case with the taking up of the glorified Christ into heaven, which, according to the analogy of Luke xxiv. 31, is perhaps conceivable in the form of a *vanishing*. (4) Of the two traditions which had grown up in regard to the *time of the ascension* (see on ver. 50), in any case the one bearing that after His resurrection Jesus still abode on earth for a series of days, is decidedly to be preferred to the other, that even as early as the day of resurrection He also ascended. And this preference is to be given on the preponderating authority of John, with which is associated also Paul, by his account of the appearances of the risen Lord, 1 Cor. xv. 5-7,¹ and the notices of Acts x. 41, xiii. 31.² Still there must remain a doubt therein whether the definite specification of *forty* days does not owe its origin to *tradition*, which fixed the *approximate* time (comp. Acts xiii. 31) at this sacred number. The remarkable testimony of Barnabas, *Ep.* 15 (ἀγομεν τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ὀγδόην εἰς εὐπροσώνην, ἐν ᾗ καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνέστη ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ φανερωθεὶς ἀέρι εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς), in no way agrees with the forty days.³

¹ Although at 1 Cor. xv. it is not possible definitely to recognise whether *all* the appearances, which are specified before ver. 8, occurred *before* or *after* the ascension. Very little to the point, moreover, does Strauss (*Christus des Glaubens*, p. 172) lay stress on the fact that Paul knows nothing of "*touching and eating proofs*." These, indeed, did not at all belong to the purpose and connection of his representation, as little as in the Acts at the narrative of the conversion of Paul "*broiled fish and honeycomb*" could find a place.

² But to seek to make out an agreement between the narrative of Luke about the appearances of the risen Lord with that of Paul (see *e.g.* Holtzmann) can in no way be successful.

³ It may be supposed, with Weisse, that the ascension was here placed on the *resurrection* Sunday, or, with Ebrard, Lange, and many others, that it was *generally* placed on a Sunday. In respect of the latter supposition, indeed, the number forty has been given up, and it has been taken as a round number and increased to forty-two. But if, with Dressel, *Patr. Ap.* p. 36, a point be put

(5) If the appearances of the risen Lord are transferred as products of the imaginative faculty into the *subjective* region (Strauss, Holsten, and others), or if, in spite of the unanimous attestation of the third day as being that on which they first began, they are viewed as spiritual visions of the glorified One in the deepest excitement of aspiration and prayer (Ewald, *Gesch. d. Apost. Zeitalt.* p. 68 ff.); then, on the one hand, instead of the resurrection, in the sense of the New Testament, as an historical starting-point, there remains only the personal continuance of the exalted One (Schenkel); and, on the other hand, the ascension does not appear as an objective fact, but just as nothing more than the end of that powerful excitement, and this must carry with it the conclusion that from him to whom He in such wise appeared, the glorified One vanished again tranquilly into His everlasting glorification with God (Ewald, *l.c.* p. 95 ff.). Every spiritualizing of those appearances into internal experiences, "into glorifications of the image of His character in the hearts of His faithful people" (Schenkel), and the like, must convert a strange, widespread fanaticism into the fruitful mother of the mighty apostolic work, and into the foundation of the ecclesiastical edifice, but must regard the Gospel narratives on the matter as products and representations of self-deceptions, or as a kind of ghost stories,—a view which the narratives of the Apostle John in reference thereto most decisively forbid. Comp. on Matt., Remark after xxviii. 10. This, withal, is opposed to the generalization of the concrete appearances into continued influences of the Lord, who still lived, and of His Spirit (Weizsäcker), in which for the ascension, as such, there is left nothing historical. Weisse's view, moreover, is absolutely irreconcilable with the New Testament narratives, *identifying as it does* the ascension *with the resurrection*, so that, according to apostolic view, the fact was no going forth of the body from the grave, but the taking up of the soul (with a spiritual corporeality) out of Hades into heaven, whence the exalted One announced Himself in visions (see also Weisse, *Evangelicafrage*, p. 272 ff.; Gebhardt, *Anferst. Chr.* p. 72). To make out of the ascension absolutely the *actual* death which Jesus, being awakened from apparent death, soon after died (Paulus), could only be attained at the height of naturalistic outrage on the New Testament, but is not after *ἐκπαύω*, and what follows be taken as an independent clause, this is a very unfortunate evasion, by means of which *καὶ φανισθεὶς κ.τ.λ.* is withdrawn from all connection, and is placed in the air. Not better is Gebhardt's notion, *Anferst. Chr.* p. 52, that Barnabas, in mentioning also the ascension, did not intend to make *specification of date* at all for it.

avoided also by Schleiermacher in his wavering expressions. The *mythical* construction out of Old Testament recollections (Strauss), and the directly hostile crumbling and destruction of the Gospel narratives (Bruno Bauer), amount to subjective assumptions contradictory of history; whilst, on the other hand, the revival of the Socinian opinion of a *repeated* ascension (Kinkel in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1841, p. 597 ff.¹) depended on erroneous interpretations of single passages (especially John xx. 17). Finally, the abandoning of all attempts historically to ascertain the fact (de Wette on ver. 53) does justice neither to the accounts and intimations of the New Testament itself, nor to the demands which science must make on the ground of those intimations.

Ver. 52. *Καὶ αὐτοί]* and *they* on their part, after the Lord was separated from them (and was taken up into heaven). To the *ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τ. οὐρ.* corresponds in this place the equally suspicious *προσκυν. αὐτόν* (see the critical remarks on ver. 51 f.), which is referred to Him who was exalted to heavenly dominion. — *μετὰ χαρᾶς μεγάλ.]* at this final blessed perfecting of their Lord Himself (John xiv. 28), and at the blessing which they had just received from Him. “Praeludia Pentecostes,” Bengel. “Corpus suum intulit coelo, majestatem suam non abstulit mundo,” Augustine.

Ver. 53. *Καὶ ἦσαν διὰ παντός ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ]* *κατὰ τοὺς καιροὺς δηλονότι τῶν συνάξεων, ὅτε εἶναι ἐν αὐτῷ ἐξῆν*, Euthymius Zigabenus. The popular expression *διὰ παντός* is not to be pressed (comp. ii. 37), hence it does not exclude the coming together in another locality (Acts i. 13, ii. 44) (in opposition to Strauss). Comp. Lechler, *Apost. u. Nachapost. Zeitult.* p. 281. Moreover, after the pouring forth of the Spirit, they continued as pious Israelites daily in the temple, Acts ii. 46, iii. 1.

¹ Comp. moreover, Taute, *Religionsphilosophie*, II. 1, p. 380 ff., according to whom the resurrection of Christ is said to have been His first descent out of the intelligible region of the existence of all things, but the ascension His last resurrection appearance, so that resurrection and ascension are so related to one another as special epoch-making appearances of the Lord before the brethren after His death. With such extravagant imaginations of historical details of faith is the *philosophy of Herbert*, even against its will, driven forth far beyond the characteristic limits which by *Herbert himself* are clearly and definitely laid down.

MORRISON AND GIBB, EDINBURGH,
PRINTERS TO HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE.